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**Example on how to Disaggregate SDG Indicators by Disability at the national level**

* The overriding principle of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is to ensure that no one is left behind. To that end, the SDGs recommend that Member States disaggregate data by disability and in addition the global indicator framework for the SDGs include a number of specific indicators related to disability. Without disaggregation by disability status, it is not possible to monitor the outcomes of 2030 Agenda activities in a way that documents if people with disabilities are indeed being left behind or not.
* The Washington Group on Disability Statistics (WG) thus undertook an investigation to assess the current whether the national statistical offices are capable to disaggregate the SDG indicators by disability status. (The WG is a city group established by the UN Statistical Commission in 2001 to promote and coordinate international cooperation in the area of statistics focusing on disability measures suitable for censuses and national surveys. It is composed of national statistics offices (NSOs). In the past 15 years, over 135 countries have had representation in the WG.)
* The disaggregation of SDG indicators by disability status is feasible with the existing data instruments that will most likely be used for reporting on those indicators. To that end, the WG asked its member NSOs to report on 65 indicators identified as being either specifically related or suitable for disaggregation by disability.
* In general, the results are very promising. A number of countries are currently capable of such disaggregation for many of the indicators. Often countries can disaggregate some indicators but not others because disability questions are not included in all of their data instruments. However, as they already have experience using good disability questions on some data instruments it would require a minor effort to expand their capacity for disaggregation by simply using those questions on other already existing instruments. For example, questions can be added to any ongoing data collections and can be used in any national or subnational survey (health, labor force, income & expenditure, DHS, MICS, etc.). For countries currently using poor quality questions on disability, the cost of replacing those questions with the WG questions would be minimal.
* The results of general testing of the WG questions, and their current use by a variety of high, middle, and low-income countries, suggests that disaggregating SDG indicators by disability status is highly feasible. And, once the questions become integrated into core statistical systems (e.g., the systems used to produce the SDG indicators) – disaggregating outcomes (education, employment etc.) by disability status becomes routine.

**Background:**

**Methodology.** NSOs that have at one time participated in WG meetings or activities were asked to categorize their capability for producing each of 65 indicators identified as being either disability specific indicators or suitable for disaggregation by disability. These were in the areas of poverty, hunger, health, education, gender, water and sanitation, energy, employment, inequality, cities, climate, and justice.

The four categories for each indicator were:

* Can be produced and disaggregated by disability
* Can be produced for the general population, but not disaggregated by disability
* Cannot be produced, even for the general population
* Uncertain about whether it can be produced

NSOs were also asked to provide the questions used for that disaggregation. The best practice is to use the WG short set of six questions. Indeed, some countries used this approach. Unfortunately, some countries used other approaches that research shows tend to greatly under-identify people with disabilities. However, as they are already using questions it would not require much effort (or space on their data instruments) to replace them to be consistent with international standards.

**Results.** Thirty-four countries responded to WG questionnaire, eight of them reporting use of the Washington Group questions. The results, though, most likely under-estimate the ability of countries to disaggregate the indicators for several reasons. For example, one country was excluded from the table because although they reported that the WG questions were used in their Demographic and Health Survey and a question on health conditions is included in their census, they did not fill out the rest of the survey to report on which indictors they could produce. The same was the case of another country, which had a question asking about a list of medical conditions in their census. In addition, the secretariat of the WG is aware of at least a couple countries that have used the WG questions on multiple surveys, but did not respond to the survey.

In addition, some of the responses that indicators could not be disaggregated are probably due to the fact that while it is possible to disaggregate, it has not yet been done. For example, Egypt reported the use of the WG questions on its census and labor force survey, as well as a single disability question on its household income and expenditure survey, but also reported it could not disaggregate any indicators, which seemed inconsistent. When they were followed up with directly and asked about a set of eight key indicators (two on poverty, education, employment and one on WASH and inequality), they said that technically they could disaggregate all of them except the education indicators but have not yet done so. These six indicators are included in Table 1 for Egypt, but presumably they could produce more if asked to. The same thing is true for Turkey which reported using the WG questions on its census and a national household survey, as well as some other disability questions on its household income and expenditure and labor force surveys, but reported not having any disaggregated data. This is presumably because they have not used the data in this way, although they presumably could.

