Praia City Group on Governance Statistics

Framework for the Handbook

18 October 2018

Mandate and Objectives of the Praia City Group on Governance Statistics

1. The Praia Group has as its mandate to "contribute to establishing international standards and methods for the compilation of statistics on the major dimensions of governance".[1] To this end, the Group is charged to develop "a handbook on governance statistics for national statistical offices, which will cover the conceptualization, measurement methodology and dissemination of governance statistics". The Handbook will include "methodological and practical guidelines for the improved gathering and compilation of governance statistics at all levels, including covering issues of concept definition, data quality, comparability, methodology, possible sources, compilation and dissemination mechanisms".

2. Whilst the Praia Group aims to contribute to the development of international standards on governance statistics, and the Handbook will be a key output supporting this broader aim, the purpose of the Handbook itself is not to promulgate international standards. The development of such standards would generally require more extensive testing and further examination of proposed standardized methodologies, and as such will unfold over a longer timeframe than that foreseen for the first edition of the Handbook, which is to be submitted to the UN Statistical Commission in March 2020. The Handbook will therefore take stock of existing practices in governance data collection and propose guidelines for the improved production and compilation of official governance statistics.

Scope of the Handbook

3. The governance framework for the Handbook draws on the general conceptualization endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission, as outlined in the foundational report of the Praia Group. The report underlines the "important conceptual consensus reached in the course of the [international] deliberations"[2] on the proposed City Group held in 2014 prior to its creation, on two aspects.

- First, the inception report of the Praia Group notes that "the vast majority of actors consulted were of the view that peace and security are in fact constitutive dimensions of governance and should be investigated under the broad conceptual framework of governance. It is in that context that the present proposal refers to establishing a Praia group on *governance*

---

[1] See the "Report of Cabo Verde on governance, peace and security statistics" (E/CN.3/2015/17) which was presented to the Statistical Commission at its forty-sixth session and contained the proposal to establish a Praia group on governance statistics, whose purpose would be to encourage countries to produce governance statistics based on sound and documented methodologies and to address the conceptualization, methodology and instruments needed to produce such statistics. The Statistical Commission endorsed the report, with strong support from countries representing all continents and international organizations. http://undocs.org/E/CN.3/2015/17

[2] Ibid.

statistics."

- Second, the same report acknowledges the important ongoing work in the area of crime statistics led by the National Institute of Statistics and Geography of Mexico (INEGI) and UNODC, and stresses the importance for the Praia Group to "avoid duplication of efforts" in this area.

4. The conceptual and measurement framework draws on the 2016 review of governance statistics undertaken by the OECD, INEGI and TURKSTAT for the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) entitled "In-depth review of governance statistics"[3] (henceforth the "CES report"), providing some modifications and additions. While keeping in mind that a global Handbook on Governance Statistics needs to draw from an expanded review of experiences beyond the UNECE/OECD region, the CES report provided a useful review of a range of governance measurement initiatives. The initial elaboration of the framework also draws on the conceptual framework of indicators developed in the field of human rights by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).[4]

5. This document also provides a brief overview of a variety of relevant data sources used to measure the various aspects typically associated with the concept of governance: statistical surveys, administrative records and expert assessments commonly used or processed by various entities at national and/or international level. NSOs play a major, but not exclusive, role, in gathering, compiling and disseminating governance statistics from these various sources. As such, it is envisaged that the Handbook will primarily target, yet not limit its focus on official statistics produced by NSOs. This narrow focus would reduce the number of potentially relevant governance measures covered (namely those that meet the established international standards of official statistics, which would exclude, for example, expert assessments) and consequently provide a limited assessment of what is available in the governance field.[5]

6. While the Handbook should consider and include other types of metrics beyond traditional official statistics, all metrics and measures must be based on sound methodologies and practices, consistent with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics (A/RES/68/261), and contribute, to current or future international standards. Recognizing that the domain of governance is heavily concerned with 'structures' (i.e. adoption of legal, institutional and/or policy frameworks relevant to (good) governance, and reflecting commitments and acceptance of (good) governance norms or principles), 'processes' (i.e. how do public or other relevant institutions perform their role and how these structures are implemented in practice) as well as 'outcomes' (i.e. the results of these processes and structures on the concerned population), the Handbook will use these aspects as the three cross-cutting domains of its conceptual framework.

