



International
Labour
Office

WORLD SOCIAL SECURITY REPORT

Providing coverage in times
of crisis and *beyond* }

2010.2011

The International Labour Organization

The **International Labour Organization** was founded in 1919 to promote social justice and, thereby, to contribute to universal and lasting peace. Its tripartite structure is unique among agencies affiliated to the United Nations; the ILO's Governing Body includes representatives of governments, and of employers' and workers' organizations. These three constituencies are active participants in regional and other meetings sponsored by the ILO, as well as in the International Labour Conference – a world forum that meets annually to discuss social and labour questions.

Over the years the ILO has issued for adoption by member States a widely respected code of international labour Conventions and Recommendations on freedom of association, employment, social policy, conditions of work, social security, industrial relations and labour administration, and child labour, among others.

The ILO provides expert advice and technical assistance to member States through a network of offices and multidisciplinary teams in over 40 countries. This assistance takes the form of labour rights and industrial relations counselling, employment promotion, training in small business development, project management, advice on social security, workplace safety and working conditions, the compiling and dissemination of labour statistics, and workers' education.

ILO Publications

The **International Labour Office** is the Organization's secretariat, research body and publishing house. ILO Publications produces and distributes material on major social and economic trends. It publishes policy studies on issues affecting labour around the world, reference works, technical guides, research-based books and monographs, codes of practice on safety and health prepared by experts, and training and workers' education manuals. The magazine *World of Work* is published three times a year in printed form by the Department of Communication and Public Information and is also available online at www.ilo.org.

You may purchase ILO publications and other resources securely on line at www.ilo.org/publns; or request a free catalogue by writing to ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland; fax +41 (0) 22 799 6938; email: pubvente@ilo.org

World Social Security Report 2010/11
Providing coverage in times of crisis and beyond

World Social Security Report 2010/11

Providing coverage in times of crisis and beyond

Copyright © International Labour Organization 2010

First published 2010

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation, application should be made to ILO Publications (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland, or by email: pubdroit@ilo.org. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered with reproduction rights organizations may make copies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose. Visit www.ifrro.org to find the reproduction rights organization in your country.

World Social Security Report 2010/11: Providing coverage in times of crisis and beyond
International Labour Office – Geneva: ILO, 2010

ISBN 978-92-2-123268-1 (print)

ISBN 978-92-2-123269-8 (web pdf)

International Labour Office

social security / scope of coverage / gaps in coverage / social security policy / role of ILO / developed countries / developing countries

02.03.1

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications and electronic products can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by email: pubvente@ilo.org

Visit our web site: www.ilo.org/publns

Preface

Social security is a human right as well as a social and economic necessity. All successful societies and economies have employed development strategies where social security systems played an important role to alleviate poverty and provide economic security that helps people to cope with life's major risks or the need to quickly adapt to changing economic, political, demographic and societal circumstances.

The crisis has shown that social security systems are by design powerful economic and social stabilizers of economies and societies. They stabilize income of individuals who are affected by unemployment or underemployment and hence help to avoid hardship and social instability. They also stabilize aggregate domestic demand in times when external demand contracts due to reduced economic activity. We have also learned from past crises that countries that had effective and efficient social security systems in place before a crisis hit were much better equipped to cope with its fallout than those who had not had the foresight to put such systems into place.

It is also clear that income transfers through social security have a powerful effect on the income inequality and poverty in developing countries. There is little hope that the MDG targets will be reached without a decisive global move towards introducing a national social protection floor of basic social security benefits in countries where no such scheme exists or where they only have a limited coverage.

The Declaration of Philadelphia¹ in 1944 established the “solemn obligation of the International Labour Organization to further among the nations of the world programmes which will achieve”, among others, “the extension of social security measures to provide a basic income **to all in need of such protection** and comprehensive medical care”. In June 2008, the ILC confirmed this mandate in the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.

In 2003 the ILO launched a Global Campaign on Social Security and Coverage for All. This requires the definition of effective and sustainable national social security policies. Sound policies have to be based on facts and figures. Only through in-depth factual information about the performance of existing social security systems

¹ The ILC adopted the Declaration concerning the aims and purposes of the International Labour Organization at its 26th Session in Philadelphia on 10 May 1944.

and individual schemes all around the world can national policies benefit from global experience. This report provides such information.

It is the first in a series of World Social Security Reports which will also help to monitor the global progress on social security coverage and thus support the ILO's and national campaigns to extend coverage.

Each new edition of the report will take up one specific topic. This time for obvious reasons it had to be the crisis. It ends with repeating the plea of the Global Jobs Pact that was adopted by the constituents of the ILO in June 2009 and requested countries to make full use of social security systems when coping with the social and economic fallout of the crisis. It requested countries to develop "adequate social security for all, drawing on a basic social protection floor including access to health care, income security for the elderly and persons with disabilities, child benefits and income security combined with public employment guarantee schemes".

We hope that this report will be a useful tool for all who have to design, implement, manage, administrate or – as the case may be – defend social security systems. If you have feedback for us that would help us to improve the next version please post your comments on our web platform: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ShowTheme.do?tid=1985>

Assane Diop
Executive Director
Social Protection Sector
International Labour Office

Michael Cichon
Director of the Social Security Department
Social Protection Sector
International Labour Office

Contents

Preface	v
Abbreviations	xv
Executive summary	1
Introduction. Context, objectives, scope and structure of the report ...	7
Part I. Monitoring the state of social security coverage	11
1 Definitions, standards and concepts	13
1.1 Basic definitions	13
1.2 The scope of social security as defined by ILO standards and by other international organizations	18
1.3 Coverage concepts and measurements	22
2 Scope of social security coverage around the world: Context and overview	27
2.1 The labour market context	27
2.2 Scope of comprehensive coverage by statutory schemes	31
2.3 Effective comprehensive population coverage	33
3 Social health protection coverage	35
3.1 Definition and measurement of social health protection	35
3.2 Financing health care	36
3.3 Gaps in health-care coverage and access deficits	40
4 Coverage by social security pensions: Income security in old age	45
4.1 From legal to effective coverage by old-age pensions: An overview	45
4.2 Coverage gaps and employment status of the elderly	46
4.3 Effective extent and level of coverage at the country level	50

5	Income support to the unemployed	57
5.1	Scope of coverage by statutory unemployment schemes	58
5.2	Effective extent and level of coverage	61
6	Coverage by other branches of social security	65
6.1	Employment injury	65
6.2	Maternity protection	69
7	Minimum income support and other social assistance	73
8	Investments in social security: Amounts, results and efficiency	79
8.1	Introduction	79
8.2	Resources allocated to the financing of social security across the world	80
8.3	Measuring effectiveness and efficiency of investments in social security: An overview of approaches in selected international organizations ...	87
9	Identifying factors for extended social security coverage	99
PART II. Thematic focus: Social security in times of crisis		103
10	Responding to economic crisis with social security	105
10.1	Introduction	105
10.2	Cushioning the impacts of unemployment while protecting and creating jobs	106
10.3	The expansion of social security as a crisis response	112
10.4	Consolidating social expenditure: Short-term versus long-term concerns	112
10.5	Impact of the crisis on pension funding: The need to revisit recent pension reforms	117
10.6	Impact of the crisis on social health protection financing	119
Conclusion. Closing the coverage gaps and building social security for all		121
Bibliography		125
Statistical Annex		131
Part A. The demographic, economic and labour market environment		133
Part B. Social security coverage and expenditure		199

Tables

2.1	Employees (wage and salary workers) in the labour market worldwide, 2008	28
4.1	Participation in the labour market of elderly (65+), and life expectancy at age 65, 1980–2005	49
4.2	Projected elderly population in 2010 and 2050	55
5.1	Unemployment protection: Extent of legal and effective coverage, countries grouped by income level, latest available year	60
8.1	Social security expenditure by region and globally, latest available year	81
8.2	Social security expenditure by income level and globally, latest available year	82
8.3	Structure of social security receipts by type and sector of origin, 27 EU Member States, 2007	86
8.4	Effectiveness and efficiency of social security cash transfers received by households, and taxes paid by households, 22 OECD countries, mid-2000	92
8.5	Concentration coefficients of benefits in different branches of social security, 27 OECD countries, mid-2000	93
9.1	Legal provision, resources committed and coverage achieved in 146 countries: A typology	101
10.1	Unemployment schemes in different country groups by income level, 2009	109
10.2	Crisis response: Extending coverage and raising benefits, selected countries, 2008–09	113
10.3	Crisis response: Reductions in contributions, selected countries, 2008–09	113

Figures

Figure S.1	Social security expenditure by income level and branch, weighted by population, latest available year (percentage of GDP)	3
Figure 2.1	Employees (wage and salary workers) in total employment worldwide, latest available year (percentages)	29
Figure 2.2	Latin America: Social protection coverage among employees according to type of contract, 2005	30
Figure 2.3	Countries grouped by level of vulnerability, poverty and informality combined, latest available year	31
Figure 2.4	Branches of social security: Number covered by a statutory social security programme, 2008–09	32
Figure 2.5	Date of the first law adopted for each contingency, countries grouped by Human Development Index (HDI), latest available year	32
Figure 2.6	Branches of social security: Countries with statutory programmes or limited provision, latest available year (percentages)	33
Figure 3.1	WHO: Towards universal health coverage	36
Figure 3.2	Health-care financing: Total and public per capita expenditure by national income level of countries, 2007	37
Figure 3.3	Health-care financing levels and sources of funds, 2006 (percentage of GDP)	38
Figure 3.4	Vulnerability of countries and sources of funds: Public and private health expenditure and composition of health expenditure by level of vulnerability at the country level, 2006 (percentage of GDP)	38

Figure 3.5	Share of out-of-pocket expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure by level of country vulnerability, latest available year . . .	40
Figure 3.6	Out-of-pocket expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure by poverty incidence, 2006 (percentage of people living on less than US\$2 PPP per day)	40
Figure 3.7	Health protection: Proportion of the population covered by law, latest available year (percentages)	41
Figure 3.8	Deficits in legal health protection coverage by vulnerability at the country level, latest available year (percentage of population not covered)	42
Figure 3.9	ILO access deficit indicator, 2006 (shortfall of skilled medical professionals as a proxy)	42
Figure 3.10	The global deficit in social health protection coverage and effective access to health services in 2006 (ILO methodology)	43
Figure 4.1	Old-age pensions: Legal coverage and effective active contributors in the working-age population, by region, 2008–09 (percentages) . .	46
Figure 4.2	Old-age pension beneficiaries as a proportion of the elderly by income level, various countries, latest available year	47
Figure 4.3	Old-age pension beneficiaries as a percentage of the population above retirement age, latest available year	47
Figure 4.4	Old-age pensions: Effective active contributors as a percentage of the working-age population by the share of wage employment in total employment, latest available year (percentage of working-age population)	48
Figure 4.5	Persons above retirement age receiving pensions, and labour force participation of the population aged 65 and over, latest available year (percentages)	50
Figure 4.6	European Union: Old-age pension recipients, ratio to population over the legal retirement age (excluding anticipated old-age pensions), 2006	51
Figure 4.7	Africa: Old-age pensioners (all ages) as a proportion of the elderly population, latest available year (percentages)	51
Figure 4.8	Asia Pacific and the Middle East: Old-age pensioners (all ages) as a proportion of the elderly population, latest available year (percentages)	52
Figure 4.9	Latin America and the Caribbean: Old-age pensioners (all ages) as a proportion of the elderly population, latest available year (percentages)	52
Figure 4.10	Male and female old-age pensioners (all ages) as a proportion of male and female populations respectively, aged 60 and over, latest available year (percentages)	54
Figure 5.1	Existence of unemployment protection schemes by type of scheme, 2008–09	58
Figure 5.2	Unemployment protection schemes by type of scheme, 2008–09 . .	59
Figure 5.3	Unemployment protection schemes: Legal extent of coverage worldwide as a percentage of the economically active population (EAP), latest available year	60

Figure 5.4	Unemployment protection schemes: Legal extent of coverage, regional estimates, as a percentage of the economically active population (EAP), latest available year	61
Figure 5.5	Unemployment: Effective coverage worldwide – unemployed who actually receive benefits, latest available year (percentages)	62
Figure 5.6	Unemployment: Effective coverage, regional estimates – unemployed who actually receive benefits, latest available year (percentages)	62
Figure 5.7	Unemployed receiving unemployment benefits, selected countries, latest available year (percentage of total unemployed)	63
Figure 6.1	Types of scheme providing protection in case of employment injury, by region, 2008–09 (multiple responses)	66
Figure 6.2	Extent of legal coverage by employment injury scheme, 2008–09 . .	66
Figure 6.3	Active contributors or protected persons as a percentage of working-age population and employment, latest available year . .	68
Figure 6.4	Inequities in access to maternal health services in rural and urban areas, latest available year (percentage of live births)	69
Figure 6.5	Inequities in access to maternal health services by wealth quintile by national income level of countries, latest available year	69
Figure 6.6	Maternity legal provision: Types of programmes worldwide, 2009	70
Figure 6.7	Legal duration of maternity leave worldwide, 2009 (weeks)	71
Figure 6.8	Amounts spent on paid maternity leave per year and per child, selected countries, latest available year (US\$ current)	72
Figure 7.1	Means-tested and non-means-tested benefit expenditure, European countries, 2007 (percentage of GDP and ratio)	74
Figure 7.2	Means-tested benefits in European countries: Totals and by function, 2007 (percentage of GDP)	74
Figure 7.3	Social assistance expenditure, 75 countries, 2008 (percentage of GDP)	75
Figure 7.4	Social protection expenditure by type (ADB definitions), selected countries, 2008 (percentage of GDP)	76
Figure 8.1	Social security expenditure by region, weighted by population, latest available year (percentage of GDP)	81
Figure 8.2	Social security expenditure by income level, weighted by population, 2000 compared with latest available year (percentage of GDP)	82
Figure 8.3	Social security expenditure by income level and branch, weighted by population, latest available year (percentage of GDP)	83
Figure 8.4	Social security expenditure by vulnerability and branch, weighted by population, latest available year (percentage of GDP)	83
Figure 8.5	Size of government resources (ratio of government expenditure to GDP) and amount of social security expenditure (percentage of GDP), latest available year	84
Figure 8.6	Size of government resources (ratio of government expenditure to GDP) and GDP per capita, latest available year (international \$ PPP)	85
Figure 8.7	Share of government spending invested in social security and size of government (ratio of government expenditure to GDP), latest available year	85

Figure 8.8	Percentage of lower-income persons (first three income quintiles) reporting unmet health needs, and public spending on health (percentage of GDP), European Union countries, 2007	89
Figure 8.9	Non-pension cash transfers: Reduction in poverty risk, European Union countries, 2007	90
Figure 8.10	Percentage reduction in the Gini coefficient, and share of social security cash transfers in household incomes, 22 OECD countries, mid-2000	94
Figure 8.11	Poverty rates and social security expenditure for persons of working age and retirement age, OECD countries, mid-2000 (percentages)	94
Figure 8.12	Structure of the ADB Social Protection Index	95
Figure 8.13	Investments in social protection: Expenditure (percentage of GDP) in Asian countries for three SPI indicators	96
Figure 9.1	Components of the typology by level of income	102
Figure 10.1	Number of unemployed receiving social security unemployment benefits, weighted average, selected countries, 2007–10 (Index value 100 = January 2008)	107
Figure 10.2	Number of unemployed receiving unemployment benefits, selected countries, trends 2006–10	108
Figure 10.3	Thailand: Number of unemployed receiving unemployment benefits (monthly), and trends in the proportion of total unemployed receiving benefits, 2006–09 (percentages)	111
Figure 10.4	Real investment returns of pension funds, OECD countries, 2008 (percentages)	117

Boxes

1.1	Individual and societal need for protection by social security	14
1.2	An introduction to the terminology	16
1.3	Social security for migrant workers	19
10.1	Argentina, policy responses to the crisis: A stimulus package	114

Annex tables

Part A. The demographic, economic and labour market environment

Demographic indicators

Table 1.	Demographic trends: Dependency ratios	133
Table 2.	Demographic trends: Ageing	139
Table 3	Fertility rates, infant and maternal mortality rates, and life expectancy at birth	144
Table 4	Life expectancy at 20 or 60 years old, exact age x, both sexes (in years)	150

Labour force and employment indicators

Table 5	Labour force to population ratios at ages 15–64	155
Table 6	Labour force to population ratios at ages 65+	161
Table 7	Youth employment to population ratio at ages 15–24	167
Table 8	Employment to population ratio at ages 15+	172

Table 9	Status in employment (latest available year)	177
Table 10	Unemployment as a percentage of the labour force	184

Economic and poverty indicators

Table 11	Poverty and income distribution	188
Table 12	Levels of vulnerability	192
Table 13	GDP and Human Development Index (HDI), various years 1997–2008	194

Part B. Social security coverage and expenditure

Social security legal provision

Table 14	Ratification of ILO social security Conventions, by region	200
Table 15	Overview of social security statutory provision	203
Table 16	Social security statutory provision: Old age	208
Table 17	Social security statutory provision: Employment injury	216
Table 18	Social security statutory provision: Unemployment	223
Table 19	Social security statutory provision: Regional estimates	230
Table 20	Maternity social security legal provision	233

Social security indicators of effective coverage

Table 21	Indicators of effective coverage worldwide: Old age. Active contributors and elderly who receive an old-age pension, latest available year (percentages)	240
Table 22a	Indicators of effective coverage worldwide: Unemployment. Unemployed who actually receive benefits, latest available year (percentages)	245
Table 22b	Indicators of effective coverage worldwide: Unemployment during the financial crisis 2008–09. Unemployed receiving unemployment benefits, monthly data, selected countries	251
Table 23	Indicators of effective coverage: Employment injury. Active contributors or protected persons, selected countries	253
Table 24	Indicators of effective coverage: Occupational injury. Cases of injury with lost workdays, selected countries (total cases: fatal and non-fatal)	255

Social security expenditure

Table 25	Public social security expenditure, 2000 and latest available year (percentage of GDP)	258
Table 26	Public social security expenditure by branch, latest available year (percentage of GDP)	263

Specific health indicators

Table 27	Total (public and private) health care expenditure not financed by private households' out-of-pocket payments (percentages)	267
Table 28	Health coverage and access to medical care: Births attended by skilled health staff, and child immunization	270
Table 29	Multiple dimensions of health coverage, by levels of vulnerability	275

Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ANSES	Administración Nacional de la Seguridad Social (Social Security Administration) (Argentina)
ASSEDIC	Association pour l'emploi dans l'industrie et le commerce (Association for Employment in Industry and Trade) (France)
CCT	conditional cash transfer
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CLEEP	Comprehensive Livelihood and Emergency Employment Programme (Philippines)
COFOG	Classification of Functions of the Government (United Nations)
DB	defined benefit
DC	defined contribution
DWA	Decent Work Agenda (ILO)
DWI	Decent Work Indicators (ILO)
EAP	economically active population
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ESSPROS	European System of Integrated Social Protection Statistics
EU	European Union
EUROSTAT	Statistical Office of the European Communities
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GESS	Global Extension of Social Security database (ILO)
GFS	Government Finance Statistics (IMF)
HBS	Household Budget Survey
HDI	Human Development Index (UNDP)
ICLS	International Conference of Labour Statisticians
ILC	International Labour Conference
ILFS	Integrated Labour Force Survey
IMF	International Monetary Fund

ISSA	International Social Security Association
KILM	Key Indicators of the Labour Market (ILO)
LABORSTA	Labour Statistics database (ILO)
LFS	Labour Force Survey
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NHIS	National Health Insurance Service (Ghana)
NREGA	National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (India)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OMC	Open Method of Coordination (EU)
PAYG	Pay As You Go
PPL	paid parental leave
PPP	purchasing power parity
SME	small and medium-sized enterprise
SOCX	Social and Welfare Statistics: Social expenditure database (OECD)
SPC	Social Protection Committee (EU)
SPI	Social Protection Index (ADB)
SSA	Social Security Administration (United States)
SSI	Social Security Inquiry (ILO)
TME	Tripartite Meeting of Experts (ILO)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WHOSIS	WHO Statistical Information System

Executive summary

Objective and structure of the report

There is little hope that the Millennium Development Goals will be reached without a decisive global move towards introducing a national social protection floor of basic social security benefits in countries where no such scheme exists or where they have only limited coverage.

Sound social security policies have to be based on facts and figures. This report provides that factual basis to support the development of national social security policies. It is the first in a series of *World Social Security Reports* which will also help to monitor the global progress on social security coverage and thus support the ILO's campaign to extend coverage. It deals first with the scope, extent, levels and quality of coverage by various social security branches; it then examines the scale of countries' investments in social security, measured by the size and structure of social security expenditure and the sources of its financing; and finally presents the nature of social security responses to the crisis as a thematic focus. The main objective of the current report is to present the knowledge available on coverage by social security in different parts of the world, and to identify existing coverage gaps.

Main general findings

The notion of *social security* used here has two main (functional) dimensions, namely "income security" and "availability of medical care". Social security coverage

can be directly measured only separately for each of the specific branches, such as health care, old age or unemployment; or even for a group of specific schemes within each branch. There is no universally accepted methodology to aggregate these branch-specific coverage indicators into one overall indicator. However, the report makes an effort to provide at least a technical synopsis of the individual dimensions of coverage and the size of national social protection expenditure.

Some level of protection by social security exists in nearly all countries, though only a minority of countries provide protection in all branches. There is no country in the world without any form of social security, but in many countries coverage is limited to a few branches only, and only a minority of the global population has – both legally and effectively – access to existing schemes. Only one-third of countries globally (inhabited by 28 per cent of the global population) have comprehensive social protection systems covering all branches of social security as defined in ILO Convention No. 102. Taking into account those who are not economically active, it is estimated that only about 20 per cent of the world's working-age population (and their families) have effective access to comprehensive social protection.

Social health protection coverage

Although a larger percentage of the world's population has access to health-care services than to various cash benefits, nearly one-third has no access to any health facilities or services at all. For many more, necessary

expenditure on health care may cause financial catastrophe for their household, because they have no adequate social health protection which would cover or refund such expenditure.

Coverage by social security pensions: Income security in old age

Coverage by old-age pension schemes around the world, apart from in the developed countries, is concentrated on formal sector employees, mainly in the civil service and larger enterprises. The highest coverage is found in North America and Europe, the lowest in Asia and Africa.

Worldwide, nearly 40 per cent of the population of working age is *legally* covered by contributory old-age pension schemes. In North America and Europe this number is nearly twice as high, while in Africa less than one-third of the working-age population is covered even by legislation. Effective coverage is significantly lower than legal coverage. With the exception of North America and to a lesser extent Western Europe, effective coverage is quite low in all regions. In sub-Saharan Africa only 5 per cent of the working-age population is effectively covered by contributory programmes, while this share is about 20 per cent in Asia, the Middle East and North Africa. In Asia some countries have made major efforts to extend coverage beyond the formal sector. At the same time, while in high-income countries 75 per cent of persons aged 65 or over are receiving some kind of pension, in low-income countries less than 20 per cent of the elderly receive pension benefits; the median in this group of countries is just over 7 per cent.

Coverage of income support systems for the unemployed

Present entitlements to unemployment benefits tend to be restricted to those in formal employment, and exist mostly in high- and middle-income countries. In a large part of the world where extreme poverty is high, the very concept of “unemployment” seems to be irrelevant, as everybody has to work in order to survive. Of 184 countries studied, statutory unemployment social security schemes exist in only 78 countries (42 per cent), often covering only a minority of their labour force. Coverage rates in terms of the proportion of unemployed who receive benefits are lowest in Africa, Asia and the Middle East (less than 10 per cent).

Coverage of minimum income support benefits and other social assistance

In most countries with developed social security systems a large part of the population is covered by social insurance schemes, while social assistance plays only a residual role, providing income support and other benefits to the minority who for some reason are not covered by mainstream social insurance.¹ In the European Union (plus Iceland, Norway and Switzerland), expenditure on means-tested benefits does not exceed 3 per cent of GDP on average, while total social protection expenditure is on average over 25 per cent. While there are countries in the European Union (such as Ireland, Malta and the United Kingdom) where a relatively high share of social security benefits is delivered through targeted social assistance, nowhere does total social assistance benefit expenditure exceed 5 per cent of GDP.

While in most of the developed countries (except Australia and New Zealand) social assistance-type schemes play an important although residual role in closing relatively small coverage gaps, in many middle- and low-income countries non-contributory income transfer schemes have been recently gaining importance. Particularly in countries with large informal economies and where only a minority are covered by social insurance schemes, non-contributory social security provides an opportunity not only to alleviate poverty but also – at least in some cases – to fill a large part of the sizeable existing coverage gaps shown in this report. In fact, the most promising innovations that can help to cover the global coverage gap are conditional or unconditional cash transfer schemes in a number of developing countries, i.e. tax-financed social assistance schemes, such as the Bolsa Família scheme in Brazil, the Oportunidades schemes in Mexico, the social grant system of South Africa, or universal basic pension schemes in countries such as Namibia and Nepal.

Coverage by other branches of social security

Most countries in the world offer some coverage for work-related accidents and diseases. Coverage is generally limited to those working in the formal economy, and even there effective coverage is low with only

¹ Australia and New Zealand are the most prominent exceptions among OECD members; in these countries income-tested benefits play a dominant role in the provision of social security.

a certain portion of accidents reported and compensated. In the informal economy prevailing in many low-income countries, conditions and safety of work are often dramatically bad, accidents and work-related diseases widespread and with no protection at all for their victims. Globally, estimated legal coverage represents less than 30 per cent of the working-age population, which is less than 40 per cent of the economically active.

Reducing maternal, neo-natal and under-5 mortality through social security maternity benefits is globally among the greatest challenges of social protection; it concerns 11 million children who die before the age of 5, and 500,000 mothers dying during maternity (WHO, 2005). Coverage of cash benefits before and after birth is limited to formal sector employees. Differences in access to health care in the context of maternity protections between countries at different income levels and within countries are striking. In low-income countries no more than 35 per cent of all women in rural areas have access to professional health services, while in urban areas the access rate amounts to an average of about 70 per cent, which is still more than 20 percentage points lower than the access in high-income countries (where it is nearly complete).

Investments in social security and a tentative summary

On average, 17.2 per cent of global GDP is allocated to social security. However, these expenditures tend to be concentrated in higher-income countries as shown


in figure S.1, and so this average does not reflect the situation for the majority of the world's population, who live in lower-income countries where much less is invested in social security.

Although this prevailing pattern shows a strong correlation between income levels and amounts of resources allocated to social security, it cannot be concluded there is no fiscal or policy space for lower-income countries to decide on the size of their social security system. Countries with a similar level of GDP per capita may take very different decisions as to the size of the public sector. And at any size of government, countries have some choice as to what portion of public resources to invest in social security.

Despite methodological difficulties we attempted to build a first approximation of a typology of situations in different countries, i.e. of factors that ensure success in terms of social security coverage. The typology uses two input factors (legal foundations built, sustained level of resources committed), and a proxy for effective and good quality coverage as an output measure.

Not all the theoretically possible combinations of different factors occur in reality: not even the widest legal foundations can ever result in adequate coverage outcomes if they are not enforced and not backed by sufficient resources. But strong legal foundations are a necessary condition for securing higher resources; there are no national situations where generous resources are available despite the lack of a legal basis. In 29 per cent of 146 countries that were analysed, a comprehensive legal basis and high levels of resources coincided with high levels of good quality coverage.

Figure S.1. Social security expenditure by income level and branch, weighted by population, latest available year (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15128>

Note: The number of countries for which detailed social security data on expenditure by branch are available is smaller than the number of countries covered for the calculation of total expenditure as presented in figure 8.2. This explains some differences in the results for total expenditure.

Source: ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a). See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Thematic focus: Social security in times of crisis

In addition to providing income replacement for those who lose their jobs, thus safeguarding them from poverty, social security benefits also have major economic impacts through stabilizing aggregate demand. And, contrary to earlier beliefs, no negative effects on economic growth of increased social spending during and after crises have been found. On the contrary, well-designed unemployment schemes and social assistance and public works programmes effectively prevent long-term unemployment and help shorten economic recessions.

In those countries reviewed that have at least elements of comprehensive social security responses in areas such as pensions, health schemes or family benefits, the main crisis responses are usually automatic increases in number of beneficiaries and expenditure as well as expansions in coverage and in benefit levels of existing schemes, except for a limited number of countries which have been forced by circumstances to actually decrease benefits or to narrow coverage.

Measures expanding benefits and coverage can be found everywhere – in high-, medium- and low-income countries. Where they exist, unemployment insurance schemes are the branch of social security that bears the brunt of costs of income replacement for employees who have lost their jobs. But unemployment insurance schemes are in place in only 64 of the 184 countries for which information is available. Social assistance, public works and similar programmes also have very limited coverage globally. In the economic crises of past decades which affected countries such as those in Asia and Latin America where social security schemes were absent, it proved to be difficult – if not impossible – to introduce new schemes or ad hoc measures quickly enough to cushion the impact of the crisis. But countries which had introduced unemployment schemes before the onset of the crisis, such as the Republic of Korea, could relatively easily scale up these measures to respond in an appropriate and timely way.

In 46 high-, medium- and low-income countries analysed, government responses are found in all the three groups of countries providing income support to the unemployed. The most common responses in high-income countries are modifications of existing unemployment schemes. Since past recessions have led to higher structural unemployment in some Western

European countries, in this crisis government strategy in a number of countries, such as France, Germany and the Netherlands, aims at the avoidance of full unemployment by expanding the application, eligibility and coverage of partial unemployment benefits. Partial unemployment benefits allow workers to stay in their employment relationship, but – for example – with reduced working hours. They aim at preventing the loss of skills and the discouragement of workers, both of which may occur when they become fully unemployed.

The most common form of response in middle-income countries is the extension of cash transfer schemes (for example, in Brazil) or public employment schemes (for example, in the Philippines). The latter often have an ad hoc character: they may be implemented more quickly than social security schemes, and discontinued once the crisis is over. The availability of measures for crisis response is clearly the most limited in low-income countries. Schemes providing income support in case of unemployment exist, but rarely. In addition, many of these countries, in particular in sub-Saharan Africa, were already facing mass poverty and underemployment well before the recent global economic crisis.

Corrections to pension schemes might also be required in all countries where schemes were reformed during the last three decades. The crisis and the consequential losses in pension reserves clearly demonstrated the vulnerability of pension levels, and hence old-age income security, to the performance of capital markets and other economic fluctuations. The unpredictability of pension levels may be reduced by introducing defined-benefit-type guarantees into defined-contribution schemes, or by guaranteeing rates of return in such a manner as would provide replacement rates on retirement at target levels.

There remains a risk that countries that followed an expansionary fiscal policy during the crisis will now face pressure for fiscal consolidation to cope with increased deficits and public debt. If and wherever it happens, this may result in future cuts of social security spending to even below pre-crisis levels. This may not only directly affect social security beneficiaries and consequently the standards of living of a large portion of the population but also, through aggregate demand effects, slow down or significantly delay a full economic recovery.

Conclusions

The current crisis has once more proved how important a role social security plays in society in times of crisis and adjustment. It works as an irreplaceable economic, social and political stabilizer in such hard times – both for individual lives and the life of society as a whole. Social security plays this role in addition to its other functions – providing mechanisms to alleviate and also to prevent poverty, to reduce income disparities to acceptable levels, and also to enhance human capital and productivity. Social security is thus one of the conditions for sustainable economic and social development. It is a factor in development. It is also an important factor in a modern democratic state and in society.

This report clearly shows that the majority of the world population still has no access to comprehensive

social security systems. Thus, to prepare global society for future economic downturns and to achieve other global objectives such as the Millennium Development Goals, sustainable economic development and a fair globalization, a fundamental task is to develop comprehensive social security systems in countries where only rudimentary systems exist so far, starting with the provision of basic income security and affordable access to essential health care. The ILO is promoting the re-shaping of national social security systems based on the principle of progressive universalism. Inter alia, the Global Jobs Pact, adopted by the International Labour Conference in June 2009, advocates ensuring a minimum set of social security benefits for all – a social protection floor. Based on that floor, higher levels of social security should then be sought as economies develop and the fiscal space for redistributive policies widens.

Introduction

Context, objectives, scope and structure of the report

Social security is a fundamental human right recognized in numerous international legal instruments, in particular the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944), which is an integral part of the Constitution of the International Labour Organization (ILO), and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

More recently, the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization was adopted by the International Labour Conference (ILC) at its 97th Session (2008). The Declaration recognizes that the ILO:

based on the mandate contained in the ILO Constitution, including the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944), which continues to be fully relevant...has the solemn obligation to further among the nations of the world programmes which will achieve the objectives of full employment and the raising of standards of living, a minimum living wage and the extension of social security measures to provide a basic income to all in need, along with all the other objectives set out in the Declaration of Philadelphia. (ILO, 2008a, Annex, Part II, Section B)

In recent years ILO work on social security has been conducted within the framework of the Global Campaign on Social Security and Coverage for All, as mandated by the International Labour Conference of 2001. The Campaign focuses on the fact that there still remain many countries in the world where social security coverage is low, particularly among those with low- and middle-income levels. The ILO believes that

the best strategy for progress is for these countries to put in place a set of basic social security guarantees for all residents as soon as possible, while planning to move towards higher levels of provision – as envisaged in the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102) – as their economies develop. At the same time such a strategy would significantly help countries to achieve their Millennium Development Goals.

Although social security is a human right, only a minority of the world's population actually enjoys that right, while the majority lacks comprehensive and adequate coverage. More than half lack any type of protection at all. In sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, the number of people with access to even the most rudimentary protection is estimated to be less than 10 per cent. And people in these countries need social protection, in particular when facing additional demographic and labour force challenges due to the impact of HIV/AIDS.

In 2001 the International Labour Conference laid the foundation for a sustained ILO effort to address this challenge, by calling for a major campaign to promote the extension of social security coverage. The Global Campaign on Social Security and Coverage for All was officially launched at the 91st Session of the Conference in 2003 by ILO Director-General Juan Somavia, who said: "Social security systems contribute not only to human security, dignity, equity and social justice, but also provide a foundation for political inclusion, empowerment and the development of democracy. ... Well-designed social security systems improve

economic performance and thus contribute to the comparative advantage of countries on global markets. We have the will, and now must find the way, to provide more people with the social benefits needed to survive and prosper.”

The enhancement of the coverage and effectiveness of social security for all is one of the four strategic objectives of the Decent Work Agenda that guides the programme of the ILO. The effective governance of social security schemes – in particular their effective financial governance – is an essential prerequisite for the enhancement and extension of coverage and the enhancement of the effectiveness of social security.

The recent global financial crisis has once more demonstrated how important it is for a country to have a comprehensive social security system. In times of crisis such a system not only cushions the impact of the economic downturn on workers and their families – thus contributing to social stability – but it works at the same time as an economic stabilizer supporting aggregate demand and facilitating recovery. In April 2009, as one of its joint Crisis Initiatives, the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination adopted the Social Protection Floor Initiative (UN, 2009a). The ILO, together with the World Health Organization (WHO) and a number of collaborating agencies, are leading this initiative. At its core is the building of a coalition of international agencies and donors, supporting countries in their efforts to plan and implement sustainable social transfer schemes and essential social services on the basis of the concept of a Social Protection Floor.

This concept was endorsed as a part of the Global Jobs Pact that the International Labour Conference adopted in June 2009. The Pact requests countries that do not yet have extensive social security to build “adequate social protection for all, drawing on a basic social protection floor including: access to health care, income security for the elderly and persons with disabilities, child benefits and income security combined with public employment guarantee schemes for the unemployed and the working poor”, and urges “the international community to provide development assistance, including budgetary support, to build up a basic social protection floor on a national basis” (ILO, 2009a).

The *World Social Security Report 2010/11* is a factual report, not a policy document. Policy aspects of social security have been covered over the last years in a number of other ILO publications. In recent years the ILO has published a number of reports and other documents discussing the need for social security, and gathering evidence on its positive economic and social

impacts and on the costs and affordability of providing at least basic social protection for all in need in the poorest countries.¹ In addition to the present report, the ILO is publishing a complementary guide to recent experience across the world and proposing strategies to extend social security to all those in need, as well as summarizing challenges and developing guidelines on practice and existing strategic options.²

This report aims to inform social security planners, researchers and decision-makers about the state of social security coverage. It provides the information that policy-makers need to benchmark their national policy decisions against international experience and the situation in countries with comparable demographics, social and economic conditions. The report is also a global monitoring instrument that supports the ILO’s campaign to extend social security coverage.

The report is the first in a series of *World Social Security Reports* whose chief aim is to present the results of regular statistical monitoring of the state and developments of social security in the world. The *World Social Security Reports* will look at, first, the scope, extent, levels and quality of coverage by various social security branches; then at the scale of countries’ investments in social security measured by size and structure of social security expenditure and sources of its financing; and finally at the effectiveness and efficiency of social security systems in reaching various national social policy objectives, as well as other impacts of the policies which may be of special interest. It is based to a large extent on information and statistics collected within the ILO Social Security Inquiry and in this respect it may be seen as a continuation of the reports produced over past decades (since the 1950s) by the ILO on the cost of social security, but with broader ambitions.

¹ See, among others, ILO, 2005: *Social protection as a productive factor*, Report to the Employment and Social Policy Committee of the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization (Geneva); ILO, 2008b: *Social health protection: An ILO strategy towards universal access to health care*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 1 (Geneva); ILO, 2008c: *Setting social security standards in a global society: An analysis of present state and practice and of future options for global social security standard setting in the International Labour Organization*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 2 (Geneva); ILO, 2008d: *Can low income countries afford basic social security?*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 3 (Geneva); ILO, 2009b: *Social security for all: Investing in social justice and economic development*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 7 (Geneva); see also the recently published book: Townsend (ed.), 2009: *Building decent societies: Rethinking the role of social security in development* (Geneva, ILO and London, Palgrave Macmillan). See also Dixon-Fyle and Mulanga, 2004: *Responding to HIV/AIDS in the world of work in Africa: The role of social protection* (Geneva, ILO).

² See ILO, 2010a: *Extending social security to all: A guide through challenges and options* (Geneva).

The main objective of the current report is to present the knowledge available on coverage by social security in different parts of the world, and to identify existing coverage gaps. The measurement of social security coverage in all its dimensions is still a subject of debate. In addition, the statistical information available – not only at the international but also at the national level – is far from complete. The report thus focuses on three elements: (1) mapping social security coverage globally and by region or other country grouping (such as level of income) using the various information and statistical sources available; (2) presenting various methods and approaches to assessing social security coverage; (3) identifying and indicating gaps in measurable statistical knowledge on social security coverage, costs and impacts, in order to raise awareness of the need for and importance of high-quality social security statistics.

Due to the data situation this first edition is biased towards assessing the extent of population coverage rather than aspects of scope and level of coverage. It is based on the available statistical data and other types of relevant information. In addition to data collected by the ILO within its Social Security Inquiry it makes extensive use of information on existing legal provisions designed to provide social security coverage, from the database Social Security Programs Throughout the World jointly developed and maintained by the US Social Security Administration (SSA) and International Social Security Association (ISSA) (SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009). Data included in the ILO Social Security Inquiry (SSI) (ILO, 2009c) incorporates information from databases of other organizations: the Social expenditure database (SOCX) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2009a); the Living Conditions and Welfare (social protection expenditure and receipts) database (ESSPROS) of EUROSTAT, the Statistical Office of the European Communities (European Commission, 2009a); data on expenditure and coverage by social protection programmes in Asia from the database used to calculate the Social Protection Index of the Asian Development Bank (ADB, 2006, 2008); and data on expenditure, financing and coverage for selected countries collected by ISSA (ISSA, 2009). The report also makes extensive use of data on government expenditure from the database Government Finance Statistics (GFS) of the International Monetary Fund (IMF,

2009); and data and estimates from the World Health Organization (WHO, 2009a) on health expenditure and national health accounts.

Despite the multiple sources available, there still exist many gaps which do not allow a full assessment of all the dimensions of coverage. It is to be hoped that thanks to the joint international effort presently under way, the picture presented in the next report will be more detailed and accurate.

The structure of the report is as follows:

- Part I presents the main concepts, definitions and measurement methodologies used in the report and global and regional estimates of multiple dimensions of social security coverage – both in general and in selected branches of social security.
- Part II discusses a special feature selected for this 2010–11 report: the role of social security in times of economic crisis.
- The Statistical Annex provides in tabular form the main characteristics of the demographic, labour market and economic environment of social security, as well as more detailed data on the scope, extent and levels of coverage by social security across the world. It provides basic information for researchers and policy-makers in social security. The data in the Statistical Annex tables, as well as the data used for most figures and tables in the body of the report, are also available in spreadsheet format in the ILO Social Security Department database Global Extension of Social Security (GESS) (ILO, 2009d), accessible at <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ShowTheme.do?tid=1985>.

The report is the result of a joint effort by the ILO's Social Security Department research and statistical team led by Florence Bonnet and Krzysztof Hagemeyer. The team was significantly aided in its preparation by the work of Axel Weber, Xenia Scheil-Adlung, Sylvie Renault and Elena Lanza. Parts of the content draw on earlier research as well as results of technical cooperation activities by staff of the Social Security Department and ILO social security specialists in the field. The authors are grateful for detailed and constructive comments from many colleagues, in particular Nomaan Majid of the ILO's Employment Sector, and from an anonymous external reviewer.

Part I
**Monitoring the state of
social security coverage**

This chapter focuses on the basic concepts, definitions and methodology guiding the analytical work of the ILO on social security.

1.1 Basic definitions

The terms *social protection* and *social security* are used in various and not always consistent ways, differing widely across countries and international organizations, and also across time. It is not the purpose of this section to assert any universal definitions; it is rather simply to clarify terms and concepts as they are used in this report and in the ILO.

Social protection

The term *social protection* is used in institutions across the world with a wider variety of meanings than *social security*. It is often interpreted as having a broader character than social security (including, in particular, protection provided between members of the family or members of a local community),¹ but it is also used in some contexts with a narrower meaning (understood as comprising only measures addressed to the poorest, most vulnerable or excluded members of society). Thus, in many contexts the terminology “social security” and

¹ This usage was reflected in ILO, 2000: *World Labour Report 2000: Income security and social protection in a changing world* (Geneva).

“social protection” may be largely interchangeable, and the ILO (following the European tradition) certainly uses both in discourse with its constituents and in the provision of relevant advice to them.²

In this report, accordingly, reference is made to “social protection” as having the following aspects: (1) interchangeable with “social security” or (2) as “protection” provided by social security in case of social risks and needs.

Social security

The notion of *social security* adopted here covers all measures providing benefits, whether in cash or in kind, to secure *protection*, inter alia, from

- (a) lack of work-related income (or insufficient income) caused by sickness, disability, maternity, employment injury, unemployment, old age, or death of a family member;
- (b) lack of access or unaffordable access to health care;
- (c) insufficient family support, particularly for children and adult dependants;
- (d) general poverty and social exclusion.

² It may be noted, however, that the ILO does use the institutional title “Social Protection Sector” which comprises a wider range of programmes than social security; the Sector deals with issues including safety at work, labour migration and aspects of working conditions such as hours of work, wages and others.

Box 1.1 Individual and societal need for protection by social security

Everybody needs protection from risks and the insecurity they cause. When this need for protection remains unmet for the individual and for households, numerous negative effects follow. A growing body of evidence indicates that unfulfilled protection results in increasing poverty, higher levels of exclusion from access to health and education, low access to productive activities, an increase in the prevalence of child labour, HIV/AIDS and so on. The need for protection depends to a large extent on several factors that exist at the individual and household level as well as the national level. These include income, sex, age, health status, occupation, employment status, the location of the residence and the workplace; and at the macro level they refer to factors such as political stability, economic trends, price trends and so on.

When considering these various factors, it is relatively easy to identify situations that increase vulnerability and the need for protection. For example, at the individual level these might include being chronically ill or having a hazardous occupation. At the macro level it could refer to a financial crisis or increases in food prices. The poor tend to amass several risk-laden situations simultaneously, so that they face increased insecurity: their low income means they are less able to save and accumulate assets. This in turn renders them less able to deal with a crisis when it strikes; they most often work in the informal economy – an unregulated environment with unsafe working conditions; they may lack basic education (illiteracy) and are often beyond the reach of prevention or health education programmes because they are unaware of their social entitlements. In addition, they may live in remote areas far away from public social services. For poor people, dealing successfully with the risks they face is often a matter of life or death. But risks affect not only the existing poor; they can also plunge the non-poor into poverty. For example, the World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that each year 100 million people fall into poverty as a result of the financial burden of health-related risks, or the need to pay for health-care services.

See also the wider discussion in *Extending social security to all: A guide through challenges and options* (ILO, 2010a).

Social security thus has two main (functional) dimensions, namely “income security” and “availability of medical care”, which are specifically identified in the ILO Income Security Recommendation, 1944 (No. 67), and the Medical Care Recommendation, 1944 (No. 69), respectively, as “essential elements of social security”. These Recommendations envisage that, firstly, “income security schemes should relieve want and prevent destitution by restoring, up to a reasonable level, income which is lost by reason of inability to work (including old age) or to obtain remunerative work or by reason of the death of the breadwinner” (No. 67, Guiding principles, Paragraph 1). Secondly, “a medical care service should meet the needs of the individual for care by members of the medical and allied professions” and “medical care services should cover all members of the community” (No. 69, Paragraphs 1 and 8). This duality is also reflected in the formulation of the Declaration of Philadelphia which speaks of “social security measures to provide a basic income to all in need of such protection and comprehensive medical care”.

Access to social security is, in its essential nature, a public responsibility, and is typically provided through public institutions, financed either from *contributions* or *taxes*. However, the delivery of social security can be and often is mandated to private entities. Moreover, there exist many privately run institutions (of insurance, self-help, community-based or of a mutual

character) which can partially assume selected roles usually played by social security, including in particular occupational pension schemes, which complement and may substitute in considerable measure for elements of public social security schemes. Entitlements to social security are conditional either on the payment of social security contributions for prescribed periods (i.e. *contributory schemes*, most often structured as *social insurance* arrangements) or on a requirement, sometimes described as “residency plus”, under which benefits are provided to all residents of the country who also meet certain other criteria (i.e. *non-contributory schemes*). Other criteria may make benefit entitlements conditional on age, health, labour market, income or other determinants of social or economic status and/or even conformity to certain forms of behaviour. Means-tested *social assistance* is a special case, envisaged under the provisions of Recommendation No. 67 concerning income security.

What distinguishes social security from other social arrangements is that: (1) benefits are provided to beneficiaries without any simultaneous reciprocal obligation (thus it does not, for example, represent remuneration for work or other services delivered); and (2) that it is not based on an individual agreement between the protected person and provider (as, for example, a life insurance contract) but that the agreement applies to a wider group of people and so has a collective character.

Depending on the category of applicable conditions, a distinction is also made between *non-means-tested schemes* (where the conditions of benefit entitlement are not related to the total level of income or wealth of the beneficiary and his family) and *means-tested schemes* (where entitlement is granted only to those with income or wealth below a prescribed threshold).

A special category of “conditional” schemes includes those which, in addition to other conditions, require beneficiaries (and/or their relatives or families) to participate in prescribed public programmes (for example, specified health or educational programmes). In recent years, schemes of this type have become known as conditional cash transfer (CCT) schemes.

Social transfers

All social security benefits comprise *transfers*, either *in cash* or *in kind*, i.e. they represent a transfer of income or services (most often health-care services). This transfer may be from the active to the old, the healthy to the sick, or the affluent to the poor, among others. The recipients of such transfers may be in a position to receive them from a specific social security scheme because they have contributed to such a scheme (*contributory scheme*), or because they are residents (*universal schemes* for all residents), or they fulfil specific age criteria (*categorical schemes*), or they experience specific resource conditions (*social assistance schemes*) or because they fulfil several of these conditions at the same time. In addition, it is a requirement in some schemes that beneficiaries accomplish specific tasks (employment guarantee schemes, public works) or that they adopt specific behaviours (as in CCTs). In any given country, several schemes of different types generally coexist and may provide benefits for similar contingencies to different population groups. The more specific characteristics of these different schemes are outlined below.

In contributory schemes the contributions made by beneficiaries directly determine entitlement to benefits (acquired rights). The most common form of contributory social security scheme is of a statutory *social insurance* scheme for formal wage employment and, in some countries, for the self-employed. Other common types of contributory scheme, providing – in the absence of social insurance – a certain level of protection, include national provident funds that usually pay a lump sum to beneficiaries when particular contingencies occur (typically old age, invalidity or death). In the case of social insurance schemes for those in wage or

salary employment, contributions are usually paid by both employees and employers (by and large, employment injury schemes are fully financed by employers). Contributory schemes can be wholly financed through contributions but often are partly financed from tax or other sources, either in the form of a subsidy to cover the deficit, or in the form of a general subsidy supplanting contributions altogether, or subsidizing only specific groups of contributors or beneficiaries (those not contributing because they are caring for children, studying, in military service, unemployed, or have too low a level of income to fully contribute, or receive benefits below the minimum because of low contributions in the past).

Insurance schemes, in the context of social security, refer to schemes that guarantee protection through an insurance mechanism. Insurance is based on: (1) the prior payment of premiums or contributions, i.e. before the occurrence of the insured contingency; (2) risk sharing or “pooling”; and (3) the notion of a guarantee. The premiums paid by (or for) insured persons are pooled together and the resulting fund is used to cover the expenses exclusively incurred by those persons affected by the occurrence of the relevant (clearly defined) contingency or contingencies. It is common that contributory schemes make use of an insurance vehicle (usually social insurance), but the reverse is not necessarily true (national provident funds, for example, do not generally feature risk-pooling). It should be noted that social insurance is distinguished in strict technical terms in that the risk-pooling is based on the principle of solidarity, as against insurance arrangements of a more familiar, commercial type, based on individually calculated risk premiums.

Many social security schemes of the contributory type are presented and described as “insurance” schemes (usually “social insurance schemes”), despite being in actual fact of mixed character, with some non-contributory elements in entitlements to benefits; this allows for a more equitable distribution of benefits, particularly for those with low incomes and short or broken work careers, among others. These non-contributory elements take various forms, being financed either by other contributors (redistribution within the scheme) or by the State.

Conversely, non-contributory schemes or social assistance schemes normally require no direct contribution from beneficiaries or their employers as a condition of entitlement to receive relevant benefits. Non-contributory schemes include a broad range of schemes including universal schemes for all residents and some categorical or means-tested schemes. Non-contributory

Box 1.2 An introduction to the terminology

Contingencies are events that might or might not occur (having an accident or winning the lottery, for example). *Hazards* (often mis-termed as risks) are contingencies that are perceived as having a negative effect on individuals, groups or societies or even more complex entities, such as the environment. Hazards include a broad range and variety of contingencies such as flood, earthquake, conflict, loss of job, the death of an income-earning household member or chronic illness. The term *risk* should describe exclusively the probability that a contingency or a hazard occurs. Unfortunately it is often used in literature as a synonym for hazard and at the same time as probability that a contingency occurs and that has a negative connotation.

You are *exposed* to a hazard or a contingency if a certain event can occur and affect you – for instance, living in an environment where a certain illness can be contracted. If you move to a country where that particular illness does not exist, you are no longer exposed. You are *vulnerable* to a certain hazard if you have no means of coping with the consequences of that hazard once it has occurred: for example, not being able to afford medical care that can help you regain your health. If you are vulnerable to a certain hazard then you are in need of a protecting mechanism that reduces your vulnerability. *Social security* makes you less vulnerable to the financial consequences of certain hazards if and when they materialize, i.e. it provides security or reduces insecurity. Apart from what can be done through accident or illness prevention, the direct contribution of social security to reducing exposure to hazards is of course limited.

Not all hazards are unforeseeable and beyond our control. For example, the probability of contracting a certain illness can be reduced by health-conscious behaviour, the hazard of unemployment by moving to a region where your skills are in greater demand, and your family's exposure by sending them out of a country that is beset by political unrest or poor health conditions. If you are paying insurance contributions that entitle you to a cash benefit should a certain contingency occur, this would help to mitigate the impact of that hazard. If your society provides you with social assistance benefits should you fall into poverty, these benefits – if adequate – may help you to cope with the hazard once it has occurred. The whole portfolio of strategies and arrangements, ranging from risk reduction, avoidance or prevention to hazard mitigation and coping, is called by the World Bank *social risk management* and should strictly be called *social hazard management*.

Source: Based on Cichon et al., 2004.

schemes are usually financed through tax or other state revenues.

Universal schemes for all residents provide benefits under the single condition of residence. Such schemes are mostly put in place to guarantee access to health care. They are generally tax-financed, but may require a co-payment by users of health services; sometimes with exemption for the poorest (typically the latter may receive vouchers).

Categorical schemes target specific groups (categories) of the population. The most frequent forms of categorical schemes are those that transfer income to the elderly above a certain age or children below a certain age. Some categorical schemes also target households with specific structures (one-parent households, for example) or occupational groups such as rural workers. Categorical schemes may also be grouped as universal if they cover all residents belonging to a certain category, or include resource conditions (as in social assistance schemes). They may also include other types of conditions such as performing or accomplishing certain tasks. Most categorical schemes are tax-financed.

Means-tested schemes target people whose means (usually their assets and income) fall below a certain

threshold. Such targeted schemes are very diverse in their design and features. This diversity may manifest itself through the methods of targeting that are employed, the supplementary conditions required for beneficiaries to access benefits and the inclusion of other interventions that are delivered on top of the actual income transfer itself.

Conditional cash transfers (CCTs) are social assistance schemes that provide cash to families subject to the condition that they fulfil specific “behavioural” requirements. This may mean they must ensure their children attend school regularly (typically 85–90 per cent attendance) or that they utilize basic preventative nutrition and health-care services; CCTs are usually means-tested.

Employment guarantee schemes ensure access to a certain number of workdays a year to poor households, generally providing wages at a relatively low level (typically at the minimum wage level if this is adequately defined). Such programmes generally take the form of “public works” activity.

Social security schemes, programmes and measures should be seen as a distinct body of rules and, therefore, characterized by at least a certain degree of “formality”, supported by one or more social security institutions

governing the provision of social security benefits and their financing. It should, in general, be possible to draw up a separate account of receipts and expenditure for each social security scheme. It is often the case that a social security scheme provides protection against a single risk or need, and covers a single specific group of beneficiaries. Typically, however, one institution will administer more than one benefit scheme.

All the social security schemes and institutions in a country are inevitably interlinked and complementary in their objectives, functions and financing, and thus form a national social security system. For reasons of effectiveness and efficiency (and the ILO will always recommend this to its constituents), it is essential that there is a close coordination within the system, and that – not least for coordination and planning purposes – the receipts and expenditure accounts of all the schemes are compiled into one social security budget for the country so that its future expenditure and financing of the schemes comprising the social security system are planned in an integrated way.

The social protection floor

The origin of this concept dates back a number of years. The idea of a “socio-economic floor” and its relationship to social protection was emphasized in the report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization, which stated: “A minimum level of social protection for individuals and families needs to be accepted and undisputed as part of the socio-economic floor of the global economy” (WCSDG, 2004, p. 13). Since then, the term “social floor” or “social protection floor” has been used to mean a set of basic social rights, services and facilities that the global citizen should enjoy. The term “social floor” corresponds in many ways to the existing notion of “core obligations”, to ensure the realization of, at the very least, minimum essential levels of rights embodied in human rights treaties.

The United Nations (2009a) suggests that a social protection floor could consist of two main elements that help to realize respective human rights:

- services: geographical and financial access to essential services such as water and sanitation, health, and education;
- transfers: a basic set of essential social transfers, in cash and in kind, as aid to the poor and vulnerable to provide minimum income security and access to essential services, including health care.

In the context of its campaign to extend social security to all, the ILO is promoting the social transfer component of the social protection floor, that is, the social security floor, a basic and modest set of essential social guarantees realized through transfers in cash and in kind that could ensure a minimum level of income security and access to health care for all in need. The goal of such a basic set of guarantees is a situation in which, in all countries:

- all residents have the necessary financial protection in order to be able to afford and have access to a nationally defined set of essential health-care services, whereby the State accepts the general responsibility for ensuring the adequacy of the (usually) pluralistic financing and delivery systems;
- all children have income security, at least at the nationally defined poverty level, through family or child benefits aimed at facilitating access to nutrition, education and care;
- all those in active age groups who are unable to earn sufficient income in the labour market should enjoy a minimum level of income security through social assistance or other social transfer schemes (such as transfer income schemes for women during the last weeks of pregnancy and the first weeks after delivery), combined with employment guarantees or other labour market policies;
- all residents in old age or with disabilities have income security, at least at the nationally defined poverty level, through pensions for old age and disability.

The level of benefits and scope of population covered (for example, age eligibility for old-age pensions) for each guarantee should be defined according to national conditions (potential fiscal space, demographic structure and trends, income distribution, poverty spread and gap, and so on), political choices, characteristics of groups to be covered and expected outcomes. In no circumstance should the level of benefit be below a minimum that ensures access to a basic basket of food and other essential goods and services.

1.2 The scope of social security as defined by ILO standards and by other international organizations

ILO Conventions, Recommendations and other guiding mechanisms

The ILO is a standard-setting organization. International labour standards take the form of either Conventions or Recommendations, which cover a broad range of subjects including fundamental rights at work (freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, elimination of forced labour, abolition of child labour and elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation),³ the employment relationship and industrial relations, conditions of work (wages, hours of work, occupational safety and health), and social security as well as other related social policy areas. International labour standards are adopted on a tripartite basis by the International Labour Conference (ILC). While Conventions are open to ratification by member States and create legal obligations stemming from ratification, Recommendations cannot be ratified; they usually accompany Conventions and serve as non-binding guidelines for their application, but can also stand alone. A Convention enters into force when ratified by a specified number of governments and, from that moment, it is considered binding upon ratifying States. A Convention which has not been ratified by certain States should be regarded by those States as having the same status, legal force and effect as Recommendations.

Under the ILO Constitution, States have the obligation to report periodically on the application in national law and practice of the Conventions they have ratified. Such reports are then examined by the competent ILO supervisory bodies, the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations and the ILC Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, which sit on a yearly basis.

ILO Conventions and Recommendations in the area of social security are the main references when looking at social security coverage both globally and in specific countries and therefore will be used as such for the purpose of this report.

Since the establishment of the ILO in 1919, the ILC has adopted 31 Conventions and 23 Recommendations

on social security.⁴ The first international Convention on social security (maternity protection) (No. 3) was adopted at the First Session of the ILC in 1919, while the most recent, which revised earlier standards on maternity protection, was adopted in 2000. In 2002 the ILO Governing Body confirmed six out of these 31 Conventions as up-to-date social security Conventions. These are:

- Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102);
- Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (No. 121);
- Invalidity, Old-Age and Survivors' Benefits Convention, 1967 (No. 128);
- Medical Care and Sickness Benefits Convention, 1969 (No. 130);
- Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment Convention, 1988 (No. 168); and
- Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183).

In addition, the Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962 (No. 118), makes provision for the equality of treatment between national and non-national workers with regard to coverage by the branches of social security, as well as provisions of benefits abroad and maintenance of rights in course of acquisition (see box 1.3). The Maintenance of Social Security Rights Convention, 1982 (No. 157), also covers the latter in a broader way. The Statistical Annex of this report includes tables presenting the level of ratifications of the ILO social security Conventions.

ILO Recommendations provide policy guidance issued by the International Labour Conference that all member States should seek to comply with but are not ratifiable in nature. Their scope is often wider and more conceptual than that of Conventions, which have direct relevance for national legislation.

The adoption of the Income Security Recommendation, 1944 (No. 67), and Medical Care Recommendation, 1944 (No. 69), by the ILC were important milestones in the development of international legal instruments in the field of social security. For the first time in history, guiding principles were established in a comprehensive way for eight social security contingencies and medical care, to be provided by social insurance complemented by social assistance. Universal coverage

³ ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, 1998.

⁴ For a wider discussion see for example ILO, 2008c.

Box 1.3 Social security for migrant workers

In 2004 the 92nd Session of the International Labour Conference, in its resolution on a fair deal for migrant workers in the global economy, identified as an acute necessity the adoption of specific measures to protect the social security rights of migrant workers. Migrant workers – estimated globally at 105.5 million in 2010 – are often denied access to social security coverage in destination countries due, especially, to the insufficient duration of their periods of employment and residence. Restricting social security coverage to nationals or permanent residents is another constraint faced by migrant workers. Importantly, migrant workers in irregular situations and/or working in the informal economy are excluded from social security coverage. At the same time, these workers risk the loss of entitlement to social security benefits in their countries of origin due to their absence.

The barriers to social security coverage faced by migrant workers worldwide need to be reduced; this is particularly necessary in times of crisis. Migrant workers and their families are among the most vulnerable as they are often the first hit in case of economic crisis. In destination countries, migrant workers are employed for the most part in construction, hotels and restaurants, and manufacturing; three sectors that have suffered severe job cuts during the current economic downturn. The economic crisis affects not only the volume of employment in general but also its quality. In origin countries, as a result of the crisis, the significant drop in financial remittances is likely to have an impact on the protection they provide to families of migrant workers.

An international legal framework has been set up for the protection of migrant workers,¹ with specific instruments related to their social security. These instruments were designed to coordinate different national social security schemes and to safeguard migrant workers' social security rights by promoting equal treatment between nationals and non-nationals and maintenance of social security rights acquired and in course of acquisition.² The non-binding ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration (2005)³ calls for the conclusion of social security agreements. These are treaties which coordinate the social security schemes of two or more countries to ensure the portability of social security entitlements. There are also other mechanisms, such as the inclusion of social security provisions in temporary labour migration programmes, and voluntary insurance schemes offered by national social security systems of origin countries to their migrant workers abroad and to their family members.

¹ The Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97); the Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143); and the United Nations Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (1990). ² The specific related instruments are the Equality of Treatment (Accident Compensation) Convention, 1925 (No. 19); the Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962 (No. 118); the Maintenance of Migrants' Pension Rights Convention, 1935 (No. 48) (shelved); and the Maintenance of Social Security Rights Convention, 1982 (No. 157) and its accompanying Recommendation, 1983 (No. 167). In addition, the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), contains the obligation of equality of treatment of non-national residents for the social security branches included in the ratification process (Art. 68). ³ As part of its Decent Work Agenda, the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration provides principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration.

of social security was pursued, and the classical limitation of the applicability of ILO instruments to workers in the formal sector was given up. This new approach was laid down in Recommendation No. 67 by establishing the main features of income security schemes. The Recommendation further expresses the objective to extend social security to all workers and their families, including rural populations and the self-employed. It also establishes the principles of social assistance, along the following lines:

- general measures of assistance to secure the well-being of dependent children;
- special maintenance allowances at prescribed rates for invalids, aged persons and widows if they are not compulsory insured;
- general assistance for all persons who are in want and do not require internment for corrective care.

Recommendation No. 69 is based on the principle that the availability of adequate medical care constitutes an essential element of social security. It indicates that medical care services may be provided in two ways: either through a social insurance service with supplementary provision by way of social assistance, or through a public medical care service. The medical care service should cover all members of the community, whether or not they are in paid employment.

In addition to Conventions and Recommendations, the ILO's Governing Body regularly develops policy-guiding frameworks on specific policy issues that are relevant for a number of member States and whose implementation depends mostly on national or bilateral action, as is the case of migrant workers described in box 1.3.

For any discussion on the scope of social security by the ILO, the point of reference is the *nine branches*

of social security as originally defined by the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention (No. 102) in 1952 and later in a similar way by the European Code of Social Security in 1964. In line with the definition adopted in section 1.1, we add here a tenth branch of general income support or general social assistance schemes, as defined in Recommendation No. 67. The latter play an important role in national strategies to close the coverage gap in developing and economically emerging countries. Leaving this dimension out would mean to neglect a number of recent important initiatives in these countries that first and foremost seek to alleviate poverty. It would also give a picture of the global state of development of social security which would be too focused on industrialized countries, particularly Europe.

The extended operational definition of social security that is relevant for the analysis in this report thus comprises ten elements:

- (1–2) protection in *sickness*, including:
 - (1) medical care, as defined in Part II of Convention No. 102 and by Convention No. 130;
 - (2) income support in the form of cash sickness benefits, as defined in Part III of Convention No. 102 and by Convention No. 130;
- (3) protection in *disability*, including income support but also medical care, rehabilitation and long-term care – income support invalidity benefit as defined in Part IX of Convention No. 102 and by Convention No. 128;
- (4) protection in *old age*, including income support and long-term care – income support old-age benefit as defined in Part V of Convention No. 102 and by Convention No. 128;
- (5) protection of *survivors* in case of death of a family member (“breadwinner”) – income support benefit as defined in Part X of Convention No. 102 and by Convention No. 128;
- (6) protection in *maternity*, including medical care and income support maternity benefit, as defined in Part VIII of Convention No. 102 and by Convention No. 183;
- (7) protection in “responsibility for the maintenance of *children*”, including the provision in kind to, or in respect of, children, of “food, clothing, housing, holidays or domestic help” and of cash income support family benefits as defined in Part VII of Convention No. 102;

- (8) protection in *unemployment*, including income support in the form of unemployment benefits, and also other labour market policies promoting employment – income support benefits as defined in Part IV of Convention No. 102, and income support and other labour market policies as defined by Convention No. 168;
- (9) protection in case of *employment injury*: medical care, rehabilitation and income support in the form of sickness, invalidity or survivors’ benefit as defined in Part VI of Convention No. 102 and by Convention No. 121;
- (10) general protection against *poverty* and *social exclusion* through social assistance that provides protection to all residents without sufficient other means of income from work and not covered (or not covered sufficiently) by social security branches listed above.

There are at least three other international classifications of the scope of social security that are fully captured by the above extended definition of social security.

European Commission

In its European System of Integrated Social Protection Statistics (ESSPROS), EUROSTAT defines eight *functions* of social protection (European Commission, 2008):

- (1) sickness/health care;
- (2) disability;
- (3) old age;
- (4) survivors;
- (5) family/children;
- (6) unemployment;
- (7) housing;
- (8) social exclusion not elsewhere classified.

This classification adds two functions not covered explicitly by ILO Conventions:

- The *housing* function includes three benefits in kind: (a) rent benefit, defined as a current means-tested transfer granted by a public authority to tenants, temporarily or on a long-term basis, to help with rent costs; (b) social housing provided on a means-tested basis on non-commercial terms (that

is, rents below the normal market price) by public bodies or private non-profit institutions that own low-cost or social housing; (c) a means-tested transfer by a public authority to owner-occupiers to alleviate their current housing costs: in practice this often means help with paying mortgages and/or interest.

- The *social exclusion not elsewhere classified* function includes all other benefits, mainly of the social assistance type, not referring to any clearly identifiable risks or needs covered by other functions but targeted at the “socially excluded” or “those at risk of social exclusion”. General as this is, target groups may be identified as destitute people, migrants, refugees, drug or alcohol addicts, or victims of criminal violence, among others.

The specificity of the ILO mandate in social security and its historical evolution requires that social security in cases of “employment injury” and “maternity” are treated as distinct separate functions. In the European Commission approach these are however integrated into other functions: maternity income support under the *family/children* function; and in case of employment injury: employment injury sickness benefits under the *sickness* function, employment injury invalidity benefits under the *disability* function, and employment injury survivors’ benefits under the *survivors* function.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

For the purposes of its SOCX database (OECD, 2009a) and similar to the European Commission, the OECD has adopted the following classification of nine *policy areas* in social protection:

- (1) old age;
- (2) survivors;
- (3) incapacity related;
- (4) health;
- (5) family;
- (6) active labour market programmes;
- (7) unemployment;
- (8) housing;
- (9) other social policy areas.

The main difference from the EU classification is that the OECD adds labour market programmes not

covered by the core ESSPROS database (the *unemployment* function in ESSPROS covers only unemployment benefits and similar income support, severance payments and similar payments, pre-retirement benefits and other pensions awarded in case of early retirement for labour market reasons, and all refunding of training costs and of other employability-enhancing measures provided to the unemployed),⁵ including indirect measures such as wage subsidies, into a separate policy area: *active labour market programmes*.

United Nations

The above two classifications are similar to the United Nations Classification of Functions of the Government (COFOG), adopted also by the IMF in its *Government Finance Statistics* manual of 2001. Under COFOG, however, what is covered by *social security* or *social protection* by the ILO, European Union and OECD is split into two separate main functions:

- (1) health;
- (2) social protection.

The *social protection* main function is then classified into nine categories:

- (a) sickness and disability;
- (b) old age;
- (c) survivors;
- (d) family and children;
- (e) unemployment;
- (f) housing;
- (g) social exclusion not elsewhere classified;
- (h) research and development in social protection;
- (i) social protection not elsewhere classified.

So long as disaggregated data are available (at the individual benefit or at least scheme level) there are no problems in converting data sets from one classification to another.

⁵ There exists however another database in EUROSTAT, the Labour Market Policies database, which covers all kinds of labour market programmes; this includes data on expenditure and on participants in these programmes.

1.3 Coverage concepts and measurements

Some more definitional clarifications are in order at this point. People enjoying the protection guaranteed by the ten elements presented in the ILO extended operational definition (p. 20) and at least at a minimum level of benefits as defined by the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), are considered here to enjoy *comprehensive social security protection*. Those enjoying only a basic level of income security (guaranteeing income at the level of the poverty line) at all stages of the life cycle as well as access to essential health services are considered to benefit from *basic social protection* (the social protection floor). Those benefiting from coverage in some of the ten branches, not all of which provide comprehensive or basic coverage, are considered to enjoy only *partial basic or partial comprehensive coverage*. The ultimate objective of all ILO standards is to provide as many people as possible with comprehensive protection; the intermediate objective is to provide all people with at least a basic level of protection.

In each category of social security benefits, coverage is a multidimensional concept with at least three elements:

Scope. This is measured here by the range (number) and type of social security branches (see discussion above) to which the population of the country has access. Population groups with differing status in the labour market may enjoy different scopes of coverage, and this factor must be taken into account in assessing scope.

Extent. This usually refers to the percentage of persons covered (by gender, age, labour market status) within the whole population or the target group, by social security measures in each specific branch.

Level. This refers to the adequacy of coverage by a specific branch of social security: for example, it can be measured by the level of cash benefits provided, where measurements of benefit levels can be either absolute or relative to selected benchmark values such as previous incomes, average incomes, the poverty line, and so on. In social health protection it may measure the amount of health-care costs covered by existing financial protection mechanisms. The level of coverage can also be measured by the quality of services provided. Specific aspects of coverage in social health protection also relate to issues such as availability of services and drugs, taking into account the physical existence of health-care facilities, health work force, equipment and so on. These aspects will be discussed in more detail

in Chapter 3. Measures of quality are usually relative and may be objective or subjective – for example, the satisfaction of beneficiaries measured against their expectations.

In measuring all the above three dimensions of coverage a distinction is made between *legal coverage* (or *statutory coverage*) and *effective coverage*. A population group can be identified as legally covered if there are existing legal provisions that such a group should be covered by social insurance for a given branch of social security, or will be entitled to specified benefits under certain circumstances – for instance, to an old-age state pension on reaching the age of 65, or to income support if income falls below a specified threshold, or to national health services when sick. On the other hand, effective coverage is measured, for example, by the number of people actually contributing to social insurance in a given branch, or the number of beneficiaries of any pension benefits among all residents over 65 years of age, or the number of beneficiaries of some kind of income support among all those unemployed or all below the poverty line. Effective coverage is usually different from legal coverage, and often lower, largely due to various governance problems in implementing the legal provisions and also to gaps in funding, for instance, in social health protection.

Legal coverage

Estimates of the *scope* of legal coverage usually measure the number of branches of social security by which – according to existing legislation – a population or its specific groups is covered. The list of the nine branches covered by ILO Convention No. 102 may be used as a comparator.

Estimates of the *extent* of legal coverage use both information on the groups covered by statutory schemes for a given branch in national legislation, and available statistical information quantifying the number of persons concerned at the national level. The legal extent of coverage rate for a given branch of social security is the ratio between the estimated number of people legally covered and – as appropriate – the total number of employees (that is, wage and salary workers), the total number of employed persons (including employees and the self-employed), the total number of economically active persons (including or not including their dependants), or the total population. For example, since Convention No. 102 allows a ratifying country to provide coverage either through social insurance or through

universal benefits or through means-tested benefits, it also formulates alternatives to minimum requirements for the extent of coverage, as follows: (a) prescribed classes of employees, constituting not less than 50 per cent of all employees; or (b) prescribed classes of the economically active population, constituting not less than 20 per cent of all residents; or (c) all residents whose means during the contingency do not exceed prescribed limits.

The legal *level* of coverage rates for specific branches of social security is usually measured (for cash benefits) by benefit ratios or replacement ratios calculated for specified categories of beneficiaries, using benefit formulas or benefit amounts specified in the legislation. For example, Convention No. 102 sets minimum replacement rates for cash benefits in seven of its nine branches. It specifies that such minimum rates should apply to a defined “standard” beneficiary meeting qualifying conditions, and be guaranteed at least to those with earnings up to a certain prescribed selected level.

Effective coverage

Measurements of effective coverage should reflect how in reality the legal provisions are implemented. Effective coverage is usually different from and lower than legal coverage because of non-compliance, problems with enforcement of the legal provisions, or other deviations of actual policies from the text of the legislation.

Measurements of effective *scope* of coverage in a country reveal the number of social security branches for which there is relevant legislation that is actually enforced: that is, whether in all such branches the majority of the population legally covered is also effectively covered (as measured by effective extent of coverage; see below).

Effective *extent* of coverage measurements should tell us the actual number of protected persons as a percentage of those expected to be protected according to the legislation – for example, the percentage of those actually contributing to social insurance as compared to the number of those who should be contributing according to the law; or the number of those who actually receive benefits as compared to the size of the target group (the percentage of unemployed receiving benefits, percentage of elderly persons receiving pensions, percentage of the poor receiving social assistance benefit, and so on).

Measurements of the effective *level* of coverage would identify levels of benefits (usually related to

certain benchmark amounts) actually received by beneficiaries, such as unemployment benefits or pensions paid, compared to average earnings or to the minimum wage or the poverty line. In the case of contributory pension schemes, the effective level of coverage may also relate to future benefit levels. For example, if the self-employed are obliged to pay contributions based on declared income, and in practice they all contribute only at the level specified as a minimum contribution, the effective level of coverage can be measured by a ratio between declared income and estimates of the average actual income level.

When measuring effective extent of coverage a distinction also has to be made between coverage measured in terms of *protected persons* (those who have benefits guaranteed but are not necessarily currently recipients of such benefits – such as persons who actively contribute to social insurance and are thus guaranteed benefits for a specified contingency: for example, when they reach retirement age they will be entitled to an old-age pension) and coverage measured in terms of *actual beneficiaries*. In the first case, an adequate indicator of coverage is the percentage of those protected (such as active contributors) within a relevant reference group (such as employees, employed, or economically active population); an example is the percentage of employed persons contributing to a pension scheme. In the second case, the indicators show the percentage of beneficiaries within a target group (for old-age pensions this would be the percentage of all persons older than a certain age, such as the official retirement age) who actually receive benefit.

When assessing coverage and gaps in coverage, distinctions are to be made between coverage by (i) contributory social insurance, (ii) universal schemes covering all residents (or all residents in a given category), and (iii) means-tested schemes covering potentially all those who pass the required income or means test. In the case of social insurance it makes sense to look at the numbers of those who are actually members and contributors to such schemes and who thus potentially enjoy – sometimes with their dependants – coverage in case any of the contingencies covered by their social insurance actually happen. These people fall into a category of persons “protected” in case of a given contingency. The concept of *protected persons* may also apply where people are covered by universal or categorical programmes: if there is legislation specifying that all residents or all residents in a given (e.g. age) category are entitled to certain benefits or have free access to health or other social services, it can be said that all those

specified by law are “protected” in case of the given contingency. It is, however, rather difficult to specify who is in fact “potentially protected” in the case of income- or means-tested benefits or conditional cash transfers. If coverage is largely based on such programmes, the concept of protected persons cannot be applied; only measuring coverage in terms of actual beneficiaries makes sense, and must be related to the size of certain target groups such as children, the elderly, the unemployed or the poor.

The above measures of extent and level of coverage give partial indicators applying only to specific branches of social security (and sometimes even only to specific schemes or types of scheme). Of course, it is tempting to try to establish an aggregate indicator or index for a country which would reflect overall social security coverage in that country. One possibility is to use a set of partial indicators (quantitative and qualitative) to calculate such an index by applying statistical methods similar to those used in building the UNDP Human Development Index (UNDP, 2008). A compound coverage indicator has to be a function of the three types of partial indicators discussed above:

- *scope* of social security branches available, relative to all the branches needed;
- *extent* of coverage by percentage of the population protected for different contingencies and needs; and
- *level* of protection, measured by replacement rates and so on.

Such an index has been developed recently by the Asian Development Bank and calculated for all its member countries.⁶

When it is not possible from the data to construct the necessary partial indicators in all areas, the total amount of social security expenditure (measured as a ratio of GDP or of total public spending) may be used as a proxy aggregated indicator of coverage, as the aggregate social security expenditure in the country is also a function of all the three dimensions of coverage.

Since the identification of gaps in coverage, together with the reasons for their existence and ways of filling them, are the main objectives, the following questions need to be answered:

- Who are those not currently covered but in need of coverage?
- What are their needs?

- What risks do they face?
- What are the options for extension of coverage to them?
- What is their status regarding employment?
- What is their ability to contribute?
- What are the potential costs of increasing coverage?

The main sources of this information are: country legislation; data on protected persons, beneficiaries, benefits provided, costs and financing from the registers and accounts of the institutions administering the social security scheme; and, last but not least, household survey data from regular Labour Force Surveys (LFS) and Household Budget Surveys (HBS) or surveys of similar type, or from surveys specially designed to monitor coverage and impacts of social security.

To summarize, a number of issues have to be taken into account when measuring coverage:

1. Social security coverage can be directly measured only separately for each of the specific branches such as health care, old age or unemployment; or even for a group of specific schemes within each branch. Aggregate coverage measures such as the ADB Social Protection Index can be built only by aggregating the separate coverage indicators for all social security branches.
2. Coverage by social security schemes against specific social risks and contingencies can be understood in two ways: *potential* coverage, measured by the number of persons potentially protected if a given contingency occurs (for example, those covered by social insurance schemes, or contributors to such schemes), and *actual* coverage, measured by the number of beneficiaries actually receiving benefits or utilizing services. These two concepts are complementary to each other and should be assessed separately.
3. Legal versus effective coverage. Though people may be legally covered, enforcement of the legal provisions may be incomplete, so that effective coverage is usually lower than legal coverage.
4. In measuring the extent of coverage it is important to choose the right numerator and denominator. Ideally, the absolute number of persons covered for a specific risk is divided by the size of the population group that is targeted by the specific policy or benefit. For example: to measure the extent of actual coverage by old-age pensions, the number of

⁶ See Chapter 7 of this report, and also ADB, 2006, 2008.

pensioners should be related to the total number of older persons where both numerator and denominator can be restricted to a given age bracket, such as 65+ (or above any other legal retirement age).

5. There is a trade-off between national circumstances (and relevance of the indicator at the national level regarding, for example, the retirement age) and international comparability.
6. Both administrative and survey data are necessary to a full assessment of coverage. Administrative data are needed to assess potential and actual effective coverage rates. However, the availability and quality of such data vary across countries, and across schemes within countries. Very often, administrative data trace certain administratively registered events (such as payment of contributions or benefits) rather than the persons behind such events. This leads to double counting, in particular when aggregating administrative data, as a person can be contributing to the same scheme from more than one job, or to more than one scheme covering the same contingency, or be receiving similar types of benefit from more than one source.
7. Household survey data are particularly important in assessing the level and quality of coverage and its impacts. Also, only household survey data can help to assess the nature of the coverage gap, the characteristics of population groups not covered, and in particular the consequences of their lack of coverage and their need for specific types of coverage. Unfortunately, many regular household surveys

still either lack information relevant to assessing coverage, or the questions asked are so various that international comparisons are not possible. Special surveys, too, are rare and also not internationally standardized.

This chapter has presented a recommended approach to measuring coverage. Unfortunately the data available are still very limited, and so in the following chapters in Part I of this report, which assesses coverage using various indicators, it has proved impossible to follow the recommended approach fully. Instead, the present report is limited to a detailed assessment of coverage in selected branches of social security only, and does not fully measure all dimensions of coverage; moreover, data are available for too few countries for an assessment of the level and quality of coverage in most of the social security branches. This first report therefore presents regional estimates for selected indicators of coverage based on available data. These regional estimates are calculated only when data availability ensures that countries included represent at least two-thirds of the total population for a given region. Regional averages are weighted, depending on the indicator, by total population, the working-age population or the economically active population. Owing to the limitations in data availability most of these regional estimates are calculated for the latest available year, which is not necessarily the same for all the countries included. In the next editions, as data availability improves, so improvements in the accuracy of global and regional estimates may be expected.

Scope of social security coverage around the world: Context and overview

2

All social security systems are income transfer schemes that are fuelled by income generated by national economies, mainly by the formal economy. At the same time, the degree of formalization of the labour market co-determines how many people can be covered by the ten different branches of social security and how many of them contribute to the financing of social transfers through contributions and taxes. Tax-financed social assistance and universal benefits may reach people in informal employment. However, in a largely informal economy it may not be possible for a nation to maintain a tax and contribution base for comprehensive protection of the majority of the population with higher level benefits.

The functioning of global and national labour markets is thus an important determining context for the analysis of basic and comprehensive social protection coverage. This chapter provides an analysis of the global labour market structures and draws an initial conclusion on the levels of comprehensive coverage of the global population. The following chapters provide information on the level of partial coverage in the most important individual branches of social security.

2.1 The labour market context

Contributory social insurance and other statutory schemes in most countries cover only those who are employees (that is, those in formal wage or salary employment) and, sometimes, their dependants. Both legal

and effective coverage by these schemes is thus strongly correlated with the percentage of employees among those employed. Globally (see table 2.1) slightly over a quarter of the world's adult population (one-third of adult men and one-fifth of adult women) is employed, whether formally or informally, as employees. If one looks only at those who have some kind of employment, less than half globally have the status of wage or salary workers. However, while in developed economies nearly 85 per cent of all employed are employees, the figure is not much more than 20 per cent in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, less than 40 per cent in South-East Asia and the Pacific, slightly more than 40 per cent in East Asia and about 60 per cent in North Africa, the Middle East and Latin America and the Caribbean (see figure 2.1) – but not all of them are in formal employment and thus have access to statutory social security benefits.

People without social security coverage in developing countries usually work in the informal rather than the formal economy. No access to social security coverage is usually part of the definition of informal employment. Even in developing countries with high economic growth, increasing numbers of workers – most often women – have less than secure employment, such as casual labour, home work and self-employment, lacking social security coverage. This has an enormous impact on their lives and on work itself. What little earning power the impoverished have is further suppressed by marginalization and lack of support systems – particularly when they are unable to work because of age, illness or disability. HIV/AIDS has amplified this impact,

Table 2.1 Employees (wage and salary workers) in the labour market worldwide, 2008 (percentages)

	Total		Men		Women	
	Employed = 100	Total working-age population = 100	Employed = 100	Total working-age population = 100	Employed = 100	Total working-age population = 100
South Asia	20.8	9.7	23.4	15.6	14.6	3.5
Sub-Saharan Africa	22.9	13.8	29.2	20.5	14.4	7.4
South-East Asia & the Pacific	38.8	21.9	41.5	28.6	35.0	15.1
East Asia	42.6	23.3	46.0	28.9	38.3	17.6
North Africa	58.3	24.4	58.8	38.5	56.7	10.5
Middle East	61.5	29.0	64.4	41.6	53.5	15.0
Latin America & the Caribbean	62.7	38.6	60.6	46.1	65.8	31.8
Central & South-Eastern Europe (non-EU) & CIS	76.6	41.5	75.4	48.0	78.0	35.7
Developed economies	84.3	46.6	81.7	51.8	87.5	41.6
WORLD	46.9	26.5	47.4	33.0	46.0	20.1

Note: Labour force surveys distinguish between those who are employees (employed in wage or salary employment) and those who are not and thus are either self-employed (employers and own-account workers) or unpaid helping family workers. The table shows percentages of those who are employees among (1) all employed; (2) all population of working age, i.e. between 15 and 64.

Source: ILO calculations, based on ILO, 2008e: *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)*, 5th edition, <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/strat/kilm/> (using 2006 estimates for indicator 3: status of employment and indicator 2: employment to population ratio). Country classification also from KILM.

especially for already vulnerable groups of workers such as women, migrants and those in the informal economy.


It was once assumed that an increasing proportion of the labour force in developing countries would end up in formal employment covered by social security. However, experience has shown that the growing incidence of informal work has led to stagnant or declining rates of coverage. The most vulnerable groups outside the labour force are women, persons with disabilities and older people who cannot count on family support and who have not been able to make provisions for their own pensions.

One reason for low coverage rates is the extent of self-employment. Most social insurance and other schemes include the formally employed population, but do not cover the self-employed except in some cases on a voluntary basis; this leads to some very limited coverage rates. The average figures on the legal coverage of a population therefore do not tell much about the gap in coverage of self-employed people.

The map in figure 2.1 gives a global overview of the percentage of employees in total employment. It can be seen that in large parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America a minority of employed people are employees. In many African and South-East Asian countries especially, less than 30 per cent of the employed work as wage workers. Even among these workers there is a deficit of social and employment protection, as the following examples from Latin America and Africa demonstrate.

The informal economy in Latin America constituted 64.1 per cent of non-agricultural employment in 2005 (Tokman, 2007). Seventy-eight per cent of informal workers are found in the informal economy, but a significant minority of such workers (22 per cent) are employed in the formal sector, that is, as unprotected workers in formal establishments. Access to protection usually depends on a formally recognized employment relationship, typically through a written labour contract. In 2005, estimates showed that 37.7 per cent of wage workers in Latin America were employed without a contract, a percentage that is concentrated in the informal economy (68 per cent of such workers), but also including 26 per cent of workers in formal establishments. Differences in social protection coverage (measured by the percentage of workers in each type of contractual situation that contributes to old-age pensions) for those workers with or without written contracts were substantial, independently of whether they were employed in the informal or formal economy. On average, 19 per cent of workers without contracts had access to social protection, compared with a proportion four times higher for workers with contracts. The proportion of workers without contracts in the informal economy enjoying social protection was only 10 per cent, while the proportion for such workers with contracts was five times greater. As shown in figure 2.2 overleaf, the type of contract also matters in determining access to social protection.

Figure 2.1 Employees (wage and salary workers) in total employment worldwide, latest available year (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15092>

Note: For the majority of countries the latest available year is between 2005 and 2008. For further details see the Statistical Annex.


Sources: ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) and KILM (ILO, 2008e); and national statistical offices. Numbers in brackets give the number of countries included in a data set for each group. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Examples from Africa show the same pattern. Although Zambia (ILO, 2008f) has very specific social security arrangements for formal employees, by no means all are reached by existing social security provisions. One of the obstacles to achieving greater social security coverage may be that nearly half (49 per cent of the total, 54 per cent of women and 47 per cent of men) say either that they do not have a contract with their employer or that they do not know whether they have one. Accordingly, half of all employees (but only 19 per cent of public-sector employees) say their employers do not contribute to social security or that they do not know whether their employer contributes. Similarly, more than half of all employees (again 19 per cent of public-sector employees) indicate that they have no entitlement to paid leave or at least are not aware of this entitlement. The same situation could apply to other legal entitlements of employees regulated by the Employment Act, such as sick pay and paid maternity leave.

In the United Republic of Tanzania (ILO, 2008g), according to the 2005/2006 Integrated Labour Force Survey (ILFS), 8.6 per cent of all employed are in paid employment, with 39.1 per cent of paid employees (38 per cent of men and 42.2 per cent of women)

working in the informal economy. Only 49 per cent of paid employees (with practically no gender difference) say they have a written contract (38.9 per cent on a permanent basis and 10.7 per cent a written contract of a casual nature). Amongst paid employees working in formal economy enterprises, 70 per cent have written contracts and 15 per cent oral contracts. The corresponding proportions among employees working in informal economy enterprises are reversed, with the majority, 61 per cent, having oral contracts and only 15 per cent written contracts, in most cases on a casual basis. As in Zambia, the majority, more than 63 per cent of all paid employees (but only 28 per cent of public-sector and other corporate organizations' employees, and 17 per cent of paid employees with a permanent written contract), say that their employers are not contributing to social security or that they do not know if the employer contributes. Only 5 per cent of paid employees working in the informal economy say that their employer contributes to any of the existing formal social security schemes; the corresponding proportion for paid employees working in the formal economy is naturally higher, at just over 56 per cent, but is still far from representing full coverage. HIV/AIDS has been shown to be highest in

Figure 2.2 Latin America: Social protection coverage among employees according to type of contract, 2005



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15208>

Source: ECLAC on the basis of household surveys for 16 countries, in Tokman, 2007. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

the productive cohort, with a significant effect on population profile and mortality rates and a corresponding impact on effective coverage by social security schemes.


Despite the widespread lack of coverage, a number of middle-income countries have successfully expanded coverage of their social security systems in recent years. For example, Costa Rica has achieved full health coverage through a combination of health insurance and free access to public health services. India's National Old-Age Pension Scheme, financed by central and state resources, reaches one-fourth of all the elderly: about half of pensioners who live in poverty. And in Brazil, social assistance pensions lift about 14 million people out of extreme poverty. A newly introduced social security scheme helped the Republic of Korea to adjust more smoothly to the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s. In particular, a newly introduced unemployment insurance programme helped the country cope with a quadrupling of the jobless rate.

One major challenge in social security worldwide is to help middle-income countries continue their progress while at the same time assisting the least-developed countries to determine what types of schemes are best suited to extend their coverage. The ILO tripartite constituents hope to initiate and sustain efforts to help countries develop and expand social security systems through a process of experimentation and social dialogue. The ILO is testing new approaches to opening up access, and is monitoring initiatives by its member States to extend coverage. Moreover, it is seeking to apply its long experience in promoting social dialogue and tripartite involvement to address the special challenges of expanding social security in countries where coverage is weak and participation in the informal economy is high.

To analyse global patterns of coverage it is useful to provide estimates for relatively homogeneous groups of countries. In this report such country groupings are: by geographical region, level of income measured by GDP per capita, level of Human Development Index (HDI), and prevailing poverty incidence. As international experience has shown, specific types of labour market structures associated with low shares of wage employment and high informality, together with the prevailing low and irregular household income levels which result in a high incidence of income poverty, make populations of countries particularly vulnerable to various life-cycle, social and economic risks and contingencies. While the need in such vulnerable societies for social security coverage is even higher than elsewhere, high effective coverage by statutory social insurance schemes is usually extremely difficult to achieve there, precisely because of the prevalence of non-wage employment status and of low and irregular incomes. In this report, then, countries are also grouped according to prevailing combined levels of both informality and incidence of income poverty, as shown in figure 2.3. The level of *vulnerability* is assessed here by two combined variables: poverty rate measured as a proportion of people living on less than US\$2 PPP per day within a country, and the extent of informal employment, measured by, as proxy, a proportion of those who are not employees¹ (in wage/salary employment) in the total number of employed (see ILO, 2009f; Scheil-Adlung, Bonnet and Wiechers, 2010).

¹ Due to a lack of data, this is a broad approximation of informality which is an underestimate as it does not take into account the significant proportion of informal employment among employees in developing countries as well as developed countries. As presented earlier in this report (pp. 28–9), this could represent more than 50 per cent of employees.

Figure 2.3 Countries grouped by level of vulnerability, poverty and informality combined, latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15094>

Note: For further details on the composition of groups by level of vulnerability, see table 12 in the Statistical Annex.

Sources: For informality (non-wage workers as a proportion of total employment as a proxy of informality level): ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) and KILM (ILO, 2008e), and national statistical offices; for poverty incidence (below US\$2 per day): World Bank, 2009a. Numbers in brackets give the number of countries included in each group. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 2.3 shows that 58 countries are experiencing high or very high vulnerability in terms of poverty and informality of the labour market; this corresponds roughly to one-third of all countries. The majority of the most vulnerable countries according to this definition are in Africa and Asia.


2.2 Scope of comprehensive coverage by statutory schemes

Some level of partial protection by social security exists in nearly all countries, though only a minority of countries provide protection in all branches (see figure 2.4). There is no country in the world without any form of social security, but in many countries coverage is limited to a few branches only, and only a minority of the population has – both legally and effectively – access to existing schemes. Every country has certain forms of social security provision for social health protection, thus facilitating access to at least a limited scope of health-care services. These include some public health-care services accessible at least nominally without fee, and other

services through health insurance for at least certain population groups. Most countries have schemes designed to provide contributory old-age pensions, although in many countries coverage is limited only to a small formal economy or even only part of it. Many of these schemes are relatively new, so actual coverage measured in terms of the percentage of elderly persons receiving any benefit is very low. In most countries, formal economy employees are covered by some form of protection in case of employment injury, although often this coverage does not meet the requirements of Convention No. 102 with regard to the scope and type of benefits provided. In most countries at least certain groups of employees are entitled, either through the provision of the labour code or of collective agreements, to paid sick leave and paid maternity leave. However, the actual enforcement of these provisions is often low and thus effective coverage is equally low.

There is a large variety of approaches to social security around the world; levels of coverage through legislation, as well as degrees and types of implementation of social security, are significantly different. Figure 2.4 shows the scope of legal coverage through social security schemes around the world. It can be seen that especially in Asia, Africa and some parts of Latin America there

Figure 2.4 Branches of social security: Number covered by a statutory social security programme, 2008–09



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15095>


Sources: For identification of groups covered: SSA/ISSA, 2008 for Asia and Europe; 2009 for Africa and the Americas; quantification based on statistical databases: ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) and KILM (ILO, 2008e); and national statistical offices. Numbers in brackets give the number of countries included in each group. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d). The nine branches of social security (Convention No. 102) are aggregated to eight through the merging of sickness and health benefits. It is furthermore assumed that countries that have all eight classical branches of social security in place also have functioning social assistance schemes in place.

are large gaps in the scope of social security schemes legally available to at least certain groups of workers.

Historically, the first countries to develop social security schemes were those now seen as the highly developed countries. These were followed by middle-income countries; it is only recently that schemes have emerged in developing countries. The first schemes to be developed were those concerning invalidity, work injury, old age and survivors; the last were those concerning family allowances and unemployment (see figure 2.5).

As we have seen, nearly all countries – including low-income ones – have a statutory programme or at least limited provisions included in the labour code concerning some form of compensation in case of employment injury; they also have at least one pension scheme. Of course, these provisions often cover effectively only a small proportion of the labour force, being limited only to those in public employment or only to those in the private formal sector, and so on. Some of them do not pay periodical benefits throughout the whole duration of a contingency, as required for example by Convention No. 102, but grant benefits only as lump-sum payments. Other contingencies are less


Figure 2.5 Date of the first law adopted for each contingency, countries grouped by Human Development Index (HDI), latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15096>

Source: Legal information from SSA/ISSA, 2008 for Asia and Europe; 2009 for Africa and the Americas. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 2.6 Branches of social security: Countries with statutory programmes or limited provision, latest available year (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15097>

Source: Legal information from SSA/ISSA, 2008 for Asia and Europe; 2009 for Africa and the Americas. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

often covered: paid maternity leave, paid sick leave, benefits for families with children and, most rarely, unemployment benefits. For the latter there exists provision in only about 10 per cent of low-income countries, about half of middle-income countries and less than 80 per cent of high-income countries (see figure 2.6).

2.3 Effective comprehensive population coverage

Only one-third of countries globally (inhabited by 28 per cent of the global population) have comprehensive social protection systems covering all branches of social security (plus social assistance) as defined in Convention No. 102 and Recommendation No. 67. However, most of these social security systems cover only those in formal employment as wage or salary workers. Such workers constitute less than half of the economically active population globally, but over 70 per cent in those countries with comprehensive social security systems. Taking into account those who are not economically active, it is estimated that only about 20 per cent of the world's working-age population (and their families) have effective access to such comprehensive social protection systems.

The share of the global population enjoying a level of protection commensurate with a social protection

floor is probably higher than 20 per cent. The proportion can only be estimated by using a poverty proxy. We consider that people who fall under the international poverty line of US\$2 per day have no effective basic social protection. According to the latest UN estimates, about 60 per cent of the global population live above this line and so can be said to enjoy a basic level of social protection.² This estimate constitutes a maximum since among the non-poor there will be a number of vulnerable people that have a sufficiently high level of income at a given point in time but may not have access to protection should a certain contingency materialize.

As the estimated level of comprehensive coverage is 20 per cent of the world's population, we can conclude that between 20 per cent and 60 per cent of the global population enjoys only basic social protection.

Improving this broad estimate remains a challenge for further research and can most likely only be done on a national basis for some time to come. The ILO is developing and testing indicators to measure the extent of coverage at the level of social protection floor, in the context of the Social Protection Floor Initiative of the UN Chief Executives Board.

² This is a rough estimate based on the figure published in the UN *Report on the World Social Situation 2010: Rethinking poverty*, New York, 2010, p. 14.

Although a larger percentage of the world's population has access to health-care services than to various cash benefits, nearly one-third has no access to any health facilities or services at all. For many more, necessary expenditure on health care may cause financial catastrophe for their household, because they have no adequate social health protection which would cover or refund such expenditure (ILO, 2008b).

Health care is certainly the most complex of social security branches. From the point of view of the beneficiary it encompasses multiple benefits and measures, while on the supply side it is connected to an important sector of the economy involving interrelated financial mechanisms and economic interests.

3.1 Definition and measurement of social health protection

Social health protection is defined by the ILO as a series of public or publicly organized and mandated private measures against social distress and economic loss caused by the reduction of productivity, stoppage or reduction of earnings, or the cost of necessary treatment that can result from ill health. Some special features of social health protection are to be taken into account:

- Social health protection is closely linked to the functioning of a specific economic sector – the health sector. This requires an integrated approach towards demand and supply of health care, the availability of health infrastructure, and the sector's own health

workforce, employment opportunities and administrative capacity. The situation on the supply side determines to a large extent potential access to quality health-care services in a country.

- Globally, a significant amount of funds for financing health care is paid directly, in the form of out-of-pocket payments to providers such as health facilities, doctors, nurses, pharmacies, and so on. In many countries, these payments occur despite the fact that nominally free health care is available. Against this background, social health protection needs to provide for effective coverage combining *financial protection with effective access to quality health care*.
 - *Financial protection* has to address risks of impoverishment due to catastrophic health events and the capacity to finance any kind of out-of-pocket payments: those to be paid directly to providers, for example user fees or co-payments required by health insurance arrangements, other direct payments for health services and goods, and related costs such as the transport necessary to reach health-care facilities, particularly in rural areas. It is further important that financial protection prevents people from falling into poverty as a result of loss of income due to sickness.
 - *Effective access* to health services, medicines and health-care commodities requires the physical availability of health-care infrastructure, workforce, medical goods and products, and the provision of affordable and adequate services.

In order to achieve the objectives of social health protection, *legal* universal coverage needs to lead to *effective* access to health services. This requires that at least an essential set of services and drugs is available, affordable and provided at a specified level of quality. Further, those in need should be informed about the services to be able to take them up. Finally, the utilization of health services should be linked to financial protection that includes income support such as paid sick leave. Specific indicators including the ILO Access Deficit Indicator (see ILO, 2008b) can best describe gaps in effective access to health services.

From an ILO viewpoint an essential benefit package should be at least in line with nationally and internationally agreed objectives such as the Millennium Development Goals (in particular those related to maternal and newborns' health), the requirements for the treatment of specific diseases such as HIV/AIDS or malaria, and the requirements of Convention No. 102. This Convention specifies the scope of medical care – general and specialized, inpatient and outpatient, including maternal benefits – which has to be available and accessible. The range of health-care services specified in the Convention (Article 10) has to be, in case of sickness, either provided free of charge or, if people are “required to share in the cost of the medical care...the rules concerning such cost-sharing shall be so designed as to avoid hardship”.


The ILO defines affordability of health care to households using four main criteria: (1) lack of financial barriers such as high user fees; (2) level of insurance contributions set in relation to the household's ability to pay; (3) no risk of catastrophic health expenditure that would exceed 40 per cent of household income net of subsistence expenditure; and (4) no risk of impoverishment due to ill health.

Notions of availability and quality refer to the existence of a sufficiently qualified health-care workforce and sufficient infrastructure to provide services in response to needs in a way that is gender-sensitive and inclusive (e.g. for indigenous people).

These ILO criteria of measuring health-care coverage – which will be discussed in more detail later – are based on the overall objective of ensuring that ill health does not lead to catastrophic loss of income and impoverishment. To meet this objective, health-care costs need to be pooled and financed through pre-payment mechanisms with a view to reducing out-of-pocket payments at the point of service delivery.

The ILO concept of measuring health-care coverage is thus multidimensional, like the concept of coverage

Figure 3.1 WHO: Towards universal health coverage



Source: WHO, 2008, p. 26.


in social security in general. The overall approach, of distinguishing several dimensions regarding coverage, is shared by other international organizations such as the World Bank (2000) and the World Health Organization (WHO), which is focusing on breadth, scope and depth of health services as illustrated in figure 3.1. However, these concepts do not take into account important social aspects, such as loss of income in case of sickness, or paid sick leave; these require a broader social protection approach to address such impacts of ill health.

3.2 Financing health care

It is obvious that all dimensions of effective access to health care depend strongly on the amount of resources which are made available. In this context, countries vulnerable (see Scheil-Adlung, Bonnet and Wiechers, 2010) in terms of high poverty rates and levels of informal economy are challenged by the need to generate sufficient funds from taxes and contributions. Before moving to a more detailed discussion of the different dimensions of coverage, it is thus important to examine global patterns in the levels of financing health-care coverage and access.

Figure 3.2 shows the enormous differences between countries in health expenditure per capita – both total (public and private taken together) and even more so public expenditure. Per capita public health expenditure amounted in 2007 in low-income countries to international \$29 (PPP) as compared to international \$162 in middle-income and international \$2,342 in high-income countries. Lower-income countries have higher private health expenditure than public, but the

Figure 3.2 Health-care financing: Total and public per capita expenditure by national income level of countries, 2007



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15103>

Source: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), 2006 data. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

ability to sufficiently cover necessary health expenditure from private sources is limited to the wealthier sections of their populations and thus cannot compensate for low public expenditure in coming closer to universal coverage. The impact of inadequate or low funding in poor countries is enormous, given that people not only lack access to health services but are also more likely to die from diseases that are curable in richer countries – for instance, respiratory infections, which account for 2.9 per cent of all deaths in low-income countries, but for relatively few deaths in high-income countries (Deaton, 2006).

In order to finance health care, countries tend to draw on different sources simultaneously. Many low-income and vulnerable countries rely heavily on private un-pooled out-of-pocket payments and user fees to be paid at the point of delivery as a key financing mechanism for health care. This has to be seen as a deeply inefficient form of health-care financing which impacts significantly on the income situation of workers and their families. Also, the use of different financing sources often takes place in an uncoordinated way, which affects effectiveness and efficiency. Moreover, in many countries their impact on various groups of the population goes un-monitored, resulting in significant gaps in coverage and access to health care, and thus leading to impoverishment. Figure 3.3 shows that in 2006, while public sources dominated on average (as a percentage of GDP) in Europe, CIS, the Middle East and Asia, private expenditure dominated health-care financing in Africa, while in North America, Latin


America and the Caribbean financing came from private and public sources in more or less equal parts. In Africa, North and Latin America, the Middle East and CIS public health-care financing comes mainly from general taxation, while in Asia and Central and Eastern Europe social insurance financing dominates. In Western Europe – again on average – health-care financing comes in nearly equal shares from social insurance contributions and general taxation. Private health insurance plays a major role mainly in North America (United States). Out-of-pocket spending everywhere is at the level of 1–2 per cent of GDP; however, while in some countries (such as in Europe) it forms only a small portion of overall health spending, in others (such as the low-income countries discussed below) it accounts for more than half or even up to 80 per cent of total health expenditure (ILO, 2008b). In some low-income countries, and in particular in sub-Saharan Africa, scarce domestic fiscal resources are significantly supplemented with foreign aid in order to ensure the availability of essential levels of health care.

Figure 3.4 again shows the composition of health-care financing sources, this time according to the level of “vulnerability” of countries (combined poverty and informality). It can be seen that there is a clear correlation between the level of vulnerability as so defined in a country or its population, and the roles of public and private financing, in particular out-of-pocket financing. The poorest and most vulnerable have to rely mostly on their own resources for health care because they have much less financial protection than the less vulnerable.

The *level* of financial protection provided by existing social health protection mechanisms refers to the proportion of health-care costs covered through pooling and pre-payment mechanisms either by general government (national health services, social health insurance) or by private health insurance. In other words, it is the proportion of costs *not* borne out of pocket at the point of service delivery. Therefore, gaps in financial protection are reflected by the level of out-of-pocket expenditure borne to cover individuals’ health costs. Levels of coverage become lower when out-of-pocket payments increase; high out-of-pocket payment rates thus indicate gaps in financial coverage – insufficient financial protection provided by the existing social health protection mechanisms. However, it does not indicate other dimensions of coverage – those related to effective access to health services, such as whether the required services are available in terms of quantity and quality.


Making health-care services *affordable* to workers and their families in both the informal and formal

Figure 3.3 Health-care financing levels and sources of funds, 2006 (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15210>
 Source: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), 2006 data. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 3.4 Vulnerability of countries and sources of funds: Public and private health expenditure and composition of health expenditure by level of vulnerability at the country level, 2006 (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15212>
 Note: The grouping of countries by level of vulnerability is based on the combination of two criteria: employment and poverty level (for more details see Chapter 2 of this report, pp. 30–31, and the Statistical Annex).
 Sources: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), 2006 data for health expenditure as a percentage of GDP; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) and *KILM* (ILO, 2008e); World Bank, 2009a; and national statistical offices for employment and poverty statistics regarding levels of vulnerability. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

economy is a major objective of social health protection. The affordability of health services can be defined as the absence of financial barriers to households in receiving health services when they need them. It aims at opening access to health-care services to all in need, at the same time preventing health-related poverty. Affordability can be assessed by looking at the share of out-of-pocket health-care expenditure made by a household of its total household income or expenditure, net of necessary subsistence expenditure (including – for

example – food and basic housing costs), and comparing it with a selected threshold value. Setting the threshold value beyond which a household’s out-of-pocket health expenditure would have a catastrophic impact on its financial situation requires research into actual household spending patterns. The level of threshold value is not only country-specific but may be different for households at various income levels: for many households simply nothing is left after deducting the amounts necessary for survival, for many incomes are below the

subsistence level. Still, it may be useful to set a threshold for catastrophic health expenditure¹ so long as account can be taken of the fact that it applies only to households living above the subsistence level. For example, Scheil-Adlung et al. (2007) consider health-care expenditure to be unaffordable if it amounts to more than 40 per cent of the household income remaining after subsistence needs have been met. That share of health-care expenditure is considered to be catastrophic for households above the subsistence level, while for households at or below the subsistence level all out-of-pocket health expenditure may have catastrophic impact. Universal coverage, including effective access to social health protection, is therefore necessarily associated with equity in financing, assuring that households are asked to contribute only in relation to their ability to pay.²

In the 1980s and 1990s many countries introduced user fees in an effort to infuse new resources into struggling services, often in a context of disengagement of the State and dwindling public resources for health. Most undertook these measures without anticipating the extent of the damage they would do. In many settings, dramatic declines in service use ensued, particularly among vulnerable groups, while the frequency of catastrophic expenditure increased. Some countries have since reconsidered their position and have started phasing out user fees and replacing the lost income from pooled funds (government subsidies or contracts, insurance or pre-payment schemes). This has resulted in substantial increases in the use of services, especially by the poor. In Uganda, for example, service use increased suddenly and dramatically and the increase was sustained after the elimination of user fees. Pre-payment and pooling institutionalizes solidarity between the rich and the less well-off, and between the healthy and the sick. It lifts barriers to the uptake of services and reduces the risk that people will incur catastrophic expenses when they are sick. Finally, it provides the means to re-invest in the availability, range and quality of services.

