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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MEASURING GENDER EQUITY IN CITIES:
AN INTERSECTIONAL SET OF PROPOSED INDICATORS

INTRODUCTION

This Report is created in partnership with the Mayor’s Office of the City of Los Angeles to provide a foundation for cities to measure progress on gender equity within the City Hub and Network for Gender Equity (CHANGE). This Report proposes thematic sets of critical indicators with accompanying detailed justifications all aimed at tracking progress on gender equity in cities around the world. The data collected from these indicators can inform cities on their progress toward gender equity, giving cities the ability to identify disparities and implement initiatives across city operations. The proposed indicators seek to localize the broader goals of The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and Sustainable Development Goal 5 by providing cities with tools to assess, address, and track systems of gender equity - moving beyond the gender binary to promote gender inclusivity and create change in the best interest of all. This report acknowledges and incorporates an intersectional lens - meaning one that considers the interconnected nature of social categorization (e.g. race, gender, class) that creates overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination and disadvantage. For this reason, indicator data is intended/encouraged to be disaggregated across social categorization as well as Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity + Expression, and Sex Characteristics (SOGIESC). Each indicator focuses on areas of gender-based disparities within six thematic areas of city-life where gender equity issues manifest:
METHODOLOGY

With the guiding values of gender inclusivity and intersectionality, we built our six thematic areas and collected indicators from commonalities in existing global gender equity indices, human rights organizations, and relevant academic literature. We then researched CHANGE cities to inform the language, applicability, and proper localization of the indicators.

REVIEW OF EXISTING GENDER EQUITY INDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>UN Minimum Gender Indicators</th>
<th>EIGE Index</th>
<th>LGBTI Inclusion Index</th>
<th>OECD Gender Equality Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersectional Lens</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejects Gender Binary</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Indicators</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Focus</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This index has an intersectional lens but excludes non-gender binary conforming individuals and other identities like race.

Acronym Guide:
EIGE: European Institute for Gender Equality
LGBTI: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex
OECD: Organization for European Cooperation and Development
PRIORITIZATION

In order to consolidate the initial 250+ indicators into the Report's final selection of 52 indicators, the following prioritization criteria were utilized:

1. **References**: Is the topic referenced in other indices, SDGs, and/or CHANGE cities’ work?
2. **City Jurisdiction**: Are there potential policy interventions at the city level?
3. **Data**: Is the indicator measurable? Are the data available?
4. **Outcome Oriented**: Is there a clear, systemic outcome that is clearly related to gender equity?
5. **Applicability**: Is the indicator flexible across various cultural contexts?

SAMPLE INDICATORS

The following 18 sample indicators serve to introduce the scope and focus of each thematic area.

**Health & Related Services**

(1.1) Percentage of population who report their health to be fair to poor, disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and age
(1.2) Percentage of population diagnosed with HIV/AIDS, disaggregated by SOGIESC and age
(1.5) Percentage of population with a reliable, affordable source of ongoing care, disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and socioeconomic status

**Economics, Labor & Well-being**

(2.1) Percentage of labor force that is unemployed, disaggregated by SOGIESC and age
(2.7) Percentage of salaried vs. hourly wage workers, disaggregated by SOGIESC
(2.9) Proportion of adults with an account at a bank or other financial institutions or with a mobile-money service provider disaggregated by SOGIESC

**Schooling & Education**

(3.3) Percentage of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills, disaggregated by SOGIESC
(3.4) Proportion of educational institutions with a Lived Named Policy, disaggregated by educational level
(3.8) Percentage of population in non-formal education and training sponsored by city government, disaggregated by SOGIESC
Gender-Based Violence & Security

(4.1) Proportion of persons subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner, or by persons other than an intimate partner, respectively [in the last year] and/or [at least once in their lifetime], disaggregated by SOGIESC

(4.4) Existence of anonymous reporting systems for sexual assault or harassment within city government

(4.6) Existence of mandatory training programs that incorporate training on human rights and protection from violence concerning SOGIESC. [Cluster Options: judicial officials, law-enforcement officials, correctional officials, city government and operations teams, city administrative teams]

Governance & Public Life

(5.1) Existence of city government statistical reporting systems that disaggregate data by SOGIESC, allow calculation of statistics on health, education, economic outcomes, violence, and political participation, and is publicly available

(5.4) Rate that candidates for elective office get elected compared to men, disaggregated by SOGIESC

(5.5) Existence of an intentional gender perspective in city planning/policy making [Cluster Options: budgetary programmes, strategic plans, street light planning, city resilience planning]

Built Environment

(6.1b) Existence of laws that require security infrastructure at public transit stops and transit buildings disaggregated by location

(6.1d) Whether or not public buildings are required to have gender-inclusive menstruation product disposal areas in toilet facilities disaggregated by building type

(6.3.d) Percentage of population in government sponsored housing projects or low income housing, disaggregated by SOGIESC

CONCLUSION

The aim of this Report is to propose a set of indicators that cities can use to measure gender equity. By using an intersectional lens and specifically calling for data collection that is disaggregated by SOGIESC, we have addressed the limitation of simply measuring along the gender binary in order to make other gender identities, as well as LGBTI populations, more visible. Overall, the 52 top priority indicators proposed in this Report aim to be clearly outcome-oriented in relation to gender equity, with the ultimate goal of creating systemic change in both small and large cities, across different cultural contexts.

1 A cluster is an intentionally broad, thematic indicator that provides examples of data points that cities can report back on depending on local context and available data.
KEY TERMS

Gender

A social construct which places cultural and social expectations on individuals based on their assigned sex at birth (usually male or female), which changes over time and varies by cultural context (see also, “Gender Norms” in the Glossary). Gender is hierarchical in most societies and produces inequalities that intersect with other social and economic inequalities (see “Intersectionality”).

Gender Binary

The classification of gender into two categories of male and female, which suggests that a person’s gender must be either of the two. This simplification of gender excluded individuals whose identities fall outside of these two categories, and the systemic exclusion creates psychological harm, stress, and/or issues pertaining to identity.

Gender Equality

The equal valuing of all individuals in society whereby everyone enjoys equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities. This term does not always take into account an individual's ability-levels and environmental factors, and can still produce dramatically different outcomes based on gender and other intersecting identities.

Gender Equity

Fairness in treatment for all people according to their respective needs. This may include equal treatment, as well as treatment that is different but considered equivalent in terms of rights, opportunities, outcomes, and benefits.

Gender Norms

A social construct which places cultural and social expectations on individuals based on their assigned sex at birth (usually male or female), which changes over time and varies by cultural context (see also, “Gender Norms” in the Glossary). Gender is hierarchical in most societies and produces inequalities that intersect with other social and economic inequalities (see “Intersectionality”).

Intersectionality

The equal valuing of all individuals in society whereby everyone enjoys equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities. This term does not always take into account an individual's ability-levels and environmental factors, and can still produce dramatically different outcomes based on gender and other intersecting identities.

Equity

Fairness in treatment for all people according to their respective needs. This may include equal treatment, as well as treatment that is different but considered equivalent in terms of rights, opportunities, outcomes, and benefits.
Gender Identity

Expressed and understood by looking at inward emotions as well as how individuals perceive and label themselves (including male, female, neither, or a blend of both). It is important to note that one’s gender identity does not have to be what they were assigned at birth.

SOGIESC

Acronym for sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics (see individual definitions below)

Gender Expression

The external appearance of one’s gender identity, mostly demonstrated through an individual’s behavior, clothing, speaking style, etc.

Sex Characteristics

Physical attributes indicative of an individual's biological sex. [Note: Also referred to as sexual characteristics.]

Intersectionality

Term first coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw to explain the interconnected nature of social categorization (i.e. race, class, gender) which create overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination and disadvantage.

Sexual Orientation

This term refers to the sex(es) and gender(s) an individual is attracted to romantically, emotionally, and sexually.
INTRODUCTION

GOAL & SCOPE

This Report is created in partnership with the Mayor's Office of the City of Los Angeles to provide a foundation to measure gender equity within the City Hub and Network for Gender Equity's (CHANGE) international cities. CHANGE's mission is to empower women in all their diversity by creating systemic change that transforms government services and systems to benefit all. This Report proposes thematic sets of critical indicators with accompanying detailed justifications all aimed at tracking progress on gender equity in cities around the world. The data collected from these indicators can inform cities on their progress toward gender equity, giving cities the ability to identify disparities and implement initiatives across city operations. The proposed indicators provide cities with tools to assess, address, and track systems of gender equity - moving beyond the gender binary to create change in the best interest of all.

Included in this Report is a series of top priority indicators, as well as an appendix of additional indicators to consider. Each indicator focuses on areas of gender-based disparities within six thematic areas of city-life where gender equity issues manifest. The thematic areas are as follows: Health & Related Services; Economics, Labor & Well-being; Schooling & Education; Gender-Based Violence & Security; Governance & Public Life; and Built Environment. The conceptual framework for each thematic area will be further explained within their dedicated section of the Report.

ALIGNMENT WITH SDG 5 & CHANGE NETWORK

The top priority indicators proposed within this Report seek to localize the broader goals of Sustainable Development Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls, within the context of the CHANGE of global cities. This Report is also heavily influenced by the United Nations’ Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

Achieving gender equality is the foundational principle of the CHANGE; therefore, each indicator proposed within this Report aims to expand upon city-level practices and policies proposed by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and CEDAW. Gender equality has traditionally been referred to as the equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities of people of all genders.1 Our team has chosen to expand the concept of gender equality to the more inclusive term of gender equity, which provides the framework to achieve equality. As such, we define gender equity as fairness in treatment for all people according to their respective needs. This may include equal treatment, as well as treatment

---

that is different but considered equivalent in terms of rights, opportunities, outcomes, and benefits.\textsuperscript{2}

The alignment with the SDGs and CEDAW allows us to communicate local, city-based impacts on a global scale. CHANGE indicators harness the collective power of cities, identifying gender-based disparities and creating a level playing field to ensure equal access to opportunities and services, regardless of gender. These indicators illuminate opportunities and areas of focus for city-lead initiatives that will improve services and care across city operations. Within this work, CHANGE indicators explicitly recognize and address intersecting inequalities predicated upon race, religion, ethnic origin, disability, sexual orientation, and gender identity and expression. Cities may wish to consider other aspects of identities based on their local context.

**WHAT IS AN INDICATOR?**

The indicators proposed within this Report aim to provide cities with data that can be used to analyze the state of gender equity within various contexts. Indicators themselves are created to categorize and target pertinent issues—in this case gender equity—within a society.\textsuperscript{3} Through the use of indicators, the complexities of gender inequity can be distilled down to issues of data. In utilizing this indicator-driven data, cities are better able to identify and combat issues of gender inequity.\textsuperscript{4}

To further organize the data collection process, this Report groups indicators of similar themes and outcomes into clusters. A cluster is an intentionally broad, thematic indicator group that provides several options of indicators from which cities can choose. This flexibility acknowledges the diverse contexts and differing data collection processes of cities within the CHANGE network. This arrangement allows cities the ability to measure processes in ways that best fit their local contexts.

Beyond the organization of data into clusters and indicators, it is essential to remember that these indicators address intricate social issues that should be interpreted through an intersectional lens. To avoid an oversimplification of the issues at hand, the indicators within this Report are often disaggregated by SOGIESC: an acronym for sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics. This Task Force found SOGIESC - which is more thoroughly defined in the Key Terms section of this Report - to be one of the most


\textsuperscript{4} Ibid.
inclusive gender-based methods for disaggregation. In practice, disaggregating by SOGIESC involves data collection in the critical areas of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics - all of which may intersect. Although the tools do not yet exist to disaggregate data in this manner, one of the aims of this Report is to look beyond what is currently available, and provide cities with the foundation upon which gender equity can become more intersectional.

**Dangers of Indices & Data Collection**

In creating this Report, we acknowledge the dangers of data collection and the potential harm that index-based Reports can create. In this section, we focus on three potential areas of harm: the myth of objectivity, expertise inertia, and harm to marginalized communities.

**Myth of Objectivity**

Index-based projects (including this Report), are typically viewed as unbiased and nonpolitical both by their creators and users. In reality, indicators are deeply shaped by the institutions and resources from which they are proposed. Indicators are built on a “string of interpretive decisions” which are neither unbiased nor nonpolitical. When indicators are removed from the institutional context in which they are created, they risk losing vital background information and compromises made during the creation, justification, and/or collection processes. This myth of objectivity can lead to potentially harmful impacts on the groups that the indicators aim to serve. Furthermore, when data and its collection methods are viewed as completely objective, it overlooks the biases inherently embedded into the indicator creation process. As a result, conclusions drawn from data can be used to perpetuate harmful stereotypes, practices, and stigmas against the groups studied.

