



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



## REPORTING ON SDG INDICATOR 1.4.2 FOR HIGH INCOME COUNTRIES: THE CASE OF THE US

**BENJAMIN LINKOW\*, DIANA FLETSCHNER\*, CALEB STEVENS°, AND JENNIFER<sup>a</sup>**

**LISHER**

\*Landesa

°USAID

<sup>a</sup>MCC

Paper prepared for presentation at the  
“2019 WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY”  
The World Bank - Washington DC, March 25-29, 2019



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



*Copyright 2019 by author(s). All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.*

## **Abstract**

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) include a process of identifying globally comparable targets, indicators and harmonized data to measure progress towards each goal. One of these, SDG indicator 1.4.2, measures the percentage of the population with secure tenure rights to land, where security of tenure rights is proxied by whether people (a) have documented rights to land and (b) perceive their rights as secure.

While much attention has been devoted to data collection efforts for the SDGs in developing countries, it is also vital for European, North American, and other high income countries to report. These higher income countries can still face considerable challenges in establishing and institutionalizing data collection efforts sufficient to fully report on the indicator. This paper presents some of the challenges and potential options for the U.S. Government to report on indicator 1.4.2, which may have important lessons for other high income countries.

## **Key Words:**

Sustainable Development Goals, indicators, data collection, land rights



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



## I. Introduction

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is an ongoing United Nations initiative to set development priorities globally, and track them over time. The SDGs include a process of identifying indicators, setting targets, and collecting data to measure progress towards each goal. One of these, indicator 1.4.2, measures the percentage of the population with secure tenure rights to land, where security of tenure rights is proxied by whether people: (a) have documented rights to land; and (b) perceive their rights as secure. This indicator is closely aligned with the US Government's (USG) development agenda- secure and enforceable property rights, particularly with respect to land, are an essential precondition for an economy's private sector to flourish. Indicator 1.4.2 currently has Tier 2 status in the SDG process, meaning that regular data collection will need to expand to at least 50% of participating countries and 50% of the population per region in order for the indicator to be officially recognized as an SDG indicator. Thus, reporting by HICs, particularly those with large populations, may be critical to securing final acceptance of Indicator 1.4.2.

While it is important for all countries to report on indicator 1.4.2, little attention has been devoted to the particular set of opportunities and constraints facing high income countries (HICs). Vast amounts of data are routinely collected in HICs, which raises the possibility that existing data sources may include components of 1.4.2 and could thus provide a low-cost avenue for reporting. In the particular case of 1.4.2, real estate data and government property records are potential sources of data on the extent of legally documented land rights. This paper presents the results of an exercise to explore considerations and potential avenues for the US government to report on indicator 1.4.2, with an eye towards drawing lessons for other HICs seeking to report on 1.4.2.

After discussing the various data sources explored, the paper will address the data sources ultimately accepted by the SDG Goal Inter-Agency Working Group ("Working Group"), which is the USG body primarily responsible for assessing the strengths and weaknesses of different data sources. The paper then concludes with a series of findings relevant for other HICs reporting efforts.

## II. Background on SDG Indicator 1.4.2



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



## *Introduction to Indicator 1.4.2*

Throughout the world, secure tenure rights to land are key to accessing income, food, status, housing, credit, government services, and greater household- and community-level decision-making. Recognizing the foundational and cross-cutting role of tenure rights, the SDGs include ambitious commitments to secure tenure rights under several goals: ending poverty (goal 1), ensuring food security (goal 2), achieving gender equality and empowering women (goal 5), making cities and human settlements inclusive (goal 11), and protecting, restoring and promoting sustainable use of ecosystems, forests and land (15).

UN Member States agreed to track their progress toward these commitments by relying on three indicators: 1.4.2, 5.a.1, and 5.a.2. It is worth noting that in adopting these indicators Member States made a deliberate choice to push the data and evidence base forward. Instead of having the available data control the framing of priorities, they agreed to measure what is critical to assess tenure rights, knowing it would require additional efforts in data collection.

This note provides recommendations for the USG to report on indicator 1.4.2—a measure of people’s on-the-ground tenure rights to land that is universal, relies on primary data and helps governments track progress toward target 1.4 as well as toward targets 2.3, 5.a and 11.1. By reporting on indicator 1.4.2, however incrementally, the USG will help institutionalize its own data-based tracking of tenure rights—a critical piece of information for policymakers and investors. Moreover, by reporting on indicator 1.4.2, the US can encourage the institutionalization of this measure overseas—not only by modeling how to do it but also by contributing to the reclassification of indicator 1.4.2 to Tier I.<sup>1</sup>

### **Indicator 1.4.2:**

*Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land,  
with legally recognized documentation and  
who perceive their rights to land as secure,  
by sex and by type of tenure.*

---

<sup>1</sup> To be reclassified to Tier I, indicators need to be regularly produced for at least 50% of countries and 50% of population per region.



