

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE YOUTH  
DEVELOPMENT  
INTER-AGENCY CONSULTATION ON  
THE FORMULATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
INDEX**

**REPORT**

**Held at Marlborough House, London  
July 11-12, 2005**

# CONTENTS

<b>In their own words.....</b>	
<b>Background and Introduction.....</b>	
<b>Conceptual Framework.....</b>	
<b>Aims and objectives of the Consultation.....</b>	
<b>Secretary General’s Remarks.....</b>	
<b>Proceedings.....</b>	
<b>CYP’s Experience in the formulation and development of an YDI.....</b>	
<b>Ignatius Takawira</b>	
<b>Dr Godfrey St Bernard</b>	
<b>Armstrong Alexis</b>	
<b>Partner Agency Presentations.....</b>	
<b>Summary of Discussion .....</b>	
<b>Decisions.....</b>	
<b>Action plan and the way forward.....</b>	
<b>Appendices.....</b>	

### *In Their Own Words*

“We need (these) kind of new challenges to give input to our programme,” Professor Dr Turiman Suandi, University Putra Malaysia

“It has been a pleasure participating...I credit CYP to honing my skills on the question of youth empowerment, this has taken off at another level ...it says a lot of what CYP is all about, now things are about to happen and I am happy to be associated with this and in the interest of youth and all the stakeholders the University (UWI). I am willing to work on both the pure and applied side.” Dr Godfrey St Bernard, University of the West Indies.

“ We are grateful for this initiative....partnership is what the UN is all about,” Joop Theunissen Focal Point on Youth, UN Youth Unit.

“We are thankful that a space was opened for youth at this table....”.Youth delegate.

“Thanks (to Andrew and the CYP) for championing the cause of youth..... ..” Youth delegate.

*Comments from some of the participants at the conclusion of the Inter-Agency Consultation on the formulation and the development of Youth Development Index(YDI)*

## **Background and Introduction**

The situation of young people globally is a challenging one. The global youth landscape indicates that young people, specifically those from developing countries, are in a more vulnerable position than their counterparts in developed countries. Issues and challenges such as poverty, discrimination and inequality, lack of access to proper education and health services continue to dominate their lives.

Data suggests that more young people and those still in their early teens and twenties are HIV positive; with young women accounting for the majority of those affected. Unemployment on the other hand, can be described as a serious issue estimated at 88 million in 2003, up from 58 million in 1995. Young people generally account for 41% of the world's unemployed. However, this figure can be as high as 50-70 percent in some developing countries. Statistics have shown that over 208 million (18%) of the 1.09 billion young people globally (15-24 years old) survive on less than US \$1 (one) per day, and 515.1 million (45%) on US \$2 (two dollars) per day.

According to OXFAM (2005) over 45 million children would die in the next 10 years as a result of global poverty. This is due to unfair trade practices and mounting debts of developing countries, which have in turn led to the repatriation of large amounts of money to service debts in developed countries. As a consequence, over 75 million children within the school age do not have access to basic education facilities, resulting in over 113 million illiterate young people.

It is against this background that the Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP) and a range of partners within the UN system and the World Bank are working to provide support to governments, NGOs and other development institutions. The aim is to enhance policy, legal frameworks and programmes for young people, to enable them to live and work in a viable environment which values them, builds their confidence and self esteem and creates a space for them to participate equally as valued partners in the development process.

Numerous programmes have been implemented at local, regional and international levels in response to the challenges outlined above. However, there is still no adequate instrument or model, to measure how well these initiatives are performing. During their 1998 meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Commonwealth Youth Ministers expressed concerns about the strategies employed by the Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP) and governments to monitor and evaluate youth programmes. They endorsed the development of the Youth Development Index (YDI) as a means of enabling CYP and the Commonwealth Secretariat to work with them to develop viable indicators that will enable them to effectively implement the new Plan of Action on Youth Empowerment (PAYE). UNESCO's country office in Brazil has done a considerable amount of work in this area. During the period January 30 to February 4 2005, the UN Youth Unit, in collaboration with other agencies within the UN system, met with inter-governmental organisations and the World Bank in Coimbra, Portugal. Their mission was to review the

implementation of the World Plan of Action of Youth. They unanimously decided to develop a Youth Development Index (YDI) based on the Human Development Index (HDI) model.

### **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

In his paper, *Youth Empowerment and Indicators of Human Development – Challenges Facing the Caribbean (2000)*, Dr. Godfrey St. Bernard of the University of the West Indies, noted that the significance of the PAYE or any other Plan of Action was increased if their results could be monitored and evaluated. According to Dr. St. Bernard, for the YDI to be considered as a “framework that provides measurement for the purpose of evaluating changes in the status of youth development at human, institutional and national level, it should assume the form of statistical measures such as counts, indicators, and indices that permit assessments of changes in the status of attributes pertaining to youth and captured at the three levels under review”.

The YDI, is expected to be “based on a set of demographic, socio-economic, political and other indicators that address the status of youth” and will also serve as the primary monitoring and evaluation tool of the Plan of Action. There are several reasons for the conception of the YDI chief among them being the provision of a standardised tool that can measure critical aspects of youth development. The YDI is not intended to evaluate all aspects of youth development. Rather, its focus should be on a few critical areas that lend themselves to statistical and social analytical methods, which having been carefully studied and analyzed, provide very good approximations relative to the general status of young people.

It should also provide policy-makers with an important instrument that can be useful in shaping the direction of youth development work and policies affecting young people. The YDI may also be used to assist Youth Ministers and other policy-makers in determining how to allocate scarce resources among competing priorities of youth and other objectives.

### **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF CONSULTATION**

This consultation is aimed at providing an opportunity for partner agencies and key stakeholders to devise strategies for the development and implementation of a Youth Development Index. Its objectives are to:

- 1 Provide opportunities for representatives of partner agencies to share their experience on the development of the Youth Development Index and other aspects of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and instruments to measure youth development.
- 2 Increase knowledge and skills of representatives of partner agencies on the challenges, pitfalls and success of implementing a Youth Development Index
- 3 Develop an action plan and time frame to take the YDI development process forward and
- 4 Provide opportunities for partner organisations to commit resources (human, material and finances) to support the YDI implementation process.

**SECRETARY GENERAL RIGHT HONOURABLE DON MCKINNON  
REMARKS AT THE OPENING OF THE INTER-AGENCY CONSULTATION  
ON THE FORMULATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT  
INDEX.**

We are very pleased to host this Inter-Agency Consultation on the formulation and development of a Youth Development Index.

This initiative is a very important one for the Commonwealth. Of the 1.8 billion people living in the Commonwealth, nearly half are young people. And increasingly, young people in the Commonwealth and beyond are facing huge challenges. We live in a world where 30, 000 children die of preventable diseases every day. Nearly half of the world's unemployed are young people, 88 million people struggle through life because they don't have a job. This huge resource of energy and creativity simply goes to waste. Moreover, 75 million children in the Commonwealth, and over 100 million worldwide, have never seen the walls of a classroom.

These missed opportunities affect everyone. When millions of children are deprived of an education, the whole world loses out. What young people need are the opportunities to take control over their own lives and realise their full potential. When I talk to young people in the Commonwealth, the message that comes through time and time again is we want to have more say in decisions that affect our lives. In other words, if we want to help young people, we need to ensure they can play an active role in the lives of young people. We are well placed to influence government policy and drive change at the highest political level.

Through our programmes we help young people develop their own businesses, get professional training and improve their networks so they are in a better position to influence decisions that affect their lives. But, in order to improve the help we can provide to young people, we need to know accurately what their needs are and where they are on the development ladder. In other words, we need an instrument to measure how well youth programmes are performing. And that's why we are gathered here: to set the framework for the creation of the Youth Development Index. The Youth Development Index will fulfil three main purposes:

- 1 It will provide a tool to measure critical aspects of youth development
- 2 It will help policy makers identify gaps and direct resources where they are most needed and
- 3 It will help us identify areas of need on a country-by-country basis.

I would like to thank our partners in this project UNESCO, World Bank, UN, UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) UNDP and other international development partners. This collaboration is crucial to us and is an excellent example that international partnerships can generate positive outcomes for the people we are here to serve. I wish you a very successful meeting.

## **PROCEEDINGS**

### **OPENING OF MEETING**

The Inter-Agency Consultation on the formulation and development of a Youth Development Index (YDI) convened at the Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, London on Monday, July 11<sup>th</sup> 2005. It was called to order at 9.45 AM by Chairperson Andrew Simmons who welcomed all present paying special tribute to participants who defied the recent London bombings and made it to the British capital for

the event.

In welcoming the delegates to the meeting Special Adviser and Head of Youth Affairs at the Commonwealth Secretariat Ignatius Takawira, pointed out that the Commonwealth regarded its partnership with other agencies as an important component of its work.

In declaring the consultation open, the Commonwealth Secretary General the Right Honourable Don McKinnon, expressed his institution's pleasure at hosting what he described as an important consultation. He observed that the Commonwealth is about youth and that the challenges the institution has to face all the time has to do with youth. He also challenged the delegates to ensure action and follow up after the meeting had run its course.

As part of the meeting's official opening, statements and contributions were also given by UN Focal Point on Youth, (UN Youth Unit) Joop Theunissen and the World Bank's Advisor on Children and Youth Vivian Mangiaterra.

In his remarks, Theunissen observed that the idea of a Youth Development Index was not entirely new, but rather that the idea needed to be better known. He pointed out that the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) was one of the main reasons why an YDI was needed, stating that these are youth development goals, and therefore fit into the UN agenda.

In championing the case for the YDI, he outlined what he described as the **Three As** of such an index noting that it:

1. Should be **achievable**- at the national, regional and the international level
2. Must be **appropriate** and should focus on youth for whom its intended Education, gender, and health (HIV), income issues (already there are indicators for all of these issues) should all be important elements. Youth participation in decision-making was also cited, but he pondered on the mode of measurement for this.
3. Should be an **advocacy** tool since the success of the UNDP's Human Development Index (HDI) as a whole, was not based on book and data but had to do with it being presented to governments, debated and implemented making it a useful intervention.

The World Bank's Vivian Mangiaterra commended the Commonwealth for taking the lead in this initiative. She observed that the meeting was about youth, a very important topic and spoke of some of the World Bank's work in this area. She explained that the UN was in fact working to be more effective and focused-at two levels, analytically and operational -mainly increasing dialogue.

She listed among the bank's achievements in this area over the last four years:

- 1 the development of an action plan, monitoring operational portfolio, an increasing trend in lending, targeting young people and
- 2 intensification of dialogue.

She pointed out that the 2006 World Development Report will be on development for and by the next generation -youth. The World Bank, she said, will work at evidence, intervention and develop guidelines to allow more effective work in this area.

Stressing that work was extremely limited, she identified the need for evidence on process and impact on development programmes, noting that research needed to be stronger in this area to convince policy makers to invest in young people. She said there was need for indicators, so that data could be compared. In this light, the meeting was very important for the World Bank. Mangiaterra further noted that the meeting was about partnership and the World Bank can play a crucial role in moving the work further. She also stressed the need for support of other partners who have been working cross sectorally in this area.

In bringing this session to a close, Chairperson Andrew Simmons acknowledged the apologies from UNESCAP, ILO and UNECA. He thanked the Secretary General and Special Advisor Ignatius Takawira for their guidance. The other presenters for the opening session were also commended for their contributions.

## **PRESENTATION OF MAIN PAPER**

*Youth Development Index (YDI) A Strategy for Measuring Youth Development:* Presented by Professor Turiman Suandi Senior Fellow at the Institute of Community and Peace Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM).

In his presentation, Professor Suandi observed that the situation of youth worldwide offered an ambivalent picture. He pointed to two main pictures; one of the “youth at risk”, and another as “prime movers in the quest for social change.” According to Professor Suandi, tracking the status of youth development and identifying present and future youth issues are important to policy makers and practitioners.

The full version of Professor Suandi’s paper is contained in the Appendices affixed to this report.

## **DISCUSSION ON FIRST PAPER**

A robust discussion on the main paper ensued. The following main themes, concerns and questions were raised:

- 1 Has there been any thinking on what the YDI would be composed of?
- 2 Is the goal being set too high?
- 3 List of relevant stakeholders (in the presentation) did not include youth specifically.
- 4 Should the YDI allow measurement against baseline, and give an idea of progress

- for, or against.
- 5 The need for national indices from which the international index would be generated.
  - 6 Measurement - what should the qualitative and quantitative outcomes be?
  - 7 Communication- how should the YDI be communicated to countries?
  - 8 The need for advocacy, as opposed to communication.
  - 9 Youth participation -YDI should be a tool for and by young people that they can actually use.
  - 10 Excellent examples of what has been done in US and other countries were highlighted and participants directed to page 7 of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).
  - 11 The need for the YDI to be based more on outcomes, than on technicalities.
  - 12 'Qualitative aspect' of development
  - 13 Rights based approach to youth and the development of YDI.
  - 14 Sustainable livelihood framework allows focus on target group, and will facilitate triangulation of qualitative and quantitative process.

## **SUMMARY**

This session generated a wide- ranging discussion on a number of different views and issues relative to the development of the YDI. It also put the 'qualitative and quantitative' agenda squarely on the consultation's agenda. It was subsequently dubbed the 'qualitative/quantitative divide'. This main paper though, demonstrated the multi-dimensional and complex task of developing an YDI. In the final analysis, there was consensus that development of an YDI would and should involve the young people themselves.

## **CYP'S EXPERIENCE IN THE FORMULATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF YDI**

There were three presentations focusing on the CYP's experience in developing and implementing a Youth Development Index in the Commonwealth. They were given by CYP Director Ignatius Takawira, CYP Regional Director-Caribbean Center Armstrong Alexis and Dr Godfrey St Bernard of the University of the West Indies.

In his presentation, the CYP Director noted that young people were at the center of the CYP's mandate, and that it had implemented a number of programmes both at an organisational level as well as with other partners.

