

Provisional Proposed Tiers for Global SDG Indicators

as of March 24, 2016

Read Me First

This file contains a proposed classification of the SDG indicators into three tiers based on their level of methodological development and data availability. The Secretariat, in consultation with the IAEG-SDG Co-Chairs, invited international agencies, entities and organisations to submit responses to an online questionnaire that requested information on the state of methodological development of the indicator, whether an international standard exists, and data availability for the indicator.

During this consultation, more than 380 individual responses were received from these organisations (each individual response to a specific indicator is counted as one response, so a single agency could submit multiple responses), and these agencies also were asked to provisionally categorise the indicators into one of the following three tiers:

Tier 1: Indicator conceptually clear, established methodology and standards available and data regularly produced by countries

Tier 2: Indicator conceptually clear, established methodology and standards available but data are not regularly produced by countries

Tier 3: Indicator for which there are no established methodology and standards or methodology/standards are being developed/tested

The Secretariat reviewed and compiled. It also reviewed the proposed tier assignments across the different targets and goals and, in some cases, proposed a different tier for an indicator. This document contains the agency's tier classification, a proposed tier by the Secretariat, a possible custodian agency or agencies (who would be responsible for compiling the data at the global level and for global reporting), other involved agencies, and a column that provides a summary of the detailed information provided by these agencies.

*****This file is very preliminary in nature.***** It will be updated and revised as additional and new information is received from both agencies and countries. This file is intended as a discussion document for the 3rd IAEG-SDG meeting. It is planned that the discussion at the meeting will focus predominately on those indicators classified as Tier III.

Possible custodian agencies, other interested agencies and the tier classification itself may be changed moving forward, based on discussions at the 3rd meeting of the IAEG-SDG and in the future.

Tier Information Sheet (as of 24 March 2016)

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere						
1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than \$1.25 a day	1.1.1 Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank	ILO	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>World Bank: This indicator has been used to monitor MDG target 1.1 (of halving extreme poverty between 1990 and 2015) and was regularly reviewed in the IAEG-MDG meetings. First introduced in 1990, this well-defined indicator is based on comprehensive monetary welfare measures (either income or consumption) collected from household surveys conducted by NSOs. It is well documented, widely understood and is a meaningful statistic for monitoring progress towards eradicating extreme poverty. By using Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) exchange rates and a common poverty line, this indicator is comparable across countries and over time. The measures for each country can be relatively easily and consistently aggregated into regional and global aggregates.</p> <p>The indicator was developed by the World Bank. The Chief Economist of the World Bank has traditionally had an Advisory Committee composed of international experts on poverty measurement (who are external to World Bank). To advise on how to measure and monitor global poverty, the Chief Economist currently has convened a high-level Commission on Global Poverty (http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/commission-on-global-poverty). The Commission is chaired by Anthony Atkinson (Oxford University and London School of Economics) and has seven core group members (http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/commission-on-global-poverty#2). The Commission has a 16 member Advisory Board (two of whom are Nobel Laureates).</p> <p>The global poverty estimates are published through a publication such as the World Bank's Global Monitoring Report (http://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/global-monitoring-report). This report is reviewed by the World Bank's Board of Directors, which is represented by 25 Executive Directors and Alternates to Executive Directors, all of whom are representatives of member countries.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the international poverty line has already been used to benchmark and set the target for SDG 1.1 related to eradicating extreme poverty by 2030. This indicator is about 25 years old and the World Bank has a history of reporting on it for the MDGs. It is well documented, widely understood and is a meaningful statistic for monitoring progress towards eradicating extreme poverty. For more details please see our explanations to question 6.</p> <p>ILO: It combines the poverty indicator under the first target (1a) of the MDGs on the eradication of poverty with the corresponding working indicator for monitoring the second target (1b) of the MDGs on decent work. By combining poverty status with employment status, the concept of the working poor is captured, which aims to measure how many workers, despite being in employment, live in poverty.</p> <p>The ILO would like to refer to the existence of agreed standard on status of employment (http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/standards-and-guidelines/resolutions-adopted-by-international-conferences-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_087562/lang-en/index.h)</p>
1.2 By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions	1.2.1 Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age		Tier I	National Gov.	UNICEF, World Bank	UNICEF plans to start compiling data on the proportion of children living below the national poverty line and would be happy to collaborate with the World Bank and other agencies to report on this global SDG indicator.
	1.2.2 Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions		Tier II	National Gov.	UNICEF, World Bank	UNICEF plans to start compiling data on the proportion of children living in poverty in all its dimensions and would be happy to collaborate with the World Bank and other agencies to report on this global SDG indicator <i>World Bank intending to maintain a database for this information?</i>
1.3 Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable	1.3.1 Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, newborns, work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable	Tier II	Tier I- data coverage	ILO	World Bank	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an international standard.</p> <p>ILO: Definitions are based on World Social Protection Inquiry and on recommendation No. 202 on Social Protection Floors (ILO). The indicator is based on the number of persons having access to social protection coverage over the lifecycle. Includes the main areas of social protection but health, in line with Convention 102 and Recommendation 202 ILO.</p> <p>World Bank: A number of international organizations (ADB, EUROSTAT, ILO, OECD, UNICEF, ECLAC, World Bank) try to measure coverage of social protection programs across a range of dimensions (e.g. functional scope, extent and depth, level and quality) and collect data on direct and indirect beneficiaries, using in some cases, surveys designed to identify coverage and impacts of some specific programmes. However, there are not neither commonly accepted guidelines nor standardized methods of data collection on coverage, nor a set of basic principles on how to measure coverage.</p> <p>A distinction is made between legal (or statutory) coverage taking into account the provisions rooted by laws and effective coverage, reflecting how legal provisions are implemented in practice and the extent of coverage in the absence of legal provisions (ILO).</p> <p>ASPIRE coverage indicators refer to the effective coverage definition, measuring the direct and indirect beneficiaries who are actually receiving social protection benefits at the time nationally representative household survey data are collected, as within a target group (total population, for different income quintiles, total population in urban and rural areas). ASPIRE indicators do not include (in the current edition) those who are protected by law, or those who have benefits guaranteed but are not necessarily receiving them at the time the survey is administered – for example people who actively contribute to old age pensions and are entitled to the benefits on reaching retirement rate.</p> <p>ESSPROS Manual - The European System of Integrated Social Protection Statistics (2012 edition)</p> <p>ILO Social Security Inquiry 2005 Manual</p> <p>The availability varies by type of benefit: for children, 109 countries, for unemployment, 79 countries, for disability, 171 countries, for old age, 175 countries, for pregnant women, 139 countries, for work injury victims, 172 countries.</p> <p>This makes it difficult to classify in Tier. Further development should be included for poor and vulnerable.</p>
	1.4.1 Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services	Tier III	Tier III		UNEP, ITU, UPU	<p>There is no established methodology for this indicator.</p> <p>UNEP can contribute to the definition of basic services as this is within the scope of UNEP's existing work on SDG ontologies.</p> <p>ITU provided information on access to broadband internet access.</p> <p>UPU provided information on access to delivery of postal and parcel service.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
1.4 By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance	1.4.2 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure	Tier III	Tier III	World Bank as part of 23 members of Global Donor Working Group on Land	UN-Habitat, FAO, UNSD, World Bank, UN-Women, UNEP, IFAD?	<p>There is no established methodology for this indicator.</p> <p>FAO has not provided metadata for this indicator, however, it has provided metadata for a similar indicator 5a.1. The main differences are land versus agricultural land and the reference to perception. Coordination among the interested agencies can work towards a harmonization of tools and data collection approaches.</p> <p>UN-Women: This indicators has some commonalities with indicator 5.a.1. Please see the submission for indicator 5.a.1. UN Women would like to coordinate with the responsible agency.</p> <p>World Bank: Data on the share of private land in the entire country and the main city that is registered and mapped is being collected by the World Bank's 'Doing Business'. This can easily be disaggregated by geographical region and in many cases also gender. Information on perceived tenure security as well as the way different parts of the population access land to establish a correspondence between parcels and persons is available from household surveys and a country-specific methodology for doing so is being developed together with partners including the Global Donor Working Group on Land and FAO and IFAD in collaboration with through the World Bank's Rome data hub.</p> <p>There is no data available for this indicator at this time although the World Bank has available data for a similar indicator.</p>
	1.5.1 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people	Tier II	Tier II	UNISDR	UN-Habitat, UNEP, DESA, Pop Division	<p>Same as indicator 11.5.1/13.1.2</p> <p>There is an established and tested methodology and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNISDR: The proposed indicators will be also used to monitor Sendai Framework global targets. Therefore the detailed definitions and methodologies has been also submitted and examined by the Member States in the 1st and 2nd Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction (OEIWG), as outlined in Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction 2015-2030. The OEIWG will finalize the discussion and submit the final report to the GA in December 2016.</p> <p>Note that currently 85 countries have a comparable national disaster loss database that is consistent with the UNISDR guidelines and additional 32 countries are expected to be covered in 2015-16. Therefore, by 2020, it is expected that all countries will build/adjust the database according to the UNISDR guidelines and report the data to UNISDR.</p> <p>UNEP will continue to work on improving data and statistics on the link between disasters and the environment and vulnerability to disasters. UNEP will be currently supporting the defining of natural disasters and hazards. Additionally, UNEP will work with UNISDR and other partners on monitoring the Sendai framework.</p> <p>This indicator is also been used by UN-Habitat City Resilience Profiling Programme (CRPP), as part of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, which has helped developed tools, Resilience action plans, and normative guidance towards new resilience standards at city level.</p>
1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters	1.5.2 Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product (GDP) ^e	Tier II	Tier II	UNISDR	UNEP	<p>There is an established and tested methodology and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNISDR: This is proposal by UNISDR based on experience and knowledge built in the period under the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015). The proposed indicator was further reviewed and examined by other UN agencies including FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPDS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO (though not all organizations listed here provided comments for this indicator) and submitted to the IAEG process in early-July 2015, then again reviewed by the Technical Expert Group consisting of more than 60 experts from UN system, academic and research, civil sector and private sector in 27-29 July 2015 and submitted and examined by the Member States in the 1st Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction held in 29-30 September 2015. The suggested indicator is currently under review by the Member States and UNISDR is receiving written inputs from the Member States.</p> <p>The proposed indicators will be also used to monitor Sendai Framework global targets and therefore the detailed definitions shall be discussed and agreed in Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction, as outlined in Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction 2015-2030. The Working Group is likely to finalize the discussion and submit the final report to the GA in December 2016.</p> <p>Some of the sub-indicators on the OEIWG proposal (commercial and industrial facilities) are not yet available in all databases but the generic methodology, based on ECLAC allows assuming uniformity in the estimation of losses.</p> <p>There is currently data for about 85 countries with broad regional representation.</p>
	1.5.3 Number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies ^e	Tier I	Tier II	UNISDR	UNEP	<p>Same as indicator 11.b.2/13.1.1</p> <p>There is a suggested methodology that has not been tested and no international standard.</p> <p>UNISDR: This indicator has been developed on the basis of the reporting of 140+ countries using the HFA Monitor of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. Progress reporting by countries on the implementation of the Sendai Framework, using an updated Sendai Monitor, will not begin until the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction (OEIWG) concludes its work. A baseline for all countries as of 2015 is expected to be created by 2017 as the basis for monitoring of the Sendai Framework and the SDGs.</p> <p>This indicator was proposed by UNISDR, and reviewed and examined by other UN agencies and submitted to the IAEG process in 2015 before submission to the OEIWG. The definition, method of computation etc. of this suggested indicator is currently under review by the Member States in the OEIWG. The Working Group will finalize the discussion and submit the final report to the UNGA in December 2016.</p> <p>UNEP is currently supporting the defining of natural disasters and hazards. Additionally, UNEP will work with UNISDR and other partners on monitoring the Sendai framework.</p> <p>The availability, nature and quality of national and local strategies for disaster risk reduction varies considerably. Some strategies may exist without necessarily being named thus.</p> <p>There is data available for all countries to monitor this indicator.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
1.a Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions	1.a.1 Proportion of resources allocated by the government directly to poverty reduction programmes			World Bank- to confirm		<i>No information provided</i>
	1.a.2 Proportion of total government spending on essential services (education, health and social protection)	<i>Tier I</i>	Tier III-need to establish reporting mechanism	World Bank-to confirm	ILO, WHO, UNESCO	There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. ILO: The indicator derives from established national budget information and information from education (UNESCO) and social protection (ILO). Indicator derived from national budget statistics and sectorial statistics. Need to pool existing sources. Data is available for all countries. ILO: social protection; Compilation system to be established
1.b Create sound policy frameworks at the national, regional and international levels, based on pro-poor and gender-sensitive development strategies, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions	1.b.1 Proportion of government recurrent and capital spending to sectors that disproportionately benefit women, the poor and vulnerable groups		Tier III	Need to define a reporting mechanism	UN-Women	UN-Women: To monitor indicator 5.c.1, (Percentage of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment), UN Women and OECD are developing a methodology to measure government efforts to track budget allocations and actual expenditures for gender equality throughout the public finance management cycle and to make these publically available. The indicator considers resources allocated to gender equality and women's empowerment as follows: • Resources allocated for programmes that specifically target only women or girls. • Resources allocated to programmes that target both women and men but where gender equality is a primary objective. For example an action that promotes employment of women and men, equal representation within management posts, and equal pay • Resources allocated to programmes where gender equality is not a primary objective but where action is being taken to close gender gaps. For example, an infrastructure project that does not include gender equality as the primary objective but has specific measures to ensure that women and girls benefit equally with men and boys. The same methodology could be used for this indicator to determine whether government spending disproportionately benefits women. A similar methodology to determine spending that benefits poor and marginalized people should be developed.
Goal 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture						
2.1 By 2030, end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round	2.1.1 Prevalence of undernourishment	<i>Tier I</i>	Tier I	FAO		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. FAO: Undernourishment is an established MDG indicator. The methodology and standard to compile the indicator are fully described in: Naiken, 2003, "FAO methodology for estimating the prevalence of undernourishment", available at: http://www.fao.org/docrep/005/y4249e/y4249e06.htm Implementation of the indicator by many countries that allows fro meaningful disaggregation will require identification of a suitable survey data source. FAO is ready to provide technical assistance and methodological support, including on the use of specific software for the derivation of food security indicators from household budget and expenditure survey data. (See http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/fs-methods/adept-fsn/en/ and http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/fs-methods/householdsurvey/en/) Data is available for 116 countries. No data is currently available for developed countries.
	2.1.2 Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)	<i>Tier I</i>	Tier I	FAO		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. FAO: The FIES has been used by FAO to collect data from 147 different countries, areas and territories in 2014 and 2015. The results of this application have been peer reviewed by experts and used to derive a global reference scale of food insecurity severity that can be used to calibrate measures obtained with the FIES or any compatible survey instrument (e.g., ELCSA, EBIA, EMSA, HFSSM) in any country in the world, so that the estimated prevalence rates can be truly comparable. Implementation of the indicator by many countries to allow for meaningful disaggregation will require identification of a suitable survey through which collecting FIES data. FAO is ready to provide technical assistance and methodological support, including on guidelines for inclusion the FIES into national surveys, methods for the analysis if FIES data and the use of a dedicated open source software developed by FAO. Data is available for over 140 countries from 2010 to present with broad regional representation and for very few countries from 2000-2009.
2.2 By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children	2.2.1 Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 standard deviation from the median of the World Health Organization (WHO) Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age	<i>Tier I</i>	Tier I	UNICEF	WHO	There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. UNICEF/WHO: http://data.unicef.org/nutrition/malnutrition.html - see notes on the data section There is ongoing work by the joint malnutrition estimates group of UNICEF-WHO and World Bank Group to refine methods for generation of global and regional estimates, including development of a country level model and joint disaggregated estimates. Data is available for 106 countries from 2010 to present and for more countries from 2000-2009

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons	2.2.2 Prevalence of malnutrition (weight for height \geq +2 or $<$ -2 standard deviation from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age, by type (wasting and overweight)	Tier I	Tier I	UNICEF	WHO	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNICEF/WHO: http://data.unicef.org/nutrition/malnutrition.html - see notes on the data section</p> <p>There is ongoing work by the joint malnutrition estimates group of UNICEF-WHO and World Bank Group to refine methods for generation of global and regional estimates, including development of a country level model and joint disaggregated estimates.</p> <p>Data is available for 105 countries from 2010 to present.</p>
2.3 By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment	2.3.1 Volume of production per labour unit by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size	Tier III	Tier III	FAO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested but no agreed international standard.</p> <p>FAO: NB1. The indicator computed by FAO refers to: Value of crop production per working day (const. 2009 Int. \$). Slight modifications are necessary to compute the indicator as per SDG requirements. Disaggregation for farmers, pastoralists and forestry households is difficult if not impossible. NB2. With available household surveys, FAO can compute the indicator for about 60 countries (various years). A significant amount of resources is required to compute the indicator using existing data. The amount of resources required to monitor the indicator for the purposes of SDGs is far larger.</p> <p>FAO reports data from 2010 to present for this indicator for only 3 African countries</p>
	2.3.2 Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status	Tier III	Tier III	FAO	World Bank	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested but no agreed international standard.</p> <p>FAO: NB1. The indicator computed by FAO refers to: Household income (const. 2009 Int.\$). Slight modifications are necessary to compute the indicator as per SDG requirements. Disaggregation by sex is possible but not always possible for indigenous groups. NB2. With available household surveys, FAO can compute the indicator for about 60 countries (various years). A significant amount of resources is required to compute the indicator using existing data. The amount of resources required to monitor the indicator for the purposes of SDGs is far larger.</p> <p>Data is available for 5 African countries from 2010 to present.</p>
2.4 By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality	2.4.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture	Tier III	Tier III	FAO	UNEP	<p>There is a suggested methodology that has not been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNEP is collaborating with FAO on defining the term "sustainable agriculture" and in developing a methodology for monitoring this indicator.</p> <p>FAO: There has been considerable discussion over the past thirty years on how to define "sustainable agriculture." Sustainability was often understood mainly in its environmental dimension. Yet, it is well established that sustainability needs to be considered in terms of its social, environmental and economic dimensions. The indicator has been operationalized in order to capture its multidimensional nature. Challenges to sustainable agriculture vary within and across countries, and by region and are affected by socio-economic and bio-physical conditions. By addressing sustainability across its three dimensions, countries can select those metrics within their measurement instrument that best capture the priorities most relevant to them. A further metric will be added to capture the resilience dimension of the target.</p> <p>UNEP has experience in promoting sustainable, climate smart agriculture and will work collaboratively with FAO and other partners to define the term sustainable agriculture in a way that brings the environment fully into the scope of this indicator.</p>
2.5 By 2020, maintain the genetic diversity of seeds, cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild species, including through soundly managed and diversified seed and plant banks at the national, regional and	2.5.1 Number of plant and animal genetic resources for food and agriculture secured in either medium or long-term conservation facilities	Tier II	Tier III- methodology/ standards	FAO	UNEP	<p>There is a suggested methodology that has not been tested and work is ongoing to develop an international standard.</p> <p>FAO: PLANT (plant genetic resources for food and agriculture) element Data for gene bank collections for crops and their wild relatives are already available and covered through the reporting to the FAO Commission by countries on the implementation of the Second Global Plan of Action for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. The Plant element derives from the already well established and used indicator Number of accessions secured in gene bank collections under medium or long-term conditions, adopted by the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture in April 2013 (see Appendix C of CGRFA-15 Report http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/028/mg538e.pdf) and described in document CGRFA-15/15/Inf.9 Reporting format for monitoring the implementation of the Second Global Plan of Action for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (see indicator 20 in http://www.fao.org/3/a-mm294e.pdf).</p> <p>ANIMAL (animal genetic resources for food and agriculture) element Data for gene bank/cryobank collections for animal breeds have been collected during the process of data collection for The Second Report on the State of the World's Animal Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (see http://www.fao.org/AG/AGInfo/programmes/en/genetics/Second_state.html). The information is provided in the countries' official reports from the year 2013 (see http://www.fao.org/AG/AGInfo/programmes/en/genetics/national_report.html). Therefore the baseline for the indicator is established and corresponds to the number of breeds for which sufficient material is stored in cryobanks, based on the 78 country reports yielding an answer on the respective question.</p> <p>UNEP has and will continue to collaborate with FAO on this indicator.</p> <p>There is sparse data available for most regions of the world with better data coverage in European countries.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
<p>2.5.2 Proportion of local breeds classified as being at risk, not-at-risk or at unknown level of risk of extinction</p>		Tier I	Tier II- data availability	FAO	UNEP	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>FAO: In its Twelfth Regular Session of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture set out the outline for the indicator (http://www.fao.org/nr/cgrfa/cgrfa-meetings/cgrfa-comm/thirteenth-reg/en/). At its Fourteenth Regular Session (http://www.fao.org/nr/cgrfa/cgrfa-meetings/cgrfa-comm/fourteenth-reg/en/#c160710) the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture agreed on amendments of the methodology (any breed for which no population data have been reported for ten years is now considered to be of unknown risk status). The analysis is based on the most up-to-date current and historical data available in FAO's Global Databank for Animal Genetic Resources, backbone of the Domestic Animal Diversity Information System (DAD-IS). See the Status and Trends Reports at http://www.fao.org/3/a-at135e.pdf, http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/027/mg046e.pdf, http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/022/am649e.pdf and ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/016/ak220e.pdf.</p> <p>A slightly amended version of this indicator is used to monitor AICHI Target 13 (https://www.cbd.int/sp/indicators/factsheets/?id=11 and http://www.bipindicators.net/domesticatedanimals), the indicator is reported on a biannual basis to the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (see http://www.fao.org/3/a-at135e.pdf, http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/027/mg046e.pdf, http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/022/am649e.pdf and ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/016/ak220e.pdf.)</p> <p>UNEP: While the leadership for indicators 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 should reside with FAO, UNEP plans to play a supportive role in relation to further methodological development and narratives</p> <p>Data is available for 121 countries from 2000-2009 and for 52 countries from 2010-present. In the more recent period, there is very low data availability for Asian and Pacific countries, African countries and for Latin American and Caribbean countries.</p>
<p>2.a Increase investment, including through enhanced international cooperation, in rural infrastructure, agricultural research and extension services, technology development and plant and livestock gene banks in order to enhance agricultural productive capacity in developing countries, in particular least developed countries</p>	2.a.1 The agriculture orientation index for government expenditures	Tier I	Tier I	FAO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and work is ongoing towards the development of an international standard.</p> <p>FAO: The first known references to the term "agriculture orientation index" for public expenditures, which refers to the share of agriculture in total public expenditures/share of agriculture in GDP, appears in the State of Food Insecurity in the World 2002 and the State of Food and Agriculture 2005 (p 105). This index, its methodology and its results have been presented and accepted at three regional FAO statistical conferences since 2013 (African Commission on Agricultural Statistics (AFCAS), Asia and Pacific Commission on Agricultural Statistics (APCAS), and the Latin American and Caribbean working group on agriculture and livestock statistics (ICA)), as well as the FAO Commission on Agriculture (COAG) in 2014.</p> <p>Calculation of numerator components of the index (Government Expenditures on Agriculture, Government Expenditure) follow the internationally accepted international standards /methodology of the Classification of Functions of Government (COFOG) and the Government Finance Statistics (GFS). Calculation of the denominator components of the index (Share of Agriculture in GDP, as measured by Agriculture Value-Added divided by GDP), are based on well established and internationally accepted methodologies for constructing the System of National Accounts, led by the UN Statistics Division. Due to challenges in collecting data on expenditures of sub-national governments, it is recommended to focus on the expenditures of the central government.</p> <p>The definition of "Agriculture," refers to ISIC Rev 4. Division A - Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing</p> <p>Data is available for 92 countries with broad regional representation from 2010 to the present.</p> <p>Report on progress on agreement on international standard</p>
	2.a.2 Total official flows (official development assistance plus other official flows) to the agriculture sector	Tier I	Tier I	OECD	FAO	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>OECD: The OECD's Development Cooperation Directorate (DAC) collects and compiles data from bilateral and multilateral providers of development cooperation, publishing these data in the Creditor Reporting System (CRS). The DAC/CRS questionnaire uses established classifications follows by its respondents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of aid, including official development assistance (ODA) and other official flows, which are defined based on the donor, recipient, and share of flow provided as a concessional grant. • The sector and purpose of the expenditure, the latter of which was last modified in 2013, and allows the identification of expenditures that support the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors. <p>FAO: It is important to note that this data is best reported by donors, and not recipients, following the principles of government expenditures, as these expenditures are not only in the form of cash transfers from donors. Expenditures on regional and/or global public goods could not be adequately reported by recipient governments. It is also critical that multilateral agencies, such as FAO, who provide development expenditures to agriculture, report on these expenditures. Their absence results otherwise in an under-estimation of the total official flows to agriculture.</p> <p>FAO reported its 2013 expenditures for development assistance for the first time in 2015. It will be critical that FAO, and the other Rome food-based agencies (IFAD and WFP), continue this reporting. FAO's Statistics Division developed a methodology to facilitate the reporting of its expenditures on development assistance, and has been requested by the OECD-DAC to share this methodology with other international organizations, in order to facilitate their reporting.</p>
<p>2.b Correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets, including through the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect, in accordance with</p>	2.b.1 Producer Support Estimate	Tier I	Tier II- data coverage	OECD	WTO, FAO	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>OECD: The data cover major agricultural exporters. A choice of denominator will need to be made.</p> <p>Data is available for 28 countries from 2010 to the present.</p> <p>WTO: Legal disciplines with regard to the provision of agricultural domestic support are included in the Agreement on Agriculture and as per the Decision of the WTO Committee on Agriculture, there is a common notification format for Members to report their use annually.</p> <p>WTO Database: http://agims.wto.org/</p> <p>WTO reports data for approximately 70 countries across all regions of the world.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
the mandate of the Doha Development Round	2.b.2 Agricultural export subsidies	Tier I	Tier I	WTO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Legal disciplines with regard to the provision of agricultural export subsidies are included in the WTO agreement and as per the Decision of the WTO Committee on Agriculture, there is a common notification format for Members to report their use annually.</p> <p>WTO Database: http://agims.wto.org/</p> <p>WTO reports data for approximately 80 countries across all regions of the world.</p>
2.c Adopt measures to ensure the proper functioning of food commodity markets and their derivatives and facilitate timely access to market information, including on food reserves, in order to help limit extreme food price volatility	2.c.1 Indicator of food price anomalies	Tier II	Tier III	FAO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and work is ongoing to develop an international standard.</p> <p>FAO: The indicator has been regularly produced since 2014, not by the countries but by FAO using data generated by the countries. A decision needs to be made on which price series the indicator is applied in each country</p> <p>Data is available for 71 countries from 2010 to the present. Low data availability in Europe.</p>
Goal 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages						
3.1 By 2030, reduce the global maternal mortality ratio to less than 70 per 100,000 live births	3.1.1 Maternal mortality ratio	Tier I	Tier II- data	WHO	UNFPA, DESA-Pop Division, World Bank	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>WHO: The MMEIG has reported on this indicator for MDGs, there is an international definition applied.</p> <p>UNFPA: Well established indicator under the MDGs.</p> <p>Broad data availability. Over 130 countries that have data.</p> <p>Need for capacity building to strengthen national data sources.</p>
	3.1.2 Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel	Tier I	Tier I	UNICEF	WHO, UNFPA	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNICEF: Skilled attendance at birth is well defined in the joint statement by WHO/ICM/FIGO. However its application and measurement at country level remains challenging given lack of standards, varying curriculum and task shifting. UNICEF is currently working closely with WHO to revise the definition and improve measurement.</p> <p>Further refinement of this indicator is ongoing collaboration between WHO and UNICEF.</p> <p>UNICEF is currently carrying out field testing in preparation for its round 6 in support of reporting on SDG indicators. UNICEF has led the reporting on this indicator through for the MDG and will continue to provide leadership, in collaboration with WHO.</p> <p>UNFPA: WHO and UNICEF currently working in an agreed definition of "Skilled birth attendant" than can used across different data sources</p> <p>Data is broadly available across all regions with more than 150 countries reporting data from 2010 to the present.</p>
3.2 By 2030, end preventable deaths of newborns and children under 5 years of age, with all countries aiming to reduce neonatal mortality to at least as low as 12 per 1,000 live births and under-5	3.2.1 Under-five mortality rate	Tier I	Tier I	UNICEF	DESA-Pop Division, World Bank	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNICEF: Under-five mortality rate is the probability that a child born in a specific year or time period will die before reaching the age of five, if subject to current age specific mortality rates, expressed as deaths per 1,000 live births. Well-functioning vital registration systems is the preferred data sources for under-five mortality rate. Many low- and middle-income countries depend on household surveys, supplemented by censuses to produce under-five mortality rate. Under-five mortality data are often subject to sampling or non-sampling errors. The UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (UN IGME) is a group aiming to produce the best estimates of child mortality indicators including under-five mortality, by using all available data sources with quality assessment. The UN IGME estimates have been widely used by UN, UN agencies, donors, public health communities.</p> <p>The UN IGME is currently working on developing methods to produce trend mortality estimates by wealth quintiles, etc. Currently, the disaggregated data are mainly from household surveys and many countries only have limited number of disaggregated data points (e.g., 1 or 2 data points) over a long time period.</p> <p>UNICEF: Levels & Trends in Child Mortality Report 2015. Estimates Developed by the UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality http://www.childmortality.org/files_v20/download/IGME%20report%202015%20child%20mortality%20final.pdf</p> <p>Data is available for over 190 countries around the world.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
mortality to at least as low as 25 per 1,000 live births	3.2.2 Neonatal mortality rate	Tier I	Tier I	UNICEF	DESA-Pop Division, World Bank	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNICEF: Neonatal mortality rate is the probability of dying in the first 28 days of life, expressed as deaths per 1,000 live births. Well-functioning vital registration systems is the preferred data sources for neonatal mortality rate. Many low- and middle-income countries depend on household surveys to produce neonatal mortality rate. Neonatal mortality data are often subject to sampling or non-sampling errors. The UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (UN IGME) is a group aiming to produce the best estimates of child mortality indicators including under-five and neonatal mortality, by using all available data sources with quality assessment. The UN IGME estimates have been widely used by UN, UN agencies, donors, public health communities.</p> <p>The UN IGME is currently working on developing methods to produce trend mortality estimates by wealth quintiles, etc. Currently, the disaggregated data are mainly from household surveys and many countries only have limited number of disaggregated data points (e.g., 1 or 2 data points) over a long time period.</p> <p>UNICEF: Levels & Trends in Child Mortality Report 2015. Estimates Developed by the UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality http://www.childmortality.org/files_v20/download/IGME%20report%202015%20child%20mortality%20final.pdf</p> <p>Data is available for over 190 countries around the world.</p>
3.3 By 2030, end the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and neglected tropical diseases and combat hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other communicable diseases	3.3.1 Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 uninfected population, by sex, age and key populations	Tier I	Tier I	UNAIDS	WHO, UNFPA	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNAIDS: Please see reference to methods at http://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/UNAIDS_methodology_HIVestimates_en.pdf</p> <p>WHO: The indicator has been agreed by partners as part of the GARPR (Global AIDS Reporting) process. It is collected at country level and validated by partners based on data and documented modelling approaches (using Spectrum modelling). In regions with advanced surveillance systems, e.g. Euro, this is based more directly on case reporting. There are also defined processes to provide analytical support to countries and validation for these estimates.</p> <p>There are standard international definitions, together with country and regional workshops to test and develop this indicator. It does rely on data on HIV prevalence (and not incidence) to which standard modelling approaches are applied. Disaggregation by age, sex and key population is well established with confidence limits. There is increasing investment in sub national estimates, together with direct surveys of incidence, in a subset of countries.</p> <p>Data is available for over 130 countries across all geographical regions.</p>
	3.3.2 Tuberculosis incidence per 1,000 population	Tier I	Tier I	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>The TB indicator 3.3.2 for SDGs is similar to the indicator used for the MDGs.</p> <p>Data is available for all countries.</p>
	3.3.3 Malaria incidence per 1,000 population	Tier I	Tier I	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Metadata would need to be updated as methodology for highly endemic countries in sub-Saharan Africa was revised in 2015.</p> <p>Data are reported for countries with ongoing transmission of malaria in 2000 i.e. not shown for countries with no indigenous transmission of malaria. With a few exceptions, we normally have a recent parasite prevalence survey or reported cases (or both) from countries, but completeness could be improved.</p> <p>Data is available for over 100 countries where Malaria is present.</p>
	3.3.4 Hepatitis B incidence per 100,000 population	Tier II	Tier II	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>There is a WHO guidance document on how to conduct the biomarker survey for this indicator</p> <p>WHO is undergoing an estimation exercise for this indicator as a baseline for its hepatitis strategy. There are gaps at present but the indicator and measurement methods have been developed</p> <p>Data availability for this indicator is not well known at this time.</p>
	3.3.5 Number of people requiring interventions against neglected tropical diseases	Tier I	Tier I	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Data are reported through joint request and reporting forms for donated medicines, and the integrated NTD database. http://www.who.int/wer/2013/wer8802.pdf?ua=1 http://www.who.int/wer/2014/wer8908.pdf?ua=1 http://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/preventive_chemotherapy/reporting/en/ http://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/data/ntddatabase/en/ Aggregation across diseases, when required, is done using the following methodology: http://www.who.int/wer/2012/wer8702.pdf?ua=1</p> <p>"NTDs" are defined as NTDs targeted by the WHO NTD Roadmap and World Health Assembly resolutions and reported to WHO: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/70809/1/WHO_HTML_NTD_2012_1_eng.pdf http://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/mediacentre/WHA_66.12_Eng.pdf?ua=1 http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.A1629NTD?lang=en</p> <p>"Interventions" are defined as preventive, curative, surgical or rehabilitative treatment. Other (non-treatment) interventions (e.g. disease surveillance, morbidity management and disability prevention, vector control, veterinary public health interventions) are to be addressed in the context of targets and indicators for Universal Health Coverage (UHC).</p> <p>Data are available for over 140 countries from all regions across the world.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
3.4 By 2030, reduce by one third premature mortality from non-communicable diseases through prevention and treatment and promote mental health and well-being	3.4.1 Mortality rate attributed to cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes or chronic respiratory disease	Tier II	Tier II	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>WHO has been publishing methods for estimating causes of death by age, sex, and country, based on a well-documented methods at WHO web site as follows: http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalCOD_method_2000_2012.pdf?ua=1</p> <p>Data is widely available for European country but data coverage is much lower for other regions of the world.</p>
	3.4.2 Suicide mortality rate	Tier II	Tier II	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>WHO has been publishing methods for estimating causes of death by age, sex, and country, based on a well-documented methods at WHO web site as follows: http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalCOD_method_2000_2012.pdf?ua=1</p> <p>Data is widely available for European country but data coverage is much lower for other regions of the world.</p>
3.5 Strengthen the prevention and treatment of substance abuse, including narcotic drug abuse and harmful use of alcohol	3.5.1 Coverage of treatment interventions (pharmacological, psychosocial and rehabilitation and aftercare services) for substance use disorders	Tier III	Tier III	WHO/UNODC		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested but work is ongoing to develop an international standard.</p> <p>WHO: Though the data on treatment coverage is being collected by UNODC for drug use disorders and by WHO on alcohol and drug use disorders, there is no international standard, and the current methodology is based on expert opinions. Besides, it is not yet possible to provide data on psychosocial or rehabilitation services, and availability of data is still limited. The work is in progress, also in collaboration with UNODC, on developing the standards for treatment coverage for substance use disorders.</p> <p>While data are regularly produced by countries, there remains a need to improve consistency, quality, and comparability of data across countries. In particular, more methodological work is needed to strengthen the information on coverage of treatment and disaggregate the information by type of treatment.</p> <p>UNODC: The annual data collection conducted by UNODC provides methodological guidance on the various elements of this indicator (substance use disorders and treatment interventions) but further methodological work is needed to refine this indicator. Other source of information and methodological guidance is the data collection by WHO on treatment and prevention of substance use disorders.</p>
	3.5.2 Harmful use of alcohol, defined according to the national context as alcohol per capita consumption (aged 15 years and older) within a calendar year in litres of pure alcohol	Tier I	Tier I	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Based on the agreed international standard, this indicator has been included in numerous international monitoring frameworks approved by Member States, including the Global Monitoring Framework for NCD Prevention and Control, the monitoring framework on implementation of the WHO Global strategy to reduce the harmful use of alcohol, periodical WHO global status reports on alcohol and health (latest one published in 2014 and new one in preparation), OECD monitoring activities.</p> <p>The global data on this indicator, including metadata and confidence intervals since 2010, is included in the WHO periodic reports on alcohol and health as well as included in the WHO Global and regional information systems on alcohol and health. The latest available estimates are for 2012 and 2014.</p> <p>References: Global Status Report on Alcohol and Health 2014 (WHO, Geneva, 2014). Global Status Report on Alcohol and Health (WHO, Geneva, 2011) Global Status Report on Alcohol and Health 2004 (WHO, Geneva, 2004).</p> <p>Data is available for almost all countries in the world.</p>
3.6 By 2020, halve the number of global deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents	3.6.1 Death rate due to road traffic injuries	Tier I	Tier I	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>The standards are described in the Global Status Reports on Road Safety available at WHO web site as follows: http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/road_safety_status/2013/en/</p> <p>Death registration data are reported to WHO Mortality Database by countries. http://www.who.int/healthinfo/mortality_data/en/ Surveillance data: http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/road_safety_status/2013/en/</p> <p>Data is available for over 90% of all countries.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
3.7 By 2030, ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health-care services, including for family planning, information and education, and the integration of reproductive health into national strategies and programmes	3.7.1 Proportion of women of reproductive age (aged 15-49 years) who have their need for family planning satisfied with modern methods	Tier I	Tier I	DESA Population Division	UNFPA, WHO	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>WHO: modern methods are defined by as outlined here http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs351/en/ and in the paper http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(12)62204-1/fulltext</p> <p>DESA Population Division: • In order to generate regional and global estimates for any given reference year, the Population Division/DESA uses a Bayesian hierarchical model. Country level, model-based estimates have been used for computing the regional and global averages and were not used for global monitoring of trends at the country level in the MDG global monitoring process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodological work is ongoing in the Population Division, DESA in coordination with other partners to extend model-based estimates and projections for this indicator from women of reproductive age who are married or in a union to all women of reproductive age, regardless of their marital or union status. • Methodological work is also ongoing with respect to the usability of service statistic data that are regularly collected through national health information systems. Specific analyses are underway to identify common weaknesses in such data across countries and develop a systematic approach toward correction. <p>Data availability from 2010 to present: about 90 countries based on survey data and all countries with modelled data.</p>
	3.7.2 Adolescent birth rate (aged 10-14 years; aged 15-19 years) per 1,000 women in that age group	Tier I	Tier I	DESA Population Division	UNFPA, WHO	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>DESA Population Division: • Methodological work is ongoing to generate a series of annual, comparable age-specific fertility rates by single year and age of mother as well as to estimate fertility rates for girls under the age of 15. More methodological research needs to be done on the accuracy of estimates for reproductive health indicators, particularly for younger adolescents. For example, Neal and Hosegood (2015) found marked differences in estimates for very early first births and marriage, where women aged 15-19 were much less likely to report marriages and first births before age 15 than were women from the same birth cohort when asked five years later at ages 20-24. See: "How reliable are reports of early adolescent reproductive and sexual health events in Demographic and Health Surveys?" International Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health 2015, 41(4):210-217.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The birth rate among adolescents younger than age 15 is more meaningfully measured for ages 12-14 as births among 10-11 year olds are rare and a rate with respect to the 10-14 year old population would not correctly reflect the increased risk of early childbearing by age. Results from a comparative study of very young childbearing using birth history data from 42 large, nationally representative household surveys in low resource countries showed that very small proportions of births to mothers under age 16 occurred below age 12 (less than 1% in most countries): see Neal et al. 2012. "Childbearing in adolescents aged 12-15 years in low resource countries: a neglected issue. New estimates from demographic and household surveys in 42 countries." Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand 2012, 91:1114-1118. <p>WHO: Data reported by UNFPA and UN Pop Division, WHO supports Tier 1 status. re: data availability, response made to complete survey</p> <p>Data is currently only available for the age group 15-19 years old. For this age group, data is widely available.</p>
	3.8.1 Coverage of essential health services (defined as the average coverage of essential services based on tracer interventions that include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases and service capacity and access, among the general and the most disadvantaged population)	Tier II	Tier III- methodology/ standards	WHO	UNICEF, UNFPA, DESA Pop Division	<p>There is a suggested methodology that has not been tested and work is ongoing to develop an international standard.</p> <p>WHO: The WHO/WB universal health care service coverage index can currently be calculated for all countries, based on 16 tracer indicators of health service coverage. Across these 16 tracer indicators, we have data or comparable estimates from 75-100% of countries. Tracer indicators were selected in part based on high data availability, therefore data availability is good.</p> <p>UNICEF: The universal health coverage indicator as defined is a composite indicator that takes into account many other health coverage indicators, most of which have available data. There is currently no internationally agreed upon measure of UHC. UNICEF has been leading data collection on health coverage indicators related to maternal, newborn and child health, including water and sanitation and nutrition and has established extensive databases on these indicators. UNICEF leads data collection and compilation of coverage of individual health services related to maternal, newborn and child health, water and sanitation and nutrition including disaggregation. UNICEF is willing to collaborate with WHO, World Bank and other agencies to spearhead the development of a UHC indicator.</p> <p>Data disaggregation varies across the tracer indicators. We have more disaggregated data from lower- and middle-income countries. More work is needed to assemble disaggregated data sets from high-income countries.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
3.8 Achieve universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential health-care services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all	3.8.2 Number of people covered by health insurance or a public health system per 1,000 population	Tier III	Tier III	WHO	World Bank	<p>There is no methodology for this indicator and no work has begun on establishing an international standard.</p> <p>WHO: Target 3.8, universal health coverage, has two dimensions: (1) ensuring that people are able to get the health services that they need (service coverage); and (2) ensuring that people are protected against the financial consequences of paying for health services (financial risk protection). Correspondingly, indicator 3.8.1 is meant to reflect service coverage, and indicator 3.8.2 is meant to reflect financial protection. However, the newly proposed indicator for 3.8.1 contained in Annex IV of the 19 February 2016 Report of the IAEG is not a valid measure of financial protection.</p> <p>A valid measure for 3.8.2 should monitor the impact of the cost of health services on the household's living standards.</p> <p>The mere existence of affiliation to a health insurance scheme or entitlement to a public health system does not capture this impact. International experience shows that people may be legally entitled to a public health system but still not able to obtain health services without making substantial payments. Similarly, there is large variation in what constitutes "health insurance" from country to country, with very different implications for the objective of financial risk protection. As a result, and as shown by the experience of many countries, people's protection against the financial risk of using health services can change substantially over time even with no change in the extent of affiliation to health insurance schemes or their legal entitlement to a public health system. Therefore, the indicator based on insurance affiliation or public health system coverage is not a valid measure of financial protection.</p> <p>WHO recognizes that the IAEG has not agreed to the initial proposal for indicator 3.8.2 contained in Annex III of the 19 February 2016 IAEG report ("Fraction of the population experiencing catastrophic/impoverishing out-of-pocket health expenditure"). In response to IAEG concerns, WHO and the World Bank are submitting a refined proposal through this platform to the IAEG for their consideration in Mexico City. This alters the wording of indicator 3.8.2 from the list of proposed SDG indicators (as of 17 December 2015), as follows: "Proportion of the population not financially protected against the costs of health services".</p> <p>WHO would be happy to engage with the IAEG to reach agreement on wording that will be mutually acceptable, ensuring that the indicator will be easy to understand, relevant to the objective, feasible, and amenable to disaggregation.</p>
	3.9.1 Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution	Tier I	Tier I	WHO	UNEP	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>WHO has been publishing methods for estimating burden of disease from air pollution, based on a well-documented methods at WHO web site as follows: http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/en/ http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/AAP_BoD_methods_March2014.pdf?ua=1 http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/HAP_BoD_methods_March2014.pdf?ua=1 http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/AP_jointeffect_methods_March2014.pdf?ua=1 Ambient air pollution exposure and solid fuel use by households are the indicators used for exposure. These are combined with disease statistics (http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/estimates/en/index1.html) using Comparative Risk Assessment methods to obtain mortality attributable to air pollution.</p> <p>UNEP is collaborating with WHO to improve air quality monitoring and on air quality associated health indicators. UNEP will take the lead on air quality monitoring and will work directly with WHO to ensure there is a link between the air quality monitoring and the mortality attribution.</p> <p>WHO: 1. Data have been publicly available for ambient and household air pollution separately by country, and are about to be made available separately for almost each country in a combined format. The data have been compiled on the WHO web site: http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.ENVHEALTHJOINTAAPHAPBoDDeaths?lang=en http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/en/</p> <p>2. This indicator is classified as a Tier 1 indicator, as it is conceptually clear, has an established methodology, data are regularly produced by almost all countries that can be used for further processing and global reporting.</p> <p>Data is available for at least 80% of countries in each region.</p>
3.9 By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination	3.9.2 Mortality rate attributed to unsafe water, unsafe sanitation and lack of hygiene (exposure to unsafe Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for All (WASH) services)	Tier II	Tier II	WHO	UNEP	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>WHO: The methods with agreed international standard have been developed, reviewed and published in various documents: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/gbd_poor_water/en/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4255749/</p> <p>UNEP is collaborating with WHO to improve water quality monitoring and on water quality associated health indicators. UNEP will take the lead on water quality monitoring and will work directly with WHO to ensure there is a link between the water quality monitoring and the mortality attribution.</p> <p>WHO: 1. The indicator has been established and available since more than a decade. http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.INADEQUATEWSH?lang=en http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/gbd_poor_water/en/ 2. WHO has been collating country figures and have been using these to produce global and regional estimates against this indicator. This indicator can therefore be classified conservatively as Tier II, as it is conceptually clear, has an established methodology, data are regularly produced by many countries, as shown above, and increasingly by more countries, that can be used for global reporting against this indicator.</p> <p>Current data availability is 82 countries from 2010 until the present.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
	3.9.3 Mortality rate attributed to unintentional poisoning	Tier II	Tier II	WHO	UNEP	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>WHO: A summary of data sources and methods is available in the publication WHO (2014) Global Health Estimates Technical Paper WHO/HIS/HSI/GHE/2014.7: WHO methods and data sources for country-level causes of death 2000-2012, available from: http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalCOD_method_2000_2012.pdf?ua=1</p> <p>UNEP is collaborating with WHO to define unintentional poisoning and to ensure the indicator takes into account poisoning due to chemical infiltration of the food chain.</p> <p>WHO: The latest global, regional and country-level cause-specific mortality estimates, including unintentional poisonings, for the year 2000 and 2012 (published in 2014) are available for download from the WHO website. http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/estimates/en/index1.html The estimates can also be accessed interactively through the Global Health Observatory http://www.who.int/gho/mortality_burden_disease/en/</p> <p>Data are available for around 80 countries in the latest report.</p>
3.a Strengthen the implementation of the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control in all countries, as appropriate	3.a.1 Age-standardized prevalence of current tobacco use among persons aged 15 years and older		Tier I	WHO-to be confirmed		<p>No information provided</p> <p>CHECK DATABASE</p>
3.b Support the research and development of vaccines and medicines for the communicable and non-communicable diseases that primarily affect developing countries, provide access to affordable essential medicines and vaccines, in accordance with the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, which affirms the right of developing countries to use to the full the provisions in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights regarding flexibilities to protect public health, and, in particular, provide access to medicines for all	3.b.1 Proportion of the population with access to affordable medicines and vaccines on a sustainable basis			WHO-to be confirmed		<p>No information provided</p> <p>CHECK DATABASE</p>
	3.b.2 Total net official development assistance to medical research and basic health sectors	Tier I	Tier I	OECD		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>The methods and standards of DAC statistics on ODA and other resource flows are explained at http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm</p> <p>The numbers given above for countries are donors from whom the data are sought. Data are also available on the receipts of aid among all developing countries, including receipts from multilateral agencies.</p> <p>The data in the link are gross rather than net, and include other official flows for Korea only. As assistance in this sector is essentially in the form of ODA grants, any differences with the target variable would be minimal. It is possible to get figures for ODA only, but net figures are problematic on a sectoral basis.</p> <p>Data is available for 34 OECD/DAC member countries.</p>
3.c Substantially increase health financing and the recruitment, development, training and retention of the health workforce in developing countries, especially in least developed countries and small island developing States	3.c.1 Health worker density and distribution	Tier II	Tier I	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>WHO compiles data on health workforce from four major sources: population censuses, labour force and employment surveys, health facility assessments and routine administrative information systems (including reports on public expenditure, staffing and payroll as well as professional training, registration and licensure). The denominator data for any health workforce density (i.e. national population estimates) are obtained from the United Nations Population Division's World Population Prospects database. The classification of health workers is based on criteria for vocational education and training, regulation of health professions, and the activities and tasks involved in carrying out a job, i.e. a framework for categorizing key workforce variables according to shared characteristics. The WHO framework draws on the latest revisions to the internationally standardized classification systems of the International Labour Organization (International Standard Classification of Occupations), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (International Standard Classification of Education) and the United Nations Statistics Division (International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities).</p> <p>Data is available for over 125 countries from 2010 until the present.</p>
3.d Strengthen the capacity of all countries, in particular developing countries, for early warning, risk reduction and management of national and global health risks	3.d.1 International Health Regulations (IHR) capacity and health emergency preparedness	Tier II	Tier II	WHO		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>IHR core capacity monitoring framework: checklist and indicators for monitoring progress in the development of IHR core capacities in States Parties. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2013 (http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/84933/1/WHO_HSE_GCR_2013_2_eng.pdf, accessed 29 March 2015). World Health Assembly governing body documentation: official records. Geneva: World Health Organization (http://apps.who.int/gb/or/, accessed 29 March 2015).</p> <p>Following the Ebola outbreak there are efforts to improve the methodology and include more quality control measures to evaluate the self-reports by countries.</p> <p>Data is widely available in all regions from 2010 to the present but no data was available from 2000-2009.</p>
Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all						

