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Executive Summary

An Expert Group Meeting of statisticians and governance experts was convened on 9-10 May 2017 by UNDP and the Praia City Group secretariat, and hosted by Statistics Norway (a Praia City Group member), to further the methodological development of three tier 3 indicators under Sustainable Development Goal 16 on Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions, for which UNDP has assumed interim custodianship:

- 16.6.2 – Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services
- 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
- 16.7.2 – Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group

This meeting report summarizes the deliberations with respect to definitional, methodological and practical issues to be considered in developing the methodology for each indicator, and identifies areas of consensus and aspects requiring further research and/or consultation before the next EGM to be held in the fall 2017.

It should be noted that the metadata for all three indicators will encourage disaggregation by sex, age groups, disability and population groups (depending on relevance and data availability at country level), and by administrative level of government (national vs. regional vs. local).

Indicator 16.6.2 – “Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services”

Key areas of agreement:

- There is a need to narrow down a limited set of public services that are universally salient as far as possible for all countries and within countries (rural and urban populations).
- If the survey focuses only on actual experience of the service by the respondent, to the exclusion of perceptions, it should also capture exclusion from the service.
- Spelling out specific quality attributes of any given service in the survey question might be an effective way to ensure that respondents understand the question in the same way across various national contexts.

Needs for further research/further consultation:

- Assessment of the extent to which satisfaction with the provision of certain services is already being measured by other indicators across the SDG framework, to guide the prioritization of services to be included in indicator 16.6.2.
- Mapping of national surveying practices by approximately 10 NSOs to document sectors of focus, categories of services examined, use of quality attributes in survey questions, types of response scales, etc.
- Research to investigate the impact of using quality attributes in survey questions on levels of satisfaction, the pros and cons of using perception vs. experiential data to measure satisfaction with public services, and sectors/aspects of service delivery which would be most relevant from a gender-perspective.
Indicator 16.7.2 – “Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group”

Key areas of agreement:
- While the current formulation of indicator 16.7.2 may not be operational, there is a breadth of experience among NSOs relating to data collection on different aspects of responsiveness and inclusivity.
- Since SDG 16 focuses on state-society relations, the focus of indicator 16.7.2 is therefore perhaps best placed on the mechanisms through which formal institutions make decisions and derive their legitimacy (vs. broader range of informal decision-making processes at community level, within civic organizations, etc.)
- Survey measures for 16.7.2 should be designed with a view to being policy actionable – i.e. to inform decision-making and course correction by policymakers.
- Some candidate measures for indicator 16.7.2 were considered by the group. Appreciable concordance was noted between two empirically-based approaches that were presented, i.e. between items such as the “electoral/local authorities are trustworthy” and “MPs listen”, and items such as “trust in the civil service” and “trust in parliament”.

Needs for further research/further consultation:
- Research underpinning the proposed candidate measures referenced above should be expanded to include more multi-country surveys from other geographical contexts, to test whether the level of reliability and validity remains equally compelling.
- Mapping of national surveying practices by approximately 10 NSOs to document how responsiveness and inclusion are being measured, at different levels of decision-making.

Indicator 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?”

PUBLIC SERVICE

Key areas of agreement:
- To specify the scope of ‘the public service’, the metadata will refer to the existing internationally agreed definition of the ‘general government sector’, from the System of National Accounts (but removing the government units that belong to the legislative and judiciary branches of government.)
- It will be important that countries report separately on specific sectors known to be disproportionately staffed by either male or female populations, such as the (typically male-dominated) security sector, and the (typically female-dominated) education and health sectors.
- Administrative records maintained by a Civil Service Commission (or related public administration body) in the form of a centralized registry tend to be more precise (i.e. no sampling error), more up-to-date, and more amenable to disaggregation than public employment statistics derived from a national labor force survey.
- Since this type of tracking system is also the most commonly used across the world, the metadata for this indicator will be primarily focused on the use of administrative sources – at least as a ‘short-term solution’.
- The metadata for this indicator will provide a ‘recoding matrix’ to guide Civil Service Commissions (or related institutions maintaining a centralized registry or records on the public service workforce) in aligning their national classification system with the international standard
classification ISCO-08. This recoding matrix will distinguish ‘decision-making’ functions from other functions.

Needs for further research/further consultation:
• In collaboration with the ILO and OECD, pilot a preliminary data collection instrument both with selected civil service commissions (or relevant public administration bodies holding administrative data on the public service workforce) AND with NSOs holding labor force statistics produced from labor force surveys. (N.B. Each pilot country should test the instrument with both administrative data and labor force statistics, to see whether the figures obtained from one source differ significantly from those obtained from the other source.)
• Test the feasibility of using the Washington Group survey questions to collect data on disability in the public service – and identify which actor would be best placed to run such a survey (Civil Service Commission, NSO or other actors)

PARLIAMENT

Key areas of agreement:
• Countries should report data on three types of positions in the legislature, namely 1) members of the Lower and/or Upper House of Parliament, 2) the Speaker of the House, and 3) chairs of permanent (‘standing’) parliamentary committees.
• Since most data needed for this indicator is already being collected by parliamentary administrations for the Interparliamentary Union (IPU) – except for data on chairmanship of permanent committees – it should be relatively straightforward for NSOs and parliamentary administrations to establish a data-sharing protocol which would stipulate that any data shared with the IPU should be simultaneously shared with the NSO.

Needs for further research/further consultation:
• Review variations in committee systems across countries and investigate potential effects of these variations on the tracking of permanent committee leadership (e.g. variations in number/range of permanent committees across different types of parliaments, variations in relative weight of permanent committees as a proportion of all committees, etc.)
• In collaboration with IPU, test the feasibility of a) data collection on the chairs of permanent (‘standing’) committees, b) adding other age categories (beyond those already used by the IPU for ‘youth’) to also draw attention to the proportion of MPs in the more mature age brackets, and c) using the Washington Group survey questions to collect data on disability in the parliament.

JUDICIARY

Key areas of agreement:
• The lower-level courts (such as commercial courts, labor courts, family courts, administrative courts, social welfare courts, courts for organized crime & corruption, etc.) are those most often used by populations at local level, and therefore should be included in the scope of this indicator, which should refer to “all courts making-up a country’s specific judicial system”.
• The metadata for this indicator will state that “countries should classify positions in the court system in two categories – namely ‘judges’ and ‘non-judge (professional) staff’, and a recoding matrix will be provided to help judicial administrations align their national classification system of jobs in the judiciary with the international standard classification ISCO-08 for these two categories (judges and non-judge/professional staff).
• Since most data needed for this indicator is already being collected by judicial administrations, it should be relatively straightforward for NSOs and judicial administrations to establish a data-sharing protocol for this data, if not already in place.
Needs for further research/further consultation:

- Pilot a preliminary data collection instrument by selected judicial administrations in a diverse set of countries and test the feasibility of using a recoding matrix to translate data from national classifications into international statistics on ‘judges’ and ‘non-judge (professional) staff’, based on the ISCO-08 classification.
- Further research is needed to determine if ‘non-legal professionals’ who work in the judiciary are considered public servants and if they are accounted for in a civil servant registry – or if they are only counted as part of the judiciary.
- Test the feasibility of using the Washington Group survey questions to collect data on disability in the judiciary – and identify which actor would be best placed to run such a survey (judicial administration, NSO or other actors).
- Global mapping of data collection systems on workforce in the judiciary 1) how up-to-date are these administrative records; 2) availability of central-level registry that could serve as single source for this indicator (i.e. compiling data from lower-level courts AND high-level courts)
Background

Context and objectives for the expert meeting

UNDP has assumed interim custodianship of three tier 3 indicators under Sustainable Development Goal 16 on Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 16.6.2 – Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 16.7.2 – Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A first meeting of statisticians and governance experts was convened on 9-10 May 2017 by UNDP and the Praia City Group secretariat and hosted by Praia City Group member, Statistics Norway, with a view to:

- Discuss definitional, methodological and practical issues to be considered in developing the methodology for each one of these three indicators;
- Identify areas where there is a consensus or at least clear recommendations (with respect to conceptualisation, definitions, standards, etc.);
- Identify areas in need of further refinement and/or research before a second expert meeting to be held in the fall of 2017.

