



**Annex**

# **‘Leave no one behind’ index 2018**

## **Annex: methodology, policy analysis and references**

Francesca Grandi, Stephanie Manea and Amy Kirbyshire

July 2018

---

This annex details the methodology, scoring procedures and data sources underlying the 2018 ODI ‘leave no one behind’ index and outcome score.

---

## Methodology for the ‘leave no one behind’ index

### Data component

Household surveys are crucial to identifying who is being left behind. Countries were therefore scored based on how recently they conducted such surveys.

### Scoring the data component

Ready	Countries in which surveys have been conducted within the past three years (since 2015)
Partially ready	Countries in which surveys have been conducted within the past five years (since 2013), are currently being conducted, or will be conducted in the next year (until 2019)
Not ready	Countries that have not conducted surveys in the last five years and are not planning on doing so in the next year

### Sources for the data component analysis

To build this indicator we used data from any of the following relevant surveys:

- Demographic and Health Survey (DHS)<sup>1</sup>
- Multiple Income Cluster Survey (MIC)<sup>2</sup>
- Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS) Survey<sup>3</sup>
- European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions Survey (SILC)<sup>4</sup>

Results were also cross-checked with the data sources used in the World Bank’s PovcalNet<sup>5</sup> to establish whether any national surveys were undertaken more recently<sup>6</sup> (see list of national surveys in Appendix 1).

### Policy component

Previous ODI research identified three clusters of policy that would be most effective in leaving no one behind: key services; public awareness; and institutional and legal

reforms (Greenhill, 2017a; 2017b; Samman and Stuart, 2017; Stuart et al., 2016).

As such, the first ‘leave no one behind’ index (Greenhill, 2017a) reviewed one policy area from each of these clusters: free health services at the point of delivery (services); anti-discrimination employment laws (legislation); and legislation on women’s land ownership (institutions).<sup>7</sup>

This 2018 index, and its future annual iterations, continues and expands upon the 2017 model. It includes the same policy areas – health, anti-discriminatory laws and gender-sensitive land access – updating them where possible, and adding one – resilience to natural hazard-related disasters and climate change, which will be critical and is the theme of the 2018 High-level Political Forum (HLPF).

To construct those same indicators, the 2018 index shifts the focus away from qualitative, country-based analyses and towards quantitative, centrally compiled information sources.

**Health access.** In 2017, the indicator for health was calculated by qualitatively assessing each country’s legislation – specifically whether national legislation provided for universal health coverage, i.e. whether health services were free at point of delivery – while measuring whether the following quantitative indicators were above, below, or average: health expenditure (percentage of gross domestic product (GDP)), out-of-pocket expenditure (percentage of GDP), antiretroviral therapy coverage (percentage of people with advanced HIV infection), and perceptions of government and social security share of assistance costs (Gallup poll). In an effort to streamline this measure, the 2018 leave no one behind indicator is instead based on the figures of legal deficit in universal health protection in rural areas from the latest World Social Protection Report of the International Labour Organization (ILO, 2017). Thus, rather than assessing countries according to international

---

1 <https://dhsprogram.com/what-we-do/survey/survey-display-471.cfm>

2 <http://mics.unicef.org/surveys>

3 [http://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/lsmr#\\_r=1516018012694&collection=&country](http://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/lsmr#_r=1516018012694&collection=&country)

4 <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/income-and-living-conditions/quality/eu-and-national-quality-reports>

5 <http://iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/povOnDemand.aspx>

6 This was the case for a number of countries, which we accounted for in the countries’ rating. No surveys were found for Monaco.

7 Its data sources were primarily country-specific policy documentation (e.g., national legislation or policy documents; Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO) Health in the Americas, Country Chapters, 2012 ([www.paho.org/salud-en-las-americanas-2012](http://www.paho.org/salud-en-las-americanas-2012)); Savedoff, W.D. (2009) *A Moving Target: Universal Access to Healthcare Services in Latin America and the Caribbean*, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Working Paper 67, etc.) but also drew on various databases: ODI Poverty Eradication Policy Preparedness Index (PEPPI), L&E Global Knowledge Center on Anti-discrimination; US State Department *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices*; Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) reports on women’s access to land; the Social Institutions and Gender Index (SIGI) compiled by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Centre; the World Health Organization (WHO) Universal Health Coverage Data Portal (<http://apps.who.int/gho/cabinet/uhc.jsp>; [www.who.int/universal\\_health\\_coverage/en/](http://www.who.int/universal_health_coverage/en/)), etc.

---

spending targets on health in general, the 2018 indicator measures governments' efforts more specifically related to protecting the most vulnerable. The indicator was given a value of 0 when the proportion of a population without legal health coverage was above 80%; a value of 1 when it was below 20%; and a value of 0.5 when it was between those two thresholds.

**Anti-discriminatory employment laws.** Similar to our approach in 2017, the 2018 leave no one behind indicator of gender-based discrimination in employment laws was calculated through the qualitative analysis of country-specific official reports – the L&E Global Knowledge Center overviews of anti-discrimination laws; the CEDAW reports on countries' compliance with the treaty; and the SIGI Country Profiles. From these sources, it was assessed whether countries had discriminatory laws or rather specific anti-discrimination provisions in their employment-related legislation and whether governments had specific policies in place to facilitate women's access to the labour market.<sup>8</sup> A score of 1 was given to countries with laws explicitly prohibiting discrimination and policies to implement them; a score of 0.5 to countries with either laws or policies prohibiting discrimination or facilitating gender equality in the labour market; a score of 0 to countries with discriminatory laws or policies that explicitly hampered equality in the labour market.

**Women's land ownership.** While in 2017 the indicator for women's access to land ownership was calculated through the qualitative analysis of each country's legislation, in 2018 the same indicator was based on countries' ranking in the SIGI compiled by the OECD Development Centre – specifically the Restricted Resources and Assets Value component of such index. The leave no one behind indicator was given a value of 0 when the discrimination level in the SIGI was above 0.5; a value of 1 when it was below 0.15; and a value of 0.5 for the levels between those two thresholds.<sup>9</sup>

**Resilience to climate change and disasters.** The 2018 index adds this new policy area due to its importance in achieving the 2030 leave no one behind Agenda and its pertinence to the 2018 HLPF.<sup>10</sup> The indicator for resilience to climate change and natural hazard-related disasters was calculated through text analysis of national adaptation documents. To gauge how well the 'leave no one behind' principles are upheld in national adaptation policies to climate change, we looked at the occurrence of leave no one behind language across national adaptation documents submitted to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC),<sup>11</sup> including adaptation components of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs)<sup>12</sup> (or, where necessary, the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions),<sup>13</sup> the

---

8 CEDAW Concluding Observation Reports ([http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?Lang=en](http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/TBSearch.aspx?Lang=en)); L&E Global Knowledge Center Report, Employment Law Overview, 2017 (<https://knowledge.leglobal.org/subjects/knowledge/anti-discrimination-laws/>); SIGI Country Profiles ([www.genderindex.org/countries](http://www.genderindex.org/countries)).

