



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
16 June 2017

English only

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Sixty-fifth plenary session

Geneva, 19-21 June 2017

Item 7 (a) of the provisional agenda

Reports, guidelines and recommendations prepared under the umbrella of the Conference

Guide on poverty measurement

Extract of the Guide on poverty measurement

Addendum

Results of the consultation on the Guide on poverty measurement

Note by the secretariat

Summary

This note summarizes the comments by members of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) on the *Guide on poverty measurement*. The Secretariat carried out an electronic consultation on the Guide in March-April 2017.

A total of 40 countries and 2 organizations replied to the request for comments. There was general support for the main conclusions and recommendations made in the Guide and for the proposals for future work. Countries and organizations also provided detailed comments that are summarized in this document.

The Conference is invited to ask the Task Force on Poverty Measurement to revise the Guide as described in the present summary and agree that the revised Guide be submitted to the 2017 October CES Bureau meeting for final approval.



I. Introduction

1. The note summarizes the comments by members of the Conference of European Statisticians (CES) on the *Guide on poverty measurement*. The Secretariat carried out an electronic consultation on the recommendations in March-April 2017. The CES members were asked to structure their comments according to a set of questions on general and specific issues.
2. The Task Force on Poverty Measurement includes representatives from national statistical offices of Georgia, Germany, Italy, Poland, Russian Federation, Turkey and United Kingdom. The following international organizations and academic institutions are represented: CIS-STAT, Eurostat, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Bank, the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (United Kingdom), the UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and CIS, UNICEF and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). The UNECE acts as Secretariat to the Task Force.
3. The Task Force will consider the comments and suggestions presented in this document for revising the Guide.

II. Summary

4. In the electronic consultation, responses were received from the following 42 countries and organizations: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Czechia, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Montenegro, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Eurasian Economic Commission (EEC) and OECD.
5. Out of the 42 respondents, 40 expressed explicitly that the Guide is ready for endorsement at the CES plenary session, subject to incorporation of the comments made in the consultation. No country objected to the endorsement of the Guide.
6. The comments and the Task Force's responses are summarized in sections III-V.

III. General comments

7. Many countries expressed support to the Guide. Armenia, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Czechia, Lithuania, Mexico, Philippines and Sweden found the Guide to be a useful, informative and well-structured compendium. Israel noted that the framework is well presented. The Dominican Republic and Tajikistan added that the Guide could serve as a road map for applying different measurement methods, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses of each method, both at national and international levels. The United Kingdom noted that the Guide provides a strong mix of consolidation of existing practice into a single reference; new, more explicit recommendations to improve international comparability; and exploration of concepts and methods at the forefront of statistical development in this area. The United States stated that the Guide is well written and needed by countries as well as internationally. Canada, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Sweden and Tajikistan commended the work of the Task Force.

8. Austria found that more references could be provided to existing international attempts for collecting comparable poverty data in the CES region and suggested a stronger emphasis on the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions Survey (EU-SILC) as such an instrument. Furthermore, Austria proposed additions to the Guide related to best practice guidelines for dissemination, examples of press releases and short portraits of data collections.

9. Armenia suggested that the Guide be translated into Russian.

10. Philippines suggested that a similar Guide be replicated in the Asia and Pacific region by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) or the Asian Development Bank.

Response by the Task Force

11. The Task Force agrees to strengthen the references to international efforts in establishing comparable poverty measures. Chapter 2 will describe EU-SILC as well as the activities of OECD and the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-STAT) towards harmonizing poverty statistics.

12. Collecting best practices for dissemination and communication would require a separate additional chapter and would be outside the present terms of reference of the Task Force. The Guide is already rich of national examples and the Task Force felt that further specific examples, such as data collection portraits, would add little value.

IV. Comments on main recommendations

13. Several countries provided detailed comments on the recommendations of the Guide. Australia, Belgium and Brazil pointed out the limitations to the scope of “usual residence” and the related conceptual and measurement challenges, such as with children in shared custody.

14. Australia suggested re-wording the recommendation on the main income measure used for poverty measurement to reflect the actual income that persons in a household have available for spending or saving. Austria further suggested clarifying the use of disposable income as meaning annual equivalised income implying that an annual reference period is recommended. Brazil noted that disposable income can vary in the components taken into account and asked for the best configuration for comparison.

