HOW TO LOCALIZE TARGETS AND INDICATORS OF THE POST– 2015 AGENDA

14 November 2014

POST 2015

HOW TO LOCALIZE TARGETS AND INDICATORS

[UCLG INPUTS FOR THE GLOBAL TASKFORCE WORKING PAPER]

14th of November 2014

1st DRAFT

SUMMARY

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS STRATEGY TO LOCALIZE TARGETS AND INDICATORS OF THE POST-2015 AGENDA

I. INTRODUCTION

The deadline to agree a new development framework to replace the Millennium Development Goals is fast approaching. In September, the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG)[1] presented its outcome document to the General Assembly. The document will be the "main basis for integrating sustainable development goals into the post-2015 agenda".[2]

The next milestone in the Post-2015 process is the Secretary-General's Synthesis report, due in December. Intergovernmental negotiations in the General Assembly will start in earnest come January and culminate in September 2015, when governments are due to agree on a new development framework.

There have been a number of discussions about how to make the SDGs relevant to different local areas. This is most clearly embodied in SDG 11 – a dedicated 'urban' goal included in the OWG outcome document. SDG 11 is 'local' by design as it is meant to be owned and delivered by sub-national urban governments.

At the same time, the essential role that local and regional governments, alongside communities and private sector actors, play in delivering a new development agenda has been recognized more widely in a number of official inputs to the Post-2015 process. The High-Level Panel Report (2013) made this clear,[3] as did the preamble to the report from the United Nations Sustainable Solutions Network.[4] The introduction to the Open Working Group outcome document refers to Rio+20 and its commitments to Agenda 21, and recognizes the role of local authorities in implementing sustainable development objectives.[5]

In this proposal we recognize the importance of both a stand-alone 'urban' goal and a wider 'localizing' agenda that identifies a range of goals and targets that could be adopted at sub-national level.

---

[1] http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/focussdgs.html

[2] A/RES/68/309 Available on: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/68/309

[3] 'The most pressing issue is not rural versus urban but how to foster a local, geographic approach to the post-2015 agenda. The Panel believes this can be done by disaggregating data by place, and giving local authorities a bigger role in setting priorities, executing plans, monitoring results and engaging with local firms and communities' (High Level Panel, 2013).

[4] 'They [these goals]' are universal and apply to all countries, national and local governments, businesses and civil society.' (Sustainable Development Solutions Network, 2013).

[5] 'It also reaffirmed the commitment to fully implement the Rio Declaration, Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21' (Open Working Group Outcome Document, July 2014).

II. OUR ACTION FOR A STAND-ALONE URBAN GOAL AND FOR THE LOCALIZATION OF THE POST-2015 AGENDA

II.1. SDG 11: Why a stand-alone urban goal?

Goal 11 "*Make Cities and Human Settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable*" embodies a local and urban dimension in the proposed goal framework. Its inclusion is an important achievement and testament to the successful Urban SDG campaign by, among others, the Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments and its partners throughout 2013.

A stand-alone urban goal would begin to respond to the High Level Panel's insight that "cities are where the battle for sustainable development will be won or lost" (HLP, May 2013). An urban goal would mobilize and empower local and regional authorities and urban actors, contribute to integrate the different dimensions of sustainable development (economic, social, environmental) and the spatial design of cities, strengthen the linkages between urban and rural areas, and transform urban challenges into opportunities.,

The current proposal for *Goal 11* includes critical dimensions of the urban challenge: housing and basic services, slum upgrading, transport, participatory planning, the safeguarding of cultural and natural heritage, disaster prevention and resilience, the environmental impact of cities, green and public spaces, and urban-rural links.

However, the current proposal does not take a holistic approach to urban development. It does not cover a number of issues that are highly relevant to the day to day challenges that local and regional governments face in governing cities. For example, key urban concerns such as *local governance* (particularly decentralization, local democracy, accountability, participation and subsidiarity) are not addressed, while other key local urban responsibilities are partially included under other goals (1. poverty, 2. nutrition, 3. health, 4. education, 5. gender, 6. water and sanitation, 7. energy, 8. economic growth and employment, 9. Infrastructure, 10. Inequalities, 12. patterns of consumption and production, including waste management, 13. climate change and resilience, 15. biodiversity, 16. peaceful and inclusive societies, accountable and inclusive institutions, 17. means of implementation, including domestic resource mobilization, technology, capacity building, etc.).

Although the urban goal is among the proposed OWG goals and has influential supporters, some UN Member States believe that there is a need to reduce the final set of SDGs and propose mainstreaming urban targets and indicators in other goals.[6]

The aim of this paper to contribute to the debate among the wider development community on the importance of maintaining a stand-alone urban goal and of localizing targets and indicators of other goals to strengthen the urban and local dimensions of the SDGs.[7]

---

[6] UK and Australia. The EC in its most recent document on the Post-2015 Agenda also does not exclude the possibility of mainstreaming the urbanisation issues. COM (2014) 335, 2.6.2014, *A decent life for all: from vision to collective action*

[7] To complement this debate, it is necessary to continue the "urban SDG campaign". As suggested by the UN SDSN, the stand-alone urban goal campaign should be widened and deepened. We need to strengthen our mobilization to reach "***1000 cities and mayors supporting a stand-alone urban SDG***". Advocacy efforts will continue vis-à-vis the UN, UN Member States and other key stakeholders. The GTF and its partners should reinforce our collaboration with key mass media contacts, organizations at local, national, regional and international level and be fully committed to strengthen our presence to campaign for an urban SDG and localized SDGs in global fora.

II.2 The localization of the Post-2015 Agenda: A wider agenda

In addition to SDG 11, which is designed to be owned and delivered by sub-national governments, there are a number of other targets that are relevant at the local level in both urban and rural areas. To understand why, it is important to discuss what we mean when we talk about 'localization'.[8]

Which targets are most relevant at sub-national level?

'Localizing' the Post-2015 agenda often refers to the implementation of the goals at local level by sub-national actors, particularly local and regional governments.[9] Sub-national governments have responsibilities (either directly or shared with central government or in partnership with other stakeholders) for service provision in many areas related to the SDGs[10].

However, 'localizing' the Post-2015 agenda can also refer to the monitoring of progress at sub-national level (irrespective of whether local governments have competency in that specific area). This can help to assess inequalities within countries, inform better decision-making and resource allocation at all levels as well as enable local communities and civil society organisations to hold their governments to account.[11] In this spirit, the High-Level Panel (HLP, 2013) and the Independent Expert Advisory Group (IEAG, October 2014) reports made suggestions for geographic disaggregation of data for most outcome-based targets. This would include, for example, urban/rural and regional breakdowns and where possible disaggregation at lower levels, such as in municipalities or marginal areas, such as slums.

Our understanding of the concept of 'localizing' has implications for the selection of goals and targets. While an emphasis on monitoring inequalities within countries would mean that most outcome-based targets merit disaggregation at the sub-national level, an emphasis on the implementation of the goals would lead to local governments adopting a sub-set of the goals and targets for which they have responsibility (the latter may vary between countries, depending on the extent of decentralization).

These two approaches are complementary. Ideally, provided the final agreed set of goals and targets came to a manageable number, subnational governments that wished to (in line with their own local planning processes) could monitor, data permitting, most outcome-based targets, particularly for vulnerable areas and communities. They could even focus on the gaps in performance within their areas of jurisdiction – e.g. in slums versus the local average – to

---

[8] This is partly based on Lucci, P. (forthcoming) Localising Post-2015: What does it mean in practice?

[9] Here 'sub-national' refers to states/regions/provinces, metropolitan areas, local authorities (depending on different decentralisation systems). Note that the emphasis of this note is on the implications of 'localizing the Post-2015 agenda' for subnational governments, but of course there are other actors involved at the local level (e.g. civil society organisations, local communities, private sector actors).

[10] UCLG, *Basic Services for All in an Urbanizing World, 3rd Global Report on Local Democracy and Decentralization*, Oxon (UK) & New York (USA), Routledge, 2014

[11] Note that this does not necessarily mean that local actors are responsible for collecting this information. In many cases central government administrative systems and national statistical offices collect information on these issues disaggregated by location, and local governments can make use of this data. For other areas, local governments may produce data themselves. In some cases where there is no information or this is contested, civil society organisations collect information themselves (for example, the enumerations carried out by Slums Dwellers International). The next section highlights some of the data limitations.

clearly identify spatial inequalities.[12] In addition, among this wider group of goals and targets, a sub-set could be identified of those for which they have a delivery responsibility. This would mean that, for this specific sub-set of goals and targets, they would not only monitor performance but also assume responsibility for their delivery and achievement.

Localizing the Post-2015 Agenda: Key challenges

While, in principle, the approach mentioned above appears relatively straightforward, there are a number of challenges that need to be addressed.

Workability

The scope of the current goals and targets proposed by the OWG is notably wide. This is due to the global commitment to a shared system of inclusive and integrated goals. Proposed targets cover most development challenges and respond to the broad range of issues, needs and concerns expressed by major stakeholders. This constrains, however, the development of a manageable system of indicators that are transparent, measurable and accountable.

The sheer number of goals and targets proposed (17 and 169, respectively) could put at risk the workability of the whole framework (Norton et al., 2014). In this respect, many have emphasised the need to consolidate the number of goals and targets in the current OWG proposal in order to make it feasible for governments to act on them. By way of comparison, the MDGs had 8 goals, 21 targets and 60 indicators.

Setting target levels

Furthermore, if sub-national governments were to assume responsibility for the delivery of some of the targets, there would be two questions: i) how to select those targets and ii) at what level to set the targets.[13] Ultimately, it is up to individual countries to work this out when thinking about target setting and implementation plans, including coordination between different levels of government for the delivery of the goals. The example of how Brazil localized the MDGs is pertinent here. As part of its national agenda for the MDGs, the government supported and encouraged local governments to identify and adopt commitments which would help to achieve the MDGs.

---

[12] Watkins 2013 puts forward this approach for different types of inequalities (e.g. spatial, gender, ethnicity).

[13] At a different scale, this is already proving controversial when it comes to translating global aspirations to country level targets and that is before we start considering different actors' responsibilities for delivery at sub-national level. The MDGs were criticised because targets that were meant to be global were adopted at country level without any consideration for their starting points or the feasibility of achieving those targets for different countries. Although the exact nature of target setting this time round is still unclear, it is expected that countries will be setting these according to their national circumstances (rather than simply adopting the agreed global target as their own national target). Some have proposed to use information on historical performance to set realistic targets for countries (Melamed and Samman, 2014) or for groups of countries with similar starting points (Melamed and Bergh, 2014). A simpler version of this is a proposal for countries to adopt universal targets as aspirations and when it came to comparing progress to simply group countries with similar starting points (Melamed and Bergh, 2014).

The proposal for a new set of goals as it stands is already fairly comprehensive and complex, so as a rule of thumb it is advisable to keep processes to localize targets as simple as possible and in line with different countries' approaches to the implementation of the goals and own policy processes.

Measurability and data constraints

There is a consensus on the need to define smart targets – specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound. Ideally, targets should be few in number and quantifiable. In the current proposal, many of the targets are still difficult to operationalize.

In terms of indicators, according to UNSDSN (2012) these need to be clear and straightforward; in line with international standards; coherent with systems-based information (e.g. national accounts; environmental accounts, among others); drawn from well-established sources; disaggregated; universal (i.e. applicable to all countries); and managed by a lead organisation.[14] Note that according to the UN Committee for the Coordination of Statistical Activities, indicators for the SDGs are not likely to be finalised until March 2016.[15]

When it comes to monitoring progress at sub-national level, data constraints are more pronounced than at the national level. In many cases where data is based on survey information it is difficult to disaggregate indicators beyond rural/urban and regional breakdowns. In particular it is difficult to source data for vulnerable populations (e.g. slum dwellers).