7. The conceptual framework for the Handbook is based on nine main governance dimensions. These dimensions do not have the ambition to cover all that is relevant to the concept of governance, but

---

[3] *In-Depth Review of Governance Statistics in the UNECE/OECD Region*, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the Conference of European Statisticians, Prepared by Turkey, Mexico and OECD, October 2016 (ref: ECE/CES/BUR/2016/OCT/2) http://www.unece.org/stats/ces/in-depth-reviews/geospatial1.html

[4] Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation (HR/PUB/12/5) available in Arabic, English, French and Spanish at https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/documents.aspx

[5] Another drawback with this option is that survey-based official statistics will be more useful to policymakers if they are paired with administrative data so they can better monitor the implementation of policy measures or processes generating the desired outcomes. In other terms, if a narrow definition of official statistics, or more generally national or international statistical systems, is applied to determine which governance metrics are considered by the Handbook, many indicators obtained from administrative sources [Administrative sources are often a source of official statistics) and other non-traditional data sources, would risk being excluded at the outset, namely before their statistical and methodological assessment.

rather focus on those areas where data and statistics already exist: more dimensions could then be covered in future editions of this Handbook. The Handbook will also explain why these critical aspects of governance are not adequately captured by traditional statistics or data sources. In this context, chapters dealing with the different governance dimensions will end with a section identifying a longer-term statistical agenda for NSOs to improve the quality of existing statistics.

Concepts of governance

8. While the concept of governance has been around in both political and academic discourse for a long time, it does not have a widely agreed single definition. This is not surprising: governance is a multifaceted concept; its various terrains – market, state and society – are emphasised by different actors with particular purposes; and the operationalization of the concept has altered significantly over time, with processes like globalisation, devolution and outsourcing, and the digital age.[6]

9. In its broadest term, "governance" concerns the various institutions, mechanisms, and practices through which a country exercises governmental authority, discharges its responsibilities, and manages its public resources. Governance is an inherently neutral term, describing a framework for policy decisions but not their outcome yet it is not disputed that the quality of policies will lead to better or worst outcomes for people and therefore the importance of good governance. While there is a general consensus on the basic concept, different authors and institutions tend to have specific focuses within this universe—indeed, the same institution may define "governance" differently over time and for different purposes.[7]

International organizations have advanced various definitions:

10. The World Bank in a 1992 report introduced the concept of governance which it defined as "the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development."[8] Other institutions, while accepting the concept, gave their own contributions to the term.

11. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1997 defined governance as the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority at all levels in the management of a country's affairs. It comprises the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights and obligations and mediate their differences (UNDP 1997). Since 2002, UNDP has been using the term "democratic governance" to refer to a system of governance that allows people's rights and freedoms to be respected and for them to have a say in the decisions that affect their lives.[9] More recently UNDP has made an explicit link between democratic governance and conflict prevention as a set of values and principles that prioritize respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and promote the rule of law, accountability and transparency. Democratic governance is a critical instrument for promoting social

---

[6] UNDESA (2007), "Public governance indicators: A literature review", ST/ESA/PAD/SER.E/100.

[7] The United Nations Economic and Social Council conducted an extensive review of the literature defining governance in 2006 (UNESC 2006). For further examples of approaches to defining governance in different organizations see Center for Global Development 2013, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) 2016, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific 2009, United States Institute of Peace (USIP) 2010, and World Bank 2011.

[8] World Bank 1992, p.1. The Bank's *World Development Report 2017* (World Bank 2017a) stresses the fact that governance should not be simply viewed as a top-down, formal and instrumental process, but instead has strong interactive elements, with a mix of formality and informality and strong underlying power drivers (which may not solely be vested in formal structures). It states: "governance is the process through which state and nonstate actors interact to design and implement policies within a given set of formal and informal rules that shape and are shaped by power.

[9] UNDP Human Development Report 2002 "Deepening democracy in a fragmented world" See page p51 for a full explanation of the term "democratic governance"

cohesion, preventing conflict and ensuring inclusive, safe and peaceful societies.

12. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) provided a similar definition of *good* governance: "the process whereby public institutions conduct public affairs, manage public resources and guarantee the realization of human rights in a manner essentially free of abuse and corruption, and with due regard for the rule of law."[10] The United Nations Human Rights Council, and prior to it the Commission on Human Rights, has been adopting biennially resolutions on the role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights since the late 1990ies, so far without a vote, reflecting wide agreement on its content.

In its latest resolution on this subject, resolution 37/6 of 22 March 2018, the Council highlighted, among other things, the following elements:

- Transparent, responsible, accountable, open and participatory governance, responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people is the foundation on which good governance rests. Such a foundation is one of the indispensable conditions for the full realization of human rights, including the right to development.

