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End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Key to RAG ratings

- **GREEN**: Global or proposed UK target has been met, exceed or close to being met
- **AMBER**: Some progress or aspect of the targets met
- **RED**: Off target, poor progress, not addressed in existing policies
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SDG Target 1.1: By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.

Indicator 1.1.1 Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)

Applicable UK policy / legislation

Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 [UK Statutory Instrument]

This section only includes one Act for both of these targets, but there are many others that affect poverty and severe poverty in the UK. E.g. legislation and policy regarding support for asylum seekers, refugees and other migrants, homelessness legislation and policy (varies in the different UK jurisdictions). Also, I'm not sure if the 2016 contains all relevant policy on national benefits and tax credits. There are policies around uprating of different benefits and tax credits which may be included in that or may not, as well as the creation of Universal Credit itself. Changes to Council Tax and to Council Tax Benefit are also relevant, as are changes to the Social Fund. Also, mitigation for welfare changes in Northern Ireland. There are also drivers of homelessness within policy on the housing market – reduction to social rented housing, the way the private rented sector functions, changes to Housing Benefit etc. Also, should mention the changes to National Minimum Wage (called National Living Wage in recent years) which have had a significant impact on some groups of low income people. Likewise, cuts to income tax (through raising the Personal Allowance) have affected some low-income people (even though most of the benefit goes to the top half of the income distribution).

Proposed national target

UK commensurable indicator

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has not identified suitable data sources.

UK does not submit data to the World Bank for the $1.90 indicator


Baseline status / performance

There are data on Eurostat: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/graph.do?tab=graph&plugin=1&pcode=tsdsc100&language=en&toolbox=data

And ONS: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/incomeandwealth/datasets/persistentpovertyintheukandeu
Other relevant UK indicator/s

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation has proposed a definition of destitution in the UK; people are considered destitute if they either:

(i) lack two or more of six essentials over the last month from a list of shelter; food; heating; lighting; clothing and footwear and basic toiletries; or

(ii) Their income is so extremely low that they are unable to purchase the essentials for themselves or their children.

Indicators were developed from multiple sources:

(i) Lacking essentials was estimated from a census survey of users of voluntary sector crisis services in ten local authority areas (with quality checks and extrapolation to deliver a national estimate)

(ii) Extreme low income was estimated on the basis of the actual spend on essentials of the poorest 10% of the population, 80% of JRF minimum Income Standard costs for these items; and amounts the public thought were necessary to avoid destitution.

The Scottish Government also provides estimates of what is describes as ‘severe poverty’, which is defined as a household living with an equivalised household income below 50% of the UK national median income (most recent estimate provided for 2017).

In 2014, the Scottish Government also provided estimates for what it defined as ‘extreme poverty’, which is defined as a household living with an equivalised income that is below 40% of the national median income.

Just to flag that JRF will be publishing our second destitution study later this year which will provide updated figures across the UK.

See the definition of poverty in the Eurostat tables. This allows between country comparisons which the JRF does not.

See data for Wales at http://open.statswales.gov.wales/dataset/sieq0031

Assessment of current state

RAG Rating: AMBER amended during final drafting.

Notwithstanding that there is no target and key indicator defined by the UK Government, progress should be appraised as follows:

Green: The UK should be expect to meet the conditions of the World Bank international poverty line, given the protection that its social security system continues to provide.

Red: There is no indication that progress is being made according to the conceptualisations of severe/extreme poverty and destitution that have been conceived in the UK.

Worth mentioning the initial destitution report JRF published in 2016 which gave a figure for that. And looked at related trends over time. Forthcoming report will show changes since then.

Except of course people who cannot access the social security system for whatever reason - lack of home; lack of citizenship status

Notes/ Disaggregation

Measures of severe and extreme poverty can be disaggregated according to the same range of attributes as available for current national measures of poverty (see 1.2.1).

Local to International Dimensions

Social security is primarily a responsibility of the UK Government under the Devolution settlement. As such ensuring that vulnerable populations receive an income that is in excess of the World Bank threshold is the responsibility of the UK Government.

However, if a broader definition of destitution and/or severe/extreme poverty is deployed, then it should be acknowledged that some aspects of social security have been administered at Devolved/local levels (e.g. Housing Benefit; Free School meals; School Clothing grants) and may also fulfil key roles in tackling these problems.

