

Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Indicators – Progress, Interim List and next steps

Document 03 - For discussion



THIRD INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE GLOBAL MEETING
**“The New Deal: Achieving Better Results
and Shaping the Global Agenda”**
19 April 2013, Washington, D.C.

PEACEBUILDING AND STATEBUILDING INDICATORS – PROGRESS, INTERIM LIST AND NEXT STEPS (FOR DISCUSSION)

This note represents a milestone in the work of the International Dialogue Working Group on indicators to inform the discussion at the Global Meeting of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding in Washington, D.C. on 19 April 2013.

Part 1 takes stock of the work so far, provides a summary of main points and proposes the way forward for the continued work. Part 2 presents the rationale behind the suggested indicators for the Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs) and their intended use, explains the purpose of defining and agreeing on common indicators for the PSGs, and outlines the process through which the indicators have been developed. Part 3 contains an interim list of common indicators that has emerged on the basis of consultations and fragility assessments conducted in five of the g7+ pilot countries, a g7+ experience-sharing meeting and extensive consultations with all members of the International Dialogue.

1 Taking stock and next steps

Commitment to track PSG progress

By signing the New Deal, the g7+ countries and international partners agreed to develop “a set of indicators for each goal [...], which will allow us to track progress at the global and the country level.” An International Dialogue Working Group set up in March 2012 was tasked with developing a menu of indicators and a list of common indicators.¹

Why are indicators for the PSGs important and how should they be used?

Indicators are essential to transform the high level aspirational goals articulated in the PSGs into measurable results. Information gathered to measure achievements based on concrete, simple and measurable indicators serve to inform the country-led assessment, planning and prioritisation processes at country level that are at the core of the New Deal. Indicators provide the means to measure progress against the PSGs and allow national and international actors to communicate results. They can also provide soft incentives for different stakeholders to make greater efforts, by highlighting areas where progress is slower than it should be. Additionally, common indicators can help to inform the post-2015 development agenda.

The interim list of common indicators represent aspects of peacebuilding and statebuilding that are considered relevant across all members of the g7+. They should be used alongside country-specific indicators and qualitative analysis (e.g. fragility assessments) to get a fuller picture of the state of each dimension of the PSGs at the country level. Notwithstanding the importance of common indicators, they are in no way intended to be used to compare or rank countries, or to establish conditionality for development assistance. They are to be used by individual countries on a fully voluntary basis.

Progress to date

The development of the interim list of common indicators for peacebuilding and statebuilding has emerged through a highly consultative process aimed at ensuring that indicators are developed in a “bottom up” manner, and owned by members of the g7+. The approach has come out of the pilot

¹ The Working Group has met four times as of March 2013 (in Copenhagen, Nairobi, New York and Nairobi). In addition, a g7+ experience-sharing meeting on indicators took place in October 2012.

fragility assessments conducted against the fragility spectrum spanning over stages from crisis to resilience, extensive country consultations and discussions among the g7+. The indicator working group has supported this process, including by compiling the pilot country indicators emerging from fragility assessments into a 'long list'. The Working Group then narrowed down and refined this long list of indicators by identifying commonalities among countries, considering their relevance, coherence as a group, measurability and the availability of data. Countries were also asked to highlight indicators that would be unacceptable to them based on their potential to cause harm. It is from this process and on the basis of extensive consultations with key stakeholders that an interim list of 34 proposed common indicators has been derived. A more comprehensive description of the process can be found in section 2.2 of this paper.

Next steps

The current selection of common indicators is an interim product that may be used by and piloted by interested g7+ countries on a voluntary basis. The interim list of common indicators should therefore be viewed as an evolving list that will undergo further revision and refinement on the basis of their practical application at the country level.

Against this background, the International Dialogue plenary meeting is asked to agree on the following:

1. The Global Meeting of the International Dialogue welcomes the interim list of common PSG indicators and supports the launch of a piloting and learning process using the interim list of indicators in g7+ countries that volunteer to trial them.
2. Pilot countries will undertake further consultations and validation of indicators and will decide how to use them in national level planning, prioritisation and monitoring processes. The working group will finalise a menu of indicators as a practical tool for g7+ countries and development partners.
3. The working group on indicators will develop an action plan to support the piloting of the interim list of common indicators. The piloting phase should include the development of guidelines and tools, opportunities for joint learning and options for supporting the strengthening of data collection and statistical analytical capacities.

2 Background Note on Common PSG Indicators

2.1 Background

The ***New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States*** was adopted at the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan (Republic of Korea) in December 2011. The New Deal helps to put the principles of the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation into practice in fragile states and situations and has been welcomed in the Busan Outcome document.

The New Deal includes five Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs). To strengthen and promote these goals as a framework for national and international engagement, it was agreed in the New Deal to develop a set of simple and practical indicators to track progress towards the PSGs at the country and at the global level (i.e. across countries).²

² "By September 2012, a set of indicators for each goal will have been developed by fragile states and international partners, which will allow us to track progress at the global and the country levels. These indicators will combine objective www.pbsbdialogue.org / www.newdeal4peace.org

In January 2012, the Steering Group of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding decided to establish a **working group on indicators** (“working group”, hereafter) to advance and co-ordinate the development of peacebuilding and statebuilding indicators. The group comprises 15-20 International Dialogue members and is co-chaired by the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and the UN Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). The co-chairs are supported by a core group consisting of representatives from Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank, civil society, and the g7+ Secretariat. The International Dialogue Secretariat provides support to the working group and the core group.

