

Response¹ on 'Green' and 'Grey' indicators in the proposed Global Indicator Framework for the Goals and Targets of the Sustainable Development Goals

December 2015

General comments

Demand for data and statistics on older persons has been strengthened by the negotiations on the Sustainable Development Goal framework. However, while the Sustainable Development goals and targets have given timely attention to the rights and needs of older persons, some of these critical areas for our older populations are not easily captured or quantifiable using mainstream statistics.

Wherever a goal or target refers to older people, age or all, the associated indicator must reflect this. However, even this basic principle is not being honoured in the current indicators proposal. Furthermore, it is not enough to have an indicator which covers all ages, this must be supported by the data sets that underpin and inform them.

The challenge for older persons is that many data systems are simply inadequate. Data on older women and men are missing – Data on older women and men may be collected but is often not analysed, reported and utilized. This must not continue in the post 2015 era. The commitment to leave no one behind gives clear guidance for the development and adoption of indicators. A universal framework is not business as usual.

However, the current proposed global indicator framework relies heavily on Demographic Household Surveys (DHS) and other population based surveys, some of which only collect data across certain age groups and some stop at age 49, excluding older people.

For example, The WHO recommends an indicator on coverage of tracer interventions that includes treatment for hypertension and diabetes. While the Stakeholder Group on Ageing would welcome the inclusion of this indicator and these two measures, the current data source is population based surveys including DHS (restricted to ages 15-49, 59 for men) and STEPS (22-64). Hypertension and diabetes treatment should be included, but alternate data sources and methods of collection should be identified that ensure data is collected for the age group most affected by NCDs.

¹ This paper provides consolidated comments by the Stakeholder Group on Ageing to the Open Consultation on Proposed global SDG Indicators coded as "green" 4-7 November 2015 and Open Consultation on Grey Indicators 9-15 December 2015 plus general comments and comments on cross cutting issues provided to the Online Open Consultation of Civil Society, Academia and the Private Sector on the Global Indicator Framework for the Goals and Targets of the Sustainable Development Goals, organized by the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators - 11 August 2015 - 7 September 2015 .

Indicators for the framework should be both based on existing data sets and on future ones yet to be developed, and be suitable, feasible and relevant for our ageing world.

Data disaggregation and cross cutting issues

Disaggregation is more than just a technical discussion. It goes to the heart of the human rights approach to achieve universality and leave no one behind. It determines how some specific targets and goals will be made meaningful.

The Stakeholder Group on Ageing strongly supports the overarching commitment to disaggregate by sex, age, residence (U/R). All countries should disaggregate data by prohibited grounds of discrimination under international human rights law as a minimum which include age, marital status and disability.

However, a number of the proposed indicators will fall short of this commitment in relation to age and will not be able to adequately monitor achievement of the agreed targets, in spite of the fact that there are references to 'older people', 'age', 'all ages'. Adequate age disaggregation is essential across all goal areas. Sex disaggregation is equally essential and, taken together, age and sex disaggregation will illuminate the unique and often invisible intersectional and cumulative discrimination which older women are subjected to.

However, approaches to disaggregating data by age throughout the lifecourse must also be robust and reliable and include sensitivity testing, in particular in relation to poverty data.

There are major limitations in analysis of old age poverty in a number of developing countries, has revealed major limitations in analysis of old age poverty using household survey data. Whether older people appear to be more or less poor is strongly influenced by assumptions (specifically equivalence scales) about which there has been limited analysis in developing countries.

There is a substantial body of international literature showing that adjusting equivalence scales can lead to widely diverging results in terms of relative poverty of different age groups. In the meantime, there has been relatively little exploration of what are the most appropriate equivalence scales to use outside higher income countries. Sensitivity testing will confirm whether trends are consistent regardless of changes to these assumptions, or are highly sensitive to them. This would support informed interpretation of results.

Disaggregation is also highly relevant in the context of indicators relating to Disaster Risk Reduction. In these cases, it is critical that the disaster type is also reported in order to ensure the data is meaningful year on year. Further disaggregation at national level to include frequency of event and its magnitude would be insightful.

