



**Standing Committee
for Economic and Commercial Cooperation
of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (COMCEC)**

COMCEC POVERTY OUTLOOK 2024



**COMCEC COORDINATION OFFICE
October 2024**



**Standing Committee
for Economic and Commercial Cooperation
of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (COMCEC)**

COMCEC POVERTY OUTLOOK 2024

**COMCEC COORDINATION OFFICE
October 2024**

Preface

The COMCEC Poverty Outlook is a contribution of the COMCEC Coordination Office to enrich the discussions during the Poverty Alleviation Working Group Meetings.

Poverty Alleviation Working Group is established in accordance with the COMCEC Strategy, adopted during the 4th Extraordinary Islamic Summit held on 14-15 August 2012 in Makkah Al Mukarramah. The COMCEC Strategy envisages Poverty Alleviation Working Group Meetings as one of its instruments for enhancing cooperation towards eradicating extreme poverty and hunger in the OIC Member Countries. In this respect, Poverty Alleviation Working Group Meetings aim to provide a regular platform for the member country experts to deliberate on the issues related to poverty alleviation, and to share their experiences and good practices.

The COMCEC Poverty Outlook 2024 has been updated by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Belgi Turan at TOBB University of Economics and Technology. In this edition of Outlook, statistical tables and figures have been updated while various comments which are still valid today were kept intact.

The views expressed and conclusions reached in this publication do not necessarily reflect the official views of the COMCEC Coordination Office, COMCEC or the governments of OIC Member Countries.

For further information, please contact:

COMCEC Coordination Office

Necatibey Caddesi No: 110/A

06570 Yüce-tepe, Çankaya

Ankara/TÜRKİYE

Phone : 90 312 294 57 10

Fax : 90 312 294 57 77

Web : www.comcec.org

e-Mail : poverty@comcec.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF FIGURES	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF ANNEXES	iii
Abbreviations	iv
Introduction	1
1. Poverty Status in the World and the OIC Member Countries	2
1.1. Poverty Status in the World	2
1.1.1. Monetary Poverty.....	2
1.1.2. Non-Monetary Poverty	4
1.2. Poverty Status in the OIC Member Countries	6
1.2.1. Monetary Poverty.....	6
1.2.2. Non-Monetary Poverty	11
2. Trends in Human Development in OIC Member Countries	22
2.1. International Comparison of Human Development Trends	22
2.2. The current level of human development in OIC	23
2.2.1. Trends in OIC	25
2.2.2. Evaluation of Human Development Categories for OIC Member Countries.....	27
2.2.3. Evaluation of Gender Inequality and Women Empowerment in OIC Member Countries	29
3. Efforts on Poverty Alleviation	36
3.1. Efforts in the World	36
3.1.1. Millennium Development Goals.....	36
3.1.2. Sustainable Development Goals.....	37
3.2. Efforts under the OIC	38
Concluding Remarks	45
REFERENCES	47
ANNEXES	51

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: GDP PER CAPITA (PPP) (CURRENT INT. \$)	3
FIGURE 2: POVERTY HEADCOUNT RATIO AT US\$2.15 A DAY (PPP) (% OF POPULATION).....	3
FIGURE 3: MULTIDIMENSIONAL POVERTY BY REGION (%)	5
FIGURE 4: GDP PER CAPITA (PPP, CURRENT INT \$) IN THE HIGH INCOME OIC COUNTRIES, 2023	6
FIGURE 5: GDP PER CAPITA (PPP, CURRENT INT. \$) IN THE UPPER MIDDLE-INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES, 2023	7
FIGURE 6: POVERTY HEADCOUNT RATIO AT \$2.15 A DAY (2017 PPP) (% OF POPULATION) IN UPPER-MIDDLE INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES.	8
FIGURE 7: GDP PER CAPITA IN THE LOWER-MIDDLE INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES (PPP, CURRENT INTERNATIONAL \$), 2023	9
FIGURE 8: POVERTY HEADCOUNT RATIO AT US\$2.15 A DAY (2017 PPP) IN LOWER-MIDDLE INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES (PPP) (%)	9
FIGURE 9: GDP PER-CAPITA IN LOW INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES (PPP, CURRENT INT. US\$), 2023	10
FIGURE 10: POVERTY HEADCOUNT RATIO AT \$2.15 A DAY (2017 PPP) (% OF POPULATION) IN LOW INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	11
FIGURE 11: DISTRIBUTION OF OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES IN DIFFERENT HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES	12
FIGURE 12: SHARE OF INCOME LEVEL CATEGORIES FOR THE OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES WITH MULTIDIMENSIONAL POVERTY (%), 2022.	12
FIGURE 13: HDI VALUES OF HIGH INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	13
FIGURE 14: HDI VALUES OF UPPER-MIDDLE INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	15
FIGURE 15: MULTIDIMENSIONAL POVERTY IN UPPER-MIDDLE INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES (%) ..	16
FIGURE 16: HDI VALUES OF LOWER-MIDDLE INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	17
FIGURE 18: HDI VALUES OF LOW INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	19
FIGURE 19: MULTIDIMENSIONAL POVERTY RATE IN LOW INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	20
FIGURE 20: TRENDS IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX, 1990-2022	22
FIGURE 21: ANNUAL GROWTH RATE IN HDI BETWEEN 1990 AND 2022	23
FIGURE 23: TRENDS IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX OF OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES BY INCOME GROUPS, 1990-2022	25
FIGURE 24: ANNUAL GROWTH RATE IN HDI OF OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES BY INCOME GROUPS BETWEEN 1990 AND 2022	26
FIGURE 25: GENDER DEVELOPMENT INDEX IN OIC COUNTRIES, 2021	31
FIGURE 26: GENDER INEQUALITY INDEX IN OIC COUNTRIES, 2021	32
FIGURE 27: GLOBAL GENDER PARITY INDEX IN OIC COUNTRIES AND WORLD, 2022.	33
FIGURE 28: WOMEN EMPOWERMENT INDEX IN OIC COUNTRIES AND WORLD, 2022.	35
FIGURE 29: DIMENSIONS OF THE HDI	51
FIGURE 30: DIMENSIONS OF THE MPI	52
FIGURE 31: DIMENSIONS OF THE GDI:.....	54
FIGURE 32: DIMENSIONS OF THE GGI:.....	54

FIGURE 33: DIMENSIONS OF THE GGPI:.....	55
FIGURE 34: DIMENSIONS OF THE WEI:	55

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: INCOME LEVELS OF THE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	4
TABLE 2: GLOBAL HUNGER INDEX VALUES OF HIGH INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	14
TABLE 3: GLOBAL HUNGER INDEX VALUES OF UPPER-MIDDLE INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	16
TABLE 4: GLOBAL HUNGER INDEX VALUES OF LOWER-MIDDLE INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	18
TABLE 5: GLOBAL HUNGER INDEX VALUES OF LOW INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	20
TABLE 6: COMPONENTS OF HDI BY INCOME GROUPS, 2022	26
TABLE 7: OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES BY HUMAN DEVELOPMENT LEVEL, 1990, 2000 AND 2008 ...	27
TABLE 8: TRANSITION BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES FROM 1990 TO 2000	28
TABLE 9: TRANSITION BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES FROM 2000 TO 2008	28
TABLE 10: OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES BY HUMAN DEVELOPMENT LEVEL, 2009 AND 2022	29
TABLE 11: GLOBAL GENDER PARITY INDEX (GGPI) , 2022	34
TABLE 12: WOMEN EMPOWERMENT INDEX (WEI) , 2022	35

LIST OF ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: THE WIDELY USED NON-MONETARY POVERTY INDICES	51
ANNEX 2: OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES BY INCOME CATEGORIES	56
ANNEX 3: MPI VALUES	57
ANNEX 4: GDP PER CAPITA (PPP) FOR THE OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES BETWEEN 1990 AND 2023	58
ANNEX 5: HDI VALUES AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES OF THE COUNTRIES, 2022	60
ANNEX 6: LOW-INCOME FOOD-DEFICIT COUNTRIES	65
ANNEX 7: THE GHI VALUES OF THE COUNTRIES	66
ANNEX 8: THE OFFICIAL 3 REGIONAL GROUPS OF THE OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES	67

Abbreviations

CCO	COMCEC Coordination Office
COMCEC	Standing Committee for Economic and Commercial Cooperation of the OIC
EUROSTAT	Statistical Office of the European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GHI	Global Hunger Index
GNI	Gross National Income
HDI	Human Development Index
IDB	Islamic Development Bank
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IMF	International Monetary Fund
ISFD	Islamic Solidarity Fund for Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MPI	Multidimensional Poverty Index
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OIC	Organization of the Islamic Cooperation
OIC-VET Countries	Vocational Education and Training Programme for the OIC Member Countries
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SESRIC	Statistical, Economic and Social Research and Training Centre for Islamic Countries
SPDA	Special Program for the Development of Africa
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Introduction

The Standing Committee for Economic and Commercial Cooperation of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (COMCEC) has been working to enhance trade and economic cooperation among the Member Countries since 1984. Poverty alleviation is a key focus of the COMCEC agenda. Indeed, it is one of the six cooperation areas of the COMCEC Strategy adopted in 2012. Within this context, Poverty Alleviation Working Group has been established. The Working Group regularly convenes since 2013.

Poverty alleviation is an important component of economic and social development. Although most of the developing countries have experienced significant progress in poverty alleviation in recent years, poverty levels are still high in many countries. Especially, the countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia account for nearly half of the total poor living in developing countries. The global financial crises and food shortages that have been encountered in the recent period have also worsened this situation.

Although the total population of the OIC Member Countries accounts for nearly one-fourth of the world's total population, their total GDP accounted for only 8 percent of the total world GDP in 2022. On the other hand, per capita GDP levels vary across the OIC Member Countries (i.e. \$353 in Afghanistan to \$87,480 in Qatar)¹. The poverty status also displays a diverse picture in the OIC countries with poverty headcount ratios in the Member Countries ranging between zero and 75 percent.

Similar to the monetary poverty indicators that are mentioned above, non-monetary poverty indicators also vary across the OIC Member Countries. In this respect, their Human Development Index values are between 0.380 in Somalia and 0.937 in United Arab Emirates, Multidimensional Poverty Index values are between zero and 0.601, and Global Hunger Index values are between zero and 39.9.

Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) led to a significant consciousness in poverty alleviation and contribute to the national efforts to a great extent. By the end of 2015 the MDGs process was completed. The Sustainable Development Goals and a new development agenda was launched in 2016.

The aim of this report is to provide an overview on the human development progress both at global and OIC level. Within this framework, in the first section the poverty situation in the World and the OIC Member Countries is examined briefly both in monetary and non-monetary terms. In the second section, human development progress in the OIC Member Countries is analyzed. The efforts towards poverty alleviation are explained in the third section.

¹GDP per capita (PPP Current International \$), The World Bank, 2024.

1. Poverty Status in the World and the OIC Member Countries

The basic definition of poverty is "the inability of [an individual to possess] sufficient resources to satisfy [his or her] basic needs."² The definition and scope of basic needs can vary by location, time, and source. Hence, there are several ways to investigate the poverty levels of the countries. One of the most frequently used methods is to define poverty in monetary terms, like the US\$2.15 a day poverty line of the World Bank³, or the value of minimum calorie requirements. Another frequently used method is to investigate poverty relatively by examining the income level of the population, such as 60 percent of the median income level like the Eurostat utilizes. Poverty is a complicated phenomenon that goes beyond the monetary terms. From this standpoint, poverty arises not only when people have inadequate income, but also when they lack key capabilities or education, have poor health or insecurity, or when they experience the absence of rights.⁴ In this sense, poverty is also investigated in non-monetary terms from a multidimensional viewpoint. The widely used non-monetary poverty indices are Human Development Index, Multidimensional Poverty Index, and Global Hunger Index.⁵

In this section, the poverty situation in the World and in the OIC member countries will be examined in both monetary and non-monetary terms. As the first aspect, poverty will be investigated in monetary terms by examining GDP per capita levels and poverty headcount ratios at US\$2.15 a day, (this level is the most prevalent method that is used to reveal the extreme poverty). As the second aspect, poverty will be investigated in non-monetary terms by looking at Human Development and Multidimensional Poverty indices as well as state of hunger (state of food deficiency and Global Hunger Index values) for the countries. The human development performance of OIC countries will be discussed in more detail in Section 2. The state of poverty in OIC member countries will be analyzed according to the four income groups defined by the World Bank.

1.1. Poverty Status in the World

1.1.1. Monetary Poverty

In 2023, while the world's average GDP per capita (PPP Current International \$) was \$20,645, the averages were \$48,220 for high-income countries, \$10,461 for upper-middle-income countries, \$2,413 for lower-middle-income countries, and \$895 for low-income countries. These figures illustrate the significant income discrepancies between countries (Figure 1).


² Fields 1994: 3.

³ The World Bank updated international poverty line in 2022. The previous poverty line was US\$1.90.

⁴ Haughton and Khandker, 2009:2.

⁵ See Annex 1 for the explanation of the mentioned indices.


Figure 1: GDP Per Capita (PPP) (Current Int. \$)



Source: World Bank, 2024.

For most countries, poverty levels decreased in monetary terms over the last three decades. Indeed, during this period, significant progress was recorded in the ratio of people living under US\$2.15. In 2000, this ratio was 30% for upper-middle-income countries, 37.9% for lower-middle-income countries, and 60.3% for low-income countries. In the most recent data available, these ratios fell to 1.3%, 12.6%, and 44.5%, respectively (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Poverty Headcount Ratio at US\$2.15 a day (PPP) (% of Population)



Source: World Bank, 2024.

Despite a sustained increase in income levels across many countries, some nations are unable to benefit from this growth. To understand the extent of this disparity, it is necessary to examine non-monetary indicators of poverty.

