



**Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean  
Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean**

---

LIMITED  
LC/CAR/L. 217  
7 October 2009  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**THE STATUS OF MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS  
MONITORING AND REPORTING  
IN SELECTED CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES**

---

This document has been reproduced without formal editing.

## Table of contents

Introduction.....	1
I. Organization of data collection in the Caribbean .....	2
A. Definitions and concepts.....	2
1. Operation modalities .....	2
2. Functions of the statistical agencies and legal framework .....	4
3. Human resources .....	4
4. Equipment .....	4
5. Statistical methods and definitions .....	5
B. National MDG and IADG monitoring and reporting mechanisms .....	6
1. Results of the survey .....	6
2. MDG reporting to the United Nations.....	6
3. Government body responsible for collecting and reporting on MDGs .....	6
4. Reporting on MDG Goals and Indicators.....	6
5. MDG monitoring and reporting at national and international level .....	15
6. MDG Data Sharing Mechanisms .....	16
7. National needs in the area of MDG data collection, monitoring and sharing at the national and international level .....	16
II. Regional MDG monitoring related activities in the Caribbean .....	17
A. CARICOM .....	17
1. Databases .....	18
2. Extensive training programmes in social statistics (in-house) and demography:.....	18
3. World Bank Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (WBTF):.....	18
4. DevInfo: .....	18
5. Specific activities related to MDG monitoring and reporting .....	19
B. UNDP, OECS and CDB initiatives.....	20
1. Support to Poverty Assessment and Reduction in the Caribbean (SPARC) .....	20
2. CDB Poverty Assessment Reports.....	21
3. OECS .....	21
C. ECLAC Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean .....	22
1. ECLAC project on “Improving Caribbean Household Surveys” .....	22
2. REDATAM Training .....	22
III. Secondary data available from other sources.....	23
A. United Nations .....	23
B. United Nations Statistics Division (UNSTATS).....	23
C. World Bank.....	23
D. UNICEF – Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS).....	24
IV. Importance of metadata .....	24
A. Global guidelines for MDG monitoring .....	24
B. Metadata on MDGs in the Caribbean .....	26
1. National MDG reports.....	26
2. Poverty Reports.....	27
V. Summary and conclusions .....	31
A. Summary.....	31
B. Conclusions and recommendations.....	34
References.....	36
Annex I: MDG Indicators .....	38
Annex II: Questionnaire.....	42

## INTRODUCTION

In spite of various initiatives, Caribbean countries continue to have difficulties in addressing demands of monitoring and measuring progress towards the fulfilment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other Internationally Agreed upon Development Goals (IADGs)<sup>1</sup>. To address this gap, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) has received funding for a technical assistance project, *Strengthening the capacity of National Statistical Offices (NSOs) in the Caribbean Small Island Developing States to fulfil the Millennium Development Goals and other Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs)*. The main imperative of the project is to support the strengthening of national institutional capabilities for generating reliable data to meet these monitoring and reporting requirements. The project seeks to build on past and current initiatives directed towards broadening and improving statistics and indicators through the use of already available knowledge, experience and expertise at the national and regional level. In an effort to avoid duplication of present or repetition of past activities in this field, ECLAC considered it important to conduct a thorough assessment of the status and structure of MDG and IADG monitoring and reporting at the national and regional levels as well as to provide an overview of initiatives undertaken by other regional development partners and intergovernmental bodies in the subregion.

This paper is composed as follows: The first chapter of the document will present an overview of the statistical infrastructure at the national level, followed by a summary of the results of a survey administered to Caribbean NSOs that gathered information on the status of and mechanisms in place in MDG and IADG monitoring and reporting at the national level. Then, an attempt will be made to provide a briefing on activities carried out by intergovernmental bodies and development partners in the region. The fourth section presents a brief summary of data sources for secondary data and introduces concepts for metadata collection and reporting. It further discusses major challenges with poverty measurements and monitoring in the subregion. The paper ends with a summary and recommendations for the way forward.

---

<sup>1</sup> So far only seven Caribbean countries have prepared and submitted a national MDGs report to the United Nations. These countries are: Belize (2005), Cuba (2005), the Dominican Republic (2004), Guyana (2003), Haiti (2004), Jamaica (2005), Suriname (2005), joint report for the OECS countries. Grenada indicated in the survey to have submitted a national report but it is not available on the UN website.

## I. ORGANIZATION OF DATA COLLECTION IN THE CARIBBEAN<sup>2</sup>

Mechanisms for data collection, management and sharing are highly reliant on the available statistical infrastructure in a given country or region. The types of data collected, analysis undertaken and information shared and published depends on legal provisions as well as the existence or non-existence of the necessary infrastructure to facilitate such a process. Further, access to resources, human, information technology (IT) and financial, is often decisive in such matters. While the developed world and some of the more advanced developing countries tend to have more sophisticated approaches to data collection, management and sharing, Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) often face a variety of hurdles and obstacles that prevent good practice in these matters.

### A. Definitions and concepts

The purpose of this section is to provide a snapshot of the legal and institutional frameworks that guide the administration of statistics and data collection in Caribbean countries, with a focus on the English-speaking Caribbean. With a few exceptions, NSOs in the Caribbean are characterized by small size, limited access to human, IT and financial resources and their low profile in public administrations of their respective countries.

#### 1. Operation modalities

According to the findings of surveys conducted by ECLAC (2005, 2009), the majority of directors of NSOs report to a permanent secretary within a ministry of finance, planning or an office of the governor in the case of non-independent countries and only a few of the directors are at the level of a permanent secretary or higher. Directors of NSOs indicated that a more elevated status within their government's administration would provide direct access to the ministerial or higher level that could provide a greater leverage regarding the acquisition of resources as well as with the implementation of certain programmes. This would also provide a higher level of autonomy with less decision-making layers regarding access to resources or the approval of programmes and other activities. Across the subregion, NSOs have a variety of statuses of autonomy ranging from being independent, as in the case of Jamaica, to being a unit within a department in a ministry, in some other countries. Four countries, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname, have the status of statutory bodies and currently report to a Board of Directors. The survey data (ECLAC, 2009) show that three countries (Aruba, the Netherlands Antilles and the United States Virgin Islands) reported directly to a minister or a Vice Provost.

The status of the director of an NSO also impacts on the budgetary process. NSOs in several countries reported being solely responsible for the preparation of their annual budget and

---

<sup>2</sup> The following paragraphs draws mainly on three ECLAC publications: ECLAC (2002), ECLAC (2003), ECLAC (2005). This chapter has been taken from an earlier ECLAC publication on migration data: Migration data collection, management, sharing in the Caribbean, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, 26 October 2007, LC/CAR/L.139, pp. 9 – 14.

only a few (Anguilla, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Jamaica and Saint Lucia) were also free to spend the approved budget without the need for additional approval. Also, in the case of most countries, other agencies are involved in data collection, storage, analysis and dissemination. Today several ministries have strong statistical units that function outside and apart from the national NSOs. In the Caribbean, these are mainly (ECLAC 2005) the following governmental institutions:

- The Central Bank;
- The Ministry of Agriculture;
- The Ministry of Education;
- The Ministry of Finance/Planning;
- The Ministry of Health;
- The Ministry of Social Development.

The relationship among these organizations and the respective NSOs is not the same throughout the Caribbean in terms of coordination of statistical activities. While in some countries the national NSO might be aware of various activities undertaken by other data-collecting bodies in the country, they often have little or no control over technical aspects of the treatment of data collected and analyzed. The closest relationship seems to exist between the NSOs and the respective central banks. This general lack of cooperation and coordination often results in a number of key problems (ECLAC 2003):

- Lack of coordination and integration;
- Poor coordination of large-scale research;
- Incompatibility of measurement instruments and data representation;
- Lack of proper documentation and unavailability of meta-data;
- Lack of a consistent and coherent legal framework guiding the administration of data and their respective bodies;
- Lack of transparent systems and efficient mechanisms for data and knowledge sharing.

According to the above studies conducted by ECLAC, generally there seems to be little duplication in the collection of administrative type statistics, since they are primarily collected for a specific purpose of the respective organization or government entity. However, given the generally weak position of the national NSOs and the lack of a national coordinating body, many institutions are not aware of data collection efforts undertaken by others that might provide vital information for their own purposes (such as reporting on MDGs and other IADGs).

## **2. Functions of the statistical agencies and legal framework**

Statistics offices in the Caribbean are all governed by statistics acts that guide and regulate the collection, compilation and dissemination of data, which encompass four major areas of responsibility:

- Census taking;
- Collection, compilation, analysis and publishing of statistical information;
- Collaboration with departments of the government in the collection, compilation, analysis and publication of statistical records of administration; and
- Organizing a coordinated scheme of social and economic statistics.

While these acts provide the NSOs with the authority to undertake the above-listed core activities, they do not provide for adequate access to the resources necessary to conduct these exercises. Legislation to perform statistical activities was put in place as early as 1949 in the case of Jamaica, with the majority of the countries following suit in the 1950s and early 1960s. Though the NSOs in most countries indicate that these legal provisions no longer meet the requirements of their organizations in the twenty-first century, very little effort has been undertaken to revise or reform the existing statistical acts and other related legal provisions (for more details, see ECLAC, 2009, pp. 6 - 9).

## **3. Human resources**

The above-cited study (ECLAC 2009) also examined the staffing situation of statistical agencies with regard to qualifications and training received. According to the responses to the questionnaire, only 32% of all staff had some type of a degree, with a considerable variety among the countries surveyed. Further, an overall 71% had received some ‘subject matter’ training on the job. However, factoring in the generally high staff turnover, the study found that new recruits, particularly, often lacked subject matter knowledge and institutional memory.

## **4. Equipment**

The majority of the NSOs reported (ECLAC, 2009) not having sufficient or even nearly sufficient IT equipment and admitted that calculators were still featuring prominently in the day-to-day operations. The use of internet-based publication and data sharing mechanisms (DSM) is still limited; and while some countries have begun to publish their census and other data on their websites, the majority of the countries are still reluctant to do so. However, as the use of technology becomes more prominent and timely, issues of data security need to be addressed with utmost priority.

## **5. Statistical methods and definitions**

In addition to the need to upgrade human resource capacity and IT accessibility, there is an urgent need to streamline and standardize statistical methods and definitions at the national level and even more so across the subregion. While it might not be immediately possible to

achieve common standards in every instance, a core set of definitions and an agreed upon set of variables could mark the beginning.

