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Reaching universal social protection: A review of national strategies and policies

Key points

- Social protection strategies and policies are important expressions of governments' longer-term vision and medium-term objectives for the development of social protection systems, including floors, in line with the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202). These documents often constitute the first step towards developing the related legal and institutional frameworks and securing fiscal space for social protection.

- The majority of the national social protection strategies and policies reviewed, with dates ranging from 2011 to 2020, acknowledge the right to social security, yet few countries have articulated concrete steps and measures to address the gaps and barriers in social protection systems.

- Many national social protection strategies and policies recognize the concept of a national social protection floor and commit to extending coverage to vulnerable persons. However, most of them do not present the comprehensive and systematic vision promoted by international labour standards. Only a few of the reviewed documents present detailed plans for implementing policies that go beyond targeted poverty reduction to provide higher levels of protection.

- While many strategies and policies set out ambitious commitments to extend social protection coverage, these commitments are not frequently accompanied by clear logistical steps, such as establishing specific timelines and sequencing; considering costs and expanding fiscal space; and improving coordination within and across sectors.

- Most strategies and policies focus on children and older persons and pay less attention to social protection for the working-age population, even though it is essential for building comprehensive social protection systems that provide adequate protection throughout the life cycle.

- Social protection policies and strategies should be developed with the participation and consultation of social partners and other relevant stakeholders in order to ensure their ownership and facilitate a smooth implementation. However, the review shows that social partners are often not included in the process.
The importance of national social protection Policies and strategies

Over the past decade, an increasing number of countries around the world have prioritized social protection as a means to secure human dignity and advance sustainable development, in line with the International Labour Organization's (ILO) Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202) and Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), as well as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) target 1.3. 1 Although many countries have made significant progress in extending social protection coverage, the right to social security is not yet a reality for most people: 53.1 per cent of the world's population lack effective coverage from even a single social protection scheme or programme (ILO 2021c). In many nations, the devastating impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have highlighted the limitations of national social protection systems, which are struggling to provide comprehensive and adequate social protection for all.

ILO standards provide guidance for the development of rights-based social protection systems composed of both contributory (social insurance) and non-contributory (universal/categorical and social assistance) schemes based on internationally recognized principles and minimum benchmarks. Recommendation No. 202 calls on countries to formulate and implement national social protection strategies and policies as the main tool for building and maintaining comprehensive, adequate and sustainable social protection systems that protect people throughout their lives, as well as to strengthen their resilience against covariate shocks and crises, of which the COVID-19 pandemic is an example. 2 By capitalizing on the vision and guidance provided by Recommendation No. 202 for designing and implementing their national social protection strategies and policies, governments, social partners and society at large can effectively plan the mid- and longer-term development of their social protection systems (ILO 2019a). The framework for action towards universal, adequate, comprehensive and sustainable social protection systems (ILO 2021b), which was adopted by the International Labour Conference in June 2021, highlights the particular urgency of such efforts.

This brief highlights a selection of findings that will be further explored in a forthcoming study that analyses national social protection strategies and policies with a view to assessing the extent to which governments have committed and outlined actions to achieve a rights-based approach to universal, comprehensive, adequate and sustainable social protection systems. Drawing on a recent study (UN-Women forthcoming), ILO social security standards and an extensive review of social protection literature, an analytical framework of 57 indicators was developed and applied to a sample of 50 national social protection strategies and policies published between 2011 and 2020, taken from a unique dataset developed in collaboration with UN-Women. Annex 1 provides a more detailed description of the study design; Annex 2 lists the sources of the sample of strategies and policies reviewed; and Annex 3 contains the indicator framework. The sample includes documents from mainly low-income and middle-income countries, as well as 2 high-income countries, including 31 strategies and policies from Africa; 10 from the Americas; 6 from Asia and the Pacific; 2 from Europe and Central Asia; and 1 from the Arab States.

The sections that follow examine the extent to which these strategies and policies comply with international social security standards; how they were formulated; whether they address life-course contingencies and if so to what extent; and if they include key implementation considerations that increase the likelihood that commitments will turn into actions.

The right to social security is increasingly acknowledged

Social security is a human right. While nearly all the strategies and policies in the sample (47 of 50) acknowledge human rights and their applicability in the national context, only a little more than half (27) explicitly acknowledge the right to social security (sometimes referred to as social protection) 3 (see figure 1). About one fifth of strategies and policies (11) refer explicitly to Articles 22, 23 or 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, while nearly half (23) of 50).

---
1 Target 1.3: Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable.