Green indicators

Target	Indicator	Comments
1.3 Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030, achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable.	1.3.1 Percentage of the population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by sex, and distinguishing children, unemployed, old age, people with disabilities, pregnant women/newborns, work injury victims, poor and vulnerable.	<p>We support the change to the ILO indicator: Percentage of the population covered by social protection floors/systems disaggregated by sex, and distinguishing children, unemployed, old age, people with disabilities, pregnant women/new-borns, work injury victims, poor and vulnerable</p> <p>We support this indicator alongside the additional indicator proposed by UNFPA: "Percentage of older persons covered by pension systems"</p>
2.2 By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons.	2.2.1 Prevalence of Stunting (height for age <2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age.	<p>We support concerns raised by Colombia and two other Member States that the indicator does not respond to the target in full. A measure of malnutrition in older persons and other groups mentioned is necessary.</p> <p>If a single anthropometric measure is selected, it should be Middle Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) not BMI since it can be measured even if people are bedridden or unable to stand and it is not affected by body shape which may cause over or under reporting or malnutrition among certain ethnic groups.</p>

2.2 By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons.	2.2.1 Prevalence of Stunting (height for age <2 SD from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under five years of age	<p>This additional indicator does not address the gaps in tracking the entirety of the target. A measure of malnutrition in older persons and other groups mentioned is necessary.</p> <p>If a single anthropometric measure is selected, it should be Middle Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) not BMI since it can be measured even if people are bedridden or unable to stand and it is not affected by body shape which may cause over or under reporting or malnutrition among certain ethnic groups.</p>
3.4 By 2030, reduce by one third premature mortality from noncommunicable diseases through prevention and treatment and promote mental health and wellbeing	3.4.1 Probability of dying of cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease.	<p>We support the modification of this indicator proposed during the IAEG-SDGs second meeting in Bangkok by Mexico, Russia, Uganda, Botswana, USA, Kyrgyzstan and Cape Verde: the removal of the 30-70 age bracket. This proposal was also supported by 9 members of the IAEG in the consultation ahead of the meeting.</p> <p>We strongly reject the concept of premature mortality based on chronological age, and the current proposed indicator focused on the probability of dying of cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, or chronic respiratory disease between ages 30 and 70.</p>
4.3 By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable and quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university	4.3.1 Participation rate of adults in formal and nonformal education and training in the last 12 months.	We support this indicator. Data should be collected for people of all ages to reflect the commitment to life-long learning in Goal 4.
4.4 By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship	4.4.1 Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people	We support this indicator. Data should be collected for people of all ages to reflect the commitment to life-long learning in Goal 4.
4.6 By 2030, ensure that all	4.6.1 Percentage of the	This indicator must be collected for people of all ages to reflect the

youth and a substantial proportion of adults, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy	population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills (Disaggregations: sex, location, wealth (and others where data are available)).	focus in the target on both youth and adults and to reflect the commitment to life-long learning in Goal 4. Data should be disaggregated by age.
5.1 End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere.	5.1.1 Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote equality and nondiscrimination on the basis of sex.	<p>In principle we support the revised indicator proposed by UN Women. UN Women's proposal suggests questions on gender equality in a number of areas of the law - property, domestic violence, marriage age etc. Additional questions are necessary to ensure that the indicator monitors progress towards elimination of the multiple discrimination that women are subjected to, including in older age, for example, but not limited to:</p> <p>Does the law prohibit multiple discrimination based on sex in combination with others grounds, including age? Does the law guarantee equal rights for women to pensions? Does the law prohibit harmful or discriminatory practices related to widowhood?</p> <p>It is also important to explore further whether UN Women's tentative proposal that the CEDAW Committee be the monitoring body for this indicator is appropriate. The CEDAW Committee already has a full programme of work. Not every country has ratified CEDAW and reporting is periodic. Additional resources may be necessary for the CEDAW Committee to fulfil this additional monitoring responsibility. Alternative monitoring bodies should be considered.</p>

5.2 Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation.	5.2.1 Proportion of everpartnered women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months	We support the 8 Member States, UN Women and the UN System who have called for indicator 5.2.1 to have no upper age limit in the consultation and UN Women's call for data to be disaggregated age.
5.2 Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation.	5.2.2 Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15	We support the 8 Member States, UN Women and the UN System who have called for indicator 5.2.2 to have no upper age limit in the consultation and UN Women's call for data to be disaggregated age.
5.3 Eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation	5.3.2 Percentage of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone FGM/C, by age group (for relevant countries only).	We support Colombia, Africa IAEG-SDG Members and Australia who have questioned the need for an age range. The impact of FGM/C is lifelong.
5.4 Recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared entrepreneurship responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate.	5.4.1 Percentage of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location.	We support the current proposals and the commitment to disaggregate by age. We do not support the revision proposed by Germany in the previous consultation which limits care activities to 'child care' which would not allow for measurement of other care activities undertaken such as care of older persons, care of adult children etc.

