

# AUTHOR ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

## FINAL PUBLICATION INFORMATION

Natural Disasters, Human Development and Poverty at the Municipal Level in Mexico

The definitive version of the text was subsequently published in

Journal of Development Studies, 49(3), 2012-11-26

Published by Taylor and Francis

**THE FINAL PUBLISHED VERSION OF THIS ARTICLE  
IS AVAILABLE ON THE PUBLISHER'S PLATFORM**

This Author Accepted Manuscript is copyrighted by the World Bank and published by Taylor and Francis. It is posted here by agreement between them. Changes resulting from the publishing process—such as editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms—may not be reflected in this version of the text.

You may download, copy, and distribute this Author Accepted Manuscript for noncommercial purposes. Your license is limited by the following restrictions:

- (1) You may use this Author Accepted Manuscript for noncommercial purposes only under a CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 Unported license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>.
- (2) The integrity of the work and identification of the author, copyright owner, and publisher must be preserved in any copy.
- (3) You must attribute this Author Accepted Manuscript in the following format: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of an Article by Rodriguez-Oreggia, Eduardo; de la Fuente, Alejandro; de la Torre, Rodolfo; Moreno Moreno, Hector A. *Natural Disasters, Human Development and Poverty at the Municipal Level in Mexico* © World Bank, published in the Journal of Development Studies 49(3) 2012-11-26 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

## **Natural Disasters, Human Development and Poverty at the Municipal Level in Mexico**

Eduardo Rodriguez-Oreggia

EGAP, Tecnológico de Monterrey, Campus State of Mexico

eduardo.oreggia@gmail.com

Alejandro de la Fuente

World Bank

adelafuente@worldbank.org

Rodolfo de la Torre

UNDP Mexico and CIDE

rodolfo.delatorre@undp.org

Hector A. Moreno Moreno

UNDP Mexico

hector.moreno@undp.org

The authors acknowledge comments from Margaret Arnold, Luis Felipe Lopez-Calva, Javier Baez, Indira Santos, and assistants to the seminars for the UNDP disasters report, also to the Network on Inequality and Poverty, and the Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association congress. Part of this work was carried while Rodriguez-Oreggia was visiting at the Center for International Development at Harvard. Some research assistance was provided by Cristina Rodriguez.

**Corresponding author:** Eduardo Rodríguez-Oreggia. Email:

[eduardo.oreggia@gmail.com](mailto:eduardo.oreggia@gmail.com) EGAP Tecnológico de Monterrey CEM, Carretera Lago

Guadalupe Km 3.5, Atizapan, Estado de Mexico, CP 52926, Tel + (52 55) 5864 5643

Fax: +(52 55) 5864 5651

## **ABSTRACT**

This paper analyses the effects of natural disasters on human development and poverty levels at the municipal level in Mexico. Using several sources, we build a panel of data in order to uncover if different natural shocks can affect social indicators. After controlling for geographic and natural characteristics which can make municipalities more hazard prone, as well as for other institutional, socio-economic and demographic pre-shock characteristics, in addition to using fixed effects, we find that general shocks lead to significant drops in both types of indicators, and especially if coming from floods and droughts.

Key words: natural disasters, poverty, human development, geography, institutions

JEL classification: C52, I31, O10, O54, Q54

## **1. Introduction**

Significant social and economic consequences of major recent natural disasters in different parts of the world have reiterated the need to place disaster concerns higher on the global poverty agenda. In parallel, there seem to be evidence that global climate change would lead to wide-ranging shifts in climatic variables, possibly increasing the recurrence and virulence of climatic hazards in vast parts of the world (IPCC, 2007).

Hazards are potentially damaging physical events or phenomenon that may cause the loss of life or injury, property damage, social and economic disruption, or environmental degradation (ISDR, 2007). The probability of occurrence of hazards is associated with a threat to welfare until they materialize or vanish. If this threat becomes real and affects significantly life and property, then is called a natural disaster (Hyndman and Hyndman, 2006).

While the occurrence of a natural hazard could be considered exogenous, its transformation into a disaster is not. Being exposed to a hazard per se can be welfare damaging: households due to risk-averse behaviour typically may adopt less than optimal income-generating activities to reduce this exposure, which in low-income contexts can translate into poverty, even if the hazard event never materializes. Simultaneously, if a contingency occurs, since the poor tend to lack adequate access to financial and social insurance institutions they probably end up using their few assets which could plunge them further into persistent deprivation. Therefore, the effect of hazards on poverty could be understood from two temporal angles with respect to the hazard itself: before it happens (*ex ante*) or once it occurs and becomes a disaster (*ex post* backward-looking assessment).

And yet, with a few exceptions (UNISDR, 2009), the foreseeable effects of geological or climatic hazard events on poverty has not translated into a systematic research agenda that illustrates their connection, in part because of the availability of related data. Major reviews on poverty dynamics have noted, for instance, that few studies account for this type of risk effects (Baulch and Hoddinott, 2000; Dercon and Shapiro, 2007).

The literature on the social and economic consequences of natural disasters is still scarce since is just on the last years that data has become more available for the analysis

in this field. One strand of literature focuses on the effects of natural disasters on macroeconomic indicators or country-level variables, including GDP, its growth, and inequality. The numerous studies differ in their techniques, data and findings. This literature is relevant in two respects: it provides some orders of magnitude to the effects of disasters, and suggests channels through which their effects disseminate into the macro economy.

Some research in recent years has taken advantage of new data that has been linked to natural events. At the macro level economic growth results indicate a negative effect (Auffet, 2003; Strobl, 2011) or positive effect (Skidmore and Toya, 2002), being such effect more clear when analysed at the sectorial level as in Loayza et al (2009). Other research, at village or household level, has focused on the effect on consumption, investment health and nutrition, and human capital (i.e. Dercon, 2005; Alderman et al, 2006; Carter et al, 2007; among others). Specific effects also has been analysed and found important in local business as in Yamano et al (2007), Thompson (2009) and Ewing et al (2009).

When analysing what additional factors reduce or increase the effect of the disasters on macro indicators, Noy (2009), Kahn (2005) and Toya and Skidmore (2007) find that institutions, higher education and trade openness, as well as strong financial sector and smaller governments are important factors in determining the effect that natural disasters have on development at the international level. However, the effect may differ according to levels of aggregation of economic sectors and for different disasters.

Loayza et al (2009) recently tried to reconcile the seemingly contradictory results by estimating the medium-term effects of droughts, floods, earthquakes, storms (separately and simultaneously) on economic growth using a model with three main sectors (agriculture, industry, and services) and with the whole economy. They found that over five-year period growth falls by 0.6 percent after a drought, mainly affecting agriculture and industrial growth (falls by 1 percent). In contrast, overall growth rises by 1 percent after a flood, to the extent that they are moderate, especially benefiting industrial economic sectors. Kellenberg and Mobarak (2008) find significant effects from diverse natural disasters on human lives, especially from floodings, landslides and windstorms,

using a panel of countries, as such events they argue are more related to behavioural choices.

Mexico is not an exception for the suffering from the impact of natural events. Being in a geographical position that seem to develop natural events translating into some damages to population, and also a middle income country with high levels of poverty and inequality, makes of Mexico an interesting field for the analysis of how shocks from natural disasters affect social indicators such as human development, and poverty, at the local level. This paper contributes to the literature on the effect of natural disasters on poverty in analysing how different local shocks from natural disasters affect local social indicators such as the poverty levels and human development in municipalities in Mexico.