15. Australia and Croatia both noted the challenges associated with measurement of Social Transfers in Kind (STIK) and that guiding principles are needed to be developed in order to include this income component in total disposable income.

16. Several member countries of the European Union (EU) pointed out that some recommendations, such as the use of the square root equivalence scale and 50 per cent of median income in measuring relative poverty, are not corresponding to the agreed practice in the EU.

17. Belarus remarked that poverty thresholds do not take into account the additional costs that people with disabilities often face. Austria and the United Kingdom suggested to include disaggregation by disability status in line with the objective to 'Leave no-one behind' and to make reference to the Washington Group on how to measure the disability status. Poland noted that it is necessary to define the criterion for disaggregation by disability to be either biological or legal. Since both definitions vary across countries, a more detailed description was requested on this point.

18. Belarus, Belgium, Poland and Slovakia found the proposed classification of age groups too detailed and the upper age limit of child too high.
19. Belarus recommended to revise the classification of households to consider the complex composition of households participating in the living standards survey.
20. Switzerland noted that the recommendations on disaggregation are detailed and not sufficiently defined for ensuring comparability. For example, the employment status could be defined as the current status (time of the interview) or as most frequent status during the income reference period. Austria noted in this regard that EU-SILC uses a monthly calendar of self-defined main activity status to determine the dominant activity status. Philippines suggested considering those who are underemployed beside the categories of employed, unemployed and retired. Further disaggregation was proposed by ethnicity, occupation (Mexico, Philippines), education level and place of residence (Mexico).
21. Croatia further noted that the recommended disaggregations can be applied only at national level as representative results, while combining more than one disaggregation criteria at a lower geographical level can lead to confidentiality issues.
22. Poland suggested considering work on establishing common absolute poverty lines or quasi-relative poverty lines for the UNECE region.

Response by the Task Force

23. The Task Force takes into consideration the comments with regard to the recommendation on main income measure used for poverty measurement.
24. The Task Force proposes the following amendment to the recommendation:
 - (a) It is recommended that annual (equivalised) disposable income be the main income measure used for poverty measurement, as this reflects the actual income that individuals within a household have available for spending or saving. However, to provide additional insights into the nature of poverty in a country or area, compilers of poverty statistics may also wish to make use of supplementary income measures, such as income before social transfers.
 - (b) Disposable income should be defined in line with the practical definition set out in the Canberra Group Handbook (2011), with the exception of the net value of owner-occupied housing services, which should be excluded (see Section 3.2.8.3).
25. With regard to the use of square root equivalence scale, the Task Force notes that there is no technical/statistical reason for preferring 50 per cent over 60 per cent of the median as cut-off point for relative (at risk of) poverty and square-root scale over OECD-modified. However, OECD countries use the square-root scale for their submissions to OECD, while EU countries use the modified-OECD scale for their submissions to Eurostat. The rationale for recommending the square root scale is that the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator relates to 50 per cent of the median, which is the same as the OECD indicator and it might be troubling to have two indicators used by international organizations that were identical apart from equivalence scale.
26. The Task Force proposes the following amendment to the recommendation:
 - (a) In setting a poverty line, equivalised welfare measures should be used. For international comparisons, a trade-off needs to be made between applying country-specific approaches reflecting variation in economies of scale and ensuring comparability across the region. For comparisons across the CES region, it is recommended that the square root scale be used in order to provide consistency with existing international statistics based on a 50 per cent of median threshold contained within the OECD income distribution database for many CES countries.

(b) Use of an alternative scale (such as modified-OECD) for this headline measure could lead to inconsistencies in the levels of relative poverty reported by the UNECE and OECD, reducing the coherence of international statistics. However, use of such alternative scales would be useful for any supplementary measures to streamline comparison among a relatively homogenous (from a global perspective) set of countries.

27. In setting relative poverty line for international comparisons, the Task Force decided to stay consistent with SDG 10 indicator, which applies median of 50 per cent. Text will be added making it clear that using other cut-off points, such as the 60 per cent in EU countries, would be useful to streamline comparison among a relatively homogeneous (from the worldwide perspective) set of countries.

28. The Task Force proposes the following amendment to the recommendation:

(a) For international comparisons of relative poverty among CES countries, a 50 per cent threshold is recommended for the main indicator, in order to ensure consistency with the global SDG 10 indicator on relative poverty. In addition to the global SDG indicator, this threshold is also consistent with that used by the OECD in reporting on relative poverty in member states.