The working group was mandated to develop a menu of indicators and a list of “shared/common” indicators. At the request of the g7+, and supported by the Steering Group meeting in June 2012, the working group adapted the process of indicator selection and development to be guided by a country-led “**bottom up**” approach^f. This approach combined the piloting of fragility assessments and testing of the fragility spectrum – central commitments of the New Deal – with the process of selecting indicators.

2.2 The role and use of indicators in monitoring peacebuilding and statebuilding

The interim list of common indicators is developed foremost to help track peacebuilding and statebuilding progress within a country over time.

The PSG indicators are meant to provide states affected by conflict and fragility with tools for measuring progress in key areas for their transitions out of fragility. They are intended to be used by national governments, their policy makers and their international partners:

- To help track peacebuilding and statebuilding progress within a country over time.
- To inform regular assessments (e.g. fragility assessments, based on the fragility spectrum) to understand the current situation and provide a baseline for measurement;
- To inform national development planning and priority setting processes (e.g. One Vision/One Plan, compacts); and
- To enable national and international actors to measure progress and communicate results toward PSG implementation to citizens and other constituencies.

Common indicators represent areas of peacebuilding and statebuilding that are considered relevant across all members of the g7+.

Common indicators have been selected through a country-led, bottom-up process and have been identified as relevant across pilot countries, according to their fragility assessments. Crucially, however, this does *not* imply that these are necessarily the only or most important areas for peacebuilding in statebuilding in all countries. For this reason, caution needs to be applied when the common indicators are used as a tool for prioritisation, channelling resources to particular areas, or policy and programming guidance (see next point).

Common indicators should always be used alongside other country-specific indicators and fragility assessments.

The common indicators should be seen as *necessary but not sufficient* in explaining countries’ progress out of fragility. In many situations, they provide only part of the story of a country’s progress in relation to each PSG. Common indicators, in combination with other country-level indicators and the qualitative overview offered by regular consultative fragility assessments, can provide a fuller picture of the state of each dimension of the PSGs at country level. The fragility

measures with measures to understand the views of people on results achieved...” (New Deal, § 1). The International Dialogue Steering Group agreed to extend the process until end of 2012.

assessment offers an in-depth qualitative assessment informed by a national dialogue. Country-level indicators developed through this process can be applied by individual states to reflect local historical and contextual priorities and measure progress towards country-specific priorities.³

Common indicators are not intended for purposes of comparing or ranking countries.

Common indicators are not intended to allow for comparison across the pilot countries or to rank countries. Instead they offer a baseline for reporting change within a country over time.

Common indicators should not be used for conditionality.

Common indicators are not intended to be used to establish external conditionality for development assistance. Their development was mandated by the New Deal to support measurement of the PSGs - priorities jointly determined by the g7+ and international partners.

Common indicators are being tested for their relevance and are not fixed.

At this stage, the interim list of common indicators should not be seen as fixed, but rather, as an evolving list that is likely to need further development and revision on the basis of the results of their practical application and learning among g7+ countries. The piloting of indicators will allow for practical testing of their applicability, feasibility, relevance and usefulness. During the pilot phase, the list of common indicators will be reviewed and revised, as appropriate.

Common indicators allow for the joint development of instruments and methodologies and offer an opportunity for joint learning and support.

Common indicators imply that more than one g7+ country is interested in using the indicator and therefore g7+ countries could benefit from developing joint methodologies and instruments, sharing measurement tools and learning from each other. The agreement of a set of common indicators also helps to focus international assistance and to advance a common agenda for strengthening national statistical systems necessary to actually use and measure progress and achievements against agreed indicators and for knowledge sharing.

2.3 Indicator development process

Since its creation, the working group, the core group and members of the g7+ met multiple times. Annex A provides a comprehensive overview of the process between January 2012 and March 2013. The following section highlights the key steps in the process.

Development of fragility spectrum (January – February 2012): the g7+ met twice in early 2012 to develop the initial fragility spectrum for the 5 PSGs according to the 5 pre-identified stages of fragility (1=crisis, 5=resilience) and agree on key dimensions for assessing progress on each of the PSGs. The g7+ also agreed an indicator policy and started discussing an initial list of indicators as basis for a joint process with development partners.

Development of analytical framework (March – June 2012): The International Dialogue Working Group on indicators developed an analytical framework and guidance, building on the work of the g7+, that was applied by pilot countries to undertake the fragility assessment, apply the fragility spectrum, and develop indicators. The analytical framework will be revised to take into account lessons learned.

Piloting the fragility assessment and spectrum (June – on-going): Pilots have been conducted in DRC, Liberia, Sierra Leone, South Sudan and Timor-Leste. Other countries are expected to launch this exercise in the near future.