- Meaningful progress towards good governance can be better achieved with appropriate tools or mechanisms to review, measure and assess such progress.

- International human rights law provides a set of standards to guide governing processes and to assess performance outcomes.

- Good governance principles include impartiality, rule of law, transparency, accountability, participation, inclusivity and combating corruption.

13. Other organizations have developed definitions oriented toward their mandates. For example, the OECD brings in a political aspect with the following definition: "the use of political authority and the exercise of control in a society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development."[11]

14. The paper "[Governance: A Conceptual and Methodological Review](#)" produced by the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI)[12] provides some further definitions of governance including those advanced by leading academics. Guy Peters proposes that governance be understood as the "ability of the State to direct and control society and the market" (Peters, 2012: 1). Francis Fukuyama argues that governance is "the ability of the State to exercise authority and provide public goods" (Fukuyama, 2013: 3). Here it is necessary to measure the capacity of government, the bureaucratic procedures, the products and services it provides, as well as the bureaucratic autonomy of governmental institutions. Other scholars like Rothstein and Teorell build a definition of governance based on the notion of quality of government (Rothstein, 2013). Under this perspective, the essential characteristic of quality of government is "impartiality in the exercise of political authority" (Rothstein, 2012). Such impartiality occurs when "laws and policies are interpreted and public officials do not consider anything on the citizen or event which has not been previously stipulated by law or policy" (Stromberg in Rothstein, 2013: 1).

15. In the face of this proliferation of definitions, the conceptual and measurement framework for the Handbook adopts a deconstructive approach, **disaggregating the concept of 'governance'** and giving

---

[10]UNOHCHR (2000), "What is good governance?" http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Development/Good Governance/Pages/GoodGovernanceIndex.aspx.

[11] OECD 1993, para. 31*.*

[12] INEGI in *In Numbers, Statistical Analysis Reports*, Vol. 1, No. 8, Jan.-Mar. 2017

attention to its various components. This building-block approach to forging a common agreement around some of the 'ingredients' of governance enjoys substantial support as a pragmatic option for operationalizing multidimensional and complex concepts such as this one.[13]

16. In defining the scope of this framework for governance statistics, there are two primary starting points:

- First, the scope of governance is defined by a focus on '**public institutions** serving the common good of a community of people', which implies excluding corporations and other private institutions;

- Second, the focus is on public institutions operating at federal, state and sub-national levels that relate to all separate branches of government (i.e. excluding international or supranational ones).

The conceptual and measurement framework for governance statistics also takes into consideration an important use of the Handbook for measuring the Sustainable Development Goals and in particular the 12 targets and 23 global indicators of **SDG 16 on Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies**. Annex 1 shows how the proposed governance dimensions in the framework relate to the 12 targets of SDG 16. Indicators pertaining to each of them would be measured by an NSO or other government entities, based on both survey and administrative data.

Conceptual and measurement framework for governance statistics

17. In a pragmatic effort to simplify the conceptual framework, the primary conceptualization of governance is limited to nine dimensions as shown in **Table 1**. These nine dimensions have been reformulated to be consonant with current usage in many of the available governance definitions, and to meet the needs of users[14], in policy, popular and academic arenas.

18. The nine dimensions are supported by working definitions in the table below as well as by proposed sub-dimensions. These working definitions will be further discussed and refined in the various chapters of the Handbook.

Table 1: Governance Dimensions, working definitions and sub-dimensions

Governance dimension	Working definitions of the governance dimension	Sub-dimensions
1. Human rights	Human rights are universal legal guarantees protecting individuals and groups against actions and omissions that interfere with fundamental freedoms, entitlements and human dignity. Human rights	• Civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights • Obligations to respect, protect and fulfil • Crosscutting human rights norms or principles, such as non-discrimination

---

[13] See *In-Depth Review of Governance Statistics in the UNECE/OECD Region*, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the Conference of European Statisticians, Prepared by Turkey, Mexico and OECD, October 2016 (ref: ECE/CES/BUR/2016/OCT/2) http://www.unece.org/stats/ces/in-depth-reviews/geospatial1.html and "What Does Good Governance Mean?" Rachel Gisselquist *WIDERAngle*, January 2012. Republished on United Nations University website, 9 February 2012 https://unu.edu/publications/articles/what-does-good-governance-mean.html#info

