

ERADICATION OF POVERTY IN THE LEAST DEVELOPED AND LOW-INCOME OIC MEMBER COUNTRIES

Nabil Md. Dabour *

Poverty has spread far and wide in the Islamic countries despite the fact that this is not commensurate with the vast resources endowment of these countries. Its impact has been on such a large scale that it has become a structural phenomenon of human deprivation manifested in hunger, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, and low level and quality of consumption of hundreds of millions of people, particularly in the least developed and low-income countries (LDLICs). In recognition of the gravity of the situation of poverty in the OIC countries in general and the OIC-LDLICs in particular, this paper is meant to be an investigation into the status and determinants of poverty in the OIC- LDLICs. It attempts to assess the situation of poverty in these countries and to propose a wide range of policy recommendations for poverty alleviation at the country as well as the OIC levels.

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite the remarkable progress in economic and human development the world over in the past three decades, the backlog of human poverty remains pervasive, particularly in the poor countries of the developing world regions of South and South-East Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, and Latin America. A quarter of the world's population remains in severe poverty; nearly 1.3 billion people live on less than \$1 a day, and close to 1 billion cannot meet their basic consumption requirements. The share in global income of the richest fifth of the world's population is 74 times that of the poorest fifth. In a global economy of \$25 trillion, this reflects shameful inequalities and inexcusable failures of national and international development policies as the world approaches the 21st century.

The increase in the incidence of poverty worldwide is now being matched with a re-emergence of interest in the determinants of poverty and its alleviation. This re-emergence of interest comes as the result of an increased realisation that poverty is actually on the increase all over the globe, especially in developing countries, and that the "development" efforts of the past three decades have not really been reaching the most needy segments of the population. After three decades of development, both developing countries and

* Senior Economist, Chief of Social Research Section at the SESRTCIC.

major development finance institutions as well as development practitioners have come to recognise that the strategies of economic growth (1960s), basic human needs (1970s) and economic adjustment (1980s) have failed to eradicate poverty.

Poverty is a complex, multi-dimensional phenomenon that stems from both national and international factors. The international dimension of poverty is manifested in the fact that millions of people all over the globe, classified as poor, are suffering from hunger and malnutrition at a time when huge resources are available to humanity. The mass poverty in the developing regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America is, therefore, partly a reflection of the unjust international economic order and the structure of the international economic powers. However, despite this, the problem of poverty remains essentially a national one in the sense that perceptions of poverty are very diverse and hence the need to articulate the national character and efforts in its eradication. In this context, poverty is a result of the complex socio-economic and political structure of a particular country, and hence the status, the determinants, and the policy measures required to eradicate it would, by definition, vary from one country to another. Poverty is, then, more than poor persons; it is a problem of States, associated with poor economies, poor human resources, poor social service provisions, and poor policies to tackle the challenge of development and poverty alleviation.

Poverty has spread far and wide in the Islamic countries despite the fact that this is not commensurate with the vast resources endowment of these countries. Its impact has been on such a large scale that it has become a structural phenomenon of human deprivation manifested in hunger, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, and low level and quality of consumption of hundreds of millions of people, particularly in the least developed and low-income countries (LDLICs). The mass poverty in the OIC countries, particularly the OIC-LDCs among them, must be understood, in general, as a product of complex structural processes embedded in the political economy of these countries. Within this complexity, identifying the key causes of poverty is a precondition for formulating an effective anti-poverty strategy. Generally, the primary cause of poverty in most of these countries can be summed up in the failure of development strategies in the last three decades, including the more recently introduced macroeconomic reforms. This failure has manifested itself in the limited and inequitable access of the majority of the people to all forms of capital: physical, financial, human and social. Deprivation from capital leads to lack of remunerative employment and poverty.

The poor in these countries do not form a homogeneous group, and the data about their characteristics are patchy. They include such various groups

as: rural, landless, agricultural and non-agricultural workers, semi-subsistence farmers, low-income market-oriented farmers, urban workers with low or fixed wages in public or private sectors, self-employed persons in non-tradable sectors, and urban workers in informal sectors. Actually, these segments of society are often below the poverty line and account for the greater part of the population in the OIC-LDLICs. Therefore, it is not possible to imagine human or economic development in these countries without a significant rise in the standard of living of these groups in terms of consumption, health, housing, education and culture. If governments of these countries are to reduce poverty or to judge how their economic policies affect it, they need to know a lot about their poor. It is important to know who the poor are; where they live; what assets they command; what their education, health and housing conditions are; and what economic opportunities are available to them. Investing in people must, therefore, be the highest priority for these countries as long as human capital limitations restrain growth or keep people in absolute poverty.

In view of the severity of poverty in the OIC countries in general and the OIC- LDLICs in particular, this paper is meant to be an investigation into the status and determinants of poverty in the OIC- LDLICs. It attempts to assess the situation of poverty in these countries and to propose a wide range of policy recommendations for poverty alleviation at country as well as OIC levels. However, given the scarcity of complete data and studies at the national level and the absence of common definitions of poverty in these countries, the analysis in this paper had to rely largely on the data provided by various editions of the UNDP's *Human Development Report*, which, to a large extent, reflect the multi-dimensional nature of human poverty, and especially its social dimension.

2. POVERTY: CONCEPT AND MEASUREMENT

The analysis of poverty inevitably leads to the question of who the poor are, and particularly to the issue of how poverty is defined and measured. Answering these questions requires, in turn, an operational definition of poverty and a good sense of poverty trends over time. Measuring poverty in a population is, thus, a function of the definition one chooses to use to classify the concept of poverty. Indeed, much has been written in an attempt to define poverty and measure its existence and incidence in a given population. However, poverty is a complex multi-dimensional phenomenon, with several facets: economic, social, political, cultural and environmental. It is a state of deprivation, which is reflected at both national and international levels in low consumption of nutrients, low health status, low educational attainment, poor housing conditions, and the lack of capital assets and savings.

One consequence of the multifaceted nature of poverty is that it has many distinct definitions that vary widely among countries and international organisations and institutions. Anybody spending less than \$1 a day (adjusted for differences in purchasing power) is poor according to some; to others, it is \$2 a day. Some calculate minimum calorie requirements as their poverty line. However, poverty has traditionally been defined as a distinct characteristic--either one is poor or not. Simply defined in this context, poverty is that level of income or expenditure of an individual or a family 'poverty line', which is inadequate to meet the basic needs of survival. Given a particular indicator of welfare, a certain line or standard is drawn, and an individual or household falls one side or the other. The selection of a "poverty line" separates the population into those who have an adequate level of welfare and those who do not.

Yet, measuring the welfare level of an individual or a household is not an easy task, but it can be made easier if one restricts the concept to that of material or economic welfare. For this purpose, a specific "standard of living" indicator is often chosen for measuring welfare. In other words, defining poverty requires the selection of a welfare criterion to draw a line that divides the population into poor and non-poor. The literature on poverty analysis (see e.g. Streeten, P. 1995) also distinguishes between two types of poverty lines, namely those using the amount of income needed to satisfy the food requirements only and those that also consider income needed to satisfy non-food requirements such as housing, clothing, education and health services.

However, poverty is more than what is reflected by a certain level of consumption/expenditure. Social sectors and factors have the capacity to influence greatly people's poverty status. In this context, the United Nations has recently favoured composite indices taking into account access to education and basic health into their computation of measures of poverty and human development. Poverty is seen as lack of human development which is reflected in the extent to which people are capable of living long lives, being literate, being adequately nourished, and basically being free to choose. There have been attempts at quantifying the social dimension of poverty. The Human Development Index (HDI) developed by the UNDP in 1990 is a case in point. The HDI is a composite of life expectancy at birth, years of schooling, and GNP per capita.

The concept of human poverty, which was recently introduced in the UNDP's *Human Development Report 1997*, sees impoverishment as a multidimensional issue. More than a lack of what is necessary for material well being, poverty can also mean the denial of opportunities and choices most basic to human development. The UNDP's Human Poverty Index (HPI) is an

attempt to bring together in a composite index the different dimensions of deprivation in human life. It provides an aggregate human measure of the prevalence of poverty in a community. The UNDP's HPI draws attention to deprivation in three essential elements of human life, which were already reflected in the UNDP's traditional HDI: longevity, knowledge and a decent living standard. Nonetheless, it is important to keep in mind that the concept of human poverty is much larger than the measure because it is difficult to reflect all dimensions of human poverty in a single quantifiable composite indicator. Lack of political freedom, lack of personal security, inability to participate freely in the life of a community and threats to sustainability can hardly be measured.

In the end, the choice of definitions and lines of poverty is subjective. However, the question arises as to whether these different definitions and lines always select the same people. In practice, many definitions have been used, and it is by no means certain that they identify the same people as poor. This implies that different definitions of poverty may lead to different policy recommendations, which suggests that more attention should be given to the choice of a particular definition when analysing the effects of economic policies on the poor. In this respect, it is widely argued that different definitions of poverty select different population groups as poor, and that can lead to the design of very different policy measures to reduce poverty. From the policy perspective, definitions of poverty should correspond to the specific policy or policies under consideration and adequately define the target group of the policy programmes.

3. POVERTY AND DEVELOPMENT

The ultimate objective of any economic system is the attainment of the highest level of welfare for all. This objective means in particular that a minimum level of basic needs, consistent with human dignity as the world approaches the 21st century, must be satisfied for every one in the society. However, the widespread poverty coupled with deepening inequality undermines the prospects for economic growth, let alone development in any meaningful sense. Indeed, the persistence of mass poverty the world over has pushed poverty alleviation to the top of the development agenda in the 1990s. The increase in the incidence of poverty, especially in developing countries, is now being matched with a re-emergence of interest in the determinants of poverty and its alleviation. This re-emergence of interest comes as a result of an increased realisation that "development" efforts in the past three decades have not really been reaching the most needy segments of the population.

During the 1960s, economic growth was emphasised as a cornerstone of development. Economic growth was thought to bring with it, as a matter of course, a “trickling down” of benefits to the poor, who would be able then to help themselves out of their state of poverty. The 1970s saw the birth of the ‘Basic Needs Approach’ to development, put forward and developed by the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The basic component of this approach is the necessity for Government to act as provider of basic services such as education, health care and infrastructure. While the 1970s had exhibited high rates of improvement in terms of social and economic indicators, with virtually every country in the world boasting an increase in growth, the 1980s has come to be commonly known as the “lost decade” of development, especially for the least developed countries. Macroeconomic difficulties were triggered the world over in the mid-1980s as the debt crisis and international recession exposed structural weaknesses in the economies of the countries concerned. As a result, countries have been unable to keep up with their ambitious plans for the provision of basic services to their peoples. Economic growth was failing to come about and international funding and assistance were not forthcoming as had been hoped. Development plans therefore had to be revised accordingly.