The paper draws on a unique poverty panel dataset of municipalities in Mexico, connected with a database of natural disasters available also at the municipal level. We then bring data from other public sources to account for natural, geographic, socio-demographic and economic characteristics of municipalities, as well as for some institutional capacities to cope with disasters. After calculating in a regression framework the difference in welfare changes between affected and non-affected municipalities, our estimates show that natural disasters shocks reduce human development and increase poverty in those areas.

Overall this paper contributes to the existing literature on natural disasters in two ways. First, it assembles multiple databases (poverty maps, disaster data, census data and municipal socio-demographic and institutional panel data) at the municipal level to assess the effect of natural disasters on poverty and human development. This is a welcome development within the literature on natural disasters given the frequency of calculating and using output measures to assess disasters' effects. Furthermore, there is a glaring omission under existing literature on what policies (beyond household level) could help to redress the effect of these shocks. Empirically, we focus directly on the effects of natural disasters on human development and poverty, as well as resources, which could be fundamental prior to and during the recovery process.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 we present the data and an overview of the variables considered for the present analysis, as well as the methodology used. Section 3 presents the results. Finally some conclusions and considerations are presented.

## 2. Methodology, Data Sources and Variables

### *Methodology*

As explained earlier, hazards are threatening events that only become disasters if they find unprotected people and assets in their way. Provided one can control for vulnerability (i.e., those characteristics that make a natural hazard turn into a disaster), one can treat disasters as an exogenous shock to social welfare indicators at sub-national level allowing for comparisons between treatment and control groups. With at least two periods of data, we can know what happened to poverty before and after the disaster and therefore calculate the effect of such disasters within a regression framework through a difference in difference specification and random effects model as in the following form:

$$Y_{mt} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 T_m + \alpha_2 A_t + \alpha_3 T_m A_t + \alpha_4 X_{mt} + \varepsilon_m + u_{mt} \quad (1)$$

Where  $Y$  denotes the outcome of interest for municipality  $m$  at year  $t$ .  $T$  denotes a dummy for areas considered treatment (i.e. municipalities with incidence of a natural event),  $A$  is a year dummy taking the value of 1 for the 2005 (after) and zero for 2000,  $X$  is a vector of municipal characteristics (geographical, natural, socio-economic, institutional and financial). The term  $\alpha_3$  measures the effect of a natural disaster on the outcome variable  $Y$ .

We are including in  $X$  different sets of pre-shock variables which may render some municipalities more vulnerable to a natural hazard than others, or making the municipality more prone to a natural disaster. In this respect, we will interact the treatment dummy with these pre-shock covariates to control for existing observable variations between treatment and control groups that may determine the effect while reducing possible selection bias in the sample. Equation (1) then becomes:

$$Y_{mt} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 T_m + \alpha_2 A_t + \alpha_3 T_m A_t + \alpha_4 X_{mt} + \alpha_4 X_{mt} T_m + \varepsilon_m + u_{mt} \quad (2)$$

In addition, it may be argued that despite controlling for pre-shock variables there would be some unobservable characteristics that may affect the magnitude of the effect, therefore we will include a fixed effect model at the municipal level in the following form:

$$Y_{mt} = \alpha_m + \alpha_1 T_m + \alpha_2 A_t + \alpha_3 T_m A_t + \alpha_4 X_{mt} + \alpha_4 X_{mt} T_m + u_{mt} \quad (3)$$

Where  $Y$  is the level of the welfare indicator chosen (poverty incidence, poverty depth, poverty severity, human development) in municipality  $m$  at time  $t$ , and  $\alpha_m$  is a municipal fixed effect. Estimating regressions with fixed municipal effects constitutes a robustness test for our main results. Further robustness checks are performed with varying control groups and samples sizes as explained below. We now turn to the sets of variables created for analysis, their sources, and basic statistics.<sup>1</sup>

### *Data and Variables*

To test whether a natural disaster affects poverty on municipality, one requires information on three fronts: (i) natural hazards, ideally from units of measurement associated with the phenomenon in turn – rainfall for drought and floods, temperature for frosts, earthquake magnitude, and so forth–; or alternatively from a disasters database that lead into hazard categories; (ii) existing household, community and extra-community characteristics that account for both exposure and coping capacity to mitigate any effect; and (iii) welfare outcomes, that crudely speaking result from the interaction of the first two and can span from money-metrics to human development indicators. We have data for 2,454 municipalities, from which several experienced natural disasters between 2000-05.

Information on (i) the incidence of natural hazard events at municipal level was extracted from the DesInventar database (see the online appendices for a description of this database). Although DesInventar records disasters (a disaster triggers the inclusion



into the hazard category; more simply, hurricanes in uninhabited areas are not recorded for example), it constitutes the only nationwide dataset on hazard events at municipal level in Mexico. For analytical purposes disasters are taken from those geological and climatic events and divided into five hazard categories: floods, frost, droughts, rains, and other events.<sup>2</sup> The amount of information at our disposal on municipal characteristics (on geographic, socio-economic, demographic and public preventive and coping mechanisms, among others) still avail us to analyse disaster effects on poverty, mending potential endogeneity troubles contained on the exposure of municipalities to hazards and the coping mechanisms.<sup>3</sup> Comments on benefits and drawbacks using this kind of databases can be found in Wisner et al (2004).

Most data for components (ii) and (iii) was elicited from the 2000 Census, the 2005 Count of Population and Housing and surveys. We use as dependent variables the Human Development Index (HDI), as published by the UNDP, and income poverty levels in three officially-defined alternative measures of poverty: food-based poverty, capabilities-based poverty and assets-based poverty (which are equivalent to extreme poverty, poverty and moderate poverty) as published by the National Council for Evaluation of Social Development Policy in Mexico (CONEVAL, 2008), both for 2000 and 2005 at the municipal level. A household is considered food poor if its member's income falls below the lowest income necessary to afford a minimum basket of food. A household is considered to be in capabilities-based poverty if its members cannot afford to cover their basic expenses on food, health and education, according to an officially defined basket. Finally, a household is considered to be in assets-based poverty if its members cannot cover their expenses of food, health, education, dressing, home and public transportation.

We control for characteristics (collectively named Geography and Nature) that may make some areas more prone to natural events, including measures of latitude, altitude, surface length, percentage of arid and semiarid areas within the municipality, deforestation rates, and maximum and minimum average temperatures and rainfall. Data under this category is from 2000 or one or two previous years, and were collected from several public sources including the National Water Commission (CONAGUA in Spanish), and the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI in Spanish).

We also account for emergency preparedness and hazard mitigation practices within the municipality (collectively named Institutional/Local Capacity). This includes variables that may improve the response capacity of local governments prior to hazard events and once turned into disasters. The first group comprises variables such as the existence of risk maps, civil defence units and contingency plans, as well financial capacity such as the share of local own earnings to total local earning (tax resources) and the share of federal transfers received divided by total local earning (federal resources). This set of variables was collected from the 2000 National Survey of Municipal Governments applied by the National Institute of Social Development (INDESOL). The availability of coping funds is proxied by a dummy that captures whether the municipality received financial resources for disaster relief and reconstruction after a natural disaster occurred. The Natural Disasters Fund (FONDEN in Spanish), the government agency in charge of allocating such funds, declares which events are catastrophic triggering disbursements of the fund.<sup>4</sup>

We constructed a number of pre-shock (2000) municipal-level variables that may affect the resilience of the municipal population to natural hazards, i.e. the capacity to recover from shocks. This includes the share of individuals or households with the following characteristic within the municipality: rural population; migration intensity; population working in different economic sectors (primary, secondary and tertiary); population with social security; indigenous population; demographic composition of population; and degree of inequality within the municipality measured through the Gini index. This data was gathered from the National Population Census in 2000 (INEGI) and the UNDP. In addition we will consider in the model state level effects.

