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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report aims to measure peace in the Pacific. It also seeks to enhance our understanding of the existing data and capacity to measure Goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The report is part of a larger research project by the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) with support from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). Outlined within the report is why Sustainable Development Goal 16 (SDG16) is important to the Pacific, the data currently available to measure SDG16 and key challenges the Pacific region faces in measuring progress against SDG16.

SDG16 captures the progress of nations towards peace, justice and strong institutions and is an important part of a wider conflict prevention agenda. It is a transformative goal; conflict and instability are significant impediments for development and must be addressed if peace is to be achieved and sustained. The region had only limited success in achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Only two countries in the Pacific achieved all eight MDGs; the Cook Islands and Niue. Three countries did not achieve any of the MDGs; Kiribati, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands. In the cases of Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands, the ability of both countries to meet the MDGs was hindered by the presence of conflict and violence.

Given the region’s overall limited success in attaining the MDGs and the presence of numerous peace and security issues in the Pacific, it is important to focus on SDG16 as work commences for 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Across the region, state fragility is pervasive and there are high levels of land disputes as well as societal violence including intimate partner violence and sexual violence. Violence against women is at epidemic levels. Over a third of women in the Pacific have experienced intimate partner violence and, in some countries, up to 70 per cent of women have been raped or assaulted during their lifetime. The level of violent death is also high in some countries with Papua New Guinea estimated to have amongst the highest homicide rates in the world.

Meanwhile, the region faces many environmental challenges that act as a threat multiplier exacerbating underlying grievances and undermining livelihoods and stability. Critically, all of these challenges, including natural disasters, land availability, forced displacement, water resource issues and agricultural production decline, are indirectly mitigated via SDG16 measures. Investment in good governance and institutions can address the grievances that may arise from sudden external shocks. Countries with greater institutional capacity are generally more resilient to external shocks that pose a persistent threat to development, such as natural disasters. Given this, analysis within this report should not be seen as a critique of deficiencies within the region but rather in the context of future opportunity.

The collection of data will play a crucial role in realising this potential. The report finds that none of the Pacific Island countries nor territories have data available that fully covers all the indicators required for measuring SDG16. The comprehensive data audit found that by 2017 only 32 per cent of the SDG16 indicators are available or partially available across the Pacific. A further 25 per cent of indicators have either a proxy measure or data available through further data mining. This means that 57 per cent of indicators are either available, partially available or available through a proxy measure. The remaining 43 per cent of indicators are not available and further data generation efforts are required. This is broadly reflective of global trends: less than half of countries globally have any data for eight of the 23 SDG16 indicators.

Currently, there are numerous challenges to expanding existing statistical capacity and no country in the Pacific fulfils the recommendations for data collection frequency according to the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data standards. Furthermore, most Pacific Island countries and nations do not have a strategy in place to increase statistical capacity with the exception of three Pacific Islands that have an active...
National Strategy for the Development of Statistics (NSDS) plan: Cook Islands, Samoa and Vanuatu. Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands have completed plans that are awaiting adoption.

This data deficiency highlights the need to significantly upscale investments in statistical capacity to ensure that SDG16 is comprehensively measured. The significant costs associated with data collection must be contextualised with the potential cost-savings from policies that avoid violence and instability. The human and economic cost of violence, instability and conflict are tremendous while the long-term potential benefits of preventing conflict through SDG16 are substantial. Nevertheless, it is important to find more innovative and cost-effective solutions to capturing data and ultimate progress on the SDGs.

Looking at the Asia-Pacific region more broadly, the economic impacts of violence and conflict are noteworthy. IEP estimates the direct costs of conflict and violence in Timor-Leste, the Philippines and Papua New Guinea collectively stood at $17 billion PPP in 2015 alone. These direct costs were more than three times the entire Australian ODA budget for that year.

As the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is adopted, the Pacific have an opportunity to increase their visibility within the international community. This corresponds with the renewed commitment of major aid donors to increasing stability within the region. The Foreign Policy White Paper of the Australian government highlights a shared agenda with the Pacific focusing on security and prosperity. Similarly, the New Zealand government has pledged to improve the prosperity, stability and resilience of the Pacific region.

This report outlines challenges but it is also important to note there are also numerous opportunities for the Pacific to establish itself as a leader in practical efforts to improve data, monitoring, transparency, advocacy and policy efforts to achieving SDG16. By doing so, it can make long-term strides to strengthen resilience, safeguard hard fought development gains and prevent conflict, instability and violence.

The report features four sections:

- **Section I** - The context for SDG achievement in the Pacific examines the performance of the Pacific in the MDGs and how the region has prioritised different aspects of the SDGs.

- **Section II** - The importance of SDG16 in the Pacific outlines the region’s key peace and security issues and identifies areas of investment essential to achieve development gains.

- **Section III** - Data challenges discusses data collection shortfalls and the regional difficulties regarding data collection due to capacity, geography and demographics.

- **Section IV** - Data availability provides an audit of currently available regional data for measuring and monitoring SDG16.

- **Section V** - How to measure SDG16 outlines what data is required to measure each SDG16 indicator.

This report seeks to enhance our understanding of the existing data and capacity to measure Goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Goals across the Pacific.
KEY FINDINGS

THE CONTEXT FOR SDG ACHIEVEMENT IN THE PACIFIC

- **SDG16 is a transformative Goal for development outcomes.** The goal focuses on promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, providing access to justice for all and building effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. The attainment of SDG16 helps drive long-term development and strengthen resilience against internal and external shocks.

- **It is timely to focus on SDG16 as the region only had limited success in achieving the MDGs.** Various factors, including the presence of conflict and violence, resulted in only two countries in the Pacific achieving all eight MDGs. A focus on SDG16 presents the opportunity for the Pacific to foster resilience, safeguard hard fought development gains and ultimately transition from a peace defined by a lack of conflict to a more lasting positive peace.

- **Data is crucial for measuring progress, driving advocacy and directing action to help attain the SDGs.** Pacific countries, like many countries around the world, face challenges in collecting better data. Despite these challenges, there are unique opportunities in the region to showcase new innovations in measurement and the impact data collection may have on transparency, local ownership and accountability.

- **Prioritisation of the indicators is needed as new data collection for the SDGs will be resource intensive.** Surveys of people living in the Pacific and national sustainable development plans show that violence and conflict are prioritised to differing extents by different nations. These surveys and plans suggest the region is focused on tradition development outcomes such as education, employment and healthcare. However, SDG16 captures many of the enabling institutions and structures that will drive traditional development outcomes.

IMPORTANCE OF SDG16 IN THE PACIFIC

- **Long-standing regional peace and security issues reinforce the importance of monitoring SDG16.** Land is the most fundamental resource in the Pacific. Consequently, a high proportion of local violence, crime and conflict are land-related. Land disputes between customary landowners, the government and foreign or local investors have the potential to spiral into violence. SDG16 indicators directly measuring levels of justice and the rule of law are critically important to the reconciliation of these land conflicts.

- **Violence against women, whether it is intimate partner violence or sexual violence in broader societal settings, is exceptionally high.** The percentage of women in Kiribati, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tonga, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu who have reported experiences of sexual violence in their lifetime averaged between 60 and almost 70 per cent. One study in Bougainville based on interviews of 846 men aged 18 to 49 found that 61 per cent of men had perpetrated rape.

- **Research by IEP and others show that countries with greater institutional capacity have a greater resilience to external shocks such as natural disasters.** Natural disasters are a persistent threat to livelihoods and stability in the region. Further, environmental challenges act as a threat multiplier for domestic political instability. Given this, it is imperative to invest in good governance and institutions that help mitigate grievances which may arise from sudden external shocks.

- **There are significant potential long-term benefits from preventing conflict by investing in the attainment of SDG16.** The human and economic cost of instability and conflict can be tremendous in both the short and long term. For example, the persistence of conflict can divert foreign investment and tourism as well as redirect aid expenditure towards efforts to contain the immediate threat of violence rather than initiatives that enhance a region’s economic potential.

- **Opportunities exist to embed SDG16 in local frameworks.** The human security framework developed by the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) recognises the interlocking political, economic, environmental, social and interpersonal factors that support human security.

DATA CHALLENGES

- **This report presents the most comprehensive audit of the available data for SDG16 indicators in the Pacific.** The audit reveals numerous data gaps. However, analysis within this report should be seen in the context of future opportunity as existing local frameworks could be harnessed to capture the required data.

- **There are numerous challenges to developing existing statistical capacity.** This is reflected in the absence of baseline MDG data for several Pacific Island countries. No country in the Pacific had baselines for all indicators used to measure MDGs one, five, six and seven. A lack of financial, technical and human capital resources in many countries in the Pacific meant that many countries and territories struggled to meet the demands for statistics resulting from the MDGs. Only one country (Tonga) issued more than two MDG progress reports.

- **Currently, no country in the Pacific fulfils the recommendations for data collection frequency according to the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data standards.**
DATA AVAILABILITY

- Measuring SDG16 is an ambitious objective even for many high-income nations.
  The Pacific is not alone in the challenges it faces regarding data collection capacity. Given this, there is opportunity for the region to be a leader in piloting innovative solutions.

- A total of 57 per cent of indicators are either available, partially available or available through a proxy measure. The remaining 43 per cent of indicators are not available and further data generation efforts are required. Sovereign territories have better data availability than non-sovereign states. However no Pacific Island country or territory has data covering all the SDG16 indicators. Only 32 per cent of the SDG16 indicators are available or partially available across the Pacific but a further 25 per cent of indicators have a proxy measure and so should be calculable.

- Local datasets could capture a significant amount of data analysing SDG16 progress.
  Almost all of the Pacific Island states have conducted censuses and most have conducted National Household and Income surveys in addition to Demographic and Health Surveys. This places the Pacific in a strong position to utilise existing local datasets to help track progress against the SDG16 indicators. Eleven of the 22 countries conducted major data collection initiatives in either 2015 or 2016.

- Two SDG16 indicators can be measured immediately and fully assessed.
  These indicators are indicator 16.8.1 measuring voting rights of developing countries and indicator 16.a.1 measuring the existence of independent national human rights institutions.

- Data gaps are largely consistent across countries and concentrated around survey-dependent indicators.
  This issue is not unique to the Pacific as many countries in the world, including high-income countries have the relevant data available but lack disaggregated data. In particular, disaggregated data by gender, age and disability.

HOW TO MEASURE SDG16

- Some data relevant for SDG16 can be integrated into the currently planned official statistical collection.
  However, SDG16 will also require new data collection including survey questions about the government. Data gaps are largely consistent across countries and concentrated around survey-dependent indicators. Third party data collection initiatives to measure SDG16 specific indicators will also be necessary.

- Various interim measures are necessary for SDG16.
  This includes the use of existing and novel data sources, including proxy measures. Different indicative data collection strategies such as expert surveys will also be complementary to other data collections.
This project aims to measure SDG16 in Pacific Island countries and territories while also complementing a number of initiatives currently undertaken by regional institutions to improve statistical capacity. This report is the first of three stages to measure SDG16 across the region and identifies the data currently available and the data challenges faced in the Pacific. The second stage of the project is a review of what statistical capacity currently exists in each Pacific Island nation with recommendations to build measurement capacity. The third and final stage of the project is measuring progress in SDG16 indicators and in statistical capacity.

Specifically, the project aims to:

• Develop baseline data and empirical findings on progress in peace and SDG16 for Pacific Island nations and territories by the end of 2018.

• Understand the typologies and key forms of violence in the Pacific and how they increase fragility and interrupt progress in other development outcomes.

• Assist international organisations, governments and local actors to enhance local statistical capacity to measure SDG16 on an ongoing basis and also assist their capacity to communicate data outcomes. This will help foster a locally owned and driven ability to measure and track progress in SDG16. This will hopefully result in increased domestic awareness of the SDGs and broader policy efforts to achieve them.

In measuring SDG16, this project aligns and works toward the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which aims to build transparency in both formal and informal governance. It is also intended to help drive locally owned processes to enhance local capacity to measure and monitor SDG16. Measuring SDG16 will help guide evidence based policy and resource allocation, as well as assist with the early warning and anticipation of instability. Further, it will help direct advocacy for change by prioritising performance against regional benchmarks. This initiative will strive to, where possible, align with other activity within the region addressing the SDGs but specifically SDG16.

This project aligns with the second objective of DFAT’s Australia’s Pacific Regional Aid Program regarding fostering effective regional institutions by strengthening initiatives for building transparency and accountability across the region. By tracking progress in SDG16 in Pacific Island countries and territories this project will improve the evidence-based decision-making of Pacific Island governments and their people. Measuring SDG16 is explicitly focused on building human rights capacity through state institutions and civil society organisations, promoting justice and access to the law as well as contributing to meaningful public debate through easily accessible data and reports.

Countries and territories included in this report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Tokelau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>Wallis and Futuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>Federated States of Micronesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>Republic of the Marshall Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitcairn Island, with a population under 60 people, is not required to report the SDGs.
THE INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMICS & PEACE

The Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) is an independent, non-partisan, non-profit research institute focused on the measurement of peace and conflict.

It assesses the economic costs and benefits of peace in understanding its drivers.

IEP achieves its goals by:

• Developing new conceptual frameworks to define peacefulness;
• Providing metrics for measuring peace; and
• Uncovering the relationships between business, peace and prosperity as well as promoting a better understanding of the cultural, economic and political factors that create peace.

IEP is a world leader in measuring peace, conflict and violence. Every year IEP produces the Global Peace Index, which is the world's leading measure of global peacefulness. IEP has also extensive expertise in measuring SDG16 and is a member of the SDG16 Data Initiative, which is a consortium that compiles existing global data to assist in tracking progress towards achieving SDG16. IEP has also consulted to a variety of inter-government agencies such as United Nations Development Program (UNDP), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the World Bank, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) as well as other NGOs and think tanks on data driven research issues related to peace, fragility and development.
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Achieving peace and SDG16 is critical if development gains are to be attained. Since the MDGs were agreed upon in 2000, there has been a shift from an exclusive consideration of development measures to an examination of factors that are integral to development outcomes.

In particular, there is greater recognition of the role that violence, conflict and insecurity plays in constraining development. The World Bank's 2011 World Development Report established how insecurity, violence and conflict can be both a major impediment to development while also setting back many development gains.5

A major finding from a review of the MDGs was that violence and conflict severely impact development progress in many countries.6 Low-income fragile and conflict-affected countries recorded lower levels of MDGs achievement than those low-income settings that did not experience conflict. Violence affects poverty, life expectancy and education outcomes, as well as factors that are essential for longer-term development like infant mortality and access to services. Violence also greatly affects economic development by reducing foreign direct investment, investments in tourism and it distorts the broader macro-economic environment. The SDGs and specifically SDG16 recognise the long reaching consequences of conflict and violence for development.