1.1.2. Non-Monetary Poverty

Human Development Index

By observing the human development categories alongside the income levels of countries, it is evident that, in most cases, a country's income level aligns with its human development category. As shown in Table 1, 70% of OIC countries classified in the 'very high human development' category have high income levels. Conversely, 62% of countries in the 'low human development' category have low-income levels, while 38% of countries in this same category fall into the lower-middle-income group.⁶

Table 1: Income Levels of the Different Categories of Human Development


		Low income	Lower-middle income	Upper-middle income	High income	Total
Low human development	# of countries	13	8	0	0	21
	%	62%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Medium human development	# of countries	2	5	3	0	10
	%	20%	50%	30%	0%	100%
High human development	# of countries	0	7	8	1	16
	%	0%	44%	50%	6%	100%
Very high human development	# of countries	0	0	3	7	10
	%	0%	0%	30%	70%	100%

Source: Human Development Reports, UNDP & World Bank, 2024.

Multidimensional Poverty Index

On average, the percentage of households living in multidimensional poverty worldwide is 8.8%. This indicator shows substantial regional variation, ranging from 0.4% in Europe and Central Asia to 26.2% in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) values range from 0.0004 in Serbia to 0.601 in Niger.

⁶ See Annex 5 for the full list related to the HDI values of the countries.

Figure 3: Multidimensional Poverty by Region (%)


Source: *Multidimensional Poverty Index, 2024, UNDP.*

The percentages of the deprived population vary significantly within countries of the same income group. The contribution of deprivation in education (specifically years of schooling and child school attendance) to overall poverty ranges from 3.1% to 60.9% in upper-middle-income countries, 0% to 61.6% in lower-middle-income countries, and 21.6% to 45% in low-income countries. The range for health is even wider, varying between 20.4% and 90.4% for upper-middle-income countries, 17.3% and 95.5% for lower-middle-income countries, and 10% to 32.7% for low-income countries. Similarly, deprivation in living standards ranges from 2.1% to 46% for upper-middle-income countries, 5.5% to 47.1% for lower-middle-income countries, and 34.3% to 54.5% for low-income countries. The disparity in deprivation levels across these MPI indicators among different income groups is striking.⁷

State of Hunger

According to the FAO, there are 44 low-income food-deficit countries in total, with 34 located in Africa, 8 in Asia, and 2 in the Americas.⁸ To understand the hunger situation in various countries, it is useful to examine their Global Hunger Index (GHI) values. Between 2000 and 2022, the global trend indicates a decrease in the severity of hunger. For OIC member countries, the average GHI value was 30.4 in 2000, which dropped to 17.5 in 2022⁹ —a reduction of 42%.¹⁰

⁷ Multidimensional Poverty Index, 2023, UNDP.

⁸ FAO, 2023. See Annex 1 for the explanation of the classification. See Annex 6 for full list of low-income-food-deficit countries.

⁹ The averages are unweighted. That is, each country in the groups has the same weight irrespective of its population.

¹⁰ Global Hunger Index, 2023.

1.2. Poverty Status in the OIC Member Countries

In this subsection, the poverty status of OIC Member Countries will be briefly analyzed in both monetary and non-monetary terms. First, a general analysis will be conducted for all OIC countries. Then, to provide a clearer understanding, the poverty status will be examined based on income categories, namely high-income, upper-middle-income, lower-middle-income, and low-income groups.

1.2.1. Monetary Poverty


COMCEC in General

The COMCEC comprises 57 member countries spread across four continents. While the total population of these member countries represents nearly one-fourth of the world's total population, their combined GDP accounts for about 8% of global GDP. The OIC Member Countries do not form a homogeneous group; their GDP per capita levels exhibit significant variability, ranging from \$353 in Afghanistan to \$87,480 in Qatar.¹¹ 15 of the OIC Countries are in the Low-Income Country Group.¹² On the other hand, total GDP of these countries is only 2% of the total GDP of the OIC Region.¹³ The number of people who live under US\$2.15 a day in the OIC Region is approximately 335 million, with the available data for the period 2009-2023.¹⁴

High Income OIC Member Countries

High-income countries are defined as those with a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita exceeding US\$14,005. Within the OIC, there are eight high-income member countries: Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Guyana, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. In this group, the GDP per capita (in Purchasing Power Parity; Current International \$) is notably high, ranging from \$20,626 in Guyana to \$87,480 in Qatar (see Figure 4). Importantly, there are no individuals living below the US\$2.15 poverty threshold in these countries.

Figure 4: GDP Per Capita (PPP, Current Int \$) in the High Income OIC Countries, 2023



Source: *The World Bank, 2024.*

¹¹ See Annex 4.

¹² World Bank, 2024.


¹³ World Bank, 2024.

¹⁴ The ratio of people who live under US\$2.15 a day between 2009-2023 multiplied with 2023 population data.

Upper-Middle Income OIC Member Countries

Upper-middle-income countries are classified as those with a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita between US\$4,516 and US\$14,005. Within the OIC, there are 14 upper-middle-income member countries: Albania, Algeria, Azerbaijan, Gabon, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Kazakhstan, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Suriname, Turkmenistan, and Türkiye. The GDP per capita (in Purchasing Power Parity; Current International \$) among these countries varies significantly, ranging from \$4,503 in Iran to \$13,137 in Türkiye (see Figure 5).


Figure 5: GDP per Capita (PPP, Current Int. \$) in the Upper Middle-Income OIC Member Countries, 2023



Source: The World Bank, 2024.

The prevalence of people living below US\$2.15 a day is extremely low among upper-middle-income OIC countries. (Figure 6).

Figure 6: Poverty Headcount Ratio at \$2.15 a day (2017 PPP) (% of population) in Upper-Middle Income OIC Member Countries.




Source: The World Bank, 2024. Note: Data for, Libya, and Turkmenistan are not available. The data used in the figure reflect the latest available information for each country, ranging from 2010 to 2023.

Lower-Middle Income OIC Countries

Lower-middle-income countries are classified as those with a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita between US\$1,146 and US\$4,515. In this regard, there are 20 lower-middle-income OIC member countries: Bangladesh, Benin, Cameroon, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestine, Senegal, Tajikistan, Tunisia, and Uzbekistan. Within this group, GDP per capita (in Purchasing Power Parity; Current International \$) varies significantly, ranging from \$1,189 in Guinea to \$4,482 in Jordan (see Figure 7).


Figure 7: GDP per capita in the Lower-Middle Income OIC Member Countries (PPP, Current International \$), 2023



Source: The World Bank, 2024.

The poverty headcount ratios among lower-middle-income OIC countries present a highly diverse picture. While this ratio is below 5 percent in 10 countries, it ranges between 5 percent and 31 percent in the remaining countries in the group (Figure 8).

Figure 8: Poverty Headcount Ratio at US\$2.15 a day (2017 PPP) in Lower-Middle Income OIC Member Countries (PPP) (%)




Source: The World Bank, 2024. The data used in the figure reflect the latest available information for each country, ranging from 2010 to 2023.

Low Income OIC Member Countries

Low-income countries are defined as those with a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita of US\$1,145 or less. Within the OIC, there are 15 low-income member countries: Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Chad, The Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mozambique, Niger, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Uganda, and Yemen. In this group, the GDP per capita (in Purchasing Power Parity; Current International \$) varies significantly, ranging from \$353 in Afghanistan to \$2,272 in Sudan (see Figure 9).


Figure 9: GDP per-capita in Low Income OIC Member Countries (PPP, Current Int. US\$), 2023



Source: The World Bank, 2024.

The poverty headcount ratios in low-income OIC countries are generally very high, with particularly alarming figures observed in Mozambique, Niger, and Uganda (Figure 10).

Figure 10: Poverty Headcount Ratio at \$2.15 a day (2017 PPP) (% of population) in Low Income OIC Member Countries



Source: The World Bank, 2024. The data used in the figure reflect the latest available information for each country, ranging from 2010 to 2023.


1.2.2. Non-Monetary Poverty

COMCEC in General

Human Development Index

When examining the OIC member countries in terms of Human Development Index (HDI) values, a heterogeneous composition is observed (see Figure 11). The HDI values for OIC member countries range from 0.937 in the United Arab Emirates to 0.380 in Somalia. Among these countries, 10 are classified in the very high human development category, 16 in the high category, 10 in the medium category, and 21 in the low human development category.

Figure 11: Distribution of OIC Member Countries in Different Human Development Categories




Source: Human Development Report, 2023, UNDP.

Multidimensional Poverty Index

Among the OIC member countries with Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) values, 27 percent are classified as upper-middle-income, 44 percent as lower-middle-income, and 29 percent as low-income countries (see Figure 12). The proportion of the population living in multidimensional poverty varies significantly across these countries. For instance, in Turkmenistan, the rate is only 0.08 percent, while in Niger, it reaches as high as 60.1 percent.

Figure 12: Share of Income Level Categories for the OIC Member Countries with Multidimensional Poverty (%), 2022.



Source: Multidimensional Poverty Index, 2023, UNDP.

The contribution of educational deprivation to overall poverty in the OIC region ranges from 3.1 percent in Kazakhstan to 61.6 percent in Tunisia. Similarly, the contribution of health deprivation to overall poverty varies between 10 percent in Afghanistan and 90.4 percent in Kazakhstan. For deprivation in living standards, the range is from 2.1 percent in Turkmenistan to 54.5 percent in Uganda.

State of Hunger

Almost half of the OIC member countries are classified as low-income food-deficit countries according to FAO standards. Notably, there has been significant improvement in the Global Hunger Index (GHI) values for these countries. The mean GHI value for OIC member countries decreased from 30.4 in 2000 to 17.8 in 2023. The GHI values among member countries range from zero to 39.9.


According to the GHI classification, two countries (Yemen and Niger) are categorized as having alarming hunger levels, while 19 countries—including Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, Mozambique, Nigeria, Guinea, Sudan, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic, Mali, Burkina Faso, Uganda, Djibouti, Comoros, Benin, Togo, Mauritania, and Côte d'Ivoire—are in the serious hunger level category. Thirteen member countries, including The Gambia, Bangladesh, Gabon, Cameroon, Indonesia, Libya, Senegal, Iraq, Tajikistan, Egypt, Malaysia, Suriname, and Turkmenistan, are classified as having moderate hunger levels. Lastly, 15 countries—Guyana, Morocco, Oman, Iran, Kyrgyzstan, Saudi Arabia, Azerbaijan, Algeria, Albania, Tunisia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kuwait, Türkiye, and the United Arab Emirates—fall under the low hunger level category.

High Income OIC Countries

Human Development Index

Analysis of high income OIC Member Countries according to their HDI values, shows that all countries in this group are in *Very High Human Development* category (Figure 13).

Figure 13: HDI Values of High Income OIC Member Countries



Source: Human Development Report, 2023, UNDP.

The values for the first dimension of the Human Development Index (HDI), Gross National Income (GNI) per capita (2017 PPP US\$), range from US\$32,967 in Guyana to US\$95,944 in Qatar among high-income OIC countries. With the exception of Guyana, all high-income OIC countries are classified in the Very High HDI category, while Guyana falls under the High HDI category. Notably, except for Guyana and Oman, all other high-income countries exceed the average GNI value for the Very High Human Development (VHHD) category, which is US\$44,958.

However, in terms of other HDI dimensions—such as life expectancy at birth, mean years of schooling, and expected years of schooling—the index values for high-income OIC countries are generally below the average values for the VHHD category. Specifically, life expectancy at birth in these countries ranges from 66 years in Guyana to 81.6 years in Qatar, while the average for the VHHD category is 79.3 years. The mean years of schooling vary from 7.4 years in Kuwait to 12.8 years in the United Arab Emirates, compared to the VHHD average of 12.3 years. Lastly, expected years of schooling range from 13.3 years in Qatar to 17.2 years in the United Arab Emirates, while the VHHD average stands at 16.6 years.

Multidimensional Poverty Index

Data for multidimensional poverty index is not available for high income OIC member countries.

State of Hunger

High-income countries do not typically experience food deficiencies. Among the high-income OIC member countries, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Oman have data available for the Global Hunger Index (GHI). The GHI scores for Guyana, Oman, and Saudi Arabia are 9.3, 8.3, and 7.3, respectively. The GHI scores for the United Arab Emirates and Kuwait are negligible, falling below 5.

Table 2: Global Hunger Index Values of High Income OIC Member Countries

Country	2000	2008	2015	2023
Guyana	17,2	15,1	11,3	9,3
Oman	14,8	11,2	11,2	8,3
Saudi Arabia	12,3	10,6	9,1	7,3
United Arab Emirates	<5	6,8	5,6	<5
Kuwait	<5	<5	<5	<5

Source: Global Hunger Index, 2023.


Upper-Middle Income OIC Member Countries

Human Development Index

Among the 14 upper-middle-income OIC countries, 3 are classified in the Very High Human Development category, 8 in the High Human Development (HHD) category, and 3 in the Medium Human Development category (Figure 14). Türkiye has the highest HDI value within this group, ranking 45th globally, while Iraq has the lowest HDI value at 0.673, placing it at 128th in the ranking.

For the first dimension of the HDI, Gross National Income (GNI) per capita (2017 PPP \$), values range from US\$9,092 in Iraq to US\$32,834 in Türkiye. Regarding the second dimension, life expectancy at birth, values span from 65.7 years in Gabon to 79.9 years in the Maldives, with more than half of the countries falling below the High Human Development (HHD) average of 80.8 years. For the third dimension, mean years of schooling vary from 6.8 years in Iraq to 12.4 years in Kazakhstan. Lastly, the expected years of schooling range from 11 years in Suriname to 19.7 years in Türkiye.

Figure 14: HDI Values of Upper-Middle Income OIC Member Countries




Source: Human Development Report, 2023, UNDP.

Multidimensional Poverty Index

Among upper-middle-income countries, the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) is lowest in Turkmenistan (0.001) and highest in Gabon (0.070). In fact, the multidimensional poverty rate is less than 1% in countries like Turkmenistan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Albania, and the Maldives, while it exceeds 8% in Indonesia, Iraq, and Gabon. When comparing the multidimensional poverty rates to monetary poverty rates in these countries, it is evident that the proportion of the population living in multidimensional poverty often surpasses the proportion living in income poverty (see Figure 6 and Figure 15).

