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Development co-operation policies and approaches to leave no one behind
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Chantal Verger and Valentina Sanna, OECD Development Co-operation Directorate

With the 2030 Agenda is a collective journey for all countries, the contributions of providers of development co-operation, including Development Assistance Committee (DAC) members, are particularly vital in many development contexts where domestic resources are scarce and national capacity limited. So what does the pledge to leave no one behind really mean for DAC members? This chapter, drawing on a recent survey of members, presents an overview of the approaches they are following as they seek to translate their commitment into effective action to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for all. It acknowledges the political and operational challenges they are encountering, and the need for transformative narratives and development co-operation plans, programmes and partnerships that deliver on the potential of leaving no one behind.

This chapter also includes an opinion piece by Dr Maria Flachsbarth, Parliamentary State Secretary to the Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development of Germany, on “How the global community must step up its efforts to fulfil the pledge to leave no one behind.”
DAC members

KEY MESSAGES

To build political and public support and resist the pressure to focus on quick and easy results, DAC members should build a sound narrative that demonstrates how focusing on those left behind has a development impact and can align with other strategic interests.

Despite growing commitments, the current development co-operation business model, with its political and operational constraints, is not fit for adopting leave no one behind.

DAC members define leave no one behind in multiple ways and favour targeted approaches – focusing on specific groups of people or countries. Only a few members are adopting systematic approaches and mainstreaming leave no one behind throughout their development co-operation programmes.

Targeted interventions focusing on specific groups left behind can bring quick, visible results. However, to obtain long-term and sustainable results, providers need to mainstream leaving no one behind within adaptive, flexible and context-specific programming approaches.
The longer countries take to act, the harder it will be to fulfill the leave no one behind pledge by 2030. Research shows that if sub-Saharan Africa is to eliminate “ultra poverty” (the experience of living on less than USD 1 a day) by 2030, progress on poverty reduction needs to be nearly twice as fast as it was between 2000 and 2015. If no acceleration is seen in the next six years, progress will then need to be more than three times as fast (Stuart E et al, 2016[1]). In other words: every year counts.

Aware of the urgency of the challenge, how are members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) responding? While commitment is strong, the survey undertaken for this Development Co-operation Report shows that most of them are struggling to bridge the gaps between vision, policy and implementation. Almost all are making efforts to better target those left behind in their programming, and several have developed innovative projects and approaches that can inspire other stakeholders. However, only a few have gone beyond targeted actions to adopt a systemic approach and mainstream leave no one behind throughout their development co-operation programmes.

Do DAC members recognise and embrace the commitment to leave no one behind?

The vast majority of DAC members are committed to leave no one behind, as shown by their responses to a survey undertaken for this report (Figure 9.1). DAC members consider that working to leave no one behind is not only necessary for reasons of justice – to improve equity; tackle exclusion, discrimination and inequality; and promote human rights and the social, political and economic participation of disadvantaged groups – but also because a more inclusive society supports social cohesion, governance, security and economic growth, improving quality of life for all and making the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) achievable. In her “In My View” piece, to Dr Maria Flachsbarth, Parliamentary State Secretary to the Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development of Germany stresses, among other things, that “it is time to intensify our efforts to fulfil our pledge to reach those left behind and to create equal opportunities for all.”

Figure 9.1. The majority of DAC members are committed to leaving no one behind

Several members also strive to mainstream leave no one behind in domestic policies with an impact on developing countries. For some this means a general commitment to policy coherence for sustainable development (e.g. the European Union, Ireland, Norway and Sweden), whereas others emphasise specific domestic policies. These include trade policies that promote social and environmental standards within global value chains and create business opportunities for all, including women and indigenous...
peoples (Australia, Canada, the Netherlands and New Zealand); climate policies that protect those experiencing the adverse effects of climate change (Canada, the Czech Republic and France); as well as migration policies (Canada) and labour policies that facilitate access to labour markets for certain groups (e.g. New Zealand).

DAC members can also play a critical role at the global level. Keeping leave no one behind in mind when negotiating international agreements can have a big impact on excluded groups and populations. This includes promoting the recognition and protection of climate change refugees under international human rights law (Kamali, 2016[3]); ensuring that free trade agreements enhance rather than undermine social, environmental and human rights standards (Schmieg, 2014[4]); and promoting measures to compensate losers from globalisation (Harrison, 2018[5]).

