

Informal meetings of the plenary in the process of intergovernmental negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda

Statement of Hungary on Indicators 23 March 2015

- Hungary appreciates the work done by the UN Statistical Commission on the list of proposed preliminary indicators.
- The fact that 82 national statistical authorities already participated in the survey, the Hungarian being one of them, acknowledges the importance of the subject, and reflects the strong national interest in, and ownership of, the process.
- We welcome the technical report of the Bureau of the UNSC as a good point of departure.
- Hungary also supports the decisions of the Statistical Commission on the roadmap and the suggested timetable. The establishment of an Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDG indicators is an appropriate next step.
- These measures further prove that it is best if indicators are defined at technical level, while finalization is done in a transparent manner.
- Hungary perceives that Point 250 of the Rio +20 Outcome Document clearly mandates us to accompany the goals with targets *and indicators*. Therefore, every effort should be made to provide at least an indicative list of global and universal indicators by the Summit, and then, finish the work as soon as feasible.

On future work:

- Hungary endorses the decision of March of the UNSC on broader measures of progress in Annex 1, and also the important findings of the Expert Group Meeting in Annex 2.
- Hungary supports the idea of set of global and universal indicators to be accompanied by a broader indicator framework, containing national, regional and thematic indicators.
- We agree that the number of universal global indicators should be limited.
- Selecting global indicators that can be relevant to various targets allows for the reduction of their numbers. In this regard, we take note of concerns indicating that, due to the current structure of indicators, some inter-linkages could not be explored and indicators measuring multiple targets may not have been included.
- We agree that indicators have to be feasible, suitable and relevant, while preserving the level of ambition and important political balance of the OWG proposal. In that regard we take note of proposals to build a stable theoretical and methodological concept for the refinement of the selection, production and grouping guidelines.
- The fact that certain indicators received lower ratings means neither that the targets are wrong, nor that good indicators cannot be devised based on recent research, and advances including the work on well-being indicators, or subjective indicators.
- We note that the approach of the MDG indicators is strongly reflected. Some of the indicators will have to be enhanced to become relevant to all countries, and to be able to measure the achievement of qualitative elements, such as the “no one left behind” principle.
- Only new types of indicators can fill the gaps and cope with the complex and interrelated nature of our undertaking. Indicators, as goals and targets, also have to become a cross-referenced and integrated whole, with inter-linkages clearly understood.
- Finally, it is already clear that measurement goes beyond the mere drafting of a new set of indicators. As a consequence, this process will completely overhaul and reform the statistical world, create new sets of skills and, hopefully, diminish the silos. This will not happen overnight and will require great efforts in developed countries too.

- Therefore, capacity building, international assistance and supportive cooperation in this field should be part and parcel of the implementation process while preserving national ownership.
- In our view, this will contribute enhancing comparability of data on the global scale.

On the Task Force document on targets

- We had the chance to take a look at the document circulated in the morning on the technical proposals on 19 targets.
- Hungary, having been one of the Co-chairs of the OWG, does not advocate for political renegotiation of the goals and targets.
- Having said that, we also remember the slight time pressure that culminated in an almost 28 hour dash to the finish line before the OWG adopted its report. This was not really conducive to dotting the “i-s” and crossing the “t-s”.
- Targets containing an “x” should still be defined, and need to be defined with adequate ambition level.
- Furthermore, if there are technical proposals that would make the targets better understandable, more easily implementable, we should all be ready to look at them.