Trends
## Actions needed

A sharper political focus and intelligence based on analysis of best available data must be deployed to address the situation of those in the UK who are living in crisis situations.

For example, the Public Accounts Committee of the UK Parliament estimated in December 2017 that there were 9,000 rough sleepers and 78,000 families living in temporary accommodation (https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmpubacc/462/46202.htm).

There is a need to acknowledge that, for example, rough sleeping constitutes a crisis situation and to deploy tackling poverty in crisis situations as an appropriate UK response to indicator 1.1.1.

The role of the UK Government must be reviewed. Specifically, the deployment of benefit sanctions is creating intensifying poverty to the point of destitution in response to those who are deemed not to be adhering to welfare conditionality.

Saying that the top priority is sharper focus and intelligence seems a bit weak to me - the top priority should be taking action to eradicate destitution and homelessness. Providing more low cost rented housing, continuing the recent start to the roll out of Housing First, tackling the types of debt that are associated with destitution (debts arising from benefit advances, Council Tax and Utilities) etc.

As noted above, this kind of point should come earlier as well.
**SDG Target 1.2: By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1.2.1 Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicable UK policy / legislation</strong></td>
<td>Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 [UK Statutory Instrument]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td>Same comment as for this section in first target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Proposed national target** | The ONS proposes ‘the percentage of the population living in households at risk of poverty’, with disaggregation for sex and age, drawing from data in the EU-SILC survey (ilc_Li02 - http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=ilc_li02&lang=en). The percentage of the population whose household’s equivalised disposable income is below the ‘at risk of poverty threshold’ for the UK for the current year is established. This is defined as below 60% of the UK national median for equivalised disposable household income. |

| **Baseline status / performance** | Baseline data (%) are provided, respectively, for (i) total population (ii) men (iii) women (iv) less than 18 years (v) 18-64 years and (vi) 65 years and over. More detailed disaggregations are available. |

2008 - 18.7%; 17.4%; 24.0%; 14.7%; 27.3%

2009 - 17.3%; 16.7%; 20.7%; 14.8%; 22.3%

2010 - 17.1%; 16.4%; 20.4%; 14.9%; 21.3%

2011 - 16.2%; 14.8%; 17.6%; 18.0%; 14.1%; 21.8%

2012 - 16.0%; 15.8%; 16.3%; 16.0%; 15.3%; 16.4%

2013 - 15.9%; 15.4%; 16.4%; 18.9%; 14.7%; 16.6%

2014 - 16.8%; 16.0%; 17.6%; 19.7%; 15.6%; 17.7%

2015 - 16.6%; 16.1%; 17.2%; 19.9%; 15.6%; 16.5%

2016 - 15.9%; 15.2%; 16.5%; 18.5%; 14.6%; 17.1%

I disagree with using before housing costs as the lead indicator for the UK as I think that after housing costs is a better measure of poverty (as do other expert commentators – e.g. the Institute for Fiscal Studies now use AHC for their headline analysis). I realise that the BHC one is easier to compare with other countries but I think that the UK report should use the best measure of UK poverty as its headline. This is especially important given the salience of housing costs as a driver of poverty in the UK.

On the ONS tool, the age bands are different to this: under 16, 16-24, 25-49, 50-64, 65-74, 75 and over. The years in tool start at 2005. Also, the percentages are correct for total population, male and female, but the tool has different age breakdowns to these categories.
### Other relevant UK indicator/s

Estimates of poverty based on equivalised household income tend to be presented for three thresholds:

1. **(i) below 50% of median** - a more stringent measure, which results in fewer people being estimated as living in poverty. Of note, is that the Scottish Government define this as ‘severe poverty’.

2. **(ii) below 60% of median** - the benchmark typically applied throughout Europe and the one proposed by the UK Government for this indicator.

3. **(iii) below 70% of median** - a less stringent measure, which results in more people being estimated as living in poverty. Of note, is that this is used in conjunction with material deprivation in one of the four indicators of child poverty used by the Scottish Government (and previously used by the UK Government for the Child Poverty Act 2010).