**In my view:**

We need to step up efforts to fulfil our pledge

by Dr Maria Flachsbarth,

Parliamentary State Secretary to the Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany

With the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development now in place, the world is seeing a major transformational shift. The global community has committed itself to end poverty, reduce inequalities and ensure fair and sustainable globalisation. On this path, the leave no one behind principle is a central benchmark for all stakeholders. Leave no one behind turns the spotlight on poor and marginalised people, on those who have not yet benefited from the significant achievements in poverty reduction, and on the young persons and women who are so prominent among these groups. It is a call to fight growing inequalities worldwide. I am convinced that it is only by including those left behind in development progress and addressing their special needs and circumstances that we will be able to reach our goals and create a fair social, economic and ecological environment – for us and for succeeding generations.

Germany takes its responsibility to leave no one behind seriously. We contribute to the principle by promoting policies to reduce poverty and inequality that specifically address the poor and vulnerable. We also systematically integrate human rights into our development co-operation, and encourage good governance such as inclusive decision-making processes and non-discriminatory legal reforms. However, we still have to find more effective ways to reach those who are furthest behind first, and we are constantly trying to fine-tune our policy responses.

For us, development progress in Africa is of particular importance – for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, and especially for fulfilling the commitment to leave no one behind. This is why we initiated the “Marshall Plan with Africa”. Its objective is a co-operative partnership based on three pillars: the Economy, Trade and Employment; Peace and Security; and Democracy and the Rule of Law. By promoting inclusive growth and employment opportunities for poor and disadvantaged people, in particular, we are strengthening the leave no one behind principle.

Finally, the global community must address the rising concerns about one-sided, profit-oriented globalisation that leaves the most disadvantaged people behind. Labour conditions in developing countries, for example in the textiles industry, are often disastrous, and workers can barely live on their salaries. We have started to challenge this situation by initiating the Partnership for Sustainable Textiles. This initiative unites some 150 actors from business, civil society and government. The members have pledged to increasingly improve living and working conditions and reduce environmental threats along the whole of global value chains.

It is time to intensify our efforts to reach those left behind and to create equal opportunities for all. If we fail, sustainable development will not be possible. In order to better target the poorest and most vulnerable people, we need to know who is left behind and why. We need more and better data on existing inequalities. We must also hold those who are better off and more privileged to their responsibilities. If everyone just takes a fair share and meets their responsibilities, then – and only then – will a sustainable future for all be within our reach. We are committed to a new and more inclusive development era, and we are motivated to act now, as we listen to the voices of all those girls, boys, women and men who are striving to unlock their potential!
What does leave no one behind mean in practice for DAC members?

In the absence of a common understanding, members define leave no one behind in multiple ways. Their definitions favour specific policy angles ranging from reducing poverty in its multiple facets to diminishing inequalities, fighting discrimination, ending exclusion and promoting human rights-based approaches. Focusing on those left behind drives members to target specific groups. However, with the leave no one behind concept allowing for diverse interpretations, the categories of focus are often broad (gender, women and girls; people with disabilities; children; youth), as shown in Figure 9.2. Ethnic minorities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender/transsexual and intersexed (LGBTI) people; refugees and displaced people are less frequently quoted.

Targeting populations left behind through bilateral channels

Thus far, most members have been focusing their efforts on ensuring that their bilateral co-operation policies target populations that are left behind. Almost all members have set criteria and policy indicators to guide such allocations. Only a few members (e.g. Sweden and Switzerland) do not target specific groups or countries a priori, but instead vary their targets depending on contextual analyses, acknowledging the universal claim of leave no one behind. Most members target specific groups as described in Figure 9.2. They also focus on specific types of countries (e.g. Sahel countries, least developed countries, small island developing states and fragile contexts) or remote areas within developing countries. However, the emphasis on countries most in need does not prevent members from pursuing leave no one behind in middle-income countries where high levels of poverty persist.2

