

# Goal 10 Reduce inequality within and among countries

## Table of Contents

Target 10.1 By 2030, progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the population at a rate higher than the national average. ....	2
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. ....	3
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. ....	4
Target 10.4 Adopt policies, especially fiscal, wage and social protection policies, and progressively achieve greater equality. ....	6
Target 10.5 Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations. ....	7
Target 10.6 Ensure enhanced representation and voice for developing countries in decision-making in global international economic and financial institutions in order to deliver more effective, credible, accountable and legitimate institutions. ....	11
Target 10.7 Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies. ....	12
Target 10.a Implement the principle of special and differential treatment for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, in accordance with World Trade Organization agreements. ....	15
Target 10.b Encourage official development assistance and financial flows, including foreign direct investment, to States where the need is greatest, in particular least developed countries, African countries, Small Island developing States and landlocked developing countries, in accordance with their national plans and programmes. ....	16
Target 10.c By 2030, reduce to less than 3 per cent the transaction costs of migrant remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5 per cent. ....	17

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

**Indicator 10.1.1: Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 percent of the population and the total population**

From OHCHR:

<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 1.2 (people living in poverty) 10.1 (income growth of lowest 40%) 10.2 (inclusion) 10.3 (inequalities of outcome) 10.4 (progressive achievement of greater equality)
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	“Real disposable household income” is the sum of wages and salaries, mixed income, net property income, net current transfers and social benefits other than social transfers in kind, less taxes on income and wealth and social security contributions, after adjustment for price changes.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	The main data source is household surveys.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	This indicator should be disaggregated by ethnicity, sex, age, geographic location, disability, religion, migratory or displacement status, civil status, and other statuses relevant at the national level, which may for example include minority or indigenous status, language spoken at home, etc.
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	In many national contexts, household surveys, which are the main data source for this indicator, exclude the homeless or low-income groups without access to telephones. Face-to-face surveys often exclude non-urban populations or members of linguistic minorities.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	In many instances, household surveys are conducted only with the ‘head’ of the household, who answers for other persons living at the same address. As this is most often the oldest male resident, the indicator may not fully capture the experience of women or give a picture of women’s control over their income and resources. Where it is not feasible for this reason to disaggregate by sex, the indicator should be disaggregated for female-headed households.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	The World Bank collects some relevant data at global level, although this indicator is not currently computed.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	World Bank data: <a href="http://data.worldbank.org/">http://data.worldbank.org/</a>

**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.**

**Indicator 10.2.1: Proportion of people living below 50% of median income disaggregated by age group, sex, and persons with disabilities**

From OHCHR:

<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 1.2 (reduction in proportion of persons living in poverty) 1.3 (social protection floors) 5.1 (discrimination against women and girls) 10.1 (income growth of lowest 40%) 10.2 (inclusion) 10.3 (equal opportunities) 10.4 (progressive achievement of greater equality)
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	The indicator is calculated as the proportion of persons living in households (adjusted for household size) below 60% of the national median income, using population-weighted subgroup estimates from household surveys.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	This indicator is a measure of relative income poverty at the national level. It measures how far individuals are from the median standard of living, approximating a measure of social exclusion. Persons living in relative poverty often experience many other forms of social and economic disadvantage through unemployment, poor housing, inadequate health care and barriers in accessing education and economic, social, political and cultural activities, which can result from social stigmatisation.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	The main data source is household surveys.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	This indicator should be disaggregated by ethnicity, sex, age, geographic location, disability, religion, migratory or displacement status, civil status, and other statuses relevant at the national level, which may for example include minority or indigenous status, language spoken at home, etc.
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	In many national contexts, household surveys, which are the main data source for this indicator, exclude the homeless or low-income groups without access to telephones. Face-to-face surveys often exclude non-urban populations or members of linguistic minorities. Because it focuses on income only, this indicator does not measure other forms of poverty, and should therefore be supplemented with other indicators on access to adequate housing, social services, health care, as well as the assets or expenses of the household (e.g. home owners will have more disposable income than renters with the same household income).
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	In many instances, household surveys are conducted only with the ‘head’ of the household, who answers for other persons living at the same address. As this is most often the oldest male resident, the indicator may not fully capture the experience of women or give a picture of women’s control over their income and resources. Where it is not feasible for this reason to disaggregate by sex, the indicator should be disaggregated for female-headed households.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	At the international and regional levels, OECD and the EU both collect these data for their Member States. The World Bank currently compiles data on percentage of people below national (i.e. country-specific) poverty lines, but this could be amended or supplemented to include this comparable indicator.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	