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
4.1 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes	4.1.1 Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex	Tier I	Tier III- international standard for all countries	UNESCO-UIS	OECD	<p>Metadata: Yes Database: No Data coverage (2010+): AP 71%, AF not known, LAC 76%, Europe/NA 92% Data coverage (2000-2009): AP, LAC and Europe/NA not known, AF: 100%</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO-UIS and OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from the following cross national assessments: PISA (age 15), PIRLS (grade 4), TIMSS (grades 4 and 8), TERCE (grades 3 and 6), SACMEQ (grade 6), PASEC (grades 2 and 6) and PILNA (grades 4 and 6). OECD: Data sources include the following Name Name description Cycle PIRLS Progress in International Reading Literacy Studies Conducted first in 2001 then every 5-year interval, 2006, 2011. ; TIMSS Trend in International Mathematics and Science Studies Conducted first in 1995 then every 4 years since, 1999, 2003, 2007, 2011. ; PISA Programme for International Student Assessment Conducted first in 2000 then every 3 years since, 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012, 2015. ; TERCE Laboratorio Latinoamericano de Evaluación de la Calidad de la Educación (LLECE) Conducted first in 1997 then every 7 or 9 years since , 2006 and 2013 ; SACMEQ Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality SACMEQ I in 1995 (1995-1999); SACMEQ II in 2000 (2000-2004); SACMEQ III in 2007 (2006-2011); SACMEQ IV in 2013 (2012-2014). PASEC CONFEMEN Programme for the Analysis of Education Systems Although established in 1991, assessed in grades 2 and 5, from 2014 onward it will assess grades 2 and 6 at every 4 year interval. (Source. World Bank) PILNA Pacific Island Literacy and Numeracy Assessment A re-run of PILNA in response to low level performance in 2012 and the 2015 data will be used to confirm Literacy and Numeracy baseline. ; * Can be administered at Grades 4-6.; ** can be administered at Grades 8-9; Assessments after 2015 are indicative.</p>
4.2 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education	4.2.1 Proportion of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex	Tier II	Tier II	UNICEF	UNESCO-UIS, OECD	<p>Metadata: UNESCO-UIS and OECD - not available UNICEF previously submitted metadata but it has not been included in the compilation prepared by UNSD Database: Not available Data coverage (2010+): between 14% and 50% by region according to UNESCO-UIS/OECD -- approx 10% in 3 regions according to UNICEF Data coverage (2000-2009): low</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO-UIS, OECD and UNICEF: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from DHS, EDI, EDILA, MICS and PRIDI. UNICEF: Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS have been collecting data on this indicator (through the Early Childhood Development Index or ECDI) in low- and middle-income countries since around 2010. Many of the individual items included in the ECDI are collected through other mechanisms in high-income (OECD) countries as well. ; Existing data collection mechanisms are already in place for many countries to monitor this indicator although the ECDI in itself is a fairly new measure of child development.</p> <p>UNICEF: The MICS ECDI does indeed cover the current 4.2.1 indicator. DHS also uses the MICS ECDI. Please note that IDELA (not EDILA), PRIDI and the EDI are not standardized tools and have been only used in a handful of countries, mostly as part of the testing of the tools.</p> <p>Data coverage: UNICEF has comparable data from countries in more than 3 regions for this indicator; there are countries in all 7 UNICEF regions with data.</p>
	4.2.2 Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex	Tier I	Tier I	UNESCO-UIS	UNICEF, OECD	<p>Metadata: UNESCO-UIS and OECD NO UNICEF: Yes, UNICEF previously submitted metadata but it has not been included in the compilation prepared by UNSD for IAEG-SDG Database: UNESCO-UIS and OECD: Will be added to UIS Data Centre: http://www.uis.unesco.org/DataCentre/Pages/BrowseEducation.aspx Data coverage (2010+): AP 69%, AF 78%, LAC 97%, Europe/NA 88% Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 72%, AF 78%, LAC 94%, Europe/NA 77% (based on admin sources - from UNESCO-UIS and OECD) -- UNICEF coverage much lower.</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO-UIS and OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. UNICEF: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from administrative sources. UNICEF: "Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS have been collecting data attendance to early childhood education since 2000. UNICEF's global database includes comparable data from other surveys as well, including DHS and other national surveys. Existing data collection mechanisms are already in place for many countries to monitor this indicator."</p>
4.3 By 2030, ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable and quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university	4.3.1 Participation rate of youth and adults in formal and non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months, by sex	Tier II	Tier II	UNESCO-UIS	OECD, Eurostat, ILO	<p>Metadata: Yes Database: to be confirmed Data coverage (2010+): to be confirmed Data coverage (2000-2009): to be confirmed</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO-UIS and OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from AES, CVTS and LFS.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
4.4 By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship	4.4.1 Proportion of youth and adults with information and communications technology (ICT) skills, by type of skill	Tier II	Tier II	UNESCO-UIS, ITU	OECD	<p>Metadata: Yes - http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/intcoop/sdgs/ITU-ICT-technical-information-sheets-for-the-SDG-indicators-Sept2015.pdf (ITU)</p> <p>Database: UNESCO-UIS - ICILS: http://www.iea.nl/icils_2013.html and PIAAC http://piaacdataexplorer.oecd.org/ide/piaaac/report.aspx</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP, AF, LAC - low coverage, Europe/NA approx 70%</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP, AF, LAC - low/no coverage, Europe/NA approx 67%</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>ITU: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. - http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/publications/manual2014.aspx</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS and OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>ITU: This indicator is relatively new but based on an internationally agreed definition and methodology, which have been developed under the coordination of ITU, through its Expert Groups and following an extensive consultation process with countries. It is also a core indicator of the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development's Core List of Indicators, which has been endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission (in 2014). Data on the proportion of individuals with ICT skills, by type of skills are collected through an annual questionnaire that ITU sends to national statistical offices (NSO) and the first data collection took place in 2014.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from ICILS and PIAAC.</p>
4.5 By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations	4.5.1 Parity indices (female/male, rural/urban, bottom/top wealth quintile and others such as disability status, indigenous peoples and conflict-affected, as data become available) for all education indicators on this list that can be disaggregated	Tier I	Tier I/II/III- depending on indice	UNESCO-UIS	OECD	<p>Metadata: Yes</p> <p>Database: not available</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): depends on underlying indicator</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): depends on underlying indicator</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p>
4.6 By 2030, ensure that all youth and a substantial proportion of adults, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy	4.6.1 Percentage of population in a given age group achieving at least a fixed level of proficiency in functional (a) literacy and (b) numeracy skills, by sex	Tier I	Tier II	UNESCO-UIS	World Bank, OECD	<p>Metadata: Yes</p> <p>Database: http://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/step</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP, AF, LAC - low coverage, Europe/NA approx 50%</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP, AF, LAC, Europe/NA - low coverage</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from ALL, PIAAC and STEP.</p>
4.7 By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development	4.7.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development, including education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality and human rights, are mainstreamed at all levels in: (a) national education policies, (b) curricula, (c) teacher education and (d) student assessment	Tier I	Tier III- workplan on methodology	UNESCO-UIS	OECD, UNEP, UNWOMEN	<p>Metadata: Yes</p> <p>Database: no database</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 12%, AF 30%, LAC 21%, Europe/NA 48% (UNESCO-UIS) - not available or no coverage according to UN Women and UNEP</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 12%, AF 37%, LAC 27%, Europe/NA 52% (UNESCO-UIS) not available or no coverage according to UN Women and UNEP</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO-UIS/OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested Yes. There is an agreed international standard. UNESCO-UIS and OECD ON THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD: The UNESCO '1974 Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, cooperation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms' was adopted by UNESCO's General Conference in 1974. Since then, countries are requested to submit national reports to UNESCO every four years on the implementation of this recommendation.</p> <p>UNWOMEN: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. Yes No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: The reporting requirements for the monitoring of the 1974 Recommendation are being revised to fully capture the information needed for this indicator. Following approval by the UNESCO Executive Board in April 2016 data collection is expected to begin in 2016.</p> <p>UNEP will support UNESCO in the development and implementation of this indicator.</p>
4.a Build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all	4.a.1 Proportion of schools with access to: (a) electricity; (b) the Internet for pedagogical purposes; (c) computers for pedagogical purposes; (d) adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities; (e) basic drinking water; (f) single-sex basic sanitation facilities; and (g) basic handwashing facilities (as per the WASH indicator definitions)	Tier I/II	Tier I/II	UNESCO-UIS	UNICEF, OECD, UNEP	<p>Metadata: Yes</p> <p>Database: http://www.uis.unesco.org/DataCentre/Pages/BrowseEducation.aspx</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 45%, AF 81%, LAC 100%, Europe/NA 58% (UNESCO-UIS) - more detailed info from OECD but totals sum to the same as UNESCO-UIS</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 0%, AF 43%, LAC 0%, Europe/NA 0% (UNESCO-UIS)</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO-UIS: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>UNEP: No. There is no methodology for the indicator.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from administrative sources.</p> <p>UNEP is collaborating with UN Water on the water related indicators. UN-Water can provide support in terms of defining the measurement of schools with water and sanitation as described in the indicator.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
4.b By 2020, substantially expand globally the number of scholarships available to developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States and African countries, for enrolment in higher education, including vocational training and information and communications technology, technical, engineering and scientific programmes, in developed countries and other developing countries	4.b.1 Volume of official development assistance flows for scholarships by sector and type of study	Tier I	Tier I	OECD	UNESCO-UIS	<p>Metadata: Yes -- http://dotstat.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=70595, metadata in sidebar (from OECD)</p> <p>Database: http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=CRS1# // http://dotstat.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=70595</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP, AF, LAC - near universal coverage reported, Europe/NA approx 20% -- OECD low coverage reported for all but Europe/NA</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP, AF, LAC - near universal coverage reported, Europe/NA approx 20% -- OECD low coverage reported for all but Europe/NA</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO-UIS: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. -- The methods and standards of DAC statistics on ODA and other resource flows are explained at http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm</p> <p>OECD: "The numbers given above for countries are donors from whom the data are sought. Data are also available on the receipts of aid among all developing countries. Breakdowns by sector and type of study may be limited at this stage."</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from OECD/DAC on ODA flows from OECD Member States and other partners.</p>
4.c By 2030, substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing States	4.c.1 Proportion of teachers in: (a) pre-primary; (b) primary; (c) lower secondary; and (d) upper secondary education who have received at least the minimum organized teacher training (e.g. pedagogical training) pre-service or in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country	Tier I	Tier I	UNESCO-UIS	OECD	<p>Metadata: Yes</p> <p>Database: http://www.uis.unesco.org/DataCentre/Pages/BrowseEducation.aspx</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 64%, AF 62%, LAC 82%, Europe/NA 15%</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 80%, AF 83%, LAC 88%, Europe/NA 17%</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO-UIS: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>UNEP: No. There is no methodology for the indicator.</p> <p>UNESCO-UIS: Data are available from administrative sources.</p>
Goal 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls						
5.1 End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere	5.1.1 Whether or not legal frameworks are in place to promote, enforce and monitor equality and non-discrimination on the basis of sex	Tier III	Tier III	UN Women	OHCHR, World Bank	<p>Metadata: Yes (UN Women) No (World Bank)</p> <p>Database: No</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+):</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009):</p> <p>Methodology: UN Women No. There is no methodology for the indicator. Yes, methodology being tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. EXPLANATION: UN Women has begun working on a methodology through a series of activities, including (i) a concept paper on areas of law that could be covered and the justification for each; (ii) an Expert Group Meeting during the first half of 2016 to propose the areas of law covered by the indicator and way forward in terms of data collection and monitoring and reporting of results; (iii) presentation of the findings and proposed methodology to the IAEG-SDGs in first quarter of 2017.</p> <p>World Bank No. There is no methodology for the indicator. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>UN Women: "There are a number of global databases that collect national level information on laws that promote gender equality. Two well-known examples are: 1) The World Bank's Women Business and the Law database. The database looks at various areas, including laws and regulations that prevent women from improving their own well-being and that of their families. The data is collected at the national level and validated with primary sources. Data is collected for 173 countries. 2) OECD's Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI). The database maintained by the SIGI project uses qualitative and quantitative data to measure discrimination at national level in laws. Data is collected for 160 countries. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women is the body of independent experts that monitors implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). During each of its regular sessions the Committee considers reports from States parties to the CEDAW on their progress in adhering to the Convention, including in many area of laws."</p> <p>World Bank: The World Bank Group's Women, Business and the Law dataset measures non-discrimination on the basis of sex within legal frameworks across 189 economies, in a cross-country comparable manner. These data have been updated every 2 years since 2010 and the World Bank Group is committed to keeping this update cycle going forward. These data can be used to measure the legal frameworks portion of the indicator, depending on which elements of non-discrimination are selected for measurement (e.g. gender based violence, labor markets, property rights, etc.). However, there is no data to measure the enforcement and monitoring elements of the indicator. The Women, Business and the Law team is currently exploring ways to include enforcement of non-discriminatory legal frameworks in its next round of data updates, but no methodology currently exists. The World Bank Group, through Women, Business and the Law, could work on the development of the indicator in conjunction with UN Women who would be well placed to be the responsible reporting agency for all Goal 5 indicators.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
5.2 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	5.2.1 Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by form of violence and by age	Tier II	Tier II	UNICEF, UN Women, UNFPA, WHO	UNSD, UNDP	<p>Metadata: Yes (UNFPA, UN Women) Yes, but not included in the listing (UNICEF) No (UNODC, WHO) Database: www.evaw-global-database.unwomen.org (UN Women/ UNFPA) Data coverage (2010+): WHO - AP 19%, AF 24%, LAC 9%, Europe/NA 79% UNICEF: AP 10%, AF 41%, LAC 24%, Europe/NA 8% UN Women UNFPA: : AP 34%, AF 24%, LAC 21%, Europe/NA 69% Data coverage (2000-2009): WHO - AP 19%, AF 33%, LAC 45%, Europe/NA 69% UNICEF: AP 21%, AF 24%, LAC 36%, Europe/NA 23% UN Women UNFPA: : AP 28%, AF 31%, LAC 36%, Europe/NA 17%</p> <p>Methodology: UN Women, UNODC, UNFPA Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. EXPLANATION: United Nations, 2014. Guidelines for Producing Statistics on Violence against Women- Statistical Surveys. United Nations 2010. Report on the Meeting of the Friends of the Chair of the United Nations Statistical Commission on Statistical Indicators on Violence against Women UNICEF: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. WHO: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard."see publication http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/9789241564625/en/</p> <p>Other comments: UN Women/UNFPA: Availability of data on violence against women has increased significantly in recent years. Since 1995, more than 100 countries have conducted at least one survey addressing the issue. More than 40 countries conducted at least two surveys in the period between 1995 and 2014 (UN, 2015). These surveys collect data on all forms of violence required for this indicator. However, not all collect data for women aged 15 and above; in some cases the lower age limit of 18 is used instead of 15 and in other many cases, particularly for countries relying on Demographic and Health Surveys, data are only available for the 15-49 age group. Discussions are currently under way between UN Agencies to help support the capacity of countries through a joint global programme to improve the availability and comparability of data on violence against women and girls. UNICEF: The availability of comparable data remains a challenge in this area as many data collection efforts have relied on different study methodologies and used different definitions of partner or spousal violence. Diverse age groups are often utilized and in many high-income countries, data on intimate partner violence have largely been collected from the adult population (i.e., women and men over the age of 18). This is mostly due to the fact that relatively few adolescents in such countries can be found in marriages or other formal unions before the age of 18. This said, existing data collection mechanisms are already in place for many countries to monitor this indicator. There is an existing, standardized and validated measurement tool (the CTS) that is widely accepted and has been implemented in a large number of countries to measure Intimate Partner Violence WHO: 1, and 4 countries in Middle East have data for 2010 to present and 2000-2009 Focal persons in WHO Claudia Moreno Garcia and Lale Say completed by Doris CHOU for WHO UNODC - At international level, there is no comprehensive data repository on prevalence of physical, sexual or psychological violence against women.</p>
	5.2.2 Proportion of women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age and place of occurrence	Tier II	Tier II	UNICEF, UN Women, UNFPA, WHO	UNSD	<p>Metadata: NO Database: Data coverage (2010+): AP 36%, AF 30%, LAC 48%, Europe/NA 85% Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 41%, AF 50%, LAC 58%, Europe/NA 44%</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. EXPLANATION: UNFPA, UN Women, UNODC: United Nations, 2014. Guidelines for Producing Statistics on Violence against Women- Statistical Surveys. United Nations 2010. Report on the Meeting of the Friends of the Chair of the United Nations Statistical Commission on Statistical Indicators on Violence against Women WHO: http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/9789241564625/en/</p> <p>Additional comments: UNFPA/UN Women Based on the Guidelines for Producing Statistics on Violence against Women- Statistical Surveys (UN, 2014), Sexual violence is defined as harmful or unwanted sexual behavior that is imposed on someone. It includes acts of abusive sexual contact, forced engagement in sexual acts, attempted or completed sexual acts without consent, incest, sexual harassment, etc. However, in most surveys that collect data on sexual violence against women by non-partners the information collected is limited to forcing someone into sexual intercourse when she does not want to, as well as attempting to force someone to perform a sexual act against her will or attempting to force her into sexual intercourse. This means that even though the list of acts of sexual violence is fairly broad, only acts such as rape and attempted rape which are relatively rare in most countries – particularly when limited to the last 12 months – are captured. Evidence has shown that globally, 7% of women have been sexually assaulted by someone other than a partner at some point in their lives (WHO et al., 2013). Therefore work is needed to capture all forms of sexual violence in future surveys and when disaggregated by the severity of violence, one can capture rape and other egregious forms of sexual violence. Discussions are currently under way between UN Agencies to help support the capacity of countries through a joint global programme to improve the availability and comparability of data on violence against women and girls. UNODC: UNODC current collect data pertaining to violence against women for intentional homicide (disaggregated by gender of the victims, perpetrator characteristics and relationship between victim and perpetrator). UNODC also collects data on physical and sexual assault (by gender of the victim) from victimization surveys in its annual United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS), though currently data available are still limited. Considerable sources of data for this indicator are victimization surveys which are widely promoted by UNODC. A major revision for the UN-CTS is planned for 2017 allowing for the integration of all indicators related to victimization surveys.</p>
	5.3.1 Proportion of women aged 20-24 years who were married or in a union before age 15 and before age 18	Tier I	Tier I	UNICEF	WHO, UNFPA, UN Women, UN DESA/Pop	<p>Metadata: Yes Database: http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/child-marriage.html / www.unfpaOpenData.org</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 36%, AF 80%, LAC 42%, Europe/NA 29% (UNICEF) Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 45%, AF 85%, LAC 52%, Europe/NA 35% (UNICEF)</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Explanation (UNICEF): http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/doc14/2014-18-GenderStats-E.pdf As per the Joint Programme on Child Marriage results framework (UNFPA and UNICEF)</p> <p>WHO "WHO supports Tier 1 status. re: data availability, response given to complete survey. completed by Doris CHOU for WHO" UNICEF: "Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS and DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since around the late 1980s. In some countries, such data are also collected through national censuses or other national household surveys. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. The modules used to collect information on marital status among women and men of reproductive age (15-49 years) in the DHS and MICS have been fully harmonized."</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
5.3 Eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation	5.3.2 Proportion of girls and women aged 15-49 years who have undergone female genital mutilation/cutting, by age	Tier I	Tier I	UNICEF	UNFPA, WHO	<p>Metadata: Yes Database: http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/fgmc.html / www.unfpa.org/open-data</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 48%, AF 76%, LAC 36%, Europe/NA 19% (UNFPA) - UNICEF shows less coverage Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 53%, AF 72%, LAC 45%, Europe/NA 15% (UNFPA) - UNICEF shows less coverage</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Explanation (UNICEF): http://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/doc14/2014-18-GenderStats-E.pdf WHO: WHO classification scheme http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/fgm/overview/en/ UNFPA and UNICEF Joint Program on FGM/C and results framework.</p> <p>UNICEF: "Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS and DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since around the late 1980s. In some countries, such data are also collected through national household surveys.</p> <p>There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator. The modules used to collect information on the circumcision status of girls aged 0-14 and women aged 15-49 in the DHS and MICS have been fully harmonized." Partnership with UN Women, UNICEF and WHO "WHO supports Tier 1 Status re: data availability, response made to complete survey completed by Doris CHOU for WHO"</p>
5.4 Recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate	5.4.1 Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location	Tier II	Tier II	UN Women	UNSD	<p>Metadata: Yes - However revised metadata is being submitted as part of this exercise. Database: Data published in 2015 by UN Women can be found at the following link http://progress.unwomen.org/en/2015/ and data published by UNSD can be found at the following link http://unstats.un.org/unsd/gender/downloads.html. Both reports present data using time spent in paid and unpaid work by sex. However, a recent report commissioned by UNDP as part of the Human Development report 2015 http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2015_human_development_report_1.pdf presents data using the percentage of time spent in paid and unpaid activities.</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 7%, AF 7%, LAC 33%, Europe/NA 29% Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 17%, AF 13%, LAC 21%, Europe/NA 44%</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work is ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>EXPLANATION: Different classifications of activities are used by different country groupings. For example, while the International Classification of Time Use Surveys (ICATUS) is mainly used in developing countries in Africa and Asia. The Harmonized European Time Use Survey (HETUS) classification is used in much of Europe and in transition countries. In contrast, in most of Latin America and the Caribbean, the Classification of Time-use activities for Latin America (CAUTAL) is used. Finally in New Zealand and the United States, national classifications are used. The UN Statistics Division is currently working on an updated version of ICATUS to be presented to the Statistical Commission in 2017.</p> <p>"Based on data compiled by UN Women in 2015, 75 countries currently have data measuring paid and unpaid work activities. In most cases the survey is national representative, but not all. There are also other differences, including (as identified in Charnes, Forthcoming):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - surveys that are not nationally representative but are conducted at least on large samples of different regions in the country or at urban level - In some cases surveys based on a diary, i.e. a questionnaire designed for the collection of time spent in the various activities, per time slots of - at most - one hour (and more usually 10, 15 or 30 minutes slots) along the 24 hours of a day. Living standards surveys collecting data for a limited list of activities (less than 10) and for a reference period of a week or a month have not been taken into account. - In other cases surveys based on a detailed questionnaire for each eligible household member asking for the number of hours weekly spent (on weekdays, on the one hand, on weekend days, on the other hand) according a detailed list of activities (mostly used by countries in Latin America and the Caribbean). - The diversity of age groups used for data collection on time use: from 5 and 6 (and even 3) to 15, 18 and even 20, with some countries using a maximum age of 65 or 74. - Surveys sometimes may not capture seasonal variations in time use, limiting the data collection to a duration of a few months. - Another issue that is that survey methodologies may not deal appropriately with item non-response, limiting the quality of the data."