The capture of data relating to peace through SDG16 is essential to measure progress and prioritise action for increasing development and reducing fragility. The 2030 Agenda strongly emphasises a country-led approach. This means each country will develop their own sustainable development policies, plans and program that are shaped and directed by the SDGs. Countries are encouraged to determine a range of complementary national indicators that suit its needs and statistical capacity.

Efforts to understand and address the drivers of violence and conflict will be impaired without clear and accurate data measuring progress on the SDG16 indicators. Capturing data on peace through SDG16 is essential to measure progress and prioritise action for increasing development and reducing fragility.
SECTION I: THE CONTEXT FOR SDG ACHIEVEMENT IN THE PACIFIC
BACKGROUND ON THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

The SDG are a new set of 17 goals to target poverty, inequality, injustice and climate change by 2030. They build upon the foundation of the MDGs but broaden the meaning of development. The goals call on all countries at all stages of development to promote prosperity while protecting the planet. They carry an increased focus on the root causes of poverty and development while recognising that an integrated approach is crucial for progress across the multiple goals. The SDGs reflect that conflict and instability are significant impediments for development.

Although the MDGs were meant for the world as a whole, many countries stalled in their progress or even faced the possibility of reversals of development owing to their vulnerability to shocks, such as oil and food price spikes or the outbreak of conflict. Thus, the SDGs set out to explicitly cover the impact of these shocks on the development process through the inclusion of indicators related to violence, fragility and resilience. They also aim to be reflective and inclusive of prior intergovernmental processes, civil society organisations and public opinion. The goals have been specifically formulated to move away from the top-down, technocratic approach that characterised the MDGs to a more inclusive, consultative and bottom-up process.

The SDGs also differ from the MDGs in that they omit the distinction between developed and developing countries that was central to the MDGs. While developing countries, particularly those in a fragile or post-conflict environment may be more susceptible to shocks, many developed countries face problems relating to exclusion, environmental sustainability, debt and inequality. Furthermore, the unsustainable use of the planet’s resources is a global problem faced by countries everywhere. The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) identified ‘mega-trends’ that will globally hamper the attainment of the SDGs.

These mega trends are:

- Poverty and inequality
- Demography
- Climate change, shocks and crises
- Appropriate development financing
- Technological innovation.

Conceptually, there are three key differences between the MDGs and SDGs:

1. **There is an ‘interaction imperative’**
   The MDGs looked at the goals that were not being met and how they could be achieved specifically but the SDGs aim to identify the actions that will achieve progress on the broadest number of goals in the shortest time possible.

2. **The ‘Last-Mile’ challenge**
   The SDGs are focused on “leaving no one behind” and thus fundamentally committed to solving the ‘last-mile’ challenge. For example, there is a fundamental difference between reducing poverty and eliminating poverty. The former can be achieved by improvements in processes and service delivery. The latter requires a different approach that identifies and nullifies the structural issues that fundamentally drive poverty.

3. **There is a need for ‘risk-informed’ development**
   The MDGs did not take into account the impact on development from volatility, shocks and vulnerability despite research demonstrating that fragile and conflict-affected countries are less likely to achieve the MDGs. Furthermore, even countries with high levels of development are at risk of reversing these gains if vulnerabilities are not addressed. As such, the SDGs account for these risks.
THE MDGS & THE PACIFIC

While embracing the MDGs, the Pacific as a region did not quickly adopt the goals as part of national programming. Many countries only began focusing on MDG outcomes in the build-up to the MDG Review Summit in 2010. Regionally, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat first committed to tracking MDG progress each year at the 2009 Forum Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination.12

Only two countries achieved all the MDG goals: the Cook Islands and Niue although the majority achieved MDG4 (reducing child mortality). Three countries achieved at least half of the MDGs: Fiji, Palau and Tonga. Notably, three countries did not achieve any of the MDGs: Kiribati, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands. Two of these countries, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands, are considered conflict-affected or fragile states and other research has demonstrated that conflict-affected and fragile states disproportionately underperformed against the MDGS.13

However, even the region’s partial success regarding the attainment of the MDGs betrayed a region-wide deficiency of baseline data. For example, the Cook Islands and Niue both achieved MDG1 (eradicating extreme poverty and hunger) but did not have any baseline data for the nine indicators used to measure this goal. Baseline data is essential for determining trends and their directions in any particular indicator. In fact, only three countries had baseline data for more than half of the 52 indicators used to measure the first seven goals of the MDGs. Given that there were only one or two measures for many of the pertinent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRIES &amp; TERRITORIES</th>
<th>MDG1</th>
<th>MDG2</th>
<th>MDG3</th>
<th>MDG4</th>
<th>MDG5</th>
<th>MDG6</th>
<th>MDG7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
<td>Not achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PIFS
Only three countries had baseline measurements for over half the indicators used to measure progress in the MDGs. There were 52 indicators used to measure MDG goals one to seven. National benchmarking exercises like the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) SDG Index do not include benchmark data for Pacific Island nations because of a lack of data availability. All Pacific Islands, including Papua New Guinea and Fiji were part of the 48 countries not included in the preliminary Global SDG Index due to insufficient data availability. This suggests that the issue of insufficient benchmarking will likely continue with the SDGs.
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Only two countries achieved all the MDG goals: the Cook Islands and Niue

indicators for measuring the MDGs, the lack of a baseline made it difficult to determine with accuracy the actual trajectory of countries in relation to the goals.
As a region, the Pacific has expressed support for the SDGs throughout the deliberations and adoption process. This support reflects the more holistic view offered through the SDGs towards development, including many measures that are particularly significant for Pacific and other small island developing states. For example, the advocacy and support of Pacific Small Island Developing States was pivotal in ensuring the inclusion of SDG14 within the 2030 Agenda. This goal specifically focuses on the conservation and sustainable use of oceans.

Given both the wide scope of the 2030 Agenda and the limited financial and human capital capacity across the Pacific, certain goals and targets clearly have to be prioritised. This has been recognised by the UN. The 2030 Agenda is to be country-led, which means each country is to develop their own sustainable development policies, plans and programs that are shaped and directed by the SDGs. This enhances the focus on nationally owned and country-led sustainable development strategies. Countries are encouraged to determine a range of complementary national indicators that suit its needs and statistical capacity.

In 2015, Pacific political leaders decided on a contextualised approach to the SDG indicators to address the region’s unique challenges. The Pacific SDGs Taskforce was established to prioritise a regional set of indicators for measurement, including tailoring indicators to be more appropriate for the Pacific context. For example, in Goal 14.3.1 there was a call to include daily ranges of aragonite saturation (a measure of acidification) as well as average marine acidity (pH) levels in the Pacific as called for by the indicator.

This new process of regionally contextualising the SDGs has resulted in the Pacific Roadmap for Sustainable Development, which was accepted at the 48th PIFS meeting held in Samoa in September 2017. At this meeting, leaders committed to focus on both national as well as regional collective efforts for achieving the 2030 Agenda. This is alongside the Small Island Developing States Accelerated Modalities of Action (Samoa Pathway) which outlines how Pacific Island countries and territories are aligned to the SDGs.

As a region, the Pacific has expressed support for the SDGs throughout the deliberations and adoption process. This support reflects the more holistic view offered through the SDGs towards development, including many measures that are particularly significant for Pacific and other small island developing states. For example, the advocacy and support of Pacific Small Island Developing States was pivotal in ensuring the inclusion of SDG14 within the 2030 Agenda. This goal specifically focuses on the conservation and sustainable use of oceans.

Given both the wide scope of the 2030 Agenda and the limited financial and human capital capacity across the Pacific, certain goals and targets clearly have to be prioritised. This has been recognised by the UN. The 2030 Agenda is to be country-led, which means each country is to develop their own sustainable development policies, plans and programs that are shaped and directed by the SDGs. This enhances the focus on nationally owned and country-led sustainable development strategies. Countries are encouraged to determine a range of complementary national indicators that suit its needs and statistical capacity.

In 2015, Pacific political leaders decided on a contextualised approach to the SDG indicators to address the region’s unique challenges. The Pacific SDGs Taskforce was established to prioritise a regional set of indicators for measurement, including tailoring indicators to be more appropriate for the Pacific context. For example, in Goal 14.3.1 there was a call to include daily ranges of aragonite saturation (a measure of acidification) as well as average marine acidity (pH) levels in the Pacific as called for by the indicator.

This new process of regionally contextualising the SDGs has resulted in the Pacific Roadmap for Sustainable Development, which was accepted at the 48th PIFS meeting held in Samoa in September 2017. At this meeting, leaders committed to focus on both national as well as regional collective efforts for achieving the 2030 Agenda. This is alongside the Small Island Developing States Accelerated Modalities of Action (Samoa Pathway) which outlines how Pacific Island countries and territories are aligned to the SDGs.

The 2030 Agenda is indivisible and there are important interlinkages across the different goals and targets. However, prioritisation is a necessity. At the most fundamental level, scheduling which goals will be measured at which stage is prioritising some goals over others due to resources and capacity.

Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat Deputy Secretary General Cristelle Pratt has noted that SDG14 is the centre point for the region. Nevertheless, there is a close link between all SDGs and it is not possible to separate environmental goals from development goals. The 2030 Agenda is integrated and indivisible, balancing the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Thus, while the issue of prioritisation is unavoidable, it may be possible to jointly address multiple goals within a single strategy or approach. Prioritisation can also be addressed by tackling the goals in a specific order by either tying them to existing national or regional priorities. Another approach is to focus on the worst performing targets.

Each Pacific island country and territory has the responsibility to establish its own National Sustainable Development Plan (NSDP) for implementing the SDGs. There have already been exercises mapping the SDGs to NSDPs in Nauru, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu. Furthermore, tailoring SDG goals and indicators for local contexts has occurred in Nauru, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu. Similarly, the United Nations Development Group, through Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support for the 2030 Agenda (MAPS) have been supporting countries to develop roadmaps to implement and monitor the SDGs.
A) GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

REGIONAL SURVEYS

The MY World survey is a global UN-led survey of citizens designed to reflect the development priorities across the world and was designed to shape the directions of the SDGs. The survey had over 9.7 million responses globally and used a range of different methodologies, including offline surveys conducted by organisations, SMS for mobile phones and interactive voice responses on a toll-free number. The survey asked respondents to prioritise six of 16 proposed development priorities. Due to the disparity in collection methods, the varied response rate and because it was not translated into local languages, the results are not statistically representative. However, they do broadly reveal development priorities within the Pacific.

While the majority of respondents in the Pacific were based in Melanesia (with 2,157 respondents), there were similar priorities across the Pacific. A good education is prioritised across the Pacific as well as job opportunities and better healthcare. This aligns with the global view that similarly ranked these three development targets as priorities.

Environmental factors were prioritised more highly in the Pacific than globally. Protecting forests, rivers and oceans ranked 8th in the Pacific in contrast to 14th globally. Action taken on climate change ranked 10th in the Pacific in contrast to last globally.

Notably, there were significant discrepancies between males and females for several of the development priorities across the Pacific. Females consistently prioritised two indicators higher than men: protection against crime and violence, and equality between men and women. For most other indicators there was not much variation across the genders.

B) REGIONAL PRIORITISATION OF SDG INDICATORS

The Pacific region has determined Pacific Regional Priorities which include thematic and implementation goals.

The Pacific Regional Priorities are:
- Climate change and disaster risk reduction.
- Oceans and fisheries.
- Infrastructure for affordable and clean energy, and information and communication technology connectivity.

FIGURE 1.2
UN MY WORLD SURVEY, DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES ACROSS THE PACIFIC

The biggest priorities across the Pacific relate to education, job opportunities and healthcare.

Source: UN MY World Survey
FIGURE 1.3
SDG16 VS OTHER SDGS PRIORITISED BY THE PACIFIC

A quarter of SDG16 goals were prioritised by the Pacific, as opposed to half of all other goals. This highlights that SDG16 is not viewed as the greatest priority across the region.

Table 1.2
SDG16 INDICATORS PRIORITISED BY THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FULL INDICATOR TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.1.3</td>
<td>Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3.1</td>
<td>Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimisation to competent authorities or other officially recognised conflict resolution mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6.1</td>
<td>Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget codes or similar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.7.2</td>
<td>Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.9.1</td>
<td>Proportion of children under five years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.10.2</td>
<td>Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Health, especially non-communicable diseases.
- Empowering women and girls, and people with disabilities.

The Pacific Community (SPC) facilitated the nomination of the indicators most important to the Pacific and which will be reported at a country level. The selected SDGs reflect the Pacific Regional Priorities. SDG16, which relates to peace, justice and strong institutions, was notably underrepresented in the selected indicators. While half of all other SDGs were chosen by the region to be prioritised, only a quarter of the indicators for SDG16 were selected.

Six of the 23 indicators for SDG16 were selected by the Pacific to be measured. Of these six, only one indicator for the first target of significantly reducing all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere was selected. This means that victims of intentional homicide, conflict-related deaths...
and the proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live are unlikely to be the focus of measurement. An additional indicator was included but tailored to a Pacific proxy: 16.a.1 ‘Existence of implementation plan for the different UN Treaty Body recommendations and UPR recommendations which are fully or partially resourced.’

However, the Human Security Framework for the Pacific developed by the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) recognises that political security is essential in the region. This entails good governance, democratic structures and practices as well as tackling transnational organised crime and representative governance. These are all principles addressed by SDG16.

C) NATIONAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PLANS

In 2005, PIFS leaders through the Pacific Plan Initiative 5.1 committed to developing and implementing National Sustainable Development Strategies (NSDS) within each country by 2008. These plans reflected and complemented existing planning and strategies. While many of these plans have been developed outside the scope of the 2030 Agenda, they demonstrate the selected priorities and indicators for each region.

There is little explicit reference to the reduction of violence in the various NSDS across the region. For example, the Vanuatu National Sustainable Development Plan 2016 to 2030 outlines a number of goals including creating a vibrant cultural identity underpinning a peaceful, just and inclusive society. The plans is founded on three pillars: society, the environment and the economy. One the six components of these pillars is justice. This highlights the importance of addressing the backlog of court cases, corruption, security force institutional capacity, maritime security as well as strengthening links between traditional and formal justice systems. In some ways aspects of this plan are not dissimilar to SDG16 and its focus on peace, justice and strong institutions. Nevertheless, there is still no measure for violence.

Similarly, Tonga’s Strategic Development Framework 2015-2025 does not place a heavy emphasis on violence. Violence is addressed incidentally in relation to the second of the framework’s five pillars that relates to social institutions. Five of the 29 organisational outcomes are intended to address the unacceptably high levels of violence displayed in various social settings, including within the family (in particular towards women and children) and between students. However, only two of these five have a more than incidental impact on violence. The framework calls for more appropriate social and cultural practices, recognising that this includes violence towards women, children and others. Likewise, the goal for better care and support for vulnerable people, in particular people with disabilities, also identifies violence as a specific risk.