Summary statistics are presented in Table 1 below with their corresponding source.

### **INSERT TABLE 1**

One potential issue to be aware is the possibility that some migration may be occurring due to natural shocks in affected areas. Some comments have arisen in the sense that selective migration may occur, with the better off leaving, and those with lower welfare remaining in affected areas, potentially biasing the results. In this respect, previous studies such as Belansen and Polacheck (2009) find an increase in earning of about 4.5%

for those remaining, while in neighbouring counties decrease in same percentage, assuming that may happen because a fraction of workers may move, although from data is not possible to know it directly. DeSilva et al (2010) find a reduction of 0.7 per cent in wages for low skilled industries compared to high skilled in Houston after receiving displaced from hurricane Katrina, although such effect is only significant when interacting with sales per firm in the area. Strobl (2011) finds a positive effect from hurricanes on outward and inward migration of taxpayers in the US coasts.

In this regard, we did some checks with the available information that could hint something about, being aware that are just indicative. First, data for migration at the municipal level is only available from the population census in 2000 and 2010, although the questions change, and the information for the paper is only available for 2000 and 2005. We used information on the population for municipalities, and ran a regression to check if there is a reduction in population after the natural shocks compared to municipalities with no shocks, and the results shows no significant evidence In this sense also, Rodriguez-Oreggia (2011) for example analysed the effect of hurricanes on attrition for the labour surveys in metropolitan areas, and finding no significant effects also. According to Macías (2010), migration in Mexico is due to pre-existent factors in localities, and not due to natural shocks. Models presented in the next section control for the share of individual living in the same are after the last census. We acknowledge that specific models for migration and fertility should be applied to identify the impact of natural disasters on that issue, but that is beyond the scope of this paper and data existent in Mexico.

### **3. Results**

#### ***Disaster and poverty***

We estimated equations (2) and (3) to assess the effect of natural disasters on human development and poverty. Using a sample that comprises all municipalities, Table 2 presents the results from natural disasters in general as treatment category, with those municipalities that experienced no disasters in the period of analysis as the control group. Estimations are presented with the panel structure using random and fixed effects at the municipal level, and standard errors are clustered at the municipal level.<sup>5</sup>

## **INSERT TABLE 2 (EFFECT FROM NATURAL DISASTERS IN GENERAL)**

As Table 2 shows, the occurrence of a natural disaster in the period 2000-2005 reduced the Human Development Index by about -0.0068 on average. This represents about 1 percent drop (0.98 or 0.97 percent using random or fixed effects, respectively) in such index. For those municipalities affected by a natural hazard over the reviewed period this would be equivalent to losing on average 2 years of human development gains over the same period. This is a substantial reversal in development for an average municipality.

As for poverty, the occurrence of natural disasters during 2000-05 increased food poverty, or extreme poverty, by about 3.7 percent; capacities poverty by 3 percent and assets poverty by 1.5 percent. The effect from specific types of disasters could well vary, and for that reason, we disaggregate the natural shocks into different natural shocks as presented in Table 3.

In order to know the marginal effect from a specific variable given the shock from a natural disaster, in online appendices we present the interactions of the treatment dummy with the control variables. The coefficients present the marginal effect from such controls. Most of them are not significant, although some are. For example the use of federal resources against natural disasters effects (FONDEN) seems to have a positive effect but on poverty, even though this variable may respond more to political factors for allocating such funds rather than to palliate adverse effects. Attending seminars related to public administration, as well as having a municipal development plan, have a negative effect on poverty when using all the sample. The political controls, same party than governor or president, are mostly relevant in both samples. The share of population with social security is highly relevant in reducing poverty with both samples for those localities with a disaster. The share of indigenous population, as well as employment in the tertiary sector and the gini coefficient are only relevant using all sample of municipalities.<sup>6</sup> Financial variables for the locality are also no significant (tax resources and federal resources). These results point to the need to improve local capacity indicators for coping better to natural shocks and reduce the impact from such shocks on social indicators.

### **INSERT TABLE 3 (DIFFERENT DISASTERS ALL SAMPLE)**

Table 3 shows welfare effect disaggregated by type of disaster.<sup>7</sup> All events but rains reduce the HDI with statistical significance: floods (0.38 per cent), frosts (0.78 per cent), droughts (1.34 per cent), and other disasters (0.78 per cent). Interestingly, rains have a positive effect in such index (0.9 per cent), and this effect remains constant in further runs. This finding is not entirely surprising: Loayza et al (2009) found in a global sample of countries that moderate floods and storms have a positive effect on growth of about the same magnitude as our analysis, across different economic sectors.

Floods, droughts and other disasters<sup>8</sup> also increase poverty. In the case of floods the effect ranges from 1.9 to 3.5 per cent for assets poverty, 2.9 per cent for capacities poverty and 3.5 per cent for food poverty. Droughts also increase poverty levels in a significant way: 4.3 per cent food poverty, 2.7 per cent assets poverty, and 3.9 per cent capacities poverty. Other disasters also increase food and capacities poverty by 2.3 and 2 per cent, respectively, with no significant effect on assets poverty. Frost and rains are not significant.

In all the previous regression we have included a dummy indicating whether such municipality had been affected by a given disaster in the previous decade, but the coefficients, unreported here, are not significant, possibly indicating the prevalence of medium and short term effects at the local level. In order to make further check on this issue we will focus on restricting the sample to municipalities without previous disasters, then to those with only disasters in the period.

#### ***Robustness checks***

We performed checks on the robustness of the estimations obtained by restricting the sample first to those municipalities without reported disasters in the previous decade (1990s), with the comparison group being those municipalities without disasters previously reported and without disasters in the period under analysis. In this way, we are comparing localities that are affected in the period versus localities that have not been affected even in previous periods of time, which is the close we can get to a more pure control group. These estimations are presented in Table 4. Secondly, we restrict the

sample only to those municipalities suffering from any disaster in the period of analysis, and for this case, since only affected municipalities are in the sample, the comparison group will be municipalities under the category of “other” disasters. In this case, we are trying to identify the effect, in a differentiated way, for those with treatment or disasters in the period of analysis.

The results are presented in Table 4 for restricted sample without previous disasters.

**INSERT TABLE 4 (ALL DISASTERS SAMPLE WITHOUT PREVIOUS DISASTERS)**

In this exercise, both human development and poverty levels are adversely affected by disasters with statistical significance. Droughts reduce the Human Development Index by 2 per cent, and other disasters by 0.8 per cent, but rains tend also to increase the Index by 1 per cent. Droughts, floods, and other disasters tend also to increase poverty, though the first category without significance. Some effects are even larger than those found in Table 3, using the all-municipalities sample. Therefore, using as a control group a set of municipalities that have not been affected in any period for a natural disasters seems to present a larger effect on poverty and human development.

A final check consisted of restricting the study sample to only those municipalities that suffered a disaster in the period under analysis. In this case, the control group are those municipalities which experienced disasters contained under the “other” category. This model was applied only when we disaggregate by type of disaster.