**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.**

**Indicator 10.3.1: 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.**

**From OHCHR (and TST):**

<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 10.2 (inclusion) 10.3 (equal opportunities) 16.3 (rule of law) 16b (non-discriminatory laws and policies)
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	International human rights law outlaws discrimination against population groups on the basis of specific characteristics or 'grounds'. The grounds of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law, as enshrined in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and subsequently elaborated upon by international human rights mechanisms, include ethnicity, sex, age, income, geographic location, disability, religion, migratory or displacement status, civil status, sexual orientation and gender identity. While some grounds are common to all countries and follow standard definitions, such as sex, age or disability, the precise categories to be included under grounds such as ethnicity, geographic location and religion will vary according to national circumstances and should be determined in a participatory process at national level.  The indicator is calculated as the percentage of persons 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. This will be calculated using the full survey results, with techniques of imputation, estimation and data weighting to ensure a representative sample and data reliability.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	This outcome indicator provides a measure of how well non-discriminatory laws and policies are applied in practice, from the perspective of the population. It is based on personal experience rather than perception to ensure greater validity of data, as perceptions of the experience of others may themselves be affected by stereotyping.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	The primary data source is surveys conducted at the national or regional level.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Data for this indicator should be disaggregated by ground of discrimination, relationship with the person or entity felt to have discriminated (employer/employee, public official or employee, private enterprise, teacher/student, etc.), and place where the discrimination occurred (work, street, home, school, etc.).
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	Because the indicator measures the percentage of the population reporting discrimination during the time period, each victim is counted only once, irrespective of the number of times discrimination or harassment was experienced. Without this information, the indicator does not therefore permit estimates of incidence of discrimination.  In many national contexts, surveys may exclude the homeless or low-income groups without access to telephones. Face-to-face surveys often exclude non-urban populations or members of linguistic minorities. There is evidence to suggest that the most marginalised populations are less likely to respond to surveys, but this effect is reduced by ensuring their participation in the preparation of the survey.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	Data for the indicator should be disaggregated by sex, sexual orientation and gender identity. Multiple grounds of discrimination (e.g. women members of an ethnic minority who have suffered discrimination based on both sex and ethnicity) should be noted.
<b>Data for</b>	Data for this indicator are collected in an increasing number of countries. At the regional level,

<b>global and regional monitoring</b>	the EU Fundamental Rights Agency has collected the data for 27 EU Member States. Relevant data is also collected in Eurobarometer and Afrobarometer surveys, and this question could easily be added.
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	FRA survey data and methodology: <a href="http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/eu-midis-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey">http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/eu-midis-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey</a>

## **Target 10.4 Adopt policies, especially fiscal, wage and social protection policies, and progressively achieve greater equality.**

### **Indicator 10.4.1: Labour share of GDP, comprising wages and social protection transfers.**

**From ILO:**

#### **Definition and method of computation**

The definition of the labor share is based on ILO (2014a) and augmented with social protection transfers including (but not only) employers' social security contributions.

#### **Rationale and interpretation**

The current indicator mistakenly overlooks the internationally agreed definition of social protection, mainly based on cash transfers (eg pensions, disability, child and maternity benefits, etc). . Furthermore, coverage of social protection floor is already captured in indicator 1.3. In contrast, the alternative indicator addresses income distribution directly.