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
5.5 Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life	5.5.1 Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments and local governments	Tier I (IPU/UN Women)/ Tier III (World Bank)	Suggestions from UN Women and IPU: "As indicated, this indicator includes Tier 1 and Tier III elements. Therefore, we would suggest modifying the indicator name slightly in the following way ""Proportion of seats held by women in (a) national parliaments and (b) local governments"" and classifying the sub-components as Tier I and Tier III, respectively.	IPU, UN-Women	World Bank	<p>Metadata: Yes - However revised metadata is being submitted as part of this exercise. Database: http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): almost all for parliament - detailed info on local in the survey results Data coverage (2000-2009): almost all for parliament - detailed info on local in the survey results</p> <p>Methodology: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. Yes, it is being developed. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. EXPLANATIONS: UN Women/IPU: "This indicator includes elements for which methodologies and international standards are well established (women in parliaments) and elements for which there are no agreed international standards (women in local governments). Data on the proportion of women in parliaments exist for almost all countries in the world and are regularly compiled at the global level by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). Data on women's political participation in local government are not systematically collected at the global level. Data are collected at the country level but vary across countries, including in terms of definitions, indicators and sources. Data on the proportion of women in local government can be collected through official sources, including (i) electoral records and (ii) administrative data from ministries overseeing local governments. Other sources may include compilations of statistics by national associations of local government. UN Women has put in place a process to inform the development of internationally agreed standards on women's participation in local government. Working with multiple partners from UN and other global, regional and country-level agencies and academia, the following key activities are planned for 2016: (i) concept paper draft by UN Women on developing a standardized measurement of women's participation in local government, to be shared and discussed with key partners; (ii) an Expert Group Meeting organized by UN Women and key partners, to discuss and decide on a proposed standardized methodology; (iii) testing data compilation forms in selected countries; and (iv) presentation of the findings and proposed methodology to the IAEF-SDGs in first quarter of 2017." World Bank: There is information to measure the portion of the indicator that refers to seats in national parliaments. The source is Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). However, there is no data for the local government portion of the indicator.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: "As indicated, this indicator includes Tier 1 and Tier III elements. Therefore, we would suggest modifying the indicator name slightly in the following way ""Proportion of seats held by women in (a) national parliaments and (b) local governments"" and classifying the sub-components as Tier I and Tier III, respectively.</p> <p>In attempting to address some of the challenges with existing data, UN Women is developing a typology of local government structures and conducting a review of current practices in collecting data on women's participation in local government. These two elements are providing a strong foundation for developing a standardized measurement on women's participation in local government. "</p>
	5.5.2 Proportion of women in managerial positions	No information provided for the indicator.	Tier I	ILO		
5.6 Ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights as agreed in accordance with the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Platform for Action and the outcome documents of their review conferences	5.6.1 Proportion of women aged 15-49 years who make their own informed decisions regarding sexual relations, contraceptive use and reproductive health care	Tier II (UNFPA)/ Tier II (WHO)/ Tier III (World Bank)	Tier III	UNFPA	UN Women	<p>Metadata: Yes (UNFPA) Database: No Data coverage (2010+): AP 28%, AF 67%, LAC 21%, Europe/NA 0% (from UNFPA) Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 7%, AF 19%, LAC 12%, Europe/NA 0% (from UNFPA)</p> <p>Methodology: (UNFPA/UN Women) Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. EXPLANATION: The three indicators currently used to define this indicator has an agreed international standard as per the DHS and MICS protocols for data collection, analysis and dissemination. WHO: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. World Bank: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>"WHO supports Tier 2 status. re: data availability, response is given to complete survey completed by Doris CHOU for WHO"</p>
	5.6.2 Number of countries with laws and regulations that guarantee women aged 15-49 years access to sexual and reproductive health care, information and education	Tier III	Tier III	UNFPA	UN Women, DESA Pop Division	<p>Metadata: Yes (UNFPA) Database: No Data coverage (2010+): no information provided Data coverage (2000-2009): no information provided</p> <p>Methodology: (UNFPA/UN Women) Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. EXPLANATION: Work in progress and UNFPA and UN Women will provide a work plan. World Bank: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
5.a Undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws	5.a.1 (a) Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land, by sex; and (b) share of women among owners or rights-bearers of agricultural land, by type of tenure	Tier III	Tier III	FAO, UN Women, UNSD	UNEP, World Bank, UN-Habitat	<p>Metadata: Yes, http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sdgs/metadata-compilation/ Database: FAO - http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/en/ UNSD http://unstats.un.org/unsd/gender/EDGE/about.html Data coverage (2010+): no information provided Data coverage (2000-2009): no information provided</p> <p>Methodology: FAO: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. UN Women/World Bank/ UNEP: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. all - No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work is ongoing towards the development of one. UN WOMEN explanation: Through the Evidence and Data for gender equality project implemented by UN Women and UNSD, work is undergoing to test methodologies to measure asset ownership, including agricultural land, from a gender perspective. The methodologies developed through the EDGE project will be presented to the UN Statistical Commission in 2017. UN Women and UNSD will continue to work with FAO to apply these standards to monitor indicators 5.a.1.</p> <p>Other comments: UNEP has and will continue to collaborate with FAO and UN Women on this indicator. FAO: NB: the database does not disseminate all the data points available. Work is ongoing on the expansion of the database. Therefore, the numbers include countries whose data are already available and disseminated and countries whose data are yet to be analysed. For this reason, they should be considered an approximation. In addition, the indicators disseminated at the moment should be considered as proxies of indicator 5a1, as they slightly differ in their operational definition.</p>
	5.a.2 Proportion of countries where the legal framework (including customary law) guarantees women's equal rights to land ownership and/or control	Tier II (FAO) / Tier III (World Bank)	Tier III	FAO, World Bank, UN-WOMEN		<p>Metadata: Yes (FAO) - http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sdgs/metadata-compilation/ Database: http://www.fao.org/gender-landrights-database/legislation-assessment-tool/indicators/en/ Data coverage (2010+): little data coverage Data coverage (2000-2009): little data coverage</p> <p>Methodology: (FAO) Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. World Bank: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>FAO: "The indicator would be consistent with CEDAW Articles 3 and 4 General recommendation No. 25, on article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, on temporary special measures Validation needed before country reporting on this indicator</p> <p>UN-WOMEN?</p>
5.b Enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology, to promote the empowerment of women	5.b.1 Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex	Tier II	Tier II	ITU		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>This indicator is a newly developed ITU indicator that was approved by the World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators Symposium (WTIS) 2014. The indicator definition and methodology were developed under the coordination of ITU, through its Expert Groups and following an extensive consultation process with countries. Data for the proportion of individuals owning a mobile phone has been collected through an annual questionnaire that ITU sends to national statistical offices (NSO) since 2015. See: http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/publications/manual2014.aspx</p> <p>Metadata: http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/intcoop/sdgs/ITU-ICT-technical-information-sheets-for-the-SDG-indicators-Sept2015.pdf</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): little data coverage Data coverage (2000-2009): little data coverage</p>
5.c Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels	5.c.1 Proportion of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment	Tier I (OECD)/ Tier III (UN-Women)	Tier III	UN Women / OECD		<p>Metadata: No (OECD) Yes (UN Women) Database: Unwomen http://gender-financing.unwomen.org/en Data coverage (2010+): OECD - AP 55%, AF 72%, LAC 36%, Europe/NA 8% UN Women: : AP 16%, AF 0%, LAC 15%, Europe/NA 4% Data coverage (2000-2009): OECD - AF 0% UN Women: AF 30%</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Explanation(OECD) Agreed development cooperation effectiveness principles "UN Women in collaboration with the OECD-DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET) has developed a methodology and set of criteria to roll out this global indicator at country level and to monitor performance against this indicator over time. This indicator is part of the Global Partnership monitoring process which tracks implementation of commitments made at the Busan High Level Forum in 2011 to enhance effective development cooperation by following principles of country ownership, results focus, inclusive partnerships, transparency, and mutual accountability. The data is already collected by over two dozen countries via a survey completed by the Ministries of Finance at the country level."</p> <p>Other comments UN WOMEN Although this indicator is agreed as part of the Busan partnership, lack of consistency and comparability across countries makes it a Tier III indicators. Further methodological work is needed to ensure that it is consistently measured and standardized across countries. UN Women, in partnership with OECD GENDERNET is currently leading this work and will be able to suggest methodological revisions in 2016.</p>
Goal 6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all						

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
6.1 By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all	6.1.1 Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services	Tier I	Tier I	WHO/UNICEF	UNEP	<p>Methodology: UNEP/ WHO and UNICEF: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Over the last 25 years the JMP has established global norms and standards for monitoring drinking water, sanitation and hygiene. The proposed indicator builds on these and was developed following extensive consultations with WASH sector experts. Major international consultations took place in 2011 and 2012, as well as many regional and country consultations in various parts of the world. Existing global norms and standards and technical recommendations for SDG monitoring are documented on the JMP website: http://www.wssinfo.org/post-2015-monitoring/ and summarised in the following methodological note: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/resources/Methodological-note-on-monitoring-SDG-targets-for-WASH-and-wastewater_WHO-UNICEF_8October2015_Final.pdf.</p> <p>Metadata link: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-6.pdf UN-Water consolidated metadata at http://bit.ly/1QVGtxU and http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-6.pdf</p> <p>Data availability from WHO and UNICEF Data Availability 2010 - Present Asia and Pacific: at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region, Africa: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region), Latin America and the Caribbean: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region), Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Africa: Most countries (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Latin America and the Caribbean: Most countries (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Most countries (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region) Preliminary estimates are available for 140 countries: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2016/02/11/090224b084172a75/1_0/Original/The0costs0of0m0iene00data0catalog.xlsx. The JMP will publish baseline estimates for all regions and countries in 2017. Disaggregation by service level using the JMP drinking water ladder: see methods note 1. Preliminary estimates for 140 countries on the use of safely managed drinking water services were published in a recent report produced in collaboration between the World Bank and the JMP. The report and data sources are available here: http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/water/publication/the-costs-of-meeting-the-2030-sustainable-development-goal-targets-on-drinking-water-sanitation-and-hygiene. 2. As explained in the methods note (see link above) the JMP plans to progressively integrate data from national regulators as well other international databases (RegNet, UNSD-UNEP, OECD, EUROSTAT, FAO AQUASTAT, World Bank IBNET) to address data gaps and linkages with other SDG targets. 3. This indicator is classified as a Tier I indicator, as it is conceptually clear, has an established methodology as well as standards, and data are regularly produced by almost all countries that can be used for global reporting. 4. A coherent approach for global monitoring and reporting for SDG 6 has been established under the UN-Water umbrella, relevant UN agencies in Q3 above are designated as "custodians" coordinating input from other agencies and stakeholders</p>
6.2 By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations	6.2.1 Proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water	Tier I	Tier I	WHO/UNICEF	UNEP	<p>Methodology: UNEP/ WHO and UNICEF: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Over the last 25 years the JMP has established global norms and standards for monitoring drinking water, sanitation and hygiene. The proposed indicator builds on these and was developed following extensive consultations with WASH sector experts. Major international consultations took place in 2011 and 2012, as well as many regional and country consultations in various parts of the world. Existing global norms and standards and technical recommendations for SDG monitoring are documented on the JMP website: http://www.wssinfo.org/post-2015-monitoring/ and summarised in the following methodological note: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/resources/Methodological-note-on-monitoring-SDG-targets-for-WASH-and-wastewater_WHO-UNICEF_8October2015_Final.pdf.</p> <p>UN-Water consolidated metadata at http://bit.ly/1QVGtxU and http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-6.pdf</p> <p>Data availability: WHO and UNICEF Data Availability 2010 - Present Asia and Pacific: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region), Africa: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region), Latin America and the Caribbean: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region), Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Africa: (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Latin America and the Caribbean: (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region) Disaggregation by service level using the JMP sanitation ladder and handwashing facilities with soap and water: see methods note. Preliminary estimates are available for 140 countries: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2016/02/11/090224b084172a75/1_0/Original/The0costs0of0m0iene00data0catalog.xlsx. The JMP will publish baseline estimates for all regions and countries in 2017. 1. Preliminary estimates for 140 countries on the use of safely managed drinking water services were published in a recent report produced in collaboration between the World Bank and the JMP. The report and data sources are available here: http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/water/publication/the-costs-of-meeting-the-2030-sustainable-development-goal-targets-on-drinking-water-sanitation-and-hygiene. 2. As explained in the methods note (see link above) the JMP plans to progressively integrate data from national regulators as well other international databases (RegNet, UNSD-UNEP, OECD, EUROSTAT, FAO AQUASTAT, World Bank IBNET) to address data gaps and linkages with other SDG targets. 3. This indicator is classified as a Tier I indicator, as it is conceptually clear, has an established methodology as well as standards, and data are regularly produced by almost all countries that can be used for global reporting. 4. A coherent approach for global monitoring and reporting for SDG 6 has been established under the UN-Water umbrella, relevant UN agencies in Q3 above are designated as "custodians" coordinating input from other agencies and stakeholders This submission was made on behalf of UN-Water by Joakim Harlin (joakim.harlin@undp.org) and Lis Mullin Bernhardt (lis.bernhardt@unwater.org) UNEP: No data and UNEP is working with the other UN Water partners on all water related indicators.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
6.3 By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally	6.3.1 Proportion of wastewater safely treated	Tier I	Tier III- workplan on methodology	UN Habitat, WHO, UNSD	UNEP	<p>Methodology: UNEP/ WHO and UN-HABITAT: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-6.pdf</p> <p>Data availability: WHO and UN-HABITAT</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region), Africa: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region), Latin America and the Caribbean: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region), Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region)</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Africa: (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Latin America and the Caribbean: (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region), Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Most countries (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region)</p> <p>This indicator covers households and the entire economy, and builds on the monitoring framework of JMP, UNSD/UNEP Water Questionnaire for non OECD/Eurostat countries, OECD/Eurostat Questionnaire for OECD countries, AQUASAT, IBNET. Statistical methods for measurement of wastewater treatment is aligned with the SEEA21 statistical standard and associated definitions, classifications and treatment categories (Encompasses all wastewater generated and treated by the economy. Treatment Categories will be consistent, as much as possible within the context of global monitoring purposes, with those defined in the SEEA (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/water.asp), and International Recommendations for Water Statistics (IRWS: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/irws/irwswebversion.pdf)</p> <p>In addition, combining UNIDO industries database (http://stat.unido.org/) ISIC standard Classification system (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/seriesM/seriesm_4rev4e.pdf), will allow for data to be disaggregated for industrial/commercial wastewater into various economic activities, as well as differentiate hazardous industries from the rest. USEPA has harmonized hazardous waste classification with EU regulations complement ISIC codes for all waste classes. (www.epa.ie/pubs/reports/waste/stats/wasteclassification/EPA_Waste_Classification_2015_Web.pdf)</p> <p>The household portion of wastewater is the same indicator as 6.2.1, and the monitoring of that will be interlinked to JMP monitoring for 6.2.1. Over the last 25 years the JMP has established global norms and standards for monitoring drinking water, sanitation and hygiene. The proposed 6.2.1. indicator builds on these and was developed following extensive consultations with sector experts. Major international consultations took place in 2011 and 2012, as well as many regional and country consultations in various parts of the world. Existing global norms and standards and technical recommendations for SDG monitoring are documented here: http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/resources/Methodological-note-on-monitoring-SDG-targets-for-WASH-and-wastewater_WHO-UNICEF_8October2015_Final.pdf.</p> <p>Preliminary estimates are available for 140 countries for 6.2.1, which is the same as the household part of this indicator: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2016/02/11/090224b084172a75/1_0/Original/The0costs0of0m0iene000data0catalog.xlsx. Following further testing, a revised SDG baseline estimate will be available soon, along with estimates for other parts of this wastewater indicator, i.e. industrial and commercial parts broken down by economic activities following SEEA definitions and standards. For links to a few data sources mentioned in Q11 below: i) UNSD-UNEP questionnaire: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/environment/questionnaire.htm; ii) OECD: https://data.oecd.org/water/waste-water-treatment.htm. iii) AQUASTAT: http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/data/query/index.html?lang=en, iv) IBNET: https://www.ib-net.org/. v) GWI: https://www.globalwaterintel.com/.</p> <p>1. The latest data from 140 countries on the use of safely managed sanitation services, which is the same as domestic part of wastewater indicator, published in the report that was</p>
	6.3.2 Proportion of bodies of water with good ambient water quality	Tier II	Tier III	UNEP	UN-Water	<p>Methodology: UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work is ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>UNEP: No data and UNEP is working with the other UN Water partners on all water related indicators.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
6.4 By 2030, substantially increase water-use efficiency across all sectors and ensure sustainable withdrawals and supply of freshwater to address water scarcity and substantially reduce the number of people suffering from water scarcity	6.4.1 Change in water-use efficiency over time	Tier II	Tier III-workplan on methodology	FAO	UNEP	<p>Methodology: FAO and UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>Data availability: FAO: No data</p> <p>Note on data availability: This indicator consists of many components and although the indicator has not yet been computed, data points are available for different components of the indicator, such as water withdrawal by sector, GDP, etc., which are collected through questionnaires by FAO-AQUASTAT, FAO-FAOSTAT, UNEP-UNSD, OECD-Eurostat, World Bank, etc.</p> <p>While large part of the data needed is available in global datasets from FAO, WB or other international agencies, some of them are not yet fully available, or not for all countries. At the same time, the data available have to be checked at country level, as they may be the outcome of interpolation or modelling.</p> <p>The methodology has been proposed, and metadata have been described. The testing of the methodology is in the starting phase, and it is supposed to finalize its first round by the end of 2016.</p> <p>We recommend that the indicator is set at tier 2.</p> <p>Under the UN-Water umbrella, a joint and collaborative monitoring effort has been established which involves all relevant UN entities and ensures coherence in implementation of global monitoring and reporting for SDG 6 in its entirety. One or two of these agencies are designated as “custodians” for each of the SDG 6 indicators, coordinating input from other agencies and stakeholders. Using the data provided by the custodian agencies, UN-Water will prepare periodic global synthesis reports of progress towards SDG 6 implementation.</p> <p>Further information on methodology for all of SDG 6 can be found in the UN-Water metadata compilation: http://bit.ly/1QVGtxU.</p> <p>This submission was provided on behalf of UN-Water by Joakim Harlin (joakim.harlin@unwater.org) and Lis Mullin Bernhardt (lis.bernhardt@unwater.org) and is meant to update/replace the previous UN-Water submission by UN-Water as regards to the note on data availability.</p> <p>Although the indicator has not yet been computed, its components will be assessed through well-established international data sources, for which standards exist. Such sources can be reached at the following links:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AQUASTAT, FAO’s Global Water Information System. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome. The following resources on this site of specific interest to this indicator are: • FAOSTAT production database • UNSD/UNEP Questionnaire on Environment Statistics – Water Section (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/environment/questionnaire.htm) http://unstats.un.org/unsd/environment/qindicators.htm • Framework for the Development of Environment Statistics (FDES 2013) (Ch. 3) • OECD/Eurostat Questionnaire on Environment Statistics – Water Section • International Recommendations for Water Statistics (IRWS) (2012) • UNSD-System of Environmental Economic Accounting for Water (SEEA-Water) (2007). • UNSD-System of Environmental Economic Accounting (SEEA) (2012) • World Bank Open Data.
	6.4.2 Level of water stress: freshwater withdrawal as a proportion of available freshwater resources	Tier I	Tier I	FAO	UNEP	<p>Methodology: FAO and UNEP: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. This indicator is similar to MDG indicator 7.5, but the methodology will be refined by amongst other taking into consideration environmental water requirements, if data available.</p> <p>The indicator is published in FAO-AQUASTAT, the UN-Water-KWIP, as well as in the MDG 7.5, by country. The methodology and details are described in the relevant websites http://www.unwater.org/kwip and http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/Metadata.aspx?IndicatorId=0&SeriesId=768.</p> <p>http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-6.pdf</p> <p>Data availability from FAO:</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 2; Africa: 6; Latin America and the Caribbean: 16; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:24</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 42; Africa: 49; Latin America and the Caribbean: 27; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 47</p> <p>http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/data/query/index.html?lang=en</p> <p>The data needed are available in FAO-AQUASTAT, and the indicator has been produced for many countries since the beginning of the century. However, it is apparent that many countries struggle with keeping a constant pace in producing the data and the indicator, so that the last five years much less countries have done so with respect to the first ten years of 2000s. The methodology will be refined by taking into consideration, where possible, environmental water requirements.</p> <p>Under the UN-Water umbrella, a joint and collaborative monitoring effort has been established which involves all relevant UN entities and ensures coherence in implementation of global monitoring and reporting for SDG 6 in its entirety. One or two of these agencies are designated as “custodians” for each of the SDG 6 indicators, coordinating input from other agencies and stakeholders. Using the data provided by the custodian agencies, UN-Water will prepare periodic global synthesis reports of progress towards SDG 6 implementation.</p> <p>UNEP: No data and UNEP is working with the other UN Water partners on all water related indicators.</p>
6.5.1 Degree of integrated water resources management implementation (0-100)	Tier I	Tier I	UNEP	UN Water	<p>Metadata: UNEP: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>This indicator is based upon international agreements for IWRM status reporting. The method builds on official UN IWRM status reporting, from 2008 and 2012, of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation from the UN World Summit for Sustainable Development (1992).</p> <p>UN-Water consolidated metadata at http://bit.ly/1QVGtxU and http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-6.pdf</p> <p>Data availability:</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 28; Africa: 30; Latin America and the Caribbean: 22; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 43</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 17; Africa: 40; Latin America and the Caribbean: 28; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 2</p> <p>http://www.unepdhi.org/rioplus20</p> <p>Data are collected at the national level. The IWRM surveys will specifically address issues relating to gender, governance, ecosystems, expenditures, and human capacity, as well as transboundary interests. National estimates can be aggregated to present regional and global estimates.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The method builds on official UN IWRM status reporting, from 2008 and 2012, of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation from the UN World Summit for Sustainable Development (1992). 2. Under the UN-Water umbrella, a joint and collaborative monitoring effort has been established which involves all relevant UN entities and ensures coherence in implementation of global monitoring and reporting for SDG 6 in its entirety. One or two of these agencies are designated as “custodians” for each of the SDG 6 indicators, coordinating input from other agencies and stakeholders. Using the data provided by the custodian agencies, UN-Water will prepare periodic global synthesis reports of progress towards SDG 6 implementation. <p>Further information on methodology for all of SDG 6 can be found in the UN-Water metadata compilation: http://bit.ly/1QVGtxU.</p> <p>This submission was provided on behalf of UN-Water by Joakim Harlin (joakim.harlin@undp.org) and Lis Mullin Bernhardt (lis.bernhardt@unwater.org).</p>	

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
6.5 By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate	6.5.2 Proportion of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation	Tier II	Tier III	UNESCO, UNECE	UNECE	<p>Metadata: UNECE and UNESCO (IHP), UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. The elements of the indicator are based on the main principles of customary international water law, also contained in the two UN conventions - Convention on the Law of the Non-navigational Uses of International Watercourses (New York, 1997) and the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (Helsinki, 1992) – as well as the draft Articles on The Law of Transboundary Aquifers (2008; UN General Assembly resolutions 63/124 and 66/104).</p> <p>Data availability: UNECE and UNESCO Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 39; Africa: 48; Latin America and the Caribbean: 22; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 46 Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 39; Africa: 47; Latin America and the Caribbean: 22; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 46</p> <p>The only technically relevant disaggregation element for this indicator is “Geographic Location”. The information needs to be gathered at the basin level. Basin level data can be disaggregated /aggregated to country level (for national reporting) and aggregated to regional and global level</p> <p>Indicator 6.5.2 is conceptually clear, the methodology is established and is based on the main principles of customary international water law, also contained in the two UN conventions - Convention on the Law of the Non-navigational Uses of International Watercourses (New York, 1997) and the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (Helsinki, 1992) – as well as the draft Articles on The Law of Transboundary Aquifers (2008; UN General Assembly resolutions 63/124 and 66/104).</p> <p>Data are not produced regularly by countries but the information needed to calculate the indicator is simple, does not require advanced monitoring capacities and is normally available to all countries.</p> <p>Data is available for the 154 countries having territorial borders in a number of existing databases. Within the framework of the GEF funded project “Transboundary Waters Assessment Programme (GEF TWAP)” information was gathered covering 286 main transboundary rivers, 206 transboundary lakes and reservoirs and 199 transboundary aquifers. Information is also compiled for 592 transboundary aquifers by the UNESCO ISARM GGIS. The Freshwater Treaties Database, maintained by Oregon State University includes all water cooperation arrangements up to 2008. The formal reporting under the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes which will be held every 3 years as of 2017 will gather information on water cooperation arrangements, transboundary waters covered by them and their operationality.</p> <p>Under the UN-Water umbrella, a joint and collaborative monitoring effort has been established which involves all relevant UN entities and ensures coherence in implementation of global monitoring and reporting for SDG 6 in its entirety. One or two of these agencies are designated as “custodians” for each of the SDG 6 indicators, coordinating input from other agencies and stakeholders. Using the data provided by the custodian agencies, UN-Water will prepare periodic global synthesis reports of progress towards SDG 6 implementation. Further information on methodology for all of SDG 6 can be found in the UN-Water metadata compilation: http://bit.ly/1QVGtxU.</p> <p>This submission was provided on behalf of UN-Water by Joakim Harlin (joakim.harlin@undp.org) and Lis Mullin Bernhardt (lis.bernhardt@unwater.org).</p> <p>Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP is working with the other UN Water partners on all water related indicators.</p>
6.6 By 2020, protect and restore water-related ecosystems, including mountains, forests, wetlands, rivers, aquifers and lakes	6.6.1 Change in the extent of water-related ecosystems over time	Tier II	Tier III	UNEP	UN Water	<p>Metadata: UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. The indicator will track changes over time in the extent of wetlands, forests and drylands, and in the minimum flows of rivers, volumes of freshwater in lakes and dams, and the groundwater table. A combination of earth observation and ground-based data will be applied. For each of the ecosystem types, standard methods exist. Combining these metrics into one indicator is the novel element that needs to be developed.</p> <p>UN-Water consolidated metadata at http://bit.ly/1QVGtxU and http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-6.pdf</p> <p>Data availability Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 28; Africa: 30; Latin America and the Caribbean: 22; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 43 Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 17; Africa: 40 ; Latin America and the Caribbean: 28; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 2 http://www.unepdhi.org/iwrm%20data%20portal</p> <p>Within the WDPA we have data from 242 countries and territories (with a data for Antarctica and Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction so 244 in all) which all have a unique identifier- the International Standards Office 3166 three digit code. The only two countries and territories we have no data from are from Nauru who do not have a protected area network and San Marino where we have had difficulty getting data from. I added a comment on the regions used as I noticed that Australia, New Zealand and Japan are listed along with Europe and North America though these are all in the “Asia and the Pacific” UNEP region. All our analysis for the indicators will be at the Country and Territory level which we can aggregate to different regions and sub regions as required. Our data from 2010 to present is more complete than from before 2010 but we have digital versions of the Word Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) going back to 1998 though the quality is poorer the further you go back. He monthly updated versions of the WDPA are available on http://www.protectedplanet.net/</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
6.a By 2030, expand international cooperation and capacity-building support to developing countries in water- and sanitation-related activities and programmes, including water harvesting, desalination, water efficiency, wastewater treatment, recycling and reuse technologies	6.a.1 Amount of water- and sanitation-related official development assistance that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan	Tier I	Tier I	OECD	UN Water & WHO	<p>Methodology: OECD, WHO and UNEP: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. The methods and standards of DAC statistics on ODA and other resource flows are explained at http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm. The OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) has been collecting data on aid flows since 1973 through the OECD Creditor Reporting System based on a standard methodology and agreed definitions from member countries and other aid providers. The data are generally obtained on an activity level, and include numerous parameters to allow disaggregation by provider and recipient country, by type of finance, and by type of resources provided. Data are available for essentially all high-income countries as bilateral donors, and for an increasing number of middle-income aid providers, as well as multi-lateral lending institutions.</p> <p>Data Availability: OECD, WHO and UNEP</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region); Africa: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region); Latin America and the Caribbean: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region); Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region)</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region); Africa: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region); Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Some countries</p> <p>The numbers given above for countries refer to donors from whom the data are sought. Data are also available on the receipts of aid among all developing countries, including receipts from multilateral agencies. These data are gross total ODA and other official flows to the water sector. It would be a simple matter to exclude the other official flows, and only show ODA (by adjusting the parameters in the link accordingly). However, UN Water has suggested further restricting coverage of ODA "that is part of a government co-ordinated spending plan". They may be able to advise on how to restrict coverage of the data to flows that are part of such plans.</p> <p>Note that developed countries are disbursing rather than receiving ODA, therefore are generally excluded from data availability in Q7 and Q8 above. Hence also it is expected that data will be available for fewer countries over time as the number of countries receiving ODA decreases.</p> <p>2. Data availability is global, and are collected on a regular basis through OECD-CRS and UN-Water GLAAS, both well-established global reporting mechanisms. This will be complemented by data collected through the IWRM survey for indicator 6.5.1.</p> <p>3. Therefore this indicator is classified as a Tier I indicator, as it is conceptually clear, has an established methodology as well as standards, and data are regularly collected and compiled by the countries.</p> <p>4. Under the UN-Water umbrella, a joint and collaborative monitoring effort has been established which involves all relevant UN entities and ensures coherence in implementation of global monitoring and reporting for SDG 6 in its entirety. One or two of these agencies are designated as "custodians" for each of the SDG 6 indicators, coordinating input from other agencies and stakeholders. Using the data provided by the custodian agencies, UN-Water will prepare periodic global synthesis reports of progress towards SDG 6 implementation. Further information on methodology for all of SDG 6 can be found in the UN-Water metadata compilation: http://bit.ly/1QVGtU.</p> <p>This submission was provided on behalf of UN-Water by Joakim Harlin (joakim.harlin@undp.org) and Lis Mullin Bernhardt (lis.bernhardt@unwater.org)</p> <p>The OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) has been collecting data on aid flows since 1973 through the OECD Creditor Reporting System based on a standard methodology</p>
6.b Support and strengthen the participation of local communities in improving water and sanitation management	6.b.1 Proportion of local administrative units with established and operational policies and procedures for participation of local communities in water and sanitation management	Tier I	Tier I	WHO & UNEP	OECD	<p>Methodology: WHO and UNEP, in collaboration with OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) provides information on governance, monitoring, human resources, and financing in the water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) sector. The UN-Water GLAAS survey is currently conducted on a biennial basis, led by WHO, and collected data from 94 countries (predominantly low and lower-middle income countries) in the most recent cycle in 2013-2014. UN-Water GLAAS has completed three full cycles (2009-2010, 2011-2012, and 2013-2014), as well as a pilot conducted in 2008. The data will be complemented by Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) reporting in SDG target 6.5 (for wastewater and water quality, water efficiency, water resource management, and the status of water-related ecosystems). The analysis of IWRM has been done in the past by UN-Water in 2008 (led by UN-DESA) and in 2012 (led by UNEP, UNDP, GWP and SIWI) as requested by the UN Commission for Sustainable Development. http://www.unwater.org/fileadmin/user_upload/unwater_new/docs/Goal%206_Metadate%20Compilation%20for%20Suggested%20Indicators_UN-Water_v2015-12-16.pdf</p> <p>Data availability:</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region); Africa: Most countries (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region); Latin America and the Caribbean: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region); Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region)</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: Most countries (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region); Africa: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region); Latin America and the Caribbean: Most countries (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region); Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Most countries (at least 50% of the countries covering 50% of the population from the region)</p> <p>Data from UN-Water GLAAS is available here: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/glaas/en/</p> <p>1. Data availability is global, and are collected on a regular basis through UN-Water GLAAS, a well-established global reporting mechanism. This will be complemented by data collected through the IWRM survey for indicator 6.5.1.</p> <p>2. Administrative and additional datasets from countries will be progressively included in the calculation of the indicator as they become available.</p> <p>3. Data will be complemented by the forthcoming OECD water governance indicators for measurement the framework conditions for local participation in water management.</p> <p>4. This indicator is classified as a Tier I indicator, as it is conceptually clear, has an established methodology as well as standards, and data are regularly produced by the countries.</p> <p>4.5. Under the UN-Water umbrella, a joint and collaborative monitoring effort has been established which involves all relevant UN entities and ensures coherence in implementation of global monitoring and reporting for SDG 6 in its entirety. One or two of these agencies are designated as "custodians" for each of the SDG 6 indicators, coordinating input from other agencies and stakeholders. Using the data provided by the custodian agencies, UN-Water will prepare periodic global synthesis reports of progress towards SDG 6 implementation. Further information on methodology for all of SDG 6 can be found in the UN-Water metadata compilation: http://bit.ly/1QVGtU.</p>
Goal 7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all						