The 1980s also brought with them pressure from the international development and donor institutions, especially the Bretton Woods institutions (the World Bank and the IMF), for the application of economic stabilisation and structural adjustment policies (SAPs). Concentration on macroeconomic growth through SAPs became the slogan of the times in the 1980s and early 1990s. Benefits to the general population and to the poor in particular were once again assumed to trickle down to them as a matter of course. The international community was witnessing a return of interest in “trickle-down” economics. But the type of SAPs undertaken in many developing countries affected not only economic growth but also the social welfare and the living conditions of large segments of the populations in these countries. Evidence to date indicates that countries which sustained their adjustment efforts over a number of years have begun to experience more growth than those which did not. Meanwhile, poverty and social conditions have continued to deteriorate in many adjusting countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, where the number of poor has been growing rapidly (Jayarajah, C, *et al.* 1996).

Accordingly, SAPs policies and measures have recently been subjected to a major re-evaluation, with attempts to address the issue of poverty. To achieve poverty eradication, it is now advocated that three interdependent components should be in place to support the most vulnerable segments of the population: economic growth, social development, and the presence of safety nets (The World Bank 1995). The way this is seen to be best achieved is by involving the

poor directly. The realisation that the poor and their perceptions and their potential need to be incorporated in any attempt to alleviate or eradicate poverty is increasingly gaining ground. The World Bank appears to have come to the conclusion that effecting reductions in poverty and hunger requires a concerted effort, with the active participation and collaboration of national Governments, international organisations, bilateral agencies, NGOs, community-based organisations, and the empowerment of the poor themselves. All such concerned organisations and individuals are now calling for the necessity of involvement and participation by the poor themselves in defining their problems and in designing the solutions and the implementation process.

It is now widely believed that a balanced development strategy needs to treat equally all types of assets, human, natural, or man-made, and that it considers equally their potential contribution to the future growth stream. In this sense, investment in human capital and expenditure, which may not generate returns, will surely increase the future earning potentials of the individual. This policy reinforces the outcome to the extent that it emphasises basic human development priorities; i.e., primary education and primary health care. There should be no doubt about the feedback effects of human development on income redistribution and alleviating poverty. It is with this in mind that the UN General Assembly declared 1996 the Year for the Eradication of Poverty which ushered in the start of a whole decade to address this issue (1997 to 2006 the International Decade for the Eradication of Poverty). During the World Summit for Social Development, held in Copenhagen in March 1995, heads of State and Government committed themselves, through the Copenhagen Declaration and Programme of Action, to taking decisive national action and to mustering international co-operation to eradicate poverty in the world as an ethical, social, political and economic imperative for humanity.

4. POVERTY IN OIC MEMBER STATES: OVERVIEW

The OIC region is geographically vast. The current 56 OIC member countries, dispersed over a large area on four continents, span from the former Soviet Union member countries in Central Asia in the north to Mozambique in Africa in the south and from Guyana in Latin America in the west to Indonesia in the east. As such, the OIC member countries as a whole account for one-sixth and one-fifth of the world land and population, respectively. The OIC member countries constitute a substantial part of the developing countries and as they have different levels of economic development and policy priorities at the national level, they do not comprise a homogeneous group. There are discrepancies between these countries with regard to economic and human endowments, industrialisation and technological levels. Nonetheless, the

economies of these countries are widely believed to be complementary rather than competitive ones. Yet, this potential does not manifest itself in the form of reasonable levels of economic and human development in the OIC countries as a group.

Like many developing countries, the OIC member countries in general have been moving, albeit at different paces at the national level, according to the same development paradigms and strategies over the last three decades. Therefore, and since the OIC countries constitute a substantial part of the developing countries, it is logical to assume that what applies to the developing countries, in general, also applies to the OIC countries as a group. Moving from the economic growth strategies of development in the 1960s to the income redistribution paradigm in the 1970s and then to the most recent paradigm of economic adjustment reforms since the 1980s, the OIC countries have made remarkable progress and met with serious setbacks in human development and poverty alleviation. As in developing countries, the evidence points to considerable progress in reducing poverty in OIC countries, especially in the 1960s and the 1970s. However, the picture for the 1980s and the 1990s is mixed; in some countries the poor have suffered serious setbacks, whereas in others the progress has continued and has even accelerated.

Unfortunately, shortages of complete data at the national level and the absence of a common definition and a common approach to measure the actual extent and prevalence of poverty in the OIC countries make it impossible to be precise. However, in general, poverty has spread far and wide in the OIC member countries. Its impact has been on such a large scale that it has become a structural phenomenon of human deprivation manifested in hunger, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, and low level and quality of consumption for hundreds of millions of people, particularly in the OIC- LDLICs.

According to the *World Development Report 1990*, the proportion of people living below the poverty line in Malaysia, for example, decreased from 50% to 25% from 1965 to 1985; in Indonesia, the percentage of people living in poverty dropped by 41% between 1970 and 1987; and in Pakistan, the percentage dropped by 20% during the 1960s and 1970s (The World Bank 1990, p. 48). However, against such individual achievements, the people in 14 OIC-LDLICs (406 million) were living in 1990 under the income poverty line defined by the same report at \$370 per capita income (i.e., 40% of the total population of the OIC countries in that year). According to the report, this is the number of people who are struggling to survive on less than \$370 a year (the upper poverty line used in the report). Of these, 173 million in 10 countries, most of them in sub-Saharan Africa, (17% of the total population of the OIC countries in 1990) were extremely poor: their annual consumption was

less than \$275 (the lower poverty line used in the report). Applying the same poverty line, in 1997, the number of OIC countries under the poverty line increased to 17 countries, 11 of them were extremely poor, i.e., under the lower poverty line of \$275 (Appendix-1).

According to recent data available on the human poverty index (HPI) in the UNDP's *Human Development Report 1999*, an average of 34.7% of the people of 39 OIC countries (368.5 million) suffer from human poverty (Appendix-2). This percentage reached 46.3% (126.3 million) of the total population of 19 OIC-LDCs, and 35.1% (168.4 million) of the total population of only 5 OIC low-income countries (Appendix-3). Moreover, out of the 30 countries in which the UNDP's *Human Development Index (HDI)* declined in 1997 (more than in any other year since the *Human Development Report* was first issued in 1990), 20 countries were OIC member countries. 15 of them were OIC-LDLICs; most of them (12 countries) in sub-Saharan Africa (Appendix-4), half the population of which is estimated to be in income poverty by the year 2000.

Appendix-4 reports the general indicators on human development and poverty in the OIC countries in terms of the UNDP's HDI and HPI for which data are available. The figures indicate that poverty is not confined to the OIC-LDLICs only. The impact of human poverty is also increasingly being felt in many OIC middle-income countries and even in some OIC oil-exporting countries. The HPI which was calculated by the UNDP in 1999 for 92 developing countries, ranges from 9.8% in Bahrain and Jordan to 65.5% in Niger. In the case of the 39 OIC countries included in the sample, HPI exceeds 33% in 24 countries, 18 of them are OIC-LDLICs. This implies that an average of at least a third of the people in these countries suffers from human poverty. Moreover, in 12 OIC-LDLICs the HPI is almost or exceeds 50%. This implies that an average of at least half the people in these countries suffers from human poverty. In terms of global HPI ranks, 7 OIC-LDLICs were ranked within the lowest 10 global ranks.

More importantly, the figures in Appendix-4 reflect clearly the weak performance of the majority of the OIC countries on human development and poverty alleviation fronts as compared with their performance on the income growth front. The negative figures in column 2 of Appendix-4 (adjusted HDI; real GDP per capita rank minus HDI rank) indicate that the real GDP per capita rank is better than the HDI rank in almost all the countries. Interestingly, this is clearer and more significant in high- and middle-income countries, especially the oil-exporting ones. This can be explained, in part, by low levels of investment in people, poor social service provisions, and poor policies to tackle the challenge of human development and poverty alleviation in these

countries compared with other developing countries with the same level of income growth. Implicitly, this may also be explained as a reflection of high levels of income inequality in these countries when compared with other developing countries. Lastly, the figures in columns 5 and 6 indicate clearly the weaker performance of the majority of these countries in poverty alleviation (HPI) than in the other measures.

As in any part of the world, poverty in OIC countries is a complex, multi-dimensional problem that stems from both national and international factors. Perceptions of poverty in OIC countries are very diverse and hence the need to articulate the national character and efforts in its eradication. The poor do not form a homogeneous group, and the data about their characteristics are patchy. They include such various groups as rural, landless, agricultural, and non-agricultural workers, semi-subsistence farmers, low-income market-oriented farmers, urban workers with low or fixed wages in public or private sectors, self-employed persons in non-tradable sectors, and urban workers in informal sectors. Actually, these segments of society are often below the poverty line and account for the greater part of the population, particularly in the OIC-LDLICs. Therefore, it is not possible to imagine human or economic development in these countries without a significant rise in the standard of living of these groups in regard to consumption, health, housing, education and culture.

5. POVERTY IN OIC LEAST DEVELOPED AND LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES (OIC-LDLICs)

5.1. OIC-LDLICs: Overview

The group of the OIC least developed countries (OIC-LDCs) is made up of those member countries of the OIC (21 countries) which are designated as least developed by the United Nations, namely Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Comoros, Djibouti, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Togo, Uganda and Yemen. These countries represent 44 per cent of the total number of the LDCs of the world (48 countries). The majority of these countries are in sub-Saharan Africa (17 countries; 81 per cent of the total), two in South East Asia, and one in West Asia. On the other hand, the group of the OIC low-income countries (OIC-LICs) is made up of those member countries of the OIC which are classified by the World Bank as low-income countries according to their 1998 GNP per capita, at \$760 level or less. With the exception of Djibouti and Maldives, this group includes all the OIC-LDCs and other 9 countries, namely Cameroon, Nigeria, Senegal, Indonesia, Pakistan, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan. Together, these

two groups represent the OIC least developed and low-income countries (OIC-LDLICs) and count for more than half of the OIC member countries (30 countries out of the 56 total member countries) and for about 66.8% of the total population of the OIC member countries.

The regional distribution of the OIC-LDLICs may clearly be viewed as having a large bearing on their growth and development prospects. The majority of these countries (20) are in sub-Saharan Africa, 5 in South East Asia, 4 in Central Asia and one country in West Asia. Since the OIC-LDLICs constitute a substantial part of sub-Saharan Africa, it is logical, in general, to assume that what applies to this region, as a whole, also applies to the OIC-LDLICs as a group. In terms of economic structure and performance and the progress in human development and poverty alleviation, one may roughly consider the 20 OIC-LDLICs in sub-Saharan Africa as a homogeneous group. On the other hand, with different sizes and structures and different stages of development, this record is mixed in the case of the other 10 OIC-LDLICs in Asian regions. However, the available data indicate that, in general, the OIC low-income countries (OIC-LICs) have outperformed the OIC-LDCs (see Appendix-1 and -5).