DAC members identify specific sectors and approaches to direct flows in support of those left behind. The most popular areas are basic social services (health, education, water and sanitation, social protection, access to electricity and food security), promotion of human rights and good governance, gender equality, and climate change. Social protection, in particular, is receiving increased attention, with new instruments being developed and applied in a large variety of low- and middle-income countries (DFAT, 2015[6]) (SDC, 2017[7]). Less often cited are economic sectors (energy, employment and business development), despite their links with inclusion (WEF, 2017[8]). Conflict prevention is also rarely mentioned, even as members frequently name refugees and internally displaced people as groups left behind – often as a result of conflict (see the section in Chapter 3 on Fragility).
**Multilateral channel: Three ways to promote leave no one behind**

Many DAC members also use the multilateral channel to advance the leave no one behind agenda. They do so using three levers: their allocation policy (levels of funding allocated to multilateral organisations); their engagement in partnerships in countries (multi-bi aid); and their advocacy role on executive boards.

For the first lever of allocation, research shows that members tend to be more selective in terms of poverty criteria when funding multilateral organisations than when using the bilateral channel (Gulrajani, 2016[9]). They also use the multilateral channel to generate global public goods which support the SDGs.

The second lever of partnerships is increasingly exercised as members emphasise the value of engaging multilateral partners in the field. Some members explicitly mention the multilateral channel in the survey as a way to promote leave no one behind (Czech Republic and Greece) and note that discussing leave no one behind is an integral part of their dialogue with multilateral partners (Sweden and Switzerland).

Members, especially those who spend a large volume of ODA through the multilateral channel, are also active on the boards of multilateral organisations, where they apply the third lever by encouraging these organisations to target populations left behind. As an example, the United Kingdom, by far the biggest investor in the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), plays an influential role within the GPE board to ensure its focus on fragile and conflict-affected states (HC, 2017[10]). Switzerland is also actively advocating for leave no one behind in the GPE, both as a board member and as a member of the Grant and Performance Committee, which approves country requests and grants. Similarly, Norway, which channels 43% of its ODA through multilateral agencies, is exercising its power as a member state of these institutions to influence them to focus more on those left behind, in particular in the areas of women’s rights and education (Greenhill and Engen, 2018[11]). Replenishments to multilateral development banks also offer strong signals from members pushing for more focus on fragile contexts. For instance, the International Development Association Eighteenth Replenishment (IDA18) concluded in 2016 doubled financing for fragile countries and created windows to support refugees, crisis preparedness and response, and private investment in fragile contexts (World Bank, 2016[12]).

**Are donors adjusting their practices to translate their policy commitment into effective action?**

**ODA allocations do not yet match the needs of the furthest behind**

For all the ways of interpreting what leave no one behind means, there appear to be even more ways of putting the commitment into practice. When surveyed on the adjustments they are currently making, DAC members pointed to many actions specifically targeted at the poorest and furthest behind, and to others that aim at systematically mainstreaming a leave no one behind perspective. However, the most immediate and easily available measure of action is in members’ commitments of ODA.

While the implicit and explicit commitment to leave no one behind is strong, it has not yet translated into increasing ODA levels flowing to countries most in need, nor into donor sector allocations that are fully guided by country needs (Eger, Olher and Rudolph, 2018[13]) (see Chapter 10). Moreover, the quantity and quality of DAC members’ multilateral financing do not match the expectations put on the multilateral system to support sustainable and inclusive development in vulnerable countries. Increased earmarked funding to United Nations organisations, and pressure on multilateral development banks to draw more funding from capital markets, are not in themselves conducive to engaging with fragile contexts or the holistic, long-term perspective that is needed to pursue leave no one behind (OECD, 2018[14]).
DAC members mostly favour targeted approaches

Most DAC members are translating leave no one behind into programming through specific targeting. As part of their context analyses, they use diagnostic tools to identify who is left behind, rely on screening procedures to target programmes and assess any adverse social impact (e.g. Japan). All but one respondent to the survey reported conducting some sort of country assessment. Some members rely on qualitative and quantitative data from local, bilateral or international sources, while others collect their own data. Their analyses cover poverty (e.g. Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom), human rights (e.g. Denmark and Finland) or broader political-economic situations (e.g. Germany and Ireland), with only a few members focusing on specific knowledge gaps. Innovative programmes are being developed as a result of deeper analysis, for instance on social protection (e.g. Australia and New Zealand). Yet only a few members such as Sweden (Box 9.1) and Switzerland have developed specific guidance to help their country offices conduct these diagnostics. Such guidance is critical when country offices’ analytical capacities are limited (ICAI, 2017[15]).