Papua New Guinea has the largest number of violent deaths in the Pacific. The 2013 National Strategy for Responsible Sustainable Development for Papua New Guinea recognises that change is required in part because of high levels of conflict and violence. However, the report contains no indicators relating to measuring conflict and violence and instead there is a much greater emphasis on economic development and increasing human capital.

In contrast, the Cook Island’s National Sustainable Development Plan 2016–2020 explicitly seeks to measure levels of violence in the country. Goal 16 of this plan seeks to promote a peaceful and just society, and practice good governance with transparency and accountability. It includes measures for the rate of domestic violence as determined by the annual incidence of domestic violence reported to the police. It also includes measures for access to justice, reoffending rates and rates of motor vehicle accidents from reckless behaviour.

Kiribati also has explicit measures focused on gender based violence. Solomon Island’s National Development Strategy 2016-2035 endorses five of the targets within SDG16 although only two of these indicators are among those prioritised by the Pacific community. This reflects a broader regional trend towards prioritising economic and environmental goals across the Pacific.

While environmental concerns are an obvious priority for the Pacific, there are also significant human security issues in the region that are partly addressed in SDG16. These include reducing levels of conflict and violence as well as developing stronger and more just institutions; both of which have clear and measurable benefits to society. While it is understandable that each Pacific country and territory should prioritise SDG targets and indicators according to their local relevance, the SDGs also stipulate that no one is left behind. This means also addressing lesser priorities for the region.
SECTION II: IMPORTANCE OF SDG16 IN THE PACIFIC
**WHY SDG16?**

This specific goal recognises the long reaching consequences of conflict and violence for development outcomes. Not only is violence a severe hindrance for development, it can reverse many years of development gains. By prioritising SDG16, Pacific islanders have an opportunity to potentially enjoy a more peaceful and economically advanced society.

SDG16 is dedicated to:

- Promoting peaceful and inclusive societies as part of sustainable development.
- Providing access to justice for all.
- Building effective, accountable institutions at all levels.

The goal acknowledges that peace is fundamental to development and that the international community recognises that peace can and should be measured for development outcomes.

Conflict greatly affects economic development by reducing foreign direct investment and the broader macro-economic environment. These flow-on effects influence the level of poverty, life expectancy and education outcomes, as well as indicators of longer term development including infant mortality and access to services. SDG16 also measures everyday interpersonal violence which is a crucial importance to all Pacific nations as well as countries across the world, including highly developed countries. Interpersonal violence has detrimental social and economic impacts in severely curtailing human well-being and socio-economic progress. This underscores the universality of SDG16 and its applicability to all nations, not just the Pacific region. By focusing on this particular focus of SDG16, there is an opportunity for the Pacific to be a world leader.

Successfully addressing the drivers of violence and conflict also requires moving beyond a focus on the traditional development agenda of health, education and poverty. This means focusing on the drivers of peace including issues of governance, inequality and institutions as well as violence reduction; as recognised within SDG16 and the SDGs more broadly. This includes SDG1 that relates to poverty, SDG3 that focuses on healthcare, SDG4

**FIGURE 2.1**

**OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO THE PACIFIC ISLANDS BY DONOR, GROSS DISBURSEMENTS, 2002-2015, 2015 DOLLARS**

ODA increased in real terms by 86 per cent between 2002 and 2015. Australia accounted for just under half of all ODA to the Pacific in this period.

Source: OECD DAC CRS
that centres on education, SDG5 that refers to ending discrimination and SDG10 which addresses equality. The inclusion of the drivers of peace across the SDGs reflects the integrated and interlinked nature of the goals, which if achieved work together to bring about development outcomes. Therefore, SDG16 cannot be separated from the other SDGs and this goal should be not viewed as applying exclusively to conflict-affected countries.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

The SDGs have significance for national governments as well as donors. The Pacific region is a recipient of a large proportion of official development assistance (ODA). Australia is responsible for just under half of all ODA in the Pacific with the government providing AUD$1.134M in aid in 2015.

The majority of development assistance expenditure across the Pacific is provided under the category of social infrastructure and services. This category includes public sector policy and administrative management, legal and judicial development, education policy as well as healthcare related expenditure. Large projects account for the majority of spending with fewer than 300 projects accounting for 80 per cent of expenditure and over 2,500 projects accounting for just 20 per cent.

Significant ODA expenditure is given for projects that strengthen the instruments of government across the Pacific. This expenditure could help attain SDG16, which focuses on establishing peace, justice and strong institutions as necessary for achieving other development goals. As such, development activities related to SDG16 encompass many state building and peacebuilding measures which improve long term resilience to shocks.

The recent example from the Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI) highlights the importance of preventing conflict and crises in the Pacific. RAMSI, which began in 2003 as a response to violent unrest in Solomon Islands and ended in June 2017, was a multi-government stabilisation mission involving 15 countries. It was led by Australia and its involvement was partly justified by the potential regional security risks of a failed state coupled with fears that the Solomon Islands could become a safe haven for transnational organised crime, terrorism and lawlessness; as argued at the time by then Minister for Defence, Robert Hill and former Prime Minister, John Howard. IEP estimates that RAMSI likely cost nearly AUD $3 billion over the 15 year period.
FIGURE 2.3
ODA COMMITMENTS FROM AUSTRALIA TO SOLOMON ISLANDS, 1995-2015

Since the establishment of RAMSI in July 2003 there has been on average a 400% increase in ODA to the Solomon Islands. Note commitments do not equate to expenditure.

Prior to RAMSI, ODA commitments to the Solomon Islands increased from AUD$42M in 2002 to $219M in 2003; the year RAMSI began. In the eight years prior to RAMSI, ODA commitments to Solomon Islands were an average of $31M a year. In the subsequent years up until 2013, when RAMSI transitioned into a police-only mission, ODA commitments to Solomon Islands were six times higher with an average of $24M per year.

This example presents a clear case highlighting the importance of SDG16 to the Pacific. It is much more cost effective in the long term to focus on peace, justice and strong institutions as preventative practice rather than responding to crises. A starker example can be seen when examining the region more broadly. IEP estimates the direct costs of conflict and violence in 2015 in Timor-Leste, the Philippines and Papua New Guinea collectively was $17 billion PPP dollars alone. These direct costs are four and half times the entire Australian Official Development Assistance program for 2015.

Furthermore, a focus on SDG16 ensures a timely measure of many of the issues within the Pacific. Security issues in the Pacific have tended to revolve more around domestic political violence, climate change and associated resource scarcity, land disputes, violence against women and interpersonal violence rather than interstate armed conflict.

Security issues in the Pacific have tended to revolve more around domestic political violence, climate change and associated resource scarcity, land disputes, violence against women and interpersonal violence rather than interstate armed conflict.
CONFLICT IN THE PACIFIC

The violent conflict in the Pacific is internal rather than between countries and generally at a lower scale than other regions. Often forms of organised violence is related to domestic political concerns, such as the violent conflict in Solomon Islands from 1998 to 2002, New Caledonia in the 1980s and Bougainville from 1988 to 1998. There has also been politically tinged social unrest and riots in Tonga in 2006 and Vanuatu in 2007 and political crises caused by military and civilian coups in Fiji in 1987, 2000, 2006 and the 2009 constitutional crisis.

As shown in Figure 2.4, the majority of these uprisings have not resulted in conflict-related deaths. Deaths have occurred due to conflicts in Bougainville and the Highlands in Papua New Guinea, as well as in Solomon Islands, particularly in the Guadalcanal province in addition to the Central and Western provinces. The most recent armed conflict in the Pacific has been between the Akul and Kambririp tribes in the Enga Province in Papua New Guinea in 2012.

The lack of coded armed conflict in the Pacific does not mean that there is not armed conflict resulting in deaths. Rather, the majority of this conflict is either low scale or in remote areas with little media attention and thus, not accurately captured. This qualifier even applies to the gold-standard measure of armed conflict deaths; the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) Armed Conflict Database (ACD). Most Pacific Island countries and territories do not regularly record causes of death and therefore lack high quality data on the mode of death. Consequently, there is a high likelihood that the endemic low-level conflict in certain areas of Melanesia, and specifically violence in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea, is not fully captured as armed conflict in global databases. For example, there were reports of at least 30 deaths from election-related violence in the Papua New Guinea Highlands in 2017. Despite media reports, it is unlikely that this will be captured in many global conflict databases due to the uncertainty on the identity of actors and victims.

However, in a more positive trend, there are not protracted conflicts between heavily armed groups or counter-insurgencies like that seen in other parts

FIGURE 2.4
DEATHS FROM ARMED CONFLICT IN THE PACIFIC, 1989-2015

Only two countries in the Pacific experienced deaths from armed conflict: Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands.

Source: UCDP
of the world including Colombia, the Philippines or Sudan. Armed conflict in the Pacific, whilst still relevant, is not viewed as the most significant human security issue. This explains why conflict-related deaths, as measured through the SDG16.1.2, have not been prioritised as a Pacific Regional Priority. Furthermore, other SDG targets are considered to be of greater relevance across the whole region. For example, SDG3, which relates to ensuring healthy lives and promoting the well-being for all at all ages as essential to sustainable development, is deemed as a priority across the Pacific in general rather than Melanesia-specific. However, there are still significant peace and security issues in the Pacific that potentially undermine human security. Reflecting this, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) developed the Human Security Framework for the Pacific to show the relationship between insecurity, conflict and development. The stated goal of the human security framework is to develop a Pacific where communities, families and individuals are secure and safe from threats to their wellbeing, are guaranteed dignity and can enjoy political stability, sustainable economic development and social fulfilment in the unique context of the region.

**FIG 2.5**

**THE HUMAN SECURITY FRAMEWORK FOR THE PACIFIC**

This framework, developed by the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, provides a common foundation and strategic guidance for improving the understanding, planning, and implementation of human security approaches in stand-alone and broader peace, security and development initiatives in the unique Pacific context.

---

**INTERCONNECTED AND INTERDEPENDENT ELEMENTS FOR STRENGTHENING HUMAN SECURITY IN THE PACIFIC**

- Political Security
- Economic Security
- Community, Family, Personal Security
- Environmental Security
- Social Fulfilment

**Principles of Pacific human security**

- Preventative
- Localised
- Collaborative
- People-centred
- Inclusive

Source: PIFS

In the framework, there are five intertwining elements for strengthening human security in the Pacific. By addressing human security, the framework emphasises the specific vulnerabilities that the Pacific region faces and how this impacts individual safety and wellbeing.

Political security entails good governance as well as democratic structures and processes. Economic security relates to employment, human capital and sustainable resource extraction. Community, family and personal security addresses crime prevention, freedom from fear, inter-ethnic and inter-sectarian harmony and conflict resolution mechanisms. Environmental security relates to conservation and disaster risk management including climate change. Social fulfilment refers to human capital as well as the free flow of information and the preservation and development of culture, tradition and identity.

The framework also outlines principles for actors seeking to improve human security when engaging in peace, security and development initiatives in the region. There is a strong focus on prevention tactics, which require the tracking of changes in violent conflict along with establishing early warning strategies, facilitating community cooperation, proactively addressing emerging tensions and quickly resolving outbreaks of violent conflict. Violent conflict is addressed by determining root causes and providing justice responses as well as making conflict sensitive policy decisions. Some of these principles align with the emerging United Nations sustaining peace agenda.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES

All countries have the potential for human security issues to emerge from changes or challenges to the environment. However, like other Small Island Developing States (SIDS), the Pacific faces particular issues due to the high prevalence of environmental shocks. This is exacerbated by emerging threats posed by climate change to the populations of the region.

The Pacific region is highly vulnerable to natural disasters such as flooding, droughts, cyclones, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and tsunamis.14 These can have catastrophic consequences for the population. On 13 March 2015, Cyclone Pam devastated the islands of Vanuatu in killing 11 people and leaving thousands homeless.26 It was the most powerful cyclone ever to hit the Pacific region with an estimated 90 per cent of subsistence crops lost and a damages bill estimated at over US$590M.36 Nearly three years later, the country is still recovering from the devastating impacts of the cyclone. The Pacific is also earthquake-prone with many islands directly above fault lines.37 The 2009 tsunami, which hit Samoa, American Samoa and Tonga, highlights the immense potential impacts from these natural disasters. In Samoa alone, the tsunami killed 150 people and left homeless 5,300 people (or 2.5 per cent of the population) as well as extensively damaging the country’s infrastructure.18

As well as natural disasters, the Pacific faces precarious water issues. Many Pacific Islands are heavily reliant on rainfall for their water consumption and agricultural needs and are thus highly vulnerable to rainfall extremes associated with droughts and rain-induced flooding.39 Contamination of the water table means land can become completely inhospitable. For example, Kiribati’s highly porous soil can easily result in their bore water becoming contaminated by human remains, human and animal waste and increasing salinity from rising sea levels. The 2012 Pacific Islands Regional Climate Assessment (PIRCA) found that droughts have been more frequent and more prolonged in the region since 1950.40 This will likely lead to an increased risk of food and water shortages, malnutrition and water and food-borne diseases41 as well as increased livestock deaths, higher risks of wildfire and widespread water stress. Issues associated with climate change and losses from natural disasters are not included within SDG16 but are represented through other SDG indicators that have been prioritised by the region.

Most research to-date has concluded that climate change is not a cause of conflict in and of itself, but rather acts as a threat multiplier exacerbating already existing underlying grievances. In the Pacific, these grievances are often related to ethnic tensions, land ownership and resource scarcity.42 Although the full extent of the impacts is hard to predict, there is an overwhelming consensus surrounding the significant, negative impacts of the changing environment as a result of man-made climate change.43 These impacts can form negative feedback loops with one another and further reinforce the adverse effects that they cause. For example, the loss of land to rising sea levels or environmental disasters forces migration and erodes food security, not only in the directly impacted regions, but also in the areas to which the migrants relocate. This is not an imaginary threat: between 1993 and 2010 the global sea level rose with the highest rise taking place in the Western Pacific.44

The intersection of vulnerability to climate change and broader institutional or socio-economic fragilities drives the potential for conflict and violence. Further, less developed and most fragile states are most vulnerable to climate change.45 In the Pacific region, the most obvious and immediate consequences of climate change are rising sea levels, water resource impacts, agricultural production decline and human health challenges. Table 2.1 shows the Insularity Index of Pacific Island countries and territories. This measures susceptibility to rising sea levels. It is a measure of the ratio of coastline length to land area, where a higher value indicates a greater threat from rising sea levels.46

Many climate-affected populations are at high-risk of becoming forced migrants.47 This is due to increased frequency of natural and climate-driven disasters, loss of land to rising sea-levels, and the loss of ecosystem services including food, water, fuel, as well as cultural heritage through pollution, overexploitation, disease and heightened social tensions.48 Although it is difficult to accurately measure the extent of future population displacement due to climate change, estimates for the Pacific Islands nations range from the moderate (665,000 displaced people) to the extreme (1.725 million displaced people). Table 2.2 shows estimates of population displacements based on 2050 population projection data.49 In both the best and
TABLE 2.1
SUSCEPTIBILITY TO RISING SEA LEVELS ACROSS THE PACIFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES &amp; TERRITORIES</th>
<th>Insularity index (coastline length/land area x 100)</th>
<th>Population density (people per square kilometre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated States of Micronesia</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Marianas Islands</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis and Futuna</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNDP

worst case scenarios, the entire population of atoll islands will need to move.

