Chapter I

Cross-cutting issues

1. Introduction

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda contains several key cross-cutting initiatives that build on the synergies of the sustainable development goals (SDGs) and address critical gaps in their delivery. Cross-cutting issues and commitments in the Addis Agenda, as contained in chapter I, include: (i) the delivery of social protection and essential public services for all; (ii) scaling up efforts to end hunger and malnutrition; (iii) closing the infrastructure gap including establishing the Global Infrastructure Forum; (iv) promoting inclusive and sustainable industrialization; (v) generating full and productive employment and decent work for all; (vi) protecting ecosystems; (vii) promoting peaceful and inclusive societies. It also addresses such issues as gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls; children and youth; countries in special situations; and the global partnership for sustainable development. Each of these initiatives can contribute to progress across a large number of SDGs.

Because of the close links to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, monitoring by the Inter-agency Task Force in this chapter will be able to draw on a large number of relevant SDG indicators, in particular for commitments and action items focused on achieving specific outcomes. The Task Force will add to those as necessary, and also provide greater specificity and detail to the monitoring of financial and non-financial means of implementation (MoI).

2. Delivering social protection and essential public services

The Addis Agenda presents a new social compact. This compact contains two components: a commitment to deliver social protection systems and measures for all, including floors; and a package of essential social services. While social protection generally refers to cash transfers and social insurance, such as adequate pensions for older persons, essential public services include the provision of basic social services, such as health and education. Countries are encouraged to set national spending targets for quality investments in these areas. As part of the social compact, the international community commits to provide support to country efforts and to explore funding modalities. Specifically, countries:

- commit to provide fiscally sustainable and nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, with a focus on those furthest below the poverty line and the vulnerable, persons with disabilities, indigenous persons, children, youth and older persons (12, SDG 1.3, MoI 8.b)
- are encouraged to set nationally appropriate spending targets for quality investments in essential public services for all, including health, education, energy, water and sanitation, consistent with national sustainable development strategies (12)
- commit strong international support for these efforts, and [to] explore coherent funding modalities to mobilize additional resources, building on country-led experiences (12)

Elements of this compact are included in the SDGs focused on poverty, health, education, water and sanitation, energy, decent work and cities. Indeed, the social compact addresses the full set of social indicators in the SDGs, while building on three targets (1.3: implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable; 1.4: ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable,
have... access to basic services and 1.a: ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions. The Task Force can thus draw on SDG indicator 1.3.1 (proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, disaggregated by sex, and distinguishing children, the unemployed, old-age persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women/newborns, work injury victims, the poor and the vulnerable), SDG indicator 1.4.1 (proportion of population living in households with access to basic services) and SDG indicator 1.a.2 (proportion of total government spending on essential services (education, health and social protection)). Additional sources of data that can complement these indicators include the World Bank’s ADePT database, which contains information on coverage and benefit incidence of social protection programmes across quintiles, deciles or other population groups.

The means to implement this social compact will come in large part from domestic public sources, supported by international public finance. Examining financing from national budgets as well as from international aid can thus help in monitoring implementation of the social compact.

National data is collected and classified by function in the framework of the System of National Accounts. The International Monetary Fund’s (IMF) Government Finance Statistics (GFS) database can be used to ascertain domestic spending levels for general government spending on an annual basis, though data points can be missing and/or reported on a different basis across different years. SDG indicator 16.6.1 (primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, disaggregated by sector (or by budget codes or similar)) should provide additional data. SDG MoI indicator 8.b.1 (total government spending in social protection and employment programmes as a proportion of the national budgets and GDP) and other data sources, such as Government Spending Watch, which tracks government spending in 74 low- and middle-income countries in agriculture, education, environment, gender, health, social protection, and water, sanitation and hygiene and the International Labour Organization’s (ILO) Social Protection database (which includes social protection coverage and expenditures in 190 countries) can also be useful. In as much as possible, this effort should track spending that explicitly addresses geographic disparities of services (both quality and access) and inequities among different population groups in service provision.

Nationally appropriate spending targets for quality investments in essential public services for all can also draw on existing benchmarks such as the benchmark to allocate at least 4–6 per cent of gross domestic product (GDP) to education and/or at least 15–20 per cent of public expenditure to education, which was adopted at the World Education Forum 2015 and included in the Incheon Declaration, or the African Union’s Abuja Declaration to allocate at least 15 per cent of annual budgets to improve the health sector. Monitoring of the effective use of such resources is further elaborated in the context of chapter II.A on domestic public resources.

Monitoring for the commitment to support domestic efforts with development aid can draw on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee’s (DAC) Creditor Reporting System (CRS) codes, selecting those appropriate within codes 110 (Education), 120 (Health), 13020 (Reproductive health care and HIV/AIDS), 16010 (Social/Welfare services), 140 (Water and sanitation), 16030 (Housing and slum upgrading) and 15160 (Human Rights). Case studies can be used to help explore coherent funding modalities to mobilize additional resources, building on country-led experiences.

Finally, it has been suggested that the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) Forum on Financing for Development (FFD) Follow-up and subsequent FFD conferences could serve as an institutional home for further exploration of coherent funding modalities for different areas included in the social compact, in terms of nationally appropriate spending targets and international support, including official development assistance (ODA) allocations, as well as complementary new innovative sources of finance for education, health, housing, social protection and water.
3. Ending hunger and malnutrition

Governments also commit to prioritise the fight against hunger and malnutrition and to adequately support sustainable agriculture. These commitments are largely consistent with the SDGs (SDG 2 to end hunger, achieve food security, improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture; SDG target 12.3 on halving food losses and waste). Monitoring by the Task Force can thus rely on the SDG indicators to a great extent. However, the Addis Agenda includes several additional aspects. First, it underscores that combatting hunger is multifaceted, and emphasizes the importance of rural development and addressing urban poverty in fighting hunger. Second, it puts a greater focus on implementation and financing. One key area that the Addis Agenda emphasizes is the need to increase both public and private investment and to align financing with sustainable development. Third, in addition to focusing on smallholders and women farmers, the Addis Agenda addresses mechanisms, such as agricultural cooperatives and farmers’ networks, as potentially playing a greater role in rural development and poverty reduction. Specifically, the Addis Agenda:

- Commits to take action to fight malnutrition and hunger (SDG 2.1 and 2.2), including among the urban poor; and to strengthen efforts to enhance food security and nutrition, focused on smallholders, women farmers (SDG 2.3), and agricultural cooperatives and farmers’ networks (13)
- Commits to support sustainable agriculture, including forestry, fisheries and pastoralism (13, SDG 2.4, MoI 2.a)
- Encourages increased private investment and commits to increasing public investment, particularly for financing research, infrastructure and pro-poor initiatives (13)
- Commits to significantly reduce post-harvest food loss and waste (13, SDG 12.3)
- Calls on WTO members to correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets, including through the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and disciplines on all export measures with equivalent effect (83, MoI 2.b, see chapter II.D)
- Commits to ensure the proper functioning of food commodity markets and their derivatives (108, MoI 2.c); Commits to facilitate timely, accurate and transparent access to market information in an effort to ensure that commodity markets appropriately reflect underlying demand and supply changes and help limit excess volatility (108, MoI 2.c)

In the area of hunger and food security, there are two relevant indicators—2.1.1, prevalence of undernourishment (the established Millennium Development Goal hunger indicator), and 2.1.2, the new Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIERS). Whereas the prevalence of undernourishment has until now been applied only at the national level, the FIERS will be able to address the effective ability to access food at the individual or household level, directly.

On malnutrition, available indicators (2.2.1 and 2.2.2) are the prevalence of stunting, wasting and overweight among children under five. The Task Force could further monitor three additional World Health Assembly indicators (breastfeeding, anaemia and low birth weight). Moreover, it is possible to monitor not just nutritional outcomes, which may result from health problems or water and sanitation access, but also the quality of diets. This can be done through the Women Dietary Diversity Score, which is supported by the United Nations Standing Committee on Nutrition, and which connects food systems, including agricultural production, with diversified and healthy diets. Additional supporting data can be found in the percentage of national budgets allocated to nutrition.

Monitoring of commitments and actions should also recognize the broader multidimensional nature of interventions in the area of malnutrition and hunger, including, but not limited to, agriculture, education, food systems, health, social protection and water and sanitation. To this extent, this section is closely linked to monitoring under the social compact and infrastructure sections in this chapter of the Report.