There were 40 participants in the meeting, mostly members of the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics as well as academic, government and civil society experts with experience across the three indicator areas under discussion. See annex 1 for the participants list and program.

As an interim custodian for these three indicators, UNDP’s aim in facilitating this year-long discussion around these three indicators is to support the formulation of a widely agreed definition and metadata sheet for each indicator, which should be submitted to the UN Statistical Commission (UNSC) through the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics and the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG indicators (IAEG-SDGs) by the end of 2017.

“Official statistics are essential for a living democracy [...] In Norway, we have a strong tradition of using administrative registers, which can be used for statistical production – and indeed for the SDGs – in several ways. For instance, powerful statistics can be derived from linking one register with another, and from combining administrative data with survey data or even big data.”

- Elisabeth Nørgaard, Statistics Norway

“The overall objective of the Praia City Group is to encourage countries to produce governance statistics based on sound and documented methodologies – and to this end, we are currently

1 ‘Tier 3’ indicators are indicators for which no internationally established methodology or standards are yet available, but are being developed or tested.
developing a handbook on governance statistics for NSOs. In 2016, the UNSC welcomed the support of the Praia City Group for the development of tier 3 indicators under SDG 16, and seven working groups were established to enable methodological discussions around each one of these indicators. This meeting, which convenes members of the three UNDP-chaired working groups, will be critical to define our research agenda and consultations for the rest of the year on these three indicators.”

- Osvaldo Borges, President, INECV and Chair, Praia City Group on Governance Statistics

“The very intention of Goal 16 — to foster peaceful and just societies and inclusive and accountable institutions — makes it especially important to include peoples’ voice in monitoring progress towards the Goal. This is recognised in two of the survey-based indicators under consideration in this meeting. [...] Goal 16 represents a global understanding that the time is ripe for harmonized data on peace, justice and accountable institutions; and we owe it to future generations to be both bold and thoughtful in choosing metrics that measure the stated intent of these ambitious targets.”

- Patrick Keuleers, Director of Governance and Peacebuilding, UNDP

Global overview of NSO experiences with the three indicators

In preparation for this meeting, a survey of current data collection practices in relation to indicators 16.6.2, 16.7.1 and 16.7.2 was completed by 33 country respondents. An analysis of survey responses highlighted some broad trends:

- More than half of respondents collect national population data (in their last census or in public registers) on disability (64%), ethnicity/national identity/race/indigenous people status (64%) and income level (51%).
- 74% of respondents collect data on public satisfaction with the provision of public services (16.6.2), using a range of questions related to both experience and perception, and investigating a wide range of sectors/services. Of those who responded, 93% specified that the data collected could be disaggregated by sex, age, disability, geographical region, population group (ethnicity/language/religion), and nearly half (46%) indicated that this type of data was collected annually.
- With regards to indicator 16.7.1 on representation in national institutions:
  - 89% of respondents confirmed that data is being collected on elected members of parliament, with 85% indicating that this data (most often disaggregated by sex and age) is made publicly available.
  - 75% of respondents have a tracking system to monitor the composition of the public service: 64% specify that this data is publicly available, and nearly half (48%) indicate that this data is updated at least once annually. Of those who responded, fewer indicated that public servant data also included disability (52%) and ethnicity/language/religion (30%), compared to age (100%), grade level (79%) and occupation (92%).

---

2 The seven Praia City Group working groups on Tier 3 indicators under SDG16 are chaired by OHCHR (for indicators 16.1.2, 16.10.1 and 16.b.1), UNODC (for indicator 16.5.1) and UNDP (for indicators 16.6.2, 16.7.1 and 16.7.2).

3 Country respondents to the survey included 3 countries from the MENA region, 5 from Africa, 19 from Europe, 1 from North America, 3 from Latin America, and 2 from Asia-Pacific. The full list of respondents is as follows: Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Cote d’Ivoire, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Jamaica, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Palestine, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey and Uganda.
Finally, 76% of respondents collect data on the composition of the judiciary, but similarly to public servant data, only 38% of those who responded collect data on disability and only 25% on ethnicity/language/religion.

- With respect to indicator 16.7.2 on inclusive and responsive decision-making:
  - only 37% of respondents collect data on people’s perception of how free and fair elections are.
  - Roughly the same proportion use survey questions aimed at monitoring people’s perception of how inclusive and/or responsive the formal Executive power\(^4\) (36%) and local authorities (25%) are.
  - Others monitor civic participation in public life and membership in non-governmental organizations.

**Emerging global guidelines on disaggregation**

In 2016, the IAEG-SDGs created a ‘workstream’ on data disaggregation, thus allowing all members of the IAEG-SDGs to contribute to the definition of a consistent terminology across the SDG framework for the ‘disaggregation chapeau’ applicable for all indicators\(^5\). A Drafting Group was then formed to formulate a Work Plan for Disaggregation, and a member from this Group, Ms. Leesha Delatie-Budair, from the Jamaica NSO, shared some considerations emerging from this Work Plan for the development of tier 3 indicators:

- The main focus of efforts to disaggregate SDG indicators should be (in this initial phase, at least) on the disaggregation dimensions explicitly stated in the indicator or the target itself – and amongst those, attention should be placed first and foremost on those dimensions that are most ‘policy-relevant’ for each indicator.
- For tier 3 indicators, it may not be necessary (nor possible) in this initial phase to attempt to harmonize disaggregation categories (e.g. age groups, decision-making grades, etc.) Ultimately, what matters is that disaggregated data gets produced – and used, at the national level.
- While disaggregation by ‘population groups’ is particularly important to reveal patterns of exclusion and/or discrimination in the management of public affairs – a critical consideration for SDG16 – there is a need also to be mindful of the ‘do no harm’ principle and to make sure that people are not being put at risk when disclosing such information (if data protection rights are not enforced). Discriminatory practices and stereotypes about certain groups should not be reinforced by the publication of disaggregated data.
- The Drafting Group is also mindful of considerations (e.g. longer surveys can sometimes increase the non-response rate) which NSOs must take into account when adding specific survey questions and/or thematic modules to collect more disaggregated data, for instance on disability: methodological considerations (e.g. the need to oversample certain population groups to obtain reliable estimates); financial considerations (e.g. additional costs related to running a survey on a bigger sample) and time. The impact of such disaggregation-related requirements on support surveys can be significant, and must be carefully managed by NSOs in order not to jeopardize the quality of these support surveys.

---

\(^4\) For instance, in Uganda, this survey question is asked: “Are you fully involved in the decision-making process on issues concerning you and your village?” Or in Cameroon: “How much do the following people listen to what people like you have to tell them?”

\(^5\) As stated in Agenda 2030, “SDG indicators should be disaggregated where relevant by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability and geographic location, or other characteristics, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics.”
Before breaking into groups, a few ground rules were laid out to help frame group discussions on each one of the three indicators, and to facilitate productive deliberations:

A few ‘ground rules’ to guide working group deliberations

- **Start simple; we can improve/refine over time:** We have to be pragmatic and won’t be able to resolve all issues during this first meeting; the aim for this initial discussion is to agree on broad parameters for each indicator.
- **Search for the least common denominator (‘big tent approach’):** These indicators have to be universally measurable. We need to propose methodologies that are both politically and technically feasible in all countries – i.e. in Least Developed Countries and in OECD countries alike.
- **Respect the ‘spirit’ of the target:** It is useful to remind ourselves of the broader intention of the target related to a particular indicator, to avoid getting caught up in the nitty-gritty of existing indicator language and losing sight of the ‘bigger picture’.

**SDG Indicator 16.6.2: Summary of deliberations**

*Target 16.6 - Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels*

*Indicator 16.6.2 - Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services*

**Issues considered**

1. **Which public services?**
   A key question considered in the expert group meeting was whether the focus should be on public services that are inadequately covered by other SDG indicators.

