



DfID SDG16 Event | 9 December 2015

Measuring Progress on SDG 16

- To assess progress over time and space, we need appropriate measures that reflect the agreed targets of SDG16.
 - Ideal would be to have governance measures akin to say mortality rates in public health or GDP in economics.
 - What are the right measures for governance?
 - Basis for policy decisions (e.g., aid, investment).

Overview

Our goal is to contribute to the discussion over measurement strategies.

1. Discuss briefly criteria for good measures.
2. Apply these criteria to currently proposed indicators for 2-3 targets of SDG16.
 - Alternative or supplementary **indicators**
 - Complementary strategies for **measurement** (validation)

Characteristics of good indicators

- **Valid** – measures what its supposed to measure. Straightforward interpretation.
- **Reliable** - repeated measures produce a consistent estimate.
- **Comparable** - means the same thing across cases (over time, across countries/units).
- **Discriminatory** - successfully distinguishes between different levels (not crude).

Measurement strategies

- **Direct** (behavioral measure for an indicator capturing behavior; attitudinal measure for capturing attitudes).
- **Truthful** - not undone by intentional or unintentional obfuscation. Hard to manipulate.
 - Social desirability bias
 - Sensitive questions (fear of repercussion)
 - Career incentives
 - Poor recall

16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

16.6.1: Actual primary expenditures per sector and revenues as a percentage of original approved budget of the government

- Budget/expenditure measure
 - Reflects a mix of bureaucratic capacity, corruption, political tinkering.
 - Consistency of expenditures with a bad budget is not desirable.
 - Spending money is not the same as effective spending.
- Trust measures (earlier draft)
 - Behavioral measures for generalized trust (*brief*).

16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

16.6.2: Proportion of population satisfied with quality of public services (disaggregated by service)

- Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience with public services
 - Might reflect a mix of effectiveness and transparency.
 - Difficulties with survey measures:
 - » “I’m satisfied” means different things for different people
 - » People might not respond honestly if they fear retribution
 - » We recommend using anchoring vignette techniques + strategies that shield respondents (*briefs*)

16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Some Ideas for 16.6 Indicators: Transparency

1. Are budgets and expenditures at all levels published, publicly available, and easily accessible?
2. Are there RTI laws/rules in place? What is the cost of using them?
 - We recommend audit studies to measure responsiveness of government at all levels to all citizens (*brief*)

16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Some Ideas for 16.6 Indicators: Effectiveness

1. Service delivery: outputs and outcomes
 - A standardized data collection mechanism at the service point, can be aggregated
 - Third-party audits for information such as absenteeism
 - Audits might be conducted by citizen groups

2. We recommend keeping the budget measure, with:
 - Third-party audits for leakages
 - Other corruption measures (*briefs*)

3. Also we recommend keeping surveys on satisfaction and service utilization
 - Anchoring vignettes, surveys shielding individuals, behavioral measures (*briefs*)

16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

Some Ideas for 16.6 Indicators: Accountability

1. Are there laws/independent institutions such as:
 - Citizen review boards (e.g., police departments)
 - Whistleblower protections
 - Public hearings for rule-making/budgeting
2. We also recommend a decentralized, simple platform for reporting malfeasances
 - ICT/Crowdsourcing (*brief*)

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

- **16.7.1 Diversity in representation in key decision-making bodies**
 - Proportions of positions (by sex, disability and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.
 - Very similar other indicator also specifies executive.
- **16.7.2 Proportion of countries that address young people's multi-sectoral needs with their national development plan and poverty reduction plans.**
 - Grayed out.

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

Some Ideas for Indicators for 16.7.1: Inclusive

- Indicator: Proportions of positions (by sex, disability and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.
 - Overall, a good measure (descriptive representation).
 - A thorny issue is how to make “other groups” comparable.
 - We recommend also including the military, and potentially other accountability institutions.

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

Some Ideas for Indicators for 16.7.2: Representative

1. We recommend focusing on representation and whether elections reflect the will of the people.
 - Statistical techniques for electoral fraud (*brief*)
 - Self-administered surveys
2. Whether civil society organizations feel like they have meaningful input and access in national policy-making.
3. At the local level, whether individuals (particularly women and marginalized groups) feel welcome to participate in community decisions
 - Anchoring vignettes, surveys (*briefs*)
 - Audit studies (*brief*)

16.3 Promote the Rule of Law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all

- Percentage of victims in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms.
 - Violence is narrow.
 - Reporting crime is not the same as investigating crime.
 - Traditional/informal dispute mechanisms can substitute for reporting to state officials.
 - High rule of law would be low crime (small denominator). Small variability in the reporting (numerator) can lead to large swings in the indicator.
- We support the alternative proposed measure: duration of detention without sentence.
 - We also recommend variance of group means in trust in courts, justice system, and police.

Discussion

- Criteria for good measures & application to 16.6 & 16.7
- Some consistent themes
 - Comparability across contexts within surveys (anchoring vignettes)
 - Sensitivity of questions (self-administered surveys; behavioral measures)
 - Need for validation (audit studies; fraud detection)
 - Closer alignment between target components and indicators

Some broader ideas

- Standardized subnational administrative data
 - Power of fine-grained data beyond surveys (geospatial)
 - Crime
- Expand the current toolbox with ICT
 - Crowd-sourcing & crowd-seeding
 - Location information from mobile phones