The rationale is to monitor progress toward Target 10.4 encompassing all three policies (fiscal, wage, social protection) and their impact on inequality.

The indicator provides an aggregate measure of primary income inequality, offering insights the role that social protection can have in reducing it.

#### **Disaggregation**

National estimates: total.

Global estimates: total, by region, national income level.

#### **Comments and limitations**

#### **Gender equality issues**

The indicator is aggregate and not available by sex.

#### **Data for global and regional monitoring**

Data for global and regional monitoring are extracted from administrative data. They are available in ILO (2014a) and IMF (2014) databases and in the System of National Accounts, for 200 countries.

**Responsible Entities** ILO.

**Supplementary information** No supplementary information.

**Target 10.5 Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations.**

**Indicator 10.5.1: Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level**

From OHCHR:

<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 10.5 (regulation of global financial markets) 17.3 (mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries)
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	A “financial transaction tax (Tobin tax)” is defined as an internationally agreed, uniform tax applying to all purchases of financial instruments denominated in another currency.  This is a structural indicator. Its measurement is binary: Yes if such a tax is adopted, and no if it is not. The percentage rate of the tax should be noted in case of adoption.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	Spot conversions of one currency to another and other forms of exchange rate speculation can cause significant fluctuations in financial markets, with particular impacts on developing countries. An internationally agreed financial transaction tax would aim to reduce such volatility and return a margin of manoeuvre to governments and issuing banks in developing countries. It would also aim to raise revenue for spending on public services.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	The main source of data would be the international agreement to introduce such a tax. Under Article 102 of the UN Charter, such agreements would be registered with the UN Secretariat. The information source is therefore the Treaty Section of the UN Office of Legal Affairs.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Disaggregation does not apply to this indicator.
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	Some commentators claim that such a tax could lead to market distortion, and would be ineffective in achieving its aims, but others argue it would not in fact have a significant distortionary effect, but rather would raise significant revenue in the form of a progressive tax.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	While sudden economic crashes have been demonstrated to have more severe and immediate effects on women than men, measurement of this indicator does not require attention to any specific equality issues.
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	N/A
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	James Tobin, <i>A Proposal for International Monetary Reform</i> , Eastern Economic Journal (Eastern Economic Association): 153–159, 1978.  Mahbub ul Haq, Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg, <i>The Tobin Tax: Coping with Financial Volatility</i> , Oxford University Press, 1996.

## From IMF:

### Considerations on possible indicator(s) for SDG target 10.5.:

**“Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations”<sup>1</sup>**

**Summary:** *It is presently not feasible to have one or two numeric indicators that adequately capture target 10.5 as formulated. From the perspective of sustainable development, it is crucial to improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions, as well as strengthen the implementation of such regulations. However, attempts to provide one or two simplified measures in this area are bound to be flawed, and efforts to target such indicators could be counterproductive.*

**The previous proposal.** There were major conceptual and practical issues with the previously proposed indicator, "Adoption of a financial transaction tax (Tobin tax) at a world level". Such an indicator would have very little or no relationship with SDG target 10.5. It would not be technically sound and would have major shortcomings as a measure of improvements in the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions. Such an indicator would not be helpful and could undermine the SDGs' credibility.

**Use of country financial stability reports.** In comments from the previous rounds, some member states suggested using an indicator or indicators based on central banks' financial stability reports. This idea sounds attractive in principle but is not workable in practice. Whether a central bank publishes a financial stability report or not is by itself not a useful measure of the quality of regulation, monitoring, or financial stability. This has been well documented in existing studies, for example Cihak, M. (2006) "How Do Central Banks Write on Financial Stability", IMF Working Paper 06/163 (<https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.aspx?sk=19309.0>), and Cihak, M. and others (2012), "Financial Stability Reports: What Are They Good For?", IMF Working Paper No. 12/1 (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.aspx?sk=25470.0>). These studies also document the wide differences in methodologies, tools, and definitions employed by the individual financial stability. Due to these differences, the financial stability reports are not amenable to producing one or two indicators that would be comparable across countries.