What is well understood is that a confluence of factors including low lying land masses, high population densities and high population growth rates will contribute to the degree of population displacement. The issue of forced migration will more intensely felt in countries with high degrees of urbanisation as migration tends to see a shift from rural outlying areas towards city centres. The period known as ‘the Tensions’ in the Solomon Islands in the late 1990s is often portrayed as a purely ethnic conflict. Yet an in-depth analysis by the Solomon Islands Government in collaboration with the UNDP found a number of contributing factors including the combination of forced migration and unequal access to scarce resources. The subsequent bloodshed resulted in hundreds of deaths, as well as the displacement of more than 30,000 people during a five year period. Water scarcity issues have also caused conflicts in Fiji, Kiribati and Papua New Guinea. This issue is being addressed by PIFS through the report “Promoting Human Security and Minimizing Conflict Associated with Forced Migration in the Pacific Region.”

Forced migration may exacerbate land tenure grievances, ethnic tensions, access to resources and gender-based violence; all of which increase levels of violence and conflict in the Pacific. The forced re-population of Banabans to Fiji after the Second World War highlights the complexity of this issue. Although not due to climate change, the forced migration of Banabans resulted in land rights issues, as well as ethnic tensions in Rabi – the island to which they were relocated. More recently, this link between migration and conflict played out in New Caledonia in 2001 but on a much smaller scale. The violent confrontation between native New Caledonian Kanaks and Wallisian migrants led to about a dozen wounded and killed.
FIGURE 2.6
ESTIMATED POPULATION DISPLACEMENT DUE TO CLIMATE CHANGE

An estimated range of between 665,000 and 1,725,000 people will be displaced from the Pacific Islands in the coming years.

![Figure 2.6: Estimated Population Displacement Due to Climate Change]

Source: LSE

**LAND DISPUTES**

Land and associated access rights are the primary driver of resource conflicts in the Pacific. Land disputes between customary landowners, the government and foreign or local investors have the potential of spiralling into violence. Land disputes take the form of administrative disputes (usually between customary landowners and the government), tenure and ownership disputes and disputes over land boundaries.55

Data from the Fiji Bureau of Statistics reveals that the greatest number of recorded offences consistently relate to property and land. In the 10 years to 2014, over 100,000 property crimes were recorded out of a total 185,000 crimes. However, many of these crimes are not necessarily land disputes but property related crimes.

The Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) shows that land disputes have been increasing in many places across the Pacific. Figure 2.7 shows that the majority of households moves in Vanuatu in the last five years have been for work reasons, including looking for work. In 2005, land-disputes accounted for the movement of six per cent of households with this figure increasing to eight per cent in 2010.

There is evidence that land disputes have been increasing in recent decades.56 In the 2009-2010 PNG Household Income and Expenditure Survey, 23 per cent of households reported having a dispute related to land in the last year. This was the largest factor of dispute, followed by disputes related to domestic violence, at nine per cent. Of those reporting disputes related to land, 41 per cent reported that the dispute was with another family member and 19 per cent said with another village. In contrast, only 0.5 per cent reported having a dispute with a company or business, and one per cent reported the dispute as being with some level of government.57 It is likely that these types of disputes would be higher in countries with proportionally greater tourism and foreign investment. The results of land disputes were also not inconsequential, with 24.5 per cent of the respondents reporting property damage, 19.2 per cent reporting injury and 6.8 per cent reporting a death as a result of the dispute. Land disputes have the potential to be violent and so any focus on peace and justice in the Pacific should include some reference to land.
The second biggest defined category for a household leaving was land disputes. This has increased from six per cent in 2005 to eight per cent in 2010.

![Figure 2.7: Proportion of Households that have moved in the last five years by reason for leaving in Vanuatu, 2005-2010](image)

GENDER BASED VIOLENCE

Along with land, one of the largest forms of violence in the Pacific is intimate partner violence and violence against women. In 2010, the World Health Organisation estimated that over a third of women in the Pacific had experienced intimate partner violence. Intimate partner violence takes the form of both physical and sexual violence in many countries according to national level surveys based on the WHO Multi-country Study on Women’s Health and Domestic Violence against Women. Of countries with available data, Fiji had the highest percentage of women reporting physical violence at over 60 per cent, whereas Solomon Islands had the highest reports of sexual violence at 55 per cent. The combined results of these surveys is shown in Figure 2.8, which shows the variation in levels of physical and sexual violence across the region.58

As well as intimate partner violence, there are high levels of rape across the Pacific and in particular Vanuatu where 28 per cent of women were reportedly forced into their first sexual experience. In the Solomon Islands and Kiribati this figure was slightly lower at 21 per cent and 20 per cent respectively however, these levels are much higher than the global average.

Research conducted in the region has identified a number of driving factors behind the high rates of

... over a third of women in the Pacific had experienced intimate partner violence
gender-based violence. These include economic dependence and poverty, the low social status of women and girls, sexual double standard and a lack of sexual and reproductive health education.\textsuperscript{59} Gender-based violence is also linked to alcohol and drugs abuse and other forms of violence common within the Pacific. While the prevalence and accessibility to hard drugs remains low, this area will pose a significant future challenge for the Pacific. Similarly, gambling is an emerging regional issue, which is an exacerbating factor for intimate partner violence.

In the Pacific, attitudinal data shows that for certain categories more women consider beatings by a husband justified than men in the same age cohorts. For example, a 2009 survey in Samoa found that 4.6 per cent of men and 17.2 per cent of women agreed with the statement that ‘it is justified for a husband to beat his wife if she refuses to have sex with him.’ Similarly, the 2015 Demographic Health Survey for Solomon Islands found nearly eight in ten women agreed with at least one of the specified justifications for wife beating. By comparison, close to six in ten men in Solomon Islands agree with at least one specified justification for wife beating.\textsuperscript{60} These justifications include refusing to have sex, neglecting the children, going out without informing the husband, arguing with the husband and burning food. This is a notable increase from about seven in ten women in 2006–2007 and indicates that the majority of women still believe that violence against women is justified under certain circumstances.

The lack of systematically comparable data across the region on violence against women directly speaks to the deficiencies in being able to collect data related to indicator 3 of SDG 16’s first target: 16.1.3 Percentage of the population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months. Gender based violence and intimate partner violence are highly prevalent in the Pacific and SDG16 offers an opportunity to focus on progress to reduce regional levels of violence. Gender based violence will also be measured through SDG Goal 5 which aims to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.8.png}
\caption{Percentage of women, 15-49, reporting physical violence & sexual violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime according to available data}
\end{figure}

Fiji has the highest proportion of women reporting physical intimate partner violence, and Solomon Islands has the highest rates of sexual violence. Kiribati has the second highest levels of physical and sexual intimate partner violence. The global average for either physical or sexual violence is around 33 per cent of women.
THE LINK BETWEEN SDG16 & OTHER SDGs

The underperformance of conflict-affected or fragile states at the conclusion of the MDG process highlighted the importance of peace, justice and strong institutions in achieving development goals. It will therefore be important to recognise which SDG targets and goals most directly relate to peace to help attain development gains and build resilience.

Whilst the SDGs are purposely integrated and indivisible with strong performance in all indicators necessary for sustaining peace, there are certain SDG targets that specifically relate to peace. For example, some targets seek to reduce the drivers of violence and impediments for peace while others seek to strengthen dispute resolution mechanisms and improve access to justice.

We know violence is partly driven by inequality, both economic and social, coupled with widespread lack of resources and limited access to basic services. These drivers are addressed in SDG1, which aims to eliminate poverty in all its forms and which includes equal rights to economic resources, basic services, ownership and control over land and other resources. SDG5 addresses the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, including ending violence and harmful practices. SDG10 similarly sets out to achieve economic, social and political equality and inclusion for all irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status. Adding to this, SDG8 focusing on achieving full employment, providing equal pay and decent work for all. SDG16 is closely intertwined with these goals and advances representative decision-making at all levels and equal access to justice for all.

SDGs 13, 15 and 16 also target the drivers of conflict and seek to reduce transnational stress. SDG13 aims to strengthen national resilience and capacity for dealing with climate-related and other natural disasters, while SDG15 addresses ending the illegal poaching and trafficking of precious wildlife products. In a similar vein, SDG 16 pushes for international cooperation in dealing with violence, crime and terrorism.

Several SDGs also encourage positive peace targets, strengthening dispute resolution mechanisms and access to justice. SDG4 aims to ‘ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development’ importantly including promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence. SDG16 pushes for participatory and representative decision-making and the domestic and international promotion of the rule of law as well as equal access to justice for all.

The attainment of peace, justice and strong institutions are clearly recognised in other SDGs. This highlights that the SDGs themselves are indivisible and there is need to focus on all SDGs. Further, the experience of the MDGs highlighted how peace is necessary to achieve development, and hence a focus on SDG16 is required to achieve the other SDG goals.

FIGURE 2.9
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SDG16 AND OTHER SDGS

Whilst all SDGs relate to each other, SDG16 has stronger relationships with some goals. SDG16 is particularly significant for SDG1 that seeks to eliminate all poverty, SDG 4 that focuses on quality education, SDG5 that focuses on gender equality, SDG8 the focuses on economic growth and SDG10 that seeks to reduce inequality.

Source: IEP
DATA COLLECTION

Measuring progress for different indicators requires enough rounds of data collection to be able to compare changes in performance. For the MDGs, at least three periods were required: the baseline prior to start of the MDGs; the mid-point between 2000 and 2014; and the latest data point to determine the most recent level of performance. However, most Pacific nations did not have at least three data points for indicators measuring the MDGs. For example, no country in the Pacific had baseline data for all indicators used to measure MDGs 1, 5, 6 and 7. The only two countries that were deemed to have achieved the MDGs, Cook Islands and Niue, similarly did not have three periods of data for many measures.

In Cook Islands, there was only one year of data for seven of the nine indicators used to measure MDG1 with the remaining two indicators not measured. The collection date for the majority of these indicators was the 2005-6 Household Income and Expenditure Survey.61 This means that progress assessment for the Cook Islands was determined on one year of data that was almost a decade old when the MDGs were supposed to have been reached in 2015. Similarly, in Niue there was one or no data points for eight of the nine indicators for measuring MDG1, with five data points derived from 2002.

For the countries that were deemed to have not met the MDGs, there is even greater data scarcity. This highlights one of the fundamental issues with international goals in the Pacific: the lack of regular and reliable data collections. Table 3.1 shows the country MDG progress reports by year across the Pacific from 2000-2015. These reports show the progress a country has made in each of the MDGs and includes the trends in various indicators. In the Pacific, seven countries released only one report and seven countries released two reports. Tonga was the only country to release more than two reports. In contrast, across the Asia Pacific region, seven nations (Bhutan, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines and Vietnam) had five national MDG reports between 2000-2015. This reflects a regional trend that the Pacific either did not prioritise or lacked sufficient data to release regular progress reports. No country released a national MDG progress report prior to 2004. Many countries in the region only began prioritising the MDGs in the build-up to the MDG Review Summit in 2010.62 The member countries of the Pacific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PIFS
There are three data collections recommended to be undertaken yearly, one collection to be undertaken every two years, six collections every five years and a census every decade.

Islands Forum Secretariat committed to tracking the progress of the MDGs at the 2009 Forum Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination.

A lack of financial, technical and human capital resources in many countries in the Pacific has meant that countries often struggle to meet the statistical demands placed on them both nationally and by international organisations and initiatives. The MDGs were set without consultation with developing nations and imposed significant reporting requirements. This stimulated several capacity building initiatives in the region led by the PARIS21 initiative.

The SDGs, whilst being more representative of developing states’ priorities, quadruple the number of required indicators to be collected. A consensus exists that even well-off nations will struggle to report on all indicators in a timely fashion, if at all. It is unlikely that the same issues that impeded measurement of progress of the MDGs in the Pacific have been fully resolved for the SDGs.

The Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data’s recommendation for data collection for the SDGs, based on the experiences of the MDGs, is reproduced in Figure 3.1.

It highlights the sheer volume of surveys and censuses needed to accurately track progress of the SDGs. This is only for Tier I and II indicators. The Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG) classified these indicators as having lower barriers to measurement based on their level of methodological development and current data availability. Tier I indicators are conceptually clear, have an internationally established methodology and standards available and data is regularly produced by countries for at least 50 per cent of countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant. Tier II indicator are conceptually clear, have an internationally established methodology and standards available but data is not regularly produced by countries. Tier III means there is no internationally established methodology or standards yet available for the indicator, but methodologies and standards are being, or will be, developed or tested.

Tier III indicators are those where there is no established methodology or where standards are being developed. A significant proportion of Tier III indicators are not yet measured in any capacity and hence will likely require additional and potentially specific data collection. Over a third of the 230 indicators required to measure the SDGs are...
There are in total 83 indicators that are classified as Tier III. This is over one third of the entire SDGs classified as Tier III. It will likely take some time before methodologies can be determined for measuring many Tier III indicators. This will add to the statistical burden of many countries. For example, it is expected that the methodological work on the seven Tier III indicators for SDG16 will be completed towards the end of 2017.64 It will then take countries some time to implement these methodologies within their data collection systems. This could occur by adding to already arranged data collections or developing bespoke data collections for these new indicators.

As shown in Figure 3.2, seven of the 23 indicators for SDG16 are not currently being measured across the world. Third party producers of data will be required to fill this gap while Tier III indicators are developed. This is particularly true in the Pacific where National Statistics Offices have low levels of statistical capacity.

Table 3.2 shows the aspirational upcoming statistical collections for Pacific Island countries and territories until 2022, as of the 7th of June 2017.65 Potential shortcomings in data collection emerge when the planned statistical collections is compared to the program of censuses and surveys recommended by the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data. Fifteen of the 16 Pacific Island countries and territories have at least one census planned. Wallis and Futuna is the only countries without a planned census. Notably, five countries have censuses planned every five years: Cook Islands, Kiribati, Palau, Samoa and Tonga. If censuses in these countries continue at a similar rate, there could be sufficient data to have at least three data points by 2026.

Although a Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) should ideally occur every two to three years, only three Pacific Island countries or territories have one planned in the eight-year period. Similarly, it is recommended labour force surveys and agricultural surveys occur every year but only three countries have scheduled a labour force survey and only two countries have scheduled an agricultural census.