These data are estimated both (i) before and (ii) after housing costs have been deducted. Many anti-poverty analysts and the Scottish Government in its Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017 use an after housing cost estimate, as this is considered to be a better estimate of the income that is truly at the disposal of households. In Europe, it is more common to use before housing cost estimates (such as that proposed for indicators 1.2.1 and 1.2.2).

### Assessment of current state

**RAG Rating: RED**

Notwithstanding that there is no target defined by the UK Government, progress should be appraised as follows:

Estimates by the Institute of Fiscal Studies suggest that rates of poverty (in accordance with the national poverty line) are set to increase in the years ahead.

Levels of poverty in accordance with the national poverty line are far higher than what tends to be deemed acceptable (the targets identified in the Child Poverty Act 2010 and the Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017).

Comment: Might be worth here or somewhere making the point that there are more people in poverty in-work than out of work. See JRF for relevant stats. Also say why the IFS thinks those increases will happen (helps to lead to action points below)

### Notes/ Disaggregation

The Households Below Average Income data afford the possibility of disaggregating the estimates of current poverty by a wide range of social attributes, including:

1. **(i) tenure**
2. **(ii) Government Office Region**
3. **(iii) household type, among others**

Similarly, in addition to sex and age, the EU-SILC data on current poverty can be disaggregated by an even wider range of variables, including:

1. **(i) Work intensity of the household**
2. **(ii) Degree of urbanisation**
3. **(iii) Before social transfers are taken into account, among others**
Coherence issues & synergies

As 1.1.1, the changes brought about through Welfare Reform (Department for Work and Pensions) could be argued to have influenced poverty (in accordance with the national poverty line) in the UK. The UK administration would argue that it has encouraged work, thus tackling long-term poverty among welfare claimants. Critics would argue that the punitive measure taken by welfare claimants considered to be at fault, has intensified the poverty that they experience. The Devolved Administrations (and Scotland in particular) have sought to ameliorate the impact of Welfare Reform within their jurisdictions, creating incoherence within government(s) strategy and policy.

Comment: It mentions the debate about the impact of welfare on raising employment vs reducing incomes. This should also mention the results of analysis by IFS, JRF and others on the cumulative impact of changes to wages, benefits/tax credits and taxes: this varies for different family types in and out of work.

Comment: Could add here about levels of in-work poverty and relate to wage stagnation at the lower end/changing nature of work etc., increase in wealth and income inequality which affects poverty definition etc., (particularly links to SDG 10.1). Also, drivers of poverty SDG 3, 10, 4, and also related to affordability of transport/energy/housing and therefore SDGs 11, 7, eg. Also, SDG 8.

Local to International Dimensions

Scotland has committed to eradicate child poverty by 2030 (through the Child Poverty (Scotland) Act); this sets apart Scotland from the other parts of the UK with regard to Indicator 1.2.2 (as ‘eradicating’ poverty in the current year for children is one of the targets in the Act).

More generally, although the main levers for tackling poverty (according to the national definition) rest with the UK Parliament, i.e. taxation and social protection, it should be acknowledged that both Devolved and local administrations fulfil important functions in levying local taxes (which may or may not be socially progressive), offering local social protection (often by deciding on what local extensions to protection will be offered through ‘passported’ benefits) and by maximising household income (by reducing or removing costs to people experiencing poverty).

Comment: There is no mention here of the role of sub-UK actors in affecting poverty through influencing the labour market (directly and by working with employers and business) and services (education, training, health, social work, transport, procurement etc).


Comment: True for absolute but not for relative which is also dependent on wage structures within private sector etc.

Trends

The indicator data used by ONS suggests that (i) there was significant progress in the reduction of poverty between 2008 and 2012; but that (ii) progress in reducing poverty has stalled since 2012, with some indications of progress being reversed.

Comment: ONS Data tool shows a decrease until 2011. There is no comment on the trend before 2008 (the tool has data from 2005). The tool shows the percentage has roughly stayed the same between 2005-2008.

Actions needed

At the level of the UK Government, the political focus on making progress in reducing poverty in accordance with the indicator proposed by the ONS has been curtailed with the withdrawal of commitment to progress that was legislated through the Child Poverty Act 2010.

UK Government should consider the re-introduction of these targets in line with its SDG commitments.

There is scope for devolved and other local administrations to follow the lead of the Scottish Government in countering this by committing to local action to re-establish targets and thereafter implement action plans and monitor progress toward achievement.