The LDLICs, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa including the 20 OIC-LDLICs, are poverty-stricken. Indeed, no region in the developing world is poorer than sub-Saharan Africa. In terms of human poverty, it has both the highest proportion of people and the fastest growth. Some 220 million (38% of the total population of the region) are income-poor, and it is estimated that by the year 2000 half the people in this region will be in income poverty (UNDP, *Human Development Report 1997*, p. 3). The region-wide extreme poverty in sub-Saharan Africa reflects foremost a structural problem. Relative to countries in other regions, sub-Saharan African countries, including the OIC-LDLICs, lack the capacity to provide basic education, health care, and physical infrastructure required for sustainable development.

The absolute level of resources in these countries is inadequate to combat widespread poverty. Poverty in these countries is largely a rural phenomenon, with most of the poor depending on agriculture for jobs and income. The rural poor have very limited access to credit, land, and extension services; lack of genuine political commitment to land reform or public sector support for rural development is the major factor exacerbating poverty. Since the early 1980s, the governments of many countries in the region, including the OIC-LDLICs, have embraced market reforms and structural adjustments, and some countries are experiencing some gains in economic growth. Nevertheless, adjustment policies have yet to alleviate absolute poverty in the region (Jayarajah, C, *et al.* 1996).

With small economies and high population growth rates, the 21 OIC-LDCs have a very low share in the total OIC income, even less than the national income of some individual OIC member countries such as Indonesia, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, etc. Although they constitute 25.4% of the total OIC population, they produce only 5.6% of the total OIC income. The majority of the OIC-LDCs in sub-Saharan Africa continue to rely on too few commodities for export earnings. This situation, combined with the fact that prices for most of those commodities are low and declining, results in inadequate prospects for growth. In contrast, the 10 OIC-LICs produce more than 25% of the total OIC income, although they make up 41% of the OIC population (SESRTCIC, *Annual Economic Report on the OIC Countries: 1999*). This reflects the relatively large size of the economies in this group. Indonesia, for example, produces about 14.4% of the OIC income, but with 203.7 million people, per capita income hardly amounts to \$680. While per capita income in the OIC-LICs group amounts, on average, to \$817, it amounts to only \$298 in the OIC-LDCs. However, per capita income in the OIC-LDLICs as a group amounts to \$619, which is quite higher than that of all LDLICs of the world which was \$520 in 1998 (SESRTCIC 1999 and Appendix-5).

Appendix-5 shows that, in the 1990s, the OIC-LDLICs managed in general to realise a good level of growth in their production. The growth levels of GDP and per capita GNP in most of these countries were comparable to the levels of the world LDLICs as a group. Except for a few countries, the average annual GDP and per capita GNP growth rates in the OIC-LDLICs were notably higher than the "all LDLICs" as a group. Although still below the GDP growth rates, the high annual population growth rates may undermine the fragile economies of these countries, especially in terms of per capita GDP and per capita food production. The economic structure of almost all OIC-LDLICs has hardly changed over the past two decades. Agriculture's contribution to GDP has remained high in the majority of these countries, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, and significantly higher than that of the "all LDLICs" group. Except in Indonesia and Nigeria, industry and manufacturing performances are weaker than those in the "all LDLICs" group. In some countries, they remained constant or even lagged behind those in 1980. In most OIC-LDLICs, investments have shown considerable progress relative to all-LDLICs. However, trade performance in terms of export growth was weaker than in all LDLICs group. Foreign debt continues to be one of the most troublesome problems facing these countries. The figures in Appendix-5 reflect also the heavy burden of the external debts in almost all of these countries as compared to "all LDLICs" group.

In the following two sections, we attempt to examine the status of poverty and human development in the OIC-LDLICs. The analysis in this part relies

largely on the data available on these countries in the UNDP's Human Development Reports, which, to a large extent, reflect the multi-dimensional nature of human poverty, especially the social dimension of poverty problems. This is due, as we mentioned in the introduction, to the scarcity of complete data and studies at the national level and the absence of common definitions and approaches that measure the actual extent and prevalence of poverty in these countries.

5.2. Social and Human Development Record

Appendix-6 presents the data on the elements and the values of the UNDP's 1999 Human Development Index (HDI) for the OIC-LDLICs and reports their global ranks according to the values of this index in a sample of 174 countries. As we have mentioned earlier, the UNDP's HDI is an attempt to quantify the social dimension of poverty. It is a composite of life expectancy at birth, years of schooling and GNP per capita. When examining these elements for the OIC-LDLICs, the data in Appendix-6 reflect clearly the weak performance of most of these countries at both national and international levels.

Life expectancy at birth in 12 OIC-LDCs is lower than the average of the world LDCs of 51.7 years. It reaches only 37.2 years in Sierra Leone and 39.6 years in Uganda. However, Maldives and most of the OIC-LICs, except Nigeria, realised life expectancy rates higher than the average of 64.4 years in developing countries and even higher than the world average of 66.7 years in the case of Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Adult literacy rates and gross enrolment ratios are very low in most OIC-LDCs, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa. For example, the adult literacy rate was found to be 14.3 per cent in Niger and 20.7 per cent in Burkina Faso. The gross enrolment ratio amounted to 20 per cent in Burkina Faso and 21 per cent in Djibouti. However, these two ratios were found to be higher than the world average of 78.0 per cent in Maldives and in the four OIC-LICs in transition. Consequently, with the exception of Maldives, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and, to some extent, Azerbaijan, Indonesia and Tajikistan, it is clear that all the other 26 OIC-LDLICs have very low values and global ranks of HDI. Sierra Leone, Niger, Burkina Faso, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, and Mali were among the 10 countries with the lowest global values and ranks of HDI.

The data in the last column of Appendix-6 (Adjusted HDI; i.e., real GDP per capita rank minus HDI rank) reflect clearly the weak performance of the majority of the OIC-LDLICs on the human development front compared with their performance on the income growth front. The negative figures indicate that the real GDP per capita rank is better than the HDI rank in 19 OIC-LDLICs, including some of those with relatively high HDI values and ranks

such Maldives and Indonesia. In part, this reflects the unusual levels of growth rates realised by most of these countries in the 1990s. However, it can be explained also, as mentioned earlier, by low levels of investment in people, poor social service provisions and poor policies to tackle the challenge of human development and poverty alleviation in these countries compared with other developing countries. Implicitly, this may also be explained as a reflection of high levels of income inequality in some of these countries when compared with other developing countries.

The figures in Appendix-7 reflect the poor provision of education services. In 11 countries, most of which are OIC-LICs and out of the 16 OIC-LDLICs for which data are available, public expenditure on education as a percentage of GNP is lower than the average of developing countries and the world average and even lower than the average of sub-Saharan African countries as a group. Moreover, no significant improvements have occurred in these percentages in the last 15 years, and they even have decreased in some countries like Mali, Togo, Uganda, Cameroon and Azerbaijan. This has been reflected, therefore, in the obvious significant gap between the primary enrolment ratio and the secondary enrolment ratio and in the high percentages of children not reaching grade 5 in most of these countries.

The figures in Appendix-8 show that, with the exception of the four OIC-LICs in transition, the record on health service progress is not promising in all other OIC-LDLICs, especially in the sub-Saharan Africa region. Out of the 23 OIC-LDLICs, for which data is available, 16 countries have public expenditure on health as percentage of GNP lower than the average of developing countries and the world average. In 12 OIC-LDLICs, this percentage was even lower than the average of the world LDCs group. This has been reflected, therefore, in the obvious weak record of all health indicators in these countries. For example, the number of doctors per 100000 people was only 2 in Chad and Gambia, 3 in Niger and 4 in Mali. The numbers of Malaria and Tuberculosis cases are still very high in most of these countries. Moreover, the situation in some OIC-LDCs in sub-Saharan Africa regarding the human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS) has become catastrophic as the numbers of AIDS cases are increasing significantly.

In general, the record of food security and nutrition continued its slow progress and even deteriorated over the last two decades in many OIC-LDLICs, especially in the sub-Saharan African region. The index of food production per capita in 12 OIC-LDLICs, most of them in the sub-Saharan African region, was lower than that of both the developing and least developed countries groups in 1997 (Appendix-9). The figures in Appendix-9 reflect the

decreasing trend in daily per capita supply of calories, protein and fat in many of these countries over the period 1970-1996. The deterioration in the health situation together with the slow progress in food security and nutrition led to the unsatisfactory indicators on progress in survival as shown in Appendix-10.

Infant, under-five, and maternal mortality rates are very high in many OIC-LDLICs, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. In countries such as Sierra Leone, Niger, Mozambique, Mali, Chad, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Burkina Faso and Uganda, these rates have significantly lagged behind those realised in the developing and least developed countries groups and even in sub-Saharan countries as a group. Consequently, many of these countries recorded a very high percentage of people not expected to survive to age 60. This percentage reached, for example, 76 per cent in Uganda, 70 per cent in Sierra Leone, 64 per cent in Burkina Faso, 61 per cent in Mozambique, and over 50 per cent in Togo, Chad, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Niger, Uganda and Nigeria (Appendix-10).

To sum up, it is clear that no significant progress appears to have been achieved at both the national and the global levels in most of these countries since the mid-1980s--the period the data of which have been used in calculating the first HDI in 1990. Overall, most of the OIC-LDLICs social and human development indicators, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, continued their slow progress; no significant changes appear to have been achieved in the last two decades. Education and health systems are severely strained by the low public expenditures on them and the loss of trained personnel. Hard-won gains in life expectancy and child survival rates are being wiped out and AIDS-related suffering is enormous for individuals, families and societies.

5.3. Incidence of Poverty

Poverty has spread far and wide in the OIC-LDLICs. Its impact has been on such a large scale that it has become a structural phenomenon of human deprivation manifested in hunger, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, and low level and quality of consumption of hundreds of millions of people. The people in 14 OIC-LDLICs (406 million) were living in 1990 under the income poverty line defined by the World Bank's 1990 *World Development Report* at \$370 per capita income (i.e., 40% of the total population of the OIC countries in that year). According to the report, this is the number of people who are struggling to survive on less than \$370 a year (the upper poverty line used in the report). Of these, 173 million in 10 countries, most of them in sub-Saharan Africa, (17% of the total population of the OIC countries in 1990) were extremely poor: their annual consumption was less than \$275 (the lower poverty line used in the report). Applying the same poverty line, in 1997, the number of OIC-

LDLICs under the poverty line increased to 17 countries, 11 of them were extremely poor; i.e., under the lower poverty line of \$275 (Appendix-1).

