

# About the methodology

*Social Watch* here presents a summary of how well countries have performed in meeting the goals set for the year 2000 by the governments at the World Summit for Social Development of Copenhagen (WSSD) and the Fourth World Conference on Women of Beijing (WCW), based on the latest information available for this edition. The present report also includes an evaluation of the commitments defined in the Millennium Summit Declaration, with a critical vision of the new goals set out therein.

Four sets of tables have been constructed. The *first* is concerned with the twelve goals established at the Copenhagen Summit. A summary of the data in these tables (*Progress or Regressions in the Fulfilment of the Copenhagen Goals*) groups the objectives according to six main thematic areas. The *second* set of tables is based on indicators measuring progress and regression in the closing of the gender gap, the distribution of public expenditure (education, health, defence and foreign debt service), increases in development assistance and the ratification of key international conventions and agreements. The *third* set illustrates progress towards development goals announced at the Millennium Summit and includes a new summary table. Finally, the *fourth* set corresponds to the data represented graphically in the poster and incorporates several of the main social development issues, gathered at the corresponding Summits.

## Sources

The initial difficulties we faced in obtaining and managing data still persist,<sup>1</sup> and we have maintained the criteria employed in earlier editions for the choice of information sources. We continue to use the most recent source provided by any of the respected international organisations, on the assumption that their data are reliable, even if some changes appear surprising and could be interpreted in different ways, or be seen to result from a variety of causes.

- In those cases where the most recent data were not to be found in these sources, we chose, from among the available alternative sources, those «secondary» sources whose data for previous years corresponded most closely to those published by the most respected sources;
- In those cases where alternative sources were available, we chose whichever source is commonly regarded as the best authority on the topic in question;
- In those cases in which neither of the above two criteria applied, we chose the source offering data from the greatest number of countries.

## Data management in calculating the progress indexes

- When the only data available referred to a period (for example, 1990-1994) rather than a single year, we assigned the data to the year falling in the middle of the period (in this case, 1992), in order to allow us to calculate the rate of variation;
- In those tables in which the information for each country corresponds to a specific year, the rate of variation was calculated on the basis of those values, on the understanding that the accuracy of the information is better preserved this way, than in the alternative method based on periods;
- In cases where the goal was not defined numerically in the commitments, specific criteria were used—which are explained where relevant in the evaluation of the goals and their follow-up;

- Finally, in the tables on the poster accompanying this edition, which show «progress and regression» and «the present situation», other evaluation tools were employed. These take into account the absolute value of the indicators only, without relating them to the goals set. In these tables, the countries are ranked—with respect to both their «the present situation» and «progress and regression»—according to the distribution of values for each variable.

## Goals set and follow-up

Continuing with the monitoring strategy *Social Watch* has been carrying out since 1997, evaluations are based on a «goal by goal» follow-up of the commitments made by the governments and the progress or regression they have made in each area. We present a series of tables that illustrate the evolution of countries with respect to the commitments made by governments at the WSSD and the WCW, as well as a summary table listing countries in alphabetical order, where the indicators are grouped according to broad thematic areas.

*Social Watch* selected what we consider to be the thirteen most important commitments from among those that can be measured quantitatively. As mentioned before, this year it has not been possible to monitor the thirteenth commitment—«Improve the availability of affordable and adequate housing for everyone, in line with the World Housing Strategy for the year 2000»—since once more the information available was inadequate. With respect to the other commitments, one or more indicators have been chosen, the relevance of which varies from case to case. From among the indicators corresponding most closely to the dimensions we wish to measure, we selected those that were available for a sufficient number of countries.<sup>2</sup>

In the case of commitments with goals set beyond 2000, we adjusted all paths to correspond to the decade under consideration here (1990-2000).

For commitments with goals not linked to specific figures, we took numerically defined goals from other summits where available.<sup>3</sup> In cases where the desired outcome was universal access, the goal established was access by 100% of the target population.

