Statistical Commission Fifty-second session 1 – 3 and 5 March 2021 Item 3 (I) of the provisional agenda Items for discussion and decision: household surveys Background document Available in English only

Counted and Visible: Toolkit to Better Utilize Existing Data from Household Surveys to Generate Disaggregated Gender Statistics

Prepared by the UN Women in collaboration with the Intersecretariat Working Group on Household Surveys (ISWGHS)

Counted and Visible: Toolkit to Better Utilize Existing Data from Household Surveys to Generate Disaggregated Gender Statistics

Executive Summary

United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women)

In collaboration with Intersecretariat Working Group on Household Surveys (ISWGHS)

2

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

| 2020 A secols | 2020 Custoinable Development Accords |
|---------------|--|
| 2030 Agenda | 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda |
| ADAPT | Advanced Data Planning Tool |
| ANSD | National Agency of Statistics and Demography of Senegal/Senegal's national statistical |
| | office |
| CPEM | Presidential Council for Women Equality/Colombia's Ministry of Women |
| CV | Coefficient of variation |
| DANE | National Administrative Department of Statistics of Colombia/Colombia's national |
| | statistical office |
| DHS | Demographic and Health Survey |
| ELL | Elbers, Lanjouw and Lanjouw methodology |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| GAD | Gender and development |
| GEDI | Colombia's Differential and Intersectional Focus Group |
| GEOSTAT | National Statistics Office of Georgia |
| GEWE | Gender equality and women's empowerment |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GSO | General Statistics Office of Viet Nam |
| GSS | Gender statistical system |
| IAC-GS | Philippines' Inter-Agency Committee on Gender Statistics |
| IAEG-GS | Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Gender Statistics |
| IAWG-GD | Georgia's Inter-Agency Working Group on Gender Data |
| IAWG-GS | Albania's Inter-Agency Working Group on Gender Statistics |
| IDP | Internally displaced people |
| | |
| ILO | International Labour Organization |
| INSTAT | Albania's Institute of Statistics |
| ISWGHS | Intersecretariat Working Group on Household Surveys |
| KNBS | Kenya National Bureau of Statistics |
| LNOB | Leave No One Behind principle |
| MDA | Ministries, Departments and Agencies |
| MICS | Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey |
| NDP | National Development Plan |
| NIPS | Pakistan's National Institute of Population Studies |
| NIS | National Institute of Statistics/Cameroon's national statistical office |
| NPGEI | National priority gender equality indicators |
| NSCB | Philippines National Statistical Coordination Board |
| NSDS | National Strategy for the Development of Statistics |
| NSO | National statistical office |
| NSS | National statistical system |
| OCGS | Office of the Chief Government Statistician/Zanzibar's national statistical office |
| PSA | Philippine Statistics Authority |
| RCI | Gender-sensitive Resilience Capacity Index |
| RIMA | Resilience Measurement Analysis |
| ROAS | UN Women Regional Office for Arab States |
| SAE | Small area estimation |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goals |
| UBOS | Uganda Bureau of Statistics/Uganda's national statistical office |
| UN | United Nations |
| UN ESCAP | United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific |
| UN Women | United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women |
| UNSC | United Nations Statistical Commission |
| VNR | Voluntary National Review |
| WAGEM | STATA variable code used for the indicator, age at first cohabitation |
| WEI | Women's Empowerment Index |
| ** • | Women's Empowerment muck |

| Women Count | Making Every Woman and Girl Count: Supporting the monitoring and implementation of |
|-------------|--|
| | the SDGs through better production and use of gender statistics |

Executive Summary

Introduction

Gender statistics are indispensable tools for devising evidence-based policies to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE). Comprehensive and periodic statistics on the status of women, men, girls, and boys, including data disaggregated by sex, socio-economic characteristics and context (e.g., humanitarian), are important for setting priorities, planning interventions and assessing their gendered impacts. They are also critical for putting the spotlight on inequality and underscoring the need to realize the rights of poor and marginalized women and girls who are left behind and whose rights are not always prioritized in policy-making processes. [1]

Disaggregated gender statistics are key to successful implementation of the 2030 Agenda

The 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda (2030 Agenda) recognizes that "realizing gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls will make a crucial contribution to progress across all the Goals and targets". The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) represent a significant step forward towards achieving GEWE, covering core areas of the feminist agenda. Robust indicators and quality data are of critical importance and will to a large extent determine whether policy efforts are marshalled, and the goals and targets are achieved or missed. [2]

The 2030 Agenda also pledges to leave no one behind (LNOB) and to ensure that the SDGs and targets are met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society, including to reach the furthest behind first. [3] To identify those who are left behind, high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics is necessary. Thus, **producing disaggregated gender statistics and analyzing it with an intersectionality lens will provide a credible evidence base that can inform gender-responsive policies and catalyze actions towards leaving no one behind. [4]**

This however raises a fundamental question about whether data systems and data collection mechanisms are currently set up to prioritize the measurement and reporting of challenges that marginalized groups face, including ensuring their participation in decisions about what is measured, setting of priorities, allocation of resources, among others. Attention to intersecting inequalities, i.e., that gender inequalities intersect with other inequalities, including those based on class, race-ethnicity and ability, has also been a long-standing feature of feminist scholarship. [3]

UN Women's Strategy for Change: The Women Count Programme

Responding to these challenges, the global gender data programme of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), *Making Every Woman and Girl Count: Supporting the monitoring and implementation of the SDGs through better production and use of gender statistics* (Women Count), is affecting a radical shift in the production, availability, accessibility and use of quality data and statistics on key aspects of GEWE.

Working with partner governments, international agencies and other actors, including civil society organizations, and building on existing initiatives, the programme is achieving results in the following interlinked areas of work on gender statistics development: i) putting in place an enabling environment; ii) filling gender data gaps; and iii) ensuring that gender statistics are accessible and used.

As part of the initiative, UN Women is working closely with at least 15 national statistical systems (NSSs), and in coordination with other international agencies and all relevant actors, providing technical support to countries to improve the regular production and use of gender statistics. This includes production of disaggregated gender statistics while ensuring capacity development of NSSs in the process. [5]

Use of household surveys for SDG monitoring and the work of the Intersecretariat Working Group on Household Surveys

In generating disaggregated gender statistics, solid data sources are needed and most of the countries rely on its nationwide survey data sets. Household surveys are considered as the main data source for almost one third of all SDGs indicators. Realizing the need for the coordination and harmonization of household survey activities, the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) established the Intersecretariat Working Group on Household Surveys (ISWGHS) in 2015 with a mandate of fostering improvement in the scope and quality of social statistics as delivered through national, regional and international household survey programs. [6]

While statistical systems at the national, regional, and global levels have been making significant efforts in improving the tools and methodologies in collecting household survey data, providing sufficient policy-relevant disaggregated gender remain to be a major challenge for all countries.

Counted and Visible: Toolkit to Better Utilize Existing Data from Household Surveys to Generate Disaggregated Gender Statistics

In February 2020, UN Women, ISWGHS, and the UN Statistics Division jointly organized the *Counted* and *Visible Global Conference on the measurement of gender equality, leave no one behind and intersecting inequalities.* It aimed to contribute to current work on data disaggregation to better inform policies and advocacy on gender equality and women's empowerment. Findings and recommendations from the Conference was also meant to inform UN Women and ISWGHS's work on gender data disaggregation to better utilize existing data from household surveys. [7]

The Counted and Visible: Toolkit to Better Utilize Existing Data from Household Surveys to Generate Disaggregated Gender Statistics (hereafter referred as "Counted and Visible Toolkit") was thus developed; this also responds to the call of Member States in recent Sessions of the UNSC to develop tools and methodologies for data disaggregation ([3], [4], [8]). UN Women, in collaboration with the ISWGHS developed the Counted and Visible Toolkit with the following objectives:

- Provide guidance on mechanisms and tools to better utilize existing data from household surveys to produce policy-relevant disaggregated gender statistics based on select country experiences¹, with support from the Women Count programme;
- 2. Present methodologies used as well as assessment exercises undertaken of select country studies to produce disaggregated gender statistics using existing data from household surveys;

¹ Due to limited resources (financial, time, human), all references to select country experiences pertain to those that were directly supported by the Women Count programme.

- 3. Present statistical management and coordination mechanisms and tools undertaken by select countries towards ensuring a consultative and inclusive process in the production of select policy-relevant disaggregated gender statistics;
- 4. Provide guidance or insights on country experiences on producing policy-relevant disaggregated gender statistics; and
- 5. Offer recommendations for improving initiatives.