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services	7.1.1 Proportion of population with access to electricity	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank	International Energy Agency, FAO, GACC	<p>Methodology: World Bank: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Since 2012, under the auspices of Sustainable Energy for All, the World Bank and the International Energy Agency worked on the development of the SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework in close collaboration with a consortium of 24 international agencies (Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (GACC), Global Water Partnership (GWP), International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), International Network on Gender and Sustainable Energy (EnerGIA), International Partnership for Energy Efficiency Cooperation (IPEEC), International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Practical Action, Renewable Energy Network for the 21st Century (REN21), Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), UN Energy, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), United Nations Foundation (UNF), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), UN Statistics, World Energy Council (WEC) and the World Health Organization (WHO)). The consortium has also had discussions with UN Habitat, UNESCO and the five UN Regional Commissions (ECLAC, ESCAP, ESCWA, UNECA, UNECE) regarding their incorporation into the consortium going forward. The Global Tracking Framework developed a series of indicators to measure the three SE4ALL objectives that align closely with those proposed to measure the SDG7 targets. Data was collected on these indicators for the period 1990-2012 for more than 180 countries worldwide and is publicly available at the data platform cited below. The SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework has already been published in two editions: the 2013 Report covering the baseline period 1990-2010, and the 2015 report updating progress from 2010-2012. While the existing global household survey evidence base provides a good starting point for tracking household energy access, it also presents a number of limitations that will need to be addressed over time. In many parts of the world, the presence of an electricity connection in the household does not necessarily guarantee that the energy supplied is adequate in quality and reliability or affordable in cost and it would be desirable to have fuller information about these critical attributes of the service, which have been highlighted in SDG7. Substantial progress has already been made toward developing and piloting a new methodology known as the Multi-Tier Framework for Measuring Energy Access (World Bank) which is able to capture these broader dimensions of service quality and would make it possible to go beyond a simple yes/no measure of energy access to a more refined approach that recognizes different levels of energy access, and also takes into account the affordability and reliability of energy access explicitly referenced in the language of SDG7. The methodology for the Multi-Tier Framework for Measuring Energy Access has already been published based on a broad consultative exercise and represents a consensus view across numerous international agencies working in the field. A first Global Energy Access Survey using this methodology has already been launched and is underway expecting to yield results by early 2017. Discussions are also progressing with the World Bank's Household Survey Technical Working Group regarding the mainstreaming of this methodology into the standardized household questionnaire design that will be applied every three years in all low income countries between 2015 and 2030 as part of the broader SDG monitoring exercise. The adoption of this methodology will allow – over time – the more refined measurement of energy access, making it possible to report more disaggregated information regarding the type of electricity supply (grid or off-grid), the capacity of electricity supply provided (in Watts), the duration of service (daily hours and evening hours), the reliability of service (in terms of number and length of unplanned service interruptions), the quality of service (in terms of voltage fluctuations), as well as affordability and legality of service.</p> <p>References: 1. Global Tracking Framework Report (2013) http://trackingenergy4all.worldbank.org; 2. Beyond Connections: Energy Access Redefined (2015) https://www.esmap.org/node/55526/http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-7.pdf</p> <p>Data availability: Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 58; Africa: 53; Latin America and the Caribbean: 39; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 50 Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 58; Africa: 53; Latin America and the Caribbean: 39; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 50 http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/sustainable-energy-for-all Data are collected from household surveys, not necessarily with annual frequency, but certainly on a regular basis. Note: This the second survey submission for the indicator on Electricity access on behalf of the SE4ALL GTF consortium. The first submission incorrectly stated this indicator as being second Tier. Please refer to information in this second submission only.</p>
	7.1.2 Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology	Tier I	Tier I	WHO		<p>Methodology: WHO Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. WHO has been monitoring and tracking access to energy and its impacts on health and development using its Global household energy database, and Global health observatory for over a decade. Clear methods (e.g. use of nationally representative data) can be found at the Global Health Observatory (http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.135?lang=en) or at the WHO website (http://www.who.int/indoorair/health_impacts/he_database/en/)</p> <p>Regarding the definition of 'clean' in the indicator. WHO's evidence-based normative guidance found in the WHO guidelines for indoor air quality: household fuel combustion (http://www.who.int/indoorair/guidelines/hfc/en/) provides specific recommendations on the types and technical performance of fuels and technology combinations (i.e. in the form of emission rate targets) that can be considered clean for health.</p> <p>A statistical note was provided to the IAEG Secretariat and additional details regarding the metadata are available at: http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.135?lang=en Please note the data at this link does not yet reflect the updated SDG indicator as this data is currently undergoing internal statistical clearance but still lists the former indicator used for MDG monitoring (i.e. population with primary reliance on solid fuels for cooking) for 2013.</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Africa: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Latin America and the Caribbean: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Africa: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Latin America and the Caribbean: Most countries (at least 80% of the countries covering 90% of the population from the region) Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: Some countries</p> <p>Between 2000 and 2009, data were collected by countries and completed through modelling by WHO. Currently WHO only lists the most recently available data points online (i.e. currently 2013) but can make this made available upon request. Global Health Observatory (http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.main.135?lang=en)_ and the WHO website (http://www.who.int/indoorair/health_impacts/he_database/en/)</p> <p>1. This indicator is classified as a Tier 1 indicator, as it is conceptually clear, has an established methodology, data are regularly produced by almost all countries that can be used for further processing and global reporting.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
7.2 By 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix	7.2.1 Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank, UNSD?	IEA, IRENA, OECD	<p>CHECK DATABASE</p> <p>Methodology: International Energy Agency (OECD/IEA), World Bank, International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA): Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Renewable and total final energy consumption are computed starting from national energy balances, which are derived from national energy statistics and follow methodologies and definitions of UN International Recommendations on Energy Statistics (IRES). http://www.unosd.org/content/documents/1241UN%20STATISTICS%20BG-IRE.pdf. A proposed methodology for this share is contained in the SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework (Annex 3).</p> <p>Data availability from World Bank on behalf of the SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework consortium Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 48; Africa: 52; Latin America and the Caribbean: 36; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 44 Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 48; Africa: 52; Latin America and the Caribbean: 36; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 44 http://www.se4all.org/sites/default/files//2013/09/GTF-2105-Full-Report.pdf Proposals were made in the UNSD request for metadata. There are slight differences in the way that energy data is compiled, but it should not be difficult to agree a standard. Since 2012, under the auspices of Sustainable Energy for All, the World Bank and the International Energy Agency worked on the development of the SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework in close collaboration with a consortium of 24 international agencies (Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (GACC), Global Water Partnership (GWP), International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), International Network on Gender and Sustainable Energy (Energia), International Partnership for Energy Efficiency Cooperation (IPEEC), International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Practical Action, Renewable Energy Network for the 21st Century (REN21), Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), UN Energy, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), United Nations Foundation (UNF), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), UN Statistics, World Energy Council (WEC) and the World Health Organization (WHO)). The consortium has also had discussions with UN Habitat, UNESCO and the five UN Regional Commissions (ECLAC, ESCAP, ESCWA, UNECA, UNECE) regarding their incorporation into the consortium going forward.</p> <p>The Global Tracking Framework developed a series of indicators to measure the three SE4ALL objectives that align closely with those proposed to measure the SDG7 targets. Data was collected on these indicators for the period 1990-2012 for more than 180 countries worldwide and is publicly available at the data platform cited below. The SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework has already been published in two editions: the 2013 Report covering the baseline period 1990-2010, and the 2015 report updating progress from 2010-2012. References: 1. Global Tracking Framework Report (2013) http://trackingenergy4all.worldbank.org. Note that this methodology would produce slightly different results from other (e.g. European Renewable Directive), due to a few methodological assumptions needed. IEA collects energy data globally to produce this indicator within the World Energy Balances product. IEA shared these data within the SE4ALL Global tracking Framework database (co-led by IEA and World Bank). The indicator is Tier I in high-income countries and many middle-income countries, but energy data is not collected very regularly in many low-income countries and some sort of support and capacity building may be required</p>
7.3 By 2030, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency	7.3.1 Energy intensity measured in terms of primary energy and GDP	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank, UNSD	IEA& OECD	<p>CHECK DATABASE</p> <p>Methodology: International Energy Agency (OECD/IEA)& World Bank: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Primary energy (Total primary energy supply, or TPES) is computed starting from national energy balances, which are derived from national energy statistics and follow methodologies and definitions of UN International Recommendations on Energy Statistics (IRES) http://www.unosd.org/content/documents/1241UN%20STATISTICS%20BG-IRE.pdf The indicator TPES/GDP is then computed (various GDP measures are possible). Since 2012, under the auspices of Sustainable Energy for All, the World Bank and the International Energy Agency worked on the development of the SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework in close collaboration with a consortium of 24 international agencies (Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (GACC), Global Water Partnership (GWP), International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), International Network on Gender and Sustainable Energy (Energia), International Partnership for Energy Efficiency Cooperation (IPEEC), International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Practical Action, Renewable Energy Network for the 21st Century (REN21), Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), UN Energy, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), United Nations Foundation (UNF), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), UN Statistics, World Energy Council (WEC) and the World Health Organization (WHO)). The consortium has also had discussions with UN Habitat, UNESCO and the five UN Regional Commissions (ECLAC, ESCAP, ESCWA, UNECA, UNECE) regarding their incorporation into the consortium going forward.</p> <p>The Global Tracking Framework developed a series of indicators to measure the three SE4ALL objectives that align closely with those proposed to measure the SDG7 targets. Data was collected on these indicators for the period 1990-2012 for more than 180 countries worldwide and is publicly available at the data platform cited below. The SE4ALL Global Tracking Framework has already been published in two editions: the 2013 Report covering the baseline period 1990-2010, and the 2015 report updating progress from 2010-2012. References: 1. Global Tracking Framework Report (2013) http://trackingenergy4all.worldbank.org http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-7.pdf</p> <p>Data Availability from World Bank: Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 49; Africa: 53; Latin America and the Caribbean: 37; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 44 Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 49; Africa: 53; Latin America and the Caribbean: 37; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 44 http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/sustainable-energy-for-all IEA collects energy data globally and include this indicator within the World Energy Balances product. http://wds.iea.org/wds/pdf/WORLDBAL_Documentation.pdf</p>
7.a By 2030, enhance international cooperation to facilitate access to clean energy research and technology, including renewable energy, energy efficiency and advanced and cleaner fossil-fuel technology, and promote investment in energy infrastructure and clean energy technology	7.a.1 Mobilized amount of United States dollars per year starting in 2020 accountable towards the \$100 billion commitment	Tier I	Tier III	OECD	UNFCCC, UNEP	<p>Same as 7.a.1</p> <p>OECD: The OECD methodology has so far been investigating commitments from the provider perspective. The focus is on public climate finance.</p> <p>Database: no information provided Metadata: none provided Data coverage (2000-2009): none Data coverage (2010-present): all countries in Euro, NA, etc.; a few in LAC; none in the remaining regions Data disaggregation: Geographic Location</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. Standard information: see OECD (2015), Climate Finance in 2013-14 and the USD 100 billion goal : A report by the OECD in collaboration with Climate Policy Initiative. http://www.oecd.org/env/cc/oeecd-cpi-climate-finance-report.htm. see Annex a page 45 for the list of countries covered (OECD members)</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
7.b By 2030, expand infrastructure and upgrade technology for supplying modern and sustainable energy services for all in developing countries, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing countries, in accordance with their respective programmes of support	7.b.1 Investments in energy efficiency as a percentage of GDP and the amount of foreign direct investment in financial transfer for infrastructure and technology to sustainable development services	Tier III	Tier III	IEA		Methodology IEA: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. The IEA is working towards a richer method for measuring energy efficiency investment and would like to connect with the UN and all the relevant players to discuss further. As an additional comment, it is worth noting that the goal and the indicator are not particularly well aligned, and that further sub-indicators might be necessary to give a full picture. No data
Goal 8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all						
8.1 Sustain per capita economic growth in accordance with national circumstances and, in particular, at least 7 per cent gross domestic product growth per annum in the least developed countries	8.1.1 Annual growth rate of real GDP per capita	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank	UNSD	Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=world-development-indicators&preview=on Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 56 Africa: 52 Latin America and the Caribbean: 35 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 48 Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 59 Africa: 57 Latin America and the Caribbean: 37 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 51 http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.KD.ZG
8.2 Achieve higher levels of economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, including through a focus on high-value added and labour-intensive sectors	8.2.1 Annual growth rate of real GDP per employed person	Tier I	Tier I	ILO	World Bank, UNSD	Methodology from ILO: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. GDP from SNA and employment as from ICLS definition Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: All Africa: All Latin America and the Caribbean: All Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: All Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: All Africa: All Latin America and the Caribbean: All Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: All The indicator is available from SNA and from employment statistics (in the latter, either real data or estimates by the ILO)
8.3 Promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services	8.3.1 Proportion of informal employment in non-agriculture employment, by sex	Tier II	Tier II	ILO		Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. For details, refer to the Resolution concerning statistics of employment in the informal sector, available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/standards-and-guidelines/resolutions-adopted-by-internationalconferences-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_087484/lang-en/index.htm ; the Guidelines concerning a statistical definition of informal employment, available at http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/normativeinstrument/wcms_087622.pdf ; and the ILO manual Measuring informality: A statistical manual on the informal sector and informal employment, available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_222979.pdf Handbook on Measuring Quality of Employment: A Statistical Framework. (UNECE- CES) http://www.unecce.org/fileadmin/DAM/stats/documents/ece/ces/2015/4_Add.2_Rev1_Guidelines_on_QoEmployment.pdf http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_222979.pdf Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 15 Africa: 9 Latin America and the Caribbean: 16 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 5 Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 10 Africa: 7 Latin America and the Caribbean: 15 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 4 http://www.ilo.org/lostat/faces/help_home/data_by_subject?_adf.ctrl-state=rtff61p2p_1296&_afLoop=368560411857969 Given that informal employment is a job-based concept and encompasses those jobs that generally lack basic social or legal protections or employment benefits, which may be found in the formal sector, informal sector or households, the preferred official national data source for this indicator is a household-based labour force survey including the necessary questions specifically designed to capture all the relevant information. Other household surveys with an appropriate employment module including questions targeting informal employment can also be used to obtain the required data. This has a clear impact on data availability, since such collections are not necessarily in place in all countries. Also, given its relatively low volatility, the frequency of data collection and dissemination for the share of informal employment could be less than that required for other key labour market indicators. Furthermore, as informal employment is comprised of several component categories defined by status in employment and type of production unit, it would always be best to analyse this indicator along with statistical information on the levels and changes of its components, since the conclusions might vary significantly depending on these. It is important to note that the newly approved handbook on quality of employment by the UNECE expert group on Quality of Employment mainly focussed on developed countries, has been explicit in promoting this indicator as exploratory indicator to be calculated by European and other developed countries. The Delhi Group from UNSC, will also seek

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
8.4 Improve progressively, through 2030, global resource efficiency in consumption and production and endeavour to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation, in accordance with the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production, with developed countries taking the lead	8.4.1 Material footprint, material footprint per capita, and material footprint per GDP	Tier I	Tier II	UNEP	OECD	<p>CHECK DATABASE- maybe Tier II</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP maintains and updates the global material flows database. OECD: A suggested methodology exists, but not yet an international consensus. Once agreed, the data can be produced for most countries in the world as of 2000 (or earlier years). Work done by the OECD, the UNEP International Resource Panel and Eurostat. An OECD-UNEP expert workshop will be held in 2016 to finalize the work. Preliminary data have been produced by UNEP.</p> <p>Metadata (sent by UNEP, none from OECD): http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-12.pdf (pg. 3) Database: http://uneplive.unep.org/material Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): 79% AP/93% Africa/100% LAC/+100% Euro, NA, etc. Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): 41% AP/71% Euro, NA, etc./ no coverage for all other regions Data coverage (OECD): can be calculated for most countries in all regions for both coverage periods Data disaggregation: Type of raw material</p> <p>Methodology: UNEP: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. OECD: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP to lead. The indicator 'material footprint of consumption' has been proposed in a seminal paper in the premier Journal Proceedings of the American Academy of Sciences (PNAS) by Wiedmann et al. (2015). The UNEP International Resource Panel has adopted the indicator and has established a global dataset. The OECD has also adopted the indicator and will provide further guidance and policy support for consumption based measures of material flows. European Union member countries report material footprint (named raw material consumption) to EUROSTAT and the OECD reports yearly data for its member countries. The most complete global dataset is available at the UNEP global data platform UNEP Live http://uneplive.unep.org/ Material footprint per capita is derived by dividing material footprint by the population (from UN population statistics).</p>
	8.4.2 Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita, and domestic material consumption per GDP	Tier I	Tier II	UNEP	OECD	<p>CHECK DATABASE- maybe Tier III</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP maintains and updates the global material flows database. OECD: The data can be produced for almost all countries in the world, using an agreed methodology. All European Union countries produce material flow data regularly (mandatory reporting). The OECD database covers OECD member countries, accession countries, and key partners. In 2015, UNEP has produced data for all countries in the world.</p> <p>Metadata (sent by UNEP, none from OECD): http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-12.pdf (pg. 3) Database (UNEP): http://uneplive.unep.org/material Database (OECD): http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00695-en; OECD "Material resources", OECD Environment Statistics (database). Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): 79% AP/93% Africa/100% LAC/+100% Euro, NA, etc. Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): 41% AP/71% Euro, NA, etc./ no coverage for all other regions Data coverage (OECD): can be calculated for most countries in all regions for both coverage periods; exists for all countries in Europe, North America, etc. Data disaggregation: Type of material resource</p> <p>Methodology: UNEP/OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested OECD: No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP to lead. The indicator 'domestic material consumption' is a well-established indicator for over two decades now. Accounts are based on the EUROSTAT methods guidebook and the SEEA central framework. They are compatible with economic accounts. The UNEP International Resource Panel has adopted the indicator and has established a global dataset. The OECD has also adopted the indicator and has provided policy support. European Union member countries report domestic material consumption to EUROSTAT and the OECD reports yearly data for its member countries. Japan and China, among many other countries use the indicator to monitor their environmental policy effectiveness. The most complete global dataset is available at the UNEP global data platform UNEP Live http://uneplive.unep.org/ The indicator is derived by dividing DMC by population (from UN population statistics). UNEP maintains and updates the global material flows database.</p> <p>Standard Information (OECD): OECD (2008), Measuring Material Flows and Resource Productivity. Eurostat guidance on economy-wide material flow accounts. The data can be produced for almost all countries in the world, using an agreed methodology. All European Union countries produce material flow data regularly (mandatory reporting). The OECD database covers OECD member countries, accession countries, and key partners. In 2015, UNEP has produced data for all countries in the world.</p>
	8.5.1 Average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age and persons with disabilities	Tier I	Tier II	ILO		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. The gender wage gap measures the relative difference between the average hourly earnings for men and the average hourly earnings for women. It is computed as the difference between the gross average hourly earnings of male and female employees expressed as percentage of gross average hourly earnings of male employees. Earnings refers to regular remuneration received from employers, in cash and in kind, and includes direct wages and salaries for time worked or work done, remuneration for time not worked (e.g. paid annual leave), as well as bonuses and gratuities that are regularly received. It excludes contributions paid by employers to social security and pension schemes in respect of their employees, benefits received by employees under these schemes, and severance and termination pay.</p> <p>Resolution concerning an integrated system of wage statistics, available at: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/normativeinstrument/wcms_087496.pdf</p> <p>Data availability: The data is available for 66 countries in the world. There is a need to recalculate hourly earnings under assumptions. In terms of countries reporting, it is clear that there are many countries regularly reporting (66) but there are many not reporting it regularly. Some countries do not have any reliable source to report and work should be done to have the data estimated.</p> <p>Decent Work Indicators: ILO Manual - Second Version, available at: www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/publication/wcms_223121.pdf http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/research-and-databases/kilm/WCMS_422455/lang-en/index.htm http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/normativeinstrument/wcms_087496.pdf http://www.ilo.org/ilostat/faces/help_home/data_by_subject?_adf.ctrl-state=13woyscori_9&_afLoop=455561399705425</p> <p>The gender wage gap is calculated for paid employees only, as earnings data are typically available for employees. Hence, the gender pay gap does not cover large numbers of own-account workers or employers, especially in the informal sector where income differences between men and women may be larger. The gender pay gap does not capture either income differences between the sexes that result from uneven access to paid employment.</p>
8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value		Tier I	Tier II	ILO		

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
	8.5.2 Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities	Tier I	Tier I	ILO		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. The definition of unemployment is one of the oldest statistical standards in the world (dating back to 1923 by the first ICLS). For details, refer to the Resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilization, available at http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/normativeinstrument/wcms_230304.pdf</p> <p>Previous standard, also in use can be consulted in: http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/standards-and-guidelines/resolutions-adopted-by-international-conferences-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_087562/lang-en/index.htm</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: All Africa: All Latin America and the Caribbean: All Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: All</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: All Africa: All Latin America and the Caribbean: All Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: All</p> <p>http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/research-and-databases/kilm/lang-en/index.htm</p> <p>The indicator is widely available both from actual data provided by countries and also by estimates carried out by the ILO yearly. However, the disaggregation by disability is not widely available. It is increasingly reported but coverage is still very low.</p>
8.6 By 2020, substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training	8.6.1 Proportion of youth (aged 15-24 years) not in education, employment or training	Tier I	Tier I	ILO		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Decent Work Indicators: ILO Manual - Second Version http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/publication/wcms_223121.pdf</p> <p>Also referred in: http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/research-and-databases/kilm/WCMS_422439/lang-en/index.htm</p> <p>Decent Work Indicators: ILO Manual - Second Version</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 20 Africa: 22 Latin America and the Caribbean: 24 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 31</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 20 Africa: 20 Latin America and the Caribbean: 23 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 30</p> <p>http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/research-and-databases/kilm/WCMS_422439/lang-en/index.htm</p> <p>Still there are many countries which do not compute or report this indicator, particularly from developing countries. However, the present usual household surveys enable to compute the indicator without major problems since it is a question of reprocessing existing data sets. The world has increasingly been computing this indicator and the trend is increasing steeply.</p>
8.7 Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms	8.7.1 Proportion and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, by sex and age	Tier I	Tier I	ILO, UNICEF		<p>Methodology ILO: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard (ILO). The term child labour reflects the engagement of children in prohibited work and, more generally, in types of work to be eliminated as socially and morally undesirable as guided by national legislation, the ILO Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (No. 138), and the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, 1999 (No. 182), their respective supplementing Recommendations (Nos 146 and 190), and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The statistical measurement framework for child labour is structured around (i) the age of the child; (ii) the productive activities by the child, including their nature and the conditions under which these are performed, and the duration of engagement by the child in such activities. For the purpose of statistical measurement, children engaged in child labour include all persons aged 5 to 17 years who, during a specified time period, were engaged in one or more of the following categories of activities: (a) worst forms of child labour, (as described in paragraphs 17–30, 18th ICLS resolution); (b) employment below the minimum age, (as described in paragraphs 32 and 33 of the 18th ICLS resolution); and (c) hazardous unpaid household services, (as described in paragraphs 36 and 37 of the 18th ICLS resolution), applicable where the general production boundary is used as the measurement framework.</p> <p>Methodology UNICEF: No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work is ongoing towards the development of one (UNICEF). As per the 2008 Resolution concerning Statistics of Child Labour, the operation definition of child labour is based on number of hours spent working and working conditions, and encompasses both engagement in economic activities as well as household chores. However, there is no internationally agreed standard for the measurement of child labour as yet. http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-8.pdf</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present (UNICEF)/(ILO) Asia and Pacific: 13/28; Africa: 35/40; Latin America and the Caribbean: 20/25; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 9/8</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 18/26; Africa: 40/43; Latin America and the Caribbean: 24/25; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 17/8</p> <p>http://data.unicef.org/child-protection/child-labour.html</p> <p>Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS, DHS and ILO-supported SIMPOC have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since around 2000. Many countries also produce national labour estimates and reports that often include data on child labour and/or employment among children. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator.</p> <p>ILO: The database includes information of 5-14 years instead of the 5-17 proposed in the indicator. It is feasible to process the existing data sets to extend the age to 17 and produce regional and global estimations. The information relies heavily in household surveys (SIMPOC, MICS, DHS and others) which include child labour modules. The database is being collected by and ILO-funded centre, UCW based in Rome. As for disaggregation, in some countries it is possible to have income.</p> <p>UNICEF: Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS, DHS and ILO-supported SIMPOC have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since around 2000. Many countries also produce national labour estimates and reports that often include data on child labour and/or employment among children. There are existing tools and mechanisms for data collection that countries have implemented to monitor the situation with regards to this indicator.</p>
	8.8.1 Frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries, by sex and migrant status	Tier I	Tier I	ILO		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Refer to the Resolution concerning statistics of occupational injuries (resulting from occupational accidents), available at http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/standards-and-guidelines/resolutions-adopted-by-international-conferences-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_087528/lang-en/index.htm</p> <p>Availability of data: The ILO has data on the frequency rates of fatal occupational injuries for 117 countries; on the frequency rates of nonfatal occupational injuries for 89 countries; and on the time lost due to occupational injuries for 107 countries.</p> <p>The breakdown by migrant status is not currently available. It is not possible to provide a unique number of countries per region.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
8.8 Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment	8.8.2 Increase in national compliance of labour rights (freedom of association and collective bargaining) based on International Labour Organization (ILO) textual sources and national legislation, by sex and migrant status	Tier I	Tier I	ILO		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. The standard has been agreed at the ILO since it has been undertaken as a way of monitoring compliance of labour rights. It has not been endorsed by ICLS since the monitoring is done jointly with the Penn University and the ILO and it does not involve NSO work. It is based on alternative sources and basically it is based in the coding of violations in textual sources and endeavoured to apply the definitions of labour rights embodied in ILO conventions 87 on Freedom of association and protection of the right to organize and Convention 98 on right to organize and collective bargaining. Sources (they can be included or not as a choice):</p> <p>Reports of the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations Reports of the ILO Conference Committee on the Application of Standards Country baselines under the ILO Declaration Annual Review Representations under Article 24 of the ILO Constitution Complaints under Article 26 of the ILO Constitution Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association National legislation International Trade Union Confederation Survey of violations of Trade Union Rights U.S. Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices</p> <p>Data Availability: All countries http://tur.la.psu.edu/ http://tur.la.psu.edu/ Not currently but possible to have migratory status, gender and other possible vulnerable population The computation of this indicator (with four cluster of optative sources) is being done by the ILO jointly with Penn University (Center for Global Workers' Rights) . It has been computed for 2000, 2005, 2009, 2012 but will be computed annually as from the final adoption of this indicator as an SDG indicator. Currently the computation for 2015 is being undertaken.</p>
	8.9.1 Tourism direct GDP as a proportion of total GDP and in growth rate	Tier II	Tier II	UNWTO	UNEP	<p>Methodology: UNWTO/UNEP:Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Tourism Satellite Account: Recommended Methodological Framework 2008 (TSA: RMF 2008), which updates the 2000 version adopted by the UN Statistical Commission. Available at: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/SeriesF/SeriesF_80rev1e.pdf</p> <p>Data availability from UNWTO: Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 13; Africa: 4; Latin America and the Caribbean: 9; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:31 Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 9; Africa: 5; Latin America and the Caribbean: 15; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 28</p> <p>The indicator seems to be somewhere between Tier 1 and Tier 2. The indicator is conceptually clear, and established methodology and standards are available (Tourism Satellite Account, see above). Some countries are producing this indicator regularly (yearly) for many years now, some others have data intermittently, and still others do not produce it. UNWTO estimates that about 60 countries worldwide are in some stage of Tourism Satellite Account implementation (varying between a pilot exercise and full accounts fully integrated in the National Accounts).</p> <p>UNWTO and other organizations (Eurostat, OECD) have done periodic exercises in the past to compile information on this indicator, but there is currently no international database that compiles this information regularly. UNWTO plans to embark on worldwide compilation of this indicator in the course of 2016.</p> <p>It should also be noted that this indicator can complement indicator 14.7.1 (sustainable fisheries as % GDP) as Target 14.7 also explicitly mentions tourism in addition to fisheries and aquaculture. This would not require additional measurement activity.</p> <p>UNEP: The current proposed indicators under this target do not capture issues related to sustainability. UNEP will continue to work on improving data and statistics on sustainable tourism as opposed to only measuring the size of the tourism sector.</p>
8.9 By 2030, devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products	8.9.2 Number of jobs in tourism industries as a proportion of total jobs and growth rate of jobs, by sex	Tier II	Tier II	UNWTO		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Indicator is firmly based in the International Recommendations for Tourism Statistics 2008 (IRTS 2008), approved by the United Nations Statistical Commission at its 39th session (26-29 February 2008) and the Tourism Satellite Account: Recommended Methodological Framework 2008 (TSA: RMF 2008), which updates the 2000 version adopted by the UN Statistical Commission. Available at: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/SeriesM/SeriesM_83rev1e.pdf and http://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/SeriesF/SeriesF_80rev1e.pdf</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 12 Africa: 7 Latin America and the Caribbean: 10 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:28</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 9 Africa: 3 Latin America and the Caribbean: 15 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 28</p> <p>The indicator is conceptually clear and established methodology and standards are available (IRTS 2008, see above). Some countries are producing this indicator regularly (yearly) for many years now, some others have data intermittently, and still others do not produce it. However, it would seem that many more countries could, without too much additional effort, provide information for this indicator if the necessary detail (breakdown of jobs by activity) is available in the source data, or adjustments are made in the sources to accommodate for the required breakdowns.</p> <p>UNWTO currently compiles in its international database, yearly data for this indicator—“jobs in the tourism industries”—disaggregated by status in employment (employees/self-employed). (It is worth mentioning that UNWTO also compiles data on “full-time equivalent jobs” by status in employment and by sex, as well as “number of employees” by tourism industries.) The indicator can be disaggregated by sex, and some countries produce this information, though it is not currently compiled in an international dataset.</p> <p>In general, coverage for the indicator is still quite low but UNWTO plans to embark on a renewed effort geared at increasing this coverage in the course of 2016.</p> <p>It should also be noted that this indicator can complement indicator 14.7.1 (sustainable fisheries as % GDP) as Target 14.7 also explicitly mentions tourism in addition to fisheries and aquaculture. This would not require additional measurement activity.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
	8.10.1 Number of commercial bank branches and automated teller machines (ATMs) per 100,000 adults	Tier I	Tier I	UNCDF, IMF		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. http://fas.imf.org/Default.aspx. http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-8.pdf</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 49 Africa: 52 Latin America and the Caribbean: 33 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:51</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 49 Africa: 51 Latin America and the Caribbean: 32 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 51</p>
8.10 Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all	8.10.2 Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank	UNCDF	<p>Methodology: World Bank & UNCDF: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. http://datatopics.worldbank.org/financialinclusion/</p> <p>Data availability from UNCDF/World Bank Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 37/35 Africa: 37/38 Latin America and the Caribbean: 21/21 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:48/47</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 0/0 Africa: 0/0 Latin America and the Caribbean: 0/0 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 0/0</p> <p>http://datatopics.worldbank.org/financialinclusion/ G20 Global Partnership for Financial Inclusion (GPII) adopted the G20 Financial Inclusion Indicators in 2012. This particular indicator is one of them. http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=1228 www.worldbank.org/globalindex World Bank's Global Findex database is based on individual level surveys worldwide, conducted every three years. The first round of the survey was done in 2011, and the second in 2014. The third round will be done in 2017. The database covers about 140 countries.</p>
8.a Increase Aid for Trade support for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, including through the Enhanced Integrated Framework for Trade-related Technical Assistance to Least Developed Countries	8.a.1 Aid for Trade commitments and disbursements	Tier I	Tier I	OECD		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. See website at http://www.oecd.org/trade/aft/ http://www.oecd.org/dac/aft/aid-for-tradestatisticalqueries.htm</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 3 Africa: 0 Latin America and the Caribbean: 0 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:31</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 1 Africa: 0 Latin America and the Caribbean: 0 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 23</p> <p>The numbers given above for countries refer to donors from whom the data are sought. Data are also available on the receipts of aid among all developing countries, including receipts from multilateral agencies.</p>
8.b By 2020, develop and operationalize a global strategy for youth employment and implement the Global Jobs Pact of the International Labour Organization	8.b.1 Total government spending in social protection and employment programmes as a proportion of the national budgets and GDP	Tier III	Tier III	ILO	World Bank	<p>Methodology: No. There is no methodology for the indicator.</p> <p>No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work is ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>The indicator is a calculation with GDP and national budget as per SNA and international definitions. As for social protection there is ongoing work towards agreeing on standard definition and on employment programmes it should be defined.</p> <p>For general information on social security statistics, refer to the Resolution concerning the development of social security statistics, available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/standards-andguidelines/resolutions-adopted-by-international-conferences-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_087550/lang-en/index.htm</p> <p>Statistical information on social security can be found in the statistical knowledge base of the ILO Social Protection Department, available at: http://www.ilo.org/secsoc/areas-of-work/statistical-knowledge-base/lang-en/index.htm</p> <p>The SNA aggregates and the national budget statistics are developed. There should be a taxonomy of what is the social protection and employment programmes components including but they are both concepts taken from the national accounting at the country levels. Currently it is not computed but the raw components are usually widely available in countries.</p> <p>No data</p>
Goal 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation						