Table 1 shows the results for the thirty-two countries whose responses were tabulated. The first row shows the total number of indicators to be disaggregated by SDG goal, and the other entries show how many of those goals can be disaggregated for each country. However, it must be kept in mind many of these indicators cannot even be produced for the total population, let alone be disaggregated. The last two columns show how many of the 65 indicators could be produced for the general population, and then what percent of those can be disaggregated. The shaded countries can disaggregate at least 10 of the 65 indicators. These were Australia, Argentina, Israel, Moldova, and Mongolia.

Table 2 shows the indicators that can most commonly be both produced and disaggregated by disability status. The most common is the proportion of youth aged 15-24 years not in education, employment or training. The two main poverty indicators are also among the more commonly available for disaggregation. The justice indicators were the least producible for anyone, let alone for people with disabilities although Israel and Norway were able to produce and disaggregate two of them.

**Conclusion.** Disaggregating SDG indicators seems very feasible. A fair number of countries of different income levels are already including the WG questions in their data instruments. Even more are asking about disability in some capacity, and if they were to substitute the WG questions for their current questions they could improve the quality of that disaggregation, without imposing any noticeable burden on their current data instruments.

We suspect our results underestimate the current ability of countries to disaggregate data. Some countries responded to the survey that they did not have disaggregated data, even though some of their data instruments had disability questions that were not currently being used in analysis.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Producible** | | |
|  | | **Poverty** | **Hunger** | **Health** | **Education** | **Gender** | **WASH** | **Energy** | **Employment** | **Inequality** | **Cities** | **Climate** | **Justice** | **All** | **General Pop** | **Percent that can be disaggregated** |
| **Number of Indicators** | | **5** | **3** | **16** | **8** | **10** | **2** | **2** | **5** | **2** | **3** | **1** | **8** | **65** |  |  |
| Afghanistan | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | **6** | **83%** |
| Argentina | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | **31** | **45%** |
| Australia | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 18 | **29** | **62%** |
| Belarus | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | **33** | **9%** |
| Chad | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | **38** | **11%** |
| China | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | **6** | **83%** |
| Costa Rica | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | **37** | **24%** |
| Croatia | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | **9** | **33%** |
| Curucao | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | **1** | **100%** |
| Dem Rep | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | **16** | **38%** |
| Egypt | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | **18** | **33%** |
| El Salvador | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | **5** | **100%** |
| Hong Kong | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | **23** | **17%** |
| India | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | **30** | **13%** |
| Ireland | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | **17** | **6%** |
| Israel | | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | **40** | **33%** |
| Kosovo | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **33** | **0%** |
| Latvia | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | **9** | **78%** |
| Lithuania | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | **28** | **14%** |
| Mexico | | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | **24** | **38%** |
| Moldova | | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | **47** | **26%** |
| Mongolia | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | **39** | **41%** |
| New Zealand | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | **38** | **5%** |
| Norway | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | **23** | **22%** |
| Peru | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | **25** | **16%** |
| Poland | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | **18** | **22%** |
| Russia | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | **27** | **33%** |
| Sierra Leone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0** | **NA** |
| Slovakia | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | **26** | **15%** |
| Thailand | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | **14** | **0%** |
| Turkey | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **20** | **0%** |
| UAE | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | **4** | **100%** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Most common indicators that can be disaggregated by disability** | | |
| **Indicator Number** | **Description of indicator** | **Number of Countries (out of 32)** |
|  |  |  |
| **More than 10 countries can produce** | | |
| 1.1.1 | Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural) | 11 |
| 1.2.1 | Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age | 11 |
| 6.1.1 | Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services | 11 |
| 7.1.1 | Percentage of population with access to electricity | 11 |
| 8.6.1 | Proportion of youth (aged 15-24 years) not in education, employment or training | 14 |
|  |  |  |
| **5 to 10 countries can produce** | | |
| 1.3.1 | Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, newborns, work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable | 5 |
| 4.1.1 | Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex | 5 |
| 4.2.2 | Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex | 7 |
| 4.5.1 | Parity indices (female/male, rural/urban, bottom/top wealth quintile and others such as disability status, indigenous peoples and conflict-affected, as data become available) for all education indicators on this list that can be disaggregated | 8 |
| 5.5.2 | Proportion of women in managerial positions | 6 |
| 5.b.1 | Proportion of individuals who own a mobile telephone, by sex | 5 |
| 6.2.1 | Proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water | 7 |
| 8.3.1 | Proportion of informal employment in non-agriculture employment, by sex | 5 |
| 8.5.1 | Average hourly earnings of female and male employees, by occupation, age and persons with disabilities | 5 |
| 8.7.1 | Proportion and number of children aged 5-17 years engaged in child labour, sex and age | 5 |