Who are the urban poor groups in the largest cities in Sub-Saharan Africa countries?

Fernando C. Wehrmeister
International Center for Equity in Health
Federal University of Pelotas
Brazil
Urbanization is growing...

• Since 2008, there are more people living in urban than rural settings

• Big cities in low and middle income countries
  • The infra-structure does not follow the cities’ growth

• Poverty is very relevant in urban settings

• But how to measure poverty in these settings and how these groups “perform” compared to non-poor individuals?
What we did?

• We compared different poverty measures using:

  • 38 DHS and MICS surveys from Sub-Saharan Africa countries
    • The last one from 2010 and onwards
    • Major cities are a usual sampling unit
      • If not, we considered the region as large city if >70% of the region population lives in this city

• Absolute poverty definitions:
  • Household with slum characteristics (UN-Habitat definition)
  • Socioeconomic Deprivation Status (based on Multiple Poverty Index)
  • People living below poverty line

• Relative poverty definitions:
  • Based on the wealth index (30, 40, 50 and 60% of the distribution)
Parameters to define the poor group

• Sample size

• Ability to unmask inequalities

• Performance according to some indicators:
  • Absence of electricity, improved water and improved sanitation facilities
  • Children out of school and any household member aged >10 years and <6 years of education
### Sample size

*Table 1 – Summary statistics of the poorest group sample size, considering all 38 cities included.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty measure</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>P25</th>
<th>P75</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abs. (N)</td>
<td>Rel. (%)</td>
<td>Abs. (N)</td>
<td>Rel. (%)</td>
<td>Abs. (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty line (&lt;USD 1.9 per day)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic deprivation status</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Habitat slum definition</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth score (30%)</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth score (40%)</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth score (50%)</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth score (60%)</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Although we found larger gaps using absolute measures, this gaps are based in low precision estimates

Relative measures show larger gaps using 30 or 40% classification
Performance according to indicators (40% of wealth distribution)

- Absence of electricity
- No improved source of drinking water
- No improved source of sanitation facilities
- Children out-of-school

Legend:
- Low prevalence, low inequality
- Intermediate prevalence and low inequality, or low prevalence and high inequality
- High prevalence or intermediate prevalence and high inequality
And what about the coverage of women’s and children’s indicators?
Inequalities on DFPS & ANC (4+ visits)
Inequalities on DFPS & ANC (4+ visits)
Inequalities on institutional delivery & 3 doses of DPT/penta
Inequalities on institutional delivery & 3 doses of DPT/penta
Inequalities on institutional delivery & 3 doses of DPT/penta

Some countries the poor group have higher coverage.
Conclusions

• Surveys are an under-used source to understand health and inequalities in urban settings

• By the defined criteria:
  • Using 40% seems the best approach (30% when sample size allows)
  • Shows marked inequalities between poor and non-poor groups
  • Specific urban surveys should be encouraged to unveil more inequalities

• The poor groups in the largest city are often being left behind
  • In almost all household and health indicators in the countries
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