

---

**United Nations Economic Commission for Europe**

Conference of European Statisticians

**Group of Experts on Measuring Poverty and Inequality****Ninth meeting**

Geneva, 28 and 29 November 2023

**Report of the meeting****I. Attendance**

1. The meeting of the Group of Experts on Measuring Poverty and Inequality was held on 28 and 29 November 2023 in Geneva, Switzerland, at the Palais des Nations, back-to-back with the UNECE Workshop on Harmonization of Poverty Statistics to Measure SDG 1 and 10 (27 November).
2. The meeting was attended by participants from the following countries and organizations: Armenia; Austria; Belarus; Brazil; Canada; Estonia; France; Georgia; Ireland; Italy; Kazakhstan; Kyrgyzstan; Liechtenstein; Luxembourg; Mexico; Netherlands (Kingdom of the); Poland; Republic of Moldova; Romania; Switzerland; Ukraine; United States of America; Uzbekistan; Statistical Office of the European Union (Eurostat); United Nations Resident Coordinator Office in Kyrgyzstan; UN Women; United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); World Bank; Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-STAT); International Women's Development Agency; Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) Cross-National Data Centre; Technical University Košice (Slovakia); Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (United Kingdom) as well as an independent expert at the invitation of the Secretariat. There were 55 participants.
3. The attendance of several participants was supported financially from the United Nations Development Account (14th tranche) project "Resilient and agile national statistical systems".

**II. Organization of the meeting**

4. Andrew Heisz of Canada chaired the meeting.
5. The following substantive topics were discussed at the meeting:
  - (a) Social policies, social transfers, and data
  - (b) Disaggregation for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: going beyond averages
  - (c) Assets-based poverty and inequality

- (d) Subjective poverty
  - (e) Data sources to complement surveys
  - (f) Inflation and its impact on poverty and inequality
  - (g) Communicating statistics on poverty and inequality
  - (h) Work under the Conference of European Statisticians
  - (i) How the meaning of poverty is changing (panel discussion)
6. Discussions were prepared and led for topic *a* by Nadja Lamei, Austria; for topic *b* by Fanni Kovesdi, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative; for topic *d* by Eveline Vandewal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the); and for topic *f* by Federico Polidoro, World Bank.
7. The presented documents and slides are available on [the web page of the meeting](#).

### III. Future work

8. The meeting acknowledged the progress made by the Task Force on Subjective Poverty Measures in preparing the guide on this topic, to be completed in 2024.
9. The meeting acknowledged the steps taken by the Task Team on Measuring Social Cohesion and took note of its plan to complete its report by October 2024.
10. Participants proposed the following topics for discussion at the 2024 meeting of the Group of Experts:
- (a) Disaggregation for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
  - (b) Innovative tools in poverty and inequality measurement
  - (c) Multidimensional poverty and inequalities
  - (d) Subjective poverty
  - (e) Wealth poverty and inequality
  - (f) Inclusion of hard-to-reach groups in measures of poverty and inequality, and its impact
  - (g) Climate change and households' vulnerability and poverty
11. The Steering Group on Measuring Poverty and Inequality will elaborate the call for papers for the 2024 meeting of the Group of Experts with the aim of increasing the contributions and discussions on measuring inequality.
12. Participants took note that a meeting room and interpretation for the next meeting of the Group of Experts are reserved at the Palais des Nations in Geneva for 28 and 29 November 2024.

### IV. Adoption of the meeting report

13. The meeting adopted parts I–III of this report before adjourning. A summary of the discussion in the substantive sessions of the meeting is presented in an annex to this report, which was prepared by the Secretariat after the meeting.
-

