UNITED NATIONS
ESCAP
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
Committee on Statistics

Second session
Bangkok, 15-17 December 2010
Item 6(a) of the provisional agenda
Item for information: Millennium Development Goal indicators

Availability and use of data on the Millennium Development Goal indicators in Asia and the Pacific

Note by the secretariat

Summary

> This document informs the Committee of the availability of data for assessing progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in the Asian and Pacific region and highlights the challenges for many developing countries in producing sufficient timely and reliable data. The document describes the data source and statistical methods for progress assessment, as contained in recent regional MDG reports. It provides an assessment of the improvement in the availability of data – both by indicator and by country – on the MDGs between 2004 and 2010. It also highlights the other basic data needs beyond the MDG indicators for analyzing current development trends and related policy issues, including for assessing the potential impact of the recent financial crisis on the achievement of the MDGs in the region.

Contents

Introduction

1.   Timely and reliable data are critical for assessing the progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and for the design and evaluation of policies and programmes related to the MDGs and other development goals. The importance of statistics was most recently reiterated by world's leaders in the Outcome Document of the 2010 United Nations MDGs Summit, which was subsequently adopted by the General Assembly by consensus on 22 September 2010. The General Assembly resolution states:

> "[w]e recognize that all countries require adequate, timely, reliable and disaggregated data, including demographic data, in order to design better programmes and policies for sustainable development. We commit to strengthening our national statistical systems, including for effectively monitoring progress towards the Millennium Development Goals. We also reiterate the need to increase efforts in support of statistical capacity-building in developing countries."[1]

2.   The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the availability of timely, reliable and internationally comparable data for countries in Asia and the Pacific to track progress towards the MDGs. It describes the methodology for progress assessment, developed by the tripartite partnership of the secretariat, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the source of data contained in the official United Nations MDG Indicators database. The improvement in the availability of data on the MDGs is evaluated in the context of the minimum data required to support the application of the progress assessment methodology. By summarizing the experiences of the tripartite partnership in assessing the impact of recent financial crisis on the progress towards achieving the MDGs, the document also illustrates the importance of data availability and timeliness on the quality of progress assessments.

I.   Source of data for regional progress assessment

3.   Since 2004, the ESCAP/ADB/UNDP partnership has produced five successive regional reports on the achievements of the MDGs in Asia and the Pacific.[2] These reports have received much publicity in national, regional and international policy forums. The statistical assessments of the progress towards achieving the MDGs, which underpin the policy analysis and discussions in these reports, have played an important role in engaging stakeholders in dialogues for development.

A.   United Nations MDG Indicators database

4.   The progress assessments as contained in the regional MDG reports rely on the latest available data from the global database on official MDG

---

[1]   United Nations General Assembly (2010). *Keeping the promise: united to achieve the Millennium Development Goals* (A/65/L.1), para. 68. Accessible at http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/mdg%20outcome%20document.pdf

[2]   The five reports were published, respectively, for 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009/10 and 2010/11, all of which are accessible at http://www.mdgasiapacific.org/

Indicators – the United Nations MDG Indicators database[3] – to highlight recent trends and make simple projections as to whether countries in the Asian and Pacific region are on or off track for various MDG targets.

5.   The United Nations MDG Indicators database is the product of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on MDG Indicators (IAEG), coordinated and maintained by the United Nations Statistics Division. The IAEG includes various Departments within the United Nations Secretariat, a number of UN agencies from within the United Nations system and outside, various government agencies and national statisticians, and other organizations concerned with the development of MDG data at the national and international levels including donors and expert advisers. Annex I lists the international agencies responsible for the compilation of international data on the official MDG indicators.

6.   The IAEG is responsible for the preparation of data and analysis to monitor progress towards the MDGs at the global level. The Group also reviews and defines methodologies and technical issues in relation to the indicators, produces guidelines, and helps define priorities and strategies to support countries in data collection, analysis and reporting on MDGs.[4]

B.   International vs. national data on the MDGs

7.   The data contained in the United Nations MDG Indicators database are typically drawn from official statistics provided by ministries and national statistical offices to the respective international agencies. In some cases, nationally reported figures are adjusted by international agencies to ensure comparability across countries. For data not produced by the national statistical system, the responsible international agency often seeks to fill the gap by using data collected through surveys sponsored or carried out by international agencies. In addition, countries sometimes have more recent data that have not yet become available in the global database.

8.   Due to such time lags and the necessary adjustments or estimation made by international agencies, discrepancies may occur between national and international data series for a given MDG indicator. Such discrepancies could result in differences in the assessment of a country's progress in reaching certain MDG targets.

II.   Methodology and data requirements for tracking progress

9.   Both the methodology used for tracking progress and the set of selected MDG indicators included in the regional assessments have evolved over time, mostly in response to the gradual improvement in data availability. The following discussion pertains to the methodology used in the most recent Asia-Pacific MDG Report 2010/2011, *Path to 2015: MDG Priorities in Asia and the Pacific*.[5]

---

[3] Accessible at the official United Nations site for the MDG Indicators: http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Default.aspx

[4] Information as contained at http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/Host.aspx?Content =IAEG.htm

[5] Accessible at http://www.unescap.org/publications/detail.asp?id=1401

A. Classification of progress

10.   Under the method for progress assessment as contained in the most recent regional MDG report, countries, subregions, regions and other relevant country groupings are placed into one of the following four categories, based on the observed trends for a specific MDG target:

- ●   Early achiever: Already achieved the 2015 target
- ▶   On track: Expected to meet the target by 2015
- ■   Off track-Slow: Expected to meet the target, but after 2015
- ◀   Off track-No progress/regressing: Stagnating or slipping backwards

B. Minimum data requirement

11.   In general, the regional progress assessment for a given MDG target is produced on the basis of the trend since 1990, which requires a minimum of two data points that are at least three years apart. One exception was made in earlier reports to the indicator of HIV prevalence, where available data points were only two years apart. In this document, the availability of data is assessed against this minimum data requirement of two observations that are three years apart.