We use here data on out-of-pocket payments as one of the proxies for the size of the coverage gap in the context of a set of indicators with respect to the level of financial protection provided, assuming that the essential quantity and quality of services is available. It


¹ “Catastrophic health expenditure” is defined by WHO; see Scheil-Adlung et al., 2007.

² See ILO Convention No. 102 (Article 10) referred to above, as well as Article 71 of the same Convention which points out that financing of social security in general “should avoid hardship of persons of *small means*” (italics added).

must be understood, however, that this indicator only takes into account costs that have actually occurred; it does not reflect situations where the existing financial barriers actually prevent the use of health-care services when needed owing to individual cost-sharing rates that are too high. If a sick person cannot afford a consultation with a doctor, treatment or medication, this is not taken into account by this indicator. Further, the only data available refer to out-of-pocket payments *at the point of service*. These figures therefore underestimate actual out-of-pocket payments, since costs such as transportation to get to the doctor or hospital are not taken into account. Such unaccounted out-of-pocket costs matter more in rural than in urban areas, since infrastructure is better in urban and semi-urban areas so that distances and the consequent cost of travel are on average higher in rural areas. Nor does this indicator take into account any indirect costs borne by individuals and households, such as loss of income due to sickness. Nevertheless, data on out-of-pocket payments, in the context of a set of other indicators measuring effective access, offer a comparatively deep insight into the financial burden on individuals and households caused by illness and other health-care-related events. High out-of-pocket payment rates correlate positively to reduced affordability of service and high risk of impoverishment due to catastrophic illness events.

Figure 3.5 shows the range of out-of-pocket payments by level of country vulnerability. More than 65 per cent of expenditure in the most vulnerable countries derives from private out-of-pocket funds; this indicates not only a significant gap in sharing the health financing burden but also related issues of equity, fairness in financing, and affordability. Many people in countries such as Cambodia, India and Pakistan, for example, shoulder up to 80 per cent of total health expenditures, with only a small portion of the population being covered by any form of social health protection mechanisms providing medical benefits such as tax-funded services or social, national or community-based insurances. The issues persist even in countries of medium and low vulnerability. The share of out-of-pocket payments is even higher in countries of medium vulnerability (42 per cent) than in those that are highly vulnerable (35 per cent). The reason is most likely that in countries of medium vulnerability there is a higher availability of services and infrastructure, as well as fewer extremely poor people who cannot afford any access to health care at all, than in countries of high vulnerability. At the same time, high poverty rates in the countries of highest vulnerability, together with the

Figure 3.5 Share of out-of-pocket expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure by level of country vulnerability, latest available year




Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15107>

Note: The grouping of countries by level of vulnerability is based on the combination of two criteria: employment and poverty level (for more details see Chapter 2 of this report, pp. 30–31 and the Statistical Annex).

Sources: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), 2006 data for out-of-pocket health expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) and KILM (ILO, 2008e); World Bank, 2009a; and national statistical offices for employment and poverty statistics regarding levels of vulnerability. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 3.6 Out-of-pocket expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure by poverty incidence, 2006 (percentage of people living on less than US\$2 PPP per day)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15108>

Source: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), 2006 data. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

absence of any financial protection mechanisms, lead to extreme shares of out-of-pocket payments.

High out-of-pocket payments are a major cause of impoverishment, and so it is not accidental that there is a strong correlation between the shares of out-of-pocket expenditure in a country and poverty incidence there, as shown in figure 3.6.


That high out-of-pocket payments are a major factor leading to, maintaining and sharpening poverty is clearly shown in figure 3.6. The figure differentiates between shares of out-of-pocket expenditure among country groups with different incidences of poverty (measured as the proportion of people living on less than US\$2 a day). At the country level there is a strong correlation between the proportions of out-of-pocket payments and poverty incidence. In the 27 countries where less than 2 per cent falls below the US\$2-poverty line, on average less than 15 per cent of total health expenditure has to be borne out of pocket (this is consistent with the overall share in high-income countries shown in figure 3.5). But in countries with poverty rates between 2 per cent and 75 per cent the rate of out-of-pocket expenditure is roughly 40 per cent, and it is considerably higher in those 27 countries in which more than 75 per cent of the population falls below the poverty line. Here, two-thirds of total health expenditure is paid out of pocket.

Out-of-pocket expenditure represents the major part of overall private expenditure in developing countries. For example, among all African countries, only in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa is the share of out-of-pocket payments in overall private expenditure less than 25 per cent. In the majority of African countries, the share reaches 80 per cent and even higher. At the same time, in many of these countries more than half of the total expenditure on health is borne privately. This interaction between high shares of out-of-pocket payments in private health expenditure and high rates of that expenditure underlines once more the lack of financial protection against health-care costs. In those countries with a small portion of public health expenditure per capita, the level of out-of-pocket expenditure is relatively high.

3.3 Gaps in health-care coverage and access deficits

The gap in affordability and financial protection coverage is of course closely connected to the existing gap in extent of coverage: legal and effective coverage by social health protection mechanisms. These mechanisms include a broad variety of institutionalized solutions such as public schemes, social insurance schemes, private insurance, and also the community-based schemes that are widespread in many developing countries. In some countries all people should by law have free access to health-care services (100 per cent legal coverage) – but

Figure 3.7 Health protection: Proportion of the population covered by law, latest available year (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjmi/gess/ResseFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15109>

Source: National legislation, various dates. See ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

in reality they do not have such access when they need it (effective coverage much, much lower). Figures 3.7 and 3.8 describe legal coverage by contributory health insurance mechanisms. As figure 3.7 shows, formal legal coverage by these mechanisms remains low in many countries and especially in Africa and Asia.

When countries are grouped by vulnerability level it can be shown that legal coverage is lowest in those countries with high levels of poverty and informality. This highlights the close connection between formal employment and coverage. Figure 3.8 shows legal coverage by country “vulnerability” groups. Nearly 90 per cent of people living in the most vulnerable countries are not covered formally by any scheme or system, as compared to less than 4 per cent in the least vulnerable countries.

Indicators of legal coverage or “access” to social health-care protection mechanisms based on results are, however, insufficient. The ILO has developed an indicator which also reflects the supply side of access availability – in this case the availability of human resources at a level that guarantees at least basic, but universal, effective access to everybody. To estimate access to the services of skilled medical professionals, it uses as a proxy the relative difference between the density of health professionals in a given country and its median value in countries with a low level of vulnerability (population


access to services of medical professionals in countries with low vulnerability is thus used as a benchmark for other countries). Figure 3.9 provides a global overview of this access deficit by income level of countries. It suggests that 30–36 per cent of the world’s population has no access to the services of an adequate number of skilled medical professionals. Low-income countries in Africa and Asia show the highest levels of access deficits.

In health care, the triad between individuals/households, institutionalized health-care financing mechanisms, and the sector of health-care providers defines the field of social protection. Coverage thus means affordable access to (quality) health care by various public or private measures. Physical access to health-care providers, treatment and medication requires a sufficient health-care infrastructure and workforce as well as the provision of medical goods and services.

It is relatively easy to measure a formal coverage gap defined as the percentage of people not formally/legally covered by social health protection. But, as we have seen, measuring how many people are covered under legislation by social health protection does not reflect effective access to health services. A combination of various proxies is therefore used to sharpen the picture of coverage worldwide.

Data on effective coverage are very limited, at both the global and national levels. Despite the significant

Figure 3.8 Deficits in legal health protection coverage by vulnerability at the country level, latest available year (percentage of population not covered)




Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15110>

Note: The grouping of countries by level of vulnerability is based on the combination of two criteria: employment and poverty level (for more details see Chapter 2 of this report, pp. 30–31, and the Statistical Annex).

Sources: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), 2006 data for health expenditure as a percentage of GDP; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) and KILM (ILO, 2008e); World Bank, 2009a; and national statistical offices for employment and poverty statistics regarding levels of vulnerability. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 3.9 ILO access deficit indicator, 2006 (shortfall of skilled medical professionals as a proxy)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15112>

Note: The median used as a benchmark is just over 40 health professionals per 10,000 population. This value is above the minimum set by WHO for primary care delivery, which is 25 per 10,000. This indicator is presented in the Statistical Annex.

Source: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), 2006 data. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

efforts of many national and international institutions to develop and provide data on access to health services, particularly by the poor, information gaps still exist. Often only very specific and non-comparable data are available at national and international levels; these do not allow assessments of effective coverage and access. Nevertheless, given the close link between access to health services and lack of coverage in social health protection, the availability of such data is vital when developing and advocating strategies for universal coverage.


To measure effective access one has to look at a number of interlinked dimensions: legal coverage by social health protection measures, affordability of health-care services to households, availability of services in terms of qualified health workforce, infrastructure, and so on. But what one is likely to have in available statistics is only partial indicators related to these different dimensions – percentage of persons covered by law, out-of-pocket expenditure as a percentage of the total, density of medical personnel of different skills and some infrastructure indicators, overall levels of health spending and, finally, information on the actual utilization of selected health-care services (percentage of births attended by skilled medical personnel, percentage of children vaccinated, and so on). Effective access to health care and levels of actual utilization certainly depend on all the above factors – the level of financial protection being determined both by

legal coverage and effective coverage, as well as the availability of services – but at the same time there are other factors that influence access, including cultural ones.

Ideally, the most useful approach to measuring social health protection coverage in terms of effective access would be through a combination of key indicators reflecting the situation in a country, including the following:

- *Availability and financial protection*
 - Formal coverage gap: measured by percentage of people not formally/legally covered by social health protection;
 - Financial protection deficit: measured by proportion of out-of-pocket payments to total health expenditure.
- *Availability and quality of services*
 - Resources deficit: measured by proportion of actual total health expenditure per capita (less out-of-pocket expenditure) to a specific benchmark value (defined here as the median value for low-vulnerability countries);
 - Access deficit: measured by percentage of population not covered due to insufficient number of qualified medical personnel (using median density of medical personnel in low-vulnerability countries as the benchmark).

Figure 3.10 The global deficit in social health protection coverage and effective access to health services in 2006 (ILO methodology)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15113>

Note: The multiple dimensions of health coverage are presented in the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), 2006 data. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Another important indicator of effective access to health services relates to health outcomes such as maternal mortality, reflecting all social strata including the extremely poor.

Figure 3.10 gives an example of the result of such an analysis, combining selected indicators of the types described above. Countries are grouped into five levels of “vulnerability” as defined by two criteria: (a) percentage of population below the poverty line of US\$2 PPP per day, and (b) wage employment as a percentage of total employment. The highest vulnerability group includes countries with the highest poverty incidence and the lowest proportion of wage employment.

Figure 3.10 compares the selected set of coverage indicators. Until more reliable data become available, this set of indicators might serve as a proxy for estimating effective access to health care, even if they exhibit some inconsistencies. The simultaneous use of these proxy indicators opens up a range of relative values that might serve as a crude indicator for access or non-access to health services.

The figure reveals that in the most vulnerable group of countries represented in the outer line more than 80 per cent of the population have no legal coverage and no access to health services due to gaps in the health workforce, and experience significant gaps in financial protection and affordability of services, given the extreme values of out-of-pocket payments impacting on poverty. The deficit in per capita spending of 85 per cent based on the median value deepens the overall gap in financial protection. We also find in this group of

countries the highest values for maternal mortality of 82 deaths per 10,000 live births.

In this multidimensional statistical picture no specific indicators have been included for the third main dimension of health-care coverage discussed in Chapter 1, namely the *scope* of health-care services provided: what benefit packages are in place and whether they are accessible to all in need. This aspect of coverage is even more difficult to measure – particularly on an internationally comparable basis. In the ILO methodology of measuring coverage defined as effective access to health care this dimension is for the time being taken care of by using the health outcomes indicator of maternal mortality rates. There is general agreement that *benefit packages* should be set with a view to maintaining, restoring or improving health, guaranteeing the ability to work and meeting personal health-care needs. Countries should define health protection benefit packages specifying the health services, medicines and commodities that are to be made available to the population covered. The determination of the corresponding “essential package” of benefits can play a key role here, provided the process is conducted appropriately. As discussed above, effective access and coverage need to reflect the scope of benefits actually provided. While there is no one-size-fits-all solution, Convention No. 102 provides guidance on the scope of benefit packages. In order to achieve its objectives, social health protection benefit packages must be neither too extensive nor limited to a minimum, but need to ensure that certain essential pre-conditions are met.

Coverage by social security pensions: Income security in old age

4

The main risk when one reaches old age is poverty or income insecurity owing to the loss of one's ability to earn income, whether partially or completely. This was the main justification for the first pension schemes, which emerged at first only in the highly developed countries but which have since spread across the whole world.

A pension scheme is an arrangement by which individuals are provided with an income (a regular periodical payment) when they have reached a certain age and are no longer earning a steady income from employment. Countries where social security is more developed usually have a number of different pension schemes either covering certain groups of the population or with various specific objectives. Some of the latter include the prevention of poverty through the provision of basic income, the replacement of pre-retirement employment income in order to "smooth" consumption (that is, to prevent a fall in living standards after retirement), and the supplementation of this partial replacement income with additional income at retirement. These different pension schemes may be contributory or non-contributory, defined-benefit or defined-contribution, mandatory or voluntary, publicly or privately managed, social insurance or occupational or personal, basic or supplementary. What is important is that all these different schemes are designed to play complementary roles in order to provide comprehensive coverage, reaching different groups of the population and meeting different objectives; as such they constitute a national pension system. The specific mix of components in the national pension

system generally reflects national circumstances such as the country's policy stance and history of economic development.


4.1 From legal to effective coverage by old-age pensions: An overview

In many OECD countries pension systems have proved effective in reducing income poverty and other forms of poverty among older people (OECD, 2009b, Part III). On the other hand, in developing countries the numbers of the older poor are increasing and older people are over-represented among the chronically poor. According to HelpAge, two-thirds of older people receive no regular income, while 100 million live on less than US\$1 a day.

Coverage by old-age pension schemes around the world, apart from in the developed countries, is concentrated on formal sector employees, mainly in the civil service and large enterprises. Figure 4.1 shows the distribution of coverage measured in terms of persons protected around the world. It can be seen that the highest coverage is found in North America and Europe, the lowest in Asia and Africa. Existing legislation stating theoretical coverage may however differ significantly from effective coverage in terms of actual contributors to pension schemes.

Worldwide, nearly 40 per cent of the population of working age is *legally* covered by contributory old-age pension schemes. But the regional situation is very

Figure 4.1 Old-age pensions: Legal coverage and effective active contributors in the working-age population, by region, 2008–09 (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15143>

Sources: ILO Social Security Department based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e); national legislative texts; national statistical data for estimates of legal coverage; and compilation of national social security schemes data for effective coverage. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d). Country data are available in the Statistical Annex.

diverse. In North America and Europe this number is nearly twice as high, while in Africa less than one-third of the working-age population is covered even by legislation. The former communist countries, including the poorer countries in Central Asia, have inherited comprehensive pension schemes which provide much higher coverage than schemes in other countries of comparable GDP per capita. In all regions, the proportion of voluntary contributory programmes hardly reaches 4 per cent of the working-age population; this sheds light on the significance of mandatory contributory schemes.

As stated previously, effective coverage is significantly lower than legal coverage. With the exception of North America and to a lesser extent Western Europe, effective coverage is quite low in all regions, although it is still at nearly 50 per cent in Central and Eastern Europe. However, in sub-Saharan Africa only 5 per cent of the working-age population is effectively covered by contributory programmes, while this share is about 20 per cent in Asia, the Middle East and North Africa.

In Asia some countries have made major efforts to extend coverage beyond the formal sector. Sri Lanka, for example, has a scheme covering farmers and fishers which has achieved substantial coverage rates (57 per cent of the farmers and 42 per cent of the fishers). India too has made efforts to cover the informal sector through its new pension scheme. But other countries such as Cambodia or the Lao People's Democratic Republic have hardly any broad pension schemes. Nepal has introduced a basic non-contributory pension for all


those in extreme age. Thailand implemented a similar allowance for all the elderly as a temporary anti-crisis measure, but is now debating whether to replace it by a permanent basic pension scheme.

At the same time, while in high-income countries 75 per cent of persons aged 65 or over are receiving some kind of pension, in low-income countries less than 20 per cent of the elderly receive pension benefits; the median in this group of countries is just over 7 per cent (see figure 4.2).

4.2 Coverage gaps and employment status of the elderly

The need to extend coverage applies thus first and foremost, and urgently, to developing countries where formal coverage rates are low (see figure 4.3). To begin with, pension schemes in these countries tend to cover a restricted proportion of the workforce, mainly those in formal wage employment as shown in figure 4.4. In high-income and an increasing number of middle-income countries universal pension coverage has been – or is being – achieved. But with increasing longevity and relatively short working lives, as well as increasing demands for long-term care of older people, social security systems are under growing financial stress. This often leads to reforms which will result in lower benefits for future generations of retirees.


Figure 4.2 Old-age pension beneficiaries as a proportion of the elderly by income level, various countries, latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15144>

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, compilation of available national data collected from national pension social security schemes; UN data. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 4.3 Old-age pension beneficiaries as a percentage of the population above retirement age, latest available year




Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15145>

Note: Latest available year: for country data with corresponding year see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, compilation of national available data collected in national pension social security schemes; UN data. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 4.4 Old-age pensions: Effective active contributors as a percentage of the working-age population by the share of wage employment in total employment, latest available year (percentage of working-age population)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15146>

Note: Latest available year: for country data with corresponding year see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, compilation of national available data collected in national pension social security schemes; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e), completed with national statistical data. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

At the same time, the majority of older people in the world – particularly in low-income countries – are obliged to continue working, mainly in the informal economy, because they are not entitled to pensions, or if these exist they are too low. Since most of these people have been working in the informal economy or in rural areas, they have not contributed to pension schemes during their working life. Moreover, in most lower-income countries they cannot benefit from non-contributory social assistance or universal pensions that could lift them out of poverty when they reach retirement, because such schemes are non-existent.

Levels of economic activity rates of the elderly and the extent of a decline in economic activity with advancing age can thus be treated as indicators of how many people are actually retiring – although it is still not known how many are forced to retire either because they are unable to work or because there is no employment

for them. There are no data detailed enough to make it possible to calculate average ages of exit from the labour market in all countries. However, table 4.1 shows how labour force participation rates of those 65 and older compare with average economic activity rates for all those aged 15 years and over. Here again, it can be clearly seen that “retirement” from economic activity in old age, while widespread in developed parts of the world, is rare in developing countries. In sub-Saharan Africa men are able to reduce their economic activity rates only slightly – by up to 20 per cent – as they get older. It is striking that this situation had not changed in Africa between 1980 and 2005, differing from most other regions. South and East Asia are other regions where, apparently, an exit from economic activity in old age is less common than elsewhere. Women nearly everywhere reduce their economic activity as they reach old age more than men do; however, it is obvious that

very often they switch to occupations not seen by labour force surveys as “employment”: caregiving and running the household for other members of their families.

Table 4.1 also shows life expectancy at age 65 for men and women in different parts of the world: while the large gap between developed and developing parts of the world for life expectancy at birth is well known, it appears that in old age the gap is much smaller. Even in the poorest countries people will live another ten years on average once they reach the age of 65 – the question is how dignified a life that will be, and what kind of income security can society provide.

There is a strong link between old-age pension coverage and labour force participation in old age, as shown in figure 4.5. In Bolivia, for example, more than 50 per cent of those aged 65 years or older still work, despite the universal pension system that exists. This demonstrates the low amounts of pension payments per person


on the one hand, and on the other hand draws attention to the gap between legal coverage of beneficiaries and actual beneficiaries: as figure 4.9 shows, only two-thirds of all elderly Bolivians actually receive pensions, although by law everyone is entitled to them. In Namibia in 2008, the flat rate amount of the old-age pension grant was 450 Namibian dollars a month. There is no statutory minimum wage law, but the mining, construction, security and agricultural sectors set basic levels of pay through collective bargaining. The level of the old-age grant is almost half the minimum wage (N\$860 per month) for agricultural workers. In Mongolia, where a high level of coverage coexists with a high labour force participation rate among those aged 65 and over, the situation is different. According to the law on pension and benefits provided by the Social Insurance Fund, the minimum pension should be not less than 75 per cent of the minimum wage. In July 2007 the average pension

Table 4.1 Participation in the labour market of elderly (65+), and life expectancy at age 65, 1980–2005 (percentages)

	Labour force participation at age 65+ as a percentage of labour force participation at age 15+				Life expectancy at 65	
	Men		Women		2000–05	
	1980	2005	1980	2005	Men	Women
Middle Africa	84.4	85.0	55.1	56.5	10.96	12.38
Western Africa	81.4	82.3	58.7	56.3	11.36	12.50
Eastern Africa	82.7	81.5	62.5	59.1	11.31	13.00
South-Central Asia	68.5	60.2	39.3	43.8	13.36	14.58
South-Eastern Asia	62.0	57.9	38.4	32.7	13.36	15.33
Central America	73.6	56.6	53.4	34.0	16.24	18.16
South America	43.5	44.5	22.2	25.4	15.35	17.98
Northern Africa	59.9	42.9	61.5	22.3	12.81	14.58
Western Asia	46.2	42.7	35.7	40.5	13.16	15.14
Caribbean	47.3	38.2	29.1	17.0	15.30	17.67
Eastern Asia	38.3	33.5	10.8	16.9	14.81	17.53
Southern Africa	33.0	32.9	20.6	12.5	10.69	14.18
Australia and Oceania	19.1	19.9	10.4	9.9	16.49	19.86
Eastern Europe	20.2	15.4	8.7	10.7	11.56	15.27
Northern Europe	17.0	13.7	8.9	7.5	15.76	19.05
Southern Europe	20.3	12.8	15.7	9.7	16.12	19.75
Western Europe	10.1	5.7	7.3	3.2	16.06	20.01
WORLD	40.6	38.2	18.4	21.5	14.39	16.95
More developed regions	21.9	19.3	12.2	12.2	15.47	18.92
Less developed regions	54.2	48.5	24.9	27.8	13.80	15.64

Source: (1) Labour force participation: ILO calculations based on the ILO database Economically Active Population Estimates and Projections, 1980–2020 (ILO, 2009g); (2) Life expectancy: United Nations, 2007. Country groupings according to UN World Population Prospects (see <http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=5>).

Figure 4.5 Persons above retirement age receiving pensions, and labour force participation of the population aged 65 and over, latest available year (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15147>

Note: Latest available year: for country data with corresponding year see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, compilation of national available data collected in national pension social security schemes; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) for economically active population aged 65 and over. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

50


was 68,000 Mongolian tugrik (MNT) per month. The high labour force participation rate is probably linked to government policies: the Labour Law of Mongolia was revised in 1999 in order to promote the employment of elderly persons and to increase their income; this law enables the elderly to be employed in appropriate jobs. The majority of the elderly employed are self-employed; most of them are men, women being involved without payment in family businesses.

Higher beneficiary rates tend to correspond to lower proportions of elderly persons still working, and vice versa: in countries with relatively low coverage rates, the share of the elderly still working is comparatively higher. Japan, for example, has a coverage rate of around two-thirds of people older than 64, with one-fifth of this age group still working. This is the reason why the coverage rate in Japan is lower compared with other high-income countries.

4.3 Effective extent and level of coverage at the country level

For most of the OECD countries, the proportion of pension beneficiaries to the population over retirement age is close to 100 per cent or even higher. Among pensioners there are many younger than 60 years of age; besides, survivors' pensions need to be taken into account in addition to retirement pensions: many older women receive survivors' pensions awarded after the death of their spouse, either because they have no entitlements to an old-age pension in their own right, or because the spouse's pension entitlement was higher than their own. Figure 4.6 shows that in many European Union countries the ratio between the number of recipients of an old-age pension and the population over the retirement age is equal to or higher than 1. However, even in many of those countries for which figure 4.6 shows this ratio

Figure 4.6 European Union: Old-age pension recipients, ratio to population over the legal retirement age (excluding anticipated old-age pensions), 2006



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15152>

Note: Luxembourg appears twice, depending on the retirement age: * statutory retirement age according to social security programmes throughout the world (SSA/ ISSA, 2008); ** standard retirement age as given in ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a), pension beneficiaries.


Source: ILO Social Security Department calculations based on ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a): pension beneficiaries. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

to be below 1, the actual coverage is close to 100 per cent. In Poland, for example, many women over retirement age receive survivors' pensions rather than old-age pensions: the ratio of women to men among old-age pension beneficiaries is well below 1.

In the majority of countries outside the OECD only a minority of the elderly are receiving any pension at all from the formal social security system. The worst situation is in Africa, where 10 per cent of the elderly or fewer have any pension entitlement. Nor will the situation improve radically in the foreseeable future: although most of the African contributory pension schemes are young, and thus not many people have contributed long enough to develop entitlements to benefits, usually fewer than 10 per cent of all those in the labour force or in employment contribute to a pension scheme. The majority of people work in the informal economy and are thus not covered by any contributory social security scheme. In countries with a longer tradition in social security and a larger formal economy (such as Tunisia or Algeria, as shown in figure 4.7), the situation is significantly better

The highest coverage is in those African countries where, in addition to contributory schemes for those in the formal economy, universal pensions (Lesotho, Mauritius and Namibia) or social assistance pensions which

Figure 4.7 Africa: Old-age pensioners (all ages) as a proportion of the elderly population, latest available year (percentages)




Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15149>

Note: Population aged 60 and over, in some cases 65 and over, depending on the national legal retirement age. For further details, see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, compilation of national available data collected in national pension social security schemes; United Nations, 2009b, medium variant. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 4.8 Asia Pacific and the Middle East: Old-age pensioners (all ages) as a proportion of the elderly population, latest available year (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15150>

Note: Population aged 60 and over, in some cases 65 and over, depending on the national legal retirement age. For further details see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, compilation of national available data collected in national pension social security schemes; United Nations, 2009b, medium variant. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).


reach a large section of the population (South Africa) have been introduced. Achieving high coverage requires resources to be invested: Mauritius and South Africa spend more than 5 per cent of their GDP on pension and other social security benefits, while the majority of the sub-Saharan African countries allocate not more than 1 per cent of GDP, and even this is used mostly to pay for civil service pensions.

In Asia relatively high coverage is enjoyed by the populations of Mongolia and countries of the former Soviet Union, but low social security expenditure in some of these countries as well as other evidence indicates that actual pensions paid are very low and often not sufficient to keep the elderly out of poverty. In Japan the indicator is only below 100 per cent because many Japanese retire much later than 60. For the rest of the Asian population, it seems that a minority still have effective coverage rates of between 20 and 40 per cent, with the exception of the South-East Asian

countries where coverage is lower. Taking into account the policy reforms already under way, improvements in coverage may be expected in future in some countries (such as the current efforts in China to cover the rural population in some way), but the majority of countries are still faced with the challenge of how to effectively prevent widespread and deep poverty among rapidly ageing populations where a majority work in the informal economy and have no access to any contributory social security scheme (see figure 4.8).

In Latin America and the Caribbean, with its long history of social security, coverage in the majority of cases reflects the proportion of those working in the formal economy: 30–60 per cent with the exception of some Caribbean islands where the formalization of the economy is higher. In Brazil, contributory pensions combined with tax-financed rural and social pensions seem to allow for a majority of the population to receive some income support, although many are still not covered. Bolivia, which introduced small universal pensions several years ago, has also succeeded in covering a large section of the elderly population, but evidence shows that there are still many people who by law should be receiving benefits but who are not reached by the system (see figure 4.9). The reforms introduced recently in Argentina (Plan de Inclusión Previsional: 2006–2007) and in Chile (Pension Reform: 2008–2009) will soon allow these countries to reach levels of coverage comparable with Brazil and Uruguay.

Figure 4.9 Latin America and the Caribbean: Old-age pensioners (all ages) as a proportion of the elderly population, latest available year (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15151>

Note: Population aged 60 and over, in some cases 65 and over, depending on the national legal retirement age. For further details see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, compilation of national available data collected in national pension social security schemes; United Nations, 2009b, medium variant. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

The above examples clearly show that only if efforts to gradually expand coverage through contributory schemes are coupled with the introduction of non-contributory pensions, which can immediately provide income support to those already in the old-age brackets, can coverage be expected to reach all (or at least the majority of) those in need.

Poverty in old age has a strong gender dimension. Life expectancy for women is higher than for men; therefore women may be in poverty for a longer period of their lives. A woman's chance of losing her partner is higher, and women are less likely to remarry than men. Women over 60 who have lost their partners greatly outnumber their male equivalents. In many countries women are obliged to maintain certain levels of activity to compensate for declining intra-family support and the absence of universal pension schemes. They not only face the threat of poverty in old age but, living longer, must assume this burden for longer periods. And further, since they are likely to outlive their husbands, in some societies they have to deal with exclusion due to the stigma of widowhood.

The worldwide pattern of pension *coverage* also has a strong gender dimension. In most countries of the world women are less represented in the formal economy than men are, and are therefore contributing relatively less to social insurance pensions. When women do receive social security pensions they will generally receive them on the same basis as men, according to their earnings and years of service. The gender bias here is that women are often employed in jobs with lower pay than that of men. In addition, women may have fewer years of service – either because they interrupt their careers to look after their children or for other care responsibilities, or because women are encouraged to leave the labour market earlier than men. If the pension scheme is based on individual savings, women may have comparatively lower pensions than men.

Another common scenario is that the husband contributes to a social security pension scheme, while his wife is dependent on his pensions. This is the classic model of the male breadwinner. In this situation women are entitled to derived pension rights which are typically lower than for men. In addition, these entitlements are often conditional on the continuation of the marriage, which leaves women in a potentially vulnerable position. How women will benefit during retirement depends on the intra-household decision-making process. After the possible death of her husband, the wife normally receives less of her husband's previous pensions. In case of a marriage break-up, there is generally

no splitting of pension claims between husband and wife. In the best of cases, wives will then be eligible for lower-level tax-financed pension assistance benefits.


The most common worldwide scenario, however, is that neither husband nor wife is entitled to social security pensions, since they have worked in the informal economy. In that case, income security in old age depends on accumulated assets over life, such as savings, housing, livestock and land. Moreover, various family support mechanisms are likely to play an important role. All these aspects are naturally also important for people who do receive social security pension benefits. Where tax-financed pensions exist, relatively more women than men tend to benefit from such transfers. In most low- and middle-income countries contributory pensions tend to benefit mainly men, while tax-financed pensions benefit mainly women.

Although average indicators of coverage may be lower (as in Africa) or higher (as in Europe), a significant gender gap shows up everywhere: in nearly all countries elderly women are covered to a much lesser extent than elderly men (see figure 4.10). The key to gender equality in pensions is therefore the extension of such social security pension schemes as to enable the provision of pension rights to women through non-contributory and universal minimum guarantees, and through compensating disadvantages in the labour market such as shorter or broken careers, lower wages, or even total exclusion. Such provision cannot be provided by purely earnings- or contribution-related, “actuarially neutral” pension schemes; it requires clear, usually tax-financed redistribution mechanisms to be built into the pension systems. There is also a need for pension splitting rules, in case of a marriage or partnership break-up. Equal rights between men and women with regard to the inheritance of resources, such as savings, housing, livestock and land, are also most important in ensuring old-age income security for women.

Incomplete coverage is a widespread phenomenon; it is seen not only in developing countries but in industrialized countries too. Given the fact that a large proportion of pension schemes provide benefits on an earnings-related basis, some groups with incomplete past work records tend to fall behind. Notably hard-hit groups include women (as discussed above), low-skilled workers and ethnic minorities.

While there is a certain body of knowledge on the *extent* of old-age pension coverage, only for a very limited number of countries is there information which would permit an assessment of the *level* of coverage, that is, benefit amounts relative to national and international

Figure 4.10 Male and female old-age pensioners (all ages) as a proportion of male and female populations respectively, aged 60 and over, latest available year (percentages)



benchmarks. The OECD (2007, 2009c) has developed for its member States quite a wide number of indicators measuring benefit levels. These include estimates of legally guaranteed benefit levels – from measures of “theoretical” current and future legal replacement rates calculated for various categories of individuals, to measures of so-called “pension wealth” for selected types of individuals reflecting the present value of the future stream of pension payments resulting from existing legal provision and the age at which people become eligible to receive a pension, life expectancy and how pensions are adjusted after retirement to reflect growth in wages or prices. The European Commission (2006) has also produced studies comparing current legal replacement rates with replacement rates to be expected in the future as a result of recently implemented reforms. The OECD has published a special report on pensions in Asia (2009d) which also includes estimates of theoretical legal replacement rates and of “pension wealth” for a number of countries in the region. There is certainly a need for further research on existing pension legislation in other parts of the world so as to be able to estimate these “theoretical” legal replacement rates for more countries.

But even for OECD and EU countries there is very limited statistical information at the international level on amounts of benefits actually paid. Such information is more often available at the level of individual pension schemes. Since every country usually has a number of

pension schemes, and even retired persons often receive pensions from more than one source, there are problems with calculating national averages for all beneficiaries in the country. To assess the relative income position of pensioners, the OECD studies (2007, 2009c) look at household budget survey data and compare incomes of pensioners (including the portions coming from the various pension schemes and from other income sources such as work or assets) with incomes of those at pre-retirement age. Unfortunately, outside the EU and OECD countries there are not often household surveys with questionnaires designed in a detailed and focused enough way to allow similar analyses.

Levels of benefit received from the social security pension system are of course dependent on resources invested. High-income countries spend on average 6.9 per cent of GDP on social security old-age pensions (slightly more than the average they spend on social health protection); middle-income countries only 2.1 per cent of GDP; and low-income countries 0.6 per cent. The size of national benefit expenditure is a function of both the number of beneficiaries and the level of benefits. Pension spending per person above retirement age in a country, expressed as a percentage of its GDP per capita, is an average of 56 per cent in high-income countries, 33.2 per cent in middle-income countries and 17.8 per cent in low-income countries.

The world is ageing. Table 4.2 shows that while men and women at age 65 and over now constitute 8 per

Table 4.2 Projected elderly population in 2010 and 2050 (percentages)

	Population 65+		Proportion of population 65+ in total population		Proportion of women among 65+	
	2010	2050	2010	2050	2010	2050
World	100	100	8	16	56	55
More developed regions	37	22	16	26	59	57
Less developed regions	63	78	6	15	54	55
Less developed regions, excluding China	41	56	5	13	55	55
Africa	7	9	3	7	56	54
Asia	54	62	7	18	54	55
China	21	22	8	24	52	54
India	12	16	5	14	53	54
Europe	22	12	16	28	61	58
Latin America and the Caribbean	8	10	7	19	56	57
North America	9	6	13	21	57	56
Oceania	1	1	11	19	54	55

Source: United Nations, 2007, medium variant. Country groupings according to UN World Population Prospects (see <http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=5>).

cent of world population, they will be 16 per cent of the population by 2050. Most of the elderly live in countries where only small minorities are covered by any form of pension scheme and where social security in general – including affordable access to essential health-care services – is a luxury: over 60 per cent of the elderly now live in countries classified by the United Nations as “less developed”. In 2050 the elderly in these countries – it is to be hoped, much “more developed” by then – will constitute nearly 80 per cent of the world’s elderly population. Sixty per cent of them will be living in Asia, with over half in just two countries: China and India. These developing and ageing societies have to do something urgently to ensure the right to retirement in dignity and social security to their elderly members. Particularly dramatic is the situation of elderly women – the majority among this growing number of the elderly. In many countries women are excluded to a large extent from the labour market when they are still able to work, so that even if contributory pension schemes exist, many women have no opportunity to

contribute and build their pension entitlements. Also, very often neither prevailing traditional societal rules nor more formal pension arrangements are providing them with even a minimum of security if they are abandoned or widowed by their male partners.

For these reasons the ILO believes that a guaranteed basic pension for all the elderly should be one of the components of the set of social security guarantees referred to as the social protection floor. A growing number of low- and middle-income countries have either already implemented a basic non-contributory pension scheme (whether universal or income-tested) or are currently discussing the possibilities. Examples from countries where such pensions have been put in place, and many studies from other countries, show that even in low-income countries the basic non-contributory pension is affordable, feasible and the most effective solution for closing the existing coverage gap quickly, thus reducing poverty among the elderly and also alleviating overall poverty in those households where older men and women live.

Involuntary unemployment is an economic contingency people may often face in market economies. Income support for the unemployed is thus one of the most important branches of social security. Unemployment benefit schemes provide income support, usually over a limited period, to those who face temporary unemployment. The objective is to provide at least partial income replacement, enabling the beneficiary to maintain a certain standard of living during the transition period until a new employment is available. Amounts of cash unemployment benefits are either related to the previous earnings of the beneficiary or paid at a flat rate. In a number of countries, if the beneficiary is still unemployed after entitlements to contributory unemployment insurance benefits expire, there exist specific unemployment assistance schemes which continue to pay certain benefits (sometimes means-tested) to those in long-term unemployment. Income support to the long-term unemployed and their families is often taken over by general means-tested social assistance schemes.

In addition to unemployment benefits, which are accompanied in some countries by family benefits for those who are eligible, schemes may also pay contributions to beneficiaries' health insurance and pension schemes on their behalf.

However, the effective provision of income support benefit to the unemployed always has to be complemented by employment services and employability-enhancing measures. These offer assistance in searching for new employment, providing those unemployed with counselling, training or retraining


whenever necessary. There are also measures such as public works or other forms of employment guarantees which provide certain forms of paid employment to beneficiaries. Such beneficiaries may still, however, need income transfers in addition to what they earn from this usually very low-paid work; they also need linked benefits (access to other forms of social insurance such as health or pensions) and – since public works are temporary solutions – they need to be assisted with employability-enhancing measures as well. Mainly due to the data limitations, the analysis in this chapter is restricted to schemes providing income support to the unemployed and does not cover many other related and important programmes (such as public works, employment guarantee schemes, training and other employability-enhancing measures, and other “active” labour market policies).

Eligibility conditions for unemployment benefits, as well as benefit amounts and the duration of payment, are usually determined in national legislation. Entitlement criteria usually include:

- being in involuntary unemployment, searching for employment and ready to start employment soon.¹ Applicants for unemployment benefits are usually required to be registered as unemployed by the employment services and – within certain limits – are expected to accept offers of employment from these services as well as to undertake any training offered;

¹ Article 20 of ILO Convention No. 102 states: “The contingency covered shall include suspension of earnings, as defined by national laws or regulations, due to inability to obtain suitable employment in the case of a person protected who is capable of, and available for, work.”

Figure 5.1 Existence of unemployment protection schemes by type of scheme, 2008–09



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15154>

Note: For detailed information by country, see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; national legislative texts. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

- being below normal pensionable age;
- having completed a certain qualifying period of contributions or employment.²

Unemployment benefits are usually granted only for a limited period,³ which may depend on the number of years worked previously. The amount may depend on the previous salary or may be a flat rate.⁴

5.1 Scope of coverage by statutory unemployment schemes

Present entitlements to unemployment benefits tend to be restricted to those in formal employment, and exist mostly in high- and middle-income countries

² Such a period should not be longer than “as may be considered necessary to preclude abuse”, according to Convention No. 102 (Article 23).


³ Convention No. 102 requires such a duration limit to be not less than 13 weeks within 12 months for earnings-related benefits, or 26 weeks within 12 months for means-tested benefits (Article 24).

⁴ According to Convention No. 102, unemployment benefits, at least for all those with earnings below average earnings, should not be lower than 45 per cent of previous earnings (and in case of flat-rate benefit, not lower than 45 per cent of typical low earnings).

(see figure 5.1). In a large part of the world where extreme poverty is high, the very concept of “unemployment” seems to be irrelevant, as everybody has to work in order to survive. The main issues in these countries are underemployment and the often extremely precarious character of existing employment opportunities for those in poverty. But even in low-income countries unemployment is a growing challenge, in particular in increasingly populated urban areas. Figure 5.1 provides an overview of the existence of unemployment benefit schemes across the world.

In some countries where there is no unemployment insurance or other statutory income support programmes for the unemployed, there exist legal provisions (usually included in the Labour Code or equivalent acts) obliging employers to pay a lump sum equivalent to several months’ salary to workers who are laid off. The entitlements and amounts of such *severance pay* normally depend on past employment service with a given employer. In the Philippines, for example, employers are obliged to pay one month’s salary for every year of previous employment. The problem is that very often these provisions of the labour law are not effectively enforced: potential beneficiaries are not informed about their entitlements, while

Figure 5.2 Unemployment protection schemes by type of scheme, 2008–09



Source: ILO Social Security Department, based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

employers – particularly those going through a difficult period of adjustment – may evade the law. Even if severance pay is effectively in place it is not a substitute for social security unemployment benefits, according to international standards: unemployment benefits should be periodical payments, not one-off payments, on the one hand; while on the other, the one-sided situation where the individual employer bears total liability, replacing the element of risk-pooling and solidarity inherent in social security, may lead to adverse selections in hiring decisions as well as evasion; both eroding actual coverage.

Contributory unemployment benefits cover mainly employees with formal employment status. In countries with well-developed social security there exist (although rarely) schemes for the self-employed and other categories of employed with more independent status than wage and salary workers (such as “*intermittent du spectacle*” in France). Discussions are under way in several countries with a view to introducing voluntary schemes paid for by workers only, which would also include informal-economy workers. The problem is so-called moral hazard (in that while employees will normally do everything they can to avoid losing a job, with voluntary insurance there may be a tendency for those with a higher risk of becoming unemployed to be over-represented) and thus vulnerability to fraud; such schemes would be difficult to monitor.

Of 184 countries studied (see figure 5.2), statutory unemployment social security schemes exist in only 78 countries (42 per cent), often covering only a minority of their labour force. A majority of countries (64) have contributory unemployment insurance schemes, while:

- 17 of the 64 have, in addition, employment-related social assistance that steps in when the unemployed are no longer eligible for unemployment insurance;
- 8 of the 78 countries have non-contributory, tax-financed social assistance, instead of insurance, as the main or only scheme expected to provide income security to the unemployed; and
- 6 of the 78 countries have only provident-fund-type provisions for those unemployed.

In the other 106 countries studied (58 per cent), even workers in the formal economy have no coverage in case of unemployment. In some of these countries there exist limited provisions in labour legislation obliging employers to provide severance payments to workers who are laid off. As shown in table 5.1, statutory unemployment protection programmes exist in 80 per cent of high-income countries, 54 per cent of upper-middle-income countries, 35 per cent of lower-middle-income countries, and in only 8 per cent of low-income countries.

The figures above take note only of the existence of certain types of unemployment benefit provisions but do not take into account how many of those in employment are legally covered by these provisions. Figures 5.3 and 5.4 show the extent of legal coverage in different countries and regions of the world, measured by the percentage of the economically active population (EAP) who – according to existing legislation – should be covered by one or another type of existing social security scheme aimed at providing income security to the unemployed.


Patterns of the legal extent of coverage are quite similar to patterns of labour market structures

Table 5.1 Unemployment protection: Extent of legal and effective coverage, countries grouped by income level, latest available year

	Low income	Lower-middle income	Upper-middle income	High income	TOTAL
Legal coverage					
Existence of a statutory programme, number of countries (% of countries in parentheses)	5 (8%)	17 (35%)	20 (54%)	36 (80%)	78 (42%)
Contributory and non-contributory schemes (% of EAP)	2.9	18.1	38.4	69.2	30.6
Mandatory contributory schemes (% of EAP)	2.9	15.4	30.3	58.9	25.7
Effective coverage of unemployed (% of all unemployed)					
Total receiving benefits	1.3	3.6	10.4	38.8	12.9
Receiving benefits from contributory schemes	1.3	3.6	9.8	31.3	10.9
Receiving benefits from non-contributory schemes	0.0	0.0	0.6	7.6	2.0
Not receiving unemployment benefit	98.7	96.3	89.1	60.9	86.9

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; national legislative texts; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) completed with national statistical data for the existence of social security provision in case of unemployment, legal coverage estimates; national social security unemployment schemes data on unemployed receiving unemployment benefits compiled in the ILO Social Security Inquiry database (ILO, 2009c).

Figure 5.3 Unemployment protection schemes: Legal extent of coverage worldwide as a percentage of the economically active population (EAP), latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceld=15156>


Sources: ILO Social Security Department, based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; national legislative texts; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) completed with national statistical data for the quantification of the groups legally covered. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

(compare the map in figure 5.3 with figure 2.1 in Chapter 2 which shows percentages of wage employment worldwide). However, because unemployment benefits provision is much less widespread than other types of social security provision (such as old-age pensions), the legal extent of coverage is also much lower.

Figure 5.4 provides estimates of the legal extent of coverage by unemployment benefits for different

regions of the world. Globally, less than 30 per cent of the economically active are covered by law for any form of income support benefit in case they become unemployed. Legal coverage is as high as 80 per cent or more in Western Europe, North America and Central and Eastern Europe and a bit less (70 per cent) in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries, although effective coverage is dramatically lower

Figure 5.4 Unemployment protection schemes: Legal extent of coverage, regional estimates, as a percentage of the economically active population (EAP), latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15157>

Note: Latest available year used for calculations of regional estimates. Regional estimates are weighted by the economically active population. For detailed information by country, see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department, based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; national legislative texts; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) completed with national statistical data for the quantification of the groups legally covered. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

in the latter group. In the rest of the world only a small minority is legally covered: slightly over 20 per cent in North Africa, less than 20 per cent in Asia, Latin America and the Middle East, and just a few per cent of the economically active in sub-Saharan Africa.

When we look at countries grouped by income level we can see (table 5.1) that in high-income countries nearly 70 per cent of the labour force is covered by law for some type of unemployment protection scheme (contributory or non-contributory); the figures are less than 40 per cent in upper-middle-income countries, less than 20 per cent in lower-middle-income countries and less than 3 per cent in low-income countries.


5.2 Effective extent and level of coverage

There are no sufficient data on the effective level of potential coverage by statutory social insurance programmes at the global or regional level – that is, how many of those legally covered are actually contributing and thus may receive income support if they become unemployed, but it is known from many country cases that effective coverage is often substantially lower than legal coverage. However, for most countries which have a statutory unemployment social security scheme, there exist some data showing effective coverage by unemployment protection schemes measured as a percentage of those among the unemployed who actually receive some kind of benefit.

Figure 5.5 maps such effective coverage across the world. Again, in the majority of countries there are no unemployment protection schemes. But even in countries where the legal coverage is high, only a minority of those classified by labour force surveys as unemployed are actually receiving benefits from statutory unemployment benefit schemes. For example (see table 5.1), less than 40 per cent of all unemployed receive statutory benefits in high-income countries. The reason is obvious – many of those unemployed are long-term unemployed whose entitlement (if they ever had one) to unemployment benefit schemes has expired. Among the unemployed are also new entrants to the labour market. In many countries the unemployed are migrant workers who may not be entitled to statutory unemployment benefits. This does not mean, however, that the entire 60 per cent of unemployed not receiving any statutory unemployment benefits are without any kind of income support. Many of them probably qualify in their countries for general social assistance benefits, whether means-tested or targeted to the poor. In many countries these social assistance schemes include the families of those unemployed as a main target group.

Unfortunately there are no regularly published data from a sufficient number of countries on the numbers and structure of general social assistance benefit recipients, and thus it is impossible to calculate global or regional estimates of the coverage numbers in question. Beyond the high-income OECD countries, effective coverage is dramatically lower. This is mainly due to the fact that in many of these countries there is no social security scheme for the unemployed: in

Figure 5.5 Unemployment: Effective coverage worldwide – unemployed who actually receive benefits, latest available year (percentages)




Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15158>

Note: For detailed information by country see the Statistical Annex.

Sources: ILO Social Security Inquiry database (ILO, 2009c), compiled from data on unemployed receiving unemployment benefits collected from national social security unemployment schemes; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) for total unemployed used as the denominator. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 5.6 Unemployment: Effective coverage, regional estimates – unemployed who actually receive benefits, latest available year (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15159>


Note: Regional estimates weighted by the economically active population.

Sources: ILO Social Security Inquiry database (ILO, 2009c), compiled from data on unemployed receiving unemployment benefits collected from national social security unemployment schemes; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) for total unemployed used as the denominator. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

upper-middle-income countries slightly over 10 per cent of the unemployed receive benefits, in lower-middle-income countries less than 4 per cent and in lower-income countries less than 2 per cent (which is probably within the range of the statistical error). In addition,

in most lower-income countries there are still no large-scale social assistance schemes which would provide even a certain level of income support to the unemployed and their families. Figure 5.6 shows effective coverage by geographical region, and figure 5.7 by country,

Figure 5.7 Unemployed receiving unemployment benefits, selected countries, latest available year (percentage of total unemployed)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15160>

Notes: * Data unavailable for recipients of unemployment assistance in case of ineligibility for unemployment insurance benefit or expiry of the right to it. The overall percentage of those covered is therefore underestimated for the following countries with assistance schemes: Austria: emergency assistance; Croatia: unemployment assistance; Ireland: jobseeker's allowance (means-tested); Russian Federation: unemployment assistance; Ukraine: unemployment assistance. **United Kingdom: includes jobseeker's allowance (social insurance and social assistance). Detailed information by country is available in the Statistical Annex.

Unemployed beneficiaries of *general* social assistance schemes are not included due to unavailability of data. Including them would increase coverage rates but only in countries where such schemes exist on a larger scale (high-income and some middle-income countries).

Sources: ILO Social Security Inquiry database (ILO, 2009c), compiled from data on unemployed receiving unemployment benefits collected from national social security unemployment schemes; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) for total unemployed used as the denominator. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

for the latest available year. In Western Europe, 50 per cent of the unemployed receive benefits from contributory schemes, while another 25 per cent benefit from non-contributory schemes. Similarly high coverage is found in Australia – achieved, however, solely by a non-contributory means-tested scheme. On average, the second largest extent of effective coverage is found in North America and in Central and Eastern Europe, where about one-third and one-quarter respectively of the unemployed receive payments from contributory schemes. In Latin America this proportion is just below 10 per cent, including the limited coverage in countries where there is some unemployment social security protection such as Argentina or Brazil, and countries where there is at present no statutory provision. Coverage rates are lowest in Africa, Asia and the Middle East, where social security schemes for unemployment are still under debate rather than actually implemented.

The main conclusion from this short statistical overview of coverage by unemployment benefit schemes is that globally coverage is low and concentrated in higher-income countries. One of the reasons for this is the prevailing informality of employment in lower-income countries, which makes traditional unemployment insurance schemes not a feasible solution there. Also, unemployment insurance schemes are designed mainly to protect those who have temporarily lost employment, often due to downturns in the economic cycle; they are also relevant in case of job losses due to the restructuring of an enterprise, an industry or the whole economy. In the latter case, particularly, unemployment benefits are necessary but far from sufficient: they need to be complemented by training and retraining and other labour market policies. In lower-income countries, with a wider informal economy and more informal employment, people also lose jobs as a result of economic downturns as well as restructuring of industries or enterprises and structural adjustments of the economy. However, the main source of widespread poverty in lower-income countries is not temporary, but structural, unemployment and underemployment. The long-term solution relies on sustainable employment-generating policies, but there is still a need for interventions that alleviate the current situation. These should include income support to the unemployed and underemployed (working poor) in the form of cash transfers, as well as certain forms of basic employment guarantees in the form of public works or similar. It is for this reason that both income support and employment guarantees are among the foundations of the social protection floor (as defined in Chapter 1) promoted by the ILO and the United Nations.

Coverage by other branches of social security

6

6.1 Employment injury

Most countries in the world offer some coverage for work-related accidents (see figure 2.6). Many also include “occupational disease”: illness or disease related to employment. In fact, in most countries employment injury was the first contingency covered by social security; these schemes are often closely linked to occupational health and safety regulations. Many schemes also include preventive elements, aimed at improving workplace safety. However, coverage is limited to those working in the formal economy, and even there effective coverage is low with only a certain portion of accidents reported and compensated. In the informal economy prevailing in many low-income countries, conditions and safety of work are often dramatically bad, accidents and work-related diseases widespread and with no protection at all for their victims.

According to ILO Convention No. 102 (Article 32), the contingencies covered include the following accident-at-work or employment-related diseases:

- (a) sickness (“morbid condition”);
- (b) temporary incapacity for work resulting from such a condition;
- (c) total or partial loss of earning capacity, likely to be permanent; and
- (d) the loss of support suffered by dependants as the result of the death of the breadwinner.


The range of benefits required by Convention No. 102 includes necessary medical care, sickness benefit for the

period of incapacity for work, disability pension in case of loss of earning capacity, and survivors’ pension in case of death of a breadwinner.

Employment injury schemes providing the above benefits are often organized on a contributory basis, sometimes constituting a separate fund, sometimes merged with other social security branches. Since it is intended to link risk at the workplace with prevention targets, most countries have decided to organize employment injury schemes separately. Because of this link between workplace risk and prevention, employment injury schemes in many countries are financed from employer contributions only, which are assessed according to the specific risks in the workplace. Contribution rates are often differentiated according to the level of risk of accident or disease in different types of economic activity; this is intended to provide an incentive to enterprises to invest in reducing the probability of accidents and in other preventive measures.


Figure 6.1 shows types of employment injury scheme by region and highlights the predominance of social insurance schemes. All countries where at least one employment injury scheme of any kind exists are included in the figure. Central and Eastern Europe is the only region where social insurance schemes represent the totality of employment injury coverage; in all other regions they are complemented by employer liability schemes, especially in Africa, Asia and the Pacific. In North America, Canada has a social insurance scheme, while in the United States private insurance is mandatory.

Figure 6.1 Types of scheme providing protection in case of employment injury, by region, 2008–09 (multiple responses)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?resourceId=15161>
 Source: ILO Social Security Department based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 6.2 Extent of legal coverage by employment injury scheme, 2008–09



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?resourceId=15244>
 Sources: ILO Social Security Department based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e); national legislative texts; national statistical data for estimates of legal coverage. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Globally, estimated legal coverage represents less than 30 per cent of the working-age population, which is less than 40 per cent of the economically active.

However, there are large regional differences in legal coverage (see figure 6.2). In Central, Eastern and Western Europe as well as the CIS region and North America, around three-quarters of the economically active population is covered by employment injury schemes, whereas in Africa and Asia only around 20 per cent of this target group is covered (mainly by employer liability schemes).

The group most concerned by work injuries and diseases, as well as occupational accidents, are migrants, both regular and irregular. In most of the receiving countries – be they high-, middle- or low-income – a

majority of migrants work in the informal economy, which is globally the most important source of jobs for migrants. This situation pertains more in developing countries, such as in Egypt where some 70 per cent of all migrants start working in the informal economy; less in Europe, where irregular migrants are estimated to represent at least 1 per cent of the population (Romero-Ortuño, 2004).

Irregular migrants are vulnerable because they lack legal protection and face exclusion, very low incomes and exploitation. Work is most often in mining, construction, heavy manufacturing and agriculture, sectors with significant impacts on health; but among the most vulnerable are women working in private households.

The majority of these workers have no social protection in case of employment-related disease or accident, and they have no money to pay for any treatment they might need (Scheil-Adlung, 2009). According to the International Centre for Migration and Health,¹ in Europe the risk of occupational accidents for migrants is about two times higher than for the local workforce. Observations in African countries indicate a high incidence of occupational diseases due to chronic and unprotected exposure to pesticides and other chemical products. Unfortunately, data on effective coverage (including access to health services) exist only for selected countries – both in terms of numbers of employees effectively covered by contributions actually paid to various insurance schemes and in terms of beneficiaries of various benefits actually paid. Figure 6.3 presents the number of active contributors (or in some cases, of protected persons) as a percentage of total working-age population and total employment. Only for selected countries is there also information available on types of employment injury benefits paid – such as sickness benefit and disability and survivors' pensions – and their levels.

Still, existing data on occupational injuries can be used to some extent to assess the number of beneficiaries, since for many countries the sources of data are either labour inspections or employment injury schemes; these therefore include injuries compensated, with the relevant benefits. What is not available on a wider scale is information on unreported and uncompensated injuries. To assess this effective coverage one would need to rely more on information collected through specialized surveys.

The ILO statistical database LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) contains national series on occupational injuries.² They represent the official statistics provided by the relevant national agencies to the ILO Department of Statistics, for publication in the annual ILO *Yearbook of Labour Statistics* (ILO, 2009i). The national agencies are requested to provide the data in conformity with the most up-to-date international statistical guidelines in this field, currently the Resolution concerning statistics of occupational injuries (resulting from occupational accidents) adopted by the Sixteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) (Geneva, 1998). The Resolution contains the following definitions for statistical purposes:

¹ <http://www.who.int/workforcealliance/knowledge/en/> (accessed in 2009).

² The following text is based on methodological explanations included in LABORSTA (<http://laborsta.ilo.org>).

(a) *occupational accident*: an unexpected and unplanned occurrence, including acts of violence, arising out of or in connection with work which results in one or more workers incurring a personal injury, disease or death;

as occupational accidents are to be considered travel, transport or road traffic accidents in which workers are injured and which arise out of or in the course of work, i.e. while engaged in an economic activity, or at work, or carrying on the business of the employer;

(b) *commuting accident*: an accident occurring on the habitual route, in either direction, between the place of work or work-related training and

- (i) the worker's principal or secondary residence;
- (ii) the place where the worker usually takes his or her meals; or
- (iii) the place where he or she usually receives his or her remuneration;

which results in death or personal injury;

(c) *occupational injury*: any personal injury, disease or death resulting from an occupational accident; an occupational injury is therefore distinct from an occupational disease, which is a disease contracted as a result of an exposure over a period of time to risk factors arising from work activity;


(d) *case of occupational injury*: the case of one worker incurring an occupational injury as a result of one occupational accident;

(e) *incapacity for work*: inability of the victim, due to an occupational injury, to perform the normal duties of work in the job or post occupied at the time of the occupational accident.

The Resolution also recommends that the statistics should cover all workers regardless of their status in employment (i.e. both employees and the self-employed, including employers and own-account workers), and the whole country, all branches of economic activity and all sectors of the economy.

The following are generally excluded: cases of occupational disease (an occupational disease is a disease contracted as a result of an exposure over a period of time to risk factors arising from work activity) and cases of injury due to commuting accidents. The Resolution suggests that “where it is practical and considered relevant to include injuries resulting from commuting accidents, the information relating to them should be compiled and disseminated separately”.

Figure 6.3 Active contributors or protected persons as a percentage of working-age population and employment, latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15163>

Sources: ILO Social Security Inquiry (ILO, 2009c); ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e) and KILM (ILO, 2009h) for total employment used as a denominator. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

The type of statistics shown for a particular country depends on the source used. Data on occupational injuries are most frequently obtained from occupational accident reporting systems (e.g. to a labour inspectorate) or employment injury benefit schemes, although surveys of establishments and of households are used in a few countries. The type of source determines the coverage of the statistics. In many countries, the coverage of reporting requirements or injury compensation, and thus the coverage of the statistics, is limited to certain types of workers (employees only in many cases), certain economic activities, cases of injury with more than a certain number of days of incapacity, and so on. The type of source is shown after the country name in the LABORSTA tables, followed by the type of injury covered (reported or compensated).

The statistics relate to cases of occupational injury due to occupational accidents that occurred during the calendar year indicated. Total days lost as a result of a case of injury are included in the statistics for the calendar year in which the occupational accident took place.

Care should be taken when using these data, particularly when making international comparisons. The sources, methods of data collection, coverage and classifications used differ between countries. For example, coverage may be limited to certain types of workers (employees, insured persons, full-time workers), certain

economic activities, establishments employing more than a given number of workers, cases of injury losing more than a certain number of days of work, and so on.

The workers in the particular group under consideration and covered by the source of the statistics of occupational injuries (e.g. those of a specific sex or in a specific economic activity, occupation, region, age group, or any combination of these, or those covered by a particular compensation scheme) are known as the workers in the reference group. The number of workers in the reference group varies between countries and economic activities and from one period to another, because of differences or changes in the size and composition of employment and other factors. In order to make comparisons between countries, activities and over time, the differences in numbers need to be taken into account, e.g. by calculating comparative measures, such as frequency, incidence and severity rates.

It should be borne in mind that a rise or fall in the number of cases of occupational injury or in the rates of injury over a period of time may reflect not only changes in conditions of work and the work environment, but also modifications in reporting procedures or data collection methods, or revisions to laws or regulations governing the reporting or compensation of occupational injuries in the country concerned. Where possible, the data are classified according to economic activity and sex.

6.2 Maternity protection

Maternity protection was one of the first issues to be considered by the ILO in its first year, leading to the adoption of the Maternity Protection Convention, 1919 (No. 3). This Convention was revised in 1952 and became the Maternity Protection Convention (Revised) (No. 103) with an accompanying Recommendation (No. 95), the same year as the adoption of the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention (No. 102). Further revision took place in 2000 when the International Labour Conference adopted the Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183), with its accompanying Recommendation (No. 191). This Convention and Recommendation are the most recent ILO standards.

Maternal health is also highlighted in the ILO Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), which states that benefits in case of pregnancy and confinement and their consequences shall include at least prenatal, confinement and post-natal care either by medical practitioners or by qualified midwives, and hospitalization where necessary.

This is of high relevance, since women and young children are especially affected by a lack of access to adequate health care (UN, 2009f). Reducing maternal, neo-natal and under-5 mortality is globally among the


greatest challenges of social health protection; it concerns 11 million children who die before the age of 5, and 500,000 mothers dying during maternity (WHO, 2005). The problem is exacerbated by the fact that in many poor households health care for men and boys is generally prioritized over health care for women and girls (Dercon and Krishnan, 2000; Kabir et al., 2000).

Most countries show significant inequities in access to maternal health care as a result of place of residence, as illustrated in Figure 6.4. It shows inequities between urban and rural areas in countries at different levels of income: in lower-income countries differences between rural and urban areas in access to maternal health services are much larger than in higher-income countries (a ratio of 3.3 as opposed to 1.7).

Gaps in financial protection and poor availability of quality services are among the core reasons for under-utilization of health services in developing countries. Figure 6.5 shows differences in access to maternal health services by wealth quintile in countries at different income levels: again, inequalities in access to maternal health services are greater in lower-income countries.

In addition, low levels of female literacy and subsequent poverty or unemployment create financial barriers for women to access health care independently of their families. In many countries, the female unemployment

Figure 6.4 Inequities in access to maternal health services* in rural and urban areas, latest available year (percentage of live births)




Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15526>

Note: * Inequities in access to maternal health services are measured by births attended by skilled health personnel as a percentage of total live births in the same period. Detailed information by country is available in table 28 of the Statistical Annex.

Source: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), various years. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 6.5 Inequities in access to maternal health services* by wealth quintile by national income level of countries, latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15527>

Note: * Inequities in access to maternal health services are measured by births attended by skilled health personnel as a percentage of total live births in the same period by wealth quintiles. Detailed available information by country is available in table 28 of the Statistical Annex.

Source: ILO calculations based on WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a), various years. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

rate is much higher than the rate for men, which points to a high degree of dependency of women. In particular, women are often not able to acquire and/or spend the financial resources necessary for seeking health care and have to depend on their husbands and families.


Consequently, extending and improving social health protection for women is an important strategy for increasing women's access to maternal health services. This can be combined effectively with strategies focused on women's employment.

Among the many issues currently related to maternal health are the following. Health-care facilities are inaccessible for many households, especially in rural areas, due to the long distance to the facilities and the cost associated with travel. More pronounced, however, is the problem of a shortage of qualified staff and of modern and functional medical equipment and supplies. This lack of access affects women in particular, since the main factors of maternal mortality are obstetric complications and complications of unsafe abortion, which could be avoided through better access to good quality reproductive health care, antenatal care, skilled

birth attendance and access to emergency obstetric care. For example, more than half of the births in sub-Saharan Africa are not attended by skilled health personnel (UN, 2009f). Additionally, the health effects of HIV, malaria and other diseases increase the risk of maternal death. These diseases are particularly widespread in Africa, where two-thirds of all people with HIV live, the majority of them women.

A possible approach to addressing these barriers consists in defining essential benefit packages that guarantee access to health services; this was observed in 2007 in 55 out of 69 low- and middle-income countries (WHO, 2008, p. 27). The benefit packages provided through health protection schemes were reformed with a view to creating more equity and effectiveness, and the addressing of issues related to the conflicts inherent in approaches of universality versus targeting the poor, rationing of care, and quality. However, many of the reforms resulted in limitations of access to health care that are key for achieving global health priorities, such as those established in the Millennium Development Goals on maternal and child health care; they also

Figure 6.6 Maternity legal provision: Types of programmes worldwide, 2009



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15283>

Notes: 1. In the United States there is no national programme. Under the Family and Medical Leave Act leave is unpaid as a general rule; however, subject to certain conditions an employee may choose or an employer may require the employee to use accrued paid leave (such as vacation leave, personal leave, medical or sick leave or paid medical leave) to cover some or all of the leave she/he is entitled under the Act. A cash benefit may be provided at the state level. For example, in California, since 2004 female and male employees have been entitled to receive up to 55 per cent of their salary for six weeks to take care in particular of a newborn or adopted child. It is financed by a .08 per cent increase in state disability insurance contributions from employee pay cheques.

2. There is currently no paid maternity leave in place in Australia at the federal level. In its 2009/2010 budget the Government for the first time allocated money for a paid parental leave (PPL) scheme. The PPL scheme will be available to parents for births and adoptions that occur on or after 1 January 2011. Parents will be able to lodge PPL claims from 1 October 2010. It is expected that legislation for the scheme will be introduced to Parliament in 2010.

Sources: ILO Social Security Department based on ILO, 2009j; SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; United Nations, 2009c. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

missed adjustments to demographic and epidemiological changes, needs and perceptions and resulted in inefficiencies in the provision of services (ibid.). Countries where benefit packages have been successful have focused on integrative approaches without limiting packages to low-cost or very basic interventions (ILO, 2008h).

In Thailand, the benefit package provides for a comprehensive range of health services. It includes ambulatory services, inpatient services, free choice of providers, maternal benefits, and prevention and rehabilitation benefits provided by public and private providers.


In Ghana, the benefit package of the NHIS includes general out-patient services, in-patient services, oral health, eye care, emergencies and maternity care – including prenatal care, normal delivery, and some complicated deliveries. Only specialized services, such as HIV antiretroviral drugs, VIP accommodations and so on, are excluded from the health insurance package. According to the Legislative Instrument (LI), which accompanied Act 650, about 95 per cent of all essential or common health problems in Ghana are covered.

Legal provision for maternity protection today ranks third among social security branches providing cash benefits, after employment injury and retirement pensions (see figure 2.6). Some kind of legal provision

exists in a majority of countries (90 per cent of high-income countries, 80 per cent of middle-income countries and over 50 per cent of low-income countries). However, these provisions usually apply only to women employed in the formal economy and thus in many low- and middle-income countries only this minority enjoy benefits from maternity protection schemes. Figure 6.6 shows the types of programme existing in the nearly 180 countries for which information is available. The majority of these schemes are of the social insurance type: in two-thirds of countries, and in 52 per cent as the main or only programme; in others as a complement to employer-funded or assistance schemes. In just over a quarter of countries, maternity benefit during maternity leave should be paid directly by employers (so-called employers' liability) as legislated in the labour code or similar acts. Table 20 in the Statistical Annex presents more detailed characteristics of the existing schemes in different countries.

Convention No. 102 defines the contingency creating the entitlement to maternity benefits as “pregnancy and confinement and their consequences”, including a resulting suspension of earnings. Two types of benefit should be provided: medical care, and a cash benefit to compensate suspension of earnings. Article 49 of

Figure 6.7 Legal duration of maternity leave worldwide, 2009 (weeks)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjmi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15165>

Sources: ILO, 2009j; United Nations, 2009c. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

the Convention specifies that the medical care should include at least

(a) pre-natal, confinement and post-natal care either by medical practitioners or by qualified midwives; and (b) hospitalization where necessary. The medical care ... shall be afforded with a view to maintaining, restoring or improving the health of the woman protected and her ability to work and to attend to her personal needs... The institutions or Government departments administering the maternity medical benefit shall, by such means as may be deemed appropriate, encourage the women protected to avail themselves of the general health services placed at their disposal by the public authorities or by other bodies recognized by the public authorities.

The cash benefit paid throughout the whole period of maternity leave should be no lower than 45 per cent of previous earnings (in the case of social insurance earnings-related provision) or of typical low earnings (in the case of flat-rate categorical benefit).


The Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183), increases the above minimum requirements. Cash benefits should be provided throughout the duration of maternity leave, which should not be shorter than 14 weeks. Cash benefits should be at a level which ensures that the woman can maintain herself and her child in proper conditions of health and with a suitable standard of living. Where cash benefits are based on previous earnings, the amount of such benefits should not be less than two-thirds of the woman's previous earnings. Where other methods are used to determine the cash benefits, the amount of such benefits should be comparable.

Figure 6.7 presents an overview of maternity leave duration according to the requirements of Conventions No. 3, No. 103 and No. 183, and Recommendation No. 191.

Convention No. 183 urges member States to ensure that maternity benefits are accessible to a large majority of women in the country. Where a woman does not meet the conditions to qualify for cash benefits under the labour code or social insurance scheme, she should be entitled at least to adequate benefits from social assistance funds, subject to the means test required for such assistance.

Medical benefits should be provided for the woman and her child in accordance with national laws and regulations or in any other manner consistent with national practice. Medical benefits include prenatal, childbirth and postnatal care, as well as hospital care when necessary.

Figure 6.8 Amounts spent on paid maternity leave per year and per child, selected countries, latest available year (US\$ current)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15166>

Sources: Annual social security expenditure on maternity leave from ILO Social Security Inquiry (ILO, 2009c), and ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a). Annual crude birth rate from United Nations, 2009b. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Again, detailed information is lacking for some countries on what effective coverage is and what the actual benefit levels are. There is sometimes information on the amount spent on maternity benefits per year. Using information about the number of children born and estimates of coverage, it is possible to calculate the level of spending per child. Figure 6.8 shows the amount in dollars spent on paid maternity leave per newborn child and per year in selected countries.

Minimum income support and other social assistance

7

Both the ILO Income Security Recommendation, 1944 (No. 67), and the Minimum Standards in Social Security Convention, 1952 (No. 102), foresee that the provision of benefits ensuring protection for various contingencies may be delivered either through contributory earnings-related social insurance schemes or through flat-rate basic benefits. The latter can be universal, categorical or targeted to those of “small means”.

According to Recommendation No. 67, income security schemes should relieve want and prevent destitution by restoring, up to a reasonable level, income which is lost by reason of inability to work (including old age), or to obtain remunerative work or by reason of the death of a breadwinner. The Recommendation also says that income security schemes should be organized so far as possible on the basis of compulsory social insurance, and that only provision for needs not covered by such compulsory insurance should be made by social assistance; certain categories of persons, particularly dependent children and needy invalids, aged persons and widows, should be entitled to allowances “at reasonable rates according to a prescribed scale”. Social assistance appropriate to the needs of the case should be provided also for other persons in want.

Convention No. 102, however, leaves open choice to countries on how to provide benefits in fulfilment of the requirements of the Convention. Benefits within most social security branches can be provided either by earnings-related social insurance, or through universal flat-rate benefits to all residents in a given category, or only through income- or means-tested social assistance to all residents of “small means”.


Most of those countries with developed social security systems follow policies according to Recommendation No. 67: a large part of the population is covered by social insurance schemes, while social assistance plays only a residual role, providing income support and other benefits to the minority who for some reason are not covered by mainstream social insurance.¹ In addition, social assistance programmes are aimed at alleviating existing envelopes of poverty and social exclusion.

In the European Union (plus Iceland, Norway and Switzerland), expenditure on means-tested benefits does not exceed 3 per cent of GDP on average, while total social protection expenditure is on average over 25 per cent (see figure 7.1). While there are countries in the European Union (such as Ireland, Malta and the United Kingdom) where a relatively high share of social security benefits is delivered through targeted social assistance, nowhere does total social assistance benefit expenditure exceed 5 per cent of GDP.

Patterns of social assistance in terms of what contingencies are covered differ considerably among European countries (see figure 7.2). On average, the majority of means-tested benefits goes to the elderly, persons with disabilities and survivors (more than one-third, 1.1 per cent of GDP). Second come housing benefits (0.6 per cent of GDP); third, family benefits (0.5 per cent of GDP); fourth and fifth, income support to the unemployed (0.3 per cent of GDP) and social assistance to socially excluded groups (0.3 per cent of GDP).

¹ Australia and New Zealand are the most prominent exceptions among OECD members; in these countries income-tested benefits play a dominant role in the provision of social security.

Figure 7.1 Means-tested and non-means-tested benefit expenditure, European countries, 2007 (percentage of GDP and ratio)




Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15167>
 Source: ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a). See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

While in most of the developed countries (except Australia and New Zealand) social assistance-type schemes play an important although residual role in closing relatively small coverage gaps, in many middle- and low-income countries non-contributory income transfer schemes have been recently gaining importance. Particularly in countries with large informal economies and where only a minority are covered by social insurance schemes, non-contributory social security provides an

opportunity not only to alleviate poverty but also – at least in some cases – to fill a large part of the sizeable existing coverage gaps shown in previous chapters.


There are practically no systematically collected data which would indicate not only expenditure on such schemes, but also numbers of beneficiaries and effective coverage in terms of percentages of target groups reached. However, there exists a social assistance database containing structured descriptive and

Figure 7.2 Means-tested benefits in European countries: Totals and by function, 2007 (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15168>
 Source: ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a). See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 7.3 Social assistance expenditure, 75 countries, 2008 (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15169>


Source: World Bank, 2008. Data on 75 countries taken from World Bank public expenditure reviews and other similar work. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

mainly qualitative information on such schemes in developing countries (Barrientos, Holmes and Scott, 2008). This database includes some information on numbers of beneficiaries and total costs, but the data are not necessarily comparable across schemes and countries. There is also a data set compiled by the World Bank (World Bank, 2008) which includes certain quantitative information on “safety net” spending. This contains an inventory of social protection schemes in different countries, outlines legal coverage of main social insurance and social assistance schemes and provides estimates of annual expenditure on overall social protection, social insurance and social assistance. Based on broader estimates of spending on “social safety nets” and social protection from 75 countries studied in World Bank reports that have attempted to compile comprehensive country-specific numbers on the subject, this compilation suffers from two main problems: incomplete coverage and problems of comparability. The overall estimates in the database are not comparable with most of the estimates used in the present report (which come from ILO, OECD, EU, IMF and WHO sources); figure 7.3 shows the results for social assistance expenditure.

The Asian Development Bank provides information on expenditure by type of scheme and coverage by these schemes, measured proportionately between beneficiaries and target groups (ADB, 2008). The ADB distinguishes five categories of programmes: social insurance, social assistance, labour market programmes, child protection and micro-area-based programmes. Figure 7.4 shows the shares of these different types of programme in total social protection expenditure as defined by the Bank; it can be seen that only in a few countries do social assistance programmes play a substantial role.

The ADB report also provides coverage rates for these different types of programme, but for many countries these are based on assumptions and estimates and not on hard data from either administrative sources or household surveys. Data on a social protection programme can be made available internationally only if such data are generated at the national level. Much effort is required in the various countries to improve national databases on social security beneficiaries in general and social assistance recipients in particular. There remains also much to be done by the international community to improve and standardize the methodology used to measure coverage by social assistance, as well as to create stronger data foundations for such measurements.

Figure 7.4 Social protection expenditure by type (ADB definitions), selected countries, 2008 (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15170>

Source: ADB, 2008. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

A new generation of social assistance schemes, often called “cash transfer schemes”, has emerged over the last two decades.² Minimum income support or other social assistance schemes aim at preventing poverty through providing a minimum benefit to individuals or families that are in need. Various characteristics distinguish such schemes:

- They may or may not be means-tested.
- They may be paid for a limited or an unlimited period.
- They may be conditional or unconditional.

One example of the growing number of such income transfer schemes is the Benazir Income Support scheme in Pakistan. Created in 2008, this scheme currently provides 1,000 rupees (Rs) per month (about US\$12) to poor families, which comprise about 10 per cent of the population. The support is conditional on the monthly income of the family being less than 6,000 Rs (about US\$75) and the family owning less than three acres of land or a house of not more than 80 square yards. The cash is paid to female household members only. The programme was allocated 34 billion Rs in 2008–09. It is the third largest allocation

in the Pakistani budget and constitutes 0.3 per cent of GDP.

An overview of many such schemes, together with an analysis of their impacts, is given in *Extending social security to all: A guide through challenges and options* (ILO, 2010a). There is also a growing body of literature, to which references can be found in the above report. The overview shows that more than 30 developing countries have already implemented a range of programmes that broadly correspond with the logic underpinning the basic set of guarantees. In general, it is clear that the middle-income countries are more advanced in this field, where an increasing number of large-scale programmes have emerged during the last decade.

The flagship programmes are the Oportunidades schemes in Mexico and the Bolsa Família scheme in Brazil. Both are conditional cash transfer schemes. Bolsa Família, roughly translated as “family grant”, is the largest conditional cash transfer programme in the world. It reaches around 11.3 million families – 46 million people, corresponding to a quarter of Brazil’s population – at a cost of US\$3.9 billion (0.4 per cent of the GDP).³ Similar programmes were implemented in 16 Latin American countries, covering

² This section is based on information in ILO, 2010a.

³ UN exchange rate for January 2009: US\$ = R\$2.3.

around 70 million people or 12 per cent of the population in the region.

A further innovation is the combination of social transfers and employment guarantees. The most prominent scheme is the Indian National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS), established in 2005. Under NREGS, a rural household is entitled to demand up to 100 days of employment per year, made available on agreed schemes of public works. The programme undertakes projects facilitating land and water resource management, together with infrastructure development projects such as road construction. The wages paid are equal to the prevailing (and officially declared) minimum wage for agricultural labourers in the area. If work is not provided within the stipulated time,

the applicant is entitled to receive an unemployment allowance. The programme is designed in a manner which is effectively self-targeting, since the wage specification is such that while the poor will choose to enter the programme, the non-poor will abstain from participation. The allocation for the programme from the national budget for the financial year 2006–07 was 0.3 per cent of GDP. Official cost estimates of the scheme, once fully operational, suggest that the budget could peak at 1.5 per cent of GDP. The programme is regarded as one of the largest rights-based social protection initiatives in the world, reaching around 40 million households living below the poverty line. Owing to its relative newness, few large-scale evaluations have yet been published.

Investments in social security: Amounts, results and efficiency

8

8.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the levels of resources allocated to investments in social security in different regions of the world, and at the patterns of the sources of finance, with a view to evaluating the results of these investments in terms of poverty reduction, reductions in inequality, and other policy objectives. In order to identify the efficiency of the investments made it is obviously important to look at the relationship between resources and policy outcomes.

Since its inception the ILO has attached great importance to there being adequate and sound economic and financial foundations of the policies it promotes. This is reflected in the Declaration of Philadelphia of 1944, which is an annex to the ILO Constitution. In affirming that a fundamental objective of the ILO is that “all human beings, irrespective of race, creed or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity”, the Declaration makes it the responsibility of the ILO to assess “all national and international policies and measures, in particular those of an economic and financial character”, and states that only those which are “held to promote and not to hinder the achievement” of this fundamental objective should be accepted.

The Declaration states that “the extension of social security measures to provide a basic income to all in need of such protection and comprehensive medical care” is one of the policies on which depend the achievement of the fundamental objective stated above. And

it is clear that adequate resources for the financing of social policies in general and social security policies in particular will not be available unless sound economic and financial policies are in place.

Questions of sustainable and just financing, as well as of the effective design of benefit schemes and the overall social security system, are therefore emphasized in the ILO standards.

The Income Security Recommendation, 1944 (No. 67), the Medical Care Recommendation, 1944 (No. 69), and the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), set forth principles concerning the financial guarantees of social security systems. According to Convention No. 102, the costs of the benefits and of their administration may be borne collectively, by way of insurance contributions or taxation, or a mix of both. The mode of financing may differ according to national preferences, but in any case, Convention No. 102 specifies that the total of insurance contributions borne by protected persons should not exceed 50 per cent of the total of the overall financial resources allocated to social security in the country. Recommendation No. 67 lays down that *social insurance* should be financed by a mix of sources – both by specific social security contributions paid by protected persons and employers, and by general taxation, as follows: “The cost of benefits, including the cost of administration, should be distributed among insured persons, employers and taxpayers in such a way as to be equitable to insured persons and to avoid hardship to insured persons of small means or any disturbance to production” (Recommendation No. 67, Paragraph 26). As for social assistance,

the Recommendation refers to “public subsidies in cash or in kind, or both” for financing the maintenance of children (e.g. through child allowances) and their health care, but does not make any specific provision for the financing of other types of social assistance benefits laid down in the Recommendation. As for Recommendation No. 69, it makes a distinction between medical care provided under a social insurance service, which should be financed by way of contributions from workers and employers (and taxpayers for those costs which are not covered by contributions), and a public medical service, the costs of which should be met by public funds (by way of taxation or out of the general revenue).

Both Recommendations and the Convention are also clear that, even in cases where social security has a mainly contributory character, persons of “small means” such as those whose income is below the subsistence level should not be required to pay contributions or, as laid down in Recommendation No. 69, to pay a special tax that would be levied to finance the public medical service (at all or in the full amount); instead contributions should be fully paid on their behalf or partially subsidized from the public funds (general revenue).

According to Recommendation No. 67 there are also other circumstances where social insurance contributions should be complemented by funds provided from the general revenue:

- (a) the contribution deficit resulting from bringing persons into insurance when they are already elderly;
- (b) the contingent liability involved in guaranteeing the payment of basic invalidity, old-age and survivors’ benefits and the payment of adequate maternity benefit;
- (c) the liability resulting from the continued payment of unemployment benefit when unemployment persists at an excessive level.

The government of a country which has ratified Convention No. 102 is under an obligation to accept general responsibility for the due provision of the benefits provided in compliance with the Convention, and should take all measures required for this purpose; it should ensure, where appropriate, that the necessary actuarial studies and calculations concerning financial equilibrium are made periodically and, in any event, prior to any changes in benefits, the rate of insurance contributions, or the taxes allocated to covering the contingencies in question.

Recommendation No. 67 specifies here that contribution rates to social insurance schemes should not exceed the rate necessary to ensure collective financial

equivalence – that is, the rate which would yield, in the future, contribution income from all the insured persons such that its expected present value would be equal to the expected present value of the benefits due in the future to all those insured and their dependants. However, Recommendation No. 67 advises that “the rates of contribution of insured persons and employers should be kept as stable as possible, and for this purpose a stabilization fund should be constituted”.

The Recommendation also attaches great importance to the proper coordination of the social security system: the administration should be unified or coordinated within a general system of social security services, and contributors (both employed and employers) should, through their organizations, be represented on the bodies which determine or advise upon administrative policy and propose legislation or frame regulations. If there is a separate authority administering social insurance it should be associated with the authorities administering social assistance, medical care services and employment services in a coordinating body for matters of common interest. Central and regional advisory councils, representing – in addition to trade unions and employers – such bodies as farmers’ associations, women’s associations and child protection societies, should be established for the purpose of making recommendations for the amendment of the law and administrative methods, and generally of maintaining contact between the administration and protected persons.

In addition, Recommendation No. 67 includes a clear concern with the need to achieve a balance between benefit adequacy, labour market incentives and the financing burden involved: “Benefits should replace lost earnings, with due regard to family responsibilities, up to as high a level as is practicable without impairing the will to resume work where resumption is a possibility, and without levying charges on the productive groups so heavy that output and employment are checked” (Paragraph 22).

8.2 Resources allocated to the financing of social security across the world


How much are countries investing in social security and how is it financed? On average, 17.2 per cent of global GDP is allocated to social security. However, these expenditures tend to be concentrated in higher-income countries, and so this average does not reflect the situation for the majority of the world’s population,

Table 8.1 Social security expenditure by region and globally, latest available year (percentage of GDP)

	Social security expenditure (excluding health) as a percentage of GDP			Public health expenditure as a percentage of GDP			Total social security expenditure as a percentage of GDP		
	GDP weighted	Simple average	Population weighted	GDP weighted	Simple average	Population weighted	GDP weighted	Simple average	Population weighted
Western Europe	17.9	16.7	18.0	7.1	6.4	7.1	25.0	23.2	25.1
Central and Eastern Europe	14.5	13.9	14.1	5.0	5.0	4.8	19.5	18.9	18.9
North America	9.0	9.3	9.0	7.0	6.9	7.0	15.9	16.2	16.0
North Africa	10.5	9.5	11.0	2.5	2.4	2.5	13.0	11.9	13.6
CIS	9.0	8.2	9.9	3.9	2.7	3.6	12.9	10.9	13.5
Asia and the Pacific	7.9	3.6	3.6	4.2	3.3	1.7	12.0	6.9	5.3
Middle East	8.8	6.6	7.6	2.8	2.8	2.2	11.6	9.4	9.8
Latin America and the Caribbean	6.6	4.0	7.1	3.1	3.4	3.1	9.7	7.4	10.2
Sub-Saharan Africa	5.6	2.3	2.8	3.1	2.4	2.5	8.7	4.8	5.3
Total (138)	11.3	7.1	5.7	5.9	3.8	2.7	17.2	10.9	8.4

Sources: IMF, 2009; OECD, SOCX (OECD, 2009a); ILO Social Security Inquiry (ILO, 2009c); ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a); WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a). Country data are available in the Statistical Annex. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 8.1 Social security expenditure by region, weighted by population, latest available year (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjmi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15126>

Sources: As for table 8.1. Country data, definitions and interpretation issues are available in the Statistical Annex.

who live in lower-income countries where much less is invested in social security. An alternative measurement which better reflects the situation is a simple mean of the proportions of GDP allocated to social security in different countries. This reveals that, on average, countries in the world allocate 10.9 per cent of their respective gross domestic products to social security. The size of the population in different countries can also be used as a weight to calculate mean percentages of GDP: in this case the result shows that for the “average” resident only 8.4 per cent of the GDP of the country is

allocated as social security benefits in the form of cash and in-kind transfers (see table 8.1 for all results).


Country figures vary widely among the populations living in different regions, and among countries of different national income levels. While residents of Europe can see between 20 and 30 per cent of GDP invested in their social security, in most African countries only 4–6 per cent of GDP is spent on social security benefits; most of these funds are spent on health care rather than on cash transfers aimed at providing income security (see figure 8.1).

Table 8.2 Social security expenditure by income level and globally, latest available year (percentage of GDP)

	Social security expenditure (excluding health) as a percentage of GDP			Public health expenditure as a percentage of GDP			Total social security expenditure as a percentage of GDP		
	GDP weighted	Simple average	Population weighted	GDP weighted	Simple average	Population weighted	GDP weighted	Simple average	Population weighted
Low income	2.1	2.0	2.3	1.4	2.1	1.6	3.5	4.1	3.9
Middle income	6.2	6.6	4.8	2.7	3.5	1.9	8.9	10.1	6.7
High income	12.7	12.9	12.8	6.7	5.5	6.6	19.5	18.4	19.4
Total (138)	11.3	7.1	5.7	5.9	3.8	2.7	17.2	10.9	8.4

Sources: As for table 8.1. Country data are available in the Statistical Annex.

Figure 8.2 Social security expenditure by income level, weighted by population, 2000 compared with latest available year (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15127>

Sources: As for table 8.1. Country data are available in the Statistical Annex.

Higher-income countries in general spend more as a proportion of GDP than low-income countries do. While low-income countries spend from public resources an average of less than 4 per cent of their GDP on health care and non-health social security income transfers, in middle-income countries this proportion is at least twice as high (7–10 per cent), and in high-income countries about five times higher (about 20 per cent; see table 8.2 and figure 8.2).


Figure 8.2 compares the recent situation (data for the latest available year depending on the country) with that in the year 2000. This comparison should be treated with caution, in that data for 2000 are available for a slightly smaller number of countries, and the availability of data for the range of contingencies included has improved in some countries. Still, it seems that there has been a global increase in the share of GDP allocated to social security. Most of this increase has

taken place in middle- and higher-income countries, less in low-income countries.

Figure 8.3 shows that health and pension expenditure dominate everywhere – however, where in low-income countries health care has the largest position in social security expenditure, in other countries it is pensions that dominate. Only in higher-income countries is expenditure on branches such as unemployment benefits and family benefits significant in terms of resources allocated.

There is also a clear correlation between the amount of resources allocated to social security and the level of vulnerability of a country (defined, as earlier in this report, in relation to two combined characteristics – poverty incidence and degree of informality of the labour market; see figure 8.4). Those countries with the highest investments in social security are also the ones with both low labour market informality and low

Figure 8.3 Social security expenditure by income level and branch, weighted by population, latest available year (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15128>

Note: The number of countries for which detailed social security data on expenditure by branch are available is smaller than the number of countries covered for the calculation of total expenditure as presented in figure 8.2. This explains some differences in the results for total expenditure.

Sources: As for table 8.1.


poverty incidence. Also, only in countries with very low vulnerability levels are pensions the largest expenditure item – in all other groups it is health-care expenditure that dominates.

Already revealed in our earlier analysis of coverage gaps in respect of various contingencies, here again the serious imbalances in the allocation of resources to social security in countries with lower incomes, high poverty rates and large informal economies can be clearly seen. Not only are the resources allocated low (which is reflected by the low coverage analysed earlier), but in addition the structure of expenditure does not match obvious patterns of social priorities. While the domination of health-care spending is understandable where the resource base is small, and cannot be

questioned as a priority, it is still true that near negligible resources are allocated to income support measures other than contributory pensions – such as cash benefits to families with children, to those unemployed or to the poor.

Although this prevailing pattern shows a strong correlation between income levels and amounts of resources allocated to social security, it cannot be concluded from this that social security is a “luxury” good. On the contrary, low-income countries with high poverty incidence and large informal economies need social security even more than other countries, although they may have different priorities with respect to which branches should be developed first and how benefits should be financed and delivered. And there are many


Figure 8.4 Social security expenditure by vulnerability and branch, weighted by population, latest available year (percentage of GDP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15129>

Sources: As for table 8.1. Country data are available in the Statistical Annex.

Figure 8.5 Size of government resources (ratio of government expenditure to GDP) and amount of social security expenditure (percentage of GDP), latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15130>

Sources: Social security expenditure as a percentage of GDP: as for table 8.1. Government expenditure as a percentage of GDP: IMF, 2009. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).


studies clearly showing that social security in those countries not only can be made affordable but is also necessary as a factor in development (see for example ILO, 2008d; OECD, 2009e; Townsend, 2009).

There is certainly a correlation between the size of overall government expenditure in a country and the size of its social security expenditure (both measured as a percentage of its GDP; see figure 8.5). The link works both ways: on the one hand a certain minimum fiscal space is needed to finance social security programmes; on the other, the expansion of social security creates further incentives to raise more resources. However, it is also clear from figure 8.5 that countries with a similar size of government resources (“small” or “big”) may take very different decisions as to the share of these resources allocated to social security. We see countries with relatively “small” government allocating a large share of these limited public resources to social security programmes, and at the same time countries with “big” government unwilling to finance large-scale social security programmes. Thus, the size of social security investment (and, it follows, the extent and level of coverage of the population of the country by social security) depends to a significant extent on the prevailing political and social will (of the governments, of the taxpayers, of the electorate): it is this that effectively defines the fiscal space available to finance this and not other programmes.

All countries, whatever their level of income, enjoy a certain degree of freedom. Figure 8.6 shows that there exists a very weak correlation between levels of GDP and size of government. Countries at similar income levels differ significantly with respect to the size of government measured by the size of public finance. In many cases this is a result of different, often historically shaped, societal preferences. In some cases, however, where government expenditure is very small this may simply indicate a low capacity on the part of the authorities to raise and collect taxes and other revenue. In such countries the main challenge is to introduce and enforce tax reforms to increase fiscal resources, including, in particular, enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of tax collection. But it may also mean the need to revise spending programmes, making them more adequate to societal preferences in order to increase the willingness of the taxpayer to pay taxes.

After reaching a certain level of fiscal revenue countries can exercise a significant degree of discretion in choosing which public programmes to invest in. Of course this discretion does not mean that choices are easy – there are always opportunity costs behind any such decision and expenditure planning should combine the democratic process, reflecting societal preferences, with a careful quantities analysis of the social cost of benefits for the different alternatives. Figure 8.7 shows that, at any size of government, countries have some


Figure 8.6 Size of government resources (ratio of government expenditure to GDP) and GDP per capita, latest available year (international \$ PPP)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15131>

Sources: As for table 8.1.

Figure 8.7 Share of government spending invested in social security and size of government (ratio of government expenditure to GDP), latest available year



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15132>

Sources: As for table 8.1.

choice as to what portion of public resources to invest in social security; and that even countries with relatively very small government (as expressed by government spending in the range of 20–25 per cent of GDP) differ significantly in their decisions on the share of these resources devoted to financing social security programmes: one-tenth, one-fifth, one-third or more than half.

How decisions are made is thus crucial for the organization and financing of public social security programmes. The main choice is to what extent these programmes should be organized as contributory social insurance and to what extent as non-contributory programmes accessible to all residents or all residents in a specified category. As discussed earlier, the success of

Table 8.3 Structure of social security receipts by type and sector of origin, 27 EU Member States, 2007

Type of receipt	Sector of origin					Total receipts
	Government	Corporations	Households	Non-profit institutions serving households	Rest of the world	
General revenue	37.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.9
Contributions	8.2	29.0	20.8	0.7	0.0	58.7
Other receipts	1.1	1.5	0.4	0.0	0.4	3.3
Total receipts	47.2	30.5	21.2	0.7	0.4	100.0

Source: ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a).

the different forms of social security organization and financing depends to a large extent on labour market structure, the proportion of formal wage and salary employment in total employment, and the scope of the informal economy.

A comprehensive data set which would allow the identification of global financing patterns of social security is not yet available, although the ILO collects data on sources of finance for social security expenditure as part of its Social Security Inquiry (ILO, 2009c). With respect to public health-care expenditure, financing from general taxation dominates financing from social security contributions (WHO estimates of national health accounts; see also Chapter 3 of this report). Slightly less than one-quarter of national public health expenditure worldwide is financed from social insurance contributions (24.7 per cent). Social health insurance contributions finance slightly more than half of public health-care expenditure in Europe and Central Asia (51.1 per cent), 27.1 per cent in the Americas, 12 per cent in Asia, the Middle East and Northern Africa and only 3 per cent in sub-Saharan Africa. The picture is different if one takes not simple averages but weights the average with the size of health expenditure. Then, globally and in all countries apart from low-income countries, about 40 per cent of health expenditure is financed by contributory social security schemes, while in low-income countries the amount is only 7 per cent. At the same time, many low-income countries depend to a significant extent on foreign aid for the financing of their health-care needs: in these countries the external financing of healthcare was in 2006 on average equal nearly to half of its public health care financing (46 per cent) and has since increased significantly compared to the 2000 level of this proportion (35 per cent).¹

There are no similar global estimates for non-health social security financing patterns. It is obvious, however, from the coverage patterns that contributory social security schemes dominate, although they cover – in particular in lower-income countries – only a minority of the population. But actual comprehensive data exist only for selected countries. In the long run the objective is to be able to estimate all financing patterns of social security systems – both health and non-health – by type of receipt and sector of origin. It should be possible to estimate for every country what the European Union can already do for its 27 Member States (as well as several other European countries) through its statistical office EUROSTAT with its Integrated Social Protection Statistics methodology and ESSPROS database. These figures are presented in table 8.3.

From the table one can see that nearly 60 per cent of total receipts are social security contributions, of which 30 per cent comes from non-governmental employers, more than 20 per cent from employees and other protected persons (that is, from households), 8 per cent from the governments as employers, and less than 1 per cent from non-governmental organizations as employers. Most of the rest comes from general taxation – collected, of course, from corporations and households. Slightly over 3 per cent of the total revenue comes from other receipts – of which a large part comes from investment income from social security funds. Government is the largest financier of social security systems in the European Union (47 per cent), with 30 per cent paid directly by corporations and 21 per cent by households.

¹ Recalculated using WHO, 2009b.

8.3 Measuring effectiveness and efficiency of investments in social security: An overview of approaches in selected international organizations

Comprehensive social security requires significant investments of public resources and, like any other set of publicly financed programmes, it requires monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to be put in place so that a government and its social partners can assess the effectiveness of its policies, as well as their efficiency (that is, a relationship between resources invested and outcomes achieved). National policies should be assessed against their objectives; it is thus very important that such objectives are clearly stated when policies are formulated and social security schemes and systems designed or redesigned, and that these objectives are known to all the stakeholders. It is not feasible to assess, within an internationally comparative framework, the currently very differentiated social security systems in the various countries, operating in quite different circumstances and thus with different priorities, and aiming to achieve very different country-specific policy objectives. Such a comparison is not only beyond the ambitions of this report; it is simply impossible.

Social security systems and their individual components always have multiple objectives: among others, to reduce poverty, prevent poverty, reduce income inequality, and provide income replacement of lost or reduced income due to various life contingencies, thus “smoothing” consumption of individuals and their families over the life cycle. In the different countries there are bound to be various needs and priorities with respect to these objectives, which are then reflected in different designs of social security programmes – more or less focused on poverty reduction or prevention, more or less focused on consumption smoothing, more or less focused on redistribution. In assessing the effects of social security systems it is therefore necessary to consider multiple dimensions. At the same time, no social security system works in isolation; it exists in a context of socio-economic circumstances and is accompanied by other economic and social policies. It is not always possible to identify which circumstances and which policies have played a more important role, nor the importance of combinations of specific policies and circumstances.

This section looks at attempts to assess effectiveness and efficiency of social security programmes carried out by selected international organizations – the European Union, OECD and ADB.

8.3.1 Monitoring social protection in the European Union²

Within a so-called Open Method of Coordination (OMC) on Social Protection and Social Inclusion, it has been agreed that the overarching objectives of the social protection and social inclusion processes are to promote:

- (a) social cohesion, equality between men and women and equal opportunities for all through adequate, accessible, financially sustainable, adaptable and efficient social protection systems and social inclusion policies;
- (b) effective and mutual interaction between the Lisbon objectives of greater economic growth, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion, and with the EU’s Sustainable Development Strategy;
- (c) good governance, transparency and the involvement of stakeholders in the design, implementation and monitoring of policy.

Within this framework Member States of the European Union periodically prepare national strategies and submit them to the European Commission in the form of National Reports on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion. In these reports, Member States report on agreed sets of common objectives in this policy area. There are four sets of objectives: in addition to the three overarching objectives listed above, there are specific objectives in three strands: social inclusion, pensions and health care (including long-term care).

The European Commission then drafts a report for joint adoption by the Commission and the European Council. This report summarizes the main issues and trends and assesses Member States’ progress in reaching the common objectives. It also reviews how social protection and social inclusion policies are contributing to the Lisbon goals of employment and growth and assesses how progress towards these goals is having an impact on social cohesion.

The above reporting framework uses a set of commonly agreed indicators and context information, which are calculated and regularly updated by EUROSTAT on the basis of the commonly agreed definitions and presented on the EUROSTAT web site on well-identified and dedicated pages. Indicators are used to monitor the overarching objectives, as well as the specific objectives of the three strands: social inclusion, pensions and health care. An EU-level analysis of the indicators is carried out by the Commission, discussed

² For further details see European Commission, 2009b.

with the indicators Sub-Group of the Social Protection Committee (SPC), and made available to Member States in advance of the preparation of the National Reports on Social Protection and Social Inclusion.

Three categories of indicators are used:

- commonly agreed EU indicators contributing to a comparative assessment of progress by Member States towards the common objectives. These indicators may refer to social outcomes, intermediate social outcomes or outputs;
- commonly agreed national indicators based on commonly agreed definitions and assumptions that provide key information to assess the progress of Member States in relation to certain objectives, while not allowing for a direct cross-country comparison, or not necessarily having a clear normative interpretation. These indicators are especially suited to measure the scale and nature of policy intervention. They should be interpreted jointly with the relevant background information (exact definition, assumptions, representativeness);
- context information: each portfolio will have to be assessed in the light of key context information, and by referring to past and, where relevant, future trends.

For monitoring the overarching objectives the European Union uses the following 14 indicators, most of them presented by gender and for different age groups:

1. *At-risk-of-poverty rate*: Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalized disposable income below 60 per cent of the national median equivalized disposable income; and *relative median poverty risk gap*: Difference between the median equivalized income of persons aged 0+ below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold and the threshold itself, expressed as a percentage of the at-risk-of-poverty threshold.
2. *Quintile ratio*: Ratio of total income received by the 20 per cent of the country's population with the highest income (top quintile) to that received by the 20 per cent of the country's population with the lowest income (lowest quintile). Income must be understood as equivalized disposable income.
3. *Healthy life expectancy*: Number of years that a person at birth, at 45 and at 65 is still expected to live in a healthy condition (also called disability-free life expectancy).
4. *Early school leavers*: Share of persons aged 18 to 24 who have only lower secondary education (highest level of education or training attained is 0, 1 or 2 according to the 1997 International Standard Classification of Education – ISCED 97 (UNESCO, 1997)) and who have not received education or training in the four weeks preceding the survey.
5. *People living in jobless households*: Proportion of people living in jobless households.
6. *Projected total public social expenditures*: Age-related projections of total public social expenditures (e.g. pensions, health care, long-term care, education and unemployment transfers), current level (percentage of GDP) and projected change in share of GDP (in percentage points) for the years 2010–20–30–40–50.
7. *Median relative income of elderly people*: Median equivalized income of people aged 65+ as a ratio of income of people aged 0–64; and *aggregate replacement ratio*: Median individual pensions of persons aged 65–74 relative to median individual earnings of those aged 50–59, excluding other social benefits.
8. *Self-reported unmet need for medical care*: Total self-reported unmet need for medical care for the following three reasons: financial barriers, waiting times too long, too far to travel.
9. *At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a fixed moment in time*: Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalized disposable income below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold calculated from the year 2004, up-rated by inflation over the years.
10. *Employment rate of older workers*: Persons in employment in age groups 55–59 and 60–64 as a proportion of total population in the same age group.
11. *In-work poverty risk*: Individuals who are classified as employed (distinguishing between “wage and salary employment plus self-employment” and “wage and salary employment” only) and who are at risk of poverty.
12. *Activity rate*: Share of employed and unemployed people in total population of working age group 15–64.
13. *Regional disparities – coefficient of variation of employment rates*: Standard deviation of regional employment rates divided by the weighted national average (age group 15–64 years).
14. *Total health expenditure per capita*: Total health expenditure per capita in PPP.

The above indicators are analysed together with a number of context indicators: *GDP growth, employment rates, unemployment rates, life expectancy at birth and at 65, dependency ratio* (current and projected), *distribution of population by household type, public debt* (current and projected), *social protection expenditure* (current, by function, gross and net), *jobless households* (by main household type), *marginal effective tax rates, net income of social assistance recipients as a percentage of the at-risk-of-poverty threshold* (for selected jobless household type), *at-risk-of-poverty rate before social transfers* (other than pensions) and *change in projected theoretical replacement ratio for base case 2004–2050*.

There are also three sets of more detailed indicators designed to monitor specific objectives in the three strands: pensions, health and social inclusion (see European Commission, 2009b).


As one can see, the indicators listed above are mainly (but not all) indirect outcome indicators of social security, assessing situations with respect to poverty, income inequality and relative incomes, health status and access to health and education, and labour market behaviour. Only a few indicators are related more directly to social security coverage, and then to only some of its dimensions. There are pension replacement rates derived from household survey data, as well as theoretical replacement rates derived from existing legislation in force at present, and in the future as a

result of reforms undertaken. There is a subjective measure of coverage gap in terms of health care (self-reported unmet need for medical care due to financial barriers, or waiting time too long, or too far to travel); and there are two indicators related to the level of resources allocated to social security: current and projected age-related social expenditure and total (public and private) health expenditure per capita.

Let us look briefly at some of these indicators and how they are related to resources invested in social security. Figure 8.8 shows the average percentage incidence of persons reporting unmet health needs in the three lowest quintiles (on the vertical axis) plotted against percentage of GDP spent by countries on health care from public funds.

It seems that higher public spending on health helps to decrease coverage gaps in health care (as measured by the subjective assessment of barriers to access) but of course it is not the only factor. There are countries where, despite relatively high expenditure, perceived barriers to access are still rather high, and there are also countries with middle levels of expenditure where the health-care access gap is lower than in some countries with higher expenditure. Efficiency of expenditure depends to a large extent on how a social security system and its specific components are organized in terms of providing effective coverage to all, in particular to all those with lower incomes, in its three


Figure 8.8 Percentage of lower-income persons (first three income quintiles) reporting unmet health needs, and public spending on health (percentage of GDP), European Union countries, 2007



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15133>

Source: ILO calculations based on ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a). See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 8.9 Non-pension cash transfers: Reduction in poverty risk, European Union countries, 2007



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15134>

Source: ILO calculations based on ESSPROS (European Commission, 2009a).

dimensions – scope of benefits available, extent of the population covered and level and quality of benefits delivered.

Another indicator relates to the effectiveness of transfers in reducing poverty. Figure 8.9 shows on its vertical axis the percentage reduction in poverty risk achieved by cash transfers other than pensions, while the horizontal axis shows national expenditure on these transfers as a percentage of GDP. Here again we can see that, in general, the greater the resources invested, the stronger the impact from the point of view of the objectives of such transfers. However, once again some countries show higher than average poverty reduction despite relatively lower than average expenditure. For these countries it can be said that investments in social security are more efficient, giving higher returns in terms of poverty reduction and prevention. On the other hand, it must be remembered that poverty reduction is not the only objective of the social security system, and that some countries may have different priorities with respect to these different objectives and design their social security scheme accordingly.

8.3.2 Monitoring social protection in the OECD

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development does not have a monitoring mechanism similar to the Open Method of Coordination in the European Union. However, over the years the OECD

has developed a methodology for monitoring various social policies, as well as databases which can be used to calculate various indicators of social outcomes in addition to social policy processes. The results and analysis are periodically presented in the report *Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators* (OECD, 2009f). The objective of these indicators, as stated in the report, is to address two questions:

1. Compared with their own past and with other OECD countries, what progress have countries made in their social development?
2. How effective have the actions of society been in furthering social development?