**Use of global financial stability reports.** The formulation of target 10.5 emphasizes *global* financial markets and institutions, so one interpretation could be to use the IMF's *Global Financial Stability Report* (<https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/gfsr/>). The semi-annual reports provide a wealth of information, including a quantitative component that features a twice-yearly "Global Financial Stability Map", but here the focus is on financial stability itself, rather than improvements in regulations and their implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> This note was prepared by Martin Cihak, Advisor, Monetary and Capital Markets Department of the IMF, with inputs from other IMF colleagues.

**Financial stability indicators.** In the comments from the previous rounds, there were also various suggestions to introduce financial stability (soundness) indicators. There are three main issues.

- First, financial stability is a complex concept, which makes coming up with a single universally applicable and universally acceptable measure has been very hard. One option to consider is using the **IMF's Financial Soundness Indicators** (<http://fsi.imf.org>). On the positive side, it is the authoritative source of cross-country data on financial soundness, a major effort has gone into coming up with consistent definitions and metadata, and it is publicly available and easy to download. On the negative side, it would be misleading to focus on any single one indicator and try to target it. There is a sub-set of “core FSIs”, but going to a single indicator would be problematic. Academic literature has used measures such as distance to distress and z-scores. The z-score is defined as the sum of capital/assets plus return/assets, divided by standard deviation of return/assets. In principle, such z-scores can be—and sometimes are—calculated from the FSI data (see for example the recent IMF Staff Discussion Notes 15/08 and 15/17 on financial deepening and financial inclusion, which used such a measure). But these measures have their drawbacks that need to be taken into consideration.
- Second, the target emphasizes global markets and institutions, while the FSIs are country-by-country data. One approach could be to aggregate the FSIs, but this is extremely complex. Another approach would be to use the quantitative component of the IMF's *Global Financial Stability Report* (<https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/gfsr/>). As mentioned earlier, these semi-annual reports provide a wealth of information, including a quantitative component that features a twice-yearly “Global Financial Stability Map”.
- Third, stability indicators does not necessarily capture the target, i.e. “improvements in regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthening the implementation of such regulations”. For example, the focus of the above mentioned “Global Financial Stability Map” is on financial stability outcomes, rather than improvements in regulations and their implementation. Regulations are discussed in the Global Financial Stability Report, but the report does not provide an explicit measure (index) of regulatory progress. Similarly, also at the country level, many factors, including macroeconomic developments, influence financial stability indicators, so this would be a rather indirect and potentially misleading way of measuring progress vis-a-vis the target. For example, financial stability indicators may be deteriorating *despite* improved regulations, if there a major macroeconomic downswing. In other words, a simplified use of such indicators can be very misleading.

**Measuring improvements in country regulations.** In comments from the previous rounds, there were also suggestions to measure improvements in regulations, perhaps by using an indicator of implementation of international standards. In this context, there were some suggestions to use indicators based on the IMF/World Bank Financial Sector Assessment Program. The idea of measuring improvements in regulation more directly (e.g., via measuring compliance with international standards) is useful in principle, but it has important practical constraints. One could potentially envisage monitoring based on the Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP) undertaken by the IMF with the World Bank (see <https://www.imf.org/external/np/fsap/fsap.aspx>). The FSAP includes very rigorous country-level assessments of financial stability, financial sector policy framework, and financial safety nets. The program has a broad country coverage, with 140+ countries undergoing assessments (some several times since the program's inception in 1999).

However, the frequency of country assessments is relatively low (once in 5 years for 29 countries with systemically important financial systems, and lower in other countries). An even more importantly, FSAP are not easily amenable to simplifying into a single indicator. The assessments are rather complex in nature. One needs to read the FSAP documents to understand whether there has been a relevant improvement or not. It cannot be credibly simplified to one or two indicators.

