Reducing inequality
Indicators to match the ambition of the 2030 Development Agenda
1. Introduction

“There are rising inequalities within and among countries. There are enormous disparities of wealth, opportunity and power. Gender inequality remains a key challenge.”

Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, The Declaration, Para 13

Inequality – how we got here

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) must effectively tackle inequality if they are to address the failure of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to reach the poorest and most marginalised groups and to deliver on the stated ambition that “no one will be left behind”.

Inequality was largely ignored in the MDGs, outside goal 3 on gender which itself failed to address inequalities embedded in policy, legal and institutional frameworks. The SDGs, while imperfect, have gone a long way to overcoming the MDGs deficiencies.

Their first advance is to add a stand-alone goal on inequality, in addition to retaining a goal on gender.

The second advance is to address inequality as a cross-cutting issue, expressed in the ambition that “no one will be left behind” so that it appears across all other goals, for example through goals 6 and 7 on water and energy services, goal 16 on peace and justice. As different types of inequality interrelate, accumulate and reinforce each other, including across generations, the pledge to “reach the furthest behind first” for all types of inequality and close the gaps for marginalised groups, is important and should not be lost in the transition to implementation.

Finally, unlike the MDGs, the SDG agenda does not only have targets on inequality, it also includes targets to address the causes of inequality. For example, opening up political processes, and encouraging policies known to reduce inequality, such as equal pay (target 8.5) and social protection (target 10.4). This needs to be reflected in the indicators.

The different types of indicators can be summarized as:

- **Process indicators:** on government actions such as financing social protection or promoting women’s political empowerment.
- **Structural indicators:** on changes to policy, institutional and legal frameworks to reduce inequality. For example, targets on laws to combat discrimination.
- **Outcome indicators:** for example, targets to reduce income inequality.
- **Access indicators:** on rights and access to education, healthcare, and other services and resources for all groups.

The indicators need to reflect the full range of ambition on inequality and ensure that all the dimensions of inequality and ways in which it is reduced are captured. This goes beyond developing robust indicators for Goals 5 and 10, which directly address inequality, to properly integrating inequality into indicators that will guide and track progress towards meeting many other SDG targets. The section below presents an approach to achieve this for all goals to improve equity outcomes across the board.
Summary of Recommendations

Inequality matters – it matters for the marginalised groups for whom low income or social exclusion prevent them from realising their rights, it matters for all of us because it has a negative impact on economic growth, social cohesion and well-being and, above all, surveys reveal that it matters very much to people all over the world, the citizens of those countries adopting the 2030 Agenda.

The SDGs have made substantial progress over the MDGs in tackling inequality, by including a standalone inequality goal, by recognising inequality as a cross cutting issue that is interconnected with many other goal areas, and finally by including targets on some of the factors that cause inequality.

This paper proposes five key tests to measure whether the SDG indicators are capable of matching the 2030 Agenda’s stated aim of ‘combating inequality’ (Declaration 13):

Are the indicators

1. **Ambitious:** Do they capture ambitions, including reducing inequality?
2. **Appropriate:** Are they appropriate for poor and marginalised groups?
3. **Capable of disaggregation:** Is it possible to track that all relevant groups are being reached?
4. **Reaching the furthest behind:** Will indicators incentivise actions that favour poor and marginalised groups?
5. **Transformative:** Do indicators provide incentives for transformative change?

Applying these tests, several improvements can be made to the existing SDG indicator proposals. These include:

- Ensuring the indicators work for and favour marginalised groups. This can in part be supported by weighting targets so that progress for the poorest and most marginalised groups counts for more.
- Measuring the progressive reduction of inequality gaps over time, disaggregated by groups.
- Using outcome indicators rooted in the experience of marginalised groups.
- Using qualitative and subjective indicators to directly measure the experience and perceptions of marginalised groups.
- Investing in improving methods of data disaggregation.
- Including indicators that capture changes to the realisation of rights, to policies and changes in empowerment and social norms & attitudes.

