


SDG16

Data Initiative

2017 Global Report



Social time as girls and boys collect water at dusk in Kuajok (South Sudan). With few functioning boreholes in Warrap, pressure on the ones that work can be intense. Disagreements escalate quickly and violence is not uncommon as families and communities step in to defend their side.
© Marcus Perkins

SDG16 DATA INITIATIVE 2017 GLOBAL REPORT

**View This Report Online:
www.SDG16Report.org**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2	Target 16.8	30
State of Goal 16 Data Availability for 2017 High Level Political Forum Countries Under Voluntary Review ...	6	Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance	
Target 16.1	8	Target 16.9	33
Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere		By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration	
Target 16.2	12	Target 16.10	36
End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children		Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements	
Target 16.3	15	Target 16.a	40
Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all		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	
Target 16.4	18	Target 16.b	43
By 2030 significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen recovery and return of stolen assets, and combat all forms of organized crime		Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.	
Target 16.5	21	Targeting the national level: using SDG16 data for local accountability ^{75...47}	
Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms		Endnotes	50
Target 16.6	24		
Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels			
Target 16.7	27		
Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels			

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



Men stand atop a car with a flag that says "PEACE" in Arabic and English.
© Al Jazeera English

In 2015, United Nations (UN) Member States unanimously adopted the 2030 Agenda, which includes 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The 2030 Agenda made peaceful, just and inclusive societies—captured in SDG 16—a global development priority. The SDG16 Data Initiative (SDG16DI)—a project that supports the open tracking of progress towards the twelve SDG16 targets through a consortium of the Global Forum for Media Development, Governance Data Alliance, Institute for Economics and Peace, International IDEA, Namati, Open Society Foundations, Peace Research Institute Oslo, Results for Development, Saferworld, Small Arms Survey, Sustainable Development Solutions Network, TAP Network, Transparency International, and the World Justice Project—is proud to present its inaugural Global Report. This is intended as the first in an annual series, with a report planned each year to assess global progress towards realizing the 2030 Agenda’s commitment to peaceful, just and inclusive societies.

The Global Report is intended to provide governments, UN officials, and civil society stakeholders with a resource that will help them track progress on SDG16 targets, and provide an evidence base to help policymakers identify gaps and shortcomings in both implementing and monitoring SDG16. Thus, the report assesses the measurable progress the world is making towards meeting the twelve targets under SDG16 based on the data available. It also considers the extent of data coverage, the limitations of the data currently available and how data are being used to drive change. One chapter is dedicated to each of the twelve SDG16 targets, addressing these questions in turn.

The SDG16 Data Initiative collates data-sets in an open format to track SDG16 and to provide a snapshot of the current state of progress, recognizing the limits of data availability and coverage in many cases. The SDG16DI is intended to complement efforts currently underway to develop an official indicator framework for monitoring the SDGs and official systems for producing the data. To this end, we have included both globally agreed SDG16 indicators and additional, complementary indicators, which data experts regard as contributing to a more multi-faceted and comprehensive measure of progress against the various targets.

The report provides a baseline of the latest available data for SDG16 indicators, a review of key trends and of challenges encountered. Some of the early challenges identified in the report include the lack of effective methodologies to produce parts of the data, the misalignment between certain targets and their indicators, and insufficient coverage of particular data-sets. For example, there is no agreement on the magnitude of global illicit arms flows due to the lack of comprehensive data on arms trafficking. Another major challenge is the widespread under-reporting or refusal to report on sensitive issues, including many SDG16 indicators, which poses an obstacle to reliable data collection. A broader challenge is the very limited resources, capacity and in some cases political will to support data production, collection and monitoring across the SDG agenda as a whole, which includes 244 SDG indicators under its 17 Goals.

When considering overall progress in 2016 towards meeting SDG16 targets, there is a mixed bag of positive and negative trends. Over the past decade, rates of homicide have decreased in many parts of the world, with intentional homicide as a proportion of all violent deaths dropping from 75 to 69 percent. However, the level of violence in armed conflict in 2014 and 2015 is higher than at any time since the end of the Cold War. Moreover, while adult experience of violence seems to be declining, data for target 16.2 shows that every year one billion children across the globe experience violence. Nevertheless, while such trends highlight the scale of the challenge, it is important to bear in mind that the overall level of fatalities is relatively low when seen in historical context.

Rule of law and access to justice faced significant obstacles in 2016, with challenges to international justice institutions and with civic space continuing to shrink at the global and national level. One and a half billion people lack any form of officially recognized identification. It is estimated that more than a billion people in 53 countries have paid bribes to access public services in the last 12 months. Global surveys found that less than half of respondents believed that elections officials are impartial. On the other hand, 2016 saw progress in making public access to information a universal norm, with six more countries adopting freedom of information laws, and the majority of UN Member States now having such laws.

The overall state of ‘fundamental freedoms’ in 2016 was discouraging. Human rights groups point to increased repression and suffering of migrants; mounting civilian casualties from attacks by both terrorist groups and government forces; restrictions on civil liberties imposed in response to perceived security threats; and the rising power of authoritarian leaders in the global North and South alike. Political rights and civil liberties decreased in 67 countries in 2016, with only 36 countries registering gains. Although 40 percent of UN Member States are at least partially compliant with the Paris Principles for National Human Rights Institutions (an official indicator), it is evident that compliance with these principles does not necessarily equate with respect for human rights in these states.

In terms of the underlying challenges, transnational dynamics continue to undermine prospects for peace and sustainable development at the national level. Total illicit financial flows grew at an annual average rate of between 8.5 and 10.1 percent from 2005-2014. Meanwhile, developing countries make up 71 per cent of the membership of inter-governmental organisations, but have only 47 per cent of the voting rights, reflecting a lack of representation and inclusive decision making within the global community.

Overall, this first SDG16DI Global Report shows that, based on the available evidence, progress towards achieving the 2030 Agenda commitments to peaceful, just and inclusive societies, has so far been limited at best. This is unsurprising: it is a 15-year agenda, the targets under SDG16 represent a far-reaching and profound societal transformation, and we are only one year into the implementation period. Nevertheless, if there were any doubts about the scale of the challenge of achieving SDG16, the findings of this report will dispel them. The report also highlights the many gaps but also some opportunities in terms of the data for measuring SDG16 targets. And it underlines the critical importance of producing, collecting and monitoring robust and comprehensive data in order to enable sustained progress in building peaceful, just and inclusive societies.

State of Goal 16 Data Availability for 2017 High Level Political Forum Countries Under Voluntary Review

As part of the Data Initiative’s efforts to provide national and international policy-makers and civil society stakeholders with information to track progress on SDG16 targets, and to identify gaps in both implementing and monitoring SDG16, the Data Initiative has outlined below the coverage of data for the 44 countries under voluntary review at the 2017 High Level Political Forum (HLPF). While Goal 16 is not under review at the 2017 HLPF, the event provides an opportunity for countries to reflect on their commitments to all of the SDGs. As such the Data Initiative hopes that this report provides an opportunity for the countries under review at the 2017 HLPF to look beyond Goals 1, 2, 3, 5, 9 and 14- and to improve their efforts on Goal 16 as well. It is likewise aimed at providing civil society and policy-makers with information on data gaps, to ensure necessary support or pressure can be leveraged to address them.

The Data Initiative found that on average these countries only have available data for 44% of the IAEG official indicators, ranging from 17% (Monaco) to 61% (El Salvador & Nigeria). Out of the total 36 indicators, countries averaged data for 21 of the indicators, Monaco had the fewest at eight while Peru and El Salvador had data for 26. However, while there is less availability for the official IAEG indicators, the complementary indicators identified by the Data Initiative averaged 87% availability.

Country	Total number of indicators out of 36, for which there is data	Percentage of availability for IAEG official indicators	Percentage of availability for complementary indicators	Percentage of combined availability
Afghanistan	24	52%	92%	67%
Argentina	25	52%	100%	69%
Azerbaijan	22	52%	77%	61%
Bangladesh	23	52%	85%	64%
Belarus	22	43%	92%	61%
Belgium	21	35%	100%	58%
Belize	15	35%	54%	42%
Benin	20	43%	77%	56%
Botswana	23	48%	92%	64%
Brazil	23	43%	100%	64%
Chile	23	48%	92%	64%
Costa Rica	24	52%	92%	67%
Cyprus	18	30%	85%	50%
Czech Republic	20	35%	92%	56%

Country	Total number of indicators out of 36, for which there is data	Percentage of availability for IAEG official indicators	Percentage of availability for complementary indicators	Percentage of combined availability
Denmark	21	35%	100%	58%
El Salvador	26	61%	92%	72%
Ethiopia	21	39%	92%	58%
Guatemala	24	52%	92%	67%
Honduras	23	48%	92%	64%
India	25	52%	100%	69%
Indonesia	23	48%	92%	64%
Iran	19	26%	100%	53%
Italy	20	30%	100%	56%
Japan	21	35%	100%	58%
Jordan	24	57%	85%	67%
Kenya	25	57%	92%	69%
Luxembourg	14	30%	54%	39%
Malaysia	18	35%	77%	50%
Maldives	14	35%	46%	39%
Monaco	8	17%	31%	22%
Nepal	24	57%	85%	67%
Netherlands	18	30%	85%	50%
Nigeria	25	61%	85%	69%
Panama	23	48%	92%	64%
Peru	26	57%	100%	72%
Portugal	23	43%	100%	64%
Qatar	15	30%	62%	42%
Slovenia	21	39%	92%	58%
Sweden	21	35%	100%	58%
Tajikistan	21	52%	69%	58%
Thailand	24	48%	100%	67%
Togo	22	52%	77%	61%
Uruguay	22	43%	92%	61%
Zimbabwe	25	57%	92%	69%
Average	21	44%	87%	59%

TARGET 16.1

Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

Indicators

16.1.1 Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.1.3 Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.1.4 Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.1.5 Total number of people displaced internally due to conflict and violence (Complementary Global Indicator)

16.1.6 Percentage of ever married women aged 15-49 who have experienced physical or sexual violence in last 12 months committed by their husband or partner (Complementary Global Indicator)

Batula Hassan, Chairlady of Mandeleo ya wana-wake, is interviewed during Saferworld's County Peace Conference in Marsabit (Kenya), June 2015.

