

Stakeholders' Statement on THEME 1: Global Indicators under Goal 1 and 2 (and Goal 16 and Goal 17 as we see fit under Goal 1 and 2)

Target 2.2. Should include other social groups (older people, adolescents, pregnant women among others). On Target 2.5.1 we support exploring UNEP's alternative indicator and call for further consultation on sustainable land practices clusters, including agroecology. On 2.a. and 2.ab, we suggest including measurement of the improved livelihoods of all women, men, indigenous peoples, small-scale producers and local communities, as measurement of the quality of investments.*

Madame Chair, We would like to add some comments on the measurement of poverty - questions members rightfully raised about the proposed measurement in 1.1. The MDGs showed us that poverty measurements can be manipulated to mask poverty, something we ask you to be very mindful of. When the World Bank shifted its measurement from 1.02 ppp in 1985 to 1.08 in 1993 and then again in 2008 to 1.25, 753 million people were miraculously lifted out of poverty. It allowed systemic issues (like imposed austerity measures) that produce poverty - to be misguided. The 15 countries selected to direct the calculation have the lowest poverty threshold – a national decision affecting billions of the world's poor.

I remind you that no developed country measures poverty at less than \$10 per day.

While disaggregation was not discussed today, I also remind you that the failure to measure poverty at the community or intra-household levels meant the MDGs could not address the depth or reality of poverty.

We recall the importance throughout the targets to disaggregate data by all social and economic groups, including by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migration status, disability and geographic location.

We support members who have drawn attention to the critical need for a multi-dimensional poverty index that can be broken down by dimensions and populations. The MPI should be a priority indicator in the framework to provide a synthesis of overall performance in poverty eradication.

Madame Chair, on Indicator 1.3.1, we support the ILO proposed revised indicator.

Madame Chair, Targets 1.4, 2.3, and 5.a address secure land rights as foundational to the Agenda. Secure land rights are increasingly recognised as one of the most important indicator for poverty and hunger. We acknowledge the proposed indicator of FAO, UN Women and others. However, we are concerned that the proposed indicator 1.4.2 falls short on the principle of leaving no one behind. In particular, the reference to “agricultural land” should include lands of indigenous peoples' and local communities', and should explicitly cover both “individual and collective/customary land tenure systems” regardless of state's recognition. We therefore endorse the following indicator under 1.4, supported by several organisations, including UN Agencies, the Global Donor Platform, and UK: “Percentage of women, men, indigenous peoples, local communities, small-scale producers with secure rights to land (individual and collective tenure), property, and natural resources, measured by a. percentage with legally documented or recognized evidence of tenure, and b. percentage who perceive their rights are recognized and protected”.

The recommended indicator is feasible, and data gaps can be addressed through household surveys and geo-spatial data collection among others.

Thank you.