

“Different Types of Social Protection and Progress on SDG 1: No Hunger - An Examination of Social Protection Coverage Across Programs in Latin America Using SDG Indicator 1.3.1.”

Ahmad Tipu

SUNY New Paltz Honors Program

Class of 2019

Abstract:

The alleviation of poverty in Latin America has largely relied upon social protection programs in the form of conditional cash transfers. SDG 1 provides a space for such programs to be considered as part of the global sustainable development effort within its own Indicator 1.3.1 which measures social protection coverage. This paper uses that framework as a model to examine programs in Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, and Panama on the basis of poverty alleviation as defined by Indicator 1.3.1. By using the UNECLAC's database of Non-Contributory Social Protection Programs in conjunction with the World Bank Atlas of Social Protection I narrowed down my focus to a change in percent coverage over time which is constructed using variables from the aforementioned databases. The ensuing results show gradual increases in coverage for Brazil's Bolsa Familia, Mexico's Oportunidades/Progresas, and Panama's Red de Oportunidades accompanied by decreases in coverage for Argentina's Jefas y Jefes and Chile's Solidario. Although these results show a commitment to poverty alleviation as per SDG 1 the overall picture is mixed due to incomplete databases, limited range of disaggregated data, and the lack of consensus on a capability-based definition of poverty.

Keywords: International Relations, Social Protection, Social Welfare, Latin America, Sustainable Development Goals, SDG, United Nations, Bolsa Familia, Brazil, Chile, Solidario, Mexico, Oportunidades/Progresas, Panama, Red de Oportunidades, Argentina, Jefes y Jefas de Hogar, conditional cash transfer, integrated anti-poverty program, poverty, poverty alleviation, World Bank, UNECLAC, International Labour Organization

Introduction:

The SDGs or Sustainable Development Goals are the latest iterations of the UN's development framework. A reinvention of the previous Millennium Development Goals, they are seventeen in total and cover everything from poverty to human rights in a multifaceted approach to sustainable development. There are seventeen goals in total with a total of one hundred and sixty-nine indicators which are more specific indices of measurement that correlate with each respective goal. Within these indicators, the SDGs do well in capturing the drivers of these issues and capture the complexity of development in a multi-faceted approach clearly ahead of the MDGs of old (Sengupta, 2018,13).

SDG 1 aims to “end poverty in all of its forms everywhere by 2030” due to the fact that 11% of the world's population lives in extreme poverty or below \$1.90 US dollars a day (United Nations). The goal represents a major shift from the MDGs since poverty and hunger are encapsulated in two separate goals. In the MDGs, both were housed in Goal 1, “Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger” (United Nations) which lumped together two distinct goals. The SDGs went a step further by separating these into two goals, Goal 1: No Poverty and Goal 2: Zero Hunger. This separation is especially important as it recognizes both poverty and hunger as unique yet related and provides a space for each to receive attention and achieve progress without being lumped together. As an added bonus, two discourses were created each unique to its respective issue allowing for further specificity and more appropriate solutions.

When further breaking down the MDGs and SDGs into their targets and indicators it is apparent that the MDGs did not account for social protection at all. The MDG targets deal with reducing the number of people living under \$1.25 a day (Target 1.A), achieving decent work

(Target 1.B), and lowering the proportion of people suffering from hunger (Target 1.C). On the other hand, the targets and indicators for SDG 1 go into greater depths by adding social protection and economic resiliency to the mix along with the original three goals. As revealed by Sengupta's research on the SDGs they "[frame] poverty as a multi-dimensional problem that arises not only from a lack of income but also from a lack of equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services" (Sengupta, 2018, 13). This shows a distinct shift from the MDG framing of poverty as an inherent "lacking" on the part of those affected to an understanding that poverty may stem from restricted access to equal rights to resources. By further including Indicator 1.3.1, which measures the proportion of the population covered by social protection, the SDGs further embrace a multi-dimensional definition of poverty. This is through the fact that social protection coverage, which aims to increase access to resources and service, is made to be a standard by which progress on SDG 1: No Poverty is measured.

In this work, I aim to explore different social protection programs in Latin America which have seen an explosion of such initiatives in recent years. I begin by exploring definitions of social protection and describing a variety of programs across countries such as Brazil with Bolsa Familia, Mexico with Oportunidades/Progresas, Chile with Solidario, and Argentina with Jefas y Jefes as well as others. For each program, I will describe an area of focus as well as its targeting methodology as well as why the particular program can be categorized as either a conditional cash transfer or integrated anti-poverty program. Then I present a dataset compiled across sources such as the UN SDG Database and World Bank's Atlas of Social Protection as well as justification for my selection of each set of disaggregated data. Using this dataset as a foundation, I will analyze the data as well as note trends I observe across data and differences between each in my sample of countries' programs. To conclude I offer a set of critiques based

upon programs deemed successful at stemming poverty as per Indicator 1.3.1 and their unique characteristics.