© Emmanuel O Productions



What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.1

In 2015, a total of 383,000 intentional homicides and 97,000 battle-related deaths were recorded.¹ The world is significantly less violent than fifty years ago. Nevertheless, despite this general downwards trend globally, the number of violent deaths per inhabitant remains high in Latin America, the Caribbean, Southern Africa, North Africa, and Western Asia. The majority of victims are killed in countries suffering from endemic levels of violence, or countries that have not officially declared war. When examining the incidence of violent deaths in conflict and non-conflict settings, two trends emerge.² First, rates of homicide are decreasing in many parts of the world. Available data suggests that, over the last decade, intentional homicide as a proportion of all violent deaths dropped from 75 to 69 percent^{3,4} Second, the last few years have seen a strong increase in the number of people killed in armed conflict. In 2014, over 100,000 battle-related deaths were recorded in a single year for the first time since 1989.⁵ The level of violence in *armed conflict* seen in 2014 and 2015 is higher than any other year in the post-Cold War period. This development is concerning, but it is important to bear in mind that the level of fatalities is relatively low when seen in a historical context. In 2015, there were 2 battle-related deaths per 100,000 worldwide. In 1950, this figure was 24; in 1970, it was 55; and in 1990 it was 8, according to battle deaths data from PRIO.⁶

The relationship between levels of violence and citizens' perception of safety is not straightforward. Globally, 3 out of 5 people report feeling safe when walking alone in their neighbourhood.⁷ This proportion changes across contexts depending on several factors that go beyond the overall level of violence, such as coping mechanisms. People can report feeling safe in an at-risk context, while others may feel unsafe in low-violence contexts. The lack of a global composite indicator on the proportion of people subject to physical, psychological and sexual violence does not allow assessing What does the data tell us about the state of the world with regard to this “official” global indicator.

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

The Small Arms Survey Database on Violent Deaths monitors various forms of lethal violence, including intentional homicide, from a wide range of open-sources. Official data on intentional homicide is produced by the criminal justice and public health systems, and is disseminated by a range of governmental agencies and National Statistical Offices, international organizations—such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the World Health Organization (WHO)—as well as civil society organizations such as Observatories on violence, conflict and crime. The quality, coverage, and completeness of data on intentional homicide varies widely across the world. Sophisticated and comprehensive data recording-systems are available in all high-income regions and several low-and middle-income regions; yet in several parts of world, primary source data may not

exist at all. In 2016, only rough estimates are available for 56 countries, of which more than half in Sub-Saharan Africa.⁸

Data on conflict-related deaths come from the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP). UCDP collects data on direct battle deaths for every country for every year. This data is updated regularly and released each September. Data coverage is global, with the UCDP including every independent state in the world in their estimates. UCDP's battle deaths data are based on a clear and concise definition of armed conflict that distinguishes armed conflict from other types of violence, and which has been extensively vetted by the academic community.

Data on the perception of safety comes from Gallup World Poll and covers 122 countries. As of March 2017, there are no global sources of data on the prevalence of non-lethal violence (physical, psychological and sexual violence). Data on these issues are collected at the national level through crime victimization surveys and household surveys, which include questions on crime and security.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.1 indicators?

The most important limitation for data on intentional homicide is related to the international comparability of definitions and methodologies. Available data is generally produced for administrative purposes, according to legal definitions of intentional homicide and the implementation of rules for statistical production that differ across countries. In 2015, UNDOC released the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes, to promote international comparability of statistical data. This provides clear guidelines on the types of intentional killing that should be included and excluded in counting intentional homicide. At the national level, little or no data collection capacity in medium and low income countries, and in areas affected by armed conflict, represents another limitation for tracking changes in lethal violence.

On conflict-related deaths, UCDP's data collection relies primarily on news reports to collect information. This will invariably produce conservative estimates, but there is no indication that the data is systematically biased. In addition, the data are estimates, however since they are not collected through random sampling we have no way of calculating standard measures of sampling error. The data does not include indirect deaths and thus only covers a subset of the 'conflict-related' deaths that the SDG 16.1.2 indicator calls for. At present, the data presently cannot be disaggregated by age, sex, and cause.

The limitations of survey indicators—on reported experiences of violence and perception of safety—to monitor the implementation of the SDGs relates in part to the costs associated with the periodic repetition of surveys and the need for a rigorous methodology to allow for international comparison. Moreover, further challenges arise in countries affected by endemic violence or armed conflict, due to security and logistical constraints.

How are the data being used?

The Small Arms Survey Database on Violent Deaths is at the core of the analysis presented in the Global Burden of Armed Violence reports. Governments largely use this data, as well as the academic community and it is cited in the OECD State of Fragility Reports. The UCDP battle deaths is widely used in the academic community, often in conjunction with the PRIO battle deaths data that extends the time series back until 1946. The data are also heavily featured in the work of multilateral organizations such as the World Bank and the UN. The widely read annual Human Security Reports makes exclusive use of the UCDP battle deaths data.

Explore the data at SDG16Report.org

TARGET 16.2


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

Indicators:

16.2.1 Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.2.2 Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.2.3 Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18 (IAEG Global Indicator)



Saferworld has been working on conflict prevention issues in South Sudan since 2002, as part of our community security (Kuajok, Warrap State, South Sudan)

© Saferworld

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.2

Protection of children from all forms of violence is a fundamental right guaranteed by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and other international human rights treaties and standards. Yet, every year, one billion children across the globe experience violence⁹. Recent estimates by UNICEF indicate that around six in ten children between the ages of two and fourteen worldwide are subjected to physical punishment by their caregivers on a regular basis. The data collected from 62 countries shows that about 80 percent of children experienced some form of violent punishment across this period.¹⁰ A survey of 106 countries on the prevalence of children's experience of bullying found that children aged between 13 and 15 reported bullying at vastly different rates, from seven percent in Tajikistan to 74 percent in Samoa.¹¹ A similar study targeting school children found that an average of 32.1 percent of children in the same age group across 66 countries had experienced bullying at school at least once during the previous 30 days¹².

Estimates for the prevalence of sexual violence affecting children vary in context and methodology. A meta-study of prevalence of sexual abuse across 55 studies from 24 countries found figures ranging from eight to 31 percent among girls, and from three to 17 percent among boys.¹³ It is also estimated that 120 million girls, under the age of 20, have been subjected to forced sexual intercourse.¹⁴ Generally, girls are more likely to experience sexual violence than boys; however, boys disproportionately experience certain forms of sexual abuse and exploitation in certain regions. A recent report shows that 28 per cent of detected trafficking victims worldwide are children. In regions such as Sub-Saharan Africa, and Central America and the Caribbean, children comprise 62 and 64 per cent of victims, respectively.¹⁵

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

Three indicators have been included in the global indicators framework to monitor target 16.2, of which two focus specifically on violence. The first measures the proportion of children aged 1-17 who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month (16.2.3). The second measures the proportion of young women and men aged 18- 29 who experienced sexual violence before age 18 (16.2.1). These indicators address three important forms of violence against children: sexual abuse, physical punishment and psychological aggression by caregivers. Both indicators are measurable, and data on these indicators have been collected using existing, standardized and validated measurement tools in several national surveys, including through UNICEF-supported Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) and the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS).

Data on child discipline collected through MICS were available for 43 countries as of January 2014. Some DHS and other national household surveys have also collected the standard or modified versions of the MICS child discipline module. Data on sexual violence have been collected through a number of data collection tools and mechanisms, including household surveys such as DHS that have produced comparable data in some 50 low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s. Fully comparable data are currently available for approximately 43 countries¹⁶.

The third indicator measures the number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation (16.2.2). Data is currently collected annually focusing on the number of **detected** victims through specific questionnaire. The UNODC prepares biennial Global Reports on Trafficking in Persons. Data are available for about 130 countries since 2007, and are disaggregated by age, sex and forms of exploitation¹⁷.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.2 indicators?

