

## **REPORT ON THE IRC TECHNICAL CONSULTATION**

### **MAKING CHILDREN VISIBLE IN ROUTINE SURVEYS UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence, Italy, 26-27 July 2007**

Prepared by Leonardo Menchini\* and Shahin Yaqub\*, December 2007

#### **Summary**

Reliable and up-to-date statistical information is needed for research and monitoring of child well-being. Across countries, varying data sources promote understanding of the socio-economic conditions affecting children. These sources include administrative data derived from vital registration systems, household surveys, censuses and specialized child surveys.

Household Budget Surveys (HBS) are a key source for monitoring and analysing the socio-economic condition of a population and understanding the impact of public policies on the well-being of society. When those surveys are carried out frequently and routinely, they are particularly useful, and the data collected an invaluable tool in conducting child-centred research.

However different research experiences – including recent studies conducted at the UNICEF IRC – have highlighted significant limitations in the current surveys design for collecting information relevant to children's situations. Often children issues have low visibility in the surveys, despite the fact that their better inclusion could potentially increase the capacity of the survey to provide information on household well-being, decision-making and the impact of policies and background characteristics on socio-economic status.

In July 2007, UNICEF IRC convened a technical consultation to discuss the issue of visibility of children in Household Budget Surveys as well as in a larger set of household surveys, including the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), other specialized surveys and censuses. The consultation covered the need for data to assess themes such as vulnerability and child poverty, child work, children and migration and children's access to social services. The consultation was organized to promote dialogue between survey analysis and design, to better identify and understand the existing gaps in analysing child well-being and to determine the feasibility of collecting this additional data.

This report summarizes the meeting presentations and discussions, highlighting some important issues for further exploration. Enhancing children's visibility and using existing data tools to obtain additional and more relevant data on their lives is possible and worthwhile. Further reflection and assessments are needed on the current uses of data and the policies related to microdata access. The first step must be better use of current data in order to analyse child well-being. This requires a broad assessment and evaluation of how well existing survey tools provide relevant information. Other areas for exploration include how surveys like DHS or MICS influence routine data collection – both data needs and data collection practices – in the countries where they have been implemented; and a reflection on the framework that informs child-specific data collection in the current round of censuses.

---

\* Social and Economic Policy Analysis, UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

The views summarized in this report represent those of the participants at the technical consultation and of the drafters of this note, and do not necessarily represent the policies or views of UNICEF.

## CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Summary of presentations and discussions .....	2
	<b>General context:</b> Leonardo Menchini.....	2
	<b>Population census and data on children:</b> Grace Bediako.....	3
	<b>Household Budget Surveys and integrated household surveys in South-Eastern Europe and the CIS:</b> Leonardo Menchini .....	4
	<b>Surveys on children: MICS:</b> Gareth Jones.....	6
	<b>Surveys on children in Kyrgyzstan:</b> Shamsia Ibragimova.....	7
	<b>Vulnerability, investigating the threat of child poverty:</b> Stefan Dercon.....	9
	<b>Child work:</b> Frank Hagemann .....	10
	<b>International migration:</b> Edilberto Loaiza .....	11
	<b>Access to and use of public services: Health and education:</b> Claudia Cappa .....	13
3	Conclusions and issues for exploration .....	15
	Annex 1 – Agenda.....	19
	Annex 2 – List of participants .....	20

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Technical Consultation arose as a result of Innocenti's research which used Household Budget Surveys for the purpose of studying the multidimensionality and causes of children's well-being in countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.<sup>1</sup> The research revealed significant limitations in current household surveys for collecting data relevant to children's situations. At the same time, it showed the potential contributions that good quality household data can make to child-centred research, policymaking and advocacy. The data challenges encountered in IRC's research have broader significance. The analysis of children's issues is strongly influenced by data availability; the lack of adequate data on children therefore limits the scope of analysis of the issues, processes and remedies to problems affecting children.

Many countries collect data through household surveys on a routine basis – quarterly, annually and over longer periods – and for varied purposes. Other countries conduct household surveys occasionally. Technical, administrative and budgetary realities within countries affect the design and implementation of household surveys, and may influence the inclusion of children's issues. Children are one of several groups competing for inclusion in surveys. These concerns suggested the need to look 'upstream' at the data-collection process to understand how children are considered in the various phases of the design of household surveys, e.g., topic selection, questionnaires, survey implementation, data collection..

The consultation was organized as a dialogue between survey analysis and design, to better identify and understand the existing gaps in data needs for analysing child well-being and to determine the feasibility of collecting additional data on children. It was aimed to be an initial point of reflection on how routine household surveys cover issues relevant to children, and how such issues can be more strongly introduced in these data tools.

The presentations were grouped into two sessions as follows:

\* Part A focused on types of survey instruments and assessed their usefulness and limitations in analysing children's issues. It examined details of survey design to identify how children are included or excluded and assessed opportunities for making design changes.

\* Part B focused on children's issues, and identified the analytical challenges and related data demands. It examined the current data issues in analysing select children's issues, to understand whether any (and which) data gaps can be addressed through improved routine surveys.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Innocenti Social Monitor 2006 entitled 'Understanding Child Poverty in South-Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States' presents an analysis on child poverty derived mainly from data from Household Budget Surveys and Living Standards Measurement Surveys (LSMS) carried out in the countries of SEE and CIS over the period 1998-2003. Survey microdata were used for a multidimensional analysis of child well-being, discussing indicators of child income poverty, child survival and health, education, housing deprivation and lack of parental care as well as policy indicators like cash transfers, coverage and impact, public and private expenditure on social services and related issues.

## 2 SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section broadly follows the organization of the consultation, with early discussions of the different data collection tools followed by later examination of the relevant children's issues and their data demands. Following is a summary of the presentations and subsequent discussions on the topics covered in the consultation.

### ***GENERAL CONTEXT:*** LEONARDO MENCHINI – UNICEF IRC

Research on the socio-economic situation of children relies on the availability of suitable data that can reflect the multidimensionality of well-being and poverty. Since the 1980s, the debate on child indicators and data relevant for analysis of child well-being has accelerated. The perspective has broadened from traditional domains (child survival and education) to include new domains (including the quality of life, psychological well-being, child perception). It has moved from 'well-becoming' – related to the transition from childhood to adulthood – to well-being, recognizing that the period of childhood deserves special attention and is not only a phase of transition to adulthood. It has broadened from a focus on the 'negative' aspects of a child's life to also include the 'positive' aspects.