³ The working group is currently developing a menu of indicators as a practical tool to support g7+ countries and development partners in the identification of relevant country-level indicators.

Identification of draft country-level indicators (June – October 2012): On the basis of fragility assessments, g7+ pilot countries identified country-level indicators. These indicators were compiled by the Working Group to identify common areas of measurement (September 2012) and taken back to the country level for consultation and further elaboration.

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF INDICATORS GENERATED BY THE FRAGILITY SPECTRUM PER PILOT COUNTRY AND PSG

PSGs	DRC	Sierra Leone	South Sudan	Timor-Leste	Common / Shared
Legitimate Politics	19	11	13	11	7
Security	18	12	7	8	11
Justice	22	28	14	8	8
Economic Foundations	20	22	23	11	10
Revenue and Services	29	31	10	12	14
Total	108	104	67	50	50

Identification of a draft long-list of common indicators (October – March 2013): A South-South exchange was held in October 2012 in Nairobi for g7+ countries to present their list of country-specific indicators, share experiences and jointly develop a proposal for shared indicators. An initial list of 50 common indicators was identified on the basis of the country-level indicators and the criteria agreed by the International Dialogue Working Group, which built on the criteria identified by the g7+.

Consultations on a draft long-list of common indicators (November 2012 – January 2013): The list of 50 indicators was presented at the g7+ Ministerial meeting and the INCAF Director Level Meeting (November 2012). It was widely circulated for comments, including among g7+ and INCAF members, civil society and experts, notably southern experts. In December 2012, the Dialogue Steering Group welcomed progress to date and tasked the working group with finalising the list of common indicators by March 2013.

Identification of a draft short-list of common indicators (January – March 2013). A working group meeting held in Nairobi in January 2013 reviewed the feedback from the consultations and shortened the list to an interim list of 34 PSG indicators. The draft list was reviewed by INCAF, the g7+ and civil society at the technical level.

3 Indicator overview

PSG 1: LEGITIMATE POLITICS	Data type	Indicator level	Data collection	Level of disaggregation	Notes
Representation in the political system					
1. Diversity in representation in key state institutions (basket)⁴	Administrative Data	Objective / Outcome / Slow-changing	Breakdown of representatives (%) within selected bodies	By gender, region and social group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be complemented with indicator #2 Need to be carefully thought through so to avoid doing harm
<p><i>Whether elected and appointed officials in key state institutions and decision-making bodies are representative of the population.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>					
2. Perception of representation (and its effectiveness) in government (basket)	Perception Survey	Subjective / Outcome / Fast-changing	Perception survey questions will need to be developed or drawn from existing surveys.	By gender, region and social group	Will require follow up work to define exact methodology/basket of indicators.
<p><i>The population's level of satisfaction in the political system's inclusivity and effectiveness.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>					
Political Participation					
3. Participation in and satisfaction with elections (basket)	Administrative data, Perception survey	Objective & Subjective / Outcome / Slow changing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in recent national elections Perception survey question(s) regarding satisfaction with elections 	By gender, region and social group	
<p><i>A measure of electoral participation and public satisfaction with the electoral process.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>					
4. Participation in political processes and civic engagement at local level (basket)	Administrative data, Perception survey	Objective & Subjective / Outcome / Slow changing	<p>Suggestions (not yet selected):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Membership of political parties and political NGOs % of people who have taken part in or would consider attending lawful demonstrations 	By gender, region and social group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific indicators for basket and/or methodology not yet selected. Three suggestions provided in data collection column. Will require follow up work to define exact methodology/basket of indicators.
<p><i>Assesses civic engagement and the extent to which people can participate in the political process at the local level and have a say in key decisions that affect their vital interests.</i></p>					

⁴ A basket combines several indicators to be able to measure the concept in question and/or to get a more nuanced view than any one individual indicator.

<i>Theory of change:</i>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of people who are consulted and/or can participate in local processes (e.g. planning) affecting their daily lives. 	
Societal relationships				
5. Number of inter-group disputes that produce violence	Incident reporting	Objective / Output / Slow-changing	<i>Available data source:</i> ACLED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could look at types of conflict, e.g. land, electoral related violence, etc. but need to recognise that conflicts can have multiple causes. • Could qualify levels of violence. • Challenges in measuring disputes that produce violence, may be easier to measure disputes that produce violent deaths.
<i>Number of violent disputes between groups, representing rifts in the social fabric.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>				
6. Number of joint initiatives involving different groups in society	Experience Survey	Subjective / Outcome / Fast-changing	“Initiatives” should cover associations (membership or non-membership driven), organized or spontaneous events, or collective actions, projects, or enterprises. Initiatives can also be conceived as “social networks” and could be broken down into economic (e.g. collaborative business ventures and development projects), social (e.g. community meetings, public/cultural events, NGOs and CBOs, disaster response related) and political (e.g. political parties, civic organizations that engage in political advocacy or activism)	Discussion in Nairobi also identified Inter-group or inter-faith marriage. This does not easily fit into the conceptualisation of ‘initiative’. While it is a good measure of inter-group ties between communities it has been shown that it is not a strong enough social bond to prevent inter-group conflict or to promote human development.
<i>Assesses social cohesion, social capital, intergroup relationships and societal resilience.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>				

