

# 6 CLEAN WATER AND SANITATION

## The SDG PSS Technical Guidelines

## Introduction: Water in the World We Want 2016 - 2018

The Sustainable Development Goal Policy Support System (SDG PSS) was developed as a part of the 2016-2018 phase of the *Water in the World We Want* project, which is managed in partnership by the United Nations University Institute for Water, Environment and Health (UNU-INWEH), the Korean Environment Corporation (Keco), the Ministry of Environment Republic of Korea, and the United Nations Office for Sustainable Development (UNOSD).

The SDG PSS is currently available in Excel. In 2017, it is being trialled in 5 countries: Ghana, Pakistan, Tunisia, Costa Rica and Republic of Korea. In 2018, when the trial phase is complete, the SDG PSS will be fully online and freely and securely available for Government actors and stakeholders in any country<sup>1</sup>.

The SDG PSS is designed to enable Government actors to better collaborate to create one authoritative, national-level evidence base. The evidence base will comprise all evidence that is critically needed to strengthen the enabling environment to better address water-related issues as defined by the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development and, more specifically, by Sustainable Development Goal 6 – to ensure access to water and sanitation for all.

Having one agreed, fit-for-policy water-related evidence base will allow more comprehensive and integrated evidence-based policy-making, and more effective and informed decision-making around water-related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which can lead to accelerated SDG success.

The *SDG PSS User Guidelines*<sup>1</sup> should be read first, before this document. The *User Guidelines* describe:

- how the SDG PSS works overall;
- the 7 components that are included in the SDG PSS; these are *Status, Capacity, Finance, Policy and institutional, Gender, Risk reduction and resilience* and *Transparency* components; and
- how the SDG PSS can be contextualized for use in different countries.

This document, the *SDG PSS Technical Guidelines*, aims to supplement the general guidelines to inform users who wish to understand how different calculations and equations that were used in the SDG PSS.

These guidelines are organised into 3 sections. Section 1 describes the methodology that was used to produce the Summary View. The data entered into the SDG PSS are automatically assessed, evaluated and presented as a whole picture in the Summary View, which allows decision makers to visualise gaps, strengths and weaknesses in the enabling environment that supports the implementation of SDG 6.

Working backwards, the next sections are descriptions of how each component is first assessed, in isolation from the summary view. The descriptions are divided into two parts: Section 2 gives an overview of how the *Status* component is evaluated, and Section 3 shows all the calculations and evaluation methods employed for the other components. The components are divided into two sections because the first component, *Status*, is built, evaluated and presented differently to the other components. For more explanatory material, please go to the SDG Policy Support System itself. More information is included in introductory pages and the *resources* pages within the SDG PSS.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information and the SDG PSS download, please see <http://inweh.unu.edu/sdg-policy-support-system/>

## Section 1: the SDG PSS Summary View and how it works

The SDG PSS Summary view references 7 components, each one divided into subcomponents. Table 1 presents all components and subcomponents found in the Summary view.

Table 1: Components and subcomponents presented in the Summary view	
Components	Subcomponents
Status	None
Capacity Assessment	Overall Current Capacity
	Strengthening Mechanisms
	Overall Progress
Finance	Adequacy of Financial Flows
	Accountability
	Funding Sources
	Financing for Equity
Policy & Institutional Assessment	Policy for Equity
	Coordination and Cooperation
	Awareness
Gender Mainstreaming	National Policy
	Governance
	Organisation Mainstreaming
Risk Reduction and Resilience Mainstreaming	Strategies
	Information and Assessments
	Infrastructure
Transparency	Policy and Integrity
	Public Sector Integrity
	Whistleblower Protection

*Note: Different countries may choose to add more components when contextualising the SDG PSS for their own use. Contextualising the SDG PSS is discussed also in the User Guidelines.*

The Summary view takes processed data from all components and automatically evaluates them, using threshold analysis. The summary view is designed to show weaknesses, gaps and strengths in “traffic light” colours, allowing users to easily understand and use results. In this way, government partners can experiment with different data values in different components, and see what the changes will mean in the overall picture.