A range of indicators is necessary to capture the multidimensionality of child well-being and to contribute to understanding the situation of children in the different, complex and multiple contexts in which they live. These indicators should also capture the childhood specificity, in particular in relation to time/age, gender, agency and the key role played by parents, community and public services for child well-being. There is a need for policy-relevant indicators and indicators that use children as the unit of observation. Such indicators should capture outcomes as well as input and resources, process and policies.

Different data sources (administrative/vital registration systems, censuses and surveys) provide information that can be used for monitoring and analysing the well-being of children. These data tools have different characteristics and are thus suitable for different kind of analyses and monitoring.

Household sample surveys are designed to facilitate understanding of the situation and behaviours of a population and the impact of public policies on their lives. Such surveys may be representative of a country's entire population or may focus on specific population groups. They may be single- or multi-topic, and routine (i.e., fielded regularly) or non-routine. Most surveys use the household as the unit of observation, but also collect information on individuals, including children.

There are several questions to be answered. How can the visibility of children and children's issues be increased in routine household survey data collection? What perspectives can analysts and survey designers bring to the issues? If household surveys are amended to give higher visibility to children, they can better serve the important purposes of monitoring children's outcomes and assessing the impact of policies and socio-economic dynamics on child well-being.

Existing routine surveys and the infrastructure for their field implementation can play an important role in making more and better data available for research on children. The challenge is to identify options for dialogue to influence survey questionnaire design and the data-collection process.

Often there is little coordination between the various data-collection efforts (including between UN organizations and other international development agencies). When designing surveys and questionnaires, research on and monitoring of issues related to children's well-being should be better represented. It is also important to acknowledge, however, the limited use of some existing survey microdata for research. Increased use and analysis of this data can provide a better understanding of children's socio-economic situation.

## **Part A: Survey Instruments**

*POPULATION CENSUS AND DATA ON CHILDREN*: GRACE BEDIAKO – NATIONAL STATISTICAL OFFICE, GHANA

Many countries conduct censuses every 10 years. In some countries, a population census is the only routine household data-collection tool. The scale of a census allows analysis of small areas, including local administrative units.

The essential features of a census are that it is an individual enumeration; it is universal within a defined territory and covers everyone in a country (both nationals and non-nationals); and it is simultaneous. The goal is to provide basic data on the characteristics of all those present on the census date. Since each individual is enumerated separately, all the characteristics covered in the census questionnaire should be available on each child and presentable to the lowest geographic levels, even in the most remote parts of a country.

In terms of their intended uses, censuses perform quite well. They count the population, provide data on its basic characteristics and ensure equal survey treatment of every individual covered.

A census can, however, quickly get overloaded, particularly in situations where there are few other sources of data. There is also the challenge of competing priorities. In Ghana, for example, the 2000 census included five questions on fertility and mortality: weak birth registration systems in the country (as applies in many other developing countries) meant that the census was the tool used to capture this information. A lack of alternative data sources also meant that eight economic questions were included in the census, even though this data tool is not the best way to collect this kind of data.

In developing countries census data are mainly used in the preparation of summary descriptive statistics that are published in tabular format. However, if the data were analysed in greater depth, they could provide a better understanding of the situation of children, with indications on how to address the data gaps.

New questions can be introduced into a census, either for the entire population or for a sample of the population. For samples, the questions can be included in the census 'long form' fielded to around 10 per cent to 20 per cent of the population (still a large sample size), or in a post-enumeration survey connected to the census.

However, there are some basic challenges in including new questions into a census.

- New questions may have to displace existing questions or shift the potential focus areas of the census. This may not be easy due to a lack of alternative data sources in most developing countries.
- The census cannot be too long because of the enormity of the exercise, which covers an entire country within a few days. In the Ghana census, for example, each enumerator had to cover around 700 households within the shortest possible time.
- Censuses mainly contain third-person reporting, rather than interviews with specific individuals.. The questions included have to be simple, and the information sought should be common knowledge to the person in the home who is most likely to be interviewed.
- Only a few questions can be asked on each issue, and the enumerator has little time to probe for more complete information. Non-sampling errors increase with the size of the questionnaire.

These issues limit censuses to the inclusion of basic household characteristics and reduce their scope for attention to specific policy interests.

Yet censuses are a valuable source of data and greater use should be made of their findings. Censuses can identify the main problem areas by issue and geographic location, and help determine the need for additional data. To avoid overloading censuses, national statistical systems should be encouraged to reduce their dependence on censuses for data on topics that are best collected in other ways. This may be done, for example, by improving vital registration systems and promoting labour force surveys.

Although many countries conduct a national census every 10 years, for others, that frequency poses a challenge. But even 10 years is too long an interval to adequately assess the issues affecting children. Ghana conducted censuses in 1970, 1984 and 2000, each one with an interval of more than 10 years.

Development and testing of modules on children's issues can reduce the need for experimentation when considering questions for inclusion in censuses, including through international comparison (already established questions are more likely to be accepted for inclusion in censuses).

***HOUSEHOLD BUDGET SURVEYS AND INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEYS IN SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES: LEONARDO MENCHINI – UNICEF IRC***

Evolving from the (single-topic) Family Budget Surveys that were used in the pre-transition period, during the 1990s several countries in South-Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States started to develop and implement new routine Household Budget Surveys (HBS); in a number of cases these were integrated surveys containing rich information on household and individual living standards. Some countries without routine household surveys and a few countries that were in the process of reforming their routine survey systems, fielded one or more Living Standards Measurement Studies (LSMS)<sup>2</sup> during the past 5 to 10 years. In some cases, these surveys have a panel component.

---

<sup>2</sup> See <[www.worldbank.org/LSMS/](http://www.worldbank.org/LSMS/)>.

The countries in CIS and SEE vary markedly in terms of HB and LSM-type survey frequency, coverage and consistency and in providing access to microdata. The lack of frequent surveys is still a major issue in some of the poorest countries of region, while incomplete national coverage is a widespread reality. A major challenge for research and monitoring is the difficulty of accessing microdata.

General characteristics of the Household Budget Surveys implemented in SEE/CIS include a small or medium sample size (the number of sampling errors is related to the sample size), and long and complex questionnaires (which involve the problem of non-sampling errors). These surveys involve one to three visits for the collection of data, depending mainly on the data-collection techniques employed for expenditure items. When specific types of questions are included (for example, questions on child anthropometrics), they require that the interviewers have specific expertise.