Definitions of Social Protection:

Social protection is a wide-ranging term that can include initiatives such as conditional cash transfer, health insurance, pension, and other such programs. To be able to effectively measure progress on such programs through coverage it is necessary to first go through definitions of social protection. The United Nations, World Bank, and International Labour Organization's definitions are particularly relevant in this case as they maintain databases on social protection programs which I will reference later on in this work.

The United Nations Development Programme defines social protection as “a set of measures in the social sphere, which allows substantial contributions to the generation of frameworks of equality, by reducing the gaps in inequality and the eradication of poverty and social exclusion” (United Nations). Right off the bat, this is a definition that embraces a multi-dimensional definition of the core issue, poverty. Most importantly it mentions social protection as a set of measures in the social sphere which is already a shift from the traditional economically defined version of poverty to one that exists in multiple spheres. The definition by default also contains an acceptance that inequality is a root cause of poverty with its focus on frameworks of equality which reduce inequality gaps and eradicate poverty.

As per the World Bank Group's definition, “[social protection] helps individuals and families especially the poor and vulnerable cope with crises and shocks, find jobs, invest in the health and education of their children, and protect the aging population” (World Bank). This

definition places a greater emphasis on resilience in the sense of crisis prevention and shock preparedness for the poor and vulnerable. There is also a clear focus on job creation, health, and education for a greater deal of specificity than the UN definition which merely mentions frameworks of equality. In nature, this seems to be a definition aiming to help people pick themselves up and invest in their own futures instead of trying to deal with inequalities causing poverty.

The International Labour Organization defines the same concept as, “Social Security [which] involves access to health care and income security, particularly in cases of old age, unemployment, sickness, invalidity, work injury, maternity or loss of a main income earner” (International Labour Organization). The main focus here is on social security that fills the gap in income created by a loss of labor. Again, like the World Bank definition, the key is a “lacking” rather than inequality or another multi-dimensional factor. Here it is the lack of work which is the central issue causing poverty and is therefore identified by the ILO as a necessary focus of social protection or security programs.

After an economic crisis in the 1980s, much Latin American social protection shifted towards conditional cash transfers and integrated poverty programs based upon an updated multi-dimensional definition of poverty (Barrietos and Santibáñez, 2009, 3-4). Bolsa Familia in Brazil, Oportunidades/Progresas in Mexico, and Jefas y Jefes in Argentina are all conditional cash transfer programs based on bundling interventions to address core poverty-related issues. Integrated poverty programs such as Chile’s Solidario and Red de Oportunidades in Panama do much of the same in their approach. Since the United Nations definition of social protection

captures this shift as well as the UN's own shift in focus this is the definition upon which I will evaluate the progress of social protection programs towards poverty elimination.

Programs:

The two types of social protection programs I will explore are conditional cash transfer and integrated anti-poverty programs. Conditional cash transfer programs aim to provide income to those in need while adding conditions for transfer that focus on health, education, and nutrition in order to raise participants out of poverty and "graduate" from these programs (Barrietos and Santibáñez, 2009, 12). Integrated anti-poverty programs, on the other hand, focus on "the capability approach, wellbeing is assessed in terms of the 'beings' and 'doings' which are within the reach of individuals" (Barrietos and Santibáñez, 2009, 13). Thus, integrated anti-poverty initiatives more so aim to increase the capability of individuals to exist in a state out of poverty rather than simply provide access to cash as a form of poverty alleviation.

The first of the Latin American conditional cash transfer programs I want to examine is Bolsa Familia in Brazil which is a social protection program focusing on conditional cash transfers and attributed to the former Brazilian President Lula. The program began by consolidating a set of social policies enacted by the previous president Fernando Henrique Cardoso. Bolsa Familia's final form, however, combined two additional programs for a total of four programs in total; Bolsa Escola, Bolsa Alimentacao, Auxilio Gas, and the Cartao Alimentacao (Hall, 2006, 695). Bolsa Escola is a program targeting education which provides cash grants to those with school-age children. Bolsa Alimentacao aims to deal with maternal nutrition and gives cash assistance to pregnant or lactating women. Auxilio Gas is a cooking gas subsidy and Cartao Alimentacao is a specialized credit card program for use in the purchase of

specific food items. This combination proved immensely successful in terms of coverage as “by the end of 2006, Bolsa Familia had been scaled up to include 11 million households” (Soares Ribas and Osorio, 2010, 174). To this day Lula’s legacy is apparent in Brazil due to the far-reaching and innovative nature of Bolsa Familia and the combination of initiatives making up this Brazilian version of social protection.

