IAEG-SDG's

Open Consultation for Members and Observers

(As of 15 September 2015)

Table of Contents

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
The World Bank would like to expand on its earlier comment regarding indicators for Target 1.2:

"Both the language and the spirit of the SDG objective reflect the growing acceptance of the idea that poverty is a multidimensional concept that reflects multiple deprivations in various aspects of well-being. With this in mind, the World Bank has convened a high level Global Poverty Commission to explore how poverty should be measured. The MPI is being considered by the Commission, along with other possibilities. The selection of appropriate indicators for global monitoring depends on the interpretation of SDG target 1.2. If reducing poverty in every dimension is the major concern, then a dashboard approach – measuring each dimension of poverty/deprivation separately – would be an appropriate way to monitor progress at the global level. However, this would add a significant number of additional indicators to the framework, and since the SDG framework as a whole is a dashboard approach, introducing a smaller dashboard for SDG 1.2 could be confusing. Moreover, if the interest is to monitor the change in all dimensions of poverty using a single statistic, then there is an argument for considering a composite indicator - such as the MPI and others, which can be disaggregated to obtain the proportion of men, women, and children in poverty as required by the target."

Sincerely,
Umar Serajuddin)

24 Aug, 2015

Genevieve Verdier (IMF)
Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 1.3:

For each of the categories considered (pensions, unemployment benefits, disabilities benefits, etc.), indicators for coverage (the share of the relevant population that receives the benefit) and the generosity of the program (average benefit/average income) should be calculated. At the moment, the second component is not included in the list of indicators. Source data may be both databases based on administrative data (for example collected by ILO) and collections of household surveys (such as those used by the World Bank).

Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 1.a:

The suggested indicator is related to public expenditure and hence does not directly measure resource mobilization. Indicators for this target should be linked to those for Target 17.1.

25 Aug, 2015

Flora Sutherland (United Nations Mine Action Service)

The United Nations Mine Action Service suggests that the number of deaths due to landmines and other explosive remnants of war should be one of the causes of deaths and injuries that are disaggregated in the indicator for 1.5. The United Nations Mine Action Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism could provide a source for this data.

28 Aug, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

We would like to submit our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion.

Synergies should be sought between the indicators for the SDGs and for the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR basically proposes the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework. The indicators were discussed and reviewed by more than 60 Experts from UN System, civil sector, academic and research sector, and private sector. The Attached Annex is the proposal on the Sendai Framework indicators for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OEIWG). Some indicators are selected to be proposed for the SDG. Please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document for the details of each indicator.

This proposal is also consistent with and further revised from the UNISDR Proposal in coordination with 16 UN agencies (FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO) which was submitted to the IAEG web-platform in early July.

The paper includes nine indicator proposals for the target 1.5.

We greatly appreciate your attention.

UNISDR proposal:

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).pdf

Indicator details (please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR) (UNISDR) (ishigaki@un.org)
UNISDR
31 Aug, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)
Simonetta Zarrilli (UNCTAD) - Target 1.4 and 1.b

For target 1.4 UNCTAD would like to propose some alternate indicators that incorporate the gender perspective:

a. Female share of landholding and immovable property.
b. Female share of bank/ savings accounts.
c. Female participation rate in technical and vocational training programmes.
d. Female participation rate in government support programmes (extension services, inputs, credit).
e. Proportion of micro-enterprises and SMEs owned by women that have access to mobile phones and the internet.

For target 1.b UNCTAD would like to propose some alternate indicators that incorporate the gender perspective:

a. Domestic revenues targeting specifically women as per cent of GNI, by sector.
b. Official development assistance and net private grants targeting specifically women as percent of GNI.

01 Sep, 2015

Papa Seck (UN-WOMEN)
For target 1.2, in considering additional measures of poverty, UN-Women would like to suggest the following indicator:

Proportion of people who have an independent source of income by sex, age and source of income.

Although the lack of an independent source of income is not necessarily synonymous with poverty, it does indicates a high level of dependency vis-à-vis other members of the household or community and vulnerability to poverty. For women in particular, lack of independent income means that they are completely dependent on family members to provide for them and their children and such dependency may even prevent them from leaving violent and abusive relationships (see "Solotaroff, Jennifer L.; Pande, Rohini Prabha. 2014. Violence against Women and Girls: Lessons from South Asia. World Bank Group). Such inequalities have also been found to be an important predictor of social exclusion. Therefore, we think it that it is particularly relevant for this target. This indicator is Tier 1 and can be easily obtained from existing household surveys.

For target 1.b, we would also suggest using the Share of ODA in support of gender equality and women's empowerment, disaggregated by principal and significant. Data for this indicator are regularly produced by OECD and it is classified as Tier 1. This indicator can also monitor to target 17.1.

01 Sep, 2015

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

The following are the comments from INDEC (Argentina) on this topic:

- Target 1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day: Argentina did not participate of the 2010 PPC Round, so the index of Argentina is not the result of an official measurement, it an estimation developed by the World Bank.
- 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: Argentina does not calculate Poverty Line nor Indigence Line based on Monetary Income (the last information available is from the year 2013).
- 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:

    Available information in INDEC:

    A. YES
    B. We request a definition of "child support"
    C. YES
    D. NO
    E. NO
    F. NO
    G. NO. We request a definition of the terms.

- 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: Require to define "basic services"

Sincerely,
Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)
02 Sep, 2015

Enrique Ordaz (Mexico)
This is a comment from CONEVAL, the Mexican agency responsible for poverty measurement:

There is no doubt that poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon which includes aspects related to living conditions that affect the dignity of people, limit their rights and freedoms, hamp the fulfilment of their basic needs and obstruct their full social integration. Considering only an income component neglects other dimensions of poverty, which are equally important for poverty eradication and to protect and fulfill all human rights.

A multidimensional poverty measure has place within the frame of the Agenda, not only as a means to operationalize the achievement of Goal 1 which takes into account the concept of "poverty in all its forms", but also as part of the shared principles and commitments which guide the Agenda, which recognize that to address effectively integrated solutions a new approach is needed (page 4, point 13).

Based on the foregoing, it is proposed that the indicator for Target 1.2 traced for Objective 1 could be stated as: "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." This proposal comprehends two essential aspects of Target 1.2: it

i)   recognizes the multidimensionality of poverty, and

ii)   favours each country with their specific needs. Also, allowing each country's particular definitions would take into account the specific contexts of poverty and the availability of sources of information in each one of them."

04 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

When executed correctly, the process of globalization becomes a key aspect of growth. Economic growth does not reduce poverty, it assures more equality and increases work opportunities, if and only if public spending is aimed at social programs for vulnerable population groups and institutions.

For the measurement of Targets 1.1 and 1.2 we request an explanation for the corresponding indicators of whether the measurement should be done for consumption or income expenditure. We consider that it is important to include an indicator in reference to multidimensional poverty.

To measure Target 1.3 we recommend the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean direct their efforts to the strengthening of administrative records that would allow them to calculate the indicator of percentage of population under social security systems. This indicator measures the performance of social protection networks, however, it does not take into account the system's weakness.

In order to measure Target 1.4 we request the determination of basic necessities for the estimation of the first indicator, undergoing this conceptualization implies making normative judgements on what these necessities are.

The proposed indicator for Target 1.5 does not measure enables resilience capacity to the poor. For the measurement of Target we recommend the addition of another indicator that would allow the estimation of the capacity of building resilience in impoverished individuals, Ecuador proposes the following: percentage of territory that has evacuation plans in response to extreme environmental events and the number of contingency plans.

To measure Target 1.a we request the definition of a methodology to discriminate expenditure aimed at the poorest 40% of the population. We propose an indicator relating the total amount of target specific programs over total budget assignments.

We consider the removal of the indicator 1.b important given that it does not add to the objective or the target.

Ecuador does not have the sources required for the estimation of indicators necessary to measure targets 1.4 and 1.b.

Best regards.
José Rosero
 INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 1

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

UN System Template Goals FULL - Goal 1 Sep 4 2015.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 1. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include:

  i)   reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators;
  ii)   distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators;
  iii)   refinement of the classification in tiers; and
  iv)   provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (FAO, ILO, ITU, UNEP, UNICEF, UNISDR, UN Women, UPU, and the World Bank), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 1.1: A small clarification in the language of proposed indicator that disaggregation by employment would imply measuring the 'working poor', for continuity with the MDG indicator. The proposed wording of the indicator would be: "Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day, with disaggregation by sex and age group, and by employment status (or Proportion of employed people living on less that $1.25 PPP a day - "working poor")"

Target 1.2: A small clarification in the language of one of the proposed priority indicators suggesting that the national poverty line can be monetary or multidimensional. This would incorporate comments raised by Colombia and Mexico. The proposed wording of the indicator would be: "Proportion of population living below national poverty line (defined nationally as monetary or multidimensional), disaggregated by sex and age group, and by employment status.

The other proposed priority indicator remains the same and we suggest an 'additional' indicator as well.

Target 1.3: No change. We propose IAEG-SDGs preferred indicator as well because it captures the essence of the target that calls for social protection coverage for all. We add a few details about the data sources for monitoring. For example, besides the use of administrative data, household survey data can be used to disaggregate by poverty status.

Target 1.4: The discussion here attempted to focus on the notion of 'access to basic services'. Countries are also thinking about this deeply. Consequently, there are three 'priority' indicators for consideration that reflect access to land, finance, technology and social services, and attempt to capture equality of access as well. As a result a few indicators have modified language (from the August 11 compilation).We also list the several 'additional' indicators that were discussed by the agencies.

Target 1.5: No change to suggested priority indicator. However, we list another priority indicator for consideration as well. The rest are 'additional' indicator proposals.

Target 1.a: The discussion recommends a close review of the indicator "Share of total overall government spending (incl. subnationals) on programs directed to bottom 40% of population of country (%)" since this indicator is not yet fully developed.

Two indicators that are more readily measurable are proposed for consideration as priority indicators; both were included in the August 11 document as well. One of them is modified to include spending on social protection and reads: "Spending on essential services (education and health and social protection as % of total government spending)." The other is as before.

Target 1.b: No change.

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: new loans for SMEs (# and $)

Indicator 1.2. Percentage of population using banking services. Please disaggregate by gender .

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Targets 1.5, 11.5, 13.1 and 14.2 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of deaths and missing due to hazardous events per 100,000.
- Number of affected people due to hazarouds events per 100,000. (can be combined with the above indicator)
- Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product.

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx (I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

In response to several countries' inputs on these indicators, we would like to add explanation why we propose these indicators.

1. **Linkage of follow-up / review mechanisms between the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**

The SDGs require that "data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible". (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). UNISDR would like to inform on Sendai Framework reporting mechanism:

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted in March 2015. The Members States agreed to set seven global targets and assigned a task to UNISDR to support development of indicators to monitor the Sendai global targets in coordination with other relevant mechanisms for sustainable development and climate change (para 48 (c) in the Sendai Framework).

The seven global targets include substantial reduction of (a) mortality, (b) affected people, (c) direct economic loss, (d) damage to critical infrastructure) and (e) increase of the number of countries having national and local DRR strategy, (f) international cooperation, and (g) increased availability of and access to risk information and early warning system. (Para 18 in the Sendai Framework)

The indicators we proposed for the SDGs are also proposed to the " Open- Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group for indicators and terminology of the Sendai Framework (OEIWG) " to be discussed by the government experts (the 1st meeting will be held in 28-29 September). We believe the coherence between the Sendai and the SDG follow-up/review mechanism will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis .

2. "Multi-purpose indicators" to express inter-linkage between the SDG Targets

The SDG goals and targets are inter-linked. This is supported by texts such as "sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent. (Para 13 in the SDG, finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

The 1st IAEG Report concludes that there also appeared to be broad agreement among Member States that the number of global indicators should be limited and should include multi-purpose indicators that address several targets at the same time . (Para7-1 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3))

Building on the SDG and IAEG discussion, we proposed the same indicators for several targets under different goals. For example, human related loss and economic loss indicators to monitor 1.5 (vulnerability and resilience), 11.5 (disaster loss), and 13.1 (climate change impact). In the 1 st IAEG, the Secretariat of UNDESA (UNSD) provided an illustration of links between targets and introduced this human loss indicator as an example of multi-purpose indicators.

While we understand the IAEG promotes one indicator per target, mechanically applies the principle to all targets might lose the important spirit of each target. The 1 st IAEG Report also concludes that while the number of global indicators must be limited, some targets might require multiple indicators to measure its different aspects (Para7-2 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3). For example, in the target 11.5, "number of death" "number of affected people" and "economic loss" are critical elements and it would be extremely difficult to monitor all elements if we need to select only one indicator.

We have proposed the same indicators for several targets. By this way, while the number of indicator per target might be more than one, the total number of indicators does not increase, or even less than the case for one indicator/target. (e.g. if we select the same 2 indicators for 3 targets, total number of indicators will be two). We believe the multi-purpose indicators will be the only solution to reduce the total number of indicators while allowing several indicators per target not to lose important elements included in each target.

3. National ownership

We would like to emphasize that <u>our proposals are all based on national data sources.</u> We think this is consistent with the spirit of the SDGs that says "the global review will be primarily based on national official data sources" (para 74 (a) in the SDGs, in the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). <u>Currently 85 countries have standardized national disaster loss databases and more countries will have such databases under the request of the Sendai Framework</u>. The indicators we proposed are therefore <u>measurable and comparable across time and space</u>.

In the inter-governmental working group for the Sendai Framework (OEIWG), the Member States will discuss for further standardization of disaster loss data and policy related data.

4. Indicator development process accounting for the technical robustness, measurability and inclusiveness

Between the 1st IAEG and the submission of this input, we organized a technical expert meeting inviting <u>UN agencies, scientific and academic organizations, civil sector and private sector</u> to examine and discuss indicator proposals to monitor the Sendai Framework and how to build linkage between the Sendai Indicators and SDG indicators(27-29 July, Geneva). More than 60 experts participated in the meeting and/or provided written inputs.

In the meeting, the indicator proposals were examined from <u>measurability perspective</u>. Terminology was defined and remaining challenges identified. In the meeting of intergovernmental expert working group (OEIWG), the proposed indicators will be further discussed and refined from <u>government perspective</u>.

The proposal for the Sendai Framework indicator is uploaded in the website.
http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

We appreciate your attention.

Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki UNISDR
07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)
Need to be more specific about definition of disaster

07 Sep, 2015

Live Margrethe Rognerud (Norway)
From Statistics Norway:

Comments to indicator 1.3: Regarding e) should not just be "women" but "percentage of parents" receiving maternity benefits at childbirth - to include fathers and non-traditional family structures and exclude including women that do not have children

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)

Comments from Statistics Denmark:

Indicator for target 1.1:
Very few people will be covered by this indicator in Denmark. But we believe this indicator can be very illustrative in a global perspective.

Indicator for target 1.2
We support that dimensions of poverty has to be approached according to national definiftions, as they vary a lot among the MS.

Indicator for target 1.4
Acceptable. The indicator does not capture the natural resources element, however we realize that this is not the key focus of the target and hence it cannot be expected that the indicator has a specific environmental focus for this target.

Indicator for target 1.4
Acceptable.

Usefulness in DK:
The merging of "death" and "evacuation" number seams inappropriate and will give a wrong impression on the disaster impact, e.g. 1.500. per. 100.000 could cover 1.500 deaths in Bangladesh and 1.500 temporarily evacuated in Denmark.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)

Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts, Sustainable
Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

<u>Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 1</u>

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 1:

- Proportion of population living below national poverty line
- Life expectancy at birth
- GDP per capita

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 1. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 1.1 – By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day disaggregated by sex and age group and employment status (or Proportion of employed people living on less than $1.25 PPP) a day)

Remark: This target does not stipulate disaggregated data. We do not support a disaggregation as part of the indicator.

Suggestion: *Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day.*

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.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age group.

Remark: The target already declares that the indicator using national definitions should be used. Thus, no indicator has to be "suggested" and states are free using their own poverty indicator. A disaggregation is not requested by the target and thus not required within the indicator.

Suggestion: National poverty indicator

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.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by sex, composed of the following: a) Percentage of older persons receiving a pension; b) Percentage of households with children receiving child support; c) Percentage of working-age persons without jobs receiving support; d)Percentage of persons with disabilities receiving benefits; e) Percentage of women receiving maternity benefits at childbirth; f) Percentage of workers covered against occupational injury; and g) Percentage of poor and vulnerable people receiving benefits.

Remark: Not one but seven different indicators (a to g) are suggested by the list of Aug 11. We do believe that they don`t really give a good insight in the effects of national social protection systems and data availability for these indicators in general is poor. That is why we do suggest replacing them by maximal three indicators:

Suggestion: We would like to replace the indicators by at maximum:

- "Average social protection transfers as % of income / or poverty line" (previously 1.3.2)
- "Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems" (previously 1.3.1) and

- "Reduction of the poverty gap by social transfers"

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.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services.

Remark: The definition of "basic services" is unclear.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)

Remark: Agriculture takes place to a considerable extent on rented land, so far no significance.

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.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.

Remark: Adding up deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated people does not make much sense. Should these cases really be equally weighted? Was a death person injured before and is counted twice?

Suggestion: We would be pleased to replace the indicator by: Number of deaths due to disasters per 100,000 people

Target 1.b – Create sound policy frameworks at the national, regional and international levels, based on pro-poor and gender sensitive development strategies, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of national action plans related to multi-lateral environmental agreements that support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty and sustainably use natural resources.

Remark: Only counting the number of national action plans does not provide any information on fulfilment of target 1b. In general it should be questioned if indicators are required to measure political actions.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

For the indicators that pertain to employment, we suggest to also take into account informal employment arrangements.

07 Sep, 2015

Marielza Oliveira (UNDP)

The Multidimensional Poverty Index is a synthetic measure of acute **multidimensional poverty**, particularly suited to measure Target 1.2 as It reflects multiple deprivations, in basic services and core human functionings, for people. The MPI uses the household as a unit of analysis, and reveals deprivations in three dimensions: <u>health</u>, <u>education</u>, and <u>standard of living</u>. These are measured using ten indicators : two each for health and education, and six for assets. It uses micro data from household surveys. Each dimension is equally weighted; each indicator within a dimension is also equally weighted.

The MPI is the product of two numbers: the **multidimensional poverty headcount ratio** H or percentage of people who are poor, and the intensity of poverty A – which reflects the proportion of dimensions in which households are deprived: **MPI = H * A**

Each person is assigned a deprivation score according to his or her household's deprivations in each of the 10 component indicators. The maximum deprivation score is 100% with each dimension equally weighted; thus the maximum deprivation score in each dimension is 33.3%. The education and health dimensions have two indicators each, so each indicator is worth 33.3% / 2, or 16.7%. The standard of living dimension has six indicators, so each indicator is worth 33.3% / 6, or 5.6%. The indicator thresholds for households to be considered deprived are as follows:

Education:

- *School attainment:* no household member has completed at least six years of schooling.
- *School attendance*: a school-age child (up to grade 8) is not attending school.

Health:

- *Nutrition*: a household member (for whom there is nutrition information) is malnourished, as measured by the body mass index for adults (women ages 15–49 in most of the surveys) and by the height-for-age z score calculated using World Health Organization standards for children under age 5.
- *Child mortality:* a child has died in the household within the five years prior to the survey.

Standard of living:

- Electricity: not having access to electricity.
- Drinking water : not having access to clean drinking water or if the source of clean drinking water is located more than 30 minutes away by walking.
- Sanitation: not having access to improved sanitation or if improved, it is shared.6
- Cooking fuel: using 'dirty' cooking fuel (dung, wood or charcoal).
- Housing: Having a home with a dirt, sand or dung floor.
- Assets: not having at least one asset related to access to information (radio, TV, telephone7) and not having at least one asset related to mobility (bike, motorbike, car, truck, animal cart, motorboat) or at least one asset related to livelihood (refrigerator, arable land, livestock).

To identify the multidimensionally poor, the deprivation scores for each indicator are summed to obtain the **household deprivation score**, c. A cutoff of 33.3%, which is equivalent to 1/3 of the weighted indicators, is used to distinguish between the poor and non-poor.

- If the deprivation score is 33.3% or greater, that household (and everyone in it) is multidimensionally poor.
- Households with a deprivation score greater than or equal to 20% but less than 33.3% are considered to be near multidimensional poverty.
- Households with a deprivation score of 50% or higher are severely multidimensionally poor.

The headcount ratio, H, is the proportion of the multidimensionally poor in the population: **H=q/n**, where q is the number of people who are multidimensionally poor and n is the total population.

The intensity of poverty, A, reflects the proportion of the weighted component indicators in which, on average, poor people are deprived. For poor households only (deprivation score c greater than or equal to 33.3%), the deprivation scores are summed and divided by the total number of poor people. The deprivation score c of a poor individual can be expressed as the sum of deprivations in each dimension j (j = 1, 2, 3): **c = c 1 + c 2 + c 3**

07 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Marielza Oliveira (UNDP)

Serge Kapto (UNDP)
Further to Marielza's message in support of Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), and on behalf of Babatunde Omilola, Sustainable Development cluster in UNDP, here are additional suggestions of poverty indicators:

- Poverty incidence ratio
- Poverty gap ratio
- Share of poorest quintile in national income

08 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Marielza Oliveira (UNDP)

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

I have a series a concerns on the MPI.

Progress in the MPI are very difficult to interpret and a quantitative target cannot be set.

The choice of dimensions and indicators included in the MPI seems rather arbitrary, but most importantly, these dimensions (i.e. health, education, nutrition) are already fully covered by other targets. Therefore we do not need a multidimensional index of poverty as specific indicators to monitor the health, education and nutrition targets are already included in the SDG indicator framework. If we accept the logic of the MPI, why shouln't we identify composite indexes for each Goal? Or a "super" index combining all the SDG indicators?

More problematic still is the fact that all the indicators to inform the MPI have to be collected with the same survey tool. This will require a major change in the methodology of the current HH survey initiatives, or to initiate a new dedicated survey just for collecting data for the MPI, with significant waste of resources.

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

08 Sep, 2015

Vincius Pinheiro (ILO)

Reply to the comments made by the German Federal Statistical Office on the proposed indicator to measure target 1.3. (the implementation of social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable).

Many thanks for your very insightful comments. Please note that the essence of target 1.3 is the extension of social protection coverage and, therefore, measurement on "reduction of poverty gap" and "average social protection transfers as % of income or poverty line" are insufficient capture the main policy direction given by member states in the intergovernmental negotiations. The suggestion to consider the "Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems" is precisely the one included in the document and the definitions of social protection system/floors could follow the international practice as foreseen in the ILO World Social Protection Report (ILO, 2014; p. 161) and on Recommendation No. 202 on Social Protection Floors.

The aggregate indicator is estimated based on the number of persons having access to social protection coverage over the lifecycle. This includes coverage in all the main areas of social protection but health (old-age pensions, support for the jobless, occupational injury, child benefits, maternity, disability)) in line with Convention No. 102 and Recommendation 202. The indicators should be interpreted as a straightforward approximation the share of persons covered by social protection. Date is currently available as follows: Old age pensions: 175 countries; Child benefits:

109; Jobless support: 79 countries; Disability: 171 countries; Maternity: 139 countries; Occupational injury coverage: 172 countries. Further data work feasible in the short-term.

We are at your disposal to provide any further clarifications as needed. Best, Vinicius

08 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)
Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE
IAEG-SDGs Member
Goal 1

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

Suggested indicator: "Proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age group"

Comment: The suggested indicator is relevant; however, the Multidimensional Poverty Index should also be included as priority indicator in order to take into account poverty in all its dimensions.

Target 1.4: By 2030 ensure that all men and women, particularly 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

Suggested indicator: "Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)"

Comment: The suggested indicator is restricted to agricultural land and women; it is necessary to include other areas and population of interest in order to cover the target.

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.

Suggested indicator: "Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people"

Comment: We suggest complementing with some of these indicators: Population located in high-risk zones, population located in places with risk of flooding and landslides.

Target 1.A: Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular LDCs, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions.

Suggested indicator: "Share of total overall government spending (incl. subnationals) on programs directed to bottom 40% of population of country (%)"

Comment: The suggested indicator doesn't completely cover the target. It is necessary to include information about international cooperation. Also, we suggest defining the indicator in relative terms according to the magnitude of the poverty.

Target 1.B: Create sound policy frameworks at national, regional and international levels, based on pro-poor and gender-sensitive development strategies, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions

Suggested indicator: "Number of national action plans related to multi-lateral environmental agreements that support accelerated investment in actions that eradicate poverty and sustainably use natural resources"

Comment: The suggested indicator doesn't completely cover the target, excludes gender-sensitive development strategies. Also, we suggest defining the indicator in terms of compliance percentage of the action plans.

08 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)

Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 1. Changes made since the July comment period appear in red font..

Goal 1 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Singapore

Target 1.1 and 1.2: Singapore does not have a national poverty line and assistance for those who need help are means-tested.

Target 1.3: It's not clear what child support means. If it means child or family allowance such as basic income support for children (see ILO social protection for all), then it is not applicable to Singapore.

Target 1.b: As Target 1.b refers to "pro-poor and gender sensitive" development strategies, the proposed indicator on number of action plans related to MEAs has little relevance to the target.

10 Sep, 2015

Anibal Sanchez Aguilar (Peru)

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.

Suggested indicator : "Proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age group "

Comment : Peru measures poverty with the monetary approach from household surveys, measurements are also made by unsatisfied basic needs information from population censuses; it has been updating the poverty map to smaller geographical areas, and coordinates and evaluates with the University of Oxford with multidimensional measurement approach.

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.

Suggested indicator :"Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services":

Comment : Peru has some of these indicators to basic services such as potable water, sewage and electricity, therefore, it is recommended to define "basic services" in the suggested indicator.

Suggested indicator: "Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)" :

Comment : Peru incorporates questions in the Census of Agriculture to estimate this indicator, however the Agricultural Census is conducted every 10 years or more.

11 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)
Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal1. Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day.

Suggested Indicator	Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day disaggregated by sex and age group and employment status (or Proportion of employed people living on less that $1.25 PPP) a day)	Relevant

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.

Suggested Indicator	Proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age group	We support Columbia and Mexico's suggestion

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.

Suggested Indicator	Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services.	Relevant.
Suggested Indicator	Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)	"Economic resources" should not be restricted to land ownership. "Ratio of entreprenuer women-employer and self employed " could be a more relevant indicator.

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.

Suggested Indicator	Share of total overall government spending (incl. subnationals) on	Relevant

	programs directed to bottom 40% of population of country (%).	

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

As a general comment relating all goals; in terms of comparability of indicators a guideline is needed where description and scope of indicators and classifications are clearly defined.

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte(Cabo Verde)

Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow African members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day disaggregated by sex and age group and employment status (or Proportion of employed people living on less that $1.25 PPP a day)

Comment: Poverty indicator part of the MDGs and already being monitored; however data disaggregated employment status maybe difficult to collect for national statistical systems. Proposed additional indicator: Multi-Dimensional Poverty Indicator

Indicator: Percentage of population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by sex, composed of the following: a) Percentage of older persons receiving a pension; b) Percentage of households with children receiving child support; c) Percentage of working-age persons without jobs receiving support; d)Percentage of persons with disabilities receiving benefits; e) Percentage of women receiving maternity benefits at childbirth; f) Percentage of workers covered against occupational injury; and g) Percentage of poor and vulnerable people receiving benefits.

Comment: It´s not an indicator, but a series of indicators.

Need to define more precisely who are the vulnerable, or delete 'vulnerable'.

Reduce the number composing variables.

Eliminate g)

Indicator: Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services.

Comment: Need to define more precisely what we mean by 'basic services'. This applies only for private land, not community land. Also, the data will come from administrative records e.g. Registrar of Deeds.

Indicator: Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)

Comment: Difficult to collect data by age. There is a need to define landowners (UN WOMEN proposal is worth considering)

Indicator: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.

Comment: Need to define 'disasters' more precisely - is it only natural or does it also includ industrial accidents, etc

Indicator: Share of total overall government spending (incl. subnationals) on programs directed to bottom 40% of population of country (%).

Comment: Difficult to isolate the expenditure on either the poor or on the bottom 40% because for shared access by the entire population - e.g. to schools, health clinics, roads, etc. Also, difficult to target the bottom 40% - there will be many errors of exclusion and inclusion. Alternative indicator: "Percentage of resources allocated by the government directly to poverty reduction programmes"

14 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted on Behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

ODS 1..pdf

14 Sep, 2015

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

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

We would like to submit our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion.

Synergies should be sought between the indicators for the SDGs and for the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR basically proposes the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework. The indicators were discussed and reviewed by more than 60 Experts from UN System, civil sector, academic and research sector, and private sector. The Attached Annex is the proposal on the Sendai Framework indicators for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OEIWG). Some indicators are selected to be proposed for the SDG. Please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document for the details of each indicator.

This proposal is also consistent with and further revised from the UNISDR Proposal in coordination with 16 UN agencies (FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO) which was submitted to the IAEG web-platform in early July.

The paper includes indicator proposal for the target 2.4.

We greatly appreciate your attention.

UNISDR proposal:

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).pdf

Indicator details (please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR) (UNISDR) (ishigaki@un.org)
UNISDR
31 Aug, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)
Simonetta Zarrilli (UNCTAD) - Target 2.3

UNCTAD would like to propose some alternate indicators that incorporate the gender perspective:

   a. Female share of landholding.
   b. Female participation rate in technical and vocational training programmes.

     c. Female participation rate in government support programmes (extension services, inputs, credit).
     d. Female use rate of storage, drying and processing facilities.
     e. Female rural employment in non-farm activities.

01 Sep, 2015

Papa Seck (UN-WOMEN)

For Target 2.2, in line with India's comments (see compilation of IAEG-SDGs members), UN-Women would like to suggest adding the indicator "Prevalence of anaemia (Hb = g/dl) among women or reproductive age", disaggregated by age, location and income.

01 Sep, 2015

Hubert Escaith (WTO)

WTO comments on Target 2.b., based on the 11 August list of trade related indicators

The proposed indicator on agricultural subsidies, if implemented indiscriminately, might provide perverse incentives to increase production at the expense of environment or neighbouring countries farmers' welfare. For example, increasing subsidies to fisheries without regard to stock potential contribute to overfishing and contradicts 14.6; increasing trade distorting subsidies (those identified in the red and amber boxes by international trade agreements) create negative spillovers for farmers in other countries.

We do support OECD' suggestion of an indicator correcting and preventing "trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets, including through the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect…" Thus, a reduction in the PSE would arguably show progress towards the achievement of this target.

Either we keep indicators, PSE and tariffs, or we favour PSE for this specific entry, considering that tariffs will be monitored somewhere else (in 17.12).

04 Sept, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

One of the leading problems burdening humanity, that is hardest to confront, is the lack of food resulting in dietary deficiencies. Even while food production has grown, the number of people suffering from hunger has increased because of rapid population expansion and the lack of effective food distribution. To measure Target 2.1 we must point out that Ecuador is not familiar with the proposed Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) necessary for the calculation of the second indicator. For the measurement of Target 2.2 it is necessary to consider, in addition, the calculation

of acute and global stunting. To measure Target 2.4 we require a methodological definition of sustainable agricultural practices. It is of upmost importance that the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean focus their efforts on the strengthening of administrative records for the calculation of this indicator. To measure Target 2.a we find it important to clarify the calculation methodology of the Agriculture Orientation Index. We suggest a simpler indicator that allows the measurement of the percentage of public inversion aimed at technological improvement programs and agricultural research and others To measure Target 2.c it is necessary to define and standardize the methodology of calculation of the indicator. Ecuador does not have the required sources for the estimation of the first and second indicator of the Target 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.c. Best regards, José Rosero INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from David Muñoz (Ecuador)

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
INEC-ECUADOR and many other countries have requested additional information on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES).

The FIES allows calculating two related indicators, the percentage of individuals in the national adult population (15 or more years of age) that during the previous year have experienced moderate or severe levels of food insecurity, respectively. The severity of food insecurity is defined as the extent to which people have difficulties in accessing food of adequate quality and/or quantity due to lack of money or other resources.

This indicator is a direct implementation of the concept of "access to food" that informs the target. Experience-based food insecurity scales are the only available tools to measure directly the effective ability to access food at the individual or household level. Reliable measure at individual level is crucial to respond to the need to ensure monitoring access "by all people" and that monitoring can be conducted "in particular for the poor in vulnerable situations".

Since 2014 FAO annually collects data for about 150 countries covering more than 95% of the world population. Results for 2014 have already been processed and will be disseminated very soon.

Moreover, a number of countries already use similar tools for national food insecurity assessment (e.g., HFSSM in the US and Canada; EMSA in Mexico; EBIA in Brazil; ELCSA in Guatemala) that could provide the data needed to compute FIES comparable indicators of the prevalence of food insecurity in the population. More information on this indicator, as well as on the other indicators proposed by FAO to monitor Goal 2 can be found at the following link:

FAO indicator proposals for SDG 2.pdf

07 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 2

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

Goal 2_04092015.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 2. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (FAO, IFAD, OECD, UNEP, UNICEF UNISDR, WFP, WHO and WTO), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

- For target 2.1, we distinguish between priority indicators, "Prevalence of Undernourishment" and "Food Insecurity Experience Scale", and additional indicator, "Food Consumption Score".
- For target 2.2, we distinguish between priority indicators, "Prevalence of Stunting" and "Prevalence of Obesity" for children under five, and the rest of the World Health Assembly approved indicators which are listed as additional, as is the "Women's Dietary Diversity Score".
- For target 2.4, emissions indicators have been dropped. A second priority indicator is proposed to capture resilience: "Agriculture damage and loss to hazardous events", which will be operationalized jointly by FAO and UNISDR. "ODA to agriculture and rural

development" has been introduced as additional indicator for target 2.a
http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/Goal 2_04092015.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: *new loans for SMEs (# and $) for agribusiness*

Private sector investment in agriculture

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 2.1
Indicator should be changed. Indicator on "Prevalence of overweight and obesity" should be included

Indicator for Target 2.2
The Danish Ministry of Health believes the new indicator is very relevant in a context of developing countries mainly.

Indicator for Target 2.4
Indicator should be changed. We lack knowledge on the indicator. Is the environmental dimension included: "Sustainable agriculture" how is this defined in DK ? - as compliance of EU regulation, as organic farming, or… ?

07 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Statistics Denmark

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Withe reference to the comments from Statistics Denmark, I would like to clarify that:

Target 2.1 concerns food access whereas the indicator "Prevalence of overweight and obesity" monitors one of the possible outcomes of malnutrition. In our proposal "Prevalence of overweight and obesity" is included as priority indicator for target 2.2.

Target 2.2: In our proposal there are 2 priority indicators, "Prevalence of stunting" which is relevant mainly for developing countries (as the Danish Ministry of Health highlights) and the "Prevalence of overweight and obesity" which is relevant for developed countries and increasingly so also for the developing ones.

Target 2.4: We aknowledge that an internationally agreed definition of sustainable farming practices is needed. This does not mean that the indicator proposed is not relevant and feasible. Please find attached a document that provides detailed information on the proposed definition and methdology for the indicataros proposed by FAO for Goal 2.

FAO indicator proposals for SDG 2.pdf

We would be more than happy to continue this discussion.

Pietro Gennari
Chief Statistician and Director FAO Statistics Division

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators Sven C. Kaumanns
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 2

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 2:

- Proportion of population living below national poverty line
- Life expectancy at birth

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 2. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 2.2 – By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and

address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age

Remark: Only the combination of the indicators stunting and overweight offers a full picture of the nutrition situation. Therefore, not only stunting but also stunting, overweight, and all other forms of malnutrition need to be applied. Thus, one indicator covering all aspects should be implemented.

Suggestion : We would like to suggest a different indicator: Percentage of population showing effects of malnutrition

Target 2.4 – By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices.

Remark: In general we do support the suggested indictor. However, the definition of sustainable agricultural practices has not been clarified yet. Until a reasonable indicator for " sustainable food production systems" is available we do suggest replacing the indicator by a nutrient balance indicator.

Suggestion : We would like to replace indicator 2.4.2 and ask for a nutrient balance indicator (until something more reasonable becomes available).

Target 2.5 – By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels, and ensure access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Ex Situ Crop Collections Enrichment index

Remark: The definition of sustainable agricultural practices has to be clarified. The indicator only focuses on the conservation of genetic diversity, reflecting benefit-sharing is missing.

Suggestion: We would be pleased to replace the indicators by: "Number of permits or their equivalents made available to the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearinghouse established under the Nagoya Protocol and number of Standard Material Transfer Agreements, as communicated to the Governing Body of the International Treaty"

Target 2.a – Increase investment, including through enhanced international cooperation, in rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development and plant and livestock gene banks in order to enhance agricultural productive capacity in developing countries, in particular least developed countries.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: The Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) for Government Expenditures

Remark: It has to be clarified what is meant. Only transfers? Alternatively, government consumption or public investment?

Target 2.b – Correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets, including through the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect, in accordance with the mandate of the Doha Development Round.

Indicators suggested by the list of Aug 11: Percent change in Import and Export tariffs on agricultural products Agricultural Export Subsidies

Remark: The suggested indicators "Percentage change in import and export tariffs on agricultural products (by WTO)" and "Agricultural Export Subsidies" (by OECD) should be replaced.

Suggestion : We would be pleased to replace the indicators by: Evolution of amount of export subsidies and measures of equivalent effect notified. Distortion to agricultural incentives

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_02.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file.

We would like to highlight the following issues:

Both suggested indicators for target 2.1 fail to cover the second aspect of the target, i.e. the access to safe, nutritious and sufficient food.

Both indicators for target 2.2 cover only one specific aspect of malnutrition. An indicator on dietary diversity might be a good proxy.

The suggested indicator on target 2.3 is rather limited in scope, as it does not reflect access to land and may furthermore not be very meaningful in an international comparison. Since it is closely related to the target on income inequality (10.1), one approach could be to disaggregate the latter for small farmers.

07 Sep, 2015

Hien Ngo (IPBES)

Hien Ngo (IPBES Secretariat)

Target 2.3 - By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particulra women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment.

Suggested indicator: Value of production per labour unit (measured in constant USD), by classes of farming/pastoral/foresetry enterprise size

Source: National Enterprise surveys (LSMS-ISA) and World Bank defining a new Agricultural and Rural Integrated Survey (AGRIS)

Comment: The current LSMS-ISA survey from the World Bank is quite thorough. On the WB website currently there are only 8 countries which have data and an additional country survey results (Mali) forthcoming. I am unsure about the plans for expansion of this survey to other continents with representative countries within sub-regions. This is currently an effective indicator for particular countries within Africa only. This should probably be categorized as possibly a Tier III

Within the current LSMS – ISA - how are surveyors/WB defining soil degradation (Section 1)

Within the current LSMS – ISA approach for providing indicators – there is no specific questions for indigenous peoples or the mechanisms/farming techniques for producing crops or owning livestock.

Indicates that indicators would be published through AGRIS FAO site. This would be better kept under the FAOSTAT website or COUNTRYSTAT website as AGRIS is underdeveloped and is a web portal into country literature relating to agriculture.

Indicator 2.3.1

Comment in response to IFAD: Agreed that there should be one definition of "small scale producer" that allows for cross country comparison and the issues of scaling and extrapolation to occur (more relevant for status, trends, scenarios, and models etc.)

Comment in response to IFAD: When is the new AGRIS program (approach, questionnaire etc.) available for assessment?

Target 2.4 - By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practice that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other diseases that progressively improve land and soil quality

Suggested Indicator: % of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices

Comment: Is there an agreed definition of what constitutes "sustainable agricultural practices"? – It notes in the sources column that "most of the countries record areas which are the object of

practices contributing to environmental sustainability under various schemes….” – This is not true for many developing countries.

There is no agreement on “practices which contribute to biodiversity” therefore, it is unclear how this will be reported accurately in the national reports for the state of the world biodiversity for food and agriculture (FAO).

Similar comment above: When will the draft (proposal) for FAO's “

Area under sustainable land management” consultation process/preliminary results be available?

Are we defining “Sustainable Agricultural Practices” as SLM here? Also this should be again probably be recognized as Tier III status.

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Targets 2.4 and 15.3 (as “multi-purpose indicator”)

- Direct agricultural loss due to hazardous events (agreed to merge with FAO indicator and modify)

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx

(I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

In response to several countries' inputs on these indicators, we would like to add explanation why we propose these indicators.

1. **Linkage of follow-up / review mechanisms between the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**

The SDGs require that “data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible”. (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

UNISDR would like to inform on Sendai Framework reporting mechanism:

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted in March 2015. The Members States agreed to set seven global targets and assigned a task to UNISDR to support development of indicators to monitor the Sendai global targets in coordination with other

relevant mechanisms for sustainable development and climate change (para 48 (c) in the Sendai Framework).

The seven global targets include substantial reduction of (a) mortality, (b) affected people, (c) direct economic loss, (d) damage to critical infrastructure) and (e) increase of the number of countries having national and local DRR strategy, (f) international cooperation, and (g) increased availability of and access to risk information and early warning system. (Para 18 in the Sendai Framework)

The indicators we proposed for the SDGs are also proposed to the "Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group for indicators and terminology of the Sendai Framework (OEIWG) " to be discussed by the government experts (the 1st meeting will be held in 28-29 September). We believe the coherence between the Sendai and the SDG follow-up/review mechanism will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis.

2. "Multi-purpose indicators" to express inter-linkage between the SDG Targets

The SDG goals and targets are inter-linked. This is supported by texts such as "sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent. (Para 13 in the SDG, finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

The 1 st IAEG Report concludes that there also appeared to be broad agreement among Member States that the number of global indicators should be limited and should include multi-purpose indicators that address several targets at the same time . (Para7-1 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3))

Building on the SDG and IAEG discussion, we proposed the same indicators for several targets under different goals. For example, human related loss and economic loss indicators to monitor 1.5 (vulnerability and resilience), 11.5 (disaster loss), and 13.1 (climate change impact). In the 1 st IAEG, the Secretariat of UNDESA (UNSD) provided an illustration of links between targets and introduced this human loss indicator as an example of multi-purpose indicators.

While we understand the IAEG promotes one indicator per target, mechanically applies the principle to all targets might lose the important spirit of each target. The 1 st IAEG Report also concludes that while the number of global indicators must be limited, some targets might require multiple indicators to measure its different aspects (Para7-2 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3). For example, in the target 11.5, "number of death" "number of affected people" and "economic loss" are critical elements and it would be extremely difficult to monitor all elements if we need to select only one indicator.

We have proposed the same indicators for several targets. By this way, while the number of indicator per target might be more than one, the total number of indicators does not increase, or even less than the case for one indicator/target. (e.g. if we select the same 2 indicators for 3

targets, total number of indicators will be two). We believe <u>the multi-purpose indicators will be</u> <u>the only solution to reduce the total number of indicators while allowing several indicators per</u> <u>target not to lose important elements included in each target.</u>

3. National ownership

We would like to emphasize that <u>our proposals are all based on national data sources.</u> We think this is consistent with the spirit of the SDGs that says "the global review will be primarily based on national official data sources" (para 74 (a) in the SDGs, in the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). <u>Currently 85 countries have standardized national disaster loss databases and more</u> <u>countries will have such databases under the request of the Sendai Framework.</u> The indicators we proposed are therefore <u>measurable and comparable across time and space.</u> In the inter-governmental working group for the Sendai Framework (OEIWG), the Member States will discuss for further standardization of disaster loss data and policy related data.

4. Indicator development process accounting for the technical robustness, measurability and inclusiveness

Between the 1st IAEG and the submission of this input, we organized a technical expert meeting inviting <u>UN agencies, scientific and academic organizations, civil sector and private sector</u> to examine and discuss indicator proposals to monitor the Sendai Framework and how to build linkage between the Sendai Indicators and SDG indicators(27-29 July, Geneva). More than 60 experts participated in the meeting and/or provided written inputs.

In the meeting, the indicator proposals were examined from <u>measurability perspective.</u> Terminology was defined and remaining challenges identified. In the meeting of intergovernmental expert working group (OEIWG), the proposed indicators will be further discussed and refined from <u>government perspective.</u>

The proposal for the Sendai Framework indicator is uploaded in the website. http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

We appreciate your attention.

Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki
UNISDR

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 2. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis

of the SDG indicators on Goal 2, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

Goal 2 Agriculture.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Serge Kapto (UNDP)
On behalf of Babatunde Omilola, Sustainable Development cluster, UNDP, please find below some suggested indicators for hunger and food and nutrition security:

Hunger

- Proportion of the population below minimum dietary energy consumption
- Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age
- Global Hunger Index

Food and nutrition security

- Dietary diversity score
- Resilience score
- Share of food expenditure

08 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia.

Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 2

Target 2.2: By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons.

Suggested indicator: Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age.

Comment: We suggest including Global malnutrition (low weight-for-age) among children under five years of age as a priority index. Also, other indicators must be included in order to cover the target: We suggest the Body-mass index for adolescents, pregnant and lactating women and older persons.

Target 2.3: By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment.

Suggested indicator: Value of production per labour unit (measured in constant USD), by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size.

Comment: We suggest measuring this indicator in constant PPP USD. Also, it is necessary to complement with other indicators and disaggregations in order to cover the target.

Target 2.B: Correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets, including through the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect, in accordance with the mandate of the Doha Development Round Suggested indicator: Agricultural Export Subsidies

Comment: It is necessary to define a denominator for this indicator in order to have a reference of magnitude.

Target 2.C: Adopt measures to ensure the proper functioning of food commodity markets and their derivatives and facilitate timely access to market information, including on food reserves, in order to help limit extreme food price volatility."

Suggested indicator: Indicator of (food) Price Anomalies (IPA)

Comment: This indicator should be complemented with one about timely access to market information.

08 Sep, 2015

Dorian Kalamvrezos Navarro (FAO)
Dear members and observers, The following message by FAO has been posted in response to Brazil's comment under Topic 22. It is relayed here due to its relevance to Goal 2.

On page 4 of its assessment, Brazil comments on the need to meet minimum requirements adopted by international recommendations and statistical/technical good practices, with respect to sampling methods, using as an example the "Prevalence of population with moderate or severe food insecurity, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES).

FAO would like to address this concern by IBGE, by clarifying that:

a) Whenever national official data on food insecurity experiences, collected through food security experience-scales such as those in use in the US, Canada, Mexico, Brazil and other countries in Latin America are available, the indicator is compiled by FAO using those national data;

b) When no suitable national data are available, FAO uses data collected through the Gallup® World Poll™, after having verified that, indeed, sampling methods used do conform to best practice. This include verification that the sampling design in each country is based on available population sampling frames from national statistical institution, and that the sample selection follows appropriate statistical procedures. Gallup® is bound by contractual agreements with FAO to provide all necessary information for the verification that the procedures used in selecting the sample indeed conform to the highest possible standards;

c) FAO encourages and promotes the inclusion of the FIES survey module – or of other compatible food security scales, such as the HFSSM or the ELCSA, within large scale, national household or individual surveys conducted by national statistical agencies in order to obtain the data needed to inform the estimator.

Further on page 4, you also comment that: "the use of mathematical and/or statistical models to calculate indicators must also be disregarded , since any model is developed according to a given set of assumptions and relatively arbitrary parameters".

We wish to clarify that the statement, as it is, is rather generic and that the suggestion of disregarding any statistical model would lead to the impossibility to compute meaningful indicators. Even if it were assumed that elementary data could be obtained with no error, with the possible exception of census type data collection with full enumeration of the target population, statistical models are indispensable to produce any indicator that applies to the reference population. Moreover, statistical methods are usually necessary to quantify and minimize the likely impact of both sampling and non-sampling errors on the final indicator values. Contrary to the implied preoccupation that informs the statement, it is the absence of a proper statistical model in informing an indicator that creates arbitrariness, variability and the impossibility to harmonize measures across countries. The presumption that meaningful indicators could be produced by simple arithmetic computation from primary data collected through censuses or surveys without any statistical treatment is actually a very dangerous one. Models based on sound statistical inference theory are essential, and their use should be broadly promoted, as they are the only instrument to ensure a sufficient degree of reliability and comparability of indicators, which should always be seen as estimates of the likely true value of the variable of interest.

It is true, though, that only models demonstrated to be theoretically sound and robust to empirical application in a broad range of settings should be used and that their use in computing indicators should be fully documented, so that the published estimates should always be fully replicable from available microdata.

Further, on pages 4-5, you state "Some information will only be available when carrying out census operations. Example: those related to decennial agricultural census […] to obtain data on [establishment area information, its size and owner's gender. Examples are: Target 2.3 – Indicator "Value of production per labor unit […]".

The statement points to what is often the current situation, where no system of agricultural surveys is in place, and therefore where information on agricultural establishments is update only every decade or so, in occasion of new agricultural census. As documented in the note describing the proposed indicator for Target 2.3., FAO suggests instead that a regular system of agricultural surveys is put in place to allow for more frequent update of several indicators on farm operations and agricultural practices.

Comments included in the table provided by Brazil

Target 2.c. – Indicator of (food) Price Anomalies.

Brazil's comment suggests that: "The knowledge of food market prices must be constructed by understanding the food prices variation in relation to the total variation of the consumer price index" and proposes using an indicator formed as a ratio of "Food price variation/Consumer price variation"

The comment and the proposal are affected by a confusion between the problem that exists with measuring and evaluating food price levels and that related with price volatility . While it is true that food price levels should always be correctly evaluated with reference to the general price level as measured for example by a consumer price index, it makes little sense to create a ratio of volatility indexes as proposed. Such a ratio may be stable when both food prices and general consumer prices are highly volatile, and therefore would fail to function as an indicator of the proper functioning of food markets. On the other hand, the IPA can and should be applied to any relevant series of food prices, including to series of relative prices of food , to reveal conditions of market instability. In other words, your proposal should have been of an indicator of volatility of the ratio Food Prices/Consumer Prices, and not of the ratio of volatility, and the IPA can be used as an application of the former.

We hope you find these comments useful and we are at your disposal should you need further clarification.

FAO

08 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 2. Changes to comments since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 2 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Haji Abdul Rahman bin Hasan (Malaysia)(Malaysia)

Target 2.3	By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment.
Indicator 2.3.1	Value of agricultural production per hectare (measured in constant USD/ hectare, disaggregated for the two lowest quintiles of countries' farm size distribution, as well as for female-headed smallholder producer households).
Comment	Malaysia has the value of agricultural production per hectare (measured in constant USD/ hectare, disaggregated for the two lowest quintiles of countries' farm size distribution only and not spesific to female-headed smallholder producer households. The characteristics of farm size is: Paddy: 1.2 ha Orchard:5 ha Vegetable farms: 2 ha

Target 2.5	By 2030, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and international levels, and ensure access to and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge, as internationally agreed.
Indicator 2.5.1	Ex-situ crop collections indicator
Comment	Review for the indicators to be changed as below: Indicator 2.5.1: Ex-situ plant/ crop and animal genetic resource collection indicators Indicator 2.5.2: Number of plant/crop and animal genetic resources conserved and utilised

	Indicator 2.5.3: Area of plant/crop and animal genetic resources conserved and utilised
	Indicator 2.5.4: Number of capacity building in conservation and utilisation of plant/ crop and animal genetic resources developed

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal2, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

 11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 2.2 By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons.		
Suggested Indicator	Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age	Indicator is only related to age <5 it should be more comprehensive.
Target 2.4 By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality.		

Suggested Indicator	Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices.	Relevant indicator. "Sustainable practices" should be made clear.
Target 2.c Adopt measures to ensure the proper functioning of food commodity markets and their derivatives and facilitate timely access to market information, including on food reserves, in order to help limit extreme food price volatility.		
Suggested Indicator	Indicator of (food) Price Anomalies (IPA) (CBB)	Clarification is needed.

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow African members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Prevalence of undernourishment

Comment: Replace indicator by "Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption".

Indicator: Prevalence of population with moderate or severe food insecurity, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)

Comment: Alternative indicator: "Prevalence of children under age five moderately and severely stunted". Linked to 2.1.

Respect the target group enunciated in the target.

Indicator: Value of production per labour unit (measured in constant USD), by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size

Comment: Alternative Indicator: "Volume of production per unit labour (in tonnes)" disaggregated by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry/fisheries/ enterprise size.

Indicator: Percentage of agricultural area under sustainable agricultural practices.

Comment: Alternative Indicators: "% of agricultural households using irrigation systems compared to all agricultural households", and % of agricultural households using eco-friendly fertilizers compared to all agricultural households using fertilizers". We need further information on the concept of sustainable practices.

Indicator: Ex Situ Crop Collections Enrichment index

Comment: We need more information on that indicator

Indicator: The Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) for Government Expenditures

Comment: We need more information on that indicator

Indicator: Percent change in Import and Export tariffs on agricultural products

Comment: We need more information on that indicator

Indicator: Percent change in Import and Export tariffs on agricultural products

Comment: The suggested indicator needs to be refined to track reductions of tarrifs. We need more information on that indicator

Indicator: Agricultural Export Subsidies

Comment: We need more information on that indicator

Indicator: Indicator of (food) Price Anomalies (IPA) (CBB)

Comment: We need more information on that indicator

14 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

ODS 2.pdf

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

Enrique Ordaz (Mexico)

Comment for Target 3.4.1 "Probability of dying from cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes and chronic respiratory diseases, between 30 and 70 years old.":

Regarding this we consider that studying and monitoring deaths only occurring between 30 - 70 years of age by non-communicable diseases and to consider them as premature diseases, it is conceivable that the indicator discriminates against older people, i.e. deaths occurring after that age, since it would not be not possible to visualize what happens with mortality and its causes after 70 years of age, we would be avoiding giving evidence of the need to implement public policies that work in favor of the elderly population exceeding 70 years of age.

01 Sep, 2015

Papa Seck (UN-WOMEN)

Target 3.9 refers to "By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination". However, the current suggested indicator only refers to "Population in urban areas exposed to outdoor air pollution levels above WHO guideline values". In many low income countries indoor air pollution mainly from household use of biomass fuels is a significant health hazard. Children are particularly vulnerable to it and due to their cooking responsibilities, women are also significantly affected. WHO Research suggests that 36 per cent of lower respiratory infections worldwide are attributable to solid fuel use alone, and 1 per cent of all respiratory infections to outdoor air pollution. Based on current trends of traditional biomass use, it is estimated that household indoor air pollution will lead to 1.5 million deaths per year by 2030. Therefore UN-Women would like to suggest adding as an additional indicator the

Prevalence of lower respiratory infections by sex and age. It would serve as a way to monitor the health impacts of indoor air pollution, also mentioned as part of the target. This indicator is compiled by WHO as part of its global database on the causes of death.

01 Sep, 2015

Akihito Watabe (WHO)

Resubmit the joint letter from the WHO and World Bank, "Monitoring Intervention Coverage and Financial Protection: Essential to Monitoring Progress Towards Target 3.8 Universal Health Coverage". For more details, please read the attached document.

WHO-WBG letter to IAEG (2015.07.23)vFINAL

1. The World Health Organization and the World Bank Group recognise and commend the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) and the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on

Sustainable Development Goals (IAEG-SDGs) for leading efforts in the momentous task of developing the Sustainable Development Goals indicators and monitoring framework.

2. We are pleased to see that there is full agreement to 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".

3. Universal health coverage (UHC) is comprised of two dimensions: (1) everyone, irrespective of their ability-to-pay, receives the health services they need (service coverage), and (2) any direct payments made by users to obtain services do not expose them to financial hardship (financial protection). The latest list of priority indicators[1], put forward by UNSD at the first IAEG-SDGs meeting June 1-2, however, includes only one indicator for UHC: "coverage of tracer interventions for prevention and treatment services[2]". This omission would result in not measuring UHC; indicators for both service coverage and financial protection dimensions are required and must be monitored simultaneously to assess progress towards target 3.8.

4. **In addition to the service coverage indicator already included, we therefore respectfully request the inclusion of an indicator to monitor financial protection with the following two components to adequately measure UHC and assess progress toward achieving target 3.8: (i) the "fraction of population protected from experiencing catastrophic health expenditures" and (ii) the "fraction of population protected from experiencing impoverishing health expenditures".** A description of the proposed financial protection indicators including methods and data sources is provided in Annex 1.

5. Following the latest proposed indicator selection criteria[3], in the remainder of our letter (WHO-WBG letter to IAEG (2015.07.23)vFINAL) we demonstrate that indicators of UHC for both service coverage and financial protection, are relevant, methodologically sound, measureable, and easy to communicate and access. We give particular attention to financial protection indicators given their exclusion from the list of priority indicators put forth by UNSD.

We strongly believe that both intervention coverage and financial protection indicators are needed in order to adequately assess progress in achieving target 3.8. We recognize the need for parsimony in the overall SDG framework; however, without inclusion of both service coverage and financial protection indicators, country progress towards target 3.8 will not be measured. WHO and the World Bank are fully committed to assisting UNSD and IAEG-SDGs in consolidating efforts, and will provide further technical contributions as needed.

04 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
The majority of indicators proposed for this objective are measurable in Ecuador and we find them coherent with the objective and target posed.

To measure Target 3.1 we consider it essential that the countries in Latin America and the Caribbean focus their efforts on the strengthening of administrative records with the aim to reduce coverage bias and additional classifiers, to calculate first indicator.

In the first two indicators required to measure Target 3.2 we think it is necessary to identify the principal causes of death in children under the age of five and newborns, in order to define what types of deaths are preventable. On the other hand, is important improve the quality of administrative records, as the source of information for calculation of this type indicators.

To calculate the first indicator in Target 3.3 it is important to define what is considered susceptible population. The determination of a generic indicator of tropical diseases in different countries is needed for the estimation of the second, third and fourth indicator, so as to take into consideration which of these are applicable depending on national situations.

To measure Target 3.4 we require a justification for the age range chosen to calculate this indicator.

In order to measure Target 3.5 it is necessary to specify if the indicator proposed is focused on people, number of plans or sums. We propose a calculation of the percentage of people with treatment over the total population that report alcohol or other substance abuse.

To measure first indicator of Target 3.8, clarification is needed on whether the proposal is of various indicators or only one indicator that summarizes all of the specific coverages.

In Target 3.9 only one indicator is provided to determine the exposure to bad quality air, however, other factors like water and soil contamination are left out. We pose an indicator that measures the rate of exposure to chemical products, air, water, and soil contamination.

To measure Target 3.b we require further explanation on whether the population with access to essential drugs refers to existence or rather payment capacity. It is also necessary to determine what drugs are considered essential.

Indicator is not clearly defined to measure Target 3.d

Ecuador does not have the sources required to estimate the third indicator in Target 3.3, and for targets 3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 3.9, 3b and 3d.

Best regards,

José Rosero

INEC-ECUADOR
05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

Goal 3

Contribution of the UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

SDG 3 UN System Template v.3 Health indicators Sep4.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 3. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank, UNICEF and UN Population Division and OECD), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are described below. Responses to the specific comments from IAEG members have also been provided under each target.

Target 3.1: no changes

Target 3.2: no changes

Target 3.3:

Comment IAEG: Colombia suggests defining the indicator as Number of new individuals diagnosed with HIV per 100,000 inhabitants to address the entire population. Colombia also states it is necessary to include an additional indicator on neglected tropical diseases.

We have added a NTD indicator, as proposed by the experts in the WHO NTD department

"Number of people requiring interventions against neglected tropical diseases".

This indicator is measured on a regular basis and derived from country reported data. This is a priority indicator, as it is specified in the target and addresses a major public health issue for many countries.

The proposed HIV incidence indicator indeed aims to capture the whole population. This is not just those diagnosed but also includes data on those who have not been diagnosed, obtained through population surveys and surveillance data.

Target 3.4

Colombia states that the age range on the indicator should not be restricted to ages 30-70 and that it is necessary to include an additional indicator on mental health and well-being.

An indicator on mental health was added as priority indicator: suicide mortality rate. This indicator has been agreed upon by the member states in a World Health Assembly resolution as the most suitable. Others such as depression treatment coverage are also recommended by the World Health assembly but are less subject to greater measurement problems and therefore not selected.

The age range for the NCD mortality indicator was kept at 30-70 years because this is what was agreed upon by the member states in the World Health Assembly as a follow up to the UN General Assembly resolution on NCDs.

Target 3.5

Russia comments that the first indicator on coverage of opioid substitution therapy be removed as it is forbidden in Russia and in more than 60 other countries and as a result, should not be used as a global indicator. Russia proposes instead using:, *"Share of patients who successfully complete the rehabilitation program out of the total number of patients with drug addiction who participated in outpatient rehabilitation programs during the reporting year."*

The opioid substitution therapy indicator has been dropped. Two indicators are proposed that directly relate to the target. The wording was slightly changed from the previous version:

- Percentage of people who suffer from substance abuse disorders receiving treatment and care (by substance and type of treatment/care). This ties well with the indicator proposed above. The success component adds another dimension.
- Harmful use of alcohol defined according to the national context as alcohol per capita (15+ years old) consumption within a calendar year in litres of pure alcohol, age-standardized prevalence of heavy episodic drinking or alcohol-related morbidity and mortality

Target 3.6: no changes

Target 3.7: no changes

Target 3.8:

India suggests that an additional indicator on financial risk protection be considered. Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure

This has been implemented. Universal health coverage monitoring needs two priority indicators, disaggregated by key stratifiers: coverage of interventions and financial protection as defined by India. World Bank and WHO have provided an extensive note explaining the arguments.

