

Goal 17 Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

(Updated on 29 March 2016)

Table of Contents

Target 17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection.....	3
Target 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 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.....	3
Target 17.3 Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources.....	9
Target 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.....	10
Target 17.5 Adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries.....	11
Target 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.....	12
Target 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.....	15
Target 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.....	16
Target 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.....	18
Target 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.....	20
Target 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.....	21
Target 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.....	23
Target 17.13 Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence.....	25
Target 17.14 Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development.....	26
Target 17.15 Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development.....	27
Target 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.....	31
Target 17.17 Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships.....	37
Target 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.....	38

Target 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..... 39

Target 17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection.

Indicator 17.1.1: Total government revenue as a proportion of GDP, by source

From OECD:

Definition and method of computation

Total taxes as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). In the OECD classification the term “taxes” is defined as compulsory unrequited payments to general government. The definition of government follows that of the 2008 System of National Accounts (SNA). The important parts of the SNA’s conceptual framework and its definitions of the various sectors of the economy have been reflected in the OECD’s classification of taxes. The data are predominantly recorded on an accrual basis. Data on tax revenues are recorded without offsets for the administrative expenses connected with tax collection. GDP also follows the definition used in the SNA. The methodology used in compiling the OECD’s internally comparable revenue statistics has been carefully developed and refined through consultation with national statisticians and tax policy makers for more than 40 years. It continues to evolve.

Rationale and interpretation

The headline measure presents the total tax revenues received by the national government during the year, expressed as a percentage of GDP – i.e., total national income. Taxes include personal and corporate income taxes, taxes on property, value added taxes, excise taxes, tariffs, customs duties and social security contributions. The tax to GDP ratio is the leading indicator to estimate the financial domestic means of a government to conduct its programme, to raise resources to supply physical infrastructure, public goods and services. The tax to GDP ratio supports the development of effective tax systems and is an essential feature of a successful governance framework. Normalising the data, by dividing total revenues by GDP, enables easy comparisons across countries. Comparable and consistent tax statistics, such as the tax to GDP ratio, facilitate transparent policy dialogue and provide policy makers with an important tool to assess alternative fiscal reforms and to undertake relevant policy actions.

Sources and data collection

The OECD Revenue Statistics data are compiled by the OECD and are provided by each country in accordance with the OECD classification. The accuracy of the data is guaranteed as it is verified and validated by national authorities and regional organisations.

Disaggregation

The OECD Revenue Statistics publications not only contain the overall tax burden as measured by tax to GDP ratios but also provide comparative statistics on: the tax mix (i.e., the distribution of the total tax take by the main types of taxes – for example, personal and corporate income taxes, social security contributions, taxes on goods and services; taxes on payroll and workforce; taxes on property); the share of tax revenues attributed to the different levels of government (i.e., federal or central, state and local). In certain sub-headings, distinctions are made between different categories of taxpayers.

Comments and limitations

The coverage of the OECD Revenue Statistics data currently includes more than 60 countries and is progressively increasing. It would be possible to complement the missing countries with alternative sources of data such as national accounts.

Gender equality issues

Not applicable.

Data for global and regional monitoring

The *OECD Revenue Statistics* publication is an annual report presenting a unique set of internationally comparable tax data in a common format from 1965 onwards for OECD member countries. The OECD’s Revenue Statistics publications have been expanding to include a larger number of partner countries in three regions – Africa / Asia and

Pacific Islands / Latin America and the Caribbean. The OECD has published four annual editions of *Revenue Statistics in Latin America and the Caribbean* and two annual editions of *Revenue Statistics in Asian countries*. The OECD is currently working towards the publication of the first edition of *Revenue Statistics in Africa*, due to be released in early 2016.

Supplementary information

Methodology of collection and classification and data are on-line. They are publicly available at all time, freely reusable for analysis.

References

<http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?lang=en&SubSessionId=bce616ae-0181-41e1-aae7-4d820bbd68e1&themetreeid=18>

Indicator 17.1.2: Proportion of domestic budget funded by domestic taxes

From IMF:

Indicator:

Proportion of domestic budget funded by domestic taxes

Goals and Target Addressed

This indicator is a multi-purpose indicator that addresses two Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs):

- Target 17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection.
- **Cross-cutting with:** 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; specifically the role of tax administration under 16.6.

Definition and Method of Computation

Definition

Tax burden: Revenue in the form of taxes as defined under government finance statistics (GFS) code 11 as a share of total revenue.

In GFS, taxes are classified into six major categories: (i) taxes on income, profits, and capital gains; (ii) taxes on payroll and workforce; (iii) taxes on property; (iv) taxes on goods and services; (v) taxes on international trade and transactions; and (vi) other taxes.

(Source: IMF, [Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 \(GFSM 2014\)](#), Table 4A.1, assessed Dec 28 2015)

Concepts

Tax burden concept may be disaggregated into the complementary concepts of:

“direct taxes” or taxes that take into account individual circumstances of taxpayers (e.g., taxes on individual and corporate income), which can be calculated from the following detailed GFS revenue classifications: 111 Taxes on income, profits, and capital gains+1131 Recurrent taxes on immovable property+1132 Recurrent taxes on net wealth+1136 Other recurrent taxes on property; and

“indirect taxes” or taxes that do not take into account individual circumstances of taxpayers (e.g., taxes imposed on goods and services), which can be calculated from the following detailed GFS revenue classifications 112 Taxes on payroll and workforce+114 Taxes on goods and services+115 Taxes on international trade and transactions+116 Other taxes.

Tax burden is directly related to the wider concept of fiscal burden, which can be derived from combining two *GFSM 2014* revenue codes: code 11 Taxes *plus* code 12, Social Contributions or, alternatively 11+121+122.

These concepts can also be found in the *2008 System of National Accounts (2008 SNA)*.

The coverage, timing, and valuation of tax revenue in *GFSM 2014* and the *2008 SNA* are identical, but the classification systems differ. The 2008 SNA classifies taxes according to their role in economic activities—namely: (i) taxes on production and imports (D2); (ii) current taxes on income, wealth, etc. (D5); and (iii) capital taxes (D91). The result is that some categories of taxes in GFS need to be allocated between two of the SNA tax categories according to whether they are payable by producers or final consumers, or whether they are current or capital taxes. A detailed description of the linkages between the GFS and the 2008 SNA categories of taxes is provided in Appendix 7 of the *GFSM 2014*.