Figure 15: Multidimensional Poverty in Upper-Middle Income OIC Member Countries (%)



Source: *Multidimensional Poverty Index, 2022, UNDP.*

The contribution of deprivation in education to overall multidimensional poverty varies significantly, ranging from 3.1% in Kazakhstan to 60.9% in Iraq. Similarly, the impact of deprivation in living conditions fluctuates between 2.1% in Turkmenistan and 46% in Gabon. Notably, the contribution of deprivation in health tends to be the highest, spanning from 20.4% in Suriname to 90.4% in Kazakhstan.

State of Hunger

According to the Global Hunger Index, among the upper-middle-income countries, seven nations—Gabon, Indonesia, Libya, Iraq, Malaysia, Suriname, and Turkmenistan—are classified as low-income food-deficit countries ($GHI \geq 9.9$).¹⁵

Table 3: Global Hunger Index Values of Upper-Middle Income OIC Member Countries

Country	2000	2008	2015	2023
Gabon	21.0	20.2	17.3	18.7
Indonesia	26.0	28.5	21.9	17.6
Libya	16.6	12.8	18.5	16.1
Iraq	23.6	20.3	16.5	13.8
Malaysia	15.4	13.7	12.0	12.5
Suriname	15.1	11.0	10.6	10.4
Turkmenistan	20.3	14.5	11.4	10.3
Iran	13.7	8.8	7.7	7.7
Azerbaijan	24.9	15.0	9.3	6.9
Algeria	14.7	11.1	8.5	6.8
Albania	16.4	15.5	8.8	6.1
Kazakhstan	11.3	11.0	5.7	5.5
Türkiye	10.1	5.7	<5	4

Source: *Global Hunger Index, 2023.*

¹⁵ See Annex 5.


Lower-Middle Income OIC Countries

Human Development Index

Among the 20 lower-middle-income countries, seven—Egypt, Jordan, Kyrgyz Republic, Lebanon, Palestine, Tunisia, and Uzbekistan—are classified in the High Human Development category. Five countries—Kyrgyzstan, Morocco, Tajikistan, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Pakistan, and Comoros—are categorized under Medium Human Development, while eight countries fall into the Low Human Development category (Figure 16). Jordan has the highest Human Development Index (HDI) value at 0.736, ranking 99th globally, while Guinea has the lowest value of 0.471, placing it at 181st.

For the first dimension of the HDI, Gross National Income (GNI) per capita (2017 PPP US\$) in lower-middle-income countries ranges from US\$2,404 (Guinea) to US\$12,361 (Egypt). In terms of life expectancy at birth, values vary from 53.6 years (Nigeria) to 75 years (Morocco). Mean years of schooling range from 2.4 years (Guinea) to 12.0 years (Kyrgyz Republic). Lastly, for the fourth dimension, expected years of schooling range from 7.9 years (Pakistan) to 14.6 years (Tunisia).

Figure 16: HDI Values of Lower-Middle Income OIC Member Countries




Source: Human Development Report, 2023, UNDP.

Multidimensional Poverty Index

The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) values for lower-middle-income OIC Member Countries range from 0.001 (Kyrgyzstan) to 0.373 (Guinea) (Figure 17). Within this group, the proportion of the population living in multidimensional poverty varies significantly, from just 0.4 percent in Jordan and Kyrgyzstan to a staggering 66.8 percent in Benin. Notably, in nearly one-third of the lower-middle-income countries, over 40 percent of the population is classified as multidimensionally poor.

Figure 17: Multidimensional Poverty in Lower-Middle Income OIC Member Countries (%)



Source: Multidimensional Poverty Index, 2023, UNDP.

The contribution of educational deprivation to overall multidimensional poverty varies significantly among the OIC Member Countries, ranging from 0.0 in Uzbekistan to 61.6 in Tunisia. Similarly, deprivation in living conditions contributes between 5.5 in Uzbekistan and 53.5 in Jordan. In terms of health deprivation, the range is from 17.3 in Bangladesh to a substantial 94.5 in Uzbekistan.

State of Hunger

Within the lower-middle-income group, two countries—Uzbekistan and Tunisia—are classified as experiencing low levels of hunger, with a Global Hunger Index (GHI) of 9.9 or below. Eight countries face serious hunger levels, with GHI values ranging from 20.0 to 34.9; these include Nigeria, Guinea, Pakistan, Djibouti, Comoros, Benin, Mauritania, and Côte d'Ivoire. Additionally, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Senegal, Tajikistan, Egypt, Morocco, Kyrgyzstan, and Tunisia are categorized as having moderate levels of hunger.

Table 4: Global Hunger Index Values of Lower-Middle Income OIC Member Countries

Country	2000	2008	2015	2023
Nigeria	39.9	31.2	27.8	28.3
Guinea	40.2	29.3	28.4	27.1
Pakistan	36.7	31.3	28.8	26.6
Djibouti	44.4	33.9	29.6	23.0
Comoros	38.2	30.4	24.0	22.7
Benin	33.9	26.4	23.3	22.6
Mauritania	30.5	18.8	22.4	21.0
Côte d'Ivoire	32.5	36.0	22.1	20.6
Bangladesh	33.8	30.6	26.2	19.0
Cameroon	36.0	29.0	20.7	18.6
Senegal	34.3	21.8	18.0	15.0
Tajikistan	40.1	29.9	16.9	13.7

Egypt	16.4	16.9	15.2	12.8
Morocco	15.8	12.2	9.1	9.0
Kyrgyzstan	17.5	12.9	9.1	7.5
Tunisia	10.3	7.4	6.4	5.9
Uzbekistan	24.2	14.9	5.9	5.0


Source: Global Hunger Index, 2023.

Low Income OIC Member Countries

Human Development Index

All low-income OIC countries fall within the Low Human Development (LHD) category, with the exception of Syria and Uganda, which are classified in the Medium Human Development category. Syria has the highest Human Development Index (HDI) value in this group at 0.557, ranking 157th, while Somalia has the lowest HDI value at 0.380, positioned at 193rd (Figure 18).

Figure 18: HDI Values of Low Income OIC Member Countries



Source: Human Development Report, 2023, UNDP.


In the low-income group, the index values for the first dimension of the Human Development Index (HDI), Gross National Income (GNI) per capita (2017 PPP US\$), range from US\$1,072 (Somalia) to US\$3,594 (Syria). For the second dimension, life expectancy at birth, values span from 53.0 years (Chad) to 72.3 years (Syria). In terms of the third dimension, mean years of schooling, the values vary between 1.3 years (Niger) and 6.2 years (Uganda). Finally, the index values for the fourth dimension, expected years of schooling, range from 7 years (Mali) to 13 years (Togo).

Multidimensional Poverty Index

The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) values for low-income OIC Member Countries range from 0.180 (Togo) to 0.601 (Niger). In this income group, the percentage of the population living in multidimensional poverty exceeds 50% for all countries, except for Togo,

Gambia, and Yemen (Figure 19). Niger has the highest share, with nearly 91.0% of its population experiencing multidimensional poverty. Additionally, the proportion of the population living in severe multidimensional poverty varies significantly, from 37.6% in Togo to 91.0% in Niger.

Figure 19: Multidimensional Poverty Rate in Low Income OIC Member Countries



Source: *Multidimensional Poverty Index, 2023, UNDP.*

The contribution of deprivation in education to overall multidimensional poverty varies from 21.6% in Uganda to 45.0% in Afghanistan. In terms of health deprivation, the contribution ranges from 10.0% in Afghanistan to 32.7% in Gambia. For deprivation in living conditions, the figures range between 34.3% in Gambia and 54.5% in Uganda.

State of Hunger

All countries within the low-income group are categorized as Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries by the FAO. In 2023, the Global Hunger Index (GHI) values for these nations ranged from 17.6 in Gambia to 50.8 in Yemen. Yemen and Niger are facing alarming levels of hunger, indicated by GHI scores between 35 and 49.9, while other countries in this group experience serious hunger levels, defined by GHI scores between 20.0 and 34.9, except for Gambia, which is classified as having a moderate level of hunger.

Table 5: Global Hunger Index Values of Low Income OIC Member Countries

Country	2000	2008	2015	2023
Yemen	41.4	37.8	42.1	39.9
Niger	53.3	39.5	35.2	35.1
Chad	50.6	49.9	40.1	34.6
Guinea-Bissau	37.7	29.6	33.3	33.0
Sierra Leone	57.4	45.4	32.8	31.3

Afghanistan	49.6	36.5	30.4	30.6
Mozambique	48.2	35.6	37.0	30.5
Sudan	—	—	28.5	27.0
Syrian Arab Republic	13.9	16.2	23.9	26.1
Mali	41.9	32.2	27.1	25.6
Burkina Faso	45.0	33.7	28.0	25.5
Uganda	35.0	29.0	27.8	25.2
Togo	38.2	29.6	25.7	21.1
Gambia	29.2	24.9	24.3	19.7

Source: *Global Hunger Index, 2023.*


2. Trends in Human Development in OIC Member Countries

This section aims to analyze trends in human development among OIC Member Countries by utilizing the Human Development Reports (HDR) published by the UNDP. Human development focuses on enhancing the richness of human life, emphasizing opportunities and choices available to individuals rather than solely economic growth. Since 1990, the UNDP has produced these reports, with the most recent edition released in 2023.

2.1. International Comparison of Human Development Trends

Figure 20 illustrates the changes in the Human Development Index (HDI) for selected country groups between 1990 and 2022. All groups experienced improvements during this period. The global average HDI increased from 0.598 to 0.739, while the average HDI for OIC Member Countries rose from 0.505 to 0.645, remaining significantly lower than both the OECD and world averages. Notably, OIC HDI values are only higher than those of Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Furthermore, the gap between the HDI of OIC member countries and that of developing countries has widened over the last three decades; in 1990, the difference was a mere 0.011 points, which expanded to 0.049 points by 2022, indicating more rapid progress in developing countries.

Figure 20: Trends in Human Development Index, 1990-2022




Source: Human Development Reports, 2023, UNDP.

Note: The averages are unweighted. That is, each country in the groups has the same weight irrespective of its population.

Figure 21 illustrates the annual growth rates of HDI values from 1990 to 2022. As expected, the growth rates tend to be higher for groups with lower initial HDI values. Throughout this period, OIC Member Countries achieved an average annual growth rate of approximately 0.77 percent, which lags behind the growth rates of both developing countries and Least Developed Countries (LDCs). This disparity in growth rates contributes to the widening gap between the HDI values of OIC Member Countries and those of other developing countries.

Figure 21: Annual growth rate in HDI between 1990 and 2022



Source: Human Development Reports, 2023, UNDP.

Note: The rates are calculated as the annual compound growth rate.

2.2. The current level of human development in OIC

Progress in human development among OIC Member Countries remains highly uneven. According to the 2023 Human Development Report (HDR), HDI values range from 0.380 for Somalia to 0.937 for the United Arab Emirates. Only 18 out of the 57 OIC Member Countries have HDI values exceeding the world average, while 39 fall below it.


The United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Türkiye, Kuwait, Brunei Darussalam, Oman, and Malaysia all have HDI values above 0.800, placing them in the Very High Human Development category. Notably, this indicates that only 9 out of 69 countries (13 percent) in this category are OIC members.

In the High Human Development category, Albania, Iran, the Maldives, Azerbaijan, Libya, Algeria, Turkmenistan, Guyana, Jordan, Tunisia, Egypt, Uzbekistan, Lebanon, Palestine, Indonesia, and Kyrgyz Republic have HDI values ranging from 0.701 to 0.789. These countries represent 32.7 percent of the total in this category (16 out of 49).

The Medium Human Development category includes Morocco, Gabon, Suriname, Tajikistan, Iraq, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Comoros, Syria, and Uganda, with HDI values between 0.550 and 0.698. Lastly, Nigeria, Togo, Pakistan, Mauritania, Côte d'Ivoire, Senegal, Sudan, Djibouti, Benin, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Afghanistan, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Burkina Faso, Yemen, Mali, Chad, Niger, and Somalia fall into the Low Human Development category, making up 63.6 percent of this group (21 out of 33).

Given that OIC Member Countries constitute 29.5 percent of the countries included in the HDR 2023 (57 out of 193), these figures highlight the OIC's significant underrepresentation in high development categories and overrepresentation in low development categories.

Figure 22: Human Development Index, OIC Member Countries in 2022




Source: Human Development Report, 2023 UNDP

2.2.1. Trends in OIC

Figure 23 illustrates the evolution of the Human Development Index (HDI) for OIC Member Countries across different income groups from 1990 to 2021. The data reveals consistent improvements in HDI values for each income group over this period. The figure clearly shows a strong correlation between income levels and HDI values. Specifically, high-income and upper-middle-income countries consistently exhibit HDI values above the OIC average, while lower-middle-income and low-income countries show values that fall below the OIC average. This trend underscores the significant influence of income level on human development, with wealthier nations achieving higher levels of human development compared to less affluent ones.

Figure 23: Trends in Human Development Index of OIC Member Countries by income groups, 1990-2022




Source: Human Development Report, 2023, UNDP

Note: The averages are unweighted. That is, each country in the groups has the same weight irrespective of its population.

Figure 24 demonstrates a clear sign of convergence in Human Development Index (HDI) across income groups. The data indicates that low-income and lower-middle-income countries experienced significantly higher growth rates in HDI compared to other income groups during the observed period. Specifically, the growth rate of the low-income group was more than twice that of high-income countries. This suggests that, while high-income countries have historically achieved higher HDI values, lower-income nations are now catching up at a faster pace, reflecting greater strides in development and progress, especially in areas such as health, education, and living standards. However, despite these higher growth rates, the gap between income groups remains substantial in absolute HDI values.

Figure 24: Annual growth rate in HDI of OIC Member Countries by income groups between 1990 and 2022



Source: Human Development Report, 2023, UNDP.

Note: The rates are calculated as the annual compound growth rate.