Highlighting country-led experiences, with Women Count programme support

As a means to ensure relatability to target users (that is, similar experiences, constraints and resources of NSSs particularly national statistical offices (NSOs)), the Counted and Visible Toolkit mainly focuses on the country level experiences in the generation of disaggregated gender statistics using existing data from household surveys. The Toolkit also recognizes the many initiatives implemented by various international agencies and development partners (e.g., International Labour Organization's reprocessing of available microdata to enable additional analysis [9], UN Habitat's [10], World Bank's, UN Women).² For example, implementing countries' counterparts in other countries are most likely faced with similar situation, needs, and resources (e.g., NSOs/NSSs share almost similar financial and human resources as well as statistical infrastructure).

At least 10 country level is included in the Counted and Visible Toolkit. As UN Women's Women Count programme is strategically placed to contribute to the gender data disaggregation initiative, the following countries are included (Table 1):

| Region | Country cases |
|--------------------------|---|
| Africa: | Kenya, Uganda, and the United Republic of Tanzania in East and Southern |
| | Africa; Senegal and Cameroon in West and Central Africa |
| Asia and the Pacific: | Vietnam and Mongolia |
| Europe and Central Asia: | Albania and Georgia |
| Latin America and the | Colombia |
| Caribbean: | |

Table 1. Country case studies included in the Counted and Visible Toolkit, with Women Count Support

Source: UN Women.

Existing national household surveys as the main data source used in the Counted and Visible Toolkit

Various data sources can be used to generate disaggregated gender statistics. The Counted and Visible Toolkit focuses on existing household surveys considering resources available for this study (i.e., financial, time, and human) and scope of work of the co-collaborator, the ISWGHS, which is focused on household surveys.

Select country case studies using different data sources will nonetheless be featured in select sections of the Counted and Visible Toolkit. For example, the document presents Iraq's gender-sensitive resilience capacity index (RCI)³ measuring changes in programme beneficiaries' resilience and whether this is the same for all women across communities of origin (that is, host communities, refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs)). These were generated through repeated surveys with the same group of women at different points in time. (See Annex 1) [11]

² Cognizant of the importance of the initiatives directly implemented by international agencies, particularly in terms of data production and methodological development, select cases are likewise presented in the Counted and Visible Toolkit (i.e., ILO's UN Habitat's, and the World Bank's).

³ UN Women Regional Office for Arab States used the Resilience Measurement Analysis Model (RIMA) conceptualized by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations' (FAO) (http://www.fao.org/resilience/background/tools/rima/en/)

The Counted and Visible Toolkit covers five major stages promoting capacity development of NSSs, particularly NSOs throughout the process. The stages were also guided by the overarching aims of UN Women's Women Count programme (Table 2):

| Table 2. Interlinkages of the statistical processes to produce disaggregated gender statistics as defined in the |
|--|
| Counted and Visible Toolkit vis-à-vis the outcomes of the Women Count Programme |

| | Stages of the Counted and Visible Toolkit | Pillars of the Women Count Programme | | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Stage 1: | NSSs leadership's commitment to appropriate normative frameworks and increasing the amount and quality of gender statistics produced | Outcome 1: Creating an enabling environment | | | | | |
| Stage 2: | Identification of national priority gender equality indicators (NPGEIs) | | | | | | |
| Stage 3: | Development of methodology(ies) and production of statistics on select NPGEIs | Outcome 2: Increasing data production | | | | | |
| Stage 4: | Assessment and publication of results | | | | | | |
| Stage 5: | Dissemination, advocacy and use of gender statistics produced | Outcome 3: Improving data accessibility and use | | | | | |

Source: UN Women.

Stage 1: NSSs leadership's commitment to appropriate normative frameworks and increasing the amount and quality of gender statistics produced

Better utilization of existing data from household surveys to produce disaggregated gender statistics is guided by the overarching principle of sustainable development of gender statistics. This means that it should be based on efficient coordination within the NSS, data sharing agreements among the producers of gender data as well as shared priorities and strong collaboration between users and producers of gender data. [12]

Effective leadership of the NSS is also essential towards the development of standards in the NSS for collecting and producing disaggregated gender statistics critical. It is required for advocacy, to create greater political will to develop and use the statistics generated, make decisions on advancing gender-responsive statistical developments in the NSS, formulation of gender-responsive statistical policies, creating coordination arrangements, and investing in household surveys and gender statistics. It should also be nationally led and owned and be backed by political support. [12]

Engaging stakeholders and co-leadership roles of the NSO and national women's machinery

To ensure production of disaggregated gender statistics that are relevant, used, and institutionalized, there is a need develop a gender statistical system (GSS) within an NSS. Engaging stakeholders in the GSS is a key action to get the commitment of the GSS. Moreover, both the NSO and national women's machinery play and *share* critical roles to coordinate the GSS efficiently and effectively as the process of producing disaggregated gender statistics needs to be not only product-oriented but also user-oriented.

Users' and stakeholders' cooperation is absolutely critical

Users' and stakeholders' cooperation is one of the important dimensions towards sustainable and effective production of disaggregated gender statistics. This mechanism does not only improve the production process, but more importantly, strengthens trust and understanding among stakeholders, forges new networks, and educates all those who take part. Stakeholder cooperation may take various forms: institutionalized users-producers dialogues, multi-stakeholder consultations, and other capacity development activities in the GSS. [12]

Establishing mechanisms and tools for efficient statistical coordination and management of a GSS

Mechanisms should be put in place within a GSS to get the commitment, engagement, and participation of gender data users and stakeholders. However, the readiness a GSS to engage with concerned actors vary from country to country. In this regard, following are some mechanisms and tools offered in the Counted and Visible Toolkit:

- Assignment or designation of gender statistics focal points or establishment of a gender statistics unit within NSOs or other key actors of the GSS [13];
- Formation of an inter-agency group or task force on gender statistics within the GSS [14];
- Legislation, statistical policies and agreements on the utilization of existing household surveys to generate disaggregated gender statistics;
- Development of a multi-year work program for the generation of disaggregated gender statistics; and
- Web portal for gender statistics.

Stage 1 country case studies: Albania, Cameroon, and Georgia

In **Albania**, the Inter-Agency Working Group on Gender Statistics (IAWG-GS), led and coordinated by the Institute of Statistics (INSTAT), plays an important role for improving access, dissemination, and communication of gender data. Key achievements of the group include the updating of the country's priority gender indicators as defined in the statistical publication, *Women and Men in Albania 2020* using existing data from household surveys, censuses and administrative data. More importantly, the creation of the IAWG-GS boosted users-producers dialogue resulting to concrete actions and positive changes on the production of more and better gender statistics (e.g., new partnership between INSTAT and the National Human Rights Institutions/Office of the Ombudsperson). In addition, serving as coordinator of the NSS as well as GSS, INSTAT has been liaising and enhancing cooperation in the IAWG-GS and leading initiatives toward improving technical capacities for data production, increasing awareness and statistical literacy of gender data (e.g., integration of new indicators from administrative data sources in INSTAT's gender data dashboard).

The Chief Statistician of **Cameroon** committed and decided to have dedicated staff in the NSO focused on gender statistics work, including its coordination within the NSO and the NSS. A Permanent Working Group on Gender Statistics, led by no less than the Chief Statistician himself, was formed. Key achievements from this working group includes the identification and adoption of a minimum set of gender indicators covering priority areas of concern in Cameroon. Relatedly, data-driven policy briefs drilling down to women entrepreneurship, health, and financial inclusion, were produced.

Led by the National Statistics Office of **Georgia** (GEOSTAT), the country has been building a genderresponsive statistical system through the development of a National Strategy on Gender Statistics and establishing the Inter-Agency Working Group on Gender Data (IAWG-GD) under the Interagency Commission on Gender Equality, Violence against Women and Domestic Violence. The Working group serves as the country's mechanism for cooperation and coordination of gender statistics. It also facilitated the identification of their NPGEIs, which involved the mapping of policy priorities and identification of most vulnerable groups of population. The NPGEIs will inform the basis of selection of the level of disaggregation of gender statistics that will be compiled on a regular basis using existing data from household surveys and other data sources. More importantly and more concretely, it contributed to the assessment and development of new policies, particularly the National Action Plans on combating violence against women and domestic violence, human rights, Security Council Resolutions in women, peace, and security. The NPGEIs is also envisaged to increase the demand for data-driven policies and set up a framework for a national gender data ecosystem.

