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**1. Benchmark: indicator on equity**

In August 2019, the sixth meeting of the Technical Cooperation Group (TCG) on SDG 4 indicators endorsed seven indicators to be benchmarked in fulfilment of the commitment made in paragraph 28 of the framework for Action for countries to set intermediate benchmarks. While six of the seven indicators were well defined, the seventh indicator, which was meant to focus on equity, was left to be determined at a subsequent stage. The seventh (virtual) TCG meeting in October 2020 approved a technical and political process for setting benchmarks, which have since been implemented. For the purpose of making this decision, two short papers were submitted:

* A paper [An Equity Benchmark for SDG 4: Options for Discussion: A Brief for The Technical Cooperation Group](http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2021/06/Equity-benchmark-Options.pdf) was prepared to address the outstanding gap on the seventh benchmark, offering a range of options for discussion.
* Following the discussion, another short document was prepared by the statistical service of the Ministry in charge of education in France.

## 1.1. Which underlying indicator/measure should be used as benchmark indicator for equity?

More details on each of the five options are presented in **Table 1**.

* Option 1: Gender gap of the secondary completion rate
* Option 2: Gender odds ratio of the secondary completion rate
* Option 3: Gender parity index of the secondary completion rate
* Option 4: Residual of a regression on the parity index on the secondary completion rate
* Option 5: Standard deviation of the secondary completion rate by survey cluster
* Option 6: none of the above

**Table 1 – Benchmark indicator on equity: options proposed**

| **Option** | **Benchmark setting** | **Advantage** | **Disadvantage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Gender Gap of secondary completion rate** | * Values set for completion rate.
* The change on the gap can be predicted based on average trends.
* The proposed equity benchmark level will assume a trend faster than the predicted one.
 | * Very simple and easy to understand.
* Maintains focus on gender equality.
 | * The gap is not an SDG 4 measure/indicator
 |
| 2 | **Gender odds ratio of secondary completion rate** | * Values set for completion rate.
* Levels and trends are more difficult to interpret
 | * Easy to compute.
* Only positive values (≥0)
* No ceiling effect.
 | * The odds ratio is not an SDG 4 measure/indicator
* Difficult to interpret
* Can give very high levels of inequity when rates for subgroups are close to 100 %
 |
| 3 | **Gender Parity index of secondary completion rate** | * Values set for completion rate.
* The change on the gender parity index can be predicted based on average trends.
* The proposed equity benchmark level will assume a trend faster than the predicted one.
 | * Maintains a compact set of indicators related to each other.
* Relatively transparent.
 | * Difficult to interpret trends.
* Ceiling effect
* Correlation with average (when average closer to 100 %, ratio closer to 1)
* Differences depending on whether we observe the result or its opposite
 |
| 4 | **Residual of a regression on the parity index on the secondary completion rate** | * A regression of the gender parity index on the completion rate will generate the predicted level of the index at each level of the completion rate. The equity benchmark level will be proposed assuming that progress towards the global trend will be faster than average.
 | * Need to focus on countries with disparities higher than average.
 | * Difficult to interpret.
 |
| 5 | **Standard deviation of secondary completion rate by survey cluster** | * No clear benchmark setting process; 2 alternatives:
1. Values set with reference to minimum observed value among all countries, which all will need to reach.
2. Regression of standard deviation on the completion rate will lead to the residual identifying countries that are more unequal than predicted.
 | * Characteristic-free measure (variation across enumeration areas).
 | * Survey cluster design may differ substantially between countries, affecting interpretation.
 |

# 2. Regional and global aggregates

In March 2021, UNDESA assembled a task team in order to harmonize and improve existing methodologies, share experiences and best practices in calculating aggregates, provide guidance to other international and regional organizations, and make the methodology used transparent. Currently, different methodologies are being used by different international agencies, for instance with respect to the use of population or income estimates, weights, country grouping classifications, and the handling of missing data. As part of the work in progress, the task team has agreed to start mapping custodian agencies’ current practices and to do a stock-tacking on how the different issues are addressed.

