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AIMS

LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND
Embedding equity in the post-2015 framework through stepping stone targets

• Look into concrete mechanisms needed to incentivise inclusive progress under the post-2015 framework.

• Assess implications of Kevin Watkins’ Stepping Stone Equity Targets

• Illustrate Equity Targets through a newly developed dataset on group-based inequality - best metrics & graphic representations

• Assess equitable progress in MDG4 – forthcoming research next flagship report ‘The Lottery of Birth’
What do we mean by Equitable pathways?

Pakistan - example of the poorest being left behind

Mozambique - an example of equitable progress

Save the Children
Defining inclusive progress under the post-2015 framework

1) Rapid average progress.
2) All groups meet 2030 targets.
3) Gaps close between more and less advantaged groups.
What measure should we use to measure disparities? (see Delamonica & Minujin 2003, Stewart 2002)

**Simply distance (absolute)**
Disadvantaged Group is in absolute numbers $x$ more than reference group in the given indicator

**Life chances (relative)**
Disadvantaged Group is $x$ times more likely to experience event than other group

$$\text{Gap} = \bar{y}_r - \bar{y}_d$$

$$\text{Ratio} = \frac{\bar{y}_d}{\bar{y}_r}$$

$\bar{y}_d =$ estimate (U5MR) disadvantaged group
$\bar{y}_r =$ estimate (U5MR) reference group

What group should we use as reference group? Advantaged Group or National Average?
Trade-off between various metrics

How to measure disparities?

✓ **Gap:** More intuitive, talks about absolutes, but depends on level (no so good for comparison across country/groups)

✓ **Ratio:** Useful for comparison and closer to notion of life chances or likelihood (but less intuitive)

What to compare?

✓ **Top/Bottom:** It looks at the whole spectrum but it is only about the extremes (groups can swap places over time)

✓ **Bottom/Average:** It looks at groups with outputs below country average (what is normal in the country), less political
Other more comprehensive measures
(From joint research with Emma Samman and Laura Rodriguez Takeuchi)

Weighted coefficient of variation \(= \frac{1}{\bar{y}} \left[ \sum g w_g \times (\bar{y}_g - \bar{y})^2 \right]^{1/2} \)

Group Theil \(= \sum g w_g \times \frac{\bar{y}_g}{\bar{y}} \ln \left( \frac{\bar{y}_g}{\bar{y}} \right) \)

\(w_g\) = population share of group \(g\): (weighted)share of births
\(\bar{y}\) = mean of all groups’ U5MR
\(\bar{y}_g\) = U5MR of group \(g\)

Measure the whole Distribution
but less intuitive - so far we have used these metrics for robustness tests only
Group & Inequality Dataset (GRID)

- Direct data processing of 257 household surveys (DHS / MICS) + plus aggregate public sources (UN IGME, WHO, UNICEF, etc.) + (soon) aggregates for Brazil, China, India and Mexico

- Data set aimed to monitoring progress in under-5 child mortality, malnutrition, access to water and sanitation.

- Level and confidence intervals disaggregated by: Gender, Urban/rural, Regions, Ethnic Groups, Socio Economic Groups (wealth index)

- A total of 91 countries with data on disparities (59 by Regions, 29 by Ethnic Groups). A total of 64 countries with data overtime (up to 7 data points for a total of 170 periods)
Official MDG4 data is based on a statistical model that generates a smooth trend curve which averages over possible disparate estimates from different data sources. It uses only data that has been assessed of “good quality” by the UN IGME.

For our analysis we “root” the level on the official figures and assume disparities based on available surveys. Confidence intervals were computed for each group.
What can we learn from historical trends?
Child mortality, Benin

http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/resources/online-library/leaving-no-one-behind
Child mortality, Indonesia

http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/resources/online-library/leaving-no-one-behind
Change in Inequality (Annualized Percentage)

- Fast reduction and increase in inequality: 25%
- Slow reduction and decrease in inequality: 21%
- Fast reduction and decreased in inequality: 29%

Change in Under-Five Child Mortality (Annualized Percentage)

- 25% Increase in inequality
- 21% Slow reduction and decrease in inequality

Too many are being left behind

Economic Groups
Regions
Urban/Rural
Ethnic Groups

Preliminary findings from forthcoming research

Save the Children
Under business as usual not all groups will meet the targets, and in many contexts disparities between social and economic groups will increase.
Stepping stone targets

• By 2030 – no target met unless met for all.
• Kevin Watkins’ Stepping stones equity targets—interim benchmarks between 2015 and 2030 to ensure:
  - All groups are on track.
  - Gaps between advantaged and disadvantaged are closing.
• Defined nationally across all goal areas for disadvantaged groups.
On a business as usual trajectory Peru will achieve a 50% reduction target at the national level, but children in Huancavelica will be left behind.
Challenges & questions

• Need to identify most appropriate baselines, metrics and benchmarks for targets.
• Need improvements in quality and coverage of disaggregated data.
• Identifying disadvantaged groups is political.
• Setting up mechanisms to reporting to citizens as a way to promote national accountability.