Rationale and Interpretation

Rationale for 17.1.2:

Measures of tax burden are indicators of how well tax policy meets one of its primary goals, equitably raising the revenues needed to run government. Equity has two aspects. The first, vertical equity, concerns the way taxes are distributed among taxpayers with different abilities to pay. The second, horizontal equity, concerns the way taxes are distributed among taxpayers with the same ability to pay. Tax burden measures thus answer broad economic and social questions about the effect of tax policy on the distribution of income and wealth.

The distinction regarding national, state and/or local level government is important. For the purposes of monitoring this indicator, the central budget is seen as the focus (even if some of tax payments go to other jurisdictions). When decisions about resources are made, the budgetary central government is a key subsector of the general government sector of the economy. The general government sector consists of resident institutional units that fulfill the functions of government as their primary activity. In all countries, there is an institutional unit of the general government sector particularly important in terms of size and power, in particular the power to exercise control over many other units and entities. The budgetary central government is often a single unit of the central government that encompasses the fundamental activities of the national executive, legislative, and judiciary powers. This component of general government is usually covered by the main (or general) budget. The budgetary central government’s revenue and expense are normally regulated and controlled by a ministry of finance, or its functional equivalent, by means of a budget approved by the legislature. Most of the ministries, departments, agencies, boards, commissions, judicial authorities, legislative bodies, and other entities that make up the budgetary central government are not separate institutional units. This is because they generally do not have the authority to own assets, incur liabilities, or engage in transactions in their own right (see *GFSM 2014* Chapter 2).

There is a widespread acceptance – in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and indeed in Agenda 2030 – that multiple sources of finance will be needed to meet the SDGs, and that these will need to work

together effectively. This includes a greater role for domestic resources in meeting national development goals, and for interventions in which public resources – including ODA - strengthen domestic capacities for expanding their revenue bases. Indeed, especially in developing countries, vertical fiscal gaps will potentially widen as demands increase for higher public spending – particularly in countries where there is significant pressure on central authorities to provide quality infrastructure and basic services. In many cases the execution of the budgetary central government’s proposed budget is constrained by poor revenue administration and/or a lack of a statistical framework for monitoring revenue streams. Given unpredictable and fluctuating levels of revenue in many developing countries, improved revenue statistics will help mitigate any possible budget shortfalls and support the sustainable development of national economies.

Sources and Data Collection

Revenue data: annual and sub-annual tax data in either GFS format or a national presentation that can be “bridged” to the GFS classifications are generally available from Ministry of Finance data. Such data refer to the six main GFS categories as indicated under Definition.

Disaggregation

It is suggested, based upon the complexity of data collection, standardised reporting, and cost implications that data should not be disaggregated below the level of detail presented in the *GFSM 2014*.

Comments and Limitations

Key issues related to this indicator are (1) level of disaggregation of the six main GFS tax categories, (2) cost of linking national presentations to the GFS classification system, (3) data accuracy, and (4) cross-country comparability. Although the SNA and OECD Revenue Statistics may be utilised to determine the tax burden, ensuring cross-country comparability can best be achieved through the use of the *GFSM 2014* classifications.

Gender Equality Issues

No key gender issues related to this indicator.

Supplementary Information

Revenue Statistics, published annually by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the related database, although limited to OECD countries and a specific timeline, does provide a widely adopted and largely comparable methodology that can support addressing this indicator. This annual publication gives a conceptual framework to define which government receipts should be regarded as taxes. It presents a unique set of detailed and internationally comparable tax data in a common format for all OECD countries from 1965 onwards.

It should also be noted that the classification employed in OECD *Revenue Statistics* has two main differences from the GFSM 2014: Compulsory social security contributions are treated as taxes and the categories of taxes on goods and services, and taxes on international trade and transactions are combined into a single category. In addition, at a detailed classification level, *Revenue Statistics* differs in the following aspects: (i) payable tax credits are recorded as negative taxes to the extent that the payable tax credit off sets existing income tax receivable; (ii) imputed taxes or subsidies resulting from the central bank imposing a rate of interest other than the market rate are excluded from *Revenue Statistics*; and (iii) imputed taxes or subsidies resulting from the operation of multiple exchange rate systems are excluded from *Revenue Statistics*.

Examples

Key revenue classifications of the GFS system as well as the detailed GFS tax classification is provided below.

GFSM 2014 REVENUE CLASSIFICATION (Summary)		GFSM 2014 TAX CLASSIFICATION (Detail)	
1	REVENUE	1	REVENUE
11	Taxes	11	Taxes
111	Taxes on income, profits, and capital gains	111	Taxes on income, profits, and capital gains
112	Taxes on payroll and workforce	1111	Payable by individuals
113	Taxes on property	1112	Payable by corporations and other enterprises
114	Taxes on goods and services	1113	Other
115	Taxes on international trade and transactions	112	Taxes on payroll and workforce
116	Other taxes	113	Taxes on property
12	Social contributions	1131	Recurrent taxes on immovable property
121	Social security contributions	1132	Recurrent taxes on net wealth
122	Other social contributions	1133	Estate, inheritance, and gift taxes
13	Grants	1135	Capital levies
131	From foreign governments	1136	Other recurrent taxes on property
132	From international organizations	114	Taxes on goods and services
133	From other general government units	1141	General taxes on goods and services
14	Other revenue	11411	Value-added taxes
141	Property income	11412	Sales taxes
142	Sales of goods and services	11413	Turnover & other general taxes on G & S
143	Fines, penalties, and forfeits	11414	Taxes on financial and capital transactions
144	Transfers not elsewhere classified	1142	Excises
145	insurance and standardized guarantee schemes	1143	Profits of fiscal monopolies
		1144	Taxes on specific services
		1145	Taxes on use of goods and on permission to use goods or perform activities
		11451	Motor vehicles taxes
		11452	Other
		1146	Other taxes on goods and services
		115	Taxes on international trade and transactions
		1151	Customs and other import duties
		1152	Taxes on exports
		1153	Profits of export or import monopolies
		1154	Exchange profits
		1155	Exchange taxes
		1156	Other taxes on international trade and transactions
		116	Other taxes

References

IMF, [Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 \(GFSM 2014\)](#), assessed Dec 28 2015.

OCED, Revenue Statistics and the related database, (<http://www.oecd.org/ctp/tax-policy/revenue-statistics-19963726.htm>), assessed Dec 28 2015.

Target 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 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.

Indicator 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)

From OECD:

Definition and method of computation

Net [official development assistance](#) (ODA) to all countries on the [DAC List of ODA Recipients](#) and net official development assistance to the [Least Developed Countries, SIDS and LLDCs](#), as well as African countries. Data are usually expressed in US dollars at the average annual exchange rate, or as a share of provider countries' gross national income (GNI).