No country or territory in the Pacific fulfils the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data’s recommendations for data collection frequency. Countries range from no major statistical collections planned to four data collections. Nauru has a mini-census planned in 2022 and so will be unlikely to organically measure SDG indicators without supplementary data collections. Three countries have four planned major data collections that could contribute to tracking SDG progress (assuming SDG-relevant data will be collected). Kiribati, Samoa and Tonga all have two censuses planned: a Household Income...
and Expenditure Survey and either a Demographic and Health Survey or a Labour Force Survey. However, planned data collection will not necessarily collect the relevant indicators for measuring the SDGs. These four planned statistical collections were not scheduled specifically in response to the SDGs, but rather reflect national and regional priorities in data collection for effective governance. As it stands, the region will be unable to deliver on data collection requirements of the SDGs using planned major statistical collections. Table 3.2 also demonstrates the significant differences across the region in planned data collections, suggesting that the experience of the MDGs whereby not all countries are able to report on many indicators will continue with the SDGs.

No country or territory in the Pacific will be able to measure all the SDGs based on currently planned data collections. Supplementary collections will likely be necessary.
Measuring progress in the SDGs will require significant investment to enhance statistical capacity in most Pacific Island countries and territories. This is particularly so given that a third of indicators are not currently measured in any country. The Pacific has lower statistical capacity than other regions, so the financial burden to increase capacity to measure the SDGs will likely be substantial.

A combination of limited technical resources and human capital resources limits the statistical capacity of Pacific Island countries and territories to collect the required data should they have the financial means to do so. Figure 3.3 shows the individual country scores for the World Bank’s Statistical Capacity Indicator, as compared to the global average for non-high-income countries. This composite score tries to assess a country’s statistical system based on methodology, data sources and periodicity and timeliness.

Figure 3.3 shows that even Fiji, which scores the highest in the region, has a statistical capacity below the global average for non-high-income countries. For example, a post-MDGs review of data collection efforts in the Marshall Islands found that most government agencies from which data is required to be collected simply do not have data collection systems in place due to planning, funding and staff shortages. Furthermore, even where data did exist, it was problematic: birth data, for example, was collected in three different databases; but none of which were consistent.

The Pacific also underperforms in other measures of statistical capacity. Platform for Innovations in Statistics (PISTA) is associated with PARIS21 and has measures of statistical capacity in official statistics to encourage innovative approaches in National Statistical Systems. It includes measures of statistical capacity assessments to comprehensively gauge different official statistic capabilities. This includes measures that assess the engagement by statistical offices in disseminating information (with methods ranging from the currency of websites to functional information such as data accessibility and the availability of tailored

### FIGURE 3.3

**WORLD BANK STATISTICAL CAPACITY INDICATOR**

All countries in the Pacific are below the statistical capacity of the global average for non-high-income countries.

Source: World Bank
Pacific island countries and territories perform lower on most of the alternative measures of statistical capacity and engagement than other countries.

Governance related indicators include details relating to legislation, organisation and the budgetary measures. The Pacific underperforms in all three measures by at least 18 per cent. The worst performing measure relates to the details of budgets. Only 11 per cent of NSOs for the Pacific had details on budgets as opposed to 35 per cent for all other countries. This is particularly notable as there have been historical concerns regarding corruption in many Pacific Islands. Papua New Guinea, for example, ranked 136 out of 176 countries in Transparency International’s 2016 Corruption Perceptions Index. The Pacific also underperforms in other data accessibility measures, such as whether data is in a processing-friendly format or users can tailor data.

Similarly, the measure assessing whether vital statistics exist is much lower in the Pacific than in other countries. Civil registration and vital statistics systems register all births and deaths, issue birth and death certificates and compile vital statistics including deaths. According to data from Platform for Innovations in Statistics (PISTA) by PARIS21, civil registrations and vital statistics are present in 32 per cent of countries in the Pacific, as opposed to 48 per cent for the rest of the world. Six of the 19 Pacific island countries and territories measure civil registrations and vital statistics: American Samoa, Fiji, Guam, Marshall Islands, New Caledonia and Niue. While other countries do record civil registration and vital statistics, the spread and reliability of this data is low and is frequently marked by wide variations. For example, in Vanuatu in 2013 it was estimated the proportion of recorded birth registrations in children under age five improved from 40 per cent to over 80 per cent. In Kiribati this figure improved from 68 per cent to 82 per cent. The majority of countries or territories in the Pacific do not have the most basic statistical facilities required to provide an accurate measure of the population between surveys with annual population estimates undertaken centrally by SPC. This is particularly significant, as 96 of the SDG indicators require some form of population data.
Other measures of statistical capacity are also weaker in the Pacific. On average, Pacific nations have four micro data sets available and one that is accessible. In contrast, the global average stands at 24 and 13 respectively. According to PISTA, only Fiji and Samoa have civil society organisations active in statistics.

Human capital limitations, as measured by various indicators including overall youth well-being and secondary school enrolment rates,\(^6\) influences the region’s statistical capacity deficit. There are fewer people in the Pacific with statistical skills, knowledge and experience than other regions in the world, which partly reflects the smaller population sizes and GDP.

Figure 3.5 shows individual scores for Pacific Islands with available relevant data according to the 2016 Human Development Index and as compared to the global average. The Human Development Index is a multi-dimensional composite index measuring three basic dimensions of human development in 188 countries. These dimensions are a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living. Only Palau, Fiji and Tonga score above the global average. These three countries also are the only countries that have over 10.5 mean years of schooling, close to the Europe and Central Asia average. The lower levels of human development in the majority of the Pacific Island countries and territories, as compared to the global average, reflect lower levels of human capital. Investments in human capital will likely have substantial flow-on effects, including for statistical capacity as more people are trained to undertake the skilled work of compiling and generating official statistics.

**FINANCIAL BURDEN**

It is difficult to measure the exact cost of data collection for the SDGs for the period from 2015-2030. The Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data initiative estimates that the cost of collecting data on Tier I and Tier II indicators of the SDGs for the 77 countries eligible for International Development Assistance (IDA) is $1.2

---

**FIGURE 3.5**

**HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX SCORE, 2016**

Many countries in the Pacific are below the global average for the Human Development Index. This is a proxy measure of levels of human capital and reflects another challenge in developing statistical capacity in these countries.
Eleven of the 19 countries and regions in the Pacific which PARIS21 assess do not have a strategy for developing statistical capacity.

![NSDS Status Diagram]

Source: PISTA

The cost of data collection varies by country population amongst other things, so this estimate could actually be higher for countries where there are greater costs associated with data collection. While reliable data is not available to provide a per country estimate for the Pacific region, Fiji provides an illuminating example. The total cost for MDG data collection in Fiji over the period from 1990-2015 was estimated at USD$28.25M or USD$1.13M per year. This is USD$63,000 per year, per target. The annual budget for the Fijian statistical office for the 2016-2017 period is FJD$13.8 million (USD$6.61 million) of which FJD$7.9 million (USD$3.78 million) is allocated towards the national census. Thus, the Fijian Statistical Office would have allocated at least one-sixth of its annual budget to monitor the 18 targets of the MDGs.

Based on the experience of the MDGs in the Pacific, as well as estimates from the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data, it is likely that there will be substantial costs associated with measuring the SDGs in the Pacific. This shows the need for donor investments, as well as the introduction of cheaper and innovative data collections to ensure the costs are not prohibitive. This is particularly true for the Pacific where there are significant and unique challenges for data collection.

Reflecting this need for enhancing the statistical capacity of many countries, PARIS21 has been working with countries to develop National Strategies for the Development of Statistics (NSDS). This will help grow capacity for countries to have nationally owned and produced data; thereby allowing them to meet the requirements to identify national and regional needs and develop data-driven effective policies for development and poverty reduction. These NSDS plans assist in developing data production units, addressing analysis and use of data issues as well as aligning policies towards international standards. The NSDS outlines strategies for developing statistical capacity across the entire national statistical system with a 5-10 year outlook. According to PARIS21, these strategies are necessary to develop a comprehensive and unified framework for continual assessment of evolving user needs and priorities for statistics and for building the capacity needed to meet these needs in a more coordinated, synergistic and efficient manner.

PARIS21 monitors the development and implementation of statistical plans for 19 countries and regions in the Pacific. Of these, 11 do not have a
strategy for developing statistical capacity. However, eight of these countries are making efforts to formalise a strategy. Fiji is currently designing its strategy, which will run until 2020 and both the Federated States of Micronesia and Tuvalu have planned a strategy. Tonga is also in the process of developing a new strategy that will cover 2017-2025. A further three Pacific Islands had a strategy but it has now expired. Additionally, two of the most populated countries in the Pacific, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands, have completed plans which are awaiting adoption. Only three Pacific Islands have an active NSDS plan: Cook Islands, Samoa and Vanuatu. The development and implementation of NSDS is a vital preliminary step in developing the statistical capacity of the Pacific. The NSDS is a focused approach which examines the elements of a national statistics system most in need of further attention and resources.

There has also been a regional push to enhance statistical capacity. SPC has also been involved with the Ten-Year Pacific Statistics Strategy (TYPSS) 2011–2020, which provides a blueprint for greater regional leadership of statistical developments and operations. The first of three phases was completed in 2014, the second phase completed by 2017 and the final phase is planned for completion by 2020. The first phase focused on governance, including ensuring statistical data is collected when scheduled; capacity development across the region, which also entailed introducing new and innovative statistical tools and systems and agreeing on a set of core statistics across different sectors. The second phase focused in part on implementing region-wide statistical systems and expanding the range of countries that can undertake timely GDP estimates. SPC has also been involved in developing the Pacific Vital Statistics Action Plan.

In addition to issues related to statistical capacity and the financing of data collections, the Pacific region faces many unique geographic and demographic data-related challenges. While some countries are able to conduct national censuses every five years with relative ease and efficiency, censuses present an extraordinary challenge for many small island developing states. For example, in the 2000 census round, the coverage and the quality of the census data was compromised by lack of geographic identifiers and vast distances.

There is also a large geographical and demographic diversity within the region. Many Pacific Islands are sparsely populated across many different islands. This increases the costs and logistical challenges associated with data collection and compounds the statistical burden for these countries.

The Pacific Islands region is comprised of several thousand islands spread out over 34 million square kilometres of ocean. The total population of the Pacific Island countries and territories, estimated at 11.4 million, is dispersed across these islands and atolls that span an area one-third of the globe's surface. While some nations, such as Nauru, are relatively more contained in their territorial boundaries, others are more spread out. For example, the Republic of Kiribati consists of 26 inhabited islands with a land area of only 810.5 square kilometres but spread over five million square kilometres of the central Pacific Ocean.

Furthermore, six countries or territories account for 92 per cent of the population of the region: Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, New Caledonia and French Polynesia. Papua New Guinea alone has over eight million people and accounts for 71 per cent of the region's population. This variation in geography and population density presents enormous challenges in terms of data collection, transport and communication.

According to population estimates from the Food and Agriculture Organisation and World Bank, the Pacific region has among the lowest levels of population density as measured by people per square kilometre of land area. The least densely populated Pacific Islands feature the largest populations but also the largest land mass and hence reflect widely dispersed populations. Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu have less than 22 people per square kilometre and Fiji has 49 people per square kilometre. Countries like Bangladesh have over 1,000 people per square kilometre. In contrast, countries with smaller populations can have much denser populations due to a smaller land mass. The most densely populated
Six of the Pacific Island countries and territories account for 92% of the population of the Pacific, with Papua New Guinea alone accounting for 71%.

Countries of Tuvalu and Nauru have around 10,000 people in total in each country. In 2015, Kiribati had an estimated 139 people per square kilometre, which is almost triple the number from 1961. Likewise, Nauru expanded from 234 people per square kilometre to 624 people in 2015.

One measure that reflects the spread of population is the proportion of the population that lives in urban areas as shown in Figure 3.9. This is calculated by the number of people living in urban areas divided by the total population and multiplied by 100. The most populated countries have among the smallest proportions of the population living in urban areas. For example, the majority of populations in Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu are rural. This has substantial implications for data collection. Highly rural population increase the costs associated with data collection, as there are greater travel requirements for undertaking censuses and other large-scale data collections. It also raises logistical challenges, particularly with full population surveys, in ensuring all areas are fully captured.

There are also significant privacy implications that arise from either small or geographically diverse populations as people can be easily identified when data is disaggregated. This means that often collected data cannot be shared, even across government.
departments or agencies due to privacy concerns. For example, the 2013 constitution of Fiji outlines a right to privacy and the Statistics Act (Cap 71) significantly restricts certain data from being published or shown to any person not employed to undertake the census. Similar clauses exist in other countries. The Pacific United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) is currently undertaking a project examining data availability, sharing agreements and quality.

The region’s expansive geography has also contributed to extremely high levels of diversity in terms of cultures, ethnicities and languages. There are an estimated 1,200 languages spoken across the Pacific. There are at least 830 living languages in Papua New Guinea alone. This raises substantial linguistic challenges for censuses data collections teams. The 2017 mini-census for Vanuatu highlights some of these challenges. Along with the associated costs to traveling to Vanuatu’s 65 inhabited islands, there are additional costs and challenges associated with the diversity of languages and cultures. For some people, a visit by the census team could be the only involvement they have with the government in any form for many years. Recognising this and the necessity to build trust for the census to be successful, the Vanuatu NSO tries to ensure that the census team visiting each area also be able to speak in the local language, which increases the logistical challenges with data collection.

**REGULAR COLLECTION OF STATISTICS**

These geographic, cultural and linguistic challenges influence collection capacity and combined this issues collectively hamper the regular and reliable collection of key statistics. With dispersed and largely rural populations, the government and its representatives are not present everywhere. There are centre-periphery issues with government resources focused on urban areas rather than rural and remote areas. This has implications for statistical capacity due to the absence of regular official data collections undertaken through civil registration systems.

An example of some of the issues for regular collection of data in the Pacific region are seen in ‘cause of death’ data. Knowing the cause of death is a requirement of at least seven of the SDG targets, disaggregated by age-groups, sex and types of causes. Two of the targets for SDG16 require countries to routinely produce data on the cause of death: Target 16.1.1 Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age; and Target 16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause. In order to accurately measure and monitor the scale of mortality by cause, a country must have a well-functioning civil registration system that, through a standardised approach of certification and coding, captures both the cause and mode of death. The World Health Organisation has developed guidance and tools for measuring, monitoring and evaluating this data with a universally applicable framework for certifying and coding deaths.

Most Pacific Island countries and territories do not regularly record causes of death and thus lack good quality data on the cause of death. However, the continual recording of statistics have different dynamics than large-scale surveys or censuses, which hamper the statistical quality and capacity of many countries. For ‘cause of death’ data, the lack of a standardised format for recording cause of death information, which is in part due to poor medical certification practices, is problematic. Many countries tend to group causes of death due to injuries in the general category of “External causes of mortality” rather than specifying particular causes of death. The collection of this detailed data would be illuminating for measuring the relevant SDG indicators. Thus, there is inadequate capacity in coding of causes of death in accordance to the World Health Organisation’s international standard for classification of morbidity and mortality. There is the added requirement to record the mode of death as well as the cause.

