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THE MONITORING FRAMEWORK FOR THE MDGs

• Timeline –
  – 2000, Millennium Declaration (MD)
  – 2001, Roadmap towards the implementation of the MD
  – 2007, Revised monitoring framework from 2005 World Summit
    • Four new targets

• Currently -
  – Eight goals, 21 targets, 60 indicators
    • Goals 1-7 cover 15 targets, 44 indicators
GLOBAL AND NATIONAL MONITORING

• Differences in objectives
  – Globally
    • Comparable across countries; set incentives for national action; used for regional and global aggregates
  – Nationally
    • Advocacy and national ownership; policy design; challenges in country context; empowerment at UN debates and negotiations

• Differences in mechanisms
  – Inter-Agency Expert Group
    • Annual reports
  – UNDP - scorekeeper of the MDGs at national level
    • Over 400 national MDG reports – government owned
    • Available information/data for emerging priorities, estimates for 2015 as baselines for next agenda
GOALS, TARGETS AND INDICATORS

• Goal – Ambitious, specific commitment; operational and easy to communicate

• Targets – Quantified, time-bound outcome contributing to achievement of the goal
  – Can be global or national

• Indicators – Quantified, objectively measurable metric(s) that can be used to assess
  – Progress towards the goal (outcome)
  – Express different dimensions of the goal
  – Intermediate steps that are expected to contribute significantly to progress
  – Obtained from different sources – surveys, administrative data, model estimates
EXAMPLE 1 – MDG 1

• Goal – Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger

• Targets –
  – Global – Halve, between 1990 and 2015 the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day
  – National – ‘Reduce, from 20.4 to 8.8%, the proportion of people living in extreme poverty’ (Colombia)

• Indicators –
  – Progress towards the goal (outcome)
    • Proportion below the poverty line – global, national
  – Express different dimensions of the goal
    • Inequality – share of poorest quintile in national consumption
  – Intermediate steps that are expected to contribute significantly to progress
  – Obtained from different sources – surveys, administrative data, model estimates
EXAMPLE 2 – MDG 5

• Goal – Improve maternal health

• Targets –
  – Global –
    • Reduce, by ¾ between 1990-2015, the maternal mortality ratio
    • Achieve, by 2015, universal access to maternal health
  – National – ‘By 2015, maintain the fertility rate at current levels, reduce the abortion rate by half and double the proportion of women using modern contraceptive methods’ (Serbia)

• Indicators –
  – Progress towards the goal (outcome)
    • Maternal mortality ratio
  – Express different dimensions of the goal
    • Antenatal care coverage
    • Adolescent birth rate
  – Intermediate steps that are expected to contribute significantly to progress
    • Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel
  – Obtained from different sources – surveys, administrative data, model estimates
REPORTING VARIES BY INDICATOR

Trends in reporting for goal 5

Source: Own calculations based on developing countries’ national MDG reports at http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/mdg/mdg-reports/
NATIONAL ADAPTATION CONSIDERABLE

Change in Target by Country / MDG Theme (%)

MDG Theme

MDG 1 - Poverty: 31.1%
MDG 1 - Employment*: 9.9%
MDG 1 - Food & Nutrition: 23.2%
MDG 2 - Education: 32.5%
MDG 3 - Gender: 33.1%
MDG 4 - Child Mortality: 26.5%
MDG 5 - Maternal Mortality: 21.2%
MDG 5 - Reproductive Health: 7.3%
MDG 6 - Access to HIV/AIDS Treatment*: 14.6%
MDG 6 - Malaria & TB: 4.0%
MDG 7 - Environment*: 13.9%
MDG 7 - Water & Sanitation: 19.2%
MDG 7 - Housing: 13.9%

Source: Own calculations based on countries’ national MDG reports at http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/mdg/mdg-reports/
CHANGING TARGETS, ADDING GOALS AND INDICATORS

- **MDG 2**
  - ‘Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of preschool and high school’ (*Morocco*).

- **MDG 3**
  - ‘Ensure that, by 2015, at least 50% women in economically active workforce’ (*Tajikistan*).

- **MDG 4**
  - ‘Reduce by half, between 2005 and 2015, the under-5 mortality rate in highland areas and selected northern and three southernmost provinces’ (*Thailand*).

- **MDG 6**
  - ‘Achieve by 2015, universal access to treatment and prevention of NCDs and control of major risk factors - smoking, alcohol use, obesity, physical activity, kava, by gender’ (*Vanuatu*).

- **MDG 7**
  - ‘Increase waste recycling ratio to 75%’ (*Saudi Arabia*).

- **‘MDG 9’**
  - ‘Zero impact of landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) by 2012’ (*Cambodia*).
DISAGGREGATING TO SUB-NATIONAL LEVELS

• Initially – rural/urban, but increasingly by territory
  – 2001-2005: 23%
  – 2006-2010: 33%
  – 30 countries more than once – including CAR, Congo, Djibouti as well as a number of MICs

• Most frequent

• Least frequent
  – Reproductive health, environment

• Philippines, Indonesia, Colombia and some others also disaggregated goals and targets by region
GUIDING POLICY THROUGH ADMIN DATA

THINKING AHEAD…

• National priorities already being set (UNDP survey and 2013-2015 national MDG reports- ongoing)
  – Vision statements, perspective plans: several anticipate items likely to feature in future agenda
  – *What are the data needs for supporting them?*

• Balancing national and global agendas
  – MDG model for adaptation was *laissez faire* – but allowed national adaptation *and* global reporting
  – Transitioning from global to national could need guidance – *what targets could need this?*

• More universal targets likely
  – Eradicating poverty or universal school attendance
  – *What are cost-effective methods for monitoring progress, globally and nationally*

• Targets could involve the need to balance trade-offs within and across goals
  – Indicators can motivate action (e.g. efficiency of water use in agriculture)
  – *How to encourage universal reporting on such indicators?*

• Administrative data covers a spectrum
  – *Process versus outcome indicators – how certain are the theories of change?*
  – *What are good criteria for their use? -mapping, defining and increasing reliability and objectivity*

• Using and validating data linked to new technology
  – Pace of change has increased, as has demand for more timely data; GIS, internet, mobile phones
  – *How best does ‘big’ data complement ‘small’ data?*