

United Nations Statistical Commission

Fifty-third session

Item 3 (a) of the provisional agenda

Items for discussion and decision: data and indicators for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Document E/CN.3/2022/2 - Report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators

Statement provided by:

BPS - Statistics Indonesia

Statement:

- (a) Indonesian comments and expressions are presented in point b and so on.
- (b) Currently, Indonesia has not adopted global metadata for the Target 11.5.2 indicator. However, for the indicator resulting from the refinement of 11.5.2, Indonesia agreed to adopt it because it is in accordance with the proxy indicator that has been used so far. Refinement of indicator 11.5.2 into 2 separate indicators, namely indicator *11.5.2 Direct economic loss attributed to disasters in relation to global GDP* (according to indicator 1.5.2) and indicator *11.5.3 Damage to critical infrastructure and number of disruptions to basic services, attributed to disasters* is very possible because it will further clarify the definition of metadata, including its measurement and consistency of compliance with indicator 1.5.2
Indonesia in principle agrees to adopt the target indicator 16.1.4 as a result of the refinement, because the variables related to this indicator have been included in the National Socio-Economic Survey, Social Resilience Module (SUSENAS Modul HANSOS) question. Indonesia proposes that if possible 16.1.4 can be calculated for conditions during the day, after dark, and both.
- (c) Indonesia is currently unable to display data from indicator 17.3.1 of the previously existing metadata on FDI, development assistance and South-South cooperation as a proportion of Gross National Income. The revised indicator proposed in the Working Group on Measurement of Development Support adds sub-indicators for the measurement of indicator 17.3.1. namely regarding grants (including South-south cooperation), loans, FDI, private party funds, private grants. Data is provided by providers (assistance providers). Thus, the measured variables or sub-indicators become larger and if Indonesia is to support this reporting as a provider, it is necessary to coordinate data collection from all relevant parties in accordance with the said sub-indicators.
Regarding the toolkit for using small area estimation for the Goals, Indonesia agreed to produce various indicators needed. Indonesia encourages prioritizing the preparation of guidelines "officialized indicators on the use of SAE as official statistics".
- (d) Regarding the SDGs Geospatial Roadmap, Indonesia has compiled its own Geospatial Roadmap which is affiliated with the Bappenas SDGs dashboard <https://sdgs.bappenas.go.id/dashboard/>
In addition to being displayed on the web, Indonesia's Geospatial SDGs are also realized in the form of Indonesia's SDGs Atlas.
- (e) Considering the proposed changes to the sub-indicator (6 points) as stated in the annex II needs to be explored first. It is necessary to consider for countries that do not have a sub-indicator (6 points), how to calculate it if it does not have one or more of these sub-indicators.
Regarding the dissolution of the Working Group on Measurement of Development Support, Indonesia agreed.

United Nations Statistical Commission

Fifty-third session

Item 3 (a) of the provisional agenda

Items for discussion and decision: data and indicators for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Document E/CN.3/2022/2 - Report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators

- (f) Indonesia agrees with the proposed ways in which one or more member countries review the outline recommended by the Working Group and report back to the commission. Measurement of the regional efforts in support of the Goals is important for country members to contribute to the data provision. Indonesia (represented by BPS, Bappenas and related K/L) can and should be involved in discussions at the Asia Pacific regional level.
- (g) Indonesia agrees with all proposed work programs from the Expert Group. The IAEG should start focusing on data collection and presenting data as per agreed indicators and since it is the decade of actions, the review metadata should be focused on feasibility of data provision instead of revising and refining the metadata itself.

Submitted on:

2/17/2022