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SDG 16 – for peaceful, just and inclusive societies

• Lessons from the MDGs – strong accountable institutions, inclusion in decision making = the missing link for sustainable development and conflict prevention

• Ambitious goal with a deliberate theory of change around positive peace for sustainable development: well functioning government; low corruption; free flow of information; realization of rights to participate

• SDG 16 important aspiration in its own right and a critical enabling goal for all SDGs
SDG 16 targets
Internationally agreed normative frameworks related to participation in political and public affairs

- **Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (1948)** - Article 21. “(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives. (2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

- **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (1966)** - Article 25. “Every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity, without any of the distinctions mentioned in article 2 and without unreasonable restrictions

- **United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (1989)** - Article 12. 1. “States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child.

- **United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/ RES/70/127 (2016)** - 15. “Recognizes that youth participation is important for development, and urges Member States and United Nations entities, to explore and promote effective, structured and sustainable participation of young people and youth-led organizations in relevant decision-making processes

- **Security Council Resolution 2250 on youth, peace and security (2015)** - “Urging Member States to consider ways to give youth a greater voice in decision-making at the local, national, regional and international levels.”
### Conceptual and measurement framework for participation in political and public affairs

#### Dimensions and sub-dimensions of participation in political and public affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Participation in electoral processes and referendums</th>
<th>B. Participation through association in political parties and other organizations</th>
<th>C. Representation and participation in political office, including as members of national and sub-national legislative and executive bodies</th>
<th>D. Representation in judicial bodies</th>
<th>E. Representation in bodies of public service/administration</th>
<th>F. Representation in informal governance bodies with power or influence over local matters</th>
<th>G. Enabling environment of participation, including whether other rights are fully respected and enjoyed by all individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-dimensions for statistical measurement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-dimension for statistical measurement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Voting-age population;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Court staff dealing with criminal, civil, and administrative matters, by level of court and category of occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Registered voters;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Voter turnout in presidential, legislative, and local government elections, and in referendums;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Candidates standing in elections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-dimensions for statistical measurement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-dimension for statistical measurement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members of political parties, including in leadership positions;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Employment in public service by category of occupation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members of non-governmental organizations whose aim is to influence the conduct of public affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-dimensions for statistical measurement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-dimension for statistical measurement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members of parliaments, including in leadership positions;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Members of informal popular assemblies with decision-making power over local issues and communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ministers, including by type of portfolios held;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members of deliberative and executive bodies of local government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Potential data disaggregation: sex, age, disability status, income/wealth, sub-national administrative level and other relevant characteristics.
SDG 16.7.2: Responsive and inclusive decision making

**Target 16.7:** Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory 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

---

**Inclusive decision-making**

Decision-making which provides people with an opportunity to ‘have a say’, that is, to voice their demands, opinions and/or preferences to decision-makers.

**Responsive decision-making**

Decision-making in which decision-makers and/or political institutions listen to and act on the stated demands, opinions and/or preferences of people.
Rationale and interpretation

Indicators based on well-established concept of “external political efficacy”

Indicator 16.7.2 is based on two well-established survey questions used by the European Social Survey to measure self-reported levels of ‘external political efficacy’ i.e. people’s feeling that their views can impact on the political processes (OECD How’s Life? 2017: Measuring Well-Being – Chapter on Governance and Well-Being)

**Question 1: To measure inclusive participation in decision-making**

*How much would you say the political system in [country X] allows people like you to have a say in what the government does?*

*(ESS 2016)*

**Question 2: To measure responsive decision-making**

*And how much would you say that the political system in [country] allows people like you to have an influence on politics?*

*(ESS 2016)*
Method of computation

Global reporting on SDG 16.7.2 will require:
- Distributions of answers across all answer options, for each one of the two questions;
- Average % of those who responded positively (3-'some', 4-'a lot' or 5-'a great deal') to the two questions.

1. How much would you say the political system in [country X] allows people like you to have a say in what the government does?
   (Sample: 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Not at all</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Very little</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Some</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- A lot</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- A great deal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of those who responded positively: % who responded 3,4 or 5: \((26+34+10)/100 = 70\%\)

2. And how much would you say that the political system in [country] allows people like you to have an influence on politics?
   (Sample: 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Not at all</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Very little</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Some</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- A lot</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- A great deal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of those who responded positively: % who responded 3,4 or 5: \((26+14+14)/100 = 54\%\)

Average % of those who responded positively to the 2 questions: \((70\% + 54\%) / 2 = 62\%\)
Disaggregation

**Indicator 16.7.2 requires disaggregation by age, sex, disability and population group**

- **Sex:** Male/Female
- **Age groups:** It is recommended to follow UN standards for the production of age-disaggregated national population statistics, using the following age groups: (1) below 25 years old, (2) 25-34, (3) 35-44, (4) 45-54, (5) 55-64 and (6) 65 years old and above.
- **Disability status:** If possible, NSOs are encouraged to add the [Short Set of Questions on Disability developed by the Washington Group](https://www.washingtongroupinternational.org) to the relevant survey vehicle
- **Nationally relevant population groups:** Groups with a distinct ethnicity, language, religion, indigenous status, nationality or other characteristics

And based on empirical analysis of pilot results, and OECD’s analysis of socio-demographic factors affecting levels of self-reported efficacy across OECD countries:

- **Income level:** By income quintile
- **Education level:** Primary education, Secondary education, Tertiary education
- **Place of residence:** by administrative region e.g. by province, state, district; urban/rural
ESS political efficacy (internal) data by age

Able to take an active role in political group

average outcome

AT BE BG CH CY CZ DE EE FI FR GB HU IE IT NL NO PL RS SI

- 15-24
- 25-44
- 45-64
- 65-84
- 85+
ESS political efficacy (internal) data by age

Confident in own ability to participate in politics

average outcome

15-24  25-44  45-64  65-84  85+

AT  BE  BG  CH  CY  CZ  DE  EE  FI  FR  GB  HU  IE  IT  NL  NO  PL  RS  SI
ESS political efficacy (external) data by age

Political system allows people to have a say in what government does

Average outcome

Countries:
- AT
- BE
- BG
- CH
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- FI
- FR
- GB
- HU
- IE
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Age groups:
- 15-24
- 25-44
- 45-64
- 65-84
- 85+
ESS political efficacy (external) data by age

Political system allows people to have influence on politics

Average outcome

Countries: AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, EE, FI, FR, GB, HU, IE, IT, NL, NO, PL, RS, SI

Age groups: 15-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-84, 85+
Conclusions

• **SDG 16.7.2 is an effective approach** to measuring people’s perception of the extent to which public decision-making is inclusive and responsive (integrating **people’s voice** in the measurement is essential to the concept being measured, i.e. people’s *feeling* that their views can impact on the political processes)

• Will encourage NSOs to produce data on a concept that has **high policy relevance** at country-level: high levels of external efficacy correlated with 1) government trust and legitimacy, 2) levels of political participation, incl. voting in elections, and 3) people’s overall life satisfaction.

• An important opportunity for NSOs to start producing official statistics on this **concept which up until now has only been measured in a systematic and globally comparable way by independent research networks** (ESS, WVSA, PIAAC), in a limited number of countries worldwide, and with small-size samples which only allow for limited disaggregation

• However, while indicator limited to population of 18+ there is an increasing body of measurement experience and research on levels of political efficacy (external and internal) of adolescents and young adults.