C. Assessing the state of progress towards the MDGs

12.   A total of 21 indicators were used in the 2010/2011 regional MDG report for progress assessments. These indicators were chosen on the basis of their relevance to the region as well as data availability. For purpose of progress classification, they can be divided into two types – those with explicit targets and those without – and the specific methodology for classifying the state of progress differs accordingly.

Indicators with explicit targets

13.   For MDG indicators that have an explicit target value, such as the $1.25-a-day poverty, under-five mortality rates, school enrolment ratios and the gender parity indices, all four categories of the state of progress towards the MDGs apply.

14.   To determine the state of progress towards a given MDG target for a country, the year by which a country is expected to reach its MDG target is estimated based on the assumption that the trends observed since 1990 were to continue.

15.   If the "expected" year for a country to reach a target is estimated to be before the reference year of the assessment, the country is categorized as an "Early achiever;" if the "expected" year lies between the reference year of the assessment and 2015, the country is categorized as "On Track;" if the "expected" year is after 2015, the country is categorized as "Off track-Slow;" and when it is not possible to determine the year to achieve a particular target because the country has not made any progress at all or has moved in the 'wrong' direction, i.e. moving away from the target, then the country is categorized as "Off track-No progress/regressing."

Indicators without specific targets

16.   The second type of MDG indicators does not have a specific target value. Take HIV prevalence as an example. The target monitored by this indicator is to have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS. In other words, the target would have been achieved if a country is moving in the 'right' direction. Accordingly, only three of the four categories of progress apply: countries trending in the 'right' direction since 1990 are categorized as "Early achievers;" countries showing no change at all over the period, implying no worsening of the situation, are categorized as "On track;" and countries trending in the 'wrong' direction are categorized as "Off track-No progress/regressing."[6] Other indicators of this type include TB prevalence, TB death rate, forest cover, protected area, CO_2 emissions and consumption of ozone-depleting substances.

III.   Improvements and challenges in meeting the data requirements

17.   This section highlights the improvement and challenges for many countries in meeting the minimum data requirements for tracking progress towards achieving the MDG targets.

A.   Data availability revealed by progress assessments

18.   Annex II presents the latest regional assessments of the country and regional progress towards achieving the 21 MDG targets for the developing members and associate members of ESCAP, as contained in the Asia-Pacific MDG Report 2010/11.[7]

19.   A positive picture on data availability emerges from the table in Annex II: for most of the selected indicators, progress can be assessed. In other words, minimum data requirements are met for the majority of the 55 countries.

20.   However, the many "blank" spaces in the table also reveal that data are insufficient for a considerable number of countries to allow the use of the method for progress assessment. Of particular concern are the indicators for Goal 1, Goal 5, HIV prevalence under Goal 6, and to a lesser extent Goal 2 and Goal 3.

21.   For example, a majority of countries (30) have insufficient data available to assess whether the proportion of the population living on less than $1.25 per day will be halved between 1990 and 2015. The situation is only slightly better for the prevalence of underweight children under-five years of age, for which almost half (27) of the countries do not meet the minimum data requirement to assess whether the target will be met.

22.   The lack of internationally comparable data to assess progress towards a reduction by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, of the maternal mortality ratio is most pronounced. The maternal mortality ratio is

---

missing from Annex II because, as of date, the United Nations MDG Indicators database only contains data for one year, 2005.[8] Data on the attendance of births by skilled health personnel, an important determinant of the prevention of maternal mortality, is also not sufficient for more than a fifth (12) of the countries. Progress towards universal reproductive health by 2015, on the basis of the coverage of antenatal care (through at least one visit), cannot be tracked for almost half (27) of the countries.

23. The picture is mixed as to whether minimum data requirements are met for assessing progress towards meeting the targets of universal primary education and gender disparity at all levels of education. While data is lacking to track primary school completion progress for 15 countries, 23 countries lack sufficient data for tracking the net enrolment ratio in primary education and 29 (i.e., more than) half for the proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach the last grade of primary school. The inability to track gender parity increases with the level of education: while sufficient data on the ratio of girls to boys in primary education is lacking for just 10 countries, this number is 14 for secondary education and 26 for tertiary education.

B. Through two datasets

24. To illustrate the changes in data availability over recent years, the analysis presented below draws on two datasets downloaded from the United Nations MDG Indicators database: one dataset obtained on 23 November 2004 (henceforth referred to as the "2004 dataset") and another on 4 August 2010 (the "2010 dataset"). The 2004 and 2010 datasets each give a snapshot of the data availability at the time of downloading. The differences between the two datasets provide an indication of any improvement in the data availability between the two time points.

25. As the MDG indicator framework changed between the two download dates – with some indicators being dropped and others added – the analysis focuses on the 18 common indicators that have been included in the progress assessments in the regional MDG reports.

C. Improvement in data availability over time

26. Annex III and IV illustrate the improvement in meeting the minimum data requirement of two data points that are three years apart among countries in the region between 2004 and 2010. As was mentioned before, the comparison was made for 18 MDG indicators contained in both datasets.

27. Judging from these 18 indicators, data availability for supporting progress tracking improved considerably between 2004 and 2010 for all but one of the developing member States. Take Timor-Leste for example. For

---

[8] Relevant member of the IAEG recently published estimates of maternal mortality ratios for five years between 1990 and 2008, which makes it possible to assess the progress of individual countries. For details of the estimates, see WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA and the World Bank (2010), Trends in Maternal Mortality: 1990 to 2008, which can be accessed from http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241500265_eng.pdf. These estimates have also been published in the Global Health Observatory website: http://apps.who.int/ghodata/

the 18 common indicators, the United Nations MDG Indicator database had only 3 meeting the minimum data requirement for the country in the 2004 dataset; the number increased to 14 in the 2010 dataset. Similarly, the number of indicators meeting the minimum data requirement more than doubled for Armenia, Marshall Islands and Solomon Islands. As a result of the improvement, quite a number of countries in the region now have all the 18 indicators meeting the minimum data requirement, including Mongolia, Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, the Philippines, India, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Kyrgyzstan. The only exception seems to be Papua New Guinea, in which case the number of indicators meeting the minimum requirement changed from 12 in 2004 to 11 in 2010 for the total of 18.