The program is unique in its multi-faceted approach to poverty and focuses on the accumulation of human capital as an indication of performance. Bolsa Familia is also unique due to a set of three features related to reporting income, unconditional transfers, and delegation of monitoring. Firstly, any income is self-reported by participants themselves instead of using a proxy means of determining household income as in many other social assistance programs. Bolsa Familia also includes an “an unconditional cash transfer component for those identified as extremely poor” (Higgins, 2012, 96) which also makes it unique. Lastly, it provides an important role for municipalities within a frequently decentralized process to take ownership of the monitoring of conditionalities attached to some of the direct cash assistance aspects. These aspects of the program, specifically the unconditional transfers for the extremely poor, provide a possibility of high proportions of coverage among the poorest populations which I will explore later on in this work.

Bolsa Familia utilizes a national household survey to determine which families fall under the national poverty line by virtue of their per capita income. To be considered eligible a family must “have a per capita income lower than half the minimum wage or [have a] total income lower than three minimum wage [payments]” (UN ECLAC, 2019). For this program, the exit criteria is simply when the household loses eligibility by having a per capita income above the

national poverty line. This “graduation” via income increase approach is exactly that which is outlined in the definition of conditional cash transfer provided by Barrietos and Santibáñez. As such this is correctly classified as a conditional cash transfer program since the purpose is to transition families out of the poverty classification through an income increase.

Mexico also has its own conditional cash transfer program in the form of Oportunidades/Progresas which focuses on investment in children’s education and well being to combat poverty. After the aforementioned Latin American economic crisis of the 1980’s Mexico also experienced economic issues and there was a subsequent shift in poverty alleviation tactics. In 1997, labeled as Progresas, a conditional cash transfer program was launched focusing on children’s health and education. Fast forward to 2015 where relabeled later as Oportunidades and then Prospera it “[covered] more than 6.1 million households (28 million people) [or] around one-fifth of the population in Mexico.” (Niño-Zarazúa, 2011, 11) thus providing one of Latin America’s first such programs.

Oportunidades/Progresas functions by providing participants a bimonthly cash stipend to spend as they see fit. To receive benefits, parents are “[required to send] their children to school and [attend] periodical health checkups” (Niño-Zarazúa, 2011, 3). The program is also unique in the fact that is one of the first to focus on the poor through a statistically-based system to identify beneficiaries in specific households. Oportunidades/Progresas focuses upon a set of central principles including an understanding that poor nutrition, schooling and health cause cycles of poverty rather than a lack of cash alone. The program also recognizes the importance of women in a thriving economy and society by transferring cash directly to mothers and increasing the size of the educational grant for girls with school progression (Niño-Zarazúa, 2011, 12). As a result,

these unique characteristics have helped to establish Oportunidades/Progresa as a reliable method of poverty alleviation in Mexico and an example for others in the region.

The targeting system in Oportunidades/Progresa rests upon a national Survey of Socioeconomic Characteristics of Households and through proxy means testing finds families that are categorized as in poverty. This categorization is structured to capture those who sit under the national food poverty line and provide a basic level of resilience to rising food prices. There is an eventual transition to other programs which provide a wider array of services if after the required three-year certification a recipient is found to be over the food poverty line. Regardless, yet again the focus of Oportunidades/Progresa is on providing recipients with a stream of cash so that they are protected from external shocks which categorizes this as another social protection program.

The last conditional cash transfer I consider is Argentina's Jefas y Jefes de Hogar which was formulated as a response to the nation's early 2000's economic crisis. One of the first such programs formulated as a direct response than a prevention mechanism for an economic crisis it aims to provide support in the form of income to families lacking employment due to the crisis. Originally advertised as a universal program around 2002 budgetary concerns forced a reevaluation to make sure those who actually needed help were the main recipients of program assistance. In order to do this effectively, there were work-related conditionalities imposed to ensure that those benefitting from the program were giving back and working towards employment.

Jefas y Jefes de Hogar centers upon a direct cash transfer of "150 pesos a month ... representing about half of the mean household income per capita in Argentina in 2002" (Galasso

and Martin, 2004, 369). This transfer does hinge upon fulfillment of “[a] minimum of 20 hours a week of basic community work, training activities, or school attendance” (Galasso and Martin, 2004, 370). The responsibility of organizing these work events falls upon municipalities while monitoring falls to the federal Ministry of Labor and local councils to create a clear bureaucratic division of labor in this program. This program is unique in the fact that it combines labor-related conditions with cash transfers in an attempt to facilitate economic recovery and reconstruction of labor markets after an early 2000’s crash.