Target 3.9

Colombia comments that the indicator does not fully cover the target and that it is necessary to include indicators on deaths and illnesses from water and soil contamination.

A second indicator has been added as additional indicator to capture the target as well as possible. "Number of deaths from air, water and soil pollution and contamination". The measurement is challenging but estimates can be made for air (indoor and outdoor pollution), water, sanitation and hygiene.

Target 3.a: no change

Target 3.b

Proportion of population with access to affordable essential medicines on a sustainable basis

Colombia states that the indicator is not adequate for covering the target and suggests a measurement on support for research and development of vaccines and medicines and India states that the phrase "sustainable basis" needs to be defined.

Two changes are proposed:

- Proportion of population with access to affordable essential medicines, vaccines and technologies: vaccines have been added and on a sustainable basis is deleted
- Total net official development assistance to the medical research and basic health sectors: this indicator is intended to address the first comment from Colombia. This should include financing for R&D of vaccines and medicines.

Target 3.c: no change

One proposal for a third indicator (from OECD) is: total official net development assistance for health.

Target 3.d

India comments that the indicator does not reflect International Cooperation.

The implementation of the IHR has not become an international affair with all countries needing to work together to ensure that all countries implement the IHR. Therefore, the IHR full implementation rate could be considered an indicator of not only the performance of single countries, but of the global community as a whole.

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: *new loans for SMEs (# and $) for health sector*

Desegregation of beneficiaries receiving the services delivered by private sector can provide information about how the private sector is contributing to bridge the gap (if any) or scale up services provided by public sector: *number of patients treated with improved services by private sector*

Private sector investment in health

07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

3.9 Target mentions reduction of number of deaths and diseases from water and soil pollution, but indicator is limited to air pollution (including chemicals).

07 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

Claire Plateau

We agree with Gyeongjoon Yoo. The indicator is too restrictive (covers air pollution only and only urban areas); the indicator should better cover the entire target. It could for instance also include the number of technological disasters.

07 Sep, 2015

Tiina Luige (UNECE)

UNECE Sustainable Transport Division, comment on target 3.6:

Countries with very low motorization rates in 2015 are less likely to see decreases in *road traffic fatal injury deaths per 100 000 population* if they achieve substantial economic growth (and an associated increase in motorization rate). Perhaps another indicator such as *road traffic fatal injury deaths per 100 000 passenger cars* should be used as well to provide further context for progress (or lack thereof) in this indicator.

In many countries, indicators are estimated and have wide confidence intervals in the WHO road safety database. Confidence intervals measuring the possible levels of change in this indicator may offer a more realistic view than comparisons of point estimates when measuring progress.

UNECE Environment Division, comment on target 3.9:

Proposed indicator: For 3.9.1 UNECE supports UNEP's alternative;

Indicator already used for Global Monitoring? N

How well does indicator measure target (1=low, 5=high)? 2

Data source: For the UNECE region, national implementation reports to the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)

Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 3.1
Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births [ADD] disaggregated by age and causes of maternal death where data allows. *Note:* Disaggregation by age is relevant to identify very young (10-14 yrs.). Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel (OK)

Indicator for Target 3.2
Denmark supports the two proposed indicators as feasible and relevant. We continue to suggest an indicator on stillbirth rates, which we consider as a major issue in developing countries.

Indicator for Target 3.3

- Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key

- populations)

- TB incidence per 1,000 persons per year

- Malaria incident cases per 1,000 person per year

- Estimated number of new hepatitis B infections per 100,000 population in a given year

These indicators are relevant from a global perspective. In a Danish perspective the diseases are less important as they account for a small fraction of the burden of disease in Denmark.

The new suggested indicator on HIV and TB are highly relevant but as it is difficult to determine time of disease onset it should be noted that it is only possible to assess reporting/notification incidence. Increase in incidence could thus be due to increased focus on the disease, even when there is no change in disease occurrence.

The suggested indicator on Malaria incident is relevant (primarily for developing countries), but Denmark is unable to deliver data on this indicator.

The Danish Ministry of Health would like to point out and ask why there is no indicator on neglected tropical diseases affecting mainly the poorest regions and populations.

Indicators on mortality have been left out for all four disease areas. They would be relevant to include as indication of treatment capacity. However if a choice has to be made in order to keep number of indicators at a minimum, incidence rates are preferred over mortality rates.

Indicator for Target 3.4
The new indicator is relevant but only feasible with strong efforts. There is still no indicator covering the last part of target 3.4 "and promote mental health and wellbeing".

Indicator for Target 3.7
We suggest a more precise indicator on the part of target 3.7 on "information and education" along the line of "comprehensive sexuality education curriculum developed and employed for primary and secondary school education as well as for out of school youth".

Adolescent birth rate (10-14; [CHANGE] ~~15-19~~ 15-17, 18-19) per 1,000 women in that age group

Note: Suggesting to use 3 age groups: the risk of 10-14 year olds of dying from childbirth-related complications is 5 times higher than for women in their 20s, and childbearing is often rooted in coercion and discriminatory practices, such as child, early and forced marriage, and sexual violence; 15-17 year olds account for the majority of unplanned and unwanted teenage pregnancies; among 18-19 year olds a significant share of births occurs within marriage and union, thus more likely to be planned.

Indicator for Target 3.9

Indicator should be changed as a priority.

The indicator measures population exposed, but not actually the number of deaths and illnesses, which is what the target is about. Equally important, the indicator only covers outdoor air pollution, while the target also covers indoor air pollution, hazardous chemicals, water and soil pollution.

While the indicator might still be useful for Denmark, given that health effects from outdoor air pollution is an issue for Denmark, it would not reflect the situation in many developing countries.

Deaths and illnesses from pesticide and biocide exposure/intake, exposure from contaminated sites and work place related exposure are issues that are very relevant and can be substantial in developing countries. In a global context the indicator therefore seems inadequate.

It should be considered how aspects that are covered by the target but not reflected in the indicator could be covered by relevant indicators of other targets with which there is overlap, for example in relation to safe, nutritious food (target 2.1) or safe work (target 8.8).

This indicator only partially reflects the "environmental-health impact" issues addressed in the Goal. A cross reference to access to clean drinking water (and similar for soil if possible?) could provide a broader picture.

Proposal for an alternative indicator:

UNEP has suggested an indicator based on Global Burden of Disease methodology, showing death and disability from indoor and outdoor air quality, water/sanitation and contaminated sites.

Data from WHO and the chemicals and waste conventions can be used.

While still not covering all the elements in the target, it would cover more of them, and would better reflect the target – to reduce the number of deaths and illnesses.

A composite indicator along the lines proposed by UNEP would therefore be better.

Indicator for Target 3.a
We support the use of the previously suggested indicator under target 3.4 to set the age cut off at 15 rather than 18 years of age, taking into account the actual age adolescents begin to smoke.

Indicator for Target 3.c
Health worker density and distribution [ADD] by categories, geographic distribution, place of employment etc.

Indicator for Target 3.d
Need a specific reference to the WHO IHR core capacities.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)

Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 3

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 3:

- Proportion of population living below national poverty line
- Life expectancy at birth

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 3. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

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.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key populations)
- TB incidence per 1,000 persons per year
- Malaria incident cases per 1,000 person per year
- Estimated number of new hepatitis B infections per 100,000 population in a given year

Remark: The indicators have to be condensed taking all kind of diseases mentioned into account.

Suggestion: We would appreciate to modify the indicator in: Number of new incidences or infections of HIV, tuberculosis, malaria, neglected tropical diseases, hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other communicable diseases per 100,000 population.

Target 3.9 – By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Population in urban areas exposed to outdoor air pollution levels above WHO

Remark: The indicator should not be limited to outdoor air pollution levels. Water and soil contamination needs to be included. Besides, we vote for putting the hazard (death and illness), as referred to in the target, at the core of the indicator, not only the risk (exposure). Therefore, we support the alternative proposal of UNEP and Colombia.

Suggestion: We would like to replace indicator by: Death and disability from indoor and outdoor air quality, water/sanitation, and contaminated sites (former indicator 3.9.1).

Target 3.c – Substantially increase health financing and the recruitment, development, training and retention of the health workforce in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing states...

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Health worker density and distribution

Remark: One indicator seems insufficient in measuring both aspects (staff and financing). An additional indicator covering the financial aspect seems indicated.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_03.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

Target 3.4: An indicator concerning mental health should be considered either here (prevalence of severe mental disorders) or under target 3.8 if the indicator related to treatment coverage/ compliance is selected.

Indicator 3.9.1 should also take into account exposure to land, soil and water contamination.

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)
Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 3

Target 3.3: By 2030, end the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and neglected tropical diseases and combat hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other comunicable diseases.

Suggested indicator: Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key populations)

Comment: We suggest defining the indicator as Number of new individuals diagnosed with HIV per 100,000 inhabitants (the entire population).

It should be included an additional indicator about neglected tropical diseases.

Suggested indicator: Malaria incident cases per 1,000 person per year

Comment: As performance indicator it would be more adequate the Malaria mortality.

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.

Suggested indicator: Probability of dying of cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease between ages 30 and 70.

Comment: The indicator shouldn't be restricted to ages 30-70. We suggest including children with cancer. Also, it's necessary to include some indicator about promotion of mental health and well-being.

Target 3.9: By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination.

Suggested indicator: Population in urban areas exposed to outdoor air pollution levels above WHO guideline values.

Comment: The indicator doesn't fully cover the target. It's necessary to include indicators about deaths and illnesses from water and soil contamination. We suggest identifying contaminant agents and related illnesses.

Target 3A: Strengthen the implementation of the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control in all countries, as appropriate.

Suggested indicator: Tobacco use among persons 18 years and older. Age-standardized prevalence of current tobacco use among persons aged 18 years and older.

Comments: The indicator should include all ages. However, information from household surveys could be not very accurate. We suggest an indicator about the progress in the implementation of the agreements.

Target 3.B: Support the research and development of vaccines and medicines for the communicable and non-communicable diseases that primarily affect developing countries, provide access to affordable essential medicines and vaccines, in accordance with the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health,which affirms the right of developing countries to use to the full the provisions in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights regarding flexibilities to protect public health, and, in particular, provide access to medicines for all.

Suggested indicator: Proportion of population with access to affordable essential medicines on a sustainable basis.

Comment: We consider that this indicator is not adequate for covering the target. It should include a measurement about support for research and development of vaccines and medicines.

Target 3.C: Substantially increase health financing and the recruitment, development, training and retention of the health workforce in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing states.

Suggested indicator: Health worker density and distribution

Comment: It is necessary to clarify if the distribution is geographical.

08 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 3. Changes to comments since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 3 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Singapore
Target 3.9: Proposed indicator does not address the target description as it only considers air pollution.

10 Sep, 2015

Anibal Sanchez Aguilar (Peru)
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.

Suggested indicator : "Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key populations)"

Comment :The indicator should be expressed as the number of new individuals diagnosed with HIV per 100,000 inhabitants.

11 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)
Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal3. Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 3.1 By 2030, reduce the global maternal mortality ratio to less than 70 per 100,000 live births.		
Suggested Indicator	Maternal deaths per 100,000 live births	Relevant
Target 3.2 By 2030, end preventable deaths of newborns and children under 5 years of age, with all countries aiming to reduce neonatal mortality to at least as low as 12 per 1,000 live births and		

	under-5 mortality to at least as low as 25 per 1,000 live births.	
Suggested Indicator	Under-five mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Neonatal mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)	Relevant
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.		
Suggested Indicator	Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key populations)	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	TB incidence per 1,000 persons per year	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Malaria incident cases per 1,000 person per year	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Estimated number of new hepatitis B infections per 100,000 population in a given year	Relevant
Target 3.6 By 2020, halve the number of global deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents		
Suggested Indicator	Number of road traffic fatal injury deaths per 100 000 population (age-standardized)	Relevant, good target-indicator harmony.
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.		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of women of reproductive age (15-49 years) who have their need for family planning satisfied with modern	Relevant

	methods.	
Suggested Indicator	Adolescent birth rate (10-14; 15-19) per 1,000 women in that age group	Relevant

Target 3.9 By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination.

Suggested Indicator	Population in urban areas exposed to outdoor air pollution levels above WHO guideline values	The suggested indicator is relevant with related target .But, only one indicator on air pollution is not enough to monitor Target 3.9. Causes of death statistics should also be considered under this target.

Target 3.a Strengthen the implementation of the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control in all countries, as appropriate.

Suggested Indicator	Tobacco use among persons 18 years and older Age-standardized prevalence of current tobacco use among persons aged 18 years and older	Relevant

Target 3.b Support the research and development of vaccines and medicines for the communicable and non-communicable diseases that primarily affect developing countries, provide access to affordable essential medicines and vaccines, in accordance with the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, which affirms the right of developing countries to use to the full the provisions in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights regarding flexibilities to protect public health, and, in particular, provide access to medicines for all.

Suggested Indicator	Proportion of population with access to affordable essential medicines on a sustainable basis	Relevant

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)
Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow African members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Probability of dying of cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease between ages 30 and 70

Comment: Difficult to measure. Alternative: Proportion of death caused by cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease between ages 30 and 70

Indicator: Coverage of treatment interventions (pharmacological, psychosocial and rehabilitation and aftercare services) for substance use disorders

Comment: We need more information on that indicator.

Indicator: Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.)

Comment: It´s not one single indicator but a large set of indicator. Methodology is not clear as an composite indicator.

Indicator: Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of- pocket health expenditure

Comment: Alternative indicator: "Number of the people covered by health insurance per 1000 population"

Indicator: Proportion of population with access to affordable essential medicines on a sustainable basis

Comment: Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis

13 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

ODS 3.pdf

14 Sep, 2015

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

Flora Sutherland (United Nations Mine Action Service)

The United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS): Regarding indicator 4 (a) 1. Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) Internet for pedagogical purposes (iii) basic drinking water and (iv) basic sanitation facilities; and (v) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions) reiterate UNESCO's input to include the need for accessibility for children and teachers with disabilities, including victims of landmines and other explosive remnants of war.

28 Aug, 2015

Papa Seck (UN-WOMEN)

For Target 4.3, in addition to monitoring adult participation in formal and non-formal education (current suggested indicator by UNESCO), it is also important to monitor gender segregation in higher education. UN-Women would like to suggest an additional indicator: the distribution of tertiary graduates by field of study and sex. This indicator is Tier I and is produced by UNESCO.

For Target 4.7, as data becomes available, it would be important to include knowledge of other topics, including human rights and gender equality, which would be a better fit for the target.

01 Sep, 2015

Marta Santos Pais (SRSG on Violence against Children)

SRSG on Violence against Children

Education 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.

In addition to ensuring universal school enrolment, attention must be given to the quality of education children receive. Around the world, many schools are not child-friendly with numerous factors that inhibit consistent attendance and hinder effective learning. Factors that negatively impact on children include: large classroom sizes, lack of learning materials, inadequate water and sanitation facilities, poor physical infrastructure, high pupil-teacher ratios, teacher absenteeism, rote learning, and institutionalized violence and an environment dominated by fear.

A significant body of research highlights how discrimination, violence against children and bullying in schools negatively impacts children's attendance, learning and development outcomes with related consequences for wider society.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

seeks to strengthen universal peace and to foster just and inclusive societies which are free from fear and violence. Recognizing the crucial importance of quality education in safeguarding children's

rights, and of how violence-free schools can act as catalysts for peaceful and non-violent communities, I strongly recommend that the indicator for target 4.a also include the non-infrastructural aspects of an effective and enabling learning environment.

I therefore suggest adding the following indicator for 4.a, in line with the UNFPA suggestion:

Percentage of students experiencing bullying, corporal punishment, harassment, violence, sexual discrimination and abuse

03 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
Education is a fundamental right and the basis for progress in any country. Real sustainable development requires qualified and educated workers.

For Target 4.1, on guaranteed quality education, academic performance evaluations are adequate to measure progress on these terms. However, it is important remember that these tests need to have international comparability. We suggest calculating an indicator only for significant years, for example, third and sixth year of primary education and for 9th grade.

The proposed indicator for Target 4.2, should be defined clearly, specify whether aims to measure "child development" or "service access". To measure Target we suggest the inclusion of and indicator of Percentage of children with access to child care services. The specification of what test will be used to measure if indeed a child is in an adequate development stage is essential for the estimation of the proposed indicator.

The determination of the objective population of this indicator is required in order to measure Target 4.3.

To measure Target 4.4 we request the specification of when an individual is considered to have "ICT abilities", under what parameters is this indicator calculated.

We suggest a change in the indicator proposed for Target 4.6 to Percentage of population 15 to 24 that is illiterate and Percentage of the population 15 to 24 that is a functioning illiterate. Ecuador does not have an indicator that allows us to measure arithmetic abilities.

To measure Target 4.7 we suggest a change in the posed indicator to the determination of whether a country has or does not have a curriculum that includes subjects related to natural sciences and earth science.

To measure Target 4.b, the proposed indicator is not relevant for Ecuador. We propose the calculation of the Number of scholarships provided by the Government for primary and secondary education.

The indicators proposed for the monitoring of the targets mentioned measure only education quality, however, it is necessary to pose indicators that also measure access to education as in Percentage of individuals ages 18 to 24 with complete secondary education.

Ecuador does not have the sources required for the estimation of indicators needed to measure targets 4.4, 4.5 and 4.a.

Best regards,
José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 4

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

UN System Template v 3_SDG4_Education_revised_20150902.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 4. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (ILO, ITU, OECD, OHCHR, UNESCO-UIS, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNHCR, UNISDR, UN Secretariat for the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, UN Women and the World Bank), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 4.1

Priority indicator

- To modify slightly the suggested priority indicator (*Percentage of children/young people (i) in Grade 2/3, (ii) at the end of primary and (iii) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least*

a minimum proficiency level in (a) reading and (b) mathematics) to include learning outcomes in the early years of primary as a stepping-stone towards the achievement of the target.

Additional indicators (from 11 August list)

- None

Target 4.2

Priority indicator

- To retain the suggested priority indicator (*Percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being*).

Additional indicators (from 11 August list)

- None

Target 4.3

Priority indicator

- To modify slightly the suggested priority indicator (*Percentage of people in a given age-range participating in education or training in the 12 months prior to being interviewed*) to cover both youth and adults.

Additional indicators (from 11 August list)

- None

New indicator

- *Distribution of tertiary graduates by field of study and sex* which is one of the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators

Target 4.4

Priority indicator

- To retain the suggested priority indicator (*Percentage of individuals with ICT skills by type of skill*).

Additional indicator (from 11 August list)

- *Skills mismatch index*

Target 4.5

Priority indicator

- To modify slightly the suggested priority indicator (*Parity indices: female/male, urban/rural, bottom/top wealth quintile and others such as disability status and conflict-affected as data become available for all indicators on this list that can be disaggregated*) to cover other equity aspects.

Additional indicators (from 11 August list)

- None

New indicators

- *Percentage of teachers in service who have received in-service training in the last 12 months to teach students with special educational needs*
- *Percentage of children and youth in vulnerable situations who have non-discriminatory access to all levels of education and vocational training*

Target 4.6

Priority indicator

*　　　To retain the suggested priority indicator (*Percentage of the population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional*

(a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills).

Additional indicators (from 11 August list)

- None

Target 4.7

Priority indicator

- To retain the suggested priority indicator (*Percentage of students of a given age (eg 15-year olds) enrolled in secondary school demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge across a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience*).

Additional indicator (from 11 August list)

- *Percentage of schools that provide life skills-based HIV and sexuality education*

Target 4.a

Priority indicator

- To modify slightly the suggested priority indicator (*Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) Internet for pedagogical purposes (iii) computers for pedagogical purposes (iv) adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities (v) basic drinking water (vi) basic sanitation facilities; and (vii) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions*) to include a measure on access to computers and on the adaptability/suitability of school premises for use by students with disabilities.

Additional indicator (from 11 August list)

- *Percentage of students experiencing bullying, corporal punishment, harassment, violence, sexual discrimination and abuse*

New indicator

- *Percentage of educational facilities that are safe with respect to a) policy planning and advocacy, b) disaster resilient learning facilities, c) school disaster management and d) risk reduction and resilience education (as defined by the World Initiative for Safe Schools)*

Target 4.b

Priority indictor

- To retain the suggested priority indicator (*Volume of ODA flows for scholarships by sector and type of study*).

Additional indicators (from 11 August list)

- None

Target 4.c

Priority indictor

- To modify slightly the suggested priority indicator (*Percentage of teachers in (i) pre-primary (ii) primary, (iii) lower secondary and (iv) upper secondary education who have received at least the minimum organized and recognised teacher (i.e. pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country*).

Additional indicators (from 11 August list)

- None

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)

Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: *new loans for SMEs (# and $) for education sector*

Desegregation of beneficiaries receiving the services delivered by private sector can provide information about how the private sector is contributing to bridge the gap (if any) or scale up services provided by public sector: *number of students enrolled and graduated in private sector institutions*

Private sector investment in education

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 4.1
- It is important that the suggested indicator only focuses on primary education.

- The suggested indicator does not capture whether the education has been free as stated in target 4.1.

Indicator for Target 4.2
This indicator is not equally relevant for all the Member States. We suggest to open for a possibility to include national circumstances.

Regarding the interlinkages we have a few additions in the linkages to the goal 4.2: 4.1 (free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education), 4.6 (By 2030, ensure that all youth and a substantial proportion of adults, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy) and 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).

We have previously commented on the wording of goal 4.2 – among other on the alignment of terminology on ECEC area and on the importance of daycare, not only as a preparation for school. A final comment in that regard could be to consider letting the goals follow each other chronologically and thereby moving the goal on ECEC from 4.2 to 4.1.

Indicator for Target 4.3
We suggest to insert a reference of the definition of "adults" that will be applied – namely, the UN definition where adults are represented by the population aged 15 years and above.

- The proposed indicator does not measure "affordable"

Indicator for Target 4.4
In relation to the proposed indicator – percentage of youth/adults with ICT skills by type of skill – we would like to point to the need to ensure that data collection include all ICT platforms – also mobile phones and mobile access to the internet.

The proposed indicator is a too narrow interpretation of target 4.4. and thus, does not capture neither "decent jobs" nor "entrepreneurship". We propose to explicate the age range referred to when writing "youth/adults".

Indicator for Target 4.5
The current proposal does not capture whether equal access has been achieve for persons with disabilities nor for indigenous peoples.

Indicator for Target 4.7
The proposed target focuses too narrowly on environmental science and geoscience and does not capture "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" as stated in the target. Support for UNFPAs proposal regarding insertion of language regarding life skills-based HIV and sexuality education.

Secondly the topics proposed or highlighted don't capture the overall sense and objective of the target. Admittedly, it is not a simple task to identify an appropriate indicator that does, but it is recommended that the search continues.

Indicator for Target 4.a
- As suggested by UNESCO we would like to insert "single sex" in front of "basic sanitation facilities".

- The current proposed indicator does not capture the entire content of target 4.a. This could be improved by in some way incorporating the proposal from UNFPA on "Percentage of students experiencing bullying, corporal punishment, harassment, violence, sexual discrimination and abuse."

Indicator for Target 4.b
- Agree with the comment made by the World Bank that "This indicator only measures some sources of scholarships"

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany 07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 4

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicator for goal 4:

- illiteracy rate

Additionally we would like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 4. They have been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

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.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Percentage of children/young people at the end of each level of education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (a) reading and (b) mathematics. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)

Remark: We agree with the indicator 4.1, but are skeptical about the proposed creation of a "universal learning scale" or a "global metric". Using indicators based on nationally defined standards might be sufficient to increase the focus on learning outcomes. The disadvantages and challenges of a universal scale (E.g. limited financial and technical capacities for measurement, analyses and usages of data for policy reforms, narrow definition of competencies, demotivation effects of countries with low scores, teaching to the test) would outweigh the advantages of international comparability. Comparability at regional level might serve as an alternative approach that may be more in line with regional interests as well as more culturally sensitive to regional learning levels and varied understandings and definitions of what relevant learning outcomes are. Feasibility may also be higher due to already existent regional assessment formats.

As the target requires no disaggregation, one figure is sufficient.

Suggestion: We would like to replace the indicator by: Percentage of children/young people at the end of each level of education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in reading and mathematics.

Target 4.2 – By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)

Remark: The target does not ask for disaggregation.

Suggestion: We would like to modify suggested indicator: Percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being.

Target 4.3 –By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable and quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Participation rate of adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months

Remark: The important element of affordability of these targets is not covered by proposed indicators

Suggestion: We would like to add the indicator: Share of annual household expenditure on education per child in higher education

Target 4.4 – By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Percentage of youth/adults with ICT skills by type of skill

Remark: This indicator seems to be too focused on ICT skills. We suggest a more global indicator trying to cover a branch of relevant skills. As first step the proposed headline indicator "illiteracy rate" might be a reasonable choice replaced as soon as available by the"percentage of population having a specific educational level (such as upper secondary or third)"

Suggestion: We would like to replace the indicator by "illiteracy rate" in the short and "Percentage of population having a specific educational level (such as upper secondary or third)" in the long run.

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.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Parity indices (female/male, urban/rural, bottom/top wealth quintile] for all indicators on this list that can be disaggregated

Remark: Regarding equity and inclusion, we would appreciate if "people with disabilities" would (gradually) be included in the parity indices. In addition, a clear definition of "people with disabilities" is needed.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)

Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_04.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

Indicators 4.3.2 and 4.4.1 are virtually identical.

In target 4.7, the proposed indicators do not cover the human rights aspect.

07 Sep, 2015

Keiruka Didigu (UNFPA)

Dear colleagues,

UNFPA is pleased to submit the following updated proposal for Goal 4 Target 4.7 (complete goal proposal is attached here).

Specifically, under target 4.7:

Indicator proposal • 4.7.1 "Percentage of schools that provided life skills-based HIV and sexual and reproductive health education including an emphasis gender and power" This is more in line with peer reviewed research findings on components of this kind of education that correlates with positive outcomes

Indicator proposal • 4.7.2 Whether or not Countries implement the framework on the World

Programme on Human Rights Education Proposal is consistent with indicator 29 of the Framework for Action of the Post 2015 Education agenda (draft version 31 March 2015), Annex I (Technical Advisory Group/TAG proposed indicators).]

Best regards,
Dr. Kiki Didigu
Post-2015 Branch
UNFPA

08 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 4

Target 4.4: By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship

Suggested indicator: Percentage of youth/adults with ICT skills by type of skill

Comment: The suggested indicator is relevant; however, currently it is not feasible in our country. Also it is necessary to define "relevant skills" and include more indicators in order to cover the target.

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.

Suggested indicator: Parity indices (female/male, urban/rural, bottom/top wealth quintile] for all indicators on this list that can be disaggregated.

Comment: The suggested indicators are relevant; however, there is not a common definition about wealth for obtaining this indicator for quintile.

Target 4.6: By 2030, ensure that all youth and a substantial proportion of adults, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy.

Suggested indicator: Percentage of the population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills. Disaggregation: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)

Comment: It is necessary to clarify the definition of the "levels of proficiency".

08 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 4. Changes to comments since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 4 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Haji Abdul Rahman bin Hasan (Malaysia) (Malaysia)

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.
Indicator 4.1.1	Percentage of children who achieve minimum proficiency standards in reading and mathematics at end of: (i) primary (ii) lower secondary
Comment	(i) Primary : At present, result from the LINUS and LINUS 2.0 could be used for this purpose. The implementation of the LINUS programme is to screen literacy and numeracy skill levels as students passed through the first three years of primary school in Malaysia. Malaysia did not participate in the international programme for reading and mathematics such as *Early Grade Reading Assessment* (EGRA) or *Progress in International Reading Literacy Study* (PIRLS). (ii) Lower Secondary: Available (Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)/Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS))

Target 4.2	By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education.
Indicator 4.2.1	Early Childhood Development Index (ECDI).
Comment	Malaysia can only provide enrolment in registered preschool and private preschool not the ECDI.

Target 4.3	By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable and quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university
Indicator 4.3.1	Enrolment ratios by level and type of education (TVET and tertiary).
Comment	Target 4.3 does not specify the age group of women and men whom will be the main target group . Malaysia can only provide TVET enrolment ratio for Vocational Colleges.

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
Indicator 4.4.1	Participation rate in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months among 25-64 year-olds
Comment	Malaysia has a public and private educational institutions, polytechnics and community colleges across the country which offers courses at certificate, diploma, undergraduate and postgraduate level throughout the year for age groups from 25 to 64 years.

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.
Indicator 4.7.1	Percentage of 15-year old students showing proficiency in knowledge of environmental science and geoscience.
Comment	Data for Malaysia can be gauged from assessment such as TIMSS or can be measured by students' performance in relevant subjects like science and geography.

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.
Indicator 4.7.2	Percentage of 13-year old students endorsing values and attitudes promoting equality, trust and participation in governance
Comment	This indicator is not available in Malaysia. Pendidikan Sivik dan Kenegaraan subject is taught to students in Form 1 to 5. However, there is no assessment at national

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
Indicator 4.a.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	Data available for registered school.

Target 4.c	By 2030, increase by [x] per cent the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing States

Indicator 4.c.1	Percentage of trained teachers by level of education according to national standards.
comment	Data available for registered school.

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal4, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

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		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) Internet for pedagogical purposes (iii) basic drinking water and (iv) basic sanitation facilities; and (v) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions)	Relevant
Target 4.c By 2030, substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing States		
Suggested	Percentage of teachers in (i) pre-primary (ii) primary, (iii) lower	Minimum

Indicator	secondary and (iv) upper secondary education who have received at least the minimum organized teacher (i.e. pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country. Disaggregations: sex (and others where data are available)	organized level should be made clear.

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)
Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow African members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Percentage of children/young people at the end of each level of education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (a) reading and (b) mathematics. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)

Comment: We need more information on that indicator. Indicator should be specific to primary and secondary levels

Indicator: Percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)

Comment: We need more information on that indicator.

Indicator: Participation rate of adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the last 12 months

Comment: Include an indicator on gross enrolment ratios for technical, vocational and tertiary education and disaggregated by sex

Indicator: Percentage of youth/adults with ICT skills by type of skill

Comment: Reformulate to: percentage of 15-34 with basic skills in ICT

Indicator: Percentage of the population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills. Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)

Comment: We need further information on that indicator

Indicator: Percentage of 15-year old students enrolled in secondary school demonstrating at least a fixed level of knowledge across a selection of topics in environmental science and geoscience. The exact choice/range of topics will depend on the survey or assessment in which the indicator is collected. Disaggregation: sex and location (and others where data are available)

Comment: The indicator needs to be on schools and availability of materials; training curricula and trained teachers (and not on learners)

Indicator: Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) Internet for pedagogical purposes (iii) basic drinking water and (iv) basic sanitation facilities; and (v) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions)

Comment: Indicator should include schools with adapted infrastructure and materials for learners with disabilities. Thus is not one single indicator but a set of indicators.

14 Sep, 2015

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

Papa Seck (UN-WOMEN)
Dear Members and Observers,

This is to respond to some of the comments by IAEG-SDGs Members, Observers and other stakeholders, including civil society organizations, during their respective consultations.

Target 5.1:

This indicator has received the support of many who have commented. Most of the critical comments received in relation to this indicator refer to the fact that the indicator measures means, not results (Colombia), the wording of the indicator (civil society compilation), and potential conceptual difficulty in measuring it including the fact that the wording may not be supported in some countries (e.g. United States).

Response: Although it is true that the indicator measures means, given the all-encompassing nature of the concept of discrimination – which as indicated in international law can be both direct and indirect – it is hard to come up with an indicator (or even a suite of indicators) that can monitor "Ending all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere". Given that most of the indicators in Goal 5 and the gender-related indicators in the other goals measure 'results', we opted for an indicator that can capture de-jure equality, which, even if not sufficient, is necessary in order to attain de-facto equality. In the course of monitoring, we could then juxtapose the different areas of law that are measured under 5.1 (e.g. laws to prevent violence) and the actual 'results' (rates of violence against women under 5.2) to indicate that even if laws are adopted, they need to be implemented.

With respect to the other comments, UN-Women, OHCHR and the CEDAW Committee are working together to develop a methodology that is consistent and applicable to all countries and to refine the indicator, including the possibility of having an ordinal scoring mechanism (as suggested through the civil society consultation).

To address the comment about the wording of the indicator, we suggest the following new formulation: **"Percentage of countries with legal frameworks that promote gender equality and non-discrimination against all women and girls"**

Target 5.2:

All who have commented have supported the violence against women and girls (VAWG) indicators proposed for this target and most have in fact requested an expansion/removal of the age ranges as well as covering other types of violence, including trafficking (e.g. Canada and Colombia).

Response: The 15-49 cutoff age range was based on the fact that most developing countries currently collect data on VAWG through DHS and MICS which mainly focus on women and girls of reproductive age. Therefore, the most consistent group for which regional and global aggregation is possible is for the 15-49 age groups (this is also the group for which prevalence rates are the highest). Many countries now collect data for women older than 49 through standalone VAWG

surveys, therefore, in principle the age ranges can (and should) be expanded. However, in order to tailor responses, it is also critical to monitor prevalence rates by age groups and form of violence. For indicator 5.2.2, disaggregating by place of occurrence would also capture sexual violence against women and girls in workplaces and public spaces, providing important links with targets 8.8 (safe workplaces) and 11.7 (safe public spaces).

We would therefore like to suggest new formulations for the current priority indicators in the August 11 list of indicators:

> 5.2.1: "Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15+ subjected to **physical, sexual and psychological violence** by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months, by **form of violence and by age**"; and

> 5.2.2 "Proportion of women and **girls aged 15+** subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15, by age and **place of occurrence**".

Because of the negative lifelong consequences on girls and the links between children's exposure to abuse and violence in later life, it is also important to monitor violence against girls younger than 15+. However, collecting data for girls below the age of 15 presents many technical and ethical challenges, including the fact that many countries have a legal requirement to report incidents of child abuse to authorities, which would clash with guarantees of survey confidentiality (see http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/Guidelines_Statistics_VAW.pdf). Therefore rather than expanding the previous indicators to girls less than 15 years of age, a NEW suggested indicator for measuring violence against girls younger than age 15 is the ***Proportion of women (aged 15-19 and 20-24) who were subjected to sexual violence before age 15, by any persons.*** To collect data for this indicator, a recall question could be easily added to existing VAW surveys. By asking 15-24 year olds about any experience(s) of sexual violence, this indicator would give a sense of prevalence rates and would minimize recall bias.

Finally, the target highlights eliminating "trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation". UNODC publishes a biennial Global Report on Trafficking in Persons including data on known victims by sex, age and form of exploitation covering over 130 countries. Methods are also being developed to estimate non-detected victims. Therefore the indicator suggested for 16.2 "Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation" would also be relevant for this target.

Target 5.4:

Most of the comments support the indicator currently proposed for this target "Average daily (24 hours) spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location (for individuals five years and above)" and most of the comments are for clarification. Few commentators have also questioned the relevance of the indicator for this target.

Response: The target refers to the **Recognition and valuation of 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.** Therefore, an indicator that measures the amount of time women and girls spend doing unpaid care and domestic work is essential for its recognition and for recognizing the value that this work has for

society. Various indicators, including the additional one (suggested below) and those suggested for other targets such as social protection (target 1.3) access to water (target 6.1) and electricity (target 7.1) are also relevant for addressing the policy-related elements of this target.

To address the other comments, with the methodological work underway (led by UNSD) to harmonize Time Use Surveys, discrepancies in the unit of measurement (i.e. 24h versus weekly) can be addressed (Colombia).

With regard to disaggregation by location (Canada), location here refers to urban/rural location but can be made more explicit if necessary. Where possible, this indicator would also be disaggregated by task in order to separate time spent on caring for persons and time spent on household maintenance activities, as recommended by the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators agreed by the UN Statistical Commission in 2013.

In addition to this indicator, another indicator to consider is the **"Participation rate of pre-school children in Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) programmes, by age of the child, location and family income"** which monitors children's participation in early childhood development as well as the availability of childcare arrangements which is critical for freeing women's time.

Data for children's (aged 3-5) participation in early childhood education are already collected in MICS and could be expanded to capture children younger than 3.

Target 5.5:

All of the commentators supported the two priority indicators. Most in fact requested an expansion of the scope to cover other areas of leadership.

Response: In order to address the target more comprehensively, UN-Women suggests a new formulation as follows**: "Proportion of women in leadership positions in political, economic and public life, by level and by type".** This indicator will be broken down by level and type of leadership positions to include the proportion of women in: the Executive (Heads of State and governments, ministers and local governments), Legislative (national parliaments), Judiciary and Law enforcement (judges and police officers), and managers in public and private sector entreprises). Most of these sub-components are already available and are being monitored as part of the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators.

UN-Women routinely collects data on women Heads of States and Governments. IPU regularly collects data on the proportion of women ministers and in parliaments (indicator 43 and 44 of the Minimum Set). Indicators on women in law enforcement (judges and police officers) are collected by UNODC (indicators 46 and 47 of the Minimum Set); and ILO regularly published data on women managers (indicator 45 of the minimum set). Data on women's political participation at the local level has not been as systematically collected at the global level. However, measuring it is important because of the important functions of local governments and the significantly higher number of opportunities (that is seats) available to women at this level. Currently data are available for many countries but are not always comparable. UN-Women is currently working with the United Cities and Local Governments to develop tools to collect and make these data systematically comparable.

In addition to these indicators, the **Share of female researchers, by seniority level,** already collected by UNESCO, could be used as an additional indicator or for an eventual set of gender equality indicators for thematic monitoring.

Target 5.6:

UN-Women is working with UNFPA to develop this indicator and aligns itself with the response to be posted on this forum by UNFPA on behalf of both agencies.

Target 5.a:

Most of the comments are related to the formulation of indicator 5.a.1. In particular, some comments questioned the principle of 'ownership' of land and others questioned the fact that the indicator only addresses the land component of the target.

Response: While the indicator refers to 'land ownership', it is indicated in the metadata that in reality it captures a bundle of rights, including officially titled ownership as well as other proxies for secure rights, such as the right to use, sell or bequeath the land, or the right to use it as collateral. The suggested new formulation addresses this point and now refers to "**people with secure rights**".

As currently formulated, the indicator only monitors the share of women among those with secure rights to land (i.e. gender parity) and therefore would not necessarily capture whether this right is enjoyed by many or few people. Therefore, the suggested reformulation has two components that would capture the extent to which women and men have secure rights to land as well as whether there is parity between women and men.

Along with the current 5.a.2, this would capture the extent to which women enjoy secure access to land which is critical for their livelihood. Suggested New formulation:

a) Percentage of people with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land (out of total agricultural population), by sex; and
b) Share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land", by type of tenure

The focus on women's access to land for this target is justified by the fact that rural women in developing countries tend to be the most deprived and most of them rely on agriculture for their livelihoods. To achieve gender equality and women's empowerment, supporting rural women should therefore be a central aim of policy. For more information, please see the UN Secretary-General's Report for the 56th Commission at http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=E/CN.6/2012/3.

In addition to these indicators, to address other elements of the target, the indicator suggested by UNCDF can also be considered as an additional indicator " **Percentage of adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months".**

Many thanks to all for your comments and for considering these suggested changes. All the best
Papa A. Seck,
Senior Research and Data Specialist, UN Women

31 Aug, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)

Simonetta Zarrilli (UNCTAD) - Target 5.1, 5.4, 5.5, 5.a and 5.b
UNCTAD would like to propose some alternate indicators that incorporate the gender perspective:

5.1 - Ratio of female wages to male wages for similar work, by sector/ industry.

5.4 - Average hours spent on paid and unpaid work, by sex.

5.5

    a. Index of Dissimilarity for occupations and sectors (among others)
    b. Female share of managerial jobs
    c. Female share of professional jobs (incl. and excl. teaching; incl. and excl. health workers)
    d. Female share of clerical jobs
    e. Female share of informal employment
    f. Female share of permanent jobs

5.a

    a. Female share of landholding and immovable property.
    b. Female share of bank/ savings accounts.
    c. Female participation rate in technical and vocational training programmes.
    d. Female participation rate in government support programmes (extension services, inputs, credit)

5.b - Proportion of micro-enterprises and SMEs owned by women that have access to mobile phones and the internet.

01 Sep, 2015

Marta Santos Pais (SRSG on Violence against Children)
SRSG on Violence against Children

Target 5.2 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

In line with international legal obligations, States must recognize, promote and protect the human rights of women, girls and boys and address all forms of gender discrimination as part of a comprehensive violence prevention and response strategy. It should be noted that both girls **and** boys are subject to sexual violence and exploitation, all indicators should attempt to measure this phenomenon and be disaggregated by gender

I therefore continue to support the suggested indicators under target 5.2 with the addition in bold noted:

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

Proportion of women, ~~and~~ **girls and boys** (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15.

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

Harmful practices may be traditional or emerging, but generally have some cultural, social or religious underpinning. Common for most harmful practices is that they have devastating consequences on women and children's lives, development, health, education and protection.

I therefore support the suggested two indicators under target 5.3:

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

Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, by age group.

03 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
For this objective the measure of almost all of the indicators proposed is feasible for Ecuador, we find these indicators coherent with the objective and targets proposed.

The measure of two indicators proposed in Target 5.2 should not be limited only to physical and sexual violence, but should also include psychological violence. In addition, there should not be an age limit for women of 15 to 49 years old.

To measure the first indicator of Target 5.3 we recommend that the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean focus their efforts on the strengthening of administrative records regarding civil unions, so as to have the necessary information to calculate this indicator.

As for the second indicator in Target 5.3, female gentile mutilation, this is not a relevant indicator in Ecuador.

For the indicator in Target 5.4 there is a lack of impact and contribution measures of house work on the economy if this was payed work; the measure can be done with satellite accounts of unpaid work.

To measure the two indicators included in Target 5.6, an adequate definition of what is known as "personal decisions on sexual and reproductive issues" is needed. Ecuador interprets this Target according to what is established in the Population and Development International Conference, to our Constitution and according to national legislation. The Ecuadorian Constitution guarantees reproductive rights to workers and includes the elimination of labor risks that may affect reproductive health, work access and stability without any discrimination for pregnancy or number of children, maternity rights, lactation period, and the right to paternity leave. The Ecuadorian State prohibits the firing of a working woman because of maternity conditions, as well as any discriminations linked with reproductive roles. The State recognizes and guarantees life, including treatment and protection from the moment of conception.

The first indicator in Target 5.a is the same as in Target 1.4, this indicator should be eliminated from either target in order to economize indicators.

The second indicator in Target 5.a does not measure access to financial services, inheritance, natural resources, as is mentioned in this target.

For Target 5.b we propose the following indicator: Proportion of people that us ITC's by sex. We find this indicator more in line with the suggested Target.

Best regards,
José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 5

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

UN System Template_SDG5_Gender_Sept3_Revised.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 5. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (FAO, UNESCO, UNICEF, ITU, UNODC, OHCHR, UNFPA and UN Women), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 5.1: A small change in the language of proposed indicator as follows:

Priority indicator:

- Percentage of countries with legal frameworks that promote gender equality and non-discrimination against all women and girls

Additional indicator:

None.

Delete: Whether or not inheritance rights discriminate against women and girls

Target 5.2:

Priority indicator: In response to comments, the following changes (in bold) are suggested to the current two priority indicators:

- 5.2.1: "Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15+ subjected to physical, sexual and psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months, by form of violence and age";
- 5.2.2 "Proportion of women and girls aged 15+ subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15, by age and place of occurrence".

The target also mentions trafficking in persons which some member states have highlighted during their consultations. Therefore we would like to suggest adding:

- Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation (also suggested for 16.2)

Additional indicators:

Some member states have suggested extending the age ranges below the age of 15 but collecting data for girls below the age of 15 presents many technical and ethical challenges (see http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/Guidelines_Statistics_VAW.pdf). Therefore rather than expanding the previous indicators to girls less than 15 years of age, a NEW suggested indicator for measuring violence against girls younger than age 15 is the

- Proportion of women (aged 15-19 and 20-24) who were subjected to sexual violence before age 15, by any persons

An additional suggested indicator is

- Number of female victims of intentional homicide killed by intimate partner or family members per 100,000 women, per year

Target 5.3

No change

Target 5.4:

Priority indicator: No change

Additional indicators:

- Average weekly time spent in water collection (including waiting time at public supply points), by sex, age and location
- Participation rate of pre-school children in Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) programmes, by age of the child, location and family income

Target 5.5:

In response to comments and to address the target more comprehensively, the following new indicator is suggested (to replace the current two priority indicators):

- Proportion of women in leadership positions in political, economic and public life, by level and by type

This indicator will be broken down by level and type of leadership positions to include the proportion of women in: the Executive (Heads of State and governments, ministers and local governments), Legislative (national parliaments), Judiciary and Law enforcement (judges and police officers), and managers in public and private sector entreprises). Most of these sub-components are already available and are being monitored as part of the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators.

Additional indicator:

- Share of female researchers (ie. The percentage of researchers who are female), by seniority level

Target 5.6:

No change

Target 5.a:

Priority indicators:

In order to capture the extent to which people enjoy rights and whether women and men do so equally, the following change is suggested for indicator 5.a.1:

a) Percentage of people with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land (out of total agricultural population), by sex; and (b) Share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land", by type of tenure

No change to indicator 5.a.2

Delete the following indicators:

Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R);

Proportion of adult population owning land, by sex, age and location (BBB)

Target 5.b:

No change

Target 5.c:

Priority indicator: Change to:

Expenditure on gender equality policies as a percentage of total government expenditures

07 Sep, 2015

Ola Awad (State of Palestine)

Target 5.2: 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.

PCBS Comment: We agree on the suggested two indicators under this target, including the addition of other type of violence, not only the sexual violence, but we believe that age group should be

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

PCBS Comment: Child marriage is an important indicator, which is common in the developing countries, this indicator is collected through DHS and MICS questionnaires, so we agree to keep it.

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.

PCBS Comment: We agree on the suggested indicator, but it is available for individuals 10 years and over, as this indicator is in the LFS questionnaire which is administrated to individuals aged 10 years and over, also the period time is the last week not the average daily, so it is good if they change the target age group to be 10+ instead of 5+ and the reference period weekly instead of daily.

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 for Action and the outcome documents of their review conferences.

PCBS Comment: Indicator (Proportion of women (aged 15-49) who make their own sexual and reproductive decisions): It is better to expand the target group to include all women aged 15-54 years regardless their marital status.

Indicator (Proportion (%) of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education (official records)): This indicator could not be applicable for many countries who have no well established official records, also we agree with Colombia comment that this indicator measures the means not results

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.

PCBS Comment: We suggest to change the first indicator (Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)) to be " Share of women among agricultural land possession… not land owners.

As for the second indicator (The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to land ownership and control (, we think that this could not be applicable especially in countries who have no well established official records.

We suggest to add additional indicator as follows: % of women/girls who have bank account.

Target 5.b Enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology, to promote the empowerment of women.

PCBS Comment: We agree with Colombia comment that owning a mobile does not necessarily promote empowerment. We think that that target should revised, as the basic concept behind this target is not clear.

Ola Awad (State of Palestine)

President, Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS)

07 Sep, 2015 at 09:05 AM

Papa Seck (UN-WOMEN)
Dear Colleagues,

I would like to clarify a point raised by Brazil with respect to the indicator proposed for 5.c and to also agree with their suggestion. In their comment, Brazil raised the point that the current indicator proposed "Percentage of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment" isn't conceptually clear. This indicator was developed and agreed as part of the monitoring framework of the Busan Action plan for gender equality. In the methodological note (included in the May 2015 submission), the conditions that needed to be met for this indicator were specified. However, we also recognize that the current indicator is a means of tracking the resources allocated to support gender equality policies and would therefore fall short of the ambition of the target. Therefore, we would like to support Brazil's suggestion to change the indicator to **"Expenditure on gender equality policies as a percentage of total government expenditures".** This indicator will need some methodological work to ensure that it is consistently measured and standardized across countries. This work will be led by UN-Women, building on its

current work on gender-responsive budgeting, and we also welcome interested partners.The following template contains some additional details on this indicator.

UN System Template_SDG5_Gender_Sept3_Revised.xlsx

All the best

Papa

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 5.1
Proposal for indicator:
Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote, enforce and monitor equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex.
Enforce and monitor should be added.

Indicator for Target 5.2
Proposal for indicator:
Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls (aged 15-49) (aged 10-49)subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months.
It should be amended to (aged 10 – 49) since many girls are victims of violence and sexual violence from the early adolescence. In parts of the world the years of early adolescence are the most dangerous years in the life of women. By setting the limit at 10 years girls subject to "early marriage" will also be covered. Age should be differentiated into groups (10-14, 15-19…)

Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15.
Same remarks as above.

Indicator for Target 5.3
Proposal for indicator:
Percentage and number of women aged 20-24 who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e. child marriage).
OK. But it should be considered to have concrete figures instead - or in addition - since there may be countries where the percentage is "low" but where absolute figures may be quite high.

Indicator for Target 5.4
Proposal for indicator:
Average daily time (24 hours) spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location (for

individuals five years and above).

There are communities where girls and women are forced to do domestic work while they get "board and lodging". This kind of "payment" should not exclude these women/girls from the statistics. In some societies married women live under slave-like conditions with husbands and in-laws, these women get "board and lodging".

Indicator for Target 5.6
Proposal for indicator:
Proportion of women (aged 15-49) who make their own sexual and reproductive decisions.

Same comment as for target 5.2 above. The age group should be 10 - 49.

Proportion (%) of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education (official records).

Focus should be on conditions in each country. "Universal" should be understood to include all citizens in a country. As a next step you may compile the data collected from all countries so as to have an over-view of the global situation and development. If one speaks of "countries" as a whole, it is difficult to identify individual countries that do or do not live up to their obligations.

Indicator for Target 5.a
Proposal for indicator:
Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)

The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to land ownership and control.

OK. An earlier proposal for an indicator had certain advantages over the above: "Proportion of adult population owning land, by sex, age and location". However, "adult" should be deleted and instead "the population" should be inserted, which would indicate whether girls and boys are discriminated against with regard to the right to own land. This point will not be addressed if you only look at the number of women who own land.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany 07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de
                    IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicator for goal 5:

- gender pay gap

Additionally we would like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 5. They have been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 5.1 – By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote equality and non- discrimination on the basis of sex

Remark: The suggested Indicator measures only means, not results

Target 5.2 – 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.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: 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

Remark: At present, the indicator is limited to ages 15-49. An extension beyond 49 should be considered.

Target 5.3 – Eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11:

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

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

Suggestion: We would like to rephrase the indicator: Percentage of women who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e.child marriage)

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.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Average daily (24 hours) spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location (for individuals five years and above)

Remark: The indicator doesn´t ask for disaggregation.

Suggestion: We would like to replace the indicator by: Average daily (24 hours) spent on unpaid domestic and care work.

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.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11:

- Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)
- The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to land ownership and control.

Remark: The indicators do not cover economic resources, financial services, inheritance and natural resources as required by the target.

Target 5.b – Enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology, to promote the empowerment of women.

Suggested indicator: Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex

Remark: We think the proportion of individuals who USE a mobile phone (not "who OWN …") is necessary.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_05.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

For target 5.2, the indicators should cover also age groups 50+ and, in the case of 5.2.2, 0-14.

For indicator 5.3.2, we note that FGM/C is not necessarily limited to certain countries. All incidences of FGM/C should be monitored.

07 ep, 2015

Luis Mora (UNFPA)

UNFPA & UN Women Comments on Target 5.6 Indicators

Dear Members and Observers,

Please, find below some comments and additional information regarding target 5.6 coordinated between UNFPA & UN Women.

The indicator is based on three central elements measuring the empowerment of women (married, in union and ever sexually active women) aged 15-49 to make the following decisions, : (a) whether they are able to reject unwanted sexual relations; (b) using or not using contraception; and (c) whether they can access sexual and reproductive health care for herself.

Methodology

- The methodology for this indicator has been developed by UNFPA in close collaboration with UN Women by building on available information from DHS surveys. These three questions are already included in the DHS: (a) DHS q. 1054; (b) DHS Phase 7, q. 819 & 820; (c) DHS q. 922). In all cases these questions are currently asked to women married or in union. Therefore the denominator will need to be expanded to include ever sexually active women. In the case of the last question, the current DHS question just refers to 'healthcare for herself', not specifically SRH care, which will need to be added.
- UNFPA is also compiling and analyzing data from available countries across different regions to understand better how the indicator behaves and whether some additional tweaking will be needed in the formulation of the indicator and its specific components.
- In DHS, the indicator is already disaggregated by location, economic quintile, and education. For the component related to contraceptive use the indicator is also disaggregated by method of contraception. The proposal is to add age, marital status (married, in union, unmarried) and disability.

Country coverage

- For the time being, this indicator is available in approximately 70 countries covered by DHS. Meanwhile, UNFPA is holding conversations with MICS and other organizations to incorporate these questions in other surveys with a view to covering all countries on a global scale. While a combination of DHS and MICS would cover most low and middle-income countries, the possibility to integrate these questions in the *gender and generations survey* run by UNECE in several European countries and World values survey would ensure near universal coverage. A few high middle income countries such as Brazil and Mexico run their own national surveys, which tend to be similar in content to DHS.

Alignment between proposed sub-questions and the concept embodied in this indicator.

- Indicator 5.6.2 measures the level of empowerment of women (aged 15-49 to make sexual and reproductive decisions. UNFPA has held a number of expert consultations on the proposed indicators in which there was a general agreement that the first question of the indicator (whether a woman can say no to a husband/partner if she does not want to have sex) is well aligned with the concept of women's empowerment.

- With regard to the second question (decision concerning using or not using contraception) the expert views as well as the initial data charts being developed for a number of countries indicate that a more clear understanding of women empowerment is obtained by looking at the indicator from the perspective of decisions being made "mainly by the partner", as opposed to decision being made "by the woman alone" or "by the woman jointly with the partner". Depending in the type of contraceptive method being used, a decision by the woman "alone" or "jointly with the partner" does not always entail that the woman is more empowered or has bargaining skills. Conversely, it is safe to assume that a woman that does not participate in making contraceptive choices is disempowered as far as sexual and reproductive decisions are concerned. A disaggregation by type of contraceptive method will provide a more clear understanding of the level of women's empowerment, in particular in cases such as condom use or withdrawal for which a woman's empowerment relies on her bargaining skills.
- With regard to the third question, there is a clear view that a woman's decision about seeking sexual and reproductive health care is directly related to the concept of empowerment.

Considerations regarding the age range of the indicator

- UNFPA advocates for the expansion of the age range of several indicators in the SDG framework that currently rely on DHS and MICS as primary sources of information. This is critical in order to better assess the health, education and general wellbeing of very young adolescents, particularly adolescent girls aged 10-14, at a critical point in their lives in which they transition from childhood to adulthood and are exposed to specific vulnerabilities that can hamper their physical and emotional integrity and their actual development as empowered rights-holders. While this is a central concern for UNFPA, expanding the age range for indicator 5.6.1 poses particular challenges. On the one hand, household surveys would not be the most appropriate tools to capture this information given the way these surveys are designed and rolled-out. On the other hand, the ability for a very young girl to make sexual and reproductive decisions has to be seen in light of legal considerations such as the "minimum age of consent to sexual relations" and the "evolving capacity of the child". For instance a very young girl who declares that she can say "yes" to sexual intercourse may not have the level of maturity or the minimum age of consent to make a valid autonomous decision in that regard. Beyond normative and ethical considerations, these legal variables differ a lot from country to country, thus making it difficult to ensure comparability of data. It will be less problematic to capture information on the situation of very young adolescent girls through other indicators such as those related to sexual and gender-based violence (5.2) and child marriage (5.3).

Indicator 5.6.2

This indicator measures the proportion of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education irrespective of age, marital status and without third party authorization.

Methodology and feasibility of data collection

- The indicator will measure the number of countries with legal and regulatory frameworks guaranteeing access to sexual and reproductive services, education and information without any of the above restrictions. Therefore, to count as a "yes" all the four requirements included in this indicator will need to be met: (i) access without third party authorization; (ii) access without age restrictions; (iii) access irrespective of marital status; and (iv) access to education and information at all levels. For countries counting as "no", nevertheless, data will be disaggregated in accordance to each of those requirements to be able to measure progress on each particular front.

Sources of information and methodology:

- The suggested methodology consists of initial ***self-reporting by governments*** through a detailed survey to be developed based on the indicators below with detailed questions that safeguard the replicability and reliability of state responses. This procedure was successfully applied for the ICPD+20 review survey with support to governments from UNFPA's country offices where needed.
- Information provided by States can be complemented with information from UN treaty monitoring bodies, including the Committee on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. These three committees are systematically collecting information and issuing recommendations to State parties on all the issues covered by this indicator. A combined use of these three committees as sources of information will ensure near universal coverage of States and will also increase the periodicity of information.
- Moreover, other actors with a monitoring role such as regional human rights mechanisms, national human rights institutions and civil society organizations often provide information on the components covered by this indicator. UN agencies such as WHO, UNFPA and UN Women also compile country specific information on legal and regulatory developments on issues pertaining to their respective mandates.

Status of indicator:

- Baseline information is already available from WHO on laws and regulations and third party authorization. UNFPA will be gathering additional information on all the other requirements by drawing on the concluding observations issued by the UN treaty monitoring bodies listed above.

Proposed research questions:[1]

1.   Access to SRH services without third party authorization (from the spouse, guardian, parents or others)

a: Are there national laws and regulations that recognize a person's right to freely decide whether or not to accept health services?

b: Are there national laws and regulations requiring someone other than the patient/client to provide authorization to seek and receive health services? If yes, in what circumstances? Whose authorization is required? What procedures are followed?

c: Do national laws and regulations reflect the general principle that once a child has acquired "sufficient maturity and/or understanding" in relation to a particular decision on an important matter, he or she is entitled to make the decision independently?

*: Provide a summary of legal provisions relating to informed consent and relating to respecting the best interests, evolving capacities and views of the child.

2.   Access to SRH services without restrictions on the basis of age and marital status

d: Are there national laws and regulations that explicitly restrict access to SRH services on the basis of minimum age and marital status?
*: Provide a summary of legal/policy provisions relating to access to SRH services for adolescents and unmarried women and girls

e: Are there national laws and regulations that explicitly ensure access to SRH services without restrictions of age and marital status?

3.   Access by adolescents to SRH information and education

f: Are there national laws and regulations ensuring that all individuals have access to health information, including sexual and reproductive health information?

g: Are there national laws and regulations that regulate the provision of sexuality education in primary, secondary and higher education institutions, and for adolescents not enrolled in school?
*: Provide a summary of legal/policy provisions relating to universal access to information and comprehensive sexuality education.

07 Sep, 2015

---

[1] Based on WHO: "Reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health and human rights: A toolbox for examining laws, regulations and policies" and the ICPD+20 review survey

Keiruka Didigu (UNFPA)

Dear colleagues,

In support of Luis Mora's comments posted above, UNFPA is pleased to submit the following updated complete proposal for Goal 5 Target 5.6 (complete goal proposal is attached here in excel and here in word).

Consolidated responses to comments and feedback on UNFPA indicator proposals under target 5.6 (5.6.1 and 5.6.2)

UNFPA has been working in close partnership with UN women and other partners, on the development of methodology and generation of baselines for this indicator. Details of this work are posted in the word document and excel spreadsheet submitted.

Best regards,
Dr. Kiki Didigu
Post-2015 Branch
UNFPA

09 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 5

Target 5.1: End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere.

Suggested indicator: Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote equality and nondiscrimination on the basis of sex

Comment: The suggested indicator measures means, not results. Legal frameworks not necessarily guarantee the meet of the target. The indicator should measure actual results about discrimination.

Target 5.2: 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.

Suggested indicator: 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

Comment: The suggested indicator should not be only for women and girls aged 15-49, girls and older women suffer violence. Also, other types of violence should be included.

Suggested indicator: Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15

Comment: The suggested indicator should not be restricted by age range.

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

Suggested indicator: Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, by age group (for relevant countries only).

Comment: What could be measure is communities that declare the abandonment of the practice, and an estimation of the population covered.

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.

Suggested indicator: Average daily (24 hours) spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location (for individuals five years and above).

Comment: Time Use Surveys in Latin America usually ask about weekly instead of daily time.

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.

Suggested indicator: Proportion of seats held by women in local governments.

Comment: We suggest including women in leadership positions, not only in government.

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.