Mr Takawira noted that the CYP was very ambitious in its plans for the development of a youth index. But, he observed that:

- 1 Although CYP had invested in a number of programmes over the years, it had not been able to show member governments what had been achieved with the money invested.
- 2 The question still remained whether or not young people in the Commonwealth were any better off than they were 30 years ago, this was a difficult question to answer.
- 3 Content and strategy were good starting points to consider with regard to the formulation and development of the YDI
- 4 The consultation would assist in identifying sign- posts for its development.
- 5 Urgent need to deliver an YDI, so that agency and country can tell on their own whether or not they were making progress.
- 6 Each agency brings different skills to the table.
- 7 The importance and need for consultative process and partnership to ensure collective ownership of the process.

### **Youth Empowerment and Indicators of Human Development-Challenges Facing Commonwealth Caribbean Countries- Dr Godfrey St Bernard-University of the West Indies**

Though not the main paper, Dr St Bernard's presentation was lively, informative and provocative and in a sense set the tone for the remainder of the meeting. He opened his presentation by referring to the 'qualitative and quantitative divide,' which had emerged and cautioned against getting too caught up in this particular debate.

See Appendices for the full version of Dr St Bernard's presentation.

### **Armstrong Alexis-CYP**

The CYP Regional Director outlined that the 18-24 age group in Commonwealth societies are faced with greatest risks of development and social problems. He cited among these problems HIV/AIDS in Africa, drugs, crime and gang warfare in the Caribbean.

- 7 He noted that data on youth development is essential for there to be a youth development index. This, he observed, has been a major challenge in the Caribbean since success was measured in terms of numbers.

### **PARTNER AGENCY PRESENTATIONS**

Regional Coordinator, Armstrong Alexis, chaired this session, which featured contributions from partner agencies. It received the following presentations:

***Success and Challenges in implementing the Youth Development Index in Brazil***  
***Successes, Challenges and Lessons to be learnt from the Human Development Index (HDI) model.***

**Successes and Challenges in implementing the Youth Development Index in Brazil-  
Jacqueline Groth (UNESCO)**

Jacqueline Groth of UNESCO presented Brazil's experience in developing a Youth Index. She observed that UNESCO had been interested in the development of a youth development index for sometime now.

She addressed issues of partnerships with youth, the importance of helping member states in youth policy and programming as well as the challenges of monitoring. Groth pointed out that attempts were being made to find answers to these challenges.

(See the Appendices for the full text of this presentation.)

**Successes and Challenges to be learnt from the Human Development Index (HDI) model**

UNDP Advisor Santosh Mehrotra, in his presentation on the successes, challenges and lessons to be learnt from the HDI, noted that there had been a paradigm shift in development and economic thinking with the Human Development Index. He advanced that the notion of human development was much wider than the HDI and was simple but more complex than GDP indicator. In his view, the notion of HDI is narrowly focused. Simplicity and direct appeal are very important for success.

(Mr Mehrotra's presentation is contained in the appendices)

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ON PAPERS PRESENTED**

The resulting discussion proved to be significant for the outcomes of the consultation. Many issues surfaced and were discussed but there were several recurring themes. The following were the main concerns raised during the discourse.

- 1 The use of the YDI as an advocacy tool.
- 2 What makes young people different from the rest of the population?
- 3 YDI should be a tool for the individual country to see how young people are developing within the national context.
- 4 The YDI should not be used to rank countries since the 53 member governments have indicated that they do not want it to be used as such. The view was however expressed that it would be used in that way even without it being so devised.
- 5 What exactly do we want from the youth index?

- 6 The bridging of the qualitative/quantitative gap.
- 7 The need to subsume all, or most of the points, within the broader youth agenda.
- 8 Some of the instruments for measurement were being missed.
- 9 Governments lacked the will to invest in monitoring and evaluation component.
- 10 The World Bank sees the use of indicators and eventually an index as an instrument for measuring impact as the most attractive approach.
- 11 What are the elements that need to be in place?
- 12 The HDI is necessary but not enough. For example, for the indigenous populations, income is not a good indicator for measuring poverty.
- 13 Subsistence living is the hallmark of indigenous living- there will be social exclusion from the starting point.
- 14 On the issue of participation, focus should be on power relations within the participatory process.
- 15 There should not be any duplication of efforts.
- 16 Institutional issues-very critical to achieving YDI, since its taken for granted and development is dealt with on an ad hoc basis, this is caused by the ground level support in place at the institutional level. Institutional capacity is of tremendous importance and should be given some attention.
- 17 Need for simplicity and for developing an instrument that is owned locally, while international in scope.
- 18 The Brazilian model was useful in the context in which it was developed and gave a picture of different dimensions.
- 19 UNESCO in Moscow conducted a similar study. Their use of income indicator tells a lot about young people since this is a very polarised county.
- 20 Gender perspective must not be forgotten.
- 21 Need to keep all regional differences in mind. There had been considerable discussion around the Caribbean and Brazil, but what of Africa?
- 22 Would the YDI categorise in sub age groups, there is a vast difference between 15 and 25 year olds

- 23 The issues that affect a 15 year old, differ to those affecting a 25 year, and needs to be taken into consideration when designing the index.
- 24 Empowerment of young people's social, economic and political capital.
- 25 While unemployment data exists for some countries, it does not for a vast majority of Commonwealth and developing countries.
- 26 Poor people cannot be unemployed.
- 27 Literacy, absolutely critical, UNESCO (Institute of Statistics) says data is so poor must discontinue use -most governments collect data based on self- declaration by asking people if they can read or write.
- 28 LAMP (UNESCO) project will provide reasonable data about literacy. Data about wages in rural areas are not available or reliable; need wage-based economy for wage-based data.
- 29 Need for new indicators or new data on youth.

**Key Words**

- 1 Literacy
- 2 Indicators
- 3 Age
- 4 Empowerment
- 5 Simplicity
- 6 Qualitative
- 7 Quantitative
- 8 Income
- 9 Regional differences
- 10 Unemployment

**PRE PLENARY SESSION**

With this session, the discussion became more centered and focused. It was decided that participants would break into three groups as opposed to the original 4-5 planned. Also, it was agreed that all three groups would discuss the three critical areas, which were identified as follows:

- 1 measurable elements of the YDI

- 2 trends and priority issues for consideration when developing a YDI and
- 3 indicators for an YDI.

The need for a list of indicators, which highlight the specific problems of youth was identified. It was felt that with such a list, the international agencies that deal with the specific information could be approached. For example education-UNESCO in Montreal, health-Geneva, employment-ILO, and child rights-UNICEF.

There was also suggestion that a consultant be hired to look at that list and try to define youth, what is the age group.

### **Challenges**

- 1 The need to leave the meeting with practical goals was emphasised
- 2 The need to clarify fully whether the YDI would be an advocacy or research tool.
- 3 CYP to give direction in terms of all the basic issues, so that there would be a common departure point.
- 4 Consensus on whether the YDI would be used for monitoring, evaluation or as an advocacy tool.
- 5 While development of a list of indicators was paramount, what is the content besides the indicators, is there anything else that can be taken on board in terms of process?

The three groups convened with the mandate to come up with their indicators for presentation on Day 2.

## **DAY 2 COMPLETION, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF GROUP DELIBERATIONS**

It was decided that this session would be shortened and will run until lunch to facilitate delegates scheduled to leave later that afternoon with the understanding that whatever was achieved during this session should be reachable.

### **Group Presentations (1)**

#### **Issues**

They acknowledged that the outcome of YDI was necessary and important, and that youth needed to be put on the central agenda.

Age of youth.

Agreement was reached on the following three sub-categories for defining youth.  
(15-19), (19-24) and (24-29)

## **Indicators**

1. Make use of available data through millennium goals 2,3, 6 and 8
2. Employment/ underemployment
3. Participation and partnership with youth at all levels-as outlined in plan of action 5
4. Youth participation at grass roots level-is there a national youth council, is government implementing a youth policy
5. Violence and crime-
6. Empowerment
7. Mortality

## **Group 2**

### **Issues-**

This group acknowledged that the HDI while necessary was not sufficient. They articulated the need for an integrated approach, which spoke to young people's contribution to development. They felt that the YDI should be used as an advocacy tool, which addresses challenges and describes an enabling environment. It should be a social development tool that captures both the qualitative and quantitative.

### **Indicators**

1. Education- formal and non-formal
2. Health
3. Participation-in relation to power relationships
4. Institutions-policy, legislation etc. how they enable or constrain positive outcomes
5. Livelihoods
6. Incentives for positive transition
7. Gender
8. Social Networks
9. Access to education, health etc
10. Choices

Tool should be holistic and not eschewed purely to economic outcomes

### **Challenges**

Way forward and how to collect data-

Data should be collected regularly, should be accurate etc.

How would policy makers see this tool, how to validate data, what of cohesiveness in collection

Partners-who should they be?

NGOs, Civil society, Government, youth driven entities.

Identify a model, in the absence of a model develop a pilot  
Reconciling the qualitative versus the quantitative approach in respect of the YDI.  
Social inclusion/exclusion.

The group felt that the cost of not pursuing an YDI would be far greater than the cost of actually producing one.

### **Group 3**

#### **Issues**

This group expressed the view that it was necessary to make the YDI relevant to international landscape to enable adaptation to local and national context. Other issues identified include:

- 1 Need for young people to hold governments accountable
- 2 Use of YDI as a tool to depict what is being done
- 3 Negative output of the media
- 4 YDI must be simple so that it can be easily marketed

#### **Indicators** (Millennium Development Goals as guide)

1. Education-everyone should be educated
2. Health-goal 4 and 6 take on more bio medical intervention
3. Sustainable livelihoods
4. Youth empowerment-CYP can take role here

### **DISCUSSION**

Chairperson of this final session Andrew Simmons led this part of the discussion by saying that the age debate was not of great concern at present, but rather the stage at which the youth is positioned as espoused in Curtin's transformational approach. The issue should be what kind of YDI do we create? He noted that comparisons would be inevitable, so there should not be too much concern on that score. The question was raised as to whether or not the YDI was adequate to measure empowerment. Queries relative to the feasibility of devising the YDI to incorporate the qualitative components were also considered.

Dr St Bernard explained that the proponents of the YDI would be the ones to define youth empowerment and the YDI is expected to measure this. The critical thing he pointed out was defining youth empowerment and all its various dimensions. This reverts to the basics of conceptualisation; there would be areas of consensus in this regard-back to qualitative/quantitative debate, mixed methodologies. He suggested asking people what youth empowerment means, noting that this consensus will come to the fore along with the various dimensions. We should consider what is the ideal situation with which we have to work, if not what is the next best thing? He also suggested employing a process of academic research to complement and augment the work being initiated at the

consultation.

There was considerable debate surrounding the creation of a YEI as opposed to an YDI and whether or not it was possible to have both -two separate entities, contained within each other. The financial implications did not advance this debate much further but it was agreed that some indicators were necessary to refine the issues using existing data.

The issue of empowerment raised its head once again with one view being that youth empowerment needed to be included in the index. It was accepted that while it was very important to do so, it would be too expensive to have a YEI and YDI. Meanwhile, the option of a merger of the two was supported by the CYP Director, who also reiterated that the YDI as a means to an end, needed indicators to show we are getting somewhere.

### **SUMMARY OF DECISIONS**

The following suggestions were put forward as a means of advancing the process initiated by the consultation:

- 1 Establishment of a thematic group to operate as a think tank to look at some of the issues being discussed.
- 2 Think tank could make appearances at conferences, which deal with youth development issues etc that could inform this work.
- 3 YDI should be simple comprising five or so elements, easy to use and with data already available.
- 4 Identification of indicators to be contained within an YDI, look at pilot and determine what would be the type of indicators that we would like to see treated within an YDI.
- 5 Set up small group to synchronise groups and identify common indicators.
- 6 Set up an inter-agency think tank to pilot indicators.

The following countries were recommended as possible pilots to determine indicators to be treated within an YDI.

#### **Caribbean**

Barbados  
Belize (alternate)

#### **Africa**

Zambia  
Uganda (alternate)

## **Asia**

Malaysia

India

## **South Pacific**

Fiji

Penje

## **Arab Nations**

Jordan

Yemen

## **Macedonian countries**

Georgia

Kosovo

## **Latin America**

Brazil

Mexico

## **INDICATORS**

All Groups had the following common indicators:

:

- 1 Participation and empowerment at all levels and access choices to engagement
- 2 Education
- 3 Sustainable livelihoods
- 4 Health and mortality
- 5 Violence and violent crime
- 6 Contribution to cultural advancement
- 7 Gender
- 8 Social institutions and networks
- 9 Incentives for positive transition
- 10

A member of each of the three groups was mandated to former refine this list so that common indicators could be arrived at. The following were the most common across all three groups.

### **Common Indicators**

- 1 Education
- 2 Health
- 3 Participation
- 4 Sustainable livelihood

(Based on common MDGs)

Rights-based approach=underpinning paradigm

There was considerable debate relative to the omission of the institution as an indicator. It was felt that this was too important to be excluded. It was felt that the lack of national capacity was a major challenge, and on this basis should be an important component of indicators.

There was some disagreement with this view however. One delegate agreed that institutions are in fact important but questioned whether they ought to be used as an indicator of the YDI. It was suggested that this be subsumed under the participation indicator. Another view agreed that institutions are important, especially within a sustainable livelihoods framework, as a qualitative indicator.

The need to be clearer on what is the focus of our attention (national, human and institutional-identified in presentation) was alluded to since there is linkage between overall national outcomes, and the part youth has to play. In this regard it was felt that the following questions-what is the unit of analysis and what is necessary to facilitate optimal functioning of youth and to what extent the institutional arrangements and youth characteristics play out-ought to be considered.

It was suggested that:

- 1 Outcomes were the indicators that should interest the consultation.
- 2 The methodology used in the Brazilian youth welfare index was a more useful starting point than the MDH index.
- 3 While the MDH index was good, it was not adequate.
- 4 While commonalities do exist, youth problems vary across board.
- 5 Regional differentials are useful.
- 6 Need to take the regional differences into account, while developing the indicators for YDI.