For Jefas y Jefes the main targeting mechanism is that of self-reported unemployment verified by government actors and on a local level by advisory councils in specific municipalities. As I have mentioned before the goal of this program is to provide a safety net for those looking for work so that beneficiaries are not left stranded. The exit criteria for Jefas y Jefes dictate that as soon as a qualifying head of household gains employment the beneficiary family will transition out of the program as it has served its purpose. This is another example of graduation from a program due to a fulfillment of a preordained condition that allows for a steady level of income which qualifies it as a conditional cash transfer program.

Moving into integrated anti-poverty programs perhaps the most well known is Chile’s Solidario started in the early 2000s as an attempt to reformulate poverty alleviation methods which had not been working in the past. The main issue that Solidario aims to address is the fact that access to economic and policy networks is limited for those in poverty and needs to be addressed first and foremost. Additionally, “extreme poverty [is] understood as a multi-dimensional problem characterized by low income and a low level of economic, human, social and psycho-social assets” (Larrañaga, Contreras and Ruiz-Tagle, 2012, 348). This inclusion of a

psycho-social dimension means cash transfers are considered a secondary priority with social support being the main issue being addressed.

To effectively deal with this psycho-social dimension, Solidario assigns social workers or apoyos familiares to families in order to provide emotional support and counseling in times of need. “The apoyos familiares aim to help beneficiaries achieve a set of 53 minimum conditions for empowerment and social insertion, and the family support component of the programme plays a key role in the coordination of public benefits for the very poor” (Larrañaga, Contreras and Ruiz-Tagle, 2012, 348). In addition to a social worker for each family, beneficiaries also get preferential access to other social programs, monetary subsidies, and a small cash transfer to incentivize them to stay with the program. Solidario is designed to be a five-year program with the first two serving to lead to the achievement of previously mentioned conditions for empowerment and social insertion followed by a three year follow up and monitoring period. By combining social work with preferential access to government programs and a cash transfer Solidario aims to delve into core issues surrounding poverty in an attempt to elevate the poorest parts of the Chilean population out of poverty.

Chile Solidario provides an example of a targeting system more focused upon wellbeing and capabilities rather than income as a measure of poverty alleviation. The Chilean Social Household Registry contains a quality of life index covering a total of fifty-three variables that comprise the eventual quality of life calculation housed in the registry. If a household is lacking in any of these variables to such a significant level that their quality of life calculation suffers then it effectively qualifies to be a beneficiary of Chile Solidario. Through a combination of family support as well as psychosocial services, a beneficiary is ultimately supposed to reach a

level of achievement among the fifty-three quality of life variable such that they can transition out. This unique approach qualifies Chile Solidario to be categorized as an integrated anti-poverty program since it aims to increase the capabilities of beneficiaries through a host of coordinated public services.

Panama also has a version of social protection in the form of Red de Oportunidades or the Network of Opportunities program which was started in 2006 to deal with extreme poverty. This is done by providing a monthly payment of 50 Panamanian balboas a month and access to basic services much like the Solidario integrated anti-poverty model. The conditionalities attached to the program are that beneficiaries attend pregnancy control checkups, keep to up to date with vaccinations of children under 5, ensure children's attendance to school, attend parent meetings in school, and participate in training for strengthening and generating productive capital (Food and Nutrition Security Platform). Through the requirement of program participants, it is easy to see a focus on children's health and education as well as family support and reproductive health.

Red de Oportunidades does follow a targeting system similar to many conditional cash transfer programs through proxy means testing to determine if citizens are in extreme poverty which qualifies them to be beneficiaries. Where it differs is in the National Vulnerability Census that is used when testing for households in extreme poverty since the census uses its own plethora of variables to examine vulnerability which stretch past income levels. The program's focus on investment in social capital through children's development is also unique since it focuses on youth development rather than cash transfer as a method of poverty alleviation. Since this follows the logic of increasing beneficiaries' capabilities rather than simple income security I believe that Red de Oportunidades is also an integrated anti-poverty program.

These programs have been selected to make sure there is a decent sample of both conditional cash transfer programs and integrated anti-poverty programs. The reason I focus upon these types of programs is to capture the shift in Latin American social assistance programs after various economic crisis during the 1980s and early 2000s. The first shift occurs after the '80s where there is a push towards conditional cash transfers rather than social pensions or insurance programs that simply aim to address a lack of monetary capital. After the crisis of the early 2000s, however, there is a further acceptance of a multi-dimensional definition of poverty and integrated anti-poverty programs which treat cash transfer as a side priority in favor of social work, education and healthcare are now pushed to the forefront.