In the area of smallholder productivity and sustainable agriculture, SDG indicators include 2.3.1 (volume of production per labour unit by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size), and 2.3.2
(average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status). This could be supplemented by case studies, particularly on the role of agricultural cooperatives and farmers’ networks.

In terms of increasing investment, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development and the World Food Programme have calculated that to end hunger and poverty by 2030, additional resources of an average of US$265 billion will be required annually. This includes public investments in social protection as well as additional targeted public and private pro-poor investments in productive activities, including agriculture. As discussed under the social compact, much of this investment will be through public finance. However, many low-income countries lack the necessary public resources, and lack of investment in agriculture over decades has meant continuing low productivity and stagnant production in many countries. The Task Force will be able to draw on indicator 2.a.1 (Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) for Government Expenditures), which is defined as the agriculture share of government expenditures, divided by the agriculture share of GDP. Examining the numerator and denominator separately can give further insight into the growth of government expenditures in agriculture. International support can be monitored through 2.a.2 (total official flows (official development assistance plus other official flows) to the agriculture sector), which is provided by the OECD and also available through the FAO Statistics Division (FAOSTAT, disaggregated into flows to agriculture, rural development, basic nutrition, food aid, food security, and others). For a complete picture of international support, it would also be helpful to capture South-South cooperation in this area, however data is currently limited (see chapter II.C).

In terms of private flows, the Task Force can track foreign direct investment (FDI) flows to developing countries going to the agricultural sector, as reported by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the OECD. Both the level and share of these flows would need to be reported on a country basis, given that recent trends show an increase in FDI with a diminishing share going to agriculture, as well a high concentration in very few countries, predominantly middle income countries (MICs). However, some FDI in agriculture is not reported. For example, long-term land concessions have not been reported as FDI. UNCTAD and FAO are working on improving the capture and coverage of relevant data on FDI in agriculture.

Measuring domestic private flows is particularly challenging. It is possible to measure credit to agriculture, which represents credit provided by domestic financial institutions to agricultural producers. The metric is available in FAOSTAT, using data compiled from central bank websites. Another possible metric, which focuses on equity investment, is gross fixed capital formation (GFCF), which is the year-over-year change in gross capital stock. The metric is expected to be available on FAOSTAT as of March 2016.

With respect to trade in agricultural markets, the Ministerial Decision taken at the WTO’s Nairobi Conference in December 2015 reaffirms the commitment for developed Members to immediately eliminate their remaining scheduled export subsidy entitlements and for developing Members to do so by 2018. The Task Force can draw on SDG MoI indicator 2.b.2 (Agricultural Export Subsidies) and this can be supplemented by import and export tariffs on agricultural products. The Task Force may also draw on the Producer Support Estimate (PSE, SDG indicator 2.b.1), which captures various transfers from taxpayers and consumers to agriculture, including for instance the market price differential induced by import tariffs that is borne by consumers. The PSE is designed to show what share of support to agriculture can be considered to be highly production and trade distorting (as opposed to only minimally influencing markets through more decoupled measures of support), and is thus closely aligned to the target aspirations as defined in the Addis Agenda commitments under paragraph 83.

Lastly, the Addis commitment for ensuring properly functioning commodity markets and limiting excess price volatility is closely matched to MoI target 2.c., with indicator 2.c.1 on food price anomalies, which measures the number of “price anomalies” that occur on a given food commodity price series over a given period of time. This measure can be applied to any relevant series of food prices to reveal conditions of market instability. This can be supplemented by both actual and implied volatility of
food commodity prices. Excess volatility, which is included in the Addis Agenda, is a financial metric that assesses the difference between the actual volatility of the market price and the predicted volatility based on asset pricing models, which is calculated by financial market firms. Data on commodity markets, prices and other related factors are regularly monitored in a biannual UNCTAD publication on World commodity trends and prospects. The publication covers volatility in markets, which could proxy for a measure of whether prices appropriately reflect underlying demand and supply changes.

4. Closing the infrastructure gap

Investing in sustainable and resilient infrastructure, including transport, energy, water and sanitation for all, is a key priority of the Addis Agenda. Infrastructure is critical for economic development, reducing poverty and inequality, and ensuring environmental sustainability, and is a core element of SDG 9, with additional targets on sector specific infrastructure included in many other SDGs. While the SDGs focus primarily on infrastructure outcomes, the emphasis in the Addis Agenda is on overcoming obstacles and bottlenecks to investment, including both finance and capacity.

The Addis Agenda delineates impediments to investment in infrastructure on both the supply and demand side. It emphasizes that in many countries, insufficient investment is due in part to inadequate infrastructure plans and an insufficient number of well-prepared investable projects, which underscores the need for government policies along with capacity development. At the same time, financing is insufficient. Public funds are limited, while the existing incentive structures of many private investors are not necessarily aligned with the long-term investment horizon necessary for many infrastructure projects. The Agenda points out, though, that given the large financing gap in infrastructure, all financing sources—public, private, domestic and international—will be needed. Infrastructure is thus included across the chapters of the Addis Agenda. Specifically, the Addis Agenda includes the following subpoints:

4.1. Bridging the global infrastructure gap, including the US $1-1.5 trillion gap in developing countries

- Identify and address infrastructure and capacity gaps across countries and sectors, in particular in LDCs, LLDCs, SIDS and African countries (14)

Estimates of investment requirements for infrastructure vary widely, depending on assumptions about economic growth, policies and scope. Nonetheless, such estimates can shed light on the magnitude of investment needs, as well as where those needs are greatest. Estimates are made periodically by both public and private entities. The World Bank Group will publish global estimates on infrastructure needs, which will likely be updated every three to five years. Identifying the infrastructure gap by countries and sectors is particularly challenging, but sectoral data could be a basis for understanding trends.

To date, there is no universal database on infrastructure investment. Rather, different databases cover different aspects of infrastructure investment. The table below lists several sources of infrastructure data, including World Bank Group and OECD databases on global infrastructure investments, UNCTAD’s FDI database, commercial subscription-based databases on infrastructure projects and funding, some regularly updated third-party infrastructure reports, and several national official databases on domestic infrastructure investments. The table also shows the details of the sources, in terms of how they break down infrastructure investment (i.e., by country, by sector and public-private partnership (PPP) investments), the number of countries covered and the frequency of updates. The Global Infrastructure Hub of the G20 may also compile data on infrastructure deals. These can serve as a basis for tracking trends in different types of investment across countries and sectors.

---

4.2. As a key pillar to meet the sustainable development goals, establish a global infrastructure forum, led by the multilateral development banks, aiming to:

- Improve alignment and coordination among infrastructure initiatives (14)
- Encourage a greater range of voices to be heard, particularly from developing countries (14)
- Work to ensure investments are environmentally, socially and economically sustainable (14)

The inaugural Global Infrastructure Forum will be hosted by the multilateral development banks (MDBs) during the IMF and World Bank Spring meetings in April 2016. The Task Force will report annually on the outcome of the Global Infrastructure Forum, which will also be an input to the Forum on FfD Follow-up. The future modalities of the Global Infrastructure Forum are yet to be decided, including the frequency of meetings, timing, participation, and the role of different development banks. Depending on the timing, analysis in the Task Force Report could also be an input to the upcoming Global Infrastructure Forum.

Table 2
Infrastructure Investment Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Breakdown</th>
<th>Number of Countries Covered</th>
<th>Latest Update and Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank World Development Indicators Database</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI Project Database by the World Bank</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Statistics Database</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD FDI Database</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHS Global Insight Construction Database*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Finance International*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preqin Database*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealogic Platform Database*</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Economics*</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody’s Global Infrastructure Focus Newsletter*</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRESB*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
<td>Not Disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European PPP Expertise Center (EPEC) Market Updates Report</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Census Bureau</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK HM Treasury Database</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian PPP Project Database</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Infrastructure Knowledge Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure India Project Database</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starred (*) data sources do not allow free access.