PSG 2: Security	Data type	Indicator level	Data collection	Level of disaggregation	Notes
Security Conditions					
1. Violent deaths per 100,000 population	Administrative data (police, health), incident reporting, household surveys	Objective / Outcome / Fast-changing	Various methodologies exist.	By gender, region and social group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGOs can help generate data. It will be important to look into more detail how alternative data sources can better inform this data. • Need to have section on the need to build country capacity – technical issues remain.
<i>Prevalence of violence in society resulting in death.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>					
2. Political refugees and internal displacement caused by conflict and violence (basket)	Administrative data	Objective / Outcome / Fast-changing	<i>Available data sources: Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC); UNHCR</i>	By gender, region and social group	
<i>Estimates the number of people fleeing a country due to fear of persecution and the number of Internally Displaced People (IDPs) within a country, as a proportion of the total population.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>					
3. Incidence of rape and sexual violence	Administrative data (Police and health services), household surveys, document review (civil society)	Objective / Outcome / Fast-changing	Need to determine parameters for measurement. <i>Available data sources: UNODC collects data on sexual violence, including rape against adults and children</i>	By gender, region and social group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data problems and reporting biases acknowledged but group felt it had to be kept • Source of the data will be critical. • This is one of the agreed indicators to measure the implementation of UN Resolution 1325
<i>Measures the number of cases of sexual violence that have occurred in a specific time period (in a specific population) relative to total size of the population at risk</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>					
4. % of people that feel safe	Perception survey	Subjective / Outcome / Fast-changing	Perception survey questions will need to be developed or drawn from existing surveys.	By gender, region and social group	
<i>General perceptions of security and safety.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>					

<p>5. Number of deaths as a result of external influences</p> <p><i>Measures the number of death associated with conflict and violence where there is an external influence.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>	Administrative data and incident reporting	Objective / Outcome / Fast-changing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible way to measure: Could also look at interstate conflict, frequency of cross-border violence resulting in death. Requires a strict coding system for comparable reporting over time and across space. 	By gender, region and social group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges in measurement acknowledged Need to define “external influence” (financing? weapons? Foreign combatants?) Need to determine the timeframe parameters for measurement.
Performance of Security Institutions					
<p>6. Public confidence in the performance of security institutions (basket)</p> <p><i>General satisfaction with the performance of security institutions.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change: Assess whether the public expresses confidence in security institutions, their competence and integrity and their concern for the well-being of the community.</i></p>	Perception survey	Subjective / outcome / fast or slow-changing	Perception survey questions will need to be developed or drawn from existing surveys.	By gender, region and social group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed to keep conceptually, but some technical issues remain. Need to revisit how technically you evaluate ‘confidence’.
Capacity of Security Institutions					
<p>7. PROPOSED: Presence of police and state security across the territory vs non-state armed groups</p> <p><i>Capacity of the state to provide security throughout its territory.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>	Administrative data, expert assessment	Objective/ outcome / fast-changing	Territorial coverage (%) of police and state security actors vs % coverage by non-state armed groups	By region	
<p>8. Frequency of payment of salaries within police force</p> <p><i>Whether police officers experience frequent delays in receiving their salary.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>	Administrative data	Objective / output / fast-changing			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment by Liberia: should we look at detailed aspects of capacity if we already measure level of confidence in police/military which will also be a reflection of public confidence? Should be used in addition to the confidence level indicator
<p>9. PROPOSED: Quality of human resources within police force (basket)</p>	Expert assessment	Subjective / outcome / fast or	To assess the quality of human resources within the police force		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could also look at numbers per population and regional coverage

<p><i>Whether police have personnel who are adequately screened, fairly recruited and sufficiently remunerated.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>		<p>slow-changing</p>	<p>one or several of these indicators could be selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether police recruiting practices are perceived to be fair and effective • Whether entry-level salaries for police officers are sufficient to recruit and retain qualified individuals • Whether the existing vetting process is adequate to ensure that individuals who committed gross human rights abuses and other serious crimes are identified and prevented from serving as police officers <p><i>Available methodology: UN Rule of Law Indicators</i></p>		<p>(similar to PSG 3 indicator #7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment by Liberia: should we look at detailed aspects of capacity if we already measure level of confidence in police/military which will also be a reflection of public confidence?
---	--	----------------------	--	--	--