Box 9.1. Sweden’s multidimensional poverty analysis

The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) is employing a multidimensional poverty analysis (MDPA) to identify who is living in poverty, how poverty is experienced and why people are stuck in poverty. The methodology, developed together with teams from pilot countries, was launched in 2018. A dozen country offices are currently working with the MDPA, using guiding tools available on an interactive Poverty Toolbox on Sida’s intranet. The MDPA, Sida’s comparative advantage and its mandate in a given country inform the choice of target groups or regions in the country.

Source: Adapted from (Sida, 2018[16]), “Poverty toolbox”, www.sida.se/English/partners/resources-for-all-partners/methodological-materials/poverty-toolbox. See also the case study on the framework for multidimensional poverty analysis by Sida.1

Mainstreaming leave no one behind has some way to go

Fourteen of the 27 respondents to the survey indicated that they mainstream a leave no one behind perspective into their development programming. Eight mentioned that they plan to mainstream it, and five that they do not. However, even when the response is positive, members rarely apply leave no one behind systematically to all aspects of programme management (Figure 9.3), and only a few are developing specific tools to enhance and track the impact of development co-operation programmes on those who are left behind. Most of these member countries do so by promoting a cross-cutting human rights-based approach (Canada, Denmark, the European Union, Finland, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland) that they combine with a needs- and context-based approach. Some apply the lens of a more specific policy focus, such as Finland’s focus on disability.

Meanwhile, other DAC members question whether a focus on leaving no one behind should be mainstreamed in all development co-operation instruments. They consider such an approach more challenging and resource intensive (requiring, for instance, an analysis of vulnerabilities, inequalities and discriminatory structures at the beginning of each planning phase) compared to targeted actions and specific programmes, which they consider just as effective in reaching people left behind.

Targeting and mainstreaming can be complementary to reach the furthest behind. While targeted initiatives can be instrumental in shifting specific issues by giving quick, visible results and empowering the rights-holders, their coverage is often limited, duration short and sustainability low. Mainstreamed approaches – even if they take more effort and time – can build countries’ capacities to provide long-term and sustainable results by removing barriers to inclusion and universal access, with better prospects of coverage (Nordic Consulting Group, 2012[18]). Researchers emphasise the need for an overall development co-operation strategy that is conducive to including those left behind – for
instance, promoting labour-intensive growth to support smallholder farmers instead of just targeting interventions at these farmers (Klasen and Fleurbaey, 2018[19]). Several donors recognise that they are on a learning curve (e.g. Finland, Ireland, New Zealand, Switzerland and the United Kingdom). New Zealand is moving towards a twin-track approach, building a core of programming that specifically targets gender and human rights alongside a wider integration that moves towards an aspirational, capability- and incentives-driven approach.

**Figure 9.3. What it takes to mainstream leave no one behind**

Mainstreaming requires sustained action across all management areas


Taking a pilot approach in a select number of countries to identify what needs to change remains an exception (Box 9.2). So is reconsidering the way programmes are managed – for instance, shifting towards adaptive programming in support of tailored approaches responsive to contexts, as Ireland is starting to do. Members have not set up specific leave no one behind results systems, and rely on existing indicators measuring progress against corporate objectives. Unsurprisingly, an analysis of voluntary national reviews to date found that these reviews give limited information on programmatic and policy efforts made under the leave no one behind agenda (Sarwar and Nicolai, 2018[20]).
The United Kingdom’s leave no one behind pilot approach

The UK Department for International Development (DFID) is piloting a leave no one behind approach in four “trailblazer” countries – Bangladesh, Nepal, Rwanda and Zimbabwe – through the introduction of specific action plans and monitoring and evaluation systems. In these countries, DFID prioritises leave no one behind both through targeted programmes – on disability and women’s empowerment in Rwanda and Zimbabwe – and mainstreaming, with all programmes screened against a leave no one behind lens and all development partners encouraged to apply this lens. DFID has raised local staff’s awareness on leave no one behind through specific training. Early lessons are that high-level commitment, strong leadership, evidence-based and pragmatic prioritisation, and the incorporation of equity considerations into value-for-money assessments are vital for successful leave no one behind approaches.