The availability of comparable data on certain forms of violence against children has significantly increased in recent years—especially in measuring physical and sexual violence. Yet many challenges remain. Internationally agreed standards for measuring and producing statistics are still lacking. Existing data tend to be inconsistent in terms of agreed definitions of violence, their scope, coverage, frequency and quality—thus making comparisons across countries difficult.¹⁸ Limited data coverage is compounded by a lack of capacity, insufficient resources for data collection and insufficient investment in improving measurement¹⁹.

Finally, under-reporting poses a significant limitation for collecting of data on these indicators. Children often do not feel comfortable reporting on such topics due to their fear of the perpetrators and stigma, and/or they do not have access to reporting mechanisms. This means that data collected are likely to be under-estimating the problem.

How are the data being used?

The data collected through MICS and DHS is currently being used as a basis for policy decisions and programme interventions, and to influence public opinion on the situation of children and women around the world. Data collected through other instruments such as Violence against Children Surveys carried out under the auspices of the ‘Together for Girls Initiative’ is being used to develop national action plans to end violence against children.

Explore the data at SDG16Report.org

TARGET 16.3

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

Indicators:

16.3.1 Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.3.2 Unsensenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.3.3 *The accessibility, affordability, impartiality, and effectiveness of civil justice systems (Complementary Global Indicator)*

16.3.4 *Whether justice systems are capable of investigating and adjudicating criminal offenses successfully through an impartial system that protects the rights of both victims and the accused (Complementary Global Indicator)*



Traditional Judge Chief Pasquale Udo Maktab in his office. (South Sudan)

© Marcus Perkins

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.3?

Rule of law and access to justice faced significant challenges in 2016, with tests to international justice institutions and civic space continuing to contract at the global and national level. Russia, South Africa, Burundi, and The Gambia announced their intention to withdraw from the International Criminal Court this year and *Freedom in the World* reports that 2016 marked the 11th consecutive year of decline in global freedom.²⁰ Furthermore, an estimated four billion poor and marginalized people around the world live outside the protection of the law.²¹

The picture is not all grim. In April, Kenya passed its first legal aid law as part of a commitment to Goal 16,²² and in May, representatives of ASEAN member states and civil society declared support for the Jakarta Recommendations on SDGs, Access to Justice and Legal Aid.²³ UNODC also passed Resolution 25/2 to ensure effective legal aid, and called upon states to identify national indicators for Target 16.3.²⁴ In December, several governments and civil society organizations declared their support for collective action on measuring access to justice at the Open Government Partnership Summit in Paris.²⁵

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

For the official Inter-Agency Expert Group (IAEG) on global indicators for Goal 16.3, country coverage remains low and has not increased in 2016. Data for IAEG indicator 16.3.1—the proportion of victims of violence who reported their victimization—is available for only 37 countries. Data for IAEG indicator 16.3.2—unsentenced detainees as a proportion of the overall prison population—is available for 142 countries. Coverage for complementary indicators 16.3.3 and 16.3.4, on the other hand, has grown from 102 to 113 countries in the last year.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.3 indicators?

In order to use the IAEG and complementary indicators to assess progress toward Target 16.3, there are important methodological and conceptual limitations to consider. Differences in crime reporting (16.2.1) across countries could reflect cultural differences or varying perceptions about the seriousness of certain crimes. The Open Society Justice Initiative also warns that pre-trial measures that focus exclusively on percentages of the detainee population, such as the IAEG detention indicator (16.2.2), may create perverse incentives for what does the data tell us about the state to secure convictions.²⁶ Furthermore, neither of the official IAEG indicators captures access to civil justice or the effectiveness of informal justice mechanisms,²⁷ despite legal needs studies showing that a majority of people's legal problems are civil problems.^{28,29} Indeed, at the 48th session of the United Nations Sta-

tistical Commission, Member States agreed that a civil justice indicator should be considered as an additional indicator to measure the target more meaningfully.³⁰ The Open Society Justice Initiative and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) are facilitating exchanges in order to refine effective survey-based measures for civil justice.

The complementary indicators for Target 16.3 address some of these conceptual concerns by measuring the accessibility, affordability, impartiality, and effectiveness of civil justice systems (16.3.3), as well as the extent to which countries' criminal justice systems are effective, impartial, and respect due process (16.3.4). These indicators are from the World Justice Project's *Rule of Law Index*, which relies on surveys of more than 110,000 households and 2,700 experts to measure access to justice as experienced by ordinary citizens.³¹ However, due to the logistical limitations of conducting polling in 113 countries, household data is only collected in the three largest cities of each country and does not yet capture the experiences of rural communities.

How are the data being used?

It is too early to track the practical application of the IAEG and complementary indicators for policy reform. Nonetheless, many countries are undertaking efforts to measure access to justice more effectively. In Indonesia, the Ministry of National Development and Planning (Bappenas) is creating its own Access to Justice Index as part of its National Strategy on Access to Justice and to measure its progress towards Goal 16.3. Furthermore, a Global Alliance for Reporting Progress on Promoting Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies was launched at the UN General Assembly in September 2016.³² This proliferation of data collection initiatives at the national and international levels, while still nascent, is a positive indication that the SDG monitoring demands are generating commitments to measurable improvements in adherence to the rule of law and access to justice for all.

Explore the data at SDG16Report.org

TARGET 16.4

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

Indicators

16.4.1 Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current United States dollars) (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.4.2 Proportion of seized small arms and light weapons that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.4.3 Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer scores (Complementary Global Indicator)



Bullets ready to be destroyed as decommissioned weapons and ammunition are handed in to mark International Peace Day 2013. (Moroto, Karamoja, Uganda)

© Saferworld

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.4?

The UN International Commodities Statistics Database (UN Comtrade) data shows that the legal arms trade was worth \$17.3 billion globally in 2015. Arms trafficking is estimated to represent 10 to 20 percent of the legal arms trade, which translates into a value between \$1.3 and \$2.6 billion.³³ These are considered conservative estimates based on available statistics and documented arms transfers, which account for only a part of the global arms trade.

According to the Small Arms Trade Transparency Barometer (Barometer), by the Small Arms Survey, the level of transparency of the global small arms trade is estimated as 11.16 out of a 25-point scale.³⁴ Export authorizations remain the most opaque dimension of small arms reporting. Among the top small arms exporters, 49 percent and 61 percent did not report on licenses granted or denied, respectively. This information on arms trade transparency helps assess a state's record-keeping practices with respect to arms transfers. Transparency in the authorized trade is an important practice for preventing and detecting the diversion of arms into the illicit market.

The value of total illicit financial flows (inflows and outflows) in 2014, the most recent year for which data are available, for all developing countries is between \$2 trillion and \$3.5 trillion, which represents between 14 and 24 percent of total trade for those nations. Total illicit flows grew at an annual average rate of between 8.5 percent and 10.1 percent from 2005-2014. The value of organized crime, based on a tally of estimates of 11 transnational criminal markets, ranges from \$1.6 trillion to \$2.2 trillion annually.³⁵

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016

The Barometer has identified a total of 49 major exporters of small arms, across Europe (53%), Asia (31%), the Americas (12%), Africa (2%) and Oceania (2%). The vast majority provide information on at least some of their trade in conventional weapons to the UN Register on Conventional Weapons and to UN Comtrade, which can include data on small arms and light weapons. Only 25 of these small arms exporters, however, release publicly accessible national reports on arms exports while four do not report at all.

Regarding illicit financial flows (IFFs), the Addis Ababa Action Agenda urged “appropriate international institutions” to provide estimates of IFFs, but this has not yet happened. Non-governmental measurements of IFFs use two data sources: deliberate mis-invoicing of goods trade based on the IMF's Direction of Trade Statistics (DOTS) plus leakages in the balance of payments as determined using the IMF's Balance of Payments (BOPs) data-set. Data that estimate the value of organized

crime originate primarily from intergovernmental sources including UNODC, ILO, UNEP and INTERPOL, among others.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.4 indicators

There is no agreement on the magnitude of global illicit arms flows due to the lack of comprehensive data on arms trafficking. The proposed indicator emphasizes arms that have been seized, found or surrendered whose illicit nature has been determined by competent national authorities. The current global indicator to track illicit arms flows highlights the measurement challenge. To generate better information, states need to determine—for example through tracing—the illicit nature of the arms that they seize, find, or that are surrendered to them. More specifically, states need to increase the proportion of arms subjected to such a determination. Furthermore, trafficked weapons often represent only a portion of seized weapons, which can include also those associated with crimes and administrative violations.

The primary limitation of using DOTS to estimate IFFs is that the data are highly aggregated, which renders the estimate imprecise. For example, a firm in Country X might under-invoice an import on one occasion and over-invoice an import on another occasion thereby offsetting the illicit flows of funds. Meanwhile, other data sets that provide more detail for some countries on goods trade (ex. UN Comtrade) may yield more precise estimates but are less comprehensive in their country coverage and are not well suited for the purpose of producing global estimates. The opaque nature of transnational crime limits the amount and quality of data; estimates of the value of various illicit markets are based on inferences—such as information gained from seizures—rather than comprehensive data.

How are the data being used?

Governments use the Transparency Barometer to identify areas for improvement in reporting methods, and it is featured in the annual Swiss national report on small arms and light weapons. Multilateral institutions, such as the UNECA and the UN Human Rights Council, also use illicit flows data as do countless civil society groups. Organized crime data are used by law enforcement, policy makers, academics, and civil society.

