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Why is it relevant?:

- Child poverty has greater chance of becoming permanent or with irreversible effects.
- Greater potential for its reproduction in the future, i.e. intergenerational transmission.
- Children’s economic, social and legal dependence of adults.

Contributions:

- Characterization of child poverty.
- Disaggregation of the information by groups of population (age, sex, regions, etc.).
- Public policy recommendations based on evidence.
Objectives:
To measure poverty and the state of social development

Methods:
Methodology for Multidimensional Poverty Measurement in Mexico

Institutional planning 2018-2026

UNICEF-CONEVAL AGENDA
Multidimensional Poverty Measurement in Mexico

Poverty Dimensions
(General Law of Social Development, Article 36)

Income
- Educational gap
- Access to health services
- Access to social security
- Quality and spaces of the dwelling
- Access to basic services in the dwelling
- Access to nutritious and quality food
- Degree of accessibility to paved road

Economic wellbeing

Social rights

Data Source of information by the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía, INEGI)

Periodicity
- Federal entities: 2 years
- Municipalities: 5 years
Properties of the multidimensional poverty measurement

1. Dimensional decomposability
2. Population decomposability
3. Comparability across time

Identification of disadvantaged groups

Regions
- National
- Rural / urban
- State
- Municipality

Population
- Gender
- Children and adolescents
- Ethnic minorities
- Elderly population
- Young adults
- People with disabilities
Findings:

- In 2016, half of the Mexican child population (20.7 million) lived in **poverty**.

- Among them, 3.6 million (9%) lived in **extreme poverty**.

- Only one in five was free of any economic or social deprivation.

Source: CONEVAL based on MEC of the 2016 ENIGH survey.
Child poverty gaps

- Early childhood presents a particular vulnerability: children at younger ages live in dwellings with a lower, greater deprivation in access to health care services.

- Other deprivations are accentuated for older children, such as educational gap and access to food.

Source: CONEVAL based on MEC of the 2016 ENIGH survey.
Child poverty gaps

- Attributes such as ethnicity are linked to racial discrimination that keep indigenous children in a situation of historical backwardness.

- The level of poverty of these abovementioned children is of 78.5% vs. 47.8% of non-indigenous children.

Source: CONEVAL based on MEC of the 2016 ENIGH survey.
Child poverty results

Poverty and extreme poverty in population under and over 18 years old, 2008-2016 (percentage)

Do we need specific child poverty indicators?: different approach, different implications for public policy

Specific child poverty indicators

Vs.

National multidimensional poverty measure

Complementary studies

Disaggregated indicators for childhood

We need a new political agreement

Holistic approach including a human rights perspective & wellbeing.

Provide additional evidence for specific populations

Political agreement since 2005. MPI is being used.

Targeted policies for children in partnership with UNICEF
Conclusions and recommendations:

➢ **Breaking the intergenerational reproduction of poverty** is a core aspect for the design of public policies for children.

➢ **Strengthen access and quality of basic services** in early childhood, childhood and adolescence, through **coordinated work and a long-term vision** between various social and economic development sectors.

➢ **Strengthen social protection mechanisms** against all forms of **violence, discrimination** or **exploitation** that violate the fundamental **rights** of children and adolescents.
### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Population aged 0 to 17 years</th>
<th>Population aged 18 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population living in poverty</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population living moderate poverty</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population living extreme poverty</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social deprivations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational gap</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to health services</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to social security</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and spaces of the dwelling</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to basic services in the dwelling</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to food</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellbeing (Income)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income below the extreme poverty line by income</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income below the poverty line by income</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CONEVAL based on MCS-ENIGH 2008 and MEC of the 2016 ENIGH survey.