## **ACTION PLAN AND THE WAY FORWARD**

The meeting realised several important outcomes. Among these was the setting up of a working group with the following terms of reference.

### **WORKING GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE:**

1. Further refinement of indicators to reflect regional differences
2. Development of core and non-core indicators to facilitate regional differences.
3. Review existing practices and identification of new and or additional ones
4. Identify other key stakeholders to reflect practice and theory.
5. Test and evaluate measurement strategies
6. Incorporate efforts into mainstream work of all agencies
7. Define basic principles and foundations for development of YDI

8. Feed information into political agenda at upcoming meetings
9. Sourcing of data and development of protocols for data sharing
10. Preparation of action plan with time frames etc.

Discussion on how the group should be constituted followed. It was suggested that a Virtual Sharing Group, informal in nature, but accountable was the way to start. Persons with an interest or stake, or those around table, who knew of conferences where similar issues were being discussed, were encouraged to share this information so that the panel could participate and share their work. A journal on youth development issues was put forward as another possible avenue through which information could be shared. There would be two levels of decision mentioned-internal (Commonwealth level) and interagency. In respect of the latter, a loose and informal network was recommended.

The group's membership unless otherwise indicated, comprises all agencies represented at the table as follows.

**Ignatius Takawira-CYP**  
**Viviana Mangiaterra-World Bank**  
**Ingo Imhoff-GTZ**  
**JacquelineGroth-UNESCO**  
**JoopTheunissen-UNDESA**  
**SantoshMehotraUNDP**  
**Ruby Sandhu-Rojon-UNV**  
**Dr Godfrey St Bernard-University of the West Indies**

## **COMMITMENTS**

Commitments to further the process along were solicited from all partner agencies present and articulated as follows:

### **Commonwealth Youth Programme**

The CYP will take the lead for coordinating and providing logistical support. It committed to preparation of a report on the Consultation to be disseminated as soon as possible. CYP also committed to taking the issue of indicators to regional boards and the meeting of Commonwealth Heads in Malta in September and to mainstreaming into its work.

### **UNDESA**

The representative asserted that UNDESA's commitment was already in black and white from the Secretary General-UNR/youth in its 35 page World Youth Report. This report can also be accessed at [www.un.org/youth](http://www.un.org/youth).

### **WORLD BANK**

Committed to advancing the evidence in respect of policy and will work from an intervention perspective. Representative Vivian Mangiaterra also committed to continue work on the index, be the bank's focal point and to source technical support where possible from economists and statisticians who might be in a position to help.

#### **UNV**

Will facilitate the environment and work with governments to implement youth policy, share information on youth volunteer experience, and will include information on YDI when participating at other fora. It will also take the issue to the Africa Youth Forum in November, as well as be the focal point within UNV.

#### **UNESCO**

Could not commit to specific action but expressed willingness to assist through the Institute of Statistics that specialise in education data and provide technical support where necessary.

#### **GTZ**

Committed to spreading the news of this particular initiative, share the report, and keep in touch with the main protagonists of the process. Will also propose or make process known in federal ministry, especially if partner agencies requested support.

#### **UNDP**

Noted that UNDP as a decentralised body already has gender and youth mainstreamed into its work. Can provide advice at country level. Serve as focal point and assist with linking of regional contacts once the work goes forward.

#### **BY WAY OF CLOSING**

The Consultation was brought to a close with the following notations:

- 1 Civil society groups will continue to work with the Commonwealth Youth Programme.
- 2 There are many opportunities to promote and share information on the formulation and development of the Youth Development Index.
- 3 Delegates representing various youth organisations committed themselves to work towards mainstreaming their work with the CYP and to place the initiative on the agenda of several upcoming high-level meetings.
- 4 Youth representative and LSE student from Singapore Charles Chao Rong Phua, received the meeting's commendations on being awarded the prestigious HSBC award in recognition of his work with youth in his country.
- 5 The CYP Director Ignatius Takawira once again emphasised the notion of a common agenda of all the partners involved

Chairperson Andrew Simmons brought the proceedings to a close by once again

acknowledging the Commonwealth's gratitude to those delegates who had defied the recent London bombings to gather for such an important meeting. He noted that the meeting had realised its main objectives by reaching basic agreement on indicators pertinent to the formulation of the YDI, establishing a Working Group with specific terms of reference and receiving commitments from partner agencies, thus laying the necessary groundwork to take this critical work further.

.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Youth Development Index (YDI) - A Strategy for Measuring Youth Development**

Ezhar Tamam, Turiman Suandi and Azimi Hamzah

Institute for Community and Peace Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

#### **Introduction**

The ten priority areas set out in the World Plan of Action testify the commitment to youth development of the of the United Nations' member states. This commitment is a product of a long-drawn observation of the status and condition of our contemporary youth. The situation of the youth worldwide sometimes offers an ambivalent picture. The first picture paints the youth as a particular group of peoples across race, culture and religion who is faced with social, economic, health and political crisis in their respective communities or some calls it, 'youth-at-risk'. The second picture portrays them as prime movers in our society in the quest for social change in the midst of global issues and challenges like those who are actively engaged in a peaceful dialogue for social transformation. While both scenarios may be true, there is more than what meets the eye. The situation of young people globally and locally is alarming and challenging. The World Youth 2003 Report (Economic and Social Council, United Nations, 2003) noted that illiteracy continues to be an enormous problem. Unemployment of more than 15 percent is recorded in 50 countries. About 238 million youth live under poverty (living on less than US\$1.00 daily). Health issues, drug abuse and juvenile delinquency are on the rise. Participation remains piecemeal, though, more often than not, elusive, and is insufficiently integrated into all areas of young people's lives. Most of these issues involved the youth of 15 to 25 years old. Central to youth problems are structural issues which have economic roots such as in policies and programmes (Ginwright and Cammarota 2002) that consciously and unconsciously create a real or imagined divide in the areas of gender relations, urban-rural development, and rich-poor class.

The World Youth 2003 report highlighted five new concerns influencing youth development: globalisation, information and communication technology, HIV/AIDS (see Appendix 1), youth and conflict prevention and intergeneration

relations. In light of the globalization and ICT advancement, how young people can prepare to benefit from the opportunity and respond to the risk of the technological development is an important agenda. Additionally, the youth also need the cultural competencies to confront the new challenges of borderless K-society with numerous countries still have negligible and limited access to computers and internet (See Appendix 2).

Numerous youth development programmes have been implemented by national governments to improve the well-being of the young people. Although there are numerous programmes implemented at local, regional and international level in response to the issues and affairs of the young people, there is still no adequate instrument to measure how well these youth development programmes are performing. Tracking status of youth development and identifying the present and future youth issues are important to policy makers and practitioners. It is within this context that Youth Development Index (YDI) is critical as a monitoring system and as a vehicle to youth development. The YDI addresses the status of youth and will serve primarily as a monitoring mechanism and an evaluation of plan of action on youth development, particularly the Plan of Action on Youth Empowerment (PAYE) at national level and global level.

The purpose of the paper is to share ideas on strategies to measure youth development using YDI. The paper will touch on the following topics: what is youth development, what is YDI and how to measure it, the need for YDI, strategies in institutionalizing YDI program at the national level as well as some challenges and constraints in taking the YDI program forward.

### **What Constitutes Youth Development?**

First and foremost in the strategy of measuring youth development using the YDI is to answer the fundamental question of what constitutes youth development and to agree on the specifics of the answer. Small and Memmo (2004) commented that the literature on youth development and problem prevention fails to provide consistency and clarity in the terminology used to designate fundamental constructs related to youth development particularly the terms risk factor, protective factor, developmental assets/competencies and youth outcomes. Clearly there is a missing link between what the body of literature has presented and the fundamental and crucial understanding of pertinent constructs that capture the very essence of youth development and its ramifications. Interestingly, since the beginning, youth literature was narrowly focused on the psychological dimension of youth development and issues (e.g. juvenile delinquency, drugs, sexual perversion, etc.) (Ginwright and Cammarota 2002) to the point where relevant and apt youth issues on youth participation deprivation and disempowerment were relegated to the background. It is only in recent times that concerted efforts have been initiated to look at other non-psychological issues such as identity, gender relations, participatory development and empowerment that are now positioned in the forefront in the youth development agenda (see for example, Commonwealth Youth Ministers' Meeting 1998). It is therefore necessary that youth development should follow this lead.

The term youth development has been used in several ways— as a process, as a goal, as a framework and as an approach. The widely used definition of youth development is viewed as a process which prepares young people to meet the challenges of adolescence and adulthood through coordinated, purposive series of activities and experiences which help them to become socially, morally, emotionally, physically, and cognitively competent (Roth and Brook-Gunn, 2003). Most of the definitions of youth development stress on a range of personal assets young people need that span physical, intellectual, emotional and social dimensions. These assets represent the skills, competencies, and support that protect them from risky behavior, besides enabling them to be productive.

Positive youth development focuses on building assets or competencies necessary for positive youth outcomes. A developmental asset should not be equated to protective factor; although the later serves to decrease an individual vulnerability to risk, it does not necessarily enhance a person's potential in other areas. On the other hand, developmental assets are responsible for enhancing and promoting outcomes that are indicative of competence. Assets are defined as the building blocks that are crucial for promoting healthy youth development and well-being. By viewing development asset as a necessary element in understanding of and in the promotion of youth development, it henceforth recognizes the primordial contributive roles of youth's latent capacities and strengths in community mobilization and capacity building, as part of the overall agenda. This is very important to bear this in mind so that policies and programmes designed for youth development would not provide the how to "fix it" solutions of youth deficits but rather utilize their full potential in a participative spirit.

Several typologies of needs and assets are available in the literature (some have been empirically validated). Some have discussed the assets in terms of competencies or equate it with competencies. For instance, Politz (1996) has identified five basic needs of young people. At the same time, to succeed as adult, all youth must acquire positive attitude and appropriate behavior and skills in five areas (health, personal/social, knowledge, reasoning and creativity, vocation and citizenship). Pittman and Irby (1996) have identified seven critical "input" needed for youth to successfully develop into adulthood. Search Institute, on the other hand, has identified seven essential assets of positive youth development (viewed as youth outcomes) which are categorized into external assets (support, empowerment, boundaries and expectation and time use) and internal assets (educational commitment, positive values, social competencies and positive identity). The handbook of positive youth outcomes by the Youth Development Institute suggests seven youth developmental competencies (viewed as outcomes): creative competence, personal competence, cognitive competence, civic competence, physical health competence, mental health competence, employability and social competence (Networks for Youth Development 1998).

All four contemporary approaches to youth development are built upon the basic

principles of risk, protection, assets/competencies and outcomes, but they differ with regard to the relative emphasis placed on each. Positive youth development approach and community youth development approach are two recent approaches. Positive youth development approach emphasized the promotion of positive development and the condition that contribute to youth health and well-being.

The model of positive youth development approach as developed by Benson, Lefferts, Scales and Blyth (1998) seems comprehensive in which the model is built around developmental assets. These assets focus on the relationship, social environment, pattern of interaction, and norm are central to promoting youth development. Another model of positive development approach (Lerner, Fisher, and Weinberg 2000) categorized desired outcomes of youth into five Cs: (1) competence in academic, social and vocational areas, (2) a positive self-identity, (connection to community, family, and peer, (4) positive values, integrity, and moral commitment, (5) caring and compassion. Moreover, Pitman et al. (2001) added one more element i.e. C to stand for contribution. The community youth development approach is a variant and extension of positive youth development approach. The community approach as advocated by Huges and Curnan (2000) adds the element of engaging young people as contributor to and active shapers of their community.

Another important work in this youth development area is the one by Catalano and his colleagues. Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak and Hawkins (2002) have developed a set of construct that collectively define positive youth development and identified measurable set of characteristics. The youth development construct proposed by Catalano et al. consisted of the following: competence, self-efficacy, pro-social norms, opportunities for pro-social involvement, recognition for positive behavior, bonding, positive identity, self-determination, belief in the future, resiliency, and spirituality.

Allow me to stress here the importance of youth education - considerably the most important asset or competency - as a potent weapon against ignorance and poverty. Many education gurus today orchestrate various strategies to "educate" the young with the hope that such strategies will revitalize them and make their "passing" time "worth living". However, my understanding of education reflects that of Paulo Freire's (1970) classic view of education as a process of "conscientisation". It demands that human beings - or youth - in this case, must not be viewed as "receptacles" of knowledge/information being taught to them by those in authority. By viewing them as receptacles it is tantamount to seeing them as mere object of education and, thus, stifling their initiative and creativity to understand their own view of the world. Conscientisation therefore demands that the youth be seen as a subject capable of initiating change for the betterment of his/her social milieu. As a subject, he/she is instrumental in the transformation and emancipation of his community from dependency, poverty and misery.

This process should lay the groundwork for the education of the youth when we view them as active receivers of knowledge. Providing quality education for the youth is a sure way of guiding them towards creating an independent mind

capable of critically understanding and synthesizing various issues and challenges that lay before him/her, and whose sensitivity is attuned towards desiring to help his/her community. This type of education for the youth provides a fertile ground for empowerment since this is one of the outcomes that the education system envisages.

Another equally important asset is the role of participatory process to achieve involvement of youth development. It is crucial to recognize that young people have the right to be included in decision-making that affects their own lives and their societies, and that they must have the means to exercise the rights and the assurance that their contributions are recognized. As argued by Gurstein et al. (2003), young people are usually seen as “constituting a class without power, which is disenfranchised economically, politically, and socially...engender[ing] an alienation, especially from the essence of oneself as a self-determining creative individual” (p.25). Youth cannot participate meaningfully where they are alienated or exploited (UN 1986) and when they are marginalized in the process of development.

