Nairobi., 25.02.2026

**Written comments by GERMANY on:**

**Baseline of monitoring framework (Preparations for the first session of the Executive Board 2026: Update on the implementation of the 2026-2029 Strategic plan)**

- The logic of contribution versus attribution is very helpful. For the next submission, it would be appreciated if an annex could be included detailing the indicators (with disaggregation), baselines, targets with rationale, data collection methods, means of verification incl dependence on other sources and underlying assumptions.

**Detailed questions around Monitoring Framework:**

- **Indicator 1:** There appears to be a huge data gap given that SDG 11 data coverage is below 50%.
- **Indicator 2:** What is considered as a benefit here? Programme presence? Delivered outputs (outcomes below), measured change for the population? Baseline not available and data sources still evolving. Hence suggestion to declare Y1 as "baseline establishment year".
- **Indicator 8:** Both unclear and measurement will be difficult, given that multiple datasets would be required to make a causal link to alignment with UN Habitat support. These could be easily output formulations instead of Indicator. Very assumption heavy indicator. Suggestion to separate number of aligned policies and estimated population coverage. Both are not observable. One is countable, the other an estimate.
- **Indicator 9:** How can methodology be partial; baseline exists but target not set? Is it maybe methodologically not entirely clear? Year to year measurement will be highly difficult with this one, a minimum threshold is needed.
- **Means of implementation:** Some outcome statements formulated to measure system changes but indicators are mostly measuring adoption or implementation of plans: risk of results gaps. Either outcome formulations to be adapted or indicator to be added that can demonstrate achievement. e.g.: investment mobilised.
- **Outcome:** Outcome formulation and indicators not really matching well. Outcome formulation rather system change while indicators measure concretely strategic adoptions and investment flow. Does not imply functioning.
- **Indicator 11:** How will external economic growth be distinguished from UN Habitat programme?
- **Indicator 12:** MI partially done but without baseline ready. Wouldn't the methodology need to take baseline into account?
- **Indicator 13**: Attempts to measure many aspects. indicator definition sheet required. Minimum functionality criteria to be defined.
- **Indicator 15**: How does institutionalized look like? Not a smart indicator. No metric set. 10 countries implementing 1-10 measures to varying degree would be all counted here. Might be difficult to measure across countries.
- **Indicator 17:** Not entirely clear on what qualifies as „use". Evidence rule and definition will need to be set. Suggestion for the indicator definition matrix to set a classification for knowledge products e.g.: technical guidance, toolkits, digital products.

- **Outcome:** No increased awareness measured in the indicators.
- **Indicator 21:** Why is no target set when baseline exists?
- **Indicator 21+22:** Rather proxy to outcome formulation. would ideally need to be paired with behaviour change or uptake of policy that can be linked or attributed to the campaigns and events.