[14] A description of user needs and the expected uses for governance statistics will be elaborated in the "cross cutting themes" section of the Praia Handbook.

		have been enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and codified in international treaties.	• Human Rights-Based Approach to Data (HRBAD): participation, disaggregation, self-identification, transparency, privacy and accountability
2.	Participation	The structures and processes that enable citizens to participate freely, openly and fully in public decision making, politics and the political process	• Civic engagement • Measure of "voting" participation (including post-electoral surveys) • Elections process (right to vote, eligibility of voters, registration process, access to vote, existence of National Independent Electoral Council, voters registry, etc.) • Direct population consultations (referendum) • Political efficacy (internal efficacy)
3.	Openness	The extent to which public institutions provide access to information and are transparent in their decision and policy making processes. It also covers the openness and accessibility of public institutions and their representatives to people/businesses.	• Access to information • Open government provisions • Media pluralism • Freedom of expression
4.	Access to and quality of justice	Access to justice is a right provided by the principle of the rule of law. It relates to the existence of structures, processes and outcomes that enable people to identify and manage their everyday legal needs and address their legal problems, seek redress for their grievances, demand and have their rights be upheld. Justice is delivered timely by competent, ethical, and independent representatives who are accessible, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve.	• Civil justice • Criminal justice
5.	Responsiveness	The degree to which public institutions listen to what people want and act on it; whether public policies and institutions respond to the needs of citizens and uphold their rights.	• Inclusive public sector and public decision-making • Representativeness in decision making in public institutions • Public service delivery and satisfaction with public services

			• Political efficacy (external efficacy) • Impartiality of public institutions/public servants
6.	Government effectiveness	The extent to which public institutions are delivering outputs and outcomes expected from them. Government effectiveness captures the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations, and the quality of policy formulation and implementation.	• Cost effectiveness • Bureaucratic autonomy • Regulatory quality • Government capacity
7.	Absence of corruption	The extent to which public power is exercised for the common good rather than private gain. It includes both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as "capture" of the state by private interests.	• People's perceptions and experiences of corruption • Firms' perceptions and experiences of corruption • Illicit financial flows • Integrity of public institutions • Performance of national public procurement systems • Performance/Effectiveness of anticorruption agencies
8.	Trust	A person's belief that another person or institution will act consistently with expectations of positive behaviour	• Interpersonal trust • Institutional trust
9.	Safety and security	The extent that governments have a monopoly over legitimate use of force/violence, their ability to prevent crime and assaults on human security, the likelihood of political instability and/or politically-motivated violence, including terrorism.	• Absence of violence and terrorism • Public security • Public safety • Civil protection • Defence system

Proposed outline for each chapter covering the nine dimensions

19. Based on the above considerations, the following structure is proposed for each chapter covering the nine dimensions of governance:

- Why is this 'dimension' important?

- What statistics are currently available? i.e. considering a) different data sources available and b) all three domains i.e. to measure 'structures', 'processes' and 'outcomes')

- What do we know about the quality of these statistics? (e.g. empirical review of the reliability and validity of various measures)

- What methodological considerations do we need to bear in mind?

- What are the key/few indicators that all countries should aim to develop in the short/medium term? (i.e. those found to be robust enough)?

- What issues will affect analysis and reporting of the statistics?

- What is the longer-term statistical agenda in this thematic area?

Structural, process and outcome indicators for measuring governance

20. Measurement efforts in the field of human rights have been based on a tri-partite categorization of indicators distinguishing between *structural, process* and *outcome* indicators. This categorisation was adopted by the United Nations Human Rights Treaty Bodies[15] following consultations with statisticians, human rights experts, development practitioners, civil society organizations, UN and other international organizations.

It is proposed that the same categorisation of indicators is used in the Handbook. It is worth noting that, in the context of the development and review of the SDG indicator framework, several stakeholders were categorizing proposed SDG indicators into structural, process or outcome.[16]

Applying the proposed categorization to governance statistics more broadly means that indicators should also seek to measure the linkage between governance commitments or acceptance of governance norms or principles (structural indicators), their implementation on the ground by the responsible authorities or institutions (process indicators), with the results therefrom on people (outcome indicators):

1. **Structural indicators** measure governance commitments and acceptance of governance norms or principles. They refer to the adoption of legal, institutional and policy instruments or frameworks relevant to governance. This could be, for instance, the date of ratification or entry into force of an internationally agreed governance-relevant treaty (e.g. United Nations Convention against Corruption) or the date of adoption of national legislation or mechanisms (e.g. date of adoption of procedures for public officials to report misconduct or suspected corruption). The first data source of structural indicators will be administrative.