Suggested indicator: Proportion of women (aged 15-49) who make their own sexual and reproductive decisions.

Comment: The suggested indicator should not be restricted by age range.

Suggested indicator: [Proportion (%) of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education (official records)

Comment: The suggested indicator measures means, not results.

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.

Suggested indicator: The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to land ownership and control.

Comment: We suggest defining the indicator in terms of degree of implementation of the reforms. The suggested indicator doesn't cover financial services and natural resources.

Target 5.B: Enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology, to promote the empowerment of women.

Suggested indicator: Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex

Comment: The owning of a mobile telephone not necessarily promote the empowerment, it depends on the services provided.

08 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)

Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 5. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

[Goal 5 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx](#)

09 Sep, 2015

Anibal Sanchez Aguilar (Peru)

Target 5.2 : 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

Suggested indicator : "Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15"

Comment : It is suggested that the indicator should add "the last 12 months" to be similar to the first proposed indicator.

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.

Suggested indicator : " Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments".

Comment : It is suggested to extend the indicator to other areas of political power.

Target 5b : Enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology, to promote the empowerment of women.

Comment :It is suggested to add another indicator of women's access to other technologies such as the Internet that promotes empowerment.

Suggested indicator: "Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex"

11 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal5, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 5.2 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.		
Suggested Indicator	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	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15	Relevant
Target 5.3 Eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation.		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of women aged 20-24 who were married or in a union before age 18 (i.e. child marriage)	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, by age group (for relevant countries only)	This indicator is irrelevant for our country.

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.		
Suggested Indicator	Average daily (24 hours) spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location (for individuals five years and above)	Relevant
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.		
Suggested Indicator	Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Proportion of seats held by women in local governments	Relevant
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 for Action and the outcome documents of their review conferences.		
Suggested Indicator	[Proportion (%) of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee all women and adolescents access to sexual and reproductive health services, information and education (official records)	Relevant
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.		
Suggested Indicator	Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R)	"Economic resources" is not only related to agriculcute. "Ratio of entreprenuer women" could be used instead.
Target 5.c Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels.		

Suggested Indicator	Percentage of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment	Relevant

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives.

Indicator: Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex

Comment: That´s not an indicator. That´s a question. Once measured globally you will not have "Yes" or "No", since you'll have countries where the answer is "Yes" and countries where the answer is "No". The current formulation is only measurable if it's a national indicator.

Indicator: The legal framework includes special measures to guarantee women's equal rights to land ownership and control.

Comment: Should be removed. The subject measured is an enabler of the precedent **indicator:** Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (U/R).

14 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

ODS 5.pdf

14 Sep, 2015

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

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

The following are the comments from INDEC (Argentina) on this topic:

Target 6.1 By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all: INDEC measures "water's origin". In this sense, the category "Tap Water" is the only one that ensures the quality of the water.

Target 6.2 By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations:

We request the definition of the term "Sanitary services".

Sincerely,
Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)
02 Sep, 2015

UNSGAB
Dear members and observers of the IAEG-SDG

Please find below the comments from the UN Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation (UNSGAB) regarding the suggested indicators for targets under Goal 6.

In general, a single core indicator for each target would be insufficient to address the multiple elements that many of the targets in this goal contain.

Target 6.1: we support the suggested indicator "percentage of population using safely managed water services", noting that safely-managed water services provide for water not being contaminated to monitor progress towards target 6.1

Target 6.2 encompasses two substantially different notions: 1. Sanitation (toilets) 2. Hygiene (handwashing with soap).Using only the suggested indicator "Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services" would mean renouncing to part of the political ambition of the target. Therefore a second priority indicator "population with a handwashing facility with soap and water in the household" is needed.

Target 6.3 encompasses two different actions that contribute to water quality: 1. treatment of wastewater 2. recycling and safe reuse. The suggested indicator "percentage of wastewater safely treated" addresses the first action, but not the second one. To maintain the political ambition of target 6.3, we request the adoption, in addition to this first indicator, of another priority indicator to monitor recycling / safe reuse.

Target 6.4 deals with water efficiency and sustainable water withdrawals. The first suggested indicator "Percentage change in water use efficiency over time" allows to monitor meaningfully the first issue. The second suggested indicator "Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements in account" provides useful information but doesn't adequately measure progress towards the political ambition - sustainable withdrawals. Another indicator would be needed.

Target 6.5 calls for implementation of integrated water resources management, with a specific note about the need for transboundary cooperation. Using only the suggested indicator "Status of IWRM implementation" would result in the specific issues of transboundary watercourses being overlooked and would reduce the political ambition of the target. Therefore we support the second priority indicator "% of transboundary basin area with an operation arrangement for water cooperation".

Target 6.6 we support the suggested indicator

Sincerely
Francois Guerquin, UNSGAB coordinator

04 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
The measure of the second indicator in Target 6.1 is not relevant for Ecuador. We suggest that in the first indicator access to water be considered in the house perimeters.

To measure Target 6.2 the definition of what sanitation services should be managed in a safe way.

Ecuador does not have a disaggregation by economic activity for the first indicator proposed to measure Target 6.3.

For first indicator of Target 6.4 there should be an indicator that allows us to highlight the volume of wasted water in this distribution, with the goal to guarantee broader coverage to homes.

Clarification is needed in the methodology for the calculation of the indicator proposed in Target 6.5.

Targets 6.a and 6.b do not have a defined indicator.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 6

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

UN System Template v 3_SDG 6_UN-Water_v2015 4 September.docx

The attached table following the template agreed among the UN statistical system represents the collective UN input on SDG 6 indicators consolidated by UN-Water, the UN's inter-agency coordination mechanism on water and sanitation which counts 31 UN agency Members, including the Regional Commissions and all those agencies which are currently mandated to collect data on water-related indicators, plus 37 Partner organizations from outside the UN. The suggestions and comments on this list include a set of 12 core global indicators for SDG 6 that is being put forward for consideration by IAEG-SDGs member countries after an extensive consultation with agencies, outside organizations and countries.

The attached table displays comments in support of or slighting editing the list of indicators provided by the UN Statistical System on 11 August 2015. Suggestions include: i) changes in priority indicators for a few of the targets; ii) the inclusion of one priority indicator for a target which was currently blank (6.b); iii) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

As requested by the IAEG, data are disaggregated by gender, age and disability wherever this is feasible. The suggested indicators can be used as multipurpose indicators for many other targets, and these are noted in the attached metadata note being submitted as a PDF to the IAEG-SDGs, as well as at the following link:

http://www.unwater.org/publications/publications-detail/en/c/296330/. UN-Water also supports wherever possible the concept of 'monitoring ladders' to capture different monitoring starting points, ambitions and goals at the national level. More information on methodology is contained in the attached metadata note, accompanied by an updated statistical note prepared by WHO/UNICEF JMP for 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3.1.

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/Consolidated metadata note from UN agencies for SDG 6 indicators_v2015-09-04.pdf

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 6.1:

For target 6.1, we are supportive of the suggested priority indicator "**Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services**". "Safely managed" is defined as a basic drinking water source (using current WHO/UNICEFJMP categories for improved drinking water), located on premises and available when needed (i.e., negligible time for water collection), and free of faecal and priority chemical contamination.

Target 6.2:

For target 6.2, we are supportive of two priority indicators, including the suggested indicator "**Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services**". The target also calls for adequate and equitable hygiene for all and therefore requires a minimum of two indicators, to not lower the ambition of the target and risk antagonising Member States. Improved hygiene is essential to the achievement of SDG targets for health and nutrition. A second priority indicator on "**Percentage of population with a hand washing facility with soap and water in the household**", which is already on the list that has been circulated to the IAEG-SDGs on 11 August, is thus proposed.

Target 6.3

For target 6.3, we are supportive of the two suggested priority indicators currently on the list, but would suggest slightly altered wordings: "**Percentage of wastewater safely treated**" and "**Percentage of water bodies with good ambient water quality**", and want to emphasise the importance of keeping both indicators. Wastewater (domestic and industrial) is one of the most important pollutants and target 6.3 specifically calls on halving the proportion of untreated wastewater, and the indicator is particularly action-oriented. Further, domestic wastewater is an integral part of the sanitation chain, and its safe treatment is essential for reaching target 6.2. Industrial wastewater responds to the target 6.3 component of minimizing release of hazardous chemicals, and it is closely linked to industrialization and production practices. The target element on "substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally" is not directly covered, but in the future as the methods and data improve, the proposed wastewater indicator could be disaggregated to cover the proportion of safely treated wastewater that is safely reused. Ambient water quality represents the outcome of all pollution and pollution reduction activities, and is essential to fully report on target 6.3. The indicator describes the status of ecosystems and their functions, e.g. in regard to food production and biodiversity, and it is also strongly linked to marine pollution.

Target 6.4:

For target 6.4, we are supportive of the two suggested priority indicators, but would prefer slightly different wordings: "**Level of water stress: freshwater withdrawal in percentage of available freshwater resources**" and "**Percentage of change in water use efficiency over time**", and want to emphasize the importance of keeping both indicators. An indicator on withdrawals is essential to report on the environmental component of target 6.4 and the actual status of global water resources. An indicator on use-efficiency is essential to report on the economic component and is also action-oriented and of highest relevance for the goals on agriculture, energy, industry, and production and consumption. Finally, the two indicators are closely related and are two sides of the same coin: the level of water stress indicates the importance and urgency of the need for use-efficiency. Countries need both indicators to understand the challenge in achieving target 6.4. For this reason, we believe that there cannot be a priority between the two indicators and we are not able to propose a ranking.

Target 6.5:

For target 6.5, UN-Water supports the suggested priority indicator "**Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation (0-100)**". However, the target also explicitly mentions "transboundary cooperation" and we are thus suggesting to make a priority the additional

indicator on the 11 August list, namely "**Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation**". The inclusion of a transboundary aspect represents a significant increase in the aspiration regarding water management compared to previous international commitments (Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, 2002) and an associated indicator is essential to not lower this ambition. The transboundary element of target 6.5 must also be measured for each transboundary river basin, so this element needs different spatial metrics and a separate data collection from the indicator on national IWRM implementation. Both indicators are needed to cover the full scope of Target 6.5.

Target 6.6:

For target 6.6, we are supportive of the suggested priority indicator "**Percentage of change in wetlands extent over time**". The Ramsar broad definition of "wetland" is used, which includes rivers and lakes, enabling three of the biome types mentioned in the target to be assessed – wetlands, rivers, lakes – plus other wetland types. In many countries, wetlands (and rivers and lakes) constitute a prominent type of water-related ecosystems, and play a – by area – disproportionally important role in hydrology; countries without wetlands may choose to report on a different type of water-related ecosystem.

Target 6.a:

For target 6.a, we support in principle the suggested indicator but propose a slightly modified indicator: "**Amount of water and sanitation related Official Development Assistance <u>that is part of a government coordinated spending plan</u>**", computed as the proportion between the amount of water and sanitation related ODA a government receives, and the total amount budgeted for water and sanitation in a government coordinated spending plan. The modification allows for a better understanding of how much a country depends on ODA, and highlights its total budget for water and sanitation over time.

Target 6.b:

Although the target is essential for the long-term sustainability of interventions, we note that the circulated list of 11 August does not include an indicator, and we would thus like to reiterate our proposal: "**Percentage of local administrative units with established and operational policies and procedures for participation of local communities in water and sanitation management**". Monitoring builds directly on the UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) and the Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) reporting in SDG target 6.5.

08 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 6

Target 6.1: By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services"

Comment: It is necessary to define the variables that allow qualify the management of drinking water services as safe and establish if the potability is enough.

Target 6.2: By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation service"

Comment: It is necessary to define the safe management of sanitation services.

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 substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally.

Suggested indicator: " Percentage of wastewater safely treated, disaggregated by economic activity"

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health"

Comment: Currently not feasible in Colombia.

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.

Suggested indicator: "Percentage change in water use efficiency over time"

Comment: It is necessary to define the variables of the indicator and disaggregate by sector.

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress)"

Comment: It is necessary to clarify the definition of Water Stress. We could report the Water Use Index.

Target 6.6: By 2020, protect and restore water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, rivers, aquifers and lakes.

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of change in wetlands extent over time"

Comment: The suggest indicator does not cover the entire target. It is necessary to include other ecosystems.

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

Suggested indicator: "ODA for water and sanitation related activities and programmes"

Comment: We suggest complementing the indicator with information about capacity building.

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: *new loans for SMEs (# and $) for water and sanitation*

Desegregation of beneficiaries receiving the services delivered by private sector can provide information about how the private sector is contributing to bridge the gap (if any) or scale up services provided by public sector: *Number of people with improved water and sanitation provided by the private sector*

Private sector investment in water and sanitation

07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)
6.2 Proportion of population provided with sanitation in households, commercial area and public (toilets) can be estimation only Need more specific definition for 'non-threatening surrounding water quality

6.3 Need more specific definition for 'non-threatening surrounding water quality

6.4 The item is covered in the OECD Questionnaire on the state of Environment (Territorial variation) and has integrity and validity, but lacks measurability (in terms of agency in charge and high quality data production).

6.6 - Need more specification on "change in size of wetland over time' (i.e. method for calculating) - Need internationally agreed standard for 'change'

07 Sep, 2015

Tiina Luige (UNECE)
UNECE Environment Division: UNECE supports the consolidated proposal by the UN system. Below is some additional information on targets 6.5 and 6.b

Target 6.5

Additional justification for the proposed indicator for the transboundary cooperation aspect of target 6.5 "Percentage of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation (6.5.2)"

Transboundary cooperation in water management is crucial

By covering almost half of the Earth's land surface and some 40 per cent of the world's population lives within them, transboundary river or lake basins are extensive and affect many peoples' lives. Some 60% of the transboundary basins lack a working arrangement that supports cooperation. A lack of coordination and cooperation in the management of these shared resources is a major obstacle to sustainable development and a source of friction between countries.

It was a major political achievement to have the transboundary aspect in the wording of target 6.5 on integrated water resources management (IWRM), after a thorough debate by the Open Working Group. This represents one of the main increases in the aspiration regarding the water management compared previous international commitment (Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, 2002). To respect the intention of the OWG, it would be important for spurring progress in transboundary water cooperation to have this indicator.

River basin being the basic management unit, limiting monitoring of IWRM to the national level would a significant omission. The transboundary element of target 6.5 must be measured for each transboundary river basin, so this element needs a different spatial metrics and a separate data collection from the indicator on national IWRM implementation. Both proposed indicators are needed to cover the full scope of Target 6.5.

Measuring the indicator is feasible.

Countries could easily report on the geographical coverage of their transboundary water cooperation. At the most minimal level this would require communicating the summed-up area covered by operational agreements/arrangements or institutions, or even just the actual basins covered. With the river basins traversing national borders, it would be important to monitor the situation at the global level.

Basic information for monitoring the indicator is available for all countries. Moreover, baseline data is available, thanks to international projects, including geo-referenced datasets of the extent and location of transboundary basins as well as about existing agreements and institutions for transboundary cooperation. Reporting on transboundary water cooperation is currently being developed under the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, a global instrument, in the activities of which also non-Parties participate. Such reporting would allow for gathering information from the Member States.

Target 6.b

Proposed indicator: Effective participation of local communities and other members of the public concerned in water and sanitation management.

Indicator already used for Global Monitoring? Part of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) - this information should be collected through the mechanisms and means used for other IWRM-related indicators.

Interlinkages: 6.5

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 6.1
Indicator should be changed

Target 6.1 is well reflected in the two indicators and the disaggregation of the "weekly time spent" makes it strong in relation to the social, gender, equity dimension.

The indicator builds on previous MDG monitoring.

Suggest to use "safe" instead of "safely managed" as the end product, drinking water, is what matters. Water can be safely managed but still be unsafe to drink if the original source is polluted.

Relevant data from BBR and the GEUS database JUPITER.

Indicator for Target 6.3

The terms "safely treated" and "not presenting risks" may need to be further defined.

Indicator for Target 6.4
Indicator should be changed as a priority

The water use efficiency indicator is useful, but an additional indicator on water "withdrawals" is needed to cover the agreed target scope. That indicator would also contribute to underpin Target 6.6

The proposed indicator is relevant in DK, but the baseline at national level and how to define/measure water-use efficiency will be a global challenge.

A specific indicator on sustainable withdrawals is important.

Alternatively some kind of proxy-indicator e.g. "Percent change of people living in areas with water stress" would globally address developed and developing countries.

GEUS has the relevant data

Indicator for Target 6.6
Indicator should be changed as a priority

The indicator on wetlands extent is useful, but only covers part of the agreed target scope. A dedicated indicator on sustainable withdrawals (under Target 6.4) may alleviate this gap if environmental flow requirements are explicitly included.

(if no change is made: "wetlands" is a good "proxy", choice, to make it operational)

Indicator for Target 6.a
Suggest to add the word "volume" or "level" of ODA. Otherwise it doesn't make sense.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 6

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicator for goal 6:

- Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water service
- Percentage of wastewater safely treated

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 6. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 6.1 – By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Average weekly time spent in water collection (including waiting time at public supply points), by sex, age, location and income.

Remark: The target does not ask for disaggregation. The element of affordability is not covered by proposed indicator.

Target 6.2 – By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11: Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services

Remark: Hygiene has been dropped out (hand-washing), which is a major setback when it comes to safe sanitation and health.

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 substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally.

Indicator suggested by list of Aug 11:

- Percentage of wastewater safely treated, disaggregated by economic activity
- Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health

Remark: The target does not ask for disaggregation by economic activity but minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials. Why shouldn't be this reflected in the indicator?

Target 6.5 – By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate.

Remark: The proposed indicator should be further considered. However, it should be extended by an additional feature which allows for integrating transboundary cooperation into the suggested questionnaire-based evaluation instead of a second specific indicator on transboundary cooperation.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_06.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

Several of the proposed indicators throughout the goal use the term "safely managed". This has different meanings depending on the context and should either be replaced by more concrete wordings or clearly defined.

For indicator 6.3.2, it may be practical to limit the coverage to a narrow selection of parameters, including microbiological contamination. The priority should not be to be comprehensive but to address substances that give a useful proxy of the overall status of water bodies.

For indicator 6.4.1, we propose to differentiate the data by a) water use for cooling b) water use for hydropower, and c) water use for other purposes. Depending on the structure of the country in question, use types a) and/or b) may dominate the total volume of water used but pose less of a problem for the environment. Please also note that water stress is measured at river basin level (not country), which raises questions about the added value of aggregation at national and global level.

For indicator 6.5.1, the definition of "degree of implementation" needs to be clarified.

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find 2 contributions from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 6. The word document contains Annex 1: Towards Standards Based Global Monitoring – The Case of Water. Please note that the full paper which includes this annex has been posted in Topic 22. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 6, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA.

Regards,

Goal 6 Water.xlsx

Annex 1 Water.docx

07 Sep, 2015

Keiruka Didigu (UNFPA)

Dear colleagues,

UNFPA is pleased to submit the following updated complete proposal for Goal 6 Target 6.2 (complete goal proposal is attached here).

Target 6.2 UNFPA Indicator proposal one under target 6.2 tweaked to read as follows: "Percentage of primary and secondary schools providing basic drinking water, adequate sanitation and adequate hygiene services."

Best regards,
Dr. Kiki Didigu (UNFPA)
Post-2015 Branch
UNFPA
08 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)

Please find below US comments to indicators for Goal 6. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 6 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Singapore

Target 6.4: We would like to seek clarifications on whether "water use efficiency" has the same meaning as "water productivity".

10 Sep, 2015

Anibal Sanchez Aguilar (Peru)

Target 6.1 : By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking wáter

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services"

Comment: Peru has an indicator of safe water, mainly defined by the water distributed by public network. Therefore, it is suggested to define what is meant by safe water for the proposed indicator.

11 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal6, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 6.1 By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all.		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Average weekly time spent in water collection (including waiting time at public supply points), by sex, age, location and income.	Not relevant to all countries (especially in weekly basis)
Target 6.2 By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services	Relevant
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 substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally.	
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of wastewater safely treated , disaggregated by economic activity	The indicator can be changed as "Percentage of wastewater safely treated , disaggregated by economic activity (for point sources)". The definition says "composite indicator based on treatment ladders for domestic and industrial wastewater", but the indicator itself is mentioned as "by economic activity". In order to overcome this conflict and misunderstanding, it would be better to seperate non-point sources such as runoff from agricultural activities, and only emphasize point sources such as domestic and industrial. (Point source: a source of one or more pollutant(s) that can be geographically located and represented as a point on a map, for example the point of discharge of a sewer into a river. http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/coded_files/OECD_ESTAT_JQ_Manual_version_2_21.pdf)
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health	Relevant
	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.	
Suggested Indicator	Percentage change in water use efficiency over time.	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress)	Relevant
	Target 6.5 By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate	

Suggested Indicator	Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation (0-100)	Relevant
Target 6.6 By 2020, protect and restore water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, rivers, aquifers and lakes.		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of change in wetlands extent over time	It may not be an indicator that can be very important in determining the target. Although no change was observed over time, it is possible to ensure sustainable management for wetlands.

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow African members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services

Comment: We need more information on the metadata regarding "safely managed".

Indicator: Percentage of waste water safely treated , disaggregated by economic activity

Comment: The issue is important to address, but the methodology of measurement is complex for the disaggretation by economic activity. We agree with the indicator but removing the disaggregation suggested.

Indicator: Percentage of receiving water bodies with ambient water quality not presenting risk to the environment or human health

Comment: The issue is important to address, but the methodology of measurement is complex. We need further information on the measuring methodology before commenting.

Indicator: Percentage change in water use efficiency over time.

Comment: Difficult to measure / Need further information

Indicator: Percentage of total available water resources used, taking environmental water requirements into account (Level of Water Stress)

Comment: Needs more clarity

Indicator: Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation (0-100)

Comment: Need further information on that indicator.

Indicator: Percentage of change in wetlands extent over time

Comment: Need to integrate other ecosystem areas such as forest, rivers, lakes…

14 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

[ODS 6.pdf](ODS 6.pdf)

14 Sep, 2015

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

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

For Target 7.1 we recommend dividing the first indicator into urban and rural areas. The indicator in Target 7.2 answers to the objective, however, it only partially contributes to the target given that this indicator only measures consumption and the target only mentions raises in participation of renewable energy in total energy without specifying if it refers to consumption or no. In Target 7.3 the indicator should be separated by economic activity; in doing this it is important to take into consideration the energy intensity levels in these sectors: transportation, industrial, residential; that do not necessarily consume primary energy. This indicator does not answer to Target 7.a, we propose an indicator that measures cooperation in the generation of clean energy.

Best regards,
José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR
05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 7

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

[UN System Template v.3 SDG 7 ENERGY Rev1.xlsx](#)

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 7. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among over 30 international and regional organizations which are part of UN-Energy, SE4ALL and the "Global Tracking Framework" effort[2]. The organizations supporting this set of energy indicators are the

---

[2] UN-Energy, SE4ALL, World Bank, UNSD, UNDESA, UNIDO, UNDP, UNEP, UNEP/Riso, WHO, IAEA, FAO, UN Women, UN-Habitat, UNFCCC, UNECE, ECLAC, ESCWA, ESCAP, ECA, IEA, ESMAP, IRENA, IIASA, REN21, WEC, UN-Foundation, Global Alliance for Clean Cookstove, Energia, IIASA, IPEEC, GWP, Practical Action and SIWI.

world leaders involved in energy research activities including in the definition of goals, targets and indicators. The Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 7.1

Priority indicators

- **Indicator 7.1.1(Percentage of population with electricity access, %) and Indicator 7.1.2 (Percentage of population with primary reliance on non-solid fuels, %)** are solid indicators and fit for purpose (AAA, Tier 1). They are the same indicators proposed in the 11 August table. The indicators are fully defined and supported in the "Global Tracking Framework-SE4ALL" effort.

Additional indicator

- **Indicator 7.1.3 (Percentage of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technologies in the home, %).** This is an additional indicator which was not on the 11 Aug table. The indicator is strongly supported by WHO. Agencies would like to see an evolution of indicator 7.1.2 to indicator 7.1.3 in the future.

In relation to **Target 7.1**, it is important to note that a **multi-tier metric system** is being developed by the "Global Tracking Framework" multi-agency effort. This system will be able to capture the levels of energy access as well as reliability and affordability. This multi-tier metric methodology is described in the 2015 ESMAP/World Bank report "*Beyond Connections: Redefining Energy Access*."

Target 7. 2

Priority Indicator

- **Indicator 7.2.1 (Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption, %)** is solid indicator and fit for purpose (AAA, Tier 1). This is the same indicator in the 11 Aug table. The indicator is fully defined and supported in the "Global Tracking Framework-SE4ALL" effort. Organizations support 7.2.1 with Final Energy Consumption as defined by energy statistics, so data are widely available on a comparable basis.

The alternative definition proposed in the 11 Aug table "Share of energy from renewable sources in net domestic energy use" is not recommended. The use of the SEEA framework as suggested in the "source" column by UNSD has considerable limitations, as very few (if any) countries are compiling energy accounts and therefore a baseline 2015 figure against which to measure progress toward the target will be impossible to establish. Besides, SEEA-Energy has not yet been approved by the UN Statistical Commission.

Target 7.3

Priority Indicator

- **Indicator 7.3.1 (Rate of improvement in energy intensity (%) measured in terms of primary energy and GDP in PPP)** is solid indicator and fit for purpose (AAA, Tier 1). This is the same indicators in the 11 Aug table. The indicator is fully defined and supported in the "Global Tracking Framework-SE4ALL" effort. Organizations support this proposed indicator, with Total (Primary) Energy Supply defined by energy statistics and energy balances, a well-established and widely compiled aggregate agreed by international organizations and countries alike. The alternative definition proposed in the 11 Aug table "Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry" is not recommended.

Proposed indicator 7.3.2 in the 11 Aug table is valuable at pointing to the need to measure underlying energy input to output measures in different sectors. Unfortunately, the data needed to implement such an indicator is only available for a handful of countries.

Target 7.a

Priority Indicator

- **Indicator 7.a.1 (Improvement in the net carbon intensity of the energy sector (GHG/TFC in CO_2 equivalent)** is useful insofar as the carbon intensity of energy production is a measure that paints a much broader picture of the environmental sustainability of the energy sector, going beyond renewable energy to capture nuclear power as well as lower carbon fossil fuels. Organizations support this indicator as an indirect indicator for this target.

Indicator 7.a.2 proposed in the 11 Aug table focuses primarily on financing, which is an input variable, and there are doubts the necessary data would be available.

Target 7.b

For Target 7.b, organizations support the use of the **indicator 7.1.1 proposed for Target 7.1 (Percentage of population with electricity access,%)**, as it suits better the stated target of "expand[ing] infrastructure and upgrad[ing] technology for supplying modern and sustainable energy services for all in developing countries".

Proposed indicators in the 11 Aug table 7.b.1 "Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry" and 7.b.2 "Percentage of international cooperation projects being implemented to facilitate access to clean energy" are not recommended.

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 7

Target 7.A: By 2030 enhance international cooperation to facilitate access to clean energy research and technologies, including renewable energy, energy efficiency, and advanced and cleaner fossil fuel technologies, and promote investment in energy infrastructure and clean energy technologies

Suggested indicator: "Improvement in the net carbon intensity of the energy sector (GHG/TFC in CO2 equivalents)"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not include the **international cooperation**. We suggest include indicator 7.A.2. Include 2 indicators: One regarding financial resources and other about non-financial resources **to facilitate access to clean energy research and technologies.**

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: *new loans for SMEs (# and $) for sustainable energy*

Desegregation of beneficiaries receiving the services delivered by private sector can provide information about how the private sector is contributing to bridge the gap (if any) or scale up services provided by public sector: *Number of people with improve sustainable energy provided by the private sector*

Private sector investment in sustainable energy

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 7.a
7.a.1 Indicator seems fine, however, its technical nature makes it difficult to communicate to the

population. 7.a.2- Indicator is useful, however, would it be possible to create a valid quantifiable objective?

Indicator for Target 7.b
7.b.1 - Useful indicator closely related to the efficiency objective? Do we need an additional indicator measuring energy efficiency? 7.b.2- Not useful as a global indicator, because it measures "input" rather than "outcome".

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany 07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 7

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 7:

- Percentage of population with electricity access
- Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 7. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 7.1 – By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Percentage of population with electricity access (%)

Remark: The element of affordability of these targets is not covered by proposed indicator.

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Improvement in the net carbon intensity of the energy sector (GHG/TFC in CO_2

Equivalents)

Remark: Indicator can only be the net carbon intensity and not the improvement.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_07.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

In principle, we support the indicators suggested for targets 7.1 and 7.2, but they need some improvement regarding the definitions.

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 7. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 7, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA.

Regards,

Goal 7 Energy.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 7. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 7 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Haji Abdul Rahman bin Hasan (Malaysia)

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.
Indicator 7.a.2	Amount of Foreign Direct Investment and Financial transfer for these purposes Data on Foreign Direct investment (FDI)
Comment	This indicator is based on section in Malaysia Standant Industrial Classification (MSIC) 2008. Please specify the definition "Energy" and the the diferrent between "Affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern categories listed under Goal 7 "

10 Sep, 2015

Singapore

Target 7.1: Singapore does not compile data on electricity access. However, we believe that this percentage is close to 100%. We also do not compile data on non-solid fuels but the percentage is likely to be negligible.

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal7, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of population with electricity access (%)	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of population with primary reliance on non-solid fuels (%)	Clarification is needed.
Target 7.2 By 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix		
Suggested Indicator	Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption (%)	Relevant
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		
Suggested Indicator	Improvement in the net carbon intensity of the energy sector (GHG/TFC in CO2 equivalents)	Relevant
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		
Suggested Indicator	Ratio of value added to net domestic energy use, by industry.	Relevant

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

[ODS 7.pdf](ODS 7.pdf)

14 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

The National Statistics Institute of Cabo Verde has no comments regarding the indicators for Goal 7.

14 Sep, 2015

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

Sainarayan Ananthanarayan (ICAO)

Proposed indicator for the SDG Goal 8, Target 8.9

The indicators being considered by the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) to monitor the progress towards implementing Goal 8, Target 8.9 are the indicators proposed by UNWTO and ICAO. The UNWTO's suggested indicator is tourisms contribution to GDP and Jobs created. The ICAO's suggested indicator is the merging of this UNWTO indicator with its connectivity utilization indicator. The merged indicator would be better suited because it provides an opportunity to States to directly monitor the progress of policy making and its implementation to drive sustainable tourism.

ICAO – UNWTO Merged Indicator

ICAO proposes that the suggested indicator of the UNWTO and its 'Connectivity Utilization Indicator' be merged into one indicator. More than half of the tourists into a State arrive by air. The international tourists contribution to the GDP and Jobs created is significantly higher. The economic contribution due to air connectivity is therefore a key catalyst and directly benefits the tourism industry.

It is essential that to reap the full economic benefits that tourism offers, policies that promote air connectivity are formulated and adopted by States. This is all the more critical not only for States that rely heavily on tourisms contribution to their GDP but also for the sustainable economic development of Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs) as well as Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The pace of policy making to increase connectivity and to translate connectivity opportunities available to actual utilization is a key factor in promoting sustainable tourism and economic development.

ICAO and the UNWTO have been coordinating their efforts in the UNSC to develop a merged indicator which essentially displays for each State, in one holistic view, both the UNWTO's suggested indicator i.e. the tourisms contribution to the GDP as well as ICAO's suggested indicator i.e. air connectivity utilisation. The merged indicator can specifically measures the efficacy of policy making at the State level aimed at maximizing air connectivity and tourism opportunities.

With the merged indicator, the gap between connectivity opportunity available and unutilized and/or the slow pace of policy formulation to improve connectivity can be easily monitored at the State level as a function of the opportunity available to the State to increase its GDP and Job creation. The merged indicator monitors critical policy implementation and thus is better suited to monitoring Target 8.9 as opposed to a standalone indicator of either the UNWTO or ICAO.

Data for the Merged indicator

Data required for the air connectivity indicator is collected by ICAO as part of its core statistics program from its 191 Member States. For tourisms contribution to GDP, data is collected by UNWTO through its statistics and tourism satellite account program.ICAO is responsible for global monitoring

of the 'Connectivity Opportunities Utilization Indicator'. Data is available for all ICAO Member States. UNWTO is responsible for global monitoring of indicators related to tourism contribution to GDP for its 156 Member States.

ICAO – UNWTO Collaboration

ICAO and UNWTO collaborate actively in sharing and analysis of each others data and metadata as well as in range of policy issues to promote connectivity and tourism. They are also collaborating in the UNSC and other technical bodies to make their indicators available to the UN Member States to better monitor progress towards the Goal 8 – Target 8.9 SDGs. ICAO will, following UN recommended standards for exchange of statistical information, make the merged indicator available in a web based platform and disseminate the same to the UN Member States to facilitate policy formulation to promote sustainable tourism and economic growth.

17 Aug, 2015

> ***Reply to comments from Sainarayan Ananthanarayan (ICAO)***
>
> Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)
>
> The ILO supports this indicator which will be instrumental in following up the proposed target 8.9 and is in line with the joint activities between the UNWTO and the ILO in developing a framework in tourism satellite account and the impact on job creation.

19 Aug, 2015

Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)
Comments on proposed indicator on 8.3 regarding informal employment.

In reference to the application of this proposed indicator to developed economies, reacting to some of the concerns expressed by some countries, it should be noted that the UNECE Group on Quality of Employment within the Conference of European Statisticians has just agreed in June 2015 to use the concept of informal employment as discussed in the 17th. International Conference of Labour Statisticians to all countries. However, the actual definition can be adapted to various types of countries and this is going to be one of the main focus of the forthcoming meetings of the Delhi Group. However, the definition of informal employment as it is defined in the metadata presented to the UNSC, is applicable to all countries.

It is clear that the target is wider than the indicator and it could be combined with other indicators. However, if there is a need to focus only on one indicator to capture the essence of the target, the proposed indicators can be seen as the main core of the target, since it is specific referred to informality.

19 Aug, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)

Torbjörn Fredriksson (UNCTAD) - Target 8.2 & 8.3

8.2 - The Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development proposed the indicator "value added of the ICT sector" in February 2015. It was taken out in the prioritization process. As there are proposals of alternative, complementary and new indicators in the July 2015 list, we suggest to re-propose this indicator. It is feasible, suitable and relevant; it is 2nd tier (a methodology has been established but data are not easily available). The proposal can be included as follows:

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
UNCTAD	Complementary indicators: **Value added of the ICT sector as a share of total value added in the economy** Justification: The ICT sector is technology intensive, and a source of high-value added and innovation	National accounts	UNCTAD, currently collects this indicator yearly	2	2	1.4, 2.3, 5.b, 8.3, 8.9, 8.10, 9.3, 17.11 (based on WSIS-SDG matrix re. action line C7 e-business)

8.3 - The Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development proposed the indicator "employment in the ICT sector/employment in ICT occupations" in February 2015. It was taken out in the prioritization process. Since there are proposals of alternative, complementary and new indicators in the July 2015 list, we suggest to re-propose this indicator. It is feasible, suitable and relevant; it is 3rd tier (an internationally agreed methodology has not yet been developed) although work is being done to develop the definition of ICT occupations.

01 Sep, 2015

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

The following are the comments from INDEC (Argentina) on this topic:

Target 8.1 Sustain per capita economic growth in accordance with national circumstances and, in particular, at least 7 per cent gross domestic product growth per annum in the least developed countries: Argentina did not participate of the 2010 PPC Round, so the index of Argentina is not the result of an official measurement, it an estimation developed by the World Bank .

Target 8.2 Achieve higher levels of economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, including through a focus on high-value-added and labour-intensive sectors: The indicator could be elaborated, but the definition of the term "employed person" is needed.

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: Definition of indicator is requested.

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: It is possible to be estimated if it is normalized by hours. Otherwise, the indicator would have a bias

Target 8.6 By 2020, substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training: INDEC does not agree with theis indicator, because payed employment is not considered (on the contrary, the non paid employment as recognized by the19th WLO-CIET).

Target 8.10 Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all: INDEC disagrees with this indicator.

Sincerely,
Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)
02 Sep, 2015

Marta Santos Pais (SRSG on Violence against Children)
SRSG on Violence against Children

Target 8.7: Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms.

Violence against children and child labour are closely related. Across the world, violence forces children to work, surrounds children's working conditions and affects many millions of children who are working, both legally and illegally. The 2006 UN Study on Violence against Children noted that the workplace is among the most difficult settings to address. Although information about the extent of the phenomenon is often weak, the very nature of child labour and its worst forms represents violence against children. The Study recommended that governments should ensure that all possible means of collecting data on child labour should be deployed.

I therefore support the suggested indicator under target 8.7:

Percentage and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, by sex and age group (disaggregated by the worst forms of child labour).

Also, in my view the following indicator, which is currently proposed under 16.2, would be more suitable as an indicator for target 8.7, as it explicitly aims to eradicate forced labour, slavery and human trafficking:

Number of victims of trafficking (within and across countries), slavery, exploitation and forced labour, per 100,000

04 Sep, 2015

Hubert Escaith (WTO)

WTO comments on Target 8.a based on the 11 August list of trade related indicators We agree with the suggested indicator for monitoring. Additional indicators (e.g., doubling of AfT in 5 years) are targets rather than indicators.

04 Sep, 2015

Mondher Mimouni (ITC)

SDG 8: ITC comments based on the list of indicators circulated on August 11

Target 8.2

The indicator **Export diversification in terms of products and markets**, originally proposed by ITC/WTO, should be considered as an important complement/alternative to the **Growth rate of GDP per employed person**. Among the main reasons to maintain also this indicator we would like to mention that:

- The indicator would allow inferring a country's level of value addition, level of processing and degree of diversification of its production from the composition of its export sector
- Data and a draft methodology prepared by ITC to calculate this indicator are already available (http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/ITC_Export diversification.docx)
- The indicator could be usefully cross linked with Goal 17 (i.e. 17.11) resulting, therefore, as multipurpose indicator that could enhance synergies among different goals.
- The target is broad in scope and a single indicator wouldn't' allow to capture all the nuances of economic productivity. As it was already mentioned in this forum by our colleague *Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO), "the target is wider than the indicator [i.e.* **Growth rate of GDP per employed person**] *and it could be combined with other indicators"*

- The concept of "diversification" is clearly mentioned in the target but is not captured by the **Growth rate of GDP per employed person**. Diversification will be instead at the core of the proposed indicator.
- The final version of the background paper for the interactive dialogue on *Fostering sustainable economic growth and transformation and promoting sustainable consumption and production* refers explicitly to export diversification, technological advancement and value addition: *"Sustained growth can only be realized through structural transformation, i.e. the ability of an economy to constantly diversify into new rapidly expanding activities characterized by higher technological intensity, greater value added and productivity, export diversifying potential and increasing returns to scale."*

Target 8.3

ITC would like to propose the possibility of rolling out a country survey that would allow calculating the **N° of policies dedicated to the enhancement of MSMEs that have been implemented at the national/regional level**. Differently from other measurements proposed, the above mentioned indicator would address directly the prescriptions of the target, i.e. "*Promote development-oriented policies".* The survey could target governmental institutions as well as trade support institutions. Policies could be further disaggregated by economic sector. Further methodological work would be needed to identify a list of criteria that have to be satisfied in order to attribute a value to the relevant development-oriented policy.

07 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
We propose an improvement on the indicator for Target 8.1 by measuring average GDP growth rate at purchasing power parity for a determined time period (4-5 year periods), this would allow for a smoother trend of irregular economic cycles and a better comparison of growth in developed economies with economies in development.

For Target 8.2, the proposed indicator offers a glance at the evolution over time of labor productivity of any country; however, we feel it is necessary to divide sectors with high aggregated value and those that are labor intensive.

The indicator in Target 8.4 does not answer to the objective or the target given that it is too general. "Resource productivity" does not indicate on what specific variable efficiency and sustainable developmental are measured. An alternative indicator could be "generation of non-contaminating electric energy rate" (e.g. hydroelectric energy), over total energy production.

For Target 8.7, considering that the percentage of population in reference is small, a disaggregation by worse types of child labor is not relevant. We consider that regional policy should focus on eliminating child labor from 5 to 14 years of age.

The first indicator in Target 8.8, in reference to fatal and non-fatal work-related accidents, we recommend a separation of two different indicators; one covering frequency of work-related accidents and another for time lost because of these accidents.

To reduce the number of indicators, we recommend the removal of the second indicator of Target 8.8 since the first indicator measures the target in the best way.

For Target 8.9 there are two proposed indicators; however, looking to be more efficient and optimize indicators, we recommend the use of only the indicator of tourism as a percentage of GDP, considering this is the best indicator.

The relation of the first indicator in Target 8.10 with the objective or the target is not very clear; measuring the number of ATMs and the number of bank branches does not allow us to observe access, even there is coverage in the entire country the clients could still only belong to the upper quintiles with more resources. We recommend the inclusion of the following indicator: Financial Depth Index in the first quintile, this would allow us to effectively observe the access to financial capital that individuals with lower income have. In addition, another more relevant indicator for economic growth could be volume of credit given.

The second indicator of Target 8.10 is not clearly related with the objective or the target, given this, it should be replaced with an indicator that measures "microcredit participation rate over total productive credit".

The indicator in Target 8.a is undetermined, given that it lacks specificity in the calculation and is not in accordance with the objective. We propose an indicator that measures growth in exportation from developed countries to countries in development, or an indicator that measures exportations of goods with no tariff rates from countries in development.

To measure Target 8.b we recommend the division of two indicators; one for public expenditure on social protection and labor programs as a percentage of total budget and of GDP. On the other hand, an indicator for rate of collective negotiation, under the assumption that it is an independent indicator. We suggest that only the first indicator of this proposal be maintained.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from David Muñoz (Ecuador)

Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)
As for Target 8.b, the target refers to the ILO Global Jobs Pact which has been taken by the UN and within this pact there is a strong component of social dialogue as main part of decent and productive employment, namely collective bargaining and that is the reason of inclusion of collective agreement rates in the proposal. Otherwise the target is not even addressed.

07 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

Goal 8

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

[Goal 8- -Consolidated version 3.02.15.xlsx](#)

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 8. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (ILO programmes, World Bank, OECD, WTO, UNIDO, UNEP, UNWTO, ICAOS, UN Women, UNICEF), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it. In target 8.4, there are two separate proposals, one by UNEP and one by the World Bank, which are displayed as alternative courses of action to be decided by the IAEG.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 8.1

Priority indicator (Tier I), with only a minor change is proposed (underlined):

GDP per capita growth rates

Target 8.2

Remains unchanged

Priority indicator (Tier I)

Growth rate of GDP per employed person

Target 8.3

Remains unchanged

Priority indicator (Tier II)

Share of the informal employment in non-agriculture employment by sex

Target 8.4

This target received two different proposals which are similar but would require decision from IAEG since there was no time to get consensus between various agencies.

Proposed by UNEP:

Priority indicator (Tier III): National resource efficiency in consumption and production activities measured, also providing guidance for implementation of the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns.

Proposed by World Bank:

Priority indicators:

8.4.1) *Adjusted Net Savings* indicator,which, as a percentage of the Gross National Income, measures gross savings minus consumption of fixed capital, plus education expenditures, minus energy depletion, mineral depletion, et forest depletion, and particulate emissions and carbon dioxide damage.

8.4.2) *Adjusted Net National income per capita*, which equals gross national income minus consumption of fixed capital, energy depletion, mineral depletion, and net forest depletion, divided by midyear population.

Target 8.5

Remains unchanged but with the addition of one indicator (8.5.3) under the assumption that the target is too broad and would be better captured with this additional indicator.

Priority indicators (Tier I for all disaggregation except disability):

8.5.1 Unemployment rate by sex, age group and disability

8.5.2 Average hourly earnings of female and male employees by occupation (Wage/Gender gap)

8.5.3 Employment to working population (15 years and above) ratio by sex and age group.

In the case of the 8.5.2, it could be extended to include also the self-employed and therefore defined as Gender pay gap, insofar countries start reporting and producing the necessary information, which is not the case at the present.

Target 8.6

Remains the same with the additional disaggregation by sex.

Priority indicator (Tier I):

Percentage of youth (15-24) not in education, employment or training (NEET),by sex.

Target 8.7

Remains the same

Priority indicator (Tier II):

Percentage and number of children aged 5-17 engaged in child labour, per sex and age group (disaggregated by the worst forms of child labour)

Target 8.8

Remains the same

Priority indicators

8.8.1 Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and time lost due to occupational injuries by sex and migration status

8.8.2) Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention.

Target 8.9

Some refinements and an additional indicator were produced, but it remains mostly unchanged.

8.9.1) Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP, per capita and in growth rates) and number of jobs in tourism industries as % of total jobs and growth rates of jobs by sex

8.9.2) Connectivity opportunity utilization as % of air connectivity opportunity available and utilised.

Target 8.10

Remains unchanged

8.10.1) Number of commercial bank branches and ATMs per 100.000 adults;

8.10.2) Percentage of adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months.

Target 8.a)

Remains unchanged

Aid for Trade Commitments and Disbursements

Target 8.b)

Remains unchangedTotal government spending in social protection and employment programmes as percentage of the national budgets and GDP and collective bargaining rates.
07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 8

Target 8.2: Achieve higher levels of economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, including through a focus on high-value-added and labour-intensive sectors

Suggested indicator: "Growth rate of GDP per employed person"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not completely cover the target. It's necessary to include information about **diversification, technological upgrading and innovation.**

Target 8.3: Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services

Suggested indicator: "Share of informal employment in non-agriculture employment by sex"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not completely cover the target. It's necessary to include some measures on **entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and access to financial services.** Also, it should not be restricted to non-agriculture employment.

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

Suggested indicator: "Resource productivity"

Comment: Currently not feasible for our country. We are working on it and hope to have information in 5-10 years.

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

Suggested indicator: "Average hourly earnings of female and male employees by occupations (Wages/Gender wage gap)"

Comments: The suggested indicator does not cover completely the target.

Decent work is more than earnings (opportunities, productive work, decent working hours, work-family conciliation, security and stability).

An indicator for the productivity of the work could be the poverty rate among employees.

Also, there are some phenomena behind the gender wage gap: in some countries women can´t participate in labour market or work less hours per month than men because they have to take care of children, elderly and sick people, and perform other unpaid domestic work, so even if the average hourly earnings were the same, the real monthly income would be much lower. The suggested indicator does not reflect those phenomena, so there are some options: measure the average monthly earnings, or complement with other indicators like labour market participation rate, hours worked per month and time-related underemployment.

Target 8.7: Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, incluiding recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025, end child labour in all its forms.

Suggested indicator: "Percentage and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, per sex and age group (disaggregated by the worst forms of child labour)"

Comment: Disaggregation by worst forms currently not feasible for our country. It´s necessary to include measures of human trafficking

Target 8.8: Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment

Suggested indicator: "Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and time lost due to occupational injuries by gender and migrant status"

Comment: Not completely feasible for our country. We have information about formal employment, but not about informal employment.

Suggested indicator: "Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not reflect the target; ratification of a convention is a mean but does not necessarily imply results in terms of protection of labour rights**.** We suggest including unionization rate as indicator.

Target 8.9: By 2030, devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products

Suggested indicator: "Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP and in growth rate); and Number of jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by gender)"

Comment: We have information about added value by activities related with tourism, but not GDP. The suggested indicator does not include information about promotion of **local culture and products.**

07 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)

I agree that the in most of the targets the indicator (and in some cases the set of indicators) is not enough to capture the objective of the target. This is particularly the case of 8.5 where decent work encompasses at least four dimensions (employment, social protection, rights at work and social dialogue). However, the selected indicators were selected taking other indicators from other goals in order to combine them. For instance, your comment on working poor (which we fully share) is part of the indicators under Goal 1 where it was suggested to have poverty rates BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS, in order to capture this missing dimension here as a proxy for labour productivity. In the case of 8.2 and 8.3 it is clear that the chosen indicator will have to be combined with other goals in order to have a broader picture. However, in order to have a very reduced number of indicators the more representative of the target was chosen, bearing in mind other indicators in other goals. For instance, trafficking is included in other goal and therefore should not be duplicated here. We agree that the number of indicators is not enough but this is due to the scope agreed for the targets, which is not our task to rephrase them.

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators. We propose to include indicators that reflect *Employment (#)/Temporary employment, disaggregated by gender, by private sector*

07 Sep, 2015

Ola Awad (State of Palestine)
Target 8.3 Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services

PCBS Comment: in State of Palestine there is indicator about share of Household value added to GDP by activity that covers attributes of the target.

Ola Awad (State of Palestine)

President, Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics

07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

8.6 - Need to harmonize NEET definition with the OECD definition

*OECD's concept of NEET: Unemployed persons who have not received regular education and training and economically inactive persons among youths. - As for 'have not received training', it was agreed that attending informal institution counted as receiving training and to be excluded from NEET, based on Korea's suggestion. (LSO 12th General Convention Labor Market Implementation Sub-Committee,'14.9.)

8.7 Need further clarification on "by the worst forms of child labour"

8.8 Number of ILO conventions ratified is not appropriate measure of labor rights protection as ILO member countries are under different (legal and social) circumstances for ratification of conventions, and such ratification cannot be mandated among countries.

8.10 Estimation may not be possible if secondary financial markets are to be included Practically not possible to produce the indicator due to privacy issue

8.b Unclear what (collective bargaining rates)' means

8.3 This indicator is included in the quality of employment indicator by EU and ILO, but is not covered in the EU Labor Force Survey (Korea's Economically Active Population Survey).

07 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)

Thanks for your comments. As for 8.7. it refers to ILO Convention 182 and the 18th. International Conference of Labour Statisticians. Worst forms of child labour : as defined by ILO Convention No. 182xlix include, (a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labour, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict, (b) the use, procurement or offering of a child for prostitution, production of pornography or pornographic performances, (c) the use, procurement or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular, for the production and trafficking of drugs; and (d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.

As for collective agreement rates please refer to http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/publication/wcms_223121.pdf, page 195, where the metadata is explained. I am posting it in the platform for your reference, along with the other doubts on indicator definition.

07 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)

As for the NEET, please note that the concept is defined in
http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---
stat/documents/publication/wcms_223121.pdf(page 35)

Measurement objective and rationale Youth not in employment, education or training
(NEET) provides a measure of youth who are outside the educational system, not in training
and not in employment, and thus serves as a broader measure of potential youth labour
market entrants than youth unemployment. It includes discouraged worker youth as well as
those who are economically inactive due to disability and engagement in household chores,
among other reasons.

Concepts and definitions For statistical purposes, the United Nations defines youth as those
persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years, the age group recommended to define
unemployed youth. In practice, many national statistics offices apply definitions of youth
which differ from the international standard. Youth not economically active are youth who
are neither employed nor unemployed. According to the International Standard
Classification of Education (ISCED),18 education is defined as 18 See the International
Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) developed by UNESCO, available at
http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/international-standard-classification-of-
education.aspx 36 organized and sustained communication designed to bring about
learning.19 Youth in formal and nonformal educational programmes should be included in
the scope of coverage for NEET.

However, youth in informal educational programmes should not be included as they do not
fall within the scope of ISCED for measuring participation in education. Formal education is
defined in ISCED as education that is institutionalized, intentional, and planned through
public organizations and recognized private bodies and, in their totality, make up the formal
education system of a country. Non-formal education, like formal education is defined in
ISCED as education that is institutionalized, intentional and planned by an education
provider but is considered an addition, alternative and/or a complement to formal
education. It may be short in duration and/or low in intensity and it is typically provided in
the form of short courses, workshops or seminars. Informal learning, which is to be excluded
from the scope of NEET, is defined in ISCED as forms of learning that are intentional or
deliberate, but not institutionalized. It is thus less organized and less structured than either
formal or non-formal education. Informal learning may include learning activities that occur
in the family, in the work place, in the local community, and in daily life, on a self-directed,
family-directed or socially-directed basis.

The training concept as used in NEET refers to non-academic learning in which trainees
acquire specific skills intended for vocational or technical jobs. Vocational training prepares
trainees for jobs that are based on manual or practical activities, and for skilled operative
jobs, both blue and white collar related to a specific trade, occupation or vocation. Technical

training on the other hand imparts learning that can be applied in intermediate-level jobs, in particular those of technicians and middle managers. The coverage of vocational and technical training includes only programmes that are solely schoolbased vocational and technical training.

07 Sep, 2015

Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)

We agree that the in most of the targets the indicator (and in some cases the set of indicators) is not enough to capture the objective of the target. This is particularly the case of 8.5 where decent work encompasses at least four dimensions (employment, social protection, rights at work and social dialogue). However, the selected indicators were selected taking other indicators from other goals in order to combine them. For instance, your comment on working poor (which we fully share) is part of the indicators under Goal 1 where it was suggested to have poverty rates BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS, in order to capture this missing dimension here as a proxy for labour productivity. In the case of 8.2 and 8.3 it is clear that the chosen indicator will have to be combined with other goals in order to have a broader picture. However, in order to have a very reduced number of indicators the more representative of the target was chosen, bearing in mind other indicators in other goals. For instance, trafficking is included in other goal and therefore should not be duplicated here. We agree that the number of indicators is not enough but this is due to the scope agreed for the targets, which is not our task to rephrase them.

07 Sep, 2015

Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)

I would like to suggest the consultation of the following link where the definition of various suggested indicators are explained:

http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/publication/wcms_223121.pdf

On informal employment, please refer to:

http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_222979.pdf

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)

Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 8.4
Indicator should be changed as a priority

Priority to maintain resource productivity as indicator with a preference to use DMC/BNP as key indicator, possibly supplemented with DMC/GVA for selected sectors.

Priority to include an indicator for "decoupling of growth from environmental degradation".

Indicator should also measure environmental degradation.

An indicator on GDP/natural capital should be included for example by using the work by World Bank and UNEP.

See report by UNEP and UHU-IHDP (2012) "Inclusive wealth report 2012 – measuring progress towards sustainability".

Indicator for Target 8.9
Indicator should be changed as a priority

Indicator does not at all cover the sustainability element and thus does not respond to the target. We strongly encourage that outreach is made to the UNEP Programme on Sustainable Tourism (under the 10 YFP-SCP) and the World Tourism Organisation to identify a more appropriate indicator.

The focus of the target is on policy. Thus, if no better indicator can be found, one solution could be to use "No of countries with dedicated strategies/programmes/action plans for sustainable tourism".

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany 07 Sept 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

<u>Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 8</u>

Dear chairwomen, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 8:

- GDP per capita
- Unemployment rate

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 8. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 8.1 – Sustain per capita economic growth in accordance with national circumstances and, in particular, at least 7 per cent gross domestic product growth per annum in the least developed countries

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: GDP per capita, PPP

Remark: We do support the suggested indicator.

Target 8.2 – Achieve higher levels of economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, including through a focus on high-value-added and labour-intensive sectors

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Growth rate of GDP per employed person

Remark: This is a useful indicator. However, the concept of informal employment needs further conceptual specification for its application in developed countries. Otherwise, the cross-national comparability of the indicator will be poor.

Target 8.3 – Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Share of informal employment in non-agriculture employment by sex.

Remark: This is a useful indicator. However, the concept of informal employment needs further conceptual specification for its application in developed countries. Otherwise, the cross-national comparability of the indicator will be poor. Besides, for Germany there is no data on informal employment. Furthermore, a disaggregation is not requested by the target and thus not required within the indicator.

Target 8.4 – Improve progressively, through 2030, global resource efficiency in consumption and production and endeavor to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation, in accordance with the 10-year framework of programs on sustainable consumption and production, with developed countries taking the lead

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Resource productivity

Remark: At present, resource productivity is the best available indicator to measure progress in resource efficiency.

Suggestion: We would like to use the indicator "resource productivity" defined as GDP/DMC_{abiot}

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Unemployment rate by sex, age-group and disability.

Remark: The concept of disability should be further specified to allow for international comparability. We suggest supplementing the suggested indicator with the indicator "gender pay gap".

Target 8.9 – By 2030, devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP and in growth rate)
- Number of jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by gender)

Remark: The second indicator should refer to "decent" jobs. A disaggregation is not asked by the target. Although we already have two indicators, they do not completely meet the target regarding the sustainability aspect.

Suggestion: We would like to rephrase the indicators:

- *Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP)*
- *Number of decent jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs)*

Target 8.10 Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Number of commercial bank branches and ATMs per 100,000 adults
- % adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months

Remark: The target itself primarily focuses on "capacity of domestic financial institutions" which is far from being directly covered by the indicators. The indicator still does not consider insurance products as a separate line of financial services.

Suggestion: We would like to replace indicators:

- *Holder of a debit-card, credit-card or bank account per 100,000 adults.*
- *Number of insurance policy holders per 100,000 adults*

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Total government spending in social protection and employment programmes as percentage of the national budgets and GDP and collective bargaining rates

Remark: The level of public expenditure does not necessarily reflect effectiveness. This indicator is especially for countries of a high level of development not unambiguous. For a universal agenda it is not ideal.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_08.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

Several of the proposed indicators would benefit from a disaggregation to sub-national level, e.g. for level 1 in the NUTS classification for the EU. This would highlight different economic statuses and developments within the countries.

For several indicators, the proposed disaggregation by disability status would complicate data collection for the EU, since the Labour Force Survey does not capture this variable.

Please also consider the proposed alternatives for target 8.4: Trade in environmental goods and services in USD/year, Investments in environmental goods and services in USD/year and/or the Global Competitiveness Index (see http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-report-2014-2015/defining-sustainable-competitiveness)

07 Sep, 2015

> ### Reply to comments from Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
>
> ### Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)
> Thanks for your contribution. I think that the the list you were looking at is not the more recent one submitted by UNSD in August 11. Many of your concerns have been solved there after the first round of the IAEG. In the case of disability, we also think that the availability of this disaggregation is limited. However, the target has been explicit in mentioning this breakdown and we could see that in the future we should be having this information available. If we want to be forward looking we may need to include it and then increasingly incorporating it.
>
> 08 Sep, 2015

Hien Ngo (IPBES Secretariat)
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 on sustainable consumption and production, with developed countries taking the lead

Suggested indicator: Resource productivity

Comment: It would be great to see discussion and development on this idea from SEEA a the meeting in Bangkok as this will be a useful indicator for IPBES products

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 8. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 8, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

Goal 8.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 8. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 8 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Anibal Sanchez Aguilar (Peru)
Target 8.1 : Sustain per capita economic growth in accordance with national circumstances and, in particular, at least 7 per cent gross domestic product growth per annum in the least developed countries.

Suggested indicator : "GDP per capita, PPP".

Comment :It is pertinent to point out that the GDP purchasing power parity at international agencies jointly developed with countries.
11 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal8, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 8.1 Sustain per capita economic growth in accordance with national circumstances and, in particular, at least 7 per cent gross domestic product growth per annum in the least developed countries		
Suggested Indicator	GDP per capita, PPP	Relevant
Target 8.2 Achieve higher levels of economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, including through a focus on high-value-added and labour-intensive sectors		
Suggested Indicator	Growth rate of GDP per employed person	Relevant
Target 8.3 Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services		
Suggested Indicator	Share of informal employment in non-agriculture employment by sex.	Relevant
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 on sustainable consumption and production, with developed countries taking the lead	
Suggested Indicator	Resource productivity.	Relevant

Target 8.6 By 2020, substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training

Suggested Indicator	Percentage of youth (15-24) not in education, employment or training (NEET)	Relevant

Target 8.7 Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human traffickign and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms.

Suggested Indicator	Percentage and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, per sex and age group (disaggregated by the worst forms of child labour)	Relevant

Target 8.8 Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment

Suggested Indicator	Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and time lost due to occupational injuries by gender and migrant status	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Number of ILO conventions ratified by type of convention.	Relevant

Target 8.10 Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all

Suggested Indicator	Number of commercial bank branches and ATMs per 100,000 adults	Relevant

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

Suggested	Total government spending in social protection and employment	Relevant

Indicator	programmes as percentage of the national budgets and GDP and collective bargaining rates	

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

[ODS 8.pdf](ODS 8.pdf)

14 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)
Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow African members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Resource productivity.

Comment: We need further information. The suggested methodology is the SEEA one?

Indicator: Unemployment rate by sex, age-group and disability.

Comment: We suggest to remove the disaggregation by disability. Disability is important and should be measured, but disaggregation of unemployment rate by disability will greatly increase the survey cost.

Indicator: Tourism direct GDP (as % of total GDP and in growth rate); and Number of jobs in tourism industries (as % total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by gender)

Comment: Please separate. They are two distinct indicators.

Indicator: Number of commercial bank branches and ATMs per 100,000 adults

Comment: Please separate. They are two distinct indicators.