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



## *Definition of the indicator*

Characterizing and tracking progress on the extent to which tenure rights to land are secure is a complex and multidimensional exercise that would typically require several measures. Recognizing this complexity yet mindful of the multiple and competing demands that the SDGs place on the National Statistical Offices, indicator 1.4.2 operationalizes the concept of *secure tenure rights to land* by focusing on the twin aims of tracking:

- (a) Government's legal, administrative and judicial progress in recognizing and protecting tenure rights to land (legally recognized documentation); and,
- (b) People-defined progress on the security of their tenure rights to land (perceptions of rights to land as secure).

The legal recognition of tenure is important, but not always sufficient, to fully guarantee that rights to land are experienced in practice. For these rights to be secure, they must be backed by effective, inclusive and gender-responsive systems of land administration and justice. By tracking the extent to which these rights are documented (documentation component), the indicator captures governments' steps to formally grant and protect the rights.

By tracking individuals' perceptions of their land rights as secure (perception component), the indicator captures the economic, social, and political risks affecting individuals, their households, and their communities as they perceive them. Individuals may face different kinds of threats to their land rights. Examples of these threats include the possibility of losing land due to adverse economic circumstances, to conflict in their communities, to large scale land acquisitions, or as is often the case for women, to intra-family dynamics such as losing a husband. No indicator is perfect, but documentation and perceptions provide fundamental and complementary information on tenure security. In addition, they both highlight outcomes and on-the-ground realities. Because the SDGs are particularly concerned with promoting inclusive and gender-responsive development, these two measures must be disaggregated by sex and by tenure type.

## *Estimation of the Documentation Component*

The documentation component is defined as:



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



$$\frac{\text{Number of adults with legally recognized documentation}}{\text{Total Adult Population}} \times 100$$

The denominator is the **total adult population**. This figure should be based on the latest available national census and should include the entire adult population of the country, regardless of where they live, in which sector they operate, what livelihood they have, under what tenure arrangement they access land, or what is known about them.

For the purpose of the global monitoring of this indicator, **adults** are individuals who are at least 18-years old. However, countries may decide to adapt this threshold for their national monitoring and use country specific cuts-off. The US will consider as adults those who are at least 18 years old.

To calculate or estimate the numerator, an adult is considered as **having legally recognized documentation** of his/her tenure rights to land if three conditions are met:

- i. **The person has access to land through a type of tenure arrangement that is recognized and protected by the government.** Each country has to indicate which tenure arrangements are recognized by its government. Examples include individual, shared, joint, or collective ownership, certain types of lease arrangements (excluding unregistrable private contracts), or use rights. In general, to be captured by the indicator the tenure rights must be registrable. In the case of the US, tenure arrangements recognized by the Government include fee simple ownership. Leaseholds, based on non-registrable private contracts, will not be captured. .
- ii. **The person must possess the type of document that the government recognizes as proof of the existence of those rights.** Each country will determine what type of documentation its government deems necessary and sufficient for the individual or group-based tenure rights to land to be claimed and protected. Legally recognized documents may include, for example, title deeds and certificates of use rights. For reporting on the SDGs, the US will consider a fee simple deed—the document that proves land ownership—as the only legally recognized document.



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



- iii. **The document must include the person's name.** To fully ensure the person's rights are documented and recognized it is important that the person's name is included in the document. In the case of group-based tenure arrangements for which documents are issued to a household, community or group and do not list all members entitled to the right, then the person must possess a document to demonstrate that he or she is a member of the group entitled to those rights.

It is important to note that people often access more than one plot of land. As long as they meet the three conditions listed above *for at least one plot*, this indicator will consider them as having legally recognized documentation that demonstrates their tenure rights to land.

As such, this indicator is not meant to provide a full picture of the land tenure system. It does not tell us, for example, the extent to which a country's land is legally documented. Nor does it reflect how land is distributed: it does not talk about the size, the quality or the number of plots people access. It is a people-centered indicator focused on tracking what proportion of the population can demonstrate tenure rights to at least one plot of land relying on the type of documents that the government recognizes.

## *Estimation of the Perceptions Component*

The perceptions component is defined as:

$$\frac{\text{Number of adults who perceive their rights to land as secure}}{\text{Total Adult Population}} \times 100$$



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



Perceptions matter because they influence behavior. Whether or not people feel tenure secure influences the livelihoods they choose, the risks they take, the investments they make, how empowered they feel in their families and communities, and eventually their income, food security and quality of their lives.