Although HDI values typically increase with income, the relationship between income and HDI rank shows more complexity at the country level within specific income groups. Table 6 highlights this difference by comparing HDI ranks with gross national income (GNI) ranks for various income categories. On average, OIC Member Countries show a gap of -7, indicating that their human development lags behind their economic prosperity overall. The difference is smaller for low-income countries (-1.8) and lower-middle-income countries (-3.1), suggesting these groups have been somewhat more successful in aligning economic growth with improvements in health, education, and living standards.

However, the gap is more pronounced for upper-middle-income and high-income countries. For the high-income group, the disparity is substantial, at -27.4, implying that wealthier OIC nations have struggled to convert their economic success into human development achievements, especially in comparison to other high-income countries globally. This reflects a broader issue within these countries, where the benefits of increased income do not fully translate into higher quality of life or better social outcomes for their populations.

Table 6: Components of HDI by income groups, 2022

	Life expectancy at birth	Expected years of schooling	Mean years of schooling	GNI (2017 PPP \$)	GNI rank - HDI rank difference
OIC	68,5	12.0	7.3	14,287	-7.0
Low income	61.5	9.1	3.5	1,909	-1.8
Lower middle income	67.3	11.4	7.1	6,262	-3.1
Upper middle income	73.1	13.8	9.3	16,776	-6.7
High income	76.6	14.7	10.3	56,765	-27.4

Source: Human Development Report, 2023, UNDP. Note:

The averages are unweighted. That is, each country in the groups has the same weight irrespective of its population.

Table 6 provides insight into the different components of the Human Development Index (HDI) across OIC Member Countries. The OIC average for life expectancy is 68.5 years, while the expected and mean years of schooling stand at 12.0 and 7.3 years, respectively. The average Gross National Income (GNI) per capita is \$14,287. These figures vary significantly by income group, with all four parameters—life expectancy, expected years of schooling, mean years of schooling, and GNI—showing an upward trend as income levels increase.

For low-income countries, both life expectancy and mean years of schooling are notably below the OIC average, reflecting significant challenges in health and education. However, in the lower-middle-income group, these values are much closer to the OIC average, indicating some progress in these areas. High-income countries exhibit significantly higher values across all parameters, particularly when compared to upper-middle-income countries, highlighting the stark disparity in development between these income groups within the OIC.

2.2.2. Evaluation of Human Development Categories for OIC Member Countries

In the Human Development Reports (HDRs), countries are grouped based on their HDI values, with the classification evolving over time. From 1990 to 2009, HDRs categorized countries into three groups: low, medium, and high human development. This changed in 2009 when a "very high" human development category was added, resulting in four distinct groups.

Initially, in 1990, 38 OIC Member Countries were included in the HDR. Of these, 22 were classified under the low human development category, 14 in the medium category, and only 2 in the high human development category. By 2000, the number of OIC Member Countries in HDRs expanded to 54, with significant shifts: 29 countries (over half) were in the medium human development category, and 5 were classified as high. The proportion of countries in medium and high human development grew considerably compared to 1990.

By 2008, although the number of OIC Member Countries remained at 54, there was further progress. The share of countries in the medium and high development categories rose to 59 percent and 19 percent, respectively. This shift indicates gradual but noticeable improvements in human development across OIC countries over the years.

Table 7: OIC Member Countries by human development level, 1990, 2000 and 2008

HDI Category	1990		2000		2008	
	# of Countries	%	# of Countries	%	# of Countries	%
Low Human Development	22	58	20	37	12	22
Medium Human Development	14	37	29	54	32	59
High Human Development	2	5	5	9	10	19
Total	38	100	54	100	54	100

Source: Own calculations from corresponding years' HDR.

Note: The methodology of HDI has evolved over time. Therefore, the HDI values and hence categories are not fully comparable over time.

Tables 8 and 9 can indeed be interpreted as transition matrices, illustrating how OIC Member Countries moved between human development categories over time. Table 8 shows that out of the 21 OIC Member Countries classified under the low human development category in 1990, the majority (18 countries) remained in this category by 2000. However, 3 countries improved and transitioned into the medium development category, reflecting some upward mobility. Meanwhile, no transitions occurred between the medium development category and either the low or high development categories during this period.

Regarding the two countries initially classified in the high development category in 1990, one remained in the same category by 2000, while the other regressed into the medium development category. This indicates that while progress was made by some countries, setbacks occurred for others, highlighting the variability of human development trajectories across OIC Member Countries.

Table 8: Transition between development categories from 1990 to 2000

		2000		
		Low HD	Medium HD	High HD
1990	Low HD	18	3	0
	Medium HD	0	14	0
	High HD	0	1	1

Source: Own calculations from corresponding years' HDR.

Between 2000 and 2008, all transitions in human development categories among OIC Member Countries were upward movements, reflecting a period of positive change. Out of the 20 OIC countries classified under the low development category in 2000, 8 moved up to the medium development category, while the remaining 12 countries stayed in the low category. This upward mobility shows significant progress, especially for those that transitioned from low to medium development.

For the medium development category in 2000, the majority of countries (23) remained in the same category by 2008, while 5 countries advanced to the high development category, indicating further progress.

Regarding the high development category in 2000, all 5 countries stayed within this category by 2008. This stability suggests that once countries reached high human development, they were able to maintain their position during this period. Overall, the upward transitions reflect improvements in human development across many OIC Member Countries during the 2000-2008 period.

Table 9: Transition between development categories from 2000 to 2008

		2008		
		Low HD	Medium HD	High HD
2000	Low HD	12	8	0
	Medium HD	0	23	5
	High HD	0	0	5

Source: Own calculations from corresponding years' HDR.

In the 2009 Human Development Report (HDR), OIC Member Countries were heavily represented in the lower development categories, with 25% in the low human development category and 51% in the medium category. This meant that 75% of OIC countries were either in low or medium development, leaving only a small fraction in the high or very high development category.

However, by 2022, nearly half of OIC Member Countries had progressed into the high or very high development categories, indicating some level of improvement for a substantial portion of the member countries. Despite this progress, the share of countries in the low human development category increased significantly, from 25% in 2009 to 37% in 2022. This rise suggests that while some countries advanced, others faced challenges that left them behind, potentially widening the gap between countries in different development tiers.

It's important to note that this apparent shift in human development across OIC countries between 2009 and 2022 should not be interpreted as direct evidence of improvement or decline. The HDI methodology underwent a significant change in 2010, making HDI scores before and after that period not directly comparable. This methodological shift affects how human development is assessed, meaning the changes observed might be partly due to this revision rather than solely reflecting real changes in development outcomes.

Table 10: OIC Member Countries by human development level, 2009 and 2022

	2009		2022	
	# of Countries	%	# of Countries	%
Low Human Development	14	25	21	37
Medium Human Development	28	51	10	18
High Human Development	9	16	16	28
Very High Human Development	4	7	10	18
Total	55	100%	57	100%

Source: Own calculations from corresponding years' HDR.

2.2.3. Evaluation of Gender Inequality and Women Empowerment in OIC Member Countries

Gender inequality and the empowerment of women are pivotal components of any comprehensive strategy aimed at alleviating poverty and achieving sustainable development in OIC countries and beyond. The undeniable link between gender equality, development, and poverty reduction has become increasingly apparent on the global stage. It is a recognition that has been emphasized through the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and, more prominently, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In the journey towards addressing the multifaceted challenges of poverty, the world first set its sights on the MDGs, which guided international development efforts from 2000 to 2015. Among the eight MDGs, the third goal specifically sought to promote gender equality and empower women. This marked a significant recognition of the role women play in fostering economic growth, social progress, and overall human development.

Building upon the MDGs' foundation, the international community adopted the SDGs in 2015. These 17 interconnected goals aim to tackle a wide range of global issues by 2030, including poverty, hunger, health, education, clean water, and gender equality. Goal 5, "Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls," stands at the heart of these aspirations, highlighting the central role of gender equality in achieving all other development objectives.

The importance of addressing gender inequality in the context of poverty alleviation cannot be overstated. Women and girls constitute approximately half of the population in OIC countries, and their empowerment is inextricably linked to the overall well-being and progress of these nations. When women have equal access to education, economic opportunities, healthcare, and participation in decision-making processes, societies flourish, poverty rates decline, and development becomes more sustainable.


This chapter summarizes the current situation on gender inequality and women empowerment in OIC countries. UNDP has been monitoring gender inequality using Gender Development Index (GDI) and Gender Inequality Index (GII). The compounding global crises, including the impact of COVID-19, have not only brought existing gender inequalities into sharp focus but have also exacerbated them. Recognizing the importance of this issue UNDP and UN Women have developed novel composite indices with the ultimate goal of propelling significant advancements in women's empowerment and gender equality. These indices employ a multifaceted framework to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the global status of women. The first of these indices, the Women's Empowerment Index, centers on assessing women's agency and their capacity to exercise choices and seize opportunities in life. Notably, it represents the inaugural UN gender index to include violence against women and girls as a distinct dimension. The second, the Global Gender Parity Index, evaluates gender disparities across four dimensions of human development: health, education, inclusivity, and decision-making.¹⁶

The Gender Development Index (GDI) is essentially the Human Development Index (HDI) adjusted for gender disparities. The global average for GDI is 0.958, while the average GDI is 0.898 in OIC region. However, there is significant variation within the OIC member countries, with GDI ranging from 0.496 in Yemen to 1.019 in Qatar.¹⁷ Based on this index, 16% of member countries are classified as having high gender equality, 7% as having medium-high equality, 13% as having medium and medium-low equality, and 51% as having low gender equality (Figure 26).

¹⁶ See Annex 1 for the explanation of the mentioned indices.

¹⁷ A GDI higher than 1 means that women in a particular country are doing better than men in terms of human development.


Figure 25: Gender Development Index in OIC Countries, 2021



Source: UNDP, 2023.

The Gender Inequality Index (GII) offers a distinct perspective on gender disparities by excluding income from its calculations. It ranges from 0, which signifies complete gender equality, to 1, indicating extreme gender inequality. According to recent data, the average GII for OIC countries stands at 0.445, positioning it close to the global average of 0.465 but significantly higher than the OECD average of 0.185, highlighting greater gender disparities in OIC Member Countries. The GII values among OIC countries demonstrate considerable variation, with the United Arab Emirates reporting the lowest GII at 0.049, reflecting strong gender equality, while Yemen exhibits the highest GII at 0.820, indicating severe gender inequality.


Figure 26: Gender Inequality Index in OIC Countries, 2021



Source: UNDP, 2023

The Global Gender Parity Index (GGPI) is an innovative tool that measures women's status in relation to men across key dimensions of human development. This index operates on a scale from 0 to 1, where 1 indicates perfect gender parity and 0 signifies complete gender inequality. Recent findings indicate that OIC countries, on average, fall behind the global level in terms of women's empowerment, as illustrated in Figure 27.

Figure 27: Global Gender Parity Index in OIC Countries and World, 2022.



Source: UNDP, 2023.


While the average value of the Global Gender Parity Index for OIC member countries is lagging, there is significant variation among member countries. The index ranges from as low as 0.141 in Yemen to as high as 0.860 in Albania (Table 12). Out of the 27 OIC countries for which the GGPI is calculated, 18 are classified as having low gender parity, 6 countries are classified as having lower-middle gender parity, 2 countries are classified as having upper-middle gender parity, and 1 country is classified as having high gender parity (Table 12).

Table 11: Global Gender Parity Index (GGPI) , 2022

	Value	Gender Parity Group ¹⁸
Yemen	0.141	Low
Iran	0.393	Low
Lebanon	0.422	Low
Iraq	0.486	Low
Benin	0.497	Low
Türkiye	0.511	Low
Nigeria	0.514	Low
Gambia	0.524	Low
Bangladesh	0.527	Low
Egypt	0.534	Low
Guinea	0.546	Low
Jordan	0.562	Low
Maldives	0.575	Low
Mali	0.579	Low
Sierra Leone	0.588	Low
Côte d'Ivoire	0.594	Low
Tunisia	0.594	Low
Burkina Faso	0.595	Low
Senegal	0.623	Lower-middle
Panama	0.646	Lower-middle
Indonesia	0.652	Lower-middle
Niger	0.662	Lower-middle
Togo	0.664	Lower-middle
Uganda	0.672	Lower-middle
Cameroon	0.752	Upper-middle
United Arab Emirates	0.783	Upper-middle
Albania	0.860	High

The final indicator focusing on women is the Women’s Empowerment Index (WEI), which assesses women’s empowerment across five dimensions: life and good health, education, skill-building and knowledge, labor and financial inclusion, and participation in decision-making while being free from violence. The WEI exclusively targets women, measuring their power and freedom to make choices and seize opportunities in life. Scores on the WEI are calculated on a scale from 0 to 1, with 0 representing no empowerment and 1 representing full empowerment. A higher WEI score indicates a greater degree of women’s empowerment. Figure 28 shows that there is a significant gender empowerment gap in OIC countries compared to the global level.

¹⁸ The cut-off points are GGPI value of less than 0.600 for low performance in achieving gender parity, 0.600–0.699 for lower-middle performance in achieving gender parity, 0.700–0.799 for upper-middle performance in achieving gender parity and 0.800 or greater for high performance in achieving gender parity (UNDP, 2023).

Figure 28: Women Empowerment Index in OIC Countries and World, 2022.

Source: UNDP, 2023.

Out of the 27 OIC countries for which the Women's Empowerment Index (WEI) is calculated, 25 are classified as having *low women's empowerment*, while 2 countries are classified as *lower-middle women's empowerment* countries (Table 12).

Table 12: Women Empowerment Index (WEI) , 2022

	Value	Women's Empowerment Group ¹⁹
Yemen	0.141	Low
Niger	0.307	Low
Iraq	0.363	Low
Lebanon	0.372	Low
Guinea	0.400	Low
Mali	0.400	Low
Benin	0.418	Low
Gambia	0.427	Low
Sierra Leone	0.438	Low
Bangladesh	0.443	Low
Burkina Faso	0.443	Low
Nigeria	0.444	Low
Iran	0.454	Low
Côte d'Ivoire	0.455	Low

¹⁹ The cut-off points are WEI value of less than 0.600 for low women's empowerment, 0.600–0.699 for lower-middle women's empowerment, 0.700–0.799 for upper-middle women's empowerment and 0.800 or greater for high women's empowerment (UNDP, 2023).

