Session D. Multidimensional poverty

Discussion questions
Findings derived from newly released Global Multidimensional Poverty Index 2021 (UNDP-OPHI)

The report examines the level and composition of multidimensional poverty across 109 countries covering 5.9 billion people and presents an ethnicity/race/caste disaggregation for 41 countries with available information;

Report finds that disparities in multidimensional poverty among ethnic groups are consistently high across many countries and in nine ethnic groups more than 90 percent of the population is trapped in poverty;

MPI is disaggregated by ethnic group, the range in values is greater than that across all 109 countries and all other disaggregation's performed.

It also shows how, within a country, multidimensional poverty among different ethnic groups can vary immensely. For, example in India five out of six multidimensionally poor people are from lower tribes or castes

Q? Which survey contained needed ethnicity/race/caste disaggregation (MICS, DHS, HBS) and what problems you encountered in collecting this data from other countries.

Q? What is your recommendation for inclusion of this question into relevant surveys for the remaining countries?
Presented a new trial moderate poverty measure to capture higher ambitions outlined in the SDGs, especially targeting SDG 4;

Stressed the importance of disaggregated data in addressing LNOB principle of SDGs for reducing poverty and inequalities;

Highlighted that gender-based differences within households estimated that the share of MPI poor people living in households without an educated women or girl, which in the case of Europe and Central Asia is nearly 13 percent.

Q? How you can explain this finding, considering that in this region 9 years schooling is compulsory and Mean Years of Schooling (UNESCO) is also above 9 years in EECCA?

As countries look to recover from the Covid-19 pandemic and fulfil their commitment towards Agenda 2030, it is vital that measurement tools developed for the SDG framework are able to capture vulnerabilities, inequalities, and offer clear pathways for poverty reduction.

Q: Unfortunately, MPI uses 2-3 year old data (pre-Covid in this case), so how can policy-makers build on your findings in current realities. Can anything be done to obtain timely data for MPI up-dates?
Brazil: *Quality-of-life loss and socioeconomic performance*

- Presented the new methodologies and statistics on quality-of-life loss in Brazil, and a second index that measures socioeconomic performance.

- A well-known IBGE survey on household budgets and living conditions (POF 2017-2018) was used to obtain a wide set of non-monetary (and also subjective) indicators.

- Q: Composite inececs containing over 15 indicators is already a complex for designing index formula

- Dimensions included: Housing; Access to public utility services; Health and food; Education; Access to financial services and standard of living; Transport and leisure.

- Properties of these indices allowed to compare different parts of the population: geographic location, family composition, disposable income, etc which helped identify inequalities and in which subgroups of the population the greatest losses in quality-of-life are concentrated

- Next step is to calculate these indexes with previous editions of the survey (POF 2002-2003 and POF 2008-2009), to identify changes over time

- Q? Are you planning to generate a synthetic panel based on POF for longitudinal datasets? Do you envisage any problems with that, especially since you operate with so many indicators for the Quality of Life loss Index and function?

- Q? Are you considering to build scenarios for your indices for future years (apply some modeling techniques)?