The multidimensional measure method **starts with people**. By mapping outcomes for each individual or household against the criteria being measured, the method **captures**:

- The **percentage of people who are multidimensionally poor** and;
- The **overlapping deprivations that each individual or household faces**.

**Multidimensional Poverty**

INEGI
• Multidimensional Measure Method **reflect the intensity of poverty** (the average number of deprivations or weighted sum of deprivations that each individual experiences).

• Multidimensional Measure Method **can be disaggregated**: they can be broken down quickly and easily by **region, social groups, and dimensions**, in order to provide information to policymakers about the priorities and needs of specific regions and groups.

• Such analyses are essential if we are to meet the **Sustainable Development Goals’ overarching promise to ‘leave no one behind’**.
Main issues of multidimensional poverty:

1. Vulnerable groups
2. Overlapping forms of discrimination
3. Multi-level disaggregation for indicators
1. Vulnerable groups

- **Sex**
  - E.g. Women usually are paid less than men for the same job

- **Age**
  - E.g. Young people generally face higher unemployment
  - E.g. Older people have less access to healthcare

- **Ethnicity**
  - E.g. Minority ethnic groups have fewer years of education

- **Disability**
  - E.g. People with disabilities face greater discrimination at work.

- **Geography**
  - E.g. People in rural areas face more energy, water and sanitation problems.

Multidimensional deprivation impacts social groups differently.
Deprivation is more extreme as more forms of discrimination overlap.

With only four forms of discrimination we have the following groups that are lagging behind:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Level</th>
<th>2nd Level</th>
<th>3rd Level</th>
<th>4th Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deprived</td>
<td></td>
<td>deprived</td>
<td>deprived</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1: A  
Group 2: B  
Group 3: C  
Group 4: D

Group 5: AB  
Group 6: AC  
Group 7: AD  
Group 8: BC

Group 9: BD  
Group 10: CD

Group 11: ABC
Group 12: ABD
Group 13: ACD
Group 15: BCD

Group 16: ABCD

E.g. A (Women) / B (Indigenous) / C (Disabled) / D (Rural)
Indicators can be disaggregated in multi-level to inform programs and policies.
1. As multidimensional deprivation impacts social groups differently, how can we know which deprivations to select without being partial to a specific group?

2. As the forms of discrimination increase, the number of possible groups increases exponentially, how can we rank these overlapping groups in social policies?

3. As the indicators can be disaggregated in multi-level to inform programs and policies, how do we maintain statistical significance in the household survey variables when the number of observations decreases?
This methodology includes all the constitutive dimensions of poverty the Mexican State identified in the General Law of Social Development (LGDS).
Percentage of population in poverty and number of average deprivations, according to vulnerable groups, 2018, Mexico.

- Senior people (+65): 41.1% (2.0 deprivations)
- Young people (12-29): 42.4% (2.1 deprivations)
- Women: 42.4% (2.1 deprivations)
- People with disabilities: 48.6% (2.2 deprivations)
- People in rural areas: 55.3% (2.6 deprivations)
- Indigenous: 69.5% (2.8 deprivations)

National Aggregate: 41.9% (2.2 deprivations)
Among the multidimensional poor, it is possible to identify the population in extreme multidimensional poverty by combining the minimum wellbeing threshold and the extreme deprivation threshold ($C^* = 3$).
When we disaggregate data on extreme poverty by sex, we find the surprise that the percentage of men living in extreme poverty is higher than that of women. The reason, although women have less income than men, they also have less deprivation than men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty indicator</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Population in extreme poverty</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Population with income below the extreme poverty line</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of deprivations for people in extreme poverty</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. w/ Educational backwardness</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. w/ Lack of access to health services</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. w/ Lack of access to social security</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. w/ Lack of quality and housing spaces</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. w/ Lack of access to basic services in housing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. w/ Lack of access to food</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>