The goals were established with reference to the following variables:

Goal 1a: Percentage of children reaching 5<sup>th</sup> grade in primary school; Goal 1b: Primary school enrolment rate (net); Goal 2: Life expectancy; Goal 3a: Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 born live); Goal 3b: Under-5 mortality rate (per 1,000 born live); Goal 4: Maternal mortality (per 100,000 live births); Goal 5: Daily calorie intake; Goal 6: Percentage of under-5 children suffering from severe or moderate malnutrition; Goal 7: Percentage of the population with access to health services; Goal 8a: Pregnancies attended by skilled personnel (per 1,000 live births); Goal 8b: Percentage of deliveries attended by skilled personnel; Goal 9: Malaria cases (per 100,000 people); Goal 10: Percentage of under-1 children totally immunised; Goal 11: Illiteracy rate; Goal 12a: Percentage of the population with access to sanitation; Goal 12b: Percentage of the population with access to improved water sources.

All the tables relating to goals present the initial situation of the country (first column, 1990 or next closest year), the latest figure available (second column),<sup>4</sup> the rate of progress according to the goal set (third column, «progress or regressions»), and the goal set by the country's government for 2000 (final column). Given the delays in the publication of data, information

<sup>1</sup> For example, the difficulty in obtaining information for the same year across the board, or the significant differences that exist between statistics provided for the same year by different sources.

<sup>2</sup> These indicators and the corresponding tables are the same as in last year's edition.

<sup>3</sup> For example, in the case of the goal of nutritional security, we adopted the goals proposed at the 1996 World Nutritional Summit.

<sup>4</sup> In some tables, two additional columns are used to indicate the date of the information selected.

for the year 2000 is still not available for all indicators and it is therefore not yet possible to check whether the goals set for that year have, in fact, been reached. The information available, which corresponds to previous years, allows us to establish each country's rate of variation or progress at the date for which the latest data is available.

As we explained in previous editions, any progress index of the type used here implies the adoption of a normative path, which serves as the «ideal» against which progress can be measured. However, as we have already pointed out, each of the specific indicators may follow different paths. These model paths should either be determined by specialist bodies or be inferred from some previously existing study (for example, a longitudinal analysis). While it would be desirable to conduct our follow-up in this rigorous and exhaustive manner, we recognise that the majority of variables associated with the commitments do not meet these conditions. Furthermore, since the number of observations over time required for the construction of more precise evolutionary models is lacking in many cases, the only alternative was to opt for a simple and straightforward way of evaluating progress towards the fulfilment of goals.

In order to calculate progress and setbacks in relation to the goals set, we chose to «impose» a simple, uniform evolutionary reference model that would prove least demanding when evaluating changes over time or when comparing the evolution of different countries. Given the limitations of the methodology adopted, the conclusions reached are not, and cannot be, regarded as exhaustive or definitive; they are merely an approximation or useful guide. Ultimately, the resulting progress index classifies the actual value of each variable as ahead of schedule, on schedule or behind schedule, in relation to its projected value. For the follow-up of the goals set, we maintained this basic system, which generates a fulfilment index reflecting the degree to which countries had advanced towards achieving their established goals. This index has been re-scaled in sections (we converted the progress indexes to a reference scale of 1 to 5), and to make it easier to read and to eliminate the false impression of precision that a numerical progress index would give, «Progress or Regression» are represented by a series of symbols.

The categories resulting from this re-scaling are:

- ← Significant regression
- ← Some regression
- || Stagnation
- Some progress
- Significant progress or goal already achieved

«Significant progress or goal already achieved» applies to countries that had already achieved the goal by 1990, have reached the goal subsequently, or will reach the goal on schedule if they continue at their current rate of progress.

«Some progress» applies to countries with positive indexes, but where progress is not rapid enough to reach the goal on schedule.

«Stagnation» applies to countries where no significant changes (or quantitatively insignificant changes) have been recorded in the period.

«Some regression» applies to countries that show a negative value and a gradual process of regression.

«Significant regression» applies to countries that are regressing at a faster rate.

Additionally, where relevant, for those countries that had reached the goal by 1990, different icons are used in the «Progress or Regression» column to distinguish between four sub-groups: countries that had achieved the goal by 1990; countries for which no data is available for the year 1990, but which at the end of the period had reached the goal; countries that had achieved the goal by 1990 and continue to make progress; and countries that had reached the goal by 1990 but are experiencing setbacks.