This paper proposes improvements to indicators across the framework but in particular to Goal 10, including adding:

- An income inequality indicator – the Palma ratio - that tracks the progress of the bottom 40% against the top earners in the population and measures the wealth concentration of the top 10% and 1%.
- An indicator to measure gaps in inequality of rights, access and inclusion, not just wealth.
- Ensuring a social protection indicator that measures how many people benefit from social protection as well as the amounts received.
- Including indicators on progressive tax policy and tax incidence, as well as on equitable public spending.
Five tests for addressing inequality in SDG indicators

“What we measure affects what we do; and if our measurements are flawed, decisions may be distorted... if metrics of performance are flawed, so too may be inferences we draw.”

The Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress

Getting indicators right is essential to SDG implementation. Indicators serve several critical purposes in the delivery of the new Sustainable Development agenda. The choice of indicator is critical to determining policy actions, priorities and funding.

Criticisms of the MDGs included that the development of indicators was left too late, there were time lags that undermined the capacity of reporting to guide action; and the MDGs had mixed effectiveness resulting in “orphaned” issues on which progress was neither effectively monitored nor prioritised.

Indicators for SDGs must build on lessons of the limitations of the MDG indicators. They should be technically robust and politically compelling, not selective or distorting. They should ensure that the causes of inequality as well as its outcomes are addressed.

Gender indicators – learning from experience

- Two critical gender indicators (Gender Development Index and Gender Empowerment Measure) were reviewed after ten years of use. The study found that the lack of measurement of physical insecurity, time and poverty made it hard to track progress on closing the gender gap. The analysis also found that indicators tracked individual experiences but not policies and institutional frameworks.

- MDG 3 indicators have been found lacking for their ability to properly track and incentivise political and policy change. For example, the indicator on numbers of women in parliament did not give a full picture of women’s political participation. Women counted in this indicator were not necessarily in positions of influence, and by only looking at national level parliaments it was not possible to tell what level of influence women had across other areas of public life, such as local government.

- The causes of inequality need to be measured in order for indicators to bring about change. For example, girls may be prevented from going to school because of experiences of violence, or may not be able to use their education to improve their livelihoods due to negative attitudes towards women not changing. Therefore measuring attendance is not sufficient to understand the dynamics of gender inequality in education. Experience of NGO monitoring in rural India of female education demonstrates the need for indicators to be based in the realities of marginalised groups. Enrolment improved, but attendance did not as attitudes had not changed. Locals identified indicators of change in attitude such as: acceptance of non-traditional roles for women, increased use of labour saving technologies.

There is an extensive literature on the features of good indicators, for example that they are practical and communicate well to the relevant audience. Whilst these features are also important for indicators for inequality, the focus of this paper is on approaches to ensure that indicators will support, and not undermine, the aim of reducing inequality. Five tests for relevance to inequality are set out here.
1. **Ambition:** Do they capture the ambitions of the goal or target, including reducing inequality?

All indicators need to reflect the ambition of the goals and targets they measure. They should be relevant, tell you something useful about the goal and target that you are trying to achieve and measure changes that will help to achieve them.

Ensuring that synergies are fully realised between interrelated goals and targets is particularly important in the case of inequality, as it is multi-dimensional and deprivations are mutually reinforcing. Indicators that directly correspond to target outcomes are preferable. However, the broader and more complex targets present a particular challenge and multiple indicators and proxies may have to be used. In these cases, it is even more important to check that the intended objectives of the target are being addressed.

As well as checking the indicators correspond to targets, the following solutions are useful to ensure indicators support and do not undermine inequality objectives.

### Solutions

- Indicators for political and policy targets should monitor whether the gaps in access for poor and marginalised groups are being reduced.
- Indicators for process goals should ensure that these will work for poor and marginalised groups.
- Indicators for structural goals should check for desired impacts on inequality. For example, for targets that require change in norms or attitudes, these can be captured through use of qualitative indicators.