Indicator: % adults with a formal account or personally using a mobile money service in the past 12 months". Possible to have a break down by income e.g. bottom 40% of income share or <$1.25/day, by gender, age (youth) and rural. Adults: ages 15+

Comment: Access to and utilization of financial services is the important thing to measure in Africa

14 Sep, 2015

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

Marco Merens (ICAO)
ICAO is proposing an additional indicator for 9.1

[ICAO Indicator Proposal to 9.1](#)

12 Aug, 2015

Shyam Upadhyaya (UNIDO)
From the document that summarized member's comments I took the note of France on 9.4 and China on 9.b

Here is my response to those comments:

1) France asks if the indicator takes into account CO_2 emissions only or emissions in CO_2 equivalent.

> The indicator actually refers to CO_2 emissions only. It should have been written CO_2 emissions (*Not* carbon emissions) to be more precise. CO_2 equivalent is supposed to include other elements of GHG; however in case of emission caused by industrial production CO_2 has very high share (around 80 %) and data are more readily available.

2) China comments on definition of MHT

> MHT stands for Medium high and High Technology sectors. There are four categories (High, Medium high, Medium low and Low) of technological intensity based on R&D expenditure per unit of value added. For this indicator first two categories are combined. It is general practice to use combined MHT categories as the technological shift in developing economies is gradually taking place from MLT to MHT. Very few countries have high-tech sectors dominant. Technological changes are more visible with MHT data both for developing and industrialized economies.

17 Aug, 2015

Genevieve Verdier (IMF)
Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 9.1:

- "Infrastructure" is usually classified into "economic" and "social" categories. The first includes roads, railroads, airports, bridges, waterways, dams, etc. The second, schools, hospitals, water and sewage treatment facilities, etc. The target and indicators mix both.
- Regarding economic infrastructure, the suggested indicator "Share of the rural population who live within 2km of an all season road" commendably focuses on rural population's access to all season roads.

- Adding indicators on telecommunications' coverage would be useful, such as proportion of households with broadband internet access (raised by UNIDO and ITU). Another indicator to consider is the number of cellphones/inhabitant, as cellphones are an important tool for financial inclusion, increasing savings of the poor, etc. and their penetration is an indicator of the usefulness and accessibility of this element of communications infrastructure.
- The indicator "share of population employed in business infrastructure (consultancy, accounting, IT and other business services)" is meaningful only for countries were the services industry is growing faster than the traditional industry (US, Korea, Finland, Sweden, etc.), i.e. for highly developed countries.
- On social infrastructure, the indicator "number of health and educational facilities affected by disasters and for how long" alone addresses the resilience of social infrastructure.
- The list of indicators should include measures of the level of infrastructure (public capital per capita or relative to GDP). They could also include measures of infrastructure quality—survey measures are available from the World Economic Forum as well as measures of infrastructure services (electricity consumption, access to water, roads per capita, etc.) from the World Bank's World Development Indicators. A measure of public and private investment relative to GDP should also be included (available from the IMF's IFS or WEO).
- Many of these indicators will be highly correlated with income. For example, there could be very good paved roads to the president's home town, but this will not serve the purpose of either economic development or public well-being. The issue should be that whatever infrastructure exists should effectively promote economic development and human well-being.
- Some indicators have the potential to provide an unrealistically rosy picture. For example, passenger and freight volumes could be through a country rather than serving a country, e.g. Mongolia's main rail line is a conduit between China and Russia.
- Clear measurement problems exist with some indicators. What constitutes a "walking and cycling facility" – a large number of streets would qualify. Many public transport systems cannot measure the two points of a trip necessary to measure distance – rather, they measure the number of rides. How will "effective implementation of airports" be determined? The share of rural population within 2 km of an all-season road will, in many cases, not be known.

Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 9.a:

- The indicator suggested by UN ("Amount of investments in infrastructure as a % of GDP") and another indicator raised by UNIDO ("Annual credit flow to infrastructure projects") do not address Target 9.a, which calls for increased support by the international community to least developed countries in infrastructure development.
- In particular, the indicator suggested by UN does not address the issue of "facilitating" infrastructure development. Both the level of infrastructure investments and credit flow to infrastructure projects address only financial support, leaving unaddressed technological and technical means of support.
- Indicators of whether development is being facilitated would include supportive measures such as the existence of independent regulators.

25 Aug, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

We would like to submit our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion.

Synergies should be sought between the indicators for the SDGs and for the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR basically proposes the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework. The indicators were discussed and reviewed by more than 60 Experts from UN System, civil sector, academic and research sector, and private sector. The Attached Annex is the proposal on the Sendai Framework indicators for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OEIWG). Some indicators are selected to be proposed for the SDG. Please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document for the details of each indicator.

This proposal is also consistent with and further revised from the UNISDR Proposal in coordination with 16 UN agencies (FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO) which was submitted to the IAEG web-platform in early July.

The paper includes indicator proposal for the target 9.1.

We greatly appreciate your attention.

UNISDR proposal:

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).pdf

Indicator details (please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

Best regards,

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR) (UNISDR) (ishigaki@un.org)

UNISDR

31 Aug, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)

Jan Hoffman (UNCTAD) - Targets 9.1, 9.3 and 9.a

UNCTAD proactively promotes a set of indicators that capture different aspects of access to international transport networks and global value chains, including the World Bank's Doing Business

(DB) component on border crossing, the World Bank's Logistics Performance Index (LPI), UNCTAD's Liner Shipping Connectivity Index (LSCI) and ICAO's air connectivity index.

While none of these four indicators captures all aspects of the above targets, and none has a clear cut target level or threshold, they nevertheless offer indicators for achieving better access.

The UNCTAD LSCI is a readily available indicator, which is increasingly established and used in international benchmarks (e.g. WEF) and research on trade and trade costs. It is available since 2004 and updated annually. The 2015 LSCI is already on-line (see http://stats.unctad.org/lsci).

Best regards

Jan

01 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Jan Hoffman (UNCTAD)

Shyam Upadhyaya (UNIDO)

I can see the relevance of LSCI to Target 9.1 and 9.a, but I do not see its relation to 9.3 which is purely related to small scale industry.

01 Sep, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)
Angel Gonzalez-Sanz (UNCTAD) - Target 9.5 & 9.b

A general comment that we already made in February is that nearly all the indicators suggested in the area of science, technology and innovation would provide information about changes in the inputs to R&D, not about the outputs either in terms of knowledge or, more importantly, of innovation. This may reflect a rather outdated vision of innovation (presumably the desired outcome given that it is innovation and not knowledge per se that results in socioeconomic change) as a linear function of the amount of resources spent in R&D. This is reflected in the language of target 9.5.

For target 9.5 we propose to add the following indicator

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
UNCTAD	Complementary indicator: Change in percentage of enterprises reporting having introduced product, process, marketing or organizational innovation. Disaggregated by size of enterprise.	National innovation surveys.		2	2	9.b, 12.a, 17.6, 17.7, 17.8

For target 9.b we propose an alternative indicator that may be more comprehensive and readily available for virtually all countries:

Contributor Name	Specification	Source	Entity	Tier	Priority	Interlinkages
UNCTAD	Complementary indicator: Change in exports of medium- and high-skills and technology intensive manufactures.	UNCTAD	UNCTAD	2	2	9.5

01 Sep, 2015

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

The following are the comments from INDEC (Argentina) on this topic:

Target 9.2 Promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and, by 2030, significantly raise industry's share of employment and gross domestic product, in line with national circumstances, and double its share in least developed countries: GDP related infromation is published in Argentine Pesos.

Sincerely,

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)

02 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

The calculation of the first indicator of Target 9.1 is not feasible for Ecuador.

The second indicator for Target 9.1 does not show any direct relation with the target, we consider it should be removed to reduce number of indicators.

For the second indicator of Target 9.4, considering that in Ecuador there are no direct sources to measure it, it is complicated for us to obtain and adequate source for this calculation.

The monitoring of Target 9.c could be strengthened if an indicator that incorporates the percentage of population with mobile phone service, access to internet and owning a computer is created.

Best regards,
José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

Goal 9

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

[Goal9_UN System 4 Sept_final.xlsx](#)

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 9. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (ICAO, ITU, UNCTAD, UNESCO-UIS, UNIDO, UNISDR, UN Women, World Bank), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 9.1

Priority indicators

- To retain one of the two suggested priority indicators (Share of the rural population who live within 2km of an all season road).

Additional indicators

- Note: this target is multidimensional (about infrastructure), therefore several types of infrastructures were considered.
- To reduce the number of additional indicators to 3.
- To add:
  - *Damage to critical infrastructure due to hazardous events*

Target 9.2

Priority indicators

- No suggested change on the indicators.

Target 9.3

Priority indicators

- No suggested change on the indicator.
- To add one of the additional indicators as a second priority indicators (Percentage of SME with a loan or line of credit)

Target 9.4

Priority indicators

- No suggested change on the indicator.

Target 9.5

Priority indicators

- No suggested change on the indicator.

Additional indicators

- To add:
    - *Percentage of enterprises reporting having introduced product, process, marketing or organizational innovation.*

Target 9.a

Priority indicators

- No suggested change on the indicator.

Target 9.b

Priority indictors

- No suggested change on the indicator.

Target 9.c

Priority indicators

- No suggested change on the indicator.
- To add a second priority indicator since the target is multidimensional:
    - *Broadband Internet prices.*

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 9

Target 9.1: Develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including regional and transborder infrastructure, to support economic development and human well-being, with a focus on affordable and equitable access for all.

Suggested indicator: "Passenger and freight volumes"

Comment: We suggest define the indicator in relative terms, i.e per 1.000 inhabitants. Clarify if it´s only referred to road transport, or also include air, water and rail transport.

Target 9.2: Promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and, by 2030, significantly raise industry's share of employment and gross domestic product, in line with national circumstances, and double its share in least developed countries

Suggested indicator: "Manufacturing Value Added (share in GDP, per capita, % growth)"

Suggested indicator: "Manufacturing employment, in percent to total employment"

Comment: The suggested indicators don't include inclusivity and sustainability

Target 9.3: Increase the access of small-scale industrial and other enterprises, in particular in developing countries, to financial services, including affordable credit, and their integration into value chains and markets

Suggested indicator: "Percentage share of (M) small scale industries' value added in total industry value added"

Comment: The suggested indicator doesn't necessarily measure access to financial services

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

Suggested indicator: "Amount of investments in infrastructure as a % of GDP"

Comment: The indicator should include international support, and not just financial but also **technological and technical support.**

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

Suggested indicator: "Percentage share of medium and high-tech (MHT) industry value added in total value added"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not reflect the target as mean of implementation.

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)

Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

Comment on indicator 63. In a set of high level indicators an indicator in R&D is questionable rather than an indicator on innovation.

Comment on indicator 9.2. Not sure why measure employment only in "public utilities" rather than utilities in general.

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Target 9.1

- Damage to critical infrastructure due to hazardous events
- Number of countries that adopt and implement critical infrastructure protection plan

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx

(I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

In response to several countries' inputs on these indicators, we would like to add explanation why we propose these indicators.

1. **Linkage of follow-up/review mechanisms between the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**

The SDGs require that "data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible". (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

UNISDR would like to inform on Sendai Framework reporting mechanism:

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted in March 2015. The Members States agreed to set seven global targets and assigned a task to UNISDR to support development of indicators to monitor the Sendai global targets in coordination with other relevant mechanisms for sustainable development and climate change (para 48 (c) in the Sendai Framework).

The seven global targets include substantial reduction of (a) mortality, (b) affected people, (c) direct economic loss, (d) damage to critical infrastructure) and (e) increase of the number of countries having national and local DRR strategy, (f) international cooperation, and (g) increased availability of and access to risk information and early warning system. (Para 18 in the Sendai Framework)

The indicators we proposed for the SDGs are also proposed to the "Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group for indicators and terminology of the Sendai Framework (OEIWG)" to be discussed by the government experts (the 1st meeting will be held in 28-29 September). We believe the coherence between the Sendai and the SDG follow-up/review mechanism will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis.

2. **National ownership**

We would like to emphasize that our proposals are all based on national data sources. We think this is consistent with the spirit of the SDGs that says "the global review will be primarily based on national official data sources" (para 74 (a) in the SDGs, in the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). Currently 85 countries have standardized national disaster loss databases and more countries will have such databases under the request of the Sendai Framework. The indicators we proposed are therefore measurable and comparable across time and space. In the inter-governmental working group for the Sendai Framework (OEIWG), the Member States will discuss for further standardization of disaster loss data and policy related data.

3. **Indicator development process accounting for the technical robustness, measurability and inclusiveness**

Between the 1st IAEG and the submission of this input, we organized a technical expert meeting inviting UN agencies, scientific and academic organizations, civil sector and private sector to examine and discuss indicator proposals to monitor the Sendai Framework and how to build linkage between the Sendai Indicators and SDG indicators(27-29 July, Geneva). More than 60 experts participated in the meeting and/or provided written inputs.

In the meeting, the indicator proposals were examined from <u>measurability perspective</u>. Terminology was defined and remaining challenges identified. In the meeting of intergovernmental expert working group (OEIWG), the proposed indicators will be further discussed and refined from <u>government perspective</u>.

The proposal for the Sendai Framework indicator is uploaded in the website.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

We appreciate your attention.

Best regards,

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 9.4
Indicator should be changed as a priority

Indicator does not cover all the elements of the target as the element of adoption of clean and environmentally sound technologies is missing in the proposed indicator just as increased resource-use efficiency in the target is expected to cover more than just carbon emissions, e.g. use of natural resources.

It should be further considered if an indicator covering the uptake of clean and environmentally sound technologies could be developed, especially in relation to other important pollution components.

We acknowledge that data quality could be a challenge, but we encourage investigating further whether investments in green technologies at national level and/or amount of public and private infrastructure retrofitted would be more suitable indicators.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 Sept 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 9

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 9:

- GDP per capita
- Manufacturing Value Added
- %-of GDP for R&D
- Gross capital formation per capita
- Consolidated government debt in percentage of GDP

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 9. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 9.1 – Develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including regional and transborder infrastructure, to support economic development and human well-being, with a focus on affordable and equitable access for all

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Passenger and freight volumes

Remark: Volume of transportation alone is not a suitable indicator because it does not meet the target.

Target 9.2 – Promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and, by 2030, significantly raise industry's share of employment and gross domestic product, in line with national circumstances, and double its share in least developed countries

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Manufacturing Value Added (share in GDP, per capita, % growth)
- Manufacturing employment, in percent to total employment

Remark: Both indicators do not reflect the (social and) environmental dimension of sustainable industrialization. The environmental dimension of sustainable industrialization is covered by target 9.4 and its respective indicator.

Suggestion:

- Manufacturing Value Added (share in GDP)
- Manufacturing employment, in percent to total employment

Target 9.3 – Increase the access of small-scale industrial and other enterprises, in particular in developing countries, to financial services, including affordable credit, and their integration into value chains and markets

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Percentage share of (M) small-scale industries' value added in total industry value added

Remark: Need to be clarified. Small-scale industries or small-scale enterprises? Moreover we would like to avoid duplications with indicator 8.3.

Suggestion: Replace indicator by: **"***Percent of SMEs with outstanding loan or line of credit***"**

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Carbon emission per unit of value added

Remark: It is not clear if the indicator takes into account CO_2 emissions only or emissions in CO_2 equivalent. Furthermore, the indicator considers only one part of the target. Therefore we can revert to the indicator "DMC_{abiot} per capita" which is also used to meet target 12.2.

Suggestion:

- *GHG emission per unit of value added*

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Amount of investments in infrastructure as a % of GDP

Remark: For the sake of comparability, a definition for infrastructure would seem useful, also explaining whether private or military expenditure on infrastructure are included as well.

Suggestion: Proportion of investment agreements with explicit human rights safeguards

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

<u>Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:</u> Percentage share of medium and high-tech (MHT) industry value added in total value added

Remark: A definition for medium and high-tech industry would seem useful.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_09.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

The indicators for target 9.1 are limited to transport infrastructure. We recommended broadening the scope of the indicators to capture all critical infrastructure.

The suggested indicators for target 9.2 do not capture the sustainability aspect of the target.

The suggested indicator 9.4.3 is very narrow. Carbon emissions are only one aspect of sustainability. At the very least, we suggest capturing all GHG emissions, not just carbon. We would also advise to consider the alternative suggestions "companies engaged in eco-industry activities", "employment in eco-industries" and/or "water productivity".

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 9. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 9, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

Goal 9.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)

Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 9. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

[Goal 9 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx](#)

09 Sep, 2015

Haji Abdul Rahman bin Hasan (Malaysia)

Target 9.c	Significantly increase access to information and communications technology and strive to provide universal and affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by 2020.
Indicator 9.c.1	Fixed and Mobile broadband quality measured by mean download speed
Comment	Based on the target set, Malaysia is of the view that the indicator may not be an appropriate indicator as this relates to the quality of service rather than measuring the provision of universal and affordable access to the Internet in LDCs. Perhaps we could propose for other indicators such as: Number of community WIFI installed Number of active users at community WIFI

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal9, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 9.1 Develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including regional and transborder infrastructure, to support economic development and human well-being, with a focus on affordable and equitable access for all

Suggested Indicator	Passenger and freight volumes	Indicator divided to the common value as GDP or population rather than directly using will produce better results.

Target 9.2 Promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and, by 2030, significantly raise industry's share of employment and gross domestic product, in line with national circumstances, and double its share in least developed countries

Suggested Indicator	Manufacturing Value Added (share in GDP, per capita, % growth)	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Manufacturing employment, in percent to total employment	Relevant

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

Suggested Indicator	Carbon emission per unit of value added	Relevant

Target 9.5 Enhance scientific research, upgrade the technological capabilities of industrial sectors in all countries, in particular developing countries, including, by 2030, encouraging innovation and substantially increasing the number of research and development workers per 1 million people and public and private research and development spending

Suggested Indicator	R&D expenditure as percentage of GDP	Relevant

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

Suggested Indicator	Amount of investments in infrastructure as a % of GDP	Relevant

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

Suggested Indicator	Percentage share of medium and high-tech (MHT) industry value added in total value added	Medium tech indusrty and high tech industiry value added sholuld be seperately measured.

Target 9.c Significantly increase access to information and communications technology and strive to provide universal and affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by 2020

Suggested Indicator	Percentage of the population covered by a mobile network, by technology	It is useable indicator within questioning of the communications technology services.Also we suggest this indicator:ratio of internet usage

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives.

Indicator: Share of the rural population who live within 2km of an all season road

Comment: If the source is a survey is preferable to use time instead of distance. This using the current methodology for that effect. Common population, specially illiterate have difficult in answering in terms of kilometres.

Indicator: Passengers and freight volumes

Comment: Need to specify the means of transportation. We need further information on the metadata.

Indicator: Percentage of the population covered by a mobile network, by technology

Comment: We need further information on this indicator. As we see it, we would require to georeference the coverage of the different operators and then proceed to estimate the population on the uncovered area. We're unsure if that's what was meant on this indicator.

14 Sep, 2015

Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries

Genevieve Verdier (IMF)
Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 10.1:

- We agree that the suggested indicator "Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population" is more direct than indicator 10.1.1 "Measure income inequality using the Gini coefficient or Palma ratio, pre- and post-social transfers/tax, at global, regional and national level, disaggregated by groups." In addition, Gini coefficient itself, and changes in Gini coefficient, are often difficult to interpret and communicate, and collecting data for the regional breakdown of the indicators in 10.1.1 could be highly challenging.

Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 10.2:

- The suggested indicator, " *Proportion of people living below 50% of median income disaggregated by age and sex*," is straightforward and can be relatively easily estimated using household expenditure survey. The indicator, however, needs to be tailored to address the other dimensions mentioned by the target, e.g., disability and ethnicity. The proposal by UNCDF, " *Adults owning an account either through a financial institution or mobile money provider, disaggregated by income level, geography location gender, age and education*," does not appear to directly measure the target.

Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 10.4:

- The suggested indicator ("Labour share of GDP, comprising wages and social protection transfers") does not directly measure the progress toward the target.
- An alternative would be indicators to measure coverage, benefit adequacy, and benefit incidence of both cash and in-kind benefits.
- For cash benefits such as pensions, unemployment benefits, disabilities benefits, etc., indicators for coverage (the share of the relevant population that receives the benefit) and the generosity of the program (average benefit/average income) should be calculated. Source data may be both databases based on administrative data (for example collected by ILO) and collections of household surveys (such as those used by the World Bank).
- For in-kind benefits, such as health, long term care and education, indicators can be calculated on the coverage of such programs (i.e. the share of population that is included in the program). If available, quality/outcome indicators could be provided (such as Health Adjusted Life Expectancy for health or scores in standardized tests for education). Sources could be data collected and published by World Bank, WHO, Eurostat and OECD (the latter for example for outcomes indicators such as standardized tests scores collected). Outcome indicators may be available for a restricted sample of countries.
- Finally, it should be noted that the overall impact of fiscal policies on income distribution can only be properly gauged by considering jointly both tax and spending programs. Providing an assessment of the impact on inequality (measured for example by the Gini index) of the

government budget is therefore demanding in terms of data availability. It may be the case that for many countries this type of information is difficult to compile.

25 Aug, 2015

Carol Baker (IMF)
IMF Comment on Indicator for Target 10.5:

- As we have noted on previous occasions, even leaving aside the very considerable objections to a broad financial transactions tax that the IMF has made clear over many years, this indicator bears little relationship to the target "regulation and monitoring of global financial markets..."

26 Aug, 2015

Janusz Witkowski (Poland)
Comments from Central Statistical Office of Poland for Target 10.5:

The Central Statistical Office of Poland suggests that it should be clarified whether the wording "Adoption" in indicator ***Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level*** means including the Tobin tax to the legal system (execution) or political support for this tax (even voted); one of the meanings of *adopt* is *vote to accept.*

01 Sep, 2015

Papa Seck (UN-WOMEN)
In order to address gender equality and women's empowerment, the indicator suggested for Target 10.1 should be disaggregated to look at the growth rate of the income of single mother households. Data for this level of disaggregation is available for over 160 countries and produced by the World Bank. The data show that single mother households are significantly worse-off than other households. Therefore, in order to increase the growth rate of income of the bottom 40, policy-makers should pay particular attention to this group. The suggested reformulation of this indicator is "Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population (also disaggregated to look at single mother households within the bottom 40 percent)".

01 Sep, 2015

Papa Seck (UN-WOMEN)
Target 11.7, refers to **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.** However, the current suggested indicator only measures the 'average share of the built-up areas of

cities in open space in public ownership and use'. This indicator does not capture an important aspect of the target which is the safety aspect. Access to safe public spaces is a basic human right. If women and girls are to enjoy a life free from violence, authorities need to ensure that public spaces are free from any form of violence, including sexual violence. In urban and rural areas, developed or developing countries, women and girls are constantly subjected to acute levels of sexual harassment and violence on streets, public transport and parks, in and around schools and workplaces, in public sanitation facilities and water and food distribution sites, or in their own neighborhoods. Instead of the current indicator, UN-Women would like to suggest the ***Proportion of women and girls aged 15+ subjected to physical or sexual harassment, in the last 12 months.*** In order to distinguish between harassment that happens in workplaces or in public spaces such as streets and parks, this indicator should be disaggregated **by perpetrator and place of occurrence.**

01 Sep, 2015

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

The following are the comments from INDEC (Argentina) on this topic:

Target 10.5 Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations: This is not related to INDEC's tasks.

Sincerely,

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)

02 Sep, 2015

Hubert Escaith (WTO)
WTO comments on Target 10.a based on the 11 August list of trade related indicators

We agree with the suggested indicator, and would like to have it extended to South-South trade, which will remain most probably the dominant source of trade and growth dynamism in the next 15 years. Moreover, a growing number of developing countries are adopting preferential schemes for helping LDCs to diversify their exports and the SDG should take stock of these initiatives.

The alternate indicator on degree of utilization of preferences is mis-specified in the referenced document as it duplicates the original one.

Target 10.a.2

Regarding target 10.a, this target is about S&D, which goes beyond preferential market access. The list of S&D is an enumeration rather than a statistics. Additional work need to be done to reinforce its significance. Nevertheless, at this stage we support as indicator, "an inventory of the number of S&D provisions resulting from the Doha Round negotiations and the number of recommendations

resulting from the Monitoring Mechanism on S&D that was adopted at the Bali Ministerial Conference."

The WB suggestion covers services. It complements the mapping of trade in services policies, as monitored by WTO on the basis of official notification, with an estimate of their restrictiveness impact. While it is a very interesting analytical indicator complementing the "inventory" option, it is ultimately based on econometric/expert estimates and needs to be validated by Member State before being used for the official monitoring of government policies.

04 Sep, 2015

Bela Hovy (UNPD)
Population/UNDESA

Comment on Target 10.7 (Migration)

SDGs- Target 10.7

Population Division/DESA

Introduction

This submission was prepared in response to the three "suggested indicators" for SDG 10.7 that were proposed by UNSD on 11 August 2015. The three suggested indicators are: (1) recruitment costs, (2) international migration policy index, and (3) human trafficking. This proposal also takes into account the revised submission of 2 September by the co-leads for SDG10 .

Given the broad conceptual description of the migration policy index provided by members of the Global Migration Group (GMG), and the general critique by the statistical community regarding the use of composite indices in the SDG monitoring framework, this submission provides some more concrete ideas for the operationalization of the index. In case the index is not accepted by the statistical community, the below provides indicators to measure its key dimensions.

1. Recruitment costs

This indicator is already included as a suggested indicator in the UNSD list. This topic was also included in Addis Ababa Action Agenda, referring to the means of implementation of the SDGs, which provides additional rationale for its inclusion. For details, see UNSD list.

2. Dimensions of the international migration policy index *(as per GMG submission)*

a. Human rights dimension:

- Ratification of relevant UN/ILO conventions (**NEW**)[3]. Ratification of these instruments expresses commitment to well-managed migration policies and to safe, orderly and regular migration. For details, see Annex.

b. Crisis dimension:

- Persons killed while crossing an international border ("migrant fatalities"). For details, see proposal from co-leads for SDG10. From a measurement perspective, we recommend removing "or injured".

c. Outcome dimension:

- Naturalization rate (**NEW**). This is an indicator of legal integration. For details, see Annex.

d. Mobility dimension:

- Acceptance of dual citizenship (**NEW**). This is an indicator of policies to facilitate return and circular migration. For details, see Annex.

e. Cooperation dimension:

- Number of bilateral/regional agreements ratified (**NEW**)[4]. Agreements covering all dimensions of human mobility, including labour migration, refugee repatriation, return of migrants, mutual recognition of diplomas, skills and qualifications, portability of acquired rights, etc. For details, see Annex.

3. Human trafficking => Refugees

The human trafficking indicator was included as a suggested indicator by UNSD under 16.2 and should thus be removed from 10.7. From a measurement perspective, we suggest dropping "number of non-detected victims".

Instead, we propose:

- Durable solutions for refugees. This indicator features in both the GMG submission and the latest proposal of the co-leads of SDG10. We propose to use the formulation included in the GMG submission (item 6) focusing on durable solutions. From a measurement perspective we suggest dropping "IDPs".

Population Division
United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
New York, 4 September 2015

---

[3] Relevant UN conventions (5): 1951 Refugee Convention, 1967 Refugee Protocol, 1990 Migrant Worker Convention, 2000 Protocol on Migrant Smuggling, 2000 Protocol on Human Trafficking. Relevant ILO conventions (4): 1949 Migration for Employment Convention, 1975 Migrant Workers Convention, 1997 Private Employment Agencies Convention, 2011 Domestic Workers Convention.
[4] Agreements covering all aspects of human mobility, including labour migration, return of migrants, mutual recognition of diplomas, skills and qualifications, portability of acquired rights, refugee repatriation, etc.

1. ANNEX

	% of UN/ILO migration related conventions ratified	% of citizenship applications granted (naturalization rate)	Acceptance of dual citizenship	Number of bilateral / regional agreements ratified**
Indicator already used for Global Monitoring? Y/N - Specify how many countries are covered	Yes All UN/ILO member states	No However, all countries have naturalization procedures.	Yes All UN Member States	Yes Surveys by ILO and university
Is indicator directly related to (a component of) target? 1 = Low, 5 = High	5	2	3	5
How comprehensively does indicator measure target? 1 = Low, 5 = High	5	2	3	4
Data source	United Nations Treaty collection – online database; ILO	Administrative data from ministries of interior	World Population Policies database	Relevant line ministries, ILO, UNHCR, UNODC, OHCHR, IOM, ...
Agency Responsible (currently mandated to collect/disseminate data)	United Nations; ILO	TBC	DESA	UNESCO, ILO, DESA, University of Waterloo (International Migration Research Center)
Tier 1 to 3	1	3	1	3
Priority	P			
Interlinkages	1.5, 8.7, 8.8, 11.5, 16.1, 16.2			

05 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

For Target 10.1 we suggest the following calculation for the relation of mean income per capita: riches 10% / poorest 40%.

In Target 10.3 we believe a definition of what is considered discrimination is needed. This indicator represents inequalities present inside each country, however and indicator that allows us to monitor inequalities between countries is lacking. For this, we propose a regional Gini coefficient.

For Target 10.4 we recommend the following indicators: i) Percentage of the participation of direct taxes in total recollection and ii) Income tax concentration (10% with highest income/10% with lowest income).

To measure 10.5 a methodology for the calculation of this tax on financial transaction is needed.

For the first two indicators in Target 10.7 a definition of these indicators and the calculation method is necessary.

The indicator for Target 10.a is measured at a global level because of its focus on developed country, it is not to be calculated at national levels.

More specificity on determining what type of flows take place between donors and receptors of ODA's is required for the indicator in Target 10.b. The most common type is economic contributions, however, they can also be technical help, and this is why specification is necessary.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 10

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

SDG10_UN_stat_system_September4_old.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 10. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (ILO, UNEP, UNHCR, UNODC, UNWomen, WB, UNICEF and OHCHR), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 10.1:

Priority indicator

- To slightly modify the suggested priority indicator from Aug 11 list: Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population (to be disaggregated by single mother households and other relevant characteristics)

New indicator

- To add a new indicator to capture real and disposable income: Growth rates of real household net-adjusted disposable income among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population

Target 10.2:

Priority indicators

- To prioritise another indicator from Aug 11 list: Inequality gap (ratio of disadvantaged/advantaged groups) and/or the rate of change in this gap or ratio, disaggregated by grounds of discrimination prohibited by international human rights law. For example, wage gap and literacy rate gap ratios between women/men. Calculation of inequality gap ratios should be made under all relevant SDGs

Additional indicator

- To slightly modify an existing indicator from Aug 11 list: Proportion of people living below 60% of median income disaggregated by age and sex. Recognizing a certain risk of arbitrariness in selecting a benchmark, instead of 50% of median income, 60% is recommended based on existing practices at national and international levels (e.g. EU level).

<u>Target 10.3</u>:

Priority indicator

- To prioritise a new indicator: Gini coefficients on real disposable incomes (before and after taxes and social transfers). The target is about overall inequalities of outcome (resulting from efforts to eliminate discriminatory laws, policies and practices). Compilation of the Gini coefficient before and after taxes and social transfers measures the result of laws, policies and practices.

Additional indicator

- To retain the priority indicator from Aug 11 as an additional indicator: Percentage of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited by international human rights law
- To retain the suggested additional indicator from Aug 11: Level of compliance with international standards of independent body responsible for promoting and protecting non-discrimination

<u>Target 10.4</u>:

Priority indicators

- To retain the suggested priority indicator from Aug 11: Labour share of GDP, comprising wages and social protection transfers.
- To add a new priority indicator: Ratio of average income of the richest 10% to the poorest 40% (Palma ratio, before and after taxes/social transfers). In order to measure more comprehensively the impact of 'fiscal, wage and social protection policies' on achieving 'greater equality', compilation of the ratio of average income of the richest 10% to the poorest 40% (before and after taxes and social transfers) is recommended. This is seen as highly complementary to indicators proposed under target 10.1 – 10.3 that will mask inequalities between the top and bottom sections of the income distribution.

Additional indicator

- To add an additional indicator: Average tax rate by income quintile which is already collected by OECD

<u>Target 10.6</u>

<u>Priority indicator</u>

- <u>To retain the suggested priority indicator:</u> Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organisations

<u>Target 10.7</u>:

Priority indicator

The use of an index (and indices more generally throughout the agenda) is not being favoured for conceptual and methodological reasons hindering their interpretation. Instead, a broader set of indicators measuring directly the whereabouts of migrants, including refugees and asylum seekers, victims of trafficking and smuggled migration is suggested

- To retain the suggested priority indicator: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000
- To add a new priority indicator: Number of detected and non-detected smuggled migrants per 100,000
- To prioritise another indicator from the Aug 11 list: Number of refugees, asylum seekers or migrants killed or injured while attempting to cross maritime, land or air borders

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

Additional indicators that measure how the private sector is participating in the country.

- Doing Business (http://www.doingbusiness.org/reports/global-reports/doing-business-2015). It measures the regulations that enhance business activity and those that constrain it. *Doing Business* measures regulations affecting 11 areas of the life of a business. Ten of these areas are included in the 2015's ranking on the ease of doing business: starting a business, dealing with construction permits, getting electricity, registering property, getting credit, protecting minority investors, paying taxes, trading across borders, enforcing contracts and resolving insolvency. *Doing Business* also measures labor market regulation, which is not included in this year's ranking.

- Private sector investment in infrastructure, such as investment in energy, transportation and telecommunications.

- *Employment in private sector*

- *Number of Women in Boards or percentage of firms with a majority of women on boards*

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 10

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

Suggested indicator: "Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population"

Comment: It is necessary to specify how the rates are going to be related to generate the indicator. We suggest using the Palma ratio (the ratio of the richest 10% of the population's share of income, divided by the poorest 40% of the population's share).

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

Suggested indicator: "Proportion of people living below 50% of median income disaggregated by age and sex"

Comment: The indicator does not completely cover the target, specifically does not measure political inclusion. Also some disaggregation included in the target would not be feasible (disability, race, ethnicity, religion).

Target 10.4: Adopt policies, especially fiscal, wage and social protection policies, and progressively achieve greater equality

Suggested indicator: "Labour share of GDP, comprising wages and social protection transfers"

Comment: The indicator does not adequately cover the target. Some information about fiscal policies and its impact on equality should be added; inequality indicator (Gini or Palma ratio) before and after taxes and social transfers.

Target 10.5: Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations

Suggested indicator: "Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level"

Comment: The suggested indicator is not adequate; it does not measure the improvement of the regulation and monitoring of financial markets and institutions. An indicator about financial stability should be considered. Also, we suggest the progress made in the implementation of international standards ((Basel RCAP, IOSCO, and FSB).

Target 10.6: "Ensure enhanced representation and voice for developing countries in decision-making in global international economic and financial institutions in order to deliver more effective, credible, accountable and legitimate institutions"

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organizations"

Comment: The suggested indicator is not adequate. We suggest defining this indicator in relative terms according to the national GDP as percentage of global GDP, and including developed countries too in order to identify and monitor gaps.

Target 10.7: "Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies"

Suggested indicator: "Recruitment cost born by employee as percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination"

Comment: The suggested indicator is not adequate and not feasible. We suggest including an indicator on restrictive migration actions

Suggested indicator: "Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation"

Comment: It is not clear how we could measure non-detected victims. Also, it is necessary to clarify if each country should report national victims in other countries or foreign victims in its country.

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

Suggested indicator: "Share of tariff lines applied to imports from LDCs/developing countries with zerotariff"

Comment: The indicator should be defined for both LDCs and developing countries, and in relative terms compared to developed countries.

07 Sep, 2015

Mondher Mimouni (ITC)
ITC Comments on 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***)**

ITC supports the proposition of using **Share of tariff lines applied to imports from LDCs/developing countries with zero tariff** as an indicator for his target**.** The indicator would belong to the first tier,

since an established methodology exists and data are already widely available. Moreover, linkages exist not only with 17.10 but also with 17.12.

However, taking into account some of the comments already posted in this forum (*Comment from Japan -Goal10, Suggested Indicator for Post2015 agenda.pdf*), some modifications to the indicator might be considered, namely:

- the indicator should focus exclusively on non-reciprocal treatment
- It would be better to take into account also the amount of trade related to this tariff lines

Additionally (or alternatively) the indicator **Preferences utilization by developing and least developed countries on their export to developed countries** could be used to reflect the degree of utilisation of preferential treatment. This indicator was originally proposed by WTO/UNCTAD/ITC under target 17.12. Preference utilization can be defined as a proportion between the value of imports that exporters/importers claim for preferential tariff treatment under a specific trade agreement and the total value of imports eligible for the preferential tariff under the above mentioned agreement. The unit of measurement will be in % (i.e. percentage of imports sourced under preferential treatment). The rate of utilization of preferences can be a good proxy to measure the impact of obstacles (e.g. specific requirements as rules of origin, lack of transparency) over the effective use of such preferences (e.g. Duty Free Quota Free for LDCs). The calculation of this indicator might not be possible on a yearly basis. Refer to the following paper (and other related research) for more information on the methodology
https://www.wto.org/ENGLISH/res_e/reser_e/ersd201212_e.pdf.

In addition to that and as previously done for the other trade related indicaotrs, it would be recommended to present the source of the data as WTO/UNCTAD/ITC database.

07 Sep, 2015

Nicolas Fasel (OHCHR)

In reference to Pietro Gennari's comments (5 December), the international organisations that provided inputs to the list of indicators attached in his message were ILO, UNEP, UNHCR, UNODC, UNWomen, WB, UNICEF and OHCHR.

07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)
10.2 Relative poverty line is defined as below 50% of average income (median income) in Korea. It's identical to 1.2.2.

10.c Remittance fee consists of remittance fee charged by the originating bank (including electronic wire fee), fee charged by the broker bank, fee charged by the receiving bank. The remittance fee

charged by the originating bank is determined autonomously by the bank itself, so it is unsuitable measure of target.

07 Sep, 2015

Emma Reilly (OHCHR)
A number of NSOs and NGOs requested that OHCHR publish our draft paper on human rights-based indicators for SDGs 10 and 16, from May 2015. This is available here:
http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/MDGs/Post2015/SDG_10_16_ProposedIndicators.pdf

07 Sep, 2015

Nicolas Fasel (OHCHR)
Comments from Pia Oberoi, OHCHR Adviser on Migration

OHCHR would like to stress that there are a number of conceptual and methodological issues that would need to be appropriately addressed in defining the 'migration governance index'. OHCHR would also underline that the index and particularly its components that relate to human rights, should be developed in compliance with international human rights law.

OHCHR calls for systematic disaggregation of indicators to measure progress in the effective protection all migrants, as equal subject of development, regardless of their status, including in relation to social protection (1.3), food (2.1), health (3.8), education (4.1-5), water and sanitation (6.1-2), decent work (8.8), and access to justice (16.3), in a non-discriminatory and participatory way (10.2-3).

In the specific context of target 10.7, OHCHR calls for an indicator to monitor the "number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while attempting to cross maritime, land or air borders" in order to measure the extent to which migrants are able to migrate in safe and dignified ways, thereby providing an indicator of the extent to which policies at international borders respond to the need for safe, regular and human rights-based migration.

07 Sep, 2015

Tiina Luige (UNECE)
UNECE Environment Division, **comments on indicators for targets 10.2 and 10.3:**

Target 10.2

Proposed indicator: Proportion of countries with legislation in place to progressively reduce inequalities over time in the fields of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status.

Data source: National legislation

Target 10.3

Proposed indicator: Proportion of countries with legislation in place to against discrimination with regard to environmental rights on the grounds of citizenship, nationality or domicile.

Indicator already used for Global Monitoring? Parties to the Aarhus Convention report on discrimination with regard to environmental rights as to citizenship, nationality or domicile in their national implementation reports.

Data source: National implementation reports of Parties to the Aarhus Convention. 46 Countries

Agency Responsible (currently mandated to collect/disseminate data): UNECE

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 10.5
Denmark does not support the indicator for goal 10.5: *Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level."*

We align ourselves with the comment by the WB. This indicator is not valid nor measurable.

Indicator for Target 10.7
The International Migration Policy index covers the EU Member States and a number of developed countries, however as a global indicator, it will not be suitable to evaluate e.g. the African States which are not covered by this index.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 10

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a

good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 10:

- Gender pay gap
- GDP per capita
- Unemployment rate
- Percentage of ODA in GNI

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 10. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population

Remark: Due to a number of methodical questions with the idea of observing consumption, preference for the rather traditional observation of income distribution

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Percentage of population reporting having personally, felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law

Remark: The indicator should be retained because it refers explicitly to grounds of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law.

Target 10.5 – Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: *Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level*

Remark: The proposed indicator is not an indicator but a political measure. An alternative indicator should cover financial stability, efficiency and depth. Moreover, the indicator do not reflect the improvement of monitoring of global financial markets. Further consultation is needed.

Target 10.7 – Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Recruitment cost born by employee as percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination.
- International Migration Policy Index

Remark: Data availability might be very poor for both indicators. But we support the first one. There is no public information on the elements of the proposed International Migration Policy Index; in particular, on whether/how the protection of migrants' human rights will be measured.

Suggestion: We prefer to replace indicator 2 by "Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while at-tempting to cross maritime, land, air borders"

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Share of tariff lines applied to imports from LDCs/developing countries with zero- tariff

Remark: The indicator seem not to be operational.

Suggestion: We prefer to replace the indicator by: Number of countries with duty and quota free market access provisions in place.

Target 10.c – By 2030, reduce to less than 3 per cent the transaction costs of migrant remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5 per cent

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Remittance costs as a percentage of the amount remitted

Remark: We do support the suggested indicator.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_10.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

Indicator 10.3.1 should possibly take into account slavery and also disaggregate data for different groups that can be victims of discrimination: indigenous people and ethnic groups, people with disabilities, LGBT etc.

Indicator 10.6.1 is identical to 16.8.1.

Target 10.7 includes refugee issues. We therefore suggest that direct policy measures and procedures should also be assessed: i.e. average time of processing of claims, time spent in detention, etc.

07 Sep, 2015

Christopher Richter (IOM)
International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Inputs to target 10.7

The inclusion of migration into the SDGs is one of the key innovations of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A number of SDG targets refer to or are relevant for migration. The center-piece for migration in the SDGs is target 10.7.

IOM proposes an indicator for target 10.7 in the form of a composite index, which would aim to track progress on the key aspects of *well-managed migration policies.* IOM is collaborating in developing such an index with the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), which has a long track-record of developing methods and tools for assessing complex policy areas in a number of fields. The proposed MGI will also be able to inform reporting on other migration related targets such as target 8.7 as it relates to trafficking and target 11.b. as it relates to migration policies within disaster risk reduction.

The MGI aims to measure the degree to which national policies *facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people*, as laid out in Target 10.7. The index would also serve as a tool to assist governments in building capacity in planning and implementing such policies, through greater transparency, the identification of sound practices and an understanding of the progress made towards improvement of migration governance for national development.

The MGI is a simple yet comprehensive index that will be able to provide an objective and methodologically robust indication of various aspects of countries' migration management.

More specifically, MGI comprises **5 areas of migration governance**:

1. Institutional capacity: indicators under this domain will assess countries' institutional as well as legal and regulatory framework for effective design and implementation of migration policies. This area also looks at the existence of a national migration strategy in line with the country's development objectives and overseas development efforts (where applicable), as well as at institutional transparency and coherence in relation to migration management.

2. Migrant rights and integration: indicators included in this area of migration governance will aim at measuring the extent to which migrants have the same status as citizens in terms of access to basic social services such as health and education, and social security. It will also look at other types of migrant rights such as family reunification, right to work and access to residency and citizenship.

3. Migration management: this area will assess countries' approach to migration management in terms of border control and enforcement policies, admission criteria for migrants, preparedness and

resilience in case of significant and unexpected migration flows, as well as the fight against modern day slavery, as outlined in targets 5.2, 8.7 and 16.2.

4. Labour, economics and investment: indicators under this area will assess, among others, countries' policies for managing labour migration, including the recognition of migrants' qualifications to optimize their contribution to the national economy, provisions regulating student migration and the existence of bilateral labour agreements between countries. Aspects of diaspora engagement in the country of origin and migrant remittances also come under this domain.

5. Regional and international cooperation and partnerships: this category includes elements such as the signature and ratification of international conventions, countries' efforts in establishing inter-state cooperation on migration-related issues and collaboration with relevant non-governmental actors, including civil society organizations and the private sector.

IOM will initially apply the Migration Governance Index to 15 pilot countries, selected on the basis of criteria such as regional balance, broad migration trends, and economic performance. The index includes both qualitative and quantitative indicators. A rigorous weighting and scoring system aimed at ensuring validity of the index and consistency across countries is currently being developed and will be tested on the 15 pilot countries.

Pilot countries:

- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Canada
- Costa Rica
- Germany
- Ghana
- Italy
- Mexico
- Moldova
- Morocco
- South Africa
- South Korea
- Sweden
- The Philippines
- Turkey

An interactive, dashboard-style platform will display results for each country, allow changing scores and weights to reflect different assumptions about the importance of each category and indicator. Country comparisons and country profiles as well and the identification of correlations between indicators and categories will be available through a range of analytical tools.

The result of the index exercise is not to ultimately produce a world ranking on migration policy. Rather, countries will be grouped according to migration challenges/opportunities and levels of institutional capacity in general. The intention would be to create an evidence base for actionable

reporting to the HLPF that can shed light on gaps in migration policies, as well as to highlight best practices.

The main findings for the 15 pilot project countries will be presented in a report due to be published in early 2016. The aim is to have surveyed enough countries by the summer 2016 to be able to report to the HLPF a first set of findings from all regions.

Separately, IOM is partnering with Gallup to help meet the ambition set by the 2030 Agenda of "leaving no one behind". Using data and findings from the Gallup World Poll, IOM and Gallup propose to establish a system to measure migrant outcomes against several core SDG variables. The Gallup World Poll provides a unique source of data on international and internal migration trends that can help fill in some of the existing data gaps necessary to formulate comprehensive migration policies. The combination of these data with IOM's on-the-ground knowledge provides an unparalleled reserve of knowledge on the conditions of migrants worldwide. Specifically, the indicators of the proposed "Migrants Matter Monitor" will:

- provide a baseline against which the progress of the SDGs can be benchmarked
- describe the distribution of migrants across the world and identify percentages of those suffering across the world
- create comparisons and illuminate equality gaps between migrant and non-migrant populations
- provide explanatory insight into the state of well-being of migrants and the link between migrants' work, health and well-being
- make available reliable information about the effect of social determinants on the self-reported health of migrants
- be an essential component of the IOM suite of indicators, helping to shape the organization's policy and practices
- provide key information to inform the global, regional and national indicators of the post-2015 development agenda

09 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 10. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 10 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Singapore
Target 10.3: Discrimination is a sensitive issue that merits greater caution. Not every form of "discrimination" is prohibited by international human rights treaties. Also, the proposed indicator should not apply international human rights treaties that the state is not a party to. We propose to edit (in red) the indicator for Target 10.3 to the following:

"Percentage of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground and form of discrimination prohibited under applicable international human rights law".

Target 10.7: We are unable to find from open sources any information regarding the International Migration Policy Index. More information would be required regarding this index such as the information/statistics that Singapore would need to feed into the Index. We would also like to seek clarifications on and understand the obligations required of Singapore and the definition of 'non-detected victims of trafficking' and 'per 100,000'.

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal10, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

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		
Suggested Indicator	Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population	Relevant
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		
Suggested Indicator	Proportion of people living below 50% of median income disaggregated by age and sex	Relevant
Target 10.4 Adopt policies, especially fiscal, wage and social protection policies, and progressively		

	achieve greater equality	
Suggested Indicator	Labour share of GDP, comprising wages and social protection transfers.	Relevant

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of the Australian Bureau of Statatistics:

The following responses are the coordinated input of the Australian Government.

Australia: comments on indicators - Goal 10

Target 10.2. Concerns that the indicator relating to median income is too narrow to reflect the issues of 'social, economic and political inclusion of all'. **Alternative approach**: an indicator of multidimensional poverty (noting links to the suggested indicator for Target 1.2).

Target 10.3. While information is available for Australia, a 'personal' as opposed to an 'objective' assessment of having been harassed or discriminated against will not directly measure the existence of discriminatory laws, policies and practices; or the effectiveness of legislation, policies and action to ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome.

Target 10.4. Australia does not support inclusion of this indicator. The labour share of income has been gradually declining in most countries as a result of technological progress. Attempting to improve the labour share of income through policy means seems to be at odds with Target 8.2, which seeks further technological innovation. Action to restore the old labour income share or to recover 'lost' income share through wage rises would probably only have adverse consequences for employment and inflation and for industries already facing adjustment pressures. Furthermore, the indicator does not provide any information about the distribution of income in a country, and as such is not a good measure of equality. Australia would prefer the use of the GINI coefficient suggested by World Bank.

Target 10.5. Concurs with the World Bank's comments that a financial transactions tax (FTT) is not a relevant indicator of 'regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions', and agrees that the chosen indicator should cover broader measures of 'financial stability, efficiency, and depth'.

Target 10.6. Australia supports improving the voice/ representation of developing countries at the IFIs. This indicator could be used as a partial indicator for the target, however there may be limitations. Representation and voice can also be achieved through other means, e.g. the World Bank's 2010 Voice Reforms created an additional Executive Board seat for Sub-Saharan Africa and improved staff responsiveness to client country needs.

Target 10.7. (Indicator 1) This indicator appears to be focused on the remittance aspect of migration, and therefore the 'responsible' nature of migration in that the programme and associated

recruitment agencies do not exploit migrants with exuberant costs. However, this may not be as applicable to Australia as it is to other economies. This is an indirect indicator of the target concepts.

Target 10.7. (Indicator 3) Suggest rephrasing: "Number of identified suspected victims of human trafficking, slavery and slavery-like practices per 100,000; by sex (or gender), age and form of exploitation".

Target 10.b. Indicator is too narrow to measure all financial flows which the OECD also measure. The exclusion of FDI flows omits a large part of the picture. The indicator will also not measure whether ODA and other financial flows are being delivered in accordance with national plans and programs.

14 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)
Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives.

Indicator: Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level

Comment: We don't consider this indicator relevant for the SDG framework. We agree with part of the World Bank comment ("The indicator proposed (10.5.1) is technically not sound. What is the baseline? What is the target? How is it quantified, measured? Instead, any indicator for this target should cover financial stability, efficiency, and depth. However, these areas are difficult to measure, especially stability").

Indicator: Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organizations.

Comment: The indicator is extremely relevant but we need further information on how will it be measured.

Indicator: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation

Comment: We're unsure about the methodology to measure non-detected victims of human trafficking. We suggest as an alternative: ""% of migrants who lose their lives, while attempting to cross borders as a percentage of total migrants, disagreggated by age, sex and region".

Indicator: Share of tariff lines applied to imports from LDCs/developing countries with zero- tariff

Comment: We need further information on this indicator.

14 Sep, 2015

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

Carol Baker (IMF)

IMF comment on Indicator 11.c.2:

Indicator 11.c.2 seems to bear no relationship to the Target 11.c on sustainable buildings using local materials.

26 Aug, 2015

Flora Sutherland (United Nations Mine Action Service)

The United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) suggests that the number of deaths due to landmines/ ERW should be one of the 'causes' that are disaggregated in the indicator for 11.5 "Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people". The United Nations Mine Action Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism could provide a source for this data.

28 Aug, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

We would like to submit our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion.

Synergies should be sought between the indicators for the SDGs and for the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR basically proposes the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework. The indicators were discussed and reviewed by more than 60 Experts from UN System, civil sector, academic and research sector, and private sector. The Attached Annex is the proposal on the Sendai Framework indicators for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OEIWG). Some indicators are selected to be proposed for the SDG. Please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document for the details of each indicator.

This proposal is also consistent with and further revised from the UNISDR Proposal in coordination with 16 UN agencies (FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO) which was submitted to the IAEG web-platform in early July.

The paper includes indicator proposals for the targets 11.5 and 11.b.

We especially think that reviving economic loss indicator is critical because the economic loss is clearly included in the text of Target 11.5.

We greatly appreciate your attention.

UNISDR proposal:

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).pdf

Indicator details (please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

Best regards,

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR) (UNISDR) (ishigaki@un.org)

UNISDR

31 Aug, 2015

Janusz Witkowski (Poland)
Comments from Central Statistical Office of Poland for Target 11.2:

The Central Statistical Office of Poland suggests to consider the following indicator: ***Transport of passengers per one inhabitant*** instead of indicator ***Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km.***

01 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
> **(Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Mr. Eduardo Moreno, from UN-HABITAT)**
>
> Eduardo Moreno (UN-Habitat)
>
> Dear IAEG-SDGs members
>
> An updated submission from UN-Habitat for Goal 11 is available featuring some changes made after suggestions from further consultations with partners and members/agencies
>
> We look forward to having your feedback and inputs on this latest submission.
>
> UN System Template v.3 Goal 11_UN-Habitat_Final.xlsx
>
> Regards
>
> Moreno
>
> 04 Sep, 2015

UNSGAB

The UN Secretary-General's Advisory Board on water and sanitation (UNSGAB) supports the suggested indicator to monitor target 11.5

04 Sep, 2015

Anton Santanen (OCHA)

As one of the contributors, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) support the joint proposal for 1.5 submitted by ISDR. A minor additional specification concerns the proposed indicator "Number of affected people per 100,000" and the adjacent cell stating "Affected includes injured/ill, evacuated, relocated, people whose houses were damaged/destroyed and people who received food aid." To ensure comprehensive monitoring coverage of the total number of people forced to leave their habitual residence due to the threat or impact of hazard events, suggest to use "displaced (including evacuated and relocated)" or "forced to leave their homes or places of habitual residence (including evacuated and relocated)" among the elements collectively comprising "affected".

04 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

To measure Target 11.1 a statistical definition of slum is fundamental.

To measure the indicator in Target 11.3 a definition of what is considered "efficient land use" is necessary.

The indicator of Target 11.5 is the same as the indicator of Target 1.5.

The connection between Target 11.7 and the proposed indicator is not apparent, it does not clearly highlight a spatial distribution of green and public spaces. We suggest the calculation of the "Green Urban Index", whose objective is to measure the surface area of green space inside an urban zone, either for ecological o recreational purposes.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

Goal 11

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

[**UN System Template v.3 Goal 11_UN-Habitat_Final.xlsx**](#)

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 11. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (UNHABITAT, UN-Women, UNISDR, OECD, World Bank, UNFPA, UNESCO, UNECA, UNECE, UNSD), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 11.1: by 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services, and upgrade slums

1. Proportion of urban population living in slums

All consulted agencies fully agree with the indicator, and recognize that it has been extensively used for the MDGS. It has proven reliability and UNHABITAT has been tracking and reporting on this indicator for the last 10 years. In addition it is now possible to estimate and track this indicator at city level beyond national urban levels only.

Target 11.2: by 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons

1. Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km.

2. Proportion of income spent by families on transport (to reach services such as employment, health, education and community services)

The proposed priority indicator 1 covers one or two dimensions form the target that deals with accessibility to transport system. This indicator provides and monitors information on service provision and this was endorsed by several UN agencies and has a strong spatial component. Indicator 2 was proposed by the World Bank and endorsed by several UN agencies including UNHABITAT. This indicator addresses the dimensions of the target that seeks to track accessibility, sustainability and affordability of transport.

Target 11.3: by 2030 enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacities for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries

1. Efficient land use (by enhancing inclusive and sustainable urbanization) (ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate at comparable scale)

2. Percentage of cities with direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management, which operate regularly and democratically.

The land use efficiency indicator was endorsed by majority UN agencies as the priority indicator that would measure how well the enhancement of inclusive and sustainable urbanization was progressing. It also connects well to the other spatial component indicators as well as the data revolution agenda, by looking at land consumption in relation to the population growth.

Priority no 2 relates to notion of participation and this was proposed by UN regional commissions and endorsed by several UN agencies. However, this indicator is more a process oriented indicator.

Target 11.4. strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage

1. Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage including World Heritage sites.

2. Number and percentage of the labour force that holds a heritage occupation or is employed in the heritage sector

UNESCO supported UNHABITAT and suggested this indicator which was endorsed by several agencies as priority 1 indicator. The second priority indicator was also proposed by UNESCO and received endorsement from several UN agencies.

Target 11.5: By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations

1. Number of deaths, missing and affected people due to hazardous events (per 100,000 people).

2. Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product.

Several UN agencies agreed on priority indicator 1, and this was suggested by UNISDR with some modifications adopted. There was overall agreement that this indicator will be monitored and reported through the existing Sendai framework.

Priority indicator 2 received a number of responses mostly about the need to have it revised to capture direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product. That this would improve on its measurability. Indicator 2 was later reformulated and supported by UNISDR alongside several agencies and it will be monitored within the Sendai framework.

Target 11.6: by 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality, municipal and other waste management.

1. Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed

2. Level of ambient particulate matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5)

Several UN Agencies suggested the two components of these target to emphasize on waste management and air quality. The consensus was that we should keep both indicators and that among the two there was no priority indicator. The second indicator is already being monitored in several cities among member states.

Target 11.7: by 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, particularly for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities

1. The average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space in public ownership.

2. The average share of the built up areas (of communities) that are accessible and safe for all, including women, children, older persons and those with disabilities.

The connection between Target 11.7 and the proposed priority indicator attempts to clearly highlight and integrate the spatial distribution and measurements of green and public spaces. This was proposed by UNHABITAT and several UN agencies endorsed these indicators. The indicator was also presented to UNSD New York meeting, and several UN agencies reviewed it and agreed that this was a good indicator. The second priority indicator integrates spatial nature that direct impacts on communities. Both proposed indicators allow for mapping and can be disaggregated at various levels and layers.

Target 11.a: support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning

1. The number of countries that are developing or implementing a National Urban Policy that (a) responds to population dynamics, (b) ensures balanced territorial development, (c) prepares for infrastructure development, (d) promotes urban land-use efficiency, (e) enhances resilience to climate change, (f) protects public space, and (g) develops effective urban governance systems.

2. Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs

The priority indicator above received several comments and proposals from several UN agencies without clear agreement. UNHABITAT wanted an all-encompassing indicator that integrates elements that are related to the main components of the goal and articulate national and urban responses of urban planning, while UNFPA preferred an indicator that integrated elements of population projections. The second priority indicator has tried to integrate population projections.

Target 11.b: By 2020, substantially increase 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, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels

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 marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring.

2. Percentage of local governments that adopt and implement local DRR strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030

The two priority indicators above are closely related to target 11.5 and will be monitored with the agreed Sendai framework as outlined earlier. These were proposed by UNSIDR and endorsed by several agencies and agreement for monitoring and reporting received consensus as per the mechanisms outlined in the Sendai framework. .

Target 11.c: support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, for sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials

1. Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings

This target is ambitious and mutli-dimensional in nature. Several agencies proposed an integrated indicator, but there was no overall agreement prior to adopting the current nature of this indicator.

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 11

Target 11.2: By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons

Suggested indicator: "Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not completely cover the target; it does not include a measure on **special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations.**

Target 11.5: By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to gross domestic product caused by disasters, including waterrelated disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations

Suggested indicator: "Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people"

Comment: We suggest including an additional indicator on economic losses.

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Targets 1.5, 11.5, 13.1 and 14.2 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of deaths and missing due to hazardous events per 100,000.
- Number of affected people due to hazarouds events per 100,000. *(can be combined with the above indicator)*
- Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product.

Target 11.b

- Percentage of local governments that adopt and implement local DRR strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx

(I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

In response to several countries' inputs on these indicators, we would like to add explanation why we propose these indicators.

1. **Linkage of follow-up/review mechanisms between the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**

The SDGs require that "data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible". (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

UNISDR would like to inform on Sendai Framework reporting mechanism:

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted in March 2015. The Members States agreed to set seven global targets and assigned a task to UNISDR to support development of indicators to monitor the Sendai global targets in coordination with other relevant mechanisms for sustainable development and climate change (para 48 (c) in the Sendai Framework).

The seven global targets include substantial reduction of (a) mortality, (b) affected people, (c) direct economic loss, (d) damage to critical infrastructure) and (e) increase of the number of countries having national and local DRR strategy, (f) international cooperation, and (g) increased availability of and access to risk information and early warning system. (Para 18 in the Sendai Framework)

The indicators we proposed for the SDGs are also proposed to the "Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group for indicators and terminology of the Sendai Framework (OEIWG)" to be discussed by the government experts (the 1st meeting will be held in 28-29 September). We believe the coherence between the Sendai and the SDG follow-up/review mechanism will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis.

2. **"Multi-purpose indicators" to express inter-linkage between the SDG Targets**

The SDG goals and targets are inter-linked. This is supported by texts such as "sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent. (Para 13 in the SDG, finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

The 1st IAEG Report concludes that *there also appeared to be broad agreement among Member States that the number of global indicators should be limited and should include multi-purpose*

indicators that address several targets at the same time. (Para7-1 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3))

Building on the SDG and IAEG discussion, we proposed the same indicators for several targets under different goals. For example, human related loss and economic loss indicators to monitor 1.5 (vulnerability and resilience), 11.5 (disaster loss), and 13.1 (climate change impact). In the 1st IAEG, the Secretariat of UNDESA (UNSD) provided an illustration of links between targets and introduced this human loss indicator as an example of multi-purpose indicators.