Methods:

In order to analyze the progression of coverage in these Latin American countries, I use the United Nations' Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean's database of Non-contributory Social Protection Programs. It is a collection of state-provided data on conditional cash transfer programs, social pensions, and labor programs compiled in conjunction with Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). I will mainly utilize the database's program profiles for Brazil's Bolsa Familia, Mexico's Oportunidades/Progresa, Argentina's Jefas y Jefes, Chile's Solidario, and Panama's Red de Oportunidades. These provide a cross-section of data for each program which includes two variables most relevant to my research, percent coverage of population expected to be eligible for each program and percent coverage of those actually eligible. That variable measures the proportion of the population expected to be eligible and actually eligible for a certain social protection program that is actually covered by that program.

This will help me evaluate how effective each program is at alleviating poverty as per SDG Indicator 1.3.1 in the manner best defined by the program itself.

I will also utilize the World Bank's Atlas of Social Protection Indicators of Resilience and Equity Database which collects data on social protection indicators from international household surveys. It is an ongoing and constantly updated project of the World Bank and serves as a one-stop shop for social protection data. The variable of interest to me in this database is coverage in extreme poor (<\$1.90 PPP a day) (%) - All Social Assistance and Labor. It measures the proportion of the total population in extreme poverty in a certain country that is covered by at least one social assistance or labor program. By examining overall social protection coverage extremely poor populations across all such programs in each country I can pinpoint the accuracy of targeting systems used in these programs in capturing populations in need.

In terms of data analysis, the main measure I will use is the average change in percentage over time which will indicate the general trend in coverage for each program or nation being examined. This will be calculated by finding the numerical difference between the coverage figures for each year and finding the average of the difference values obtained across a row of data. By utilizing such an analysis, I hope to be able to find a clear coverage trend in each country that is easy to follow and understand when considering anti-poverty efforts in each respective nation.

I expect to find similar trends of positive change in both specific programs and overall social assistance which should indicate significant progress towards SDG 1: No Poverty through the fulfillment of Indicator 1.3.1. Additionally, the integrated anti-poverty programs should show a slower yet stronger increase in coverage due to the fact that they address more poverty

indicators than conditional cash transfer programs. As such I believe they should take longer to scale but when properly scaled will show greater positive effects encouraging more enrollment and thus coverage. The only exception to my expected results is that of Jefas y Jefes de Hogar in Argentina which added work requirements specifically to curb coverage of those that may not be in greatest need of the programs help. In general, I do admit it may be hard to conclusively determine the effectiveness of these programs given that the SDG framework I am using as a guide does not establish concrete coverage goals or best practices.

Data and Analysis:

Table 1.1:

Coverage in extreme poor (<\$1.90 PPP a day) (%) - All Social Assistance											
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Average change
Brazil	31.3%	-	-	-	21.2%	29.8%	37.7%	45.3%	-	-	+6.0%
Mexico	67.0%	-	-	24.0%	-	28.5%	26.0%	-	-	76.4%	-14.8%
Argentina	93.3%	-	-	91.3%	-	87.6%	-	89.8%	-	-	-1.2%
Chile	-	-	55.0%	-	78.9%	-	74.5%	-	-	-	+9.8%
Panama	-	-	75.9%	85.4%	89.2%	83.4%	86.7%	84.4%	81.7%	-	+1.0%

I choose to begin with Table 1.1 which shows coverage of the extreme poor who live under \$1.90 USD, as per the World Bank's definition, to provide a surface level examination of social protection coverage in each country. This table shows the general trend in coverage of the extreme poor by all social assistance programs in Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, and Panama. In Brazil from 2006 to 2013 it seems as if there is a 6.0% average increase while in Mexico there is a 14.8% average decrease from 2006 to 2015, and in Argentina, there is a 1.2% average decrease from 2006 to 2013. The increase in coverage in Brazil seems expected given an increase in social protection expenditure in the same time period (UN Commission on Latin

America and the Caribbean, 2006-2013). The decrease in coverage in Mexico seems surprising given the same trend in expenditure seen in Brazil is also seen in Mexico. In Argentina, however, we see a decrease in social protection expenditure on Jefas y Jefes de Hogar from 0.10% of the GDP in 2008 to 0.00001% in 2012 (UN Commission on Latin America and the Caribbean, 2008-2012) which could indicate a shift in policy priorities away from social protection in the country. Trends in coverage for Chile and Panama which both have integrated anti-poverty programs are positive with Chile having a 9.8% average increase from 2008 to 2012 and Panama having a 1.0% average increase from 2008 to 2014.