**Expertise Inertia**

Individuals who have a say in proposing indicators are typically of the same social, economic, and ethnic background. Therefore, the final product can overlook inclusive measurements and individual experiences. The phenomenon of wealthy and educated elites driving the production of indicators meant to protect those less fortunate is known as “expertise inertia”. Expertise inertia highlights the complexity of data representation when someone's identity or experience does not fall into a specific one-dimensional-identifying box. When data is not disaggregated, it is likely that many populations will be excluded from the indicators and protective policies which come out of that data collection process. If, for example, an indicator finds that the literacy rates of schoolchildren are improving but does not disaggregate by socioeconomic status, it could be possible that the improvements of wealthier children with greater access to resources are skewing the data and hiding the needs of children who are lower income. For these reasons, it is extremely important for indicators to align with the experiences of all populations, not just those of privileged policymakers and researchers.

---

5 Merry, Sally Engle. “The Seductions of Quantification.”
7 Merry, Sally Engle. “The Seductions of Quantification.”
8 Merry, Sally Engle. “The Seductions of Quantification.”
Marginalized Communities

Inclusive data collection is essential to the success of any project; however, the challenges inherent in research processes have the potential to further harm targeted groups.⁹ Data collection on these groups can reinforce stigmas and unequal power relations within societies, and conversely influence marginalized communities against participation in data collection efforts. Fear of further discrimination and harms by data collection can also dissuade individuals from self-identifying in research studies, making it nearly impossible for researchers to adequately measure and respond to issues unique to certain identities. In order to address these power dynamics, it is critical that more robust support and information dissemination is provided to marginalized communities.¹⁰ Researchers must work to overcome historical structures of oppression and injustice, and move toward practices that honor community and result in shared power between all.¹¹

POSITIONALITY STATEMENT

We recognize that the process of creating indicators is not unbiased and is shaped by social processes - including power relations. This positionality statement serves as an intentional, self-reflective, and critical space to consider the way in which our identities, values, and personal experiences inform the creation of this Report and subsequent indicators therein.

This Report has been crafted by a twelve-member student task force from Occidental College, a private undergraduate academic institution located in Los Angeles, CA. As such, many of us come to the project with a research and academic-biased lens that has historically been built on the exploitation of “research subjects” for the benefit of the researcher and research institution. We seek to remedy this by informing ourselves on the dangers of research and data collection on local communities, and dedicate a section of our Report to these findings. We also seek to maintain “Do No Harm” principles throughout our research and report writing process, but concede that despite our best attempts to minimize harm by tuning into concepts such as intersectionality (Kimberlé Crenshaw’s idea of the interconnected and compounding way forms of oppression interact), harm may inadvertently occur.

Furthermore, we acknowledge that many task force members are not full-time residents of CHANGE network cities and all are primarily based in the United States. While our methodology includes investigating the work of current and prospective CHANGE network city-members, we remain aware that due to a lack of lived experiences in these cities (save for Los Angeles, in which Occidental College is based), our understanding of the current progress, barriers, and opportunities will be limited to that of our research findings. We hope this Report will provide a foundation on which cities can begin to expand the scope of gender equity measures, and find innovative ways to recognize, center, and cater to various intersecting identities.

¹⁰ Ibid.
Various international groups have created indices intended to produce data that can measure gender equity to some extent. These include the UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, the European Institute for Gender Equality Index, the UN Development Programme LGBTI Inclusion Index, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Gender Data Portal. This section is dedicated to reviewing these four indices and their alignment with SDG 5 on Gender Equality. These indices informed the formation of the thematic areas and many of the indicators in this Report. Through conducting this analysis of existing indices, we were able to identify gap areas that this Report aims to fill. Mainly, we identified a lack of consistent commitment to intersectionality and a failure to measure gender beyond the binary. Additionally, although not a fault of these indices, they all aim to measure gender equity at the international level. Emerging from these observations and subsequent research are this Report’s proposed indicators, which aim to encourage an intersectional approach to measuring gender equity in local contexts, specifically in cities.

**REVIEW OF EXISTING GENDER EQUITY INDICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>UN Minimum Gender Indicators</th>
<th>EIGE Index</th>
<th>LGBTI Inclusion Index</th>
<th>OECD Gender Equality Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Areas</strong></td>
<td>Economic Structures,</td>
<td>Work, Money, Knowledge,</td>
<td>Health, Education, Civil and Political</td>
<td>Employment, Education, Entrepreneurship, Health,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related Services, Public</td>
<td>Against Women, Intersecting</td>
<td>Security and Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life and Decision</td>
<td>Inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making, Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Women and Girl Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersectional Lens</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rejects Gender Binary</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of Indicators</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Focus</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This index has an intersectional lens but excludes non-gender binary conforming individuals and other identities like race.
The Gender Equality Index was produced in 2013 by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) in order to strengthen gender equality across the European Union.¹ With this index, EIGE is able to inform and support policy makers as they seek to design more effective gender equality measures. The Gender Equality Index includes six core domains, two additional domains, and 31 indicators. The six core domains include: work, money, knowledge, power, time, and health, with the additional two domains being violence against women and intersecting inequalities.

The main strength of the Gender Equality Index is its focus on intersecting inequalities. Specifically, the index examines how “disability, age, level of education, country of birth, and family type,” intersect with gender to affect people differently.² However, they failed to include race as an intersection. The inclusion of race is vital to any intersectional analysis of equity. Other identities to consider are migratory/citizenship status, religion, and class. The main limitation of the EIGE’s index is its adherence to the gender binary. Due to this, other gender identities and sexual orientations are excluded from the indicators and data. The index also does not disclose whether people with gender identities beyond men and women were included in the comparisons, thus obscuring the experience of people who identify outside the gender binary. Additionally, the index relies on parity as a goal. Parity is often conflated with equality, ignoring differing opportunities and ultimate outcomes. For example, while women might outpace men in college graduation rates, that doesn’t mean they occupy more high paying or degree-oriented industries. The indicators proposed later in this Report aim to avoid a reliance on parity, recognizing that systemic change prioritizes equity, considering not only outcomes but also opportunity.

LGBTI INCLUSION INDEX

The LGBTI Inclusion index was published in 2019 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in collaboration with the World Bank, as well as various LGBTI rights organizations, experts from human rights and development agencies, businesses, academia, and civil society members.³ The LGBTI Inclusion Index aims to “measure development outcomes for LGBTI people and inform policies, programmes and investments for

strengthening LGBTI inclusion and rights.” The index includes 51 indicators “in line with the SDG global indicator framework,” and separated into the thematic areas of health, education, civil and political participation, economic well-being, and security and violence. The index prioritizes the following: (1) comparing the overall degree of inclusion across countries; (2) measuring progress toward inclusion over time within countries, regions, or globally; (3) setting benchmarks for countries to achieve new levels of inclusion; and, (4) demonstrating where resources are most needed to support sustainable human development for LGBTI people. They emphasize the importance of each indicator being clearly related to an opportunity or outcome that is relevant to the dimension it measures.

A strength of LGBTI Inclusion Index was its creation in collaboration with civil society actors and sectoral group experts, which allowed for confirmation of its viability and applicability towards relevant SOGIESC issues. A second strength of the index is its differentiation between “opportunity measures” and “outcome measures.” These measures highlight the difference between the existence of a law or policy that allows LGBTI persons to enjoy human rights, and the de facto individual achievement of a level of health, education, economic well-being, safety, and political and civic participation that is consistent with human dignity, respectively. Another strength of the index is its commitment to the use of common language and

---

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.


7 Ibid, 8.
communication across borders, so that the indicators are culturally translatable over time and place.\(^8\) The index also provides a list of abbreviations and definitions at the beginning of the report, recognizes intersectionality and the need for disaggregation of data, and acknowledges the need for agreed-upon guidelines of data collection for the safety of subjects.

In terms of weaknesses, although the index encourages intersectionality, it fails to reference pansexuality or indigenous gender expression variants. Additionally, the indicator data table includes a section on the feasibility of measurement, despite acknowledging that, “no country has data on a representative sample of the population or of LGBTI people that can disaggregate outcomes by sexual orientation, gender identity & expression, and sex characteristics.”\(^9\) Thus, the need to use data precedent could potentially lead to a narrower scope of the data pooling and limit the index’s impact.

**OECD GENDER EQUALITY DATA**

The Organisation for European Cooperation and Development’s (OECD) “Gender Equality” data portal has 6 general thematic areas: employment, education, entrepreneurship, health, development, and governance.\(^10\) These categories feature 64 various indicators that compare data between women and men, frequently disaggregated by age. All countries who make up the OECD record data for each indicator and this data is grouped to compare not only women and men within the country, but also for cross-country comparison.

The overall assumption that seems to drive OECD’s gender data portal is that the inclusion of women in the economy will increase economic development for the entire country, thus providing an incentive to be proactive on these measures. Benefits for the economy would include better social security services, higher family incomes, and improved tax/benefit policies. This focus may affect the data since gender equality is treated as a means to reach economic development rather than treating gender equality itself as the desired outcome in mind when creating the indicators.

OECD has mostly raw data on the site, which can be useful for countries as this minimizes bias and manipulation in how the data is represented. However, it may lack the clarity regarding the desired outcome of these indicators and thus how they should be used by policymakers. An example of a database developed using OECD statistics that avoids this issue is the Gender, Institutions and Development Database (GiD-DB) 2019.\(^11\) This is a database that provides “researchers and policymakers with key data on gender-based discrimination in social institutions.”\(^12\) This data, “helps analyse women’s empowerment and understand gender

---

\(^8\) Ibid, 6.
\(^9\) Ibid, 7.
gaps in other key areas of development.”

The main limitation of OECD’s Gender data portal is the data’s lack of intersectionality. This is both because the indicators are based on binary understandings of gender (they only compare men and women and do not make clear if this includes trans people), but also because indicators are never disaggregated by other demographic characteristics (such as race, or socio-economic status, or citizenship). Moreover, within the larger data set, gender is not listed as its own thematic area. Instead, indicators regarding gender equality are dispersed among some 23 larger thematic areas. This may hinder the ability of member countries wanting to use these indicators to apply the data easily to gender-specific policy and thus should be given more priority within the larger set of indicators.

UN MINIMUM SET OF GENDER INDICATORS

The UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators were created in 2013 to serve as a metric for one or more of the Beijing Platform for Action’s critical areas of concern. However, because of the unavailability of data, clear concepts, or definitions, three of the twelve total critical areas of concern from the Beijing Platform are not covered in this set of indicators. The Interagency Expert Group on Gender Statistics revised the indicators in 2018 to fully align them with the Sustainable Development Goals, their related indicator set, and corresponding custodian agency.

In total, there are 52 quantitative indicators and 11 qualitative indicators covering the following five categories: (1) economic structures, participation in productive activities and access to resources, (2) education, (3) health and related services, (4) public life and decision making, and (5) human rights of women and girl children. All categories are measured quantitatively and the economic structure, public life, and decision making, and human rights of women and girl children categories also have qualitative measuring elements.

A main strength of the UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators is that the data collected is constantly updated and clearly states the custodian agencies responsible for the collection.

13 Ibid.
15 We recognize that the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action was predicated on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and that the Beijing Platform for Action subsequently entrusted the CEDAW Committee with monitoring its implementation. Therefore, because the UN Minimum Gender Indicators were developed in alignment with the Beijing Platform for Action, we found it unnecessary to include a full analysis of CEDAW in this Literature Review.
and dissemination of such data. The rate at which information and data are collected and analyzed on their website makes the data accessible and effective. The main limitation of this data is that these 63 indicators do not explicitly state a goal. They must be applied directly to the methods of the Beijing Platform for Action or the Sustainable Development Goals in order to be useful. Because the indicators must be connected to these other projects, the user needs to cross-reference multiple sources to understand the desired outcome of the indicators, which negatively affects the political utility of the data. Another limitation of these indicators is their reinforcement of the gender binary and lack of intersectionality. Although the indicators are disaggregated by sex, age, and persons with disabilities, further disaggregation (by race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status for example) would improve the data and its application.

