

Vulnerability Studies: An Introduction

Prof. Pramod K Nayar

Department of English

University of Hyderabad

Week- 01

Lecture- 04

Interpreting Vulnerability, Precarity of Work and Access Equality for Equal Opportunity

Okay, so hello everyone. My name is Deepanshu Mohan and I'm a Professor of Economics and Director of the Center for New Economics Studies at the O.P. Jindal Global University. I'm here as part of an effort to take a two-part lecture for the topic of interpreting vulnerability in context to the nature of precarity of work that we see in the informal economy in India. And my motivation to be part of this platform was to engage with those who are interested in understanding about the nature of vulnerability that affects India's what you would consider as a very stratified, unorganized and informalized labor market.

The first lecture will briefly outline the key concepts on which discussions around the nature of vulnerability, precarity affecting India's unorganized informal workforce are based upon. Any foundational basis of ensuring, you know, the progressive realization of justice, the humanitarian response action for communities living in vulnerable conditions remains safeguarded in the core pursuit of access equality. So, we'll discuss what our center created as part of an effort in 2021: an access and equality index report. The purpose of this was to be in consistent terms, try assessing Indian state's performance on different parameters and pillars on what were the performance evaluation of the citizens and the population of respective states in terms of their measured access to basic amenities, education, healthcare, social security and legal recourse.

Now these are basic social, economic and public goods, which according to scholars like John Rawls and Amartya Sen are essential in the way human being organize their own capabilities, how they're able to move in terms of higher order of well-being over a period of time. You would find in the reference reading sections, different links that are provided to the index, the report itself and the dissemination of its findings across platforms that were able to carry the index measure findings. Part two of this lecture would focus a lot more around some of the micro ethnographies that our center has conducted as part of its initiative called the Visual Study Boards. This would be a lecture which will move around or beyond concepts of access equality as we would discuss that

today, but to be able to build more from understanding through case studies or ethnographic work from our center to provide an illustrative reading on how you measure or understand capability enhancing humanitarian model for those who are working across India as part of the informal sector and those who are occupied in precarious work and vulnerable living conditions. The reference readings for those, that is lecture two, has been already shared in terms of articles from our work in the area of Kapashera, which is close to the border between Delhi and Gurgaon.

There's a chapter which is shared from our work on the narratives of daily wage workers from Mazdur Mandis or what you consider as informal labor markets. The project was undertaken during the pandemic. So, a lot of this work and the findings around these work beyond their academic deliverance have also been published with platforms like *the Wire* and *Scroll* and the links of these have been shared in case you want a shorter reading and then get access to a larger contextual analysis in the chapter. There are also video essays for the micro ethnographies for lecture two which you would be able to find from our YouTube channel and the links of those have been already shared with you. So, let me get started with our first lecture topic today, which would focus more on our understanding of our own informal economy from looking at the measurement around access and equality index.

So, when we talk about vulnerability or precarity of work, a lot of times the concepts around measurement of vulnerability tend to look at the nature of economic, social, cultural, and in some cases, political disposition of communities within societies. The purpose here for the two-part lecture series, as I mentioned, is to not just be able to determine through certain benchmarks what vulnerability may mean, but look at a set of research questions that can help you understand how precarity of work and vulnerability can be understood when we talk about India's own labor market. Because the nature of working communities which are a composite group of India's very fragmented and stratified labor market is not consistent with any what you would consider as predefined notions of what you find in labor studies. In fact, it's difficult to understand how much of the nature of labor contracts that affect the participation of different groups based on their social, political, cultural, and in some cases economic dispositions are not consistent with any predefined criterias. In fact, even the policy ecosystem in many cases fails to highlight the nature of vulnerabilities that are affecting those low-income migrant workers.

We saw this during the pandemic more recently when as a result of the lockdown being declared, a lot of migrant workers were left to fend for themselves. They did not have, I mean, many cities did not have any idea on how many workers would need safety and safe mobility transition. And for the simple reason being because the state authorities and

in many cases the government do not have a realistic estimate on the nature of the participation of migrant workers in different sectors where communities are working. So, with that keeping in mind, I want to discuss a little bit about the work that our Center has been undertaking in context to studying India's labor market. If you were to be able to look at what we want to understand through the research questions that I highlight here, “measuring vulnerability and precarity of work” is something that you would be able to understand through the nature of research questions that we are looking at.