Table 2.1:

Coverage (%) of Population Expected to Qualify - Bolsa Familia, Brazil																Average Change
2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
8.8%	15.2%	20.8%	25.9%	25.8%	24.4%	27.8%	27.9%	28.4%	28.8%	28.4%	27.4%	27.1%	26.1%	26.4%	26.5%	1.2%

I then move on towards a closer look at specific program coverage starting with percentage coverage of the population in Brazil expected to qualify for Bolsa Familia by the program itself. The data provided in the ECLAC database range from 2003 to 2018 in one of the most comprehensive sets of information I found provided. An average change of +1.2% shows a gradual increase in coverage which corresponds with increasing expenditure and scaling. This also corresponds to the Lula and Rouseff administrations terms both of whom were in favor of social protection measures and indicates a favorable political climate for Bolsa Familia. Although percentage coverage remains in the twenties the gradual increase shows a rough

commitment to SDG 1 and can be said to indicate that Brazil is at least attempting to meet Indicator 1.3.1.

Table 2.2:

Coverage (%) of Population Expected to Qualify - Oportunidades/Progresá, Mexico																		
1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average Change
1.5%	8.0%	11.4%	12.1%	15.0%	20.2%	19.9%	23.2%	22.9%	22.6%	22.4%	22.3%	22.5%	24.5%	23.6%	22.8%	23.3%	24.4%	1.3%

Table 2.2 shows the same variable but for the Oportunidades/Progresá program in Mexico for coverage of those expected to qualify for the program. The data provided by ECLAC for this program is also quite comprehensive and goes from 1997 to 2014 which show an average change of a 1.3% increase in coverage. This gradual increase of just over a percentage point, much like that of Bolsa Familia, corresponds with the increase in expenditure for the program. Yet again, this slow scaling effort lends some evidence for Mexico's Oportunidades/Progresá program attempting to abide by SDG Indicator 1.3.1 in its approach to poverty alleviation.

Table 2.3:

Coverage (%) of Eligible Population - Jefas y Jefes, Argentina							
2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Average Change
24.0%	22.3%	19.4%	17.1%	13.4%	9.4%	5.5%	-3.1%

In Table 2.3 we see data for the coverage of who do qualify for the Jefas y Jefes de Hogar program in Chile. The data provided by ECLAC for this program goes from 2002 to 2008 and show an average change of a -3.1% decrease in coverage over this time period. This slow decrease corresponds with the restructuring of Jefas y Jefes to include work requirements in an

attempt to focus the program on those who need it most. Since the program was designed as a response to an economic crisis and attempts to have beneficiaries graduate when heads of households lose their unemployed status it is in the interest of the state to scale down expenditure and efforts. However, the fact that this data covers those who do actually still qualify for the program and its benefits, this decrease in coverage is worrying when considering poverty alleviation as it shows those who need help are not covered.

Table 2.4:

Coverage (%) of Eligible Population - Solidario, Chile																
2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Average Change
1.2%	2.6%	4.0%	5.4%	6.7%	7.7%	8.9%	10.1%	11.1%	12.3%	13.4%	1.9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	-0.1%

The coverage of those who are eligible for Solidario, Chile's integrated anti-poverty program, from 2002 to 2017 is shown in Table 2.4. There is a decrease of 0.1% between those years and coverage remains mixed with a high of 13.4 % in 2012 and a low of 0.1% in 2015. These results are hard to interpret as the target population is families in extreme poverty which is a wide set of qualified citizens and as such would require large expenditure and efforts to drive up coverage numbers. As such I hesitate to conclusively state whether this program effectively alleviates poverty as per SDG Indicator 1.3.1. Although numbers of those qualified as per the dataset are low, targeting through a quality of life index as done by Solidario may not be as accurate as the World Bank's below \$1.90 threshold for extreme poverty.

Table 2.5:

Coverage (%) of Expected to Qualify - Red de Oportunidades, Panama												
2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Average Change
3.8%	9.2%	11.2%	12.2%	11.4%	12.1%	11.8%	11.6%	11.6%	9.9%	9.8%	8.2%	0.6%

The last table I have constructed for consideration is Table 2.5 which looks at the percent coverage of those expected to qualify for benefits through Panama's Red de Oportunidades program. ECLAC's database provides data from 2006 to 2017 for this program and upon analyzing it I find a 0.6% increase in the coverage of those expected to qualify. Expenditure changes for this program are also mixed and vary around 1% of the national GDP and the coverage reaches a high around 2010 and then dips consistently. Again it is difficult to conclusively establish if this program is effective at poverty alleviation through its coverage. Just as in Chile's Solidario the main target is families in extreme poverty as defined by a social vulnerability survey rather than a dollar amount threshold. As such I find it difficult given the narrow scope of my own data analysis to put forth a statement.