The Household Budget Surveys are not constructed for a child-focused analysis. The core of these surveys is represented by the household consumption, expenditure and incomes modules, and contains information mainly related to households and less often to individuals.

Yet, integrated HB and LSM surveys in SEE/CIS contain a set of modules that provide a wealth of information on different aspects of the living standards of households and individuals, including decision-making practices and the impact of public policies on their well-being. This information may be key to an improved understanding of child well-being. The survey roster in which all members of the household are registered is crucial for data analysis. It includes information on the basic characteristics of family members such as age, gender, ethnicity and family relationships, and often data on the education level of each individual family member.

The range of the other modules varies somewhat between surveys. In a few cases the modules used in routine surveys for a particular country can vary each year.

The review of several recent HBS and LSMS conducted in SEE/CIS countries highlighted the potential and existing weaknesses of questionnaires in providing information on children. These potentialities and limitations exist in sections like the roster (which includes basic information on household members and their relationships); modules on housing and utilities; employment of household members (generally collecting information only for those members aged 14 and above); self-evaluation of living standards (usually done by the head of the household); access/distance to 'public places'; education, health (in general on utilization of health facilities and expenditure, but sometimes including health status assessments); anthropometrics of children under five; fertility (for all women aged 14 and above); social programmes etc.

Some HB-type surveys contain modules that collect child-specific information. In general, these additional modules are heterogeneous relative to the core of the survey (for example, the modules on fertility or anthropometrics included in some HBS). These modules often face several challenges: lower quality of information received, a lower response rate, and, consequently, less usability for research and monitoring.

There are several areas where minor changes in questionnaires can improve the quality and quantity of child-specific information collected:

- *Roster*: More specific information to improve the understanding of decision-making practices, relationships and income- and consumption-sharing within the household can be obtained by changing the ways in which the data are collected. It is important to include full information on

household members who are temporarily absent, including migrant members. In some surveys in the SEE/CIS region, in the case of multigenerational or multi-family households, it is not always easy to identify the father and mother of children. Including questions that can easily identify parents and, if not present, the reasons for their absence, would facilitate the use of microdata for the analysis of child well-being.

- *Consumption*: Collect information on specific items consumed by children, with more attention paid to age and gender in the classification of expenditure items.

- *Education*: Collect more detailed information on pre-school. Questions on enrolment and attendance must be linked to reflect the timing of the school year and must be clear.

- *Additional modules (e.g. anthropometrics)*: There are issues involving the cost of implementing these modules. In addition, the quality of information provided by these modules is sometimes problematic.

In general, but in the poorest countries of the region in particular, the questions included and the surveys themselves have to be simple in order to get good quality information. To support this process, it is important to promote the use of data in the respective countries. Promoting and improving coordination among the agencies supporting survey data collection can be an effective way to improve and optimize survey processes.

***SURVEYS ON CHILDREN: MICS<sup>3</sup>***: GARETH JONES, CONSULTANT AND FORMER CHIEF OF STRATEGIC INFORMATION, DIVISION OF POLICY AND PLANNING, UNICEF NEW YORK.

The rationale for the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) has changed over time. One of the starting points was the lack or inadequacy of administrative data on children.

The World Summit for Children (WSC) [1990] was an early motivator for MICS because of the need to monitor progress on the goals of the Summit. The second round of MICS (MICS2) was driven by the WSC end-decade report. There was an agreement with the Demographic Health Surveys (DHS)<sup>4</sup> that the same countries would not be surveyed in the same round but to use standardized questionnaires. MICS3 was driven by the goals of the Millennium Agenda, the 'World Fit for Children' and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The scope for MICS4 is not yet fully decided. Although MICS are budgeted as surveys that are conducted every three years, they may not necessarily maintain the same focus across survey rounds.

Survey complexity increased from MICS1 to MICS3: the number of modules increased, as did the complexity of the content; optional modules were also added.<sup>5</sup>

In ongoing surveys, it becomes more difficult to drop existing questions or include new ones. This applies to MICS as well as to routine household surveys. Adopting the same questionnaire represents continuity and consistency, but may also reflect system inertia. Moreover, new questions can affect the rest of the survey, although this is often not easily recognized. Given the potentially adverse effect on data quality, the introduction of new questions should be carefully

---

<sup>3</sup> See <[www.childinfo.org](http://www.childinfo.org)>.

<sup>4</sup> See <[www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com)>.

<sup>5</sup> The quality of the information provided in the additional module is challenged by the fact that specific modules require expertise and techniques that may differ from those required by the core modules of the survey.

evaluated. The challenge is to determine what should be included in the survey. The possibilities for changing survey systems depend on considerations such as cost, sample size, data quality, country situation (e.g. cultural, conflict and capacity) and type of survey. Mechanisms to validate new questions are important for data quality, especially if these additions are going to complicate the questionnaire.

There is already a degree of pressure on surveys to include topics from different users, so data to analyse children's issues is in competition with other data demands. Practical improvements should focus on what can be developed quickly utilizing existing infrastructure and capacity. They should also focus on changes related to issues that can offer significant additional insight on the situation of children.

Before making changes to a survey, the driving force behind it needs to be analysed. For MICS, the data demands of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Along with UNICEF; MICS3 involves collaboration among several international and national organizations, including a number of UN agencies. The partnerships affect survey content and funding. The MDGs also affect other international data-collection projects like LSMS and the Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire surveys (CWIQs).

Relatively little data is actually collected directly from children in household surveys. In MICS3, questions on household information are directed to an 'informed person'. Usually data on women aged 15-49 is collected from the women themselves. Clearly different respondents may give different answers, e.g. child discipline data is collected from a mother or caregiver; children's responses would probably be different.

A child labour survey added to a labour force survey raises the overall cost, but the marginal cost is less than it would be if a stand-alone child labour survey were to be implemented. The International Labour Organization (ILO) used this approach in Azerbaijan. However, the quality and content of the data obtained from the combined approach has not yet been compared to the data obtained from a stand-alone child labour survey.

There is scope to use existing data more intensively. For example, although neither expenditure nor income data are collected in DHS, a wealth index has been constructed and has facilitated analysis of levels of inequality. This was replicated in MICS3. Issues such as why children do not attend school are infrequently analysed since the answers are often coded into the 'other' category. In some countries these issues may relate to a third of responses, which suggests the need to revise the survey questions.

The bulk of requests<sup>6</sup> for MICS data come from users in affluent countries; the low demand from developing countries probably influences child-focused data collection and priorities. The low use of the data is a general problem (in particular low usage in the countries under analysis): if countries do not use the data, it is difficult to convince them to implement surveys.