### Examples of tests/principles in practice

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current indicators</th>
<th>Comments and improvements for relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services.</td>
<td>The indicator does not capture the complexity of the target or its focus on realising rights. Additional indicators are needed. For example, an indicator on whether poor and vulnerable groups report experiencing improved rights and access to services and resources to support their livelihoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of women among agricultural land owners by age and location (Urban/Rural).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current indicators</th>
<th>Comments and improvements for relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments.</td>
<td>The Gender and Development Network (GADN) highlight that the current indicator is a poor proxy for the full ambition of the target. The quantitative indicator should truly measure progress towards ‘full and effective participation’ and ‘equal opportunities for leadership’, by looking at the share of seats women have at all the highest levels of decision-making, including also ministerial and cabinet positions. An additional qualitative indicator would allow measurement of changes in influence, perception and attitudes. We support the Christian Aid proposal for a subjective indicator of female politicians’ perception of impact and an indicator for decision-making at household level. These are useful for testing change in social norms and attitudes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of seats held by women in local governments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


2. Appropriateness: Are they appropriate for poor and marginalised groups?

Indicators need to reflect the realities and barriers faced by poor and marginalised groups. For example, whilst upgrading legal frameworks is important, it is often not sufficient to overcome the discrimination experienced by these groups. Ensuring appropriate indicators is important because the needs of poor and marginalised groups often don’t fit standard prescriptions and solutions. An experience in development programming has been that as a result of non-targeted or insensitive programming, highly marginalised groups sometimes remain under-served or are excluded.19

Solutions:

• Use outcomes indicators (or proxies where necessary) based in the experience of marginalised groups.20 For example, monitoring some of the health targets by not only tracking whether health services are provided, but also whether disease prevention is improved for marginalised groups.

• Use qualitative as well as quantitative indicators. For example, indicators for goals on access to services and resources like energy and water, should not just measure reach, but whether increased access is benefiting the poorest and most marginalised groups, and whether services are of good quality, affordable, and appropriate.

• Use additional survey based indicators. For example, on discrimination, do marginalised groups feel less discriminated against? Not simply, does anti-discrimination legislation exist?

Participative and qualitative data not only allows direct access to the experience of marginalised groups, (and by doing so empowering them and increasing accountability) citizen data is also increasingly robust, meaningful and recognised as a valuable resource.21

Examples of tests/principles in practice

| Target 3.8: Achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential health-care services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all. |
|---|---|
| Current indicators | Comments and improvements for relevance |
| • Coverage of tracer interventions (e.g., child full immunisation, ARV therapy, TB treatment, hypertension treatment, skilled attendant at birth, etc.). | Access targets mostly have quantitative coverage indicators – i.e., the numbers or proportion of people accessing a service. Additional qualitative indicators are needed for these targets, to ensure that services are appropriate and affordable to all relevant groups. |
| • Fraction of the population protected against catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure. | |

| Target 5.1: End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere. |
|---|---|
| Current indicator | Comments and improvements for relevance |
| • Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex. | Whilst legal frameworks matter, the indicator does not show whether women are benefiting in reality. UN Women highlights that specific dimensions of discrimination should be monitored such as age of marriage, inheritance and nationality/citizenship. |
**3. Disaggregation:** Is it possible to track that all relevant groups are being reached?

In order to observe differences between groups and highlight possible discrimination or marginalisation, it is necessary to disaggregate data. Without data on key minority or marginalised groups, these groups are effectively invisible to decision-makers and the SDG implementation process. Yet the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) has calculated that 350 million people are not covered by household surveys.\(^{22}\) Even for those that are counted, data is not of sufficiently good quality to be disaggregated to highlight the needs of many groups. For example, household surveys are inadequate to track differences relating to gender or age.

Better availability of disaggregated data is a means to achieving equity; it can also help improve equality in its own right, because the process involves recognising and empowering these groups.