Explore the data at [SDG16Report.org](https://www.sdg16report.org)

TARGET 16.5

Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

Indicators

16.5.1 Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.5.2 Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials during the previous 12 months (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.5.3 Corruption Perception Index score (Complementary Global Indicator)



Anti-Corruption billboard in Namibia

© Philip Schuler / World Bank

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.5?

An untrustworthy and dysfunctional public sector will undermine attainment of many or all of the SDGs. Indicator 16.5.2 captures the incidence of bribery—the percentage of firms experiencing at least one bribe payment request during public transactions dealing with utilities access, permits, licenses, and taxes.³⁶ According to the World Bank Enterprise Survey, the Global average is 17.8 percent, with a range from 1.9 percent average in high-income OECD countries, to 30.4 percent in the East Asia & Pacific region. At the country level, rates of bribery victimization vary greatly, with zero reported incidents in Eritrea and Estonia, up to a staggering 64 percent in Cambodia and Yemen, and 70 percent in Liberia.³⁷

When viewed through the lens of complementary indicator 16.5.3—Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) score—over two-thirds of the 176 countries and territories in the 2016 CPI fell below the midpoint on a scale of 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean). The global average score is a paltry 43, which indicates endemic corruption in a country’s public sector.

The Global Corruption Barometer estimates that more than one billion people have paid bribes across 53 countries in Asia Pacific, Middle East and North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa in order to access public services in the last 12 months.³⁸ In Europe and Central Asia, on average, one in six households have paid a bribe to access public services.³⁹

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

The World Bank Enterprise Survey is a company specific face-to-face survey, which can be expensive and time consuming to administer. Only 105 countries have at least one data point after 2010, and figures are therefore outdated for many countries. In addition, since the surveys are done mostly in World Bank client countries, most high-income countries are not covered.

As for the complementary indicators, the Corruption Perceptions Index 2016 covered 176 countries and territories in the world. However, because each indexed country is required to have a minimum of three CPI data sources to be included in the index, some of the small island nations in the Pacific and the Indian Ocean were not covered in the 2016 CPI.⁴⁰

The Global Corruption Barometer was conducted from 2015 to 2017 in 95 countries in four regions⁴¹ of the world, capturing views and experiences of corruption and bribery of more than 135,000 people.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.5 indicators?

The sensitive nature of corruption can limit data collection, as people and firms may not be comfortable answering questions on bribery incidence. The actual incidence of this particular type of corruption may therefore be higher than reported in some countries.

Furthermore, while perception-based measures of corruption are useful since corruption is a hidden and (usually) illegal act, they also have their limitations, such as a potential subjectivity bias of the citizen or expert respondent, and the potential impact of the respondents' exposure to news about corruption on her or his answer. However, there are measures to mitigate these challenges, particularly in terms of selecting expert respondents who can provide an assessment of the extent of corruption based on expertise and evidence, rather than only perceptions.

A comprehensive global analysis of the Global Corruption Barometer will be launched in June 2017 and will cover all regions in the world, providing a global picture for the next report.

How are the data being used?

Specific governments and their agencies—such as the government of Malaysia and the Anti-Corruption Commissions of Thailand and Indonesia—use CPI results as a key performance indicator to measure their anti-corruption efforts. Moreover, the CPI is distributed to Transparency International's network via website and social media. The results receive considerable media coverage both domestically and internationally. Drawing on the findings of the 2016 CPI, TI published several web features illustrating how CPI scores translate to the reality of various indexed countries, and what this means for each region in the world.⁴²

The results of the Global Corruption Barometer are used in a similar manner, and feed into the policy briefings and campaigns of TI. It is widely shared with governments and inter-governmental agencies, as well as national and international CSOs.⁴³

[Explore the data at SDG16Report.org](http://SDG16Report.org)

TARGET 16.6

Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Indicators:

16.6.1 Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget code or similar) (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.6.2 Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services (Complementary Global Indicator)

16.6.3 Global Indicators of Regulatory Governance (Complementary Global Indicator)



A woman expresses her local security concerns to the district and national level government stakeholders during an event. (Nepal)

© Saferworld

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.6?

According to Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem), a research collaborative focused on collecting global data-sets for complex indicators of democracy, there were considerable improvements in global and regional indicators for government accountability over recent decades. They also show substantial increase in access to free and fair elections in recent decades. However, as for civil society organizations' freedom from governmental repression, a distinct negative trend can be noticed in all regions, in particular in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, MENA, and Asia Pacific. This trend is corroborated by CIVICUS, a global organization for citizen participation, and by the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, which has noted 96 significant restrictions on the rights of civil society in the period between June 2014 and May 2015. There has been progress in the independence of high courts, according to V-Dem, although there is still substantial room for improvement. Despite strengthened accountability mechanisms in Central Asia and MENA, averages in these two regions remain lower than in other regions.⁴⁴

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

V-Dem data with world-wide coverage measures accountability aspects of target 16.6 based on the assessments of multiple independent experts. The V-Dem data currently covers 177 countries from 1900 through 2016. For horizontal accountability, V-Dem indicators address high court independence and legislature investigations in practice, and for vertical accountability they measure levels of freedom and fairness of elections, provide an index of judicial constraints on the executive and of legislative constraints on the executive. Finally V-Dem can also provide indicators of government censorship of the media, and the extent of government repression of CSOs.

Data derived from the World Values Survey⁴⁵ (WVS) build on nationally representative surveys conducted in almost 100 countries, covering approximately 90 percent of the world's population, and using a standard questionnaire. The seventh wave of WVS data collection will be in 2017-2018, and will include questions on electoral integrity and the importance of free and fair elections to economic development. WVS connects with academics, policy makers and journalist to complement and enrich their analysis on vertical accountability by adding people's perceptions and experiences of whether election officials are fair with their emerging data. Furthermore, WVS data on whether people perceive free and fair elections to be important for economic development could be used to add a development lens to the analysis.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.6 indicators?

The two official indicators capture only limited aspects of target 16.6. For example, 16.6.1 focuses on primary government expenditures as a percentage of the originally approved budget. Although budget transparency and efficiency in budget implementation are important, this indicator does not capture how accountable or transparent state institutions are, nor does it capture the 2030 Agenda's call for people-centered accountability. In order to achieve accountability, robust and sustainable mechanisms to hold decision-makers responsible for their actions need to be in place. Thus, additional indicators are required, such as those used by V-Dems, which relate to the ways that citizens, civil society, the media, and other public institutions are able to oversee and hold the government to account.

The second official indicator and the complementary indicator measure the implementation of recommendations to strengthen national anti-corruption frameworks, as corruption is a significant correlate of negative consequence of poor transparency and accountability. V-Dem can provide supplementary indicators for SDG target 16.6 to address some of these limitations.

How are the data being used?

V-Dem indicators are used to track variations in accountability mechanisms and monitor with high precision developments over time to provide policymakers with best practices. Along with producing briefing and research papers, V-Dem hosts an annual a Policy Conference to connect its research with policymakers and the public. The World Values Survey has been downloaded over 100,000 times by academics and policy makers in order to understand global and national trends in public opinion on issues such as democracy, tolerance to ethnic minorities, support for gender equality, and attitudes toward politics. These surveys can help reframe policymakers' perspectives towards more people-centered approaches.

[Explore the data at SDG16Report.org](https://SDG16Report.org)

TARGET 16.7

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


Indicators:

16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.7.2 Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.7.3 Percentage of seats held by women in parliament (lower house) (Complementary Global Indicator)

16.7.4 Power distributed by social group (Complementary Global Indicator)



Community participants raising their hands to demonstrate that the new community centre will be beneficial for them. (Bangladesh)

© Shoeb Ahmed, Saferworld

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.7?

When it comes to civic space, Civicus found that ‘in many countries, and in all global regions, civic space has worsened appreciably in recent years.’⁴⁶ At particular risk are those organizations in civil society that question the power of political and economic elites, or that expose corruption and poor governance.⁴⁷ In terms of civil society participation in decision-making, V-Dem indicators show considerable improvement in the last decades. Nonetheless, there remains substantial variations in decision-making levels. In regions such as Central Asia or MENA, although improvements can be noted, their averages remain lower than in other regions.

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

The V-Dem data currently covers 177 countries up until 2016. The World Values Survey Wave 6 data builds on interviews with 60 000 people across 42 countries, conducted from 2010-2014. Survey fieldwork for WVS wave 7 will be conducted worldwide in 2017-2018 and this wave will be the second one using a questionnaire, which includes questions on electoral integrity and confidence in institutions.

Available data on the share of women in national parliaments responds to ‘inclusive’ and ‘representative decision making’. A regional comparison indicates that between 2005 and 2015 the proportion of women increased most in the Arab world, albeit from a low level, followed by the Americas and Sub-Saharan Africa; while the Pacific experienced the lowest growth in proportion of women in parliament.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.7 indicators?