28.   The regional MDG reports always display the assessments of progress towards achieving the MDGs at the sub-regional and regional levels, which means producing aggregates for groups of countries. The availability of data for individual countries thus not only affects the progress assessment for these countries individually, but also that for the relevant country groupings. Annex IV compares, for each of the 18 common indicators, the change in the number of countries meeting the minimum data requirement between the 2004 and 2010 datasets. As can be seen, the number of developing members and associate members of ESCAP meeting the minimum data requirement, out of a total of 55, increased for all but two indicators between the two datasets. Most noticeable were the indicators on skilled birth attendance, TB prevalence and protected areas, for which none of the 55 countries met the minimum data requirement in the 2004 dataset but almost all do in the 2010 dataset.

D.   Remaining challenges

Type of data

29.   Data for the MDG indicators discussed above are of different "type," as indicated in the United Nations MDG Indicators database and shown in Annex V based on the 2010 dataset. The type of data refers to whether an indicator value contained in the database refers to (i) "country data" produced and disseminated, including data adjusted to meet international standards, by a country; (ii) "country adjusted" data produced and provided by the country but adjusted by the designated international agency for international comparability to comply with internationally agreed standards, definitions and classifications; (iii) "estimated" by the designated international agency when corresponding country data for a specific year or set of years are not available, when multiple sources exist or there are issues of data quality; or (iv) "global monitoring" data regularly produced by the designated agency for the global monitoring, based on country data, with no corresponding figure at the country level because the indicator is defined for international monitoring only (e.g., proportion of population below $1.25 a day).

30.   From information on the "type" of data, and the information on the timeliness and frequency of observations presented below, one could get a rough idea of a country's capacity to produce required data for an indicator according to the agreed standards and definitions.

31.   As shown in Annex V, there are certain MDG indicators, such as the proportion of the population living below $1.25 a day and CO_2 emissions, that are defined for international monitoring only and the data required for

progress assessment are mainly produced by designated international agencies (G).

32.   In the cases of infant mortality and under-five mortality rate, HIV prevalence, TB prevalence, TB incidence, the proportion of protected areas, the proportion of the population using an improved drinking water source and the proportion of the population using an improved sanitation facility, data are   estimated (E) by the relevant international agencies. For these indicators, national data are available; however, the national data may be for different years, multiple data sources may exist, or there are data quality issues.

33.   Data for the prevalence of underweight children under-five and the proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel are all produced by countries; for the latter indicator, however, data for some countries are adjusted by the relevant international agency (UNICEF) to make them internationally comparable (C and CA).

34.   Data for the remaining seven of the 21 indicators are of a mixture of two types: country produced (C) or estimated by an international agency (E). For six of these indicators under Goals 2 and 3, UNESCO is the custodian international agency. These indicators include: net primary enrolment ratio, proportion of students reaching the last grade of primary school, primary completion rate, gender parity index of enrolment at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. The other indicator in this group is the proportion of land covered by forest, for which FAO is the custodian agency.

Timeliness

35.   The timeliness of indicator data has a direct bearing on the quality of progress assessment. This is because the assessment of a trend that is based on a data series including a value for 2008 captures more recent developments, while an assessment that is based on data with a latest value for, say, 1998, does not.

36.   Annex VI presents the latest year for which data are available in the 2010 dataset, by both country and indicator. It illustrates the challenge in obtaining timely data for many of the 21 MDG indicators covered in the progress assessments of the regional MDG reports. It should be noted in this context that data for indicators that rely on household survey data, such as the proportion of the population below $1.25 per day and the prevalence of children under-five years of age who are underweight, are often less up-to-date than data for indicators that are generated from routine administrative reporting systems, such as the education-related indicators is the timeliness of the latest data available.

37.   The median year of latest data for $1.25/day poverty and underweight children, which rely on household income and expenditure-type and demographic and health-type surveys respectively, is 2005. This makes the "average" assessment of progress for these indicators half a decade old and implies that, if the timeliness pattern of data continues, the global statistical community will only be able to say by 2020 whether the targets for these indicators have been met by most countries. For some indicators in some countries this will even be later. Annex VI shows that the some latest data date more than seven years back: Lao People's Democratic Republic, Sri Lanka and Turkmenistan for $1.25/day poverty; Maldives and

Pakistan for underweight children; Kiribati for net primary enrolment; Nepal for both primary completion and gender parity in primary education; Brunei Darussalam, Myanmar, Cooks Islands, Palau, Samoa and Tonga for skilled birth attendance; and Myanmar for antenatal care coverage.

Number of observations

38.   The number of observations also impacts the quality of progress assessments. The reason is that the classification of countries by state of progress towards a specific MDG target relies on projections based on the observed recent trends. Thus the more data observations available, the more robust the classifications and the conclusions are likely to be.

39.   Annex VII provides information on the number of observations for each of the 21 MDG indicators over the period from 1990 to 2009 for the developing countries in the region. It shows that the indicators with relatively more coverage years include the proportion of protected areas, TB incidence and prevalence, CO_2 emissions, and the consumption of ozone-depleting substances. In contrast, the number of observations was much smaller for such indicators as HIV prevalence, proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel, antenatal care coverage and proportion of land area covered by forest. Overall, the number of observations is limited for the indicators related to the goals of reducing poverty, reducing child mortality and improving maternal health, which ultimately affects negatively the reliability of trend assessments for the achievement of these goals.

IV. Other basic data needs beyond the MDG indicators

40.   In addition to the minimum data requirement for assessing progress towards achieving the MDGs in the region, tremendous challenges remain for many countries in producing other basic social and economic statistics required for timely analysis of development trends and related policy issues. Such challenges were apparent in the statistical analyses conducted for the 2009/10 and 2010/11 regional MDG reports to assess the impact of the global financial crisis on the progress towards achieving the MDGs in the region.

41.   The 2009/10 regional MDG report sought to assess the impact of the global financial crisis by developing a vulnerability index, which is a composite indicator that measures the exposure of a country to the global economic crisis and the country's coping capacity to mitigate the crisis.[9] Each of these two dimensions – exposure and coping capacity – was assessed with the combination of 5 indicators by drawing on social and economic statistical data from a variety of sources. The vulnerability of a country was compared with its MDG achievement to assess how far it was at risk for each goal.