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
	9.1.1 Proportion of the rural population who live within 2 km of an all-season road	Tier II	Tier III	World Bank	UNEP	<p>Methodology World Bank and UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>Data availability from World Bank</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 2; Africa: 6; Latin America and the Caribbean: -; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:-</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: -; Africa: -; Latin America and the Caribbean: -; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: -</p> <p>The Rural Access Index (RAI) is a well-defined development indicator in the transport sector. It measures the share of people who live in 2km distance from an all-season road (see Roberts et al. (2006) "Rural Access Index: A Key Development Indicator" Transport Papers No. 10). The World Bank is currently working on establishing a new method to measure this index with new global spatial data and GIS techniques used. The definition remains broadly the same, although the way of measuring road condition is slightly changed because the new method uses different sources of data. It measures the share of rural people who live within 2 km of a road in good condition. With 8 pilot countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Nepal and Bangladesh) tested, the proposed method has been confirmed to be robust and implementable. All technical details will be available in the forthcoming report "Measuring Rural Access: Using new technologies" by the World Bank, which will be published by end-June. The developed methodology is planned to be rolled out to other 30 countries in the next FY.</p> <p>UNEP: No data. UNEP's transport work does not cover this aspect so we are not equipped as an agency to contribute to any data collection but we can contribute to bringing the environment into the scope of measuring the target.</p>
9.1 Develop quality, reliable, sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including regional and trans-border infrastructure, to support economic development and human well-being, with a focus on affordable and equitable access for all	9.1.2 Passenger and freight volumes, by mode of transport	Tier I	Tier I	ICAO	UPU, UNEP	<p>Methodology from ICAO: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) through its Statistics Division have established standard methodologies and definitions to collect and report traffic (passenger and freight volume) data related to air transport. These standards and methodologies have been adopted by the 191 Member States of ICAO and also by the Industry stakeholders i.e air carriers and airports. The data of ICAO is used by States and also the World Bank for its development indicators, http://www.icao.int/sustainability/Documents/DataDescription.pdf; file:///C:/localcache/asainarayan/Downloads/Form_A-Instructions_en%20(7).pdf</p> <p>Methodology from Universal Postal Union: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>Methodology from UNEP: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. UNEP will work with Eurostat and Regional SCs. To date rising passenger and freight volumes have generally led to increases in GHG emissions and - in many areas - other direct environmental impacts, most noticeably the degradation of urban air quality but also conversion of land. Most problems arise from the increase in use of (poor quality) fossil fuels. Cleaner fuels and vehicles can reduce but not eliminate the environmental impacts of transport.</p> <p>Data availability from ICAO/UPU</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 55/ almost all countries; Africa: 52/almost all countries; Latin America and the Caribbean: 31/ almost all countries; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:50/ almost all countries</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 55/none; Africa: 52/ none; Latin America and the Caribbean: 31/ none; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 50/ none</p> <p>Can we provided immediately in CSV or MDX format</p> <p>In cooperation with ICAO, UPU is currently contributing to an improved measure of transported freight, that would include all postal and express shipments covering most of e-commerce transactions worldwide.</p> <p>To date rising passenger and fright volumes have generally led to increases in GHG emissions and - in many areas - other direct environmental impacts, most noticeably the degradation of urban air quality but also conversion of land. Most problems arise from the increase in use of (poor quality) fossil fuels. Cleaner fuels and vehicles can reduce but not eliminate the environmental impacts of transport.</p>
9.2 Promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and, by 2030, significantly raise industry's share of employment and gross domestic product, in line with national circumstances, and double its share in least developed countries	9.2.1 Manufacturing value added as a proportion of GDP and per capita	Tier I	Tier I	UNIDO	World Bank	<p>Methodology: (World Bank and UNIDO) Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Data availability from World Bank and UNIDO</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present</p> <p>Asia and Pacific: 60/26</p> <p>Africa: 50/35</p> <p>Latin America and the Caribbean: 25/34</p> <p>Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:60/52</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009</p> <p>Asia and Pacific: 60/28</p> <p>Africa: 50/38</p> <p>Latin America and the Caribbean: 25/31</p> <p>Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 360/9</p> <p>stat.unido.org</p> <p>System of National Accounts 2008. http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NV.IND.MANF.ZS</p>
	9.2.2 Manufacturing employment as a proportion of total employment	Tier I	Tier I	UNIDO		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. www.enterprisesurveys.org</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present</p> <p>Asia and Pacific: 45</p> <p>Africa: 25</p> <p>Latin America and the Caribbean: 25</p> <p>Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:60</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009</p> <p>Asia and Pacific: 40</p> <p>Africa: 15</p> <p>Latin America and the Caribbean: 20</p> <p>Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 60</p> <p>www.enterprisesurveys.org</p> <p>Although there is agreed standard on value added, there is no established definition of the term small scale. Small scale as defined for policy purpose such as taxation varies from country to country. For statistical purpose industries employing less than 10 persons are considered as small.</p> <p>IAEG-SDG should form a task force or committee of NSOs and international agencies to come up with some recommendations on definition of small scale industry.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
9.3 Increase the access of small-scale industrial and other enterprises, in particular in developing countries, to financial services, including affordable credit, and their integration into value chains and markets	9.3.1 Proportion of small-scale industries in total industry value added	Tier I	Tier III	UNIDO & UNCDF		<p>Methodology (UNIDO/UNCDF): Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Although there is agreed standard on value added, there is no established definition of the term small scale. Small scale as defined for policy purpose such as taxation varies from country to country. For statistical purpose industries employing less than 10 persons are considered as small.</p> <p>Data Availability from UNCDF/UNIDO Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 23/25; Africa: 26/15; Latin America and the Caribbean: 30/10; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:25/35 Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 30/20; Africa: 42/10; Latin America and the Caribbean: 17/10; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 29/35 IAEG-SDG should form a task force or committee of NSOs and international agencies to come up with some recommendations on definition of small scale industry.</p>
	9.3.2 Proportion of small-scale industries with a loan or line of credit	Tier I	Tier III	UNIDO & UNCDF	World Bank	<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. G20 Global Partnership for Financial Inclusion (GPII) adopted the G20 Financial Inclusion Indicators in 2012. This particular indicator is one of them. www.enterprisesurveys.org</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 14 Africa: 13 Latin America and the Caribbean: 29 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:18 Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 28 Africa: 41 Latin America and the Caribbean: 15 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 23</p> <p>This is based on the “green indicators” from the November 2, 2015 document: 9.3.2 Percentage of SMEs with a loan or line of credit. The February 19, 2016 document, Annex IV, has a different wording for 9.3.2 which is “Proportion of small-scale industries with a loan or line of credit”. We feel that this is not well-defined, as all small-scale industries in a given country will likely have at least one enterprise with a loan or line of credit. The value of this latter indicator will likely be artificially high while the actual access to finance by SMEs in the country is low. Instead we propose to use the indicator from the November 2, 2015 document, which was already “green”, and is a better measure of access to finance by SMEs.</p> <p>Methodology (UNIDO/UNCDF): Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Although there is agreed standard on value added, there is no established definition of the term small scale. Small scale as defined for policy purpose such as taxation varies from country to country. For statistical purpose industries employing less than 10 persons are considered as small.</p> <p>Data Availability from UNCDF/UNIDO Data Availability 2010 – Present: Asia and Pacific: 23/25; Africa: 42/10; Latin America and the Caribbean: 30/10; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:25/35 Data Availability 2000-2009: Asia and Pacific: 30/20; Africa: 26/15; Latin America and the Caribbean: 17/10; Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan: 29/35 IAEG-SDG should form a task force or committee of NSOs and international agencies to come up with some recommendations on definition of small scale industry.</p>
9.4 By 2030, upgrade infrastructure and retrofit industries to make them sustainable, with increased resource-use efficiency and greater adoption of clean and environmentally sound technologies and industrial processes, with all countries taking action in accordance with their respective capabilities	9.4.1 CO ₂ emission per unit of value added	Tier I	Tier I	UNIDO IEA UNFCCC?	UNEP	<p>Methodology (UNIDO, IEA, UNEP) Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Data availability (IEA/UNIDO) Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 40/23 Africa: 20/29 Latin America and the Caribbean: 20/22 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:60/all Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 40/23 Africa: 15/29 Latin America and the Caribbean: 15/22 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:55/all</p> <p>CO₂ emissions are computed: - according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Inventories (as required within UNFCCC process); http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol2.html - starting from national energy statistics, which follow methodologies and definitions of UN International Recommendations on Energy Statistics (IRES) http://www.unosd.org/content/documents/1241UN%20STATISTICS%20BG-IRES.pdf CO₂/GDP can be computed at economy-wide level. (Various measures of GDP are possible) This indicator could also be computed at sectoral level (e.g. CO₂ emissions / VA, for each industrial ISIC subsector, etc). http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/co2-emissions-from-fuel-combustion-highlights-2015.html For information: the IEA currently publishes this indicator with global coverage, based on its own energy statistics data collection and application of IPCC methodologies to estimate CO₂ emissions. Estimated number of countries coverage above only based on current availability within IEA database. UNEP will work with lead agencies on clean and EST technologies (CTCN)</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
9.5 Enhance scientific research, upgrade the technological capabilities of industrial sectors in all countries, in particular developing countries, including, by 2030, encouraging innovation and substantially increasing the number of research and development workers per 1 million people and public and private research and development spending	9.5.1 Research and development expenditure as a proportion of GDP	Tier I	Tier I	UNESCO-UIS		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Data are collected globally using the methodology as laid down in the Frascati Manual - Guidelines for collecting and reporting data on Research and Experimental Development. Although an OECD Manual, it has been adopted globally, including by UNESCO. In the latest edition, which came out in October 2015, the perspective of developing countries was fully mainstreamed in the Manual. Website: http://oe.cd/frascati http://www.uis.unesco.org/DataCentre/Pages/BrowseScience.aspx Sector of performance; Source of funds; Type of activity; Type of cost; Fields of R&D; Socio-economic objective</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 34 Africa: 15 Latin America and the Caribbean: 16 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:44</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 36 Africa: 28 Latin America and the Caribbean: 22 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:46</p>
	9.5.2 Researchers (in full-time equivalent) per million inhabitants	Tier I	Tier I	UNESCO-UIS		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Data are collected globally using the methodology as laid down in the Frascati Manual - Guidelines for collecting and reporting data on Research and Experimental Development. Although an OECD Manual, it has been adopted globally, including by UNESCO. In the latest edition, which came out in October 2015, the perspective of developing countries was fully mainstreamed in the Manual. Website: http://oe.cd/frascati http://www.uis.unesco.org/DataCentre/Pages/BrowseScience.aspx Sector of performance; Source of funds; Type of activity; Type of cost; Fields of R&D; Socio-economic objective</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 25 Africa: 15 Latin America and the Caribbean: 13 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:42</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 28 Africa: 15 Latin America and the Caribbean: 13 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:42</p>
9.a Facilitate sustainable and resilient infrastructure development in developing countries through enhanced financial, technological and technical support to African countries, least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States	9.a.1 Total official international support (official development assistance plus other official flows) to infrastructure	Tier I	Tier I	OECD		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. The methods and standards of DAC statistics on ODA and other resource flows are explained at http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm http://dotstat.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=70690, metadata in sidebar</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present: Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:31 Data Availability 2000-2009: Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:23 http://dotstat.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=70690</p> <p>The numbers given above for countries refer to donors from whom the data are sought. Data are also available on the receipts of aid among all developing countries, including receipts from multilateral agencies.</p>
9.b Support domestic technology development, research and innovation in developing countries, including by ensuring a conducive policy environment for, inter alia, industrial diversification and value addition to commodities	9.b.1 Proportion of medium and high-tech industry value added in total value added	Tier I	Tier II	OECD UNIDO		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. www.oecd.org/sti/ind/40729523.pdf plus http://dotstat.oecd.org/OECDStat_Metadata/ShowMetadata.ashx?Dataset=SNA_TABLE6A&Lang=en</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 1 Africa: 0 Latin America and the Caribbean: 3 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:28</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 1 Africa: 0 Latin America and the Caribbean: 1 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:30</p> <p>http://dotstat.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=STAN08BIS http://dotstat.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=SNA_TABLE6A</p> <p>Input data (value added by industry) is widely available and can be collected, and combined with the OECD list of high and medium tech industries, to produce the indicator for a wide variety of countries over time. Currently only OECD countries are available.</p>
9.c Significantly increase access to information and communications technology and strive to provide universal and affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by 2020	9.c.1 Proportion of population covered by a mobile network, by technology	Tier I	Tier I	ITU		<p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/publications/handbook.aspx http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/intcoop/sdgs/ITU-ICT-technical-information-sheets-for-the-SDG-indicators-Sept2015.pdf</p> <p>Data Availability 2010 – Present Asia and Pacific: 44 Africa: 46 Latin America and the Caribbean: 29 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:51</p> <p>Data Availability 2000-2009 Asia and Pacific: 56 Africa: 50 Latin America and the Caribbean: 32 Europe, North America, Australia, New Zealand and Japan:52</p> <p>http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/publications/wtid.aspx</p> <p>ITU collects data for this indicator through an annual questionnaire from national regulatory authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet service providers. By 2014, data on 2G mobile population coverage were available for about 144 countries, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. Data on 3G mobile population coverage were available for 135 countries. ITU publishes data on this indicator yearly.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
Goal 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries						
10.1 By 2030, progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the population at a rate higher than the national average	10.1.1 Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 per cent of the population and the total population	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank		<p>Metadata: Yes, http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/brief/global-database-of-shared-prosperity</p> <p>Database: http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/brief/global-database-of-shared-prosperity</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 36%, AF 30%, LAC 48%, Europe/NA 85%</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 41%, AF 50%, LAC 58%, Europe/NA 44%</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>"The indicator is calculated based on fundamental principles of economic distribution and analysis. It uses the same household survey data country's use to calculate national poverty measures. It is a simple and unambiguous measure. Thus, despite not having a formal agreed international standard because of its methodological clarity and use of existing data sources to calculate other SDG targets (such as targets 1.1 and targets 1.2) this should be a tier 1 indicator.</p> <p>For details see: http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/brief/global-database-of-shared-prosperity"</p>
10.2 By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status	10.2.1 Proportion of people living below 50 per cent of median income, by age, sex and persons with disabilities	Tier III	Tier III	World Bank		<p>Metadata: No</p> <p>Database: No</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): no availability</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): no availability</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>The indicator is conceptually clear and the methodology can be developed. It would use the same household income or consumption data used by countries to produce official estimates of poverty (based on monetary measures). The same underlying data source that this indicator would use would also be used for monitoring SDG targets 1.1 and 10.1.</p>
10.3 Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard	10.3.1 Proportion of the population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed within the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law		Tier III	OHCHR		<p>No information provided for the indicator.</p> <p>Same as indicator 16.b.1.</p>
10.4 Adopt policies, especially fiscal, wage and social protection policies, and progressively achieve greater equality	10.4.1 Labour share of GDP, comprising wages and social protection transfers	Tier I	Tier I	ILO	IMF	<p>Metadata: Yes</p> <p>Database: http://www.ilo.org/dyn/ilossi/ssimain.home</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): all</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): all</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Explanation: "Data for global and regional monitoring are extracted from administrative data. They are available in ILO (2014a) and IMF (2014) databases and in the System of National Accounts, for 200 countries."</p> <p>"National estimates: total. Global estimates: total, by region, national income level"</p>
10.5 Improve the regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions and strengthen the implementation of such regulations	10.5.1 Financial Soundness Indicators		Tier III	IMF		<p>Check to see if any information sent in.</p> <p>No information provided for the indicator.</p>
10.6 Ensure enhanced representation and voice for developing countries in decision-making in global international economic and financial institutions in order to deliver more effective, credible, accountable and legitimate institutions	10.6.1 Proportion of members and voting rights of developing countries in international organizations		Tier I			<p>Identify compiling agency.</p> <p>No information provided for the indicator.</p>
	10.7.1 Recruitment cost borne by employee as a proportion of yearly income earned in country of destination	Tier III	Tier III	ILO, World Bank		<p>Metadata: No</p> <p>Database: http://www.ilo.org/dyn/ilossi/ssimain.home</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 16%, AF 4%, LAC 12%, Europe/NA 6%</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 0%, AF 2%, LAC 3%, Europe/NA 0%</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work is ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>The Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development (KNOMAD), the ILO and the World Bank are surveying workers to learn about their labour migration costs, which include recruitment cost, foregone wages due to underpayment, late payment or non-payment of wages, lack of compensation for work-related sickness or injuries among other issues. KNOMAD is preparing a bilateral matrix on these costs with focus on agricultural, construction and domestic workers.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
10.7 Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies	10.7.2 Number of countries that have implemented well-managed migration policies	Tier II (IOM)/ Tier III (WB)	Tier III	Population Division, IOM	World Bank, Global Migration Group	<p>Metadata: Yes - http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-10.pdf 7. Data (IOM) No (World Bank)</p> <p>Database: http://esa.un.org/PopPolicy/about_database.aspx (IOM)</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): universal coverage reported by IOM; low coverage reported by World Bank</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): universal coverage reported by IOM; low coverage reported by World Bank</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested.</p> <p>WORLD BANK: No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>IOM and UNDESA/PD - No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. Explanation: "There is currently no agreed international standard of what represents a "well-managed migration policy". However, efforts are underway within IOM and DESA to identify a viable proxy.</p> <p>Indicator 10.7.2 is based on IOM Council resolution No. 1310 adopted on 24 November 2015, which encouraged Member States to use a Migration Governance Framework to enhance their own governance of migration and mobility. The framework uses six policy domains to define a "'well-managed migration policy'". These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutional capacity and policy 2. Migrant rights and integration 3. Safe and orderly migration 4. Labour migration and recruitment costs 5. International cooperation and partnerships 6. Humanitarian crises and migration policy <p>Each policy domain includes one key sub-indicator."</p> <p>WORLD BANK: The Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development (KNOMAD), the OECD, UNDP and the World Bank are developing a dashboard of indicators for measuring policy and institutional coherence for migration and development. This dashboard could serve as the indicator for assessing well managed migration policies. The dashboard promotes an understanding of the links between migration and development in different contexts. The set of indicators will help to measure how countries have implemented well-managed migration policies. The indicator has five policy dimensions: 1) Promote institutional coherence; 2) Reduce the costs of migration; 3) Protect the rights of migrants and their families; 4) Promote the (re) integration of migrants; 5) Enhance the development impact of migration.</p>
10.a Implement the principle of special and differential treatment for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, in accordance with World Trade Organization agreements	10.a.1 Proportion of tariff lines applied to imports from least developed countries and developing countries with zero-tariff	Tier I	Tier I	ITC/ UNCTAD/ WTO		<p>Metadata: Yes, Referring to MDG Target 8.A (indicator 8.6) the metadata is available at the following link http://www.mdg-trade.org/Metadata38.aspx</p> <p>Database: www.macmap.org/ http://tao.wto.org</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 72%, AF 91%, LAC 100%, Europe/NA 96%</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 76%, AF 94%, LAC 100%, Europe/NA 96%</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested</p> <p>Yes. There is an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Explanation: "The indicator has been agreed jointly by ITC, UNCTAD and WTO.</p> <p>A very similar indicator was already calculated under MDG Target 8.A (indicator 8.6). For reference purposes see The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015 available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%2015).pdf (p. 64)"</p> <p>"Data availability it has been indicated for tariff data. 1 data point for trade data (which are also needed to calculate this indicator) is available for all countries (whether through direct or mirror data). This indicator can generally be compiled around March of each year. At that time (say year y), the indicator is compiled for (y-2), corresponding to the availability of detailed bi-lateral trade flows.</p> <p>Tariff data for the calculation of this indicator are retrieved from ITC (MACMap) - http://www.macmap.org/ - WTO (IDB) - http://tao.wto.org - and UNCTAD (TRAINS) databases. Tariff data are collected every year for more than 130 countries and territories. WTO data are received directly from WTO Members and are processed and verified. They are jointly validated by the members themselves. Calculations of ad valorem equivalents are provided by ITC.</p> <p>Trade data are needed for specific calculations are retrieved from ITC (Trade Map) - http://www.trademap.org/ - UNSD (COMTRADE) - http://comtrade.un.org/ - and WTO (IDB) - http://tao.wto.org - databases. Trade data has at least a one-year lag in terms of availability compared to tariffs.</p> <p>The following caveats should be taken in consideration while reviewing this indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Accurate estimates on special and differential treatment for developing countries do not exist, thus the calculations are limited to tariffs only. These are only part of the trade limitation factors, especially when looking at exports of developing or least developed countries under non-reciprocal preferential treatment that set criteria for eligibility. > A full coverage of preferential schemes of developed countries are used for the computation, but preferential treatment may not be fully used by developing countries' exporters for different reasons such as the inability of certain exporters to meet eligibility criteria (i.e., complying with rules of origin). As there is no accurate statistical information on the extent of the actual utilisation of each of these preferences, it is assumed that they are fully utilised. > Duty free treatment is an indicator of market access, but is not always synonymous with preferential treatment for beneficiary countries, because a number of MFN tariffs are already at, or close to, zero, especially for fuels and minerals. International agreements on IT products also offer duty-free treatment for components and equipment used for production purpose"
10.b Encourage official development assistance and financial flows, including foreign direct investment, to States where the need is greatest, in particular least developed countries, African countries, small island developing States and landlocked developing countries, in accordance with their national plans and programmes	10.b.1 Total resource flows for development, by recipient and donor countries and type of flow (e.g. official development assistance, foreign direct investment and other flows)	Tier I	Tier I (ODA)/ Tier II (FDI)	OECD		<p>Metadata: Yes, http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm</p> <p>Database: http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm</p> <p>Data coverage (2010+): AP 100%, AF 93%, LAC 91%, Europe/NA 65%</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): AP 100%, AF 93%, LAC 91%, Europe/NA 63%</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested</p> <p>Yes. There is an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Explanation: The methods and standards of DAC statistics on ODA and other resource flows are explained at http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm</p> <p>"Numbers of countries here include both donors and recipients. Data for recipients are less complete for private flows."</p>
10.c By 2030, reduce to less than 3 per cent the transaction costs of migrant remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5 per cent	10.c.1 Remittance costs as a proportion of the amount remitted	Tier I	?	World Bank-to confirm		<p>Note World Bank submitted info on alt indicator (10.c.1 Average total cost of sending \$200 (or equivalent in local sending currency, adjusted for inflation) in each country corridor (expressed as % of amount sent)).-- Check on how calculated for applicability for current indicator.</p> <p>No information provided for the indicator.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable						
11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums	11.1.1 Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements or inadequate housing	Tier I	Tier I	UN-Habitat	UNEP	<p>UN-Habitat: The definition of this indicator and its methodology and metadata was approved by the UNSC in 2002. Indicator 11.1.1 was used in the use MDG monitoring and reporting, as part of the slum component of this indicators. This indicator was part of MDG 7 “Ensure Environmental Sustainability” that belonged to Target 4 of the MDGs: “Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020”. The indicator has been estimated for the past 15 years as part of the MDG reporting, and its feasibility has been already proven.</p> <p>Data on slums is available for all developing countries as it has been reported by UN-Habitat in the S-G Reports The Millennium Development Goals Reports in a yearly basis. Since 2015, UN-Habitat collects information related to slums and improved shelter as part of the City Prosperity Initiative (CPI) at the city level. Data is being collected for nearly 400 cities around the world. This information can be disaggregated as per the slum components as follows: i) improved shelter; ii) access to improved water; iii) access to improved sanitation; and iv) overcrowding.</p> <p>UN-Habitat can continue to provide technical support on the estimation of this indicator and its recent use integrating spatial and risk analysis and the disaggregation of the information at city level that is now available.</p> <p>The inadequate housing component of the indicator has extensive metadata, studies and analysis that can be found in the biographic references of “UN-Habitat: Monitoring Framework SDG 11”. Data on inadequate housing, measured through housing affordability, is available in many countries. UN-Habitat and World Bank computed this indicator for many years (1996-2006) as part of the Urban Indicators Programme. Recently, the Global Housing Indicators Working Group, a collaborative effort of Cities Alliance, Habitat for Humanity International, the Inter-American Development Bank, UN-Habitat and the World Bank are collecting data on the housing adequacy component of this indicator worldwide.</p> <p>The inadequate housing component of the indicator has extensive metadata, studies and analysis that can be found in the biographic references of “UN-Habitat: Monitoring Framework SDG 11”. Data on inadequate housing, measured through housing affordability, is available in many countries. UN-Habitat and World Bank computed this indicator for many years (1996-2006) as part of the Urban Indicators Programme. Recently, the Global Housing Indicators Working Group, a collaborative effort of Cities Alliance, Habitat for Humanity International, the Inter-American Development Bank, UN-Habitat and the World Bank are collecting data on the housing adequacy component of this indicator worldwide.</p> <p>UNEP can contribute to the definition of basic services as this is within the scope of UNEP's existing work on SDG ontologies.</p>
11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons	11.2.1 Proportion of population that has convenient access to public transport, by sex, age and persons with disabilities	Tier II	Tier II	UN-Habitat	UNEP	<p>UN-Habitat: Information for public transport accessibility measurement is currently available for high- and upper-middle- income countries. Although there is a paucity of data from low income countries, the level of data availability for monitoring this indicator is increasingly growing.</p> <p>Several organizations such as the European Commission, the International Association of Public Transport (UITP), WB Global Transport Database, BRTdata.org, Metrobis, OECD in figures, International Transport Forum, WDI, have advanced definitions and metadata on Public transport that can constitute the basis to agree on an international definition and standard.</p> <p>Based on the above available definitions, and institutional and regional standards, UN-Habitat has been working towards the development of an international agreed definition that incorporates spatial analysis to fit to the indicator 11.2.1.</p> <p>The City Prosperity Initiative (CPI) has been collecting information in several related transport indicators. Recently, to respond to SDGs Monitoring needs, UN-Habitat has adapted the CPI framework to respond to this particular indicator. (The Global Goals for Sustainable Development and City Prosperity Initiative, http://unhabitat.org/the-global-goals-for-sustainable-development-and-city-prosperity-initiative/).</p> <p>Several databases on transport are available. This information and related methods can be adjusted and developed to allow the computation of indicator 11.2.1. New technologies that rely on open data information can become reliable methods of data collection for cities and countries that do not have officially available information.</p> <p>Since data for this indicator is originated at urban or city level, UN-Habitat has developed the methodology to aggregate the information at national, regional and global levels. This method consists in the creation of national samples of cities that are statistically representative of the country. Specialized training and capacity development is already being implemented in selected countries.</p> <p>UNEP can contribute through working with lead agencies on definitions</p> <p>Data available for about 1/3 of countries in Latin America and in Asia. Better coverage exists in Europe but there is ver low data availability for African countries.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
11.3 By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries	11.3.1 Ratio of land consumption rate to population growth rate	Tier II	Tier II	UN-Habitat	UNEP, UNDP	<p>UN-Habitat: Data for indicator 11.3.1 is available for all cities and countries through UN-DESA for population data and satellite images from various open sources. The methodology of this indicator has been extensively applied by several countries and cities as well as other international organizations dealing with land consumption measurements and monitoring.</p> <p>Based on the above database and sources of information, UN-Habitat has developed a method that can constitute an international agreed definition for the indicator 11.3.1.</p> <p>Data for this indicator can be easily availed using global and local sources. The indicator has been collected and analyzed since 2000 by several municipalities and countries. Various governments (Mexico, Colombia Brazil, India, Ethiopia, etc., and most European countries) have collected data on this indicator recently.</p> <p>Eurostat collects data on this indicator using other comparable techniques. World Bank and Lincoln Institute collected data for 120 cities and published it in the Atlas of Urban Expansion. Currently UN-Habitat, Lincoln Institute and New York University prepared a similar study for another 200 cities.</p> <p>UN-Habitat City Prosperity Initiative is collecting data on this indicator for nearly 300 cities as part of the Agency's efforts to integrate spatial analysis in the SDGs.</p> <p>Since data for this indicator is originated at urban or city level, UN-Habitat has developed the methodology to aggregate the information at national, regional and global levels. This method consists in the creation of national samples of cities that are statistically representative of the country. Specialized training and capacity development is already being implemented in selected countries.</p> <p>UNEP can contribute through work with GEO-GEOSS on land conversion</p> <p>Data availability is for about 1/3 of countries outside of Europe and for about half of European countries. There is established and tested methodology, but work is still ongoing regarding an international standard.</p>
	11.3.2 Proportion of cities with a direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning and management that operate regularly and democratically			Tier III		
11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage	11.4.1 Total expenditure (public and private) per capita spent on the preservation, protection and conservation of all cultural and natural heritage, by type of heritage (cultural, natural, mixed and World Heritage Centre designation), level of government (national, regional and local/municipal), type of expenditure (operating expenditure/investment) and type of private funding (donations in kind, private non-profit sector and sponsorship)	Tier II	Tier III	UNESCO-UIS		<p>There is a methodology but it has not yet been tested and there is an international standard.</p> <p>UNESCO: Data for this indicator is currently not collected at the international level. Therefore it is not possible to gauge what data are available at the national level.</p> <p>A global data collection mechanism will need to be developed. UIS will monitor the indicator. The measurement of private expenditure will require more micro-level financial data and will require a new survey. The survey should consider collecting financial information from a wide range of institutions including foundations and other non-for-profit organizations'; corporate sponsorship and philanthropy; private donations (individuals and other legacies).</p> <p>International concepts and definitions for culture and heritage will be based on the 2009 UNESCO Framework for cultural statistics standard. http://www.uis.unesco.org/culture/Documents/framework-cultural-statistics-culture-2009-en.pdf</p> <p>There also exist UNESCO Recommendation concerning the International Standardization of Statistics on the Public Financing of Cultural Activities 1980. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13068&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html</p> <p>The use of existing international classifications such as the Classification of the Function of the Government (COFOG) could be used.</p>
11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses	11.5.1 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people ²	Tier II	Tier II	UNISDR	UN-Habitat, UNEP	<p>There is an established and tested methodology and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNISDR: The proposed indicators will be also used to monitor Sendai Framework global targets. Therefore the detailed definitions and methodologies has been also submitted and examined by the Member States in the 1st and 2nd Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction (OEIWG), as outlined in Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction 2015-2030. The OEIWG will finalize the discussion and submit the final report to the GA in December 2016.</p> <p>Note that currently 85 countries have a comparable national disaster loss database that is consistent with the UNISDR guidelines and additional 32 countries are expected to be covered in 2015-16. Therefore, by 2020, it is expected that all countries will build/adjust the database according to the UNISDR guidelines and report the data to UNISDR.</p> <p>UNEP will continue to work on improving data and statistics on the link between disasters and the environment and vulnerability to disasters. UNEP will be currently supporting the defining of natural disasters and hazards. Additionally, UNEP will work with UNISDR and other partners on monitoring the Sendai framework.</p> <p>This indicator is also been used by UN-Habitat City Resilience Profiling Programme (CRPP), as part of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, which has helped developed tools, Resilience action plans, and normative guidance towards new resilience standards at city level.</p> <p>UN-Habitat: This metadata provided in collaboration with UNISDR, is based on experience and knowledge built in the period under the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015). It has been tested in xxx countries over a period of xxx years.</p> <p>The proposed indicator has been further reviewed and examined by several UN agencies including FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO (though not all organizations listed here provided comments for this indicator) and submitted to the IAEG process in early-July 2015. It was further reviewed by the Technical Expert Group consisting of more than 60 experts from UN system, academic and research, civil sector and private sector in 27-29 July 2015 and submitted and examined by the Member States in the 1st Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction held in 29-30 September 2015. The indicator is currently under review by the Member States and UNISDR is receiving written inputs from the Member States.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations	11.5.2 Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global GDP, including disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services ^d	Tier II	Tier II	UNISDR	UNEP	<p>There is an established and tested methodology and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UN-Habitat: - UN ECLAC Methodology for economic assessment of loss and damage, and its variants and extensions, namely the World Bank DALA (Damage and Loss Assessment) and the PDNA (Post Disaster Needs Assessment, and extension of the two previous) see http://www.cepal.org/en/publications/handbook-disaster-assessment</p> <p>- GAR methodology, applied in Editions 2015 and 2015 to 56 and 82 countries. see http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/gar/2015/en/gar-pdf/Annex2-Loss_Data_and_Extensive_Risk_Analysis.pdf</p> <p>This is proposal by UNISDR based on experience and knowledge built in the period under the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015). The proposed indicator was further reviewed and examined by other UN agencies including FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO (though not all organizations listed here provided comments for this indicator) and submitted to the IAEG process in early-July 2015, then again reviewed by the Technical Expert Group consisting of more than 60 experts from UN system, academic and research, civil sector and private sector in 27-29 July 2015 and submitted and examined by the Member States in the 1st Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction held in 29-30 September 2015. The suggested indicator is currently under review by the Member States and UNISDR is receiving written inputs from the Member States.</p> <p>The proposed indicators will be also used to monitor Sendai Framework global targets and therefore the detailed definitions shall be discussed and agreed in Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction, as outlined in Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction 2015-2030. The Working Group is likely to finalize the discussion and submit the final report to the GA in December 2016.</p> <p>Note that currently 85 countries have a comparable national disaster loss database that is consistent with the UNISDR guidelines and additional 32 countries are expected to be covered in 2015-16. Therefore, by 2020, it is expected that all countries will build/adjust the database according to the UNISDR guidelines and report the data to UNISDR.</p> <p>Note that for direct economic loss, countries have no data on two sub-indicators (industrial and commercial establishments), however the methodology, based on ECLAC, should be consistent.</p> <p>Damages to infrastructure and interruption of basic services has been collected so far as qualitative indicators (yes/no) of affection due to a hazardous events.</p> <p>UNEP can contribute to the definition of basic services as this is within the scope of UNEP's existing work on SDG ontologies.</p>
11.6 By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management	11.6.1 Proportion of urban solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge out of total urban solid waste generated, by cities	Tier I	Tier II	UN-Habitat, UNSD	UNEP	<p>UN-Habitat: The definition of indicator 11.6.1, its methodology and metadata was initially standardized and largely utilized under UN-Habitat Urban Indicators Programme as two separate indicators (extensive indicator 9: regular solid waste collection, key indicator 15: solid waste disposal). These two indicators have been estimated for the past 10 years as part of the Global Monitoring mandate of UN-Habitat.</p> <p>Based on the existing definitions and methods of data collection, and the use of this indicator in more than 300 cities that are part of the City Prosperity Initiative, UN-Habitat has refined the metadata for the indicator 11.6.1. This can constitute the basis to reach an international agreed definition.</p> <p>Data for the approved SDG indicator 11.6.1 is available at the city and town levels. Information from municipal records, service providers, community profiles and household surveys allow collecting the information. However, in many cities, "solid waste collection and adequate final discharge" data are currently incomplete or not available, particularly in the cities from the developing world. The development of adequate data collection systems may require a significant effort in some jurisdictions. Indicator 11.6.1 has two points of reporting, (i.e the source for establishing if waste is collected regularly or not regularly, and the final discharge point and its level of adequacy), there is a need to integrate them in the monitoring. To solve this problem, training and capacity development programmes are being developed.</p> <p>Since data is originated at urban or city level, UN-Habitat has developed the methodology to aggregate the information at national, regional and global levels. This method consists in the creation of national samples of cities that are statistically representative of the country. Specialized training and capacity development is already being implemented in selected countries.</p> <p>UNEP collects information on wastes through the Basel reporting which can be used for this indicator and some information from the city level</p> <p>UN-Habitat has good data coverage in Europe, Asia and Latin America but lower data coverage for African countries.</p>
	11.6.2 Annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (e.g. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities (population weighted)	Tier I	Tier I	WHO	UN-Habitat, UNEP, OECD	<p>There is an established and tested methodology and an international standard.</p> <p>WHO: Data from cities are being measured and systematically compiled since a few years. A summary of methods to compile urban air pollution methods is available at the following location: http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/en/ http://www.who.int/phe/health_topics/outdoorair/databases/AAP_database_methods_2014.pdf?ua=1 Additional methods to model for current year, and complete for missing cities is currently being developed, and is expected to become available in May 2016.</p> <p>UN-Habitat: The definition of indicator 11.6.2, its methodology and metadata has been proposed by WHO in accordance to the WHO Air Quality Guidelines. The European Commission and several countries have air quality standards limiting the concentration of pollutants in the air.</p> <p>The WHO Global Health Observatory (GHO) houses information on both the exposure (i.e. ambient air quality measurements of fine particulate matter) and associated disease burden. In addition, the GHO provides graphs, tables and interactive tools to depict air pollution levels across regions and countries which can support countries in visualizing their situation and in monitoring progress towards SDG11 more readily.</p> <p>UNEP will lead on AQ monitoring at city level; with WHO for health effects and with UN Habitat</p> <p>Data is available for over 100 countries with good geographical and regional distribution.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities	11.7.1 Average share of the built-up area of cities that is open space for public use for all, by sex, age and persons with disabilities	Tier II	Tier II	UN-Habitat		<p>There is an established and tested methodology but no international standard.</p> <p>UN-Habitat was mandated by its 23rd Governing Council to assist cities and countries in the development of strategies for increasing the public space. Expert Group Meetings and series of Global conferences (Future of Places) have brought together a global community of expert's opinion. Over the last 15 years UN-Habitat and partners have advanced in the creation of definitions, metadata, develop guidelines and toolkits. In addition, UN-Habitat has also advanced in the incorporation of innovative sources of information with the principle of not leaving anyone behind. For this purpose, it has developed and tested tools for doing city inventories of public space to assist cities that do not have available data.</p> <p>There is some data available but data availability is not for most countries and there is low data availability for African countries.</p>
	11.7.2 Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment, by sex, age, disability status and place of occurrence, in the previous 12 months	Tier III	Tier III	UNODC	UN-Women, UN-Habitat, UNDP	<p>UNODC: While there are already agreed international standards on measuring physical and sexual violence through distinct survey instruments (specialized surveys on violence and victimization surveys), there is currently no agreed international standard on the measurement of physical and sexual harassment.</p> <p>In 2010 UNODC-UNECE published a Manual on Victimization Surveys, that provides technical guidance on the implementation of such surveys, on the basis of good practices developed at country level.</p> <p>UN-Women: The initial indicator proposed by UN Women "Proportion of women subjected to physical or sexual harassment by perpetrator and place of occurrence (last 12 months)" was modified to take into account UNODC's suggestion to measure the "Proportion of persons victim of physical or sexual harassment by sex, age and place of occurrence (last 12 months)" which is more comprehensive and more suitable for comparisons. The terms The term physical and sexual harassment will need to be defined. Therefore UN Women would like to suggest working with UNODC to develop such standards.</p> <p>UN-Habitat: The definition of this indicator and its methodology was developed by the Friends of the Chair of the United Nations Statistical Commission on the indicators on violence against women. (E/CN.3/2009/13) in response to the request by the United Nations Statistical Commission to identify and list statistical indicators on violence against women.</p> <p>There is currently no data available that measures harassment.</p>
11.a Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning	11.a.1 Proportion of population living in cities that implement urban and regional development plans integrating population projections and resource needs, by size of city	Tier III	Tier III	UN-Habitat		<p>The indicator 11.a is difficult to measure, ambiguous and not suitable for "strengthening national and regional development planning". The evaluation places the indicator in the category of Tier 3 due to several methodological issues described below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indicator 11.a.1 evaluates "cities that implement urban and regional development plans". However, cities in every country of the world do not implement regional development plans as it is above their jurisdiction. It is under the capacity of regional or national governments to plan at regional level. This methodological inconsistency makes the proposed indicator not linked to policies, not implementable and not measurable. • The concept of 'resource needs' is ambiguous, contextual and difficult to measurable. It can refer to land, natural, energetic, economic, human or technical resources, or all of the above. For example, when taking in consideration the natural resource needs of a city, such as oil, gas, steel, they could each be sourced from a different country. This makes it extremely difficult to 'integrate them in urban and regional development plans', even for cities in developed regions. • Measuring the indicator by the 'percentage of population living in cities...' may result in some governments mainly focusing on large cities in order to have higher coverage in the indicator. This would tend to leave behind smaller cities that would not contribute to improve the rating. Considering that smaller and intermediate cities will grow faster than any other city in the world and that they are home of half of the population in the world, it is important that governments pay special attention to cities of this size, taking into account that this group of cities have higher potential to 'support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas'. • The proposed disaggregation 'by size of city' is not applicable to the indicator, unless the unit of measurement is changed to 'number of cities'. Under the proposed indicator, a single city will either be 'implementing urban development plans' or not, therefore the 100 per cent of its population will be counted as positive or negative for the national aggregation. • The indicator 11.a.1 could be technically improved to make it feasible and better connected to policies in the following way: "Number of cities that implement urban development plans, integrating population projections and LAND resource needs, by size of city." However, this indicator would be measuring URBAN planning. It would still not be relevant to objective of the target to 'support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning'. • UN-Habitat recommendation is to measure the target 11.a through the following proposed indicator: "Number of countries that are developing and implementing a National Urban Policy or Regional Development Plans that (a) respond to population dynamics (b) ensure balanced territorial development and (c) increase local fiscal space." <p>The concept of fiscal space is related to the provision of the necessary resources that would allow the implementation of the national urban policy or regional development plan to achieve the objectives of the targets, Analyzed at the policy level. UN-Habitat can provide further clarifications to the definition of local fiscal space. However, acknowledging that the incorporation of the resources is a fundamental provision to guarantee implementation of the development plans, UN-Habitat can propose the necessary adjustments for this indicator.</p>
11.b By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and	11.b.1 Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 ⁶	Tier III	Tier III	UNISDR	UN-Habitat, UNEP	<p>UNISDR: This indicator has been developed on the basis of the reporting of 140+ countries using the HFA Monitor and the Local Government-Self Assessment Tool of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. Progress reporting by countries on the implementation of the Sendai Framework, using an updated Sendai Monitor, will not begin until the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction (OEIWG) concludes its work. A baseline for all countries as of 2015 is expected to be created by 2017 as the basis for monitoring of the Sendai Framework and the SDGs.</p> <p>UN-Habitat: The indicator 11.b.1 will be also used to monitor the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The Sendai Framework is the first major agreement of the post-2015 development agenda. It was endorsed by the UN-General Assembly following the 2015 Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (WCDRR). Metadata has been provided, and will be adapted to the agreed method as adopted by the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030</p> <p>UNEP is working with UNISDR to improve the definition of natural disaster and hazard</p> <p>There is a suggested methodology but it has not been tested.</p> <p>There is currently no data availability for this indicator.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels	11.b.2 Number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies ^a	Tier II	Tier II	UNISDR	UNEP	<p>UNISDR: This indicator has been developed on the basis of the reporting of 140+ countries using the HFA Monitor of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. Progress reporting by countries on the implementation of the Sendai Framework, using an updated Sendai Monitor, will not begin until the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction (OEIWG) concludes its work. A baseline for all countries as of 2015 is expected to be created by 2017 as the basis for monitoring of the Sendai Framework and the SDGs.</p> <p>This indicator was proposed by UNISDR, and reviewed and examined by other UN agencies and submitted to the IAEG process in 2015 before submission to the OEIWG. The definition, method of computation etc. of this suggested indicator is currently under review by the Member States in the OEIWG. The Working Group will finalize the discussion and submit the final report to the UNGA in December 2016.</p> <p>The availability, nature and quality of national and local strategies for disaster risk reduction varies considerably. Some strategies may exist without necessarily being named thus.</p> <p>There is a suggested methodology but it has not been tested.</p> <p>All countries can report on whether they have these strategies in place, but currently there is no reporting mechanism in place.</p>
11.c Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, in building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials	11.c.1 Proportion of financial support to the least developed countries that is allocated to the construction and retrofitting of sustainable, resilient and resource-efficient buildings utilizing local materials	Tier III	Tier III	UN-Habitat		<p>The indicator 11.c is difficult to measure, ambiguous and not policy oriented. The evaluation places the indicator in the category of Tier 3 due to several methodological issues described below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current indicator is not connected to policy, as LCDs do not have a role in the implementation of the target in order rather than receiving the financial support. The indicator is therefore, not action-oriented towards the improvement of building sustainable and resilient building, nor on the increase utilization of local materials. The current indicator lacks clarity in various aspects, in particular in the 'percentage of financial support', it is not clear which is the denominator to calculate such percentage. Does the indicator refer to the total financial support that each donor country provides to the entire group of LDCs? Or does it refer to the total financial support that each LDC receives? Concepts of "retrofitting buildings" "resilient building" and "resource-efficient buildings" are contextual and need to be clarified. UN-Habitat experience in computing similar information shows that the level of disaggregation of information does not allow –now- to identify the different categories in the utilization of materials, particularly in LDC. UN-Habitat suggests reformulating the indicator to be feasible, suitable, relevant and connected to policies. <p>There is no established methodology and no data currently collected for this indicator.</p>
Goal 12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns						
12.1 Implement the 10-Year Framework of Programmes on Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns, all countries taking action, with developed countries taking the lead, taking into account the development and capabilities of developing countries	12.1.1 Number of countries with sustainable consumption and production (SCP) national action plans or SCP mainstreamed as a priority or a target into national policies			UNEP		<p>No information provided. No metadata received. UNEP (SCP Secretariat) to contact</p>
	12.2.1 Material footprint, material footprint per capita, and material footprint per GDP	Tier I (UNEP)/ Tier II (OECD)	Tier II	UNEP	OECD	<p>UNEP: UNEP maintains and updates the global material flows database. OECD: A suggested methodology exists, but not yet an international consensus. Once agreed, the data can be produced for most countries in the world as of 2000 (or earlier years). Work done by the OECD, the UNEP International Resource Panel and Eurostat. An OECD-UNEP expert workshop will be held in 2016 to finalize the work. Preliminary data have been produced by UNEP.</p> <p>Metadata (sent by UNEP, none from OECD): http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-12.pdf (pg. 3) Database: http://uneplive.unep.org/material Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): 79% AP/93% Africa/0% LAC/+100% Euro, NA, etc. Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): 41% AP/Africa/100%71% Euro, NA, etc./ no coverage for all other regions Data coverage (OECD): can be calculated for most countries in all regions for both coverage periods Data disaggregation: Type of raw material</p> <p>Methodology: UNEP: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. OECD: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP to lead. The indicator 'material footprint of consumption' has been proposed in a seminal paper in the premier Journal Proceedings of the American Academy of Sciences (PNAS) by Wiedmann et al. (2015). The UNEP International Resource Panel has adopted the indicator and has established a global dataset. The OECD has also adopted the indicator and will provide further guidance and policy support for consumption based measures of material flows. European Union member countries report material footprint (named raw material consumption) to EUROSTAT and the OECD reports yearly data for its member countries. The most complete global dataset is available at the UNEP global data platform UNEP Live http://uneplive.unep.org/ Material footprint per capita is derived by dividing material footprint by the population (from UN population statistics).</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
12.2 By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources	12.2.2 Domestic material consumption, domestic material consumption per capita, and domestic material consumption per GDP	Tier I (UNEP)/ Tier II (OECD)	Tier II	UNEP	OECD	<p>UNEP: UNEP maintains and updates the global material flows database.</p> <p>OECD: The data can be produced for almost all countries in the world, using an agreed methodology. All European Union countries produce material flow data regularly (mandatory reporting). The OECD database covers OECD member countries, accession countries, and key partners. In 2015, UNEP has produced data for all countries in the world.</p> <p>Metadata (sent by UNEP, none from OECD): http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-12.pdf (pg. 3) Database (UNEP): http://uneplive.unep.org/material Database (OECD): http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00695-en; OECD "Material resources", OECD Environment Statistics (database). Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): 79% AP/0% Africa/100% LAC/+100% Euro, NA, etc. Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): 41% AP/93Africa/71% Euro, NA, etc./ no coverage for all other regions Data coverage (OECD): can be calculated for most countries in all regions for both coverage periods; exists for all countries in Europe, North America, etc. Data disaggregation: Type of material resource</p> <p>Methodology: UNEP/OECD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested OECD: No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP to lead. The indicator 'domestic material consumption' is a well-established indicator for over two decades now. Accounts are based on the EUROSTAT methods guidebook and the SEEA central framework. They are compatible with economic accounts. The UNEP International Resource Panel has adopted the indicator and has established a global dataset. The OECD has also adopted the indicator and has provided policy support. European Union member countries report domestic material consumption to EUROSTAT and the OECD reports yearly data for its member countries. Japan and China, among many other countries use the indicator to monitor their environmental policy effectiveness. The most complete global dataset is available at the UNEP global data platform UNEP Live http://uneplive.unep.org/ The indicator is derived by dividing DMC by population (from UN population statistics). UNEP maintains and updates the global material flows database. Standard Information (OECD): OECD (2008), Measuring Material Flows and Resource Productivity. Eurostat guidance on economy-wide material flow accounts. The data can be produced for almost all countries in the world, using an agreed methodology. All European Union countries produce material flow data regularly (mandatory reporting). The OECD database covers OECD member countries, accession countries, and key partners. In 2015, UNEP has produced data for all countries in the world.</p>
12.3 By 2030, halve per capita global food waste at the retail and consumer levels and reduce food losses along production and supply chains, including post-harvest losses	12.3.1 Global food loss index	Tier III	Tier III	FAO, UNEP		<p>FAO: The concepts of " loss" (from post harvest up to retail) and " waste" (retail, household and other public consumption) have to be clearly defined and with agreed methodologies.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP has extensive experience in analysis of food waste and reducing food waste. UNEP will work with FAO to bring food waste into context for monitoring this target.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-12.pdf (pg. 5) Database: FAOSTAT Data coverage (2000-2009, FAO): 17% AP/2% Africa/18% LAC/46% Euro, NA, etc./20% of 193 MS Data coverage (2010-present, FAO): 16% AP/2% Africa/12% LAC/33% Euro, NA, etc./16% of 193 MS Data disaggregation: Geographic Location</p> <p>Methodology: UNEP: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. FAO: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. Standard information (UNEP): UNEP can collaborate with FAO on bringing food wastes within the context of monitoring this target.</p>
12.4 By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment	12.4.1 Number of parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous waste, and other chemicals that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement	Tier I	Tier I	UNEP		<p>Metadata: www.informea.org Data coverage (2000-2009): all countries Data coverage (2010-present): all countries</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested Standard Information: UNEP to lead; actively tracks all MEA agreements.</p>
	12.4.2 Hazardous waste generated per capita and proportion of hazardous waste treated, by type of treatment	Not suggested	Tier II	UNSD, UNEP		<p>ADD in UNSD database</p> <p>No information provided for metadata or data coverage.</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. Standard information: UNEP to lead; collects information on wastes through the Basel reporting which can be used for this indicator. Need to define what type of waste recycled</p> <p>ADD in UNSD database</p>
12.5 By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse	12.5.1 National recycling rate, tons of material recycled	Not suggested	Tier III	UNSD, UNEP		<p>No information provided for metadata or data coverage.</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested Standard Information: UNEP can lead on this indicator</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
12.6 Encourage companies, especially large and transnational companies, to adopt sustainable practices and to integrate sustainability information into their reporting cycle	12.6.1 Number of companies publishing sustainability reports	Tier I	Tier III- no agreed methodology	UNEP, GRI		<p>GRI: The GRI Sustainability Disclosure Database is the tool that can be used to monitor indicator 12.6.1.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The database includes all types of sustainability reports, whether GRI-based or otherwise, and relevant information related to the reporting organizations such as size, location, sector, type of organization and other characteristics. - Currently, the database includes more than 30,000 sustainability reports collected since 1999 until today, from over 100 countries and territories. Inclusion of reports in the database is free of charge and it is an open source freely available to the general public. Registration of reports on the database is voluntary. - The database includes all the reports that GRI is currently aware of and it is also populated in collaboration with GRI Data Partners (around 40 partners worldwide). In addition, further desk research can be provided by the GRI secretariat to ensure the robustness of the data. <p>Metadata: http://database.globalreporting.org/ Database: http://database.globalreporting.org/ Data coverage (2000-2009, GRI): 36% AP/20% Africa/33% LAC/77% Euro, NA, etc./42% of 193 MS Data coverage (2010-present, GRI): 52% AP/22% Africa/48% LAC/92% Euro, NA, etc./52% of 193 MS Data disaggregation: Geographic Location, Year; company's size, sector and type of organization</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p>
12.7 Promote public procurement practices that are sustainable, in accordance with national policies and priorities	12.7.1 Number of countries implementing sustainable public procurement policies and action plans	Tier III	Tier III	UNEP		<p>No metadata Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): 3% AP/6%Africa/31% Euro, NA, etc./0 for LAC/8% of 193 MS Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): 7% AP/0% Africa/21% LAC/52% Euro, NA, etc./20% of 193 MS</p> <p>Methodology: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. Standard Information: UNEP can lead the methodological development. There is already a methodology from: http://www.iso.org/iso/news.htm?refid=Ref1873 http://www.iso.org/iso/home/stores/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=63026</p> <p>UNESCO: The reporting requirements for the monitoring of the 1974 Recommendation are being revised to fully capture the information needed for this indicator. Following approval by the UNESCO Executive Board in April 2016 data collection is expected to begin in 2016. UNEP: UNEP will support UNESCO in the development and implementation of this indicator.</p> <p>Metadata: both UNESCO and UNEP state it has been provided to UNSD previously (but no web links) Database: not available (UNESCO) Data coverage (2000-2009, UNESCO): 12% AP/30% Africa (includes Arab states)/27% LAC/52% Euro, NA, etc./32% of 193 MS Data coverage (2010-present, UNESCO): 12% AP/37% Africa (includes Arab states)/21% LAC/48% Euro, NA, etc./27% of 193 MS Data disaggregation: type of education and sector of mainstreaming</p> <p>Methodology: UNESCO: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. Standard Information (UNESCO): The UNESCO '1974 Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, cooperation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms' was adopted by UNESCO's General Conference in 1974. Since then, countries are requested to submit national reports to UNESCO every four years on the implementation of this recommendation. Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP has an active partnership with UNESCO on defining sustainability literacy and will continue to support the development of the methodologies and definitions for this indicator.</p>
12.8 By 2030, ensure that people everywhere have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature	12.8.1 Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development (including climate change education) are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education; and (d) student assessment	Tier I (UNESCO)/ Tier II (UNEP)	Tier III- workplan on methodology	UNESCO	UNEP	<p>UNEP: UNEP will work with UNESCO and the World Bank on the classification of R&D in order to measure this indicator.</p> <p>Metadata: state it has been provided to UNSD previously (but no web links) No data coverage information</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested.</p>
12.a Support developing countries to strengthen their scientific and technological capacity to move towards more sustainable patterns of consumption and production	12.a.1 Amount of support to developing countries on research and development for sustainable consumption and production and environmentally sound technologies	Tier II	Tier III	UNEP UNESCO World Bank OECD-to confirm		<p>UNEP: UNEP will work with UNESCO and the World Bank on the classification of R&D in order to measure this indicator.</p> <p>Metadata: state it has been provided to UNSD previously (but no web links) No data coverage information</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested.</p>
12.b Develop and implement tools to monitor sustainable development impacts for sustainable tourism that creates jobs and promotes local culture and products	12.b.1 Number of sustainable tourism strategies or policies and implemented action plans with agreed monitoring and evaluation tools	Tier III (UNWTO)/ Tier II (UNEP)	Tier III	UNWTO	UNEP	<p>UNWTO: While the indicator duly recognizes the "means of implementation" character of target 12.b, it should be recognized that there are some fundamental measurement issues. Primarily, there is no internationally agreed (statistical) concept that can be used to define a "sustainable tourism strategy or policy and action plan", nor what the relationship/boundary may be between the three different instruments (e.g. a tourism master plan may contain elements of all three—thus would this count as 1 or 3 actions?). In addition, there is currently no international dataset collecting this information, nor any plans to do so, and it would seem difficult to incorporate into existing statistical infrastructures due to the above-mentioned issues. Taking into account this situation, it is suggested that the indicator on "number of strategies or policies and implemented actions plans with agreed monitoring and evaluation tools" be refined to focus on the monitoring tools themselves. The appropriate monitoring tools are the international statistical standards applicable to the measurement of sustainable tourism: the TSA-RMF 2008 and the SEEA 2012 Central Framework. Consequently, the indicator would measure the stage of implementation (number of tables produced) of the SEEA and TSA frameworks. Adopting this refinement would immediately resolve the issues of (1) a lacking standard or methodological framework and (2) lack of data, whilst providing meaningful information for monitoring the Target. It would have the added advantage that it could help motivate the necessary statistical development in countries towards implementing a SEEA-TSA based statistical framework for sustainable tourism which, in turn, would support the production of indicators on sustainable tourism itself (such as those necessary to monitor Target 8.9 listed above). The refined indicator (number of SEEA and TSA table produced) would be situated somewhere between Tier 1 and Tier 2: with an established methodology and standards (the TSA: RMF 2008 and the SEEA 2012) and with the information available in countries and ready to be compiled regularly in an international database. In fact, UNWTO has plans to embark on regular compilation of this information in the course of 2016 (UNWTO and Eurostat have done periodic exercises in the past). It is expected that data coverage would be quite high, given that implementation of 0 tables would also count as a data point. UNEP: The current proposed indicators under this target do not capture issues related to sustainability. UNEP will continue to work on improving data and statistics on sustainable tourism as opposed to only measuring the size of the tourism sector.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-12.pdf (pg. 13) [repeat of the above] No data coverage</p> <p>Methodology: UNWTO: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. Standard Information (UNWTO): There is no internationally agreed (statistical) concept, let alone a framework, that can be used to define a "sustainable tourism strategy or policy and action plan", nor what the relationship/boundary may be between the three different instruments (e.g. a tourism master plan may contain elements of all three—thus would this count as 1 or 3 actions?). In addition, there is currently no international dataset collecting this information, nor any plans to do so, and it would seem difficult to incorporate into existing statistical infrastructures due to the above-mentioned issues. Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP will work with UNWTO to bring aspects of sustainable tourism into the context of the tourism monitoring indicators.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
12.c Rationalize inefficient fossil-fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption by removing market distortions, in accordance with national circumstances, including by restructuring taxation and phasing out those harmful subsidies, where they exist, to reflect their environmental impacts, taking fully into account the specific needs and conditions of developing countries and minimizing the possible adverse impacts on their development in a manner that protects the poor and the affected communities	12.c.1 Amount of fossil-fuel subsidies per unit of GDP (production and consumption) and as a proportion of total national expenditure on fossil fuels	Tier II	Tier III	UNEP	World Bank- to confirm	<p>Metadata: States metadata provided previously, but no web link and not in the metadata compilation. No data coverage information</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested.</p> <p>Standard Information: UNEP can support the World Bank with the definitions around this indicator.</p>
Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts[b]						
	13.1.1 Number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies ^d	Tier II (UNISDR)/ Tier III (UNEP)	Tier II	UNISDR	UNEP	<p>UNISDR: This indicator has been developed on the basis of the reporting of 140+ countries using the HFA Monitor of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. Progress reporting by countries on the implementation of the Sendai Framework, using an updated Sendai Monitor, will not begin until the Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction (OEIWG) concludes its work. A baseline for all countries as of 2015 is expected to be created by 2017 as the basis for monitoring of the Sendai Framework and the SDGs. This indicator was proposed by UNISDR, and reviewed and examined by other UN agencies and submitted to the IAEG process in 2015 before submission to the OEIWG. The definition, method of computation etc. of this suggested indicator is currently under review by the Member States in the OEIWG. The Working Group will finalize the discussion and submit the final report to the UNGA in December 2016. The availability, nature and quality of national and local strategies for disaster risk reduction varies considerably. Some strategies may exist without necessarily being named thus.</p> <p>UNEP: The current proposed indicators under this target do not capture issues related to vulnerability, resilience or the natural environment. UNEP will continue to work on improving data and statistics on the link between disasters and the environment and vulnerability to disasters. UNEP will be currently supporting the defining of natural disasters and hazards. Additionally, UNEP will work with UNISDR and other partners on monitoring the Sendai framework.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-13.pdf (pg. 2)</p> <p>Database (UNISDR): All countries can report if they have a national strategy for disaster risk reduction. Not all sub-national authorities can report the existence of local strategies for disaster risk reduction. As countries have not yet begun reporting on progress in implementing the Sendai Framework, existing data from country reporting on the implementation of the HFA 2005-2015 is available via http://www.preventionweb.net/applications/hfa/qbnhfa/ and local reporting is available via http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/?pid:73&pih:2</p> <p>Database (UNEP): preview.grid.unep.ch</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009, UNISDR): all countries</p> <p>Data coverage (2010-present, UNISDR): all countries</p> <p>Data disaggregation: Geographic Location; The availability, nature and quality of national and local strategies for disaster risk reduction varies considerably. Some strategies may exist without necessarily being named thus.</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work is ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>Standard Information (UNISDR): Data to be computed through summation of data from National Progress Report of the Sendai Monitor.</p> <p>Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP will work with UNFCCC and UNISDR to improve the definition of natural disaster and hazard. Additionally, UNEP will support the monitoring of Target 1.5 through work on mapping climate change and disaster vulnerability. This work is already underway: preview.grid.unep.ch</p>
13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries	13.1.2 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people ^e	Tier II (UNISDR)/ Tier I (UNEP)	Tier II	UNISDR	UN-Habitat UNEP	<p>UNISDR: This is proposal by UNISDR based on experience and knowledge built in the period under the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015). The proposed indicator was further reviewed and examined by other UN agencies including FAO, GFDRR, IOM, UNCCD, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNOOSA, UNOPS, UNU, UNWOMEN, WHO and WMO (though not all organizations listed here provided comments for this indicator) and submitted to the IAEG process in early-July 2015, then again reviewed by the Technical Expert Group consisting of more than 60 experts from UN system, academic and research, civil sector and private sector in 27-29 July 2015 and submitted and examined by the Member States in the 1st Open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction held in 29-30 September 2015. The suggested indicator is currently under review by the Member States and UNISDR is receiving written inputs from the Member States. The proposed indicators will be also used to monitor Sendai Framework global targets and therefore the detailed definitions shall be discussed and agreed in Open ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction, as outlined in Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction 2015-2030. The Working Group is likely to finalize the discussion and submit the final report to the GA in December 2016. Methodologies and standards for Mortality are very solid and robust, as well as data. However, methodologies and standards for Affected are not as universal, and still under development. Sendai OEIWG is defining methodologies for all sub-indicators.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP is currently supporting the defining of natural disasters and hazards. Additionally, UNEP will work with UNISDR and other partners on monitoring the Sendai framework.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-13.pdf (pg. 6)</p> <p>Database (UNISDR): http://www.desinventar.net, http://www.emdat.be, other individual databases</p> <p>Database (UNEP): preview.grid.unep.ch</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009, UNISDR): +70% AP/24% Africa/66% LAC/25% Euro, NA, etc.//+45% of 193 MS</p> <p>Data coverage (2010-present, UNISDR): +70% AP/24% Africa/66% LAC/25% Euro, NA, etc.//+45% of 193 MS</p> <p>Data disaggregation: Geographic Location, All countries have data disaggregated by hazard and hazardous event. <5 countries have partial disaggregation by sex, age</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Standard Information (UNISDR): 1.-Desinventar methodology (used in 90 countries, de facto standard, see www.desinventar.net) 2.-European Commission JRC, Guidance on Disaster loss data collection (http://dr.jrc.ec.europa.eu/Portals/0/Loss/JRC_guidelines_loss_data_recording_v10.pdf) 3.-IRDR DATA GROUP: Disaster Loss Data Standards (see http://www.irdrinternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/DATA-Project-Report-No.-2-WEB-7MB.pdf)</p> <p>Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP will work with UNFCCC and UNISDR to improve the definition of natural disaster and hazard. Additionally, UNEP will support the monitoring of Target 1.5 through work on mapping climate change and disaster vulnerability. This work is already underway: preview.grid.unep.ch</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning	13.2.1 Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalization of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production (including a national adaptation plan, nationally determined contribution, national communication, biennial update report or other)	Not suggested	Tier III	UNFCCC-to confirm	UNEP	Clarify reporting mechanism and who will be custodian agency. No metadata or data coverage information. Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested Standard Information: UNEP will work with UNFCCC
13.3 Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning	13.3.1 Number of countries that have integrated mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning into primary, secondary and tertiary curricula	Not suggested	Tier III	UNESCO?	UNEP	No metadata or data coverage information. Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested Standard Information: UNEP will work with UNESCO
	13.3.2 Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions	Not suggested	Tier III	UNFCCC-to confirm	UNEP	Clarify reporting mechanism and who will be custodian agency. No metadata or data coverage information. Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested Standard Information: UNEP will work with UNFCCC
13.a Implement the commitment undertaken by developed-country parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to a goal of mobilizing jointly \$100 billion annually by 2020 from all sources to address the needs of developing countries in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation and fully operationalize the Green Climate Fund through its capitalization as soon as possible	13.a.1 Mobilized amount of United States dollars per year starting in 2020 accountable towards the \$100 billion commitment	Tier III	Tier III	OECD	UNFCCC UNEP	Same as 7.a.1 OECD: The OECD methodology has so far been investigating commitments from the provider perspective. The focus is on public climate finance. Database: no information provided Metadata: none provided Data coverage (2000-2009): none Data coverage (2010-present): all countries in Euro, NA, etc.; a few in LAC; none in the remaining regions Data disaggregation: Geographic Location Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. Standard Information: see OECD (2015), Climate Finance in 2013-14 and the USD 100 billion goal : A report by the OECD in collaboration with Climate Policy Initiative. http://www.oecd.org/env/cc/oecd-cpi-climate-finance-report.htm . see Annex a page 45 for the list of countries covered (OECD members)
13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least developed countries and small island developing States, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities	13.b.1 Number of least developed countries and small island developing States that are receiving specialized support, and amount of support, including finance, technology and capacity-building, for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change-related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities			WMO-to confirm	OECD-to confirm	No information provided Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-13.pdf (pg. 14)
Goal 14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development						
14.1 By 2025, prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds, in particular from land-based activities, including marine debris and nutrient pollution	14.1.1 Index of coastal eutrophication and floating plastic debris density	Tier II	Tier III	UNEP	FAO UNESCO-IOC IMO	UNEP: UNEP has been collaborating with FAO, IOC, UNESCO, IMO and others for the indicators under 14. Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-14.pdf (pg. 2) No database or data coverage information provided. Methodology: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. Standard information: UNEP will co-lead with IOC on the methodology around nutrients and marine litter.
14.2 By 2020, sustainably manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems to avoid significant adverse impacts, including by strengthening their resilience, and take action for their restoration in order to achieve healthy and productive oceans	14.2.1 Proportion of national exclusive economic zones managed using ecosystem-based approaches	Tier II	Tier III	UNEP	UNESCO-IOC FAO	UNEP: UNEP has been working to build national EM capacity through coverage monitoring systems. Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-14.pdf (pg. 3) No database or data coverage information provided. Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. Standard information: UNEP will work with IOC and FAO on the methodology.
14.3 Minimize and address the impacts of ocean acidification, including through enhanced scientific cooperation at all levels	14.3.1 Average marine acidity (pH) measured at agreed suite of representative sampling stations	Tier II	Tier III	UNEP	UNESCO-IOC FAO-to confirm	UNEP: UNEP is linking with GOOS and GCRMN to assess actual impacts on ecosystem Metadata: States metadata provided previously, but no weblink and not in the metadata compilation. Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. Standard information: UNEP will co-lead with IOC (GOOS) on the methodology.