2 For more information on definitions of "policy" and "strategy", as well as the approach in selecting national strategies and policies, see Annex 1.

3 “Social security” and “social protection” are used interchangeably in this brief, recognizing that UN institutions, including the ILO, use both terms in discourse with their constituents and in providing relevant advice to them.
refer explicitly to at least one of the ILO standards, such as Recommendation No. 202 and Convention No. 102.  

Formulating social protection strategies and policies

The process of formulating a strategy or policy determines its uptake and can therefore be as important as the outcome itself. Two key elements of document formulation were analysed: the participation of relevant national stakeholders in the development of the strategy or policy; and the support of international development partners.

Participation of national actors

Recommendation No. 202 underlines the importance of the meaningful participation of stakeholders in the formulation of national social protection strategies and policies. This includes the participation of social partners, that is workers and employers and their representatives, as well as consultation with other relevant and representative organizations of persons concerned, government ministries and national civil society organizations.

In the sample of strategies and policies analysed, social partners were infrequently consulted during the document development process, with only 8 of 50 strategies and policies indicating that workers or employers representatives had participated in drafting the document. The weak representation of workers and employers in the development of national social protection strategies and policies may negatively impact the reflection of their concerns and needs in those documents and hamper the appropriateness of suggested social protection reforms, particularly in relation to contributory benefits. This is particularly concerning in countries with high levels of informality, in which the lack of access to social protection among informal economy workers is common and opportunities to integrate persons with contributory capacity into contributory schemes may go unrealized.

National women’s machineries or public entities dedicated to gender equality (such as national women’s ministries, commissions or other gender equality agencies) were also poorly represented among participants in the development of strategies and policies, with only 15 of them indicating such participation. This is notable in the widespread context of gender gaps in access to

---

4 This figure captures only explicit mentions of “Recommendation No. 202” or “the ILO’s Social Protection Floors Recommendation” and “Convention No. 102” (or variations on the long and short titles of these). It does not include references to ILO conferences or sessions such as those at which these standards were adopted.

5 Those of Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, Honduras, Jordan, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, the Niger and Spain.
comprehensive social protection coverage: women are less likely to have access and/or they receive lower benefits. The participation of civil society organizations is most frequently mentioned (34 of 50), although references to specific organizations are uncommon, making the extent and quality of such participation unclear. The participation of international development partners in the development of strategies and policies (37 of 50) was even greater than that of civil society actors.

Support of international development partners

International development partners, such as UN agencies, development banks, academics and development consultants, play an important role in supporting the formulation of national social protection strategies and policies. Two thirds of the strategies and policies reviewed (37 of 50) listed at least one international development partner. The most frequently acknowledged partners are the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) (29) and the World Bank (19), followed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (12); the ILO (10); the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID, now Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO)) (6); and the European Union (EU) (6) (see figure 2). The ILO’s acknowledged support for the formulation of strategies and policies in 10 countries suggests that it was less directly involved than other international actors. However, this review does not fully capture the support that the ILO has provided to governments and social partners for example in the context of assessment-based national dialogues (ILO 2019a) (ILO 2021a).

Initial analysis suggests that when the ILO and social partners both participate in the formulation of a strategy or policy, the likelihood increases that some key social security considerations that reflect the international standards promoted by the ILO are included. For example, the documents for Burundi and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic (in which both social partners and the ILO participated) include actions, programmes or policies to provide income security in cases of unemployment, sickness and employment injury, while the Democratic Republic of the Congo included both except in cases of unemployment. These strategies and policies also address the extension of coverage to workers in the informal economy. This effect is not as strong when either social partners or the ILO (but not both) participate in the drafting process.

Universality of protection in all dimensions? Extension of coverage favoured over comprehensiveness and adequacy

SDG target 1.3 calls for the implementation of nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including social protection floors. Under Recommendation No. 202, which complements Convention No. 102, floors are an important first dimension of national social protection systems, but countries should also seek to provide higher levels of protection for as many people with contributory capacity as possible, reflecting national economic and fiscal capacities, and as soon as possible (see figure 3).

---

6 Some strategies and policies refer to research and guidance documents drafted by international development partners, including the ILO; these were not included in the analysis for this figure, which includes only specific references to participation and/or consultation in the formulation of the strategy or policy. For the full list of indicators, see Annex III.