Rationale and interpretation

ODA is the accepted measure of development co-operation, including both grants and soft loans provided by governments for development and welfare objectives in developing countries. UN members have agreed a total net ODA target for economically advanced countries of 0.7% of GNI, and a target of 0.15-0.20% for ODA to LDCs.

Sources and data collection

Data on ODA are compiled by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development from returns submitted by its member countries and other aid providers. Data can be accessed [here](#).

Disaggregation

The data are generally obtained on an activity level, and include numerous parameters. They can thus be disaggregated by provider and recipient country, by the groups of countries listed in Target 10b; and by sector assisted, by type of finance, and by type of resources provided.

Comments and limitations

The data only address concessional flows for development and welfare purposes provided by governments. The OECD and other organisations also collect data on broader financial flows to developing countries, including non-concessional official flows, foreign direct investment, bank lending, export credits and other flows. The World Bank makes estimates of remittance flows, and the IMF compiles balance-of-payments data. However the poverty focus and concordance of the various categories of flows with national development plans is less clear, and further discussion may be required to arrive at an agreed measure of non-ODA official and private flows “to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions”.

Gender equality issues

The data include a [“gender equality” marker](#) which identifies individual projects that have a clear gender dimension. There are also dedicated purpose codes for activities specifically targeting gender equality or that aim to combat violence against women and girls (in preparation).

Data for global and regional monitoring

Data are available for essentially all high-income countries, and for an increasing number of middle-income aid providers.

Supplementary information

See the [DAC Aid Statistics page](#).

References

OECD 2011, [Measuring Aid](#)

Target 17.3 Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources.

Indicator 17.3.1: Foreign direct investments (FDI), official development assistance and South-South Cooperation as a proportion of total domestic budget

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Indicator 17.3.2: Volume of remittances (in United States dollars) as a proportion of total GDP

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Target 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.

Indicator 17.4.1: Debt service as a proportion of exports of goods and services

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Target 17.5 Adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries.

Indicator 17.5.1: Number of countries that adopt and implement investment promotion regimes for least developed countries

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Target 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.

Indicator 17.6.1: Number of science and/or technology cooperation agreements and programmes between countries, by type of cooperation

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Indicator 17.6.2: Fixed Internet broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants, by speed

From ITU and Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development:

Definition and method of computation

The indicator *fixed Internet broadband subscriptions, by speed*, refers to the number of fixed-broadband subscriptions to the public Internet, split by advertised download speed.

Fixed Internet broadband subscriptions refer to subscriptions to high-speed access to the public Internet (a TCP/IP connection), at downstream speeds equal to, or greater than, 256 kbit/s. This includes cable modem, DSL, fibre-to-the-home/building, other fixed (wired)-broadband subscriptions, satellite broadband and terrestrial fixed wireless broadband. This total is measured irrespective of the method of payment. It excludes subscriptions that have access to data communications (including the Internet) via mobile-cellular networks. It should include fixed WiMAX and any other fixed wireless technologies. It includes both residential subscriptions and subscriptions for organizations.

The Internet is a worldwide public computer network. It provides access to a number of communication services including the World Wide Web and carries e-mail, news, entertainment and data files.

The indicator is currently broken down by the following subscription speeds:

- **256 kbit/s to less than 2 Mbit/s subscriptions:** Refers to all fixed broadband Internet subscriptions with advertised downstream speeds equal to, or greater than, 256 kbit/s and less than 2 Mbit/s.
- **2 Mbit/s to less than 10 Mbit/s subscriptions:** Refers to all fixed -broadband Internet subscriptions with advertised downstream speeds equal to, or greater than, 2 Mbit/s and less than 10 Mbit/s.
- **Equal to or above 10 Mbit/s subscriptions (4213_G10).** Refers to all fixed -broadband Internet subscriptions with advertised downstream speeds equal to, or greater than, 10 Mbit/s.

ITU collects data for this indicator through an annual questionnaire from national regulatory authorities or Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Ministries, who collect the data from national Internet service providers. The data can be collected by asking each

Internet service provider in the country to provide the number of their fixed-broadband subscriptions by the speeds indicated. The data are then added up to obtain the country totals.

Rationale and interpretation

The Internet has become an increasingly important tool to provide access to information, and can help foster and enhance regional and international cooperation on, and access to, science, technology and innovations, and enhance knowledge sharing. High-speed Internet access is important to ensure that Internet users have quality access to the Internet and can take advantage of the growing amount of Internet content – including user-generated content –, services and information.

While the number of fixed-broadband subscriptions has increased substantially over the last years and while service providers offer increasingly higher speeds, fixed Internet broadband can vary tremendously by speed, thus affecting the quality and functionality of Internet access. Many countries, especially in the developing world, have not only a very limited amount of fixed-broadband subscriptions, but also at very low speeds. This limitation is a barrier to the Target 17.6 and the indicator highlights the potential of the Internet (especially through high-speed access) to enhance cooperation, improve access to science, technology and innovation, and share knowledge. The indicator also highlights the importance of Internet use as a development enabler and helps to measure the digital divide, which, if not properly addressed, will aggravate inequalities in all development domains. Information on fixed broadband subscriptions by speed will contribute to the design of targeted policies to overcome those divides.

Sources and data collection

The indicator *fixed Internet broadband subscriptions, by speed* 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). The indicator on fixed Internet broadband subscriptions is also included in the ITU ICT Development Index (IDI), and thus considered a key metric for international comparisons of ICT developments. In the future, as more countries collect data on this indicator broken down by speed, breakdowns could be included and used to calculate the IDI.

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 were available for about 80 economies, from developed and developing regions, and covering all key global regions. 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.

Disaggregation

Since data for this indicator are based on administrative data from operators, no information on individual subscribers is available and therefore the data cannot be broken down by any individual characteristics. Data could in theory be broken down by geographic location and urban/rural, but ITU does not collect this information.

Comments and limitations

Since most Internet service providers offer plans linked to download speed, the indicator is relatively straightforward to collect. Countries may use packages that do not align with the speeds used for this group of indicators. Countries are encouraged to collect the data in more speed categories so as to allow aggregation of the data according to the split shown above. In the future, ITU might start to include higher-speed categories, reflecting the increasing demand and availability of higher-speed broadband subscriptions.

Gender equality issues

Data cannot be broken down by gender.

Data for global and regional monitoring

Regional and global aggregates of the number of *fixed Internet broadband subscriptions, by speed* have not yet been produced since data exist for about 80 economies (in 2014). However, more countries are expected to provide information on this indicator over the next few years, which will allow ITU to produce regional and global estimates. Data on fixed-broadband subscriptions not broken down by speed are widely available, and regional and global aggregates can easily be produced.