Stage 2: Development of national priority gender equality indicators framework

The compilation of gender equality indicators relies on monitoring initiatives and considers the existing demand for statistical information in this field at national and international levels. The Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Gender Statistics (IAEG-GS) has established a minimum set of gender indicators for international compilation worldwide, to provide a basis for monitoring gender issues on the global level and also serve as basis for regional and national exercises of indicator development. [15]

The stakeholders in the GSS working on the generation of disaggregated gender statistics need to formulate the National Priority Gender Equality Indicators (NPGEIs) framework. In the development of the framework, there is a need to prioritize which among the numerous indicators had to be disaggregated, considering resources available (e.g., existing data source, human resources, funding, and lifespan of the project) and country's requirements. There are generic tools developed used by several NSOs around the world to identify NPGEIs as well as those that need to be disaggregated. This includes the 'Every Policy is Connected' or EPIC tool developed by United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UN ESCAP) [16] as well as the Advanced Data Planning Tool (ADAPT) developed by PARIS21. [17]

Stage 2 country case studies: Senegal, United Republic of Tanzania, and Viet Nam

The Government of **Senegal** aimed contextualize the SDGs by adapting the targets and indicators to the country context. Moreover, it was deemed essential that disaggregated data are available to ensure the reliability of the planning, monitoring and evaluation processes of policies at the local level. This is even more necessary given existing legal frameworks on decentralization, wherein the government has decided to give more responsibilities to local authorities to promote better economic and social development. Presently, the country is using the same framework in updating and replicating the process and has focused on two policy-relevant indicators – education and informal work, under the leadership and coordination of the National Agency of Statistics and Demography of Senegal (ANSD, Agence Nationale de Statistique et de la Démographie).

In the **United Republic of Tanzania**, the Department of Social and Demographic Statistics of the Office of the Chief Government Statistician (OCGS) in Zanzibar developed, for the first time, the Zanzibar SDG Gender Indicators Report, with support from the Women Count programme. The Report covers detailed disaggregated gender statistics which is a product of using existing data from household surveys as well as censuses and administrative records to derive disaggregated priority GEWE indicators. The report provides valuable evidence-based information and deemed instrumental towards gender-responsive decision-making in Zanzibar.

Led by the General Statistics Office of **Viet Nam** (GSO), the country identified their NPGEIs by assessing the coverage of national policy documents for action and mapping national indicators and globalregional indicators, among others. Capacity development workshops to strengthen gender indicators and their production and use in response to policy demands in Viet Nam was also held to ensure the involvement of the different stakeholders in the NSS. The final set of Viet Nam NPGEIs were identified in 2019, which is currently being used by GSO to produce gender statistics that inform the biannual publication, *Women and Men in Vietnam*, with UN Women support.

Stage 3: Development of methodology(ies) and production of disaggregated statistics of select NPGEIs

There are different data sources to be considered: censuses, surveys, administrative records or registries as well as 'big data' sources. The Counted and Visible Toolkit focuses on existing data from household surveys. National household surveys are designed with specific domains of estimation which has sufficient number of observations to produce relatively reliable estimates. In producing disaggregated gender statistics, the estimates will be obtained from 'smaller' domains or subdomains. Sampling weights should be included in the estimation process as the estimates should reflect the achieved weighted values in accordance with the sample survey sampling procedure used in the conduct of the national survey.

Stage 3 country case studies: Mongolia and Pakistan

NSO **Mongolia** and UN Women jointly analyzed the indicator, '*Proportion of people who did not complete more than six years of education (or those who are education-poor)*' using Mongolia's Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey (MICS) 2014–15. Computations show that the likelihood of being education-poor increases if women and girls identify with ethnic minorities, religious minorities and live in a poor household. These factors compound to create substantially deprived groups of women. NSO Mongolia also used its MICS 2018 to estimate the indicator, '*Proportion of women who married as children*'. Undertaking a gender and intersectionality analysis, smaller subdomains were also considered in estimating the indicator such as the proportion of child marriage among women aged at least 18 years residing in urban areas by wealth index quintile.

The **Pakistan** case study presents how Geographic Information System (GIS) information can give an overview on the relationship between gender-based deprivations and other forms of inequality related to geographic location and intersection of geography with other group-based inequality. The GIS modules of its Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) 2017 were used to capturing spatially segregated socio-economic disadvantage of women and girls. The study indicates, overlapping inequalities, for example, those based on gender, ethnicity, geography, and wealth can and often do produce a form of disadvantage that is acute and distinct, leaving women and girls facing these overlapping forms of discrimination worse off than other groups in society. See Annex 2 showing inequalities in SDG-related outcomes between different groups of women and girls aged 18-49 years in Pakistan. [18]

Stage 4: Assessment and publication of results

Under Principle 15 of the United Nations' National Quality Assurance Frameworks Manual [19], statistical data and outputs should be assessed and validated and systems allowing this to be done regularly should be developed and managed. Guided by this, while in many cases disaggregated gender statistics can be directly estimated using existing data from household surveys, measures of precision and reliability should be obtained to assess the statistical soundness of the estimates. Stage 4 thus covers the quantitative as well as qualitative assessment when disaggregated gender statistics are produced and how these should inform publication of results.

Quantitative assessment involves evaluating the statistical properties of the estimates. There are many properties to consider in the assessment process of the disaggregated gender statistics produced. Considering practicality and existing common practices, the Counted and Visible Toolkit focused on the following three properties; that is, the disaggregated gender statistics produced must be:

- Sufficiently *accurate*, as measured by the bias;
- Sufficiently *precise*, as measured by the standard error (SE); and
- Sufficiently reliable, as measured by the coefficient of variation (CV),

in estimating the true value of the indicator.

A qualitative assessment is more of a practical evaluation of the estimates whose main objective is to assess how the estimates provide the true picture of reality. While quantitative are usually done by data producers, qualitative assessment usually involves group of prospective users and people who are most knowledgeable in the type of disaggregation being studied.

Regarded as good practice, data producers, particularly NSOs, are encouraged to present estimates along with corresponding CVs - ideally, as a minimum. If observed by NSOs and other data producers, there is, however, no internationally agreed standards or recommendations to determine the value of the CV that may be regarded as sufficiently reliable. Hence, cut-offs vary country to country and in some cases, from surveys to surveys. In cases where CVs are greater than the defined threshold, caveats should be provided to increase awareness of users in terms of the level of reliability of these estimates. Relevant information on the sampling design and explanations on why certain estimates do not meet criteria must be available to users. Relatedly, standard errors and confidence intervals may also be presented as supplemental indicators.

Stage 4 country case studies: Philippines and Mongolia

The then **Philippines** National Statistical Coordination Board (NSCB; now part of the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA))⁴ employed small area estimation (SAE) techniques based on the Elbers, Lanjouw and Lanjouw (ELL) methodology developed by the World Bank. Almost two decades ago, this generated – for the first time – intercensal small area estimates of poverty of all 1,622⁵ cities and municipalities. Given the nature of drilling down to very low levels of geographic disaggregation, the SAE exercise called for the examination of the reliability of these small area estimates. Coefficients of variation as well as standard errors and confidence intervals were made available to all users, published along with the release of the small area estimates. This practice was institutionalized in all succeeding SAE exercises undertaken by the PSA. (See Annex 3.) Further, this good practice of integrating and institutionalizing publication of measures of precision and reliability of estimates were also applied in the release of official estimates of poverty, directly generated from results of the Family Income and Expenditures Survey (FIES). (See Annex 4.)

Disaggregated gender statistics were generated for nine gender indicators using **Mongolia**'s MICS 2018: one indicator used only one disaggregation variable; four indicators used two variables; and the remaining four used three variables. Examining the reliability of the estimates as measured by their corresponding CVs, only five of eight estimates are relatively reliable. Two estimates with CVs greater than 10 but less than 20 percent are relatively sufficiently reliable but should be used with caution. On the other hand, a caveat should be provided when publishing the remaining indicator given a CV of 30 percent. (See Annex 5.)

⁴ In accordance with the *Philippine Statistical Act of 2013, An Act Reorganizing the Philippine Statistical System and for Other Purposes.*

⁵ As of 2000.

Stage 5: Dissemination, advocacy and use of disaggregated gender statistics produced

Gender statistics will only be valuable to users if they are "easily found and accessible, and if users find them relevant and easy to understand." [20] This stage examines important components of disseminating, communicating, and advocating for use of disaggregated gender statistics.

