

**MULTIDIMENSIONAL VULNERABILITY INDEX**  
**COLOMBIA STATEMENT**  
**CONSULTATIONS WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

May 10<sup>th</sup>, 10:00am

Thank you, Your Excellency,

Colombia appreciates the convening of this informal consultations and the work of the High-Level Expert Panel for the design of a Multidimensional Vulnerability Index (MVI).

The relevant material that has been produced so far by the Panel requires rigorous and careful consideration by the relevant technical entities at the national level to assess the acceptability and feasibility of the MVI and the indicators proposed. We welcome your proposal of having additional consultations on this matter.

In the meantime, we would like to raise the following comments:

First, it is critical that Member States receive more information about the criteria used by the Panel to select the current indicators and to disregard others. This would benefit the process of acceptability of the final proposal. We would appreciate the circulation of an explanatory note indicating the criteria used and how the indicators selected performed in light of the criteria. If the criteria used were the guiding principles of the Samoa Pathway Resolution, it is still valuable to know how the indicators performed against each one of them.

Second, Colombia is convinced that Data Ownership should be considered among the rules for the final selection of indicators applied, as well as for informing the governance arrangements of the MVI, given the close link that exists between data ownership and capacity development-which came out as one of the key elements of the consultations carried out by the Panel. We need to ensure that the MVI is informed mainly by the best quality possible, including official statistics.

Furthermore, those indicators in line with resolution A/RES/68/261 on the Fundamental Principles of Statistics

duplicate the functions with existing UN bodies, mainly the United Nations Statistical Commission.

Once again, we believe that the United Nations Statistical Division could shed some light on pertinent governance arrangements that still ensure the role of the Commission as the primary body for the coordination of the global statistical programs in general and the apex forum for discussions, knowledge exchange and sharing of best practices on statistics and data across all domains. This will also benefit efforts related to addressing challenges on capacity building.

Fourth, we are concerned about the additional burden of report associated with the MVI, but particularly with the elaboration of the Voluntary Country- Resilience Country Profiles. As per the proposal of the Panel, it seems that creating the profiles would mobilize a major effort at the national level in the collection of cross sectoral data, an effort similar to the challenges to monitor the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the 17 SDGs.

Your Excellency,

We encourage the Panel to include in the report those valuable conclusions on what the MVI is not about (not a replacement of GDP, not a development measure, not a poverty index, not tackling endogenous factors). It will be extremely useful to reassure that the MVI is a piece of the puzzle that addresses a critical issue (structural multidimensional vulnerabilities based on exposure to external shocks and pressures, and levels of resilience to overcome impacts of those shocks and pressures), but that there are still fundamental gaps when it comes to measuring development and inform financing and targeted policies in a balanced manner