Supplementary information

Year-end data are released in December of the following year through the ITU World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators Database.

References

- [ITU Handbook for the Collection of Administrative Data on Telecommunications/ICT](#), 2011, (and revisions and new indicators)

Targets for which indicator are relevant

8.2, 9.1, 9.c, 17.8

Target 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.

Indicator 17.7.1: Total amount of approved funding for developing countries to promote the development, transfer, dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Target 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.

Indicator 17.8.1: Proportion of individuals using the Internet

From ITU, UNCDF, Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development:

Definition and method of computation:

This indicator is defined as the proportion of individuals who used the Internet from any location in the last three months. The *Internet* is a worldwide public computer network. It provides access to a number of communication services including the World Wide Web and carries e-mail, news, entertainment and data files, irrespective of the device used (not assumed to be only via a computer – it may also be by mobile telephone, tablet, PDA, games machine, digital TV etc.). Access can be via a fixed or mobile network.

For countries that collect data on this indicator through an official survey, this indicator is calculated by dividing the total number of in-scope individuals using the Internet (from any location) in the last 3 months by the total number of in-scope individuals. For countries that have not carried out an official survey, data are estimated (by ITU) based on the number of Internet subscriptions and other socioeconomic indicators such as for example GNI per capita, and on the time series data of the indicator.

Rationale and interpretation

The Internet has become an increasingly important tool to access public information, which is a relevant means to protect fundamental freedoms. The number of Internet users has increased substantially over the last decade and access to the Internet has changed the way people live, communicate, work and do business. Internet uptake is a key indicator tracked by policy makers and others to measure the development of the information society and the growth of Internet content – including user-generated content – provides access to increasing amounts of information and services.

Despite growth in networks, services and applications, information and communication technology (ICT) access and use is still far from equally distributed, and many people cannot yet benefit from the potential of the Internet. This indicator highlights the importance of Internet use as a development enabler and helps to measure the digital divide, which, if not properly addressed, will aggravate inequalities in all development domains. Classificatory variables for individuals using the Internet – such as age, sex, education level or labour force status – can help identify digital divides in individuals using the Internet. This information can contribute to the design of targeted policies to overcome those divides.

The proportion of individuals using the Internet is an established indicator and also one of the three ICT-related Millennium Development Goal (MDG) indicators (for Target 8F). It is part 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). It is also included in the ITU ICT Development Index, and thus considered a key metric for international comparisons of ICT developments.

Sources and data collection

This 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). In this questionnaire ITU collects absolute values. The percentages are calculated a-posteriori. The survey methodology is verified to ensure that it meets adequate statistical standards. The data are verified to ensure consistency with previous years' data and situation of the country for other related indicators (ICT and economic).

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.

Disaggregation

For countries that collect this indicator through an official survey, and if data allow breakdown and disaggregation, the indicator can be broken down by region (geographic and/or urban/rural), by sex, by age group, by educational level, by labour force status, and by occupation. ITU collects data for all of these breakdowns from countries.

Comments and limitations

While the data on the percentage of individuals using the Internet are very reliable for countries that have collected the data through official household surveys, they are less reliable in cases where the number of Internet users is estimated by ITU. ITU is encouraging all countries to collect data on this indicator through official surveys and the number of countries with official data for this indicator is increasing.

Gender equality issues

Discrepancies exist between the proportion of men and women that use the Internet and it is important to track this gender divide. For countries that collect this indicator through an official survey, and if data allow breakdown and disaggregation, the indicator can be broken down by sex. About 70 countries have sex-disaggregated data for this indicator for at least one year in the period 2011-2014 and more countries are expected to produce these data over the next years

Data for global and regional monitoring

Regional and global aggregates of the number of Internet users are calculated as unweighted sums of the country values. Regional and global values for the percentage of individuals using the Internet are averages of the country values weighted by the population of the countries and regions. They are widely available since ITU produces data for this indicator for 200 economies, covering the large majority of developed and developing countries, and all regions.

Supplementary information

Discrepancies between global and national figures may arise when countries use a different definition than the one agreed internationally and used by ITU. Discrepancies may also arise in cases where the age scope of the surveys differs, or when the country only provides data for a certain age group and not the total population.

Year-end estimates are usually released in June of the following year through the ITU World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators Database. Data are also available at no cost through the ITU ICT Eye, see: <http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/>

References:

- [ITU Manual for Measuring ICT Access and Use by Households and Individuals 2014](#)

Targets for which indicator are relevant:

1.4, 2c, 5b, 9c, 10.3, 12.8, 16.10, 16.6, 16.7, 16.10, 17.6, 17.8,

Target 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.

Indicator 17.9.1: Dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries

From OECD:

Definition and method of computation

[Official development assistance](#) (ODA) to countries on the [DAC List of ODA Recipients](#) in the following subsectors as explained in the list of Creditor Reporting System purpose codes available [here](#):

- 11110 Education policy and administrative management
- 12110 Health policy and administrative management
- 13010 Population policy and administrative management
- 14010 Water sector policy and administrative management
- 15110 Public sector policy and administrative management
- 15210 Security system management and reform
- 16020 Employment policy and administrative management
- 16030 Housing policy and administrative management
- 21010 Transport policy and administrative management
- 22010 Communications policy and administrative management
- 23110 Energy policy and administrative management
- 24010 Financial policy and administrative management
- 31110 Agricultural policy and administrative management
- 31210 Forestry policy and administrative management
- 31310 Fishing policy and administrative management
- 32110 Industrial policy and administrative management
- 32210 Mineral/mining policy and administrative management
- 32310 Construction policy and administrative management
- 33110 Trade policy and administrative management
- 33210 Tourism policy and administrative management

Rationale and interpretation

ODA covers the value of both financial and technical assistance for development purposes. The above sectors broadly correspond to the coverage of the SDGs and focus on capacity building and national planning opposed to the implementation of specific projects and programmes.

Sources and data collection

Data on ODA are compiled by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development from returns submitted by its member countries and other aid providers. Data can be accessed [here](#).

Disaggregation

The data are generally obtained on an activity level, and include numerous parameters. They can thus be disaggregated by provider and recipient country, by the groups of countries; and by each sub-sector assisted, by type of finance, and by type of resources provided.