**INSERT TABLE 5 (DIFFERENT DISASTERS SAMPLE ONLY DISASTERS)**

Table 5 shows that, relative to those municipalities that experienced “other” disasters, droughts and frosts reduce the Human Development Index by 1.27 and 0.66 per cent, respectively. For poverty levels, the main effects are coming from floods and droughts. Floods increase food poverty by about 3.2 per cent, capacities poverty by 2.7 per cent and asset poverty by 1.9 per cent, compared to those municipalities that suffered other type of disasters. Droughts have also a negative and significant effect on poverty: 4.2% increase in food poverty, 3.8% in capacities poverty, and 2.6% in asset poverty, again compared to those localities who experienced other types of disasters.

## **Conclusion**

Natural disasters have gained prominence in recent times as they are becoming more recurrent. Notwithstanding the expected harm of these and many other hazards on poverty, an empirical agenda that illustrates their connection is still missing by and large, at least for Mexico. In this context, this paper analyses the effect of natural disasters on human development (measured through the Human Development Index developed by UNDP) and poverty (measured under three different poverty lines: food, capacities and assets) during the 2000-05 period, years for which data is available.

In a panel setting, we exploit the variation on the incidence of natural disasters across municipalities in Mexico using a difference-in-difference strategy within a regression framework. Having pre and post-disaster welfare outcomes and covariates, we control for different sets of pre-shock variables that may influence the magnitude of the effect of natural disasters, including geographical and natural characteristics; socioeconomic factors, institutional and local administrative capacity, as well as financial coping mechanisms and political covariates, and their interactions with the treatment dummies.

Our results show a significant and adverse effect of natural disasters on both human development and poverty. Poverty levels increased between 1.5-3.7 percent, based on the measure considered. Similarly, for affected municipalities, the effect on the Human Development Index was similar to going back 2 years in human development over the same period analysed on average. Disaggregating by type of event we found that floods and droughts had the most adverse effects compared to other hazards. Institutional factors suggest a big room for implementing more efficient public mechanisms to cope with the shock from disasters at the local level and for preventing ex ante the shocks.

An area for future research could be to determine whether these indicators catch-up after a longer period of time. Previous literature suggests that an initial drop in economic growth could be followed by larger growth due to reconstruction inflows. Can we expect the same with poverty and human development? It would be interesting to document, for example, if some sectors benefited after an initial dip, but poverty did not, but for that availability of data for the long term will be required.

## Footnotes

1. These models measures the average effect from any specific shock, since the data is not suitable for better measures of intensity, as shown in online appendices, we will focus on the model presented.
2. Other events comprise a set of events with lower frequency including: landslide, avalanche, eruption, hailstorm, surge, snowstorm, earthquake, electric storm, tornado, strong winds.
- 3 Although the DesInventar database has information on both casualties and economic losses we decided not to rely on those parameters.
4. For this analysis we received from CENAPRED a base that only includes if a municipality had a declared emergency and authorized the use of FONDEN, but not the specific amounts. In addition, FONDEN usually runs out of funds given the prevalence of diverse events during a year, in addition to be subject to political voracity in order to have the money transferred, besides that local government are not exactly accountable for the use of such money for affected population (Borensztein et al, 2008). For other issues of FONDEN regarding the lack of complementarity between federation and states due to financial constrains see for example Saldaña-Zorrila (2007).
5. Ideally, one should use municipal fixed effects for separating the causes of changes within municipalities, but cannot be used if we want to analyse time invariant variables, such the those pre-shock we included in the models. For a matter of comparison we present both estimations, fixed and random although the Hausman test for all the regressions in Table 2, 3 and 4 are mostly no significant, except for Table 2 in assets poverty, where fixed effects are then preferred.
6. We only present in the online appendices the controls interacted for general disaster for matter of space.
7. For this case, some municipalities can be accounted for different disasters (i.e. if they suffered from a hurricane they are recording under floods and under storms), since the DesInventar records the disaggregated event.
8. Comprises: avalanche, eruption, hailstorm, surge, snowstorm, earthquake, electric storm, tornado, strong winds.

## References

Alderman, H, Hoddinott, J., and Kinsey, B. (2006). Long term consequences of early child malnutrition. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 58(3), pp. 450-474.

Baulch, B., and Hoddinott, J. (2000). *Economic mobility and poverty dynamics in developing countries*. (London: Frank Cass Publishers).



Belasen, A. R. and Polachek, S. W. (2009). How disasters affect local labor markets: The effects of hurricanes in Florida. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 44(1), pp. 251-276.

Borensztein, E., Cavallo, E., and Valenzuela, P. (2008). Debt sustainability under catastrophic risk: the case for government budget insurance. IMF Working Paper WP/08/44. Washington, IMF.

Carter, M. R., Little, P., and Mogues, T. (2007). Poverty traps and natural disasters in Ethiopia and Honduras. *World Development*, 35(5), pp. 835-856.

CENAPRED. 2008. Database of unpublished data provided to the UNDP Office in Mexico. UNDP. Mexico.

CNA. 2007. *Estadísticas del Agua en México. Edición 2007*. Comisión Nacional del Agua. (Mexico: Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales).

CONEVAL. 2008. Poverty maps 2000-2005. Available online [www.coneval.gob.mx]

De Silva, D.G., McComb, R., Moh, YK, Schiller, A., Vargas, A. (2010). The effects of migration on wages: Evidence from a natural experiment. *American Economic Review*, May, pp. 321-326.

Dercon, S., Hoddinott, J. and Woldehanna, T. (2005). Shocks and consumption in 15 Ethiopian villages 1999-2004. *Journal of African Economies*, 14(4), pp. 559-585.

Dercon, S. and Shapiro, J.S. (2007). Moving on, staying behind, getting lost: Lessons on poverty mobility from longitudinal data, in Narayan, D. and Petesch, P. (eds) *Moving out of poverty: cross-disciplinary perspectives on mobility*. (Washington: Palgrave and The World Bank).

Ewing B. T, Kruse, J. B., Thompson, M. A. (2009) Twister! Employment responses to the 3 May 1999 Oklahoma City tornado. *Applied Economics*, 41 (6), pp. 691-702.

Hyndman, D. and Hyndman, D. (2006). Natural hazards and natural disasters. (Belmont: Brooks).

IPCC (2007). *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

ISRD (2007). *Disaster risk reduction : Global review*. (Geneve: ISRD).

Kahn, M. (2005). The death toll from natural disasters: the role of income, geography and institutions. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 87(2), pp. 271-284.

Kellenberg, D. K. and Mobarak, A. M. (2008). Does rising income increase or decrease damage risk from natural disasters? *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63, pp. 788-802.

Loayza, N., Olaberria, E., Rigolini, J. and Christiaensen, L. (2009). Natural disasters and growth: going beyond the average. Policy Research Working Paper 4980, World Bank.

Macías, J.M. (2010). Reubicaciones y desplazamientos por desastres en Mexico. Seminario migracion, medio ambiente y desastres. Colegio de la Frontera Norte.

Noy, I. (2009). The macroeconomic consequences of disasters. *Journal of Development Economics*, 88, pp. 221-231.

Rodriguez-Oreggia, E. (2011). Hurricanes and labor market outcomes: a difference-in-difference approach for Mexico. ITESM, mimeo.

Saldaña-Zorrilla, S (2007). Socioeconomic vulnerability to natural disasters in Mexico: rural, poor, trade, and public response. *Serie Estudios y Perspectivas 92*. ECLAC, Santiago.

Sanghi, A. (2010). *Natural hazards, unnatural disasters: the economics of effective prevention*. (Washington: World Bank).

Skidmore, M. and Toya, H (2002). Do natural disasters promote long run growth? *Economic Inquiry*, 40(4), pp. 664-687.