## Annex: Summary of discussions

### I. Social policies, social transfers and data

1. The session included presentations by Eurostat, Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), and Mexico, with discussion led by Austria.
2. The discussion showed how indicators based on EU-SILC data can provide insights into the capacity of social protection systems to reach individuals in need of support and inform social policy development. The data for the EU countries showed that variations can be significant across countries and years. It was agreed that analysts should look at more than one indicator to tell the story.
3. Social transfers usually comprise pensions, housing allowances, social assistance and various benefits related to unemployment, family, sickness and invalidity, education, etc. Analysis on the data before and after social transfers demonstrated that social transfers in EU countries could make a big difference for the population at risk of poverty. It is however difficult to compare social policies and specifically the impact of social transfers across countries. In some countries, pensions can contribute significantly to the reduction of the risk of poverty, while in others this is not the case. Big differences can be observed on sub-national level too. When it comes to country comparability, the choice of (national) poverty method and parameters for poverty threshold matters as well.
4. Further data breakdowns of the social transfer data by type of benefits and by sub-groups of population can be especially insightful. LIS showed the size of the impact of various benefits to poverty alleviation across distinct policy areas, such as family support, unemployment benefits, disability assistance and general assistance. Information on vulnerable population groups was also noted as important. In Mexico, data on transfer to children is collected by interviewing 12 years and older children directly and shows its significant impact on child's life. Eurostat is working to propose a portfolio of indicators covering children's social and material deprivation and participation of children in formal education and childcare. Other risk groups were also underscored, such as older people, families with young children or single-parent households. It was recommended to also include the gender aspect to assessing the impact of transfers.
5. In-kind transfers are challenging to evaluate and often imputations should be made (sometimes household may not even know about the subsidies, e.g., government subsidies on electricity). In certain cases, there may be double counting – for example when food is bought (expenditure) and then when it is given to others (transfer). In this case, it is important to make a distinction between expenditure and consumption. In Mexico, such a case will be perceived as “gift”. In the United States, there are questions for certain goods and services but not household repairs for example. It was noted that in-kind transfers (e.g., health service) might be more relevant to well-being, as it includes aspects not covered by the monetary concept.
6. The national social programs are extremely diverse and country specific. For illustration, in Mexico, INEGI is evaluating the impact of government programs, among which the program for financial assistance to families with economic needs and children enrolled in preschool, primary, or secondary education; a program for the low-income population enrolled in public higher education, prioritizing the indigenous community living in poverty or vulnerable conditions; a program to support small and medium-sized producers; a program for financial assistance to senior adults 68 years or older (the

program also extends its benefits to those aged 65 years or above who reside in indigenous areas), the monetary scholarship program aimed at young individuals aged between 18 and 29 who are neither studying nor employed; and many others. This example shows the importance as well as the breadth of the measurement challenge, especially when targeting specific population groups.

## **II. Disaggregation for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: going beyond averages**

7. The session included presentations by France, UNICEF Innocenti, and Rafkat Hasanov (UNECE consultant), with discussion led by OPHI.

8. Data disaggregation is an important element for reducing poverty. It allows to identify those who are experiencing poverty and engage them with targeted policies. The [UNECE Poverty Measurement: Guide to Data Disaggregation \(UNECE 2020\)](#) recommends the following standard variables as a priority for poverty disaggregation: age, sex, disability status, migratory status and ethnicity”. In addition, the following disaggregation variables are suggested to better understand socio-economic processes and effectiveness of policies: household type, employment status, tenure status of the household, receipt of social transfers, educational attainment and degree of urbanisation (see Recommendation 2, UNECE 2020).

9. Disaggregation plays a crucial role in times of crises. This was illustrated with the case of Kyrgyzstan where specific groups (e.g., people with disabilities, pensioners, informal workers, etc.) are disproportionately affected by external shocks such as the global food, energy and financing crises. Another study in this session came from Georgia and showed the impact of another external shock, this time of the Covid-19 pandemic that caused the increase in the number of those who entered poverty, the so called ‘new poor’. Their profile was in many ways different from those in chronic poverty, as well as those who experience transient poverty. The new poor after the pandemic were mostly households with children, living in urban areas and in poorly educated households. The studies highlighted the need to rethink, refocus and adapt social protection systems to shocks, especially with regards to age-sensitive social protection systems.

10. While the experts recognised the essential necessity of disaggregating the data by demographic and social-economic characteristics, they stressed the growing importance of identifying vulnerable groups of the so called “hidden” dimensions of poverty. These are usually not reflected in the measures, for instance people who live in social isolation, institutional abuse and suffering. In these cases, information on other characteristics such as “loses and ruptures of social ties”, “lack of networks”, “addictions” or “difficulties in access due to digitalisation” could help to focus not so much on affordability but also on “qualitative” aspects of life.