Comments and limitations

The data only address concessional flows for development and welfare purposes provided by governments. The OECD and other organisations also collect data on broader financial flows to developing countries, including non-concessional official flows, foreign direct investment, bank lending, export credits and other flows. The World Bank makes estimates of remittance flows, and the IMF compiles balance-of-payments data. The sustainable development focus and concordance of these other categories of flows with national development plans is less clear, and substantial further work would be required to arrive at an agreed measure of non-ODA official and private flows “for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the sustainable development goals”. Nevertheless, in the medium term, data will also be available on Total Official Support to Sustainable Development (TOSSD) to the same sectors.

The degree of consonance of individual aid activities with the Sustainable Development Goals will also depend on the level of commitment to the Goals by the provider and developing countries concerned, and on the extent to which donors avoid using the codes to “park” assistance to the relevant sectors which does fit under a more specific code

Gender equality issues

The data include a “[gender equality](#)” marker which identifies individual projects that have a clear gender dimension. There are also dedicated purpose codes for activities specifically targeting gender equality or that aim to combat violence against women and girls (in preparation).

Data for global and regional monitoring

Data are available for essentially all high-income countries, and for an increasing number of South-South providers, and means are available to report on triangular co-operation.

Supplementary information

See the [DAC Aid Statistics page](#).

References

OECD 2011, [Measuring Aid](#)

Target 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.

Indicator 17.10.1: Worldwide weighted tariff-average

From ITC/UNCTAD/WTO:

Definition and method of computation

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.

Rationale and interpretation

The average level of customs tariff rates applied worldwide can be used as an indicator of the degree of success achieved by multilateral negotiations.

Disaggregation

This indicator can be disaggregated and analysed by type of tariffs (MFN tariffs and preferential tariffs), product sector, by geographical region and by level of development.

Comments and limitations

Tariffs are only part of the factors that can explain the degree of openness and transparency in the international trade arena. However, accurate estimates on non-tariff measures or of transparency indicator do not exist.

Gender equality issues

Gender equality issues cannot be captured by this indicator

Supplementary information and references

To further refine the quality of the information, additional sub-measurements could be calculated including: a) Tariff peaks (i.e. % of tariffs on some products that are considerably higher than usual, defined as above 15 per cent) and b) Tariff escalation (i.e. wherein a country applies a higher tariff rate to products at the later stages of production). These calculations were already provided by ITC as part of the MDG Gap Task Force Report. See the report for further information on the methodology at http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/mdg_gap/mdg_gap2014/2014GAP_FULL_EN.pdf

Responsible entities

ITC/UNCTAD/WTO

Sources and data collection

Tariff data for the calculation of this indicator are retrieved from the ITC (MAcMap) - <http://www.macmap.org/> - and WTO (IDB). Data from these 2 databases are also displayed on the World Integrated Trade Solution application <http://wits.worldbank.org/>

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 for the calculation of weights and unit values are retrieved from ITC (Trade Map), WTO (IDB) and UNSD (COMTRADE) databases. Trade data has at least a one-year lag in terms of availability compared to tariffs.

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.

Current data availability

Tariff data is available for overall more than 190 countries. Data are updated every year for approximately 130 countries.

Target 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.

Indicator 17.11.1: Developing countries' and least developed countries' share of global exports

From ITC/UNCTAD/WTO:

Definition and method of computation

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.

Rationale and interpretation

The indicator is self-explanatory and measures precisely what is required by the target.

Sources and data collection

Data on goods trade is retrieved from ITC (Trade Map), WTO (IDB) and UNSD (COMTRADE) 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.

Disaggregation

This indicator can be disaggregated and analysed by product sector, by geographical region and by level of development.

Comments and limitations

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.

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) .

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.

Gender equality issues

Gender equality issues cannot be captured by this indicator

Supplementary information and references

Responsible entities

ITC/UNCTAD/WTO

Current data availability

Data on goods trade is available for almost all countries and territories.

Data on services trade are available for almost 200 countries but bilateral data are scarcer and as well as information at the higher level of detail

From Universal Postal Union (UPU):

In the sections below, the UPU provides metadata regarding an e-commerce component for the indicator “Developing countries and LDCs’ exports (by partner group and key sectors), including services”, namely “Developing countries and LDCs’ e-commerce flows at the export level (volumes and/or values, and by product)”.

Definition and method of computation

Developing countries and LDCs’ e-commerce flows at the export level (volumes and/or values, and by product): this indicator would be a volume or value index of international e-commerce flows from developing countries and LDCs to the rest of the world.

International postal and parcel flows would be a proxy for international e-commerce flows since the e-commerce ecosystem heavily relies on the international postal and express infrastructure to transport e-commerce-related shipments.

Rationale and interpretation

E-commerce is likely to represent a significant share of international trade transactions by 2030. In order to avoid an e-commerce divide between developing and developed countries, trade policies must fully take into account this irreversible phenomenon. Moreover, international e-commerce will play an essential development role for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the coming two decades, particularly for those interested in internationalizing their activities.

Source and data collection

The indicator can be estimated thanks to data available in UPU’s international tracking systems for parcels and postal items enabling real-time analysis of billions of data records.

Disaggregation

The possibility of accessing tracking systems data enables the maximal disaggregation level from a geographic perspective, with detailed information available for any location involved in international postal and parcels exchanges within a country. Moreover, the forthcoming systematic use of an electronic customs declaration system by UPU member countries will considerably enrich the data with product information at the most disaggregated HS classification level for international trade.

Comments and limitations

While international postal exchanges reflect the development of international e-commerce very well, a small number of international postal transactions represents exchanges between individuals only. However, the latter exchanges are typically not submitted to commercial customs declaration.

Gender equality issues

The proportion of male or female recipients of postal items could be estimated by sampling postal traffic in each country.

Supplementary information

Postal, parcel and express delivery networks are dealing with at least half a trillion economic transactions every year. Furthermore, post offices represent the largest physical retail network in the world with over 650,000 offices worldwide.

References

UNCTAD. (2015). Information Economy Report 2015. Unlocking the Potential of E-commerce for Developing Countries. UNCTAD. At: http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/ier2015_en.pdf

UPU Postal Statistics website: <http://www.upu.int/en/resources/postal-statistics/about-postal-statistics.html>

Targets for which indicators are relevant

2.3, 8.2

Target 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.

Indicator 17.12.1: Average tariffs faced by developing countries, least developed countries and small island developing States

From ITC/UNCTAD/WTO:

Definition and method of computation

Similar calculations were already used for the calculation of MDG 8.7 (Average tariffs imposed by developed countries on agricultural products and textiles and clothing from developing countries). 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\(July%2011\).pdf](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%2011).pdf) (p. 64)

Rationale and interpretation

The reduction of average tariff on key sector as agriculture can represent a proxy of the level of commitment of developed country to improve market access conditions. As it was done for MDG 8.7, the term “key sector” has to be interpreted as those sectors of particular interest for LDCs and developing countries exports. The list of key sectors used by the MDG indicator 8.7 (i.e. agriculture, textile and clothing) might have to be reviewed.