While we understand the IAEG promotes one indicator per target, mechanically applies the principle to all targets might lose the important spirit of each target. The 1st IAEG Report also concludes that *while the number of global indicators must be limited, some targets might require multiple indicators to measure its different aspects* (Para7-2 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3). For example, in the target 11.5, "number of death" "number of affected people" and "economic loss" are critical elements and it would be extremely difficult to monitor all elements if we need to select only one indicator.

We have proposed the same indicators for several targets. By this way, while the number of indicator per target might be more than one, the total number of indicators does not increase, or even less than the case for one indicator/target. (e.g. if we select the same 2 indicators for 3 targets, total number of indicators will be two). We believe the multi-purpose indicators will be the only solution to reduce the total number of indicators while allowing several indicators per target not to lose important elements included in each target.

3. **National ownership**

We would like to emphasize that our proposals are all based on national data sources. We think this is consistent with the spirit of the SDGs that says "the global review will be primarily based on national official data sources" (para 74 (a) in the SDGs, in the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). Currently 85 countries have standardized national disaster loss databases and more countries will have such databases under the request of the Sendai Framework. The indicators we proposed are therefore measurable and comparable across time and space. In the inter-governmental working group for the Sendai Framework (OEIWG), the Member States will discuss for further standardization of disaster loss data and policy related data.

4. **Indicator development process accounting for the technical robustness, measurability and inclusiveness**

Between the 1st IAEG and the submission of this input, we organized a technical expert meeting inviting UN agencies, scientific and academic organizations, civil sector and private sector to examine and discuss indicator proposals to monitor the Sendai Framework and how to build linkage between the Sendai Indicators and SDG indicators(27-29 July, Geneva). More than 60 experts participated in the meeting and/or provided written inputs.

In the meeting, the indicator proposals were examined from measurability perspective. Terminology was defined and remaining challenges identified. In the meeting of intergovernmental expert

working group (OEIWG), the proposed indicators will be further discussed and refined from <u>government perspective</u>.

The proposal for the Sendai Framework indicator is uploaded in the website.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

We appreciate your attention.
Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
UNISDR
07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

11.5

- Need to determine the scope of 'disaster'
- Natural disaster should be approached as activities for reducing disaster while social disaster should be approached from safety and management perspectives.
- Need indicator on economic losses
- Measure economic losses reduction related to GDP in target

11.6

- Korea has different standard for 'urban solid waste' and thus unable to come up with this estimate
- Estimation may be possible using Solid Waste Accounts in the SEEA as suggested by UNSD

07 Sep, 2015

Tiina Luige (UNECE)

UNECE Forests, Land and Housing Division and UNECE Environment Division, comments on targets 11.3 and 11.b

Targets 11.3 and 11.b:

<u>Proposed indicator:</u> Measure to what extent inhabitants of a city/ local authority are enabled to access information and to actively participate in decision-making, through also e.g. number of Parties to the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)

<u>Indicator already used for Global Monitoring?</u> This information should be collected through the mechanisms and means used for other urban development-related indicators. Data on number of Parties available at the Secretariat of the Aarhus Convention

<u>Data source:</u> Relevant organisations. Secretariat of the Aarhus Convention - 46 countries

Agency Responsible (currently mandated to collect/disseminate data): Relevant organisations. UNECE.

Target 11.b:

Proposed indicator (UNECE Forests, Land and Housing Division): The UNECE Industrial Accidents Convention proposes the following new indicator: "Number of national governments adopting strategies for resilience to disasters, including policies on safety and land-use planning/siting of hazardous activities."

Indicator already used for Global Monitoring? No

How well does indicator measure target (1=low, 5=high)? 2

Data source: For the UNECE region, national implementation reports of the UNECE Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 11.5
Indicator should be changed as a priority

Usefulness in DK:

The merging of "death" and "evacuation" number seams inappropriate and will give a wrong impression on the disaster impact, e.g. 1.500. per. 100.000 could cover 1.500 deaths in Bangladesh and 1.500 temporarily evacuated in Denmark.

Suggesting an indicator having more focus on the impact on livelihoods (this will be critical for all, including the most vulnerable groups and hence have a strong poverty focus).

07 Sep, 2015

Eduardo Moreno (UN-Habitat)
UN-Habitat has prepared a document with the Responses to the consolidated comments from IAEG members' and observers' to Goal 11. The PDF of this document can be opened in the following link:

External link: "Responses to the consolidated comments from IAEG members' and observers' to Goal 11" by UN-Habitat

Attachment: Responses to the consolidated comments from IAEG members and observers GOAL 11 UN-Habitat.pdf

09 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 11

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 11:

- Proportion of urban population living in slums

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 11. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 11.3 – By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Efficient land use

Remark: This is not an indicator. "Efficient land use" - specification missing.

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed (disaggregated by type of waste)
- Level of ambient particulate matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5)

Remark: Air quality is a ‚multi-purpose 'indicator for the quality of life in a city. A disaggregation is not requested by the target and thus not required within the indicator.

Suggestion: We would like to add indicator: Annual average level of NO$_2$-equivialents in µg/m^3 air in cities

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: The average share of the built-up areas of cities in open space in public ownership and use.

Remark: Data availability might be very poor.

Target 11.a – Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, periurban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs

Remark: Data availability might be very poor.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_11.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

None of the indicators in this goal cover accessibility requirements.

Consider modifying indicator 11.7.1 to also indicate green spaces.

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 11. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 11, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

[Goal 11 Cities.xlsx](#)

07 Sep, 2015

Keiruka Didigu (UNFPA)
Dear colleagues,

UNFPA is pleased to submit the following updated complete proposal for Goal 11 Target 11.3 (complete goal proposal is attached [here](#)).

Target 11.3- Indicator proposal tweaked to read as follows: "Percent of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement participatory urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs"

UNFPA proposes deletion of both indicators under Target 11.a, in the previous submission, and is working on a more concrete indicator proposal that captures the concept expressed in the target more fully.

Best regards,
Dr. Kiki Didigu (UNFPA)
Post-2015 Branch
UNFPA
09 Sep, 2015

Darah Aljoudar (UNCDF)
UNCDF would like to make the following indicator proposals for Goal 11, with acknowledgement to the UCLG report "How to Localize Targets and Indicators of the Post-2015 Agenda" for the indicators proposed for target 11.2, 11.5 and 11.a.(http://www.uclg.org/sites/default/files/localization_targets_indicator_web.pdf)

Target 11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons

Indicator Proposal: Percentage of people within 0.5 Km of public transit running at least every 20 minutes (UN SDNS) [an indicator of availability/reliability of public transport]

Target 11.3. By 2030 enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacities for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries

Indicator Proposal: Resources per capita invested in human settlement per sq. km

Target 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations

Indicator Proposal: Proportion of housing units built on hazardous locations (per 100,000 housing units)

Linkages: 1.5, 11.b, 11.1

Target 11.a. Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning

Indicator Proposal: Local Fiscal Space, or % of sub-national governments revenues and expenditures on general government revenues and expenditures (source IMF)

09 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 11. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 11 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Singapore
Target 11.6: We should also take into account the contribution of transboundary sources to the level of ambient particulate matter if possible.

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)
Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums		
Suggested Indicator	Proportion of urban population living in slums	The term "slum" should be defined clearly to ensure the international comparability. For example, in Turkey there are buildings called "gecekondu" that denotes the unauthorized buildings which were built without permission of the competent authority. This kind of buildings generally have most of the facilities (bath, toilet, piped water etc.) and made from improved materials. So in our opinion these buildings are different from the barracks that called as "slum."
Target 11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons		
Suggested Indicator	Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km	Relevant
Target 11.3 By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries		
Suggested Indicator	Efficient land use	It is unclear.Clarification is needed
Target 11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage		
Suggested Indicator	Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation,	Relevant

	protection and conservation of national cultural natural heritage including World Heritage sites	

Target 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations

Suggested Indicator	Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.	The vulnerability factors that contribute to the occurrence of disasters should be taken into account and some indicators to measure this vulnerability should be constructed. In order to measure the direct economic losses relative to GDP caused by disasters, new indicators should be driven that take into account the damage to buildings, transportation networks etc. Moreover, common classifications and agreed definitions of disasters and extreme events are needded.

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

Suggested Indicator	Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed (disaggregated by type of waste)	The related indicator is relevant. But the definition of "well managed" should be well clarified in order to overcome misunderstandings. Moreover the indicators on waste and ambient air quality are not enough to monitor Target 11.6. A new indicator on expenditure for waste management can also be considered under this target.
Suggested Indicator	Level of ambient particulate matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5)	There should be a target value in the indicator.In other words the lower threshold value should be determined for particulate matter

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

[ODS 11.pdf](ODS 11.pdf)

14 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow African members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Proportion of the population that has a public transit stop within 0.5 km

Comment: If the source is a survey is preferable to use time instead of distance. This using the current methodology for that effect. Common population, especially illiterate have difficult in answering in terms of kilometres.

Indicator: Efficient land use

Comment: The indicator is important but we're unsure of its measurability as it's been implement in only 300 cities, which is very small. Should be considered it as a regional or a national indicator. Alternative Indicator: - Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate.

Indicator: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.

Comment: It's difficult to have accurate measures on injured. We suggest to be removed. We also suggest to include displaced.

Indicator: Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and well managed (disaggregated by type of waste)

Comment: We suggest to remove "well managed".

Indicator: Cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs

Comment: Just existence is insufficient. We suggest to add a complementary indicator. Additional Indicator: - Share of land consumption rate to population growth rate at comparable scale

Indicator: Percentage of cities implementing risk reduction and resilience policies that include vulnerable and marginalized groups.

Comment: Should be measured in cities with 100.000 inhabitants or more.

Indicator: Percentage of financial support that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings

Comment: The indicator should include "utilizing local material". Further, the indicator should be measured from the donors side and the recipient side.

14 Sep, 2015

Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

Genevieve Verdier (IMF)
IMF comments on indicators for Target 12.c

The suggested indicator, "*Amount of fossil fuel subsidies, per unit of GDP (production and consumption), and as proportion of total national expenditure on fossil fuels*," in general is fine. However, it is not clear what is the rational for second part "*as proportion of total national expenditure on fossil fuels.*" First of all, why should there be expenditure on fossil fuels? Would such an indicator penalize countries that shift away from fossil fuels, for example, to renewables?

More importantly, the concept of fossil fuel subsidies needs to be clearly defined. As the target is to remove market distortions and to also reflect environmental impacts from wasteful consumption, fossil fuel subsidies here should not only reflect the failure to recover the opportunity costs of supplying fossil fuels but also the failure to adequately charge for environmental damage from fossil fuel consumption (i.e., global warming, local pollution, traffic congestion and accidents) as well as to tax energy consumption in the same way as other consumption goods to raise government revenues. This subsidy concept is based on the true cost of fossil fuel consumption and benchmarks the actual fossil fuel prices to the optimal/desired levels from a societal perspective. An indicator based on this concept will be applicable not only for developing countries but also for advanced economies. The current IEA subsidy framework and databases do not appear sufficient for the estimation of this subsidy concept. The IMF, however, recently provided initial estimates under this broad concept for a large number of countries, which it intends to update on a regular basis.

24 Aug, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
The indicator for Target 12.1 is a global level indicator not a national level.

To measure Indicator 12.4 we suggest including indicators in accordance with the target in reference to the use of fertilizers with a high chemical content or contamination sources coming from oil industries.

The indicator proposed in Target 12.6 only measures the reports effectively published by industries. We propose evaluating companies that have been certified, even though this could or could not be a generalized practice in all the countries of the region it might be the only way to progressively monitor industries that have incorporated valid mechanisms and recognized sustainable practices.

There is no relation between Target 12.a and the proposed indicator, we suggest the elimination of this indicator.

For Target 12.c Ecuador made the following declaration: Since the Negotiations of the Final Document adopted in Rio+20, Ecuador has been hesitant on the treatment of this means of implementation "sustaining that is goes against various dispositions of our national Constitution and is therefore against national law. Ecuador also clarified that any evaluation, tracking, reporting and

revision of our policies and energy sector actions, including tax structures would affect our national sovereignty and is unacceptable." As far as this State entity knows the approval of de Agenda Post 2015 was given with this reluctance (it would have to be confirmed with Chancellery) which is why Ecuador cannot make any statements about this indicator so as to be in accordance to what was stated during negotiations.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 12

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

[UN System Goal 12 September 4.xlsx](#)

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 12. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (UNEP, OECD, FAO, Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, Montreal Protocol -Ozone, SAICM, and Interim Secretariat of the Minamata Convention, GRI, UNESCO, UNWTO, IEA), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

12.2 Good mid-to long-term indicator with work in progress, but short-term indicator is needed immediately as an alternative.

12.5 - Difficult to estimate recycling ratio

    - Estimation may be possible using Solid Waste Accounts in the SEEA as suggested by UNSD

07 Sep, 2015

Tiina Luige (UNECE)
UNECE Environment Division

Target 12.4

UNECE Industrial Accidents Convention agrees with indicator as proposed, but would suggest as an alternative to add number of Parties to the Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs) to list of MEAs.

Indicator already used for Global Monitoring? Data available at the Secretariat of the Aarhus Convention and the Protocol on PRTRs

Data source: Number of Parties submitting national implementation reports to the UNECE Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, Secretariat of the Aarhus Convention and the Protocol on PRTRs for 32 countries

Agency Responsible (currently mandated to collect/disseminate data): UNECE

Target 12.8

Proposed indicator: Legislative, regulatory and other measures taken to promote education on environmental awareness

Indicator already used for Global Monitoring?: Parties to the Aarhus Convention report on this provision in their national implementation reports.

Data source: National implementation reports of Parties to the Aarhus Convention, 46 countries

Agency Responsible (currently mandated to collect/disseminate data): UNECE

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 12

Target 12.1: Implement the 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production, all countries taking action, with developed countries taking the lead, taking into account the development and capabilities of developing countries

Suggested indicator: "Number of countries with SCP National Actions Plans or SCP mainstreamed as a priority or target into national policies, poverty reduction strategies and sustainable development strategies"

Comment: We suggest as better indicator the national progress in the implementation of those plans.

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

Suggested indicator: "Global Food Loss Index (GFLI)"

Comment: We suggest disaggregating the indicator into food waste at the retail and consumer levels and food losses along production and supply chains.

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.

Suggested indicator: "Number of Parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous and other chemicals and waste that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement"

Comment: The suggested indicator is not adequate for monitoring the target; the meeting of commitments and obligations in transmitting information does not guarantee environmentally sound management of chemicals and wastes and the minimization of their adverse impacts of wastes on human health and the environment. We suggest using a pollution indicator, treatment of waste, generation of hazardous waste (tonnes), hazardous waste management by type of treatment.

Target 12.5: By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse.

Suggested indicator: "National recycling rate, tonnes of material recycled"

Comment: We suggest including other indicators on reduction and prevention. Amount of waste generated per unit of GDP/per capita. Percentage of solid waste reused.

Target 12.6: Encourage companies, especially large and transnational companies, to adopt sustainable practices and to integrate sustainability information into their reporting cycle.

Suggested indicator: "Number of companies publishing sustainability reporting"

Comment: We suggest defining the indicator in relative terms; using the total number of companies as denominator.

Target 12.8: By 2030, ensure that people everywhere have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature

Suggested indicator: "Number of countries reporting inclusion of sustainable development and lifestyles topics in formal education curricula"

Comment: Due to there could be different strategies for sharing relevant information and awareness-raising for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature, we consider that the indicator should not be restricted to formal education curricula. We suggest including other related communication, dissemination and education means.

Target 12.A: Support developing countries to strengthen their scientific and technological capacity to move towards more sustainable patterns of consumption and production

Suggested indicator: "Number of qualified green patent applications"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not measure the support to developing countries. We suggest defining the indicator in terms of resources or number of technical cooperation projects to developing countries **for strengthening their scientific and technological capacity to move towards more sustainable patterns of consumption and production.**

Target 12.B: Develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts for sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products

Suggested indicator: "Residual flows generated as a result of tourism direct GDP (derived from an extended version of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) for tourism)"

Comment: The suggested indicator is not currently feasible, and there is not yet a conceptual framework.

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)

Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 12.2
Indicator should be changed

Preferably in combination with DMC.

Suggestion: Indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD)

Indicator for Target 12.3
Indicator should be changed

We still do not know the definition of GFLI, so we do not have any Danish experience with this indicator. Is "Food Loss" the same as "Food Waste"? Please give a definition of both terms

Indicator for Target 12.4
Indicator should be changed as a priority

The indicator has several weaknesses: It is limited to the global conventions, which only cover a very small proportion of the existing hazardous and otherwise problematic chemicals on the market. Further, it only focuses on the number of states already parties to the agreements (that have not only signed, but also ratified them). There is a focus on meeting obligations in transmitting information. However, reporting is for example not required under the Rotterdam Convention, which would then not seem to be reflected here, and it also does not say anything about the quality or completeness of the information and whether it would contain the most important information to be able to indicate progress towards the target, especially the reduction of releases.

We acknowledge that establishing an optimal indicator taking into account the broader picture would be very difficult at this point in time, especially given data gaps, but think a better indicator can be formulated.

We propose the following indicator:

The proportion of states that have ratified the global international environmental agreements on hazardous and other chemicals and waste, and that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting emission and release data and other information as required by each relevant agreement.

That is:

=total number of states that have ratified and have submitted the mentioned data and information under the four chemicals and wastes conventions (BRS and Minamata) divided by the total possible number of ratifications (4x number of UN Member States= 772)

This composite indicator will give a fuller and better picture of developments. It will be affected by the number of ratifications, implying that environmentally sound management of chemicals and waste will improve at the national level when a country ratifies a convention- a valid assumption - and further explicitly emphasizes the importance of the reduction of releases and emissions, which is highlighted in the target.

Indicator for Target 12.5
Indicator should be changed as a priority

This indicator is limited to recycling of waste, but the target is on reduction of waste generation, including both waste prevention and recycling.

It is not clear whether the indicator shall show the recycling rate or whether it shall include 'tonnes of material recycled'. The indicator could be worded in the following way: Tonnes of total waste recycled in kg per capita/year

We suggest adding indicator 1 from earlier papers: National waste generation (solid waste to landfill and incineration and disaggregated data for e-waste) in kg per capita/year.

Indicator for Target 12.6
Indicator should be changed as a priority

The number of companies worldwide is increasing and will continue to do so. Thus, measuring only the number of companies and not the share does not give a clear direction and may lead to misinterpretation.

Denmark suggests that the indicator should include both number and share of companies publishing sustainability reporting – preferably divided on company size.

Indicator for Target 12.7
Indicator should be changed

The proposed indicator has the very important weakness that it is completely open for interpretation. We could imagine that all countries can reply positively to the present indicator, referring to one example of a policy that can be considered sustainable, without necessarily promoting public procurement practices overall, which is what the target is about. This makes it somewhat invaluable.

We acknowledge that data at a global level is somewhat of poor quality. However, Denmark encourages that a more suitable indicator is developed, e.g. UNEP has proposed an indicator: "% of Sustainable Public Procurement

In total public procurement for

a set of prioritized product groups".

Indicator for Target 12.8

As the target relates to the access to information an <u>alternative indicator</u> could be: "number of countries that have implemented the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)".

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 12

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 12:

- DMC_{abiot} per capita
- GHG per capita

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 12. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 12.2 – By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources

<u>Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:</u> Material footprint (MF) and MF/capita

<u>Remark:</u> Detailed specification missing. Depending on MF-definition Indicator could be meaningful. France states that "material footprint" is not currently available. The best currently available indicator at global scale for resource efficiency is indeed GDP/DMC.

<u>Suggestion:</u> Replace indicator by DMC_{abiot} per capita.

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of Parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous and other chemicals and waste that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement

Remark: We strongly recommend accepting the proposal.

Target 12.5 – By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11*:*

- National recycling rate
- tonnes of material recycled

Remark: Detailed specifications are missing. "Prevention" und "reuse" not measureable. In order to allow for sufficient differentiation between waste streams and their specific challenges, we strongly recommend accepting the following alternative proposal.

Suggestion: Waste generation rates (kg per capita/year)

Target 12.6 – Encourage companies, especially large and transnational companies, to adopt sustainable practices and to integrate sustainability information into their reporting cycle

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of companies publishing sustainability reporting

Remark: Indicator does not make much sense. Large and transnational companies often have obligation in publishing such reports.

Target 12.7 – Promote public procurement practices that are sustainable, in accordance with national policies and priorities

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of countries implementing Sustainable Public Procurement policies and action plans

Remark: No national indicator. Counting pure number of countries does not make much sense.

Target 12.8 – By 2030, ensure that people everywhere have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of countries reporting inclusion of sustainable development and lifestyles topics in formal education curricula

Remark: No national indicator. Counting pure number of countries does not make much sense.

Target 12.b – Develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts for sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Residual flows generated as a result of tourism direct GDP (derived from an extended version of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) for tourism)

Remark: Principle uncertainty how 'sustainability' and 'promotion of regional cultures and products' should be measured.

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Amount of fossil fuel subsidies, per unit of GDP (production and consumption), and as proportion of total national expenditure on fossil fuels

Remark: Suggested indicator is based on IEA estimations.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

[http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_12.xlsx](http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list%20of%20indicator%20proposals_EC_feedback_theme_12.xlsx)

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

Indicators 12.1.1 and 12.1.2 could be merged.

Indicator 12.2.2 should also address water consumption and waste generation, with potential links to targets 6.4 and 12.5.

We would prefer indicator 12.4.2 over 12.4.1, as the number of parties to an agreement does not give indication on the actual progress on reduction of release of chemicals to various compartments. Furthermore, 12.4.2 has several strong links to other targets: 2.4, 6.3, 14.1, 15.3 and 11.6.

Both waste generation and waste management need to be covered, the suggested indicator 12.5.2 captures only a part of the goal. "Amount of waste that is generated, landfilled, incinerated or recycled in kg per capita/year, including household waste, hazardous waste and e-waste" could be a suitable replacement.

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 12. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 12, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

Goal 12 SCP.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 12. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 12 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Singapore
Target 12.8: Formal curricula should not be the sole indicator. Awareness building activities for schools should include relevant programmes open to students from NGOs, government or community partners. Relevant community outreach programmes should also be included.

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)
Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal12 Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 12.2 By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources		
Suggested Indicator	Material footprint (MF) and MF/capita	Indicator needs clarification and assessment to whether domestic processed output should be included or not.
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		
Suggested Indicator	Number of Parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous and other chemicals and waste that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement	Relevant
Target 12.5 By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse		
Suggested Indicator	National recycling rate, tonnes of material recycled	Relevant
Target 12.b Develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts for sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products		
Suggested Indicator	Residual flows generated as a result of tourism direct GDP (derived from an extended version of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) for tourism)	It is unclear.Clarification is needed
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 the 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		
Suggested Indicator	Amount of fossil fuel subsidies, per unit of GDP (production and consumption), and as proportion of total national expenditure on fossil fuels	Relevant

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

The National Statistics Institute of Cabo Verde has no comments regarding the indicators for Goal 12.

15 Sep, 2015

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

Genevieve Verdier (IMF)
Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 13.2:

In addition to the suggested indicator, an indicator such as "rates of taxation applied to fossil fuel consumption" could be useful to measure the progress toward the target.

25 Aug, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

We would like to submit our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion.

Synergies should be sought between the indicators for the SDGs and for the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR basically proposes the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework. The indicators were discussed and reviewed by more than 60 Experts from UN System, civil sector, academic and research sector, and private sector. The Attached Annex is the proposal on the Sendai Framework indicators for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OEIWG). Some indicators are selected to be proposed for the SDG. Please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document for the details of each indicator.

This proposal is also consistent with and further revised from the UNISDR Proposal in coordination with 16 UN agencies (FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO) which was submitted to the IAEG web-platform in early July.

The paper includes indicator proposals for the targets 13.1,13.2 and 13.3.

We especially think that reviving economic loss indicator is critical because the climate change will significantly influence economic loss.

We greatly appreciate your attention.

UNISDR proposal:

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).pdf

Indicator details (please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

Best regards,

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR) (UNISDR) (ishigaki@un.org)

UNISDR

31 Aug, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

The indicator for Target 13.1 is the same as for Target 1.5, to economize indicators we suggest the removal of this indicator.

The indicator in Target 13.a is measured at a global level, not a national level.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)

Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: *new loans for SMEs (# and $) for sustainable energy and adaptation activities*

Private sector financing for climate change (expand indicator 80)

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Targets 1.5, 11.5, 13.1 and 14.2 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of deaths and missing due to hazardous events per 100,000.
- Number of affected people due to hazarouds events per 100,000. *(can be combined with the above indicator)*

- Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product.

Target 13.2

- Number of countries that adopt and implement national DRR strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030
- Number of countries that integrate climate and disaster risk into development planning

Target 13.3 and 15.3 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of countries that have multi-hazard early warning system
- Number of countries that have multi-hazard national risk assessment with results in an accessible, understandable and usable format for stakeholders and people

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx

(I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

In response to several countries' inputs on these indicators, we would like to add explanation why we propose these indicators.

1. **Linkage of follow-up/review mechanisms between the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**

The SDGs require that "data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible". (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

UNISDR would like to inform on Sendai Framework reporting mechanism:

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted in March 2015. The Members States agreed to set seven global targets and assigned a task to UNISDR to support development of indicators to monitor the Sendai global targets in coordination with other relevant mechanisms for sustainable development and climate change (para 48 (c) in the Sendai Framework).

The seven global targets include substantial reduction of (a) mortality, (b) affected people, (c) direct economic loss, (d) damage to critical infrastructure) and (e) increase of the number of countries having national and local DRR strategy, (f) international cooperation, and (g) increased availability of and access to risk information and early warning system. (Para 18 in the Sendai Framework)

The indicators we proposed for the SDGs are also proposed to the "Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group for indicators and terminology of the Sendai Framework (OEIWG)" to be discussed by the government experts (the 1st meeting will be held in 28-29 September). We believe

the coherence between the Sendai and the SDG follow-up/review mechanism will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis.

2. "Multi-purpose indicators" to express inter-linkage between the SDG Targets

The SDG goals and targets are inter-linked. This is supported by texts such as "sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent. (Para 13 in the SDG, finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

The 1st IAEG Report concludes that *there also appeared to be broad agreement among Member States that the number of global indicators should be limited and should include multi-purpose indicators that address several targets at the same time*. (Para7-1 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3))

Building on the SDG and IAEG discussion, we proposed the same indicators for several targets under different goals. For example, human related loss and economic loss indicators to monitor 1.5 (vulnerability and resilience), 11.5 (disaster loss), and 13.1 (climate change impact). In the 1st IAEG, the Secretariat of UNDESA (UNSD) provided an illustration of links between targets and introduced this human loss indicator as an example of multi-purpose indicators.

While we understand the IAEG promotes one indicator per target, mechanically applies the principle to all targets might lose the important spirit of each target. The 1st IAEG Report also concludes that *while the number of global indicators must be limited, some targets might require multiple indicators to measure its different aspects* (Para7-2 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3). For example, in the target 11.5, "number of death" "number of affected people" and "economic loss" are critical elements and it would be extremely difficult to monitor all elements if we need to select only one indicator.

We have proposed the same indicators for several targets. By this way, while the number of indicator per target might be more than one, the total number of indicators does not increase, or even less than the case for one indicator/target. (e.g. if we select the same 2 indicators for 3 targets, total number of indicators will be two). We believe the multi-purpose indicators will be the only solution to reduce the total number of indicators while allowing several indicators per target not to lose important elements included in each target.

3. National ownership

We would like to emphasize that our proposals are all based on national data sources. We think this is consistent with the spirit of the SDGs that says "the global review will be primarily based on national official data sources" (para 74 (a) in the SDGs, in the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). Currently 85 countries have standardized national disaster loss databases and more countries will have such databases under the request of the Sendai Framework. The indicators we proposed are therefore measurable and comparable across time and space. In the inter-

governmental working group for the Sendai Framework (OEIWG), the Member States will discuss for further standardization of disaster loss data and policy related data.

4. **Indicator development process accounting for the technical robustness, measurability and inclusiveness**

Between the 1st IAEG and the submission of this input, we organized a technical expert meeting inviting UN agencies, scientific and academic organizations, civil sector and private sector to examine and discuss indicator proposals to monitor the Sendai Framework and how to build linkage between the Sendai Indicators and SDG indicators(27-29 July, Geneva). More than 60 experts participated in the meeting and/or provided written inputs.

In the meeting, the indicator proposals were examined from measurability perspective. Terminology was defined and remaining challenges identified. In the meeting of intergovernmental expert working group (OEIWG), the proposed indicators will be further discussed and refined from government perspective.

The proposal for the Sendai Framework indicator is uploaded in the website.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

We appreciate your attention.
Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

07 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 13

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

UN System Goal 13 rev1.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 13. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (UNEP, UNESCO, UNFCCC, UNISDR and WMO), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

13.1 - Target is about response, but indicator is related to damage.

- Need to consider time taken since the outbreak of disaster to return to everyday life and value of damage, percentage of GDP (or other measure of economy) spent on adaption capacity and resilience building

13.2 - Policy commitment across countries cannot be measured based on 'number of countries that have formally communicated the establishment of climate resilient strategies'

- Availability of budget plans on improvement and adaptation and its percentage of total budget should be considered into the indicator.

13.b Need more specification on scope of 'support for raising capacities for management'

07 Sep, 2015

Tiina Luige (UNECE)
UNECE Task Force on Climate Change Related Indicators, comment on indicator for target 13.2

Proposed indicator: GHG emissions (in CO_2 equivalent)

Background: The UNECE Expert Forum for Producers and Users of Climate Change-related Statistics (2-3 September 2015, Geneva) expressed concern that no indicators on GHG emissions are included in the draft SDG indicator framework. 36 countries and 17 international organizations were represented at the Forum. GHG emissions is one of the most widely used indicators related to climate change for which there exists an internationally comparable methodology and data are widely available. The Forum requested the UNECE Task Force on climate change related indicators to make a proposal to IAEG-SDG on this indicator.

Definition: The annual amount of anthropogenic GHG emissions by country (in CO2 -equivalent units).

Further breakdowns by sector could be made available. GHG emissions per capita, per commodity and per GDP could also be calculated.

Relevance: GHG emissions are a key element to formulate mitigation policies and monitor their success over time. This indicator is already used for global monitoring and is related to target 13.2. In fact, the indicator is a key tool to reach the target.

Sources: UNFCCC and other organizations

Tier: Tier I indicator (methodology and data are available)

Methodological soundness: Clear methodological guidance on the calculation of this indicator is available from the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC); the robustness of that guidance has been tested for many years during the implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and its Kyoto Protocol.

Measurability and data availability:

The outcome document "Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development" emphasizes that data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible (para 48). Currently the so-called Annex I Parties under UNFCCC (44 countries) produce annually a very detailed GHG inventory. Non-Annex I Parties (152 countries) have less stringent reporting requirements, although since 2014 they need to report to the UNFCCC their emissions every two years, under so-called Biennial Update Reports. The anticipated new agreement from COP-21 in Paris is expected to include a new legal instrument under the Convention applicable to all Parties.

In addition, "GHG emissions" is a core indicator in UNECE Guidelines on Environmental Indicators for countries of Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia, and part of the pan-European Shared Environmental Information System being established. It is also one of the EU SDG and Europe 20/20 indicators.

A similar indicator (CO_2 emissions) was part of the monitoring framework for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and thus measurability/monitoring experience is available.

Data source: The main source of data is the UNFCCC secretariat (for Annex I parties). For non-Annex I parties' additional information can be obtained from the International Energy Agency (IEA), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the Carbon Dioxide Information and Analysis Center (CDIAC) in the United States of America; other organizations may be considered as well.

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 13

Target 13.1: Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate related hazards and natural disasters in all countries

Suggested indicator: "Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people"

Comment: The suggested indicator measures affectation after disasters, a complementary indicator could be population covered by climate change adaptation plans.

Target 13.2: Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies, and planning

Suggested indicator: "Number of countries that have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low-carbon, climate-resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies (e.g. a national adaptation plan process, national policies and measures to promote transition to environmentally-friendly substances and technologies)"

Comment: We suggest not just measure the communication of the establishment of those strategies, but its implementation and the population covered.

Target 13.3: Improve education, awareness raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction, and early warning .

Suggested indicator: "Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula"

Comment: Taking into account that the improvement of education, awareness raising and human and institutional capacity could be reached through different instruments, the indicator *% of population with increased knowledge on climate change* could better cover the target.

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 13.1
Indicator should be changed

Usefulness in DK:

The merging of "death" and "evacuation" number seams inappropriate and will give a wrong impression on the disaster impact, e.g. 1.500. per. 100.000 could cover 1.500 deaths in Bangladesh and 1.500 temporarily evacuated in Denmark.

Suggesting an indicator having more focus on the impact on livelihoods (this will be critical for all, including the most vulnerable groups and hence have a strong poverty focus).

Indicator for Target 13.3
The proprosed indicator has mainly focus on the "education"/ awareness. The long term result of

sum of education, awareness and institutional capacity will be "climate aware" societies – having climate adaptation plans in place.

Relevant in DK.

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of populated areas having a climate adaptation plan" in place.

Indicator for Target 13.a
It is still to be decided which financial sources that will included in the 100 billion USD. Thus, the target should be reformulated based on agreed language from Copenhagen Consensus.

Indicator 13.a.1

This indicator should be referred to pending UNFCCC-negotiations as issue of climate financing is very sensitive politically as there is no commonly agreed definition.

Indicator 13.a.2
As the GCF Board has still not finally defined and decided the targets of the fund, this indicator is premature. Another UN body should not define targets for the fund at this stage. In addition, the indicator is arbitrary as the percentage of funded projects does not reflect on the quality of those projects. Also, projects initially funded by GCF will most likely not only receive national funding but funding from a variety of sources.

Indicator for Target 13.b
Agrees with WB's comment that the indicator seems less meaningful. Support the proposal from the WB to try to develop sectoral indicators (for agriculture/irrigation, water supply/water management and energy production).

07 Sep, 2015 at 06:47 PM

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 13

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a

good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 13:

- GHG per capita

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 13. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 13.3 – Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11*: Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula*

Remark:* The meaning of this indicator is limited.*

Target 13.b – Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least developed countries, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11*: Number of LDCs that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and marginalized communities*

Remark:* The meaning of this indicator is limited.*

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_13.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

The suggested indicator for target 13.1, "Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people" does not distinguish between climate change related casualties and others (e.g. Earthquakes). This is of course difficult to attribute, but in the current form, the indicator is not very closely related to the goal and target.

Several of the proposed indicators are not very well defined and suffer from being dependent on self-reporting.

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

UNISDR comments on Target 13.1

In response to several comments on the proposed disaster loss indicators for 13.1, UNISDR would like to clarify the data should be reported from national disaster loss database to UNISDR by hazard according to the existing standard. The current hazard classification we are utilizing is IRDR classification, which categorizes the hazards into climatological, meteorological, hydrological, geological etc. It is possible to exclude loss caused by hazards not related with climate change (e.g. geological event) and make "proxy" for climate-change related loss while we admit it is very difficult to clearly identify and isolate the loss caused by climate change. (e.g. identifying whether certain flood events are caused by climate change or not is extremely difficult). The data source is the same as the one we proposed for indicator 1.5 and 11.5. Therefore, it will not cause additional burden on countries. Further standardization of national disaster loss database will be discussed in the inter-governmental working group for the Sendai Framework.

Best regards,

Kazuko Ishigaki,

UNISDR

07 Sep, 2015

Stephen Gold (UNDP)

Dear colleagues,

On behalf of UNDP, please find below suggested indicators for the various targets for SDG 13. Please note that these are based on our experience supporting countries on climate change interventions in line with the suggested focus of Goal 13.

13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries

-Suggested indicators:

- Number of countries in which disaster and climate risk management explicitly addressed in national, sub-national and sectorial planning frameworks, policies and budgetary systems
- Number of countries with clearly defined institutional responsibilities and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms for disaster and climate risk management at national and sub-national level.

13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning

-Suggested indicator:

- Number of countries with comprehensive measures - plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets - implemented to achieve low-emission and climate-resilient objectives.
- Number of countries with legislative/or regulatory provisions at national and sub-national level for managing disaster and climate risks;

13.3 Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning

-Suggested indicator:

- Number of countries with comprehensive measures - plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets - implemented to strengthen or build capacity at national and subnational level, within both institutions and communities

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

-Suggested indicator:

- Number of countries with systems in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on and verify use of climate finances

13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least developed countries and small island developing States, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities

-Suggested indicator:

- Number of countries with adaptation strategy/action plans, disaster risk reduction and/or integrated disaster risk reduction and that specifically addresses equity and gender considerations

We hope that this helps in the overall discussion and finalization of indicators now, and in the forthcoming workshop in October.

09 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 13. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 13 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Singapore

Target 13.3: Suggested indicator may not be appropriate currently. Countries will need to first introduce climate change as part of the school curricula.

A possible indicator would be "no. of countries that have put in place programmes to promote awareness of climate change issues to schools, communities, and the general public."

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal13 Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries		
Suggested Indicator	Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.	Relevant
Target 13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning		
Suggested Indicator	Number of countries that have formally communicated the establishment of integrated low-carbon, climate-resilient, disaster risk reduction development strategies (e.g. a national adaptation plan process, national policies and measures to promote transition to environmentally-friendly substances and technologies).	Relevant

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		
Suggested Indicator	Mobilized amount of USD per year starting in 2020 accountable towards the USD 100 billion commitment	Relevant
Target 13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least developed countries, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities		
Suggested Indicator	Number of LDCs that are receiving specialized support for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and marginalized communities	Relevant

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

[ODS 13.pdf](ODS 13.pdf)

14 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Comment from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde is based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow African members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.

Comment: It's difficult to have accurate measures on injured. We suggest to be removed. We also suggest to include displaced.

15 Sep, 2015

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

Andrew Hudson (UNDP)

Indicator 14.7 would read better as "Fisheries, aquaculture and tourism as % of GDP" to bring it fully in line with the same 3 sectors shown in the target.

Indicator 14.1 - suggested indicator is fine but only incorporates nutrient pollution, target includes marine debris so need to add it such as "..and metric tonnes per year of plastic waste entering ocean from all sources against 2015 baseline"

28 Aug, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

We would like to submit our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion.

Synergies should be sought between the indicators for the SDGs and for the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR basically proposes the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework. The indicators were discussed and reviewed by more than 60 Experts from UN System, civil sector, academic and research sector, and private sector. The Attached Annex is the proposal on the Sendai Framework indicators for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OEIWG). Some indicators are selected to be proposed for the SDG. Please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document for the details of each indicator.

This proposal is also consistent with and further revised from the UNISDR Proposal in coordination with 16 UN agencies (FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO) which was submitted to the IAEG web-platform in early July.

The paper includes indicator proposal for the target 14.2

We greatly appreciate your attention.

UNISDR proposal:

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).pdf

Indicator details (please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR) (UNISDR) (ishigaki@un.org)

UNISDR
31 Aug, 2015

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

The following are the comments from INDEC (Argentina) on this topic:

Target 14.a Increase scientific knowledge, develop research capacity and transfer marine technology, taking into account the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology, in order to improve ocean health and to enhance the contribution of marine biodiversity to the development of developing countries, in particular small island developing States and least developed countries

Indicator: Budget allocation to research in the field of sustainable marine technology as a percentage of all research in field of marine technology

It does not exist as such, but it could be calculated.

Sincerely,
Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)
02 Sep, 2015

Hubert Escaith (WTO)
WTO comments based on the 11 August list of indicators

Target 14.6

Indicator 14.6.1 poses also a definitional issue, as there is little or no consensus on which are the harmful subsidies. Calculating the 2015 baseline may prove difficult: even if Member States could agree on a common list of harmful subsidies, they would still be reluctant to publicly identify how much harmful subsidies they provided in 2015.

14.6.2. This indicator (legal framework or mechanisms prohibiting certain form of fish subsidies) will probably be difficult to monitor. Instead of prohibiting, most countries will probably eliminate subsidies, or establish substitute programmes after eliminating the prohibited subsidies (such as the "blue" box in agriculture subsidies, that are meant - inter alia- to reduce harmful practices). So this indicator, as such, may have few data points.

Target 14.7

The proposed indicator (fisheries as % of GDP) does not look at the sustainability of fisheries nor the need to diversify exports out of primary commodities. Alternative indicators such as percentage of fish produced by aquaculture and increase in services exports or employment derived from tourism and other services activities are better substitutes from a sustainable development point of view.

04 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
For Target 14.1 we suggest an indicator more aligned to the target be considered, for example: "Liquid discharge treatment plant care".

To measure Target 14.4 the calculation methodology of the indicator should be proposed based on an estimation for each known species and the determination of biologically sustainable levels.

We suggest the name of the indicator in Target 14.5 mention that it refers to the coastal area.

The indicator for Target 14.7 should be better defined so as to enable its evaluation, given that the indicator refers to economy income as a percentage of GDP and does not denote whether fishing is done in a sustainable manner or if it is directly contribution to small fisher's income.

The indicator for Target 14.b has no clear relation to the target and objective, it not would monitor "greater access for small fishermen." We suggest use as indicator the "rate of capture made by artisanal fishermen on the total catch".

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 13

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UN System Goal 13 rev1.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 13. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (UNEP, UNESCO, UNFCCC, UNISDR and WMO), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UN System Goal 13 rev1.xlsx

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 14

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

Copy of Indicators SDG 14 (04.sept.2015. 17.00) FINAL.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 14. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (CBD, DOALOS, FAO, UNEP, IOC-UNESCO, IUCN, ILO, and IMO), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

- On target 14.1, the proposal "Metric tonnes per year of plastic materials entering the ocean from all sources" is reformulated as "Floating Plastic Debris" and suggested as priority, whereas the "Index of Coastal Eutrophication (ICEP)"

is also introduced as a second priority indicator. The proposal "Fertilizer consumption" is replaced with "Nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator" which is proposed as an additional indicator, with sources to be identified.

- On target 14.2, "% of national EEZ managed using ecosystem-based approaches" is proposed as the sole priority indicator. Other relevant indicators (such as the Red List Index and a number of resilience indicators) are dropped from this target on the understanding that they are priority indicators for other targets (e.g. 11.5, 13.1 and 15.5) and do not need to be repeated here, although their relevance is highlighted in the 'interlinkages' section.

- On target 14.3, "carbonate chemistry parameters" is proposed as the priority indicator whereas "Growth in scientific ocean acidification cooperation" is proposed to capture the international cooperation dimension. "Loss of marine biodiversity caused by ocean acidification" is proposed as additional.

- On target 14.4, "Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels" is retained as the sole priority indicator.

- On target 14.5, "Coverage of protected areas" is retained as the sole priority indicator.

- On target 14.6, "Progress by countries in the implementation of international instruments aiming to combat IUU fishing" is proposed as the priority indicator. Earlier proposals relating to negative fishery subsidies are not listed as they have not been further substantiated or endorsed by countries.

- On target 14.7, "Revenues and ecosystem services derived from sustainable fisheries, aquaculture, tourism and other coastal and marine resources uses" is proposed as the priority indicator, whereas "productivity of aquaculture" is listed as additional.

- On target 14.a, "% of GDP invested in ocean research" and "Growth in ocean science capacity, technology and knowledge, as well as cooperation between countries and regions" are proposed as priority, whereas "Budget allocation to research in the field of sustainable marine technology as a percentage of all research in field of marine technology" is proposed as additional.

- On 14.b, "Progress by countries in adopting and implementing a legal/regulatory/policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries" is proposed as priority, and "Percentage of catches that are subject to a catch documentation scheme or similar traceability system as a percentage of the total catches that are less than x tons and traded in major markets" is retained but categorized as additional.

- On 14.c, "Progress by countries in implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in relevant legally binding and voluntary instruments for sustainable use and conservation of the ocean including, instruments related to fisheries, shipping, labour, conservation at global and regional levels" is proposed as the overall priority indicator. Several additional indicators are also listed that can support the priority indicator. Some agencies have expressed reservations in the use of indicators formulated in terms of

'number of countries' as these indicators would take a Yes or No value at country level and would not be able to reveal progress at country level.

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: *new loans for SMEs (# and $) for sustainable fisheries*

Private sector investment in sustainable fisheries

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Targets 1.5, 11.5, 13.1 and 14.2 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of deaths and missing due to hazardous events per 100,000.
- Number of affected people due to hazarouds events per 100,000. *(can be combined with the above indicator)*
- Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product.

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx

(I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

In response to several countries' inputs on these indicators, we would like to add explanation why we propose these indicators.

1. **Linkage of follow-up/review mechanisms between the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**

The SDGs require that "data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible". (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

UNISDR would like to inform on Sendai Framework reporting mechanism:

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted in March 2015. The Members States agreed to set seven global targets and assigned a task to UNISDR to support development of indicators to monitor the Sendai global targets in coordination with other relevant mechanisms for sustainable development and climate change (para 48 (c) in the Sendai Framework).

The seven global targets include substantial reduction of (a) mortality, (b) affected people, (c) direct economic loss, (d) damage to critical infrastructure) and (e) increase of the number of countries having national and local DRR strategy, (f) international cooperation, and (g) increased availability of and access to risk information and early warning system. (Para 18 in the Sendai Framework)

The indicators we proposed for the SDGs are also proposed to the "Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group for indicators and terminology of the Sendai Framework (OEIWG)" to be discussed by the government experts (the 1st meeting will be held in 28-29 September). We believe the coherence between the Sendai and the SDG follow-up/review mechanism will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis.

2. **"Multi-purpose indicators" to express inter-linkage between the SDG Targets**

The SDG goals and targets are inter-linked. This is supported by texts such as "sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent. (Para 13 in the SDG, finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

The 1st IAEG Report concludes that *there also appeared to be broad agreement among Member States that the number of global indicators should be limited and should include multi-purpose indicators that address several targets at the same time*. (Para7-1 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3))

Building on the SDG and IAEG discussion, we proposed the same indicators for several targets under different goals. For example, human related loss and economic loss indicators to monitor 1.5 (vulnerability and resilience), 11.5 (disaster loss), and 13.1 (climate change impact). In the 1st IAEG, the Secretariat of UNDESA (UNSD) provided an illustration of links between targets and introduced this human loss indicator as an example of multi-purpose indicators.

While we understand the IAEG promotes one indicator per target, mechanically applies the principle to all targets might lose the important spirit of each target. The 1st IAEG Report also concludes that *while the number of global indicators must be limited, some targets might require multiple indicators*

to measure its different aspects (Para7-2 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3). For example, in the target 11.5, "number of death" "number of affected people" and "economic loss" are critical elements and it would be extremely difficult to monitor all elements if we need to select only one indicator.

We have proposed the same indicators for several targets. By this way, while the number of indicator per target might be more than one, the total number of indicators does not increase, or even less than the case for one indicator/target. (e.g. if we select the same 2 indicators for 3 targets, total number of indicators will be two). We believe the multi-purpose indicators will be the only solution to reduce the total number of indicators while allowing several indicators per target not to lose important elements included in each target.

3. National ownership

We would like to emphasize that our proposals are all based on national data sources. We think this is consistent with the spirit of the SDGs that says "the global review will be primarily based on national official data sources" (para 74 (a) in the SDGs, in the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). Currently 85 countries have standardized national disaster loss databases and more countries will have such databases under the request of the Sendai Framework. The indicators we proposed are therefore measurable and comparable across time and space. In the inter-governmental working group for the Sendai Framework (OEIWG), the Member States will discuss for further standardization of disaster loss data and policy related data.

4. Indicator development process accounting for the technical robustness, measurability and inclusiveness

Between the 1st IAEG and the submission of this input, we organized a technical expert meeting inviting UN agencies, scientific and academic organizations, civil sector and private sector to examine and discuss indicator proposals to monitor the Sendai Framework and how to build linkage between the Sendai Indicators and SDG indicators(27-29 July, Geneva). More than 60 experts participated in the meeting and/or provided written inputs.

In the meeting, the indicator proposals were examined from measurability perspective. Terminology was defined and remaining challenges identified. In the meeting of intergovernmental expert working group (OEIWG), the proposed indicators will be further discussed and refined from government perspective.

The proposal for the Sendai Framework indicator is uploaded in the website.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

We appreciate your attention.

Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
UNISDR
07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

14.4 Resource restoration effect takes place slowly even when scientific management plan is implemented for restoring catches in shortest amount of time. So indicator is not suitable for measuring target.

14.a Need more specification and data source on "sustainable marine science technology research"

14.b "Proportion of national fishery production by country that are catches by small-medium fishery businesses" can be alternative indicator.

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 14

Target 14.1: By 2025, prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds, particularly from land-based activities, including marine debris and nutrient pollution

Suggested indicator: "Nitrogen Use Efficiency composite indicator"

Comment: We don´t have information on this indicator. We suggest a Marine Water Quality Indicator.

Target 14.3: Minimize and address the impacts of ocean acidification, including through enhanced scientific cooperation at all levels

Suggested indicator: "Average marine acidity (pH) measured at agreed suite of representative sampling stations"

Comment: The indicator should be complemented with one about scientific cooperation.

Target 14.7: By 2030 increase the economic benefits to SIDS and LDCs from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and tourism

*Suggested indicator: "*Fisheries as a % of GDP"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not measure adequately the target, because fisheries are not necessarily sustainably managed, and does not include other uses of marine resources.

Target 14.B: Provide access of small-scale artisanal fishers to marine resources and markets

*Suggested indicator: "*Percentage of catches that are subject to a catch documentation scheme or similar traceability system as a percentage of the total catches that are less than x tons and traded in major markets"

Comment: We could report number of fishers in the traceability plan.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
 07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 14

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 14:

- Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable level (int. level)

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 14. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: *% of coastal and marine development (to be defined) with formulated or implemented ICM/MSP plans (that are harmonized where applicable), based on an ecosystem approach, that builds resilient human communities and ecosystems and provides for equitable benefit sharing and decent work*

Remark: *Meaning of indicator is limited and indicator is not finally defined.*

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable limits

Remark: Biologically sustainable level" is a very general term; while the in target the term "maximum sustainable yield (MSY)" is used, which is a very common quantity in fisheries science. A better wording for the indicator could be be: "% of populations of fish stocks at or above biomass levels capable of producing maximum sustainable yield"

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: *Coverage of protected areas*

Remark: Indicator not finally defined. Definition of "protected area" missing

Target 14.7 – By 2030, increase the economic benefits to Small Island developing States and least developed countries from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and tourism

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Fisheries as a % of GDP

Remark: Indictors are not reflecting sustainable use of marine resources. Indicators should focus more on marine protected area concepts and the way how these can benefit to SIDS. Inshore artisanal fisheries in SIDS are not practiced sustainably mainly through the use of unregulated seine netting (with small mesh size). The offshore fishing in SIDS mainly targets Tuna fish through long line fishery. In terms of fish biomass and diversity a reduction of bycatch through Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) in (offshore) seamounts and a transparent reporting system would contribute to the sustainable use of marine resources in SIDS. In essence all facts and figures generated by the scientific community support that sustainable fishing practices in the medium and long run are more profitable than non-sustainable ones.

Suggestion: We would like to replace the indicator by: Coverage and management effectiveness of inshore and offshore protected areas

Target 14.a – Increase scientific knowledge, develop research capacity and transfer marine technology, taking into account the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology, in order to improve ocean health and to enhance the contribution of marine biodiversity to the development of developing countries, in particular small island developing States and least developed countries

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: *Budget allocation to research in the field of sustainable marine technology as a percentage of all research in field of marine technology*

Remark: This seems like a very specialized indicator which is relevant and applicable to only a specific group of countries.

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 14.1
The indicator does not cover marine debris.¨

Proposal: Proportion of marine and coastal areas affected by pollution

Indicator for Target 14.2

Very vague indicator.

Proposal: Indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD)

Marine trophic index

Indicator for Target 14.3

Proposal: Nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator

Indicator for Target 14.4

acceptable

Goal is in line with EU policy/indicator.

Generally OK, but how is "biologically sustainable level" defined?

Proposal: Trends in pressures from unsustainable fisheries and aquaculture

Indicator for Target 14.5

acceptable

What defines "conserve … costal and marine area"?

Generally OK, but how is "coverage" defined?

Proposal: Marine trophic index

Indicator for Target 14.6

Should be in line with WTO rules..

Indicator for Target 14.7

The indicator is not irrelevant, but it will have to be complemented by other aspects. As a minimum, and as proposed by others, the other sectors mentioned in 14.7 (aquaculture and tourism) will have to be added, as well as the revenue from these. Local value-added would also be a relevant parameter, since low revenue is often a consequence of exporting the products unprocessed. Data on exports might be used.

It is also important to note that an increasing part of GDP from fisheries is not necessarily a positive sign, since it might be a sign of lacking development in other sectors.

Finally, the target talks about *sustainable* use of the resources, and the indicators ought to reflect this as well. In the fisheries sector, the concept of "catch per unit effort" is often used, indicating developments in the efficiency and hence the possibility of bigger catches using less inputs. Further, the average size of relevant marine resources and species is an indicator of sustainable use of the resources, avoiding over-fishing, etc. However, traditional "Fish Stock Assessments" trying to measure the resource

Indicator for Target 14.a

The number of researchers may generally talk to the level of research activity, but not directly to the volume of knowledge or to the transfer of knowledge and technology. The same is true for the research budgets.

The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission belongs under UNESCO and has about 130 members, and the mentioned guidelines belong under UNCLOS (UN Convention on the Law of the Sea), which is developing continuously. The guidelines state under which conditions marine research can be carried out and results shared and have a mechanism allowing developing countries to apply for support for marine research.

Indicator for Target 14.b

Indicator should be changed

How is the indicator saying anything about access to marine resources and markets?

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_14.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

While the indicator suggested for target 14.1 is relevant, it is also highly selective relative to the target, there is nothing on e.g. chemical pollution (land abused, oil spills, etc.) and on microplastics.

If the microplastics indicator (14.1.2) is retained, it needs to cover also the existing levels, not only the input, for example by measuring beach litter density.

The suggested indicator for target 14.3 only measures the acidification, not its impacts.

For indicator 14.4.2, the priority should be fishing mortality (the degree of pressure), which management can control. So we would advise to consider "proportion of fish stocks fished within Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY)". Other aspects of the target are missing, e.g. IUU, plans, destructive fishing practices.

For indicator 14.5.2, some qualitative aspects should be captured to avoid 'paper parks'.

We are not certain about the purpose of tracking indicator 14.7.1, since the sustainability aspect is not considered. It could be modified to cover only fisheries revenue fished from stocks within the maximum sustainable yield (MSY).

07 Sep, 2015

Hien Ngo (IPBES)
Hien Ngo (IPBES Secretariat)

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

General comment regarding indicator proposals: When would a tier III indicator be developed to Tier II or Tier I status? What is the time frame in indicator development and implementation of programmes/datasets to support indicators?

Target 14.3 Minimize and address the impacts of the ocean acidification, including through enhanced scientific cooperation at all levels.

Comment: Agree with IUCN for a complementary indicator "Red List Index (Corals) while the suggested indicator of "Average marine acidity (pH) measured at agreed suite of representative sampling stations" is only at a Tier II status.

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 14. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 14, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

Goal 14 Marine.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 14. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 14 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Haji Abdul Rahman bin Hasan (Malaysia)

Target 14.1	By 2025, prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds, in particular from land-based activities, including marine debris and nutrient pollution
Indicator 14.1.1	Fertilizer consumption (kg/ha of arable land)
Comment	Malaysia calculate fertilizer consumption base on nutrient requirement and planted area
Indicator 14.2.2 Comment	Ocean Health Index. Malaysia suggest the title is Coral Health Index (CHI).
Target 14.3	Minimize and address the impacts of ocean acidification, including through enhanced scientific cooperation at all levels
Indicator 14.3.2 Comment	Coral coverage in the marine parks. Malaysia use the Reefcheck method to determine the coral coverage.
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
Indicator 14.5.1	Percentage area of each country's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) in Marine Protected Area (MPA Percentage area) of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ) in MPA

| Comment | Percentage area of global ocean under MPA.

Malaysia suggested to Change the indicator to Percentage MPA Area of EEZ. |
|---|---|
| Target 14.7 | By 2030, increase the economic benefits to small island developing States and least developed countries from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and tourism |
| Indicator 14.7.2

Comment | Level of revenue generated from sustainable use of marine resources.

Malaysia suggested title Level of revenue generated from sustainable use of marine resources change to Total Economic Value in Marine parks. |

10 Sep, 2015

Anibal Sanchez Aguilar (Peru)

Target 14.7: By 2030, increase the economic benefits to small island developing States and least developed countries from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and tourism.

Suggested indicator: "Fisheries as a % of GDP".

Comment :It is pertinent to point out that the GDP purchasing power parity at international agencies jointly developed with countries.

11 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal14, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

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		
Suggested Indicator	Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable level	Relevant
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		
Suggested Indicator	Coverage of protected areas	Relevant
Target 14.6 By 2020, prohibit certain forms of fisheries subsidies which contribute to overcapacity and overfishing, eliminate subsidies that contribute to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and refrain from introducing new such subsidies, recognizing that appropriate and effective special and differential treatment for developing and least developed countries should be an integral part of the World Trade Organization fisheries subsidies negotiation		
Suggested Indicator	Dollar value of negative fishery subsidies against 2015 baseline	This indicator can be used for the target. Beside this for the countries which use the Quota System, the indicators acquired from the Quota System are very important to find overcapacity and overfishing.
Target 14.7 By 2030, increase the economic benefits to Small Island developing States and least developed countries from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and tourism		
Suggested Indicator	Fisheries as a % of GDP	Relevant
Target 14.a Increase scientific knowledge, develop research capacity and transfer marine technology, taking into account the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology, in order to improve ocean health and to enhance the contribution of marine biodiversity to the development of developing countries, in particular		

small island developing States and least developed countries		
Suggested Indicator	Budget allocation to research in the field of sustainable marine technology as a percentage of all research in field of marine technology	It is unclear.Clarification is needed
Target 14.b Provide access for small-scale artisanal fishers to marine resources and markets		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of catches that are subject to a catch documentation scheme or similar traceability system as a percentage of the total catches that are less than x tons and traded in major markets.	Relevant
Target 14.c Enhance the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and their resources by implementing law as reflected in UNCLOS, which provides the legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and their resources, as recalled in paragraph 158 of The Future We Want.		
Suggested Indicator	Number of countries implementing either legally or programmatically the provisions set out in regional seas protocols and ratification and implementation of the ILO Maritime and Fisheries Conventions	Relevant

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

[ODS 14.pdf](ODS 14.pdf)

14 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Indicator: Nitrogen use efficiency composite indicator

Comment: We need further information on this indicator.

Indicator: % of coastal and marine development (to be defined) with formulated or implemented ICM/MSP plans (that are harmonized where applicable), based on an ecosystem approach, that builds resilient human communities and ecosystems and provides for equitable benefit sharing and decent work

Comment: We need further information on this indicator.

Indicator: Net forest emissions

Comment: Specify "Net forest emissions of CO_2".

Indicator: Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal

Comment: The indicator is difficult to be measured. Once we have the metadata it might become more understandable.

15 Sep, 2015

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

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

We would like to submit our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion.

Synergies should be sought between the indicators for the SDGs and for the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. UNISDR basically proposes the same indicators for both the SDGs and the Sendai Framework. The indicators were discussed and reviewed by more than 60 Experts from UN System, civil sector, academic and research sector, and private sector. The Attached Annex is the proposal on the Sendai Framework indicators for the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group (OEIWG). Some indicators are selected to be proposed for the SDG. Please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document for the details of each indicator.

This proposal is also consistent with and further revised from the UNISDR Proposal in coordination with 16 UN agencies (FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO) which was submitted to the IAEG web-platform in early July.

The paper includes indicator proposal for the target 15.3.

We greatly appreciate your attention.

UNISDR proposal:

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).pdf

Indicator details (please see the Annex B of the OEIWG document.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

Best regards,

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR) (UNISDR) (ishigaki@un.org)

UNISDR

31 Aug, 2015

Janusz Witkowski (Poland)

Comments from Central Statistical Office of Poland for Target 15.1

Definition of forest area used by Central Statistical Office of Poland differs from those used by international organizations. According to the Polish definition, the minimum area of forest should be at least 0,1 ha.

Comments from Central Statistical Office of Poland for Target 15.4

The Central Statistical Office of Poland would like to note that indicator Coverage of protected area does not specify mountain areas, so there is some doubt whether it is appropriate for this target.