Uganda	0.463	Low
Egypt	0.466	Low
Jordan	0.488	Low
Türkiye	0.498	Low
Senegal	0.511	Low
Tunisia	0.512	Low
Maldives	0.518	Low
Cameroon	0.520	Low
Togo	0.537	Low
Panama	0.563	Low
Indonesia	0.568	Low
Albania	0.610	Lower-middle
United Arab Emirates	0.680	Lower-middle

Source: UNDP, 2023.

3. Efforts on Poverty Alleviation

In this section, first, poverty alleviation efforts in the world with a focus on Millennium Development Goals (henceforth MDGs) and Sustainable Development Goals (henceforth SDGs) will be elaborated. Afterwards, poverty alleviation efforts in the OIC Region will be summarized.

3.1. Efforts in the World

3.1.1. Millennium Development Goals

In 2000, the world agreed upon the MDGs. This agreement reflects the world leader's commitment to a new global partnership to ending poverty and hunger, improving education, gender, health and promoting sustainable development. Under this understanding, eight goals with a deadline of 2015 were set. These goals, namely MDGs, were:

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Promote gender equality and empower women
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Develop a global partnership for development

Despite its multisectoral approach, the main objective of MDGs was poverty alleviation. Goal 1 was directly; the remaining were indirectly addressing poverty. In fact, Goal 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 under the MDGs were priority areas that must be addressed to eliminate extreme poverty. The aim was to make the nations to accept the MDGs as national goals and increase the coherence and consistency of national policies and programs while trying to achieve these goals.

Under the MDGs, 21 targets and 60 indicators were officially defined to monitor the progress of the countries. The progress during the MDG period (2000-2022,) in the selected indicators is summarized below based on the latest available year.

Under the first goal, extreme poverty (less than \$1.90 a day) declined significantly from 26 percent in 1990 to 10 per cent as of year 2015. This number of people living under the \$1.90 a day fell to 632 million people or 8.2% of the world population in 2019. However, The Covid-19 pandemic has caused reversals in poverty reduction lead to number of people living under the \$1.90 a day increase to 656 million people or 8.6% of the world population 2022. The proportion of undernourished people in the developing regions has fallen by almost half from 23 per cent to 13 per cent from 1990 to 2015²⁰. The alleviation under the goal 2, the primary school net enrolment rate has reached to 89.4 percent in 2018, from 82.0 per cent in 1990. Under goal 3, the target to eliminate gender disparity in primary, secondary and tertiary education almost fully achieved. Under goal 4, the global under-five mortality rate has declined from 93 to 37 deaths per 1,000 live births from 1990 to 2020. Under goal 5, the maternal mortality ratio has declined from 342 deaths per 100,000 live births to 211 deaths per 100,000 live births from 2000 to 2017. Under goal 6, new HIV infections fell by approximately 28 per cent from 1990 to 2021. Under goal 7, the share of population using at least basic drinking water services rose from 80.6 percent to 90.0 percent from 2000 to 2020 and the proportion of population using at least basic sanitation services climbed from 55.4 percent to 78.0 percent at the same period. Under goal 8, official development assistance (ODA) by member countries of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) increased by 98 per cent in real terms between 2000 and 2021, reaching \$169.2 billion²¹.

3.1.2. Sustainable Development Goals

To follow and reinforce the commitment to the unfinished MDGs after 2015, the Post-2015 Development agenda in which the SDGs are at the core has been designed and declared at the UN Special Summit in September 2015. While the MDG agenda mostly focused on the challenges of the poor countries, SDG envisages a transition to a more comprehensive development framework that concerns all countries regardless of their level of development.

The Post-2015 Development Agenda provides a unique opportunity to end poverty, to protect the planet, and to ensure prosperity and well-being of people. The new development framework forces a transition from the MDG agenda focused on the challenges of the poor countries to a more comprehensive sustainable development agenda that concerns all countries regardless of their level of development. Besides, the new development agenda in which SDGs at the core will have implications for all development actors from the national to the international level. International and regional development actors will have a tremendous role for translating the goals and targets into action.

The adapted 17 SDGs are listed below:

1. **No Poverty** - End poverty in all its forms everywhere.
2. **Zero Hunger** - End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture.
3. **Good Health and Well-being** - Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages.
4. **Quality Education** - Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.
5. **Gender Equality** - Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls.

²⁰ FAO, <https://ourworldindata.org/hunger-and-undernourishment#undernourishment-by-world-region>.

²¹ The figures for goals 1 to 7 are from World Bank (2022). The figure for goal 8 is from OECD (2022).

6. **Clean Water and Sanitation** - Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all.
7. **Affordable and Clean Energy** - Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all.
8. **Decent Work and Economic Growth** - Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all.
9. **Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure** - Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation.
10. **Reduced Inequalities** - Reduce income inequality within and among countries.
11. **Sustainable Cities and Communities** - Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.
12. **Responsible Consumption and Production** - Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns.
13. **Climate Action** - Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts by regulating emissions and promoting developments in renewable energy.
14. **Life Below Water** - Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development.
15. **Life on Land** - Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.
16. **Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions** - Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.
17. **Partnerships for the Goals** - Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

Among these, Goal 1 directly addresses poverty alleviation in the world. Furthermore, Goals 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 17 are indirectly related to poverty alleviation. However, this does not be interpreted as the other goals are completely irrelevant of poverty reduction. The remaining seven goals are also serving poverty reduction but at a lesser degree compared to others.

3.2. Efforts under the OIC

In this section main poverty alleviation efforts under the OIC umbrella will be analyzed in terms of the activities of the OIC Institutions.

COMCEC Strategy

Poverty alleviation has an important place in the agenda of the COMCEC. As mentioned in the first section, poverty is a significant challenge in the OIC Region particularly among the African Member countries. The COMCEC Strategy adopted by the 4th Extra-ordinary Islamic Summit Conference held in Makkah on 14-15 August 2012, has identified poverty alleviation as one of its six cooperation areas. Furthermore, "Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger in the OIC Region" has been determined as a strategic objective.

The COMCEC Strategy has identified four output areas in its Poverty Alleviation Section, which are aid effectiveness, productive capacity of the poor, effective utilization of financial resources and monitoring poverty.

The COMCEC Poverty Alleviation Working Group has been established within the framework of the implementation of the COMCEC Strategy. The Working Group (WG) provides a regular platform in this field for the country experts to deliberate on the issues related to poverty, and to share their experiences and good practices. The Poverty Alleviation Working Group (WG) meets twice a year in Ankara.

The Strategy has also introduced a well-defined Project Funding Mechanism for the realization of the COMCEC Projects. In this respect, the Member Countries' and the relevant OIC Institutions' technical cooperation and the capacity building projects which will serve to the realization of the objectives of the COMCEC Strategy and to multilateral cooperation are funded by the COMCEC Coordination Office.

Islamic Solidarity Fund for Development (ISFD) and Special Program for Development of Africa (SPDA)

Islamic Solidarity Fund for Development (ISFD) is a special fund within the IDB. In line with the decision of the 3rd Extraordinary Islamic Summit held in 2005 in Makkah, the Fund was officially launched in 2007. The fund focuses on human development, agriculture, rural development, and basic infrastructure. The targeted budget of the Fund is US\$ 10 billion. The Paid-up capital reached US\$2.6 billion by 2022 representing 25% of the target capital. By 2022, the ISFD has provided a total of USD 1.2 billion in the form of concessional loans and grants to finance projects and programs in member countries. Out of the total approved projects, about 78% have been allocated to the Least Developed Member Countries (LDMCs). The main sectors of operations are agriculture (including rural development) with around 26%, education (including vocational training) with 20%, and health (including a COVID-19 pandemic response program) which accounted for around of 22% of the ISFD financing.²²

In accordance with the relevant decision of the 3rd Extraordinary Islamic Summit held in 2005 in Makkah, Special Programme for Development of Africa (SPDA) has been initiated by the IDB Group with the aim of supporting African OIC Member Countries, particularly least developed ones, in their poverty alleviation and economic development endeavors for the emergence of sustainable economic growth and the reinforcement of regional integration. The target capital of the SPDA is \$12 billion. The amount of total approvals has reached 5.01 billion USD since the beginning of the Program. In all 490 operations were approved during the approval phase of SPDA. Of these, 315 have been completed amounting to USD 2.9 billion (55.4% of the approved amount), 143 are still active, representing 35.5% of the gross approvals, and 32 have been cancelled, representing 9.2% of the approvals.²³

Vocational Education and Training Programme (OIC-VET) of SESRIC

Vocational education and training issues have significance impacts on enhancing the productive capacity of the poor. In this respect, a programme on vocational education and training was initiated by the Statistical, Economic and Social Research and Training Centre for Islamic Countries (SESRIC) in 2009. The Programme aims at supporting and contributing

²² The Islamic Solidarity Fund for Development (ISFD)

<https://www.isdb.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2022-10/ISFD%20Leaflet%20-%20English.pdf>

²³ Report on SPDA submitted to the 37th Session of the COMCEC

<https://www.comcec.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/4-Update-on-SPDA-2021-CI-pdf.pdf>

to the efforts of the OIC member countries towards addressing the challenges and limitations in the field of technical and vocational education and training (TVET).

Main objectives of OIC-VET are;

- to provide the exchange of people involved in VET throughout OIC Member Countries, so as to increase placements in enterprises.
- to enhance the quality and innovation capacity of Member Countries' vocational training systems, and to facilitate the transfer of innovative practices from one country to another.
- to increase the volume of cooperation among training institutions, enterprises, social partners and other relevant bodies throughout OIC Member Countries
- to expand the transparency and recognition of qualifications and competencies, including those acquired through formal and informal learning among Member Countries.
- to support the development of innovative Information and Communication Technology based on content, services, pedagogies and practice for lifelong learning.

SESRIC and the Islamic World Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ICESCO) have coordinated the preparation of the “OIC-TVET Strategic Roadmap 2020-2025” in collaboration with TVET authorities of OIC Member Countries through four thematic working group meetings and two consecutive workshops organized by SESRIC during the period 2017-2018. The Strategic Roadmap was welcomed by the 35th Ministerial Session of the COMCEC. SESRIC monitors the implementation of the Roadmap within the framework of the OIC-VET Programme and submits the progress report to the COMCEC Sessions and to the Follow-up Meetings.²⁴

Implementation of SDGs

By building directly on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), announced at the UN Special Summit in September 2015, present more ambitious and comprehensive development agenda in coverage. SDGs provide a roadmap to reach a sustainable world with mutual prosperity for all.

SESRIC annually reports²⁵ the progress towards achievement of the prioritized SDGs in the OIC Member Countries. These reports analyze whether the OIC region is on track to achieve the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the light of the selected indicators.

In addition to the annual report of the SESRIC, COMCEC Coordination Office compiles the relevant OIC Institutions' activities aligned with the prioritized SDG areas and submits the list to the annual COMCEC Sessions.

COMCEC COVID Response

The COVID-19 pandemic has caused unprecedented reversals in poverty reduction that are further exacerbated by rising inflation worldwide. Recent projections expect an additional 75

²⁴ Progress Report Towards the Implementation of the OIC-TVET Strategic Roadmap 2020-2025

https://www.comcec.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/4-ENProgress_Report_OIC_VET_Programme.pdf

²⁵ Towards the Achievement of Prioritised Sustainable Development Goals in OIC Countries 2021: A Progress Report by SESRIC, 2021 https://www.comcec.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/2-ENSDG_Report_2021.pdf

million to 95 million people living in extreme poverty in 2022, compared to pre-pandemic projections. Under the pessimistic scenario, which includes the disproportionate impact of rising food prices on the bottom 40% compared to the top 60% over the baseline scenario, 2022 could be the second-worst year (after 2020) in terms of progress made in reducing extreme poverty this century, when there was an actual increase in global poverty²⁶.

Real economy has been hit hard resulting in decline in business activities and increase in unemployment; and recovery is expected to take a long time as the decline in the tax revenues and increased debt would imply that the public sector will find it challenging to provide further incentives for a speedy economic recovery²⁷. COVID-19 induced slowdown had asymmetric detrimental effects on poverty alleviation, gender equality, education, social protection, refugees/IDPs, slum dwellers, labor market outcomes, remittances, international trade, commodity prices, food insecurity, and tourism dimensions in the OIC economies.

In order to alleviate the negative impacts of the pandemic on member country economies CCO initiated the *COMCED COVID Response (CCR)* for the benefit of member country public institutions in 2020. It particularly focuses on agriculture, finance, poverty alleviation, trade, transport and tourism. Under the Program, the CCO finances certain types of projects, which focus on needs assessment, sharing expertise, providing direct grants to final beneficiaries.

Moreover, given the importance of the issue, the 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th Meetings of the Poverty Alleviation Working Group were devoted to socioeconomic impacts of the COVID-19 (COMCEC, 2021) and effective social assistance provision programs in the OIC Member Countries (COMCEC, 2022).

The socioeconomic impacts of the COVID-19

Following are the determined as the challenges that might exacerbate income inequality and intergenerational transmission of poverty²⁸.

- Workers who have lost their jobs could lose their skills and have difficulty in returning to the labor market.
- The lack of sufficient support and relief programs for households adversely affected the socioeconomic status of disadvantaged groups.
- Disruptions in the education system could lead to hard-to-reverse damages to human capital.
- Businesses could suffer from a debt overhang. If a high debt burden discourages businesses from investing, the economy could suffer in the long run.

To overcome these challenges, following policy recommendations are highlighted:

For OIC Members which may need to improve their institutional capacity

²⁶ World Bank, 2022.