I'll be talking about the conceptual framework of the creation of the Access and Equality Index. This is an index which can help you understand how the vulnerability and precarity conditions of work is consistent with how communities find it difficult to access basic amenities. It is inhumane to consider or assume that people would want to stay in slums and urban and in almost inhabitable conditions in cities just because they would want to necessarily do so. They end up doing so because they're looking for finding livelihood, basic economic opportunity to earn, get income to be able to meet their ends, and more importantly get access to basic amenities like education, healthcare for the children and family. So, if we have a good sense of how we measure some of these access criterias, it can not only help in understanding how working communities can access or get into a better standard of living or a better standard of quality of life, but there's more that we can always understand as a result of providing equal opportunity and towards the progressive realization of well-being and capability enhancement.

These concepts have been out there in developmental philosophy for decades now. I mean, if you could look at scholars like Amartya Singh, John Rawls, his own work on theory of justice in Sen's reference, his work on the capability measure, Martha Nussbaum, all of these scholars have written extensively how well-being enhancement is connected less with how much of income you earn, but more in terms of the access to basic economic and social opportunities that human beings have and which allowed them over a period of time to get into a higher standard of living. So, keeping that in mind, a few questions that we need to put out there. These questions, I feel, are important in the way we understand much of the work, not only what our center does, but more importantly, how we look at measuring understanding or interpreting vulnerability when it comes to the working communities in India. The first key question here is to look at the way we understand informality.

A lot of the work that you see around urban informality in mainstream policy and economic discourse tends to have or take a very dualistic view around what informality means. By that, what I mean is there is a sense of disconnect between what is the formal sector and what is the informal sector established on certain pre-considered legal norms, as a result of which the community, which is part of what we predefine as the informal

sector, tends to be disconnected with what's happening in the formal economy. And that's where one of the first sort of conceptual fallacies provide what you'd consider as a disconnected and segregated policy approach. There's a need for a more holistic, inclusive, and what you would consider as an entwined social policy thinking access when it comes to looking at the applied and functional aspects of urban informality. Most of the working communities that are part of the informal sector are not disconnected with the way much of the economy is organized.

Think of the domestic worker who's working in your house and how she is part of much of what happens in your household and is an integral part of your intra-household dynamics. So, to be able to segregate someone just because they're coming in and being paid in cash and do not have a safely safeguarded organized labor contract doesn't mean that they do not occupy or entwine in the formalized and organized outlook of the way the household activities are organized. In the same way, you can talk about construction and the business of construction where much of the real estate property developers might be complying with formal legal rules and guidelines, but the workers whom they might be hiring may not be part in a lot of sense of the work that is entailed. And you find a lot of daily wage workers getting to work in construction work on low wages, very exploitative working conditions and contracts, and the informal labor market scenario allows for that exploitation to take place because the formal is so much disconnected with the informal. So, that's one of the first sort of key questions where vulnerability on precarity of work and the way we understand that in India's labor market needs to be moving away from a dualistic approach and outlook.

The second is the question around mobile insecurities. What are the key motivations that make unsecured workers more mobile and floating in nature? We've discussed this more extensively in our work on daily wage workers and I'll come back to this when we look at that particular case study in part two of this lecture series. Access and equality is something we'll talk about as part of the creation of the index in a while from now, but what you have to understand is how much of the access to work, employment, and industrial organization remains deeply entwined with the way much of the pattern of housing or allocation of work is organized within and across cities in India. If you look at much of the inadequacies of the labor market to understand structural weaknesses in India's labor market, we also need what we would consider as a narrative focused approach to using micro ethnographies to look into the daily lives and livelihoods of different working groups. A lot of our structured analysis of quantifiable reasoning sometimes misses the nuances of the everyday emergencies of the vulnerable communities and what they face and experience on a day-to-day basis.

An ethnographic narrative-based outlook helps in doing that and that's something which

much of our case studies that we'll discuss tend to complement in addition to what the access and equality index does. So, there's a complementarity in terms of the work that I am going to share starting from a more quantifiable analysis of how access and equality is measured to where and how we can look at micro ethnographies to complement much of that analysis by talking to people, knowing about their personal and professional disposition through an ethnographic lens. There is another angle in which much of our center's research work takes place but that's something which is connected for another time and discussion. Having said that, the question around embeddedness of how culture intersects with the social and working or what you'd consider as the occupational pattern of a particular community is something we look at very closely but mostly in context of the textile and crafts landscape in India. This is an extension of Karl Polanyi's work on how embedded our culture, our social norms tend to be in the way markets are organized in societies and if you look at India's textile or crafts market, a lot of this has cultural linkages with communities' own past, their own sort of religious belief systems in some cases and that has a lot to do in defining their occupational pattern.