<p>5.6: Ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights as agreed in accordance with the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Platform for Action and the outcome documents of their review conferences</p>	<p>5.6.1 Proportion of women (aged 15-49) who make their own sexual and reproductive decisions.</p>	<p>We support Colombia and USA who have called for this indicator to not be restricted by age, and the four members of the IAEG-SDGs which support these comments in the consultation ahead of the second IAEG meeting in Bangkok.</p> <p>As the target refers to sexual health and reproductive health and reproductive rights, not family planning, it should not be limited to women of reproductive age.</p> <p>Furthermore, during the consultation in August/September UNFPA stated that the indicator is based on three central elements measuring the empowerment of women (married, in union and ever sexually active women) to make the following decisions: (a) whether they are able to reject unwanted sexual relations; (b) using or not using contraception; and (c) whether they can access sexual and reproductive health care for herself.</p> <p>With these three elements in mind, there is no rationale for limiting the indicator to ages 15-49.</p>
<p>10.2: By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status.</p>	<p>10.2.1 Proportion of people living below 50% of median income disaggregated by age and sex.</p>	<p>We support comments by Colombia and Australia that this indicator is too narrow to reflect the issues covered in the target. We support the comment by The Philippines that additional indicators need to be considered.</p>
<p>11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable</p>	<p>11.2.1 Proportion of the population that has convenient access to public transport.</p>	<p>Because of the emphasis on vulnerable subgroups in the target, disaggregation is essential. We echo comments made by Canada, Colombia and United States during the open consultation that the indicator does not adequately measure all aspects of the target.</p>

situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons.		
11.3 By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries	11.3.1 "Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate" with further research as in France's proposal to also address the issue of "quality of life".	The indicator does not respond to the target in its entirety. We welcome proposals made by UN Statistical System Organisations and UNECE to include an indicator which measure participation and the recommendation by UN-Habitat that a version of these two should be included as a second priority indicator.
11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities	11.7.1 The average share of the builtup area of cities that is open space in public use for all.	Because of the emphasis on vulnerable subgroups in the target, disaggregation is essential.
11.b By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels	11.b.1 Percent of cities that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring.	We support the proposed indicator.

<p>Target 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decisionmaking at all levels</p>	<p>16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by age, sex, disability and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions.</p>	<p>We support the proposed indicator.</p>
<p>16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration</p>	<p>16.9.1 Percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered with civil authority.</p>	<p>We support comments by Germany that the proposed target does not cover the entirety of the target and we support the proposal by the OHCHR:</p> <p>(a) Percentage of adult population holding an identity document which allows them to access public services and entitlements, conclude a lease, open a bank account, and enter and leave their country of residence;</p> <p>(b) Percentage of children whose births have been registered with a civil authority;</p> <p>Proof of legal identity is prerequisite for accessing the benefits and obligations of citizenship, The issuance of identity papers should therefore not be focused only on children under 5. and should be more inclusive of persons at all stages of life.</p>

<p>17.18 By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts</p>	<p>17.18.1 Proportion of sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at the national level.</p>	<p>We support the proposed indicator 17.18.1: Proportion of national sustainable development indicators with full disaggregation produced at national level.</p>
---	---	--

Grey Indicators

<p>1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters.</p>	<p>1.5.1 Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.</p>	<p>THIS INDICATOR MUST BE DISAGGREGATED: We support comments by the EC, UN Women, UK and Africa IAEG members that this indicator needs to be disaggregated by age and sex and by disability (UK).</p> <p>THIS INDICATOR MUST BE ALIGNED WITH SENDAI INDICATORS: We support Australia and Mexico's comments that this indicator will need to align with the Sendai indicators (which are not yet determined). This indicator should remain grey until the process to determine indicators for Sendai is complete.</p> <p>THE CURRENT PROPOSAL IS NOT AN APPROPRIATE MEASURE OF RESILIENCE: We support comments from Algeria and Ecuador that the current proposed indicator does not measure resilience adequately. As such, this indicator fails to respond to the target.</p>
---	--	---