2. **Process indicators** measure the practical implementation of the governance commitments and norms or principles by the authorities, institutions and other responsible entities. They measure the implementation of policy programmes and delivery of services or goods relevant to governance. An example could be the proportion of administrative units audited for possible missing expenditures. While the primary data source for process indicators will be administrative records, statistical surveys may also provide useful data (e.g. proportion of persons who were victims of corruption and reported it to relevant bodies).[17]

3. **Outcome indicators** measure the results of the efforts/processes on the concerned

---

[15] See for instance, HRI/MC/2006/7 and HRI/MC/2008/3.

[16] There are other approaches to clustering governance indicators and measures e.g. the OECD and Council of European Statistics adopt a clustering around (i) principles (instead of structural), (ii) processes and (ii) outcomes. This classification is broadly consistent with the configuration of indicators outlined above. These three categories are defined as follows: (i) the high-level *principles* governing the functioning of various public institutions, which are critical for establishing the legitimacy of the decisions taken; (ii) the *processes* through which decisions are taken and implemented, which are important for the capacity of public institutions to undertake a given function; and; (iii) The *outcomes* delivered by these institutions that are valued as important by all members of a community.

[17] In a human rights-based approach framework, structural and process indicators relate to a duty-bearer(s) perspective.

population. Examples include data on the share of population satisfied with the quality of public services provided, or having being treated fairly by the justice system.

21. The measurement framework for the Praia Handbook will consider each governance dimension from the viewpoint of 'structural', 'process' *and* 'outcome' indicators given that this is an internationally agreed framework. While for some dimensions, the relevant metrics may fall predominantly under one or the other indicator domain, it will nevertheless be useful to adopt this broader measurement framework when considering any given dimension. As reminded by several measurement experts[18], using single, standalone indicators – or a single *type* of indicator, such as only survey-based statistics – is unlikely to reflect the full situation and can even provide a misleading assessment of progress. On the other hand, using multiple indicators investigating all three domains at once allows for triangulation of data and enables a more robust assessment of progress or performance. In other words, using 'baskets of indicators' help to shed light on interconnected aspects between 'structural', 'processes' and 'outcomes', and to capture the experiences or views of a diverse set of stakeholders (e.g. public servants recording administrative processes, service users expressing their level of satisfaction, independent experts assessing the extent of corruption along the service delivery chain, etc.)

Proposed structure for the Praia City Group Handbook

22. The Praia Handbook will include chapters on each of the nine dimensions (no more than 25 pages) and a chapter in cross cutting themes. Issues to be covered by the different chapters are set out below in Table 2.

Table 2: Proposed Handbook structure

Executive Summary	
Chapter 1. Introduction	• What is governance? • Why is governance important? • Existing international norms and standards • Rationale and objectives of this 'Handbook' • Scope and limitations of the 'Handbook' • Structure of the 'Handbook'
Chapter 2. Measuring Governance: Cross-Cutting Themes	• Concepts and dimensions (e.g. review of the frameworks in use, the one used for this 'Handbook', key domains and dimensions, what falls outside the remit of this 'Handbook', etc.) • Setting out the framework for different governance measures based on structural, processes and outcomes • Guidance from the UN 10 Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics and Principles of Governing International Statistics and Activities • Statistical sources (e.g. censuses, surveys, administrative data, expert assessments, crowdsourcing/web scraping/ big data) including reference to the IAEG report on the data revolution19

---

[18] See for instance Milante, Gary and others, *Goal 16—The Indicators We Want: Virtual Network Sourcebook on Measuring Peace, Justice and Effective Institutions* (New York, UNDP, 2015); Institute for Economics and Peace, *Sustainable Development Goal 16: 2016: From Now to 2030: What Is Needed to Measure Goal 16*, IEP Report 43 (Sydney, 2016); Stephanie Trapnell, Matthew Jenkins and Marie Chêne, *Monitoring Corruption and Anti-Corruption in the Sustainable Development Goals: A Resource Guide* (Berlin, Transparency International, 2017); UNDP, *Voices from the Field: African Experiences in Producing Governance, Peace and Security Statistics* (2017), etc.