CONCLUSION

The strengths of the indices include a focus on intersectional frameworks and disaggregation (albeit inconsistent), and clear prioritization of indicators based on criteria such as feasibility and adaptability. While the limitations of each index differ depending on its specific focus, an overall limitation to the current landscape of gender equity indices is the lack of consistency in commitment to intersectionality, and failure to measure beyond the gender binary. Although we have attempted to replicate and localize the strengths of the existing indices where possible, this project aims to fill observed gaps by suggesting indicators that can be applied to city contexts, have the potential to create systemic change, move beyond the gender binary, and are ultimately outcome-oriented in relation to gender equity.
The goal of this Report is to create a set of research-based indicators for measuring gender equity across the CHANGE network’s cities. The data collected from these indicators can inform cities on their progress toward gender equity, allowing for local governments to implement more inclusive initiatives across city operations. Here, we outline our methodology for creating these indicators.

GUIDING VALUES

The following values of gender-inclusivity and intersectionality guided the manifestation and prioritization of indicators recommended in this report. By choosing to disaggregate by using SOGIESC, we aspire to encapsulate gender-inclusivity and intersectionality throughout all indicators included in this report.

Gender-Inclusivity

- Throughout our report, the team used a gender inclusive lens, employing language that transcends the traditional gender binary that is still often the default approach in public policy. We recognize that data has been collected in a binary fashion for years and it will take time and dedication to progress past this limitation. When creating our indicators, the task force attempted to advance gender-inclusive language in a way that does not discriminate against a particular gender identity nor further perpetuate gender stereotypes. Overall, we recognize that given the fundamental role of language in framing social and cultural attitudes, using gender-inclusive language is an influential way to promote gender equality and eradicate gender bias.

Intersectionality

- The Combahee River Collective’s “A Black Feminist Statement” (1977) articulated an understanding of identity that is “multiply shaped by their shared social location as African American women within interlocking systems of oppression.” This conception of identity which recognizes how systemic oppressions such as racism, patriarchy and capitalism interlock, informed Kimberlé Crenshaw’s coining of the term intersectionality. Intersectionality explains the interconnected nature of social categorization (i.e. race, gender, class) which creates overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination and disadvantage. Further disaggregation in data reporting is necessary to reflect the intersectionality of social characteristics and how they impact lived realities for diverse gender identities. Applying a lens of intersectionality is especially pertinent to this work because although the proposed indicators are divided into thematic areas to characterize topics and promote organization, the indicators are inherently related and cannot function in isolation. To this point, we recommend looking at the indicators not in isolation, but rather noting their synergies. In order to promote intersectionality, the Task Force worked on a shared document to monitor overlap and ensure that the indicators capture the breadth of identities people hold.

References:
3 Columbia Law School. “Kimberlé Crenshaw on Intersectionality, More than Two Decades Later.” (See Glossary)
GENERATION OF THEMATIC AREAS

Analysis of Existing Gender Equity Indices

The Task Force conducted an analysis of existing global gender indices with the purpose of identifying major trends to frame the generation of our thematic areas. Through a critique of these indices, we were able to further research how to generate, localize, and prioritize indicators using a gender perspective.

Following a review of the aforementioned global indices and international conventions, the Task Force compiled a list of thematic areas that best addressed gender equity. Here, the group found significant overlap in the areas of “Education,” “Health,” and “Economic Development and Well-being.” With these three thematic areas secured, the group then consulted relevant academic literature, human rights organizations, and international indices to consolidate the remaining categories into thematic areas. Through this process the Task Force proposed “Gender Based Violence & Security” as well as “Governance and Public Life” as two more thematic areas.

From here, the team began to refine pre-existing categories, as well as the language used in our thematic areas. The ambiguity of certain terms such as “Well-being” directed the Task Force to form our final thematic area. “Built Environment” includes housing, transportation, access to greenspaces, environmental issues and homelessness. With this new thematic area, we decided to rename “Economic Development and Well-being” to “Economic, Labor and Well-being,” which would encompass work and workplace culture, food security, water, sanitation, hygiene, and other goods and services that the city can provide. During this process, the task force also identified Legal Protections as a possible thematic area, but decided instead to mainstream legal protections through the thematic areas to reflect that legal protections are necessary in all aspects of city life. Indicators of legal nature are marked with a diamond symbol (◊) before the indicator number.

Finally, the Task Force solidified 6 thematic areas based on research on global indices. The areas are as follows: Health and Related Services; Economics, Labor, and Well-being; Schooling and Education; Gender-based Violence & Security; Governance & Public Life; and Built Environment.

4 The term ‘well-being’ could be applied to many issues outside of economic development such as transportation and housing. Since ‘well-being’ is so similar to ‘quality of life,’ the category became too broad and required further synthesis. The group then considered the possibility of framing well-being as its own indicator under each separate category, but ultimately decided that a new, separate category would better encompass housing, transportation, and other urban issues.
Generation of Indicators

The task force compiled and consolidated data on potential indicators, assessing for ability to localize indicators to CHANGE cities. We collected data through the application of existing gender equity indices to specific thematic areas, conducting further research on other literature and indices within the international arena, and researching CHANGE cities. This informed the language, applicability of indicators within the network, and proper localization.

Localization

Throughout the localization process, the Task Force thought about the proposed indicators in regard to what they meant for cities. Given that these indicators are created for CHANGE’s international cities, it was important to adapt language to fit city jurisdiction, and use terms that were applicable to as many city contexts as possible. This is one reason for the inclusion of terms such as SOGIESC, that are able to include many diverse identities and be used across city, state, and national lines.

Prioritization

During the prioritization process, the Task Force created a comprehensive set of prioritization criteria to sort the indicators between Priority One and Two. The criteria are as follows:

Prioritization Criteria:

1. **References**: Is the topic referenced in other indices, SDGs, and/or CHANGE cities’ work?
2. **City Jurisdiction**: Are there potential policy interventions at the city level?
3. **Data**: Is the indicator measurable? Are the data available?
4. **Outcome Oriented**: Is there a clear, systemic outcome that is clearly related to gender equity?
5. **Applicability**: Is the indicator flexible across various cultural contexts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritization One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Prioritization One includes indicators that meet all or most of the criteria listed above. These indicators are measurable within the scope of CHANGE, outcome oriented with a potential for addressing gender disparities, and can be localized to create systemic change in various city contexts. These are the indicators captured in the below discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritization Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Indicators listed as Prioritization Two did not meet critical aspects of the team’s prioritization criteria, but have potential for further workshopping and improvements. Indicators in this category will only be included in the final appendix table of the Report.
The following 52 indicators were created to encompass and highlight data-driven ways to measure gender disparities within the local context while providing appropriate outcome-oriented pathways towards the creation of gender equity at the city level, which includes, but is not limited to, impacts on city infrastructure, public policy, presence of women and LGBTI people in places of leadership, and equitable access to resources. The indicators encompass a variety of thematic areas relating to gender equity, including Health, Economics & Well-being, Education, Gender-based Violence & Security, Governance & Public Life, and Built Environment. Many of the 52 indicators are qualitative, requiring cities to report on simply the existence of certain policies, protections, etc. Because the aim of this Report is to provide cities with indicators that can measure gender equity beyond the gender binary, and the reality that data on sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex characteristics is not widely available, we hope that the number of qualitative indicators can serve as a bridge for cities to report on what they can in pursuit of eventually collecting SOGIESC-disaggregated data.
HEALTH & RELATED SERVICES

Within the thematic area of Health and Related Services, there are many systemic barriers that make health an essential area of focus when measuring gender equity. In connection to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and Sustainable Development Goals 3 and 5.6, Health and Related Services is a category that encapsulates individual outcomes, household decision-making, and overall opportunities available in cities.

These indicators aim to address the distinct needs of women and gender non-conforming individuals by identifying the structural barriers to inclusive and accessible health-related services, and presenting opportunities for intervention. In order to measure and address the structural barriers to health equity, most indicators are framed around access to health services, with the desired response being policy to remove barriers and increase access for all. Accessibility to health and wellness resources serves as a large avenue for empowerment.

*Indicators of legal nature are marked with a diamond symbol (◊) before the indicator number.*
Self-Perceived Health

(1.1) Percentage of population who report their health to be fair to poor, disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and age

Self-perceived health has been used as a proxy to illustrate a respondent’s overall satisfaction with their healthcare.¹ How a person perceives their health can tell us more about broader systems’ efficacy.² Additionally, self-perceived health functions as a good proxy for quality of life and objective health.³ Overall, women consistently self-report worse health, and that gender gap increases with age.⁴ Also according to the American Public Health Association, “in comparison with cisgender individuals, transgender individuals had a higher prevalence of poor general health”⁵ making this relevant focus of gender equity in health.

Relevant References: EIGE Gender Equality Index, Barcelona Health Indicators⁶

---

Sexual and Reproductive Health

(1.2) Percentage of population diagnosed with HIV/AIDS, disaggregated by SOGIESC and age

Lowered access to information, tools of prevention and barriers to the negotiation of safer sex are all structural barriers that illustrate how HIV/AIDS is a gender equity issue. Additionally, HIV is a distinct concern for LBTI communities, as transgender women are 49x more at risk for HIV compared to the general population, and “while transgender men are less likely to be HIV positive than transgender women, their rates of infection are still higher than that of the general population.” Overall, HIV rates can reflect systemic factors of gender inequalities such as: harmful gender norms, violence based on SOGIESC, barriers in access to services, the burden of care, stigmas and discrimination, the lack of economic security and the lack of education.

Relevant References: LGBTI Inclusion Index, UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators

(1.3) Pregnancy/Delivery, or Maternal Mortality Ratio (MMR), disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and age

Tracking MMR is important because it indicates the quality of care during delivery and pregnancy. This is an important systemic assessment, since “most maternal deaths are preventable, as the health-care solutions to prevent or manage complications are well known,” and the presence of a high MMR itself is an intersectional manifestation of disparities in health care. Furthermore addressing high MMR “requires the elimination of

discrimination and violence against women -- in short it is a matter of human rights.”"11 This indicator aims to parallel the goals and methodology of MMR measurement by LA County, Sierra Leone and the UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, but has adjusted the title to pregnancy/delivery mortality ratio to be inclusive of parents who don't align with “maternal” or mother.

Relevant References: UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, LA County Health Indicators for Women, The Sierra Leone National survey,12 SDG 3.1.1

Access to Wellness and Health Resources

(1.4) Number of vendors/ grocery stores selling fresh fruit and vegetables within walking distance

Typically, nutrition is assessed through malnutrition and obesity indicators, but this indicator pivots to focus on the systemic issue of access to nutritious and affordable food. The ability to find nutritious foods, particularly fresh fruits and vegetables, is often directly influenced by one’s socioeconomic status and the neighborhood resources their community attracts. As such, this indicator allows for the discussion of “food deserts”13 and the inequitable distributions of resources based on race and class. In connection to gender equity initiatives, this indicator recognizes that women and gender non-conforming people are more likely to be impoverished, and thus face food insecurity or access to low-quality food at higher rates. Furthermore, the responsibility of collecting and preparing food is heavily influenced by gender roles, and therefore, the distance and inaccessibility of food exacerbates existing disparities of unpaid labor across gender.

Relevant References: Building Research Establishment’s International Healthy Cities Indices (BRE HCI)

13 A food desert is an area where it is difficult to access affordable, nutritious, fresh foods. These areas are traditionally found in urban settings of lower socioeconomic status.
Access to healthcare is a gender equity issue, since gender is a reliable predictor on whether a patient has unmet healthcare needs. In order to measure the accessibility of healthcare, indices have framed these indicators on “difficulty” accessing care, or whether or not they have health insurance. However, the LGBTI index argues this indicator is “a better measure of access than insurance coverage, but doesn’t recognize quality of care.” However, this can still be more helpful than measuring health insurance, since it applies to cities with nationalized health care systems. Additionally, the language of “sources of care” allows for this indicator to be applied to a variety of culturally relevant healthcare providers. This further measures gender equity issues, since The American Public Health Association has recognized a disparity between trans and cis gender people in having a source of ongoing care or a provider. Additionally, the LGBTI index also believes that this indicator can be expanded to illustrate access to gender-affirming care, if it is phrased to measure if there is a “known” place providing services.

**Relevant References:** LGBTI Inclusion index, LA County Health Indicators for Women, the London Health Commission Survey, SDG 3.8.1

---

**1.6 Percentage of population who have their sexual and reproductive health needs met, including anti-discrimination policies which cover gender inclusive care, disaggregated by SOGIESC**

Sexual and reproductive health is a field that expands beyond contraception and pregnancies, and should be a central focus of gender equity initiatives. Many distinct health concerns of varied SOGIESC identities are addressed through sexual and reproductive health services, including hormone replacement treatment and specialized cancer screenings. Agency over sexual and reproductive health is an important factor of gender equity in all spheres of life, since for example unplanned pregnancies have a large impact on future opportunities. Within the context of sexual orientation, access to reproductive health services for couples can also be indicative of non-discrimination and reproductive rights. Overall, the WHO asserts that met demands for access to contraception can illustrate the presence of political and educational opportunities, which makes sexual and reproductive health a good indicator of gender equity.

