

Civil Society statement on Goals 1,2 and 10 at the 3rd meeting of the Inter Agency and Expert Group on SDGs indicators in Mexico city from 30 March to 1st April, 2016.

Delivered by Jose Manuel Roche, Save the Children.

Mexico, Wednesday, 30th March

Thank you Madam Chair.

Thank you for this opportunity to feed into the discussion regarding cluster Goals 1, 2 and 10. This statement is made on behalf of the stakeholder group.

In relation to indicators for Goal 1, we would like to start by celebrating indicator 1.2.2, which recognizes that poverty is multidimensional and that it needs to be reduced in “all its forms and dimensions”. However, Goal 1 still lacks a global headline indicator for non-monetary poverty and fails to recognize that National Multidimensional Poverty measures are available for only some countries but not yet available for the poorest countries in the world. We would like to propose that countries without national MPIs use a global measure, like the UNDP’s global MPI, until they develop a national measure.

Monetary poverty indicators 1.1.1 and 1.2.1 are strongly influenced by assumptions (specifically equivalence scales) for which there have been limited analysis in developing countries. As a result certain groups, for example older persons, children and persons with disabilities, may appear more or less poor depending on the assumptions used. Measurement of these indicators should include sensitivity testing using alternative equivalence scales to confirm whether trends are consistent regardless of the underlying assumptions. Coupled with appropriate disaggregation, this will provide a more robust and reliable assessment of progress towards meeting poverty targets.

Indicator 1.4.1 measures the population with access to basic services, a critical measure and we hope that a process can be set out to define basic services and develop a methodology. Indicator 1.4.2 measures secure tenure to land, and we applaud the presentation by the World Bank and UN Habitat, and support their path to refine this critical indicator, including

documented as well as informal or perceived tenure, and including community tenure, particularly for indigenous groups.

We note inconsistent designations to tiers on indicators relating to social protection coverage and spending (for example 1.3 , 1.a.1 and 8.b.1). At global level ILO convention 102 and recommendation 202 on social protection floors should serve as the common definition to each for these indicators to progress to tier 1.

Regarding Goal 2, we would like to draw members' attention that target 2.2 explicitly mentions adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons, but these groups are missing in the current indicators. The absence of indicators on breastfeeding, anemia and MUAC puts at risk target 2.2 on ending all forms of malnutrition. We trust that this can be included in the discussion on procedure for the methodological review of the indicators later in the agenda on Friday.

We applaud indicator 2.3.2 that, in its current state, better recognizes the needs of smallholder farmers, and also the simplification under 2.4. These indicators are vital, and we hope a clear process to define methodology can be put in place quickly, so that data collection can begin rapidly.

Regarding Goal 10, we urge members of the IAEG to amend Indicator 10.2.1 to ensure the disaggregation for all groups mentioned in Target 10.2, not just the three groups currently included. We also recommend the use of consumption over income as a more appropriate measure of wellbeing. We remind you the Washington Group Questions should be used to disaggregate by disability in expenditure surveys to fulfill the disaggregation ambition in target 10.2.

Many thanks for this opportunity.