Source: Interviews with DFID staff in Rwanda and Zimbabwe.

Political and operational challenges: What is missing and why?

Nearly two decades ago, the DAC Guidelines on Poverty Reduction (OECD, 2001[21]) were already highlighting the challenges of addressing the multidimensional aspects of poverty through the integration of economic, social, environmental and governance concerns in a comprehensive approach to development. DAC members are still grappling with finding effective ways of implementing these guidelines. DAC peer reviews have consistently found strong policy statements and political commitment on poverty reduction in their development co-operation policies, but less clarity on how the members plan to put these commitments into action, and a lack of guidance on how to operationalise their policies.

The survey carried out for this report highlights a similar situation. In their responses, DAC members advance both political and technical reasons to explain why progress in reaching the furthest behind is slow.

Political challenges

Gaining and sustaining political support at home

Political will is crucial within donor countries, and this depends on government priorities and the state of public support. Priorities are evolving, with general trends towards a stronger focus on national interests and pressure to show results quickly. Reaching the most vulnerable populations is often more costly and carries a lower probability of achieving quick results. Demonstrating the value of these approaches and their long-term results requires robust cost-benefit analyses. For instance, a recent study on electrification in Kenya showed that providing connections from a centralised electricity grid to under-served areas carried high costs and did not automatically ensure high power consumption from new customers, highlighting the need to look for alternative means of electrification (Taneja, 2018[22]).

Members also feel tension between the pressure to reach groups quickly and the call to work through national systems to support long-term, transformational change. Easing these tensions requires strong narratives for domestic audiences showing the value of living in a more equal world where everybody gains, backed by sound evidence on what works to reach the furthest behind in order to use resources in the most effective and efficient way. The value-for-money narrative needs to evolve into one of long-term social and economic benefits from inclusive societies. This is not out of reach. As an illustration, DFID, a strong advocate for the value-for-money agenda internationally, has now incorporated equity into its value for money assessments, acknowledging that reaching marginalised groups may entail additional – but worthwhile – efforts and costs (ICAI, 2018[23]).
**Engaging in sensitive dialogue with partner countries**

Engaging national policy makers in a dialogue to promote inclusion of groups and people left behind requires a sound understanding of the political economy of the choices made by governments, and a long-standing partnership on which to build. Strong national leadership is needed to prioritise laws and policies and decide on programmes that will accelerate outcomes for poor and marginalised people. Meanwhile, those left behind often lack a voice; they may be under-represented in political processes; less able to articulate their needs and interests; and discriminated against as religious, ethnic, sexual or other minorities.

Engaging in a dialogue with partner governments around exclusion can be politically sensitive, and several members argue that it is becoming even more difficult to handle such a dialogue, as the role of bilateral donors is changing and space for civil society is shrinking (see Chapter 6). Approaches vary among DAC members. Some place respect for partner ownership up front and refrain from taking unilateral decisions (e.g. Norway), while others are proactive in pushing for inclusion. They highlight the need to question power structures and strengthen the capacity of groups advocating for poor and marginalised populations at all levels, while engaging in dialogue with partner governments.

Political sensitivities can also influence data collection and availability, exacerbating already limited statistical capacities (OECD, 2017[24]). Targeting populations for development programmes can also put some groups, such as religious minorities, ethnic groups or LGBTI people, in danger or at least raise tensions. For instance, one review of donor support showed that “singling out conflict-affected women and ex-combatants in women, peace and security work in Nepal risked causing local tensions”, and provoked sentiments “that a wider range of marginalised women with similar needs (e.g. migrants and women from socially excluded groups) should have been included” (OECD, 2017[25]). The reality of political situations sometimes requires pragmatic choices, such as targeting less politically sensitive vulnerabilities (e.g. disability) or sectors (e.g. water and sanitation) in order to build trust and open intervention pathways to more sensitive areas.

**Operational challenges**

Members also identify a number of operational issues that affect their capacity to programme, carry out and track results of development co-operation programmes from a leave no one behind perspective. Building such internal capacity takes time. Meanwhile, in the absence of guidance on how to translate leave no one behind into actual programming, some members are concerned that this agenda adds another layer of complexity on top of their other priorities, without clear gains.