In the table showing «Progress or regressions in the fulfilment of the Copenhagen goals», indicators are grouped in the following manner:

- Goals 1a, 1b in the column headed Basic Education;
- Goals 3a, 3b and 10 in the column headed Children's Health;

- Goals 5 and 6 in the column headed Food Security and Child Nutrition;
- Goals 8a and 8b in the column headed Reproductive Health;
- Goals 2 and 7 in the column headed Health and Life Expectancy;
- Goals 12a and 12b in the column headed Safe Water and Sanitation.

## 2015 goals adopted at the Millennium Summit

Millennium Development Goals as stated in the United Nations Resolution 55/2, September 2000

- To halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of the world's people whose income is less than one dollar a day and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger and, by the same date, to halve the proportion of people who are unable to reach or to afford safe drinking water.
- To ensure that, by the same date, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling and that girls and boys will have equal access to all levels of education.
- By the same date, to have reduced maternal mortality by three quarters, and under-five child mortality by two thirds, of their current rates.
- To have, by then, halted, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS, the scourge of malaria and other major diseases that afflict humanity.
- To provide special assistance to children orphaned by HIV/AIDS.
- By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers as proposed in the «Cities Without Slums» initiative.

In constructing the table on the follow-up of goals announced at the Millennium Summit, a similar scheme has been used. The difference lies in the fact that data on the years within the interval to be analysed is not yet available. The delay in obtaining information about the various social indicators to be monitored makes it impossible to establish real progress reports from the year 2000 on. Therefore, the method adopted to establish whether a country is performing at a pace good enough to reach the 2015 goals is to extrapolate from the pace at which it has been performing since the 1990s. A linear model has been adopted to establish trends, both past and normative, for the period between 2000 and 2015. In this way, comparison of the trend line gradients will make it possible to establish whether a country is «on track» to achieving the goals set out or has already achieved them, whether its pace is too slow to achieve them, or whether performance is stagnant or shows regression in absolute terms.

The table presented in this edition represents a systematic synthesis of all the indicators and their trends for all the countries for which comparative information was obtained.

In our understanding, nowhere in the commitments is it explicitly stated that the starting point for the new goals continues to be 1990. Beyond the indicators selected for measuring progress, it is important to pay attention to the timeframe used for this analysis.

A point that should be underscored is that *Social Watch* has decided to use the year 2000 as the starting point in their monitoring with respect to the Millennium Summit goals, *not* the year 1990, which is used by other institutions.

The pace of improvement to which the countries have committed themselves is not the same if considered from one or the other point in time.

Consider, for example, the goal of *reducing under-5 mortality by two thirds by 2015*. In the case of Gambia, with an under-5 mortality rate of 132 per thousand in 1990, and 61 per thousand in 1999, establishing the 2015 goal with a starting point in the year 1990 would result in a goal of 44 per thousand. If the 2000 value (or 1999, the nearest year for which data are available) is used as a starting point, the 2015 goal demands reducing the under-5 mortality to a rate of 20 per thousand live births.

It is evident that, starting from the 1990 value of the indicator, the countries will have achieved part of the goal in the 1990-2000 period and the additional demands moving towards the year 2015 will be obviously less.

We believe the adoption of the earlier starting point «lowers the bar» for governments and would lead to less significant progress over the next 15 years.

Finally, it may be seen that effectively extending the deadlines for fulfilling these goals by using an earlier starting point for measurement increases the

pressure on those countries that have had some regression in the past decade. This may seem only logical, in the sense that this strategy demands more from those who have complied less. But it is undoubtedly a step backwards in that it places fewer demands for improvements on countries that have had *some* progress in the decade 1990-2000 but are still not acceptably closer to the 2000 goal.

## Gender Inequality, Public Expenditure and Official Development Assistance

The changes that have taken place since 1990 in Women's Situation, Public Expenditure, and Official Development Assistance (ODA) are presented in three tables: «Gender Gap Evolution», «Changes in Public Expenditure» and «Trends of the Official Development Assistance».