9 Our three categories map roughly on SIGI's categories ('very low' and 'low', 'medium' and 'high' and 'very high'). They cannot correspond exactly because the SIGI includes more countries than our more limited sample and ranks them on a curve.

10 Resilience features in the four major international policy processes for climate, disaster, development and humanitarian issues (Peters et al., 2016). The Paris Climate Agreement (UNFCCC) includes a goal on adaptation, in terms of 'enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change, with a view to contributing to sustainable development' (UNFCCC, 2015: 9). The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 targets include: (1) reducing global mortality from disasters; (2) reducing the number of affected people by disasters; (3) reducing direct economic loss from disasters; (4) reducing disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services; and (5) increasing the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies (UNISDR, 2015). These targets and indicators are used to measure progress on several goals within the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): SDG 1: end poverty in all its forms everywhere; SDG 11: make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable; and SDG 13: take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (UN, 2015). Following the World Humanitarian Summit, the Agenda for Humanity highlights five core responsibilities and 24 strategic transformations to 'reduce humanitarian need, risk and vulnerability', the third of which is to 'leave no one behind' in situations of conflict, disaster, vulnerability and risk (UN, 2016: 3).

11 These documents serve different purposes as they cover different timelines and countries (thereby reducing the availability of country data across time and in regard to leave no one behind).

12 [www4.unfccc.int/ndcregistry/Pages/All.aspx](http://www4.unfccc.int/ndcregistry/Pages/All.aspx)

13 [www4.unfccc.int/submissions/index/Submission%20Pages/submissions.aspx](http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/index/Submission%20Pages/submissions.aspx)

National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)<sup>14</sup> and the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs)<sup>15,16</sup> and developed countries' strategies and plans.<sup>17</sup> For each document, we performed a word search and counted the number of words relevant to leave no one behind principles<sup>18</sup> or related to vulnerable groups or people. The number of relevant words identified was calculated as a percentage of the number of adaptation-relevant words over the total document length. Countries with little or no mention of indicative words in any documents (below 0.10% of total document word count) were scored as 0, while countries with 0.10–0.50% of indicative words, as 0.5.<sup>19</sup> The remaining five countries with a score of 1 – Jordan, Mali, Mexico, Peru and Viet Nam – also scored over the mean plus one standard deviation (0.33%), with percentages ranging between 0.58% and 0.81%. These countries performed nearly twice as well as the next best performers.<sup>20</sup>

### Scoring the policy component

To calculate the policy score, each country was given a ranking of 0, 0.5 or 1 in each policy area, according to the degree to which they had the policy or legislation in place, and then the sum of those four scores was calculated.

For countries with data available for all four indicators (women's land access, health access, anti-discriminatory employment laws and resilience):

Ready	Countries with an overall score of 3 or above
Partially ready	Countries with an overall score of 1.5 to 2.5
Not ready	Countries with an overall score of 0.5 or less

For countries with data available for three of the total four indicators:

Ready	Countries with an overall score of 2 or above
Partially ready	Countries with an overall score of 1 to 1.5
Not ready	Countries with an overall score of 0.5 or less

Countries with data available for only one or two out of the four indicators were not scored and 'insufficient data' was noted.

### Data sources for the policy component

The main data sources are:

- SIGI compiled by the OECD Development Centre – specifically the Restricted Resources and Assets Value component of such index

14 [www4.unfccc.int/nap/Pages/national-adaptation-plans.aspx](http://www4.unfccc.int/nap/Pages/national-adaptation-plans.aspx)

15 [http://unfccc.int/adaptation/workstreams/national\\_adaptation\\_programmes\\_of\\_action/items/4585.php?black=j](http://unfccc.int/adaptation/workstreams/national_adaptation_programmes_of_action/items/4585.php?black=j)

16 Support for producing NAPAs was the first major adaptation initiative under the UNFCCC, which aimed to address the most urgent and immediate adaptation needs in the most climate-vulnerable countries. All least developed countries (LDCs) from 2004 onward submitted these documents. The NAP process, introduced in 2010, facilitates countries to conduct comprehensive, medium- and long-term climate adaptation planning, and integrate adaptation concerns into national policies and plans, building on existing adaptation activities. All developing countries (not just LDCs) are invited to submit the resulting NAPs to the UNFCCC. The NAP process was introduced in 2010 under the Cancun Adaptation Framework, and to date, 10 countries have submitted their NAPs and over 80 countries are believed to have begun the NAP process. Every country submitted INDCs ahead of the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP21), which were converted into NDCs once Parties joined the Paris Agreement. While some developing countries called for the inclusion of an adaptation component as a requirement of the (I)NDCs, this was made optional, and the NDCs are primarily a vehicle to communicate national mitigation commitments. However, most countries did choose to provide descriptions of adaptation goals, priorities, actions and needs, alongside their mitigation plans. Since states received no guidance for the adaptation content, the scope and quality of that component varies considerably. As NDCs are shorter communication documents rather than detailed national plans and large segments of them cover mitigation, even the NDCs with adaptation components contain considerably less adaptation-relevant text than NAPs or NAPAs. For the purposes of this study, we looked only at the adaptation text of countries' NDCs, where they exist, and disregarded mitigation text.

17 [www4.unfccc.int/nap/Pages/adaptation-plans-and-strategies.aspx](http://www4.unfccc.int/nap/Pages/adaptation-plans-and-strategies.aspx)

18 The full list of words included in the document search is: poor/poverty; equitable; marginalised; women/female/gender; child/children; minority/ethnic/race; caste; indigenous; disability; Hyogo/Sendai; leave no one behind. Despite the relevance of 'vulnerable' we omitted this because it appears regularly throughout the documents with regard to climate vulnerability more generally (including of sectors, regions, communities and other issues), and not only in reference to the groups of concern to the leave no one behind agenda. Given the IPCC definition of vulnerability as 'sensitivity or susceptibility to harm, and lack of capacity to cope and adapt', many instances of 'vulnerable/ vulnerability' will refer to these groups – usually, within a wider community of vulnerable people, such as people dependent on rain fed agriculture, or located in vulnerable regions.)