Also, in order to be able to adequately use the information available metadata, such as the information on data quality and applied definitions and concepts, need to be properly documented. Standards need to be established following internationally accepted rules and regulations and proper documentation on qualifiers of data quality, production dates and methodologies must be made available to the end user of such data. Guidance on the establishment of such a process has been provided in the realm of economic statistics by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in its General Data Dissemination System (GDDS) and the Special Data Dissemination System (SDDS)<sup>3</sup>. The main principles of the GDDS that, at this point in time, mainly focus on economic statistics could also be applied to other areas of data collection. With the exception of a few countries, Barbados, Belize and Saint Lucia, Caribbean countries have so far not yet adopted such mechanisms nor signed any of these frameworks. Further guidance on statistical and operational procedures can also be derived from the United Nations Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics that comprise a set of nine principles covering issues such as data collection, data sharing, professional standards and ethics, accountability and transparency and legislation<sup>4</sup>.

Some efforts have been undertaken at the Caribbean level to develop common methodologies (see also section II) in respect to various types of data and surveys. One such example is the use of a common questionnaire for the 2000 census round in the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) member countries. The OECS has further set the example in harmonization of statistical administrative procedures for its member States in other areas such as national accounts and balance of payments. The Eastern Caribbean Central Bank (ECCB) is using common methodologies for the computation of national accounts and balance of payments in all the member countries. Further, household surveys, such as Surveys of Living Conditions (SLCs) and others, were administered in some countries in the subregion using the same survey instrument.

## **B. National MDG and IADG monitoring and reporting mechanisms**

While the previous chapter provided a general overview of data collection, analysis and sharing mechanisms, this chapter will focus on MDGs and target specific information collection and reporting mechanisms. In order to obtain the most realistic and detailed picture possible of the situation in each country, ECLAC has administered a survey (see annex 1) to 23 Caribbean countries and territories<sup>5</sup>. In total, 74% (N=17) of the countries contacted returned the completed

---

<sup>3</sup> More information can be derived from the following web-site: <http://dsbb.imf.org/Applications/web/getpage/?pagename=gddshome>

<sup>4</sup> The Conference of European Statisticians adopted the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics in 1992 and the United Nations Statistical Commission endorsed them in 1994. More information can be found on the following website: <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/default.htm>.

<sup>5</sup> The following countries received the questionnaire: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago. Non-Independent countries and territories received the questionnaire: Anguilla, Aruba,

questionnaire. These countries were Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname. The associate member countries that responded are Anguilla, Aruba, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, Netherlands Antilles, Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands. Several attempts were made, without success, to obtain completed questionnaires from the other countries and territories.

## **1. Results of the survey**

The findings of the survey confirm what the earlier analysis demonstrated. The production of statistics in Caribbean countries is quite fragmented in the sense that various bodies and institutions such as national NSOs, ministries and other governmental bodies are involved in the collection, analysis and reporting of data and statistics. The extent of the actual involvement of the respective bodies and agencies in the collection as well as in the reporting varies from indicator to indicator and from country to country. However, no country in the Caribbean seems to have a central body with overall oversight and responsibility for data collection, analysis and reporting.

The following paragraphs present a summary of the responses to the survey.

## **2. MDG reporting to the United Nations**

Of the countries that responded to the survey, five indicated that they had already submitted a national MDG report to the United Nations. These countries are: Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Suriname. A joint report was produced for the OECS member States and Barbados.

## **3. Government body responsible for collecting and reporting on MDGs**

The majority of the countries did not report to have a central government body responsible for MDG monitoring and reporting. Three countries stated to have a central body responsible for these duties. Saint Lucia reported that the Ministry of Social Transformation was responsible; the Bahamas indicated that the Ministry of Health was in charge; and Antigua and Barbuda stated that the MDGs Task Force was the responsible entity.

## **4. Reporting on MDG Goals and Indicators**

### ***Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger***

#### **1. Proportion of population below \$1 Purchasing Power Parities (PPP) per day**

The majority of the countries reported that the \$1/day concept was not in use and thus no data were available. The majority of the countries stated that the NSO was in charge of poverty statistics. Other bodies, such as the Ministry of Finance and Planning, Ministry of Social

---

Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Netherlands Antilles, Turks and Caicos Islands and the United States Virgin Islands.

Transformation, the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Sustainable Development, were also reported to be involved.

2. Poverty Gap Ratio

All but one country (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) reported collecting and reporting this indicator. The majority of the countries reported that the NSO was in charge of such data. Other bodies, such as the Ministry of Finance and Planning, Ministry of Social Transformation and the Ministry of Sustainable Development, were also reported to be involved.

3. Share of poorest quintile in national consumption

Thirteen of the 17 countries indicated to collect and report on this indicator. The countries with no data are: the British Virgin Islands, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, and the United States Virgin Islands. The majority of the countries reported that the NSO was in charge of such data. Other bodies, such as the Ministry of Finance and Planning, Ministry of Social Transformation and the Ministry of Sustainable Development were reported to be involved.

4. Growth rate of GDP per person employed

Fifteen out of 17 countries reported to collect and report on this indicator. The countries with no data are: Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. The majority of the countries reported that the NSO was in charge of such data. But other bodies, such as the Ministry of Finance and Planning, Ministry of Social Transformation and the Ministry of Sustainable Development, were also reported to be involved.

5. Employment-to-Population ratio

Fourteen out of 17 countries indicated to collect and report on this indicator. The countries with no data are: Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. The majority of the countries reported that the NSO was in charge of such data. But other bodies, such as the Labor Department, were also reported to be involved.

6. Proportion of employed people living below \$1/day

While some of the countries reported to collect and to report on this indicator, seven countries stated that they did not have such data (see also indicator 1). The countries without data are: Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, the British Virgin Islands, Turks and Caicos, the United States Virgin Islands. Almost all countries reported that the NSO was in charge of data collection, with the exception of two countries, indicating the Ministry of Finance and Planning and the Ministry of Social Transformation to be in charge.

7. Proportion of own-account and contributing family workers in total employment

Thirteen out of 17 countries indicated to collect data and to report on this indicator. The countries with no data are: Grenada, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Saint Lucia and the British Virgin Islands. Almost all countries reported that the NSO was in charge of data collection.

8. Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age

Eleven out of 17 countries reported to collect data and to report on this indicator. The countries without data are: Bermuda, Dominica, Netherlands Antilles (collect data, but no reporting mechanism), Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. In the majority of the countries, these data were collected and often also reported by the ministries of health and related governmental bodies. Very few reported the involvement of the NSO.

9. Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption:

Thirteen out of 17 countries report to collect data and report on this indicator. The countries without data are: Bermuda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and the Netherlands Antilles. In the majority of the countries, these data are collected and often also reported by the Ministry of Health and related governmental bodies. Very few report the involvement of the NSO.

***Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education***

1. Net enrolment ratio in primary education

All countries reported to collect data on this indicator and only two countries indicated not to have a reporting mechanism. These two countries are: Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Saint Kitts and Nevis. In the majority of the countries, these data were collected and often also reported by the ministries of education and related government bodies with limited involvement of the NSO.

2. Proportion of students starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary education

Eight out of 17 countries reported to collect data and to report on this indicator. The countries without data are: Saint Kitts and Nevis (collection - no reporting), Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (collection - no reporting), Bermuda and the Netherlands Antilles. In the majority of the countries, these data were collected and often also reported by the ministries of education and related governmental bodies. Very few reported the involvement of the NSO.

3. Literacy rate of 15 – 24 year-olds, women and men

Only nine out of 17 countries reported collecting data and reporting on this indicator. Two countries collected, but did not report (Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) and five countries had no data: the Bahamas, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and

the United States Virgin Islands. In most cases, the data were collected and reported with involvement of the Ministry of Education and the NSO.

***Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women***

1. Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education

All countries report collecting data for this indicator and three countries report not to have a reporting agency: Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. In most cases, the data are collected and reported with involvement of the Ministry of Education and the NSO.

2. Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector

Fifteen out of 17 countries report to collect data and report on this indicator. The countries without data are: Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Saint Kitts and Nevis. In almost all countries, the NSO was in charge of data collection and reporting.

3. Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament

Fourteen countries reported to collect data and to report on this indicator. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines neither collected nor reported on this indicator. Saint Kitts and Nevis collected data but had no reporting mechanism in place. Antigua and Barbuda reported to have no data collection but there was a reporting mechanism in place. This variable was not applicable for the United States Virgin Islands.

***Goal 4: Reduce child mortality***

1. Under-five mortality rate

All countries reported collecting data and reporting on this indicator, with the exception of Saint Kitts and Nevis that reported to collect the data but had no reporting mechanism. Almost all countries indicated that the Ministry of Health collected the data and either the NSO or both bodies reported.

2. Infant mortality rate

All countries reported to collect data and to report on this indicator, with the exception of Saint Kitts and Nevis and the Netherlands Antilles. These countries reported to collect the data, but did not appear to have a reporting mechanism. Almost all countries indicated that the Ministry of Health collected the data and either the NSO or both bodies reported.

3. Proportion of 1-year-old children immunized against measles

All countries indicated to collect data and to report on this indicator, with the exception of the British Virgin Islands. Saint Kitts and Nevis and the Netherlands Antilles reported to

collect the data, but did not have a reporting mechanism. No information was sent by the United States Virgin Islands. Almost all countries indicated that the Ministry of Health collected the data and either the NSO or both bodies reported.

***Goal 5: Improve maternal health***

1. Maternal mortality ratio

All countries reported to collect data and to report on this indicator; with the exception of Saint Kitts and Nevis that indicated that the data was collected, but had no reporting mechanism. The majority of the countries reported that the Ministry of Health collected and also reported on this indicator, with generally less involvement of the NSO.

2. Proportion of birth attended by skilled health personal

With the exception of Saint Kitts and Nevis, which reported to collect the data but had no reporting mechanism, all countries collected data and reported on this indicator. The Netherlands Antilles had no information on this indicator. The majority of the countries reported that the Ministry of Health collected and also reported on this indicator, with generally less involvement of the NSO.

3. Contraceptive prevalence rate

Six countries indicated to collect data and five to report on this indicator. Six countries reported neither collecting data nor reporting on this indicator, with Antigua and Barbuda stating to collect and report but not to have data available, and Saint Kitts and Nevis reported to collect but not to report on this indicator. Dominica indicated to collect such data but also indicated not to have data available. The majority of the countries with data reported that the Ministry of Health collects and also reported on this indicator with seemingly generally less involvement of the NSO.