**Measuring improvements in global regulation and monitoring.** One interpretation the target could be to emphasize that it refers to improvements in *global* regulation and monitoring (as opposed to domestic regulation and monitoring). Under this interpretation, this target should thus deal mostly with systemically important financial systems and their regulatory and monitoring issues. In this interpretation, the indicators used to measure it should refer to actions taken by international organizations, including the IMF, to strengthen global regulation and monitoring, rather than attempt to measure global financial stability itself. That said, there are no simple quantitative measures of the actions taken to improve global financial stability.

**Bottom line.** As observed by many commentators, areas of financial stability and regulations are difficult to measure. Given the universal nature of the SDG document, it may be useful to keep this as a “below the line item” for the time being, with a descriptive or a qualitative statement. In other words, keep this useful target, but carve it out of being indicator-based. Over time, it may be possible to move towards indicator-like reporting. For example, the Financial Stability Board (FSB)’s November 2015 annual report on the implementation of global financial regulatory reforms ( <http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/2015/11/implementation-and-effects-of-the-g20-financial-regulatory-reforms/> ) contains a useful color-coded table on page 3, summarizing implementation in priority areas. One could envisage that an extension of this kind of reporting could go some way towards monitoring progress under target 10.5. However, this reporting at present (i) focuses on a relatively small number of countries from the SDG perspective, and (ii) is still far away from the idea of having a single indicator under this target.

**Target 10.6 Ensure enhanced representation and voice for developing countries in decision-making in global international economic and financial institutions in order to deliver more effective, credible, accountable and legitimate institutions.**

**Indicator 10.6.1: Percentage of members and voting rights of developing countries in international organizations.**

From OHCHR:

<b>Goal and target addressed</b>	This indicator is proposed to monitor the following targets: 10.6 (enhanced representation for developing countries in decision-making) 16.3 (rule of law at the international level) 16.8 (participation of developing countries in institutions of global governance) 17.10 (non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system)
<b>Definition and method of computation</b>	The indicator is computed as the number of voting rights allocated to developing countries, divided by the total number of voting rights in international organizations, multiplied by 100.
<b>Rationale and interpretation</b>	The UN is based on a principle of sovereign equality of all its Member States (Article 2, UN Charter). Voting rights in international organizations, particularly those under the auspices of the UN system, should respect this principle. This indicator aims to measure the degree to which States enjoy equal representation in international organizations.
<b>Sources and data collection</b>	The data for this indicator are publicly available in the founding documents of each international organization, as updated.
<b>Disaggregation</b>	Data should be calculated and presented separately for each organization (World Bank, IMF, etc.).
<b>Comments and limitations</b>	To be meaningful, the indicator must be compared to the relevant percentage of UN Member States, i.e. the voting rights in the General Assembly. This is a structural indicator. Such indicators do not in general track gradual change or progress, but they are useful to demonstrate a state of affairs or policy commitments.
<b>Gender equality issues</b>	N/A
<b>Data for global and regional monitoring</b>	N/A
<b>Supplementary information</b>	
<b>References</b>	

**Target 10.7 Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies.**

**Indicator 10.7.1: Recruitment cost borne by employee as percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination.**