PSG 3: Justice	Data type	Indicator level	Data collection	Level of disaggregation	Notes
Performance and Independence of Justice Institutions					
1. Public confidence in the performance of justice institutions (formal / customary), including human rights mechanisms <i>General satisfaction with the performance of justice institutions.</i> <i>Theory of change: Assess whether the public believes that the judicial system (both formal and customary) is accessible, affordable, fair and effective and respects individual rights.</i>	Perception surveys	Subjective / Outcome / Slow-changing	Perception survey questions will need to be developed or drawn from existing surveys.	By gender, region and social group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The customary justice system would include alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, traditional, informal, faith-based systems, etc. The indicator 5 (under PSG 1) would be important for PSG 3 to measure the effectiveness of the performance of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.
2. % of victims who reported crime to authorities <i>Percentage of victimized individuals who reported their victimization to the authorities within the last 12 months.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>					
3. PROPOSED: Independence of judiciary – Tenure of judges <i>Percentage of judges who are appointed for fixed terms that provide a guaranteed tenure (term).</i> <i>Theory of change: The extent to which judges are guaranteed full tenure and not arbitrarily removed serves as an indicator of the relative independence of the court and a marker of the integrity of the justice system.</i>	Administrative data (Ministry of justice)	Objective / Input / Slow-changing	% of judges who are appointed for fixed terms that provide a guaranteed tenure, which is protected until retirement age or the expiration of a defined term of substantial duration.		Proposed as way to measure independence of the judiciary.
Capacity of Justice Institutions					
4. Extent of pre-trial detention <i>The average length of time suspects spend in jail or prison before trial or sentencing.</i> <i>Theory of change: The indicator assesses the extent to which justice systems are capable to</i>	Administrative data	Objective / Output / Slow changing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average length of time suspects spend in jail or prison before trial or sentencing 	By political association and social group of detainees	Was generally seen as good but not fully consensual. Concern was raised on including a new indicator that has not been part of the fragility assessment and the risk of not reflecting a commonality in all fragile
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage of prison 		

<i>effectively process cases in a responsive manner. It also captures whether pre-trial detention is used as tool against political opposition.</i>			detainees who have been held in detention for more than 12 months while awaiting sentencing or another final disposition of their case (excluding appeals)		countries
5. % change of police files / cases accepted by prosecuting agency			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change of police files / cases accepted by prosecuting agency • Could also focus on gender-based violence only (agreed UN indicator to measure the implementation of UN Resolution 1325: % change in cases of sexual and gender-based violence referred, investigated and sentenced) 		Potential but there was concern about including a new indicator that has not been part of the fragility assessment in and the risk of not reflecting a commonality in all fragile countries
<i>Capacity of justice institutions to process cases.</i> <i>Theory of change: Assesses the effectiveness of the criminal justice spectrum, i.e. how well police investigates crimes, collects evidence, assemble case files etc.</i>	Administrative data	Objective / Input / Slow changing			
Access to Justice					
6. People's legal awareness, including human rights and legal representation / assistance					
<i>The extent to which citizens are aware of their basic rights.</i> <i>Theory of change: Reflects citizen capacity to seek redress and actively engage in political, social and economic life.</i>	Knowledge survey, focus group discussions	Subjective / Outcome / Slow-changing	Perception survey questions will need to be developed or drawn from existing surveys.	By gender, region and social group	It is difficult to measure awareness but it is a crucial part of people's access to justice and rights. There are examples where awareness has been measures through large n surveys. Could be narrowed down to look at those issues that are critical from a conflict and fragility perspective ('priority case types').
7. Proximity to formal and customary justice institutions to the public (basket)					
<i>Physical accessibility of formal and customary judicial services to the public.</i> <i>Theory of change: The proximity of formal judicial institutions could be assessed by the size of the justice sector bureaucracy. Access to customary justice will be more difficult to measure.</i>	Administrative data (Ministry of justice)	Objective / Input / Slow-changing	<p>Could include several indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of judicial sector personnel (qualified judges, magistrates, ...) per 100,000 population and distribution across the territory. • Number of legal professionals produced annually. 		Challenge: geographic proximity doesn't necessarily translate to access for many people that need it most. Needs to be complemented by indicator 1, i.e. confidence in justice institutions to which people have access.

PSG 4. Economic Foundations	Data type	Indicator level	Data collection	Level of disaggregation	Level of disaggregation
Productive Resources and Prospects for Growth					
1. Population with access to useable and serviceable transport networks, communication, water and energy (basket)	Administrative data, satellite imagery, household survey data	Objective / Output / Slow-changing	% of population with access to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • useable and serviceable transport networks • communication • potable water • energy 	By gender, region and social group	
<i>Extent the population has access to key infrastructure related to transportation, communication, water and energy.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>					
2. Income inequality among regions	Administrative data, household survey data, document review	Objective / Outcome / Slow-changing		By region	
<i>Extent to which the distribution of income among individuals or households between regions deviates from a perfectly equal distribution.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>					
Employment and Livelihoods					
3. % of labour force under- and unemployed (basket)	Administrative data, household survey data	Objective / Outcome / Slow-changing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of labour force underemployed • % of labour force unemployed 	By youth, gender, region	
<i>Prevalence of underemployment and unemployment.</i> <i>Theory of change: Unemployment and underemployment, particularly, among youth, can be a key factor for conflict, especially where there are significant employment differentials among social groups.</i>					
4. % change in food prices over last three months	Administrative data	Objective / Output / Slow-changing	% change in food prices over last three months		
<i>Degree of fluctuation in food prices.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>					
Natural Resources Management					
5. Existence and enforcement of regulatory framework for natural resource management (basket)	Administrative data, expert review	Subjective (quality aspect) & objective	Will require additional work to define methodology or indicators for basket.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs more work to define way to measure