Ten countries stated that they collected data and, of those, eight reported. Seven countries indicated that they neither collected nor reported data. Antigua and Barbuda and the Bahamas stated to collect and report, but not to have data available<sup>6</sup>. Saint Kitts and Nevis indicated to collect, but not to report. Dominica reported to collect the data, but not to have data available. The British Virgin Islands reported gaps in their data. The majority of the countries with data reported that the Ministry of Health collected and also reported on this indicator, generally with less involvement of the NSO.

---

<sup>6</sup> While this statement seems to be contradictory to the earlier stated fact, no additional information had been provided by these countries. It is therefore assumed that while such data existed in other agencies, the respondent to the survey (the NSO) did not have these data at their disposal. This seems to be also the case in relation to data for other MDGs indicators (see below).

4. Adolescent birth rate

Fourteen countries reported to collect data and to report on this indicator and Saint Kitts and Nevis indicated to collect but not to report. Antigua and Barbuda and Guyana neither collected nor reported on this indicator. Almost all countries indicated that the Ministry of Health collected the data and either the NSO or both bodies reported.

5. Antenatal care coverage

Twelve countries reported to collect data and to report on this indicator. The Turks and Caicos reported to have no data, in spite of the fact that they indicated to collect and report. Two countries collected but do not report: Saint Kitts and Nevis and the Netherlands Antilles. Three countries neither collect nor report: Antigua and Barbuda, Bermuda and the British Virgin Islands. The majority of the countries with data reported that the Ministry of Health collected and also reported on this indicator with seemingly generally limited involvement of the NSO.

6. Unmet Family planning needs

Ten countries reported collecting data and reporting on this indicator. Seven countries indicated neither collecting nor reporting: Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, Aruba, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Netherlands Antilles and the Turks and Caicos Islands. The Bahamas indicated to collect data and to report, but not to have data available. The majority of the countries with data reported that the Ministry of Health collected data and reported on this indicator with seemingly limited involvement of the NSO.

***Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases***

1. HIV/AIDS prevalence among population aged 15-24 years

Thirteen countries reported to collect and to report on this indicator. Dominica and the Turks and Caicos Islands collected data and reported, but indicated that they had no data. Saint Kitts and Nevis and the Netherlands Antilles collected data but indicated not to have a reporting mechanism. In the majority of countries with data, the Ministry of Health, National Aids Secretariat and similar bodies collected and reported the data. Only in some cases the NSO was also involved in reporting.

2. Condom use at last high risk sex

Six countries reported to collect and report data on this indicator. The Bahamas, Dominica and Turks and Caicos collected and reported, but indicated having no data. In Saint Kitts and Nevis, data were collected but no reporting mechanism was in place. Seven countries indicated to neither collect nor report on this indicator: Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, the British Virgin Islands, Bermuda, Guyana and the Netherlands Antilles. In the majority of countries with data, the Ministry of Health, the National Aids Secretariat and similar bodies collected and reported the data and, only in some cases the NSO was also involved in reporting.

3. Proportion of population aged 15-24 years with comprehensive and correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS

Eight countries reported to collect and report on this indicator. Three countries, the Bahamas, Dominica and Turks and Caicos collected and reported data, but indicated to have no data available. Saint Kitts and Nevis collected data on this indicator, but had no reporting mechanisms in place. Four countries, Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, Aruba, Bermuda and Netherlands Antilles had neither data collection nor reporting procedures in place. In the majority of countries with data, the Ministry of Health, National Aids Secretariat and similar bodies collected and reported the data and, only in some cases, was the NSO also involved in reporting.

4. Ratio of school attendance of orphans to school attendance of non-orphans aged 10-14 years

Nine countries reported to collect and report on this indicator. Eight countries indicated to neither collect nor report on this indicator. Antigua and Barbuda indicated that data was available and four countries reported neither collecting nor reporting on this indicator: These are Bermuda, Guyana, the Netherlands Antilles, Saint Kitts and Nevis. In the majority of countries with data, the Ministry of Health, the National Aids Secretariat and similar bodies collected and reported the data and, only in some cases was the NSO also involved in reporting.

5. Proportion of population with advanced HIV infection with access to anti-retroviral drugs

Eleven countries reported to collect and report data on this indicator. Two countries collected and reported on this indicator, but had no data: Dominica and the Turks and Caicos. One country, Antigua and Barbuda, reported to neither collect nor report, but indicated that data was available. Saint Lucia did not provide any information on this indicator. Two countries, Aruba and Saint Kitts and Nevis, reported to collect data but not to have a reporting mechanism in place. In the majority of countries with data, the Ministry of Health, National Aids Secretariat and similar bodies collected and reported the data and, only in some cases was the NSO also involved in reporting.

6. Incidence and death rates associated with malaria

While most countries indicated to have collection and reporting mechanisms in place, this indicator was reported not to be relevant for the majority of the Caribbean countries.

7. Proportion of children under 5 sleeping under insecticide-treated bed nets

While most countries indicated to have collection and reporting mechanisms in place, this indicator was reported not to be relevant for the majority of the Caribbean countries.

8. Proportion of children under 5 with fever who are treated with appropriate anti-malaria drugs

While most countries indicated to have collection and reporting mechanisms in place, this indicator was reported not to be relevant for the majority of the Caribbean countries.

9. Incidence, prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis

Thirteen countries indicated to collect data and to report on this indicator. Saint Kitts and Nevis reported to collect data but not to have a reporting mechanism. Grenada and the British Virgin Islands neither collected nor reported. No information was provided by Saint Lucia. While most countries indicated to have collection and reporting mechanisms in place, this indicator was reported not to be relevant for the majority of the Caribbean countries.

10. Proportion of tuberculosis cases detected and cured under directly observed treatment short course

Eleven countries indicated to collect data and to report on this indicator. Two countries, the Netherlands Antilles and Saint Kitts and Nevis, reported to collect data but had no reporting mechanism in place. Three countries, the British Virgin Islands, Grenada and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, neither collected nor reported on this indicator. Saint Lucia did not provide any information on this indicator. While most countries indicated to have collection and reporting mechanisms in place, this indicator was reported not to be relevant for the majority of the Caribbean countries.

***Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability***

1. Proportion of land area covered by forest

Thirteen countries indicated to collect data and to report on this indicator. Anguilla reported collecting and reporting, but had no data. Three countries, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, reported to collect data but not to have a reporting mechanism in place. In most cases, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry Divisions/Departments, and Lands and Survey Departments, were responsible for collection and reporting with little involvement of the NSO.

2. Carbon dioxide emissions, total, per capita and per \$1 GDP (PPP) and consumption of ozone depleting substances

Twelve countries indicated to collect data and report on this indicator. The Turks and Caicos reported to collect and to report, but not to have data. Saint Kitts and Nevis reported to collect but not to have a reporting mechanism in place. Aruba, the British Virgin Islands and Grenada have neither data collection nor reporting mechanisms in place. Various governmental bodies, such as the Department of Infrastructure, Ministries of Health, Environment, Sustainable Development, collected data and, in most instances, were also involved in reporting. Limited involvement of the NSO was indicated.

### 3. Proportion of ozone depleting substances

Nine countries indicated to collect and report data on this indicator. One country, Saint Kitts and Nevis, reported to collect data but not to have a reporting mechanism in place. Three countries, Anguilla, Grenada and the Turks and Caicos, collected and reported data but indicated to have no data. Six countries: Aruba, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, Grenada, Guyana, and the Netherlands Antilles neither collected nor reported any data. Two countries, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, collected but had no reporting mechanisms in place. Various bodies, such as departments of infrastructure, ministries of health, environment, sustainable development and others were reported to collect data and in most instances were also involved in reporting. Limited involvement of the NSO was indicated.

### 4. Proportion of fish stocks within safe biological limits

Five countries indicate collecting and reporting<sup>0</sup> on this indicator. Three countries collect and report, but have no data: Anguilla, Grenada, and Turks and Caicos. Two countries collect, but do not report: the Netherlands Antilles and Saint Kitts and Nevis. Seven countries neither collect nor report: Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, the British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Guyana, Jamaica, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. Antigua and Barbuda indicates to have data available. Various bodies, such as ministries of agriculture, department of fisheries, etc. collect and report, at times in collaboration with the NSO.

### 5. Proportion of total water resources Used

Eight countries indicated to collect and report on this indicator. Two countries, Anguilla and Turks and Caicos, indicated to have collection and reporting mechanisms in place, but to have no data. One country, Saint Kitts and Nevis, collected data but had no reporting mechanism in place. Six countries had neither data collection nor reporting mechanisms in place: Antigua and Barbuda, the British Virgin Islands, Grenada, Guyana, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and the Netherlands Antilles, but Antigua and Barbuda indicated to have data. Various bodies, such as ministries of agriculture, water department, department of planning, collected and reported, at times in collaboration with the NSO.

### 6. Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected

Ten countries indicate to collect and report on this indicator, with two countries, Anguilla and Turks and Caicos, not having data. Two countries, Aruba and Saint Kitts and Nevis, collect data but have no reporting mechanism in place. Five countries have neither collection nor reporting mechanisms in place: Grenada, Dominica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and the Netherlands Antilles. Various bodies, such as the department of conservation, ministry of sustainable development, collect and report. There is little collaboration with the NSO.

7. Proportion of species threatened with extinction

Ten countries indicated to collect and report data on this indicator. Three countries, Grenada, Anguilla and Turks and Caicos, indicated to have no data. Seven countries had neither collection nor reporting mechanisms in place: Antigua and Barbuda, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Aruba and the Netherlands Antilles. Antigua and Barbuda indicated having data. Various bodies, such as department of conservation, forestry division, collected and reported. There was some collaboration with the NSO reported.

8. Proportion of population using an improved drinking water source

Twelve countries indicated to collect and report data on this indicator. Three countries collected, but did not report: Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saint Kitts and Nevis and the Netherlands Antilles. The majority of the countries reported that the NSO, along with the Ministry of Health and related bodies, collected data and reported on this indicator.

9. Proportion of population using an improved sanitation facility

Fourteen countries indicated to collect and report on this indicator. Three countries indicated that they collected data, but did not have reporting mechanisms in place: Netherlands Antilles, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. In the majority of the countries, the NSO along with Ministry of Planning, Central Water Authority, collected and reported on this indicator.

10. Proportion of urban population living in slums

Most countries indicated that this indicator was not applicable. Ten countries indicated to collect and report on this indicator. Five countries neither collected nor reported on this indicator: Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, Guyana, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Saint Kitts and Nevis. One country, the Netherlands Antilles, collected data but did not have a reporting mechanism in place. In the majority of the countries with data, the NSO, at times in collaboration with government departments, was involved collecting and reporting.