42.   The focus of the analysis was clearly on less developed countries, for which data availability is often an issue. Thus the challenge was to strike a balance between ensuring the relevance of the underlying concept of the index and carefully choosing the data sources so as for the resulting index

---

[9]   The analysis was based on a theoretical framework in Briguglio, L., Cordina, G., Farrugia, N. and Vella, S., 2008. Economic Vulnerability and Resilience: Concepts and Measurements. UNU-WIDER Research Paper No. 2008/55, May 2008.

to cover a maximum number of the less developed countries. Despite such efforts, there were insufficient data to construct the index for as many as 11 member States of ESCAP, which in a way limits the scope of analysis. It was acknowledged in the report that this index could be refined with regard of the variables included for the measurement of the two dimensions. However, once again the lack of data in terms of coverage and timeliness was an impediment to include other measures in the analysis.

43.   Similar challenges were encountered in conducting the analysis of the impact of the global financial crisis on reaching the MDG targets for the 2010/11 regional report. After evaluating a number of potential analytic approaches, a decision was made at an early stage to choose an analytic approach that was simpler and less demanding on data over another approach that would allow more sophisticated analyses but was much more demanding on data.

44.   Even the application of this simpler and less data-demanding approach had to allow for the lack of trend data for the MDG indicators for the region. Data constraints were particularly marked for analysis covering the Pacific subregion. For example, while for Asia-Pacific countries, projections of the GDP growth rate were available for 41 out of 55 countries in the World Economic Outlook Database of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the projections were calculated for only seven of the 19 tracked countries in the Pacific subregion.

45.   An additional challenge for evaluating the impact of the global financial crisis that started in 2008 is the lack of timely data. In the United Nations MDG Indicators database, data were available for 2008 or earlier for the vast majority of the indicators and countries. This is because the collection and publication of most of the indicators take about two years. Given the lag in time, the 2010 dataset does not contain enough data to assess the impact of the crisis on the MDG indicators.

V.   Conclusion

46.   The analysis presented in this document shows that the availability of data for meeting the minimum data requirements for regional progress assessments improved substantially from 2004 to 2010 for many of the MDG indicators. There is no doubt that, since the early 1990s, there has been increased commitment by national governments and international development partners to evidence-based policy-making, which, combined with the global commitment to the MDGs and related progress assessments, has contributed to the improvement in the capacity of many countries to produce and disseminate data on the MDGs and other basic development indicators.

47.   However, tremendous challenges still remain. This document also makes it clear that the ability of many countries in the region to produce timely and reliable data in accordance with internationally agreed standards and definitions, and to direct and evaluate development policies and programmes, is far from adequate. It points to the need for continuously improving the statistical capacity of many developing countries to meet the basic data needs for assessing progress towards the MDGs.

Annexes

Annex I.   MDG Indicators and the responsible international agencies

Short indicator name	Original Indicator name	Responsible agency
Goal 1		
$1.25 per day poverty	Population below $1 (PPP) per day, percentage	World Bank
Underweight children	Children under 5 moderately or severely underweight, percentage	UNICEF
Goal 2		
Primary enrolment	Total net enrolment ratio in primary education, both sexes	UNESCO-UIS
Reaching last grade	Percentage of pupils starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary, both sexes	UNESCO-UIS
Primary completion	Primary completion rate, both sexes	UNESCO-UIS
Goal 3		
Gender primary	Gender Parity Index in primary level enrolment	UNESCO-UIS
Gender secondary	Gender Parity Index in secondary level enrolment	UNESCO-UIS
Gender tertiary	Gender Parity Index in tertiary level enrolment	UNESCO-UIS
Goal 4		
Under-5 mortality	Children under five mortality rate per 1,000 live births	UNICEF
Infant mortality	Infant mortality rate (0-1 year) per 1,000 live births	UNICEF
Goal 5		
Skilled birth attendance	Births attended by skilled health personnel, percentage	UNICEF
Antenatal care ($\geq$ 1 visit)	Antenatal care coverage, at least one visit, percentage	UNICEF & WHO
Goal 6		
HIV prevalence	People living with HIV, 15-49 years old, percentage	UNAIDS
TB incidence	Tuberculosis incidence rate per year per 100,000 population	WHO
TB prevalence	Tuberculosis prevalence rate per 100,000 population	WHO
Goal 7		
Forest cover	Proportion of land area covered by forest, percentage	FAO
Protected area	Terrestrial and marine areas protected to total territorial area, percentage	UNEP
CO2 emissions	Carbon dioxide emissions (CO_2), metric tons of CO_2 per capita (CDIAC) 2010 dataset	
	Carbon dioxide emissions (CO_2); metric tons of CO_2 per capita (UNFCCC-UNDESA/Statistics Division) 2004 dataset	UNFCCC
ODP substance consumption	Consumption of all Ozone-Depleting Substances in ODP metric tons	UNEP
Safe drinking water	Proportion of the population using improved drinking water sources, total	WHO & UNICEF
Basic sanitation	Proportion of the population using improved sanitation facilities, total	WHO & UNICEF