Having reviewed what constitutes the construct of youth development and its related terms, the most basic question to answer in developing YDI is: what domain of assets or competencies are critical for positive youth outcomes? This is the fundamental question that the workshop needs to articulate and agree upon on the answer. In order to render the YDI important and useful at national and global level researchers, practitioners and policy makers must share similar meaning and framework of the youth development construct. While all the assets/competencies/outcomes are important, it is imperative to consider the issue of the importance of particular assets/competencies/risk factors. Which assets or risk factors are most important for the prediction of particular outcomes? Another important issue is some assets and risk factors are more feasible to change than the others. In sum, what are the domains of youth positive youth outcomes? As youth development is age-specific and occurs within a cultural context, the two contextual factors must be considered in developing a YDI. Answers to these questions have implication on the notion of YDI. A model or a paradigm of the construct positive youth development needs to be developed, and a framework to measuring condition and status of youth development must be informed by the model or paradigm.

### **What constitutes Youth Development Index?**

An index refers to a summary statistic, and it consists of indicators. The YDI should be a summary measurement that tells progress made in critical areas of youth development. The YDI should tell condition and well-being of the youth in these critical areas. Although there are three broad approaches to index development, namely, the one-number approach, the accounting framework approach, the suite-of-indicators approach, the one-number approach is most widely used. The one-number approach combines information about progress across a number of fronts (such as health and education) into a single composite indicator. The Human Development Index, for instance, adopted the one-

number approach.

Once the domain of youth development has been identified, then, the next logical question would be: what are the dimensions/sub-dimensions of youth development? And what are the indicators for each dimension/sub-dimension that are important in creating an index of youth development. Before discussion on the indicators, first we need to agree upon the dimension to be included in the YDI.

In coming up with a YDI, how comprehensive should the index be is a salient question? Should the YDI cover all dimensions of the relevant domain? What are the critical areas of youth outcomes? Whatever the dimensions and the domains, they must have direct influence on youth well-being. A nation of healthy well-being refers to a condition of well-being that is contented and satisfied with life. It typically includes material, physical, mental, social and spiritual aspects of life, one that is expected to produce a community of youth that is empowered, critical and sensitive to their socio-political environment and which development direction is to creating a culture of optimism about life. In the context of CYP, it must have direct relevance to the Plan of Action of Youth Empowerment (PAYE) and other strategic areas of CYP plan such as youth participation and youth rights, as well as the MDG agenda.

Coming up with a good YDI that is nationally and globally relevant is a daunting task. The YDI should consist of few dimensions and indicators or a host of dimensions and indicators. It is important to take note that while all the dimensions of youth development are necessary, the dimensions are interrelated. Some dimensions are more important than the other dimension. In other words, the relative importance or weight of the dimensions of youth outcomes needs to be theoretically and empirically assessed.

This workshop needs to examine theoretically the relative importance of the dimensions and to validate it later in benchmarking research on YDI development. The following guideline can be used in identifying the relevant, meaningful and useful dimensions of YDI:

1. It must directly relate to key or critical positive youth outcome,
2. It must be integral to youth well-being,
3. It must be globally relevant and locally specific, and
4. It must relate to trends in youth issues.

(For example, in African countries, economic (employment and poverty) and health issues (HIV/AIDS) are more pressing; in Asian countries, issues of employment and poverty (see Appendix 2)...

The Australian Bureau Statistics used the following broad mechanisms for choosing aspects of progress to be measured (<http://www.abs.gov.au?Ausstats/abs@.nsf>):

1. Referring to current policy issues and debate,

2. Referring to view of stakeholders, and
3. Referring to international standard and practice.

A review of some of the existing models of measuring and monitoring youth development provides some insights into formulating a YDI. One example is the Iowa Youth Development Results framework (Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development 2001). In identifying youth progress and monitoring youth development outcomes, the framework organized causes and conditions related to youth development into five broad results areas: (i) families are secure and supportive; (ii) communities and schools are safe and supportive; (iii) youth are engaged in and contribute to the community; (iv) youth are healthy and socially competent, and (v) youth are successful in school and prepared for a productive adulthood. For the latter category, for instance, the operational components include school attachment, academic achievement, vocational and career awareness, employability skills, self-sufficiency, and life skills). More than 100 potential indicators have been identified that could measure progress toward the five results areas.

The Developmental Assets instrument developed by Search Institute is a more elaborate tool for assessing the health and well-being of middle and high school age youth. The asset framework represents a common core of developmental building blocks crucial for youth, regardless of community size, gender, family economics, or race/ethnicity (Search Institute 1996). A total of 40 developmental assets were included in the measurement involving numerous indicators.

Now back to the fundamental issue, how comprehensive should the YDI be? The index needs to be comprehensive of the critical areas of youth outcome and at the same time limited and feasible. Not all dimensions of the domains of positive youth development need to be included. Contextual factors need to be taken into account in a manner that some dimensions in the domain may not be applicable in certain communities or localities because of cultural and religious differences.

A study in Pakistan, for instance, used a simple summary measurement to index youth development. The survey employed four indicators (educational attainment, employment, recreation and health-seeking behavior) representing human capital and social capital dimension (Faizunnisa and Ikram, 2004). And the model is predictive of the selected aspect of youth outcome studies. In another study, Memmo and Small (cited in Small and Memmo, 2004) found that their model consisting of eleven critical assets could predict an outcome as well as when using twenty-five assets. These studies illustrate the case of using fewer dimensions of youth outcomes to index youth development. These studies also clearly suggest the practical and economic need for selecting core or critical dimensions and indicators of positive youth outcomes.

### **Choosing and Measuring Indicators of YDI**

Choosing the indicators of the dimensions of YDI and measuring it must be

guided by some principles and guidelines. Some of the points raised earlier are also relevant here. For instance the indicators must directly relate to the major theme and strategic issues, and conceptually and directly relate to youth outcomes.

What type of indicators should be included in the YDI? There are three different types of indicators: criterion indicator, life satisfaction indicator, and descriptive indicator. Criterion indicator is a normative indicator that sets target or outcome for public policy and planning. Life satisfaction indicator seeks to measure psychological satisfaction. Descriptive indicator focuses on social measurement and analysis to improve understanding of how society operates. As such, should the YDI incorporate subjective or objective indicator or both? Subjective indicators include attitude and feeling. If we were to link well-being of the youth with their quality of life, it is important to include the subjective indicator in the YDI. One common methodological challenge in choosing indicators is the significance of each indicator both spatially and temporally.

How can we tell the indicators are relevant, meaningful and useful? Should the indicators focus on the outcome rather than input or other influences that generate the outcome. What seems to be the trend nowadays is to employ the impact and outcome indicators. What is a good impact or outcome indicators? For this purpose, we can use the criteria employed in the MDG. As good impact or outcome indicator of development as used in the MDG includes:

1. Provide a direct and unambiguous measure of progress,
2. Is relevant to the development intervention that need to be measured,
3. Measure goals, or factors that have an impact on the goals,
4. Varies across areas and group and over time,
5. Is sensitive to change in policies and programmes,
6. Is not easily blown off course by unrelated development,
7. Cannot be easily manipulated to show achievement where none exists,
8. Can be tracked
9. Is available frequently, and
10. Is not too costly to track.

The Jacksonville Community Council Inc. uses the following guidelines for the selection of indicators: purpose (meaningful), importance, validity and accuracy, relevance, responsiveness, anticipation, understandability, availability and timeliness, stability and reliability, driving forces and outcomes, asset orientation, and representativeness

([www.westir.org.au/SOCINDICpaper.html](http://www.westir.org.au/SOCINDICpaper.html)).

### **The Need for the Youth Development Index**

A common system of monitoring youth development at the national level and global level is categorically absent. The YDI to be developed is a way of defining shared goals, measuring progress, and/or identifying problem to be addressed at

the national and global level. Monitoring youth development at a national level in a systematic manner and using internationally comparable method allows nations to make informed decision on key development issues affecting the youth. In other words, the YDI is not only a monitoring tool but also a vehicle for youth development. Borrowing on the monitoring approach for MDG, the establishment of the YDI will allow national government to:

1. Establish baseline and assess situation concerning youth,
2. Make better development plans, programmes and strategies on youth development, Formulate better policies, Identify areas for external assistance, and
3. Monitoring the implementation of youth development.

To ensure that the YDI is locally specific and yet globally relevant, references to the following criteria should help in the selection of critical indicators:

1. National strategies, target and priorities
2. Existing indicators
3. The availability of data for the indicator and the source, continuity, delivery and reliability of the data.

### **Strategies in Institutionalizing the Development of YDI at a National Level**

The development of YDI should be an intensive effort of collaboration between the relevant ministries, academic/research institutions, non-governmental organizations responsible on youth development, representation from the UN organization and Commonwealth, and representation of individuals with interdisciplinary expertise on youth development, methodology, among others.

A clear workable coordinating mechanism must be in placed. There must be a task force involving official representing the various stakeholders and a coordinating body responsible for the development process of the YDI. In Malaysia for example, the Institute of Community and Peace Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia can take the coordinating role. It has the capacity to play the coordinating role in the YDI development process. As a research university it could provide technical support and expertise (particularly in instrument development, data collection and analysis) and linkage with other institutions related to youth development. The Universiti Putra Malaysia is actively involved in youth development studies and research since then. The University offers a Diploma program in Youth Work in collaboration with the CYP and has been conducting numerous researches on youth. In 1997, the University has conducted a national study, funded by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, on contemporary youth life style. Recently, the Ministry of Science, technology and Innovation, has approved the research proposal submitted by the Institute of Community and Peace Studies to carry out a national study on "Indexing Youth Culture" which is continuation and extension of the contemporary youth life style survey. In fact, the University is the only university

in Malaysia that offers programmes in youth studies, and an established research university actively conducting research on youth.

To be recognized as a national program, the political will of the government is critical in the formulation of YDI and to ensure the sustainability of the YDI formulation initiative. Involvement of the relevant stakeholders is very important to ensure receptivity and sustainability of the YDI initiative as a national program. In Malaysia, the Ministry of Youth and Sports is the prime stakeholder. As about 60 percent of the youth live in rural areas, the Ministry of Rural Development is another key stakeholder. The YDI initiative should be viewed and treated as a more permanent program that is closely linked with key agencies. A participatory approach to YDI development, implementation and dissemination is imperative. They must be involved from the conceptualization phase up to the utilization phase.

Another important requirement is the endorsement and the support of international body such as the CPY in ensuring the support and commitment of the government and the involved party in the task force, and the administrative support from the host organization. The institutionalization of the YDI initiative at national level is one way to move the YDI initiative forward.

In any process of development an index will involve a series of exercises including training and capacity building of human resources engaged in the formulation, implementation and dissemination of the YDI. If the national YDI initiative is placed in a research university, the potential for successful work in the YDI is enhanced. There is already existing research capacity to carry a benchmark measure of condition and well-being of the youth. Nevertheless, training has to be given to all stakeholders particularly the relevant government agencies in using the YDI for monitoring progress in youth development.

One clear benefit from involving in the YDI initiative is the establishment of national database on youth development either managed by the university or the Ministry responsible for youth development. This data product should be made available to the decision-makers at all level. A strategy for dissemination of YDI information to stakeholder (e.g. via short summary, comprehensive reporting, headline indicators, YDI web-site) must be in placed.

Some structural constraints in implementing the YDI initiative must be adequately addressed to ensure program effectiveness and sustainability. Finance is definitely one of them. While the University does get research funding to do policy studies, the amount is not sufficient. Financial assistance from international body is required to implement the required benchmarking and validation research of the YDI, and a series of workshop is required throughout the formulation, implementation, and application phases of the YDI development process. The objective of the workshop would be to provide training on the use of the YDI as tool for decision making at all levels of youth development, and to explore related methodologies for indicator development. Another is that ICT capability must be upgraded for the purpose of establishing a good database center and a national clearinghouse on YDI and youth development.

## **Assessment and Evaluation of the YDI Formulation Process**

Assessment and evaluation of the implementation of the YDI development process should take place continuously. It should focus on the technical issues, decision-making issues, institutional support and capacity building issues.

## **Replication across Nations and Inter-Agency Networking**

A replication in another interested country is important in order to establish a YDI as a standard monitoring system to track and evaluate youth status across countries. The potential for replication is high if the YDI development process involved the CYP through the development phases. Sharing experiences in workshop and inter-country meeting supported by CYP can be designed for the replication initiative. Report of YDI development initiative from the implementing country should be included in the agenda in CYP regional meeting.

## **Final Remark on taking the YDI Forward**

Situation and affairs concerning young people need to be continuously monitored and improved as the young people are key actors and the driving force for global development and peace. Youth must be seen as equal partners in the development of the nation whose contribution does not only lie on the extent of their monetary contributions in the society but must also be measured in terms of their non-monetary productive pursuits they engage in the community of which they are a part.

Monitoring of youth status and progress as well as identifying youth issues through YDI is paramount. The application of YDI will be a strategic approach to positive youth development at the national and global level. The database from the application of the YDI can provide solid basis for decision making at all levels. The process of YDI development involves a network of cooperation and consensus building. Key stakeholders must be involved from the beginning. And more importantly, to be more successful, it is felt that endorsement of the YDI initiative at the national level as a flagship program could certainly secure the commitment of the key stakeholders, particularly the relevant ministries. Additionally, the support and the legitimization from the international agencies such as CYP would add leverage to the initiative.

## **References**

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2002). Measuring Australia's progress 2002. (<http://www.abs.gov.au?Ausstats/abs@.nsf>)

Benson, P., Leferts, N., Scales, P., & Blyth, D. (1998). Beyond the village rhetoric: Creating healthy children and adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science*, 2, 138-159.

Bumbarger, B., & Greenberg, M. T. (2002). Next step in advancing research on positive youth development. *Prevention and Treatment*, 5, Article 16. <http://www.journals.apa.org/prevention/volume5/pre0050015a.html>.

Catalano, R. F., Berglunf, M. L., Ryan., J. A. M., Lonczak, H. S., & Hawkins, D. (2002). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluation of positive youth development programmes. *Prevention & Treatment*, 5, Article 15. <http://www.journals.apa.org/prevention/volume5/pre0050015a.html>

Economic and Social Council, United Nations. (2003). World Youth Report 2003. Report of the Secretary-General. New York: United Nations.