Strobl, E. (2011) The economic growth impact of hurricanes: Evidence from the US Coastal counties. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(2), pp. 575-589.

Thompson, M. A. (2009). Hurricane Katrina and economic loss: an alternative measure of economic activity. *Journal of Business Valuation and Economic Loss Analysis*, 4(2), Art. 5.

Toya, H. and Skidmore, M. (2007). Economic development and the impact of natural disasters. *Economic Letters*, 94, pp. 20-25.

UNISDR (2009). Global assessment report on disasters risk reduction: risk and poverty in a changing climate. (Geneve: United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Secretariat).

UNDP (2008) Human development index at municipal levels. (Mexico: UNDP).

Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T. and Davids, I (2004). At risk: Natural hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. (New York: Routledge).

Yamano, N., Kajitani, Y., and Shumuta, Y. (2007). Modelling the regional economic loss of natural disasters: The search for economic hotspots. *Economic System Research*, 19 (2), pp.163-181.

**Table 1. Descriptive statistics**

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Source
<b><i>Dependent</i></b>					
HDI *	0.7079	0.0758	0.3915	0.9165	PNUD (2008)
Food poverty incidence*	0.4438	0.2423	0.0160	0.9680	CONEVAL (2008)
Capacities poverty incidence*	0.5141	0.2427	0.0280	0.9810	CONEVAL (2008)
Assets poverty incidence*	0.6828	0.2119	0.0920	0.9950	CONEVAL (2008)
<b><i>Natural Disasters Occurrence</i></b>					
Any event /2	0.4234	0.4942	0	1	Desinventar (2008)
Flood /2	0.2326	0.4226	0	1	Desinventar (2008)
Frost /2	0.0835	0.2768	0	1	Desinventar (2008)
Drought /2	0.0831	0.2761	0	1	Desinventar (2008)
Rains /2	0.0811	0.2730	0	1	Desinventar (2008)
Others /2	0.1716	0.3771	0	1	Desinventar (2008)
<b><i>Geography and Nature</i></b>					
Altitude *	1304	819	2	2924	INEGI (2006)
Latitude *	198388	33461	143827	322993	INEGI (2006)
Length *	985658	43623	865878	1166813	INEGI (2006)
Arid surface *	6.49	17.04	0.00	97.50	CNA (2007)
Semiarid surface*	16.38	20.22	0.00	72.50	CNA (2007)
Deforestation rate *	-18.27	17.89	-62.57	-0.56	Davis, R. (1997)
Minimum temperature *	7.25	5.74	0.00	24.00	CNA (2007)
Maximum temperature *	27.46	2.90	16.00	30.00	CNA (2007)
Minimum rain*	15.76	10.17	1.50	57.40	CNA (2007)
Maximum rain *	175.78	51.93	8.00	315.50	CNA (2007)
<b><i>Socioeconomic</i></b>					
Rural municipalities **	0.8350	0.3713	0.0000	1.0000	INEGI (2001)

Economic dependency rate *	0.8333	0.1693	0.3945	2.3700	INEGI (2001)
Population with social security **	0.2148	0.1824	0.0000	0.8055	INEGI (2001)
Population living in the same state 5 years before **	0.9677	0.0252	0.6714	1.0000	INEGI (2001)
Indigenous population **	0.0379	0.0993	0.0000	0.7682	INEGI (2001)
Gini coefficient*	0.4044	0.0556	0.1955	0.5978	PNUD (2008)
Employed at primary sector ** /1	0.1284	0.0781	0.0005	0.5533	INEGI (2001)
Employed at secondary sector ** /1	0.0705	0.0458	0.0000	0.3461	INEGI (2001)
Employed at tertiary sector ** /1	0.0968	0.0618	0.0023	0.4098	INEGI (2001)
<b>Coping Funds and Covariates</b>					
With FONDEN resources 2000-2005 **	0.8014	0.3990	0.0000	1.0000	CENAPRED (2008)
Same political party at municipal and state level when hazard occur	0.0348	0.1833	0	1	SNIM
Same political party at municipal and federal level when hazard occur	0.0168	0.1285	0	1	SNIM
<b><i>Institutional/Local Capacity</i></b>					
NGO for consultation or courses	0.2645	0.4412	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Seminar attendance	0.1716	0.3771	0	1	ENGM (2002)
No NGO	0.3014	0.4590	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Associated services	0.2158	0.4115	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Municipal regulations	0.2121	0.4089	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Municipal development plan	0.7211	0.4485	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Civil defense unit	0.5733	0.4947	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Civil defense program	0.4607	0.4986	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Natural contingency in the 1990s	0.5909	0.4918	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Hazard map	0.3055	0.4607	0	1	ENGM (2002)
Tax resources **	6.4960	8.1633	0	90	ENGM (2002)
Federal resources **	40.9682	19.8749	0	100	ENGM (2002)

Notes: \*average \*\* proportion. /1 Relative to total population. / 2 between 2000-2005. Data for year 2000 except coping

### **Statistical references**

CNA. 2007. Estadísticas del Agua en México. Edición 2007. Comisión Nacional del Agua. Secretaría de medio ambiente y recursos naturales. 2a. Reimpresión. México

INEGI. 2001. "XII Censo General de Población y Vivienda 2000". Consulta interactiva de datos.

INEGI. 2006. "II Conteo de Población y vivienda 2005" Consulta interactiva de datos.

PNUD. 2008. Índice de Desarrollo Humano Municipal en México 2000-2005. Programa de Naciones unidas para el Desarrollo. México

CONEVAL. 2008. Mapas de pobreza 2000-2005. Consulta en red [www.coneval.gob.mx]

Desinventar. 2008. Consulta en red [www.desinventar.org/]

Davis, R. (1997). Mexico country brief: Interim forest cover assessment for SOFO. FAO.

CENAPRED. 2008. base de datos proporcionada por CENAPRED a la Oficina de Investigación en Desarrollo Humano. PNUD. México

**INEGI. 2003. Encuesta Nacional a Gobiernos Municipales 2002. ]Consulta interactiva de la base de datos**

**INAFED. 2008. Sistema Nacional de Información Municipal. Secretaría de Gobernación. <http://www.inafed.gob.mx/wb/inafed09/descargas>**

**Table 2. Effect of a natural disaster on social municipal indicators**

Social indicator	All municipalities in sample		Municipalities without previous disaster	
	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(3) Random Effects	(4) Fixed Effects
<b>Human Development Index</b>	-0.00688*** (0.00108)	-0.00684*** (0.00108)	-0.00392** (0.00181)	-0.00371** (0.00179)
R2	0.8447	0.756	0.8082	0.786
N	4836	4836	2370	2370
<b>Food Poverty (severe)</b>	0.0367*** (0.00495)	0.0371*** (0.00493)	0.0225*** (0.00873)	0.0222*** (0.00860)
R2	0.8116	0.472	0.0181	0.549
N	4884	4884	2404	2404
<b>Capacities Poverty</b>	0.0300*** (0.00485)	0.0305*** (0.00483)	0.0206** (0.00842)	0.0199** (0.00828)
R2	0.8209	0.427	0.7881	0.508
N	4884	4884	2404	2404
<b>Assets Poverty</b>	0.0154*** (0.00431)	0.0160*** (0.00427)	0.0147** (0.00693)	0.0135** (0.00679)
R2	0.8150	0.210	0.7753	0.318
N	4884	4884	2404	2404
<b>Natural Disasters Occurrence</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Geography and Nature</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Socioeconomic</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Coping Funds</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Institutional/Local Capacity</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes

**Inequality**

yes

yes

yes

yes

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Robust standard errors clustered at the municipal level in parentheses.