OECD social indicators are grouped along two dimensions. The first dimension considers the nature of these indicators:

- *Social context* indicators refer to variables that, while not usually direct policy targets, are crucial for understanding the social policy context (such as demographic indicators).
- *Social status* indicators describe the social outcomes that policies try to influence (such as poverty rates, inequality measures, and so on).
- *Societal response* indicators provide information about what society is doing to affect social status indicators. Societal responses include indicators of government policy settings.

The second dimension groups indicators according to the broad policy fields that they cover. Four broad objectives of social policy are used to classify indicators of social status and social response:

- *Self-sufficiency*
- *Equity*
- *Health status*
- *Social cohesion*

While there seems to be agreement concerning the main policy objectives, it seems there is less with respect to the list of specific indicators: different editions of *Society at a Glance* have included different indicators, although some have been published in all editions. Among the indicators used at least once in the report there are a number in the “societal response” category which relate directly to social security:

Self-sufficiency

- Adequacy of benefits of last resort: net incomes of social assistance recipients as a percentage equivalent of median household income

Equity

- Public social protection spending
- Total social protection spending (public and private)
- Private social protection spending
- Percentage of unemployed receiving benefits
- Pension replacement rates

Health

- Health-care expenditure
- Responsibility for financing health care (public and private)
- Percentage of elderly receiving long-term care

In addition to *Society at a Glance* (OECD, 2009f), the OECD also publishes periodically the reports *Pensions at a Glance* (OECD, 2009c) and *Health at a Glance* (OECD, 2009g) which also contain sets of indicators calculated for most of the member countries, including a number of specific social security indicators. Other OECD research and publications focus on the effectiveness and efficiency of social policies and in particular social security transfers. The recently published report *Growing unequal?* (OECD, 2009b) on income inequality and poverty in OECD countries has two sections specifically on the role and impact of social security transfers: “How much redistribution do governments achieve? The role of cash transfers and household taxes” (Chapter 4, pp. 97–124) and “The role of

household taxes and public cash transfers in reducing income poverty” (Chapter 5, pp. 139–143).

The OECD analysis of the redistributive force of social transfers on the one hand and taxes paid by households on the other gives interesting results. The report calculated indicators of concentration of both transfers and taxes, using a measure similar to the Gini coefficient. Social transfers are usually concentrated in lower-income households; this is why the concentration coefficient used – see column D in table 8.4 – has a negative sign for most of the countries. If transfers were distributed equally to all households the coefficient value would be 0; its high negative value shows that a larger share of transfers goes to households with lower incomes. Taxes are usually progressive; thus the concentration index is positive and higher when a larger share of taxes is paid by higher-income households.

Table 8.4 shows that in OECD countries the redistributive force of transfers is far more differentiated than that of taxes. Of course the highest concentration occurs in those countries where a major part of the social security system is based on income or means-tested benefits (as in Australia, Denmark or New Zealand); it is much lower in countries where earnings-related social insurance provisions dominate social security (Austria, France, Germany, Italy and a number of others). In the latter countries a large part of the social security system is less concerned with the pure redistribution of income than with income smoothing for persons at all income levels. This is clearly visible when we look at the “efficiency” indicator for transfers presented in column C of table 8.4, and at the same time study figure 8.10. As a general trend, the higher the cash transfers, the stronger the inequality reduction effect. However, there is a group of countries with relatively higher spending but lower effectiveness in inequality reduction. The efficiency index (as calculated by table 8.4) is thus lower for those countries, but any assessment of effectiveness and efficiency should take into account all important multiple objectives of the social security system, not just the one. As already pointed out, different countries have different priorities in their social security policies and accordingly allocate resources to different components of their social security systems. Table 8.5 shows the concentration of transfers for different social security branches in various OECD countries. Non-pension benefits (benefits to the unemployed, families with children, housing support and other social assistance benefits) are in general more concentrated within

Table 8.4 Effectiveness and efficiency of social security cash transfers received by households, and taxes paid by households, 22 OECD countries, mid-2000

	A. Effectiveness index (inequality reduction)		B. Size (share of household disposable income)		C. Efficiency index A / (B/100)		D. Concentration index	
	Household taxes	Public cash transfers	Household taxes	Public cash transfers	Household taxes	Public cash transfers	Household taxes	Public cash transfers
Australia	0.045	0.097	23.4	14.3	0.193	0.679	0.533	-0.400
Austria	0.029	0.052	33.4	36.6	0.086	0.142	0.381	0.157
Belgium	0.037	0.119	38.3	30.5	0.096	0.391	0.398	-0.120
Canada	0.037	0.060	25.8	13.6	0.145	0.444	0.492	-0.152
Czech Republic	0.037	0.114	21.6	24.3	0.170	0.468	0.471	-0.154
Denmark	0.042	0.118	52.5	25.6	0.080	0.461	0.349	-0.316
Finland	0.038	0.065	30.1	14.4	0.127	0.449	0.428	-0.219
France	0.020	0.056	26.0	32.9	0.079	0.171	0.374	0.136
Germany	0.046	0.086	35.5	28.2	0.130	0.303	0.468	0.013
Ireland	0.041	0.100	19.4	17.7	0.210	0.565	0.570	-0.214
Italy	0.047	0.073	30.2	29.2	0.156	0.251	0.546	0.135
Japan	0.003	0.048	19.7	19.7	0.015	0.244	0.378	0.010
Rep. of Korea	0.005	0.011	8.0	3.6	0.067	0.312	0.380	-0.012
Luxembourg	0.032	0.066	23.8	30.6	0.135	0.215	0.420	0.085
Netherlands	0.041	0.080	24.7	17.1	0.166	0.468	0.471	-0.198
New Zealand	0.038	0.080	29.0	13.0	0.132	0.615	0.498	-0.345
Norway	0.027	0.093	33.2	21.7	0.082	0.427	0.376	-0.183
Slovakia	0.028	0.094	20.0	26.0	0.138	0.361	0.422	-0.056
Sweden	0.032	0.121	43.2	32.7	0.075	0.368	0.337	-0.145
Switzerland	-0.012	0.057	36.0	16.0	-0.034	0.355	0.223	-0.170
United Kingdom	0.039	0.085	24.1	14.5	0.164	0.586	0.533	-0.275
United States	0.044	0.041	25.6	9.4	0.170	0.434	0.586	-0.089
OECD-22	0.032	0.078	28.3	21.4	0.117	0.396	0.438	-0.114

Note: The effectiveness index is defined as the percentage point reduction in the Gini coefficient of income inequality due to household taxes (i.e. between gross and disposable income) and cash transfers (i.e. between market and gross income) in each OECD country. The efficiency index is the effectiveness index of taxes and transfers divided by the respective share of taxes and transfers in each country. The concentration index of household taxes and public cash transfers is computed in the same way as the Gini coefficient of household income, so that a value of zero means that all income groups receive an equal share of household transfers or pay an equal share of taxes. However, individuals are ranked by their equalized household disposable incomes.

Source: OECD, 2009b, table 4.6.

poorer households than pension benefits, which are more often strictly earnings-related and have limited redistributive force.

These findings are once again confirmed in another graph borrowed from the excellent OECD report on inequality (2009b). Figure 8.11 shows on the one hand the relationship between the poverty rates achieved after social security transfers to persons of working age and the social security transfers aimed at this group of the population. A second graph shows a similar relationship with respect to poverty among the elderly and transfers to that group. While for those of working age there is a clear and strong relationship (higher transfers

result in less poverty), the situation is much more complex with respect to the elderly and the impact of pension transfers on reducing poverty within the population of older people. Some countries spend not so much on pensions but still achieve strong poverty reduction effects (Canada, Netherlands or New Zealand). At the same time there are countries where spending is much higher but the poverty reduction effects are comparable (Austria, France, Germany, Poland). Are the public pension systems in the second group of countries less efficient than in the first? Yes – but only if poverty reduction were to be the only objective of the pension system. In fact, pension systems have multiple

Table 8.5 Concentration coefficients of benefits in different branches of social security, 27 OECD countries, mid-2000

	Old-age pensions	Disability benefits	Compensation for occupational injury and diseases	Survivor benefits	Family cash benefits	Unemployment benefits	Housing benefits	Other benefits
Australia	-0.47	-0.35	...	-0.30	-0.33	-0.44	...	-0.40
Austria	0.25	0.14	0.16	0.00	-0.09	-0.17	-0.48	-0.05
Belgium	-0.09	-0.27	-0.13	-0.14	0.03	-0.22	-0.15	-0.50
Canada	-0.11	-0.46	-0.06	...	-0.22
Czech Republic	-0.11	-0.06	...	0.19	-0.26	-0.28	-0.66	-0.36
Denmark	-0.49	-0.18	-0.04	-0.22	-0.58	-0.37
Finland	-0.44	0.07	0.12	0.02	-0.07	-0.24	-0.61	-0.39
France	0.25	0.14	...	0.05	-0.13	0.08	-0.55	-0.23
Germany	0.10	...	0.07	-0.04	-0.04	-0.28	0.00	-0.24
Greece	0.15	0.06	0.25	0.02	-0.02	0.04	-0.17	-0.11
Hungary	0.01	-0.06	-0.25	...	-0.17
Ireland	-0.32	-0.27	0.27	0.08	-0.21	-0.07	-0.46	0.02
Italy	0.22	0.90	-0.52	-0.04	...	-0.05
Japan	0.02	-0.11	...	-0.33
Luxembourg	0.17	0.00	...	0.13	-0.02	-0.09	-0.41	-0.52
Netherlands	-0.16	-0.11	...	-0.14	-0.36	0.03	-0.65	-0.37
New Zealand	-0.32	-0.35	-0.41	0.02	-0.43	-0.38	-0.37	-0.14
Norway	-0.27	-0.06	...	-0.18	-0.06	-0.12	-0.65	-0.24
Poland	0.26	0.04	0.40	0.15	-0.22	0.13	-0.26	-0.13
Portugal	0.33	0.03	...	0.03	...	0.20	0.13	-0.77
Slovakia	0.00	-0.19	-0.01	0.24	-0.01	-0.07	0.84	-0.59
Spain	0.04	0.11	0.14	0.05	0.35	0.02	0.48	0.02
Sweden	-0.19	0.25	0.25	...	-0.07	-0.10	-0.66	-0.16
Switzerland	-0.19	-0.02	-0.15	...	-0.29
Turkey	0.37	0.07	...	0.25	0.17	0.08	...	0.52
United Kingdom	-0.21	-0.20	-0.37
United States	-0.04	-0.56	0.07	...	-0.10
OECD-27	-0.05	-0.01	0.10	0.02	-0.14	-0.10	-0.29	-0.24

Note: ...: not available

Source: OECD, 2009b, table 4.4.


objectives. In the second group of countries, in addition to poverty prevention the public pension systems deliver a large portion of after-retirement income not only to the poor but also to those with higher incomes, while in countries in the first group income from public pensions is a smaller part of overall retirement income, which comes mainly from occupational or private pension schemes. In the second group public transfers account for more than 70 per cent of the overall income of the retired, while in most of the countries in the first group public transfers amount to less than half of the income of those above retirement age – a large portion coming from accumulated capital and from continuing

some form of gainful employment (see OECD, 2009c: Part I, “Policy issues”, Chapter 2, “Incomes and poverty of older people”, and figure 2.3, “Sources of incomes of older people”).

8.3.3 The Asian Development Bank Social Protection Index


In both the European Union and OECD the set of indicators selected is usually subject to years of discussion among experts, statisticians and representatives of the governments responsible for social policies. Data used

Figure 8.10 Percentage reduction in the Gini coefficient, and share of social security cash transfers in household incomes, 22 OECD countries, mid-2000



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15135>
 Source: Based on table 8.4. See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

Figure 8.11 Poverty rates and social security expenditure for persons of working age and retirement age, OECD countries, mid-2000 (percentages)



Link: OECD StatLink, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/422333665216>


Note: Poverty rates based on a threshold set at half of median household disposable income. Social spending includes both public and mandatory private spending in cash (i.e. excluding in-kind services). Social spending for persons of working age is defined as the sum of outlays for incapacity, family, unemployment, housing and other (i.e. social assistance) programmes; social spending for persons of retirement age is the sum of outlays for old-age and survivor benefits. Data on poverty rates refer to the mid-2000s for all countries; data for social spending refer to 2003 for all countries except Turkey (1999).
 Source: OECD, 2009b.

to calculate agreed indicators are usually produced on a regular basis by the national statistical offices; in order to ensure maximum possible comparability they are standardized, at less frequent intervals, according to internationally agreed methodologies.

In Asia and the Pacific the situation is different. Only a few members of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) are members of the OECD and produce

high-quality statistics in their various areas of enquiry, including social security. In the majority of ADB member countries social security systems are not well developed; further, statistics on expenditure and coverage are not produced at the national level: information is dispersed and available only at the level of individual social security schemes. Household surveys, if done on a regular basis, usually do not look deeply

Figure 8.12 Structure of the ADB Social Protection Index



Source: ADB, 2006, figure 3.1, p. 468.

into the situations of those covered by social security schemes.

To ameliorate this situation, the Asian Development Bank has over the last several years successfully implemented an ambitious project aimed at collecting basic information on different aspects of social security coverage in 31 countries of the Asia and Pacific region. A new concept, the Social Protection Index (SPI), was developed for the purposes of the project and was piloted in six countries of the region. The first report published in 2006 (ADB, 2006) included, in addition to country analyses, a methodological section discussing the SPI concept in detail. The second volume of the report (ADB, 2008) includes information on social protection in all 31 countries as well as a multi-country analysis using the SPI. A long-term goal is to update the country information more regularly and discussions are in progress between the Bank, the OECD and the ILO on joint activity in this respect.

Unlike the European Union or OECD with their rich sets of indicators, the Asian Development Bank focuses on only four indicators at the national level:

Social Protection Expenditure (SPEXP): Measured as a percentage of GDP, it shows total expenditure in all social protection schemes identified in the country.

Social Protection Coverage (SPCOV): Average number of beneficiaries as a proportion of the number of persons in the assumed target population.³


Poverty-Targeting Rate (PTR): Percentage of the poor in the country who are beneficiaries of a social protection scheme.

Social Protection Impact (SPIMP): Amount of benefit received on average by a poor beneficiary as a proportion of the poverty line.

It can be seen that these indicators differ from the OECD or EU approaches in that they are directly related to social security interventions (amount of

³ Beneficiaries for each of the schemes identified are assumed to belong to one of the target groups (poor, unemployed, elderly, disabled, children, etc.). For each target group a beneficiary coverage ratio is calculated; the average is then calculated for the country level using the size of the target group as weight.

Figure 8.13 Investments in social protection: Expenditure (percentage of GDP) in Asian countries for three SPI indicators



resources invested, overall beneficiary coverage, coverage of the poor, level of coverage of the poor) rather than to indirect outcomes.

The Social Protection Index is calculated as a synthesis of these four summary indicators, again a different approach from the EU and OECD. The coverage component involves the combination into a single indicator of seven indicators expressed by the target group (see figure 8.12). The four summary indicators are scaled and weighted to produce an additive index which takes into account resources invested and three aspects of coverage.

On average, in 2004–05 the Asian and Pacific countries were found to spend just under 5 per cent of their GDP on social protection, achieving an overall average coverage level of 35 per cent of the seven key target groups. The average proportion of the poor (using national poverty lines) who receive some benefits from these programmes, whether in cash or kind, was 57 per cent. The impact of social protection programmes on the incomes of the poor is, however, generally low, averaging under 25 per cent of the poverty line per capita income.

Three broad groups of countries may be detected. The first, a group with high levels of social protection, comprises 11 countries, all of which have an SPI greater than two standard deviations above the All-Asia average. These include Japan and the Republic of Korea, followed by all but one of the Central Asian countries. Three of the South Asian countries (China, India and Sri Lanka) also appear in this group, though with substantially lower values than for Central Asia because of their relatively high expenditure and impact values. In this first group of countries, which by definition have relatively adequate provision of social protection, priorities for assistance might be the improvement of effectiveness and governance, and of the inclusion of the poor and those in the informal economy into the current social protection system.

The second group, with medium levels of social protection, is made up of 10 countries as diverse as Armenia and the Maldives. The distinguishing features of these countries, which all have an SPI within two standard deviations of the mean, is that two of the four indicators – usually expenditure and impact – are much lower than the other two. This suggests an imbalance

between the desire of these countries to provide relatively extensive social protection programmes and the financing available to fund them.

The third group, with low levels of social protection, consists of 10 countries with an SPI of less than two standard deviations below the mean. This group includes most of the Pacific countries together with Bhutan, Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, Pakistan and the Philippines. In this group of countries, all four indicators tend to be uniformly low, suggesting the need to develop new, affordable social protection programmes with higher coverage and greater inclusion of the poor and those in the informal economy.

The averages therefore mask substantial variations between countries and regions (see ADB, 2008). There is also substantial variation in the overall SPIs and some components (such as the degree of inclusion of the poor) for countries with similar income levels (GDP per capita). Once again this shows that the political will to extend social security is at least as important as the level of development of the country. It is clearly possible for most countries to provide more adequate levels of social protection, irrespective of their level of economic development. This finding has important policy implications: most of these countries have the scope to provide improved social protection to their populations in need, so long as they have the political will to do so.

The amount of resources invested in social security certainly matters. Figure 8.13 shows the correlation between the level of social protection expenditure (EXP) and three other ADB social protection indicators: coverage (CV), inclusion of the poor (TR) and levels of benefits paid to the poor (IMP). On average, the level of investment in social security in the region is low. Limited resources are undoubtedly the main barrier to achieving better outcomes in terms of the extent and level of coverage, as well as inclusion of the poor. As is clear from the several parts of figure 8.13, other factors matter as well – design, implementation and governance of social security – at any level of resources allocated. But a country needs to invest a certain minimum amount of resources in order to reach a substantial level of coverage and also to be able to achieve efficiency gains from improved governance.

Identifying factors for extended social security coverage

9

Part I of this report has presented the various dimensions of social security coverage. Data are still very limited for most of the individual branches of social security, so that it is impossible to aggregate all partial measures of coverage into one indicator encompassing all branches. But even if data were available the development of one single indicator would meet with a number of methodological problems. As already observed in Chapter 2, research is under way but more is needed in order to develop an indicator of basic protection. And even if a single indicator describing the extent, quality and scope of social security did exist, policy-makers would still need to know their contributing factors.

Despite our incomplete information base we attempt here to build what may be called a first approximation of a factor analysis explaining the success of social security schemes. It uses a proxy methodology in the form of a typology of situations in different countries. This focuses on two input factors, which can be broadly defined as the legal foundations created by a society and the sustained level of resources committed, and on a results measurement that describes qualitatively the extent to which these resources have been used successfully. The typology helps to broadly identify what preconditions for a successful social protection system are needed to achieve a high level of population coverage and a decent benefit level in the most important social security benefits.

The input factors are as follows:

The legal factor. An overview of the scope of legal social security provision is provided through a single

indicator: the number of social security branches covered by a statutory social security programme as presented in figure 2.4 (Chapter 2). The main source of information is the database *Social Security Programs Throughout the World* (SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009) completed where necessary with information based on national legislation.

The resource factor. Resources invested in social security are measured by two indicators of social security expenditure combined with a third indicator referring to the quality or nature of health expenditure:

- *Public social security expenditure (excluding health care) as a percentage of GDP.* This indicator is available for more than 100 countries from four main sources of information: the EUROSTAT and OECD social protection databases (European Commission, 2009a; OECD, 2009a); the IMF's *Government Finance Statistics* (GFS) database (IMF, 2009); and the *ILO Social Security Inquiry* (ILO, 2009c), the latter especially for developing countries not yet covered by any other international source.
- *Public health expenditure as a percentage of GDP.* This indicator is estimated by the World Health Organization for most countries of the world (WHO, 2009a, 2009b).
- *Effective level of financial protection provided to the population by the social health protection system* is measured here by a proxy indicator, expressed as a percentage of total (public and private) health-care expenditure in the country **not financed** by private

households with out-of-pocket payments. This is more or less equivalent to the percentage of total (public and private) health-care expenditure in the country financed either from general government revenues or from pre-paid private insurance by employers or NGOs. This indicator is calculated using the national health account estimates available in the WHOSIS database (WHO, 2009a).

The results measurement is a compound notion of coverage measured in two dimensions:

- *Extent of legal coverage* within four social security branches: old age, employment injury, health and unemployment. Legal coverage is measured by estimating the size of those groups in the population who should be covered by existing legislation under national schemes. This produces indicators reflecting: (a) the proportion of the working-age population legally covered by the old-age pension system; (b) the proportion of the total population legally covered by the social health-care protection system; and the proportion of the economically active population legally covered by (c) systems of protection in case of employment injury and (d) unemployment.
- *Effective coverage* by the health-care and old-age pension branches of social security – the two largest branches in every country in the world in terms of resources invested. *Effective extent of coverage by the old-age pension system* in a country is measured by the proportion of the population above retirement age receiving any type of old-age pension. *Effective coverage in health* is reflected here by a proxy indicator of health professional staff density, and measured as the relative difference between specific country staff density levels and a benchmark staff density level assumed to be equal to a median value of health professional density observed in the group of countries of low vulnerability (low poverty and low informality indicators combined). We thus assume that in the group of countries with low vulnerability, population access to services of qualified medical staff is at the adequate level, while in countries with a lower density of qualified medical personnel, there is a coverage gap in terms of insufficient access to services of such qualified medical professionals.

Taking into account all existing data limitations, the following types of outcome typology can be identified (see table 9.1):

- **Very limited or limited rights – low resources – low coverage.** A narrow scope of legal foundations of social security (a few branches only), often combined with a low level of resources invested in them, results in a relatively small proportion of the population covered and thus a significant coverage gap. This pattern occurs most often in the world's poorest countries, particularly in Africa and Asia, and results to a large extent from resource constraints (limited fiscal space) and also, often, from the fact that comprehensive national social security strategies and policies are still at the early stage of debate, so that the policy space is still to be decided. In these countries the majority of the population is in the large informal economy; both legal foundations and resource allocations are missing if access to social security by this majority is to be provided. However, even those in the formal economy are insufficiently covered. This situation concerns more than half of the 146 countries included in this typology, with more than 80 per cent of all African countries and more than 70 per cent of all Asian countries included.
- **Comprehensive rights – low resources – low coverage.** A relatively wide scope of legal foundations existing for different branches of social security, but coupled with low resource allocations, may result in very low effective coverage and low levels of protection. There are a number of countries, for example, which developed relatively strong legal foundations in the past but which then, owing to economic downturns, structural adjustments and/or policy changes, lost the sufficient resource foundations necessary to turn the legal provision into effective coverage.
- **Limited or comprehensive rights – high resources – low coverage.** A relatively wide scope of legal foundations existing for different branches of social security, even combined with an above-average level of resource allocations, may result in limited population coverage. This situation usually arises in countries where the informal economy is large: while those in formal employment enjoy a wide scope of relatively generous benefits, a large part of the population remains uncovered. There is a need to strengthen this part of the social security system so that it is able to reach those in the informal economy.
- **Limited or comprehensive rights – low resources – high coverage.** A few countries with

Table 9.1 Legal provision, resources committed and coverage achieved in 146 countries: A typology

	Low coverage		High coverage	
	Limited resources	High resources	Limited resources	High resources
Very limited rights	22 countries (15%) Informality 69% Poverty 70%	NONE	NONE	NONE
Limited rights	53 countries (36%) Informality 57% Poverty 51%	3 countries (2%) Informality 41% Poverty 22%	6 countries (4%) Informality 28% Poverty 23%	5 countries (3%) Informality 23% Poverty 18%
Comprehensive rights	5 countries (3%) Informality 42% Poverty 12%	3 countries (2%) Informality 37% Poverty 19%	7 countries (5%) Informality 38% Poverty 28%	42 countries (29%) Informality 17% Poverty 2%

Notes:

Informality: The proportion of non-wage workers in total employment is used as a proxy for workers in the informal economy.

Poverty: The proportion of the population living above \$2 a day is used as a proxy for the effective coverage of the population by basic social protection.

Scope of legal provision: Very limited rights (or very limited legal provision) refers to countries where fewer than five of the eight social security branches are covered in national legislation: old age, invalidity, survivors and employment injury; limited legal provision where five to seven branches are covered (with in most cases no legal provision for unemployment protection); and comprehensive legal provision for countries with legal provision for all social security branches.

Resources: Expressed in terms of public expenditure on social security as a percentage of GDP combined with an indicator of quality of health expenditure (the percentage of total health expenditure not financed by out-of-pocket payments).

Low coverage/high coverage: The cut-off point between low and high groups is based on the value observed for each component for the 6th decile (i.e. 60 per cent of the countries have values below the cut-off point).

Sources: ILO calculations based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; European Commission, 2009a; OECD, 2009a; ILO, 2009c; WHO, 2009a, 2009b; national legislation. See further details in the text, and in the Statistical Annex.

relatively low resource allocations, and sometimes even with a relatively narrow scope of legal foundations, still show relatively high outcomes in coverage and protection levels in selected areas. This is usually thanks to the existence of provisions for benefits which, although at a basic level, have either universal outreach or are effectively targeted by other means to large sections of the population. In such countries, however, the challenge of how to broaden the scope of protection and improve its adequacy remains. This is the case for less than 9 per cent of all countries considered.

- **Comprehensive rights – high resources (with exceptions) – high coverage.** The last type is where legal provision, resources and results are relatively high for the overall set of countries under study (comprehensive rights – high resources and high coverage). A few countries (representing just over 3 per cent of all countries considered) present a rather similar pattern but with a relatively low level of legal provision. This pattern, which concerns around 30 per cent of countries considered (green cells in table 9.1), is typical for industrialized nations and the few developing countries that have achieved high levels of social security. In many of these countries


efficiency becomes the main question; there needs to be careful monitoring of whether the resources invested result in sufficiently adequate outcomes.

It is noticeable that not all the theoretically possible combinations of different factors occur in reality: not even the widest legal foundations can ever result in adequate outcomes if they are not enforced and not backed by sufficient resources. Strong legal foundations are a necessary but not sufficient condition for securing higher resources; there are no situations where generous resources are available despite the lack of a legal basis.

Table 9.1 presents the possible combinations of situations with, for each, the number of countries; the average percentage of non-wage workers in total employment as a proxy for informal employment; and the proportion for the group of countries of the population living on less than US\$2 PPP per day. Figure 9.1 shows the various components of the typology by income levels of groups of countries.

The largest group of countries in the world still belongs to the first category: low legal foundations, low resources and low results. Many of these countries are facing significant resource constraints in terms of the fiscal space available. In many of them there is also a lack of “policy space”, where social protection strategies

Figure 9.1 Components of the typology by level of income



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceld=15189>

Note: For presentation purposes, only two indicators are normalized: those for which maximum values are significantly smaller than the other variables taken into account in this graph. The normalization follows the standard procedure developed for the UNDP's Human Development Index (HDI), which can be defined as follows:

Normalized value = $(actual - minimum\ values) / (maximum - minimum\ values)$, where *actual* is the proportion attained by the country on a particular indicator, *minimum* is the lowest value attained by any country on that particular variable, and *maximum* is the maximum value attained by any country for that variable.

Sources: As for table 9.1.

are still at a relatively early stage in national debate. Currently, attention usually focuses on easing the most urgent problems. This is understandable. However, the need for a structured approach is increasingly acknowledged, an approach that will yield sustained solutions

rather than ad hoc ones. In the multi-faceted crisis now facing so much of the world, the need for social protection has become even more obvious as the majority's lack of access to effective social protection becomes ever more dramatic and disastrous.

Part II
Thematic focus:
Social security in times of crisis

Responding to economic crisis with social security

10

10.1 Introduction

All economic downturns, including the economic crisis of 2008–09, lead to falling or even disappearing labour incomes, increasing unemployment, and falling revenues from self-employment. Families worldwide are deeply affected, whether they rely on income from the formal economy, the informal economy, locally earned income, or earnings sent home by those working in the cities or abroad. Besides consequences for income and poverty, severe impacts on workers' health are to be expected. If no action is taken to close the gaps in social health protection, there is no doubt that the 2008–09 crisis will result in lower global health and increased mortality rates; due to reduced accessibility to health services it is expected that up to 400,000 women will die (WHO, 2009c). UNICEF estimates an increase in infant mortality between 3 and 11 per cent (UNICEF, 2009). It is to be expected that the main social security response to such a crisis is to replace these disappearing labour incomes with unemployment benefits and related labour market interventions, in the hope that the crisis will be temporary. Those who have no access to such protection – and they are many, as this report has shown – should be addressed by widely defined social assistance and social health protection programmes or, if even those are not in place, by ad hoc cash transfers and other measures, such as providing for access to health services, in the hope that these can be transformed into regular programmes in the future. The downturn of 2008–09 has once again served as a reminder of the importance of having schemes already in

place before crisis strikes, in order to be able to provide social security to the unemployed and all those affected.

In any economic downturn, revenues from contributions or taxes earmarked for the financing of social security programmes fall, while expenditure rises due to increases in the number of beneficiaries of unemployment and other income support programmes. The counter-cyclical behaviour of social security expenditure is inbuilt; it is a source of its power as the automatic stabilizer of individual incomes and aggregate demand. However, funding for increased expenditure does not come automatically (beyond existing reserves of those social security systems that keep such contingency reserves); it has to come either from a reallocation of existing public spending, or from increased contributions and taxes, or from increasing the overall deficit financing of public finance.

When reviewing¹ the experiences of different countries with a view to discussing the role of social security in the economic crisis, a number of key areas emerge:

¹ Sources include the ILO's 46 country reviews (5 low-income countries: Bangladesh, Kenya, Nepal, United Republic of Tanzania and Viet Nam; 9 countries in the lower middle-income group: China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and Ukraine; 14 countries from the upper middle-income group: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Latvia, Malaysia, Poland, Russian Federation, St Kitts and Nevis, Serbia, South Africa, Turkey and Uruguay; 18 high-income countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain, United Kingdom and United States); the ILO Social Security Department's own continuous monitoring of the experience of selected countries since the onset of the crisis; the results of a survey undertaken by ISSA (2009); and information provided by the OECD (2009b, 2009d).

- (1) the protection of the unemployed, and related policies;
- (2) increases in other social security benefits as part of the counter-cyclical stimulus packages, and strengthening protection of the most vulnerable (as a result of either automatic reactions of the existing social security system or policy-induced changes or both);
- (3) cases where fiscal constraints lead to pro-cyclical cuts or restrictions in benefit levels; and
- (4) negative rates of return in pension funds – specifically for pre-funded defined-contribution pensions. Negative returns undermine the benefit levels of those already retired, those about to retire and those retiring in the future.

Further, analyses of past crisis impacts show that financial and economic crises usually lead to decreases in access to health care and coverage that concern the most vulnerable parts of the population (Saadah, Pradhan and Surbakti, 2000; WHO, 2009d). However, the major challenge remains: the fact that a large majority of the world's population has no access to even basic protection provided by social security schemes, leaving them vulnerable to all economic and social risks, including those brought about by the current crisis.

10.2 Cushioning the impacts of unemployment while protecting and creating jobs

In the 2008–09 crisis millions of workers around the world are losing their income opportunities in both the formal and the informal economies. Such massive losses, coming on top of already existing underemployment and poverty, entail the risk of a social crisis unless states are prepared to provide income support in the short run and new employment opportunities in the long run to these workers and their families, and take the necessary measures to do so.

In this respect the action most immediately needed is to sustain income levels; this can be realized by a range of social security responses, as outlined in Part I of this report:

- a) *Unemployment benefits.* Such benefits are typically funded by contributory schemes for employees in the formal economy, and offer income replacement related to the employee's former earnings after a qualifying period, mostly for a limited period of time.
- b) *Unemployment assistance and general social assistance benefits.* These are usually not based on prior earnings but are flat-rate non-contributory cash transfers to those who are still unemployed, either once their entitlements to unemployment benefits have expired or when they have never been entitled.
- c) *Other labour market policies.* These include public employment programmes providing income support, conditional upon participation in employment or training programmes.


But here lies the crux: such a wide range of responses is unavailable in many countries affected by the crisis, in particular in the majority of low- and middle-income countries. Effective crisis response has to meet one common condition: the response has to be available quickly. Such an immediate response is only possible on the basis of *existing* administrative structures, that is, existing social institutions which either can automatically react to changing economic conditions thanks to their design, or can be easily adjusted (e.g. extended) to crisis-induced requirements.

Where they exist, unemployment insurance schemes are the branch of social security that bears the brunt of costs of income replacement for employees who have lost their jobs (see figures 10.1 and 10.2). It is part of the design of an unemployment protection scheme that effective coverage is automatically extended when more employees who meet the eligibility criteria become unemployed. But unemployment insurance schemes are in place in only 64 of the 184 countries for which information is available. Social assistance, public works and similar programmes also have very limited coverage globally. Even where such programmes exist their effective outreach is often very limited. Hence, what we see on a global scale is a massive gap in coverage for the unemployed and underemployed working-age population who are in need of income support.

However, even if their legal coverage is limited to formal-economy workers and effectively reaches only a limited number of those unemployed, unemployment protection schemes are crucial pillars of social security systems, offering income replacements but being at the same time a source of technical knowledge and administrative capacity which can be easily used to extend coverage and increase outreach.

In the economic crises of past decades which affected countries such as those in Asia and Latin America where social security schemes were absent, unemployment and poverty rates soared. It proved to be difficult – if not impossible – to introduce new schemes or

Figure 10.1 Number of unemployed receiving social security unemployment benefits, weighted average, selected countries, 2007–10 (Index value 100 = January 2008)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gjimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15190>

Note: Indexed value weighted by the number of unemployed receiving unemployment benefits. Countries covered for the global estimates are the following: Argentina; Armenia; Australia (jobseekers receiving newstart allowance and youth allowance); Belarus; Belgium; Brazil; Bulgaria; Canada (employment insurance beneficiaries receiving regular benefits); Chile; Croatia; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Denmark (unemployment social insurance and social assistance beneficiaries); Estonia; Finland (recipients of basic unemployment allowance); France (ASSEDIC); Germany; Hungary (jobseekers' allowance recipients and recipients of jobseekers' assistance); Israel (claims for unemployment benefit); Japan (unemployment insurance basic allowance); Kazakhstan; Latvia; Lithuania; Luxembourg; Mexico (unemployed receiving financial support); Montenegro; Netherlands; New Caledonia; New Zealand; Poland; Republic of Korea; Romania; Russian Federation; Serbia; Slovakia; Slovenia; South Africa; Spain (contributory and non-contributory social security unemployment schemes); Sweden; Thailand; The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Turkey; Ukraine; United Kingdom (claimants for jobseeker's allowance); United States (continued claims); Uruguay.

Source: Administrative data from national social security schemes (see Statistical Annex for further detail). See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

ad hoc measures quickly enough to cushion the impact of the crisis. But countries which had introduced unemployment schemes before the onset of the crisis, such as the Republic of Korea, could relatively easily scale up these measures to respond in an appropriate and timely way (Kang, 2001). Korean and also Argentinian examples (Prasad and Gerecke, 2009) show that it was timely investment in social security that enabled these countries to emerge strengthened from the crisis. A number of other countries such as Chile and Mexico have used lessons from earlier crises with massive social fall-outs as a good starting point for the introduction of new schemes offering income replacement to the unemployed and the poor (Frieje-Rodriguez and Murrugarra, 2009). Today, these countries are much better prepared to cope with the consequences of the crisis.









In addition to providing income replacement for those who lose their jobs and thus safeguarding them from poverty, social security benefits also of course have major economic impacts through stabilizing aggregate demand. And, contrary to earlier beliefs, no negative effects of increased social spending during and after crises on economic growth have been found (Prasad and Gerecke, forthcoming). On the contrary, well-designed unemployment schemes and social assistance and public

works programmes effectively prevent long-term unemployment and help shorten economic recessions.

In a subset of 46 countries analysed, government responses are found in all the three groups of measures providing income support to the unemployed (see table 10.1). And as governments' ability for social security interventions is primarily confined to the instruments available, the global distribution of crisis responses reflects the distribution of coverage by established social security systems.

The most common responses in high-income countries are modifications of existing unemployment schemes. Since past recessions have led to higher structural unemployment in some Western European countries, in this crisis government strategy in a number of countries such as France, Germany and the Netherlands aims at the avoidance of full unemployment by expanding the application, eligibility and coverage of partial unemployment benefits. Partial unemployment benefits allow workers to stay in their employment relationship, but – for example – with reduced working hours. Also called reduced working hour compensation, these benefits are paid to employees who are working in enterprises that due to specified (economic, cyclical, seasonal) conditions have shortened their working

Figure 10.2 Number of unemployed receiving unemployment benefits, selected countries, trends 2006–10



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15223>

Notes and sources:

Australia. Non-seasonally adjusted data. Source: ILO, based on official administrative records from the Australian Government.

France. Seasonally adjusted data. Source: ILO, based on official administrative records from ASSEDIC.

Germany. Non-seasonally adjusted data. Source: ILO, based on official administrative records available from the State Statistical Institute.

Netherlands. Unemployment benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Act (WW), seasonally adjusted data. Source: ILO, based on official administrative records available from Statistics Netherlands.

Poland. Non-seasonally adjusted data. Source: ILO, based on official administrative records from the Ministry of Labour.

Spain. Non-seasonally adjusted data. Source: ILO, based on official administrative records from the Ministry of Labour and Migration published in the monthly statistical bulletin of the National Statistical Office.

United Kingdom. Seasonally adjusted data. Source: ILO, based on official administrative records from the Office for National Statistics.

United States. Unemployment Insurance weekly claims data are used in current economic analysis of unemployment trends in the nation, and in each state. Initial claims measure emerging unemployment, and continued weeks claimed measure the number of persons claiming unemployment benefits. Seasonally adjusted data. Source: ILO, based on official administrative records of Unemployment Insurance weekly claims from the United States Department of Labor.

See also ILO, GESS (ILO, 2009d).

hours. The loss of income from fewer hours worked is partly compensated (50–70 per cent) by either the unemployment scheme, the state budget or both. Partial unemployment benefits aim at preventing the loss of skills and the discouragement of workers, both of which may occur when they become fully unemployed.

Although it is too early for a full assessment of any of the measures taken, those under way in Germany seem to be successful so far. The unemployment insurance scheme reported modest increases during the first three-quarters of 2009. The labour market has adjusted primarily through a decline in hours worked in nearly all sectors of the economy, especially manufacturing in the first half of 2009.

Pisani-Ferry (2009) discusses partial unemployment benefits in Germany versus the experience in Spain. He suggests that partial unemployment benefits offer more equitable and more flexible labour market outcomes than the fixed-term contracts common in Spain. The latter puts a higher burden of adjustment on young and

low-skilled workers, while in the partial unemployment solution the burden is spread more equitably.

In Germany requests for partial unemployment benefit have to be made by the employer to the public employment agency (Bundesagentur für Arbeit). The employer has to prove that the enterprise is hit by an unavoidable lack of work which affects at least one-third of the workforce, who have lost at least 10 per cent of their gross income for a minimum period of one month. If the claim is accepted, employees receive as benefit 60 per cent (67 per cent in certain family situations) of the difference between their full earnings and their actual net earnings received at reduced hours. In 2009 on average 1.3 million workers are expected to be on partial employment; costs for the public employment scheme are estimated at €3.5 billion.

Although the number of workers in partial unemployment in Germany has skyrocketed (an increase of over 1.1 million beneficiaries, or eightfold on a year-to-year basis in March 2009), the monthly number

Table 10.1 Unemployment schemes in different country groups by income level, 2009

Selected countries by income level (number of cases)	At least one statutory unemployment social security scheme in place	Extension of maximum unemployment benefits payment period	Expansion of unemployment insurance coverage	Increase of unemployment benefit level	Introduction/extension of public employment schemes	Extension of cash benefit and social assistance schemes
Low-income countries (5)	●2/○2/×1				1	4
Lower-middle-income countries (9)	●5/○1/×3	2	1/×1		5	5
Upper-middle-income countries (14)	●10/○1/×3	4	5	3	5	3
High-income countries (18)	●15/×2	11	6	4/×1	3	2/×1
Total (46)	●32/○4/×9	15	12/×1	7/×1	14	14/×1

Notes: ● At least one statutory unemployment scheme in place. ○ Unemployment scheme with limited provisions. × No scheme in place. One-time payments not included.

Source: ILO country reviews (see note 1, p. 105).

of newly unemployed workers has remained comparatively stable so far.

In Thailand the introduction of a future unemployment insurance scheme was already planned at the beginning of the 1990s, when the country started its social insurance system for private-sector employees with the introduction of health insurance and disability pensions. The scope of the system has been gradually expanded over the years to branches such as family benefits and old-age pensions. The unemployment insurance scheme started only a few years ago, after long discussions fuelled by the Asian financial crisis of 1997–98. Recent trends in both the absolute numbers of unemployed receiving unemployment benefits and the total number of unemployed seem to reveal a significant increase in the proportion of unemployed benefiting from the social security scheme (see figure 10.3).

No unemployment benefit scheme, whether partial or full, can work to its full potential unless it is combined with other labour market instruments that increase employability, such as training. The crisis will lead to structural changes in many economies, and measures to ensure the employability of laid-off or partially unemployed workers will be crucial in the new circumstances. Training and related measures are part of the stimulus packages introduced in most European countries (often in combination with partial unemployment benefits) and also, for example, in the Republic of Korea, where workers who undergo training are entitled to higher benefits. Korea has also decided to invest in tools aimed at providing better information on jobseekers, qualifications and open positions, which should help to avoid long-term unemployment.

Partial unemployment benefits are also being added to existing unemployment benefit schemes or are being extended in a number of middle-income countries such as Poland and Turkey. In Poland until recently there were no provisions for partial unemployment. In autonomous social dialogue workers' and employers' organizations represented in the Tripartite Commission agreed, in March 2009, on a desired package of anti-crisis measures and accordingly formulated proposals for the government. Among these were proposals aiming at opening a possibility for partial and technical forms of unemployment status and respective benefits. As a result, in July 2009 Parliament adopted a law allowing, for the next two years, collectively agreed reductions of working time and proportional reductions in wages without a need to change individual work contracts; and establishing compensation financed from the Guaranteed Employee Benefits Fund to employees

for such reduced working time and wages (70 per cent of unemployment benefit) or for technical unemployment (100 per cent of unemployment benefit). It also established support for the training of employees affected by reduced working time or technical unemployment, financing from the Unemployment Benefits/Labour Fund up to 90 per cent of training costs (the rest being financed by employers from their training funds) and training stipends to employees in the amount of 100 per cent of unemployment benefit.


But while in most middle-income countries in Europe these schemes potentially cover a majority of the employed, in many middle-income countries in Asia and Latin America self-employment and informal employment remain high and thus the existing unemployment schemes are inaccessible to many of those whose labour incomes are affected by the crisis; these people need some form of income support. When formal labour markets are small, an extension of coverage under existing schemes solves only part of the problem; additional special measures for both the formal and the informal sector become necessary.

In Brazil, for example, responses to the crisis target formal-economy workers in the most crisis-ridden sectors, for whom unemployment benefits have been prolonged by two months. This extension will reach around 103,000 people, or 20 per cent of the scheme's beneficiaries. Additionally, those who lack formal income opportunities will be targeted through extended access to the Bolsa Família programme (see ILO, 2009k). The government planned to extend the programme in 2009, which covered 11.1 million families at the end of 2008, to another 1.3 million families, and has raised the income threshold determining eligibility from BRL 120 to BRL 137 per capita.

The most common form of response in middle-income countries is the extension of public employment schemes or the creation of new ones. Since such schemes often have an ad hoc character they may be implemented quicker than social security schemes, and discontinued once the crisis is over.

An example comes from the Philippines. All government departments and offices have been directed to mobilize available resources, at the level of at least 1.5 per cent of their operating budgets, for emergency job creation under the pro-poor Comprehensive Livelihood and Emergency Employment Programme (CLEEP). Up to May 2009 nearly 100,000 jobs had been created, and efforts were then reinforced to create another 700,000 before the end of the year. India too has several years of experience with its National Rural

Figure 10.3 Thailand: Number of unemployed receiving unemployment benefits (monthly), and trends in the proportion of total unemployed receiving benefits, 2006–09 (percentages)



Link: <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=15243>

Sources: Thailand Social Security Office for unemployed receiving unemployment benefits; ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e), unemployment general level, quarterly, for total number of unemployed.

Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), and plans to use this experience to cover urban areas with a similar scheme (World Bank, 2009b).

The availability of measures for crisis response is clearly the most limited in low-income countries. Although national differences remain, low-income countries share a triple constraint in the crisis: they are adversely hit through declines in global demand, remittances, FDI and trade; they have limited access to foreign capital; and their scope of social security is very narrow: its coverage is limited to the minority in formal employment, and schemes providing income support in case of unemployment exist but rarely. In addition, many of these countries, in particular in sub-Saharan Africa, have already been facing mass poverty and underemployment well before the recent global economic crisis. It can be said that they face a permanent crisis of lack of income opportunities and subsequent poverty.

In this situation a sufficient response is not to be expected from the few existing unemployment benefit schemes, such as those set up only a few years ago in Bangladesh and Viet Nam, for example. Comprehensive social security systems are not in place in any of these countries and even social assistance, which could provide income support to the unemployed or underemployed working-age poor population, is very limited.

On the other hand, in all the countries reviewed for this report and in many other low-income countries there exist small-scale pilot income support schemes of various natures, providing cash benefits and/or employment to various targeted groups of the population. These are usually too small to help in the current crisis

beyond the relatively small groups covered. But there is evidence that capacities of benefit delivery and administration are gradually being built. The decisive and missing factor in many cases is sustainable funding, which has to come through joint long-term commitments of the governments, supported temporarily – wherever necessary – by the donor community.

The assessments given above of the measures reviewed, among which some are referred to as good practice, are obviously highly dependent on context. The evaluation of the measures at this point in time draws mostly from experience of past crises; it is too early for a full assessment of the particular measures applied in this crisis of 2008–09.

Among the policy responses discussed above, past experience advises caution on public works schemes. Such schemes are often praised for their “self-targeting”, as the low remuneration they provide attracts only those in dire need. With respect to targeting, they may therefore be easier to implement in contexts where social security infrastructure and expertise are limited. Their ad hoc character, however, often prevents them from delivering sustainable and reliable support to those in need in the form of adequate income, and they also often indirectly exclude the more vulnerable (such as women).

Where access to health care and health insurance is linked with employment, workers who become unemployed (and their families) not only lose their jobs and thus their sources of income, but simultaneously they lose affordable health services when they need them. Measures that protect the unemployed from losing access to health care and other social services,

or other social benefits such as pensions and maternity and family benefits, are thus crucial – but often forgotten – elements of the design of any scheme providing protection to those affected by unemployment.²

A minority of countries reviewed have cut rather than expanded their expenditure on social security programmes, under the pressure of circumstance. Lowering benefits and limiting access to income replacement and other social security schemes not only aggravates the consequences of the crisis for workers and their families but may have economic consequences that negatively affect aggregate demand.

Like previous crises, this one will hit the poorest people hardest. Many households, already weakened, are faced with having to sell assets such as livestock to survive. Malnutrition could well rise, and school enrolment may well fall. The financial crisis will turn into a human one if the poor are left to fend for themselves.

The short-term responses to a crisis – macroeconomic stabilization, trade policies, financial sector policies and social security – cannot ignore longer-term implications for both economic development and vulnerability to future crises.

10.3 The expansion of social security as a crisis response

In those countries reviewed that have developed at least elements of comprehensive social security responses in areas such as pensions, health schemes or family benefits, such responses are usually expansions in coverage and in benefit levels of existing schemes, except for a limited number of countries which have been forced by circumstances to actually decrease benefits or to narrow coverage.

Measures expanding benefits and coverage can be found everywhere – in high-, medium- and low-income countries. The difference is of course in the scale of impact of such measures. In countries where coverage is comprehensive the expected impact of these changes is significant, not only in individual income levels of the recipients covered, but also in overall aggregate demand. On the other hand, in countries where coverage is limited to those in the small formal economy the impact

may be important from the point of view of effective protection of recipients covered, but from the point of view of aggregate demand it is negligible.

The case of Argentina is particularly interesting in that measures were either already in place from previous economic crises in the country or were in a state of transition when the 2008–09 global economic crisis began. The Government of Argentina has launched a wide-ranging stimulus package ranging from major structural reforms such as the renationalization of the pension system, to temporary measures such as salary subsidies and reductions in social security contributions (see box 10.1). Other examples of expanded benefit levels and coverage are given in table 10.2 for selected countries.

In addition to these changes in benefit levels and coverage of existing social security systems, some governments have announced special *one-time payments*, usually to low-income households, for example in Australia, France, Indonesia, Italy, Thailand and the United Kingdom. As opposed to the extension of coverage or permanent adjustments in benefit levels, such measures give temporary relief and may also boost aggregate demand if large in scale, but do not make a long-term impact on households' income situation.

Other responses include (usually temporary) *exemptions from social security contributions* with a view either to reducing costs for employers and thus stimulating employment, or to raising the net earnings of low-income workers. Countries which have introduced such measures are listed in table 10.3.

However tempting such reductions in social security contributions may be with a view to decreasing labour costs or increasing net wages, such measures must be properly compensated both in terms of financing the benefits currently paid as well as in terms of future benefit entitlements of contributors, in cases where these will depend on the amount of contributions actually paid.

10.4 Consolidating social expenditure: Short-term versus long-term concerns

While most countries have expanded social security coverage and benefits in response to the global economic crisis, a few of the countries reviewed have announced cuts or freezes in social spending and benefits, usually as part of the wider plan of consolidating public finances and reducing public deficits.

² In many European countries, e.g. Poland, those entitled to unemployment benefits additionally have their contributions to health insurance paid for them, as well as to old-age, survivors' and disability insurance. In the case of Poland this amounts in total to 35 per cent of the cash benefit cost.

Table 10.2 Crisis response: Extending coverage and raising benefits, selected countries, 2008–09

Country	Measures taken
Armenia	Various benefits raised
Australia	Pension benefits raised
Bangladesh	20% increase in old-age pensions
Brazil	Extension of social assistance Old-age pension raised in line with minimum wage
Chile	Extension of social pensions to another 5% of the poor elderly Benefit levels raised
China	Gradual extension of old-age pensions to the rural population Encouragement of lower health insurance premiums
Costa Rica	15% increase in benefit level for non-contributory pensions
Egypt	Extension of health coverage
France	6.9% increase in old-age pensions Extension of health coverage
India	Extension of pension and health coverage
Italy	Extension of certain types of social security coverage to hitherto excluded groups
Kenya	Cash transfers to the elderly
Pakistan	Extension of health coverage and social safety net
Philippines	Extension of health coverage
Russian Federation	Adjustment of pensions to inflation forecast
South Africa	Decreased retirement age for men Prolongation of child benefit payments
Spain	Increase in minimum pension benefit levels
Tanzania, United Republic	Increase in minimum pension benefit levels
United Kingdom	Child benefits raised
United States	Extension of health insurance coverage
Uruguay	Minimum contribution period for full pensions shortened from 35 to 30 years

Source: ILO country reviews (see note 1, p. 105).

Table 10.3 Crisis response: Reductions in contributions, selected countries, 2008–09

Country	Measures taken
Canada	Contribution rate to unemployment insurance lowered
China	Numerous exemptions from unemployment insurance contributions
Czech Republic	Degressive reduction in contributions, compensated with higher state support to unemployment insurance
Germany	Reduced contributions to health and unemployment insurance schemes
Japan	0.4% reduction in unemployment insurance contributions
Spain	Various exemptions for employers from social security contributions

Source: ILO country reviews (see note 1, p. 105).

Ireland has halved its unemployment benefit for job-seekers under the age of 20, introduced a pension levy of 1 per cent across all wage earners and announced a freeze in welfare expenditure for at least two years. In Hungary the 13th-month pension and the 13th-month salary have been scrapped; the duration of paid parental leave has been reduced; and future pension increases

will be indexed to GDP growth and inflation rather than wages and inflation. Latvia has announced cuts in the unemployment benefit scheme, where benefits decrease more quickly than originally foreseen; pensions for working pensioners decrease by 70 per cent; family allowances are down by 10 per cent; pre-retirement pensions decrease from 80 per cent of the full benefit to

Box 10.1 Argentina, policy responses to the crisis: A stimulus package

Fiscal and sector policies

The main fiscal policy was the renationalization of the pension system; which had been partially transformed into a defined-contribution scheme administered by privately managed pension fund companies in 1994 (except for the pension fund managed by the state-owned Banco Nación). The unification of the pension system into a publicly managed defined-benefit scheme allowed the flow of salary contributions (1.5 per cent of GDP annually) to be transferred to public revenues. The pension assets formerly administered by the private firms (about 10 per cent of GDP) were also transferred to the National Social Security Administration (ANSES) and a sustainability reserve fund was created (Fondo de Garantía de Sustentabilidad). At least 50 per cent of assets were in the form of public bonds and treasury financial instruments.

Other major fiscal policies include an increase in resources for public works: the 2009 budget doubles the 2008 plan, including projects to finance housing, hospitals, roads and sanitary sewers. The government has also presented a plan to finance a roads programme through the emission of bonds which are being bought by ANSES and other private institutional investors. These fiscal measures have been supplemented by the expansion of tax credit programmes for enterprises that invest in capital goods and infrastructure (a significant part targeted to SMEs); a lump-sum payment of US\$56 to all retirees; a moratorium on tax and social security contributions; and reductions of employer contributions (50 per cent in the first year and 75 per cent in the second) for new or previously undeclared employees. The latter measure was expected to benefit up to 800,000 employees. As of September 2009, 169,000 contributors had declared tax debts in the moratorium and 330,547 employees had been registered under the plan.

Among the sector policies, the most important are housing credits for new or used units, financed from social security resources; credits for automobiles and durable goods financed from public resources; and support to private firms that make a commitment to preserving or increasing jobs.

Labour and social protection

Labour and social protection policies are a major part of the stimulus package. The three main areas are related to (a) the prevention of lay-offs, and retaining workers in employment; (b) the expansion of transfer programmes to improve employability, and development of public employment services; and (c) expansion of child benefits to vulnerable families in the informal economy.

(a) *Prevention of lay-offs and retaining workers in employment.* The two main instruments are the Crisis Prevention Procedure (*Procedimiento Preventivo de Crisis – PPC*) and the Production Recovery Programme (*Programa de Recuperación Productiva – REPRO*), both already in place before the current crisis.

The Crisis Prevention Procedure (PPC), created in 1991 under the Labour Law, provides a space for negotiation and agreement between the social partners, with state intervention or mediation, when an enterprise decides to adopt measures affecting employment (mostly lay-offs and suspensions) motivated by *force majeure* or for financial or technological reasons. The PPC gained momentum towards the end of 2008; between October 2008 and May 2009 the number of workers affected in the firms applying for the PPC was approximately 12,000. For the most part (about 70 per cent of cases), the enterprises chose to adopt such measures as suspension and shorter working hours rather than lay-offs.

The Productive Recovery Programme (REPRO), established in 2002, offers workers in affiliated enterprises a fixed monthly non-remunerative sum of up to AR\$600 (43 per cent of the minimum wage in August 2009) for a period of 12 months, designed to complete the working wage for their category. It is paid directly by the National Social Security Administration. To access this benefit, firms must show evidence of their present crisis situation, describing what actions are planned for recovering the enterprise and engaging not to lay off any personnel. While in 2008 the number of enterprises and workers receiving benefits from the programme was 448 and 22,846 respectively, by November 2009 coverage had extended to 2,658 enterprises and 139,034 workers.

(b) *Programmes to improve employability and development of public employment services.* The 2008–09 global economic crisis found the government already in the process of implementing a new generation of programmes aiming to improve the employability of those who were affected by the 2002 crisis, when about 2 million were reached by a major transfer-employment programme for unemployed household heads (*Programa Jefes*). The new programmes are the Training and Employment Insurance (*Seguro de Capacitación y Empleo – SCE*) and the Youth with More and Better Work Programme (*Programa Jóvenes con Más y Mejor Trabajo – PJMMT*).

The SCE is a non-contributory transfer of about US\$70, limited to two years, for the promotion of effective work retraining. Deteriorating conditions in the labour market led the government to extend this benefit by up to six additional months. Beneficiaries of unemployment insurance (the contributory programme for formal salaried workers) can also now join SCE after exhausting their benefit period. As of June 2009, the SCE had 61,420 beneficiaries and in addition to the cash benefit had been able to provide 68,931 beneficiaries with in-kind benefits such as support to complete years of obligatory schooling, vocational training and insertion into the labour market.

The Ministry of Labour launched the PJMMT in May/June 2009 for young people aged 18 to 24 with employability and employment difficulties. Its aim is to create opportunities for social and work inclusion for youth through

integrated actions enabling them to identify the professional profile they wish to develop, finish their obligatory schooling, gain experience in skills through internships in working environments, and begin a productive activity either independently or by joining the labour force. As of July 2009, the number of beneficiaries of PJMMT reached 62,753; 46,099 were already recipients of the cash transfer and several of the in-kind benefits mentioned above. The programme was expected to reach 100,000 beneficiaries by the end of 2009.

The government was also in the process of expanding and strengthening the network of municipal public employment offices (MPEOs) as part of a national employment strategy. Conceived as a space where local governments take the leading role in assisting people with employment problems in their own communities, the MPEOs have become a crucial tool for implementing active employment policies for SCE and PJMMT beneficiaries. Since 2005 when they began to operate, up to the first quarter of 2009 MPEOs had helped a total of 1,312,196 persons with job advisory services, support in seeking work and advice to the self-employed. They had also provided job brokerage and referrals to schools or professional training for social services and other programmes of the Ministry of Labour.

(c) *Expansion of child benefits to vulnerable families in the informal economy.* Argentina has a contributory family allowance programme that covers about 3.8 million infants and adolescents. Still, this left between 4 and 5 million boys and girls under 18 not covered systematically, some of them only reached by one of the many small targeted income support programmes. In October 2009 the government enacted a Decree that extends child benefits to: (a) workers not registered (i.e. not contributing to social security) earning less than the minimum wage; (b) the unemployed; (c) domestic workers; and (d) workers registered in “*monotributo social*” (a simplified regime for self-employed workers on very low incomes). The new programme *Asignación Universal por Hijo para Protección Social* consists in a monthly amount of AR\$180 (about US\$47) per child, which has an unconditional component (AR\$144) and a conditional transfer (AR\$36) that is deposited in a savings account. The parent responsible for the child can withdraw the amount saved upon demonstrating that the child has fulfilled obligatory schooling or, in the case of children under 5, the obligatory vaccinations plan. Entitlement conditions consist in being under 18 years of age, born in the country (or parents resident for at least three years) and enrolled in public school. The programme is administered and financed by the Social Security Administration (ANSES)¹ and the government aims to gradually consolidate within this programme other family transfers currently provided under various social programmes.

As of 1 December 2009, the government was able to create a first register of beneficiaries showing that 2.7 million children and adolescents were entitled to receive the benefit. This is about 55 per cent of the population that could be potentially enrolled. The remaining potential beneficiaries are expected to continue joining the programme as they fulfil the requirements. The total cost of the programme will be about 0.5 per cent of GDP; once universal coverage is reached the total cost of the non-contributory component is expected to reach 1 per cent of GDP.

Note: ¹ ANSES is financed roughly as follows: 50 per cent workers' and employers' salary contributions; 50 per cent earmarked taxes (added value tax, income tax and other taxes).

Source: ILO, 2009I.

50 per cent; retirement pensions and length-of-service pensions decrease by 10 per cent overall; parental benefits reduce by 50 per cent for working parents; and the number of health centres will be halved and preparatory classes abolished. Ukraine has tightened eligibility conditions for the unemployment scheme, with the effect that the number of registered unemployed has decreased by 17 per cent compared to the previous year; at the same time the level of contributions and contributors has widened, although whether benefit levels have been affected is difficult to assess.

While the above examples show that the countries in question have had to prioritize restrictions in public spending in order to limit public finance deficits in an often dramatic crisis situation, the negative social impacts of such measures on the living standards of affected groups, as well as the potential longer-term economic impacts that depend on the depth and length of the recession, are too early to assess. In some countries

such measures have been adopted as a condition for receiving large-scale loans supporting the financial sector and the economy.

In addition, there is a risk that other countries, those that followed the expansionary fiscal policy during the crisis (a policy which helped to prevent a deeper and longer recession in many of them), will now face pressure for fiscal consolidation to cope with increased deficits and public debt. If and wherever it happens, this may result in cuts of social security spending to even below pre-crisis levels. This in turn may not only directly affect social security beneficiaries and consequently the standards of living of a large portion of the population but also, through the aggregate demand effect, slow down or significantly delay a full economic recovery.

There is always a conflict between concerns about long-term financial sustainability and the countercyclical role of social security (and wider public) spending.

An interesting illustration and solution comes from Sweden. Several years ago, within the main Swedish old-age pension scheme (which is PAYG-funded but organized as the Notional Defined Contribution (NDC)), a special feature was added in the form of an “automatic balancing mechanism”. Special calculation methods have been established to make it possible to estimate the long-term assets and liabilities of the PAYG scheme. If the estimated liabilities of the system exceed its assets, the annual indexation both of acquired pension rights and pensions in payment is supposed to be automatically reduced for the period necessary to bring back equilibrium. Obviously, such a mechanism would make the system financially stable. Whatever happens, it reduces current and future pensions by as much as needed in order to restore financial equilibrium to the system.

Up to 2007 the so-called “balance ratio” of the Swedish pension system was above 1 (assets higher than liabilities) and so the automatic balancing mechanism was not activated. The situation has changed with the crisis. In 2008 the balance ratio was calculated as less than 1 for the first time (liabilities surpassed the assets, activating the automatic balancing mechanism). Pension levels would therefore need to be actually decreased in 2010 and for at least another several years grow at a much slower pace than before. However, such a prospect opened a debate as to whether this should be allowed in conditions of crisis. The debate concluded that a discretionary intervention should be allowed, suspending the existing rule and reducing the scale of the decrease in pension levels expected for 2010, spreading it over a longer period to cushion the impact on pensioners’ living standards (Scherman, 2009).

Automatic adjustment mechanisms, linking pension entitlements to the state of the pension system’s finances, also exist in different forms in Canada, Germany, Japan and the Netherlands (occupational pensions).

The above example from Sweden clearly illustrates an important dilemma. On the one hand it reveals a willingness to introduce automatic budgetary mechanisms which would help to ensure long-term sustainability of specific expenditure programmes or overall public finances, thus making them immune to discretionary political decisions. This can be seen not only in Sweden but also in many other countries, in other recent reforms of social security pension programmes and also in wider reforms of public finances that require permanently balanced budgets at the local or national

level. But such long-term automatic mechanisms and regulations in times of economic downturn such as the current one may instead act as “automatic de-stabilizers” rather than stabilizers, as Joseph Stiglitz stressed in his speech in March 2009 to the ILO Governing Body (Stiglitz, 2009), unless governments can make discretionary corrections to the rules in time to achieve the policy outcomes desired in the current circumstances – as in the case of Sweden described above, or in Germany, where the “sustainability” factor of the German pension system would have led in 2008 and 2009 to pension increases of 0.46 per cent and 1.76 per cent, but the government has overridden the “automatic” mechanism, increasing pensions by 1.1 per cent and 2.41 per cent respectively. In the summary of its recent report *Pensions at a Glance 2009*, the OECD apparently supports such discretionary interventions and comes to the conclusion that the design of such automatic balancing “needs a re-think” as “it does not seem sensible to reduce benefits in a pro-cyclical way, taking money from the economy when it is weak” (OECD, 2009h, p. 8).

The crisis has demonstrated that rules such as automatic balancing mechanisms are not necessarily viable solutions. When they were activated by the crisis, this led in a number of cases to discretionary political interventions to prevent the benefits from decreasing in a pro-cyclical manner. Such interventions were justified in terms of both social policy (protecting living standards in the crisis) and economic policy (protecting aggregate demand).

Will the fate of these rules be the same in the future when demographic changes activate automatic balancing mechanisms more often, with a corresponding deterioration in the adequacy of benefits and relative living standards of the elderly? There is no doubt that there will be growing political pressure for discretionary interventions correcting or abolishing these systemic rules.

Should the future adequacy of benefits be left entirely to political discretion? Or rather, is it not better to supplement the rules related to financial equilibrium with other rules which would prevent benefits from falling below accepted levels? Such levels can be related to international standards but should be developed nationally and monitored, verified and adjusted through social dialogue that includes all stakeholders.

10.5 Impact of the crisis on pension funding: The need to revisit recent pension reforms³

The effect of the financial and economic crisis on pension systems depends on the category of pension schemes people belong to (defined contribution (DC), defined benefit (DB), PAYG or fully funded) and whether they are already retirees, close to retirement, or still have many years of contributing ahead of them.

In defined-benefit (DB) schemes, where pension amounts are calculated without regard to the level of reserves, the immediate impact will be less than in defined contribution schemes, where benefit guarantees are by their nature less effective. However, long-term contraction of employment and hence the number of contributors will also force governments to downward adjustments in DB schemes.


In fully funded defined-contribution (DC) pension schemes, pension entitlements in some cases might be lost completely. In OECD countries private pension funds lost 23 per cent of their value in 2008 (see figure 10.4). If the crisis turns into a long-term downward adjustment of asset prices, the outcome in DC schemes will inevitably be lower benefits paid at retirement. Any prolonged suppression of interest rates and asset prices will lead to serious difficulties by way of destabilized annuity rates (prices) and management of annuity reserve funds. The size of the long-term effect will depend on the depth and the duration of the downturn of asset prices. If the present price reductions turn into permanent level adjustments then old-age income will be reduced; if the downturn is short-lived the effect will be transitional.

While these losses are not permanent, they still show the vulnerability of pension levels in DC schemes, notably for people who are close to retirement and whose savings portfolios might not recover during their remaining active life. The most affected are people who will retire within the next months and years, those with long periods of membership in DB-funded pension schemes, and in particular those whose investment policy is heavily exposed to riskier assets (many people in Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States). Those pensioners in private pension plans who did not take annuity on retirement may also be seriously affected (see figure 10.4 and OECD, 2009c, p. 26). The reason why ILO Convention No. 102 requires an old-age pension to be paid as a

life annuity (periodical payment throughout a contingency) is precisely to protect the income security of the elderly from the impact of such events as the 2008–09 financial and economic crisis.

In the OECD countries at present, private financial sources constitute on average one-fifth of retirement incomes, but they are over 40 per cent in five countries: Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States. On the other hand, they are less than 5 per cent in Austria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. However, in the future private pensions (both mandatory and voluntary) are expected to provide 75 per cent of future retirement incomes in Mexico, 60 per cent in Slovakia, 50 per cent in Poland and 30 per cent in Hungary. As many of these schemes are relatively young and thus even if current losses in the pension funds are significant (in Poland, for instance, it is estimated that in real terms members lost on average between two and three years of their contributions), the impact of this single crisis on the incomes of future retirees may turn out to be relatively minor. Nevertheless, as the OECD stresses, these developments “highlight the need for resilience to future crisis” (OECD, 2009h, p. 3). In view of the recent experience a fundamental review is needed of social security pension systems; some of the pension reforms undertaken during the last two decades need to be revisited to see if corrections are required to decisions taken in the past, and if so, what they should be.

Figure 10.4 Real investment returns of pension funds, OECD countries, 2008 (percentages)



Link: OECD StatLink, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/635276166554>
Source: OECD, 2009c, p. 33, figure 1.3.

³ The following two sections of this chapter are based on Diop, 2009.

And corrections are needed. The degree of vulnerability of future pension levels to the performance of capital markets and other economic fluctuations, introduced in so many pension systems during the last three decades, was clearly a mistake that stands to be corrected. What is needed immediately is to protect the pension levels of those who are close to retirement. Strong minimum pension guarantees may work here as “automatic stabilizers” of retirees’ living standards. Some countries have such guarantees already; others have included one-off payments to older people in their stimulus packages as a temporary relief (Australia, Greece, United Kingdom and United States). Others have decided as a result of the current crisis to strengthen and expand minimum guarantees in their pension systems (Belgium, Finland, France and United Kingdom, as well as countries with higher than average poverty incidence among the elderly – Australia, Republic of Korea and Spain).

Policies strengthening pension guarantees for low-income earners and thus significantly correcting past reform trends will have to be further increased. As the OECD study shows (2009b, p. 5), in countries such as Germany, Japan or the United States future low-income earners will be receiving pensions at the level of 20–25 per cent of average earnings. The OECD average will be 36 per cent with Denmark (62 per cent) at the top of the list.

In the short run the state may authorize pension schemes to reduce their levels of capitalization for a transitional period, as has been done in the Netherlands, for example. This is probably the only realistic option at present, given global resource constraints. If asset prices rebound at some point, the overall cost of the guarantees will be only a fraction of the temporary losses.

In their observations in response to the crisis, the OECD have suggested that governments could play a more active role in managing the risks associated with the payout phase of pensions and annuities, with the idea that they could encourage the market for longevity hedging products by producing an official longevity index. Other OECD proposals include suggestions that governments should issue longevity bonds that “would set a benchmark for private issuers”, and should also consider issuing more long-term and inflation-indexed bonds – a move already taken by a small number of countries, most recently by the Danish Government with the release of a 30-year bond that was primarily bought by domestic pension funds and insurance companies.

But much more fundamentally, this is the time for a new approach in debating pension reform. This should include:

- rebuilding trust in public DB schemes – which have once again proved to be much more secure in times of economic turbulence – by clearly showing the trade-offs between DC and DB schemes in terms of the security of future benefit levels;
- rebalancing pension systems in their DB/DC and funded/PAYG mixes so that they can achieve their multiple objectives,⁴ in particular preventing poverty in old age and providing secure replacement income on retirement, thus enabling pensioners to achieve what society sees as an adequate standard of living;
- returning to the debate on necessary reforms of public pensions, in order to make them sustainable as populations age without losing adequate income security. Reforms to be debated should include:
 - the introduction into pension schemes, as stabilizers, of such rules as would adjust the age at which people can retire, and the minimum duration that people have to contribute in order to qualify for full pension, in line with the improving life expectancy and health status of those around retirement age; such rules would also need to take into account the pace of progress in working conditions;
 - the establishment of such funding levels in the DB public pension schemes as are necessary to optimize the economic role of pension schemes both in the short (economic fluctuations) and the long run (demographic processes);
- introducing reforms in other parts of social security systems through enhancing coverage and improving unemployment benefit schemes so that pension schemes are not used as a substitute;
- achieving such decent working conditions that people can both work longer and live longer in good health;
- expanding lifelong learning so that workers are always up to date with new technologies;
- changing the attitudes of employers towards older workers;
- changing the attitudes of society to caregivers;

⁴ In-depth analysis by Barr and Diamond (2008) includes evidence that some of the main objectives of pension systems have been neglected during the reforms of the last three decades.

- introducing reforms of the DC pensions including:
 - the enforcement of efficiency through decreasing administrative cost levels in any reform of DC and funded schemes;
 - the removal of tax breaks for voluntary private third-tier pension schemes;
 - the reduction of the dependency of benefit levels in pension schemes on volatile market performance through introducing DB-type guarantees into the DC schemes, or by guaranteeing rates of return in such a manner as would provide replacement rates on retirement at target levels.

The ILO does not have a specific pension model, but it does have a set of basic requirements for pension systems. These are included in its social security standards which have been built up over many decades, and which specify the way in which social security systems should perform. It has never been timelier than now to remember, promote and apply those principles:

- (1) *Universal coverage.* Everybody has a right to affordable retirement through pension systems that provide all residents with at least a minimum level of income protection in old age. Similarly, everybody has a right to income security in case of loss of a breadwinner or of disability.
- (2) *Benefits as a right.* Entitlements to pension benefits should be precisely specified as predictable rights.
- (3) *Equity and fairness.* There should be equal treatment of all without discrimination, including equal treatment of national and non-national residents. Entitlement conditions and benefit provisions should be gender-fair.
- (4) *Protection against poverty.* Pension systems should provide a reliable minimum benefit guarantee.
- (5) *Replacement of lost income.* Contributory earnings-related systems should provide guaranteed replacement rates at least to those with below-average earnings.
- (6) *Collective actuarial equivalence of contributions and pension levels.* Benefit amounts for all contributors should adequately reflect the overall contributions paid.
- (7) *Guarantee of a minimum rate of return on savings.* The real value of contributions paid into savings schemes should be protected wherever these are part of the national pension systems.
- (8) *Sound financing and fiscal responsibility.* Schemes should be financed in such a way as to avoid

uncertainty about their long-term viability. Pension schemes should not crowd out the fiscal space for other social benefits in the context of limited overall national social budgets.

- (9) *Policy coherence and coordination.* Pension policies should be an inherent part of coherent and coordinated social security policies aimed at providing affordable access to essential health care and income security to all those in need.
- (10) *State responsibility.* The State should remain the ultimate guarantor of the right to affordable retirement and access to adequate pensions.

Such guarantees can be applied to both PAYG and fully funded pension schemes. They can be legislated by any government. Most likely they will not lead to major increases in real expenditure, but in any case they will cost a fraction of the cost to taxpayers of the recent bailout of the financial system.

10.6 Impact of the crisis on social health protection financing

The current and past financial and economic crises have substantially affected the most vulnerable: the elderly depending on old-age pensions, and the sick in need of effective access to quality health services in order to continue working and generating income for themselves and their families. In the following we provide insight into lessons learnt from the past on how to reduce financial risks for pension funding and ensure social health protection in times of economic crisis.

When it comes to social health protection, financial and economic crises tend to severely affect workers' health and even result in increased morbidity and mortality, as well as contributing to deepened poverty particularly for the most vulnerable parts of the population. The crisis impacts are mostly linked to the delivery of services covered by social health protection and relate particularly to access to quality health services and drugs. The most important impact is expected to be shouldered by women and children/newborns. Further, health-care costs might force workers to reduce their utilization of needed services if public health systems cannot respond due to budget constraints; as a result private health facilities serving the better off might develop more rapidly.

At the national level, these developments are mostly induced during crises by increases in unemployment,

and decreases in tax revenues and often donor support in developing countries. Frequently this leads, at first, to significant impacts on the health workforce and the availability and affordability of quality services and drugs. As a result, the availability of quality services will be significantly reduced and prices will increase. Thus key objectives of social health protection will be threatened.

In addition, shrinking household incomes will constrain access to health services, while health risks with poverty are expected to increase (Saadah, Pradhan and Surbakti, 2000): during the East Asian financial crisis of 1997/98 a reduction in household incomes due to job losses was observed. This development was accompanied by increases in prices for services in the public health sector compared to the private sector, and led to decreasing quantity and quality of needed health care. As a result, utilization rates of health services changed, since the poor could no longer afford them.

As in previous crises, governments have recently employed various means to lessen the impact of the current one. Policy options deployed during this economic crisis have been taken with particular focus on the financial sector. Some of these measures have produced unforeseen and unintended effects impacting on social health protection coverage and access to health care. They include, particularly, public budget cuts and measures that shift health-care costs towards workers and their families.

Key measures in social health protection coverage observed during the current period of crisis include the following (Fridfinnsdottir and Jonsson, 2009; te Velde et al., 2009):

- Cuts in budgets available for social health protection coverage were widely proposed as part of general cuts in the public spending of Eastern and Western European countries (Timmins, 2009; WHO, 2009e), the United States (Simms and Rowson, 2009) and developing countries of Asia and Africa.
- In Iceland, it has been proposed that health services be cut back by approximately 7 per cent. Further, health-care facilities should be merged and terminations or cutbacks of contractual payments to the health workforce foreseen.
- In Montenegro it has been decided to cut social health protection spending by reducing its minimum benefit health package.

- In 2009, Georgia launched a private health insurance to cover emergency care and some primary care services. State subsidies will cover two-thirds of insurance premiums in privately run health insurance firms. To mitigate poverty, the State is also extending its Medical Assistance Programme to an additional 200,000 individuals below the poverty line.
- Slovenia also began a similar programme that includes state subsidies for private health insurance premiums for vulnerable groups in 2009.
- In Latvia, the Government considered the closure of rural health centres as a cost-saving measure.
- Croatia plans to increase user charges for health services and prescriptions by 20 per cent and at the same time promote the uptake of supplementary insurance where vulnerable groups will be exempted.

The impact of the crisis on social health protection will vary among and within countries, depending on their exposure to international financial markets, public debt, exports and remittances (WHO, 2009f, p. 1). The 98th Session of the International Labour Conference held in June 2009 pointed out that “dramatic falls in international trade, foreign investment, migrant workers’ remittances and flows of migrant workers are major factors in spreading and deepening the world recession”. According to the projections, the low-income countries of sub-Saharan Africa were expected to experience a decline of 4.5 per cent in their growth rates in 2009, whereas middle- and high-income country economies were expected to shrink by 0.1 per cent in 2009.

There is no doubt that all these developments will have significant implications for the health of the population and social health protection coverage. In fact, workers’ health and gaps in social health protection coverage are among those areas through which the severity of the crisis is already most visible; and it is the vulnerable populations, such as workers in the informal economy, the poor and women in rural areas, who are at greatest risk of suffering increased morbidity and mortality from the crisis. Against this background, it is most important to address, in upcoming policy decisions, equity in effective coverage and access – particularly with a view to protecting women and newborn children and with the aim of scaling up efforts to maintain and improve social health protection coverage.

Conclusion

Closing the coverage gaps and building social security for all

The current crisis has once more proved how important a role social security plays in society in times of crisis and adjustment. It works as an irreplaceable economic, social and political stabilizer in such hard times – both for individual lives and the life of society as a whole. Social security plays this role in addition to its other functions – providing mechanisms to alleviate and also to prevent poverty, to reduce income disparities to acceptable levels, and also to enhance human capital and productivity. Social security is thus one of the conditions for sustainable economic and social development. It is a factor in development. It is also an important factor in a modern democratic state and in society (Townsend, 2009).

This report has clearly shown that the majority of the world population still has no access to comprehensive social security systems. Thus, to prepare global society for future economic downturns and to achieve other global objectives such as the Millennium Development Goals, sustainable economic development and a fair globalization, a most fundamental task is to develop comprehensive social security systems in countries where only rudimentary systems exist so far, starting with the provision of basic income security and affordable access to essential health care. The demands of the current crisis carry with them the risk that we seek only short-term “quick fixes” to poverty and insecurity while neglecting longer-term solutions that would help to correct the fundamental inequities in the global economy and society.

Social security will effectively cushion the negative impacts of the crisis if its foundations, based on social

solidarity, are strengthened. The ILO is promoting the reshaping of national social security systems based on the principle of progressive universalism. It seeks first to ensure a minimum set of social security benefits for all: the social protection floor. Based on that floor, higher levels of social security should then be sought as economies develop and the fiscal space for redistributive policies widens.

Higher- and middle-income countries. Despite the talk about over-burdened welfare states in past decades, this crisis gives new visibility to the crucial role of social security in weathering economic storms, now and in the future. Memories of the devastating effects an economic crisis can have on households and individuals have nearly faded for most people in the high-income countries. This can be seen as a success story, largely attributable to the comprehensive social security systems that have been established – often as a response to earlier crises. Thus, in developed economies comprehensive and state-organized social security based on the principle of solidarity must not be treated as a relic of the past – it is a powerful tool for economic and societal development in the future. It is of central importance to sustain the fiscal space for public social security schemes through government policies.

Low-income countries. While many higher-income and some middle-income countries are relatively well equipped in social security and thus have effective instruments for the prevention of poverty, this is far from being the case in many other countries of the

world, where only a minority has access to even basic levels of social protection. Fortunately it seems that the crisis has helped the international community to reach a wide consensus on the necessity of investments in social protection in low-income countries. As the OECD Development Assistance Committee says (2009i):

Social protection directly reduces poverty and helps make growth more pro-poor. It stimulates the involvement of poor women and men in economic growth, protects the poorest and most vulnerable in a downturn and contributes to social cohesion and stability. It helps build human capital, manage risks, promote investment and entrepreneurship and improve participation in labour markets. Social protection programmes can be affordable, including for the poorest countries, and represent good value for money.

Sharing this view, the Chief Executives' Board of the UN System has presented the concept of establishing a social protection floor by ensuring access to basic social services, and the empowerment and protection of the poor and vulnerable (United Nations, 2009a). Such social protection should consist of two broad main elements:

- (a) *services*: geographical and financial access to essential public services such as water and sanitation, health, and education; and
- (b) *transfers*: a basic set of essential social transfers, in cash and in kind, paid to the poor and vulnerable to provide a minimum level of income security and access to essential services, including health care.

The ILO's Global Jobs Pact as agreed in June 2009 (2009a) thus requests countries to develop

adequate social protection for all, drawing on a basic social protection floor including: access to health care, income security for the elderly and persons with disabilities, child benefits and income security combined with public employment guarantee schemes for the unemployed and the working poor

and urges the international community "to provide development assistance, including budgetary support, to build up a basic social protection floor on a national basis".

There is an urgent need to introduce basic social protection mechanisms where they are not already in place; equally needed is the provision of support to strengthen existing social security schemes. Both actions are indispensable as means to protect men and women against the worst effects of the crisis and as instruments to support effective demand in economies and help their recovery. The value of social transfers and expenditures to reduce poverty and ensure access to basic services, as well as the value of social investment and social policies aimed at protecting the most vulnerable, are increasingly recognized not only internationally but also in national debates. To translate the several objectives into practice – the provision of income security to all, including financial protection against catastrophic health expenditure together with access to health-care services – while recognizing that the poorest countries face strong financial constraints, requires a strategy that focuses first on putting in place a basic and modest set of social security guarantees, defined in Chapter 1 (p. 17) as the social transfer component of a social protection floor.

Donors seem to be positive to the call for support in expanding social protection in low-income countries both during the crisis and beyond. The OECD Development Assistance Committee (OECD, 2009i) declares:

Donors' support for social protection programmes should provide adequate, long-term and predictable financial assistance to help partner governments establish gender-sensitive social protection programmes and create the conditions for those programmes to be politically and financially sustainable. This is especially important in the current situation of contracting fiscal space and declining financial inflows. Such support must be provided through harmonized and coordinated financing mechanisms in support of nationally defined strategies and programmes.

In its recent White Paper on International Development, *Building our common future* (DfID, 2009, p. 25), the Government of the United Kingdom urges the World Bank to "pay greater attention to social protection" and to use the Rapid Social Response Programme more effectively to help low-income countries build the necessary basic social protection programmes. Echoing a similar resolution of the Second Committee of the UN General Assembly, the UN Commission for Social Development adopted a resolution in February 2010 that "urges Governments ... to develop systems

of social protection and to extend or broaden, as appropriate, their effectiveness and coverage, including for workers in the informal economy, ... and invites the International Labour Organization to strengthen its social protection strategies, including the assistance to countries in building Social Protection Floors and policies on extending social security coverage”.

Such a growing global coalition has a real opportunity to make a difference and help the majority at present without social security coverage to weather the current crisis and be better prepared for future ones. But this is not all: in the long run it is the way to gradually build a fair globalization and thus a richer and more peaceful world.

Bibliography

- Asian Development Bank (ADB). 2006. *Social Protection Index for Committed Poverty Reduction*, Vol. 1 (Manila).
- . 2008. *Social Protection Index for Committed Poverty Reduction*, Vol. 2 (Manila).
- Barr, N.; Diamond, P. 2008. *Reforming pensions: Principles and policy choices* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Barrientos, A.; Holmes, R.; Scott, J. 2008. *Social Assistance in Developing Countries*, Database (Version 4.0, August 2008), Brooks World Poverty Institute, The University of Manchester Overseas Development Institute. Available at <http://www.chronicpoverty.org> (accessed December 2009).
- Betcherman, G.; Islam, R. (eds). 2001. *East Asian labor markets and the economic crisis: Impacts, responses and lessons* (World Bank, Washington, DC and ILO, Geneva).
- Cichon, M. et al. 2004. *Financing social protection* (Geneva, ILO).
- Deaton, A. 2006. Annual Lecture 2006, World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER), United Nations University, Helsinki.
- Department for International Development (DfID). 2009. *Building our common future* (London).
- Dercon, S.; Krishnan, P. 2000. "In sickness and in health: Risk sharing within households in rural Ethiopia", in *Journal of Political Economy* (Chicago), Vol. 108, No. 4, pp. 688–727.
- Diop, A. 2009. *The need for solidarity: Social security systems in times of crisis*, Paper presented at the Seminar on Social Security in Times of Crisis: Impact, Challenges and Responses, International Social Security Association, Geneva, 24–25 April 2009. Available at <http://www.issa.int> (accessed September 2009).
- Dixon-Fyle, K.; Mulanga, C. 2004. *Responding to HIV/AIDS in the world of work in Africa: The role of social protection*. ILO/AIDS Working Paper 5 (Geneva, ILO).
- European Commission. 2006. *Current and prospective theoretical pension replacement rates*. Report by the Indicators Sub-Group (ISG) of the Social Protection Committee (SPC), 19 May 2006.
- . 2008. *ESSPROS Manual* (Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Commission).
- . 2009a. *Living Conditions and Welfare: Social Protection Database*, ESSPROS, European System of Integrated Social Protection Statistics (Luxembourg, EUROSTAT).
- . 2009b. *Portfolio of indicators for the monitoring of the European Strategy for Social Inclusion and Social Protection*, Sep. 2009 update, Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities DG (Brussels).

- Freije-Rodriguez, S.; Murrugarra, E. 2009. *Labor markets and the crisis in Latin America and the Caribbean: A preliminary review for selected countries*, World Bank Latin America and Caribbean Region, LCR Crisis Briefs, 15 June 2009 (Washington, DC).
- Fridfinnsdottir, E. B.; Jonsson, J. A. 2009. *The impact of the economic recession on nurses and nursing in Iceland*, unpublished draft (Iceland Nurses Association).
- International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS). 1982. *Resolution concerning statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment*. Adopted by the Thirteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva).
- . 1998. *Resolution concerning statistics of occupational injuries resulting from occupational accidents*. Adopted by the Sixteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva).
- International Labour Office (ILO). 1993. *International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE-93)* (Geneva).
- . 1999. *Sources and Methods. Vol. 8: Occupational injuries. Companion to the Yearbook of Labour Statistics* (Geneva).
- . 2000. *World Labour Report 2000: Income security and social protection in a changing world* (Geneva).
- . 2005. *Social protection as a productive factor*. Report of the Employment and Social Policy Committee of the Governing Body of the International Labour Organization (Geneva).
- . 2008a. *Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization*. Adopted by the International Labour Conference, 97th Session, 2008 (Geneva).
- . 2008b. *Social health protection: An ILO strategy towards universal access to health care*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 1 (Geneva).
- . 2008c. *Setting social security standards in a global society: An analysis of present state and practice and of future options for global social security standard setting in the International Labour Organization*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 2 (Geneva).
- . 2008d. *Can low income countries afford basic social security?*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 3 (Geneva).
- . 2008e. *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)*, 5th edition (Geneva).
- . 2008f. *Zambia: Social protection expenditure and performance review and social budget* (Geneva).
- . 2008g. *Tanzania: Social protection expenditure and performance review and social budget* (Geneva).
- . 2008h. *Extending social protection in the Asia-Pacific region: Progress and challenges*, Paper presented at the Asia-Pacific Regional High-Level Meeting on Socially Inclusive Strategies to Extend Social Security Coverage, New Delhi, India, 19–20 May 2008.
- . 2009a. *Recovering from the crisis: A Global Jobs Pact*. Adopted by the International Labour Conference, 98th Session, 2009 (Geneva). Available at <http://www.ilo.org> (accessed September 2009).
- . 2009b. *Social security for all: Investing in social justice and economic development*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 7 (Geneva).
- . 2009c. ILO Social Security Inquiry (SSI). Database (Geneva).
- . 2009d. Global Extension of Social Security (GESS). Database. ILO Social Security Department and STEP. Available at <http://www.socialsecurityextension.org/gimi/gess> (accessed July 2010).
- . 2009e. LABORSTA. Database on labour statistics. Available at <http://www.laborsta.ilo.org> (accessed Feb. 2010).
- . 2009f. *Social health protection coverage and access to health care: Concepts, definitions and measurements. Preliminary ideas*. Mimeo (Geneva).
- . 2009g. *Economically Active Population Estimates and Projections: 1980–2020*, 5th edition (Geneva).
- . 2009h. *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)*, 6th edition (Geneva).
- . 2009i. *Yearbook of Labour Statistics 2009*, Time series and Country profiles, 68th edition (Geneva).

- . 2009j. *Database of Conditions of Work and Employment Laws: Working Time – Minimum Wages – Maternity Protection*. Database, ILO/TRAVAIL. Available at <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/travail> (accessed January 2010).
- . 2009k. *Bolsa Familia in Brazil: Context, concept and impacts*, ILO Social Security Department (Geneva).
- . 2009l. “Argentina’s response to the crisis”, draft notes (Buenos Aires).
- . 2010a. *Extending social security to all: A guide through challenges and options* (Geneva).
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). 2001. *Government Finance Statistics: Manual 2001* (Washington, DC).
- . 2009. *Government Finance Statistics (GFS)*. Database. *Public social protection (excluding health) expenditure in percentage of GDP* (Washington, DC). Available at <http://www.imfstatistics.org/gfs> (accessed January 2010).
- International Social Security Association (ISSA). 2009. *Social security responses to the financial crisis*. ISSA Survey. Available at <http://www.issa.int> (accessed September 2009).
- Kabir, A. et al. 2000. “Sickness among the urban poor: A barrier to livelihood security”, in *Journal of International Development* (London), Vol. 12, No. 5, pp. 707–722.
- Kang, Soon-Hie et al. 2001. “Korea: Labor market outcomes and policy responses after the crisis”, in G. Betcherman; R. Islam (eds): *East Asian labor markets and the economic crisis: Impacts, responses and lessons* (World Bank, Washington, DC and ILO, Geneva).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2007. *Pensions at a Glance 2007* (Paris).
- . 2009a. *Social Expenditure Database (SOCX)*. Database (Paris). Available at <http://www.oecd.org/els/social/expenditure> (accessed January 2010).
- . 2009b. *Growing unequal? Income distribution and poverty in OECD countries* (Paris).
- . 2009c. *Pensions at a Glance 2009: Retirement-income systems in OECD countries* (Paris). Available at <http://www.oecd.org/els/social/pensions/PAG> (accessed December 2009).
- . 2009d. *Pensions at a Glance, Special Edition: Asia/Pacific* (Paris).
- . 2009e. *Promoting pro-poor growth: Social protection*, OECD Development Assistance Committee (Paris).
- . 2009f. *Society at a Glance 2009: OECD Social Indicators* (Paris).
- . 2009g. *Health at a Glance 2009: OECD Indicators*, 5th edition (Paris).
- . 2009h. “Pensions and the crisis: How should retirement-income systems respond to financial and economic pressures?”, in *Summary of Pensions at a Glance, 2009* (Paris). Available at <http://www.oecd.org> (accessed September 2009).
- . 2009i. “Making economic growth more pro-poor: The role of employment and social protection”, Policy Statement by the OECD Development Assistance Committee, High Level Meeting, 27 and 28 May 2009, Paris. Available at <http://www.oecd.org> (accessed September 2009).
- . 2009j. *Income distribution – Inequality*. Database. Available at OECD StatExtracts, <http://stats.oecd.org> (accessed July 2010).
- Pisani-Ferry, J. 2009. “Les bonnes et mauvaise flexibilités” [Good and bad flexibility], BRUEGEL Opinion piece in *Le Monde*, 29 June 2009. Available at <http://www.bruegel.org> (accessed December 2009).
- Prasad, N.; Gerecke, M. 2009. *Employment-oriented crisis responses: Lessons from Argentina and the Republic of Korea* (Geneva, International Institute for Labour Studies).
- . Forthcoming. *Insecure and uninsured? An empirical investigation of social security spending in times of crisis* (Geneva, International Institute for Labour Studies).
- Romero-Ortuño, R. 2004. “Access to health care for illegal immigrants in the EU: Should we be concerned?”, in *European Journal of Health Law* (Amsterdam, Martinus Nijhoff), Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 245–272.
- Saadah, F.; Pradhan, M.; Surbakti, S. 2000. *Health care during financial crisis: What can we learn from the Indonesian National Socioeconomic Survey?* Health, Nutrition and Population (HNP) Discussion Paper (Washington, DC, World Bank).

- Scheil-Adlung, X. 2009. "Providing health services to migrants worldwide", in *Labour Markets and Migrations' Impact on Healthy Workplaces*, McGill World Platform for Health and Economic Convergence (Montreal).
- ; Bonnet, F.; Wiechers, T. 2010. *New approaches to measuring universal coverage and access to health care* (Geneva, ILO).
- , et al. 2007. "Social protection, poverty reduction and access to care. A comparative study on Kenya, Senegal and South Africa", in GTZ-ILO-WHO: *Extending social health protection – developing countries' experiences: Lessons learnt and recommendations* (Frankfurt/Eschborn).
- Scherman, K. G. 2009. "Politicians dodge the pension issue", in *Svenska Dagbladet* (3 June).
- Simms, C.; Rowson, M. 2009. "Effect of the financial crisis and rescue plan on ordinary Americans", in *The Lancet* (London), Vol. 373, No. 9658, pp. 123–124.
- Stiglitz, J. 2009. "Nobel prize-winning economist, Professor Joseph Stiglitz addresses Governing Body", available at <http://www.ilo.org/global/> (accessed September 2009). The speech has been published as an article: "The global crisis, social protection, and jobs", in *International Labour Review*, Vol. 148 (2009), No. 1–2, pp. 1–13.
- SOCX *see* OECD.
- SSA/ISSA (US Social Security Administration/International Social Security Association). 2008, 2009. *Social Security Programs Throughout the World* (Washington, DC and Geneva). Available at <http://www.socialsecurity.gov> (accessed December 2009).
- Timmins, N. 2009. "Budget lays bare full cost to public services of economic crisis". Abstract of article in *British Medical Journal*, Vol. 338 (28 Apr.), b1754.
- Tokman, V. E. 2007. *Informality: Exclusion and precariousness*, Paper prepared for the Tripartite Interregional Symposium on the Informal Economy: Enabling Transition to Formalization, organized by the International Labour Office, Geneva, 27–29 November 2007.
- Townsend, P. (ed.). 2009. *Building decent societies: Rethinking the role of social security in development* (Geneva, ILO and London, Palgrave Macmillan).
- United Nations. 2007. *World Population Prospects: The 2006 revision*, CD-ROM edition. United Nations Population Division (New York).
- . 2009a. Communiqué of 5 April 2009, Secretariat of the United Nations System, Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) (Paris).
- . 2009b. *World Population Prospects: The 2008 revision*, United Nations Population Division (New York).
- . 2009c. *Indicators on women and men*. United Nations Statistics Division (New York).
- . 2009d. UNDATA. Internet-based data service bringing together data from the United Nations and specialized agencies. Available at <http://data.un.org> (accessed February 2010).
- . 2009e. *Millennium Development Goals Database*, United Nations Statistics Division (New York).
- . 2009f. *The Millennium Goals Report 2009*, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) (New York).
- . 2010. *Report on the World Social Situation 2010: Rethinking poverty*, UNDESA (New York).
- United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). 2009. *Impact of the Economic Crisis on Children*, Report of the Conference for East Asia and the Pacific Islands, Singapore, 6–7 January 2009.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2008. *Human Development Report 2008* (New York).
- . 2009. *Human Development Report 2009* (New York). Available at <http://hdrstats.undp.org> (accessed January 2010).
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). 1997. *International Standard Classification of Education – ISCED 97* (Paris).
- United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). 2008. *Social insurance (pensions and health), labour markets and coverage in Latin America* (Geneva).
- te Velde, D. W. et al. 2009. *The global financial crisis and developing countries: Synthesis of the findings of 10 country case studies*, ODI Working Paper 306 (London, Overseas Development Institute).

- World Bank. 2000. *Towards universal health care coverage* (Washington, DC).
- . 2008. *Spending on social safety nets: Comparative data compiled from World Bank analytic work*. Database (Washington, DC).
- . 2009a. *World Development Indicators*. Database (Washington, DC).
- . 2009b. *South Asia: Jobs in times of crisis*, Discussion Note for the Regional Management Team, 24 April 2009 (Washington, DC).
- . 2009c. *Total beneficiaries of mandatory pension systems* (Washington, DC).
- World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization. 2004. *A fair globalization: Creating opportunities for all* (Geneva, ILO).
- World Health Organization (WHO). 2005. *World Health Report 2005: Make every mother and child count* (Geneva).
- . 2008. *World Health Report 2008: Primary health care, now more than ever* (Geneva).
- . 2009a. *Statistical Information System (WHOSIS)* (Geneva). Available at <http://www.who.int/whosis/> (accessed January 2010).
- . 2009b. *World Health Statistics 2009* (Geneva).
- . 2009c. Background documents, Technical Consultation on the Health and Economic Crisis (Geneva).
- . 2009d. "Health and the financial crisis: A complex diagnosis", in *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* (Geneva), Vol. 87, No. 1 (Jan.).
- . 2009e. "Addressing the global economic crisis while fighting inequalities", press release of the WHO Regional Office for Europe about the Meeting of Experts hosted by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services and the Norwegian Directorate of Health, Oslo, Norway, 1–2 April 2009.
- . 2009f. Briefing note for the Ministry of Health on health and crisis.