Faizunnisa, A., & Ikram, A. (2004). Determinants of Youth development In Pakistan. *The Lahore Journal of Economic*, 9(2).

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Penguin Books.

Ginwright, S. and Cammarota, J. (2002). New Terrain in Youth Development: the promise of a social justice approach. *Social Justice*, 29, 4, 82+.

Gurstein, R., Lovato, C., and Ross, S. (2003). Youth Participation in Planning: Strategies for Social Action. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 12, 2, 249+.

Huges, D., & Curnan, S. (2000). Community youth development: A framework for action. *Community Youth Development Journal*, 1, 9-13.

Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development. (2001). *Iowa Youth Development Results Framework*.

Lerner, R. M., Fisher, C. B., & Weinberg, R. A. (2000). Toward a science for and of the people: Promoting the civil society through the application of developmental science. *Child Development*, 71, 11-20.

Networks for Youth Development (1998). *The handbook of positive youth outcomes*. New York: The Fund for the City Council.

Pittman, K. J. (2001). *Promoting youth development: Strengthening the role of youth serving and community organization*. Washington, DC: Academy for Educational Development, Center for Youth Development and Policy Research.

Pittman, K., & Irby, M. (1996). *Preventing problems or promoting development: Competing priorities or inseparable goals?* Baltimore, MD: International Youth Foundation.

Politz, B. (1996). *Making the Case: Community Foundation and Youth Development.* Washington, DC: Center for Youth Development and Youth Policy.

Roth, J. L., & Brook-Gunn, J. (2003). What exactly is a youth development program? Answer from research and practice. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7(2), 94-111.

Search Institute (1996). *Developmental Assets: A Profile of Your Youth.* Sample Report. Search Institute and Developmental Assets. Minneapolis: Search Institute.

Small, S. & Memmo, M. (2004). Contemporary models of youth development and problem prevention: Toward an integration of terms, concepts and models. *Family Relations*, 53, 3-11.

Social Indicators. <http://www.westir.org.au/SOCINDICpaper.html>

United Nations (1986). International Youth Year 1985: Participation, Development and Peace. *UN Chronicle*, 23, p.28.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Youth Empowerment and Indicators of Human Development – Challenges Facing Commonwealth Caribbean Countries**

*Author: Godfrey St. Bernard*

*Affiliation: The Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies*

*The University of the West Indies*

*St. Augustine*

*Trinidad and Tobago, West Indies*

*Telephone: 1-868-662-2002 ext. 2148*

*Fax: 1-868-645-6329*

*E-mail: [gstbiser@tstt.net.tt](mailto:gstbiser@tstt.net.tt)*

#### **1. Preamble**

Young people are among the most vulnerable in the Commonwealth Caribbean. This phenomenon can be attributed to several reasons among them the:

- disproportionately high levels of unemployment
- alarming rates of exposure to the risk of **HIV/AIDS**
- education, information and skills training are not easily accessible placing selected groups of young people in disadvantageous positions.

Young men and women have as a consequence been rendered powerless – a situation that has to be reversed so that the fortunes of future generations can be enhanced.

The Caribbean has a relatively large youthful population.

- Camejo (1997) analyzed the 1990-1991 Population and Housing Census for a number of Caribbean countries showing that the age group 15-24 years combined with children 0-14 years forms a substantial part of the population of Caricom countries, from 43% in Barbados to 64% in Belize.
- Not surprisingly, several countries have been targeting young people as a unique sub-population that is worthy of investigation and made attempts during the 1990s toward establishing National Youth Policies.

This suggests that there is need for systematic studies and hence, data collection to be undertaken based upon qualitative and quantitative processes. For those hinging upon quantitative processes, the need to collect and compile indicators of youth structures and youth culture becomes real.

This paper draws upon efforts from the pioneering work of the Commonwealth Secretariat – an international agency that has spearheaded efforts toward developing a Youth Development Index. With reference to the Commonwealth Caribbean, however, it examines emergent challenges to the proposal of the Commonwealth Secretariat and considers some interesting departures as alternative procedures. Whatever the outcome, the paper recognizes the need to develop a framework that has to be tested to vouch for its feasibility.

## **2. Human Development Targeting Youth Empowerment**

The idea of a Youth Development Index (YDI) was first articulated by Dr. Bhagbanprakash, of the Commonwealth Youth Programme's (CYP), Asia Regional Centre, India. He conceived of the YDI as a tool similar to the HDI, the GDI, and the GEI and others such as the Human Poverty Index. Initially, he argued that the Commonwealth Secretariat should develop the YDI as a tool to be used in the evaluation of the status of youth development across the 54 countries of the Commonwealth.

He alluded to the fact that gender issues and gender-based research have gained prominence in recent times while research relating to youth is still in a “nascent stage”.

Accordingly, he felt that the YDI could throw light upon the situation of young people, fulfill the requirements of research on youth issues and eventually, contribute toward improving the lot of youth. Carter (1999) who has recognized the virtues of the YDI has also addressed these issues.

### **3. Youth Empowerment: The Impact of the Commonwealth Secretariat**

In the context of the Commonwealth, youth empowerment emerged as a guiding principle in the 1995 CYMM in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. In 1998, a Commonwealth Plan of Action on Youth Empowerment (PAYE) was developed and formally approved at the Commonwealth Youth Ministers Meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

The birth of the PAYE meant that Commonwealth governments had access to a model that guided their efforts toward developing and securing a set of enabling conditions that would, in turn, facilitate empowerment among young men and women.

#### **3.1 The PAYE**

The PAYE recognizes the significance of enabling conditions that assume the following forms:

- (a) the promotion of economic and material bases that are consistent with youth empowerment
- (b) the establishment of mechanisms that will enhance political will, facilitate the allocation of resources and foster the adoption of critical legal and administrative frameworks
- (c) the development of attitudes and practices that are consistent with equality, democracy and peace and,
- (d) the dissemination of knowledge, information, skills and values.

#### **3.2 The Youth Development Index (YDI)**

In order to enhance the significance of the PAYE, the CYP felt that it was necessary to develop a monitoring and evaluation tool. It was expected that such a tool would assume the form of a framework of indicators that could be referred to as the Youth Development Index (YDI).

- From the standpoint of the Secretariat, the YDI is considered to be a framework that provides measurement for the purpose of evaluating changes in the status of youth development at human, institutional and national levels

- It assumes the form of statistical measures such as counts, indicators and indices that permit assessments of changes in the status of attributes pertaining to youth and captured at the three levels under review.

#### 4. Proposed Outcomes of the YDI

*Table I - Substantive Areas for the Measurement of Youth Empowerment*

<b>Substantive Areas</b>	
1.	The Acquisition of Wealth
2.	The Pursuit of Education and Training
3.	Labour Market Activities
4.	Personal and Reproductive Health
5.	Family Life and Living Arrangements
6.	Substance Use including Abuse and Addiction
7.	Technology and its Impact upon the Link between the Labour Market, Education and Training

8.	Social Relations across Gender, Age, Socio-Economic Status, Disability Status, Race/Ethnic background
9.	Longevity of Life
10.	<p>Social Services, Opportunities and Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Availability</li> <li>- Knowledge</li> <li>- Attitudes</li> <li>- Access</li> <li>- Utilization</li> <li>- Perception</li> </ul>

***Table II – The Ten Action Points of the PAYE***

1.	To develop and implement measures to provide the economic enfranchisement of young people and their participation in the economy
2.	To strengthen support systems and collaborate key stakeholders in youth empowerment
3.	To develop and strengthen youth ministries/departments, national youth policies and legislative and constitutional provisions impacting upon youth affairs
4.	To promote positive national models and self images for young people and foster their senses of responsibility and self esteem
5.	To promote the full participation of young people in decision making at all levels, including communities and local provincial and national governments
6.	To take affirmative and direct action to establish gender equity for all young people, and equality of treatment and outcome for youth in special circumstances
7.	To promote a democratic, stable and peaceful environment in which the human rights of young people as defined in international covenants are fully implemented

	and in which they can fully accept their responsibilities
8.	To engage in action for the development and maintenance of human resources and intellectual capital
9.	To adopt measures to improve access to information and communications technology (ICT) and provide young people with the skills to make use of it
10.	To pursue measures to broaden youth participation in sporting and cultural activities as a means of promoting positive values and advancing human development

*Table III – Selected Dimensions to Measure Institutional Activism*

<b>Dimensions of Institutional Agencies' Activism</b>
The medium of format through which an action or activity is undertaken (i.e. how the action or activity in question reaches the beneficiary)
The frequency of delivery (i.e. weekly, monthly, bimonthly, quarterly, annually, etc.)
Duration of activity/action when delivered
The prevalence of youth initiative in the formulation and implementation of an activity or action
Longevity (i.e. how long has the action/ activity been delivered in its current format)
Youth representation/ participation in the activity according to key social characteristics and level of involvement
Selection of criteria for youth participation

The last set of indicators relate to those captured at the national level. Some of the principal arenas that have been the focus of attention by the Commonwealth Secretariat include the following:

1. National prosperity, economic competitiveness and reduced unemployment
2. An educated skilled workforce
3. A just and equitable society
4. Good governance and,
5. The building of peace and positive values in society.

## **5. Data Collection Options in the Commonwealth Caribbean**

### **5.1 Censuses**

Since 1960, these censuses have been conducted every ten years in most Caribbean Countries.

Between 1990 and 1992, twelve Commonwealth Caribbean nations and the dependent territory of Montserrat undertook censuses.

Most of these countries propose to conduct new rounds of censuses between 2000 and 2002. The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago has already completed enumeration in connection with the Y2K census.

In the context of its young people, the government of Barbados, through its Ministry of Education and Youth Affairs, has commissioned an annual census of its youthful population. This exercise feeds into youth policy processes in Barbados and assists efforts geared toward greater precision in targeting.

- The inquiry is also instrumental insofar as it provides a longitudinal basis for conducting trend studies to determine variations in the experiences of different cohorts of young people with respect to these individual and group attributes that provide a means of assessing access to condition and opportunity across time.

### **5.2 Sample Surveys**

### 5.2.1 Routine Surveys

Routine sample surveys and ad hoc surveys are additional mechanisms for data gathering to meet the needs of the proposed YDI framework. Efficiently executed sample surveys constitute a reliable medium for obtaining estimates that could be used to benchmark and set targets. They are among the most appropriate approaches for gathering data on characteristics, attitudes, behaviour and experiences to address concerns akin to human resources development, living conditions, sexual and reproductive health, recreation and leisure and the delivery of social services.

- In Jamaica, for example, the Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions has been conducted annually since 1988 and is perhaps, one of the most successful undertakings of its kind in developing countries. Similar inquiries have been conducted in Trinidad and Tobago, Grenada, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, St. Lucia, Barbados and Belize, but with variable degrees of regularity and success.
- Other social surveys such as household budgetary surveys and labour force surveys are routinely conducted over fixed intervals and yield valuable data. This is evident in countries such as Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago. There is also evidence suggesting that these surveys have been undertaken in countries such as St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Grenada.

Since there are several factors threatening the sustainability of these efforts in the latter set of countries, a region-wide institutional strengthening programme should be established to formulate and implement methodologies and bring into fruition the requisite inputs to realize such critical data.

- Data can also be obtained from ad hoc surveys that target concerns such as housing, recreation and leisure, fertility behaviour, personal health and specific attributes of special sub-populations. Examples in Trinidad and Tobago, Belize and Jamaica
- A number of different agencies including research units, government departments and NGOs have attempted to gauge literacy in countries such as Jamaica, St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago
- More specifically, some countries undertook national youth surveys in a relatively spontaneous manner during the 1990s. This was the case in Barbados (1992), Trinidad and Tobago (1994), Grenada (1995) and St. Lucia (1998) and permitted these countries to obtain a broad range of indicators on a wide cross-section of issues relating to the social development status of youth.

All in all, these developments suggest that countries can learn from the experiences of one another insofar as background materials and operational processes have already been

tried and tested in some settings. Modification and replication in other settings become possible especially when deemed essential to serve country-specific needs.

Unlike the routine surveys that are conducted annually, a process could be established to conduct ad hoc surveys, particularly those pertaining to youth, at regular intervals say every three to five years.

This, however, hinges upon the political will of policy-makers, the technical will of technocrats in the respective statistical, research and planning units, and financial constraints within public arenas.

### **5.3 Existing Data**

This kind of data is useful for the development of indicators whether they relate to specific sub-populations of youth or to specific institutional settings. In the case of the former, useful data may be stored in the departmental records of the Ministries responsible for Education, Labour, Welfare and Youth Activities. In the case of the latter, provision ought to be made for the collection of data on programmes and related activities that cater directly and indirectly to the needs of young people. At the national level, archival data could provide useful means for developing composite indices of youth developmental status. Such indicators might be considered to be analogous to the HDI and the GDI, only that they focus specifically upon youthful populations. Such a thrust would rely upon empirical work rooted in factor analytical techniques.

## **6. Quantitative versus Qualitative Traditions and the YDI**

1. The YDI is deemed to be a yardstick for measuring youth empowerment. From an epistemological standpoint, measurement hinges upon a reliance on quantitative inputs. An index is invariably a quantitative phenomenon that could only be derived on the basis of quantitative methods and techniques. Quantitative methods and techniques are associated with the use of statistics that are essential ingredients in the derivation of an index. Qualitative methods and techniques, on the other hand, are concerned with unearthing dimensions and themes as they relate to phenomena that are the focus of inquiry.
2. While the development of an index is implicitly a quantitative pursuit, there is room for qualitative inputs in the development of the YDI. This makes a strong case for triangulation especially when qualitative phenomena are to be evaluated quantitatively insofar as they can only be observed indirectly on the basis of qualitative responses that can be quantified. Before such indirect observations can be made, in-depth interviews with key informants and focus group sessions could provide bases for enhancing the validity of the items selected as a basis for capturing the various dimensions of phenomena that are central to youth empowerment. The qualitative inputs also provide a basis for reducing errors due to specification and measurement as one strives to develop quantitative mechanisms to tap qualitative attributes. In sum, the

relevance of qualitative insights to this point is principally to enhance the validity of the quantitative measurement tool that will likely be established to gauge youth empowerment. The reliability of the input data is purely a quantitative pursuit. Altogether, the reliability of the input data and the validity of the overall measurement instrument are critical virtues in enhancing the quality of the YDI as a yardstick for gauging youth empowerment.