***SURVEYS ON CHILDREN IN KYRGYZSTAN: SHAMSIA IBRAGIMOVA, CONSULTANT FOR THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION, FORMER HEAD OF THE POVERTY ANALYSIS UNIT AT THE NATIONAL STATISTICAL COMMITTEE OF THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC***

---

<sup>6</sup> From 80 per cent to 90 per cent.

There have been three major research efforts on child poverty in Kyrgyzstan: in 2002 (based on the survey of child and maternal mortality in Talas region); in 2003 (“Generation in peril? Childhood poverty in Kyrgyzstan” by the Research Centre of American University of Central Asia (AUCA), based on ad hoc survey); and in 2003-2005 (by Falkingham and Ibragimova, research drawing on the results of the LSMS surveys (1996-1998), Household Energy Survey (1999), HBS (1998-2002), and panel data of HBS (1998-2001)). MICS3 was fielded in Kyrgyzstan in December 2005.

The main limitations of the surveys mentioned above are insufficient sample sizes, sample design, questionnaire design and piloting of questions. Often model questionnaires are translated from English originals, with the meaning and purpose of the questions often lost or altered during translation. Questionnaires should be structured so the response time is not more than 2 hours. Piloting of questionnaires can show how the questions are being understood by respondents but cannot show whether the right questions are being asked. Incorrect or incorrectly formulated questions may be asked, but this often only becomes clear during analysis.

The AUCA survey on children did not have a random sample, but was formed on the basis of target groups and was therefore not representative of the whole country. The survey included a question on household income, but did not include a specific reference period.

In countries like Kyrgyzstan, where most of the population live in rural areas and agriculture is the main source of income, seasonality can influence data quality. The harvesting season is over by the end of October, and therefore rural respondents remember income best between October and November. Moreover, it is difficult to find respondents in the summer when rural populations are engaged in farm work and urban residents go on holiday. From December to February, the very cold weather means that interviewers face challenges in reaching children in order to measure their height and weight (as occurred during the MICS, which was fielded in December). High levels of snowfall also make it difficult to reach some villages<sup>7</sup>.

More generally, these sample and questionnaire issues can lead to problems in the policy space because state employees and politicians do not always understand that the results have to be interpreted carefully.

Sample surveys are expensive and countries are dependent on continued donor support (e.g. after four rounds of LSMS, funding for further rounds has not been available). When funds are short, there is a temptation to cut the sample size, but a small sample size and ambitious objectives do not add up to good results. Designing good questionnaires and defining key questions depends on the early involvement of those who will do the analysis. Survey results and reports should be accessible and understandable to different groups of users.

The statistical office in Kyrgyzstan carries out regular household surveys. Currently an integrated household survey is carried out quarterly, with a sample of 5,000 households. In 2001 and 2004, the World Health Organization (WHO) helped with a health module for the integrated household survey. This approach reduces survey time (the module takes 30-40 minutes to complete) and includes quantitative data such as income and expenditure. Another advantage is that it allows

---

<sup>7</sup> Seasonality also has an impact on other modules (e.g. the module on education). The issue should not only relate to when it is most convenient to field the survey. Surveying counter to the seasons may capture rural households when in most stress. For example, the period after a harvest is a good time to collect income data, but not to collect data on hunger.

researchers to have alternative sources of data on the same issue. For example, in Kyrgyzstan, the education ministry budget depends on the number of schoolchildren, and this acts as a disincentive for the ministry to report on dropouts. But with no alternative data sources, there is no pressure on the education ministry to improve data collection.

## **Part B: Children Issues - Survey Modules**

*VULNERABILITY, INVESTIGATING THE THREAT OF CHILD POVERTY*, STEFAN DERCON, QUEEN ELIZABETH HOUSE, OXFORD, UK

Vulnerability refers to the potential threat of poverty. This is not captured in the standard concepts that apply to poverty and other forms of deprivation commonly used for policy planning. Most poverty and well-being measurements are ‘ex-post’ and are good for monitoring. However they are weak as an expression of ill-being, ‘ex-ante’. For policy planning, these measurements are weak because they are backward looking.

The term ‘vulnerability’ is used here to mean ‘risk-related vulnerability’, whereby risk constitutes a threat to well-being. It is forward-looking, and encompasses future threats to well-being. It is different from the other common definitions of vulnerability, such as a “state of being helpless or weak”, as in ‘vulnerable groups’ who are liable to serious hardship and poverty, unable to take advantage of opportunities, and who have limited defences if shocks occur.

The key question is how to use standard surveys to measure, monitor and analyse children’s vulnerability to poverty – with the key proviso being that bad data is worse than no data.

One might approach this as a two-step process:

1. Design a measure of vulnerability using information on potential outcomes; and
2. Calculate this measure. While measures of vulnerability have already been designed, there are difficulties in their empirical application because they lack a ‘forecast’ model of possible welfare outcomes.

Alternatively, vulnerability might be approached by looking at some of the central underlying processes that influence ‘potential suffering’: Identify risks faced; coping and risk management strategies; impact, resilience or suffering; develop a typology of those facing problems and their responses; study potential suffering or resilience.

This could help understand what the risks are, who is at risk, how people cope and the effectiveness of responses. For example, this could facilitate understanding of the effect of a drought or other hardship on children’s nutrition, school enrolment and well-being. Data on children’s nutrition, school enrolment, hours worked and other factors could be linked to secondary data on ‘risk’ in the areas covered (e.g. rainfall, price shocks), to analyse whether the risks are ‘real’ (have an impact) and who is affected. And data on items such as assets and transfers could be used to assess risk management, coping mechanisms and resilience.

Survey questions on vulnerability can be designed along three tracks: (1).listing and characterizing shocks, and then assessing outcomes, (2) start with child well-being and probe the reasons for any lacks thereof, including by gathering information on shocks; and (3) hypothetical questioning on what people would do or how they would cope in various situations. These questions can generate complicated but very revealing narratives on inter-temporal well-being and processes. Problems with (1) and (2) include that they both involve self-reported data,

framing issues/leading questions, complicated narrative, and long lists of codes. The third track of using hypothetical questions may be highly problematic, even if answers may seem to come very close to getting a sense of ‘vulnerability’.