**5. MDG monitoring and reporting at national and international level**

1. Agency responsible for MDG/IADG monitoring

The majority of the countries did not list a central governmental body/agency. Only three countries indicated the existence of such a body: the Bahamas - the CSO; Grenada - the NSO; Turks and Caicos - the Social Indicators and MDGs Committee.

2. Online data bases:

No country seemed to have an online database to access MDG- and other IADG-related indicators. Dominica reported to have Excel sheets and the Bahamas stated that they were

working on creating a database of national MDG indicators in Excel format. Suriname reported that the staff of the NSO was to use DevInfo and that a national version of DevInfo would be launched soon. Many of Aruba's MDG indicators were posted on website of the country's Central Bureau of Statistics

3. Legislation and/or procedural documents to authorize data collection, sharing etc.

The majority did not list any such rules or laws. The following countries provided information: Aruba: the Statistics Act; the British Virgin Islands: Statistical Act of 2005; Bermuda: Statistics Act 2002; Anguilla: Statistics Act; the Netherlands Antilles: numerous laws and regulation – main authority: Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS); Antigua and Barbuda: Statistics Act. Jamaica reported that an amendment to their Statistics Act has been proposed which would make data related to the indicators more readily available to the country's NSO, STATIN.

**6. MDG Data-sharing Mechanisms**

1. Sharing of data with international bodies

All countries reported sharing data with various international agencies on a regular basis.

2. Willingness to contribute to regional web-based MDG data sharing mechanism

All countries indicated willingness to do so.

**7. National needs in the area of MDG data collection, monitoring and sharing at the national and international level**

The following general requests were made:

- Strengthen inter-agency collaboration at the national level (institutionalize data sharing mechanisms at country level);
- Address issues of data quality;
- Assist with specific surveys (LAMPS, CWIQs, etc.);
- Strengthen specific areas in need: environmental statistics, education, health, gender, HIV/AIDS;
- Establish and strengthen national data sharing platforms (such as DevInfo).
- Assist with a programme to develop a coherent system of social-demographic and socio-economic indicators;
- Assist with the development of environmental indicators;
- Strengthen environmental, education and health statistics;
- Best practices and instructions for a step by step approach to creating a DevInfo MDG Database.

## **II. REGIONAL MDG MONITORING-RELATED ACTIVITIES IN THE CARIBBEAN**

This section provides an overview of subregional activities undertaken to enhance national capacities in the areas of statistical data analysis and reporting in relation to MDGs and other IADGs. It will further undertake an assessment of subregional initiatives to regionalize and/or localize MDG indicators to enhance their relevance and suitability for the countries in the subregion. This overview does not claim to be either complete or comprehensive, but it lays out the main contributions of actors such as the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), the OECS and the United Nations system, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and ECLAC, amongst others.

### **A. CARICOM**

The statistics subprogramme of the CARICOM Secretariat has the primary responsibility for the production, compilation, analysis and distribution of regional statistics. In order to accomplish this task, the Secretariat has established various mechanisms to enhance coordination and collaboration among Caribbean statisticians, officials from Caribbean statistical offices and governmental bodies dealing with data collection<sup>7</sup>. The two bodies that coordinate activities related to statistics within CARICOM are the Regional Census Coordinating Committee (RCCC) and the Standing Committee of Caribbean Statisticians (SCCS). Both committees meet once a year to address matters such as regional census planning, data harmonization, and identification and allocation of resources, among other topics.

In light of the subregional integration in the framework of the Caribbean Single Market and Economy (CSME), the need for closer cooperation and collaboration among the participating countries was recognized, and the process to establish a Regional Statistical Programme at the CARICOM level in support of the CSME was initiated in 2003. An advisory group was formed and a statistical work programme was prepared and adopted by the CARICOM Community Council of Ministers in January 2005.<sup>8</sup> This work programme covers topics such as economics, population, demographics, social and living conditions, environment, information technology, and issues related to public relations, data dissemination and statistical coordination and finally the modernization of national statistical systems.

Past and current projects were and are being directed towards strengthening capacity in the subregion to enable the compilation of social/gender and environmental statistics inclusive of the statistics and indicators of the MDGs. The following presents a brief summary of recent and ongoing activities carried out under the CARICOM statistics work programme.

---

<sup>7</sup> More information available on the CARICOM Statistics Sub-Programme through the following web-site: <http://www.caricomstats.org/>

<sup>8</sup> See CARICOM Secretariat, *Monitoring and Evaluating Progress on the Millennium Development Goals – The State of CARICOM Statistics*, presentation at CDB and UNDP Regional Workshop on Creating A Sustainable Framework for the Monitoring of the Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals in the Caribbean, 17-18 November, 2005.

## **1. Databases**

Updating databases on labor force, education, health, population and family and collaboration with relevant agencies to enhance statistics in various areas, such as health and education.

## **2. Extensive training programmes in social statistics (in-house) and demography**

Supported by the CDB and in collaboration with the University of the West Indies (UWI), CARICOM has convened three intensive training workshops in demographic analysis to staff of NSOs and other governmental institutions and will continue with this activity in 2009.

## **3. World Bank Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building (WBTF)**

The World Bank supported the programme for the period of 2004/2005 with a total of US\$ 200,000 to follow up on the UNSD/CARICOM programme on gender, social and environment statistics;

Additional funds were allocated for basic training on fertility and mortality statistics convened in Grenada July/August 2008: 15 participants from Grenada, Dominica, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. A similar workshop was also conducted in Guyana, 2005;

The development of a comprehensive approach to CARICOM social/gender and environment statistics was initiated;

The harmonization of gender/social data workshop;

2009/2010: Follow-up to training on strengthening national capacity in civil registration and vital statistics systems to enhance national capacity in these areas, particularly with reference to MDG reporting and to enhance harmonization of concepts and definitions; provision of a forum for exchange of experience.

## **4. DevInfo**

DevInfo is a powerful database system developed by the United Nations that is used to compile and disseminate data on human development. In 2004, DevInfo was endorsed by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) to assist countries in monitoring achievement of the MDGs. The DevInfo initiative originated as ChildInfo and is managed by the United Children's Fund (UNICEF) on behalf of, and with support from, 20 member agencies of the UNDG.

Work undertaken by the CARICOM Secretariat:

- Continuation of training for the implementation of DevInfo in Caribbean countries; procurement of computer equipment to establish DevInfo;
- Financial support provided by UNICEF and CDB for follow-up to training to strengthen national capacities in civil registration and vital statistics systems;
- The establishment of DevInfo at the national level in Belize, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago;
- The process of adopting this platform in the majority of the other countries;
- Establishment of subregional platforms: CARICOM Info (in progress); DevInfo for the OECS: to commence in 2009;
- Launch of CARICOMInfo in 2009.

## **5. Specific activities related to MDG monitoring and reporting**

### **(a) Social Indicators and MDGs Committees (SIMDGSCs)**

In order to address fragmentation in data collection, analysis and reporting in Caribbean countries, CARICOM has supported the establishment of SIMDGSCs in all countries. In the case of Belize, there was an existing Social Indicators Committee and the decision was taken not to change its name. Members of these committees should ideally comprise representatives from Government, civil society and academia as well as the international agencies operating within the respective country. The SIMDGSCs are expected to establish a network for data and information sharing, analysis and reporting with a particular focus on monitoring and reporting of MDGs and other IADGs.

### **(b) Regionalization and localization of MDGs**

Under the leadership of CARICOM, a technical working group on Caribbean specific MDG indicators was established to develop a set of Caribbean specific indicators. The first meeting of this group was held in January 2008 in Barbados (supported by the CDB). The outcomes and recommendations of this meeting were presented to the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Council for Human and Social Development (COHSOD) in November 2008 and were adopted by the government officials present. This document is currently being circulated to countries for further comments.

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.caricomstats.org/DEVINFOPAGE/index.htm>

**(c) Population and Housing Census 2010**

The CARICOM Regional Coordination Strategy aimed at assisting member States to execute their Population and Housing Census activities.

**B. UNDP, OECS and CDB initiatives**

With the need to integrate MDG targets into national and regional development plans, countries increasingly recognize the need to adjust the globally adopted goals to their national conditions. While some indicators do not comprehensively address the specific situations of Caribbean realities, it has been realized that other critical indicators would more accurately reflect Caribbean realities and would therefore need to be added to the list. Various initiatives have been undertaken and discussions are still ongoing as to what extent these indicators need to be regionalized or even localized and which indicators should be added to the list.

**1. Support to Poverty Assessment and Reduction in the Caribbean (SPARC)**

The SPARC programme is multi-donor project supported by the CDB, the Department for International Development (DFID), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), UNDP and the World Bank. This multi-donor programme is a coordinated response designed to provide capacity-building inputs to support the strengthening of poverty monitoring and social policy development systems in the Caribbean. In particular it addresses the need to strengthen national and regional capacities to systematically collect, analyze and disseminate social data from various sources. Further, it has a strong focus on efforts to harmonize, standardize, and integrate data collection systems at various levels. And finally it looks at capacity-building to bridge the gap between empirical research and evidence-based policy and programme formulation, promotes strong regional coordination and the revision and further development of a comprehensive regional framework to address poverty in a coherent and integrated manner. One of the major goals of this project is to prepare an inventory of existing data and to enhance the methodologies linking the various sources of data. It also furthers national capacities for the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) as a tool and platform for analysis and interpretation of data and the establishment of national and subregional coordination and integration mechanisms will be a critical outcome of this effort. Finally, the project will support research on specific topics and the training in the use of statistical software at the national and subregional levels.

In 2008, SPARC identified some key strategic areas to enhance support to countries for increased access to reliable and sound social data that include<sup>10</sup>:

(a) The development of a Toolkit for Poverty and MDG Monitoring in the Caribbean in collaboration with the UNDP Caribbean Subregional Resource Framework (SURF). The Toolkit is expected to support the needs of countries in effectively monitoring and evaluating progress in poverty reduction and the development of social policies;

---

<sup>10</sup> Informal communication with UNDP Subregional Office Barbados and the OECS (e-mail from 24/10/08)

(b) A comprehensive review of the region's efforts to achieve the MDGs through the formulation of the second Caribbean regional MDG report, and

(c) Advancing efforts to enhance dissemination of data. SPARC has initiated discussions with the World Bank's Accelerated Data Programme (ADP) towards the creation of a framework to support data dissemination, with a specific focus on micro-data.

(d) At least one full scholarship, provided by SPARC, to a student interested in pursuing the Masters in Development Statistics which will be offered by the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute for Social and Economic Studies (SALISES), UWI, in September.