Source: http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Default.aspx

Annex II. Countries on-track and off-track for the MDGs

Region	Country	1 $1.25/day poverty	1 Underweight children	2 Primary enrolment	2 Reaching last grade	2 Primary completion	3 Gender primary	3 Gender secondary	3 Gender tertiary	4 Under-5 mortality	4 Infant mortality	5 Skilled birth attendance	5 Antenatal care (≥ 1 visit)	6 HIV prevalence	6 TB incidence	6 TB prevalence	7 Forest cover	7 Protected area	7 CO2 emissions	7 ODP substance consumption	7 Safe drinking water	7 Basic sanitation
East & North-East Asia	China	●	●			●	●	●	●	■	■	►	■	►	●	●	●	●	◄	●	●	■
	Hong Kong, China			●	●	●	●	●	●						●	●		●	◄			
	Macao, China			■		●	●	●	►						●	●		●				
	DPR Korea		●							◄	◄	◄		►	►	●	◄	●	●	●	●	◄
	Republic of Korea			●	●	●	●	●	■	■	■			►	◄	●	◄	◄	◄	◄	●	●
	Mongolia	●	►	●	■	►	●	●	●	►	■	●	●	►	►	●	◄	●	◄	●	►	►
South East Asia	Brunei Darussalam			●	●	●	●	●	●	■	■	►			●	◄	◄	●	◄	●		
	Cambodia	►	■	■	■	►	►	►	■	■	■	■	■	●	●	●	◄	●	●	●	►	■
	Indonesia		■	●	◄	●	●	●	►	■	■	►	►	◄	●	●	◄	●	●	●	■	■
	Lao PDR	■	■	■	■	■	►	■	►	►	►	■	■	●	●	●	◄	●	●	●	■	►
	Malaysia	●	●	●	◄	●	●	●	●	●	►	●		◄	●	●	◄	●	◄	●	●	●
	Myanmar		■		■	■	●	●	●	■	■	■	◄	●	►	●	◄	●	●	●	●	●
	Philippines	■	■	◄	◄	◄	●	●	●	■	■	■	■	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	■	►
	Singapore									►	●			◄	●	●	►	●	◄	●	●	●
	Thailand	●	●			■	●	●	●	►	●	◄	●	●	►	●	◄	●	●	●	●	●
	Timor-Leste	►	◄	■			►		◄	■	■	◄	◄		►	●	◄	●	●	●	►	►
	Viet Nam	●	●		►		●	●	●	●	●	►	►	◄	◄	●	●	●	◄	●	●	●
South & South-West Asia	Afghanistan		■				■	◄		■	■	■	◄		►	●	◄	►	◄	●	►	■
	Bangladesh	■	►	◄	●	◄	●	●	■	►	►	■	■	►	►	●	◄	●	◄	●	●	■
	Bhutan			●	■	■	●	●	●	►	►	►	►	►	●	●	●	●	◄	●	●	■
	India	■	■	●	■	►	●	►	●	►	■	■	●	●	●	●	►	●	●	●	■	■
	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	►	■	●	●	◄	●	●	►	●	●	●	●	◄
	Maldives		►	●		●	◄	●		●	●	◄			●	●	►		◄	●	●	●
	Nepal	■	■		■	■	►	►	■	►	►	■	■	►	►	◄	◄	●	●	●	●	●
	Pakistan	●	◄	■		►	►	►	●	■	■	■	■	►	►	●	◄	●	●	●	●	●
	Sri Lanka	■	►	●		●	●	●	●	■	■	●		►	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
	Turkey	◄	●	●	◄	●	●	►	●	●	●	►	■	●	●	●	●	●	◄	●	●	●
North & Central Asia	Armenia	●	◄	■	●	●	●	●	●	►	►	●	►	►	●	●	◄	●	◄	●	●	■
	Azerbaijan	●	■	●	●	●	●	●	►	►	►	►		◄	●	●	►	●	◄	●	■	◄
	Georgia	◄	►	●	●	●	●	●	●	■	■	►	◄	►	●	●	►	●	◄	●	●	◄
	Kazakhstan	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	■	■	●	●	◄	◄	●	◄	●	◄	●	◄	●
	Kyrgyzstan	●	●	◄	●	►	●	●	●	■	■	◄	●	►	◄	◄	●	●	◄	●	◄	●
	Russian Federation	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	■	■	■		◄	●	●	◄	●	◄	►	●	►
	Tajikistan	●		●	●	●	●	■	■	■	■	●	►	◄	◄	◄	●	●	◄	●	■	►
	Turkmenistan	●	■							■	■	●	●				►	►	●	●	◄	●
	Uzbekistan	◄	●		●	◄	●	●	◄	■	■	●	●	►	►	●	●	●	●	●	◄	●
Pacific	American Samoa														●	●	◄	●				
	Cook Islands									■	■	►			◄	◄	●	●	◄	●	■	●
	Fiji			◄	►	◄	●	●		■	■			►	●	●	●	●	◄	●		
	French Polynesia														●	●	►	●	◄		●	◄
	Guam														●	●	◄	●			●	◄
	Kiribati			●		●	●	●		■	■	◄			●	●	►	●	●	●	►	■
	Marshall Islands			◄		◄	●	●		■	■	◄			●	●		●	●	●	◄	●
	Micronesia (F.S.)					●				■	■				●	●	►	●	◄	●	►	◄
	Nauru				◄	●	●			◄	◄				●	●		◄	●			
	New Caledonia														●	●	►	●	◄			
	Niue			●	●	●	●					●			●	●	◄	●	◄	●	●	●
	Northern Mariana I.														●	●	◄	●			◄	●
	Palau			●	●	●	●			■	■	●			●	●	●	●	◄	●	●	►
	Papua New Guinea				◄					■	■	■	■	◄	►	●	◄	●	◄	●	◄	◄
	Samoa		►		►	●	●			■	■	●			●	◄	●	●	◄	►	●	◄
	Solomon Islands		■			●	►			■	■	◄			●	●	◄	●	●	●	■	●
	Tonga		●	◄	●	●	●	●	●	■	■	●			●	◄	►	●	◄	●	●	◄
	Tuvalu				●	●	●			■	■	◄			●	◄	►	●	◄	●	●	●
	Vanuatu			●	■	◄	●	►		◄	◄	◄			●	●	◄	●	●	●	◄	●

● Early achiever   ► On track   ■ Slow   ◄ Regressing/No progress

Source: ESCAP, ADB and UNDP (2010), *Paths to 2015: MDG priorities in Asia and the Pacific, Asia-Pacific regional report 2010/2011*