²⁷ The Role of Islamic Finance in Supporting Microenterprises and SMEs Against COVID-19
<http://ebook.comcec.org/Kutuphane/Icerik/d1f81c4e-46e8-4bfa-b5df-9c76a9c6967f.pdf>

²⁸ COVID-19 and Its Adverse Effects on Socio-Economic Inequalities in the OIC Member Countries
<https://www.comcec.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/ITEM-10-4-Poverty.pdf>

- Diversify concentrated exposures and resolve over-reliance on a single or small number of suppliers for critical goods and services to minimize the damages in future emergencies.
- Design labor market policies (i) to establish a balance between protecting existing shocks and addressing the destructive effects of labor reallocations and (ii) to provide unemployment subsidies that also cover informal workers.
- Utilize online databases and other digital tools to identify the needs, monitor changing situations of individuals and households, build automatic decision systems to check for eligibility, and effectively distribute social assistance in emergency situations.
- Develop effective food safety strategies to address the problems of food insecurity and undernourishment that emerged during the COVID-19 crisis due to the dramatic fall in income levels especially for disadvantaged groups.
- Devote more resources and set fiscal spending priorities to reverse learning depreciations among disadvantaged children, who lost substantial amounts of instructional time during the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Invest in health infrastructure and ensure health equality to effectively provide health care for disadvantaged and vulnerable groups during emergencies.
- Increase priority actions to ensure equal access to vaccines to achieve global herd immunity, save lives, prevent the emergence of new variants, and contribute trillions to global economic recovery.
- Improve policy coordination both within the OIC group, and between OIC countries and the rest of the world for more effective policy implementation during times of crises and to continue to narrow the gap between their living standards and those of advanced countries.

For OIC Members with relatively sufficient institutional capacity

- Reducing economic damage of the pandemic through applying semi-targeted lockdowns with contact tracing and testing programs instead of full lockdowns.
- Developing food safety strategies, promoting social assistance interventions, unemployment subsidies and alternative job generation with a view to alleviating poverty especially stemming from the job losses during the pandemic.

For OIC Members which may need to improve their institutional capacity

- Raising awareness of the importance of the measures and benefitting from information systems with a view to ensure effective implementation of public health measures.
- Ensuring equal access to education, employment, and health facilities particularly by women, youth, and unskilled workers through benefitting from online databases, employing activation policies, and unemployment subsidies.
- Closing learning gaps through remedial educational programs.
- Mitigating internal economic imbalances that could disrupt growth through implementing fiscal measures.
- Increasing the scope and capacity of social protection and assistance programs by allocating more resources and supporting them with digital technologies.

Integrated Monitoring and Information Systems

With the outbreak of the pandemic, governments have realized the importance of the integrated information systems for social protection. Integrated social protection systems are superior over traditional social assistance provision methods as former increase the efficiency, transparency, and effectiveness of the delivery of social programs. COMCEC (2022) reported that existing systems in OIC countries vary significantly in terms of the level of integration. While Azerbaijan, Türkiye, Uzbekistan, Pakistan, Qatar, and Indonesia have built nearly fully integrated systems, Albania, Malaysia, United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Tunisia, Lebanon, Morocco, and Tunisia have made notable progress in achieving high levels of interoperability across national programs. The degree of integration seems to correlate with member countries' economic development levels. In terms of geographical distribution, the member countries of the MENA region seem to have more advanced systems for social services provision. In contrast, African members seem to lag in exhibiting the critical building blocks of integrated monitoring and information systems in social assistance.

OIC member countries²⁹ classified into 4 categories based on levels of social protection integration: "Very-high-level" integration (Türkiye, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Uzbekistan, Pakistan, Qatar), "high-level" integration (Albania, Indonesia, Malaysia, United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco, Islamic Republic of Iran, Nigeria, Tunisia), "low level" integration (Uganda, Kyrgyzstan, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Bangladesh, Somalia, Jordan), and "very low" level integration (Iraq, Libya, Mali, Sudan, Algeria, Niger). For other members, the information does not exist, which suggests that these countries might have low degrees of integration (COMCEC, 2022).

COMCEC, 2022 suggests three separate pathways to three types of country typologies to move towards integrated information systems for social protection.

For OIC countries that have multiple social programs with insufficient interoperability.

- Program level delivery should be improved.
- Each delivery stage can be digitized, leading to digital databases with client interfaces.
- The outreach strategies should be expanded, particularly with a shift from on-demand to administer-driven systems.
- Digitized databases can be interconnected by interoperable data platforms through binary data interfaces or more holistic single registries.
- Provision and delivery (cash or service provision) can be connected to more efficient provision.
- A single beneficiary system helps identify "who gets what, when, and how."
- A single payment gateway storing all transactions between organizations and beneficiaries is essential.

- A single or connected grievances platform helps dynamic inclusion.
- Digital data analytics helps organizations evaluate their programs.

For OIC countries that currently have functional interoperable systems.

²⁹ Data are available only for 29 countries.

- The main challenge is creating a fully integrated beneficiary system through social registries, thus increasing the interconnectedness between social assistance programs and other relevant databases.
- Policymakers should consider introducing all programs into a single registry and connecting social registries with other institutional databases.
- A national ID system can be the basis of the social registry as it allows the identification of potential and existing beneficiaries.
- The current birth registers, census-type data, and similar broad databases will be helpful.
- Technical barriers and the intuitional "data politics" at this stage can overcome the political will toward integration.

For OIC countries that already have social registries and integrated beneficiary systems.

- These countries must adjust the integration by designing tools addressing grievances, identifying the under-covered parts of the population, and creating an adaptive social system responding to unexpected shocks and risks.
- Dynamic improvement of outreach and intake, not in terms of coverage but temporal adjustments, should be based on intelligent warning systems and better digital monitoring tools.
- Specific targeting mechanisms can be helpful for vulnerable groups (for instance, informal workers, women, and rural groups).
- Dynamic adjustment relying on effective information systems can potentially avoid the misallocation of resources and extend support to those in immediate need, thus increasing the adequacy of social protection as a whole.
- Alternative data sources such as geographical and climate information, socio-economic indicators, the measures of economic distress can be utilized to predict the needs of the poor and respond accordingly.
- Intelligent data analytics approaches and Big Data tools can provide critical predictive algorithms.

Concluding Remarks

There is a significant level of extreme poverty in the OIC Member Countries, with over 335 million people affected. The poverty headcount ratios among these countries range from zero percent to nearly 74.5 percent. Additionally, non-monetary poverty indicators also show considerable variation across the OIC Member Countries. The Human Development Index (HDI) values for these countries range from 0.937 to 0.380, while the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) values vary from zero to 0.601 for the countries where MPI has been calculated. Furthermore, Global Hunger Index values span from zero to 39.9.

This report aims to provide a comprehensive overview of poverty status in the OIC Member Countries, elaborating on both monetary and non-monetary poverty, with a particular focus on human development progress within these nations.

The OIC Member Countries are not a homogeneous group in terms of poverty levels. Among them, 8 countries fall into the high-income category, 14 into upper-middle income, 20 into lower-middle income, and 15 into low-income. High-income OIC countries have GDP per capita (current international PPP) levels exceeding \$20,000, with 7 of these 8 countries classified as very high in human development, while 1 is at the high human development level.

In the upper-middle income OIC countries, GDP per capita varies significantly, ranging from \$4,503 to \$13,137. Of these, 3 countries are classified as having very high human development, 8 as high human development, and 3 as medium human development.

For lower-middle income OIC countries, GDP per capita falls between \$1,189 and \$4,482. Poverty rates in this group show considerable variation, ranging from 0.4 percent to 66.8 percent. These countries can be categorized under high (5) and medium (7) human development levels. Notably, the situation regarding multidimensional poverty is more severe than that of monetary poverty; in nearly one-third of the lower-middle income countries, over 40 percent of the population is multidimensionally poor.

Regarding the low-income OIC Member Countries, both monetary and non-monetary poverty indicators present a stark picture. Their GDP per capita levels range between \$353 and \$2,272, reflecting the severe economic challenges these nations face. All countries in this group are classified as low-income food-deficit countries and exhibit serious or alarming hunger situations.

Furthermore, nearly all low-income OIC countries (13 out of 15) fall under the low human development category according to the Human Development Index (HDI), while 2 countries are in the medium human development category. The multidimensional poverty rate in this group exceeds 37%, indicating a significant level of deprivation across various dimensions of well-being, including health, education, and living standards.

Regarding human development progress, the OIC has seen an improvement in its Human Development Index (HDI) levels over the years. Between 1990 and 2022, the average HDI level of OIC countries increased from 0.505 to 0.645. Despite this progress, the OIC average remains significantly below both the OECD and global averages. Furthermore, the gap between the OIC and developing countries has widened over the last three decades, increasing from 0.011 to 0.049 points.

This implies that the human development progress in the OIC has been slower than that of developing countries. Furthermore, the new development agenda, specifically the

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), will have significant implications for all countries, including the OIC. The implementation of the SDGs will play an important role in the OIC development agenda. In alignment with the global development agenda, OIC countries and institutions are actively working to alleviate poverty through several programs, such as the Islamic Solidarity Fund for Development (ISFD), the Special Program for Development Assistance (SPDA), and the OIC Vocational Education and Training (OIC-VET).

Regarding gender inequality, 16% of member countries are classified as having high gender equality, 7% as having medium-high equality, 13% as having medium to medium-low equality, and 51% as having low gender equality. Additionally, based on new measures introduced by UNDP, OIC countries, on average, lag behind the global level in terms of gender parity and women's empowerment.

While significant progress has been made in alleviating both monetary and non-monetary poverty over the decades, the COVID-19 pandemic has reversed three decades of poverty reduction efforts, presenting OIC member countries with additional challenges. In response, the Central Commission for the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (CCO) initiated the COMCED COVID Response (CCR) to support member countries' public institutions. The aim is to mitigate the negative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, which have had asymmetric detrimental effects on poverty alleviation, gender equality, education, social protection, refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs), slum dwellers, labor market outcomes, remittances, international trade, commodity prices, food insecurity, and tourism within the OIC economies.

REFERENCES

- Alkire, S., A. Conconi, and J.M. Roche (2013) Multidimensional Poverty Index 2013: Brief Methodological Note and Results. Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, Oxford University.
- Bello, A., A. Suleman (2011) The Challenge of Achieving the MDGs in IDB Member Countries in the Post-Crisis World. Islamic Development Bank Occasional Paper No.16.
- COMCEC (2012) COMCEC Strategy. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.
- (2013) COMCEC Progress Report 2013. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.
- COMCEC. (2015). Poverty Outlook 2015: Achievements on the Millennium Development Goals. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.
- COMCEC, & IDB. (2015). The Critical Success Factors in the Implementation of the Post-2015 Development Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals: Current Situation and Prospects for the OIC. Ankara.
- COMCEC (2021). COVID-19 and Its Adverse Effects on Socio-Economic Inequalities in the OIC Member Countries.
- COMCEC (2022). Effective Social Assistance Provision and Socioeconomic Empowerment in light of COVID-19 Pandemic in the OIC Member Countries: Integrated Monitoring and Information Systems.
- Dabour. N. Md. (2000) Eradication of Poverty in the Least Developed and Low-Income OIC Member Countries. Journal of Economic Cooperation. 21(1), pp. 57-96.
- European Commission (2013) Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion: Progress Microfinance. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=836>
- FAO (2021) Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries (LIFDC) - List for 2021. <https://www.fao.org/countryprofiles/lifdc/en/>
- Fields. G. (1994) Poverty Changes in Developing Countries, in Rolph van der Hoeven and Richard Anker.eds.Poverty Monitoring: An International Concern. New York: St Martin's Press, pp.1-14.
- Global Hunger Index <https://www.globalhungerindex.org/about.html>
- Global Hunger Index <https://www.globalhungerindex.org/download/all.html>
- Hardiman. M. and J. Midgley (1982) The Social Dimensions of Development: Social Policy and Planning in the Third World. Chichester: Wiley.
- Haughton. J. and S. R. Khandker (2009) The Handbook on Poverty and Inequality. Wahington D.C.: The World Bank.
- Hunt, D. (1989) Economic Theories of Development: An Analysis of Competing Paradigms. New York; London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Husain.I. (2007) Economic Development and Poverty Alleviation in OIC Countries. International Forum. Kuala Lumpur: Institute of Strategic and International Studies.
- Hussain.M. (2010) State of Poverty in OIC Member Countries. International Symposium on Poverty Alleviation Strategies: Experiences and New Ideas. İstanbul: General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity. Vol.2, pp. 349-362.
- IFPRI, Welthungerhilfe (WHH); and Concern Worldwide. 2015. 2015 Global hunger index data. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). (2013) 2013 Global Hunger Index: The Challenge of Hunger: Building Resilience to Achieve Food and Nutrition Security. Washington DC.
- IDB (2011a) Report on Activities of the ISFD. Report presented at the 27th Meeting of the Follow-Up Committee of the COMCEC. Ankara: IDB.
- Klugman, J., F. Rodriguez and H.J. Choi (2011) The HDI 201: New Controversies, Old Critiques. The Economic Journal of Economic Inequalities.9(2), pp.249-288.
- Manning, R. (2007) Pro-Poor Growth: Negotiating Consensus on a Contentious Issue. Development.50(2), pp.42-47.
- OECD (2001) The DAC Guidelines: Poverty Reduction. Paris.
- (2006) Promoting Pro-Poor Growth: Policy Statement. Development Assistance Committee High Level Meeting on 05 April 2006.
- (2009) Promoting Pro-Poor Growth: Social Protection.
- (2013) POVNET Mandate 2007-08. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/povertyreduction/povnetmandate2007-08.htm>
- <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-data/ODA-2020-detailed-summary.pdf>
- OIC (2008) Charter of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference. Senegal.
- (2013b) Vocational Education and Training Program for the OIC Member Countries. Available at: <http://www.oicvet.org/aims.php>
- Overseas Development Institute (2008) Pro-Poor Growth and Development. Briefing Paper 33. Available at: <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/825.pdf>
- Rahi, M. (2011) Human Development Report 2010: Changes in Parameters and Perspectives. Indian Journal of Public Health.55(4), pp.272-275.
- Sagar, A. D. and A. Najam (1998) The Human Development index: A Critical Review. Ecological Economics.25(3), pp.249-264.
- Streeten.P. (1994) Poverty Concepts and Measurement. in Rolph van der Hoeven and Richard Anker. eds..Poverty Monitoring: An International Concern. New York: St Martin's Press.pp.15-30.
- Sumner, A. (2010) The MDGs and Beyond: Pro-Poor Policy in a Changing World. Poverty in Focus. Number 19, January 2010, pg.3-4.