Causes of death related to injuries are often poorly reported in the Pacific. There are two main reasons for this. First, when the death is certified, the cause of injury may be listed without information about how the injury occurred (such as from a traffic-related incident, assault, fall or other causes). Second, the death occurred without health personnel present and a medical certificate was subsequently not completed.

Researchers have identified key weaknesses in mortality reporting systems in the Pacific. Societal issues, include private land burials without official approval are a key weakness as ultimately there are no death records for a significant number of deceased. There are also administrative concerns including inadequate or inconsistent implementation of laws regarding death records. Furthermore, there is often an onus on citizens to report deaths, which given the government’s limited local presence, can lead to underreporting of deaths as the process is perceived as burdensome.
Another administrative issue is that statistical reporting requirements are rather complex, which again leads to underreporting of deaths. Other problems include inadequate coordination with private health institutions and delineated responsibility across public institutions, which leads to task duplication and no reconciled mortality dataset. In many countries, there is an improper emphasis on community nurses to report cause of death.

Technical issues also exist and include the lack of routinely tabulated medical certificates and a high turnover of trained staff. Statistical analysis is limited to the ten leading causes of death, which encourages the selection of generic descriptions that offer little analytical value. There is often insufficient data quality assessment and control as well as the use of either outdated or dysfunctional software programs that cannot be modified or upgraded.

Furthermore, there are gaps in ownership throughout the mortality reporting system that dissuade accurate and timely information. Many systems are highly dependent on one or two key individuals with a strong interest in providing health data and there is generally poor feedback to local level staff about the significance of recording mortality data. Hence, statistical capacity development for the Pacific needs to include National Statistics Offices but also all levels of the civil registration and vital statistics system.

One measure that reflects the spread of population is the proportion of the population that lives in urban areas as shown in Figure 3.9.
TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS

Mobile phone technology offers a potential solution to some of the geographic challenges associated with data collection, and indeed the Pacific Island countries and territories are increasingly undergoing an information communication and technology revolution.79 By 2014, estimates of mobile phone penetration rates stood at 37 per cent, which is an increase from under ten per cent in 2006. Although the 2014 rate was still below the global average of 50 per cent, the growth rate between 2009 and 2014 was 12.6 per cent, which is well ahead of the global average of 7.2 per cent. In 2014, subscriber penetration rates varied from 16 per cent in Micronesia to 80 per cent in New Caledonia, as seen in Figure 3.10.79

Increasing mobile penetration coupled with the uptake of more modern mobile technology including the move from 2G to 4G, account for an increase in internet penetration rates with this trend likely to continue. In 2007, only 1.5 per cent of the Pacific population had internet access. In 2015, this figure grew to 29.8 per cent although there is significant variation between countries as seen in Figure 3.11.

The combination of increased mobile and internet penetration could overcome some of the geographic, monetary and communication challenges associated with data collection and this report recommends harnessing this technology for data collection purposes. For example, the 2016 Tonga census, the 2016 Vanuatu mini-census and the 2017 Tuvalu mini-census used electronic tablets for data collection.

Whilst new technologies could potentially help overcome some of the financial and capacity burdens associated with measuring the SDGs, it cannot replace official statistics.80 New data sources should complement official statistics as outlined by the UN in the March 2017 Action Plan for Sustainable Development Data, which establishes guidelines for generating data outside the official statistical system. For example, many of the novel ways of capturing data have certain preconditions for different societies. There also needs to be relatively high levels of human capital and extensive mobile phone or internet penetration. Both of these measures are underrepresented in the Pacific.

FIGURE 3.10
MOBILE PHONE PENETRATION RATES, 2014

Mobile phone penetration rates vary from 16% to 80%.

Source: GSMA Intelligence
FIGURE 3.11
INTERNET PENETRATION RATES, 2007-2015

Internet rates have been steadily increasing in all countries. Countries that have greater geographic spread, such as Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, tend to have lower internet rates than other countries.

Nevertheless, there have been initiatives to generate data using technology in the Pacific. For example, SPC’s Coastal Fisheries Programme has assisted in measuring current fish stocks and flows across the Pacific by using innovative technologies for developing platforms for reporting as well as monitoring and surveillance. This includes the release of a mobile application ‘PacFishID’ to assist in the identification of finfish species across the Pacific Islands region. Another example is the ‘Phones against corruption’ project in Papua New Guinea with UNDP. This project generated nearly 30,000 SMS from citizens regarding potential cases of corruption as a result of a prompted SMS hotline linked to a survey. The reliance on SMS rather than a smartphone app maximised the reach of the project, as mobile phone penetration is almost five times greater than access rates to mobile broadband. Whilst such projects are undoubtedly, they have limited use for representative surveys and it is doubtful that they could substantially reduce the costs associated with collecting official statistics.

For example, UReport is a free messaging tool that allows young people within a country to express their views through small-scale polls. It is currently active in Papua New Guinea and 39 other mainly African countries. In December 2017 in Papua New Guinea, a poll of 356 people asked whether they had visited a health facility to get a SRH or HIV related service. The results were disaggregated by age, gender and district. Technology can also ensure that data collection is more accurate and reliable, particularly for survey collections. For example, the 2009 Vanuatu census used geographic information system (GIS) technology to determine the exact GPS location of each household with scanning technology enabling the digital capture of written information. Similarly, Tonga experimented with the use of tablet computers to capture census data, which allowed live tracking to detect mistakes and implement corrections. These technological advances can significantly improve data quality.

Nevertheless, these methods can be used as a proxy for performance in certain measures. Initiatives such as those by UNICEF’s Global Innovation Centre are low cost approaches that, whilst not necessarily statistically vigorous, are easily replicated by using mobile phone infrastructure.

Technology can ensure that data collection is more accurate and reliable ...
This standardisation of data helps address one of the most pressing issues relating to the continual recording of data, such as cause of death. The Solomon Islands is currently determining how data captured in this system can be used to measure SDG16 indicators.

In summary, there are significant issues for the Pacific in monitoring progress in the SDGs. The SDGs require a substantial investment in accurate and timely information which, given the limited statistical capacity and the many unique data challenges, will continue to present a challenge in the Pacific. However, new technologies may be able to assist improve the quality of data collection even if it cannot replace official statistics.

The SDGs require a substantial investment in accurate and timely information which, given the limited statistical capacity and the many unique data challenges, will continue to present a challenge in the Pacific.
SECTION IV: DATA AVAILABILITY
MAJOR DATA COLLECTIONS AROUND THE PACIFIC

The lack of data availability in the Pacific presents a major challenge to measuring the SDGs. However, data does exist. Since 2000 there have been censuses conducted in all Pacific Island countries and territories.

Table 4.1 shows the last major data collections across three categories: the census, which should take place every five or ten years; Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HIES), which collect information on income, spending patterns, and living conditions; and Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), which collect information on health and nutrition across the population.

Table 4.1 shows 11 of the 21 Pacific Island countries and territories had a major data collection in either 2015 or 2016. The countries with the most recent major data collections are Tonga and Kiribati, which both had at least two collections in 2015. Nine countries have conducted a survey with DHS questions. The remaining countries and territories have never undertaken this type of survey.

However, the existence of major data collections does not guarantee the capture of data relevant to the SDGs. There is also no guarantee regarding data quality, in particular accuracy at the province and municipality levels. It should also be noted that data can be collected outside the scope of these three major collections.

### TABLE 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES &amp; TERRITORIES</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Household Income &amp; Expenditure Surveys</th>
<th>Demographic &amp; Health Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis and Futuna</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>2010 (US)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td>2010 (US)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>2010 (US)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPC
The first step in attempting to measure SDG16 is to assess the data currently available. Table 4.2 shows the data availability in the Pacific across these 23 indicators. This is an assessment of availability only in relation to the requirements of the indicator. It does not take into account the age or reliability of the data and it is possible that some of the data coded as available is not of sufficient quality or coverage, or is simply too old to be useable.

Furthermore, data coded as available may only provide part coverage and so may not be adequate for determining a national score. For example, there may only be data for the Highlands in Papua New Guinea, which accounts for around 40 per cent of the total population but is likely not representative of the rest of the country. Conversely, data may exists in some countries and territories but it has been coded as not available or unknown.

### TABLE 4.2
**DATA AVAILABILITY OF SDG16 INDICATORS ACROSS THE PACIFIC**

| SDG16 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 8.1 | 9.1 | 10.1 | 10.2 | a.1 | b.1 |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Vanuatu | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Solomon Islands | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Papua New Guinea | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Samoa | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Tonga | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Fiji | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Kiribati | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| FSM | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Marshall Islands | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Tuvalu | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Palau | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Nauru | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Cook Islands | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| French Polynesia | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Guam | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| American Samoa | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Niue | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| New Caledonia | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Wallis and Futuna | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Pitcairn Island | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Tokelau | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |

Source: PIFS

1. Available and fully covers what the indicator measures
2. Available but only partially covers the indicator measure (i.e. not disaggregated, incomplete age breakdown, etc.)
3. Proxy measure available or should be able to be calculated
4. Not available / unknown
No Pacific Island country or territory has data available that fully covers all the indicators required. Measures for 43 per cent of indicators across the Pacific are not available or could not be found. Indicators for which there is a proxy measure or which could be calculated accounted for 25 per cent of all indicators, including assessments on legislation or the demographic breakdown of staff in public institutions. A proxy measure is an indirect and highly correlated measure of the desired outcome. Only 32 per cent of the SDG16 indicators are available or partially available across the Pacific.

Very few countries currently have high levels of data availability across the SDG16 indicators. Vanuatu and Solomon Islands have data available for nearly half of the indicators. These countries differ in coverage by one indicator, 16.9.1 which measures birth registration for children under five. In Vanuatu, the coverage of birth registration is now over 80 per cent. For Solomon Islands, the

FIGURE 4.1  
ASSESSMENT OF DATA AVAILABILITY OF SDG16 INDICATORS ACROSS THE PACIFIC

There are two countries, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands, which have nearly half of indicators as available or partially available. Nine Pacific Island countries or territories do not have more than half of the available indicators. There are two countries, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands, which have nearly half of indicators as available or partially available. Nine Pacific Island countries or territories do not have more than half of the available indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Available / fully covers what the indicator measures</th>
<th>Available / only partially covers the indicator measure (i.e. not disaggregated, incomplete age breakdown, etc.)</th>
<th>Proxy measure available or should be able to be calculated</th>
<th>Not available / unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis and Futuna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitcairn Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ?????????

No Pacific Island country or territory has data available that fully covers all the indicators required.
2015 DHS reported registrations for 88 per cent of births for children under age five years, although only 26 per cent of those registered have a birth certificate.

Both Fiji and Papua New Guinea have nine indicators, which are available or partially available. However, these countries do not have the most recent major data collections and hence a significant number of these indicators will be based on older data.

Nine countries or territories have fewer than half of the indicators for SDG16 available. It is likely that significant data collections will be required in order to determine progress in SDG16. Notably, data for many of the non-sovereign territories could not be found. Eight of the ten Pacific Islands with the lowest data availability for SDG16 are non-sovereign territories and the remaining two, Cook Islands and Niue, are states in free association with New Zealand. This suggests that data capture for these territories for SDG16 relevant indicators are not as common as for the sovereign countries in the Pacific.

Gaps in data are highly consistent across countries. For example, no countries have data for the proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services nor the proportion of the population who believe decision making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group.

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, by age group and sex

The two sources of national level data on homicides are from the criminal justice system and the civil registration system. Homicide figures are generally reported to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) or sourced through estimates from the World Health Organisation (WHO).

The homicide rate across the Pacific varies considerably from nearly 17 per 100,000 in Tuvalu, albeit from a small population, to none in Palau and Niue.

FIGURE 4.2
AVERAGE VIOLENT DEATH RATE PER 100,000, 2010-2015

The average violent death rate varies from a high of 17 in Tuvalu to zero in Palau and Niue. However, rates are skewed by the small populations and the countries with the smallest populations account for the highest and lowest rates.
There is little disaggregated homicide data in the Pacific although some proxy measures are available. Data exists for seven countries on the number of female victims of homicide as shown in Table 4.3. Further development of national civil registration systems will be required to ensure regular and disaggregated reporting of homicides as well as the measurement of violent deaths.

### 16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population (disaggregated by age group, sex and cause)

Since the 1970s, the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) has measured conflict-related deaths via media monitoring and other public sources such as global news database, Factiva. However, this conflict-related deaths data has not been disaggregated by age group, sex and cause of death. Further, as the UCDP database relies on media reportage there is the risk of underreporting in the Pacific due to isolation and the lack of media presence in many areas although this risk of underreporting is low given conflict-related deaths have historically been low in the Pacific.

### 16.1.3 Proportion of the population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months

This indicator is determined by the number of survey respondents who have been victim of physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months, divided by the total number of survey respondents. There is no known comprehensive global data source for this indicator. UNODC currently compiles data from national sources. The International Crime Victimisation Survey does not cover any of the Pacific Islands.

Whilst victimisation surveys have not been undertaken in the Pacific, there are measures of violence against women that have been determined. Two relevant indicators in the SDGs that will be measured in the Pacific region - 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 - could be useful as a proxy for SDG16.1.3. Indicator 5.2.1 is the proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by form of violence and by age. Indicator 5.2.2 is the proportion of women

### TABLE 4.3
NUMBER OF HOMICIDES BY ALL AND FEMALE VICTIMS, 2010-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES &amp; TERRITORIES</th>
<th>Count of all victims</th>
<th>Count of female victims</th>
<th>Disaggregated data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated States of Micronesia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>National Statistics Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polynesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age and place of occurrence.

WHO has undertaken some studies in the Pacific for women’s health and domestic violence and additional studies either have replicated or adapted the methodology of the WHO multi-country study on women’s health and domestic violence. Yet there only one country in the Pacific, Tuvalu in 2007, undertook the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) with the Domestic Violence module. United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and DFAT will further develop data analyse violence against women in the Pacific between 2016 and 2019.

Whilst data on violence against women can act as a useful proxy, SDG16 indicator 16.1.3 requires the measurement of violence against all of the population. This includes violence against men as well as children. These measures need developing to fully determine progress on this indicator.

16.1.4 Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live

Data on the perception of safety comes from Gallup World Poll and covers 122 countries. There is currently no Gallup data for the Pacific.

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 who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month

Four countries have measures of the proportion of children between 2-14 years old who experience any violent discipline (psychological aggression and/or physical punishment). This is an approximate measure of the indicator but does not fully cover the required age range. The source of this data is either Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) or country reports. MICS are surveys implemented by countries with UNICEF to provide internationally comparable, statistically rigorous data on the situation of children and women. Vanuatu undertook a MICS survey in 2007-2008 as well as a DHS in 2013. Beyond this, country reports, such as Fiji’s 2008 ‘Protect me with love and care’ report.
developed a baseline for the levels of violence, abuse and exploitation of children in Fiji.88

16.2.2 Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age group and form of exploitation

UNODC has historically covered instances of trafficking in Cook Islands, French Polynesia, FSM, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, New Caledonia, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu.89 The 2017 Trafficking in Persons report by the US State Department covers Fiji, FSM, Marshall Islands, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Tonga.90 The Global Slavery Index estimates that 47,200 people in Papua New Guinea are subject to modern slavery.91 This is the only Pacific Island for which estimates are provided. These estimates do not provide rates of trafficking or disaggregate characteristics of victims.