		<p>MORE APPROPRIATE MEASURES OF RESILIANCCE HAVE BEEN PROPOSED: We support the UN Statistical System proposal for an additional indicator to have a more resilience orientated target for 1.5 (as the current proposed indicator is more suited to measuring target 11.5)</p> <p><i>UN Statistical System Organisations propose: a. Proportion of population resilient/robust to hazards and climate - related events by sex; (this should include disaggregation by age in addition to sex).</i></p> <p>The OECD's suggestion that this target could incorporate indicators from other SDG targets in order to measure resilience, including climate change related indicators and indicators related to social protection, improved production, access to markets and financial services is a good approach to incorporating existing indicators into a more adequate measure of resilience.</p> <p>IF THE PROPOSED INDICATOR IS RETAINED IT SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO INCORPORATE EXPOSURE AND SUPPLEMENTED WITH A RESILIANCCE FOCUSSED INDICATOR: We support Australia's suggestion that this indicator needs to incorporate a measurement of exposure if it is retained. However an additional indicator measuring resilience as per suggestions above still needed to respond to the target.</p> <p><i>Australia suggested recasting the specification to: "Number of people exposed to disasters and the number of deaths, missing people, injured relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people".</i></p>
--	--	--

<p>3.8 Achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential health-care services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all.</p>	<p>3.8.1 Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g. child full immunization, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.)</p>	<p>While we would welcome a measure that includes treatment for hypertension and diabetes, the current data source is population based surveys including DHS and STEPS. With DHS restricted to people between the ages of 15 and 49 (or 59 for men) and STEPS recommended for people between the ages of 25 and 64, the data collected for these health interventions risks being exclusive of people in older age despite the fact that they are most affected by NCDs.</p> <p>Hypertension and diabetes treatment should be included in the indicator, but alternate data sources and methods of collection should be identified that ensure data is collected for the age group most affected by NCDs.</p> <p>This indicator and any additional indicators discussed in response to universal health coverage must by definition be inclusive of all people and all ages and supported by comprehensive data sources that collect data throughout the lifecycle.</p>
--	--	---

<p>11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations.</p>	<p>11.5.1 Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people.</p>	<p>THE INDICATOR SHOULD INCLUDE DISPLACEMENT: We support OCHA's suggestion to include displacement within measure of "affected" within in this indicator.</p> <p>OCHA suggests using "displaced (including evacuated and relocated)" or "forced to leave their homes or places of habitual residence (including evacuated and relocated)" among the elements collectively comprising "affected."</p> <p>THE INDICATOR DOES NOT MEASURE THE TARGET IN FULL: We support the inclusion of a measure of economic loss as recommended by a number of states.</p> <p>THIS INDICATOR MUST BE DISAGGREGATED: This indicator should be disaggregated by age and sex. Numbers of people exposed, deaths, missing, injured and displaced should also be reported separately.</p> <p>THIS INDICATOR MUST BE ALIGNED WITH SENDAI INDICATORS: This indicator will need to align with the Sendai indicators (which are not yet determined). This indicator should remain grey until the process to determine indicators for Sendai is complete.</p>
<p>11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities</p>	<p>11.7.2 Proportion of women subjected to physical or sexual harassment by perpetrator and place of occurrence (last 12 months)</p>	<p>The proposed indicator does not measure the entirety of the target. We support The UN Statistical System Organisations previous proposal to add an additional indicator, "The average share of built up areas (of communities) that are accessible and safe for all, including women, children, older persons and those with disabilities."</p> <p>If this indicator is retained, it should be expanded to include the other groups mentioned in the target or additional indicators should be added.</p> <p>Gallup Analytics currently provides data on perceptions of safety of older persons:</p>

		<p>Percentage of people aged 50-plus who responded “yes” to the survey question: “Do you feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where you live?”</p> <p>Gallup Analytics: https://analytics.gallup.com</p>
13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries.	13.1.1 Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people	<p>We support UNEP’s earlier proposed indicator which includes disaggregation and measures adaptive capacity rather than just disaster loss which is the focus of the current indicator and is therefore not an adequate measure of this target.</p> <p>UNEP proposal: [Decrease in the ratio of vulnerable vs resilient (in terms of death and impact) subpopulation (disaggregated+D12, poor) to exposure of climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters, (and food safety, cf target 2.1 and 2.4)]</p>
16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision making at all levels	16.7.2 Proportion of countries that address young people's multisectoral needs with their national development plans and poverty reduction strategies	<p>We support comments made by Germany and Switzerland that the suggested indicator does not meet the target by focusing exclusively on the needs of young people, and recommends that all groups should be reflected when measuring the target.</p>