

MVI – Possible Governance Arrangement



H.E. Ms Erna Solberg
Co-Chair
High-level Panel on the MVI





- **Mandates**
- **Consultations**
- **Findings**
- **Issues**
- **Recommendations**
- **Guiding Principles**



MANDATE

“Make evidence-based recommendations, on the most appropriate governance arrangements for the MVI, including modalities for the publication of MVI results and procedures for reviewing and/or revising the MVI and its components”.





Human Development Index (HDI)



LDC Graduations



Multi-dimensional Fragility Framework



Productive Capacity Index



Human Capital Index

CONSULTATIONS



Findings



- (i) Purpose -** each index, across the board, had a very clear objective or purpose and target (s) to measure, i.e., all had very well-defined issue(s) or item(s) to target or address.
- (ii) Personnel -** each index relied on the expertise of a core group of individuals, in the form of either a team, a secretariat, an office, or an expert group, tasked with essential responsibilities, irrespective of the existence of a written mandates or remuneration.
- (iii) Organs-** each organization, within their own respective set up, had very clear organizational allocation or demarcated areas of responsibilities, including for upkeep, verifications, and/or reporting.
- (iv) Consultation -** each governance arrangement had very clear and credible consultations and review processes in place.
- (v) Member States -** each arrangement had a clear mechanism for engagement with member States.
- (vi) Capacity Development Component**

 - all arrangements had in one form or another, a capacity development component to assist targeted countries, including data and policy support.
- (i) Data -** all organizations acknowledged the importance and sacredness of data, its availability, credibility, and reliability in their work

Purpose



Identification of the Most Vulnerable

Allow vulnerable countries to provide granularity and greater characterization of their specific vulnerability and resilience factors, including non-structural resilience through the development of the vulnerability and country resilience profiles (VRCP).



Issues



PERSONNEL

The MVI will require two sets of personnel, each with its own specified roles and functions.

ORGANS

- (i) an *MVI Secretariat*, with similar arrangements to those employed by the ECOSOC's CDP Secretariat, the UNDP HDRO, or the OECD's SFI; and
- (i) (ii) an *MVI Expert Review Panel*, mirroring the arrangements adopted by UNDP's SAP and UNCTAD's PCI High Level Advisory Body or by the ECOSOC's CDP. Further elaboration on the Panel's views regarding the possible home of these two bodies is contained in paragraphs 28 below, under Consultation.



Issues



CONSULTATIONS

- Clear and credible consultations and review processes are vital to the overall success of any governance arrangement in delivering on its mandate(s).

MEMBER STATES

- Such a mechanism, in the Panel's view, given the universal nature of the MVI, is a subject that should continue to be considered in the spirit of partnerships, under the auspices of the United Nations General Assembly.

DATA

- The Panel suggests that the task of identifying, selecting, and validating indicators not presently included in their recommended MVI to be one of the priority tasks of the MVI Secretariat, including through extensive empirical research and a literature review.



Recommendation 1

- **Option One:** - Creation of an MVI Secretariat and the issuance of additional mandate(s) to a UN Agency, to also act as the independent Expert Panel responsible for the review of the MVI.
- **Option Two:-** Creation an MVI Secretariat and the establishment an independent High-level Panel of Experts (co-located in a UN Entity), to be responsible for the review of the MVI.



Recommendation 2

(ii) Recommendation Two - Procedures for Reviewing and/or Revising the MVI and its components.

Without prejudice to any subsequent decision of member States, the Panel recommends that information relating to the up-keep and review of the MVI, including its results, be on a biennial basis, brought to the attention of member States under the auspice of the United Nations General Assembly.



Pros & Cons



- The **MVI Secretariat** in the Panel’s assessment will be only body, under both options, attracting budgetary consideration, since the members the MVI High-level Review Panel, will serve in their personal capacity, without remunerations
- “**Option One**” primarily in response to comments made by some member States during consultations, for avoidance of “*unnecessary creation of new bodies to house the MVI.*”
- the establishment of an “*independent High-level Panel of Experts*” to be responsible for the review of the MVI. The Panel envisages the members of this body to serve in their personal capacity, thus satisfying the “independent” test and will do so without remuneration, satisfying the “economic” test.



Principles



- (i) Balancing the need for independent Experts and a mechanism that allows engagement with member States.**
- (ii) Appropriate provision of resources.**
- (iii) Freedom from undue influence- protecting the integrity of the index**
- (iv) A governance mechanism that is well placed to influence uptake from member States, the UN system and from organizations outside the UN system.**



Thank you!

H.E. Ms Erna Solberg
Co-Chair
High-level Panel on the MVI