The evidence base needs to be built up if we are serious about monitoring progress for vulnerable areas and communities and having a powerful accountability tool. This has obvious resource and capacity implications in terms of data collection and would require the support of national statistics offices. For regional and larger local governments, particularly in metropolitan areas, capacity is less of a concern. Some are already using this type of information in their policy-making, although data often does not cover the most marginal populations (Lucci, 2014). However, in the case of smaller poorly resourced authorities, this could be a huge task.

Finally the complexity and number of indicators are an issue. If each target has more than two or three indicators (and in many cases, the wording of the targets requires the development of many indicators), the feasibility, reliability and accountability of the indicators will be very complex.

---

[14] http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/140403-Principles-for-Framing-SDGs.pdf
[15] http://unstats.un.org/unsd/accsub/2014docs-24th/SA-2014-9-Post2015.pdf

III. A PROPOSAL FOR THE LOCALIZATION OF TARGETS AND INDICATORS: SOME EXAMPLES

This draft proposal takes the current OWG goals and targets as a starting point. It also takes into consideration major proposals produced by other GTF members, as well as those of some key partners (UN SDSN, UN HABITAT, Communitas, Cities Alliance, and CSOs), Member States, the UN Major Groups and stakeholders concerned with urban and local issues in fields like transport, energy and gender.

In the specific case of Goal 11, the proposal includes many contributions from the UN SDSN meeting held in London on August 24-26th. The meeting brought together UN partners, academics, cities and local government organizations to work on the proposed targets under the "urban goal" and to take steps to develop a set of indicators under each target to ensure both an integrated (socially, economically and environmentally) and a "localized" approach.[16]

III. 1: This exercise and our approach to target selection

Given that the Open Working Group outcome document contains over 160 targets, to keep this exercise manageable we selected a few targets to illustrate what kind of indicators could be adopted by sub-national governments.

The criteria used to select those examples prioritized targets that refer to areas that are often local government responsibility (of course, in some cases these responsibilities may be shared among different levels of governments and may vary across countries). An introductory paragraph for each target described in section III.3 further explains the rationale for selection. The list is illustrative, rather than exhaustive.

In fact, as argued in Section II.2 competency/responsibility for implementation is just one criterion. There are a number of areas for which it is crucial to understand the geography of deprivation through detailed geographical disaggregation of data for monitoring purposes, even if sub-national governments may not have full delivery responsibility (e.g. poverty, education, health, economic growth to name a few).

Ideally, provided the final framework came to a manageable number of goals and targets, most outcome-based targets could be disaggregated by rural/urban/region/municipality. Among those, a sub-group could be identified for which sub-national governments have responsibility for delivery in addition to monitoring progress.

This draft proposal contains the following information for each illustrative target:

- Dimensions to be measured
- Proposed indicators
- Alternative indicators (if necessary)
- Dissaggregation proposals
- Cross cutting linkages with other goals/targets
- Sources
- Comments and limitations

---

[16] UNSDSN, Urban Futures, ACCC and Stockholm Resilience Center, *Consultation on the UN Open Working Group on the SDG's – Urban SDG Goal 11: Targets and Indicators*, London, 22-24 August 2014 (working document)

Note that for many of the indicators outlined in the following sections, availability at sub-national level still needs to be confirmed. Data limitations can represent a serious constraint when it comes to localising some of the targets. The UN Statistical Committee is currently undertaking a review of available indicators for the SDGs.[17]

In addition, the draft proposal below needs to be further consolidated to reach a smaller, more manageable number of indicators. Additional indicators that could be particularly relevant for local areas, but which are not included in the core set of indicators (first column) are suggested as a set of optional indicators (second column). Further, as indicators for the SDG framework are further discussed and agreed in early 2016[18] disaggregated indicators for local areas should be in line with the set of agreed post-2015 core indicators.

Finally, considering the high number of targets and indicators, it could be worth considering the creation of a system of composite indicators that allow the grouping of different indicators into just one measurement. This would make it easier for all actors to understand and follow up the process. In the introduction to Goal 11, reference is made to the UN Habitat proposal to use an indicator of this type to monitor the urban goal. A similar proposal could be considered to monitor inequalities between territories in Goal 10.

---

[17]http://unstats.un.org/unsd/broaderprogress/pdf/Questionnaire%20on%20broader%20measures%20and%20SDGs%20(Final).pdf

[18] http://unstats.un.org/unsd/broaderprogress/pdf/SA-2014-9-Post2015.pdf

III.2. Proposed targets and indicators: Some examples

Proposed Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere

The daily work of most Local and Regional Governments (LRGs) is relevant to the fight against poverty. Therefore, there is a clear link between Goal 1 and local governance. We have focused on targets 4 and 5 as examples of targets that are directly connected to LRG responsibilities. Target 4 addresses the universal right to access basic services, ownership and property. Basic services are related to some of the key fields of LRG action (water supply, sanitation, waste management, transport, education, health), while access to property in urban areas is related to affordable housing policies, another local competency in some countries. Target 1.5 refers to resilience to economic, social and environmental shocks, and LRGs are fully engaged in promoting resilience in their territories and reducing the vulnerability of their citizens', especially the poor. However, local and regional policies also have a crucial impact on the rest of proposed targets, for example target 1.2 presents a multidimensional approach to reduce poverty in urban and rural areas, and target 1.3 deals with social protection policies. The set of indicators we propose are based on reliable sources.

Target 1.4 By 2030 ensure that all men and women, particularly the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership, and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology, and financial services including microfinance

(a) Dimensions that could be measured:
-   Recognition and enforcement of legal rights to use, control and transfer land , property and other assets
-   Availability of affordable housing and land
-   Access to basic, affordable services
-   Access to affordable and fair credit and financial resources

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Proportion of women and men without secure tenure and with secure tenure (measured by the percentage with and without legal documented rights to their house); the percentage who do not fear arbitrary eviction.	1. Proportion of household heads possessing documents as evidence of legal or legitimate access to their houses and/or land over the total population (Sietchiping (2012), The World Bank - Gender Equality data and statistics (revised)) 2. Citizens' perception about security of tenure related to land, housing or other assets (Communitas) 3. Number of homeless people per 100,000 population (Global City Indicator)	Linkages: Goal 11.1 Disaggregation by: Gender of household head, level of income, urban / rural To be Developed ((TBD); not readily available). Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014). Note that this indicator is not readily available internationally, although there are increasing efforts to measure it (e.g. Urban Inequalities Survey in 25 cities). See: http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/integration/pdf/commissiononstatistics.pdf http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Metadata.aspx?IndicatorId=32
2. Proportion of the urban population in the lowest quintiles that spends more than 30 per cent of its income on accommodation	1. Housing price to income ratio: ratio between the median price of house premises and the median household income per year 2. Land price to income ratio: ratios between the median price of 1 square	Linkages: goal 11.1 Disaggregation by: Urban / rural, level of income (TBD not readily available) Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014). Note that this indicator does not appear to be readily available internationally. It could be computed from income/expenditure household surveys.

	metre of highly-developed, developed and raw land and the median household income per month (UNHABITAT (2004),)	
3. Proportion of the population in the lowest quintiles that spends more than [xx per cent] of its income on basic services (water, sanitation, energy, education, health, transport)		Linkages: Goal 11.1; Disaggregation by: Gender, urban / rural, level of income TBD (not readily available). Sources: Proposed by UNSDN (London, 2014) TBD. Note that this indicator does not appear to be readily available internationally. It could be computed from income/expenditure household surveys.
4. Percentage of adults with an account in a formal financial institution		Linkages: Goal 8.10 Disaggregation by: Gender, urban / rural, level of income Sources: The World Bank - Global Financial Inclusion Database http://datatopics.worldbank.org/financialinclusion/

Comments:
Indicators on access to basic services can be linked to other goals: Goal 6 for access to safe and affordable drinking water, and adequate and equitable sanitation in the home; Goal 7 for reliable and modern energy services, Goal 3 for education (e.g.: ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education), Goal 4 for health (e.g.: ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health care service), Goal 11.1 for access to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services. With regard the access to adequate new technologies, see below target 9.c.

Target 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

(a) Dimensions that could be measured:
- improving resilience of poor and vulnerable groups of populations to disasters and environmental impact
- Improved resilience to other shocks

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Proportion of housing units built on hazardous locations (per 100,000 housing units)		Linkages: 11.5, 11.b and 11.1 (safe housing) Disaggregation by: urban / rural, cities/municipalities (TBC; indicator does not appear readily available). Sources: Proposed in UN Habitat (2004).It would be worth checking with UN Habitat whether they hold the data. It is not readily available from UN Habitat data repository: http://www.devinfo.info/urbaninfo/. In this document (Page 11) it is stated that it is mostly unavailable: http://ww2.unhabitat.org/programmes/guo/documents/urban_indicators_guidelines.pdf
2. Losses from natural disasters, by climate and non-climate related events, by urban/rural (in US$ and lives lost)		Linkages: 11.5 and 11.b and 11.1 (safe housing) Disaggregation by: urban / rural, cities/municipalities (TBC). It does not appear like data is disaggregated at this level, but as the data is recorded by disaster event, in which case, it is localised, it could be tracked back to a certain area. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014). Data

		available at: UNISDR and http://www.emdat.be/database

Comments: Link with targets 11.5 and 11.b., 12. Additional indicators could be considered that look at capacity of local governments and poor and vulnerable communities to react to and cope with natural disasters. These are not currently available (in a way that is internationally comparable).

a. % change in proportion of women and individuals from marginalised sections represented within local and government decision-making bodies
b. % of national and local annual budgets committed to reducing disaster risk and building resilience
c. % of municipalities/districts with risk reduction and resilience plans
d. % of schools with climate resilience and DRR mainstreamed into curricula.

Proposed goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture

LRGs, in many countries, play a role in ending hunger, particularly through food security and nutrition programmes. Food security has a territorial dimension. Regional governments in many countries are currently developing specific policies to guarantee production, storage, distribution chains, market stability and access to food to the most vulnerable. Local markets are also commonly the responsibility of LRGs and play a key role in: access to distribution chains to local producers; and access to food for the poor. Meanwhile, local governments manage, in different contexts, operational plans and budgets to support nutrition, prevent undernourishment and mobilize citizens through awareness raising campaigns. Especially relevant are initiatives that focus on children through specific programmes in schools (universal access to at least one nutritious meal at school for children in pre-school and school ages), pregnant and lactating women. The set of indicators that we are proposing are addressed at local level, like those proposed by the World Health Organisation in target 2.2, and localized through urban/rural disaggregation.

Target 2.1. by 2030 end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round

(a) Dimensions that could be measured:
- Ensuring food security through adequate production and consumption chains
- Ensure access to safe, nutritious and sufficient food among poor and vulnerable people including infants

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Access to drying, storage, and processing facilities		Linkages: Goal 1. Disaggregation by: To be determined. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (2014). This indicators needs to be developed as it is currently unavailable.
2. Percentage of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption in urban and rural areas		Linkages: Goal 1; Goal 8 Disaggregation by: urban / rural Sources: MDG Indicator; FAO (Food security) http://faostat3.fao.org/browse/D/FS/E. Disaggregation available here: http://faostat3.fao.org/download/D/HS/E
3. Prevalence of stunting in children under 5 years old.		Linkages: Goal 1; Goal 2.2 Disaggregation by: urban / rural Sources: DHS/MICS compiled by UNICEF: http://data.unicef.org/nutrition/malnutrition
4. Prevalence of underweight in children under 5 years of age		Linkages: Goal 1; Goal 2.2 Disaggregation by: urban / rural Sources: DHS/MICS compiled by UNICEF: http://data.unicef.org/nutrition/malnutrition
Comments: Food security has a growing presence in regional and local government policies.		