(b) This measure may be complemented by the use of additional thresholds (such as 60 per cent in EU countries), in order to provide further context when comparing across groups of countries, particularly relating to sensitivity of poverty rates to the choice of threshold.

29. The Task Force agrees with the comments on age groups and proposes new age breakdown as follows:

- 0-17 (children)
- 18-24
- 25-49
- 50-64
- 65 and over

30. In response to the comment from Belarus, the Task Force proposes new household classification as follows:

- One-person households;
- Two adult household without children;
- Two adult household with one child under 18;
- Two adult household with two or more children under 18;
- One adult households with children under 18;
- Other.

31. The Task Force maintains its opinion that as a minimum, national poverty indicators for the UNECE region should be disaggregated by age, sex, employment status, household type, disability status and urban/rural population. It will be mentioned that disaggregation by other variables, such as ethnicity, occupational group, education level is also relevant.

32. The Task Force feels that using two approaches of poverty measurement in official statistics of one country would not be an issue if communication is sufficiently clear.

33. The Task Force considers that a common absolute poverty line would not be meaningful for the UNECE region because of the difference in living standards between countries.

V. Chapter-specific comments

34. Several respondents provided more detailed comments on specific parts of the Guide. These are summarized by chapter in the following subsections. Some respondents also provided specific editorial remarks, which will be taken into account in revising the Guide. Several countries asked for strengthening the connections between chapters. This will be also reflected as per the comments received.

A. Chapter 1: Introduction

35. Montenegro mentioned that the introductory chapter offers a clear presentation of the content of Guide. Latvia commented that the objectives, contents of the Guide and agenda for enhanced measurement of poverty are very well described and added that the target audience of the Guide should be also specified.

36. Austria suggested to highlight further the contribution of EU-SILC to the international comparability and to mention other established data collections, which are used on national level to measure poverty such as the American Community Survey or the Current Population Survey, the German Microcensus, different panel surveys, etc.

37. Finland proposed to add references to the OECD guidelines, in particular to the OECD Framework for Statistics on the Distribution of Household Income, Consumption and Wealth and OECD Guidelines on Micro Statistics on Household Wealth.

38. Brazil remarked that the percentage of people living under a relative poverty line may lead to counterintuitive results both in times of crisis as well as in times of economic growth.

39. Regarding the statement that national statistical offices "mainly rely on two major surveys", the United States wished to specify the countries. Finland noted that some (Nordic) countries also measure income poverty from register data.

Response by the Task Force

40. The Task Force will take into account all the above points in amending the text.

B. Chapter 2: Conceptual background

41. Latvia and Montenegro appreciated the comprehensive description of methodological issues of measuring poverty, which includes existing approaches of poverty measurement, coverage of vulnerable groups potentially being poor, reviewing existing data on poverty and social exclusion.

42. Austria proposed a number of edits to improve the historical summary and the consistency of the chapter, such as moving the material currently in section 4.3 to Chapter 2 and shortening the chapter by doing editorial changes. Italy and Poland also noted the need for more clarity in describing the differences between monetary poverty, other non-monetary economic poverty and other non-economic dimensions such as health, education, labour and access to services.

43. Brazil suggested that concepts such as “equivalised disposable income” and “equivalised adult” should have a definition when appearing for the first time and a reference to that definition in later occurrences. They also requested more attention to the use of “consumption” and “consumption expenditure” in this chapter.

44. Canada and Italy found the discussion on time poverty less useful.

45. Lithuania questioned the comparison of the shares of population living below national poverty lines provided in Table 2.3.

46. Several countries found valuable Table 2.1 “Different approaches on poverty measurement”. A few editorial remarks concerned the distinction between multi- and uni-dimensional approaches and highlighting the place of material deprivation in the table.

Response by the Task Force

47. The Task Force will revise Chapter 2 by moving there the material currently in section 4.3 and by implementing the proposed editorial changes.

48. Definitions will be stated explicitly in the main text of the Guide when introducing new concepts for the first time.

49. The Task Force considers time poverty useful for gender analysis and therefore necessary to keep the related description in the Guide.