There is a need to include more questions on shocks in surveys, how households respond and the overall impact on their well-being; to increase analysis of who is at risk and facing a threat of poverty and ‘ill-being’. The information would form the basis for better ‘prediction’ models and vulnerability measures may be more credible and operational. However, much validation work is needed to know whether what is measured is what is needed. Risks can vary widely globally, and so survey questions will need to be strongly adapted. Questions on shocks have been pilot tested in some child labour surveys carried out by the ILO.

***CHILD WORK:*** FRANK HAGEMANN, *INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME ON THE ELIMINATION OF CHILD LABOUR, ILO*

International Labour Organization (ILO) Conventions Nos. 138 and 182 stipulate that children 12 years and older can perform certain light work for a few hours each week; and children 15 years and older can work if it is not hazardous to their safety, physical or mental health, or moral development, either because of its nature or because of excessive workload, physical conditions, and/or working hours. All other economically active children are ‘child labourers’. Economic activity encompasses productive activities, except schooling and chores in the child’s own household, of at least one hour per week (whether in the labour market or not, paid or unpaid, casual or regular, legal or illegal).

Based on these definitions, countries need child labour surveys to capture data on child work in terms of occupations or hours of work. Questions include:

- How many are child labourers?
- Where are they?
- How old are they?
- What are their work conditions?
- What is their intensity of work?
- How many hours do they work?
- In which sectors do they work?

For children up to age 11, all economic activity is defined as child labour. For ages 12-14 years, light work is allowed, but some surveys do not collect hours of work or work intensity. For ages 15-18, work is legal but specialized surveys are needed to capture data on children involved in hazardous labour.

The ILO Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC) started pilot programmes in 1992, and since 1998 has made a concerted effort to increase coverage. There have been 300 surveys, of which around 60 were nationally representative household surveys; the others were surveys of schools or employers, baseline rapid surveys or project-related surveys of specific sectors or locations.

Generally questions are fielded to the most knowledgeable household member. Some questions are fielded to children older than 5, although certain questions can be fielded only to children older than 10. Several vulnerable groups are not included in the ILO surveys: children living or

working on the street, trafficked children, and children in prostitution, bonded and forced labour. ILO has recently started developing survey instruments that will capture data on these groups of children.

In the past eight years, around USD 40 million has been spent on child labour surveys (by ILO and others), but funding is likely to decrease. Hence, promoting sustainability by integrating child labour into the main survey processes is important.

Several countries have fielded SIMPOC surveys, sometimes repeatedly. Other countries such as Turkey added it to their labour force surveys. In some countries questions were integrated into other surveys, such as the HBS in Cameroon, LFS in Mongolia, and DHS in Uganda. Weak statistical systems in some countries pose challenges for integrating child labour modules into the surveys, and so child labour surveys remain ad hoc, with each one having very little sustainability.

ILO has produced manuals and conducted training programmes to promote sustainability in child labour surveys in terms of data collection, processing, analysis and baseline and rapid assessment. In some countries, the manuals are followed; in other countries, training processes are needed to increase usage. There is a well-recognized bottleneck in capacity for post-survey analysis.

Twenty four questions have been identified in the effort to set what might be the 'essential questions' in a child labour survey. Smaller modules are more easily entered into routine surveys. Introducing even a few questions into a routine survey raises questions about funding and other negotiations with statistical agencies.

One limitation of integrating labour force surveys is that most capture those who are 15 years and over, and so there is a need to lower the age threshold to 5 years and over.

***INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION: EDILBERTO LOAIZA, UNICEF, STRATEGIC INFORMATION SECTION, DIVISION OF POLICY AND PLANNING***

The 2006 UN General Assembly High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development was largely about adult migration into rich destination countries; there was little emphasis on children. Children are affected by migration in several ways: when they are left behind by one or both migrating parents; when they migrate with their parents (or are born abroad); when they migrate alone; or when they are living in areas with high levels of migration.

When UNICEF began to examine the issue, it immediately became clear that although qualitative studies existed, little relevant statistics were available, such as population movements by age. To improve understanding of the impact of migration on children, more basic information is needed on:

- The duration of migration, frequency of parents' absences or relatives' visits.
- Reliable data on age and sex of the children, on the living conditions and expenditure patterns of households prior to receiving remittances; assessment of changes in expenditure.
- Quality and rules of access of public and private social institutions in areas of high out-migration.
- Expectations of migrants and remaining adults for children's development, gender, health and education

- Children’s expectations for their own future
- The economic and social consequences of gender differences in the composition of migration and the utilization and impact of remittances
- The role of gender in the acquisition of social capital prior to and after migration, and its influence on the level and impact of remittances.
- The impacts of ‘positive’ and potentially ‘negative’ social capital (i.e. gangs).
- The emergence of stigmatization of children of migrants.
- The links between community-based organizations, home-town associations and private and public institutions at the national and local level in remittance receiving areas.
- To determine what public policies contributed to stabilizing and stemming migration in long-established migrant communities that have achieved an important degree of economic and social security for women and children.

UNICEF’s Division of Policy and Planning (DPP) has focused on data on children left behind by migrant parents or large outflows of community members. Reliable national-level data about migration magnitude is rare. Public policy formulation may rest on analyses that may lack reliability or validity.

To address these challenges, UNICEF formed a partnership with the Population Division of the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs to estimate the global number of children affected by international migration, broken down by gender and age. A survey instrument within the MICS framework is being developed to assess the impact of international migration on children left behind. A module will be piloted in MICS to assess the impact of migration on children’s lives in the areas of education, health, amount and use of remittances and subjective well-being.

The objectives of the pilot are to develop the survey instrument, sampling recommendations and guidelines for implementation. It is also hoped to improve country-specific migration data, document and disseminate experiences of the pilot project, and increase global, regional and national awareness and commitment towards recording international migration flows. The pilot ran from November 2006 to December 2007 in Albania and Ecuador. Mexico, Moldova and the Philippines have expressed an interest in using the results from the pilot.

Surveys on international migration are complicated because it is a ‘rare phenomenon’ affecting a small proportion of the population who are difficult to find, or widely dispersed geographically, or both. In order to gauge the impact of international migration on those left behind, it is necessary to design a sampling frame that contains households with one or more parents that have an international migration experience as well as households without migrant parents.

The MICS module focuses on background characteristics of the migrant members and on the material and immaterial dimensions of migration’s impact.