In the analysis of women's status on the evolution of the gender gap, the progress or regression in the female to male ratio with reference to three basic areas was studied: illiteracy rates among 15-24 year-olds, unemployment rates and primary school enrolment rates.<sup>5</sup>

For the analysis of public spending, we concentrated on the evolution of expenditure on education as a percentage of Gross National Product (GNP), and on the evolution of expenditure on health, defence and external debt service as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The third table measures progress and setbacks in ODA *vis-à-vis* the goal set by developed countries to assign 0.7% of their GNP to aid.

In the first two cases, given that no specific goal was set, we chose to classify countries on the basis of relative progress and regression. For the table showing evolution of the gender gap the analysis consisted in considering the annual rate of variation in the female to male ratio in the three areas indicated above. Thus, three broad categories can be identified, corresponding to situations showing no change, progress or regression. The differences in the scale of progress or regression were measured by taking into account whether the countries were advancing or regressing above or below the average for each group.

The following criteria were used to produce the table on Changes in Public Expenditure: for Social Expenditure (education and health) countries were regarded as showing «significant regression» if the reduction in expenditure was equal to or greater than 1% of GNP; reductions of up to 1% were classified as «some regression»; those which showed no change or changes of one-tenth of one percentage point were classified as «no change»; «some progress» applies to those countries in which spending increased by up to 1%; and, finally, countries showing an increase of over 1% were classed as making «significant progress». For Defence Expenditure and External Debt, the criterion used was exactly the opposite, in other words, reductions in these areas' share of GDP were classified as progress.

## The poster and its tables

This year's report once again includes a poster with a third set of tables summarising progress and setbacks on the basis of a selection of areas taken from the measurable goals established at the 1995 WSSD and WCW, and at the 2000 Millennium Summit.

The indicators used to produce two of the three tables are grouped in seven areas, each of which combine more than one variable: «Illiteracy» (adult illiteracy rates and illiteracy among 15-24 year olds); «Reproductive health» (percentage of pregnancies and deliveries attended by skilled personnel); «Food» (daily *per capita* calorie intake and percentage of under-5 children suffering from malnutrition); «Services» (percentage of population with access to sanitation, percentage of population with access to improved water sources and telephone lines per 1,000 inhabitants); «Childhood» (infant mortality rate, under-5 mortality rate, percentage of children reaching 5<sup>th</sup> grade and net primary school enrolment rate); and «Gender» (female to male ratio with respect to unemployment, gross enrolment rate in primary school and illiteracy among 15-24 year-olds).

The table «**Progress and Regression**» presents the countries in order from those showing greatest progress to those showing the highest levels of

regression or stagnation. The way in which progress and regression have been calculated aims to reveal recent changes (between 1990 and the most recent date for which information is available) with respect to key indicators for selected commitments. Each variable was categorised on a scale ranging from significant progress to significant regression, taking into account the distribution of the annual growth rates registered between 1990 and the latest available date.

A second table, «**The Present Situation**» shows the current situation in each country with regard to the same series of chosen indicators. This table reflects the situation regarding social development based on the most recent data available. In other words, it shows how near or far countries are on average from achieving their targets, without indicating whether they are progressing towards them or not. The ranking was calculated by taking into account the distribution of values for each variable and converting them into four categories: the highest corresponds to those countries whose situation regarding the indicator in question is the best, and *vice versa* for the lower categories. In this way, the countries were classified in order, ranging from those showing the best performance to those with the worst record. The values relating to the current situation are as follows: 1) close to or beyond targets; 2) above average; 3) below average; 4) critical situation.

The table «Progress and Regression» therefore reflects the rate of progress, while the table «The Present Situation» provides a «snapshot» of countries' current situation. The two tables are designed to complement each other. A small advance in a country with a high level of social development is not the same as a small advance in a country that still has a long way to go.

A third table «**Political will**» reflects the current position of countries on issues directly linked to governmental decisions. This table includes five indicators: percentage of GNP assigned to education expenditure; percentage of the GDP assigned to health expenditure; percentage of GDP assigned to military expenditure; percentage of GNP assigned to ODA (for member countries of the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD); and number of key international Covenants and Agreements signed and ratified by governments.

## Sources of the infographics «The Hood Robin economy»

### Notes to the graphs:

The main graph on net transfer of financial resources, and the table in the lower left corner are based on the data included by the UN secretary-general in his report on «*International financial system and development*», UN General Assembly document A/57/151. 2 July 2002.

