

TEN YEAR PACIFIC STATISTICS STRATEGY (TYPSS) Phase II
11TH PACIFIC STATISTICS STEERING COMMITTEE (PSSC) MEETING

Tanoa Plaza Hotel, Suva, Fiji Islands
24th – 27th November, 2015

PSSC-11 Agenda Item 10.3

Meeting Paper Title: Development of core set of SDG regional headline indicators

1. Purpose of Paper

Provide back-ground information on regional work undertaken by SPC, at the request of PSIDS UN-based ambassadors, to feed into both UN Open Working Group discussions, as well as providing regional input in ongoing SDG-IAEG discussion.

2. Introduction / Background – see Annex I

3. Key Developments – see Annex I

4. Key Issues – see Annex I

5. Key Recommendations

For relevant CROP agencies (PIFS, SPC, SPREP, FFA) to convene a high-level review meeting, involving head of agencies/directors of relevant technical programs once final Global list of “green” indicators is known (post United Nations Statistics Commission meeting, 4 – 11 March 2016), to identify regional monitoring and reporting priorities.

6. Annex

Annex I: Copy of last update prepared to PSIDS UN-based ambassadors, “Monitoring development progress: a “manageable scenario” – Development of a core set of Pacific regional SDG Headline indicators”.

Annex I_PSSC-11 Agenda 10.3

Monitoring development progress, from MDGs to SDGs: “a manageable scenario” – Development of a core set of Pacific regional SDG Headline indicators

(Gerald Haberkorn, SPC: update on work-in-progress for UN PSIDS ambassadors, Noumea 8 July 2015)

Premise

- From a strictly political angle, we know that the UN community will not back-track from its advocacy/embrace of 17 SDGs (**untouchable**)
- From a strictly pragmatic angle, we need to embrace another reality, and that is that 169 targets and indicators are **unworkable** – both from a global development financing support for implementation (investments in projects), as well as regards regular monitoring of progress (investments in data collection).

Way forward

- Reach agreement on a limited set of targets/associated **headline indicators** (between 2–4) **all countries can commit to for global monitoring**.
Caveat: this should not, however, “allow” countries (political/regional groupings) to opt out of the difficult challenges.

PACIFIC head-start

- At final MDG IAEG meeting, the possibility of having such a more limited set of headline indicators was raised by some members as a pragmatic step forward, and we agreed to discuss this at the 1st SDG Interagency Expert Group Meeting in New York, 1-2 June.
- At the same time, the United Nations Statistics Division contacted all national statistical agencies across the world with a request to undertake a preliminary assessment of the (feasibility, suitability and relevance of each proposed draft indicator across the 169 targets.
- Given the tight deadline UNSD imposed on NSOs (2 weeks for reply – while all agencies heads were still in NY!), I proposed to PSIDS ambassadors to undertake a preliminary regional assessment in parallel, for two reasons:
 - To have something on the table from the region by the requested deadline, in case most countries would not respond to this tight deadline request (going by past experience);
 - No Pacific NSOs has the specialist expertise to make an accurate judgement call regards the suitability and relevance of most of the indicators.

Regional Response-1

- I organized a first preliminary attempt to review, from a **strictly technical/professional angle**, of what targets/associated indicators are most feasible, suitable and relevant for the region. This work involved senior staff/sectoral specialists from key technical divisions at SPC, PIFS and SPREP, as well as some interdisciplinary/agency working groups (CC-DRM; NCDs-Food Security; Marine Sector Working Group, involving SPC, SPREP, FFA, PIFS).
- I provided this list to NY-based PSIDS ambassadors at our debrief 1 June, prior to the inaugural SDG IAEG meeting 1-2 June. African colleagues apparently undertook a similar exercise, and UNSD advised on work in progress, doing the same, allocating a TIER-1, 2, 3 ranking to all proposed indicator/target combinations, following replies from 77/190+ countries to their request in mid-March.
(Note: “politics” prevented any meaningful technical discussions at this meeting – which we agreed to undertake out of session, prior to 2nd planned meeting, October 2015).

Regional Response-2 (ongoing – deadline to send to UN-based PSIDS ambassadors: 10 July)

- I committed in my PSIDS ambassador's debrief on 3 June, to combine our preliminary assessment (Regional Response-1) with the UNSD global Tier-1 rankings, to give us some pointers/a clearer picture of what a Global-Regional priority list could look like, that **recognises the importance of working "bottom -> up"**: acknowledging the importance of regional development priorities, in context of a global agenda.
- In other words: ensure co-existence between initial/indicative regional priority list of 62 indicators, combined with the proposed draft Global list of Tier-1 indicators.

Outcome of matching exercise (see separate document), mapping draft Pacific headline indicators to Global TIER-1 indicators (update for PSIDS ambassadors, Noumea, 8 September 2015)

1. **Regional versus Global:** we identified 62 draft Pacific regional headline indicators; proposed UN Tier-1 headline indicators amount to 82.
Personal observations: not a bad outcome, as there seems to be a sense of reality emerging that 320+ indicators "may not work too well".
2. **Regional versus Global: only 28 overlaps.**
This means, 34 of the draft Pacific regional headline indicators do not feature among the 82 global TIER-1 (priority) indicators.
Implications of this from a Pacific regional angle: with 54 global TIER-1 indicators not on draft regional list of priorities, in terms of **combined regional/global monitoring**, Pacific island countries would be looking at 62 (Regional) + 54 (global TIER-1 indicators not matching Pacific headline indicators) = **116 SDG indicators !**
3. On the positive side: this is a welcome relief from current 320+ indicators in first draft.
On the more challenging side: **still about double (116 vs 62) of current MDG monitoring volume.**
4. **SDG-13: Climate change:** not surprising the mismatch between regional (5) and global (1) priority headline indicators; perhaps also not surprising (to me at least), but worrying, that globally, only one TIER-1 headline indicator was proposed: 13.a.1 + *"Mobilised amount of USD per year starting in 2020 accountable towards the USD 100 billion commitment"*.
Personal observation: this single indicator, in my humble view, measures absolutely nothing tangible regards climate change; if anything – it's a simple book-keeping item.

Gerald Haberkorn
Director, Statistics for Development Division
Secretariat of the Pacific Community