To help identify migrants, the household register needed to be modified<sup>8</sup>. Questions were asked on immigrant characteristics, including place and period of residence, who paid for the trip and

---

<sup>8</sup> Migration is selective on unobserved characteristics, and this complicates measurement of impact based on survey data. Retrospective data can help show how migration is selective. Migration restructures household membership, and this may affect the collection and interpretation of retrospective data because the households have changed (i.e. which household is the retrospective data referring to?). Careful attention to data on household structure would allow identification of other migrant children (apart from those left behind), and their well-being indicators could then be analysed – but with the limitation that after age 5, the data tends to focus on firstly on education, and secondly on

forms of travel documentation. Interviewees were asked questions about their socio-economic situation and possession of household items before migration, and about the use of remittances and level of debt.

Two components of subjective well-being were also included: affective (mental health) and cognitive (life satisfaction). Life satisfaction refers to a cognitive process by which individuals assess the quality of their lives by assigning different weights to different components of their lives. These components were seen to be more experimental than others<sup>9</sup>. The questions were accompanied with focus groups to complement the pilot study.

The notable challenges in this process, apart from the limited financial support received, were the competing approaches and frameworks, and the pressures for prompt measurement and results. (Meanwhile, there is very little demand for work to pilot, validate questions and develop survey tools). The inclusion of the migration module in multi-purpose surveys instead of the use of stand-alone surveys is an important opportunity for providing a broader basis for the analysis. The major challenge remains translating results into policies and programmes.

***ACCESS TO AND USE OF PUBLIC SERVICES: HEALTH AND EDUCATION:*** CLAUDIA CAPPA, UNICEF, *STRATEGIC INFORMATION SECTION, DIVISION OF POLICY AND PLANNING*

Access to services is a multidimensional concept with six main components as follows:

1. Availability in the community
2. Appropriateness
3. Quality
4. Affordability
5. Cultural acceptability
6. Social accessibility and barriers

Components 1-3 relate more to service supply side issues, and 4-6 to demand side issues. To operationalize this concept for measuring and analysing access to services, one needs to: identify a specific set of indicators to measure all the dimensions of access; select indicators that allow consideration of equity; collect data, which, given the multidimensionality of the concept of access to services, may call for new or varied instruments; analyse some indicators by the background characteristics of the respondents (in the case of individual questionnaires) to identify disparities and the role of other risk factors (e.g. educational level of the parents).

Surveys such as MICS, DHS, EdData, Service Provision Assessments (SPA)<sup>10</sup> and LSMS have international relevance, having been fielded in many countries. Many are multi-topic or are linked to multi-topic surveys. It is timely to assess the pertinence of indicators in these surveys with regards to the concept of access, and the usefulness of the data to develop and monitor policies aimed at guaranteeing universal and equal access to services for children.

---

labour. Analytical complications because of unobserved heterogeneity and selectivity have been recognized, and data from the control group will help resolve these issues.

<sup>9</sup> At present, MICS do not include any data on subjective well-being, and the pilot module adds another dimension of well-being. But unless this is backed up with anthropological and qualitative work, the extra knowledge gained might well be quite small because the dimensions are highly correlated. Cross-cultural understanding of mental health is problematic, and was tried in LSMS surveys and dropped. In other surveys, an approach called the 'ladder of life' has been used to gather information on where children see themselves fit on a scale or ladder of well-being.

<sup>10</sup> See <[www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/spa.cfm](http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/spa.cfm)>

Data on access to education in MICS and DHS provide information on the educational status of the surveyed population. Access to education is assessed by asking questions about school attendance and highest grades attended or completed. Generally questions on reasons for not attending school (i.e. affordability, accessibility, acceptability) are not included, and there is no information on the availability, appropriateness and quality of education services.

MICS and DHS provide information on the health status of the overall population of women aged 15-49 and children under five. Several questions relate to utilization of services. However, there are no questions on the utilization of services relating to some important health issues, e.g. data on the prevalence of disability is collected, but there is no data on which health services are accessed by children with disabilities. There are other gaps as well. Questions on health issues for children aged 5-18; on reasons for not using the available services; and on the availability, appropriateness and quality of health services are lacking.

In sum, data from MICS and DHS on access to education and health have several strengths: continuity; large coverage of health outcomes both for children and mothers; and multidimensionality. But they are also limited to a focus on outcomes rather on determinants, and the data are more useful to monitor access and less useful for development of policies aimed at improving access.

EdData is a household survey using a subset of DHS survey households. It is designed to collect information on education that addresses issues surrounding both the demand for schooling and school availability. It covers children aged 4-16, and can be linked to DHS information on parents'/guardians' characteristics. The questionnaire includes reasons for not attending school, dropping out of school and absenteeism; household expenditure on schooling; informal training; availability, perceived quality and type of educational services; perceived value of school (advantages and disadvantages); and household decision-making about schooling. The survey provides good coverage of educational topics but there are major concerns about its sustainability (especially since it includes 700 questions). Given this limitation, only 10 EdData modules have been fielded since 1997.

SPA surveys are conducted in health facilities and communities. The objective is to provide information about the characteristics of health services, including their cost, quality, infrastructure, availability and utilization. The surveys can be fielded at national or subnational levels, and can be a stand-alone assessment of services or a supplement to other DHS data. The survey compares the services of various providers with the aim of tracking service improvements over time.

The surveys cover five key service areas: child health, maternal health, family planning, sexually transmitted infections, and HIV prevention, care and support. The indicators include: facility infrastructure, equipment and supplies, support systems, management systems and providers' adherence to standards. Each surveys samples around 400 facilities. However, the data only cover supply side components, i.e. availability and quality of services. There are no questions on affordability, barriers to use, factors influencing demand for health, and no data on those who do not access these services.

One of the difficulties of determining the impact of policy is that health and education service facilities are not placed randomly, and this is difficult to address through MICS. Linking household surveys and service facilities surveys is not straightforward, because it encounters the problem of non-random placement.

LSMS were developed to understand the determinants of observed social and economic outcomes, and to assist policymakers in their efforts to elaborate policies to positively affect these outcomes. The instrument has three main modules: consumption, income and sectoral (household roster, housing, education, health/fertility, anthropometric and migration). LSMS have good information on service availability, quality and appropriateness, but limited information on demand for schooling and factors influencing this demand. With some specific exceptions (e.g., Kyrgyzstan 1993), LSMS have a limited focus on children.

The multidimensional nature of the concept of access to services makes it difficult to ensure consistent, complete and harmonized reporting. There are difficulties in assessing all the dimensions of access as part of the overall assessment of children well-being. There is a trade-off in using general surveys versus specialized surveys. When possible, it is useful to integrate data from household surveys with data from other sources, such as administrative data. The goal of guaranteeing universal and equal access increases the need for policy-oriented indicators. There is a need to collect data on processes and causes (how and why), integrate survey data with data from participatory techniques, and to involve policymakers in data-collection processes.