The most recent initiatives undertaken by SPARC are the following: (a) preparation of a regional MDG report; and (b) discussions on data dissemination frameworks with the World Bank

Collaboration with the World Bank on data anonymisation research and training; SPARC established partnership with ADP (PARIS21<sup>11</sup>, World Bank and other partners). It is expected that projects with a focus on data anonymisation will be launched in two pilot countries, Dominica and Saint Lucia.

## **2. CDB Poverty Assessment Reports**

The CDB supports Caribbean countries in the production of poverty assessment reports. The following countries have benefited from this activity: Anguilla (2002), Antigua and Barbuda (2007), British Virgin Islands (2003), Cayman Islands (2008), Dominica (2003), Grenada (1999), Saint Kitts and Nevis (2001, 2009), Saint Lucia (2005/6), Turks and Caicos (2000).

## **3. OECS**

According to the information available on the OECS website, studies on the status of MDG monitoring were conducted in Saint Kitts and Nevis and Dominica. Fieldwork was expected to be completed in the British Virgin Islands, Montserrat and Saint Lucia in 2008. Ultimately it is expected to have all OECS member States included into this exercise. The purpose of these studies is to assess the status of MDG achievement at the national level and also identify local indicators that would better reflect the situation in the specific country. The World Bank approved US\$4 00,000 to support a mini Measurement of Living Conditions in Latin America and the Caribbean (MECOVI) programme to strengthen institutional capacities of OECS member countries in survey capabilities, poverty analysis and social indicators. So far, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines have received support through this programme.

---

<sup>11</sup> PARIS: Partnership for Statistics in Development: OECD, World Bank and other partners.

## **C. ECLAC Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean**

### **1. ECLAC project on “Improving Caribbean Household Surveys”**

Due to the ad hoc nature of the status of surveys in the region, and the fact that access to metadata for these surveys is rather limited, much caution needs to be taken when comparing the data and analysis of various surveys. Therefore, there is a need to compare results of these surveys in a structured manner. As such, the current two year Household Survey Project seeks to provide the means to harmonize the data and metadata to improve the comparability of social statistics produced in the Caribbean through household surveys and to ensure international standards of comparability. The main counterparts of this project are NSOs in the Caribbean.

Strategically, this project intends to build on existing programmatic support already in place at the national, regional and subregional levels through the ongoing efforts of development partners. It seeks to support and implement various activities including consensus-building on systematization/harmonization of household data sets, training with respect to the systematization/harmonization of micro data sets, internet-based dissemination and processing of a micro data dictionary. The general objective of this project is to improve the comparability of social statistics produced in the Caribbean through household surveys and to ensure international standards of comparability.

The major challenge faced by the project is the reluctance of NSOs to share micro data. While a total of six countries signed a Letter of Agreement (LoA) to share household data sets, all other countries were not willing to share their data on the grounds of either country policies that restricted sharing of data or the general reluctance to share micro data for reasons of confidentiality. The countries consenting to share micro data of some of their surveys are Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago. Further, data sets on the annual Survey of Living Conditions were received from Jamaica and their 10-year series of Labor Force Survey statistics data sets are also currently being procured.

### **2. REDATAM Training**

REDATAM is a database management tool that administers large volumes of census microdata with hierarchical structure down to the smallest area of the census administrative exercise, often to city blocks or similar-sized areas. It was developed to promote access to and analysis of census and other data for informed decision making for sectoral and local development programmes and policies. In collaboration with CELADE, the Statistics Unit of the ECLAC Subregional Headquarters convened a subregional workshop to train staff from NSOs in the use of this software in Saint Lucia in December 2008. Plans are on track later this year, for the conduct of another similar workshop for the CSO Trinidad and Tobago, as well as a parallel workshop on the more advanced module of REDATAM.

### **III. SECONDARY DATA AVAILABLE FROM OTHER SOURCES**

Since the project's main focus is primary data for MDG monitoring and reporting at the country level, only a brief overview of sources for secondary data is offered in order to complete the assessment of available data and indicators.

#### **A. United Nations**

The MDG Monitor was created by the UNDP in partnership with the Statistics Division of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) and other United Nations departments and agencies. The MDG Monitor showcases existing United Nations data from the official MDG Indicators database, maintained by the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD). The complete MDG database can be accessed at <http://MDGs.un.org>. Data are available for the following Caribbean countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago. The information available covers the period 1990 to 2007. Noticeable is the scarcity of data in the area of poverty and health MDG Monitor: (<http://www.MDGsmonitor.org/>).

#### **B. United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD)**

This site presents the official data, definitions, methodologies and sources for more than 60 indicators to measure progress towards the MDGs. The data and analyses are the product of the work of the Inter-agency and Expert Group (IAEG) on MDG indicators, coordinated by the United Nations Statistics Division. Further, official progress reports and documents produced by IAEG are accessible. Links to related sites and documents and constantly updated news on ongoing activities on MDG monitoring are provided. This database offers access to statistics from the following countries in the Caribbean that also includes information for non-independent countries: Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Montserrat, Netherlands Antilles, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and the United States Virgin Islands (UNSD: <http://MDGs.un.org/unsd/MDGs/Default.aspx>).

#### **C. World Bank**

The World Development Indicators Online (WDI) database provides direct access to more than 800 development indicators, with time series for 209 countries and 18 country groups from 1960 to 2007, where data are available. The WDI database holds data for the following Caribbean countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago. The complete datasets are only available to subscribers while selective data sets can be freely viewed at the below-cited website.

(<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/0,,contentMDK:20398986~menuPK:64133163~pagePK:64133150~piPK:64133175~theSitePK:239419,00.html>).

#### **D. UNICEF – Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS)**

Almost half of the MDG indicators are collected through MICS, making it one of the largest single sources of data for MDGs monitoring. For MICS3, which began in 2005, UNICEF added several new indicators to track progress toward the MDGs and other major international commitments. The following countries in the Caribbean have recently conducted MICS: Belize (2006), Cuba (2006), Guyana (2006), Jamaica (2005), Suriname (2006), and Trinidad and Tobago (2006) (<http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index.html>).

### **IV. IMPORTANCE OF METADATA**

#### **A. Global guidelines for MDGs monitoring**

To monitor progress towards the goals and targets, the United Nations system, including the World Bank and the IMF, as well as the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), came together under the Office of the Secretary-General to agree on a set of now 60 quantitative indicators. The indicators built upon an intergovernmental process to identify relevant indicators in response to global conferences related to economic, social and environmental sustainable development convened in the 1990 and early 2000s.

Under the leadership of the UNSD of DESA, a handbook was prepared to provide guidance on the definitions, rationale, concepts and sources of data for each of the indicators that are being used to monitor the goals and targets. These indicators along with the manual are accessible through the official United Nations website for the MDG indicators (<http://MDGs.un.org/unsd/MDGs/Data.aspx>), which is currently maintained by the UNSD. The data and analyses available on this website are the product of the work of the Inter-agency and Expert Group<sup>12</sup> (IAEG) on MDG Indicators that is coordinated by the UNSD<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Inter-Agency and Expert Group (IAEG) on MDGs Indicators includes various Departments within the United Nations Secretariat, a number of United Nations agencies from within the United Nations system and outside, various government agencies and national statisticians, and other organizations concerned with the development of MDGs data at the national and international levels including donors and expert advisers. IAEG is responsible for the preparation of data and analysis to monitor progress towards the MDGs. The Group also reviews and defines methodologies and technical issues in relation to the indicators, produces guidelines, and helps define priorities and strategies to support countries in data collection, analysis and reporting on MDGs. Over the past few years, the IAEG has worked to promote improvement and better documentation on the standards and methods used in compiling and analyzing MDGs indicators, including finding ways to aggregate country data in a meaningful way, overcoming problems of comparability and, even more importantly, providing a meaningful analysis of the aggregate

According to these guidelines, the documentation of metadata for each indicator in a MDG report should consist of:

- (a) Definition
- (b) Method of computation
- (c) Comments and limitations
- (d) Source of discrepancies
- (e) Process of obtaining data
- (f) Treatment of missing data
- (g) Data availability
- (h) Regional and global estimates
- (i) Expected time of release

The list of global MDG indicators was developed, guided by the above-cited background documents and manuals.

Indicators, generally, should:

- (a) Provide relevant and robust measures of progress towards the targets of the MDGs;
- (b) Be clear and straightforward to interpret and provide a basis for international comparison;
- (c) Be broadly consistent with other global lists and avoid imposing an unnecessary burden on country teams, governments and other partners;
- (d) Be based, to the greatest extent possible, on international standards, recommendations and best practices;
- (e) Be constructed from well-established data sources, be quantifiable and be consistent;
- (f) Enable measurement over time.

However, the formulation of these indicators was not intended to be prescriptive. Countries are expected to take into account their specific settings and the views of various stakeholders in preparing national report.

---

figures that represents the local situation. This work is undertaken through thematic sub-groups established within IAEG and through other inter-agency mechanisms bringing together specialized agencies in the various fields covered by the MDGs.

<sup>13</sup> In order to facilitate access to these metadata, the Statistics Division (XX) of ECLAC STGO consolidated these metadata into a compendium (ECLAC, 2009).

## **B. Metadata on MDGs in the Caribbean**

In a first effort to assess the availability and use of metadata in MDG monitoring and reporting in the Caribbean, ECLAC reviewed available MDG reports submitted to the United Nations, to date, and reports based on poverty assessments conducted in numerous countries over the past years. These documents generally reported on progress made or gaps identified in pursuing the achievement of the IADGs. Given the fact that so far no metadata have been provided for the Caribbean specific indicators as adopted by COHSOD in 2008, the work of ECLAC within the framework of the above-cited project is currently focusing on the monitoring and reporting of MDGs as agreed upon by the General Assembly in 2007 (Annex 1).

### **1. National MDG reports**

An in-depth review of available MDG reports concerning information provided and documentation of metadata presented showed the following:

(a) The MDG reports are the main means by which countries report scorecards and outlook to 2015.

(b) The MDG reports contain little or no significant annexed metadata addressing the relevant issues set out by the guidelines provided through the United Nations. In more detail, the following was observed:

- (i) All MDG reports contained significant comparisons of poverty indicators (1) cross country, across districts within the same country and intertemporal comparisons, but little or no clarification or justification of such comparisons (especially in relation to cost of living differences).
- (ii) They rely heavily on administrative data for all goals other than Goal 1, without the benefit of close supervision and data re-weighting by the NSOs. This has the strength of availability but also several limitations with regard to the needs of monitoring. The most important consideration here is that administrative data are generally not 'clean' in relation to the needs of MDG monitoring. There are normally severe problems of:
  - a. Missing data.
  - b. Inaccurate data, including data resulting from deliberate falsification.
  - c. Incomplete data and imbalance in the degree of accuracy of measurement.
  - d. Unweighted data.
  - e. Inadequate representation of relevant clusters.
  - f. Absence of links to other data that yield causal factors.
  - g. Inadequate classification identifiers to facilitate aggregation.