Figures on Official Development Assistance (ODA) are based on data provided by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Eurodad ([www.eurodad.org](http://www.eurodad.org)) is the source of the data linking debt and HIV/AIDS.

Figures on trade and commodity prices are based on data from UNCTAD ([www.unctad.org](http://www.unctad.org)) and Third World Network ([www.twinside.org.sg](http://www.twinside.org.sg)).

The graph on the cost of capital mobility for the poor is based on data published by Oxfam America in its report «*Global Finance Hurts the Poor. Analysis of the impact of North-South private capital flows on growth, inequality and poverty. An Oxfam America Report*», May 2002. All figures are in 1995 dollars. The capital inflow-induced growth is estimated by the World Bank. The part of this income that benefited the poorest 20% is based on the poorest 20% of the population receiving between 3% and 10% of total income in most developing countries. The part of the transfers paid by the poor was estimated on the assumptions that (i) the whole fiscal cost is eventually paid for by extra taxes without reducing spending; (ii) the ratio of consumption taxes in total government revenues remains unchanged; (iii) consumption inequality remains unchanged; and (iv) the poorest 20% of the population only pays taxes on consumption, in the same proportion as the rich. This is a conservative estimate as tax and spending systems in developing countries are often regressive.

Global income inequality was estimated by UNDP's «*Human Development Report 1999*».

Boxes on the burden of debt repayment are based on data from the World Bank's, «*Global Development Finance 2001*», the Jubilee 2000 report «*Unfinished Business*» and the IMF website ([www.imf.org](http://www.imf.org)).

<sup>5</sup> We chose to consider the gross enrolment rate as this was available for a greater number of countries. While this rate includes matriculation of people over school age, we are of the opinion that this does not create a bias affecting the female to male ratio, which is the indicator used to determine the gender gap.

The criterion for listing the countries in these tables responds to three basic features:

1. the value of the average status or progress in all areas;
2. the quantity of areas for which the country has information;
3. the alphabetical order of the country's name.

The following points system, based on the distribution of variables, was used to construct the ranking measuring the advances shown in the table «**Progress and Regression**». The general criterion applied consisted in calculating the Annual Rate of Variation (ARV) for progress and regression, and ranking countries according to whether they are above or below the respective average rates of progress or regression.

*Reduction of adult illiteracy rate:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV below -3.3%
- 4) progressing with an ARV above -3.3%
- 3) ARV close to 0%

*Reduction of illiteracy among 15-24 year olds:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV below -4.5%
- 4) progressing with an ARV above -4.5%
- 3) ARV close to 0%

*Pregnancies attended by skilled personnel (per 1,000):*

- 5) progressing with an ARV above 5.2%
- 4) progressing with an ARV below 5.2%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV above -1.7%
- 1) regressing with an ARV below -1.7%

*Deliveries attended by skilled personnel:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV above 2.6%
- 4) progressing with an ARV below 2.6%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV above -1.5%
- 1) regressing with an ARV below -1.5%

*Daily calorie intake:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV above 0.8%
- 4) progressing with an ARV below 0.8%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV above -0.9%
- 1) regressing with an ARV below -0.9%

*% infant malnutrition:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV below -4.6%
- 4) progressing with an ARV above -4.6%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV below 3.6%
- 1) regressing with an ARV above 3.6%

*% of people with access to safe water:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV above 1.2%
- 4) progressing with an ARV below 1.2%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV above -0.7%
- 1) regressing with an ARV below -0.7%

*% people with access to sanitation:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV above 1.3%
- 4) progressing with an ARV below 1.3%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV above -0.4%
- 1) regressing with an ARV below -0.4%

*Telephone lines per 1,000 inhabitants:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV above 7.2%
- 4) progressing with an ARV below 7.2%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV above -3.0%
- 1) regressing with an ARV below -3.0%

*Infant mortality (under-1) per 1,000 live births:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV below -3.1%
- 4) progressing with an ARV above -3.1%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV below 2.0%
- 1) regressing with an ARV above 2.0%

*Primary school enrolment rate (net):*

- 5) progressing with an ARV above 1.7%
- 4) progressing with an ARV below 1.7%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV above -1.0%
- 1) regressing with an ARV below -1.0%