A dissemination plan specific to gender statistics should be developed as gender issues occupy a unique place in policymaking [20] and gender concepts require in-depth clarification to avoid confusion and misrepresentation. The plan should ideally feature important components of dissemination such as the dissemination team, target users, what gender statistics will be disseminated, how it will be disseminated, and timeline.

Communication activities do not only include the promotion of dissemination materials and events related to it but the overall improvement of awareness, understanding, and use of gender statistics. The promotion of statistical products and events will increase awareness of users on the availability of gender statistics.

There are several ways to inform the users of the availability of new gender statistics. The NSS unit's official website is a good start. A good turn-around would be to send electronic mails to statistical contacts and targets users. Official social media pages can be utilized for announcements. Media outlets can be contacted to effectively reach broad exposure and dissemination of information. Press releases can be prepared by the dissemination team to guide the media on reporting the gender issues that the dissemination team may want to highlight. [21]

Several activities can be done to ensure understanding and use of gender statistics such as preparing key messages, maintaining good relationships with users, conducting training courses for statistics literacy, making use of social media for promotion, and institutionalizing dissemination team members and plans.

Stage 5 country case studies: Colombia, Uganda, and Kenya

In November 2020, Colombia released its first edition of Women and Men: Gender Gaps in Colombia. (See Annex 6.) This publication includes a strategic selection of themes and indicators describing and analyzing the current situation of women and men in the country. A clear demonstration of the strong and high-level support of national government in this initiative, no less than the female Vice President of Colombia opened the launch event. Less than a month since the launch of the report, two positive and institutionalized changes have been committed by Colombia's NSO:

- Annual publication of the report; and
- Regional observatories will launch similar publications to inform local decision- and policymaking in their respective regions.

The launch also increased awareness and fostered interactions among gender data users and stakeholders. It was live broadcasted on Facebook and garnered more than 25,000 views and 752 interactions. The Women and Men: Gender Gaps in Colombia was made publicly available for download at the UN Women Colombia, DANE and Presidential Council for Women Equality/Colombia's Ministry of Women (CPEM) website. [22] Within a month after its release, it has already achieved 87,300 impressions from the UN Women Colombia website. It was also covered in at least 47 publications in national, regional, and local media.

Uganda developed its NPGEIs framework starting in 2016. The process involved the harmonization of indicators of the country's NDP II, Sector Development Plans and the SDGs. The initiative involved the compilation and reprocessing of survey and administrative data by strategic institutions. In updating the NPGEIs in 2019, the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) in collaboration with other Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) embarked on reprocessing existing census, survey and administrative data to provide disaggregated statistics on select NPGEIs, particularly those related to SDG Tier 1 indicators. With the identification and production of NPGEIs, reporting of gender indicators in Uganda's Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) have increased by 150% in a span of four years: from 11 in 2016 to 28 in 2020. [23]

In partnership with **Kenya** National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and UNICEF, UN Women's Women Count programme co-led the conceptualization, coordination, and hosting of the launch of Kenya's Women's Empowerment Index (WEI). WEI is a major milestone in the country's monitoring of SDG 5 as it is the first comprehensive and systematic measure for women's and girls' empowerment in Kenya. It identified women's status in the following domains of empowerment as follows: i) attitudes toward wife beating; ii) human and social resources; iii) household decision-making; d) control over sexual relations; e) economic domain. The products and events related to the dissemination of Kenya's WEI garnered substantial positive coverage in the mainstream media. These media coverage contributed to informed public discourse in gender equality in the country.

Summary

The Counted and Visible Toolkit goes beyond estimation exercises to produce disaggregated gender statistics using existing data from household surveys – it aims to promote NSS-wide capacity development and strengthening

The Counted and Visible Toolkit is a collection of good practices as well as learnings of select country studies, each focusing on specific aspects of the statistical process aimed at ensuring a *holistic, sustainable, and institutionalized* approach of producing disaggregated gender statistics using existing data from household surveys. The stages were also guided by the overarching aims of UN Women's global gender data programme, Women Count, of ensuring an enabling environment, increasing data production, and increasing access and use to inform policies.

Guided by the above principles, NSSs are encouraged to *intentionally* consider the following in the generation of disaggregated gender statistics using existing data from household surveys:

- The initiative requires strong commitments of institutions and actors in NSS working on gender equality and women's empowerment (that is, gender statistical system). Leadership and commitment by the NSO and/or national women's machinery are indispensable elements to ensure stakeholders' engagement and cooperation throughout the process.
- Gender data production process should be user-oriented rather than product-oriented.
- The basis for the selection of gender statistics to be disaggregated should be guided by priority and policy-relevant indicators (NPGEIs) identified and owned by both gender data producers and users.
- Existing data from household surveys can be further tapped to produce disaggregated data of NPGEIs that is, beyond traditional gender statistics usually from standard statistical tables or with limited disaggregation specifications.
- Extraction of new disaggregated gender statistics using existing data from household surveys also calls for capacity development activities within the NSO, GSS, and NSS to ensure institutionalization, transfer as well as sharing of knowledge across key actors.
- Estimates of "smaller" domains or subdomains (e.g., geographic or specific sub-population group) may not necessarily have been considered when the household survey was earlier

designed. Hence, there is a need to examine whether disaggregated gender statistics produced are *sufficiently* precise and reliable as measured by the standard error and coefficient of variation in estimating the true value of the indicator. As there is currently no internationally agreed standards or recommendations regarding sufficient levels of precision and reliability, these vary across countries considering their level of statistical development.

- Towards increasing statistical appreciation of gender data users, data producers are also encouraged to present these data quality measures along with other relevant information that will be helpful for users to understand and evaluate the estimates themselves.
- The initiative should be undertaken within the framework of "nothing about us without us."
 [7] Thus, qualitative assessments should involve the specific population of interest themselves as well as other prospective users and those also knowledgeable in the type of disaggregation being studied.
- There is no single formula to produce disaggregated gender statistics that are relevant to the users, easy to find, easy to understand, and ensure uptake and use. It is composed of different good practices not just in disseminating statistical products but also in communicating and advocating the use of disaggregated gender statistics and tailor-fitting them to the target users, influencers and movers of the GEWE agenda in the country.
- Lastly and not least, investments are needed human, information and communications technology, financial in undertaking this initiative.

Counted and Visible Toolkit as a living document

The Counted and Visible Toolkit is a living document and is not intended to be the final word on how to better utilize existing household surveys to produce disaggregated gender statistics. UN Women and the ISWGHS consider this as a dynamic document that should be periodically updated as other countries use and adapt the Counted and Visible Toolkit to their country-specific needs. Contributions of NSSs of their country experiences, challenges, and learnings are likewise encouraged.

List of References

| LIST UI | Nerel ences |
|---------|---|
| [1] | UN Women. Making Every Woman and Girl Count: Supporting the monitoring and implementation of the SDGs through better production and use of gender statistics. Project Document (Updated version). New York, USA. 2018. |
| [2] | United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. New York, USA. 25 September 2015. (https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda) |
| [3] | UN Women, UNSD, and Intersecretariat Working Group on Household Surveys (ISWGHS). Global conference on the measurement of gender equality, leave no one behind and intersecting inequalities: Concept Note and Agenda. New York, USA. 26-27 February 2020. (https://data.unwomen.org/news/counted-and-visible-global-conference-measurement- gender-and-intersecting-inequalities) |
| [4] | Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs). Data Disaggregation and SDG Indicators: Policy Priorities and Current and Future Disaggregation Plans. Background Document for the 50 th Session of the UN Statistical Commission. 5-8 March 2019. (<u>https://unstats.un.org/unsd/statcom/50th-</u> <u>session/documents/BG-Item3a-Data-Disaggregation-E.pdf</u>) |
| [5] | UN Women. Making Every Woman and Girl Count: Supporting the monitoring and implementation of the SDGs through better production and use of gender statistics. 2019 Annual Report. New York, USA. 23 July 2020. (<u>https://data.unwomen.org/publications/women-count-annual-report-201</u>) |
| [6] | Intersecretariat Working Group on Household Surveys (ISWGHS). (<u>https://unstats.un.org/iswghs/</u>) |
| [7] | UN Women, ISWGHS, and UNSD. Counted and Visible Global Conference on the measurement of gender equality, leave no one behind and intersecting inequalities. New York, USA. 26-27 February 2020. (https://data.unwomen.org/news/counted-and-visible-global-conference- measurement-gender-and-intersecting-inequalities) |
| [8] | UNSD and UN Women. Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals: The Gender Snapshot 2020. New York, USA. 17 September 2020. (<u>https://data.unwomen.org/publications/progress-sustainable-development-goals-gender-snapshot-2020</u>) |
| [9] | International Labour Organization and UN Women. The Impact of Marriage and Children on Labour Market Participation: Spotlight on Goal 8. May 2020. (https://data.unwomen.org/publications/impact-marriage-and-children-labour-market- participation) |
| [10] | UN Habitat and UN Women. Harsh Realities: Marginalized Women in Cities of the Developing World: Spotlight on Goal 11. February 2020. (<u>https://data.unwomen.org/publications/spotlight-sdg11-harsh-realities-marginalized-</u> women-cities-developing-world) |
| [11] | UN Women. Gender Sensitive Resilience Capacity Index: Iraq Report. Strengthening the Resilience of Syrian Women and Girls and Host Communities in Iraq, Jordan and Turkey Programme. 2020. (<u>https://arabstates.unwomen.org/en/digital-</u> <u>library/publications/2020/10/gender-sensitive-resilience-capacity-index-iraq-report</u>) |