3. At the other end of the spectrum, purely qualitative research designs could be embraced as a means of evaluating the substance of findings emanating from the purely quantitative results that would emerge out of the YDI in its purest sense. It is in this context that the true essence of a triangulated process becomes manifest.
4. In sum, the YDI is primarily a quantitative tool but there is room for qualitative insights. The process has to consider an all-embracing epistemological framework that has a critical function in enhancing and reinforcing data quality using the tenets and strengths of the two research traditions.

## **7. Prospective Challenges in the Commonwealth Caribbean**

- 1 The census data provide a mechanism for benchmarking and extrapolating to monitor the effects of activities that have been implemented to enhance the lot of specific target populations.
2. There is also a need for many of the countries to undertake rigid technical evaluations of their vital statistics since they feature prominently in the estimation of mid-year populations.
- 3 With respect to migration patterns, there is a paucity of data of satisfactory quality. This is especially important in the context of youthful populations insofar as they are predisposed to a substantial amount of mobility whether to seek and obtain employment, to pursue further education and training, to leave home, or to enter into marriage or some kind of union. Special efforts have to be made to provide a continuous basis for assessing migration, not only in terms of stocks but also in terms of pattern.
- 4 Another critical area of concern is the capacity of countries to develop relevant indicators of young people's status in small spatial domains. Several of the countries could benefit from the use of Win R+; a software application developed by CELADE in Santiago, Chile and capable of providing a basis for the generation of indicators and the conduct of analyses at small spatial levels.
5. Except for Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, Grenada and St. Lucia, there have been no known accounts of efforts to undertake quantitative surveys

that throw light upon young people, their characteristics, attitudes, experiences, behaviour and expectations; attributes deemed to be instrumental in determining variable outcomes associated with access to conditions and opportunities.

6. To be of any significance, these inquiries should be pursued every five years targeting individuals between the ages of 10 and 29. The process should be designed in a manner that would permit panel studies of young persons as they progress through different stages in their lives, for example, 10-14, 15-19, 20-24 and 25-29.
7. While this type of approach is amenable to efforts to evaluate the effect of action and observe change with respect to indicators associated with specific cohorts of individuals, the main challenge is that there is a dearth of such training in the Commonwealth Caribbean region.
8. A sustainable process of training and internship has to be embarked upon by suitably qualified personnel from the Caribbean region or internationally in order to accomplish this feat.
9. At national levels and within specific sub-national domains of interest to countries, it is worthwhile to consider the development of a “youth status index” (YSI) that will represent a composite measure of the overall status of young people according to specific age groups, say 10-14, 15-19, 20-24 and 25-29.
10. Such a measure is likely to assume the form of a linear combination of dimensions that reflect levels of education, health, living conditions, labour market experiences and involvement in processes of governance.
  - a. Age specific items will be identified as being associated with these dimensions and will provide a basis for measurement
  - b. It is proposed that empirical processes relying principally upon factor analysis will be used to perform the necessary analyses. Much of the data should be core items that can be obtained from reliable data sources. Where necessary, data collection processes can be modified to ensure that the core items permit assessment of the dimensions of interest.

## **8. Concluding Remark**

The Commonwealth Secretariat has provided a framework for member countries to embark upon programmes leading to the establishment of National Youth Policies by the year 2000. The development of such policies rely upon existing country-specific statistics, for which, there will undoubtedly be gaps. In the Caribbean Sub-Region as elsewhere in the Commonwealth, emergent national policy statements are expected to spawn questions that require answers based upon the availability of a set of relevant

indicators. In addition, the prescriptions inherent in such policy statements are expected to consist of different sets of goals and objectives that link important concepts deemed to be important in the context of the human development of young people and the structures that shape and influence their lives. These concepts might be operationalized at several different levels including the youth sub-population, the community, government departments and the different arms of civil society administering youth programmes, and at the national level.

**Acknowledgments:** This paper incorporates thoughts and ideas developed in work that I am currently pursuing under the auspices of the Commonwealth Secretariat. I am indebted to the staff of the Commonwealth Youth Programme in London and the four Regions of the Commonwealth for a number of the thoughts and ideas that have found their way into this paper. Several other individuals through different processes of consultation have made contributions directly and indirectly. I am also indebted to them.

## **References**

Bhagbanprakash (1999). 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Development Challenges. Commonwealth Youth Programme, Asia Centre, Commonwealth Secretariat.

Camejo (1997). 1990-1991 Population and Housing Census of the Commonwealth Caribbean: Socio-Economic Conditions of Children and Youth in Caricom Countries: A Situational; Analysis, Caribbean Community Secretariat.

Carter (1999) The Research Driven Approach as an Imperative in Youth Programme Development, Youth Division, Ministry of Education and Youth Affairs, Barbados.

Del Valle Irala, T. and Puerta Gil C (1999). New Methodologies for Calculating the HDI. Paper presented at the First Global Forum on Human Development. 29-31 July, 1999, New York.

Sen Amrita (1999). Keynote Speech: A Decade of Human Development. Paper presented at the First Global Forum on Human Development. 29-31 July, 1999, New York.

Wieringa (1999). Women's Empowerment in Japan: Towards an Alternative Index on Gender Equality. Paper presented at the First Global Forum on Human Development. 29-31 July 1999, New York.

## ***The UNESCO Youth Development Index***

**Author:** Julio Jacob

**Presenter:** Jacqueline Groth

**Affiliation:** UNESCO

### **I . BACKGROUND OF THE BRAZILIAN CONTEXT**

The publication of the 2003 Human Development Report, of which many are proud, made it possible for us to see that Brazil's position improved in the past year. Among 175 countries in the world, Brazil went from ranking 69th to ranking 64th. Over the last decade, the country has moved ten ranking positions upward. Credit for this progress may be given to the increase in registration rates in the educational field, to the increase in the longevity of the population due to advances in the area of health and to the progress, however moderate, made in terms of overcoming illiteracy. Only in relation to the economy was data not positive. While the *per capita* income increased 1.2% on average in the world, in Brazil this increase only reached 0.6%. In other developing countries, on average, the *per capita* income increased 2.3%, and this caused Brazil to fall behind in this area. The Gini Index, which measures the concentration of income, was not encouraging either. In this respect, Brazil is in the 6th worst position, the Gini Index only having been judged better than that in Namibia, Botswana, Swaziland, the Central-African Republic and Sierra Leone.

What can be said about the situation of development indexes related to our youths? In fact, international research is not available so we can compare our results to those in the rest of the world. There is also no history of this type of research in the country so we can verify which aspects have improved and which have remained the same over the past few years.

We already know, however, judging by the close relation between the GDP in the HDI and the Family Income of youths used as an indicator for this study, that we cannot hope for much improvement in terms of the economic situation of our youths in the short term. It is also not probable that the poverty and social exclusion that affect great portions of our youth will subside due to the high levels of income concentration in the country, which have persisted over the years. As demonstrated over the course of this study, this polarization in the distribution of income has created extreme differences in the forms of access to several basic social benefits like education and health. This reinforces the vulnerability of great

<sup>1</sup> Coordinator of the UNESCO Antenna Office of Recife

**The UNESCO Youth Development Index**

2

segments of the population – low-income whites, blacks and mixed-race individuals – and of geographic locations like the North and Northeast, which have been historically disfavored.

Since 1997, UNESCO-Brazil has carried out research and studies on the theme 'youth', focusing on different areas and dimensions currently related to Brazilian youths: education, culture, health, work, poverty, citizenship and identity. During these past few years, the fact that youths are now a population group which is particularly vulnerable to the social and economic problems of the country has been widely acknowledged by researchers and government authorities. Youth-related issues are now more present in the agenda of planners and, although still scarcely, in the outlines of public policies.

The several studies developed by UNESCO in Brazil on that topic are intended to map-out situations and perceptions, so as recommendations for the several types of social groups that today constitutes the Brazilian youth segment (over 35 million people).

The creation of the YDI is undoubtedly a unique contribution for the definition of focus areas for planning and developing social policies for youths. Its greatest quality, however, is the fact that its establishment and continuation over the next few years might make it possible for the situation of our youths and its evolvement to be monitored. It will be possible to point out the advances, critical aspects and places where this group is more exposed to situations of vulnerability and social exclusion, and this will serve as a basis for decision-making and for the evaluation of social policies.

## **II. WHY A YOUTH DEVELOPMENT INDEX (YDI)?**

Created by economists Amartya Sen and Mahbub ul Haq, the Human Development Index replaced the indicator used until then to measure the development of countries: the *per capita* GDP. The HDI measures the degree of development of a nation considering not only the GDP but also *life expectancy* (the number of years a newborn is expected to live), *access to knowledge* (adult literacy rates and combined registration rates for primary, secondary and higher education) and *access to basic services* that give people dignified life conditions, like sanitation.

The inclusion of these dimensions is the representation of a change in the concept of development from a merely economic point of view to a broader perspective.

Many authors refer to this change as the human development paradigm.

The indicators used in the establishment of the HDI are of equal importance for the evaluation. So that they can be combined into a single index, they are first made

### **The UNESCO Youth Development Index**

3

into partial indexes. The combination of these indexes, which are looked at as being at the same level of importance, generates the synthetic indicator.

The formulation of the YDI followed a model similar to that of the HDI.

Nevertheless, this model was adapted to express issues that are specific to youths and to show the configuration of these issues in relation to the situation in Brazil.

In the HDI, the average of the partial indexes results in the final index, which varies from 0 to 1. The closer the index is to 1, the greater the level of human development in the country or region. The same procedure was used to evaluate the YDI in the Federative Units.

## **III. WHICH YOUTH?**

Before we move on to the presentation of results, we need to define the concept of youth which guided this work. Youth was limited to the 15 to 24 age group and characterized as (...) *the process of preparation for individuals to take on the role of adults in society, both at the family level and at the professional level*<sup>11</sup>.

Analyses carried out previously pointed out the specificities within this age group according to the presence of youths in socially defined activities (work and school). This made it possible for the age group to be divided into three subgroups: 15 to 17, 18 to 19 and 20 to 24 years of age. It also made it possible for four situations to be considered. They were defined by Filgueira and Fuentes as follows<sup>2</sup>:

- **Youths that study and do not work:** typically, youths in this situation are economically dependent and live with their parents. This combination, according to the authors, is more common among youths who are not from low-income families, who are single and live with their family.
- **Youths that work and study:** this phase characterizes a transition between youth and adulthood.
- **Youths that work and do not study** (having dropped out of school): this phase characterizes the configuration of adult roles.
- **Youths that do not work and do not study:** this category characterizes youths in a very serious situation of social exclusion once it demonstrates the failure of the “transition phase” that is youth: the individual is becoming unattached from his roles as a young person but cannot include himself socially in order to play the roles of an adult.

<sup>2</sup> ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN. *Panorama Social de América Latina 2000*. Santiago de Chile: CEPAL, 2000. Apud ABRAMOVAY, Miriam *et alii*. *Juventude, Violência e Vulnerabilidade Social na América Latina: Desafios para Políticas Públicas*. Brasília: UNESCO, IDB, p. 45.

#### **The UNESCO Youth Development Index**

4

#### **IV. THE METHODOLOGY**

The basic purpose of the construction of the Youth Development Index was to identify the precise localities, aspects and degrees of inequality that affect Brazilian youth. Moreover, the adoption of the Index being proposed and its replication along time will afford a view of the evolution of the various factors that affect, either positively or negatively, the present life and the future of our youth.

The basic indicators were constructed in the following manner:

- **Illiteracy**, percentage of illiterate persons in the 15-24 bracket, relative to the total population in that same age bracket. Source: PNAD 2001.
- **Appropriate schooling**, percentage of 15-24 year old youths who attend Highschools or Colleges, relative to the total population in that same age bracket. Source: PNAD 2001.
- **Quality of education**, Standardized mean<sup>1</sup> of the proficiency scales in the 8th grade of Fundamental Education and in the 3rd grade of High schools, in the Portuguese and Mathematics subjects. Source: SAEB 2001.
- **Mortality due to internal causes**, rate of deaths of 15-24 year olds in every 100.000 youths attributed to internal causes, according to the definition adopted in the International Classification of Diseases – ICD-10 – Source: SIM 2000.
- **Mortality due to violent causes**, rate of deaths of 15-24 year olds in every 100.000 youths caused by violence (suicides, motor vehicle accidents and homicides, according to the definition adopted in the International Classification of Diseases – ICD-10 – Source: SIM 2000.
- **Per capita family income**, amount of the monthly family income divided by the number of family members of youths between 15 and 24 years of age. Source: PNAD 2001.

These six indicators were combined in order to structure the three partial indexes: education, health and income, which jointly constitute the Youth Development

Index.

The three dimensions selected were the ones that assessed the peculiarities of youths and at the same time measured the degrees of exclusion and social integration of this group. The dimensions used to calculate the YDI and its respective indicators were the following:

**The UNESCO Youth Development Index**

5

**a) Education**, *formed by three indicators:*

- *Illiteracy.* Literacy has been vastly recognized as a determining factor in an individual's social and economic situation. It could not have been left out, therefore, of the group of basic indicators of the YDI. Although it was relevant that several spheres of literacy be approached (functional, prose, documental, quantitative), the operational concept defined by the National Household Survey (PNAD) was used for this study. According to this definition, *people who can read and write at least a simple note in the language they know*<sup>4</sup> are classified as literate. Operationally, it was defined as the relation between the number of illiterate individuals aged 15 to 24 registered by the National Household Survey and the population aged 15 to 24 in a given Federative Unit.