People's perceptions of their tenure rights to land may be affected by a host of factors. They may perceive their households' or their communities' tenure rights as insecure because of boundary disputes, because they lack documentation to claim those rights, because they lack the capacity or resources to make use of the land, because there is a high likelihood of investors or developers acquiring the land without proper consultation and compensation, because of conflicts or displacements in the area, because they cannot afford the taxes, fees or other requirements, or because they lack political clout or connections to local or traditional leaders or authorities, among many other reasons.

Even if their households and communities are secure, people may perceive their own tenure rights as insecure for many reasons. They may not know the rights they have. Their families or communities may not recognize those rights. They may not know where and how to claim those rights or be able to afford legal protection. They may not be able to ensure those rights will be enforced, or they may be vulnerable to losing those rights when their spouses die, remarry or abandon them, or when their community leaders change.

The strong advantages of relying on perceptions as a measure that can summarize so many dimensions of insecurity are tempered by the challenges of eliciting people's perceptions in a consistent way. Understanding that data on perceptions can be affected by the framing, wording and sequencing of the questions, and mindful of the burden of each additional question added to surveys, the perceptions component relies on the best available information from questions likely to produce robust and meaningful data on perceptions of tenure security.

For the perceptions component, people will be categorized as **perceiving their rights as secure** if: (1) they report that they are unlikely to experience an involuntary loss of their land in the next five years, and (2) they have the right to bequeath their land. The reported right to bequeath is particularly important for gender equity, as women's ability to influence intergenerational land transfers is an important aspect of female



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



empowerment. Since an individual can access more than one plot of land, they will be categorized as secure if they perceive their rights *to at least one plot* as secure.

Both **adults** and the **total adult population** are defined as in the documentation component.

### III. Administrative Data Sources

To assess the USG's near term ability to report on indicator 1.4.2, we conducted a thorough review of the existing data sources. We considered: private sector data providers; US government sources at federal, state, and local levels; and data collected by non-profit institutions. For each data source, we assessed what relevant measure(s) could be calculated with the data they track, the coverage of their data, the timing of the most recent round of data, the frequency with which the data is updated, and whether and under which conditions the data could be available to the USG. In this section, we present the results of our analysis as to potential data sources available for the USG to report on indicator 1.4.2 and discuss the strengths and limitations of each. This section will also discuss the data sources the USG will use to report on 1.4.2, in particular why those data sources were preferred over others.

#### *Tax Assessor Data*

We identified four private sector vendors in the US that provide tax assessor datasets: First American, Attom Data Solutions, CoreLogic, and Black Knight.<sup>2</sup> These data providers compile, standardize and link publicly available county-level administrative data.

The tax assessor data has four critical properties. First, it has wide coverage. Tax assessments are carried out and the data is made publically available for nearly all properties in the US—the only exception that we identified was property on Indian Reservations, which we discuss below. Second, because the data is already combined into one nationwide dataset, it eliminates the task of procuring and aggregating data across more than 3000 counties. Third, by relying on the name and tax mailing address of the property owners, the dataset enables the aggregation of data at the individual level—ensuring that owners with more than one property are only counted once. Lastly, this dataset is updated annually. Armed with this data one

---

<sup>2</sup> Two interviewees at these firms expressed confidence that there are no other providers of tax assessor data in the US.



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



can calculate the number of adults with documented ownership rights and estimate the **proportion of the US adult population that holds documented *ownership* rights to land.**

In addition, tax assessor data may shed light on the sex-disaggregation of property owners. Counties differ in the type of data they make publicly available. In some cases the data includes the gender of the owners. According to one vendor, gender of the owner is available for approximately 10% of properties. With the appropriate econometric tools, data from these counties could be used to estimate national figures.

## *Factors to Consider when Procuring Tax Assessor Data*

Our detailed discussions with First American and Attom Data Solutions uncovered differences among the tax assessor datasets provided by each vendor. These differences have important implications for calculating indicator 1.4.2. We identified the need for more information about the following:

- **Coverage of owner's name and mailing address:** while tax assessment data is available for all properties in the US,<sup>3</sup> in some cases the owner's name and mailing address are missing from tax assessor datasets. There were substantial differences in the percentage of missing cases across vendors—First American reported 22%, while Attom Data Solutions reported 13%. More complete coverage provides higher and more accurate estimates, and thus fewer missing cases should be seen as an advantage when comparing tax assessor datasets from different vendors.
- **Allowable number of owner's names and mailing addresses:** in cases of multiple owners of the same property, the tax assessor datasets may not include the names and addresses of all owners. The First American dataset was limited to a maximum of two owners for each property, while Attom Data Solutions allowed for four. Thus, in cases where properties have more owners than the datasets allow, some owners will be excluded from the dataset. tax assessor datasets that allow for more owners will produce higher and more accurate estimates.
- **Coverage of gender of property owner:** as described above, the gender of the property owner can be obtained for some counties. Coverage across vendors may differ. For example First American indicated that their tax assessor data do not include any information about gender. Disaggregation by gender is

---

<sup>3</sup> Tax assessor data for property on Indian Reservations is not available.



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



an important emphasis of the SDGs, and thus more coverage of gender should be seen as an important advantage.

- **Cost:** none of the vendors offer information on their websites that enabled us to estimate how much it would cost to obtain the data needed to initially report on indicator 1.4.2. The rough estimates we obtained from them were: \$50,000 from First American and \$150,000 from Attom Data Solutions.

## *Limitations of the Tax Assessor Data*

- **It does not systematically cover Indian Reservations.** There is considerable variation in how the 326 Indian Reservations in the US define and record property rights. In some cases, parcels are allocated to individuals and households who hold rights and documentation similar to property owners elsewhere in the US. In other cases, the tribe maintains ownership of the land, and issues more limited leaseholds to residents. As a result, the tax assessor data, which relies on county-level administrative data on private ownership, will not consistently record the rights of Native Americans.
- **It does not enable reporting of perceptions of tenure security.** Neither the tax assessor data nor any other currently available data on the US includes nationally-representative information on tenure security.
- **It is unclear whether and to what extent it will enable the disaggregation of the indicator by sex.** This is an important requirement of the indicator. As described above, how feasible it will be to disaggregate the indicator depends on whether the dataset obtained includes information on sex and how representative are the counties for which that data is available.

Our research indicates that no other currently available administrative data source addresses these challenges. However, other sources considered and reviewed for our analysis were:

## *Private Sector Data*

- **On-line real estate companies:** companies such as Zillow, Trulia, and Redfin provide property owner information online, with wide coverage. However, a vendor we interviewed indicated they purchase their information from the same four vendors that sell tax assessor data.



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



- **Title companies:** One of the persons we interviewed reported that these companies use tax assessor data and supplement it as needed by getting information on individual properties directly from county records. They do not expand and maintain their own databases and therefore their coverage does not expand the tax assessor data in a significant or systemic way.
- **Google maps:** A Google interviewee with knowledge of their spatial data work indicated that Google does not maintain data on property ownership since that data is publicly available—albeit decentralized and/or not free.
- **Other datasets available from real estate data vendors:** we reviewed other datasets maintained by the tax assessor dataset vendors as well as other real estate data available from private vendors. Our review of their websites and interviews with the tax assessor vendors suggest that there are no other commercially available datasets that satisfy any of the (a)-(e) criteria listed above.

## *Government Data*

- **US Census:** the 2010 US Census questionnaire included a question on whether the respondent's primary residence was owned or rented. However, the questionnaire did not include any information on whether the arrangement was documented, nor did it have questions on perceptions of tenure security. Adding questions on documentation and perceptions to the 2020 census is feasible and would be helpful to the sector, but because it is only carried out every 10 years it will fall short of the SDG data needs.
- **US Agricultural Census:** as part of the US Agricultural Census program, a survey called Tenure, Ownership, and Transition of Agricultural Land (TOTAL) was administered in 2014. The survey included a module to collect detailed information on tenure arrangements, including ownership and rental data. Unfortunately, these data only cover agricultural land and therefore cannot yield representative data on tenure rights for the entire population<sup>4</sup>.
- **County-level records:** can substitute or complement tax assessor datasets. By not being limited to data that is publicly available, relying on county-level records can improve over tax assessor datasets in at least three ways: (i) it can include data from property owners who requested that their

---

<sup>4</sup> While the TOTAL data could not be used here, it could potentially be used to measure indicator 5.a.1 on women's ownership of agricultural land. However, it is not clear whether the US Agricultural Census program is planning to conduct further rounds of TOTAL in future years that would allow progress on the indicator to be tracked over time. As a result, using TOTAL to measure indicator 5.a.1 may require coordination with the US Agricultural Census program and/or additional funding.