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
14.4 By 2020, effectively regulate harvesting and end overfishing, illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and destructive fishing practices and implement science-based management plans, in order to restore fish stocks in the shortest time feasible, at least to levels that can produce maximum sustainable yield as determined by their biological characteristics	14.4.1 Proportion of fish stocks within biologically sustainable levels	Tier I	Tier I	FAO		<p>FAO: The indicator cannot be split by country. However, an indicator by country can only be applied to species that are resident within EEZs, not to the cross-boundary migratory and high seas species. Regional data for the indicator (eg by Asia and Pacific, Africa, etc) can be calculated.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-14.pdf (pg. 5) Data coverage (2000-2009): not applicable Data coverage (2010-present): not applicable</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Standard information: FAO. 2011. Review of the state of world marine fishery resources. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper No.569. Rome, Italy.</p>
14.5 By 2020, conserve at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information	14.5.1 Coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas	Tier I	Tier I	UNEP-WCMC UNEP		<p>UNEP-WCMC: Regions: Unsure why Japan is listed outside Asia & Pacific as for UN Stats it is under Asia (Eastern Asia) http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm#asia and under UNEP regions it is Asia & Pacific, similarly Australia and New Zealand are under Asia & Pacific. I have treated all ISO3 codes as being in their respective geographical region see http://www.nature.com/articles/sdata20167 for methodology and details of ISO 3166 code and region it geographically occurs in. Agreement on regions would be ideal. We will disaggregate all data by ISO 3166 code</p> <p>UNEP: Within the WDPA we have data from 242 countries and territories (with a data for Antarctica and Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction so 244 in all) which all have a unique identifier- the International Standards Office 3166 three digit code. The only two countries and territories we have no data from are from Nauru who do not have a protected area network and San Marino where we have had difficulty getting data from. I added a comment on the regions used as I noticed that Australia, New Zealand and Japan are listed along with Europe and North America though these are all in the "Asia and the Pacific" UNEP region. All our analysis for the indicators will be at the Country and Territory level which we can aggregate to different regions and sub regions as required. Our data from 2010 to present is more complete than from before 2010 but we have digital versions of the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA)going back to 1998 though the quality is poorer the further you go back. He monthly updated versions of the WDPA are available on http://www.protectedplanet.net/</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-14.pdf (pg. 7) Database: http://www.protectedplanet.net/ Data coverage (2000-2009): all countries (240 countries total) Data coverage (2010-present): all countries (240 countries total) Data disaggregation: Geographic Location, ISO3</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p> <p>Standard information (UNEP-WCMC): The standard methodology used for this analysis has been discussed in the Protected Planet 2012 and 2014 reports and in the World Database on Protected Areas User Manual which and has been discussed with several partners notably the EU Joint Research Centre.</p> <p>Standard information (UNEP): UNEP through UNEP-WCMC will lead with their partners. There is an established methodology that has been used for the Protected Planet reports (2012 & 2014) and in published papers- all of these have been peer reviewed both internally and externally.</p>
14.6 By 2020, prohibit certain forms of fisheries subsidies which contribute to overcapacity and overfishing, eliminate subsidies that contribute to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and refrain from introducing new such subsidies, recognizing that appropriate and effective special and differential treatment for developing and least developed countries should be an integral part of the World Trade Organization fisheries subsidies negotiation[c]	14.6.1 Progress by countries in the degree of implementation of international instruments aiming to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing	Tier III	Tier III	FAO		<p>FAO: The indicator will be based on FAO's biannual survey on CCRF implementation which compiles country responses by Members on IUU fishing action plans and on ratification and implementation of the FAO Port State Measures Agreement and the FAO Compliance Agreement. Responses received during above period will need to be computed. The indicator on IUU fishing will be global, covering all FAO members, and it will be possible to compare across countries and regions. The indicator is new and will need a baseline to be formulated during the next survey period.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-14.pdf (pg. 14) Data coverage (2000-2009): 0 Data coverage (2010-present): 0</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p>
14.7 By 2030, increase the economic benefits to small island developing States and least developed countries from the sustainable use of marine resources, including through sustainable management of fisheries, aquaculture and tourism	14.7.1 Sustainable fisheries as a percentage of GDP in small island developing States, least developed countries and all countries	Tier II	Tier III	FAO, UNEP, World Bank		<p>UNEP: The UNEP proposed indicator taking a broad look at ocean resource and services was not adopted which makes this indicator more difficult to measure. However, UNEP can work with FAO on the methodology and definitions for this indicator.</p> <p>States metadata provided previously, but no weblink and not in the metadata compilation. No data coverage information.</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested.</p> <p>Standard information: UNEP can collaborate with FAO to define sustainable fisheries and to operationalize this indicator. However UNEP's proposed indicator taking a broad look at ocean resource and services although not adopted.. The current indicator is still 'Sustainable fisheries as a percentage of GDP in small island developing States, least developed countries and all countries', which is a poor indicator.</p>
14.a Increase scientific knowledge, develop research capacity and transfer marine technology, taking into account the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology, in order to improve ocean health and to enhance the contribution of marine biodiversity to the development of developing countries, in particular small island developing States and least developed countries	14.a.1 Proportion of total research budget allocated to research in the field of marine technology	Tier III	Tier III	UNEP World Bank-to confirm		<p>UNEP: Good data on patents and R&D is available from WIPO and UNESCO; however, improving the definition of marine technology is needed in order to measure this indicator.</p> <p>Metadata: States metadata provided previously, but no weblink and not in the metadata compilation. No data coverage information.</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested.</p> <p>Standard information: UNEP will work with WIPO and UNESCO on patents and R&D classifications which can then be used as the basis for this indicator.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
14.b Provide access for small-scale artisanal fishers to marine resources and markets	14.b.1 Progress by countries in the degree of application of a legal/regulatory/policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries	Tier III	Tier III	FAO		<p>FAO: It is a composite indicator based on FAO member country responses to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) survey questionnaire which is circulated by FAO every two years to members and IGOs and INGOs. This indicator is calculated on the basis of the efforts being made by countries to implement selected key provisions of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines), as reported in a given year of the survey.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-14.pdf (pg. 20)</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009): 0 Data coverage (2010-present): 0 Data disaggregation: Geographic Location</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun.</p>
14.c Enhance the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and their resources by implementing international law as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, which provides the legal framework for the conservation and sustainable use of oceans and their resources, as recalled in paragraph 158 of "The future we want"	14.c.1 Number of countries making progress in ratifying, accepting and implementing through legal, policy and institutional frameworks, ocean-related instruments that implement international law, as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, for the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans and their resources	Tier III	Tier III	UN-DOALOS FAO UNEP ILO other UN Oceans agencies		<p>UN-DOALOS: Since this is a new indicator, considerable work is needed for this indicator, as indicated below. (1) Methodology- Methodology for this indicator is only partially developed. While the methodology to measure "progress in ratifying [...] ocean-related instruments" is established, the methodology to measure "progress in [...] implementing [...] ocean-related instruments" is not currently established and subject to further discussion. (2) Metadata- Metadata for this indicator is not yet available. However, metadata is currently being developed by agencies. For your information, metadata for the indicator proposal by DOALOS, which is relevant to this indicator, is contained in the document entitled "Compilation of Metadata Received on Indicators for Global Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals and Targets (updated 23 October 2015)" available on the IAEG-SDGs website. As noted therein, DOALOS has information on the legal status of treaties (e.g. ratification) for the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement, as well as some information on national legislation and other relevant instruments relating to the implementation of ocean-related instruments. (3) Data availability- Availability of some data for this indicator was noted above. It is noted that questions 7 and 8 regarding data availability are not necessarily relevant to this indicator. FAO, UN-DOALOS and other UN Oceans agencies: The metadata documentation for this indicator still needs to be developed by UN Oceans and interested agencies. UN-DOALOS, FAO and other UN agencies are presently working towards such metadata documentation which will determine the methodology for detailed design and use of a composite indicator covering multiple sectoral and cross-sectoral/thematic components.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP proposes to coordinate and harmonise national reporting mechanisms to Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans and their protocols in order to monitor ratification and implementation of the legal instruments. As a mandated coordination body for the eighteen Regional Seas Conventions and Action Plans, UNEP will lead the process to standardize monitoring on the ratification and implementation of agreements under the Regional Seas framework. Each Regional Seas Secretariats would monitor its ratification / implementation status in a standardized manner. Currently, ratification status is available. Implementation of the agreements needs to be further defined in order to make an assessment. The Global Programme of Action for the Protection of Marine Environment from the Land-Based Activities (GPA), which is an intergovernmental body, dealing with pollution prevention from land-based sources, is working at a regional level through the Regional Seas programme by helping countries develop regional action plan. At the national level, GPA helps countries develop national action plan, which is a framework embedded in the integrated water resources management and integrated coastal zone management. GPA together with UNEP monitors implementation of national action plans. This could contribute to the overall achievement to 14.c.</p> <p>Metadata: FAO provided for fisheries component Data coverage 0 (UN-DOALOS and FAO, etc) Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): 26% AP/+56% Africa/88% LAC/31% Euro, NA, etc.//+46% of 193 MS Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): 26% AP/+56% Africa/88% LAC/31% Euro, NA, etc.//+46% of 193 MS Data disaggregation: Geographic Location</p> <p>Methodology: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. FAO, etc. states that there is work on the methodology and UN-DOALOS says there is not</p>
Goal 15. Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss						
	15.1.1 Forest area as a proportion of total land area	Tier I	Tier I	FAO	UNEP	<p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-15.pdf (pg. 2)</p> <p>Database: http://faostat3.fao.org/download/E/EL/E</p> <p>Data coverage (2000-2009, FAO): 79% AP/83% Africa/+100% LAC/+100% Euro, NA, etc.//+100% of 193 MS Data coverage (2010-present, FAO): 79% AP/+100% Africa/+100% LAC/+100% Euro, NA, etc.//96% of 193 MS Data disaggregation: Geographic Location</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one.</p> <p>Standard information (UNEP): UNEP will collaborate with FAO .</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
15.1 By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements	15.1.2 Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type	Tier I	Tier I	UNEP-WCMC UNEP		<p>UNEP-WCMC: Regions: Unsure why Japan is listed outside Asia & Pacific as for UN Stats it is under Asia (Eastern Asia) http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm#asia and under UNEP regions it is Asia & Pacific, similarly Australia and New Zealand are under Asia & Pacific. I have treated all ISO3 codes as being in their respective geographical region see http://www.nature.com/articles/sdata20167 for methodology and details of ISO 3166 code and region it geographically occurs in. Agreement on regions would be ideal. We will disaggregate all data by ISO 3166 code</p> <p>UNEP: Within the WDPA we have data from 242 countries and territories (with a data for Antarctica and Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction so 244 in all) which all have a unique identifier- the International Standards Office 3166 three digit code. The only two countries and territories we have no data from are from Nauru who do not have a protected area network and San Marino where we have had difficulty getting data from. I added a comment on the regions used as I noticed that Australia, New Zealand and Japan are listed along with Europe and North America though these are all in the "Asia and the Pacific" UNEP region. All our analysis for the indicators will be at the Country and Territory level which we can aggregate to different regions and sub regions as required. Our data from 2010 to present is more complete than from before 2010 but we have digital versions of the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) going back to 1998 though the quality is poorer the further you go back. He monthly updated versions of the WDPA are available on http://www.protectedplanet.net/</p> <p>States metadata provided previously, but no weblink and not in the metadata compilation. Database: http://www.protectedplanet.net/ Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): all countries (240 countries total) Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): all countries (240 countries total) Data disaggregation: Geographic Location</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. Standard information (UNEP-WCMC): The methodology used for this calculation has been discussed between UNEP-WCMC and Bird Life International whom host one of the key data sets. This analysis has been published in the Protected Planet reports as well as in peer reviewed journals/ Standard information (UNEP): UNEP, through UNEP-WCMC, will lead. All three have an established methodology that has been used for the Protected Planet reports (2012 & 2014) and in published papers- all of these have been peer reviewed both internally and externally. We have discussed the methodology behind the different analysis with a number of collaborators including IUCN, Bird Life, the EEA and JRC as well as several researchers.</p>
15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally	15.2.1 Progress towards sustainable forest management	Tier III (FAO)/ Tier I (UNEP)	Tier III	FAO	UNEP	<p>FAO: The indicator is a Tier 1 as all the sub-indicators are collected by the Global Forest Resources Assessment, FRA, published quinquennially by FAO. The indicator is composed by several "sub-indicators". Globally we have: Forest area: Data from all countries (234) for 2010 and 2015; Carbon stock: 172 countries and territories, for 2010 and 2015. For remaining countries/territories we have FAO estimates; Designation for biodiversity cons.: 194 countries / terr (2010 and 2015); Forest management plans: 167 countries and territories for 2010 only. The proposed index however has not been tested and is the reason for having stated that the methodology has not been tested.</p> <p>UNEP: This indicator is a Biodiversity Indicators Partnership indicator maintained by the Forest Stewardship Council and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-15.pdf (pg. 5) Data coverage (2000-2009): 0 Data coverage (2010-present): 0 Data disaggregation: Geographic Location</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. Standard information (UNEP): UNEP through UNEP-WCMC, will work with FAO. This indicator is a Biodiversity Indicators Partnership with established methodology.</p>
15.3 By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world	15.3.1 Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area	Tier II (UNCCD)/ Tier III (FAO/UNEP)	Tier III	UNCCD	FAO UNEP	<p>UNCCD: Many countries have data and information for this indicator from multiple sources at the global, regional and national levels. National reporting on the three sub-indicators by the 195 country Parties to the UNCCD will begin in 2018 and continue thereafter every 4 years. The UNCCD expects to be the lead entity to compile this data for global reporting on indicator 15.3.1.</p> <p>FAO: The methodology has been tested in some countries under the LDN program of UNCCD. However it still requires refinement to introduce country-based data into it, creating the conditions for more detailed and disaggregated information.</p> <p>UNEP: This indicator was under recent discussion at the Expert meeting in Washington on land-based indicators hosted by the UNCCD together with CBD and FAO. UNEP through WCMC will continue to be engaged on the development of this indicator.</p> <p>Metadata (UNCCD): http://www.unccd.int/Lists/SiteDocumentLibrary/Rio+20/LDN%202016/DC%20expert%20meeting%20SDG%20indicator%2015.3.1%20summary.pdf, http://www.unccd.int/Lists/SiteDocumentLibrary/Rio+20/LDN%202016/UNCCD%20response%20to%20request%20on%20grey%20indicators_19.12.2015.pdf, http://www.unccd.int/Lists/SiteDocumentLibrary/Rio+20/Land%20degradation%20neutrality%202015/UNCCD%20Metadata%20Target%2015.3.pdf Metadata (FAO): States metadata provided previously, but not in the metadata compilation. Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): 0/uncertain Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): 0/uncertain Data disaggregation: Geographic Location, land cover class (UNCCD)</p> <p>Methodology: UNCCD: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. FAO/UNEP: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. Standard information (UNEP): UNEP is collaborating with UNCCD, FAO and the CBD Secretariat on developing the methodology. Standard information (FAO): The indicator has been tested in 14 countries in the context of the Land Degradation Neutrality program of the UNCCD. The reports can be found at http://www.unccd.int/en/programmes/RioConventions/RioPlus20/Pages/LDN-Project-Country-Reports.aspx. The UN Statistical division have adopted FAO's LCCS/LCML to define the land cover classes used for reporting under SEEA.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
15.4 By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development	15.4.1 Coverage by protected areas of important sites for mountain biodiversity	Tier I	Tier I	UNEP-WCMC UNEP		<p>UNEP-WCMC: Regions: Unsure why Japan is listed outside Asia & Pacific as for UN Stats it is under Asia (Eastern Asia) http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm#asia and under UNEP regions it is Asia & Pacific, similarly Australia and New Zealand are under Asia & Pacific. I have treated all ISO3 codes as being in their respective geographical region see http://www.nature.com/articles/sdata20167 for methodology and details of ISO 3166 code and region it geographically occurs in. Agreement on regions would be ideal. We will disaggregate all data by ISO 3166 code</p> <p>We need to check the number of country and territories that have mountains in them so the numbers may change.</p> <p>UNEP: Within the WDPA we have data from 242 countries and territories (with a data for Antarctica and Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction so 244 in all) which all have a unique identifier- the International Standards Office 3166 three digit code. The only two countries and territories we have no data from are from Nauru who do not have a protected area network and San Marino where we have had difficulty getting data from. I added a comment on the regions used as I noticed that Australia, New Zealand and Japan are listed along with Europe and North America though these are all in the "Asia and the Pacific" UNEP region. All our analysis for the indicators will be at the Country and Territory level which we can aggregate to different regions and sub regions as required. Our data from 2010 to present is more complete than from before 2010 but we have digital versions of the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) going back to 1998 though the quality is poorer the further you go back. He monthly updated versions of the WDPA are available on http://www.protectedplanet.net/</p> <p>Metadata: States metadata provided previously, but no weblink and not in the metadata compilation. Database: http://www.protectedplanet.net/ Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): all countries (240 countries total) Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): all countries (240 countries total) Data disaggregation: Geographic Location</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP will lead through UNEP-WCMC. All three have an established methodology that has been used for the Protected Planet reports (2012 & 2014) and in published papers- all of these have been peer reviewed both internally and externally. We have discussed the methodology behind the different analysis with a number of collaborators including IUCN, Bird Life, the EEA and JRC as well as several researchers.</p>
	15.4.2 Mountain Green Cover Index	Tier II	Tier II	FAO	UNEP	<p>FAO to clarify data-- should this be Tier I?</p> <p>FAO: This indicator is meant to measure the changes of the green vegetation in mountain areas - i.e. forest, shrubs and trees – in order to allow for monitoring progress on the mountain targets. It is informed by satellite imagery data.</p> <p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-15.pdf (pg. 9) Database: not provided Data coverage (2000-2009, UNEP): all countries Data coverage (2010-present, UNEP): all countries Data disaggregation: Geographic Location, mountain areas and land cover</p> <p>Methodology: UNEP: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested FAO: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. Standard information (UNEP): UNEP will work with FAO</p>
15.5 Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species	15.5.1 Red List Index		Tier I	IUCN	UNEP CITES	<p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-15.pdf (pg. 11)</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested Standard information: UNEP will lead working with CITES</p>
15.6 Promote fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources and promote appropriate access to such resources, as internationally agreed	15.6.1 Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits	Tier III	Tier III	CBD-Secretariat	FAO UNEP	<p>FAO, ITPGRFA: ITPGRFA provides a legal governance framework for the management and exchange of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFAs) and establishes a multilateral system for that purpose which facilitates access to PGRFAs and shares in a fair and equitable way the benefits arising from the utilization of those resources. This new indicator could draw on the following sources: Article 21 of the ITPGRFA provides on the promotion of compliance with the provisions of the ITPGRFA. Each Contracting Party is to submit to the Compliance Committee of the ITPGRFA a report on the measures it has taken to implement its obligations under the ITPGRFA. There is a standard reporting format on compliance adopted by the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA and first reports are due in September 2016. The Governing Body of the ITPGRFA also adopted the standard material transfer agreement (SMTA). Under the multilateral system, SMTA facilitates the exchange of PGRFAs by setting out the obligations of the provider and recipient of the material and providing details of the benefit-sharing mechanisms. SMTAs are communicated to the Governing Body of the ITPGRFA and stored in the Data Store of the ITPGRFA. Coordination with the CBD Secretariat, overseeing the Nagoya Protocol, would also be opportune for the methodological development of this new indicator.</p> <p>UNEP: UNEP has a programme of work related to policy monitoring and can contribute to the compilation of raw data for this indicator from the environmental perspective, especially in relation to MEA-related reporting. Additionally, UNEP is able to work on the methodology for this indicator to ensure the environmental aspect of the indicator is brought into the methodology and definitions.</p> <p>Metadata (FAO): http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-15.pdf (pg. 18) Metadata (UNEP): States metadata provided previously, but not in the metadata compilation. ; www.informea.org Data coverage (2000-2009): 0 Data coverage (2010-present): 0 Data disaggregation: data on policies adopted at national level are available through INFORMEA(www.informea.org) and ecolx (www.ecolx.org) and are searchable based on geographic and thematic criteria.</p> <p>Methodology: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. Methodology is being developed. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP will lead. Although there is not an overall agreed standard, there are many frameworks that require regular monitoring, for instance, from the environmental perspective, multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) require, in the majority of cases, that parties report on the level of implementation of the convention at regular intervals. these reports are reviewed by the relevant governing bodies. The role of MEAs in delivering the SDGs and therefore in tracking progress is key, because of the multiple linkages between MEAs objectives, decisions, strategic plans and the SDGs. While more specific information could be provided by the respective MEAs, consolidated information across multiple MEAs can also be accessed through the www.informea.org website. UNEP would be happy to work with others in better defining the terms of this indicator (including the concept of "multi-stakeholder"). There are many voluntary frameworks and partnerships (e.g. multi agency programmes UNEP is part of or provides secretariat for, such as the UNDP-UNEP poverty-environment initiative in selected countries, the 10YFP and many others, that do/could require progress reports in specific areas/countries/regions and could therefore contribute to assessing progress toward this indicator.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
15.7 Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products	15.7.1 Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked	Tier I (UNODC)	Tier I	UNODC CITES	UNEP	<p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-15.pdf (pg. 20) Database: none provided Data coverage (2000-2009, UNODC): 41% AP/22% Africa/27% LAC/77% Euro, NA, etc./50% of 193 MS Data coverage (2010-present, UNODC): 53% AP/50% Africa/33% LAC/77% Euro, NA, etc./47% of 193 MS Data disaggregation: Geographic Location, type of wildlife</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. No. There is currently no agreed international standard, but work in ongoing towards the development of one. Standard Information (UNODC/CITES Secretariat): While the indicator is new, the elements which make up this indicator are defined according to agreed international standards: 1) The required details on the legal trade in protected wildlife and wildlife products are derived from import and export permits issued. The records of this legal trade collected by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) Secretariat. All CITES parties (n=180) are required to submit data annually on the export and import permits they issue. 2) Seizures of protected wildlife and wildlife products. The records of these seizures are being collected by the CITES Secretariat and the World Customs Organization. The records of this illegal trade are managed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime under the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime partnership. 3) Declared values for imported wildlife products. These are collected by national governments and are maintained in the global wildlife database by UNODC. Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP will lead working with CITES</p>
15.8 By 2020, introduce measures to prevent the introduction and significantly reduce the impact of invasive alien species on land and water ecosystems and control or eradicate the priority species	15.8.1 Proportion of countries adopting relevant national legislation and adequately resourcing the prevention or control of invasive alien species		Tier III	UNEP CBD?		<p>Metadata: http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-15.pdf (pg. 22)</p> <p>Methodology: No. There is no methodology for the indicator. Standard information: UNEP will develop a methodology with relevant partners</p>
15.9 By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts	15.9.1 Progress towards national targets established in accordance with Aichi Biodiversity Target 2 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020	Tier III	Tier III	UNEP-SCBD UNEP		<p>UNEP-SCBD: Given the qualitative nature of the target and the flexibility of countries to establish national targets on which they report, the reporting will always remain qualitative, i.e. a national self-assessment of progress towards the established national target. A rating system with guidance can provide a degree of standardization, and in testing this has proven to be fairly robust. This rating system has been implemented in the online reporting tool (https://chm.cbd.int/submit/online-reporting) under the Convention which enables Parties to provide updated assessments as these become available.</p> <p>Metadata: none Database: https://www.cbd.int/reports/ Data coverage (2000-2009): 0 Data coverage (2010-present): 81% AP/91% Africa/82% LAC/+100% Euro, NA, etc./89% of MS Data disaggregation: For some countries, the information reported allows assessment by subcomponents, i.e. integration of ecosystem and biodiversity values into (a) national planning, (b) local planning, (c) development processes, (d) poverty reduction strategies, and (e) accounts</p> <p>Methodology: UNEP-SCBD: Yes. There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested. Methodology being developed. No. No work on an international standard for this indicator has begun. UNEP: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Standard Information (UNEP-SCBD): In accordance with CBD COP-10 decision X/2, Parties to the Convention and other Governments are urged to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Targets, as a flexible framework, including for Target 2 ("By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems"). Parties to the Convention and other Governments are further urged to monitor and review the implementation of their ... national targets ... and to report to the Conference of the Parties through their fifth and sixth national reports. The global target is qualitative and national target formulations differ between countries. Information contained in 172 fifth national reports on the progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 has been analysed. A more systematic approach is envisaged for the sixth national report in which countries are asked to use a rating system to report on a self-assessment of progress towards their national target. Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP will work with CBD/InforMEA</p>
15.a Mobilize and significantly increase financial resources from all sources to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and ecosystems	15.a.1 Official development assistance and public expenditure on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems	Tier I (OECD)/ Tier II (UNEP)	Tier I (ODA)/ Tier III (public expenditure)	OECD UNEP World Bank		<p>OECD: Numbers of countries here include both donors and recipients. The OECD only has data on the ODA part of this indicator, not on domestic public expenditure in developing countries. UNEP: This indicator has already undergone discussion by the UNCEEA; however, further defining the classifications that underlie the indicator are necessary. UNEP can support the classification of ecosystem services and the refinement of the methodology. UNEP will also work with countries to support national capacity around this indicator, as UNEP has practical experiences at the country level in SEEA implementation, including recent activities in Kenya, Gabon, Morocco, South Africa and more recently Cote d'Ivoire. Last but not least and the address an issue you had raised while we were discussing, UNEP could take the lead (especially from making the linkages between biodiversity management and expenditures) in very close collaboration with institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank.</p> <p>Metadata: http://dotstat.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=70652, metadata in sidebar; http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/metadata-compilation/Metadata-Goal-15.pdf (pg. 27) Database: http://dotstat.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=70652 Data coverage (2000-2009, OECD): +100% AP/93% Africa/91% LAC/65% Euro, NA, etc./94% of 193 MS Data coverage (2010-present, OECD): +100% AP/93% Africa/91% LAC/65% Euro, NA, etc./94% of 193 MS</p> <p>Methodology: Yes. There is an established methodology and it has been tested. Yes. There is an agreed international standard. Standard Information (OECD): See http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Biodiversity-related%20aid%20Flyer%20-%20May%202014.pdf. The methods and standards of DAC statistics on ODA and other resource flows are explained at http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm. http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/Biodiversity-related%20aid%20Flyer%20-%20May%202014.pdf Standard Information (UNEP): UNEP will work with UNSD and WB on this. The SEEA is the standard, but it still needs development in this area.</p>
15.b Mobilize significant resources from all sources and at all levels to finance sustainable forest management and provide adequate incentives to developing countries to advance such management, including for conservation and reforestation	15.b.1 Official development assistance and public expenditure on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems	repeat of 15.a.1				

