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Leaving No One Behind

➢ In the 2030 Agenda, member States pledged to leave no one behind

➢ Leaving no one behind (LNOB) means moving beyond assessing average progress, towards ensuring progress for all population groups at a disaggregated level

➢ LNOB is the central, transformative promise of the 2030 Agenda and its SDGs
A five-step methodology for LNOB at country level

**Step 1**
Who is being left behind? Gathering the evidence

**Step 2**
Why? Prioritization and analysis

**Step 3**
What? What should be done?

**Step 4**
How to measure and monitor progress

**Step 5**
How to advance accountability for LNOB

**Across**
Meaningful participation

Source: United Nations Sustainable Development Group’s ‘Operational guide to Leaving No One Behind’
Statistical tools for LNOB

❖ Measuring inequality of opportunity (D-index)
  ✓ Average access masks unequal distribution

❖ Identifying the furthest behind (Tree classification)
  ✓ Help direct policy interventions

❖ Measuring gaps between population groups
  ✓ Are they significantly narrower?
Our basic assumptions

- Access to fundamental services (opportunities) should be universal

- Individual circumstances & characteristics should NOT impact access
Which opportunities have we studied?

**Individual-based**
- ✓ Education (secondary & higher)
- ✓ Malnutrition (stunting & wasting & overweight)
- ✓ Women’s health (modern contraception & skilled birth attendance)
- ✓ Full-time employment

**Household-based**
- ✓ Safe drinking water
- ✓ Basic sanitation
- ✓ Clean energy (electricity & clean fuels)
- ✓ Ownership of a bank account
Which circumstances are we using?

- Wealth: Bottom 40 or Top 60 households
- Residence: Living in rural or urban area
- Number of children in the household
- Sex: male or female
- Marital Status: single, married, divorced
- Education level: primary, secondary or higher
- Ethnicity, religion, language
- Age group: 15-24, 25-49, 50+
The D-index methodology

- Measuring inequality in access to any of the 14 identified opportunities
- Using combinations of circumstances to create distinct groups

\[ D = \frac{1}{2p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i |p_i - \bar{p}| \]

- Takes values from 0-1, similar to Gini
- D-index can be decomposed using the Shapley method

\[ D_A = \sum_{S \subseteq N \{A\}} \frac{|S|! (n - |S| - 1)!}{n!} \left[ D(S \cup \{A\}) - D(S) \right] \]

The contribution of characteristic A to the D-Index is given

\[ M_A = \frac{D_A}{D(N)} \]
Average inequality of opportunities in Asia-Pacific

- Clean fuels
- Higher education
- Full-time employment
- Bank account
- Secondary education
- Basic sanitation
- Professional help in childbirth
- Electricity
- Modern contraception
- Basic drinking water

Average D-index
Inequality of opportunity varies greatly by country.
Classification tree methodology

➢ Is an algorithm that partitions the sample into different groups based on the circumstances chosen (e.g. gender, residence)

➢ The algorithm starts by searching for the first split (or branch) of the tree, calculating entropy, where entropy for jth end node is defined as:

\[ I_E(p_j) = -(p_j \times \log_2 p_j + (1 - p_j) \times \log_2(1 - p_j)) \]

➢ The aggregated entropy for the entire tree is calculated by:

\[ H(T) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} q_j \times I_E(p_j) \]

➢ Each time the sample is partitioned new end-nodes are generated and the entropy is calculated and compared to the entropy before the new partition. The algorithm continues until no more increments of entropy reduction (information gain) can be made by new partition.
Completion of secondary education in Lao PDR

- Richer men in urban areas: Rate: 64%
- Richer women in urban areas: Rate: 58%
- Richer men in rural areas: Rate: 38%
- Richer women in rural areas: Rate: 26%
- Poorer men: Rate: 12%
- Poorer women: Rate: 5.4%

Source: SDD elaboration based on MICS 2017
Completion of secondary education

Source: SDD elaboration based on latest DHS and MICS
Measuring progress by studying gaps over time

- Define advantaged vs. disadvantaged groups
- Measure access to an opportunity at 2 points in time
- Estimate if gaps have closed, significantly
Closing the gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upward trend</th>
<th>Gap narrowing</th>
<th>No evidence of gap change</th>
<th>Gaps widening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of trend</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward trend</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td></td>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Green: Faster convergence
- Yellow: Inclusive progress
- Pink: Regressing or growing apart
Malaysia: Percentage of population having access to education, 2009–2016

- Persons with no disabilities
- Men
- Women
- Persons with disabilities

Percentage (%)

2009 2015
Accelerating development

SDG Accelerator :

“…. social protection systems and floors, are likely to have multiplying impacts not only for that group but for broader society, across multiple goals and targets.”

Source: Leaving No One Behind, USDG Operational Guide (draft), 2019
Social Protection can help accelerate development

Investment in social protection

- Promotes economic growth
- Reduces inequality
- Fosters social cohesion

- Builds human capital and increase labour participation
- Mitigates shocks and minimizes losses in production
- Drives demand and economic activity

- Reduces inequality
- Fosters social cohesion

- Mitigates shocks and minimizes losses in production
- Drives demand and economic activity

- Promotes economic growth
- Reduces inequality
- Fosters social cohesion

- Builds human capital and increase labour participation
- Mitigates shocks and minimizes losses in production
- Drives demand and economic activity

Social protection can help eliminate poverty

**2020**
PEOPLE IN THE REGION LIFTED OUT OF POVERTY

126 million
COUNTRIES ENDING POVERTY
1. Azerbaijan
2. Malaysia
3. Thailand

**2025**
PEOPLE IN THE REGION LIFTED OUT OF POVERTY

167 million
COUNTRIES ENDING POVERTY
1. China
2. Mongolia
3. Turkey

**2030**
PEOPLE IN THE REGION LIFTED OUT OF POVERTY

233 million
COUNTRIES ENDING POVERTY
1. Armenia
2. Fiji
3. Tajikistan
4. Viet Nam
...and by 2030 end extreme poverty in:
✓ Indonesia
✓ Philippines
Public spending on social protection
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Is social protection inclusive in Asia & Pacific?

✓ Only 2 out of 10 unemployed receive benefits or support
✓ Only 3 out of 10 families with children receive benefits
✓ Only 3 out of 10 mothers receive maternity benefits
✓ Only 4 out of 10 people have access to health care
✓ Only 5 out of 10 older persons receive a pension
✓ Only 5 out of 10 persons with disabilities receive a benefit
An affordable investment across countries

Public expenditure on social protection

Percentage of GDP

ESCAP regional average

Lowest income quartile
Second lowest quartile
Second highest quartile
www.unescap.org/our-work/social-development
Thank you

www.unescap.org