As shown in Figure 1, the summary view first lists the SDG targets, then presents the indicators that have been defined nationally – that is, the national aspiration – in the vertical axis. In the SDG era, each country must make its own targets and indicators for SDGs overall; however, for SDG 6 there are some

exceptions to this. First, SDG 6.1 and 6.2 call for universal drinking water, sanitation and handwashing services - the implication here is that every nation will aspire to values of 100% when defining SDG indicators 6.1.1 and 6.2.1. In the same way, target 6.3 has some parameters that are not well defined, but does call for “halving the proportion of untreated wastewater”; therefore indicator 6.3.1 should reflect that.

Figure 1 then shows that the first component to be presented along the horizontal axis is the *Status* component.

Water-related SDG Targets		National Aspiration	Status
			% Goal
6.1	By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all	100% of population using safely managed drinking water	100%
6.2	By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations	71% of population using safely managed sanitation and hygiene services	77%
6.3	By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally	42% of wastewater safely treated	98%
		100% of water bodies with good ambient water quality	14%

Figure 1: *Status* component results displayed in the Summary view

It is important to note that summary view shows achievement (% Goal) as a percentage against the *nationally defined* indicator. If a country has not yet defined their targets and indicators, it is not possible to show progress (% Goal) against that indicator.

The status evidence is evaluated using customised classification values. For the Status component in the summary view:

- No aspiration defined (coloured light blue): if data = “unknown”
- Inadequate progress (coloured red): if data < =66% progressed
- Adequate progress (coloured white): if data >66% and <=99%,
- Significant progress (coloured green): if result = 100% goal achieved

These colours are described as “traffic lights” as it is intuitive for many people to understand that red indicates areas of weakness or gap, and green indicates areas of strength and achievement.

Figure 2 presents the next extract from the Summary view. For each SDG 6 target (on the vertical axis) and for each subcomponent for capacity; policy & institutional strength; finance; gender; risk reduction and resilience; and transparency /integrity (on the horizontal axis), there is one piece of evidence.

Water-related SDG Targets		National Aspiration	Policy & Institutional		
			Policy for equity	Coordination & cooperation	Awareness
6.1	By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all	100% of population using safely managed sanitation and hand-washing services	No evidence	Inadequate	Significant
6.2	By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention	71% of population using safely managed drinking water services	Inadequate	Significant	Inadequate
6.3	By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally	42% of wastewater safely treated	Significant	Inadequate	Adequate
		100% of water bodies with good ambient water quality	Inadequate	Inadequate	Significant

Figure 2: Results displayed in the Summary view

These threshold values were defined following ‘equal interval’ classification. This means that data are divided into equal-sized subranges. This method emphasises the amount of an attribute value relative to other values in that column. That is, in the subcomponent ‘policy for equity’ shown in Figure 1, each value is coloured according to a comparison against the values for other indicators of ‘policy for equity’ subcomponent. It is important to note that evidence for these components are not assessed against the national aspiration or the SDG 6 target; they are coloured relative to each other within a subcomponent. Overall, assuming that data range from 0 – 100, this classification results in one of four colours:

- No evidence (coloured light blue): if data = “unknown”
- Inadequate progress (coloured red): if data <=33%
- Adequate progress (coloured white): if data >33% and <66%,
- Significant progress (coloured green): if result >= 66%

It is important to notice that the threshold values are different for one subcomponent:

Component “Capacity” subcomponent “Overall current capacity” threshold values:

- No evidence (coloured light blue): if data = “unknown”
- Inadequate progress(coloured red): if data = 1
- Adequate progress(coloured white): if data = 2 or result = 3
- Significant progress(coloured green): data = 4

## Section 2: Status Component

Before the data in the Status component is referenced in the Summary View, several calculations are applied. These calculations follow the methods and metadata currently defined by international SDG monitoring and reporting processes. Through 2017 and into 2018, these metadata are still being defined and finalised by the international community. Because of this, the SDG PSS is regularly updated and the information presented in Table 2 may change.

