



---

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe  
Statistical Division

# UNECE MDG: Lessons Learned

UNECE

Inter regional MDG indicators Meeting:

“Sharing knowledge to improve MDG monitoring and reporting”

*UNECLAC, Santiago, Chile, 15-17 May 2012*





# Areas

- ❖ Country reports
- ❖ Data Sources
- ❖ Data dissemination
- ❖ Data availability
- ❖ Methodology
- ❖ Additional indicators
- ❖ International Organizations



# Country Reports:

- ❖ Metadata is often missing en sometimes inconclusive or contradictive
- ❖ Not all available data (indicators & time-series) is being used
- ❖ NSOs have in general a minor role in the production
- ❖ **NSOs should be involved more**





# Data Sources for MDGs

- ❖ Many surveys held, results not always available
- ❖ If available, results not always taken into account in MDG monitoring
- ❖ Administrative records should be used more (but coverage not always complete)
- ❖ Not all primary data sources are available to international organizations
- ❖ Access to micro data or detailed results would be useful
- ❖ **Access to and use of all data sources important**



# Data dissemination

- ❖ Dissemination and accessibility of MDG-related data can be improved.
- ❖ On-line is very limited dissemination of data used for official monitoring
- ❖ A separate publication on MDG indicators and/or a chapter in annual Statistical Yearbooks would be useful
- ❖ Improve the on-line dissemination and accessibility of MDG-related data and include sufficient metadata
- ❖ Data can be marketed better and users should also be educated
- ❖ **On-line dissemination of MDG data and metadata (in a client friendly way) crucial**



# Methodology

- ❖ Training and methodological guidance needed for several indicators
- ❖ More information is needed in Russian (or national language)
- ❖ Methodology and Definitions not always clear and surveys needed for several indicators are not held in many countries
- ❖ **MDG handbook and methodological material, including in Russian, essential**



# Additional Indicators

- ❖ Not all indicators relevant in Eastern and South-eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia.
- ❖ Disaggregated data often available but not always used in MDG monitoring
- ❖ Most countries are using other/additional indicators (and targets and goals) in the national monitoring of MDGs
- ❖ **Additional (sub) regional indicators relevant, common list useful**



---

# NSOs

---



- ❖ More analytical capacity needed regarding MDGs
- ❖ Methodologies and definitions not always as internationally recommended
- ❖ NSOs face financial challenges
- ❖ Data dissemination can be improved
  
- ❖ **(continuous) Capacity building of staff critical**





# Coordination

- ❖ National coordination often not optimal
- ❖ Government agencies not always aware of each others activities
- ❖ Coordination within office sometimes not adequate
- ❖ Role of NSO in MDG monitoring not clear in many cases
- ❖ **Good national coordination necessary**



# International organizations



- ❖ Better coordination needed between international agencies
- ❖ Data often different between agencies and methodology and data sources not always clear
- ❖ All national data not always used and estimates are sometimes outdated
- ❖ MDGs have to be made more relevant for non least developed countries
- ❖ **UN should act as one and tailor towards needs of member states**



# Conclusions

- ❖ Most countries produce MDG reports
- ❖ Although limited manpower available, staff of NSO are in general good and knowledgeable professionals
- ❖ Many surveys and registers available in the region as source for MDG indicators
- ❖ Willingness to improve statistical systems and production of MDG indicators



## Conclusions:

- ❖ NSOs should be involved in official national MDG reports
- ❖ More metadata is essential
- ❖ More official MDG data should be available on-line
- ❖ National and regional capacity building efforts important
- ❖ Better national and international coordination crucial