## **III. Assets-based poverty and inequality**

11. The session included presentations by Eurostat and Switzerland.

12. Since 2021, EU-SILC is collected under new framework regulation and its implementing acts that foresee the multi-annual rolling modules. The Quality-of-life module is a new six-year module that will be launched in 2026. The variables are similar to those in 2020, including over-indebtedness, wealth and consumption

elements. The new EU- SILC module however broadens the scope of EU-SILC as a data instrument and allows for analysis of poverty in its multidimensional aspects.

13. Using the EU-SILC module, Switzerland has been collecting monetary values of assets and debts. The objective is to integrate wealth into poverty measurement and see the difference, in particular in the case of elderly for which the poverty rate is likely overestimated. The analysis provided insights on models that are currently being developed to assess whether basic needs can be covered if a percentage of assets is added to household income (continuous asset depletion). This approach seems to be best fitted to pensioners, especially in Switzerland where the retiring persons can choose to convert part of the pension (called second pillar) into a lump sum, instead of receiving additional monthly pension payments.

14. With regard to imputed rent, Switzerland noted that they use it in relation to relative poverty but not to absolute poverty. Eurostat did not include imputed rent in EU-SILC because these data are not considered to be of good quality.

#### IV. Subjective poverty

15. The session included presentations by CIS-STAT, Kazakhstan, Poland and the Technical University of Košice, with discussion led by the Netherlands.

16. Specific modules in Household Cluster Surveys in several CIS countries have been identified to contain subjective questions that can be of use in measuring poverty and living standards. Several examples of questions related to the monetary situation of the households were given, i.e., evaluating the degree of satisfaction of household members with the level of their monetary income, financial or material situation.

17. Going beyond assessments of the material situation, other reasons for self-identification as poor could include poor health, housing conditions, low level and quality of the education attainment, low level and quality of the medical service, environmental situation, and access to basic services. Kazakhstan also collected information on the perception of the population on food security. Various disaggregation options of indicators on perceptions were presented, including age, gender and region of the respondent and over time.

18. Using statistical techniques, Poland showed a comparative analysis on subjective versus objective measures of poverty using EU-SILC on “making ends meet” as a proxy for a subjective poverty indicator. It showed the impact of potential factors (e.g., household type by composition, presence of a person with severe disability, presence of an unemployed person and level of education of the head of household) that could lead to the occurrence of various forms of poverty.

19. The representative of the Technical University of Košice highlighted the fundamental role of the minimum income question and the intersection approach in establishing a subjective poverty line and identifying populations falling below this threshold. This was demonstrated by using various approaches: defining a subjective poverty line based on binary classification methods (and Deleeck attitude question) and using a range of machine learning techniques applied on the minimum income question and intersection approach, as well as a set of variables correlated with subjective poverty, collected as part of the EU-SILC core variables.

20. When reporting on progress, the Chair of the Task Force on Subjective Poverty Measures presented an overview of the concepts and the proposed categorisation in measuring subjective poverty. A distinction was made between **qualitative questions**

such as “Does the respondent consider his/her family to be poor?” that rely on categorical responses “Yes” or “No” and typically ask respondents about perceptions of their material, financial, or economic situation. The qualitative questions are opposed to the **money metric questions** focused on specific level (expressed in e.g., dollar value) of income or consumption. Both categories are in turn viewed as identification, evaluation and prediction type of questions. The Chair noted the various effects of the sample frame, the survey mode as well as the wording of the questions that may have on the respondent when obtaining information on perceptions on poverty.

21. The task force put forward the following recommendations:

- Subjective measures of poverty should be included among the set of assessment tools used by countries as complementary to objective measures.
- Given their inclusion in EU-SILC, and their utility in identifying subjective poverty, the Deleeck and minimum income questions should be considered as a standard for international comparison purposes.
- Should consider the possible impacts of survey mode, sampling methods, the context (framing) and the wording differences when analysing indicators on subjective poverty.
- Should continue to demonstrate the utility of subjective poverty measures, considering issues of overlap with objective poverty measures and policy applications.
- Subjective poverty measures should be disaggregated to at-risk groups.

22. The participants noted that further work is needed in analysis of the presence and overlap of different poverty approaches and how the various indicators can be used for policy.