Proposed goal 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well−being for all at all ages

Although LRGs are, in some contexts, deeply involved in health and well-being public strategies, managing policies dealing with reducing maternal, new-borns and child mortality, water-borne, communicable and non-communicable diseases, and substance abuse, among others, we have decided to focus on targets 6, 7 and 9 as they are directly linked to LRGs responsibilities. However, for the rest of targets localizing through urban/rural disaggregation is advisable to better measure public interventions and facilitate effective implementation overall. LRGs in some countries in Africa, Asia or Latin America, play a crucial role in preventing communicable disease as AIDS, tuberculosis, hepatitis and malaria through awareness raising campaigns and supporting affected populations. UN Habitat (City Prosperity Index, 2014) proposes to "localize" the following index in urban areas: Life expectancy at birth, under five mortality rate, physicians density, vaccination coverage and maternal mortality. It could be also considered the number of in-patient hospital beds per 100,000 population (Global City Indicators)

Target 3.6. By 2020 halve global deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents

(a) Dimensions that could be measured:
- Injured people in traffic accidents
- Mortality due to traffic accidents
- Accident rate

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Injury rate: Number of people injured in traffic accidents per 100.000 population per year (at local and district level)		Linkages: Goal 11.2 Disaggregation by: area of state from OECD IRTAD, see this link for more details: http://internationaltransportforum.org/irtadpublic/coverage.html WHO Global Burden of Disease (GBD) has only gender as readily available disaggregation (would need to check with data holders possibilities for other breakdowns). Sources: OECD IRTAD for about 29 countries (developed countries) http://internationaltransportforum.org/irtadpublic/coverage.html; WHO Global Burden of Disease (GBD) has more country coverage.
2. Mortality rate: Deaths due to traffic accidents per 100.000 population per year		Linkages: Goal 11.2 Disaggregation by: Urban / rural, municipal level, transportation mode TBD. Currently disaggregation by gender readily available. Sources: OECD IRTAD; indicator also included in UN Habitat (CPI, 2014). This data is available from WHO Mortality Dataset. http://apps.who.int/healthinfo/statistics/mortality/whodpms/
Comments:		

Target 3.7. By 2030 ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health care services, including for family planning, information and education, and the integration of reproductive health into national strategies and programmes

(a) Dimensions to be measured:

- Contraceptive use
- Local policy

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Unmet need of contraception		Linkages: Goal 5.6. Disaggregation by: Urban / rural TBD. Currently disaggregation not readily available but could be computed from household surveys. Sources: DHS and other household surveys. (available through WB WDI, or WHO http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/family_planning /unmet_need_fp/en/)
Comments:		

Target 3.9. By 2030 substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water, and soil pollution and contamination

(a) Dimensions to be measured:

- Air pollution and contamination
- Water pollution and contamination
- Soil pollution and contamination

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Levels of Particulate Matter (PM 10 - mg/m3 & PM2.5 - mg/m3)		Linkages: Goal 11.6; Goal 12.4 Disaggregation by: cities Sources: World Bank (2014) data at country level in WDI, indicator also used in UN Habitat CPI (2014); although data could not be downloaded/checked from UN Habitat database. WHO data for 1600 cities in 91 countries. http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/cities/en/
2. Water quality index/score		Linkages: Goal 6.3; Goal 12.4 Disaggregation by: Urban / rural TBD; not readily available Sources: UN Global Environment Monitoring System Water Programme. Data available at: http://www.gemstat.org/default.aspx
3. Progress in management of contaminated sites		Linkages: Goal 12.4 Disaggregation by: urban / rural TBD, not readily available (if

		information is available by site then urban/rural or other geographical groupings could be constructed) <u>Sources</u>: European Environment Agency (2014) for European countries only.

Comments: Rapid urbanization has resulted in increasing urban air pollution in major cities, especially in developing countries. It is estimated that over 1 million premature deaths can be attributed to urban outdoor air pollution (UNSDSN)

Complementary indicators:

1. Share of motor vehicles meeting Euro 6 and Euro 5 or equivalent vehicle emission standards (UNSDSN 2014)

2. Share of transportation fuel (gasoline and diesel) that is ultra-low sulfur (under 50 ppm and under 10 ppm) (UNSDSN 20114)

3. Share of in-use passenger, commercial, and freight vehicles covered by regular Inspection and Maintenance Programs and renewable motor vehicle registration requirements (UNSDSN 2014)

Proposed goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life−long learning opportunities for all

Education is strongly linked to LRGs responsibilities in most countries. In some cases, local governments are in charge of pre-primary and/or primary education; in others they deal with education infrastructures or have complete or partial responsibilities for secondary or higher education. Although the proper implementation and monitoring of the whole set of targets proposed by the OWG under this goal allows an urban/rural disaggregation, we are focusing only on indicators proposed under target 4.1 and 4.2 to show the feasibility of monitoring this goal from a local perspective and to highlight the need to underline the share of national and subnational expenditure and its distribution among territories to measure efficiency in public allocation. UN Habitat (City Prosperity Index, 2014) proposes to "localize" the following index in urban areas: means of years of schooling, literacy rate, gross enrolment rate in higher education.

Target 4.1. By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Coverage of primary and secondary education
- Free and equitable access to primary and secondary education
- Quality of primary and secondary education

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Gross enrolment ratio: the number of children enrolled in a level of education (primary or secondary), regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the eligible official school-age population corresponding to the same level of education in a given school year	1. Net enrolment ratio in primary school (UNESCO) 2. Out of school children and adolescents (thousands) (UNESCO) 3. Equitable Secondary School Enrolment (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014)	Linkages: - Disaggregation by: gender and by level of education readily available. Geographical location (region, urban/rural) not readily available from internationally comparable data sources. That said for NET enrollment ratio in primary education (only for this level of education) UN Habitat has data disaggregated by slum and shelter deprivation: http://www.devinfo.info/urbaninfo/ Sources: UNESCO (UIS, WIDE). Also World Bank WDI and UN Habitat.
2. Gross graduation ratio: total number of graduates from the last grade of education level (primary / secondary), regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the population at the theoretical graduation age.	1. Expected cohort completion rate in primary school(UNESCO) 2. Lower secondary completion rate (UNESCO)	Linkages: - Disaggregation by: gender and level of education readily available. Geographical location (region, rural/urban) not readily available from internationally comparable data sources. Sources: UNESCO (UIS, WIDE)
3. Educational attainment of the population aged 25 years and above: Mean years of education		Linkages: - Disaggregation by: gender, by geographical location (region, urban/rural), by age group, wealth and ethnicity. Sources: UNESCO (WIDE database)
4. Public expenditure on education as % of total government expenditure	1. Total public expenditure on education as % of GDP	Linkages: Disaggregation by: level of education (primary, secondary) readily available. Level of administration (central, regional, local), geographical location (region, urban/rural), and by purpose of expenditure (salaries, teaching material, etc.) not readily available from internationally comparable data sources.

		Sources: UNESCO (UIS)
5. % of boys and girls who achieve proficiency across a broad range of learning outcomes, including in mathematics by the end of primary and lower secondary schooling cycle (based on credibly established national standards)	1. % of children who reach minimum benchmark in grades 4-6 (TIMMS/PIRLS) 2. % of adolescents who reach minimum benchmark in grade 8 (TIMMS/PIRLS)	Linkages: --; Disaggregation by: to be confirmed. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN/UNESCO; Note that proficiency standards will only be available for a group of countries. In fact, there is OECD PISA data for 65 countries: http://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/pisa-2012-participants.htm
Comments: extracted from EFA-GMR *Education for All Global Monitoring Report, Proposed post-2015 education goals* **Complementary indicators:** Quality standards of infrastructure in schools and process indicators (e.g. interactive skills of teachers) could be considered but they are unlikely to be available (as internationally comparable indicators) and are harder to measure. For quality of infrastructures for water, sanitation and hygiene see Goal 6.		

Target 4.2. By 2030 ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Coverage
- Inputs

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Gross enrolment ratio in early childhood care and education (ECCE): Total number of children enrolled in early childhood care and education programmes, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the population in the relevant official age group	Under-six years' old population who are enrolled on first stage education programs. These programs might either be financed by the local government or by the central government (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014)	Linkages: Disaggregation by: gender readily available. Geographical location (region, urban/rural) not readily available from UNESCO web databases. Sources: UNESCO (UIS)
2. Percentage of new entrants to primary education with ECCE experience: number of new entrants to primary grade 1 who have attended some form of organized early childhood care and education (ECCE) programme for the equivalent of at least 200 hours, expressed as a percentage of total number of new entrants to primary grade 1.		Linkages: --- Disaggregation by: gender (readily available) and geographical location (region, urban/rural) (not readily available from internationally comparable sources web databases) Sources: UNESCO
Comments: Quality of pre-primary is more difficult to measure. See http://unsdsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/140724-Indicator-working-draft1.pdf (Indicators 35 and 36). There is an Early Child Development Index (ECDI) that could be sourced from MICS surveys.		

Proposed goal 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls

LRGs play a crucial role in developing policies to promote gender equality. While the whole set of targets proposed by the OWG should be disaggregated by urban/rural to facilitate coordination between policies of different levels of government, we focus on target 5.5 as it has direct political, economic and social links with local institutions. UN Habitat (City Prosperity Index, 2014) proposes to "localize" the following index in urban areas: women in the workforce.

Target 5.5. Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic, and public life

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Equal opportunities for leadership in the political sphere
- Equal opportunities for leadership in the private sphere

 (b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Proportion of seats held by women in national and sub-national elected office according to their share of the population (revised MDG Indicator)	Women representation rate in elected local government positions (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014)	Linkages: -- Disaggregation by: urban/rural TBD (not currently available) Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN/UNHABITAT, CPI (2014); not readily available.
2. Proportion of managerial positions held by women in local administrations		Linkages: Disaggregation by: Urban / rural TBD (not currently available) Sources: TBC
Comments: outline the link to goal 1.b on gender-sensitive development.		

Proposed goal 6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all

Our main concern when analysing this goal is to define smart and reliable indicators adaptable to urban and rural contexts. Assessing the quality and extent of basic service provision within and between countries is difficult due to the lack of agreement on standards for judging provision and of data on provision. This is seen most dramatically in standards for water and sanitation provision. In high-income and many middle-income countries, adequate provision for water is considered to be 24 hours a day provision of drinking quality water piped into each home. Cost is also a concern if a proportion of households cannot afford to pay the full costs of provision. But the only global dataset on provision for water has no data on whether the water provided is regular or of drinking quality, or on whether it is affordable. It only has data on two indicators: who has water piped to their premises and who has 'improved provision'. This last category used in the MDGs includes, not only the use of piped water into a dwelling, yard or plot, but also public tap or standpipe, tube-well or borehole, protected spring, protected dug well or rainwater collection. So, those who only have access to a public tap or standpipe still get classified as having 'improved provision' even when getting water involves long queues and great effort needed to fetch and carry water back and forth to the home. If a household of six persons needs at least 150 litres of water per day (which is far below the norm in high-income nations), this means fetching and carrying 150 kilos of water. And the water at the tap or standpipe may be irregular and undrinkable. Obviously many of these modalities are not adequate for dense urban areas (David Satterthwaite, GOLD III, 2014).

There are comparable problems for sanitation. 'Improved provision', as defined in the MDGs, includes flush or pour-flush to a piped sewer system, septic tank, but also a pit latrine, a pit latrine with a slab and a composting toilet, that are not well adapted to dense urban areas. However, in general, there is no data on what proportion of each nation's national (urban or rural) populations have each of these, only the aggregated figure for 'improved provision'.