Furthermore, all administrations (including the Scottish Government) should consider introducing similar targets, action plans and monitoring programmes for other population groups (in the case of Scotland, in addition to commitment to tackle child poverty).

Comment: Comment as for first target. For this one we also need action on benefits and tax credits (unfreezing them, restoring the Work Allowances cut from Universal Credit and some of the other cuts to UC), and action to improve the quality of jobs and create more progression for low paid workers.

Comment: Likewise, I would question whether the top priority for 1.2 should be reintroducing child poverty targets: by themselves they don’t do anything to reduce poverty and progress on reducing poverty had stalled well before they were abolished. The priority should be for governments and others to take actions to reduce poverty. Also, the targets were only ever for children so reintroducing them would do nothing for those without children.
Indicator | 1.2.2 Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definition

Applicable UK policy / legislation | Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017 [Scottish Statutory Instrument]
| Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 [UK Statutory Instrument]

Baseline status / performance | Baseline data (%) are provided, respectively, for (i) total population (ii) men (iii) women (iv) less than 18 years (v) 18-64 years and (vi) 65 years and over. More detailed disaggregations are available.

2008 - 8.5%; 7.7%; 9.2%; 12.8%; 5.5%; 14.4%
2009 - 8.0%; 7.6%; 8.3%; 10.9%; 6.2%; 11.3%
2010 - 7.4%; 7.0%; 7.7%; 7.6%; 5.8%; 11.9%
2011 - 6.9%; 6.1%; 7.8%; 7.6%; 5.2%; 11.6%
2012 - 8.6%; 8.1%; 9.1%; 6.8%; 8.2%; 10.9%
2013 - 7.8%; 7.0%; 8.6%; 6.3%; 7.5%; 10.1%
2014 - 6.5%; 5.7%; 7.2%; 9.1%; 4.7%; 9.1%
2015 - 7.3%; 6.3%; 8.2%; 7.8%; 6.3%; 9.8%


First, the percentage of the population whose household’s equivalised disposable income is below the ‘at risk of poverty threshold’ for the UK for the current year is established. This is defined as below 60% of the UK national median for equivalised disposable household income. Next, those whose income is determined to be below the ‘at risk of poverty threshold’ for two of the previous three years are considered to be living in ‘persistent poverty’.

On the ONS tool, the age ranges are 25-49, 50-64 and 65 and over. These are correct for total population, men, women and 65 years and over. The tool does not show data for less than 18, and 18-64.
Other relevant UK indicator/s

The Child Poverty Act 2010 and the Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017 both draw on four measures of poverty. The current targets for Scotland, which reflect these four indicators are listed below:

(i) Less than 10 per cent of children live in households that are in relative poverty - equivalent to SDG 1.2.2
(ii) Less than five per cent of children live in households that are in absolute poverty
(iii) Less than five per cent of children live in households that are in combined low income and material deprivation
(iv) Less than five per cent of children live in households that are in persistent poverty - equivalent to SDG 1.2.1

More generally, the EU-SILC data provide a wide range of indicators (used for 1.2.1 and 1.2.2) that could also be used as national measures of poverty. For example:

(i) EU measure of at risk of poverty or social exclusion
(ii) In-work at poverty rate
(iii) various indicators on economic strain, among others

Assessment of current state

RAG Rating: RED

Notwithstanding that there is no target defined by the UK Government, progress should be appraised as follows:

Estimates by the Institute of Fiscal Studies suggest that rates of poverty (in accordance with the national poverty line) are set to increase in the years ahead.

Levels of persistent poverty in accordance with the national poverty line are considerably lower than that for current year, suggesting that poverty is a transient experience for many. On the positive side, this suggests that enduring poverty is not prevalent, but also implies that either the data for poverty in current year underestimates the prevalence of poverty among the population in recent years (many who are not counted as living in poverty in the current year, may have experienced it in recent years) or that poverty is a recurrent / intermittent experience for some.