Indicator 16.7.1 refers to the proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions. While diverse and representative public institutions are important for many reasons, it is important to acknowledge that representation in number may not translate into influence (substantial representation). In other words, an increased proportion of marginalised groups (whether women, youth, ethnic or religious minorities) in public institutions, including parliaments, does not necessarily translate into increased influence over public policy or other outcomes. Therefore, it is critical to supplement this indicator with others that capture influence, rather than simply measuring numerical representation. Indicator 16.7.2, refers to the percentage of the population that believes that decision making is inclusive and responsive. This is difficult to aggregate because of varying expectations as to what is understood by ‘inclusiveness’ and ‘responsiveness’. V-Dem can offer three indices to supplement the measurement of target 16.7.

How are the data being used?

V-Dem indicators are used to track variations in responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making, and can monitor developments over time for each country in the world with a high degree of precision. This can provide policymakers with a clear picture of the outcomes of their decisions. Emerging data collected by World Value Surveys could also be used to complement and enrich the analysis on 'inclusive' and 'representative decision making' by adding people's perceptions and experiences of whether candidates are prevented from running; whether media coverage favours a particular party; and whether journalists provide balanced coverage.

Explore the data at SDG16Report.org

TARGET 16.8

Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance

Indicators:

16.8.1 Proportion of members and voting rights of developing countries in international organizations (IAEG Global Indicator)



The flags of the 193 member states are back after the renovation of the "Allée des Drapeaux" at the Palais des Nations.

© Jean-Marc Ferré / UN

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.8?

There is a long way to go in terms of strengthening and broadening the participation of developing countries in international organisations. Developing countries make up 75 per cent of all UN member states, but they are underrepresented in many of its institutions. The range of representation includes full proportional representation in the UN General Assembly, with one vote for each member, to the UN Security Council where developing countries currently account for seven of the 15 members. China is the only developing country to occupy one of the five permanent seats on the Security Council. Similarly, voting rights do not reflect the proportion of membership of developing countries. For example, developing countries hold 37 per cent of the voting rights in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) despite constituting 76 per cent of its membership, because voting rights are based on contributions. The Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) has measured the voting rights for five international organisations and determined a discrepancy of nearly 25 per cent of voting rights. On average, developing countries made up 71 per cent of membership, but only 47 per cent of the voting rights. This is represented in the chart below.

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

The data for this measure is currently available and can be measured by calculating the level and significance of developing countries involvement in international organisations as measured by voting rights. This could include regional bodies and trade agreements as well as international institutions and international governance structures. IEP has developed a database of the membership and voting rights of 11 different international organisations (IMF, IBRD, AFDB, ADB, IADB, UNSC, UN ECOSOC, UNGA, WTO, FSB, IFC). These organisations range in size from the UN General Assembly with 193 members and the IMF and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development with 189 members, to smaller, regionally-focused organisations such as the various regional development banks. Developing countries account for 75 per cent of all countries but they make up on average 65 per cent of the membership of these 11 organisations. There is no foreseeable barrier to accessing the data required to measure this indicator across all countries.

What are the data limitations for the Target 16.8 indicator?

The indicator to measure 16.8 is the percentage of members and voting rights of developing countries in international organizations. This information is publicly available from the websites and annual reports of each organisation, although there has not been a compilation of the different levels of representation across different organisations. If an organisation does not include many developing

countries, this does not reflect a shortage of data but rather the lack of membership of developing countries, which is itself part of the measure for this target. A potential limitation of this indicator is that voting rights and membership are only one of many ways that a country can be influential in international organisations. Further disaggregation of the data could be undertaken by looking at the nationality of leaders of organisations as well as the membership of various groups and committees within international organisations. Furthermore, the number of nationals from each country in the organisation's staff could also be seen as an indicator of the level and significance of developing country involvement.

How are the data being used?

Unlike other measures which look at the number of participants as a proxy for measuring the significance of involvement, such as the number of women in parliament, members and voting rights of developing countries in international organisations cannot easily be aggregated. Membership of certain organisations, such as the OECD, are explicitly dependent on development status. It is probable that an index would need to be developed for this information to be aggregated and measured collectively. Nevertheless, the data that currently exists can and is being used within the relevant organisations to advocate for greater participation by developing countries.

[Explore the data at SDG16Report.org](https://www.sdg16report.org)

TARGET 16.9

By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration

Indicators:

16.9.1 Proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age (IAEG Global Indicator)



Women in Ng'omkeni village,
Mombasa (Kenya).

© Saferworld

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.9?

Globally, a staggering 1.5 billion people lack any form of officially recognized identification, either paper-based or digital.⁴⁸ This includes an estimated 230 million children under five whose births were never registered, and who therefore simply do not exist in any legal capacity.⁴⁹ Individuals lacking a recognized form of identification often cannot access basic services or participate in the modern economy, and are at increased risk of human trafficking. Without accurate population data, governments cannot provide well-coordinated social services, while global development efforts suffer because beneficiaries cannot be individually identified and targeted with appropriate support.

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

Data on those who enjoy legal identity are limited and rely on a patchwork of sources, reflecting the historic variety of organizations and efforts in this space, which have largely targeted specific “snapshot” registration programs, such as voter or birth registration. A recent unpublished study by UNDP estimated that, within the UN alone, nine different agencies address some element of digital identity management, but that each engage at different points in an individual’s life.⁵⁰ As a result, UN systems are ill-suited to ongoing and lifelong engagement with beneficiaries—and, without a mechanism to cross-reference individuals between these systems, it can be difficult to untangle which individuals are covered by each.

Given these limitations, Target 16.9 is unique in that there is only a single official SDG indicator: the proportion of children under five whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age. UNICEF’s global birth registration data is aggregated from Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys, Demographic and Health Surveys, the UN Statistics Division, and other sources. Source data are often many years old, and, in some cases, may refer only to a portion of the country. As of May 2016, data were available for 167 countries, with birth registration rates ranging from an estimated 3 percent in Somalia to an average of 99.7 percent in OECD countries.⁵¹

The World Bank’s Identification for Development (ID4D) program builds on UNICEF data and other sources to compile a global data-set showing the status of civil registration and identification practices in 198 countries.⁵² The data-set contains summary information on the entities responsible for civil registration and estimates the number of unregistered individuals in each country based on UN and country statistics. This compilation provides a helpful benchmark to compare coverage levels for civil registration. However, given the limitations described above, it does not account for the full breadth of functional registers and alternate entry points for identity.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.9 indicators?

While birth registration coverage is important, concerns have been raised that the data are not sufficiently disaggregated to account for vulnerable and marginalized populations. Citing data that shows that women are disproportionately unregistered, UN Women, OHCHR, and others have called for the disaggregation of indicator data by gender. Age disaggregation, important as a measure of prompt birth registration, has been included in the indicator, but is not widely available in global data-sets at present.

Furthermore, birth registration does not address the broader question of legal identity for all. The concept of legal identity, included in the text of Goal 16.9, cannot currently be measured since a definition of “legal identity” has not been agreed upon. In the interim, no alternate indicator has been chosen to measure the coverage of legal identity for adults.

How are the data being used?

These data are relevant to the mandates of international organizations. For example, UNICEF provides targeted support to countries with low birth registration coverage and has drilled down into disaggregated data to understand the drivers of low or high coverage.⁵³

UNHCR and IOM (along with WFP, below) are unique among UN agencies in that they enrol, store, and process identity data about refugees and What does the data tell us about the stateless. The World Food Programme (WFP) intends to enrol all individual beneficiaries of its food assistance programmes in their SCOPE digital beneficiary and transfer management programme system by the end of 2017.⁵⁴ Therefore these agencies are originators and consumers not just of coverage data, but also originators of the underlying identity data. Critically, this also means that Personally Identifying Information (PII) is already collected and stored by the UN system. As these agencies have detailed data protection policies, they can lead the rapid development of harmonized policies on personal data collection and handling.

[Explore the data at SDG16Report.org](https://sdg16report.org)

TARGET 16.10

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

Indicators:

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

16.10.2 Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.10.3 Confirmed cases of journalists killed in previous calendar year (Complementary Global Indicator)

16.10.4 Freedom of the Press index score (Complementary Global Indicator)

Protest against ACTA (Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement) in Toulouse, France. Sign reads "Information wants to be free" *slogan without copyright" in English.

© Pierre-Selim



What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.10?

Open and effective public access to information depends upon the protection of the fundamental freedoms articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including freedom of expression. Conversely, the free flow of information is a prerequisite for the enforcement of all basic human rights. These two mutually reinforcing principles were combined in one single target of the SDGs for good reason. The two official UN indicators for SDG16.10 were designed to reflect that interrelationship. In assessing progress towards SDG16.10 as a whole over the past year, neither element alone tells the whole story.

2016 saw significant gains for the target's objective of making public access to information a universal norm. Six countries adopted freedom of information laws for the first time. The majority of UN member states—109 of 192—now have such statutes on the books. Implementation of these new laws is the essential next step, with some countries moving more quickly than others. On a practical basis, continuing increases in internet connectivity, cell-phone capacity and online resources gave more people access to information than ever before in history.

Nevertheless, the overall state of 'fundamental freedoms' in 2016 was far less encouraging. Human rights groups pointed to the suffering and repression of migrants; mounting civilian casualties from attacks by both terrorist groups and government forces; restrictions on civil liberties imposed in response to perceived security threats; and the rising power of authoritarian populists in North and South alike. Freedom House, in its annual Freedom in the World report, stated: "A total of 67 countries suffered net declines in political rights and civil liberties in 2016, compared with 36 that registered gains. This marked the 11th consecutive year in which declines outnumbered improvements."