The seventh TCG meeting in October 2020 touched upon the issue of regional/global aggregates but only addressed two partial issues related to aggregates based on survey data and it therefore did not look comprehensively at the full set of issues related to regional/global aggregates for all indicators and the decisions that are needed to report on them – those were discussed during the TCG Meeting of 21 June 2021 and are presented in [SDG 4 Indicators Regional/Global Aggregation Methodology: A Brief for the Technical Cooperation Group](http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2021/06/SDG-4-Regional-or-global-aggregation-methodology-Note-for-TCG.pdf), and subject to the current consultation.

## 2.1. Indicator 4.1.1 - Learning assessment data-based indicators

### 2.1.1 What type of population weight should be used?

* Option 1: School-age population
* Option 2: Enrolment

### 2.1.2 Which approach should be done when data is missing?

* Option 1: Assume a country has a regional value.
* Option 2: Impute missing values based on other information. The statistical model and the variables used for imputation will be clearly documented and reported to TCG.

### 2.1.3 What is the minimum representation to report the regional/global aggregate?

* Option 1: 50% of countries
* Option 2: 50% of population

### 2.1.4 What is the reference period used to report the regional/global aggregate?

* Option 1: Past 5 years
* Option 2: Past 7 years
* Option 3: Past 10 years

## 2.2 Indicator 4.1.2 – Survey based indicators

### 2.2.1 What type of population weight should be used?

* Option 1: Cohort size (10-14 year old for primary, 15-19 year old for lower secondary, 20-24 year old for upper secondary)
* Option 2 School-age population for a given age group, i.e., UIS data specifically, which is consistent with the out-of-school rate indicator.

### 2.2.2 Which approach should be done when data is missing?

* Option 1: Assume a country has the regional value from countries for which information is available.
* Option 2: Impute missing values based on other information. The statistical model and the variables used for imputation will be clearly documented.

### 2.2.3 What is the minimum representation to report the regional/global aggregate?

* Option 1: 50% of countries
* Option 2: 50% of population

### 2.2.4 What is the reference period used to report the regional/global aggregate?

* Option 1: Past 5 years
* Option 2: Past 5 years with nowcasting

## 2.3 Parity indices

### 2.3.1 What type of population weight should be used?

* Option 1: Median of **countries**, i.e., average over individual countries’ parity index
* Option 2: Mean of **populations**, i.e., aggregate populations and divide the 2 groups.

### 2.3.2 What is the minimum representation to report the regional/global aggregate?

* Option 1: 50% of countries
* Option 2: 50% of population

### 2.3.3 What is the minimum representation to report the regional/global aggregate?

* Option 1: 50% of countries
* Option 2: 50% of population

## 2.4 1.a.2 – Finance indicators

Refer to paper [Filling the data gaps for Expenditure Data - Proposal from the UIS TCG Secretariat](http://tcg.uis.unesco.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2021/06/Filling-the-data-gaps-for-Expenditure-Data-Proposal-from-the-UIS-TCG-Secretariat.pdf) for more details on the proposed options.

### 2.4.1 What type of population weight should be used?

* Option 1: Median of countries, i.e., average over individual countries
* Option 2: Mean of spending volume, i.e., public expenditure or GDP

### 2.4.2 Which approach should be done when data is missing?

* Option 1: Median of countries, i.e., assume country has the regional value.
* Option 2: Impute missing values based on other information. The statistical model and the variables used for imputation will be clearly documented.

### 2.4.3 What is the minimum representation to report the regional/global aggregate?

* Option 1: 50% of countries in the region
* Option 2A**:** 50% of total government expenditure in the region.
* Option 2B:
	+ ≥60% of total general government expenditure in PPP$ in the region: publish
	+ <60% and ≥33% of total general government expenditure in PPP$ in the region: publish as ‘UIS estimate’.
	+ <33% of total general government expenditure in PPP$ in the region: do not publish.

## 2.5 – Confidence intervals and disaggregation

The following question is related to indicators 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.2.2.

**Should the indicators 4.1.1, 4.1.2 and 4.2.2 be disaggregated for urban/rural region and bottom/top quintile?**

* Option 1: Aggregates for urban/rural and bottom/top quintile
* Option 2: No aggregates for urban/rural and bottom/top quintile