Note: All regressions are also controlled for state fixed effects and interaction of the treatment dummy with local declaratories when using random effects.

**Table 3. Effects of different natural disasters on social municipal indicators. All municipalities in sample**

	Human Development Index		Food Poverty (severe)		Capacities Poverty		Assets Poverty	
	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects
<b>Flood</b>	-0.00271** (0.00124)	-0.00269** (0.00123)	0.0354*** (0.00544)	0.0358*** (0.00538)	0.0295*** (0.00545)	0.0299*** (0.00539)	0.0188*** (0.00520)	0.0193*** (0.00512)
<b>Frost</b>	-0.00555*** (0.00204)	-0.00556*** (0.00202)	-0.00814 (0.00847)	-0.00815 (0.00839)	-0.00605 (0.00833)	-0.00608 (0.00824)	0.00108 (0.00763)	0.00100 (0.00753)
<b>Drought</b>	-0.0101*** (0.00195)	-0.0100*** (0.00193)	0.0434*** (0.00784)	0.0440*** (0.00774)	0.0390*** (0.00810)	0.0397*** (0.00798)	0.0266*** (0.00807)	0.0274*** (0.00790)
<b>Rains</b>	0.00641*** (0.00189)	0.00640*** (0.00187)	-0.000950 (0.00785)	-0.00116 (0.00777)	-0.00599 (0.00793)	-0.00625 (0.00785)	-0.0133* (0.00760)	-0.0137* (0.00749)
<b>Others</b>	-0.00558*** (0.00132)	-0.00557*** (0.00130)	0.0232*** (0.00576)	0.0234*** (0.00570)	0.0200*** (0.00572)	0.0202*** (0.00567)	0.00705 (0.00528)	0.00726 (0.00522)
<b>Adjusted R2</b>	0.8457	0.7604	0.8151	0.4814	0.8233	0.4357	0.8166	0.2173
<b>N</b>	4,836	4,836	4,884	4,884	4,884	4,884	4,884	4,884
<i>Natural Disasters Occurrence</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Geography and Nature</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Socioeconomic</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Coping Funds</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes



<b>Institutional/Local Capacity</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Inequality</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Robust standard errors clustered at the municipal level in parentheses

Note: All regressions are also controlled for state fixed effects and interaction of the treatment dummy with local declaratories when using random effects.

Note: *Overall* R-squared is reported when using random effects, meanwhile *within* R-squared is reported when using fixed effects.

**Table 4. Effects of different natural disasters on social municipal indicators restricted to municipalities without natural disaster in previous period**

	Human Development Index		Food Poverty (severe)		Capacities Poverty		Assets Poverty	
	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects
<b>Flood</b>	-0.00395 (0.00250)	-0.00350 (0.00247)	0.0459** (0.0112)	0.0462*** (0.0111)	0.0402*** (0.0106)	0.0399*** (0.0104)	0.0274*** (0.00864)	0.0260*** (0.00838)
<b>Frost</b>	0.00528 (0.00374)	0.00526 (0.00367)	-0.0747*** (0.0181)	-0.0749*** (0.0178)	-0.0615*** (0.0183)	-0.0617*** (0.0180)	-0.0233 (0.0156)	-0.0236 (0.0153)
<b>Drought</b>	-0.0142*** (0.00492)	-0.0143*** (0.00483)	0.0306 (0.0205)	0.0304 (0.0201)	0.0223 (0.0209)	0.0222 (0.0205)	-0.000326 (0.0185)	-0.000243 (0.0182)
<b>Rains</b>	0.00772* (0.00412)	0.00744* (0.00403)	-0.0262 (0.0225)	-0.0265 (0.0221)	-0.0283 (0.0203)	-0.0283 (0.0199)	-0.0271** (0.0127)	-0.0266** (0.0125)
<b>Others</b>	-0.00589** (0.00250)	-0.00546** (0.00246)	0.0342*** (0.0113)	0.0345*** (0.0111)	0.0339*** (0.0113)	0.0337*** (0.0110)	0.0241** (0.01000)	0.0227** (0.00970)
<b>Adjusted R2</b>	0.8080	0.7879	0.7889	0.5607	0.7915	0.5183	0.7771	0.3238
<b>N</b>	2,370	2,370	2,404	2,404	2,404	2,404	2,404	2,404
<b>Natural Disasters Occurrence</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

<b>Geography and Nature</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Socioeconomic</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Coping Funds</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Institutional/Local Capacity</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<b>Inequality</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Robust standard errors clustered at the municipal level in parentheses

Note: All regressions are also controlled for state fixed effects and interaction of the treatment dummy with local declaratories when using random effects.

Note: *Overall* R-squared is reported when using random effects, meanwhile *within* R-squared is reported when using fixed effects.

**Table 5. Effects of different natural disasters on social municipal indicators restricted to municipalities with natural disaster only**

	Human Development Index		Food Poverty (severe)		Capacities Poverty		Assets Poverty	
	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects	(1) Random Effects	(2) Fixed Effects
<b>Flood</b>	-0.000621 (0.00153)	-0.000614 (0.00151)	0.0326*** (0.00675)	0.0327*** (0.00664)	0.0278*** (0.00677)	0.0280*** (0.00665)	0.0193*** (0.00636)	0.0195*** (0.00624)
<b>Frost</b>	-0.00478** (0.00204)	-0.00479** (0.00200)	-0.00777 (0.00857)	-0.00791 (0.00844)	-0.00529 (0.00844)	-0.00546 (0.00831)	0.00202 (0.00787)	0.00180 (0.00772)
<b>Drought</b>	- 0.00908*** (0.00200)	- 0.00905*** (0.00197)	0.0425*** (0.00816)	0.0430*** (0.00802)	0.0386*** (0.00840)	0.0392*** (0.00824)	0.0271*** (0.00834)	0.0277*** (0.00814)
<b>Rains</b>	0.00721*** (0.00193)	0.00719*** (0.00190)	-0.00145 (0.00799)	-0.00176 (0.00787)	-0.00606 (0.00805)	-0.00643 (0.00792)	-0.0128* (0.00773)	-0.0133* (0.00757)

<b>Adjusted R2</b>	0.8717	0.7606	0.8299	0.4612	0.8359	0.4134	0.8154	0.1866
<b>N</b>	2,062	2,062	2,068	2,068	2,068	2,068	2,068	2,068
<i>Natural Disasters Occurrence</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Geography and Nature</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Socioeconomic</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Coping Funds</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Institutional/Local Capacity</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>Inequality</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Robust standard errors clustered at the municipal level in parentheses

Note: All regressions are also controlled for state fixed effects and interaction of the treatment dummy with local declaratories when using random effects.

Note: *Overall* R-squared is reported when using random effects, meanwhile *within* R-squared is reported when using fixed effects.

## **Appendix 1**

### **The DesInventar database**

DesInventar is an initiative of the Social Studies Network for Disaster Prevention in Latin America (DesInventar, 2011). It contains information for a set of countries such as Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Argentina. This system follows a methodology for recording information on the incidence, and sometimes the impact (losses, damage, or other effects caused by emergencies), of disaster on sub-national administrative units, such as municipalities in the case of Mexico. In this database, started recording in 1980, a disaster is defined as the combination of effects produced by an event on human lives, infrastructure or economy in a geographical unit, registering events as disasters only when there are deaths or missing individuals, loss value, routes affected, affected agricultural and livestock, and effects on housing, population, services, etc.; earthquakes in uninhabited areas are not recorded for example.