However, poverty in OIC-LDLICs is not just income poverty. According to recent data on the Human Poverty Index (HPI) available in the UNDP's *Human Development Report 1999*, an average of 46.3% of the people of 19 OIC-LDCs (126.3 million) suffer from human poverty. This percentage reached 35.1% (168.4 million) of the total population of only 5 OIC-LICs (Appendix-3). The above discussion on the indicators of HDI, education and health, food security and nutrition, and progress in survival shows that the problem of poverty in most of the OIC-LDLICs emanates from the fact that large segments of the population have little access to the basic social needs and do not command sufficient material resources to improve their income and welfare. Therefore, poverty is very much associated with deprivation.

Appendix-11 presents the data on the elements of the 1999 HPI of the OIC-LDLICs. The figures on deprivation in income provisioning show that high proportions of people in most of these countries are still without access to basic social and human needs such as education, health care, safe water and sanitation. In 9 out of the 24 OIC-LDLICs for which data are available, the percentage of population without access to safe water in the period 1990-97 amounted to over 50 percent. In 12 OIC-LDLICs, this percentage was lower than the average percentage achieved by the group of the world LDCs in the same period. The percentage of population without access to health services was over 50 per cent in 13 OIC-LDLICs and the percentage of population without access to sanitation was over 50 per cent in 18 OIC-LDLICs. In 11 OIC-LDLICs, this percentage was lower than the average percentage achieved by the group of the world LDCs in the same period.

Moreover, the ratios of the richest 20 per cent to the poorest 20 per cent in the 10 OIC-LDLICs for which data are available are very low reflecting the high levels of income inequality in these countries. This ratio was less than 10 in five countries namely, Bangladesh, Niger, Uganda, Indonesia and Pakistan (Appendix-11). The HPI, which has been calculated by the UNDP in 1999 for 92 developing countries, ranges from 25.4 per cent in Maldives and 27.7 per cent in Indonesia to 65.5 per cent in Niger and 59.3 per cent in Burkina Faso. In the case of the 26 OIC-LDLICs included in the sample, HPI was almost or above 50 per cent in 12 countries. This implies that an average of at least half the people in these countries suffers from human poverty. HPI was also more than 33 per cent in 18 OIC-LDLICs. This implies that an average of at least a third of the people in these countries suffers from human poverty. In terms of global HPI ranks, 7 OIC-LDLICs were ranked within the lowest 10 global ranks (Appendix-11). Overall, the progress on the performance on the HPI in

the 1990s was very low in most of these countries. It is clear that no significant progress appears to have been achieved in the majority of the OIC-LDLICs at both the national and the global levels.

Taking all the above into account, the mass poverty in OIC-LDLICs must be understood, in general, as a product of complex structural processes embedded in the political economy of these countries. Within this complexity, identifying the key causes of poverty is a precondition for formulating an effective anti-poverty strategy. Generally, the primary cause of poverty in most of these countries can be summed up in the failure of development strategies in the last three decades, including the more recently introduced macroeconomic reforms. This failure has manifested itself in limited and inequitable access of the majority of the people to all forms of capital: physical, financial, human and social. Deprivation from capital leads to lack of remunerative employment and poverty. Thus, in order to reduce poverty or to judge how economic policies affect poverty, we need to know a lot about the poor. It is important to know who the poor are; where they live; what assets they command; what their education, health and housing conditions are; and what economic opportunities are available to them. Investing in people must, therefore, be the highest priority for these countries as long as human capital limitations restrain growth or keep people in absolute poverty.

5.4. Characteristics of the Poor

Accurate identification of the characteristics of the poor in the OIC-LDLICs necessitates the availability of detailed and regular data and information about geographic location, demographic characteristics, economic activities, health and nutritional status, educational levels, and living conditions. Unfortunately, gathering this sort of information is not always easy. The poor in these countries are heterogeneous, and the data about their characteristics are patchy. Nonetheless, based on available studies and statistics, attempts have been made here to identify the general features and characteristics of the poor in these countries.

Within these countries, the poor do not form a homogeneous group. Generally, they include such various groups as rural, landless, agricultural and non-agricultural workers, semi-subsistence farmers, low-income market-oriented farmers, urban workers with low or fixed wages in public or private sectors, self-employed persons in non-tradable sectors and urban workers in informal sectors. Within these broad groups, some people, particularly children, women and the aged, suffer more than others. The poor are often concentrated in certain places like resource-poor areas and areas with high population densities. The problems of poverty, population, and environment

are often intertwined: low levels of development and the pressure of rapidly expanding populations mean that many of the poor live in areas of acute environmental degradation.

The statistics and information available on these countries confirm that rural poverty is a critical factor in the overall incidence and depth of poverty. The extent of poverty can vary greatly among rural areas within the same country. Many of the poor are located in regions where arable land is scarce, agricultural productivity is low, and drought, floods, and environmental degradation are common. Such areas are often isolated in every sense. Opportunities for non-farm employment are few, and the demand for labour tends to be highly seasonal. Others among the poor live in rural regions that have a more promising endowment of natural resources but lack access to social services like education and health, and infrastructure facilities such as irrigation, information and technical assistance, transport, and market centres.

On the other hand, although urban incomes are generally higher and urban services and facilities more accessible, poor town-dwellers may suffer more than rural households from certain aspects of poverty. The urban poor, typically housed in slums or squatter settlements, often have to contend with appalling overcrowding, bad sanitation, and contaminated water. The sites are often illegal and dangerous. Some of these people are migrants from the countryside who are seeking better-paid work. For many, migration is permanent, and for others it may be temporary, reflecting, for example, seasonality in agriculture.

Evidence points out that poor households tend to be large, with many children or other economically dependent members. Poor families often have too many children spaced too close together. Poverty and hunger among children (child poverty) is of particular concern since it is strongly self-perpetuating. Children are highly vulnerable to malnutrition and disease, and poverty-related illnesses can cause permanent harm. Child labour is common in highly populated poor countries; many poor households depend on it as their main source of income, but this is often at the expense of schooling. It is widely documented that the work that children do is highly exploitative with long working hours in unhealthy conditions for low wages.

Women are particularly at risk in these countries. They face all manner of cultural, social, legal, and economic obstacles that men, even poor men, do not. Their lack of access to land, credit and better employment opportunities handicaps their ability to fend off poverty for themselves and their families. The available data on incomes, health, education, nutrition, and labour force participation show that women are often severely disadvantaged. Data for 1997

indicate that real GDP per capita of women in the least developed countries is almost half that of men. The adult literacy rate for women is 38 per cent while that for men is almost 59 percent. In developing countries, half a million women die each year in childbirth, at rates 10-100 times those in industrial countries. Lastly, the aged people often live their twilight years in poverty and neglect.

The poor usually lack assets as well as income. In economies in which wealth and incomes come from the land (i.e., rural areas), poverty is highly correlated with landlessness, and the disadvantaged households are typically rural landless workers. In many cases, even when the poor do own the land, it is often unproductive and lies outside the irrigated areas. The poor are usually unable to improve their land, since they lack income and access to credit. In other cases, the poor have access to land without having ownership rights, e.g., land that is owned by the community or is common property. The poor are also lacking in human capital. Everywhere, they have a lower level of educational achievement than the population at large. They frequently suffer from hunger and malnutrition and related illnesses, and this undermines their capacity for labour, which is their main or only asset.

Since the greatest number of the poor in these countries are found in rural areas, agriculture is still the main source of income for them. Their livelihoods are linked to farming, whether or not they earn their incomes directly from it. In rural areas, the poor are concentrated in traditional industries with low skill and capital requirements and very low labour productivity. Their products are normally intended for home consumption or for the local market. Rural non-farm employment, which often consists of cottage industries, services, and commerce, tends to be highly seasonal or part-time. Wages in these jobs are generally lower than wages in agriculture.

On the other hand, informal sector jobs of one sort or another are the main source of livelihood for a high percentage of urban poor; even when they are generally the lowest-paying jobs. Disadvantaged urban groups are largely self-employed and casual unskilled workers. They sell services and engage in trade or work on a casual basis in construction, manufacturing, and transport. However, the poor households in urban areas are the most vulnerable and the least able to protect themselves from contingencies. Because incomes fluctuate, a static picture of the poor in urban areas can be deceptive. Evidence indicates that some people in urban areas move in and out of poverty, whereas others never cross the poverty threshold.

Lastly, the poor in these countries have less access to publicly-provided goods, services, and infrastructure than do other groups. They are often set

apart by cultural and educational barriers. Illiterate people may be intimidated by officials or may simply lack information about development programmes. Sometimes the design of the services unintentionally adds to the problem. The poor play little part in politics and are often, in effect, deprived.

6. CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Poverty has spread far and wide in the OIC member countries although it is widely believed that this is not commensurate with the vast resource endowments of these countries. The burden of poverty spreads unevenly among the regions of the OIC, among countries within those regions, and among localities within those countries. Unfortunately, shortages of complete data at the national level and the absence of common definition and approach that measure the actual extent and prevalence of poverty in OIC countries make it impossible to be precise. However, the impact of poverty has been on such a large scale that it has become a structural phenomenon of human deprivation manifested in hunger, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, and low level and quality of consumption of hundreds of million of people, particularly in the OIC- LDLICs.

Recently, an average of 46.3% (126.3 million) of the people of 19 OIC-LDCs suffered from human poverty. This percentage reached 35.1% (168.4 million) of the total population of only 5 OIC low-income countries. Out of the 30 countries in which the UNDP's *Human Development Index* (HDI) declined in 1997 (more than in any other year since the *Human Development Report* was first issued in 1990), 20 countries are OIC member countries. 15 of them are OIC-LDLICs; most of them (12 countries) in sub-Saharan Africa, half the population of which is estimated to be in income poverty by the year 2000.

The indicators of HDI and HPI, education and health, food security and nutrition, progress in survival and characteristics of the poor in OIC-LDLICs show that the problem of poverty in most of these countries emanates from the fact that large segments of the population have little access to the basic social needs and do not command sufficient material resources to improve their income and welfare. Therefore, poverty in these countries is very much associated with deprivation. However, the reality of poverty is a complex multi-dimensional problem. It is the result of a complex socio-economic and political structure of a particular country, and hence the status, the determinants, and the policy measures required to eradicate it would, by definition, vary from one country to another.

The mass poverty in the OIC-LDLICs must be understood, in general, as a product of complex structural processes embedded in the political economy of

these countries. Within this complexity, identifying the key causes of poverty is a precondition for formulating an effective anti-poverty strategy. Generally, the primary cause of poverty in most of these countries can be summed up in the failure of development strategies in the last three decades, including the more recently introduced macroeconomic reforms. This failure has manifested itself in limited and inequitable access of the majority of the people to all forms of capital: physical, financial, human and social. Deprivation from capital leads to lack of remunerative employment and poverty. It is then a matter of access to resources which enable the people to continually improve their standards of living. The extended poverty is, then, a reflection of inequality in the distribution of wealth and income as well as political power.