01 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Janusz Witkowski (Poland)

DorianKalamvrezos Navarro (FAO)

Dear Mr. Witkowski,

UNEP, FAO and other agencies have been discussing the indicators for both these targets under the coordination initiative launched by Mr. Pietro Gennari (FAO) (see Topic 22).

We have agreed that the "protected area overlays with biodiversity" indicator should be placed under 15.1, alongside the forest area indicator, given the breadth of this target, and that by disaggregating it across terrains, it will also be able to support the mountain target 15.4. However, we have agreed that the main indicator for target 15.4 should be the 'Green Mountain Cover Index' as mountain protected areas by themselves are not a sufficient proxy for monitoring the health of all mountain ecosystems. In the table that Mr. Gennari will submit on Friday, further details will be provided.

As to your comment on 15.1, the minimum unit area for forest definition indeed varies across countries. For FAO/FRA reporting it is supposed to be converted to the global standard (0.5 ha), which should also be the SDG standard to improve comparability across countries.

Best regards

03 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

For Target 15.3 the proposed indicator is not well defined, which is why we suggest: Percentage of land that is degraded over total land area.

For the second indicator of Target 15.4, we find that a global scale standardization of the methodology of the calculation of the indicator is necessary.

In order to measure Target 15.8 we propose the following indicator: the number of public policies adopted that prevent the entry of invasive species to country.

For Target 15.b we propose as an indicator: "resources invested in providing adequate incentives for forest conservation."

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 15

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

UN System Template Goal 15 04092015 FINAL.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 15. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iii) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance. Overall, there are no 'additional' indicators included for this Goal – all proposals are priority. This reflects the very strong consensus amongst the relevant agencies and the willingness to partner on many of the indicators.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (CBD, FAO, IUCN, OECD, UNCCD, UNEP, UNFF and UNODC), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

- For target 15.1, two priority indicators are suggested: "forest area as a percentage of total area" and "protected area overlays with biodiversity". The

indicator "Percentage of change in wetlands extent over time" proposed for target 6.6. is also very relevant to this target.

- For target 15.2, emissions indicators have been dropped. The "Sustainable Forest management Index" and "carbon stocks in woody biomass" are proposed as priority indicators for this target. Forest certification, while it has been dropped as an indicator proposal, is suggested that it may be used by some countries to complement the other indicators.

  - On 15.3, UNCCD and FAO have agreed to jointly monitor "trends in land degradation" as the only priority indicator for this target.

  - On 15.4, the "Green Mountain Cover Index" is suggested as the only priority indicator, to be complemented as appropriate by the indicator "protected area overlays with biodiversity" of target 15.1

  - On 15.5, the "Red List Index" is suggested as the only priority indicator. While the "Living Planet Index" has been dropped, it may be used by some countries to monitor progress towards related Aichi Targets.

  - On 15.6, CBD and FAO have agreed to jointly monitor the one priority indicator "Number of permits or their equivalents made available to the Access and Benefit-sharing Clearinghouse established under the Nagoya Protocol and number of Standard Material Transfer Agreements, as communicated to the Governing Body of the International Treaty"

  - On 15.7, only one priority indicator is retained: "Ratio between detected illegal trafficking and legal trade in wildlife and wildlife products", which is also proposed as the indicator for 15.c.

  - On 15.8, "Adoption of national legislation relevant to the prevention or control of invasive alien species" is proposed as the only priority indicator.

  - On 15.9, "Progress towards national targets established in accordance with Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020" is proposed as the only priority indicator.

  - On 15.c, only one priority indicator is retained: "Ratio between detected illegal trafficking and legal trade in wildlife and wildlife products", which is also proposed as the indicator for 15.c.

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

Percentage of land under protection by private and public management. This can be a better indicator than financial resources for forest management or biodiversity (15.7)

We propose to include indicators that reflect financing from private sector to poverty reduction, in particular the role of access to finance for SMEs: *new loans for SMEs (# and $) for* sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems

Private sector investment in sustainable in forestry or land conservation

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Target 13.3 and 15.3 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of countries that have multi-hazard early warning system
- Number of countries that have multi-hazard national risk assessment with results in an accessible, understandable and usable format for stakeholders and people

Target 2.4 and 15.3 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Direct agricultural loss due to hazardous events *(agreed to merge with FAO indicator)*

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx

(I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

In response to several countries' inputs on these indicators, we would like to add explanation why we propose these indicators.

1. **Linkage of follow-up/review mechanisms between the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction**

The SDGs require that "data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible". (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

UNISDR would like to inform on Sendai Framework reporting mechanism:

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted in March 2015. The Members States agreed to set seven global targets and assigned a task to UNISDR to support development of indicators to monitor the Sendai global targets in coordination with other relevant mechanisms for sustainable development and climate change (para 48 (c) in the Sendai Framework).

The seven global targets include substantial reduction of (a) mortality, (b) affected people, (c) direct economic loss, (d) damage to critical infrastructure) and (e) increase of the number of countries having national and local DRR strategy, (f) international cooperation, and (g) increased availability of and access to risk information and early warning system. (Para 18 in the Sendai Framework)

The indicators we proposed for the SDGs are also proposed to the "Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group for indicators and terminology of the Sendai Framework (OEIWG)" to be discussed by the government experts (the 1st meeting will be held in 28-29 September). We believe the coherence between the Sendai and the SDG follow-up/review mechanism will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis.

2. "Multi-purpose indicators" to express inter-linkage between the SDG Targets

The SDG goals and targets are inter-linked. This is supported by texts such as "sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent. (Para 13 in the SDG, finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

The 1st IAEG Report concludes that *there also appeared to be broad agreement among Member States that the number of global indicators should be limited and should include multi-purpose indicators that address several targets at the same time*. (Para7-1 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3))

Building on the SDG and IAEG discussion, we proposed the same indicators for several targets under different goals. For example, human related loss and economic loss indicators to monitor 1.5 (vulnerability and resilience), 11.5 (disaster loss), and 13.1 (climate change impact). In the 1st IAEG, the Secretariat of UNDESA (UNSD) provided an illustration of links between targets and introduced this human loss indicator as an example of multi-purpose indicators.

While we understand the IAEG promotes one indicator per target, mechanically applies the principle to all targets might lose the important spirit of each target. The 1st IAEG Report also concludes that *while the number of global indicators must be limited, some targets might require multiple indicators to measure its different aspects* (Para7-2 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3). For example, in the target 11.5, "number of death" "number of affected people" and "economic loss" are critical elements and it would be extremely difficult to monitor all elements if we need to select only one indicator.

We have proposed the same indicators for several targets. By this way, while the number of indicator per target might be more than one, the total number of indicators does not increase, or

even less than the case for one indicator/target. (e.g. if we select the same 2 indicators for 3 targets, total number of indicators will be two). We believe the multi-purpose indicators will be the only solution to reduce the total number of indicators while allowing several indicators per target not to lose important elements included in each target.

3. National ownership

We would like to emphasize that our proposals are all based on national data sources. We think this is consistent with the spirit of the SDGs that says "the global review will be primarily based on national official data sources" (para 74 (a) in the SDGs, in the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). Currently 85 countries have standardized national disaster loss databases and more countries will have such databases under the request of the Sendai Framework. The indicators we proposed are therefore measurable and comparable across time and space. In the inter-governmental working group for the Sendai Framework (OEIWG), the Member States will discuss for further standardization of disaster loss data and policy related data.

4. Indicator development process accounting for the technical robustness, measurability and inclusiveness

Between the 1st IAEG and the submission of this input, we organized a technical expert meeting inviting UN agencies, scientific and academic organizations, civil sector and private sector to examine and discuss indicator proposals to monitor the Sendai Framework and how to build linkage between the Sendai Indicators and SDG indicators(27-29 July, Geneva). More than 60 experts participated in the meeting and/or provided written inputs.

In the meeting, the indicator proposals were examined from measurability perspective. Terminology was defined and remaining challenges identified. In the meeting of intergovernmental expert working group (OEIWG), the proposed indicators will be further discussed and refined from government perspective.

The proposal for the Sendai Framework indicator is uploaded in the website.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

We appreciate your attention.
Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
UNISDR
07 Sep, 2015

Sasha Alexander (UNCCD)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG

We would like to submit our updated indicator proposal for target 15.3.

Under the "Chief Statisticians Initiative", the UNCCD, FAO, UNEP and other UN agencies have agreed to submit a consensus proposal for this indicator, namely "Trends in land degradation".

During the next months, coordination among UNCCD, FAO, UNEP, and the other agencies involved, such as EC, will be put in place, in collaboration with voluntary pilot countries, in order to formulate/develop the most appropriate metrics and interpretation guidance for the proposed indicator.

For this indicator 1) there are global datasets (including those of the FAO), 2) the indicators have been accepted globally (195 countries), and 3) are now being operationalized and used for global monitoring in the context of the UNCCD.

The UNCCD also supports the proposed indicators for targets 2.4 and 15.2 and look forward to working closely with the FAO and others to make them practical as soon as possible. Indeed we see their linkages and potential to complement and enhance the indicator "Trends in land degradation".

The updated meta-document with a country example on the indicator "Trends in land degradation" can be found here:

http://www.unccd.int/Lists/SiteDocumentLibrary/Rio+20/Land%20degradation%20neutrality%202020 15/UNCCD%20Metadata%20Target%2015.3.pdf

Best regards

Sasha Alexander (salexander@unccd.int)
United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
07 September 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)
15.7 Practically unable to measure the illegal trade volume for imported CITES

15.c Practically unable to measure the illegal trade volume for imported CITES

07 Sep, 2015

Live Margrethe Rognerud (Norway)
From Statistics Norway:

Regarding 15.2:

Be aware there is no UN definition of "sustainable forest management".

and 15.2.1:

Net emissions camouflage gross deforestation, It will not be possible to track progress towards the only strong and quantifiable part of this goal, namely "halt deforestation". Suggest separate indicators for deforestation (gross emissions, gross deforestation, gross forest loss) and restoration. Suggest hectare indicator of restoration/afforestation that references existing goals - the New York Declaration of Forests (UNGA2014) and the Bonn Challenge.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany 07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 15

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 15:

- Forest area as a percentage of total land area
- Traffic and settlement area per capita

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 15. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 15.1 – By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Forest area as a percentage of total land area

Remark: We do agree to the suggested indicator. For analytical purposes it should be expanded to the whole spectrum of the FAO Forest Resource Assessment (including the standardization of forest categories such as primary forest, secondary forest, plantations)

Suggestion: We would like to add: Coverage of protected areas broken down by ecosystem type, including total area of forests in protected areas (thousands of hectares)

Target 15.2 – By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forest, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests, and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Forest cover under sustainable forest management

Remark: We do support the indicator proposed by UNEP on certified forest management as suggested indicator.

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Trends in land degradation

Remark: This indicator is not finally defined and might be depending on national situations meaningless.

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

Indicators suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Coverage of protected areas
- Mountain Green Cover Index

Remark: The indicator 1 is not finally defined and depending on national situation meaningless. For indicator 2 a detailed definition is also missing.

Target 15.6 – Promote fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and promote appropriate access to such resources, as internationally agreed.

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol

Remark: We do support the proposed indicator.

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Forestry official development assistance and forestry FDI

Remark: We support this indicator. Public and ODA support to the forest sector and SFM should be monitored. For this purpose, a clear definition and distinction between investments going into extractive forest industry (sawmills, pulp and paper industry, oilmills) and funds flowing into SFM is necessary.

Suggestion: We would like to add a second indicator: Public funding for sustainable forest management

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

The suggested indicator for target 15.1 is very limited in its scope, as only forests are included, while the target also mentions wetlands, mountains and drylands.

Several of the other indicators are also too narrow to capture the essence of the respective targets.

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 15.1

indicator should be changed as a priority

The indicator on forest (15.1.2.) can cover significant change in the quality of the forest ecosystems, e.g. if biodiversity rich natural forests are replaced by monoculture plantations. On the other hand, the indictor is simple and well founded in existing data collections notably those provided by FAO and it might be difficult to replace the forest indicator with only one alternative forest indicator globally. It should therefore be considered to keep the indicator, but complement it with specifications to the degree of naturalness of the forests, e.g. forest area broken down to those classes already use by FAO in the Global Forest Ressources Assessment 2010 (Primary forest, Other naturally regenerated forest and Planted Forest). In any case a common definition of "forest", e.g. that used by FAO would be needed.

The indicator (15.1.2) is on forests only. Thus, the other ecosystems must be covered by a separate indicator (15.1.1).

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Consider complementing with a sub-indicators on "Area with primary forest and other naturally regenerated forest"

(Source: FAO Forest Ressources Assessements)

Water quality of freshwater ecosystems Connectivity/fragmentation of ecosystems

Health and well-being of communities

Biodiversity for food and medicine

Trends in pressures from unsustainability agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture.

Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species.

Areas under sustainable management: forest area under sustainable management (certification/degradation); area of agricultural ecosystems under sustainable management

Forest and protected area as a percentage of total land and inland freshwater area.

Trends in the extent of selected biomes, ecosystems, and habitats

Indicator for Target 15.2

Indicator should be changed

This indicator would be an ideal one, if agreed sub criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management (SFM) were in place for assessments in absolutes of the degree of SFM reached nationally. However, there is no such agreement, and no reporting on the degree of SFM reached nationally. The FAO reporting on a number of sub criteria and indicators related to forest management provides an overview of TRENDS TOWARDS SFM but does not include a framework for assessing the degree of SFM it in absolutes. It is therefore questionable if existing data collections will allow data to be provided for this indicator.

A more robust indicator would therefore be to only count those forest areas that have been concretely assessed and considered sustainably managed, e.g. indicated by an SFM certification or other concrete "bluestamp" that SFM is reached.

Conclusion: In the lack of an agreed common framework for assessing SFM in absolutes an indicator on certified forest area – as suggested by UNEP - seems more operational and better.

Forest cover under sustainable forest management: certification.

(FAO: Certified forest area).

Red list could be used as well

Trends in pressures from unsustainability agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture.

Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species.

Areas under sustainable management: forest area under sustainable management (certification/degradation); area of agricultural ecosystems under sustainable management

Indicator for Target 15.3

Indicator should be changed

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Areas under sustainable management.

Trends in pressures from unsustainability agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture.

Indicator for Target 15.4

Indicator should be changed

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Trends in pressures from unsustainability agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture.

Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species.

Areas under sustainable management: forest area under sustainable management (certification/degradation); area of agricultural ecosystems under sustainable managementOK

Trends in the extent of selected biomes, ecosystems, and habitats

Indicator for Target 15.5

Indicator should be changed

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where pproriate

Trends in extent, condition and vulnerability of ecosystems, biomes and habitats.

Trends in pressures from unsustainability agriculture, forestry, fisheries and aquaculture.

Trends in pressures from habitat conversion, pollution, invasive species, climate change, overexploitation and underlying drivers

Trends in abundance and distribution of selected species.

Trends in genetic diversity.

Areas under sustainable management: forest area under sustainable management (certification/degradation); area of agricultural ecosystems under sustainable management.

Indicator for Target 15.6

Acceptable

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Indicator for Target 15.7

Support to utilising IUCN Red list as a data source

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Use the MIKE and ETIS programmes to monitor illegal ivory trade and poaching of elephants and rhinos

Indicator for Target 15.8

Acceptable

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Indicator for Target 15.9

Indicator should be changed

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Indicator for Target 15.a

Indicator should be changed

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Official development assistance in support of the CBD (OECD RIO markers) as well a domestic flows and flows from the private sector including knowledge transfer.

Number of national development plans which integrate cost, plan and pay for action on biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use.

Number of national reporting on domestic and international flows to CBD

Indicator for Target 15.b

In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Indicator for Target 15.c
In general indicators used within the work of the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) should be applied in regard to this target and supplemented where appropriate

Proposal: Number of national prosecutions of illegal trade in wildlife

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)
Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDG Member

Goal 15

Target 15.1: By 2020 ensure conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements.

Suggested indicator: "Forest area as a percentage of total land area"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not cover other ecosystems included in the target. Some suggestions: Proportion in terms of area of the key ecosystems (for the regulation of water supply) that have been preserved. Proportion of the key ecosystems (for the regulation of water supply) for which a management plan has been implemented. Proportion of the key ecosystems (for the regulation of water supply) in terms of the environmental services provided and the water resource.

Target 15.2: By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally.

Suggested indicator: "Forest cover under sustainable forest management"

Comment: We suggest: Proportion of deforested area and Net forest loss.

Target 15.3: By 2030, combat desertification, and restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land-degradation neutral world.

Suggested indicator: "Trends in land degradation"

Comment: We suggest: Proportion of reforested area for protection and Proportion of the area affected by desertification.

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

Suggested indicator: "Coverage of protected areas"

Comment: We suggest disaggregating by type of ecosystem.

Target 15.6: Promote fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, and promote appropriate access to genetic resources.

Suggested indicator: "Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks for the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not adequately cover the target. It should be focused on the effective implementation of actions that ensure appropriate access to genetic resources.

Target 15.B: Mobilize significantly resources from all sources and at all levels to finance sustainable forest management, and provide adequate incentives to developing countries to advance sustainable forest management at local level, including for conservation and reforestation as well as participating in carbon markets to ensure multiple benefits

Suggested indicator: "Forestry official development assistance and forestry FDI"

Comment: The suggested indicator should be more accurate in terms of the relation of the assistance with sustainability of the forest management.

Target 15.C: Enhance global support to efforts to combat poaching and trafficking of protected species, including by increasing the capacity of local communities to pursue sustainable livelihood opportunities

Suggested indicator: "Proportion of detected trade in wildlife and wildlife products that is illegal"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not measure the target. The indicator should reflect the global support.

07 Sep, 2015

Hien Ngo (IPBES)

Hien Ngo (IPBES Secretariat/Germany)

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

Suggested indicators: Forest area as a percentage of total land area

Comment: Agreed this is a good starting indicator with an established mechanism for reporting but shouldn't be limited to this one indicator for this one goal.

These statistics/data are harvested from FRA 2015 Country reports – mostly questionnaires from national correspondents or relevant government divisions on land area statistics; furthermore the total land area/country area must match the official UN statistics in FAOSTAT. Can this type of indicator not be cross-checked with satellite imagery maps or remote sensing?

Comment: Agree with IUCN's comment that for the purposes of monitoring biodiversity (by extension habitat and protected areas) – that coverage of protected areas for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity, or ecosystem type. Under all of these indicators clear AGREED definition of "Land" and "forest" , "sustainable forest management" before the discussion of indicators.

Comment: Looking forward to discussions Goal 15 Target 15.9

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 15. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 15, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

Goal 15 Ecosystems.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)

Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 15. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 15 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Anibal Sanchez Aguilar (Peru)

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

Suggested indicator : " Coverage of protected áreas"

Comment :It is suggested to use the protected area coverage disaggregated by type of natural areas.

11 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal15, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 15.1 By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements		
Suggested Indicator	Forest area as a percentage of total land area	The definition should be clarified whether forests includes for example only forests or forests and other wooded land etc.
Target 15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally.		

Suggested Indicator	Forest cover under sustainable forest management	The most relevant indicator. It is very significant to define forest area in order to enhance comparability of the indicator value since countries uses different definition for forest area.

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

Suggested Indicator	Coverage of protected areas	Relevant
Suggested Indicator	Mountain Green Cover Index	Mountain green cover index depends on not only the green vegetation in mountain areas but also the geographical characterisation of the country. So the indicator values would not be comparable and the index is not a relevant one.

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

ODS 15.pdf

14 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

The National Statistics Institute of Cabo Verde has no comments regarding the indicators for Goal 15.

15 Sep, 2015

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

Genevieve Verdier (IMF)

IMF comments on indicators for Target 16.6

- Although the proposed indicators as well as other indicators identified by various organizations capture several aspects of fiscal transparency, they do not directly target accountability issues. They also lack reference to oversight bodies such as external audit bodies. Also, the indicator "*Generalized trust (share of people trusting others)*" does not seem related to this target.
- We would propose two potential new indicators: (a) percentage of public sector expenditure covered by accrual accounting; and (b) percentage of public sector expenditure subject to audit by independent bodies.

IMF comments on indicators for Target 16.7:

- The suggested indicators could be complemented with data on citizens' informed participation in decisions regarding the government units' budget.
- We would propose two possible new indicators: (a) percentage of government units publishing a detailed account of the implications of the budget for different demographic groups; and (b) percentage of government units (constituencies) providing citizens with a formal voice in budget deliberations.

IMF comments on indicators for Target 16.10:

- The two indicators discussed on fiscal transparency—"Percentage of actual government budget, procurement, revenues and natural resource concessions that are publicly available and easily accessible" and "Public access to key fiscal information"—are defined very broadly, making it difficult to assess the degree to which public access to information translates into more effective and transparent decision-making. They should make a reference to fiscal legislation stipulating the disclosure of fiscal reports.
- We would propose possible new indicators as follows: (a) percentage of investment projects' cost subject to a published cost-benefit analysis before approval; (b) the percentage of investment projects' cost contracted via open and competitive tender; and (c) Number of countries with fiscal legislation, defining (i) the timetable for budget preparation, approval, and monitoring; (ii) the key content requirements for the executive's budget proposals and fiscal reports; (iii) the legislature's powers to amend the executive's budget proposal.
- Another aspect that could be considered under this target would be the degree of professional independence granted to central statistical authorities. The IMF's Data Quality Assessment Framework provides a substantial number of indicators for this.

25 Aug, 2015

Carol Baker (IMF)
IMF Comment on Indicators for Target 16.4:

Regarding the indicator for target 16.4 (and also 16.5) on illicit financial flows (and corruption and bribery), the relevant data for monitoring these indicators are not available in the IMF Statistics Department external sector databases; we caution against attempting to measure the phenomena by using discrepancies in macroeconomic datasets. For instance, official estimates of trade misinvoicing cannot be derived by transforming trade data from the IMF Director of Trade Statistics and/or UN COMTRADE, either by individual country or in aggregate. In fact, the trade invoices that are submitted by an importer and exporter could match (resulting in no asymmetry at the macroeconomic level), even when there are IFFs and conversely they might mismatch even if there is no illicit trade. The same concerns other possible indicators of IFF. Estimates of IFF should be based on an understanding of specific country's circumstances and on administrative data e.g., customs reports and banks' records.

26 Aug, 2015

Nicholas Menzies (World Bank)
Joint comments on Target 16.3 Indicators

From: *Henk-Jan Brinkman (PBSO), Edric Selous (UNSG – ROLCRG), Jane Anttila (UNSG – ROLCRG), Jana Schuhmann (UNDP) (UNDP), Chris Murgatroyd (UNDP), and Nicholas Menzies (World Bank) (World Bank)*

We have some concerns with both the substance of the indicators suggested for Target 16.3 and the process by which they have been suggested inserted into the lists of proposals.

Substance

Both proposed indicators (crime reporting rate; un-sentenced prisoners) now focus on the criminal justice system. Whilst criminal justice is important to many people's lives – in truth only a small percentage of the population comes into direct contact with the criminal justice system. Sustainable development is about much more.

Target 16.3 on rule of law and equal access to justice, has a much broader scope that just criminal justice. The Outcome Document calls for the global indicator framework to "preserve the political balance, integration and ambition" of the agenda. To faithfully reflect these outcomes we should be suggesting an indicator (or indicators) that capture more fully the scope of the target, as well as the purpose of the SDGs overall. That is, an indicator that gets to the link between justice and sustainable development.

Justice systems contribute, for example, to the resolution of land disputes, help keep governments accountable for the delivery of services, regulate the financial markets and give businesses the confidence to enter and enforce contracts. All of these (amongst many others) are important in achieving sustainable development and lie outside of the criminal justice system. It is important to prioritize a global indicator which captures this.

The indicator that is being proposed by the Virtual Network and the (TST) Inter-Agency Group on Goal 16 makes a valiant attempt to do this:

"Suggested Indicator 16.3.1. Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just"

It gets to the heart of what justice systems do – which is resolve disputes. Disputes between people, between businesses, and between citizens and the state. The indicator also captures criminal justice issues as well.

Process

The indicator currently listed first in the list of proposals (crime reporting rate) was not included in the Priority Indicator List for Target 16.3 discussed at the first IAEG-SDG meeting in June (instead a similar indicator was put forward under Target 16.a). This crime reporting rate indicator was not subject to any of the Inter-Agency discussions that we have been involved in over the past 24 months, and indeed was not put forward by the (TST) Inter-Agency Group on Goal 16 or the Virtual Network for Goal 16 – both of which had full representation by UN agencies (and other groups including National Statistics Offices and civil society). These processes were established to ensure that the widest range of views could be synthesized.

By putting forward an indicator outside of these processes we infer that it does not have the support of a wide range of stakeholders.

Henk-Jan Brinkman (PBSO), Edric Selous (UNSG – ROLCRG), Jane Anttila (UNSG – ROLCRG), Jana Schuhmann (UNDP) (UNDP), Chris Murgatroyd (UNDP), and Nicholas Menzies (World Bank) (World Bank)

27 Aug, 2015

Jana Schuhmann (UNDP)
We would like to share our comments on behalf of the

inter-agency-group on Goal 16, co-lead by EOSG/RoLU, UNDP and PBSO

16.3.1: The inter-agency-group on Goal 16, co-lead by EOSG/RoLU, UNDP and PBSO, had recommended **"Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months, who have accessed a fair formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute mechanism"**, not the indicator included in the list of proposed indicators of 11 August, which focuses on % of victims reporting the crime, and is basically the same as the indicator for 16.a.

The suggestion prioritized in the list would introduce a narrow focus on criminal justice only, and displace an outcome focus on the rule of law and access to justice. A narrower focus on criminal justice only would not help to preserve the balance and ambition of the SDGs and targets.

16.6.2: The inter-agency-group on Goal 16, co-lead by EOSG/RoLU, UNDP and PBSO had recommended **"Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services satisfied with quality public services** ", not the indicator on % of recommendations on anti-corruption measures implemented, which is unfortunate. The Anti-corruption indicator belongs under 16.5.

The suggestion prioritized indicator would introduce into 16.6 a narrow focus on anti-corruption only (and Target 16.5 already covers corruption specifically), and would displace an outcome focus on the quality of public services, and effective and accountable institutions. A narrower focus on corruption in 16.6 (as opposed to 16.5) would not help to preserve the balance and ambition of the SDGs and targets.

16.7.2: The inter-agency-group on Goal 16, co-lead by EOSG/RoLU, UNDP and PBSO, had recommended "**Turnout as a share of voting-age population in national elections**", not the indicator on % of countries (!!) that address multi-sectoral needs of youth, which is not a national indicator. The reference to "proportion of countries" does not make sense in this context.

16.9: Should be **"Percentage of children under 1 whose births have been registered with civil authority"**not under 5.

Jana Schuhmann (UNDP), UNDP

27 Aug, 2015

Flora Sutherland (United Nations Mine Action Service)
United Nations Mine Action Service comments on the suggested indicator for 16.1.1 suggested indicator (b) "Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause)". Recommend that the number of deaths due to landmines and other Explosive Remnants of War should be one of the 'causes' that are disaggregated in 16.1 target (b). The United Nations Mine Action Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism could provide a source for this data.

28 Aug, 2015

Janusz Witkowski (Poland)
Comments from Central Statistical Office of Poland for Target 16.b

The Central Statistical Office of Poland would like to note that it is not possible for polish statistics to distinguish the reasons of discrimination. Moreover, presentation of the disaggregated indicators should be preceded by the analyses of accuracy.

01 Sep, 2015

Alison Kennedy (UNESCO)
UNESCO input for Target 16.10

UNESCO supports the priority indicator *Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months* but also proposes an additional indicator: *Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information. This indicator is included in the list of 11 August. Please find attached the metadata for the indicator.*

[Metadata for SDG 16 10 - UNESCO-GFMD indicator for public access.docx](#)

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact Silvia Montoya, Director of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (uis.director@unesco.org) or Guy Berger, Director of UNESCO's Division of Freedom of Information and Media Development(g.berger@unesco.org) . Please also copy any questions to Alison Kennedy (UNESCO) (a.kennedy@unesco.org) and Juan Cruz Perusia (jc.perusia@unesco.org) who represent UNESCO on the IAEG-SDGs.

03 Sep, 2015

Marta Santos Pais (SRSG on Violence against Children)
SRSG on Violence against Children

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

In 2012 alone, homicide took the lives of almost 95,000 children and adolescents aged 0 to 19 years of age – almost one in five of all homicide victims that year. The risk of dying as a result of homicide varies according to a child's age, with the risk increasing towards adolescence. Child homicide and the protection of children from violence is compounded by high levels of inequality and social exclusion, lack of opportunities, the widespread use of arms, the presence of organized crime and gangs, and a culture of impunity. For many children, life is defined by two words: fear and pain. This is a sad reality, but it is not a fate.

I therefore support the suggested indicator under target 16.1:

Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population.

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

Violence against children is a universal concern and takes many forms; neglect, physical and emotional violence, sexual abuse, rape, trafficking, torture, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment, acid attacks, killings in the name of honour, forced begging, bonded labour and so many others. Such violence has serious and long-lasting consequences. It compromises child development and increases the risk of poor health, poor school performance and long-term welfare dependency. It is often associated with poverty and deprivation, and acts as a brake on the potential of individuals and nations. Violence against girls and boys cuts across boundaries of age, race, culture, wealth and geography and it happens in the home, schools, online, institutions, community

and workplace. Sadly, many children are polyvictims, subject to several forms of violence at the same time or serially.

The complex and multifaceted nature of violence against children urges us to identify indicators to measure progress against target 16.2.

I therefore recognize the particularly strong value of the composite indicator:

Percentage of young adults aged 18-24 years who have experienced violence by age 18, by type (physical, psychological and/or sexual).

With its comprehensive and far-reaching nature, this suggested indicator is particularly robust as it attempts to capture several different forms of violence – physical, psychological and/or sexual – rather than being limited to one or two of these significant forms of violence. In recent years, there has been major progress in developing methodologies to measure these types of violence against children using household surveys that have been conducted in a range of different national contexts, including most recently in the African and Asian regions. Please see http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/vacs/vacs-survey-methods.html

The results of these surveys have informed initiatives to raise awareness of the scale of violence against children, as well as to form baselines for action, including the enactment of legislation and the development of national plans and programmes to prevent and respond to the child protection concerns arising from the survey.

I believe that the new Sustainable Development Agenda should encourage and strengthen the development of methodologies to measure progress on all forms of violence against children, and in this regard we should capitalize on work already done through the Violence against Children Surveys and other tools. These are becoming the standard and scientifically sound source of data on the prevalence of physical, emotional, and sexual violence against girls and boys. They also capture data to identify risk and protective factors, the health consequences of violence, as well as assess the use of services and barriers for children seeking help.

As part of the means of implementation (MOI) for target 16.2, the composite indicator would also be in line with the objectives of the new Global Partnership to End Violence against Children: http://16-2endviolenceagainstchildren.org/

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

Resources are increasingly being invested in access to justice as part of global, regional and national agenda on human rights and the rule of law but only a limited portion of these resources are devoted towards extending the benefits to children. Children are rarely considered as a distinct priority, and actors can sometimes assume that general efforts to enhance access to justice will automatically enable children to enjoy this human right. This overlooks the fact that children require special protection as a result of their vulnerability and often on their inability to access justice on their own, and this can be realized only with measures specially adapted to their age, gender, and maturity and evolving capacities. Very little is known globally about the experience of children as they try to seek counselling, access justice institutions for their care and protection, or to report or

obtain redress for violations of their rights; about how child-friendly justice systems are to be understood and effectively used by children; or about how equipped adults and professionals are to support children in these processes.

I support the suggested indicator under target 16.3:

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

16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration

Birth registration is crucial to building a protective environment for children and ensuring there is a solid foundation for safeguarding their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. I therefore strongly support the suggested indicator under target 16.9:

Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with a civil authority.

03 Sep, 2015

Jana Schuhmann (UNDP)
UNDP would like to share its comments on indicators for Goal 16. Please note, that *these comments are additional* to the comments which had already been posted in behalf of UNDP and other UN organizations and are not meant to replace them. By mentioning *TST proposal* we refer to the discussions in the TST Sub-Group for Goal 16, co- ordinated by designated co-chairs over a number of months, which fed in to the previous version of the list of proposals. These discussions were open to all of the members of the Sub-Group (PBSO, EOSG/RoL, UNODC, UNDP, DPA, DPKO, ECA, ILO, IOM, ITU, OCHA, OHCHR, OSAA, UN Women, UNAIDS, UNCDF, UNCITRAL, UNEP, UNECE, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF), and were informed by other expertise, including the work of the Virtual Network on Indicators for Goal 16.

Target 16.1.

Target 16.1. consists of two dimensions, which should accordingly be measured, either with two indicators as suggested or with one single indicator covering both concepts as suggested by the TST:

"Homicide and conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people"

In particular:

Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100.000 population: The focus on homicide is narrow, but benefits from relative ease and reliability of measurement. The suggested indicator however does not measure domestic or gender-based violence which is a form of violence especially experienced by women, children and the elderly – work will be required to disaggregate data for this indicator, and to ensure strong links with measurement of Target 5.2 (violence against women) and Target 16.2 (violence against children)"?

As it concerns the second suggested indicator *Conflict-related death per 100.000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause):* While it is important to measure the level of conflict-related violence, the narrow definition leaves out measurement of violence that exists outside of conflict circumstances, such as domestic violence and gender-based violence. Also much of violent acts committed under conflict circumstances do not lead into death (such as sexual violence or torture). The indicator suggested by TST " *homicide and conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people"* would be more comprehensive, especially when disaggregated by sex.

Target 16.2.

An additional indicator on sexual violence disaggregated by gender and age and type of sexual violence would measure better the progress against the target. The indicator proposed by the TST *Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18* can also be reconciled or linked with SDG 5, Target 5.2 which measures sexual violence by type but exclusively for women and girls aged 15-49.

Regarding the proposed indicator *Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100.000 by sex, age and form of exploitation* we suggest removing "detected" and "non-detected" to avoid confusion and to simplify the measurement.

Target 16.3.

The suggestions prioritized in the list would introduce a narrow focus on criminal justice only, and displace an outcome focus on the rule of law and access to justice. A narrower focus on criminal justice only would not help to preserve the balance and ambition of the SDGs and targets. The first suggested indicator *Percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 month who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms (also called crime reporting rate)* focuses only on victims of violence, whereas the target is access to justice for all. A large proportion of women globally struggle with lack of property rights, or inheritance rights, and also majority of cases of Gender-Based Violence, including Domestic Violence, are never reported to officials due to stigma or fear of unequal treatment. A better indicator would be the one suggested by TST,

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.

as it is more inclusive and wider in definition of cases that require access to justice. The focus on all forms of "dispute" is helpful in meeting the ambition of the 2030 Agenda, and will need to be translated appropriately into national contexts to allow for collection. Definitions/qualifiers are needed to meet the risk to make the indicator otherwise open to broad interpretations.

Target 16.4.

This new indicator *Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments* is fine from the point of view of seizures. However, not all collected firearms will be traced — for example if an amnesty has been part of the collection process, if people are handing in legal weapons they don't want anymore, or

are not allowed to have because of a change in the law, etc. So, if we are to keep this indicator, we suggest deleting "and collected." The advantage of the original proposed indicator

"Percentage of small arms marked and recorded at the time of import in accordance with international standards"

is that all states import small arms, usually in significant numbers. Not all States seize them, or at least a significant number of them. And marking at the time of import is a commitment that all States have agreed to. Also, UNODC's global study focuses on seizures of firearms by law enforcement, not on the collection of firearms

Target 16.6.

The definition of primary spending as per the indicator *Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget* needs to be specified (ie. it means expenditures without interest).

As flagged earlier by the TST, this indicator is also relevant for other targets: 1.3 (social protection), 3.8 (health coverage), 4.1 (education), 17.1 (domestic resource mobilization), 17.9 (capacity building), 17.13 (macro-economic stability)".

Alternatively of evaluating the capacity of the government to spend their budget, this indicator could focus on the transparency of the budgeting process: *"Proportion of the national budget planning and spending data made publicly available" which also relevant for measuring target 16.10.* Another approach would be to refer to audit/oversight functions, e.g. percentage of public sector expenditure subject to audit by independent bodies.

In practice it will be difficult to measure all aspects of "effective, accountable or transparent" institutions with only one indicator, but the focus on planning/budgeting/spending is a useful proxy taken from competence in a core aspect of government business which has a direct impact for beneficiaries and the 2030 Agenda as a whole.

In addition, this indicators can be supplemented on the national level with other indicators such like:

Public advertising of all government procurement (national and subnational)

Trust in local government institutions: Percentage of people saying that they trust/ have confidence in national and sub-national governments

These indicators capture the accountability and transparency aspects with regards to local institutions.

Regarding the proposed indicator: *Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism.*

The narrow focus on implementation of anti-corruption framework recommendations is not capturing the real level of efficiency, accountability and transparency of public institutions, as it

doesn't echo the voice of the end beneficiaries of the public institutions – often the most vulnerable of the population such as women, children, elderly and minorities. The TST indicator

Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services

captures better the level of access to services of all people, and the satisfaction rate of the beneficiaries in regards to public institutions and the services they are required to deliver. As flagged earlier by the TST, this indicator is also relevant for other targets: 16.a, 16.3, 16.9 and all other targets with access to basic services such as health, education, etc, eg. 1.4 (access to basic services), 3.8 (health coverage), 4.1, 4.2, 4.a (education), 7.1 (energy), 10.2 (social inclusion), 11.1 (housing)".

The definition of "satisfaction" needs to be specified in this context.

Target 16.7.

Regarding the proposed indicator *Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies:*

The reference to "proportion of countries" does not make sense in this context and is also not a national indicator. The suggested indicator collects data only from strategies but doesn't measure their implementation, thus the inclusiveness of real decision-making is not actually measured. The indicator suggested by TST

Turnout as a share of voting-age population in national election

responds better to the needs of the target, especially if the data is to be disaggregated by age groups and gender. Measuring turnout is systematic and comparable, but cannot measure election quality.

Target 16.a.

"The proposed indicator Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 month disaggregated by age, sex, region and population group and does not capture the full range of concepts in this Target, but is one proxy. A possible alternative that measures "number of verified crime, terror acts or violence that were prevented by national authorities or through international cooperation" or "percentage of population protected through timely prevention of crime, terror acts or violence by national authorities or through international cooperation" could work as well

Target 16.b.

UNDP supports the indicator

Existence of independent national human rights institutions (NHRIs) in compliance with the Paris Principles

 as 'A' status NHRIs - i.e. those in full compliance with the Paris Principles - will be reporting on human rights trends within their respective countries. Furthermore, evidence supports the assertion that the presence of an 'A' status or well-functioning, independent NHRI has a multiplier effect for human rights across the board and in this respect is multi-purpose. In addition, the status of NHRIs is determined through an accreditation sub-committee supported by OHCHR and the global body of

NHRIs (the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights) and is therefore readily available.

UNDP, 3 September 2015

See attachment: UNDP comments on indicators for Goal 16.docx

04 Sep, 2015

Nicholas Menzies (World Bank)

Current Priority Indicator(s) [Per 11 August 2015 IAEG List of Proposals]	World Bank Suggested Indicator	World Bank Comments
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		
Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments	Proportion of seats held by women in national and sub-national parliaments, and local governments.	We support UNWOMEN's proposal to conflate the two Current Priority Indicators into a single indicator. In addition, the indicator should measure the proportion of seats held by women in sub-national parliaments (where applicable). Data should be disaggregated on the basis on how women received their mandate (ie direct election, political party prioritization, reserved seats etc) to track how women have been able to move into formal leadership roles.
Proportion of seats held by women in local governments.	Delete and combine with the indicator above.	
Target 12.7: Promote public procurement practices that are sustainable, in accordance with national policies and priorities		

Number of countries implementing Sustainable Public Procurement policies and action plans.	Percentage of Sustainable Public Procurement in total public procurement for a set of prioritized product groups.	The Suggested Indicator is preferred to the Current Priority Indicator as it allows progress to be tracked within countries. The set of "prioritized product groups" will need to be pre-determined. Including CO_2 emissions is too ambitious.

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

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).	Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just.	Both Current Priority Indicators for 16.3 currently focus on the criminal justice system, yet Target 16.3 has a much broader scope. The SDG Outcome Document calls for the global indicator framework to "preserve the political balance, integration and ambition" of the agenda. Justice systems contribute to the resolution of land disputes, help keep governments accountable for the delivery of services, regulate the financial markets and give businesses the confidence to enter and enforce contracts. All of these (amongst many others) are important in achieving sustainable development and lie outside of the criminal justice system. To faithfully reflect the Target our Suggested Indicator more fully captures the link between justice and sustainable development. The first Current Priority Indicator also duplicates the indicator suggested for 16.a and we suggest it replaces the indicator at 16.a (see below).
Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population.	No comment.	

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

Total volume of inward and outward illicit financial flows.	Value of inward and outward illicit financial flows, by country (US$). Additional indicator: Value (by country) of assets that have been frozen, confiscated, and recovered relating to criminal offences and the cross-border sharing or return of such assets.	*Global* data on inward and outward illicit financial flows cannot be reliably calculated. Data and methodological issues would undermine the value of any reported changes in the indicator – which would fundamentally compromise its value. Finally, the indicator itself is ambiguous since it is unclear whether you should add inflows and outflows together or subtract them in an attempt to capture a net flow. The proposed modification would place the indicator on par with most of the other indicators which examine changes within a country, and would support greater linkages and understanding between the international financial flows indicator and other indicators relating to the use of public resources to achieve development objectives.
Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels		
Primary government expenditure as a percentage of original approved budget.	Support the current priority indicator.	Under the revisions to the PEFA Framework, PI-1 (the Current Priority Indicator) includes debt service and donor funded expenditures that were previously excluded.

Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism	Support the current priority indicator.	We would suggest disaggregating reporting on the suggested indicator by categories of recommendations, which are of four kinds: (a) legislative changes, (b) establishing new institutions (c) establishing new systems, and (d) capacity building.
Target 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision making at all levels		
Proportion of positions (by age, sex, disability, and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.	Support the current priority indicator, and suggest the following two - *Additional indicators:* Percentage of parliamentary enquiries that hold open hearings with public submissions. Percentage of decisions in parliament and committee where votes of individual members are made public.	Parliaments, as constitutionally mandated representative institutions, provide a forum for citizens to provide inputs into decision-making processes. The additional Suggested Indicators measure the extent of participation and transparency in parliamentary processes.

Target 16.9: By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration		
Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority.	Percentage of children under 1 whose births have been registered with civil authorities.	The Current Priority Indicator is not in line with the Global CRVS investment plan which the World Bank and WHO developed in consultation with several agencies and countries last year: http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/health/publication/global-civil-registration-vital-statistics-scaling-up-investment. The UN Principles and Recommendations for a Vital Statistics System states that birth registration should be "immediate" (where defined, this is usually 7-30 days); up to 12 months is viewed as "late registration" and beyond 12 months is "delayed registration."
Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements		
Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months.	Level of implementation of legislative guarantees and mechanisms for public access to information, including but not limited to information pertinent to each and all of the Sustainable Development Goals and protection of fundamental freedoms.	We believe the indicator for this target must go beyond tracking violations, as important as this is, to also lay a foundation to actively help countries in building capacity to provide public access to information and respect fundamental freedoms. A methodology exists (RIDE) for measuring implementation of legislative guarantees of RTI. We join those who are calling for two indicators: a first indicator tracking legal guarantees and mechanisms for public access to information and a corollary indicator (the Current Priority Indicator).

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.		
Percentage of victims who report physical and sexual crime to law enforcement during past 12 months	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).	The Suggested Indicator is a proxy for trust in the state and covers a broader range of issues that the Current Priority Indicator.
Target 17.1: Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection		
Composition of Tax Revenue (by sources), including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as a % of GDP.	Domestically generated revenues (general government) as a percentage of GDP.	The target relates to strengthening domestic resource mobilization, not just to taxes and so the focus on "tax revenues" in the Current Priority Indicator is misplaced.

04 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
Countries for which the second indicator of Target 16.1 does not apply because they are not subject to ongoing armed conflict, we recommend including the number of violent deaths for 100.000 residents.

We consider both indicators proposed to measure Target 16.3 are adequate.

For the first indicator in Target 16.4 we suggest taking into account the monetary value of incoming and outgoing stolen assets that have been retrieved, seized goods, seized money; considering that this allows the measure of illegal flows.

For the second indicator in Target 16.4 we suggest the determination of international norms and legal instruments that should be considered.

The first indicator in Target 16.6 is not related with the target and we suggest its removal.

To measure Target 16.6, instead of the second indicator, we consider another alternative addressing the confidence level placed on public institutions that would allow the implementation of corrective actions resulting in responsible and transparent public institutions.

To measure Target 16.7 we consider the second indicator to be irrelevant and suggest its removal.

The indicator for Target 16.10 is not relevant and we suggest its replacement with an alternative indicator.

The indicator for Target 16.a is not relevant and we suggest its replacement with an alternative indicator.

To measure Target 16.b we recommend the definition of what is considered discrimination. This indicator represents inequalities present in the interior of a country, however, it does not allow a monitoring of inequalities between countries. We propose including an indicator like regional Gini coefficient.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 16

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

goal16.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 16. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (OHCHR, UNODC, UNICEF, UNWomen, UNESCO, UNHCR, UN Population Division and OECD), but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 16.1

Priority indicators

- To retain 16.1.1 (Number of victims of intentional homicide disaggregated by characteristics of victims, perpetrators and killing mechanisms, 100,000 population) to be classified as tier I and not tier I/II (standard methodology is widely available). If properly disaggregated the indicator can be used to monitor target 5.2, 16.2 and 16.3.
- To replace 16.1.2 (Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people disaggregated by age, sex and cause) with the priority indicator: Percentage of the population subjected to physical, sexual violence or psychological violence within the last 12 months, by type of violence (no consensus on the need to treat this indicator as priority, UNWomen and OHCHR supported this suggestion to propose a more comprehensive measurement of the target). To note that there was a discussion on the methodological challenges related to a global measurement of psychological violence and OHCHR opted to maintain a global call for a comprehensive measurement of violence in all its forms.

Additional indicators

- Conflict-related deaths to be included as additional indicator with an assigned tier III
- To add:

    - *Number of migrants killed, injured or victims of crime while attempting to cross maritime, land or aid borders*

    - *Incidence of death during arrest or apprehension or in custody*

    - *Number of people displaced due to conflict, war, persecution or human rights violations*

Target 16.2

Priority indicators

- The target involves two aspects which need to be equally monitored: violence against children and trafficking in persons and the 11 August table reflects well the need to have at least two priority indicators. The group however felt that another indicator could be added

as priority: *Percentage of young women and men aged 18-24 years who have been subjected to sexual violence by age 18*.

- Indicator on trafficking in persons to be classified as tier II. The first part of the indicator (detected victims) is standardized and widely available and it could be classified as tier I, but the second part of the indicator (non-detected victims) is still under development and can be classified as tier III.

Target 16.3

Priority indicators

- No suggested change on the indicators, but a revised classification of the tier level as both indicators can be classified as tier I. Standard methodology exists for victimization surveys and it is widely used to construct the indicator on the victims of violence. Same for the indicator on pre-trial detention.

Additional indicators

- To add: *Average period of pre-trial detention*

Target 16.4

Priority indicators

- Target 16.4 calls for action on several aspects: illicit financial flows, asset recovery, organized crime, and arms flows, so a comprehensive monitoring of this target requires a multi-set of indicators. Much of these areas however, lack a standardizedmeasurement methodology. Work is on-going by various actors to define better indicators but work is still in progress. While an indictor on global illicit financial flows would probably be one of the most relevant for this target the group suggestion is to replace it with the priority indicator: *Value of illegal economy as percentage of national GDP*. Some parts of this indicator is measured within the European Union (as part of the SNA) and the SNA provides a standardized framework to underpin it. Until better indicators are developed and tested this priority indicator could be a resource to monitor the target.
- To consider *Percentage of seized and collected firearms that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments* as additional indicator.

Target 16.5

No suggested changes to priority/additional indicators, only a change in the tier level of the priority indicatoras a standard methodology exists to undertake population-based corruption surveys.

Target 16.6

Priority indicators

- To replace 16.6.1(Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget) with: *Share of people reporting a high degree of trust in different public institutions*.

- To consider *Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism* as additional indicator.

Target 16.7

Priority indictors

- To consider *Proportion of countries that address young people's mulisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies* as additional indicator

Additional indicators

- To add the following indicators:

    - Turnout as a share of voting-age population (disaggregated by sex, age, disability and other population groups) in and frequency of national elections or referenda

    - Proportion of non-governmental organisations, trade unions and other associations consulted about government decisions, strategies and policies in their sector

Target 16.8

No suggested changes to the nature of the indicators

Target 16.9

Priority indicators:

- To disaggregate 16.9.1 by age to read: *Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority, by age*

Target 16.10

No suggested changes to priority indicator

Additional indicators:

- To add *Existence and implementation of constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information*

Target 16.a

Priority indicators:

- To add:*Level of compliance of national human rights institutions with the Paris Principles*

Target 16.b

No suggested changes to the nature of the indicators

07 Sep, 2015

Steven Malby (Commonwealth Secretariat)
Commonwealth Secretariat comments on Target 16.3 Indicators

The Commonwealth Secretariat shares the view of PBSO, UNSG-ROLCRG, UNDP, WB and the inter-agency group on Goal 16 that the focus of the proposed indicators for Target 16.3 on criminal justice alone results in information about a highly limited aspect of the rule of law and access to justice.

The rule of law can be characterised through three key elements – *legal frameworks*, *institutional capacity*, and *legal empowerment*. Each of these intersects with the *economic*, *social* and *environmental* dimensions of sustainable development. Two global indicators for Target 16.3 cannot capture all of these elements and dimensions. However, they can provide a stronger insight into the essence of the rule of law and access to justice than the current proposals.

Rule of law experts from small developing Commonwealth countries have consistently highlighted that, in addition to criminal aspects, the rule of law and access to justice concerns challenges and opportunities in areas such as investment, commercial, corporate, land, and family law. The SAMOA Pathway, representing the views of SIDS, emphasizes the importance of an 'enabling environment.. to attract more public and private investment'. This includes the promulgation of fair and predictable legal frameworks and dispute resolution mechanisms.

In place of the suggested indicator on reporting of victimisation, the Commonwealth Secretariat is of the view that **Indicator 16.3.1** should provide information on the fairness and substantive justice of dispute resolution mechanisms. This goes to the heart of the concept of the rule of law and access to justice.

In this respect, the Commonwealth Secretariat supports the proposal of the SDG16 Virtual Network:

Suggested Indicator 16.3.1 "**Proportion of those who have experienced a dispute in the past 12 months who have accessed a formal, informal, alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanism and who feel it was just**"

The Commonwealth Secretariat notes, however, that:

- The reference to 'who feel it was just' is important in order to assess the operation of the system. An indicator that measures only whether a dispute resolution mechanism is *accessed* is largely dependent upon the nature and circumstances of the dispute, as opposed to the effectiveness and fairness of the justice system itself.

- It is acknowledged that there can be a bias as to whether respondents perceive a mechanism as 'just' depending upon if the case is won or lost by the respondent. A number of steps can be taken in this respect: (a) the indicator should be disaggregated by dispute outcome; and (b) where possible, the indicator should be supplemented by information from additional respondents including (at least in the case of formal justice systems), legal counsel or independent court monitors.

- Methodological guidance is needed in respect of data collection methodologies for measurement through population-based and business surveys, as well as court (or other dispute resolution mechanism) user surveys.

- The indicator should be further disaggregated by type of dispute and resolution mechanism.

The Commonwealth Secretariat supports the current proposal for **Indicator 16.3.2** and agrees that this represents a good general measure of the criminal justice system. Including a benchmark of 12 months may create perverse incentives however, and a preferred indicator would be:

"**The average period spent in detention whilst awaiting sentencing or final case disposition**"

This is measured from administrative statistics on persons completing a period of pre-sentence detention during a specified 12 month period (See UNODC/UNICEF Juvenile Justice Indicators Manual, p.13, which makes use of the same indicator). Indicator results should be disaggregated by basic crime type category, using the International Classification of Crimes for Statistical Purposes (ICCS) endorsed by the Statistical Commission at its 46th session in March 2015, as serious crimes will warrant longer periods of pre-sentence detention than less serious offences.

Rule of Law Division, Commonwealth Secretariat

07 Sep, 2015

Emma Reilly (OHCHR)
A number of NSOs and NGOs requested that OHCHR publish our draft paper on human rights-based indicators for SDGs 10 and 16, from May 2015. This is available here:
http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/MDGs/Post2015/SDG_10_16_ProposedIndicators.pdf

Please note that updated metadata on indicators under 16.10, providing further details on methodologies, will be circulated in due course.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
 07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de
IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 16

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 16:

- Homicide and conflict-related death per 100,000 people
- Victims of trafficking
- Consolidated government debt in percentage of GDP

Additionally we'd like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 16. They've been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population

Remark: In general we do support the measuring of homicides and conflict related deaths as suggested, but indicator should definitely include assault and sexual violence, including attempts. The target does not request a disaggregation.

Suggestion: We prefer to expand the indicator to "Number of victims of intentional homicide, assault, sexual violence and attempt per 100,000 population"

Target 16.2 – End abuse, exploitations, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children

Indicators suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month
- Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation

Remark: The second indicator and its disaggregation in the list of Aug 11 does not meet the target as it refers only to children and human trafficking is a kind of violence. The UN Children's Convention defines a child as human between 0-18. The indicator should respect this! We suggest using only one indicator.

Suggestion:

- *We would like to rephrase the indicator: "Percentage of children aged 0-18 years who experienced any physical punishment in the past 12 months"*

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

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- 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)
- Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population

Remark: Both indicators are not feasible for the social court. The first indicator focuses exclusively on violent crime.

Target 16.6 – Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Indicators suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget
- Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism.

Remark: A definition of primary government expenditure would be useful. The definition of the indicator should be specified in general. Otherwise, the Indicator 1 should be dropped and replaced or at least combined with the PEFA indicator P-26 focusing on the interplay between executive, legislative and external control thus is more suitable to measure all target dimensions. The indicator 2 is not suitable to measure the goal as it targets the mere percentage of implemented recommendations without assessing their content or the prior level of corruption. However, the current indicator would also cover target 16.5. (corruption) and target 16.4 (asset recovery). This must be considered if the indicator should be altered.

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

Indicators suggested by the list of Aug 11:

- Proportions of positions (by age, sex, disability and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.
- Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies

Remark: We do support the first indicator. By focusing exclusively on the needs of young people, the second indicator does not meet the target which aims for inclusive and representative decision-making at all levels.

Target 16.9 – By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority

Remark: The indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11 only focuses on one single aspect.

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

Indicators suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months

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

Indicators suggested by the list of Aug 11: Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months. Disaggregated by age, sex, region and population group

Remark: Important elements of the target (e.g. international cooperation and fight against terrorism) not covered by the indicator. We suggest looking at the expenditures.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Contribution of the European Commission

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/IAEG-SDG_list of indicator proposals_EC_feedback_theme_16.xlsx

Please find our detailed comments in the attached Excel file. We would like to highlight the following issues:

Several of the suggested indicators are problematic because they try to quantify criminal or unreported activities, which is very difficult to accomplish with sufficient quality.

The indicators suggested for target 16.1 may be difficult to measure and might benefit from a perception based complementary survey (e.g. "Did you know anybody who has been killed").

The suggested indicators for target 16.3 are relevant, but very narrow. Again, a complementary survey might help.

The indicator suggested for target 16.5 focusses on petty corruption and fails to capture other dimensions of corruption.

For target 16.6, we would like to propose (a) the proportion of public revenues transferred to the sub-national level (Decentralisation) [Source: database of Decentralization Indicators, including Fiscal Decentralisation, ex. IMF Government Finance Statistics (GFS), World Bank Fiscal Decentralization Indicators, OECD Fiscal Decentralization Database, UCLG Indicators on Decentralization. Entity: WB, IMF, OECD, UCLG (United Cities and Local Government).] and (b) the number of countries with legislation to promote participatory mechanisms related to local-decision making, including urban planning [Source: Participatory planning and transparent and accountable

management Index (to be developed); Entity: UNSDSN proposal (2014).] as alternative/additional indicators.

For target 16.7, we would like to propose the "number of countries with institutionalised spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogues on national and local decision-making and existence of independent monitoring and feedback mechanisms" [Source: Universal Periodic Review (UPR); GPEDC Global Indicator 2 on CSOs enabling environment (methodology under development for the second monitoring round 2015/2016); CPDE review of evidence. Entity: UN, GPEDC (JST/UNDP), country-led, CPDE] as an additional indicator.

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 16.2
It is relevant to measure the frequency as well as the extent of abuse and violence against children. However, the target suggested requires a method of data collection which it is very doubtful with regards to the quality of the data. By using an indicator based on violence experienced in the past month and using household surveys it is very unlikely that it is possible to collect reliable data on the subject in Denmark. Abuse and violence against children is connected with great taboos as it is illegal, and therefore household surveys asking the caregivers themselves about abuse and violence committed against their children will be highly unreliable. Studies show that as long as the children themselves still live in a home with abuse and violence, they will not share this issue with anyone, and a survey in this regard is therefore also due to be highly unreliable.

National data on the subject is collected in Denmark through the criminal records as well as through specialized children's' houses that support children who have been victims of violence and abuse.

Indicator for Target 16.7

It is unclear if it possible to obtained specific data regarding persons with disabilities.

07 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 16

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

Suggested indicator: "Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population"

Suggested indicator: "Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause)"

Comment: This second indicator is not a global indicator. We consider that the first one is adequate and enough for measuring the target, disaggregated by age, sex and cause.

Target 16.2: End abuse, exploitations, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children.

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of children aged 1-14 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month"

Comment: We suggest percentage of children victims of maltreatment in the past year.

Suggested indicator: "Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation"

Comment: It is not clear how we could measure non-detected victims. Also, it is necessary to clarify if each country should report national victims in other countries or foreign victims in its country.

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

Suggested indicator: "Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current US$)"

Comment: While the suggested indicator is relevant and adequate, it is not currently feasible. Firstly it is necessary to establish an internationally accepted definition of *illicit financial flows*, and a measurement methodology.

Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

Suggested indicator: "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 disaggregate by age, sex, region and

population group. This concept of bribery prevalence makes clear that it has to be measured amongst those who had contact with a public official"

Comment: The indicator should include other type of corruption, not just bribery.

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

Suggested indicator: "Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget"

Comment: The suggested indicator reflects planning and management capacity, however it does not completely cover the target, in particular we consider that it should be complemented with information about transparency.

Target 16.8: Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of members or voting rights of developing countries in international organizations"

Comment: We suggest defining this indicator in relative terms according to the national GDP as percentage of global GDP, and including developed countries too in order to identify and monitor gaps.

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

Suggested indicator: Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months"

Comment: The suggested indicator is not adequate for monitoring the target. We suggest including some indicator related to diversification of media and interlink with Internet access.

Target 16.A: Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacities at all levels, in particular in developing countries, for preventing violence and combating terrorism and crime

Suggested indicator: "Percentage of victims who report physical and/or sexual crime to law enforcement agencies during past 12 months Disaggregated by age, sex, region and population group"

Comment: The suggested indicator is not adequate for monitoring the target, it should be referred to the cooperation for building capacities for preventing violence and combating terrorism and crime.

07 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)
Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 16. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 16 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Singapore
Target 16.2 (Suggested indicator: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation): We would like to seek clarifications on the definition of 'non-detected victims of trafficking' and 'per 100,000'.

Target 16.3 (Suggested indicator: 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): A lack of confidence in government institutions is not the only reason victims of violence do not report their victimisation to the relevant authorities or mechanisms. We are hence uncertain as to whether there is a sufficiently direct correlation between the proposed indicator and the Rule of Law at the national level.

Target 16.5: Countries are more likely to have available data to support the original formulation of indicator 16.5.1 and 16.5.2 through their existing corruption crime case load and company register. This will be more practical than expecting the UN and countries to expend additional resources to conduct specific business/population surveys on corruption for slightly more targeted data on businesses/persons who had at least one contact with a public official. It may also be noted that targeting persons who have had contact with a public official may exclude the possibility of persons who paid bribes to government officials indirectly through third parties (thus avoiding any contact) and hence may not be an accurate representation of bribery prevalence either. We would thus support keeping the original 16.5.1 and 16.5.2 indicators.

Target 16.6 (Suggested indicator: Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism): In view of the potentially large variation in the quantity and substance of UNCAC review recommendations across States Parties, we do not agree that this would be an appropriate indicator.

10 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

[(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal16, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf](#)

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere		
Suggested Indicator	Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population	It is unclear.Clarification is needed
Suggested Indicator	Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause)	It is unclear.Clarification is needed
Target 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels		
Suggested Indicator	Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget	Relevant
Target 16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration		
Suggested Indicator	Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority	Relevant
Target 16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements		

Suggested Indicator	Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months	It is unclear.Clarification is needed

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow african members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Number of victims of intentional homicide by age, sex, mechanism and where possible type of perpetrator, per 100,000 population

Comment: Exclude disaggregation by mechanism and type of perpetrator.