## V. Data sources to complement surveys

23. The session included presentations from Italy, the United States, Kazakhstan and UNICEF Innocenti.

24. The representative of Italy described a successful new estimation method to determine thresholds for absolute poverty by integrating a range of data sources. In the United States, the National Experimental Wellbeing Statistics ('NEWS') have been developed to address simultaneously the multiple and increasing sources of bias arising from both unit and item non-response to household surveys (most specifically the income questions) and from misreporting, all of which pose a significant challenge to producing poverty estimates. In Kazakhstan, a shift towards using estimated median income rather than physical subsistence criteria to determine eligibility for social assistance benefits has necessitated concomitant shifts in statistical methodology to determine this median income, with a greater dependence on administrative sources. UNICEF described a project to improve the estimation of child poverty by combining household survey data with geospatial information using machine learning models.

25. Discussion looked at the reasons for the misreporting of self-declared incomes by the over-65s mentioned in the presentation from the United States. In France, for example, it was found that respondents often focused on the end of each month, and hence recall problems affected the accuracy of reporting concerning incomes earlier in the month. Comparison with other data sources, such as administrative data from the social security system, along with matching of these sources with the household survey

data, can help to identify and correct for such recall errors. Discussion also touched on the reasons for greater recall errors in older groups. Part of the explanation may lie in the complexity of different income support programmes and the challenges to individuals of identifying pre-deduction gross amounts, as well as a tendency to not see single large receipts as income.

26. Participants discussed the challenges entailed in assessing income when using administrative sources, which may not include ‘under-the-table’ (unofficial) earnings. In some cases, research has found that such earnings are reported accurately, e.g. in the United States many restaurant workers have been found to report tips; but in other cases there are portions that are entirely absent from administrative sources, such as those from unhoused populations. Administrative data may also bring timeliness challenges, such as in the case of tax filing data which can come with a significant time lag. The lag may also vary systematically with wealth or poverty, e.g. in the United States those with greater wealth tend to be granted extensions for tax filing, resulting in as much as a two-year lag between the income being received and the data being available for statistical use.

27. The discussion about the diversity of methods used to compute absolute poverty thresholds included those recommended by the World Bank and an EU-SILC consumption-expenditure method. Attempts have been made to calculate a European basket of goods to establish an index that works for all EU countries, but the work is still in its infancy and has been difficult because there is such wide variation across the countries.

28. Responding to the presentation from UNICEF, participants discussed the implications of using machine learning in the production of official statistics in general and poverty statistics specifically. Several examples were mentioned by participants, including the use of machine learning for calculating disposable income in Kazakhstan. Questions may arise in relation to communicating with the public when machine learning is used to impute to fill gaps in data sources. It was observed that there is a long way to go before the methods and findings of machine learning can be effectively communicated in an understandable way to non-specialists. A suggestion was made to dedicate a session or a panel discussion on this topic in a future meeting of this expert group. It was also observed that in some cases, the quest for ever-more granular quantitative data such as detailed small-area child poverty estimates may not necessarily be the solution to uncovering key messages that will sway policymakers. Sometimes qualitative data, such as that derived from personal interviews, can be more effective.

## **VI. Inflation and its impact on poverty and inequality**

29. The session included presentations from the United States of America, Brazil and Belarus. Reflections were offered and discussion led by the World Bank.

30. Research into producing an expanded range of consumer price indices in the United States is motivated by increasing interest in information pertaining to specific demographic groups, and a greater focus on households rather than macro-level trends in the economy. In Brazil, spatial techniques have been employed to identify specific population subgroups at risk of food insecurity or hunger, who may be eligible for public support programmes. Belarus presented analyses of how living standards have changed in the context of rising prices, and the impacts of anti-inflationary measures in the country.

31. The discussant underlined the salience of this topic at present as the repercussions of the pandemic and the impacts of conflicts have led to sharp rises in inflation. Much of the analysis that has been conducted so far relates to periods prior to these inflation shocks, and it can be expected that the poverty impacts will be more significant than is currently known, especially for the poorest.

32. It was observed that growing attention is being paid to the interpretation of inflation from the perspective of households, rather than only as a macroeconomic indicator. It was also stressed that one index of inflation is rarely adequate to meet all needs, and in this sense the production of a range of measures can offer useful information for different purposes, shedding light on different aspects of the experience of inflation. On the other hand, a proliferation of measures has the potential to cause confusion among users. Participants discussed the importance of guidance to empower users to select and interpret correctly when there is a range of measures of similar but slightly different aspects.