Note 1: European Investment Bank (EIB) and other RDBs may have additional data but not released to the public.
Note 2: Only UK Treasury database explicitly presents pure private and public financing data.
Note 3: “Not Disclosed” because access is based on subscription, or unknown at time of publication.
Note 4: Breakdown information of the data sources requiring subscriptions is given in their marketing materials.
4.3. Domestic actions and international cooperation for infrastructure financing

- Governments commit to embed resilient and quality infrastructure investment plans in national sustainable development strategies, and to improve domestic enabling environments (47)

- Commit enhanced financial and technical support to facilitate development of sustainable, accessible and resilient quality infrastructure in developing countries (Mol 9.a), including to translate plans into concrete project pipelines, as well as for individual implementable projects, including for feasibility studies, negotiation of complex contracts, and project management (47)

Case studies can help to better understand developments in infrastructure plans. Country reporting within the context of reporting on national sustainable development strategies would be particularly useful here. Several tools that can be used to assess the domestic enabling environment are discussed in chapter II.B on private business and finance. Infrascope, developed by the Economist Intelligence Unit in conjunction with several MDBs, in particular, looks at the policy and regulatory framework for infrastructure, particularly PPPs, including experience in projects. The MDBs are also undertaking work to measure specific aspects of the enabling environment, for example through the Benchmarking PPP Procurement survey. The IMF’s Public Investment Management Assessment (PIMA) framework, which helps countries evaluate the strength of their public investment management practices in planning, allocation and implementation, could be used to assess countries’ institutions related to domestic public investment.

The Addis Agenda calls for support for countries in translating plans into concrete project pipelines, as well as in project preparation, which can perhaps be best monitored through case studies. There are several initiatives aimed at capacity development, including through the MDBs. For example, the MDB infrastructure working group is building harmonized approaches to project preparation, procurement, supervision, monitoring and reporting. In addition, this Task Force can serve as a vehicle for United Nations agencies to report jointly on their capacity development efforts.

In terms of financing and official support more broadly, the proposed SDG Mol 9.a on infrastructure (total official international support — official development assistance plus other official flows to infrastructure), can be used to measure the level of international public support. This can be based on data from the OECD. In addition, South-South cooperation is particularly important in the area of infrastructure. (See the discussion in II.C on South-South cooperation.) The Task Force can also follow up on infrastructure funds, such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Infrastructure Fund established by the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the Silk Road Fund, the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa, the Africa50 Fund, along with new funds from development banks and the private sector.

One of the biggest challenges in this section will be to measure the ‘quality’ of infrastructure. There is no clear-cut set of criteria for what constitutes ‘quality’ infrastructure investment. It could comprise the condition and attributes of the final infrastructure, the nature of the financing, the terms of the contract, and/or the impact on sustainable development, including issues of labour and the environment, as well as resilience. The World Economic Forum’s Executive Opinion Survey, which is conducted in collaboration with some 150 partner institutes, could be used as an estimate of the business sector’s perception of the quality of overall infrastructure in a country. However, it does not include issues associated with economic/financial, social or environmental sustainability. Bloomberg collects some data on ‘sustainable deals’ and there is good data on clean energy sources (See chapter II.B). Again, case studies can be useful here.

4.4. Development banks and infrastructure financing

- Calls on national and regional development banks to expand contributions in sustainable infrastructure (33)

- Emphasizes the role of MDBs in infrastructure investment, including sub-sovereign loans (75)
and encourages MDBs to address regional infrastructure gaps (87)

- Encourages MDBs to help channel resources of long-term investors towards sustainable development, including through long-term infrastructure and green bonds (75)

The Addis Agenda recognizes the enormous potential of development banks with regards to infrastructure investment and development. Indeed, the MDBs have recently put in place several mechanisms to facilitate support for infrastructure investments. The Global Infrastructure Facility (GIF) housed in the World Bank Group facilitates the preparation and structuring of infrastructure PPPs, and provides a platform for MDBs to collaborate. Other MDBs are developing their own project preparation facilities aimed at strengthening the infrastructure pipeline, including the Islamic Development Bank’s (IDBG) InfraFund, the African Development Bank’s (AfDB) New Partnership for Africa’s Development Infrastructure PPF, European Investment Bank-hosted initiatives such as the Arab Financing Facility Technical Assistance Fund (co-managed by the IDBG and the International Finance Corporation, IFC); the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development’s Infrastructure Project Preparation Facility (PPF); the ADB’s Asia Pacific PPF, as well as AfDB’s Africa50 Initiative, which will focus on both project preparation and project finance. The MDBs can report on progress in implementation of these facilities and other activities, such as the level of support provided to projects, broken down by region, the level of development and other categories, for example projects taken to the market and funds mobilized by them.

To date, however, there is no consistent data on MDB investment in infrastructure across development banks. The new Global Infrastructure Forum can provide a platform for MDBs to work together to develop (i) a common approach to measuring MDB financial support to infrastructure so that this can be aggregated across the MDBs; and (ii) a task force to establish a joint framework and methodology to measure catalyzing capacity as intermediaries. This data could also aim to delineate specific investments, such as on sub-sovereign lending, in line with commitments in the Addis Agenda. The MDBs will report on these issues once they have been agreed upon.

Tracking infrastructure and green bond issuance is complicated by the fact there is currently no agreement on the definition of what constitutes a green bond. Nonetheless, there is a general understanding that green bonds usually refer to projects to fund climate change adaptation or mitigation. Currently, green bonds are primarily issued by MDBs, though they are also issued by governments, municipalities and the private sector.

The Addis Agenda also encourages development banks to go further to channel the resources of long-term investors to infrastructure and green bonds for investment in sustainable and resilient infrastructure more broadly. There are several potential mechanisms for this, including: (i) direct issuance; (ii) enhancing the credit quality of green bonds issued by governments, national development banks, agencies and the private sector; and (iii) supporting green securitization and market development, such as standardization of loan contracts for green assets and warehousing.

 MDB annual green bonds issuance can be tracked using 2015 as a base line year. The Task Force can also monitor overall growth of the green bond market. Data on climate bonds are available at www.climatebonds.net. Bloomberg also collects data on green bond issuance more broadly.

The MDBs can also report on efforts to enhance the credit quality of green bonds by other issuers, and to support green securitization. Specifically, the MDBs could share the amount and value of green bonds to which they have provided credit enhancement, as well as a list of green securitization and market development projects they have supported.

4.5. Private investment in infrastructure

Bank lending to infrastructure has fallen since the financial crisis. At the same time, institutional investors currently invest less than 1 per cent of their portfolios directly in infrastructure and less than 3 per cent in broader investments, such as in companies that invest in infrastructure, in both developed and developing countries. In addition to strengthening the enabling environment and pipeline of feasible projects (see 4.3 above), the Addis Agenda encourages actions to overcome impediments to long-term
investment in infrastructure on the part of investors. Specifically, Addis:

- Encourages long-term institutional investors, such as pension funds and sovereign wealth funds, which manage large pools of capital, to allocate a greater percentage to infrastructure, particularly in developing countries (47).

The World Bank’s Private Participation in Infrastructure (PPI) Database can be used to track private investment in infrastructure. The database provides information on the overall deal flow of private infrastructure projects in emerging markets. In addition, the GIF, as part of its results framework, will monitor the share of long term financing from institutional investors over the medium term. This will look at infrastructure projects post financial closing and draw on commercial data sources as well as the PPI Database. Several private sector databases also provide data on institutional investor asset allocation, including the percentage of funds invested in infrastructure, as well as bank lending to infrastructure (see table 2). Chapter II.B on private business and finance also addresses some of the impediments to private sector investment in infrastructure. In particular, chapter II.B calls for investors to take measures to incentivize long-term investment, as well as for standards-setting bodies to identify adjustments to encourage longer-term investment.

4.6. Public and private blended finance for infrastructure financing

The Addis Agenda notes that both public and private investment have key roles to play in infrastructure financing, including through PPPs and blended finance that share risks and rewards fairly. Efforts to monitor blended finance are complicated by the fact that there is no agreed definition. The Addis Agenda defines blended finance as combining concessional public finance with non-concessional private finance and expertise from the public and private sector, special-purpose vehicles, non-recourse project financing, risk mitigation instruments and pooled funding structures, which is consistent with that provided by the United Nations Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing (ICESDF). Specifically, Addis:

- Calls for projects involving blended finance, including PPPs, to share risks and rewards fairly, include clear accountability mechanisms and meet social and environmental standards (48).
- Calls for careful consideration on the structure and use of blended finance instruments (48).
- Commits to capacity development for PPPs and to build a knowledge base and share lessons learned through regional and global forums (48).
- Commits to hold inclusive, open and transparent discussion when developing and adopting guidelines and documentation for the use of PPPs (48).