16.2.3 Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18

There are some estimates of levels of sexual violence in the Pacific. However, this data is generally not at a level of coverage or specificity to fulfil the criteria for this indicator. Figure 4.5 shows the countries and territories where there are reported levels of physical or sexual violence against women that could be used as a proxy measure. This data does not specify the age in which women are victims. Nor does it examine levels of sexual violence against men. A study in Bougainville based on interviews of 846 men aged 18 to 49 found that 61 per cent of men had perpetrated rape, with 2.6 per cent of total perpetrators raping only against men.92

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

Most women who experience intimate partner violence do not seek help from police, other authorities or services. In Solomon Islands, 18 per cent of women who experience intimate partner violence did not seek help from authorities or service providers.93 This figure stood at 36 per cent in the Cook Islands.94 In the Pacific, one of the complications of measuring this indicator is that some disputes, including criminal offences, are handled through informal systems by chiefs.

FIGURE 4.4
PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN 2–14 YEARS OLD WHO EXPERIENCE ANY VIOLENT DISCIPLINE (PSYCHOLOGICAL AGGRESSION AND/OR PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT)

The majority of the Pacific does not have coverage on this indicator. Vanuatu, the country with the most recent data, reported 84% of children have experienced violent discipline.

Source: UNICEF
A crude measure of victimisation rates can be developed by determining the difference between the official reported rates of crime and the levels of crime victimhood from surveys. A proxy measure which would only capture one form of violence would be attitudes towards violence against women. If a large proportion of the population views violence against women as acceptable, then victims are much less likely to report incidents to the relevant authorities.

A proxy measure for the underreporting rate is the level of violence against women compared to societal attitudes.

**16.3.2 Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population**

Data is available for this indicator for seven Pacific countries. This indicator is a proxy measure for the effectiveness of the judicial system, as a high level of unsentenced prisoners reflects either an overcrowded prison system or judicial process delays. This only takes into account formal avenues of justice.
**16.4** BY 2030, SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE ILLEGITIMATE FLOWS, STRENGTHEN THE RECOVERY AND RETURN OF STOLEN ASSETS AND COMBAT ALL FORMS OF ORGANIZED CRIME

**16.4.1 Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current USD)**

The value of illicit financial flows has grown over the last decade by around ten per cent annually. Global Financial Integrity, an American-based think tank generates estimates for financial flows in five Pacific Islands based on discrepancies in balance of payment data and the direction of trade statistics. Several countries in the Pacific have been flagged for illicit financial flows and evasive tax policies. For example, due to international pressure Vanuatu has committed to the international standard of automatic exchange of financial account information to tackle tax evasion and avoidance.

**16.4.2 Proportion of seized, found or surrendered arms whose illicit origin or context has been traced or established by a competent authority in line with international instruments.**

The Pacific has relatively low levels of firearms compared to other world regions. However, despite their relative scarcity, firearms continue to fuel instability across the region. A strategic assessment of illicit small arms in the West Pacific region determined most illicit small arms in the region were recirculated. It was also determined that illicit small arms in Western Pacific Island countries and territories were a national government problem. Alpers and Twyford undertook a stocktake assessment of lawful civilian gun ownership in 2003, shown in Figure 4.8. As the majority of firearms in the Pacific are recirculated current stock rather than unlawful importation, the levels of legal gun ownership can be used as a very broad proxy for the levels of firearms in each island and territory. Additional qualitative assessments of the status of illicit firearms can be undertaken from the Australian Civil-Military Centre’s 2016 country assessments of illicit small arms in Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and Solomon Islands.

**FIGURE 4.7**

**TOTAL VALUE OF INWARD AND OUTWARD ILLEGITIMATE FLOWS (IN CURRENT U.S. DOLLARS), 2013**

Illicit financial flows were the highest in Papua New Guinea.
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

The source for this indicator internationally is Transparency International’s Global Corruption Barometer but no Pacific Island countries and territories have been included in the Barometer’s most recent report. This question used in this indicator was asked in 2013 in Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu with 27, 34 and 13 per cent of respondents respectively claiming they were asked for a bribe. Fiji has data for the question "over the past two years how has the level of corruption in this country/territory changed?" All of these interviews were conducted by Tebbutt Research using a process of Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing. A proxy measure of public sector corruption in many of the Pacific countries is found in the World Bank’s Country Policy and Institutional Assessment. This is a rating of transparency, accountability and corruption in the public sector across nine Pacific Island countries and territories as shown in Figure 4.9.

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

The World Bank Enterprise Surveys ask businesses whether they have had interactions with public officials and whether they were asked to pay a bribe. From this, the percentage of firms experiencing at least one bribe payment request is determined. Seven Pacific Island countries and territories have data from this measure, five from 2009 and two from 2015. This ranges from 4.5 per cent for Federated States of Micronesia, 10.5 per cent in Fiji and 11.9 per cent in Vanuatu to high levels at 30.5 per cent in Samoa and 43.8 per cent in Solomon Islands.
**16.6 DEVELOP EFFECTIVE, ACCOUNTABLE AND TRANSPARENT INSTITUTIONS AT ALL LEVELS**

16.6.1 Primary government expenditures as a percentage of original approved budget, disaggregated by sector (or by budget codes or similar)

Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) Program provides assessments of the status of public financial management. They include the difference between actual expenditure and the originally budgeted expenditure for ten Pacific Islands. However, this data is not disaggregated by sector or by budget code. Proxy measures are also available for five other Pacific Islands using the World Bank Global Indicators of Regulatory Governance. This measures how governments interact with stakeholders which can act as a proxy for accountable and transparent institutions.

16.6.2 PROPORTION OF THE POPULATION SATISFIED WITH THEIR LAST EXPERIENCE OF PUBLIC SERVICES

This indicator can only be measured through a survey but it has not been asked across the Pacific.

---

Target 16.6 looks at developing effective, accountable and transparent institutions. More data will likely be required to measure this in the Pacific.
16.7 ENSURE RESPONSIVE, INCLUSIVE, PARTICIPATORY AND REPRESENTATIVE DECISION-MAKING AT ALL LEVELS

16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by age group, sex, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions

This indicator should be able to be measured across the Pacific by tallying the demographic breakdown of different public institutions. There may be some difficulty in determining how the breakdown compares to national distributions as not all countries have the required level of disaggregation in their census data. Conversely, the number of seats held by women in the lower house of parliament could serve as a proxy measure. In the Pacific, women make up seven per cent of parliament, which is only a third of the global average of 21 per cent. Three countries, Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu, currently have no women representatives.

16.7.2 Proportion of population who believe decision making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group

This indicator requires a survey question, but it does not appear to have been asked across the Pacific.

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

This indicator applies at a global level rather than a national one. However, the Pacific region as a whole can be assessed compared to other developing countries to determine whether the Pacific is over or under represented in the institutions of global governance. The Pacific has 12 members of the UN General Assembly and have never had a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council. Not all of the Pacific Islands are independent. Two, Cook Islands and Niue, are non-United Nations member states. Eight of the 22 countries and territories assessed in this report are non-sovereign territories.

The Pacific has wide representation across many international organisations. There are ten members...
of the International Finance Corporation, 12 members of the International Monetary Fund, 12 members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and 13 members of the Asian Development Bank. There are also representatives for the Pacific in the World Trade Organisation (WTO). In 2012 Samoa and Vanuatu joined Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Tonga as members of the WTO and the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group. Ten Pacific Islands that have non-member observer status with the WTO. There are no representatives from the Pacific at UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). There are also region specific institutions including the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Melanesian Spearhead Group.

### 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

UNICEF’s global birth registration data is the official source for this indicator, aggregated from MICS, DHS and other sources. In the Pacific, the vast discrepancy in legal identification of children in part reflects the differences in civil registration and vital statistics systems. Birth registration for children under five in the Solomon Islands is estimated to be 0.1 per cent of all births. In contrast, the Marshall Islands, Kiribati and Tonga have over 90 per cent of births registered. There are at least seven Pacific Island countries and territories that have birth registration disaggregated by sex from DHS sources.

#### 16.10 ENSURE PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND PROTECT FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

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

The source for this indicator is United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

### FIGURE 4.11
PERCENTAGE OF REGISTERED BIRTHS FOR CHILDREN UNDER 5 INCLUDING SEX

Three countries have more than 90% of their births registered. Vanuatu has less than half of its births registered. Pacific Islands that are not included in this chart have not conducted a Demographic and Health Survey so the rate of registrations is unknown.

![Figure 4.11](source: Demographic and Health Surveys)
(UNESCO) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). No Pacific Islands are in the relevant databases. However, this could be due to the absence of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention or torture. The Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) has recorded the last journalist murder in any Pacific Island was in Papua New Guinea in 1992. CPJ, Reporters Without Borders and the International Federation of Journalists, are key sources for UNESCO reports on attacks against the media. There is no equivalent source for cases against trade unionists and human rights advocates across the world.

16.10.2 Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information

There is no agreed upon methodology for measuring the implementation of access to information laws. Nevertheless, avenues exist that will enable this to be measured across the Pacific. PacLII, the Pacific Islands Legal Information Institute, provides free access to laws across the Pacific. PacLII collects and publishes legal materials from 20 Pacific Island countries and territories. This mainly includes legislation and court decisions, of which a search would show whether there are constitutional or statutory guarantees for public access to information. Determining implementation and policy guarantees is more difficult to ascertain and will likely require a decision by UNESCO over assessing implementation of access-to-information commitments.

16.A STRENGTHEN RELEVANT NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, INCLUDING THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, FOR BUILDING CAPACITY AT ALL LEVELS, IN PARTICULAR IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, TO PREVENT VIOLENCE AND COMBAT TERRORISM AND CRIME

16.a.1 Existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles

The UN General Assembly adopted the Paris Principles in 1993 to determine the responsibilities for national human rights institutions. The Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions accredits these institutions and has assessed 117 national human rights institutions. Samoa is the only Pacific Island that is fully compliant with the Paris Principles. Fiji is one of two suspended institutions, with its accreditation suspended in 2007. All other Pacific Islands have not been accredited which likely means they do not have a national human rights institution.

16.B PROMOTE AND ENFORCE NON-DISCRIMINATORY LAWS AND POLICIES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

16.b.1 Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law

This indicator requires a survey that has not been done in the Pacific. A proxy measure from Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) looking at the levels of educational equality and the promotion of non-discrimination is available for four Pacific Islands. Data availability for measuring SDG16 in the Pacific is scarce and non-uniform in terms of cross-country or cross-temporal comparability. Almost all countries conduct censuses, which is the most comprehensive data source in terms of country coverage in the Pacific. However, SDG16 indicators are generally not considered in these surveys but the inclusion of a set or subset of related indicators in the next rounds of data collection may help close the data gap.

Many of the global data sources, including Gallup polls and World Values Surveys, have not conducted data collection in the Pacific states. There are also limitation in using data from official international organisations, such as various UN organisations or the World Bank, as in the majority of cases these institutions rely on reporting from national sources.

“Data availability for feeling discriminated across the Pacific is scarce and non-uniform.”
Based on the difficulties in collecting relevant data and the large burden of measuring all of the SDGs across the Pacific, supplementary sources of data will be necessary. There are multiple options available to measure SDG16, all of which could be supplementary. Even with different methodologies, triangulation of data can enhance the statistical voracity of data and influence the actions drawn from particular data.
COLLECTING NEW DATA

Many of the data gaps for measuring SDG16 exist across the same indicators for Pacific Island countries and territories. There will be a need to collect new data to measure it. Seven of the SDG16 indicators are Tier III and so there is no established methodology or standards are being developed. Given this, future data collection will be required to measure these indicators. In the short-term, there are at least four available options to measure SDG16 data that is currently not measured or where proxy data does not exist.

These are:

- Integrate new data collection within the currently planned official statistical collection.
- Third party data collection initiatives to measure SDG16 specific indicators.
- Develop interim measures through existing and novel data sources, including proxy measures.
- Use of different indicative data collection strategies such as expert surveys.

These methods are not mutually exclusive and it is likely a combination of options will be necessary. As stated above, National Statistics Offices will be excessively burdened if they are expected to integrate the measurement of all SDG indicators through planned collections. However, it is possible that some indicators could be included in these planned collections. Third party data collection initiatives are already underway in a number of countries, albeit not explicitly for SDG16 indicators. For example, third party initiatives measuring gender-based violence and domestic violence such as that undertaken by the Fiji Women’s Crisis Centre can be used to measure SDG16 indicators.

Interim measures using existing and novel data sources also can be useful for measuring SDG16. This includes potentially collecting data from online sources such as social media or mobile phone data collections. However, whilst these novel data collections can be cheap and easily updatable, the interpretability of the data could be problematic. It is important to tie changes in these novel data collections with an accepted baseline, likely gathered from a different methodology.

EXPERT SURVEYS

Another interim measure is the use of expert surveys. Expert surveys are often used to gather information where objective data is either not available or of poor quality, or where the nature of the quantity of interest doesn’t lend itself to straightforward measurement. For example, the extent to which a political party is left or right oriented. A well-designed expert survey that gauges responses from a significant number of experts can thus aid in quickly, and relatively cost-effectively, bridging data gaps.

Expert surveys are used by a range of organisations and data collection initiatives. This includes the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), the WomanStats Project, the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators and Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem). The most critical element of any expert survey is defining who counts as an expert. Once this definition is clear, as a general rule, the greater the number of survey responses from experts the better. In order to maximise the response rate, any expert survey ought to succinct, and follow-up on survey responses are crucial. Furthermore, when undertaking expert surveys across countries and nations, it is necessary to determine how experts compare across territories. This can be achieved by engaging experts across multiple countries and territories.

For the purposes of measuring certain indicators on SDG16 in the Pacific, it is proposed that the definition of expert include:

- Policy makers in government departments such as employees of the prime minister’s office or other government department.
- Members of the judicial branch including judges, public defendants and state prosecutors
- Leaders and members of local NGOs engaged in the peacebuilding and human rights and advocacy sectors
- Leaders and members of international NGOs engaged in the peacebuilding and human rights and advocacy sectors who have been stationed in country already for a minimum of one year
- Academics (both local and international) who are considered experts on a particular country’s socio-political situation.

In order to develop a measure of SDG16 across the Pacific, IEP is undertaking a pilot expert survey in multiple Pacific Island countries and territories. This pilot focuses on SDG16 indicators not currently measured across the Pacific and is designed to complement other regional data gathering initiatives.
SDG16 MEASUREMENT GUIDE

This SDG16 measurement guide outlines what is required for each SDG16 indicator. This guide aims to assist Pacific Island countries and territories determine data collection approaches required to measure SDG16. It includes how to measure different indicators and calculate the relevant rate as well as an example measure. Ideally, the majority of SDG16 indicators will be measured through administrative data and regular surveys. This measurement guide provides insights into how this can be achieved.