Annex III. Improvement in data availability between 2004 and 2010

Number of indicators meeting minimum data requirements, by country

		2004 Dataset		2010 Dataset	
		Number	%	Number	%
East and North-East Asia	China	14	77.8	16	88.9
	Hong Kong, china	4	22.2	9	50.0
	Macao, China	6	33.3	7	38.9
	DPR Korea	5	27.8	11	61.1
	Republic of Korea	11	61.1	15	83.3
	Mongolia	13	72.2	18	100.0
South-East Asia	Brunei Darussalam	9	50.0	13	72.2
	Cambodia	10	55.6	18	100.0
	Indonesia	12	66.7	17	94.4
	Lao PDR	12	66.7	18	100.0
	Malaysia	12	66.7	18	100.0
	Myanmar	12	66.7	15	83.3
	Philippines	13	72.2	18	100.0
	Singapore	5	27.8	9	50.0
	Thailand	12	66.7	16	88.9
	Timor-Leste	3	16.7	14	77.8
	Viet Nam	13	72.2	13	72.2
South and South-West Asia	Afghanistan	5	27.8	12	66.7
	Bangladesh	13	72.2	17	94.4
	Bhutan	9	50.0	16	88.9
	India	12	66.7	18	100.0
	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	13	72.2	17	94.4
	Maldives	9	50.0	14	77.8
	Nepal	11	61.1	17	94.4
	Pakistan	11	61.1	17	94.4
	Sri Lanka	11	61.1	16	88.9
	Turkey	12	66.7	17	94.4
North and Central Asia	Armenia	5	27.8	18	100.0
	Azerbaijan	11	61.1	18	100.0
	Georgia	10	55.6	18	100.0
	Kazakhstan	13	72.2	17	94.4
	Kyrgyzstan	11	61.1	18	100.0
	Russian Federation	10	55.6	16	88.9
	Tajikistan	9	50.0	17	94.4
	Turkmenistan	5	27.8	11	61.1
	Uzbekistan	9	50.0	17	94.4
Pacific	American Samoa	1	5.6	3	16.7
	Cook Islands	6	33.3	9	50.0
	Fiji	9	50.0	12	66.7
	French Polynesia	3	16.7	6	33.3
	Guam	3	16.7	5	27.8
	Kiribati	6	33.3	13	72.2
	Marshall Islands	4	22.2	12	66.7
	Micronesia (F.S.)	5	27.8	9	50.0
	Nauru	3	16.7	7	38.9
	New Caledonia	1	5.6	4	22.2
	Niue	7	38.9	10	55.6
	Northern Mariana Islands	3	16.7	5	27.8
	Palau	6	33.3	12	66.7
	Papua New Guinea	12	66.7	11	61.1
	Samoa	11	61.1	13	72.2
	Solomon Islands	4	22.2	12	66.7
	Tonga	11	61.1	15	83.3
	Tuvalu	4	22.2	10	55.6
	Vanuatu	9	50.0	14	77.8

Source: ESCAP secretariat based on data obtained from the United Nations MDG Indicators database.

Annex IV. Improvement in data availability between 2004 and 2010

Number of countries (out of a total of 55) meeting minimum data requirements, by indicator

Indicator	2004 Dataset		2010 Dataset	
	Number	%	Number	%
$1.25 per day poverty	20	36.4	25	45.5
Underweight children	12	21.8	28	50.9
Primary enrolment	31	56.4	32	58.2
Reaching last grade	6	10.9	26	47.3
Primary completion	22	40.0	40	72.7
Gender primary	35	63.6	45	81.8
Gender secondary	35	63.6	41	74.5
Gender tertiary	22	40.0	29	52.7
Under-5 mortality	47	85.5	47	85.5
Infant mortality	47	85.5	47	85.5
Skilled birth attendance	0	0.0	43	78.2
HIV prevalence	27	49.1	30	54.5
TB prevalence	0	0.0	55	100.0
Forest cover	49	89.1	51	92.7
Protected area	0	0.0	52	94.5
CO_2 emissions	46	83.6	51	92.7
Safe drinking water	34	61.8	48	87.3
Basic sanitation	30	54.5	48	87.3

Source: ESCAP secretariat based on data obtained from the United Nations MDG Indicators database.

Annex V. Type of data for the latest observation in the 2010 dataset, by country and indicator

Region	Country	$1.25 per day poverty	Underweight children	Primary enrolment	Reaching last grade	Primary completion	Gender primary	Gender secondary	Gender tertiary	Under-5 mortality	Infant mortality	Skilled birth attendance	Antenatal care (≥ 1 visit)	HIV prevalence	TB incidence	TB prevalence	Forest cover	Protected area	CO2 emissions	ODP substance consumption	Safe drinking water	Basic sanitation
East and North-East Asia	China	G	C			C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
East and North-East Asia	Hong Kong, china			C	C	C	C	C	C						E	E		E	G			
East and North-East Asia	Macao, China			C		C	C	C	C						E	E			G			
East and North-East Asia	DPR Korea		C							E	E	CA		E	E	E	E	E	G	C	E	E
East and North-East Asia	Republic of Korea			C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E			E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
East and North-East Asia	Mongolia	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Brunei Darussalam			C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	CA			E	E	C	E	G	C		
South-East Asia	Cambodia	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Indonesia		C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Lao PDR	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Malaysia	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	CA		E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Myanmar		C		C	C	C	C		E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Philippines	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Singapore									E	E			E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Thailand	G	C			C	C	C	C	E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Timor-Leste	G	C	C			C		C	E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South-East Asia	Viet Nam	G	C		E					E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Afghanistan		C				C	C		E	E	CA	NS		E	E	E	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Bangladesh	G	C	C		C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Bhutan			C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	India	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	G	C	C		E	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Maldives		C	C		C	C	E		E	E	CA		E	E	E	E		G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Nepal	G	C		C	C	C	E	C	E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Pakistan	G	C	C		C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Sri Lanka	G	C	C		C	C	E		E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
South and South-West Asia	Turkey	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS		E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Armenia	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Azerbaijan	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	E	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Georgia	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Kazakhstan	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	CA	NS		E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Kyrgyzstan	G	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Russian Federation	G			C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS		E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Tajikistan	G		C	C	C	C	C	C	E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Turkmenistan	G	C							E	E	CA	NS		E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
North and Central Asia	Uzbekistan	G	C		C	C	C	C	C	E	E	CA	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	American Samoa														E	E	C	E				
Pacific	Cook Islands									E	E	CA			E	E	E	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Fiji			C	C	C	C	C		E	E			E	E	E	C	E	G	C		
Pacific	French Polynesia														E	E	E	E	G		E	E
Pacific	Guam														E	E	C	E			E	E
Pacific	Kiribati			E		E	E	E		E	E	NS			E	E	E	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Marshall Islands			C		C	C	C		E	E	NS			E	E		E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Micronesia (F.S.)						C			E	E				E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Nauru					E	E	E		E	E				E	E			G	C		
Pacific	New Caledonia														E	E	E	E	G			
Pacific	Niue					E	C	C				NS			E	E	E	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Northern Mariana Islands														E	E	C	E			E	E
Pacific	Palau					E	E	E		E	E	CA			E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Papua New Guinea						C			E	E	NS	NS	E	E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Samoa			C		C	C	C		E	E	CA			E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Solomon Islands			C			C	C		E	E	NS			E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Tonga			C	C	C	C	C	E	E	E	NS			E	E	E	E	G	C	E	E
Pacific	Tuvalu					E	C			E	E	NS			E	E	E	E			C	E
Pacific	Vanuatu			C	C	C	C	C		E	E	NS			E	E	C	E	G	C	E	E