Statistical Annex

The demographic, economic and labour market environment

A

Demographic indicators

Table 1. Demographic trends: Dependency ratios

Major area, region or country	Total dependency ratio (%)					Old-age dependency ratio (%)					Youth dependency ratio (%)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
World	59.1	55.3	52.7	52.3	56.0	10.9	11.3	11.6	17.8	25.3	48.3	44.1	41.2	34.5	30.6
More developed regions ^a	48.5	47.8	48.1	61.1	71.3	21.3	22.6	23.6	36.2	44.9	27.2	25.2	24.4	24.8	26.4
Less developed regions ^b	61.9	57.2	53.8	50.8	53.8	8.1	8.5	8.8	14.6	22.5	53.8	48.7	44.9	36.2	31.3
Least developed countries ^c	84.0	80.0	76.0	61.8	52.5	5.8	5.8	5.8	7.3	11.3	78.2	74.2	70.2	54.5	41.2
Less developed regions, excluding least developed countries ^d	58.9	53.9	50.4	48.6	54.1	8.4	8.9	9.3	16.1	25.6	50.5	45.0	41.1	32.5	28.5
Less developed regions, excluding China	67.4	63.0	59.1	51.4	51.9	7.3	7.6	7.9	12.2	19.3	60.1	55.4	51.2	39.2	32.6
Sub-Saharan Africa ^e	88.5	86.0	83.5	65.4	52.4	5.7	5.7	5.8	6.4	9.1	82.9	80.3	77.7	58.9	43.3
Africa	83.9	80.2	77.6	62.6	52.5	6.0	6.0	6.1	7.4	10.8	78.0	74.2	71.5	55.2	41.7
<i>Eastern Africa</i> ¹	92.9	90.4	87.9	67.9	52.9	5.7	5.7	5.7	6.1	8.6	87.2	84.7	82.2	61.8	44.3
Burundi	96.6	79.4	68.7	56.4	49.5	5.7	5.1	4.7	6.7	11.5	90.9	74.3	63.9	49.7	38.0
Comoros	74.8	70.8	69.9	53.4	51.6	5.3	5.2	5.2	7.6	14.5	69.5	65.6	64.7	45.8	37.1
Djibouti	78.2	70.7	63.6	51.6	46.7	4.8	5.1	5.4	7.7	12.4	73.4	65.6	58.2	43.9	34.3
Eritrea	89.1	79.3	78.6	54.6	50.8	4.6	4.2	4.5	4.4	10.8	84.6	75.1	74.1	50.2	40.0
Ethiopia	95.3	91.9	86.5	64.1	48.2	5.7	5.9	6.0	6.6	9.2	89.5	86.0	80.5	57.6	39.0
Kenya	88.5	83.5	83.3	64.3	53.4	5.2	5.0	4.8	6.0	9.3	83.3	78.5	78.5	58.3	44.1
Madagascar	93.3	89.9	83.6	62.5	50.9	6.0	5.9	5.6	7.1	10.3	87.3	84.1	78.0	55.4	40.5
Malawi	95.8	99.3	96.2	73.5	54.3	5.9	6.1	6.1	6.2	7.4	89.9	93.2	90.1	67.3	46.9
Mauritius ²	46.7	45.4	42.2	49.8	60.0	8.5	9.4	10.7	21.3	32.7	38.2	35.9	31.5	28.4	27.3
Mayotte	91.0	81.9	69.9	49.1	46.4	5.3	5.4	5.6	8.5	16.7	85.6	76.5	64.3	40.6	29.6
Mozambique	88.0	89.6	89.3	68.0	52.9	5.9	6.1	6.2	6.8	7.8	82.1	83.6	83.0	61.2	45.1
Réunion	52.9	51.9	50.8	55.0	57.5	9.8	10.8	11.7	21.9	28.7	43.1	41.1	39.1	33.1	28.9
Rwanda	94.0	82.3	81.2	65.6	54.4	5.2	4.8	4.5	5.8	9.1	88.8	77.5	76.8	59.8	45.3
Somalia	88.4	90.1	90.8	78.8	60.5	5.2	5.3	5.2	6.0	7.5	83.2	84.9	85.7	72.8	53.1
Tanzania, United Rep. of	90.9	90.8	91.8	74.5	57.4	5.5	5.8	6.0	6.1	8.0	85.4	85.1	85.8	68.4	49.4
Uganda	109.4	108.1	105.1	79.4	56.3	5.9	5.4	5.2	4.1	6.4	103.5	102.7	99.9	75.3	49.9

Major area, region or country	Total dependency ratio (%)					Old-age dependency ratio (%)					Youth dependency ratio (%)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
Zambia	92.7	96.1	97.0	73.0	54.5	5.5	5.8	6.0	5.2	6.2	87.1	90.3	91.0	67.8	48.3
Zimbabwe	84.0	81.1	77.3	55.0	46.2	6.3	6.8	7.3	5.7	10.5	77.7	74.2	70.0	49.2	35.8
<i>Middle Africa</i>	<i>97.4</i>	<i>94.9</i>	<i>90.5</i>	<i>68.9</i>	<i>51.8</i>	<i>5.8</i>	<i>5.6</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>5.6</i>	<i>7.8</i>	<i>91.6</i>	<i>89.3</i>	<i>85.0</i>	<i>63.4</i>	<i>44.0</i>
Angola	98.2	94.9	89.2	71.3	54.6	4.9	4.8	4.7	5.5	7.7	93.2	90.1	84.5	65.8	47.0
Cameroon	86.8	82.6	79.6	60.3	50.6	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.7	10.0	80.2	76.1	73.2	53.6	40.6
Central African Republic	84.6	83.2	79.3	60.5	49.9	7.2	7.1	6.9	7.1	9.7	77.4	76.1	72.3	53.4	40.2
Chad	96.6	95.8	93.9	76.3	56.4	6.1	5.7	5.5	5.4	6.9	90.5	90.1	88.4	70.8	49.4
Congo	86.4	82.0	78.6	56.6	49.1	7.2	7.0	6.8	6.6	11.2	79.1	75.0	71.8	50.0	37.8
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	103.0	101.3	96.2	70.9	50.8	5.4	5.3	5.2	5.0	7.1	97.6	95.9	91.0	65.9	43.7
Equatorial Guinea	91.1	83.3	77.3	72.7	54.1	6.8	5.8	5.1	9.1	8.1	84.3	77.4	72.2	63.6	46.0
Gabon	84.2	75.6	66.4	53.6	48.0	8.8	7.8	7.2	9.7	14.2	75.4	67.8	59.2	43.9	33.8
Sao Tome and Principe	87.2	85.0	79.2	54.1	48.5	8.2	8.1	6.9	7.0	13.6	79.0	76.9	72.2	47.2	34.9
<i>Northern Africa</i>	<i>68.4</i>	<i>60.5</i>	<i>56.5</i>	<i>49.5</i>	<i>52.1</i>	<i>7.1</i>	<i>7.2</i>	<i>7.3</i>	<i>11.7</i>	<i>20.8</i>	<i>61.3</i>	<i>53.3</i>	<i>49.2</i>	<i>37.8</i>	<i>31.4</i>
Algeria	62.0	52.0	46.3	44.9	55.8	6.8	6.9	6.8	12.6	27.5	55.2	45.1	39.5	32.3	28.3
Egypt	70.0	60.8	58.1	49.7	50.8	7.3	7.2	7.3	11.5	19.8	62.7	53.6	50.8	38.2	31.1
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	55.1	51.8	52.5	42.3	57.5	5.2	5.8	6.6	11.6	27.7	49.9	46.0	45.9	30.7	29.8
Morocco	62.2	55.1	50.2	48.3	54.3	7.6	8.1	8.1	14.6	25.5	54.6	47.0	42.1	33.7	28.7
Sudan	83.3	79.0	73.4	55.4	48.9	6.0	6.2	6.4	8.1	12.8	77.3	72.9	67.0	47.3	36.2
Tunisia	57.1	47.8	42.0	45.8	59.7	9.9	9.9	9.6	17.1	33.2	47.2	37.9	32.4	28.7	26.5
Western Sahara	60.5	51.0	44.7	43.9	52.6	4.0	3.5	3.4	9.9	23.7	56.5	47.5	41.3	34.0	28.9
<i>Southern Africa</i>	<i>61.8</i>	<i>57.7</i>	<i>55.3</i>	<i>52.3</i>	<i>47.9</i>	<i>5.9</i>	<i>6.3</i>	<i>7.0</i>	<i>11.4</i>	<i>13.9</i>	<i>55.9</i>	<i>51.4</i>	<i>48.3</i>	<i>40.9</i>	<i>34.0</i>
Botswana	69.8	63.0	58.2	51.4	45.9	5.1	5.7	6.1	8.7	11.5	64.7	57.3	52.1	42.7	34.4
Lesotho	87.6	81.5	76.2	61.9	51.2	8.8	8.7	8.4	8.5	9.1	78.7	72.9	67.9	53.4	42.1
Namibia	79.8	73.8	66.8	54.9	47.7	6.2	6.1	6.1	8.5	11.8	73.7	67.7	60.7	46.4	35.9
South Africa	59.4	55.6	53.6	51.6	47.9	5.8	6.3	7.1	11.9	14.5	53.6	49.3	46.6	39.7	33.3
Swaziland	90.3	82.1	73.0	59.9	47.3	5.6	5.8	5.9	6.9	6.6	84.7	76.3	67.1	53.0	40.8
<i>Western Africa</i> ³	<i>88.1</i>	<i>85.6</i>	<i>83.8</i>	<i>64.4</i>	<i>53.0</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>5.6</i>	<i>6.2</i>	<i>9.1</i>	<i>82.6</i>	<i>80.1</i>	<i>78.2</i>	<i>58.3</i>	<i>43.9</i>
Benin	91.8	88.2	85.8	67.8	53.6	6.1	5.9	6.1	6.9	9.9	85.8	82.3	79.7	60.9	43.7
Burkina Faso	96.1	91.9	93.9	72.1	54.6	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.3	6.9	91.8	87.9	90.0	67.8	47.7
Cape Verde	91.0	78.2	65.5	50.5	50.8	8.4	8.1	6.8	10.5	21.1	82.6	70.1	58.7	40.0	29.8
Côte d'Ivoire	80.8	81.5	79.6	60.8	50.1	5.8	6.5	7.0	7.7	11.0	75.0	75.0	72.6	53.1	39.1
Gambia	84.1	83.9	81.6	63.0	50.3	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.8	8.6	79.1	78.8	76.4	57.1	41.7
Ghana	80.5	75.9	71.8	58.9	53.3	6.0	6.1	6.3	7.9	12.2	74.5	69.8	65.5	51.1	41.1
Guinea	89.4	86.8	84.9	67.6	53.0	5.8	5.8	6.1	7.1	9.9	83.5	81.1	78.8	60.5	43.2
Guinea-Bissau	82.8	84.9	85.4	72.8	58.2	6.4	6.3	6.4	6.8	8.3	76.5	78.6	79.0	66.0	49.9
Liberia	89.3	87.0	83.9	65.1	51.7	5.6	5.6	5.7	7.2	10.0	83.7	81.4	78.2	57.9	41.8
Mali	92.7	88.5	86.5	68.3	54.3	5.0	4.5	4.3	4.3	6.9	87.7	84.0	82.2	64.0	47.4
Mauritania	81.5	76.3	72.1	54.6	48.5	4.9	4.7	4.6	6.2	11.3	76.6	71.6	67.5	48.4	37.2
Niger	102.4	103.8	108.8	97.1	71.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.6	5.1	98.3	99.8	104.7	92.5	66.1
Nigeria	88.1	85.7	83.5	61.2	50.4	5.6	5.7	5.8	6.3	9.4	82.5	80.0	77.7	55.0	41.0
Senegal	92.3	88.2	84.2	58.9	49.0	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.4	8.7	87.5	83.6	79.8	54.5	40.4
Sierra Leone	79.1	80.7	82.9	66.2	53.5	4.0	3.5	3.4	3.6	6.2	75.2	77.2	79.5	62.6	47.3
Togo	85.7	80.7	75.8	57.8	50.5	6.0	6.1	6.3	7.8	12.8	79.7	74.6	69.5	50.0	37.7
Asia	57.4	52.5	49.0	48.2	54.4	9.0	9.5	9.9	17.0	26.7	48.4	43.0	39.0	31.2	27.7
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	<i>47.7</i>	<i>42.7</i>	<i>40.3</i>	<i>50.3</i>	<i>65.1</i>	<i>11.4</i>	<i>12.4</i>	<i>13.4</i>	<i>25.8</i>	<i>40.5</i>	<i>36.3</i>	<i>30.3</i>	<i>27.0</i>	<i>24.5</i>	<i>24.6</i>
China ⁴	48.2	42.0	39.1	48.7	62.9	10.1	10.7	11.4	23.7	38.0	38.1	31.2	27.7	25.1	24.9
Hong Kong, China ⁵	38.6	36.3	32.3	60.5	78.1	15.3	16.7	17.0	42.2	58.0	23.4	19.6	15.3	18.4	20.1
Macau, China ⁶	42.4	30.2	24.8	53.7	82.4	10.5	9.3	9.2	36.2	63.7	31.9	20.9	15.6	17.4	18.7
Japan	46.7	50.9	55.7	71.3	96.3	25.3	30.0	35.1	52.8	74.3	21.4	20.8	20.5	18.5	22.0
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	48.3	47.9	44.9	45.2	53.2	10.3	12.6	14.2	18.0	27.7	37.9	35.2	30.6	27.2	25.5

Major area, region or country	Total dependency ratio (%)					Old-age dependency ratio (%)					Youth dependency ratio (%)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
Korea, Republic of	39.2	39.6	37.4	55.7	83.8	10.2	13.0	15.2	36.1	62.9	29.0	26.6	22.3	19.6	20.9
Mongolia	61.8	48.2	42.1	42.5	52.8	5.5	5.5	5.8	11.9	25.7	56.3	42.7	36.4	30.7	27.1
<i>South-Central Asia</i> ⁷	66.6	61.3	56.3	46.7	48.5	6.9	7.2	7.4	11.6	19.7	59.7	54.1	48.9	35.1	28.7
Afghanistan	97.1	96.2	92.8	78.4	57.7	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	5.7	92.7	91.8	88.5	74.0	52.0
Bangladesh	67.2	59.9	53.4	43.1	49.5	5.6	5.8	6.1	10.4	22.3	61.6	54.1	47.4	32.7	27.2
Bhutan	81.0	63.0	53.2	43.4	50.5	7.9	7.4	7.5	10.5	22.6	73.2	55.6	45.8	32.9	27.9
India	64.7	60.5	55.6	45.3	47.0	7.0	7.4	7.7	12.2	20.2	57.7	53.1	47.9	33.1	26.8
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	57.8	45.8	40.2	39.9	58.1	7.3	7.3	6.8	12.7	31.1	50.5	38.5	33.4	27.3	27.0
Kazakhstan	52.6	47.4	44.5	47.4	52.9	10.4	11.7	10.0	16.3	23.8	42.2	35.8	34.5	31.2	29.1
Kyrgyzstan	67.9	59.0	51.7	46.3	50.3	9.2	9.3	7.7	13.3	22.1	58.7	49.7	44.1	33.0	28.3
Maldives	76.4	58.2	46.0	41.1	52.3	6.0	6.3	6.4	9.9	25.6	70.4	51.9	39.6	31.3	26.8
Nepal	80.0	74.7	66.6	50.3	46.9	6.3	6.6	6.8	8.8	15.6	73.7	68.1	59.8	41.5	31.3
Pakistan	81.6	73.5	68.6	54.0	49.6	6.7	6.6	6.9	8.9	15.0	75.0	66.9	61.7	45.1	34.7
Sri Lanka	49.2	45.8	47.1	55.4	63.5	9.5	9.9	11.4	24.9	35.0	39.7	35.9	35.7	30.5	28.5
Tajikistan	84.9	76.4	66.5	52.7	44.2	6.6	6.8	6.0	9.3	14.5	78.3	69.6	60.6	43.4	29.7
Turkmenistan	68.3	58.5	49.6	43.8	48.7	7.2	7.2	6.2	11.7	20.8	61.1	51.2	43.4	32.1	27.9
Uzbekistan	71.4	60.1	49.3	46.2	49.2	7.4	7.6	6.6	12.5	22.0	64.1	52.5	42.7	33.7	27.2
<i>South-Eastern Asia</i>	58.0	53.4	49.4	47.5	55.3	7.8	8.3	8.7	15.8	26.8	50.3	45.1	40.7	31.7	28.4
Brunei Darussalam	52.0	47.2	42.4	42.5	50.6	4.5	4.7	4.9	13.0	23.1	47.5	42.5	37.5	29.6	27.6
Cambodia	81.3	67.2	56.6	49.4	46.0	5.4	5.3	5.6	9.1	15.1	75.9	61.9	51.0	40.3	30.8
Indonesia	54.3	51.3	48.7	44.3	56.3	7.5	8.4	9.0	15.4	29.1	46.8	43.0	39.7	28.9	27.3
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	87.3	78.1	68.1	53.9	47.7	6.7	6.5	6.1	8.3	14.0	80.7	71.6	61.9	45.5	33.7
Malaysia	59.6	55.5	51.3	47.5	52.9	6.2	6.8	7.3	15.4	25.0	53.4	48.7	44.0	32.1	27.9
Myanmar	55.0	50.3	47.2	45.5	55.1	8.4	8.2	8.1	14.7	27.1	46.6	42.1	39.1	30.7	28.0
Philippines	70.3	65.1	60.7	51.9	50.9	6.0	6.4	6.9	11.6	19.1	64.3	58.7	53.8	40.3	31.8
Singapore	40.8	39.0	34.7	67.9	77.9	10.1	11.8	13.8	46.2	58.0	30.6	27.2	21.0	21.7	19.9
Thailand	46.0	42.9	41.2	51.1	60.1	9.3	10.2	10.9	23.1	32.4	36.7	32.8	30.3	28.1	27.7
Timor-Leste	107.7	95.9	91.2	79.4	56.1	5.1	5.4	5.8	6.4	7.2	102.5	90.5	85.4	73.0	48.9
Viet Nam	64.2	54.7	45.8	47.5	58.2	9.3	9.5	9.3	18.3	31.7	55.0	45.1	36.6	29.1	26.5
<i>Western Asia</i>	66.8	61.2	56.7	49.0	51.3	7.5	7.6	7.4	11.5	20.3	59.3	53.7	49.4	37.5	31.0
Armenia	55.9	51.4	45.5	56.3	61.5	15.6	18.2	16.1	27.8	34.7	40.3	33.2	29.4	28.5	26.9
Azerbaijan	58.3	50.1	43.9	48.8	54.5	9.0	10.2	9.5	19.0	27.6	49.3	39.9	34.4	29.8	26.9
Bahrain	44.7	43.1	39.3	36.4	53.3	4.1	3.7	3.1	10.7	28.1	40.6	39.3	36.2	25.8	25.1
Georgia	52.4	49.0	44.9	58.1	66.0	19.0	21.5	20.7	32.9	40.2	33.5	27.5	24.2	25.2	25.8
Iraq	86.4	82.6	78.3	55.0	49.0	6.4	6.2	5.8	7.1	13.2	80.0	76.3	72.5	47.9	35.8
Israel	61.8	61.3	60.8	58.3	60.9	16.0	16.3	16.4	23.3	30.8	45.8	45.0	44.4	35.0	30.1
Jordan	73.4	68.5	60.4	45.1	49.6	5.0	5.8	5.9	8.7	20.6	68.4	62.7	54.4	36.4	29.0
Kuwait	37.7	34.3	34.5	36.7	57.4	1.9	2.4	3.2	11.6	30.7	35.8	31.9	31.3	25.1	26.7
Lebanon	59.4	53.1	47.2	46.8	56.9	10.8	10.9	10.8	17.1	30.2	48.6	42.2	36.4	29.7	26.7
Oman	63.7	57.4	51.5	47.4	52.2	3.5	4.0	4.7	10.5	22.5	60.2	53.3	46.8	36.8	29.7
Qatar	37.2	23.8	20.5	23.2	38.0	1.9	1.6	1.3	4.2	18.4	35.3	22.2	19.2	19.0	19.6
Saudi Arabia	68.7	59.5	53.6	45.5	48.0	4.6	4.4	4.6	9.8	19.9	64.1	55.1	49.1	35.8	28.1
Syrian Arab Republic	77.4	66.7	61.2	46.4	50.0	5.4	5.2	5.2	8.7	20.1	72.1	61.5	56.1	37.7	29.9
United Arab Emirates	33.1	26.1	25.2	23.6	37.0	1.4	1.4	1.3	5.3	17.9	31.7	24.7	24.0	18.3	19.1
West Bank and Gaza Strip	100.8	95.7	90.1	63.6	51.2	7.0	6.0	5.5	7.1	11.1	93.8	89.7	84.6	56.5	40.2
Yemen	102.6	92.4	84.2	62.2	47.7	4.8	4.5	4.4	5.6	9.4	97.8	87.9	79.8	56.6	38.3
Europe	47.8	46.6	46.3	59.6	73.5	21.8	23.3	23.8	36.1	47.5	25.9	23.3	22.5	23.5	26.0
<i>Eastern Europe</i>	45.2	42.0	40.0	53.2	68.5	18.8	20.2	19.4	30.8	42.9	26.4	21.7	20.6	22.4	25.7
Belarus	47.4	42.9	39.0	49.1	64.9	19.8	20.5	18.6	29.0	42.9	27.7	22.4	20.4	20.1	22.0
Bulgaria	47.7	44.7	45.1	57.5	80.7	24.5	24.8	25.5	36.4	54.8	23.2	19.9	19.6	21.1	25.9

Major area, region or country	Total dependency ratio (%)					Old-age dependency ratio (%)					Youth dependency ratio (%)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
Czech Republic	43.5	40.6	41.5	55.8	75.4	19.8	19.9	21.6	33.4	48.4	23.6	20.7	19.9	22.4	27.0
Hungary	46.7	45.3	45.2	53.5	69.2	22.1	22.7	23.8	31.4	44.3	24.7	22.6	21.4	22.1	25.0
Moldova, Republic of	50.6	43.0	38.4	52.0	60.1	14.8	15.8	15.4	27.2	34.5	35.8	27.2	23.0	24.8	25.6
Poland	46.0	42.0	39.4	55.2	74.4	17.9	18.8	18.8	34.7	52.2	28.1	23.2	20.6	20.5	22.2
Romania	46.8	43.8	43.0	48.3	71.8	19.8	21.3	21.3	28.5	48.9	27.0	22.5	21.8	19.8	22.9
Russian Federation	44.0	40.6	38.7	53.0	65.6	17.8	19.4	17.9	29.7	38.8	26.2	21.2	20.8	23.3	26.8
Slovakia	44.9	39.9	37.8	51.0	71.7	16.4	16.3	16.9	30.2	48.6	28.5	23.5	20.9	20.8	23.1
Ukraine	45.9	44.4	41.8	54.7	68.6	20.4	23.2	22.1	31.2	41.6	25.5	21.2	19.7	23.6	27.0
<i>Northern Europe</i> ⁸	52.8	51.0	51.0	61.6	66.1	23.8	23.9	24.9	34.2	38.9	29.1	27.1	26.1	27.4	27.1
Channel Islands ⁹	45.9	45.1	44.6	63.4	75.6	20.8	21.3	22.4	41.7	51.8	25.2	23.8	22.2	21.7	23.8
Denmark	50.0	51.3	53.2	64.9	66.5	22.2	22.9	25.6	37.5	39.7	27.7	28.4	27.6	27.4	26.8
Estonia	49.7	46.7	48.0	60.3	69.4	22.5	24.5	25.2	33.2	40.9	27.1	22.3	22.7	27.1	28.4
Finland ¹⁰	49.3	50.0	50.9	70.6	71.6	22.2	23.9	25.9	42.8	44.5	27.1	26.1	25.0	27.8	27.1
Iceland	53.5	51.1	47.2	58.2	72.5	17.7	17.7	17.4	30.5	45.4	35.7	33.4	29.8	27.7	27.1
Ireland	48.9	45.8	47.3	51.4	69.2	16.7	16.0	16.7	25.3	41.0	32.3	29.8	30.6	26.1	28.3
Latvia	49.6	45.1	45.5	56.9	70.3	23.0	24.0	25.4	33.1	44.2	26.6	21.0	20.1	23.9	26.1
Lithuania	51.2	47.1	44.9	58.5	66.6	21.0	22.4	23.7	34.6	42.5	30.2	24.7	21.2	23.9	24.0
Norway ¹¹	54.0	51.9	51.0	61.3	67.0	23.2	22.0	22.6	33.4	39.8	30.8	29.8	28.4	27.8	27.2
Sweden	55.3	52.8	53.4	65.7	68.3	26.7	26.2	28.1	37.5	40.5	28.6	26.6	25.3	28.2	27.8
United Kingdom	53.5	51.7	51.4	61.3	64.7	24.4	24.4	25.1	33.6	37.7	29.1	27.2	26.3	27.7	27.0
<i>Southern Europe</i> ¹²	47.9	48.5	49.4	60.0	83.4	24.5	26.0	27.0	38.5	57.5	23.3	22.5	22.4	21.5	25.9
Albania	60.8	54.2	48.5	55.7	60.5	11.9	13.4	14.4	25.2	34.5	48.9	40.8	34.0	30.5	26.0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	44.5	43.0	41.0	54.5	72.9	16.0	19.2	19.6	35.0	52.5	28.5	23.8	21.4	19.5	20.4
Croatia	48.4	49.1	47.7	61.4	74.5	23.1	25.3	25.6	38.4	49.2	25.2	23.7	22.1	23.0	25.2
Cyprus	51.4	47.0	44.2	55.8	64.2	17.2	17.9	19.0	29.6	38.3	34.2	29.1	25.2	26.2	25.9
Greece	46.5	47.8	48.2	58.3	81.6	24.2	26.6	27.2	38.0	56.8	22.3	21.2	21.1	20.3	24.7
Italy	48.7	51.1	52.9	64.1	87.7	27.4	29.7	31.3	43.9	62.4	21.3	21.5	21.7	20.2	25.3
Macedonia ¹³	47.7	44.9	41.9	50.9	66.1	14.8	16.1	16.9	27.6	42.3	32.9	28.8	25.0	23.3	23.9
Malta	47.7	44.1	42.9	59.3	72.4	18.2	19.1	21.2	37.6	50.6	29.5	25.0	21.7	21.7	21.8
Montenegro	45.0	48.6	47.1	55.0	62.3	13.7	18.7	18.8	28.1	36.2	31.3	29.9	28.3	26.9	26.1
Portugal	47.6	48.5	49.3	59.5	83.0	23.8	25.3	26.7	39.0	58.8	23.8	23.2	22.7	20.5	24.3
Serbia	50.5	49.6	46.9	53.4	65.3	20.5	22.0	21.1	28.4	39.2	30.0	27.6	25.9	25.0	26.1
Slovenia	42.7	42.3	43.3	61.5	80.1	20.0	22.1	23.5	39.7	54.4	22.7	20.2	19.8	21.8	25.7
Spain	46.2	45.5	47.3	58.0	87.1	24.6	24.4	25.3	35.9	59.5	21.6	21.1	22.0	22.1	27.6
Turkey	55.9	51.9	47.8	44.6	56.2	8.2	8.6	8.8	15.1	28.7	47.7	43.3	39.0	29.5	27.4
<i>Western Europe</i> ¹⁴	49.6	50.7	51.8	67.9	77.3	23.9	26.1	27.9	43.4	51.3	25.7	24.6	23.9	24.5	26.0
Austria	48.0	47.5	47.7	63.2	76.7	22.9	23.9	25.9	40.5	52.0	25.1	23.6	21.8	22.8	24.8
Belgium	52.4	52.2	51.9	68.0	74.3	25.8	26.3	26.4	40.5	46.4	26.6	26.0	25.4	27.4	28.0
France	53.8	53.6	54.7	68.6	75.9	24.8	25.3	26.2	40.9	47.3	29.0	28.3	28.4	27.7	28.6
Germany	47.0	49.7	51.1	68.6	82.0	24.0	28.2	30.9	47.6	59.1	23.0	21.4	20.2	21.0	22.9
Luxembourg	49.3	48.4	46.3	54.6	60.2	21.3	21.0	20.5	27.8	33.6	28.0	27.4	25.7	26.8	26.6
Netherlands	47.4	48.1	49.2	66.9	70.7	20.0	21.0	22.9	39.8	43.7	27.4	27.2	26.3	27.1	27.0
Switzerland	48.6	47.3	48.0	64.3	71.5	22.9	23.5	25.5	39.5	44.7	25.7	23.8	22.4	24.8	26.9
Latin America and the Caribbean	60.2	56.4	52.8	48.8	57.5	9.2	9.8	10.6	18.3	30.7	50.9	46.5	42.3	30.6	26.9
<i>Caribbean</i> ¹⁵	59.3	56.3	53.8	54.6	59.3	11.6	12.1	13.0	20.7	30.0	47.7	44.2	40.8	33.9	29.3
Aruba	43.1	42.1	40.2	61.9	65.0	10.9	12.3	13.6	34.2	38.9	32.3	29.8	26.6	27.7	26.1
Bahamas	52.8	50.3	47.1	50.1	60.1	7.8	9.0	10.3	20.4	32.4	45.0	41.3	36.8	29.7	27.6
Barbados	45.1	40.4	37.9	59.5	76.6	14.6	14.2	14.4	35.9	50.8	30.4	26.2	23.5	23.6	25.8

Major area, region or country	Total dependency ratio (%)					Old-age dependency ratio (%)					Youth dependency ratio (%)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
Cuba	44.3	42.9	42.1	55.3	75.1	14.6	15.3	17.5	34.1	54.4	29.7	27.6	24.6	21.2	20.7
Dominican Republic	66.5	62.8	59.3	53.1	55.2	8.3	9.1	9.8	15.8	24.9	58.2	53.7	49.5	37.3	30.3
Grenada	74.3	60.0	52.4	51.9	59.0	13.3	12.0	10.6	17.3	30.8	61.0	48.0	41.9	34.6	28.2
Guadeloupe	51.4	55.3	54.2	64.1	73.7	15.7	19.6	20.3	34.3	45.5	35.7	35.7	34.0	29.8	28.2
Haiti	79.4	73.0	67.5	53.1	50.2	7.1	7.3	7.3	8.7	16.1	72.3	65.8	60.2	44.3	34.1
Jamaica	67.6	64.3	57.9	56.3	56.9	12.5	12.6	12.2	19.7	27.6	55.1	51.6	45.7	36.6	29.3
Martinique	53.6	53.8	51.9	67.2	74.0	18.5	20.5	21.8	39.6	48.8	35.1	33.3	30.2	27.6	25.1
Netherlands Antilles	51.3	48.2	44.7	55.2	85.2	14.0	14.4	15.2	32.5	59.3	37.3	33.9	29.6	22.7	25.9
Puerto Rico	53.9	52.2	51.5	61.6	70.7	17.3	19.0	21.2	34.0	44.2	36.6	33.1	30.3	27.7	26.5
Saint Lucia	66.1	55.1	48.4	46.7	56.5	12.6	10.8	10.1	16.3	29.1	53.6	44.3	38.3	30.4	27.4
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	62.3	55.5	49.8	49.5	53.8	11.2	11.1	10.0	18.3	25.7	51.1	44.4	39.7	31.2	28.1
Trinidad and Tobago	47.2	39.3	37.9	48.1	64.2	8.7	8.8	9.5	20.9	36.3	38.5	30.6	28.3	27.2	27.9
Virgin Islands (US)	52.6	50.8	53.7	79.0	74.0	12.9	16.4	21.8	47.1	48.1	39.6	34.4	31.9	31.9	25.9
<i>Central America</i>	66.5	61.7	56.7	49.5	57.7	8.4	9.0	9.7	16.5	29.9	58.0	52.7	47.0	33.1	27.9
Belize	80.4	72.1	62.9	48.6	49.7	7.2	7.0	6.7	11.3	21.0	73.2	65.1	56.3	37.2	28.6
Costa Rica	59.1	52.0	46.6	49.2	58.7	8.6	8.9	9.5	19.8	31.9	50.5	43.1	37.1	29.4	26.8
El Salvador	75.7	71.5	63.5	54.0	51.6	10.2	11.3	12.0	15.7	22.7	65.5	60.2	51.5	38.3	28.9
Guatemala	92.7	90.3	85.0	59.8	47.0	7.8	8.2	8.2	8.8	13.8	84.9	82.1	76.8	50.9	33.2
Honduras	86.3	78.4	69.8	50.9	47.1	7.3	7.4	7.3	10.2	18.4	79.0	71.0	62.5	40.7	28.8
Mexico	62.2	57.4	52.7	47.4	62.2	8.5	9.1	10.0	18.3	35.9	53.7	48.3	42.7	29.1	26.3
Nicaragua	80.5	72.1	64.2	51.1	52.1	6.7	7.1	7.5	12.1	22.4	73.8	65.0	56.6	39.1	29.8
Panama	59.8	57.1	55.4	52.2	56.1	8.9	9.4	10.4	17.5	27.3	50.9	47.7	45.0	34.7	28.9
<i>South America</i> ¹⁶	57.9	54.4	51.3	48.0	57.3	9.3	9.9	10.7	18.7	31.1	48.7	44.5	40.6	29.3	26.2
Argentina	60.6	57.6	55.2	52.5	58.3	16.2	16.3	16.6	21.0	30.2	44.4	41.3	38.6	31.5	28.1
Bolivia	78.2	74.3	68.2	51.6	48.2	7.7	7.9	8.0	11.1	18.6	70.6	66.4	60.2	40.5	29.6
Brazil	54.1	50.9	47.9	44.2	59.3	8.4	9.3	10.2	19.7	35.9	45.6	41.6	37.7	24.5	23.4
Chile	54.0	49.2	46.0	55.0	62.9	11.2	12.1	13.5	26.1	36.0	42.7	37.1	32.5	28.9	26.9
Colombia	60.2	55.9	52.4	51.3	55.9	7.6	7.9	8.6	17.3	27.3	52.6	48.0	43.8	34.0	28.6
Ecuador	65.5	62.6	59.5	52.8	56.0	8.5	9.6	10.6	17.5	27.2	57.0	53.0	48.8	35.3	28.7
French Guiana	65.7	66.0	60.7	54.9	51.3	5.9	6.1	6.4	13.7	19.1	59.9	59.9	54.3	41.2	32.2
Guyana	55.6	57.9	54.5	55.9	60.8	7.9	9.0	9.5	21.4	33.1	47.7	49.0	45.0	34.5	27.7
Paraguay	74.2	68.3	63.2	52.1	50.9	7.7	8.0	8.4	12.9	19.7	66.5	60.3	54.7	39.2	31.2
Peru	63.7	59.6	56.0	48.6	53.9	7.9	8.6	9.3	15.0	25.7	55.8	51.0	46.7	33.6	28.2
Suriname	57.0	55.9	53.9	50.0	52.7	9.0	9.5	9.9	16.8	25.6	48.0	46.5	44.0	33.2	27.1
Uruguay	60.4	59.5	57.2	56.4	62.0	21.0	21.6	21.8	26.8	34.8	39.4	37.9	35.4	29.6	27.2
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	62.1	57.0	54.1	50.9	53.8	7.4	7.8	8.7	16.1	25.2	54.7	49.2	45.4	34.8	28.6
North America ¹⁷	50.9	49.2	49.1	60.9	63.6	18.7	18.6	19.5	32.2	35.9	32.2	30.6	29.6	28.6	27.7
Canada	46.4	44.4	43.8	63.3	69.9	18.5	18.9	20.3	37.1	43.4	27.9	25.4	23.5	26.2	26.5
United States	51.3	49.7	49.6	60.6	62.9	18.7	18.5	19.4	31.7	35.1	32.6	31.2	30.3	28.9	27.8
Oceania	55.6	54.3	53.8	59.7	60.6	15.4	15.7	16.6	25.5	30.0	40.2	38.7	37.2	34.2	30.7
<i>Australia–New Zealand</i>	50.2	48.9	48.9	61.9	67.6	18.7	19.1	20.5	33.5	39.7	31.6	29.8	28.5	28.5	27.9
Australia ¹⁸	49.7	48.5	48.8	62.0	67.9	18.8	19.2	20.7	33.6	39.9	31.0	29.3	28.1	28.4	28.0
New Zealand	52.7	50.7	49.7	61.7	66.0	18.1	18.3	19.4	32.8	38.5	34.7	32.4	30.3	29.0	27.4
<i>Melanesia</i>	74.6	73.1	69.7	55.3	48.2	4.4	4.8	5.0	8.0	12.2	70.2	68.3	64.7	47.3	36.1
Fiji	60.2	58.9	55.9	51.1	49.8	5.6	6.6	7.7	14.6	21.2	54.5	52.3	48.2	36.5	28.6
New Caledonia	54.8	51.4	48.8	50.1	58.6	8.7	10.0	11.5	20.3	31.4	46.2	41.4	37.3	29.8	27.3
Papua New Guinea	77.0	75.8	72.3	56.1	47.8	3.9	4.2	4.3	7.1	10.9	73.1	71.6	68.0	49.0	36.9
Solomon Islands	81.6	77.0	71.8	52.8	48.4	5.3	5.2	5.4	7.1	13.4	76.3	71.7	66.4	45.7	35.0
Vanuatu	83.4	76.6	71.2	55.7	49.8	6.1	5.8	5.7	8.6	13.9	77.3	70.8	65.4	47.1	35.9

Major area, region or country	Total dependency ratio (%)					Old-age dependency ratio (%)					Youth dependency ratio (%)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
<i>Micronesia</i> ¹⁹	60.7	56.8	53.5	50.8	50.3	6.1	6.7	6.9	14.3	20.6	54.6	50.1	46.5	36.5	29.7
Guam	55.9	56.1	52.5	54.9	54.3	8.4	10.2	10.8	20.5	26.1	47.5	45.8	41.7	34.4	28.2
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	78.2	72.7	67.3	53.7	43.0	6.7	6.7	6.1	10.8	14.4	71.5	66.0	61.2	42.9	28.5
<i>Polynesia</i> ²⁰	68.8	64.6	60.8	54.6	50.7	7.7	8.4	9.0	15.3	20.6	61.1	56.1	51.8	39.3	30.1
French Polynesia	55.7	48.2	46.9	48.6	55.6	6.7	7.6	8.9	18.0	28.3	49.0	40.5	38.0	30.6	27.3
Samoa	81.6	84.3	77.2	62.9	44.2	8.0	8.6	8.6	12.9	12.8	73.6	75.7	68.6	49.9	31.5
Tonga	79.4	76.7	76.3	57.6	52.2	9.8	10.2	10.3	11.5	15.4	69.5	66.5	66.0	46.1	36.7

SOURCES

Based on United Nations 2009a. *World Population Prospects: The 2008 revision* (New York).
Projections based on medium variant of the population projections.

NOTES

* **Only countries or areas with 100,000 inhabitants or more in 2009 are listed individually; the rest are included in the regional groups but are not listed separately.**

^a More developed regions comprise Europe, North America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan.

^b Less developed regions comprise all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean plus Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

^c Least developed countries: 49, of which 33 are in Africa, 10 in Asia, 5 in Oceania and 1 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

^d Other less developed countries comprise the less developed regions excluding the least developed countries.

^e Sub-Saharan Africa refers to all of Africa except Northern Africa, with the Sudan included in sub-Saharan Africa.

¹ Including Seychelles.

² Including Agalega, Rodrigues and Saint Brandon.

³ Including Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha.

⁴ For statistical purposes, the data for China do not include Hong Kong and Macao, Special Administrative Regions (SARs) of China.

⁵ As of 1 July 1997, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁶ As of 20 December 1999, Macao became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁷ The regions Southern Asia and Central Asia are combined into South-Central Asia.

⁸ Including Faeroe Islands and Isle of Man.

⁹ Refers to Guernsey and Jersey.

¹⁰ Including Åland Islands.

¹¹ Including Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands.

¹² Including Andorra, Gibraltar, Holy See and San Marino.

¹³ The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

¹⁴ Including Liechtenstein and Monaco.

¹⁵ Including Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Turks and Caicos Islands.

¹⁶ Including Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

¹⁷ Including Bermuda, Greenland and Saint Pierre and Miquelon.

¹⁸ Including Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands and Norfolk Island.

¹⁹ Including Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands and Palau.

²⁰ Including American Samoa, Cook Islands, Niue, Pitcairn, Tokelau, Tuvalu and Wallis and Futuna Islands.

DEFINITIONS

Total dependency ratio (%): a measure showing the number of dependants (aged 0–14 and over the age of 65) to the total working-age population (aged 15–64).

This indicator gives insight into the number of people of non-working age compared to the number of those of working age. A high ratio means those of working age – and the overall economy – face a greater burden in supporting the ageing population.

The total dependency ratio is the sum of the youth and old-age dependency ratios.

Youth dependency ratio (%): a measure showing the number of youth dependants (aged 0–14) to the total population (aged 15–64).

The youth dependency ratio includes only under 15s. For example, if in a population of 1,000 there are 250 people under the age of 15 and 500 people between the ages of 15–64, the youth dependency ratio would be 50% (250/500).

Old-age dependency ratio (%): population aged 65 years or over to the population aged 15–64.

Table 2. Demographic trends: Ageing

Major area, region or country	Population less than 15 (% of total population)					Population over 60 (% of total population)					Population over 80 (% of total population)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
World	30.3	28.4	26.9	22.7	19.6	9.9	10.2	11.0	16.5	21.9	1.1	1.3	1.5	2.3	4.3
More developed regions ^a	18.3	17.0	16.5	15.4	15.4	19.5	20.1	21.8	28.8	32.6	3.1	3.7	4.3	6.4	9.5
Less developed regions ^b	33.2	31.0	29.2	24.0	20.3	7.5	8.0	8.6	14.2	20.2	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.6	3.5
Least developed countries ^c	42.5	41.2	39.9	33.7	27.0	4.9	5.0	5.2	7.0	11.1	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6	1.1
Less developed regions, excluding least developed countries ^d	31.8	29.3	27.3	21.9	18.5	7.9	8.5	9.3	15.8	22.7	0.7	0.9	1.0	1.8	4.1
Less developed regions, excluding China	35.9	34.0	32.2	25.9	21.5	6.7	7.0	7.5	11.8	17.8	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.3	2.7
Sub-Saharan Africa ^e	44.0	43.2	42.3	35.6	28.4	4.8	4.8	4.9	5.9	9.1	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.8
Africa	42.4	41.2	40.3	34.0	27.3	5.1	5.2	5.4	6.9	10.6	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.6	1.1
<i>Eastern Africa</i> ¹	45.2	44.5	43.7	36.8	29.0	4.6	4.6	4.7	5.5	8.7	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.8
Burundi	46.2	41.4	37.9	31.8	25.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	6.5	12.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.9
Comoros	39.8	38.4	38.1	29.9	24.4	4.7	4.7	4.7	7.7	13.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.3
Djibouti	41.2	38.4	35.6	29.0	23.4	4.5	4.9	5.4	8.0	13.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.6	1.1
Eritrea	44.7	41.9	41.5	32.5	26.5	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.6	10.8	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.7
Ethiopia	45.8	44.8	43.2	35.1	26.3	4.7	4.9	5.1	6.1	9.6	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.9
Kenya	44.2	42.8	42.8	35.5	28.8	4.1	4.0	4.1	5.5	9.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.8
Madagascar	45.1	44.3	42.5	34.1	26.9	4.8	4.6	4.6	6.7	10.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.1
Malawi	45.9	46.8	45.9	38.8	30.4	4.7	4.7	4.9	5.2	7.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7
Mauritius ²	26.0	24.7	22.2	19.0	17.1	8.7	9.9	11.6	20.6	26.1	0.9	1.1	1.3	2.7	5.9
Mayotte	44.9	42.1	37.9	27.2	20.3	4.2	4.5	5.0	8.6	16.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.0	2.2
Mozambique	43.7	44.1	43.9	36.4	29.5	5.0	5.0	5.1	6.0	7.7	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.8
Réunion	28.2	27.1	26.0	21.4	18.3	9.4	10.1	11.1	19.9	23.8	1.1	1.3	1.5	2.5	5.8
Rwanda	45.8	42.5	42.4	36.1	29.3	4.1	3.9	3.8	5.3	9.6	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.7
Somalia	44.2	44.6	44.9	40.7	33.1	4.4	4.3	4.3	5.3	7.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.6
Tanzania, United Rep. of	44.7	44.6	44.7	39.2	31.4	4.6	4.7	4.9	5.3	7.7	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7
Uganda	49.4	49.3	48.7	42.0	31.9	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.6	6.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5
Zambia	45.2	46.0	46.2	39.2	31.3	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.4	6.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5
Zimbabwe	42.2	41.0	39.5	31.8	24.5	5.1	5.6	5.8	4.9	12.0	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.7
<i>Middle Africa</i>	46.4	45.8	44.6	37.5	29.0	4.6	4.6	4.5	5.2	8.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.6
Angola	47.1	46.2	44.7	38.4	30.4	4.0	3.9	3.9	5.1	7.8	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.6
Cameroon	42.9	41.7	40.8	33.4	27.0	5.4	5.4	5.4	6.3	10.2	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9
Central African Republic	41.9	41.5	40.3	33.3	26.8	6.0	5.9	5.8	6.7	10.0	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9
Chad	46.0	46.0	45.6	40.2	31.6	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.8	7.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5
Congo	42.5	41.2	40.2	31.9	25.4	5.8	5.7	5.7	6.5	11.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	48.1	47.7	46.4	38.6	29.0	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.7	7.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.6
Equatorial Guinea	44.1	42.2	40.7	36.8	29.9	5.1	4.6	4.3	8.1	8.4	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.1
Gabon	40.9	38.6	35.6	28.6	22.8	6.6	6.3	6.4	9.3	14.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.7
Sao Tome and Principe	42.2	41.6	40.3	30.6	23.5	6.5	5.8	5.3	6.7	13.3	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	1.1
<i>Northern Africa</i>	36.4	33.2	31.5	25.3	20.6	6.4	6.6	7.2	11.6	19.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.1	2.5
Algeria	34.1	29.6	27.0	22.3	18.2	6.3	6.5	6.9	13.3	24.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.1	3.4
Egypt	36.9	33.3	32.1	25.5	20.6	6.5	6.7	7.5	11.4	19.2	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.1	2.3
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	32.2	30.3	30.1	21.6	18.9	5.3	6.0	6.6	12.4	23.1	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.4	3.4
Morocco	33.6	30.3	28.0	22.7	18.6	7.2	7.5	8.1	14.3	22.9	0.6	0.6	0.8	1.3	3.3
Sudan	42.2	40.7	38.7	30.5	24.3	5.1	5.4	5.7	7.9	12.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.7	1.3
Tunisia	30.1	25.7	22.8	19.7	16.6	9.1	9.2	9.7	16.9	28.2	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.8	4.6
Western Sahara	35.2	31.4	28.5	23.7	18.9	3.8	3.6	4.0	11.4	21.8	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	2.4
<i>Southern Africa</i>	34.6	32.6	31.1	26.9	23.0	5.9	6.4	7.2	10.5	13.7	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.2	2.0
Botswana	38.1	35.2	32.9	28.2	23.6	4.8	5.4	5.9	8.0	12.4	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.2
Lesotho	42.0	40.1	38.5	33.0	27.9	6.9	6.8	7.0	6.8	9.4	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.8

Major area, region or country	Population less than 15 (% of total population)					Population over 60 (% of total population)					Population over 80 (% of total population)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
Namibia	41.0	39.0	36.4	29.9	24.3	5.1	5.3	5.6	8.0	12.1	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.8	1.4
South Africa	33.6	31.7	30.3	26.2	22.5	5.9	6.5	7.3	11.1	14.2	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.3	2.2
Swaziland	44.5	41.9	38.8	33.1	27.7	4.7	4.9	5.3	5.9	7.8	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.7
<i>Western Africa</i> ³	<i>43.9</i>	<i>43.2</i>	<i>42.6</i>	<i>35.4</i>	<i>28.7</i>	<i>4.7</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>5.8</i>	<i>9.2</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>0.7</i>
Benin	44.7	43.7	42.9	36.3	28.5	4.9	5.0	5.0	6.4	9.6	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.9
Burkina Faso	46.8	45.8	46.4	39.4	30.9	3.6	3.5	3.3	4.3	7.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4
Cape Verde	43.2	39.3	35.5	26.6	19.7	6.5	5.9	5.4	10.8	20.3	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.7	2.8
Côte d'Ivoire	41.5	41.3	40.4	33.0	26.0	5.3	5.7	6.1	7.1	11.0	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.7	1.0
Gambia	43.0	42.8	42.1	35.1	27.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	6.0	8.9	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.6
Ghana	41.3	39.7	38.1	32.1	26.8	5.2	5.4	5.8	7.7	11.8	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	1.2
Guinea	44.1	43.4	42.6	36.1	28.2	4.9	5.1	5.2	6.4	9.7	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.9
Guinea-Bissau	41.8	42.5	42.6	38.2	31.6	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.6	7.9	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6
Liberia	44.2	43.5	42.5	35.1	27.5	4.7	4.8	4.9	6.7	9.9	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.9
Mali	45.5	44.5	44.1	38.0	30.7	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.4	7.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4
Mauritania	42.2	40.6	39.2	31.3	25.1	4.4	4.4	4.4	6.7	11.6	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.8
Niger	48.6	48.9	50.1	46.9	38.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.8	4.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3
Nigeria	43.9	43.1	42.4	34.1	27.3	4.8	4.9	4.9	6.0	9.6	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.8
Senegal	45.5	44.4	43.3	34.3	27.1	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.8	9.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.5
Sierra Leone	42.0	42.7	43.5	37.7	30.8	4.0	3.6	3.5	4.0	6.7	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3
Togo	42.9	41.3	39.5	31.7	25.0	5.0	5.2	5.5	7.5	12.5	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.7	1.2
Asia	30.8	28.2	26.2	21.1	17.9	8.5	9.1	9.9	16.7	23.6	0.8	1.0	1.1	2.0	4.4
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	<i>24.6</i>	<i>21.2</i>	<i>19.2</i>	<i>16.3</i>	<i>14.9</i>	<i>11.2</i>	<i>12.3</i>	<i>13.9</i>	<i>24.6</i>	<i>32.1</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>3.6</i>	<i>7.8</i>
China ⁴	25.7	22.0	19.9	16.9	15.3	10.0	10.8	12.3	23.4	31.1	0.9	1.2	1.4	2.8	7.2
Hong Kong, China ⁵	16.9	14.4	11.5	11.4	11.3	14.8	15.7	18.4	33.6	39.5	2.2	2.9	3.7	6.0	13.7
Macau, China ⁶	22.4	16.1	12.5	11.3	10.2	9.7	9.9	11.9	31.9	43.6	1.5	1.7	2.0	4.0	13.9
Japan	14.6	13.8	13.2	10.8	11.2	23.3	26.5	30.5	37.9	44.2	3.8	4.9	6.3	12.9	15.6
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	25.6	23.8	21.2	18.7	16.6	11.6	13.4	14.3	19.9	24.7	0.7	0.9	1.1	2.0	4.0
Korea, Republic of	20.8	19.1	16.2	12.6	11.4	11.2	13.3	15.6	31.1	40.8	1.1	1.4	2.0	5.1	12.7
Mongolia	34.8	28.8	25.6	21.5	17.8	5.3	5.7	6.0	12.9	24.3	0.5	0.6	0.6	1.0	3.4
<i>South-Central Asia</i> ⁷	<i>35.8</i>	<i>33.6</i>	<i>31.3</i>	<i>23.9</i>	<i>19.3</i>	<i>6.5</i>	<i>6.8</i>	<i>7.2</i>	<i>11.8</i>	<i>19.0</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>2.5</i>
Afghanistan	47.0	46.8	45.9	41.5	33.0	3.8	3.7	3.8	4.1	5.9	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
Bangladesh	36.8	33.8	30.9	22.9	18.2	5.3	5.7	6.2	11.3	21.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.8	2.3
Bhutan	40.4	34.1	29.9	22.9	18.5	6.7	6.8	7.2	11.1	21.7	0.4	0.5	0.7	1.1	2.5
India	35.0	33.1	30.8	22.8	18.2	6.7	7.0	7.5	12.4	19.6	0.5	0.6	0.7	1.2	2.6
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	32.0	26.4	23.8	19.5	17.1	6.7	6.9	7.1	13.6	28.1	0.5	0.8	0.8	1.1	3.4
Kazakhstan	27.6	24.3	23.8	21.1	19.0	11.2	10.3	10.2	15.5	22.4	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.5	3.4
Kyrgyzstan	35.0	31.3	29.1	22.5	18.8	8.2	7.3	7.3	13.0	21.1	0.6	0.7	1.0	1.1	3.0
Maldives	39.9	32.8	27.1	22.2	17.6	5.5	6.1	6.0	11.2	24.5	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.9	3.1
Nepal	41.0	39.0	35.9	27.6	21.3	5.6	5.9	6.2	9.0	15.6	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.7
Pakistan	41.3	38.5	36.6	29.3	23.2	5.7	5.9	6.2	8.8	14.9	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.8
Sri Lanka	26.6	24.6	24.3	19.7	17.5	9.5	10.1	12.3	21.9	27.8	1.1	1.2	1.4	3.3	6.5
Tajikistan	42.4	39.4	36.4	28.4	20.6	5.5	5.1	5.0	9.0	15.6	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7	2.1
Turkmenistan	36.3	32.3	29.0	22.3	18.8	6.6	6.1	6.1	12.2	20.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9	2.8
Uzbekistan	37.4	32.8	28.6	23.0	18.2	6.6	6.2	6.3	12.5	21.5	0.6	0.7	0.9	1.1	3.2
<i>South-Eastern Asia</i>	<i>31.8</i>	<i>29.4</i>	<i>27.2</i>	<i>21.5</i>	<i>18.3</i>	<i>7.5</i>	<i>8.0</i>	<i>8.7</i>	<i>15.8</i>	<i>23.3</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.9</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>4.0</i>
Brunei Darussalam	31.3	28.9	26.3	20.7	18.3	4.4	4.7	5.8	13.5	20.8	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.2	3.5
Cambodia	41.9	37.0	32.5	27.0	21.1	4.6	5.2	5.9	9.3	16.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.7	1.5
Indonesia	30.3	28.4	26.7	20.0	17.4	7.7	8.3	8.9	16.0	24.8	0.5	0.6	0.8	1.5	4.0
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	43.1	40.2	36.8	29.6	22.8	5.4	5.4	5.5	8.4	14.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.5
Malaysia	33.5	31.3	29.1	21.7	18.3	6.2	6.7	7.8	15.0	22.2	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.6	4.0
Myanmar	30.1	28.0	26.6	21.1	18.0	7.7	7.8	8.2	14.9	23.6	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.5	3.7
Philippines	37.8	35.6	33.5	26.5	21.1	5.5	6.0	6.7	11.3	17.9	0.4	0.5	0.5	1.1	2.5

Major area, region or country	Population less than 15 (% of total population)					Population over 60 (% of total population)					Population over 80 (% of total population)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
Singapore	21.8	19.6	15.6	12.9	11.2	10.6	12.3	16.0	35.6	39.6	1.2	1.5	2.0	5.9	14.6
Thailand	25.1	22.9	21.5	18.6	17.3	9.6	10.2	11.5	21.6	26.4	0.9	1.0	1.2	2.2	5.3
Timor-Leste	49.4	46.2	44.7	40.7	31.3	4.3	4.7	4.8	5.3	7.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6
Viet Nam	33.5	29.2	25.1	19.8	16.8	7.8	8.5	8.7	18.2	26.6	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.8	5.7
<i>Western Asia</i>	35.5	33.3	31.5	25.2	20.5	6.7	6.7	7.0	11.6	18.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.1	2.7
Armenia	25.9	21.9	20.2	18.2	16.6	15.1	14.4	14.5	22.4	29.8	1.2	1.6	2.7	3.0	6.5
Azerbaijan	31.1	26.6	23.9	20.0	17.4	8.9	8.9	8.7	18.0	25.2	0.6	0.7	1.1	1.5	4.9
Bahrain	28.1	27.5	26.0	18.9	16.4	4.3	3.8	3.7	13.4	24.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.8	4.2
Georgia	22.0	18.4	16.7	15.9	15.5	18.4	18.1	19.1	26.9	32.4	1.8	2.1	3.1	3.8	7.2
Iraq	42.9	41.8	40.7	30.9	24.0	5.1	5.1	4.7	7.4	13.0	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.5	1.3
Israel	28.3	27.9	27.6	22.1	18.7	13.2	13.2	14.6	19.1	24.3	2.1	2.5	2.8	4.1	6.1
Jordan	39.4	37.2	33.9	25.1	19.4	4.7	5.4	5.5	9.7	19.1	0.4	0.6	0.5	1.0	2.5
Kuwait	26.0	23.8	23.3	18.4	17.0	2.6	3.1	4.1	14.1	24.9	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.0	4.4
Lebanon	30.5	27.6	24.7	20.2	17.0	10.1	10.1	10.5	16.9	25.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.7	4.3
Oman	36.8	33.9	30.9	25.0	19.5	3.5	4.2	4.8	10.9	20.6	0.3	0.3	0.4	1.0	3.0
Qatar	25.7	17.9	15.9	15.4	14.2	2.6	2.4	2.0	6.4	19.6	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.9
Saudi Arabia	38.0	34.5	31.9	24.6	19.0	4.0	4.2	4.6	10.8	18.6	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.8	2.7
Syrian Arab Republic	40.6	36.9	34.8	25.8	19.9	4.6	4.7	4.9	9.2	18.9	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.8	2.4
United Arab Emirates	23.8	19.6	19.1	14.8	14.0	1.9	1.8	2.0	8.0	17.6	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	2.0
West Bank and Gaza Strip	46.7	45.9	44.5	34.5	26.6	4.8	4.5	4.4	6.6	10.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.4
Yemen	48.3	45.7	43.3	34.9	25.9	3.7	3.8	3.8	5.4	10.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.8
Europe	17.6	15.9	15.4	14.7	15.0	20.3	20.6	22.0	29.3	34.2	3.0	3.5	4.2	6.1	9.6
<i>Eastern Europe</i>	18.2	15.3	14.7	14.6	15.2	18.7	18.2	19.3	26.0	33.6	2.0	2.4	3.2	4.2	6.7
Belarus	18.8	15.7	14.7	13.5	13.4	19.0	18.1	18.3	25.6	35.0	2.0	2.3	3.1	3.5	6.5
Bulgaria	15.7	13.7	13.5	13.4	14.3	22.2	22.9	24.5	30.2	38.2	2.3	3.2	3.8	5.8	8.5
Czech Republic	16.5	14.7	14.1	14.4	15.4	18.3	19.9	22.2	27.6	34.5	2.4	3.1	3.5	5.9	7.9
Hungary	16.8	15.5	14.7	14.4	14.8	20.2	21.3	22.4	26.7	33.0	2.6	3.3	3.8	5.2	6.9
Moldova, Republic of	23.8	19.0	16.6	16.3	16.0	14.4	14.9	15.9	23.3	31.2	1.1	1.6	2.0	2.7	5.1
Poland	19.3	16.3	14.8	13.2	12.7	16.7	17.2	19.4	28.0	38.0	2.0	2.7	3.4	5.3	8.5
Romania	18.4	15.7	15.2	13.4	13.3	19.0	19.3	20.3	26.9	37.0	1.8	2.4	3.0	4.4	7.6
Russian Federation	18.2	15.1	15.0	15.2	16.2	18.4	17.2	18.1	25.0	31.7	1.9	2.1	3.0	3.7	6.0
Slovakia	19.7	16.8	15.2	13.8	13.4	15.3	16.1	17.7	26.0	36.2	1.8	2.4	2.8	4.3	7.5
Ukraine	17.5	14.7	13.9	15.2	16.0	20.9	20.6	20.9	26.2	32.8	2.2	2.6	3.4	4.1	6.4
<i>Northern Europe</i> ⁸	19.0	18.0	17.3	17.0	16.3	20.4	21.1	22.6	27.4	29.5	4.0	4.3	4.6	6.3	8.7
Channel Islands ⁹	17.3	16.4	15.4	13.3	13.5	19.2	19.8	22.4	33.6	36.1	3.6	3.6	3.7	6.7	12.0
Denmark	18.5	18.8	18.0	16.6	16.1	19.8	21.2	23.4	29.4	29.3	4.0	4.1	4.2	6.9	9.2
Estonia	18.1	15.2	15.4	16.9	16.8	21.0	21.7	22.6	26.5	31.8	2.6	3.2	4.2	5.5	7.4
Finland ¹⁰	18.2	17.4	16.6	16.3	15.8	19.9	21.4	24.7	31.2	31.9	3.3	3.9	4.6	7.9	10.2
Iceland	23.3	22.1	20.3	17.5	15.7	15.0	15.8	16.5	25.1	32.6	2.7	3.0	3.3	4.9	9.3
Ireland	21.7	20.4	20.8	17.2	16.7	15.1	15.2	16.1	22.5	30.1	2.5	2.7	2.8	4.3	7.2
Latvia	17.8	14.5	13.8	15.2	15.3	21.3	22.3	22.5	27.3	34.7	2.9	3.1	3.9	5.1	7.5
Lithuania	20.0	16.8	14.6	15.1	14.4	19.2	20.3	21.5	28.5	33.7	2.4	2.9	3.8	5.2	8.3
Norway ¹¹	20.0	19.6	18.8	17.2	16.3	19.2	19.6	21.1	27.2	29.6	4.3	4.6	4.5	6.1	9.0
Sweden	18.4	17.4	16.5	17.0	16.5	22.1	23.3	25.0	28.9	30.2	5.0	5.4	5.3	7.6	9.2
United Kingdom	19.0	18.0	17.4	17.2	16.4	20.8	21.3	22.7	27.2	28.8	4.1	4.5	4.7	6.2	8.6
<i>Southern Europe</i> ¹²	15.8	15.2	15.0	13.5	14.1	22.0	22.6	23.8	31.5	37.5	3.5	4.1	4.9	7.1	11.5
Albania	30.4	26.5	22.9	19.6	16.2	11.0	12.3	13.7	21.6	29.1	1.1	1.4	1.8	3.3	6.7
Bosnia and Herzegovina	19.7	16.6	15.2	12.6	11.8	16.6	17.7	19.1	29.8	39.2	1.2	1.8	2.4	4.3	9.1
Croatia	17.0	15.9	15.0	14.3	14.5	21.7	21.9	23.5	30.4	35.0	2.2	2.9	3.9	6.1	9.3
Cyprus	22.6	19.8	17.4	16.8	15.8	15.4	16.9	18.4	24.9	30.1	2.4	2.7	3.0	4.8	7.4
Greece	15.3	14.4	14.2	12.8	13.6	22.4	23.0	24.3	31.6	37.6	2.9	2.8	3.9	6.6	10.7
Italy	14.3	14.2	14.2	12.3	13.5	24.4	25.2	26.6	34.8	39.1	4.3	5.1	6.0	8.8	13.4

Major area, region or country	Population less than 15 (% of total population)					Population over 60 (% of total population)					Population over 80 (% of total population)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
Macedonia ¹³	22.3	19.9	17.6	15.4	14.4	14.5	15.5	16.8	24.7	33.0	1.2	1.7	2.1	3.5	6.8
Malta	20.0	17.4	15.2	13.6	12.6	16.9	18.4	21.9	29.2	36.9	2.4	2.9	3.4	7.0	9.4
Montenegro	21.6	20.1	19.2	17.4	16.1	14.4	16.7	17.8	23.8	29.4	1.4	1.8	2.3	3.7	6.2
Portugal	16.1	15.6	15.2	12.8	13.3	21.5	22.3	23.6	31.6	38.4	3.3	3.9	4.5	7.0	11.0
Serbia	19.9	18.4	17.6	16.3	15.8	18.9	19.0	19.7	24.6	30.7	1.6	2.4	3.1	3.9	6.3
Slovenia	15.9	14.2	13.8	13.5	14.3	19.3	20.4	22.4	31.4	37.0	2.3	3.1	4.1	6.4	10.5
Spain	14.8	14.5	14.9	14.0	14.8	21.6	21.6	22.4	30.1	37.5	3.8	4.3	5.0	6.8	11.3
Turkey	30.6	28.5	26.4	20.4	17.6	7.8	8.2	9.0	15.5	24.4	0.5	0.6	0.8	1.5	3.7
<i>Western Europe</i> ¹⁴	<i>17.1</i>	<i>16.3</i>	<i>15.7</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>14.7</i>	<i>21.7</i>	<i>22.6</i>	<i>24.3</i>	<i>33.1</i>	<i>35.2</i>	<i>3.6</i>	<i>4.4</i>	<i>5.1</i>	<i>7.7</i>	<i>12.3</i>
Austria	17.0	16.0	14.7	13.9	14.0	20.6	21.9	23.1	32.5	35.8	3.5	4.3	4.8	7.1	12.1
Belgium	17.5	17.1	16.7	16.3	16.0	22.0	22.0	23.4	30.7	32.3	3.6	4.3	5.0	7.1	10.8
France	18.8	18.4	18.4	16.4	16.2	20.7	20.9	23.2	30.4	32.6	3.8	4.6	5.5	7.9	11.3
Germany	15.6	14.3	13.4	12.5	12.6	23.2	24.9	26.0	36.5	39.5	3.5	4.3	5.1	8.0	14.1
Luxembourg	18.8	18.5	17.6	17.3	16.6	19.1	18.7	19.1	24.5	26.7	3.2	3.2	3.8	4.4	7.4
Netherlands	18.6	18.3	17.6	16.3	15.8	18.2	19.2	21.9	30.8	31.3	3.2	3.6	3.9	6.8	10.5
Switzerland	17.3	16.1	15.2	15.1	15.7	20.3	21.6	23.3	31.0	31.8	4.1	4.5	5.0	7.5	11.3
Latin America and the Caribbean	31.8	29.8	27.7	20.5	17.0	8.3	9.0	10.0	17.1	25.5	1.1	1.2	1.5	2.7	5.5
<i>Caribbean</i> ¹⁵	<i>29.9</i>	<i>28.3</i>	<i>26.5</i>	<i>21.9</i>	<i>18.4</i>	<i>10.4</i>	<i>11.0</i>	<i>12.0</i>	<i>18.7</i>	<i>24.7</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>5.9</i>
Aruba	22.5	21.0	19.0	17.1	15.8	11.4	12.7	14.6	28.9	29.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	3.4	8.7
Bahamas	29.4	27.5	25.0	19.8	17.3	7.8	9.1	10.3	19.1	26.2	1.0	1.0	1.2	2.6	6.0
Barbados	21.0	18.7	17.0	14.8	14.6	13.3	13.6	15.4	29.6	36.0	2.5	2.5	2.7	4.3	10.1
Cuba	20.6	19.3	17.3	13.6	11.8	14.4	15.2	17.3	30.9	38.7	2.1	2.2	2.7	5.4	12.1
Dominican Republic	34.9	33.0	31.1	24.3	19.5	7.3	8.0	8.8	14.7	21.4	0.9	1.1	1.3	2.2	4.6
Grenada	35.0	30.0	27.5	22.8	17.8	10.3	9.6	9.2	14.6	28.0	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.8	4.3
Guadeloupe	23.6	23.0	22.0	18.1	16.2	14.0	16.7	18.0	27.6	32.8	2.6	4.0	4.0	5.4	10.5
Haiti	40.3	38.0	35.9	29.0	22.7	6.2	6.4	6.5	8.6	15.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	2.0
Jamaica	32.9	31.4	28.9	23.4	18.7	9.9	10.3	10.7	17.7	23.1	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.4	5.8
Martinique	22.9	21.7	19.8	16.5	14.4	16.3	17.7	19.3	30.7	34.7	2.9	3.3	3.9	6.3	12.2
Netherlands Antilles	24.7	22.9	20.4	14.6	14.0	13.0	13.9	15.5	28.5	39.3	2.3	2.2	2.2	4.2	10.0
Puerto Rico	23.8	21.8	20.0	17.1	15.5	15.4	17.3	19.6	26.9	32.1	2.7	3.1	3.4	6.2	9.1
Saint Lucia	32.2	28.5	25.8	20.7	17.5	10.1	9.4	9.5	16.0	25.4	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.9	4.7
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	31.5	28.5	26.5	20.9	18.3	9.6	9.4	9.5	17.4	22.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.5	3.8
Trinidad and Tobago	26.2	21.9	20.5	18.4	17.0	8.6	9.4	10.6	19.6	30.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	2.2	5.2
Virgin Islands (US)	26.0	22.8	20.8	17.8	14.9	12.9	16.9	21.0	32.6	34.0	1.6	2.0	2.5	8.1	13.4
<i>Central America</i>	<i>34.9</i>	<i>32.6</i>	<i>30.0</i>	<i>22.1</i>	<i>17.7</i>	<i>7.2</i>	<i>8.0</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>15.6</i>	<i>24.6</i>	<i>0.9</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>2.4</i>	<i>5.2</i>
Belize	40.6	37.8	34.5	25.1	19.1	5.6	5.6	5.9	11.4	19.5	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.2	3.5
Costa Rica	31.7	28.4	25.3	19.7	16.9	7.7	8.3	9.5	18.4	26.7	1.2	1.3	1.5	2.7	6.1
El Salvador	37.3	35.1	31.5	24.9	19.1	8.4	9.3	10.2	14.0	20.3	1.2	1.5	1.7	2.7	4.3
Guatemala	44.1	43.2	41.5	31.9	22.6	5.9	6.1	6.5	7.8	13.3	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.3	2.0
Honduras	42.4	39.8	36.8	27.0	19.5	5.6	5.9	6.2	9.7	17.7	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.3	2.8
Mexico	33.1	30.7	27.9	19.7	16.2	7.5	8.3	9.4	17.7	28.2	1.0	1.2	1.4	2.7	6.2
Nicaragua	40.9	37.8	34.5	25.8	19.6	5.4	5.9	6.2	11.3	20.2	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.5	3.5
Panama	31.8	30.4	29.0	22.8	18.5	8.0	8.8	9.7	16.3	22.8	1.1	1.2	1.3	2.4	4.9
<i>South America</i> ¹⁶	<i>30.8</i>	<i>28.8</i>	<i>26.9</i>	<i>19.8</i>	<i>16.7</i>	<i>8.5</i>	<i>9.2</i>	<i>10.3</i>	<i>17.5</i>	<i>26.0</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>2.7</i>	<i>5.6</i>
Argentina	27.7	26.2	24.9	20.7	17.7	13.7	14.1	14.7	18.3	24.9	2.0	2.3	2.6	3.6	5.3
Bolivia	39.6	38.1	35.8	26.7	20.0	6.5	6.7	7.2	10.6	17.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	1.3	2.8
Brazil	29.6	27.5	25.5	17.0	14.7	8.1	8.9	10.2	18.9	29.3	1.0	1.2	1.5	2.9	6.5
Chile	27.8	24.9	22.3	18.6	16.5	10.3	11.6	13.2	22.6	28.7	1.5	1.7	2.1	3.9	7.6
Colombia	32.8	30.8	28.8	22.5	18.3	6.9	7.5	8.6	16.3	23.1	0.8	1.0	1.1	2.2	5.0

Major area, region or country	Population less than 15 (% of total population)					Population over 60 (% of total population)					Population over 80 (% of total population)				
	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050	2000	2005	2010	2030	2050
Ecuador	34.4	32.6	30.6	23.1	18.4	7.4	8.4	9.5	15.8	23.0	1.0	1.2	1.4	2.6	5.1
French Guiana	36.1	36.1	33.8	26.6	21.3	5.5	5.7	6.6	13.0	17.1	0.6	0.8	0.7	1.3	3.3
Guyana	30.7	31.0	29.1	22.1	17.2	7.1	8.2	9.4	19.3	25.4	0.9	1.0	1.2	2.2	6.2
Paraguay	38.2	35.8	33.5	25.8	20.7	6.5	7.0	7.7	11.8	18.3	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.7	3.1
Peru	34.1	31.9	29.9	22.6	18.3	7.2	7.9	8.7	14.4	22.5	0.8	0.9	1.1	2.1	4.3
Suriname	30.6	29.8	28.6	22.1	17.8	8.5	8.8	9.3	16.3	22.7	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.8	4.3
Uruguay	24.6	23.8	22.5	18.9	16.8	17.4	17.9	18.4	22.3	27.4	2.8	3.2	3.7	4.7	6.8
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	33.7	31.3	29.5	23.1	18.6	6.7	7.5	8.6	15.0	22.1	0.7	0.9	1.0	2.1	4.4
North America¹⁷	21.3	20.5	19.8	17.8	16.9	16.2	16.8	18.4	25.6	27.8	3.3	3.6	3.8	5.2	8.0
Canada	19.1	17.6	16.3	16.1	15.6	16.7	17.8	20.0	28.8	31.8	3.0	3.5	3.9	6.0	9.7
United States	21.6	20.8	20.2	18.0	17.1	16.2	16.7	18.2	25.3	27.4	3.3	3.6	3.8	5.2	7.8
Oceania	25.8	25.0	24.2	21.4	19.1	13.4	14.0	15.4	21.0	23.9	2.3	2.6	2.9	4.3	6.5
<i>Australia–New Zealand</i>	<i>21.0</i>	<i>20.0</i>	<i>19.1</i>	<i>17.6</i>	<i>16.6</i>	<i>16.5</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>19.3</i>	<i>26.5</i>	<i>29.5</i>	<i>3.0</i>	<i>3.4</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>5.9</i>	<i>9.0</i>
Australia ¹⁸	20.7	19.7	18.9	17.5	16.7	16.7	17.6	19.5	26.5	29.5	3.1	3.5	3.9	6.0	9.0
New Zealand	22.7	21.5	20.2	17.9	16.5	15.8	16.5	18.2	26.3	29.2	2.9	3.2	3.5	5.4	9.0
<i>Melanesia</i>	<i>40.2</i>	<i>39.5</i>	<i>38.1</i>	<i>30.5</i>	<i>24.3</i>	<i>4.3</i>	<i>4.5</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>8.1</i>	<i>12.1</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.3</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>1.4</i>
Fiji	34.0	32.9	30.9	24.2	19.1	5.9	6.9	8.1	13.6	19.6	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.4	2.9
New Caledonia	29.8	27.3	25.1	19.8	17.2	8.5	9.9	11.5	19.1	25.9	1.0	1.2	1.5	3.0	6.0
Papua New Guinea	41.3	40.7	39.5	31.4	25.0	3.9	3.9	4.2	7.3	11.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.5	1.2
Solomon Islands	42.0	40.5	38.6	29.9	23.6	4.6	4.7	4.9	7.4	13.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.6	1.2
Vanuatu	42.1	40.1	38.2	30.2	24.0	5.1	5.0	5.4	8.6	13.7	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.7	1.7
<i>Micronesia¹⁹</i>	<i>34.0</i>	<i>32.0</i>	<i>30.3</i>	<i>24.2</i>	<i>19.8</i>	<i>5.8</i>	<i>6.3</i>	<i>7.3</i>	<i>13.8</i>	<i>18.9</i>	<i>0.5</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>0.7</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>3.4</i>
Guam	30.5	29.4	27.4	22.2	18.2	8.2	9.5	10.9	18.7	22.3	0.6	1.0	1.1	2.3	5.1
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	40.1	38.2	36.6	27.9	20.0	5.2	5.4	5.9	9.8	15.6	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.8	1.8
<i>Polynesia²⁰</i>	<i>36.2</i>	<i>34.1</i>	<i>32.2</i>	<i>25.4</i>	<i>20.0</i>	<i>7.0</i>	<i>7.7</i>	<i>8.2</i>	<i>14.5</i>	<i>19.2</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>0.8</i>	<i>0.9</i>	<i>1.6</i>	<i>3.9</i>
French Polynesia	31.5	27.4	25.9	20.6	17.6	6.7	8.1	9.0	17.9	25.2	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.9	5.1
Samoa	40.5	41.1	38.7	30.7	21.8	6.5	6.6	6.9	11.2	13.2	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.3	3.1
Tonga	38.8	37.6	37.4	29.2	24.1	8.2	8.3	8.2	11.1	13.4	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.4	2.6

SOURCES

Based on United Nations Population Division. 2009a. *World Population Prospects: The 2008 revision* (New York). Projections based on medium variant of the population projections.

NOTES

* Only countries or areas with 100,000 inhabitants or more in 2009 are listed individually; the rest are included in the regional groups but are not listed separately.

^a More developed regions comprise Europe, North America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan.

^b Less developed regions comprise all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean plus Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

^c The least developed countries are 49 countries, 33 are in Africa, 10 in Asia, 5 in Oceania plus 1 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

^d Other less developed countries comprise the less developed regions excluding the least developed countries.

^e Sub-Saharan Africa refers to all of Africa except Northern Africa, with the Sudan included in sub-Saharan Africa.

¹ Including Seychelles.

² Including Agalega, Rodrigues and Saint Brandon.

³ Including Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha.

⁴ For statistical purposes, the data for China do not include Hong Kong and Macao, Special Administrative Regions (SARs) of China.

⁵ As of 1 July 1997, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁶ As of 20 December 1999, Macao became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁷ The regions Southern Asia and Central Asia are combined into South-Central Asia.

⁸ Including Faeroe Islands and Isle of Man.

⁹ Refers to Guernsey and Jersey.

¹⁰ Including Åland Islands.

¹¹ Including Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands.

¹² Including Andorra, Gibraltar, Holy See and San Marino.

¹³ The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

¹⁴ Including Liechtenstein and Monaco.

¹⁵ Including Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Turks and Caicos Islands.

¹⁶ Including Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

¹⁷ Including Bermuda, Greenland and Saint Pierre and Miquelon.

¹⁸ Including Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands and Norfolk Island.

¹⁹ Including Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands and Palau.

²⁰ Including American Samoa, Cook Islands, Niue, Pitcairn, Tokelau, Tuvalu and Wallis and Futuna Islands.

Table 3. Fertility rates, infant and maternal mortality rates and life expectancy at birth

Major area, region or country	Total fertility rate (per woman)		Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)		Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)		Life expectancy at birth						Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)	Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n)
	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	Both sexes combined (in years)		Male (in years)		Female (in years)			
							2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009
World	2.7	2.5	54	46	81	69	65.8	68.0	63.6	65.8	68.0	70.2	400 ²¹	92 ²¹
More developed regions ^a	1.6	1.6	8	6	10	8	75.4	77.4	71.7	73.9	79.0	80.8	11 ²¹	5900 ²¹
Less developed regions ^b	3.0	2.7	59	50	89	76	63.7	66.0	62.1	64.3	65.5	67.8	450 ²¹	76 ²¹
Least developed countries ^c	5.0	4.3	95	80	154	128	53.0	56.5	51.8	55.2	54.3	57.8	870 ²¹	24 ²¹
Less developed regions, excluding least developed countries ^d	2.7	2.4	50	41	71	60	66.0	68.1	64.3	66.3	67.8	70.0
Less developed regions, excluding China	3.4	3.0	66	55	99	84	61.7	64.1	60.0	62.3	63.4	66.0
Sub-Saharan Africa ^e	5.6	5.0	100	86	169	143	49.6	52.0	48.2	51.0	51.0	53.1	900 ²¹	22
Africa	5.1	4.5	93	80	156	132	52.3	54.6	50.9	53.5	53.7	55.8	820 ²¹	26 ²¹
<i>Eastern Africa</i> ¹	5.8	5.2	90	73	150	119	49.8	54.0	48.4	53.0	51.3	54.9
Burundi	5.8	4.5	109	96	190	162	46.9	50.9	45.6	49.4	48.1	52.4	1100	16
Comoros	4.3	3.9	63	46	85	59	61.8	65.8	59.8	63.6	63.9	68.1	400	52
Djibouti	4.8	3.8	98	82	146	121	53.6	55.8	52.0	54.4	55.1	57.2	650	35
Eritrea	5.4	4.5	66	52	96	72	55.9	60.0	53.5	57.6	58.3	62.2	450	44
Ethiopia	6.2	5.2	94	76	160	126	51.4	55.7	49.9	54.3	53.0	57.1	720	27
Kenya	5.0	4.9	71	62	114	100	52.8	54.9	51.7	54.5	53.9	55.3	560	39
Madagascar	5.6	4.6	79	63	125	96	56.5	60.8	55.0	59.2	58.0	62.5	510	38
Malawi	6.2	5.5	104	80	160	115	51.0	53.9	49.3	52.9	52.8	54.7	1100	18
Mauritius ²	2.0	1.8	16	14	20	17	71.3	72.1	67.6	68.5	75.1	75.8	15	3300
Mayotte	4.5	3.0	8	7	10	9	74.7	76.0	71.0	72.3	79.3	80.3
Mozambique	5.7	5.0	108	86	188	145	47.6	48.1	46.0	47.4	49.3	48.8	520	45
Réunion	2.4	2.4	7	7	10	9	75.3	76.6	71.1	72.5	79.5	80.7
Rwanda	5.9	5.3	113	97	181	151	43.1	50.7	41.2	48.8	44.9	52.5	1300	16
Somalia	6.5	6.4	115	107	191	176	48.4	50.1	46.8	48.7	50.0	51.5	1400	12
Tanzania, United Rep. of	5.7	5.5	82	62	138	100	50.7	56.3	49.6	55.5	51.9	57.1	950	24
Uganda	6.8	6.3	87	72	145	118	46.3	53.5	45.6	52.8	46.9	54.1	550	25
Zambia	6.2	5.7	107	90	182	152	42.0	46.4	40.9	45.8	43.2	46.9	830	27
Zimbabwe	3.9	3.4	68	54	110	88	43.3	45.7	40.6	45.3	46.2	45.6	880	43
<i>Middle Africa</i>	6.4	5.5	118	110	201	186	47.2	48.6	45.6	47.2	48.8	50.1
Angola	6.8	5.6	138	113	240	198	43.6	47.6	41.7	45.6	45.4	49.6	1400	12
Cameroon	5.0	4.5	90	85	150	141	51.5	51.4	50.5	50.8	52.5	51.9	1000	24
Central African Rep.	5.4	4.7	113	103	193	175	46.4	47.4	44.3	45.9	48.6	48.8	980	25
Chad	6.6	6.1	131	128	213	208	49.3	49.0	47.8	47.7	50.9	50.2	1500	11
Congo	4.8	4.3	75	79	120	129	53.6	53.7	52.2	52.8	55.0	54.7	740	22
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	6.9	5.9	121	115	207	195	46.3	47.8	44.7	46.2	48.0	49.4	1100	13
Equatorial Guinea	5.8	5.3	108	97	185	164	48.7	50.6	47.3	49.5	50.2	51.8	680	28
Gabon	4.1	3.2	58	49	90	76	59.9	60.9	57.9	59.6	62.0	62.1	520	53
Sao Tome and Principe	4.6	3.7	79	71	106	93	63.8	65.9	62.1	63.9	65.5	67.7
<i>Northern Africa</i>	3.3	2.8	51	40	70	54	66.0	68.4	64.3	66.6	67.7	70.2	160 ²¹	210
Algeria	2.6	2.3	42	29	46	31	70.1	72.7	68.8	71.2	71.3	74.1	180	220
Egypt	3.3	2.8	43	33	51	39	68.2	70.3	66.6	68.6	69.9	72.2	130	230
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3.2	2.6	22	17	24	19	72.3	74.3	70.0	72.0	75.2	77.2	97	350
Morocco	2.7	2.3	42	29	52	34	68.7	71.6	66.6	69.4	70.9	73.9	240	150
Sudan	5.1	4.1	77	67	127	107	56.1	58.5	54.5	57.0	57.7	60.1	450	53

Major area, region or country	Total fertility rate (per woman)		Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)		Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)		Life expectancy at birth						Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)	Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n)
							Both sexes combined (in years)		Male (in years)		Female (in years)			
	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009		
Tunisia	2.1	1.8	24	19	27	21	72.6	74.2	70.6	72.1	74.7	76.3	100	500
Western Sahara	3.2	2.6	59	42	79	52	62.6	66.5	61.0	64.8	64.4	68.7
<i>Southern Africa</i>	3.0	2.6	60	46	86	66	55.4	51.8	52.7	50.4	58.2	53.0
Botswana	3.4	2.8	64	34	96	48	50.6	55.1	49.3	55.1	51.9	54.8	380	130
Lesotho	4.1	3.3	78	67	113	99	50.5	45.6	48.1	45.0	52.3	45.7	960	45
Namibia	4.0	3.3	52	32	76	46	58.8	61.7	57.1	60.8	60.3	62.4	210	170
South Africa	2.9	2.5	59	45	84	65	55.8	51.7	52.9	50.3	58.8	53.1	400	110
Swaziland	4.2	3.5	82	62	122	94	50.8	46.4	49.2	47.1	52.2	45.5	390	120
<i>Western Africa</i> ³	5.8	5.1	109	96	190	162	48.9	51.5	48.0	50.7	49.8	52.3
Benin	6.0	5.4	97	82	144	116	58.3	61.9	57.1	60.7	59.4	63.0	840	20
Burkina Faso	6.3	5.8	90	79	180	153	50.4	53.4	49.3	52.0	51.4	54.7	700	22
Cape Verde	3.7	2.7	34	24	42	29	69.0	71.7	66.1	68.7	71.4	74.1	210	120
Côte d'Ivoire	5.2	4.5	94	85	137	119	55.4	57.9	53.9	56.7	57.5	59.3	810	27
Gambia	5.6	5.0	90	75	136	113	53.9	56.3	52.4	54.6	55.5	58.0	690	32
Ghana	4.7	4.2	69	72	111	115	57.9	56.8	57.0	55.9	58.8	57.7	560	45
Guinea	6.0	5.3	117	95	186	141	53.3	58.4	51.5	56.4	55.1	60.4	910	19
Guinea-Bissau	5.9	5.7	125	111	218	191	45.8	48.2	44.3	46.7	47.4	49.8	1 100	13
Liberia	5.9	5.0	110	93	174	135	54.4	58.7	52.9	57.3	56.0	60.1	1 200	12
Mali	5.8	5.4	117	104	219	185	45.6	48.8	45.1	48.1	46.2	49.5	970	15
Mauritania	5.1	4.4	73	72	121	118	56.5	57.0	54.6	55.0	58.4	59.0	820	22
Niger	7.5	7.1	119	85	232	165	46.4	51.9	45.8	51.1	47.0	52.9	1 800	7
Nigeria	5.9	5.2	121	108	210	184	45.9	48.2	45.2	47.6	46.5	48.7	1 100	18
Senegal	5.6	4.9	64	58	134	117	54.1	55.9	52.7	54.4	55.5	57.5	980	21
Sierra Leone	5.4	5.2	130	102	213	144	41.9	47.9	40.4	46.7	43.4	49.2	2 100	8
Togo	5.1	4.2	86	69	122	94	59.8	62.9	57.6	61.2	61.9	64.6	510	38
Asia	2.6	2.3	50	40	69	56	66.7	69.3	65.1	67.5	68.5	71.2	330 ²¹	120 ²¹
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	1.7	1.7	25	21	32	27	72.5	74.4	70.6	72.4	74.5	76.6	50 ²¹	1 200
China ⁴	1.8	1.8	27	22	34	28	71.3	73.3	69.8	71.6	72.9	75.1	45	1 300
Hong Kong, China ⁵	1.0	1.0	4	4	5	5	80.8	82.4	78.0	79.6	83.8	85.3
Macau, China ⁶	0.9	1.0	5	5	6	5	79.0	81.0	76.7	78.8	81.2	83.0
Japan	1.3	1.3	3	3	5	4	81.4	83.0	77.7	79.4	84.9	86.5	6	11 600
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	2.0	1.9	49	47	64	62	67.0	67.5	63.9	65.3	69.6	69.5	370	140
Korea, Rep. of	1.4	1.2	6	4	8	6	75.9	79.6	72.2	76.2	79.5	82.8	14	6 100
Mongolia	2.2	2.0	47	41	49	43	64.2	66.9	61.4	63.8	67.1	70.2	46	840
<i>South-Central Asia</i> ⁷	3.3	2.7	68	55	96	79	61.6	64.5	60.5	63.1	62.7	66.0
Afghanistan	7.7	6.5	170	154	255	231	41.8	44.3	41.9	44.3	41.8	44.3	1 800	8
Bangladesh	3.0	2.3	64	42	88	53	61.3	66.6	60.4	65.5	62.2	67.7	570	51
Bhutan	3.8	2.6	61	42	92	60	61.4	66.4	59.7	64.7	63.1	68.4	440	55
India	3.3	2.7	66	53	95	79	61.3	64.0	60.3	62.6	62.3	65.6	450	70
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	2.2	1.8	39	27	46	32	69.0	71.7	67.9	70.3	70.3	73.1	140	300
Kazakhstan	1.9	2.3	38	25	46	29	63.6	65.2	58.0	59.2	69.5	71.5	140	360
Kyrgyzstan	2.7	2.5	44	36	53	44	66.1	68.2	62.2	64.5	70.2	71.9	150	240
Maldives	2.8	2.0	44	22	56	25	66.0	71.9	64.9	70.4	67.4	73.6	120	200
Nepal	4.0	2.8	63	40	86	50	61.7	67.1	61.3	66.4	62.0	67.8	830	31
Pakistan	4.7	3.9	74	62	106	86	63.9	66.8	63.5	66.5	64.4	67.2	320	74
Sri Lanka	2.2	2.3	18	15	23	19	70.9	74.2	67.4	70.6	74.9	78.1	58	850

Major area, region or country	Total fertility rate (per woman)		Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)		Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)		Life expectancy at birth						Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)	Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n)
	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	Both sexes combined (in years)		Male (in years)		Female (in years)			
							2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009
Tajikistan	4.0	3.4	71	59	92	76	63.5	67.1	59.9	64.5	67.8	69.7	170	160
Turkmenistan	2.8	2.4	56	49	71	63	63.9	65.1	60.1	61.1	67.9	69.2	130	290
Uzbekistan	2.8	2.2	52	47	62	57	67.0	68.0	63.8	64.8	70.2	71.2	24	1 400
<i>South-Eastern Asia</i>	2.6	2.3	37	27	48	34	67.6	70.5	65.3	68.3	69.9	72.8	300 ²¹	130 ²¹
Brunei Darussalam	2.5	2.1	6	5	8	7	75.9	77.3	73.8	75.2	78.5	80.0	13	2900
Cambodia	3.9	2.9	78	59	112	84	57.1	61.7	54.9	59.7	59.0	63.4	540	48
Indonesia	2.5	2.1	39	25	49	29	67.4	71.2	65.6	69.2	69.3	73.2	420	97
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	4.6	3.4	66	47	90	61	61.0	65.5	59.8	64.0	62.2	66.9	660	33
Malaysia	3.0	2.5	11	9	14	11	72.5	74.5	70.2	72.3	75.0	77.0	62	560
Myanmar	2.5	2.3	80	72	119	105	59.9	62.1	58.0	59.9	62.0	64.4	380	110
Philippines	3.5	3.0	31	22	37	25	69.5	72.1	67.4	69.9	71.6	74.4	230	140
Singapore	1.5	1.3	3	3	4	4	77.9	80.6	76.0	78.1	80.0	83.1	14	6200
Thailand	1.8	1.8	11	7	16	10	68.1	69.1	63.6	66.1	73.0	72.2	110	500
Timor-Leste	7.1	6.4	88	63	126	86	56.2	61.6	55.5	60.7	57.0	62.5	380	35
Viet Nam	2.3	2.0	25	19	31	22	72.1	74.7	70.2	72.7	73.8	76.6	150	280
<i>Western Asia</i>	3.4	2.9	37	29	47	35	69.7	71.5	67.5	69.2	72.0	73.9	160 ²¹	170
Armenia	1.7	1.7	33	24	37	26	71.2	74.0	67.8	70.6	74.4	77.1	76	980
Azerbaijan	2.0	2.2	54	42	71	51	67.1	70.6	63.9	68.2	70.4	72.8	82	670
Bahrain	2.6	2.2	12	10	15	12	74.4	75.9	73.0	74.5	76.2	77.7	32	1300
Georgia	1.6	1.6	36	33	38	35	71.4	71.9	67.7	68.3	74.8	75.2	66	1100
Iraq	5.0	4.0	40	32	50	39	71.2	68.1	68.7	64.6	73.3	71.9	300	72
Israel	2.9	2.8	5	5	6	6	79.0	81.0	76.9	78.8	81.0	83.0	4	7800
Jordan	3.9	3.0	25	18	29	21	70.6	72.9	69.0	71.1	72.3	74.9	62	450
Kuwait	2.4	2.2	10	9	11	10	76.6	77.8	75.0	76.2	78.8	80.1	4	9600
Lebanon	2.4	1.8	27	21	32	25	70.6	72.3	68.6	70.1	72.8	74.4	150	290
Oman	4.4	3.0	17	12	20	13	73.3	75.9	72.1	74.6	75.0	77.8	64	420
Qatar	3.1	2.4	11	8	13	10	73.2	75.8	72.2	75.1	75.2	77.2	12	2700
Saudi Arabia	4.2	3.0	24	18	28	21	71.1	73.1	69.4	71.2	73.4	75.6	18	1400
Syrian Arab Rep.	3.8	3.2	21	15	24	18	72.4	74.4	70.5	72.5	74.2	76.4	130	210
United Arab Emirates	2.7	1.9	10	9	12	11	76.4	77.6	75.3	76.9	78.4	79.0	37	1000
West Bank and Gaza Strip	5.8	4.9	23	17	27	19	71.8	73.7	70.1	72.1	73.3	75.3
Yemen	6.3	5.1	74	56	104	74	59.2	63.4	57.8	61.8	60.6	65.1	430	39
Europe	1.4	1.5	9	7	11	9	73.4	75.4	69.2	71.5	77.6	79.4	13 ²¹	5700 ²¹
<i>Eastern Europe</i>	1.2	1.4	16	11	19	14	67.7	69.5	62.3	64.2	73.5	75.0
Belarus	1.2	1.3	12	9	15	12	68.1	69.4	62.3	63.5	74.3	75.5	18	4800
Bulgaria	1.2	1.4	14	11	18	14	71.4	73.5	68.0	70.1	75.0	77.1	11	7400
Czech Rep.	1.1	1.5	4	4	5	5	75.0	76.8	71.6	73.7	78.4	79.8	4	18 100
Hungary	1.3	1.4	8	7	10	8	71.6	73.7	67.4	69.6	76.0	77.7	6	13 300
Moldova, Rep. of	1.6	1.5	21	18	26	23	66.8	68.7	62.9	64.9	70.6	72.5	22	3700
Poland	1.3	1.3	8	7	10	8	73.8	75.8	69.6	71.6	78.0	80.0	8	10 600
Romania	1.3	1.3	19	14	23	17	70.5	73.0	66.8	69.5	74.3	76.5	24	3200
Russian Federation	1.2	1.4	20	11	24	15	65.0	66.9	58.8	60.7	71.9	73.4	28	2700
Slovakia	1.3	1.3	8	7	9	8	73.3	74.9	69.2	71.1	77.3	78.7	6	13 800
Ukraine	1.1	1.4	15	12	19	15	67.4	68.5	61.8	63.0	73.1	73.9	18	5200
<i>Northern Europe</i> ⁸	1.7	1.8	5	5	6	6	77.3	79.2	74.5	76.7	80.0	81.7
Channel Islands ⁹	1.4	1.4	6	5	7	6	78.0	79.3	75.6	76.9	80.3	81.7

Major area, region or country	Total fertility rate (per woman)		Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)		Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)		Life expectancy at birth						Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)	Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n)
							Both sexes combined (in years)		Male (in years)		Female (in years)			
	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2005	2005
Denmark	1.8	1.8	5	4	6	6	76.7	78.6	74.3	76.2	79.1	80.9	3	17800
Estonia	1.3	1.7	9	7	11	9	70.4	73.5	64.7	68.0	76.1	78.7	25	2900
Finland ¹⁰	1.7	1.8	3	3	4	4	77.6	79.9	74.1	76.5	81.1	83.2	7	8500
Iceland	2.0	2.1	3	3	4	4	80.1	82.0	78.2	80.4	82.1	83.5	4	12700
Ireland	1.9	2.0	6	4	7	6	76.8	80.2	74.3	77.8	79.5	82.5	1	47600
Latvia	1.2	1.4	12	9	15	11	69.7	72.8	64.0	67.8	75.3	77.4	10	8500
Lithuania	1.3	1.4	9	8	11	11	71.3	71.9	65.8	66.1	76.8	77.9	11	7800
Norway ¹¹	1.8	1.9	4	3	5	5	78.8	80.8	76.0	78.7	81.4	83.0	7	7700
Sweden	1.6	1.9	3	3	4	4	79.7	81.1	77.3	79.0	82.0	83.2	3	17400
United Kingdom	1.7	1.9	5	5	6	6	77.8	79.6	75.4	77.4	80.2	81.8	8	8200
<i>Southern Europe</i> ¹²	1.3	1.5	7	5	8	6	78.0	79.9	74.9	76.9	81.1	82.9
Albania	2.2	1.9	22	15	25	17	74.4	76.7	71.4	73.7	77.6	80.0	92	490
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1.4	1.2	14	12	17	14	74.5	75.3	72.0	72.7	76.7	77.9	3	29000
Croatia	1.4	1.4	7	6	8	7	74.8	76.5	71.2	73.1	78.3	79.8	7	10500
Cyprus	1.7	1.5	6	5	7	6	78.5	79.8	76.1	77.5	81.0	82.2	10	6400
Greece	1.3	1.4	5	4	6	4	77.5	79.5	75.3	77.3	79.8	81.7	3	25900
Italy	1.2	1.4	5	4	6	5	79.5	81.3	76.4	78.3	82.5	84.3	3	26600
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of ¹³	1.7	1.4	17	14	19	16	73.0	74.4	70.8	72.0	75.3	76.8	10	6500
Malta	1.6	1.3	7	6	9	7	78.1	79.9	75.6	78.0	80.4	81.6	8	8300
Montenegro	1.8	1.6	14	8	16	10	74.9	74.3	71.9	72.0	78.0	76.7
Portugal	1.4	1.4	5	4	7	5	76.8	78.9	73.3	75.6	80.2	82.1	11	6400
Serbia	1.7	1.6	14	11	16	13	72.7	74.2	70.4	71.9	75.0	76.6
Slovenia	1.2	1.4	4	4	5	5	75.8	78.6	71.8	74.9	79.6	82.2	6	14200
Spain	1.2	1.5	4	4	6	5	79.2	81.1	75.7	77.9	82.7	84.3	4	16400
Turkey	2.4	2.1	35	26	41	30	70.0	72.1	67.7	69.7	72.4	74.5	44	880
<i>Western Europe</i> ¹⁴	1.5	1.6	4	4	5	5	78.3	80.6	75.1	77.7	81.4	83.4
Austria	1.4	1.4	5	4	5	5	78.1	80.2	74.9	77.5	81.1	82.8	4	21500
Belgium	1.6	1.8	5	4	6	5	77.8	80.0	74.7	77.0	80.8	83.0	8	7800
France	1.8	1.9	4	4	5	5	78.9	81.5	75.1	78.0	82.6	84.9	8	6900
Germany	1.3	1.3	4	4	5	5	78.0	80.1	74.8	77.4	80.8	82.6	4	19200
Luxembourg	1.7	1.7	5	4	7	6	77.8	79.8	74.5	77.1	80.8	82.3	12	5000
Netherlands	1.7	1.7	5	4	6	5	78.2	80.2	75.6	78.0	80.7	82.2	6	10200
Switzerland	1.4	1.5	4	4	6	5	80.0	82.1	77.1	79.6	82.7	84.3	5	13800
Latin America and the Caribbean	2.6	2.2	29	21	36	27	71.4	73.8	68.2	70.6	74.8	77.0	130 ²¹	280 ²¹
<i>Caribbean</i> ¹⁵	2.6	2.3	40	34	51	44	69.9	71.9	67.3	69.4	72.7	74.5
Aruba	1.9	1.7	18	15	21	17	73.7	74.9	71.0	72.3	76.4	77.5
Bahamas	2.2	2.0	13	9	20	12	70.3	74.0	67.1	71.2	73.6	76.7	16	2700
Barbados	1.5	1.5	13	10	15	11	75.4	77.5	72.0	74.6	78.5	80.0	16	4400
Cuba	1.6	1.5	8	5	9	7	76.6	78.8	74.7	76.9	78.7	81.0	45	1400
Dominican Rep.	2.9	2.6	38	28	43	31	70.9	72.7	68.6	70.0	73.5	75.6	150	230
Grenada	2.6	2.3	17	13	20	14	73.5	75.6	72.1	74.0	74.8	77.1
Guadeloupe	2.1	2.1	8	7	10	9	77.9	79.3	74.4	76.2	81.2	82.4
Haiti	4.3	3.4	71	62	98	84	59.1	61.5	56.7	59.7	61.6	63.2	670	44
Jamaica	2.6	2.4	26	23	32	27	71.0	72.1	67.9	68.8	74.2	75.5	170	240
Martinique	1.9	1.9	7	6	9	8	78.3	79.8	75.1	76.8	81.2	82.5

Major area, region or country	Total fertility rate (per woman)		Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)		Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)		Life expectancy at birth						Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)	Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n)
							Both sexes combined (in years)		Male (in years)		Female (in years)			
	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2005	2005
Netherlands Antilles	2.1	2.0	15	12	17	14	74.9	76.4	71.4	72.9	78.4	79.6
Puerto Rico	1.9	1.8	10	7	11	8	76.3	79.0	72.0	75.0	80.8	82.9
Saint Lucia	2.3	2.0	16	12	21	15	71.9	74.0	70.2	72.1	73.7	75.9
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	2.4	2.1	28	22	33	26	70.4	71.8	67.9	69.8	72.9	74.1
Trinidad and Tobago	1.6	1.6	29	25	36	32	68.5	69.7	64.8	66.1	72.3	73.2	45	1 400
Virgin Islands (US)	2.3	2.1	11	9	12	10	77.6	79.2	74.3	76.1	81.0	82.2
<i>Central America</i>	2.8	2.4	27	18	33	23	73.3	75.5	70.6	72.9	75.9	78.2
Belize	3.6	2.8	22	16	28	20	74.1	76.6	72.2	74.7	76.2	78.6	52	560
Costa Rica	2.4	1.9	11	10	13	11	77.7	79.0	75.5	76.7	80.2	81.5	30	1 400
El Salvador	2.9	2.3	29	20	33	25	69.5	71.7	65.0	66.8	74.6	76.3	170	190
Guatemala	4.8	4.0	42	28	53	37	67.7	70.5	64.3	67.1	71.4	74.2	290	71
Honduras	4.0	3.2	33	27	46	38	70.3	72.4	67.8	70.1	72.9	74.9	280	93
Mexico	2.5	2.2	24	16	28	19	74.3	76.5	71.9	74.1	76.8	79.0	60	670
Nicaragua	3.3	2.7	29	20	37	24	69.6	73.4	67.0	70.5	72.5	76.7	170	150
Panama	2.7	2.5	22	17	29	23	74.3	75.8	71.8	73.3	76.9	78.5	130	270
<i>South America</i> ¹⁶	2.5	2.1	28	20	36	26	71.0	73.3	67.4	69.9	74.7	76.9
Argentina	2.5	2.2	18	13	21	15	73.8	75.5	70.1	71.8	77.6	79.4	77	530
Bolivia	4.1	3.4	61	43	79	58	63.0	66.0	61.0	63.9	65.1	68.2	290	89
Brazil	2.4	1.8	30	22	38	28	70.2	72.7	66.4	69.1	74.1	76.4	110	370
Chile	2.1	1.9	10	7	11	8	76.8	78.7	73.8	75.7	79.9	81.9	16	3 200
Colombia	2.6	2.4	22	18	30	25	71.0	73.2	67.3	69.6	74.8	77.0	130	290
Ecuador	3.0	2.5	29	20	35	24	73.4	75.3	70.6	72.4	76.3	78.3	210	170
French Guiana	3.8	3.2	15	13	18	15	74.7	76.2	71.8	72.8	78.4	80.1
Guyana	2.5	2.3	54	41	74	54	63.2	67.4	59.8	64.8	66.5	70.5	470	90
Paraguay	3.7	3.0	37	31	45	37	70.1	72.1	67.9	70.0	72.3	74.2	150	170
Peru	2.9	2.5	35	20	48	31	70.5	73.5	68.0	70.9	73.2	76.2	240	140
Suriname	2.7	2.4	26	22	36	30	68.1	69.2	64.8	65.7	71.7	72.9	72	530
Uruguay	2.2	2.1	15	13	18	16	74.7	76.5	71.0	73.1	78.5	80.1	20	2 100
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	2.8	2.5	20	16	25	21	72.4	74.0	69.6	71.1	75.5	77.1	57	610
North America ¹⁷	2.0	2.0	6	6	8	7	78.1	79.6	75.7	77.3	80.4	81.7	10 ²¹	5 100 ²¹
Canada	1.5	1.6	5	5	6	6	79.3	80.9	76.6	78.6	81.8	83.1	7	11 000
United States	2.0	2.1	6	6	8	7	78.0	79.4	75.6	77.1	80.2	81.6	11	4 800
Oceania	2.4	2.4	28	22	37	29	74.3	76.7	71.5	74.4	77.3	79.1	180	250 ²¹
<i>Australia–New Zealand</i>	1.8	1.9	5	4	6	5	79.5	81.5	76.9	79.3	82.2	83.7
Australia ¹⁸	1.8	1.8	5	4	6	5	79.8	81.7	77.1	79.4	82.4	84.0	4	13 300
New Zealand	1.9	2.0	6	4	7	6	78.5	80.5	76.0	78.5	80.8	82.4	9	5 900
<i>Melanesia</i>	4.3	3.8	56	45	78	61	59.7	63.0	57.3	61.0	62.7	65.4
Fiji	3.1	2.7	22	19	28	24	67.3	69.0	65.2	66.8	69.5	71.4	210	160
New Caledonia	2.4	2.1	7	6	11	8	73.9	76.4	70.8	73.1	77.5	80.0
Papua New Guinea	4.5	4.0	61	49	85	66	57.7	61.3	55.3	59.3	60.9	63.6	470	55
Solomon Islands	4.6	3.8	61	42	82	53	62.2	66.7	61.6	65.7	62.8	67.7	220	100
Vanuatu	4.5	3.9	39	27	49	32	67.4	70.5	65.9	68.7	69.4	72.6
<i>Micronesia</i> ¹⁹	3.1	2.5	31	24	39	29	70.0	72.4	68.1	70.3	72.1	74.5
Guam	2.9	2.5	11	9	12	10	74.1	75.8	71.9	73.5	76.5	78.2
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	4.3	3.5	39	33	49	41	67.3	68.8	66.7	67.9	67.9	69.6

Major area, region or country	Total fertility rate (per woman)		Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births)		Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births)		Life expectancy at birth						Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)	Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n)
							Both sexes combined (in years)		Male (in years)		Female (in years)			
	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2000	2009	2005	2005
Polynesia ²⁰	3.4	2.9	21	17	26	20	70.9	73.2	68.3	70.6	73.8	76.0
French Polynesia	2.5	2.2	10	8	12	10	72.2	74.6	69.7	72.3	75.1	77.2
Samoa	4.5	3.9	28	21	34	25	69.3	71.9	66.3	68.9	72.8	75.2
Tonga	4.2	3.9	24	21	29	25	70.7	72.0	68.8	69.2	72.8	74.9

SOURCES

Total fertility rate (per woman); Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births); Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births); and Life expectancy at birth: based on United Nations. 2009a. *World Population Prospects: The 2008 revision* (New York). Medium variant of the population projections.

Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births): WHO Statistical Information System (WHOSIS) (WHO, 2009a) – <http://www.who.int/whosis/indicators/compendium/2008/3mrf>

Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n): United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) as presented in UNDATA: <http://data.un.org> (last update: 11 February 2009).

NOTES

... = Not available.

* **Only countries or areas with 100,000 inhabitants or more in 2009 are listed individually; the rest are included in the regional groups but are not listed separately.**

^a More developed regions comprise Europe, North America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan.

^b Less developed regions comprise all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean plus Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

^c Least developed countries: 49 countries, of which 33 are in Africa, 10 in Asia, 5 in Oceania plus 1 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

^d Other less developed countries comprise the less developed regions excluding the least developed countries.

^e Sub-Saharan Africa refers to all of Africa except Northern Africa, with the Sudan included in sub-Saharan Africa.

¹ Including Seychelles.

² Including Agalega, Rodrigues and Saint Brandon.

³ Including Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha.

⁴ For statistical purposes, the data for China do not include Hong Kong and Macao, Special Administrative Regions (SARs) of China.

⁵ As of 1 July 1997, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁶ As of 20 December 1999, Macao became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁷ The regions Southern Asia and Central Asia are combined into South-Central Asia.

⁸ Including Faeroe Islands and Isle of Man.

⁹ Refers to Guernsey and Jersey.

¹⁰ Including Åland Islands.

¹¹ Including Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands.

¹² Including Andorra, Gibraltar, Holy See and San Marino.

¹³ The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

¹⁴ Including Liechtenstein and Monaco.

¹⁵ Including Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Turks and Caicos Islands.

¹⁶ Including Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

¹⁷ Including Bermuda, Greenland and Saint Pierre and Miquelon.

¹⁸ Including Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands and Norfolk Island.

¹⁹ Including Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands, and Palau.

²⁰ Including American Samoa, Cook Islands, Niue, Pitcairn, Tokelau, Tuvalu and Wallis and Futuna Islands.

²¹ Maternal mortality in 2005 and Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n): Regional estimates developed by WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA and the World Bank (http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2007/9789241596213_eng.pdf).