   Many other public services are covered in the sectorial goals (health, education etc.) and as such, one option would be for 16.6.2 to focus exclusively on public services of specific relevance to SDG16, for example in three distinct areas, as outlined below. However, the remainder of this document does not limit itself to these three sectors:

   1. **Access to justice including for women and marginalized groups with ‘usage’ defined as last (recent) encounter with public legal authorities**
   2. **Policing as a public good linked with public safety with usage defined as the everyday notion of feeling safe and being adequately serviced by the police force**
   3. **Public authorities’ service provision within areas relating to identity and ownership with usage being defined as private citizens’ last encounter with authorities managing processes like birth registrations, civil registries, land ownership, etc. (SDG16 makes specific reference to the issue of birth/civic registrations and legal identity. While this is a critical activity in terms of ensuring rights and identity, the service is used very infrequently.)**

   2. **Public goods versus public services on-demand**
   Public goods and public services comprise a broad range of offerings, interactions and experiences. In identifying the types of services/public goods to prioritise, Mexico, for example, divided public services into three categories.
1. Public goods e.g. drinking water provision, waste collection, street lighting, parks and gardens, police, streets and avenues, highways and freeways
2. On-demand public services that were used in the last 12 months (e.g. public education, public healthcare services, electricity, public transportation in different modalities, and turnpikes)
3. Public proceedings made personally in the last 12 months (e.g. payment of public services, public services requests, issuance of passport and driver’s license).

This reflects that public services are used in very different ways and with different frequency. Some services – referred to as ‘public goods’ – are readily available (or should be) whether citizens actively request them or not, such as street lighting. Other services require action/demand by the citizen, such as electricity provision to individual households. These are ‘individual’ services to the extent that one household’s experience of, for example, reliability, may differ significantly from its neighbour’s. Finally, there are public proceedings, which are understood as citizens’ interactions with public authorities, such as registering a new household for electricity provision, or registering a birth to give a legal identity to a child.

3. Direct experience vs. perception

It was argued that survey questions should make the respondents focus on their personal experience, rather than conveying a perception that may reflect the experience of others, or media reporting on various types of mismanagement in public administration. On this view, survey questions should be formulated so as to ask about personal use of public services, and avoid proxy responses from other members of the household. With a focus on ‘last experience’, the focus must be on usage. However, usage must evidently also include “secondary users” i.e. individuals indirectly affected by the services provided, for example a family member assessing the quality of health services accessed by someone she is caring for.

However, it was also argued that it is of equal importance for the survey and data to also provide information on exclusion from, or unavailability of, service provision in order to give a voice to those deprived of services. A counter-argument was therefore raised that perception data better allows for capturing those who lack, or are excluded from, the services concerned.

It is also important to measure recent experience to avoid memory bias, and to establish a reference period. The use of lists or cards, along with specific characteristics of the public services, can also help respondents concentrate on their experiences.

4. Assessing service provision

There may be a need to provide a list of attributes for satisfaction tailored to the particularities of the service (e.g. water, electricity etc.). For example, INEGI uses a list of quality attributes to help guide people to evaluate their experience with water provision - is the water clean and plentiful, is provision reliable, are there leaks in the streets, etc. This helps the respondent understand what is considered a satisfactory service level for a given service, and encourages him/her to focus on the service in question, rather than on state-society relations more broadly.

The impact on survey results of using service quality criteria in the formulation of questions varies. In some cases, people’s satisfaction goes down when they know that a better service should be provided to them. Yet in other cases, satisfaction levels go up.

It does seem evident that responses on the quality of public services will be more meaningful if detailed and nuanced questions for each service are used, which reflect appropriate service delivery
dimensions such as service availability, efficiency, accessibility and completeness of information, professionalism of employees, affordability, geographic proximity, etc.

5. Survey methods and design

- There are a number of pitfalls in designing surveys on public satisfaction with public service provision. Participants noted that survey design and methodological choices can be made unconsciously, without awareness of their impact on survey results. For example, the order and phrasing of questions can affect responses and the overall quality of survey results.
- It is important to determine who will respond to the survey – an individual or an individual representing the household. In the latter case, those who self-select as respondents may not be representative of the national population and this can potentially lead to problematic gender disparity in responses. As such, the survey methodology must be clear on who the respondent should be. As children and young people are not allowed to serve as respondents in many contexts, special efforts must be made to solicit their inputs by proxy.
- The choice of scale influences survey results. Experience shows that there is not one “unique” best option and experts have different views on whether it is better to have a scale of 0-10, 0-7 or 1-4 – with larger scales allowing for more granularity in responses, and smaller ones presenting the advantage of simplicity. One option applied by Mexico consists in using a narrative scale (extremely bad, very bad, bad, good, very good, excellent) when posing the question orally, and then juxtaposing a numerical scale for analysis.
- Another question is how often data should be collected, and the need to strike the right balance between relatively slow- or fast-moving changes in levels of satisfaction, and the feasibility of data collection. Many experts in the meeting noted that they measure public services satisfaction every 2 years. They have observed that satisfaction levels within some sectors move slowly while they may be very fluid in others.

Areas of agreement

- It will be useful to agree on a limited set of public services that are salient as far as possible for all countries and within countries (rural and urban populations). This could include key services like water and electricity, key social services like health and education, or SDG-16 specific services like policing or judicial services.
- If the survey focuses only on actual experience of the service by the respondent, to the exclusion of perceptions, it should also capture exclusion from the service.
- It is desirable, if the survey length permits, to supplement survey questions with supportive framing (by spelling out specific quality attributes when posing a survey question) to ensure that respondents understand the question in the same way and to minimize the influence of various traditions of “complaining or praising” public services on survey results.
- Public services delivered at the local level must be included to assess the quality of the services that most people encounter and use in their daily life.
- Annual data collection was deemed unnecessary while a survey every 2-3 years would be more feasible and frequent enough to inform policy-making.

Needs for further research / further consultation

- A mapping document should be prepared of at least 10 NSOs to document which sectors they focus on and what categories of services are included. Candidate countries could include South Africa, Latvia, Mexico, Cameroon, the Nordics, India, the Philippines etc.
• The mapping should also include whether the NSOs provide service tailored attributes for respondents to use and the type of scale adopted.
• Examine any existing research on whether rates of satisfaction are higher when respondents are provided with a list of guiding attributes.
• A short technical paper should be developed examining existing research on the use of perceptions (no experience) vs direct experience to measure satisfaction with public services. This would be useful to show the importance of focusing as much as possible on direct experience and to show varying degrees of ‘directness’ in service usage amongst respondents e.g. the experience with schools by parents of children; a caregiver’s experience of health services; etc.
• Undertake a critical review of the surveying practices of a selected number of NSOs, highlighting strengths and weaknesses of their varying approaches in using tailored questions relevant for each service versus asking the same questions for each service
• A short piece of research could be conducted to identify which sectors would be most relevant from a gender-perspective and within those, which aspects of service delivery have gender implications
• Research should be undertaken to determine to what extent satisfaction with service provision is already being measured through indicators relating to other service-delivery focused SDGs i.e. do existing SDG indicators sufficiently cover satisfaction with health, education-related services to justify not being prioritized in SDG 16.6.2?

SDG Indicator 16.7.2: Summary of deliberations

Target 16.7 – Ensure responsive, inclusive and representative decision making at all levels

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

Issues considered

1. Conceptual clarity to address conceptual complexity

• Key attributes of survey questions including for those underpinning SDG indicator 16.7.2 include ‘validity’ and ‘reliability’. Reliability is the extent to which a measure yields consistent results i.e. concordance between surveys on results for a given question, e.g. AfB, WVS, SHaSA-GPS. Validity is the extent to which an indicator actually captures the underlying concept that it purports to measure. Face validity relates to whether respondents and/or data users understand what they are asked to report i.e. good qualitative design, manifested in successful past use and analysis; convergent validity focuses on whether the measure correlates well with other measures of the same underlying concept; and construct validity asks whether the measure has the expected relationship with outcomes thought to be influenced by the measure.