Table 2 presents these calculations that are used in the Status component. To understand the table, it will be necessary to refer to the document 'Metadata on Suggested Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Water and Sanitation' at:

<http://www.sdg6monitoring.org/news/integrated-monitoring-guide-sdg-6?rq=INDICATORS%20AND%20MONITORING>

Table 2: Calculation methods used in the <i>Status</i> component					
Sub-indicator for measurement		Measure	Abbreviation and Data description	Calculation	
	6.0.1.1	Number of people ('000,000)	Total population	$P_i$ : Total population	
6.1.1	6.1.1.1	Percentage population using safely managed drinking water services	Population using improved water sources that are located on premises and available when needed and free of faecal (and priority) contamination	$PIW_i$ : Population using improved water sources are located on premises and available when needed and free of contamination [%]	$\left(\frac{PIW}{P}\right)_{2017} - \left(\frac{PIW}{P}\right)_{2016}$
					$\left(\frac{PIW}{P}\right)_{2017} / \left(\frac{PIW}{P}\right)_{2016}$
6.2.1	6.2.1.1	Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation and hygiene services	Population using improved sanitation services that are not shared with other households and where excreta are safely disposed in situ or treated off-site	$PIS_i$ : Population using improved sanitation services [%]	$\left(\frac{PIS}{P}\right)_{2017} - \left(\frac{PIS}{P}\right)_{2016}$
					$\left(\frac{PIH}{P}\right)_{2017} - \left(\frac{PIH}{P}\right)_{2016}$

		Population using a hygiene facility [a device to contain, transport or regulate the flow of water to facilitate handwashing] with soap and water at home	$PIH_i$ : Population using a hygiene facility with soap and water at home [%]	$\frac{\left[ \left( \frac{[PIS/P]_{2017}}{[PIS/P]_{2030}} \right) + \left( \frac{[PIH/P]_{2017}}{[PIH/P]_{2030}} \right) \right]}{2}$
--	--	--	---	--

Table 2: Calculation methods used in the *Status* component

Sub-indicator for measurement		Measure	Abbreviation and Data description	Calculation
6.3.1	6.3.1.1	Volume of wastewater produced from commercial establishments	$WHI_i$ : Volume of wastewater produced from hazardous industries [m <sup>3</sup> ]  $WHF_i$ : Volume of wastewater treated from hazardous flows [m <sup>3</sup> ]	$\left( \frac{WHF}{WHI} \right)_{2017} - \left( \frac{WHF}{WHI} \right)_{2016}$
		Volume of wastewater produced from non-hazardous industries		
		Volume of wastewater produced from hazardous industries		$\frac{HWS_{2017} - HWS_{2016}}{100}$
		Volume of wastewater treated from hazardous flows		$\left[ \frac{\left( \frac{WHF/WHI}{WHF/WHI} \right)_{2017} + \left( \frac{HWS_{2017}/HWS_{2030}}{HWS_{2017}/HWS_{2030}} \right)}{2} \right]$
6.3.1.2	Percentage of wastewater from households [sewerage and faecal sludge] that is safely treated	$HWS_i$ : Proportion of wastewater from households that is safely treated [ - ]		
6.3.2	6.3.2.1	Number of waterbodies classified as holding a good general status (based on measures of DO, EC, pH, OrthoP and TON)	$WGS_i$ : Number of waterbodies classified as holding a good general status $TW_i$ : Total number of classified waterbodies	$\left( \frac{WGS}{TW} \right)_{2017} - \left( \frac{WGS}{TW} \right)_{2016}$
		Total number of classified waterbodies		$\left( \frac{WGS}{TW} \right)_{2017} / \left( \frac{WGS}{TW} \right)_{2030}$