DEFINITIONS

Total fertility rate (per woman): The average number of children a hypothetical cohort of women would have at the end of their reproductive period if they were subject during their whole lives to the fertility rates of a given period and if they were not subject to mortality. It is expressed as children per woman. (Source: UN, 2009b; Glossary: <http://esa.un.org/UNPP/index.asp?panel=7>)

Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 births): Probability of dying between birth and exact age 1. It is expressed as deaths per 1,000 births. (Source: UN, 2009b; Glossary: <http://esa.un.org/UNPP/index.asp?panel=7>)

Mortality under age 5 (per 1,000 births): Probability of dying between birth and exact age 5. It is expressed as deaths per 1,000 births. (Source: UN, 2009b; Glossary: <http://esa.un.org/UNPP/index.asp?panel=7>)

Life expectancy at birth: The average number of years of life expected by a hypothetical cohort of individuals who would be subject during all their lives to the mortality rates of a given period. It is expressed as years. (Source: UN, 2009b; Glossary: <http://esa.un.org/UNPP/index.asp?panel=7>)

Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births): Number of maternal deaths per 100,000 live births during a specified time period, usually 1 year. (Source: WHO indicator definitions and metadata, 2008: WHO, 2009a: <http://www.who.int/whosis/indicators/compendium/2008/en/>)

Lifetime risk of maternal death (1 in n): detailed information from WHO in *The lifetime risk of maternal mortality: Concept and measurement* (<http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/87/4/07-048280/en/index.html>)

Table 4. Life expectancy at 20 and 60 years old, exact age x, both sexes (in years)

Major area, region or country	Life expectancy at exact age x, both sexes (in years)			
	20 years old		60 years old	
	1995–2000	2005–2010	1995–2000	2005–2010
World	52.5	54.0	18.5	19.7
More developed regions ^a	56.1	57.9	20.2	21.8
Less developed regions ^b	51.0	52.5	17.3	18.5
Least developed countries ^c	45.0	46.8	15.4	16.1
Less developed regions, excluding least developed countries ^d	51.8	53.3	17.5	18.7
Less developed regions, excluding China	49.8	51.2	17.0	18.0
Sub-Saharan Africa ^e	43.1	43.1	15.3	15.7
Africa	44.9	45.2	15.6	16.2
<i>Eastern Africa</i> ¹	<i>41.9</i>	<i>43.3</i>	<i>15.8</i>	<i>16.4</i>
Burundi	41.2	43.8	15.1	15.6
Comoros	48.4	50.6	15.7	16.4
Djibouti	45.1	45.0	14.8	15.3
Eritrea	42.6	45.4	13.5	14.9
Ethiopia	44.3	46.0	15.5	16.3
Kenya	43.8	42.7	17.1	16.9
Madagascar	46.9	49.1	15.9	16.8
Malawi	45.0	41.4	15.7	16.4
Mauritius ²	52.7	53.7	18.1	18.9
Mayotte	55.3	56.7	19.2	20.0
Mozambique	43.0	39.2	15.1	15.9
Réunion	55.8	57.3	19.7	20.6
Rwanda	34.2	43.6	14.3	15.6
Somalia	43.4	44.5	14.6	15.0
Tanzania, United Republic of	41.6	44.2	16.0	16.9
Uganda	35.9	42.4	15.8	16.3
Zambia	36.4	36.9	15.5	15.5
Zimbabwe	34.0	30.6	17.7	16.5
<i>Middle Africa</i>	<i>43.0</i>	<i>43.2</i>	<i>14.9</i>	<i>15.2</i>
Angola	41.9	43.0	14.1	15.0
Cameroon	44.7	42.4	16.0	16.0
Central African Republic	42.1	40.6	15.2	15.3
Chad	45.9	44.2	14.9	14.9
Congo	43.6	44.2	16.7	16.2
Congo, Democratic Republic of	42.1	43.3	14.5	14.9
Equatorial Guinea	44.0	43.6	15.2	15.5
Gabon	48.6	47.2	17.4	17.7
Sao Tome and Principe	52.1	53.2	16.9	17.4
<i>Northern Africa</i>	<i>51.7</i>	<i>53.0</i>	<i>17.0</i>	<i>17.6</i>
Algeria	53.9	55.4	18.0	18.7
Egypt	52.0	53.4	16.6	17.2
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	53.8	55.7	18.1	19.2
Morocco	52.7	54.4	17.2	17.8
Sudan	46.7	47.6	16.2	16.7
Tunisia	54.6	55.8	17.8	18.6
Western Sahara	48.6	50.8	15.7	16.4
<i>Southern Africa</i>	<i>44.5</i>	<i>36.7</i>	<i>15.5</i>	<i>15.9</i>
Botswana	41.5	39.1	16.7	16.6
Lesotho	43.6	31.9	15.9	15.5
Namibia	47.8	45.6	16.6	17.3
South Africa	44.5	36.6	15.4	15.8
Swaziland	44.4	32.4	15.9	15.9

Major area, region or country	Life expectancy at exact age x, both sexes (in years)			
	20 years old		60 years old	
	1995–2000	2005–2010	1995–2000	2005–2010
<i>Western Africa</i> ³	43.6	44.1	14.6	15.0
Benin	49.5	50.9	16.1	16.8
Burkina Faso	43.6	45.0	12.9	13.4
Cape Verde	52.3	54.0	17.1	17.8
Côte d'Ivoire	46.6	46.5	16.1	16.3
Gambia	44.2	44.9	12.7	12.7
Ghana	48.3	46.5	16.7	16.5
Guinea	47.2	49.1	15.1	16.1
Guinea-Bissau	43.0	43.2	14.5	15.1
Liberia	47.5	49.0	15.3	16.3
Mali	41.2	42.3	12.0	12.2
Mauritania	46.0	46.1	13.5	13.5
Niger	43.1	44.1	13.2	13.0
Nigeria	42.3	42.5	14.6	15.2
Senegal	44.4	44.9	12.7	12.7
Sierra Leone	36.1	38.1	9.7	9.7
Togo	49.5	50.1	16.6	17.4
Asia	52.2	54.0	17.7	19.0
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	54.7	56.7	18.9	20.4
China ⁴	53.7	55.7	17.9	19.4
Hong Kong, China ⁵	60.6	62.7	22.9	24.6
Macau, China ⁶	59.5	61.3	21.7	23.2
Japan	61.2	63.1	23.6	25.1
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	52.8	52.4	16.8	16.5
Korea, Republic of	55.6	60.0	19.6	22.4
Mongolia	47.9	50.2	16.0	17.1
<i>South-Central Asia</i> ⁷	49.1	50.9	16.0	17.0
Afghanistan	39.9	40.9	13.0	13.3
Bangladesh	47.8	50.9	15.4	16.5
Bhutan	48.5	51.8	16.6	17.9
India	48.8	50.4	15.8	16.9
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	52.3	54.1	16.7	17.6
Kazakhstan	47.2	47.4	15.4	15.5
Kyrgyzstan	50.6	51.5	16.6	17.1
Maldives	49.8	53.8	16.1	17.6
Nepal	47.9	51.3	15.5	16.6
Pakistan	52.2	53.8	17.2	18.0
Sri Lanka	51.4	55.9	17.3	20.2
Tajikistan	51.4	53.3	17.4	18.6
Turkmenistan	49.8	50.0	16.7	16.7
Uzbekistan	52.3	52.6	18.1	18.3
<i>South-Eastern Asia</i>	51.4	53.4	17.3	18.2
Brunei Darussalam	56.4	57.9	19.4	20.4
Cambodia	45.9	48.3	15.3	16.1
Indonesia	51.0	53.5	16.5	17.6
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	48.0	50.4	15.5	16.4
Malaysia	53.6	55.4	17.9	18.9
Myanmar	49.6	50.4	17.1	17.4
Philippines	52.3	54.2	17.0	17.9
Singapore	57.8	60.8	20.2	22.8
Thailand	50.3	50.2	17.9	18.3
Timor-Leste	45.3	48.5	14.6	15.8

Major area, region or country	Life expectancy at exact age x, both sexes (in years)			
	20 years old		60 years old	
	1995–2000	2005–2010	1995–2000	2005–2010
Viet Nam	54.3	56.7	19.1	20.3
<i>Western Asia</i>	53.4	54.4	17.8	18.2
Armenia	53.4	56.0	18.0	19.5
Azerbaijan	52.6	54.6	17.6	18.9
Bahrain	55.5	56.9	18.6	19.4
Georgia	54.3	54.6	18.6	18.7
Iraq	56.2	51.1	20.1	16.1
Israel	59.1	61.4	21.5	23.4
Jordan	52.8	54.6	17.9	18.7
Kuwait	57.4	58.7	19.9	20.9
Lebanon	53.3	54.3	17.4	17.9
Oman	54.6	56.9	18.1	19.5
Qatar	53.7	56.6	18.6	19.9
Saudi Arabia	53.3	54.8	17.4	18.2
Syrian Arab Republic	54.0	55.8	17.8	18.8
United Arab Emirates	57.1	58.4	19.5	20.6
West Bank and Gaza Strip	53.8	55.3	17.7	18.4
Yemen	47.2	49.4	15.3	16.0
Europe	54.4	56.1	19.0	20.6
<i>Eastern Europe</i>	49.8	50.5	16.5	17.5
Belarus	49.8	50.2	16.5	16.5
Bulgaria	52.7	54.6	17.0	18.2
Czech Republic	55.3	57.0	18.8	19.8
Hungary	51.8	54.2	17.3	18.6
Moldova, Republic of	48.9	50.4	15.1	15.8
Poland	54.0	56.4	18.5	20.1
Romania	52.0	54.2	17.0	18.2
Russian Federation	48.0	48.0	16.0	16.8
Slovakia	53.8	55.5	17.9	19.0
Ukraine	49.3	49.7	16.2	17.0
<i>Northern Europe</i> ⁸	57.5	59.6	20.6	22.2
Channel Islands ⁹	58.2	59.7	20.2	21.5
Denmark	56.8	59.0	20.2	21.7
Estonia	51.0	54.1	17.4	19.5
Finland ¹⁰	57.6	60.1	20.9	22.7
Iceland	59.8	62.2	22.0	23.8
Ireland	57.0	60.5	19.8	22.5
Latvia	50.5	53.5	17.2	18.7
Lithuania	51.9	52.9	18.2	18.7
Norway ¹¹	58.8	61.1	21.5	23.1
Sweden	59.7	61.3	22.0	23.3
United Kingdom	58.0	60.1	20.8	22.3
<i>Southern Europe</i> ¹²	58.3	60.4	21.4	22.8
Albania	55.8	58.1	19.0	20.6
Bosnia and Herzegovina	54.9	56.4	18.6	19.2
Croatia	55.4	57.0	18.9	20.1
Cyprus	58.8	60.4	21.1	22.3
Greece	58.0	59.7	20.7	21.8
Italy	59.5	61.7	22.2	23.9
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of ¹³	54.4	55.7	17.8	18.7
Malta	58.4	60.5	20.7	22.4
Montenegro	57.1	55.0	20.8	18.5

Major area, region or country	Life expectancy at exact age x, both sexes (in years)			
	20 years old		60 years old	
	1995–2000	2005–2010	1995–2000	2005–2010
Portugal	57.0	59.3	20.6	22.0
Serbia	53.8	55.3	17.7	18.6
Slovenia	55.9	58.9	19.6	21.6
Spain	59.3	61.4	22.2	23.7
Turkey	52.8	54.5	17.0	17.8
<i>Western Europe</i> ¹⁴	58.4	60.9	21.5	23.3
Austria	58.1	60.6	21.1	22.9
Belgium	58.2	60.3	21.3	22.7
France	59.0	61.7	22.3	24.3
Germany	57.9	60.4	20.9	22.7
Luxembourg	58.1	60.1	21.1	22.5
Netherlands	58.6	60.6	21.1	22.7
Switzerland	60.0	62.4	22.6	24.4
Latin America and the Caribbean	54.4	56.1	19.9	21.1
<i>Caribbean</i> ¹⁵	54.3	55.8	20.0	21.1
Aruba	55.5	56.4	18.7	19.2
Bahamas	51.4	54.8	19.8	20.7
Barbados	56.5	58.3	19.8	20.9
Cuba	57.4	59.6	20.9	22.5
Dominican Republic	54.4	55.6	20.9	21.6
Grenada	54.8	56.8	18.1	19.4
Guadeloupe	58.3	59.9	22.2	23.0
Haiti	47.1	48.3	15.8	16.2
Jamaica	54.2	54.5	20.2	20.7
Martinique	58.8	60.4	22.3	23.3
Netherlands Antilles	56.3	57.6	20.6	21.4
Puerto Rico	56.2	59.6	21.3	22.7
Saint Lucia	53.7	55.3	18.7	19.3
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	53.2	54.1	17.5	17.8
Trinidad and Tobago	51.9	52.2	17.5	17.9
Virgin Islands (US)	58.2	59.9	21.0	22.2
<i>Central America</i>	55.9	57.6	20.6	21.7
Belize	56.4	58.1	20.5	21.9
Costa Rica	58.7	60.0	22.0	23.0
El Salvador	52.9	54.1	20.7	21.5
Guatemala	51.5	54.0	18.7	20.3
Honduras	54.1	55.9	20.2	20.9
Mexico	56.7	58.2	20.8	21.8
Nicaragua	52.5	55.6	18.8	21.1
Panama	56.6	57.9	20.6	21.5
<i>South America</i> ¹⁶	53.9	55.7	19.6	20.9
Argentina	55.5	56.9	19.6	20.7
Bolivia	49.9	51.5	16.8	17.8
Brazil	53.1	55.1	19.8	21.0
Chile	57.3	59.6	20.9	22.7
Colombia	53.6	55.6	19.5	20.6
Ecuador	56.2	57.7	21.2	22.2
French Guiana	56.0	57.3	19.1	20.0
Guyana	48.8	51.6	17.3	18.2
Paraguay	53.8	55.3	19.2	20.3
Peru	54.4	56.3	19.4	20.7
Suriname	51.5	51.5	17.6	18.1

Major area, region or country	Life expectancy at exact age x, both sexes (in years)			
	20 years old		60 years old	
	1995–2000	2005–2010	1995–2000	2005–2010
Uruguay	56.0	57.9	20.0	21.2
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	54.8	56.0	19.6	20.5
North America¹⁷	58.6	60.1	22.1	23.1
Canada	59.5	61.3	22.2	23.6
United States	58.5	60.0	22.1	23.0
Oceania	57.2	59.4	21.3	22.9
<i>Australia–New Zealand</i>	<i>59.6</i>	<i>61.9</i>	<i>22.3</i>	<i>24.0</i>
Australia ¹⁸	59.8	62.1	22.4	24.1
New Zealand	58.6	60.9	21.5	23.2
<i>Melanesia</i>	<i>45.3</i>	<i>47.8</i>	<i>14.2</i>	<i>15.4</i>
Fiji	49.6	51.0	15.3	16.0
New Caledonia	54.0	57.0	18.4	20.1
Papua New Guinea	43.8	46.4	13.6	14.8
Solomon Islands	48.4	50.9	15.6	16.5
Vanuatu	51.1	53.1	16.5	17.3
<i>Micronesia¹⁹</i>	<i>53.1</i>	<i>54.8</i>	<i>17.5</i>	<i>18.4</i>
Guam	54.9	56.6	18.3	19.4
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	51.5	52.2	16.8	17.0
<i>Polynesia²⁰</i>	<i>52.6</i>	<i>54.7</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>18.6</i>
French Polynesia	52.9	55.4	17.4	18.9
Samoa	51.6	53.8	17.0	18.2
Tonga	53.0	54.0	17.6	18.2

SOURCES

Based on United Nations. 2009a. *World Population Prospects: The 2008 revision* (New York). Projections based on medium variant of the population projections.

NOTES

* Only countries or areas with 100,000 inhabitants or more in 2009 are listed individually; the rest are included in the regional groups but are not listed separately.

^a More developed regions comprise Europe, North America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan.

^b Less developed regions comprise all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean plus Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

^c Least developed countries: 49, of which 33 are in Africa, 10 in Asia, 5 in Oceania and 1 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

^d Other less developed countries comprise the less developed regions excluding the least developed countries.

^e Sub-Saharan Africa refers to all of Africa except Northern Africa, with the Sudan included in sub-Saharan Africa.

¹ Including Seychelles.

² Including Agalega, Rodrigues and Saint Brandon.

³ Including Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha.

⁴ For statistical purposes, the data for China do not include Hong Kong and Macao, Special Administrative Regions (SARs) of China.

⁵ As of 1 July 1997, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁶ As of 20 December 1999, Macao became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁷ The regions Southern Asia and Central Asia are combined into South-Central Asia.

⁸ Including Faeroe Islands and Isle of Man.

⁹ Refers to Guernsey and Jersey.

¹⁰ Including Åland Islands.

¹¹ Including Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands.

¹² Including Andorra, Gibraltar, Holy See and San Marino.

¹³ The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

¹⁴ Including Liechtenstein and Monaco.

¹⁵ Including Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Turks and Caicos Islands.

¹⁶ Including Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

¹⁷ Including Bermuda, Greenland and Saint Pierre and Miquelon.

¹⁸ Including Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands and Norfolk Island.

¹⁹ Including Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands and Palau.

²⁰ Including American Samoa, Cook Islands, Niue, Pitcairn, Tokelau, Tuvalu and Wallis and Futuna Islands.

DEFINITIONS

Life expectancy at exact age x, both sexes (in years): the life expectancy at certain ages is the number of years still to be lived by a person who has reached a certain exact age (x), if subjected throughout the rest of his life to the current mortality conditions (age-specific probabilities of dying).

Labour force and employment indicators

Table 5. Labour force to population ratios at ages 15–64

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 15–64 (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
World	70.3	69.9	69.9	69.8	83.6	82.9	82.6	82.7	56.7	56.6	56.8	56.6
More developed regions ^a	71.3	71.7	72.3	73.1	79.1	78.6	78.7	78.8	63.7	64.8	65.9	67.5
Less developed regions ^b	70.1	69.5	69.3	69.2	84.8	83.9	83.4	83.4	54.8	54.6	54.7	54.4
Least developed countries ^c	74.8	75.0	75.1	75.7	86.5	85.8	85.0	84.6	63.3	64.4	65.4	66.9
Less developed regions, excluding least developed countries ^d	69.4	68.7	68.4	68.0	84.6	83.7	83.2	83.2	53.6	53.1	53.1	52.2
Less developed regions, excluding China	64.9	65.2	65.6	66.1	83.4	83.2	82.9	82.9	46.1	46.9	47.9	48.9
Sub-Saharan Africa ^e	71.1	71.6	72.1	73.2	82.0	81.8	81.7	82.0	60.5	61.6	62.7	64.5
Africa	67.7	68.1	68.8	70.0	81.5	81.3	81.6	81.8	54.1	55.1	56.2	58.2
<i>Eastern Africa</i> ¹	83.3	83.8	84.1	84.5	88.6	88.3	87.9	88.0	78.1	79.5	80.3	81.1
Burundi	91.0	90.0	90.0	91.3	90.5	88.6	88.2	89.5	91.4	91.3	91.7	93.0
Comoros	77.9	79.4	80.8	81.7	84.1	85.1	86.0	85.7	71.6	73.7	75.6	77.6
Djibouti	70.3	71.2	72.0	74.1	82.3	81.0	79.8	79.9	58.4	61.4	64.1	68.3
Eritrea	69.7	71.8	74.4	75.5	83.6	83.9	84.6	83.9	56.6	60.5	64.6	67.2
Ethiopia	83.7	86.3	87.1	87.5	92.1	91.9	90.7	90.4	75.5	80.8	83.5	84.7
Kenya	82.9	83.0	83.6	84.2	89.0	88.6	88.8	88.5	77.0	77.5	78.4	80.0
Madagascar	88.1	88.0	87.7	88.2	90.4	90.0	89.3	89.5	85.9	86.0	86.0	87.0
Malawi	76.8	76.9	76.0	76.1	78.2	78.7	77.7	78.1	75.4	75.1	74.3	74.0
Mauritius ²	64.5	63.6	62.4	61.9	84.7	81.8	79.3	77.2	44.2	45.3	45.5	46.7
Mozambique	86.8	86.4	86.0	85.3	87.2	86.9	86.5	85.7	86.5	86.0	85.5	84.8
Réunion	64.2	64.8	65.0	64.4	71.5	71.3	70.7	68.7	57.1	58.5	59.5	60.2
Rwanda	87.4	86.4	87.4	87.7	87.3	85.4	86.1	86.3	87.5	87.3	88.6	89.1
Somalia	72.8	72.1	71.8	71.5	86.1	86.1	86.1	85.9	59.8	58.6	57.9	57.5
Tanzania, United Republic of	90.3	90.0	90.0	90.0	91.5	91.2	91.2	91.2	89.1	88.9	88.8	88.8
Uganda	86.4	86.1	85.8	85.9	91.8	91.5	91.1	90.9	81.1	80.7	80.4	80.7
Zambia	70.5	69.8	69.7	70.7	78.7	78.7	79.6	81.2	62.5	61.0	59.9	60.0
Zimbabwe	71.6	69.6	67.9	70.9	79.0	77.0	75.5	79.6	64.7	62.9	61.0	62.4
<i>Middle Africa</i>	73.2	73.1	73.3	74.2	86.4	85.9	85.4	85.2	60.3	60.6	61.4	63.3
Angola	83.9	83.3	82.6	82.3	91.1	90.3	88.8	87.4	76.9	76.7	76.5	77.3
Cameroon	67.3	67.8	68.4	69.8	82.7	82.3	82.0	81.5	52.2	53.3	54.8	57.9
Central African Republic	78.7	79.0	79.4	80.8	87.1	87.1	87.1	87.5	70.6	71.2	71.9	74.2
Chad	72.5	70.7	70.5	70.3	79.9	78.1	77.7	77.4	65.2	63.4	63.4	63.3
Congo	72.3	72.7	73.3	75.4	84.0	83.7	83.5	83.6	60.9	61.8	63.2	67.2
Congo, Democratic Republic of	71.9	71.8	72.2	73.3	87.6	87.2	86.9	86.9	56.7	56.9	57.9	59.9
Equatorial Guinea	64.5	65.8	67.2	67.6	95.2	94.3	93.7	93.1	34.8	38.1	41.2	42.6
Gabon	75.9	76.7	77.7	79.8	84.9	83.9	82.7	83.9	67.2	69.6	72.6	75.7
Sao Tome and Principe	60.0	61.8	62.6	63.6	76.6	78.4	78.4	78.9	44.0	45.8	47.3	48.6
<i>Northern Africa</i>	53.6	53.6	54.4	54.7	78.8	78.4	79.5	79.6	28.2	28.6	29.3	29.8
Algeria	57.7	59.7	61.3	61.5	82.2	82.6	82.8	80.9	32.7	36.2	39.3	41.7
Egypt	51.3	50.6	51.7	51.9	77.1	76.7	79.5	80.8	25.2	24.3	23.8	23.0
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	52.1	54.2	55.1	53.5	77.6	80.2	81.8	80.0	23.7	25.6	26.2	25.4
Morocco	56.3	55.3	55.3	55.7	84.3	83.6	83.7	84.7	29.5	28.4	28.3	28.4
Sudan	52.7	53.1	53.3	54.3	75.3	74.7	73.9	73.9	30.0	31.4	32.5	34.4
Tunisia	51.0	50.6	51.0	51.6	76.0	74.0	73.7	73.9	25.8	27.0	28.0	29.0
Western Sahara	74.6	76.6	78.4	80.4	82.2	81.9	82.2	82.9	65.8	70.3	74.1	77.5
<i>Southern Africa</i>	56.4	58.0	60.2	62.1	64.5	65.4	67.9	70.1	48.6	50.8	52.7	54.0
Botswana	76.7	77.8	79.1	81.1	81.7	81.7	82.2	83.5	71.8	73.8	75.9	78.5

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 15–64 (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
Lesotho	75.1	75.1	75.3	76.5	81.0	79.6	78.4	78.5	70.4	71.5	72.7	74.8
Namibia	57.2	57.8	58.9	62.2	65.0	64.1	64.0	66.7	49.9	51.8	53.9	57.8
South Africa	54.8	56.5	58.9	60.6	63.1	64.2	67.0	69.2	46.9	49.1	50.9	51.9
Swaziland	63.8	64.5	65.6	69.3	79.0	76.9	75.7	78.3	50.4	53.1	56.1	60.3
<i>Western Africa</i> ³	<i>64.1</i>	<i>64.3</i>	<i>64.7</i>	<i>65.5</i>	<i>78.8</i>	<i>78.4</i>	<i>78.1</i>	<i>77.5</i>	<i>49.6</i>	<i>50.3</i>	<i>51.3</i>	<i>53.4</i>
Benin	73.4	73.4	73.6	74.1	81.6	79.2	78.0	77.1	65.2	67.6	69.1	70.9
Burkina Faso	85.3	85.6	85.7	86.0	91.5	91.3	91.3	90.9	79.5	80.0	80.3	81.0
Cape Verde	65.5	67.6	69.6	72.1	85.1	83.4	82.8	83.6	48.7	53.7	57.7	61.3
Côte d'Ivoire	67.0	67.1	67.5	68.8	82.4	82.6	82.6	83.2	49.9	50.6	51.7	54.1
Gambia	78.5	78.3	77.9	77.5	85.9	85.7	84.9	83.8	71.2	71.2	71.1	71.3
Ghana	75.5	75.5	75.6	76.9	77.1	76.2	75.9	76.9	73.9	74.7	75.4	76.9
Guinea	86.3	86.2	86.3	86.9	90.5	90.2	89.9	89.5	82.1	82.2	82.7	84.2
Guinea-Bissau	73.2	73.2	73.3	73.3	85.1	85.5	85.5	85.5	61.7	61.3	61.3	61.3
Liberia	73.1	72.9	72.9	73.4	77.9	77.3	76.7	76.3	68.4	68.7	69.2	70.4
Mali	52.9	52.9	53.2	53.3	69.9	69.0	68.0	65.5	37.0	37.8	39.1	41.5
Mauritania	70.0	71.0	71.7	72.2	82.5	82.3	81.9	80.6	57.4	59.5	61.2	63.7
Niger	63.0	63.3	63.3	63.2	88.6	88.1	87.9	87.3	38.6	39.4	39.4	39.8
Nigeria	56.9	57.0	57.3	58.0	75.4	74.9	74.6	73.4	38.7	39.2	40.1	42.5
Senegal	76.8	77.1	77.6	78.6	90.4	90.1	89.6	88.8	63.6	64.6	66.0	68.9
Sierra Leone	68.9	67.7	67.3	66.5	68.5	67.8	68.0	67.4	69.2	67.6	66.7	65.6
Togo	73.9	74.8	75.8	77.1	86.9	86.6	86.3	86.0	61.3	63.3	65.4	68.3
Asia	71.1	70.0	69.5	69.0	85.6	84.5	83.9	83.9	55.8	54.8	54.5	53.2
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	<i>81.4</i>	<i>79.4</i>	<i>78.6</i>	<i>78.1</i>	<i>87.6</i>	<i>85.4</i>	<i>84.4</i>	<i>84.4</i>	<i>74.8</i>	<i>73.2</i>	<i>72.5</i>	<i>71.4</i>
China ⁴	83.3	80.8	79.7	79.0	88.5	85.9	84.9	84.8	77.8	75.4	74.3	72.6
Hong Kong, China ⁵	69.3	70.0	68.6	68.6	82.5	80.9	77.9	77.9	57.1	60.3	60.4	60.5
Macau, China ⁶	70.7	70.6	75.1	77.5	81.0	78.3	81.3	84.1	61.3	63.8	69.6	71.8
Japan	72.4	72.7	73.2	74.6	85.3	84.5	84.2	83.5	59.5	60.8	62.1	65.4
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	69.3	70.5	71.5	73.0	80.3	80.9	81.2	82.4	58.3	60.0	61.6	63.4
Korea, Republic of	64.1	65.5	65.2	66.3	76.0	76.6	75.4	76.0	52.2	54.4	54.9	56.4
Mongolia	75.3	75.0	75.7	78.2	80.7	80.1	80.3	82.2	69.9	70.0	71.1	74.3
<i>South-Central Asia</i> ⁷	<i>61.4</i>	<i>61.5</i>	<i>61.9</i>	<i>62.5</i>	<i>84.6</i>	<i>84.5</i>	<i>84.2</i>	<i>84.7</i>	<i>36.7</i>	<i>37.2</i>	<i>38.3</i>	<i>39.1</i>
Afghanistan	59.6	60.0	60.7	62.6	85.3	85.4	85.5	85.9	31.7	32.3	33.8	37.5
Bangladesh	72.5	73.4	73.8	73.8	87.7	86.6	84.9	82.3	56.9	59.9	62.4	65.0
Bhutan	56.4	62.7	66.0	67.6	74.1	73.9	73.6	74.3	38.1	49.7	57.2	59.8
India	61.1	60.8	60.8	61.2	85.2	84.9	84.6	85.2	35.2	34.7	35.3	35.5
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	53.0	54.8	55.1	55.9	75.8	76.8	76.2	76.6	29.7	32.1	33.5	34.7
Kazakhstan	76.1	76.3	76.9	78.1	80.6	80.2	80.7	82.3	71.9	72.7	73.3	74.3
Kyrgyzstan	69.5	69.4	71.1	72.9	77.7	80.2	83.3	86.1	61.4	59.0	59.2	60.0
Maldives	55.5	64.5	69.7	74.2	72.8	76.9	79.1	83.3	38.1	51.9	60.2	64.9
Nepal	71.9	72.8	74.0	75.8	82.6	82.1	82.0	83.0	61.6	63.9	66.4	69.0
Pakistan	52.5	54.4	56.3	58.1	86.2	86.8	87.8	88.8	16.4	19.9	22.9	25.5
Sri Lanka	60.4	59.5	58.9	57.8	81.2	81.2	80.6	79.4	39.9	38.3	38.1	37.0
Tajikistan	59.0	66.9	70.9	72.3	70.3	77.7	81.6	84.1	47.7	56.6	60.6	60.9
Turkmenistan	67.2	71.0	72.1	73.0	73.0	76.7	77.6	79.0	61.5	65.6	66.9	67.2
Uzbekistan	62.1	65.5	68.4	71.0	67.5	71.1	74.5	77.4	56.8	59.9	62.4	64.6
<i>South-Eastern Asia</i>	<i>72.6</i>	<i>72.3</i>	<i>72.1</i>	<i>72.2</i>	<i>85.3</i>	<i>85.0</i>	<i>84.4</i>	<i>84.3</i>	<i>60.1</i>	<i>59.7</i>	<i>59.9</i>	<i>60.1</i>
Brunei Darussalam	70.1	70.5	70.4	70.3	81.5	79.3	77.8	76.8	57.7	61.1	62.6	63.7
Cambodia	82.2	81.9	81.3	81.8	86.0	86.9	87.0	88.3	78.9	77.2	75.8	75.5
Indonesia	69.6	69.8	70.4	70.7	86.9	87.6	87.4	87.5	52.3	52.0	53.4	53.9

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 15–64 (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	83.6	82.0	80.9	82.0	83.4	81.6	80.8	83.3	83.8	82.4	81.0	80.7
Malaysia	65.2	65.0	64.7	64.0	83.2	82.7	81.6	79.6	46.6	46.7	47.2	48.0
Myanmar	79.0	76.0	74.8	75.7	89.4	87.4	86.4	86.5	68.9	65.1	63.9	65.4
Philippines	66.5	66.1	65.5	65.4	83.0	81.1	79.9	78.9	49.9	50.9	50.8	51.7
Singapore	71.1	71.5	70.8	72.4	84.2	83.3	81.3	82.2	57.7	59.4	60.2	62.4
Thailand	77.6	77.8	77.4	77.5	84.9	84.9	84.7	84.4	70.5	71.0	70.4	70.9
Timor-Leste	70.5	73.1	73.6	74.7	81.9	84.4	85.0	86.4	58.5	61.3	61.8	62.6
Viet Nam	78.6	77.9	77.3	77.3	81.7	81.2	80.7	81.2	75.6	74.7	74.0	73.3
<i>Western Asia</i>	53.8	53.7	53.2	52.3	77.5	77.2	76.3	75.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	27.7
Armenia	70.8	74.3	75.5	75.1	78.5	81.5	82.8	82.8	64.2	68.2	69.2	68.5
Azerbaijan	68.4	68.9	68.1	69.5	75.4	73.2	71.2	72.9	61.9	65.0	65.1	66.3
Bahrain	67.1	66.3	65.0	62.4	88.0	87.3	86.1	84.8	35.5	34.5	33.5	31.2
Georgia	66.3	67.2	68.2	71.4	76.1	76.6	78.0	81.1	57.4	58.7	59.4	62.5
Iraq	43.7	43.5	43.1	42.9	73.4	71.9	70.7	69.1	13.4	14.3	14.7	15.9
Israel	63.3	63.9	64.7	65.1	69.1	68.6	68.7	68.1	57.5	59.3	60.7	62.0
Jordan	51.6	51.3	51.9	49.9	78.1	77.6	77.4	72.1	22.7	23.4	24.9	26.4
Kuwait	71.6	70.7	69.9	65.0	86.1	84.8	84.0	77.8	45.3	46.4	46.7	45.3
Lebanon	47.3	48.1	49.4	51.3	74.9	74.8	75.6	77.2	21.7	23.2	24.7	26.5
Oman	59.6	58.3	57.5	56.1	80.9	79.9	79.0	77.9	24.5	25.8	26.8	27.5
Qatar	76.2	82.9	85.2	85.4	92.9	92.9	93.5	94.5	37.7	47.1	51.5	52.1
Saudi Arabia	55.5	56.5	56.1	54.7	81.5	82.2	81.4	79.4	18.5	20.8	22.5	24.3
Syrian Arab Republic	51.3	51.2	52.2	51.4	81.3	81.0	81.7	79.3	20.9	20.9	22.2	22.1
United Arab Emirates	76.5	77.6	78.1	74.3	91.9	92.0	92.7	89.1	35.0	40.0	42.7	40.3
West Bank and Gaza Strip	41.2	42.8	44.9	45.2	70.0	69.7	70.5	69.2	11.1	14.6	18.0	20.1
Yemen	46.3	46.8	48.0	50.5	74.3	74.0	74.5	76.7	17.8	19.2	20.9	23.8
Europe	68.7	69.8	70.9	71.9	76.1	76.3	76.9	77.2	61.5	63.4	65.0	66.6
<i>Eastern Europe</i>	68.0	68.0	68.6	69.8	73.1	72.9	73.4	74.1	63.1	63.3	64.1	65.8
Belarus	69.9	71.0	71.3	70.5	73.8	74.3	74.4	73.8	66.3	67.9	68.4	67.3
Bulgaria	64.6	62.4	67.6	69.7	68.5	67.4	73.1	75.3	60.7	57.5	62.2	64.0
Czech Republic	71.1	70.3	69.3	72.3	78.6	78.3	77.7	79.4	63.5	62.4	60.7	64.9
Hungary	59.4	61.2	61.5	63.5	67.2	67.8	68.6	70.0	52.0	54.8	54.7	57.1
Moldova, Republic of	65.4	53.9	54.5	56.0	68.3	54.6	56.9	58.7	62.8	53.3	52.3	53.5
Poland	64.8	64.3	62.8	64.5	70.3	70.6	69.7	70.9	59.3	58.0	56.1	58.1
Romania	69.8	62.4	60.9	60.5	76.0	69.4	68.0	67.5	63.8	55.4	53.8	53.5
Russian Federation	69.3	70.9	72.4	74.1	74.2	74.8	75.9	76.7	64.8	67.2	69.3	71.8
Slovakia	69.4	69.1	69.4	71.6	76.1	76.7	76.9	78.7	62.8	61.5	61.8	64.6
Ukraine	66.8	66.7	66.7	66.6	71.4	72.0	72.1	71.9	62.6	61.9	61.8	61.8
<i>Northern Europe</i> ⁸	75.2	75.3	76.1	77.2	81.5	80.8	81.5	82.1	68.9	69.7	70.8	72.1
Channel Islands ⁹	73.9	73.5	73.0	73.1	78.6	77.1	75.5	74.5	69.4	69.9	70.5	71.7
Denmark	79.8	79.7	80.0	80.2	84.1	83.5	83.3	83.4	75.4	75.8	76.5	76.8
Estonia	69.9	70.4	74.0	75.4	75.3	73.8	78.4	80.0	64.9	67.2	69.8	71.0
Finland ¹⁰	76.7	74.5	75.2	76.1	79.2	76.3	76.9	78.2	74.1	72.7	73.4	74.0
Iceland	88.6	85.7	85.8	85.7	91.3	88.8	90.2	90.3	85.8	82.5	81.0	80.3
Ireland	67.6	70.9	72.9	73.0	79.4	80.8	81.5	80.7	55.7	60.8	64.1	65.1
Latvia	67.3	69.4	74.9	77.8	73.2	74.2	79.7	82.7	61.8	64.9	70.3	73.0
Lithuania	71.1	68.3	67.9	70.0	74.9	72.0	71.3	73.5	67.6	64.9	64.7	66.6
Norway ¹¹	80.5	77.9	78.2	78.8	84.5	81.1	80.5	81.0	76.2	74.5	75.7	76.5
Sweden	76.7	78.7	79.8	81.7	78.6	80.9	82.3	84.1	74.8	76.4	77.2	79.1
United Kingdom	75.1	75.3	75.9	76.9	82.6	81.9	82.3	82.7	67.7	68.7	69.6	71.1

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 15–64 (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
<i>Southern Europe</i> ¹²	63.4	66.3	67.8	67.7	75.7	77.0	77.3	76.4	51.1	55.5	58.1	58.7
Albania	66.6	66.2	66.1	67.9	77.7	77.0	76.4	77.3	55.7	55.7	56.1	58.6
Bosnia and Herzegovina	70.8	71.5	71.6	72.5	77.1	77.9	78.0	76.9	64.9	65.5	65.7	68.2
Croatia	64.3	65.3	65.0	65.5	72.3	71.6	70.8	70.6	56.4	59.0	59.2	60.3
Cyprus	67.9	70.3	72.1	74.7	78.9	79.5	79.7	82.5	57.2	61.6	64.8	67.1
Greece	64.5	66.7	67.1	66.2	78.0	78.7	78.7	77.6	50.9	54.6	55.3	54.3
Italy	59.8	62.5	63.3	62.3	73.6	74.6	74.4	72.7	46.2	50.4	52.1	51.7
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	60.2	60.6	62.5	63.3	73.1	71.8	73.6	74.0	47.2	49.1	51.0	52.2
Malta	58.4	58.3	58.9	60.9	80.6	78.8	77.9	78.9	35.9	37.1	39.3	42.1
Portugal	71.0	73.3	74.3	73.4	78.7	78.9	79.3	77.6	63.6	67.8	69.4	69.3
Serbia	62.9	64.2	64.0	65.5	72.8	73.4	72.1	71.6	52.9	55.0	55.9	59.2
Slovenia	67.5	70.6	71.2	70.8	71.8	75.0	75.4	75.3	63.2	66.0	66.7	66.1
Spain	65.2	69.7	73.2	73.6	78.5	80.9	82.4	81.7	51.8	58.2	63.8	65.0
Turkey	52.5	51.4	49.6	48.3	76.6	76.0	73.3	72.1	28.0	26.5	25.5	24.2
<i>Western Europe</i> ¹³	70.9	73.0	74.7	75.7	78.5	79.1	80.0	79.9	63.1	66.8	69.4	71.4
Austria	71.0	72.4	75.1	75.5	79.7	79.2	81.2	80.9	62.3	65.5	69.0	70.1
Belgium	65.2	66.8	67.3	68.4	73.7	73.9	73.4	73.8	56.5	59.5	61.1	62.9
France	68.6	70.0	70.4	70.9	75.0	75.3	75.2	75.1	62.3	64.8	65.6	66.7
Germany	71.6	74.5	77.3	78.5	79.4	80.9	82.6	82.6	63.5	68.0	71.8	74.2
Luxembourg	64.1	66.7	66.9	67.6	76.3	76.1	73.7	72.8	51.6	57.1	59.9	62.3
Netherlands	74.9	76.9	79.7	81.7	83.9	83.7	85.0	85.6	65.6	70.0	74.3	77.7
Switzerland	80.5	80.8	81.8	82.7	89.3	87.3	86.7	85.7	71.7	74.3	76.9	79.9
Latin America and the Caribbean	66.7	68.2	69.2	70.0	83.6	83.3	82.8	82.3	50.2	53.6	55.9	58.0
<i>Caribbean</i> ¹⁴	64.8	65.5	66.3	67.4	79.7	79.2	79.0	79.3	50.2	52.2	53.8	55.6
Bahamas	76.6	78.0	78.5	79.8	81.9	82.7	82.7	83.9	71.6	73.5	74.4	76.0
Barbados	80.1	80.5	80.6	80.3	85.1	85.2	85.0	84.7	75.2	76.0	76.3	75.9
Cuba	60.9	60.4	62.3	64.5	78.1	75.5	75.9	76.1	43.7	45.1	48.6	52.5
Dominican Republic	67.9	68.7	69.2	68.8	85.2	84.8	83.5	81.5	50.6	52.6	54.8	56.1
Guadeloupe	72.7	72.3	72.8	72.3	79.8	77.9	77.7	75.8	66.1	67.2	68.4	69.1
Haiti	68.7	69.7	70.3	71.1	81.8	82.7	83.5	85.0	56.3	57.4	57.6	57.7
Jamaica	72.3	70.3	69.2	69.8	80.2	79.0	77.8	79.3	64.9	62.1	61.0	60.8
Martinique	69.0	69.2	68.7	68.6	72.1	71.2	70.0	69.2	66.2	67.4	67.6	68.1
Netherlands Antilles	67.8	69.5	70.1	70.8	73.9	75.1	75.1	76.1	62.5	64.8	65.9	66.3
Puerto Rico	53.2	56.8	54.0	54.4	67.1	69.7	66.1	66.2	40.5	45.0	42.8	43.1
Saint Lucia	64.9	66.6	68.3	70.4	80.2	80.1	80.6	82.0	50.3	53.7	56.4	59.3
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	70.8	72.6	73.1	73.8	85.0	85.1	83.9	82.8	56.0	59.6	61.9	64.4
Trinidad and Tobago	66.1	70.2	72.0	72.7	81.2	81.4	83.0	82.8	51.5	59.5	61.4	62.9
Virgin Islands (US)	66.7	67.7	67.8	68.8	83.4	82.5	80.4	79.0	51.6	54.7	56.7	59.5
<i>Central America</i>	63.4	64.0	65.2	66.7	85.6	84.4	83.9	83.7	41.9	44.3	47.3	50.5
Belize	63.3	65.7	67.1	67.9	84.3	83.6	83.1	81.7	41.8	47.5	50.8	53.9
Costa Rica	62.8	65.5	67.1	68.0	85.0	84.1	84.1	83.8	39.8	46.3	49.4	51.7
El Salvador	64.0	63.6	63.6	65.5	82.4	81.9	80.5	82.2	48.0	48.2	49.6	51.7
Guatemala	64.5	66.8	69.2	71.8	87.4	89.1	89.9	90.6	43.3	46.6	50.6	54.6
Honduras	67.7	63.6	61.3	62.0	89.4	85.5	81.1	81.5	46.3	42.3	41.8	42.6
Mexico	62.9	63.5	64.9	66.3	85.3	84.1	83.8	83.2	41.2	43.6	46.8	50.1
Nicaragua	63.2	63.9	64.9	66.6	87.5	82.9	80.3	80.6	39.7	45.5	50.2	53.2
Panama	67.2	68.6	69.1	69.8	85.5	84.9	84.9	84.3	48.6	52.0	53.0	55.0

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 15–64 (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
<i>South America</i> ¹⁵	68.1	70.1	70.9	71.5	83.3	83.3	82.9	82.0	53.3	57.2	59.3	61.1
Argentina	67.1	69.3	70.0	70.9	82.6	82.4	81.5	80.9	51.7	56.2	58.4	60.8
Bolivia	72.1	72.9	73.5	74.9	83.0	83.0	82.9	83.9	61.5	62.9	64.2	65.8
Brazil	71.8	73.9	74.7	74.7	85.4	85.6	85.1	83.8	58.5	62.7	64.6	65.8
Chile	59.2	60.2	62.6	65.2	79.0	77.7	77.9	79.1	39.6	42.8	47.3	51.3
Colombia	59.0	60.6	61.3	61.5	80.4	80.2	79.6	78.1	38.5	41.8	43.8	45.5
Ecuador	61.1	62.6	63.9	65.1	79.3	79.3	79.3	79.6	42.8	45.8	48.6	50.7
French Guiana	64.2	64.1	63.3	64.1	71.0	70.9	68.9	68.2	56.8	57.4	57.8	60.1
Guyana	64.7	67.6	67.2	66.6	83.6	85.6	84.9	84.2	47.2	48.6	48.2	47.9
Paraguay	71.2	72.6	73.9	75.6	88.2	87.9	87.8	87.7	53.7	57.0	59.6	63.3
Peru	67.8	69.4	70.1	71.5	77.7	77.8	77.6	77.8	57.7	60.8	62.6	65.1
Suriname	54.7	55.6	57.4	56.2	71.5	71.0	71.5	68.4	37.3	39.8	43.0	44.0
Uruguay	71.9	73.8	75.1	76.9	84.7	84.9	84.6	85.0	59.5	63.0	65.9	68.9
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	65.6	68.1	69.5	71.0	83.3	83.4	83.4	83.2	47.7	52.7	55.6	58.8
North America ¹⁶	76.8	75.1	74.6	74.8	83.3	81.1	80.3	79.9	70.4	69.1	68.8	69.6
Canada	76.2	77.8	79.5	80.9	82.0	82.6	83.3	84.3	70.4	73.1	75.5	77.4
United States	76.9	74.8	74.0	74.1	83.4	81.0	80.0	79.4	70.4	68.6	68.1	68.7
Oceania	73.1	74.3	75.3	75.9	80.8	81.0	81.2	81.1	65.3	67.6	69.3	70.6
<i>Australia–New Zealand</i>	74.2	75.8	77.1	78.2	82.7	82.9	83.4	83.8	65.8	68.6	70.8	72.6
Australia ¹⁷	74.0	75.4	76.8	77.9	82.6	82.6	83.1	83.4	65.5	68.2	70.5	72.4
New Zealand	75.3	77.6	78.7	79.7	83.4	84.5	85.0	85.8	67.4	70.9	72.6	73.6
<i>Melanesia</i>	69.6	70.1	70.1	70.5	74.1	74.4	74.4	74.4	64.9	65.6	65.8	66.5
Fiji	60.3	60.5	60.4	60.9	79.9	80.1	80.0	80.2	40.1	40.2	40.0	40.6
New Caledonia	63.7	63.0	62.7	62.3	77.3	76.4	76.2	75.9	49.7	49.2	49.1	48.8
Papua New Guinea	73.3	73.7	73.7	73.8	74.3	74.8	74.8	74.9	72.2	72.6	72.6	72.7
Solomon Islands	38.1	38.8	39.0	39.3	50.5	51.6	52.0	52.5	25.0	25.3	25.2	25.2
Vanuatu	84.4	84.7	84.7	85.1	88.9	89.2	89.2	89.7	79.7	80.2	80.2	80.4
<i>Micronesia</i> ¹⁸	69.0	68.6	68.0	68.1	81.4	80.9	80.3	80.0	55.9	55.8	55.3	55.7
Guam	69.0	68.6	68.0	68.1	81.4	80.9	80.3	80.0	55.9	55.8	55.3	55.7
<i>Polynesia</i> ¹⁹	63.1	62.3	62.4	61.4	76.5	74.5	73.8	71.7	48.6	49.2	50.2	50.5
French Polynesia	62.4	60.8	61.7	60.1	72.9	70.4	70.6	67.6	51.1	50.6	52.3	52.2
Samoa	64.6	62.5	61.1	61.7	82.8	80.3	78.3	77.8	44.4	42.5	41.7	43.5
Tonga	62.3	66.3	66.6	65.3	75.2	76.5	75.8	73.0	49.4	55.9	57.4	57.2

SOURCES

ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e). ILO, 2009g: *Economically Active Population Estimates and Projections: 1980–2020* (EAPPE), table E5 (http://laborsta.ilo.org/applv8/data/EAPPE/eaapep_E.html).

NOTES

These estimates and projections are for international comparisons and are neither superior nor necessarily inferior to national estimates and projections, which are produced using country-specific additional information. This additional information is (a) not necessarily available to us for all countries and/or (b) different between countries and so would make international comparability difficult.

¹ More developed regions comprise Europe, North America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan.

² Less developed regions comprise all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean plus Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

³ Least developed countries: 49, of which 33 are in Africa, 10 in Asia, 5 in Oceania and 1 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

⁴ Other less developed countries comprise the less developed regions excluding the least developed countries.

⁵ Sub-Saharan Africa refers to all of Africa except Northern Africa, with the Sudan included in sub-Saharan Africa.

Country/region-specific notes:

¹ Including Seychelles.

² Including Agalega, Rodrigues and Saint Brandon.

³ Including Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha.

⁴ For statistical purposes, the data for China do not include Hong Kong and Macao, Special Administrative Regions (SARs) of China.

⁵ As of 1 July 1997, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁶ As of 20 December 1999, Macao became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁷ The regions Southern Asia and Central Asia are combined into South-Central Asia.

⁸ Including Faeroe Islands and Isle of Man.

⁹ Refers to Guernsey and Jersey.

¹⁰ Including Åland Islands.

¹¹ Including Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands.

¹² Including Andorra, Gibraltar, Holy See and San Marino.

¹³ Including Liechtenstein and Monaco.

¹⁴ Including Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Turks and Caicos Islands.

¹⁵ Including Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

¹⁶ Including Bermuda, Greenland and Saint Pierre and Miquelon.

¹⁷ Including Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, and Norfolk Island.

¹⁸ Including Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands and Palau.

¹⁹ Including American Samoa, Cook Islands, Niue, Pitcairn, Tokelau, Tuvalu and Wallis and Futuna Islands.

DEFINITIONS

The economically active population comprises all persons of either sex who furnish the supply of labour for the production of goods and services during a specified time-reference period. According to the 1993 version of the System of National Accounts, production includes all individual or collective goods or services that are supplied to units other than their producers, or intended to be so supplied, including the production of goods or services used up in the process of producing such goods or services; the production of all goods that are retained by their producers for their own final use; and the production of housing services by owner-occupiers and of domestic and personal services produced by employing paid domestic staff.

Economically active population for specific age range = Employed + unemployed in the same age range

Labour force participation rates of population at ages **15–64** (%) = Economically active population aged **15–64** / Population aged **15–64**

Labour force participation rates of population at age **65 and over** (%) = Economically active population aged **65 and over** / Population aged **65 and over**

Methodology: See ILO, 2009g: *Economically Active Population Estimates and Projections: 1980–2020* (5th edition): Methodological description (http://laborsta.ilo.org/app/v8/data/EAPEP/EAPEP_methodology.pdf).

Table 6. Labour force to population ratios at ages 65+

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 65+ (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
World	19.0	19.2	19.5	19.9	30.0	29.5	29.2	28.6	10.5	11.1	11.8	12.8
More developed regions ^a	10.0	10.3	11.0	11.9	14.6	14.4	15.1	15.7	7.0	7.5	8.2	9.1
Less developed regions ^b	25.3	25.0	24.7	23.9	39.2	38.0	36.8	34.6	13.2	13.7	14.3	14.9
Least developed countries ^c	49.2	48.0	46.2	45.7	65.3	62.9	61.0	60.3	35.3	35.4	33.9	33.7
Less developed regions, excluding least developed countries ^d	23.0	22.8	22.6	21.9	36.8	35.7	34.6	32.3	11.1	11.7	12.4	13.1
Less developed regions, excluding China	28.6	27.9	27.5	26.8	43.5	42.0	40.6	38.7	15.9	16.2	16.7	17.0
Sub-Saharan Africa ^e	48.0	47.9	47.5	47.2	62.2	62.2	61.9	61.2	36.4	36.3	35.9	36.2
Africa	40.5	40.0	39.7	38.7	54.1	53.5	53.0	50.8	29.3	29.0	28.9	29.0
<i>Eastern Africa</i> ¹	59.2	60.8	61.3	61.4	73.7	75.3	76.3	76.4	47.3	48.8	49.1	49.7
Burundi	77.1	78.3	78.6	79.0	78.6	75.8	73.0	72.1	76.3	79.9	82.2	83.9
Comoros	59.5	59.9	60.4	61.4	77.6	76.9	76.1	74.2	45.3	46.4	47.9	50.9
Djibouti	37.7	37.8	37.7	37.5	56.3	54.3	52.0	47.3	23.1	24.7	26.3	29.7
Eritrea	39.6	40.7	42.0	41.9	56.0	53.4	49.9	45.6	29.3	32.7	37.1	39.8
Ethiopia	46.8	56.5	60.0	61.5	67.6	76.3	80.3	82.0	29.4	39.9	42.8	44.3
Kenya	56.6	56.4	56.0	56.1	73.0	72.2	71.7	70.1	41.8	42.6	42.7	44.9
Madagascar	64.0	64.0	63.6	63.6	76.3	75.7	75.1	73.7	51.8	53.1	53.6	54.9
Malawi	88.5	88.6	88.0	87.7	93.9	94.1	94.2	94.3	83.7	83.8	82.7	82.4
Mauritius ²	10.0	7.8	7.9	7.6	18.2	13.4	14.1	13.3	4.4	4.1	3.8	3.6
Mozambique	83.7	82.1	81.2	80.9	92.2	92.5	92.7	92.8	77.4	74.4	72.7	71.9
Réunion	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.1	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.6
Rwanda	58.2	58.1	57.8	57.7	63.2	61.7	61.1	59.6	55.0	55.8	55.7	56.4
Somalia	43.1	42.4	41.9	41.8	54.4	55.2	55.7	55.8	33.5	31.7	30.5	30.2
Tanzania, United Republic of	63.8	62.8	61.8	61.5	78.4	78.7	79.0	79.1	52.0	49.8	47.9	47.6
Uganda	60.3	59.5	58.3	57.2	78.3	78.5	78.7	78.8	45.2	43.6	41.8	41.0
Zambia	64.1	63.2	62.4	61.7	75.2	76.0	76.4	76.4	54.9	52.7	50.7	50.5
Zimbabwe	61.8	51.6	50.4	48.8	70.4	60.8	57.2	55.3	54.6	44.2	45.2	45.0
<i>Middle Africa</i>	51.3	50.7	50.4	50.1	63.0	62.8	62.3	61.7	42.1	41.1	40.9	40.8
Angola	55.4	53.7	51.9	51.5	71.5	71.9	72.3	72.5	42.7	39.4	35.8	34.9
Cameroon	48.2	48.2	48.0	47.5	60.1	59.3	58.5	56.7	38.4	38.8	39.1	39.9
Central African Republic	73.6	74.4	74.7	75.4	81.8	81.3	80.9	79.6	67.1	68.9	69.7	72.1
Chad	69.0	65.9	66.2	65.9	85.6	86.4	86.4	86.5	56.1	49.7	49.8	49.6
Congo	66.0	65.8	65.6	65.3	68.4	67.8	67.3	66.5	63.9	64.0	64.1	64.3
Congo, Democratic Republic of	44.8	44.7	44.8	44.7	55.4	55.3	55.0	54.9	37.0	36.7	36.9	36.7
Equatorial Guinea	37.3	37.3	36.3	31.9	58.3	57.1	53.5	40.4	20.6	21.2	22.3	24.6
Gabon	47.8	48.4	49.0	48.3	59.4	57.5	54.2	50.9	38.6	41.1	44.5	45.9
Sao Tome and Principe	23.6	23.0	22.2	21.5	36.7	37.0	36.9	36.8	12.2	11.3	10.9	10.8
<i>Northern Africa</i>	20.3	18.9	18.1	16.8	35.8	33.8	32.1	28.4	6.8	6.2	6.2	6.8
Algeria	19.1	19.8	20.7	22.6	26.5	26.7	26.7	26.8	13.0	14.2	15.8	19.1
Egypt	15.8	12.2	9.5	5.8	27.8	22.1	17.0	8.9	5.8	3.9	3.2	3.1
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	18.7	18.6	18.9	19.6	34.1	34.2	34.3	34.4	3.1	3.2	3.5	4.6
Morocco	15.9	15.6	15.5	15.9	32.2	32.4	32.6	32.8	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.5
Sudan	39.3	39.1	38.8	38.6	72.9	72.5	72.3	72.0	10.9	10.6	10.1	9.9
Tunisia	18.8	18.5	18.3	18.2	34.2	34.4	34.6	34.8	3.6	3.9	4.1	4.3
Western Sahara	39.0	39.6	39.0	38.7	51.9	49.3	47.0	44.6	26.6	28.2	29.5	31.3
<i>Southern Africa</i>	14.2	10.5	7.2	5.7	20.7	15.3	10.5	7.2	10.0	7.3	5.2	4.7
Botswana	39.7	39.7	39.7	39.2	58.6	58.2	57.2	55.7	27.5	27.2	27.4	27.4
Lesotho	59.8	59.9	59.2	57.9	69.4	68.3	67.3	64.3	52.7	53.5	53.3	54.1

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 65+ (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
Namibia	32.8	32.4	32.2	31.4	39.5	38.4	37.9	36.3	27.8	27.8	27.9	28.0
South Africa	9.9	5.9	2.6	1.4	15.0	9.2	4.3	1.5	6.5	3.7	1.6	1.3
Swaziland	34.7	34.0	33.7	31.0	61.6	59.8	57.0	49.0	14.7	15.7	16.7	18.7
<i>Western Africa</i> ³	<i>45.0</i>	<i>44.8</i>	<i>44.6</i>	<i>44.3</i>	<i>57.6</i>	<i>57.5</i>	<i>57.4</i>	<i>56.1</i>	<i>34.2</i>	<i>33.8</i>	<i>33.6</i>	<i>34.3</i>
Benin	57.9	58.2	58.4	59.1	76.4	74.0	71.8	67.2	45.5	47.6	49.2	53.0
Burkina Faso	51.8	50.9	50.2	49.7	73.7	73.4	73.4	73.3	35.9	35.3	34.6	34.3
Cape Verde	28.9	27.6	26.4	26.1	56.2	53.5	50.5	46.2	12.1	13.3	14.4	16.6
Côte d'Ivoire	58.0	58.6	58.7	56.3	76.6	76.2	74.8	67.8	37.7	39.3	41.1	44.6
Gambia	74.1	73.7	73.1	72.6	88.1	88.1	88.1	88.2	61.8	61.3	60.5	60.2
Ghana	59.1	58.8	58.4	57.0	66.7	65.9	65.0	61.9	52.2	52.3	52.3	52.6
Guinea	50.2	49.7	49.4	47.4	75.2	74.9	74.2	69.0	30.4	30.3	30.3	30.3
Guinea-Bissau	42.0	43.0	43.5	45.1	53.5	53.2	53.3	53.4	32.5	34.7	35.4	38.2
Liberia	40.0	39.8	39.5	38.8	56.5	56.2	55.8	54.5	26.9	26.7	26.5	26.4
Mali	24.6	23.9	23.2	22.2	35.8	35.6	35.4	35.2	13.5	13.0	12.9	12.7
Mauritania	37.5	37.1	36.6	36.3	56.8	55.7	54.6	51.4	23.2	23.9	24.1	25.2
Niger	51.0	50.1	49.6	50.8	76.5	75.6	75.4	75.1	27.6	28.0	28.0	28.2
Nigeria	39.3	38.7	38.3	38.1	49.1	49.1	49.0	48.9	31.2	29.9	29.1	28.9
Senegal	54.0	53.6	53.4	52.5	62.0	61.4	60.7	59.3	46.7	46.6	47.0	47.3
Sierra Leone	39.9	38.3	37.5	36.2	50.7	52.9	53.7	53.7	29.0	24.1	22.2	22.0
Togo	55.5	56.1	56.6	56.2	74.5	73.4	72.1	68.7	40.7	42.7	44.4	46.7
Asia	23.0	22.0	21.3	20.4	36.7	34.5	32.8	30.2	11.2	11.2	11.4	11.9
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	<i>20.2</i>	<i>19.9</i>	<i>19.7</i>	<i>19.1</i>	<i>32.2</i>	<i>30.9</i>	<i>30.0</i>	<i>27.6</i>	<i>10.1</i>	<i>10.4</i>	<i>10.8</i>	<i>11.7</i>
China ⁴	19.2	19.4	19.3	18.6	31.6	30.9	30.0	27.3	8.1	8.9	9.4	10.8
Hong Kong, China ⁵	5.8	5.6	7.8	12.4	10.7	9.7	12.4	18.3	1.7	2.0	3.8	7.4
Macau, China ⁶	7.9	9.7	11.3	13.0	13.9	16.8	18.9	19.9	3.6	4.2	4.7	5.8
Japan	22.7	19.7	18.9	18.1	34.1	29.4	27.4	25.4	14.4	12.7	12.7	12.6
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	27.1	27.8	28.7	29.0	38.6	41.0	42.3	42.7	21.7	20.6	20.5	20.5
Korea, Republic of	29.6	29.9	31.1	32.0	40.6	41.2	42.5	43.1	22.8	22.5	23.3	23.9
Mongolia	27.2	29.1	30.2	30.5	40.5	39.8	38.8	37.0	17.6	21.1	23.7	25.7
<i>South-Central Asia</i> ⁷	<i>23.0</i>	<i>19.8</i>	<i>17.3</i>	<i>15.5</i>	<i>40.1</i>	<i>35.7</i>	<i>31.7</i>	<i>28.0</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>5.3</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>4.6</i>
Afghanistan	41.3	42.8	44.0	47.0	59.7	60.7	60.9	60.9	23.9	25.8	27.9	33.7
Bangladesh	37.1	27.3	20.7	20.3	56.6	43.9	35.2	35.0	17.4	10.9	7.3	7.0
Bhutan	33.0	30.1	22.1	22.1	45.0	37.5	28.1	28.1	21.4	22.8	16.0	16.0
India	19.8	17.1	15.0	13.4	36.7	33.1	29.7	26.3	3.8	2.7	2.1	2.0
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	31.1	27.3	22.2	19.8	48.2	40.6	30.9	25.7	11.6	12.7	13.3	14.5
Kazakhstan	12.3	10.1	11.0	10.9	17.4	13.7	13.9	13.0	9.7	8.2	9.7	10.0
Kyrgyzstan	14.9	12.1	11.7	11.4	22.4	19.1	18.8	18.2	10.3	7.5	7.1	7.0
Maldives	40.8	41.2	38.9	37.6	51.8	53.3	52.4	52.5	25.8	27.0	24.9	23.9
Nepal	46.3	42.0	37.4	34.9	60.2	56.3	52.6	49.9	34.3	30.0	24.9	23.1
Pakistan	32.7	30.8	28.7	25.0	51.7	49.0	44.6	36.4	10.5	10.6	12.0	13.5
Sri Lanka	14.7	12.1	9.4	7.5	28.5	25.0	20.3	16.5	2.5	1.6	0.8	0.6
Tajikistan	18.7	14.3	10.2	6.1	29.0	23.9	15.9	6.6	10.0	6.9	5.8	5.7
Turkmenistan	15.2	10.0	6.3	4.6	20.1	14.3	8.2	4.7	12.0	7.2	5.0	4.5
Uzbekistan	19.2	16.9	14.3	12.9	23.9	21.6	18.9	17.6	15.9	13.5	10.9	9.5
<i>South-Eastern Asia</i>	<i>36.3</i>	<i>38.5</i>	<i>39.7</i>	<i>39.8</i>	<i>49.3</i>	<i>50.4</i>	<i>51.2</i>	<i>50.0</i>	<i>26.0</i>	<i>29.1</i>	<i>30.7</i>	<i>31.7</i>
Brunei Darussalam	8.1	5.8	4.3	2.4	14.3	10.0	7.0	3.5	2.2	1.4	1.1	1.1
Cambodia	30.6	42.7	44.0	44.9	46.0	54.4	54.0	54.0	22.4	36.6	38.3	39.0
Indonesia	43.9	49.1	52.7	54.3	60.7	66.1	69.3	70.0	30.2	35.4	39.6	41.8

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 65+ (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	32.6	33.5	34.6	36.6	46.3	46.0	45.6	44.4	21.7	23.6	25.9	30.4
Malaysia	23.4	23.6	23.8	24.2	39.2	39.3	39.2	39.1	9.6	9.9	10.3	11.2
Myanmar	57.0	61.2	60.0	59.9	66.9	66.4	66.2	66.0	48.7	56.9	54.9	55.0
Philippines	40.7	39.3	37.4	35.0	55.7	51.6	48.3	43.1	28.9	29.4	28.5	28.3
Singapore	10.6	13.8	18.0	20.0	18.5	21.4	26.5	27.9	4.1	7.4	10.9	13.3
Thailand	29.6	30.1	30.6	31.6	38.6	38.9	38.9	39.0	22.3	23.1	23.9	25.6
Timor-Leste	25.3	26.7	27.1	26.9	41.0	42.5	43.3	43.7	11.5	12.1	12.2	12.4
Viet Nam	15.7	14.0	13.0	11.7	21.0	17.2	15.0	12.2	12.0	11.7	11.5	11.3
<i>Western Asia</i>	<i>20.8</i>	<i>17.0</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>13.9</i>	<i>33.2</i>	<i>27.6</i>	<i>24.0</i>	<i>22.5</i>	<i>10.8</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>7.2</i>	<i>6.8</i>
Armenia	20.9	14.9	11.2	8.5	27.6	21.2	15.6	9.4	16.3	10.8	8.5	8.0
Azerbaijan	13.8	11.7	10.0	9.1	17.4	13.8	10.8	9.2	11.3	10.2	9.4	9.1
Bahrain	19.2	18.9	18.8	21.1	36.4	36.6	36.8	37.0	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.2
Georgia	49.4	47.2	42.8	41.5	60.2	54.8	50.9	48.3	42.7	42.3	37.7	37.3
Iraq	10.1	10.5	10.2	11.1	22.8	22.9	23.0	23.1	2.5	2.4	2.2	2.1
Israel	8.4	10.2	10.9	12.6	14.2	16.3	17.8	19.8	4.2	5.7	5.7	7.0
Jordan	8.5	7.2	4.6	0.9	16.3	14.0	8.9	1.7	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2
Kuwait	10.4	11.6	12.2	13.8	17.7	18.3	18.5	18.5	1.8	2.6	3.4	6.5
Lebanon	22.3	19.3	16.8	14.2	41.6	36.8	33.2	30.1	3.6	2.9	2.5	1.7
Oman	11.1	11.7	12.1	13.4	21.0	21.2	21.3	21.4	1.3	1.5	1.8	2.7
Qatar	38.4	37.7	40.5	42.6	58.7	58.7	58.9	58.9	4.5	6.2	7.8	9.6
Saudi Arabia	17.6	17.6	17.5	18.9	33.1	33.2	33.3	33.4	0.9	1.1	1.3	2.2
Syrian Arab Republic	30.6	18.2	15.8	15.5	55.3	35.5	30.6	30.0	9.9	3.7	3.6	3.3
United Arab Emirates	19.3	20.2	21.2	24.0	33.1	33.3	33.4	33.5	1.7	2.2	3.0	4.4
West Bank and Gaza Strip	10.4	9.4	10.1	11.0	19.1	17.8	19.0	20.1	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.6
Yemen	27.0	26.8	26.8	27.3	50.7	50.8	50.8	50.9	5.8	6.0	6.5	8.0
Europe	6.7	6.8	6.8	7.1	9.4	9.1	9.1	9.3	5.0	5.3	5.3	5.7
<i>Eastern Europe</i>	<i>11.4</i>	<i>11.1</i>	<i>10.6</i>	<i>10.6</i>	<i>15.9</i>	<i>14.3</i>	<i>13.5</i>	<i>13.2</i>	<i>9.0</i>	<i>9.4</i>	<i>9.1</i>	<i>9.1</i>
Belarus	2.7	2.2	1.8	1.4	5.0	4.2	3.4	2.3	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.0
Bulgaria	2.6	2.5	3.8	4.8	4.2	4.0	6.2	7.3	1.4	1.4	2.2	3.2
Czech Republic	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.9	6.9	6.3	6.4	6.1	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.3
Hungary	1.8	1.5	1.8	2.1	2.8	2.6	3.0	3.2	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.4
Moldova, Republic of	18.5	16.9	15.7	15.1	24.2	20.8	19.0	16.9	15.1	14.6	13.7	14.0
Poland	7.9	5.7	4.1	3.0	12.5	8.9	6.1	3.7	5.1	3.7	2.9	2.6
Romania	38.2	14.6	10.9	10.5	43.5	16.8	11.2	10.5	34.4	13.0	10.7	10.5
Russian Federation	10.1	11.5	11.6	11.9	14.7	15.8	16.3	16.6	8.0	9.5	9.5	9.6
Slovakia	1.0	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.8	2.4	2.3	2.5	0.5	0.9	0.9	1.2
Ukraine	13.1	19.1	19.5	21.6	17.7	22.7	22.8	25.3	10.8	17.3	17.9	19.7
<i>Northern Europe</i> ⁸	<i>5.9</i>	<i>6.9</i>	<i>8.5</i>	<i>9.8</i>	<i>8.8</i>	<i>10.0</i>	<i>12.2</i>	<i>13.3</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>5.7</i>	<i>7.1</i>
Channel Islands ⁹	5.4	5.2	4.9	4.4	7.5	7.0	6.5	5.5	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5
Denmark	2.6	5.5	7.1	8.6	3.9	9.2	11.8	13.7	1.6	2.7	3.4	4.5
Estonia	7.6	10.0	12.5	13.3	11.0	14.0	17.4	17.9	6.0	8.0	10.1	10.9
Finland ¹⁰	2.3	2.8	4.1	5.4	4.3	4.5	6.7	8.0	1.0	1.6	2.3	3.4
Iceland	35.8	33.3	28.7	23.0	50.6	46.0	35.1	23.8	23.7	22.8	23.2	22.2
Ireland	8.1	8.0	9.1	9.9	14.9	14.1	15.1	15.7	2.9	3.2	4.3	5.0
Latvia	6.7	8.8	12.0	15.9	10.2	15.2	19.9	24.8	5.1	5.8	8.1	11.5
Lithuania	7.9	3.9	4.2	3.8	10.1	6.3	6.9	6.4	6.8	2.6	2.8	2.5
Norway ¹¹	10.4	12.7	17.3	20.0	13.9	15.8	21.1	23.3	8.0	10.4	14.5	17.2
Sweden	9.0	9.7	11.7	14.0	13.7	14.0	16.0	16.5	5.6	6.6	8.4	11.9
United Kingdom	5.2	6.3	7.7	8.8	7.8	9.1	11.1	12.2	3.4	4.3	5.1	6.1

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 65+ (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
<i>Southern Europe</i> ¹²	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.5	7.5	7.4	7.2	6.8	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.7
Albania	17.2	15.3	13.5	10.4	28.1	25.5	22.2	15.6	8.4	7.2	6.5	6.4
Bosnia and Herzegovina	9.8	8.8	7.8	6.8	13.8	12.4	11.0	8.9	6.9	6.0	5.4	5.3
Croatia	7.4	7.0	5.5	4.8	10.7	9.2	6.2	4.5	5.3	5.6	5.1	5.1
Cyprus	10.3	11.4	11.4	11.8	17.5	19.6	20.1	21.2	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.3
Greece	5.4	4.2	3.9	3.1	8.5	7.0	6.3	4.7	2.9	2.0	2.0	1.9
Italy	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.4	5.6	6.0	6.5	6.6	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.0
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	4.0	4.8	3.0	2.2	6.0	6.8	4.4	2.6	2.4	3.2	2.0	1.9
Malta	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.2	7.1	6.7	6.3	5.6	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.3
Portugal	18.0	18.0	18.1	18.0	25.1	24.6	24.3	23.2	12.9	13.2	13.7	14.3
Serbia	12.3	8.5	7.5	6.1	16.7	11.5	10.0	7.0	8.9	6.2	5.5	5.4
Slovenia	7.4	7.8	5.8	4.5	10.8	11.5	7.4	4.7	5.4	5.6	4.9	4.4
Spain	1.6	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.5	3.2	3.4	3.7	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.6
Turkey	21.1	15.1	11.5	10.3	32.5	24.2	17.9	15.2	11.3	7.6	6.3	6.3
<i>Western Europe</i> ¹³	2.3	2.8	3.5	4.1	3.7	4.4	5.1	5.7	1.3	1.8	2.3	2.8
Austria	3.0	3.0	4.4	5.8	4.7	5.0	7.0	8.8	1.9	1.7	2.6	3.4
Belgium	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.2	3.4	3.4	4.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.2
France	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.2	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.2
Germany	2.5	3.4	4.1	4.8	4.4	5.1	5.7	6.4	1.4	2.2	2.9	3.6
Luxembourg	1.7	1.2	1.0	1.0	2.1	1.6	1.1	1.0	1.4	0.9	0.8	0.9
Netherlands	2.6	4.5	6.8	8.4	4.3	7.8	10.5	12.2	1.4	2.1	3.9	5.2
Switzerland	9.5	7.5	8.1	7.8	14.3	11.2	11.9	11.4	6.2	4.9	5.2	5.0
Latin America and the Caribbean	25.7	28.4	30.7	32.2	41.1	43.5	45.3	46.6	13.6	16.5	19.2	20.8
<i>Caribbean</i> ¹⁴	19.3	18.9	18.3	17.4	28.3	27.1	25.9	23.5	11.6	11.8	12.0	12.4
Bahamas	20.8	21.4	22.9	26.4	32.1	32.0	31.7	31.1	12.9	13.8	16.5	23.1
Barbados	5.4	7.6	8.8	9.8	9.5	10.6	11.7	12.8	3.0	5.9	7.1	7.7
Cuba	6.7	5.9	6.0	6.0	12.3	10.5	10.5	10.1	1.7	1.6	1.9	2.5
Dominican Republic	26.7	25.8	23.5	20.9	45.0	43.1	37.6	29.4	8.3	8.8	10.1	13.2
Guadeloupe	3.1	3.9	4.3	4.6	3.1	2.9	2.6	2.5	3.1	4.8	5.7	6.1
Haiti	65.8	66.0	65.8	65.7	76.5	77.1	77.2	77.2	56.8	56.9	56.5	56.3
Jamaica	31.5	27.9	26.2	22.8	47.4	41.3	38.0	30.7	17.8	17.3	16.6	16.2
Martinique	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.7	3.5	3.2	3.0	2.8	1.7	2.2	2.5	2.7
Netherlands Antilles	8.2	4.1	10.4	12.3	14.8	8.2	20.0	24.6	3.3	1.1	3.4	3.5
Puerto Rico	8.4	7.6	7.7	7.7	13.0	12.1	11.8	11.6	4.8	4.2	4.8	5.0
Saint Lucia	16.6	15.3	14.4	13.8	26.8	25.3	24.8	24.4	7.9	6.9	6.1	5.4
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	15.5	14.3	12.6	10.3	25.4	22.9	19.4	14.2	7.8	7.5	7.1	6.9
Trinidad and Tobago	10.0	9.0	8.2	7.8	16.0	15.8	13.0	11.6	6.1	4.8	5.3	5.5
Virgin Islands (US)	17.5	18.4	19.6	19.0	32.2	30.4	28.2	24.8	5.9	8.8	12.8	14.9
<i>Central America</i>	30.5	29.9	28.6	26.4	50.1	48.0	44.5	38.8	14.7	15.0	15.1	15.8
Belize	27.8	24.5	22.0	16.6	47.4	41.5	36.9	25.4	10.4	9.6	9.2	9.1
Costa Rica	22.6	25.0	18.0	19.2	42.7	43.4	29.5	28.6	4.8	8.9	8.0	11.1
El Salvador	30.4	28.9	27.7	24.8	46.0	44.3	41.4	35.9	18.0	16.8	17.1	16.7
Guatemala	44.1	44.2	44.0	43.7	67.0	66.6	65.4	63.2	23.4	24.1	25.0	27.3
Honduras	40.6	37.9	35.7	34.5	64.4	60.5	57.3	55.2	19.5	17.8	16.6	16.4
Mexico	29.3	28.6	27.5	25.0	48.5	46.2	43.1	36.7	14.2	14.4	14.5	15.0
Nicaragua	34.2	33.0	30.6	28.9	57.9	53.2	46.1	40.2	14.4	15.7	17.2	19.4
Panama	22.8	23.2	22.5	22.6	38.4	39.5	37.0	36.6	8.3	8.1	9.2	10.1

Major area, region or country	Labour force participation rates of population at ages 65+ (%)											
	Total				Male				Female			
	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020	2000	2005	2010	2020
<i>South America</i> ¹⁵	25.0	29.1	33.0	36.0	39.9	44.3	48.2	52.3	13.5	17.5	21.4	23.5
Argentina	22.9	31.0	36.6	41.8	36.8	47.1	54.3	59.4	13.7	20.5	25.0	29.7
Bolivia	52.6	52.9	52.7	52.4	68.3	68.8	69.2	69.4	39.9	40.1	39.6	38.9
Brazil	24.0	28.4	33.2	36.7	37.3	41.9	46.2	52.2	13.4	17.9	23.2	24.9
Chile	13.6	14.6	20.4	29.6	24.4	25.5	34.0	45.0	6.0	6.7	10.3	17.8
Colombia	25.9	26.7	27.3	28.0	48.0	48.6	49.4	50.1	8.7	9.7	10.3	10.9
Ecuador	37.8	45.8	48.5	49.0	55.2	61.3	61.8	61.9	22.6	32.3	36.8	38.0
French Guiana	5.7	5.5	5.4	5.3	7.9	7.4	6.7	5.9	3.6	3.9	4.2	4.8
Guyana	21.8	22.2	22.3	22.6	34.9	34.8	34.8	34.8	11.8	11.2	11.0	10.9
Paraguay	39.1	40.3	52.4	55.5	57.0	54.6	73.3	77.9	23.8	27.7	33.6	35.0
Peru	33.2	34.9	35.9	36.7	53.8	54.8	56.3	57.2	15.6	18.0	18.8	19.7
Suriname	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.7
Uruguay	13.9	13.0	14.6	15.5	21.5	20.0	22.8	24.2	8.9	8.6	9.3	9.8
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	26.8	28.0	27.5	26.8	42.4	43.7	41.1	37.2	13.7	14.6	15.8	18.0
North America ¹⁶	12.2	14.3	16.9	19.0	16.9	19.0	21.5	23.5	8.8	10.9	13.3	15.4
Canada	6.0	8.1	10.9	12.7	9.5	12.1	15.0	16.7	3.3	5.0	7.6	9.4
United States	12.9	15.0	17.6	19.8	17.7	19.8	22.3	24.3	9.4	11.5	14.0	16.1
Oceania	8.8	10.6	13.0	15.1	13.3	15.2	18.2	20.0	5.1	6.9	8.7	10.9
<i>Australia–New Zealand</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>8.1</i>	<i>10.6</i>	<i>12.6</i>	<i>10.3</i>	<i>12.2</i>	<i>15.5</i>	<i>17.3</i>	<i>3.3</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>6.6</i>	<i>8.5</i>
Australia ¹⁷	6.1	7.4	9.4	11.3	10.0	11.4	14.0	15.9	3.1	4.2	5.5	7.4
New Zealand	7.6	11.6	17.2	19.5	11.8	16.2	23.3	25.0	4.4	7.9	12.1	14.8
<i>Melanesia</i>	<i>45.6</i>	<i>45.1</i>	<i>44.6</i>	<i>44.8</i>	<i>52.5</i>	<i>52.3</i>	<i>51.8</i>	<i>51.9</i>	<i>38.2</i>	<i>38.2</i>	<i>38.2</i>	<i>39.0</i>
Fiji	36.2	36.1	36.0	35.9	51.7	51.6	51.5	50.9	23.3	24.0	24.1	24.8
New Caledonia	5.1	5.0	5.0	5.0	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1
Papua New Guinea	54.3	53.7	53.5	53.1	59.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	48.5	48.0	48.0	47.9
Solomon Islands	9.5	9.3	9.2	9.0	13.5	13.6	13.6	13.6	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.8
Vanuatu	70.4	69.9	69.8	69.6	74.2	74.4	74.3	74.3	65.5	64.8	65.1	65.2
<i>Micronesia</i> ¹⁸	<i>28.8</i>	<i>28.8</i>	<i>29.1</i>	<i>29.0</i>	<i>38.5</i>	<i>39.9</i>	<i>40.7</i>	<i>40.9</i>	<i>19.8</i>	<i>19.1</i>	<i>19.1</i>	<i>19.0</i>
Guam	28.8	28.8	29.1	29.0	38.5	39.9	40.7	40.9	19.8	19.1	19.1	19.0
<i>Polynesia</i> ¹⁹	<i>17.2</i>	<i>16.9</i>	<i>16.1</i>	<i>14.4</i>	<i>26.9</i>	<i>26.2</i>	<i>24.7</i>	<i>21.5</i>	<i>8.6</i>	<i>8.8</i>	<i>8.8</i>	<i>8.5</i>
French Polynesia	7.7	7.5	7.5	7.2	11.2	11.0	10.9	10.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2
Samoa	13.7	13.1	12.6	12.1	28.2	27.9	27.5	25.9	1.5	1.6	1.8	2.3
Tonga	40.2	43.1	44.1	44.2	55.5	58.8	60.2	61.4	26.7	29.3	30.8	32.0

SOURCES

ILO, LABORSTA (ILO, 2009e). ILO, 2009g: *Economically Active Population Estimates and Projections: 1980–2020* (EAPPE), table E5 (http://laborsta.ilo.org/applv8/data/EAPPE/eaep_e.html).

NOTES

These estimates and projections are for international comparisons and are neither superior nor necessarily inferior to national estimates and projections, which are produced using country-specific additional information. This additional information is (a) not necessarily available to us for all countries and/or (b) different between countries and so would make international comparability difficult.

¹ More developed regions comprise Europe, North America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan.

² Less developed regions comprise all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean plus Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

³ Least developed countries: 49, of which 33 are in Africa, 10 in Asia, 5 in Oceania and 1 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

⁴ Other less developed countries comprise the less developed regions excluding the least developed countries.

⁵ Sub-Saharan Africa refers to all of Africa except Northern Africa, with the Sudan included in sub-Saharan Africa.

Country/region-specific notes:

¹ Including Seychelles.

² Including Agalega, Rodrigues and Saint Brandon.

³ Including Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha.

⁴ For statistical purposes, the data for China do not include Hong Kong and Macao, Special Administrative Regions (SARs) of China.

⁵ As of 1 July 1997, Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁶ As of 20 December 1999, Macao became a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China.

⁷ The regions Southern Asia and Central Asia are combined into South-Central Asia.

⁸ Including Faeroe Islands and Isle of Man.

⁹ Refers to Guernsey and Jersey.

¹⁰ Including Åland Islands.

¹¹ Including Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands.

¹² Including Andorra, Gibraltar, Holy See and San Marino.

¹³ Including Liechtenstein and Monaco.

¹⁴ Including Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Montserrat, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Turks and Caicos Islands.

¹⁵ Including Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

¹⁶ Including Bermuda, Greenland and Saint Pierre and Miquelon.

¹⁷ Including Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, and Norfolk Island.

¹⁸ Including Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands and Palau.

¹⁹ Including American Samoa, Cook Islands, Niue, Pitcairn, Tokelau, Tuvalu and Wallis and Futuna Islands.

DEFINITIONS

The economically active population comprises all persons of either sex who furnish the supply of labour for the production of goods and services during a specified time-reference period. According to the 1993 version of the System of National Accounts, production includes all individual or collective goods or services that are supplied to units other than their producers, or intended to be so supplied, including the production of goods or services used up in the process of producing such goods or services; the production of all goods that are retained by their producers for their own final use; and the production of housing services by owner-occupiers and of domestic and personal services produced by employing paid domestic staff.

Economically active population for specific age range = Employed + unemployed in the same age range

Labour force participation rates of population at ages **15–64** (%) = Economically active population aged **15–64** / Population aged **15–64**

Labour force participation rates of population at age **65 and over** (%) = Economically active population aged **65 and over** / Population aged **65 and over**

Methodology: See ILO, 2009g: *Economically Active Population Estimates and Projections: 1980–2020* (5th edition): Methodological description (http://laborsta.ilo.org/app/v8/data/EAPEP/EAPEP_methodology.pdf).

Table 7. Youth employment to population ratios, ages 15–24

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15–24 (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
World	46.7	44.6	44.7	54.2	51.5	51.4	39.0	37.3	37.5
More developed regions ^a	43.3	41.0	41.5	46.1	43.1	43.4	40.4	38.8	39.6
Less developed regions ^b	47.4	45.2	45.2	55.6	52.9	52.7	38.7	37.0	37.2
Least developed countries ^c	57.6	57.3	57.0	64.4	63.5	63.0	50.9	51.0	51.0
Less developed regions, excluding least developed countries ^d	45.6	43.0	42.9	54.1	51.1	50.8	36.5	34.4	34.5
Less developed regions, excluding China	43.6	42.4	42.5	55.1	53.6	53.5	31.6	30.7	31.1
Sub-Saharan Africa ^e	50.9	50.2	50.1	57.1	55.4	55.0	44.8	44.9	45.1
Africa	45.3	44.7	45.0	52.5	51.2	50.9	38.1	38.2	39.1
<i>Eastern Africa</i>	<i>65.6</i>	<i>65.9</i>	<i>65.9</i>	<i>68.8</i>	<i>68.2</i>	<i>68.2</i>	<i>62.4</i>	<i>63.5</i>	<i>63.5</i>
Burundi	77.1	74.0	73.2	75.5	72.6	72.2	78.5	75.5	74.3
Comoros	50.3	49.8	48.5	55.6	55.2	53.5	44.9	44.3	43.4
Eritrea	58.8	54.8	53.6	68.6	64.7	64.0	49.0	45.1	43.4
Ethiopia	70.0	73.3	73.5	78.2	79.1	78.9	61.8	67.5	68.1
Kenya	61.1	59.2	58.7	64.3	62.6	61.9	57.8	55.8	55.4
Madagascar	66.9	72.0	70.7	67.3	72.8	72.0	66.6	71.2	69.4
Malawi	47.7	48.9	49.0	45.0	46.2	46.3	50.4	51.6	51.6
Mauritius	38.0	32.8	37.3	50.9	42.1	44.2	24.9	23.2	30.2
Mozambique	66.7	65.9	65.7	58.9	56.6	55.9	74.1	75.3	75.4
Réunion	15.9	17.9	20.9	18.0	19.7	22.6	13.8	16.0	19.0
Rwanda	73.4	66.1	64.1	73.0	64.3	62.1	73.7	67.8	66.2
Somalia	58.1	56.9	57.9	70.3	68.1	68.6	46.0	45.6	47.1
Tanzania, United Republic of	75.7	70.5	70.0	76.0	70.2	70.3	75.3	70.9	69.7
Uganda	73.8	75.5	75.4	77.8	79.0	78.6	69.7	71.9	72.2
Zambia	45.7	45.6	46.4	52.8	51.8	52.5	38.5	39.3	40.3
Zimbabwe	47.6	49.2	49.6	50.4	53.2	54.5	44.8	45.3	44.9
<i>Middle Africa</i>	<i>56.7</i>	<i>56.4</i>	<i>56.3</i>	<i>65.0</i>	<i>64.2</i>	<i>64.1</i>	<i>48.4</i>	<i>48.5</i>	<i>48.5</i>
Angola	70.3	69.3	68.6	76.5	74.9	73.5	64.2	63.8	63.7
Cameroon	36.6	34.7	33.4	45.0	42.6	40.1	28.2	26.8	26.6
Central African Republic	57.8	58.0	58.1	64.1	65.0	65.3	51.7	51.1	51.1
Chad	51.5	50.2	50.2	50.9	46.2	46.1	52.1	54.2	54.3
Congo	45.6	45.8	45.6	55.2	55.6	55.6	36.0	35.9	35.6
Congo, Democratic Republic of	61.4	61.7	61.9	72.0	72.3	72.8	50.8	51.2	51.0
Equatorial Guinea	61.6	61.6	61.5	79.0	79.0	79.6	44.3	44.2	43.5
Gabon	37.9	34.7	33.1	40.6	37.5	36.1	35.3	31.9	30.1
<i>Northern Africa</i>	<i>26.4</i>	<i>25.6</i>	<i>26.3</i>	<i>37.3</i>	<i>36.4</i>	<i>35.9</i>	<i>15.2</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>16.4</i>
Algeria	22.0	31.5	30.6	31.5	43.2	39.9	12.1	19.3	20.8
Egypt	23.9	19.8	23.1	36.5	30.8	32.6	10.8	8.6	13.3
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	27.2	28.3	27.4	41.6	43.0	41.2	12.3	13.0	13.1
Morocco	37.3	36.0	34.7	51.3	52.0	51.0	23.5	20.2	18.5
Sudan	26.7	24.4	23.4	33.4	30.1	28.5	19.8	18.5	18.2
Tunisia	24.8	22.8	22.3	31.9	30.1	28.9	17.4	15.3	15.4
<i>Southern Africa</i>	<i>18.4</i>	<i>15.2</i>	<i>16.4</i>	<i>20.8</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>18.4</i>	<i>16.0</i>	<i>12.9</i>	<i>14.3</i>
Botswana	33.7	21.8	27.1	36.9	23.8	28.8	30.5	19.7	25.4
Lesotho	45.3	39.5	40.4	55.3	47.6	48.1	35.7	31.6	32.9
Namibia	17.2	14.2	13.6	19.3	15.9	15.0	15.1	12.5	12.1
South Africa	16.2	13.5	14.6	18.3	15.5	16.5	14.1	11.4	12.7
Swaziland	30.5	26.7	25.5	32.3	27.6	26.4	28.9	25.7	24.6
<i>Western Africa</i>	<i>40.4</i>	<i>38.0</i>	<i>37.0</i>	<i>49.7</i>	<i>46.1</i>	<i>44.2</i>	<i>31.0</i>	<i>29.9</i>	<i>29.7</i>
Benin	63.2	60.3	58.9	74.5	71.4	68.9	51.7	48.9	48.5

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15–24 (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
Burkina Faso	76.2	74.7	74.2	80.2	78.5	77.7	72.0	70.7	70.6
Cape Verde	47.2	41.6	38.1	59.3	51.9	45.9	35.5	31.4	30.5
Côte d'Ivoire	48.5	46.5	45.3	66.2	64.7	63.4	30.5	28.3	27.1
Gambia	57.2	55.7	54.5	58.3	56.5	54.8	56.0	54.8	54.3
Ghana	45.1	40.4	39.9	44.9	38.5	38.4	45.4	42.3	41.6
Guinea	74.6	73.6	72.8	76.8	75.7	74.7	72.3	71.5	70.9
Guinea-Bissau	61.2	62.4	63.1	71.5	73.1	74.3	50.9	51.7	51.9
Liberia	56.4	56.6	56.7	62.8	62.5	62.4	50.1	50.7	50.9
Mali	39.6	36.0	34.5	49.2	43.6	40.5	29.9	28.4	28.5
Mauritania	50.3	24.2	23.2	56.3	25.3	24.1	44.1	23.0	22.3
Niger	50.6	51.2	51.6	71.0	71.2	71.3	33.0	33.5	33.5
Nigeria	27.9	25.8	24.2	38.0	34.2	31.1	17.8	17.3	17.1
Senegal	57.9	55.5	54.5	69.5	66.8	65.5	46.3	44.2	43.4
Sierra Leone	43.6	41.8	42.0	40.9	35.7	35.7	46.2	47.7	47.9
Togo	55.1	53.4	52.7	66.1	64.7	64.2	44.1	42.2	41.4
Asia	47.9	45.2	45.1	55.7	52.7	52.6	39.6	37.1	37.0
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	58.4	53.2	52.8	55.1	49.2	48.6	62.1	57.6	57.4
China	61.4	55.1	54.5	57.6	50.7	49.9	65.5	59.9	59.7
Hong Kong, China	41.9	39.6	37.8	41.6	37.7	36.3	42.2	41.7	39.4
Japan	42.4	40.7	40.4	42.2	39.8	39.7	42.7	41.6	41.2
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	34.5	39.3	39.0	37.4	42.9	42.5	31.4	35.6	35.3
Korea, Republic of	31.0	31.0	27.7	28.3	27.0	24.4	33.9	35.4	31.4
Macau, China	37.3	35.8	36.1	34.1	32.8	33.5	40.1	38.5	38.5
Mongolia	38.8	35.9	34.7	41.5	37.9	36.1	36.1	33.9	33.3
Taiwan, China	29.8	26.9	25.6	27.1	23.8	22.7	32.5	29.8	28.3
<i>South-Central Asia</i>	42.1	41.4	41.6	57.8	57.1	57.5	25.3	24.6	24.6
Afghanistan	45.1	46.4	46.9	63.9	64.8	64.9	24.6	26.4	27.4
Bangladesh	56.6	56.4	56.0	65.7	66.0	65.1	47.4	46.6	46.5
Bhutan	40.3	45.7	45.5	59.5	58.9	56.8	20.7	30.6	33.4
India	41.9	40.2	39.6	58.3	57.0	56.4	24.1	22.1	21.4
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	32.3	33.4	36.2	43.3	44.5	47.3	20.9	22.2	24.9
Kazakhstan	41.7	40.9	42.1	45.1	44.2	45.3	38.2	37.5	38.9
Kyrgyzstan	40.4	39.0	39.5	46.5	47.3	48.3	34.2	30.5	30.5
Maldives	31.2	39.5	42.4	41.2	48.8	49.9	20.7	30.0	34.6
Nepal	46.6	46.2	45.9	48.9	46.8	46.0	44.2	45.6	45.8
Pakistan	35.8	40.1	43.7	62.6	63.9	69.2	7.3	14.9	16.6
Sri Lanka	34.2	33.2	35.5	46.5	45.6	47.8	21.8	20.5	22.8
Tajikistan	22.6	30.2	37.5	25.5	33.7	41.4	19.7	26.6	33.5
Turkmenistan	38.6	34.3	33.7	42.3	37.6	36.5	35.0	31.0	30.8
Uzbekistan	34.4	36.4	38.9	38.2	40.2	42.5	30.5	32.6	35.1
<i>South-Eastern Asia</i>	43.6	42.1	42.4	57.0	55.7	56.2	29.4	27.7	27.8
Brunei Darussalam	43.5	42.3	42.3	48.6	46.4	45.9	38.3	38.0	38.5
Cambodia	68.0	67.3	68.2	66.5	68.5	69.9	69.4	66.2	66.4
Indonesia	45.1	36.7	40.8	54.5	45.8	49.7	35.5	27.3	31.6
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	67.3	64.6	63.6	59.6	56.9	56.5	75.1	72.5	70.8
Malaysia	44.6	44.0	44.5	52.2	51.1	51.3	36.9	36.7	37.4
Myanmar	56.9	54.7	53.4	66.3	64.6	63.4	47.5	44.9	43.5
Philippines	38.3	39.5	39.2	47.4	48.9	47.6	28.9	29.7	30.5
Singapore	43.7	37.9	37.6	43.7	38.9	38.4	43.7	36.7	36.7

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15–24 (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
Thailand	48.8	49.2	45.6	52.5	54.8	53.0	45.2	43.4	38.0
Timor-Leste	50.5	55.3	58.1	54.5	60.5	63.5	45.8	49.7	52.4
Viet Nam	56.3	53.6	51.1	55.8	54.2	51.8	56.9	53.1	50.3
<i>Western Asia</i>	32.0	28.8	27.8	45.4	41.2	39.2	17.8	15.7	15.8
Armenia	23.1	23.9	25.4	28.5	29.5	31.9	18.1	18.4	18.9
Azerbaijan	37.3	36.5	38.6	38.6	38.1	40.6	36.0	34.8	36.5
Bahrain	31.4	31.4	30.3	43.8	43.0	41.3	17.0	17.7	17.6
Georgia	28.4	23.3	22.0	34.4	29.6	30.1	22.4	17.0	13.8
Iraq	24.7	23.8	23.2	42.4	40.3	39.0	6.3	6.4	6.7
Israel	29.0	26.8	27.1	27.8	25.6	25.2	30.2	28.1	29.0
Jordan	22.4	21.7	19.8	36.6	35.1	31.9	6.9	7.4	7.1
Kuwait	31.5	30.9	30.2	38.0	37.4	35.9	24.1	23.0	23.4
Lebanon	29.5	29.2	28.7	47.8	45.9	44.9	11.5	12.1	12.1
Oman	30.0	28.1	29.4	41.0	37.9	39.3	17.3	17.7	18.3
Qatar	28.1	43.2	47.2	43.5	53.8	55.8	7.2	13.4	18.5
Saudi Arabia	26.8	25.1	24.7	44.3	42.2	41.5	6.8	7.0	7.6
Syrian Arab Republic	39.2	33.2	32.3	60.9	52.4	49.2	16.8	13.3	14.8
United Arab Emirates	44.9	47.5	45.6	60.5	62.8	61.2	22.3	24.6	24.9
West Bank and Gaza Strip	21.3	16.6	15.2	37.2	28.1	25.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Yemen	21.6	21.8	21.9	29.3	27.8	27.4	13.4	15.5	16.1
Europe	36.2	34.8	35.8	39.8	37.9	38.6	32.5	31.6	32.9
<i>Eastern Europe</i>	31.6	29.8	30.8	35.1	33.0	33.9	28.0	26.5	27.6
Belarus	35.9	33.9	34.7	38.8	36.2	37.0	32.9	31.6	32.3
Bulgaria	17.9	23.4	26.5	17.6	25.9	29.3	18.2	20.8	23.5
Czech Republic	38.2	27.2	28.8	42.7	31.0	31.5	33.5	23.1	25.9
Hungary	32.7	21.9	20.4	36.4	24.5	22.3	29.0	19.2	18.3
Moldova, Republic of	25.6	17.2	16.9	26.5	18.1	17.8	24.6	16.2	16.0
Poland	23.8	20.3	26.8	26.7	23.0	30.0	20.9	17.5	23.5
Romania	36.2	25.5	24.0	40.7	29.3	26.9	31.6	21.5	21.0
Russian Federation	33.1	32.5	32.7	37.4	35.7	35.9	28.7	29.2	29.5
Slovakia	29.0	25.7	30.2	29.9	28.3	33.1	28.2	23.1	27.3
Ukraine	32.1	34.5	34.3	34.2	38.2	37.9	29.9	30.6	30.5
<i>Northern Europe</i>	55.0	52.2	51.5	57.3	53.8	52.1	52.7	50.5	50.9
Denmark	67.2	62.0	61.0	70.5	66.3	61.2	63.8	57.5	60.8
Estonia	32.3	28.7	29.3	36.8	32.2	32.3	27.6	25.0	26.2
Finland	40.2	39.8	43.6	40.9	39.1	42.3	39.5	40.4	45.0
Iceland	68.4	71.6	67.1	66.2	68.6	65.8	70.6	74.7	68.5
Ireland	48.5	46.2	44.4	53.0	48.4	47.1	43.7	43.9	41.7
Latvia	28.4	32.3	35.1	33.1	37.9	39.2	23.7	26.4	30.9
Lithuania	25.5	21.2	18.0	28.8	24.8	18.3	22.2	17.4	17.8
Norway	57.1	51.5	55.7	59.8	51.7	54.1	54.2	51.3	57.4
Sweden	44.5	41.2	45.2	44.8	39.9	44.1	44.3	42.5	46.3
United Kingdom	61.1	58.1	55.8	63.3	59.8	56.6	58.8	56.3	55.0
<i>Southern Europe</i>	31.0	30.6	29.9	36.3	35.2	34.1	25.5	25.8	25.4
Albania	34.0	33.1	35.9	33.9	34.1	39.5	34.1	32.2	32.2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	14.8	14.4	17.6	15.3	15.7	20.7	14.3	13.2	14.5
Croatia	26.9	26.0	28.7	30.1	28.6	31.3	23.6	23.4	26.0
Cyprus	44.3	35.4	35.7	53.5	37.9	37.2	34.6	32.8	34.1
Greece	28.1	25.8	27.6	33.4	31.0	31.9	22.3	20.1	22.9
Italy	27.7	25.4	24.7	33.2	29.9	29.0	22.0	20.7	20.2

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15–24 (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	15.5	12.3	12.8	19.2	14.2	15.1	11.7	10.4	10.3
Malta	50.6	46.5	47.2	52.4	47.9	47.9	48.7	45.0	46.4
Portugal	41.8	35.8	35.1	47.5	40.2	39.6	36.0	31.1	30.5
Serbia	32.5	27.1	29.9	37.6	32.0	34.4	27.1	22.0	25.3
Slovenia	31.2	32.6	32.3	34.1	37.1	37.4	28.1	27.9	27.0
Spain	34.8	40.5	36.8	41.4	46.2	41.3	28.0	34.5	32.1
Turkey	37.9	32.8	30.7	50.7	44.8	41.0	24.7	20.4	20.0
<i>Western Europe</i>	<i>40.7</i>	<i>39.0</i>	<i>41.2</i>	<i>43.6</i>	<i>41.4</i>	<i>43.6</i>	<i>37.6</i>	<i>36.5</i>	<i>38.8</i>
Austria	53.0	53.0	52.8	58.2	56.7	57.7	47.6	49.2	47.7
Belgium	30.3	26.5	27.2	33.8	27.6	29.7	26.6	25.3	24.7
France	23.4	26.9	29.3	26.8	30.2	32.2	19.9	23.5	26.2
Germany	47.7	42.6	44.3	50.4	44.9	46.3	44.9	40.1	42.1
Luxembourg	32.1	25.2	22.7	35.6	28.6	26.1	28.4	21.6	19.3
Netherlands	66.5	61.8	66.8	67.9	62.1	67.5	65.0	61.4	66.1
Switzerland	64.9	59.9	63.1	66.3	60.9	64.0	63.5	58.9	62.0
Latin America and the Caribbean	46.3	45.4	45.2	58.2	56.2	55.0	34.2	34.5	35.2
<i>Caribbean</i>	<i>36.4</i>	<i>38.2</i>	<i>36.6</i>	<i>45.6</i>	<i>46.8</i>	<i>44.4</i>	<i>27.1</i>	<i>29.5</i>	<i>28.8</i>
Bahamas	45.3	43.5	42.2	49.3	47.3	45.0	41.3	39.8	39.4
Barbados	46.5	43.6	43.8	50.3	49.0	49.5	42.5	38.2	38.0
Cuba	31.7	31.7	31.9	40.1	39.1	38.4	22.8	23.9	25.0
Dominican Republic	37.3	39.7	33.5	50.0	50.2	42.9	24.7	29.1	24.1
Guadeloupe	14.1	14.4	15.1	15.5	15.5	16.3	12.6	13.3	13.9
Haiti	44.4	46.3	47.0	53.5	55.7	55.7	35.4	36.9	38.4
Jamaica	30.0	30.5	29.1	38.5	38.6	37.1	21.7	22.4	21.0
Martinique	14.1	15.7	15.2	17.1	18.5	17.8	11.1	12.8	12.7
Netherlands Antilles	26.2	20.7	26.2	27.8	22.9	26.1	24.7	18.5	26.3
Puerto Rico	28.4	30.2	28.5	33.7	36.3	33.5	23.1	24.1	23.4
Trinidad and Tobago	39.7	45.4	45.7	49.1	54.2	53.2	30.1	36.4	38.1
<i>Central America</i>	<i>49.4</i>	<i>45.3</i>	<i>42.8</i>	<i>66.3</i>	<i>60.5</i>	<i>56.1</i>	<i>32.7</i>	<i>30.3</i>	<i>29.8</i>
Belize	39.3	41.7	41.8	54.6	55.4	54.2	23.6	27.5	29.1
Costa Rica	45.8	42.4	43.1	61.0	54.8	54.1	29.9	29.2	31.5
El Salvador	41.5	40.4	38.8	54.5	53.8	50.1	29.3	28.0	28.1
Guatemala	50.9	52.9	51.6	75.3	74.2	70.3	27.4	32.3	33.4
Honduras	53.6	44.2	42.8	73.5	64.7	61.3	34.0	23.7	24.2
Mexico	50.1	44.8	41.6	66.0	58.7	53.4	34.3	31.3	30.1
Nicaragua	46.9	47.4	48.0	70.4	70.5	70.2	23.5	24.3	25.9
Panama	35.3	38.4	39.5	47.7	51.0	52.4	22.5	25.4	26.1
<i>South America</i>	<i>46.0</i>	<i>46.2</i>	<i>47.0</i>	<i>56.3</i>	<i>55.5</i>	<i>55.7</i>	<i>35.6</i>	<i>36.7</i>	<i>38.1</i>
Argentina	36.4	35.4	36.2	44.7	43.0	43.4	27.9	27.6	28.7
Bolivia	48.0	47.6	49.4	56.3	54.3	57.5	39.5	40.7	41.2
Brazil	51.5	52.0	52.6	63.0	62.6	62.3	39.9	41.1	42.7
Chile	25.9	26.0	23.7	33.5	32.8	29.5	18.0	19.0	17.8
Colombia	41.7	42.1	42.9	49.7	48.6	48.4	33.5	35.5	37.1
Ecuador	40.7	39.4	39.7	51.7	49.4	49.1	29.4	29.2	30.1
Guyana	41.9	37.5	37.0	57.2	55.3	55.1	26.6	19.8	18.8
Paraguay	54.4	57.4	57.7	60.6	62.7	62.7	48.0	51.8	52.6
Peru	49.8	50.3	52.5	58.0	56.5	59.7	41.4	43.9	45.1
Suriname	17.0	21.2	21.7	26.6	31.6	32.2	6.9	10.6	10.9
Uruguay	42.8	39.1	38.6	51.8	47.6	45.7	33.5	30.3	31.4
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	33.6	34.7	39.5	46.6	47.4	52.7	20.2	21.7	25.9

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15–24 (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
North America	58.6	52.9	51.6	60.6	53.8	52.4	56.4	52.0	50.8
Canada	56.3	57.6	60.6	56.9	56.5	59.1	55.7	58.7	62.1
United States	58.8	52.4	50.7	61.0	53.5	51.7	56.5	51.3	49.7
Oceania	58.6	59.3	59.6	59.9	60.6	60.6	57.3	57.9	58.5
<i>Australia–New Zealand</i>	<i>60.9</i>	<i>62.3</i>	<i>62.7</i>	<i>62.0</i>	<i>63.4</i>	<i>63.6</i>	<i>59.7</i>	<i>61.1</i>	<i>61.8</i>
Australia	62.1	63.4	64.1	63.1	64.3	64.6	61.1	62.5	63.5
New Zealand	54.6	56.8	56.3	56.6	59.5	58.7	52.7	54.0	53.7
<i>Melanesia</i>	<i>53.2</i>	<i>52.2</i>	<i>52.5</i>	<i>54.9</i>	<i>53.9</i>	<i>53.9</i>	<i>51.4</i>	<i>50.5</i>	<i>50.9</i>
Fiji	39.9	40.3	39.7	52.3	52.9	52.1	26.8	26.9	26.4
Papua New Guinea	55.1	53.8	54.2	54.9	53.6	54.0	55.3	54.1	54.5
Solomon Islands	55.4	52.7	50.7	60.8	58.1	55.7	49.5	46.9	45.3

SOURCES

ILO 2009h. *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)* (Geneva), from KILMnet (September 2009), table 2a: Employment-to-population ratio (ILO estimates, by sex and age group).

NOTES

^a More developed regions comprise Europe, North America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan.

^b Less developed regions comprise all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean plus Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

^c Least developed countries: 49, of which 33 are in Africa, 10 in Asia, 5 in Oceania and 1 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

^d Other less developed countries comprise the less developed regions excluding the least developed countries.

^e Sub-Saharan Africa refers to all of Africa except Northern Africa, with the Sudan included in sub-Saharan Africa.

Regional averages – ILO calculations, only for listed countries.

DEFINITIONS

The employment-to-population ratio is defined as the proportion of a country's working-age population that is employed.

The youth employment-to-population ratio is the proportion of the youth population – persons aged 15 to 24 years – that is employed.

Employment-to-population ratio **15+** = Employment **15+** / Population **15+**

Youth employment-to-population ratio **15–24** = Employment **15–24** / Population **15–24**

Employment is defined in the resolution adopted by the 13th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) as persons above a specified age who performed any work at all, in the reference period, for pay or profit (or pay in kind), or were temporarily absent from a job for such reasons as illness, maternity or parental leave, holiday, training or industrial dispute. The resolution also states that unpaid family workers who work for at least one hour should be included in the count of employment, although many countries use a higher hour limit in their definition.

For most countries, the *working-age population* is defined as persons aged 15 years and older, although this may vary slightly from country to country. The ILO standard for the lower age limit is, in fact, 15 years. Similarly, some countries have an upper limit for eligibility, such as 65 years.