Data with such characteristics cannot be treated as reliable and, in any event, cannot be used for intertemporal comparisons. Therefore, monitoring progress (i.e. intertemporal comparison) in the achievement of various MDGs is from a methodological point of view not possible with the data published in these reports.

(c) Overall, it appears that the reports were not prepared according to a prescribed set of standards, guidelines or preparation procedures. This suggests one or more of the following:

- (i) The reports were not prepared with local technical leadership and coordination by the NSOs of the reporting countries. One consequence of this is that it cannot be guaranteed that many of the indicators reported, especially those based on administrative data, are nationally representative or accompanied by metadata clarifying the nature and extent of bias involved.
- (ii) The methodology of scoring as documented in UNDG (2003) and ECLAC (2009) was not fully communicated to reporting countries.
- (iii) Some countries did not invest the necessary resources into preparation of adequate MDG statistical reports that can be evaluated for their technical quality and thus be used for multi-period monitoring.

## **2. Poverty reports**

Over the past years, a series of Country Poverty Assessments (CPA) have been conducted in the Caribbean supported by the UNDP and the CDB. Often resources from other donors and/or government funding are made available to cover the expenses for these studies. The focus of these assessments is to provide an in-depth analysis of the living conditions in the countries surveyed.

Such assessments encompass generally:

- (a) An assessment of the macro-social and economic environment;
- (b) An institutional analysis;
- (c) A national Survey of Living Conditions (SLC) and/or a Household Budget Survey (HSB); and
- (d) A participatory poverty assessment.

Poverty reports appear to be the main data source for measuring achievement on the following:

- (a) Progress on the poverty rate, poverty gap, and share of the poorest quintile in consumption or income; and
- (b) Health indicators, especially malnutrition and obesity in adults and in children.

These assessments are, in many instances, one of the key documents governments rely on in their efforts to combat poverty through policies and programmes and allocate the necessary resources. Further, findings of poverty assessment are also used by bi- and multilateral donors when determining the scope of financial and technical support to be extended to a particular country.

Concerning the availability of metadata, the following is noted:

- (a) While metadata in these poverty reports were generally much better than in the case of the MDG reports earlier discussed, these too did not follow a standard set of procedures.
- (b) Metadata were not available for most variables in most country reports, especially in relation to the methods of computation and the limitations of the indicators constructed.
- (c) It appears that the poverty reports were generally not prepared with a view to supporting the production of MDG reports. In particular, the following should be noted:
  - (i) They contained significant cross-country comparisons but with little or no clarification or justification of such comparisons.
  - (ii) In some cases where cross-country comparisons were explained and justified, there is significant error in the justification. This is particularly true regarding the comparison of poverty indicators across countries.

A practical example for such invalid cross-country comparisons of poverty levels is a table published in a regional report on the achievement of MDGs in the Caribbean Community (UNDP, 2004, p.18). This table compares profiles of poverty. This “profile of poverty” in the Caribbean is provided based on comparisons of poverty rates constructed using national poverty lines that are not comparable since they are not based on PPP<sup>14</sup> (with only a minor reservation that computations were done in different years). The following statement in the above cited report is instructive:

‘Estimates of the Head Count ratio have been prepared in various Country Poverty Assessment studies conducted by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) during the 1990s as well as Living Standards Measurement Surveys funded by the World Bank but these were done for different years in the different countries, which imposes a limitation in terms of comparison among countries. However, allowing for this limitation, the

---

<sup>14</sup> Purchase Power Parity (PPP) based poverty measurements

incidence of poverty ranges from a low of 13.9% in Barbados in 1997 to a high of 81% in Haiti in 1995. Except for Barbados and Jamaica, the incidence of poverty in all the other countries in this table was above 20%, and for eight of the fourteen countries, it was above 30% (UNDP, 2004, p.18).’

Specialists in poverty measurement widely agree that, as in other areas of economic measurement, intertemporal comparison of poverty rates requires a fixed real line, which can be rebased from time to time (Mueller, 2005; Coudouel, et al., 2004: 36). In Coudouel, et al (2004: 36).

(a) The poverty reports contained intra-country comparisons across districts that are generally sound, even though data related to cost of living differences across districts and regions had not been carefully detailed in most cases.

(b) They contained significant intertemporal comparisons but little or no clarification or justification of such comparisons. Indeed, the following are noteworthy:

- Poverty rates were compared over time even though the poverty lines were also being revised upwards. In many reports, the poverty rates were shown to be rising - a result which might be due to the increase in the poverty line. Cases include Belize, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Lucia.

A practical example of such measurements can be demonstrated by reviewing the poverty assessment for Saint Kitts and Nevis that was conducted in 2007/2008 (KAIRI, 2009). Some of the problems identified above were found in the very first table on page xvi (KAIRI, 2009) and propagates throughout the document (see table below – this table contains additional data from an earlier poverty report (Kairi 2001)).

Poverty Indicators by Island, 2000 and 2007								
	St. Kitts		Nevis		National		Purchasing Power Parity	
	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007	2000	2007
	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Poverty Rate% (Individuals)	30.5	23.7	32	15.9	<b>21.8</b>			
Indigence% (Individuals)	11	1.4	17	0				
Poverty Rate% (households)	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>				
Indigence% (households)	<b>4.3</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>0</b>				
Poverty Line (EC\$, current)	3,360.60	7329	3,940.90	9788			<b>1.17</b>	<b>1.34</b>
Indigence Line (EC\$, current, based on 2400 calories per day)	2135.3	2595	2448	2931			<b>1.15</b>	<b>1.13</b>
Sample Size (Expected)					<b>10</b>	<b>6.20</b>		
Mean household size	<b>NA</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>2.2</b>				
Mean household size, poor	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>				

(EC\$ = Eastern Caribbean Dollar)

The evidence presented suggests that, with respect to general poverty, this table is comparing the **incomparable**.

- (a) The SKN poverty lines for 2000 were EC3,360/3,940.
- (b) The SKN poverty lines for 2007 was EC7,329/9,788
- (c) These are different real lines.

Recalculation of the poverty lines based on Consumer Price Indices (CPIs) (Kairi, 2009, p. 34) a reasonable deflator, for the reference years can be used to demonstrate that these lines are too far apart in real terms to be the same. ECLAC internal calculations suggest that the Saint Kitts line for 2000 inflates to about EC\$ 4387, while the line for 2007 deflates to EC\$ 5541. Therefore the comparison of the poverty rates is not valid. The more important point is that the estimates are correspondingly giving a false estimate for one of these years. Consequently, if the

year 2000 is taken as the benchmark, the increase in the real line means a significant underassessment of improvements regarding poverty eradication in the country.

This has profound implications for

- (a) The national self-confidence about development possibilities and the positive impact of national programmes to address poverty;
- (b) National development policy making; and,
- (c) The measurement of the national and international obligations under MDGs.

Development policy based on such findings and recommendations will be seriously misguided. Consequently, resources might not be allocated to efforts such as entrepreneurial development, quality upgrade and similar capacity building activities that would allow sustaining positive and successful development efforts.

As illustrated earlier, this report also undertakes cross-country comparisons of national poverty levels (headcount index) that are not based on PPP (Kairi, 2009, p. 50, table 5.4), thus from a methodological standpoint not comparable. In large measure, Jamaica's Poverty Reports were an exception to these problems, given the fact that Jamaica is the only country in the English-speaking Caribbean that has maintained its national poverty line to allow for intertemporal comparisons.

## **V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **A. Summary**

Any MDG target and indicator specific discussion needs to take into consideration the national and regional mechanisms for data collection, sharing and reporting. The study confirms what has been stated elsewhere:

1. The production of statistics in Caribbean countries is quite fragmented in the sense that various bodies and institutions, such as national NSOs, ministries and other governmental bodies are involved in a rather uncoordinated way in the collection, analysis and reporting of data and statistics.

2. Further, the vast majority of the countries in the subregion seem not to have a central authority that coordinates and oversees statistical activities at the national level. Thus, various governmental bodies often conduct their own surveys and study with limited or no involvement of the NSO. In spite of this, it is often assumed that the NSO is the national authority and, therefore, generally is the only body involved in regional and/or international efforts to streamline and harmonize data collection, definitions and reporting. As a consequence,

various efforts to coordinate, harmonize and streamline data collection, sharing and reporting at the national or regional level have not been very successful since other major data agents have not been involved.

3. Various subregional bodies, such as CARICOM, regional and international development banks and the United Nations system are engaged in numerous regional and national projects to enhance data collection and analysis mechanisms, and to build capacity at the country level. Quite often, however, these efforts mainly focus on NSOs, while other relevant governmental institutions are not included and thus often lack the capacity to utilize available data efficiently and effectively (see point 2). Also, it can be expected that acceptance of such concepts is limited as a result of being excluded from activities related to harmonizing and streamlining statistics in the subregion,

4. The review of specific MDG monitoring and reporting mechanisms has illustrated the following:

(a) There seem to be three categories of countries: countries that are reasonably advanced in both data collection and reporting; countries which seem to be stronger in data collection but seem to lack appropriate reporting mechanisms; and countries which seem to lag behind in both, data collection and established reporting mechanisms established.

(b) With respect to data availability and reporting mechanisms established for the specific development indicators, there are considerable gaps among countries and among the indicators for the various goals.

(c) The results of the inquiry show that considerable efforts seem to have been undertaken to improve survey data and statistics, while far less efforts have been underway to strengthen national administrative data collection and reporting mechanisms. The survey findings also point to the fact that data collection and reporting (particularly in the area of administrative data) are, in many instances, the responsibility of different bodies that only at times seem to cooperate and collaborate. Gaps between collecting and reporting agencies seem to exist, particularly in the areas of health, education and environment statistics.

(d) With regard to the specific MDGs and indicators, the following can be summarized:

*Goal 1:* Data for all indicators referring to Goal 1 seem to be widely available and also reported. However, there seems to be a common understanding that indicator 1 ‘proportion of population below \$US 1/per day’ is neither an adequate nor appropriate measurement for poverty in the Caribbean. Therefore this concept is not in use. The majority of the countries have established national poverty line that are the basis for the assessment of poverty in the respective country.