19 For the NAPs and NAPAs, the threshold between 0 and 0.5 was set as a percentage – 0.1% when considered to represent more than tokenistic reference to leave no one behind issues, while 0.5 to 1 set at 0.5%. For the NDCs, any country with just one or no mention of any of the leave no one behind words was given a 0, and the boundary between 0.5 and 1 set at 0.5%.

20 For the countries that produced more than one document for adaptation measures, the highest of all their scores was selected for the final analysis.

- ILO *World Social Protection Report*
- the L&E Global Knowledge Center overviews of anti-discrimination laws; the CEDAW reports on countries' compliance with the treaty
- national adaptation documents submitted to the UNFCCC.

## Financing component

A necessary condition to leave no one behind is to meet internationally agreed targets for public spending on health, education and social protection. Countries were assessed based on whether they did so, according to the following targets:

1. **Education:** country meets either of the two targets set out by the Education for All (EFA) coalition, by which education accounts for either 20% of total government expenditure or 6% of GDP
2. **Health:** country meets the Abuja target of 15% of government expenditure for health. Only African countries agreed to this target but we consider it to be a reasonable target for other countries too
3. **Social protection:** country meets the ILO minimum threshold of 2.9% of GDP going toward social protection mechanisms.

## Rating the financing component

Ready	Countries that meet the target in two or more sectors
Partially ready	Countries that meet the target in one sector
Not ready	Countries that do not meet the target in any of the sectors

## Data sources for the financing component

The main database used for education and health spending was the World Bank's World Development Indicators,<sup>21</sup> which is consistent and up to date with the United Nations Scientific, Educational and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO)<sup>22</sup> indicators on education and the WHO's<sup>23</sup> indicators on health. The main source for social protection spending was the ILO's *World Social Protection Report 2017–19*.<sup>24</sup> To compile the most up to date figures as possible, we used alternative sources to integrate that core data. Among these was the Government Spending Watch (GSW),<sup>25</sup> a joint initiative by Development Finance International and Oxfam to track government spending on the SDGs, with data in all three areas.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, EUROSTAT<sup>27</sup> indicators on general expenditure according to the Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG) were used in all three areas for European Economic Area (EEA) countries. Other sources included the OECD health resources<sup>28</sup> database, used to extract health spending, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) Government Finance Statistics<sup>29</sup> (expenditure by COFOG), used to extract education spending.

The figures used to calculate social protection spending were drawn from a variety of additional sources, including the OECD general government spending<sup>30</sup> database, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC/CEPAL) Database on Social Investment,<sup>31</sup> the World Bank Atlas of Social Protection Indicators of Resilience and Equity (ASPIRE)<sup>32</sup> database, the Asian Development Bank Social

21 <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=world-development-indicators&preview=on>

22 <http://data.uis.unesco.org/index.aspx?queryid=181>

23 <http://apps.who.int/nha/database/ViewData/Indicators/en>

24 [www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS\\_604882/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS_604882/lang--en/index.htm)

25 [www.governmentspendingwatch.org/spending-data](http://www.governmentspendingwatch.org/spending-data)

26 Most of the GSW data reflects planned expenditures by governments, a sufficiently good indicator of the governments' commitment given the limited availability of actual expenditures.

27 <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/government-finance-statistics/data/database>

28 <https://data.oecd.org/healthres/health-spending.htm>

29 <http://data.imf.org/?sk=5804C5E1-0502-4672-BDCD-671BCDC565A9>

30 <https://data.oecd.org/gga/general-government-spending.htm>

31 <https://observatoriosocial.cepal.org/inversion/en/indicador/expenditure-social-protection>

32 <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/aspire/>

Protection Indicator,<sup>33</sup> and the ILOSTAT<sup>34</sup> database. In some cases, the figures were drawn from national statistics offices, government documents, or reports by international organisations (see Appendix 2). In some cases, no recent data could be found (see Appendix 3).

### Overall country score

Each country was given an overall rating based on the rating across the three areas of data, policy and finance. If a country lacked data in one of the three areas, we did not rank it, due to ‘insufficient data’. For 84 of the 86 countries, the overall score was calculated as the sum of the scores in the three areas – with a maximum score of six, or ‘ready’ in all three areas, and a minimum of 0, or ‘not ready’ in any.

Ready	Countries with an overall score of 4 or above (ready in 2 or more areas)
Partially ready	Countries with an overall score of 1.5 to 3.5
Not ready	Countries with an overall score of 1 or below

### Methodology for the outcome score

Adding a separate analysis of countries’ progress on outcomes allows an additional cross check as to whether the benefits of progress toward the SDGs extend to the poorest, the most disadvantaged and the most vulnerable. The 2018 LNOB outcome score measures four policy outcomes: under-five mortality rate; electricity access; undernourishment; and financial inclusion.

**Under-five mortality rate.**<sup>35</sup> Due to the centrality of healthcare for the leave no one behind agenda, we decided to include health both as a policy and as an outcome indicator. Latest research confirms and illustrates that governments’ commitment to invest in health systems that prioritise newborns is key to reach the poorest and the most marginalised, even under budgetary constraints. Most babies do not die from medical causes (such as prematurity or pneumonia), but rather because ‘their families are too poor or marginalized to access the care they need’ (UNICEF, 2018: 14). We used the mortality rate of children under five to measure governments’ achievements in providing quality health services to the most

marginalised. Countries with a mortality rate below the SDG maximum target level of 25 deaths per 1,000 live births were awarded a score of 1. Countries that on past performance since 1990 are expected to be below 25 deaths per 1,000 live births by 2030 were awarded a score of 0.5 based on the assumption that they would sustain the rates of reduction in mortality rates they exhibited in 1990–2016. Countries that, according to this projection, would still record mortality rates above that target by 2030 were awarded a score of 0.

**Electricity access.** We chose the percentage of total population with access to electricity to measure the policy outcome relating to the ‘access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all’ (SDG 7).<sup>36</sup> The leave no one behind indicator for electricity access was given a value of 0 when the proportion of population with access to electricity was below 50%; a value of 1 when it was above 90%; and a value of 0.5 when it was between those two thresholds.

**Undernourishment.** Adequate food is critical for the livelihoods and wellbeing of all and, in particular, for lifting the poorest from poverty and providing an important safety net for many households. The leave no one behind indicator for undernourishment was given a value of 0 when the proportion of undernourished population was above 20%; a value of 1 when it was below 3%; and a value of 0.5 when it was between those two thresholds.

**Financial inclusion.** Access to formal banking institutions is crucial to lift the marginalised from exclusion and build a sustainable path out of poverty or extreme poverty. We chose to include the percentage of people among the population’s poorest 40% who have an account in a formal financial institution as a measure of financial inclusion. The leave no one behind indicator for financial inclusion was given a value of 0 when the proportion of the population’s poorest 40% with an account in a formal institution was below 50%; a value of 1 when it was above 90%; and a value of 0.5 when it was between those two values.