Table 8. Employment to population ratios at ages 15+

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15+ (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
World	60.7	60.2	60.3	73.5	72.5	72.4	48.0	48.0	48.4
More developed regions ^a	54.2	54.0	54.3	63.5	62.4	62.2	45.9	46.4	47.2
Less developed regions ^b	62.7	61.9	62.0	76.4	75.2	75.1	48.7	48.5	48.8
Least developed countries ^c	68.8	68.9	69.0	80.7	80.1	79.6	57.1	58.1	58.5
Less developed regions, excluding least developed countries ^d	61.9	61.0	61.0	75.9	74.5	74.4	47.6	47.2	47.3
Less developed regions, excluding China	58.2	58.2	58.6	75.7	75.0	75.2	40.7	41.3	42.0
Sub-Saharan Africa ^e	64.9	65.1	65.4	75.4	74.6	74.5	54.8	55.8	56.5
Africa	59.6	60.1	60.6	73.0	72.7	72.8	46.6	47.8	48.7
<i>Eastern Africa</i>	76.0	76.8	76.8	82.3	82.0	81.8	70.0	71.8	72.0
Burundi	85.5	84.2	84.2	85.6	84.1	84.3	85.3	84.3	84.1
Comoros	67.9	68.7	69.4	77.5	78.1	78.5	58.5	59.4	60.3
Eritrea	65.7	65.7	65.6	80.0	79.9	80.1	52.5	52.5	52.2
Ethiopia	75.0	79.9	80.6	86.9	88.5	88.3	63.5	71.6	73.1
Kenya	73.2	72.8	73.0	79.2	78.6	78.7	67.4	67.0	67.3
Madagascar	80.4	84.2	83.3	84.5	87.5	86.9	76.4	81.0	79.8
Malawi	71.8	72.3	72.1	74.7	75.3	75.1	69.1	69.5	69.3
Mauritius	54.2	52.5	53.8	75.2	72.0	72.2	34.0	33.7	36.1
Mozambique	78.5	78.1	77.9	74.1	72.7	72.3	82.2	82.9	83.0
Réunion	36.6	39.2	43.1	44.1	46.4	50.2	29.7	32.6	36.6
Rwanda	83.8	80.4	80.3	84.5	79.7	79.5	83.2	81.0	81.1
Somalia	66.0	66.2	66.5	82.8	82.3	82.4	49.9	50.6	51.2
Tanzania, United Republic of	84.9	79.6	78.0	87.3	81.8	80.3	82.6	77.6	75.8
Uganda	81.9	82.9	83.0	87.4	88.0	87.8	76.5	77.9	78.1
Zambia	60.9	61.0	61.2	69.1	68.3	68.7	52.9	53.9	53.9
Zimbabwe	67.1	65.9	64.9	73.1	73.3	73.3	61.5	59.2	57.4
<i>Middle Africa</i>	67.1	67.2	67.1	80.0	79.5	79.3	54.8	55.5	55.4
Angola	76.3	76.2	76.4	84.4	83.6	82.8	68.5	69.2	70.3
Cameroon	60.2	59.8	59.1	71.4	70.3	69.0	49.3	49.6	49.4
Central African Republic	72.8	72.6	72.6	81.6	81.8	81.9	64.6	63.9	63.8
Chad	68.0	69.7	69.7	75.1	72.3	72.3	61.2	67.2	67.1
Congo	64.3	64.5	64.6	76.1	76.5	76.8	52.8	52.6	52.6
Congo, Democratic Republic of	66.7	66.8	66.7	83.1	83.1	83.3	51.1	51.2	50.8
Equatorial Guinea	63.3	63.3	62.6	86.2	85.7	85.8	41.4	41.8	40.3
Gabon	58.9	58.4	58.2	66.0	64.7	64.4	52.2	52.3	52.1
<i>Northern Africa</i>	43.0	44.3	45.6	65.7	66.7	67.5	20.5	22.2	23.8
Algeria	38.4	47.7	49.4	55.5	66.3	66.6	21.4	29.1	32.1
Egypt	42.1	41.3	43.2	67.8	65.4	67.2	16.6	17.3	19.3
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	46.4	47.6	48.6	70.0	71.3	71.9	20.2	21.8	23.5
Morocco	45.6	45.9	46.1	69.6	71.1	71.9	22.7	22.2	22.0
Sudan	47.1	46.9	47.3	68.3	67.1	66.5	26.1	26.9	28.1
Tunisia	40.2	40.6	41.0	60.9	60.5	60.9	19.5	20.8	21.2
<i>Southern Africa</i>	40.1	39.4	41.9	47.5	46.5	48.8	33.2	32.8	35.5
Botswana	49.6	37.7	46.0	58.9	44.5	53.6	40.7	31.1	38.5
Lesotho	56.6	51.5	54.1	66.0	59.1	61.6	49.2	45.3	47.9
Namibia	44.4	42.6	42.9	51.3	48.5	48.5	37.9	37.1	37.7
South Africa	38.7	38.7	41.1	46.1	45.9	48.1	31.8	31.9	34.6
Swaziland	53.2	51.2	50.4	59.3	56.2	54.8	48.0	46.7	46.4

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15+ (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
<i>Western Africa</i>	58.8	58.2	58.3	73.4	71.7	71.1	44.4	44.9	45.6
Benin	71.9	71.7	71.6	86.9	85.9	85.0	57.6	57.7	58.2
Burkina Faso	81.9	81.8	81.9	88.0	87.5	87.3	76.2	76.4	76.7
Cape Verde	55.7	55.2	55.7	74.1	71.0	69.4	40.5	41.7	43.9
Côte d'Ivoire	61.9	60.9	60.4	82.4	81.7	81.2	39.3	38.5	38.3
Gambia	72.6	72.2	72.1	79.7	79.0	78.0	65.8	65.7	66.5
Ghana	66.8	65.5	65.2	68.8	66.3	66.1	64.7	64.6	64.2
Guinea	81.9	81.5	81.2	86.3	85.8	85.3	77.5	77.2	77.1
Guinea-Bissau	67.4	67.3	66.9	83.3	84.2	84.5	52.1	51.0	50.1
Liberia	65.4	65.6	65.9	79.3	79.2	79.4	52.0	52.6	53.0
Mali	49.1	47.0	47.0	65.3	60.8	59.9	33.9	34.0	34.9
Mauritania	66.1	47.1	47.2	76.2	52.1	51.9	56.1	42.1	42.4
Niger	59.7	59.8	59.8	82.9	82.7	82.6	37.6	37.8	37.8
Nigeria	51.9	51.8	51.8	69.1	67.6	66.5	35.1	36.3	37.4
Senegal	66.0	65.6	66.0	77.4	76.4	76.1	54.8	55.2	56.3
Sierra Leone	64.8	64.5	64.8	67.3	63.9	64.2	62.5	65.1	65.4
Togo	65.0	64.7	64.6	81.4	81.1	81.1	49.2	49.0	48.7
Asia	63.7	62.3	62.2	77.1	75.5	75.3	49.9	48.8	48.7
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	71.4	69.5	68.8	77.0	74.6	73.6	65.7	64.3	63.8
China	73.9	71.7	71.0	78.1	75.5	74.6	69.5	67.8	67.2
Hong Kong, China	56.5	55.7	56.6	68.1	64.8	64.2	46.1	47.7	50.0
Japan	57.8	55.6	54.2	71.4	68.5	66.4	45.2	43.9	43.2
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	61.6	63.6	63.9	73.3	73.3	72.6	50.6	54.6	55.8
Korea, Republic of	57.8	58.6	58.1	69.4	70.0	69.5	46.7	47.8	47.3
Macau, China	59.4	61.6	63.9	68.2	69.4	70.9	51.6	54.8	57.7
Mongolia	51.0	51.7	51.6	54.1	53.6	52.7	48.0	49.8	50.6
Taiwan, China	54.3	54.2	54.4	65.5	62.6	61.2	43.4	46.0	47.7
<i>South-Central Asia</i>	56.3	55.9	56.2	78.0	77.1	77.2	33.4	33.6	34.2
Afghanistan	53.7	54.0	55.2	81.4	81.1	83.0	23.7	24.6	25.1
Bangladesh	68.1	68.1	67.9	83.1	83.0	81.6	52.7	53.0	53.9
Bhutan	51.8	58.9	61.1	79.6	78.7	77.0	23.1	36.0	42.6
India	56.7	55.7	55.6	78.9	77.7	77.4	32.9	32.4	32.4
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	45.6	46.6	48.9	66.6	67.0	69.1	23.9	25.4	28.0
Kazakhstan	60.4	62.4	63.5	67.6	69.1	70.3	54.2	56.5	57.7
Kyrgyzstan	58.2	57.7	58.3	67.4	68.3	69.4	49.7	47.8	47.9
Maldives	49.0	56.7	57.3	66.9	70.8	71.4	30.7	42.3	42.9
Nepal	59.3	60.8	61.5	70.3	69.1	68.7	48.9	52.9	54.7
Pakistan	47.5	48.7	51.5	79.0	78.6	81.3	13.5	16.8	19.8
Sri Lanka	53.0	52.4	54.7	72.7	69.8	71.2	33.7	35.8	39.1
Tajikistan	45.4	50.5	55.4	48.0	54.3	60.4	42.8	46.9	50.7
Turkmenistan	59.1	58.2	58.3	64.5	63.4	63.2	53.9	53.3	53.7
Uzbekistan	54.2	55.9	57.5	59.1	60.9	62.7	49.5	51.1	52.5
<i>South-Eastern Asia</i>	58.9	58.2	58.6	78.1	77.1	77.5	39.2	38.8	39.3
Brunei Darussalam	64.1	63.8	63.3	75.2	72.8	70.7	52.1	54.1	55.4
Cambodia	77.4	74.5	74.6	82.3	80.2	80.6	73.0	69.5	69.1
Indonesia	63.2	59.8	61.8	79.9	77.3	80.0	46.8	42.6	44.0
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	78.7	78.0	77.7	79.5	78.4	78.2	77.9	77.6	77.3
Malaysia	60.7	60.1	60.5	78.4	77.6	77.4	42.6	42.3	43.2
Myanmar	74.0	74.2	74.4	82.9	82.9	83.0	65.5	66.0	66.5

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15+ (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
Philippines	58.3	59.8	60.1	73.2	73.7	74.2	43.5	45.9	46.0
Singapore	60.8	60.7	61.6	73.7	72.0	72.4	48.0	49.5	50.9
Thailand	71.8	72.5	71.5	79.1	79.5	78.8	64.9	65.9	64.5
Timor-Leste	64.8	65.4	66.8	77.2	77.8	79.0	52.0	52.5	54.3
Viet Nam	70.9	70.0	69.4	75.0	74.4	73.8	67.1	65.9	65.3
<i>Western Asia</i>	<i>46.8</i>	<i>45.5</i>	<i>45.3</i>	<i>68.4</i>	<i>66.4</i>	<i>66.0</i>	<i>23.9</i>	<i>23.3</i>	<i>23.4</i>
Armenia	37.4	38.6	38.1	44.4	45.7	45.6	31.7	32.8	32.1
Azerbaijan	57.3	58.6	60.0	61.6	62.8	64.5	53.4	54.9	55.9
Bahrain	61.0	61.3	61.0	81.7	81.6	80.8	30.1	30.8	31.6
Georgia	56.4	54.5	54.3	65.6	62.2	62.7	48.7	48.0	47.2
Iraq	36.7	36.9	37.1	62.9	62.1	61.9	10.9	12.0	12.5
Israel	48.5	49.0	50.4	54.9	54.6	55.8	42.6	43.7	45.4
Jordan	37.0	37.9	37.9	60.8	61.4	61.2	11.1	12.8	13.3
Kuwait	68.3	65.9	65.3	82.9	80.1	79.5	42.1	41.6	41.8
Lebanon	45.7	45.9	45.9	71.9	71.2	70.9	21.4	22.3	22.6
Oman	53.3	51.9	51.4	73.7	72.4	71.4	20.3	21.7	22.9
Qatar	70.2	75.0	76.9	86.2	85.8	86.3	33.7	37.2	39.8
Saudi Arabia	50.9	51.2	50.9	76.0	76.1	75.6	15.6	17.1	18.0
Syrian Arab Republic	48.1	44.3	44.8	78.9	72.6	72.5	17.2	15.8	16.9
United Arab Emirates	74.4	75.1	75.9	90.1	90.2	91.3	33.0	36.3	38.0
West Bank and Gaza Strip	33.4	31.2	30.2	57.0	50.7	48.4	9.3	11.2	11.5
Yemen	38.1	38.8	39.0	58.9	57.5	57.5	17.0	19.9	20.4
Europe	50.4	50.9	51.9	59.4	59.0	59.5	42.4	43.7	45.1
<i>Eastern Europe</i>	<i>51.2</i>	<i>52.1</i>	<i>53.4</i>	<i>58.4</i>	<i>59.0</i>	<i>60.2</i>	<i>45.1</i>	<i>46.2</i>	<i>47.7</i>
Belarus	52.0	52.3	52.3	58.4	58.6	58.8	46.8	47.2	47.0
Bulgaria	38.4	43.8	46.3	42.6	49.3	52.2	34.4	38.8	41.0
Czech Republic	53.6	52.8	54.3	63.7	62.9	63.7	44.5	43.6	45.7
Hungary	44.9	45.0	44.8	53.2	53.2	53.0	37.7	38.0	37.9
Moldova, Republic of	51.0	45.4	44.7	54.5	47.1	45.8	47.8	43.9	43.7
Poland	46.1	43.8	48.2	53.6	51.2	56.1	39.2	37.1	41.3
Romania	58.3	49.2	48.1	64.9	56.1	54.3	52.3	42.9	42.5
Russian Federation	53.4	55.7	56.7	60.8	62.6	63.5	47.3	50.1	51.3
Slovakia	47.7	48.5	52.6	54.4	57.0	61.9	41.7	40.9	44.2
Ukraine	48.9	52.5	53.5	55.7	59.5	60.0	43.3	46.9	48.3
<i>Northern Europe</i>	<i>56.1</i>	<i>56.5</i>	<i>56.7</i>	<i>63.8</i>	<i>63.6</i>	<i>63.2</i>	<i>49.1</i>	<i>50.0</i>	<i>50.7</i>
Denmark	60.0	59.5	60.3	66.8	66.5	66.1	53.8	53.0	54.8
Estonia	50.9	53.0	54.5	58.2	58.6	60.6	45.1	48.6	49.6
Finland	53.3	53.4	54.7	59.2	58.1	59.5	48.0	49.1	50.4
Iceland	72.8	71.8	71.2	78.7	76.9	75.8	67.1	66.9	66.5
Ireland	55.0	57.4	57.8	67.0	67.5	66.2	43.5	47.7	49.7
Latvia	46.9	52.1	55.0	53.8	60.2	63.2	41.6	45.6	48.4
Lithuania	48.7	50.2	50.2	53.2	56.8	56.0	44.9	44.8	45.5
Norway	62.1	60.8	62.3	68.5	66.3	67.1	56.1	55.7	57.7
Sweden	57.0	56.6	57.6	62.1	61.6	62.6	52.3	52.0	53.0
United Kingdom	56.3	56.6	56.3	64.6	64.2	63.1	48.7	49.8	49.9
<i>Southern Europe</i>	<i>44.2</i>	<i>46.1</i>	<i>46.6</i>	<i>57.0</i>	<i>57.5</i>	<i>57.0</i>	<i>32.5</i>	<i>35.6</i>	<i>37.1</i>
Albania	47.2	45.8	46.2	59.6	58.1	59.0	35.4	34.3	34.4
Bosnia and Herzegovina	41.3	40.5	41.5	47.3	46.5	48.0	36.0	35.0	35.7
Croatia	44.0	44.7	45.9	53.2	53.5	54.8	35.8	36.9	38.1

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15+ (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
Cyprus	56.5	56.5	57.5	69.9	66.5	66.1	43.9	47.3	49.7
Greece	45.3	47.0	48.4	58.8	59.7	59.9	32.4	34.9	37.3
Italy	41.0	42.7	43.6	55.1	55.1	54.9	28.5	31.5	33.4
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	35.4	32.6	34.8	44.9	40.0	43.3	26.2	25.3	26.5
Malta	44.5	44.2	45.2	65.2	62.8	61.7	24.8	26.4	29.4
Portugal	57.0	55.6	55.7	66.5	63.3	63.5	48.6	48.6	48.8
Serbia	50.5	45.9	47.4	58.2	53.9	55.5	43.1	38.3	39.8
Slovenia	52.7	53.7	54.1	59.5	61.1	61.6	46.6	47.0	47.3
Spain	43.9	49.2	48.6	58.2	61.2	59.0	30.8	37.9	38.9
Turkey	46.7	43.3	42.3	68.5	64.5	63.0	24.8	22.2	21.7
<i>Western Europe</i>	<i>51.0</i>	<i>50.1</i>	<i>51.3</i>	<i>60.6</i>	<i>58.0</i>	<i>58.6</i>	<i>42.4</i>	<i>43.0</i>	<i>44.7</i>
Austria	53.7	53.3	54.5	64.6	62.3	62.5	44.0	45.4	47.3
Belgium	46.7	46.2	46.5	56.7	54.2	53.9	37.7	38.9	39.7
France	47.0	47.9	47.9	55.3	55.0	54.4	39.6	41.7	42.2
Germany	51.7	49.6	51.7	61.5	57.8	59.3	42.8	42.2	44.8
Luxembourg	50.0	50.7	51.2	63.2	61.4	59.8	37.8	40.8	43.1
Netherlands	58.4	57.2	59.3	69.1	65.3	66.9	48.3	49.7	52.3
Switzerland	62.8	60.9	61.2	73.9	69.8	69.4	52.8	52.9	53.6
Latin America and the Caribbean	57.8	59.6	60.5	74.1	74.3	74.3	42.2	45.7	47.5
<i>Caribbean</i>	<i>52.4</i>	<i>53.9</i>	<i>53.0</i>	<i>67.4</i>	<i>67.9</i>	<i>66.3</i>	<i>37.9</i>	<i>40.4</i>	<i>40.4</i>
Bahamas	66.5	64.6	65.4	73.7	71.2	71.9	59.7	58.5	59.4
Barbados	62.1	63.2	64.4	70.7	71.2	72.6	54.5	56.1	57.1
Cuba	53.9	55.0	54.4	67.4	67.8	66.2	40.5	42.4	42.7
Dominican Republic	52.0	56.4	53.3	69.3	69.6	64.8	34.8	43.2	41.8
Guadeloupe	42.8	40.1	40.9	48.1	43.6	44.0	38.2	37.0	38.1
Haiti	55.4	55.0	55.4	75.9	76.8	77.2	36.1	34.6	35.0
Jamaica	57.0	57.5	56.2	68.5	69.3	68.4	46.3	46.7	45.1
Martinique	41.7	43.2	41.7	46.5	47.3	45.4	37.6	39.7	38.6
Netherlands Antilles	50.6	48.2	51.6	58.0	54.2	59.3	44.4	43.3	45.3
Puerto Rico	40.7	40.9	40.6	51.4	50.4	49.0	31.3	32.5	33.3
Trinidad and Tobago	53.5	59.3	60.7	68.6	72.2	73.1	39.5	47.5	49.3
<i>Central America</i>	<i>57.6</i>	<i>57.9</i>	<i>57.5</i>	<i>79.7</i>	<i>78.2</i>	<i>76.7</i>	<i>36.6</i>	<i>38.9</i>	<i>39.4</i>
Belize	53.8	55.6	56.9	74.9	74.6	74.8	32.6	36.5	38.8
Costa Rica	57.8	56.3	57.2	77.3	75.0	74.9	38.0	37.2	39.1
El Salvador	56.1	54.9	54.3	71.9	70.3	68.4	42.5	42.0	42.6
Guatemala	49.4	61.5	62.4	75.6	84.1	82.8	25.4	41.1	44.1
Honduras	63.0	56.6	56.3	84.3	80.3	78.8	42.2	33.6	34.4
Mexico	58.3	57.9	57.1	80.5	78.0	76.2	37.2	39.0	39.1
Nicaragua	56.5	57.1	58.3	81.6	81.9	82.0	32.5	33.6	36.0
Panama	54.1	57.3	58.7	71.6	74.0	74.7	36.4	40.6	42.6
<i>South America</i>	<i>58.4</i>	<i>60.9</i>	<i>62.5</i>	<i>72.8</i>	<i>73.5</i>	<i>74.3</i>	<i>44.7</i>	<i>48.8</i>	<i>51.3</i>
Argentina	50.0	54.2	56.5	64.8	68.4	70.3	36.5	41.1	43.9
Bolivia	67.2	69.1	70.7	78.7	78.0	79.5	56.1	60.6	62.2
Brazil	60.6	62.5	63.9	75.1	75.4	75.8	46.8	50.3	52.8
Chile	49.3	50.5	49.6	67.8	67.7	65.2	31.8	34.2	34.9
Colombia	58.9	61.3	62.0	70.8	71.1	71.2	47.8	52.0	53.5
Ecuador	56.5	59.3	60.5	73.6	74.1	74.5	39.6	44.7	46.7
Guyana	55.2	56.6	57.8	74.9	73.2	73.4	37.5	39.7	41.5
Paraguay	67.7	72.0	72.8	78.9	80.5	80.5	56.4	63.4	65.1

Major area, region or country	Employment rates of population at ages 15+ (%)								
	Total			Male			Female		
	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2008
Peru	63.6	67.1	68.8	74.9	75.6	77.1	52.4	58.7	60.5
Suriname	43.3	46.1	46.5	58.2	60.2	60.8	28.4	32.1	32.4
Uruguay	54.7	55.4	56.4	68.7	69.1	69.3	42.3	43.3	45.1
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	53.6	56.4	61.3	70.4	71.1	75.6	37.0	41.8	47.2
North America	61.7	60.0	59.4	69.5	67.2	66.0	54.4	53.3	53.3
Canada	58.9	60.0	61.2	65.7	65.9	66.4	52.4	54.3	56.4
United States	62.0	60.0	59.2	69.9	67.3	66.0	54.7	53.2	52.9
Oceania	59.4	61.2	61.5	67.5	68.5	68.1	51.7	54.2	55.1
<i>Australia–New Zealand</i>	<i>57.6</i>	<i>59.7</i>	<i>60.0</i>	<i>66.4</i>	<i>67.5</i>	<i>67.1</i>	<i>49.4</i>	<i>52.2</i>	<i>53.2</i>
Australia	57.3	59.0	59.4	66.1	66.9	66.5	49.0	51.5	52.7
New Zealand	59.1	62.8	62.7	67.6	70.7	69.9	51.3	55.5	56.0
<i>Melanesia</i>	<i>68.1</i>	<i>68.1</i>	<i>68.2</i>	<i>73.0</i>	<i>72.7</i>	<i>72.8</i>	<i>63.1</i>	<i>63.4</i>	<i>63.6</i>
Fiji	55.7	56.4	56.3	75.3	75.8	75.7	35.9	36.7	36.6
Papua New Guinea	70.4	70.1	70.2	72.2	71.8	72.0	68.5	68.4	68.5
Solomon Islands	66.0	65.2	64.5	78.3	78.0	77.3	53.0	51.6	50.9

SOURCES

ILO 2009h. *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)* (Geneva), from KILMnet (September 2009), table 2a: Employment-to-population ratio (ILO estimates, by sex and age group).

NOTES

^a More developed regions comprise Europe, North America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan.

^b Less developed regions comprise all regions of Africa, Asia (excluding Japan), Latin America and the Caribbean plus Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

^c Least developed countries: 49, of which 33 are in Africa, 10 in Asia, 5 in Oceania and 1 in Latin America and the Caribbean.

^d Other less developed countries comprise the less developed regions excluding the least developed countries.

^e Sub-Saharan Africa refers to all of Africa except Northern Africa, with the Sudan included in sub-Saharan Africa.

Regional averages – ILO calculations, only for listed countries.

DEFINITIONS

The employment-to-population ratio is defined as the proportion of a country's working-age population that is employed.

The youth employment-to-population ratio is the proportion of the youth population – persons aged 15 to 24 years – that is employed.

Employment-to-population ratio **15+** = Employment **15+** / Population **15+**

Youth employment-to-population ratio **15–24** = Employment **15–24** / Population **15–24**

Employment is defined in the resolution adopted by the 13th International Conference of Labour Statisticians (ICLS) as persons above a specified age who performed any work at all, in the reference period, for pay or profit (or pay in kind), or were temporarily absent from a job for such reasons as illness, maternity or parental leave, holiday, training or industrial dispute. The resolution also states that unpaid family workers who work for at least one hour should be included in the count of employment, although many countries use a higher hour limit in their definition.

For most countries, the *working-age population* is defined as persons aged 15 years and older, although this may vary slightly from country to country. The ILO standard for the lower age limit is, in fact, 15 years. Similarly, some countries have an upper limit for eligibility, such as 65 years.

Table 9. Status in employment (latest available year)

Major area, region or country	Year	Status in employment																				
		Total						Male						Female								
		Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)
Africa																						
Algeria	2004	59.8	31.7	5.0	26.7	...	8.2	0.3	61.9	30.7	5.8	24.9	...	7.1	0.4	49.8	36.6	1.3	35.3	...	13.6	0.3
Botswana	2006	62.2	9.6	4.8	4.8	...	2.1	26.1	60.5	12.3	3.7	8.6	...	3.2	24.0	58.6	15.3	2.5	12.8	...	4.3	21.8
Burkina Faso	1994	3.6	26.3	0.3	26.0	...	69.2	0.8	5.8	40.7	0.5	40.2	...	52.2	1.4	1.4	11.0	0.0	11.0	...	87.3	0.3
Cameroon	2001	19.2	59.3	1.6	57.7	...	18.2	3.3	29.3	57.0	2.1	54.9	...	9.5	4.2	8.7	61.7	1.1	60.6	...	27.2	2.5
Cape Verde	2000	38.9	31.8	2.5	29.3	...	10.3	19.0	43.8	32.6	3.3	29.4	...	6.5	17.1	33.0	30.9	1.6	29.2	...	14.8	21.3
Chad	1993	4.9	65.6	0.2	65.4	...	28.3	1.2	8.8	76.7	0.3	76.4	...	13.2	1.3	0.8	53.7	0.1	53.6	...	44.4	1.1
Egypt	2007	61.4	29.9	17.0	12.9	...	8.7	...	58.5	27.4	14.1	13.3	...	14.1	...	47.9	18.2	3.4	14.8	...	33.9	...
Equatorial Guinea	1983	21.1	38.3	39.5	1.2	30.7	51.8	16.5	1.3	6.0	16.8	76.5	0.0
Ethiopia	2006	46.3	42.8	0.7	41.8	0.3	10.0	0.4	49.3	41.8	1.0	40.5	0.4	7.8	0.5	42.7	44.0	0.4	43.4	0.2	12.7	0.3
Gabon	1993	45.2	45.4	0.6	44.8	...	3.5	5.8	58.6	35.4	0.9	34.5	...	2.0	4.0	29.2	57.5	0.2	57.3	...	5.3	7.9
Lesotho	1999	25.7	5.5	0.8	4.8	68.8	22.5	4.6	0.7	3.8	73.0	29.9	6.8	0.8	6.0	63.4
Madagascar	2005	13.4	34.1	...	52.3	0.1	16.0	51.8	...	32.1	0.1	10.8	16.1	...	73.0	0.1
Malawi	1987	16.1	83.9	0.2	83.5	0.3	29.0	71.0	0.1	70.7	0.3	3.9	96.1	0.0	95.7	0.4
Mali	2004	13.6	71.4	15.0	...	15.2	66.4	18.4	...	11.4	78.4	10.2	...
Mauritius	2008	78.0	20.7	4.4	16.2	0.1	0.9	0.4	80.0	17.6	3.3	14.2	0.1	2.1	0.4	83.8	11.5	1.1	10.4	...	4.4	0.3
Morocco	2008	47.5	37.4	3.2	32.2	2.0	15.0	0.1	43.8	32.0	2.5	27.9	1.6	24.0	0.1	34.0	17.3	0.8	16.0	0.5	48.6	0.1
Namibia	2004	72.8	22.3	5.6	16.7	...	4.4	0.4	76.0	20.4	6.6	13.7	...	3.2	0.4	68.8	26.6	4.3	22.3	...	5.8	0.4
Rwanda	1996	6.0	61.4	0.1	61.3	...	31.2	1.4	9.4	56.2	0.1	56.2	...	32.7	1.6	3.3	65.5	0.0	65.5	...	30.0	1.2
Sao Tome and Principe	1991	71.2	26.8	0.4	26.4	...	0.8	1.3	72.3	25.5	0.5	25.1	...	0.8	1.3	68.9	29.2	0.1	29.1	...	0.7	1.2
Senegal	1991	11.3	55.4	0.6	54.8	...	28.5	4.8	14.4	52.7	1.0	51.7	...	25.3	7.6	7.5	58.7	0.1	58.6	...	32.4	1.4
Sierra Leone	2004	7.6	...	74.3	18.1	...	11.3	...	73.9	14.8	...	3.7	...	74.7	21.6	...
South Africa	2008	84.5	15.0	7.5	7.5	...	0.4	...	84.4	14.7	5.5	9.2	...	0.9	...	84.2	14.4	3.0	11.4	...	1.4	...
Swaziland	1997	76.4	21.1	1.5	19.6	...	1.1	1.4	82.7	15.3	1.6	13.7	...	0.8	1.2	67.4	29.4	1.3	28.1	...	1.5	1.7

Major area, region or country	Year	Status in employment																					
		Total					Male					Female											
		Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	
Tanzania, United Republic of	2006	10.5	78.1	1.8	76.3	...	11.4	...	15.3	75.0	2.6	72.4	...	9.7	...	6.1	80.9	1.0	79.9	...	13.0
Tunisia	2003	64.3	26.8	8.7	0.2
Uganda	2003	14.5	59.4	0.3	59.1	...	26.1	...	22.2	67.5	0.4	67.1	...	10.3	...	7.5	52.1	0.2	51.9	...	40.5
Zambia	2003	18.7	59.7	0.0	59.7	...	19.6	1.9
Zimbabwe	2002	37.7	50.4	0.5	49.9	...	11.9	...	51.0	38.6	0.6	38.0	...	10.4	...	23.1	63.2	0.3	62.9	...	13.6
Asia																							
Armenia	2007	49.7	50.3
Azerbaijan	2008	47.7	52.3	4.9	47.4	42.4	57.6	3.0	54.7	37.0	63.0	0.9	62.1
Bangladesh	2005	13.9	63.6	0.3	63.3	...	21.7	0.9	14.5	75.1	0.3	74.8	...	9.7	0.6	11.7	26.5	0.1	26.4	...	60.1	1.7	...
Bhutan	2005	39.5	21.2	1.3	19.9	0.0	32.4	6.9	51.9	19.3	1.7	17.6	0.0	21.3	7.4	18.0	24.6	0.7	23.9	0.0	51.7	6.1	...
Brunei Darussalam	1991	94.9	4.6	1.0	3.7	0.0	0.5	0.0	94.4	5.2	1.2	4.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	96.1	3.3	0.5	2.8	0.0	0.6	0.0	...
Cambodia	2004	12.9	41.2	0.2	41.0	...	45.7	0.2
Georgia	2008	36.6	43.7	1.4	42.3	...	19.6	0.1	35.7	36.1	1.0	35.0	...	28.1	0.1	34.7	27.4	0.7	26.7	...	37.9	0.0	...
Hong Kong, China	2008	84.5	15.4	5.6	9.8	...	0.1	...	88.8	10.6	3.8	6.9	...	0.5	...	93.8	5.2	1.6	3.6	...	1.0
Indonesia	2008	32.6	50.4	2.9	47.5	...	16.9
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	2007	51.4	37.8	5.4	32.4	...	10.4	0.5	53.4	40.8	6.4	34.4	...	5.4	0.4	42.2	24.3	0.9	23.4	...	32.7	0.8	...
Israel	2008	83.3	16.6	6.8	8.9	0.9	0.1	...	87.3	12.5	4.5	7.0	1.0	0.2	...	92.0	7.7	1.7	5.0	1.0	0.3
Japan	2008	86.1	12.3	3.6	8.7	...	1.1	0.5	86.5	9.5	2.5	7.0	...	3.5	0.5	87.0	5.6	1.0	4.6	...	6.9	0.5	...
Kazakhstan	2008	67.5	31.9	2.0	29.4	0.5	0.6	...	66.2	33.1	1.6	31.2	0.3	0.8	...	64.8	34.3	1.1	33.0	0.2	0.9
Korea, Republic of	2008	68.1	30.6	8.6	22.0	...	1.2	...	68.7	25.3	6.5	18.8	...	5.9	...	69.6	18.0	3.5	14.5	...	12.5
Kyrgyzstan	2006	50.8	36.0	1.1	34.1	1.0	13.2	...	50.2	41.1	1.5	38.6	1.0	8.8	...	51.7	29.0	0.6	27.8	1.0	19.3
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	1995	9.7	56.9	0.2	56.6	...	33.5	...	14.3	56.6	0.4	56.3	...	29.1	...	5.4	57.1	0.1	57.0	...	37.6
Macau, China	2008	90.1	9.6	4.1	5.6	...	0.2	...	92.5	6.7	2.8	3.9	...	0.7	...	95.2	3.3	1.3	2.0	...	1.4
Malaysia	2008	72.2	25.2	4.7	20.5	...	2.6	...	74.6	20.8	3.5	17.4	...	4.6	...	78.9	13.0	1.4	11.7	...	8.1

Major area, region or country	Year	Status in employment																					
		Total						Male						Female									
		Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	
Maldives	2006	61.1	21.3	4.8	11.6	4.8	7.9	9.7	55.2	24.9	3.5	16.2	5.2	13.4	6.5	45.0	31.2	1.1	24.1	6.0	22.9	0.9	
Mongolia	2003	39.3	35.6	0.6	35.0	...	24.8	0.1	37.1	44.1	0.7	43.4	...	18.4	0.1	41.8	26.1	0.4	25.7	...	31.7	0.2	
Nepal	2001	24.6	66.5	3.8	62.7	...	8.8	...	33.7	60.5	3.9	56.7	...	5.7	...	12.8	74.4	3.7	70.6	...	12.9	...	
Oman	2000	87.8	11.4	1.8	9.6	0.8	87.8	11.6	2.0	9.6	0.5	87.8	9.9	0.6	9.2	2.3	
Pakistan	2007	37.4	35.3	0.8	34.5	...	27.2	...	40.6	40.8	1.0	39.8	...	18.6	...	24.6	13.5	0.1	13.4	...	61.9	...	
Philippines	2008	52.9	38.1	5.3	32.8	...	9.0	...	52.4	35.4	4.2	31.3	...	12.2	...	51.4	31.2	2.4	28.8	...	17.4	...	
Qatar	2004	98.8	1.1	0.7	0.4	...	0.0	0.0	98.7	1.3	0.8	0.5	...	0.0	0.0	99.9	0.1	0.1	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	
Singapore	2008	81.0	18.7	6.8	11.9	...	0.3	...	84.9	14.4	5.1	9.3	...	0.6	...	90.1	8.9	2.9	6.0	...	1.1	...	
Sri Lanka	2008	56.7	38.7	4.2	34.6	...	4.5	...	56.0	33.2	3.0	30.2	...	10.8	...	54.7	22.9	0.7	22.2	...	22.4	...	
Syrian Arab Republic	2007	51.5	41.1	9.5	31.6	...	7.4	...	53.7	37.4	8.5	28.9	...	8.9	...	68.9	12.1	2.1	10.0	...	19.1	...	
Taiwan, China	2008	76.0	18.1	6.0	
Thailand	2008	43.7	41.6	3.7	37.8	0.1	14.7	...	43.2	34.6	2.6	31.8	0.1	22.3	...	42.6	26.3	1.3	24.8	0.2	31.1	...	
United Arab Emirates	2008	95.1	4.9	3.6	1.4	95.8	4.2	3.0	1.2	...	0.0	...	99.0	1.0	0.7	0.3	...	0.0	...	
Viet Nam	2004	25.6	41.7	0.5	41.2	...	32.7	0.0	29.8	51.4	0.7	50.7	...	18.9	0.0	21.2	31.6	0.3	31.3	...	47.2	0.0	
West Bank and Gaza Strip	2008	66.3	27.8	5.1	22.7	...	5.9	0.0	65.3	25.0	4.2	20.7	...	9.7	0.0	61.1	12.8	0.8	12.0	...	26.1	0.0	
Yemen	1999	41.6	58.0	2.2	31.0	25.0	0.3	...	50.7	49.0	2.7	33.4	13.0	0.3	...	13.8	85.8	0.4	23.6	62.0	0.3	...	
Europe																							
Austria	2008	86.3	11.4	4.8	6.6	...	2.3	...	84.3	13.6	6.5	7.2	...	2.0	...	88.5	8.7	2.8	6.0	...	2.7	...	
Belgium	2008	85.8	13.0	4.2	8.8	...	1.2	...	83.0	16.6	5.9	10.7	...	0.4	...	89.2	8.6	2.1	6.5	...	2.2	...	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2008	72.6	25.0	2.6	...	72.5	22.1	5.4	...	72.6	17.0	10.4	...	
Bulgaria	2008	87.6	11.4	3.7	7.7	...	1.0	...	85.3	14.1	4.9	9.2	...	0.6	...	90.2	8.3	2.3	6.0	...	1.5	...	
Croatia	2008	77.4	21.6	7.1	14.5	...	1.0	...	78.4	19.4	5.3	14.1	...	2.2	...	79.7	16.7	3.1	13.6	...	3.7	...	
Cyprus	2008	80.0	18.1	5.5	12.5	...	1.9	...	74.4	24.7	9.0	15.7	...	0.9	...	87.2	9.9	1.3	8.6	...	3.0	...	
Czech Republic	2008	83.9	15.5	3.6	11.9	...	0.6	...	79.8	19.9	4.8	15.1	...	0.3	...	89.4	9.6	1.9	7.7	...	1.0	...	

Major area, region or country	Year	Status in employment																				
		Total						Male						Female								
		Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)
Denmark	2008	91.1	8.5	3.9	4.6	...	0.4	87.6	12.1	5.9	6.2	...	0.3	95.0	4.5	1.6	2.9	...	0.5
Estonia	2008	92.3	7.6	3.2	4.3	89.5	10.4	5.0	5.5	95.1	4.7	1.5	3.2
Finland	2008	87.2	12.3	3.8	8.5	...	0.5	83.3	16.1	5.5	10.6	...	0.6	91.4	8.1	1.9	6.2	...	0.4
France	2008	89.5	9.9	4.6	5.3	...	0.6	86.7	13.0	6.3	6.7	...	0.3	92.7	6.4	2.5	3.8	...	0.9
Germany	2008	88.4	10.7	4.7	5.9	...	0.9	86.0	13.6	6.6	6.9	...	0.4	91.3	7.2	2.5	4.8	...	1.5
Greece	2008	64.6	29.5	8.5	21.1	...	5.9	61.8	34.8	11.1	23.7	...	3.4	69.0	21.3	4.3	16.9	...	9.8
Hungary	2008	87.8	11.9	5.1	6.7	...	0.4	84.7	15.0	6.9	8.1	...	0.3	91.4	8.1	3.0	5.2	...	0.5
Iceland	2008	82.9	16.9	6.4	10.5	87.2	12.5	4.5	8.0	92.4	7.2	2.3	4.9	0.2
Ireland	2008	82.6	16.7	5.7	11.0	...	0.7	74.9	24.5	8.3	16.2	...	0.6	92.5	6.7	2.4	4.3	...	0.8
Italy	2008	74.5	23.7	6.9	16.8	...	1.7	70.5	28.3	8.9	19.4	...	1.2	80.7	16.8	3.9	13.0	...	2.5
Latvia	2008	89.9	8.8	3.3	5.5	...	1.3	87.2	11.3	4.8	6.6	...	1.4	92.6	6.2	1.8	4.5	...	1.2
Lithuania	2008	88.5	10.1	2.2	7.9	...	1.5	85.8	13.2	3.3	9.9	...	1.0	91.2	6.8	1.0	5.8	...	2.0
Luxembourg	2008	93.5	6.3	2.4	3.9	93.4	6.6	3.2	3.4	93.6	6.0	1.4	4.6
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	2008	69.9	23.8	6.1	17.6	...	6.3	71.8	17.9	4.9	12.9	...	10.3	74.9	8.6	3.1	5.5	...	16.6
Malta	2008	86.7	13.3	4.3	9.0	83.2	16.8	5.8	11.0	93.6	6.2	1.3	4.9
Moldova, Republic of	2008	64.9	33.7	1.3	32.4	...	1.3	68.0	29.6	1.0	28.7	...	2.4	71.0	25.5	0.6	24.9	...	3.5
Montenegro	2005	80.5	17.3	2.2	77.1	21.1	1.9	85.4	11.9	2.6
Netherlands	2008	86.8	12.7	3.7	9.0	...	0.4	84.2	15.6	5.4	10.2	...	0.2	89.9	9.3	1.8	7.5	...	0.8
Norway	2008	92.2	7.5	2.1	5.4	...	0.3	89.2	10.5	2.8	7.7	...	0.2	95.5	4.1	1.2	2.9	...	0.4
Poland	2008	77.1	18.8	4.1	14.7	...	4.1	75.0	22.3	5.1	17.1	...	2.7	79.6	14.5	2.7	11.8	...	5.9
Portugal	2008	76.0	23.1	5.5	17.6	...	0.9	74.6	24.7	7.4	17.3	...	0.7	77.6	21.2	3.3	17.9	...	1.2
Romania	2008	67.4	20.8	1.3	19.4	...	11.8	67.2	26.8	1.9	24.9	...	6.0	67.6	13.4	0.7	12.7	...	18.9
Russian Federation	2008	92.1	7.8	1.8	5.8	...	0.1	92.7	7.2	1.5	5.6	...	0.1	93.3	6.6	1.1	5.3	...	0.1
Serbia	2008	64.8	31.1	5.6	25.5	...	4.1	66.2	24.8	4.5	20.4	...	9.0	67.9	16.5	3.0	13.5	...	15.6
Slovakia	2008	86.1	13.6	3.2	10.4	...	0.1	81.5	18.3	4.4	14.0	...	0.1	91.8	7.7	1.7	6.0	...	0.2	0.3

Major area, region or country	Year	Status in employment																						
		Total						Male					Female											
		Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)		
Slovenia	2008	85.9	9.9	3.2	6.7	..	4.2	..	83.5	13.3	4.4	8.9	..	3.2	..	88.7	5.9	1.7	4.2	..	5.4	
Spain	2008	82.3	16.6	5.8	10.8	0.1	1.0	79.2	20.0	7.4	12.6	..	0.8	0.1	86.7	11.8	3.5	8.4	..	1.4	..	0.0	..	
Sweden	2008	89.6	10.2	3.8	6.4	..	0.3	85.6	14.2	5.7	8.5	..	0.2	..	94.1	5.6	1.6	4.1	..	0.3	
Switzerland	2008	81.9	16.7	8.7	8.0	..	1.4	84.1	13.9	6.2	7.7	..	2.0	..	86.8	10.7	3.3	7.4	..	2.6	
Turkey	2008	58.9	27.2	5.7	21.5	..	13.9	62.3	32.5	7.3	25.1	..	5.3	..	49.7	12.6	1.3	11.3	..	37.7	
Ukraine	2008	83.2	16.5	0.4	82.0	17.7	0.3	..	80.7	18.9	
United Kingdom	2008	86.4	13.0	2.8	10.2	0.2	0.3	82.0	17.5	4.0	13.5	..	0.2	0.2	91.6	7.7	1.4	6.4	..	0.5	0.2	
Latin America and the Caribbean																								
Argentina	2006	75.8	23.1	4.1	19.0	1.1	0.0	72.5	26.7	5.3	21.4	..	0.7	0.0	80.2	18.2	2.5	15.7	..	1.6	0.0	..
Aruba	1997	96.8	..	2.6	..	0.5	0.1
Bahamas	2004	84.4	14.8	0.2	0.6	81.6	17.8	0.0	0.6	87.4	11.5	0.5	0.6	..
Barbados	2004	84.4	15.2	1.2	13.9	0.1	0.4	79.5	19.8	1.9	17.9	..	0.0	0.6	89.5	10.2	0.5	9.7	..	0.2	0.2	..
Belize	2005	69.3	26.7	7.1	19.6	3.9	0.1	66.9	29.3	8.4	20.9	..	3.7	0.1	73.9	21.7	4.5	17.2	..	4.3	0.1	..
Bolivia	2007	43.1	41.7	7.2	34.1	0.4	15.0	34.0	39.0	5.4	33.4	0.2	23.7	3.4	22.7	35.7	3.2	32.5	0.0	34.4	7.2	..
Brazil	2007	63.0	29.5	4.8	24.8	4.5	3.0	64.8	24.9	3.8	21.2	..	5.8	4.4	67.2	18.6	2.4	16.3	..	7.7	6.4	..
Chile	2008	71.8	27.1	3.5	23.6	1.0	..	72.8	25.6	2.9	22.7	..	1.6	..	74.3	23.0	1.8	21.2	..	2.7
Colombia	2008	47.3	49.9	5.9	44.0	2.7	0.0	48.9	46.9	4.6	42.3	..	4.1	0.0	51.4	42.3	2.6	39.7	..	6.3	0.0	..
Costa Rica	2008	71.4	27.7	9.4	18.3	0.9	..	72.9	25.6	7.5	18.1	..	1.6	..	75.4	22.0	4.3	17.7	..	2.6
Cuba	2008	77.1	22.9	..	16.6	6.3	..	83.3	16.7	..	12.0	4.7	93.4	6.6	..	4.5	2.2
Dominican Republic	2007	53.6	43.3	4.0	39.3	3.1	..	46.5	50.6	4.7	45.9	..	2.9	..	67.3	29.3	2.5	26.7	..	3.4
Ecuador	2006	59.7	33.3	6.5	26.8	7.1	0.0	63.1	32.5	7.8	24.7	..	4.4	0.0	54.5	34.4	4.5	29.9	..	11.1	0.0	..
El Salvador	2007	62.4	26.7	5.2	21.5	0.0	9.0	53.9	31.6	4.3	27.2	0.0	9.4	5.1	42.2	38.3	3.1	35.1	..	10.0	9.6	..
Grenada	1998	71.3	22.9	5.6	17.3	1.1	4.7	68.6	23.9	6.6	17.3	..	0.7	6.8	75.2	21.4	4.1	17.3	..	1.7	1.7	..
Guatemala	2002	28.9	37.9	5.3	32.6	22.4	10.8	30.7	37.1	7.0	30.1	..	21.3	11.0	25.6	39.4	2.4	37.0	..	24.5	10.4	..

Major area, region or country	Year	Status in employment																				
		Total						Male						Female								
		Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)
Guyana	1992	52.4	39.5	8.0	...	52.2	37.7	10.1	...	52.9	43.5	3.6
Haiti	1990	18.9	67.7	11.9	1.5	17.4	68.9	12.3	1.4	21.2	65.8	11.2	1.8	...
Honduras	2007	48.4	39.6	12.1	...	47.6	40.7	2.3	38.4	46.0	42.9	1.7	41.2	11.1
Jamaica	2008	55.3	44.2	3.9	40.3	0.4	0.1	60.2	38.4	3.1	35.3	...	1.2	66.6	31.1	2.1	28.9	2.1	0.2	...
Mexico	2008	66.3	28.8	6.4	22.4	4.8	...	65.9	27.4	4.9	22.5	...	6.7	65.1	25.1	2.4	22.7	9.7
Netherlands Antilles	2007	76.8	22.6	11.5	11.1	0.2	0.4
Nicaragua	2006	50.5	38.3	4.2	33.9	0.1	11.0	49.7	37.9	5.3	32.4	0.1	12.2	51.7	38.9	2.5	36.4	0.1	9.1	0.3
Panama	2008	67.2	30.3	4.1	26.2	...	2.5	69.4	27.4	3.4	24.0	0.0	3.2	73.1	22.4	2.2	20.2	...	4.4
Paraguay	2008	51.2	38.3	6.7	31.6	...	10.4	50.4	38.8	5.0	33.8	...	10.6	49.2	39.7	2.3	37.4	...	11.0	0.2
Peru	2008	60.8	35.0	7.4	27.6	...	4.0	57.3	36.9	5.5	31.3	...	5.6	53.2	39.1	3.3	35.8	...	7.5	0.3
Puerto Rico	2008	79.7	20.3	85.3	14.6	92.0	7.8
Saint Lucia	2000	64.1	33.2	5.4	27.8	...	0.9	58.8	38.3	7.3	30.9	...	0.5	70.6	26.9	3.1	23.8	...	1.4	1.1
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1991	74.0	23.5	5.6	17.9	...	2.3	71.2	26.6	6.8	19.8	...	2.1	79.4	17.8	3.3	14.5	...	2.7	0.2
Suriname	1998	80.7	16.3	0.6	15.7	...	1.2	77.8	19.6	0.9	18.8	...	0.9	86.8	9.4	0.2	9.2	...	1.6	2.1
Trinidad and Tobago	2005	79.0	19.2	4.4	14.8	...	0.9	76.4	22.5	5.5	17.0	...	0.3	83.0	14.2	2.8	11.4	...	1.7	1.1
Uruguay	2007	69.9	28.1	4.8	23.3	...	1.8	67.7	31.3	6.3	25.1	...	0.9	72.7	24.0	2.9	21.0	...	3.0	0.4
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	2007	59.3	39.7	4.2	28.9	6.7	1.0	58.5	41.0	5.6	27.3	8.0	0.6	60.6	37.7	1.9	31.3	4.6	1.6	0.0
North America																						
Canada	2008	80.9	19.0	0.1	...	84.6	15.2	0.1	88.8	11.0	0.2
United States	2008	91.7	8.2	0.1	...	93.0	6.9	0.1	94.4	5.5	0.1
Oceania																						
Australia	2008	85.9	14.0	3.4	10.6	...	0.2	88.2	11.6	2.8	8.8	...	0.2	91.0	8.7	2.1	6.6	...	0.3
Fiji	2005	58.6	25.5	1.1	24.4	...	14.6	59.4	27.6	1.1	26.5	...	12.3	56.6	20.6	1.1	19.5	...	19.9	2.9
French Polynesia	2002	80.6	16.9	2.5	...	78.7	19.2	2.1	83.6	13.4	3.0

Major area, region or country	Year	Status in employment																				
		Total			Male			Female														
		Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)	Wage & salaried workers	Total self-employed workers (a + b + c)	Employers (a)	Own-account workers (b)	Members of producers' cooperatives (c)	Contributing family workers (d)	Not classified (e)							
New Caledonia	1996	83.8	15.9	0.3	0.3	...	89.1	10.4	0.5	...							
New Zealand	2008	78.7	20.5	6.7	13.8	0.7	0.1	82.8	16.2	5.0	11.1	...	1.0	0.1	87.4							
Samoa	2001	48.7	...	4.8	...	46.5	...	44.2	...	4.6	51.2	...	59.1							
Tonga	1996	42.2	26.4	0.5	25.9	0.0	31.1	0.2	43.5	26.7	0.6	26.1	0.0	29.7	0.2	40.2	25.8	0.3	25.5	0.0	33.6	0.4

SOURCES
ILO, 2009h, *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)* (Geneva), at KILMnet (September 2009), table 3; Status in employment (by sex).
ILO, LABORSTA, table 2D: Total employment, by status in employment (thousands).

NOTE
... = Not available.

DEFINITIONS
Employees are all those workers who hold the type of job defined as "paid employment jobs". *Employees with stable contracts* are those "employees" who have had, and continue to have, an explicit (written or oral) or implicit contract of employment, or a succession of such contracts, with the same employer on a continuous basis. "On a continuous basis" implies a period of employment which is longer than a specified minimum determined according to national circumstances. (If interruptions are allowed in this minimum period, their maximum duration should also be determined according to national circumstances.) Regular employees are those "employees with stable contracts" for whom the employing organization is responsible for payment of relevant taxes and social security contributions and/or where the contractual relationship is subject to national labour legislation. *Self-employment jobs* are those jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits (or the potential for profits) derived from the goods and services produced (where own consumption is considered to be part of profits). The incumbents make the operational decisions affecting the enterprise, or delegate such decisions while retaining responsibility for the welfare of the enterprise. (In this context "enterprise" includes one-person operations.) (a) *Employers* are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or a few partners, hold the type of job defined as a "self-employment job", and, in this capacity, on a continuous basis (including the reference period) have engaged one or more persons to work for them in their business as "employee(s)". The meaning of "engage on a continuous basis" is to be determined by national circumstances, in a way which is consistent with the definition of "employees with stable contracts". (The partners may or may not be members of the same family or household.) (b) *Own-account workers* are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or more partners, hold the type of job defined as "self-employment job", and have not engaged on a continuous basis any "employees" to work for them during the reference period. It should be noted that during the reference period the members of this group may have engaged "employees", provided that this is on a non-continuous basis. (The partners may or may not be members of the same family or household.) (c) *Members of producers' cooperatives* are workers who hold a "self-employment" job in a cooperative producing goods and services, in which each member takes part on an equal footing with other members in determining the organization of production, sales and/or other work of the establishment, the investments and the distribution of the proceeds of the establishment amongst their members. (It should be noted that "employees" of producers' cooperatives are not to be classified to this group.) (d) *Contributing family workers* are those workers who hold a "self-employment" job in a market-oriented establishment operated by a related person living in the same household, who cannot be regarded as a partner, because their degree of commitment to the operation of the establishment, in terms of working time or other factors to be determined by national circumstances, is not at a level comparable to that of the head of the establishment. (Where it is customary for young persons, in particular, to work without pay in an economic enterprise operated by a related person who does not live in the same household, the requirement of "living in the same household" may be eliminated.) (e) *Workers not classifiable by status* include those for whom insufficient relevant information is available, and/or who cannot be included in any of the preceding categories. For further information see ILO, 1993: *International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE)* (<http://laborsta.ilo.org/app/v8/data/csee.html>).

Table 10. Unemployment as a percentage of the labour force

Major area, region or country	Unemployment as a percentage of the labour force											
	Total				Male				Female			
	1995	2000	2005	2008	1995	2000	2005	2008	1995	2000	2005	2008
Africa												
Algeria ¹	...	27.3	15.3	26.6	14.9	31.4	17.5	...
Botswana ^{2,3}	21.5	15.8	17.6	...	19.4	14.7	15.3	...	23.9	17.2	19.9	...
Burundi ⁴	...	14.0	15.0	13.2
Cameroon ^{1,2}	8.1	7.5	9.5	8.2	6.5	6.7
Egypt	11.3	9.0	11.2	...	7.6	5.1	7.1	...	24.1	22.7	24.3	...
Ethiopia ³	16.7	11.5	22.1	...
Lesotho ^{4,5}	39.3	27.3	30.7	20.8	47.1	34.2
Madagascar	...	5.8	6.0	5.7
Mali ^{5,6}	3.3	...	8.8	...	3.3	...	7.2	...	3.3	...	10.9	...
Mauritius	9.8	...	9.6	7.2	7.8	...	5.8	4.1	13.9	...	16.5	12.7
Morocco	...	13.6	11.0	9.4	...	13.8	10.8	9.4	...	13.0	11.5	9.5
Namibia ⁶	21.9	19.4	25.0	...
Niger	5.1	3.6	8.1
Réunion ²	37.1	36.5	29.5	24.5	33.7	34.4	26.6	22.8	41.7	39.1	33.3	26.5
Rwanda ²	0.6	0.8	0.3
Senegal ³	11.1	7.9	13.6	...
Sierra Leone ⁶	2.8	3.1	2.5	...
South Africa	...	25.4	26.7	22.9	...	22.2	22.6	20.0	...	29.2	31.7	26.3
Tanzania, United Republic of ³	4.3	2.8	5.8	...
Tunisia ⁵	15.9	15.7	14.2	...	15.5	15.3	13.1	...	17.4	16.9	17.3	...
Uganda ⁷	3.2	2.5	3.9	...
Zambia	...	12.9	14.1	11.3
Zimbabwe ^{4,5}	6.9	6.0	8.7	7.3	5.1	4.6
Asia												
Afghanistan	8.5	7.6	9.5	...
Armenia	6.7	11.7	8.2	...	3.8	8.0	4.6	...	10.4	15.7	12.1	...
Azerbaijan	0.8	1.2	1.4	1.0	0.6	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.4	1.5	1.0
Bangladesh ²	2.5	3.3	4.3	...	2.7	3.2	3.4	...	2.3	3.3	7.0	...
Cambodia ⁶	...	2.5	7.1	2.1	7.6	2.8	6.7	...
China	2.9	3.1	4.2	4.2
Georgia	...	10.8	13.8	11.1	14.8	10.5	12.6	...
Hong Kong, China	3.2	4.9	5.6	3.6	3.4	5.6	6.5	4.1	2.9	4.1	4.4	3.0
India	2.2	4.3	2.4	4.3	1.7	4.3
Indonesia ²	4.0	6.1	11.2	8.4	3.3	5.7	9.3	7.6	5.1	6.7	14.7	9.7
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	11.5	10.4	10.0	9.1	17.0	16.7
Iraq ⁶	26.8	29.4	15.0	...
Israel	6.9	8.8	9.0	6.1	5.6	8.4	8.5	5.7	8.6	9.2	9.5	6.5
Japan	3.2	4.7	4.4	4.0	3.1	4.9	4.6	4.1	3.2	4.5	4.2	3.8
Kazakhstan ¹	...	10.4	8.1	6.6	...	8.9	6.7	5.3	...	12.0	9.6	7.9
Korea, Republic of	2.0	4.4	3.7	3.2	2.3	5.0	4.0	3.6	1.7	3.6	3.4	2.6
Kuwait ²	0.7	0.8	1.5	...	0.8	0.8	1.0	...	0.5	0.7	3.1	...
Kyrgyzstan ⁸	...	12.5	8.1	11.2	7.4	14.3	9.1	...
Lebanon ⁹	9.0	8.6	10.1	...
Macau, China	3.6	6.8	4.1	3.0	4.1	8.6	4.4	3.2	3.0	4.6	3.8	2.8
Malaysia	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.3	2.8	3.0	3.4	3.2	3.8	3.1	3.7	3.7
Mongolia	5.5	4.6	3.3	2.8	5.0	4.1	3.0	2.3	6.7	5.0	3.6	3.2
Nepal ⁴	...	1.8	2.0	1.7

Major area, region or country	Unemployment as a percentage of the labour force											
	Total				Male				Female			
	1995	2000	2005	2008	1995	2000	2005	2008	1995	2000	2005	2008
Pakistan	5.4	7.8	7.7	...	4.1	6.1	6.6	...	13.7	17.3	12.8	...
Philippines	8.4	11.2	7.8	7.4	7.7	10.9	7.8	7.6	9.4	11.6	7.8	7.1
Qatar ¹	...	3.9	2.3	12.6
Saudi Arabia ³	...	4.6	6.3	5.0	...	3.8	4.7	3.5	...	9.3	14.7	13.0
Singapore ^{1,3}	2.7	3.8	4.5	4.0	2.7	3.7	4.1	3.6	2.8	3.9	4.9	4.4
Sri Lanka	12.3	7.6	7.7	5.2	9.0	5.8	5.5	3.6	18.7	11.0	11.9	8.0
Syrian Arab Republic ^{1,9}	...	11.2	8.4	8.0	5.2	23.9	25.7	...
Tajikistan	2.0	2.7	2.0	...	1.9	2.1
Thailand	1.1	2.4	1.4	1.2	0.9	2.4	1.5	1.3	1.4	2.3	1.2	1.0
United Arab Emirates	4.0	2.0	12.0
Uzbekistan	0.4	0.4	0.3	...	0.3	0.5
Viet Nam ^{2,6}	1.9	2.3	2.1	...	2.2	2.4	1.9	...	1.7	2.1	2.4	...
West Bank and Gaza Strip ²	23.8	14.1	23.3	25.7	24.5	14.4	23.6	26.2	19.6	12.3	22.1	23.5
Yemen ⁴	...	11.5	12.5	8.2
Europe												
Albania	12.9	16.8	14.1	...	11.6	14.9	12.1	...	14.8	19.3	17.2	...
Austria	3.7	3.6	5.2	3.8	3.2	3.3	4.9	3.6	4.3	3.8	5.5	4.1
Belarus	2.9	2.1	1.5	0.8	2.2	1.7	1.0	0.7	3.5	2.4	2.0	0.9
Belgium	9.3	7.0	8.5	7.0	7.3	5.8	7.7	6.5	12.2	8.7	9.6	7.6
Bosnia and Herzegovina ³	31.1	23.4	28.9	21.4	34.9	26.8
Bulgaria	15.7	16.3	10.1	5.6	15.5	16.7	10.3	5.5	15.8	15.9	9.8	5.8
Croatia	14.5	21.1	17.9	19.0	14.1	23.4	22.0	...
Cyprus	...	4.9	5.3	3.7	...	3.2	4.4	3.2	...	7.4	6.5	4.2
Czech Republic	4.0	8.8	7.9	4.4	3.4	7.3	6.5	3.5	4.8	10.6	9.8	5.6
Denmark	7.0	4.6	5.0	3.4	5.6	4.0	4.6	3.0	8.6	5.2	5.5	3.7
Estonia	9.7	13.6	7.9	5.5	10.5	14.5	8.8	5.8	8.9	12.6	7.1	5.3
Finland	15.2	9.7	8.3	6.4	15.3	8.9	8.1	6.1	15.1	10.6	8.6	6.7
France	11.6	8.5	8.9	7.4	9.7	7.3	8.0	6.9	13.8	10.1	9.8	7.9
Germany	10.1	7.9	11.1	7.5	8.7	7.6	11.3	7.4	11.9	8.3	10.9	7.6
Greece	10.0	11.2	9.6	7.2	6.7	7.4	5.8	4.6	15.4	17.0	15.2	10.9
Hungary	10.2	6.4	7.2	7.8	10.7	7.0	7.0	7.6	8.7	5.6	7.5	8.1
Iceland	4.9	2.3	2.6	3.0	4.8	1.8	2.6	3.3	4.9	2.9	2.6	2.6
Ireland	12.2	4.3	4.2	5.2	12.1	4.3	4.6	6.2	12.2	4.2	3.8	3.9
Italy	11.3	10.5	7.7	6.7	8.9	8.1	6.2	5.5	15.2	14.5	10.1	8.5
Latvia ²	20.6	14.4	8.7	7.5	21.0	15.4	9.0	8.1	20.3	13.5	8.4	7.0
Lithuania	17.1	16.4	8.3	5.8	...	18.8	8.2	6.0	...	13.9	8.3	5.6
Luxembourg	4.8	4.0	5.8
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of ¹	...	30.5	37.3	33.8	...	29.5	36.5	33.5	...	32.0	38.4	34.2
Malta	...	6.7	7.3	6.1	...	6.8	6.6	5.7	...	6.4	8.9	6.9
Moldova, Republic of	...	8.5	7.3	4.0	...	9.7	8.7	4.6	...	7.2	6.0	3.4
Montenegro	30.3	26.2	35.5	...
Netherlands	7.1	3.1	5.1	3.0	5.9	2.4	4.8	2.8	8.8	3.9	5.5	3.2
Norway	4.9	3.4	4.6	2.6	5.2	3.6	4.8	2.8	4.6	3.2	4.4	2.4
Poland	13.3	16.1	17.7	7.1	12.1	14.4	16.6	6.4	14.7	18.1	19.1	8.0
Portugal	7.1	3.9	7.6	7.6	6.3	3.1	6.7	6.5	8.1	4.9	8.7	8.8
Romania	8.0	7.1	7.2	5.8	7.5	7.7	7.7	6.7	8.6	6.4	6.4	4.7
Russian Federation	9.5	9.8	7.2	6.3	9.7	10.2	7.3	6.6	9.2	9.4	7.0	6.1
Serbia	20.8	13.6	16.8	11.9	26.2	15.8

Major area, region or country	Unemployment as a percentage of the labour force											
	Total				Male				Female			
	1995	2000	2005	2008	1995	2000	2005	2008	1995	2000	2005	2008
Slovakia	13.1	18.6	16.2	9.6	12.6	18.6	15.3	8.4	13.8	18.6	17.2	11.1
Slovenia	7.4	7.2	5.8	4.2	7.7	7.0	5.5	3.5	7.0	7.4	6.1	4.9
Spain	22.9	13.9	9.2	11.3	18.0	9.6	7.0	10.1	30.8	20.4	12.2	13.0
Sweden	7.7	4.7	6.0	6.2	8.5	5.0	6.2	5.9	6.9	4.3	5.7	6.6
Switzerland	3.3	2.7	4.4	3.4	2.9	2.3	3.9	2.8	3.9	3.1	5.1	4.0
Turkey	7.5	6.5	10.3	11.0	7.6	6.6	10.3	10.7	7.3	6.3	10.3	11.6
Ukraine	5.6	11.6	7.2	6.4	6.3	11.6	7.5	6.6	4.9	11.6	6.8	6.1
United Kingdom	8.6	5.4	4.6	5.3	10.1	6.0	5.0	5.7	6.8	4.7	4.2	4.7
Latin America and the Caribbean												
Argentina	18.8	15.0	10.6	...	16.5	14.1	9.2	...	22.3	16.4	12.4	...
Aruba ⁹	5.7	5.0	6.5	...
Bahamas ¹	11.1	6.9	10.2	...	10.3	6.7	9.2	...	12.0	7.0	11.2	...
Barbados	19.7	9.4	9.1	8.1	16.5	7.5	7.3	6.8	22.9	11.5	10.9	9.4
Belize ¹	12.5	9.1	11.0	8.2
Bolivia	3.6	7.5	8.1	...	3.3	6.2	6.8	...	4.0	9.0	9.9	...
Brazil ¹	6.1	9.4	9.3	...	5.3	7.5	7.1	...	7.3	11.9	12.2	...
Chile	4.7	8.3	6.9	7.5	4.4	8.0	6.1	6.7	5.3	9.0	8.5	8.7
Colombia ¹	...	14.6	11.6	11.4	...	11.5	8.8	8.9	...	19.1	15.7	15.1
Costa Rica	5.2	5.2	6.6	4.9	4.6	4.4	5.0	4.2	6.5	6.9	9.6	6.2
Cuba	8.3	5.4	1.9	1.6	5.4	3.8	1.8	1.3	13.0	8.3	2.2	2.0
Dominican Republic ²	16.7	13.9	17.9	14.2	10.6	7.9	11.0	8.5	28.4	23.8	28.8	22.8
Ecuador	6.9	9.0	7.9	7.3	5.5	6.2	5.8	5.6	8.8	13.1	10.8	9.6
El Salvador	7.7	7.0	7.2	...	8.7	9.1	8.9	...	5.9	3.6	4.8	...
French Guiana	23.0	25.8	26.5	21.2	23.8	32.2	29.7	...
Guatemala ³	...	1.4	1.8	1.4	1.5	1.5	2.4	...
Honduras ¹	3.2	3.9	4.1	...	3.1	3.7	3.1	...	3.4	4.3	6.1	...
Jamaica	16.2	15.5	10.9	10.3	10.8	10.2	7.4	7.4	22.5	22.3	15.3	13.8
Mexico	6.9	2.6	3.5	3.5	6.0	2.2	3.4	3.3	8.6	3.3	3.6	3.9
Netherlands Antilles	13.1	14.2	18.2	10.3	9.9	12.0	17.1	8.1	17.0	16.2	19.2	12.4
Nicaragua	5.6	5.4	5.9	...
Panama	14.0	13.5	10.3	5.8	10.8	11.1	8.1	4.6	20.1	...	14.0	7.8
Paraguay ^{5,9}	5.4	7.6	5.6	5.7	4.5	6.8	4.3	4.6	6.8	8.9	7.5	7.4
Peru ⁸	7.1	7.7	7.5	6.8	6.0	7.5	7.1	5.4	8.7	7.8	8.1	8.3
Puerto Rico	13.7	10.1	11.3	11.5	15.6	11.8	12.2	12.9	10.8	7.7	10.2	9.9
Saint Lucia ⁶	16.3	16.4	21.0	...	11.7	12.6	17.5	...	21.7	20.7	25.0	...
Suriname ⁴	8.4	14.0	7.0	10.0	10.9	20.0
Trinidad and Tobago	17.2	12.2	8.0	4.6	15.1	10.2	5.8	3.5	20.6	15.2	11.0	6.2
Uruguay	10.3	13.6	12.2	...	8.0	10.9	9.5	...	13.3	17.0	15.3	...
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	10.3	13.2	11.4	6.9	9.1	12.5	10.3	6.5	12.9	14.4	13.0	7.4
Virgin Islands (US)	5.7
North America												
Canada	9.5	6.8	6.8	6.1	9.8	6.9	7.0	6.6	9.1	6.7	6.5	5.7
United States	5.6	4.0	5.1	5.8	5.6	3.9	5.1	6.1	5.6	4.1	5.1	5.4
Oceania												
Australia	8.4	6.4	5.0	4.2	8.7	6.5	4.9	3.9	7.9	6.2	5.2	4.6
Fiji	4.6	4.1	5.9	...
New Zealand	6.3	6.1	3.8	4.2	6.2	6.3	3.5	4.1	6.3	6.0	4.1	4.2
Papua New Guinea	...	2.8	4.3	1.3
Tonga ^{2,7}	13.3	...	5.2	3.6	7.4	...

SOURCE

ILO, LABORSTA, table 3A: Unemployment, general level (thousands).

NOTES

... = Not available.

¹ For 2000, data 2001.

² For 1995, data 1996.

³ For 2005, data 2006.

⁴ For 2000, data 1999.

⁵ For 1995, data 1997.

⁶ For 2005, data 2004.

⁷ For 2005, data 2003.

⁸ For 2000, data 2002.

⁹ For 2005, data 2007.

DEFINITIONS

Unemployment is defined as follows in the *Resolution concerning statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment*, adopted by the Thirteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians (Geneva, 1982):

(1) The "unemployed" comprise all persons above a specified age who during the reference period were:

(a) "without work", i.e. were not in paid employment or self-employment;

(b) "currently available for work", i.e. were available for paid employment or self-employment during the reference period; and

(c) "seeking work", i.e. had taken specific steps in a specified reference period to seek paid employment or self-employment. The specific steps may include registration at a public or private employment exchange; application to employers; checking at worksites, farms, factory gates, market or other assembly places; placing or answering newspaper advertisements; seeking assistance of friends or relatives; looking for land, building, machinery or equipment to establish own enterprise; arranging for financial resources; applying for permits and licences, etc.

(2) In situations where the conventional means of seeking work are of limited relevance, where the labour market is largely unorganized or of limited scope, where labour absorption is, at the time, inadequate, or where the labour force is largely self-employed, the standard definition of unemployment given in subparagraph (1) above may be applied by relaxing the criterion of seeking work.

(3) In the application of the criterion of current availability for work, especially in situations covered by subparagraph (2) above, appropriate tests should be developed to suit national circumstances. Such tests may be based on notions such as present desire for work and previous work experience, willingness to take up work for wage or salary on locally prevailing terms, or readiness to undertake self-employment activity given the necessary resources and facilities.

(4) Notwithstanding the criterion of seeking work embodied in the standard definition of unemployment, persons without work and currently available for work who had made arrangements to take up paid employment or undertake self-employment activity at a date subsequent to the reference period should be considered as unemployed.

(5) Persons temporarily absent from their jobs with no formal job attachment who were currently available for work and seeking work should also be regarded as unemployed in accordance with the standard definition of unemployment. Countries may, however, depending on national circumstances and policies, prefer to relax the seeking work criterion in the case of persons temporarily laid off. In such cases, persons temporarily laid off who were not seeking work but classified as unemployed should be identified as a separate subcategory.

(6) Students, homemakers and others mainly engaged in non-economic activities during the reference period who satisfy the criteria laid down in subparagraphs (1) and (2) above should be regarded as unemployed on the same basis as other categories of unemployed identified separately, where possible.

National definitions of unemployment may differ from the recommended international standard definition. The national definitions used vary from one country to another as regards inter alia age limits, reference periods, criteria for seeking work and treatment of persons temporarily laid off and of persons seeking work for the first time. For further information, see Definition of unemployment on the ILO STATISTICS web site (<http://laborsta.ilo.org/applv8/data/c3e.html>); and ICLS, 1982: *Resolution concerning statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment, adopted by the Thirteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians* (http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---integration/---stat/documents/normativeinstrument/wcms_087481.pdf).

Economic and poverty indicators

Table 11. Poverty and income distribution

Major area, region or country	Year	People living on less than		Year	Gini index	Source
		1.25 USD PPP a day	2 USD PPP a day			
Africa						
Algeria	1995	6.8	23.6	1995	35.3	WDI
Angola	2000	54.3	70.2	2000	58.6	KILM
Benin	2003	47.3	75.3	2003	36.5	WDI
Botswana	1994	31.2	49.4	1993	61.0	KILM
Burkina Faso	2003	56.5	81.2	2003	39.5	WDI
Burundi	2006	81.3	93.4	2006	33.3	KILM
Cameroon	2001	32.8	57.7	2001	44.6	WDI
Cape Verde	2001	20.6	40.2	2001	50.5	KILM
Central African Republic	2003	62.4	81.9	2003	43.6	KILM
Chad	2003	61.9	83.3	2003	39.8	KILM
Comoros	2004	46.1	65.0	2004	64.3	KILM
Congo	2005	54.1	74.4	2005	47.3	KILM
Congo, Democratic Republic of	2006	59.2	79.5	2005	44.4	KILM
Côte d'Ivoire	2002	23.3	46.8	2002	44.6	WDI
Djibouti	2002	18.8	41.2	2002	40.0	KILM
Egypt	2005	2.0	18.4	2004	32.1	KILM
Ethiopia	2004	39.0	77.5	2005	29.8	KILM
Gabon	2005	4.8	19.6	2005	41.5	KILM
Gambia	2003	34.3	56.7	2003	47.3	KILM
Ghana	2006	30.0	53.6	2005	42.8	KILM
Guinea	2003	70.1	87.2	2003	38.6	WDI
Guinea-Bissau	2002	48.8	77.9	2002	35.5	KILM
Kenya	2005	19.7	39.9	2005	47.7	KILM
Lesotho	2003	43.4	62.2	2003	52.5	KILM
Liberia	2007	83.7	94.8	2007	52.6	KILM
Madagascar	2005	67.8	89.6	2005	47.2	KILM
Malawi	2004	73.9	90.4	2004	39.0	WDI
Mali	2006	51.4	77.1	2006	39.0	KILM
Mauritania	2000	21.2	44.1	2000	39.0	WDI
Morocco	2007	2.5	14.0	2007	40.9	KILM
Mozambique	2003	74.7	90.0	2003	47.1	KILM
Namibia	1993	49.1	62.2	1993	74.3	KILM
Niger	2005	65.9	85.6	2005	43.9	KILM
Nigeria	2004	64.4	83.9	2004	42.9	KILM
Rwanda	2000	76.6	90.3	2000	46.8	WDI
Senegal	2005	33.5	60.3	2005	39.2	KILM
Sierra Leone	2003	53.4	76.1	2003	42.5	KILM
South Africa	2000	26.2	42.9	2000	57.8	WDI
Swaziland	2001	62.9	81.0	2001	50.7	KILM
Tanzania, United Republic of	2000	88.5	96.6	2000	34.6	WDI
Togo	2006	38.7	69.3	2006	34.4	KILM
Tunisia	2000	2.6	12.8	2000	39.8	WDI
Uganda	2005	51.5	75.6	2005	42.6	KILM
Zambia	2004	64.3	81.5	2004	50.8	WDI
Asia						
Armenia	2003	10.6	43.4	2003	33.8	WDI
Azerbaijan	2005	2.0	2.0	2005	16.8	KILM

Major area, region or country	Year	People living on less than		Year	Gini index	Source
		1.25 USD PPP a day	2 USD PPP a day			
Bangladesh	2005	49.6	81.3	2005	33.2	KILM
Bhutan	2003	26.2	49.5	2003	46.8	KILM
Cambodia	2004	40.2	68.2	2004	41.7	WDI
China	2005	15.9	36.3	2005	35.4	KILM
Georgia	2005	13.4	30.4	2005	40.8	KILM
India	2005	41.6	75.6	2005	32.5	KILM
Indonesia	2005	21.4	53.8	2005	34.5	KILM
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	2005	2.0	8.0	2005	38.3	KILM
Israel	2001	39.2	WDI
Japan ^{2b}	...	2.0	2.0	2005	32.1	OECD
Jordan	2006	2.0	3.5	2006	37.7	KILM
Kazakhstan	2003	3.1	17.2	2003	33.9	WDI
Korea, Rep. of ^{2b}	1998	2.0	2.0	2005	31.2	OECD
Kyrgyzstan	2004	21.8	51.9	2004	32.9	KILM
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	2002	44.0	76.8	2002	34.6	WDI
Malaysia	2004	2.0	7.8	2004	37.9	KILM
Mongolia	2005	22.4	49.0	2005	33.0	KILM
Nepal	2004	55.1	77.6	2004	47.2	WDI
Pakistan	2005	22.6	60.3	2005	31.2	KILM
Philippines	2006	22.6	45.0	2006	44.0	KILM
Singapore	1998	2.0	2.0	1998	42.5	WDI
Sri Lanka	2000	14.0	39.7	2002	40.2	WDI
Tajikistan	2004	21.5	50.8	2004	33.6	KILM
Thailand	2005	2.0	11.5	2004	42.5	KILM
Timor-Leste	2001	52.9	77.5	2001	39.5	KILM
Turkmenistan	1998	24.8	49.6	1998	40.8	WDI
Uzbekistan	2003	46.3	76.7	2003	36.8	WDI
Viet Nam	2006	21.5	48.4	2006	37.8	KILM
Yemen	2005	17.5	46.6	2005	37.7	KILM
Europe						
Albania	2005	2.0	7.8	2005	33.0	KILM
Austria ^a	2008	26.0	Eurostat
Belarus ¹	2005	2.0	2.0	2005	27.9	KILM
Belgium ^a	2008	28.0	Eurostat
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2004	2.0	2.0	2004	35.8	KILM
Bulgaria ^a	2003	2.0	2.4	2003	36.0	WDI
Croatia	2005	2.0	2.0	2005	29.0	KILM
Cyprus	2008	28.0	Eurostat
Czech Republic ^{1a}	1996	2.0	2.0	2008	25.0	Eurostat
Denmark ^a	2008	25.0	Eurostat
Estonia ^a	2004	2.0	2.0	2008	31.0	Eurostat
Finland ^a	2008	26.0	Eurostat
France ^a	2008	28.0	Eurostat
Germany ^a	2008	30.0	Eurostat
Greece ^a	2008	33.0	Eurostat
Hungary ^a	2004	2.0	2.0	2008	25.0	Eurostat
Iceland ^a	2008	27.0	Eurostat
Ireland ^a	2008	30.0	Eurostat
Italy ^a	2008	31.0	Eurostat

Major area, region or country	Year	People living on less than		Year	Gini index	Source
		1.25 USD PPP a day	2 USD PPP a day			
Latvia ^{1a}	2004	2.0	2.0	2008	38.0	Eurostat
Lithuania ^{1a}	2004	2.0	2.0	2008	34.0	Eurostat
Luxembourg ^a	2008	28.0	Eurostat
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	2003	2.0	3.2	2003	39.0	KILM
Malta ^a	2008	27.0	Eurostat
Moldova, Republic of	2004	8.1	28.9	2004	35.6	KILM
Netherlands ^a	2008	28.0	Eurostat
Norway ^a	2008	25.0	Eurostat
Poland ^{1a}	2005	2.0	2.0	2008	32.0	Eurostat
Portugal	2008	36.0	Eurostat
Romania ^a	2005	2.0	3.4	2008	36.0	Eurostat
Russian Federation	2005	2.0	2.0	2005	37.5	KILM
Serbia	2003	2003	30.0	WDI
Slovakia ^{1a}	1996	2.0	2.0	2008	24.0	Eurostat
Slovenia ^{1a}	2004	2.0	2.0	2008	23.0	Eurostat
Spain ^a	2008	31.0	Eurostat
Sweden ^a	2008	24.0	Eurostat
Switzerland	2000	33.7	WDI
Turkey	2005	2.7	9.0	2005	43.2	KILM
Ukraine ¹	2005	2.0	2.0	2005	28.2	KILM
United Kingdom ^a	2008	34.0	Eurostat
Latin America and the Caribbean						
Argentina	2005	4.5	11.3	2006	48.8	KILM
Bolivia	2005	19.6	30.3	2005	58.2	KILM
Brazil	2007	5.2	12.7	2007	55.0	KILM
Chile	2006	2.0	2.4	2006	52.0	KILM
Colombia	2006	16.0	27.9	2006	58.5	KILM
Costa Rica	2005	2.4	8.6	2005	47.2	KILM
Dominican Republic	2005	5.0	15.1	2006	51.9	KILM
Ecuador	2007	4.7	12.8	2007	54.4	KILM
El Salvador	2005	11.0	20.5	2005	49.7	KILM
Guatemala	2006	11.7	24.3	2006	53.7	KILM
Guyana	1998	7.7	16.8	1999	43.2	WDI
Haiti	2001	54.9	72.1	2001	59.2	WDI
Honduras	2006	18.2	29.7	2006	55.3	KILM
Jamaica	2004	2.0	5.8	2004	45.5	WDI
Mexico	2006	2.0	4.8	2006	48.1	KILM
Nicaragua	2005	15.8	31.8	2005	52.3	KILM
Panama	2006	9.5	17.8	2006	54.9	KILM
Paraguay	2007	6.5	14.2	2007	53.2	KILM
Peru	2006	7.9	18.5	2006	49.6	KILM
Saint Lucia	1995	20.9	40.6	1995	42.6	WDI
Suriname	1999	15.5	27.2	1999	52.9	KILM
Trinidad and Tobago	1992	4.2	13.5	1992	40.3	KILM
Uruguay	2006	2.0	4.2	2006	46.2	KILM
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	2006	3.5	10.2	2006	43.4	KILM
North America						
Canada ^{2b}	2005	31.7	OECD
United States ^{2b}	2005	38.1	OECD

Major area, region or country	Year	People living on less than		Year	Gini index	Source
		1.25 USD PPP a day	2 USD PPP a day			
Oceania						
Australia ^{2b}	2005	30.1	OECD
New Zealand ^{2b}	2005	33.5	OECD
Papua New Guinea	1996	35.8	57.4	1996	50.9	KILM

SOURCES

People living on less than 1.25 USD PPP a day and 2 USD PPP a day: World Bank. 2009a. *World Development Indicators* (Washington, DC).

Gini index:

Eurostat: Living conditions and social protection statistics (http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/living_conditions_and_social_protection/data/database).

OECD. 2009j. *Income distribution – Inequality database* (<http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DatasetCode=INEQUALITY>).

ILO. 2009h. *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)* (Geneva), on KILMnet (September 2009), table 20: Poverty, working poverty and income distribution (<http://kilm.ilo.org/KILMnetBeta/default2.asp>).

World Bank. 2009a. *World Development Indicators (WDI)* (Washington, DC).

NOTES

... = Not available.

¹ Actual values are less than 2.0% and should be treated with caution.

² Gini coefficient: mid-2000s. Gini coefficient after taxes and transfers.

a) Eurostat metadata: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/en/hbs_esms.htm.

b) OECD: See more details in *Growing unequal? Income distribution and poverty in OECD countries* (Paris, OECD, 2009b), annex 1, A1, and in figure 1.1: Gini coefficients of income inequality in OECD countries, mid-2000s (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/420515624534>).

Table 12. Levels of vulnerability

		Non-wage workers as a percentage of total employment			
		Very low proportion Less than 20 per cent		Low proportion 20–40 per cent	
Level of poverty Proportion of the population living on less than \$2 PPP per day	Very low level of poverty Less than 2 per cent of the population	Very low vulnerability			
		Australia	Lithuania	Belarus	New Zealand
		Austria	Luxembourg	Croatia	Poland
		Bahamas	Malta	Italy	Portugal
		Belgium	Montenegro	Korea, Republic of	Serbia
Canada	Netherlands	Macedonia,			
Cyprus	Norway	The former Yugoslav Rep. of			
Czech Republic	Russian Federation				
Denmark	Singapore				
Estonia	Slovakia				
Finland	Slovenia				
France	Spain				
Germany	Sweden				
Hungary	Switzerland				
Iceland	Ukraine				
Ireland	United Kingdom				
Japan	United States				
Latvia					
		Low vulnerability			
	Low level of poverty 2.1 to 25 per cent	Bulgaria	Albania	Malaysia	
		Jordan	Argentina	Mexico	
			Brazil	Panama	
			Chile	Peru	
			Costa Rica	Romania	
			Egypt	Trinidad and Tobago	
			El Salvador	Tunisia	
			Kazakhstan	Uruguay	
		Medium vulnerability			
	Medium level of poverty 25.1 to 50 per cent	South Africa	Botswana	Moldova, Republic of	
		Suriname	China	Saint Lucia	
			Djibouti	Turkmenistan	
		High vulnerability			
	High level of poverty 50.1 to 75 per cent		Namibia		
			Tajikistan		
		Very high vulnerability			
	Very high level of poverty More than 75 per cent		Central African Republic		
			Swaziland		
			Uzbekistan		

Sources: People living on less than US\$2 PPP per day: *World Development Indicators* (Washington, DC, World Bank, 2009a); Non-wage workers as a percentage of total employment from ILO, LABORSTA, table 2+A7D: Total employment, by status in employment (thousands); *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)* (ILO, 2009h), on KILMnet (September 2009), table 3: Status in employment (by sex).

Non-wage workers as a percentage of total employment			
High proportion 40–75 per cent		Very high proportion More than 75 per cent	
Low vulnerability			
Azerbaijan			
Medium vulnerability			
Algeria	Jamaica		
Dominican Republic	Morocco		
Ecuador	Paraguay		
Gabon	Thailand		
Guatemala	Turkey		
Guyana	Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of		
Iran, Islamic Rep. of			
High vulnerability			
Armenia	Mauritania	Côte d'Ivoire	
Bhutan	Mongolia	Kenya	
Bolivia	Nicaragua		
Cape Verde	Philippines		
Colombia	Sri Lanka		
Georgia	Viet Nam		
Honduras	Yemen		
Very high vulnerability			
Indonesia	Lesotho	Cambodia	Haiti
Kyrgyzstan	Pakistan	Cameroon	Papua New Guinea
		Congo	Senegal
		Gambia	Togo
		Ghana	
Very high vulnerability			
Ethiopia	Bangladesh	Mali	
India	Benin	Mozambique	
	Burkina Faso	Nepal	
	Burundi	Niger	
	Chad	Nigeria	
	Congo, Democratic Rep. of	Rwanda	
	Guinea	Sierra Leone	
	Guinea-Bissau	Tanzania, United Rep. of	
	Lao People's Dem. Rep.	Uganda	
	Madagascar	Zambia	
	Malawi		

Table 13. GDP and Human Development Index (HDI), various years 1997–2008

Major area, region or country	Gross Domestic Product per capita								Human Development Index					
	\$ Current				\$ PPP				General			Gender-related		
	1997	2000	2005	2008	1997	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2007	2005	2007	
Africa														
Algeria	1 649	1 796	3 115	5 060	4 840	5 385	7 176	8 032	0.713	0.746	0.754	0.720	0.742	
Angola	581	639	1 843	4 627	2 062	2 273	3 611	5 898	...	0.541	0.564	0.439	...	
Benin	354	339	545	771	1 020	1 131	1 309	1 467	0.447	0.481	0.492	0.422	0.477	
Botswana	3 163	3 573	5 726	6 808	6 917	8 813	12 087	13 391	0.632	0.673	0.694	0.639	0.689	
Burkina Faso	225	220	390	523	704	793	1 026	1 161	0.319	0.367	0.389	0.364	0.383	
Burundi	155	110	108	144	295	308	340	383	0.358	0.375	0.394	0.409	0.390	
Cameroon	666	635	932	1 238	1 453	1 620	1 958	2 215	0.513	0.520	0.523	0.524	0.515	
Cape Verde	1 220	1 211	2 108	3 468	1 725	2 126	2 694	3 504	0.674	0.692	0.708	0.723	0.701	
Central African Rep.	277	248	322	445	595	649	644	736	0.378	0.364	0.369	0.368	0.354	
Chad	202	164	579	755	781	777	1 468	1 455	0.350	0.394	0.392	0.370	0.380	
Comoros	418	374	645	824	939	967	1 127	1 169	0.540	0.570	0.576	0.554	0.571	
Congo	806	1 061	1 782	2 959	2 607	2 820	3 496	3 945	0.536	0.600	0.601	0.540	0.594	
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	128	85	123	180	263	227	273	321	0.353	0.370	0.389	0.398	0.370	
Côte d'Ivoire	736	603	850	1 137	1 552	1 537	1 560	1 651	0.481	0.480	0.484	0.413	0.468	
Djibouti	758	755	881	1 031	1 592	1 558	1 849	2 140	...	0.513	0.520	0.507	0.514	
Egypt	1 183	1 423	1 162	1 997	3 066	3 532	4 318	5 416	0.665	0.696	0.703	
Equatorial Guinea	1 032	2 371	13 497	28 102	4 040	7 558	24 769	33 872	0.655	0.715	0.719	0.631	0.700	
Eritrea	205	172	257	331	717	603	630	632	0.431	0.466	0.472	0.469	0.459	
Ethiopia	147	125	165	328	449	467	633	868	0.332	0.391	0.414	0.393	0.403	
Gabon	4 649	4 109	6 329	9 967	13 043	11 742	13 028	14 526	0.735	0.747	0.755	0.670	0.748	
Gambia	350	323	302	471	880	963	1 142	1 362	...	0.450	0.456	0.496	0.452	
Ghana	379	255	489	690	839	926	1 192	1 452	0.495	0.512	0.526	0.549	0.524	
Guinea	480	371	354	434	794	876	1 055	1 203	...	0.426	0.435	0.446	0.425	
Guinea-Bissau	220	165	205	273	693	566	497	538	0.370	0.386	0.396	0.355	0.381	
Kenya	454	406	527	895	1 104	1 138	1 349	1 589	0.522	0.530	0.541	0.521	0.538	
Lesotho	511	415	695	804	974	1 026	1 265	1 587	0.533	0.508	0.514	0.541	0.509	
Liberia	133	199	159	229	257	426	323	388	0.419	0.427	0.442	...	0.430	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	6 103	6 453	7 053	15 920	...	10 502	12 559	15 402	0.821	0.837	0.847	0.797	0.830	
Madagascar	254	254	286	469	737	804	882	1 048	0.501	0.532	0.543	0.530	0.541	
Malawi	251	150	216	299	599	623	648	837	0.478	0.476	0.493	0.432	0.490	
Mali	269	242	457	688	673	758	1 003	1 127	0.316	0.361	0.371	0.371	0.353	
Mauritania ¹	596	421	620	893	1 315	1 412	1 684	1 927	0.495	0.511	0.520	0.543	0.516	
Mauritius	3 818	3 766	5 059	6 818	6 378	7 547	9 975	12 079	0.770	0.797	0.804	0.796	0.797	
Morocco	1 225	1 301	1 975	2 764	2 387	2 637	3 588	4 388	0.583	0.640	0.654	0.621	0.625	
Mozambique	222	234	320	447	381	448	677	855	0.350	0.390	0.402	0.373	0.395	
Namibia	2 075	2 080	3 595	4 050	3 712	4 006	5 360	6 342	0.661	0.672	0.686	0.645	0.683	
Niger	185	162	251	365	494	502	584	684	0.258	0.330	0.340	0.355	0.308	
Nigeria	315	369	794	1 401	1 226	1 288	1 730	2 081	0.466	0.499	0.511	0.456	0.499	
Rwanda	301	218	265	458	567	582	793	1 021	0.402	0.449	0.460	0.450	0.459	
Sao Tome and Principe	746	1 084	1 416	1 738	...	0.639	0.651	0.637	0.643	
Senegal	511	474	770	1 081	1 151	1 295	1 614	1 771	0.436	0.460	0.464	0.492	0.457	
Seychelles	7 281	7 579	10 661	9 648	14 036	16 141	17 352	21 529	0.841	0.838	0.845	
Sierra Leone	212	150	238	351	383	360	640	766	...	0.350	0.365	0.320	0.354	
South Africa	3 636	3 020	5 178	5 684	6 349	6 633	8 503	10 108	0.688	0.678	0.683	0.667	0.680	
Sudan	360	354	708	1 413	1 031	1 172	1 600	2 153	0.491	0.515	0.531	0.502	0.516	

Major area, region or country	Gross Domestic Product per capita								Human Development Index				
	\$ Current				\$ PPP				General			Gender-related	
	1997	2000	2005	2008	1997	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2007	2005	2007
Swaziland	1 690	1 380	2 245	2 241	3 089	3 567	4 334	4 928	0.598	0.567	0.572	0.529	0.568
Tanzania, United Rep. of	243	266	363	482	692	758	1 034	1 262	0.458	0.510	0.530	0.464	0.527
Togo	316	253	352	437	746	701	772	829	...	0.495	0.499	0.494	...
Tunisia	2 051	2 033	2 888	3 890	4 099	4 817	6 444	7 996	0.678	0.758	0.769	0.750	0.752
Uganda	281	253	321	459	606	694	901	1 164	0.460	0.494	0.514	0.501	0.509
Zambia	405	309	610	1 134	882	886	1 126	1 355	0.431	0.466	0.481	0.425	0.473
Zimbabwe ²	697	594	274	274	0.505	...
Asia													
Afghanistan	0.347	0.352	...	0.310
Armenia	523	621	1 599	3 872	1 618	2 029	4 097	6 070	0.738	0.777	0.798	0.772	0.794
Azerbaijan	506	655	1 578	5 330	1 644	2 203	4 496	8 765	...	0.755	0.787	0.743	0.779
Bahrain ³	10 451	12 261	18 571	21 421	18 281	20 608	28 069	28 069	0.864	0.888	0.895	0.857	0.895
Bangladesh	318	335	394	494	681	790	1 069	1 334	0.493	0.527	0.543	0.539	0.536
Bhutan	662	762	1 187	1 978	2 025	2 377	3 363	4 755	...	0.602	0.619	...	0.605
Brunei Darussalam ⁴	16 751	17 996	25 497	30 32	40 928	42 066	46 991	50 199	0.905	0.917	0.920	0.886	0.906
Cambodia	308	293	463	651	710	892	1 443	1 904	0.515	0.575	0.593	0.594	0.588
China	774	949	1 715	3 263	1 836	2 357	4 076	5 961	0.719	0.756	0.772	0.776	0.770
Georgia	718	648	1 433	2 931	1 768	2 072	3 520	4 896	0.739	0.765	0.778
Hong Kong, China	27 170	25 375	26 092	30 863	24 823	26 354	35 677	43 923	...	0.939	0.944	0.926	0.934
India	426	453	740	1 068	1 286	1 520	2 233	2 972	0.556	0.596	0.612	0.600	0.594
Indonesia	1 089	80	1 296	2 253	2 595	2 401	3 197	3 974	0.673	0.723	0.734	0.721	0.726
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	1 732	1 584	2 779	5 352	6 181	6 784	9 314	11 665	0.738	0.773	0.782	0.750	0.770
Iraq ⁶	751
Israel	18 480	19 666	19 220	27 298	17 836	23 302	23 206	27 547	0.908	0.929	0.935	0.927	0.921
Japan	33 774	36 789	35 627	38 442	24 276	25 587	30 310	34 098	0.943	0.956	0.960	0.942	0.945
Jordan	1 625	1 764	2 330	3 388	2 971	3 213	4 342	5 282	0.691	0.764	0.770	0.760	0.743
Kazakhstan	1 446	1 229	3 771	8 435	4 004	4 783	8 699	11 314	0.747	0.794	0.804	0.792	0.803
Korea, Rep. of	11 235	11 347	17 551	19 114	14 591	17 137	22 783	27 939	0.869	0.927	0.937	0.910	0.926
Kuwait ⁷	15 329	17 223	31 867	42 102	29 438	29 732	43 560	46 574	0.874	0.915	0.916	0.884	0.892
Kyrgyzstan	374	279	478	837	1 181	1 328	1 727	2 188	0.687	0.702	0.710	0.692	0.705
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	346	321	470	837	1 020	1 180	1 671	2 134	0.566	0.607	0.619	0.593	0.614
Lebanon	4 295	4 459	5 375	6 923	7 092	7 369	9 560	11 569	...	0.800	0.803	0.759	0.784
Macau, China ⁸	15 398	13 839	2 360	36 249	20 127	19 941	35 878	59 430	0.895	0.935	0.942
Malaysia	4 623	4 030	5 378	7 221	8 700	9 087	11 745	14 215	0.797	0.821	0.829	0.802	0.823
Maldives	1 965	2 287	2 539	4 059	2 298	2 816	3 995	5 503	0.730	0.755	0.771	0.744	0.767
Mongolia	452	454	903	1 997	1 640	1 795	2 608	3 566	0.676	0.713	0.727	0.695	0.727
Myanmar ⁹	882	...	0.583	0.586
Nepal	216	225	30	441	717	801	960	1 112	0.500	0.537	0.553	0.520	0.545
Oman ⁴	6 965	8 271	11 813	13 381	14 001	15 008	19 544	21 195	...	0.836	0.846	0.788	0.826
Pakistan	486	536	703	1 013	1 581	1 708	2 184	2 644	...	0.555	0.572	0.525	0.532
Philippines	1 127	977	1 156	1 847	2 132	2 288	2 926	3 509	0.726	0.744	0.751	0.768	0.748
Qatar ³	20 494	28 793	47 957	52 690	...	55 001	63 587	63 587	0.870	0.903	0.910	0.863	0.891
Saudi Arabia	8 485	9 121	13 650	18 972	16 524	17 445	21 219	23 920	...	0.837	0.843	0.783	0.816
Singapore	25 255	23 019	28 352	37 597	28 839	33 146	43 755	49 283	0.944
Sri Lanka	821	873	1 241	2 019	2 278	2 714	3 545	4 560	0.729	0.752	0.759	0.735	0.756
Syrian Arab Rep.	946	1 170	1 475	2 600	3 213	3 296	3 954	4 439	0.715	0.733	0.742	0.710	0.715
Tajikistan	155	139	354	751	744	887	1 480	1 905	0.641	0.677	0.688	0.669	0.686
Thailand	2 473	1 968	2 544	3 868	4 667	4 687	6 423	7 702	0.753	0.777	0.783	0.779	0.782

Major area, region or country	Gross Domestic Product per capita								Human Development Index				
	\$ Current				\$ PPP				General			Gender-related	
	1997	2000	2005	2008	1997	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2007	2005	2007
Timor-Leste	...	388	335	453	...	773	713	801	...	0.488	0.489
Turkmenistan	565	645	1 676	3 633	1 381	2 054	4 677	6 640	0.739
United Arab Emirates ¹⁰	18 730	21 739	32 405	38 436	39 251	39 387	48 810	53 211	0.848	0.896	0.903	0.855	0.878
Uzbekistan	623	558	547	1 022	1 271	1 444	2 000	2 656	0.687	0.703	0.710	0.699	0.708
Viet Nam	356	402	635	1 052	1 172	1 413	2 142	2 784	0.690	0.715	0.725	0.732	0.723
West Bank and Gaza Strip ²	1 408	1 412	1 160	1 160	0.736	0.737
Yemen	417	519	794	1 152	1 667	1 826	2 188	2 400	0.522	0.562	0.575	0.472	0.538
Europe													
Albania	711	1 202	2 693	3 911	3 028	4 252	6 162	7 715	0.784	0.811	0.818	0.797	0.814
Andorra	0.934
Austria	26 188	24 195	37 057	49 899	25 143	29 132	33 615	38 151	0.940	0.949	0.955	0.934	0.930
Belarus	1 397	1 273	3 090	6 228	4 090	5 140	8 540	12 260	0.786	0.812	0.826	0.803	0.824
Belgium	24 498	22 623	35 838	46 486	23 837	27 524	32 033	34 493	0.945	0.947	0.953	0.940	0.948
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 091	1 491	2 847	4 890	3 472	4 433	6 233	8 389	...	0.803	0.812
Bulgaria	1 247	1 563	3 513	6 545	5 015	6 153	9 229	12 392	0.803	0.829	0.840	0.823	0.839
Channel Islands ⁸	...	43 893	59 394	77 172
Croatia	5 167	4 823	1 003	15 635	9 650	10 821	15 200	19 083	0.837	0.862	0.871	0.848	0.869
Cyprus ⁵	11 813	11 848	20 322	24 895	14 507	17 134	22 116	24 788	0.897	0.908	0.914	0.899	0.911
Czech Rep.	5 545	5 521	12 168	20 760	13 836	14 973	20 362	24 712	0.868	0.894	0.903	0.887	0.900
Denmark	32 254	29 993	47 665	62 332	25 277	28 792	33 276	36 607	0.936	0.950	0.955	0.944	0.947
Estonia	3 596	4 106	10 244	17 222	7 970	9 777	16 413	20 662	0.835	0.872	0.883	0.858	0.882
Finland	23 983	23 543	37 297	51 061	21 008	25 651	30 689	35 427	0.938	0.952	0.959	0.947	0.954
France	24 471	22 548	35 263	45 981	22 366	26 027	30 709	34 044	0.941	0.956	0.961	0.950	0.956
Germany	26 326	23 114	33 848	44 470	23 587	25 912	31 397	35 612	...	0.942	0.947	0.931	0.939
Greece	12 609	11 501	22 244	31 748	16 051	18 388	25 049	29 360	0.922	0.936
Greenland ¹¹	22 405
Hungary	4 443	4 690	10 924	15 408	9 767	12 249	16 955	19 329	0.844	0.874	0.879	0.872	0.879
Iceland	27 290	30 951	54 909	52 556	26 005	28 822	34 904	36 775	0.943	0.965	0.969	0.962	0.959
Ireland	22 113	25 329	48 290	63 184	21 716	28 544	38 436	44 199	0.936	0.961	0.965	0.940	0.948
Isle of Man ¹²	16 054	20 416	36 365	42 726
Italy	20 957	19 269	30 310	38 309	22 594	25 561	28 122	30 756	0.927	0.947	0.951	0.936	0.945
Latvia	2 503	3 302	6 973	14 908	6 394	8 031	13 040	17 100	0.810	0.852	0.866	0.853	0.865
Liechtenstein	0.951
Lithuania	2 793	3 267	7 604	14 096	7 223	8 603	14 197	18 823	0.830	0.862	0.870	0.861	0.869
Luxembourg	44 145	46 457	80 293	111 239	40 886	53 582	67 754	78 598	...	0.956	0.960	0.924	0.943
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	1 883	1 785	2 859	4 672	5 069	5 935	7 664	10 040	0.800	0.810	0.817	0.795	0.812
Malta ⁵	8 720	9 981	14 669	18 203	14 029	18 292	20 832	23 079	0.874	0.897	0.902	0.873	0.895
Moldova, Rep. of	452	314	795	1 664	1 294	1 301	2 258	2 925	0.683	0.712	0.720	0.704	0.719
Montenegro	...	1 490	3 614	7 265	...	6 020	8 266	13 950	0.815	0.823	0.834
Netherlands	24 767	24 180	38 785	52 321	24 109	29 365	34 800	40 849	0.950	0.958	0.964	0.951	0.954
Norway	35 926	37 472	65 324	94 353	27 984	36 083	47 305	58 137	0.961	0.968	0.971	0.957	0.961
Poland	4 064	4 455	7 965	13 822	8 793	10 503	13 784	17 625	0.853	0.871	0.880	0.867	0.877
Portugal	11 096	11 016	17 579	22 841	14 449	17 066	20 656	23 073	0.895	0.904	0.909	0.895	0.907
Romania	1 565	1 651	4 572	9 300	5 511	5 654	9 361	14 064	0.788	0.824	0.837	0.812	0.836
Russian Federation	2 749	1 775	5 341	11 338	6 517	7 623	11 861	16 138	...	0.804	0.817	0.801	0.816
San Marino ⁸	46 099	55 681

Major area, region or country	Gross Domestic Product per capita								Human Development Index				
	\$ Current				\$ PPP				General			Gender-related	
	1997	2000	2005	2008	1997	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2007	2005	2007
Serbia	2 573	1 193	3 520	6 810	6 407	6 003	8 840	11 456	0.797	0.817	0.826
Slovakia	3 971	3 771	8 890	17 565	9 745	10 986	16 175	22 080	0.840	0.867	0.880	0.860	0.877
Slovenia	10 207	9 999	17 843	26 779	14 752	17 451	23 460	27 604	0.892	0.918	0.929	0.914	0.927
Spain	14 467	14 422	26 033	35 203	17 706	21 295	27 366	31 954	0.931	0.949	0.955	0.944	0.949
Sweden	28 521	27 689	40 559	52 057	23 423	27 734	32 319	37 383	0.954	0.960	0.963	0.955	0.956
Switzerland	37 328	34 787	5 069	64 014	28 605	31 690	35 774	42 536	0.948	0.957	0.960	0.946	0.946
Turkey	2 994	4 021	6 801	10 745	6 004	8 855	10 977	13 920	0.758	0.796	0.806	0.763	0.788
Ukraine	991	636	1 829	3 898	2 925	3 270	5 583	7 271	0.754	0.783	0.796	0.785	0.793
United Kingdom	22 905	24 637	3 730	43 088	22 049	25 568	32 206	35 444	0.932	0.947	0.947	0.944	0.943
Latin America and the Caribbean													
Antigua and Barbuda	8 102	...	10 481	14 317	11 471	...	15 950	21 323	0.868
Argentina	8 206	7 703	4 728	8 235	9 024	9 106	10 814	14 332	...	0.855	0.866	0.865	0.862
Aruba ¹³	17 969	20 502	...	20 136
Bahamas	13 250	16 507	18 506	20 698	0.852	0.856	0.841	...
Barbados ¹⁴	8 588	10 168	12 087	13 393	19 547	19 547	...	0.890	0.903	0.887	0.900
Belize	2 854	3 330	3 821	4 402	4 080	4 971	6 254	6 940	0.735	0.770	0.772	0.814	...
Bermuda ⁸	47 401	56 459	76 312	91 490
Bolivia	1 014	1 010	1 040	1 721	2 825	3 008	3 757	4 278	0.699	0.723	0.729	0.691	0.728
Brazil	5 228	3 701	4 741	8 399	6 680	7 008	8 505	10 296	0.790	0.805	0.813	0.798	0.810
Cayman Islands ¹¹	29 547
Chile	5 585	4 880	7 257	10 111	8 586	9 268	12 173	14 464	0.849	0.872	0.878	0.859	0.871
Colombia	2 816	2 364	3 371	5 440	5 751	5 691	7 231	8 884	0.772	0.795	0.807	0.789	0.806
Costa Rica	3 510	4 059	4 614	6 591	6 168	7 182	9 004	11 241	0.825	0.844	0.854	0.842	0.848
Cuba	0.839	0.863	0.839	0.844
Dominica	3 412	3 802	4 190	4 978	5 552	6 254	7 262	8 695	...	0.814	0.814
Dominican Rep.	2 359	2 744	3 591	4 654	4 187	5 029	6 242	8 217	0.748	0.765	0.777	0.773	0.775
Ecuador	206	1 295	2 847	3 900	4 921	4 858	6 736	8 008	0.806
El Salvador	1 907	2 209	2 818	3 605	4 065	4 586	5 686	6 794	0.704	0.743	0.747	0.726	0.740
Grenada	3 078	4 079	4 830	6 045	4 644	6 064	7 136	8 540	...	0.812	0.813
Guatemala	1 699	1 718	2 146	2 850	3 175	3 506	4 064	4 760	0.664	0.691	0.704	0.675	0.696
Guyana	988	942	1 039	1 516	1 965	2 062	2 384	2 541	...	0.722	0.729	0.742	0.721
Haiti	396	449	464	711	1 005	1 053	1 067	1 176	0.532
Honduras	801	1 147	1 415	1 943	2 437	2 564	3 298	3 964	0.690	0.725	0.732	0.694	0.721
Jamaica	2 949	3 479	4 208	5 603	5 661	5 780	7 027	7 705	0.750	0.765	0.766	0.732	0.762
Mexico	4 274	5 935	8 216	10 211	7 780	9 189	12 563	14 495	0.825	0.844	0.854	0.820	0.847
Nicaragua	697	771	889	1 161	1 625	1 870	2 310	2 682	0.667	0.691	0.699	0.696	0.686
Panama	3 626	3 939	4 786	6 801	6 369	7 210	9 185	12 504	0.811	0.829	0.840	0.810	0.838
Paraguay	1 768	1 323	1 267	2 565	3 561	3 355	3 900	4 709	0.737	0.754	0.761	0.744	0.759
Peru	2 389	2 049	2 852	4 419	4 730	4 877	6 323	8 507	0.771	0.791	0.806	0.769	0.804
Puerto Rico ¹⁵	12 818	1 604	...	17 692
Saint Kitts and Nevis	6 752	7 441	8 932	10 980	9 846	10 385	12 857	16 160	...	0.831	0.838
Saint Lucia	4 038	4 224	5 355	5 949	6 598	7 208	8 929	9 906	...	0.817	0.821
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	2 715	3 102	4 037	5 441	4 553	5 339	7 047	9 154	...	0.763	0.772
Suriname	2 075	1 910	3 557	5 593	4 354	4 403	6 067	7 505	...	0.759	0.769	0.767	0.763
Trinidad and Tobago	4 469	6 270	11 440	17 864	9 353	11 556	18 886	24 747	0.806	0.825	0.837	0.808	0.833
Uruguay	7 361	6 914	5 252	9 653	7 917	8 194	9 682	12 734	0.837	0.855	0.865	0.849	0.862
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	3 739	4 819	5 475	11 229	8 743	8 462	9 924	12 804	0.802	0.822	0.844	0.787	0.827
Virgin Islands (US) ¹⁶	18 728

Major area, region or country	Gross Domestic Product per capita								Human Development Index					
	\$ Current				\$ PPP				General			Gender-related		
	1997	2000	2005	2008	1997	2000	2005	2008	2000	2005	2007	2005	2007	
North America														
Canada	21 260	23 560	35 118	42 030	24 416	28 372	35 064	36 443	0.948	0.963	0.966	0.956	0.959	
United States	30 261	34 606	41 873	46 715	30 261	34 605	41 873	46 715	0.949	0.955	0.956	0.937	0.942	
Oceania														
Australia	23 063	21 151	33 088	47 497	22 306	25 641	31 701	35 676	0.954	0.967	0.970	0.960	0.966	
Fiji	2 679	2 108	3 589	4 205	3 098	3 442	4 245	4 382	...	0.744	0.741	0.757	0.732	
French Polynesia ¹⁷	15 928	14 601	...	14 601	
Kiribati	575	556	1 148	1 357	1 622	2 017	2 269	2 484	
Marshall Islands	1 809	2 097	2 466	2 654	
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	1 929	2 014	2 109	2 221	2 459	2 565	2 818	2 830	
New Caledonia ¹⁷	16 323	12 580	...	12 580	
New Zealand	16 938	13 193	26 223	30 617	18 468	20 782	24 718	27 029	0.930	0.946	0.950	0.935	0.943	
Palau	6 268	6 266	7 296	8 952	
Papua New Guinea	993	654	811	1 266	1 877	1 737	1 882	2 208	...	0.532	0.541	0.529	...	
Samoa	1 436	1 339	2 432	2 883	2 480	2 865	4 047	4 484	0.742	0.764	0.771	0.776	0.763	
Solomon Islands	1 484	1 047	876	1 275	2 061	2 610	...	0.599	0.610	
Tonga	1 784	1 571	2 115	2 547	2 579	2 952	3 411	3 824	0.759	0.765	0.768	0.814	0.765	
Vanuatu	1 427	1 289	1 717	2 481	3 016	3 096	3 225	3 978	0.663	0.681	0.693	...	0.692	

SOURCESWorld Bank. 2009a. *World Development Indicators* (Washington, DC).UNDP. 2009. Human Development Index, in *Human Development Report 2009* (New York) (<http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/indicators/74.html>).**NOTES**

... = not available.