Alleviation, and eventual eradication, of poverty is, thus, a matter of concrete policies and strategies that would aim to address the above-mentioned causes and determinants of poverty. Because of the widespread poverty in the OIC-LDLICs, alleviation and eradication of poverty becomes somewhat synonymous with the development process itself. The distribution of the fruits of development should be geared in a manner to benefit the poor and deprived groups in the country. Therefore, combating poverty should be visualised within the framework of a long-term developmental strategy. Crisis management solutions would only have temporary effects, and targeted programmes to the poor might not be very meaningful in such countries where the majority of the populations are poor.

The poor in OIC-LDLICs do not form a homogeneous group. They include such various groups as rural, landless, agricultural and non-agricultural workers, semi-subsistence farmers, low-income market-oriented farmers, urban workers with low or fixed wages in public or private sectors, self-employed persons in non-tradable sectors, and urban workers in informal sectors. Actually, these segments of society are often below the poverty line and account for the greater part of the population. Therefore, it is not possible to imagine human or economic development in these countries without a significant rise in the standard of living of these groups in regard to consumption, health, housing, education and culture. Investing in people must, therefore, be the highest priority for these countries as long as human capital limitations restrain growth or keep people in absolute poverty.

As we mentioned in the introduction, the problem of poverty is essentially a national one. However, since economic co-operation is a main pillar of OIC action as an institution, and the ultimate aim of this co-operation is the well-being of the people in the member countries, the widespread poverty in the OIC-LDLICs is simply incoherent with this objective. Thus, alleviation of poverty calls for articulate strategies at national levels targeting the

marginalised population at large. Objectives for and efforts to address poverty alleviation are to be outlined specifically in national poverty alleviation strategies and programmes. These programmes are to be accompanied by a process of creating a supportive OIC environment. Whatever efforts are made would only treat the symptoms, not the ailment itself. Therefore, the problem of poverty in OIC-LDLICs and the strategies for its alleviation should be considered with a new vision at the country level as well as at the OIC level. A wide range of policy recommendations can be proposed for such a new vision of poverty alleviation strategies as follows:

(1) To reduce poverty in OIC-LDLICs or to judge how their economic policies affect poverty, they need to know a lot about their poor in these countries. It is important to know who the poor are; where they live; what assets they command; what their education, health and housing conditions are; and what economic opportunities are available to them. This can be achieved through:

- Identifying and building on an expanded definition of poverty that is relevant to the context and socio-economic and political realities of the country in order to construct a baseline of the poverty situation and to contribute more effectively to the formulation of well-targeted policies for its alleviation.
- Monitoring the status of poverty through developing accurate, complete and regular data and information about the poor in the country (e.g., household surveys). This would serve to build a framework for identifying areas requiring intervention by the government or on which work can be started in the fight against poverty and its social ramifications at each stage of development.
- Identifying issues of relevance to poverty eradication policies in the areas of employment and population programmes in order for policy work on these issues to be well aimed and targeted. This would help to identify areas for prioritising work so that realistic policies may be adopted for the short and medium terms.
- Identifying and prioritising social issues of relevance to the marginalised and vulnerable population groups in order to better focus limited resources and save time in the fight against poverty.

(2) In applying these measures, it should be borne in mind that poverty alleviation is not merely the provision of a mechanism whereby the poor are helped to cross a given threshold of income or consumption, but rather involves a sustained increase in productivity and an integration of the poor into

the process of growth. Therefore, understanding the causes of poverty and the mechanism of impoverishment and poverty perpetuation is what will eventually determine the policies to address the problem.

(3) The focus of attention should be directed towards concrete proposals for future action. In this respect, the main change of direction is that a human development strategy would imply that the government should use its resources in a fundamentally different way. The implementation of the strategy will require a change in the composition of government spending and an expenditure reallocation toward those activities which benefit the largest number of people.

(4) The ownership of assets directly affects income opportunities. Without assets such as land, the poor must hire out their labour. But, without adequate human capital, they are limited to unskilled work. The importance of assets, broadly defined, suggests that poverty alleviation policies should seek to increase the assets owned by the poor--especially skills, health, and other aspects of human capital and, in agricultural economies, land.

(5) In order to guide anti-poverty policies effectively, further attention should be given to specific aspects concerning the issue of governing the inter-linkages between macro-policies and the poor. In this context, there is widespread fear that the structural adjustment and economic reform programmes, which are being implemented now in many OIC-LDCs would have severe negative social impacts, especially on the poor. Therefore, additional corrective measures must be undertaken to alleviate these adverse impacts on the poorest and marginalised groups. A human development strategy is not just structural adjustment with a human face, but the shaping of policies beyond the conventional budgetary and financial changes. The components of such a strategy are all positively correlated with poverty reduction. These include, among others, emphasis on job creation and public work programmes, assessing public spending on primary education and basic health care, increasing income equality without undermining growth, private transfers, social assistance programmes and safety nets, reorientation of public spending, more accurate targeting, which are all consistent with sustainable macroeconomic equilibrium.

(6) Evidence suggests that rapid and sustainable progress on poverty in developing countries has been achieved by pursuing a strategy that has two equally important elements. The first is to promote the productive use of the poor's most abundant asset, labour. It calls for policies that harness market incentives, social and political institutions, infrastructure, and technology to that end. The second is to provide basic social services to the poor; primary

education and health care, family planning, and nutrition are especially important. Progress has been greatest in the countries that have implemented both parts of this strategy. By promoting the productive use of labour, these countries have furnished opportunities for the poor, and by investing in health and education they have enabled the poor to take full advantage of the new possibilities

(7) An important effort in the eradication of poverty involves supported self-help. Many people living in poverty may be able to raise their standards of living through their own efforts, especially if those efforts receive assistance. Examples include maximising opportunities for the establishment and expansion of small businesses by increasing the availability of credit, including microcredit, minimising interest rates, improving infrastructure and the equity of access to productive inputs such as land and sites for enterprises, and increasing the accessibility of information and advisory services.

(8) Promoting the employment potential of the small enterprise sectors. Encouraging credit and technical assistance for these sectors in order to achieve the goal of more rapid poverty reduction and expanding productive employment where the poor can participate. Examples include small-scale agricultural and labour-intensive industries which can be an effective poverty-reducing development strategy. With appropriate small-scale credit, these enterprises could be multiplied many times, resulting in both improved food security and poverty reduction.

(9) Diversification of commodity production and exports is an effective way of improving food security, raising employment and incomes and, consequently, lessening countries' vulnerability to changes in the external environment.

(10) Encouraging consideration of incorporation of microcredit schemes in the strategy of poverty eradication and implementation of related recommendations as reflected in the Plan of Action adopted in the International Micro-Credit Summit held in 1997, which launched a global movement to reach 100 million of the world's poorest families for self-employment and other financial and business services by the year 2001.

(11) Specific measures should be taken by the OIC member states for the fulfilment and implementation of the commitments made at the World Summit for Social Development held in Copenhagen in 1995, so as to enable the OIC-LDLICs to meet the basic needs of all under the main commitment of poverty eradication adopted at the Summit. This can be achieved through:

- Creating an enabling environment for social development through sound policies and good practices and emphasising the role and social responsibilities of the private sector.
- Adopting an OIC poverty reduction target to reduce by one half the number of people living in extreme poverty by the year 2015.
- Adopting national programmes and an OIC plan of action for achieving full employment.
- Strengthening procedures and institutions for social dialogue; this should include specific modalities for strengthening representative employer and work organisations.
- Increasing the employment potential of infrastructure development, and expanding OIC co-operation in this field.
- Formulating an OIC action plan for education for all, and for basic health services, by the year 2015.
- Encouraging the 20 OIC-LDLICs in sub-Saharan Africa most affected by the Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome to adopt a target of reducing infection levels in young people by 25% by 2005.
- Affirming that governments must control the setting of policy directions and priorities of anti-crisis policy measures and programmes by the inclusion of social development and poverty alleviation goals. In particular, adjusting countries must give priority to restructuring the economy to provide more opportunities and better education and training, health care, and other social adjustments to help broaden the participation of those who are left behind in adjusting programmes.

The discussion of the means of addressing those issues will relate goals, strategies, policies and programmes at both national and OIC levels.

On the whole, poverty should be seen as a state which, unless curbed, tends to regenerate itself. The chances are that a poor child will grow up into a poor adult. A poor health status coupled with low educational levels is likely to result in lower employability which, in turn, results in lower income and, therefore, the increased likelihood of marrying a poor spouse. Thus, in the absence of external intervention or a change in the conditions of a poor person or his/her access to assets, the cycle of poverty will be perpetuated through the

next generations. Therefore, breaking the cycle will be a necessity requiring outside input and interjection. At the very least, this would need to be in the form of State provision of basic social services such as water, sanitation services, roads, education, and health services. It is unrealistic to expect that the poor would pay for such services themselves or that the private sector is likely to do so. In addition, the awareness of the poor should be raised so that they perceive their situation as amenable to change and improvement. Because without the active and wholehearted participation of the poor in the process, poverty cannot be overcome.

REFERENCES

Jayarajah C., Branson W., and Sen B. (1996). "Social Dimensions of Adjustment: World Bank Experience, 1980-93", A World Bank Operations Evaluation Study. The World Bank, Washington D.C., April 1996.

SESRTCIC (1999). "Annual Economic Report on the OIC Countries," SESRTCIC, October 1999.

Streeten, P. (1995). "Poverty Concepts and Measurement". In *Poverty Monitoring: An International Concern*. Edited by R. van der Hoeven and R. Anker. New York, St. Martin's Press.

UNDP, *Human Development Report*, 1990 to 1999. New York, Oxford University Press.

World Bank (1999). *World Development Report 1999/2000 'Entering the 21st Century'*, Oxford University Press, New York.

----- (1995). *The World Bank's Strategy for Reducing Poverty and Hunger: A Report to the Development Community*. Prepared by H.P. Binswanger and P. Landell-Mills. Environmentally Sustainable development Studies and Monographs Series No. 4. Washington, D.C.