The UN (2001) Road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration. Report of the Secretary-General. A/56/326.

(2013) Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger. We Can End Poverty: millennium Development Goals and Beyond. UN Fact Sheet

(2015a) The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015. Available at: <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx>

(2015b) Millennium Development Goals Indicators. Available at: <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx>

<https://sdgs.un.org/goals>

UNCTAD, Gross domestic product: Total and per capita, current and constant (2010) prices, annual <http://unctadstat.unctad.org/wds/TableViewer/tableView.aspx>

UNDP. (1990). Human Development Report 1990 Concept and Measurement of Human Development. NY: United Nations Development Programme.

UNDP. (2000). Human Development Report 2000 Human rights and development. NY: Human Development Report 1990.

UNDP. (2007). Human Development Report 2007/2008 Fighting climate change: Human solidarity in a divided world. NY: United Nations Development Programme.

UNDP. (2009). Human Development Report 2009 Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development. NY: Human Development Report 1990.

UNDP. (2016). Human Development Report 2016 Human Development for Everyone. NY: United Nations Development Programme.

UNDP. (2018). Human Development Report - 2018 Statistical Update

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi>

UNDP (2021) Human Development Reports <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/download-data> Human Development Report,

The 2022 Global Multidimensional Poverty Index
<https://hdr.undp.org/content/2022-global-multidimensional-poverty-index-mpi#/indicies/MPI>

UNDP (2023), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women). 2023. The paths to equal: Twin indices on women's empowerment and gender equality. New York.

The World Bank (2024)

Population, total

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL>

GDP per capita, PPP (current international \$)

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD>

GDP (Current US\$)

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>



Poverty headcount ratio at \$2.15 a day (2017 PPP) (% of population)

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.DDAY>

People using at least basic sanitation services (% of population)

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.STA.BASS.ZS>

Mortality rate, under-5, male (per 1,000 live births)

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.DYN.MORT.MA?end=2019&start=1989>

School enrollment, primary (% net)

<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.PRM.NENR?end=2019&start=1988>

MDG Progress Status from The World Bank:

<http://datatopics.worldbank.org/mdgs/compare-trends-and-targets-of-each-mdg-indicator.html>

Thomas. A. and T. Allen (2000) Agencies of Development in Tim Allen and Alan Thomas.eds. Poverty and Development into the 21st Century. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.189-216

Zeinelabdin. A.R. (1996) Poverty in OIC Countries: Status Determinants and Agenda for Action. Journal of Economic Cooperation. 17(3-4). pp. 1-40.

ANNEXES


Annex 1: The Widely Used Non-Monetary Poverty Indices

Human Development Index

Human development approach relies on a view that poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon. This perspective is inspired by Amartya Sen's³⁰ notion of well-being and poverty. Within the context of human development in order to investigate development by assuming that it is something beyond income and economic growth rates of countries the UNDP calculates a Human Development Index (HDI).³¹ The HDI defines people as "the real wealth of a nation"³² and posits *health, knowledge* and *income* as three basic aspects of human measures for development, and calculates a country's average achievements in these areas. In conclusion, the HDI sees poverty in terms of human poverty and defines it as a lack of income, education and health.³³

The HDI utilizes four indicators, namely GNI per capita, mean years of schooling, expected years of schooling and life expectancy at birth, under three dimensions (Figure 29). When being calculated the index, minimum and maximum values are set in order to transform the indicators into indices between 0 and 1. The HDI is calculated by taking the geometric mean of the three dimension indices.

Figure 29: Dimensions of the HDI



Source: The UNDP, 2023.

Multidimensional Poverty Index

Within the context of human development thinking, in addition to HDI, the UNDP have started to calculate MPI, in order to measure poverty in a much broader context, since 2010. The MPI considers multiple deprivations of the population and their overlap by utilizing the dimensions of health, education and standard of living (

Figure 30). While the health and education dimensions are similar to the dimensions of HDI, but use different indicators, the standard of living is a different dimension that consists of six

³⁰Sen 1987 quoted in Haughton and Khandker 2009, p.2.

³¹Klugman et al. 2011, p.250; Sagar and Najam 1998, p.251

³²The UNDP 1990, p.9.


³³The UNDP 1990, p.63.

indicators related to basic living standards. On the other hand, income is not included in the calculation of MPI.

Deprivation in education is examined by years of schooling and child school attendance, deprivation in health is measured by child mortality and nutrition, and deprivation in living conditions is measured by electricity, improved sanitation, drinking water, flooring, cooking fuel, and asset ownership.

Because each main dimension is equally weighted in calculation of the index, one dimension affects the index 33 percent at most. Also each component of dimensions has equal weight. MPI has maximum and minimum scores for its three dimensions and the related indicators, which demonstrates for a household a maximum deprivation value of 10 and a minimum value of zero. A household having a deprivation value of 3 and more is considered as living under multidimensional poverty, and one who has a value between 2 and 3 is recognized as being under the risk of multidimensional poverty. (The UNDP, 2010b:215-222).

Figure 30: Dimensions of the MPI



Source: The UNDP, 2023.

Global Hunger Index

Global Hunger Index (GHI) which is calculated by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) is a significant indicator that reveals the state of hunger for countries. The GHI displays the level of hunger by taking undernourishment³⁴, child wasting, child stunting and under-five mortality rate into account. The methodology of GHI is revised in 2015 report. According to this new methodology, GHI scores on a 100-point scale where 0 is the best score (no hunger) and 100 the worst. In practice, neither of these extremes can be attained. A value of 100 means that the country' undernourishment, child wasting, child stunting and child mortality levels are the same as the maximum thresholds in all the dimensions. A value of zero imply that the country has no undernourished people, no wasted or stunted children under five-year age and under-five mortality rate is zero.

A GHI value addresses to a low hunger situation when it is under 9,9, moderate when it is between 10.0 and 19.9, serious when it is between 20,0 and 34.9, alarming when it is between 35,0 and 49.9, and extremely alarming when it is above 50.

³⁴ "Undernourishment" indicates the calorie consumption of fewer than 1,800 a day, which is thought to represent the minimum calorie requirement that most people need to live a healthy and productive life. (FAO, 2011a quoted in IFPRI et.al., 2013:7)

For technical details on the GHI methodology go to <https://www.globalhungerindex.org/about.html>

Low-Income Food Deficiency:


The classification of a country as low-income food-deficit used for analytical purposes by FAO is determined by three criteria. First, a country should have a per capita Gross National Income (GNI) below the "historical" ceiling used by the World Bank to determine eligibility for assistance by the International Development Association (IDA) and for the 20-year IBRD terms, applied to countries included in World Bank's categories I and II. The newly updated LIFDC list is based on the GNI for 2021 (estimated by the World Bank using the Atlas method) and the historical ceiling of USD 2 045 for 2021. The second criterion is the net food trade position (i.e. gross exports minus gross imports) of a country averaged over the last three years for which statistics are available, in this case 2019, 2020 and 2021. Trade volumes for a broad basket of basic foodstuffs (cereals, roots and tubers, pulses, oilseeds and oils other than tree crop oils, meat and dairy products) are converted and aggregated by the calorie content of the individual commodities. Third, the self-exclusion criterion is applied if a country meeting the above two criteria specifically requests to be excluded from the LIFDC category.

Furthermore, in order to avoid countries changing their LIFDC status too frequently – typically reflecting short-term, exogenous shocks – an additional factor was introduced in 2001. This factor, called "persistence of position" postpones the "exit" of a LIFDC from the list, despite the country not meeting the LIFDC income criterion or the food deficit criterion, until the change in its status is verified for three consecutive years. In other words, a country is taken out of the list in the fourth year, after confirming a sustained improvement in its position for three consecutive years.

Gender Development Index:

GDI measures gender inequalities in achievement in three basic dimensions of human development: health, measured by female and male life expectancy at birth; education, measured by female and male expected years of schooling for children and female and male mean years of schooling for adults ages 25 years and older; and command over economic resources, measured by female and male estimated earned income. Dimensions and indicators are summarized as follows:

Figure 31: Dimensions of the GDI:




Source: UNDP, 2023.

Gender Inequality Index:

The Gender Inequality Index (GII) gauges gender-based disparities in three key aspects: reproductive health, empowerment, and the labor market. It quantifies the extent of lost potential in human development resulting from inequality between women and men in these areas. The index varies between 0, indicating equal outcomes for both genders, and 1, where one gender faces the worst possible outcomes in all the measured dimensions. The GII values are computed using an inequality measurement method, which involves a multi-stage calculation process. First, it involves a geometric mean across dimensions, calculated separately for women and men. Then, these means are combined using a harmonic mean across both genders. Dimensions and indicators are summarized as follows:

Figure 32: Dimensions of the GGI:




Source: UNDP, 2023.

Global Gender Parity Index:

GGPI is a composite index that assesses the relative achievements between women and men in four dimensions: life and good health (one indicator); education, skill-building and knowledge (two indicators); labour and financial inclusion (two indicators); and participation in decision making (three indicators). Dimensions and indicators are summarized as follows:

Figure 33: Dimensions of the GGPI:




Source: UNDP, 2023.

Women Empowerment Index:

The Women’s Empowerment Index (WEI) is a composite index that measures the level of women’s empowerment across five dimensions: life and good health (two indicators); education, skill-building and knowledge (two indicators); labour and financial inclusion (two indicators), participation in decision-making (three indicators); and freedom from violence (one indicator). Dimensions and indicators are summarized as follows:

Figure 34: Dimensions of the WEI:



Source: UNDP, 2023.

Annex 2: OIC Member Countries by Income Categories

High Income Countries	Upper-middle Income Countries	Lower-middle Income Countries	Low Income Countries
Bahrain	Albania	Bangladesh	Afghanistan
Brunei Darussalam	Algeria	Benin	Burkina Faso
Guyana	Azerbaijan	Cameroon	Chad
Kuwait	Gabon	Comoros	Gambia
Oman	Indonesia	Cote d'Ivoire	Guinea-Bissau
Qatar	Iraq	Djibouti	Mali
Saudi Arabia	Iran	Egypt	Mozambique
United Arab Emirates	Kazakhstan	Guinea	Niger
	Libya	Jordan	Sierra Leone
	Malaysia	Kyrgyzstan	Somalia
	Maldives	Lebanon	Sudan
	Suriname	Mauritania	Syria
	Turkmenistan	Morocco	Togo
	Türkiye	Nigeria	Uganda
		Pakistan	Yemen
		Palestine	
		Senegal	
		Tajikistan	
		Tunisia	
		Uzbekistan	

Source: The World Bank, 2024.

Annex 3: MPI values

Afghanistan	0.272	Liberia	0.259
Albania	0.003	Libya	0.007
Algeria	0.005	Madagascar	0.386
Angola	0.282	Malawi	0.231
Argentina	0.001	Maldives	0.003
Armenia	0.001	Mali	0.376
Bangladesh	0.104	Mauritania	0.327
Barbados	0.009	Mexico	0.016
Belize	0.017	Moldova (Republic of)	0.004
Benin	0.368	Mongolia	0.028
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.038	Montenegro	0.005
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.008	Morocco	0.027
Botswana	0.073	Mozambique	0.372
Brazil	0.016	Myanmar	0.176
Burundi	0.409	Namibia	0.185
Cambodia	0.070	Nepal	0.074
Cameroon	0.232	Nicaragua	0.074
Central African Republic	0.461	Niger	0.601
Chad	0.517	Nigeria	0.175
China	0.016	North Macedonia	0.001
Colombia	0.020	Pakistan	0.198
Comoros	0.181	Palestine. State of	0.002
Congo	0.112	Papua New Guinea	0.263
Congo (Democratic Republic of the)	0.331	Paraguay	0.019
Costa Rica	0.002	Peru	0.026
Côte d'Ivoire	0.236	Philippines	0.024
Cuba	0.003	Rwanda	0.231
Dominican Republic	0.009	Saint Lucia	0.007
Ecuador	0.008	Samoa	0.025
Egypt	0.020	Sao Tome and Principe	0.048
El Salvador	0.032	Senegal	0.263
Eswatini (Kingdom of)	0.081	Serbia	0.000
Ethiopia	0.367	Seychelles	0.003
Fiji	0.006	Sierra Leone	0.293
Gabon	0.070	South Africa	0.025
Gambia	0.198	Sri Lanka	0.011
Georgia	0.001	Sudan	0.279
Ghana	0.111	Suriname	0.011
Guatemala	0.134	Tajikistan	0.029
Guinea	0.373	Tanzania (United Republic of)	0.284
Guinea-Bissau	0.341	Thailand	0.002
Guyana	0.007	Timor-Leste	0.222
Haiti	0.200	Togo	0.180
Honduras	0.051	Tonga	0.003
India	0.069	Trinidad and Tobago	0.002
Indonesia	0.014	Tunisia	0.003
Iraq	0.033	Turkmenistan	0.001
Jamaica	0.011	Tuvalu	0.008
Jordan	0.002	Uganda	0.281
Kazakhstan	0.002	Ukraine	0.001
Kenya	0.171	Uzbekistan	0.006
Kiribati	0.080	Viet Nam	0.008
Kyrgyzstan	0.001	Yemen	0.245
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.108	Zambia	0.232
Lesotho	0.084	Zimbabwe	0.110

Multidimensional Poverty Index, 2023, UNDP (based on 2022 or latest available survey)