Indicator: Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people (disaggregated by age, sex and cause)

Comment: Should be removed since there´s no methodology to measure, existing data are estimates. We recommend to be a regional indicator, not a global one.

Indicator: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation

Comment: The indicator should exclude the non-detected victims. The methodology is unclear and unreliable.

Indicator: 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)

Comment: The indicator is not aligned with the target and limited with the criminal justice. Alternative Indicator: Percentage of people who have experienced a dispute, or did not have access and have reported to an adequate resolution mechanism

Indicator: Unsentenced detainees as percentage of overall prison population

Comment: Be sure to distinguish temporary imprisionment inside the legal limits of time, with imprisonment without sentence that already constitutes a crime.

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

Comment: We disagree with this indicator. The methodology is not consolidated enough. The amount that might be outside the registered is not registered.

Indicator: Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget

Comment: Additional Indicator: Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services, disaggregated by servisse

Indicator:Percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism.

Comment: The indicator can be measured and monitored by UNCAC. There's no need to be a SDG indicator. We'd also like to mention that not all Member States have ratified the UNCAC and the Peer Review Mechanism takes place in cycles (4 years), where not all countries are reviewed at once, each cycle also reviews only some chapters of the UNCAC.

Indicator: Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies

Comment: We do not recommend this indicator as is methodologically too complex. This indicator is also not national, "proportion of countries" does not make sense.

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

Comment: Disaggregate by age (under 1 and under 5)

Indicator: Percentage of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law. Disaggregate by age, sex, region and population group

Comment: "Existence of independent national human rights institutions (NHRIs) in compliance with the Paris Principles" as 'A' status NHRIs - i.e. those in full compliance with the Paris Principles - will be reporting on human rights trends within their respective countries. Furthermore, evidence supports the assertion that the presence of an 'A' status or well-functioning, independent NHRI has a multiplier effect for human rights across the board and in this respect is multi-purpose. In addition, the status of NHRIs is determined through an accreditation sub-committee supported by OHCHR and the global body of NHRIs (the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights) and is therefore readily available.

13 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Cuba's National Statistical Office

ODS 16.pdf

14 Sep, 2015

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

Shyam Upadhyaya (UNIDO)
On 17.19: I would suggest to replace 'financial and other resources' by 'financial and staff' resources.

19 Aug, 2015

Genevieve Verdier (IMF)
Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 17.1:

- The indicators should cover all government revenue, i.e., not only tax revenue but also non-tax revenue (e.g., including from the resource sector).
- Total government revenues as a percent of GDP, and total government revenues raised per capita make much more sense as indicators for the target "strengthen domestic revenue mobilization" than does a compositional breakdown as suggested here.*It should be noted though that the UN paper now uses much more nuanced language for this than simple percentage of GDP, that is, country owned strategies with certain increases toward a twenty percent revenue ratio for countries now below that; increases as possible, for countries above that. This would be preferable to a "one size fits all" notion.*
- In addition, the indicator "Total volume of inward and outward illicit financial flows" would have little bearing to measure the progress in strengthening domestic resource mobilization.

Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 17.5:

- The suggested indicator can be easily manipulated. It is difficult to determine in a systematic basis what constitutes a discrete policy reform. For example, do different provisions in a regulation designed to promote sustainable development each count as a reform, or the one regulation as a whole. If the latter, countries may simply break up their regulations to the detriment of wide understanding of policies.
- The suggested indicator does not take effectiveness into account. Reforms may be approved, but may not be well-designed or well-implemented.

Comments from IMF on indicators for Target 17.17:

- We suggest more effective indicators to measure progress in public-private partnerships (PPPs), such as either the amount of PPP commitments or the number of PPPs. Also, indicators for this target should aim at encouraging and promoting underline effective PPPs, with due consideration to value for money and fiscal affordability. For this purpose, we would also recommend to add the share of PPP projects cancelled or under distress, which is produced by the World Bank (Private Participation in Infrastructure database).

25 Aug, 2015

Carol Baker (IMF)

IMF comment on the Indicator for 17.11.1:

- "Monitoring he evolution of developing countries export by partner group and key sectors" (included in 17.11)–Data on total exports of goods and services can be sourved from the IMF Statistics Department (STA) balance of payments database, and export by partner from the Direction of Trade database. However, the level of granularity required (e.g., data by sector) is not collected/disseminated by STA.

26 Aug, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)
Angel Gonzalez-Sanz (UNCTAD) - Target 17.6

The relevance of the proposed indicator is not obvious to us. We would support the alternative proposed by UNEP as changes in the number of jointly filed patents (we would add by residents of developed and developing countries) are more likely to reflect the outcome of joint technological undertakings.

01 Sep, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)

Simonetta Zarrilli (UNCTAD) - Target 17.10
UNCTAD would like to propose some alternate indicators that incorporate a gender perspective:

    a. Female share of seasonal export jobs.
    b. Gender wage gap, work conditions and social benefits in the export sector relative to the domestic sector.
    c. Female under-employment rate in import-competing sectors [1].
    d. Female share of high skilled jobs in export-oriented sectors.[2]
    e. Female share of managerial jobs in export-oriented sectors.
    f. Female share of permanent jobs in export-oriented sectors.

    [1] Import-competing sectors are broadly defined as those where domestic production is larger than imports.

    [2] Export-oriented sectors are broadly defined as those where exports are larger than domestic consumption.

01 Sep, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)

Steve MacFeely (UNCTAD) - Target 17.13
UNCTAD has concerns with the proposal (Doc July 7). In our view GDP is not an appropriate or adequate measure of macro-economic stability. As there is no consensus on what macro-economic stability means or what appropriate targets might be we would argue that the 'dashboard' approach is the better option here. At the very least such a dashboard should incorporate elements such as debt, deficit, un/employment and price to supplement measures of income or production. Consideration should also be given to inclusion of income inequality.

01 Sep, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)

Steve MacFeely (UNCTAD) - Targets 17.10 - 17.12
UNCTAD, ITC and WTO support the proposed indicators for 17.10, 17.11 and 17.12. These were in fact originally, jointly proposed by UNCTAD-ITC-WTO and not UNCDF as mistakenly recorded in July 7 Document.

01 Sep, 2015

Ekaterina Chernova (UNCTAD)

Steve MacFeely (UNCTAD) - Target 17.2
UNCTAD supports the proposal for the 'ODA Gap'. Obviously this must be measured correctly, but the concept is straight-forward and shows neatly the shortfall in DAC ODA.

UNCTAD estimates that since Monterrey, the cumulative shortfall now stands (i.e. in 2014) at just over USD 2 Trillion (current prices).

01 Sep, 2015

Enrique Ordaz (Mexico)
On behalf of the Statistical Office of Panama: after reviewing the list, the proposal is complete and quite ample, there are well-defined objectives, with indicators to monitor them. However, for the construction of some of the indicators it is required to have information that is currently not provided by any of the research being conducted in Panama, which would require conducting new surveys at regular intervals. Similarly, in the case of some indicators there are not currently administrative records available for their calculation.

 For instance with regard to poverty indicators: 1.1 can be further developed based on data from the Household Survey Labor Market, but that is not the case for all the indicators proposed in subsection 1.1.1, and 1.2.1. (The consumption aggregate and multidimensional measurement of poverty) as the former comes from a survey of living standards, which has not been conducted in Panama since

2008 and involves quite a significant cost; and the second, MICS, which although the country held for the first time in 2013, to date its continuity has not been defined.

We suggest to further explore the ability of countries to generate these indicators, which should emerge from an internal debate, since their construction in many cases involves strengthening the national capacity. It is not only the development of technical capabilities, but financial capabilities as well, as not all institutions involved in these themes systematize the primary data, which would imply the creation of an infrastructure to generate data

01 Sep, 2015

Hubert Escaith (WTO)
Target 17 : WTO comments based on the 11 August list of indicators

Target 17.7

There are still no agreed list of environmental goods, albeit progress has been made in some international/regional fora such as APEC. Agreeing on such a list for international monitoring may nevertheless prove an issue in the short term. Perhaps we could suggest that for this indicator, each UN member State should self-select its own list of environmental goods in accordance with its national circumstances. After all, this would be consistent with the spirit of the new Post-2015 Agenda, which is supposed to allow each Government to set its own national targets "guided by the global level of ambition but taking into account national circumstances".

Target 17.10

We strongly suggest sticking to the agreed WTO/UNCTAD/ITC indicator which is both transparent and statistically implementable. All other suggested indicators are potentially contentious as they will need to include individual expert's judgement on the implication of a governmental policy. Our position is that the official indicators should avoid subjectivity, and the subjective ones should be kept aside for secondary analysis, under the exclusive responsibility of the agencies and their secretariat.

Moreover, we suggest taking out the reference to the DDA round of trade negotiation: SDGs are meant for the long term (15 years) and should not be linked to the particular outcome of present negotiations.

Target 17.11

17.11.1: We agree with the suggested indicator 17.11.1 as it is, and have reservations with the other suggestions.

17.11.2: Similarly, we do not know what could be a list of exports derived from sustainable management of resources; moreover we doubt all primary exporters, especially less advanced countries facing economic difficulties, will agree on having such a definition being agreed internationally and creating an objective basis for further trade restriction. Here, the OECD suggestion, under 17.11.1, could be reworded to track the value-added of LDC exports derived from

services and industrial activities that are not intensive in natural resources. Yet, we need to be realistic and it may also be difficult to have less developed countries agreeing to exclude some industries from their potential development goals…

Target 17.12

We agree with indicator 17.12.1 and 17.12.2 and recommend keeping them as they are: they are doable, comprehensive yet flexible enough to adapt to the changes in the nature of trade. Other indicators, such as the rate of utilization, may be difficult to measure (especially when preferences are granted by developing countries on the fast growing South-South trade). Moreover, they can be analytically difficult to assess. For example, importers stop using a preference when the normal (MFN) tariff is reduced and become low (a commonly used threshold is 5% ad valorem); reciprocally, they will use as much as possible when normal tariffs are high. So, the lower the MFN tariff, the lower the incentive for importers to avoid paying duties. A crude assessment of preference utilization may therefore result in blaming those Member States that are open to trade and reward those with protectionist policies.

04 Sep, 2015

Mondher Mimouni (ITC)
SDG 17: ITC comments based on the list of indicators circulated on August 11

Target 17.7

While ITC would be ready to offer its support to the calculation of the indicator **Average applied tariffs imposed on environmental Goods,** some methodological and conceptual issues should be addressed:

- As mentioned by other colleagues in this forum, an agreement has to be reached on the list of environmental goods that should be adopted
- The target mentions the "*transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favourable terms".* How could exactly the analysis of import tariffs capture the transfer of environmentally sound technologies? Shouldn't the focus be, in the first place, on investments or services exports of environmentally sound technologies from developed to developing countries?

Target 17.10

- The indicators **Worldwide weighted tariff-average** and **Trade restrictiveness,** as well as the proposed modifications in the wording, were submitted by WTO/UNCTAD/ITC and not by UNCDF. Please amend this for clarity reasons.
- While ITC supports the IAEG decision to select the **Worldwide weighted tariff-average** indicator as a "suggested indicator" for this target**,** we think that is important to keep in consideration the indicator on **Trade restrictiveness** that WTO/UNCTAD/ITC proposed. Data on non-tariff measures and trade related costs are available from the WTO/UNCTAD/ITC/WB databases. Further work will clearly be needed to finalize a methodology that could allow

calculating this composite indicator. Nevertheless, it would be better not to neglect NTMs at this stage and to explore in detail all the existing possibilities to keep this dimension. The absence of an indicator on NTMs under this target was also highlighted by the Federal Statistical Office of Germany (150721_Consultation_StBA_UGR - Goal17.pdf). Therefore, we suggest that both indicators are maintained and further analysed.

Target 17.11

- The indicator **Developing countries and LDCs' exports (by partner group and key sectors), including services,** as well as the proposed modifications in the wording, were submitted by WTO/UNCTAD/ITC and not by UNCDF. Please amend this for clarity reasons.

Target 17.12

- The indicator **Average tariffs faced by developing countries and LDCs by key sectors** and **Preferences utilization by developing and least developed countries on their export to developed countries,** as well as the proposed modifications in the wording, were submitted by WTO/UNCTAD/ITC and not by UNCDF. Please amend this for clarity reasons.

04 Sep, 2015

Carol Baker (IMF)
Comment for the IMF on indicators for Target 17.4:

We propose the following measurable indicator for this target:

The number of countries using the World Bank-IMF LIC Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) assessed to be "high risk" or "in debt distress".

Success would be measured by the number of countries coming down over time

04 Sep, 2015

Nicholas Menzies (World Bank)

World Bank Submission on Select Governance Indicators under the Sustainable Development Goals		
Target 17.1: Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection		
Current Priority Indicator(s) [Per 11 August 2015 IAEG List of Proposals] Composition of Tax Revenue (by sources), including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as a % of GDP.	**World Bank Suggested Indicator** Domestically generated revenues (general government) as a percentage of GDP.	**World Bank Comments** The target relates to strengthening domestic resource mobilization, not just to taxes and so the focus on "tax revenues" in the Current Priority Indicator is misplaced.

04 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

The indicator for Target 17.2 is a global level indicator and not one calculated at a national level.

The indicator in Target 17.3 should differentiate the origins of inflows per country and the concept of inflow (Direct Foreign Investment, transfers, etc.). Considering that the target is to secure additional resources the determination of an adequate baseline is fundamental for this calculation.

The indicator of Target 17.4 does not reflect the efforts made by countries in development to mitigate the debt situation of developing countries. This could be measured, for example, with indicators such as "renegotiated sums of debt with developing countries" or "sums of debt condoned to developing countries". The ratio currently proposed only measures the state of debt in a country. This information should be generated in developing countries.

The indicator in Target 17.5 should measure the efforts of developed countries to assure that resources of their territories reach developing countries as investment, however, what is proposed is a measure of reforms applied in developing countries to attract foreign investments. We suggest that the indicator be reformulated to this measure the target set.

The indicator for Target 17.11 should define what sectors are considered key sectors so as to assure uniformity in all countries.

To evaluate Target 17.13, GDP and GDP variation rate are not considered the most ideal indicators. Taking this into consideration, we believe it is necessary to incorporate a group of relevant macroeconomic indicators that reflect macroeconomic stability, considering volatility. The indicators suggested by United Nations include: GDP; Current account surplus and deficit/GDP; Capital flows, inwards and outwards; Net international investment position/GDP; Current account surplus and deficit/GDP; Terms of trade; Export market shares ($) ; Nominal unit labor cost; Functional distribution of labor and capital/GDP; Minimum wage, average wage and wage dispersion; Inequality Measure; Real effective exchange rates based on CPI deflators; Interest rates (including spread);Private sector debt level and change; Short term and long-term debt level of official reserves and reserves in banks; Private sector credit/GDP; Prices of food and energy; General government revenues, expenditure and debt/GDP; Employment and unemployment (%, composition, length of term); General price changes (CPI).

For the indicator in Target 17.15 we feel it is necessary to specify what international treaties and compromises should be considered for the measurement, and alternative to this indicator would be focusing on international treaties to battle poverty and on sustainable production.

The definition and alignment of the indicator for Target 17.16 is not clear, with either the target or the objective. Alternatively, we propose a measure of the number of participations of countries in regional or global association members that have come together for development cooperation. This information can be obtained through regional organisms like UNASUR, CAN, CELAC, etc.

The first indicator for target 17.19 should be aided by Target 17.18 through making resources necessary to the target available.

Relation between second indicator and the target 17.19 is not understood, we suggested to removing it to reduce the number of indicators.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Goal 17

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

SDG 17 UN System Template 7 Sept.xlsx

The attached table displays the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations for Goal 17. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this

revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by the goal (UNCTAD, UNCDF, WIPO, ITU, WTO, ITC, OHCHR, UNEP, CBD, GEF, ILO, IOM and UNFPA). They also included the expert advice from the Task Force on Financial Statistics that include as members: Eurostat, IMF, World Bank, OECD, BIS, ECB, Paris Club and the Commonwealth Secretariat. In this round of consultations, additional comments/proposals have been made by ITU, UNCTAD, UPU and the World Bank. The Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We agree with the "Note on Disaggregation" in the List of Proposals of 7 July 2015 which specifies for all goals and targets that "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible."

The main changes with respect to the list of 11 August are:

Target 17.1

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Composition of Tax Revenues [by sources], including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as % of GDP*)

- Retain additional indicator 17.1.1 (*Total Tax/GDP*).

- Retain additional indicator 17.1.2 (*Total Tax Per Capita - $ value*).

Target 17.2

- Replace Priority Indicator (*Net ODA, total and to LDCs, as percentage of OECD/Development Assistance Committee donors' gross national income)* with (*ODA Gap*) as this highlights in simple, clear terms the shortfall to ODA commitments and thus addresses the target directly.

There are divided views here, with some agencies preferring 17.2.1. Thus it is recommended that both indicators be kept or further reviewed.

- Retain additional indicator 17.2.1 (*Net ODA, total and to LDCs, as percentage of OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors' gross national income*)

- Drop 17.2.2 (*Proportion of total bilateral, sector-allocable ODA of OECD/DAC donors to basic social services [basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation]*) as this goes beyond the mandate of the target.

Target 17.3

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Total Capital Inflow*)

- Replace 17.3.1 (*Cost of remittances*) as this is too limiting an indicator and only addresses one narrow element of the target, with new additional indicator (*Foreign Direct Investments as % of total FDI + ODA*).

- Drop 17.3.2 (Cost of remittances in the top tier of high-cost corridors) as this also is too narrow.

Target 17.4

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services*)

- Retain additional indicator 17.4.1 (*Total number of countries that have reached their Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC) decision points and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative)*).

- Retain additional indicator 17.4.2. (*Debt relief committed under HIPC initiative*).

Target 17.5

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Number of national & investment policy reforms adopted that incorporate sustainable development objectives or safeguards x country*).

- Retain additional indicator 17.5.1 (*Adoption/Implementation of sustainable development orientated targets by new or existing investment promotion agencies*)

- Modify additional indicator 17.5.2 to read (*Number of national investment policy reforms adopted that incorporate sustainable development objectives or safeguards*).

Target 17.6

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Access to patent information (WIPO Patent Database) and use of the international IP system*)

- Replace 17.6.1 (*Access to existing patent information (creation of a patent database)*) with additional indicator (*Fixed Internet broadband subscriptions broken down by speed*).

- Drop 17.6.2 (*Number of exchanges - Exchange of scientists and technological staff*)

Target 17.7

- Retain Priority Indictor (*Average applied tariffs imposed on environmental Goods*) but modify text slightly to read (*Average applied tariffs imposed on environmentally sound goods and technologies).

- Retain additional indicator 17.7.1 (*Total STEM Investment/GDP*)

- Retain additional indicator 17.7.2 (*Total STEM per capita ($ value)*)

Target 17.8

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Proportion of individuals using the Internet*)

- Drop 17.8.1 (*Internet penetration*)

- Replace 17.8.2 (*Quality of internet access*) with additional indicator (*International Internet bandwidth per inhabitant*)

Target 17.9

- Simplify Priority indicator (*The dollar value of financial and technical assistance, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation, committed to developing countries' designing and implementing a holistic policy mix that aim at sustainable development in three dimensions (including elements such as reducing inequality within a country and governance*) to read (*$ value of financial and technical assistance, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation committed to developing countries*). This is more feasible.

- Retain additional indicator 17.8.2 (*Number (share) of national plans to implement SDGs approved by governments by end of 2016 compared to by 2020*).

- Replace 17.8.2 (*Substantial increase in capacity built through south-south cooperation*) with additional indicator (*Percentage of total capacity building ODA coming from South-South cooperation*).

Target 17.10

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Worldwide weighted tariff-average*).

- Drop 17.10.1 (*Stock of potentially trade-restrictive measures in WTO members*)

- Drop 17.10.2 (*Worldwide weighted tariff-average: a. MFN applied and preferential, b. Applied to Devd/Dvg/LDCs, c. Applied by Devd/Dvg/LDCs, and d. By main sectors*) - see priority indicator.

Target 17.11

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Developing country's and LDCs' exports (by partner group and key sectors), including Services*)

- Retain additional indicator 17.11.1 (*Monitoring the evolution of developing countries export by partner group and key sectors. Such as: a) Exports of high technological content as proportion of total exports, b) Labour-intensive exports as proportion of total exports (pro-poor exports), and c) Export diversification (by product; by market destination*)

- Reword additional indicator 17.11.2 (*Value of non-oil exports from LDCs that are derived from sustainable management of natural resources*) to read (*Percentage of non-oil exports*

from developing and LDCs countries derived from sustainable management of natural resources).

- A new additional indicator 17.11.3 has also been proposed (Flow of e-commerce) that would be populated with existing data from UPU.

Target 17.12

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Average tariffs faced by developing countries and LDCs by key sectors*)

- Drop 17.12.1 (*Average tariffs faced by developing countries and LDCs by key sectors*) as it is the same as priority indicator

- Retain additional indicator 17.12.2 (*Preferences utilization by developing and least developed countries on their export to developed countries*)

Target 17.13

- Replace Priority Indicator (*GDP*) with (*Macro-Economic Dashboard*) as GDP does gives a very limited view of macro-economic stability.

- Drop 17.13.1 (*GDP*) - see above

- Retain additional indicator 17.13.2 (*Current account surplus and deficit/GDP*). This too, is too limited a view of macro-economic stability, but these are superior measures than GDP.

Target 17.14

- Replace Priority Indicator (*Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments including environmental, human rights, and labour instruments*) with (*Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments under the IMO (safety, security, environmental protection, civil liability and compensation and insurance) and adopted carbon pricing mechanisms*).

- Drop 17.14.1 *(Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments under the IMO (safety, security, environmental protection, civil liability and compensation and insurance)).*

- Retain additional indicator 17.14.2 (*Number of countries with multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms in place for a coordinated implementation of chemicals and wastes conventions and frameworks*).

Target 17.15

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Numbers of constraints that are embodied in ODA or loan agreements, IIAs. RTAs etc.*)

- Retain additional indicator 17.15.1 (*Number of countries signing on for sharing of fiscal information*)

- Drop 17.15.2 (*Automatic transfer of financial information*)

Target 17.16

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Indicator 7 from Global Partnership Monitoring Exercise: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews).*

- Amend additional indicator 17.16.1 from (*Changes in the number of multi-stakeholder partnerships participants active in developing countries*) to read (*Percentage of countries participating at annual SDG meetings*).

- Amend additional indicator 17.16.2 from (*Classification and trajectory of the above in terms of: a) Nature of partnership, b) Region: Global, regional, c) Objectives: Sharing technology, expertise etc. and d) Country type (where partnership is active*) to read (*Number of countries reporting on the full set of SDGs*).

Target 17.17

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Amount of US$ committed to public-private partnerships*)

- Retain additional indicator 17.17.1 (*Number of PPP projects*)

- Amend additional indicator 17.17.2 (*Number of PPP projects implemented by developing countries*) to read (*Amount of US$ annually committed to public-private partnerships as a percentage of all money spent on development projects on national level*).

Target 17.18

- Retain Priority Indicator (*Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at the national level*).

- Retain additional indicator 17.18.1 (*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*)

- Retain additional indicator 17.18.2 (*Number of countries that have formal institutional arrangements for the coordination of the compilation of official statistics (at international, national and regional level*)).

Target 17.19

- Retain Priority Indicators (*Inclusive Wealth Index*) and amend (*Financial and other resources made available to strengthen the statistical capacity in developing countries*) to read *($ value of all resources made available to strengthen statistical capacity in developing countries*)

- Drop 17.19.1 (*Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare*).

- Drop 17.19.2 (*Gross National Happiness*).

07 Sep, 2015

Umar Serajuddin (World Bank)
Submitting the following comment on behalf of IFC's (International Finance Corporation) Claudio R. Volonte (cvolonte@ifc.org):

Comments from the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is difficult to see how the private sector's contribution to the SDG would be reflected in these indicators.

- Private sector investment mobilized (new or additional) for sustainable development from private sector domestic sources (17.1 target) or foreign (17.3 target, indicator 97). Split indicator 96 to reflect the private sector contribution.

- Change the title of 17.1 indicator to Total Official Investment for development (instead of support).

- Indicator 17.10. not sure what "net private grants" are. Why grants and not investments?

07 Sep, 2015

Ola Awad (State of Palestine)
Target 17.11 Significantly increase the exports of developing countries, in particular with a view to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020

PCBS Comment:

The Indicator 17.11.1 concerns target 17.11 and the suggested indicator "Developing country's and LDCs' exports (by partner group and key sectors), including services. It's better that this indicator calculated on the annual basis either as total in Thousand US$.

TARGET 17.11

The paragraph mentioned by UPU under specification "At a later stage, the above mentioned international e-commerce statistics could also be provided by the size of the firm (in order to monitor e-commerce related exports and imports by micro, small and medium size" enterprises). This indicator can't be provided by all partners since some countries don't rely on enterprises as data sources.

Ola Awad (State of Palestine)
President, Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS)
07 Sep, 2015

Gyeongjoon Yoo (Korea)

17.8 This indicator only consists of ICT accessibility, and hence more indicators need to be considered.

07 Sep, 2015

Rafael Diez de Medina (ILO)

Referring to Target 17.14, the ILO would add to the suggested text a minor but relevant text:

Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments under the IMO (safety, security, environmental protection, civil liability and compensation and insurance) and the ILO Maritime Convention, and adopted carbon pricing mechanisms

07 Sep, 2015

Simon Scott (OECD)

[Comment by OECD] Re: 17.17: Indicators proposed so far only deal with public-private partnerships, and focus on specific projects and investments. The wording of 17.17 suggests a broader coverage of partnerships may be intended. We would propose two additional indicators that measure: i) quality of public-private dialogue, and ii) CSO enabling environment and CSO effectiveness. Details below.

Proposed indicator: Quality of public-private dialogue

- *Is the indicator already used for global monitoring?* This indicator corresponds to indicator 3 of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation (GPEDC). It will be monitored in the GPEDC's 2015-16 monitoring round (number of participating countries yet te be determined).

- *Is the indicator directly related to (a component of) the target? (1=low, 5=High): 4*

- *How comprehensively does the indicator measure the target (1=low, 5= high):* 2 (focuses only on public-private dialogue)

- *Data source*: Combination of (1) qualitative data sourced at the country level and (2) quantitative data drawing from existing indices (from the Open Budget Survey and the World Wide Governance Indicators).

- *Agency responsible*: OECD / UNDP

- *Tier (1 to 3):* 2

- *Priority / additional*: additional

Proposed indicator: Extent to which governments and providers of development cooperation contribute to an enabling environment; and Extent to which CSOs are implementing development effectiveness principles in their own operations.

- *Is the indicator already used for global monitoring?*This indicator corresponds to indicator 2 of the GPEDC. It will be monitored in the GPEDC's 2015-16 monitoring round (number of participating countries yet to be determined).

- *Is the indicator directly related to (a component of) the target? (1=low, 5=high): 4*

- *How comprehensively does the indicator measure the target (1=low, 5=high): 2* (focuses only on civil society)

- *Data source*: qualitative data sourced at the country level

- *Agency responsible*: OECD / UNDP

- *Tier (1 to 3):* 2

- *Priority / additional:* additional

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany
07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

Comments of the Federal Statistical Office regarding goal 17

Dear chair, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

Referring to our general comments – stating that each goal should be accompanied by a selected number of well-established, comparable easy to gain and understand headline indicators, giving a good overview of the attainment of the goal itself – we do suggest the following indicators as headline indicators for goal 17:

- GDP per capital

- %-of ODA in GNI

General remarks regarding the means of implementation are covered by a separate document we have uploaded in the folder 22. Additionally we would like to transmit the following comments and remarks regarding separate targets within goal 17. They have been collected from the federal administration and the different units in charge within our office:

Target 17.1 – Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Composition of Tax Revenues (by sources), including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as % of GDP

Remark: The suggested indicator intends to measure the composition of tax revenues by various sources. Yet, environmental taxes as well as other innovative financing instruments derived from public sources are not explicitly mentioned in the AAAA. The tax-to-GDP-ratio is a good starting point but using it as a single quantitative indicator is problematic.

Suggestion: Nationally defined domestic targets to enhance domestic revenues taking into account the economic and social environment could define an alternative indicator. Alternatively, a combination of selected qualitative indicators from TADAT could be used as indicators for the target, e.g. "The adequacy of internal and/or external controls to protect the systems of tax administration from loss, error, and fraud"

Target 17.7 – Promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed

Suggested indicator: Average applied tariffs imposed on environmental Goods

Remark: The content of the indicator is not clear.

Target 17.10 – Promote a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organization, including through the conclusion of negotiations under its Doha Development Agenda

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Worldwide weighted tariff-average

Remark: Non-tariff measures and prohibitive tariffs are not covered due to the methodology (simple average, export-weighted average).

Target 17.11 – Significantly increase the exports of developing countries, in particular with a view to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Developing country's and LDCs' exports (by partner group and key sectors), including services

Remark: This indicator is very specific to a certain type of exports not further specified neither in the Agenda 2030 nor in FfD. A disaggregation is not requested by the target and thus not required within the indicator.

Suggestion: We would prefer to rephrase the indicator to: imports from DC and LDCs'.

Target 17.13 – Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: GDP

Remark: It would seem useful (also) to look at real GDP.

Target 17.14 – Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments including environmental, human rights, and labour instruments

Remark: In general, we do support this indicator. However, the indicator says nothing about the coordination of, nor about synergies or overlaps between the relevant international instruments.

Target 17.15 – Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Numbers of constraints that are embodied in ODA or loan agreements, IIAs. RTAs etc.

Remark: It needs to be ensured that the definition of financing / lending purpose, covenants, social and environmental safeguards do not count towards these constraints, as they are crucial to ensure sustainability in its three dimensions. In addition, the meaning of constraint has to be defined.

Suggestion: We would like to delete the indicator due to these difficulties or replace indicator by "Number of specific policy constraints in ODA financing and lending agreements not including any definition of financing / lending purpose, covenants, social and environmental safeguards, references to established standards for preventing corruption, money laundering and financing of terrorism."

Target 17.18 – By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at the national level.

Remark: Disaggregation not possible for a significant number of the indicators.

Target 17.19 – By 2030, build on existing initiatives to develop measurements of progress on sustainable development that complement gross domestic product, and support statistical capacity building in developing countries

Indicator suggested by the list of Aug 11: Inclusive Wealth Index

Remark: The indicator seems unsuitable.

07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
Comments from Statistics Denmark

Indicator for Target 17.1

No comments other than a recommendation for a more precise description of which tax sources that should be reported on to ensure uniform reporting and easier comparison. If the definition is too vague you risk that countries end up reporting on different categories.

Indicator 17.5.1

Agree with UNCDF's and UNEP's suggestion to "remove the indicator".

Indicator 17.5.2

Agree with UNCDF's suggestion.

Indicator for Target 17.6

This indicator seems very limited and does not encompass all the areas contained in the goal .The challenge is that the goal is very broad and thus very difficult to capture in one indicator. However, instead of limiting the reporting to an indicator on 'access to patent information', it would be recommendable to add other indicators to get a more accurate picture of whether or not the goal has been reached.

Indicator for Target 17.7

Indicator should be changed as a priority.

The indicator does not reflect diffusion and uptake of environmentally sound technologies.

Alternative indicator could be amount of Official Development Assistance (ODA) aimed at green development.

Or to consider the Negotiations of the Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) on global free trade in environmental technologies for certain products and services.

Indicator for Target 17.9

- The suggested indicator is formulated in such a way that it is very difficult to understand. Clarity in the formulation is a first condition of measurability.

- The target aims to "enhance" support, not only increase support. Therefore the indicators developed need to capture qualitative as well as quantitative aspects. As they are drafted now, the indicators focus on dollar value and number of national plans approved, etc. While these may be relevant, there is no reflection of the quality of capacity development.

- The dollar value may however be an acceptable proxy indicator on the quantitative side (if a number of definitions, etc. can be agreed with a view to collecting comparable data from the various organisations – otherwise it will hardly make any sense).

- It needs to be complemented by a proxy on the qualitative side, a very difficult task. There is probably no good simple proxy available. The proposed indicator on the number of development plans that capture sustainable development is unambitious and ambiguous. The alternative suggested by UNCDF and UNEP appears slightly more indicative of the desired outcome. However, the causal link between the capacity development effort targeted and this indicator is not obvious.

Alternative lines of thought might be the following:

- Work could be done in order to capture measurements of "state capability" (indicators do exist)

- Shares of capacity development using north-south, south-south, and triangular approaches would capture whether there is positive development in this distribution

- Ensure that capacity development for sustainability is not measured only in organisations which are strictly thematically based, a contradiction in terms of sustainability in the broad definition of the word

- Acknowledge that this is work in progress and that work is needed to define what good capacity development is.

Indicator for Target 17.13

This indicator does not measure variability and does not as such capture the intended goal.

Indicator for Target 17.15

This indicator again does not seem sufficient in comparison to the goal that it is meant to report on. It gives rise to the question about the meaning of "constrains"? The word 'conditions' would be more accurate and a well-known terminology in the development sector. However, this data may not be derived from OECD DAC reporting. The department of Quality Assurance in the MFA was very much in doubt of whether it was possible to generate this information from the DAC reporting. At the same time, it seems that an indicator capturing whether or not donors are aligning their development cooperation to the developing countries' own national plans would be more accurate vis-à-vis the sub-goal

Another question is whether or not the UNSTATCOM has considered the reporting ongoing within the GPEDC monitoring process. In this process the recipient countries report on the following indicators: 1) 'Development cooperation is focused on results that meet developing countries priorities', 2) 'Aid on budget', og 3) 'Aid is untied'. It seems that these indicators could provide a more complete picture of the status of the sub-goal "respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development".

Indicator for Target 17.18

The suggested indicator seeks to measure the effect of the targeted capacity-developing effort instead of the capacity itself, which may be a feasible choice in this context. The alternative suggested by UNEP however seems slightly more appropriate since it is clearer (granted that "essential data" can be, or is already defined). The two proposed sub-indicators (17.18.1 and 17.18.2) do not appear sufficiently relevant in the context.

Indicator for Target 17.19

Acceptable

Can support both indicators, but with preference for Inclusive Wealth

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to Goal 17. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators on Goal 17, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

Goal 17.xlsx

Serge Kapto (UNDP)
On behalf of Babatunde Omilola, Sustainable Development cluster, UNDP, please find below some suggested indicators for the means of implementation:

- Governance and economic management: Percent of population satisfied with political governance by: (1) gender; (2) rural/urban; (3) age group; (iv) sector
- Macroeconomic management: (1) deficit to GDP; (2), revenue to GDP; (3) inflation rate; (4) debt to GDP
- Donor harmonization: Share of ODA for total budget support

09 Sep, 2015

Mauricio Perfetti del Corral (Colombia)

Colombia. Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística – DANE

IAEG-SDGs Member

Goal 17

Target 17.1: Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection

Suggested indicator: " Composition of Tax Revenues (by sources), including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as % of GDP"

Comment: This indicator does not completely cover the target. It should be included information about international support to developing countries, mechanisms for Automatic Information Exchange between countries and its impact on tax collection.

Target 17.4: "Assist developing countries in attaining long-term debt sustainability through coordinated policies aimed at fostering debt financing, debt relief and debt restructuring, as appropriate, and address the external debt of highly indebted poor countries to reduce debt distress"

Suggested indicator: "Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services"

Comment: This indicator measures the result of the debt service and its management but does not reflect the assistance to developing countries in attaining long-term debt sustainability.

Target 17.6: "Enhance North-South, South-South and triangular regional and international cooperation on and access to science, technology and innovation and enhance knowledge sharing on mutually agreed terms, including through improved coordination among existing mechanisms, in particular at the United Nations level, and through a global technology facilitation mechanism"

Suggested indicator: "Access to patent information (WIPO Patent Database) and use of the international IP system"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not adequately measure the target. We consider that indicator 17.6.2 could monitor better the target, and the number of exchange projects in science and technology.

Target 17.7: "Promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed"

Suggested indicator: " Average applied tariffs imposed on environmental Goods"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not adequately measure the target. We consider as a better option the indicator suggested by UNEP: *Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agree.*

Target 17.9: "Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the sustainable development goals, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation"

Suggested indicator: "The dollar value of financial and technical assistance, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation, committed to developing countries' designing and implementing a holistic policy mix that aim at sustainable development in three dimensions (including elements such as reducing inequality within a country and governance)"

Comment: The South-South cooperation is not comparable with other types of cooperation like ODA, it is based on exchange and the measurable part of the management is minimum and does not reflects its actual impact, therefore we do not consider adequate this indicator in dollar value including South-South cooperation.

Target 17.11: "Significantly increase the exports of developing countries, in particular with a view to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020"

Suggested indicator: "Developing countries' and LDCs' exports (by partner group and key sectors), including services"

Comment: The indicator should be defined in relative terms using global exports as denominator.

Target 17.13: "Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence"

Suggested indicator: GDP

Comment: We suggest defining a more complete indicator that measures the variability in terms of the main macroeconomic indicators.

Target 17.16: "Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the sustainable development goals in all countries, in particular developing countries".

Suggested Indicator: Indicator 7 from Global Partnership Monitoring Exercise: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews.

Comment: This target is not measurable through a quantitative indicator. We suggest a political monitoring that takes into account, among others, the reports in the context of the "Addis Abeba Action Agenda" document.

Target 17.18: "By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts"

*Suggested Indicator: "*Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at the national level"

Comment: The suggested indicator does not adequately monitor the target. It should be defined in terms of support to developing countries, financial and non-financial resources aimed at increasing and strengthening capacity of national statistical systems.

09 Sep, 2015

Jennifer Park (United States)

Please find below US comments to indicators associated with Goal 17. Changes since the July comment period appear in red font.

Goal 17 US Expert September Cmtns 20150908.xlsx

09 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We earnestly exchanged opinions with related ministries and agencies, and we are submitting the attached document.

- We have submitted our comments towards the suggested indicators in July 2015. Since then, further discussion has been held among the related ministries and agencies within Japan, to contribute more to the activities of the IAEG-SDGs. Those comments updated or revised since July 2015 are colored in "red" in the attached document.

- It is important to adopt a broad range of opinions for development of global indicators and for the development of agenda, and we hope that our opinions will be accepted.

(Japan) Updated and Revised Comments -Goal17, Suggested Indicator for 2030 agenda for SDGs.pdf

11 Sep, 2015

Birol Aydemir (Turkey)

Target 17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection		
Suggested Indicator	Composition of Tax Revenues (by sources), including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as % of GDP	Relevant

Target 17.2 Developed countries to implement fully their official development assistance commitments, including the commitment by many developed countries to achieve the target of 0.7 per cent ODA/GNI to developing countries and 0.15 to 0.20 per cent of ODA/GNI to least developed countries; ODA providers are encouraged to consider setting a target to provide at least 0.20 per cent of ODA/GNI to least developed countries.		
Suggested Indicator	Net ODA, total and to LDCs, as percentage of OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors' gross national income (GNI)	Relevant
Target 17.3 Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources		
Suggested Indicator	Total Capital Inflow (TCI)	Relevant
Target 17.4 Assist developing countries in attaining long-term debt sustainability through coordinated policies aimed at fostering debt financing, debt relief and debt restructuring, as appropriate, and address the external debt of highly indebted poor countries to reduce debt distress		
Suggested Indicator	Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services	Relevant
Target 17.8 Fully operationalize the technology bank and science, technology and innovation capacity-building mechanism for least developed countries by 2017 and enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology		
Suggested Indicator	Proportion of individuals using the Internet.	Relevant
Target 17.13 Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence		
Suggested Indicator	GDP	Relevant
Target 17.15 Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development		
Suggested	Numbers of constraints that are embodied in	Relevant

Indicator	ODA or loan agreements, IIAs. RTAs etc.	

Target 17.18 By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts

Suggested Indicator	Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at the national level.	Relevant

Target 17.19 By 2030, build on existing initiatives to develop measurements of progress on sustainable development that complement gross domestic product, and support statistical capacity-building in developing countries

Suggested Indicator	Financial and other resources made available to strengthen the statistical capacity in developing countries	Indicator is not measureable and comparable.It does not produce an amount, rate, proportion etc.
Suggested Indicator	Inclusive Wealth Index	Relevant

11 Sep, 2015

António dos Reis Duarte (Cabo Verde)

Comments from the Instituto Nacional de Estatística of Cabo Verde are based on INECV perspectives, and those resulted from discussions with fellow african members of IAEG and partners.

Indicator: Composition of Tax Revenues (by sources), including revenues derived from environmental taxes, and as % of GDP

Comment: It´s too much detail and countries do not have to report composition of their tax revenues.   Alternative Indicator:- "Total tax revenue/GDP"

Indicator: Number of national & investment policy reforms adopted that incorporate sustainable development objectives or safeguards x country

Comment: We need further information on this indicator.

Indicator: Access to patent information (WIPO Patent Database) and use of the international IP system

Comment: The indicator measures a very small part of the target. It does not reflect what is intended by the target. Alternative Indicator: -"Fixed Internet broadband subscriptions disaggregated by speed". We recommend IAEG-SDG to explore other indicators for this specific target. We recommend: Percentage of patents generated through south-south partnerships.

Indicator: Proportion of individuals using the Internet.

Comment: We suggest Additional Indicators: - Proportion of business establishment using the internet, Sciente, Techonology, Innovation, ICT contribution to GDP.

Indicator: The dollar value of financial and technical assistance, including through North- South, South-South, and triangular cooperation, committed to developing countries' designing and implementing a holistic policy mix that aim at sustainable development in three dimensions (including elements such as reducing inequality within a country and governance).

Comment: There are too many elements in this indicator. We suggest to divide the indicator in several.

Indicator: Worldwide weighted tariff-average This indicator can be disaggregated and analysed by type of tariff (MFN applied rates and preferential rates), by product sector, by region and by level of development. The unit of measurement will be in % terms. Ad valorem equivalents (AVE) will be calculated for those tariffs that are not expressed in percentage. This methodology also allows for cross-country comparisons. Calculations can be performed on a yearly basis. These calculations are already part of the MDG Gap task force report.

Comment: There are too many elements in this indicator. We suggest to divide the indicator in several.

Indicator: GDP

Comment: We recommend additional indicators: annual average inflation rate; ratio debt/GDP. These two are more suited to measure stability.

Indicator: Number of countries that have ratified and implemented relevant international instruments including environmental, human rights, and labour instruments

Comment: There are too many elements in this indicator (e.g. a country can have ratified but not implement, or ratified and implement human rights, but not environmental and labour statistics). We suggest to divide the indicator in several.

Indicator: Numbers of constraints that are embodied in ODA or loan agreements, IIAs. RTAs etc.

Comment: We need further information on "constraints". What precisely will be measured.

Indicator: Indicator 7 from Global Partnership Monitoring Exercise: Mutual accountability among development co-operation actors is strengthened through inclusive reviews

Comment: We need more information on that indicator.

Indicator: Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at the national level.

Comment: Should add indicador on legislation and also funding. Additional Indicators: 1a: Number of countries that have national statistical legislation that complies with the Fundamental Principles of Official statistics. 1b: Ratio of available funding / budget for the production of indicators with full disaggregation. It is essential to monitor the funding availability for the production of SDG indicators, as the lack of funding is the main cause of information gaps. National Statistics Institutes are forced to reduce the disaggregation in order to have sufficient funding to guarantee the execution of the operations.

Topic 18: Verify and match the indicator proposed against existing major indicator frameworks, including those developed at the regional level

Gerald Haberkorn (SPC)

Matching draft Pacific Regional headline indicators to Global Tier-1 indicators.

2 documents:

- summary: highlighting matches and almost-matches, SPC 2015-07 Summary of Matching Pacific Regional Headline to Global TIER-1 Indicators 11Aug2015-FINAL.docx
- full document, using original UNSD table SPC 2015-07 Full Version of Matching Pacific Regional Headline to Global TIER-1 Indicators 11Aug2015.xlsx

Cheers,

Gerald

12 Aug, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Targets 1.5, 11.5, 13.1 and 14.2 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of deaths and missing due to hazardous events per 100,000.

- Number of affected people due to hazardous events per 100,000 (*can be combined with the above indicator*)

- Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product.

Target 2.4 and 15.3 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Direct agricultural loss due to hazardous events *(agreed to merge with FAO indicator)*

Target 9.1

- Damage to critical infrastructure due to hazardous events

- Number of countries that adopt and implement critical infrastructure protection plan

Target 11.b

- Percentage of local governments that adopt and implement local DRR strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030

Target 13.2

- Number of countries that adopt and implement national DRR strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030

- Number of countries that integrate climate and disaster risk into development planning

Target 13.3 and 15.3 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of countries that have multi-hazard early warning system

- Number of countries that have multi-hazard national risk assessment with results in an accessible, understandable and usable format for stakeholders and people

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx

(I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

We would like to inform and emphasize that these suggested indicators will be consistent with the Sendai Framework Indicator Framework once selected by the Member States for the both SDGs and the Sendai Framework. In the field of disaster risk reduction policies, the Hyogo Framework for Action Monitor (HFA Monitor) and standardized national disaster loss database (using DesInventar methodology) have been global framework for monitoring progress. In March 2015, the Sendai Framework was adopted as the successor of the HFA and the discussion on how to make transition to new follow up mechanism is on-going. This is a great opportunity to develop consistent indicators.

Linkage of follow-up/review mechanisms between the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction

The SDGs require that "data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible". (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

UNISDR would like to inform the Sendai Framework reporting mechanism:

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 was adopted in March 2015. The Members States agreed to set seven global targets and assigned a task to UNISDR to support development of indicators to monitor the Sendai global targets in coordination with other relevant mechanisms for sustainable development and climate change (para 48 (c) in the Sendai Framework).

The seven global targets include substantial reduction of (a) mortality, (b) affected people, (c) direct economic loss, (d) damage to critical infrastructure) and (e) increase of the number of countries having national and local DRR strategy, (f) international cooperation, and (g) increased availability of and access to risk information and early warning system. (Para 18 in the Sendai Framework)

The indicators we proposed for the SDGs are also proposed to the "Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group for indicators and terminology of the Sendai Framework (OEIWG)" to be discussed by the government experts (the 1st meeting will be held in 28-29 September). We believe the coherence between the Sendai and the SDG follow-up/review mechanism will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis.

The proposal for the Sendai Framework indicator is uploaded in the website.

http://www.preventionweb.net/files/45466_indicatorspaperaugust2015final.pdf

We appreciate your attention.
Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
UNISDR

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Eurostat comments:

Preferably the indicators should be based on internationally agreed frameworks and standards such as the System of Environmental Accounting (SEEA) and the System of National Accounts (SNA) not only to ensure the reliability, independence and comparability of the provided data but also to allow analysis of inter-linkages by using the full range of datasets included in these harmonised systems.

Furthermore, priority should also be given to indicators based on SD indicator frameworks already applied by statistical authorities in several parts of the world.

By mapping the list of proposed indicators with available datasets in Eurostat database we concluded in a first round that only 27 of the 204 suggested indicators (13 %) are available in the current datasets of Eurostat. But some of the suggested indicators need further specification for a proper evaluation.

In general, we suggest that the matching will improve by specifying SDG indicators more in line with data offered by official statistics (see comments on particular indicators included in our feedback on topic 1 -17!).

07 Sep, 2015

Topic 19: Develop a framework for the presentation and communication of the list of proposed indicators for global monitoring

Hubert Escaith (WTO)
General WTO comments: not sure it fits here, but with topic 22, this is the best place I could find. So I copy here what I wrote for topic 22.

We would like to provide WTO general comments. We reviewed the 11 August list of trade related indicators and compared it to the original list which was jointly proposed by UNCTAD, UN-ITC, World Bank and WTO. **We believe that the final list should remain as close as possible of the initial one, which was based on both substantive relevance and statistical feasibility.**

- On substantive ground, some of the additional suggestions, such as production subsidies, if implemented indiscriminately, may have adverse effect on environment or create negative externalities for neighbouring countries.
- From a statistical perspective, we are surprised by the negative assessment given to the feasibility of trade-related indicators. We understand that a "C" grading refers to feasibility. Many of the trade indicators that were graded "C" for feasibility in the August 11 document do exist and have been routinely compiled by international organizations for many years; actually, some of them are derived from the MDG monitoring exercise. Indeed, when the four agencies met to prepare our initial list of indicators, we took care of proposing indicators which were doable on the basis of our current and future statistical programmes. In general, the WTO tends to support monitoring on the basis of observable data (tariffs, trade flows) rather than synthetic indicators derived from general or partial equilibrium models, unless there is a consensus on the methodology and the parameters used for calibration (a big "if", considering the wide range of econometric estimates produced by researchers for relatively "simple" parameters such as import elasticity of demand).

04 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Eurostat comments:

Any list of indicators has to be accompanied by the necessary explanatory and context information, analysis and user-oriented reporting. *The analysis of policy options and of inter-linkages among different SDGs and targets requires that indicators are embedded in the wider statistical infrastructure* to the maximum extent possible.

In view of a user-oriented reporting, we suggest developing on the basis of the approved full set of SDG indicators a sub-set of core or headline indicators, which will be the most representative for each goal and covering in a balanced way the issues of the 5 Ps according to the preamble of the draft outcome document "Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for sustainable development".

07 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)
Different objective populations should be considered in all communication actions, ranging from policy makers, statistical offices, general public and others. A thorough understanding of the indicators and targets proposed requires an adequate selection of channels and formats. General dissemination of all targets and indicators should be done at a specific location and time, after which each indicator should be treated separately and grouped together by targets in other spaces. The segmentation of audiences is fundamental and designs with specific products for each audience is needed, paired with the use of new communication channels such as social networks and local activations using non-traditional marketing.

Statistical information should be treated as a public good, which is why guaranteeing democratic access to information, statistical operation production, and use of new resources and timely publication of data is crucial; as is working with feedback, harmonizing data and strengthening statistical offices and national statistical systems.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to this topic. The three papers attached deal with the following topics:

1. SEEA and Transforming Global and National Statistical Systems for Monitoring SDG Indicators

2. The SEEA as a Statistical Framework to meet Data Quality Criteria for SDG indicators

3. A two page summary paper on the above topics

For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

UNCEEA-10-3.a_Rev1_Clean.docx

UNCEEA.10.3b_ Rev1_Clean.docx

SEEA and SDGs Note_Rev 1.docx

07 Sep, 2015

Topic 20: Address the issue of data disaggregation, and other cross-cutting issues such inequality, special groups etc.

Nicolas Fasel (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights)
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Data disaggregation is critical to honour the central commitment of the 2030 Agenda to "leave no one behind" and "to reach those left furthest behind first". Without disaggregated indicators, discrimination and inequality, and more importantly the efforts to remedy it, tend to remain undetected.

The indicators chosen to measure the SDGs should match the call made by States, such as in target 17.18 and paragraph 74 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, to disaggregate data by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability and geographic location, and other characteristics relevant in national contexts.

Disaggregation is not only essential for the effective implementation of the Agenda, it is also a human rights issue, impacting on the realisation of the rights of populations, whether visible or invisible statistically speaking. States have a legal duty to disaggregate data according to all grounds of discrimination prohibited by international human rights law. They have also the obligations to protect the rights of the concerned populations in their data collection and statistical work.

To ensure that relevant SDG indicators are consistent with the provisions on data disaggregation of the 2030 Agenda and under international human rights law, OHCHR is proposing that the following note or chapeau be included with the SDG indicators:

<u>Note on data disaggregation</u>: all relevant SDG indicators should be disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability and geographic location, and other characteristics relevant in national contexts, in line with all grounds of discrimination prohibited by international human rights law

For more information on a human rights-based approach to data disaggregation:

http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/MDGs/Post2015/DataDisaggregation.pdf

http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/DataDisaggregation.pdf

http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/MDG/Pages/MDGPost2015Agenda.aspx

28 Aug, 2015

Bela Hovy (DESA)
United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs

1. In their joint submission to the IAEG-SDGs, dated 15 May 2015, DESA (Population), IOM, the World Bank and the SRSG for migration have recommended that the following indicators should be disaggregated by "migratory status".

2. Disaggregation of these indicators by migratory status is essential for monitoring the (socio-economic) outcomes for, or well-being of, migrants compared to those of non-migrants. This should inform the achievement of the target 10.7 (well-managed migration policies).

3. In line with census recommendations, we propose to operationalize "migratory status" in two main ways, namely (1) *nativity status* (native-born/foreign-born) and/or (2) *citizenship status* (citizen, foreign citizen, stateless).

> 1.2.2: proportion of population living below national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age
> 2.1.1: Prevalence of population with moderate or severe food insecurity (based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale), disaggregated by displacement status
> 5.a.2: Proportion of population with an account at a formal financial institution, by sex and age.
> 8.5.2: Unemployment rate of population
> 8.8.2: Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries and time lost due to occupational injuries by gender
> 10.3.1: Percentage of population reporting perceived existence of discrimination based on all grounds of discrimination prohibited by international human rights laws.
> 10.4.1: Percentage of people covered by minimum social protection floor, that include basic education and health packages.
> 11.5.1: Number of people killed, injured, displaced, evacuated, relocated or otherwise affected by disasters, disaggregated by displacement status
> 16.2.2: Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 people.
> 16.9.1: Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority disaggregated by displacement status as well as nativity or citizenship status.

4. In addition, it has been suggested to disaggregate some indicators by "displacement status" (internationally displaced/refugee, internally displaced/IDP, not displaced).

02 Sep, 2015

Mary Mahy (UNAIDS)
As our colleague from OHCHR states, data disaggregation is fundamental for ensuring the sustainable development goals are met for all people. More nuanced data by different sub-populations, age-groups, sex, geographic sub-areas, migratory-status, etc can improve all development responses. For example, recent efforts to summarize data for specific sub-populations has been especially beneficial for focusing the HIV response (See 2014 UNAIDS Gap Report).

An emphasis on the importance of analysis and use of disaggregated data must be clearly presented in this framework.

However, it might be beneficial to take this proposal one step further: To avoid reporting-overload for countries, each target should have indicator-specific recommendations for what disaggregations

and which categories of the disaggregation are relevant and feasible. This will help countries prioritize what data they collect. The comment by Bela Hovy is nicely specific about which indicators should be disaggregated by migration status. Blanket statements might result in the disaggregations being ignored.

03 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

We share with you our comments about level of disaggregation of several indicators:

Goal 1:

For goal 1 it is possible to disaggregate the indicators by gender. However, it is essential check the representativeness of the results by age groups. In this line, it is suggested to use large groups for the indicator of target 1.2.

In addition, it is possible making certain types of disaggregation in the indicators which measure target 1.3, given the representation of data that comes from different modules of the same survey.

Goal 3:

For goal 3 it is showed the feasibility of making the indicator´s disaggregation which measures the target 3.7 for the following age groups (15-17; 15-19 and 18-19 years of age of the female teenager 10-14)

We suggest specify the type of disaggregation is required for indicators of target 3.3

Goal 4:

For goal 4 we propose to add an indicator to measure the target 4.1, considering symbolic years; in this way is possible to specify the students which have achieved at least one of the skills described in third and sixth grade.

Goal 5:

In the case of the indicator of goal 5 it is identified that 4 of the 14 indicators could be divided principally by the sex variable. However, in Ecuador it is not possible to calculate two indicators of the 4 aforementioned, because we don't have information for calculation.

Goal 6:

For the indicator for target 6.2, we suggest a disaggregation by sex and age groups. Furthermore, for the 6.3 target indicator we suggest a disaggregation by economic activity in wastewater treatment.

Goal 7:

Respect to goal 7, the indicator "sustainable access to modern energy," it is not possible to disaggregate because of the concept of modern energy; these refer to various types of energy such as electricity, fossil fuels, and others.

Goal 8

Respect to Goal 8, the indicators targets 8.5 and 8.7 can be disaggregated by sex and age. Meanwhile, the indicator 8.8 cannot be disaggregated by sex, because in Ecuador there is no information for it.

Goal 9:

In reference Goal 9 we thought the indicator resilient infrastructure, sustainable industrialization and innovation requires not be disaggregated into several indicators. Meanwhile, the indicator only target 9.c, population covered a mobile network can be disaggregated by type of technology.

Goal 11:

We suggest to disaggregate indicator of Target 11.2 by urban or rural population.

Goal 12:

We suggest disaggregating by segments of society that recycle, so that indicator of target 12.5 has more specification.

Goal 16:

For the goal 16 in the target 16.1, the indicator deaths by homicides can be disaggregated by age, sex, probable cause of death, weapon used, among others. Calculation of indicator about conflicted-related deaths is not feasible, because the topic is not frequently in Ecuador.

For target 16.3 it is possible to disaggregate by sociodemographic variables such as sex, age, education level and others.

For target 16.b we can get information by age, sex and region about person who has suffer any kind of discrimination.

Best regards,

José Rosero
INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Nicolas Fasel (OHCHR)
As the Global Migration Group Working Group on Human Rights and Gender has noted "A critical lack of data collection and disaggregation by migrant status conceals exclusion and inequalities and makes it difficult to measure progress and dismantle entrenched patterns of discrimination ... The post-2015 agenda could ensure systematic disaggregation of indicators by migrant status (i.e. nationality and migration status), in addition to disaggregation by age and sex in all relevant goals."

Migration status refers to the administrative status that the person holds in the country, i.e in the first instance whether the migrant is authorised to enter, stay and/or work according to the law of that State and to international agreements to which that State is a party.

The Global Migration Group has recognised the particular vulnerability of migrants who are in an irregular administrative status, noting that such individuals can be more vulnerable to unequal treatment and exclusion from development.

http://www.globalmigrationgroup.org/sites/default/files/uploads/GMG-Working-Groups-and-Task-Forces/Working-Group-on-Human-Rights-Gender-and-Migration/GMG-WG-HR-position-document.pdf

07 Sep, 2015

Live Margrethe Rognerud (Norway)
From Statistics Norway:

As a national statistical institute we are concerned that issus of confidentiality are not being addressed when such detailed break-downs of data are being required. This is a concern that we want to bring to everyone's attention.

With such detailed breakdowns the issue of data quailty also could be problematic.

07 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Live Margrethe Rognerud (Norway)

Emma Reilly (OHCHR)

This is indeed an important point. The human right to privacy of individuals must be protected in all cases, but there are existing good practices in compiling, processing and publishing disaggregated data while maintaining individual privacy. OHCHR is organising an expert meeting on human rights-based approaches to data which will cover these issues in more detail. We hope to present a guidance note on this and related issues at the next session of the IAEG in Bangkok.

07 Sep, 2015

Emma Reilly (OHCHR)
When considering disaggregation, OHCHR proposes breaking the targets down into 5 categories:

1. Targets that do not apply at national level (a very small number! An example would be targets relating to coastlines in a land-locked country);

2. Targets that have already been achieved at national level, where monitoring will be to ensure there is no retrogression;
3. Targets that require legal, policy or institutional reform at the national level;
4. Targets that require monitoring of gradual progress over time at the national level;
5. Targets that require international cooperation to monitor.

Most targets in categories 1-3 would not require disaggregation. Only around 50 targets potentially fall within the fourth category, where disaggregation at the national level would be required. These targets should indeed be disaggregated by relevant population groups to enable the detection of possible discrimination. States have already recognised in the draft 2030 agenda that this disaggregation is vital, and in target 17.18 they commit to enhancing capacity strengthening support to developing countries to improve disaggregation. The challenge for the members and observers of the IAEG is to make this happen.

07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Eurostat comments:

The draft outcome document "Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for sustainable development" states in point 74.g that the review process will be based on "… data disaggregated by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location …".

This request is crucial for the criteria that no one should be left behind. At the same time, breakdown requirements have an important impact on data availability and the costs of data production.

We therefore suggest showing the disaggregation requirements as a separate part in the SDG indicator lists, indicating for each target which of the types of disaggregation according to point 74.g :

- is part of the target and is therefore mandatory for monitoring (e.g. target 4.5)

- is not requested in the target (e.g. 7.3)

This approach would allow identifying in a specific and efficient way the data needs and data gaps and would help setting priorities. It allows also an easy selection of relevant indicators to tackle cross-cutting issues such as inequality, special groups etc.

07 Sep, 2015

Tarek AbouChabake (UNHCR)

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

As colleagues from OHCHR and DESA have noted, disaggregation of data is crucial to avoid not to leave anyone behind. The soon to be adopted Declaration makes clear reference to the inclusion of refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons in the SDGs. However, in the absence of targets or indicators specifically dedicated to monitor such population groups, disaggregation of data by displacement status will be essential. UNHCR certainly agrees that not all indicators need to be disaggregated to the very last variable as it may lead to "disaggregation fatigue" and thus to actually leaving some groups behind. As others in this forum have stated, the proposal to specify disaggregation requirements per target and indicator is a good approach.