----- (1990). *World Development Report 1990 'Poverty'*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Appendix-1: OIC-LDLICs: Income Poverty (GDP per capita; 1987 US\$)

	1960	1970	1980	1990	1997
<u>OIC-LDCs</u>					
Bangladesh	146	162	145	179	218
Benin	320	361	337	332	371
Burkina Faso	173	198	237	257	290
Chad	213	198	208	215	211
Comoros	-	-	(458)	(474)	370
Gambia	189	240	278	275	256
Guinea	-	-	-	(409)	(447)
Guinea-Bissau	-	202	157	209	234
Mali	217	225	268	260	271
Mauritania	359	(581)	(523)	(466)	(513)
Mozambique	-	-	165	173	199
Niger	(556)	(554)	(430)	318	262
Sierra Leone	119	222	260	227	159
Somalia	-	-	120	106	169
Sudan	(814)	(729)	(784)	(684)	355
Togo	244	(400)	(474)	(394)	363
Uganda	-	-	162	(470)	(602)
Yemen	-	-	-	(535)	300
<u>OIC-LICs</u>					
Indonesia	190	211	349	(537)	(680)
Cameroon	(601)	(652)	(871)	(903)	(756)
Pakistan	135	223	258	350	(417)
Nigeria	329	361	373	311	315
Senegal	(713)	(723)	(661)	(676)	(674)
Azerbaijan	-	-	-	(1020)	(402)
Kyrgyzstan	-	-	-	210	111
Tajikistan	-	-	-	(718)	240
Turkmenistan	-	-	-	-	(630)
DCs	330	474	686	745	908
LDCs	245	272	287	272	245
S.S Africa	-	-	661	542	518

Sources: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1998* and *1999*.

Notes: \$ 370 indicates the upper poverty line, while \$ 275 indicates the lower poverty line. Figures in brackets indicate that a country is above the upper poverty line of \$ 370.

Appendix-2: Human Poverty in Selected OIC Countries

	HPI (1)		Population Mid- 1997 (million)	Population suffering from human poverty (million)
	Rank (2)	Value		
Jordan	9	9.8	5.77	0.57
Bahrain	10	9.8	0.62	0.06
Guyana	11	10.2	0.85	0.09
Lebanon	14	11.3	3.14	0.35
Malaysia	18	14.2	21.67	3.08
Libya	22	16.4	5.78	0.95
Turkey	24	16.7	63.75	10.65
U.A.E	27	17.7	2.58	0.46
Syria	32	20.1	14.95	3.00
Iran	34	20.4	60.69	12.38
Tunisia	38	23.1	9.22	2.13
Oman	39	23.7	2.4	0.57
Maldives	43	25.4	0.27	0.07
Indonesia	46	27.7	199.87	55.36
Algeria	52	28.8	29.05	8.37
Egypt	57	33.0	62.01	20.46
Comoros	58	34.6	0.65	0.22
Sudan	61	36.8	27.9	10.27
Cameroon	62	38.1	13.94	5.31
Nigeria	63	38.2	118.37	45.22
Togo	65	38.4	4.32	1.66
Morocco	67	39.2	27.31	10.71
Uganda	68	40.6	20.44	8.30
Djibouti	69	40.8	0.63	0.26
Pakistan	71	42.1	138.16	58.17
Bangladesh	73	44.4	122.01	54.17
Mauritania	77	47.5	2.39	1.14
Yemen	78	49.2	16.48	8.11
Mozambique	79	49.5	18.27	9.04
Senegal	80	49.6	8.8	4.36
Gambia	81	49.9	1.17	0.58
Guinea	82	50.5	7.61	3.84
Benin	83	50.9	5.83	2.97
Guinea-Bissau	84	51.8	1.11	0.57
Chad	86	52.1	6.7	3.49
Mali	87	52.8	11.48	6.06
Sierra Leone	90	57.7	4.43	2.56
Burkina Faso	91	59.3	11.09	6.58
Niger	92	65.5	9.79	6.41
Total			1,061.50	368.54 ^(a)
^(a) as % of total			34.71	

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999*.

Notes: (1) The HPI is a composite index that attempts to bring together the different dimensions of deprivation in three essential elements of human life which are already reflected in the HDI: longevity, knowledge and a decent living standard. (2) HPI ranks have been calculated for the universe of 92 developing countries.

Appendix-3: Human Poverty in OIC-LDLICs

	HPI		Population Mid- 1997 (million)	Population suffering from human poverty (million)
	Rank	Value		
<u>OIC-LDCs</u>				
Maldives	43	25.4	0.27	0.07
Comoros	58	34.6	0.65	0.22
Sudan	61	36.8	27.9	10.27
Togo	65	38.4	4.32	1.66
Uganda	68	40.6	20.44	8.3
Djibouti	69	40.8	0.63	0.26
Bangladesh	73	44.4	122.01	54.17
Mauritania	77	47.5	2.39	1.14
Yemen	78	49.2	16.48	8.11
Mozambique	79	49.5	18.27	9.04
Gambia	81	49.9	1.17	0.58
Guinea	82	50.5	7.61	3.84
Benin	83	50.9	5.83	2.97
Guinea-Bissau	84	51.8	1.11	0.57
Chad	86	52.1	6.7	3.49
Mali	87	52.8	11.48	6.06
Sierra Leone	90	57.7	4.43	2.56
Burkina Faso	91	59.3	11.09	6.58
Niger	92	65.5	9.79	6.41
Total			272.57	126.30⁽¹⁾
⁽¹⁾ as % of total			46.3	
<u>OIC-LICs</u>				
Indonesia	46	27.7	199.87	55.36
Cameroon	62	38.1	13.94	5.31
Nigeria	63	38.2	118.37	45.22
Pakistan	71	42.1	138.16	58.17
Senegal	80	49.6	8.8	4.36
Total			479.14	168.42⁽²⁾
⁽²⁾ as % of total			35.15	
<u>OIC-LDLICs</u>			751.71	294.72⁽³⁾
⁽³⁾ as % of total			39.20	

Source: Appendix-2 above.

Appendix-4: Human Development and Human Poverty Indicators in OIC Countries

	HDI Rank	Real GDP PC rank	HPI (3)		HPI rank minus	HPI rank minus	Population below Income poverty line (%)	
	(1)	Minus HDI rank (2)	Rank	Value	HDI Rank (4)	\$ 1 a day Poverty rank (4)	\$ 1 a day 1989-94	National 1989-94
Brunei	25	-23	-	-			-	-
Kuwait	35	-30	-	-			-	-
Bahrain	37	-8	10	9.8			-	-
Qatar	41	-23	-	-			-	-
U.A.E	43	-18	27	17.7	8	-	-	-
Malaysia	56	-7	18	14.2			5.6	16.0
Surinam	64	6	-	-			-	-
Libya	65	-6	22	16.4	9	-	-	-
Lebanon	69	-4	14	11.3			-	-
Kazakhstan (*)	76	15	-	-			-	-
Saudi Arabia	78	-37	-	-			-	-
Turkey	86	-22	24	16.7			-	-
Oman	89	-47	39	23.7			-	-
Uzbekistan (*)	92	19					-	-
Maldives	93	-3	43	25.4			-	-
Jordan (*)	94	2	9	9.8	-11	1	2.5	15.0
Iran	95	-29	34	20.4	14	-		
Turkmenistan	96	24						
Kyrgyzstan (*)	97	19						
Guyana	99	2	11	10.2				43.0
Albania	100	19						
Tunisia	102	-34	38	23.1	15	15	3.9	14.0
Azerbaijan (*)	103	34						
Indonesia	105	-11	46	27.7	-4	3	14.5	8.0
Tajikistan (*)	108	46						
Algeria (*)	109	-31	52	28.8	20	21	1.6	
Syria	111	-11	32	20.1	9	-		
Egypt	120	-14	57	33.0	14	15	7.6	
Gabon	124	-71	-	-			-	-

Appendix-4: Human Development and Human Poverty Indicators in OIC Countries (continued)

	HDI Rank (1)	Real GDP PC rank minus HDI rank (2)	HPI (3)		HPI rank minus HDI Rank (4)	HPI rank minus \$ 1 a day Poverty rank (4)	Population below Income poverty line (%)	
			Rank	Value			\$ 1 a day 1989-94	National 1989-94
Gabon	124	-71	-	-			-	-
Iraq (*)	125	-22	-	-	1	-	-	-
Morocco	126	-27	67	39.2	19	30	1.1	13.0
Cameroon (*)	134	-11	62	38.1	-4	-		
Pakistan	138	-3	71	42.1	14	24	11.6	34.0
Comoros	139	-1	58	34.6				
Sudan (*)	142	-7	61	36.8	-8	-		
Togo (*)	143	-3	65	38.4	-7	-		17.3
Nigeria (*)	146	15	63	38.2	3	9	28.9	21.0
Yemen (*)	148	18	78	49.2	9	-		
Mauritania	149	-20	77	47.5	6	11	31.4	57.0
Bangladesh	150	6	73	44.4	13	-	28.5	48.0
Senegal (*)	153	-24	80	49.6	1	0	54.0	
Benin	155	-7	83	50.9				33.0
Djibouti	157	-7	69	40.8			-	-
Uganda	158	-5	68	40.6	-13	-3	50.0	55.0
Guinea (*)	161	-37	82	50.5	0	19	26.3	
Chad (*)	162	-4	86	52.1			-	-
Gambia (*)	163	-22	81	49.9				64.0
Mali	166	1	87	52.8	0	-	-	-
G. Bissau (*)	168	-5	84	51.8	-11	-8	87.0	49.0
Mozambique	169	-2	79	49.5	2	-	-	-
Burkina Faso (*)	171	-14	91	59.3	1	-	-	-
Niger	173	-9	92	65.5	2	3	61.5	
Sierra Leone (*)	174	0	90	57.7	-1	-		75.0

Sources: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1997 and 1999*. **Notes:** (1) HDI ranks have been calculated for the universe of 174 countries. (2) Adjusted HDI; a positive figure indicates that the HDI rank is better than the real GDP per capita (PPP\$) rank, a negative the opposite. (3) HPI ranks have been calculated for the universe of 92 developing countries. (4) HPI, HDI and \$ 1 a day poverty ranks have been recalculated for the universe of 78 countries. A negative figure indicates that the country performs better on the HPI than on the other measure, a positive the opposite. (*) OIC countries with a declined HDI in 1997.