In the specific area of press freedom—which has a direct bearing on public access to information—the Committee to Protect Journalists reported 48 confirmed cases of journalists killed in 2016 as a consequence of their profession, a significant drop from recent annual death tolls. CPJ's 2016 'Impunity Index'—tracking failure to prosecute the murders of journalists worldwide—showed a rise in convictions for such crimes in several countries with previously poor records. Yet Reporters sans Frontiers said its global and regional indices for 2016 revealed nonetheless a "deep and disturbing decline in respect for media freedom throughout the world."

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

Data coverage for indicator 16.10.1—journalists killed and imprisoned—is reliable and comprehensive, covering all UN member states in 2016. In contrast, there are no comparable international data

sets covering the job-related deaths and jailings of labour organizers or human rights activists, as also required under 16.10.1.

Indicator 16.10.2 also has good coverage. As of 2016, at least 110 of the 192 UN member states had adopted access-to-information laws or equivalent legal mechanisms, as verified by specialized NGOs in this field, including FOIANet, Article 19, and the Centre for Law and Democracy. What remains to be done is systematic, consistent, internationally comparable monitoring or measurement of ‘implementation’ of such national laws by UN member states, to track compliance with 16.10.

As for the proposed complementary indicators, 16.10.3 and 16.10.4, there is complete data coverage as they are designed to function based on pre-existing global data-sets.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.10 indicators?

Cases of journalists killed or unjustly imprisoned for their work (16.10.1) are documented rigorously and consistently by the NY-based Committee to Protect Journalists (CJP). However, the same cannot be said for cases of trade unionists or human rights advocates killed or jailed in reprisal for their work. CPJ is a key source for UNESCO’s reports on SDG16.10.1, along with Reporters sans Frontiers (RSF) and the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ), as well as uncorroborated cases based on news reports. However, there are no equivalent corroborated and publicly available figures from specialized NGOs for cases of trade unionists or human rights advocates killed or jailed. Though many such cases are documented and denounced by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), respectively, neither UN agency has ever provided or attempted to provide systematic global accounting of these cases, primarily because of the inherent definitional, legal, evidentiary and political challenges in compiling comprehensive statistics on such abuses in all UN member states.

Cases of torture of individuals in all three categories are difficult to confirm for international reporting purposes in any systematic manner, as such abuses are documentable only after the fact, with independently corroborated evidence from victims and/or perpetrators. The rare cases confirmed in legal proceedings and/or by human rights groups represent only a small and unrepresentative sampling of such abuses. Cases of ‘enforced disappearance’ of journalists, trade unionists and human rights activists—a category intended to include kidnappings and hostage-taking by insurgent forces, criminal organizations and other armed groups—are also by definition exceedingly difficult to document in any systematic statistical manner, as such incidents are often not reported until after the fact, and sometimes never, for security reasons.

Measuring ‘implementation’ of access to information laws in a rigorous, consistent, internationally comparable manner is a challenge for which there is currently no agreed factual consensus or meth-

odology. UNESCO is now working with specialized NGOs to create a reporting framework for UN member states on the implementation of their access-to-information commitments under SDG16.10.

How are the data being used?

The data are used by activists and journalists to push for improved access to information and free speech within national and global institutions. International policy makers and activists alike, use this data to pressure regimes to increase the freedom of the press. For example, data from CPJ has helped to secure the “release of imprisoned journalists, secure convictions in journalist murders, and enable positive legal reform in countries where the climate for free expression has deteriorated.”⁵⁵

[Explore the data at SDG16Report.org](https://SDG16Report.org)

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

Indicator

16.a.1 Existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles (IAEG Global Indicator)



Youth from around the world participating in the Vatican Youth Symposium on the SDGs

© SDSN

What does the data tell us about the state of the world regarding Target 16.a?

According to the indicator for 16.a, nearly 40 percent the UN Member States are at least partially compliant with the Paris Principles. However, this measure does not reflect the status of human rights in these states nor national institutions ability to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime.

The Paris Principles which underlie indicator 16.a.1, were adopted by the General Assembly in 1993, and outline the responsibilities for national human rights institutions (NHRIs), and are used by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) to accredit NHRIs. GANHRI divides NHRIs into three levels of accreditation: ‘A’ complies fully with the Paris Principles; ‘B’ does not fully comply with the Paris Principles; ‘C’ does not comply with the Paris Principles.⁵⁶ As of January 24, 2017, 117 NHRIs were accredited by the GANHRI with 74 ‘A’ accreditations, 33 ‘B’ accreditations and ‘10’ non-complaint ‘C’ accreditations.⁵⁷

While NHRI compliance with the Paris Principles is focused on the legal status, legal protections and governance of these institutions, there is no measurement included on citizen perceptions of the effectiveness of these institutions, nor about the state’s respect for human rights.⁵⁸

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

GANHRI and UNOHCHR work together to periodically review the accreditation of each UN Member States’ NHRI. This information is freely available on both the GANHRI and UNOHCHR websites. Therefore, for indicator 16.a.1 “the existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles” there is complete data coverage.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.a indicators?

While there are no issues with the coverage, quality or availability of the data for indicator 16.a.1, the data is limited in its conceptual link with the target. Target 16.a was promoted by UNOHCHR and human rights groups to create more accountability for security and justice institutions in terms of human rights. In fact, a recent report by the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the UN, found that the inclusion indicator 16.a.1 “can be seen as a compromise reflecting the widely-felt need for a specific human rights indicator that shows the efforts of states to safeguard human rights. However, it is also widely acknowledged that this indicator [...] does not cover the target 16.a particularly well and was placed here for lack of an appropriate space elsewhere.”⁵⁹

While the protection of human rights can reduce violence, the purpose of this target, to strengthen national institutions to prevent violence, combat terrorism and crime, and the purpose of the indi-

cator, to increase NHRIs that are credible and effective in promoting human rights at the national level, are not aligned.⁶⁰ This misalignment reduces the effectiveness of both the target and indicator to achieve their aims—which in turns limits the relevance of the data.

How are the data being used?

The data is mainly used by GANHRI for accreditation and membership information. Other UN actors, such as the Human Rights Council and OHCHR, use GANHRI accreditation as standard for participation in events or processes.

[Explore the data at SDG16Report.org](https://www.sdg16report.org)

TARGET 16.B

Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.

Indicators:

16.b.1 Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law (IAEG Global Indicator)

16.b.2 Educational equality (Complementary Global Indicator)

16.b.3 Health equality (Complementary Global Indicator)



A member of the local community listens to interaction between the central level and district level government and CSOs about the progress of the community security project of Saferworld. (Nepal)

© Saferworld

What does the data tell us about the state of the world in 2016 regarding Target 16.b?

The global indicator 16.b.1 looks at “the proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months based on a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law”.⁶¹ As a ‘Tier III’ indicator, there is no internationally agreed methodology or global data available yet.⁶² Additionally, target 16.b overlaps with Target 10.3, with which it shares a common “official” global indicator, and Target 5.c, which also relates to legislation on non-discrimination.

What was the extent of data coverage in 2016?

As stated above, there is no internationally agreed methodology or global data available yet for Target 16.b; however existing global, regional and national human rights mechanisms may provide this missing link, such as the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and various treaty bodies including the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention 111. These mechanisms provide access to a wide array of data and therefore accurate and context-specific monitoring of 16.b. Many recommendations under these mechanisms have direct links to Target 16.b, as illustrated in a recent report, which explicitly links Denmark’s most recent UPR recommendations to the SDGs.⁶³

All 44 of the countries participating in Voluntary National Reviews in 2017 have received UPR recommendations relating to the promotion and enforcement of non-discriminatory laws and policies.⁶⁴ Moreover, 41 of the 44 VNR countries have ratified the 1958 ILO Convention No. 111 on Discrimination in Employment and Occupation;⁶⁵ 38 of which have received direct requests or observations under the Convention.⁶⁶ Similarly, 43 out of the 44 VNR countries have ratified CERD,⁶⁷ 35 of which have received recommendations under this convention.⁶⁸ Progress towards Target 16.b could therefore be measured by the number and extent to which recommendations under the various mechanisms are actioned or left pending.

What are the data limitations for Target 16.b indicators?

Global indicator 16.b.1 is a perception indicator that measures people’s experiences of discrimination and can therefore give the oppressed or marginalized a voice. This indicator is meant to measure people’s experiences of discrimination on the grounds of ethnicity, sex, age, income, geographic location, disability, religion, migratory or displacement status, civil status, sexual orientation and/or gender identity. It should therefore help assess how well non-discriminatory laws and policies work

in practice. However, as a subjective outcome indicator, it does not directly measure the core element of target 16.b and hold states accountable for their commitments to law reform.⁶⁹

OHCHR has begun developing this indicator, consulting bilaterally with organizations and experts, but the methodological work will likely not be completed until the end of 2018.⁷⁰ Some NSOs and regional organizations are collecting data related to different grounds of discrimination, and OHCHR has started mapping and comparing initiatives with suitability for global reporting.⁷¹ However, it will be challenging to operationalise this indicator on a global scale, as people are not necessarily aware of the principles of discrimination under international human rights; while the way individuals or groups experience discrimination may reflect ingrained social, cultural, economic patterns that only change over prolonged periods.⁷² Additionally, because the indicator measures experiences of discrimination during a defined period, each victim is counted only once, even though they may have suffered multiple experiences of discrimination or harassment. Therefore, the indicator does not allow estimates of incidence or show the magnitude of discrimination faced.