7 Botswana, Burundi, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
Efforts to reach more people but not enough attention to higher levels of protection

Two thirds of the strategies and policies in the sample (36 of 50) make an explicit commitment to providing universal social protection coverage or social protection for all. Even more strategies and policies (46 of 50) identify specific actions, policies or programmes for extending social protection coverage in terms of persons covered. This is sometimes framed as the establishment of a social protection floor; in other cases, it refers to less comprehensive objectives, such as the extension of coverage to specific groups like impoverished households, workers in the informal economy or children.

Many strategies and policies commit to extending coverage to vulnerable persons through poverty-targeted programmes or non-contributory schemes in more general terms. However, far fewer strategies and policies present a comprehensive vision of how to mobilize contributory capacities and provide progressively higher levels of protection, which would cover a more comprehensive set of risks and would enable persons covered to maintain their standard of living even when impacted by individual and household-level shocks or covariate shocks such as COVID-19.

While only a handful of strategies and policies (4 of 50) explicitly commit to “providing higher levels of social protection,” slightly more than half mention actions that communicate the intent to extend social insurance coverage, which typically achieves benefits higher than subsistence levels. Mali and Cote d’Ivoire, for example, specifically refer to the two-dimensional approach called for in Recommendation No. 202 to attain “higher levels of social protection”. Sao Tome and Principe, however, commits to develop and expand a system of mandatory contributory social protection that “effectively covers the risks of disability, old age and death for all families participating in the system”. In another example, Zambia sets objectives that include the attainment of an “all-inclusive and comprehensive social security system” and universal health coverage, through actions such as the reform of the national pension system; the provision of universal social health insurance; the inclusion of a maternity protection component in social insurance; and the extension of social security coverage to workers in the informal economy.

Commitments to extend access to health care and non-contributory pensions are somewhat more common. By comparison, dedicated commitments to ensure higher benefit levels and broader coverage of contingencies across the social protection system are significantly less frequent. Overall, while the objective of reaching universal social protection coverage of the population appears to be relatively well reflected in most strategies and policies, less attention is paid to ensuring that such coverage is adequate and comprehensive (ILO 2019b).

Little focus on adequacy of benefits

The United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights makes clear that in order to realize the
right to social security, nationally defined benefit levels must be adequate in amount and duration (United Nations 2008), ultimately allowing a life in health and dignity, as also reflected in Recommendation No. 202. The majority of strategies and policies (38 of 50) recognize the importance of providing benefits at a level that ensures an adequate standard of living or a life of dignity. However, far fewer strategies and policies lay out specific mechanisms or pathways through which adequacy is defined, achieved or maintained.

Less than one fifth of the strategies and policies reviewed (8 of 50) mention specific actions to ensure the adequacy of benefit levels, for example by setting benefit levels in relation to minimum consumer baskets, minimum wages, national subsistence levels or poverty lines, or with reference to the benchmarks set out in international standards. Spain, for example, commits to develop a basic minimum income, while Saint Lucia commits to develop “household and community-level minimum standards based on vulnerability and poverty risk factors and level of resilience to shocks”.

Less than one quarter of the strategies and policies (12 of 50) mention a regular review of benefit levels to make sure that their value does not erode over time, for example by adjusting for inflation. An example is the policy of Botswana, which specifies that the older persons grant will be annually re-evaluated and benchmarked against the poverty line or consumption needs so that the pension will "retain or increase its purchasing power over time".

Social protection across the life course: varied provision of benefits

Convention No. 102 defines nine contingencies for which benefits should be provided: medical care, sickness, unemployment, old age, employment injury, family, maternity, invalidity, and death of a household’s sole income-earner. International standards establish that in building comprehensive and adequate social protection systems, action can initially focus on where the needs are greatest, with progressively higher levels of coverage achieved over time (United Nations 2008) (ILO 2019a).

A majority of the national social protection strategies and policies in the sample (35 of 50) refer to a life-course approach, yet very few operationalize this by systematically addressing the nine life-course contingencies set out in Convention No.102. This gap in commitment and action may be explained at least in part by a widespread focus on poverty reduction rather than on higher levels of protection (see above). Indeed, only 7 of the 50 strategies and policies refer to all nine life-cycle contingencies: Burkina Faso, Burundi, Djibouti, Kenya, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lesotho and Morocco.

Among the nine contingencies, some are far more likely to be addressed than others (see figure 4). The national social protection strategies and policies in the sample are more likely to mention income support for children (45 of 50), health or medical care (44 of 50) and income security for older persons (43 of 50) than coverage of the other contingencies that may be faced by persons of working age. In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, while 47 of the 50 strategies and policies commit to providing access to health care, only 17 cover income security in cases of sickness and only 20 ensure income security in cases of unemployment.