**From Global Migration Working Group:**

Indicator	<b>Recruitment cost born by employee as a percentage of yearly income earned in country of destination</b>
OWG targets addressed	<i>10.7 facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies</i>
Rationale	Migrant workers often pay recruitment agencies sums amounting to several months' expected wage. This contravenes the ILO Private Employment Agencies Convention commitment to abolish such fees. These fees disproportionately affect low-skilled, low-income workers from low-income countries. By reducing recruitment costs the disposable incomes of low-income workers are increased and inequalities are reduced by enabling people who could otherwise not afford to seek employment abroad to do so without ending up in debt bondage.
Method of computation	Recruitment cost borne by agricultural workers, domestic workers and construction workers divided by yearly income earned in country of destination
Data sources and number of countries for which data is currently available	Progress is measured as reduction in comparison to baseline, currently under development by KNOMAD (ILO and the World Bank). Data would be collected through annual cost surveys based on household surveys, labour force surveys, or ad hoc surveys.
Responsible entity	National statistical offices, ministries of labour.  Global Migration Group
Other targets for which this indicator is relevant	<i>8.8 protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments of all workers, including migrant workers, particularly women migrants, and those in precarious situations<sup>2</sup></i>
Comments	Much could be covered by introducing new questions into existing surveys, but in some instances new surveys might be needed.

**Indicator 10.7.2: International Migration Policy Index**

**From Global Migration Working Group (and TST):**

Indicator	<b>International Migration Policy Index</b>
OWG targets addressed	<i>10.7 facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies</i>
Rationale	With target 10.7 the OWG has acknowledged the significance of well-managed migration policies for the quality of migration (“orderly, safe, regular and responsible”) which in turn determines development outcomes of migration. This would ensure that migrants are not left behind. Bearing in mind that “well-managed migration policies” is a multi-dimensional issue, spanning issues like migrant remittances, circular migration, responses to climate change and crises; a composite index would be the only way to capture progress and to make actionable gap analyses. The monitoring of the commitment to “well-managed migration policies” through a

<sup>2</sup> Noting that migration is a cross-cutting issue, a number of additional targets would benefit from this indicator including: 10.2 (social and economic inclusion); 10.3 (equal opportunity and ending discriminatory laws); 10.4 (adopt policies and achieve greater equality); 1.3 (implement social protection systems for all); 1.4 (ensure that all men and women, particularly the vulnerable have access to basic services); 3.8 (achieve universal health care coverage); 4.1 (girls and boys complete primary and secondary education); 17.3 (mobilize additional financial resources); 16.1 (reduce violence and related death rates); 1.5 (build the resilience of those in vulnerable situations to disasters); 11.5 (reduce the number of deaths and people affected by disasters).

	<p>composite index would enable to bring together the already existing broad range of sources on migration policy such as follow-up mechanisms of international conventions and protocols related to international migration<sup>3</sup> as well as elements captured in the outcome documents from the deliberations in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Committees of the General Assembly, the High-level Dialogues on International Migration and Development, the Commission on Population and Development, the Human Rights Council, the <a href="#">Global Forum on Migration and Development</a> and IOM Council.</p>
Method of computation	<p>The International Migration Policy Index would track development and identify gaps through aggregation of reporting on migration policies relevant for the SDG framework. The aggregation of constituent items of “well-managed migration policies” will be based on existing regional and thematic migration policy indexes and state of the art methodology on conceptualizing and measuring migration policies (<a href="#">Bjerre et. al 2015</a>). Current work points toward the index tracking status regarding the following migration policy strands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promoting and protecting the human rights of migrants</li> <li>• Supporting socio-economic outcome</li> <li>• Supporting regulated mobility</li> <li>• Mobility dimensions of crisis</li> <li>• Partnerships and cooperation</li> </ul> <p>Computation would be based on a three-tier-scale, e.g. 100 = <i>comprehensive</i>; 50 = <i>elaborated</i>; 0 = <i>basic</i> level of implementation; or 100 = 100%-90%; 50 = 89%-40%; 0 = 39% and below for proportion of coverage etc.</p>
Data sources and number of countries for which data is currently available	<p>Government agencies, including reporting to follow-up mechanisms of relevant human rights instruments.</p> <p><a href="#">The United Nations Inquiry among Governments on Population and Development</a>, collected every 5 years since 1963, and the associated <a href="#">World Population Policies Database</a> and <a href="#">World Population Report</a>, which has data on migration policy dating back to 1976, which currently puts out data covering 196 countries on a biannual basis.</p> <p>83 countries covered by either thematic or regional migration policy indexes (<i>cf. Bjerre supra</i>)</p> <p>171 countries’ migration policies covered by <a href="#">Migration Profiles</a></p>
Responsible entity	Collective effort by members of the Global Migration Group, supported by national governments and statistical agencies
Other targets for which this indicator is relevant	This could be a "multi-purpose indicator" for 5.2/16.2, 8.8, 10.7 and 16.1.
Comments	<p>There exist already 13 migration policy indexes that either are limited to certain themes of migration policy (e.g. integration or “migrant accessibility”) or cover certain regions (e.g. OECD countries). The International Migration Policy Index will be the first global index intended to cover all major aspects of migration policy output. Efforts are currently under way, and broad consultations with stakeholders will be held, including through the Global Forum on Migration and Development as well as the IOM Council.</p> <p>The index <u>will not present a ranking of countries</u>, as this would not serve any purpose in the post-2015 context but rather to group countries in a manner that would serve to illustrate to HLPF progress on migration policies and gap-analysis.</p>