Data for 2008 except:

¹ GDP per capita \$ PPP, data for 2007² GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2005³ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2006 – GDP per capita \$ PPP, data for 2005⁴ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2006 – GDP per capita \$ PPP, data for 2006⁵ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2007 – GDP per capita \$ PPP, data for 2007⁶ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 1999⁷ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2007 – GDP per capita \$ PPP, data for 2006⁸ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2007⁹ GDP per capita \$ PPP, data for 2004¹⁰ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2006 – GDP per capita \$ PPP, data for 2007¹¹ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 1996¹² GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2006¹³ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2002¹⁴ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2007 – GDP per capita \$ PPP, data for 2005¹⁵ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2001¹⁶ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 1990¹⁷ GDP per capita \$ current, data for 2000

Social security coverage
and expenditure

B

Social security legal provision

Table 14. Ratification of ILO social security Conventions, by region

Countries	Branches									
	Medical care	Sickness	Unemployment	Old age	Employment injury	Family	Maternity	Invalidity	Survivors	
Africa										
Dem. Rep. of Congo	C. 102	C. 102	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1987)	C. 121 (1967)	C. 102 (1987)	C. 102 (1987)	C. 102 (1987)	C. 102 (1987)	
Guinea	C. 130	C. 130	C. 102 (1975)	C. 128 (1975)	C. 121 (1967)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 128 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	
Mali	C. 130 (1975)	C. 130 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 128 (1975)	C. 121 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	
Mauritania				C. 102 (1968)	C. 102 (1968)	C. 102 (1968)	C. 183 (2008)	C. 102 (1968)	C. 102 (1968)	
Niger				C. 102 (1966)	C. 102 (1966)	C. 102 (1966)	C. 102 (1966)	C. 102 (1966)	C. 102 (1966)	
Senegal				C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962)	
				C. 121 (1966)	C. 121 (1966)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962)	
Americas										
Barbados		C. 102 (1972)		C. 102 (1972)	C. 102 (1972)			C. 102 (1972)	C. 102 (1972)	
				C. 128 (1972)				C. 128 (1972)		
Belize							C. 183 (2005)			
Bolivia	C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)		C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	
	C. 130 (1977)	C. 130 (1977)		C. 128 (1977)	C. 121 (1977)		C. 183 (1977)	C. 128 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	
Brazil	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	
			C. 168 (1993)							
Chile					C. 121 (1999)					
Costa Rica	C. 102 (1972)	C. 130 (1972)		C. 102 (1972)	C. 102 (1972)	C. 102 (1972)	C. 102 (1972)	C. 102 (1972)	C. 102 (1972)	
	C. 130 (1972)									
Cuba							C. 183 (2004)			
Ecuador	C. 130 (1978)	C. 102 (1974)		C. 102 (1974)	C. 102 (1974)			C. 102 (1974)	C. 102 (1974)	
		C. 130 (1978)		C. 128 (1978)	C. 121 (1978)			C. 128 (1978)	C. 128 (1978)	
Mexico	C. 102 (1961)	C. 102 (1961)		C. 102 (1961)	C. 102 (1961)			C. 102 (1961)	C. 102 (1961)	
Peru	C. 102 (1961)	C. 102 (1961)		C. 102 (1961)	C. 102 (1961)			C. 102 (1961)	C. 102 (1961)	
Bolivarian Rep. of Venezuela	C. 102 (1982)	C. 102 (1982)		C. 102 (1982)	C. 102 (1982)			C. 102 (1982)	C. 102 (1982)	
	C. 130 (1982)	C. 130 (1982)		C. 128 (1983)	C. 121 (1982)			C. 128 (1983)	C. 128 (1983)	
Middle East										
Israel				C. 102 (1955)	C. 102 (1955)				C. 102 (1955)	
Asia										
Japan		C. 102 (1976)	C. 102 (1976)	C. 102 (1976)	C. 102 (1976)				C. 102 (1976)	
					C. 121 (1974)				C. 121 (1974)	

Countries	Branches									
	Medical care C. 102 C. 130	Sickness C. 102 C. 130	Unemployment C. 102 C. 168	Old age C. 102 C. 128	Employment injury C. 102 C. 121	Family C. 102	Maternity C. 102 C. 183	Invalidity C. 102 C. 128	Survivors C. 102 C. 128	
Europe										
Albania	C. 102 (2006)	C. 102 (2006)	C. 102 (2006) C. 168 (2006)	C. 102 (2006)	C. 102 (2006)		C. 102 (2006) C. 183 (2004)	C. 102 (2006)	C. 102 (2006)	
Austria	C. 102 (1969)		C. 102 (1978)	C. 102 (1969) C. 128 (1969)		C. 102 (1969)	C. 102 (1969) C. 183 (2004)			
Belarus				C. 102 (1959)	C. 102 (1959) C. 121 (1970)	C. 102 (1959)	C. 183 (2004)	C. 102 (1959)	C. 102 (1959)	
Belgium	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993) C. 121 (1993)		C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	
Bosnia and Herzegovina				C. 102 (2008)	C. 102 (2008)	C. 102 (2008)			C. 102 (2008)	
Bulgaria	C. 102 (2008)	C. 102 (2008)					C. 102 (2008) C. 183 (2001)		C. 102 (2008)	
Croatia	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991) C. 121 (1991)		C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	
Cyprus		C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991) C. 121 (1966)		C. 183 (2005)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991) C. 128 (1969)	
Czech Rep.	C. 102 (1993) C. 130 (1993)	C. 102 (1993) C. 130 (1993)	C. 102 (1993) C. 130 (1993)	C. 102 (1993) C. 128 (1993)	C. 102 (1993) C. 121 (1966)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	
Denmark	C. 102 (1955) C. 130 (1978)	C. 130 (1978)	C. 102 (1955)	C. 102 (1955)	C. 102 (1960)			C. 102 (1955)		
Finland	C. 130 (1974)	C. 130 (1974)	C. 168 (1990)	C. 128 (1976)	C. 121 (1968)			C. 128 (1976)	C. 128 (1976)	
France	C. 102 (1974)	C. 102 (1958)	C. 102 (1974)	C. 102 (1974)	C. 102 (1974)	C. 102 (1976)	C. 102 (1974)	C. 102 (1974)	C. 102 (1974)	
Germany	C. 102 (1958) C. 130 (1974)	C. 102 (1958) C. 130 (1974)	C. 102 (1958)	C. 102 (1958)	C. 102 (1958) C. 121 (1962)	C. 102 (1958)	C. 102 (1958)	C. 102 (1958)	C. 102 (1958) C. 128 (1971)	
Greece	C. 102 (1955)	C. 102 (1955)	C. 102 (1955)	C. 102 (1955)	C. 102 (1955)		C. 102 (1955) C. 183 (2003)	C. 102 (1955)	C. 102 (1955)	
Hungary						C. 102 (1961)		C. 102 (1961)		
Iceland										
Ireland		C. 102 (1968)	C. 102 (1968)	C. 102 (1961)	C. 121 (1969)				C. 102 (1968)	
Italy				C. 102 (1956)		C. 102 (1956)				
Latvia										
Luxembourg	C. 102 (1964) C. 130 (1980)	C. 102 (1964) C. 130 (1980)	C. 102 (1964)	C. 102 (1964)	C. 102 (1964) C. 121 (1972)	C. 102 (1964)	C. 183 (2009)	C. 102 (1964)	C. 102 (1964)	
Former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991) C. 121 (1991)		C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	C. 102 (1991)	
Republic of Moldova										
Montenegro	C. 102 (2006)	C. 102 (2006)	C. 102 (2006)	C. 102 (2006)	C. 102 (2006) C. 121 (2006)		C. 183 (2006) C. 102 (2006)		C. 102 (2006)	

Countries	Branches									
	Medical care C. 102 C. 130	Sickness C. 102 C. 130	Unemployment C. 102 C. 168	Old age C. 102 C. 128	Employment injury C. 102 C. 121	Family C. 102	Maternity C. 102 C. 183	Invalidity C. 102 C. 128	Survivors C. 102 C. 128	
Netherlands	C. 102 (1962) C. 130 (2006)	C. 102 (1962) C. 130 (2006)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962) C. 128 (1969)	C. 102 (1962) C. 121 (1966)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 102 (1962) C. 183 (2009)	C. 102 (1964) C. 128 (1969)	C. 102 (1962) C. 128 (1969)	
Norway	C. 102 (1966) C. 130 (1972)	C. 102 (1966) C. 130 (1972)	C. 102 (1954) C. 168 (1990)	C. 102 (1966) C. 128 (1968)	C. 102 (1966)	C. 102 (1966)	C. 102 (1966)	C. 128 (1968)	C. 128 (1968)	
Poland	C. 102 (2003)	C. 102 (2003)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (2003)	C. 102 (2003)	C. 102 (2003)	C. 102 (2003)	C. 102 (2003)	C. 102 (2003)	
Portugal	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	
Romania	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 168 (1992)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009)	C. 102 (2009) C. 183 (2002)	C. 102 (1994)	C. 102 (1994)	
Serbia	C. 102 (2000)	C. 102 (2000)	C. 102 (2000)	C. 102 (2000)	C. 121 (2000)	C. 102 (2000)	C. 102 (2000)	C. 102 (2000)	C. 102 (2000)	
Slovakia	C. 102 (1993) C. 130 (1993)	C. 102 (1993) C. 130 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993) C. 128 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993) C. 183 (2000)	C. 102 (1993)	C. 102 (1993)	
Slovenia	C. 102 (1992)	C. 102 (1992)	C. 102 (1992)	C. 102 (1992)	C. 102 (1992) C. 121 (1992)	C. 102 (1992)	C. 102 (1992)	C. 102 (1992)	C. 102 (1992)	
Spain	C. 102 (1988)	C. 102 (1988)	C. 102 (1988)	C. 102 (1988)	C. 102 (1988)	C. 102 (1988)	C. 102 (1988)	C. 128 (1968)	C. 128 (1968)	
Sweden	C. 102 (1962) C. 130 (1970)	C. 102 (1962) C. 130 (1970)	C. 102 (1953) C. 168 (1990)	C. 128 (1968)	C. 102 (1953) C. 121 (1969)	C. 102 (1953)	C. 102 (1962)	C. 128 (1968)	C. 128 (1968)	
Switzerland	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 168 (1990)	C. 102 (1977) C. 128 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977)	C. 102 (1977) C. 128 (1977)	C. 102 (1977) C. 128 (1977)	
Turkey	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	C. 102 (1975)	
United Kingdom	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1954)	C. 102 (1954)	

Note: The Office has been informed that the ratification by Uruguay has been decided by the competent national authority and that the ratification process is under way.
Source: ILOLEX (<http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/index.htm>).

Table 15. Overview of social security statutory provision

Country	Number of branches covered by at least one programme		Existence of a statutory programme							
	Number of branches covered by at least one programme	Number of social security branches covered by a statutory programme Strict definition	Sickness	Maternity	Old age	Invalidity	Survivors	Family allowances	Employment injury	Unemployment
Africa										
Algeria	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Angola	None
Benin	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Botswana	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	▲	▲	×	None	×	×	×	▲
Burkina Faso	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Burundi	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	▲	×	×	×	×	×	None
Cameroon	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Cape Verde	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Central African Rep.	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Chad	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Congo	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Côte d'Ivoire	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Djibouti	None
Egypt	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
Equatorial Guinea	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Eritrea	None
Ethiopia	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	▲	▲	×	×	×	None	×	None
Gabon	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	▲	×	×	×	×	×	None
Gambia	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Ghana	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	△	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Guinea	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Guinea-Bissau	None
Kenya	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Lesotho	None
Liberia	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	▲
Madagascar	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Malawi	1	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	None	None	None	None	×	None
Mali	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Mauritania	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Mauritius	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×
Morocco	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Mozambique	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	None	None
Namibia	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Niger	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Nigeria	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	△	▲	×	×	×	None	×	▲
Rwanda	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	▲	▲	×	×	×	None	×	None
Sao Tome and Principe	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Senegal	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	×	×	None	×	×	×	None
Seychelles	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
Sierra Leone	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
South Africa	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	None	×	×	×

Country	Number of branches covered by at least one programme		Existence of a statutory programme							
	Number of branches covered by at least one programme	Number of social security branches covered by a statutory programme Strict definition	Sickness	Maternity	Old age	Invalidity	Survivors	Family allowances	Employment injury	Unemployment
Sudan	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Swaziland	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Tanzania, United Rep. of	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	×	×	×	×	None	×	▲
Togo	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	▲	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Tunisia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Uganda	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Zambia	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	△	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Zimbabwe	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	▲	×	×	×	None	×	None
Asia										
Afghanistan	None
Armenia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Azerbaijan	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Bahrain	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	×
Bangladesh	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	×	×	×	None	None	None	×	▲
Bhutan	None
Brunei Darussalam	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	△	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Cambodia	None
China	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
Georgia	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	△	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Hong Kong, China	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
India	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
Indonesia	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	△	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Iraq	None
Israel	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Japan	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Jordan	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	△	...	×	×	×	None	×	None
Kazakhstan	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	None
Korea, Rep. of	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	...	×	×	×	None	×	×
Kuwait	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	×	×	×	None	×	None
Kyrgyzstan	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Lebanon	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Malaysia	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	...	×	×	×	None	×	None
Maldives	△	...	×	×	×	None
Mongolia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Myanmar	×	×	▲	▲	▲	None	×	None
Nepal	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	▲	▲	×	×	×	None	×	▲
Oman	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Pakistan	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	▲
Philippines	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Saudi Arabia	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	▲	▲	×	×	×	None	×	None
Singapore	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None

Country	Number of branches covered by at least one programme		Existence of a statutory programme							
	Number of branches covered by at least one programme	Number of social security branches covered by a statutory programme Strict definition	Sickness	Maternity	Old age	Invalidity	Survivors	Family allowances	Employment injury	Unemployment
Sri Lanka	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	▲	×	×	×	×	×	None
Syrian Arab Rep.	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None
Taiwan, China	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
Thailand	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Timor-Leste	None
Turkmenistan	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
Uzbekistan	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Viet Nam	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
West Bank and Gaza Strip
Yemen	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	...	×	×	×	None	×	None
Europe										
Albania	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Austria	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Belarus	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Belgium	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Bulgaria	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Croatia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Cyprus	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Czech Rep.	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Denmark	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Estonia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Finland	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
France	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Germany	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Greece	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Hungary	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Iceland	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Ireland	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Italy	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Latvia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Lithuania	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Luxembourg	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Malta	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Moldova, Rep. of	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Montenegro	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Netherlands	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Norway	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Poland	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Portugal	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Romania	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Russian Federation	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Serbia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Slovakia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×

Country	Number of branches covered by at least one programme		Existence of a statutory programme							
	Number of branches covered by at least one programme	Number of social security branches covered by a statutory programme Strict definition	Sickness	Maternity	Old age	Invalidity	Survivors	Family allowances	Employment injury	Unemployment
Slovenia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Spain	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Sweden	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Switzerland	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Turkey	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
Ukraine	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
United Kingdom	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Latin America and the Caribbean										
Antigua & Barbuda	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	None	None
Argentina	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Bahamas	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Barbados	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
Belize	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Bolivia	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	▲
Brazil	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
British Virgin Islands	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Chile	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Colombia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Costa Rica	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	▲
Cuba	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Dominica	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Dominican Rep.	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Ecuador	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
El Salvador	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Grenada	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Guatemala	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Guyana	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Haiti	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	▲	×	×	×	None	×	None
Honduras	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Jamaica	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	△	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Mexico	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	▲
Nicaragua	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Panama	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	▲
Paraguay	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	▲	×	None
Peru	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	▲
Saint Kitts and Nevis	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Saint Lucia	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	6	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	None
Trinidad and Tobago	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	None
Uruguay	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	7	Semi-comprehensive 7	×	×	×	×	×	None	×	×
North America										
Canada	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
United States	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×

Country	Number of branches covered by at least one programme		Existence of a statutory programme								
	Number of branches covered by at least one programme	Number of social security branches covered by a statutory programme Strict definition	Sickness	Maternity	Old age	Invalidity	Survivors	Family allowances	Employment injury	Unemployment	
Oceania											
Australia	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Fiji	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None	
Kiribati	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	None	
Marshall Islands	3	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	△	△	×	×	×	None	None	None	
Micronesia, Fed. States	3	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	None	None	
New Zealand	8	Comprehensive social security 8	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	
Palau Islands	3	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	None	None	×	×	×	None	None	None	
Papua New Guinea	4	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	▲	None	×	×	×	None	×	None	
Solomon Islands	5	Limited statutory provision 5 to 6	None	None	×	×	×	None	×	×	
Vanuatu	3	Very limited statutory provision 1 to 4	▲	▲	×	×	×	None	None	None	

SOURCES

SSA/ISSA. 2008, 2009. *Social Security Programs Throughout the World* (Washington, DC and Geneva): The Americas, 2009; Europe, 2008; Asia and the Pacific, 2009; Africa, 2009. National legislation.

NOTES

... = Not available.

SYMBOLS

× = One statutory programme at least.

▲ = Limited provision (e.g. labour code only).

△ = Only benefit in kind (e.g. medical benefit).

DEFINITIONS

The number of branches covered by at least one programme is the sum for a given country of the social security branches for which a programme exists through the national legislation. This indicator can take the value 0 to 8 according to the total number of branches covered by one or several statutory provisions. The eight following branches are taken into consideration: sickness, maternity, old age, invalidity, survivors, family allowances, employment injury and unemployment.

A programme or a scheme can be of several types: social insurance, social assistance, universal, employer liability (under the responsibility of the employer as mentioned in the legislation or the labour code) or mandatory private.

The number of branches covered by at least one programme provides an overview of the scope of legal social security provision.

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Statutory pensionable age ^b		Contribution rates ^c			Estimate of legal coverage ^d for old age as a percentage of the working-age population		
		Men	Women	Employee	Employer	Financing from government	All programmes: contributory and non-contributory	Contributory and non-contributory	Contributory
Namibia	Universal; social insurance	60	55	Over 75	100	8
Niger	Social insurance	60	60	1.6	2.4	No contribution	Less than 25	1	1
Nigeria	Mandatory private insurance; social insurance	50	50	7.5	7.5	No contribution	Less than 25	13	13
Rwanda	Social insurance	55	55	3	3	No contribution	50–75	53	53
Sao Tome and Principe	Social insurance	62	57	4	6	No contribution	25–50	40	40
Senegal	Social insurance	55	55	5.6	8.4	No contribution	Less than 25	5	5
Seychelles	Universal; social insurance	63	63	2.5 + a flat rate amount	20 + a flat rate amount	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	60
Sierra Leone	Social insurance	60	60	5	10	2.5	50–75	53	53
South Africa	Social assistance; universal	61	60	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Over 75	100	0
Sudan	Social insurance	60	60	8	17	No contribution	25–50	47	47
Swaziland	Provident funds; social assistance	50	50	5	5	No contribution	25–50	32	32
Tanzania, United Rep. of	Social insurance; provident funds	60	60	10	10	No contribution	50–75	73	73
Togo	Social insurance	60	60	4	8	No contribution
Tunisia	Social insurance	60	60	4.74	7.76	No contribution	25–50	50	50
Uganda	Provident funds	55	55	5	10	No contribution	Less than 25	10	10
Zambia	Social insurance	55	55	5	5	No contribution	25–50	47	47
Zimbabwe	Social insurance	60	60	4	4	No contribution	Less than 25	22	22
Asia									
Armenia	Social insurance; social assistance	63	61.5	3	Flat rate	Discretionary Irregular	25–50	27	27
Azerbaijan	Social insurance; social assistance	62	57	3	22	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	71
Bahrain	Social insurance	60	55	6	9	No contribution	50–75	65	65
Bangladesh	Social assistance; special system for government employees	60	60	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Less than 25	2	2
Brunei Darussalam	Provident funds; universal	55	55	5	5	Provident funds: no contribution; universal: whole cost

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Statutory pensionable age ^b		Contribution rates ^c			Financing from government	Estimate of legal coverage ^d for old age as a percentage of the working-age population		
		Men	Women	Employee	Employer	All programmes: contributory and non-contributory		Contributory and non-contributory	Contributory	
China	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	60	60	No contribution	20	Discretionary	Irregular	25-50	27	27
Georgia	Social insurance; social assistance	65	60	No contribution	No contribution	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	57	57
Hong Kong, China	Universal; mandatory private insurance; social assistance	65	65	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost		Over 75	100	0
India	Provident funds; employer-liability; social assistance	58	58	12	3.67	No contribution		25-50	29	29
Indonesia	Provident funds; social insurance	55	55	2	3.7	No contribution		Less than 25	23	23
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	Social insurance	60	55	7	20	3		25-50	41	41
Israel	Social insurance; social assistance	66	61	3.85	2.04	0.25		Over 75	100	65
Japan	Social insurance; universal	65	65	7.67	7.67	Discretionary	Irregular	Over 75	100	56
Jordan	Social insurance	60	55	5.5	9	Discretionary	Irregular	Less than 25	22	22
Kazakhstan	Mandatory private insurance; social insurance; social assistance	63	58	10	No contribution	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	70	69
Korea, Rep. of	Social insurance; social assistance	60	60	4.5	4.5	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	64	64
Kuwait	Social insurance	50	50	5	10	Discretionary	Irregular
Kyrgyzstan	Social insurance; social assistance	63	58	8	19	Discretionary	Irregular	25-50	33	33
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	Social insurance	60	60	4.5	5	Discretionary	Irregular	Less than 25	7	7
Lebanon	Social insurance	64	64	No contribution	8.5	No contribution		25-50	27	27
Malaysia	Provident funds; social insurance	55	55	11	12	No contribution		25-50	47	47
Nepal	Provident funds; social assistance	58	58	10	10	No contribution		Less than 25	16	16
Oman	Social insurance	60	55	6.5	9.5	No contribution		Less than 25	13	13
Pakistan	Social insurance	60	55	1	5	Discretionary	Irregular	Less than 25	19	19
Philippines	Social insurance	60	60	3.33	7.07	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	58	58
Saudi Arabia	Social insurance	60	55	9	9	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	55	55

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Statutory pensionable age ^b		Contribution rates ^c			Estimate of legal coverage ^d for old age as a percentage of the working-age population		
		Men	Women	Employee	Employer	Financing from government	All programmes: contributory and non-contributory	Contributory and non-contributory	Contributory
Singapore	Provident funds	55	55	20	14.5	No contribution	50-75	59	59
Sri Lanka	Provident funds	55	50	8	12	No contribution	25-50	48	48
Syrian Arab Rep.	Social insurance	60	55	7	14	No contribution	25-50	35	35
Taiwan, China	Social insurance	60	55	3.9	4.55	0.65	...	66	66
Thailand	Social insurance	55	55	3	3	1	50-75	100	66
Turkmenistan	Social insurance; social assistance	62	57	1	20	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	66	66
Uzbekistan	Social insurance; social assistance	60	55	2.5	31	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	64	64
Viet Nam	Social insurance	60	55	5	11	Discretionary Irregular	Less than 25	20	20
Yemen	Social insurance	60	55	6	6	No contribution	Less than 25	14	14
Europe									
Albania	Social insurance	65	60	8	21.7	Discretionary Irregular	25-50	29	29
Austria	Social insurance	65	60	10.25	12.55	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	70	70
Belarus	Social insurance	60	55	1	From 10 to 35 according to industry and type of enterprise	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	50	50
Belgium	Social insurance	65	64	7.5	8.86	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	61	61
Bulgaria	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance; social assistance	63	59.5	8.8	13.2	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	60	60
Croatia	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	65	60	20	No contribution	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	52	52
Cyprus	Social insurance; social assistance	65	65	6.3	6.3	4	Over 75	100	65
Czech Rep.	Social insurance	61.83	56.33	6.5	21.5	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	71	71
Denmark	Universal; social insurance; mandatory private insurance	65	65	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Over 75	100	71
Estonia	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	63	60.5	No contribution	20	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	73	73
Finland	Social insurance; universal	65	65	4.1	16.8	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	62

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Statutory pensionable age ^b		Contribution rates ^c		Financing from government	Estimate of legal coverage ^d for old age as a percentage of the working-age population		
		Men	Women	Employee	Employer		All programmes: contributory and non-contributory	Contributory and non-contributory	Contributory
France	Social insurance; social assistance; mandatory private insurance	60	60	6.65	8.3	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	70	70
Germany	Social insurance	65	65	9.95	9.95	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	75	75
Greece	Social insurance	65	60	6.67	13.33	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	57	57
Hungary	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	62	61	9.5	24	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	62	62
Iceland	Universal; mandatory private insurance	67	67	No contribution	5.34	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	90
Ireland	Social insurance; social assistance	65	65	4	10.75	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	74	74
Italy	Social insurance	65	60	8.89	23.81	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	57	57
Latvia	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance; social assistance	62	61.5	9	24.09	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	75	75
Lithuania	Social insurance; social assistance	62.5	60	2.5	23.7	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	66
Luxembourg	Social insurance	65	65	8	8	8	50-75	69	69
Malta	Social insurance; social assistance	61	60	10	10	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	56	56
Moldova, Rep. of	Social insurance	62	57	4	25	Discretionary Irregular	25-50	46	46
Netherlands	Social insurance	65	65	17.9	5.65	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	100
Norway	Universal; social insurance	67	67	7.8	14.1	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	80
Poland	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	65	60	9.76	9.76	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	64	64
Portugal	Social insurance; social assistance; social insurance	65	65	11	23.75	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	72
Romania	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	63.25	58.25	9.5	29	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	64	64
Russian Federation	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	60	55	No contribution	20	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	69	69

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Statutory pensionable age ^b		Contribution rates ^c		Financing from government	Estimate of legal coverage ^d for old age as a percentage of the working-age population		
		Men	Women	Employee	Employer		All programmes: contributory and non-contributory	Contributory and non-contributory	
San Marino	Social insurance	65	65	1.9	10	Discretionary Irregular	
Serbia	Social insurance; social assistance	63.5	58.5	11	11	Discretionary Irregular	25–50	38	
Slovakia	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	62	56.75	4	14	Discretionary Irregular	50–75	61	
Slovenia	Social insurance; social assistance	62.5	56	15.5	8.85	Discretionary Irregular	50–75	72	
Spain	Social insurance	65	65	4.7	23.6	Discretionary Irregular	50–75	67	
Sweden	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance; universal/demigrant	65	65	7	10.21	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	
Switzerland	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	65	64	4.2	4.2	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	
Turkey	Social insurance	60	58	9	11	No contribution	25–50	38	
Ukraine	Social insurance; social assistance	60	55	2	32.3	Discretionary Irregular	50–75	64	
United Kingdom	Social insurance; social assistance	65	60	11	12.8	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	
Latin America and the Caribbean									
Antigua & Barbuda	Social insurance; social assistance	60	60	3	5	No contribution	
Argentina	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance; social assistance	65	60	11	12.71	Discretionary Irregular	25–50	31	
Bahamas	Social insurance; social assistance	65	65	3.4	5.4	No contribution	Over 75	100	
Barbados	Social insurance; social assistance	65.5	65.5	13.5	6.75	No contribution	50–75	63	
Belize	Social insurance; social assistance	65	65	Flat rate	Flat rate	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	
Bolivia	Mandatory private insurance; universal	65	65	10.5	No contribution	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	
Brazil	Social insurance; social assistance	65	60	9	20	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	79	

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Statutory pensionable age ^b		Contribution rates ^c			Financing from government	Estimate of legal coverage ^d for old age as a percentage of the working-age population		
		Men	Women	Employee	Employer	All programmes: contributory and non-contributory		Contributory and non-contributory	Contributory	
British Virgin Islands	Social insurance	65	65	3.25	3.25	No contribution	No contribution
Chile	Mandatory private insurance; social insurance; social assistance	65	60	12.55	1.3	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	59	59
Colombia	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	60	55	3.88	11.63	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	63	63
Costa Rica	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	62	60	2.5	4.75	0.25		50-75	66	66
Cuba	Social insurance; social assistance	60	55	No contribution	14	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	65	65
Dominica	Social insurance	60	60	4	6.75	No contribution		25-50	38	38
Dominican Rep.	Mandatory private insurance	60	60	3.37	7.1	Discretionary	Irregular
Ecuador	Social insurance; social assistance	60	60	6.64	3.1	Social insurance; 40, social assistance: whole cost		25-50	47	47
El Salvador	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	60	55	6.25	4.05	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	57	57
Grenada	Social insurance	60	60	4	5	No contribution	
Guatemala	Social insurance	60	60	1.83	3.67	Discretionary	Irregular	25-50	48	48
Guyana	Social insurance	60	60	5.2	7.8	No contribution		50-75	58	58
Haiti	Social insurance	55	55	6	6	Discretionary	Irregular	Less than 25	8	8
Honduras	Social insurance	65	60	1	2	0.5		25-50	33	33
Jamaica	Social insurance	65	60	2.5	2.5	No contribution		50-75	68	68
Mexico	Mandatory private insurance; social insurance	65	65	1.13	5.15	0.25 + flat rate amount		50-75	65	65
Nicaragua	Social insurance	60	60	4	6	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	58	58
Panama	Social insurance	62	57	7.25	10.75	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	60	60
Paraguay	Social insurance	60	60	9	14	1.5		25-50	37	37
Peru	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	60	60	13	No contribution	Discretionary	Irregular	50-75	54	54

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Statutory pensionable age ^b		Contribution rates ^c			Estimate of legal coverage ^d for old age as a percentage of the working-age population		
		Men	Women	Employee	Employer	Financing from government	All programmes: contributory and non-contributory	Contributory and non-contributory	Contributory
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Social insurance; social assistance	62	62	5	5	No contribution
Saint Lucia	Social insurance	62	62	5	5	No contribution	50-75	59	59
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Social insurance	60	60	2.5	3	3.5	25-50	43	43
Trinidad and Tobago	Social insurance; social assistance	60	60	3.11	6.23	No contribution	25-50	48	48
Uruguay	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance; social assistance	60	60	15	7.5	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	70	70
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	Social insurance	60	55	1.93	4.82	1.5	25-50	45	45
North America									
Canada	Social insurance; universal	65	65	4.95	4.95	No contribution	Over 75	100	75
United States	Social insurance	65.8	65.8	6.2	6.2	Discretionary Irregular	50-75	73	73
Oceania									
Australia	Mandatory private insurance; social assistance	65	63	Discretionary Irregular	9	Discretionary Irregular	Over 75	100	67
Fiji	Provident funds	55	55	8	8	No contribution	50-75	61	61
Kiribati	Provident funds	50	50	7.5	7.5	No contribution
Marshall Islands	Social insurance	60	60	7	7	No contribution
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	Social insurance	60	60	6	6	No contribution
New Zealand	Universal; social assistance	65	65	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Over 75	100	0
Palau Islands	Social insurance	60	60	6	6	No contribution
Papua New Guinea	Mandatory private insurance	55	55	5.5	7.7	No contribution	Less than 25	9	9
Samoa	Provident funds; universal	55	55	5	5	No contribution
Solomon Islands	Provident funds	50	50	5	7.5	No contribution	Less than 25	16	16
Vanuatu	Provident funds	55	55	4	6	No contribution	Less than 25	16	16

Sources, notes and definitions are provided after table 19.

Table 17. Social security statutory provision: Employment injury

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c	Financing from government		Estimate of legal employment injury coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
			Employee	Employer	Mandatory coverage	Voluntary coverage
Africa						
Algeria	Social insurance	No contribution	1	No contribution	33.5	0.0
Benin	Social insurance	No contribution	4	No contribution	5.5	0.0
Botswana	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	49.4	0.0
Burkina Faso	Social insurance	No contribution	7	No contribution	2.7	0.0
Burundi	Social insurance	No contribution	3	No contribution	4.5	0.0
Cameroon	Social insurance	No contribution	5	No contribution	12.8	0.0
Cape Verde	Social insurance	No contribution	1	No contribution	51.1	0.0
Central African Rep.	Social insurance	No contribution	3	No contribution	92.0	0.0
Chad	Social insurance	No contribution	2.5	No contribution	2.5	0.0
Congo	Social insurance	No contribution	2.25	No contribution	18.6	0.0
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	Social insurance	No contribution	1.5	No contribution	5.4	0.0
Côte d'Ivoire	Social insurance	No contribution	5	No contribution	18.0	0.0
Egypt	Social insurance	No contribution	3	No contribution	52.5	0.0
Equatorial Guinea	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	19.7	0.0
Ethiopia	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	1.5	0.0
Gabon	Social insurance	No contribution	3	No contribution	36.8	0.0
Gambia	Employer-liability	No contribution	1	No contribution	29.1	0.0
Ghana	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	14.9	0.0
Guinea	Social insurance	No contribution	4	No contribution	18.8	0.0
Kenya	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	...	0.0
Liberia	Social insurance	No contribution	1.75	No contribution	85.7	0.0
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Social insurance; employer-liability	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	92.1	0.0
Madagascar	Social insurance	No contribution	1.25	No contribution	13.5	0.0
Malawi	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	9.6	0.0
Mali	Social insurance	No contribution	4	No contribution	10.0	0.0
Mauritania	Social insurance	No contribution	3	No contribution	30.9	0.0
Mauritius	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	69.3	0.0

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Estimate of legal employment injury coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population		
		Employee	Employer	Financing from government	Mandatory coverage	Voluntary coverage
Morocco	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	37.7	0.0
Niger	Social insurance	No contribution	2	No contribution	5.5	0.0
Nigeria	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	14.8	0.0
Rwanda	Social insurance	No contribution	2	No contribution	5.3	0.0
Sao Tome and Principe	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	46.3	0.0
Senegal	Social insurance	No contribution	2.5	No contribution	5.8	0.0
Seychelles	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	66.7	0.0
Sierra Leone	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	Discretionary Irregular contribution	6.6	0.0
South Africa	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	61.6	0.0
Sudan	Social insurance	No contribution	2	No contribution	81.4	0.0
Swaziland	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	44.6	0.0
Tanzania, United Rep. of	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	...	0.0
Togo	Social insurance	No contribution	2.5	No contribution	...	0.0
Tunisia	Social insurance	No contribution	4	No contribution	50.5	0.0
Uganda	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	9.9	0.0
Zambia	Employer-liability; social insurance	No contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	No contribution	14.4	0.0
Zimbabwe	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	28.2	0.0
Asia						
Armenia	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Discretionary Irregular contribution	36.5	0.0
Azerbaijan	Social insurance; universal	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	39.6	0.0
Bahrain	Social insurance	No contribution	3	No contribution	...	0.0
Bangladesh	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	2.5	0.0
Brunei Darussalam	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	54.6	0.0
China	Social insurance; employer-liability	No contribution	1	Discretionary Irregular contribution	31.9	0.0
Georgia	Social insurance; social assistance	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	27.0	0.0
Hong Kong, China	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	81.8	0.0

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Financing from government		Estimate of legal employment injury coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer	Employee	Employer	Mandatory coverage	Voluntary coverage
India	Social insurance	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	7.5	0.0
Indonesia	Social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	23.7	0.0
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	67.6	0.0
Israel	Social insurance	No contribution	0.59	0.03	0.03	96.9	0.0
Japan	Social insurance	No contribution	11.8	Discretionary	Discretionary Irregular contribution	72.4	0.0
Jordan	Social insurance	No contribution	2	Discretionary	Discretionary Irregular contribution	43.2	0.0
Kazakhstan	Employer-liability; social assistance	No contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Whole cost	Whole cost	54.7	0.0
Korea, Rep. of	Social insurance	No contribution	2	No contribution	No contribution	66.0	0.0
Kuwait	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	...	0.0
Kyrgyzstan	Social insurance; universal	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Discretionary Irregular contribution	45.5	0.0
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	7.3	0.0
Lebanon	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	47.3	0.0
Malaysia	Social insurance	No contribution	1.25	No contribution	No contribution	67.6	0.0
Myanmar	Social insurance	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	No contribution	No contribution
Nepal	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	20.7	0.0
Oman	Social insurance	No contribution	1	No contribution	No contribution	20.6	0.0
Pakistan	Social insurance	Flat rate amount	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	No contribution	31.4	0.0
Philippines	Social insurance	No contribution	0.2	Discretionary	Discretionary Irregular contribution	50.4	0.0
Saudi Arabia	Social insurance	No contribution	2	Discretionary	Discretionary Irregular contribution	78.1	0.0
Singapore	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	66.0	0.0
Sri Lanka	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	72.8	0.0
Syrian Arab Rep.	Social insurance	No contribution	3	No contribution	No contribution	36.4	0.0
Thailand	Employer-liability	No contribution	0.6	No contribution	No contribution	27.5	0.0
Turkmenistan	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	71.7	0.0
Uzbekistan	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	70.0	0.0

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Financing from government		Estimate of legal employment injury coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer	Employee	Employer	Mandatory coverage	Voluntary coverage
Viet Nam	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under sickness	No contribution	No contribution	23.7	0.0
Yemen	Social insurance	No contribution	4	No contribution	No contribution	27.9	0.0
Europe							
Albania	Social insurance	No contribution	0.5	No contribution	No contribution	32.6	0.0
Austria	Social insurance	No contribution	1.4	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	93.1	0.0
Belarus	Social insurance	No contribution	8.5	No contribution	No contribution	70.9	0.0
Belgium	Social insurance	No contribution	0.3	No contribution	No contribution	79.0	0.0
Bulgaria	Social insurance	No contribution	1.1	No contribution	No contribution	84.9	10.9
Croatia	Social insurance	No contribution	0.5	No contribution	No contribution	80.1	0.0
Cyprus	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	70.6	0.0
Czech Rep.	Social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	79.6	0.0
Denmark	Universal; social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	87.2	7.9
Estonia	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under sickness	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	97.1	0.0
Finland	Employer-liability; mandatory private insurance	No contribution	³	No contribution	No contribution	81.1	11.2
France	Social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	91.5	0.0
Germany	Social insurance	No contribution	1.33	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	80.8	10.0
Greece	Social insurance	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	56.0	0.0
Hungary	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	100.0	0.0
Iceland	Social insurance; social assistance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	99.1	0.0
Ireland	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	81.8	0.0
Italy	Social insurance	No contribution	³	No contribution	No contribution	89.2	0.0
Latvia	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	84.2	0.0
Lithuania	Social insurance	No contribution	⁴	No contribution	No contribution	83.5	0.0
Luxembourg	Social insurance	No contribution	⁶	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	...	0.0

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Financing from government	Estimate of legal employment injury coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer		Mandatory coverage	Voluntary coverage
Malta	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	91.8	0.0
Moldova, Rep. of	Social insurance; universal	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	57.9	26.9
Netherlands	Social insurance	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	97.2	0.0
Norway	Social insurance; universal	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	Discretionary Irregular contribution	88.7	7.4
Poland	Social insurance	No contribution	⁵	Discretionary Irregular contribution	100.0	0.0
Portugal	Employer-liability; social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	90.7	0.0
Romania	Social insurance	No contribution	⁶	Discretionary Irregular contribution	64.5	20.6
Russian Federation	Social insurance	No contribution	⁷	No contribution	85.9	0.0
San Marino	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age
Serbia	Social insurance	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	53.7	0.0
Slovakia	Social insurance	No contribution	0.8	Discretionary Irregular contribution	75.2	0.0
Slovenia	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Discretionary Irregular contribution	93.7	0.0
Spain	Social insurance	No contribution	1.98	No contribution	77.4	15.5
Sweden	Social insurance	No contribution	0.68	No contribution	92.7	0.0
Switzerland	Mandatory private insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	82.2	13.5
Turkey	Social insurance	No contribution	2.5	Discretionary Irregular contribution	47.7	22.8
Ukraine	Social insurance; universal	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	72.9	0.0
United Kingdom	Social insurance; social assistance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	80.6	0.0
Latin America and the Caribbean						
Argentina	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	Discretionary Irregular contribution	41.7	0.0
Bahamas	Social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	76.0	0.0
Barbados	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	63.7	0.0
Belize	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Discretionary Irregular contribution	81.6	0.0

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Financing from government		Estimate of legal employment injury coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer	Employee	Financing from government	Mandatory coverage	Voluntary coverage
Bolivia	Social insurance; mandatory private insurance	No contribution for temporary disability, otherwise global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	26.5	0.0
Brazil	Social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	58.1	0.0
British Virgin Islands	Social insurance	No contribution	0.5	No contribution	No contribution
Chile	Social insurance	No contribution	0.95	No contribution	No contribution	92.6	0.0
Colombia	Social insurance	No contribution	⁸	Discretionary Irregular contribution	Discretionary Irregular contribution	42.6	32.3
Costa Rica	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	70.5	0.0
Cuba	Social insurance; universal	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	97.6	0.0
Dominica	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution
Dominican Rep.	Social insurance	No contribution	1.2	No contribution	No contribution
Ecuador	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	63.1	0.0
El Salvador	Social insurance	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	80.6	0.0
Grenada	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	No contribution
Guatemala	Social insurance	1	3	1.5	1.5	28.1	0.0
Guyana	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	No contribution	38.6	0.0
Haiti	Social insurance	No contribution	3	No contribution	No contribution	12.2	0.0
Honduras	Social insurance	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	49.7	0.0
Jamaica	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old-age	No contribution	No contribution	51.4	0.0
Mexico	Social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	62.6	0.0
Nicaragua	Social insurance	No contribution	1.5	No contribution	No contribution	47.8	0.0
Panama	Social insurance; employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	No contribution	58.0	0.0
Paraguay	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	36.4	0.0
Peru	Social insurance	No contribution	⁹	No contribution	No contribution	35.1	0.0
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Social insurance	No contribution	1	No contribution	No contribution
Saint Lucia	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	Global contribution, under old-age	52.0	0.0

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Financing from government	Estimate of legal employment injury coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer		Mandatory coverage	Voluntary coverage
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Social insurance	No contribution	0.5	No contribution	43.0	0.0
Trinidad and Tobago	Social insurance	0.18	0.36	No contribution	65.8	0.0
Uruguay	Social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	63.9	0.0
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	Social insurance	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under old-age	59.5	0.0
North America						
Canada	Social insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	77.3	0.0
United States	Mandatory private insurance	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	85.3	0.0
Oceania						
Australia	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	85.1	0.0
Fiji	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	55.7	0.0
Kiribati	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution
New Zealand	Universal; employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	Discretionary Irregular contribution	96.4	0.0
Palau Islands	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution
Papua New Guinea	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	11.5	0.0
Samoa	Employer-liability	No contribution	1	No contribution	...	0.0
Solomon Islands	Employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	21.7	0.0

Sources, notes and definitions are provided after table 19.

Table 18. Social security statutory provision: Unemployment

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Employer	Financing from government	Estimate of unemployment coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer			Contributory and non-contributory coverage (grouping in 3 categories)	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (value)
Africa							
Algeria	Social insurance	0.5	1.5	No contribution	Between one-third & two-thirds ¹	33.5	
Angola	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	
Benin	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Botswana	Limited provision: employer-liability	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	26.1	
Burkina Faso	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Burundi	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Cameroon	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Cape Verde	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Central African Rep.	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Chad	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Comoros	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Congo	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Côte d'Ivoire	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Djibouti	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Egypt	Social insurance	No contribution	2	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	52.5	
Equatorial Guinea	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Eritrea	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Ethiopia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Gabon	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Gambia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Ghana	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Guinea	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Guinea-Bissau	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Kenya	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Lesotho	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Liberia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Limited provision: employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	Limited provision	0.0	
Madagascar	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	
Malawi	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.0	

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Estimate of unemployment coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (grouping in 3 categories)	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (value)
Mali	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Mauritania	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Mauritius	Social assistance; social insurance	No contribution	No contribution	Over two-thirds	100.0
Morocco	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Mozambique	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Namibia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Niger	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Nigeria	Limited provision: provident funds	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	Less than one-third	9.3
Rwanda	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Sao Tome and Principe	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Senegal	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Seychelles	Social assistance	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	None Limited provision	...
Sierra Leone	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Somalia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
South Africa	Social insurance	I	I	Between one-third & two-thirds	52.7
Sudan	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Swaziland	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Tanzania, United Rep. of	Limited provision: employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	Limited provision	0.0
Togo	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Tunisia	Social assistance	No contribution	No contribution	Between one-third & two-thirds ¹	37.2
Uganda	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Zambia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Zimbabwe	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Asia					
Afghanistan	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Armenia	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Over two-thirds	73.4
Azerbaijan	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Over two-thirds	94.9
Bahrain	Social insurance	I	I	Between one-third & two-thirds	66.5

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c			Estimate of unemployment coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer	Financing from government	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (grouping in 3 categories)	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (value)
Bangladesh	Limited provision: employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	Less than one-third	8.8
Bhutan	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Brunei Darussalam	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Cambodia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
China	Social insurance	1	2	Discretionary Irregular	Less than one-third	31.9
Georgia	Social insurance	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Less than one-third	100.0
Hong Kong, China	Social assistance	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Over two-thirds	100.0
India	Social insurance	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Global contribution, under sickness	Less than one-third	1.0
Indonesia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	Social insurance	No contribution	3	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	38.9
Iraq	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Israel	Social insurance	0.21	0.04	0.06	Over two-thirds	84.6
Japan	Social insurance	0.6	0.9	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	83.8
Jordan	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Kazakhstan	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Over two-thirds	86.8
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Korea, Rep. of	Social insurance	0.45	1.3	No contribution	Between one-third & two-thirds	66.0
Kuwait	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Kyrgyzstan	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old age	No contribution	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	44.8
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Lebanon	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Malaysia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Maldives	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Mongolia	Social insurance	Between one-third & two-thirds	29.5
Myanmar	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Nepal	Limited provision: employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	None Limited provision	0.0
Oman	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Pakistan	Limited provision: employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No statutory scheme	None Limited provision	0.0
Philippines	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c			Financing from government		Estimate of unemployment coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer		Contributory and non-contributory coverage (grouping in 3 categories)	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (value)		
Saudi Arabia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0		
Singapore	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0		
Sri Lanka	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0		
Syrian Arab Rep.	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0		
Taiwan, China	Social insurance	0.2	0.7	0.1		
Thailand	Social insurance	0.5	0.5	0.25	Between one-third & two-thirds	44.1		
Timor-Leste	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0		
Turkmenistan	Social insurance	No contribution	2	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	46.1		
Uzbekistan	Social insurance	No contribution	3	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	62.7		
Viet Nam	Social insurance	1	1	1	Less than one-third	14.2		
West Bank and Gaza Strip	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0		
Yemen	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0		
Europe								
Albania	Social insurance	No contribution	6	Discretionary Irregular	Less than one-third	27.2		
Austria	Social insurance; social assistance	3	3	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	70.2		
Belarus	Social insurance	No contribution	1	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	72.5		
Belgium	Social insurance	0.87	1.46	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	79.0		
Bulgaria	Social insurance	0.4	0.6	No contribution	Over two-thirds	84.9		
Croatia	Social insurance; social assistance	No contribution	1.7	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	62.8		
Cyprus	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Over two-thirds	70.6		
Czech Rep.	Social insurance	0.4	1.2	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	94.6		
Denmark	Mandatory private insurance; social assistance	8	Discretionary Irregular	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	100.0		
Estonia	Social insurance; social assistance	0.6	0.3	No contribution	Over two-thirds	100.0		
Finland	Mandatory private insurance; social assistance	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Over two-thirds	100.0		
France	Social insurance; social assistance	2.4	4	No contribution	Over two-thirds	99.6		
Germany	Social insurance; social assistance	1.65	1.65	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	100.0		
Greece	Social insurance; social assistance	1.33	2.67	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	56.0		

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c			Estimate of unemployment coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer	Financing from government	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (grouping in 3 categories)	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (value)
Hungary	Social insurance; social assistance	1.5	3	No contribution	Over two-thirds	90.5
Iceland	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old age	No contribution	Over two-thirds	99.6
Ireland	Social insurance; social assistance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	100.0
Italy	Social insurance	No contribution	1.61	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	54.3
Latvia	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	84.2
Lithuania	Social insurance	No contribution	1.2	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	83.5
Luxembourg	Social insurance	Discretionary Irregular	No contribution	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	96.2
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	Social insurance	Over two-thirds	...
Malta	Social insurance; social assistance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Over two-thirds	87.2
Moldova, Rep. of	Social insurance	No contribution	Global contribution, under old age	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	84.8
Netherlands	Social insurance; social assistance	3.5	1.02	No contribution	Over two-thirds	83.9
Norway	Social insurance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	88.9
Poland	Social insurance	No contribution	2.45	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds ²	67.3
Portugal	Social insurance; social assistance	5.22	5.22	No contribution	Over two-thirds	69.6
Romania	Social insurance	0.5	1	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	97.4
Russian Federation	Social insurance; social assistance	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Over two-thirds	100.0
San Marino	Social insurance	0.5	1.5	No contribution	Over two-thirds	...
Serbia	Social insurance	0.75	0.75	No contribution	Over two-thirds	...
Slovakia	Social insurance	1	1	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	86.3
Slovenia	Social insurance	0.14	0.06	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	93.4
Spain	Social insurance; social assistance	1.55	5.5	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	77.4
Sweden	Social insurance; provident funds	No contribution	Whole cost	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	92.7
Switzerland	Social insurance	1	1	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	82.2

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c		Financing from government	Estimate of unemployment coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer		Contributory and non-contributory coverage (grouping in 3 categories)	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (value)
Turkey	Social insurance	1	2	1	Between one-third & two-thirds	47.7
Ukraine	Social insurance; social assistance	0.5	1.9	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	90.0
United Kingdom	Social insurance; social assistance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Over two-thirds	92.7
Latin America and the Caribbean						
Antigua & Barbuda	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Argentina	Social insurance	No contribution	1.11	Discretionary Irregular	Less than one-third	32.7
Aruba	Social insurance
Bahamas	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Barbados	Social insurance	0.75	0.75	No contribution	Between one-third & two-thirds	49.7
Belize	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Bolivia	Limited provision: employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	Limited provision	0.0
Brazil	Social assistance	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Between one-third & two-thirds	58.1
British Virgin Islands	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Chile	Mandatory private insurance; social assistance	0.6	2.4	Whole cost	Between one-third & two-thirds	59.0
Colombia	Mandatory private insurance	No contribution	8.3	No contribution	Between one-third & two-thirds ¹	38.2
Costa Rica	Limited provision: employer-liability; mandatory private insurance	No statutory scheme	1.5	No statutory scheme	Limited provision	0.0
Cuba	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Dominica	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Dominican Rep.	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Ecuador	Mandatory private insurance; social insurance	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Global contribution, under old age	Between one-third & two-thirds	40.5
El Salvador	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Grenada	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Guatemala	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Guyana	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Haiti	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Honduras	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Jamaica	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Mexico	Limited provision: employer-liability	No contribution	Whole cost	No contribution	Limited provision	0.0

Major area, region or country	Type of programme ^a	Contribution rates ^c			Estimate of unemployment coverage ^d as a percentage of the economically active population	
		Employee	Employer	Financing from government	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (grouping in 3 categories)	Contributory and non-contributory coverage (value)
Nicaragua	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Panama	Limited provision: employer-liability	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	Limited provision	0.0
Paraguay	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Peru	Limited provision: employer-liability	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	No statutory scheme	Limited provision	0.0
Saint Kitts and Nevis	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Saint Lucia	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Suriname	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Trinidad and Tobago	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Uruguay	Social assistance	No contribution	No contribution	Discretionary Irregular	Between one-third & two-thirds	53.6
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	Social insurance	0.5	1.7	No contribution	Between one-third & two-thirds	59.5
North America						
Canada	Social insurance	1.8	2.52	No contribution	Over two-thirds	77.4
United States	Social insurance	No contribution	6.2	Discretionary Irregular	Over two-thirds	85.3
Oceania						
Australia	Social assistance	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Over two-thirds	96.7
Fiji	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Kiribati	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Marshall Islands	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Nauru	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
New Zealand	Social assistance	No contribution	No contribution	Whole cost	Over two-thirds	100.0
Niue	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Palau Islands	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Papua New Guinea	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Samoa	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Solomon Islands	Provident funds
Tonga	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0
Vanuatu	No provision	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	None	0.0

Sources, notes and definitions are provided after table 19.

Table 19. Social security statutory provision: Regional estimates

Old age

Regions	Old-age legal coverage as a percentage of the working-age population			
	All old-age social security programmes	Old-age contributory programmes excluding voluntary	Old-age contributory voluntary coverage for self-employed	Old-age non-contributory programmes
North America	75.4	73.0	0.0	2.5
Western Europe	77.4	70.4	0.5	6.5
CIS	66.8	65.3	0.0	1.5
Central and Eastern Europe	62.3	58.9	2.4	0.9
Latin America and the Caribbean	63.8	58.4	4.7	0.8
Middle East	40.3	38.5	0.3	1.6
North Africa	34.4	34.4	0.0	0.0
Asia and the Pacific	31.9	27.9	1.9	2.1
Sub-Saharan Africa	26.1	14.0	3.7	8.5
Total	42.0	37.3	2.0	2.7

Employment injury

Regions	Legal employment injury coverage as a percentage of			
	Working-age population		Economically active population	
	Mandatory	Voluntary	Mandatory	Voluntary
Africa	19.0	1.6	26.3	2.2
Sub-Saharan Africa	17.1	1.8	22.2	2.4
North Africa	26.3	0.8	46.2	1.4
Asia and the Pacific	20.8	0.2	25.9	0.3
Middle East	36.0	0.0	61.6	0.0
Latin America and the Caribbean	41.5	2.6	55.2	3.5
Central and Eastern Europe	54.5	2.8	82.4	4.3
CIS	55.8	0.2	75.8	0.3
North America	67.1	0.0	84.5	0.0
Western Europe	61.8	3.3	84.2	4.5
Total	30.3	0.8	39.3	1.1

Unemployment (1)

Regions	Legal unemployment coverage as a percentage of the working-age population			
	Mandatory contributory coverage	Non-contributory coverage	Voluntary contributory coverage	Contributory and non-contributory coverage
North America	65.7	0.0	0.0	65.7
Western Europe	60.3	2.9	0.8	64.5
CIS	49.0	0.5	1.1	56.2
Central and Eastern Europe	50.5	0.7	2.8	54.0
North Africa	9.9	4.1	0.0	14.0
Asia and the Pacific	6.3	6.8	0.5	12.9
Middle East	11.5	0.0	0.0	11.5
Latin America and the Caribbean	7.2	3.0	1.0	10.2
Sub-Saharan Africa	1.1	2.7	0.0	3.8
Total	18.4	3.1	0.6	22.3

Unemployment (2)

Regions	Legal unemployment coverage as a percentage of economically active population			
	Mandatory contributory coverage	Non-contributory coverage	Voluntary contributory coverage	Contributory and non-contributory coverage
Western Europe	79.4	3.9	1.0	85.0
North America	81.4	0.0	0.0	81.4
Central and Eastern Europe	75.5	1.0	4.6	81.0
CIS	68.3	0.6	1.6	77.8
North Africa	17.2	7.4	0.0	24.7
Asia and the Pacific	8.8	9.0	0.8	17.5
Middle East	17.3	0.0	0.0	17.3
Latin America and the Caribbean	10.0	4.0	1.3	14.0
Sub-Saharan Africa	1.9	2.2	0.0	4.1
Total	25.7	3.8	0.9	30.6

Note: Regional estimates weighted by the working-age population (old age) or the economically active population (employment injury and unemployment).

Sources: ILO Social Security Department based on SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009; ILO, LABORSTA; national legislative texts; national statistical data for estimates of legal coverage.

SOURCES

SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009. *Social Security Programs Throughout the World* (Washington, DC and Geneva): The Americas, 2009; Europe, 2008; Asia and the Pacific, 2009; Africa, 2009.

For estimates of legal coverage:

ILO, LABORSTA (<http://laborsta.ilo.org>): Total and economically active population; employment (total, by status, public sector employment).

National statistical offices: data sets and reports from national labour force surveys or other household or establishment surveys (link to national statistical offices web sites: http://laborsta.ilo.org/links_content_E.html#m2).

NOTES

n.a. = Not applicable.

... = Not available.

Table 17 Social security statutory provision: Employment injury

¹ Between 2 and 6 per cent depending on workers' status.

² Between 0.7 and 48.9 per cent of annual payroll according to the assessed degree of risk.

³ Between 0.4 and 7.5 per cent; average rate is 1 per cent.

⁴ Between 0.28 and 1 per cent according to three employment categories.

⁵ Between 0.9 and 3.6 per cent of payroll according to the assessed degree of risk and the number of employees.

⁶ Between 0.4 and 2 per cent of average gross monthly income according to the assessed degree of risk.

⁷ Between 0.2 and 8.5 per cent of payroll according to 32 classes of professional risk related to 22 categories of industry.

⁸ Between 0.348 and 8.7 per cent of payroll according to the assessed degree of risk.

⁹ Between 0.63 and 1.84 per cent of covered payroll according to the assessed degree of risk.

Table 18 Social security statutory provision: Unemployment

¹ Legal unemployment coverage is just over one-third.

² Legal unemployment coverage is just over two-thirds.

DEFINITIONS

^a Type of programme (applies to all tables)

Employment-related systems, commonly referred to as **social insurance** systems, generally base eligibility for pensions and other periodic payments on length of employment or self-employment or, in the case of family allowances and work injuries, on the existence of the employment relationship itself. The amount of pensions (long-term payments, primarily) and of other periodic (short-term) payments in the event of unemployment, sickness, maternity or work injury is usually related to the level of earnings before any of these contingencies caused earnings to cease. Such programmes are financed entirely or largely from contributions (usually a percentage of earnings) made by employers, workers or both and are in most instances compulsory for defined categories of workers and their employers.

The creation of notional defined contributions (NDCs) is a relatively new method of calculating benefits. NDC schemes are a variant of contributory social insurance that seek to tie benefit entitlements more closely to contributions. A hypothetical account is created for each insured person that is made up of all contributions during his or her working life and, in some cases, credit for unpaid activity such as caregiving. A pension is calculated by dividing that amount by the average life expectancy at the time of retirement and indexing it to various economic factors. When benefits are due, the individual's notional account balance is converted into a periodic pension payment.

Some social insurance systems permit voluntary affiliation of workers, especially the self-employed. In some instances, the government subsidizes such programmes to encourage voluntary participation.

Social assistance programmes usually refer here to means-tested programmes that establish eligibility for benefits by measuring individual or family resources against a calculated standard usually based on subsistence needs. Benefits are limited to applicants who satisfy a means test. The size and type of benefits awarded are determined in each case by administrative decisions within the framework of the law.

The specific character of means, needs or income tests, and the weight given to family resources, differ considerably from country to country. Such programmes, commonly referred to as social pensions or equalization payments, are traditionally financed primarily from general revenues. Means-tested systems constitute the sole or principal form of social security in only a few jurisdictions; in others, contributory programmes operate in tandem with income-related benefits. In such instances, means- or income-tested programmes may be administered by social insurance agencies. Means-tested programmes apply to persons who are not in covered employment or whose benefits under employment-related programmes, together with other individual or family resources, are inadequate to meet subsistence or special needs. Although means-tested programmes can be administered at the national level, they are usually administered locally.

Universal programmes provide flat-rate cash benefits to residents or citizens, without consideration of income, employment or means. Typically financed from general revenues, these benefits may apply to all persons with sufficient residency. Universal programmes may include old-age pensions for persons over a certain age; pensions for disabled workers, widow(er)s and orphans; and family allowances. Most social security systems incorporating a universal programme also have a second-tier earnings-related programme. Some universal programmes, although receiving substantial support from income taxes, are also financed in part by contributions from workers and employers.

Employer-liability systems: under these systems, workers are usually protected through labour codes that require employers, when liable, to provide specified payments or services directly to their employees. Specified payments or services can include the payment of lump-sum gratuities to the aged or disabled; the provision of medical care, paid sick leave, or both; the payment of maternity benefits or family allowances; the provision of temporary or long-term cash benefits and medical care in the case of a work injury; or the payment of severance indemnities in the case of dismissal. Employer-liability systems do not involve any direct pooling of risk, since the liability for payment is placed directly on each employer. Employers may insure themselves against liability, and in some jurisdictions such insurance is compulsory.

Provident funds: these funds, which exist primarily in developing countries, are essentially compulsory savings programmes in which regular contributions withheld from employees' wages are enhanced, and often matched, by employers' contributions. The contributions are set aside and invested for each employee in a single, publicly managed fund for later repayment to the worker when defined contingencies occur. Typically, benefits are paid in a lump sum with accrued interest, although in certain circumstances drawdown provisions enable partial access to savings prior to retirement or other defined contingencies. On retirement, some provident funds also permit beneficiaries to purchase an annuity or opt for a pension. Some provident funds provide pensions for survivors.

Mandatory private programmes are programmes delivered by financial services providers. This category covers three types of programmes:

- i) Mandatory private insurance, which applies to a programme where individuals are mandated by law to purchase insurance directly from a private insurance company.
- ii) Mandatory individual account, which applies to a programme where covered persons and/or employers must contribute a certain percentage of earnings to the covered person's individual account managed by a contracted public or private fund manager. The mandate to establish membership in a scheme and the option to choose a fund manager lie with the individual. The accumulated capital in the individual account is normally intended as a source of income replacement for the contingencies of retirement, disability, ill health or unemployment. It may also be possible for eligible survivors to access the accumulated capital in the case of the insured's death.
- iii) Mandatory occupational pension, which applies to a programme where employers are mandated by law to provide occupational pension schemes financed by employer, and in some cases employee, contributions. Benefits may be paid as a lump sum, annuity or pension.

Source: SSA/ISSA, 2009.

For more information, see *Guide to reading the country summaries* (<http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/progdesc/ssptw/2008-2009/asia/guide.pdf>).

^b **Statutory pensionable age** (applies to table 13.1): Refers to statutory retirement age according to the legislation. If several statutory retirement ages exist (e.g. depending on sector of activity), the selected age should be the most representative one in terms of persons covered.

^c **Contribution rates** (applies to tables 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3): Where there are several contribution rates, the average or most common rate is indicated or a reference to a specific note.

^d **Legal coverage** (applies to tables 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3): Legal coverage is distinct from effective coverage. A population group can be identified as legally covered if there are existing legal provisions that such a group should be covered by social insurance for a given branch of social security, or will be entitled to specified benefits under certain circumstances for instance, to an old-age state pension on reaching the age of 65, or to income support (including old-age social pension) if income falls below a specified threshold.

Estimate of legal coverage: Estimates of the extent of legal coverage use both i) information on the groups covered by statutory schemes for a given branch in national legislation (e.g. wage workers; all employed; employees in the public sector), and ii) available statistical information quantifying the number of persons concerned at the national level.

The identification of the groups covered is based on the information compiled in *Social Security programs throughout the world* (SSA/ISSA, 2008, 2009). Their quantification uses mostly ILO LABORSTA completed when necessary with national data (mostly from household surveys or establishment surveys).

The legal extent of coverage rate for a given branch of social security is the ratio between the estimated number of people legally covered and – as appropriate – the working-age population (as presented in table 13.1), the economically active population (tables 13.2 and 13.3), the number of employees (that is wage and salary workers), the total number of employed persons (including employees, self-employed, etc.), or the total population (especially in the case of health protection).

Table 20. Maternity social security legal provision

Country or area	Date of first law	Provider of maternity benefits	Length of maternity leave			Percentage of wages paid in period covered
			Period and unit	in weeks	%	
Africa						
Algeria	1949	Social insurance	14	weeks	14	100
Angola	...	Social security (if necessary, the employer adds up to the full wage)	3	months	13	100
Benin	1952	50% social security, 50% employer	14	weeks	14	100
Botswana ¹	1984	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12	weeks	12	25
Burkina Faso	1952	Social insurance and employer	14	weeks	14	100
Burundi ²	1993	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12	weeks	12	50
Cameroon	1956	National social insurance fund	14	weeks	14	100
Cape Verde	1976	Social insurance	60	days	8.5	90
Central African Republic	1952	Social insurance	14	weeks	14	50
Chad	1952	Social insurance	14	weeks	14	50
Comoros	...	Employer	14	weeks	14	100
Congo	1952	50% social insurance, 50% employer	15	weeks	15	100
Congo, Democratic Republic of ³	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	14	weeks	14	67
Côte d'Ivoire	1956	National social insurance fund	14	weeks	14	100
Djibouti	...	Employer	14	weeks	14	50, 100 ⁴
Egypt	1959	Social security and employer	90	days	13	100
Equatorial Guinea	1947	Social insurance	12	weeks	12	75
Eritrea	...	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	60	days	8.5	... ⁵
Ethiopia ⁶	2002	Employer for up to 45 days	90	days	13	100
Gabon	1952	Social insurance system	14	weeks	14	50
Gambia	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12	weeks	12	100
Ghana	n.a.	No statutory benefits are provided	12	weeks	12	100
Guinea	1960	50% social security, 50% employer	14	weeks	14	100
Guinea-Bissau	...	Employer (if a woman affiliated to a social security scheme receives a subsidy, the employer pays the difference between the subsidy and the salary)	60	days	8.5	100
Kenya ⁷	1966	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	2	months	9	100
Lesotho	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12	weeks	12	... ⁸
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1957	Employer (social security for self-employed women)	50	days	7	50, 100 ⁹
Madagascar	1952	50% social insurance, 50% employer	14	weeks	14	100
Malawi	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	8 ¹⁰	weeks	8	100
Mali	1952	Social insurance	14	weeks	14	100
Mauritania	1952	Social security fund	14	weeks	14	100
Mauritius	1975	Employer	12	weeks	12	100
Morocco	1959	Social security	14	weeks	14	100
Mozambique	...	Employer	60	days	8.5	100
Namibia	...	Social insurance	12	weeks	12	100
Niger	1952	Social insurance	14	weeks	14	100
Nigeria ¹¹	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12	weeks	12	50
Rwanda ¹²	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12	weeks	12	67
Sao Tome and Principe	1979	Social security (employer must pay for women not covered)	60	days	8.5	100
Senegal	1952	Social insurance	14	weeks	14	100
Seychelles	1979	Social insurance	14	weeks	14	... ¹³
Somalia	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	14	weeks	14	50
South Africa	1937	Unemployment insurance fund	4	months	17	60 ¹⁴
Swaziland	n.a.	No statutory benefits are provided	12	weeks	12	... ¹⁵

Country or area	Date of first law	Provider of maternity benefits	Length of maternity leave			Percentage of wages paid in period covered
			Period and unit	in weeks	%	
Tanzania, United Republic of	1997	Social insurance	12 weeks	12	100	
Togo	1956	50% employer, 50% social security	14 weeks	14	100	
Tunisia	1960	Social insurance	1–2 ¹⁶ months	4	67, 100 ¹⁷	
Uganda	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	60 days	8.5	100	
United Arab Emirates	...	Employer	45 days	6	100, 50 ¹⁸	
Zambia ¹⁹	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12 weeks	12	100	
Zimbabwe ²⁰	1984	Employer (no statutory cash benefits are provided)	98 days	14	100 ¹⁵	
Asia						
Afghanistan	...	Employer	90 days	13	100	
Armenia	1912	Social insurance	140 days	20	100	
Azerbaijan	1912	Social insurance	126 calendar days	18	100	
Bahrain	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	45 days	6	100	
Bangladesh	1939	Employer	16 weeks	16	100	
Cambodia	...	Employer	90 days	13	50	
China	1951	Social insurance and mandatory private insurance	90 days	13	100 ²¹	
China, Hong Kong SAR	1968	Employer (and social assistance)	10 weeks	10	80	
Georgia	1955	Social insurance	126 days	18	100	
India	1961	Social security or employer (for women not covered)	12 weeks	12	100	
Indonesia	1957	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	3 months	13	100	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	1949	Social insurance	90 days	13	67	
Iraq	...	Social insurance	62 days	9	100	
Israel	1953	Social insurance	14 weeks	14	100 ²²	
Japan	1922	Health insurance scheme (if managed by employer), or social insurance agency (if managed by the government)	14 weeks	14	67 ²³	
Jordan	...	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	10 weeks	10	100	
Kazakhstan	1999	Social insurance	126 calendar days	18	100	
Korea, Rep. of	1963	60 days employer, 30 days employment insurance fund	90 days	13	100 ²⁴	
Kuwait	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	70 days	10	100	
Kyrgyzstan	1922	Social security	126 calendar days	18	100 ²⁵	
Lao People's Democratic Rep.	1999	Social security or employer	90 days	13	100 ²⁶	
Lebanon	1963	Employer (through social insurance)	7 weeks	7	100	
Malaysia	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	60 days	8.5	100	
Mongolia	...	Social insurance fund	120 days	17	70	
Myanmar	n.a.	No statutory benefits are provided	12 weeks	12	67	
Nepal	1983	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	52 days	7	100	
Pakistan	1965	Employer	12 weeks	12	100 ²⁷	
Philippines	1977	Employer (reimbursed by the social security system)	60 ²⁸ days	8.5	100	
Qatar	...	Employer	50 days	7	100	
Saudi Arabia	1969	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	10 weeks	10	50, 100	
Singapore	1968	Employer and government	12 weeks	12	100	
Sri Lanka ²⁹	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12 weeks	12	86, 100 ³⁰	
Sudan	n.a.	Employer (no statutory cash benefits are provided)	8 weeks	8	100	
Syrian Arab Republic	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	50 days	7	70	
Tajikistan	1950	Social insurance	140 calendar days	20	... ⁵	
Thailand	1990	Employer and social insurance system	90 days	13	100, 50 ³¹	

Country or area	Date of first law	Provider of maternity benefits	Length of maternity leave			Percentage of wages paid in period covered
			Period and unit	in weeks	%	
Turkmenistan	1955	Social insurance	112 days	16	100	
Uzbekistan	1955	State social insurance scheme	126 calendar days	18	100	
Viet Nam	1961	Social insurance fund	4–6 ³² months	17	100	
Yemen	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	60 days	8.5	100	
Europe						
Albania	1947	Social insurance	365 calendar days	52	80, 50 ³³	
Andorra	1966	Social insurance	16 weeks	16	100	
Austria	1955	Statutory health insurance, family burden equalization fund, or employer	16 weeks	16	100	
Belarus	1955	State social insurance	126 days	18	100	
Belgium	1894	Social insurance	15 weeks	15	82, 75 ³⁴	
Bosnia & Herzegovina	1 year	52	100 ³⁵	
Bulgaria	1918	Public social insurance (general sickness and maternity fund)	135 days	19	90	
Channel Islands, Guernsey	...	Social insurance and social assistance	18 weeks	18	... ^{64,65}	
Channel Islands, Jersey	...	Social insurance	18 weeks	18	... ^{64,65}	
Croatia	1954	Health insurance fund (until the child reaches the age of 6 months); the rest is paid from the state budget	1+ year	52	100 ³⁷	
Cyprus	1957	Social insurance	18 weeks	18	75 ³⁸	
Czech Republic	1888	Social insurance	28 weeks	28	69	
Denmark	1892	Municipality and employer	52 ³⁹ weeks	52	100 ²²	
Estonia	1924	Health insurance fund	140 calendar days	22	100	
Finland	1963	Social insurance system	105 working days	21	70 ⁴⁰	
France	1928	Social insurance	16 weeks	16	100 ²²	
Germany	1883	Statutory health insurance scheme, state, employer	14 weeks	14	100 ²²	
Greece	1922	Social security/employer	119 days	17	50+ ^{41,42}	
Hungary	1891	Social insurance system	24 weeks	24	70	
Iceland	1975	Social security (social insurance and universal)	3 ⁴³ months	13	80	
Ireland	1911	Social insurance fund	26 weeks	26	80 ⁴⁴	
Isle of Man	1951	Social insurance and social assistance system	26 weeks	26	90 ⁴⁵	
Italy	1912	Social insurance	5 months	22	80	
Latvia	1924	State social insurance	112 calendar days	16	100	
Liechtenstein	1910	Social insurance	20 weeks	20	80	
Lithuania	1925	State social insurance fund	126 calendar days	18	100	
Luxembourg	1901	Social insurance	16 weeks	16	100	
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	9 months	39	...	
Malta	1981	Social insurance and universal	14 weeks	14	100 ⁴⁶	
Moldova, Republic of	1993	State social insurance fund	126 calendar days	18	100	
Monaco	1944	Social insurance	16 weeks	16	90 ²²	
Netherlands	1931	Unemployment fund	16 weeks	16	100 ²²	
Norway	1909	Social insurance fund	46–56 ⁴⁷ weeks	46–56	80, 100 ⁴⁸	
Poland	1920	Social insurance fund	16 weeks	16	100	
Portugal	1935	Social insurance	120 days	17	100	
Romania	1912	Social insurance fund	126 days	18	85	

Country or area	Date of first law	Provider of maternity benefits	Length of maternity leave			Percentage of wages paid in period covered
			Period and unit	in weeks	%	
Russian Federation	1912	Social insurance fund	140	calendar days	20	100 ^{22, 42}
San Marino	1967	Social insurance	5	months	22	100 ⁴⁹
Serbia	1922	Social insurance	365	days	52	100 ⁵⁰
Slovakia	1888	Social insurance fund	28	weeks	28	55
Slovenia	1949	State	105	days	15	100
Spain	1929	Social security	16	weeks	16	100
Sweden	1891	Social insurance	480 ⁵¹	days	68	80 ^{22, 52}
Switzerland	1911	Social insurance	14 ⁵³	weeks	14	80 ^{22, 54}
Turkey	1945	Social insurance	16	weeks	16	67 ⁵⁵
Ukraine	1912	Social insurance	126	days	18	100
United Kingdom	1911	Employer (92% refunded by public funds)	52 ⁵⁶	weeks	52	90 ⁵⁷
Latin America and the Caribbean						
Antigua and Barbuda	1973	Social insurance system and supplemented by employer	13	weeks	13	100, 60 ⁵⁸
Argentina	1934	Family allowance funds (financed through state and employer contributions)	90	days	13	100 ⁵⁹
Bahamas	1972	National insurance board (2/3) and employer (1/3)	13	weeks	13	100 ⁶⁰
Barbados	1966	National social insurance system	12	weeks	12	100
Belize	1979	Social security or employer (for women who are not entitled to receive benefits from social security)	14	weeks	14	80
Bermuda	...	Employer	12	weeks	12	100 ⁶¹
Bolivia	1949	Social insurance	12	weeks	12	70–100 ⁶²
Brazil	1923	Social insurance	120	days	17	100
British Virgin Islands	1979	Social insurance	13	weeks	13	67 ⁶³
Chile	1924	Social insurance	18	weeks	18	100
Colombia	1938	Social insurance	12	weeks	12	100
Costa Rica	1941	50% social security, 50% employer	4	months	17	100 ⁶⁶
Cuba	1934	Social insurance	18	weeks	18	100
Dominica	1975	Social security and employer	12	weeks	12	60 ⁶³
Dominican Republic	...	50% social security, 50% employer	12	weeks	12	100 ⁶⁷
Ecuador	1935	75% social security, 25% employer	12	weeks	12	100
El Salvador	1949	Social security for insured workers, otherwise employer must pay	12	weeks	12	75
Grenada	1980	60% for 12 weeks by social security, 40% for 2 months by employer	3	months	13	100, 60 ⁶⁸
Guatemala	1952	2/3 social security, 1/3 employer	84	days	12	100 ⁶⁷
Guyana	1969	Social security	13	weeks	13	70 ⁶³
Haiti	1999	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12	weeks	12	100 ⁶⁹
Honduras	1959	2/3 social security, 1/3 employer	12	weeks	12	100 ⁶⁷
Jamaica	1965	Employer	12	weeks	12	100 ⁷⁰
Kiribati	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12	weeks	12	25
Mexico	1943	Social insurance	12	weeks	12	100 ⁶⁷
Nicaragua	1955	Social insurance	12	weeks	12	60 ⁶⁷
Panama	1941	Social security fund (but employer liable to cover difference between the maternity allowance paid by the social security fund and what the worker is entitled to receive during this period)	14	weeks	14	100 ⁶⁷
Paraguay	1943	Social security system	12	weeks	12	50 ⁷¹
Peru	1936	Social insurance	90	days	13	100 ²²
Saint Kitts and Nevis	1977	Social insurance	13	weeks	13	65 ⁶³

Country or area	Date of first law	Provider of maternity benefits	Length of maternity leave			Percentage of wages paid in period covered
			Period and unit	in weeks	%	
Saint Lucia	1978	Social insurance	3 months	13	65 ⁶³	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1986	Social insurance	13 weeks	13	65 ⁶³	
Trinidad and Tobago	1939	Employer and social insurance	13 weeks	13	100, 50 ⁷²	
Uruguay	1958	Social insurance	12 weeks	12	100 ⁶⁵	
Venezuela	1940	Social insurance	18 weeks	18	67	
North America						
Canada	1996	Federal and state employment insurance	17–18 ^{73,74} weeks	17–18	55 ^{22,75}	
United States ⁷⁶	12 weeks	12	...	
Oceania						
Australia	1941	Universal and social assistance systems	12–52 ⁷⁷ weeks	12	... ⁷⁸	
Fiji	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	84 days	12	... ³⁶	
New Zealand	1938	State funds (universal and social assistance system)	14 weeks	14	100 ²²	
Papua New Guinea ⁷⁹	n.a.	No statutory benefits are provided	6+ ⁸⁰ weeks	6	...	
Solomon Islands ⁸¹	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12 weeks	12	25	
Vanuatu ⁸²	n.a.	Employer (no statutory benefits are provided)	12 weeks	12	50	

SOURCES

United Nations Statistics Division. 2009c. Indicators on Women and Men (New York)(<http://data.un.org/DocumentData.aspx?q=maternity&id=162>) based on ILO database Conditions of Work and Employment Laws: Working Time – Minimum Wages – Maternity Protection (Geneva, ILO, 2008h) (<http://www.ilo.org/dyn/travail/travmain.home>).

SSA/ISSA. 2008, 2009. Social Security Programs Throughout the World (Washington, DC and Geneva): The Americas, 2009; Europe, 2008; Asia and the Pacific, 2008; Africa, 2009.

NOTES

n.a. = Not applicable

... = Not available

¹ No statutory benefits are provided. The amended 1984 Employment Order requires employers in designated areas to pay maternity benefits to female employees. The maternity benefit is equal to at least 25 per cent of wages or 0.5 pula for each day of absence, whichever is greater, and is paid for 6 weeks before and 6 weeks after the expected date of birth; may be extended for an additional 2 weeks in the event of complications arising from pregnancy or childbirth.

² The labour code (1993) requires employers to pay 50 per cent of wages for maternity leave of up to 12 weeks (14 weeks in the event of complications arising from pregnancy or childbirth), including at least 6 weeks after childbirth, if the woman has at least 6 months of service during the year before the expected date of birth. The 1984 provision established a medical assistance programme to provide medical, surgical, maternity, hospitalization, dental, and pharmaceutical services to the low-income population.

³ No statutory benefits are provided. The labour code requires employers to provide 14 weeks of paid maternity leave.

⁴ 100 per cent for public servants.

⁵ Paid amount not specified.

⁶ The public service amendment proclamation (2002) and the labour proclamation (2003) require employers to provide paid maternity leave for up to 45 days after childbirth; thereafter, sick leave may be paid in the event of complications arising from childbirth.

⁷ The 1976 Employment Act requires employers to pay 100 per cent of earnings for up to 2 months of maternity leave. Some maternity medical benefits are also provided by employers.

⁸ No legal obligation for paid maternity leave but some employment contracts have provision.

⁹ 100 per cent for self-employed women for a period of three months.

¹⁰ Every three years.

¹¹ The labour code requires employers to provide employees with up to 12 days of paid sick leave a year and to provide paid maternity leave at 50 per cent of wages for 6 weeks before and 6 weeks after the expected date of birth.

¹² The labour code requires employers to pay 66.7 per cent of wages for maternity benefits for up to 12 weeks.

¹³ A flat monthly rate is paid for twelve weeks.

¹⁴ Up to a maximum amount of 60% depending on the level of income.

¹⁵ No statutory benefits are provided.

¹⁶ Civil servants are entitled to 2 months of maternity leave.

¹⁷ Social insurance benefits paid to private-sector employees for 30 days at a rate of two-thirds of average daily wage. Civil servants are paid full salary during maternity leave.

¹⁸ 100 per cent after one continuous year of employment, 50 per cent for employment less than one year.

- ¹⁹ No statutory benefits are provided. Women who qualified for maternity benefits under the repealed Provident Fund Act can claim them.
- ²⁰ No statutory cash benefits are provided. The labour relations Act requires employers to provide a maternity benefit; this equals 100 per cent of wages and is paid for at least 21 days before and 77 days after the expected date of birth.
- ²¹ The social insurance program applies to urban areas and the maternity insurance program covers all employees in urban enterprises, including all state-owned enterprises, regardless of their location.
- ²² Up to a ceiling.
- ²³ In addition, the Employees' health insurance scheme provides a lump-sum grant.
- ²⁴ The employer pays the first 60 days of leave, for enterprises which do not meet certain criteria.
- ²⁵ 100 per cent for the first 10 working days covered by employer. For the rest of the maternity leave, 10 times the benchmark amount is paid from social security fund. Benefits are adjusted periodically according to changes in the cost of living.
- ²⁶ Coverage limited to employees in private-sector and state-owned enterprises with 10 or more employees, and pensioners. Coverage is only available in certain regions of the country.
- ²⁷ Coverage for employees of industrial, commercial, and other establishments with five or more workers. Special systems for public-sector employees, members of the armed forces, police officers, local authority employees, and railway employees.
- ²⁸ 78 days for caesarian delivery.
- ²⁹ No statutory sickness and maternity benefits are provided. Plantations have their own dispensaries and maternity wards and must provide medical care for their employees. Employees in the plantation sector and certain wage and salary earners are entitled to 84 days of maternity leave before or after childbirth for the first two births and 42 days for subsequent births. The Maternity Benefits Ordinance requires employers to pay maternity benefits at the prescribed rate for 12 weeks for the first two births (6 weeks for subsequent births), including 2 weeks before birth and 10 weeks after (2 weeks before and 4 weeks after for subsequent births). Employed women covered under the Shop and Office Employees' Act also receive 84 days of paid maternity leave for the first two births and 42 days for subsequent births.
- ³⁰ Six-seventh (86%) of wages for workers paid at a time-rate or piece-rate. Employees covered by the Shop and Offices Employees Act receive 100 per cent of the remuneration.
- ³¹ Employer for 45 days at a rate of 100%; Social insurance for the remaining 45 days at a rate of 50%. In addition, the social insurance pays a lump sum child birth grant.
- ³² Duration depends on the working conditions and nature of the work.
- ³³ 80 per cent prior to birth and for 150 days, and 50 per cent for the rest of the leave period.
- ³⁴ 82 per cent for the first 30 days and 75 per cent for the remaining period (up to a ceiling).
- ³⁵ The level of benefits received during maternity leave varies from 50% to 100% depending upon the various cantonal regulations.
- ³⁶ Flat rate.
- ³⁷ 100 per cent until the child reaches the age of six months, then at a level determined by the Act on the Execution of the State Budget for the remaining period.
- ³⁸ The rate is increased to 80% if claimant has one dependant, to 90% if she has two dependants and to 100% if she has three dependants.
- ³⁹ Up to 32 weeks of leave period may be divided freely between both parents.
- ⁴⁰ The amount of maternity benefit varies based on income and employment conditions, but there is a minimum flat rate below which entitlement does not fall.
- ⁴¹ 50% plus a dependent's supplement (10% for each dependent, up to a maximum of 40%).
- ⁴² In addition, a birth grant is paid in lump sum.
- ⁴³ The 3-month leave period may be freely split between both parents.
- ⁴⁴ Subject to a minimum and maximum amount.
- ⁴⁵ Maternity allowance is paid for a period of up to 39 weeks at 90% of earnings, up to a ceiling.
- ⁴⁶ An employee on maternity leave is entitled to full wages during the first thirteen weeks of leave, with the fourteenth week unpaid. Social security pays maternity benefit at a flat rate for a maximum of 13 weeks for those not covered under the Employment and Industrial Relations Act.
- ⁴⁷ Two leave options depending on the choice of benefits paid: 46 weeks or 56 weeks parental leave. The mother must take at least 3 weeks immediately before birth and 9 weeks immediately after birth. 10 weeks are reserved for the father. The rest of the leave period can be shared between both parents.
- ⁴⁸ Parental benefits are paid either at 100% for 46 weeks or at 80% for 56 weeks. Prior to 1 July 2009, parental benefits paid 100% for 44 weeks or 80% for 54 weeks
- ⁴⁹ After the 5 months leave, mothers can remain on leave and receive a benefit equal to 30% of earnings for 7 months and 20% of earnings for the next 6 months, or they can return to work and take up to 2 hours of leave a day on full pay for 13 months.
- ⁵⁰ 100% of earnings are paid for the first 6 months; 60% from the 6th to the 9th month; and 30% for the last 3 months.
- ⁵¹ 480 days shared between both parents. 60 of these days are reserved for each parent while the rest are transferable to the other parent. In case of sole custody, all 480 days accrue to the custodial parent.
- ⁵² 480 calendar days paid parental leave: 80 per cent for 390 days; flat rate for remaining 90 days.
- ⁵³ Some cantons provide longer leaves. In the Canton of Geneva paid leave is 16 weeks. Employees of the Swiss Confederation are entitled to 98 at least four months if the woman has completed a year of service.
- ⁵⁴ Employees of the Confederation are entitled to 4 month paid maternity at 100%.
- ⁵⁵ 12 weeks coverage.
- ⁵⁶ Consisting of 26 weeks of Ordinary Maternity Leave and 26 weeks of Additional Maternity Leave.
- ⁵⁷ Statutory maternity leave is paid for a continuous period of up to 39 weeks: 90 per cent for the first 6 weeks and a flat rate for the remaining weeks. From April 2010, paid maternity leave will increase to 52 weeks.
- ⁵⁸ Social Insurance (60 per cent for 13 weeks) and Employer (40 per cent for the first 6 weeks).
- ⁵⁹ In addition, a means-tested birth grant is paid in lump sum.
- ⁶⁰ Benefits by the National Insurance Board are paid for 13 weeks, by the Employer for 12 weeks.
- ⁶¹ No statutory benefits are provided. However, the 2000 Employment Act provides for 8 weeks paid and 4 weeks unpaid maternity leave to employees who have worked for the same employer for at least a year; 8 weeks unpaid maternity leave for employees with less than a year.
- ⁶² 100% of national minimum wage plus 70% of wages above minimum wage.

- ⁶³ In addition, a maternity grant is paid in lump sum.
- ⁶⁴ Flat rate for the normal duration of maternity leave.
- ⁶⁵ In addition, a lump sum maternity grant is paid.
- ⁶⁶ For private-sector employees. Special system for civil servants.
- ⁶⁶ In cases where the employee does not fulfill the prerequisites to receive social security benefits, the employer shall pay two-thirds of the remuneration.
- ⁶⁷ If the worker is not entitled to social security benefits, the employer shall cover the full cost of benefit.
- ⁶⁸ 100 per cent for 2 months and 60 per cent for the last month.
- ⁶⁹ 6 weeks coverage.
- ⁷⁰ The benefit is equal to the national minimum weekly wage and is paid for 8 weeks.
- ⁷¹ 9 weeks coverage.
- ⁷² The Maternity Protection Act entitles an employee to 100% pay for 1 month and 50% for 2 months by Employer; social insurance system pays a sum depending on earnings. When the sum of the amount paid under the Maternity Protection Act and social insurance is less than full pay, the employer shall pay the difference to the employee.
- ⁷³ Duration of maternity leave depends on the province. In Quebec and Saskatchewan, maternity leave is 18 weeks, while in Alberta it is 15.
- ⁷⁴ In addition, up to 37 weeks of parental leave may be shared between the two parents within the 52 weeks following birth.
- ⁷⁵ Benefits paid vary by province and jurisdiction. In most provinces and the federal jurisdiction, 55% paid for 15 weeks of maternity leave and another 35 weeks of paternal leave which may be shared between both parents. Three provinces (Newfoundland, Prince Edward's Island and Saskatchewan) pay maternity benefits for the full 17 weeks leave (in the case of Saskatchewan 18 weeks). In Quebec, maternity benefits are paid at 70% for 18 weeks or at 75% for 15 weeks; paternity benefits are paid at 70% for 5 weeks or at 75% for 3 weeks; parental benefits (shared by both parents) are paid at 70% for 7 weeks plus 55% for 25 weeks or at 75% for 25 weeks.
- ⁷⁶ Maternity benefit: There is no national programme. Cash benefits may be provided at the state level.
- ⁷⁷ Compulsory leave: during the 6 weeks prior to the expected date of birth the employer might ask the employee to present a medical certificate about whether she is fit for work. If she does not provide this certificate she has to take unpaid parental leave for that period (Fair Work Act §§ 72, 73). General total duration: up to 12 months. The period of leave may start up to 6 weeks before the expected date of birth of the child, but must not start later than the date of birth. The entitlement to 12 months of unpaid parental is reduced by the amount of any unpaid special maternity leave taken by the employee while she was pregnant.
- ⁷⁸ A lump sum payment is paid for each child.
- ⁷⁹ The 1981 Employment Act requires employers to provide sick leave and maternity leave to employees.
- ⁸⁰ As necessary for hospitalization before confinement and 6 weeks after.
- ⁸¹ The Labor Act requires employers to provide up to 12 weeks of maternity leave to women employees (including up to at least 6 weeks after childbirth).
- ⁸² No statutory benefits are provided for sickness and maternity. The 1983 Employment Act requires employers to provide 50 per cent of wages for maternity leave of up to 12 weeks (6 weeks before and 6 weeks after the expected date of birth). Employers are required to allow a mother to interrupt work twice a day for 30 minutes to feed a nursing child.

Social security indicators of effective coverage

Table 21. Indicators of effective coverage worldwide: Old age. Active contributors and elderly who receive an old-age pension, latest available year (percentages)

Major area, region or country	Effective extent of coverage			
	Share of population above legal retirement age in receipt of a pension (%)	Year	Active contributors to a pension scheme in the working-age population (%)	Year
World^a	40.2		26.4	
Sub-Saharan Africa ^a	15.6		5.4	
Africa ^a	17.6		10.4	
Asia and the Pacific ^a	30.9		18.0	
Middle East ^a	27.3		21.7	
North Africa ^a	28.4		28.5	
Latin America and the Caribbean ^a	50.3		36.6	
CIS ^a	94.0		39.6	
Central and Eastern Europe ^a	87.3		50.0	
Western Europe ^a	92.7		65.3	
North America ^a	75.6		72.4	
Africa				
Algeria	31.7	2006	37.3	2005
Benin	2.6	2005	4.2	2004
Burkina Faso	1.6	2004	2.4	2005
Burundi	3.8	2006	3.3	2006
Cameroon	9.1	2006	11.5	2006
Cape Verde	90.0	2005	21.7	2006
Chad	1.6	2005	1.6	2005
Congo	17.0	2008	7.5	2008
Congo, Democratic Republic of	17.7	2008	10.5	2008
Côte d'Ivoire	9.5	2004	9.1	2004
Djibouti	12.0	2002	8.4	2002
Egypt	...	n.a.	27.7	2004
Gambia	3.0	2003	2.9	2003
Ghana	3.8	2004	9.2	2004
Guinea	3.1	2005	10.8	2005
Guinea-Bissau	...	n.a.	1.5	2004
Kenya	...	n.a.	6.7	2005
Lesotho	81.6	2007	3.6	2005
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	...	n.a.	38.1	2003
Mauritania	9.3	2002	9.4	2000
Mauritius	100.0	2008	33.6	2000
Morocco	16.0	2003	16.8	2003
Mozambique	19.9	2006	1.7	2006
Namibia	86.6	2008	6.1	2008
Niger	5.2	2006	1.2	2005
Nigeria	...	n.a.	1.2	2005
Rwanda	12.1	2004	4.1	2004
Senegal	10.0	2006	4.5	2004
Sierra Leone	0.2	2005	3.8	2005
South Africa	76.4	2007	...	n.a.
Sudan	3.8	2005	2.9	2005
Tanzania, United Republic of	3.2	2008	3.3	2007
Togo	3.1	2003	5.7	2003
Tunisia	55.1	2006	34.5	2005
Uganda	0.9	2004	9.3	2004

Major area, region or country	Effective extent of coverage			
	Share of population above legal retirement age in receipt of a pension (%)	Year	Active contributors to a pension scheme in the working-age population (%)	Year
Zambia	7.7	2006	8.8	2005
Zimbabwe	6.2	2006	14.5	2006
Asia				
Afghanistan	...	n.a.	2.2	2005
Armenia	93.1	2006	24.5	2004
Azerbaijan	97.9	2003	23.0	2003
Bahrain	36.5	2006	13.8	2005
Bangladesh	17.9	2004	2.3	2004
Bhutan	0.5	2005	7.0	2004
Cambodia	3.0	2005	...	n.a.
China	33.4	2007	22.6	2006
Georgia	...	n.a.	22.7	2004
Hong Kong, China	71.7	2007	...	n.a.
India	24.0	2005	6.4	2006
Indonesia	22.9	2003	14.1	2003
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	22.0	2006	20.0	2000
Iraq	79.5	2004	6.9	2004
Israel	89.1	2008	66.8	2006
Japan	67.9	2005	75.0	2005
Jordan	42.9	2008	21.2	2007
Kazakhstan	76.0	2004	61.8	2003
Korea, Republic of	33.5	2004	55.0	2005
Kuwait	43.1	2006	11.2	2006
Kyrgyzstan	100.0	2005	28.9	2006
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	6.0	2005	0.7	2004
Lebanon	23.1	2003	19.9	2003
Malaysia	37.3	2004	63.8	2003
Maldives	27.0	2005	14.1	2005
Mongolia	59.7	2004	...	n.a.
Nepal	67.1	2003	1.4	2003
Oman	3.5	2008	8.3	2007
Pakistan	25.7	2004	4.0	2004
Philippines	16.9	2005	54.7	2003
Saudi Arabia	...	n.a.	20.7	2007
Singapore	...	n.a.	...	n.a.
Sri Lanka	24.6	2005	22.2	2004
Syrian Arab Republic	30.5	2005	35.0	2005
Taiwan, China	...	n.a.	50.8	2005
Tajikistan	89.6	2004	...	n.a.
Thailand	20.3	2007	21.3	2006
Timor-Leste	...	n.a.	...	n.a.
Uzbekistan	100.0	2005	...	n.a.
Viet Nam	33.5	2004	12.4	2007
Yemen	19.2	2004	5.8	2006
Europe				
Albania	100.0	2007	33.0	2004
Austria	93.1	2006	68.7	2005
Belgium	81.4	2006	61.6	2005
Bulgaria	95.7	2006	57.4	2006

Major area, region or country	Effective extent of coverage			
	Share of population above legal retirement age in receipt of a pension (%)	Year	Active contributors to a pension scheme in the working-age population (%)	Year
Croatia	100.0	2005	50.2	2005
Cyprus	81.5	2006	77.9	2006
Czech Republic	100.0	2006	67.2	2006
Denmark	100.0	2006	75.0	2005
Estonia	88.2	2006	68.6	2004
Finland	100.0	2006	67.2	2005
France	100.0	2006	61.4	2005
Germany	100.0	2006	65.5	2005
Greece	72.5	2006	58.5	2005
Hungary	84.9	2006	51.6	2002
Iceland	76.0	2007	79.8	2005
Ireland	64.7	2006	63.9	2005
Latvia	94.8	2006	66.5	2003
Lithuania	95.0	2006	56.0	2004
Luxembourg	100.0	2006	95.5	2005
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	55.4	2003	38.9	2000
Malta	91.4	2006	...	n.a.
Moldova, Republic of	88.1	2003	49.0	2003
Montenegro	85.3	2003	36.8	2003
Netherlands	100.0	2007	70.4	2005
Norway	94.0	2006	75.7	2005
Poland	86.5	2006	52.2	2007
Portugal	100.0	2006	71.9	2005
Romania	100.0	2006	39.1	2005
Serbia	24.2	2003	34.2	2003
Slovakia	100.0	2006	55.3	2003
Slovenia	88.2	2006	...	n.a.
Spain	84.8	2006	63.2	2005
Sweden	100.0	2006	72.3	2005
Switzerland	...	n.a.	79.1	2005
Turkey	87.1	2006	29.2	2006
United Kingdom	...	n.a.	71.4	2005
Latin America and the Caribbean				
Antigua & Barbuda	...	n.a.	65.7	2004
Argentina ^{1,2}	68.3	2005	34.6	2003
Aruba	89.5	2006	68.0	2003
Barbados ²	85.4	2007	69.9	2006
Belize	...	n.a.	44.5	2005
Brazil ¹	85.9	2005	45.2	2004
Chile ^{1,2}	63.8	2005	58.2	2003
Colombia	18.6	2000	22.2	2004
Costa Rica	35.2	2007	46.6	2004
Dominica	...	n.a.	35.8	2004
Ecuador ^{1,2}	15.2	2005	21.9	2003
El Salvador ^{1,2}	14.5	2005	29.7	2003
Guatemala ^{1,2}	11.3	2005	19.6	2003
Honduras	...	n.a.	18.9	2004
Jamaica	40.0	2003	12.7	2004
Mexico ^{1,2}	19.2	2005	38.5	2003
Nicaragua ^{1,2}	4.7	2005	18.7	2003

Major area, region or country	Effective extent of coverage			
	Share of population above legal retirement age in receipt of a pension (%)	Year	Active contributors to a pension scheme in the working-age population (%)	Year
Paraguay ^{1,2}	19.6	2005	13.9	2003
Peru ^{1,2}	23.2	2005	18.9	2003
Saint Kitts and Nevis	56.4	2005	62.8	2002
Saint Lucia	19.1	2005	44.7	2007
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	45.6	2005	45.5	2005
Trinidad and Tobago	46.6	2006	57.4	2008
Uruguay ^{1,2}	87.1	2005	55.3	2003
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of ^{1,2}	23.9	2005	35.1	2003
North America				
Canada	90.5	2005	71.4	2006
United States	74.0	2006	72.5	2005
Oceania				
Marshall Islands	62.9	2005	...	n.a.
Nauru	64.5	2005	...	n.a.
New Zealand	100.0	2008	...	n.a.
Samoa	...	n.a.	22.4	2006
Tonga	9.5	2005	...	n.a.
Tuvalu	19.5	2005	...	n.a.
Vanuatu	3.1	2005	...	n.a.

SOURCES

ILO. 2009c. *Social Security Inquiry* (Geneva) based on national social security schemes data.
European Commission, EUROSTAT. 2009a. ESSPROS (European System of Integrated Social Protection Statistics) (Luxembourg). Number of pension beneficiaries by country and type of pension.
World Bank. 2009c. *Total beneficiaries of mandatory pension systems* (Washington, DC). Total beneficiaries refers to the number of people receiving a regular pension from mandatory pension systems including old-age, invalidity, survivors and social pensions.

NOTES

n.a. = Not applicable.

... = Not available.

^a Regional estimates weighted by population.

¹ For *Share of population above legal retirement age in receipt of a pension (%)*, see UNRISD, 2008: *Social insurance (pensions and health), labour markets and coverage in Latin America* (Geneva), table 5: Social insurance pension coverage of the population aged 65 and above in private and public systems, 2000–2005 (per cent).

² For *Active contributors to a pension scheme in the working-age population (%)*, see UNRISD, 2008, op. cit., table 3: Social insurance pension coverage of the labour force by private and public contributory systems, based on active contributors (per cent).

DEFINITIONS

Effective extent of coverage against specific social risks and contingencies can be understood in two ways:

- the actual number of protected persons as a percentage of those expected to be protected according to the legislation; for example, the percentage of those actually contributing to social insurance as compared to the number of those who should be contributing according to the law or, as presented in table 15, as a percentage of the working-age population
- the number of those who actually receive benefits as compared to the size of the target group
 - i. percentage of elderly persons receiving pensions (table 15)
 - ii. percentage of unemployed receiving benefits (table 16).

These two concepts are complementary but should be assessed separately.

1. Share of population above the legal retirement age in receipt of a pension**DEFINITION**

The numerator is the total number of recipients (without double counting) of a retirement pension.

- Beneficiaries from supplementary benefits received in complement to another basic old-age benefit (i.e. “second-pillar” schemes) are excluded to avoid double counting.
- Benefits covered are periodic cash retirement benefits. They can be means-tested or non-means-tested and provided through contributory, universal or targeted schemes.
- As far as possible, it includes survivor and disability benefits once the beneficiary of such benefit reaches the legal retirement age.

This total number of old-age pensioners is then set into relation with the size of the elderly population of reference. Many of the countries observed have provided figures for only the total number of old-age pension recipients. The legal retirement age in some sub-Saharan African countries can be as low as 55, but is mostly 60. Thus the national statutory retirement age (so far as there is one) is used for the calculation of the indicator.

INTERPRETATION

- Interpretation should take into account the option retained for the reference population (statutory retirement versus 65 and over). If the coverage of old-age pensions is evaluated in relation to the size of the population over a certain age limit (e.g. 65+), interpretations should take into account that this definition may not correspond to national pension ages.
- The issue of double counting: even if “supplementary” pension schemes are excluded to eliminate the main source of double counting, some may still occur. This is the case, for example, if recipients have moved between different pension schemes during the course of their working lives and receive pensions from several pension schemes. It is also the case (as in Luxembourg) where a significant proportion of old-age pensioners living on the other side of the border are not counted in the national old-age population. In order to eliminate these sources of double counting, it would be necessary to conduct additional analyses on the national level or to use micro-data in order to complement the data collected at the scheme level.
- The results have to be analysed in relation to contextual information, in particular regarding the type of schemes and combination of schemes existing in the country (see table 13.1): contributory schemes, provident funds and universal or targeted schemes; defined-benefit versus defined-contribution schemes; private versus public; means-tested or non-means-tested benefits.
- This indicator of effective coverage will preferably be analysed in combination with additional indicators on actual benefit levels for workers and the population (if not available, at least in relation to statutory information on the legal replacement rate).
- The interpretation of the indicator should take into consideration the fact that in most countries workers can postpone retirement and continue to work after the statutory retirement age.

2. Active contributors to a pension scheme as a percentage of the working-age population

DEFINITION

The numerator is the number of active contributors (without double counting) to national existing contributory retirement schemes.

- Contributors to supplementary benefits received in complement to another basic old-age benefit (i.e. “second-pillar” schemes) are excluded to avoid double counting.
- Benefits covered are periodic cash retirement benefits. They can be means-tested or non-means-tested and provided through contributory, universal or targeted schemes.

This total number of active contributors is then set into relation with the size of the working-age population.

INTERPRETATION

- Interpretation should take into account the option retained for the reference population (here the working age).
 - As previously, the results have to be analysed in relation to contextual information, in particular regarding the type of schemes and combination of schemes existing in the country: contributory schemes, provident funds and universal or targeted schemes; defined-benefit versus defined-contribution schemes; private versus public; means-tested or non-means-tested benefits. The main limitation of this indicator is that it covers only contributory schemes, excluding from its scope all non-contributory schemes, notably social pensions (either on a means-tested basis or categorical).
 - As for the previous indicator, this indicator of effective coverage will preferably be analysed in combination with additional indicators on actual benefit levels for workers and the population (if not available, at least in relation to statutory information on the legal replacement rate).
-

Table 22a. Indicators of effective coverage worldwide: Unemployment. Unemployed who actually receive benefits, latest available year (percentages)

Major area, region or country	Percentage of unemployed receiving and not receiving unemployment benefits					
	Year	Contributory schemes	Non-contributory schemes	Contributory and non-contributory schemes	Percentage of unemployed not receiving unemployment benefits	Contributory and non-contributory schemes (grouping in 3 categories)
World^a		13.5	2.0	15.4	84.6	
Africa ^a		0.7	0.0	0.7	99.3	Less than one-third
Arab States ^a		2.2	0.0	2.2	97.8	Less than one-third
Asia ^a		9.9	0.7	10.6	89.4	Less than one-third
Central and Eastern Europe ^a		22.7	1.3	24.0	75.7	Less than one-third
CIS ^a		25.6	0.0	25.6	74.4	Less than one-third
Latin America ^a		5.7	0.1	5.8	94.2	Less than one-third
North America ^a		36.8	0.1	36.9	63.1	Between one-third and two-thirds
Western Europe ^a		44.9	22.8	67.7	32.3	Over two-thirds
Africa						
Algeria	2002	3.9	0.0	3.9	96.1	Less than one-third
Angola	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Benin	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Botswana ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Burkina Faso	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Burundi	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Cameroon	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Cape Verde	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Central African Republic	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Chad	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Comoros	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Congo	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Congo, Democratic Republic of	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Côte d'Ivoire	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Djibouti	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Egypt	n.a.
Equatorial Guinea	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Eritrea	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Ethiopia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Gabon	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Gambia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Ghana	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Guinea	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Guinea-Bissau	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Kenya	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Lesotho	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Liberia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Madagascar	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Malawi	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Mali	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Mauritania	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Mauritius	2007	0.0	1.0	1.0	99.0	Less than one-third
Morocco	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Mozambique	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Namibia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None

Major area, region or country	Percentage of unemployed receiving and not receiving unemployment benefits					
	Year	Contributory schemes	Non-contributory schemes	Contributory and non-contributory schemes	Percentage of unemployed not receiving unemployment benefits	Contributory and non-contributory schemes (grouping in 3 categories)
Niger	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Nigeria ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Rwanda	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Sao Tome and Principe	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Senegal	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Seychelles ²	n.a.
Sierra Leone	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Somalia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
South Africa	2008	10.8	0.0	10.8	89.2	Less than one-third
Sudan	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Swaziland	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Tanzania, United Republic of ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Togo	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Tunisia	2008	0.0	3.0	3.0	97.0	Less than one-third
Uganda	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Zambia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Zimbabwe	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Asia						
Afghanistan	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Armenia	2007	16.4	0.0	16.4	83.6	Less than one-third
Azerbaijan	2003	13.4	0.0	13.4	86.6	Less than one-third
Bahrain	2008	34.2	0.0	34.2	65.8	Between one-third and two-thirds
Bangladesh ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Bhutan	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Brunei Darussalam	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Cambodia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
China	2007	12.9	0.0	12.9	87.1	Less than one-third
Georgia	n.a.
Hong Kong, China	2007	0.0	25.2	25.2	74.8	Less than one-third
India ³	n.a.
Indonesia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	n.a.
Iraq	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Israel	2008	26.6	0.0	26.6	73.4	Less than one-third
Japan	2008	23.5	0.0	23.5	76.5	Less than one-third
Jordan	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Kazakhstan	2008	5.0	0.0	5.0	95.0	Less than one-third
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Korea, Republic of	2008	37.2	0.0	37.2	62.8	Between one-third and two-thirds
Kuwait	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Kyrgyzstan	n.a.
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Lebanon	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Malaysia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Maldives	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Mongolia	2007	16.8	0.0	16.8	83.2	Less than one-third
Myanmar	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None

Major area, region or country	Percentage of unemployed receiving and not receiving unemployment benefits					
	Year	Contributory schemes	Non-contributory schemes	Contributory and non-contributory schemes	Percentage of unemployed not receiving unemployment benefits	Contributory and non-contributory schemes (grouping in 3 categories)
Nepal ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Oman	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Pakistan ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Philippines	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Saudi Arabia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Singapore	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Sri Lanka	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Syrian Arab Republic	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Taiwan, China	2008	71.0	0.0	71.0	29.0	Over two-thirds
Tajikistan	2005	8.5	0.0	8.5	91.5	Less than one-third
Thailand	2008	14.7	0.0	14.7	85.3	Less than one-third
Timor-Leste	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Turkmenistan	n.a.
Uzbekistan	2006	54.1	0.0	54.1	45.9	Between one-third and two-thirds
Viet Nam ⁴	2008	100.0	None
West Bank and Gaza Strip	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Yemen	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Europe	n.a.					
Albania	2008	6.2	0.0	6.2	93.8	Less than one-third
Austria ⁵	2008	94.1	...	94.1	5.9	Over two-thirds
Belarus	2008	20.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	Less than one-third
Belgium	2008
Bulgaria	2003	21.0	0.0	21.0	79.0	Less than one-third
Croatia ⁵	2006	28.6	...	28.6	71.4	Less than one-third
Cyprus	2008	90.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	Over two-thirds
Czech Republic	2007	44.5	0.0	44.5	55.5	Between one-third and two-thirds
Denmark	2007	53.0	14.4	67.4	32.6	Over two-thirds
Estonia	2008	24.1	9.9	34.0	66.0	Between one-third and two-thirds
Finland	2008	54.9	11.9	66.8	33.2	Over two-thirds
France	2008	47.9	11.8	59.7	40.3	Between one-third and two-thirds
Germany	2008	30.0	69.0	99.0	1.0	Over two-thirds
Greece	
Hungary	2007	30.7	14.6	45.3	54.7	Between one-third and two-thirds
Iceland	2008	49.9	0.0	49.9	50.1	Between one-third and two-thirds
Ireland ⁵	2008	59.0	...	59.0	41.0	Between one-third and two-thirds
Italy	2007	31.4	1.9	33.3	66.7	Less than one-third
Latvia	2008	34.8	0.0	34.8	65.2	Between one-third and two-thirds
Lithuania	2008	23.7	0.0	23.7	76.3	Less than one-third
Luxembourg	2007	53.4	0.0	53.4	46.6	Between one-third and two-thirds
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	2008	7.0	0.0	7.0	93.0	Less than one-third
Malta	n.a.