| [12] | PARIS21. Guidelines 2.3 for the Development of National Strategies for the Development of Statistics. Paris, France. April 2018. (<u>https://nsdsguidelines.paris21.org/</u>) |
|------|---|
| [13] | UN Women. Guidance note on the assignment or designation of gender statistics focal points or the establishment of a gender statistics unit within NSOs or other key actors of the GSS. Making Every Woman and Girl Count Programme. New York, USA. 18 October 2018. |
| [14] | UN Women. Guidance note on the establishment of an inter-agency coordination mechanism (e.g., inter-agency committee or technical working group on gender statistics). Making Every Woman and Girl Count Programme. New York, USA. 18 October 2018. |
| [15] | UN Women. Making every woman and girl count in the production, dissemination and use of statistics for SDGs monitoring in Colombia: Project Document. Colombia. July 2019 |
| [16] | United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division. The United Nations Minimum Set of Gender Indicators: A product of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Gender Statistics. New York, USA. 30 April 2019. (https://genderstats.un.org/files/Minimum%20Set%20indicators%202018.11.1%20web.pdf) |
| [17] | UNESCAP. EPIC: A Policy-Data integration tool (https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/EPIC%20Overview%20%28EPIC_V1.1_Final%29. pdf) |
| [18] | PARIS21. Advanced Data Planning Tool (ADAPT). Paris, France. 23 August 2017. (<u>https://paris21.org/advanced-data-planning-tool-adapt</u>) |
| [19] | Azcona, Ginette and Bhatt, Antra. Book Chapter, Revealing the Gendered Impacts of COVID- 19: Minding the Gap. 2021. (<i>To be published</i>) |
| [20] | UNSD. United Nations National Quality Assurance Frameworks Manual for Official Statistics. 2019 (<u>https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/dataquality/references/1902216-UNNQAFManual-WEB.pdf</u>) |
| [21] | United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). Guidance on Communicating Gender Statistics. Geneva, Switzerland. (<u>https://unece.org/DAM/stats/publications/2020/CommsGender_Publ_wCovers.pdf</u>) |
| [22] | PARIS21 and UN Women. e-Learning Course on Communicating Gender Statistics. PARIS21 Academy and Making Every Woman and Girl Count. Paris, France. July 2020. (<u>https://academy.paris21.org/en/course/communicating-gender-statistics</u>) |
| [23] | UN Women and National Administrative Department of Statistics and the Presidential Council for Women's Equity. Women and Men: Gender Gaps in Colombia. Colombia. September 2020. (<u>https://colombia.unwomen.org/es/biblioteca/publicaciones/2020/11/mujeres-y-hombres-brechas-de-genero-en-colombia</u>) |
| [24] | Uganda Bureau of Statistics. National Priority Gender Equality Indicators (NPGEIs). Illuminating the path towards Gender Equality in Uganda. November 2016. |

Annexes



Annex 1: Resilience profile of programme beneficiaries in Iraq, May 2020

Annex Figure 1: Resilience Capacity Index in of women programme beneficiaries in Irq by select

Source: UN Women. Gender Sensitive Resilience Capacity Index: Iraq Report. Strengthening the Resilience of Syrian Women and Girls and Host Communities in Iraq, Jordan and Turkey Programme. 2020. (<u>https://arabstates.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2020/10/gender-sensitive-resilience-capacity-index-iraq-report</u>)

Annex 2: Disaggregated gender statistics using GIS modules of the 2017 DHS

| Indicator description | Relevant SDG | Poorest rural Saraiki | Poorest rural Sindhi | Poorest rural Pashtun | Poorest rural | Poorest | Rural | National aggregate | Urban | Richest | Richest urban | Richest urban Punjabi | Richest urban Urdu |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------|--------|-----------------------|-------|---------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Proportion of women aged 18-49, who are underweight (BMI less | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| • | SDG 2 | 25.29 | 34.48 | | 24.23 | 23.81 | 11 36 | 9.05 | 5.41 | 3.94 | 4.56 | 5.14 | 4.42 |
| Proportion of women and | 5002 | 25.25 | 54.40 | | 24.23 | 25.01 | 11.50 | 5.05 | J.41 | 3.94 | 4.50 | 5.14 | 4.42 |
| girls aged 18-49 who do not have an independent/joint say in | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SDG 3 | 50.02 | 51.87 | 83.04 | 55 | 54.79 | 53.84 | 49.01 | 40.79 | 40.05 | 38.45 | 37.7 | 34.74 |
| Proportion of births not attended by skilled health personnel (births in last | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| . , , | SDG 3 | 60.69 | 45.52 | 58.34 | 54.31 | 53.96 | 37.44 | 30.65 | 16.17 | 6.82 | 7.65 | 8.87 | 0.57 |
| Proportion of women and girls aged 18-49 with six or less years of education | SDG 4 | 99.1 | 98.4 | 99.38 | 98.07 | 97.97 | 79.07 | 66.81 | 45.98 | 23.34 | 21.84 | 19.6 | 9.68 |
| Proportion of women aged 18-49 who were married before age 18 | SDG 5 | 49.35 | 52.58 | 55.5 | 51.61 | 52.13 | 28 81 | 34 32 | 26.68 | 17.53 | 17.5 | 14.82 | 11.19 |
| Proportion of women and girls aged 18-49 with no access to basic drinking | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| water services Proportion of women and girls aged 18-49 with no access to basic sanitation | SDG 6 | 13.12 | 20.7 | 39.96 | 26.24 | 26.21 | 15.49 | 13.86 | 11.04 | 8.83 | 10.1 | 15.34 | 3.6 |
| facilities | SDG 6 | 62.18 | 59.78 | 48.78 | 52.88 | 52.64 | 25.51 | 19.36 | 10.59 | 2.09 | 2.13 | 1.98 | 1.55 |
| Proportion of women and girls aged 18-49 with no access to clean cooking | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| fuel | SDG 7 | 98.35 | 97.38 | 97.89 | 97.94 | 97.79 | 73.44 | 50.69 | 11.5 | 4.41 | 0.63 | 0.06 | 0.17 |
| Proportion of women aged 18-49 currently not employed | SDG 8 | 65.98 | 68.36 | 94.14 | 72.22 | 72.41 | 80.79 | 82.55 | 85.54 | 88.45 | 88.09 | 88.69 | 87.01 |
| Proportion of women and girls aged 18-49 living in overcrowded housing | SDG 11 | 94.58 | 91.63 | 84.65 | 90.13 | 90.3 | 75.26 | 72.02 | 66.51 | 49.12 | 50.87 | 50.16 | 43.03 |
| Proportion of women and girls aged 18-49 reporting that they cannot access health care due to distance from health | | 54.50 | 51.05 | 04.03 | 50.13 | 50.5 | , 3.20 | 72.02 | 00.51 | 73.12 | 50.07 | 50.10 | +3.03 |
| facility | SDG 3 | 66.42 | 41.66 | 81.33 | 61.32 | 60.14 | 51.66 | 41.99 | 25.53 | 18.47 | 16.23 | 20.32 | 10.65 |

Annex Table 1: Inequalities in SDG-related outcomes between different groups of women and girls aged 18-49 years, Pakistan, 2017

Notes: Select groups are shown given space limitations. Urdu is used as shorthand for Urdu-speaking. No access to clean drinking water: Pashtuns reside mostly in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa region, where reliance on unprotected wells and springs is particularly high. The 2005 earthquake and 2010 floods have further raised concerns about water quality for residents of this region. These and other factors contribute to much higher rates of no access to clean drinking water for Pashtuns overall, but especially those from the poorest rural households. Data for BMI is not shown for poorest rural Pashtun due to insufficient sample size. Based on survey characteristics, married is defined as married and/or cohabitation.