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



information not be disclosed and from counties who do not want to release this information publicly (these are all cases that appear as missing data in the tax assessor datasets); (ii) it need not be limited to two or four owners per property; and (iii) by relying on social security numbers, the data can be traced to individuals and the sex-disaggregation can be complete. While these benefits are noteworthy, relying on county-level records will entail instituting a system for procuring this information from all counties, collating it, cleaning it, and analyzing it. It would require a complex software application and a process that would have to be repeated annually. In addition, accessing social security numbers may raise privacy and/or security concerns. We assumed the extra effort would not compensate for the new benefits, particularly since this information will still be limited to one component of the indicator (documentation).

## *Data from Non-Profit Organizations*

- **LOVELAND technologies:** an innovative non-profit that among other services seeks to compile and provide open-source data on property in the US, LOVELAND technologies offers a dataset with information on property ownership. However their dataset covers only 60-70% of properties and is therefore a sub-optimal option compared to tax assessor data.

## **IV. Survey Data Sources**

In addition to administrative data sources, the Working Group also explored available survey data to report on the perception and documentation component. The three viable surveys assessed were the American Housing Survey (AHS), American Community Survey (ACS), and Prindex. Both the AHS and the ACS are implemented by the US Census Bureau, with the AHS sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The AHS is conducted bi-annually, most recently in 2017, and focuses on in-depth information related to housing. The ACS is conducted annually, and covers a range of topics on social, demographic, economic, and housing issues. Prindex is a recent initiative funded by Omidyar Foundation, DfID, and other donors to collect globally comparable survey data on property rights in countries around the world. Prindex includes questions on land and property rights in the Gallup World Poll, deployable in HICs as well as developing countries.



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



All three options, AHS, ACS and Prindex, generate nationally representative results that can be used to accurately estimate population-level US averages. AHS and ACS are based on large samples (115,000 respondents for AHS and 3.5 million for ACS), which in contrast to Prindex's small sample of 1,000 respondents, present two advantages: a higher level of accuracy on what they measure and the ability to disaggregate data. In contrast, by randomizing who within the household is interviewed, Prindex provides measures that are representative of adults, rather than of households. AHS interviews the most knowledgeable adult and gives preference to the "reference person or spouse."

## **V. The US Approach to Reporting on 1.4.2**

Ultimately, the Working Group declined to use tax assessor data for two reasons: 1) cost, and 2) the nature of land tenure in the US. Sourcing the tax assessor data on a regular basis would have necessitated regular funding that exceeds acceptable limits. Moreover, given that the US has well-developed land administration systems, the Working Group concluded that it would be sufficient to rely on the American Community Survey (ACS), a partnership between the US Census and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with annual, rigorous sampling down to the local level. The ACS asks respondents whether they "own" their home or not. Although "own" is too imprecise in many developing countries, given the wide variety of tenure types with different degrees of security, in the US one can reasonably conclude that "own" means having a fee simple title with a deed properly registered in the local land registry and that the respondent's name is on the deed.

However, for reporting on perception of tenure security, the Working Group concluded that Prindex represented the only viable alternative. The Prindex survey includes questions on perceived tenure security as well as on documentation of all legally recognized forms of tenure. The data it generates can be disaggregated by sex and type of tenure and would allow for full reporting of indicator 1.4.2. However, because of the ACS' superior sampling and other reasons noted above, the Working Group opted to use ACS for reporting on documentation, given the above assumptions, and Prindex for perception.

## **VI. Conclusion: Implications for other High Income Countries**

This section will discuss the findings from the US' experience with reporting on Indicator 1.4.2, which may be relevant for other HICs. All HICs should aim to report on 1.4.2 to encourage reporting by developing



# Catalyzing Innovation

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY  
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 25-29, 2019



country partners. Domestic agencies may not immediately grasp the importance, but with proper coordination, government agencies engaged in foreign assistance can demonstrate the importance of the indicator for the government's foreign assistance priorities.

Countries with well-developed land administration systems may have all the data needed to report on the documentation component of 1.4.2 built into their systems. If their land administration systems are highly decentralized, however, as is the case in the US, a number of alternatives may prove helpful. One option is to consider relying on private sources whereby companies provide land administrative data aggregated to the national level and eliminate the need to source the data from hundreds or thousands of local registries. Alternatively, the government can rely on surveys. Because of the well-developed nature of land administration systems in HICs, surveys that ask respondents about ownership may be sufficient to report on the documentation component of 1.4.2. Surveys may prove particularly useful in HICs with a highly decentralized land administration system, such as the US. The advantage of surveys is that they can also offer an avenue to report on perceptions of tenure security, the second component of 1.4.2. If existing government surveys do not ask respondents about their tenure security and revising these surveys is impractical, HICs may consider private surveys, such as Prindex, to report on the perception component of the indicator.