<p><i>Whether natural resource management is managed through an effective regulatory framework which is enforced.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>		<p>components / output / slow-changing</p>			
<p>6. Perception of fair use of benefits from natural resources</p>					
<p><i>The population perception of whether the benefits of the state's natural resources are used equitably.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>	<p>Perception surveys</p>	<p>Subjective / Outcome / Slow-changing</p>	<p>Perception survey questions will need to be developed or drawn from existing surveys.</p>	<p>By gender, region and social group</p>	

PSG 5. Revenues and Services	Data type	Type of indicator	Data collection	Level of disaggregation	Notes
Revenue Management					
1. State monopoly and capacity to collect tax, customs and fees across its territory (basket) <i>Ability of the state to monopolise tax and customs collection in relation to other competing sources of state authority and extend tax and customs services over the full territory of the state.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>	Administrative data, expert assessment	Objective / Output / Slow-changing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which the state has a functioning tax and customs office presence at all major trading points and in all major urban areas cities in the country Alternative sources of tax authority (warlord payments, protection rackets) as determined through expert assessment 		Monopoly over customs collection could be calculated by drawing on data from national income accounts and trade statistics.
2. Tax revenue as share of GDP <i>Ability of the state to generate official tax payments as a source of development finance and service delivery.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>	Administrative data	Objective / Output / Slow-changing	Tax revenue as share of GDP		
Public Administration					
3. Quality of public financial management and internal oversight mechanisms (basket) <i>The quality of public financial management as a core government function.</i> <i>Theory of change:</i>	Administrative data/ Expert review	Objective / Output / Slow-changing	PEFA indicators are based on scores determined on an agreed framework.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to take into account development of an indicator as part of the Busan process. Care must be taken that this indicator also goes down to the subnational level. Aid on budget and predictability are critical issues that will be measured as part of the post-Busan indicators and the FOCUS and TRUS indicators.
4. % of population that reports paying a bribe when obtaining a public service or when interacting with a public official <i>Prevalence of petty corruption based on people's experience.</i>	Experience survey	Subjective / Output / Slow-changing	% of population that reports paying a bribe when obtaining a public service or when interacting with a public official		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also covers people's experience of bribery in the justice system and with security institutions.

<i>Theory of change:</i>					
Service Delivery					
5. Distribution of services					
<p><i>Whether key basic services are distributed equitably between regions and social groups</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change:</i></p>	Administrative data	Objective / Output / Slow changing		By gender, region and social group	Access to water could be included in this indicator instead of indicator 1 under PSG 4.
6. Public satisfaction with service delivery (basket)					
<p><i>Public satisfaction with standard, performance and fairness of basic social service delivery.</i></p> <p><i>Theory of change: Assesses the level of well-being within a country and the confidence the public has in governments.</i></p>	Perception survey (Citizen evaluation/ scorecard)	Subjective / Outcome / Fast changing	Perception survey questions	By gender, region and social group	

4 Origins of common indicators (based on country submissions in October 2012 and January 2013)

PSG 1: LEGITIMATE POLITICS	Proposed by
Representation in the political system	
7. Diversity in representation in key state institutions (basket)	Liberia, DRC, Timor-Leste, South Sudan, Sierra Leone
8. Perception of representation (and its effectiveness) in government (basket)	Group Discussion [was originally part of indicator 1 but indicator was split]
Political Participation	
9. Participation in and satisfaction with elections (basket)	Timor-Leste, Sierra Leone, Liberia, DRC, South Sudan
10. Participation in political processes and civic engagement at local level (basket)	Timor-Leste, Sierra Leone, Liberia, DRC, South Sudan
Societal relationships	
11. Number of inter-group disputes that produce violent death	Liberia, DRC, Timor-Leste, South Sudan, Sierra Leone
12. Number of joint initiatives involving different groups in society	Group Discussion [was proposed by South Sudan, Timor-Leste and CS as compromise instead of “trust between people”, initially identified by DRC, Sierra Leone]

PSG 2: Security	
Security Conditions	
10. Violent deaths per 100,000 population	Liberia, Timor-Leste, South Sudan, Sierra Leone
11. Political refugees and internal displacement caused by conflict and violence (basket)	DRC, Timor-Leste
12. Incidence of rape and sexual violence	Sierra Leone, DRC, Liberia
13. Percent of people that feel safe	Group discussion
14. Cross-border violence	Timor-Leste, DRC, Sierra Leone
Performance of Security Institutions	
15. Public confidence in the performance of security institutions (basket)	Liberia, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, South Sudan
Capacity of Security Institutions	
16. PROPOSED: Presence of police and state security across the territory vs non-state armed groups	Timor-Leste [number of police] and group discussion
17. Timely payment of salaries within police force	Group Discussion [was proposed as good indicator for capacity given that other indicators did not meet criteria]
18. PROPOSED: Quality of human resources within police force (basket)	Group Discussion [was proposed to complement indicator 8]