Source: ESCAP secretariat based on the 2010 dataset obtained from the United Nations MDG indicators database.

Note: Type of data is defined as follows:

C - Country Data: refer to data produced and disseminated by the country (including data adjusted to meet international standards);

CA - Country Adjusted: refer to data produced and provided by the country, but adjusted by the international agency for international comparability to comply with internationally agreed standards, definitions and classifications;

E - Estimated: refer to data estimated by the international agency, when corresponding country data on a specific year or set of years are not available, or when multiple sources exist, or there are issues of data quality. Estimates are based on national data, such as surveys or administrative records, or other sources but on the same variable being estimated;

G - Global monitoring data: refer to data regularly produced by the designated agency for the global monitoring, based on country data. However, there is no corresponding figure at the country level, because the indicator is defined for international monitoring only (e.g. proportion of population below $1.25 a day); and

NS - Not specified: a category used when a figure was provided, but the nature of data was not.

Annex VI. The latest year for which data are available in the 2010 dataset, by country and indicator

Region	Country	$1.25 per day poverty	Underweight children	Primary enrolment	Reaching last grade	Primary completion	Gender primary	Gender secondary	Gender tertiary	Under-5 mortality	Infant mortality	Skilled birth attendance	Antenatal care (≥ 1 visit)	HIV prevalence	TB incidence	TB prevalence	Forest cover	Protected area	CO2 emissions	ODP substance consumption	Safe drinking water	Basic sanitation
Goal		1		2			3			4		5		6			7					
East and North-East Asia	China	05	05			08	08	08	08	08	08	07	07	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Hong Kong, china			05	07	05	05	08	07						08	08		09	07			
	Macao, China			09		09	09	09	08						08	08			07			
	DPR Korea		04							08	08	04		07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	00
	Republic of Korea			08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08			07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Mongolia	08	05	08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	06	05	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
South-East Asia	Brunei Darussalam			08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	99			08	08	05	09	07	08		
	Cambodia	07	05	08	07	08	08	07	08	08	08	05	05	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Indonesia		03	08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	07	07	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Lao PDR	02	06	08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Malaysia	04	05	07	06	07	07	07	07	08	08	05		07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Myanmar		03		07	08	08	07		08	08	01	01	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Philippines	06	03	08	06	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Singapore									08	08			07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Thailand	04	05			07	09	09	09	08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Timor-Leste	07	07	08			08		09	08	08	03	03		08	08	05	09	07	07	08	08
	Viet Nam	06	06		05					08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
South and South-West Asia	Afghanistan		04				08	07		08	08	03	03		08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Bangladesh	05	07	08		08	08	07	07	08	08	07	07	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Bhutan			09	08	09	09	09	08	08	08	07	07	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	India	05	05	07	05	07	07	07	07	08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	05	04	04		07	08	08	08	08	08	05	05	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	00	00
	Maldives		01	08		08	08	06		08	08	04		07	08	08	05		07	08	08	08
	Nepal	04	06		07	02	02	06	04	08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Pakistan	05	02	08		08	08	08	08	08	08	07	07	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Sri Lanka	02	00	08		08	08	04		08	08	07	07	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Turkey	06	08	08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08		08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
North and Central Asia	Armenia	07	05	07	06	07	08	08	07	08	08	07	05	07	08	08		09	07	08	08	08
	Azerbaijan	05	06	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Georgia	05	05	08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	05	05	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Kazakhstan	07	06	08	08	09	09	09	09	08	08	06	06		08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Kyrgyzstan	07	06	08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Russian Federation	07			07	08	08	08	08	08	08	06		07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Tajikistan	04		08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	07	07	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Turkmenistan	98	05							08	08	06	06		08	08	05	09	07	08	05	08
	Uzbekistan	03	06		07	08	08	08	08	08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
Pacific	American Samoa														08	08	05	09				
	Cook Islands									08	08	01			08	08	05	09	07	08	05	08
	Fiji			08	07	08	08	08		08	08			07	08	08	05	09	07	08		
	French Polynesia														08	08	05	09	07		08	08
	Guam														08	08	05	09			08	08
	Kiribati			02		05	07	07		08	08	05			08	08	05	09	07	08	05	05
	Marshall Islands			07		07	07	07		08	08	07			08	08		09	07	08	08	08
	Micronesia (F.S.)						07			08	08				08	08	05	09	07	08	05	05
	Nauru					07	08	08		08	08				08	08			07	07		
	New Caledonia														08	08	05	09	07			
	Niue					05	05	05				06			08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Northern Mariana Islands														08	08	05	09			08	05
	Palau					04	07	07		08	08	02			08	08	05	09	07	08	05	05
	Papua New Guinea						06			08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Samoa			09		09	09	09		08	08	98			08	08	05	09	07	08	05	08
	Solomon Islands			07			07	07		08	08	07			08	08	05	09	07	08	05	05
	Tonga			06	05	06	06	06	04	08	08	01			08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Tuvalu					06	06			08	08	07			08	08	05	09			08	08
	Vanuatu			05	06	07	07	04		08	08	07			08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08
	Median	05	05	08	07	08	08	08	08	08	08	06	06	07	08	08	05	09	07	08	08	08

Source: ESCAP secretariat based on data obtained from the United Nations MDG Indicators database.