*Goal 2:* With regard to education indicators, the net enrolment ratio seems to be widely available, however, several countries identified a serious lack of data to monitor and report on

the ‘proportion of students who start grade 1 who complete primary education’ and on the ‘literacy rates of 15 – 24 year olds’.

*Goal 3:* The majority of the countries seem to be in a position to report on gender equality and women empowerment.

*Goal 4:* Also well covered are indicators relating to child mortality.

*Goal 5:* Data availability regarding maternal health seems to be generally sound, whereas data for indicators, such as the ‘contraceptive prevalence rate’ and ‘unmet family planning needs’ seem to be less often available.

*Goal 6:* Data availability to monitor and report on ‘HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases’ seems to be limited, with the exception of the first indicator, ‘HIV/AIDS prevalence amongst the young’. Often data are available but not broken down by gender or age and therefore only of limited value. Statistics for the other indicators within this Goal seem to be scarce and only available in some of the countries surveyed. Important to note is fact that the majority of the countries in the Caribbean are not affected by malaria and thus do not consider this indicator as relevant to their national reporting and planning mechanisms.

*Goal 7:* Data covering environmental sustainability seem to be available in some of the countries studied. The situation seems to be best for the ‘proportion of land covered by forest’, ‘carbon dioxide emissions’ and ‘access to sanitation facilities’. Very little information seems to be available on ‘ozone depleting substances’, ‘proportion of fish stocks’ and ‘proportion of water resources used’. Also, most countries indicate not to have slums and state that thus this indicator would not apply to their realities.

5. With regard to data collection, monitoring and sharing mechanisms, the majority of the countries stated that they had not established a national mechanism to share data electronically. However, a strong willingness was expressed towards contributing to a regional data sharing mechanism. Most countries reported not having any guiding laws and regulations for data sharing at the national and international level, however, in most cases the national Statistics Act seems to provide the respective legal framework.

6. Participating countries identified the following needs in the area of MDG monitoring and reporting:

- (a) Strengthening inter-agency collaboration at the national level (institutionalize data sharing mechanisms at country level);
- (b) Improving general data quality;
- (c) Providing assistance with specific surveys (LAMPS, CWIQs, etc.);
- (d) Strengthening specific areas: environmental statistics, education, health, gender, HIV/AIDS;

- (e) Establishing and strengthening national data sharing platforms (such as DevInfo).

The study has also revealed serious gaps in regard to use and documentation of metadata in MDG monitoring generally but, particularly, in poverty monitoring and reporting.

7. The assessment also found considerable methodological errors in the use of poverty indicators for monitoring and progress reporting with, at times, potential serious negative implications for the country under consideration. Given the lack of available metadata and documentation on analytical processes, users of such indicators are often not in a position to judge the validity, usability and limitations of such data for development planning purposes.

8. From the perspective of sound MDG reporting, the problems documented are serious, given that the main concern is to address comparative progress over time. They may well cause significant misallocation of local and international resources to poverty reduction.

9. The reports were not prepared with local technical leadership, coordination and validation by the NSOs of the reporting countries. One consequence of this is that it cannot be guaranteed that many of the indicators reported, especially those based on administrative data, are nationally representative or accompanied by metadata clarifying the nature and extent of bias involved. This would be particularly true for data arising from administrative sources.

10. Guidelines provided by different United Nations entities on MDG monitoring and reporting (with the exception of the United Nations bodies cited earlier) generally do not focus on the importance of metadata and, thus, many agents at the national level are often not aware of the need for such information, particularly given the fact that in most instances line ministries and not the NSO have the final responsibility for the publication of MDG reports.

## **B. Conclusions and recommendations**

1. Given the fragmentation of the statistical systems at the national level, other institutions outside the NSO need to be involved in all aspects of statistical work, from the development of concepts to data collection, analysis and reporting.

2. In the long term, there is a need to establish a central authority to enhance national coordination and communication, as well as to enhance international cooperation, harmonization and streamlining of statistical procedures, to improve the subregion's statistical basis.

3. At the regional level, regional and international agencies need to enhance their communication and coordination of activities to avoid duplication and/or repetition of activities. They also need to avoid overburdening the already often thinly-staffed NSOs and other institutions involved in statistics.

4. With regard to administrative data, there is a need to recognize that various bodies, with often no formally established data-sharing mechanisms, are involved in the collection as well as the reporting of data. Therefore, gaps in the specific areas need to be

identified and mechanisms developed to enhance communication and collaboration amongst these institutions to enhance the flow of data and other relevant information.

5. In order to produce accurate statistics based on internationally agreed upon standards and norms that are cross-country and intertemporally comparable, there is a considerable need to increase awareness for the need of proper documentation of metadata within NSOs and other data producing, monitoring and reporting agencies.

6. There is a need to substantially improve metadata reporting and harmonization of reporting practice in both the MDG reports and the poverty reports. A well-designed meta database would facilitate the desired improvements and harmonization.

7. The concept of metadata is new and some training is needed to prepare them for the MDG reports.

## REFERENCES

- Coudouel, A., J. S. Hentschel, and Q. T. Wodon. (2004). Chapter 1: Poverty Measurement and Analysis. <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/81136/Nairobi2004/readings/sp/povmeaseng.pdf>.
- ECLAC (2009). Millennium Development Goals Indicators – Metadata. Santiago: Statistics and Economic Projections Division, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, United Nations.
- ECLAC/CDCC 2002, The Production of Statistical Data and Information in the Caribbean ... Proposals for Increasing Efficiency in this Sphere, LC/CAR/G.701, October 2002.
- ECLAC/CDCC 2003, Criteria for the Efficient Coordination of the Activities for Data Collection and the Design of Instruments for Mapping and Data Collection Applicable to Countries in the Caribbean, LC/CAR/G.755, October 2003.
- ECLAC/CDCC 2005, The Statistical Infrastructure of Caribbean Countries, LC/CAR/L.69, December 2005, Port of Spain
- ECLAC/CDCC (2007), Migration data collection, management, sharing in the Caribbean; Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, 26 October 2007; LC/CAR/L.139
- ECLAC/CDCC (2009), The Statistical Infrastructure of Caribbean countries, Port of Spain, 2009; November 2009 (Forthcoming publication)
- Kairi Consultants (2001). St. Kitts and Nevis Poverty Assessment Report. Bridgetown: Caribbean Development Bank.
- Kairi Consultants (2009). Country Poverty Assessment, St. Kitts and Nevis 2007/08: Living Conditions in a Caribbean Small Island Developing State. Volume 1: Living Conditions in St Kitts and Nevis. Bridgetown: Caribbean Development Bank.
- Kroenke, D. M. and Auer, D.J. (2007). Database Concepts. 3rd ed. New York: Prentice.
- Lanjouw, P., and M. Ravallion. (1995). "Poverty and Household Size." *Economic Journal* 105:1415–34.
- Mueller, C. (2005). The Measurement of Poverty with Geographical and Intertemporal Price Comparison: Evidence from Rwanda. IVIE Working Paper WP-AD 2005-11, Departamento de Fundamentos del Análisis Económico, Universidad de Alicante, Campus de San Vicente, 03080 Alicante, Spain. E-mail: [cmuller@merlin.fae.ua.es](mailto:cmuller@merlin.fae.ua.es).
- National Information Standards Organization (NISO) (2004). Understanding Metadata. Bethesda, MD: NISO Press. Available freely at [www.niso.org](http://www.niso.org).
- Porter, C. and Quinn, N. N. (2008). Intertemporal Poverty Measurement: Tradeoffs and Policy Options. Paper presented at Gorman Workshop, Oxford University. Available from Catherine Porter, St Anthony's College, Oxford University ([catherine.porter@economics.ox.ac.uk](mailto:catherine.porter@economics.ox.ac.uk)).
- Ravallion, M. (1994). Poverty Comparisons. Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers.

United Nations Development Group (UNDG) (2003). Indicators for Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals: Definitions, Rationale, Concepts and Sources. ST/ESA/STAT/SER.F/95, United Nations Publication, Sales No. E.03.XVII. 18, ISBN 92-1-161467-8. New York: United Nations.

<http://millenniumindicators.un.org/unsd/MDGs/Resources/Attach/Indicators/HandbookEnglish.pdf>

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP (2004). Regional Report on The Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals in the Caribbean Community. New York, USA

UNDG (2003). Indicators for Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals: Definitions, Rationale, Concepts and Sources. ST/ESA/STAT/SER.F/95, United Nations Publication, Sales No. E.03.XVII. 18, ISBN 92-1-161467-8. New York: United Nations Development Group, United Nations.

<http://millenniumindicators.un.org/unsd/MDGs/Resources/Attach/Indicators/HandbookEnglish.pdf>.

Annex I**MDG INDICATORS****Official list of MDG indicators**

**All indicators should be disaggregated by sex and urban/rural as far as possible.  
Effective 15 January 2008**

<b>Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)</b>	
<b>Goals and Targets (from the Millennium Declaration)</b>	<b>Indicators for monitoring progress</b>
<b>Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</b>	
Target 1.A: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day	1.1 Proportion of population below \$1 (PPP) per day <sup>i</sup> 1.2 Poverty gap ratio 1.3 Share of poorest quintile in national consumption
Target 1.B: Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people	1.4 Growth rate of GDP per person employed 1.5 Employment-to-population ratio 1.6 Proportion of employed people living below \$1 (PPP) per day 1.7 Proportion of own-account and contributing family workers in total employment
Target 1.C: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger	1.8 Prevalence of underweight children under-five years of age 1.9 Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption
<b>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education</b>	
Target 2.A: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling	2.1 Net enrolment ratio in primary education 2.2 Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary 2.3 Literacy rate of 15-24 year-olds, women and men
<b>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women</b>	
Target 3.A: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015	3.1 Ratios of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education 3.2 Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector 3.3 Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament
<b>Goal 4: Reduce child mortality</b>	
Target 4.A: Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate	4.1 Under-five mortality rate 4.2 Infant mortality rate Proportion of 1 year-old children immunised against measles
<b>Goal 5: Improve maternal health</b>	
Target 5.A: Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal	5.1 Maternal mortality ratio 5.2 Proportion of births attended by skilled health

mortality ratio	personnel
Target 5.B: Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health	5.3 Contraceptive prevalence rate 5.4 Adolescent birth rate 5.5 Antenatal care coverage (at least one visit and at least four visits) 5.6 Unmet need for family planning
<b>Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases</b>	
Target 6.A: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS	6.1 HIV prevalence among population aged 15-24 years 6.2 Condom use at last high-risk sex 6.3 Proportion of population aged 15-24 years with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS 6.4 Ratio of school attendance of orphans to school attendance of non-orphans aged 10-14 years
Target 6.B: Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it	6.5 Proportion of population with advanced HIV infection with access to antiretroviral drugs
Target 6.C: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases	6.6 Incidence and death rates associated with malaria 6.7 Proportion of children under 5 sleeping under insecticide-treated bednets 6.8 Proportion of children under 5 with fever who are treated with appropriate anti-malarial drugs 6.9 Incidence, prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis 6.10 Proportion of tuberculosis cases detected and cured under directly observed treatment short course
<b>Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability</b>	
Target 7.A: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources	7.1 Proportion of land area covered by forest 7.2 CO2 emissions, total, per capita and per \$1 GDP (PPP) 7.3 Consumption of ozone-depleting substances 7.4 Proportion of fish stocks within safe biological limits
Target 7.B: Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss	7.5 Proportion of total water resources used 7.6 Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected 7.7 Proportion of species threatened with extinction
Target 7.C: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation	7.8 Proportion of population using an improved drinking water source 7.9 Proportion of population using an improved sanitation facility
Target 7.D: By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers	7.10 Proportion of urban population living in slums <sup>ii</sup>