A good existing proposal is to collect data disaggregated according to the list of groups recognised as vulnerable to discrimination by the UN, and other contextually relevant national groups.\(^{23,24}\)

Current indicator proposals set out that “all indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, residence (urban or rural) and other characteristics, as relevant and possible”\(^ {25}\). However, the current approach to disaggregation among indicators is patchy, with some being more comprehensive in identifying internationally relevant groups, others listing limited groups and some listing no groups to disaggregate at all. Groups that are mentioned in the target are often not listed as groups to include in disaggregation within the corresponding indicator.

For example, a list of priority indicators to be disaggregated according to disability has been identified by UNDESA-DSPS and the Secretariat for the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Yet only some of these have been explicitly earmarked for disaggregation for persons with disabilities within current indicator proposals.\(^ {26}\)

**Solutions**

- Indicators should be systematically checked to ensure that progress amongst all target groups is monitored. This should include consideration of groups recognised internationally as vulnerable, also nationally relevant groups and other groups not generally identified in household surveys, such as homeless people and older people\(^ {27}\).

- It is also important to recognise the dangers of disaggregation for some groups and the importance of a mechanism to address this.

**Examples of tests/principles in practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target 3.3:</strong> By 2030, end the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and neglected tropical diseases and combat hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other communicable diseases.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 susceptible population (by age, sex, and key populations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TB incidence per 1,000 persons per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Malaria incident cases per 1,000 person per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Estimated number of new hepatitis B infections per 100,000 population in a given year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments and improvements for relevance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregation for HIV targets is critical, as although infection rates are falling overall, they are rising for some groups. It is therefore important that ‘key populations’ are properly identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health indicators also lack disaggregation. Addressing this would help to highlight discrepancies with respect to access or outcomes such as infection rates for vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target 5.5:</strong> Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proportion of seats held by women in local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments and improvements for relevance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The indicator could be usefully disaggregated. It should be possible to track whether disabled or ethnic minority women, for example, are locked out of decision-making more than other women.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Reaching the furthest behind: Will indicators incentivise actions that target or favour marginalised groups?

Disaggregated data allows us to track the progress of the poorest and most marginalised groups. However, this is not enough to tackle inequality, as we also need to close the gaps between them and other groups. For example, in order to highlight gender discrimination, it is necessary to track the experience of women relative to men. Addressing inequality also means committing to reach the most marginalised, or “to reach the furthest behind first”. It is a frequent criticism of the MDGs that they allowed governments to reach the “low-hanging fruit” and many of the worst off were left behind by MDG progress.28

Solutions

- **Weight targets so that progress for the poorest and most marginalised groups counts for more, and have stepping stone targets for improving equity.**29 Targets on improving the overall levels of access to services and resources might support reaching large numbers but poor and marginalised groups could well remain under-served. Adding equity targets to reduce disparities between groups could help address this. For example, to targets on access (to health, education, energy) and also targets on outcomes and experiences (e.g. life expectancy and experience of violence).

- **Targets must be designed so that they support actions that target or give preference to marginalised groups.** For example, WaterAid have criticised the current Goal 6 indicators for creating perverse incentives for governments to do “all for some” rather than “some for all” (see example below).30

Example of tests/principles in practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target 6.1: By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average weekly time spent in water collection (including waiting time at public supply points), by sex, age, location and income.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Transformation:** Do indicators provide incentives for transformative change?

The MDGs were criticised for oversimplifying development problems and reducing ambition down to just meeting basic needs. They did not address the structures that cause and perpetuate inequality and poverty. One study of MDG indicators and targets found that they: ‘encouraged implementation approaches that were conceptually narrow, vertically structured and relied heavily on technological solutions, neglecting the need for social change and the strengthening of national institutions.’