50. Regarding the comment from Lithuania, the Task Force notes that the information in Table 2.3 is available online on UN official site and provides an important illustration of the different role of the internationally fixed and national lines of absolute poverty.

51. The editorial suggestions, including on Table 2.1 will be incorporated.

C. Chapter 3: Monetary poverty

52. Romania noted that the chapter is very comprehensive and gives users in a synthetic mode all the information needed for monetary measurement of poverty, underlying the advantages and disadvantages when choosing the poverty measurement indicators.

53. Switzerland added that it explains very well the different concepts and methods and that the recommendations may serve as a standard for poverty measurement in the future.

54. The United States said that the chapter represents an excellent summary of the issues and found the case studies particularly interesting and useful. Austria appreciated the explicit recommendations in this chapter.

55. Austria suggested that some recommendations of more general nature could be moved to Chapter 2. Austria also suggested to mention that when consumption is used, this will typically imply an “absolute” poverty line and that relative lines based on the distribution of consumption will not have quite the same meaning as relative lines based on income distribution, as the latter is more sensitive to inequality than consumption. Canada gave an example where relative poverty can be developed using a basket based approach, and that they are not exclusively “an explicit function of income”.

56. Austria highlighted that consumption appears as an inadequate measure of inequality and thus less favourable for developed countries where poverty is driven more by inequality than subsistence inadequacy. Furthermore, Austria pointed out a potential caveat of absolute poverty line, i.e. leaving out the majority of cases in absolute poverty, which may not be represented in conventional samples (e.g. Roma). In that respect, reference budget standards would be useful approach for the purpose of policy analysis. At the same time,

Brazil remarked that the World Bank advocates consumption as preferred measure for poverty measurement.

57. The United States found the stated distinction between consumption and consumption expenditures as another major contribution of the Guide since this distinction is often overlooked by researchers. However, a better measure of consumption would include not only consumption expenditures but also the value of gifts received into the household, in-kind transfers (public and private) and values for the flow of services from owner occupied housing and durables.

58. Austria and Mexico remarked that the need for future development of longitudinal/persistent poverty measures should be emphasised as this reveals essential characteristics of poverty and exclusion processes being transient or permanent disadvantage.

59. Croatia and Latvia observed that collecting data on specific population groups, such as homeless, ethnic minorities and people living in institutions would require additional studies and increase survey cost. Mexico noted the great challenge of sustaining adequate response rates in the institutions covered by the surveys. Australia gave example of alternative ways in estimating the homelessness when it is not possible to include them within standard household surveys. Austria raised a specific question about the meaning of "state residential institution". Brazil expressed need for more details, examples or case studies about collecting information on collective households, homeless, nomads and other such groups.

60. Brazil asked for further discussion on how to calculate disposable income and what difficulties countries experience in their calculations. They also asked for more details about how subsistence minima are constructed in Box 3.12.

61. Australia commented on the sensitivity of the absolute poverty line to peaks in the income distribution introduced by the government transfer system. Canada noted that examining headcount ratios using lower thresholds can provide a more intuitive sense of the depth of poverty. For example, in Canada, very few seniors are found below 30 per cent of the low income measure, indicating that "depth of poverty" is less severe for this group (because of guaranteed income supplements for low income seniors). Poland suggested values of poverty lines to be given for each country, for instance a line for 1-person household and another line for 4-person household (2 adults + 2 children).

62. Finland highlighted that measuring income and wealth of households in institutions is quite feasible, but measuring their consumption may be quite difficult, both conceptually and in practice.

63. Finland also observed that it would be easier to measure in-kind consumption of e.g. gifts as the consumption of the household giving the gift, instead of that of the recipient household. Another comment from Finland referred to an alternative approach, which could be used to proxy liquid financial wealth, i.e. using other survey variables, such as the EU-SILC variable on capacity to face unexpected expenses.

64. Mexico informed on work with tax registers to explore ways to correct for missing information from very high income population groups. Using administrative records has important implications for the way surveys are currently operating and require careful and planned work to incorporate changes that are deemed necessary.

65. Ukraine considered useful after the description of disadvantages of the income measure to provide recommendations on possible methods and procedures to address these disadvantages. For example, keeping auxiliary records to improve the recalling of selected types of income; launching more than one interview during the year, e.g. on quarterly household polls, to minimize the impact of short-term fluctuations of income; trainings for

interviewers; usage of data from administrative sources; use of statistical and mathematical modelling. Ukraine also noted that in the context of significant inflation and economic reforms the consumption structure changes rapidly, and therefore a five-year interval of surveys with 5 year cycle will not meet the needs of society.