<b>Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development</b>	
<p>Target 8.A: Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system</p> <p>Includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction – both nationally and internationally</p> <p>Target 8.B: Address the special needs of the least developed countries</p> <p>Includes: tariff and quota free access for the least developed countries' exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction</p> <p>Target 8.C: Address the special needs of landlocked developing countries and small island developing States (through the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly)</p> <p>Target 8.D: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term</p>	<p><i>Some of the indicators listed below are monitored separately for the least developed countries (LDCs), Africa, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States.</i></p> <p><u>Official development assistance (ODA)</u></p> <p>8.1 Net ODA, total and to the least developed countries, as percentage of OECD/DAC donors' gross national income</p> <p>8.2 Proportion of total bilateral, sector-allocable ODA of OECD/DAC donors to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation)</p> <p>8.3 Proportion of bilateral official development assistance of OECD/DAC donors that is untied</p> <p>8.4 ODA received in landlocked developing countries as a proportion of their gross national incomes</p> <p>8.5 ODA received in small island developing States as a proportion of their gross national incomes</p> <p><u>Market access</u></p> <p>8.6 Proportion of total developed country imports (by value and excluding arms) from developing countries and least developed countries, admitted free of duty</p> <p>8.7 Average tariffs imposed by developed countries on agricultural products and textiles and clothing from developing countries</p> <p>8.8 Agricultural support estimate for OECD countries as a percentage of their gross domestic product</p> <p>8.9 Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity</p> <p><u>Debt sustainability</u></p> <p>8.10 Total number of countries that have reached their HIPC decision points and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative)</p> <p>8.11 Debt relief committed under HIPC and MDRI Initiatives</p> <p>8.12 Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services</p>
<p>Target 8.E: In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries</p>	<p>8.13 Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis</p>

Target 8.F: In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications	8.14 Telephone lines per 100 population 8.15 Cellular subscribers per 100 population 8.16 Internet users per 100 population
--	---

The Millennium Development Goals and targets come from the Millennium Declaration, signed by 189 countries, including 147 heads of State and Government, in September 2000 (<http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>) and from further agreement by member states at the 2005 World Summit (Resolution adopted by the General Assembly - A/RES/60/1, <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=A/RES/60/1>). The goals and targets are interrelated and should be seen as a whole. They represent a partnership between the developed countries and the developing countries “to create an environment – at the national and global levels alike – which is conducive to development and the elimination of poverty”.

Annex II**QUESTIONNAIRE****I. General guidelines:**

1. All information provided will be treated with absolute confidentiality.
2. There is no 'right' or 'wrong' answer to any of the questions;
3. Please be concise in your responses;
4. Feel free to add additional relevant information on a separate sheet of paper.

**II. MDG Data Collection and Reporting**Status of MDG reporting

1. Has your country ever submitted a national MDG report to the United Nations?

Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ Year/s: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_ submitted by  
Min of social transformation

2. Please list which governmental body(ies) is/are responsible for collecting (a) and reporting (b) statistics on MDGs:

**Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger**

<b><i>Target 1a:</i></b> <i>Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day</i>	Governmental agency responsible for:	Not Available	
	Collecting	Reporting	
1.1 Proportion of population below \$1 (PPP) per day			
1.2 Poverty gap ratio			
1.3 Share of poorest quintile in national consumption			
<b><i>Target 1b:</i></b> <i>Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger</i>			
1.4 Growth rate of GDP per employed person			
1.5 Employment-to-population ratio			
1.6 Proportion of employed living below \$1 (PPP) per day			
1.7 Proportion of own-account and contributing family workers in total employment			
<b><i>Target 1c:</i></b> <i>Halve, between 1990</i>	Governmental	Not Available	

<i>and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger</i>	agency responsible for:		
	Collecting	Reporting	
1.8 Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age			
1.9 Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption			

## **Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education**

<b>Target 2a:</b> <i>Ensure that, by 2015 children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling</i>	Governmental agency responsible for:		Not Available
	Collecting	Reporting	
2.1 Net enrolment ratio in primary education			
2.2 Proportion of students starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary education			
2.3 Literacy rate of 15 – 24 year olds, women and men			

## **Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower men**

<b>Target 3a:</b> <i>Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education, no later than 2015.</i>	Governmental agency responsible for:		Not Available
	Collecting	Reporting	
3.1 Ratio of boys to girls in primary, secondary and tertiary education			
3.2 Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector			
3.3 Proportion of seats held by women in parliament			

**Goal 4: Reduce child mortality**

<b>Target 4a:</b> <i>Reduce by two thirds between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate</i>	Governmental agency responsible for:		Not Available
	Collecting	Reporting	
4.1 Under-five mortality rate			
4.2 Infant mortality rate			
4.3 Proportion of 1 year old children immunized against measles			

**Goal 5: Improve maternal health**

<b>Target 5a:</b> <i>Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio</i>	Governmental agency responsible for:		Not Available
	Collecting	Reporting	
5.1 Maternal mortality ratio			
5.2 Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel			
5.3 Contraceptive prevalence rate			
<b>Target 5b:</b> <i>Achieve by 2015 universal access to reproductive health</i>			
5.4 Adolescent birth rate			
5.5 Antenatal care (at least one visit and at least four visits)			
5.6 Unmet need for family planning			

**Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS**

<b>Target 6a:</b> <i>Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS</i>	Governmental agency responsible for:		Not Available
	Collecting	Reporting	
6.1 HIV prevalence among population aged 15-24 years			
6.2 Condom use at last high risk sex			
6.3 Proportion of population aged 15-24 years with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS			
6.4 Ratio of school attendance of orphans to school attendance of non-orphans aged 10 – 14 years			

<b>Target 6b:</b> <i>Achieve by 2010 universal access to treatment of HIV/AIDS for all those who need it</i>	Governmental agency responsible for:		Not Available
	Collecting	Reporting	
6.5 Proportion of population with advanced HIV infection with access to antiretroviral drugs			

<b><i>Target 6c: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases</i></b>			
6.6 Incidence and death rates associated with malaria			
6.7 Proportion of children under 5 sleeping under insecticide-treated bednets			
6.8 Proportion of children under 5 sleeping with fever who are treated with appropriate anti-malarial drugs			
6.9 Incidence, prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis			
6.10 Proportion of tuberculosis cases detected and cured under directly observed treatment short course			

### **Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability**

<b><i>Target 7a: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources</i></b>	Governmental agency responsible for:		Not Available
	Collecting	Reporting	
7.1 Proportion of land area covered by forest			
7.2 Carbon dioxide emissions, total, per capita and per \$1 GDP (PPP) and consumption of ozone-depleting substances			
7.3 Proportion of ozone-depleting substances			
7.4 Proportion of fish stocks within safe biological limits			
7.5 Proportion of total water resources used			
<b><i>Target 7b: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources</i></b>			
7.6 Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected			
7.7 Proportion of species threatened with extinction			

<b>Target 7c:</b> <i>Have halted by 2015, the proportion of people living without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation</i>	Governmental agency responsible for:		Not Available
	Collecting	Reporting	
7.8 Proportion of people using an improved drinking water source			
7.9 Proportion of population using an improved sanitation facility			
<b>Target 7d:</b> <i>By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers</i>			
7.10 Proportion of urban population living in slums			

**III. Monitoring of other IADGs:**

Please provide a brief description of efforts undertaken to monitor other IADGs (such as gender and/or population related indicators) in your country:

---



---

**IV. Coordination of MDG reporting and monitoring at the national level and international level**

1. Is there an agency/agency/national body responsible for coordinating MDG reporting and monitoring at the national level?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_ \_\_\_ (if no go to question 3)

If yes, what are the responsibilities of this agency/body?

---



---



---

2. Do you have an on-line database on MDG and IADG indicators? If yes, what type of database and what data are available?

---



---



---

No \_\_\_\_\_ (go to question 3)

3. Is there legislation, regulation or procedural documents authorizing such data collection, sharing and coordination, and if so, please describe. Not to my knowledge

3.1 at the national level

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_ No legislation or procedural documents

3.2 at the international level

---

---

---

4. Additional comments on MDG monitoring and reporting:

---

---

**III. MDG data sharing mechanisms**

Given the fact that one of the major expected outcomes of the project is the establishment of a database at the sub-regional level, could you indicate to what extent:

1. Your administration is sharing data with other international bodies (World Bank, United Nations, etc.), thematic areas, types of data

---

---

---

---

2. Your administration/CSO/other government bodies would be willing to contribute to a regional web-based MDG data sharing mechanism?

---

---

---

---

**IV. National needs in the area of MDG data collection, monitoring and sharing mechanisms at the national and international level**

Please indicate what area/s of MDG data collection, monitoring and sharing your Government/institution would need to be strengthened (please indicate the MDG/s, targets, thematic topics (health, education, environment, etc.)?)

---

---

---

---

---

**V. Additional Comments:**

---

---

---

---

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH!**

---

<sup>i</sup> For monitoring country poverty trends, indicators based on national poverty lines should be used, where available.

<sup>ii</sup> The actual proportion of people living in slums is measured by a proxy, represented by the urban population living in households with at least one of the four characteristics: (a) lack of access to improved water supply; (b) lack of access to improved sanitation; (c) overcrowding (3 or more persons per room); and (d) dwellings made of non-durable material.