**Relevant References:** LA County Health Indicators for Women, Sierra Leone National Health Surveys, SDG 3.7.1

---


(1.7) Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water sources, disaggregated by SOGIESC and race

The ability of a population to access safely managed water sources is both an issue of health and gender equity. For this indicator, archival data on water infrastructure/provision and survey data can be tools of measurement. The goal of this indicator is to ensure universal access to clean drinking water. According to UN WATER, water is an issue of gender equity because a lack of access to WASH at home and work “poses a barrier to safe, productive and healthy lives” and can prevent occupational or education opportunities. Additionally, accessibility of water is an important issue of gender equity since water collection for household use is a responsibility heavily influenced by gender roles and often designated to women.

**Relevant References:** WHO

---

(1.8) Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services with privacy, disaggregated by SOGIESC and race

The ability to maintain personal hygiene is an important topic for both health and gender equity, yet often underemphasized in international indices. There is a great need for public facilities that leave no one behind. Safe and private toilets prevent women and LGBTI individuals from having to walk to remote locations alone, which can play a role in preventing sexual harassment and violence. International health organizations regard hygiene as an important gendered issue that is best measured through health surveys - similar to those done in the cities of London and Los Angeles, and throughout the country Sierra Leone. In terms of measuring menstrual hygiene, “non controversial” indicators focusing on WASH functions as a good approach. However, having a place for general hand washing is not the same as (nor a sufficient measurement of) space for washing and bathing oneself and menstrual materials. Therefore, purposefully including measures of privacy create the space for this indicator to address both general WASH and menstrual hygiene.

**Relevant References:** WHO, UNICEF

---


Access to the labor market, economic resources, and financial well-being are all essential components of gender equity, yet many challenges remain in cities throughout the world that hinder progress towards total equality in these realms. The Economics, Labor, and Well-being thematic area builds on the gender equity agenda of SDG 5 and CEDAW by connecting issues of gender inequity to the economy and the labor market. Indicators in this thematic area hope to provide a pathway not only towards gender equity, but also towards economic growth and poverty reduction.

*Indicators of legal nature are marked with a diamond symbol (◊) before the indicator number.*

(2.1) Percentage of labor force that is unemployed, disaggregated by SOGIESC and age group (16-24 and 25+)

Unemployment is a popular metric that would establish workforce participation of those actively seeking employment opportunities. This data can be used to determine the overall health of a city’s economy and can specifically measure whether the unemployment rate is higher among women and LGBTI individuals. By disaggregating by age, we can determine if there are specific life-cycle barriers to a person’s ability to participate in the labor force (a mother having a child, for example).

**Relevant References:** LGBTI Inclusion Index, SDG 8.3.1, SDG 8.5.1, SDG 8.6.1, CEDAW Article 11.1.b

(2.2) Percentage of individuals living below the national poverty line, disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and ethnicity

Poverty is the result of power relations that affect individuals of disparate gender identities in different ways. Applying a gendered perspective to poverty can have a marked effect on how societies address issues of poverty. Poverty rate is a basic metric that captures individuals living with minimum levels of income. Disaggregating this data provides cities with information on whether or not LGBTI individuals and women are more likely to live in poverty. The poverty threshold will depend on local and national contexts as the price of living varies depending on place of residence. Measuring those living below the poverty line captures specific components of gender equity in the economy. This indicator is disaggregated by race and ethnicity in addition to SOGIESC in hopes of providing a more intersectional approach to gender inequity and poverty.

**Relevant References:** LGBTI Inclusion Index, SDG 1.1-1.5, SDG 1.A, SDG 1.B

---

(2.3) Mean monthly earnings, disaggregated by SOGIESC

Economic growth in countries around the world is not distributed equally amongst populations. Gender inequality is strongly associated with income inequality, as women and individuals of diverse gender identities struggle to enter the labor market or are paid less for the same amount of work as their male counterparts. These income inequalities are also strongly associated with decreased access to education, health, and finance services. This indicator measures monthly earnings of formal labor force employees in an effort to understand how gender relates to earnings. Therefore, collecting data on the mean monthly earnings and disaggregating it by SOGIESC can reveal important details about economic exclusion and purchasing power within cities.

**Relevant References:** EIGE Gender Equality Index, SDG 8.5.1

(2.4) Labor force participation rate, disaggregated by SOGIESC

Many international organizations, including the International Labor Organization, report that a gender gap exists in the global labor participation rate. The freedom to work is an integral part of human welfare; therefore, it is essential that these gender gaps be addressed. The labor force participation rate measures those who are actively looking for a job as well as those who are currently employed. It measures the amount of labor formally participating in the economy. Once this data is disaggregated by SOGIESC, it can reveal important inequalities amongst those who are formally employed and those who are not. However, it is important to note that such data only accounts for those participating in the formal economy, and leaves out individuals working informal jobs such as caregivers and homemakers. For a more inclusive look at labor, cities can strive to understand who is left out of the formal economy using this indicator and provide support for those groups who may be informally employed instead.

**Relevant References:** UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.3.1, SDG 8.5.1

---

3 Ibid.
(2.5) Percentage of employed who are employer/manager, disaggregated by SOGIESC

Research has shown that there are significant gender gaps in who obtains top positions within businesses. For instance, on average, women are perceived to have considerably less authority than men. This reality is the product of various social norms regarding who can wield authority well.\(^4\) By further breaking down employment data by role, we can better understand and assess whether women and LGBTI individuals are being hired and are able to obtain high-status positions. By looking at all who are employed, including self-employed and entrepreneurs, we can see not only if women and LGBTI individuals are getting into higher roles, but if they are more highly represented among entrepreneurs and self-employed people. This indicator allows us to expose inequalities within hiring practices or gaps in educational/training outreach and programs, and see how women and LGBTI individuals are making higher level job opportunities for themselves.

**Relevant References:** UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.5.1

---

(2.6) Percentage of salaried vs. hourly wage workers, disaggregated by SOGIESC

Wages are typically higher for non-hourly workers than for hourly workers for a variety of reasons. Salaried workers can remain on call and work upwards of 40 hours a week. This indicator aims to address disparities in access to higher paid, more stable job opportunities. This indicator can specifically measure whether or not salaried positions are accessible to individuals of diverse gender identities.

**Relevant References:** UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.5.1

---

Existence of national, provincial, or local level protections of property rights and asset access of individuals of women and LGBTI individuals

Economic autonomy is an important factor in an individual’s economic well being. The ability of an individual to own property or access finances/assets keeps them out of poverty and denying these rights based on gender hinders economic development and prosperity across the board, but particularly in urban settings. This indicator seeks to address the existence of discriminatory property rights and access laws that stand in the way of women and LGBTI individuals’ economic prosperity.

**Relevant References:** LGBTI Inclusion Index, CEDAW Article 13, SDG 16.10

Proportion of adults with an account at a bank or other financial institutions or with a mobile-money service provider, disaggregated by SOGIESC

Restricted or minimized access to banking or credit illustrates broader societal obstacles, especially when data is disaggregated. Access to banking and credit is a large determinant of economic status and lack of access can expose important disparities. According to the International Finance Corporation at the International Monetary Fund, one billion women still do not use or have access to the financial system. While this data focuses on women alone, those of disparate gender identities also face significant barriers in access to financial institutions. LGBTI individuals are often “unbanked” (meaning they don’t have a bank account) which leaves them vulnerable to predatory financial products like payday loans, check cashing, and expensive prepaid cards. This indicator, using World Bank Global Findex Data, aims to bridge these gaps in access for SOGIESC individuals.

**Relevant References:** UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.10.1, SDG 8.10.2, CEDAW Article 13.1.b
Building on Rabbi Jonathan Sacks’ definition of Education as “the handing on of the accumulated wisdom to the next generation,” the “Schooling & Education” thematic area embraces both the traditional classroom environment as well as lived experience as valid means of ensuring inclusive, equitable, and quality life-long learning experiences.

Schooling refers to a traditional classroom experience that puts an emphasis on a set general course of studies (typically K-12 education and higher education). Education on the other hand is a broader understanding of success within a society with expected academic norms. Education takes a more comprehensive look at ‘success’ within a society that values and encourages higher education. This section of the area will highlight generational, systemic, and cultural factors which impact an equitable, inclusive, and accessible education system. Education also includes career-building and career opportunity knowledge for those lacking a K-12 or higher education diploma, as well as the building of necessary life skills and cultural knowledge within one’s community.
(3.1) Extent to which information on and sensitivity to gender equity, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics is mainstreamed at all levels in curricula and student assessment

Ensuring diversity-inclusive curricula inclusive of information on sexual orientation, gender, identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics (SOGIESC), ensures that the unique identities and contributions that every student brings to the classroom are acknowledged, affirmed, and understood by classmates, professionals, and community-members alike. This indicator follows the lead of the LGBTI Index which states that “in keeping with standard educational norms and practices, such curricula would be evidence-based to ensure accuracy and would be age appropriate.” The mainstreaming aspect of this indicator reflects the possibility that SOGIESC-related content could fit in various learning opportunities (i.e. required subject-specific curricula, student assessments, elective courses, etc.). While some cities may not have direct control over the formation of curricula and student assessments, they can work closely with relevant educational authorities to meet the goal of full integration and mainstreaming of SOGIESC. Data collection could occur via school census instruments and other qualitative reporting mechanisms.¹

**Relevant References:** LGBTI Inclusion Index

(3.2) Existence of organized and mandatory teacher (and other relevant educational professionals, i.e. teacher’s assistants, subject specialists, etc.) training pre-service or in-service for curricula that mainstreams diversity, inclusivity, and SOGIESC-specific concerns throughout, disaggregated by educational level

Teachers need support in developing skills to instruct, include, and affirm their students, especially those from non-normative backgrounds/identities that have not been historically included or accepted within the classroom setting and teaching curriculum. Implementing inclusive and affirmative practices in the classroom starts by training teachers on what may be unfamiliar concepts and expanding their tool box to meet the needs of and educate all students on this as well.²

**Relevant References:** LGBTI Inclusion Index, SDG 4.1.c


(3.3) Percentage of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills, disaggregated by SOGIESC

Literacy and numeracy are important life skills for any person as they form foundational building blocks for future learning and living in most societies. Furthermore, strong literacy skills are linked with increased access to and engagement with life-long education opportunities, jobs, healthcare, and financial literacy (an important component in mitigating spousal/familial financial abuse). Marginalized gender identities are at particular risk of not developing this vital skill set to a level of proficiency due to gender-related concerns which interact and overlap with other aspects of their identity/lived experience (i.e. gender-based violence, poverty, and migration).  

**Relevant References:** UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 4.6.1

(3.4) Whether or not public secondary education schools have a Lived Named Policy

Lived name refers to the name that a person prefers to go by, especially if it differs from the individual’s legal first, middle, and/or last name. A lived name policy allows students to indicate, be called by, and utilize the name of their choice wherever possible during their educational experience. Because names are a significant part of an individual’s identity, lived name policies offer students the means and space to accurately represent themselves within educational institutions. These policies can be especially meaningful and helpful for folks whose official/legal names do not align with their gender identity or marital status. As such, permitting individuals to determine the names in which they are called allows educational spaces to be more inclusive. This policy can/should also offer students the option to designate their gender identity and pronouns.

**Relevant References:** Occidental College’s Lived Name & Pronoun Policy, Bowdoin College’s Lived Name Policy


4 “Lived Name & Pronoun Policy.” Occidental College, https://www.oxy.edu/student-handbook/general-college-policies/lived-name-pronoun-policy#:~:text=The,lives%20of%20students%20who%20are%20at%20risk%20of%20misrepresentation%20or%20fraud.

5 “Name Changes.” Bowdoin College, https://www.bowdoin.edu/registrar/students/
(3.5) Existence of Anti-Discrimination policies that prevent and address discrimination, bullying, and harassment on basis of one’s SOGIESC, disaggregated by educational level

In the US, anti-discrimination policies traditionally emphasize disability, age, race, ethnicity, and sex. However, expanding such policies to protect students and faculty regardless of their sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender characteristics is essential. Discrimination, bullying, and harassment can be the compounded outcome of biases against an individual's multiple identities. Thus, this indicator attempts to capture how one’s perception and experiences around safety and belonging can be impacted by one's intersectional identity. By ensuring an inclusive anti-discrimination policy around SOGIESC, it establishes an expectation of behavior for equal and fair treatment of all students, faculty and staff. It also ensures that educational institutions can hold space for protecting all of its members, regardless of their SOGIESC, and be held accountable if they do not.