How are the data being used?

Although there is currently no data specifically for 16.b, the available data from 16.a could be used in support of 16.b. The existence of an independent National Human Rights Institution (NHRI) is the global indicator for Target 16.a. Given their monitoring mandate and independent status, their focus on non-discrimination as well as the range of human rights underpinning the SDGs, NHRIs have the potential to monitor progress and serve as data providers for target 16.b and other human rights-relevant targets.⁷³ For example, in December 2016, a survey conducted at a workshop for the Arab Network of NHRIs (ANNHRI), revealed that all 14 members of ANNHRI undertake law reviews to detect discriminatory legislation. Consequently, all 14 NHRIs have detected national laws that should be eliminated or amended and have formulated recommendations for such legal reforms. This illustrates that NHRIs are ready to contribute to monitoring Target 16.b, as well as related Targets 5.1 and 10.3.⁷⁴ 24 out of the 44 countries participating in the Voluntary National Review (VNR) at the 2017 High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) have independent NHRIs in compliance with the Paris Principles, so access to information is well established for these countries. The combination of these factors points to the capacity of NHRIs to contribute to monitoring 16.b, in addition to directly monitoring progress on global indicator 16.a.1.

For example, of the 44 countries participating in the VNRs at the 2017 HLPF: 24 have independent NHRIs in compliance with the Paris Principles; 44 have received UPR recommendations relating to the promotion and enforcement of non-discriminatory laws and policies, 43 have ratified the Con-

vention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD); 41 ILO Convention 111 (C111); and 42 the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)'. Therefore there is the potential for international human rights mechanisms to contribute to the monitoring of 16.b by outlining possible data sources and the degree of information available.

Explore the data at SDG16Report.org

Targeting the national level: using SDG16 data for local accountability⁷⁵

Adapted from 'Making them Count: using indicators and data to strengthen accountability for the SDGs' by Saferworld; the TAP Network; and UNDP.

While the 17 SDGs seventeen goals were finalised and agreed by the UNGA in 2015, the IAEG will continue to refine the SDG indicators over the next 13 years. These global indicators, are expected to be accompanied by complementary regional and national indicators.⁷⁶ The IAEG has grouped all the indicators into three tiers according to the current levels of conceptualisation, methodological aspects and availability. Many tier three indicators may take years to finalize before any data can be produced—which will likely slow implementation because ‘what gets measured, gets done.’ As such, the 2030 Agenda framework should be used by local actors—inside and outside of government—who are working to reform and improve their achievement of SDG16.⁷⁷

National Statistical Offices (NSOs) are meant to be the primary source of official SDG data. With a total of 230 indicators, there is a cornucopia of global indicators for NSOs to report on, many of which lack an agreed upon and precise methodology. Few countries will have the capacity or resources to gather data for every global indicator; the United States, for example, is struggling to find data for the majority of indicators, so this is likely to be even more challenging for lower income countries. This is why a ‘data revolution’ is so critical—so that the world can harness the huge amount of data being produced by official and non-official actors across the globe.⁷⁸ Recognising that a global indicator framework will inevitably be limited, and that monitoring at the national level will be of critical importance to track progress towards the SDGs, we need to develop national level indicators and to invest resources to develop methodological capacities at the national level.

The 2030 Agenda makes clear that countries are responsible for aligning the SDGs with their own national development strategies. As few countries can be expected to meet all 17 goals and 169 targets, they will need to prioritise targets. The Georgian government, for example, has harmonised 94 targets from 16 of the goals into a national plan. Other countries have chosen to prioritise issues already addressed by their national development plans. The extent to which the process of prioritising SDGs is inclusive and consultative will shape how much they are owned beyond the government.

However, national level indicators and state buy-in are not the only keys to unlocking data for accountability and change among national actors. Awareness of the SDGs in general and of the commitments that every government has signed up to is currently very low globally. However, many of the same issues addressed by the SDGs are well-known and part of the public discourse. Bridging this divide between discourses is critical to ensure that data produced for the 2030 Agenda is accessed by activists and policymakers at the national and subnational level. While global indicators

matter, nationally-created and nationally owned indicators may have greater potential for driving accountability and changing the incentives of decision-makers. This is complementary to the global indicators, which may not be as locally owned but can catalyse debate at national level and support those seeking to advance particular global norms in their own contexts. Critically, global indicators also provide comparable data, allowing best practices to be identified and shared across countries.

Indicators need to have local resonance, legitimacy and buy-in if they are to galvanize action at the national level. One study on the use of international framework indicators found that “within civil society there was not much appetite for using global indicators for accountability purposes.”⁷⁹ An activist from Nigeria stated that indicators “don’t mean anything until they speak to personal welfare, improvements in our lives and people’s own experience of development.” Nationally-created and nationally-owned indicators have greater potential for driving accountability and changing the incentives of decision makers. However, for these national indicators, the data produced should be open and available to civil society, and it should be disaggregated by sex, disability, ethnic or racial identity and age. This will help ensure that NSOs are independent and credible, and that the data can be used by activists. The global community must also support the development of diverse data producers including non-official actors within national contexts to provide other sources of data to triangulate patterns.

A free and open press is critical for this data to be used for accountability. The media should be supported to translate the data into meaningful narratives for the public and to connect the numbers to their daily lives. This connects directly with achieving 16.10, and will in some cases require political support and advocacy from the international community. Similarly, data literacy should be strengthened among the public to ensure that the data provided can be understood and used. Accountability cannot occur without the media connecting abstract and complex data to citizens’ lived experiences. However, growing constraints on the freedom of the media and on civil society space will make this harder.

To maximise the potential impact of the SDGs, the evidence base on how indicators and data contribute to substantive change needs to be strengthened, especially when it comes to issues of peace, justice, governance and human rights. We still have much more to learn about how accountability actors use data in general, above and beyond linking it to international framework indicators. We also need to explore how quantitative data can most effectively complement qualitative narratives and other stories of progress. Engaging with the media and helping them explore how to make this link effectively will be critical. It is important to understand these issues before resources are invested in developing new data sets or portals.

There are also questions about the relative advantages of monitoring at the global or national levels. Resources are clearly limited. Is it more important for the international community to generate comparable data for the world to review progress—and each country’s contribution to it—or country-specific data for national stakeholders to mobilise around? On the one hand, the centralising tendencies of multilateral processes need to be acknowledged and challenged. On the other hand, those who campaigned long and hard for the inclusion of peace, justice and inclusive societies in the SDG framework should be under no illusion that all governments—and especially those in countries where the goal matters most—will welcome accountability processes at the national level that are seen to challenge the political status quo.

Endnotes

- 1 Widmer, Mireille and Irene Pavesi. 2016. 'Monitoring Trends in Violent Deaths.' Research Note No. 59. Geneva: Small Arms Survey: http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/H-Research_Notes/SAS-Research-Note-59.pdf
- 2 *Ibidem*
- 3 The Small Arms Survey has estimated that intentional homicide represented 75 percent of all violent deaths over the period 2004-2009, 74 percent between 2007-2012 and 69 percent between 2010 and 2015 (Geneva Declaration Secretariat, 2011, 2015; Small Arms Survey, 2016).
- 4 Other forms of violent deaths include deaths occurred during military operations in conflict affected settings but also killings due to legal intervention and unintentional homicides.
- 5 Melander, Erik and Therése Pettersson & Lotta Themnér (2016) Organized violence, 1989-2015. *Journal of Peace Research* 53(5) 727--742.
- 6 Bethany Lacina & Nils Petter Gleditsch (2005) Monitoring trends in global combat: A new data-set of battle deaths. *European Journal of Population* 21(2-3): 145-166
- 7 On average, 62 percent of people reported to feel safe walking alone around the area they live.
- 8 Small Arms Survey Database on Violent Deaths
- 9 Hillis S, Mercy J, Amobi A, et al. Global Prevalence of Past-year Violence Against Children: A Systematic Review and Minimum Estimates. *Pediatrics*, 2016;137(3):e20154079
- 10 <https://data.unicef.org/topic/child-protection/violence/violent-discipline/>
- 11 Hidden in Plain Sight: A statistical analysis of violence against children, 2014.
- 12 National Institute of Public Health, Bullying victimisation among 14 to 15-year-old school children: results from two comparative studies in 66 countries and regions, *Int J Adolesc Med Health*, 2008, Apr-Jun; 20(2);, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18714557>.
- 13 Barth et al, "The Current Prevalence of Child Sexual Abuse Worldwide: A systematic review and meta-analysis", *International Journal of Public Health*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2013
- 14 *Ibid* 3
- 15 UNODC, Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, 2016
- 16 Meta data Goal 16, <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-16.pdf>
- 17 *Ibid* 8
- 18 World Vision International, Data Mini Revolution, 2014
- 19 The International NGO Council, 10 Years On: Global Progress And Delay In Ending Violence Against Children—The Rhetoric And The Reality, 2017
- 20 Freedom House. *Freedom in the World 2017*. 2017. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2017>.
- 21 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and Open Society Foundations. "Leveraging the SDGs for Inclusive Growth: Delivering Access to Justice for All." Issues Brief, 2016. <http://www.oecd.org/gov/delivering-access-to-justice-for-all.pdf>.
- 22 National Council for Law Reporting Library. "The Legal Aid Act." *Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 56 (Acts No. 6)*. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya, 2016. http://kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/Acts/LegalAidAct_No_6_of_2016.pdf.
- 23 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). "Regional Consultation on Sustainable Development Goals, Access to Justice and Legal Aid." 2017. <https://namati.org/resources/association-of-southeast-asian-nations-asean-regional-consultation-on-sustainable-development-goals-access-to-justice-and-legal-aid/>.
- 24 United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. "Resolution 52/2. Promoting legal aid, including through a network of legal aid providers." 2016. http://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CCPCJ/CCPCJ_Sessions/CCPCJ_25/2016_Resolutions_Decisions/03.CCPCJ_2016/Resolution_25_2.pdf.
- 25 Open Government Partnership. "Paris Declaration for Open Government: Collective Actions to Accelerate Open Government." Paris, 2016. https://en.ogpsummit.org/app/uploads/2016/12/Paris-Declaration-for-Open-Government_collective-actions.pdf.
- 26 Open Society Foundations. *Strengthening Pretrial Justice: A Guide to the Effective Use of Indicators*. New York: Open Society Foundations, 2015. <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/indicators-pretrial-eng-20160205.pdf>.
- 27 Stacey Cram and Maru, Vivek. "Access to justice for all? Now that would be a measurably good thing." *The Guardian*, 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/>

