



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