• Analysis carried out prior to the expert meeting found that concepts underlying indicator 16.7.2 have been extensively measured in long-established comparative cross-country sample surveys such as Afrobarometer (AfB) and the World Values Survey (WVS); and even by national statistical offices, most recently those participating in the African statisticians’ SHaSA-GPS project.
Examples relevant to decision-making are found to be reliable, in that similarly worded items yield comparable results for countries in common between AfB and WVS, and also the SHaSA-GPS program; to have face validity, in having been comprehensible to ordinary citizens; and construct validity, in correlating significantly with a relevant outcome.

Items also displayed convergent validity, for example in that exploratory statistical analysis of AfB yields a selection of conceptually related questions that mapped onto the model of “decision making”, including those salient to the “upward” and “downward” components of 16.7.2.

In particular, using AfroBarometer as a data-source, it was found that, in combination, questions on whether “the electoral authority is trustworthy” with another on whether “local authorities are trustworthy” or “MPs listen” are significant perception items that have display reliability and validity, especially strong construct validity; and are, communicable, few in number, and largely global. Further research is needed to expand coverage of other data sources.

When comparing sample-based population surveys with expert surveys, the former correspond well with each other while they collectively differ significantly from the expert surveys, especially in that the latter tend more to extreme values of the scale. This might indicate that issues as viewed by experts have less practical impact on to the daily lives of ordinary citizens.

The expert group discussed the challenge of applying a conceptual framework for responsive and inclusive decision-making that is relevant across geographical regions and in countries with different governance traditions. It was noted that this feature – that attributes posited by a globally applied question may well have contextual variation at country level – is an unavoidable implication of the comparative approach undertaken in the SDG enterprise. It needs to be minimized with carefully designed and pilot-tested formulations.

2. Types of decision-making

Inclusiveness and responsiveness can be applied to upward and downward channels of decision-making (between citizens and the state) as well as to horizontal decision-making. Decision-making should not merely be understood as the decisions made by public office holders and public institutions, but also decision-making processes that citizens are engaged in.

There is a need to include measures on the responsiveness of decision-makers as well as measures on the inclusiveness of decision-making processes. While the former deals with the extent to which decision-makers take into account citizens’ inputs, the latter deals with the extent to which those involved in decision-making processes are perceived to represent all citizens.

In many societies, formal institutions matter less than informal institutions. Decision-making processes are correspondingly not necessarily formal and codified. On the other hand, to the extent that SDG16 focuses broadly on state-society relations, the major focus will be on the mechanisms by which formal institutions make decisions.

Also relating to formal institutions, there is a need to specify what is meant by decision-making at all levels which implies at a minimum a focus on local and national decision-making processes.

Sensitivity to the challenge of comparative validity is required. For instance important foci for institutional decision-making can differ across countries e.g. the Parliament may be very central in one country while in another the Parliament is ceremonial and insignificant. Or the Parliament may have great influence on some issues and no influence on others.
3. The role of trust

- As decisions impacting the life of citizens are taken and implemented in so many different ways, an overall catchall measure might be to focus on measuring trust and in particular trust in public institutions.
- A trust-focused measure is currently being considered by the IAEG-SDGs as an additional indicator for SDG target 16.6; however it is also relevant for this target (16.7).
- The OECD research program on measuring trust and accompanying guidelines sought to prioritize the three most salient trust-in-institution outcomes. It was recommended to measure at a minimum popular trust in the police, trust in the civil service and trust in the parliament.
- There may be a need to also include in 16.7.2 a measure of trust, to reflect the fact that trust is built (or undermined) by looking at the overall performance of a decision-making system and its institutions.

4. NSO experience

- There is a breadth of experience among NSOs relating to data collection on different aspects of responsiveness and inclusivity. Some focus on the functioning of democracy (including legitimacy of elections) broadly speaking, while others focus on the extent to which groups of decision-makers (ministers, party leaders, government, etc.) take into account the concerns and demands of the population, are willing to work with each other, and include civil society in their deliberations.
- In other examples, survey questions are less related to specific institutions and more to the ability of individuals to influence whatever processes impact their everyday lives (for example “Are you fully involved in the decision-making process on issues concerning you and your village”) and to individual agency (such as membership of organizations, knowledge of mechanisms for civic engagement, etc.)

5. Survey design

- There will be a need to address measurement challenges and to present key recommendations for question and survey design i.e. wording of questions, response format, survey context, survey mode, cross-cultural response styles etc. This should be discussed at the next EGM, drawing from existing experiences.
- The survey needs to define respondent groups.
- The survey should also be designed with a view to inform decision-making and intervention, so aggregated findings should strive to be actionable.

Areas of agreement

- The group considered candidate measures for indicator 16.7.2. Appreciable concordance was noted between two empirically-based approaches that were presented, i.e. between items such as the “electoral/local authorities are trustworthy” and “MPs listen”, and items such as “trust in the civil service” and “trust in parliament”.
- Inclusiveness and responsiveness can be applied to upward and downward channels of decision-making (between citizens and the state) as well as to horizontal decision-making. Since SDG16 focuses broadly on state-society relations, more focus will perhaps be on formal institutions.
There is a breadth of experience among NSOs relating to data collection on different aspects of responsiveness and inclusivity. Survey measures should be designed with a view to inform decision-making and intervention so aggregated findings should be policy actionable.

**Needs for further research / further consultation**

- The research underpinning the candidate measures referenced above and presented at the meeting for indicator 16.7.2 should be expanded to include more multi-country surveys from other geographical contexts to test whether the level of reliability and validity remains equally compelling.
- A mapping should be undertaken of at least 10 NSOs to document more precisely how responsiveness and inclusion is being measured. Candidate countries could include South Africa, Latvia, Mexico, Cameroon, the Nordics, India and the Philippines, etc. The mapping should also canvass experience with measuring responsiveness and inclusion at different levels of decision-making.

**SDG Indicator 16.7.1: Summary of deliberations**

**Target 16.7 – Ensure responsive, inclusive and representative decision making at all levels**

**Indicator 16.7.1 – Proportions of positions (by age group, sex, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distribution.**

**Component 1: Public service**

1. **Scope of the indicator: Which institutions should be included in ‘the public service’?**

**Issues considered**

- For this Expert Meeting, the UNDP Gender Equality in Public Administration (GEPA) project was able to synthesize findings from 79 countries across four regions on government employees in the public administration from which the following conclusions are drawn. These mappings do not include political (elected) positions nor the judiciary.
- Not all countries have a publicly available definition of public service (derived from a Civil Service Code or the like). Amongst countries that have such a definition, there are considerable variations in how public administration is codified into law, particularly with respect to which sectors are included and excluded. For instance, when comparing Cabo Verde’s definition with Malawi’s, one notes that employees who work in state-run health care and public education are not counted in Malawi’s definition of public administration (but they are counted in Cabo Verde’s), but employees in the military and government-owned businesses are included (while they are excluded in Cabo Verde’s definition).
- These differences between sectors included in each country’s national definition of the public service matter greatly because it affects who is counted and it may skew the gender/age/population group ratios and our interpretation of how representative of the national

---

7 Namely 11 countries in Asia and the Pacific, 18 in the Arab States, 17 in Eastern Europe and the CIS, and 33 in Latin America and the Caribbean.
population the public service is in any given country. For example, the inclusion of the (typically male-dominated) defense sector can significantly affect the overall gender ratio in the public service in favor of men. Similarly, the inclusion of the (typically female-dominated) education sector can heavily skew the gender ratio towards women.

- Given (1) substantial variations in national definitions of the public service, and the implications thereof for ratios of certain population groups depending on which sectors are included or excluded, and (2) given the requirement for SDG indicators to produce comparable data across countries (a prerequisite for a ‘tier 3’ indicator to be reclassified as ‘tier 2’), it will be necessary to agree on a universal definition of the public service in the metadata, and to specify a certain set of government agencies that countries need to report on.