Appendix-5: OIC-LDLICs: Economic Structure and Performance

	Size of the economy (1)				Economic growth (2)			Structure of the economy (3)								External Debt	
	Population		Per capita GNP		GDP	Export	GDI	Agriculture		Industry		Manufacturing		Services		1997	
OIC-LDCs	1998 million	1990 1998	1998 (\$)	1997- 1998	1990- 1998	1990- 1998	1990- 1998	1980	1998	1980	1998	1980	1998	1980	1998	% of GDP	DS/EX (4)
Afghanistan	25.7	6.0	-	-	-	-3.4*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bangladesh	125.6	1.9	350	3.4	4.8	13.7	-12.2	34	23	24	28	18	18	42	49	35.1	10.6
Benin	6.0	3.3	380	1.5	4.6	3.3	4.6	35	39	12	14	8	8	52	47	76.9	9.1
Burkina Faso	10.7	2.7	240	3.8	3.5	-0.8	4.1	33	32	22	28	16	21	45	40	54.3	11.8
Chad	7.4	3.5	230	3.5	4.6	3.7	18.6	45	39	9	15	-	12	46	46	65.2	12.5
Comoros	0.5	3.2	370	-1.5	0.8	-21.4*	-5.9	-	38.6+	-	12.8+	-	4.3+	-	48.5+	101.9	3.9
Djibouti	0.7	3.0	871	1.3	-	5.9*	-	-	2.9+	-	20.6+	-	4.5+	-	76.5+	57.1	3.1
Gambia	1.2	3.6	340	2.0	0.9	-7.8*	3.0	-	28.4+	-	15.0+	-	7.0+	-	58.0+	107.6	11.6
Guinea	7.1	3.0	540	1.9	5.0	2.6	5.7	-	22	-	35	-	4	-	42	95.3	21.5
Guinea-Bissau	1.2	2.1	160	-30.4	3.7	1.4*	-6.6	-	48.4+	-	16.6+	-	7.0+	-	34.6+	366.5	17.3
Maldives	0.3	3.4	1230	2.6	6.7	-	-	-	22.0+	-	16.0+	-	6.0+	-	61.6+	51.7	6.7
Mali	10.6	3.2	250	2.2	3.7	9.2	1.5	48	45	13	21	7	6	38	34	119.2	10.5
Mauritania	2.5	3.2	410	2.4	4.2	-2.3	4.0	30	24	33	27	-	9	44	45	234.5	25.6
Mozambique	16.9	2.6	210	9.2	5.7	14.8	8.9	48	34	30	18	-	10	22	48	232.9	18.6
Niger	10.1	3.9	190	0.8	1.9	-0.2	4.4	43	41	23	17	4	6	34	42	86.3	19.5
Sierra Leone	4.9	2.8	140	-2.9	-4.7	-9.4	-13.3	33	44	21	24	5	6	47	32	141.5	21.1
Somalia	9.1	2.2	169	-	-	6.3	2.6	-	65.0+	-	8.5+	-	5.0+	-	26.0+	-	-
Sudan	28.7	2.1	355	3.0	6.1	7.0	-	-	37.0+	-	16.2+	-	9.0+	-	46.2+	182.4	5.1
Togo	4.5	3.4	330	-3.5	2.3	0.8	12.6	27	42	25	21	8	9	55	58	92.7	8.1
Uganda	20.9	3.5	320	2.9	7.4	16.1	10.0	72	43	4	18	4	9	23	39	56.5	22.1
Yemen	16.5	4.7	300	4.6	3.8	6.9	8.8	-	18	-	49	-	11	-	34	76.7	2.6
OIC-LICs																	
Indonesia	203.7	1.9	680	-16.2	5.8	8.6	4.4	24	16	42	43	13	26	34	41	65.3	30.0
Cameroon	14.3	3.2	610	3.8	0.6	-1.5	-1.6	31	42	26	22	10	11	43	36	109.3	20.4
Pakistan	131.6	2.8	480	2.5	4.1	3.2	2.7	30	25	25	25	16	17	46	50	47.5	36.1
Nigeria	121.3	3.3	300	-1.7	2.6	5.2	8.0	21	32	46	41	8	5	34	27	75.6	7.8
Senegal	9.0	3.0	530	3.1	3.0	2.3	2.2	19	17	15	23	11	15	66	59	82.9	15.3
Azerbaijan	6.2	1.4	490	8.1	-10.5	19.5	7.0	-	24.0+	-	30.6+	-	9	-	36	11.7	6.7
Kyrgyzstan	4.7	1.0	350	2.8	-7.3	-1.8	8.6	-	46	-	24	-	18	-	30	42.8	6.3
Tajikistan	6.1	2.0	350	3.3	-16.4	-	-	-	33.0+	-	35.0+	-	-	-	32+	44.6	4.6
Turkmenistan	4.7	3.6	630	0.9	-9.6	-	-	-	32.0+	-	31.1+	-	-	-	37.0+	63.4	34.7
All LDLICs	2.0	520	2.1	2.4	11.1	9.9	31	21	38	41	27	29	30	38	47.6	16.9	

Sources: (1) World Bank, *World Development Report 1999/2000*. (2) SESRTCIC, *Annual Economic Report on OIC Countries 1999*. Notes: (1) 1990-98: average annual % growth. (2) 1990-98: average annual % growth; (*) 1997-98; GDI: gross domestic investment. (3) Value added as % of GDP; (+) 1993-97. (4) Ratio of total debt service to export.

Appendix-6: OIC-LDLICs: Elements of UNDP's 1999 Human Development Index (HDI)

	Life Expectancy at birth years (1997)	Adult literacy rate (%) 1997	Gross Enrolment Ratio (%) 1997	Real GDP per capita (PPP\$) 1997 (1)	HDI Value 1997	HDI rank (2) (*)	(1) minus (2) (**)
<u>OIC-LDCs</u>							
Bangladesh	58.1	38.9	35	1050	0.440	150	6
Benin	53.4	33.9	42	1270	0.424	155	-7
Burkina Faso	44.4	20.7	20	1010	0.304	171	-14
Chad	47.2	50.3	29	970	0.393	162	-4
Comoros	58.8	55.4	39	1530	0.506	139	-1
Djibouti	50.4	48.3	21	1266	0.412	157	-7
Gambia	47.0	33.1	41	1470	0.391	163	-22
Guinea	46.5	37.9	28	1880	0.398	161	-37
Guinea-Bissau	45.0	33.6	34	861	0.343	168	-5
Maldives	64.5	95.7	74	3690	0.716	93	-3
Mali	53.3	35.5	25	740	0.375	166	1
Mauritania	53.3	38.4	41	1730	0.447	149	-20
Mozambique	45.2	40.5	25	740	0.341	169	-2
Niger	48.5	14.3	15	850	0.298	173	-9
Sierra Leone	37.2	33.3	30	410	0.254	174	0
Sudan	55.0	53.3	34	1560	0.475	142	-7
Togo	48.8	53.2	61	1490	0.469	143	-3
Uganda	39.6	64.0	40	1160	0.404	158	-5
Yemen	58.0	42.5	49	810	0.449	148	18
<u>OIC-LICs</u>							
Indonesia	65.1	58.0	64	3490	0.681	105	-11
Cameroon	54.7	71.7	43	1890	0.536	134	-11
Pakistan	64.0	40.9	43	1560	0.508	138	-3
Nigeria	50.1	59.5	54	920	0.456	146	15
Senegal	52.3	34.6	35	1730	0.426	153	-24
Azerbaijan	69.9	96.3	71	1550	0.695	103	34
Kyrgyzstan	67.6	97.0	69	2250	0.702	97	19
Tajikistan	67.2	98.9	69	1126	0.665	108	46
Turkmenistan	65.4	98.0	90	2109	0.712	96	24
DCs	64.4	71.4	59	3240	0.637	-	-
LDCs	51.7	50.7	37	992	0.430	-	-
S-Sah. Africa	48.9	58.5	44	1534	0.463	-	-
World	66.7	78.0	63	6332	0.706	-	-

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1997.

(*) HDI ranks have been calculated for the universe of 174 countries.

(**) Adjusted HDI (real GDP per capita PPP\$ rank minus HDI rank) in which a positive figure indicates that the HDI rank is better than the real GDP per capita rank (PPP\$), a negative the opposite.

Appendix-7: OIC-LDLICs: Education Profile

	Adult literacy rate (%)	Net enrolment ratio		Children not reaching grade 5 (%)	Public Expenditure On education (as % of GNP)	
		Primary (as % of Relevant Age group)	Secondary (as % of Relevant Age Group)		1985	1993-96
		1997	1997		1992-95	
<u>OIC-LDCs</u>						
Bangladesh	38.9	75.1	21.6	-	1.9	2.9
Benin	33.9	67.6	28.2	39	-	3.2
Burkina Faso	20.7	32.3	12.8	25	-	3.6
Chad	50.3	47.9	17.9	-	-	-
Comoros	55.4	50.1	35.7	20	4.1	-
Djibouti	48.3	31.9	19.6	21	2.7	-
Gambia	33.1	65.9	33.3	20	3.2	-
Guinea	37.9	45.6	14.6	46	-	-
Guinea-Bissau	33.6	52.3	24.1	-	3.2	-
Maldives	95.7	-	-	-	4.4	6.4
Mali	35.5	38.1	17.9	18	3.7	2.2
Mauritania	38.4	62.9	-	36	-	-
Mozambique	40.5	39.6	22.4	54	4.2	-
Niger	14.3	24.4	9.4	27	-	-
Sierra Leone	34.3	44.0	-	-	1.9	-
Sudan	53.3	-	-	-	-	-
Togo	53.2	82.3	58.3	-	5.0	4.7
Uganda	64.0	-	-	-	3.5	2.6
Yemen	42.5	-	-	-	-	6.1
<u>OIC-LICs</u>						
Indonesia	85.0	99.2	56.1	11	-	1.4
Cameroon	71.7	61.7	-	-	3.1	2.9
Pakistan	40.9	-	-	-	2.5	3.0
Nigeria	59.5	-	-	-	-	0.9
Senegal	34.6	59.5	19.8	15	-	3.5
Azerbaijan	-	-	-	-	5.7	3.3
Kyrgyzstan	-	99.5	77.8	-	7.9	5.7
Tajikistan	98.9	-	-	-	-	2.2
DCs	-	85.7	60.4	22	3.9	3.6
LDCs	-	60.4	31.2	-	2.7	-
S-Sah. Africa	-	56.2	41.4	34	4.9	5.4
World	-	87.6	65.4	-	4.9	4.8

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Appendix-8: OIC-LDLICs: Health Profile