A lot of them organize let's say for block printing, papier-mâché in Kashmir, *ajrakh* block print in Gujarat, embroideries coming out from Bhuj. A lot of these work in crafts tend to be very closely connected with the knowledge systems that a community is at and then how that has over a period of time shaped the way their occupational patterns have been identified. There is a lot of discussion of how commercialization and commodification of the craft have disembedded the communities from applying their cultural knowledge systems in the production process of the craft. You see a lot more of mechanization now happening with certain goods or crafts that are more in demand but this is a very separate crunch in which much of our ethnographic work happens and all of these five points that I've put across as part of the research questions that the center deals in trying to understand or measure or interpret vulnerability tends to also occupy a gender conditioned and gender focused view and this is very important why, as most of you would understand, that the moment you bring a gendered perspective or as part of a social aggregate analysis to your work, you bring a particular group and study from perspective of their gender the questions around accessibility their own way of life, state of being from an intra-household level to the place of work affect the agency and bargaining power they have on the decision making. So, we look at this more in context to women and women agency, their own bargaining power. In many cases, women who are independently working as part of an informal, unsecured, vulnerable workforce prism do not find additional access to bargaining power on taking their own independent decisions due to intra household factors, social norms and many, many problems but much of this as the work of Ashwini Deshpande and many other development economists have put out is that social norms do not play that much of a role as we think they do in affecting the intra-household dynamics of women and their own agency

especially in case of vulnerable working conditions.

A lot has to do with the nature of work itself, the nature of demand for work for women. Because there is less demand for hiring women workers in many of the organized sectors, you expect women to end up working in the informal or vulnerable sector, where the exploitative conditions make it difficult for locating agency for women in that case. So, a lot of our work sort of tends to look into some of these factors these are some of the groups and communities around which a lot of our research has been based predominantly from low-income migrant workers to different ethnic minorities and nomadic tribes. We've looked at having some of our projects including community of workers or unsecured community of workers like the sex workers of Pune and the transgender, vulnerable transgender groups working in precarious working conditions across cities of Delhi, Calcutta, Mumbai in the past and much of this research work that we've undertaken has involved ethnographic work with these groups itself.

With that keeping in mind let me bring into the discussion around the work on the Access Inequality Index. A lot of the details on the index are in the report that I would suggest all of you to take a look at closely and study more at length. What I want to do here is put out the conceptual framework of what the index is about and what we mean by access equality. Whose access equality are we talking about? In what context is the index framed and what can be done in the past or in the future in terms of taking a framework like this forward. So, in the study of inequality a lot of the literature is about outcomes and inequality of opportunities that people have as a result of which their well-being is affected. You know much of the sustainable development goals and their performance in different developing countries including India pointed out that an underinvestment in human and social capital when it comes to education, health care for states across India which creates an uneven access to various or basic economic and social opportunities for communities across the country. The pandemic as most of you would know affected this and provided almost a new emergence and conceptual meaning to the way we could understand accessibility.

With the lockdown in place people were in many cases across cities expected to join for school online and those who had access to digital phones and smart phones and internet connectivity were able to switch to an online platform very quickly. But 70 percent of the population doesn't live in those well-established infrastructurally connected networks of digitized education model enabling system. You have bulk of our population in rural areas where digital access connectivity or even access to a smartphone is not even there as a result of which many kids who were not able to go physically to school and the schools were not able to connect their lessons came out of the education system completely lost on what we would consider as a one and a half or two years of essential learning. As a result, I mean the ACR report brings this out more clearly. There was a lag

in research for the access to education regressing itself for many communities especially girls across the rural areas who were out of school for very long and as a result of this our own notion of understanding accessibility becomes important to raise as a question not just from perspective of affordability or availability of resources but and more other criteria as well. So, one of our essential objectives in creating the index was to go beyond the physical access or the spatial distribution of opportunities and resources.

It's very important to look at how and to what extent when you look at physical accessibility and access what do we mean by access as well. And I think this is something which is what questions around the explanation of access which I'll shortly come to is drawn from in our case from the public health discourse. In public health you look at access not just from perspective of physical access of resources to a healthcare facility or a hospital but also many other factors on how healthcare access could be created for a community which is in need for certain care infrastructure. We're looking at in the index creation inequality from the lens of both opportunity that is means and also outcome, the end. In terms of outcome measurement, a lot of times economists tend to look at data on consumption, income, wealth and they say that "oh, the end reality of a community is unequal because their consumption is asymmetric based on what they are able to consume, what income they're able to earn, what wealth they have, what is the outcome they have on health performance indicators and how much education that they'll be able to receive". These are outcome indicators that are based on what one has, right?