Annex 4: GDP Per Capita (PPP) for the OIC Member Countries between 1990 and 2023

Country	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2023
Afghanistan			180	254	562	567	512	353
Albania	617	751	1127	2674	4094	3953	5343	8368
Algeria	2432	1467	1780	3248	4958	4741	3794	5260
Azerbaijan	1238	315	655	1578	5844	5501	4230	7155
Bahrain	9295	10851	12739	17705	21187	22851	23433	29084
Bangladesh	295	322	413	493	777	1236	2234	2529
Benin	382	359	503	806	1009	1042	1241	1435
Brunei Darussalam	13441	15828	17972	25991	34610	30681	27179	33431
Burkina Faso	340	230	250	443	627	632	824	874
Cameroon	1077	822	700	1129	1384	1400	1539	1674
Chad	298	210	168	665	897	774	644	719
Comoros	997	824	654	1103	1384	1323	1520	1587
Chad	298	210	168	665	897	774	644	719
Cote d'Ivoire	906	769	987	1267	1654	1942	2351	2729
Djibouti	784	791	743	853	1228	2409	2922	3606
Egypt	751	938	1399	1133	2510	3370	3572	3513
Gabon	6055	4420	3991	6571	8400	7090	6680	8420
Gambia	305	633	545	619	797	612	704	844
Guinea	612	721	524	469	667	756	1074	1664
Guinea-Bissau	651	591	318	464	600	644	754	914
Guyana	531	827	939	1086	4590	5668	6863	20626
Indonesia	583	1020	771	1249	3094	3323	3896	4941
Iran	2237	1586	1672	3227	6459	4991	2746	4503
Iraq	10217	616	1964	1745	4430	4417	4251	5512
Jordan	1195	1509	1673	2217	3915	4064	3999	4482
Kazakhstan	1647	1288	1229	3771	9070	10511	9122	13137
Kuwait	11002	16425	19494	36145	39212	29315	24656	37533
Kyrgyz Republic	609	364	280	477	880	1121	1257	1970
Lebanon	790	2960	3995	4630	7695	7803	5600	3350
Libya	6822	5396	7424	8108	11611	7868	9872	7330
Malaysia	2513	4405	4088	5537	8880	9700	10164	11649
Maldives	956	1545	2210	3789	7158	9480	7217	12667
Mali	300	273	263	474	688	724	823	897
Mauritania	751	879	660	975	1646	1563	1836	2149
Morocco	1219	1456	1492	2238	3068	3139	3258	3672
Mozambique		196	334	439	495	604	457	608
Niger	420	235	193	316	472	481	565	618
Nigeria	568	1303	563	1250	2280	2680	2075	1621
Oman	6475	6353	8321	12358	22552	18777	16708	23295
Pakistan	347	456	644	833	1012	1422	1322	1407
Palestine		1327	1476	1544	2557	3272	3234	3368

Country	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2023
Qatar	16665	15798	27495	52468	73021	66985	52316	87480
Saudi Arabia	7350	7589	8795	13463	17959	20442	20398	28895
Senegal	981	733	620	1003	1287	1238	1492	1746
Sierra Leone	150	201	139	286	401	581	493	433
Somalia	147	213	391	447	223	507	557	644
Sudan	1302	484	378	946	1357	1355	608	2272
Suriname	941	1592	1978	3474	8000	8908	4797	6069
Syrian Arab Republic	992	796	1161	1553	2748	857	537	
Tajikistan	481	208	137	334	740	970	852	1189
Togo	593	432	421	564	722	770	877	1013
Tunisia	1456	1940	2171	3107	4241	3961	3494	3895
Türkiye	2773	2855	4278	7369	10623	11050	8639	12986
Turkmenistan	806	587	636	1659	4287	6208	7330	9191
Uganda	245	278	258	331	825	864	847	1014
United Arab Emirates	26683	27011	31856	42191	35392	41525	37629	52977
Uzbekistan	652	586	558	547	1742	2754	1759	2496
Yemen	945	795	520	785	1249	1488	626	533

Source: World Bank, 2023

Annex 5: HDI Values and Human Development Categories of the Countries, 2022

HDI rank	Country	Value
VERY HIGH HUMAN DEVELOPMENT		
1	Switzerland	0.967
2	Norway	0.966
3	Iceland	0.959
4	Hong Kong, China (SAR)	0.956
5	Denmark	0.952
5	Sweden	0.952
7	Germany	0.950
7	Ireland	0.950
9	Singapore	0.949
10	Australia	0.946
10	Netherlands	0.946
12	Belgium	0.942
12	Finland	0.942
12	Liechtenstein	0.942
15	United Kingdom	0.940
16	New Zealand	0.939
17	United Arab Emirates	0.937
18	Canada	0.935
19	Korea (Republic of)	0.929
20	Luxembourg	0.927
20	United States	0.927
22	Austria	0.926
22	Slovenia	0.926
24	Japan	0.920
25	Israel	0.915
25	Malta	0.915
27	Spain	0.911
28	France	0.910
29	Cyprus	0.907
30	Italy	0.906
31	Estonia	0.899
32	Czechia	0.895
33	Greece	0.893
34	Bahrain	0.888
35	Andorra	0.884
36	Poland	0.881
37	Latvia	0.879
37	Lithuania	0.879
39	Croatia	0.878
40	Qatar	0.875
40	Saudi Arabia	0.875
42	Portugal	0.874
43	San Marino	0.867
44	Chile	0.860
45	Slovakia	0.855
45	Türkiye	0.855

47	Hungary	0.851
48	Argentina	0.849
49	Kuwait	0.847
50	Montenegro	0.844
51	Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.838
52	Uruguay	0.830
53	Romania	0.827
54	Antigua and Barbuda	0.826
55	Brunei Darussalam	0.823
56	Russian Federation	0.821
57	Bahamas	0.820
57	Panama	0.820
59	Oman	0.819
60	Georgia	0.814
60	Trinidad and Tobago	0.814
62	Barbados	0.809
63	Malaysia	0.807
64	Costa Rica	0.806
65	Serbia	0.805
66	Thailand	0.803
67	Kazakhstan	0.802
67	Seychelles	0.802
69	Belarus	0.801
HIGH HUMAN DEVELOPMENT		
70	Bulgaria	0.799
71	Palau	0.797
72	Mauritius	0.796
73	Grenada	0.793
74	Albania	0.789
75	China	0.788
76	Armenia	0.786
77	Mexico	0.781
78	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.780
78	Sri Lanka	0.780
80	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.779
81	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.772
82	Dominican Republic	0.766
83	Ecuador	0.765
83	North Macedonia	0.765
85	Cuba	0.764
86	Moldova (Republic of)	0.763
87	Maldives	0.762
87	Peru	0.762
89	Azerbaijan	0.760
89	Brazil	0.760
91	Colombia	0.758
92	Libya	0.746
93	Algeria	0.745
94	Turkmenistan	0.744

95	Guyana	0.742
96	Mongolia	0.741
97	Dominica	0.740
98	Tonga	0.739
99	Jordan	0.736
100	Ukraine	0.734
101	Tunisia	0.732
102	Marshall Islands	0.731
102	Paraguay	0.731
104	Fiji	0.729
105	Egypt	0.728
106	Uzbekistan	0.727
107	Viet Nam	0.726
108	Saint Lucia	0.725
109	Lebanon	0.723
110	South Africa	0.717
111	Palestine. State of	0.716
112	Indonesia	0.713
113	Philippines	0.710
114	Botswana	0.708
115	Jamaica	0.706
116	Samoa	0.702
117	Kyrgyzstan	0.701
118	Belize	0.700
MEDIUM HUMAN DEVELOPMENT		
119	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	0.699
120	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0.698
120	Morocco	0.698
122	Nauru	0.696
123	Gabon	0.693
124	Suriname	0.690
125	Bhutan	0.681
126	Tajikistan	0.679
127	El Salvador	0.674
128	Iraq	0.673
129	Bangladesh	0.670
130	Nicaragua	0.669
131	Cabo Verde	0.661
132	Tuvalu	0.653
133	Equatorial Guinea	0.650
134	India	0.644
135	Micronesia (Federated States of)	0.634
136	Guatemala	0.629
137	Kiribati	0.628
138	Honduras	0.624
139	Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.620
140	Vanuatu	0.614
141	Sao Tome and Principe	0.613
142	Eswatini (Kingdom of)	0.610

142	Namibia	0.610
144	Myanmar	0.608
145	Ghana	0.602
146	Kenya	0.601
146	Nepal	0.601
148	Cambodia	0.600
149	Congo	0.593
150	Angola	0.591
151	Cameroon	0.587
152	Comoros	0.586
153	Zambia	0.569
154	Papua New Guinea	0.568
155	Timor-Leste	0.566
156	Solomon Islands	0.562
157	Syrian Arab Republic	0.557
158	Haiti	0.552
159	Uganda	0.550
159	Zimbabwe	0.550
LOW HUMAN DEVELOPMENT		
161	Nigeria	0.548
161	Rwanda	0.548
163	Togo	0.547
164	Mauritania	0.540
164	Pakistan	0.540
166	Côte d'Ivoire	0.534
167	Tanzania (United Republic of)	0.532
168	Lesotho	0.521
169	Senegal	0.517
170	Sudan	0.516
171	Djibouti	0.515
172	Malawi	0.508
173	Benin	0.504
174	Gambia	0.495
175	Eritrea	0.493
176	Ethiopia	0.492
177	Liberia	0.487
177	Madagascar	0.487
179	Guinea-Bissau	0.483
180	Congo (Democratic Republic of the)	0.481
181	Guinea	0.471
182	Afghanistan	0.462
183	Mozambique	0.461
184	Sierra Leone	0.458
185	Burkina Faso	0.438
186	Yemen	0.424
187	Burundi	0.420
188	Mali	0.410
189	Chad	0.394
189	Niger	0.394



191	Central African Republic	0.387
192	South Sudan	0.381
193	Somalia	0.380

Source: *Human Development Report, 2022, UNDP.*

Annex 6: Low-Income Food-Deficit Countries

<i>Africa</i>	<i>Americas</i>	<i>Asia</i>
Benin	Haiti	Afghanistan
Burkina Faso	Nicaragua	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Burundi		Kyrgyzstan
Cameroon		Nepal
Central African Republic		Syrian Arab Republic
Chad		Tajikistan
Comoros		Uzbekistan
Congo		Yemen
Democratic Republic of the Congo		
Eritrea		
Ethiopia		
Gambia		
Guinea		
Guinea-Bissau		
Kenya		
Lesotho		
Liberia		
Madagascar		
Malawi		
Mali		
Mauritania		
Mozambique		
Niger		
Rwanda		
Sao Tome and Principe		
Senegal		
Sierra Leone		
Somalia		
South Sudan		
Sudan		
Togo		
Uganda		
United Republic of Tanzania		
Zimbabwe		

Source: FAO, 2023.

Annex 7: The GHI Values of the Countries

Country	2000	2008	2015	2023
Yemen	41.4	37.8	42.1	39.9
Niger	53.3	39.5	35.2	35.1
Chad	50.6	49.9	40.1	34.6
Guinea-Bissau	37.7	29.6	33.3	33.0
Sierra Leone	57.4	45.4	32.8	31.3
Afghanistan	49.6	36.5	30.4	30.6
Mozambique	48.2	35.6	37.0	30.5
Nigeria	39.9	31.2	27.8	28.3
Guinea	40.2	29.3	28.4	27.1
Sudan	—	—	28.5	27.0
Pakistan	36.7	31.3	28.8	26.6
Syrian Arab Republic	13.9	16.2	23.9	26.1
Mali	41.9	32.2	27.1	25.6
Burkina Faso	45.0	33.7	28.0	25.5
Uganda	35.0	29.0	27.8	25.2
Djibouti	44.4	33.9	29.6	23.0
Comoros	38.2	30.4	24.0	22.7
Benin	33.9	26.4	23.3	22.6
Togo	38.2	29.6	25.7	21.1
Mauritania	30.5	18.8	22.4	21.0
Côte d'Ivoire	32.5	36.0	22.1	20.6
Gambia	29.2	24.9	24.3	19.7
Bangladesh	33.8	30.6	26.2	19.0
Gabon	21.0	20.2	17.3	18.7
Cameroon	36.0	29.0	20.7	18.6
Indonesia	26.0	28.5	21.9	17.6
Libya	16.6	12.8	18.5	16.1
Senegal	34.3	21.8	18.0	15.0
Iraq	23.6	20.3	16.5	13.8
Tajikistan	40.1	29.9	16.9	13.7
Egypt	16.4	16.9	15.2	12.8
Malaysia	15.4	13.7	12.0	12.5
Suriname	15.1	11.0	10.6	10.4
Turkmenistan	20.3	14.5	11.4	10.3
Guyana	17.2	15.1	11.3	9.3
Morocco	15.8	12.2	9.1	9.0
Oman	14.8	11.2	11.2	8.3
Iran	13.7	8.8	7.7	7.7
Kyrgyzstan	17.5	12.9	9.1	7.5
Saudi Arabia	12.3	10.6	9.1	7.3
Azerbaijan	24.9	15.0	9.3	6.9
Algeria	14.7	11.1	8.5	6.8
Albania	16.4	15.5	8.8	6.1
Tunisia	10.3	7.4	6.4	5.9
Kazakhstan	11.3	11.0	5.7	5.5

Source: The Global Hunger Index, 2023

Annex 8: The Official 3 Regional Groups of the OIC Member Countries

Arab Group	Asian Group	African Group
Algeria	Afghanistan	Benin
Bahrain	Albania	Burkina Faso
Comoros	Azerbaijan	Cameroon
Djibouti	Bangladesh	Chad
Egypt	Brunei Darussalam	Cote d'Ivoire
Iraq	Indonesia	Gabon
Jordan	Iran	The Gambia
Kuwait	Kazakhstan	Guinea
Lebanon	Kyrgyzstan	Guinea-Bissau
Libya	Malaysia	Mali
Mauritania	Maldives	Mozambique
Morocco	Pakistan	Niger
Oman	Tajikistan	Nigeria
Palestine	Türkiye	Senegal
Qatar	Turkmenistan	Sierra Leone
Saudi Arabia	Uzbekistan	Togo
Somalia	Guyana*	Uganda
Sudan	Suriname *	
Syria		
Tunisia		
United Arab Emirates		
Yemen		

Note: Guyana and Suriname are in Latin America Region. However due to the limited number of countries in that region, they are included in the Asian Group.