*% children reaching 5<sup>th</sup> grade:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV above 2.9%
- 4) progressing with an ARV below 2.9%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV above -2.3%
- 1) regressing with an ARV below -2.3%

*Child mortality (under-5) per 1,000 live births:*

- 5) progressing with an ARV below -3.4%
- 4) progressing with an ARV above -3.4%
- 3) ARV close to 0%
- 2) regressing with an ARV below 2.1%
- 1) regressing with an ARV above 2.1%

- % people with access to improved water sources:*
- 4) 95% or more
  - 3) between 95% and 78.1%
  - 2) between 78.1% and 39.0%
  - 1) less than 39.0%

Points system for the table «**Political Will**». The general criterion applied in constructing this table consisted in categorising the distribution into three broad groups. 1) between 0 and 2/3 of the mean 2) between 2/3 and 3/2 of the mean; and 3) more than 3/2 of the mean.

**Cut-off values:**

*% GNP spent on education:*

- 1) less than 3.11%
- 2) between 3.11% and 7.0%
- 3) 7.0% or more

*% GDP spent on health:*

- 1) less than 2.19%
- 2) between 2.19% and 4.95%
- 3) 4.95% or more

The following points system, based on the distribution of variables, was used to construct the ranking measuring the «current situation» in the table «**The Present Situation**». The general criterion applied consisted in first identifying those countries with values close to the target and then classifying the rest of the distribution according to whether their values were above or below average. The category «critical situation» refers to values of more than twice the average (in the case of goals that imply a reduction) or under half the average (in the case of goals that imply an increase).

*% adult illiteracy:*

- 4) 5% or less
- 3) between 5% and 22.2%
- 2) between 22.2% and 44.4%
- 1) more than 44.4%

*% illiteracy among 15-24 year olds:*

- 4) 5% or less
- 3) between 5% and 12.7%
- 2) between 12.7% and 25.4%
- 1) more than 25.4%

*Pregnancies attended by skilled personnel (per 1,000):*

- 4) 950 or more
- 3) between 949 and 789
- 2) between 788 and 395
- 1) less than 394

*% deliveries attended by skilled personnel:*

- 4) 95% or more
- 3) between 95% and 74.4%
- 2) between 74.4% and 37.2%
- 1) less than 37.2%

*Daily calorie intake:*

- 4) 3200 or more
- 3) between 3200 and 2700
- 2) between 2700 and 2300
- 1) less than 2300

*% infant malnutrition:*

- 4) 5% or less
- 3) between 5% and 21%
- 2) between 21% and 42%
- 1) 42% or more

*% people with access to sanitation:*

- 4) 95% or more
- 3) between 95% and 71.7%
- 2) between 71.7% and 35.8%
- 1) less than 35.8%

*Telephone lines per 1,000 inhabitants:*

- 4) 500 or more
- 3) between 499 and 202
- 2) between 201 and 102
- 1) less than 101

*Infant mortality (under-1) per 1,000 live births:*

- 4) less than 10
- 3) between 10 and 44.4
- 2) between 44.4 and 88.8
- 1) more than 88.8

*Enrolment rate in primary school (net):*

- 4) 95% or more
- 3) between 95% and 84.1%
- 2) between 84.1% and 42.0%
- 1) less than 42.0%

*% children reaching 5<sup>th</sup> grade:*

- 4) 95% or more
- 3) between 95% and 80.1%
- 2) between 80.1% and 60%
- 1) less than 60%

*Child mortality (under-5) per 1,000 live births:*

- 4) less than 10
- 3) between 10 and 64.3
- 2) between 64.3 and 128.6
- 1) more than 128.6

Percentage of Key International Agreements signed and ratified.<sup>6</sup> Each country is assigned a percentage in accordance with its total points. The points awarded to each country were determined by adding the points assigned to each convention (2 points for each convention ratified, 1 for conventions that have only been signed and 0 for those which have not been signed).

- 1) less than 20.9%
- 2) between 20.9% and 47.2%
- 3) 47.2% or more

<sup>6</sup> The key international conventions are those that appear in the tables on the centre pages of the current edition of *Social Watch*.