Sources and data collection

Tariff data for the calculation of this indicator are retrieved from the ITC (MAcMap) - <http://www.macmap.org/> - and WTO (IDB). Data from these 2 databases are also displayed on the World Bank/UNCTAD World Integrated Trade Solution application <http://wits.worldbank.org/>

Tariff data (MFN and preferences) are collected every year for more than 120 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 for the calculation of weights and unit values are retrieved from ITC (Trade Map), WTO (IDB) and UNSD (COMTRADE) databases. Trade data has at least a one-year lag in terms of availability compared to tariffs.

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.

Disaggregation

This indicator can be disaggregated and analysed by type of tariffs (MFN tariffs and preferential tariffs), product sector, by geographical region and by level of development.

Comments and limitations

ITC/UNCTAD/WTO endorse the suggestion proposed by India, during the open consultation, to reword the indicator to read: “Average tariffs for exports faced by developing countries and LDCs by key source from developed countries” and by the United States to focus only on LDCs. The two suggestions will not change the calculation methodology behind the indicator. Agreement on these points should be sought during the next IAEG meeting.

In terms of limitations:

- Tariffs 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. 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).
- The indicator only addresses the tariff situation facing developing countries' exports and not their own tariff profiles, despite the fact that trade openness, by itself, is conducive to export promotion.

Gender equality issues

Gender equality issues cannot be captured by this indicator

Data for global and regional monitoring

Supplementary information and references

Responsible entities

ITC/UNCTAD/WTO

Current data availability

Concerning the feasibility rating, data is already available.

Target 17.13 Enhance global macroeconomic stability, including through policy coordination and policy coherence.

Indicator 17.13.1: Macroeconomic Dashboard

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Target 17.14 Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development.

Indicator 17.14.1: Number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Target 17.15 Respect each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development.

Indicator 17.15.1: Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation

From OECD:

Definition and method of computation

This indicator seeks to measure the extent to which, and the ways in which, transparent, developing country-led results frameworks (CRFs) are used by all concerned development partners to plan development cooperation efforts and assess their performance.

Specifically, the indicator assesses the degree to which providers of development cooperation (i.e. development partners) design their interventions by relying on objectives and results indicators that are drawn from developing country government-led results frameworks reflecting the country's development priorities and goals.

To provide a comprehensive measure on the extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and other government-led planning tools, the indicator calculates the degree to which *objectives*, *results indicators* and *monitoring frameworks* associated with new development interventions are drawn from government sources –including national, sector and subnational planning tools:

For each development intervention of significant size (US\$ 1 million and above) approved during the year of reference		
Q^1	Whether objectives are drawn from government-led results frameworks, plans and strategies	0/1
Q^2	Share of results (outcome) indicators that are drawn from government-led results frameworks, plans and strategies	%
Q^3	Share of results (outcome) indicators that will rely on sources of data provided by existing country-led monitoring systems or national statistical services to track project progress	%

Written in equation form, for a given project,

$$Q^1 = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{Objectives are not drawn from government – led results frameworks, plans and strategies} \\ 1, & \text{Objectives are drawn from government – led results frameworks, plans and strategies} \end{cases}$$

$$Q^2 = n_r/n, \text{ and } Q^3 = n_s/n.$$

where n_r is the number of outcome indicators drawn from existing government results frameworks and/or other planning documents; n_s is the number of outcome indicators to be tracked using government ongoing statistics, data sources or M&E systems (i.e. not project-specific sources); n is the total number of outcome indicators included in the project's results framework. Below, let Q_j^1, Q_j^2, Q_j^3 denote the values for Q^1, Q^2 , and Q^3 for project j , respectively.

For the year of reference:

- Aggregated averages per developing country will provide an assessment of the country's available policy space and leadership. For a country c , the indicator (I) takes the value:

$$I_c = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \{Q_j^1 + Q_j^2 + Q_j^3\}}{3n_c}$$

where n_c is the number of new interventions reported for country c . In the formula above, the indicator is obtained by taking the average of the three dimensions of alignment with country's priorities and goals and then aggregating across all new interventions within the country¹.

- Aggregated averages per provider of development cooperation will indicate the percentage of alignment with country-led priority setting mechanisms. For a provider p , the indicator (I) takes the value:

$$I_p = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_p} \{Q_j^1 + Q_j^2 + Q_j^3\}}{3n_p}$$

where n_p is the number of new interventions reported for provider p . Similarly to the previous formula, the indicator is obtained by taking the average of the three dimensions of alignment with country's priorities and goals and then aggregating across all new interventions for the provider.

A global aggregate for the indicator is obtained by averaging the three dimensions of alignment with country's priorities and goals across all new interventions for the reporting year:

$$I = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \{Q_j^1 + Q_j^2 + Q_j^3\}}{3n}$$

When aggregating, the decision was made not to weight by the size of the project/ intervention in order to give the same level of importance to the extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools in medium-sized vs. larger projects, as the indicator tries to capture the overall behaviour of providers in designing new interventions in a given country. Weighting by project size would otherwise over-represent infrastructure projects and underrepresent interventions focused on influencing policies and institutional arrangements. Nevertheless, data on project size is available.

Rationale and interpretation

Measuring the alignment of providers' support to country priorities in terms of intervention design and type of results-reporting mechanisms provides a relevant assessment regarding the degree of "respect for each country's policy space and leadership to establish and implement country-owned policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development".

In particular, for interventions approved in the year of reference (i.e. most recent behavior), the assessment measures the extent to which support from other countries and international organizations set exogenous priorities and conditions to recipient countries that are not reflected in existing country-led priority-setting mechanisms or planning tools.

¹ Note that data to weight the results by provider's actual contributions in terms of development finance is available, if requested by the IAEG-SDG / UN Statistical Commission.

The information collected throughout the indicator provides a “two-way mirror”, providing both a country-level estimate on a country’s existing policy space, and a provider-level aggregated estimate on a development partner’s degree of alignment with existing results frameworks and priority-setting mechanisms in recipient countries where it operates.

Sources and data collection

OECD and UNDP are currently supporting about 80 developing countries in collecting relevant data on a biennial basis, and these organisations lead data aggregation and quality assurance at the global level ([source](#)). Data collection and validation is a government-led process, with strong engagement of other stakeholders, including providers of development cooperation, representatives of parliaments, local governments, civil society organizations, the private sector, and trade unions. In addition, countries are increasingly institutionalising the data collection process within their national aid management systems and may be able to report on the indicator on a yearly basis.