Notes/ Disaggregation

The Households Below Average Income data afford the possibility of disaggregating the estimates of persistent poverty

Similarly, in addition to sex and age, the EU-SILC data on persistent poverty can be disaggregated by:

(i) Household type
(ii) Educational attainment level
| **Coherence issues & synergies** | As 1.1.1, the changes brought about through Welfare Reform (Department for Work and Pensions) could be argued to have influenced persistent poverty (in accordance with the national poverty line) in the UK. The UK administration would argue that it has encouraged work, thus tackling long-term poverty among welfare claimants. Critics would argue that the punitive measure taken by welfare claimants considered to be at fault, has intensified the poverty that they experience. In any case, the Devolved Administrations (and Scotland in particular) have sought to ameliorate the impact of Welfare Reform within their jurisdictions, creating incoherence within government(s) strategy and policy. |
| **Local to International Dimensions** | As noted for 1.2.1, Scotland has committed to eradicate child poverty by 2030 (through the Child Poverty (Scotland) Act; this sets apart Scotland from the other parts of the UK with regard to Indicator 1.2.2 (as ‘eradicating’ persistent poverty for children is one of the targets in the Act). More generally, and as noted for 1.2.1, although the main levers for tackling poverty (according to the national definition) rest with the UK Parliament, i.e. taxation and social protection, it should be acknowledged that both Devolved and local administrations fulfil important functions in levying local taxes (which may or may not be socially progressive), offering local social protection (often by deciding on what local extensions to protection will be offered through ‘passported’ benefits) and by maximising household income (by reducing or removing costs to people experiencing poverty). You appear not to have researched Wales – the WG says “The Welsh Government remains committed to the ambition of eradicating child poverty by 2020” at http://gov.wales/docs/dsjlg/publications/150327-child-poverty-strategy-walesv2-en.pdf. I do not have time to research NI as well but please give a balanced view of the UK in the responses to SDG1. |
| **Trends** | The indicator data used by ONS suggest that there has been no sustained progress in tackling persistent poverty in recent years, with the only sizable reductions being evident for those of non-working age (and even here, the trend data are inconsistent). Do we need to make this clear that non-working age is for age 65 and over, rather than under 16? |
| **Actions needed** | As 1.2.1. |
### SDG 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1.3.1 Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, newborns, work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Northern Ireland (Welfare Reform) Act 2015 Northern Ireland Statutory Rules  
Welfare Reform (Further Provision) (Scotland) Act 2012 [Scottish Statutory Instrument]  
Welfare Reform Act 2012 [UK Statutory Instrument] |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed national target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| UK commensurable indicator | The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has not identified suitable data sources |

| Baseline status / performance | Not applicable |

| Other relevant UK indicator/s | Administrative statistics on social protection uptake are available from ONS.  
More generally, the EU-SILC data provide a range of indicators that can provide some indication of the role of social protection in the UK, such as estimates of 'at risk of poverty' before social transfers, disaggregated by household type, age and sex. |

| Assessment of current state | RAG Rating: GREEN  
Notwithstanding that there is no target and key indicator defined by the UK Government, progress should be appraised as follows:  
The UK has long established systems of social protection, which although offering less protection for some as a result of Welfare Reform, do offer some form of protection for all and wide-ranging protection for many.  
I’m not sure how this can be rated Green without giving any indicators or baseline – this seems rather misleading. It would be worth looking at JRF’s destitution reports to see which groups are not experiencing effective protection even at a basic level. Also, see my earlier points about certain kinds of debts being linked to destitution.  
Also need to recognise here as above those who are not receiving protection such as rough sleepers, illegal immigrants etc. |

| Notes/ Disaggregation | Administrative data on social protection provides key disaggregations by population, as appropriate.  
Similarly, as noted above, the EU-SILC data on social transfers (their impact on alleviating poverty) can disaggregated by:  
(i) Household type  
(ii) Age and sex |
Coherence issues & synergies

As 1.1.1, the changes brought about through Welfare Reform (Department for Work and Pensions) could be argued to have used social protection as a tool to engender labour market change. The UK administration would argue that it has encouraged work, thus tackling long-term poverty among welfare claimants (reducing the need for social protection). Critics would argue that the punitive measure taken by welfare claimants considered to be at fault, has intensified the poverty that they experience (withdrawing social protection from those in need).

In any case, the Devolved Administrations (and Scotland in particular) have sought to ameliorate the impact of Welfare Reform within their jurisdictions, creating incoherence within government(s) strategy and policy.