### Scoring

To calculate the overall outcome score, each country was given a ranking of 0, 0.5 or 1 on each outcome, according to the degree to which they achieved certain

33 <https://spi.adb.org/spidmz/>

34 [http://www.ilo.org/ilostat/faces/oracle/webcenter/portalapp/pagehierarchy/Page27.jspx;ILOSTATCOOKIE=7SlwKrJymFPo0IKTIas8UNVpMrSKYvT\\_OLuI0zWxB-wYCIDW6IZp!-82771033?indicator=SOC\\_PSPE\\_EXP\\_RT&subject=SOC&datasetCode=A&collectionCode=SSI&\\_adf.ctrl-state=4o93ylxtc\\_4&\\_afLoop=1921306564334518&\\_afWindowMode=0&\\_afWindowId=null#!%40%40%3Findicator%3DSOC\\_PSPE\\_EXP\\_RT%26\\_afWindowId%3Dnull%26subject%3DSOC%26\\_afLoop%3D1921306564334518%26datasetCode%3DA%26collectionCode%3DSSI%26\\_afWindowMode%3D0%26\\_adf.ctrl-state%3D3igadq6ez\\_4](http://www.ilo.org/ilostat/faces/oracle/webcenter/portalapp/pagehierarchy/Page27.jspx;ILOSTATCOOKIE=7SlwKrJymFPo0IKTIas8UNVpMrSKYvT_OLuI0zWxB-wYCIDW6IZp!-82771033?indicator=SOC_PSPE_EXP_RT&subject=SOC&datasetCode=A&collectionCode=SSI&_adf.ctrl-state=4o93ylxtc_4&_afLoop=1921306564334518&_afWindowMode=0&_afWindowId=null#!%40%40%3Findicator%3DSOC_PSPE_EXP_RT%26_afWindowId%3Dnull%26subject%3DSOC%26_afLoop%3D1921306564334518%26datasetCode%3DA%26collectionCode%3DSSI%26_afWindowMode%3D0%26_adf.ctrl-state%3D3igadq6ez_4)

35 <http://wdi.worldbank.org/table/2.18#>

36 Though preferable, it was not possible to isolate the population concentrating in rural areas, as the data coverage from the World Bank Open Data source was not comprehensive enough with regards to the countries under analysis. World Bank Open Data – Access to electricity, 2014 (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EG.ELC.ACCS.ZS?locations=CN>).

thresholds in meeting implementation targets, and then the sum of those four scores was calculated.

For countries with data available for all four indicators (under-five mortality rate, electricity access, undernourishment and financial inclusion):

<b>On track</b>	Countries with an overall score of 3 or above
<b>Partial progress</b>	Countries with an overall score of 1.5 to 2.5
<b>Off track</b>	Countries with an overall score of 0.5 or less

For countries with data available for three of the total four indicators:

<b>On track</b>	Countries with an overall score of 2 or above
<b>Partial progress</b>	Countries with an overall score of 1 to 1.5
<b>Off track</b>	Countries with an overall score of 0.5 or less

Countries with data available for only one or two out of the four indicators were not scored and ‘insufficient data’ was noted.

## Scores for individual elements for ‘partially ready’ and ‘not ready’ countries

The following table details the scores in each policy and outcome and summarises the scores in data and finance for the countries with an overall score of ‘partially ready’ and ‘not ready’, respectively.

Within the categories of policy and outcome, countries were awarded ‘ready’ with a score of 3; ‘partially ready’ with a score between 2.5 and 1.5; and ‘not ready’ with a score below 1, when data on all four indicators were available (respectively: land access, health, employment and resilience; and mortality, electricity, undernourishment and financial inclusion). For countries, which had data on three of those categories only, the scoring scale changed as follows: countries were awarded ‘ready’ with a score of 2; ‘partially ready’ with a score between 1 and 1.5; and ‘not ready’ with a score below 0.5. Countries with data for fewer than three indicators were not scored (Andorra and Kiribati).

Within the category of data, the table summarises only whether countries conducted a survey within the past three years (‘ready’), within the past five years or currently or in the next year (‘partially ready’), or none of the above (‘not ready’). Within the category of finance, the table details whether countries met the target (‘ready’) or not (‘not ready’) in each sector (education, social protection and health).



## 'Partially ready' countries

Country	Data	Policy	Financing	Outcome
Afghanistan	Ready	Land: not ready Health: partially ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: partially ready	Education: not ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: off track Electricity: partial progress Undernourishment: off track Financial inclusion: off track
Albania	Partially ready	Land: partially ready Health: not ready Employment: ready Resilience: N/A	Education: not ready Social protection: ready Health: not ready	Mortality: on track Electricity: on track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track
Azerbaijan	Not ready	Land: partially ready Health: not ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: N/A	Education: not ready Social protection: ready Health: not ready	Mortality: partial progress Electricity: on track Undernourishment: on track Financial inclusion: off track
Bahamas	Partially ready	Land: N/A Health: ready Employment: ready Resilience: not ready	Education: not ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: on track Electricity: on track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: N/A
Bangladesh	Ready	Land: not ready Health: not ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: partially ready	Education: not ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: partially on track Electricity: partially on track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track
Belize	Ready	Land: N/A Health: not ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: not ready	Education: ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: on track Electricity: on track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track
Benin	Ready	Land: not ready Health: not ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: partially ready	Education: not ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: off track Electricity: off track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track
Egypt	Ready	Land: not ready Health: partially ready Employment: not ready Resilience: not ready	Education: not ready Social protection: ready Health: not ready	Mortality: on track Electricity: on track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track
Guatemala	Ready	Land: partially ready Health: not ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: not ready	Education: ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: partial progress Electricity: partial progress Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track
Guinea	Ready	Land: partially ready Health: not ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: partially ready	Education: not ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: off track Electricity: off track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track
India	Ready	Land: not ready Health: not ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: partially ready	Education: not ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: partial progress Electricity: partial progress Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track
Jamaica	Not ready	Land: ready Health: not ready Employment: partially ready Resilience: not ready	Education: ready Social protection: not ready Health: not ready	Mortality: on track Electricity: on track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: partial progress
Jordan	Partially ready	Land: not ready Health: partially ready Employment: not ready Resilience: ready	Education: not ready Social protection: ready Health: not ready	Mortality: on track Electricity: on track Undernourishment: partial progress Financial inclusion: off track