- jan/01/access-to-justice-for-all-sustainable-development-goal-16-indicators.
- 28 Pascoe Pleasance, Balmer, Nigel J. and Sandefur, Rebecca L. *Paths to Justice: A past, resent, and future roadmap*. London: UCL Centre for Empirical Legal Studies, 2013. <http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/sites/default/files/files/PTJ%20Roadmap%20NUFFIELD%20Published.pdf>.
- 29 Open Society Justice Initiative and World Bank Group. "Public access to effective and just dispute resolution: An additional indicator to measure Sustainable Development Goal 16.3." 2016. <http://deliver2030.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Technical-Brief-Public-access-to-effective-and-just-dispute-resolution.pdf>.
- 30 United Nations Economic and Social Council. "Report of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators." 2016. <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/48th-session/documents/2017-2-IAEG-SDGs-E.pdf>.
- 31 World Justice Project. *World Justice Project Rule of Law Index® 2016*. 2016. <https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/wjp-rule-law-index/wjp-rule-law-index-2016>
- 32 Leone, Faye. "Partners Launch Global Alliance for SDG 16 Reporting." International Institute for Sustainable Development, 2016. <http://sdg.iisd.org/news/partners-launch-global-alliance-for-sdg-16-reporting/>.
- 33 Channing May. 2017. *Transnational Crime and the Developing World*. Washington: Global Financial Integrity. **March** <http://www.gfintegrity.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Transnational_Crime-final.pdf>
- 34 Pavesi, 2016, Trade Update. Transfers and Transparency. Geneva: Small Arms Survey. <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/S-Trade-Update/SAS-Trade-Update.pdf>>
- 35 Global Financial Integrity, *Illicit Financial Flows from Developing Countries: 2005-2014*, p. vii. <http://www.gfintegrity.org/reports/>.
- 36 <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-16-05-02.pdf>
- 37 <http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/data/explore-topics/corruption>
- 38 The survey was conducted in 16 countries in Asia Pacific, 9 countries in Middle-East and North Africa and 28 countries in Sub-Sharan Africa. http://www.transparency.org/research/gcb/gcb_2015_16
- 39 http://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/publication/people_and_corruption_europe_and_central_asia_2016
- 40 For the full country list, see http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_perceptions_index_2016
- 41 Asia Pacific, Europe and Central Asia, Middle and North Africa and Sub-Sharan Africa
- 42 See http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_and_inequality_how_populists_mislead_people; http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/africa_corruption_is_a_big_issue_in_2016_african_elections; http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/americas_sometimes_bad_news_is_good_news;
- http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/asia_pacific_fighting_corruption_is_side_lined.
- 43 Ibid 5
- 44 V-Dem Policy Brief No. 1 2015
- 45 <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org>
- 46 See State of Civil Society Report 2016, by CIVICUS, available at <http://www.civicus.org/index.php/socs2016>
- 47 ibid
- 48 World Bank, ID4D Data-set. Available at data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/id4d-data-set
- 49 UNICEF, Birth Registration Homepage. Available at https://www.unicef.org/protection/57929_58010.html
- 50 UNDP Unpublished Research.
- 51 UNICEF Data, Birth Registration. Available at <https://data.unicef.org/topic/child-protection/birth-registration/>
- 52 See <http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/id4d>
- 53 UNICEF, "A Passport to Protection: A Guide to Birth Registration Programming." Available at https://www.unicef.org/protection/files/UNICEF_Birth_Registration_Handbook.pdf
- 54 WFP, "SCOPE In Five Minutes." Available at <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/resources/wfp280992.pdf>
- 55 <https://cpj.org/impact/>
- 56 <http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/ICCAccreditation/Pages/default.aspx>
- 57 <http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/Documents/Status%20Accreditation%20Chart.pdf>
- 58 http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2017/02/Goal16_2016_webfile.pdf
- 59 http://www.heuni.fi/material/attachments/heuni/reports/vcqOZtedb/HEUNI_report_no.86.pdf
- 60 <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-16-0A-01.pdf>

- 61 SDG16 Data Initiative at http://www.sdg16.org/map/?layer=proportion_discriminated_against&layerType=indicator
- 62 Danish Institute for Human Rights (2017) “Human Rights and Data” retrieved from https://www.humanrights.dk/sites/humanrights.dk/files/media/dokumenter/sdg/data_report_final_2017.pdf at 16.
- 63 Danish Institute of Human Rights (2016) “UPR of Denmark 2016” retrieved from https://www.humanrights.dk/sites/humanrights.dk/files/media/dokumenter/udgivelsesr/upr/list_of_selected_recommendations_upr_denmark_24_session_2016_-_new_version.pdf
- 64 See UPR Info database report at: <http://s.upr-info.org/2op9LeQ>
- 65 With the exception of Japan, Malaysia, Monaco and Thailand.
- 66 With the exception of Qatar and the Maldives.
- 67 With the exception of Malaysia.
- 68 With the exception of Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria and Zimbabwe.
- 69 Ibid.
- 70 UNSD (2017) “Work Plans for Tier III Indicators” at 223. Available at: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/meetings/iaeg-sdgs-meeting-05/TierIII_Work_Plans_03_03_2017.pdf
- 71 Ibid, at 225.
- 72 DIHR “Human Rights and Data” above n 2, at 17.
- 73 Ibid, at 56.
- 74 DIHR “Human Rights and Data” above n 2, at 56.
- 75 This was adapted from ‘Making them Count: using indicators and data to strengthen accountability for the SDGs’ by Thomas Wheeler, Saferworld; John Romano, TAP Network; and Jairo Acuna-Alfaro and Alexandra Wilde, UNDP. This note draws upon a consultation on 6 December 2016, held as an official side-event to the Fourth Open Government Partnership (OGP) Summit in Paris co-hosted by Saferworld, the Transparency, Accountability and Participation (TAP) Network, and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The views expressed in this note do not necessarily reflect the official position of UNDP or the United Nations.
- 76 Global indicators are to be used to track global progress towards the SDGs, aggregating data provided to the UN system from each member state (or from other sources in the case of transnational issues). Though countries can draw on global indicators, national indicators are to be identified at the country level and used to track issues of particular relevance to each context. Regional bodies will also potentially create further indicators to track regional issues.
- 77 See for example Miller-Dawkins, M (2015) *Global Goals and International Agreements: Lessons for the SDGs* ODI: London, ODI (2015), Binat Sarwa, M (2015) *National MDG Implementation: Lessons for the SDG era*, ODI: London, Vernon P & Baksh, D (2010) *Working with the Grain to Change the Gain* International Alert: London.
- 78 See United Nations Secretary-General Independent Expert Advisory Group (2014) *A World that Counts: Mobilising the data revolution for sustainable development* United Nations: New York
- 79 Serban, M. (2015) ‘Rule of Law Indicators as a Technology of Power in Romania’ in Merry, S, Davis, K & Benedict Kingsbury, B. eds (2015) *The Quiet Power of Indicators: Measuring Governance, Corruption, and Rule of Law*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

View This Report Online:
www.SDG16Report.org

SDG16

Data Initiative

With support from the following TAP Network members: World Vision, V.Dem, ID2020, GFI and DIHR. We would also like to thank Jatinder Padda, for her excellent copy-editing, Fearless Future for their graphic design, and TAP members for responding to our consultation survey.



SDG 16

Data Initiative