**Areas of agreement**

- To specify the scope of ‘the public service’, the metadata will refer to the existing internationally agreed definition of the ‘general government sector’[^8], from the System of National Accounts.
- Since the ‘general government sector’ includes all three branches of government, it will be important, for the public service component of indicator 16.7.1, to remove the government units that belong to the legislative and judiciary branches of government.
- It will also be important that countries report separately on specific sectors known to be disproportionately staffed by either male or female populations, such as the (typically male-dominated) security sector, and the (typically female-dominated) education and health sectors.

**Needs for further research / further consultation**

- In the metadata, the ‘statistician language’ of the general government sector from the System of National Accounts will need to be ‘translated’ in terms that are easy to understand by Civil Service Commissions (or the related public administration body responsible for the collection of data on the public service workforce). It will be important to test in a diverse set of pilot countries how such a definition is interpreted in different contexts, i.e. how a civil service commission’s own reading of this definition leads it to include and/or exclude certain sectors and/or institutions, compared to others. Ultimately, the definition of the ‘public service’ provided in the metadata should lead to relatively consistent interpretations across countries.
- There is a need to specify in the metadata which male- or female-dominated sectors included in the ‘general government sector’ are likely to skew sex ratios, and should therefore be reported on separately.

2. **Data sources: What are the most common tracking systems used to collect data on the public service workforce?**

**Issues considered**

- The UNDP GEPA mapping shows that there are multiple ways to collect data on the public service workforce – it will therefore be important for the metadata to account for this diversity in tracking systems and to propose a methodology that is applicable irrespective of the tracking system used.
- Globally, the UNDP GEPA mapping shows that the following three types of tracking systems are most prevalent:
  - **Human Resource Management Information Systems (HRMIS):** by as many as 45% of the countries reviewed by the UNDP GEPA mapping use such a tracking system.

[^8]: The ‘general government sector’ consists of all units of central, state or local government and all non-market non-profit institutions that are controlled by government units. It does not include public corporations, even when all the equity of such corporations is owned by government units.
Pros: Centralized, high-quality and high-frequency data collection, ‘easy’ extraction of specified data.
Cons: Expensive, initial time investment to develop system and train users. Aggregated data quality is not guaranteed.

Civil Service Census\(^9\): Globally, only 16% of the countries reviewed by the UNDP GEPA mapping use such a tracking system.
- **Pros:** Less expensive (i.e. one-off survey), ability to target specific info.
- **Cons:** Time-consuming, lower frequency (e.g. snapshot every 4-5 years), risk of low comparability if the methodology changes every time.

Labor Force Survey: Globally, only 5% of the countries reviewed by the UNDP GEPA mapping use this standardized survey instrument.
- **Pros:** Low cost, would be possible to adapt labor force survey questionnaires to get disaggregated data.
- **Cons:** Labor force surveys are not specific to the public service (they produce statistics on all types of employment, i.e. private, public and self-employment), and as such the representation of public servants in the national sample of a labor force survey may be too small to produce reliable statistics on the public sector specifically. Furthermore, standardized labor force surveys do not collect information on the respondent’s self-identified affiliation to certain ‘population groups’.

**Areas of agreement**

- Administrative records maintained by a Civil Service Commission (or related public administration body) in the form of a centralized registry tend to be more precise (i.e. no sampling error), more up-to-date, and more amenable to disaggregation than public employment statistics derived from a national labor force survey.
- Since this type of tracking system is also the most commonly used across the world, the metadata for this indicator will be primarily focused on the use of administrative sources for the measurement of this indicator – at least as a ‘short-term solution’.
- While most NSOs around the world lack the resources to collect granular data on public service employment at this point in time, statisticians can (should) nonetheless play an important quality assurance role in validating the data produced by the public administration for this indicator.

**Needs for further research / further consultation**

- For countries that do not have a centralized registry maintained by a Civil Service Commission (or related public administration body), we will need to test the feasibility of extracting relevant data on the public service only from official employment statistics produced by the NSO. More specifically, we will need to assess how feasible it is to disaggregate existing employment data 1) between the public and private sectors, 2) between the various branches of government (executive, legislative, judiciary), and 3) between the various levels of government (national, regional, local).

---

\(^9\) While not considered a ‘census’ per se, many countries are producing ad-hoc specialized reports that capture public servant data. The strengths and weakness of this approach are largely the same. One additional weakness of this ad-hoc approach is that the reports are not always carried out by a civil service commission or public administration body, which means there is more room for incomparability across time and across countries. However, the data sources for these reports are often the civil servant registry.
3. Classification of jobs: Which positions should the indicator focus on?

**Issues considered**

- The intent of the target is to see how representative of the national population are those in ‘decision-making positions’, i.e. those in the higher echelons of the public service hierarchy.
- The UNDP GEPA mapping shows that globally, 42% of countries reviewed for the mapping have defined ‘decision-making positions’, i.e. they have identified which grades are considered ‘senior grades’ in their national classification system.
- Based on a review of national, regional and international data collection initiatives on the public service workforce, four options for the classification of jobs in the public service were discussed:
  
  o **Leaving it to each country to define which jobs are categorized as ‘decision-making’**: This approach was rejected as the data produced by this indicator would not be comparable across countries, a core requirement for ‘tier 3 indicators’ to move up to ‘tier 2’.
  
  o **Focusing on the top two tiers of public service institutions (the ‘minimalist approach’)**: For example, the EC Database on Men and Women in Decision-Making\(^{10}\) tracks the staffing composition of the first (i.e. from the head of the ministry down to the level of the head of directorate) and second (i.e. all positions below the head of directorate down to the level of head of division/department) highest administrative levels, as defined by the country.
    - **Strengths**: This is a simple approach with ‘clean’ decision-making categories that allows for the compilation of comparable data across countries.
    - **Considerations**: Some would argue that this approach fails to include other positions that hold decision-making responsibilities in lower/mid-level brackets. Furthermore, countries that have a simpler classification structure (e.g. with three categories of positions: executive, technical, support) may not be able to align with such a ‘top-two-tier’ approach (executive + technical?). Finally, it was felt that this approach does not sufficiently capture the movement from lower brackets of civil servants to mid-management, which is a crucial dynamic to the spirit of the target and which is a challenge in many countries for youth, women and other populations groups that are eventually under-represented in the top echelons.
  
  o **Using employment statistics codified on the basis of the international standard classification of occupations ISCO-08 (the ‘official statistics approach’)**:
    - **Strengths**: Data produced by NSOs tends to be seen as more reliable than data produced by a public administration. Furthermore, ISCO-08 is the official classification standard (adopted in 2007) used by statistical services around the world to classify jobs and persons into occupations. It is an internationally agreed tool for organizing jobs into a clearly defined set of groups according to the tasks and duties undertaken in the job, and is meant to serve as a model for the development of national and regional classifications of occupations – which is likely to be triggered by indicator 16.7.1.
    - **Considerations**: NSOs have limited resources to run labor force surveys – and as such their frequency is highly uneven across countries. Furthermore, labor force surveys are run on a representative sample of the population, and therefore our population of interest for this indicator (public service employees) represents only a fraction of total survey respondents, which may dramatically reduce possibilities

\(^{10}\) See [http://eige.europa.eu/gender-statistics/dgs/browse/wmidm](http://eige.europa.eu/gender-statistics/dgs/browse/wmidm)
for disaggregation and may even cause sampling errors. Finally, since the ISCO-08 codes are not specific to the public sector (all of the occupations listed are relevant for both the public and private sectors\textsuperscript{11} e.g. code 12: ‘Administrative and Commercial Managers’), it would be difficult to extract from existing statistics those figures which pertain only to the public sector. Likewise, it would be difficult to extract from existing statistics those figures that pertain to specific branches of government, as called for by the breakdown of indicator 16.7.1 between the three branches, as several ISCO-08 codes lump together employees in the executive and in another branch, such as code 11: ‘senior officials and legislators’.