- *Adequate schooling.* This indicator is related to the combined schooling rates used for the HDI. This rate is based on the sum of registration rates in all levels of schooling<sup>5</sup>. It replaces the option used for the Municipal HDI, which utilizes 'attendance rates', also considering all levels of schooling, instead of registration rates<sup>6</sup>. Here, like for the Municipal HDI, attendance rates were used, but this use was limited to the schooling levels that correspond to the age group targeted by this study (15 to 24 years of age). According to the Ministry of Education, students should be attending high school from 15 to 17 years of age and, under regular circumstances, a youth should finish college at around 22. Based on this premise, the *adequate* schooling rate is determined based on the number of youths attending high school and higher educational levels. Thus, this indicator does not include youths aged 15 to 24 still enrolled in primary education. The operational definition of this indicator is the following: it is the percentage of youths aged 15 to 24 attending high school or higher education classes according to the National Household Survey 2001 in relation to the population aged 15 to 24 in a given Federative Unit.

- *Quality of education:* no corresponding indicator in the HDI. Just as important as the quantitative aspects of coverage that are part of the HDI are the aspects that indicate the quality of access to knowledge. It is probable that this aspect was not included in the HDI because there are not many countries in the world that have the evaluation tools that make it possible for the quality of education to be assessed in a systematic manner. Since 1990, Brazil has had a national system to assess the quality of education, the Basic Education Evaluation System (SAEB), developed by the National Institute for Educational Studies and Research (INEP) of the Ministry of Education. Therefore, it was deemed convenient for this indicator to be considered within the educational index. Every two years, the SAEB gives Portuguese and Mathematics tests to sample groups of students in the 4th and in the 8th grade and to high school seniors. The results of these tests are made public through a single scale for all grades ranging from 150 to 500 points. For the establishment of the YDI, the available grades that corresponded to the target age group were selected: the 8th grade and the last year of high school. This indicator has been operationally defined as the standardized average<sup>7</sup> of proficiency scales

for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade and for the last year of high school in the areas of Portuguese and  
**The UNESCO Youth Development Index**

6

Mathematics assessed by the Basic Education Evaluation System – SAEB 2001.

b) **Health**, formed by two indicators:

- Deaths from internal causes. This refers to the deaths of youths that result from problems that negatively affect their physical health. According to an analysis of the Ministry of Health itself made available by the Informatics Department of the Single Health System, the causes of more than 80% of the deaths of this type among youths would be perfectly 'avoidable'<sup>8</sup>. This means that these deaths occur despite the existence of health coverage and possibilities of treatment. This shows, when mortality rates are high, that public services are frail and that there is a lack of policies so youths will have access to health services. This indicator is closely related not only to poverty but also, especially, to the possibility of access to social services. In operational terms, this indicator was based on the number of deaths from internal causes per 100,000 youths aged 15 to 24 registered in the database of the Information System on Mortality (SIM) of the Ministry of Health.
- Violent deaths. The selection of this indicator is due to a specific characteristic of youth nowadays: the vulnerability of youths to violence in Latin American countries. This indicator was established by adding the number of deaths per 100,000 youths by homicide, suicide and traffic accidents registered in the year 2000 in the Information System on Mortality (SIM) of the Ministry of Health.

c) **Income**

- *Per capita family income*. This is the corresponding item to the *per capita* GDP used for the HDI. It is the total monthly income of the family of youths aged 15 to 24, according to their answers to the 2001 National Household Survey, in relation to the number of people in this group. In order to make it possible to compare current data to future data, the monthly income is shown in minimum salaries. The minimum salary in 2001 was R\$180,00 (aprox. US\$ 60,00). For the establishment of the YDI, the original rates, averages or percentages of basic indicators were changed into indexes according to the same procedures utilized for the HDI:

**Index** =  $\frac{\text{Value observed} - \text{Minimum Value}}{\text{Maximum Value} - \text{Minimum Value}}$

---

*Maximum Value – Minimum Value*

Based on these dimensions, the following parameters were used for the establishment of the YDI:

**The UNESCO Youth Development Index**

7

**Indicators Limitations Proportion of  
the indicator**

**within the  
dimension**

**Proportion of the  
dimension within the  
YDI**

**DIMENSIONS/INDICATORS**

**Minimum**

**0**

**Maximum**

**1**

**EDUCATION**

**0**

**1**

Illiteracy 20% 0% 1/3  
 Adequate schooling 10% 50% 1/3  
 Quality of education 0 1 1/3  
 Portuguese, 8th grade 194,0 277,6 ¼\*  
 1/3  
 Mathematics, 8th grade 200,8 286,4 ¼\*  
 Portuguese, Senior year 213,7 313,9 ¼\*  
 Mathematics, Senior year  
 219,4 339,9 ¼\*

**HEALTH 0 1**

Deaths from internal causes 100 0 ½  
 Violent deaths  
 200 0 ½  
 1/3

**INCOME 0 1**

Per capita family income 0,5 3,5 1/3 1/3

\*proportion of the variable within the indicator

**V. COMPARISON BETWEEN THE YDI AND THE HDI**

The last study published dealing with the Human Development Index in Brazil, discriminated by federative units dates from 1996<sup>3</sup>. In spite of the fact that study is outdated, it was deemed convenient to carry out a correlational study comparing the YDI with the HDI.

Both indexes present a strong association:  $R=0.786$ , and this association is nearly perfect ( $R=0.956$ ) when the educational indexes of both the HDI and the YDI are compared. This strong association means that the educational indexes for the population in general, estimated by the HDI, and the educational indexes for the young segment of this population present a marked correlation. In analyzing each of the components of this dimension, we can see that there also exists a close correspondence between the HDI and the YDI, which is almost perfect regarding the illiteracy issue.

<sup>3</sup> UNITED NATION DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME/IPEA. *Relatório sobre o Desenvolvimento Humano no Brasil*. Brasília, 1996.

**The UNESCO Youth Development Index**

8

**Table - Comparison between HDI and YDI**

**HDI YDI R**

HDI YDI 0,786  
 Education Index Education Index 0,956  
 Life Expectancy Index Health Index 0,032  
 GDP Index Income Index 0,845  
 Illiteracy Illiteracy 0,955  
 Combined enrolment Adequate enrolment 0,742  
 Education Quality of education 0,785  
 Life Expectancy Mortality by internal causes 0,446  
 Life Expectancy Mortality by violent causes -0,212  
 GDP Per Capita family income 0,845

The correspondence between the GDP index of the HDI and the Income index of the YDI is also high ( $R=0.845$ ). But the area that present the lowest degree of association, that could be viewed as an area of almost absolute independence between the two indexes, concerns health. Indeed, the association between the Life Expectancy Index of the HDI and the Health Index of the YDI practically does not exist ( $R=0.032$ ). If juvenile mortality due to internal causes still presents a moderate correspondence to the Life Expectancy Index of the HDI ( $R=0.446$ ), juvenile deaths due to violence present a low and negative association ( $R=0.212$ ). How is that possible? It its presence in the YDI still justifiable?

As demonstrated in previous UNESCO publications on youth, the evolution of juvenile mortality patterns in Brazil presents strong contrasts to the mortality patterns of the population in general. *If the global mortality rate of the Brazilian population fell from 663 for each 100,000 inhabitants, in 1990, to 573, in 2000, the rate referring to youths rose from 123 to 133 in that same period.* That is, whereas the life expectancy for the population in general (an indicator used by the HDI) improved during recent decades, the life expectancy of the young population worsened due, basically, to deaths caused by violent factors.

This fact becomes even clearer in view of other findings of the Brazilian YDI study, showing that the escalate of violence that took place in recent decades affects exclusively young victims. Based on this data, it is possible to conclude that juvenile deaths due to violent causes represent one of the few indicators that are specific and differentiated regarding Brazilian youth. For that reason, in spite of the discrepancy regarding the HDI, it was decided that this indicator would be used in the YDI composition, which made the YDI a frequently used instrument by Brazilian institutions and media as a legitimate UN reference for youth development.

Contact:

Mr. Julio Jacobo

E-mail: [Julio.jacobo@unesco.org.br](mailto:Julio.jacobo@unesco.org.br)

UNESCO in Brazil

SAS - QUADRA 5 - BL. H - LOTE 6

ED. CNPq/IBICT/UNESCO 9º ANDAR

70070-914

BRASÍLIA – DF

#### **Appendix 4**

### **Successes and Challenges to be learnt from the Human Development**

## **Index (HDI) model**

**Author:** Santosh Mehrotra

**Affiliation:** Regional Adviser, Poverty and Governance, Asia, UNDP

This paper is structured around three main areas namely:

1. How is the HDI calculated
2. YDI technical proposal
3. Data issues: HDR data problems as a user (not producer) of data

### **1. How is the HDI calculated**

### **2. YDI Technical Proposal (TP) : Methodological and Conceptual Issues around the current form of the proposal, and its current implementation in Brazil**

1. HDI has been extended to one half of the population – women – in the GDI. But the extension is to all ages of women, not just one group of women, unlike in the YDI. It is entirely unclear what is new that we learn about *youth* from the YDI as proposed in the TP. Therefore, it might be better to focus the proposal on determining a good list of indicators that will truly reflect the situation and problems that youth face.
2. Income: three issues around the income measure in the TP:
  - A. When you study income and consumption theory in economics, one of the first things you learn about is the Life Cycle of income and consumption. Young people have lower incomes than older people; but that is only as it should be: you acquire more experience, you accumulate human capital, you are worth more, your income is higher. So suppose the data was to allow us to determine what the incomes of youth are – itself an assumption – and you find out that youth incomes are lower, does that tell you something you did not already know? And if you feed that data into a YDI, you will obviously get a number that suggests that youth are doing worse than the rest of the population! But can you base your youth advocacy on that income figure?

- B. A similar logic holds for unemployment rates being higher for youths – to the extent that unemployment rates generally are believable, and worth taking seriously in developing countries (an issue I will return to in a minute). The YDI proposal points out that: “Unemployment can be described as a serious issue estimated at 88 million in 2003 up from 58 million in 1995. Young people generally account for 41% of the World’s unemployed, however, this figure can be as high as 50 - 70 percent in some developing countries.”

Unemployment rates are to be taken seriously in countries where the share of formal sector employment is very high. In the rich Commonwealth countries (Australia, Britain, Canada, New Zealand), where the formal sector is dominant, youth unemployment may be higher – but this is merely the reflection of the life-cycle theory of income/consumption. Those with the least skills/human capital will be employed last and fired first. But in the vast majority of Commonwealth countries, the formal sector of employment is so marginal that most youth, and most of the population is either in informal employment or agriculture.<sup>1</sup> The poor in such countries cannot be unemployed, otherwise they will not survive. Hence open unemployment rates are low; though people are underemployed, with plenty of time on their hands. But if data was available, I would be very surprised if underemployment rates are higher for youth than for the rest of the population – simply because they are the physically fittest in the population; and since so much of the informal sector work in developing countries is unskilled, it is likely that they are the ones who are picked up for work first, before other older unskilled labour. Perhaps not the young women, but the young men would be picked up for work. So there might be gender dimension here.

“Statistics have shown that over 208 million (18%) of the 1.09 billion

young people globally (15-24 years old) survive on less than US \$1 (one) per day, and 515.1million (45%) on US\$2 (two) per day.” But young people are a high share of the total population in developing countries: that is a defining characteristic of underdevelopment, that a country is at an early stage of the demographic transition. But is the share of youths below a \$1 a day higher than their share in the population – that is questionable.

3. The education component of the HDI is already about youth, since it is youth who are at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education – not middle aged people. More importantly, consistently the data from developing countries suggests that as enrolments rise, it is the younger people who have higher literacy rates, and it is the younger people who have higher mean years of education than older people. That is only logical. Hence, a YDI which reveals that youth are actually doing much better than the rest of the population may not serve very well the purposes of youth advocates. And a YDI which has a high weight (0.35) for education, may actually be counter productive.
4. Health: it is true that youth suffer to a greater degree from HIV AIDS than other other sections of the population, so for *many* countries it might tip the YDI in the opposite direction that the education component might. Youth are likely to engage in unsafe sex. In South Asia because of early marriage and existing stereotypes around sexuality, young monogamous women are the most HIV affected. Youth also cannot easily access condoms in South Asia because of the judgmental attitude of service providers nor access counselling services in time to protect themselves from HIV/AIDS. In Africa because of the maturity of the AIDS epidemic orphans are exploding in numbers – orphans are often youth, or growing into becoming youth. So youth may naturally be healthier, but HIV AIDS may be seriously affecting their life expectancy.
5. Participation: There are two gender related indices that the HDR presents: GDI and GEM (Gender Empowerment Measure). GDI is simply the HDI for men and

---

<sup>1</sup> Caribbean countries may be collecting open unemployment perhaps because of the small size of the population/economy – but that still gives us no idea of the scale of underemployment in

for women, and shows discrimination based on population shares. But the Gender Empowerment Measure has some relevance for the YDI. It estimates *political participation*, as measured by women's and men's percentage share of parliamentary seats. Many people would have to be convinced as to why youth – 15-24 year olds, or even 30 year olds, should have their share in population reflected also in their share in parliamentary or even local body seats. Women are half the population, but why is it that only young people can represent young people? Also, do we want to entrust our law making authority to young people even proportionately, let disproportionately? Member states may have agreed to increase their representation in legislative bodies from current levels – but the issue is whether we are advocating for proportionality!

The GEM also reflects economic participation and decision-making power, as measured by two indicators – women's and men's percentage shares of positions as legislators, senior officials and managers, and women's and men's share of professional and technical positions. Now women are half the population, so disempowerment is often a violation of human rights. But are we all convinced that *senior* officials and managers should necessarily be young people? Is there not some contradiction here – some young people can be senior officials, but it is only logical that the young are not on average senior officials/managers.