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
15.c Enhance global support for efforts to combat poaching and trafficking of protected species, including by increasing the capacity of local communities to pursue sustainable livelihood opportunities	15.c.1 Proportion of traded wildlife that was poached or illicitly trafficked					
<i>repeat of 15.7.1</i>						
Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels						
16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere	16.1.1 Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age	Tier I	Tier I	UNODC	DESA-Pop Division,	<p>The definition of intentional homicide is part of the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS), which is a classification structure of criminal offences. The United Nations Statistical Commission, at its 46th session in March 2015, and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its 24th session in May 2015 have endorsed the ICCS as an international statistical standard for data collection and production. Within ICCS, all forms of unlawful killings amounting to intentional homicide are defined precisely.</p> <p>Another international statistical standards, the International Classification of Diseases and Causes of Death (ICD-10) defines various forms of violent deaths. The definition of 'deaths due to assault' is very close to the definition of intentional homicide (for further information, see ICCS 1.0).</p> <p>At the international level UNODC collects data on intentional homicide every year, including on some disaggregation like sex, age group and mechanism. The World Health Organization (WHO) has a regular data collection on deaths by cause, including by assault. UNODC and WHO are working to harmonize the production of international data on intentional homicide.</p> <p>There is data availability for most countries (approximately 90% of all countries).</p>
	16.1.2 Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause	Tier I	Tier II/Tier III (pending provision of methodology from OHCHR)	OHCHR	UNMAS, DESA-Pop Division,	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>UNMAS: As conflict related deaths are regularly collected and reported by OHCHR and others in various countries, I believe there must be an international standard and agreed methodology for these.</p> <p>As discussed, UNMAS does not have input on the overall indicator, but continues to recommend that victims of landmines and other explosive hazards are included in the disaggregation of any indicator on conflict and/ or violence related deaths. This information is collected and monitored by the United Nations Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism for Mine Action in countries with a UN mine action presence and is generally collected and available in most affected states.</p>
	16.1.3 Proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months	Tier II	Tier II	UNODC	UN-Women, UNFPA, WHO, UNDP	<p>This indicator measures the prevalence of victimization from physical or sexual or psychological violence. While there is an established methodology to measure physical and sexual violence, there is no standard to measure to measure psychological violence. Experience of sexual and physical violence is captured through victimization surveys, for which international guidance is provided by the UNODC-UNECE Manual on Victimization Surveys.</p> <p>There is an established methodology that has been tested but no international standard.</p> <p>UNODC included crime reporting rates in its annual data collection (UN-CTS) starting in 2009 and data availability at country level is not yet properly reflected in UNODC datasets. From a recent review, it resulted that more than 70 countries have implemented at least one victimisation survey after 2009</p>
	16.1.4 Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live	Tier I	Tier II	UNODC	UNDP	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and work is ongoing towards agreement on an international standard.</p> <p>There is a widely used standard formulation of this indicator that refers to the proportion of the population (adults) who feel safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark, however this is not yet consolidated in an international standard. Data are collected through sample surveys among the general population, most often through crime victimization surveys.</p> <p>At international level, there is not yet a data repository on perception of security or fear of crime. The UNODC collects data on crime, criminal justice and victimization surveys in its annual United Nations Crime Trends Survey (UN-CTS). A major revision for the UN-CTS is planned for 2017 allowing for the inclusion of new indicators. From a recent review conducted by UNODC, it resulted that more than 70 countries have implemented at least one victimisation survey after 2009 and most of these surveys include perception of security according to the common question formulation (see above).</p>
	16.2.1 Proportion of children aged 1-17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month	Tier I	Tier I	UNICEF	UNDP	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and work is ongoing towards agreement on an international standard.</p> <p>Household surveys such as UNICEF-supported MICS and DHS that have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since around 2005. In some countries, such data are also collected through other national household surveys.</p> <p>Existing data collection mechanisms are already in place for many countries to monitor this indicator. There is an existing, standardized and validated measurement tool (the CTS) that is widely accepted and has been implemented in a large number of countries.</p> <p>The data availability indicate in sections 7 & 8 above refer to countries with data on the percentage of children aged 1-14 who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month.</p> <p>UNICEF can confirm that fully comparable data are available for nearly 60 countries in the world, across all 7 UNICEF regions, indicating coverage of around 25%.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children	16.2.2 Number of victims of human trafficking per 100,000 population, by sex, age and form of exploitation	Tier II	Tier I	UNODC		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and there is no international standard, but work is ongoing to develop one.</p> <p>This indicator is composed of two parts: detected and undetected victims of trafficking in persons. For the detected part there is a well-developed methodology and international standard (see UNODC, Global Report on Trafficking in Persons). Methodology to measure undetected victims of trafficking in persons is under development: some recent studies have been conducted to estimate the number of undetected victims, but further testing is needed and there is not yet an agreed international standard. Trafficking in persons may take different forms and different methodologies are used to estimate different type of victims.</p> <p>UNODC reports data availability for most countries.</p> <p>Data availability refers to the component of detected victims of trafficking.</p>
	16.2.3 Proportion of young women and men aged 18-29 years who experienced sexual violence by age 18	Tier II	Tier II	UNICEF	UNSD, UNDP, UNODC	<p>There is a suggested methodology, but it has not been tested and work is ongoing towards developing an international standard.</p> <p>UNICEF previously submitted metadata to UNSD but these were not included in the compilation prepared by UNSD for IAEG-SDG</p> <p>UNICEF: Household surveys such as DHS have been collecting data on this indicator in low- and middle-income countries since the late 1990s.</p> <p>The availability of comparable data remains a serious challenge in this area as many data collection efforts have relied on different study methodologies and designs, definitions of sexual violence, samples and questions to elicit information. A further challenge in this field is underreporting, especially when it comes to reporting on experiences of sexual violence among boys and men.</p> <p>UNODC: In 2010 UNODC-UNECE published a Manual on Victimization Surveys, that provides technical guidance on the implementation of such surveys, on the basis of good practices developed at country level.</p> <p>While there is considerable experience in measuring prevalence of sexual violence during a specific reference period (eg over one or three years) or life-time, the specific formulation of this indicator will require further development work and testing.</p> <p>At international level, there is no comprehensive data repository on general physical violence. Selected data on specific forms of physical violence (against women, children, etc.) are collected and disseminated by the World Health Organization, UNICEF, UN Women, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Selected data have been collected in national and international crime victimization surveys, such as the British Crime Survey or the International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), which has been conducted in over 70 countries worldwide between 1992 and 2010. Most of these surveys include questions on violence. Data on the prevalence of physical and sexual violence from sample surveys is collected by UNODC in its annual UN Crime Trends Survey (UN-CTS) but data availability is still limited. Additional data can be obtained from national surveys on crime and violence.</p>
16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all	16.3.1 Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms	Tier II	Tier II	UNODC		<p>There is an established and tested methodology and work is ongoing towards the development of an international standard.</p> <p>In 2010 UNODC-UNECE published a Manual on Victimization Surveys, that provides technical guidance on the implementation of such surveys, on the basis of good practices developed at country level.</p> <p>While victimization surveys typically include questions on crime reporting, there is not yet an agreed standard on some important elements of this indicator (violent crime to include, counting rules regarding reporting rates, competent authorities to consider) and for which methodological work is needed.</p> <p>UNODC included crime reporting rates in its annual data collection (UN-CTS) starting in 2009 and data availability at country level is not yet properly reflected in UNODC datasets. From a recent review, it resulted that more than 70 countries have implemented at least one victimisation survey after 2009.</p>
	16.3.2 Unsensitized detainees as a proportion of overall prison population	Tier I	Tier I	UNODC		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>There is a widely used standard formulation of this indicator that refers to the total number of persons held in detention who have not yet been sentenced, as a percentage of the total number of persons held in detention, on a specified date (also referred to as persons in "pre-trial" detention). 'Sentenced' refers to persons subject to criminal proceedings who have received a decision from a competent authority regarding their conviction or acquittal. For the purposes of the indicator, persons who have received a 'non-final' decision (such as where a conviction is subject to appeal) are considered to be 'sentenced'.</p> <p>At international level, data on the number of persons held in pre-sentence detention are collected in the United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS). At the moment, data are available for 145 countries in the world in total. A major revision for the UN-CTS is planned for 2017 allowing for the refinement of data collection on this indicator.</p>
	16.4.1 Total value of inward and outward illicit financial flows (in current United States dollars)	Tier III	Tier III	UNODC IMF		<p>There is no methodology for this indicator and work is ongoing towards the development of an international standard.</p> <p>The concept of illicit financial flows has not been explicitly defined in the international normative framework dealing with crime, corruption, transnational organized crime, money laundering and financing of terrorism.</p> <p>UNODC is currently working, together with other international agencies, towards the formulation of an agreed definition that can be used for international monitoring purposes.</p> <p>The methodological approach to measure IFF will make use of a number of tools, including those recently developed to measure illegal economy.</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
16.4 By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime	16.4.2 Proportion of seized small arms and light weapons that are recorded and traced, in accordance with international standards and legal instruments	Tier II	Tier II	UNODC	UNODA, UNDP	<p>There is an established and tested methodology but work is ongoing to develop an international standard.</p> <p>UNODC: The indicator measures the percentage of seized firearms that have been recorded and traced, in line with international standards and instruments. The focus of this indicator is on the ability of criminal justice systems to identify and record seized firearms and to establish their provenance and point of diversion through domestic and international tracing. The proposed indicator will help to measure the progress in enforcing the control system that will enable national authorities in the fight against firearms trafficking.</p> <p>The Arms Trade Treaty (Arms Trade Treaty, New York, 2 April 2013, A/RES/67/234B) and the Firearm Protocol of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime provide the international legal framework to regulate international trade in conventional arms and on the means to establish a control regime to prevent and combat the illicit manufacturing and trafficking of firearms. In such treaties, legal definitions of several concepts relevant for the indicator can be found: firearms, small arms and light weapons, seizure, recording and tracing of firearms</p> <p>On the basis of such basis, operational guidelines need to be developed to precisely define the indicator and identify the data needed for its accurate calculation.</p> <p>In 2012, UNODC was mandated by the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (COP-UNTOC) to conduct a study on the transnational nature of and routes used in trafficking in firearms, based on the analysis of information provided by States on confiscated weapons and ammunition. UNODC has collected and analysed data on firearms seizures and additional information on firearms trafficking through two sets of questionnaires – total annual seizures and significant individual seizure data – from 2010 – 2013, and in published in 2015 its first UNODC Study on Firearms. In 2014 UNODC also received a mandate to continue in the data collection on seizures made by Member States, building on the results of the previous work.</p> <p>UNODA: UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) provides a primary source for the data for target 16-4-2. UNODA also has expertise in this area, and discussed with UNODC for collaboration in the data collection. UNODA would also collect data for target 16-4-2, which will complement data provided by UNODC.</p> <p>UN Member States submit reports on small arms to UNODA every 2 years. The reporting form would be revised in 2016 to include information needed to collate data for target 16-4-2.</p> <p>This will be a new data to be collected from 2016 as a part of biennial report by States. Typically around 80 States submit reports. It would cover information that may not be captured by UNODC data source, such as certain weapon types or States that are not party to the Firearms Protocol.</p> <p>UNDP: The international standard on small arms is: http://www.smallarmsstandards.org/isacs/0531-en.pdf</p> <p>Current data availability is limited to very few countries.</p>
16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms	16.5.1 Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months	Tier II	Tier II	UNODC	UNDP	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and work is ongoing to develop an international standard.</p> <p>This indicator is based on the definition of bribery as defined by the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS), which is the standard classification of criminal offences.</p> <p>There is consolidated experience on the conduct of surveys on the experience of bribery, both on general population and business sector. Documentation of corruption surveys (analytical reports and methodological information) is available on the UNODC website.</p> <p>Methodological documentation to develop and implement surveys on corruption can also be found in the UNODC-UNEP Manual on Victimization surveys.</p> <p>Current data availability is limited to only a handful of countries.</p> <p>Data availability reflects only what is known to UNODC. There isn't in place a system to systematically collect data from Member States on this indicators.</p>
	16.5.2 Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials during the previous 12 months	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank	UNODC	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and work is ongoing to develop an international standard.</p> <p>The indicator measures the proportion of firms expected to give gifts in meetings with tax official. It is built based on the World Bank Group Enterprise Surveys data (ES). An ES is a firm-level survey of a representative sample of an economy's private sector. The surveys interview firms in the formal (registered), non-agricultural, non-mining private sector. Interviewed firms have 5+ employees. The survey covers a broad range of business environment topics including access to finance, corruption, infrastructure, crime, competition, and performance measures. Since 2006 ES have been collected using a standard methodology, which includes standard questionnaire and sampling methodology, to 130,000 firms in 135 countries. ES are collected in regional roll-out with a 3-4 years rotation.</p>
16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels	16.6.1 Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget codes or similar)	Tier II	Tier I	World Bank		<p>CHECK DATABASE</p> <p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>The indicator is one of the standard indicators used in the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) framework, recognised as PI-1 Aggregate Expenditure Outturn. The PEFA methodology has been used in 149 countries over 500 times since it was established in 2001. The methodology has been refined recently following a 4 year consultation, testing and upgrading initiative.</p> <p>Although not all countries have used the methodology on an annual basis for this indicator, the methodology relies on standard data sets for approved and final budget outturns which are commonly produced at least annually in every country. The countries that have not used the methodology to date are primarily highly developed countries which would have less difficulty in providing the necessary data than those in the lower and middle income categories that have been primary users of PEFA to date.</p> <p>The collection agency for this data could be the World Bank Group, the OECD Effective Institutions Platform or the PEFA Secretariat. The World Bank and the Effective Institutions Platform may be best placed to collect data from all countries in view of their previous experience, but they have not collected information on this indicator previously. They may require additional resources to undertake this task. The PEFA Secretariat could perform the collections since it would be an expansion of existing activities but on a more frequent and larger scale. The PEFA Secretariat is a small technical unit, relying on donor trust fund resources and would need to consult its donor partners on whether this activity is something that they would be prepared to provide additional funds for the PEFA Secretariat to do.</p>
	16.6.2 Proportion of the population satisfied with their last experience of public services		Tier III		UNDP	<p>No information provided</p> <p>Confirm which custodian agency. (UNDP to confirm???)</p>