Local to International Dimensions

As noted in 1.1.1, social security is primarily a responsibility of the UK Government under the Devolution settlement. However, some aspects of social security have been administered at Devolved / local levels (e.g. Housing Benefit; Free School meals; School Clothing grants).

Devolution has afforded the opportunity for some divergence in social protection across the UK, e.g. Wales introducing a Play Sufficiency standard for children; free prescriptions and university education being offered in Scotland.

More recently, the Devolved Administrations have had their responsibilities extended with regard to social security provision and the ability to raise taxation in order to fund extensions to this (through the Scotland Act 2016).

Trends

The UK Government has committed to a Welfare Reform programme through which it aims to tackle poverty by promoting work and ‘making work pay’.

As noted for 1.1.1, an adverse consequence of these Welfare Reforms has been the role of the UK Government in creating crisis situations by deploying sanctions and deploying household budget stress (through benefit reductions) as a means to ‘encourage’ labour market participation. Arguably, the UK Government could be said to have actively sought to weaken social protection systems.

The UK Government should consider the whether its approach to welfare reform is consistent with its SDG commitments. In contrast, are the social security principles that have been established by the Scottish Government (http://www.gov.scot/Topics/People/Fairerscotland/Social-Security/Principles).

Furthermore, there is a need to ensure protection in the workplace to ensure that ‘work pays’ and is a secure and stable route from poverty. It should not be assumed that increasing levels of workforce participation is commensurate with reducing levels of poverty - the deployment of work as a poverty-alleviating tool requires intervention to protect workers and to ensure that ‘work pays’.

It looks odd that the mention of ‘work pays’ comes under target 1.3, it should be part of the main poverty sections I think.
SDG Target 1.4: By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1.4.1 Proportion of population living in households with access to basic services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicable UK policy / legislation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed national target</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK commensurable indicator</strong></td>
<td>The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has not identified suitable data sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline status / performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other relevant UK indicator/s</strong></td>
<td>UK Social Surveys (such as the British Household Panel Survey or the Scottish Household Survey) provide estimates of access to services. Similarly, access to services is one of the domains that is used to compute the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation. EU-SILC also estimates access to a range of key services and estimates the difficulties (self-expressed) that groups encounter paying for these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of current state</strong></td>
<td><strong>RAG Rating: GREEN</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notwithstanding that there is no target and key indicator defined by the UK Government, progress should be appraised as follows:

The UK has long established systems of providing access to basic services to its people, which although government budget cutbacks imply that the level and range of service may be being reduced, still provides wide ranging access to basic services for citizens.

| **Notes/ Disaggregation**                                                 |                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|                                                                                 |
|                                                                              | UK Social Surveys (such as the British Household Panel Survey or the Scottish Household Survey) which provide estimates of access to services, allow for a range of data disaggregations. EU-SILC indicators which estimate access to basic services allow for disaggregation by age and sex. |
| **Coherence issues & synergies**                                           | The aspirations of UK and Devolved Governments to provide citizens with access and entitlement to basic services, it might be argued, is compromised by funding settlements that make less money available to local government to deliver these services. |
| **Local to International Dimensions**                                     | The UK Government sets the broad parameters within which basic services can be delivered (budget setting for Devolved Administrations). In turn, the Devolved Administrations have some responsibility for budget setting for local administrations. However, the design and delivery of basic services is primarily a local issue, with many key services provided by local administrations (rather than Devolved or UK Government). |

**Trends**

**Actions needed**

A sharper political focus and intelligence based on analysis of best available data must be deployed to better understand what constitutes ‘access to basic services’ and, thereafter to set targets for improving access to be achieved through aligned action plans and monitoring of progress.
## Indicator 1.4.2 Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure

### Applicable UK policy / legislation
- Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2016 [Scottish Statutory Instrument]
- Housing and Planning Act 2016 [UK Statutory Instrument]
- Private Housing (Tenancies) (Scotland) Act 2016 [Scottish Statutory Instrument]
- Housing (Scotland) Act 2014 [Scottish Statutory Instrument]

### Proposed national target

#### UK commensurable indicator
- The ONS proposes two indicators:
  - The percentage of households by housing tenure
  - The combined economic activity status of household members, disaggregated by household work status.