Conclusion

My work aimed to measure the success of new forms of social protection in Latin America in dealing with poverty as defined by the SDGs which identify coverage as a key correlate of success. I chose a total of five social programs to analyze using this variable: Brazil's Bolsa Familia, Mexico's Oportunidades/Progresa, Chile's Solidario, Argentina's Jefas y Jefes de Hogar, and Panama's Red de Oportunidades. This sampling provided a decent spread of conditional cash transfer programs, which give cash transfers to those in need given they fulfill conditionalities, and integrated anti-poverty programs, which focus on bundling access to

economic and social programs along with traditional cash transfers. I used the World Bank's Atlas for Social Protection and its measurement of coverage for those in extreme poverty by all programs in a nation to get a general picture of social protection in each country. Then I utilized the UN ECLAC's Non-contributory Social Protection Programs Database and its variables related to coverage by specific social protection programs of those expected to qualify for them and those who actually qualify for them. These two forms of variables were used to calculate an average change over the series of years provided and then broken down to be analyzed in the interest of poverty elimination.

At the end of the day, the results provided by my analysis are mixed due to a variety of limiting factors. Although it is plain to see the trends in coverage and claim that Bolsa Familia, Oportunidades/Progresas, and Red de Oportunidades are successful at addressing poverty while Solidario and Jefes y Jefas are not I hesitate to do so. I feel that such a conclusion would oversimplify impact assessment and place blind faith in the effectiveness of SDG defined indicators of poverty alleviation.

A major issue I could see throughout my analysis centered upon the narrow definition of success attached to social protection in relation to poverty elimination as the only factor mentioned was coverage, SDG 1 itself also sets no concrete goals at the indicator levels which makes analysis quite difficult. The only solid goal is outlined in SDG 1 itself which centers upon the elimination of poverty on the whole. Even Indicator 1.3.1 simply states "Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, newborns, work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable" (United Nations). Although it is an indicator by

nature, there is no indication of what an acceptable proportion of the population covered should be. This proves an issue as member states can use their own definitions of acceptable proportions which although accepting of their own limitations is far from helpful in the coordination of global poverty elimination.

There is also a gap in best practices as the methodology around Indicator 1.3.1 which does mention multiple forms of social protection both non-contributory and contributory but halts there. The disaggregated data provided by the UN SDG database is only split into social assistance and social insurance which fails to account for the split between conditional cash transfers and integrated anti-poverty programs. I believe this is a gap that needs to be addressed as some of the new dimensions explored by integrated anti-poverty programs such as the psychosocial proposed by Solidario are important factors in eliminating poverty and cannot afford to be ignored.

The data sets provided by the UN SDG website, ECLAC and the World Bank also need some work as since most of the data is state provided it, therefore, lacks a centralized source which leaves many gaps. Within Indicator 1.3.1 there is a call for disaggregated data with groupings based on gender, age, race, etc. but in reality, the data sets provided are sparse and difficult to analyze due to a sparse population of the very data itself into these databases. Even when provided the range of years can be inconsistent which again contributes to the uncertainty within my own conclusions.

There is also room for improvement within how poverty is defined as well as where the lines for qualification are drawn. The World Bank defines poverty as living below \$1.90 PPP per day which, although adjusted for purchasing power parity, is a rather narrow definition. It

completely ignores the complexity of poverty which is well captured by Chile's Quality of Life Index and Panama's Vulnerability Census. Additionally, when conducted research across various programs this difference in definition makes it hard to measure actual achievement or even rationalize what success looks like in this context. With this in mind, it is quite surprising that SDG 1 so squarely places program coverage at the center of achievement despite the fact that qualification criteria differ so wildly across programs. In short, poverty needs a definition more focused on capability and actual needs rather than an arbitrary acceptable level of income.

I must also admit that my own constraints in data analysis render my own conclusions rather toothless and mixed. In order to provide a more complete picture of the effectiveness of these social protection programs, it would be necessary to combine an econometric analysis of their impact focused on the unique characteristics of each in combination with a look at coverage of populations deemed to be qualified to receive benefits. Due to the inherent difference in income security and capability increases as methods of poverty alleviation it may be more useful to examine the program-defined correlates of success. Many of these are quite specific and would require a more targeted approach that expands past coverage as a measure of poverty alleviation. By utilizing a more detailed and statistically specific approach one may begin to pinpoint specific target areas and benefits that are actually effective in addressing the issue of poverty.