---

8 See also Recommendation No. 202, Paras 1, 3(g) and 13.
9 However, of the 44 strategies and policies that commit to providing health-care coverage, only 27 explicitly commit to providing access to maternity care.
Moving from commitments to implementation

While this analysis cannot capture whether governments have taken action on the commitments laid out in national social protection strategies and policies, it can offer insights into the extent to which countries have considered the necessary steps to achieve effective and sustainable social protection systems, including with respect to mechanisms for coordination; setting time-bound goals; sequencing; and financial and fiscal considerations.

Internal coordination and external coordination

The extent to which the various elements of social protection systems are well coordinated reduces fragmentation and enhances the effective, efficient and sustainable functioning of the system (ILO 2019a). Coordination within the social protection system and with external actors in related policy areas can help ensure that the combination of benefits is adequate and meets the needs of the population; public resources are used efficiently and transparently; and those in charge of the system and its components are held accountable (Bierbaum and Wodsak 2021).

The relevance of internal coordination was explicit in 40 of the 50 strategies and policies reviewed, which mentioned specific actions or bodies aiming to increase coordination and or coherence within the social protection system. Anguilla, for example, created a “Group for Social Protection”, composed of technical officers from non-contributory social protection programmes, contributory programmes and social services, that is chaired by the Permanent Secretary for Social Development and reports annually to the Executive Council.

The COVID-19 crisis has made it even more relevant to ensure the external coordination of social protection systems with shared databases and broader social and economic policies, including employment and health policies, as well as wage and tax policies. Concrete actions taken to support external coordination of the social protection system with other policy areas, including actions taken by coordination bodies, were mentioned in less than half of the strategies and policies in the sample (20 of 50). One example is Jordan’s strategy, which mentions coordination between the Ministry of Planning, the Department of Statistics, the Ministry of Social Development and the Ministry of Labour to harmonize terms and indicators with various policies and legislation, such as the minimum wage.

---

10 All the strategies in the sample except one (Botswana) were published before the COVID-19 crisis, between 2011 and 2019.
Few strategies and policies provide concrete steps and benchmarks to achieve commitments

Recommendation No. 202 urges Member States to establish targets and time frames in order to effectively work towards the progressive realization of universal social protection. While a significant share of the reviewed national strategies and policies (40 of 50) mention a time frame, timeline or sequencing for the extension of social protection, a much smaller share of them (15 of 50) provide specific or detailed information about what the time frame or sequencing entails. For example, strategies and policies may refer to actions in the “short term” or “medium term” but fail to specify what the short or medium terms involve in terms of years.

Other strategies and policies provide significantly more detail: the policies for Paraguay and Zambia, for example, include annual targets for each social protection programme, while Lesotho details yearly sequencing for each programme that provides coverage for a life-course contingency. Other strategies, such as Spain’s, refer to separate documents such as “action plans” that focus more explicitly on the implementation details of specific policies and programmes.

Costs and financing of commitments made are often not clearly considered

Among the barriers to achieving social protection coverage acknowledged in the sampled strategies and policies, financial barriers were by far the most common and were mentioned in 20 of the 47 strategies and policies in which at least one barrier was mentioned. Other barriers mentioned, though less frequently, included high levels of informality, legal limitations and access limitations.

Recommendation No. 202 urges governments to consider the financial and fiscal implications of their commitments, including but not limited to the diversity of financing mechanisms, as well as economic sustainability with due regard to social justice and equity. Yet financial and fiscal considerations are not systematically assessed in most national social protection strategies and policies. A little more than half of the strategies and policies in the sample (28 of 50) mention the specific costs that achieving the strategy or policy’s objectives would entail. Slightly more of them (31 of 50) discuss the specific financial resources to be leveraged to cover the costs associated with the expansion of social protection, such as projected GDP growth and ongoing tax reforms (Gambia); capital injections from profitable public sector entities (Jamaica); and the establishment of a donor trust fund for specific elements of the national social protection system (Papua New Guinea).

Recommendation No. 202 also encourages governments to balance the responsibilities and interests of those who finance and benefit from social security schemes, while also ensuring solidarity in financing as an important principle to consider. However, less than one quarter of the strategies and policies in the sample (12 of 50) mention actions involving redistributive measures, such as collective financing by both workers and employers through social insurance contributions in a manner that avoids hardship to persons of small means (Convention No. 102, Art. 71) and limited contributory capacity (Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation, 2015 (No. 204), Para. 20), subsidies or social pensions.