Inequality is linked to political capture, social norms and economic structures. Tackling inequality will require changes to political processes, economic systems and policies. Even when the right structures and policy frameworks are in place, groups might still face discrimination and social barriers.

**Solutions**

- The indicators should capture relevant changes to rights, structures, and policies and their impact.

- The indicators should also capture empowerment where possible, as well as changes in attitude and social norms. This can be achieved through the use of subjective and qualitative indicators in particular.

**Examples of tests/principles in practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target 8.5: By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hourly earnings of female and male employees by occupations (wages/gender wage gap).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate by sex, age-group and disability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target 6.1: By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the last 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of women and girls (aged 15-49) subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner, since age 15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing Goal 10: Inequality within and between countries

Whilst inequality is relevant across all goals and targets, it is most directly addressed in Goals 5 and 10. A fuller assessment of improvements to Goal 5 is outlined by the Gender and Development Network and is endorsed by BOND. In this paper we therefore focus on Goal 10.

Goal 10 has as its overarching objective to reduce inequality within and between countries. Its targets pledge to reduce income inequality of the bottom 40%, empower and promote social, economic and political inclusion, end discrimination, reduce inequalities of opportunity and of outcome, and put in place policies and change structures to end inequality.

Guided by the inequality tests outlined in this paper, it is obvious that the draft indicators for this goal fall short of its ambitions.

There are several instances where the draft indicators have only partial or even passing relevance to the goal and targets aims. For example, target 10.2 seeks the “social, economic and political inclusion of all.” Yet the indicator measures only the proportion of people living below median income, which is a useful indicator of distributional gains to growth, but does not reflect the target well. See also target 10.3, which seeks reduction in inequality of opportunity and outcome and appropriate policy and legislative changes to support this, but the indicator measures only perception of discrimination.

It can be difficult to assign indicators per target, particularly when these are complex, broad and overlapping. However, even taken as a whole the indicators under Goal 10 do not fully reflect its ambition and in particular are not sufficiently transformative.

For example, the indicators do not measure wealth inequality, even though this is proven to have a significant impact on the ambitions of the goal. Further, whilst the proposed indicators disaggregate for and give preference to the bottom 40% of the population, they do not track rising incomes at the top. These are significant, as inequalities at the top of the distribution can create political, social and economic barriers to change. Whilst basic education opportunities for the poorest might improve, the usefulness of this is undermined if quality and opportunities of education for the wealthiest widen the gap further.

It is also important that the structural and process changes targeted in this goal are appropriate to the poorest groups. For example, it is most important to track coverage of social protection to check that it is helping all relevant groups to cope with shocks and life-cycle risks, rather than simply focusing on amounts transferred. Measuring transfers can say something about distributional impact, but does not highlight whether transfers are preventing people from falling into poverty. Similarly, the indicator on fiscal policy is currently inadequate to test whether systems are progressive; it would not ensure more equitable public spending or tax incidence.
## Recommendations for improving Goal 10

With the above analysis in mind, indicators for Goal 10 could be improved in the following ways:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current indicator</th>
<th>Recommendations for improvements for inequality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40% of the population and the total population.</td>
<td>The current indicator for the income inequality target should be replaced by the Palma ratio, which tracks the post-tax income of the top 10%, top 1% and top 0.1% as well as the post-transfer income of the bottom 40%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target 10.2: By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current indicator</th>
<th>Recommendations for improvements for inequality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of people living below 50% of median income disaggregated by age and</td>
<td>An indicator on change in real median income is useful and should be retained. However, a further indicator is needed to capture social and political factors of exclusion and marginalisation in order to address the full ambition of the target. One currently suggested is: Measure the progressive reduction of inequality gaps over time, disaggregated by groups as defined above, for selected social, economic, political and environmental SDG targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target 10.3: Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current indicator</th>
<th>Recommendations for improvements for inequality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the last 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law.</td>
<td>The social protection indicator should include coverage as well as transfers. It should also include indicators on progressive tax policy and indicators on progressive taxation of income and wealth, for example, by improving the ratio of taxes on wage income vs. capital gains income. Include indicators that demonstrate equitable public spending, for example, existence of budget processes that allow allocation on basis of need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Conclusion

It is vital that the SDG indicators are true to the original intention and ambition of the 2030 Agenda.