- **Applying the international standard classification of occupations ISCO-08 to administrative data (the ‘hybrid approach’):** For example, the OECD recently collected data on the composition of the public service workforce in 35 OECD countries, with a focus on 6 occupational codes in the ISCO-08 classification, by requesting civil service commissions (or relevant public administration body in each country) to report data on the number of staff (and socio-demographic characteristics) performing these functions. Since each national public administration has already elaborated its own national classification of jobs, no reference was made to the numerical ISCO-08 codes in the survey instrument developed by the OECD for civil service commissions. Rather, the OECD shared detailed descriptions for each occupation, the language of which came from the ‘ISCO-08 group definitions’, and civil service commissions were able to extract from their registry the relevant figures that matched these occupational definitions.

  - **Strengths:** Using the definitions attached to individual ISCO-08 codes allows for the compilation of comparable data across country – i.e. data categorized based on functions and not hierarchy as defined by a country. In other words, applying the ISCO-08 classification standard to the registry managed by a public administration body allows us to draw on ‘the best of both worlds’ – i.e. leveraging the comprehensive records of data on all public service employees maintained by a public administration, rich with socio-demographic data allowing for relatively easy disaggregation, while respecting and promoting the adoption of the internationally agreed ISCO-08 standard.
  
  - **Considerations:** The OECD experience shows that it can be time-consuming to get civil service commissions on board with the understanding of externally-imposed categories/definitions of occupations – but with time, initial ‘confusion’ can be fairly easily overcome.

**Areas of agreement**

- The metadata for this indicator will provide a ‘recoding matrix’ to guide Civil Service Commissions (or related institutions maintaining a centralized registry or records on the public service workforce) in aligning their national classification system with the international standard classification ISCO-08. Such a matrix will extract relevant definitions of occupations in the public service from the international ISCO-08 codes, and will simplify their formulations so as to ease the recoding exercise as much as possible. Civil Service Commissions (or related institutions) will be asked to extract from their administrative records the counts of employees performing these functions (and their socio-demographic characteristics, for disaggregation),

\textsuperscript{11} As stated in the Introductory and Methodological Notes for ISCO-08 (http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/docs/methodology08.docx), “With the exception of some very specific groups, such as those occupations included in Minor Group 335: Government Regulatory Associate Professionals, ISCO-08 makes no distinction between administrative occupations in the public sector and the private sector. Almost all ISCO-08 unit groups may therefore include jobs in both sectors.”
thus effectively ‘translating’ counts in national classification codes (custom/country-specific data) to counts in ISCO-08 codes (statistical data).

- Reporting will need to be done separately for ‘decision-making’ functions (in Group 1 – ‘Managers’ of the ISCO-08 classification) and other functions (in Groups 2 – ‘Professionals’ and 3 – ‘Technicians and Associate Professionals’ of the ISCO-08 classification)

**Needs for further research / further consultation**

- There is a need to review the structure of the ISCO-08 classification and to identify relevant codes for the public service (and potential gaps.) At the level of the Major Groups, a cursory review suggests that the first three Groups (1. Managers, 2. Professionals and 3. Technicians and Associate Professionals) may be the most relevant rubrics, within which pertinent Sub-Major, Minor and Unit Groups will need to be identified.
- Once the relevant ISCO-08 rubrics are identified, a specific subset of ‘decision-making positions’ will need to be agreed upon, to enable disaggregated reporting on these positions in comparison to other positions in the lower tiers of the public service hierarchy.
- Once the draft metadata sheet is ready, it will be important to pilot-test in diverse country settings (i.e. in a subset of developed, developing and least developed countries) the data collection instrument both with civil service commissions (or relevant public administration bodies holding administrative data on the public service workforce) AND with NSOs holding labor force statistics produced from labor force surveys. Each pilot country should test the instrument with both administrative data and labor force statistics, to see whether the figures obtained from one source differ significantly from those obtained from the other source. If so, we will want to find out why that is, and how these divergences could be addressed/minimized by the data collection instrument to maximize comparability of data across countries (mindful of countries that do not have a centralized registry on the public service workforce, and thus have to rely on labor force statistics.)

4. **Disaggregation: What are relevant categories for disaggregation of the public service workforce?**

**Issues considered**

- The UNDP GEPA mapping shows that the disaggregation categories most frequently used for public service workforce data are sex (sex-disaggregated data was available in 67% of countries reviewed for the mapping) and age groups (age-disaggregated data was available in 28% of countries reviewed for the mapping). Age-disaggregated data in the lower tiers of a hierarchy is particularly important to assess the ‘pipeline to decision-making’.
- However, disaggregation by ethnicity is rare; in many countries, collecting data on the ethnicity of public employees is even illegal (data disaggregated by ethnicity is available in only 10% of countries reviewed for the mapping, often in countries – such as Nepal – that have set aside a percentage of the total posts in the civil service reserved for indigenous communities, ethnic minorities, and disadvantaged communities such as Dalits.)
- Disaggregation by disability is even more uncommon, with data available in only 4% of countries reviewed for the mapping (these are often countries that have established a quota for disabled persons in the public services, as legislated in the Civil Service Act.)
- The UNDP GEPA mapping found that sub-national data on the public service workforce was available in 29% of countries reviewed for the mapping.

**Areas of agreement**

- The metadata for this indicator will encourage disaggregation by sex, age groups, disability and population groups (depending on relevance and data availability at country level), and by administrative level of government (national vs. regional vs. local).
Needs for further research / further consultation

- It would be useful to further investigate the availability of data on disability and population groups across various national contexts.

- It would be useful to investigate the feasibility of data collection on disability using the Washington Group survey questions (disability is often registered on the basis of submission by staff of a certification of disability by a governmental social welfare entity or by a certified doctor, which may be a complex or burdensome procedure to undertake for a disabled person). An important consideration here would be to identify which actor would be best placed to run such a survey, between the Civil Service Commission (or relevant public administration body maintaining the central registry), the NSO or other actors, in terms of placing the respondent at ease to self-report a disability without fear of adverse consequences on his/her employment situation.

Component 2: Legislature

1. Classification of jobs in the legislature: Which positions should the indicator focus on?

Issues considered

- Given the focus of the target on ‘decision-making’, parliamentary staff\(^\text{12}\) may be excluded from the scope of this indicator.

- In terms of decision-making power, relevant positions are mainly elected members in the Lower House and/or Upper House (Senate) of parliament. Some specific leadership positions also warrant attention, such as the Speaker of Parliament\(^\text{13}\) (the presiding officer of the House) and chairs of parliamentary committees\(^\text{14}\), who are usually responsible for preparing committees’ draft work program.

- While some committees – such as the Budget Committee – are particularly influential in terms of resource allocation and policymaking across a wide range of development issues, it would be unrealistic to expect that any given committee, constituted by a few dozen members, be representative of the national population.

- Nonetheless, the national representativeness of the chairs of committees is important because committees can work as intermediary bodies between interest groups and the relevant authorities, and can be entry points for citizens to the work of parliament.

- Each parliament has its own committee system, the evolution of which is unique to each country. While the naming and number of committees varies enormously from one parliament to another, an overarching distinction can be made between permanent committees (also known as ‘standing committees’), which tend to be related to the policy areas of government departments, and \textit{ad hoc} committees that are set up to address a specific question on a time-limited basis.

\(^{12}\) Parliamentary staff includes full-time permanent staff positions, including the Secretary General and his/her staff, staff supporting committee structures, legal services research Services, Communication Services, and the human resources offices.

\(^{13}\) The Speaker has duties to call the House to order, to recognize members to speak on the House floor, to make rulings about House procedures, and to appoint members and chairpersons of committees. The Speaker also determines which legislation is assigned to each committee and which legislation reaches the House floor for a vote. Furthermore, the Speaker determines the House legislative agenda, in consultation with party leaders, committee chairpersons, the president, and the Senate.