These commitments are partly covered by SDG target 17.17: Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships. The corresponding indicator focuses on the Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private and civil society partnerships. While it is unclear how this will be measured, the World Bank’s databases (including the PPI project database and World Development Indicators database) are useful sources of information on investment in PPPs. Existing data can also be used as a starting point to assess the impact of PPPs beyond US dollars committed. As one example, the PPI project database would allow assessing the share of PPP projects cancelled or under distress.

These quantitative measures would need to be complemented by qualitative analysis. The information required to track the record of blended finance initiatives in sharing risks and rewards efficiently, incorporating accountability mechanisms and meeting social and environmental standards would be qualitative in nature and likely to vary widely across projects. Obtaining this would involve accessing a wide range of case studies and reviews by National Audit Offices, by bilateral and multilateral donors and by civil society organizations.

2 Social and environmental standards would include the IFC’s Performance Standards to take into account associated environmental, social and governance risks.
The PPP Fiscal Risk Assessment Model (P-FRAM), which was developed by the IMF and the World Bank to assess fiscal costs and risks from PPP projects, can provide additional information. The P-FRAM is designed to help efforts to increase capacity development for PPPs, as well as the application of international standards in accounting for PPPs, and to ensure transparent reporting. In addition, the tool will allow monitoring of risk allocation (different types of risks) between the public and private parties for each PPP contract.

In addition, the Infrascope index provides quantitative and qualitative indicators pertaining to the governance, institutional framework and capacity to undertake PPPs for countries across four regions. The indicators are divided into six categories: the legal and regulatory framework supporting PPPs (e.g., consistency and quality of PPP regulations, effective PPP selection and decision-making); the institutional framework (e.g., quality of institutional design, PPP contract, hold-up and expropriation risk); operational capacity (e.g., public capacity to plan and oversee PPPs, methods and criteria for awarding projects, regulator’s risk-allocation award); supporting investment climate; and financial facilities. The main sources used in the index are drawn from the Economist Intelligence Unit, the World Bank Group, Transparency International and the World Economic Forum. The Task Force can use the pertinent elements of this index to enhance tracking of PPPs in the relevant regions.

Over the past decade, efforts towards the development of more general sets of guidelines for PPP contracts have been made at different fora and at different levels. At the national level, some countries with well-developed programmes such as the United Kingdom, South Africa, Australia and Chile, have made efforts to introduce more transparent accounting and reporting practices for PPPs. International and regional organizations, such as the OECD, the European Commission, the IMF, the World Bank Group and Regional Commissions of the United Nations, have issued guidelines and recommendations on the introduction of more transparent accounting and reporting practices for PPPs.

These initiatives, along with efforts to further capacity development for PPPs and to build a knowledge base and share lessons through regional and global forums, can be monitored by the Task Force and reported at the annual ECOSOC Forum on Financing for Development as well as at associated regional and international meetings.

5. Promoting inclusive and sustainable industrialization

The Addis Agenda commits to promoting inclusive and sustainable industrialization for developing countries as a critical source of growth, economic diversification and value addition. These commitments are related to SDG 9. While the indicators for the SDG focus on monitoring by outcome, that is, by assessing progress in industrialization and diversification, the Task Force will also look to assess inputs, such as investment flows and policies to promote industrial development. Specifically, the Addis Agenda:

- Commits to invest in promoting inclusive and sustainable industrial development to effectively address major challenges such as growth and jobs, resources and energy efficiency, pollution and climate change, knowledge-sharing, innovation and social inclusion (15, SDG 9.2, 9.4)
- Commits to craft policies that incentivize the creation of new technologies, research and innovation in developing countries, recognizing the importance of ... industrial diversification and value added to commodities (116, MoI 9.b)
- Calls on national and regional development banks to expand contributions in industrialization (33)

The Task Force will draw on the indicators for SDG 9 on building resilient infrastructure, promoting inclusive and sustainable industrialization and fostering innovation to monitor outcomes. These are manufacturing value added as a percentage of GDP and per capita (9.2.1), manufacturing employment as a proportion of total employment (9.2.2), CO2 emission per unit of value added (9.4.1) and the proportion of...
medium and high-tech industry value added in total value added (9.b.1). In addition, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) maintains an international industrial statistical database, which contains detailed statistics on mining and quarrying, manufacturing and utility sectors within the scope of industrial statistics as defined by International Recommendations for Industrial Statistics. The database is regularly updated with the recent annual industrial survey data received from the OECD for OECD countries and directly from national statistical offices for non-OECD countries.

To follow up on the commitment to invest in industrial development, the Task Force could monitor public and private investments in infrastructure, both domestic and international (see section 4 in this chapter on infrastructure), as well as FDI in manufacturing sectors, based, for example, on the UNCTAD FDI database which contains data at the country and industry level. UNCTAD also reports on investment in green/low-carbon sectors, which could be made more regular as part of the monitoring process. This report’s sections on infrastructure and on development banks will provide a useful complement and further information in this regard. ODA toward economic infrastructure and services, which covers assistance for networks, utilities and services that facilitate economic activity, and which is collected by OECD DAC, provides data on concessional international finance supporting industrial development. This could be supplemented by information on South-South cooperation (see II.C).

In terms of advancing linkages between infrastructure development, inclusive and sustainable industrialization and innovation, UNIDO can provide qualitative monitoring through its background analysis on policy frameworks for science, technology and innovation and national development strategies, which exists for many countries. UNIDO collects qualitative information as part of its projects to establish knowledge-sharing platforms. UNIDO could also provide data on the number of regional and international knowledge-sharing platforms and processes in which countries participate. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is also building a global database on science, technology and innovation policy instruments, legislation and institutional frameworks, in the framework of its GO->SPIN Programme, which, along with the UNESCO Science Report, can also provide qualitative monitoring in this area (see also chapter II.G).

6. Generating full and productive employment for all

In the Addis Agenda, governments commit to generate full and productive employment and decent work for all and promote micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) to enable all people to benefit from growth. Specifically, the Addis Agenda:

- **Commits to include full and productive employment and decent work for all (SDG 8) as a central objective in national development strategies (16)**
- **Calls for full and equal participation of women and men, including persons with disabilities, in the formal labour market (16, SDG 8.5)**
- **Will work … to integrate the informal sector into the formal economy in line with country circumstances (22, SDG 8.3)**
- **Commits to developing and operationalizing, by 2020, a global strategy for youth employment and to implement the ILO Global Jobs Pact by 2020 (16, SDG 8.6 and 8.b)**
- **Commits to promote national youth strategies as a key instrument for meeting the needs and aspirations of young people (16)**
- **Commits to promoting appropriate, affordable and stable access to credit to MSMEs (SDG 8.3), as well as adequate skills development training for all (16)**

These commitments are in large part covered in targets under SDG 8 to promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all. The SDG indicators can be used to inform monitoring by the Task Force. These include indicators 8. 3. 1 (proportion of informal employment in non-agriculture employment, by sex), 8. 5. 2 (unemployment rate, by sex, age group and persons with disabilities), and 8.5.1 (average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age and persons with disabilities). Unemployment rates are defined according to the recently adopted international statistical standard by
the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians, which was developed to address the universal nature of the new development agenda, and which is meant to be more meaningful for both developing and developed countries. The targets on youth employment can be monitored by including age group in some of the above indicators, as well as by indicator 8.6.1 (proportion of youth not in education, employment or training), the so-called NEET (see also section 10 on Investing in Children and Youth).

The ILO will follow up on its programme, the Global Jobs Pact. The official indicator for this is 8.b.1, total government spending in social protection and employment programmes as a proportion of the national budgets and GDP. Many of these employment programmes are a means of operationalizing the ILO Global Jobs Pact. The rights at work dimension of decent work, one of the pillars of the Global Job Pact, will be captured by indicators referring to occupational injuries (8.8.1) and an indicator dealing with the compliance of various labour rights derived from ILO labour conventions (8.8.2). Other dimensions also to be monitored can include the elimination of the worst forms of child labour and forced labour, including through indicator 8.7.1 (proportion and number of children aged 5–17 years engaged in child labour, by sex and age). The Addis Agenda commitment on the global strategy on youth employment and monitoring thereof can build on efforts by the ILO in the context of its 2012 call for action on youth employment and the United Nations Chief Executives Board Global Initiative on Decent Jobs for Youth.

The Addis Agenda and the SDGs recognize the important role that MSMEs play in generating employment. Access to finance, particularly credit, for MSMEs, will be monitored in the context of chapter II. B. With regard to multinational enterprises (MNEs), the ILO is developing a methodology that will allow national statistical offices to better measure the impact of FDI and MNEs on decent work.