Relevant References: American Civil Liberties Union

(3.6) Number of contact hours of instruction per day per week, disaggregated by educational level and SOGIESC

A “contact hour” is a measure that represents an hour of scheduled instruction given to students. This metric replaces daily attendance focused metrics which do not go so far as to consider the amount of time the student actually spends per day receiving instruction and/or education related help from a professional (i.e. teacher, teacher’s assistant, subject specialists, etc.). Barriers to receiving a quality school-based education, including inability to receive any instructional contact hours (“absenteeism”), take on a gender dynamic for those with marginalized sexual orientations, gender identities, and/or sex characteristics. Gender norms, in particular, intersect with other identities to further hinder opportunities for marginalized gender identifying people to receive minimum instructional contact hours determined by local policies.


credentials/lived-name.


Studies have shown that at least a third of students who identify as LGBTQ+ have dropped out of high school in the United States. These dropouts seem to correlate with school environments perceived as unsafe for LGBTQ+ identifying folks due to bullying, discrimination, and unwelcoming spaces, and can be applied to other, global contexts as well. Moreover, other studies show that girls around the world often drop out of school due to gender-based reasons, such as early marriages and economic insecurity. By measuring graduations rates and disaggregating by SOGIESC, it can be more apparent who is being left behind and/or blocked from fully reaping the benefits of an education.


Percentage of population in non-formal education and training sponsored by city government. Lifelong skills are an important aspect of the education category as it acknowledges the educational aspects of skills outside of the academic norm. It is important to understand that a general secondary or tertiary education is not accessible or not an option for many people whether that be economic, social, or health reasons. However, for this indicator specifically, it is important to see the ways that measuring the percentages of those who chose to not attend college and instead attend city-sponsored non-formal education and training opportunities should be disaggregated by SOGIESC. The UN Statistics website cites the percentage of the population who participate in non-formal educational and training programs, however, the SOGIESC disaggregation is missing.

(3.9) Proportion of schools with adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities (including proportion of schools with access to basic drinking water and proportion of schools with access to gender appropriate and affirmative basic sanitation facilities)

The development, implementation, and upkeep of infrastructure and materials are of great importance as they are the foundation of equitable education. Without these resources, accessible and meaningful education would not exist. Health and infrastructure concerns are what linked together education as it is key in demonstrating intersectionality within the system. It is difficult to link resource and infrastructure to gender equity from an education standpoint only, however, understanding the intersectionality of these cases demonstrates the significance of including this indicator in priority 1. Suitable facilities are important to ensure those who are underrepresented and typically overlooked to be taken into account and provided with the correct resources to achieve an education.

**Relevant References:** SDG 4.a1, US ADA Compliance Standards
GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE & SECURITY

The Gender-Based Violence and Security thematic area was developed in alignment with SDG target 5.2 which seeks to, “Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation.”¹ This thematic area also references CEDAW’s General Recommendation No. 19, which “asserted that violence against women is a form of discrimination, directed towards a woman because she is a woman or that affects women disproportionately.”² Additionally, two of the indices that were evaluated in our analysis of existing gender equity indices—the LGBTI Inclusion Index and the EIGE Gender Equality Index—both have a specific category for violence and/or security. Emerging from this research, the Gender-Based Violence and Security thematic area features indicators that aim to capture data on physical, sexual, or psychological harm to individuals on the basis of their SOGIESC. This definition of gender-based violence (GBV) was influenced by the United Nations definition of GBV, which also importantly recognizes that GBV includes acts that occur in both “public” and “private” life.³ This thematic area also includes indicators that aim to capture data on personal security, meaning what hinders or enables freedom from violence or other crimes.⁴

Indicators of legal nature are marked with a diamond symbol (◊) before the indicator number.

(4.1) Proportion of persons subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner, or by persons other than an intimate partner, respectively [in the last year] and/or [at least once in their lifetime], disaggregated by SOGIESC

Tracking rates of violence against people on the basis of their SOGIESC interrogates norms that justify intimate partner violence and its connection to broader systems of violence.\(^5\) Collecting data on violence in this way has demonstrated utility in tracking femicide in Latin American and Caribbean countries.\(^6\) Moreover, collecting data on the experience of all forms of violence, with care to its gendered dimensions, enables stakeholders to identify gender-responsive locally relevant and owned interventions.\(^7\) Collecting data on violence perpetrated by persons other than an intimate partner encourages tracking violence in cities more broadly (violence manifests in many ways, not solely in the form of intimate-partner violence or domestic violence). Ultimately, this indicator aims to serve as a direct way to track the experience of gender-based violence.

**Relevant References:** SDG 5.2.1, SDG 5.2.2, LGBTI Inclusion Index, OECD Gender Data

(4.2) Proportion of persons killed by a family member or partner, and by persons other than an family member or partner, disaggregated by SOGIESC

In 2015, The United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, Dubravka Šimonović, encouraged all states to participate in a global “Femicide Watch,” asserting that, “violence against women is still the most atrocious manifestation of the systematic and widespread discrimination and inequality that women and girls around the world continue to face,” and that, “women and their children continue to die as victims of gender related killing, often in cruel ways.”\(^8\) Although Šimonović is pointing out the often lethal outcome that women and girls who experience of violence face, we know that transgender and

---


gender non-conforming persons also face fatal violence at disproportionate rates. Fatal violence against women, trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, as well as LGBTI populations is important to track in comparison to the ongoing lived experiences of violence presented in indicator 4.1 regarding physical, sexual, and psychological violence. With this indicator, cities can aim to track who is being killed (by means of SOGIESC disaggregation) as well as whom they are killed by (whether homicides are a result of interpersonal violence, or a broader system of violence, such as gun and gang violence). We know gender-based violence has causes and consequences, and this indicator seeks to illustrate one of the most egregious consequences of GBV.

Relevant References: EIGE Gender Equality Index

◊ (4.3) Existence of local policy and/or provision against sexual harassment in public spaces (on streets, public transportation, in and around schools, workplaces, parks, and public toilets)

This indicator is aligned with UN Women’s Global Flagship Initiative, “Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces for Women and Girls,” which aims to prevent and respond to sexual violence against women and girls in public spaces, and deliver on SDG Target 5.2. In Cuenca, Ecuador, “a 2018 survey found that 90 per cent of women living in urban areas said they had experienced some form of sexual harassment in the last 12 months,” and, “in Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam, a baseline survey found that 41 per cent of women and 39 per cent of men said that they had witnessed sexual harassment in public spaces.” The experience of sexual violence in public spaces is widespread. Policies and provisions against such harassment have the potential to improve freedom of movement and ability to participate in school, work, and public life for women, trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, as well as LGBTI populations. Moreover, a local regulation including a specific provision against sexual harassment was proven to have reduced sexual harassment on transportation in Quito, Ecuador, and also informed the national strategy on gender-based violence. Importantly, this indicator would provide a legal basis for victims to receive justice and services based on their experiences with sexual harassment in public spaces.

Relevant References: UN Women

11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
(4.4) Existence of anonymous reporting systems for sexual assault or harassment within city government

On behalf of UN programs for violence against women, the World Health Organization analyzed surveys from 161 countries taken during 2000 to 2018 and found that about one third of women in the world have experienced physical and/or sexual violence.\(^{13}\) Based on a recent EU study looking at its own member countries, up to 55% of women surveyed had experienced sexual harassment since the age of 15.\(^{14}\) However, sexual assault and harassment are largely unreported to criminal justice systems in these (and all) countries. There are various reasons for someone to choose not to report an instance of sexual assault or harassment directly to police or other criminal justice agencies in their localities. The U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics found that within the U.S. context, reasons include shame, embarrassment, desire to keep information about the assault private, fear of not being believed or even being accused of somehow partaking in the crime, or overall lack of trust in their criminal justice system.\(^{15}\) These reasons may expand or change depending on cultural context as well as a victim’s SOGIESC. Dependence on police data regarding levels of sexual assault and harassment within city spaces will thus fail to include a large portion of the victims. With this in mind, an anonymous reporting system for these crimes—either within the legal framework for crime reporting or aside from it—is crucial in allowing the city to obtain more accurate data regarding the issue of sexual assault and harassment. City government offices and administration buildings can also serve as models for safe reporting for private organizations.

**Relevant References:** WHO, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights

(4.5) Existence of standardized data collection process that is shared by various city government entities working in response to gender-based violence

This indicator is related to indicator 4.4 regarding anonymous reporting systems, but is concerned more specifically with how reporting systems are shared across various government based and related entities. In a report produced by the City of L.A. in 2015 regarding the city response to domestic violence specifically, the city noted the lack of a standardized and consistent approach when recording data related to domestic violence. This is in reference to data from their policing systems as well as that produced by city government programs such as DART (Domestic Abuse Response Teams) which works with community-based organizations.\(^{16}\) A city assessment found that the LAPD miscategorized assaults related to domestic violence by about 27%.\(^{17}\) This standardization would work against such miscategorization by requiring consistent processes through which data related to gender-based violence is reported. For example, this would include set/institutionalized definitions for various types of gender-based violence that are shared between government entities; this would ensure that when reports of violence are translated into numerical data,

17 Ibid.
the resulting data will be consistent throughout government entities. Without an enforced standardization of data collection related to gender-based violence, cities are unable to make appropriate interventions in order to combat this violence. Additionally, if data is collected in a standardized and consistent manner, this can help make this data more widely accessible to the public. Although this is taken from reports by the LAPD, the need for standardized reporting systems and data collection is applicable to all cities working against gender-based violence.

**Relevant References:** City of Los Angeles

(4.6) **Existence of mandatory training programs that incorporate training on human rights and protection from violence concerning SOGIESC.** [Cluster Options: judicial officials, law-enforcement officials, correctional officials, city government and operations teams, city administrative teams]

This indicator recognizes the importance of training on gender-based violence in the city, especially throughout the judicial system. People within law enforcement, in many cases, are either perpetrators of gender-based violence or not equipped to appropriately deal with instances of gender-based violence. UN Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women, Dubravka Šimonović, emphasizes the responsibility “to take positive measures to change and modify harmful stereotypes of gender roles conducive to violence” and “undertake activities to empower women and reduce their vulnerability to violence.”

Cities have the power to use trainings to implement agreed standards on protection from violence. Trainings have the potential to change attitudes and behaviors to promote the right of women, girls, trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, as well as LGBTI populations to enjoy public spaces free from said violence. Ultimately, training programs work both to help prevent gender-based violence (both perpetrated and perpetuated by law enforcement) and to provide people with the tools to better support victims of such violence.

**Relevant References:** LGBTI Inclusion Index, UN Women

---


The Governance and Public Life thematic area was added in alignment with SDG Target 5.5, which seeks to, “Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life,” as well as CEDAW Article 8, which states that, “States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure to women, on equal terms with men and without any discrimination, the opportunity to represent their Governments at the international level and to participate in the work of international organizations.” This thematic area is intended to capture how power operates with gender at the city-level by measuring the inclusion of women, trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, and LGBTI populations, as well as the existence of gender perspectives. Therefore, the indicators measure gender equity in public offices within city government. Ideally, it would be beneficial to track participation in leadership roles within non-governmental spaces as well, but doing so may be out of the purview of city governments.

Indicators of legal nature are marked with a diamond symbol (◊) before the indicator number.

(5.1) Existence of city government statistical reporting systems that disaggregate data by SOGIESC, allow calculation of statistics on health, education, economic outcomes, violence, and political participation, and is publicly available

The LGBTI Inclusion Index cites how an indicator such as this one allows us to, “Evaluate whether reporting systems exist and whether they include the collection of data on LGBTI status or SOGIESC victimization.” This indicator is meant “to ensure all the [city’s statistical] information systems break down data by gender and use this data for gender analysis.” Disaggregating data in this way enables cities to avoid the two frequently observed shortcomings: (1) “the lack of diagnostic studies carried out with a gender perspective and the lack of gender impact reports,” and (2) the “insufficient use of the gender-segregated data collected in achieving this gender perspective.”