Country	Data	Policy	Financing	Outcome
Kenya	<b>Ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> partially ready <b>Employment:</b> partially ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> partial progress <b>Electricity:</b> off track <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Monaco	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Land:</b> N/A <b>Health:</b> ready <b>Employment:</b> ready <b>Resilience:</b> not ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> N/A <b>Health:</b> ready	<b>Mortality:</b> on track <b>Electricity:</b> on track <b>Undernourishment:</b> N/A <b>Financial inclusion:</b> N/A
Namibia	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> partially ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> ready <b>Social protection:</b> ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> off track <b>Electricity:</b> off track <b>Undernourishment:</b> off track <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Nepal	<b>Ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> not ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> partial progress <b>Electricity:</b> partial progress <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Niger	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> not ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> off track <b>Electricity:</b> off track <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Nigeria	<b>Ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> not ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> off track <b>Electricity:</b> partial progress <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Paraguay	<b>Ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> partially ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> not ready <b>Resilience:</b> not ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> on track <b>Electricity:</b> on track <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> N/A
Saudi Arabia	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> not ready <b>Resilience:</b> not ready	<b>Education:</b> ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> on track <b>Electricity:</b> on track <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> partial progress
State of Palestine	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> not ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> on track <b>Electricity:</b> N/A <b>Undernourishment:</b> N/A <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Tajikistan	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> partially ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> partially ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> partial progress <b>Electricity:</b> on track <b>Undernourishment:</b> off track <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Viet Nam	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> partially ready <b>Health:</b> partially ready <b>Employment:</b> partially ready <b>Resilience:</b> ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> on track <b>Electricity:</b> on track <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track

## 'Not ready' countries

Country	Data	Policy	Financing	Outcome
Laos	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> partially ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> partially ready <b>Resilience:</b> not ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> off track <b>Electricity:</b> partial progress <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> N/A
Lebanon	<b>Not ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> partially ready <b>Employment:</b> partially ready <b>Resilience:</b> not ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> on track <b>Electricity:</b> on track <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Qatar	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> ready <b>Employment:</b> not ready <b>Resilience:</b> not ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> on track <b>Electricity:</b> on track <b>Undernourishment:</b> N/A <b>Financial inclusion:</b> N/A
Sudan	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> partially ready <b>Employment:</b> not ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> off track <b>Electricity:</b> off track <b>Undernourishment:</b> off track <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track
Togo	<b>Partially ready</b>	<b>Land:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready <b>Employment:</b> partially ready <b>Resilience:</b> partially ready	<b>Education:</b> not ready <b>Social protection:</b> not ready <b>Health:</b> not ready	<b>Mortality:</b> off track <b>Electricity:</b> off track <b>Undernourishment:</b> partial progress <b>Financial inclusion:</b> off track

---

## Further reading

- Allendorf, K. (2007) 'Do women's land rights promote empowerment and child health in Nepal?' *World Development* 34 (117): 1975–1988
- Bahadur, A., Peters, K., Wilkinson, E., Pichon, F., Gray, K. and Tanner, T. (2015b) *The 3As: tracking resilience across BRACED*. ODI Working Paper. London: ODI
- Diwakar, V., Lovell, E., Opitz-Stapleton, S., Shepherd, A. and Twigg, J. (2018 forthcoming) 'Child poverty, disasters, and climate change: examining relationships and assessing implications over a child's life course'. London: ODI
- Greenhill, R. (2017a) 'The "leave no one behind" index'. ODI Briefing Note. London: ODI
- Greenhill, R. (2017b) 'The "leave no one behind" index annex: methodology, policy analysis and references'. ODI Briefing Note. London: ODI
- ILO – International Labour Organization (2017) *World Social Protection Report 2017–19*. Washington, DC: ILO
- Lovell, E. and Le Masson, V. (2014) *Equity and inclusion in disaster risk reduction: building resilience for all*. London: CDKN and ODI
- Peters, K., Langston, L., Tanner, T. and Bahadur, A. (2016) *Resilience across the post-2015 frameworks: towards coherence*. ODI Working Paper. London: ODI
- Samman, E. and Stuart, E. (2017) 'Defining "leave no one behind"'. ODI Briefing Paper. London: ODI
- Stuart, E., Bird, K., Bhatkal, T., Greenhill, R., Lally, S., Rabinowitz, G., Samman, E. and Sarwar, M. with Lynch, A. (2016) *Leaving no-one behind: a critical path for the first 1,000 days of the Sustainable Development Goals*. ODI Report. London: ODI
- UN – United Nations (2015) *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York NY: UN
- UN (2016) *Agenda for humanity*
- UNFCCC – United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2015) *Paris Agreement*. Bonn: UNFCCC
- UNICEF – United Nations Children's Fund (2018) *Every child alive: the urgent need to end new-born deaths*. Geneva: UNICEF
- UNISDR – United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (2015) *The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030*. Geneva: UNISDR
- UNISDR (2017) *UNISDR Terminology*. Geneva: UNISDR

# Appendices

## Appendix 1

List of national surveys used in data analysis:

Survey	Source
Andorran Household Budget Survey 2010–2012	<a href="http://www.estadistica.ad/serveiestudis/web/index.asp?lang=4">www.estadistica.ad/serveiestudis/web/index.asp?lang=4</a>
Argentinian Continuous Permanent Household Survey (Encuesta Permanente de Hogares Continúa – EPH) 2017	<a href="http://www.indec.gob.ar/bases-de-datos.asp">www.indec.gob.ar/bases-de-datos.asp</a> ; <a href="http://www.ilo.org/surveydata/index.php/catalog/1425">www.ilo.org/surveydata/index.php/catalog/1425</a>
Australian Household Income and Wealth Survey 2015–2016. Australian National Health Survey 2014–2015	<a href="http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/6523.0Main+Features12015-16?OpenDocument">www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/6523.0Main+Features12015-16?OpenDocument</a>
Bahamas Household Expenditure Survey 2013, previous Bahamas Living Conditions Survey 2001	<a href="http://www.bahamas.gov.bs/wps/portal/public/key%20statistics/economics%20statistics/household%20expenditure%20survey">www.bahamas.gov.bs/wps/portal/public/key%20statistics/economics%20statistics/household%20expenditure%20survey</a>
Bahrain Household Expenditure and Income Survey 2014–2015, previous Household Expenditure and Income Survey 2005–2006	<a href="http://www.data.gov.bh/en/ResourceCenter/DownloadFile?id=2484">www.data.gov.bh/en/ResourceCenter/DownloadFile?id=2484</a> ; <a href="http://www.data.gov.bh/en/ResourceCenter/">http://www.data.gov.bh/en/ResourceCenter/</a>
Bangladesh Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) 2016	<a href="http://bbs.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/bbs.portal.gov.bd/page/b343a8b4_956b_45ca_872f_4cf9b2f1a6e0/HIES%20Preliminary%20Report%202016.pdf">http://bbs.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/bbs.portal.gov.bd/page/b343a8b4_956b_45ca_872f_4cf9b2f1a6e0/HIES%20Preliminary%20Report%202016.pdf</a>
Annual Byelorussian Sample Household Living Standards Survey 2016, 2015, etc.	<a href="http://www.belstat.gov.by/en/ofitsialnaya-statistika/social-sector/uroven-zhizni-naseleniya/publikatsii__1/index_7743/">www.belstat.gov.by/en/ofitsialnaya-statistika/social-sector/uroven-zhizni-naseleniya/publikatsii__1/index_7743/</a> ; <a href="http://www.belstat.gov.by/en/ofitsialnaya-statistika/social-sector/uroven-zhizni-naseleniya/publikatsii__1/index_7743/">www.belstat.gov.by/en/ofitsialnaya-statistika/social-sector/uroven-zhizni-naseleniya/publikatsii__1/index_7743/</a> ; <a href="http://www.belstat.gov.by/ofitsialnaya-statistika/solialnaya-sfera/uroven-zhizni-naseleniya/ofitsialnye-publikatsii_6/index_5430/">www.belstat.gov.by/ofitsialnaya-statistika/solialnaya-sfera/uroven-zhizni-naseleniya/ofitsialnye-publikatsii_6/index_5430/</a>
Benin Enquête Modulaire Intégrée sur les Conditions de Vie des Ménages (EMICoV) 2015	<a href="http://www.insae-bj.org/autres_publ.html?file=files/publications/Autres%20publications/Note%20sur%20la%20pauvrete_final.pdf">www.insae-bj.org/autres_publ.html?file=files/publications/Autres%20publications/Note%20sur%20la%20pauvrete_final.pdf</a>
Bhutan Living Standard Survey 2017, Bhutan Living Standard Survey 2012	<a href="http://www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/publications.php?id=1">www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/publications.php?id=1</a> ; <a href="http://www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/files/pub2yo10667rb.pdf">www.nsb.gov.bt/publication/files/pub2yo10667rb.pdf</a>
Botswana Multi-Topic Household Survey (BMTHS) 2015–2016, previous Botswana Core Welfare Indicators Survey (BCWIS) 2009–2010	<a href="http://www.statsbots.org.bw/sites/default/files/publications/BMTHS%20Economic%20Activity%20Stats%20Brief%20Aug%202015%202017.pdf">www.statsbots.org.bw/sites/default/files/publications/BMTHS%20Economic%20Activity%20Stats%20Brief%20Aug%202015%202017.pdf</a> ; <a href="http://www.ilo.org/surveydata/index.php/catalog/1552/study-description">http://www.ilo.org/surveydata/index.php/catalog/1552/study-description</a>
Brazilian National Household Sample Survey 2015	<a href="http://ww2.ibge.gov.br/home/estatistica/populacao/trabalhoerendimento/pnad2015/default.shtm">ww2.ibge.gov.br/home/estatistica/populacao/trabalhoerendimento/pnad2015/default.shtm</a>
Cabo Verde Continuous Multi-Objective Survey (Inquérito Multi-objetivo Contínuo) 2016	<a href="http://ine.cv/en/publicacoes/estatisticas-das-familias-condicoes-vida-inquerito-multi-objetivo-continuo-2016/">http://ine.cv/en/publicacoes/estatisticas-das-familias-condicoes-vida-inquerito-multi-objetivo-continuo-2016/</a> ; <a href="http://ine.cv/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/imc-2016-condicoes_vida-1.pdf">http://ine.cv/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/imc-2016-condicoes_vida-1.pdf</a>
Canadian General Social Survey 2016, Canadian Income Survey (CIS) 2015	<a href="http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&amp;SDDS=5221">www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&amp;SDDS=5221</a> ; <a href="http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&amp;Id=333413">www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&amp;Id=333413</a>
Chile National Socioeconomic Characterization Survey (Chile Encuesta Nacional de Caracterización Socio-económica (CASEN)) ongoing 2017, previous CASEN 2015, CASEN 2013	<a href="http://observatorio.ministeriodesarrollosocial.gob.cl/casen-multidimensional/casen/casen_2017.php">http://observatorio.ministeriodesarrollosocial.gob.cl/casen-multidimensional/casen/casen_2017.php</a>
Colombian Gran Encuesta Integrada de Hogares 2016, 2015, etc.	<a href="http://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/estadisticas-por-tema/mercado-laboral/empleo-y-desempleo/geih-historicos">www.dane.gov.co/index.php/estadisticas-por-tema/mercado-laboral/empleo-y-desempleo/geih-historicos</a> ; <a href="https://dhsprogram.com/What-We-Do/Survey-Search.cfm">https://dhsprogram.com/What-We-Do/Survey-Search.cfm</a>
Costa Rican National Household Survey (Encuesta Nacional de Hogares) 2016	<a href="http://www.inec.go.cr/sites/default/files/documentos-biblioteca-virtual/reenaho2016_0.pdf">www.inec.go.cr/sites/default/files/documentos-biblioteca-virtual/reenaho2016_0.pdf</a>
Ecuadorian Living Conditions Survey (Encuesta Condiciones de Vida ECV) 2015	<a href="http://www.ecuadorencifras.gob.ec/documentos/web-inec/ECV/ECV_2015/documentos/ECV%20COMPENDIO%20LIBRO.pdf">www.ecuadorencifras.gob.ec/documentos/web-inec/ECV/ECV_2015/documentos/ECV%20COMPENDIO%20LIBRO.pdf</a> ; <a href="http://www.ecuadorencifras.gob.ec/page/2/?s=encuesta">www.ecuadorencifras.gob.ec/page/2/?s=encuesta</a>
El Salvador Encuesta de Hogares de Propósitos Múltiples 2015	<a href="http://www.digestyc.gob.sv/index.php/temas/des/ehpm/publicaciones-ehpm.html?download=578%3Apublicacion-ehpm-2015">www.digestyc.gob.sv/index.php/temas/des/ehpm/publicaciones-ehpm.html?download=578%3Apublicacion-ehpm-2015</a>

