

**Case study for Road Map on Statistics for SDGs 2.0**  
**OECD: Child well-being**

**Description**

Based on its Measuring Distance Study<sup>1</sup>, OECD used the same methodology – adapted to suit purpose - to assess the situation of children and young people in relation to the SDG targets<sup>2</sup>. As in the case of the original Measuring Distance Study, the UN Global Indicator Framework was taken as a starting point<sup>3</sup>. However, for the purpose of this analysis, the indicator set was divided into two groups: indicators which can be assessed specifically for children and young people, and indicators that pertain to common public goods that cannot be easily disaggregated across population groups. The indicators selected for the first group each fall into at least one of the following categories:

1. The indicator belongs to a target explicitly focusing on children. E.g. target 4.1: “By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes”.
2. The indicator relates to a target where the UN Global Indicator Framework specifies that data should be disaggregated by age. E.g. target 1.2 on reducing poverty is measured by the indicator “Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age”.
3. The corresponding target is not specific to children, and disaggregation by age is not explicitly required by the target, but the indicator is nonetheless meaningful and available for children and/or young people. E.g. target 16.1 on reducing all forms of violence, which is measured by the indicator “Proportion of the population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live”.
4. The indicator cannot be disaggregated, and the target does not focus on children per se, but is directly related to the immediate environment of children. E.g. target 3.1 on maternal mortality.

Common public goods, on the other hand, refer to targets that are formulated at the economy- or society-wide level. In these cases, it is not straightforward (or even meaningful) to measure results separately for children and young people (e.g. target 14.5 on conserving at least 10% of coastal and marine areas). These indicators were therefore not assessed in this analysis, as the main goal was to focus on children and youth. A detailed analysis including these indicators, which are often central to the resources that will help to sustain children’s well-being in the future, can be found in the OECD Measuring Distance Study.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.oecd.org/sdd/measuring-distance-to-the-sdgs-targets.htm>

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/child-well-being-and-the-sustainable-development-goals\\_5e53b12f-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/child-well-being-and-the-sustainable-development-goals_5e53b12f-en)

<sup>3</sup> This framework continues to evolve; the analysis used the version adopted by the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) in March 2017.