As for further research along the same lines, I feel it is important to extend these questions past Latin America in order to find if this expansion of poverty dimensions is common globally. There are integrated anti-poverty programs similar to Solidario and Red de Oportunidades in Latin American but an examination of other such global programs in terms of

their coverage would be valuable in establishing the set best practices missing from the SDGs.

Also, a closer look at any of the programs I have addressed utilizing impact assessment in conjunction with coverage analysis could provide better insight into their effectiveness as well as areas for future improvement.

Bibliography

"ASPIRE: The Atlas of Social Protection Indicators of Resilience and Equity." Social Protection Statistics. Accessed December 01, 2018. <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/aspire/>.

Barrientos, Armando, and Claudio Santibáñez. "New Forms of Social Assistance and the Evolution of Social Protection in Latin America." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 41, no. 1 (2009): 1-26. <http://www.jstor.org.libdatabase.newpaltz.edu/stable/27744080>.

"Conditional Cash Programs." Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. Accessed December 01, 2018. <https://dds.cepal.org/bpsnc/cct>.

Galasso, Emanuela, and Martin Ravallion. "Social protection in a crisis: Argentina's Plan Jefes y Jefas." *The World Bank Economic Review* 18, no. 3 (2004): 367-399.

"Goal 1: End Poverty in All Its Forms Everywhere - United Nations Sustainable Development." United Nations. Accessed November 12, 2018. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/poverty/>.

Hall, Anthony. "From Fome Zero to Bolsa Família: Social Policies and Poverty Alleviation under Lula." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 38, no. 4 (2006): 689-709. <http://www.jstor.org.libdatabase.newpaltz.edu/stable/4491737>.

Higgins, Sean. "The Impact of Bolsa Família on Poverty: Does Brazil's Conditional Cash Transfer Program Have a Rural Bias?" *The Journal of Politics and Society*, (2012): 90-125. doi:<https://doi.org/10.7916/D8B27S8K>.

"Inscripción Al Programa Red De Oportunidades." PanamaTramina. September 6, 2018. <https://www.panamatramita.gob.pa/tramite/inscripcion-al-programa-red-de-oportunidades>.

Kostzer, Daniel. "Argentina: A case study on the Plan Jefes y Jefas de Hogar Desocupados, or the employment road to economic recovery." *Levy Economics Institute of Bard College*, (2008): 1-31. http://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/wp_534.pdf.

LARRAÑAGA, OSVALDO, DANTE CONTRERAS, and JAIME RUIZ-TAGLE. "Impact Evaluation of Chile Solidario: Lessons and Policy Recommendations." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 44, no. 2 (2012): 347-72.
<http://www.jstor.org.libdatabase.newpaltz.edu/stable/41674533>.

Niño-Zarazúa, Miguel Angel. "Mexico's Progresa-Oportunidades and the Emergence of Social Assistance in Latin America." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, (2011): 1-31.
doi:10.2139/ssrn.1788074.

"PROGRAMA RED DE OPORTUNIDADES." Food and Nutrition Security Platform. Accessed December 02, 2018. <https://plataformacelac.org/en/programa/333>.

Rowe, Nicholas. "Mexico's Oportunidades: Conditional Cash Transfers as the Solution to Global Poverty?" *Donald A. Henriksen Fellowship in International Political Economy, Keck Center for International and Strategic Studies*, (2011): 1-20
https://www.cmc.edu/sites/default/files/keck/student/RoweN_Fellowship_REP_10-11.pdf.

Sengupta, Mitu. "Transformational Change or Tenuous Wish List? A Critique of SDG 1 ('End Poverty in All Its Forms Everywhere')." *Social Alternatives* 37, no. 1 (2018): 12-17.

Soares, Fábio Veras, Rafael Perez Ribas, and Rafael Guerreiro Osório. "EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF BRAZIL'S BOLSA FAMÍLIA: Cash Transfer Programs in Comparative

Perspective." *Latin American Research Review* 45, no. 2 (2010): 173-90.

<http://www.jstor.org.libdatabase.newpaltz.edu/stable/27919200>.

"Social Protection." ILO. Accessed November 25, 2018.

<https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/social-security/lang--en/index.htm>.

"Social Protection." World Bank. Accessed November 24, 2018.

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/socialprotection>.

"Social Protection | Poverty Eradication." United Nations. Accessed November 24, 2018.

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/socialperspectiveondevelopment/issues/social-protection.html>.

"United Nations Millennium Development Goals." United Nations. Accessed November 12,

2018. <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml>.