



## WRITTEN SUBMISSION COLOMBIA

### Multidimensional Vulnerability Index (MVI) National Administrative Department of Statistics May 12<sup>TH</sup>, 2023

The following inputs are presented as an extension of the statement delivered by Colombia during the informal consultations with developing countries convened by the High-Level Expert Panel on May 10<sup>th</sup>. We recommend considering both documents as a complement to each other.

General comments and specific requests and recommendations to the panel are presented in this text, reacting to the different documents published by the panel on the MVI webpage.

#### 1. Principles to develop the MVI:

- a. Data Ownership should serve as a principle to develop the MVI, as well as to guide the selection of indicators and the design of governance arrangements. Throughout the documents shared it is mentioned that the process associated with the MVI should be a country-led process, nonetheless the data sources presented for the current proposal do not provide a solid basis upon which a country could exercise its data ownership through the data collected and analyzed.
- b. The previous comment is particularly associated with the universality principle “the index needs to employ available, recognized, comparable and reliable data”. Nonetheless it should be acknowledged that in many cases the data -even if available- is not nationally produced by an institution (e.g. NSO), but is collected by a third party (e.g. UNHCHR). It is therefore needed that the High-Level Panel avails further time to assess the availability of data of the proposed indicators or consider a governance arrangement of the MVI that includes the validation of data from national governments.

#### 2. Criteria to select indicators:

- a. **Data quality and availability:** As highlighted in the past round, one of the main flaws of the report was that it did not make any distinction among data, statistics, and more importantly “official statistics”, for that matter it is important to remember resolution A/RES/68/261 (2014) which refers to the fundamental principles of official statistics, and to take into account both its preambulatory clauses and the principles, and strive to draw indicators from the best quality possible-official statistics. Official Statistics differ greatly from other type of data, as an example there are processes like the GSBPM for the production of Official Statistics, as well as manuals (e.g.: United Nations National Quality Assurance Frameworks Manual for Official Statistics).

We consider that the articulation with the United Nations Statistical Division could be of use to provide further technical guidance to the MVI development on data quality and quality assurance of official statistics, as this would provide a solid ground for the selection of indicators. Indicators used should be aligned with the Quality Assurance of Official Statistics before approving the MVI. Otherwise, quality in the context of the MVI should be defined, aligned with international standards intergovernmentally agreed. In the same line, working together with both the Committee of the Chief Statisticians of the United Nations System (CCS-UN) and the Committee for the Coordination of Statistical Activities



(CCSA) could bring valuable insight on the choice of the indicators to be included on the MVI.

- b. **Transparency:** During the last round of consultation, Colombia highlighted the importance that the High-Level Panel managed to share the process associated with the consultations and deliberations associated with the choice of indicators. We would like to echo, once more, the importance of having a transparent process in this occasion as Member States have received a proposal of selected indicators, without having clarity of which other indicators were considered for each one of the choices. We kindly request the preparation of a note by the Panel providing a) further information on the full extent of indicators considered and the reasons to disregard them before submitting the proposal; and b) clarifying the thematic-sectorial consultations that were carried out when assessing each dimension. This request is made to gain further understanding of each choice, in sake of having further acceptability.

### 3. Governance Arrangements:

#### a. General Arrangements:

From the proposal shared on the governance arrangements, it is valued that the High-Level Panel has conducted consultation with other institutions, such as the OECD and UNDP, as the process allowed to draw some key conclusions such as the importance of data as a key asset. Nonetheless, there are a few worrying factors within this proposal, upon which the main one concerns both an overlap and duplication of functions with existing UN bodies, mainly the United Nations Statistical Commission.

The renewed mandate of the commission ([2022](#)) reaffirms key functions of the commission, such as its coordinating role among specialized agencies (p.2 (a)), and includes renewed functions, such as:

- P.1; the role of the Commission as the primary body for the coordination of the global statistical programmes in general and of the United Nations statistical and data-related system.
- P.3: Calls upon the United Nations statistical and data-related system to report on work on statistics and data within all domains to the Statistical Commission, to enable the Commission to fulfil its function as the primary body responsible for the management of statistical information and governance of statistics and data;
- P.12. 12. Requests the Statistical Commission, with the support of the Statistics Division as its secretariat, to play the role as the apex forum for discussions, knowledge exchange and sharing of best practices on statistics and data across all domains, to develop and maintain international statistical standards and norms, tools and methodologies, to support and bolster the development of sustainable national statistical systems, to develop and build the capacity of national systems, to advocate for the professional community of official statistics, and to ensure continued innovations to adapt to the changing statistical and data system.

Given the above, we urge the expert panel, to take into consideration the importance of avoiding overlaps and compliance with existing frameworks, to facilitate coordination of future activities of



the MVI. Further consultation with the UN Statistical Division, who acts as the secretariat of the Commission, will shed some light on the arrangements that should be taken into consideration when establishing a Working Group/ Inter Agency and Expert Group in the field of data and statistics. From the perspective of Colombia, the Statistical Commission should be part of any governance arrangement or follow-up exercise related to the MVI.

- b. **VCRP:** The elaboration of Voluntary Country- Resilience Country Profiles, is one of the most complex issues under the current proposal, as even if we acknowledge the benefits of developing these kinds of reports, its construction could entail several methodological challenges, particularly differences between global and national frameworks, even more when the data sources used for the MVI are not- in any sense- nationally produced. The experiences learnt from the SDG's are very valuable as the submission of VNR's per year varies between 22 and 41 each year in the framework of the HLPF. At this stage we would like to indicate that the development of VCRP seems to entail a significant burden report and further reflections on how to minimize it would be welcomed.

#### 4. **Policy Alignment with the 2030 Agenda:**

- At this stage it is worth noting that the shared proposal of the MVI could have a conflicting implications in terms of the connotation of terms with huge political relevance used in the context of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. The reason for this possible overlap lies in the core message embedded in each of these frames (the MVI and the 2030 Agenda): on one hand the need to address “the most vulnerable” countries, and on the other hand, a call for action seeking to “leave no one behind”, which recognizes the importance of targeting vulnerable populations. Recommendations of both existing frameworks could lead to conflicting messages on prioritization. A note from the panel exploring the connection of both frames, or at least a reflection on the potential implications on the understanding of the term vulnerability in the context of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda as part of the final report, would be appreciated.