PSG 3: Justice	
Performance and Independence of Justice Institutions	

8. Public confidence in the performance of justice institutions (formal / customary), including human rights mechanisms	South Sudan, Liberia, Timor-Leste, Sierra Leone, DRC
9. % of victims who reported crime to authorities	Group Discussion [identified as good objective indicator for measuring performance of justice system and triangulate indicator 1]
10. PROPOSED: Independence of judiciary – Tenure of judges	Group Discussion [identified independence of judiciary as critical dimension]
Capacity of Justice Institutions	
11. Extent of pre-trial detention	Group Discussion [identified as strong indicator to measure capacity of justice institutions – replaced other capacity indicators]
12. % change of police files / cases accepted by prosecuting agency	Sierra Leone
Access to Justice	
13. People's legal awareness, including human rights and legal representation / assistance	Liberia, South Sudan, Timor-Leste and group discussion
14. Proximity to formal and customary justice institutions to the public (basket)	Timor-Leste, South Sudan [number/presence of judges etc], DRC [access] Group Discussion [suggested to group and to include customary institutions]

PSG 4. Economic Foundations	
Productive Resources and Prospects for Growth	
7. Population with access to useable and serviceable transport networks, communication, water and energy (basket)	Liberia, Timor-Leste, DRC, Sierra Leone
8. Income inequality among regions	Timor-Leste
Employment and Livelihoods	
9. % of labour force under- and unemployed (basket)	Timor-Leste, Sierra Leone
10. % change in food prices over last three months	Sierra Leone [price inflation], group discussion
Natural Resources Management	
11. Existence and enforcement of regulatory framework for natural resource management (basket)	South Sudan, group discussion [identified NRM as critical issue]
12. Perception of fair use of benefits from natural resources	Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, DRC

PSG 5. Revenues and Services	
Revenue Management	
7. State monopoly and capacity to collect tax, customs and fees across its territory (basket)	Liberia, Somalia
8. Tax revenue as share of GDP	Sierra Leone, DRC, Liberia
Public Administration	
9. Quality of public financial management and internal oversight mechanisms (basket)	Liberia, DRC

10. % of population that reports paying a bribe when obtaining a public service or when interacting with a public official	Sierra Leone, Liberia
Service Delivery	
11. Distribution of services (by region and social groups)	Timor-Leste, DRC, Sierra Leone
12. Public satisfaction with service delivery (basket)	Sierra Leone, DRC

5 Annexes

Annex A: Timeline (January 2012 – March 2013)

Timeline	Milestones	Deliverables
January 2012	g7+ meeting (Dili)	- development of initial fragility spectrum
20-22 February 2012	g7+ meeting on indicators (New York)	- development of g7+ policy on indicators - development of g7+ long list of indicators - identification of PSG dimensions
23-24 March 2012	First meeting of the working group (Copenhagen)	- agreement on work programme and ways of working - discussion on parameters for indicator selection - development of analytical framework for fragility spectrum and menu of indicators
April 2012	Circulation of first drafts to working group members for comment by 20 April	- updated work programme and timeline circulated - draft parameters for indicator selection circulated - draft analytical framework circulated
19-21 April 2012	g7+ meeting (New York) and margin meeting at the World Bank spring meetings (Washington D.C.)	- progress update for g7+ members and presentation of fragility spectrum
11 May 2012	INCAF Task Team Meeting (Paris)	- progress update for INCAF members
14-15 May 2012	Working Group Co-Chairs/Core Group Meeting	- discussion on purpose of framework and links with fragility spectrum and PSG indicators - review of analytical framework (including dimensions, sub-dimensions and key questions) - discussion on parameters guiding indicator selection on the basis of g7+ indicator policy and comments received. - update of timeline
22 May 2012	Progress update for International Dialogue members	- progress update, including revised work programme and timeline
25 May 2012	Progress update and documents for Nairobi meeting circulated to working group members	Circulation of room documents for Nairobi working group meeting: - work programme and timeline - analytical framework - menu of indicators - concept note on road testing - parameters for indicator selection
23-27 May 2012	g7+ Working Group Co-chair mission to Timor-Leste	- progress update - discussion on purpose of framework and links with fragility spectrum, and PSG indicators - review of analytical framework (including dimensions, sub-dimensions and key questions) - review of format and descriptions of the draft fragility spectrum and discussion on process for finalising fragility spectrum and TA requirements - review indicator mapping
24-25 May 2012	CSO Meeting on indicators (Mombasa, Kenya)	- progress update for African CSOs
6-7 June 2012	Second meeting of the working group (Nairobi)	- discussion on draft analytical framework and parameters for indicator selection; - discussion on concept note for piloting,
8 June 2012	International Dialogue Steering Group meeting (Nairobi)	- progress update and presentation of interim results - discussion on options for next steps and timeline - agreement to extend deadline for preparation of indicators until end of 2012
27 June 2012	Working Group Co-Chairs/Core Group meeting (Paris)	- preparation of proposal for new process and agreement on revisions to analytical framework and concept note for piloting
10 July 2012	Deadline for Steering Group members to comment on revised process proposal	- agreement on new process put forward by the core group
1 July – 31 August 2012	Piloting fragility assessment and identifying indicators at country level	- country-level piloting of fragility assessment and identification of indicators or areas for measurement (using analytical framework)