Relevant References: LGBTI Inclusion Index, City of Barcelona

◊ (5.2) Existence of required gender parity quotas [Cluster Options: city boards, commissions, heads of departments, general managers, assistant general managers]

The use of gender quotas as a mechanism to increase the political representation of women is a worldwide phenomenon. The goal of requiring gender quotas is often to achieve representational equality for women at the national legislative level. At the city level, Los Angeles has achieved gender parity on its 41 boards and commissions, as of 2015. And as of 2020, more women lead on L.A.'s boards and commissions. Quotas are seen as an overall successful and effective method to increase women's participation. Importantly, this

4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
indicator understands the spectrum of gender identity that exists, and encourages cities to report on parity quotas that prioritize trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, as well as LGBTI populations, not simply the leadership of women.

**Relevant References:** City of Los Angeles

(5.3) Percentage of elected and/or appointed officials, disaggregated by SOGIESC
[Cluster Options: mayor, city controller, city attorney, city councilmembers, judges, and general managers]

The EU Gender Equality Index cites the power that exists in decision-making spaces (and positions) across the political, economic and social spheres. Therefore, data that tracks participation and leadership in these spaces should be disaggregated by SOGIESC in order to illuminate imbalances and signal where policy outcomes are poorly represented. This indicator is meant to produce data that can ensure cities, “include the voice, needs and proposals of women, [trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, as well as LGBTI communities] in institutional spaces to make room in the production of local public actions for the discourse of gender equality coming from citizens.”

Without properly providing the space for these voices, gender perspectives and perspectives concerning diverse SOGIESC will be left out of important decisions.

**Relevant References:** CEDAW: Article 7, EIGE Gender Equality Index, LGBTI Index, OECD Gender Data, UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, City of Barcelona

(5.4) Rate that candidates for elective office get elected compared to men, disaggregated by SOGIESC

The relevance of this indicator is similar to indicator 5.3 regarding elected city officials. This indicator, however, also has the potential to illuminate if there are barriers to running/getting elected to important decision-making, power-wielding spaces. An analysis of the importance of tracking the rates at which women get elected compared to men is presented in L.A.’s Report on the Status of Women and Girls (produced in collaboration with Mount Saint Mary’s University): “where women run, they win”—meaning that female candidates win at similar rates to male candidates. In Los Angeles, we see that women win elected office at similar rates to their prevalence as candidates. In order for Los Angeles to elect more women to public office, more women in Los Angeles need to run for office in primary elections.”

In other words, this indicator can provide data that signals whether women, trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, and/or LGBT populations are facing barriers to running. Additionally, cities may choose to collect data on the number of women, LGBTI persons, and non-binary and gender fluid persons that register as candidates to compare to the data that this indicator produces in order to validate the city of Los Angeles’s findings.

**Relevant References:** City of Los Angeles


A gender perspective is meant to take into account “gender-based differences when looking at any social phenomenon, policy, or process.”

Employing a gender perspective recognizes that women, trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, as well as LGBTI populations experience all spheres of life (i.e. political, economic, environmental) differently than men, and therefore their needs and long-term interests differ from men. As such, an indicator tracking the existence of gender perspectives can ensure that the concern and experiences of women, trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, as well as LGBTI communities are “an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes.”

For example, if street light planning (at markets, bus terminals, metro stations, and along the route that girls take to school) is done with a gender perspective, cities can increase safety, and therefore gender-based mobility.

Additionally, employing a gender perspective in city resilience planning (such as environmental or synthetic disaster planning or legislation) is crucial to including the perspectives of women, trans, non-binary, and gender fluid persons, as well as LGBTI populations into city planning and city emergency planning, meaning that the city has taken into account varied, gendered experiences and impacts of both synthetic and environmental disasters. The broadness of this qualitative indicator (i.e. cities simply reporting on the “existence” of a gender perspective) is intended to encourage cities to elaborate and report on how and where a gender perspective is being employed in planning and policy making. The cluster options serve as examples, but cities should feel implored to report on specific examples of best practices and share knowledge regarding how gender is considered at every level of city planning.

Relevant References:
EIGE Gender Equality Index, UN Women, City of Barcelona
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The Built Environment is a key aspect to the fulfilment of gender equity, encompassing made or modified structures that provide people with living, working, and recreational spaces. It includes but is not limited to the buildings we live in, the distribution systems that provide us with water and electricity, and the roads, bridges, and transportation systems we use to get from place to place. Built infrastructure allows for individuals to access basic services and be mobile throughout the urban environment. Because it is integral to daily life and human welfare, the Built Environment is crucial in addressing gender disparities as gendered roles often play into access to civic spaces, types of roles played within the built environment, and the ability for women and LGBT individuals to safely traverse the built environment.¹

The Built Environment includes three sections: Sanitation Infrastructure, Safety Infrastructure, Housing. These categories account for intersectionality of identities, including a wide range of gender identities into the indicators’ scope and applicability.

Indicators of legal nature are marked with a diamond symbol (◊) before the indicator number.

Sanitation Infrastructure

The right to sanitation and waste services is an essential component to achieving gender equity within the diverse SOGIESC population. The WHO cites that individuals who menstruate, including women and the LGBTI population, are disproportionately impacted by lack of sanitation and hygiene facilities, due to their needs related to menstruation, gendered roles on child birth and caring, and gendered power inequities present within urban planning. This section draws on connections made in the Sustainable Development Goals between water, sanitation, and hygiene (SDG 6) and gender equality and empowerment (SDG 5). However, this grouping attempts to take a lens outside the traditional gender binary.

This section specifically targets built spaces under the purview of city government, which we define as public buildings, schools, community centers, transit stops, libraries, courts, information centers, post offices, washrooms in parks, government buildings, public housing, and any other structure that is owned, administered or funded by the city government. The indicators disaggregate by building type to target any resource access disparities present in different types of public governments, allowing the data to lead to action plans and tangible change towards gender equity in city infrastructure.

◊ (6.1.a) Whether or not public buildings are required to have gender inclusive sanitation facilities by law

Access to adequate gender-inclusive sanitation facilities in public buildings, such as in schools, transit stops and buildings, and other public buildings helps meet the basic needs of the SOGIESC population and make them feel safe/comfortable being in public spaces, increasing their safe mobility and access to the urban environment. Specifically from a LGBTI lens, requiring gender affirmative and inclusive sanitation facilities, such as gender inclusive signage and gender neutral bathrooms, is paramount to not only equitable sanitation access, but safety as LGBTI individuals are disproportionately at risk for bullying and violence in public spaces. Through tailoring the Built Environment to meet the diverse SOGIESC population's needs, gender inclusive sanitation facilities are also an affirmation of the rights of the LGBTI population. Therefore, it is imperative to qualitatively measure the presence of legislation that mandates sanitation services across all genders as this directly

correlates to being able to address gender inequities in the Built Environment. 5

**Relevant References:** World Bank, LGBT Equity Center, Occupational Safety and Health Administration

◊ (6.1.b) Whether or not public buildings are required to have child changing facilities in all sanitation facilities

The United State’s American with Disabilities Act mandates that “that baby changing stations be present in both men’s and women’s restrooms and must be located in an area that is easily accessible and free from obstructions.” To break down and address gendered roles around child caregiving often associated with the SOGIESC population, it is essential to measure whether similar mandates exist within the built infrastructure in CHANGE cities, making sure they also incorporate gender inclusive language to break down gender stereotypes and stigma concerning LGBTI population. 6

**Relevant References:** ADA - American with Disabilities Act

◊ (6.1.c) Whether or not public buildings are required to have breastfeeding areas disaggregated by building type

California Breastfeeding Laws require a workplace lactation space for all employees with a stipulation that the space cannot be a bathroom”. Given the purview of Change city governments, we propose that the city mandates that breastfeeding areas be present in public buildings. Measuring legal requirements around breastfeeding areas in public restrooms will help ensure equitable access to resources and a safe space for any woman or LGBTI individual with a child. Due to gendered caregiving roles, ensuring and measuring access to these services will be a major contribution to gender equity within the Built Environment. 7

**Relevant References:** California State Law


◊ (6.1.d) Whether or not public buildings are required to have gender-inclusive menstruation product disposal areas in toilet facilities disaggregated by building type

Human Rights Watch notes that access to menstrual hygiene is a critical component to realizing human rights for individuals who menstruate within the diverse SOGIESC population. In addition, public presence and dialogue around menstruation has the capacity to destigmatize discriminatory cultural norms or practices. It is, therefore, critical to provide menstrual disposal areas in all sanitation facilities within public buildings, taking into consideration inclusivity outside the traditional binary of solely women menstruating through increasing access to menstrual disposal areas for diverse identities within the LGBTI population.  

Relevant References: Human Rights Watch, Culture, Health & Sexuality Research Journal

◊ (6.1.e) Whether or not public buildings are required to have hazardous waste disposal bins disaggregated by building type

Based on varying health and sanitation needs within the Built Environment, certain individuals within the SOGIESC population may need access to sharp waste containers for biomedical waste, such as hormonal injections, insulin needles, or other health related needs. Having them in public buildings, specifically government hospitals or health care clinics, government health departments, city medical waste facilities, and police or fire stations distimitizes them and allows them to be more accessible to the SOGIESC population. 

Relevant References: Planned Parenthood, FDA, LA County


Safety Infrastructure

Security in transport services is an essential determinant for the ability of SOGIESC groups to be mobile in the Urban Environment. Interventions and data collection around infrastructure relating to transport can have tangible impacts on the SOGIESC population’s safety while traveling and their ability to access resources outside the home. Gendered mobility patterns play into the importance of safety infrastructure including a gendered perspective as the SOGIESC population is disproportionately impacted by gender-based safety issues while traveling and being in public spaces. The World Bank also cites that women and LGBTI individuals bear a greater transport burden than men as they are disproportionately without car access and, thus, are forced into often dangerous public transportation spaces to be mobile across the urban space.  

Because of this issue surrounding gendered mobility, portions of the female and LGBTI population suffer from “time poverty,” which impacts their ability to participate in the economy, and therefore, their opportunities to reduce their economic and social vulnerability. Thus, we emphasize how gendered mobility and safety are multi-sectional issues connected to other thematic foci addressed in this report. This grouping will focus mainly on city and operated public transportation stops, since these are most under the purview of city governance and therefore have the most potential for tangible changes related to gender-based inequities in urban mobility.  


(6.2.a) Existence of laws that require security infrastructure at public transit stops and transit buildings disaggregated by location

The World Bank notes that security infrastructure at public transit stops and buildings is a critical determinant of women and LGBTI individuals being able to safely and comfortably traverse the urban environment. They note specific policy interventions, such as lighting in stations, designs of buses, and trains to allow for strollers, and alarm systems being critical components in adding a gendered safety design in transport spaces. Other possible examples of security infrastructure could include secure transfer and waiting areas, security cameras, blue help buttons, alarm systems and security officers.

**Relevant References:** The United Nations, Sustainable Mobility, American Public Transit Association- US Department of Transportation

(6.2.b) Incidents of public transportation and walking related deaths and injuries disaggregated by SOGIESC and location

In both global south and global north countries women and LGBTI population walk and take public transit more than men, causing them to be at greater risk for related deaths as they traverse the built environment. Therefore, sidewalks and paths leading up to transit stops and across roadways need to take into account the needs of the diverse SOGIESC population when conducting urban planning. To target areas of concern for women and the LGBTI population within their mobility routes, death and injuries have to be measured so adequate change to urban planning can be implemented along highly trafficked areas.

**Relevant References:** International Transport Forum, Sustainable Mobility

(6.2.c) Existence of mobile reporting systems for gender-based violence and safety


issues at public transit stops

The ability for women and LGBTQI individuals, who disproportionately experience physical, verbal, and sexual harassment and violence outside the home, to report unsafe situations is crucial for providing accountability measures within public and transit spaces. Los Angeles currently provides a reporting system through the LA Metro Transit Watch App, which allows riders to communicate directly to Metro about suspicious activity or incidents of sexual harassment or misconduct. These reporting services also provide a level of emotional security while SOGIESC individuals are traveling, making them more comfortable using public transit services and traversing the urban environment. Overall, measuring the presence of mobile reporting infrastructure at public transit stops within Change promotes urban mobility and safety for women and LGBTQI individuals.

Relevant References: LA Metro, RTI International Research Institute, Stop Street Harassment

(6.2.d) Presence of regularly mandated city-based audits of security measures at transit stops and transit buildings

While tracking built safety infrastructure is paramount to ensuring equity in gendered mobility, it is also essential to monitor the upkeep and implementation of security infrastructure at transit stops and buildings regularly to ensure effectiveness and that they are meeting the needs of passengers.