### **3 CONCLUSIONS AND ISSUES FOR EXPLORATION**

A final round-table discussion highlighted and discussed several recurrent themes raised during the presentations: the need for data on children, access and actual use of existing household survey microdata, as well as methodological and practical issues specific to the survey tools, definitions, survey modules and questions. The following conclusions were reached.

Research and monitoring of child well-being need reliable and up-to-date information. A regular supply of primary household data is therefore needed. Although highly varying across countries, there are different potential sources of data: administrative data, Household Budget or labour surveys, and censuses and specialized surveys on children. The consultation discussed the characteristics of different primary household data sources, with a view to understanding how the focus on children can be strengthened within the more routine processes.

The meeting was designed along two tracks: first, to assess some survey instruments for their potential for inclusion of children's issues, and second, to assess some specific children's topics for their data collection needs, survey questions and modules. The meeting discussed two routine surveys (Household Budget Surveys and censuses), two specialized children's surveys (MICS and project-related surveys) and five topics (labour, poverty and vulnerability, migration, health, education).

Administrative data are a good source for calculating some of the key child indicators. They are generally less suitable for causal multivariate analysis (at the micro level) because they are collected as part of the public administration process and hence include a limited range of indicators. Household survey and census data cover a larger range of topics and are more suitable for multivariate and causal analysis, as well as monitoring very specific aspects of human well-being. Specialized surveys can range from those with very small sample sizes ( $N < 100$ ) to nationally representative samples, and since they are purpose-designed, can collect data on children's well-being that is unavailable elsewhere.

In household surveys, the focus of data collection is the household, but a large part of the information is collected at the individual level, including children. In many countries, Household

Budget Surveys are carried out on a routine basis as part of the regular data collection efforts by National Statistical Offices. The existing infrastructure for data collection and their regular (short) frequency make them an attractive instrument for collecting child-centred data. However, in existing HBS, children are often not sufficiently visible, with much information relevant for children not being collected carefully or collected at the child level. A further challenge concerns the way in which data are collected: in fact survey instruments have been mostly geared towards monitoring at the relative expense of data for analysis. As a result, there is unexploited potential for surveys to provide more, better and more timely data on children that can be analysed along with household background and community characteristics.

A parallel set of surveys exist that are specialized in children's issues. The larger child surveys (e.g. MICS and ILO child labour surveys) provide data to monitor fundamental indicators of child well-being like infant mortality, schooling or children's work. This is particularly valuable in countries where vital registration and other administrative data are lacking or incomplete. In addition, a significant number of specialized children's surveys are commissioned with small sample sizes, usually for project development: these surveys facilitate focused research on priority issues. Currently much of the analytical work on children's issues is based on this type of data. However, project-related surveys often have unclear documentation of methodology, unknown statistical quality and are not representative of the population. They are often fielded on small budgets without accessing national statistical and administrative infrastructure. Moreover, the data is rarely available for future re-analysis of the same or different topics.

Most specialized children's surveys, and many household budget surveys, are not large enough to allow disaggregation for sub-national analysis, in particular for children. Censuses are the only large-scale surveys in many countries, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, and may occur after intervals of more than a decade.. This can place multiple and diverse demands on this single survey instrument, which is usually designed for simplicity and ease of fielding at scale. Improved vital registration systems and better quality administrative data and labour force surveys would reduce dependence on censuses.

In some countries there is no real 'routine' survey process to be taken advantage of, and there is an extremely long time interval between each census. In these instances, specialized children's surveys will remain the key primary data source on children. Furthermore, because it has to compete with data collection on other issues, the scope to include children's issues may be severely limited in countries where few surveys are fielded, or where there are long intervals between surveys. An ideal would be multiple data sources, with a mix of routine and specialized surveys, at least because there is a policy advantage to providing researchers with alternative sources of data on the same issue, especially when the issue is contested in national debates.

A recurrent issue raised in several presentations and discussions, is that insufficient analysis is done of the existing data due to problems in accessing datasets. This is a version of data shortage – even if collected from households, if access is not available, data might as well not exist from an analyst's point of view; from a policymaker's point of view, they remain as 'data' and not useful information. When data have not been analysed, it is impossible to comment on the quality or usefulness of such data for studying children's issues. Even if only basic descriptive analyses could be achieved with the data, they might help identify the main issues and locate where further in-depth surveys are required.

Access problems are connected to the fact that most analytical capacity (and hence demand for access) is located outside developing countries. National statistical agencies in developing countries collect data that are used to generate standardized indicators of child well-being. They

rarely conduct deeper research, perhaps due to a lack of research capacity or due to other reasons, such as the prioritization of indicators by donors for monitoring purposes. The result is that data often get collected and remain within statistical agencies with no procedures or incentives for sharing them with researchers. However, some datasets are complex and can take years to analyse even when access is possible.

Another recurrent issue raised is that individual datasets would be more powerful if linked with other data. However, legal barriers and the fact that the information needed to link datasets is not collected at the survey stage limit the practice of linking datasets.

With regards to the contents of survey instruments, there appears to be a range in terms of the development of survey modules relevant to children's issues. At one end of the spectrum is child labour, with widely-tested survey questions that can be developed into standardized modules for inclusion in routine survey processes (and the ILO is already doing this to some extent). At the other end of the spectrum are issues like vulnerability (the threat of poverty) and subjective well-being, where data collection modules are at a more experimental stage.

One conclusion from the consultation is the need for a broad assessment and evaluation of data sources on children's well-being. By 'data sources', it is meant the primary household level survey data (rather than child indicators derived from the data, of which there are several secondary sources). For example, what has been obtained from various recent household surveys and censuses, and how does this compare to the contribution of specialized surveys to the knowledge base? There is a sense that a lot of routine household surveys are under-exploited for child well-being analysis and monitoring because they are designed for, and used to generate rather basic indicators for national and global monitoring, and not much else. On the other hand, there is a sense of a strong reliance on specialized (but ad hoc) surveys for the deeper analysis needed to understand children's well-being and to design policies. A systematic assessment can facilitate understanding of the situation and its implications, and potential alternatives for generating primary data, given the technical and budgetary realities in global regions.