[19] There should also be consideration of the reasons why it is important to have a variety of sources for measuring governance. Each data source should have a description of its strengths, limitations and a discussion of how they complement each other. The costs and technical/political/institutional constraints of collecting data on governance will also be covered

	• Guidance and criteria for the inclusion of non-official statistics in the Handbook • Guidance on "scope and severity" and its implications for governance indicators and data sources.[20] • Operationalization (e.g. challenges in data collection, data quality, comparability, disaggregation, best practices, costs, and technical/political/institutional constraints of collecting data on governance etc.) • Governance statistics users and uses (e.g. monitoring, uses in policy process, key indicators, etc.) • Access to information and data
Chapter 3 – Measuring Human Rights	• The chapter will help clarify the human rights normative framework as enshrined in internationally agreed treaties and illustrate how it can be measured. • Linkages with other governance dimensions • Review of national and international efforts in setting-up human rights indicators and measurement framework [21], including in connection with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development • Focus on the cross-cutting nature of human rights, non-discrimination and equality. • Human Rights-Based Approach to Data consistent with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics
Chapter 4 - Participation	• Civic engagement • Measure of "voting" participation (including post-electoral surveys) • Elections process (right to vote, eligibility of voters, registration process, access to vote, existence of National Independent Electoral Council, voters registry, etc.) • Direct population consultations (referendum) • Composition of elected officials (e.g. MPs) compared to the voting age population • Political efficacy (internal efficacy)
Chapter 5 - Openness	• Access to information • Open government provisions • Media pluralism • Freedom of expression
Chapter 6 - Access to and quality of justice	• Civil justice • Criminal justice
Chapter 7 - Responsiveness	• Inclusive public sector and public decision-making • Diversity of the public sector • Public service delivery and satisfaction with public services • Political efficacy (external efficacy) • Impartiality of public institutions/public servants
Chapter 8 - Government effectiveness	• Cost effectiveness • Bureaucratic autonomy • Regulatory quality

[20] Scope addresses issues related to prevalence and breadth i.e. how widespread is the phenomenon or governance issue (e.g. how many people are affected? Are some subgroups disproportionately affected? In what regions/places are people most affected? Severity or depth address how severely the phenomenon affects peoples' lives (i.e. what effects does the issue have on the people involved?). The distinction between Scope and severity is highly relevant to governance statistics in that some governance phenomenon e.g. human rights violations or conflict may affect the entire population or only a small targeted segment of the population. The measurement of the governance dimensions must be transparent in any use of weightings or preferences related to scope and severity.

[21] See for example "Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation" accessible from: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Indicators/Pages/documents.aspx.

	• Government capacity
Chapter 9 - Absence of corruption	• People's perceptions and experiences of corruption • Firms' perceptions and experiences of corruption • Illicit financial flows • Integrity of public institutions • Performance of national public procurement systems • Performance/Effectiveness of anticorruption agencies
Chapter 10 - Trust	• Interpersonal trust • Institutional trust
Chapter 11 - Safety and security	• Absence of violence and terrorism • Public security • Public safety • Civil protection • Defence system

23. A proposed structure for each of the nine thematic chapters is presented in Appendix C. This structure could be adapted to account for the specificities of any dimension.

Relevant data sources for the compilation of governance statistics

24. This measurement framework for the Handbook calls for a more comprehensive embrace of various data sources under each dimension, building on the earlier recommendation that indicators for each dimension be clustered in terms of structural, processes and outcomes. These data sources can be categorised as administrative, survey and expert data. While all sources have their strengths and weaknesses, only sources that meet certain standards of statistical quality will be included in the Handbook.

25. It will be important that, for each chapter of the Handbook, a common framework is used when assessing the statistical quality of existing sources. The *Quality Framework and Guidelines for OECD Statistical Activities* and its seven dimensions of statistical quality is a helpful reference in this regard.[22]

Surveys

26. For a topic such as governance, which is contingent in many ways on society's perceptions, subjective measurements using experiential or perception surveys are especially important for understanding outcomes for people. Already in 2009, the Commission on measuring economic and social progress, led by Professors Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi[23], noted that sufficient progress had been made in measuring good governance and political voice for these issues to be included in larger-scale surveys undertaken by national statistical offices (NSOs). There are now numerous examples of NSOs running surveys on a regular basis to collect data on people's experiences and perceptions on aspects of peace, justice and governance. Further, there has also been also long been impressive progress in this regard in the global South. A notable instance from the South, confirming the feasibility of governance surveys *conducted specifically by national statistical offices (NSOs)*, is the

---

[22] The OECD Working Paper undertakes empirical comparisons among expert assessments with their variously defined expert panels, and among cross-country household surveys, and then moves to compare the two kinds of surveys. In making these empirical comparisons, the paper carefully and importantly shows how the reliability of various data sources and instruments can be assessed (i.e. whether any given indicator produces consistent information over time and across different measurement vehicles) and how different kinds of validity can be assessed (i.e. whether any given indicator actually reflects the underlying concept to be measured).[22] It would be important for the Handbook to apply similar 'quality checks' when considering available data sources and measurement approaches for any given dimension.