Table 2: Calculation methods used in the *Status* component

		Sub-indicator for measurement	Measure	Abbreviation and Data description	Calculation
6.4.1	6.4.1.1	$CWI_i$ : Change in water use efficiency of industries (including power production)	Gross value added by industry (including energy)	$I_{we}$ : Industrial water use efficiency [USD/m <sup>3</sup> ] $GVA_i$ : Gross value added by industry [USD] $V_i$ : Volume of water withdrawn by the industries [m <sup>3</sup> ]	$I_{we} = \frac{GVA_i}{V_i}$
			Volume of water withdrawn by the industries (including energy)		$CWI_{2017} = \frac{\left(\frac{GVA_i}{V_i}\right)_{2017} - \left(\frac{GVA_i}{V_i}\right)_{2016}}{\left(\frac{GVA_i}{V_i}\right)_{2016}}$
	6.4.1.2	$CWA_i$ : Change in water use efficiency of irrigated agriculture	Gross value added by agriculture (excluding river and marine fisheries and forestry)	$A_{we}$ : Irrigated agriculture water use efficiency [USD/m <sup>3</sup> ] $GVA_a$ : Gross value added by agriculture [USD] $C_r$ : Proportion of agricultural GVA produced by rainfed agriculture [-] $V_a$ : Volume of water withdrawn by the agricultural sector [m <sup>3</sup> ] $A_i$ : Proportion of irrigated land on the total arable land [-] 0.375 : Generic default ratio between rainfed and irrigated yields	$A_{we} = \frac{GVA_a \times (1 - C_r)}{V_a}$
			Proportion of agricultural GVA produced by rainfed agriculture		$C_r = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{A_i}{(1 - A_i) \times 0.375}}$
			Volume of water withdrawn by the agricultural sector (including irrigation, livestock and aquaculture)		$CWA_{2017} = \frac{A_{we2017} - A_{we2016}}{A_{we2016}}$
	6.4.1.3	$CWS_i$ : Change in water use efficiency of water service sectors	Gross value added by services	$S_{we}$ : Services water use efficiency [USD/m <sup>3</sup> ] $GVA_s$ : Gross value added by services [USD] $V_s$ : Volume of water withdrawn by the service sector [m <sup>3</sup> ]	$CWS_{2017} = \frac{\left(\frac{GVA_s}{V_s}\right)_{2017} - \left(\frac{GVA_s}{V_s}\right)_{2016}}{\left(\frac{GVA_s}{V_s}\right)_{2016}}$
Volume of water withdrawn by the service sector			$S_{we} = \frac{GVA_s}{V_s}$		

	6.4.1.1, 6.4.1.2 and 6.4.1.3	Change in water use efficiency over time			$\frac{CWI_{2017} + CWA_{2017} + CWS_{2017}}{CWI_{2030} + CWA_{2030} + CWS_{2030}}$
6.4.2	6.4.2.1	Reduction in percentage of freshwater withdrawal compared to available freshwater resources	Total [internal and external] renewable freshwater resources	<i>TFWW</i> : Total freshwater withdrawn [ $10^9$ m <sup>3</sup> ] <i>TRWR</i> : Total renewable freshwater resources [ $10^9$ m <sup>3</sup> ] <i>EFR</i> : Environmental flow requirements [ $10^9$ m <sup>3</sup> ]	$Stress_i = \left( \frac{TFWW_i}{TRWR_i - EFR_i} \right)$
			Total freshwater withdrawn		$Stress_{2017} - Stress_{2016}$
			Environmental flow requirements		$\frac{Stress_{2017}}{Stress_{2030}}$

**Table 2: Calculation methods used in the *Status* component**

Sub-indicator for measurement		Measure	Abbreviation and Data description	Calculation
6.5.1	6.5.1.1	Improvement in policy, legal and strategic planning tools i.e. enabling environment	Enabling environment score	<p>The indicator is determined from the results of the IWRM questionnaire, which is divided into 4 sections. The section for this sub-indicator consists of 5 questions. Each question has a response value of between 0 and 100, in increments of 10. Question scores are averaged to form a section score. The section scores are then averaged to create an indicator score on a scale of 0-100, which represents the degree of IWRM integration</p>
	6.5.1.2	Improvement in institutions and participation	Enabling environment score	
	6.5.1.3	Improvement in management instruments	Enabling environment score	
	6.5.1.4	Improvement in financing	Enabling environment score	
			Score between 0 and 100	