Source: Azcona and Bhatt's calculations based on based on microdata from National Institute of Population Studies (NIPS) and ICF international 2017.



Annex Figure 2: Disaggregated gender statistics using GIS modules of the 2017 DHS

Source: Azcona and Bhatt's calculations based on based on microdata from NIPS and ICF international 2017.

Annex 3: Illustration of Philippines' publication of measures of precision and reliability of small area estimates of poverty generated

| City and Region | Province | -level Small Are Municipality | | EStimat Standard en | | 3 efficient of | Rank (P | oorest=1) M | agnitude of | Poor Pove | rty Gap | SE | Severity of | SE | |
|---|---------------|--|-------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| NCR | 1st district | TONDO | Incidence 6.73 | (SE) | | iation (CV) | 82 | 1557 | Populatio | n 5300 | 125 | 0.30 | Poverty | 0.12 | |
| NCR | 1st district | BINONDO | 6.73 | | .09 198 | | 6.2 6.0 | 1557 | 4 | 5,300 147 | 1.25 | 0.30 | 0.37 | | |
| | | QUIAPO | 4.18 | 1 | .89 | 48 | 5.2 | 1582 | | 1,032 | 0.77 | 0.51 | 0.22 | | |
| | | SAN NICOLAS | 8.93 | | .78 | | 3.5 | 1523 | | 120 | 1.71 | 1.24 | 0.52 | | |
| | | SANTA CRUZ SAMPALOC | 3.35 | | 1.88 | | 6.3 3.8 | 1599 1615 | | 4,247 7,303 | 0.59 | 0.23 | 0.17 | | |
| | | SAN MIGUEL | 4.37 | | 176 | | 3.2 | 1580 | | 752 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.22 | | |
| | | ERMITA | 2.40 | | .58 | | 5.8 | 1611 | | 159 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.11 | | |
| | | INTRAMUROS MALATE | 7.97 | | .26 | | 3.5 7.4 | 1535 1587 | | 427 | 1.47 | 1.08 | 0.42 | | |
| | | PACO | 3.00 | | .87 | | 8.3 | 1602 | | 2,271 | 0.51 | 0.19 | 0.13 | | |
| | | PANDACAN | 3.66 | | .96 | | 6.2 | 1592 | | 2,974 | 0.62 | 0.23 | 0.17 | | |
| | | PORT AREA SANTA ANA | 13.17 3.79 | | 199 193 | | 5.9 4.5 | 1463 1590 | | 3,844 7,232 | 2.71 | 3.11 0.25 | 0.86 | | |
| | 2nd district | MANDALUYONG | 2.96 | | .77 | | 4.5 9.8 | 1605 | | 9,073 | 0.67 | 0.25 | 0.19 | | |
| | | CITY | 2.72 | | 91 | _ | 0.2 | 1609 | | | 0.47 | 0.50 | | | |
| | | CITY OF MARIKINA CITY OF PASIG | 2.72 | | .91 67 | | 0.2 8 1 | 1609 | | 1,727 1,928 | 0.47 | 0.50 | 0.14 | | |
| | | QUEZON CITY | 3.03 | 0 | 1.88 | 20 | 9.0 | 1604 | 7 | 3,710 | 0.55 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.11 | |
| | | SAN JUAN | 1.50 | | .03 | | 8.7 | 1619 | | 2,024 | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.09 | | |
| | 3rd district | KALOOKAN CITY MALABON | 5.16 5.10 | | .70 82 | | 2.9 5.7 | 1575 1578 | | 5,183 7.575 | 0.91 | 0.39 | 0.26 | | |
| | | NAVOTAS | 7.41 | | 12 | | 2.1 | 1543 | | 7,484 | 1.37 | 0.80 | 0.39 | | |
| | | CITY OF VALENZUELA | 4.40 | 1 | .52 | 34 | 4.5 | 1579 | 2 | 2,676 | 0.73 | 0.35 | 0.20 | 0.13 | |
| | | | | | | | | | Catin | | | | 2000 | | |
| re 4. Cit | v and | Municipa | al Lev | el Sn | nall / | Area | Pov | ertv | ESTIC | nate | s: 20 | JU6. | 2009 | . anc | 1 20 |
| | - | Municipa | | | | Area | Pov | erty | Estir | nate | s: 20 | JU6, | 2009 | , and | 1 20 |
| | - | | | 2009 and | 2012 | | 1 | | | nate | | | ence Interv | | d 20 |
| Municipal and | City Level Sn | all Area Poverty Esti | mates; 2006, | 2009 and | | | 1 | erty | | | | 0% Confid | | al | d 20 |
| | City Level Sn | | mates; 2006, | 2009 and | 2012 | | 1 | | | 20 | 91 106 | 0% Confid 20 Lower | ence Interv 109 | al 20 Lower | 112 |
| Municipal and Region/Pr | City Level Sn | all Area Poverty Esti | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov | 2012 rerty Incide | ence | Coeffic | cient of Va | riation* | | 9 | 0% Confid 20 | ence Interv | al 20 | |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | ali Area Poverty Esti. Municipality | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 | 2012 Perty Incide 2009 | ence 2012 | Coeffic 2006 | cient of Va | riation* 2012 | 20 Lower Limit | 9 106 Upper Limit | 0% Confid 2(Lower Limit | ence Interv 009 Upper Limit | al 20 Lower Limit | 112 Upper Limit |
| Municipal and Region/Pr | City Level Sn | all Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 | 2012 rerty Incide 2009 2.9 | ence 2012 3.1 | Coeffic 2006 | 2009 27.5 | riation* 2012 20.4 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 | 9 06 Upper Limit 5.0 | 0% Confid 20 Lower Limit 1.6 | ence Interv 009 Upper Limit 4.2 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | all Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 | 2012 Perty Incide 2009 | ence 2012 | Coeffic 2006 | cient of Va | riation* 2012 20.4 41.9 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 | 9 106 Upper Limit | 0% Confid 2(Lower Limit | ence Interv 009 Upper Limit | al 20 Lower Limit | 112 Upper Limit |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | all Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 | 2012 rerty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 | ence 2012 3.1 1.5 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 | 2009 27.5 68.0 | riation* 2012 20.4 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 | 9 06 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 | 0% Confid 20 Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 | ence Interv 009 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 | al Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | All Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 | 2012 rerty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 | ence 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 | riation* 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 | 9 06 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 | 0% Confid 20 Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 | ence Interv 009 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 | al Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 3.1 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | All Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 | 2012 rerty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 | ence 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 | 9 06 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 | 0% Confid 20 Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 | Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | All Area Poverry Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc San Miguel | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 | 2012 rerty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 | ence 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 | 9 006 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 | 0% Confid 20 Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 | ence Interv 009 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | And Area Poverry Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaioc Sam Miguel Ermita | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 | 2012 erty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 | ence 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 | 9 006 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 | 0% Confid Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 | ence Interv 009 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 | 12 Upper 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | Auf Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Dinondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc San Miguel Emita Intramuros | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 | 2012 erty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 | ence 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 | 9 06 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 8.5 4.1 | 0% Confid Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.5 | ence Interv 109 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 4.5 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | And Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Biondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc San Miguel Emita Intramuros Malate | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 | 2012 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 | ence 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 8.9 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 | 9 06 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 | 2% Confid 2% Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 | ence Interv 109 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.7 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 4.5 1.9 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | All Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc San Mguel Ermita Intramuros Malate Paco | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 | 2012 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.8 | 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 14.3 14.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 8.9 5.8 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 31.3 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 | 90 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 | 2% Confid 2% Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 | ence Interv 009 Upper 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | And Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc San Miguel Emita Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 | 2012 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.8 1.9 | 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 8.9 5.8 7.8 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 25.6 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 5.2 | 9006 Upper 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 6.8 | 0% Confid 20 Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.8 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 | ence Interv 109 Upper 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.7 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 | 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 2.2 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | All Area Poverty Estil Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc San Nicolas Santa Quel Emita Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan Potr Area | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 13.2 | 2012 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.8 1.9 11.9 | 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 10.0 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 8.9 5.8 7.8 15.2 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 57.5 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 25.6 45.2 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 5.2 9.9 | 9006 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 6.8 16.5 | 0% Confid 2% Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.6 | ence Interv 109 Upper 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 2.3.1 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 2.6 | 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 2.2 17.5 |
| Municipal and u Region/Pr NCR 1st district | City Level Sn | Auf Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc Santa Aruz Sampaloc Esmita Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan Pot Area Santa Ana | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 13.2 4.7 | 2012 rerty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.8 1.9 11.9 2.2 | 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 10.0 1.3 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 8.9 5.8 7.8 15.2 17.8 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 57.5 29.0 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 25.6 45.2 27.6 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.2 9.9 3.3 | 90 06 Upper 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.8 16.5 6.0 | 2% Confid 2% Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.6 1.1 | ence Interv 109 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 2.3.1 3.2 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 2.6 0.7 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 2.2 17.5 1.8 |
| Municipal and C Region/Pr NCR | City Level Sn | All Area Poverty Estil Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc San Nicolas Santa Quel Emita Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan Potr Area | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 13.2 4.7 6.1 | 2012 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.8 1.9 11.9 | 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 10.0 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 8.9 5.8 7.8 15.2 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 57.5 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 25.6 45.2 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 9.9 9.3 3.3 4.3 | 90 06 Upper 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.0 7.9 | 2% Confid 2% Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.6 1.1 0.5 | ence Interv 109 Upper 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 2.3.1 | al 20 20 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 2.6 0.7 0.6 | 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 2.2 17.5 |