<sup>3</sup> The core international human rights instruments including the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families; 1951 refugee convention and its 1967 protocol; human trafficking and migrant smuggling protocols to transnational crime convention;; two conventions on prevention and reduction of statelessness; two ILO labour migration conventions; ILO domestic worker convention (to be completed with formal nomenclature).

**Indicator 10.7.3: Number of detected and non-detected victims of human trafficking per 100,000; by sex, age and form of exploitation**

- No current metadata
- No metadata received

**Target 10.a Implement the principle of special and differential treatment for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, in accordance with World Trade Organization agreements.**

**Indicator 10.a.1: Share of tariff lines applied to imports from LDCs/developing countries with zero-tariff.**

- No current metadata
- No metadata received.

**Target 10.b Encourage official development assistance and financial flows, including foreign direct investment, to States where the need is greatest, in particular least developed countries, African countries, Small Island developing States and landlocked developing countries, in accordance with their national plans and programmes.**

**Indicator 10.b.1: Total resources flows for development, disaggregated by recipient and donor countries and type of flow (i.e. ODA, FDI and other flows)**

- Indicator changed to all flows for development.
- Request OECD to review the metadata.

**Target 10.c By 2030, reduce to less than 3 per cent the transaction costs of migrant remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5 per cent.**

**Indicator 10.c.1: Remittance costs as a percentage of the amount remitted**

**From Global Migration Working Group (and TST):**

Indicator	Remittance costs as a percentage of the amount remitted
OWG targets addressed	<i>10.c by 2030, reduce to less than 3% the transaction costs of migrant remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5%</i>
Rationale	Remittances are an important private source of income for migrant families. They benefit wider communities and improve the human development of migrant households. With total remittances going to developing countries projected at USD 454 billion in 2015, reaching the target of reducing remittances to less than 3% would save more than USD 20 billion/year. The G20 has already committed to reducing the transfer costs of remittances (with 5 percentage points over five years), the so-called “5x 5 initiative”. To monitor this commitment, a designated group in the World bank was created to monitor the implementation of this commitment.
Method of computation	Fees paid, including indirect costs for inflated exchange rates, divided by the amount remitted.
Data sources and number of countries for which data is currently available	Data already collected through quarterly surveys in 226 migration corridors. Information is compiled in existing remittance price database: <a href="http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/en">http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/en</a> , (survey based, mystery shopping)
Responsible entity	The World Bank
Other targets for which this indicator is relevant	<i>10.7 facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies;</i> <i>17.3 Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources</i>
Comments	The ratings this indicator received from UN Statistics Division survey among national statistics offices (CBB) is misleading as it does not take into account the existing data collection (quarterly surveys) carried by the World Bank in a large number of number of migration corridors. Suggested rating: AAA