Members note in particular that a lack of disaggregated data makes it difficult to identify gaps – which is critical to target groups, design programmes for their needs and report progress – and that filling these gaps is costly. Mobilising enough resources for identifying and monitoring the complex multidimensional and inter-related determinants of social, economic and political exclusion in a given context is an additional challenge. This requires co-ordinated and partner-led approaches (Chapter 11), and here good practices exist. One example is the support provided by Germany to Cambodia’s Ministry of Planning since 2005 to create a poverty identification mechanism. This mechanism, called “Identification of Poor Households” or “IDPoor”, serves as a single basis for all support programmes targeting the poor. IDPoor has developed from a small-scale project to a nation-wide programme that will reach full national coverage in 2019.6

Finally, managing programmes and tracking results for leaving no one behind require flexible and adaptive approaches. Many donors emphasise performance information to demonstrate how well they conduct development co-operation, rather than focusing on achieving development results (Zwart, 2017[26]). They tend to use top-down and predictive approaches along with time-bound results metrics. Research, however, shows that these often prevent front-line workers from using skills, local knowledge and creativity to solve problems (Honig, 2018[27]). Time-bound metrics may also be inappropriate for activities supporting the transformational changes that are required to eradicate poverty, as these changes require time (Gertz and Kharas, 2018[28]).
What will it take to ensure that development co-operation embraces leave no one behind?

Adopting a leave no one behind approach that aligns with other strategic interests requires a strong narrative on development co-operation, backed by a solid theory of change that articulates the long-term benefits of leaving no one behind – and the risks of leaving some behind. This narrative should not shy away from demonstrating that meeting the needs of the furthest behind requires time. But it should also show the potential of consistent, joined-up approaches at various levels, including on the executive boards of multilateral organisations, in international negotiations, when engaging the private sector and in partner countries. Such a narrative will help to build political and public support and resist the pressure to emphasise quick and easy results, leaving space to focus on the transformational interventions needed in many contexts.

Targeted approaches are useful to draw attention to and catalyse efforts for a particular group left behind. Yet alongside evidence-based, targeted programmes, DAC members should seek to apply a leave no one behind lens to the other parts of their programmes. While requiring consistent leadership, this can be an incremental approach, accompanied by the development of appropriate capacities and incentives. More than ever, this also requires a deliberate move towards strengthened collaboration in partner countries, in particular to build partner country capacities, draw on existing diagnostics and data gathering, and share knowledge and best practices on what works and what does not.

DAC members will need to adopt adaptive, flexible and context-specific programming approaches. With each context being different, donors need to be agile. Adaptive management practices can help to reach the furthest behind while contributing to learning through iterative approaches (USAID, 2018[29]). They can help to seize new opportunities as they arise and recognise how innovations can benefit the left behind. And they can broaden accountability to encompass donors, partners and beneficiaries. Working to leave no one behind also requires the development of results indicators and monitoring and evaluation systems that can measure the distance to stated objectives and how effective development interventions are in pursuing these objectives.

Finally, as much as it requires a new mindset, this new vision should not translate into another layer of administrative constraints. The shifts should, rather, benefit development co-operation systems as a whole – increasing their overall performance with the most impactful use of resources possible and a strengthened results orientation.

Notes
1. For a comparative snapshot to DAC member approaches to leave no one behind see here: http://www.oecd.org/dac/DCR2018-Leave-No-one-Behind.PDF.
2. As an illustration, in Indonesia, where 100 million people live on less than USD 2 per day, Australia helped the government to improve its targeting of social protection programmes and supported its reform of electricity subsidies to benefit the poorest 40% of households (Commonwealth of Australia, 2018[32]).
3. This provides an incentive to increase loan provision on harder terms, but allow donor contributions to decrease in IDA18.
5. Populations left behind can be overlooked when progress is measured in averages across the whole population (Samman, 2017[30]). Disaggregated data are, however, lacking in many partner countries. Out of the 42 countries that reported voluntary national reviews to the High-Level Political Forum in 2017, only 14 provided an indication of data on no one left behind, 11 of which noted that additional disaggregated data by sex, region, ability, age, social status or particular groups were needed (CCIC, 2018[31]).
7. This might also lead donors to review their internal risk management strategies.
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