#### Baseline status / performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of working households</th>
<th>% of workless households</th>
<th>% of mixed households</th>
<th>% of owner occupied households</th>
<th>% of rented households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>55.7% 18.5% 25.8% 70.9% 29.0%</td>
<td>2009: 53.9% 18.5% 27.6% 66.3% 33.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56.0% 18.5% 25.6% 70.7% 29.3%</td>
<td>2010: 53.0% 19.2% 27.8% 64.8% 35.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>56.0% 18.4% 25.6% 70.7% 29.2%</td>
<td>2011: 53.2% 18.8% 28.0% 63.6% 36.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>56.1% 17.9% 26.1% 71.2% 28.7%</td>
<td>2012: 52.9% 18.0% 29.1% 62.6% 37.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>56.2% 17.8% 26.0% 70.8% 29.1%</td>
<td>2013: 53.8% 17.3% 28.9% 61.9% 38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>56.3% 17.9% 25.8% 70.5% 29.4%</td>
<td>2014: 55.3% 16.0% 28.7% 61.4% 38.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>56.2% 17.3% 26.5% 69.8% 30.1%</td>
<td>2015: 55.9% 15.8% 28.3% 60.6% 39.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>56.1% 17.5% 26.4% 69.0% 30.9%</td>
<td>2016: 57.0% 14.9% 28.1% 60.3% 39.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56.1% 17.4% 26.5% 67.5% 32.4%</td>
<td>2017: 57.8% 14.5% 27.7% 61.4% 38.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other relevant UK indicator/s
- At present, there is no data which directly estimates ‘secure tenure rights’, whether or not that population is experiencing poverty.
### Assessment of current state

**RAG Rating: AMBER**

Notwithstanding that there is no target defined by the UK Government (and that the indicator proposed does not measure what is sought by the SDGs), progress should be appraised as follows:

- Insecurities in the housing market and the vulnerabilities experienced by those already marginalised in the housing market imply that although security is experienced by the majority, a significant minority do not benefit from this.

As noted in the actions for 1.1.1, the Public Accounts Committee of the UK Parliament estimated in December 2017 that there were 9,000 rough sleepers and 78,000 families living in temporary accommodation (https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmpubacc/462/46202.htm).

### Notes/ Disaggregation

UK Social Surveys (such as the British Household Panel Survey or the Scottish Household Survey) which provide estimates of tenure status across the UK population allow for data disaggregations, such as household income level. See http://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/national-survey/?lang=en for an annual survey in Wales.

### Coherence issues & synergies

As 1.1.1, the changes brought about through Welfare Reform (Department for Work and Pensions) could be argued to have shaped the security/vulnerability of those previously in receipt of social protection. The UK administration would argue that it has encouraged work, thus providing longer-term security among previous welfare claimants. Critics would argue that the punitive measure taken by welfare claimants considered to be at fault, has increased the vulnerability of those welfare claimants by making it more difficult for them to maintain housing.

In any case, the Devolved Administrations (and Scotland in particular) have sought to ameliorate the impact of Welfare Reform within their jurisdictions, creating incoherence within government(s) strategy and policy.

### Local to International Dimensions

Housing is a devolved responsibility within the UK, with much social housing and crisis intervention services administered locally (at the level of local government). Do we need to specify that it’s after 2012?

### Trends

The indicator data used by ONS suggests that there has been a recent increase in the proportion of working households and a longer-term shift away from owner occupation to renting.

### Actions needed

The data used by the ONS for this indicator do not address what is sought through the SDGs. Legislation, such as that introduction by the Scottish Government to enhance the security of private tenancies is a concrete action that can be taken to achieve this SDG. Similarly, interventions by the UK Government and devolved administrations to bolster housing supply of the social rented sector and entry-level owner-occupied sectors have the potential to arrest the insecurities that are an everyday reality for many economically disadvantaged households.

