

Preparatory expert meeting from Brazil to Qatar

Reporting on SDG indicator 17.3.1

Background

Doha, Qatar, June 4th, 2024

ipea Institute for Applied
Economic Research

André de Mello e Souza

*Tenured Researcher
and Policy Analyst*

Indicators originally proposed for SDG 17.3.1

- **Foreign direct investment** posed no significant conceptual or data challenges
- **Official development assistance** has had widely tested and precise definition as well as data collection processes
- **South-South cooperation** as a proportion of gross national income has been main challenge for 17.3.1
 - Data unavailable & unreliable for most Southern Providers
- Development cooperation metrics involve long-standing and politically sensitive debates
 - **Definition of developing countries**
 - **Concessionality**
 - **South-South Cooperation vs. ODA**
 - **Private vs. Official flows**

Origins and Evolution of the SSC Framework

- The tenth meeting of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG indicators (IAEG-SDGs) in Addis Ababa in 2019 considered a proposal for the replacement of indicator 17.3.1 by Total Official Support for Sustainable Development (TOSSD), with the OECD as the custodian agency
 - Opposition from many countries, including TOSSD members, such as Colombia and Ghana
 - Only ODA portion of TOSSD would be acceptable
- The IAEG-SDGs Working Group on Measurement of Development Support approved by UN Statistics Commission (UNSC) established in May 2020
- Subgroup established to address the measurement of South-South cooperation

UNWGMDS Membership

Eastern Africa:	Middle and Southern Africa:	Western Africa	Northern Africa:
Kenya	South Africa [^]	Ghana ^{*^}	Egypt ^{*^}
United Republic of Tanzania [*]	Cameroon [*]		
Western Asia:	Central, Eastern, Southern, and South-Eastern Asia:	Oceania	The Caribbean
Jordan	China [^]	Samoa [*]	Cuba
	India		Grenada [*]
	Japan ^{*^}		
Central and South America:	Eastern Europe:	North America and Northern, Southern and Western Europe	
Colombia ^{*^}	Russian Federation [*]	France ^{*^}	Switzerland
México		Norway [^]	USA [^]
		Sweden ^{*^}	
*	Observers		
Members of the IAEG-SDG's	Brazil		
^	The Netherlands		
TOSSD International Task Force Members or Observers	Republic of Korea		
Member/observers of the SSC Sub-group	Germany		
	Observers/Secretariat Support		
	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)		
	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)		

Source: Table elaborated by the Government of Colombia

South-South Cooperation Conceptual Framework

- Sub-group chaired by India with UNCTAD as secretariat
- Regionally diverse participation from developing countries:
 - Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, India, Mexico, South Africa and Tanzania
- Brazil and Mexico prepared a matrix of alternatives for grouping SSC modalities, then refined with contributions of China
- Sub-group achieved wide agreement on conceptual framework of measuring SSC, with support of G77 and China
- Framework represents first agreement by Southern Providers on a common metric to report SSC
- WG co-chairs and UNSD asks UNCTAD to become custodian of SSC Framework

- Indicator 17.3.1: Additional financial resources mobilized for developing countries from multiple sources
 - Foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows
 - Gross receipts by developing countries of official sustainable development grants
 - Gross receipts by developing countries of official concessional sustainable development loans
 - Gross receipts by developing countries of official non-concessional sustainable development loans
 - Gross receipts by developing countries of mobilized private finance (MPF) - on an experimental basis
 - Gross receipts by developing countries of private grants

- Indicator 17.3.1, in its current form, does not allow for non-financial values and measurements, excluding Group C
- and only covers FDI, grants and loans, excluding Group B
- Possibility of revising SDG indicators ended in the end of April
- Yet, the main innovation and value-added of the SSC Framework is precisely Group C, comprised of non-financial SSC modalities
- To report only Group A and exclude Groups B and C would therefore beat the purpose of the Framework and undermine its very reason for being
- Many developing and least developed countries will only be able to report the SSC they provide in Group C

- Moreover, Brazil understands that the SSC Framework should not be divided either
- The purpose of this Framework goes well beyond SDG 17.3.1 and it should be only employed as a whole, meaning with Groups A, B and C
- Indicator 17.9.1 is also not an option for Group C, since it is expressed monetarily: Dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries
- Perhaps use of the Framework will have to wait until after 2030

Thank You!

andre.souza@ipea.gov.br

ipea Institute for Applied
Economic Research

André de Mello e Souza
Senior Researcher