Survey	Source
Honduras Encuesta Permanente de Hogares y Propósitos Múltiples 2016	<a href="http://170.238.108.229/index.php/catalog/79">http://170.238.108.229/index.php/catalog/79</a>
Indonesian National Socio-Economic Survey 2015	<a href="https://microdata.bps.go.id/mikrodata/index.php/catalog/762/study-description">https://microdata.bps.go.id/mikrodata/index.php/catalog/762/study-description</a>
Japanese Comprehensive Survey of Living Conditions (CSLC) 2016	<a href="http://www.mhlw.go.jp/toukei/saikin/hw/k-tyosa/k-tyosa16/index.html">www.mhlw.go.jp/toukei/saikin/hw/k-tyosa/k-tyosa16/index.html</a> ; <a href="http://www.mhlw.go.jp/english/database/db-hss/cslc.html">www.mhlw.go.jp/english/database/db-hss/cslc.html</a>
Kiribati Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) 2006	<a href="http://www.mfed.gov.ki/statistics/kiribati-document-library?view=download&amp;format=raw&amp;fileId=767">www.mfed.gov.ki/statistics/kiribati-document-library?view=download&amp;format=raw&amp;fileId=767</a> ; <a href="http://www.mfed.gov.ki/statistics/kiribati-document-library">www.mfed.gov.ki/statistics/kiribati-document-library</a>
Lebanese Household Budget Survey 2012	<a href="http://www.cas.gov.lb/index.php/all-publications-en#households-budget-survey-2012">www.cas.gov.lb/index.php/all-publications-en#households-budget-survey-2012</a>
Malaysian Household Expenditure Survey 2016 and Household Income and Basic Amenities Survey 2016	<a href="http://www.dosm.gov.my/v1/index.php?r=column/ctwoByCat&amp;parent_id=119&amp;menu_id=amVoWU54UTI0a21NWmdhMjFMMWcyZz09">www.dosm.gov.my/v1/index.php?r=column/ctwoByCat&amp;parent_id=119&amp;menu_id=amVoWU54UTI0a21NWmdhMjFMMWcyZz09</a>
Panama Household Survey (Encuesta de Hogares) 2017 – preliminary figures available	<a href="http://www.contraloria.gob.pa/inec/Publicaciones/Publicaciones.aspx?ID_SUBCATEGORIA=38&amp;ID_PUBLICACION=841&amp;ID_IDIOMA=1&amp;ID_CATEGORIA=5">www.contraloria.gob.pa/inec/Publicaciones/Publicaciones.aspx?ID_SUBCATEGORIA=38&amp;ID_PUBLICACION=841&amp;ID_IDIOMA=1&amp;ID_CATEGORIA=5</a>
Peruvian National Household Survey on Living Conditions and Poverty (Encuesta Nacional de Hogares sobre Condiciones de Vida y Pobreza) 2015	<a href="http://www.inei.gov.pe/biblioteca-virtual/boletines/condiciones-de-vida/3/">www.inei.gov.pe/biblioteca-virtual/boletines/condiciones-de-vida/3/</a>
Qatari Living Conditions Index Survey 2012-2013, Qatari Household Expenditure and Income Survey 2012-2013	<a href="http://www.mdps.gov.qa/en/statistics1/Pages/StatisticsSurveysandPolls.aspx">www.mdps.gov.qa/en/statistics1/Pages/StatisticsSurveysandPolls.aspx</a>
Saudi Household Expenditure and Income Survey 2013	<a href="http://www.stats.gov.sa/en/37">www.stats.gov.sa/en/37</a>
Singapore General Household Survey 2015	<a href="http://www.singstat.gov.sg/publications/publications-and-papers/GHS/ghs2015">www.singstat.gov.sg/publications/publications-and-papers/GHS/ghs2015</a>
Sri Lankan Household Income and Expenditure Survey 2016	<a href="http://www.statistics.gov.lk/page.asp?page=Income%20and%20Expenditure">www.statistics.gov.lk/page.asp?page=Income%20and%20Expenditure</a>
UAE Household Expenditure and Income Survey 2014-2015	<a href="http://www.dsc.gov.ae/en-us/Programs-Statistical-Surveys/Pages/Statistical-Project-details.aspx?ProjectId=23">www.dsc.gov.ae/en-us/Programs-Statistical-Surveys/Pages/Statistical-Project-details.aspx?ProjectId=23</a>
Uruguay Continuous Household Survey (Encuesta Continua de Hogares) 2016, previous Encuesta Continua de Hogares 2015, 2014.	<a href="http://ine.gub.uy/encuesta-continua-de-hogares1">http://ine.gub.uy/encuesta-continua-de-hogares1</a>
Vietnam Household Living Standards Survey 2014	<a href="http://www.gso.gov.vn/default_en.aspx?tabid=515&amp;idmid=5&amp;ItemID=18411">www.gso.gov.vn/default_en.aspx?tabid=515&amp;idmid=5&amp;ItemID=18411</a>

## Appendix 2

List of cases where financing data was drawn from national statistics offices, government documents or reports by international organisations:

Country	Source
Afghanistan	Social Protection figure – Planned for financial year (FY) 2017/18. Authors' calculation based on the Afghan Budget for the Fiscal Year 1396: 3 ( <a href="http://www.budgetmof.gov.af/images/stories/DGB/BPRD/National%20Budget/1396_Budget/1396%20National%20Budget%20-%20Approved%20-%20English%20dated%2025Feb2017.pdf">www.budgetmof.gov.af/images/stories/DGB/BPRD/National%20Budget/1396_Budget/1396%20National%20Budget%20-%20Approved%20-%20English%20dated%2025Feb2017.pdf</a> ). Social protection = 6% of total expenditure = 26,419,905.2 thousand Afghani (AFN) (p.12). National gross domestic product (NGDP) = 1337.64 billion AFN
Andorra	Planned education expenditure and social protection expenditure 2016. Authors' calculation based on Andorran Budget Project 2016 and 2018: Pressupost per a l'exercici 2016: 490 ( <a href="http://www.finances.ad/images/stories/Docs/Pressupost_2016.pdf">www.finances.ad/images/stories/Docs/Pressupost_2016.pdf</a> ) for government expenditure figures and Projecte de pressupost per a l'exercici 2018: 10 ( <a href="http://www.finances.ad/images/stories/Docs/Projecte_Pressupost_2018.pdf">www.finances.ad/images/stories/Docs/Projecte_Pressupost_2018.pdf</a> ) for GDP figure. Planned education expenditure as a percentage of total government expenditure for 2016 = 63899670.30/847860512.41 = 7.53%. Planned social protection expenditure as a percentage of GDP for 2016 = 18773615.21/847860512.41 = 2.21%.
Bahamas	Education expenditure 2016. Authors' calculation based on The Central Bank of the Bahamas Quarterly Statistical Digest November 2017, 26(4): 57 ( <a href="http://www.centralbankbahamas.com/download/056167000.pdf">www.centralbankbahamas.com/download/056167000.pdf</a> ) for government expenditure figures and Press Release National Accounts GDP 2016 Figures: 5 ( <a href="http://www.bahamas.gov.bs/wps/wcm/connect/f9b22fb7-d39e-43fb-9bf6-f7031e0be310/PRESS+RELEASE++National+Accounts+2016+for+website.pdf?MOD=AJPERES">www.bahamas.gov.bs/wps/wcm/connect/f9b22fb7-d39e-43fb-9bf6-f7031e0be310/PRESS+RELEASE++National+Accounts+2016+for+website.pdf?MOD=AJPERES</a> ) Education expenditure as a percentage of total government expenditure for 2016 = 329,791/2,729,904 = 12.08% Education expenditure as a percentage of GDP for 2016 = 329,791/10,107,100 = 3.26%.
Botswana	Planned education spending 2016–2017 figures. Authors' calculation based on the Botswana 2016/17 Budget in Brief ( <a href="http://www.gov.bw/globalassets/amfdp/budget-speeches/2016/2016_17budgetinbrief.pdf">www.gov.bw/globalassets/amfdp/budget-speeches/2016/2016_17budgetinbrief.pdf</a> ) p. 16: GDP FY 2016/17 = 159,888 million Pula p. 17: Total expenditures and net lending = 54,444.5 million Pula = 34.05% of GDP pp. 9–10: education expenditure = ministerial expenditure budget 10,636 million Pula + proposed allocation of development budget 1,089 million Pula = 21.53% of total expenditures = 7.33% of GDP Social protection spending 2012–2013. World Bank Botswana Social Protection Assessment 2013 ( <a href="http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/586501468182341474/pdf/890030NWPOP132085260B00PUBLIC001405.pdf">http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/586501468182341474/pdf/890030NWPOP132085260B00PUBLIC001405.pdf</a> )
Canada	Education spending 2014 figures. Authors' calculation based on STATCAN Table 385-0041 Canadian Classification of Functions of Government (CCOFOG) by consolidated government component annual (dollars x 1,000,000) – education at ( <a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=3850041&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;p1=-1&amp;p2=9&amp;srchLan=-1">www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=3850041&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;p1=-1&amp;p2=9&amp;srchLan=-1</a> ); Table 385-0042 Canadian government finance statistics (CGFS), statement of operations and balance sheet for consolidated governments annual (dollars x 1,000,000) – expense at ( <a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=3850042&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;p1=-1&amp;p2=9&amp;srchLan=-1">www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=3850042&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;p1=-1&amp;p2=9&amp;srchLan=-1</a> ); Table 379-0029 GDP at basic prices, by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) annual (dollars x 1,000,000) – all Industries at ( <a href="http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=3790029&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;p1=1&amp;p2=-1&amp;srchLan=-1&amp;pattern=GDP">www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&amp;retrLang=eng&amp;id=3790029&amp;tabMode=dataTable&amp;p1=1&amp;p2=-1&amp;srchLan=-1&amp;pattern=GDP</a> )
Ethiopia	Social protection 2013 figure. World Bank Ethiopia Public Expenditure Review 2016, table 3.2: 48.
Namibia	Social protection 2010–2011 figure. Namibia Social Protection Floor Assessment ILO Report, 2014: xi
Nigeria	Education spending 2015 figures. Authors' calculation based on the Central Bank of Nigeria Annual Report 2015: 289–290 ( <a href="http://www.cbn.gov.ng/out/2016/rsd/central%20bank%20of%20nigeria%20annual%20economic%20report%20-%20draft.pdf">www.cbn.gov.ng/out/2016/rsd/central%20bank%20of%20nigeria%20annual%20economic%20report%20-%20draft.pdf</a> )
State of Palestine	Health spending 2014 figure. Authors' calculation based on the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics Percentage distribution of total expenditure on health in Palestine by source of funding for the years 2014 ( <a href="http://www.pcbs.gov.ps/Portals/_Rainbow/Documents/Annual%202014%20E%20-%20Copy.htm">www.pcbs.gov.ps/Portals/_Rainbow/Documents/Annual%202014%20E%20-%20Copy.htm</a> ) and General Government Finance 2014 ( <a href="http://www.pcbs.gov.ps/Portals/_Rainbow/Documents/GFS%202014.htm">www.pcbs.gov.ps/Portals/_Rainbow/Documents/GFS%202014.htm</a> )
United Arab Emirates	Latest found education spending 2011 figures. Authors' calculation based on the IMF Country Report No. 14/188: 9, Figure 11. Federal Spending by Function ( <a href="http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2014/cr14188.pdf">www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2014/cr14188.pdf</a> ) and the IMF Fiscal Monitor, Fiscal Indicators (expenditure as a percentage of GDP) ( <a href="http://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/G_X_G01_GDP_PT@FM/ADVEC/FM_EMG/FM_LIDC/ARE">www.imf.org/external/datamapper/G_X_G01_GDP_PT@FM/ADVEC/FM_EMG/FM_LIDC/ARE</a> )
Uruguay	Education spending 2016 figure. Panorama de la Educación 2016 – Presentación Panorama 2016 (pptx), slide 31 ( <a href="http://www.mec.gub.uy/innovaportal/v/11078/5/mecweb/publicaciones/?3colid=927">www.mec.gub.uy/innovaportal/v/11078/5/mecweb/publicaciones/?3colid=927</a> )

---

## Appendix 3

List of country cases with outdated financing data:

Country	Indicator and year
Bahrain	Social protection from 2010
Lebanon	Social protection from 2011
Mali	Social protection from 2010
Monaco	No social protection figure
Namibia	Education expenditure from 2010, social protection from 2011
Niger	Social protection from 2011
Panama	Education expenditure from 2011
Qatar	Social protection from 2010
Saudi Arabia	Education expenditure from 2008
Sudan	Education expenditure from 2009
United Arab Emirates	Education expenditure from 2011





**Evidence.  
Ideas.  
Change.**

**ODI**

203 Blackfriars Road  
London SE1 8NJ

+44 (0)20 7922 0300  
info@odi.org

odi.org  
odi.org/facebook  
odi.org/twitter

**ODI is an independent, global think tank, working for a sustainable and peaceful world in which every person thrives.**

We harness the power of evidence and ideas through research and partnership to confront challenges, develop solutions, and create change.

Readers are encouraged to reproduce material for their own publications, as long as they are not being sold commercially. As copyright holder, ODI requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication. For online use, we ask readers to link to the original resource on the ODI website. The views presented in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of ODI or our partners.

© Overseas Development Institute 2018. This work is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0.