As in the case of the global disaster dataset EMDAT (collected by the Center for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters - CRED) that records bigger events at national level, DesInventar records disasters at municipal level with the criteria that the events (at least one): have at least a minimal impact on human lives (at least 10 deaths or 100 affected); the affected community cannot cope with the emergency and relies on external aid; declaration of state of emergence; social order is disrupted.

It has to be noted as limitation of the database that since DesInventar records the climatic events from the media, and public and private organizations, sometimes it is necessary to disaggregate the events geographically, given it is used to be aggregated by those agencies with political or financial purposes. When disaggregating, they can either assign all damages to one unit, or assign them to a lesser geographical resolution, or provide estimates in each unit. Another limitation is that they record the event with the damage, i.e. rains provoke a landslide that

kills some people, landslide is recorded and not rains as the primary event. Another limitation is the duration of the events, since there is no formal approach to include the span of time an event takes.

The module of DesInventar for Mexico contains information from 1980 to 2006 with a total of 17,177 disasters. In our case, we are only considering events from geological and climatic events, leaving aside other man-made disasters such as fires and chemical accidents. For presentational purposes, disasters are divided into five hazard categories: floods (with over 60% of the records) (22.1%), droughts (7.0%), frost (6.6%), rains (4.6%), and then other minor events under “other category” which includes: landslides, avalanches, eruptions, hailstorms, surge, snowstorm, earthquakes, electric storms, tornado, and strong winds. Basic statistics for these events are reported in table 1 in the manuscript.

## Appendix 2

**Table A1 Controls with treatment interaction for table 2 (random effects)**

Interacted controls	All municipalities in sample				Municipalities without previous disaster			
	Human Development Index	Food Poverty (severe)	Capacities Poverty	Assets Poverty	Human Development Index	Food Poverty (severe)	Capacities Poverty	Assets Poverty
Annual deforestation rate	-0.000127 (0.000108)	0.000658** (0.000322)	0.000560* (0.000316)	0.000177 (0.000283)	0.000462* (0.000259)	-0.000112 (0.000682)	-0.000214 (0.000650)	-0.000457 (0.000542)
Altitude *	-1.11e-06 (2.04e-06)	1.11e-05* (5.98e-06)	9.32e-06 (5.91e-06)	2.09e-06 (5.28e-06)	-5.88e-06 (3.89e-06)	1.85e-05* (1.04e-05)	1.70e-05* (1.01e-05)	1.00e-05 (8.20e-06)
Latitude *	-7.53e-08 (9.63e-08)	4.32e-07 (2.80e-07)	3.70e-07 (2.86e-07)	1.00e-07 (2.75e-07)	-1.99e-07 (2.13e-07)	1.14e-06** (5.75e-07)	1.11e-06** (5.42e-07)	6.90e-07 (4.34e-07)
Length *	-5.76e-08 (6.52e-08)	1.21e-07 (1.93e-07)	1.21e-07 (1.98e-07)	1.73e-07 (1.91e-07)	6.05e-07*** (2.06e-07)	-1.36e-06*** (5.04e-07)	-1.33e-06*** (5.03e-07)	-9.80e-07** (4.51e-07)

Coast	0.00916** (0.00360)	-0.0210* (0.0109)	-0.0201* (0.0110)	-0.0143 (0.0106)	0.0138 (0.00863)	-0.0350 (0.0229)	-0.0344 (0.0221)	-0.0302 (0.0193)
Arid surface	- 0.000482*** (0.000170)	0.000351 (0.000487)	0.000484 (0.000501)	0.000503 (0.000483)	-0.00206** (0.000953)	0.00627*** (0.00235)	0.00599*** (0.00230)	0.00423** (0.00201)
Semiarid surface	-6.55e-05 (0.000111)	9.81e-06 (0.000343)	2.69e-05 (0.000348)	6.57e-05 (0.000325)	-4.66e-05 (0.000270)	0.000736 (0.000794)	0.000671 (0.000766)	0.000467 (0.000650)
Minimum temperature	0.000234 (0.000296)	-0.00108 (0.000846)	-0.00102 (0.000846)	-0.000746 (0.000774)	0.00186*** (0.000666)	- (0.00170)	- (0.00165)	- (0.00145)
Maximum temperature	0.00250*** (0.000595)	-0.00363* (0.00198)	-0.00379* (0.00200)	-0.00342* (0.00182)	0.00601*** (0.00134)	-0.00747* (0.00386)	-0.00688* (0.00354)	-0.00504 (0.00312)
Minimum rain	-0.000343 (0.000209)	0.000883 (0.000614)	0.000703 (0.000619)	0.000178 (0.000585)	0.00134** (0.000618)	-0.00120 (0.00155)	-0.00132 (0.00154)	-0.00156 (0.00140)
Maximum rain	-0.000118* (6.23e-05)	0.000185 (0.000180)	0.000154 (0.000181)	2.39e-05 (0.000164)	-0.000118 (0.000142)	0.000410 (0.000404)	0.000337 (0.000394)	0.000126 (0.000329)
With FONDEN resources 2000-2005	-0.00294 (0.00228)	0.0226*** (0.00726)	0.0242*** (0.00728)	0.0212*** (0.00669)	-0.00274 (0.00403)	0.0217* (0.0119)	0.0239** (0.0118)	0.0223** (0.0102)
NGO for consultation or courses	-0.00783* (0.00441)	0.0112 (0.0111)	0.0104 (0.0113)	0.00428 (0.0111)	0.00127 (0.00638)	0.00653 (0.0177)	0.00869 (0.0174)	0.00471 (0.0150)
Seminar attendance	0.0116** (0.00468)	-0.0255** (0.0125)	-0.0231* (0.0128)	-0.00978 (0.0126)	0.00116 (0.00775)	-0.0210 (0.0203)	-0.0179 (0.0202)	-0.000615 (0.0183)
No NGO	0.00376 (0.00278)	-0.0144* (0.00786)	-0.0123 (0.00795)	-0.00493 (0.00748)	0.00391 (0.00495)	-0.0207 (0.0137)	-0.0155 (0.0133)	-0.00184 (0.0108)
Associated services	-0.00303 (0.00265)	0.0110 (0.00736)	0.00816 (0.00738)	0.000504 (0.00682)	-0.00115 (0.00478)	0.0109 (0.0126)	0.00626 (0.0122)	-0.00599 (0.0103)
Municipal regulations	-7.67e-05	-0.00216	-0.00461	-0.00849	0.00292	-0.0103	-0.00997	-0.00594