Disaggregation

Given the bottom-up approach in generating the indicator, disaggregation will be possible at the country level, at the provider level, at the sector level, and at the development project level.

Data for global and regional monitoring

While data collection is led at the country level, in a bottom-up approach, global and regional aggregates can be used for monitoring internationally-agreed commitments related to strengthening country ownership and better partner alignment with nationally-set development goals.

Comments and limitations

Data collection currently covers about 80 developing countries for the 2015-2016 period. The estimates for developed countries are generated taking as a reference their role as development cooperation providers (second formula).

Current data availability

About 80 developing countries are currently leading the process of collecting data to set a baseline value for 2015. New measurements for the indicator will be collected every two years.

Data collected will set a baseline for those 80 developing countries and for at least 75 official providers of development cooperation –including the 29 developed countries that are members of the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee as well as the six major multilateral organizations in terms of development finance (i.e. the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations Development Programme, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank).

Responsible entities

OECD and UNDP.

Additional information

The ongoing monitoring exercise is collecting data beyond the scope of the proposed indicator, including additional aspects such as provider-government engagement in planning project/programme evaluations. Details of the data collection strategy and the indicator's methodology may be refined further in light of the first wave of collected data for 2015 (to be reported in mid-2016).

References

Ocampo, Jose Antonio (2015). *A Post-2015 Monitoring and Accountability Framework*. UNDESA: CDP Background Paper No. 27. ST/ESA/2015/CDP/27

Espey, Jessica; K. Walecik and M. Kühner (2015). *Follow-up and Review of the SDGs: Fulfilling our Commitments*. Sustainable Development Solutions Network: A Global Initiative for the United Nations. New York: SDSN.

Coppard, D. and C. Culey (2015). *The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation's Contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Plenary Session 1 Background Paper. Busan Global Partnership Forum, Korea.

GPEDC (2015). *Monitoring Guide 2015-2016*. New York/Paris: GPEDC. Accessed at www.effectivecooperation.org

Target 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.

Indicator 17.16.1: Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals

From OECD:

Goal and target addressed

Goal 17 Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

Target 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.

Definition and method of computation

The indicator tracks the number of countries reporting progress in *multi-stakeholder* monitoring frameworks that track effective development cooperation, to support the achievement of sustainable development goals (SDGs).

To reflect the universal nature of target 17.16 this indicator is presented as the global aggregate number of countries. For any country reporting towards one (or more) multi-stakeholder development effectiveness framework(s), it is considered to be reporting progress when, for the year of reference, the number of indicators within the framework(s) that experienced a positive trend is greater than the number of indicators that experienced a negative trend (as compared to the previous reporting round).²

Using a minimal definition, “multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks” that track effective development cooperation are monitoring frameworks: whose indicators have been agreed on a voluntary basis; whose indicators measure the strength of the relationship between development actors; where data collection and review is led by the countries themselves; and where participation in data collection and review involves relevant multi-stakeholder representing, at minimum, the public sector, the private sector and civil society organizations.

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) monitoring framework is an example of existing development effectiveness monitoring frameworks. There are other complementary efforts, such as the ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum (DCF) mutual

² When a country meets and sustains all targets for the indicators it reports on (i.e. it is logically impossible to make further progress) it should be considered as “making progress”.

accountability survey. Emerging and future monitoring frameworks that fit the above definition, such as recent efforts to track South-South Cooperation by SEGIB, could also be considered.

Rationale and interpretation

The frameworks included in this indicator measure the quality and effectiveness of the relationship between development partners. The better the relationship between all the relevant partners, the better the global partnership for sustainable development.

Target 17.16 aims to (1) enhance the global partnership for sustainable development; (2) complemented by multistakeholder partnerships that mobilize expertise, technology and financial resources.

- (1) The indicator measures enhancement of the global partnership for sustainable development by looking at *progress* on a set of indicators that measure *how* development partners are working together.
- (2) The indicator takes account of the need to capture *complementarity* of multistakeholder partnerships by looking at frameworks that are led by countries but include the participation of all relevant stakeholders. As the frameworks considered include multistakeholder participation in review of data, the indicator captures mobilization of expertise. The frameworks capture the quality of development cooperation with higher quality cooperation supporting mobilization of cooperation in the form of expertise, technology and finance.

Reflecting the spirit of the global partnership for sustainable development, and the universal nature of the SDGs, the collected data also monitors the contribution and behaviour of developed countries in achieving more effective, inclusive multi-stakeholder partnerships to support and sustain the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, by measuring the quality of their development efforts.

Sources and data collection

OECD and UNDP are currently supporting about 80 developing countries in collecting relevant data on a biennial basis through the GPEDC monitoring framework, and these organisations lead data aggregation and quality assurance at the global level ([source](#)). In addition, countries are increasingly institutionalising the data collection process within their national aid management systems and are reporting on a yearly basis.

Complementarily, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs has been conducting a regular survey for the Development Cooperation Forum, in cooperation with UNDP, to identify national progress in mutual accountability and transparency. Survey results are assessed in comprehensive studies, informing global monitoring and providing practical suggestions for improving development results. Synergies with the measurement of indicator 7 of the GPEDC monitoring framework are being used. Other complementary sources of data (i.e. additional multi-stakeholder frameworks) may be incorporated in the future to provide a broader picture of progress made by countries towards development effectiveness in support of SDG implementation.

Disaggregation

The indicator presented as a global aggregate is generated through a bottom-up approach whereby data is collected at the country level and can therefore be disaggregated back at the level of countries (for both development cooperation providers and recipients) for national analysis and mutual dialogue. The data can also be further disaggregated according to individual indicators (i.e. specific dimensions of effective development cooperation) that are included within the multi-stakeholder frameworks.

Comments and limitations

The design of the indicator has practical benefits:

- (a) the indicator allows for relevant monitoring frameworks to be updated in line with evolving commitments and country specific context without affecting the spirit of the indicator;
- (b) the indicator does not presume a globally-set multistakeholder framework, acknowledging the diversity of complementary efforts supporting effective development cooperation;
- (c) the indicator allows participating countries to choose whether they would like to report as a provider of development co-operation, as a recipient, or both.

Data collection for the GPEDC monitoring framework currently covers about 80 developing countries for the 2015-2016 period. Progress of developed countries in implementing development effectiveness commitments is captured through their partnership behaviour in those developing countries. Depending on each case, middle income countries that currently are both recipient and providers of development cooperation opt to report in their role as recipient and/or provider of development cooperation. Other developing and/or developed countries could be included through their future participation in the OECD and UNDP led data collection, or through their reporting to complementary monitoring frameworks on a regular basis.