Annex VII. Number of available observations over the period of 1990 to 2009 in the 2010 dataset, by country and indicator

Region	Goal	1		2			3			4		5		6			7					
	Country	$1.25 per day poverty	Underweight children	Primary enrolment	Reaching last grade	Primary completion	Gender primary	Gender secondary	Gender tertiary	Under-5 mortality	Infant mortality	Skilled birth attendance	Antenatal care (≥ 1 visit)	HIV prevalence	TB incidence	TB prevalence	Forest cover	Protected area	CO2 emissions	ODP substance consumption	Safe drinking water	Basic sanitation
East and North-East Asia	China	6	7			3	7	6	6	5	5	14	13	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Hong Kong, china			5	4	6	8	9	5						19	19		20	18			
	Macao, China			12		11	12	12	11						17	19			18			
	DPR Korea		4							5	5	4		2	19	19	3	20	18	15	5	2
	Republic of Korea			10	9	11	11	11	11	5	5			2	19	19	3	20	18	18	4	5
	Mongolia	4	4	10	7	10	11	11	11	5	5	4	4	2	19	19	3	20	18	15	5	4
South-East Asia	Brunei Darussalam			5	5	11	11	11	11	5	5	2			14	19	3	20	18	18		
	Cambodia	3	4	7	9	10	10	8	9	5	5	3	3	2	19	19	3	20	18	15	5	5
	Indonesia		4	8	5	9	10	10	7	5	5	13	5	2	19	19	3	20	18	18	5	5
	Lao PDR	3	4	10	9	10	11	10	10	5	5	2	2	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	4	4
	Malaysia	4	7	8	4	8	10	10	9	5	5	8		2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Myanmar		7		7	9	10	10		5	5	3	2	2	19	19	3	20	18	16	5	4
	Philippines	6	5	10	6	8	10	9	7	5	5	6	5	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Singapore									5	5			2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Thailand	7	2			2	12	10	12	5	5	2	3	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Timor-Leste	2	3	3			4		2	5	5	3	3		19	19	3	20	6	8	3	3
	Viet Nam	5	9		5					5	5	4	4	2	19	19	3	20	18	16	5	5
South and South-West Asia	Afghanistan		3				9	6		5	5	2	2		19	19	3	20	18	12	4	4
	Bangladesh	4	5	3		4	4	9	9	5	5	8	8	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Bhutan			7	4	7	8	8	6	5	5	4	2	2	19	19	3	20	18	12	3	3
	India	2	3	8	4	9	10	9	9	5	5	4	4	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	4	3	6		9	11	11	11	5	5	3	2	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	3	3
	Maldives		3	9		5	10	7		5	5	3		2	19	19	3		18	19	5	5
	Nepal	2	5		7	5	5	8	6	5	5	6	5	2	19	19	3	20	18	18	5	5
	Pakistan	5	4	7		4	9	7	7	5	5	6	6	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Sri Lanka	3	3	3		6	8	4		5	5	3	3	2	19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
	Turkey	4	5	10	5	6	11	11	11	5	5	4	4		19	19	3	20	18	19	5	5
North and Central Asia	Armenia	6	3	7	6	7	8	9	10	5	5	5	3	2	19	19	3	20	16	15	4	4
	Azerbaijan	3	4	11	10	10	11	11	11	5	5	7	4	2	19	19	3	20	16	14	5	4
	Georgia	9	2	5	9	10	11	11	11	5	5	11	3	2	19	19	3	20	16	16	5	5
	Kazakhstan	6	3	9	9	10	11	11	11	5	5	3	3		19	19	3	20	16	16	5	5
	Kyrgyzstan	5	2	10	9	10	10	11	10	5	5	2	2	2	19	19	3	20	16	18	4	4
	Russian Federation	7			4	5	10	6	7	5	5	17		2	19	19	3	20	16	19	4	4
	Tajikistan	3		9	9	10	11	10	10	5	5	4	3	2	19	19	3	20	16	15	4	4
	Turkmenistan	2	2							5	5	3	2		19	19	3	20	16	19	3	5
	Uzbekistan	3	3			9	10	11	10	10	5	5	3	3	2	19	19	3	20	16	17	5
Pacific	American Samoa														19	19	3	20				
	Cook Islands									5	5	3			19	19	3	20	18	13	4	5
	Fiji			6	5	9	11	11		5	5			2	19	19	3	20	18	19		
	French Polynesia														18	19	3	20	18		5	5
	Guam														12	19	3	20			5	5
	Kiribati			2		7	8	8		5	5	3			19	19	3	20	18	17	4	4
	Marshall Islands			4		4	8	6		5	5	2						20	18	19	5	5
	Micronesia (F.S.)						3			5	5				19	19	3	20	9	15	4	4
	Nauru					4	9	9		4	4				19	19			18	14		
	New Caledonia														19	19	3	20	18			
	Niue					4	5	5				4			19	19	3	20	18	13	5	5
	Northern Mariana Islands														17	19	3	20			5	4
	Palau					3	6	6		5	5	3			19	19	3	20	18	15	4	4
	Papua New Guinea						8			5	5	3	2	2	19	19	3	20	18	18	5	5
	Samoa			8		8	9	8		5	5	2			19	19	3	20	18	18	4	5
	Solomon Islands			4			10	10		5	5	3			19	19	3	20	18	19	3	3
	Tonga			5	3	6	9	7	6	5	5	3			19	19	3	20	18	15	4	5
	Tuvalu					8	8			5	5	4			19	19	3	20		17	5	5
	Vanuatu			7	2	7	10	7		5	5	4			19	19	3	20	18	15	5	4
	Median	4	4	7	6	8	10	9	10	5	5	3	3	2	19	19	3	20	18	18	5	5

Source: ESCAP secretariat based on the 2010 dataset obtained from the United Nations MDG Indicators database.