This paper has focused on what will make the indicators better at addressing inequality, using the five tests outlined above. It has not assessed all the features that need to be considered in developing good indicators such as feasibility. However, whilst feasibility is important, not all indicators that will be needed already exist in the appropriate form. Choosing indicators that are desirable and effective, is much more important than choosing indicators purely based on what data is readily available. Efforts outlined in the outcome document to build data capacity and to support improved disaggregation will be critical to ensuring the indicators fulfil the ambitions of a new sustainable development agenda.

Although not discussed here, it is also important that indicators can evolve and build on experience particularly as understanding and evidence of how different levels and types of inequality interact and how inequality relates to other development ambitions is still developing.

This paper has outlined a set of tests that can be applied to improve how inequality is addressed across all goals. It is important that inequality cuts across indicators, as it is multi-dimensional and different types of inequality are mutually reinforcing. The tests for inequality-relevance must be applied across all types of targets, if they are to address structural causes of inequality and overcome the failures of the MDGs to reach all segments of society.

It is essential to take this opportunity to agree the best possible indicators, including from the perspective of reducing inequality, to drive action, political attention and funding over the next 15 years.
Endnotes

1. Available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/7891Transforming%20Our%20World.pdf


4. For instance, the SDGs do not have a target on reducing wealth inequality

5. Horizontal and vertical, social environmental and economic; Ibid

6. Adapted from UNOHCHR

7. These are not always clear cut divisions, for example “access” targets could overlap with process or substantive targets, depending on the situation of the country involved, but this is nevertheless a useful categorisation when thinking about the relevance of targets to inequality and the kinds of indicators that will be useful.


9. IAEG (August 2015)

10. These include
- to monitor compliance and map progress towards internationally agreed commitments
- to empower citizens and support advocacy
- to guide priorities, policies, programming and spending
- to provide feedback, support analysis and promote shared learning


12. BRIDGE (2007)

13. WomanKIND


15. Concerns around practicality have led to a debate around numbers of indicators and capacity building of national statistical offices. See http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/First%20meeting%20IAEG-SDGs%20-%20June%202015%20-%20Meeting%20report%20-%20June%202015.pdf and also SDSN Data Revolution.

16. There is a good literature available on the qualities of good indicators for public policy, including a list of a list of ten criteria for SDG indicators proposed by SDSN

17. For more detail on examples and text of indicator proposals, please see attached annex

18. Christian Aid (August 2015)


20. See for example proposals for cross-cutting indicators in IGLHRC/IDS (2014)

21. Recent examples include My World surveys and OECD Better Life index.


23. Gender, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, income, geographical location, language, ethnicity, race, caste, indigenous status, religion, citizenship or lack thereof, nationality or lack thereof, HIV status, intersex status, marital status, migrant status, work, including sex work. Cited in International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission / Institute for Development Studies (undated) Proposal for Cross-Cutting Indicators: Closing the Evaluation Gap for Marginalized Groups

24. The list is a useful starting point, it is not comprehensive as some groups might be overlooked such as those who have grown up in care or homeless people.
Endnotes continued

25. IAEG (August 2015)
27. Some data is collected only until age 49 (see for example, indicator for 5.2. For more on this issue see HelpAge (2014)
31. Fakuda-Parr et al (May 2013)
32. Christian Aid (August 2015)
33. GADN (2015)
34. NEF (2014)
35. IBID
36. Save the Children (2012)
37. The current indicator for the relevant target (10.4) is Labour share of GDP, comprising wage and social protection transfers.
38. IAEG (August 2015)
39. For more detail see Christian Aid & CESR (2014)
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