\(^{14}\) Committees are universally found in parliaments across the world. A parliamentary committee is a group of parliamentarians appointed by one chamber (or both chambers, in the case of joint committees in a bicameral parliament) to undertake certain specified tasks, such as detailed scrutiny of draft legislation, oversight of government activities and interaction with the public and external actors. A significant part of parliamentary work is now conducted in committees rather than in the parent chamber.
Areas of agreement

- The metadata for this indicator will state that countries should report data on three types of positions in the legislature, namely 1) members of the Lower and/or Upper House of Parliament\(^{15}\), 2) the Speaker of the House, and 3) chairs of permanent (‘standing’) parliamentary committees.
- It does not matter that the number and names of parliamentary committees vary considerably across parliaments: the metadata will request to consider only the chairs of permanent (‘standing’) committees\(^{16}\), so that figures can be compared over time for a given parliament. If ad hoc committees were also included, the total number of committees would change from one year to another, and therefore measures of representativeness would not be comparable over time.

Needs for further research / further consultation

- While the IPU collects and updates (on a daily basis) data on 1) members of the Lower and/or Upper House of Parliaments in the 193 countries where a national legislature exists, and on 2) Speakers of Parliament, data on the chairs of permanent (‘standing’) committees is not being collected by the IPU at this point in time. As such, there is a need to test the feasibility of data collection on this aspect, while paying particular attention to variations in committee systems across countries and to the effect these variations may have on the tracking of permanent committee leadership (e.g. relative weight of permanent committees as a proportion of all committees in different types of parliaments, such as those of the Westminster tradition and those of the ‘consensus system’ in continental Europe.)

2. Data source: Who collects the most comprehensive data on these positions in the legislature?

Issues considered

- The principle of separation of power tends to mean that the parliament owns the data and manages the data collection processes, at country level (NSOs are rarely involved).
- Data on parliaments and their members, as well as on Speakers of Parliament, is compiled in the Parline database\(^{17}\), for all of the 193 countries where a national legislature exists.
- This data is updated by the IPU on a daily basis, through continuous communication with individual parliaments (usually with the Speaker’s office) and through survey questionnaires filled out by parliamentary administrations every 6 months at IPU Assemblies, and after each election.

Areas of agreement

- Since most data needed for this indicator is already being collected by parliamentary administrations for the IPU (i.e. on elected members of parliament and on Speakers of Parliament), it should be relatively straightforward for the NSO and the parliamentary administration of any given country to establish a data-sharing protocol which would stipulate that any data shared with the IPU should be simultaneously shared with the NSO.

\(^{15}\) A parliament is either unicameral (composed of a single parliamentary chamber) or bicameral (composed of two parliamentary chambers). Parliaments are bicameral (Lower + Upper House) in 78 countries (40% of all parliaments worldwide) and they are unicameral (Lower House only) in 115 countries (60% of all parliaments worldwide). The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) collects data on the composition of all chambers in any given parliament.

\(^{16}\) For instance, if a parliament has 30 standing committees, this indicator will look at the representativeness of the 30 chairs of these committees.

\(^{17}\) See [http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp](http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp)
• Likewise, the parliamentary administration is best placed to track the chairmanship of permanent committees.

3. Disaggregation: What are relevant categories for disaggregation for these positions in the legislature?

**Issues considered**

• The data collected by IPU on elected members of parliament is disaggregated by sex and age.
• With respect to age disaggregation, the latest data gathering by the IPU was carried out in 2015 in 128 countries across all regions. The IPU Forum of Young Parliamentarians defines MPs as “young” if they are under 45, in a bid to be inclusive of all parliaments, recognizing that some chambers – especially upper houses – have relatively high minimum age requirements (young people rarely gain office before the age of 35). Survey responses indicate varied definitions of “youth” across countries. The IPU data for all 128 countries therefore uses three cut-off ages (30, 40 and 45 years old) and is disaggregated by sex as well. As such, data currently available for this indicator can be disaggregated in 4 age-group categories i.e. below 30 years old, 30-40 years old, 40-45 years old, and above 45 years old.
• With respect to disability, the IPU only collects qualitative information on structural aspects, such as legal frameworks providing for reserved seats for disabled MPs. Very few parliaments collect data on disability.
• With respect to indigenous status, research was carried out by the IPU and UNDP on the possibility to track indigenous representation in parliament, but challenges related to definition (several countries have not yet adopted an official national definition of ‘indigenous people’ and/or ‘minorities’), self-identification (several MPs showed resistance to such externally-imposed classifications) and lack of formal status of indigenous people in certain countries led the IPU to conclude that such tracking would be very difficult.

**Areas of agreement**

• The metadata for this indicator will encourage disaggregation of elected members of parliament, Speakers of Parliament and chairs of permanent committees by sex, age groups, disability and population groups (depending on relevance and data availability at country level.)

**Needs for further research / further consultation**

• It would be useful to map availability of data on the composition of local legislatures (for which the IPU does not collect data.)
• It would be useful to map availability of data on disability and ‘population groups’ across various national contexts, and to investigate the feasibility of data collection on disability using the Washington Group questions.
• It would be useful to test the feasibility of adding other age categories to also draw attention to the proportion of MPs in the more mature age brackets.

Component 3: Judiciary

1. Scope of the indicator: Which institutions should be included in ‘the judiciary’?

**Issues considered**

• The legal system of each country is shaped by its unique history and therefore incorporates considerable national variations. This makes it nearly impossible to spell out which specific courts should be included in the definition of ‘the judiciary’ for this indicator.
• In common-law countries (the most common legal system employed, by population size), the legal system is not organized in a coherent and clear structure. Its development tends to be incremental – and therefore, the types of courts making up common-law legal systems vary considerably across countries. Civil-law systems (the most widespread by landmass), on the other hand, are easier to compare as they place greater emphasis on system and structure.

• This great diversity in the structure of court systems across the world explains why most international initiatives (such as World Bank’s biennial report on Women, Business and the Law18) and regional initiatives (such as the EC Database on Women in Men in Decision-Making19) tracking the composition of the workforce in justice systems have decided to use as their ‘common unit of analysis’ the highest-level of courts in countries – i.e. supreme courts, supreme administrative courts, constitutional courts and the public prosecutor’s office.

• The language of the target however, with its emphasis on ‘decision-making at all levels’, also calls for the consideration of courts at the lower level, which are those used by populations for the resolution of the most frequent legal problems they face (consumer problems, employment issues, land and property disputes, family problems, debt-related issues, etc.)

• Two well-established regional and international initiatives have adopted this broader scope and consider ‘all courts’ when tracking the composition of the workforce in justice systems: the Council of Europe database on European judicial systems20 and UNODC’s crime and criminal justice database21.

Areas of agreement

• The lower-level courts (such as commercial courts, labor courts, family courts, administrative courts, social welfare courts, courts for organized crime & corruption, etc.) are those most often used by populations at local level, and therefore should be included in the scope of this indicator.

• Therefore, the metadata for this indicator will state that the ‘judiciary’ here refers to “all courts making-up a country’s specific judicial system, including first instance courts of general jurisdiction, first instance specialised courts, second instance courts and courts of appeal, and supreme and/or constitutional courts.”

2. Classification of jobs in the judiciary: Which positions should the indicator focus on?

Issues considered

• Most international and regional monitoring initiatives (incl. WB, UNODC, EC) focus on ‘key decision-making positions’ in judicial institutions, i.e. judges, presidents of supreme/constitutional courts and heads of prosecution offices, etc. This focus on the most senior level allows for the compilation of comparable data across countries, given these positions are easily defined and common to all countries.

• The language of the target however, with its emphasis on ‘representative decision-making at all levels’, calls for a consideration of other types of legal professions below the most senior level, which also hold decision-making power – such as lawyers, prosecutors, judicial experts, notaries, etc.

• The Council of Europe database on European judicial systems is a good example of a successful attempt at compiling harmonized statistics on a wide range of legal professions (beyond those at the most senior level) in the judicial systems of 47 members of the Council of Europe – such as

18 See http://wbl.worldbank.org
19 See http://eige.europa.eu/gender-statistics/dgs/browse/wmidm
20 See http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/cooperation/cepej/evaluation/2016/STAT/default.asp
21 See https://data.unodc.org
lawyers, non-judge staff, assisting judges, administrative staff, staff attached to public prosecution services, notaries, interpreters, accredited judicial experts, etc.

