SDG monitoring: Where are we now and what are the implications for monitoring the Asia-Pacific Ministerial Declaration (APMD) on Population and Development?
SDG framework & monitoring challenges

As of May 2019:

➢ 104 Tier I indicators ➔ (Data gaps still exist?)
➢ 88 Tier II indicators ➔ (Capacity/resource constraints; lack of uptake; raw data may exist; data flows; data integration)
➢ 34 Tier III indicators ➔ (Lack of methodology)
➢ 6 indicators with multiple tiers ➔ (Maybe partially available)
2020 Comprehensive Review

- Mandated by the General Assembly (Resolution 71/313)
- Opportunity to review global indicator framework and make improvements
- Open call launched for proposals to be considered in the Review
- Proposals:
  - Refinement/adjustment of existing indicators
  - Replacement of existing indicators (also where methodological progress or data collection efforts have stalled)
  - Deletions of existing indicators
  - Addition of indicators
Guiding principles of 2020 Comprehensive Review

- Takes into account investments already made at national and international levels, without undermining ongoing efforts.

- Revised framework not to significantly impose additional burden on national statistical work.

- Space for improvements, while ensuring changes are limited in scope and size of the framework remains the same.
Criteria for Implementation of 2020 Comprehensive Review (1)

- **Additional indicators** are considered only in **exceptional cases:**
  - When a crucial aspect of a target is not being monitored by the current indicator(s);
  - Need to address a critical or emerging issue not monitored by the existing indicators;
  - When a Goal has very few tier I or tier II indicators for the follow up;
  - Sub-indicators within existing indicators is discouraged.

- **Deletions** are being considered when:
  - Methodological work of a tier III indicator has stalled or has not produced the expected results;
  - A replacement will be proposed if the deleted indicator is the only indicator monitoring the corresponding target.
Criteria for Implementation of 2020 Comprehensive Review (2)

- Adjustments or replacements are being considered when:
  - The indicator does not map well to the target;
  - Does not track the target well.

- Proposed indicators must have an agreed methodology and available data (tier III indicator proposals will not be considered) and be suitable for global monitoring.

- The aim of the review is to maintain the same number of indicators in order not to alter significantly the original framework, which is already being implemented in most countries and not to increase the reporting burden on national statistical systems.
Timeline

- **June – July 2019**
  - Update from custodian agencies on Tier III workplans
  - Proposals for replacements, refinements, adjustments and additional indicators submitted to Secretariat
  - IAEG-SDGs reviewed proposals received and prepared an initial proposal for changes

- **August – September 2019**
  - Open consultation on preliminary list of possible deletions, adjustments, replacements and additions. Interested parties were invited to provide inputs (deadline 8 September 2019)
  - IAEG-SDGs to review results of open consultation and develop a second proposed of changes

- **October 2019**
  - The revised list of proposals will be discussed during the 10th IAEG-SDG meeting (21-24 October 2019)

- **November 2019**
  - The IAEG-SDGs to finalize its proposal for the 2020 Comprehensive Review and submit it to the UN Statistical Commission for its consideration at the 51st session in March 2020.
### Summary of proposed changes* (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tier I</th>
<th>Tier II</th>
<th>Tier III</th>
<th>Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refinement/Adjustment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.3.1</td>
<td>1.4.1, 8.3.1</td>
<td>15.9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td>4.1.1, 4.6.1, 5.2.2, 10.1.1</td>
<td>1.a.3, 1.b.1, 7.b.1, 8.9.2, 11.a.1, 11.c.1, 12.a.1, 12.b.1, 13.2.1, 13.3.1, 13.3.2, 13.a.1, 13.b.1, 14.2.1, 14.c.1, 17.6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.a.2</td>
<td>1.a.1, 17.18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier III retained</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.1, 4.2.1, 4.5.1, 4.7.1, 11.4.1, 11.7.2, 12.3.1b, 12.4.2, 12.5.1, 12.6.1, 12.7.1, 12.8.1, 14.1.1, 15.b.1, 16.4.1, 17.5.1, 17.7.1, 17.14.1, 17.17.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additions under 19 SDG targets:**
2.2, 2.a, 3.4, 3.c, 3.d, 4.3, 8.5, 8.9, 10.1, 10.4, 10.7, 13.2, 13.a, 13.b, 15.5, 15.a, 16.3, 16.6, 17.3

- Blue highlight shows indicators taken on-board also in the draft monitoring framework of the APMD on Population and Development. Only 6/59 SDG indicators might be affected. New additions might be of interest.
Draft monitoring framework for the APMD: Data availability in Asia-Pacific

➢ Sufficient data
If the indicator has two or more data points between the years 2000 and 2018 for at least 50 per cent of the countries in the region, allowing for trend analysis. 22 indicators, mainly in thematic areas A, B and F

➢ Insufficient data
If the indicator has only one data point (or two or more data points, but for less than 50 per cent of the countries in the region) between the years 2000 and 2018, allowing for status analysis only. 22 indicators, mainly thematic areas E and K

➢ No data
If the indicator has no data for any countries in the region between the years 2000 and 2018. 15 indicators, mainly thematic areas G, H, I and J

✓ The number of countries in the region considered as 58
✓ Source: ESCAP Online Statistical Database (July 2019), which has multiple data series for each indicator. Best data series used in most cases to demonstrate data availability.
✓ Monitoring framework of the APMD on Population and Development has taken on-board 59 SDG indicators (including 2 repeated indicators)
Draft monitoring framework for the APMD: selection of indicators

✓ Internationally agreed definition
✓ Established methodology
✓ Regularly produced by countries (with sufficient coverage to track progress over time)

Vs

✓ Priority issue

(acceleration of methodological development + investment in official statistics at national level)