66. The United States noted that the full value of rental equivalence (or the full value of user costs) would be included in consumption or consumption expenditures while only net rental equivalence (or net user costs) would be included in income (or resources). The United States provided further explanation on their use of the family as the observation unit instead of the household.

67. Austria suggested to mention the potential effect of the so called “top coding” (e.g. if values above a certain threshold are set to an arbitrary maximum), which will affect the mean, but not the median.

68. Austria, Finland and the United States provided additional references.

Response by the Task Force

69. The Task Force will reflect the above points in amending the text. The paragraphs below provide some further explanation.

70. Regarding the comment from Brazil on World Bank’s emphasis on consumption approach, the opinion of the Task Force, and as also pointed out by Austria, is that consumption appears less favourable measure for developed countries where poverty is driven more by inequality than subsistence inadequacy.

71. No common definition exists regarding the question raised by Austria on “state residential institution”. Reference will be made to the interpretation of institutions in the CES census recommendations.

72. For further details on national experiences, the Task Force notes that additional information could be obtained through references in order not to overload the case studies with very specific details.

73. Regarding the comment of the United States on rental equivalence, the Task Force notes that both income and expenditure should use net values.

74. Regarding the comment of the United States on the inclusion of in-kind transfers from households and businesses as well as own production, consumption expenditure rather than consumption is used as the recommended measure, because social transfers in kind are excluded due to the challenges associated with measurement.

D. Chapter 4: Multidimensional poverty dashboards and the multiple deprivation indices

75. Several countries emphasised the importance of non-monetary measures.

76. Latvia remarked that the value of this chapter is very high in view of monitoring the 2030 Agenda.

77. Philippines noted that it is helpful to consider non-monetary factors like housing characteristics, aside from income and consumption.

78. Italy and Latvia asked for recommendations on establishing comparable indicators of multidimensional poverty based on countries' best practices. Italy also emphasised the need for a limited set of indicators for monitoring progress on specific targets.

79. Austria asked for more emphasis on the fact that the list of EU-SILC deprivation items is subject to change. The addition of new items which address specifically the situation of the individual is currently under discussion in the Indicator Sub Group (ISG) which is an important steering body of poverty indicators in the European Union.

80. Latvia proposed to study carefully the idea about a dashboard containing data from surveys, administrative registers and big data. Besides, there is a question who will maintain such a dashboard, which countries shall be covered and how much finances and workload would be needed in this process.

81. Italy also raised some theoretical shortcomings regarding the “at risk of poverty or social exclusion” (AROPE) methodology as the different indicators proposed cover either part or the population as whole. For example, the persons living in households with very low work intensity are computable only for a subset of individuals whereas the indicator of “at risk of poverty or social exclusion” is an overlap of three indicators, two of which referring to all population and one only to a subset of it. That could cause difficulties in analysis.

82. Another comment from Italy referred to the low labour market participation, which could be the result of voluntary choices associated to a well-off economic situation and not only because of social exclusion. That means that the low work intensity households rate could be better used as a context indicator in association with other social exclusion indicators rather than having an absolute value as a component of the social exclusion overall indicator.

83. Italy suggested the introduction of personal deprivation items instead of only household deprivation items. This could complement the specification of how to determine the household deprivation status, i.e. for all its members, or for some individuals in case of enforced lack of some personal items only for these individuals and not for all in the household.

84. Poland and the United Kingdom asked for more attention regarding the difference between multiple (including also non-material) and material deprivation.

Response by the Task Force

85. The Task Force will reflect the above points in amending the text.

86. The shortcomings in the AROPE methodology identified by Italy will be reflected in the Guide. Concerning the proposal to evaluate deprivation on individual versus household level, the Task Force considers this suggestion appropriate for gender analysis and will propose it for further work.

87. Proposing a set of comparable indicators on multidimensional poverty would be outside the current Task Force’s terms of reference. The Task Force feels that this is an important area for further work and would reflect it in Chapter 6 of the Guide.