Relevant References: UN Women, LA Controller- City Auditor

Housing Instability

Access to safe, affordable, and long-term housing offers a myriad


of benefits for SOGIESC groups beyond providing shelter, a home offers safety, privacy, and a space to raise a family.\textsuperscript{17} Housing costs often make up a large share of household budgets and place financial strain on families, minimizing the amount of money left for other goods and services. Alleviating the financial burden of housing enables SOGIESC groups to allocate money to future investments such as quality medical care, stable educational opportunities, better jobs, and more nutritious food. We recommend combining all of these indicators if localization ability permits as this grouping of indicators as a whole encompasses crucial facets of housing instability amongst at risk populations, such as numbers of women and LGBTI population’s living in a state of homelessness, the current numbers of SOGIESC in the shelter system, and overall scope of housing services not being met.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{(6.3.a) Percentage of population who are currently housed in homeless shelters, disaggregated by SOGIESC and varied types of homeless shelters}

Shelters provide secure accomodation but also offer a range of important services, such as educating women and LGBTI populations on what constitutes as gender-based violence and violations of human rights. Having this disaggregated data will direct policy makers to create housing instability intervention programs and diverse resource offerings tailored towards the gender perspective.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Relevant References: SDG 11.1}

\textbf{(6.3.b) Percentage of population living in slums, informal settlements or without access to adequate housing, disaggregated by SOGIESC}

With 24 percent of the global urban population living with inadequate housing, the necessity to ensure access to safe and affordable housing for these more vulnerable populations is of paramount importance.\textsuperscript{20}

\textbf{Relevant References: SDG 11.1}

\textbf{(6.3.c) Existence of protection programs against eviction disaggregated by race and socioeconomic level}

\textsuperscript{17} Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. n.d. “Housing.” OECD Better Life Index. \url{http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/topics/housing/}.
\textsuperscript{20} UN Women. “Why shelters are important”, 2014. \url{https://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/1367-why-shelters-are-important.html}.
SOGIESC populations are at heightened risk of experiencing homelessness. This indicator would direct city officials to better understand the overwhelming burdens women and LGBTI populations face. The implementation of this indicator could lead to government interventions and assistance programs, such as providing rent assistance or other housing benefits.  

**Relevant References:** C40 Urban Climate Action Impacts Framework

**(6.3.d) Percentage of population in government sponsored housing projects or low income housing, disaggregated by SOGIESC**

A more accurate understanding of the demographics of the inhabitants of these types of housing structures enables policy makers to tailor upkeep and modification initiatives to best fit the needs of occupants.

**Relevant References:** Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

**(6.3.e) Percentage of population receiving housing benefits or rent assistance, disaggregated by SOGIESC**

A disaggregated view of recipients of these types of assistance measures enables policy makers to better understand the financial burden placed on SOGIESC groups, which will inform the need for more or improved social safety nets for those needing rent assistance or other subsidized housing.

**Relevant References:** Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

**(6.3.f) Existence of shelters specifically tailored for women and LGBTI individuals**

Women and LGBTI individuals experiencing homelessness are faced with a unique range of difficulties and safety threats, such as a high proportion of female domestic violence in the shelter system and LGBTI youth facing homelessness. Women and LGBTI-specific shelters provide essential services of protection, services, and resources that enable re-entry to independent living. Understanding occupancy rates of these shelters will help policymakers understand varying demand levels and inform the construction of new shelters and strategic social safety net funding.

**Relevant References:** LA Downtown Women’s Shelter, Covenant House

---

The aim of this Report has been to propose a set of indicators that cities can use to more effectively measure gender equity. By using an intersectional lens and specifically calling for data collection that is disaggregated by SOGIESC, we have addressed the limitation of simply measuring along the gender binary in order to make other gender identities, as well as LGBTI populations, more visible. Moreover, we adapted and created indicators with cities in mind, recognizing that international standards do not always apply to, or lie within the jurisdiction of city governments. We have made a unique contribution to the current landscape of existing indices measuring gender equity with our Built Environment thematic area, recognizing how the experience of living in an urban setting – full of human-made or modified structures that provide people with living, working, and recreational spaces – is itself gendered. Overall, the top priority indicators proposed in this Report aim to be clearly outcome-oriented in relation to gender equity, with the ultimate goal of creating systemic change in both small and large cities, across different cultural contexts. Recognizing that the goal of the CHANGE network is to identify disparities, implement initiatives to address needs across city operations, and track measures for success in pursuit of gender equity, we hope this Report can serve as a starting point to see this mission through.
**Affordable Housing:** Affordable housing is housing that is appropriate for the needs of a range of very low to moderate income households and priced so that these households are also able to meet other basic living costs such as food, clothing, transport, medical care and education.¹

**Biological sex / Sex assigned at birth:** A label given at birth based on one’s physiology and anatomy, such as genitalia, chromosomes, and hormones (Often condensed to: “sex”)²

**Built Environment:** The built environment consists of the human-made or modified structures that provide people with living, working, and recreational spaces. It includes but is not limited to the buildings we live in, the distribution systems that provide us with water and electricity, and the roads, bridges, and transportation systems we use to get from place to place.³

**Cisgender:** A term that describes an individual whose personal sense of gender and identity corresponds with the individual's sex assigned at birth. (For example, a female-bodied individual who identifies as a woman is a cisgender woman.)⁴

**Cluster Indicator:** A cluster is an intentionally broad, thematic indicator that provides examples of data points that cities can report back on depending on local context and available data.

**Eviction:** The legal process a landlord uses to remove a tenant. Reasons for eviction include failing to pay rent on time, breaking the rental agreement, usage of the property for illegal purposes, or occupying the space past the agreed upon date of departure.⁵

**Financial Literacy:** General literacy encompasses a person's ability to read and write. Financial literacy is an expansion of this basic definition and can be understood as having two dimensions: understanding (personal financial knowledge) and use (personal finance application). Financial literacy can therefore be understood as how well an individual can understand and use financial information.

**Gender:** A social construct which places cultural and social expectations on individuals based on their assigned sex at birth (usually male or female) which changes over time and vary by cultural context (see also, “Gender Norms”). Gender is hierarchical in most societies and produces inequalities that intersect with other social and economic inequalities (see “Intersectionality”).⁶

---


Gender Binary: The classification of gender into two categories of male and female, which suggests that a person's gender must be either of the two. This simplification of gender excluded individuals whose identities fall outside of these two categories, and the systemic exclusion creates psychological harm, stress, and/or issues pertaining to identity.\(^7\)

Gender Equity: Fairness in treatment for all people according to their respective needs. This may include equal treatment, as well as treatment that is different but considered equivalent in terms of rights, opportunities, outcomes, and benefits.

Gender Expression: Typically expressed through outward impression and appearance, gender expression is the external appearance of one's gender identity. Mostly demonstrated through someone's behavior, clothing, speaking style, etc.\(^8\)

Gender Identity: Expressed and understood by looking at inward emotions and perceptions and understanding how individuals perceive themselves. This includes how individuals perceive themselves and what they like to call themselves (male, female, neither, or a blend of both). It is important to note that one's gender identity does not have to be what they were assigned at birth.\(^9\)

Gender Mobility: Refers to the mobility of women and gender variant groups and their access to civic spaces and basic services that have a huge impact on other thematic foci mentioned within this report. For instance, barriers to female labor force participation include safety issues on the way to work and in the workplace; low availability of quality care services for children, the sick, and elderly dependents; and lack of safe and affordable transportation.\(^10\)

Gender Norms: Standards and expectations attributed to specific gender identities (usually within the binary - male/female) which define how an individual should be and act within a particular society and culture at a particular time. Gender norms are usually internalized early in life and can establish a life cycle of gender socialization and stereotyping.\(^11\)

Gender Perspective: "The gender perspective looks at the impact of gender on people's opportunities, social roles and interactions. Successful implementation of the policy,

---


programme and project goals of international and national organizations is directly affected by the impact of gender and, in turn, influences the process of social development.”

**Gender-Affirming Care:** Healthcare and trained healthcare providers that respectfully address the physical, mental, and social health needs that each patient seeks out, whilst affirming their gender identity.

**Gender-Based Violence:** Healthcare and trained healthcare providers that respectfully address the physical, mental, and social health needs that each patient seeks out, whilst affirming their gender identity.

**Green Spaces:** Green space is any open piece of land that is undeveloped (has no buildings or other built structures), is accessible to the public, and that is partly or completely covered with grass, trees, shrubs, or other vegetation.

**Housing Benefits:** Money paid by the government for people of low income to pay for a place to live.

**Housing Infrastructure:** Refers to the array of safe and affordable living spaces available to city residents. Existence of long-term housing infrastructure also enables access to other services such as education and health services.

**Housing Instability:** Housing instability is defined as struggling to pay rent, spending more than half of household income on housing, experiencing frequent moves, and living in overcrowded conditions.

**Housing Projects:** A publicly supported and administered housing development planned for low-income families.

**Low Income Housing:** A dwelling that a household can purchase for or devote less than 30% of their income towards.

---


15 The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Rental Assistance. [https://www.hud.gov/topics/rental_assistance].


19 California Department of Housing and Community Development, Income Limits. [https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-].
**Indicator:** Indicators are created to categorize and target pertinent issues within a society while creating a simple system in which data can be compared over time.

**Informal Settlements:** Informal settlements are areas where groups of housing units have been constructed on land that the occupants have no legal claim to or are unauthorized to exist on that land.²⁰

**Infrastructure:** the system of public works of a country, state, or region and its resources, such as personnel, buildings, roads, or equipment, required for the operation of human activity. ²¹

**Intersectionality:** Term first coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw to explain the interconnected nature of social categorization (i.e. race, class, gender) which create overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination and disadvantage.²²

**LGBTI:** An acronym that is often used as an umbrella term for capturing sexuality and gender identities. L.G.B.T.I. stands for “Lesbian,” “Gay,” Bisexual,” “Transgender,” and “Intersex” respectfully. This acronym is often expanded to include additional letters to represent more gender identities (LGBTQ, LBTDQIA+, etc.). The following letters are most common: Q stands for “Queer” or “Questioning” ; A can stand for “Asexual” or “Ally” ; and the + signifies any additional sexualities or gender identities not mentioned in the acronym. Throughout the report the research team utilizes LGBTI as a shorthand to refer to the full spectrum of sexuality and gender identities.²³

**Lived Name Policy:** Typically acknowledged by schools and work, the implementation of Lived Name Policy allows for the preferred name use rather than the use of a legal name.²⁴

**Pregnancy Mortality Ratio:** Pregnancy Mortality Ratio refers to the deaths due to complications from pregnancy or childbirth. The ratio measures parental deaths for every 100,000 live births. While this term is typically used regarding maternity, the language has been adjusted to include non-binary and trans-masculine pregnant parents. This aims to be a gender neutral approach that resists the gender and maternal/paternal binary.

---


²¹ American Society of Civil Engineers, America's Infrastructure Score.  https://infrastructurereportcard.org


Rent Assistance: Government subsidies aimed at providing rental assistance to low income tenants as well as helping landlords offer reduced rents to low-income tenants.  

Sanitation Facilities: Sanitation generally refers to the provision of facilities and services for the safe disposal of human urine, faeces, and waste.

Security Infrastructure: Security infrastructure includes all technologies that enhance the security, and the possibility of safety for transit customers, personnel, equipment, and facilities. Technologies include radio communications, silent alarms, covert microphones, closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras (also known as video surveillance), automatic vehicle location (AVL) and other equipment that assist transit agencies in monitoring and responding to situations on board vehicles, along the routes, and at transit facilities. In addition, security personnel are included in this definition.

Sex Characteristics: Physical attributes of the indicative of an individual's biological sex. Also referred to as sexual characteristics.

Sexual Orientation: This term refers to the sex(es) and gender(s) an individual is attracted to romantically, emotionally, and sexually.

Sexuality: Sexuality explains the sexual feelings, behaviors, and behaviors you have towards other people. This can be an attraction to someone physically, sexually, or emotionally. It can be influenced by many aspects of life and can change over time.

Slums: A slum is a living situation in which residents are subjected to a lack of access to improved water sources, sanitation facilities, sufficient living areas, housing durability, and security of longevity.

SOGIESC: Acronym for sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics (see individual definitions)
Time Poverty: “Time poverty is the concept that individuals do not have enough discretionary time – the time available after engaging in necessary activities like sleep and in the committed activities of paid and unpaid work – to engage in activities that build their social and human capital.” 33

Transgender: Term that describes the various ways in which a person’s gender identity or expression differs with the sex assigned to the individual at birth (Often referred to as: “trans”) 34

WASH: A broadly utilized acronym for “Water, Sanitation and Hygiene” within initiatives and organizations focusing on the accessibility of water. Explicitly including the lens of water’s uses such as, sanitation and hygiene, aims to emphasize water’s broader availability and infrastructure.