6.5.2	6.5.2.1	Percentage of total surface area of transboundary basins that have an operational arrangement for water cooperation	Total surface area of transboundary basins that have an operational arrangement for water cooperation	$TBA_i$ : Total surface area of transboundary basins that have an operational arrangement for water cooperation [km <sup>2</sup> ]	$\left(\frac{TBA}{TB}\right)_{2017} - \left(\frac{TBA}{TB}\right)_{2016}$
	6.5.2.2	Percentage of total surface area of transboundary basins that have an operational arrangement for water cooperation	Total surface area of transboundary basins	$TB_i$ : Total surface area of transboundary basins [km <sup>2</sup> ]	$\left(\frac{TBA}{TB}\right)_{2017} / \left(\frac{TBA}{TB}\right)_{2016}$

**Table 2: Calculation methods used in the *Status* component**

Sub-indicator for measurement		Measure	Abbreviation and Data description	Calculation	
6.6.1	6.6.1.1	Percentage change in wetland spatial extent	Area/extent of water-related ecosystems	$\frac{WEA_{2017} - WEA_{2016}}{WEA_{2016}}$	
	6.6.1.2	Percentage change in wetland quality (wetland health or state)	Stream-flow	$SF_i$ : Stream-flow [Mm <sup>3</sup> ]	$\frac{(SF + VOW + VG)_{2017} - (SF + VOW + VG)_{2016}}{(SF + VOW + VG)_{2017}}$
			Volume of water storage in open water (lakes and reservoirs)	$VOW_i$ : Volume of water storage in open water [Mm <sup>3</sup> ]	$WGQ_{2017} - WGQ_{2016}$
	Volume of groundwater	$VG_i$ : Volume of groundwater [Mm <sup>3</sup> ]			
6.6.1.3	Percentage change in inland open water [lakes, reservoirs and rivers] quality over time	Percentage of water bodies with good quality	$WGQ_i$ : Water bodies with good quality [%]	$\left[ \frac{\frac{WEA_{2017} - WEA_{2016}}{WEA_{2016}} + \frac{(SF + VOW + VG)_{2017} - (SF + VOW + VG)_{2016}}{(SF + VOW + VG)_{2017}}}{3} + (WGQ_i - WGQ_b) \right]$	

6.6.1.4	Percentage change in groundwater quality over time	Percentage change in groundwater quality over time	$PHC_i$ : Percentage change in health or state of water-related ecosystems [relative to natural state (100%)]	$PHC_{2017} - PHC_{2016}$
---------	--	--	---	---------------------------

The actual monitoring of SDG 6 indicators will be undertaken using ongoing and emerging national and international mechanisms and processes. The *Status* component can then become the place where data from many different monitoring tools are brought together to facilitate analysis and comparisons.

It is important to notice that the *Status* component requires not only current data, which for this SDG PSS is 2017, but also baseline data (set at 2015 or 2016, following international monitoring guidance) and national aspirational values. In this way, the SDG PSS allows different government partners to visualise all of these data together and then to run simple scenarios, and visualise different indicator-level options and different aspirational outcomes. By bringing all monitoring data together, it will also become easier to see where monitoring data about SDG 6 reporting needs is missing or inadequate.

To facilitate this, there are two sets of evaluations embedded in the Status component, shown on the *Status data page*. These are:

- Percentage change between 2017 and baseline  
This will show the progress, or lack of progress, from the baseline – whether that is 2015 or 2016 – and the current year. These guidelines are for the 2017 SDG PSS, so 2017 will be referred to here.
- Percentage of 2030 National aspiration achieved in 2017  
This is a calculation of progress against the national aspiration: this is the same value that is presented in the Summary view.