In terms of opportunity you look at the aspects around accessibility and availability of basic resources that based on their social conditions, gender, race, ethnicity, caste, geographical position are able to look into in terms of accessing basic economic opportunities which gives you the means to be able to have realizable outcomes to get better education, better health outcome. Both go hand in hand. There are two sides of the same coin but are very essential in the way the inequality of access is or requires to be measured. If you just measure it on the outcome of the end variable side a lot of that discussion, I think tends to miss out on what the opportunity or the means that are most essential to the way in which human beings are able to enhance their well-being is shaped. Unfortunately, I think much of the measurement has somehow in the inequality discourse has had a skewed focus a lot on the outcome-based indicators.

Our effort, in this case, for the creation of the index was to focus a lot more on the opportunity or the means and or the means perspective of what populations have. If they have the means or the accessibility to basic social and economic opportunities through better education, health care, the outcomes are likely to get better over time as well. So, our objective was to develop a multi-dimensional index to capture the inequality of access to basic key opportunities to look at inequality of whom between groups of

individuals or households based on their gender, caste, region. That's something which we want to do and the way the work on the index is developing in the future. What we have done is taken forward the meaning of access from the basis of four key measures or the four A's where we talk about access in general way of approaching, reaching or entering a place is the right or opportunity to reach.

It is broadly conceptualized in terms of availability, which means physical access to basic opportunities, approachability which measures for geographical access, a particular group being able to get to a school or a hospital and how close is that through GIS and geospatial technology. Now, a lot of this measurement is possible more clearly with satellite data, phone data and others. Affordability in terms of measuring financial access, how much of accessibility you have on potential needs and appropriateness, which is in terms of the adequacy of the services, the qualitative aspect of what these services are, whether that makes it accessible or not. I remind a lot of students of the study undertaken by the World Bank in Tamil Nadu where many people, despite having access to better performing public healthcare facilities at the primary level, were conditioned to be able to travel to district hospitals which were farther off in terms of physical travel, just because there was a conditioning that healthcare facilities were better at district hospitals as against in primary healthcare clinics. Despite any regulatory check happening on primary healthcare clinics giving you the better possible service in a state which does well on social development indicators, but the conditioning might be such that people might think that it's appropriate to go to a district hospital when you're sick as against go to a primary healthcare clinic just because that's the way the conditioning might work.

So, to be able to assess some of these criteria, these four A's tend to help us understand on how AEI measurement takes place. We have five key pillars in the way the index is constructed and designed. There are 23 categories and 58 indicators. It was an expansive level of work in identifying which indicators come to part of which pillar and what we've kept in mind is parameters that are consistent with the needs of both; as I said, means to giving access to basic economic social opportunities for a community and then how is that connected to the outcome or the end goal of getting equal opportunity for a particular pillar as well. These are all pillars which are crucial to social and human development.

They relate to an important opportunity for improving the social and economic overall quality of life for a community at large and we look at the data from a household level and individual level based on what's available as per government sources. That is a big question. The accessibility of data in the quality of what is available in public domain is something which requires an extensive exercise in Indian context now on trying to determine which parameters have what data available and then you have to look and depend on proxies. That's what makes the construction of an index quite a complex

exercise. I would say complex and not use the word complicated because of the design in which you want as a researcher to shape the index, you can try to remove certain indicators to make sure that you have certain consistency in outcomes and the process of the way in which your selection has taken place is consistent with some basic principles that are conceptually relatable. So, the five pillars include access to basic amenities, healthcare, education, socio-economic security, and justice. We've revised now using the word "access to justice" to "access to legal recourse" because what we're really looking at within the pillar is how timely legal recourse can be made possible for communities which file for a dispute. What are the kind of human resources that are available? What is the physical infrastructure made possible? Digital infrastructure, legal aid, a lot of these criteria which tend to sort of measure access to legal recourse than justice. Conceptualization of the use of the term justice tends to be also a lot more complex in the way justice is understood.