The multidimensional nature of full and productive employment and decent work underscores the need to combine the SDG indicators with a wider range of additional data, as well as linkages with the other chapters of this report. Global monitoring could be combined with regional and national reporting, which could delve deeper into national circumstances and priorities. Domestic sources of data include household and establishment surveys, administrative registries and other non-official sources. International compilations such as the ILO’s central statistics database, ILOSTAT, and others will have to increasingly provide internationally comparable data based on agreed statistical standards. However, there are important gaps in data availability, especially in developing countries, as well as for informal and rural sectors. As discussed in Section III of this Report on “Data, monitoring, and follow-up”, the need for strengthening of national statistical systems in their coordination and for producing regular quality basic data is seen as a priority when defining how to monitor and set benchmarks to measure progress.

7. Protecting ecosystems

The Addis Agenda contains a range of commitments to protect ecosystems, many of which are also included in the SDGs and their MoI targets. Monitoring of these commitments will therefore often draw on indicators monitored in that context. However, the Addis Agenda also includes a strong emphasis on changing business behaviour, including policies aimed at changing incentives (see chapter II.B.) Indeed, the commitments to protect ecosystems are spread throughout the seven action areas of the Addis Agenda. Nonetheless, because of their wide range and very diverse implications for monitoring, these are also included as a cross-cutting issue in chapter I of the Addis Agenda. In particular, Addis:

- Commits to coherent policy, financing, trade and technology frameworks to protect, manage and restore our ecosystems, including marine and terrestrial ecosystems, and to promote their sustainable use, build resilience, reduce pollution and combat climate change, desertification and land degradation (17)

This commitment supports the implementation of a range of SDG targets under goals 2, 12, 13, 14 and 15. The Task Force can draw on the respective SDG indicators for monitoring purposes, including for example indicators for targets 14.2, 14.4 and 14.6 on fisheries and indicator 15.1.1 (forest area as a pro-
**Cross-cutting issues**

portion of total land area) on forestry. The Task Force can also monitor the coverage of protected areas broken down by ecosystem type, as well as forests, wetlands and drylands as percentages of total land area. The latter data builds on the SDG indicator, and FAO, Ramsar, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), as well as UNESCO’s Man and the Biosphere Programme and its World Heritage Centre, which already maintain relevant databases in this respect.

- **Welcomes implementation of the global Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets; commits to mobilize resources, support country efforts to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and ecosystems (63, MoI 15.a)**

The CBD, at its 12th Conference of Parties in 2014, reaffirmed its commitment to an overall substantial increase in total biodiversity-related funding, from a variety of sources. It adopted a number of targets for resource mobilization, including: the doubling of total biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries; for 100 per cent, but at least 75 per cent, of Parties to have included biodiversity in their national priorities or development plans by 2015, and to have therefore made appropriate domestic financial provisions; to mobilize domestic financial resources from all sources to reduce the gap between identified needs and available resources at the domestic level; and others. Resources for biodiversity provided to the Global Environment Facility, as the financial mechanism for the CBD, also serves as another measure of available resources. These targets will be reviewed at the CBD meeting in Cancun, Mexico in December 2016, and findings can inform monitoring by the Task Force.

The indicator for SDG MoI target 15.b (ODA and public expenditure on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems) can provide additional data, sourced from the OECD on international public finance. The United Nations Development Programme could assist through its biodiversity finance initiative (BIOFIN) and CBD through its financial reporting framework by providing information on domestic resource mobilization.

- **Commits to combat desertification (63, SDG 15.3)**

The Task Force can monitor this commitment through the indicator for SDG target 15.3 (proportion of land that is degraded over total land area). In addition, the Task Force can draw on monitoring efforts in the context of the UNCCD ten-year strategy adopted in 2008, which includes objectives relevant to financing. In particular, strategic objective 4 is to mobilize resources to support the implementation of the Convention to Combat Desertification through the building of effective partnerships between national and international actors, and operational objective 5 is to mobilize and improve the targeting and coordination of national, bilateral and multilateral financial and technological resources in order to increase their impact and effectiveness. The UNCCD Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention has been monitoring implementation of the ten-year strategy, including operational objective 5. The Global Mechanism of the UNCCD, which focuses on financing sustainable land management, could also provide data to this end.

- **Encourages the mobilization of financial resources from all sources at all levels to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and ecosystems, including promoting sustainable forest management (63, MoI 15.b)**

Mobilization of resources to conserve and sustainably use ecosystems is discussed above. The commitment to financing of sustainable forest management is also contained in the fourth Global Objective on Forests of the United Nations Forest Instrument, which aims to reverse the decline in ODA for sustainable forest management and mobilize significantly increased new and additional financial resources from all sources for the implementation of sustainable forest management.

For monitoring purposes, SDG indicator 15.b.1 addresses forest finance (official development assistance and public expenditure on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems), with data sourced from the OECD. The Task Force will also be able to access and analyse data on domestic resource mobilization for forests, provided by
the World Bank Group and FAO through the Government Expenditure on Agriculture initiative and the Forest Resources Assessment. In order to track relative trends, the percentage increase in forest-relevant finance tracked through ODA and climate finance channels could also be useful. The Voluntary REDD+ Database and Climate Funds Update both monitor REDD+ financing, however it has to be noted that REDD+ financing is not necessarily in addition to forestry ODA. The World Bank Group could also provide data on domestic resource mobilization for sustainable forest management through its analytical, advisory and lending instruments.

- Stresses importance of the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans and the seas, recognizes that international law, as reflected in UNCLOS, provides the legal framework for the conservation and the sustainable use of the oceans and their resources (64, MoI 14.c) and commits to protect/restore oceans and ecosystems, and maintain their biodiversity (64, SDG 14)

This commitment mirrors SDG MoI target 14.c, with the indicator number of countries making progress in ratifying, accepting and implementing through legal, policy and institutional frameworks, ocean-related instruments that implement international law, as reflected in UNCLOS, for the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans and their resources. The Task Force will rely on the contribution of United Nations agencies working on ocean-related matters, including UNESCO’s Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and FAO, to support the compilation of national data reporting in this regard.

- Commits to support the most vulnerable in addressing and adapting to climate change (65, SDG 1.5, 13.1, MoI 13.b)

This commitment will be monitored in Section II.C, 8.1 on climate finance.

- Commits to provide access for small-scale artisanal fishers to marine resources and markets, consistent with sustainable management practices as well as initiatives that add value to outputs from small-scale fishers (108, MoI 14.b)

The monitoring of this commitment can draw on SDG MoI indicator 14. b. 1 (progress by countries in the degree of application of a legal/regulatory/policy/institutional framework which recognizes and protects access rights for small-scale fisheries). FAO can monitor the legal, regulatory, policy and institutional aspects of this commitment through its Code of Conduct for Sustainable Fisheries biennial survey (including in particular its questions on small-scale fisheries issues) and its legislative and policy database, FAOLEX. In addition, the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication is expected to be endorsed by the FAO Committee on Fisheries in 2014. This will provide further elements for monitoring over the coming years.

- Will increase scientific knowledge, develop research capacity and transfer marine technology, taking into account the Criteria and Guidelines on the Transfer of Marine Technology adopted by the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, in order to improve ocean health and to enhance the contribution of marine biodiversity to the development of developing countries, in particular small island developing States and least developed countries (121, MoI 14.a)

The UNESCO IOC is mandated to promote scientific research, capacity development and facilitate the transfer of marine technology. IOC’s capacity development strategy, adopted in 2015, will provide a framework for guiding the development of research capacities and transfer of marine technology in regions.

Monitoring by the Task Force will draw on the IOC’s Global Ocean Science Report, to be published in 2017. The Report will assess national and regional investment in marine research, and will depict the status of ocean research, investment in research infrastructure and human capacity in countries. Data will be derived from national surveys, as well as existing IOC programmes on ocean observation and ocean data exchange, the UNESCO World Science Report, the Institute for Statistics and the OECD. In addition, the indicator for SDG MoI target 14.a. (budget allocation to research in the field of
marine technology as a percentage of total budget for research) will provide relevant data.

Finally, Addis also

- Commits to promote corporate sustainability (17, SDG 12.6)

Monitoring of corporate sustainability is discussed in detail in chapter II.B.