| Municipal and u Region/Pr NCR 1st district | City Level Sn | Auf Area Poverty Esti Municipality Dinordo Dinordo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaioc San Miguel Emnta Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan Paco Pandacan Port Area Santa Ana Mandaluyong City Marikina City | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 3.1 4.4 9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 13.2 4.7 6.1 6.0 | 2012 rerty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.8 1.9 11.9 11.9 2.2 1.8 2.2 | 3.1 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 10.0 1.3 1.4 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 8.9 5.8 7.8 15.2 7.8 15.8 7.8 15.2 17.8 17.6 11.9 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 57.5 53.0 29.0 45.1 41.1 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 25.6 45.2 27.6 45.2 27.8 30.5 | 20 Lower Limer 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5 | 9 006 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 6.8 16.5 6.8 16.5 7.9 7.2 | 2% Confid 24 Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 | ence Interv 109 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 2.3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 2.3.1 3.2 3.8 | al 20 Lower Limit 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 2.6 0.7 0.6 0.7 0.6 | 12 Upper Limit 42 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 1.2 6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.4 2.7 5.5 1.9 1.4 2.7 5.5 1.8 2.0 2.1 |
| Municipal and u Region/Pr NCR 1st district | City Level Sn | An Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaioc San Alguel Emita Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan Port Area Santa Ana Mandatyong City | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 13.2 4.7 6.1 | 2012 rerty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.9 11.9 2.2 1.8 | 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 10.0 1.3 1.3 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 8.9 5.8 7.8 7.8 15.2 17.8 17.6 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 67.4 67.4 8.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 57.5 29.0 45.1 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 55.6 25.6 25.6 25.6 27.6 32.8 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 9.9 9.3 3.3 4.3 | 90 06 Upper 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.0 7.9 | 2% Confid 2% Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.6 1.1 0.5 | ence Interv 109 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 2.3.1 3.2 3.2 | al 20 20 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 2.6 0.7 0.6 | 12 Upper Limit 42 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 2.2 17.5 1.8 2.0 |
| Municipal and u Region/Pr NCR 1st district | City Level Sn | Auf Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc Santa Cruz Sampaloc Emnita Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan Pot Area Santa Ana Mandaluyong City Markina City | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 13.2 4.7 6.1 6.0 5.0 | 2012 retty Incide 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.8 1.9 11.9 2.2 1.8 2.2 2.2 | 3.1 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 10.0 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.8 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 9.6 14.3 11.3 14.7 2 56.4 20.9 8.9 8.9 8.5 8 7.8 15.2 17.8 15.2 17.8 15.2 17.8 15.2 17.9 9.5 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 33.0 57.5 29.0 45.1 41.1 37.3 | riation* 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 25.6 45.2 27.6 32.8 30.5 24.6 | 20 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 9.9 9.3 3.3 4.3 4.3 4.9 4.2 | 9005 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.5 8.5 5.5 8.5 5.5 8.5 5.5 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.8 10.5 5.6 8.5 6.0 7.9 7.2 5.7 | 2% Confid 2% Confid 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 | ence Interv 009 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 2.3.1 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.5 4.5 3.5 3.5 4.5 3.5 4.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3 | al 200 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 0.4 0.5 0.0 0.5 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 2.6 0.7 0.7 0.6 0.7 1.1 | 12 Upper Limit 4.2 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 1.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 2.2 17.5 1.8 2.0 2.1 1.2 6 |
| Municipal and u Region/Pr NCR 1st district | City Level Sn | All Area Poverty Estil Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Samaloic San Nicolas Santa Cruz Samaloic Santa Cruz Samaloic Santa Cruz Emita Intramuros Malate Padoacan Port Area Santa Ana Mandaluyong City Mankina City Pasig City Quezon City | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 13.2 4.7 6.1 6.0 5.0 4.1 | 2012 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.9 11.9 2.2 1.8 2.2 2.4 | 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 1.3 1.4 1.6 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 56.4 20.9 5.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 15.2 17.8 17.6 11.9 9.5 16.0 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 23.6 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 29.1 31.3 35.5 29.0 46.1 41.1 3.25.3 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 24.7 73.1 49.6 26.7 31.1 25.6 45.2 27.6 32.8 30.5 24.6 18.5 | 22 Lower Lower 12 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 5.5 5.5 2.0 9.9 3.3 4.3 4.9 9.9 3.3 4.3 4.2 3.0 | 9 06 Uper 1.mit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 5.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8.5 4.1 7.3 6.6 8.5 6.0 7.9 7.2 5.7 5.7 5.7 | 9% Confid 2 Cover Lower 1.6 0 0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 | ence Interv 09 Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 3.1 3.2 3.2 3.5 3.4 | al Lower 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 2.6 0.7 0.6 0.7 0.6 0.7 1.1 1.1 | 42 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 4.5 1.6 4.5 1.6 4.5 1.4 2.2 17.5 1.8 2.0 1.4 2.2 1.7 5 1.4 2.2 1.4 2.5 1.4 2.5 1.4 2.5 2.5 1.4 2.5 5.5 1.4 2.5 5.5 1.4 2.5 5.5 1.4 2.5 5.5 1.4 2.5 5.5 1.4 2.5 5.5 1.4 2.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.2 0 1.4 5.5 5.2 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 5.5 1.4 5.5 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 |
| Municipal and u Region/Pr NCR 1st district 2nd district | City Level Sn | Auf Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Dinordo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc Santa Gruz Sampaloc Emita Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan Paco Pandacan Pott Area Santa Ana Mandaluyong City Markina City Pasig City Quezon City | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 4.3 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 6.0 13.2 4.7 6.1 6.0 5.0 0 13.2 2.9 | 2012 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.9 9 2.2 1.8 2.2 2.2 1.8 2.2 2.4 1.5 | 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 10.0 1.3 1.4 1.8 0.3 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 55.4 20.9 5.8 7.8 15.2 5.8 7.8 15.2 17.8 17.8 15.8 17.8 15.2 17.8 15.8 17.8 15.8 15.8 15.8 15.8 15.8 15.8 15.8 15 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 32.5 67.4 68.7 48.0 67.4 68.7 48.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 57.5 57.5 29.0 45.1 41.1 37.3 22.5 342.5 | 2012 20.4 41.9 28.1 53.6 19.5 54.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 24.7 73.1 25.6 45.2 27.6 32.8 30.5 22.6 32.8 30.5 24.6 18.5 60.7 | 212 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 3.1 2.0 0.7 0.3 2.0 0.7 0.3 2.0 0.7 0.3 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5 | 906 Upper Limit 5.0 2.3 6.0 5.7 5.3 6.9 5.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 8.5 6.8 16.5 7.9 7.2 5.7 7.2 5.7 16.0 16.0 7.9 7.2 | 2% Confid 2% Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 | Upper Limit 4.2 2.2 3.5 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.9 2.3.1 4.5 2.6 2.9 2.3.1 4.5 2.8 2.9 2.3.1 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.4 2.5 | al 20 200 21 05 1.1 0.5 1.1 0.4 1.0 0.5 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.5 1.1 0.4 0.5 0.5 0.0 0 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0 | 12 Upper Limit 42 2.5 3.1 5.5 2.0 1.1 2.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 2.2 1.7.5 1.8 2.0 2.1 2.6 2.1 2.6 2.1 0.6 |
| Municipal and u Region/Pr NCR 1st district 2nd district | City Level Sn | Auf Area Poverty Esti Municipality Tondo Binondo Quiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc Santa Aruz Emnita Intramuros Malate Paco Pandacan Port Area Santa Arua Port Area Santa Arua Mandaluyong City Markina City Pasig City Quezon City San Juan City | mates; 2006, | 2009 and 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 5.8 3.1 5.8 3.1 5.8 3.1 4.4 4.3 0.6,4 6.0 6.0 13.2 4.7 6.1 6.0 5.0 5.0 | 2012 erty Incid 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.8 1.9 11.9 2.2 2.4 1.5 3.1 | 2012 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 4.5 3.0 8 4.2 9 9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 1.0 0.9 2.5 1.3 1.1 1.5 1.5 1.5 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 9.6 8.9 5.8 15.2 17.8 15.2 17.8 15.2 17.8 15.2 17.9 5.5 16.0 9.5 16.0 9.5 16.1 9.5 16.1 19.1 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 23.5 23.6 67.4 8.0 29.1 31.3 3.0 57.5 220.0 57.5 220.0 45.1 41.1 37.3 25.3 25.2 28.2 | Fieldon* 2012 204 41.9 28.1 53.6 28.1 53.6 24.7 73.1 49.6 25.6 45.2 27.6 30.5 30.5 24.6 18.5 24.6 19.4 | 212 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 2.0 0.7 0.3 2.0 0.7 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.5 5 | 906 Upper 2,3 6,0 5,7 5,3 6,9 5,5 8,5 8,5 8,5 8,5 8,5 8,5 8,5 8,5 8,5 | 2% Confid 24 Lower Limit 1.6 0.0 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 | 4.2 2.2 3.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 2.6 2.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 | al 20 20 20 21 05 1.1 0,5 0,5 0,5 0,5 0,5 0,5 0,7 0,4 0,9 2,6 0,7 0,4 0,9 2,6 0,7 0,7 0,6 0,7 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,1 1,1 1 | 12 Upper Limit 42 25 3.1 55 2.0 1.1 2.6 4.5 1.9 1.4 2.2 17.5 1.8 2.0 2.1 2.6 2.1 0.6 2.1 0.6 3.7 |
| Municipal and u Region/Pr NCR 1st district 2nd district | City Level Sn | All Area Poverty Estil Municipality Dinordo Guiapo San Nicolas Santa Cruz Sampaloc San Nigole Emita Intramoros Malate Paco Pandacan Port Area Santa Ana Mandalyong City Mankina City Pasig City Calocon City Malabon City | mates; 2006, | 2009 and Pov 2006 4.1 1.8 5.3 4.9 5.8 3.1 4.4 3.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 6.4 6.0 6.0 6.1 1.2 2.9 5.0 6.1 | 2012 enty Incidé 2009 2.9 1.0 2.1 2.4 1.7 1.3 1.4 1.5 5.5 1.8 1.8 1.9 1.9 2.2 1.8 1.9 2.2 2.4 2.4 1.5 3.1 4.0 | ence 2012 3.1 1.5 2.1 1.5 0.8 1.2 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.6 0.9 2.5 1.3 0.9 1.5 1.3 0.9 1.5 1.3 0.9 1.5 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 | Coeffic 2006 12.6 18.1 7.9 9.6 14.3 11.9 47.2 20.9 8.9 5.8 7.8 17.8 17.8 17.8 17.8 17.8 17.9 19.5 16.0 67.0 19.1 15.8 | 2009 27.5 68.0 42.4 57.0 22.5 22.6 67.4 48.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 29.1 31.3 33.0 29.1 29.2 29.0 29.1 29.2 29.2 29.2 29.2 29.2 29.2 20.2 20.2 | 2012 2014 419 28.1 536 24.7 73.1 47.8 49.6 26.7 31.1 24.6 25.7 31.1 25.6 25.7 32.8 32.8 32.8 32.8 18.5 24.6 18.5 19.4 19.4 22.9 | 21 Lower Limit 3.3 1.2 4.6 4.1 3.3 4.7 0.7 0.3 5.5 5.5 2.0 9 9 3.3 4.3 4.9 4.2 3.0 0.0 0 0.3 5.5 | 9 06 Upper 2.3 6.0 5.7 3.6 9 5.5 8.5 5.5 8.5 5.5 8.5 5.5 8.5 6.8 4.1 7.3 6.6 8.8 5.5 6.8 7.2 7.2 5.7 5.1 6.2 6.6 7.7 | 2% Confid 24 Lower Limit 16 00 0.6 0.1 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.5 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 | Upper Upper 42 22 3.5 3.1 4.7 2.5 1.8 2.9 3.1 4.5 6.2 8 2.9 3.1 4.5 3.2 3.8 3.5 3.4 2.5 4.5 6.6 | al 200 200 2.1 0.5 1.1 0.5 1.1 0.5 0.5 0.7 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 0.2 0.5 0.7 0.4 0.9 0.2 0.7 0.6 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 | 12 Upper Limit 42 25 3.1 55 2.0 1.1 2.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1 |