Major area, region or country	Percentage of unemployed receiving and not receiving unemployment benefits					
	Year	Contributory schemes	Non-contributory schemes	Contributory and non-contributory schemes	Percentage of unemployed not receiving unemployment benefits	Contributory and non-contributory schemes (grouping in 3 categories)
Moldova, Republic of	2003	21.2	0.0	21.2	78.8	Less than one-third
Montenegro	2008	33.0	0.0	33.0	67.0	Less than one-third
Netherlands	2007	67.9	2.3	70.2	29.8	Over two-thirds
Norway	2008	90.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	Over two-thirds
Poland	2008	18.4	0.0	18.4	81.6	Less than one-third
Portugal	n.a.
Romania	2008	24.0	0.0	24.0	76.0	Less than one-third
Russian Federation ⁵	2008	23.4	...	23.4	76.6	Less than one-third
San Marino	n.a.
Serbia	2003	12.7	0.0	12.7	87.3	Less than one-third
Slovakia	2008	9.0	0.0	9.0	81.0	Less than one-third
Slovenia	2008	26.4	0.6	27.0	73.0	Less than one-third
Spain	2007	42.5	31.0	73.5	26.5	Over two-thirds
Sweden	2007	66.0	0.0	66.0	34.0	Between one-third and two-thirds
Switzerland	n.a.
Turkey	2008	12.7	0.0	12.7	87.3	Less than one-third
Ukraine ⁵	2007	34.4	...	34.4	65.6	Between one-third and two-thirds
United Kingdom	2008	51.4	0.0	51.4	48.6	Between one-third and two-thirds
Latin America and the Caribbean						
Antigua & Barbuda	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Argentina	2006	8.7	0.0	8.7	91.3	Less than one-third
Aruba	2003	15.7	0.0	15.7	84.3	Less than one-third
Bahamas	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Barbados	2003	77.7	0.0	77.7	22.3	Over two-thirds
Belize	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Bolivia ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Brazil	2005	7.0	0.0	7.0	93.0	Less than one-third
British Virgin Islands	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Chile	2008	20.1	0.0	20.1	79.9	Less than one-third
Colombia	n.a.
Costa Rica ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Cuba	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Dominica	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Dominican Republic	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Ecuador	n.a.
El Salvador	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Guatemala	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Guyana	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Haiti	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Honduras	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Jamaica	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Mexico ^{1,6}	2009	7.5	0.0	7.5	92.5	Less than one-third
Nicaragua	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Panama ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit
Paraguay	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Peru ¹	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	No statutory benefit

Major area, region or country	Percentage of unemployed receiving and not receiving unemployment benefits					
	Year	Contributory schemes	Non-contributory schemes	Contributory and non-contributory schemes	Percentage of unemployed not receiving unemployment benefits	Contributory and non-contributory schemes (grouping in 3 categories)
Saint Kitts and Nevis	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Saint Lucia	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Suriname	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Trinidad and Tobago	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Uruguay	2007	0.0	12.5	12.5	87.5	Less than one-third
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	n.a.
North America						
Canada	2007	44.4	0.3	44.7	55.3	Between one-third and two-thirds
United States	2008	37.5	0.0	37.5	62.5	Between one-third and two-thirds
Oceania						
Australia	2006	0.0	68.5	68.5	31.5	Over two-thirds
Fiji	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Kiribati	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Marshall Islands	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Nauru	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
New Caledonia	2008	20.3	0.0	20.3	79.7	Less than one-third
New Zealand	2007	0.0	37.0	37.0	63.0	Between one-third and two-thirds
Niue	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Palau Islands	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Papua New Guinea	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Samoa	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Solomon Islands	n.a.
Tonga	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Tuvalu	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None
Vanuatu	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	None

SOURCES

Numerator: *ILO Social Security Inquiry* (Geneva, ILO, 2009c) based on national social security schemes data.
Denominator: LABORSTA (Geneva, ILO, 2009e), table 3A: Unemployment, general level.

NOTES

n.a. = Not applicable.

... = Not available.

^a Regional estimates weighted by EAP.

¹ No statutory benefits are provided.

Botswana: Under the amended 1984 Employment Order, employees with 60 months of continuous employment are entitled to a severance benefit from their employer.

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya: The 1980 Social Security Law requires employers to pay a severance benefit to laid-off employees equal to 100 per cent of earnings for up to 6 months.

Nigeria: The 2004 Pension Reform Act provides enabling legislation for the National Social Insurance Trust Fund to introduce a social insurance programme for unemployment benefits. However, the contingencies to be covered and sources of funds have yet to be specified. For insured persons who contributed under the previous provident fund system, the 1961 Provident Fund Act No. 20 permits limited cash drawdown payments after 1 year of unemployment.

Tanzania, United Rep. of: The labour code requires employers to provide severance pay to employees with continuous service of at least 3 months.

Bangladesh: The 2008 labour law requires employers to provide a termination benefit, a retrenchment and lay-off benefit, and a benefit for discharge from service on the grounds of ill health to workers in shops and commercial and industrial establishments. Monthly rated permanent employees receive half the average basic wage for 120 days (plus a lump-sum payment of 1 month of salary for each year of service); casual workers for 60 days (plus a lump-sum payment of 14 days' wages for each year of service); and temporary workers for 30 days.

Nepal: The 1992 Labour Act requires employers to pay lump-sum severance benefits to laid-off employees equal to 1 month of wages for each year of service in all establishments employing 10 or more workers. The 1993 Labour Rules require employers in establishments with 10 or more workers to pay a cash benefit to workers with at least 3 years of employment when they retire or resign, as follows: 50 per cent of monthly wages for each of the first 7 years of service, 66 per cent of monthly wages for each year between 7 and 15 years, and 100 per cent of monthly wages for each year of service exceeding 15 years. The employee may choose between a cash benefit or a lump sum.

- Pakistan: The labour code requires employers with 20 employees or more to pay a severance payment equal to the last 30 days of wages for each year of employment.
- Bolivia: The labour law requires employers to grant severance pay to dismissed employees. Dismissed workers are covered for medical and maternity benefits for 2 months after employment ceases.
- Costa Rica: The labour law requires employers to contribute 1.5 per cent of payroll to finance a mandatory severance pay scheme.
- Mexico: See note 6.
- Panama: Under the 1972 Labour Code, employers are required to provide workers with a severance payment at the end of the labour contract.
- Peru: The labour code requires private-sector employers to provide a severance payment to employees at the end of the labour contract.
- ² Seychelles: Under the 1980 Unemployment Fund Act, the social security fund provides subsistence income for unemployed persons.
- ³ “Unemployment allowance” was added in 2005 to the existing Employees’ State Insurance Corporation scheme, which covers sickness and maternity; and covers 24 per cent of all formal-sector workers, or 2 per cent of the entire workforce.
- ⁴ Unemployment insurance legislation was first implemented in 2007 (SSA/ISSA, 2009) but effective coverage began only in January 2009 when enterprises were advised to take action; accordingly, statistical information is as yet very limited.
- ⁵ Unemployment assistance schemes exist but no data are available. Accordingly, coverage is underestimated for: Austria | Emergency assistance; Croatia | Unemployment assistance; Ireland | Job-seeker’s allowance; Russian Federation | Unemployment assistance; Ukraine | Unemployment assistance.
- ⁶ Mexico: The Mexican Social Security Institute pays an unemployment benefit of between 75 per cent and 95 per cent of the old-age pension for unemployed persons aged 60 to 64 (the benefit is paid under Old Age, Disability and Survivors). The labour law requires employers to pay dismissed employees a lump sum equal to 3 months’ pay plus 20 days’ pay for each year of service. Unemployed persons may withdraw an amount equal to 65 days of earnings in the last 250 weeks of contributions or 10 per cent of the individual account balance, whichever is lower, after 46 consecutive days of unemployment. One withdrawal is permitted every 5 years. At the end of 2008 the Mexican Secretary for Labour announced that Mexico had begun to put in place a new National Employment Service (SNE) which will offer help to the unemployed. Mexico has never before had an unemployment system for workers and this represents a significant change in the nation’s labour and social welfare system. Under the new system, workers who become unemployed owing to an economic, social or natural “labour contingency” are able to apply for financial assistance equal to 2.5 minimum wages (about \$10 per day) for 3 months. This programme has a budget of 650 million pesos in 2010.
- Data available for Mexico cover unemployed receiving financial assistance.
- The source is the National Statistical Office (household survey data).
-

Table 22b. Indicators of effective coverage worldwide: Unemployment during the financial crisis 2008–09.
Unemployed receiving unemployment benefits, monthly data, selected countries

Selected countries	Number of unemployment benefit recipients			Indexed value (100 in January 2008)	Latest available (date month/year)	
	January 2008	Highest level in the period Jan 2008–July 2010 (date)				
Argentina: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	111 789	149 573	(09/09)	133.8	147 535	(10/09)
Armenia: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	14 750	17 944	(03/09)	121.7	17 944	(03/09)
Australia: Jobseekers receiving newstart allowance and youth allowance	322 051	427 537	(07/09)	132.8	340 825	(06/10)
Belarus: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	26 300	20 800	(02/09)
Belgium: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	516 922	728 579	(01/10)	140.9	688 264	(05/10)
Brazil: Recipients of unemployment benefits	634 173	856 080	(03/09)	135.0	502 154	(06/10)
Bulgaria: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	92 895	112 967	(04/09)	121.6	107 165	(06/09)
Canada: Employment insurance beneficiaries receiving regular benefits	606 660	905 990	(03/09)	149.3	759 040	(04/10)
Chile: Superintendencia de Pensiones – Unemployment beneficiaries	94 925	177 371	(01/10)	186.9	109 379	(06/10)
China: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	2 852 000	2 610 000	(11/09)	91.5	2 610 000	(12/09)
Croatia: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	63 534	89 902	(03/10)	141.5	72 267	(06/10)
Cyprus: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	16 578	24 817	(01/10)	149.7	17 593	(06/10)
Czech Republic: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	123 831	214 161	(01/10)	172.9	143 891	(07/10)
Denmark: Unemployed recipients of social assistance	13 111	18 194	(02/10)	138.8	17 624	(06/10)
Denmark: Unemployed recipients of unemployment benefits	51 058	114 361	(01/10)	224.0	86 681	(06/10)
Estonia: Unemployment insurance	3 204	32 998	(02/10)	1029.9	31 651	(03/10)
Finland: Recipients of basic unemployment allowance	16 708	29 820	(12/09)	178.5	29 820	(12/09)
France: Social insurance beneficiaries	1 754 500	2 278 500	(01/10)	129.9	2 015 600	(06/10)
France: “Solidarity” allowance	413 600	424 700	(03/10)	102.7	423 900	(06/10)
Germany: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	1 166 934	1 427 740	(02/10)	122.3	1 060 633	(05/10)
Hungary: Jobseekers’ allowance recipients	109 297	173 507	(02/10)	158.7	131 009	(06/10)
Hungary: Recipients of jobseekers’ assistance	47 650	82 418	(02/10)	173.0	60 648	(06/10)
Israel: Claims for unemployment benefit – SA	55 582	94 726	(06/09)	170.4	73 232	(07/10)
Japan: Unemployment insurance – Basic allowance actual recipients	542 000	1 012 000	(06/09)	186.7	678 000	(06/10)
Korea, Republic of: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	273 465	362 000	(06/10)
Latvia: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	29 293	82 092	(01/10)	280.2	63 021	(06/10)
Lithuania: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	22 400	81 500	(06/09)	363.8	53 127	(07/10)
Luxembourg: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	4 984	7 692	(02/10)	154.3	6 440	(06/10)
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	24 544	25 380	(03/09)	103.4	25 380	(03/09)
Montenegro: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	9 222	13 102	(01/10)	142.1	12 499	(10/09)
Netherlands: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries – SA	189 800	281 200	(02/10)	148.2	268 900	(05/10)
New Caledonia: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	1 169	1 871	(02/10)	160.1	1 683	(05/10)
New Zealand: Unemployment benefit recipients	22 748	66 328	(12/09)	291.6	62 085	(06/10)
Poland: Unemployed with rights to benefit	267 800	426 790	(02/10)	159.4	347 783	(06/10)
Romania: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	128 357	468 863	(02/10)	365.3	410 933	(05/10)
Russian Federation: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	1 269 100	1 933 900	(04/09)	152.4	1 447 977	(06/10)
Serbia: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	70 358	74 805	(03/09)	106.3	72 395	(03/09)
Slovakia: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	21 124	63 495	(08/09)	300.6	45 088	(06/10)
Slovenia: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	15 223	27 940	(02/10)	183.5	27 492	(06/10)
South Africa: Payments to beneficiaries	150 549	215 515	(11/09)	143.2	215 515	(11/09)
Spain: Unemployment beneficiaries – Contributory	932 517	1 671 319	(02/09)	179.2	1 417 008	(06/10)
Spain: Unemployment beneficiaries – Non-contributory	610 373	1 528 823	(04/10)	250.5	1 436 218	(06/10)
Sweden: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	165 307	176 863	(02/10)	107.0	132 624	(07/10)
Switzerland: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	115 681	173 425	(01/10)	149.9	136 340	(06/10)
Thailand: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	59 214	188 986	(06/09)	319.2	177 385	(07/09)

Selected countries	Number of unemployment benefit recipients			Indexed value (100 in January 2008)	Latest available (date month/year)	
	January 2008	Highest level in the period Jan 2008– July 2010 (date)				
Turkey: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	106 945	311 000	(03/09)	290.8	311 000	(03/09)
Ukraine: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	495 800	670 900	(01/09)	135.3	291 300	(06/10)
United Kingdom: Claimants – SA (Jobseeker's Allowance)	794 900	1 627 800	(09/09)	204.8	1 461 200	(07/10)
United States: Continued claims – SA	2 723 000	6 409 084	(03/09)	235.4	4 597 000	(07/10)
Uruguay: Unemployment insurance beneficiaries	20 794	29 282	(02/09)	140.8	23 658	(10/09)

Sources

National social security schemes.

NOTES

SA = Seasonally adjusted data.

... = Not available.

Table 23. Indicators of effective coverage: Employment injury. Active contributors or protected persons, selected countries

Country	Number of contributors / protected persons	Ratio: contributors or protected persons as a percentage of			Year
		Working-age population	Economically active population	Total employment	
Albania	619 176	30.3	44.5	57.0	2006
Aruba	29 310	46.2	68.0	...	2003
Barbados	117 180	64.5	81.8	84.8	2007
Benin	127 779	2.9	3.8	3.9	2006
Brazil	50 832 020	36.6	51.9	56.2	2007
Bulgaria	2 021 000	42.6	59.8	70.0	2003
Burkina Faso	138 288	2.4	2.2	2.3	2005
Burundi	128 778	2.5	2.9	3.1	2008
Cameroon	487 735	5.8	7.7	8.4	2002
Chad	72 889	1.4	1.9	0.0	2005
China	121 733 000	13.5	15.7	16.2	2007
Côte d'Ivoire	449 076	4.3	6.1	6.6	2004
Croatia	1 499 000	55.8	75.0	86.8	2005
Cyprus	389 837	77.9	92.7	97.0	2006
Dominica	17 436	35.8	48.0	...	2004
Gambia	74 139	9.5	11.6	12.5	2003
Ghana	894 200	8.0	10.2	11.3	2001
Guinea	525 323	10.6	11.9	12.3	2005
Indonesia	19 300 000	13.5	18.8	20.9	2003
Israel ¹	2 821 000	66.8	101.1	111.6	2006
Jordan	570 669	17.3	30.3	39.7	2007
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of ¹	1 129 793	81.8	131.3	207.0	2003
Malaysia	5 454 799	32.3	48.6	49.9	2006
Mauritania	31 048	1.9	2.8	2.9	2002
Moldova, Republic of	1 238 468	49.0	31.9	84.5	2003
Niger	448 366	0.8	1.2	1.3	2001
Oman	131 775	8.3	12.9	13.8	2007
Philippines	21 738 544	41.0	62.7	69.4	2003
Poland	14 074 500	52.2	81.0	89.5	2007
Rwanda	194 734	4.1	2.2	4.8	2004
Saint Lucia	46 687	44.7	61.1	64.6	2007
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	34 263	48.6	65.3	...	2006
Senegal	189 000	3.3	3.1	4.4	2004
Syrian Arab Republic	1 459 473	13.3	22.0	24.7	2007
Tanzania, United Rep. of	308 916	1.5	0.7	1.7	2007
Thailand	7 992 025	17.1	21.3	21.3	2006
Togo	66 872	2.1	2.8	3.1	2003
Trinidad and Tobago	465 389	51.1	68.5	71.2	2006
Tunisia	1 208 504	18.7	34.5	40.1	2005
Viet Nam	6 970 000	12.4	15.5	15.8	2007
Yemen	500 000	4.4	4.2	10.8	2006
Zambia	112 479	2.0	2.5	2.8	2006
Zimbabwe	2 092 935	21.9	41.8	42.9	2006

SOURCES

Albania: Employment injury insurance (active contributors)

Aruba: Sickness and accident insurance (SVb). Beneficiaries of accident benefit only.

Barbados: National Insurance and Social Security Scheme, National Insurance Office. Coverage for employment injury: employed persons, including public employees and some categories of fishers. Self-employed and unpaid family labour are not included. There are a number of protected persons, as contributions are paid by employers on behalf of their employees.

Benin: Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale. Protected persons.

Brazil: Contributory Social Security Scheme and Employment Injury Scheme (SAT).

Bulgaria: Employment Injury and Professional Disease scheme (Trudova zlopoluka I profesionalna bolest).

Burkina Faso: Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale du Burkina Faso. Protected persons.

Burundi: Institut national de sécurité sociale du BURUNDI (INSS). Régime d'Assurance Risques Professionnels et Maladies Professionnelles. Protected persons.

Cameroon: Caisse nationale de prévoyance sociale (CNPS).

Chad: Caisse nationale de prévoyance sociale (CNPS). Rapports d'activité et Bilans comptables de la CNPS.

China: Work Injury Insurance (MOLSS). Source: *China Statistical Yearbook 2008* (<http://www.stats.gov.cn/english/statisticaldata/yearlydata/>).

Côte d'Ivoire: Institution de prévoyance sociale – Caisse nationale de prévoyance sociale (IPS-CNPS). Protected persons.

Croatia: Mandatory pension insurance based on generational solidarity, and basic health insurance.

Cyprus: Social Insurance Scheme.

Dominica: Social Security Fund.

Gambia: Industrial Injury Compensation Fund, Social Security and Housing Finance Corporation. Protected persons: payment is made by the employer only.

Ghana: Workman's Compensation Scheme, Ministry of Mobilization and Social Welfare. The Workman's Compensation Scheme is non-contributory.

Guinea: Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale.

Indonesia: Private Company Employee Social Insurance (Jamsistek).

Israel: Work Injury, Hostile Action Casualties (NII).

Jordan: Social Security Corporation (SSC). Insured persons do not pay contributions for the work injury insurance.

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia: Health insurance.

Malaysia: Social Security Schemes (SOSCO) and The Workman's Compensation Benefit (Act of 1952) which applies to all Malaysian citizens not covered under the Employee's Social Security Act 1969, as well as to all foreign workers. A special scheme, enacted under the Foreign Workers Compensation Scheme (Insurance) Regulation 1996, provides coverage against the risk of work accidents and death or permanent disablement from any cause to all foreign workers. The employer pays for the insurance coverage provided by private insurance companies.

Mauritania: Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale (CNSS).

Republic of Moldova: State Social Insurance.

Niger: Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale (CNSS). Protected persons corresponds to the number of persons declared at the end of 2001 (CNSS annual report).

Oman: Public Authority for Social Insurance (PASI).

Philippines: Government Service Insurance System (GSIS) and Social Security System (SSS). Protected workers.

Poland: Social Insurance Scheme, Social Insurance Institution (ZUS).

Rwanda: Caisse sociale du Rwanda.

Saint Lucia: National insurance corporation.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines: National Insurance Scheme. This is an estimate of the formal working population. The government is the largest employer and has outstanding records. Number of persons protected is simply the number of persons in formal employment, who contribute to the scheme.

Senegal: Occupational Accident and Occupational Disease (AT/MP). Contributors are those covered by IPRES (General Scheme of Retirement).

Syrian Arab Republic: Social insurance (work injury only, "stage 4"). Scheme covering workers in small enterprises (less than 5 employees), work injury only (contribution rate of 5%).

United Republic of Tanzania: National Social Security Fund.

Thailand: Workmen's Compensation Fund, Social Security Office.

Togo: Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale (CNSS).

Trinidad and Tobago: National Insurance System (NIS).

Tunisia: Caisse nationale de sécurité sociale (CNSS).

Viet Nam: Social security system. Work injury and occupational diseases benefit.

Yemen: Estimate. General Agency for Insurance and Pensions.

Zambia: Workers' Compensation Fund; coverage for employment injury: employed persons, including casual workers, domestic servants and apprentices. Workers' Compensation Fund Control Board (WCFCB); short-term benefits. Pneumoconiosis Compensation Board (PNEUMO); long-term benefits.

Zimbabwe: National Social Security Authority.

ILO, LABORSTA (Geneva, 2009e) and KILM (6th edition, Geneva, 2009h) for total employment used as a denominator.

NOTES

... = Not available.

¹ A percentage superior to 100 per cent simply indicates that the coverage goes beyond employment or economically active population.

Table 24. Indicators of effective coverage: Occupational injuries. Cases of injury with lost workdays, selected countries (total cases: fatal and non-fatal)

Countries	Injuries	Cases of injury with lost workdays		
		Number ^a Notes	Rate per 100,000 workers employed ^b	Year
Algeria	Compensated	40 423 ¹	397	2004
Argentina	Reported	598 702 ^{1,8}	3 551	2007
Armenia	Reported	76 ³	8	2008
Australia	Compensated	97 550 ^{1,9}	936	2007
Austria	Reported	66 172 ¹	1 654	2007
Azerbaijan	Reported	284 ²	7	2008
Bahrain	Reported	975 ¹	280	2008
Barbados	Reported	406 ²	318	2002
Belarus	Reported	3 000 ⁵	67	2008
Belgium	Compensated	94 077 ^{1,10}	2 276	2004
Benin	Reported	744 ¹	24	2004
Botswana	Reported	1 242 ^{2,11}	211	2008
Brazil	Compensated	326 071 ¹	433	2000
Bulgaria	Reported	3 811 ⁴	122	2007
Burkina Faso	Reported	1 512 ¹	23	2007
Burundi	Reported	6 078 ¹	197	2001
Cameroon	Reported	3 296 ^{3,12}	60	2000
Canada	Compensated	318 577 ^{1,13}	1 825	2007
Chile	Reported	205 997 ^{1,14}	3 314	2004
China	Reported	18 679 ^{2,15}	3	2002
Colombia	Reported	125 651 ^{1,16}	739	2003
Costa Rica	Compensated	109 408 ¹	6 155	2005
Croatia	Compensated	25 262 ¹	1 410	2008
Cuba	Reported	6 139 ³	119	2008
Cyprus	Reported	2 105 ²	511	2007
Czech Republic	Reported	71 455 ⁴	1 428	2008
Denmark	Reported	43 694 ²	1 593	2001
Dominican Republic	Compensated	1 896 ¹	50	2006
Egypt	Reported	26 994 ²	133	2003
El Salvador	Compensated	21 325 ^{1,17}	969	2003
Estonia	Compensated	4 059 ^{1,18}	625	2008
Finland	Compensated	62 132 ¹	2 470	2007
France	Compensated	720 772 ¹	2 804	2007
Gabon	Compensated	1 132 ^{1,19}	253	2001
Germany	Compensated	1 055 796 ¹	2 776	2007
Greece	Compensated	15 310 ^{1,20}	340	2003
Guyana	Reported	2 300 ²	784	2000
Honduras	Reported	2 101 ²	92	2000
Hungary	Reported	22 217 ^{2,21}	558	2008
Iceland	Reported	1 625 ³	914	2006
Ireland	Reported	7 972 ²	446	2002
Italy	Compensated	488 600 ¹	2 056	2008
Japan	Reported	119 291 ²	187	2008
Jordan	Reported	15 388 ¹	1 099	2006
Kazakhstan	Reported	3 043 ^{2,22}	40	2008
Kyrgyzstan	Reported	170 ²	8	2006
Latvia	Reported	1 739 ⁵	156	2008
Lithuania	Reported	3 678 ²	244	2007
Luxembourg	Compensated	10 627 ¹	5 048	2008

Countries	Injuries	Cases of injury with lost workdays		
		Number ^a Notes	Rate per 100,000 workers employed ^b	Year
Malaysia	Reported	81 810 ^{1,23}	822	2002
Malta	Compensated	4 026 ^{1,24}	2 508	2008
Mauritius	Reported	2 743 ¹	522	2007
Mexico	Reported	451 381 ¹	1 017	2007
Myanmar	Reported	183 ^{2,25}	1	2008
Namibia	Compensated	628 ^{1,26}	125	2001
New Zealand	Reported	25 945 ^{1,27}	1 194	2007
Nicaragua	Compensated	11 387 ¹	625	2003
Nigeria	Reported	53 ^{3,28}	0	2004
Norway	Reported	16 681 ²	658	2008
Papua New Guinea	Compensated	2 012 ³	83	2003
Philippines	Reported	23 265 ⁵	74	2003
Poland	Reported	97 632 ^{2,29}	604	2008
Portugal	Reported	173 527 ^{1,30}	3 319	2006
Romania	Reported	4 953 ^{2,31}	55	2008
Russian Federation	Reported	58 310 ⁵	83	2008
Rwanda	Compensated	1 381 ^{1,32}	38	2000
Sierra Leone	Compensated	5 446 ⁵	298	2004
Singapore	Reported	11 072 ²	460	2008
Slovakia	Reported	12 604 ⁵	510	2008
Slovenia	Reported	36 743 ²	3 776	2007
South Africa	Reported	5 950 ²	51	2000
Spain	Reported	923 523 ¹	4 664	2007
Sri Lanka	Reported	1 574 ^{2,33}	19	2008
Sweden	Reported	29 750 ¹	637	2007
Switzerland	Compensated	86 372 ¹	2 106	2007
Syrian Arab Republic	Compensated	8 215 ^{2,34}	145	2006
Thailand	Compensated	54 541 ¹	144	2007
Togo	Reported	307 ^{1,35}	14	2004
Trinidad and Tobago	Reported	388 ²	59	2006
Tunisia	Compensated	43 317 ¹	1 462	2004
Turkey	Reported	3 868 ¹	17	2006
Uganda	Compensated	323 ³	3	2004
Ukraine	Reported	16 491 ²	75	2008
United Kingdom	Reported	146 060 ^{2,36}	492	2006
Zimbabwe	Reported	14 055 ¹	286	2001

SOURCES

ILO, LABORSTA, table 8A: Occupational injuries (annual): Cases of injury with lost workdays.

ILO 2009h. *Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM)* (Geneva), 6th edition, for total employment used as a denominator.

NOTES

¹ Insurance records.

² Labour inspectorate records.

³ Administrative records and related sources.

⁴ Administrative reports.

⁵ Other sources: Labour-related establishment census, labour-related establishment survey, population census.

⁶ Compensated injuries.

⁷ Reported injuries.

⁸ Year ending in June of the year indicated.

⁹ Financial year ending in year indicated.

¹⁰ Private sector. From 1992 including commuting accidents. 2001: Break. Not strictly comparable.

¹¹ Cases reported during the year indicated.

¹² Year beginning in July of year indicated.

¹³ Total may differ from the sum of data by sex due to difficulties in coding certain cases.

¹⁴ Including commuting accidents.

¹⁵ State-owned enterprises. 2000: Total covers all enterprises in all sectors. 2001: Total covers all enterprises in all sectors. 2002: Total covers all enterprises in all sectors.

- ¹⁶ Including non-fatal cases without lost workdays.
- ¹⁷ Establishments with 50 or more persons employed.
- ¹⁸ Excluding agricultural workers, own-account workers, domestic service workers, public employees and casual workers. From 1998, including public sector.
- ¹⁹ Cases recognized for compensation during the year.
- ²⁰ Total may differ from the sum of data by sex due to difficulties in coding certain cases.
- ²¹ Private sector.
- ²² Excluding general construction.
- ²³ Total may differ from the sum of data by sex due to difficulties in coding certain cases.
- ²⁴ Up to 2001: Excluding agriculture and forestry.
- ²⁵ Excluding public sector and parastatal bodies. 2002: Break. Not strictly comparable.
- ²⁶ 2000–2007: Data for IMSS only.
- ²⁷ Year ending in March of the year indicated.
- ²⁸ Year beginning in July of year indicated. Including cases of temporary incapacity with absence from work of more than one year.
- ²⁹ Establishments with 10 or more persons employed. Figures rounded to nearest 10.
- ³⁰ Establishments with 20 or more persons employed.
- ³¹ Excluding public administration and services and defence. Including non-fatal cases without lost workdays.
- ³² Deaths occurring within the same reference year as accident.
- ³³ Total may differ from the sum of data by sex due to difficulties in coding certain cases. Including non-fatal cases without lost workdays.
- ³⁴ Including cases of dental injury.
- ³⁵ Including non-fatal cases without lost workdays.
- ³⁶ Private sector.

DEFINITIONS

Occupational accident: An unexpected and unplanned occurrence, including acts of violence, arising out of or in connection with work which results in one or more workers incurring a personal injury, disease or death; as occupational accidents are to be considered travel, transport or road traffic accidents in which workers are injured and which arise out of or in the course of work, i.e. while engaged in an economic activity, or at work, or carrying on the business of the employer.

Occupational injury: Any personal injury, disease or death resulting from an occupational accident; an occupational injury is therefore distinct from an occupational disease, which is a disease contracted as a result of an exposure over a period of time to risk factors arising from work activity;

Case of occupational injury: The case of one worker incurring an occupational injury as a result of one occupational accident;

Incapacity for work: Inability of the victim, due to an occupational injury, to perform the normal duties of work in the job or post occupied at the time of the occupational accident.

^a *Total cases:* All cases of occupational injury with lost workdays, i.e. the total of fatal cases and non-fatal cases.

Fatal cases: Cases where workers were fatally injured as a result of occupational accidents, and where death occurred within one year of the day of the accident.

Non-fatal cases (temporary and permanent incapacity): Cases of occupational injury where the workers injured were unable to work temporarily or permanently from the day after the day of the accident.

^b Total cases/total employment *100,000.

Further information on the definition of occupational injuries is available at:

ILO, LABORSTA (<http://laborsta.ilo.org/applv8/data/c8e.html>);

ILO, 1999. *Sources and Methods. Vol. 8: Occupational injuries* (Geneva) (<http://laborsta.ilo.org/applv8/data/SSM8/E/SSM8.html>);

ICLS, 1998. *Resolution concerning statistics of occupational injuries resulting from occupational accidents* (Geneva) (http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---integration/---stat/documents/normativeinstrument/wcms_087528.pdf).

Social security expenditure

Table 25. Public social security expenditure, 2000 and latest available year (percentage of GDP)

Major area, region or country	Public social security expenditure excluding health expenditure (% of GDP)				Health			Total	
	2000	Latest available year ^a	Year	Source	2000	Latest available year ^a	Source	2000	Latest available year ^a
World		5.72				2.67			8.39
Western Europe ^b		17.98				7.10			25.08
Central and Eastern Europe ^b		14.08				4.82			18.91
North America ^b		8.98				6.98			15.96
North Africa ^b		11.02				2.53			13.56
CIS ^b		9.93				3.59			13.52
Middle East ^b		7.09				3.11			10.20
Latin America and the Caribbean ^b		7.63				2.20			9.83
Asia and the Pacific ^b		3.65				1.68			5.32
Sub-Saharan Africa ^b		2.81				2.51			5.32
Africa									
Benin	0.70	1.00	2005	SSI	2.19	3.00	WHO	2.89	4.00
Burkina Faso	1.80	1.60	2004	SSI	2.06	3.30	WHO	3.86	4.90
Burundi	0.90	1.10	2006	SSI	0.55	0.74	WHO	1.45	1.84
Cameroon	0.40	0.50	2006	SSI	1.33	1.46	WHO	1.73	1.96
Chad	0.40	0.10	2005	SSI	2.67	2.70	WHO	3.09	2.80
Congo	1.10	0.90	2005	SSI	1.21	0.89	WHO	2.31	1.79
Côte d'Ivoire	0.40	0.90	2004	SSI	1.31	0.87	WHO	1.71	1.77
Egypt ^{1,6,11}	6.72	11.51	2007	IMF	2.24	2.56	WHO	8.96	14.07
Ethiopia ^{2,11}	...	6.46	2002	IMF	...	3.12	WHO	...	9.58
Gambia	1.30	1.20	2003	SSI	1.96	2.94	WHO	3.26	4.14
Ghana	0.80	1.90	2004	SSI	3.03	2.32	WHO	3.83	4.22
Guinea	0.20	0.10	2005	SSI	0.66	0.67	WHO	0.86	0.77
Liberia	11.33	9.87	2005	IMF	1.17	4.36	WHO	12.50	14.23
Madagascar ^{2,6,11}	0.33	0.27	2007	IMF	1.37	2.01	WHO	1.70	2.28
Mauritania	0.30	0.80	2004	SSI	1.99	1.53	WHO	2.29	2.33
Mauritius	5.14	5.91	2007	IMF	1.99	2.08	IMF	7.13	7.99
Morocco ^{3,11}	3.02	...	n.a.	IMF	1.41	...	WHO	4.43	...
Mozambique	0.20	0.70	2006	SSI	3.79	3.26	WHO	3.99	3.96
Namibia	...	1.80	2004	SSI	4.82	4.98	WHO	...	6.78
Niger	0.30	0.50	2005	SSI	1.87	1.92	WHO	2.17	2.42
Rwanda	0.50	0.80	2005	SSI	1.57	4.10	WHO	2.07	4.90
Senegal ¹	1.80	1.90	2006	SSI	1.95	1.70	WHO	3.75	3.60
Seychelles	7.71	12.61	2007	IMF	3.78	4.10	IMF	11.49	16.71
Sierra Leone ¹	0.30	1.00	2006	SSI	2.25	1.72	WHO	2.55	2.72
South Africa	3.65	8.43	2005	IMF	3.23	3.92	IMF	6.88	12.35
Sudan	0.50	0.30	2003	SSI	0.79	1.26	WHO	1.29	1.56
Tanzania, United Rep. of ^{5,6}	0.40	1.20	2007	SSI	2.03	3.26	WHO	2.43	4.46
Togo	1.20	1.30	2003	SSI	1.24	1.05	WHO	2.44	2.35
Tunisia ^{6,11}	6.01	7.50	2007	IMF	2.72	2.32	WHO	8.73	9.82
Uganda	0.10	0.40	2006	SSI	1.77	1.94	AHO	1.87	2.34
Zambia	1.60	1.60	2006	SSI	2.92	2.43	WHO	4.52	4.03
Zimbabwe	0.30	0.30	2005	SSI	3.58	3.63	WHO	3.88	3.93
Asia									
Afghanistan	...	0.73	2006	IMF	...	1.14	IMF	...	1.87
Armenia ²	2.90	4.20	2004	SSI	1.59	1.71	WHO	4.49	5.91

Major area, region or country	Public social security expenditure excluding health expenditure (% of GDP)				Health			Total	
	2000	Latest available year ^a	Year	Source	2000	Latest available year ^a	Source	2000	Latest available year ^a
Azerbaijan ²	7.80	7.60	2003	SSI	0.87	0.86	WHO	8.67	8.46
Bahrain ¹¹	1.23	1.28	2005	IMF	2.70	2.53	WHO	3.93	3.81
Bangladesh	...	1.10	2004	SSI	0.82	0.90	WHO	...	2.00
Bhutan	...	0.20	2005	SSI	4.02	2.84	WHO	...	3.04
Cambodia	...	0.80	2005	SSI	1.31	1.55	WHO	...	2.35
China ¹¹	2.93	4.08	2006	IMF	1.76	1.89	WHO	4.69	5.97
Georgia ⁹	4.29	4.85	2007	IMF	1.20	1.54	IMF	5.49	6.39
Hong Kong, China ¹	2.53	2.24	2006	IMF	2.63	2.31	IMF	5.16	4.55
India ^{4,10}	0.67	3.10	2005	SSI	1.01	0.95	WHO	1.68	4.05
Indonesia	...	1.40	2003	SSI	0.65	0.92	WHO	...	2.32
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	5.45	8.38	2007	IMF	1.91	1.85	IMF	7.36	10.23
Israel	11.98	11.42	2007	IMF	5.23	5.12	IMF	17.21	16.54
Japan ¹³	10.60	12.30	2005	OECD	5.90	6.30	OECD	16.50	18.60
Jordan ¹	8.10	8.40	2006	SSI	4.43	4.16	WHO	12.53	12.56
Kazakhstan	6.58	3.91	2007	IMF	2.09	2.33	IMF	8.67	6.24
Korea, Republic of ¹³	2.80	3.70	2005	OECD	2.20	3.20	OECD	5.00	6.90
Kuwait ¹	8.71	9.37	2007	IMF	2.77	1.70	IMF	11.48	11.07
Kyrgyzstan	1.90	6.10	2005	SSI	2.08	2.37	WHO	3.98	8.47
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	...	0.60	2005	SSI	1.04	0.74	WHO	...	1.34
Lebanon	...	2.77	1996	IMF	...	2.51	IMF	...	5.28
Macau, China	2.14	1.30	2006	IMF	2.50	1.58	IMF	4.64	2.88
Malaysia	...	4.20	2004	SSI	1.73	2.25	WHO	...	6.45
Maldives	1.05	3.36	2007	IMF	4.07	5.49	IMF	5.12	8.85
Mongolia ¹⁰	7.46	8.30	2004	SSI	4.49	3.99	WHO	11.95	12.29
Nepal	...	1.30	2005	SSI	1.34	1.63	WHO	...	2.93
Pakistan	...	1.50	2004	SSI	0.50	0.41	WHO	...	1.91
Philippines	1.60	1.90	2006	SSI	1.67	1.31	WHO	3.27	3.21
Singapore	0.67	0.62	2007	IMF	0.97	0.92	IMF	1.64	1.54
Sri Lanka	1.80	4.20	2005	SSI	1.77	1.89	WHO	3.57	6.09
Syrian Arab Republic ³	1.23	...	n.a.	IMF	1.99	...	WHO	3.22	...
Taiwan, China ⁷	6.60	11.10	2005	SSI	3.76	3.76	WHO	10.36	14.86
Tajikistan	2.34	2.40	2001	IMF	0.95	0.95	IMF	3.29	3.35
Thailand	1.06	2.55	2007	IMF	1.51	2.19	IMF	2.57	4.74
Uzbekistan	...	8.30	2005	SSI	2.60	2.39	WHO	...	10.69
Viet Nam	2.43	3.40	2004	SSI	1.63	1.53	WHO	4.06	4.93
Yemen ¹	2.70	4.70	2004	SSI	1.92	1.92	WHO	4.62	6.62
Europe									
Albania ⁴	8.26	7.90	2007	IMF	2.10	2.46	IMF	10.36	10.36
Austria ¹³	19.90	20.40	2005	OECD	6.50	6.80	OECD	26.40	27.20
Belarus	11.37	13.54	2007	IMF	4.63	4.50	IMF	16.00	18.04
Belgium ¹³	18.70	19.10	2005	OECD	6.60	7.30	OECD	25.30	26.40
Bulgaria	14.11	12.04	2007	IMF	3.51	4.81	IMF	17.62	16.85
Croatia ^{6,11}	19.14	15.72	2007	IMF	7.52	6.01	WHO	26.66	21.73
Cyprus ⁸	12.50	15.10	2006	EURO-STAT	2.10	3.00	EURO-STAT	14.60	18.10
Czech Republic ¹³	13.90	13.20	2005	OECD	5.90	6.30	OECD	19.80	19.50
Denmark ¹³	20.70	21.20	2005	OECD	5.10	5.90	OECD	25.80	27.10
Estonia ⁸	10.00	9.00	2006	EURO-STAT	3.70	3.20	EURO-STAT	13.70	12.20

Major area, region or country	Public social security expenditure excluding health expenditure (% of GDP)				Health			Total	
	2000	Latest available year ^a	Year	Source	2000	Latest available year ^a	Source	2000	Latest available year ^a
Finland	19.20	1990	2005	OECD	5.10	6.20	OECD	24.30	26.10
France ¹³	20.60	21.40	2005	OECD	7.30	7.80	OECD	27.90	29.20
Germany ¹³	18.50	19.00	2005	OECD	7.70	7.70	OECD	26.20	26.70
Greece ¹³	14.50	14.90	2005	OECD	4.70	5.60	OECD	19.20	20.50
Hungary ¹³	15.10	16.50	2005	OECD	4.90	6.00	OECD	20.00	22.50
Iceland ¹³	8.80	10.60	2005	OECD	6.50	6.30	OECD	15.30	16.90
Ireland ¹³	9.00	10.20	2005	OECD	4.60	6.50	OECD	13.60	16.70
Italy ¹³	17.50	18.20	2005	OECD	5.80	6.80	OECD	23.30	25.00
Latvia	12.88	8.60	2007	IMF	3.22	3.78	IMF	16.10	12.38
Lithuania	11.36	11.14	2007	IMF	4.43	5.48	IMF	15.79	16.62
Luxembourg ¹³	14.50	16.20	2005	OECD	5.20	7.00	OECD	19.70	23.20
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of ²	17.80	24.80	2002	SSI	5.33	5.71	WHO	23.13	30.51
Malta	12.94	14.01	2006	IMF	4.44	6.41	IMF	17.38	20.42
Moldova, Republic of	12.21	12.57	2007	IMF	2.95	4.93	IMF	15.16	17.50
Montenegro ¹	22.40	17.40	2003	SSI	5.70	6.13	WHO	28.10	23.53
Netherlands ¹³	14.80	14.90	2005	OECD	5.00	6.00	OECD	19.80	20.90
Norway ¹³	16.40	15.80	2005	OECD	4.90	5.80	OECD	21.30	21.60
Poland ¹³	16.60	16.70	2005	OECD	3.90	4.30	OECD	20.50	21.00
Portugal ¹³	13.20	15.90	2004	OECD	6.40	7.20	OECD	19.60	23.10
Romania	10.12	11.02	2007	IMF	4.40	3.84	IMF	14.52	14.86
Russian Federation	8.07	8.25	2006	IMF	1.99	4.04	IMF	10.06	12.29
San Marino ¹	14.97	16.52	2004	IMF	8.28	6.56	IMF	23.25	23.08
Serbia ¹¹⁰	20.50	15.93	2007	IMF	5.87	6.18	IMF	26.37	22.11
Slovakia ¹³	13.00	11.30	2005	OECD	4.90	5.30	OECD	17.90	16.60
Slovenia	17.73	16.56	2006	IMF	6.11	6.19	IMF	23.84	22.75
Spain ¹³	15.10	15.40	2005	OECD	5.20	5.80	OECD	20.30	21.20
Sweden ¹³	22.20	22.60	2005	OECD	6.30	6.80	OECD	28.50	29.40
Switzerland ¹³	12.80	14.20	2005	OECD	5.10	6.10	OECD	17.90	20.30
Turkey ^{3,12}	9.30	8.30	2005	OECD	3.08	5.40	WHO	12.38	13.70
Ukraine	14.48	18.76	2007	IMF	2.90	3.96	IMF	17.38	22.72
United Kingdom ¹³	13.40	14.30	2005	OECD	5.80	7.00	OECD	19.20	21.30
Latin America and the Caribbean									
Argentina ¹¹	8.99	8.49	2004	IMF	4.93	4.35	WHO	13.92	12.84
Barbados	4.40	5.20	2005	SSI	4.06	4.32	WHO	8.46	9.52
Belize	1.00	1.00	2005	SSI	2.40	2.76	WHO	3.40	3.76
Bolivia	5.34	4.36	2007	IMF	3.73	3.26	IMF	9.07	7.62
Brazil	9.10	9.60	2001	SSI	2.88	3.08	WHO	11.98	12.68
Chile	7.16	5.37	2007	IMF	2.84	2.98	IMF	10.00	8.35
Costa Rica ^{6,11}	5.51	4.19	2007	IMF	5.02	5.33	WHO	10.53	9.52
Dominica	3.40	4.10	2002	SSI	4.56	4.49	WHO	7.96	8.59
Dominican Republic	1.29	2.99	2003	IMF	2.17	1.46	IMF	3.46	4.45
El Salvador ²	3.76	3.87	2007	IMF	3.63	2.69	IMF	7.39	6.56
Jamaica	0.49	0.51	2007	IMF	1.09	3.00	IMF	1.58	3.51
Mexico ¹³	3.20	4.50	2005	OECD	2.60	2.90	OECD	5.80	7.40
Panama ¹¹	5.06	5.12	2001	IMF	5.31	5.17	WHO	10.37	10.29
Saint Kitts and Nevis ⁵	2.70	2.60	2005	SSI	3.26	3.47	WHO	5.96	6.07
Saint Lucia ²	0.80	1.90	2004	SSI	3.28	3.29	WHO	4.08	5.19
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	3.37	3.41	2004	IMF	3.90	3.39	IMF	7.27	6.80

Major area, region or country	Public social security expenditure excluding health expenditure (% of GDP)				Health			Total	
	2000	Latest available year ^a	Year	Source	2000	Latest available year ^a	Source	2000	Latest available year ^a
Uruguay	19.16	...	n.a.	IMF	1.82	8.83	IMF	20.98	...
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	3.13	2.07	2005	IMF	1.53	1.92	IMF	4.66	3.99
Virgin Islands (US)	1.60	0.50	2003	SSI
North America									
Canada ¹³	10.30	9.70	2005	OECD	6.20	6.80	OECD	16.50	16.50
United States ¹³	8.60	8.90	2005	OECD	5.90	7.00	OECD	14.50	15.90
Oceania									
Australia ¹³	12.30	11.20	2005	OECD	5.50	5.90	OECD	17.80	17.10
Cook Islands	...	3.10	2005	SSI	5.54	4.21	WHO	...	7.31
Fiji	...	2.30	2005	SSI	3.24	2.91	WHO	...	5.21
Marshall Islands	7.40	7.90	2005	SSI	21.56	14.95	WHO	28.96	22.85
Nauru	...	0.90	2005	SSI	8.26	5.49	WHO	...	6.39
New Zealand ¹³	13.40	11.60	2005	OECD	6.00	6.90	OECD	19.40	18.50
Papua New Guinea	...	0.20	2005	SSI	2.94	3.62	WHO	...	3.82
Solomon Islands	...	0.70	2005	SSI	4.87	3.96	WHO	...	4.66
Tonga	...	0.90	2005	SSI	4.23	3.79	WHO	...	4.69
Tuvalu	...	3.80	2005	SSI	12.38	7.93	WHO	...	11.73
Vanuatu	...	0.60	2005	SSI	2.99	2.81	WHO	...	3.41

SOURCES

IMF. 2009. *Public social protection (excluding health) expenditure in percentage of GDP* (Washington, DC).

OECD. 2009a. *Social and Welfare Statistics: Social Expenditure Database (SOCX)* (Paris) (http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=SOCX_AGG).

ILO. 2009c. *ILO Social Security Inquiry (SSI)* (Geneva). Table E-1f: Public social protection expenditure excluding health benefit in kind as a percentage of GDP.

European Commission. 2009a. EUROSTAT. *Living Conditions and Welfare: Social Protection Database (ESSPROS)* (Luxembourg) (http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/living_conditions_and_social_protection/data/database).

WHO. 2009a. *Statistical Information System (WHOSIS)* (Geneva) (<http://www.who.int/entity/whosis/en/index.html>). Public health expenditure in percentage of GDP, combination of existing indicators.

NOTES

^a Latest year available: same year for all three indicators.

^b Regional average (weighted by population), latest available year.

¹ For 2000, data 2002.

² For 2000, data 2001.

³ For 2000, data 1999.

⁴ For 2000, data 1998.

⁵ For 2000, data 2003.

⁶ WHO data 2006 instead of 2007.

⁷ National Health Research Institutes (Taiwan, China). 2001 data.

⁸ EUROSTAT health expenditure: health benefit in kind only.

⁹ Health expenditure from WHO for 2000; comprehensive general government data are not available in IMF for this year. 2007 data from IMF (general government level data).

¹⁰ Various sources depending on years for social security expenditure (excluding health). IMF for 2000 data and SSI for latest year available.

¹¹ Health public expenditure from IMF; general government level data are not available in IMF.

¹² Various sources for health expenditure. WHO for 2000 data and OECD for 2005.

¹³ OECD public health expenditure: benefit in kind only.

DEFINITIONS

Public social security expenditure excluding health expenditure (% of GDP)

Numerator

Total annual public social security expenditure is the sum of expenditure (including benefit expenditure and administration costs) of all existing public social security/social protection schemes or programmes in the country. The scope of the indicators corresponds to the scope of the Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), which established nine classes of benefits: medical care, sickness benefit, unemployment benefit, old-age benefit, employment injury benefit, family benefit, maternity benefit, invalidity benefit and survivors' benefit, plus other income support and assistance programmes, including conditional cash transfers, available to the poor and not included under the above classes.

Denominator

Gross Domestic Product.

Numerators and denominators should be expressed in national currency units, current prices.

For analytical purposes this indicator is disaggregated into health and non-health public social security expenditure. And, when possible and depending on data availability, disaggregate the non-health social security expenditure into old-age benefit expenditure and other non-health social security expenditure (see table 26).

INTERPRETATION

Total public social security expenditure synthesizes the overall public redistributive effort and is closely correlated with overall coverage. It is a useful indicator for comparative purposes at the national and scheme levels but its interpretation presents inherent difficulties (either in global level, composition and changes over times) in relation to further contextual information (legal framework, economic and social context):

- i) While social protection expenditure is – in the long run – positively correlated with overall coverage (its scope, extent and level), it may also change, owing to factors other than coverage changes.
- ii) Changes in social security expenditure are often countercyclical – a fall in total public social security expenditure as a percentage of GDP could result from higher employment rates (declining unemployment) or from a reduction in occupational injuries which could point towards progress.
- iii) In specific branches (such as employment injury insurance) an increase or decrease in expenditure may be the result of changes in the need or utilization of those benefits (such as more or fewer accidents at work) and not changes in coverage.
- iv) Aggregate expenditure can be distributed in various ways among the lower- and higher-income population: expenditure may be high (or increase) as a result of expansion of a specific generous programme for a relatively narrow, better-off group of the population (such as civil servants or military personnel).
- v) This indicator should be analysed in relation to the different branches covered at the statutory level and the respective share of the different branches (health, old age, unemployment). Many developing countries do not have, at a statutory level, a comprehensive social system covering the nine branches mentioned above. One common situation is a system covering long-term benefits (old age, survivors and invalidity) and work injury benefit.
- vi) Comparison across countries is difficult because countries differ with respect to the level of taxes imposed on social benefits directly and indirectly. When such taxation rules change over time within the country, the interpretation of changes in social protection expenditure should also be affected.
- vii) Demographic structure, and in particular the share of older persons, is another factor that can have a direct impact on old-age and health expenditure, and accordingly to the global public expenditure indicator.
- viii) The size of the formal and informal economy has direct implications on the coverage of social insurance and other contributory schemes.

Social security systems around the world relate to various institutional structures, including public, private and mixed; compulsory and voluntary; universal and targeted programmes. This indicator relates to public expenditure and has to be considered in the national context and the possible development of private social security schemes. In many countries private (mandatory or voluntary) expenditure substitutes for expenditure on public programmes. In Latin American and European Union countries with large private mandatory funded schemes, a focus on public expenditure alone will not provide an accurate picture of social protection expenditure. In these and similar countries this indicator should be analysed in combination with private expenditure (making the distinction between mandatory and voluntary expenditure).

Many of these arrangements, although not all, are employment-based. Population groups covered can go beyond workers, as the common goal of social security is to provide basic protection from the financial consequences of basic life contingencies for workers and their families.

Table 26. Public social security expenditure by branch, latest available year (percentage of GDP)

Major area, region or country	Total	Total public		Health		Unemployment		Active labour market	Survivors	Family allowance	Disability	Employment injury	Old age	Other*
		Total public without health	Year	Source	Year	Source	Year							
Africa														
Benin	4.0	1.0	2005	SSI	3.0	WHO	0.0	n.a.	<0.1	<0.1	0.5	0.5
Burkina Faso	4.9	1.6	2004	SSI	3.3	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.5
Burundi	1.8	1.1	2006	SSI	0.7	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.2
Cameroon	2.0	0.5	2005	SSI	1.5	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1
Congo	1.4	0.5	2005	SSI	0.9	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.0	...	0.3	0.1
Côte d'Ivoire	1.8	0.9	2006	SSI	0.9	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.1
Gambia	4.1	1.2	2003	SSI	2.9	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	0.1	1.1
Mauritania	2.8	0.8	2003	SSI	2.0	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.1
Mauritius	8.1	5.9	2007	IMF	2.2	WHO	0.0	SSI	0.4	...	0.5	0.0	2.0	3.0
Mozambique	4.0	0.7	2006	SSI	3.3	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.0	...	0.2	0.4
Namibia	6.8	1.8	2004	SSI	5.0	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.3	0.1	...	1.1	0.2
Niger	2.7	0.5	2004	SSI	2.2	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
Rwanda	4.9	0.8	2005	SSI	4.1	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	0.1	...	0.5	0.1
Senegal	3.6	1.9	2006	SSI	1.7	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.3	0.0	...	1.1	0.3
South Africa	12.0	8.4	2005	IMF	3.6	WHO	0.1	SSI	0.0	1.3	0.8	...	1.2	5.1
Tanzania, United Rep. of	4.5	1.2	2007	SSI	3.3	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.5
Togo	2.4	1.3	2003	SSI	1.1	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.4
Tunisia	9.6	7.1	2004	IMF	2.4	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.9	0.1	0.2	3.3	2.3
Uganda	2.4	0.4	2005	SSI	2.0	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	0.0	...	0.1	0.2
Zambia	4.0	1.6	2006	SSI	2.4	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.9	0.2
Asia														
Armenia	5.9	4.2	2004	SSI	1.7	WHO	0.0	SSI	0.1	1.4	0.1	0.1	2.4	0.1
Azerbaijan	8.5	7.6	2003	SSI	0.9	WHO	0.0	SSI	0.4	0.6	0.9	0.0	2.7	3.0
Bahrain	4.6	1.9	2004	IMF	2.7	WHO	...	n.a.	...	0.0	0.1	...	0.8	1.0
Bangladesh	2.0	1.1	2004	SSI	0.9	WHO	...	n.a.	...	0.2	0.1	...	0.3	0.5
Bhutan	3.0	0.2	2005	SSI	2.8	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	0.1	0.2
Cambodia	2.3	0.8	2005	SSI	1.5	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.1	0.2	...	0.3	0.1
China	6.0	4.1	2006	IMF	1.9	WHO	0.1	SSI	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.4
Hong Kong, China	4.6	2.2	2006	IMF	2.3	IMF	...	n.a.	1.6	0.6
India	4.1	3.1	2005	SSI	1.0	WHO	0.0	SSI	0.0	0.1	0.1	...	1.9	1.8
Israel	16.5	11.4	2007	IMF	5.1	IMF	0.3	SSI	...	1.3	1.4	0.5	4.8	3.2
Japan	18.6	12.3	2005	OECD	6.3	OECD	0.3	OECD	1.3	0.8	0.7	...	8.6	0.3

Major area, region or country	Total		Health		Unemployment		Active labour market	Survivors	Family allowance	Disability	Employment injury	Old age	Other*
	Total public	Total public without health	Year	Source	Source	Source							
Jordan	12.5	8.3	2005	SSI	4.2	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.3	0.0	1.6	6.3
Kazakhstan	6.9	4.6	2004	IMF	2.2	WHO	0.1	SSI	...	0.4	...	2.9	0.6
Korea, Republic of	6.9	3.7	2005	OECD	3.2	OECD	0.2	OECD	0.1	0.6	...	1.5	0.8
Kuwait	11.1	9.4	2006	IMF	1.7	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.2	...	2.4	1.0
Kyrgyzstan	8.5	6.1	2005	SSI	2.4	WHO	...	n.a.	...	0.1	...	4.8	1.0
Lao People's Democratic Rep.	1.3	0.6	2005	SSI	0.7	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2
Malaysia	6.5	4.2	2004	SSI	2.3	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.1	0.1	2.7	0.9
Maldives	10.6	5.2	2005	IMF	5.4	IMF	0.0	n.a.	...	0.1	...	0.6	4.4
Mongolia	12.3	8.3	2004	SSI	4.0	WHO	0.1	SSI	0.6	2.6	0.3	6.2	0.8
Nepal	2.9	1.3	2005	SSI	1.6	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	...	0.8	0.5
Pakistan	1.9	1.5	2004	SSI	0.4	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	...	1.4	0.6
Philippines	3.1	1.8	2003	SSI	1.3	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.2	...	1.0	0.4
Sri Lanka	6.1	4.2	2005	SSI	1.9	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	...	2.3	1.6
Taiwan, China	14.9	11.1	2005	SSI	3.8	SSI	0.1	SSI	0.3	0.1	0.1	5.7	4.5
Thailand	3.3	1.7	2006	IMF	1.6	IMF	0.0	SSI	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.6
Uzbekistan	10.7	8.3	2005	SSI	2.4	WHO	0.0	SSI	0.1	1.4	...	6.2	0.2
Viet Nam	4.9	3.4	2004	SSI	1.5	WHO	0.1	SSI	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.6	0.6
Yemen	6.6	4.7	2004	SSI	1.9	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.4	0.0	0.7	3.1
Europe													
Austria	27.2	20.4	2005	OECD	6.8	OECD	1.1	OECD	0.6	2.4	0.0	12.6	0.5
Belgium	26.4	19.1	2005	OECD	7.3	OECD	3.3	OECD	1.1	2.0	0.0	7.2	0.6
Bulgaria	16.7	12.6	2006	IMF	4.1	IMF	0.3	EURO-STAT	...	0.8	...	6.9	2.2
Cyprus	18.1	15.1	2006	EURO-STAT	3.0	EURO-STAT	1.1	EURO-STAT	...	1.1	...	7.2	3.1
Czech Republic	19.5	13.2	2005	OECD	6.3	OECD	0.6	OECD	0.3	2.4	...	7.5	0.5
Denmark	27.1	21.2	2005	OECD	5.9	OECD	2.8	OECD	1.7	0.0	0.0	7.3	1.7
Estonia	12.2	9.0	2006	EURO-STAT	3.2	EURO-STAT	0.1	EURO-STAT	...	0.1	...	5.4	0.7
Finland	26.1	19.9	2005	OECD	6.2	OECD	2.0	OECD	0.9	3.8	...	8.5	0.8
France	29.2	21.4	2005	OECD	7.8	OECD	1.7	OECD	0.9	1.9	...	10.9	1.2
Germany	26.7	19.0	2005	OECD	7.7	OECD	1.7	OECD	1.0	1.9	...	11.2	0.6
Greece	20.5	14.9	2005	OECD	5.6	OECD	0.4	OECD	0.1	0.9	...	10.8	0.8
Hungary	22.5	16.5	2005	OECD	6.0	OECD	0.6	OECD	0.3	2.8	...	8.8	0.6
Iceland	16.9	10.6	2005	OECD	6.3	OECD	0.3	OECD	0.1	2.7	...	3.8	0.7

Major area, region or country	Total	Total public without health		Health		Unemployment		Active labour market	Survivors	Family allowance	Disability	Employment injury	Old age	Other*
		Total public	Year	Source	Source	Source	Source							
Ireland	16.7	10.2	2005	OECD	6.5	OECD	0.9	OECD	0.6	2.5	2.9	2.5
Italy	25.0	18.2	2005	OECD	6.8	OECD	0.5	OECD	0.6	1.3	1.7	...	11.6	0.0
Latvia	12.8	9.1	2006	IMF	3.8	IMF	0.4	EURO-STAT	...	1.2	0.9	...	5.5	0.8
Lithuania	15.3	9.9	2006	IMF	5.4	IMF	0.2	EURO-STAT	...	1.1	1.4	...	5.3	1.5
Luxembourg	23.2	16.2	2005	OECD	7.0	OECD	1.0	OECD	0.5	3.6	3.3	...	5.2	0.6
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	25.1	19.2	2003	SSI	5.9	WHO	...	n.a.	...	0.2	9.5	9.5
Malta	20.4	14.0	2006	IMF	6.4	IMF	0.6	EURO-STAT	...	1.1	1.1	...	7.6	1.7
Moldova, Republic of	12.9	9.2	2003	IMF	3.6	IMF	0.1	SSI	...	0.4	1.0	0.0	4.4	3.1
Montenegro	23.5	17.4	2003	SSI	6.1	WHO	0.7	SSI	...	0.6	3.6	...	5.7	4.6
Netherlands	20.9	14.9	2005	OECD	6.0	OECD	1.5	OECD	1.3	1.6	3.6	...	5.5	1.1
Norway	21.6	15.8	2005	OECD	5.8	OECD	0.5	OECD	0.7	2.8	4.4	...	6.3	0.8
Poland	21.0	16.7	2005	OECD	4.3	OECD	0.5	OECD	0.4	1.1	2.7	...	10.4	0.6
Portugal	23.1	15.9	2004	OECD	7.2	OECD	1.2	OECD	0.7	1.2	2.3	...	8.7	0.2
Romania	14.9	11.0	2007	IMF	3.8	IMF	0.4	EURO-STAT	...	1.2	1.0	...	6.0	1.6
Serbia	22.0	16.0	2003	SSI	6.0	WHO	0.6	SSI	...	1.3	3.7	0.1	6.1	2.2
Slovakia	16.6	11.3	2005	OECD	5.3	OECD	0.3	OECD	0.3	2.1	1.7	...	6.2	0.5
Slovenia	22.8	16.6	2006	IMF	6.2	IMF	0.7	EURO-STAT	...	1.9	1.9	...	8.4	2.0
Spain	21.2	15.4	2005	OECD	5.8	OECD	2.2	OECD	0.8	1.1	2.5	...	7.9	0.3
Sweden	29.4	22.6	2005	OECD	6.8	OECD	1.2	OECD	1.3	3.2	5.6	...	9.6	1.1
Switzerland	20.3	14.2	2005	OECD	6.1	OECD	0.9	OECD	0.7	1.3	3.3	...	6.6	1.0
Turkey	13.7	8.3	2005	OECD	5.4	OECD	0.1	OECD	0.0	0.0	0.2	...	6.4	-0.0
Ukraine	22.7	18.8	2007	IMF	4.0	IMF	0.3	SSI	...	1.1	1.6	0.3	13.7	1.3
United Kingdom	21.3	14.3	2005	OECD	7.0	OECD	0.3	OECD	0.5	3.2	2.4	...	6.1	1.6
Latin America and the Caribbean														
Argentina	12.6	8.3	2003	IMF	4.3	WHO	0.1	SSI	...	0.6	2.9	3.3
Barbados	9.5	5.2	2005	SSI	4.3	WHO	...	n.a.	...	0.0	0.5	0.2	3.5	0.8
Belize	3.8	1.0	2005	SSI	2.8	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.1
Bolivia	7.6	4.4	2007	IMF	3.3	IMF	0.0	n.a.	2.0	2.4
Brazil	12.7	9.6	2001	SSI	3.1	WHO	0.4	SSI	1.7	0.6	1.0	0.2	4.5	1.3

Major area, region or country	Total		Health		Unemployment		Active labour market	Survivors	Family allowance	Disability	Employment injury	Old age	Other*
	Total public health	without health	Source	Year	Source	Source							
Costa Rica	9.5	4.2	2007	IMF	5.3	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.0	1.7	2.5
Dominica	8.6	4.1	2002	SSI	4.5	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.2	1.9	1.9
Mexico	7.4	4.5	2005	OECD	2.9	OECD	0.0	OECD	0.3	0.1	...	1.0	2.1
Saint Kitts and Nevis	6.1	2.6	2005	SSI	3.5	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.2
Saint Lucia	5.2	1.9	2004	SSI	3.3	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.7
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	7.6	3.6	2003	IMF	4.1	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.4
Trinidad and Tobago	6.0	3.6	2005	IMF	2.4	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.7	2.6
North America													
Canada	16.5	9.7	2005	OECD	6.8	OECD	0.6	OECD	0.4	0.9	0.0	3.7	2.8
United States	15.9	8.9	2005	OECD	7.0	OECD	0.3	OECD	0.8	1.3	...	5.3	0.5
Oceania													
Australia	17.1	11.2	2005	OECD	5.9	OECD	0.5	OECD	0.2	2.4	0.0	4.4	0.5
Cook Islands	7.3	3.1	2005	SSI	4.2	WHO	0.0	SSI	0.0	1.8	0.2
Fiji	5.2	2.3	2005	SSI	2.9	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.0	0.5	2.2
Marshall Islands	22.9	7.9	2005	SSI	15.0	WHO	0.0	n.a.	2.4	0.9	...	4.1	0.5
Nauru	6.4	0.9	2005	SSI	5.5	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	...	0.6	-0.0
New Zealand	18.5	11.6	2005	OECD	6.9	OECD	0.4	OECD	0.1	2.9	...	4.2	1.0
Papua New Guinea	3.8	0.2	2005	SSI	3.6	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
Tonga	4.7	0.9	2005	SSI	3.8	WHO	0.0	n.a.	...	0.0	0.0	0.9	-0.0
Tuvalu	11.7	3.8	2005	SSI	7.9	WHO	0.0	n.a.	3.2	0.6
Vanuatu	3.4	0.6	2005	SSI	2.8	WHO	0.0	n.a.	0.2	0.1	...	0.0	0.3
SOURCES													
IMF. 2009. Public protection (excluding health) expenditure in percentage of GDP (Washington, DC).													
OECD. 2009a. Social and Welfare Statistics: Social Expenditure Database (SOCX) (Paris) (http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=SOCX_AGG).													
ILO. 2009c. ILO Social Security Inquiry (SSI) (Geneva). Table E-1f: Public social protection expenditure excluding health benefit in kind as a percentage of GDP.													
European Commission. 2009a. EUROSTAT. Living Conditions and Welfare: Social Protection Database (ESSPROS) (Luxembourg) (http://lepp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/living_conditions_and_social_protection/data/database).													
WHO. 2009a. Statistical Information System (WHOSIS) (Geneva) (http://www.who.int/entity/whosis/en/index.html). Public health expenditure in percentage of GDP), combination of existing indicators.													
NOTES													
n.a. = Not applicable.													
... = Not available.													
* Not counted elsewhere.													

Specific health indicators

Table 27. Total (public and private) health-care expenditure not financed by private households' out-of-pocket payments (percentages)

Major area, region or country	2000	2005	2006	Major area, region or country	2000	2005	2006
Africa				Uganda	58.5	63.0	62.1
Algeria	74.2	76.6	78.5	Zambia	59.9	63.5	62.2
Angola	82.2	81.5	86.6	Zimbabwe	75.9	71.3	75.9
Benin	49.5	55.6	53.3	Asia			
Burkina Faso	43.5	61.8	60.6	Afghanistan	3.5	22.1	29.5
Burundi	17.9	28.6	24.6	Armenia	22.8	40.1	48.5
Cameroon	32.8	31.9	31.8	Azerbaijan	24.4	36.4	42.3
Cape Verde	73.6	81.9	81.6	Bahrain	77.3	76.8	76.7
Central African Rep.	43.8	40.4	38.6	Bangladesh	35.6	37.4	44.2
Chad	44.0	42.1	38.0	Bhutan	87.7	71.0	68.6
Comoros	54.9	53.3	55.5	Brunei Darussalam	83.5	79.8	79.9
Congo	66.5	47.1	40.8	Cambodia	26.7	39.9	37.6
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	100.0	34.6	37.1	China	41.0	47.8	46.1
Côte d'Ivoire	25.1	31.1	32.4	Georgia	29.2	23.0	27.9
Djibouti	65.7	76.2	75.8	India	27.3	23.9	24.4
Egypt	40.4	41.2	43.7	Indonesia	48.1	64.5	67.1
Equatorial Guinea	72.8	84.5	84.0	Iran, Islamic Rep. of	46.0	58.1	57.9
Eritrea	66.9	62.9	54.5	Iraq	29.1	74.4	72.5
Ethiopia	64.1	68.6	68.0	Israel	72.4	76.7	75.9
Gabon	73.1	74.0	78.7	Japan	83.2	85.3	85.3
Gambia	58.8	75.7	70.7	Jordan	59.1	58.4	55.6
Ghana	35.3	47.9	50.0	Kazakhstan	50.9	64.2	64.6
Guinea	14.0	12.3	12.7	Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	100.0	85.6	85.6
Guinea-Bissau	36.1	55.5	55.3	Korea, Republic of	55.1	61.4	63.1
Kenya	57.1	57.3	58.6	Kuwait	79.3	79.1	80.7
Liberia	58.3	68.6	64.3	Kyrgyzstan	46.8	42.5	45.9
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	58.1	69.5	70.2	Lao People's Dem. Rep.	57.3	26.4	25.9
Madagascar	57.5	80.3	80.5	Lebanon	42.2	57.8	60.7
Malawi	70.9	91.2	91.5	Malaysia	64.1	58.2	59.8
Maldives	86.9	85.6	84.1	Mongolia	85.5	80.5	86.2
Mali	55.3	50.8	51.9	Myanmar	14.0	11.1	17.3
Mauritania	63.3	63.2	68.6	Nepal	30.8	37.4	40.8
Mauritius	58.7	60.5	59.6	Oman	88.7	90.3	89.8
Morocco	46.9	51.8	51.3	Pakistan	34.3	19.2	18.2
Mozambique	87.4	85.3	87.9	Philippines	59.5	49.1	51.6
Niger	58.1	57.8	59.7	Qatar	78.3	80.7	80.7
Nigeria	38.4	37.5	36.8	Saudi Arabia	93.0	96.1	96.7
Rwanda	76.7	84.1	77.3	Singapore	37.3	36.1	37.6
Sao Tome and Principe	85.9	84.8	85.4	Sri Lanka	55.5	53.7	56.4
Senegal	38.6	38.3	38.1	Syrian Arab Republic	43.0	50.5	47.6
Seychelles	84.6	82.6	83.9	Tajikistan	28.2	25.4	24.9
Sierra Leone	55.5	51.5	49.0	Thailand	66.3	72.3	72.7
Somalia	44.8	...	100.0	Timor-Leste	92.4	95.0	95.8
South Africa	89.1	89.9	89.8	Turkmenistan	72.6	66.7	66.7
Sudan	37.1	38.7	37.9	United Arab Emirates	83.9	77.9	78.9
Tanzania, United Rep. of	56.6	64.1	66.0	Uzbekistan	47.3	49.2	51.6
Togo	38.5	36.9	38.8	Viet Nam	37.3	36.0	39.5
Tunisia	57.9	54.2	54.0	Yemen	45.1	44.6	49.0

Major area, region or country	2000	2005	2006	Major area, region or country	2000	2005	2006
Europe				Bolivia	67.4	68.7	69.9
Albania	42.5	42.1	38.9	Brazil	61.7	69.5	66.7
Andorra	73.2	78.9	...	Chile	74.8	73.6	74.1
Austria	79.6	83.6	83.4	Colombia	88.7	93.1	93.6
Belarus	86.0	83.3	82.7	Costa Rica	79.5	80.9	80.8
Belgium	75.4	77.5	77.3	Cuba	89.3	91.4	91.3
Bosnia and Herzegovina	52.0	58.7	57.2	Dominica	73.6	70.6	71.2
Bulgaria	59.6	62.1	60.7	Dominican Republic	47.4	45.5	45.3
Croatia	86.8	82.5	81.3	Ecuador	41.3	49.0	51.7
Cyprus	44.3	50.6	53.5	El Salvador	47.5	58.0	62.7
Czech Republic	91.4	89.1	88.4	Grenada	74.0	67.1	66.7
Denmark	84.0	85.6	85.6	Guatemala	46.0	42.7	43.1
Estonia	80.1	79.5	76.0	Guyana	84.5	83.6	84.5
Finland	79.6	82.2	82.8	Haiti	55.9	56.1	71.0
France	89.5	93.3	93.3	Honduras	62.3	57.0	54.5
Germany	89.4	86.9	86.7	Jamaica	69.2	67.4	70.1
Greece	55.1	64.5	64.1	Mexico	49.1	48.8	47.6
Hungary	73.7	74.7	74.7	Nicaragua	56.3	53.3	58.1
Iceland	82.6	82.5	83.1	Panama	74.1	74.9	74.9
Ireland	86.4	87.8	87.6	Paraguay	47.0	44.3	45.9
Italy	77.2	79.7	80.3	Peru	62.7	60.4	66.8
Latvia	55.0	61.4	64.2	Saint Kitts and Nevis	63.7	65.0	63.6
Lithuania	73.9	67.8	70.5	Saint Lucia	69.8	58.7	59.1
Luxembourg	93.0	93.4	93.4	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	63.9	62.9	62.8
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	84.6	70.4	71.6	Suriname	77.5	69.1	69.8
Malta	78.8	79.8	80.1	Trinidad and Tobago	48.5	59.3	59.6
Moldova, Republic of	52.3	57.1	57.9	Uruguay	82.8	82.1	82.4
Monaco	76.0	79.0	...	Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	60.3	51.8	55.3
Montenegro	79.5	North America			
Netherlands	91.0	92.3	94.0	Canada	84.1	85.5	85.5
Norway	83.3	84.4	84.4	United States	85.2	86.9	87.3
Poland	70.0	73.9	74.4	Oceania			
Portugal	70.8	77.9	77.4	Australia	79.7	81.8	81.7
Romania	68.3	74.8	75.3	Cook Islands	88.0	91.5	...
Russian Federation	68.8	68.7	70.0	Fiji	65.2	76.9	77.0
San Marino	78.1	86.3	84.5	Kiribati	99.1	92.4	92.4
Serbia	74.9	Marshall Islands	96.9	97.1	...
Serbia and Montenegro	63.3	75.6	...	Micronesia	95.3	96.2	...
Slovakia	89.4	77.4	77.0	Nauru	88.9	69.4	...
Slovenia	91.4	87.6	88.1	New Zealand	84.6	83.2	83.4
Spain	76.4	79.1	79.0	Niue	96.8	98.6	...
Sweden	86.2	83.8	83.5	Palau	89.1	90.8	...
Switzerland	67.1	69.4	69.7	Papua New Guinea	89.6	94.1	92.6
Turkey	72.3	80.1	80.0	Samoa	79.2	84.8	85.0
Ukraine	69.3	60.0	58.9	Solomon Islands	96.4	95.7	96.2
United Kingdom	89.5	88.1	88.4	Tonga	80.6	80.1	79.1
Latin America and the Caribbean				Tuvalu	98.8	98.0	98.5
Antigua and Barbuda	72.0	71.6	71.6	Vanuatu	86.4	82.7	82.4
Argentina	71.8	75.7	76.1				
Bahamas	78.7	80.5	79.9				
Barbados	73.6	71.3	70.5				
Belize	48.0	56.4	59.5				

SOURCES

This indicator is calculated using the national health account estimates available in the World Health Organization Statistical System (WHOSIS). Calculations are based on two WHO indicators: Out-of-pocket expenditure as a percentage of private expenditure on health, and Private health expenditure in percentage of total health expenditure.

For further information on the original indicators see <http://www.who.int/whosis/indicators/compendium/2008/3exo/en/>.

NOTES

... = Not available.

DEFINITIONS

Out-of-pocket spending by private households (OOPs) is the direct outlay of households, including gratuities and payments in kind, made to health practitioners and suppliers of pharmaceuticals, therapeutic appliances and other goods and services, whose primary intent is to contribute to the restoration or to the enhancement of the health status of individuals or population groups. It includes household payments to public services, non-profit institutions and non-governmental organizations. It includes non-reimbursable cost sharing, deductibles, co-payments and fee-for-service, but excludes payments made by companies that deliver medical and paramedical benefits, whether required by law or not, to their employees. It excludes payments for overseas treatment.

Total (public and private) health-care expenditure not financed by private households' out-of-pocket payments

The effective level of financial protection provided to the population by social health protection systems is measured here by a proxy indicator expressed as a percentage of total (public and private) health-care expenditure in the country not financed by private households through out-of-pocket payments. The proxy is more or less equivalent to the percentage of total (public and private) health-care expenditure in the country financed either by general government or by pre-paid private insurance, employers or NGOs.

Table 28. Health coverage and access to medical care: Births attended by skilled health staff, and child immunization

Major area, region or country	Year	Births attended by skilled health staff (%)	Immunization of children under 12 months (%)			
			Measles ³		DTP ⁴	
			2005	2007	2005	2007
Africa						
Algeria	2006	95	83	92	88	95
Angola	2007	47	45	88	47	83
Benin	2006	78	61	61	67	67
Botswana	2000	94	90	90	97	97
Burkina Faso	2006	54	84	94	96	99
Burundi	2005	34	75	75	74	74
Cameroon	2006	63	68	74	80	82
Cape Verde	2005	78	65	74	73	81
Central African Rep.	2006	53	62	62	54	54
Chad	2004	14	23	23	20	20
Comoros	2000	62	80	65	80	75
Congo	2005	83	56	67	65	80
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	2007	74	70	79	73	87
Côte d'Ivoire	2006	57	84	67	79	76
Djibouti ¹	2006	93	65	74	71	88
Egypt	2008	79	98	97	98	98
Equatorial Guinea	2000	65	51	51	33	33
Eritrea	2002	28	95	95	97	97
Ethiopia	2005	6	59	65	69	73
Gabon	2000	86	55	55	38	38
Gambia	2006	57	84	85	88	90
Ghana	2008	59	83	95	84	94
Guinea	2005	38	59	71	68	75
Guinea-Bissau	2006	39	76	76	63	63
Kenya	2003	42	69	80	76	81
Lesotho	2004	55	85	85	83	83
Liberia	2007	46	94	95	87	88
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya ¹	2006	100
Madagascar	2004	51	70	81	72	82
Malawi	2006	54	82	83	93	87
Mali	2006	45	68	68	68	68
Mauritania	2007	61	61	67	71	75
Mauritius	2005	99	98	98	97	97
Morocco	2004	63	97	95	98	95
Mozambique	2003	48	77	77	72	72
Namibia	2006	81	73	69	86	86
Niger	2006	33	47	47	39	39
Nigeria	2003	35	62	62	54	54
Rwanda	2008	52	89	99	95	97
Sao Tome and Principe	2006	81	88	86	97	97
Senegal	2005	52	74	84	84	94
Sierra Leone	2005	43	67	67	64	64
Somalia	2006	33	35	34	35	39
South Africa	2003	92	84	83	97	97
Sudan	2006	49	69	79	78	84
Swaziland	2007	69	91	91	95	95
Tanzania, United Rep. of	2005	43	91	90	90	83

Major area, region or country	Year	Births attended by skilled health staff (%)	Immunization of children under 12 months (%)			
			Measles ³		DTP ⁴	
			2005	2007	2005	2007
Togo	2006	62	70	80	82	88
Tunisia	2000	90	96	98	98	98
Uganda	2006	42	68	68	64	64
Zambia	2007	47	85	85	80	80
Zimbabwe	2006	69	66	66	62	62
Asia						
Afghanistan	2003	14	64	70	76	83
Armenia	2005	98	94	92	90	88
Azerbaijan	2006	89	98	97	93	95
Bahrain	2005	99	99	99	98	97
Bangladesh	2007	18	88	88	90	90
Bhutan ¹	2005	51	93	95	95	95
Brunei Darussalam	2005	100	97	97	99	99
Cambodia	2005	44	79	79	82	82
China	2006	98	86	94	87	93
Georgia	2005	98	92	97	84	98
Hong Kong, China	2005	100
India	2006	47	64	67	61	62
Indonesia	2007	73	78	80	74	75
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	2005	97	94	97	95	99
Iraq	2006	89	69	69	62	62
Israel	n.a.	...	96	97	96	96
Japan	2004	100	99	98	99	98
Jordan	2007	99	95	95	95	98
Kazakhstan	2006	100	99	99	98	93
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	2004	97	96	99	79	92
Korea, Rep. of ¹	2006	100	99	92	96	91
Kuwait ¹	2006	100	99	99	99	99
Kyrgyzstan	2006	98	99	99	98	94
Lao People's Dem. Rep.	2006	20	41	40	49	50
Lebanon	2004	98	53	53	74	74
Macau, China	2004	100
Malaysia	2005	98	90	90	95	96
Maldives	2004	84	97	97	98	98
Mongolia	2006	99	97	98	99	95
Myanmar	2003	68	72	81	73	86
Nepal	2006	19	74	81	75	82
Oman	2006	98	98	97	99	99
Pakistan	2007	39	78	80	80	83
Philippines	2003	60	92	92	89	87
Qatar ¹	2006	100	99	92	97	94
Saudi Arabia	2004	96	97	96	96	96
Singapore ^{1,2}	2006	100	96	95	96	96
Sri Lanka	2007	99	99	98	99	98
Syrian Arab Rep.	2006	93	98	98	99	99
Tajikistan	2005	83	86	85	85	86
Thailand	2006	97	96	96	98	98
Timor-Leste	2003	18	48	63	55	70
Turkmenistan	2006	100	99	99	99	98
United Arab Emirates ¹	2005	100	92	92	94	92

Major area, region or country	Year	Births attended by skilled health staff (%)	Immunization of children under 12 months (%)			
			Measles ³		DTP ⁴	
			2005	2007	2005	2007
Uzbekistan	2006	100	99	99	99	96
Viet Nam	2006	88	95	83	95	92
West Bank and Gaza Strip	2006	99
Yemen	2006	36	76	74	86	87
Europe						
Albania	2005	100	97	97	98	98
Austria	1993	100	75	79	86	85
Belarus	2005	100	99	99	99	95
Belgium	1999	99	88	92	97	99
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2006	100	90	96	93	95
Bulgaria	2006	99	96	96	96	95
Croatia	2007	100	96	96	96	96
Cyprus	2003	100	86	87	98	97
Czech Rep.	2006	100	97	97	97	99
Denmark	n.a.	...	95	89	93	75
Estonia	2006	100	96	96	96	95
Finland	2003	100	97	98	97	99
France	1993	99	87	87	98	98
Germany	2006	100	94	94	97	97
Greece	n.a.	...	88	88	88	88
Hungary	2006	100	99	99	99	99
Iceland	n.a.	...	90	95	95	97
Ireland	2003	100	84	87	90	92
Italy	2003	99	87	87	96	96
Latvia	2006	100	95	97	99	98
Lithuania	2006	100	97	97	94	95
Luxembourg	2003	100	95	96	99	99
Macedonia, The former Yugoslav Rep. of	2006	98	96	96	97	95
Malta	2006	100	86	79	92	74
Moldova, Rep. of	2005	100	97	96	98	92
Montenegro	2005	99	...	90	...	92
Netherlands ¹	2006	100	96	96	98	96
Norway	n.a.	...	89	92	91	93
Poland ¹	2006	100	98	98	99	99
Portugal	2001	100	93	95	93	97
Romania	2006	98	97	97	97	97
Russian Federation	2006	100	99	99	98	98
Serbia	2005	99	96	95	98	94
Slovakia	2006	100	98	99	99	99
Slovenia	2006	100	94	96	96	97
Spain	n.a.	...	97	97	96	96
Sweden	n.a.	...	96	96	99	99
Switzerland	2006	100	86	86	94	93
Turkey	2003	83	91	96	90	96
Ukraine	2007	99	96	98	96	98
United Kingdom	1998	99	82	86	91	92
Latin America and the Caribbean						
Argentina	2006	99	99	99	94	96
Aruba	2002	96

Major area, region or country	Year	Births attended by skilled health staff (%)	Immunization of children under 12 months (%)			
			Measles ³		DTP ⁴	
			2005	2007	2005	2007
Bahamas	2006	99	85	96	93	95
Barbados ¹	2005	100	93	75	92	93
Belize	2006	96	95	96	96	96
Bolivia	2008	66	81	81	81	81
Brazil ^{1,2}	2004	97	99	99	96	98
Chile	2005	100	90	91	91	94
Colombia	2005	96	89	95	87	93
Costa Rica ¹	2006	94	89	90	91	89
Cuba	2007	100	98	99	99	93
Dominican Rep.	2007	98	99	96	79	79
Ecuador ¹	2005	80	93	99	94	99
El Salvador	2003	92	99	98	89	96
Grenada	2007	99	99	98	99	99
Guatemala	2002	41	95	93	81	82
Guyana	2006	83	92	96	93	94
Haiti	2006	26	58	58	53	53
Honduras	2006	67	92	89	91	86
Jamaica	2005	97	84	76	88	85
Mexico	2006	93	96	96	98	98
Nicaragua	2006	74	96	99	86	87
Panama	2006	91	99	89	88	88
Paraguay	2004	77	90	80	75	66
Peru	2006	71	80	99	89	80
Puerto Rico	2004	100
Saint Lucia	2005	100	94	94	95	99
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	2005	100	97	99	99	99
Suriname	2006	90	99	85	72	84
Trinidad and Tobago	2006	98	93	91	95	88
Uruguay ¹	2005	100	95	96	96	94
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	2003	95	76	55	87	71
Virgin Islands (US)	2003	99
North America						
Canada ¹	2005	100	94	94	94	94
United States ¹	2004	100	93	93	96	96
Oceania						
Australia ¹	2004	100	94	94	92	92
Fiji ^{1,2}	2005	99	70	81	75	83
French Polynesia	2000	99
Guam	2001	99
Micronesia (Fed. States of)	2001	88	96	92	94	79
New Zealand ^{1,2}	2004	95	82	79	89	88
Papua New Guinea ¹	2005	38	60	58	61	60
Samoa	2004	100	57	63	64	71
Solomon Islands ^{1,2}	2003	43	70	78	78	79
Tonga	2004	98	99	99	99	99
Vanuatu ¹	2005	92	70	65	66	76

SOURCES

World Bank. 2009a. *World Development Indicators* (Washington, DC).
Complemented by: United Nations Statistics Division. 2009e. *Millennium Development Goals Database* (<http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=MDG&f=seriesRowID%3A570>); and World Health Organization 2009a. *Statistical Information System (WHOSIS)* (<http://www.who.int/whosis/en/index.html>). The World Health Organization has been responsible for the development of this indicator.

NOTES

... = Not available.

¹ Source: WHOSIS, for percentage of births attended by skilled health personnel.

² For percentage of births attended by skilled health personnel, data are only available for births in institutions.

³ Measles (MCV) immunization coverage among 1-year-olds (%).

⁴ Diphtheria, tetanus toxoid and pertussis (DTP3) immunization coverage among 1-year-olds (%).

DEFINITIONS

Percentage of births attended by skilled health staff

The proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel.

Numerator

The number of births attended by skilled health personnel (doctors, nurses or midwives) trained in providing life-saving obstetric care, including giving necessary supervision, care and advice to women during pregnancy, childbirth and the post-partum period; to conduct deliveries on their own; and to care for newborns.

Denominator

The total number of live births in the same period.

Immunization of children under 12 months

Measles (MCV) immunization coverage among 1-year-olds (%)

The percentage of children under 1 year of age who have received at least one dose of measles-containing vaccine in a given year.

For countries recommending the first dose of measles vaccine in children over 12 months, the indicator is calculated as the proportion of children less than 12–23 months receiving one dose of measles-containing vaccine.

Diphtheria, tetanus toxoid and pertussis (DTP3) immunization coverage among 1-year-olds (%)

The percentage of 1-year-olds who have received three doses of the combined diphtheria, tetanus toxoid and pertussis vaccine in a given year.

For further information see WHOSIS (WHO, 2009a): *Indicator definitions and metadata* (<http://www.who.int/whosis/indicators/en/>).

Table 29. Multiple dimensions of health coverage, by levels of vulnerability

Country and level of vulnerability	Estimate of health formal coverage (% of population) ¹	Estimate of health formal deficit coverage (% of population) ¹	Out-of-pocket expenditure (as % of total health expenditure) ^{2,4}	Maternal mortality ratio (per 10,000 live births) ²	Per capita total expenditure on health (international \$ PPP) ²	Per capita health expenditure not financed by private households' out-of-pocket payments (international \$ PPP) ²	Population not covered (% due to financial resources deficit ^{3,6})	Population not covered (% due to professional health staff deficit ^{3,5})
Very low level of vulnerability	96	4	13.9	0.9	2441.9	2007.9	0.22	0.0
Australia	100	0	18.3	0.4	3122	2550.6	0.0	0.0
Austria	98	2	16.6	0.4	3545	2956.5	0.0	0.0
Bahamas	0	100	20.1	1.6	1516	1211.2	0.0	0.0
Belarus	100	0	17.3	1.8	572	473.0	0.0	0.0
Belgium	100	0	22.7	0.8	3183	2460.5	0.0	0.0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	100	0	42.8	0.3	794	454.2	0.0	0.0
Canada	100	0	14.5	0.7	3672	3139.6	0.0	0.0
Croatia	100	0	18.7	0.7	1084	881.3	0.0	0.0
Cyprus	46.5	1.0	1696	907.4	0.0	0.0
Czech Rep.	100	0	11.6	0.4	1490	1317.2	0.0	0.0
Denmark	100	0	14.4	0.3	3349	2866.7	0.0	0.0
Estonia	94	6	24.0	2.5	989	751.6	0.0	0.0
Finland	100	0	17.2	0.7	2472	2046.8	0.0	0.0
France	100	0	6.7	0.8	3554	3315.9	0.0	0.0
Germany	100	0	13.3	0.4	3328	2885.4	0.0	0.0
Hungary	100	0	25.3	0.6	1382	1032.4	0.0	0.0
Iceland	100	0	16.9	0.4	3319	2758.1	0.0	0.0
Italy	100	0	19.7	0.3	2623	2106.3	0.0	0.0
Japan	100	0	14.7	0.6	2514	2144.4	0.0	0.0
Lithuania	29.5	1.1	1041	733.9	0.0	0.0
Luxembourg	100	0	6.6	1.2	5773	5392.0	0.0	0.0
Malta	19.9	0.8	1825	1461.8	0.0	0.0
Netherlands	100	0	6.0	0.6	3383	3180.0	0.0	0.0
New Zealand	100	0	16.6	0.9	2447	2040.8	0.0	0.0
Norway	100	0	15.6	0.7	4521	3815.7	0.0	0.0
Poland	25.6	0.8	910	677.0	0.0	0.0
Portugal	100	0	22.6	1.1	2080	1609.9	0.0	0.0
Russian Federation	88	12	30.0	2.8	638	446.6	0.0	0.0
Singapore	62.4	1.4	1228	461.7	0.0	0.0
Slovakia	96	4	23.0	0.6	1235	951.0	0.0	0.0
Slovenia	100	0	11.9	0.6	2065	1819.3	0.0	0.0
Spain	99	1	21.0	0.4	2388	1886.5	0.0	0.0
Sweden	100	0	16.5	0.3	3119	2604.4	0.0	0.0
Ukraine	100	0	41.1	1.8	542	319.2	8.8	0.0
United Kingdom	100	0	11.6	0.8	2784	2461.1	0.0	0.0
United States	100	0	12.7	1.1	6714	5861.3	0.0	0.0
Low vulnerability	13	87	38.5	7.9	636.4	423.8	19.3	14.7
Albania	61.1	9.2	358	139.3	60.2	0.0
Argentina	100	0	23.9	7.7	1665	1267.1	0.0	12.0
Azerbaijan	57.7	8.2	218	92.2	73.7	0.0
Brazil	85	15	33.3	11.0	765	510.3	0.0	0.0
Bulgaria	100	0	39.3	1.1	741	449.8	0.0	0.0
Chile	96	4	25.9	1.6	697	516.5	0.0	58.6
Costa Rica	100	0	19.2	3.0	743	600.3	0.0	49.7
Egypt	48	52	56.3	13.0	316	138.1	60.5	0.0
El Salvador	59.6	40	37.3	17.0	387	242.6	30.7	51.8

Country and level of vulnerability	Estimate of health formal coverage (% of population) ¹	Estimate of health formal deficit coverage (% of population) ¹	Out-of-pocket expenditure (as % of total health expenditure) ^{2,4}	Maternal mortality ratio (per 10,000 live births) ²	Per capita total expenditure on health (international \$ PPP) ²	Per capita health expenditure not financed by private households' out-of-pocket payments (international \$ PPP) ²	Population not covered (%) due to financial resources deficit ^{3,6}	Population not covered (%) due to professional health staff deficit ^{3,5}
Jamaica	29.9	17.0	240	168.2	51.9	38.6
Jordan	80	20	44.4	6.2	611	339.7	2.9	0.0
Kazakhstan	70	30	35.4	14.0	330	213.2	39.1	0.0
Malaysia	40.2	6.2	500	299.0	14.6	42.2
Mexico	78.6	21	52.4	6.0	756	359.9	0.0	32.5
Panama	100	0	25.1	13.0	721	540.0	0.0	4.3
Romania	100	0	24.7	2.4	610	459.3	0.0	0.0
Trinidad and Tobago	40.4	4.5	811	483.4	0.0	12.3
Tunisia	99	1	46.0	10.0	488	263.5	24.7	0.0
Uruguay	87.8	12	17.6	2.0	989	814.9	0.0	0.0
Medium vulnerability	69.2	30.8	41.7	24.0	382.3	260.3	39.4	27.3
Algeria	85	15	21.5	18.0	188	147.6	57.8	21.2
Botswana	6.4	38.0	635	594.4	0.0	26.4
China	23.9	76	53.9	4.5	342	157.7	55.0	40.5
Djibouti	24.2	65.0	100	75.8	78.3	86.7
Dominican Rep. of	54.7	15.0	449	203.4	41.9	19.3
Ecuador	73	27	48.3	21.0	297	153.5	56.1	26.3
Gabon	55	45	21.3	52.0	252	198.3	43.3	0.0
Guatemala	72.6	27	56.9	29.0	259	111.6	68.1	0.0
Guyana	15.5	47.0	264	223.1	36.3	28.8
Iran, Islamic Rep. of	42.1	14.0	731	423.2	0.0	38.5
Moldova, Rep. of	78.6	21	42.1	2.2	190	110.0	68.6	0.0
Morocco	41.2	59	48.7	24.0	273	140.0	60.0	67.3
Paraguay	63.7	36	54.1	15.0	342	157.0	55.1	31.0
Peru	71	29	33.2	24.0	300	200.4	42.7	57.5
Saint Lucia	40.9	...	421	248.8	28.9	0.0
South Africa	100	0	10.2	40.0	869	780.4	0.0	0.0
Suriname	30.2	7.2	361	252.0	28.0	51.7
Thailand	97.7	2	27.3	11.0	346	251.5	28.1	23.2
Turkey	69.2	31	20.0	4.4	645	516.0	0.0	0.0
High vulnerability	46.7	53.3	35.6	26.9	233.7	147.9	61.1	43.2
Armenia	100	0	51.5	7.6	272	131.9	62.3	0.0
Bhutan	31.4	44.0	107	73.4	79.0	69.9
Bolivia	66.9	33	30.1	29.0	204	142.6	59.3	24.0
Cape Verde	65	35	18.4	21.0	278	226.8	35.2	69.1
Colombia	31.3	69	6.4	13.0	626	585.9	0.0	54.6
Côte d'Ivoire	5	95	67.6	81.0	66	21.4	93.9	83.8
Georgia	55	45	72.1	6.6	355	99.0	71.7	0.0
Honduras	65.2	35	45.5	28.0	241	131.3	62.5	56.2
Kenya	25	75	41.4	56.0	105	61.5	82.4	71.5
Mauritania	0.3	100	31.4	82.0	45	30.9	91.2	81.9
Mongolia	100	0	13.8	4.6	149	128.4	63.3	0.0
Namibia	22.5	78	5.4	21.0	338	319.7	8.6	17.6
Nicaragua	68.5	32	41.9	17.0	251	145.8	58.3	64.3
Philippines	48.4	23.0	223	115.1	67.1	0.0
Sri Lanka	0.1	100	43.6	5.8	213	120.1	65.7	43.1
Tajikistan	75.1	17.0	71	17.7	94.9	0.0
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	100	0	44.7	5.7	396	219.0	37.4	30.1

Country and level of vulnerability	Estimate of health formal coverage (% of population) ¹	Estimate of health formal deficit coverage (% of population) ¹	Out-of-pocket expenditure (as % of total health expenditure) ^{2,4}	Maternal mortality ratio (per 10,000 live births) ²	Per capita total expenditure on health (international \$ PPP) ²	Per capita health expenditure not financed by private households' out-of-pocket payments (international \$ PPP) ²	Population not covered (%) due to financial resources deficit ^{3,6}	Population not covered (%) due to professional health staff deficit ^{3,5}
Viet Nam	23.4	77	60.5	15.0	264	104.3	70.2	69.0
Yemen	6.3	94	51.0	43.0	82	40.2	88.5	76.4
Very high vulnerability	11.6	88.4	65.7	83.0	86.2	49.7	85.8	74.6
Bangladesh	0.4	100	55.8	57.0	69	30.5	91.3	86.8
Benin	0.5	100	46.7	84.0	46	24.5	93.0	82.6
Burkina Faso	0.2	100	39.4	70.0	87	52.7	84.9	87.4
Burundi	13	87	75.4	110.0	15	3.7	98.9	95.3
Cambodia	62.4	54.0	167	62.8	82.1	76.8
Cameroon	0.1	100	68.2	100.0	80	25.4	92.7	59.9
Central African Rep.	6	94	61.4	98.0	55	21.2	93.9	88.6
Chad	62.0	150.0	40	15.2	95.7	93.2
Congo	59.2	74.0	31	12.6	96.4	70.0
Congo, Democratic Rep. of	0.2	100	62.9	110.0	18	6.7	98.1	85.7
Ethiopia	32.0	72.0	22	15.0	95.7	94.6
Ghana	18.7	81	50.0	56.0	100	50.0	85.7	75.1
Guinea	1.1	99	87.3	91.0	116	14.7	95.8	85.3
Guinea-Bissau	1.6	98	44.7	110.0	40	22.1	93.7	80.9
Haiti	60	40	29.0	67.0	96	68.2	80.5	92.6
India	5.7	94	75.6	45.0	109	26.6	92.4	56.2
Indonesia	54.6	45	32.9	42.0	87	58.4	83.3	77.1
Kyrgyzstan	54.1	15.0	127	58.3	83.3	0.0
Lao People's Democratic Rep.	16.1	84	74.1	66.0	85	22.0	93.7	67.0
Lesotho	26.5	96.0	143	105.1	70.0	84.8
Liberia	35.7	120.0	39	25.1	92.8	92.1
Madagascar	19.5	51.0	34	27.4	92.2	85.8
Malawi	8.5	110.0	70	64.1	81.7	86.1
Mali	2	98	48.1	97.0	65	33.7	90.4	80.4
Mozambique	12.1	52.0	56	49.2	85.9	92.0
Nepal	0.1	100	59.2	83.0	78	31.8	90.9	84.4
Niger	0.7	99	40.3	180.0	27	16.1	95.4	94.3
Nigeria	63.2	110.0	50	18.4	94.7	57.6
Pakistan	81.8	32.0	51	9.3	97.3	69.4
Rwanda	36.6	63	22.7	130.0	210	162.3	53.6	89.2
Senegal	11.7	88	61.9	98.0	72	27.4	92.2	92.0
Sierra Leone	51.0	210.0	41	20.1	94.3	88.3
Swaziland	15.8	39.0	353	297.2	15.1	0.0
Tanzania, United Rep. of	14.5	86	34.0	95.0	45	29.7	91.5	91.1
Timor Leste	4.2	38.0	169	161.9	53.7	57.9
Uganda	0.1	100	37.9	55.0	143	88.8	74.6	82.3
Uzbekistan	48.4	2.4	177	91.3	73.9	0.0
Zambia	37.8	83.0	62	38.6	89.0	50.3

SOURCES

Formal health coverage: ILO. 2008b. *Social health protection: An ILO strategy towards universal access to health care*. Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 1 (Geneva). Table A2.2: Formal coverage in social health protection, p. 83 (<http://www.ilo.org/gimi/gess/ResFileDownload.do?ressourceId=5956>). National health account estimates: WHO. 2009a. *Statistical Information System* (WHOSIS).

NOTES

n.a. = Not applicable.

... = Not available.

¹ Latest available year. Detailed information is available in ILO, 2008b.

² 2006 data.

³ Based on median value in low-vulnerability group of countries.

DEFINITIONS

Formal health coverage: For definition and sources of data, see ILO, 2008b.

⁴ *Out-of-pocket expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure:*

Out-of-pocket spending by private households (OOPs) is the direct outlay of households, including gratuities and payments in kind, made to health practitioners and suppliers of pharmaceuticals, therapeutic appliances and other goods and services, whose primary intent is to contribute to the restoration or to the enhancement of the health status of individuals or population groups. It includes household payments to public services, non-profit institutions and non-governmental organizations. It includes non-reimbursable cost sharing, deductibles, co-payments and fee-for-service, but excludes payments made by companies that deliver medical and paramedical benefits, whether required by law or not, to their employees. It excludes payments for overseas treatment. These data are generated from sources that WHO has been collecting for over ten years. The most comprehensive and consistent data on health financing is generated from national health accounts that collect expenditure information within an internationally recognized framework. Not all countries have or update national health accounts and, in these instances, data is obtained through technical contacts in-country or from publicly available documents and reports. Missing values are estimated using various accounting techniques depending on the data available for each country.

The principal international references used are the International Monetary Fund (IMF), government financial statistics and international financial statistics; OECD health data; and the United Nations national account statistics. National sources include national health account reports, public expenditure reports, statistical yearbooks and other periodicals, budgetary documents, national account reports, central bank reports, non-governmental organization reports, academic studies, reports and data provided by central statistical offices and ministries, and statistical data on official web sites.

WHO sends estimates to the respective Ministries of Health every year for validation.

⁵ *Percentage of the population not covered due to professional health staff deficit* (based on median value in low-vulnerability group of countries):

The ILO staff access deficit indicator reflects the supply side of access availability – in this case the availability of human resources at a level that guarantees at least basic, but universal, effective access to everybody. To estimate access to the services of skilled medical professionals, it uses as a proxy the relative difference between the density of health professionals in a given country and its median value in countries with a low level of vulnerability (population access to services of medical professionals in countries with low vulnerability is thus used as a benchmark for other countries). This median value is just over 40 health professionals per 10,000 population.

Another way to look at it is to refer to population not covered due to a deficit from the supply side (see second part of example below). Then, the ILO staff access deficit indicator estimates the dimension of the overall performance of health-care delivery as a percentage of the population that has no access to health care if needed. This value is above the minimum set by WHO for primary care delivery, which is 25 per 10 000.

Professional staff includes physicians and nursing and midwifery personnel as defined by WHO. See WHO 2009: *Indicator definitions and metadata* (http://apps.who.int/gho/indicatorregistry/App_Main/browse_indicators.aspx).

Example of calculation

	Algeria	Burkina Faso
Total of health professional staff [A=B+C]	105 117	7 265
Number of nursing and midwifery personnel [B]	69 749	6 557
Number of physicians [C]	35 368	708
Total population (in thousands) [D]	33 351	14 359
Number of health professional per 10,000 persons [F=A÷D×10]	31.52	5.06
The ILO staff access deficit indicator [(benchmark–value _{country x})÷benchmark * 100]	21.2	87.4
If referring to population covered:		
Total population covered if applying benchmark * (thousands) [E = A÷benchmark×10]	26 279.25	1 816.25
Total population not covered due to health professional staff deficit (thousands) [F = D–E]	7 071	12 542
Percentage of total population not covered due to health professional staff deficit G = F÷D×100	21.2	87.4

* Benchmark: 40 professional health staff per 10,000 persons.

⁶ *Percentage of total population NOT covered due to financial deficit* (based on median value in low-vulnerability group of countries):

The ILO financial deficit indicator follows the same principle as the access deficit indicator regarding total health spending (in international \$ PPP) except out-of-pocket payments. It uses the relative difference between the national health expenditure in international \$ PPP (excluding out-of-pocket) and the median density observed in the country group with low levels of vulnerability as a benchmark for developing countries. This median value is just over 350 international \$ PPP per capita.

Example of calculation

	Namibia	Bhutan
Per capita health expenditure NOT financed by private households' out-of-pocket payments (PPP in int. \$) [A]	319.748	73.402
Population (in thousands) total [B]	2 047	649
Total health expenditure not financed by out of pocket in int. \$ PPP (thousands) [C=A×B]	654 524.156	476 378.98
Population covered by total health expenditure in int. \$ PPP per capita (thousands) [D=C±Benchmark*]	1 870	136
Population not covered due to financial resources deficit (thousands) [E=B–D]	177	513
Percentage of the population not covered due to financial resources deficit (%) [F = E÷B×100]	8.6	79.0

* Benchmark: Total health expenditure not financed by out-of-pocket per capita = 350 international \$ PPP.

The *World Social Security Report 2010/11* is the first in a new series of biennial reports from the ILO that monitor social security coverage, presenting various methods and approaches for assessing coverage and identifying gaps.

Social security systems play a critical role in alleviating poverty and providing economic security. They help people to cope with life's major risks and to adapt to change, and through income transfers they can also have a remarkable effect on income inequality. The 2008–09 financial crisis has shown that social security systems are also powerful economic and social stabilizers, with both short- and long-term effects. However, the crisis has thrown into sharp relief the serious problems of access to social security around the world, and how the financing of systems is being put at risk as national budgets shrink. This timely report takes a comprehensive look at how countries are investing in social security, how they are financing it, and how effective their approaches are. The report also analyses the role of social security systems in buffering the effects of the crisis.

With its global scope and valuable statistical annexes, the *World Social Security Report 2010/11* is an essential reference for anyone interested in social security issues.

ISBN 978-92-2-123268-1



9 789221 232681