07 Sep, 2015

Claire Plateau (France)

Disaggregation according urban/rural is requested for many indicators. The definition should be clarified. At European level, current developments on territorial nomenclatures are moving towards a classification based on density areas which are measured continuously with grids. We should also be aware that territory disparities are not limited to urban/rural disparities.

Disaggregation by race/ethnie. Some countries are not allowed to produce ethnic statistics because the law in their country prohibit them. Therefore, they will not be able to disaggregate data by ethnic group. A proxy, which is also a more objective measure could be the country of birth and the country of birth of parents

09 Sep, 2015

Topic 21: Identify interlinkages across goals and targets with the purpose of reducing the total number of indicators, using text and scientific analysis

Claire Plateau (France)

Dear all

I would like to share with you a SDSN contribution for the interlinkage analysis .

The SDSN paper provides a pragmatic approach to the question of inter-linkages. It does not examine causal relationships (for instance the "nexus" approach) but looks at dimensions of sustainable development with shared measurement approaches, which will not only encourage cross-sectoral monitoring and collaboration, but will help to ease the total number of indicators, that countries are expected to compile.

More specifically, the paper suggests considering whether the target is measuring inputs, outputs, or outcomes. The indicator chosen should attempt to reflect the target's ambition, whether on process or final outcome. Then the paper considers the core, underlying issue to be measured, before framing the best possible corresponding indicator.

This streamlined approach focuses on the core dimension at the heart of each target, and ensures that each and every issue covered is addressed by one or more indicators. It also helps to ensure that all targets are treated equally. In practice, due to the complex and multi-issue nature of the targets, some targets will be tracked by several indicators, without increasing the overall number of global indicators, as illustrated below.

Here, I attached the SDSN document

150816 Identifying inter-linkages - SDSN Briefing for IAEG.docx

All the best

Claire Plateau (France)

01 Sep, 2015

David Muñoz (Ecuador)

We identify the following interlinkages among indicators for targets:

GOAL 1

- The indicator of the target 1.1 is linked to target 1.2
- The indicator of the target 1.2 is linked to target 1.1
- The indicator of the target 1.3 is linked to target 10.4

- The indicator of the target 1.4 is linked to targets 10.4 and 5.a

GOAL 2

- The indicator of the target 2.1 is linked to target 2.2
- The indicator of the target 2.4 is linked to target 15.3

GOAL 3

- The indicator of the target 3.1 is linked to targets 3.7 and 3.8
- The indicator of the target 3.3 is linked to targets 3.1, 3.2 and 10.2
- The indicator of the target 3.8 is linked relates to target 10.4 partially.

GOAL 4

- The indicator of the target 4.2 is linked to target 10.4
- The indicator of the target 4.4 is linked to targets 8.5 and 8.6
- The indicator of the target 4.7 is linked to targets 1.5 and 13.3

GOAL 5

- The indicator of the target 5.2 is linked to targets 5.1 and 16.1
- The indicator of the target 5.3 is linked to targets 5.2 and 5.1
- The indicator of the target 5.6 is linked to target 3.7
- The indicator of the target 5.a is linked to target 1.4

GOAL 6

- The indicator of the target 6.2 is linked to targets: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 11.1
- The indicator of the target 6.3 is linked to targets: 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.4, 11.1, 11.3, 11.6
- The indicator of the target 6.4 is linked to targets: 2.4, 9.4, 12.2, 12.3, 15.1.
- The indicator of the target 6.6 is linked to targets: 11.5, 11.7, 12.2, 14.1, 14.2, 15.1, 15.2.

GOAL 8

- The indicator of the target 8.3 is linked to targets: 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 6.4, 11.1, 11.3, 11.6
- The indicator of the target 8.2 is linked to target 8.5
- The indicator of the target 8.6 is linked to targets 4.4, 8.5 and 8.b
- The indicator of the target 8.7 is linked to target 4.1
- The indicator of the target 8.b is linked to targets 8.3 and 8.6.

GOAL 9

- The indicator of the target 9.1 is linked to target 11.2
- The indicator of the target 9.4 is linked to target 8.5.1
- The indicator of the target 9.5 is linked to targets 2a, 12a, 14a

GOAL 10

- The indicator of the target 10.3 is linked to targets 10.2 and 16.b.
- The indicator of the target 10.6 is linked to targets 16.7 and 17.10

GOAL 11

- The indicator of the target 11.5 is linked to targets 1.5 and 15.3. Also, the indicator proposed is the same indicator of the target 13.1
- The indicator of the target 11.6 (first indicator) is linked to targets 12.3 and 12.5
- The indicator of the target 11.6 (second indicator) is linked to target 3.9
- The indicator of the target 11.b is linked to target 13.3

GOAL 12

- The indicator of the target 12.5 is linked to target 11.6
- The indicator of the target 12.6 is linked to target 12.8
- The indicator of the target 12.7 is linked to targets 8.4 and 12.2

GOAL 13

- The indicator of the target 13.1 is linked to target 14.2. Also, the indicator proposed is the same indicator of the targets 1.5 and 11.5

GOAL 14

The indicator of the target 14.5 is linked to targets 14.2 and 15.1. Also, the indicator proposed is the same indicator of the target 15.4

GOAL 15

- The indicator of the target 15.1 is linked to target 6.6
- The indicator of the target 15.2 is linked to target 15.3
- The indicator of the target 15.3 is linked to targets: 1.5, 2.3, 2.4, 6.6, 12.2, 13.1, 14.1, 15.1, 15.2 and 15.5
- The indicator of the target 15.5 is linked to targets: 1.5, 15.5, 12.2, 12.4.
- The indicator of the target 15.a is linked to target 1.a.

GOAL 16

- The indicator of the target 16.1 is linked to target 5.2
- The indicator of the target 16.2 is linked to targets 5.2 and 10.3

Best regards, José Rosero INEC-ECUADOR

05 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from David Muñoz (Ecuador)

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
We UNISDR agree with your analysis. That is a reason why we propsoed "multi-purpose indicator" to monitor several targets.

The same indicators are repeatedly suggested over several targets, just because their being multi-purpose indicators.

For example,

Agriculture loss to monitor 2.4 and 15.3

-->Your analysis:The indicator of the target 2.4 is linked to target 15.3

Disaster related loss to monitor 1.5, 11.5 and 13.1

--> Your analysis: The indicator of the target 11.5 is linked to targets 1.5 and 15.3. Also, the indicator proposed is the same indicator of the target 13.1

Best regards,

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
Dear Members and observers of the IAEG-SDGs,

We submitted our proposal for disaster-related indicators to contribute to SDG indicator discussion in this web-forum on 31 August. While we analysed all proposed indicators from the perspective of the interlinkages across goals and targets, we proposed the following indicators as "multi-purpose indicators" expressing strong inter-linkages across several targets. The suggested indicators are all already included in the list under consultation (the list as of Aug 11). They include:

Targets 1.5, 11.5, 13.1 and 14.2 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of deaths and missing due to hazardous events per 100,000.

- Number of affected people due to hazardous events per 100,000 (*can be combined with the above indicator*)

- Direct economic loss due to hazardous events in relation to global gross domestic product.

Target 2.4 and 15.3 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Direct agricultural loss due to hazardous events *(agreed to merge with FAO indicator)*

Target 13.3 and 15.3 (as "multi-purpose indicator")

- Number of countries that have multi-hazard early warning system

- Number of countries that have multi-hazard national risk assessment with results in an accessible, understandable and usable format for stakeholders and people

Details: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/UNISDR input to SDG indicators (Aug2015).xlsx

(I attach the link to dropbox. The function of attaching the file or link did not work from my computer.)

"Multi-purpose indicators" to express inter-linkage between the SDG Targets

The SDG goals and targets are inter-linked. This is supported by texts such as "sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent. (Para 13 in the SDG, finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

The 1st IAEG Report concludes that *there also appeared to be broad agreement among Member States that the number of global indicators should be limited and should include multi-purpose indicators that address several targets at the same time*. (Para7-1 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3))

Building on the SDG and IAEG discussion, we proposed the same indicators for several targets under different goals. For example, human related loss and economic loss indicators to monitor 1.5 (vulnerability and resilience), 11.5 (disaster loss), and 13.1 (climate change impact). In the 1st IAEG, the Secretariat of UNDESA (UNSD) provided an illustration of links between targets and introduced this human loss indicator as an example of multi-purpose indicators.

While we understand the IAEG promotes one indicator per target, mechanically applies the principle to all targets might lose the important spirit of each target. The 1st IAEG Report also concludes that *while the number of global indicators must be limited, some targets might require multiple indicators to measure its different aspects* (Para7-2 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3). For example, in the target 11.5, "number of death" "number of affected people" and "economic loss" are critical elements and it would be extremely difficult to monitor all elements if we need to select only one indicator.

We have proposed the same indicators for several targets. By this way, while the number of indicator per target might be more than one, the total number of indicators does not increase, or even less than the case for one indicator/target. (e.g. if we select the same 2 indicators for 3 targets, total number of indicators will be two). We believe the multi-purpose indicators will be the only solution to reduce the total number of indicators while allowing several indicators per target not to lose important elements included in each target.

We appreciate your attention.

Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
UNISDR
07 Sep, 2015

Simon-Johannes Bley (Eurostat)
Eurostat comments:

Eurostat submitted an evaluation of interlinkages across goals and targets in a former review of the SDG indicator list. These comments are well reflected in the list of indicator proposals of 11 August 2015.

Our impression from this evaluation is that inter-linkages do not necessarily allow reducing the total number of indicators. They are more promising in view of scientific analysis of specific issues.

The purpose of reducing the total number of indicators might be achieved in a better way by identifying simple targets which address only one single issue, for example target 7.3 "By 2030, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency". For such targets, the global monitoring could be consistently limited to one single indicator. These targets will in general only need one indicator.

Complex multidimensional targets which address several issues, however, will generally require more than one indicator, for example target 9.2 "Promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and, by 2030, significantly raise industry's share of employment and gross domestic product, in line with national circumstances, and double its share in least developed countries".

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find a contribution from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) relevant to this topic. The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators for all goals, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. The second tab presents the grouping of the relevant indicators into a matrix form, organised by theme and by "type" of indicator.

For ease of reference please note that all of the various UNCEEA inputs are also included under topic 22.

Regards,

Broad Brush_v2.xlsx

07 Sep, 2015

Topic 22: Provide any additional comments/proposals on the indicator framework that you believe would be useful to the work towards developing an indicator framework.

Lisa Grace Bersales (Philippines)

From Lisa Bersales of the Philippines:

My staff and I reviewed the indicators from Goals 1 to 17 and came up with a list of indicators we find to be

"Critical/Imperative to remain in the existing list" and those which "Should have been included but were missed out".

Below is the background document on how we did the review. I shall put in the next post the two lists mentioned above.

See attachments:

[Assessment of proposed SDG indicators (priority and missing).pdf](#)

[Annex 1_SDG Matrix_with updates, 21aug15.xlsx](#)

GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED GOALS, TARGETS, AND INDICATORS

FOR THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

Background

This document provides a (general) assessment on the proposed goals, targets, and indicators for the sustainable development agenda, particularly focusing on the Philippine Statistics Authority's perspective on the following:

- Indicators **already in the proposal** whose inclusion in the list is perceived to be imperative;
- Indicators **not included in the proposal** whose inclusion in the list is perceived to be necessary;
- Among others.

This assessment is being done per request of the National Statistician.

Considerations during the Assessment

Perspective is mainly from the PSA, which may be "liberally" regarded as a possible representative of the views of national statistical systems from developing countries.

The assessment will also draw on earlier assessment/review exercises requested by various international organizations and/or development partners (e.g., FOC of the UN Statistical Commission, UNSD, among others).

The assessment contains two parts: 1) an overall/macro-level view/perspective in terms of the indicators that should be included and might have missed; and 2) technical/micro-level details of these indicators.

In the selection of the aforementioned indicators, the following, among others, were considered:

6.1 National priority indicators as provided in the national development agenda;

6.2 Indicators that have clearly demonstrated its actual policy/program use (i.e., **useful statistics** in its truest sense);

6.3 Feasibility of monitoring the indicators (e.g., availability and/or established methodologies); and

6.4 Past and current experience in monitoring the MDGs.

Assessment done is purely from a statistical perspective.

General Assessment

Learnings from the MDGs in terms of MDG indicators that delivered the largest (and smallest) impact

Much has been said, analyzed, written, and discussed on the progress of achieving the MDGs through the indicators. Learning from these comprehensive and extensive work, for the selection of indicators that must be included in the list as well as those that have been missed out, two things may possibly be considered:

1. Priority will be given on indicators that are deemed to deliver or monitor high-impact results/progress; and
2. Priority will be given on indicators with little progress or those that may be considered as "unfinished business" of the MDGs.

Selection of core indicator(s) that would generally represent the Goal of interest

The **MDG framework has 8 goals, 21 targets, and 60 indicators; but many national statistical systems, especially from developing countries, faced and/or are continuously facing difficulty monitoring some of these.**

On the other hand, **the initial sustainable development agenda has proposed 17 goals, 169 targets and 304 indicators** [1] may be reasonably regarded as challenging to monitor for national statistical systems, especially among Least Developed Countries (LDC). Thus, it may be deemed critical to identify a core set of indicators per Goal (say, at least two indicators) that would generally represent the Goal of interest. In this way, national statistical systems can be guided as to the prioritization of the generation of indicators per Goal. Further, this can result to greater comparability across countries in the world (with the assumption that most of these countries are all able to monitor at least the two core indicators per Goal).

Subnational monitoring of the proposed indicators should be consciously considered.

In the proposed 304 SDG indicators, the PSA appreciates the focus on inequalities as demonstrated by the desired disaggregation of most proposed indicators. For example,

- *Target 1.1. Proposed Indicator 1, Proportion of population below $1.25 (PPP) per day,* requires for its disaggregation **by sex** and **age group**;
- Target 1.3. 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 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

However, for the country to achieve its target by 2030, progress should first be achieved at the local level – and this makes it imperative for countries to likewise monitor the SDG indicators at the subnational level.

Hence, subnational monitoring of highly disaggregated indicators may be regarded as a challenge but should be consciously considered in the selection of indicators that must be included and are deemed missing in the current list.

Assessment of Specific Indicators

A data assessment on the proposed indicators was conducted focusing on the PSA's perspective on the following:

- Indicators already in the proposal whose inclusion in the list is perceived to be imperative;
- Indicators not included in the proposal whose inclusion in the list is perceived to be necessary.

[1] As of February 2015.

31 Aug, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)
Dear Colleagues,

As we enter the final round of consultations ahead of the second IAEG-SDG meeting, I wish to inform you that the Chief Statisticians of the UN System have launched an initiative for strengthening UN coordination on SDG indicators. This initiative aims to develop a unified proposal for the SDG indicators on behalf of the entire UN System with a view to helping countries in their deliberations. A coordinator has been designated for each Goal with the task of reviewing the proposals from

different UN entities and advancing consensus in areas where different proposals exist. The first draft of the revised list of SDG indicators will be posted on this forum on 4 September.

With best regards,

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

Chair of the Chief Statisticians of the UN System

24 Aug, 2015

Lisa Grace Bersales (Philippines)
To Pietro Gennari

Chair of the Chief Statisticians of the UN System

Dear Pietro,

As Co-Chair of the IAEG on SDG Indicators, I would like to extend my appreciation and offer some points of reflection in relation to the initiative launched by you as Chair of the Chief Statisticians of the UN System.

In particular, I very much appreciate the efforts to coordinate and advance the discussion among the statistical experts from the various UN System agencies. This certainly represents a welcome contribution to clarify and resolve important issues related to the proposed list of indicators.

At the same time, however, I would like to stress that importance of making sure that contributions to the current process of consultation take place on this platform, which is the process established by our group, who has received the mandate to develop the list of global indicators.

As IAEG-SDGs we will consider and incorporate the inputs provided by all observers on the list of proposals as it appears in the version of 11 August.

Unfortunately, it might be difficult to take into account any further proposal that has not been through the open consultation process as established by the IAEG-SDGs.

I would therefore encourage everyone to submit inputs, comments and suggestions for modification on the current list of indicators to this platform, as soon as possible, so that they can be visible to everyone well before this phase of the consultation is concluded.

I would also like to invite comments from the other IAEG members on this particular issue.

Yours sincerely,

Lisa

Lisa Grace S. Bersales

National Statistician

Philippine Statistics Authority

31 Aug, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

Dear Lisa and Enrique,

Thank you for your message and for your appreciation of our work.

Please note that our work is based indeed on the table circulated by UNSD on 11 August. I would like to clarify that that table contained mainly input from UN Agencies; the same Agencies that now are trying to refine the proposal. As you know, for each target there were many alternative indicators proposed and the work we are doing now is to try to reach an agreement among the Chief Statisticians of the UN System on a reduced list of indicators.

We are also reviewing the tiers assigned to each indicator, we are providing more information on the existence of global monitoring programmes and we are commenting the allocation of priority/additional indicators in light of the experience accumulated when managing global/regional statistical indicators.

Many statistical programmes in UN agencies and other international organizations have greatly contributed to this exercise. We have reached a common view on almost all targets.

We hope that you and the IAEG will consider this as a useful input for your deliberations. We hope to be able to post our input on this platform by 4 September.

Best regards

Pietro

02 Sep, 2015

Enrique Ordaz (Mexico)

Dear Lisa, Pietro,

So far the consultation process in Mexico, in the countries of Central America and most likely in all the region, has been conducted using as reference the list provided by the UNSD. It is not clear to me what a **unified proposal for indicators** means. It seems to be a new (and surely different) list from the one with which we have been working with all our colleagues. It would be better to receive comments and suggestions on the list currently under discussion, instead of having a new list by the UN System.

 Regards

31 Aug, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

Dear Lisa and Enrique,

Thank you for your message and for your appreciation of our work.

Please note that our work is based indeed on the table circulated by UNSD on 11 August. I would like to clarify that that table contained mainly input from UN Agencies; the same Agencies that now are trying to refine the proposal. As you know, for each target there were many alternative indicators proposed and the work we are doing now is to try to reach an agreement among the Chief Statisticians of the UN System on a reduced list of indicators.

We are also reviewing the tiers assigned to each indicator, we are providing more information on the existence of global monitoring programmes and we are commenting the allocation of priority/additional indicators in light of the experience accumulated when managing global/regional statistical indicators.

Many statistical programmes in UN agencies and other international organizations have greatly contributed to this exercise. We have reached a common view on almost all targets.

We hope that you and the IAEG will consider this as a useful input for your deliberations. We hope to be able to post our input on this platform by 4 September.

Best regards

Pietro

02 Sep, 2015

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

The following are the comments from INDEC (Argentina) on this topic:

Answering procedure

Taking into account that the request related to the assessment of the SDG indicators (in total, 205 indicators) was received by the INDEC's authorities on Tuesday 25th August, and having an answering deadline by the 31st of August, so due to lack of enough time, the INDEC will not be able to conduct **a new consulting round within the organizations that composes the Argentine National Statistical System (SEN).**

Therefore, the INDEC is answering the aforementioned request **based upon the availability (or not) of the included indicators.**

 Sincerely,

Ana Nora Feldman (Argentina)

02 Sep, 2015

Fabiola Riccardini (Italy)

Dear Members and Observers,

As ISTAT (Italy) was designed to represent the South European Countries at the IAEG-SDGs a particular effort was undertaken to collect the opinions of the other South Europe Countries. To this purpose on July 16th the Statistical Agencies of 13 countries were invited to give inputs and observations on the List of Proposals (7July2015). At the moment 6 countries answered:

1) National Statistical Institute - Spain (reply of July 27th). Spain due to short time frame consultation sent few comments hereafter (file)

2) State Statistical Office - Republic of Macedonia (reply of August 14th): (file)

3) Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (reply of August 28th): (file)

4) Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) (reply of August 31st): (file)

5) Statistics Portugal (reply of August 31st): (file)

6) Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina (reply of September 2nd): no specific position on these indicators

In their replies there are many interesting suggestions to the more inclusive ongoing discussion process about the SDGs global indicators list.

Best Regards.

03 Sep, 2015

Hubert Escaith (WTO)
General WTO comments:

We would like to provide WTO general comments here. We reviewed the 11 August list of trade related indicators and compared it to the original list which was jointly proposed by UNCTAD, UN-ITC, World Bank and WTO. We believe that the final list should remain as close as possible of the initial one, which was based on both substantive relevance and statistical feasibility.

- On substantive ground, some of the additional suggestions, such as production subsidies, if implemented indiscriminately, may have adverse effect on environment or create negative externalities for neighbouring countries.
- From a statistical perspective, we are surprised by the negative assessment given to the feasibility of trade-related indicators. We understand that a "C" grading refers to feasibility. Many of the trade indicators that were graded "C" for feasibility in the August 11 document do exist and have been routinely compiled by international organizations for many years; actually, some of them are derived from the MDG monitoring exercise. Indeed, when the

four agencies met to prepare our initial list of indicators, we took care of proposing indicators which were doable on the basis of our current and future statistical programmes. In general, the WTO tends to support monitoring on the basis of observable data (tariffs, trade flows) rather than synthetic indicators derived from general or partial equilibrium models, unless there is a consensus on the methodology and the parameters used for calibration (a big "if", considering the wide range of econometric estimates produced by researchers for relatively "simple" parameters such as import elasticity of demand).

04 Sep, 2015

Cara Williams (Canada)
Dear Colleagues

Canada is submitting further comments and suggestions related to the proposed indicators for Goals 1 -17. The attached document provides findings from our examination of the adequacy and relevance of proposed indicators and mapping to frameworks. It further suggests indicators for consideration to ensure adequate measurement of targets.

Our consultations took place within the National Statistical System and also with relevant Government Departments and Agencies. SEPT7 Deadline Canada OGD Consult IAEG.xlsx

04 Sep, 2015

Fabiola Riccardini (Italy)
Dear Members and Observers,

ISTAT is submitting comments related to proposed list of indicators of the 11 August for Goals 1-17. The document takes in consideration only evaluations coming from our Institute, without having the possibility to contact Ministries and Agencies at this time.(file)

Best Regards
Fabiola Riccardini (Italy)
Italian Statistical Institute

04 Sep, 2015

Enrique Ordaz (Mexico)
I am submitting the comments received from the consultation conducted within the Mexican Statistical System on the list of indicators from August 11th, concerning goals 1-17. The file is in the attachments list.

Mexico comments to list Agust 11 2015.docx

05 Sep, 2015

Pietro Gennari (FAO)

Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG

5 September 2015

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/Contribution of UN Statistical System Orgs to the work of the IAEG_submitted by FAO.zip

The above link contains under each Goal the list of indicators proposed by the Chief Statisticians of the UN and other international organisations. This list is based on the table disseminated by UNSD on 11 August 2015 which compiled proposals by many of the same agencies that are submitting this revised list. Overall, only a few changes were introduced in the table. In particular, the 11 August table was further refined in order to keep the number of indicators for each target to a minimum and to meet the criteria of feasibility, availability, relevance and methodological soundness.

Suggestions include: i) reduction of the number of priority indicators and, for few targets, modification of the priority indicators; ii) distinction between priority and additional (optional) indicators; iii) refinement of the classification in tiers; and iv) provision of additional information on the existence of global monitoring systems and on indicators' relevance.

The comments reflected in the attachment are the results of extensive consultations among global/regional statistical programmes which have specific expertise on areas covered by each goal, but all the Chief Statisticians of the UN System reviewed the submission and approved it.

We have also uploaded our comments for each Goal under the relevant topic.

http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/open-consultation-iaeg/Contribution of UN Statistical System Orgs to the work of the IAEG_submitted by FAO.zip

06 Sep, 2015

Wasmalia Bivar (Brazil)

Dear Members and Observers,

The following are the assessments collected by Brazil up to the present date as a representative of MERCOSUR countries and Chile.

The document comprises comments from Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay. Brazil has incorporated the evaluation made by its national institutions responsible for information management related to each theme.

Consultations and discussions at national level in these countries are still ongoing. Therefore, they are not complete and it was not possible to propose indicators in order to cover all situations in which were identified objections to the indicators initially proposed.

Besides that, although the document registers the main agreements and disagreements between countries, it is required a deeper overview on the common aspects resulting from this regional evaluation round.

We believe that countries will continue working in the perspective that the chosen indicators represent adequately the Post-2015 Agenda.

Brazil Assessment IAEG SDGs.pdf

Yours sincerely,
Wasmália Bivar
Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics - IBGE
06 Sep, 2015

Reply to comments from Wasmalia Bivar (Brazil)

DorianKalamvrezos Navarro (FAO)
Dear Ms. Bivar,

Thank you for sharing Brazil's assessment. On page 4 you comment on the need to meet minimum requirements adopted by international recommendations and statistical/technical good practices, with respect to sampling methods, using as an example the "Prevalence of population with moderate or severe food insecurity, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES).

FAO would like to address this concern by IBGE, by clarifying that:

a) Whenever national official data on food insecurity experiences, collected through food security experience-scales such as those in use in the US, Canada, Mexico, Brazil and other countries in Latin America are available, the indicator is compiled by FAO using those national data;

b) When no suitable national data are available, FAO uses data collected through the Gallup® World Poll™, after having verified that, indeed, sampling methods used do conform to best practice. This include verification that the sampling design in each country is based on available population sampling frames from national statistical institution, and that the sample selection follows appropriate statistical procedures. Gallup® is bound by contractual agreements with FAO to provide all necessary information for the verification that the procedures used in selecting the sample indeed conform to the highest possible standards;

c) FAO encourages and promotes the inclusion of the FIES survey module – or of other compatible food security scales, such as the HFSSM or the ELCSA, within large scale, national household or individual surveys conducted by national statistical agencies in order to obtain the data needed to inform the estimator.

Further on page 4, you also comment that: "the use of mathematical and/or statistical models to calculate indicators must also be *disregarded*, since *any* model is developed according to a given set of assumptions and relatively arbitrary parameters".

We wish to clarify that the statement, as it is, is rather generic and that the suggestion of disregarding *any* statistical model would lead to the impossibility to compute meaningful indicators. Even if it were assumed that elementary data could be obtained with no error, with the possible exception of census type data collection with full enumeration of the target population, statistical models are indispensable to produce *any* indicator that applies to the reference population. Moreover, statistical methods are usually necessary to quantify and minimize the likely impact of both sampling and non-sampling errors on the final indicator values. Contrary to the implied preoccupation that informs the statement, it is the *absence of a proper statistical model* in informing an indicator that creates arbitrariness, variability and the impossibility to harmonize measures across countries. The presumption that meaningful indicators could be produced by simple arithmetic computation from primary data collected through censuses or surveys without any statistical treatment is actually a very dangerous one. Models based on sound statistical inference theory are essential, and their use should be broadly promoted, as they are the only instrument to ensure a sufficient degree of reliability and comparability of indicators, which should always be seen as *estimates* of the likely true value of the variable of interest.

It is true, though, that only models demonstrated to be theoretically sound and robust to empirical application in a broad range of settings should be used and that their use in computing indicators should be fully documented, so that the published estimates should always be fully replicable from available microdata.

Further, on pages 4-5, you state "Some information will only be available when carrying out census operations. Example: those related to decennial agricultural census […] to obtain data on [establishment area information, its size and owner's gender. Examples are: Target 2.3 – Indicator "Value of production per labor unit […]".

The statement points to what is often the *current* situation, where no system of agricultural *surveys* is in place, and therefore where information on agricultural establishments is update only every decade or so, in occasion of new agricultural census. As documented in the note describing the proposed indicator for Target 2.3., FAO suggests instead that a regular system of agricultural surveys is put in place to allow for more frequent update of several indicators on farm operations and agricultural practices.

Comments included in the table

Target 2.c. – Indicator of (food) Price Anomalies.

Your comment suggests that: "The knowledge of food market prices must be constructed by understanding the food prices variation in relation to the total variation of the consumer price index" and proposes using an indicator formed as a ratio of "Food price variation/Consumer price variation"

The comment and the proposal are affected by a confusion between the problem that exists with measuring and evaluating food price *levels* and that related with price *volatility*. While it is true that food price levels should always be correctly evaluated with reference to the general price level as measured for example by a consumer price index, it makes little sense

to create a ratio of volatility indexes as proposed. Such a ratio may be stable when both food prices and general consumer prices are highly volatile, and therefore would fail to function as an indicator of the proper functioning of food markets. On the other hand, the IPA can and should be applied to any relevant series of food prices, *including to series of relative prices of food*, to reveal conditions of market instability. In other words, your proposal should have been of an indicator of volatility of the ratio Food Prices/Consumer Prices, and not of the ratio of volatility, and the IPA can be used as an application of the former.

We hope you find these comments useful and we are at your disposal should you need further clarification.

FAO

08   Sep, 2015

Lisa Grace Bersales (Philippines)
Thank you very much for your inputs, Pietro. They are very helpful, indeed.

Thank you also, Enrique.

07 Sep, 2015

Lisa Grace Bersales (Philippines)
May I share this message to all, with my appreciation to NSOs/NSIs who have individually posted comments on our e-platform using the August 11 list of indicators. The Asia and Pacific countries will soon also share with all our regional input:

Dear Fellow Statisticians of National Statistics Offices and Institutes,

The active participation of various colleagues within and outside NSOs/NSIs in the work of the Inter-agency Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs) is most encouraging. This IAEG's mandate is to recommend a list of indicators for global monitoring and it operates under the following basic principles: (1) it is country-led, (2)it is inclusive; and, (3) it is transparent.

For efficiency of work and clear integration of comments, please post your comments on the e-platform of the IAEG using the list of indicators distributed on 11 August 2015. In this manner, your inputs will be visible to all.

Thank you very much,

Lisa

Lisa Grace S. Bersales
National Statistician, Philippine Statistics Authority
and co-chair, IAEG-SDGs

07 Sep, 2015

Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

General comments by UNISDR

We posted our specific proposal to each platform.

In general we think the following elements are important when selecting and developing indicators for the SDGs and would like to support further discussion among the Member States.

1. **Linkage of follow-up/review mechanisms between the SDGs and the relevant global monitoring mechanism**

The SDGs require that "data and information from existing reporting mechanisms should be used where possible". (Para 48 in the SDGs, the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). The coherence of the follow-up/review mechanism between the SDGs and other relevant mechanisms will minimize the reporting burden on countries and facilitate comparability and cross-analysis.

We would like to inform that in the field of disaster risk reduction policies, the Hyogo Framework for Action Monitor (HFA Monitor) and standardized national disaster loss database (using DesInventar methodology) have been global framework for monitoring progress. In March 2015, the Sendai Framework was adopted as the successor of the HFA and the discussion on how to make transition to new follow up mechanism is on-going. This is a great opportunity to develop consistent indicators.

2. **"Multi-purpose indicators" to express inter-linkage between the SDG Targets and to reduce the total number of indicators**

The SDG goals and targets are inter-linked. This is supported by texts such as "sustainable development recognizes that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, combatting inequality within and among countries, preserving the planet, creating sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and fostering social inclusion are linked to each other and are interdependent. (Para 13 in the SDG, finalized text for adoption as of 1 August).

The 1st IAEG Report concludes that *there also appeared to be broad agreement among Member States that the number of global indicators should be limited and should include multi-purpose indicators that address several targets at the same time*. (Para7-1 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3))

While we understand the IAEG promotes one indicator per target, mechanically applies the principle to all targets might lose the important spirit of each target. The 1st IAEG Report also concludes that *while the number of global indicators must be limited, some targets might require multiple indicators to measure its different aspects* (Para7-2 in Report of the First Meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on the Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (ESA/ST/AC.300/L3). For example, in the target 11.5, "number of death" "number of affected people" and "economic loss" are critical

elements and it would be extremely difficult to monitor all elements if we need to select only one indicator.

By introducing and identifying multi-purpose indicators with our best efforts, while the number of indicator per target might be more than one, the total number of indicators does not increase, or even less than the case for one indicator/target. (e.g. if we select the same 2 indicators for 3 targets, total number of indicators will be two). We believe the multi-purpose indicators will be the only solution to reduce the total number of indicators while allowing several indicators per target not to lose important elements included in each target.

3. **National ownership (Data should be produced at national level)**

It would be important to ensure that indicators selected will be informed by national data sources. We think this is consistent with the spirit of the SDGs that says "the global review will be primarily based on national official data sources" (para 74 (a) in the SDGs, in the finalized text for adoption as of 1 August). In this case, "national official data" should not be limited to "official statistics" directly managed by the National Statistics Office. Currently many important data are compiled and owned by sectoral ministries and agencies. Given that sustainable development is cross-cutting objective, it is more important that each country build cross-sectoral mechanism for reviewing the SDG progress. NSO will play an important role in coordinating these review process.

4. **Indicators measurable, clear-cut and easy to understand to all**

Letting alone indicators should be relevant to the targets, selected indicators should be examined from measurability perspective in technical and practical terms including data collection costs. The SDG Indicators should avoid ambiguity and multi-interpretation as much as possible. We think complicated composite index or indicator based on scientific modelling might not be necessarily appropriate as the SDG indicators.

We appreciate your attention.

Best regards,
Kazuko Ishigaki (UNISDR)
UNISDR
07 Sep, 2015

Alda Carvalho (Portugal)
Dear colleagues,

Concerning detailed comments on the list of indicators, please find attached our contribution to the list being developed by the IAEG-SDGs.

Statistics Portugal

PT_comments_SDGs_indicators.pdf

07 Sep, 2015

Andres Oopkaup (Estonia)
Dear Colleagues,

We have some general comments for the global indicators:

1. Almost half of the indicators require further development of regular basic statistics produced by national statistical organisations (at least in Estonia);

2. In order to be able to monitor the progress of achieving the SD goals and targets on national level measured by these indicators in period 2015-2030, national statistical offices also need to invest in new methods and analytical practices, which use has been foreseen in current set of indicators. In order to produce same statistics several indicators require application of additional methods;

3. The definitions of the indicators have to be clearly defined (see also the comments in the attached file);

4. In order to be able to produce regular quality statistics in all areas (covered by SDG indicator set) yet not covered by official statistics, the interagency collaboration with the producers of wide range of still non-official statistics has to be initiated on national regional levels as well.

Specific comments on single indicators set:

Proposed global indicators developed by IAEG-SDG were consulted with relevant government departments and Statistics Estonia experts as well. The results were assembled in Statistics Estonia. Attached file (List_of_Indicator_Proposals_Estonia_07_09_2015.xls) provides detailed comments and recommendations on a single indicator level and also some proposals of additional indicators and/or improvement actions. List_of_Indicator_Proposals_Estonia_07_09_2015.xlsx

Best regards,

Statistics Estonia

07 Sep, 2015

Fabiola Riccardini (Italy)
Dear Members and Observers of IEAG-SDGs,

here attached you can find comments on all goals from Montenegro, in the context of the South Europe countries consultation that ISTAT-Italy launched mid of July.

Comments- MONTENEGRO-SDG Indicators.doc

Best Regards
Fabiola Riccardini (Italy)
Italian Statistical Institute

07 Sep, 2015

Live Margrethe Rognerud (Norway)
From Statistics Norway:

Number of the indicators will need to be using geographical data combined with statitics. The work of the UN-GGIM expert group should be taken into consideration in the methodological developments for those indicators.

It should also be considered as relevant for point 10 in the introduction about the three tiers.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany 7 Sept 2015
Supra- & International Coordination,
Sustainable Development Goals
Annette Pfeiffer
Head of Section
annette.pfeiffer@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Discussion platform

Monitoring the Means of Implementation

One of the most important area, where we think there is an urgent need to develop a more sophisticated approach concern the development of the indicators for the means of implementation. At the moment, we are often missing suggestions for indicators which are able to measure the respective mean of implementation reasonable accurately. Nevertheless, we are sure there are promising approaches to work on in order to get a better quality in the monitoring of the means of implementation.

Within the SDG goals and targets the means of implementation play above all a political role. During the international negotiations, it was especially the Group of 77 that emphasized their particular importance. Subsequently, in the field of monitoring the SDGs, there is an *obligation to develop indicators for all 169 targets including all means of implementation*.

Compared with the other targets, the means of implementation are focusing more on *directions for political actions and means to achieve objectives set by the other targets*. To render visible the "different nature" of the means of implementation within the list, each of them is marked with a character, not with a numeral like all other targets (except goal 17, which is only made of means of implementation). Technically, the 59 means of implementation are input-oriented targets whereas the other 110 targets are more output-oriented.

Taking a closer look shows that there are differences regarding *the structure of the means of implementation* in between themselves. Essentially three different types of categories exist. Means of implementation …

1. … describing clearly defined spheres of activity, but there's no predefined target value. In the main, they can be realized through an investment of financial resources.

2. … describing clearly defined spheres of activity and there's a predefined target value as well. The way to realize the target value differs (e.g. financial resources, implementing a law or a conversation …).

3. … describing (first stage) that a kind of "political activities" countries have to be set up for (second stage) special objectives (=> double-stage structure). Such a political activity can be either to develop a political framework or pass a law or has to undertake reforms or set up strategies or something else. There is no information how these processes will be organised, more over each country will have its own way dealing with it (country driven process).

As mentioned above, we have noticed that a number of suggested indicators for the means of implementation (especially category 3) don't meet or not broad enough meet the requirements to monitor the target suitably. We think the often complex and double-stage structure of the means of implementation is one of the reasons for the difficulties. Adding supplementary "qualitative" information to the indicator could be an option in cases where they alone are not able to measure the level of target achievement sufficiently. To work further in this direction could become a promising approach.

07 Sep, 2015

Sven Christian Kaumanns (Germany)
Federal Statistical Office of Germany 07 September 2015
Environmental-Economic Accounts,
Sustainable Development Indicators
Sven C. Kaumanns (Germany)
Head of Section
sven.kaumanns@destatis.de

IAEG-SDG Observers: Open-Discussion platform

General comments of the Federal Statistical Office

Dear chairs, dear colleagues of the IAEG-SDG, and the UNSD as secretariat of the group,

1. Taking into account the summary of remarks and discussions made by the IAEG-SDG members in their discussion forum and the comments made by observers in the IAEG-SDG observers discussion platform;

2. Re-emphasising that the balanced consideration of all three dimensions on sustainability – economy, social and environment – is the key principle of the Post-2015 agenda and thus of the sustainable development goals;

3. Believing, that the indicator framework is mainly a tool to monitor and communicate the fulfilment of the goals and targets and less a tool for detailed and scientific analysis;

4. Understanding that goals and targets form a hierarchized concept; Indicators are required for both levels;

5. Claiming for harmonised but easy to communicate and (at least on goal level) comprehensive indicators;

6. Agreeing having harmonized indicators on international level and as far as necessary additional ones on regional and national level;

7. Calling for the national responsibility for at least the indicators on national level and on regional and international level where ever possible;

8. Seeing the need having a usable set of indicators soon;

9. Strongly demanding for headline indicators for each goal;

10. Underlining the need for caution if producing or communicating composite indicators;

11. Believing, that in general all states should be able delivering at least basic indicators regarding all goals and dimensions of sustainable development;

12. Acknowledging disaggregation could be important for analysing developments of indicators and thus can be seen as prerequisite for an effective implementation of the Post-2015 agenda it has to be addressed in an adequate manner.

I would like to adjust and complement our comments given on the IAEG-SDG Observers discussion platform as following:

1. We do believe that the indicator framework is mainly a tool to monitor and communicate the fulfilment of the goals and targets and less a tool for detailed and scientific analysis. For communication reasons the number of suggested indicators is far too big and "headline indicators" for each goal are missing. For detailed analysis individual studies using all available information should be more useful than sprawling, endless indicator lists agreed on lowest common denominator or being impossible to be filled by most states.

2. All three dimensions on sustainability – economy, social and environment – is the key principle of the Post-2015 agenda and thus of the sustainable development goals. However, not every goal or target refers every dimension, but the system of all goals together reflects this idea. Ideally, each dimension of a goal and target is covered by an indicator. This could mean using more than one indicator per target or leaving a dimension within a target tentatively blank, in cases no suitable indicator is available yet. However, by default every indicator reflects a dimension of sustainability stipulated by the referring target.

3. We see the need of having a usable set of indicators soon. Within time given, we will most probably not be able having a set of globally available indicators referring to every individual target on state-level. That is why we push the idea forward to start with only a limited number of well established, suitable, easy to understand and gain headline indicators for each goal. This would enable us having results taking into account all states rather soon without too much effort. These headline indicators could but do not necessarily have to be

an indicator referring to an underling target but could serve more than one goal. As first approach and starting point for discussion, we have attached a matrix of possible indicators for the seventeen goals taking into account all dimensions of sustainable development. Such system would allow us starting monitoring with a comparable set of indicators for as many as possible states. In cases, indicators for targets are already agreed and available they should be taken into account on the underling target level.

4. The process of defining indicators is not static but a process in motion. As following step indicators on target-level should complement the headline indicators as soon as more and more sophisticated indicators are made available by the NSOs.

5. On international level, harmonised indicators being as far as possible available on all territory levels (international, regional and national) should be used. Additional indicators to be calculated aside might be useful in different cases: Some NSIs might be able providing more sophisticated indicators for specific targets or some target might be adjusted on regional or national level meeting the individual requirements better. This might require adjusted indicators. In some cases, international indicators have a different referrer. This is necessary for some selected targets (e.g. fish stocks). However, whenever possible the regional and international indicators should be calculated out of the national ones and additional national or regional indicators should be calculated aside.

6. Composite indicators aggregating individual indicators of different nature and being measured in different units show numerous problems. First, the weighting of a composite indicator is never non-judgmental. Even using the same weight for all components is a kind of prejudice that has to be decided politically and not by statisticians. Second, a composite indicator might be popular in communication. However, it might lead to factoid impressions and its movement is never self-explaining. Third, a composite indicator can only be calculated if all its components are made available. An overarching, well-established single headline indicator (see c) does not have this problem. This is why we strongly underline the need for caution if producing or communicating composite indicators.

7. Job of an indicator is indicating the fulfilment of a specific goal or target. Disaggregated indicators normally do not point at the goal/target set by politics but on other targets stipulated by the variable used for disaggregation. As most goals and targets stipulate no disaggregation, no disaggregation of the indicators itself is needed, as long as this is not explicitly asked by the goal or target. Thus, detailed and multidimensional disaggregation must not be part of the indicator set but it should be part of detailed analysis to be implemented at a later stage.

8. Setting up, maintaining and running an indicator system measuring for 17 goals and 169 targets (eventually complemented by additional indicators for national and regional purposes) is a challenging job for every national statistical system. Thus, not only the suitability but also the feasibility of an indicator has to be a main criterion for its selection. In addition, the indicators for the targets should be limited to the lowest possible number.

9. In a previous exercise, indicators have already been rated by national statistical offices regarding their feasibility, suitability and relevance. In our opinion, only those indicators

fulfilling all three aspects ("triple A rating") or being least suitable and relevant but only feasible with strong effort should be put forward. In case no suitable indicator can be identified, we should be brave enough to leave a blank space and seek filling it at a later stage.

10. The United Nation Statistical Commission emphasized in its report on its forty-sixth session that the national statistical offices are to play the leading role in the development of the indicator framework. The indicator selection and especially a sound monitoring can only be done by independent entities – such as the statistical offices – and not by policy and interest driven organizations. Most proposed indicators in the list of July 7 as amended on August 11 are suggested by UN or other international organizations using their own data. These suggestions have been a good starting point for discussing indicators. Nevertheless, we understand that the indicator selection and monitoring should be a country driven process to be made by the statistical offices. Statistical offices can only guarantee for sound data quality and reliable indicators when data and definitions of – or at least approved by – the statistical system are being used for the monitoring process. Thus, as far as possible, national indicators and their aggregates should be used.

11. Within the SDG goals and targets the means of implementation (goal 17 and in total 59 out of the 169 targets) play especially a political role. We believe that this a most important area, where we think there's an urgent need to develop a more sophisticated approach concerning the development of the indicators to measure the respective mean of implementation reasonable accurately. Addressing this, we have analysed the three different types of means of implementation in a separate paper (uploaded in folder "topic 22")

12. Specific comments regarding single goals and their targets can be found in our remarks we have uploaded in the goal related folders.

Suggested headline indicator	Goal																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Percentage of wastewater safely treated						x											
Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption							x										
Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable level (int. level)														x			
Forest area as a percentage of total land area															x		
Traffic and settlement area per capita															x		
DMCabiotper capita												x					
GHG per capita												x	x				
GDP per capita	x							x	x	x							x
Percentage of GDP for R&D									x								
Gross capital formation per capita									x								
Manufacturing Value Added per capita									x								
Unemployment rate								x		x							
Illiteracy rate				x													
Gender pay gap					x					x							
Proportion of population living below national poverty line	x	x	x														
Life expectancy at birth	x	x	x														
Proportion of urban population living in slums											x						
Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water service						x											
Percentage of population with electricity access							x										
Homicide and conflict-related deaths per 100,000 people																x	
Victims of trafficking																x	
Percentage of ODA in GNI										x							x
Consolidated government debt in percentage of GDP									x							x	

Best wishes,
Sven
07 Sep, 2015

Maciej Truszczynski (Denmark)
General Comments from Denmark

Comments from the Ministry of Children, Education and Gender Equality on the general issue of gender mainstreaming of indicators:

The Ministry of Children, Education and Gender Equality would like to high-light the issue of gender mainstreaming of the indicators. Only certain indicators (mostly goal 1 on poverty) explicitly mention the disaggregation by sex. Several key indicators on hunger, health and education are not disaggregated by sex. The partial disaggregation by sex of the proposed list of indicators is worrying, since this seems to imply that the disaggregation by sex is not deemed relevant for the other indicators.

A Note on Disaggregation mentions: "All indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (U/R) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible." This Note on Disaggregation could work as an instruction for the elaboration of the list of indicators, but should not be included as such in the list itself.

The Ministry finds that all indicators at individual level need to be disaggregated by sex and this needs to be mentioned in the official name of the indicator. This needs to be done in order to ensure that the monitoring looks at the situation of both women and men and that difference in situation between women and men can be identified by people who are not gender experts.

The fact that certain data are not available by sex should not be seen as a reason to remove the mention 'by sex' but should be interpreted as a stimulus to improve the availability of these data. This will also help the achievement of target 17.18 that asks to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by gender.

In the light of the above comments the Ministry of Children, Education and Gender Equality does not find it necessary to give comments regarding gender equality on each of the indicators in the revised document.

Comments from Danish Ministry of Heath:

In general we recommend that indicators are continually coordinated with OECD-indicators or other international indicators (e.g. indicators collected by WHO) if such indicators exist.

General comments from Ministry of Foreign Affairs (UGS):

(regarding goal 3,4,5) Support for the suggestion that all indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence etc. While acknowledging the difficulties associated with the data situation the indicator framework should, however, not be bound by what we are able to measure at the present

moment but allow for new methodologies and improvements in the data situation over time. The establishment of proper baselines will also be crucial to be able to measure progress.

07 Sep, 2015

Thomas Brooks (IUCN)

IUCN strongly supports the approach of disaggregating multipurpose indicators to allow tracking of multiple SDG targets.

This would allow a great breadth of insight in tracking progress towards the SDGs, without incurring a proliferation of unconnected indicators.

Such an approach is reflected in the attached matrix SDG targets x indicators matrix.xlsx, which presents as an example the 169 SDG targets relative to the indicators proposed in the "Contribution of UN Statistical System organisations to the work of the IAEG", posted on 5 September by FAO (documenting each interlinkage specified in the final column of the 17 spreadsheets).

Such a presentation shows that multipurpose indicators offer a cost-efficient way of measuring progress, by harnessing indicators essential to track progress towards SDG target X to also track progress towards SDG targets Y, Z, etc. Such presentation could be used for any combination of targets and indicators.

In addition, such multipurpose indicators strengthen explicit integration of the targets.

07 Sep, 2015

Bert Kroese (UNCEEA)

Dear Members and Observers of the IAEG,

Attached you will find all the various contributions from the UN Committee of Experts on Environmental Economic Accounting (UNCEEA) for this round of consultations. In particular ,the three papers attached deal with the following topics:

1. SEEA and Transforming Global and National Statistical Systems for Monitoring SDG Indicators

2. The SEEA as a Statistical Framework to meet Data Quality Criteria for SDG indicators

3. A two page summary paper on the above topics

The excel sheet constitutes an initial "broad brush" analysis of the SDG indicators for all goals, which have the potential to be informed by the SEEA. The second tab presents the grouping of the relevant indicators into a matrix form, organised by theme and by "type" of indicator.

Regards,
SEEA and SDGs Note_Rev 1.docx
UNCEEA-10-3.a_Rev1_Clean.docx

UNCEEA.10.3b__Rev1_Clean.docx
Broad Brush_v2.xlsx
07 Sep, 2015

Claire Plateau (France)

Please find attached some comments from France on the proposed list of 11 August

Best regards
Claire Plateau
French_comments_7 September.doc

09 Sep, 2015

Wasmalia Bivar (Brazil)

As requested, Brazil would like to clarify that, in what concerns the assessment proposed by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics - IBGE related to the preliminary indicators of Sustainable Development Goals, the inputs sent by the National Institute of Statistics and Census (INDEC) of Argentina consisted only on an evaluation about the availability of indicators sources. Thus, those answers do not represent INDEC's approval or agreement with the set of indicators proposed.

This disclaimer has been included on the assessment document, substituting the following paragraph (page 52): "Argentina declared that there are no sources for 28 suggested indicators, listed below. The remaining indicators have been evaluated as "Agree" or are still being evaluated".

The updated version of the document follows attached on the message posted on 6th September.

Thanks for your comprehension.

Wasmália Bivar
Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics – IBGE

10 Sep, 2015

Anibal Sanchez Aguilar (Peru)

Target 22 : Provide any additional comments/proposals on the indicator framework that you believe would be useful to the work towards developing an indicator framework.

Comment:

- The number of proposed indicators is excessive.
- You must define a set of priority indicators to monitor them.
- Indicators must be clearly defined.
- Metadata should be developed for each indicator.

11 Sep, 2015

Hiroyuki Ikeda (MIC of Japan)

Japan would like to make the following comments:

- We find that it will be difficult for all the countries to report on all the suggested global indicators, as there are many indicators not for all countries but mainly for the specific countries or areas, among these suggested global indicators.
It should state that the targeted countries only report on the suggested indicators and not all the countries need to do so.

- Currently, it is not clear when the monitoring of the global indicators will start, nor how many-year cycle each monitoring period will have. It is necessary for the members of IAEG-SDGs to discuss these details.

- The suggested indicators have the descriptions such as "percentage of…" or "proportion of …" with many of them without the denominator. The denominator of the suggested indicator should always be made clear. (For example, as to a percentage of countries, it is not clear which is used as a denominator, the UN member states or all the countries in the world. The denominator can simply be stated as "number of countries".

- It is not clear who will have the responsibility over the collection and analysis of the data produced by each country. This unclear point should be discussed and made clear.

11 Sep, 2015

Palm Viveka (Sweden)
From Viveka Palm, Statistics Sweden

General reflections on policy vs statistics

We have been in contact with many policy institutions during the last months. There are some issues that would be good to reflect upon.

Going straight to discuss how to measure the policy targets in a comprehensive way, the existing statistics often falls short for a number of reasons. However existing data is also a blessing and a good starting point. For the global reporting the need for global data sets is then the main starting point.

1) The targets are formulated in words – the data needs to be much more specific. This is the only way to gather data in a harmonised fashion. So between the policy makers wish and the possible measurement there will often be a gap. The statistics strive to be objective and so they are sometimes hard to interpret in the indicator sense (Measuring the activities in the economy is not equivalent to measure 'Sustainable economy' for example.)

2) Having an existing proxy indicator based on already gathered statistics is a good start.

Designing new surveys or models take more time and needs more experimenting than what is often realised (several years on a national scale). Even to go from a national data set to a harmonised regional one takes a lot of work and to get to the global level even more so since the countries are more different then.

3) It is not always clear if the suggested indicators have a data set to back them up. For the process to go forward, we need to use existing data, and even existing statistics that have already been harmonised between (at least some) countries and tested in practice. Before the trends can be seen it is not really clear if the indicator can be followed-up. Even the areas where we know there is a genuine lack of statistics will need to start developing from some existing core of measurements. Here, the mapping exercise that the OECD has made this spring on available data versus the SDGs is very valuable for us, as it shows what harmonised data we already send in to their databases, and that they are experienced in interpreting. We hope this data can be used in the SDG global follow up.

4) The data can sometimes be found in analyses but might not come from statistics. If the data are from a specific scientific study and not repeated then they will not be available for follow-up or time trends. If they are regularly produced by organisation outside of the statistical systems then they may still be very useful if the quality can be described.

5) In order to make integrated analyses the experts and researchers have made models that are based on some data but often have to estimate a lot of data too. This imputation is needed to be able to get to a full description. So, even if we don't have data for a specific topic in the country, we may still be represented in the global picture. This is a fact of life and something to be thankful for, as it means we do not have to generate data for every issue. However, it is important for the countries to know about this when the data are being used in the SDG follow up. In the process such declarations will need to be set up. For nationally important issues, the capacity to generate own data should be encouraged for future measurement.

6) Some indicators that are suggested are very unlikely to come from the statistical system. In particular, the indicators that refer to the number of plans or initiatives for certain policies, are very far removed from statistical practices. They can still be part of the follow-up but would typically be initiated by other actors.

7) The call for disaggregated indicators on vulnerable groups needs to be taken seriously. For good reasons there are strong limits to what information can be part of a register with personal information in many countries. It will be needed to develop separate data sets on vulnerable groups that cannot be combined with other data so as to expose them to danger. Having statistics on the national legal system might sometimes be a way to investigate the situation for these groups, or setting up birth register systems that better include all the population but without noting sensitive data.

8) Many issues that are taken up but which do not really have the measurement ready could perhaps be seen as separate analyses rather than as indicators. For communication purposes the number of indicators is too big already and we keep getting requests for addition of new ones. We have asked people to think of ways of framing their policy issues so that they fit in this particular context rather than to have many separate components of policy relevant that you want to bring on.

9) At this stage in the process the framework needs to be a communication framework. For making better integrated analysis we need work on statistical analysis frameworks in the coming years. Such frameworks should then build on using already existing data production and be built by practical pilot studies, where analysis can be tested for its relevance with users.

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of the Office for National Statistics of the United Kingdom

Attached is the .pdf containing our assessment and views relating to the 'Open consultation on the development of a global indicator framework for the SDGs'.

List of Indicator Proposals_UK ONS_FINAL Submission v2.pdf

This response represents the views of the UK Government Statistical Service (GSS) as collected through consultation. Our technical assessment and views of indicators do not reflect the view of UK HM Government Policy Departments.

When considering our input, we ask you to note:

- There are considerable challenges to measuring at this level of detail in many countries. Even sex disaggregation is not straightforward as many SDG indicators use household surveys with information collected from the head of household, usually a man. But it is important to set a clear ambition in order to drive incentives to improve the availability and quality of disaggregated data, to ensure we can measure whether people are being left behind.
- Support for a supplementary indicator should not be taken as the 'UK's preferred indicator' unless we explicitly make this point.
- Given the timing of this consultation, not all GSS Departments had time to contribute to this consultation.

Yours faithfully
Sophie Elfar and Matthew Steel
Office for National Statistics, Post-2015 Coordination Team

11 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)
Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of African IAEG-SDG members.

Please find attached the first set of inputs/comments from Africa on the global indicators circulated by UNSD (as the secretariat of the IAEG-SDG). This was prepared by the seven IAEG-member states, Statistics South Africa (as the chair of ASSD) and supported by AUC, African Development Bank and ECA who met last week to undertake this exercise. The seven member states will now consult the

remaining countries in their respective regions following which a final set of comments/inputs from Africa will be provided to UNSD by 21st September 2015.

The member states have authorized ECA to submit the proposal on their behalf.

Best Regards

Raj Gautam Mitra
Chief
Demographic and Social Statistics Section
African Centre for Statistics
United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

First set of input by Africa IAEG-SDG member states.xlsx

14 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)

Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Please find attached comments from Australia. This is the coordinated input of the Australian Government.

Cover note Australian response to SDG indicators_Topics 18-22.docx

14 Sep, 2015

Luis Gonzalez Morales (Secretariat)

Posted by the Secretariat on behalf of Sudan Central Bureau of Statistics

SBS Sudan.docx

14 Sep, 2015

Appendix: Comments provided outside the Open Consultation Forum

Chris Murgatroyd (UNDP)

Many thanks for the opportunity to comment. The 7 July version of the List of Proposals contains significant changes to the "suggested indicator" for some targets of Goal 16. These new suggestions do not reflect the discussions in the TST Sub-Group for Goal 16, co-ordinated by designated co-chairs over a number of months, which fed in to the previous version of the List of Proposals. These discussions were open to all of the members of the Sub-Group (PBSO, EOSG/RoL, UNODC, UNDP, DPA, DPKO, ECA, ILO, IOM, ITU, OCHA, OHCHR, OSAA, UN Women, UNAIDS, UNCDF, UNCITRAL, UNEP, UNECE, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF), and were informed by other expertise, including the work of the Virtual Network on Indicators for Goal 16 (an online platform with more than 200 subscribers and around 50 active members from NSOs, civil society, academia and other groups). The Virtual Network report has been posted separately on this forum.

Accordingly, in each case below, the original TST suggestion is listed in bold and recommended to the IAEG in place of the current "suggested indicator" in the 7 July list:

16.3 - "**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 resolution mechanism**" instead of "percentage of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimisation to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict reduction mechanism". The suggestion prioritised in the 7 July List would introduce a narrow focus on criminal justice only, and displace an outcome focus on the rule of law and access to justice. A narrower focus on criminal justice only would not help to preserve the balance and ambition of the SDGs and targets.

16.6 - "**proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services**" instead of "percentage of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks (institutional and legislative) implemented, as identified through the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism". The suggestion prioritised in the 7 July List would introduce into 16.6 a narrow focus on anti-corruption only (and Target 16.5 already covers corruption specifically), and would displace an outcome focus on the quality of public services, and effective and accountable institutions. A narrower focus on corruption in 16.6 (as opposed to 16.5) would not help to preserve the balance and ambition of the SDGs and targets.

16.7 - "**percentage of population who believe decision-making at all levels is inclusive and responsive**" instead of "proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies" - the reference to "proportion of countries" does not make sense in this context.

Thank you

Chris Murgatroyd, UNDP

7 Aug, 2015

Carol Baker (IMF)

I am posting the following comments on behalf of my IMF colleagues Ali Abbas (Target 17.4) and Chris Papageorgiou (all other targets). They have cleared by Sean Nolan.

IMF comments on selected SDGs targets.docx

05 Sep, 2015

Yunhong Ba (China)

Comments on the list of indicators distributed on 11 August from NBS of China

After we received the list of indicators distributed by UNSD on 11 August, we have conducted wide-range consultation with the relevant subject-matter departments within NBS of China and line ministries and agencies of China, focusing on the feasibility, applicability and availability of the suggested indicators.

Following are our comments and suggestions on the list of indicators:

I. Data Availability

Of the 199 suggested indicators under evaluation, 52 indicators are available, accounting for 26.1%, 141 indicators are not available, accounting for 70.9%, 6 indicators are not relevant to China, accounting for 3%.

II. Main Problems existing in the suggested indicators

1. The definition, coverage or calculation methods of some indicators are not clearly defined, such as indicator under Target 1.4, 'Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services'.

2. For some indicators, we may have similar ones but different in definition, coverage or calculation method in China, such as indicator under Target 7.1, 'Percentage of population with electricity access'.

3. There are no relevant surveys or data sources on some indicators in China, such as indicator under Target 4.2, 'Percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being'.

4. There is no disaggregated data for some indicators, such as indicator under Target 5.b, 'Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex'.

5. Some indicators are not applicable to China, such as indicator under Target 8.a, 'Aid for Trade Commitments and Disbursements (CBB)'.

6. Some indicators cannot be quantified as they have been defined qualitatively, such as indicator under Target 15.3, 'Trends in land degradation'.

7. Some indicators consist of several sub-indicators, for which we are not able to provide all, such as indicator under Target 1.5, 'Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people'.

III. Suggestions

Indicators monitoring in global level should be less, precise, representative, reasonable and available, taking different statistical capacities and reduction of the burden of NSIs into account. Specific suggestions are as follows:

1. Further clarify the data sources of some indicators. It is better to distinguish for some indicators whether they are provided by the international organizations or NSIs, and for whom they are applicable including developed countries, developing countries, LLDCs and LDCs.

2. Further clarify definition, coverage or calculation methods of some indicators, to increase the availability of the list of proposed indicators.

3. Further evaluate the availability of all the indicators from the feedback submitted by various countries and take actions accordingly.

Comments on the list of proposals 11August2015 from NBS China.xls

13 Sep, 2015