In addition to evaluating uses of data, some conceptual reflection is needed to understand 'routine surveys' as compared to 'specialized surveys' (and 'administrative data'), given that each has particular strengths and weaknesses. Such an assessment would be a first step towards better planning and coordination of survey instruments (including the possibility of linking microdata sources). In particular, a review and assessment of a range of specialized surveys in varied country settings would be needed to locate questions and survey modules that have been field-tested, for inclusion in routine household surveys.

Similar to ILO's collection of data on child labour, some standards for children's visibility in household surveys can be identified (for example with the introduction of specific modules, or questions in existing modules, or with reformulation of existing questions, or simply asking children certain relevant questions that are currently asked only to adults). Such a process should result in the formulation of specific recommendations on how children's issues can be taken into consideration during the survey design process. A concrete result can be the elaboration of survey modules or, more simply, survey questions to be fielded in existing survey processes (done in the framework of increased dialogue and coordination between survey efforts).

Many of the issues encountered in the technical consultation are certainly being addressed in different countries. But there is a sense that experiences of developing child-relevant statistical capacity have not been well documented, and are therefore unavailable for wider use and learning. A case in point is UNICEF's own efforts in the MICS process since 1990. This has

helped set high standards for specialized children's surveys, starting from very basic beginnings in many developing countries. Yet much of the experiences and learning in the process appear not to have been documented or widely disseminated.

In particular, there is a need for reflection on what has been achieved through MICS and other similar donor-driven surveys, not in terms of their contribution to data availability (clearly a lot), but in terms of their contribution to statistical processes (survey modules, methodologies, capacity and related issues). Such a review could contribute to future data-collection programmes, not only in terms of data but also creation of capacity and awareness at country level. For example, it would be interesting to evaluate if MICS has strengthened awareness of the importance of collecting data on children, or has influenced how data are collected (have other surveys become more child-focused?), or whether modules in routine surveys have changed, especially in countries in which MICS has now established a tradition.

The consultation has happened when a new global round of censuses is well under way, centred on the year 2010. A number of international meetings have already taken place to exchange knowledge of survey instruments and implementation. An assessment of the extent to which children's issues are included in the 2010 census process, particularly on issues on which some consensus exists regarding survey methodologies, could help identify ways to raise children's visibility. Child labour could be a good starting point because its survey instrument is relatively well developed. Since many of the censuses will be fielded from 2008 onwards, there is insufficient time to influence them. But many will be fielded around 2010 and later. (See a schedule at: [http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/sources/census/2010\\_PHC/default.htm](http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/sources/census/2010_PHC/default.htm).) A particular related goal should be to consider how children's topics can be included in the census 'long form'.

The serious question of access to data was raised during the consultation. Even when primary survey data are collected, they may be unavailable to researchers and therefore underutilized. Although this is partly a political decision by countries, it should not be seen as a fixed state. Development interventions and statistical design can have a bearing on the issue, but this appears to have been a relatively neglected area. Policies of data access vary greatly between countries (even neighbouring countries), and lessons can be learned from this variance. Those who fund surveys need to pay greater attention to this issue, although this may not be particularly appealing because it does not result in concrete deliverables (such as a report), and the task is more characteristic of a public good. International organizations can help by providing more coordinated efforts, because there are likely to be considerable challenges in increasing access and usage in developing countries. This could include helping to reform and update fundamental legislation on rights to information, defining protocols for access to statistical information on a national and multilateral basis, and providing technical and budgetary resources to mount datasets in databanks.

## ANNEX 1 – AGENDA

### Technical Consultation on Making Children Visible in Routine Surveys UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre Florence, Italy, 26-27 July 2007

#### Agenda

---

#### Thursday, 26 July 2007

---

*CHAIR: EVA JESPERSEN*

9:00 Welcome and introduction round *DAVID PARKER*  
9:20 Objectives of the meeting and general context *SHAHIN YAQUB*  
*LEONARDO MENCHINI*

---

#### **PART A – Survey Instruments**

---

9:45 HBS and Integrated household surveys. Understanding child well-being in SEE/CIS: strength and weaknesses of data from HBS and IHS *LEONARDO MENCHINI*  
10:00 *Discussion*  
11:10 Surveys on children: MICS *GARETH JONES*  
11:30 *Discussion*  
12:00 Surveys on children: “Childhood poverty in Kyrgyzstan” *SHAMSIA IBRAGIMOVA*  
12:20 *Discussion*  
14:30 Census and data on children *GRACE BEDIAKO*  
14:50 *Discussion*

---

#### **PART B – Survey Modules**

---

15:45 Vulnerability *STEFAN DERCON*  
16:05 *Discussion*  
16:45 Child work *FRANK HAGEMANN*  
17:05 *Discussion*  
17:45 *Close of first day*

---

#### Friday, 27 July 2007

---

*CHAIR: EVA JESPERSEN*

8:30 Migration *EDILBERTO LOAIZA*  
8:50 *Discussion*  
9:30 Capturing access to and use of public services: health and education *CLAUDIA CAPP*  
9:50 *Discussion*  
11:00 Round table/discussion/conclusions  
12:00 Next steps *SHAHIN YAQUB*  
*LEONARDO MENCHINI*  
13:00 Closure of the meeting

---

## ANNEX 2 – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Ms. Grace Bediako	Head - National Statistical Office: Ghana
Mr. Simone Bertoli	Department of Economics University of Florence, Italy
Ms. Claudia Cappa	Assistant Programme Officer Strategic Information Section Division of Policy and Planning UNICEF New York
Prof. Stefan Dercon	Queen Elizabeth House, Oxford, United Kingdom
Ms. Francesca Francavilla	Department of Economics, University of Florence, Italy
Mr. Frank Hagemann	Senior Policy Analyst and SIMPOC Coordinator - International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), International Labour Office, Geneva
Ms. Shamsia Ibragimova	Consultant on Poverty Analysis and Measurement, Kyrgyzstan
Mr. Gareth Jones	IRC Consultant
Mr. Edilberto Loaiza	Senior Programme Officer Strategic Information Section Division of Policy and Planning UNICEF New York
Mr. Luca Tiberti	Department of Economics, University of Florence, Italy
<b>UNICEF IRC</b>	
Ms. Eva Jespersen	Chief, Social and Economic Policies (SEP)
Mr. David Parker	Deputy Director
Ms. Sheila Marnie	Consultant, SEP
Mr. Leonardo Menchini	Programme Specialist, SEP
Mr. Shahin Yaqub	Social Policy Specialist, SEP
Ms. Luisa Cavalieri	Intern, SEP