Target 6.1. By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Access to basic drinking water supply
- Access to intermediate drinking water services
- Affordability of drinking water services

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Complementary indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Percentage of population using basic drinking water services at home (basic = using an improved source (for urban areas excluding protected dug wells and springs) with a total collection time of 30 minutes or less for a roundtrip including queuing.)		Linkages: Goal 1.4; Goal 3.3; Goal 11.1 Disaggregation by: urban, peri-urban and rural areas (indicator used for MDGs readily available for urban/rural); level of income; slums/formal urban settlements, disadvantaged groups/general population (these breakdowns are not readily available); Sources: JMP WHO/UNICEF modified. Currently refining indicators, so not readily available: http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/4408trevett.pdf; http://www.unicef.org/wash/files/4_WSSCC_JMP_Fact_Sheets_4_UK_LoRes.pdf

2. Percentage of population using an intermediate drinking water service at home (intermediate = Percentage of households using an improved source on premises with discontinuity less than 2 days in the last 2 weeks; with less than 10 cfu E.coli/100ml year round at source; accessible to all members of the household at the times they need it)		Linkages: Goal 1.4: Goal 3.3; Goal 11.1; Disaggregation by: urban, peri-urban and rural areas (indicators used for MDGs readily available for urban/rural), level of income, slums/formal urban settlements, disadvantaged groups/general population (these breakdowns are not readily available) Sources: JMP WHO/ Currently refining indicators, so not readily available. For example: http://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/4408trevett.pdf; http://www.unicef.org/wash/files/4_WSSCC_JMP_Fact_Sheets_4_UK_LoRes.pdf
3. Percentage of population in the poorest quintile whose financial expenditure on water, sanitation and hygiene is below 3% of the national poverty line	Percentage of population using water and sanitation service providers registered with a regulatory authority (disaggregated by rural and urban)	Linkages: Disaggregation by: urban, peri-urban and rural areas TBD Sources: JMP WHO/UNICEF, indicator to be developed.
Comments: Water and sanitation are considered as basic services. Thus, links with Goal 1.4 and 11.1 should be outlined. 'Improved source' in urban areas include: piped water into dwelling, yard or plot, or a standpipe/public tap or a tube. UN Habitat (CPI, 2014), proposes for urban areas: *"Percentage of urban households with connection to piped water. Piped water is defined as a household connection, where a water service pipe is connected with in-house plumbing to one or more taps. Piped water to yard/plot, also called a yard connection, is defined as a piped water connection to a tap placed in the yard or plot outside the house."* **Complementary indicators:** 1. Percentage of pupils enrolled in primary and secondary schools that provide basic drinking water in urban and rural areas(not readily available from internationally comparable databases) 2. Percentage of beneficiaries using hospitals, health centers and clinics providing basic drinking water (not readily available from internationally comparable databases)		

Target 6.2. By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all, and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Practice of open defecation
- Access to adequate sanitation facilities at home
- Access to adequate sanitation facilities at schools and health centers
- Adequacy and safety of excreta management
- Access to hand washing and basic hygiene facilities at home, schools and health centers

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Complementary indicators as defined by JMP Who / UNICEF (see also comments below)	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Percentage of population reporting practicing open defecation.	1. Percentage of households not using any sanitation facility;	Linkages: 1.4 and 11.1 Disaggregation by: urban, peri-urban and rural areas (readily available at

	2. 2. Percentage of households in which open defecation is practiced by any household member 3. Percentage of households with children under 5 reporting hygienic disposal of the stools of children under 5	urban/rural level); slum/formal urban settlements; disadvantaged groups/general population (does not appear to be readily available from web databases); Sources: JMP WHO/UNICEF
2. Percentage of population using an adequate sanitation facility.	1. Percentage of the population with access to sewer system facilities that hygienically separate human excreta from human and animal contact (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014) 2. Percentage of households in which the sanitation facility is used by all members of household (including men and women, boys and girls, elderly, people with disabilities) whenever needed	Linkages: goals 1.4 and 11.1 Disaggregation by: urban, peri-urban and rural areas (readily available), level of income; slums/formal urban settlements, disadvantaged groups/general population (does not appear to be readily available from web databases) Sources: JMP WHO/UNICEF; for example http://www.unicef.org/wash/files/4_WSSCC_JMP_Fact_Sheets_4_UK_LoRes.pdf
3. Percentage of population living in households whose excreta are safely managed.		Linkages: : goals 1.4 and 11.1 Disaggregation by: urban, peri-urban and rural areas, level of income; slums/formal urban settlements, disadvantaged groups/general population; Sources: JMP WHO/UNICEF; for example: http://www.unicef.org/wash/files/4_WSSCC_JMP_Fact_Sheets_4_UK_LoRes.pdf

Comments: Water and sanitation are considered as basic services. Thus, links with Goal 1.4 and 11.1 should be outlined.
[Adequate sanitation = pit latrine, sewer or septic tank, shared by no more than 5 families or 30 persons]
[Adequate excreta management: containment extraction, and transport to a designated disposal or treatment site, safe reuse at the household or community level]
Complementary indicators:
1. Percentage of pupils enrolled in primary and secondary schools that provide adequate sanitation services (Percentage of primary and secondary schools with gender-separated sanitation facilities on or near premises, with at least one toilet for every 25 girls, at least one toilet for female school staff, a minimum of one toilet and one urinal for every 50 boys and at least one toilet for male school staff)
2. Percentage of beneficiaries using hospitals, health centers and clinics providing adequate sanitation services. (gender separated sanitation facility on or near premises (at least one toilet for every 20 users at inpatient centers, at least four toilets – one each for staff, female, male and child patients – at outpatient centers).
3. Percentage of population with basic hand washing facilities in the home
4. Percentage of pupils enrolled in primary and secondary schools that provide adequate hygiene services
5. Percentage of beneficiaries using hospitals, health centers and clinics providing adequate hygiene services

Target 6.3. by 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater, and increasing recycling and safe reuse by x% globally

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Percentage of urban wastewater flows treated to national standards either collective or individual facilities, by domestic and industrial source.	Percentage of wastewater treated from wastewater produced within the urban agglomeration (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014)	Linkages: 11.6 Disaggregation by: urban and peri-urban areas, slum/ formal human settlements, disadvantaged groups/general population TBC. Sources: JMP WHO/UNICEF. Data not readily available from internationally comparable data sources.
2. Proportion of the population connected to collective sewers or with on-site storage of all domestic wastewaters	Percentage of city population served by wastewater collection (Global City Indicators)	Linkages: 11.6 Disaggregation by: urban and peri-urban areas, slum/ formal human settlements, disadvantaged groups/general population TBC. Sources: JMP WHO/UNICEF. Data not readily available from internationally comparable data sources. Data at national level available from: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/environment/wastewater.htm
3. Proportion of the flows of treated municipal wastewater that are directly and safely reused		Linkages: 11.6 Disaggregation by: urban and peri-urban areas TBC. Sources: JMP WHO/UNICEF Data not readily available from internationally comparable data sources

Proposed Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all

For goal 7 we present examples of indicators for target 7.1, which seeks to make access to modern energy systems universal. It is important to understand spatially where access is insufficient – often in poor informal settlements as well as isolated rural contexts. Although this is an area where some local governments may not have competence, some local authorities are energy service providers, and all have a role in spatial planning, which affects access. Local authorities also have responsibility for air pollution which is due, in part, to energy consumption.

Although targets 7.2 and 7.3 on renewables and energy efficiency, respectively, are framed as global targets and not included below as examples, many local areas can also affect the amount of renewables sources and energy efficiency, for example through procurement, land use and enforcement of building codes. In fact, many local areas, particularly big cities, take a number of measures to decarbonise through promotion of use of renewable sources and energy efficiency. Indicators for Target 7.2 could include the share of renewables in total energy use particularly in urban areas (already included under Goal 11, proposed by UN Habitat - CPI Indicators Guide, 2014); total energy and industry related emissions and implicit incentives for low-carbon energy in the electricity sector. In the case of 7.3 the rate of primary energy intensity improvement (a proxy for energy efficiency) could also be considered. Note that UNSDSN (Urban SDG Goal 11, 2014) also suggests the inclusion of indicators on motor vehicle fuel economy of all (new and in-use) Light Duty Vehicles.

Target 7.1 By 2030 ensure universal access to affordable, reliable, and modern energy services
(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Access to affordable energy services (to be developed)
- Access to reliable energy services
- Access to modern energy services

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Percentage of population with access to reliable electricity	Percentage of households that are connected to electricity with continuous supply from the grid. (UN Habitat, CIP, 2014)	Linkages: Goals 1, 3, 5, 9, 11 and 12. Disaggregation by: urban/rural and often by administrative authority. Sources: SE4All/IEA data, drawn from census/household surveys and in some cases utility providers. Limitations: Data do not cover quality of access. Imperfect for off-grid electricity access. See Indicator 56UNSDSN (July 2014) for more detailed comments.
2. Percentage of population dependent on solid fuels for cooking		Linkages: Goals 1, 3, 5, 9, 11 and 12. Disaggregation by: urban/rural. Sources: SE4All, WHO, IEA data, drawn from census/household surveys Limitations: Data not routinely collected by many countries. See Indicator 55 UNSDSN (July 2014) for more detailed comments.
Comments: Data for slums/municipalities may require census data/administrative data as household survey often not representative to disaggregate information for these detailed geographies. The SDGs are more ambitious that the current Sustainable Energy for All Framework in that it includes affordability and reliability considerations. At the moment, indicators only allow for binary measures of access to energy services (whether a household has access or does not have access), but does not include considerations of quality and affordability. The latter are under discussion. For more details, see http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2013/05/28/000112742_20130528084417/Rendered/PDF/778890GTF0full0report.pdf		

Proposed goal 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all

Targets proposed under Goal 8 are fully relevant to LRGs as employment and economic development are at the core of their responsibilities in many countries. Therefore, urban/rural disaggregation is necessary to facilitate the adequate implementation of policies in a multilevel intervention framework. Furthermore, as the economic dimension has not been taken into consideration in the current formulation of the urban goal (SDG 11), seeking cross-cutting synergies between the two goals is crucial. The set of indicators that we are proposing focus on targets 8.3 and 8.9. However, the proper implementation of others, as those focusing in informal jobs (8.5) and youth (8.6), will require reliable local data. UN Habitat (City Prosperity Index, 2014) proposes to "localize" the following index in urban areas: city product per capita, economic specialization, employment to population ratio, informal employment, unemployment rate, youth unemployment and women in workforce.

Target 8.3. Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises including through access to financial services

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
-   Pro-business institutional framework and policies
-   Decent job creation
-   Level of Informal economy
-   Level of corruption
-   Access to financial services

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Annual net employment creation rate (formal, informal, gender, age, urban, rural) (%)		Linkages: 11 Disaggregation by: TBD Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (TBD
2. Estimated share of informal economy (own account and contributing family workers ILO definition) over the GDP in urban and rural areas	1. Informal employment ratio (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014)	Linkages: 11 Disaggregation by: Economic sector, urban / rural (TBC ILO KILM data is not disaggregated on the web database by rural/urban0 Sources: ILO
3. Average time for new business registration at all level of administrations (including local level)		Linkages: Disaggregation by: Economic sector, urban / rural TBD (not readily available). Only for selected countries there is data at the regional and city level (for some cities only) Sources: Doing Business (WB)
4. Business and investors' perception on Government Integrity / prevalence of corruption practices at all levels		Linkages: Goal 16 Disaggregation by: Economic sector, urban / rural. Disaggregation not available. Sources: Transparency International Corruption Perception Index (CPI); World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators (Control of Corruption); Global Integrity country scores

5. Businesses' access to credit and other financial services, including MSMEs		Linkages: Disaggregation by: economic sector, urban, peri-urban and rural areas. Disaggregation not available. Only for selected countries there is data at the city level (for some cities only) Sources: Country level: Doing Business (WB)
Comments: UNSDSN proposes to develop an Index of decent work to track countries' compliance with the decent work agenda adopted by members states of the ILO. Decent work, as defined by the ILO, includes access to full and productive employment with rights at work, social protection and the promotion of social dialogue, with gender equality as a crosscutting issue. Currently, such a single index does not exist, but it could be created (potentially as a composite indicator).		