33. The relationship between income and food insecurity was discussed. In Brazil, where a large share of the population is informally employed, there is significant uncertainty about future income. As such the relationship between income and food security is present but not as strong as may be expected since increased income does not necessarily bring increased certainty and may still be subject to significant fluctuations. A key conclusion of the Brazilian research is that vulnerability is not limited only to those currently living in poverty or those currently experiencing food insecurity, and in this case a policy move like increase in tax on food can be detrimental to these vulnerable groups.

34. Participants also discussed the possibilities offered by alternatives to the Consumer Price Index (CPI), such as the deflator of consumption, which may better capture the scope of household consumption when considering transfers in kind. There are pros and cons of each, such as the rapid availability of CPI which makes it better equipped for informing public policy responses; the practice of revising the deflator of consumption; and the methodological differences between the United States and EU methodologies.

## **VII. Panel discussion – How the meaning of poverty is changing**

35. A panel consisting of representatives of Austria, Ireland, Switzerland, the United States and Eurostat was invited to discuss the evolving understanding of what poverty means and the implications of this for its measurement. The conventional idea of poverty as merely a monetary concept has given way to a much more expansive understanding, meaning that statisticians are asked to provide information to inform a much wider set of questions than in earlier times.

36. The panellist from Austria observed the heightened importance of timeliness in today's poverty measures, as poverty is increasingly understood to be something which can and does change rapidly. Existing, well-established measurement instruments such as the EU-SILC survey collect a lot of important information which is standardized, widely accepted, high quality and comparable, but such tools are inevitably slow to change as they are designed to meet many different requirements. New tools are needed to fill this timeliness gap, with smaller and more targeted samples, more subjective questions and a greater focus on change. An example of such a tool is the 'How we are today' survey being conducted in Austria and ten other EU countries, which looks at topics such as living standards, making ends meet and personal evaluations of income



situations. It offers the potential to better capture the impacts of rapid changes such as the energy crisis. Impacts on vulnerable groups, such as single parents and the unemployed, can be identified fast and responded to. It is also possible to see the effects of new social transfer schemes. The survey has limitations such as being CAWI-based only and having a limited age range of respondents, but it complements the larger, longer-term surveys with its flexibility and timeliness, which have proved popular with policymakers. The panellist likened the comparison between these two types of survey to that between a heavy tanker and a speedboat: one has a large capacity but is slow to change, while the other is nimble and can change course easily but can hold less cargo.

37. The representative of Eurostat offered reflections on the way that evolving policy demands create a need for greater granularity in published poverty indicators. Multiple intersecting dimensions including sex, age, region, migratory status, educational attainment, activity limitations, income quintiles and poverty status, among others, are all commonly demanded by data users and decision-makers. A developing understanding of the roles of energy and transport in poverty is also leading to calls for new indicators on these topics, such as those which measure the sustainability of energy for households and the impacts of energy saving measures. Other emerging themes in poverty measurement include a growing focus on the specificities of child poverty and children's material deprivation; and on the interrelations between poverty and mental health, including the poverty determinants of mental health issues, and the economic impacts of mental health challenges.

38. The panellist from Switzerland noted that even the existence of a mandate for poverty monitoring and reporting can be seen as a reflection of changing demands for information to help formulate responses to poverty. Policymakers want to better understand what the key drivers of poverty are; what the main problems and experiences are; and who the main actors are in the multi-faceted fight against poverty, as well as the roles played by these actors. Statistics are needed to show what is worth doing. With a great diversity of stakeholders and a similarly diverse set of information needs, there is a shift underway to more data-driven analysis. The experience in Switzerland points to growing demand for longer-term perspectives including life-course analysis. New and emerging topics include indebtedness and hidden poverty. There is also growing attention towards understanding the significance of existing poverty indicators and trends, i.e., analysing what they really tell us and what actions they suggest.

39. The panellist from Ireland emphasized the communication challenges in releasing figures which are not identical across different sources, such as from EU-SILC and the 'How we are today' survey results. Relatedly, participants discussed the issues in reconciling and explaining different meanings of 'poverty', arising from different definitions, from a public communication standpoint. Several participants echoed the point that communicating the meaning of different indicators for different purposes, and emphasizing that they are complementary rather than contradictory, is one of the greatest current challenges. The panellist from Ireland also described plans for providing indicators of 'consistent poverty' and the lived experiences of children and older persons, using indicators of social inclusion and material deprivation.