Even if a member country was not interested in how youth are doing relative to the rest of the population, a YDI as currently proposed in the TP can only be of interest if data was available to estimate the YDI over a long period of time, going back into the past. In other words, a YDI could help establish how youth are doing – not in relation to the rest of the population – but in relation to themselves over a period of time. However, if the data does not permit this estimation going back in time, then we would establish the baseline today by estimating it for the last year, and then estimate it every year in the future, and wait for some years before the trend line could be established.

If the CYP wants to establish YDI estimates for each sub-region in a country, inter-spatial comparisons could be made, just as the HDI has been estimated for provinces or

---

those economies.

even districts in some countries. However, the fundamental issue still remains: as currently constituted, is it a helpful measure for youth advocates?

The conclusion appears to be that we still have to find the indicators that would reflect the true problems of youth. Having arrived at a set of indicators (as opposed to an Index), we can determine whether it would add value if an Index was constructed from those (or a subset) indicators. It may well be the case that the indicators we arrive at to assess the situation of youth are not those for which data is currently collected. New data may then have to be collected for such new indicators. For example, if the formal sector's share in employment is low, it is not open unemployment but rather under-employment that needs to be measured. Is data being collected on the scale of under-employment, which seriously affects both the youth as well as the rest of the population? Youth are often seen to be perpetrators of crimes; are data being collected on the crimes being committed by youth and their nature?

Data collection is an expensive exercise. Finding that data for many indicators for monitoring the World Summit for Children (1990) goals for children was not being collected in many countries or not frequently, UNICEF encouraged and financed the collection of data in regard to the survival, development and protection of children from the mid 1990s onwards. Tailor-made Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys were launched in a large number of countries. Can the CYP expect to find the resources or governments to find resources to now collect data on youth? It may be asking for too much from some governments, particularly when there are a large number of African countries where even censuses have not been carried out for a few decades. If new data is to be collected, perhaps youth-related modules could be added on to already planned and funded surveys (e.g. the Demographic and Health Surveys, or Living Standards Measurements Surveys).

### **3. DATA ISSUES with the HDR**

In the 14 years of its publication, the Human Development Report has faced many issues around data quality. Discrepancies between national and international estimates for some

of the indicators constantly pose questions, however, on the accuracy and reliability of data presented in the HDR, and cast doubt on the Report's overall statistical credibility. Such discrepancies are often brought to light

through government complaints around the launch of the Report to the Human Development

Report Office (HDRO) or UNDP Country Offices: sometimes the data gap in an international data series is contested and a national estimate is claimed to be available; but more frequently, the accuracy of the international estimate is questioned and a different national estimate is proposed.

The HDRO has found itself, more frequently than before, in a difficult situation of having its credibility challenged, and having to explain the inconsistency between national data and the international data provided by other international agencies. It works increasingly between international data agencies and national governments, seeking clarifications, providing technical explanations and facilitating communications and coordination between the two.

Fortunately, many of these cases in fact have turned to be constructive for improving data quality and understanding. There are cases where weaknesses in international series were discovered and corrected (e.g., gross enrolment ratio for Jordan and Armenia, and adult literacy rate for Belize); and cases where governments (as users of the HDR) were linked directly to the international agencies and its own data producers, and helped improve the data availability/transfer to international agencies (e.g., education indicators for Russia). However, the data discrepancy issue remains extensive, beyond the HDI and the HDR, and its increased implications for the HDR's statistical credibility demand a more systematic approach.

But, feedback from users of the HDR often indicates that many people have long-held misconceptions about the statistical principles and content of the Report. For example:

- Many users do not recognize that the HDR is a user, not a producer (except in the case of HDI and other composite indices), of the secondary statistics presented in the Report, hence, they place the direct blame for data problems on the HDRO;
- They do not realize that, to ensure minimum comparability across countries and for practical reasons, the HDR must rely on international data series produced by international agencies/organizations. Too often, when a discrepancy is uncovered, governments or UNDP Country Offices immediately request that the HDRO collect and compile data directly from national sources;
- Others fail to acknowledge that some differences are inevitable - national data may not conform to international standards and definitions or may be of poor quality and need to be adjusted; or that there is usually a time-lag (uneven across indicators) between national and international data availability; and
- Some governments do not seem to be fully informed of the regular procedures for incorporating national data into international series – a clear indication of the lack of coordination between national and international statistical agencies, as well as lack of coordination within a country's statistical system.

One solution suggested in HDRO is, identification of the problematic data areas that governments have concerns with, (through UNDP Country Offices) communicate the issues to the respective international data agencies, and help follow through the process to ensure the data problems are clarified or resolved.

The question is whether or not the Commonwealth Secretariat has the equivalents of UNDP country offices to help resolve these problems.



## COMMONWEALTH YOUTH PROGRAMME

### Inter-Agency Consultation on the Formulation and Development of Youth Development Index (YDI)

Commonwealth Secretariat,  
Marlborough House, London  
11 - 12 July, 2005

#### *List of Participants – 13 July 2005*

Agency	Name	Designation	Address	Telephone	E-mail
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Regional Centre in Bangkok	Mr Santosh Mehrotra	Regional Adviser	Poverty and Governance, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Regional Centre in Bangkok, 3rd Floor, UN Service Building, Rajdamnern Nok Avenue, Bangkok, Thailand	00 66 (2) 288 2736	<a href="mailto:santosh.mehrotra@undp.org">santosh.mehrotra@undp.org</a>
German Technical Assistance (GTZ), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH	Mr Ingo Imhoff	Priority Area Manager	Children and Youth Department Health Education, Social Security, German Technical Assistance (GTZ), GmbH Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5, Postfach 5180 65760, Eschborn, Germany	00 49 6196 7980 1447	<a href="mailto:ingo.imhoff@gtz.de">ingo.imhoff@gtz.de</a>
United Nations	Mr Joop Theunissen	Focal Point on Youth	Division for Social Policy and Development DESA, United Nations Room DC2-1318 2 UN Plaza , New York, NY 10017, USA	00 1 212 963 7763	<a href="mailto:theunissen@un.org">theunissen@un.org</a>
World Bank	Ms Viviana Mangiaterra	Advisor Children and Youth	Human Development Network, World Bank, Room G7-053, Washington, USA	00 1 202 473 4502	<a href="mailto:vmangiatuerra@worldbank.org">vmangiatuerra@worldbank.org</a>
Universiti Putra Malaysia	Prof Turiman Suandi	Senior Fellow	Institute for Community and Peace Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Malaysia	00 603 8946 8247	<a href="mailto:tdpp@educ.upm.edu.my">tdpp@educ.upm.edu.my</a>
UNESCO	Ms Jacqueline Groth		Section for Youth/Section pour la Jeunesse, Bureau of Strategic Planning-Bureau de la Planification Strategique, UNESCO 7 Place de Fontenoy 75352, Paris 07 SP, France	00 33 1 45 68 17 09	<a href="mailto:j.groth@unesco.org">j.groth@unesco.org</a>
University of the West Indies	Dr Godfrey St Bernard	Senior Lecturer	University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad & Tobago	001 868 776 4768	<a href="mailto:gstbernard@tsst.net.tt">gstbernard@tsst.net.tt</a>
United Nations Volunteers Programme	Ms Ruby Sandhu-Rojon	Chief	Africa Section, United Nations Volunteers Programme, Postfach 260 111, D-53153 Bonn, Germany	00 49 228 815 2001	<a href="mailto:Ruby.sandhu-rojon@unv.org">Ruby.sandhu-rojon@unv.org</a>
University of Guyana	Dr Paulette Bynoe	Lecturer II	Environmental Studies Unit, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Guyana, Turkeyen Campus, P.O. Box 10-1110, Georgetown, Guyana	00 592 222 4180	<a href="mailto:bynoep2000@yahoo.com">bynoep2000@yahoo.com</a>

Agency	Name	Designation	Address	Telephone	E-mail
<b>Commonwealth Organisations</b>					
Commonwealth Youth Exchange Council	Mr Vic Craggs	Chief Executive	7 Lion Yard, Tremadoc Rd , London SW4 7NQ	00 44 20 7498 6151	<a href="mailto:vic@cyec.org.uk">vic@cyec.org.uk</a>
Commonwealth Youth Exchange Council	Ms Helen Jones	Deputy Chief Executive	7 Lion Yard, Tremadoc Rd, London SW4 7NQ	00 44 20 7498 6151	<a href="mailto:helen@cyec.org.uk">helen@cyec.org.uk</a>
Commonwealth Youth Exchange Council	Ms Alex Lowe	Exchanges Officer	7 Lion Yard, Tremadoc Rd, London SW4 7NQ	00 44 20 7498 6151	<a href="mailto:alex@cyec.org.uk">alex@cyec.org.uk</a>
Commonwealth Foundation	Mr Leo Bashyam	Chief Programme Officer	Marlborough Hse, Pall Mal, London SW1Y 5HX	00 44 20 7747 6570	<a href="mailto:l.bashyam@commonwealth.int">l.bashyam@commonwealth.int</a>
Royal Commonwealth Society	Ms Susannah Darch	Public Affairs Manager	8 Northumberland Ave, London WC2N 5BJ	00 44 20 7930 6733	<a href="mailto:Susannah.darch@rcsint.org">Susannah.darch@rcsint.org</a>
Commonwealth Policy Studies Unit	Mr Joseph Crost		c/o Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London, 28 Russell Square, London, WC1B 5DS, UK	079 665 5751/020 74316830	<a href="mailto:hurstcroft@hotmail.com">hurstcroft@hotmail.com</a>
Commonwealth Policy Studies Unit	Mr Kosi Quist		c/o Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London, 28 Russell Square, London, WC1B 5DS, UK	00 44 20 8558 1166	<a href="mailto:urshapaz@yahoo.com">urshapaz@yahoo.com</a>
The Open University	Ms Rajni Kumrai	Lecturer in Education	Faculty of Education & Language Studies, Centre for Educational Policy Leadership & Life-long Learning, The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom MK7 6AA	00 44 1908 652605	<a href="mailto:r.r.kumrai@open.ac.uk">r.r.kumrai@open.ac.uk</a>
<b>Consultant</b>					
	Mr Julian Jack	Legal Consultant	Flat C 16, Kenworthy Road, London E9 5TE	0779 1246 857/079 0326 0949	<a href="mailto:jackjulianj@hotmail.com">jackjulianj@hotmail.com</a>
	Ms Theresa Daniel	Consultant	19 Marlborough St, Hartlepool, Cleveland TS25 5RL, UK	01429298755	<a href="mailto:t.daniel@tees.ac.uk">t.daniel@tees.ac.uk</a>
	Dr Mbololwa Mbikusita-Lewanika	Consultant	Ground Floor Flat, 188 Clive Rd, West Dulwich, London SE21 8BS	00 44 20 8766 0024	<a href="mailto:m.mbikusita-lewanika@commonwealth.int">m.mbikusita-lewanika@commonwealth.int</a>
<b>Young People</b>					
National Youth Council, Zambia	Ms Mulako Mwanamwalye	Former Chair, Commonwealth Youth Caucus	c/o 22 Middleton Crescent, Norwich NR5 0PX, Norwich NR5 0PX UK	0790 622 8011	<a href="mailto:mulakom@yahoo.co.uk">mulakom@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Student - Singapore	Mr Charles Chao Rong Phua		NYAA Gold Award Holders', Alumni #02-01 StarDuS, Clubhouse 277,Valley Road, Singapore 238318	07717 214192	<a href="mailto:c.r.phua@lse.ac.uk">c.r.phua@lse.ac.uk</a>
Student -	Ms Diane Mensah-Bonsu		28 Barforth Road, London SE15 3PS	00 44 20 7639 2885/07984616693	<a href="mailto:d_mensah@hotmail.com">d_mensah@hotmail.com</a>
	Ms Onome Ako	Youth Representative	c/o CYEC, 7 Lion Yard, Tremadoc Rd, London SW4 7NQ, or Tyrell Close, Sudbury Hill, HA7 3UX	00 44 208 930 8912/07745340117	<a href="mailto:Onomakol@yahoo.com">Onomakol@yahoo.com</a>
<b>Commonwealth Youth Programme</b>					
	Mr Ignatius Takawira	Director	Commonwealth Youth Programme, Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX, UK	00 44 207 747 6463	<a href="mailto:i.takawira@commonwealth.int">i.takawira@commonwealth.int</a>

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
	Mr Andrew Simmons	Deputy Director	Commonwealth Youth Programme, Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX, UK	00 44 207 747 6464	<a href="mailto:a.simmons@commonwealth.int">a.simmons@commonwealth.int</a>
	Mr Armstrong Alexis	Regional Director	CYP Caribbean Centre, Homestretch Avenue, D'Urban Park, P O Box 101063, P O Box 101063, Georgetown,, Guyana	00 592 2 237816	<a href="mailto:aalexis@cypcaribbean.org">aalexis@cypcaribbean.org</a>
	Ms Cristal de Saldanha Stainbank	Senior Programme Officer	Commonwealth Youth Programme, Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX, UK	00 44 207 747 6463	<a href="mailto:c.desaldanha@commonwealth.int">c.desaldanha@commonwealth.int</a>
<b>Commonwealth Secretariat</b>					
	Dr Meena Shivdas	Adviser	Social Transformation Programmes Division (STPD), Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX, UK	00 44 207 747 6463	<a href="mailto:m.shivdas@commonwealth.int">m.shivdas@commonwealth.int</a>
	Ms Geraldine Goh	Communications Adviser	Communications & Public Affairs Division (CPAD), Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX, UK	00 44 207 747 6463	<a href="mailto:g.goh@commonwealth.int">g.goh@commonwealth.int</a>
	Mr Carlos James	Intern	Communications & Public Affairs Division (CPAD), Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX, UK	00 44 207 747 6554	<a href="mailto:j.carlos@commonwealth.int">j.carlos@commonwealth.int</a>
	Mr Sharfuddin Syed Sharfuddin	Special Adviser	Political Affairs Division (PAD), Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX, UK	00 44 207 747 6463	<a href="mailto:s.syed@commonwealth.int">s.syed@commonwealth.int</a>