You might have legal recourse available but justice may not be delivered during the period of time where cases file. So, we're using the word for now and much more often terms in common language access to legal recourse for this pillar. We measure for all in their performance where we look at states and disparities across gender, rural, and urban divide and the findings from the index tend to be categorized for allowing states to be measured or labeled as frontrunners where certain states that do very well across pillars get a score of anywhere between or higher than 0.42 are seen as frontrunners. Then you have achievers who are the states with composite scores between 0.33 to 0.42 and aspirants those with score less than 0.33. There are scores available for states, union territories, we've kept it separately and then in some cases measures for across pillars where you'll see that certain states who might have very good composite scores do not do very well in certain pillars and performance of certain pillars. So, you see that with the frontrunners here on the green label of states that states like for example Punjab, Haryana do not do very well in case of certain pillars when it comes to basic amenities as compared to other states as well or social economic security for that matter. While you have states like West Bengal, Rajasthan and Gujarat in certain cases doing better if not at the composite level but more at a certain pillar level evaluation.

So this is what makes the exercise of looking at access equality more exciting across looking at pillars and the composite scores around that. Of course, there are divisions around how you have certain states doing very well for example in access to pipe drinking water. You have states like Goa doing much better and states like Bihar doing the worst. On digital access you have the union territory of Delhi doing much better and Tripura being the least connected state in that sense. You have on nutrition many states doing very well as compared to a state like Puducherry which is not performing that well. But a similar union territory might be doing very well on other indicators as well.

Manipur not doing very well in housing as against Punjab which does tremendously well on access to affordable housing. So, it's important to see what the numbers tend to bring out. It is not easy to interpret an index from just by looking at composite numbers and draw conclusions and generalizations about state level performance. You need to look at what goes in the details. The higher value on aspects of services around insurance, postnatal care, you have union territories, certain territories doing well.

You've distinguished in the report which you'll find union territory performance and state performance more explicitly so it's easier to follow through that. Again, on digital readiness you have states like Uttar Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir doing worse while you have states like Punjab, union territories like Lakshadweep, Chandigarh doing much better. There is a state like Goa which does very well on secondary level education enrollment and Uttar Pradesh doing worse off there. You might have a state doing very well in primary education enrollment but doing very bad on secondary education enrollment. So for policy makers I think and for those looking at these numbers, the idea is to look at what in what regard a state does relatively well compared to others when what context it is not doing as well led to others and what processes are set in motion in being able to correct for those policy level implications.

India faces much better in terms of equal access to bank accounts through the nature of interventions that are available or if you look at finance or access to finance or social security a state like Mizoram or Goa does very well in that regard while if you look at states like Chhattisgarh, Manipur or Punjab they do tremendously bad on access to social security presence or involvement of MGNREGA schemes and in terms of having an active bank account. Manipur for example has a lower score of not enabling many of its state population to have access to bank account the way other states have. On legal recourse you find again very similar states like Jammu and Kashmir, Sikkim, Mizoram not doing well on criteria of women and police, high court judge vacancies and access to digital infrastructure while in states like Sikkim you see a higher representation of women as judges, Bihar zero, which means that that's clearly a problem for the state. You have court hall shortfall which was at least in Meghalaya but you have Delhi for example doing very well on prison occupancy while Lakshadweep actually doing not that well. So, you have measures in the way you understand how inequality could be understood in context to looking at performance of these states and union territories across pillars. When you look at inequality of whom it's important to understand where people are and reside have a strong impact on the nature of opportunities they have.

You know access to opportunities and resources have a very clear spatial dimension and I think a lot of times you don't do a good job in understanding the role geography plays in

making people to have access. I'll give you an example, if you look at rural and urban level disparities across India, 87.6 percent of the households in rural areas have sufficient drinking water access while 90.9 in percent in urban areas has it. If you look at approachability and appropriateness of access to drinking water there exists a wide disparity the quality of drinking water you'd get in cities and rural it is extremely different.

People residing in urban areas would have relatively higher access to unshared and quality sanitation services as compared to majority of as you see in states not having that. Among households living in houses about 76.7 percent of the households in the rural in about 96 percent in urban areas have, you know, better housing infrastructure. Nearly 31 percent of rural population and 65 percent of urban population are internet users whereas the inequality gap is much lower for mobile users. There are widespread spatial inequalities as soon as you bring the urban and rural picture into the story and that's not true of just certain states but across states you see that there'll be a consistent reality.