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels	16.7.1 Proportions of positions (by sex, age, persons with disabilities and population groups) in public institutions (national and local legislatures, public service, and judiciary) compared to national distributions		Tier III		UN-Women, UNDP	No information provided
	16.7.2 Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group		Tier III		UNDP	No information provided UNDP-to confirm
16.8 Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance	16.8.1 Proportion of members and voting rights of developing countries in international organizations		Tier I			Identify compiling agency. No information provided for the indicator. Same as indicator 10.6.1
16.9 By 2030, provide legal identity for all, including birth registration	16.9.1 Proportion of children under 5 years of age whose births have been registered with a civil authority, by age	Tier I	Tier I	UNSD UNICEF	UNFPA, DESA-Pop Division,	There is an established methodology that has been tested and work is ongoing towards the development on an international standard. The number of children who have acquired their right to a legal identity is collected mainly through censuses, civil registration systems and household surveys. Civil registration systems that are functioning effectively compile vital statistics that are used to compare the estimated total number of births in a country with the absolute number of registered births during a given period. However, the systematic recording of births in many countries remains a serious challenge. In the absence of reliable administrative data, household surveys have become a key source of data to monitor levels and trends in birth registration. In most low- and middle-income countries, such surveys represent the sole source of this information. UNICEF global database includes data from surveys as well as CRVS systems. The data availability indicated in sections 7 & 8 above refer to countries with data on birth registration. For some countries, these data refer to the percentage of births registered in a given year and not the total percentage of children under 5 whose births have been registered. Data availability is for over 140 countries.
16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements	16.10.1 Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months	Tier II	Tier III	OHCHR	ILO, UNESCO	There is a suggested methodology that has not been tested and an agreed international standard. Internationally agreed standards include UN Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/27/5; UNGA Resolution A/RES/69/185; UN Security Council Resolution 1738; UNESCO Executive Board Decision 196 EX/Decision 31; and the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity. The Intergovernmental Council of the IPDC receives the UNESCO Director General's Report on the Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity. SEE ALSO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY ILO, UNESCO. INFORMATION ABOUT DATA AVAILABILITY PROVIDED HERE IS FROM OHCHR OWN DATABASE, AND DOES NOT INCLUDE UNESCO AND ILO COLLECTED INFORMATION. The information referring to trade unions is based on existing data compiled by ILO and ITUC Based on submissions and complaints received through the ILO supervisory system, one notes that trade unionist represent a specific category whose fundamental freedoms are regularly violated across the globe. In the 2008 ILO Global Report on "Freedom of association in practice: Lessons learned" which covered the exercise of freedom of association between 2004 and 2007, the report noted that the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA) addressed violations of civil liberties in a host of countries. "These cases involved grave violations of civil liberties, including murder, abductions, disappearances, threats, arrests and detentions of trade union leaders and members, as well as other acts of anti-union harassment and intimidation, violations of Data is not widely available for all aspects of the indicator.
	16.10.2 Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information	Tier II	Tier II	UNESCO	World Bank, UNEP	There is an established methodology that has been tested and an international standard. UNESCO, within its mandate for the right to freedom of expression, which includes the corollary of the right to freedom of information, already monitors progress and issues in this area through its existing submissions to the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and research reports on World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development There is broad coverage for this indicator in all regions except Africa, where there are no countries that report on this indicator. The World Bank submitted information on an alternative data source: RIDE Indicators – Right to Information Indicators on Drivers of Effectiveness. The methodology for this indicator has been pilot tested in six countries. The RIDE Indicator focuses on implementation, as opposed to solely on adoption, of legislative guarantees of public access to information. There are other well-established indicators for adoption already. The indicator is based on research identifying drivers of effective implementation of legislative guarantees of public access to information, effectiveness being defined as elements that result in public access to information that results, in turn, in positive social and/or economic change for individuals and/or society. The methodology has been pilot tested in six countries – Albania, Jordan, Scotland, South Africa, Thailand, and Uganda – and found robust. The cost of global rollout of the indicator is estimated to be in the order of \$250,000USD, and it is suggested that it could be updated every five years at a similar cost adjusting for inflation.

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
16.a Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime	16.a.1 Existence of independent national human rights institutions in compliance with the Paris Principles	Tier I	Tier I	OHCHR	UNDP	There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. 1. General Assembly resolution A/RES/48/134 , http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/48/a48r134.htm 2. GA resolution A/RES/69/168, http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/69/168 3. GA resolution A/RES/64/161, http://nhri.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/Governance/Resolutions/Forms/DispForm.aspx?ID=24 4. Human Rights Council resolution A/HRC/RES/27/18, https://daccess-ods.un.org/TMP/9476142.52567291.html Data is available for all countries.
16.b Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development	16.b.1 Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law		Tier III	OHCHR		No information provided for the indicator. Same as indicator 10.3.1
Goal 17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development						
Finance						
17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection	17.1.1 Total government revenue as a proportion of GDP, by source		Tier I	World Bank-to confirm		No information provided
	17.1.2 Proportion of domestic budget funded by domestic taxes		Tier I	IMF		No information provided
17.2 Developed countries to implement fully their official development assistance commitments, including the commitment by many developed countries to achieve the target of 0.7 per cent of gross national income for official development assistance (ODA/GNI) to developing countries and 0.15 to 0.20 per cent of ODA/GNI to least developed countries; ODA providers are encouraged to consider setting a target to provide at least 0.20 per cent of ODA/GNI to least developed countries	17.2.1 Net official development assistance, total and to least developed countries, as a proportion of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee donors' gross national income (GNI)	Tier I	Tier I	OECD		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. The methods and standards of DAC statistics on ODA and other resource flows are explained at http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm Data is available for all 27 OECD/DAC donor countries.
17.3 Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources	17.3.1 Foreign direct investments (FDI), official development assistance and South-South Cooperation as a proportion of total domestic budget	Tier I	Tier I	OECD UNCTAD		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. Numbers of countries here include only developing countries. Data availability is for 150 countries. The OECD can provide data on official development assistance, including South-South development co-operation. This indicator may need further consideration as FDI is not part of government budgets.
	17.3.2 Volume of remittances (in United States dollars) as a proportion of total GDP	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. The World Bank reports data for 134 countries (all developing countries).
17.4 Assist developing countries in attaining long-term debt sustainability through coordinated policies aimed at fostering debt financing, debt relief and debt restructuring, as appropriate, and address the external debt of highly indebted poor countries to reduce debt distress	17.4.1 Debt service as a proportion of exports of goods and services	Tier I	Tier I	World Bank		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. The World Bank reports data for about 84 countries, with very few European countries reporting on this information.
17.5 Adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries	17.5.1 Number of countries that adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries			UNCTAD-to confirm		No information provided
Technology						
17.6 Enhance North-South, South-South and triangular regional and international cooperation on and access to science, technology and innovation and enhance knowledge-sharing on mutually agreed terms, including through improved coordination among existing mechanisms, in particular at the United Nations level, and through a global technology facilitation mechanism	17.6.1 Number of science and/or technology cooperation agreements and programmes between countries, by type of cooperation			UNESCO-to confirm		No information provided
	17.6.2 Fixed Internet broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants, by speed	Tier I	Tier I	ITU		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. ITU collects data for this indicator through an annual questionnaire from national regulatory authorities or Information and Communication Technology Ministries, who collect the data from Internet service providers. In 2014, data were available for about 80 economies, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions and more countries are expected to provide this information over the next years. Data on fixed broadband subscriptions (not broken down by speed) exist for almost 200 economies in the world. ITU publishes data on this indicator yearly.

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
17.7 Promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed	17.7.1 Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies	Blank	Tier III	OECD UNEP		There is a suggested methodology that has not been tested and work is ongoing to develop an international standard. UNEP through CTCN will develop a methodology.
17.8 Fully operationalize the technology bank and science, technology and innovation capacity-building mechanism for least developed countries by 2017 and enhance the use of enabling technology, in particular information and communications technology	17.8.1 Proportion of individuals using the Internet	Tier I	Tier I	ITU		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. The indicator proportion of individuals using the Internet, which was also an MDG indicator, is based on an internationally agreed definition and methodology, which have been developed under the coordination of ITU, through its Expert Groups and following an extensive consultation process with countries. It is also a core indicator of the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development's Core List of Indicators, which has been endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission (last time in 2014). Data on individuals using the Internet are collected through an annual questionnaire that ITU sends to national statistical offices (NSO). See: http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Pages/publications/manual2014.aspx . For most developed and an increasing number of developing countries, percentage of individuals using the Internet data are based on methodologically sound household surveys conducted by national statistical agencies. If the NSO has not collected Internet user statistics, then ITU estimates the percentage of individuals using the Internet. Data are usually not adjusted, but discrepancies in the definition, age scope of individuals, reference period or the break in comparability between years are noted in a data note. For this reason, data are not always strictly comparable. Some countries conduct a household survey where the question on Internet use is included every year. For others, the frequency is every two or three years. Overall, the indicator is available for 100 countries at least from one survey in the years 2011 2014. ITU makes the indicator available for each year for 200 economies by using survey data and estimates for almost all countries of the world. Data is widely available for all regions of the world except for Africa, where only 6 countries have reported data in the past 6 years.
Capacity-building						
17.9 Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the Sustainable Development Goals, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation	17.9.1 Dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries	Tier I	Tier I	OECD		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. The methods and standards of DAC statistics on ODA and other resource flows are explained at http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/methodology.htm Numbers of countries here include both providers and receivers of assistance. The precise coverage of this indicator is a little unclear. The OECD can provide data on official development assistance, including South-South development co-operation. For details of ODA, see metadata on 17.2. For details of South-South development co-operation see http://www.oecd.org/dac/dac-global-relations/non-dac-reporting.htm In principle, disbursements data are more readily available than commitments data, and a decision would need to be made whether gross or net figures are sought.
Trade						
17.10 Promote a universal, rules-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organization, including through the conclusion of negotiations under its Doha Development Agenda	17.10.1 Worldwide weighted tariff-average	Tier I	Tier I	WTO ITC UNCTAD		There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard. The indicator has been agreed jointly by ITC, UNCTAD and WTO. This indicator was already calculated under MDG Target 8.A (Indicator 8.7). For reference purposes see The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015 available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%2015).pdf (p. 64). The only difference is that now also tariffs applied by Developing and Least developed countries will be taken into consideration. Data availability it has been indicated for tariff data. At least 1 data point for trade data (which are also needed to calculate tariffs ad valorem equivalents) is available for all countries (please refer to questionnaire submitted by ITC/UNCTAD/WTO on indicator 17.11). This indicator can generally be compiled around March of each year. At that time (say year y), the indicator is compiled for (y-2), corresponding to the availability of detailed bi-lateral trade flows. Tariff data for the calculation of this indicator are retrieved from ITC (MACMap) - http://www.macmap.org/ - WTO (IDB) - http://tao.wto.org - and UNCTAD (TRAINS) databases. Tariff data (MFN and preferences) are collected every year for more than 130 countries and territories. WTO data are received directly from WTO Members and are processed and verified. They are jointly validated by the members themselves. Calculations of ad valorem equivalents (AVE) are provided by ITC. Trade data are needed for specific calculations are retrieved from ITC (Trade Map) - http://www.trademap.org/ - UNSD (COMTRADE) - http://comtrade.un.org/ - and WTO (IDB) - http://tao.wto.org - databases. Trade data has at least a one-year lag in terms of availability compared to tariffs. Worldwide weighted tariff-average is an indicator that provides the value of custom duties levied by every importing country from all their trading partners. The unit of measurement will be in % terms. All calculations are based on official data. However, in order to include all tariffs into the calculation, some rates which are not expressed in ad valorem form (e.g., specific duties) are converted in ad valorem equivalents (i.e. in per cent of the import value). The conversion is made at the tariff line level for each importer by using the unit value method. Import unit values are calculated from import values and quantities. Only a limited number of non-ad valorem tariff rates (i.e. technical duties) cannot be provided with ad valorem equivalents (AVE) and are excluded from the calculation. This methodology also allows for cross-country comparisons. Data availability is for over 170 countries.

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
17.11 Significantly increase the exports of developing countries, in particular with a view to doubling the least developed countries' share of global exports by 2020	17.11.1 Developing countries' and least developed countries' share of global exports	Tier I	Tier I	WTO ITC UNCTAD		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Data on goods trade is retrieved from ITC (Trade Map) – www.trademap.org, WTO (IDB) - http://tao.wto.org - UNSD (COMTRADE) - http://comtrade.un.org/ - and UNCTADstat - http://unctadstat.unctad.org/EN/ - databases. For services trade, WTO, ITC, UNCTAD have harmonized their databases and are now providing the same information. This indicator can generally be compiled around March of each year. At that time (say year y), the indicator is compiled for (y-2), corresponding to the availability of detailed bi-lateral trade flows. This indicator provides calculations of developing and LDCs exports of goods and services toward the rest of the World. The unit of measurement could be in % (developing countries' and LDCs share of global exports) or alternatively in value (i.e. USD '000). Alternatively, and in order to reflect the dual purpose of the target (i.e. increase of developing countries exports / doubling the LDCs share for global exports) 2 different indicators can be calculated out of the same data, namely: (1) least developed countries' share of global exports (in % terms), (2) exports of developing countries (in value terms). The indicator will not include export of oil and arms.</p> <p>To further refine the quality of the information, additional sub-measurement could be calculated including a) Exports of high technological content as proportion of total exports, b) Export diversification (by product; by market destination). This sub measurement can be calculated only for goods trade and not for services trade.</p> <p>Synergies could be created with target 8.2 (as a measurement of diversification, technological upgrading and innovation) and target 2.3 (to measure the increase of productivity of small scale food producers and the enhanced opportunities to access market and value addition segments).</p> <p>In terms of limitation: > Concerning missing data for trade in goods (especially in the case of LDCs) ITC (Trade Map) uses mirror data to complete the information and UNCTAD provides systematic estimates. > Information on services trade is less detailed.</p> <p>Data is available for over 130 countries across all regions of the world.</p>
17.12 Realize timely implementation of duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for all least developed countries, consistent with World Trade Organization decisions, including by ensuring that preferential rules of origin applicable to imports from least developed countries are transparent and simple, and contribute to facilitating market access	17.12.1 Average tariffs faced by developing countries, least developed countries and small island developing States	Tier I	Tier I	WTO ITC UNCTAD		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>The indicator has been agreed jointly by ITC, UNCTAD and WTO.</p> <p>This indicator was already calculated under MDG Target 8.A (Indicator 8.7). For reference purposes see The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015 available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%2015).pdf (p. 64).</p> <p>Data availability it has been indicated for tariff data. At least 1 data point for trade data (which are also needed to calculate tariffs ad valorem equivalents) is available for all countries (please refer to questionnaire submitted by ITC/UNCTAD/WTO on indicator 17.11). This indicator can generally be compiled around March of each year. At that time (say year y), the indicator is compiled for (y-2), corresponding to the availability of detailed bi-lateral trade flows.</p> <p>Tariff data for the calculation of this indicator are retrieved from ITC (MacMap) - http://www.macmap.org/ - WTO (IDB) - http://tao.wto.org - and UNCTAD (TRAINS) databases. Tariff data (MFN and preferences) are collected every year for more than 130 countries and territories. WTO data are received directly from WTO Members and are processed and verified. They are jointly validated by the members themselves. Calculations of ad valorem equivalents (AVE) are provided by ITC.</p> <p>Trade data for the calculation of weights and unit values are retrieved from ITC (Trade Map) - http://www.trademap.org/ - UNSD (COMTRADE) - http://comtrade.un.org/ - and WTO (IDB) - http://tao.wto.org - databases. Trade data has at least a one-year lag in terms of availability compared to tariffs.</p> <p>The reduction of average tariffs on key sector as agriculture can represent a proxy of the level of commitment of developed country to improve market access conditions.</p> <p>In terms of limitations: > Tariffs are only part of the trade limitation factors to the implementation of duty-free and quota-free market access, especially when looking at exports of developing or least developed countries under non-reciprocal preferential treatment that set criteria for eligibility. Accurate estimates on non-tariff measures do not exist, thus the calculations on market access are limited to tariffs only. > A full coverage of preferential schemes of developed countries has been used for the computation, but preferential treatment may not be fully used by developing countries' exporters for different reasons such as the inability of certain exporters to meet eligibility criteria (i.e., complying with rules of origin).</p>
Systemic issues						
<i>Policy and institutional coherence</i>						
17.13 Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence	17.13.1 Macroeconomic Dashboard coherence			World Bank-to confirm		No information provided
17.14 Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development	17.14.1 Number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development	Tier III	Tier III	UNEP		<p>There is no established methodology for this indicator.</p> <p>UNEP would be happy to work with other agencies on defining a standard or methodology. UNEP works on promoting policy coherence within the field of environment and between the environment and other fields, at the international level through its interagency work, support to intergovernmental processes, and at regional and national level, through its work on mainstreaming environment in development processes, promoting poverty-environment objectives, supporting governments in adoption of strategies, policies, and plans on interlinks issues, e.g. on sustainable consumption and production. UNEP also promotes policy coherence within environmental clusters addressed by Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), for instance, it supports the development of national implementation plans that address biodiversity issues in a coherent way. Information on the adoption of such plans, approaches, instruments etc. is available from various sources. A central source on the implementation of MEAs is www.informea.org. UNEP would be happy to collaborate with various other entities to develop a methodology/standards and if relevant standards.</p>
17.15 Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development	17.15.1 Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation	Tier I	Tier II	OECD		<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>Approximately 25% of all member states currently report data on this indicator (51 countries from 2010 to the present) with most coming from the Asia and the Pacific region.</p>
<i>Multi-stakeholder partnerships</i>						
17.16 Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries	17.16.1 Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals	Tier I	Tier II	OECD	UNEP	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>OECD reports data for about 80 countries from 2010 to present with none of these countries being from Africa.</p> <p>UNEP has a programme of work related to policy monitoring and can contribute to the compilation of raw data for this indicator from the environmental perspective, especially in relation to MEA-related reporting. Additionally, UNEP is able to work on the methodology for this indicator to ensure the environmental aspect of the indicator is brought into the methodology and definitions.</p>
17.17 Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships	17.17.1 Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private and civil society partnerships		Tier III	World Bank-to confirm		No information provided
<i>Data, monitoring and accountability</i>						

Target	Indicator	Proposed Tier by Agency	Revised Tier (by Secretariat)	Possible Custodian Agency(ies)	Other Involved Agencies	Detailed Information on Tier (methodology, data availability, etc)
17.18 By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts	17.18.1 Proportion of sustainable development indicators produced at the national level with full disaggregation when relevant to the target, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics	Tier II	Tier III	UNSD	UNEP, UNFPA	<p>There is a suggested methodology but it has not been tested and no international standard.</p> <p>UNFPA currently starting work with UNSD to develop the final methodology and to develop databases, baselines and targets.</p> <p>UNEP is developing an SDG monitoring portal and SDG ontology interface on the UNEP Live website. Additionally, UNEP is directly supporting countries in compiling and reporting environmental data and indicators through promoting the implementation of a national Indicator Reporting Information System (IRIS). This system provides real time information on data availability for all countries.</p> <p>UNEP is in a position to provide up-to-date information on the availability of environment data for all UN member States. Information for all member States is currently in the database; however, this information will be strengthened as indicator reporting processes improve.</p>
	17.18.2 Number of countries that have national statistical legislation that complies with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics		Tier III	UNSD/PARIS21 w/ Regional Commissions World Bank		No information provided
	17.18.3 Number of countries with a national statistical plan that is fully funded and under implementation, by source of funding	Tier II	Tier I	PARIS21	UNSD w/ Regional Commissions World Bank	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>The PARIS21 Secretariat monitors and reports annually on the implementation of National Strategies for the Development of Statistics (NSDS) as part of the Logical Framework of the Busan Action Plan for Statistics (BAPS). The funding and the source of funding of the NSDS is covered within the development process of the NSDS. In addition, a further source will be used through the methodology of the NSDS evaluation tool that was approved in 2015 by the PARIS21 Executive Committee and Board (which includes UNSD) and since implemented in several countries.</p> <p>Data is available for all countries.</p>
17.19 By 2030, build on existing initiatives to develop measurements of progress on sustainable development that complement gross domestic product, and support statistical capacity-building in developing countries	17.19.1 Dollar value of all resources made available to strengthen statistical capacity in developing countries	Tier I	Tier I	PARIS21	UNSD w/ Regional Commissions World Bank	<p>There is an established methodology that has been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>The PRESS has been published annually since 2008 with a methodology that has been approved by the PARIS21 Executive Committee and Board, which includes UNSD. The description of the methodology is available at http://www.paris21.org/sites/default/files/PRESS2009-methodology.pdf</p> <p>The report contains data for about 107 countries across all regions of the world.</p>
	17.19.2 Proportion of countries that (a) have conducted at least one population and housing census in the last 10 years; and (b) have achieved 100 per cent birth registration and 80 per cent death registration	Tier I	Tier I	UNSD	UNFPA other involved agencies in the inter-agency group on CRVS, DESA-Pop Division	<p>There is a suggested methodology that has not been tested and an agreed international standard.</p> <p>International agreement on CRVS and population census in existence.</p> <p>The work to be developed in partnership with UNSD, WHO, UNICEF, the World Bank and the inter agency group on CRVS.</p>

[a] An open-ended intergovernmental expert working group on indicators and terminology relating to disaster risk reduction established by the General Assembly (resolution 69/284) is developing a set of indicators to measure global progress in the implementation of the Sendai
[b] Acknowledging that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is the primary international, intergovernmental forum for negotiating the global response to climate
[c] Taking into account ongoing World Trade Organization negotiations, the Doha Development Agenda and the Hong Kong ministerial mandate.