	Infant with low birth-weight (%)	AIDS Cases (per 100000 People)	Tuber-culosis cases (per 100000 people)	Malaria cases (per 100000 people)	Doctors (per 100000 people)	Nurses (per 100000 People)	Public Expenditure on health (as % of GDP)	
	1990-97	1997	1996	1995	1993	1993	1960	1995
<u>OIC-LDCs</u>								
Bangladesh	50	-	52.6	126.6	18	5	-	1.2
Benin	-	39.8	43.3	10570.4	6	33	1.5	1.8
Burkina Faso	21	91.2	16.9	4680.5	-	-	0.6	4.7
Chad	-	109.7	28.1	-	2	6	0.5	2.7
Comoros	8	2.8	22.5	30030.2	10	33	-	1.1
Djibouti	11	263.7	503.5	550.7	20	-	-	-
Gambia	-	43.1	108.0	-	2	25	-	1.7
Guinea	13	44.0	58.9	7048.7	15	3	1.0	1.2
Guinea-Bissau	20	74.0	155.6	-	10	45	-	1.1
Maldives	13	1.8	82.8	-	19	13	-	-
Mali	16	35.1	35.9	-	4	9	1.0	2.0
Mauritania	11	6.7	-	-	11	2.7	0.5	1.8
Mozambique	20	33.5	102.7	-	-	-	-	-
Niger	15	30.7	-	8697.7	3	17	0.2	1.6
Sierra Leone	11	4.6	75.6	-	-	-	-0	-
Sudan	15	5.9	74.7	854.9	10	70	1.0	-
Togo	20	185.2	39.6	-	6	31	1.3	1.6
Uganda	13	249.0	140.5	-	4	28	0.7	1.6
Yemen	19	0.5	91.6	-	26	51	-	1.0
<u>OIC-LICs</u>								
Indonesia	8	-	12.3	728.8	12	67	0.3	0.7
Cameroon	13	69.1	22.5	1631.2	7	-	1.0	1.0
Pakistan	25	0.1	3.1	79.9	52	32	0.3	0.8
Nigeria	16	14.4	23.7	-	21	142	0.3	0.3
Senegal	4	22.6	99.6	-	7	35	1.5	1.2
Azerbaijan	6	0.1	32.6	37.4	390	1081	-	1.1
Kyrgyzstan	-	0	89.1	-	310	879	-	3.5
Tajikistan	-	0.0	28.2	105.3	210	738	-	5.8
Turkmenistan	5	-	49.9	-	353	1195	-	1.2
DCs	18	28.9	78.7	883.1	76	85	0.9	1.8
LDCs	22	69.1	112.5	3220.7	14	26	-	1.6
S-Sah. Africa	15	111.1	129.3	-	16	75	0.7	1.4
World	17	39.7	68.5	-	122	241	-	5.55

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Appendix-9: OIC-LDLICs: Food Security and Nutrition

	Daily per capita supply of calories		Daily per capita supply of protein		Daily per capita supply of fat		Food Production per capita index (1989-91=100)
			Total (grams)	Change (%)	Total (grams)	Change (%)	
	1970	1996	1996	1970-96	1996	1970-96	1997
OIC-LDCs							
Bangladesh	2177	2105	45.0	-	23.2	55.0	111
Benin	1964	2415	57.3	19.4	42.9	-	127
Burkina Faso	1762	2137	63.5	17.6	48.5	61.3	123
Chad	2183	1972	56.7	-11.4	55.1	14.7	119
Comoros	1848	1824	42.1	20.3	41.1	2.8	118
Djibouti	1842	1920	39.0	-7.1	53.9	46.1	83
Gambia	2108	2332	46.8	-16.4	56.8	9.0	84
Guinea	2212	2099	44.0	-8.3	47.2	-15.6	133
Guinea-Bissau	1989	2381	47.7	10.9	57.3	-4.2	112
Maldives	1428	2495	85.1	57.6	49.0	32.3	113
Mali	2095	2027	60.8	3.1	42.3	-	127
Mauritania	1868	2653	78.3	5.8	64.1	23.3	105
Mozambique	1886	1799	34.5	-1.4	32.5	12.2	133
Niger	1992	2116	62.2	11.1	31.5	-	121
Sierra Leone	2419	2002	43.7	-5.0	55.5	-13.8	97
Sudan	2167	2391	73.5	20.5	72.5	-	146
Togo	2261	2155	52.7	3.3	42.3	24.9	138
Uganda	2294	2110	46.1	-19.1	28.8	-20.1	110
Yemen	1763	2041	54.3	6.5	38.2	31.8	121
OIC-LICs							
Indonesia	1859	2930	67.8	73.8	58.9	103.5	124
Cameroon	2280	2175	51.0	-16.4	45.5	-2.8	119
Pakistan	2198	2408	59.9	10.9	65.6	92.9	134
Nigeria	2254	2609	56.3	12.6	66.3	24.9	136
Senegal	2546	2394	67.6	4.0	67.2	-0.1	112
Azerbaijan	-	2139	62.6	-	40.5	-	58
Kyrgyzstan	-	2489	82.0	-	47.7	-	124
Tajikistan	-	2129	58.5	-	40.1	-	68
Turkmenistan	-	2563	71.5	-	77.5	-	99
DCs	2129	2628	66.4	30.1	57.7	92.9	132
LDCs	2090	2095	51.4	-3.3	33.3	24.3	115
S-Sah. Africa	2226	2205	52.7	-5.7	44.8	9.5	116
World	2326	2751	73.5	26.5	70.4	79.0	124

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Appendix-10: OIC-LDLICs: Progress in Survival

	Life expectancy at birth (years)		Infant mortality rate (per 1000 live births)		Under-five mortality rate (per1000 live births)		People not expected to survive to age 60 (%)	Maternal mortality rate (per 100000 live births)
	1970	1997	1970	1997	1970	1997	1997	1990
OIC-LDCs								
Bangladesh	44.2	58.1	148	81	239	109	38	850
Benin	42.5	53.4	149	102	252	167	46	990
Burkina Faso	39.3	44.4	163	110	278	169	64	930
Chad	38.0	47.2	149	118	252	198	56	1500
Comoros	47.8	58.8	159	69	215	93	37	-
Djibouti	40.0	50.4	160	111	241	156	49	-
Gambia	36.0	47.0	183	66	319	87	54	1100
Guinea	36.5	46.5	197	126	345	201	54	1600
Guinea-Bissau	36.0	45.0	186	130	316	220	58	910
Maldives	49.9	64.5	121	53	188	74	28	-
Mali	41.9	53.3	221	145	391	239	43	1200
Mauritania	42.5	53.5	150	120	250	183	44	930
Mozambique	41.9	45.2	163	130	281	208	61	1500
Niger	38.3	48.5	191	191	320	320	52	1200
Sierra Leone	34.4	37.2	206	182	363	316	70	1800
Sudan	42.6	55.0	107	73	177	115	43	660
Togo	44.2	48.8	128	78	216	125	59	640
Uganda	46..3	39.6	110	86	185	137	76	1200
Yemen	40.9	58.0	175	76	303	100	38	1400

Appendix-10: OIC-LDLICs: Progress in Survival (continued)

	Life expectancy at birth (years)		Infant mortality rate (per 1000 live births)		Under-five mortality rate (per 1000 live births)		People not expected to survive to age 60 (%)	Maternal mortality rate (per 100000 live births)
	1970	1997	1970	1997	1970	1997	1997	1990
<u>OIC-LICs</u>								
Indonesia	47.6	65.1	104	45	172	68	27	650
Cameroon	44.3	54.7	127	64	215	99	46	550
Pakistan	49.2	64.0	118	95	183	136	27	340
Nigeria	42.7	50.1	120	112	201	187	52	1000
Senegal	40.6	52.3	164	72	279	124	47	1200
Azerbaijan	68.4	69.9	42	34	54	45	22	22
Kyrgyzstan	62.4	67.6	63	38	86	48	25	110
Tajikistan	62.7	67.2	78	56	111	76	25	130
Turkmenistan	60.0	65.4	82	57	120	78	28	55
DCs	54.5	64.4	111	64	170	94	28	491
LDCs	43.4	51.7	149	104	242	162	50	1041
S-Sah. Africa	44.1	48.9	137	105	225	169	56	979
World	59.1	66.7	98	58	149	85	25	437

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Appendix-11: OIC-LDLICs: Elements of UNDP's 1999 Human Poverty Index (HPI)

	Survival deprivation People not expected to survive to age 40 (%), 1997	Deprivation in education and knowledge Adult illiteracy rate (%), 1997	Deprivation in economic provisioning				GNP PC (PPP\$) Richest 20% to Poorest 20% 1980-1994	HPI Value (%)	HPI Rank (*)
			Population without access to safe water (%), 1990-97	Population without access to health services (%), 1990-97	Population without access to sanitation (%), 1990-97	Underweight children under age five (%) 1990-97			
OIC-LDCs									
Bangladesh	21.5	61.1	5	26	57	56	4.0	44.4	73
Benin	29.0	66.1	44	58	73	29	-	50.9	83
Burkina Faso	40.5	79.3	58	30	63	30	-	59.3	91
Chad	37.4	49.7	76	74	79	39	-	52.1	86
Comoros	20.6	44.6	47	18	77	26	-	34.6	58
Djibouti	33.3	51.7	10	63	45	18	-	40.8	69
Gambia	37.7	66.9	31	-	63	26	-	49.9	81
Guinea	38.3	62.1	54	55	69	26	16.7	50.5	82
Guinea-Bissau	40.6	66.4	57	36	54	23	28.1	51.8	84
Maldives	13.5	4.3	40	25	56	43	-	25.4	43
Mali	33.6	64.5	34	80	94	40	-	52.8	87
Mauritania	29.2	61.6	26	70	68	23	12.9	47.5	77
Mozambique	39.8	59.5	37	70	46	27	-	49.5	79
Niger	35.7	85.7	52	70	83	43	5.9	65.5	92
Sierra Leone	51.0	66.7	66	64	89	29	-	57.7	90
Sudan	27.1	46.7	27	30	49	34	-	36.8	61
Togo	34.5	46.8	45	-	59	19	-	38.4	65
Uganda	47.4	36.0	54	29	43	26	7.1	40.6	68
Yemen	21.8	57.5	39	84	76	39	-	49.2	78

Appendix-11: OIC-LDLICs: Elements of UNDP's 1999 Human Poverty Index (HPI) (continued)

	Survival deprivation People not expected to survive to age 40 (%), 1997	Deprivation in education and knowledge Adult illiteracy rate (%), 1997	Deprivation in economic provisioning				GNP PC (PPP\$) Richest 20% to Poorest 20% 1980-1994	HPI Value (%)	HPI Rank (*)
			Population without access to safe water (%), 1990-97	Population without access to health services (%), 1990-97	Population without access to sanitation (%), 1990-97	Underweight children under age five (%) 1990-97			
<u>OIC-LICs</u>									
Indonesia	12.8	15.0	25	57	41	34	4.7	27.7	46
Cameroon	27.2	28.3	50	85	50	14	-	38.1	62
Pakistan	14.7	59.1	21	15	44	38	4.7	42.1	71
Nigeria	33.4	40.5	51	33	59	36	12.3	38.2	63
Senegal	28.5	65.4	37	60	61	22	16.8	49.6	80
DCs	14.6	28.4	28	-	57	31	-	27.7	
LDCs	30.8	51.6	41	-	63	40	-	44.9	
S-Sah. Africa	34.6	42.4	50	-	56	32	-	40.6	

Source: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999*. (*) HPI ranks have been calculated for the universe of 92 developing countries.