Conclusion

In formulating national social protection strategies and policies, many countries are taking a key initial step by addressing the challenges and gaps in this area of social policy. The strategies and policies analysed in this brief reflect diverse national contexts and priorities and as a result address a diversity of issues. However, few of these strategies and policies adopt a holistic approach that aims to build and maintain comprehensive and sustainable social protection systems with universal coverage that provide adequate benefits, as suggested by the ILO’s landmark Recommendation No. 202. In addition, the social partners are in many cases not involved in these policy-making processes, thereby foregoing the opportunity to achieve better results through social dialogue.

The narrow focus of many strategies and policies on targeted poverty relief, as opposed to a broader and more ambitious vision of comprehensive and adequate coverage, indicates that there is a significant need for the ILO to increase its standards-based guidance and technical support in national policy formulation processes.

Even where commitments are articulated, there is often a lack of clear planning of the necessary steps to achieve an extension of coverage and improved adequacy and comprehensiveness in terms of financing and institutional arrangements. The results of this study suggest that greater efforts are needed by governments and social partners, as well as the ILO, to align national strategies and policies with the holistic two-dimensional vision formulated by Recommendation No. 202.

Given the continuing COVID-19 crisis and the threat of austerity on the horizon, this is a pivotal time for governments to capitalize on iterative policy-making
processes in order to increase their investments in rights-based, universal, comprehensive, adequate and sustainable social protection systems that make individuals, families, economies and societies at large more resilient to health, economic and climate-related shocks, as well as to common life-cycle risks. A concerted effort to strengthen rights-based social protection systems is key for achieving a faster recovery towards inclusive growth and enhancing resilience against future shocks (ILO 2021b).

Given the significance and financial weight of social protection, a stronger emphasis on formulating and implementing inclusive national social protection strategies and policies, in line with Recommendation No. 202, would facilitate reaching the objectives of building strong social protection systems that underpin economic and social development. Social protection policy needs to be seen in conjunction and coordinated with the other main public policies, notably such as employment policies, of which it represents the necessary counterpart.
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Annex 1: Study design

The sample for the analysis elaborated in this brief consists of 50 national social protection strategies and policies, published in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese between 2011 and 2020. While their titles vary (strategy, policy, plan, note), they all clearly set out a strategic vision for the development of national social protection systems and schemes. National development plans and poverty reduction strategies were excluded, although some social development strategies were included when there were more in-depth explorations of social protection.

Similar to national development plans, the strategic documents making up the sample express a country’s commitment to – and set out a vision for – the development of its social protection system. Designed to guide medium- and long-term political decisions, national social protection strategies and policies typically include an assessment of social risks and vulnerabilities; a review of the strengths and weaknesses of existing social protection mechanisms; and priorities for strengthening their availability, coverage and effectiveness.

This framework builds on prior work by UN-Women to analyse the gender sensitivity of national social protection strategies and policies around the globe (UN-Women forthcoming). It assesses the extent to which these documents align with ILO social security standards for the structure and implementation of social protection systems and policies, in particular Convention No. 102 and Recommendation No. 202. The framework includes 57 indicators (see list in Annex 3), which are organized in five key dimensions, as follows.

1. **Overarching framework.** Under this dimension, the overall orientation of the strategy or policy is assessed, including elements expected to provide an enabling framework for social protection planning and implementation. This includes the acknowledgment of the relationship between social protection, human rights and the principles of non-discrimination and inclusion.

2. **Process of drafting the strategy or policy.** This dimension considers the actors that were involved in the development of the strategy or policy and the evidence that informed the drafting process. This includes tracking the participation of social partners, international actors and civil society in the drafting process. It also identifies what sources of evidence were leveraged during the drafting process to highlight areas of need and provide support for the implementation of specific policy actions.

3. **Universality of protection in all dimensions.** Under this dimension, the strategies’ commitments to constructing and implementing a comprehensive and adequate social protection system for all are considered. This includes the recognition of existing gaps and barriers to protection, as well as commitments to extending coverage and ensuring the adequacy and comprehensiveness of protection. This dimension also considers access to social protection coverage that address the nine life-course contingencies of social security: medical care, sickness, unemployment, old-age, employment injury, family, maternity, invalidity and survivors’ benefits.

4. **Implementation/sound administration.** This dimension assesses the strategy or policy’s consideration and commitment to implementing the adequate administrative structures required to oversee the functioning of a social protection system. This includes consideration of the management, financial resources and the internal and external coordination required to implement the series of policies that will comprise the nations’ social protection systems.