Target 8.5. By 2030 achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Rate of employment of men, women and youth
- Employment of persons with disabilities
- Decent job creation
- Discrimination in employment and salaries

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Employment rates (by gender, by age, by sector and region)		Linkages: Disaggregation by: gender, age, economic sector (readily available). Urban / rural not available on KILM database. Sources: ILO
2. Annual average unemployment rate in urban and rural areas		Linkages: 11 Disaggregation by: Economic sector, urban / rural, municipal. Disaggregation not readily available on KILM database. For young people (15-24) this data is available on UN Habitat web database by gender and shelter deprivation (urban/rural/slum) Sources: ILO, UN Habitat.
3. Youth employment rate, by formal and informal sector		Linkages: Disaggregation by: gender, economic sector (readily available). Urban / rural not readily available on KILM database. Sources: ILO
Comments:		

Target 8.9. By 2030 devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism which creates jobs, promotes local culture and products

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Policies that promote sustainable tourism, local culture and products
- Jobs related to sustainable tourism, local cultures and products

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Percentage of active population employed in culture enterprises and activities (heritage, arts, libraries, etc.)		Linkages: Disaggregation by: urban / rural, municipal (not readily available) Sources: tbc
2. Percentage of tourism enterprises that subscribed social corporate responsibilities		Linkages: Disaggregation by: urban / rural, municipal (not readily available) Sources: to be developed
Comments:		

Goal 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation

Many Member States see this goal as a pre-requisite for growth and industrialisation and a goal that is complementary to Goal 11 on making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. As centres of economic activity, cities require adequate and future-proof infrastructure to develop their full economic potential.

This goal is also relevant in strengthening links between rural-urban areas, supply chains and improving the productivity of rural areas. The infrastructure deficit in poorer countries is significant with sizeable investments required in sustainable transport, energy, water and ICT. The specific characteristics of the infrastructure deficit and its spatial manifestation are context specific and developing an appropriate response requires articulation between different levels of government. Below we include examples of indicators for Targets 9.1 and 9.c, trying to capture types of infrastructure which are not covered under other targets (e.g. water, sanitation and energy are all included under other goals).

Target 9.1 Develop quality, reliable, sustainable, and resilient infrastructure, including regional and trans-border infrastructure, to support economic development and human well-being, with a focus on affordable and equitable access for all
(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- *Quality of infrastructure*
- *Reliability of infrastructure*
- *Resilience of infrastructure*
- *Equitable access*

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Access to all-weather road : percentage of rural population with access within 2 km distance to road		Linkages: Goal 2 and 8. Disaggregation by: Rural areas. A few examples for countries' sub-regions; perhaps could be further disaggregated. Sources: Proposed by the WB as part of a Rural Infrastructure Index. Also included in UNSDSN proposals (July, 2014 and Urban SDG). Reported at country level for rural areas in aggregate and very few examples for countries sub-regions. http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/rural-access-index; http://www.worldbank.org/transport/transportresults/headline/rural-access.html Limitations: TBC.
2. Passenger-kilometres by various land transport modes in major national and regional corridors		Linkages: Goal 2, 8 and 11. Disaggregation by: Regional corridors. Sources: TBC suggested by UNSDSN (Urban SDG Goal 11; August 2014). Limitations: TBC
3. Cost of national and regional freight per ton-km		Linkages: Goals 2, 8 and 11; Disaggregation by: TBC Sources: TBC suggested by UNSDSN (Urban SDG Goal 11; August 2014); Limitations: TBC

Comments: Non-SMART target as it does not define what 'quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient' infrastructure means.
Note that 'affordability' should also be factored in by looking at costs of transport. However, this is currently not measured on a comparable basis. See Starkey (2013) 'Assessment of a possible post-MDG rural transport indicator', *Evidence on Demand,* for more details.

Target 9.a. Facilitate sustainable and resilient infrastructure development in developing countries through enhanced financial, technological and technical support to African countries, LDCs, LLDCs and SIDS

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- *Investments in sustainable and resilient infrastructures*
- *Technological and technical support*

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Percentage of total international public finance commitments in African countries, LDCs, LLDCs and SIDs (particularly from ODA and international public funds through concessional long-term loans) in sustainable basic infrastructures (e.g. drinkable water and sanitation, including sewage, drainage and flood control systems, transportation, energy, waste management, including waste-water, communication)		Linkages: Goals 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17. Disaggregation by: TBD but not available at local level Sources: OECD DAC, IFM, WB.
Comments:		

Target 9.c. Significantly increase access to ICT and strive to provide universal and affordable access to internet in LDCs by 2020

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- *Access to ICT*
- *Affordability of ICT services*

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
2. Mobile/Fixed broadband subscriptions per 100,000 inhabitants		Linkages: 9.1, 8. Disaggregation by: Data only reported at the national level but possibly available at more disaggregated level. Sources: International Telecommunication Union, World Telecommunication/ICT Development Report and database, and World Bank estimates. Limitations: Would need to be developed for sub-national areas.
Comments: Non-SMART target as it does not define what 'significantly increase' means. Note that we are not aware of measures of affordability of access to ICT. Costs and affordability considerations could be factored in, but currently unlikely to be available on a consistent basis.		

Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries.

The rise of inequality has been well documented in the literature. Inequality also manifests itself spatially: large cities are home to stark disparities in income and access to services (e.g. slums, poor or marginalized neighbourhoods). In addition to inequalities within cities, there are also significant inequalities between urban and rural areas and between regions. This is an important issue for sub-national governments, as they control land use, policies to drive local economic growth, and provision of basic services, which can all impact on inequality. Examples of indicators for target 10.1, focused on income inequalities, are included below.

Note that, for target 10.2, which refers to economic, social and political inequalities, targets could be framed as achieving reductions in the gap in attainment/outcomes for different vulnerable groups/areas (Watkins, 2013). Reducing the gap in maternal mortality rates between slums and non-slum areas (or between better and worse performing authorities) could be an example of such an approach. This could provide incentives to reduce inequalities. Further, reducing inequalities between regions/territories needs equalisation mechanisms towards poorer areas (see below target 10.2)

Target 10.1: By 2030 progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 percent of the population at a rate higher than the national average

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Inequality of income

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Palma Ratio (ratio of richest 10% of the <u>urban</u> population's share of gross national income (GNI) divided by the poorest 40% of the population's share)	GINI coefficient (UN Habitat calculates it for cities; see for example UN Habitat, CPI, 2014) the possibility of calculating it for regions could also be explored	<u>Linkages:</u> N/A <u>Disaggregation by:</u> Would need to be calculated for sub-national areas (rural/urban; cities; districts). <u>Sources:</u> Households surveys (disaggregation depends on sampling frame and survey size). <u>Limitations:</u> Would need to be developed for sub-national areas. International comparisons challenging.
2. Percentage of urban households with incomes below 50% of median income (an indicator of inequality at the bottom of the income distribution, which acts as a cause of social exclusion and undermines equality of opportunity)	Poverty rate in urban areas (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014): household per-capita (which is composed by the household labour income and the household non-labour income) income with a poverty line	<u>Linkages:</u> N/A <u>Disaggregation by:</u> sex and age of household head, urban/rural locality (ethnicity, religion, language, disability, indigenous status should be reviewed). Would need to be calculated for these breakdowns and for sub-national areas (rural/urban; cities; districts). <u>Sources:</u> Household surveys. <u>Limitations:</u> Would need to be developed for sub-national areas. International comparisons challenging.
Comments: Some household surveys measure consumption, while others measure income. The mix makes international comparison difficult. It is useful to collect pure income based data. See Luxembourg Income Study. Surveys may not be representative at local level.		

Target 10.2. By2030 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

(a) Dimensions to be measured:

   - Reducing spatial /territorial inequality

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Percentage of national budget transferred to poor regions and municipalities within the country through equalization mechanisms to reduce basic services and infrastructures gaps between rich and poor regions (measured against the benchmark or average to be defined at national level)		Linkages: -- Disaggregation by: region, district, municipality Sources: National accounting systems.
Comments: Equalization budget mechanisms can contribute to reduce spatial and territorial inequalities improving investments in basic and social services, and promoting economic development. The definition of "poor regions and municipalities" tbc.		

Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable [19]

The current OWG SDGs proposal does not approach Goal 11 in a holistic manner. It does not cover the whole range of dimensions dealing with the urban agenda, focusing specifically in some key issues not envisaged in other goals. Indeed, Goal 11 deals with housing, slums upgrading, basic services, transport, participatory planning, preservation of natural and cultural heritage, prevention of natural disasters, urban environment and green and public spaces. Thus, cross-cutting linkages with other goals will be required for a coherent implementation and monitoring of SDGs in urban areas. Furthermore, strong multilevel governance mechanisms should be required as urban policies are deployed by different levels of government (local, regional, national and international). However, no governance target has been defined.

We propose a set of indicators to address the OWG targets in line with proposals endorsed by some of the most relevant stakeholders in the field as UN-Habitat or the USNDSN. As with regards to any other system of indicators defined as smart, reliable and feasible, implementing and monitoring the urban goal will require improved data collection mechanisms at national and subnational levels. This will be one of the greatest challenges to address.

As mentioned above at the end of the introduction (page 8), to reduce the complexity and the quantity of indicators, one option is to consider the use of a composite indicator that covers various targets and facilitates their monitoring. This is the proposal made by UN Habitat in their *City Prosperity Indicator* in their report *State of the World's Cities, Report 2012-2013* and in the already mentioned *City Prosperity Index Methodological Guide* (August 2014). The CPI index combines 50 indicators into 5 consolidated indicators that cover different dimensions of urban development: productivity, quality of life, infrastructure development, social equity and inclusive cities, and environmental sustainability. However, the CPI doesn't include all of the elements foreseen for SDG 11 (e.g. it doesn't include indicators of resilience, 11.5, or urban planning, 11.3) and some of the dimensions it covers are spread across a number of SDG goals (Goals 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10). The CPI *Methodological Guide* also includes a sixth dimension on governance and legislation that has not yet been developed, but it is an option worth considering.

Target 11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services, and upgrade slums [*to make cities and human settlements inclusive (amendment proposed by UN SDSN in the meeting in London)*].