Annex 4: Illustration of Philippines' publication of measures of precision and reliability of official poverty statistics



Annex 5: Measures of precision and reliability of select disaggregated statistics using Mongolia's MICS 2018

Annex Table 2. Measures of precision and reliability of select disaggregated statistics using Mongolia's MICS 2018

| INDICATOR | ESTIMATE | DISAGGREGATING VARIABLE/S | NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS | STANDARD ERROR | CV (%) |
|--|----------|--|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. Proportion of child marriage among women aged at least 18 years | 0.0938 | AGE OF WOMAN | 846 | 0.0053 | 5.65 |
| 2. Proportion of child marriage among <i>poorest</i> women aged at least 18 years | 0.1142 | AGE OF WOMAN and WEALTH INDEX QUINTILE | 280 | 0.0094 | 8.23 |
| 3. Proportion of child marriage among <i>richest</i> women aged at least 18 years | 0.0491 | AGE OF WOMAN and WEALTH INDEX QUINTILE | 45 | 0.0096 | 19.55 |
| 4. Proportion of child marriage among women aged at least 18 years and residing in <i>urban</i> areas | 0.0906 | AGE OF WOMAN and LOCATION (URBAN/RURAL) | 388 | 0.0070 | 7.73 |
| 5. Proportion of child marriage among women aged at least 18 years and residing in <i>rural</i> areas | 0.1006 | AGE OF WOMAN and LOCATION (URBAN/RURAL) | 399 | 0.0067 | 6.66 |
| 6. Proportion of child marriage among <i>poorest</i> women aged at least 18 years and residing in <i>urban</i> areas | 0.1141 | AGE OF WOMAN, WEALTH INDEX QUINTILE and LOCATION (URBAN/RURAL) | 14 | 0.0342 | 29.97 |
| 7. Proportion of child marriage among <i>richest</i> women aged at least 18 years and residing in <i>urban</i> areas | 0.0492 | AGE OF WOMAN, WEALTH INDEX QUINTILE and LOCATION (URBAN/RURAL) | 45 | 0.0096 | 19.51 |
| 8. Proportion of child marriage among <i>poorest</i> women aged at least 18 years and residing in <i>rural</i> areas | 0.1142 | AGE OF WOMAN, WEALTH INDEX QUINTILE and LOCATION (URBAN/RURAL) | 266 | 0.0096 | 8.41 |
| 9. Proportion of child marriage among <i>richest</i> women aged at least 18 years and residing in <i>rural</i> areas | - | AGE OF WOMAN, WEALTH INDEX QUINTILE and LOCATION (URBAN/RURAL) | 0 | - | - |

Source: UN Women's computations using Mongolia's MICS 2018.

Annex 6: Colombia's first-ever Women and Men statistical report, November 2020



Source: UN Women and National Administrative Department of Statistics and the Presidential Council for Women's Equity. Women and Men: Gender Gaps in Colombia. Colombia. November 2020.