## Section 3: 6 Components

Tables 4 to 9 present the calculation methods used in the *Capacity, Finance, Policy and institutional, Gender, Risk reduction and resilience and Transparency* components of the SDG PSS. A full description of each component can be found in the SDG PDD User Guidelines.

The aim of these calculations is to capture the key values in each component and summarise them into three to four subcomponents, so that these values can then be referred to in the Summary view.

Table 4: Calculation methods used in the <i>Capacity</i> component				
		Measure	Calculation	Questions that are used in the sub-component
Subcomponents	Overall current capacity	Overall current capacity scale	The user must specify which is the level of national Government capacity available to achieve the agreed 2030 aspiration for the given indicator.	6.1.1.2
	Strengthening mechanisms	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.3
	Overall Progress	Proportion of positive overall progress	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.4

**Table 5: Calculation methods used in the *Finance* component**

		Measure	Calculation	Questions that are used in the sub-component
<b>Subcomponents</b>	<b>Overall current capacity</b>	<p><math>TOF_i</math>: Total available funds as % of funds needed in 2016</p> <p><math>PPR_i</math>: Proportion of positive responses for 'financial flows'</p>	$\frac{TOF_i + PPR_i}{2}$	6.1.1.1 to 6.1.1.11
	<b>Accountability</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.13
	<b>Funding Sources</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.14 to 6.1.1.18
	<b>Financing for Equity</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.19 and 6.1.1.20

**Table 6: Calculation methods used in the *Policy and Institutional* component**

		<b>Measure</b>	<b>Calculation</b>	<b>Questions that are used in the sub-component</b>
<b>Subcomponents</b>	<b>Police for Equity</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.6
	<b>Coordination and Cooperation</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.8
	<b>Awareness</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.14

**Table 7: Calculation methods used in the *Gender* component**

		Measure	Calculation	Questions that are used in the sub-component
<b>Subcomponents</b>	<b>National Policy</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.1 to 6.1.1.3
	<b>Governance</b>	Proportion of senior women to all senior staff	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Women senior staff}}{\sum \# \text{ Senior staff}}$	6.1.1.6
	<b>Organisation main-streaming</b>	<p><math>FGI_i</math> : Female staff responsible for gender issues</p> <p><math>TGI_i</math> : Staff responsible for gender issues</p> <p><math>FRB_i</math> : Female representation on scientific or advisory boards</p> <p><math>TRB_i</math> : Representation on scientific or advisory boards</p>	$\frac{\left(\frac{\sum FGI_i}{\sum TGI_i}\right) + \left(\frac{\sum FRB_i}{\sum TRB_i}\right)}{2}$	6.1.1.9 and 6.1.1.10

Table 8: Calculation methods used in the <i>Risk Reduction and Resiliency</i> component				
	Measure	Calculation	Questions that are used in the sub-component	
Subcomponents	Strategies	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.1 to 6.1.1.7
	Information and Assessments	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.8 to 6.1.1.10
	Infrastructure	$PHZ_i$ : Proportion of critical infrastructure located in high hazard/disaster risk areas $PHA_i$ : Proportion of critical infrastructure that have Hazard, Risk and Vulnerability Analysis completed	$\frac{(1 - PHZ_i) + PHA_i}{2}$	6.1.1.11 and 6.1.1.12

Table 9: Calculation methods used in the <i>Transparency</i> component				
		Measure	Calculation	Questions that are used in the sub-component
<b>Subcomponents</b>	<b>Policy and Integrity</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.1 to 6.1.1.3
	<b>Public Sector Integrity</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.5
	<b>Whistleblower Protection</b>	Proportion of positive responses	$\frac{\sum \# \text{ Positive responses}}{\sum \# \text{ Responses}}$	6.1.1.6

If you have any questions on the SDG Policy Support System, please feel free to contact the project team at [contact.inweh@unu.edu](mailto:contact.inweh@unu.edu)