E. Chapter 5: Multidimensional poverty indices

88. Several countries supported the chapter on multidimensional poverty indices (MPI) and expressed appreciation of the work done on this chapter. Austria observed that the chapter contains a great deal of novelty and possibly practical relevance if adequately supported by international organizations. Hungary noted that MPI are key tools to measure and monitor poverty in its different forms. Latvia found this chapter a significant step towards measuring sustainable development goals at global level.

89. Philippines stressed the importance of wide consultations among different sectors of society at the national and sub-national level in developing the MPI methodology in the national and local context.

90. Austria drew attention to the MPI methodology's high data requirements from one single source. Furthermore, Austria pointed out that some indicators like gender pay gap or those related to life expectancies cannot be replaced nor included in the MPI.

91. Austria suggested to strengthen the recommendations in this area using the format similar to Chapter 3 "Monetary poverty". For example, the recommendations could clarify the need of (survey) data, include information on all dimensions that are deemed relevant; how the relevant dimensions (and cut-offs) should be selected (upon consultation with stakeholders); when and how weights should be used; whether or not the inclusion of income is recommended. Along these lines, the United Kingdom suggested a conclusion section to the chapter, even if no specific recommendations for UNECE countries are possible at this time.

92. Israel asked for further methodological details for calculating multidimensional poverty indices. The United States found the section on multidimensional indices rather detailed.

Response by the Task Force

93. The Task Force will explore the possibility for strengthening the recommendations in this chapter considering the specific remarks described above. The Task Force did not go into detail in the few occasions when countries asked for further explanations on issues beyond the present Task Force's mandate, e.g. regarding detailed calculation of the multidimensional indices (Israel).

F. Chapter 6: Challenges for the future

94. Montenegro recognised that this chapter covers areas where the statistical community has expressed a particular need for further guidance in measuring poverty. Austria and the United Kingdom stressed the importance of international support for activities, which foster knowledge transfer and harmonization of household surveys, and which help to identify the potential role for international organizations in coordinating work or facilitating sharing of best practice. Mexico agreed that it is necessary for countries to work towards regional and global comparability of poverty measures and that statistical offices should seek continuous improvement in the data sources that this demand.

95. Austria pointed out the challenges arising from the 2030 Agenda for statistical practices in general and for monitoring poverty eradication in particular, and the need to inform and involve stakeholders without compromising the independence of the statistical office.

96. Brazil asked for references and further details in defining asset-based poverty.

97. Canada asked for revision of section 6.5 on comparable welfare aggregates to sharpen the text and make it less general.

98. Croatia noted that it is crucial to develop guidelines for measuring imputed rent to obtain comparable data across the countries.

99. Ukraine stressed the potential bias caused by the non-inclusion of the hard-to-reach populations when reporting on surveys.

100. In addition, Ukraine proposed to include a table with participation rates of respondents by region and highlight the highest income and expenditure rates among regions for different countries.

Response by the Task Force

101. A new section on the 2030 Agenda will be added as future work in this chapter. The need to strengthen the work at international level will be further emphasised.

102. The Task Force has no access to information on participation rates of respondents by regions in different countries. Therefore Box 6.1 on Ukraine was suggested as a case study example.

103. The Task Force will review and improve section 6.5.

H. Additional comments

104. Austria commented that in Annex II most of the countries that come from the European Statistical System make more or less use of the same EU definition of at risk of poverty or social exclusion. It would be interesting to identify those countries which go beyond these European definitions and developed additional national indicator (sets) - as is done for example in Austria.

105. Brazil found the survey results presented in the Annexes very interesting but would appreciate also a text summary from the sample for the main variables.

106. Canada, Ukraine and the United States provided further precisions on their data in the annexed tables.

107. Brazil proposed to include a glossary.

Response by the Task Force

108. The Task Force considered that the survey results can be best presented in table format as further details would be needed to make a more comprehensive comparison of approaches between countries. A new data collection from member countries would not be justified in this context.

109. Given that the Guide does not introduce any new terminology and that the terms used in the Guide are easily found in existing literature on poverty measurement or online glossaries such as the one of Eurostat, the Task Force did not consider it necessary to include a new glossary.

VI. Proposal to the Conference

110. The Conference is invited to:

- (a) Ask the Task Force to revise the Guide as described in the present summary;
 - (b) Agree that the revised Guide be submitted to the 2017 October CES Bureau meeting for final approval, including the proposals for further work.
-