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Urban population with access to adequate and safe houses
- Affordability of housing costs
- Legal rights on housing
- Urban population with access to adequate, safe and affordable basic services

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Proportion of urban population living in slums or informal settlements (MDG Indicator)[20]		Linkages: target 11.c support for sustainable and resilient

---

[19] This section is based on the proposals discussed in the workshop organised by UNSDSN in London (UNSDSN, Urban Futures, ACCC and Stockholm Resilience Center, *Consultation on the UN Open Working Group on the SDG's – Urban SDG Goal 11: Targets and Indicators*, London, 22-24 August 2014, working document). UNDSN propose the following rewording of the goal: By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services, and upgrade slums *to make cities and human settlements inclusive* (*amendment proposed by UN SDSN in the meeting in London*)

		building utilizing local materials and target 1.4. <u>Disaggregation by</u>: city (sex of head of household and age) TBC Not readily available from UN Habitat's website http://www.devinfo.info/urbaninfo/, but they have the data to calculate slum estimates and perhaps further disaggregation could be possible (see footnote 21) <u>Sources:</u> UNHABITAT, drawn from census/household surveys, Global City Indicator
2. Proportion of urban population living in spaces with under three persons per room or under 3 square metres of space per person (overcrowding)		<u>Linkages</u>: 1.4; <u>Disaggregation by</u>: city, urban (sex of head of household and age) TBC. On UN Habitat's website the data is only available at national level, but further disaggregation may be possible[21]. <u>Sources:</u> UNHABITAT (CPI, 2014), drawn from census/household surveys.
3. Proportion of households living in a housing unit considered as 'durable'[22] i.e. that has a permanent structure that protects against extreme climate conditions and that is located in a non-hazardous area.		<u>Linkages</u>: goal 11.c support for sustainable and resilient building utilizing local materials; Goal 1.5 Resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations <u>Disaggregation by</u>: city, urban (sex of head of household and age) TBC. On UN Habitat's website the data is only available at national level, but further disaggregation may be possible. <u>Sources:</u> UNHABITAT (CPI, 2014), drawn from census/household surveys.
4. Percentage of women and men in urban areas with secure tenure, measured by (i) percentage with documented rights to housing, and (ii) percentage who do not fear arbitrary eviction	Average annual number of urban population evicted from their dwellings during the past five years (UNHABITAT, 2004)	<u>Linkages</u>: Target 1.4. By 2030 ensure that all men and women, particularly the poor and the vulnerable, have … control over land and other forms of property, inheritance. <u>Disaggregation by</u>: TBC this is a new indicator. <u>Sources:</u> UNHABITAT/UNDP/UNSDSN, Sietchiping (2012)
5. The proportion of the urban population in the lowest quintiles that spends more than 30 percent of its income on accommodation		<u>Linkages</u>: Target 1.4; <u>Disaggregation by</u>: city, (sex of head of household and age) TBD, currently not available. <u>Sources:</u> Information to be drawn from census/household surveys. Needs to be developed.
Comments: Indicators on access to basic services can be linked to other goals: Goal 1.4 on access to basic services, Goal 6 for access to safe and affordable drinking water, and adequate and equitable sanitation in home; Goal 7 for reliable and modern energy services, Goal 3 for education (e.g.: ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education), Goal 4 for health (e.g.: ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health care service). Links with 11.6 for air and waste management (and also 12.5).		

---

[20] *Note that the definition of slums includes the elements mentioned below (2, 3, 4 plus access to water and sanitation).* Therefore, it aggregates indicators 2, 3 and 4. More accurate measures of slums/informal settlements could be developed together with Slum Dwellers organisations.

[21] Note that the possibilities of further geographical disaggregation in the case of household surveys will depend on sample size, often not big enough for disaggregation by municipalities. Detailed geographical disaggregation possible in the case of census data. This applies to most indicators under this target.

[22] The structure quality is determined by the following criteria: permanency of structure, permanent building material for the walls, roof and floor and compliance of building codes. The dwelling is not in a dilapidated state, not need major repair, is not located on a steep slope, near toxic waste, in a flood plain or in a dangerous right of way (rail, highway, airport, power lines)". See UN Habitat, CPI, 2014 p. 50 for more details

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 situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons [23]

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Availability and accessibility of transport systems
- Affordability of transport systems
- Safety of transport systems (covered also under Goal 3)
- Sustainability of transport systems

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Mean daily travel time to work for people by mode and by level of income (e.g. work and by income quintile)	1. Average of daily travel time of all trips using all modes of transport (UNHABITAT, CPI, 2014) 2. (i) Average daily commuting time/cost, (ii) proportion of population within x min/kms of a public transit/NMT system (UN Habitat /Communitas)	Linkages: Possibly goal 9, which covers infrastructure. Disaggregation: TBC. Harmonized global transport data does not exist. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014)
2. Shares of trips by public transport, cycling, walking, and other sustainable modes respectively and motor vehicle occupancy (by income quintile.	1. Percentage of trips made in a public transport (PT) mode (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014) 2. Vehicles km travelled (VKT) per population, mode of transport (public, private) and type of vehicle (including cycling and walking) (Nathan and Reddy (2011)) 3. Percentage of people within [0.5] Km of public transit running at least every [20] minutes (UN SDNS) [an indicator of availability/reliability of public transport]	Linkages: Possibly goal 9, which covers infrastructure and Goal 13 on climate change. Disaggregation TBC. Harmonized global transport data does not exist. Sources: Proposed by UN Habitat (2004 & 2011), UNSDSN (London, 2014)
3. Share of income spent by urban households on transport (by income quintile)	Monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE) on transport over total MPCE [Nathan and Reddy (2011)]	Linkages: Possibly goal 1.4; Disaggregation by: Level of income and geographical disaggregation TBC, not readily available. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014)
4. Average trip length (in km) (by mode and journey purpose)		Disaggregation by: tbc Harmonized global transport data does not exist Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014)

---

[23] Alternative wording proposed by UN SDSN in the meeting in London: By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible, clean and energy efficient transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, enhancing walking and cycling, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons.

5. Rapid public transport length per urban resident (in km per million) (by mode)	Length of Mass Transport Network [Total length of all superior modes of public transport; i.e., BRT, trolleybus, tram, light rail and subway, cable cars, relative to the size of the city, expressed as the number of inhabitants or the total number of trips] UN Habitat (CPI, 2014)	Disaggregation by: mode and geographical disaggregation TBC. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014)
6. Share of public transport accessible to persons with disabilities	Proportion of streets, public transport vehicles, public transport stops, and buildings accessible to persons with disabilities (percentage) (UN SDSN, London, 2014)	Disaggregation: TBC Sources: Proposed in Nathan and Reddy (2011)
Comments: Safety aspects (accidental deaths and injured on urban roads) have not been included as this is covered by Target 11.5 below and 3.6 (under the Health goal). Air pollution is included in target 11.7 and 3.9. There could also be links with Goal 13 on climate change.		

11.3. By 2030 enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacities for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Enhancement of inclusive and sustainable urbanization
- Enhancement of capacities for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Ratio of population growth rate and land consumption rate	1. Rate of growth of urban built-up sprawl [Angel, S., et al (2011)] 2. Urban residential density (persons per area)	Disaggregation by: city. TBC whether it is readily available. Sources: Proposed by UN Habitat /UN SDSN (London, 2014)
2. Number of street intersections per one square kilometre of land	1. Arterial grid of roads covering the entire projected urban area, spaced one kilometer, with designated lanes for intra-city traffic (public and private, motorized and non-motorized) and safe crosswalk, included in urban planning sprawl [Angel, S., et al (2011)] 2. Public open space for resident (Aromar Revi & Cinthya Rosenzweig (2013)	Disaggregation by: city TBC not readily available from web databases with internationally comparable data. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014) & UN Habitat (CPI, 2014)
3. Land use mix: diversity of land use per square kilometre		Disaggregation by: city TBC not readily available from web databases with internationally comparable data.Sources: Proposed by UN SDSN (London, 2014) & UN Habitat (CPI, 2014)
4. Sustainable development Planning Index: existence of urban development plans for each agglomeration with more than 500 thousand inhabitants	Existence of capacity building and participatory mechanisms related to urban planning, which ensure a fair representation of the urban population, including slum dwellers and other social groups in vulnerable situations (Angel, S., et	Disaggregation by: city. TBC not readily available from web databases with internationally comparable data. Sources: Proposed by UN SDSN (London, 2014); UN Habitat,

	al -2011)	
5. Total annual financial resources allocated for implementation of the urban plan/year (disaggregated by public sector and other sources) (current units)		Disaggregation by: cities TBC not readily available from web databases with internationally comparable data. Source: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014)
6. Number of countries with legislation to promote participatory mechanisms related to urban planning and local decision-making, which ensure a fair representation of the urban population.	Participatory planning and transparent and accountable management Index (to be developed)(UN SDSN London, 2014)	Disaggregation by: cities Sources: Proposed in Angel, S., et al (2011)
Comments: There could be linkages with the goal on accountable and inclusive institutions, Goal 16.		

11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Knowledge of the heritage resources
- Condition of heritage
- Community awareness and action

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Number and distribution of identified cultural and natural heritage items (places and objects)	Inventory of all cultural components of urbanization: heritage sites, distinctive architecture, public art works and cultural landscapes.	Disaggregation by: city/municipality. TBC. If data is available by heritage items, data could be grouped for cities/municipalities. Sources: tbc. UNESCO; http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/
2. Number of natural and cultural heritage under threat.	Existence of a specific "cultural impact assessment" (protection of heritage and provision of cultural services) as a pre-requisite of all urbanization plans	Disaggregation by: city/municipality TBC. Sources: tbc UNESCO; http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/
3. Number of public libraries per 100,000 people		Disaggregation by: city/municipality. TBC [cannot access CPI data online to check availability of breakdown] Sources: UN Habitat (CPI, 2014)
4. % of budget provided for maintaining cultural and natural resources	% of full time employees working in research, preservation, management and dissemination of cultural and natural heritage, over total full time employment (UNESCO -2013)	Disaggregation by: city/municipality TBD. Sources: tbc; not readily available from internationally comparable sources.
Comments: other indicators proposed 1. Polices and framework for the protection and promotion of natural heritage 2. Existence of a long-term local cultural strategy, developed and evaluated through participative exercises 3. Establishment of minimum service standard (i.e.: number of libraries/books per inhabitant, at least a heritage site per neighbourhood, at least a community centre per district) for cultural facilities.		

11.5 By 2030 significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of affected people and decrease by y% the economic losses relative to GDP caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with the focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
   – Existence of comprehensive measures related to disaster prevention and resilience strengthening
   – Consequences of natural disasters

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. % of cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants with risk reduction and resilience plans developed and implemented in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels.	Disaster Risk Policy, Planning & Implementation Index (Index) (UNSDSN, London, 2014)	Linkages: 11.b and 11.3 Disaggregation by: urban / rural, cities/municipalities. TBC/ Not readily available from internationally comparable data. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014)
2. Proportion of housing units built on hazardous locations (per 100,000 housing units)		Linkages: 1.5 and 11.b and 11.1 (safe housing) Disaggregation by: urban / rural, cities/municipalities (TBC; indicator does not appear readily available) Sources: Proposed in UN Habitat (2004).It would be worth checking with UN Habitat whether they hold the data. It is readily available from UN Habitat data repository: http://www.devinfo.info/urbaninfo/ In this document (Page 11) it is stated that it is mostly unavailable: http://ww2.unhabitat.org/programmes/guo/documents/urban_indicators_guidelines.pdf
3. Number of deaths and injured caused by natural disasters annually per 10,000 population	Total number of human lives lost, people injured or affected in urban and peri-urban areas (persons per year, by sex, hazard type and category (intensive/extensive) (UNSDSN, London, 2014)	Linkages: 1.5., 11.b, 13.1. Disaggregation by: urban / rural, cities/municipalities. (TBC). It does not appear like data is disaggregated at this level, but as the data is recorded by disaster event, in which case, it is localised, it could be tracked back to a certain area. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014). Data available at: UNISDR and http://www.emdat.be/database
4. Estimation of economic losses related to GDP caused by disasters	1. Total damaged and destroyed urban and peri-urban buildings and lifeline infrastructure (numbers/appropriate indicator) (UNSDSN, London, 2014) 2. Replacement costs of destroyed and damaged urban and peri-urban assets (monetary value annual, by hazard type and category (intensive/extensive) (UNSDSN, London, 2014) 3. Annual Average Loss (AAL) due to disaster (annual monetary value, by hazard type and category (intensive/extensive) (UNSDSN, London, 2014) 4. Urban public investment in Disaster risk management (percentage of GDP) (UNSDSN,	Linkages: 1.5., 11.b, 13.1. Disaggregation by: urban / rural, cities/municipalities. (TBC). It does not appear like data is disaggregated at this level, but as the data is recorded by disaster event, in which case, it is localized, it could be tracked back to a certain area. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014). Data available at: UNISDR and http://www.emdat.be/database.

	London, 2014)	

Comments: Links with Goal 13, particularly targets 13.1

Additional indicators that look at capacity of local governments and poor and vulnerable communities to react and cope with natural disasters could be considered. These are not currently available (in a way that is internationally comparable).

a. % change in proportion of women and individuals from marginalised sections represented within local and government decision-making bodies
b. % of national and local annual development budgets committed to reducing disaster risk and building resilience
c. %/number of people covered by appropriate risk reduction investment (infrastructure and capacity) in place to priority climate related (and other) disasters
d. % of municipalities/districts with risk reduction and resilience plans
e. % of schools with climate resilience and DRR mainstreamed into curricula.
f. Number of sector/departmental strategies (e.g. water, transport, energy) with climate resilience and disaster risk reduction mainstreamed.

11.6 By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality, municipal and other waste management

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
  - Greenhouse gases / Energy Efficiency
  - Air quality
  - Waste/ Reuse/ Recycle
  - Noise

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Total amount of GHG emissions per city and per capita	Percentage of total energy consumed in the city that comes from renewable sources (Canadian International Development Agency -2012)	Linkages: Goal 13 Disaggregation by: city; TBC extent to which data is disaggregated. Sources: Proposed by Canadian International Development Agency (2012) & UNSDSN (London, 2014), UN Habitat (CPI, 2014). IEA and UNFCCC. http://data.iea.org/ieastore/product.asp?dept_id=101&pf_id=305
2. Traffic noise level		Linkages: Goal 3 Disaggregation by: city Sources: Proposed by Nathan and Reddy (2011)
3. Mean urban air pollution of particulate matter (PM10 - mg/m3 and PM2.5)	1. Air Quality Index (UNSDSN, London, 2014) Air pollution related: Emissions of acidifying substances, Emissions of airborne particulate matter (PM), Emissions of ground-level ozone (O3), Emissions of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) (Communitas)	Linkages: Goal 3.9 and 7 Disaggregation by: city Sources:World Bank (2014) data at country level in WDI, indicator also used in UN Habitat CPI (2014); although data could not be downloaded/checked from UN Habitat database. WHO data for 1600 cities in 91 countries. http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/cities/en/;
4. % of solid waste collected from households, industrial and construction, % non-collected, % that is well	1. Volumes or mass of waste generated per capita and per year, % of solid and organic	Linkages: Goal 12.5 Disaggregation by: city TBC whether available as internationally

managed to adequate final disposal (recycled, reused, deposited in landfills, composted, etc.)	waste recycled (UNSDSN, 2014) 2. Share of waste collected by the city and adequately disposed either in sanitary landfills, incineration sites or in regulated recycling facilities (UN Habitat, CPI, 2014) 3. Recycling rate (Percentage diverted from waste stream) (Canadian International Development Agency -2012)	comparable data. <u>Sources:</u> TBC. Information is likely to be collected by municipalities and private entities but at the moment it seems there is no systematic collection of that data at international level (at least readily available online).

Comments:
Consider the use of a low carbon indicator as the PWC 2011 Low Carbon Economy Indicator. Urban development and urban planning is closely linked to the decarbonizing process. While many are specifically related to energy efficiency (See McKinsey & Company's greenhouse gas abatement cost curves), abundant de-carbonising opportunities also exist around construction processes and building materials (low carbon alternatives), transportation and urban resource management (energy, water and waste production and management).
For water quality, see goal 6.
UNSDSN proposes: Water quality index (index), City Biodiversity Index (index)
UN Habitat (CPI, 2014) include: Share of Protected Area in Natural Systems that Provide Water to the City and Number of monitoring stations for air quality

11.7. By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, particularly for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Availability and safety of public spaces
- Accessibility of urban public spaces

(b Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Urban public space per capita (sqm per capita)	Percentage of people (or residential area) who live (is located) less than 300 meters away from an open public space (UN Habitat, CPI Indicators Guide, 2014)	<u>Disaggregation by:</u> cities/ municipalities TBC whether available as internationally comparable data. <u>Sources:</u> UN HABITAT (2013). Does not appear readily available from UN Habitat web databases.
2. Urban green space per capita (forests, parks, gardens, etc.) (sqm per capita)	1. Percentage of preserved areas/ reservoirs/ waterways/parks in relation to total land area (Canadian International Development Agency - 2012) 2. Percentage of trees in the city in relation to city area and/or population size (Canadian International Development Agency -2012) 3. Proportion of urban land allocated to public open spaces (streets, squares, gardens, parks...) over the total urban land (UN Habitat) 4. Average walking time to nearest green open	<u>Disaggregation by:</u> cities/ municipalities TBC whether available as internationally comparable data. <u>Sources:</u> UN HABITAT CPI Indicator Guide, 2014 & UNSDSN (London, 2014). Does not appear readily available from UN Habitat web databases.

		space (minutes) (UNSDSN, London, 2014)
3. Number of reported crimes (homicides, injures and theft rates) committed annually in urban areas, per 100,000 population	1. Rate(s) of violence committed in public spaces affecting women and men by location [disaggregated by sex, race, sexual orientation, age, disability, as appropriate to the context] (UNSDSN, London 2014) 2. Proportion of urban road length having footpath and street lighting (Nathan and Reddy -2011)	Disaggregation by: Homicides by Gender and 'most populous cities'. Injuries by type (road, assault, intentional self-harm, accidental, falls), sex and age. Depending on the original data source, more levels of disaggregation could be available. Sources: UNODC based on national police and national statistical offices, WHO data, the UN Crime Trends Surveys, the UNODC Homicide Statistics, and Interpol data. WHO Mortality Database for injuries)
4. Proportion of urban public spaces (open and sheltered) accessible to persons with disabilities		Disaggregation by: cities/ municipalities TBD ; not currently available. Sources: Proposed in UN HABITAT (2004). Currently not available on UN Habitat's web databases.

Comments:
UNSDSN (London, 2014) also proposes: Proportion of secure public space as a proportion of all urban space (percentage)
UN Habitat (CPI, 2014): Access to public goods [Public goods is a space or facility that is generally open and accessible to people. They include open public spaces such as playgrounds, plazas, gardens, squares, etc.; and public facilities for cultural, sport and recreational activities. The access to public goods indicator measures the distribution of public goods in the territory]

Means of implementation as featured in Goal 11: Examples of possible indicators[24]

11.a. Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri–urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning

- Number of countries with national plans for sustainable urban development
- % of sub-national governments revenues and expenditures on general government revenues and expenditures (source IMF)

11.b. By 2020, increase by x% 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, develop and implement in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels

- % of settlements with more than 100,000 inhabitants with climate change mitigation and adaptation, risk reduction and resilience plans
  (developed and implemented in line with the forthcoming Hyogo Framework holistic disaster risk management at all levels).

---

[24] Indicators suggested below are in most cases not readily available and would need to be developed. There is also a question of the extent to which process-type of indicators are effective in driving change. Also note that the targets in this section are not necessarily SMART.

- % of national and local annual budgets committed to climate change adaptation and mitigation and to reduce disaster risk and build resilience

Note overlap with Targets 11.5 in Goal 11 and with targets under Goal 13.

11.c.   Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, for sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials

- % ODA devoted to LDC to support urban sustainable infrastructure projects

Note overlap with Targets under Goal 9.a and Goal 17.

Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

This goal has strong linkages with Goal 11, make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable, as both increasing demand for consumption and the challenges of sustainable production are likely to be particularly relevant in urban areas. It is also relevant for rural areas and it is related to sustainable agriculture (Goal 2). There are also cross-references with objectives 7, 8 and 13 on energy, sustainable growth and climate change.

As an example, indicators for Target 12.5 on waste management are included below, as this is a local government responsibility and highly related to Goal 11 (for example, Target 11.6).

Target 12.5 By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through preventions, reduction, recycling and reuse

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Waste generation
- Prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. % of solid waste collected from total households, public institutions, business, including industrial and construction waste 2. % that is well managed to adequate final disposal (recycled, reused, composted, deposited in landfills, incineration sites, etc.)	1. Volumes or mass of waste generated per capita and per year 2. Recycling rate (Percentage diverted from waste stream) (Canadian International Development Agency -2012)	Linkages: Goals 11.6 and 3 (3.9) and 12.4 Disaggregation by: needs development to achieve disaggregation but data likely to be collected at municipal level. In UN Habitat database solid waste collection is available at slum/non-slum/urban/1shelter deprivation and 2+ shelter deprivation: (http://www.devinfo.info/urbaninfo/ Sources: Proposed by UN Habitat (CPI, 2014) & (UNSDSN)
Comments: The indicator measures the proportion of solid waste collected by a municipal authority or by a private entity that is diverted for recycling and composting and does not end in landfill. In many countries, monitoring systems to measure solid waste collection is weak. Data on municipal waste collected are usually gathered through surveys of municipalities, which are responsible for waste collection and disposal, or from transport companies that collect waste and transport it to a disposal site. Such surveys deliver fairly reliable data. However, the figures only cover waste collected by or on behalf of municipalities. Therefore, amounts of waste will vary, depending on the extent that municipal waste collection covers small industries and the services sector. Waste collected by the informal sector, waste generated in areas not covered by the municipal waste collection system or illegally dumped waste are not included. Caution is therefore advised when comparing countries. Information is likely to be collected by municipalities and private entities but at the moment it seems there is no systematic collection of that data at international level. For the target to be SMART it requires specificity on what 'substantially reduce' means.		

Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts

Targets under goal 13 are not easy to operationalise. This goal was the subject of heated debate in the Open Working Group and the result did not include a target for climate change mitigation, under the understanding that these negotiations are taking place under the UNFCCC. There are significant cross-references to Goal 11 as cities are focal points of energy use and carbon dioxide emissions. In particular, there is a huge opportunity for those urban areas that have not been built yet to have new infrastructure that is climate proof (UNSDSN, Urban SDG 11).

Examples of indicators are included for Targets 13.1 and 13.2; note that in both cases indicators are already included under Goal 11. Under this goal disaggregation could also be included for rural areas.

Target 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate related hazards and natural disasters in all countries

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
>   *- Resilience*
>   *- Adaptive capacity*

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Percentage change in people killed or injured after disasters in a given time period		Linkages: Goal 1, 2 (particularly target 2.4), 6, 11, other targets in 13. Disaggregation by: urban / rural, cities/municipalities. (TBC). It does not appear like data is disaggregated at this level, but as the data is recorded by disaster event, in which case, it is localised, it could be tracked back to a certain area. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014). Data available at: UNISDR and http://www.emdat.be/database
2. Percentage change in economic losses (as % of GDP) in a given time period		Linkages: Goal 1, 2 (particularly target 2.4), 6, 11, other targets in 13. Disaggregation by: urban / rural, cities/municipalities. (TBC). It does not appear like data is disaggregated at this level, but as the data is recorded by disaster event, in which case, it is localised, it could be tracked back to a certain area. Sources: Proposed by UNSDSN (London, 2014). Data available at: UNISDR and http://www.emdat.be/database
Comments: In addition to the core indicators listed above, there are a number of additional ones that could be developed that have not been included as there exist scant sources to produce them. More details available in Twigg (2007); Jones and Bahadur (2013); Brooks, Aure and Whiteside (2014); Silva et al. (undated); UNISDR (undated). Target framed at country level, but also applicable to local areas.		

Target 13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning

(a) Dimensions to be measured:

- Climate change national policies, strategies and planning

 (b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Total amount of GHG/CO2 emissions per capita / CO2 intensity (and by sector		Linkages: Goal 11 Disaggregation by: municipalities/districts; sector Sources: UNFCCC
2. Percentage of municipalities/districts with climate change mitigation/adaptation; risk reduction and resilience plans [to be developed]	1. Number of sector/departmental strategies (e.g. water, transport, energy) with climate resilience and disaster risk reduction mainstreamed [to be developed]	Linkages: 1, 2 (2.4), 6, 11, other targets in 13. Disaggregation by: Municipalities/district level, TBD. Sources: N/A. Limitations: Data not readily available. Indicator needs to be developed to collect disaggregated data along these lines.
3. Percentage/number of national and local annual budgets committed to with climate change mitigation/adaptation, reducing disaster risk and building resilience [to be developed]		Linkages: 1, 2 (2.4), 6, 11, other targets in 13. Disaggregation by: Municipalities/district level, TBD. Sources: N/A. Limitations: Data not readily available. Indicator needs to be developed to collect disaggregated data along these lines.
Comments: Data sources to be reviewed and indicators developed. Non-SMART target difficult to operationalise and mostly include 'process' type of indicators. There is also a question of the extent to which this type of indicators is effective in driving change.		

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.

Effective, accountable and inclusive institutions are crucial for the attainment of all other sustainable development goals. For Goal 16, we selected as examples targets that are particularly relevant for local governments: Target 16.1 on violence, target 16.6 on effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels, Target 1.7 on responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels, and Target 16.9 on birth registrations (often a local government competence).

Targets 16.6 and 16.7 are particularly important as they complement Goal 11 on cities and human settlements, which does not include a governance dimension.

Target 16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. Violent injuries, deaths and homicide rates (per 1,000,000 habitants)		Linkages: 11.7 Disaggregation by: homicides by gender/ injuries by type, sex and age/geographical breakdowns TBC (Some disaggregated data for most populous cities) Sources: Interpol, UN Crime Trends Survey, UNODC, WHO Mortality Database. Limitations: Data partially available.
2. Refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) caused by conflict and violence		Linkages: N/A. Disaggregation by: By territory of residence (or refugees by country / territory of asylum), location of residence (within country), country of origin (refugees), gender, age and population type. Sources: UNHCR.
Comments: For the target to be SMART it requires clarification of what 'significantly reduce' means.		

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

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Effective, accountable and transparent institutions
 (b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation, and sources)
1. Open data: government budget data publicly available at all levels (national and subnational)	Openness in both the formulation and execution of budgets. Indicator TBD. Possible options: 1) from perception/opinion surveys (example from Afrobarometer R5) 2) Adapt Open Budget surveys and Index for local governments 3) UNHABITAT	Linkages: None. Disaggregation by: level of government and region (urban/rural). Sources: open budget index, national data Limitations: Data only available at country level
2. Public advertising of all government procurement (national and subnational)		Linkages: None. Disaggregation by: level of government and region (urban/rural). TBC. Sources: National data [difficult to check availability as it will depend on different governments' statistics]
3. Trust in local government institutions: Percentage of people saying that they trust/ have confidence in national and sub-national governments	1. Percentage of respondents saying that they trust their taxes/local revenue are well spent. Indicator TBD from perception/opinion surveys (e.g. Afrobarometer R5). 2. Percentage of respondents saying that information is provided to citizens on (local) government decisions or that local government decisions reflected their priorities. Indicator TBD from perception/opinion surveys (example from SLRC).	Linkages: None. Disaggregation by: gender, age, place of residence and region (also depends on sampling procedure and survey size). Sources: Perception /opinion surveys (e.g. World Value Surveys, Afrobarometer, LatinoBarometer, Gallup World Poll, etc.). Limitations: Data partially available, cross country comparability difficult, survey questions would need standardization.
4. Citizen satisfaction with local public services: Percentage of people 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' [to be developed]		Linkages: None. Disaggregation by: gender, age, place of residence and region (also depends on sampling procedure and survey size) Sources: WHO, perception surveys (Afrobarometer R5). Limitations: Data partially available, cross country comparability difficult, survey questions need standardization. Data available for services in general – particularly health – would need to further develop for other services often provided at local level.
Comments: Note that these targets are difficult to operationalise and as a result indicators rely on subjective information, which is not readily available in a standardised form across countries.		

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

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
- Responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation, and sources)
1. Voter turnout (%) in national and local elections		Linkages: N/A. Disaggregation by: N/A. Sources: potentially increasing coverage of IDEA Voter Turnout data to cover local elections. Limitations: Data not readily available. While some regional datasets may be available, e.g. African elections database, standard procedures for data collection and reporting need to be ensured for cross-country comparability.
2. Number of countries with legislation that promote citizen participatory mechanisms within local governments	Participatory budget process	Linkages: N/A. Disaggregation by: N/A. Sources: TBD (Proposed in UNHABITAT Urban Indicators). Limitations: Data not readily available.
Comments: Note that these targets are difficult to operationalise and as a result indicators rely on subjective information (some of which is not readily available in a standardised form across countries. Another possible indicator of inclusive institutions it the proportion of seats held by women in local councils. It has been excluded from here as it is already under Goal 5. Indicators on participation in planning and budgeting (e.g. public audit, social audits, public hearings) could be considered, but data availability an issue.		

Target 16.9 By 2030 provide legal identity for all including birth registration

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation, and sources)
1. Coverage of birth registration (also found as completeness of birth registration in WDI)		Linkages: N/A. Disaggregation by: sex, place of residence (rural/urban), region and household wealth quintile (also depends on sampling procedures and survey size). Sources: WDI, UNICEF (based on national civil registration data, census or household surveys e.g. MICS). Limitations: See indicator 98 UNSDSN (July, 2014). Note that registrations systems in some countries are notorious for being incomplete. Data complemented with household survey information.
Comments: None.		

GOAL 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development. *Examples of Targets include 17.1 and 17.9*

For goal 17 we have included as an example Target 17.1, which focuses on strengthening domestic resource mobilisation. This includes the fiscal capacity of local governments, as they are ultimately responsible for the implementation of many of the goals.

Target 17.1 (Finance) Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection

(a) Dimensions to be measured:
    - Fiscal capacity of local governments
(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
• Local governments revenues and expenditures as % of total government revenues and expenditures		Linkages: N/A. Disaggregation by: national level/further disaggregation TBC, currently not readily available. Sources: WB (fiscal decentralisation indicators), IMF (GFS database), both based on national accounts. Limitations: Data partially available. Indicator is an aggregation of subnational data but presented at national level. Currently indicator not reported for each subnational administrative/political unit.
• Tax revenue (percentage of total subnational revenues and grants)		Linkages: N/A Disaggregation by: national level/further disaggregation TBC, currently not readily available. Sources: WB (fiscal decentralisation indicators), IMF (GFS database), both based on national accounts. Limitations: Data partially available. Indicator is an aggregation of subnational data but presented at national level. Currently indicator not reported for each subnational administrative/political unit.
Comments: The first indicator measures vertical imbalance - the degree to which subnational governments rely on central government revenues to support their expenditures. The fiscal flows to, from and among different levels of government can be used to assess some aspects of fiscal decentralisation. The GFS is the best international source for fiscal flows with consistent definitions across countries and years, however, it is not particularly focused on decentralisation issues and subnational data is limited to about 2/3 of countries (out of 149 in total). It allows for differentiation between state or provincial and local governments, but no data is currently available for analyzing dispersion among subnational regions. GFS revenues can be broken down into tax and non-tax revenue, intergovernmental transfers and other grants. It is difficult to assess the degree of autonomy that subnational governments have in raising revenue (e.g. how much is collected through shared taxes versus piggybacked taxes versus locally determined taxes). Shared taxes appear as subnational revenue, although the subnational government has no autonomy in determining the revenue base or rate, since the GFS reports revenues based on which level of government ultimately receives the revenues. This indicator does not distinguish what proportion of transfers is conditional versus general purpose, and the GFS data do not provide this information. Both indicators aim to measure local financial capacity for resource mobilisation.		

Target 17.9 (Capacity Building) Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all sustainable development goals, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation

(a) Dimensions to be measured:

(b) Proposed indicators:

Proposed indicators	Possible alternative indicators	Comments (Linkages, disaggregation and sources)
1. % of ODA supporting sub-national government programmes, urban and rural infrastructures[to be developed]		Sources: OECD Limitations: Data not currently available
2. Share of ODA to decentralisation support and subnational government[25]		Linkages: N/A. Disaggregation by: country. Sources: OECD (Creditor Reporting System). Limitations: Data only available by country.
Comments: A more specific indicator needs to be developed that tracks Official Development Assistance (ODA) funds that reach local governments. This should include OECD-DAC and non-DAC donors. See also proposed SDSN (July, 2014) indicators 104, 105 and 106.		

13. Disaggregation by: North-South. Code 15112 in the CRS defined as: Decentralisation processes (including political, administrative and fiscal dimensions); intergovernmental relations and federalism; strengthening departments of regional and local government, regional and local authorities and their national associations. Decentralisation of sector management and services is not included in this category. The CRS code refers to the purpose of the project (strengthen local governments) rather than resources channelled to local governments. The information on channels in the CRS considers the general public sector without distinguishing local and central governments. The proposed data source only tracks OECD-DAC donor contributions, excluding the possibility to track ODA from non-OECD donors, thus South-South, and triangular cooperation. Definitions of South-South, North-South and triangular cooperation need to be clarified.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The current approach of the Open Working Group to the SDGs is still very broad and, therefore, complex. Not only because of the high number of proposed goals and targets (17 and 169), but also because of the quantity of measurable dimensions included in every target, which make the whole system difficult to implement and monitor. The intergovernmental negotiation process is still open and many important stakeholders, especially some UN Member States, are calling for the mainstreaming of some of the current goals.

In this context, it is essential to show the importance of maintaining the stand-alone goal on urban sustainable development. Indeed, many of the dimensions of the current proposed SDG11 are crucial for the new development agenda because they deal with some of the greatest challenges our societies are facing: urbanization, planning, housing, slums, transport, access to basic services, citizens' participation, cultural and natural heritages, and public spaces. These challenges cannot be addressed in the framework of other goals.

Besides, an urban goal would mobilize and empower local and regional authorities and other urban actors (civil society, private sector, etc.), contribute to integrate the different dimensions of sustainable development (economic, social, environmental) and the spatial design of cities, strengthen the linkages between urban and rural areas, and transform urban challenges into opportunities.

There's a consensus on the fact that local and regional governments should play a crucial role in implementing and monitoring most of the proposed goals. The scope of their work is clearly linked to fighting poverty, securing nutrition, ensuring health and education, promoting gender equality, managing water, sanitation, waste and energy resources, promoting economic development, decent jobs, and fighting climate change. They face critical challenges, many of which are global concerns with a strong local dimension. In fact, localizing SDGs means both: providing smart targets and indicators to measure its impact at territorial level; and proposing strategies and tools to facilitate an efficient involvement of LRGs in the implementation process.

This document proposes some examples of localizable smart indicators that could help to disaggregate the SDGs taking local contexts into account. Improving access to reliable territorial data, (especially urban and rural) would help, without a doubt, in the development of sound and efficient strategies to implement the new development agenda at local level and to monitor and evaluate their results and impacts on the ground in an accountable way.

However, access to territorial data is far from becoming a reality in most developing countries. There's a clear lack of institutional capacities at national and local levels. Therefore, a strong international commitment should be made to reinforce national statistical systems in their efforts to systematize and collect local data as well as to develop sub-national statistical mechanisms that could contribute to monitor and evaluate SDGs at local and regional level.

But, besides the need to improve mechanisms to obtain local reliable data, the implementation process needs strong and empowered local and regional governments. Thus, processes oriented to facilitate enabling environments for LRGs should be prioritized. Supporting decentralization processes, both political and fiscal, strengthening their institutional and operational capacities to deliver basic services and sound public policies, and developing new forms of governance that enable multilevel partnerships, as

well as multi-stakeholder approaches, are important conditions to allow the localization of the development agenda.

This document has aimed to provide a set of examples of how to localize targets and indicators, while remaining aware of the lack of capacities and resources and the great challenges that LRGs and the whole international community face in drawing up an inclusive and sustainable development agenda to which local stakeholders can contribute.