As noted for 1.1.1, there is also a need to address the housing crisis situations that are being endured by rough sleepers and those in temporary accommodation.
SDG Target 1.5: By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1.5.1 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable UK policy / legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed national target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK commensurable indicator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline status / performance</td>
<td>The International Disaster Database (EM-DAT) provide national estimates for the UK. EM-Dat reports that there were 815 deaths from 2006 and 2016 from disasters (most from extreme temperature, but also from floods and storms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONS tool reports male, female, total population for England and Wales and 10 different causes of death (the vast majority from exposure to excessive natural cold)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant UK indicator/s</td>
<td>There is no target and key indicator defined by the UK Government for 1.5.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is also pertinent to note that this SDG indicator presents data for the whole population and not specifically for the population experiencing poverty. Although it might be justly claimed that those experiencing poverty are more vulnerable to disasters, even if data were available, it would provide a less-than-robust indication of the vulnerability to disasters of people experiencing poverty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of current state</td>
<td>RAG Rating: AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed on basis of evidence available for targets 11.5 and 13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes/ Disaggregation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence issues &amp; synergies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local to International Dimensions</td>
<td>No local to international dimensions to consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends</td>
<td>The tool shows a substantial decrease between 2013 and 2015, then slight increase to 2016 for exposure to cold. The other causes of death have varied greatly over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1.5.2 Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product (GDP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable UK policy / legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed national target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UK commensurable indicator

Baseline status / performance  As above
Other relevant UK indicator/s  As above
Assessment of current state  RAG Rating: AMBER

Assessed on basis of evidence available for targets 11.5 and 13.1

As for 1.5.1., it is also pertinent to note that this SDG indicator presents data for the whole population and not specifically for the population experiencing poverty. Although it might be justly claimed that those experiencing poverty are more vulnerable to disasters, even if data were available, it would provide a less-then-robust indication of the vulnerability to disasters of people experiencing poverty.

Notes/ Disaggregation  Not applicable, although this might be interpreted as additionally providing data for each of the Devolved Administrations, in addition to the UK.

Coherence issues & synergies

Local to International Dimensions

Trends

Actions needed

Indicator  1.5.3 Number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies

Applicable UK policy / legislation

Proposed national target

UK commensurable indicator

Baseline status / performance

Other relevant UK indicator/s

Assessment of current state  RAG Rating: AMBER

Assessed on basis of evidence available for targets 11.5 and 13.1

As for 1.5.1., it is also pertinent to note that this SDG indicator presents data for the whole population and not specifically for the population experiencing poverty. Although it might be justly claimed that those experiencing poverty are more vulnerable to disasters, even if data were available, it would provide a less-then-robust indication of the vulnerability to disasters of people experiencing poverty.

Notes/ Disaggregation  Not applicable, although this might be interpreted as providing data for each of the Devolved Administrations, in addition to the UK.

Another SDG covers this point so need to reconcile any differences/fuse.
Coherence issues & synergies

Again - this has synergy with other SDGs but obvious links and also trends to potential increases in particularly flood risk SDG 13

Local to International Dimensions

It should be noted that the responsibilities for local government are determined by the Devolution settlement and that conditions set for disaster management may vary across (and within) the Devolved administrations of the UK.

Trends

Actions needed


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1.5.4 Proportion of local governments that adopt and implement local disaster risk reduction strategies in line with national disaster risk reduction strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable UK policy / legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed national target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK commensurable indicator</td>
<td>The Office for National Statistics (ONS) reports that it has identified a possible data source, but that further work is needed on this indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline status / performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant UK indicator/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of current state</td>
<td>RAG Rating: AMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As for 1.5.3., it is also pertinent to note that this SDG indicator presents data for the whole population and not specifically for the population experiencing poverty. Although it might be justly claimed that those experiencing poverty will be adequately protected by whole population disaster risk reduction strategies, it might also be argued that in order to ensure adequate protection for people experiencing poverty, poverty-specific measures would be required within the generic strategy. No risk rating is possible at the current time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes/ Disaggregation</td>
<td>Were data to become available, disaggregations would be provided at the level of local government and Devolved Administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence issues &amp; synergies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local to International Dimensions</td>
<td>As for 1.5.3, it should be noted that the responsibilities for local government are determined by the Devolution settlement and that conditions set for disaster management may vary across (and within) the Devolved administrations of the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again - see I think SDG 13 where similar if not same question asked
### Actions needed


---

**Target 1.a** Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions

Outside of the scope of the research

**Target 1.b** Create sound policy frameworks at the national, regional and international levels, based on pro-poor and gender-sensitive development strategies, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions

Outside of the scope of the research