5. **Data and accountability.** The indicators under this dimension consider how the policies’ and strategies’ implementation will be monitored. This includes commitments to collect data and statistics, the monitoring and evaluation system to be employed and the mechanisms for accountability. This dimension also considers the parties that the strategy or policy foresees as participants in its implementation and whether efforts will be made to share information about social protection with the general population.
Annex 2: Sample of national social protection strategies and policies included in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/territory</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Income group</th>
<th>Strategy date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan*</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Lower-middle income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia*</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana*</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Arab States</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Rep.</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania*</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger*</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria*</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Countries with an asterisk have indicated that their strategies are in draft format: The strategies of Bhutan and Nigeria are labeled as “Draft,” while the strategies of Ethiopia, Ghana, Mauritania, Niger, and Zambia are labeled as “Final Draft” or “Final Version.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>High-income</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>High-income</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Upper-middle-income</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia*</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Lower-middle-income</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 3: Indicator framework

### I. OVERARCHING FRAMEWORK

**The strategy or policy:**

1. Acknowledges human rights.
2. Acknowledges the right to social security.
3. References the embedding of social protection in the national and/or constitutional framework.
4. Expresses a commitment to universal coverage.
5. Adopts a life-course approach.
6. Recognizes the principle of non-discrimination.
7. Acknowledges that the provision of social protection is a tool to achieve social inclusion.
8. Recognizes the connection between gender equality and the provision of social protection.
9. Commits to adequate benefit levels.

### II. PROCESS OF DRAFTING THE STRATEGY OR POLICY

**The drafting process of the strategy or policy:**

10. Includes the participation of social partners.
11. Includes the participation of women machineries.
12. Includes the participation of civil society organizations.
13. Includes the participation of international actors.
14. Is based on evidence (situational analysis, diagnostic studies and/or assessments).

### III. UNIVERSALITY OF PROTECTION IN ALL DIMENSIONS

**The strategy or policy:**

15. Identifies gaps in protection.
16. Acknowledges barriers to protection.
17. Commits to undertaking actions to extend coverage.
18. Commits to actions to ensure adequate benefit levels.
19. Foresees a regular review of benefit levels.

**The strategy or policy includes specific actions. policies or programmes that provide:**

20. Access to health and medical care.
22. Income security for persons in case of unemployment.
23. Income security for older persons.
24. Income security for persons in case of employment injury.
25. Income security and in-kind support for children.
26. Income security for persons in case of maternity/paternity.
27. Income security for persons in case of disability.
28. Income security for persons in case of widowhood.
The strategy or policy:

29. Commits to progressively providing higher levels of protection.
30. Commits to actions to extend protection to workers in the informal economy.
31. Commits to integrating persons with contributory capacity into contributory schemes.
32. Refers to equal treatment of non-nationals.
33. Refers to specific actions that establish portability of benefits for migrant workers.
34. Acknowledges the need to provide social protection to populations with special needs.
35. Considers specific actions to address special needs.
36. Acknowledges gendered risks and vulnerabilities.
37. Considers specific actions to reduce/redistribute unpaid care.
38. Considers specific actions to address violence against women and gender-based violence.
39. Acknowledges the importance of addressing covariate risk through social protection.
40. Commits to actions to address covariate risk.
41. Considers specific actions to facilitate a just transition.
# IV. IMPLEMENTATION/SOUND ADMINISTRATION

**The strategy or policy:**

42. Refers to a specific time frame or sequencing of the expansion of social protection.

43. Refers to the specific costs of achieving the strategies commitments.

44. Refers to the actions to secure the financial resources needed to achieve the strategies commitments.

45. Commits to actions that seek solidarity in financing through redistributive measures.

46. Commits to actions to improve the social protection system's financial management and administration.

47. Refers to specific actions or bodies that aim to increase coordination across the social protection system.

48. Refers to specific actions or bodies that aim to increase coordination between the social protection system and different policy areas.

49. Refers to maintenance or improvement in the quality of public services.

50. Refers to maintenance or improvement of infrastructure.

51. Refers to actions to prevent or respond to corruption/errors/fraud.

# V. DATA AND ACCOUNTABILITY

**The strategy or policy:**

52. Foresees regular collection, analysis and publication of data and statistics.

53. Refers to actions to ensure confidentiality of private information.

54. Commits to the development or maintenance of grievance and/or appeal mechanisms.

55. Foresees regular monitoring and evaluation.

56. Foresees the participation of relevant non-governmental stakeholders.

57. Commits to awareness-raising and/or information-sharing activities.