- The compilation of harmonized statistics across these 47 countries was made possible by the drafting of a detailed ‘explanatory note’ which provides common definitions for categorizing each legal profession.

**Areas of agreement**

- To enable the highest degree of comparability of data between countries, the ISCO-08 international standard classification of occupations will be used to categorize legal professions for this indicator.
- The metadata for this indicator will state that “countries should classify positions in the court system in two categories – namely ‘judges’ and ‘non-judge (professional) staff’, and the relevant ISCO-08 codes/definitions fitting under these two categories will be provided in the metadata.

**Needs for further research / further consultation**

- There is a need to review the ISCO-08 classification to identify the relevant codes/definitions for the two proposed categories – namely ‘judges’ and ‘non-judge (professional) staff’.
- A cursory review of the ISCO-08 classification points to:
  Major Group 2 ‘Professionals’ ➔ Sub-Major-Group 26 ‘Legal, Social and Cultural Professionals’ ➔ Minor Group 261 ‘Legal Professionals’ ➔ 3 Unit Groups:

  o 2611 – Lawyers
  o 2612 – Judges
  o 2619 – Legal Professionals Not Elsewhere Classified (this group includes those who perform legal functions other than pleading or prosecuting cases or presiding over judicial proceedings.)

The first category of ‘judges’ could therefore correspond to ISCO-08 code 2612, and the second category of ‘non-judge (professional) staff’ could correspond to ISCO-08 codes 2611 and 2619.

- Further research is needed to determine if “non-legal professionals” who work in the judiciary are considered public servants and if they are accounted for in a civil servant registry – or if they are only counted as part of the judiciary.
- The ease with which the ISCO-08 classification could be applied on existing national classifications of jobs in the judiciary will need to be tested across national contexts, and feedback from national judicial administrations will need to be carefully considered, particularly with respect to the additional burden imposed on them by this requirement.

3. **Data source: Who collects the most comprehensive data on the workforce in the judiciary?**

**Issues considered**

- The most comprehensive records on the workforce in the judiciary are produced by and housed in judicial administrations.

---

22 Examples of occupations classified under ISCO-08 code 2611 ‘Lawyer’: Attorney, Barrister, Lawyer, Prosecutor, Solicitor.

23 Examples of occupations classified under ISCO-08 code 2612 ‘Judges’: Chief justice, Judge, Magistrate.

24 Examples of occupations classified under ISCO-08 code 2619 ‘Legal Professionals Not Elsewhere Classified’: Coroner, Jurist (except lawyer or judge), and Notary.
• Even when official statistics are produced on the “number (Total / Male / Female) of professional judges or magistrates (absolute count AND per 100,000 population)” (a question in the UN Survey on Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems, UN-CTS), NSOs seek this data directly from judicial administrations.

• In some countries, the requisite computerized information management system may not yet be in place to enable real-time data-sharing between lower-level courts across the country and the central registry maintained by the judicial administration, which may complicate the compilation of data for this indicator.

**Areas of agreement**

• Administrative records held by the judicial administration on personnel working in the judiciary will be the primary source for this indicator.

• Since most data needed for this indicator is already being collected by judicial administrations, it should be relatively straightforward for the NSO and the judicial administration of any given country to establish a data-sharing protocol for this data, if not already in place.

**Needs for further research / further consultation**

• There is a need to investigate across various national contexts a) how up-to-date are these administrative records, and b) the extent to which administrative records of personnel in lower-level courts are centralized into a national-level registry which could serve as single source for this indicator. In some least developed countries, such a central-level registry may not always be found.

• It would be useful to find national experiences where the NSO is actively involved in supporting the production of such statistics by the judicial administration, e.g. through quality assurance/validation of data, training of data collection units in courts, publication of data in official statistical publications, etc.

4. **Disaggregation: What are relevant categories for disaggregation of data on the workforce in the judiciary?**

**Issues considered**

• Most international/regional initiatives only track representation of women in the judiciary.

• Even in the most developed countries, sex-disaggregated data is not always readily available, as highlighted by a representative of the Council of Europe Database on European Judicial Systems: “Data collection disaggregated by sex is already proving difficult in some countries […] As such we do not ask countries to further disaggregate the data they provide.”

**Areas of agreement**

• The metadata for this indicator will encourage disaggregation by sex, age groups, disability and population groups (depending on relevance and data availability at country level).

**Needs for further research / further consultation**

• It would be useful to map availability of data on disability and population groups across various national contexts, and to investigate the feasibility of data collection on disability using the Washington Group questions. An important consideration here would be to identity which actor would be best placed to run such a survey, between the judicial administration, the NSO or other actors, in terms of placing the respondent at ease to respond truthfully without fear of adverse consequences on his/her employment situation.
Next steps
A second smaller expert group meeting will be held in the fall of 2017 (at a date and location still to be determined) to review outcomes and progress in the follow up on the concrete areas recommended for further research and exploration identified for each of the indicators.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1: Tuesday May 9:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:00 - 9:30 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opening Remarks</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Statistics Norway (Elisabeth Nørgaard)&lt;br&gt;• INECV/Praia City Group (Osvaldo Borges)&lt;br&gt;• UNDP (Patrick Keuleers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:30 - 10:00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meeting objectives and meeting format</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Meeting objectives and overall metadata development process (Alexandra Wilde, UNDP)&lt;br&gt;• Focus of meeting on three Tier 3 indicators:&lt;br&gt;  ✓ SDG 16.6.2: Percentage of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services;&lt;br&gt;  ✓ SDG 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;&lt;br&gt;  ✓ SDG 16.7.2: Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:00 - 10:20 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presentation of Statistics Norway experience with collecting data for SDG 16 Indicators 16.6.2, 16.7.1 and 16.7.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:20 - 11:00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presentation of proposed agenda for each of the 3 Indicator Working Groups</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Key issues (16.6.2, 16.7.1 and 16.7.2) to be discussed in the Working Groups and key findings from the NSO survey on these issues&lt;br&gt;• Identification/discussion of cross-cutting considerations, challenges and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:00 - 11:15 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Participants sign up for the Working Group of their choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:15 - 12:00 pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Emerging global guidelines on disaggregation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 13:00 pm</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 14:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Working Group 1 (16.6.2 &amp; 16.7.2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Country experiences in collecting data relevant to 16.6.2 and 16.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Drawing lessons/recommendations relevant to both indicators from existing efforts to measure citizen satisfaction with public services and citizen perceptions of ‘decision-making’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Presentation from INEGI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working Group 2 (16.7.1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country experiences in collecting data relevant to 16.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Drawing lessons/recommendations from existing efforts to collect data on workforce composition in public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Presentation from Statistics South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 - 15:00 pm</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - 16:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Working Group 16.6.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations of relevant experiences continued, and in focused indicator-groups, review and discussion of likely candidate indicators and associated methodologies for each indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working Group 16.7.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working Group 16.7.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2: Wednesday May 10</td>
<td>In focused indicator-groups, review and discussion of likely candidate indicators and associated methodologies for each indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-12:00 pm</td>
<td><strong>Working Group 16.6.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working Group 16.7.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working Group 16.7.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:00 pm</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-14:30 pm</td>
<td><strong>Working Group 16.6.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas of agreement and recommendations and identification of areas/topics for which additional research is needed, identification of additional expertise needed, more detailed mappings of existing practices etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 - 14:45 pm</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14:45 - 16:15 pm | Plenary        | Towards a methodological proposal for each of the three SDG 16 indicators: methodology options and remaining questions  
• Report back by the three indicator groups, and plenary comments / identification of synergies |
| 16:15 - 16:30 pm | Plenary        | Closing remarks  
• Statistics Norway (SN)  
• UNDP  
• INECV / Praia City Group |
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