[23] Joseph E. Stiglitz, Amartya Sen and Jean-Paul Fitoussi (2009), *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*

SHaSA[24] governance, peace and security (GPS) survey project. In the past five years, eleven African NSOs – spanning Arabic, English French and Portuguese – have already implemented the add-on survey modules on governance and on peace and security.[25] The two modules were designed in a consensus process among NSO representatives from Africa's five sub-regions, academic advisers, Afrobarometer, and African supranational agencies, convened by the AU Statistics Department; and informed *inter alia* by previous such work with NSOs in Francophone Africa and Andean South America.[26] However, the integrated curation and web dissemination of the NSOs' data remains to be officially addressed.

Administrative sources

27. Official statistical data based on administrative sources will be invaluable in their own right for some indicators of SDG16, and for triangulating with household surveys and with expert data.[27] However, NSOs will find that the actual gathering of such data is quite onerous, both in time and in human, technological and financial resources. Especially in a new area such as governance, multiple challenges will need to be tackled: to secure adequate coverage of its numerous dimensions and sub-dimensions; to achieve the necessary cross-country harmonisation of definitions and classifications across the endogenously developed and embedded in-country systems; to foster the necessary operational collaboration among disparate government departments and agencies, at national and local levels, and with the national statistical office;[28] and especially, in less developed countries, to secure the resources to see all this through. In contemplating the use of administrative data, it may be wise for the 'Handbook', at least initially, to recommend a limited number of "sentinel" indicators[29] which can then be used to triangulate or complement other data sources.

Expert assessments

28. According to evidence presented in the OECD Working Paper "Governance Statistics in OECD Countries and Beyond", expert assessments generally do well in terms of reliability and validity. But when expert measures are compared with household surveys, the correlations are weak, and even weaker when considered separately for OECD and non-OECD countries.[30] The OECD Working Paper identifies likely reasons for this discrepancy, explaining that the "drawbacks of data drawn from expert assessments are that little information may be available about the criteria used for selecting experts, the standards guiding their assessment (leading to results that can change depending on the expert being interviewed), and differences between the views of experts and those of ordinary people on the

---

[24] The Governance, Peace and Security (GPS) task team is one of twelve task teams implementing the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa (SHaSA) – see https://au.int/en/ea/sd/shasa – of the African Symposium for Statistical Development, i.e. the community of African national statisticians.

[25] A policy brief illustrating GPS-SHaSA data is: Mark Orkin, Mireille Razafindrakoto and Francois Roubaud, "EU Policy Brief No. 3: Governance, peace and security in Burundi, Mali and Uganda. Comparative NSO data for measuring Goal 16 of the SDGs", http://www.nopoor.eu/publication/eu-policy-brief-no-3-governance-peace- and-security-burundi-mali-and-uganda-comparative.

[26] J. Herrera, M. Razafindrakoto and F. Roubaud (2008), "Poverty, Governance and Democratic Participation in Francophone Africa and the Andean Region", *OECD Journal on Development,* Vol.9, No. 2, pp. 99-118; M. Razafindrakoto and F. Roubaud F. (2015), "Les modules *Gouvernance, Paix et Sécurité* dans un cadre harmonisé au niveau de l'Afrique (*GPS-SHaSA*)", *Statéco* Vol. 109, pp.122-158.

[27] Rotberg (2015), "The governance of nations: definitions and measures", *op. cit.*

[28] For a painstaking attempt, see Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2015), "Report of the pilot exercise on collection of governance, peace and security statistics administrative data in Kenya".

[29] Andrews, despairing of cross-country comparability of administrative statistics on "soft" processes, recommends "hard" firm administrative statistics on outputs, such as infant mortality. Matt Andrews, Roger Hay & Jerrett Myers (2010): "Can governance indicators make sense? Towards a new approach to sector-specific measures of governance", *Oxford Development Studies*, 38:4, 391-410.