8. Promoting peaceful and inclusive societies

The Addis Agenda commits to promote peaceful and inclusive societies and to build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels to enable the effective, efficient and transparent mobilization and use of resources. These Addis commitments are broadly consistent with SDG 16, and are also covered by other goals, such as SDG 5 on gender equality, or integrated across the Agenda, as in the case of human rights.

Specifically, the Addis Agenda:

- Reaffirms the importance of peaceful and inclusive societies (5, 18, 67, SDG 16)
- Stresses the need to build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (5, 18, 20, 30, 112, SDG 16.6, MoI 16.a)
- Recognizes that good governance, rule of law (SDG 16.3), human rights, fundamental freedoms, equal access to fair justice systems are integral to efforts (5, 18, 20, 36, 37, 112)
- Recognizes measures to combat corruption and curb illicit financial flows as integral (5, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 112, SDG 16.4, 16.5) See chapter II.A on Domestic public resources
- Commits to promoting and enforcing non-discriminatory laws (21, MoI 16.b)

8.1. Peaceful and inclusive societies

Monitoring the commitment on peaceful, secure and inclusive societies can draw on a number of existing data sources and surveys, such as the United Nations Crime Trends Survey, (collected by the UN Office on Drugs and Crimes, UNODC), household surveys such as Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys and Demographic and Health Surveys, International CrimeVictimization Surveys, as well as administrative data, such as judicial records and public health/civil registration (World Health Organization). According to a recent review conducted by UNODC’s and the National Statistics and Geography Institute of Mexico’s (INEGI) Centre of Excellence on crime statistics, 72 countries have implemented at least one national victimization survey after 2009. In addition, nine African countries have already implemented or are in the process of implementing a victimization survey module as part of the Strategy for Harmonisation of Statistics for Africa. A focus by the Task Force on conflict and violence is of particular significance: countries that experienced major violence during the period 1981–2005 had poverty rates that were on average 21 percentage points higher than in countries without violence.

These sources also inform a number of SDG indicators, which the Task Force will be able to draw on, including 16.1.1. number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age; 16.1.2. conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause; 16.1.3. proportion of population subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months; and 16.2.1 proportion of children aged 1–17 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month.

The chapter on systemic issues, and its subsection on combating transnational crime, presents additional data sources and options for monitoring, in particular with regard to organized crime, terrorism, and transnational crime.

8.2. Effective, accountable, transparent and inclusive institutions

The commitment to build effective, accountable, transparent and inclusive institutions can be monitored by analysing existing data on institutional performance, accountability and inclusiveness, and of the public perception thereof. The Task Force can draw on surveys of public financial management systems and performance, data collected on national human rights institutions, national refugee commissions and women’s representation in the public sector, parliaments and other relevant institutions. Attention can also be paid to the activities of parliament in scrutiny and oversight of the SDGs, including measures such as numbers of hearings, and fol-
low up on committee recommendations. The World Bank Group’s “Worldwide Governance Indicators” dataset, which measures the perceived quality of institutions and traditions that governments use, can also provide input, particularly on government effectiveness and regulatory quality. Perception surveys of institutional performance such as the World Value Survey, Gallup, or Afrobarometer will further complement this exercise.

Specific dimensions of institutional performance are covered by other sections of the Task Force Report and by indicators for the SDGs. The cross-cutting section on gender will provide inputs for assessing the inclusiveness of institutions. The chapter on domestic public resources includes combating corruption, in particular in the context of illicit financial flows and the return of stolen assets, and contains a subsection on national control and oversight mechanisms, transparency and non-discrimination in budgeting and expenditure decisions.

The indicator 16.6.1 (primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget codes or similar)) can be based on Indicator PI-2 of the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) dataset: composition of expenditure outturn compared to original approved budget. PEFA was started in 2001 to develop a country-led agenda on public financial management reform. Indicator 16.a.1 (existence of independent National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs) in compliance with the Paris Principles) measures the proportion of countries that have internationally recognized independent NHRIs. Compliance with the Paris Principles vest NHRIs with a broad mandate, competence and power to investigate, report on the national human rights situation, and publicise human rights through information and education. The main sources of data are administrative records of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation reports of the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights compiles the data into a global directory.

SDG indicators 16.6.2 and 16.7.2 assess proportions of populations satisfied with public services and who believe that decision-making is inclusive. Data in this area comes from perception and household surveys. Perception surveys are conducted in an increasing number of countries, and often include a number of measures of quality. They include the World Value Survey, Gallup, Afrobarometer and the other Barometers, and surveys conducted by various non-state organizations at the national level. In Africa, the approach has already been applied and reported by several state organizations using the Harmonised Module on Democratic Governance of SHaSA, the Strategy for the Harmonisation of Statistics in Africa.

8.3. Good governance

Addis recognizes good governance, rule of law, human rights, equal access to fair justice systems as central to the mobilization and effective use of resources. They comprise the enabling environment necessary for sustainable development. The chapter on domestic and international private business and finance contains a section on the investment climate, which lays out in detail options for monitoring commitments to stable investment climates, contract enforcement and respect for property rights, and transparent and stable rules, among others.

Human rights accountability mechanisms, including the Human Rights Council’s Universal Periodic Review, the periodic reviews and complaint mechanisms of the human rights treaty bodies, the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, regional human rights mechanisms, and national human rights institutions play a role in ensuring that State commitments on economic, social and cultural as well as civil and political rights are met. They can contribute to the monitoring and review of the implementation of the Addis Agenda in a number of areas, including cross-cutting commitments to end hunger and malnutrition, generate full and productive employment for all, promote peaceful and inclusive societies, and focus on children, youth, gender equality and the empowerment of women, among other objectives.

In addition, the Task Force will want to monitor broader measures of civil and administrative justice, including public access to information and protection of fundamental freedoms, and the promotion and enforcement of non-discriminatory laws. A number of SDG indicators will also provide relevant data in this regard. They include indicators for means of
implementation target 16.b (proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a grounds of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law), target 16.10 to ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, and indicator 16.3.1 (proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms). UNODC also collects data on crime reporting rates through the long-standing annual data collection mandated by the United Nations General Assembly. UNESCO has developed a comprehensive set of Media Development Indicators aimed at enabling the assessment of media landscapes at the national level. These indicators cover all aspects of media development and can inform monitoring by the Task Force.

International human rights law outlaws discrimination against population groups on the basis of specific characteristics or ‘grounds’. One option to assess the promotion and enforcement of non-discriminatory law is to measure how well non-discriminatory laws and policies are applied in practice, from the perspective of the population. Relevant data is collected through surveys in an increasing number of countries. At the regional level, the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency has collected the data for 27 European Union Member States. Relevant data is also collected in Eurobarometer and Afrobarometer surveys. These data sources will also inform monitoring of SDG MoI indicator 16.b.

8.4. Combating corruption

The commitment to combat corruption and curb illicit financial flows will be followed up in the chapter on domestic public resources, and its section on illicit financial flows and return of stolen assets. In addition, SDG indicator 16.5.1 (proportion of persons (alternative: businesses 16.5.2) who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by these public officials, during the previous 12 months) will provide data, which will be based on household corruption surveys and victimization surveys. UNODC also collects prevalence data on bribery from surveys (since 2009) through the annual data collection in the United Nations Crime Trends Surveys.

9. Gender equality

In the Addis Agenda, Member States have committed to promoting and ensuring gender equality. Addis’ strong focus on gender is anchored in its first paragraph, which commits to ensure gender equality and women’s and girls’ empowerment, and is reflected in gender-specific commitments and actions throughout the seven Action Areas of the Addis Agenda. In particular, Addis:

- **Commits to ensuring gender equality and women’s and girls’ empowerment (1, SDG MoI 1.b, 5.c)**
- **Commits to adopt and strengthen policies, enforceable legislation and transformative actions for the promotion of gender equality and women’s and girls’ empowerment at all levels, to ensure women’s equal rights, access and opportunities for participation and leadership in the economy and to eliminate gender-based violence and discrimination in all its forms (6, SDG 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 SDG MoI 1.b, 5.c)**
- **Commits to promoting and enforcing non-discriminatory laws, social infrastructure and policies for sustainable development as well as enabling women’s full and equal participation in the economy and equal access to decision-making processes and leadership (21, SDG 5.1, 5.5, SDG MoI 1.b)**
- **Commits to increase transparency and equal participation in the budgeting process, and promote gender responsive budgeting and tracking (30, SDG MoI 5.c)**
- **Commits to women’s and girls’ equal rights and opportunities in political and economic decision-making and resource allocation and to removing barriers for women’s full participation in the economy (41, SDG 5.5)**
- **Commits to improve access and opportunities for economic advancement for women; Resolves to undertake legislation and administrative reforms to give women equal rights with men to economic resources, including access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, credit, inheritance, natural resources and appropriate new technology (41, SDG 5.1, SDG MoI 5.a)**
- Supports Women’s Empowerment Principles by UN Women and the Global Compact; Encourages the private sector to ensure women’s full and productive employment and decent work, equal pay for equal work or work of equal value, and equal opportunities, and to protect them from discrimination and abuse in the workplace; Encourages increased investments in female-owned companies (41, SDG 5.1, 8.8)
- Urges countries to track and report resource allocations of international public finance for gender equality and women’s empowerment (53, SDG MoI 5.c)
- Commits to address challenges to women’s equal and active participation in domestic, regional and international trade (90)
- Commits to scaling up investments in science, technology, engineering and mathematics education, and enhance technical, vocational and tertiary education and training, ensuring equal access for women and girls and encouraging their participation therein, (including through international cooperation) (119, SDG 4.5, 17.6)

In addition to the commitments and action items listed, a significant number of additional commitments across the Action Areas of the Addis Agenda contain gender-specific provisions. They include commitments on smallholder and women farmers (13), women’s participation in the labour market (16), addressing gender equality in principles for responsible business and investing (37), access to financial services (39, 40, 43), social and environmental safeguard systems for development banks (75), upgrading education facilities (78), gender-balanced and merit-based selection of the heads of international financial institutions and diversity of their staff (106), human rights and fundamental freedoms of migrants (111), strengthen institutions to prevent violence, end human trafficking and exploitation of persons (112), access to technology and science (114), capacity building for social and gender-responsive budgeting (115), and increased use of disaggregated data (126).

Monitoring of these commitments and action items will be covered, in part, by the outcome and MoI indicators under SDG 5 to achieve gender equality and empowerment of women and girls, and additional targets under SDGs 1, 4, 8, 10, 12, 16 and 17. However, it is important to recognize the limitations of the SDG indicator framework in capturing the full complexity of the gender equality commitments in the Addis Agenda. To adequately measure progress, several of these will require multiple sources of data which currently fall outside the scope of the proposed gender equality indicators. There are a number of existing data resources that could support and complement monitoring of these commitments. They include:

The World Bank Group’s Women, Business and the Law (WBL) project, which has a dataset on laws and regulations that constrain women’s economic choices and restrict their ability to engage in entrepreneurial and employment activities. A recent edition reveals the magnitude of the challenge: of the 173 countries covered, 155 have at least one law that differentiates between women and men. The WBL may be useful for monitoring Addis commitments on discriminatory laws in particular. Data on the proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments is included in the World Development Indicators, and data on the percentage of firms with a female top manager is included in the World Bank Group’s Enterprise Surveys. These can be used to monitor women’s equal access to decision making processes and leadership. Additionally, the WBL dataset also includes a question measuring industry and job specific restrictions on women which can be used to measure women’s equal participation in the economy.

The World Bank Group’s Global Financial Inclusion Index (Global Findex) regularly reports sex-disaggregated data on access to financial services (see chapter II. B). One relevant indicator in Findex is the percentage of women with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile money service provider. The latest report reveals that there are big opportunities to expand financial inclusion, particularly among women and the poor. The gender gap is not significantly narrowing: some 58 per cent of women have an account, compared to 65 per cent of men. It would be useful to consider using the Global Findex as a tracking indicator for the commitments on women’s financial inclusion.

The OECD’s Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) is a cross-country measure of discrimi-
nation against women in social institutions (formal and informal laws, social norms and practices) across 160 countries. SIGI measures the level of discrimination at the national level based on variables, combining qualitative and quantitative data, which quantify discriminatory social institutions such as unequal inheritance rights, early marriage, violence against women, and unequal land and property rights. Since the SIGI measures discriminatory laws and policies, it can be used alongside the two data sources discussed above for Addis commitments related to legislative and structural discrimination.

UN Women captures data on Gender Responsive Budgeting annually. Since 2001, UN Women and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) have supported countries in integrating gender perspectives into national development strategies and sectorial plans and budgets as well as increasing women’s participation in budget processes. This data is used for SDG Mol indicators 5.c.1 (proportion of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment). The IMF is currently compiling data on significant gender budgeting—analysing practices and impacts in all regions. Once completed (by end-2016), the dataset will provide detailed information for approximately 50 countries on the origin and legal basis of the gender budgeting effort, the roles of government and civil society, and the extent to which gender budgeting is incorporated into the fiscal process. In addition, the IMF summarizes, in narrative form, more than 75 gender budgeting initiatives, and the work includes extensive as well as nascent gender budgeting efforts. These data sources will complement UN Women’s data collection and allow for monitoring the Addis commitments on gender responsive budgeting.

ILOSTAT may be useful for monitoring Addis commitments related to women’s labour market participation. United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and Women’s Empowerment Principles (WEPs) set expectations for business to promote gender equality and empowerment of women in the workplace, market and community. Framed around seven principles, the WEPs encourage the private sector to promote human rights as well as women’s economic empowerment in all its operations. The number of companies signing up to these Principles measures the commitment of the private sector to promote women’s economic empowerment (see also the ILOSTAT information mentioned above).

The OECD DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker tracks bilateral ODA in support of gender equality. As part of the annual reporting of their aid activities to the DAC, DAC members are required to indicate whether each aid activity targets gender equality as a policy objective according to a three-point scoring system. The data generated by the marker provides a global estimate of DAC members’ aid in support of gender equality annually and a breakdown by each DAC member. In addition, the OECD DAC has two Creditor Reporting System purpose codes that contribute to tracking ODA in support of gender equality: on aid to women’s equality organizations and institutions and aid to eliminate violence against women and girls. The OECD DAC Gender Marker combined with the purpose codes may be the most apt source for monitoring the commitment on international public finance allocations for gender equality and women’s empowerment.

UNESCO’s Institute of Statistics contains all available data and indicators for education, literacy, science, technology and innovation, culture, communication and information (see also chapter II.G). It provides data on science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), including human resources in science, technology and innovation. This data may be useful for monitoring gender-related aspects of Addis commitments on education, training, technology and science.

In addition to the above data sources, the Minimum Set of Gender Indicators, endorsed by the United Nations Statistical Commission, serves as a guide for the national and international compilation of gender statistics. The level of their integration into national monitoring systems will be a measurement of the increase and use of high-quality, timely and reliable data as stated in the Addis commitment on disaggregated data by sex. The Evidence and Data for Gender Equality (EDGE) initiative (a partnership between UN Women, the United Nations Statistics Division, the World Bank Group, and the OECD) has already contributed to the strengthening of gender statistics.
10. **Investing in children and youth**

The Addis Agenda commits to investing in children and youth. Specifically, the Agenda:

- **Recognizes that investing in children and youth is critical to achieving inclusive, equitable and sustainable development for present and future generations** (7)
- **Recognizes the need to support countries that face particular challenges to make the requisite investments in children and youth** (7)
- **Reaffirms the vital importance of promoting and protecting the rights of all children, and ensuring that no child is left behind** (7)
- **Commits to promote national youth strategies as a key instrument for meeting the needs and aspirations of young people** (16)

In addition, children and youth are mentioned throughout the document, including in the new social compact (12), with regard to youth employment (16), access to technology and science for youth and children (114), in global partnerships (77) and education (78), with regard to the human rights of girls (78) and migrants (112), and as part of responsible business (37).

Data and other methods for monitoring in these areas are discussed throughout the report, including for example in the sections on international development cooperation for education and the social compact. Often, indicators can be adapted through further disaggregation of domestic spending and interventions to include child- and youth-focused purposes and categories. For example, in the area of social protection, indicator 1.3.1 is meant to distinguish children in the breakdown of the population covered by social protection systems. Another example is in the area of education, where indicators are meant to distinguish the participation rate of youth in formal and non-formal education and training.

In some countries it is also possible to monitor spending that has direct and indirect impacts on children, including on child-focused multi-sectoral SDG priorities that are not well captured by traditional sectorial budgets, such as nutrition, early childhood development and child protection. Examples of potential public expenditure measurement instruments in this context include child-spending markers and taxonomies developed by countries such as Argentina, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Honduras, India, Mexico, Peru, Uganda and Yemen, and established reporting practices on child-focused allocations by signatories of the Convention of the Rights of the Child. While to date no such markers exist for the youth sector, efforts could be undertaken to establish these and offer them to Member States.