	(0.00245)	(0.00743)	(0.00760)	(0.00730)	(0.00609)	(0.0163)	(0.0160)	(0.0136)
Municipal development plan	0.00305	-0.0238***	-	-	0.000420	-0.000672	0.000667	0.00344
	(0.00243)	(0.00724)	(0.00719)	(0.00640)	(0.00426)	(0.0123)	(0.0120)	(0.0101)
Civil defence unit	0.00266	-0.00361	-0.00434	-0.00771	0.00137	-0.00265	-0.00392	-0.00612
	(0.00321)	(0.00947)	(0.00955)	(0.00900)	(0.00522)	(0.0142)	(0.0138)	(0.0121)
Civil defence program	3.76e-05	-2.93e-05	0.00190	0.00727	-0.00706	0.0144	0.0110	0.00628
	(0.00289)	(0.00874)	(0.00874)	(0.00816)	(0.00548)	(0.0149)	(0.0143)	(0.0120)
Natural contingency in 10 years	0.00853***	-0.00656	-0.00398	0.00168	0.00862*	-0.0135	-0.0132	-0.0120
	(0.00244)	(0.00718)	(0.00723)	(0.00674)	(0.00496)	(0.0134)	(0.0127)	(0.0102)
Hazard map	-0.000784	0.00259	0.00147	-0.00277	0.00987*	-0.00976	-0.00597	-0.00313
	(0.00255)	(0.00800)	(0.00800)	(0.00741)	(0.00515)	(0.0140)	(0.0134)	(0.0115)
Tax resources	0.0132	0.0356	0.0234	-0.00884	0.0225	0.0137	-0.00543	-0.0468
	(0.0146)	(0.0414)	(0.0423)	(0.0403)	(0.0256)	(0.0750)	(0.0739)	(0.0660)
Federal resources	0.00319	-0.00588	-0.00682	-0.00583	0.0187*	-0.0285	-0.0257	-0.0146
	(0.00641)	(0.0189)	(0.0191)	(0.0182)	(0.00972)	(0.0289)	(0.0279)	(0.0231)
Same political party at municipal and state level when hazard occur	-0.00557	0.0256***	0.0256***	0.0225**	0.0266***	-0.0486**	-0.0491**	-0.0431**
	(0.00346)	(0.00918)	(0.00990)	(0.0112)	(0.00817)	(0.0202)	(0.0198)	(0.0179)
Same political party at municipal and federal level when hazard occur	0.00626**	0.0167	0.00789	-0.0122	-0.0298**	0.0692*	0.0684*	0.0567*
	(0.00281)	(0.0105)	(0.0105)	(0.0105)	(0.0118)	(0.0354)	(0.0352)	(0.0310)
Population with social security	0.0548***	-0.0323	-0.0603*	-	0.0386**	-0.139***	-0.153***	-0.125**
	(0.0115)	(0.0309)	(0.0326)	(0.0332)	(0.0178)	(0.0530)	(0.0551)	(0.0514)
Population living in the same state 5 years before	0.0540	-0.334*	-0.308*	-0.195	0.0795	-0.385	-0.263	0.137

	(0.0613)	(0.180)	(0.182)	(0.163)	(0.126)	(0.371)	(0.369)	(0.343)
Indigenous population	-0.0298*	0.174***	0.150***	0.0962***	0.0207	0.0491	0.0356	0.0228
	(0.0170)	(0.0471)	(0.0439)	(0.0328)	(0.0233)	(0.0543)	(0.0506)	(0.0394)
Employed at primary sector	0.00914	-0.0301	-0.0492	-0.0980	0.0305	-0.0665	-0.0907	-0.109
	(0.0310)	(0.0792)	(0.0778)	(0.0658)	(0.0383)	(0.0938)	(0.0924)	(0.0787)
Employed at secondary sector	0.0468	-0.178	-0.178	-0.141	0.0279	-0.157	-0.191	-0.218
	(0.0399)	(0.114)	(0.115)	(0.109)	(0.0703)	(0.182)	(0.181)	(0.162)
Employed at tertiary sector	-0.115***	0.285***	0.314***	0.317***	-0.000401	0.0286	0.121	0.307
	(0.0367)	(0.107)	(0.108)	(0.102)	(0.0786)	(0.208)	(0.211)	(0.194)
Rural municipalities	0.000415	0.000104	0.00196	0.00533	9.35e-05	-0.0290	-0.0202	0.00491
	(0.00307)	(0.0101)	(0.0104)	(0.0107)	(0.00780)	(0.0219)	(0.0228)	(0.0232)
Gini coefficient 2000	0.0469*	-0.163**	-0.150**	-0.122**	0.0648**	-0.0832	-0.0910	-0.115
	(0.0240)	(0.0655)	(0.0665)	(0.0611)	(0.0301)	(0.0851)	(0.0853)	(0.0760)
Constant	0.979***	-0.176	-0.245	-0.175	0	0	0	0
	(0.0963)	(0.306)	(0.308)	(0.272)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)

### Appendix 3

#### Intensity effects of natural disasters

Another issue to consider is the intensity of the natural shocks affecting the areas. In this regard, some papers include as measure of intensity the number of affected population divide by the total population in the affected are (usually countries). For example, in Loayza et al (2009) when analysing the effect on growth in countries affected by different disasters, they include the number of affected divided by population in logs then normalized, with data from the EMDAT database. However such measure have a bias in the reporting of the affected population given the



sources and times when occurred the shock and coming from official sources. Desinventar reports the natural events where happened but it warns about using affected population and estimated damages, first because is not available at the same level, given reports of affected are not separated by municipality, and the official data usually comes from state or federal authorities and usually reporting one figure for all affected areas. Second, local authorities use to underestimate affected population when reporting to the media. Third, estimated damages are not for all shocks, and also there is not a methodology to estimate such figure, only reports from local newspapers if any. In this sense, Desinventar has same problems as the EMDAT data, or any other reporting magnitude of natural shocks but fuelled by the fact that depends on several more internal sources (local governments). As Sanghi (2010) mentions measuring damages in this context is prone to overestimation or underestimation, depending on the incentives (monetary, political, etc), thus such bias affect the estimation of the effect of natural shocks on other indicators.

With this database, we aggregated the affected population divided by the total population, we find that there is a high subreport in each type of disaster. For example, for those municipalities with drought reported, 93% do not have report of affected individuals. In the same manner, 71% of municipalities with rains do not report affected population, 54% of those with frozen, 51% of those with floods, and 58% of other disasters. Thus, the subreport in identified affected areas for those affected population is high.

Even though damages report may introduce bias to the estimates as mentioned above, in addition to increase the endogeneity problem, we report in the next table the same estimation than in Table 5, but using the log of affected population divided by total population. Following Loayza et al (2009), for those areas with no disasters in a specific category we impute a -16. However, also due to the underreport of damages in the sample, we have to impute several -16 in the cells.

**Table 3.1 Intensity measures and natural disasters**

Variables	(1) IDH	(2) Food poverty	(3) Capacities poverty	(4) Assets poverty
Ln(affected by drought/population)	9.37e-05 (0.000423)	-0.000289 (0.00126)	-0.000337 (0.00139)	-0.000419 (0.00173)
Ln(affected by rain/population)	-0.000196 (0.000297)	-0.000423 (0.00101)	-0.000211 (0.00103)	0.000549 (0.000958)
Ln (affected by frozen/population)	-0.000673 (0.000410)	0.00303** (0.00130)	0.00304** (0.00130)	0.00299** (0.00126)
Ln(affected by flood/ population)	0.000131 (0.000153)	-0.000933** (0.000450)	-0.000872* (0.000461)	-0.000364 (0.000456)
Ln(affected by other natural events/population)	4.71e-05 (0.000193)	0.00226*** (0.000648)	0.00230*** (0.000635)	0.00191*** (0.000561)
Constant	0.770*** (0.107)	-0.185 (0.337)	-0.160 (0.340)	0.132 (0.315)
N	2062	2068	2068	2068

Robust standard errors in parentheses \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

All regressions are using panel data and controlling for same variables as in Table 2

Results show no significant results for IDH in any shock. For poverty, there is a positive result on increasing all levels of poverty when using shocks categorized within other natural events, and also from frozen shocks. Instead there is a negative effect from floods on poverty, but only for food and capacities levels. These results are not comparable to those in Table 5, since there we use the occurrence of an average shock compared to an affected area by other categories.