[30] "Governance statistics in OECD countries and beyond: What exists, and what would be required to assess their quality?" Santiago González, Lara Fleischer[i] and Marco Mira d'Ercole, [i]OECD, (Mar 2017) https://doi.org/10.1787/c0d45b5e-en..

same phenomena."[31] Ultimately, while expert assessments provide useful contextual information, especially regarding 'structures ' and 'processes', they are considered as *non-statistical* indicators.[32] While administrative and survey-based sources can be brought under protocols and standardised in the international statistical system to yield reliable and valid statistics across all domains, i.e. structures, processes and outcomes, the same does not apply in the case of expert assessments. These considerations regarding the possible uses and misuses of expert-based data sources will need to be carefully reviewed for each dimension.

---

[31] Gonzalez et al. (2017), "Governance statistics in OECD countries and beyond », *op. cit.*, para. 32 on p. 20.
[32] *loc. cit.*

Appendix A: Dimensions of the Praia Group Framework and SDG 16 Targets and Indicators

Praia Framework Governance Dimension	SDG 16 Target	SDG 16 Global Indicator
Safety and Security	16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere	16.1.1 Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population
		16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age …
		16.1.3 Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months
		16.1.4 Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live
Safety and Security	16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children	16.2.1 Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month
		16.2.2 Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation
		16.2.3 Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18
Access to & quality of Justice	16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all	16.3.1 Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms
		16.3.2 Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population
		16.3.x Access to civil justice [proposed as a 'possible additional indicator']
Absence of Corruption & Safety and Security	16.4 By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows,…and combat all forms of organized crime	16.4.1 Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current United States dollars)
		16.4.2 Proportion of seized small arms and light weapons that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments
Absence of Corruption	16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms	16.5.1 Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months
		16.5.2 Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials during the previous 12 months
Government Effectiveness; Responsiveness; Trust	16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels	16.6.1 Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget codes or similar)
		16.6.2 Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services
		16.6.x Trust in different public institutions [proposed as a 'possible additional indicator']
Participation & Responsiveness	16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making…	16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities, population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, judiciary) compared to national distributions
		16.7.2 Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group)

Participation	16.8 Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance	*16.8.1 Proportion of members and voting rights of developing countries in international organizations*
Responsiveness & Government Effectiveness	16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration	*16.9.1 Proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age*
Openness & Human Rights	16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms…	*16.10.1 Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months*
		16.10.2 Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.
		16.10.x Other fundamental freedoms [proposed as a 'possible additional indicator']
Human Rights & Safety and Security	16.A Strengthen relevant national institutions… to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime	*16.a.1 Existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles*
Human Rights	16.B Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies…	*16.b.1 Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against … in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law*

Appendix B: Proposed structure for the chapters on the various governance dimensions

1)	**Why is [dimension x] important to measure?**	• Introducing a simple conceptual framework (i.e. distinguishing 'principles', 'processes' and 'outcomes') for measuring [dimension x], drawing from existing literature • Situating [dimension x] in the SDG framework and in other international development commitments/international legal frameworks • Who are the intended target audiences and what are their informational needs? • Some limitations/ known shortcomings of measuring [dimension x]
2)	**What indicators / statistics / data are currently available to measure [dimension x]?**	• Mapping of existing approaches to measuring [dimension x] across all three domains i.e. to measure 'principles', 'processes' and 'outcomes' of [dimension x] • Mapping of various data sources (official and non-official) used by these various measurement approaches
3)	**What do we know about the quality of these indicators / statistics / data?**	• What is their relevance? (various potential uses for various audiences) • What is their reliability? (the extent to which a measure yields consistent results) • What is their validity? (the extent to which an indicator actually captures the underlying concept that it purports to measure) • What is their comparability?
4)	**Methodological considerations in the measurement of [dimension x]**	• Guidance on good practice for survey-based measures: Question wording / response format / question order / context effects / survey mode / timing / etc. • Guidance on good practice for measures derived from administrative sources: meeting quality requirements of timeliness, frequency and comparability
5)	**Recommended 'key indicators'**	• Suggested 'minimal set' of measures of [dimension x] found to be the most robust (i.e. for which there is the strongest evidence for their relevance, validity and reliability) and most amenable to international comparability
6)	**Analysing and reporting statistics / data on [dimension x]**	• Interpreting, analysing and reporting statistics / data on [dimension x] • Best practices on facilitating policy impact
7)	**Longer-term statistical agenda to improve the measurement of [dimension x]**	• Gaps in current knowledge • Priorities for future work / research to improve the measurement of [dimension x]