Similarly for healthcare I mean the moment you look at rural and urban outcomes in terms of the spatiality of where state populations are- access to maternal health, percentage of households covered by health scheme- you see wide level disparities and I think the reality of that was exposed during COVID and the way the the pandemic or the virus spread much of the impact was felt worse in cities initially but as it spread across rural areas the extendibility to care and infrastructure for healthcare to be taken care of those affected by the virus in rural areas was limited because of a poor infrastructural presence across healthcare. Similarly for finance, access to finance in rural areas compared to how it is in urban area is something where there's a widespread difference and the diverse access of facilities, infrastructure on internet, computer availability makes a huge role in how people use these services. A lot of people in cities with better financial literacy and infrastructure, digital infrastructure use now banking services via online banking. You don't expect that to happen with the system of what you find in rural areas. However, having said that with the Unified Payments Interface (UPI) system now revolutionizing payment systems across the country even many rural area consumers of UPI enabled systems of payment transfers have improved as the infrastructure for the digital payments ecosystem has improved in certain rural areas across states as well.

So, there are changes of course but it's important to look at the numbers more closely and see. Social identity plays a huge role. We're working on this parameter more closely now within the index and the way the index is upgraded. We want to look at how communities as part of the social identity are able to access certain facilities and economic opportunities at a much better position in terms of availability, approachability and access as compared to other groups. So, much of the national level data is available on SCs, STs, OBCs and religious minorities but we need to do a better job in being able

to know how marginalized groups can access or cannot access the same services as compared to the other groups as well.

It's very well known how marginalized caste groups do not have access in some cases to the same water sources as dominant caste groups have in rural villages in particular areas. How do we measure that? How do we factor that? This is something which the index and the methodology on the index is working upon. I mentioned earlier about gender and how the moment we bring gender as a perspective to understand how communities across different social groups based on their gendered identities tend to have a different outcome both in terms of opportunities and both in terms of what they realize. The measure around inequality and even vulnerability for that matter gets affected. I mean if you look at for example in terms of owning a house, 66% of married men according to the data that's available own houses on their own compared to 22% married women.

That's a huge disparity when it comes to ownership of housing and that's a huge, that's a big factor. Property ownership is essential for asset acquisition and asset liquidation of resources as individuals might need more money and if men have more of the wealth or the assets in their name that affects the agency of women to be able to command our financial independence when they need that. Particularly in cases of intra-household disputes, women awareness of the mobile internet has increased from 19 to 50 percent but it still remains considerably low when it compares to the access of mobile internet for men. In the worker population ratio, I think this is something which is well known in the analysis of labour force participation rate critique as well where much of the worker population group in ratio in rural areas is skewed in favour of men as compared how it is for females.

In the urban sector the scenario doesn't change much at all. So, this affects their ability to get social security. Women tend to work more in the informal sector because the nature of jobs available in the organized sector has been less sensitive to the needs of women and that's been a major factor on how labour force participation rate and worker population ratios have been more gender skewed in favour of men. There are other findings that are available in the report. I don't want to sort of take a lot of time in going through these right here but you'd want to look at how growth performance of certain states tend to relate to their overall performance across AEI measures. There is a strong correlation definitely whether with states which have higher growth performance, better investment potential, better capital mobility to be able to allow for better opportunities of access to basic amenities for their population but it's not as if that it's a one-on-one mapping.

There are complexities in the way you look at the numbers. There are certain states where

their regional disparities are very strong. You look at some of the states in the south which do very well on access equality measurement as compared to states in the north of India and that's something which is in need for better and more closer reflection. Similarly, for education, healthcare you see that sense of division in terms of spatial and regional diversion which we need to get a better look at. We're trying to improve the index as I mentioned earlier.

It's a work in progress for the work that it requires. As I said 58 indicators is no joke. You look at the numbers more closely and carefully but what we're trying to do is to try look at inequality and the measurement of inequality and the progress of equality more from the lens of understanding what opportunities people have and communities have as against to what outcomes they're able to create. The link in being able to just say that you earn an income which is less than what your neighbor does doesn't say much about the access to opportunity that you have as compared to your neighbor, right? So, we want to look at what opportunities in terms of availability of certain basic social and economic resources do you have compared to others.

There's a lot more work that needs to be done. We are still sort of in the initial stages of how the AEI index can sort of expand in terms of its horizon of work but a lot that you see in the report and the disseminated finding give you a sense of the range of findings that we've been able to make. With that we'll pause. I'll come back with lecture two. Take a good close look at the report, its findings and I hope you'll be able to make some good sense out of the work that we've done. Thank you.