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, by age group and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Data from administrative records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Crime data (Police records or justice department or other source) | Disaggregated by homicide victims:  
- number of male  
- number of female  
- number by age groups (<18, 18-25, 26-35, etc.). | e.g. $X$ = number of male homicide victims aged 18-25 | $X = 15$            |
| Population data (census or otherwise)          | Current estimate of country’s population.                                   | $Pop$                                 | Example 1: $Pop = 50,000$  
Example 2: $Pop = 300,000$ |
| Calculations                                    | If your total population is < 100,000                                       | $100,000 / Pop$                       |                     |
|                                                |                                                                              | $Z$                                   | Example 1: $Pop = 50,000$  
$Z = 100,000 / Pop$  
$= 100,000 / 50,000$  
$= 2$ |
| Rate                                           | $X \times Z$                                                                | Rate $= X \times Z$                   |                     |
| If your total population is > 100,000          | $Pop / 100,000$                                                             | $Z$                                   | Example 2: $Pop = 300,000$  
$Z = Pop / 100,000$  
$= 300,000 / 100,000$  
$= 3$ |
| Rate                                           | $X / Z$                                                                     | Rate $= X / Z$                        |                     |
|                                                |                                                                              | $= 15 / 3$                            |                     |
|                                                |                                                                              | $= 5$                                 |                     |
|                                                |                                                                              | 5 homicides per 100,000 people        |                     |
### 16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population (disaggregated by age group, sex and cause)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Data from administrative records or external sources such as Uppsula Conflict Database</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict death data</td>
<td>Disaggregated by conflict deaths: - number of male - number of female - number by age groups (&lt;18, 18-25, 26-35, etc.).</td>
<td>e.g. X = number of male conflict deaths</td>
<td>X= 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population data</td>
<td>Current estimate of the population. Y= total population of country</td>
<td>Y= 50,000 Or Y= 300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example calculations**

**If your total population is < 100,000**

- \( \frac{100,000}{Y} \) \( \text{Z} \)
- \( X \times Z \)
- Rate

**If your total population is > 100,000**

- \( \frac{Y}{100,000} \) \( \text{P} \)
- \( X \div P \)
- Rate

### 16.1.3 Proportion of the population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>&quot;Have you or anybody in your household been the victim of physical, psychological or sexual violence in the last 12 months?&quot;</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes or No response allocated to each individual taking the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If response = Yes</td>
<td>&quot;How many members of the household were victims of physical, psychological or sexual violence in the last 12 months?&quot;</td>
<td>X= number of victims per household</td>
<td>2 household members responded 'yes' X= 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data required</td>
<td>Household members covered by survey</td>
<td>Y= total household members involved in survey</td>
<td>There are 6 household members total Y= 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example calculations**

- Total number of victims of household violence
- Total number of household members covered in survey
- Population proportion estimate

\( \frac{V}{W} \)

Proportion = 9/24 = 0.375 = 37.5%
### 16.1.4 Proportion of people that feel safe walking alone around the area they live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>“Do you feel safe walking alone in the area you live?”</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data required</td>
<td>Number of survey respondents</td>
<td>Z = total survey respondents</td>
<td>Z= 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example calculations</td>
<td>Sum the number of Yes’s across all surveys</td>
<td>V = total ‘yes’ responses</td>
<td>V= 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population proportion estimate</td>
<td>Proportion= V/Z = (total yes/ total respondents)</td>
<td>V/Z = 5,000/ 10,000 =0.5 = 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>“Have any children – those between the ages of 1 and 17 - in this household been physically disciplined (for example smacked), in the past month?”</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If response = Yes,</td>
<td>“How many of the children in this household have been physically disciplined in the past month?”</td>
<td>X= number of children physically disciplined in household</td>
<td>House 1: X= 1 child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House 2: X=3 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data required</td>
<td>Number of children in the household</td>
<td>Y= total children in household</td>
<td>House 1: Y= 2 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House 2: Y=3 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example calculations for</td>
<td>Total children physically disciplined across households</td>
<td>V = Sum X’s across all surveys</td>
<td>Y= house 1 (X)+ house 2 (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=1+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children in households surveyed</td>
<td>W= Sum Y’s across all surveys</td>
<td>W= house 1 (Y) + house 2 (Y)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=2+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population proportion estimate</td>
<td>Hit children divided by total children</td>
<td>V/W</td>
<td>V/W= 4/5 = 0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 16.2.2 Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age group and form of exploitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Have you or anybody in this household been the victim of human trafficking?&quot;</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **If response = Yes** | "How many individuals in the household have been the victim of human trafficking?" | X= number of victims in household | House 1: X= 1 child  
House 2: X=1 child |
| **Additional data required** | Number of household members covered by survey | Y= number of people in household | House 1: Y= 5 children  
House 2: Y= 9 children |
| **Example calculations** | Total victims of human trafficking across households | V= Sum X's across all surveys | House 1 (X)+ house 2 (X)  
= 1+1  
= 2 |
| | Total number of people living in surveyed households | W= Sum Y's across all surveys | House 1 (Y)+ house 2 (Y)  
= 5+9  
= 14 |
| **Population proportion estimate** | V/W= Sum of all human trafficking victims in survey/ sum of all people living in surveyed houses | V/W= 2/14  
= 0.143 |
| **Population rate per 100,000** | V/W * 100,000  
(Proportion times 100,000) | V/W= 100,000  
= 0.143* 100,000  
= 14,285 per 100,000 people |

### 16.2.3 Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Were you or anybody in this household ever the victim of sexual violence before your/their 18th birthday?&quot;</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **If response = Yes** | "How many individuals in the household were victims of sexual violence before their 18th birthdays?"  
"Of those individuals who were victims of sexual violence before their 18th birthday, how many are still below the age of 30 today?" | X= number of victims per household  
Y= number of victims <30 per household | House 1: X= 1 victims  
House 2: X=3 victims  
House 1: Y= 1 victim  
House 2: Y=2 victims |
| **Additional data required** | Number of household members under the age of 30 covered by survey | Z= number of household members under 30 | House 1: Z= 5 members  
House 2: Z=4 members |
| **Example calculations** | Total number of victims currently under age 30 across surveys | V = Sum of Y's across all surveys | House 1 (Y)+ House 2 (Y)  
= 1+2  
= 3 |
| | Total number of people currently under 30 across surveys | W= Sum of Z's across all surveys | House 1 (Z)+ House 2 (Z)  
= 5+4  
= 9 |
| **Population proportion estimate** | Estimate: V/W | V/W= 3/9  
= 0.333 |
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>“Have you or anybody in your household been the victim of physical, psychological or sexual violence in the last 12 months?”</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| If response = Yes | “How many members of the household were victims of physical, psychological or sexual violence in the last 12 months?” | X= number of household members who were victims | House 1: X= 3 victims  
House 2: X=2 victims |
| Additional data required | Household members covered by survey | Z= total household members included in survey | House 1: Z= 5 total members  
House 2: Z=7 total members |
| Example calculations | Total number of household members who were victims AND reported | V= Sum Y’s across all surveys | V= House 1 (Y) + House 2 (Y)  
= 1+0  
= 1 |
| Total number of household members in surveys | W= Sum Z’s across all surveys | W= House 1 (Z) + House 2 (Z)  
= 5+7  
= 12 |
| Population proportion estimate | V/W = victims who reported divided by total individuals in survey | V/W= 1/12  
= 0.083 |

16.3.2 Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Data from administrative records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unsentenced prisoners in the country</td>
<td>X = number of unsentenced prisoners in the country</td>
<td>X= 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of prisoners across all prisons in the country</td>
<td>Y = number of total prisoners in country</td>
<td>Y=100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Example calculations | Proportion | X/Y (unsentenced prisoners/ total prisoners) | X/Y= 400/100,000  
= 0.004 |
16.4 BY 2030, SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE ILLICIT FINANCIAL AND ARMS FLOWS, STRENGTHEN THE RECOVERY AND RETURN OF STOLEN ASSETS AND COMBAT ALL FORMS OF ORGANIZED CRIME

16.4.1 Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current United States dollars)

Given that, by their nature, illicit flows are hidden, only estimates can be used for this indicator. There are multiple approved methods for estimating illicit financial flows adapted from the Mbeki Report of the High-level Panel on Illicit Financial Flows from Africa.105

16.4.2 Proportion of seized, found or surrendered arms whose illicit origin or context has been traced or established by a competent authority in line with international instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Data from administrative records</td>
<td>X = number of seized, found or surrendered arms that have been traced</td>
<td>X = 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of seized, found or surrendered arms for which the origin or context has been established by the responsible authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y= total seized, found or surrendered arms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y= 100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example calculations

- Proportion of arms whose origin is traced or established: X/Y = Traced arms divided by total arms seized, found, etc
- X/Y = 1,000/100,000 = 0.01

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example

- “In the last 12 months, have you or anyone in your household paid a bribe to a public official or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official?”
- Yes/No

If response = Yes

- “How many individuals in your household paid a bribe or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official in the last 12 months?”
- X = number of individuals involved in bribes, collected from each household
- For house 1: X= 3
- For house 2: X=2

Additional data required

- Number of household members covered by survey (including houses that responded ‘no’)
- Y = total number of people covered by survey, collected from each household
- For house 1: Y= 6
- For house 2: Y=9

Example calculations

- Sum X’s across all surveys
  - V= total involved in bribes
  - V= House 1 (X) + house 2 (X) = 3+ 2 = 5

- Sum Y’s across all surveys
  - W= total household members surveyed
  - W= House 1 (Y) + house 2 (Y) = 6+9 = 15

- Population proportion estimate
  - V/W= bribed people divided by total people
  - V/W = 5/15 = 0.333
## 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on business survey conducted on representative sample of businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>&quot;In the last 12 months, have you or anyone in your organisation/company paid a bribe to a public official or were asked to pay a bribe by a public official in the course of trying to conduct business?&quot;</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data required</td>
<td>Number of businesses surveyed</td>
<td>B= number of businesses surveyed</td>
<td>B= 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example calculations</td>
<td>Sum the number of 'yes' responses across all surveys</td>
<td>Y= number of 'yes' responses</td>
<td>Y= 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total proportion estimate</td>
<td>Y/B= 'yes responses' divided by total number of responses</td>
<td>Y/B = 2,000/5,000 = 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 16.6 DEVELOP EFFECTIVE, ACCOUNTABLE AND TRANSPARENT INSTITUTIONS AT ALL LEVELS

### 16.6.1 Primary government expenditures as a percentage of originally approved budget, disaggregated by sector (or by budget codes or similar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Data from administrative records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual primary government expenditure disaggregated by sector for a given year</td>
<td>X = actual spending on education</td>
<td>X= 100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed government expenditure disaggregated by sector for a given year</td>
<td>Y = proposed spending on education</td>
<td>Y= 150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example calculations</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>X/Y *100 = Actual spending/ proposed spending * 100</td>
<td>X/Y* 100 = 100,000/150,000* 100 = 0.667*100 = 66.667% of proposed spending is being spent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16.6.2 Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>&quot;Were you satisfied with your last experience of a public service of any kind?&quot;</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data required</td>
<td>Number of survey respondents</td>
<td>Z is total respondents</td>
<td>Z= 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example calculations</td>
<td>Sum number of 'yes' responses across all surveys</td>
<td>V= total 'yes' responses</td>
<td>V= 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population proportion estimate</td>
<td>V/Z is 'yes' responses/ total responses</td>
<td>V/Z = 1,000/4,000 = ¼ or 0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.7 ENSURE RESPONSIVE, INCLUSIVE, PARTICIPATORY AND REPRESENTATIVE DECISION-MAKING AT ALL LEVELS

16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by age group, sex, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Data from administrative records</td>
<td>e.g. Females</td>
<td>x = no. females in parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y = no. females in judiciary</td>
<td>z = no. females in police force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                          |                                                                             | t = total individuals in parliament, judiciary and police force | x = 20  
|                                          |                                                                             | y = 10                                     | z = 50  
|                                          |                                                                             | t = 6,000                                  | |
| Census data or equivalent                | Number of people in population disaggregated by:                          | e.g. females                               | w = no. of women in population                                         |
|                                          |                                                                             | n = population number                      | w = 300,000                                                             |
|                                          |                                                                             | n = 600,000                                | |
| Example calculations                     | Proportion in population                                                   | e.g proportion of women in the population: w/n | w/n = 300,000/600,000 = ½ = 0.5                                         |
|                                          |                                                                             | Proportion in public institutions          | e.g. proportion of females amongst total individuals in parliament, judiciary, and police: (x+y+z)/t | x+y+z)/t = (20+10+50)/6,000 = (80)/6,000 = 0.013 |
|                                          |                                                                             | Comparison                                 | e.g. discrepancy in representation: w/n - (x+y+z)/t                     | (w/n) - (x+y+z)/t = (300,000/600,000) - (20+10+50)/6,000 = (0.5) - (0.013) = 0.487 |

16.7.2 Proportion of population who believe decision making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>&quot;Do you believe formal government decision making is inclusive and responsive?&quot;</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data required</td>
<td>Number of survey respondents</td>
<td>Y= total number of respondents</td>
<td>Y= 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example calculations</td>
<td>Sum number of Yes’s across all surveys</td>
<td>X = all 'yes answers' across surveys</td>
<td>X= 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population proportion estimate</td>
<td>X/Y= yes responses/ total responses</td>
<td>X/Y = 20,000/150,000 = 0.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 organisations

This indicator is measured globally and individual countries are not required to create their own measure. For the Pacific there is some logic in creating a Pacific-specific measure to determine the Pacific’s representation in international organisations as compared to other regions.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Survey question on DHS or other similar representative survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>“How many children in this household under the age of 5 have a birth certificate?” X= number of children under age 5 who have birth certificates (interviewer needs to site the certificates)</td>
<td>House 1: X= 2 children</td>
<td>House 2: X= 1 child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional data required</td>
<td>Number of children in the household under 5 Z= total number of children &lt;5 in house</td>
<td>House 1: Z= 5</td>
<td>House 2: Z= 2 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example calculations</td>
<td>Total number of children &lt;5 with birth certificates V= Sum number of X’s across all surveys</td>
<td>V= H1 X + H2 X = 2 + 1 = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of children &lt;5 W= Sum Z’s across all surveys</td>
<td>Z= H1 Z + H2 Z = 5 + 2 = 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population proportion estimate Proportion= V/W</td>
<td>V/W = 3/7 = 0.429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.10 ENSURE PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND PROTECT FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>EXAMPLE VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Data from independent civil society organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>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 X= number of verified cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example calculations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.10.2 Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>EXAMPLE VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Data from national law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Does the country have a Freedom of Information Act or equivalent Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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