Gender equality issues

One of the indicators in the GPEDC monitoring framework, which will contribute to the 17.16 indicator, measures gender equality and women's empowerment, so this dimension would be reflected as part of the overall effectiveness of development cooperation.

Data for global and regional monitoring

In providing a global aggregate on progress in multi-stakeholder development partnerships, the indicator evidence can be used to inform policy discussions at several key forums, including as a complementary basis of evidence for the UN Secretary General's reporting on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, as an input for the discussions at the High Level Political Forum; the Financing for Development Forum; and ECOSOC's Development Cooperation Forum.

To foster regional policy dialogue, disaggregation at the regional level is possible and encouraged. Some existing platforms are already using the evidence for regional monitoring, learning and policy

discussions (e.g. NEPAD in Africa, the Asia-Pacific Development Effectiveness Facility in Asia-Pacific, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, the UN Regional Economic Commissions).

Current data availability

Global aggregates are available for the 2006, 2008, and 2011 surveys on monitoring the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, as well as the 2013-2014 GPEDC monitoring exercise. The 2015-2016 GPEDC monitoring results will be available mid-2016.

Responsible entities

OECD and UNDP support the GPEDC monitoring exercise. Other entities and countries may provide an indication of similar or complementary monitoring frameworks.

Fit against UN Statistical Commission Principles for SDG Indicators

UN Statistical Commission: 10 Principles	Our proposed indicator
1. Limited in number and globally harmonized	Met. One single indicator captures 17.16, with a harmonized global approach.
2. Simple, single-variable indicators, w/ straightforward policy implications	<p>Partially met. The indicator relies on a number of sub-indicators. This reflects the complex nature of Target 17.16 and of SDG 17 and the global partnership for sustainable development more broadly.</p> <p>However, the methodology for the indicator builds in flexibility, so that a single indicator of progress can be collected despite differences in approaches to sub-indicators across countries.</p> <p>Given the complexity of the global partnership for sustainable development and Goal 17, policy implications will naturally be complex. However, given this context, the general implication of the indicator is relatively clear.</p>
3. Allow for high frequency monitoring	Met. GPEDC monitoring reporting occurs every 2 years. In addition, country domestication allows for annual reporting of indicators in some cases. Use of other comparable monitoring frameworks may allow for higher frequency.
4. Consensus based, in line with int. standards & system-based information	Met. GPEDC monitoring data reflects agreed principles and commitments resulting from broad international consensus and referenced in the <i>Addis Ababa Agenda for Action</i> .

	<p>The indicator allows flexibility for countries to measure those indicators capturing the voluntary commitments they have made, not imposing a one-size-fits all definition of effectiveness.</p> <p>Data collection for relevant frameworks is country-led, relying on existing country and provider systems for tracking data.</p>
5. Constructed from well-established data sources	Met. Relevant monitoring frameworks have been operating since 2005, with successive waves of technical refinement.
6. Disaggregated	Met. Allows for reporting at the country level as a binary (yes/no) and at the regional level as a subset, if needed. Can also be disaggregated by sub-indicator.
7. Universal	Met. “Mutual but differentiated responsibilities” means that the indicator tracks commitments involving both developing and developed countries, in the spirit of the global partnership for sustainable development.
8. Mainly outcome-focused	Partially met. While the indicator is process-oriented, given the focus on the quality of partnership in SDG 17. However, the indicator measures progress over time, seeking to capture outcomes in terms of behaviour change.
9. Science-based and forward-looking	Met. The indicator is defined in a way that changing priorities in effective development cooperation up to 2030 can be reflected without modifying the indicator.
10. A proxy for broader issues or conditions	<p>Partially Met. The frameworks behind this indicator are a selected set of sub-indicators used as proxies for the multidimensional concept of effective development co-operation, which is in turn a proxy for the broader global partnership for sustainable development.</p> <p>Given the complexity and breadth of the global partnership for sustainable development, a proxy reflecting all dimensions will be extremely challenging.</p>

References

Coppard, D. and C. Culey (2015). *The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation’s Contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Plenary Session 1 Background Paper. Busan Global Partnership Forum, Korea.

Espey, Jessica; K. Walecik and M. Kühner (2015). *Follow-up and Review of the SDGs: Fulfilling our Commitments*. Sustainable Development Solutions Network: A Global Initiative for the United Nations. New York: SDSN.

GPEDC (2015). *Monitoring Guide 2015-2016*. New York/Paris: GPEDC. Accessed at www.effectivecooperation.org

Hazlewood, P. (2015). *Global Multi-stakeholder Partnerships: Scaling Up Public-Private Collective Impact for SDGs*. Independent Research Forum, Background Paper 4: IRF2015.

Ocampo, J.A. and Gómez, N. (2014). *Accountable and Effective Development Cooperation in a Post-2015 era*. Background Study 3: Accountability for Development Cooperation. ECOSOC: DCG Germany High-Level Symposium.

Ocampo, Jose Antonio (2015). *A Post-2015 Monitoring and Accountability Framework*. UNDESA: CDP Background Paper No. 27. ST/ESA/2015/CDP/27

Target 17.17 Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships.

Indicator 17.17.1: Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private partnerships and civil society partnerships

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Target 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.

Indicator 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

From TST:

Definition and Method of Computation

The ability of National Statistical Offices and other bodies within countries to report on the diversity of SDG indicators is itself a measure of capacity, particularly when we think about the eventual complexity of the indicator framework as well as the points of disaggregation. Right now, a number of the existing indicators are calculated or modeled at global level, and the purpose of this indicator is to measure the shift in that calculation process to the national level.

Disaggregation would be assessed on the basis of the language of target 17.18, as well as the metadata and agreements on disaggregation for each indicator itself. The baseline and targets for this indicators will be determined in a later stage using trend data on the MDGs reporting and independent assessments of current capacity of countries for reporting towards the final results framework and indicators for the SDGs.

Sources and Data Collection

MDG reporting databases (UNDESA and UNDP) plus baseline assessment in 2015 by UNFPA.

Disaggregation

Not applicable.

Indicator 17.18.2: Number of countries that have national statistical legislation that complies with the Fundamental Principles of Official statistics

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Indicator 17.18.3: Number of countries with a national statistical plan that is fully funded and under implementation, by source of funding

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Target 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.

Indicator 17.19.1: Dollar Value of all resources made available to strengthen statistical capacity in developing countries

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.

Indicator 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

No metadata received on current indicator formulation.