40. The panellist from the United States emphasized that meeting a diversity of user needs through production of many indicators and tools must be weighed against the risk of confusion and deliberate misinterpretation. When politically motivated groups wish to make a point related to poverty (e.g. that there is no poverty because living standards have universally risen, or that poverty is worse than ever because inequalities are so marked), they can 'cherry pick' statistics to support their point. The onus is on the

producers of statistics to ensure they are presented in the best possible way to avoid misuse and facilitate understanding. It was stressed in discussion that transparency is key: people can always criticize the specifics of methods, but by being transparent about all assumptions, thresholds etc. the NSO can pre-empt some of this criticism. It is also possible to engage users in determining the assumptions, e.g., in Canada, an online survey is seeking users' views on different poverty thresholds.

41. A range of emerging areas of focus was raised by panellists and participants in discussion, including subjective poverty measurement from the perspective of children; data literacy among policymakers; the potential of using administrative data for producing small area poverty statistics; and the growing importance of user-defined experiences e.g., through data visualization tools. In relation to the latter, discussion touched on the value of interactive tools as a means of 'democratizing' access to a detailed understanding of the components of indicators, especially for those without the capacity to conduct their own statistical analyses of microdata. Yet this must be weighed against the possibility that by offering fully interactive tools in which thresholds and assumptions can be altered, conclusions could be manipulated to suit the users' pre-defined perspectives.

42. Some participants noted the importance of non-monetary aspects of poverty, including energy, environmental degradation and natural resource availability, access to transport, etc. It was observed that sometimes it is not merely the cost of something but the real-life availability of it that affects whether people can access it (e.g., childcare, water supply). The distance to amenities such as banks, food shops and public open spaces may offer important information. Others mentioned that while there are many aspects to deprivation, the centrality of monetary poverty should not be downplayed.

43. A key theme in discussion was the necessity to better focus on the needs of stakeholders. Participants noted that it is not always clear who 'stakeholders' really are, and statistical producers may need to do more to identify and engage with them. It was noted that such engagement requires commitment to long-term relationship-building and giving feedback, e.g., explaining why the NSO will not or cannot do something when there is a demand for it from a certain group. In concluding the panel discussion, the Chair of the meeting observed that engaging with stakeholders should include conducting culturally appropriate investigations of what poverty means to different groups living in or at risk of poverty. In Canada, for example, a Nunavut-specific poverty measure has been developed which includes a component based on Inuit cultural concerns. This means that the resulting poverty statistics are not merely statistical artefacts, but rather, being the result of genuine consultation, they are reflective of the real understanding of poverty among those to whom they relate.

## **VIII. Communicating statistics on poverty and inequality**

44. In this session a presentation was given by Kazakhstan on the development of interactive dashboards of poverty statistics, and CIS-Stat presented an overview of methods and tools that have been developed for the dissemination of poverty and inequality data via a data portal.

45. Participants noted the great potential of user-friendly interactive dashboards to permit detailed assessment of levels and trends in poverty, potentially also offering a basis for forecasting. Further development of such tools will be very welcome.

46. It was noted that the user experience of interactive tools may be impacted by data gaps. It is important to provide the necessary metadata to permit users to understand why such gaps exist and whether or when they can expect them to be filled.

47. Discussion considered the different capabilities, as well as security limitations, entailed in interactive platforms which contain full data to permit calculations on-the-fly, versus those containing pre-configured tabulations and calculations.

## **IX. Work under the Conference of European Statisticians**

48. The session included a presentation from Canada on the progress of the UNECE Task Team on Social Cohesion, and a presentation from UNECE on past, ongoing and planned work on the measurement of poverty and inequality under the auspices of the Conference of European Statisticians.

49. A list was presented of proposed topics for discussion at the 2024 meeting of the group of experts. These included:

- a) Disaggregation for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
- b) Innovative tools in poverty and inequality measurement
- c) Multidimensional poverty and inequalities
- d) Subjective poverty
- e) Wealth poverty and inequality
- f) Inclusion of hard-to-reach groups in measures of poverty and inequality, and its impact
- g) Climate change and households' vulnerability and poverty.

50. These topics were welcomed by participants and no additional proposals were made.

51. It was noted that capacity development, especially among the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, is a highly valued activity which can best be achieved when there is periodic and systematic gathering of information from countries about their needs in this regard. UNECE will continue to coordinate the gathering of such information when necessary.