# APPENDIX

## TABLE 1: PRIORITY 1 INDICATORS

*Indicators of legal nature are marked with a diamond symbol (◊) before the indicator number.*

### HEALTH & RELATED SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number and Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Percentage of population who report their health to be fair to poor, disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and age</td>
<td>EIGE, Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Percentage of population diagnosed with HIV/Aids, disaggregated by SOGIESC and age</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Pregnancy/ Delivery Mortality Ratio (MMR), disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and age</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, LA County and Sierra Leone Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Number of vendors selling fruit and vegetables within 500m of domestic properties</td>
<td>Building Research Establishment's International Healthy Cities Indices (BRE HCI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Percentage of population with a reliable, affordable source of ongoing care, disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and socioeconomic status</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, LA County, London Health Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ 1.6 Percentage of population who have their sexual and reproductive health needs met, including gender inclusive care, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>LA County, Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Percentage of population using safely managed drinking water sources, disaggregated by SOGIESC and race</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Percentage of population using safely managed sanitation services with privacy, disaggregated by SOGIESC and race</td>
<td>WHO, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Number and Content</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Percentage of labor force that is unemployed, disaggregated by SOGIESC and age group (16-24 and 25+)</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, SDG 8.3.1, SDG 8.5.1, SDG 8.6.1, CEDAW Article 11.1.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Percentage of individuals living below the national poverty line, disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, and ethnicity</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, SDG 1.1-1.5, SDG 1.A, SDG 1.B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Mean monthly earnings, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>EIGE Gender Equality Index, SDG 8.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Labor force participation rate, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.3.1, SDG 8.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Percentage of employed who are employer/manager, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Percentage of salaried vs. hourly wage workers, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Existence of national, provincial, or local level protections of property rights and asset access of individuals of women and LGBTI individuals</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, CEDAW Article 13, SDG 16.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Proportion of adults with an account at a bank or other financial institutions or with a mobile-money service provider disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.10.1, SDG 8.10.2, CEDAW Article 13.1.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Number and Content</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1  Extent to which information on and sensitivity to gender equity, sexual orientation,</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics is mainstreamed at all levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in curricula and student assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2  Existence of organized and mandatory teacher (and other relevant educational</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, SDG 4.1.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionals, i.e. teacher's assistants, subject specialists, etc.) training pre-service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or in-service for curricula that mainstreams diversity, inclusivity, and SOGIESC-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific concerns throughout, disaggregated by educational level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3  Percentage of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4  Proportion of educational institutions with a Lived Named Policy, disaggregated by</td>
<td>Occidental College’s Lived Name &amp; Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational level</td>
<td>Policy, Bowdoin College’s Lived Name Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5  Existence of Anti-Discrimination policies that prevent and address discrimination,</td>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bullying, and harassment on basis of one's SOGIESC, disaggregated by educational level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6  Percentage of salaried vs. hourly wage workers, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, SDG 8.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7  Existence of national, provincial, or local level protections of property rights and</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, CEDAW Article 13, SDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asset access of individuals of women and LGBTI individuals</td>
<td>16.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOLING & EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number and Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Proportion of schools with access to adopted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities (including proportion of schools with access to basic drinking water and proportion to schools with access to gender appropriate and affirmative basic sanitation facilities)</td>
<td>SDG 4 Indicator 4.a.1, US ADA Compliance Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE & SECURITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number and Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Proportion of persons subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner, or by persons other than an intimate partner, respectively [in the last year] and/or [at least once in their lifetime], disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>SDG 5.2.1, SDG 5.2.2, LGBTI Inclusion Index, OECD Gender Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Proportion of persons killed by a family member or partner, and by persons other than a family member or partner, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>EIGE Gender Equality Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Existence of local policy and/or provision against sexual harassment in public spaces (on streets, public transportation, in and around schools, workplaces, parks, and public toilets)</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Existence of anonymous reporting systems for sexual assault or harassment within city government</td>
<td>WHO, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator Number and Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Existence of standardized data collection process that is shared by various city government entities working in response to gender-based violence</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Existence of mandatory training programs that incorporate training on human rights and protection from violence concerning SOGIESC. [Cluster Options: judicial officials, law-enforcement officials, correctional officials, city government and operations teams, city administrative teams]</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, UN Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOVERNANCE & PUBLIC LIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Existence of city government statistical reporting systems that disaggregate data by SOGIESC, allow calculation of statistics on health, education, economic outcomes, violence, and political participation, and is publicly available</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Existence of required gender parity quotas [Cluster Options: city boards, commissions, heads of departments, general managers, assistant general managers]</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Percentage of elected and/or appointed officials, disaggregated by SOGIESC [Cluster Options: mayor, city controller, city attorney, city councilmembers, judges, and general managers]</td>
<td>CEDAW: Article 7, EIGE Gender Equality Index, LGBTI Inclusion Index, OECD Gender Data, UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Rate that candidates for elective office get elected compared to men, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOVERNANCE & PUBLIC LIFE (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number and Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◊ 5.5 Existence of an intentional gender perspective in city planning/policy making [Cluster Options: budgetary programmes, strategic plans, street light planning, city resilience planning]</td>
<td>EIGE Gender Equality Index, UN Women, City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Existence of mandatory training programs that incorporate training on human rights and protection from violence concerning SOGIESC. [Cluster Options: judicial officials, law-enforcement officials, correctional officials, city government and operations teams, city administrative teams]</td>
<td>LGBTI Inclusion Index, UN Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sanitation Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number and Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◊ 6.1.a Whether or not public buildings are required to have gender inclusive sanitation facilities by law</td>
<td>World Bank, LGBT Equity Center, Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ 6.1.b Whether or not public buildings are required to have child changing facilities in all sanitation facilities</td>
<td>American with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ 6.1.c Whether or not public buildings are required to have breastfeeding areas disaggregated by building type</td>
<td>California State Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ 6.1.d Whether or not public buildings are required to have gender-inclusive menstruation product disposal areas in toilet facilities disaggregated by building type</td>
<td>Human Rights Watch, Culture, Health &amp; Sexuality Research Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◊ 6.1.e Whether or not public buildings are required to have hazardous waste disposal bins disaggregated by building type</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood, FDA, LA County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Number and Content</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.a Existence of laws that require security infrastructure at public transit stops and transit buildings disaggregated by location</td>
<td>The United Nations, Sustainable Mobility, American Public Transit Association- US Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.b Incidents of public transportation and walking related deaths and injuries disaggregated by SOGIESC and location</td>
<td>International Transport Forum, Sustainable Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.c Existence of mobile reporting systems for gender-based violence and safety issues at public transit stops</td>
<td>LA Metro, RTI International Research Institute, Stop Street Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.d Presence of regularly mandated city-based audits of security measures at transit stops and transit buildings</td>
<td>UN Women, LA Controller-City Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Instability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.a Percentage of population who are currently housed in homeless shelters, disaggregated by SOGIESC and varied types of homeless shelters</td>
<td>SDG 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.b Percentage of population living in slums, informal settlements or without access to adequate housing, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>SDG 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.c Existence of protection programs against eviction disaggregated by race and socioeconomic level</td>
<td>C40 Urban Climate Action Impacts Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.d Percentage of population in housing projects or low income housing, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.d Percentage of population in housing projects or low income housing, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator Number and Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.d</td>
<td>Percentage of population in housing projects or low income housing, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.e</td>
<td>Percentage of population receiving housing benefits or rent assistance, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.f</td>
<td>Existence of shelters specifically tailored for women and LGBTI individuals</td>
<td>LA Downtown Women’s Shelter, Covenant House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2: PRIORITY 2 INDICATORS

#### HEALTH & RELATED SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the population using modern and safe fuel for cooking, heating, and lighting, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of poor physical health days reported by persons in the past month, disaggregated by SOGIESC and race</td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the population reporting that their mental health needs are met (including addiction counseling and suicide prevention services) disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>SDG 3.4 and 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the population that undergoes forced or coerced genital mutilation and sterilization, disaggregated by SOGIESC, age, and economic status</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the population with access to appropriate single-use or reusable menstrual hygiene materials, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ECONOMICS, LABOR & WELL-BEING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of individuals at risk of poverty disaggregated by SOGIESC, age, disability, race, ethnicity</td>
<td>EIGE Gender Equality Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of employed population by sector, disaggregated by SOGIESC, race, ethnicity, and age</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ECONOMICS, LABOR & WELL-BEING (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage gap disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours spent on unpaid domestic care work disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours spent on total work disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UN Minimum Set of Gender Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of working life disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>EIGE Gender Equality Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population receiving credit and micro-credit funding by size of loan, duration, and training disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UNDP Gender Inequality Index</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SCHOOLING & EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of Indigenous history and cultural teachings in school curricula and taught to all students, disaggregated by educational level</td>
<td>Mexico City Pilares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of individuals able to attend school in primary language, disaggregated by educational level and SOGIESC</td>
<td>Mexico City Pilares, City of Barcelona, City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of schools with access to technological tools and training for pedagogical purposes, disaggregated by education level and SOGIESC [Cluster Options: school-wide internet access, ratio of computers/tablets to students, existence of a technology/computer lab, proportion of teachers having received technological training]</td>
<td>SDG 4.a.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrollment ratio, disaggregated by educational level and SOGIESC</td>
<td>City of Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOLING & EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of youth and adults with information and communications technology (ICT) skills, disaggregated by type of skill and gender</td>
<td>Freetown Digital Literacy Report, Mexico City Pilares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of students participating in non-academic, extracurricular activities supported by the city, disaggregated by activity type and SOGIESC</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles, City of Tokyo, City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of individuals reporting strong comprehensive personal-cultural identity and knowledge, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>Mexico City Pilares, City of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population receiving credit and micro-credit funding by size of loan, duration, and training disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UNDP Gender Inequality Index</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE & SECURITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of individuals in a city who believe that a. homosexuality, b. bisexuality, c. transgender, d. variation in sex characteristics is socially acceptable</td>
<td>UNDP LGBTI Inclusion Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of local organizations that monitor incidents of violence against people, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UNDP LGBTI Inclusion Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of local organizations monitoring incidents of violence against people in places of detention, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>UNDP LGBTI Inclusion Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of women aged 20–24 years who were married or in a union before age 15 and before age 18</td>
<td>SDG 5.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of people who are victims of reported violent crimes on the basis of their gender, disaggregated by crime</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of city funds allocated to domestic violence shelters</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide total number of domestic violence calls for service</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE & SECURITY (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women who, after seeking services from DV support programs, consider their situation to have improved/anticipate their situation will improve</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents of sexual violence in public spaces and transportation reported by persons surveyed, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents of sexual violence in public spaces and transportation reported by persons surveyed, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>City of London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GOVERNANCE & PUBLIC LIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Content</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of boards in largest quoted companies, supervisory board, or board of directors, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>EIGE Gender Equality Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of persons in leadership positions in non-governmental organizations or associations, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>CEDAW, Article 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of experts tasked with fostering gender equality within different areas of municipal organizations</td>
<td>City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in city government who have received gender-conscious training</td>
<td>City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of people who are victims of reported violent crimes on the basis of their gender, disaggregated by crime</td>
<td>City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of training sessions required within city structures on issues of gender equality</td>
<td>City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of criteria within municipal grants that encourages the incorporation of a gender perspective</td>
<td>City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of public honors given by cities with criteria that take gender equality into account</td>
<td>City of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Content</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population commuting by public transportation, disaggregated by SOGIESC and race</td>
<td>EPA:Sustainable Transportation Performance Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car ownership, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>International Transportation Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population with access to safe, inclusive and accessible green/public spaces, disaggregated by SOGIESC</td>
<td>SDG Target 11.7, Chicago Policy Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of public work projects spearheaded by women or LGBTI population</td>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of empty city lots in relation to occupied lots</td>
<td>Chicago Sustainable Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of women and LGBTI population displaced by synthetic and environmental disasters, disaggregated by SOGIESC and type of disaster</td>
<td>Center for Disaster Philanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of female and LGBTI deaths caused by disasters, disaggregated by SOGIESC and type of disaster</td>
<td>Center for Disaster Philanthropy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEMATIC AREAS

1. Health & Related Services
2. Economics, Labor, & Well-Being
3. Schooling & Education
4. Gender-Based Violence
5. Governance & Public Life
6. Built Environment