10-11 September 2012	Working Group Co-Chairs/Core Group meeting in Paris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - discussion of preliminary results, indicators and lessons from g7+ fragility assessments - preparation for third working group meeting - revision of process and timeline
26 September 2012	High-level side event g7+ with support of partners at United Nations General Assembly	
27-28 September 2012	Third Meeting of the working group in New York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of results and lessons from country-level piloting by g7+ of the fragility assessments - discussion of compilation of country indicators and identification of preliminary common areas for measurement across countries - agreement on revisions for fragility assessment guidance and glossary - agreement on consultation strategy and next steps for indicator development
By 19 October 2012	Consultation and refinement of indicators at country level (in five pilot countries)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - country-level consultations/discussion and technical review on draft indicators emerging from fragility assessments - identification of indicators for preliminary common areas of measurement (identified by the working group)
22-23 October 2012	South-south knowledge-sharing meeting on peacebuilding and statebuilding indicators in Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of revised indicator lists by country, informed by other g7+ country focal points and statistics experts - preparation of shared indicator list by g7+ participants on basis of country indicators - agreement on next steps and needs for each country in process
Early November 2012	Progress update and list of shared indicators for g7+ and INCAF meetings circulated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - circulation of progress report and list of shared indicators as basis for consultation with key stakeholders.
13-14 November 2012	g7+ Ministerial meeting in Haiti	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation by g7+ countries on process of fragility assessment pilots and lessons learned - presentation of draft shared indicators based on g7+ country inputs - presentation of suggested next steps for indicator process - discussion and feedback by g7+ Ministers
19-20 November 2012	INCAF Director Level Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of feedback from g7+ Ministers on indicator work - presentation of draft shared indicators based on g7+ country inputs - presentation of suggested next steps for indicator process - discussion and feedback by INCAF Directors
17-18 December 2012	Discussion and feedback at Steering Group Meeting in Juba	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of progress to date and revised shared indicators - feedback and guidance from the Steering Group on next steps, including agreement to finalise common indicators by March 2013.
November 2012-January 2013	Consultations on draft long-list of common indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - indicators circulated for comments, including among g7+ and INCAF members, civil society and experts, including southern experts
29-31 January 2013	Fourth Meeting of the working group in Nairobi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation and discussion of feedback from consultations - development of revised list of 34 common/shared indicators based on feedback from consultations - initial discussions on possible actions to address capacity and data collection challenges.
February 2013	INCAF Task Team meeting and g7+ technical meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - presentation of progress and revised list of 34 common/shared indicators - feedback from consultations with members.
Proposed next steps		
19 April 2013	Agreement on interim-indicators and piloting at global International Dialogue Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International Dialogue members welcome draft interim-list of common indicators and agree to piloting process - presentation of guidance on measurement - launch of roll out and data collection process
After endorsement	Fifth Meeting on the working group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion on modalities for piloting of indicators, including development of methodologies and options for statistical capacity development - discussion on approach for preparing the menu of indicators
By July 2013	Revision of guidance on the fragility assessment and development of the fragility spectrum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - revised guidance on use of fragility assessment and fragility spectrum
By October 2013	Development of methodologies & tools, menu of indicators and of guidance for how to use it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - compiled menu of indicators for country-level use - finalised guidance on using menu of indicators

Annex B: Criteria for selection of indicators

Country-level indicator Parameters

1.	Indicators should avoid duplicating Millennium Development Goals and other measures of more general development, focusing instead on indicators that reflect how sectoral efforts interact with drivers of conflict and fragility and contribute to <i>peacebuilding</i> and <i>statebuilding</i> . Indicators should be measured at least annually, when possible/appropriate.
2.	Indicators should be selected based on, or aim to be backed by, baseline data collection capabilities.
3.	Indicators should reinforce statistical capacity in countries undertaking fragility assessments. National statistical offices should lead and co-ordinate the data collection process and should be the primary source of data, where possible. Indicators will be drawn from civil society, academic, private sector and UN/international agencies only when the national statistics offices cannot collect the data.
4.	Indicator data collection methods and mechanisms should be reliable and transparent.
5.	Indicators should be simple, relevant and practical. They should be easy to communicate and should measure real and broad progress in the PSG area, and in the everyday lives of people.
6.	Indicators should be adaptable to norms and traditions of the country and able to be localised to the country context.
7.	Indicators should be balanced to demonstrate changes in both government capacity and performance (e.g. a mix of input/output and outcome/impact indicators).
8.	Indicators should be balanced to also capture population views of progress.
9.	Indicators should be as much as possible disaggregated by gender, region and identity group.
10.	Indicators should reflect short-term progress as well as longer-term institutional reform, consistent with the concept of the fragility spectrum

Additional criteria for a smaller sub-set of shared/common indicators

1.	Shared indicators should be able to adequately indicate overall progress in a particular PSG. Together the share indicators should be able to tell a representative story about the status and progress of PSGs within a country
2.	Shared indicators should be appropriate/relevant to all g7+ countries at all stages of fragility and be comparable across countries.
3.	Shared indicators should be limited in number.
4.	Where local capacity to monitor shared indicators differ by country context, mixed data collection efforts drawing on other sources will be used to create comparable indicators.