Case studies could also be used to follow-up on the development and implementation of national youth strategies. However, monitoring the promotion and protection of the rights of all children is challenging given that reporting of spending on children and youth, including geographic disparities of quality services for children, is currently limited. Tools and methods for results-based reporting of spending on children and youth could be developed in the context of wider reforms in the area of results-based budgeting.

International support to countries with particular needs and challenges can be monitored through existing OECD DAC indicators for ODA to child and youth-focused programme areas (e.g., primary and secondary education, basic life skills for youth and adults, early childhood education, health, nutrition, etc.). Monitoring of child and youth-related commitments in other areas of the Addis Agenda can draw on recent international data collection and harmonization efforts, such as under the Global Nutrition Report initiative, the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement, new Partnerships on Child Protection and Early Child Development (UNICEF and the World Bank Group), the Lancet Countdown to 2015 Initiative for tracking progress in maternal, newborn and child survival, the H4+ technical partnership for the Secretary General’s Every Woman, Every Child initiative, and the new Global Financing Facility for Maternal, Neonatal, Child and Adolescent Health.

---

It is also challenging to follow-up on the promotion of national youth strategies. Case studies can be useful here, as well as voluntary country reporting, in the context of national sustainable development strategies.

11. **Addressing the diverse needs and challenges faced by countries in special situations**

Addis commits the international community to support countries in special situations. Specifically, Addis:

- **Commits to support the implementation of relevant strategies and programmes of action for least developed countries, landlocked developing countries, and small island developing States (8)**
- **Reaffirms the need to achieve a positive socioeconomic transformation in Africa, and the need to address the diverse and specific development needs of middle-income countries (8)**
- **Recognizes the development challenge posed by conflict and the importance of the Peace-building Fund, and takes note of the principles set out in the New Deal by the Group of Seven Plus (8)**

These commitments are mirrored in many concrete commitments across the Action Areas of the Addis Agenda, as well as in SDGs and targets specific to vulnerable countries. Some of these targets build on those agreed in the programmes of action for the least developed countries (LDCs), landlocked developing countries (LLDCs) and small island developing States (SIDS).

The indicators for targets relevant to vulnerable countries either directly monitor commitments toward vulnerable countries, or can be disaggregated to highlight developments in these country groups. They will thus provide input for monitoring commitments toward vulnerable countries throughout the chapters of the Task Force report. This cross-cutting section addresses global commitments to address specific development challenges of countries in special situations. One option for monitoring these commitments is to rely on qualitative assessments of the level of global awareness and debate on the development issues of relevance to LDCs, LLDCs, SIDS, Africa and middle-income countries, informed, for example, by language in new resolutions, agreed conclusions, declarations and communiques emanating from the United Nations and other international processes. United Nations reports, such as UNCTAD’s annual LDC Report and its Vulnerability Profiles, which provide economic analysis of those LDCs that have been found eligible for graduation by the Committee for Development Policy, or the annual Report on the state of the LDCs, prepared by the United Nations Office of the High Representative for Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States, can also provide input.

The sub-section can also cover the cross-cutting aspects of the set of commitments toward vulnerable countries that will be difficult to address fully or adequately in the subsequent chapters. One example of such dimensions is progress towards socioeconomic transformation. Monitoring by the Task Force could be informed by data on economic structural transformation (the dynamic reallocation of resources from less productive to more productive sectors) and on social transformation (human and social development). In this context, UNCTAD is developing performance measures and quantifiable indicators to measure economy-wide productive capacities, with a view to providing an operational methodology and policy guidelines on how to mainstream productive capacities into national development policies and strategies in LDCs. Monitoring of economic structural transformation could also draw on data collected in the context of section 5 on promoting industrialization, as well as on UNCTAD’s Export Diversification Index. Social transformation in vulnerable countries could be captured through two sub-indices of the human development index: life expectancy index and education index. In the area of infrastructure, aerodromes are an integral and essential component of the aviation infrastructure, and are drivers for economic development and trade especially in LLDCs and SIDS. The International Civil Aviation Organization collects data on the quality, reliability, sustainability and reliance of aerodrome infrastructure.

Another dimension that will be worth monitoring will be the level of inequality among countries,
which could be considered the ultimate objective of “addressing the needs of countries in special situations”. This monitoring can draw on those indicators of SDG 10 that focus on reducing inequality among countries. This assessment should be complemented—in the subsequent chapters of the report—by a monitoring of progress to be informed by quantitative indicators measuring the level of fulfilment of global commitments in favour of these groups of countries in the seven action areas of the Addis Agenda.

Commitments made towards Africa’s development are reviewed in the United Nations Monitoring Mechanism, which was established by General Assembly resolution 66/293. The Task Force can draw on the assessment of progress in implementation of commitments by African countries and their development partners contained therein. To monitor the commitment on countries affected by conflict, the Task Force will be able to draw on a New Deal Monitoring framework prepared by the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and State building. It has reported on progress to monitor financial flows dedicated to peacebuilding and state building every two years (last report issued in 2014, the next is due in 2016) and will be collecting data on progress on implementing aspects taken up in the Addis Agenda (notably on the use of country systems). Nonetheless, it remains challenging to accurately monitor financial flows dedicated to peacebuilding and state building in conflict/post-conflict contexts.  

12. Global partnership

The Global Partnership enshrined in the Addis Agenda is a vehicle for strengthening international cooperation for implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The Addis Agenda in its entirety and the myriad commitments contained within, as well as SDG 17, reflect the reinvigorated global partnership. More specifically, Addis:

- Recognizes that the enhanced and revitalized global partnership for sustainable development, led by Governments, will be a vehicle for strengthening international cooperation for implementation of the 2030 Agenda; and that multi-stakeholder partnerships and the resources, knowledge and ingenuity of the private sector, civil society, the scientific community, academia, philanthropy and foundations, parliaments, local authorities, volunteers and other stakeholders will be important to mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, complement the efforts of Governments, and support the achievement of the sustainable development goals, in particular in developing countries (10, MoI 17.16)
- Commits to respect each country’s policy space and leadership to implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development, while remaining consistent with relevant international rules and commitments (9, MoI 17.15)
- Encourages and promotes partnerships to support country-driven priorities and strategies, building on lessons learned and available expertise (76, MoI 17.17)

The overarching commitment in this subsection, and perhaps in the Addis Agenda as a whole, is to enhance the global partnership. As noted in the Addis Agenda “The enhanced and revitalized global partnership for sustainable development, led by Governments, will be a vehicle for strengthening international cooperation for implementation of the post-2015 development agenda.” The SDG 17.16 indicator is focused on development cooperation efforts, assessing the number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the SDGs. This will serve to monitor one dimension of the global partnership, which is also discussed in more depth in chapter II.C. A more complete assessment of progress on the global partnership will need to look across the seven Action Areas of the Addis Agenda. Indeed, this entire Task Force Report will

---

be a report on the progress of the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development.

In terms of the specific commitments, the indicator for SDG 17.15 on policy space is to assess extent of use of country-owned results frameworks and planning tools by providers of development cooperation, also focusing on development cooperation. The Addis Agenda addresses country ownership issues with regard to development effectiveness in chapter II.C on international cooperation. The Addis Agenda also addresses the broader issue in the context of policy coherence on the national and international levels, as discussed in chapter II.F on systemic issues.

Finally, the promotion of multi-stakeholder partnerships can be informed by SDG 17.17. The indicator for this is the amount of US dollars committed to public-private and civil society partnerships. This will need to be complemented by qualitative analysis and by further disaggregation of available data that distinguishes different types of partnerships. In part, this effort will be able to draw on the information collected at the Partnerships for SDGs online platform which will support the global review to be undertaken by the High-Level Political Forum starting in 2016. The platform contains partnership initiatives in all areas, including commitments and initiatives stemming from Every Woman, Every Child, Sustainable Energy for All, Global Compact, Partnerships for Small Island Developing States, and the Rio+20 Conference, among others. It will further be informed by progress on the partnership initiatives and voluntary commitments that were launched at the sidelines of the Addis Conference. These initiatives will be reported on in a separate Annex to this Report in future years. The Task Force will also give account of other partnership initiatives and programmes relevant to the implementation of the Addis Agenda.

---

6 As of March 2016, more than 1900 initiatives have been registered on the partnerships for SDGs platform, see: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnerships.