

# Appendix

## A. Data and Methodology

### Data: Regional Household Survey Archive

To arrive at the internationally comparable assessment of poverty, this report uses primary unit record data from recent household surveys to construct a comparable indicator of living standards across all countries in the Region.

The comparable indicator of living standards created for this study is described in detail below. Based on the indicator, the study team calculated poverty and inequality data and a set of indicators presented in this appendix (B. Key Poverty Indicators, tables 1–10) and used throughout the book.

All data are taken from household-level surveys implemented in the Region's countries during 1997–2003. Survey names, years, and basic characteristics are shown in chart 1). The data of the surveys included in the analyses are nationally representative. To ensure representativeness, most countries, with a few exceptions (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo), rely on the most recent census of the population as a sampling frame and use random multistage sampling techniques. Some of the surveys, such as the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (RLMS) and Bosnia and Herzegovina's Living

Standards Measurement Study (LSMS) are implemented as panels designed to follow the same households over time.

Countries differ substantially in sample sizes used (as revealed by chart 1). Those that intend to collect regionally representative information have larger samples than countries that aim at representativeness by location types only (urban-rural). None of the surveys used relies on simple one-stage random samples, so everywhere sampling weights have to be used to arrive at the estimates based on surveys.

Survey data were available for 23 countries, although the data do not span the entire period of 1998–2003 in all countries. Those that do have reasonably comparable data over time spanning the entire period are grouped into cluster A on chart 1 and used as the main source for the dynamic analysis in this book. Overall, there are 10 countries for which data are available and comparable (see discussion of comparability in this appendix, “Comparable Consumption Aggregate”) over the entire period under review, 1998–2003.

Several countries are represented by a single survey (year) or by surveys that are not sufficiently comparable to assess trends in poverty over time: Albania, Azerbaijan, and Serbia and Montenegro. To widen the coverage of the study, the team also relied on data that cover a shorter period, but provide useful information with regard to poverty profile or coverage of nonincome dimensions of poverty (cluster B, chart 1). The countries not covered are Croatia, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Turkmenistan, and the UN Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) (cluster C, chart 1). Some of these are not covered based on the assessment of their household survey data as inaccurate: in addition to design flaws in the Czech Republic and Slovak Republic, the response rates to Household Budget Surveys deteriorated to the extent that their representativeness is questioned (EC 2004). Other countries (Croatia, Slovenia, Turkmenistan) make access to data extremely cumbersome and are not willing to provide access to the entire data sets—a precondition to construct a comparable welfare aggregate. Finally, for UNMIK, many auxiliary data necessary to carry out international comparisons (such as reliable price indexes, or PPP exchange rates) are not available, which preclude the use of data for comparison purposes.

Finally, three countries were used as benchmarks (Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam), and the surveys used are also listed in cluster D on chart 1. The choice of these countries was based on several factors. First, it was important to have a broad geographic coverage. Second, benchmark countries had to have comparable levels of living standards to the Region’s countries and some systemic features of the economies that resemble transition settings. Third, survey data had to

be easily available and include variables necessary to create consumption aggregates (see next section). The team of the World Bank *World Development Report 2005* helped to identify such data and kindly provided access to them. Turkey, being the only nontransition country in the Region, was an automatic choice; in fact, its geopolitical and economic situation is very similar to CEE countries. Vietnam, a country in East Asia transiting to a market economy from a planned system, was identified as a good comparator to the poorest countries in the Region. Colombia, with its large informal sector and dependence on natural resources, was a good match for the middle income CIS group.

The previous regional report on poverty, *Making Transition Work for Everyone* (World Bank 2000a), relied on a single survey data set for many countries and could produce an estimate of poverty over time for only three countries (Hungary, Poland, and Russia); it also had to use partial data, with full data sets closed to any users outside statistical offices. In some countries, there was no option but to rely on non-representative data (Albania, Azerbaijan), and data for some countries were missing (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro).

Since the end of the 1990s, many countries in the Region have moved to ongoing surveys that periodically (normally every month or quarter) collect representative data on income and nonincome dimensions of living standards. Because such data collection is often too costly, some countries rely on one-time comparable surveys conducted every three to five years. In both cases, data generated can be used to monitor poverty over time. In addition, countries in the Region started to use collected survey data better by providing open access to researchers trying to understand poverty and its causes and to assess public policies. Not only did the middle-income countries in the EU-8 (such as Hungary) achieve the greatest improvements in collecting data and providing open access but also some countries in SEE (such as Bosnia and Herzegovina and Romania), middle income CIS countries (Kazakhstan), and even low income CIS countries (Georgia and Moldova).

However, many countries continue to lag behind the leaders in both adequacy and openness of data, as reflected by the survey description provided on chart 1. Some countries are still struggling to start continuous data collection on living standards, or they change the survey design too often to make any comparisons over time (Albania, Azerbaijan, Serbia and Montenegro, Turkmenistan, and UNMIK). Some countries recently introduced new standards in data collection (following recommendations of the Statistical Office of the European Communities [Eurostat]), and the new surveys are not comparable

with the previously collected data (Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, and FYR Macedonia). There are countries in which household surveys of living standards suffer from extremely low response rates, to the point of making them not fully representative (the Slovak Republic). Unfortunately, most countries in the Region still do not provide open access to household survey data. They either impose many restrictions on data users and require significant access fees or simply treat household survey data as closed-access information that is not available outside statistical offices, even in the anonymized form.

Normally, survey data sponsored by international agencies are open-access information. Such data sets (in the chart, labeled “Open”) are simply downloadable through the Internet free of charge or with a minimum fee (after provision of sufficient information on the user). Of course, as with any data set in the public domain, all personal information that would allow identification of individual respondents is removed from such data sets. The Household Budget Survey (HBS) can also be open access and easily accessible to any individual or organization, either by a request that is reviewed by the staff of the statistical office and payment of service fees (in the chart, labeled “Limited”), or it can be restricted to a narrow set of users, sometimes exclusively to statistical offices. Some of the data sets included in the study are not freely available; the World Bank used these data with the permission of the countries’ authorities solely for the comparative poverty data analysis presented in this report (in the chart, labeled “Restricted”). None of the data sets used in this report will be disseminated to any user, given the confidentiality and rights restrictions on most of them.

Countries differ in types of household data available. In most countries, there are official household surveys that collect information on expenditures and incomes. Such detailed surveys of household budgets, with limited information on other aspects of well-being, are classified as Expenditure and Income (EI) Surveys (Household Budget Surveys, in a narrow sense). Nevertheless, such one-topic surveys also normally collect detailed labor market information alongside information on the characteristics of household members and household conditions. Other nonincome indicators are not normally included in such surveys. If they are included, and information on the health status of household members, their social participation, and access to education is also collected, these are classified as Integrated (IN) Surveys. Multi-topic design is a standard inherent feature of a different type of survey, designed and implemented as part of the Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS) of the World Bank (see [www.worldbank.org/lsms](http://www.worldbank.org/lsms) for details). Several countries in the Region undertook LSMS surveys

and rely on them for poverty monitoring (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Tajikistan), but the mainstream approach is clearly the use of the HBS integrated with additional modules to capture nonmonetary aspects of living standards.

The LSMS survey and the HBS rely on two different approaches and types of instrument to collect detailed expenditure and income information from households: the LSMS survey is a recall questionnaire asking a household to remember all expenditures over a certain period (usually the past quarter); the HBS is a diary of purchases and incomes that a household has to fill in daily over a certain period (usually two weeks). Sometimes these two types of instrument are combined within the same survey. It is clear that the nature of the data collected by each of the instruments will differ. Unfortunately, few studies are available that compare the relative strengths and weaknesses of both instruments to assess possible biases in each type of data (all of these studies are from outside the Region), so they are treated as comparable.

The recall data are normally collected by an integrated type of survey supported by the World Bank: the LSMS program, with some degree of standardization and common features of data collection. LSMS surveys are particularly prevalent in the developing countries. The HBS programs across transition countries have benefited from large flows of international technical assistance (Eurostat and the World Bank being particularly active), also with a useful unification and standardization.

Notwithstanding the progress achieved in data quality and accessibility, chart 1 documents significant gaps. First, improvements to data quality and availability are very recent, and for many countries in the Region, reliable data on poverty changes could be obtained for only a few recent years. The efforts in collecting data should be maintained to provide policy makers with data on the evolution of poverty and inequality in the future. The survey coverage and response rates have universally fallen in all countries, and there is a need to strengthen the technical capacity of statistical offices to curb this trend and deal with it appropriately.

Second, this report documents wide gaps in data collection on non-income dimensions of poverty: there are practically no attempts to gauge trends in the quality of health, education, and infrastructure services, and even indicators of access are not consistently collected. Many countries rely on one-topic surveys, and integrated survey design is not yet mainstreamed. Moreover, there is a worrying tendency in some countries to move away from multitopic design to a narrowly focused Expenditure and Income Survey. Given the chang-

ing nature of poverty with the increasing role of nonincome components, this gap is the most worrying with regard to collecting relevant and useful data.

Finally, not all countries have disseminated their data and opened data sets to researchers, undermining the effective use of public funds spent on data collection and monitoring. These areas—keeping up with period surveys providing comparable data, collecting information on nonincome dimensions, and opening up access to survey data—are priorities for action to ensure adequate information support for poverty reduction efforts.

### **Comparable Consumption Aggregate**

To examine poverty and inequality, one needs a measure of material well-being. Ideally, this measure should correspond as closely as possible to the way a person experiences his or her standard of living. It is natural to think that a person's standard of living, or material well-being, is a function of all goods and services consumed by that person.

But how can one compare different individuals consuming different quantities of various goods? Economic theory allows one to rank levels of well-being using the cost (monetary value) of the consumption bundle consumed in a given period. In theory, any welfare measure should include all of the factors (including health, leisure, social capital, and other desiderata) that contribute to welfare. In practice, however, because of measurement and valuation difficulties, the focus in microdata analysis is on only material well-being, using information on consumption of goods and services by a household. Even such "simple" measures are, in practice, quite complicated to capture well, and there is debate as to whether income or consumption is the preferable measure (see Deaton and Zaidi 2002).

*Income* is often considered to be the preferred measure because it is an indicator of the "potential" to enhance welfare (including nonmaterial aspects such as leisure). Income data are used by Eurostat to compile EU statistics on poverty and social inclusion, using the integrated survey model that is intended to provide comparable data within the EU: the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) and the European Community Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC).

However, measuring income suffers from several defects, both in theory and in practice. First, income can be highly volatile, whereas consumption can be, and is, more readily smoothed by individuals. This smoothing makes consumption a better indicator of welfare than income, because it more accurately represents the welfare level of an

## CHART 1

## Data Sources

Country	Survey Name	Year	Access Policy	Type	Sample
<b>A. Countries with Extended Time Series of Comparable Household Data</b>					
Armenia	Integrated Living Conditions Survey	2003	Limited	IN	4,600 hh
	Integrated Living Conditions Survey	2001	Limited	IN	4,037 hh
	LSMS-Integrated Survey	1998/99	Limited	IN	3,600 hh
Belarus	Household Income and Expenditure Survey	1998–2002	Restricted	EI	4,882 hh
Georgia	Integrated Survey of Georgian Households	2000–2003	Open	IN	2,800 hh
	Survey of Georgian Households	1996–1999	Open	EI	2,800 hh
Hungary	Household Budget Survey	1998–2002	Open	EI	10,200 hh
Lithuania	Household Budget Survey	1998–3	Limited	EI	7,111 hh
Moldova	Household Budget Survey	2003	Open	IN	4,592 hh
	Household Budget Survey	1998–2002	Open	IN	6,159 hh
Poland	Household Budget Survey	1998–2002	Limited	EI	31,708 hh
Romania	Family Budget Survey	1998–2003	Open	IN	32,000 hh
Russian Fed.	Household Budget Survey	1997–2002	Restricted	EI	49,000 hh
	RLMS (9-11 rounds)	2002, 01, 1998	Open	IN	3-4,000 hh
Tajikistan	Living Standards Survey (LSMS)	2003	Open	IN	4,160 hh
	Living Standards Survey (LSMS)	1999	Open	IN	2,000 hh
<b>B. Countries with Limited Time Series</b>					
Albania	Living Standards Survey (LSMS)	2002	Open	IN	3,600 hh
Azerbaijan	Household Budget Survey	2002–3	Restricted	EI	8,157 hh
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Living in BiH Panel	2004	Open	IN	3,000 hh
	BiH Living Standards Survey	2001	Open	IN	5,402 hh
	Household Budget Survey	2003	Limited	IN	3,000 hh
Bulgaria	Integrated Household Survey	2001	Limited	IN	2,633 hh
	Living Standards Survey (LSMS)	1995, 1997	Open	IN	2,322 hh
	Household Budget Survey	2000–3	Limited	EI	4,600 hh
Estonia	Household Budget Survey	2001–2003	Limited	EI	12,000 hh
Kyrgyz Rep.	Household Budget Survey	2001–3	Limited	IN	2,857 hh
	Household Budget Survey	2000	Limited	IN	1,894 hh
Latvia	Household Budget Survey	2002–3	Limited	EI	3,600 hh
Macedonia, FYR	Household Budget Survey	2002–3	Restricted	EI	4,100 hh
	Household Budget Survey	1996–2000	Restricted	EI	1,025 hh
Serbia & Montenegro	Serbia Living Standards Survey	2002–3	Limited	IN	6,400 hh
Ukraine	Household Budget Survey	2002–3	Restricted	EI	9,646 hh
Uzbekistan	Household Budget Survey	2001–3	Restricted	EI	9,600 hh
<b>C. Countries with Outdated or Limited Availability (Not Used in this Report)</b>					
Croatia	Household Budget Survey	On going	Restricted	EI	3,123 hh
Czech Rep.	Household Budget Survey	On going	Restricted	EI	3,650 hh
Slovak Rep.	Household Budget Survey	On going	No Access	EI	1,640–4,700 hh
Slovenia	Household Budget Survey	On going	No access	EI	2,577 hh
Turkmenistan	Living Standards Measurement Study	1998	Open	IN	2,099hh
UNM Kosovo	Household Budget Survey Kosovo	2003	Restricted	EI	2,800 hh
	Living Standards Survey (LSMS)	2000	Open	IN	2,880 hh
<b>D. Benchmark Countries</b>					
Colombia	National Survey of Living Standards	2003	Open	IN	23,000 hh
Turkey	Household Income and Consumption				
	Expenditure Survey	2002	Restricted	EI	9,555 hh
Vietnam	Vietnam Living Standards Survey	1997/98	Open	IN	6,000 hh

Note: Types of survey: EI- Expenditure and Income survey; IN- integrated surveys, Access Policy: Open – data are downloadable for free or limited fee from the statistical office with minimum restraints; Limited – policy provides access to data or sets of data to researchers or organizations meeting certain criteria; Restricted- data were made available only to the World Bank/selected agencies on exceptional basis; No access – no access to data from outside statistical office.

individual at any given time. In transition economies, people are paid very irregularly, with several months of wage arrears being common. In this context, relatively steady consumption-based welfare measures give a more accurate picture than often erratic income-based measures.

Second, regardless of the measure, it is essential that it be comprehensive, that no aspect of income or consumption be omitted. Otherwise, erroneous conclusions may be drawn about the numbers and characteristics of the poor. If, for example, the value of home-produced food were omitted from an income aggregate (total income measure), then rural populations would look much poorer than they actually are. Or if a consumption aggregate is constructed using only monetary expenditures, those who receive in-kind benefits from employment would look poorer than they actually are.

Measurement problems are more severe in transition countries for income than for consumption. Income underreporting is common for many reasons, including sometimes because survey respondents are not willing to fully disclose illegal or semilegal income sources. Experience in many countries showed that households were not willing to provide information on unregistered businesses and informal sector activities. Repeatedly, practical experience suggests that the quality of consumption-based data obtained from households is better than the quality of income-based data. At the top end of the income distribution, households tend to underreport their income, reflecting a lack of faith in the confidentiality of the survey, concerns about the tax authority, complexity of earnings that would lengthen an interview, and the like. At the other end of the income distribution, the problem is less one of willingness to provide accurate data and more one of inability to do so. Households engaged in informal activities or with household businesses of a subsistence nature often cannot separate out what is "household" income and what is "business income," thus undermining the reliability of the data collected.

This specificity of countries in the Region with regard to quality of income data collected through the regular surveys is recognized by Eurostat and by the countries themselves, which continue to use consumption expenditure to monitor poverty. It also raises an important question about whether the EU-SILC will provide credible and comparable data on the context of poverty in transition economies for the new EU member states.

In summary, given the difficulties of defining a total welfare measure, the problems noted above with income-based measurement, and the practices of countries in the Region to measure poverty, this report relies on measuring welfare here with consumption.

*Consumption* is being used as a measure of well-being in most poverty assessments undertaken in the Region over the past five years (14 countries covered) and is accepted as the main base to monitor poverty officially in a number of countries (for example, in Armenia, Bulgaria, the Kyrgyz Republic, and FYR Macedonia).

*Making Transition Work for Everyone*, the previous regional report on poverty and inequality (World Bank 2000a), relied on any welfare indicator (for example, income where consumption was not available) supplied with the data to carry out the analysis. This study follows a different approach: it re-creates consumption aggregates from unit record data, using the same set of rules and definitions (see appendix, A. Data and Methodology, chart 2). Why was it deemed necessary?

There are significant differences in the details of how aggregates of consumption expenditures are constructed in different countries. The list of items included in consumption expenditures differs across countries (for example, inclusion or exclusion of purchases of durables). The procedure for imputing the value of goods and services consumed in-kind (housing, flow of services from durables, or own food production) differs a great deal. The treatment of outliers is also strikingly different. Finally, different versions of price indexes to correct for regional and intertemporal prices are applied.

All of these differences in procedures to construct consumption aggregates imply that some part of observed differences in outcomes could be attributed to differences in procedure and that only to some extent do they reflect real differences. Of course, data comparability depends not only on consistency of processing the data but also on underlying data quality, which may differ. Clearly this aspect was beyond the control of the team, but to the extent that it was possible to set up the data in the most comparable way, it is reflecting a standard approach to international comparative studies. For example, the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), which relies on income survey data to carry out social welfare comparisons between OECD countries, relies on a set of strictly and uniformly defined rules to construct an income aggregate.

In relying on uniformly defined consumption of goods and services by a household as the measure of living standards, there were a number of conceptual and practical issues that needed to be addressed.

First, unlike food, consumer durables and housing are consumed over a long time. It is customary, therefore, to include the imputed value of the consumption flow associated with the possession of consumer durables (including housing), but exclude the expenditure on

## CHART 2

## Structure of Consumption Aggregate Constructed, Percentage

COICOP Divisions	Included components, structure						
	Food, beverages, tobacco I, II	Clothing III	Utilities (w/o rent) IV	Furnishings <sup>a</sup> V	Transport and communication <sup>a</sup> VII,VIII	Education IX	
Albania 2002	61.7	4.5	10.8	4.3	7.3	1.6	
Armenia 2003	72.3	5.5	6.2	2.3	4.1	5.1	
Azerbaijan 2003	64.3	7.6	6.0	3.1	6.8	1.0	
Belarus 2002	68.1	7.6	6.0	2.8	6.1	1.3	
Bulgaria 2002	58.7	3.5	18.3	1.1	7.3	4.7	
Georgia 2003	67.7	5.5	5.7	2.7	10.7	1.9	
Estonia 2003	42.2	7.4	16.0	3.1	12.0	1.8	
Hungary 2002	38.7	7.0	16.2	6.7	15.1	1.6	
Kazakhstan 2003	60.5	8.5	10.2	3.5	6.9	2.0	
Kyrgyz Rep. 2003	65.0	11.9	8.2	0.5	6.1	1.6	
Latvia 2003	41.0	8.5	13.5	2.8	16.0	1.4	
Lithuania 2003	44.5	10.3	14.9	2.8	15.6	1.1	
Macedonia, FYR 2003	54.2	8.9	12.0	3.6	11.6	0.3	
Moldova 2003	66.4	9.0	12.4	2.5	3.5	0.8	
Poland 2002	39.8	6.4	19.7	3.3	13.5	1.5	
Romania 2003	57.8	6.4	15.6	2.2	10.1	1.0	
Russian Fed. 2002	55.8	13.7	8.0	2.3	6.9	1.1	
Serbia 2002	60.8	5.9	13.0	3.7	8.1	1.2	
Tajikistan 2003	71.2	5.4	6.4	3.3	4.8	4.1	
Ukraine 2003	72.2	6.0	9.9	1.0	4.5	1.3	
Uzbekistan 2003	72.3	6.8	1.6	2.6	9.6	0.3	
Colombia 2002	41.1	6.9	8.5	4.6	14.7	6.3	
Turkey 2002	38.8	7.3	14.2	3.8	12.9	1.7	
Vietnam 1998	56.0	6.3	3.4	5.7	3.8	5.5	

Note: a = excluding durables; b = at 2000 PPP, top and bottom coded; c = ratio to total consumption aggregate; — = not available.

the purchase of these goods. However, for the Region, data availability limits the application of this approach to all countries. The authors did not, therefore, include estimates of flow of services of durables, nor have they added in durable purchases or rents. Catastrophic health expenditures were excluded from the estimate of current consumption on similar grounds.

Second, when consumption is used as a measure of well-being, higher consumption should indicate a higher level of well-being. For most consumption items, this correspondence is reasonable; however, for some categories such as health expenditures, this correspondence is questionable. As a result, health expenditures were not included as a part of consumption (Deaton and Zaidi 2002).

Third, given the significance of spatial differences, the authors adjusted for spatial price differences, employing survey-data-based Paasche price indexes using the same set of information in all coun-

Included components, structure					Excluded components, ratios		
	Hotels & restaurants XI	Recreation and other <sup>a</sup> X, XII	All components	Total consumption, \$ per capita <sup>b</sup>	Health <sup>c</sup> VI	Rent <sup>c</sup>	Durables <sup>c</sup>
	2.9	6.8	100	1,388.00	7.7	0.6	—
	1.2	3.2	100	913.72	11.5	—	0.8
	5.2	6.0	100	1,429.84	3.5	0.5	7.5
	1.5	6.6	100	2,704.13	2.3	—	1.7
	0.0	6.4	100	2,248.00	3.1	0.7	0.6
	1.7	4.0	100	972.89	5.7	0.3	1.3
	3.5	14.0	100	2,752.61	4.1	1.2	7.3
	3.1	11.6	100	2,890.00	4.4	0.9	8.1
	0.7	7.7	100	1,476.00	2.4	0.2	3.6
	1.0	5.6	100	708.00	1.6	0.5	2.6
	5.7	11.1	100	3,401.00	3.8	0.9	8.1
	2.4	8.4	100	2,762.00	4.7	0.0	10.0
	3.3	6.1	100	3,171.00	3.2	0.1	4.1
	0.8	4.6	100	1,045.81	4.8	1.0	4.4
	2.0	13.8	100	2,611.00	5.5	4.4	6.1
	1.5	5.4	100	1,624.00	3.0	0.3	1.6
	2.5	9.6	100	2,179.00	2.4	0.8	11.0
	1.2	6.1	100	1,992.98	8.0	1.0	1.6
	0.6	4.3	100	670.00	5.8	0.2	—
	1.6	3.5	100	2,496.30	2.8	0.4	2.5
	3.3	3.5	100	1,042.00	3.0	—	0.6
	4.6	13.3	100	4,398.00	2.9	5.9	4.0
	3.0	18.3	100	1,816.00	2.8	3.8	9.1
	5.9	13.4	100	1,078.00	18.0	0.2	18.8

tries (see Deaton and Zaidi [2002] for a detailed discussion; also see Price Deflators section below).

Fourth, households in the Region cope with poverty by relying on an array of nonmarket strategies, including producing their own food and engaging in reciprocal exchange with other households and institutions. A consistent approach was used in assigning a *monetary value* to these components of consumption. Median local prices were relied on to impute the value of in-kind food consumption from own agricultural activities, and households' own estimations of the value of gifts and transfers in-kind for food and nonfood items were used.

Fifth, the same procedure, which conforms to methods used in other international household survey data depositories (such as the Luxembourg Income Study), was used to clean the data of outliers across all data sets. The data are "bottom-coded" at 1 per cent of per capita mean real consumption and "top-coded" at 10 times the median

of household consumption, following a similar approach to income survey data proposed by Gottschalk and Smeeding (1997, 661). This procedure limits the effect of extreme values at either end of the distribution. The final data set excludes all records with zero consumption. This decision is consistent with Atkinson and Micklewright (1995) and with the method used and recommended by the LIS Key Figures reported on the LIS Web site (<http://www.lisproject.org/>).

Because the authors have followed a consistent approach across all data sets, they are reasonably confident that differences across countries in the final consumption measure are due to differences in the primary data and are not due to the method of aggregation. The basic descriptive statistics for all countries covered (latest available year) are presented in chart 2.

The constructed consumption aggregate produces a ranking that fits closely with the macroeconomic data (see appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 1 for GDP per capita data). Richer countries tend to have lower food shares. The excluded rent, being a small component, makes little effect on the ranking of households (note that utilities included in the consumption are large, reflecting the climatic and infrastructure features of the Region). Finally, food share behaves in a standard fashion across deciles of the distribution, falling with higher welfare. (Full details on consumption aggregates' components are provided on the dedicated Web site: <http://www.worldbank.org/eca/>.)

All these features show the validity of the approach chosen to construct a measure of living standards. Some countries stand out somewhat, and the comparability may not be fully taken for granted. For example, Ukraine has a food share comparable to the poorest countries in the Region, yet its consumption per capita measured at PPP puts the country solidly in the middle-income range. Vietnam, on the other hand, has a rather low food share, which would imply a higher living standard than suggested by other data. However, these peculiarities, while important, are not in themselves undermining the comparability of consumption *aggregates*.

There are also some persistent differences between countries in the consumption aggregate as measured by different types of survey; for example, education and health expenditures seem to have much higher shares and ratios in the LSMS surveys than in the HBS. Given that the information on these types of expenditure is collected in LSMS surveys in a contextual section (that is, in a module on the use of education services) and with much longer recall periods than in the HBS, it is not a surprising outcome. The ongoing research project conducted by the LSMS group intends to answer the question about the effect of different designs of data collection instruments on the welfare indicators.

The constructed estimate of consumption has several shortcomings that reflect some persistent data problems in the Region. Over time, there has been a considerable deterioration in response rates in many countries. Countries deal with this problem in different ways, which may have (as yet unknown) implications for survey-based poverty and inequality measures. There are other issues (reliability of diaries versus recall estimates and so forth) that are behind the research and are less evident, but affect the quality of data.

This is the first time to the authors' knowledge that comparable consumption aggregates have been constructed for countries in the Region.

### **Poverty Lines and Purchasing Power Parity**

This report uses an *absolute* concept of poverty, which is consistent with a large body of literature from both outside and within the World Bank, in which poverty is seen as the inability to meet basic material needs. Although the notion of basic needs differs across countries, it can be reasonably well defined as the current cost of the subsistence consumption basket. In practically all countries in the Region, one finds groups of the population unable to meet such basic needs. This group, and the group who are "nearby" in income terms, are the focus of this book.

The alternative measure of deprivation—*relative* poverty—has also been used in the literature. It is also a mainstay of the official poverty and social exclusion statistics used by the European Commission to monitor the situation in the EU member states (see Atkinson, Marlier, and Nolan 2004). However, the difficulties that it creates for monitoring differences across countries and changes over time within countries, combined with the still relatively fragile economic situation in many countries of the Region, make the authors favor the absolute poverty approach. The noncomparability of poverty lines based on the relative concept is also admitted by the EC and Eurostat (Dennis and Guio 2003).

An absolute poverty line, as the name implies, attempts to establish the value of consumption that a person needs to stay out of poverty, regardless of time and place. Clearly there are difficulties with doing this. The first widely accepted global poverty estimates, produced by the World Bank's *World Development Report 1990*, chose a poverty line measured in 1985 purchasing power parity (PPP). Chen and Ravallion (2001) have since updated these numbers, using an expanded database of household surveys based on 1993 PPP exchange rates for consumption.

This report uses the most recent PPP numbers from 2000, as reported in OECD (2003). The report uses data from most countries in the Region

and provides PPP exchange rates between national currencies and the euro. The report also provides the PPP conversion factor from the euro to U.S. dollars of 2000. Thus, these data can be used to convert national currencies to U.S. dollars of 2000, based on their PPP for that year. To make it comparable and relevant for global poverty monitoring, the 2000 U.S. dollars are then converted to the 1993 ones, using the U.S. consumer price inflation index. The final set of factors then represents the amount of national currency needed to buy a bundle of consumer goods that one dollar in 1993 would have bought. To get current value for the survey years, national inflation rates (CPI) are used to inflate (deflate) these 2000 exchange rates.

Some countries excluded from OECD (2003) (such as Bosnia and Herzegovina) were estimated based on the PPP from neighboring countries and exchange rates. PPP data for some came from EBRD (Sanfey and others 2004), and data for Albania have been estimated based on the 1996 PPP set.

More recent data on PPP are more relevant for the transition economies of the Region because they reflect contemporary (in many cases, liberalized) prices, as opposed to the administered prices of the past rounds of international price comparison surveys. Using 2000 PPPs also provides more plausible estimates of absolute poverty (see chapter 1, annex 1 for a detailed discussion). For example, it is highly implausible that poverty in Uzbekistan is negligible (which is the impression that one gets using the 1993 and 1996 PPPs). Errors can also go the other way (that is, overstate poverty), as appears to be the case when the 1993 PPP is used for Georgia. In addition to issues with relative prices, Georgia experienced one of the worst hyperinflations in its history in 1993, which would have made measurement of prices problematic.

On one hand, the total poverty headcount for the Region does not change much whether one uses 1993 PPP or 2000 PPP; however, individual country assessments are affected. On the other hand, 1996 PPP, with few exceptions—Bulgaria, Estonia, and Lithuania—produces a lower poverty count than 2000 PPP.

The use of 2000 PPP has additional drawbacks. The OECD (2003) reported both consumption and GDP PPP euro exchange rates, but conversion from euros to dollars were provided only for GDP numbers. The choice was made to use GDP 2000 PPP figures (which are also more easily available for countries outside the Region) as a baseline. The full set of the PPP exchange rate estimates used for this study is provided on the dedicated Web site: <http://www.worldbank.org/eca/>.

There is some arbitrariness inherent in setting the level of poverty lines. The absolute poverty line attempts to gauge a standard in a way that is comparable across time and space (Ravallion 1994). The World

Bank often uses \$1 a day for cross-country comparisons, which (in 1985 PPPs) was chosen around 1990 because it was the most typical poverty line among the low-income countries (later updated to \$1.075 a day, using 1993 PPPs). None of the Region's countries was considered when coming up with this estimate. This \$1-a-day poverty line has since come to be regarded as providing the absolute minimum standard of living.

Much has changed since 1990, particularly in the Region. Comparing national poverty lines for a group comprising countries of the Region, outside the Region, and in the EU, one sees that, as elsewhere in the world, there is a close correlation in the Region between the average standard of living and the national minimum needs definition (see box 1.1 for a detailed discussion). However, no country in the Region has a poverty line close to \$1 a day. On the contrary, the lowest poverty lines cluster around the \$2 mark. (See appendix B, table 2.)

The study therefore uses \$2 a day (or, more accurately, \$2.15, which is exactly double \$1.075) as an absolute poverty line for the purposes of this report. The study also uses a higher poverty line (\$4.30 a day) as a proximate vulnerability threshold to identify households that are not suffering absolute material deprivation, but are vulnerable to poverty. Although it seems somewhat arbitrary, it does bear some relation to empirically observed vulnerability to poverty. Analysis of panel data from the Region suggests that households with per capita consumption at least twice the poverty line face less than a 50 percent chance of becoming poor in the foreseeable future (World Bank 2002).

To provide data comparable to other regions and test for robustness of findings based on a single estimated PPP, the study also calculated a full set of poverty indexes (reported in appendix B, Key Poverty Indicators, table 2). For the 1993 and 1996 PPP revisions, they are provided for any interested reader on <http://www.worldbank.org/eca/>. There one can also find estimated poverty rates for the Region and benchmark countries with \$1-a-day international poverty lines not reported in this book.

## **Price Deflators**

In the cases in which data were collected over a long period of time, it was also necessary to adjust for changes in prices over time. Quarterly CPI (IMF) indexes were used to compute real values.

This measure ignores the differential impact of price increases on the poor and nonpoor. No price indexes for low-income groups are routinely available in the Region that would allow this study to address this issue.

Regional price differences can cause the same bundle of goods to be more expensive in one region than in another. However, the difference in expenditure caused by these regional price differences does not reflect differences in material well-being. Hence, these regional price differences need to be corrected.

As discussed in Deaton and Zaidi (2002), the Paasche price index offers a most reliable way to measure spatial price differences. Note that this index involves not only the prices faced by a household in relation to the reference prices but also its expenditure pattern, something that is not true of a Laspeyres index. The distinction is an important one: to convert total expenditure into the welfare index, the price index must be tailored to the household's own demand pattern, a demand pattern that varies with the household's income, demographic composition, location, and other characteristics. The reference prices are the median of the prices observed from all households. Based on these deflators estimated for each household, an indicator of regional price levels is calculated, which is then aggregated (using the median) to the regional level in each country.

The resulting indexes usually range within 0.9–1.1 of the national price level. Because nonfood prices are usually not available for the Region's countries from statistical offices and unit values for nonfood are normally not collected by household surveys, the spatial price deflator is based entirely on differences in food prices. This clearly is an issue but given data limitations, nothing can be done to deal with it.

### **Equivalence Scales**

Consumption data from household surveys are collected at the level of the household rather than of the individual; however, to determine the welfare levels of people, total household consumption must be divided among household members. Consumption cannot, however, be explicitly assigned to individual household members using the data. Instead, an adjustment based on some allocation rule must be imposed to attribute their share of a household's resources to individuals within the household.

One such allocation rule is simply to divide total household consumption by the number of household members. This yields per capita consumption. This report relies on per capita measure of consumption, and, as discussed in Deaton and Zaidi (2002), it is a reasonable choice. This is the most commonly applied method, and it implies that all family members receive an equal share of household resources. For some findings that are sensitive to the equivalence-of-

scale assumptions (especially demographic profiles), the robustness checks have been carried out, and the results reported in the study.

## Poverty Indexes

The sections that follow describe a set of poverty indicators to assess the extent of the deprivation of individuals in the income dimension.

### *Measuring Poverty (appendix B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 2)*

The simplest and most commonly used measure of poverty is the headcount index, which is given by the fraction of individuals with equivalent consumption below the poverty line (Foster, Greer, and Thorbecke 1984).<sup>1</sup> This measure, however, does not show whether the poor are only slightly below the poverty line or whether their consumption falls substantially short of the poverty line. The headcount measure also does not reveal whether all the poor are about equally poor or whether some are very poor and others just below the poverty line.

To examine these three dimensions of poverty—headcount, shortfall, and inequality among the poor—an FGT class of poverty measures is used. This class is described by the following equation:

$$P(\alpha) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \max \left( \frac{z - c_i}{z}, 0 \right) \right]^\alpha$$

where  $\alpha$  is parameter (explained below),  $z$  is the poverty line,  $c_i$  is consumption of individual  $i$ , and  $n$  is the total number of individuals.

If one sets  $\alpha$  equal to 0,  $P(0)$ , or the *poverty headcount index*, is obtained.  $P(0)$  simply measures the fraction of individuals below the poverty line.

If one sets  $\alpha$  equal to 1,  $P(1)$ , or the *poverty deficit*, is obtained. The poverty deficit is a poverty measure that takes into account how far the poor, on average, are below the poverty line. One can show the following equation:

$$P(1) = P(0) * (\text{Average Deficit})$$

in which the average deficit is the amount, measured as a percentage of the poverty line, by which the consumption of the poor on average fall short of the poverty line.

Finally, if one sets  $\alpha$  equal to 2,  $P(2)$ , sometimes also called the *severity of poverty* or *FGT(2)*, is obtained. This poverty measure also

takes into account whether some of the poor are deeper into poverty than others.

In this presentation of the poverty results in the appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 2, the authors rely on the headcount index, P(1), and P(2) indexes.

***Measuring Inequality (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 2)***

Because inequality has many aspects, there are many ways to measure it. This report relies mainly on two types of inequality measure: quintile shares and Gini coefficients.

Quintile shares are straightforward indicators of inequality that are easy to interpret because they depict the share of total consumption that goes to each of the 20 percent groups of equal size ranked by per capita consumption. The report uses the share of the bottom 20 percent in the total consumption. Quintiles are used to construct tables on nonincome dimensions to highlight socioeconomic differences by income groups.

Quintile shares do not reflect what happens in other parts of the distribution. To address this shortcoming, the Gini coefficient is also used. It is given by the following equation:

$$G = \frac{2}{\mu n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( r_i - \frac{n+1}{2} \right) c_i,$$

in which there are  $n$  individuals indexed by  $i$ , their consumption per capita is given by  $c_i$ , and mean consumption is denoted by  $\mu$  and in which  $r_i$  is household's  $i$  rank in the consumption ranking (that is, for the household with lowest consumption,  $r_i$  equals 1, while for the household with the highest consumption,  $r_i$  equals  $n$ ). The Gini coefficient is bounded between 0 and 1, with 0 indicating absolute equality and 1 indicating absolute inequality. The Gini coefficient is especially sensitive to changes in inequality in the middle of the consumption distribution.

**Poverty Profiles Characteristics**

Identifying the key characteristics of the poor is an important first step in understanding causes of poverty. Because poverty in the Region is a multifaceted phenomenon, the multiple poverty profiles show simple correlations between household and individual characteristics and poverty and the contribution of each group to total poverty (structure of poverty).

***Regional Characteristics (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 3)***

All surveys used in the analysis are representative by urban-rural location or by the size of the population center, because these normally form the strata for survey samples. In several countries, surveys are also conducted to produce representative data by regions. Capital cities are often distinguished as a “region.” In countries where samples are representative by region (note that definition of a *statistical* region differs from that of an *administrative* one), poverty statistics could also be computed by these regions. Given the importance of spatial dimensions of poverty as produced in this report, poverty indexes are reported for both poverty line (\$2.15 at 2000 PPP) and vulnerability to poverty line (\$4.30 at 2000 PPP) on panels A and B. To give a sense of the variation of poverty across regions and the concentration of poverty in the poorest regions, maximum and minimum poverty rates and contribution to national poverty are presented for countries where data allow this breakdown. Names of the poorest and richest regions are given for reference.

***Demographic Dimension of Poverty (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 4)***

The table reports both the poverty rates and contributions to the national poverty by age groups, gender, and number of children in a family. Age groups are defined based on the common age brackets and use the age of respondents at the time of the survey.

***Education Dimension of Poverty (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 5)***

To make sure that those in the compulsory education process are not influencing the distribution (because computation of completed level may be problematic for them), the table uses only individuals above 15 years old. It classifies the detailed educational categories that differ across countries into a set of standard classifications (a simplified version of the International Standard Classification of Education [ISCED] 1997) proposed by Sullivan and Smeeding (1997). It distinguishes five levels of education: persons without education or with incomplete primary education, those with completed primary only, those with general secondary, those with specialized (vocational or technical) secondary, and those with university education.

***The Labor Market Profile of Poverty (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 6)***

To construct labor market indicators, the labor section of the house-

hold surveys are used. Sometimes they are detailed enough to build employment and unemployment categories, following the ILO definitions. In other cases, they rely entirely on respondents' self-identification. Employment is normally defined in Household Expenditure and Income Surveys in a very inclusive way: all types of gainful activity over the reference period (usually a month, but sometimes even a year) are considered as employment, however short that work period was. The table is built for all individuals above 15 years old. In addition, those above 65 years old are considered outside the working age and reported as "retired." Classification into self-employment or wage (salaried) employment is based on the type of job in the primary occupation of a household member. All unpaid family workers reporting work for a family farm or business are classified as "self-employed."

### **Nonincome Poverty Indicators**

Different aspects of poverty—income and nonincome—interact and reinforce each other in ways that often exacerbate the deprivation that poor people face. Poor health outcomes and low educational achievement not only decrease well-being but also limit people's income-earning potential.

Defining poverty as multidimensional, however, also raises the question of how to measure these different dimensions. There are no strict and agreed-on standards that would fit every country. This report uses the survey data and other sources of information to obtain individual or household-level measures of deprivation in the following dimensions: education, health, housing, and infrastructure.

To see whether deprivation in these dimensions is different across groups, all four tables highlight spatial differences (reporting value of indexes by location). They also show the correlation between poverty in the monetary dimension with the nonincome space by reporting nonincome indicators for the top and bottom quintiles.

#### ***The Profile of Poverty: Health Dimension (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 7)***

Only a few surveys in the Region allow the construction of health indicators. The most common question is about a health condition over the reference period (which differs across countries) serious enough to limit daily activities. This indicator (morbidity rate) is reported by groups described above. The use of services is computed for those with a health condition as a share of respondents that used formal medical services (clinics, hospitals, private doctors) to take care of their illness in a reference period. There are significant differences

across countries in the length of the reference period; hence, large differences in the value may be partly ascribed to these design features.

***The Profile of Poverty: Education Dimension (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 8)***

Surveys allow construction of basic enrollment rates (for two age groups), which are reported by quintiles and locations.

***The Profile of Poverty: Infrastructure Dimension (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 9)***

Two indicators are selected: access to water (connection to a water pipe) and use of clean fuels (electricity, liquid fuels, and gas) for heating. The use of dirty fuels (coal and firewood) is shown to have significant health effects. Overall, there is no consistently collected information on the quality of infrastructure services (with a few exceptions discussed in the report). This is a major gap in the data.

***The Profile of Poverty: Housing Dimension (appendix, B. Key Poverty Indicators, table 10)***

Housing dimension is reported as the ownership rights on the dwelling the household is residing in (thus a reflection of inequality in asset ownership), and the measure of quality is determined by reporting the share of population living in overcrowded dwellings (with more than three persons per room or with a total living space per person of less than six square meters).

## **Endnote**

1. The exposition of the poverty and inequality measures is phrased in equivalent consumption, but the same measures could be applied to equivalent income.

## B. KEY POVERTY INDICATORS

TABLE 1

### Macroeconomic Environment

Country	Year	Population	GDP growth	GDP per capita, 2000 PPP	Inflation (CPI, annual % change)	Government expenditure, total (% of GDP)	Real wages index, 1998 = 1.00
Albania	2002	3,150,265	5	4,113	5.2	—	—
Armenia	1998/99	3,162,500	5	2,206	4.65	—	1.06
Armenia	2001	3,086,704	10	2,669	3.1	—	1.25
Armenia	2002	3,067,953	13	3,019	1.1	—	1.38
Armenia	2003	3,055,630	14	3,468	4.6	—	1.46
Azerbaijan	2002	8,172,000	11	3,096	2.8	—	1.93
Azerbaijan	2003	8,233,000	11	3,417	2.2	—	2.29
Belarus	1998	10,069,000	8	4,369	73.0	30.37	1.00
Belarus	1999	10,035,000	3	4,527	294.0	30.86	1.07
Belarus	2000	10,005,000	6	4,802	168.6	28.90	1.20
Belarus	2001	9,970,260	5	5,043	61.1	29.58	1.56
Belarus	2002	9,925,000	5	5,331	42.6	—	1.68
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	4,057,056	4	5,378	3.2	58.8	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	4,158,000	6	6,267	0.4	50	1.87
Bulgaria	1995	8,400,000	3	6,285	62.1	40.96	—
Bulgaria	2001	7,910,000	4	6,585	7.5	34.38	1.08
Bulgaria	2003	7,823,000	4	7,304	2.3	—	1.20
Estonia	2000	1,369,500	8	10,253	4.0	29.52	1.14
Estonia	2001	1,364,000	6	11,064	5.8	28.02	1.21
Estonia	2002	1,358,000	7	11,907	3.6	—	1.30
Estonia	2003	1,353,000	5	12,790	1.3	—	1.40
Georgia	1997	5,320,000	11	1,725	7.1	17.32	—
Georgia	1998	5,307,000	3	1,755	3.6	15.16	1.00
Georgia	1999	5,289,000	3	1,814	19.2	14.98	1.02
Georgia	2000	5,262,000	2	1,880	4.0	12.26	1.05
Georgia	2001	5,224,000	5	2,040	4.7	10.93	1.32
Georgia	2002	5,177,000	5	2,169	5.6	12.35	1.50
Georgia	2003	5,126,000	11	2,445	4.8	—	1.58
Hungary	1998	10,114,000	5	11,503	14.3	43.99	1.00
Hungary	1999	10,068,000	4	12,010	10.0	43.42	1.02
Hungary	2000	10,024,000	5	12,705	9.7	41.37	1.06
Hungary	2001	10,187,000	4	13,105	9.2	41.45	1.14
Hungary	2002	10,159,000	3	13,391	5.3	—	1.28
Kazakhstan	2001	14,909,200	14	5,206	8.4	14.63	1.34
Kazakhstan	2002	14,875,000	10	5,672	5.8	—	1.49
Kazakhstan	2003	14,878,100	9	6,302	6.4	—	1.60
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	4,915,000	5	1,560	18.7	18.00	0.90
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	4,955,000	5	1,599	6.9	17.73	1.00
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	5,003,900	0	1,570	2.1	—	1.14
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	5,052,000	7	1,654	3.1	—	1.25
Latvia	2002	2,338,000	6	8,922	1.9	—	1.13
Latvia	2003	2,321,000	7	9,702	2.9	—	1.19
Lithuania	1998	3,555,000	7	8,464	5.1	29.38	1.00
Lithuania	1999	3,531,000	-2	8,384	0.8	30.58	1.05
Lithuania	2000	3,505,000	4	8,716	1.0	27.34	1.03

TABLE 1 (continued)

Country	Year	Population	GDP growth	GDP per capita, 2000 PPP	Inflation (CPI, annual % change)	Government expenditure, total (% of GDP)	Real wages index, 1998 = 1.00
Lithuania	2001	3,482,000	6	9,313	1.3	26.08	1.02
Lithuania	2002	3,469,000	7	9,955	0.3	—	1.07
Lithuania	2003	3,454,000	9	11,055	-1.2	—	1.17
Macedonia, FYR	2002	2,038,000	1	6,257	1.8	—	1.03
Macedonia, FYR	2003	2,049,000	3	6,419	1.2	—	1.07
Moldova	1998	4,299,000	-7	1,337	7.7	35.86	1.00
Moldova	1999	4,288,000	-3	1,294	39.3	29.71	0.87
Moldova	2000	4,278,000	2	1,290	31.3	29.58	0.89
Moldova	2001	4,270,000	6	1,332	9.8	22.80	1.08
Moldova	2002	4,255,000	8	1,420	5.2	25.52	1.31
Moldova	2003	4,237,600	6	1,426	11.7	—	1.51
Poland	1998	38,666,152	5	9,159	11.8	35.19	1.00
Poland	1999	38,658,000	4	9,529	7.3	33.24	1.28
Poland	2000	38,648,000	4	9,935	10.1	32.72	1.30
Poland	2001	38,251,000	1	10,125	5.5	34.65	1.33
Poland	2002	38,232,000	1	10,299	1.9	—	1.36
Romania	1998	22,503,000	-5	5,751	59.1	33.33	1.00
Romania	1999	22,457,990	-1	5,699	45.8	35.06	1.00
Romania	2000	22,443,000	1	5,715	45.7	34.09	1.01
Romania	2001	22,132,000	5	6,098	34.5	30.40	1.12
Romania	2002	21,803,000	4	6,476	22.5	—	1.15
Romania	2003	21,744,000	5	6,875	15.3	—	1.25
Russian Fed.	1997	147,304,000	1	6,427	14.8	0.00	1.15
Russian Fed.	1998	146,899,008	-5	6,244	27.7	26.14	1.00
Russian Fed.	1999	146,308,992	6	6,642	85.7	21.68	0.78
Russian Fed.	2000	145,555,008	10	7,242	20.8	22.89	0.94
Russian Fed.	2001	144,752,000	5	7,559	21.5	24.63	1.13
Russian Fed.	2002	144,070,800	5	7,993	15.8	—	1.31
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	8,160,000	4	—	21.2	—	1.53
Tajikistan	1999	6,160,000	4	740	27.5	12.41	1.06
Tajikistan	2003	6,304,700	10	1,045	16.4	—	1.67
Ukraine	2002	48,717,300	5	4,719	0.8	—	1.38
Ukraine	2003	48,355,700	9	5,188	5.2	—	1.61
Uzbekistan	2000/01	24,808,500	4	1,539	26.1	—	1.67
Uzbekistan	2002	25,271,000	4	1,604	27.3	—	1.93
Uzbekistan	2003	25,590,000	4	1,648	10.2	—	1.98
Colombia	2003	44,584,000	4	6,331	7.13	—	—
Turkey	2002	69,626,000	8	6,145	45.0	—	1.36
Vietnam	1998	76,520,000	6	1,855	7.27	20.34	1.00

Source: WDI 2005.

Note: — = not available.

**TABLE 2**  
**Main Poverty and Inequality Indicators**

Country	Year	Poverty indices, \$PPP 2.15/day			Poverty indices, \$PPP 4.30/day		
		Poverty rate P0	Poverty depth P1	Poverty severity P2	Poverty rate P0	Poverty depth P1	Poverty severity P2
Albania	2002	24	5	2	71	28	14
Armenia	1998/99	58	19	8	92	49	30
Armenia	2001	59	19	9	91	50	31
Armenia	2002	55	17	7	91	48	28
Armenia	2003	50	14	5	93	46	26
Azerbaijan	2002	5	1	0	74	19	7
Azerbaijan	2003	4	1	0	70	17	6
Belarus	1998	9	2	1	48	15	6
Belarus	1999	7	2	1	42	13	5
Belarus	2000	6	1	0	38	11	4
Belarus	2001	4	1	0	27	7	3
Belarus	2002	2	0	0	21	5	2
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	5	1	0	40	10	4
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	4	1	0	35	9	4
Bulgaria	1995	3	1	1	20	6	3
Bulgaria	2001	10	3	1	36	13	6
Bulgaria	2003	4	1	0	33	9	4
Estonia	2000	4	1	0	26	7	3
Estonia	2001	4	1	0	28	8	3
Estonia	2002	4	1	0	27	8	3
Estonia	2003	5	1	0	26	8	3
Georgia	1997	45	18	10	80	42	26
Georgia	1998	42	16	9	80	40	25
Georgia	1999	50	20	11	84	45	29
Georgia	2000	53	22	12	86	48	31
Georgia	2001	55	22	12	88	49	32
Georgia	2002	49	19	10	84	45	28
Georgia	2003	52	21	11	85	46	30
Hungary	1998	1	0	0	20	4	1
Hungary	1999	1	0	0	19	4	1
Hungary	2000	1	0	0	18	4	1
Hungary	2001	1	0	0	13	3	1
Hungary	2002	0	0	0	12	2	1
Kazakhstan	2001	31	9	4	73	32	17
Kazakhstan	2002	26	7	3	71	29	15
Kazakhstan	2003	21	5	2	66	25	13
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	78	32	16	97	61	42
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	74	29	14	97	59	40
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	73	28	14	97	59	39
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	70	24	11	96	56	36
Latvia	2002	3	1	0	18	5	2
Latvia	2003	3	1	0	17	5	2
Lithuania	1998	3	1	0	24	6	3
Lithuania	1999	3	1	0	25	7	3
Lithuania	2000	4	1	0	29	8	3
Lithuania	2001	4	1	0	29	8	3
Lithuania	2002	4	1	0	30	8	3
Lithuania	2003	4	1	0	24	7	3

Country	Year	Inequality indices		Mean per capita annual consumption in local currency	\$PPP 2.15 in local currency, annual	National poverty line in local currency, annual
		Gini coefficient (per capita)	Share of the lowest 20%			
Albania	2002	0.3194	8	96,518	54,553	58,359
Armenia	1998/99	0.3208	8	141,940	128,484	140,584
Armenia	2001	0.3249	8	143,828	131,800	143,783
Armenia	2002	0.3102	9	151,498	133,250	145,364
Armenia	2003	0.2850	10	162,286	139,379	152,051
Azerbaijan	2002	0.1812	13	2,026,126	1,150,929	1,478,966
Azerbaijan	2003	0.1822	13	2,143,867	1,176,639	1,512,004
Belarus	1998	0.2908	9	38,983	16,699	27,263
Belarus	1999	0.2994	8	167,415	65,796	107,417
Belarus	2000	0.2933	8	475,632	176,741	288,544
Belarus	2001	0.3008	8	902,610	284,730	464,845
Belarus	2002	0.2918	9	1,399,101	406,025	662,869
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	0.2634	9	2,687	1,064	2198
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	0.2951	9	3,026	1,077	—
Bulgaria	1995	0.3261	8	52,249	14,070	20,287
Bulgaria	2001	0.3368	7	1,496	522	753
Bulgaria	2003	0.2774	9	1,562	565	815
Estonia	2000	0.3386	7	21,384	6,023	14,953
Estonia	2001	0.3323	8	21,709	6,372	15,890
Estonia	2002	0.3350	7	22,800	6,602	16,900
Estonia	2003	0.3301	7	23,457	6,687	17,167
Georgia	1997	0.4041	5	586	415	543
Georgia	1998	0.3855	6	614	430	562
Georgia	1999	0.3936	6	655	512	670
Georgia	2000	0.3970	6	646	533	697
Georgia	2001	0.3825	6	646	558	729
Georgia	2002	0.3901	6	763	589	770
Georgia	2003	0.3906	6	765	617	807
Hungary	1998	0.2498	10	261,938	81,765	219,572
Hungary	1999	0.2589	10	294,765	89,942	241,530
Hungary	2000	0.2540	10	322,988	98,666	264,958
Hungary	2001	0.2510	10	390,509	107,743	289,334
Hungary	2002	0.2496	10	417,447	113,346	304,379
Kazakhstan	2001	0.3458	7	67,472	40,178	37,876
Kazakhstan	2002	0.3297	8	74,844	42,548	40,111
Kazakhstan	2003	0.3183	8	85,163	45,271	42,678
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	0.2993	9	6,578	8,322	7,548
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	0.2902	9	7,390	8,897	8,069
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	0.2924	9	7,663	9,083	8,238
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	0.2761	10	8,445	9,365	8,494
Latvia	2002	0.3403	7	982	236	416
Latvia	2003	0.3503	7	1,051	243	437
Lithuania	1998	0.3029	8	4,524	1,348	2,822
Lithuania	1999	0.3035	8	4,503	1,359	2,845
Lithuania	2000	0.3057	8	4,298	1,373	2,873
Lithuania	2001	0.3052	8	4,286	1,391	2,911
Lithuania	2002	0.3050	8	4,285	1,395	2,919
Lithuania	2003	0.3251	8	4,850	1,378	2,884

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 2 (continued)

## Main Poverty and Inequality Indicators

Country	Year	Poverty indices, \$PPP 2.15/day			Poverty indices, \$PPP 4.30/day			
		Poverty rate P0	Poverty depth P1	Poverty severity P2	Poverty rate P0	Poverty depth P1	Poverty severity P2	
Macedonia, FYR	2002	4	1	0	23	7	3	
Macedonia, FYR	2003	4	1	0	24	7	3	
Moldova	1998	67	29	16	93	56	38	
Moldova	1999	79	37	22	96	64	46	
Moldova	2000	77	35	19	96	62	44	
Moldova	2001	70	29	15	94	57	39	
Moldova	2002	56	20	10	90	48	30	
Moldova	2003	43	13	5	85	41	23	
Poland	1998	2	0	0	23	5	2	
Poland	1999	2	0	0	25	6	2	
Poland	2000	2	0	0	26	6	2	
Poland	2001	2	0	0	26	7	2	
Poland	2002	3	0	0	27	7	3	
Romania	1998	14	3	1	63	21	9	
Romania	1999	19	4	2	69	25	12	
Romania	2000	20	5	2	72	26	13	
Romania	2001	16	4	1	64	22	10	
Romania	2002	16	4	1	62	22	10	
Romania	2003	12	3	1	58	19	9	
Russian Fed.	1997	10	3	1	41	14	7	
Russian Fed.	1998	13	4	1	46	17	8	
Russian Fed.	1999	21	6	3	59	24	12	
Russian Fed.	2000	17	5	2	54	20	10	
Russian Fed.	2001	11	3	1	47	16	7	
Russian Fed.	2002	9	2	1	41	13	6	
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	6	1	1	42	12	5	
Tajikistan	1999	91	45	26	100	71	53	
Tajikistan	2003	74	30	15	96	59	40	
Ukraine	2002	3	1	0	31	8	3	
Ukraine	2003	1	0	0	22	5	2	
Uzbekistan	2000/01	54	19	9	89	48	29	
Uzbekistan	2002	42	12	5	86	41	23	
Uzbekistan	2003	47	14	6	86	43	25	
Colombia	2003	6	2	1	24	8	4	
Turkey	2002	20	6	2	58	23	12	
Vietnam	1998	41	10	4	85	39	21	

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: P0 reported in %. P1 and P2 are multiplied by 100. — = not available.

Country	Year	Inequality indices		Mean per capita annual consumption in local currency	\$PPP 2.15 in local currency, annual	National poverty line in local currency, annual
		Gini coefficient (per capita)	Share of the lowest 20%			
Macedonia, FYR	2002	0.3678	6	73,520	17,784	59,881
Macedonia, FYR	2003	0.3732	6	72,735	17,997	58,644
Moldova	1998	0.3710	6	1,368	1,454	1,359
Moldova	1999	0.3653	7	1,536	2,026	1,894
Moldova	2000	0.3500	7	2,095	2,660	2,487
Moldova	2001	0.3571	7	2,674	2,920	2,730
Moldova	2002	0.3449	8	3,482	3,072	2,872
Moldova	2003	0.3280	8	4,573	3,432	3,208
Poland	1998	0.2960	9	4,967	1,467	2,592
Poland	1999	0.3024	9	5,236	1,574	2,781
Poland	2000	0.3050	8	5,722	1,733	3,062
Poland	2001	0.3072	8	6,039	1,828	3,230
Poland	2002	0.3197	8	6,199	1,863	3,291
Romania	1998	0.2736	9	5,311,954	2,736,291	3,372,638
Romania	1999	0.2834	9	7,100,299	3,989,513	4,917,307
Romania	2000	0.2820	9	9,979,185	5,812,720	7,164,516
Romania	2001	0.2862	9	14,849,780	7,818,109	9,636,274
Romania	2002	0.2939	8	18,767,966	9,577,183	11,804,435
Romania	2003	0.2878	9	22,797,434	11,013,761	13,575,100
Russian Fed.	1997	0.3527	7	6,417,704	2,276,173	3,059,599
Russian Fed.	1998	0.3694	6	7,760	2,907	3,907
Russian Fed.	1999	0.3566	7	11,412	5,398	7,256
Russian Fed.	2000	0.3488	7	14,961	6,521	8,765
Russian Fed.	2001	0.3392	7	20,256	7,922	10,648
Russian Fed.	2002	0.3381	7	25,467	9,173	12,331
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	0.2920	9	85,313	33,593	44,940
Tajikistan	1999	0.2890	8	147,001	253,064	245,296
Tajikistan	2003	0.3274	8	519	608	589
Ukraine	2002	0.2736	9	2,551	891	1,691
Ukraine	2003	0.2681	10	2,982	937	1,779
Uzbekistan	2000/01	0.3549	7	103,091	87,324	—
Uzbekistan	2002	0.3260	8	178,741	132,397	—
Uzbekistan	2003	0.3545	7	193,781	145,902	—
Colombia	2003	0.4877	4	2,645,884	472,157	—
Turkey	2002	0.3932	6	1,436,459,264	620,648,442	916,489,450
Vietnam	1998	0.3110	9	2,443	1,779	1,794

TABLE 3

## Panel A (Based on 2.15 \$ PPP) Poverty Profile: Spatial Dimension

Country	Year	Poverty rate (%), \$PPP 2.15/day				Regional poverty rates (%), \$PPP 2.15/day	
		Capital	Other urban	All urban	Rural	Maximum	Minimum
Albania	2002	16	19	18	27	32 (Mountain)	16 (Tirana)
Armenia	1998/99	58	66	62	52	77 (Shirak)	35 (Tavush)
Armenia	2001	55	64	60	59	74 (Tavush)	27 (Siunik)
Armenia	2002	48	67	57	51	81 (Shirak)	40 (Siunik)
Armenia	2003	35	57	46	57	70 (Armavir)	35 (Yerevan)
Azerbaijan	2002	5	7	6	5	..	..
Azerbaijan	2003	4	8	6	3	..	..
Belarus	1998	8	11	10	7	12 (Gomel)	7 (Minsk)
Belarus	1999	5	9	8	6	10 (Vitebsk)	5 (Minsk)
Belarus	2000	3	8	7	4	8 (Mogilev)	3 (Minsk)
Belarus	2001	2	5	4	3	5 (Gomel)	2 (Minsk)
Belarus	2002	1	3	2	2	4 (Vitebsk)	1 (Minsk)
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	3	5	5	5	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	2	6	4	4	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	3	3	3	4	—	—
Bulgaria	2001	0	8	10	17	—	—
Bulgaria	2003	0	5	6	6	—	—
Estonia	2000	2	5	4	6	—	—
Estonia	2001	3	4	4	6	—	—
Estonia	2002	2	5	4	5	—	—
Estonia	2003	4	5	5	5	—	—
Georgia	1997	34	42	38	52	63 (Guria)	34 (Tbilisi)
Georgia	1998	35	41	38	47	59 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)	35 (Tbilisi)
Georgia	1999	44	51	48	52	61 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)	39 (Adjara)
Georgia	2000	46	53	50	57	80 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)	42 (Samegrelo)
Georgia	2001	40	60	51	60	72 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)	40 (Tbilisi)
Georgia	2002	32	54	43	56	68 (Kakheti)	32 (Tbilisi)
Georgia	2003	32	50	41	62	67 (Kakheti)	32 (Tbilisi)
Hungary	1998	1	1	1	2	..	..
Hungary	1999	1	1	1	1	..	..
Hungary	2000	1	1	1	2	..	..
Hungary	2001	0	1	1	1	..	..
Hungary	2002	0	0	0	0	..	..
Kazakhstan	2001	7	25	24	40	54 (Jambyl)	7 (Astana)
Kazakhstan	2002	5	19	18	35	44 (Kyzylorda)	5 (Almaty)
Kazakhstan	2003	2	14	13	31	39 (South)	2 (Astana)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	55	79	68	84	94 (Naryn)	55 (Bishkek)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	50	77	65	79	96 (Naryn)	50 (Bishkek)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	49	72	62	79	94 (Naryn)	49 (Bishkek)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	42	68	57	77	95 (Naryn)	37 (Chui)
Latvia	2002	1	3	2	4	—	—
Latvia	2003	1	3	2	5	—	—
Lithuania	1998	1	3	2	5	—	—
Lithuania	1999	1	3	2	7	—	—
Lithuania	2000	1	2	2	9	—	—
Lithuania	2001	3	3	3	8	—	—
Lithuania	2002	1	3	2	9	—	—
Lithuania	2003	1	2	1	8	—	—

Country	Year	Contribution to poverty (%), \$PPP 2.15/day				Regional contributions poverty (%), \$PPP 2.15/day	
		Capital	Other urban	All urban	Rural	Maximum	Minimum
Albania	2002	8	25	33	67	49 (Central)	8 (Tirana)
Armenia	1998/99	28	34	62	38	28 (Yerevan)	2 (Vayots D)
Armenia	2001	26	34	60	40	26 (Yerevan)	2 (Siunik)
Armenia	2002	26	35	62	38	26 (Yerevan)	3 (Vayots Dzor)
Armenia	2003	20	34	54	46	20 (Yerevan)	3 (Vayots Dzor)
Azerbaijan	2002	33	25	57	43	..	..
Azerbaijan	2003	11	45	56	44	..	..
Belarus	1998	14	62	76	24	22 (Gomel)	11 (Grodno)
Belarus	1999	11	64	75	25	20 (Gomel)	9 (Grodno)
Belarus	2000	9	72	80	20	19 (Mogilev)	9 (Minsk)
Belarus	2001	10	66	76	24	20 (Gomel)	10 (Minsk)
Belarus	2002	7	67	75	25	22 (Vitebsk)	3 (Grodno)
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	11	49	60	40	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	7	53	60	40	—	—
Bulgaria	1996	12	47	59	41	—	—
Bulgaria	2001	0	42	42	58	—	—
Bulgaria	2003	0	60	60	40	—	—
Estonia	2000	14	45	59	41	—	—
Estonia	2001	20	39	60	40	—	—
Estonia	2002	16	48	64	36	—	—
Estonia	2003	24	42	66	34	—	—
Georgia	1997	19	26	46	54	25 (Imereti)	4 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)
Georgia	1998	22	27	50	50	23 (Imereti)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	1999	23	28	52	48	23 (Tbilisi)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	2000	22	27	48	52	22 (Tbilisi)	5 (Guria)
Georgia	2001	18	29	47	53	18 (Tbilisi)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	2002	17	28	45	55	18 (Imereti)	5 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)
Georgia	2003	15	23	39	61	17 (Imereti)	3 (Swaneti)
Hungary	1998	12	30	43	57	..	..
Hungary	1999	17	37	53	47	..	..
Hungary	2000	11	36	47	53	..	..
Hungary	2001	4	43	46	54	..	..
Hungary	2002	13	52	65	35	..	..
Kazakhstan	2001	1	43	44	56	21 (South)	1 (Astana)
Kazakhstan	2002	1	40	40	60	21 (South)	1 (Astana)
Kazakhstan	2003	0	36	36	64	26 (South)	0 (Astana)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	11	19	30	70	27 (Osh)	5 (Talas)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	10	20	31	69	28 (Osh)	5 (Talas)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	10	19	29	71	29 (Osh)	5 (Talas)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	9	19	28	72	31 (Osh)	6 (Talas)
Latvia	2002	17	39	56	44	—	—
Latvia	2003	11	34	45	55	—	—
Lithuania	1998	15	27	42	58	—	—
Lithuania	1999	12	27	39	61	—	—
Lithuania	2000	14	17	32	68	—	—
Lithuania	2001	24	17	41	59	—	—
Lithuania	2002	13	19	31	69	—	—
Lithuania	2003	10	18	28	72	—	—

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 3 (continued)

## Panel A (Based on 2.15 \$ PPP) Poverty Profile: Spatial Dimension

Country	Year	Poverty rate (%), \$PPP 2.15/day				Regional poverty rates (%), \$PPP 2.15/day	
		Capital	Other urban	All urban	Rural	Maximum	Minimum
Macedonia, FYR	2002	5	3	4	5	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	4	5	5	3	—	—
Moldova	1998	42	70	56	74	—	—
Moldova	1999	57	80	69	85	—	—
Moldova	2000	54	83	69	82	—	—
Moldova	2001	49	78	64	74	—	—
Moldova	2002	33	61	47	61	—	—
Moldova	2003	27	48	37	47	—	—
Poland	1998	1	1	1	2	..	..
Poland	1999	1	1	1	3	..	..
Poland	2000	1	2	2	3	..	..
Poland	2001	1	2	2	3	..	..
Poland	2002	2	2	2	3	..	..
Romania	1998	6	9	8	20	23 (North-East)	6 (Bucharest)
Romania	1999	7	13	12	27	31 (North-East)	7 (Bucharest)
Romania	2000	10	15	14	28	30 (North-East)	10 (Bucharest)
Romania	2001	7	10	9	25	26 (North-East)	7 (Bucharest)
Romania	2002	6	9	8	24	25 (North-East)	6 (Bucharest)
Romania	2003	4	7	6	20	18 (North-East)	4 (Bucharest)
Russian Fed.	1997	1	9	8	14	28 (Tyva Republic)	1 (Moscow)
Russian Fed.	1998	3	13	12	15	75 (Ingushetiya Rep.)	0 (Belgorod oblast)
Russian Fed.	1999	18	20	20	24	45 (Dagestan Rep.)	3 (Belgorod oblast)
Russian Fed.	2000	15	16	15	20	68 (Ingushetiya Rep.)	2 (Belgorod oblast)
Russian Fed.	2001	5	10	10	16	40 (Dagestan Rep.)	1 (Yamalo- Nenetskiy Aut. Reg.)
Russian Fed.	2002	5	7	7	14	39 (Taimyr Aut. Reg.)	0 (St. Petersburg)
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	6	4	4	9	9 (South-East Serbia)	5 (Vojvodina)
Tajikistan	1999	73	90	85	92	—	—
Tajikistan	2003	54	73	67	76	—	—
Ukraine	2002	2	3	3	4	..	..
Ukraine	2003	0	1	1	2	..	..
Uzbekistan	2000/01	24	50	44	60	85 (Kashkadarya)	24 (Tashkent city)
Uzbekistan	2002	11	39	33	47	66 (Kashkadarya)	10 (Tashkent city)
Uzbekistan	2003	4	43	34	55	72 (Syrdarya)	4 (Tashkent city)
Colombia	2003	1	3	3	14	13 (Pacific)	1 (Bogota D.C.)
Turkey	2002	8	21	18	24	39 (SE Anatolia)	8 (Aegean)
Vietnam	1998	3	19	14	48	65 (Rur. N. Mountains & Midlands)	3 (Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City)

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: Latvia, FYR Macedonia, Poland (1998), Romania, Serbia & Montenegro column "Capital" includes some rural dwellings.

Lithuania: column "Capital" contains estimates for the five largest cities.

Poland (1999–2002): column "Capital" includes urban dwellings of Mazowieckie vojvodship, which contains five urban counties—Warsaw, Radom, Plock, Siedlce, Ostroleka.

Russian Federation: data for Ingushetiya Republic is not available for 1999.

Turkey: "Capital" contains estimates for Ankara and Istanbul and includes some rural dwellings.

Vietnam: column "Capital" contains estimates for Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City.

.. = Negligible; — = not available.

Country	Year	Contribution to poverty (%), \$PPP 2.15/day				Regional contributions poverty (%), \$PPP 2.15/day	
		Capital	Other urban	All urban	Rural	Maximum	Minimum
Macedonia, FYR	2002	33	29	62	38	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	30	42	71	29	—	—
Moldova	1998	11	20	31	69	—	—
Moldova	1999	13	20	32	68	—	—
Moldova	2000	13	21	34	66	—	—
Moldova	2001	13	21	33	67	—	—
Moldova	2002	11	21	31	69	—	—
Moldova	2003	11	20	31	69	—	—
Poland	1998	3	49	52	48	..	..
Poland	1999	4	35	38	62	..	..
Poland	2000	3	42	45	55	..	..
Poland	2001	3	44	47	53	..	..
Poland	2002	6	46	52	48	..	..
Romania	1998	5	31	36	64	29 (North-East)	5 (Bucharest)
Romania	1999	4	32	35	65	28 (North-East)	4 (Bucharest)
Romania	2000	5	34	38	62	25 (North-East)	5 (Bucharest)
Romania	2001	4	27	31	69	27 (North-East)	4 (Bucharest)
Romania	2002	4	26	30	70	27 (North-East)	4 (Bucharest)
Romania	2003	3	23	27	73	25 (North-East)	3 (Bucharest)
Russian Fed.	1997	1	61	62	38	4 (Rostov oblast)	0 (Belgorod oblast)
Russian Fed.	1998	1	67	68	32	5 (Moscow oblast)	0 (Murmansk oblast)
Russian Fed.	1999	5	65	70	30	6 (Moscow oblast)	0 (Kamchatka oblast)
Russian Fed.	2000	5	63	68	32	5 (Moscow)	0 (Krasnoyarsk territory)
Russian Fed.	2001	3	59	62	38	5 (Moscow oblast)	0 (Evenkiyskiy Aut. Reg.)
Russian Fed.	2002	4	54	58	42	6 (Moscow oblast)	0 (Evenkiyskiy Aut. Reg.)
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	19	27	46	54	22 (Vojvodina)	12 (East Serbia)
Tajikistan	1999	5	15	21	79	—	—
Tajikistan	2003	7	18	24	76	—	—
Ukraine	2002	3	59	61	39	..	..
Ukraine	2003	2	54	56	44	..	..
Uzbekistan	2000/01	4	26	30	70	14 (Kashkadarya)	2 (Syrdarya)
Uzbekistan	2002	2	26	28	72	15 (Kashkadarya)	2 (Navoi)
Uzbekistan	2003	1	26	27	73	12 (Andizhan)	1 (Tashkent city)
Colombia	2003	3	31	34	66	23 (Atlantica)	0 (San Andres & Providencia)
Turkey	2002	6	48	54	46	19 (Mediterranean)	5 (Aegean)
Vietnam	1998	0	7	8	92	26 (Rur. N. Mountains & Midlands)	0 (Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City)

TABLE 3

## Panel B (Based on 4.30 \$ PPP) Poverty Profile: Spatial Dimension

Country	Year	Poverty rate (%), \$PPP 4.30/day				Regional poverty rates (%), \$PPP 4.30/day	
		Capital	Other urban	All urban	Rural	Maximum	Minimum
Albania	2002	63	67	66	75	80 (Mountain)	63 (Tirana)
Armenia	1998/99	91	95	93	91	88 (Siunik)	84 (Tavush)
Armenia	2001	87	94	91	92	98 (Shirak)	53 (Siunik)
Armenia	2002	87	94	91	92	99 (Vayots Dzor)	81 (Siunik)
Armenia	2003	86	94	90	96	100 (Siunik)	86 (Yerevan)
Azerbaijan	2002	72	78	74	74	90 (Nakhchivan)	66 (Sheki- Zagatala)
Azerbaijan	2003	66	74	69	70	84 (Nakhchivan)	62 (Baku)
Belarus	1998	44	52	50	45	53 (Gomel)	44 (Minsk)
Belarus	1999	38	44	42	42	45 (Vitebsk)	38 (Minsk)
Belarus	2000	28	42	39	34	44 (Mogilev)	28 (Minsk)
Belarus	2001	19	32	29	23	30 (Mogilev)	20 (Minsk)
Belarus	2002	14	26	23	18	26 (Brest)	14 (Minsk)
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	39	43	37	42	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	21	39	38	33	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	17	18	18	24	—	—
Bulgaria	2001	23	30	29	49	—	—
Bulgaria	2003	20	34	31	36	—	—
Estonia	2000	17	27	23	32	—	—
Estonia	2001	23	27	25	33	—	—
Estonia	2002	21	27	24	32	—	—
Estonia	2003	21	27	24	28	—	—
Georgia	1997	76	79	78	83	91 (Guria)	72 (Adjara)
Georgia	1998	78	78	78	82	86 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)	78 (Tbilisi)
Georgia	1999	84	86	85	84	91 (Guria)	75 (Kvemo Kartli)
Georgia	2000	81	89	85	88	95 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)	81 (Tbilisi)
Georgia	2001	80	92	86	89	92 (Samtskhe-Javakheti)	80 (Tbilisi)
Georgia	2002	73	89	81	87	92 (Guria)	73 (Tbilisi)
Georgia	2003	75	87	81	89	94 (Kvemo Kartli)	75 (Tbilisi)
Hungary	1998	14	18	16	25	25 (Nograd)	10 (Csongrad)
Hungary	1999	14	16	16	26	29 (Baranya)	11 (Csongrad)
Hungary	2000	14	17	16	22	27 (Baranya)	12 (Heves)
Hungary	2001	7	12	10	18	25 (Nograd)	5 (Csongrad)
Hungary	2002	8	11	10	16	20 (Baranya)	5 (Csongrad)
Kazakhstan	2001	40	66	65	82	91 (Jambyl)	40 (Astana)
Kazakhstan	2002	37	63	62	82	90 (South)	37 (Astana)
Kazakhstan	2003	29	57	55	79	90 (South)	29 (Astana)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	94	98	96	97	100 (Naryn)	92 (Chui)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	92	97	95	98	100 (Naryn)	92 (Bishkek)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	93	97	95	98	100 (Naryn)	89 (Chui)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	89	96	93	98	100 (Naryn)	88 (Chui)
Latvia	2002	11	19	14	26	—	—
Latvia	2003	7	19	12	27	—	—
Lithuania	1998	15	20	17	40	—	—
Lithuania	1999	14	21	17	42	—	—
Lithuania	2000	18	27	22	44	—	—
Lithuania	2001	17	28	22	46	—	—
Lithuania	2002	16	30	22	47	—	—
Lithuania	2003	11	21	15	42	—	—

Country	Year	Contribution to poverty (%), \$PPP 4.30/day				Regional contributions poverty (%), \$PPP 4.30/day	
		Capital	Other urban	All urban	Rural	Maximum	Minimum
Albania	2002	10	28	38	62	47 (Central)	10 (Tirana)
Armenia	1998/99	27	31	58	42	27 (Yerevan)	2 (Vayots Dzor)
Armenia	2001	27	32	60	41	27 (Yerevan)	2 (Siunik)
Armenia	2002	28	30	58	42	28 (Yerevan)	3 (Vayots Dzor)
Armenia	2003	27	30	58	42	28 (Yerevan)	3 (Vayots Dzor)
Azerbaijan	2002	33	21	54	46	23 (Baku)	5 (Nakhchivan)
Azerbaijan	2003	32	21	53	47	22 (Baku)	5 (Nakhchivan)
Belarus	1998	15	55	70	30	17 (Gomel)	13 (Grodno)
Belarus	1999	14	54	68	32	17 (Gomel)	12 (Mogilev)
Belarus	2000	12	60	72	28	16 (Brest)	12 (Minsk)
Belarus	2001	12	62	73	27	17 (Brest)	12 (Minsk)
Belarus	2002	11	63	74	26	19 (Gomel)	10 (Grodno)
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	18	42	60	40	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	12	43	55	45	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	12	48	60	40	—	—
Bulgaria	2001	9	44	53	47	—	—
Bulgaria	2003	8	57	66	34	—	—
Estonia	2000	19	41	60	40	—	—
Estonia	2001	24	39	63	37	—	—
Estonia	2002	23	40	63	37	—	—
Estonia	2003	25	39	64	36	—	—
Georgia	1997	24	27	51	49	24 (Tbilisi)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	1998	26	28	54	46	26 (Tbilisi)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	1999	26	28	54	46	26 (Tbilisi)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	2000	23	28	51	49	23 (Tbilisi)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	2001	22	28	50	50	22 (Tbilisi)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	2002	22	27	49	51	22 (Tbilisi)	4 (Guria)
Georgia	2003	22	25	46	54	22 (Tbilisi)	3 (Swaneti)
Hungary	1998	13	39	52	48	13 (Budapest)	2 (Csongrad)
Hungary	1999	13	39	53	47	13 (Budapest)	2 (Vas)
Hungary	2000	14	43	57	43	14 (Budapest)	2 (Zala)
Hungary	2001	9	41	50	50	12 (Borsod-Abauj-Zempen)	2 (Csongrad)
Hungary	2002	11	42	54	46	11 (Budapest)	2 (Veszprem)
Kazakhstan	2001	2	49	51	49	17 (South)	2 (Astana)
Kazakhstan	2002	2	48	49	51	28 (South)	2 (Astana)
Kazakhstan	2003	2	46	48	52	20 (South)	2 (Astana)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	15	19	34	66	25 (Osh)	4 (Talas)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	15	20	34	66	25 (Osh)	4 (Talas)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	15	19	34	66	26 (Osh)	4 (Talas)
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	14	20	34	66	26 (Osh)	4 (Talas)
Latvia	2002	23	34	57	43	—	—
Latvia	2003	16	35	51	49	—	—
Lithuania	1998	24	23	47	53	—	—
Lithuania	1999	22	24	46	54	—	—
Lithuania	2000	24	27	51	49	—	—
Lithuania	2001	23	27	50	50	—	—
Lithuania	2002	21	27	49	51	—	—
Lithuania	2003	19	24	42	58	—	—

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 3 (continued)

## Panel B (Based on 4.30 \$ PPP) Poverty Profile: Spatial Dimension

Country	Year	Poverty rate (%), \$PPP 4.30/day				Regional poverty rates (%), \$PPP 4.30/day	
		Capital	Other urban	All urban	Rural	Maximum	Minimum
Macedonia, FYR	2002	26	20	20	26	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	26	25	24	25	—	—
Moldova	1998	83	93	88	96	—	—
Moldova	1999	88	97	93	98	—	—
Moldova	2000	87	98	93	98	—	—
Moldova	2001	84	97	90	96	—	—
Moldova	2002	75	93	84	93	—	—
Moldova	2003	75	88	81	87	—	—
Poland	1998	9	18	17	32	45 (Przemysl)	9 (Warsaw)
Poland	1999	13	20	19	35	34 (Podkarpackie)	20 (Slaske)
Poland	2000	15	21	21	34	34 (Podkarpackie)	18 (Lodzkie)
Poland	2001	16	22	21	34	34 (Podkarpackie)	20 (Slaske)
Poland	2002	20	22	22	36	35 (Podkarpackie)	22 (Lodzkie)
Romania	1998	47	56	55	72	73 (North-East)	47 (Bucharest)
Romania	1999	55	62	61	79	79 (North-East)	55 (Bucharest)
Romania	2000	59	66	65	81	80 (North-East)	59 (Bucharest)
Romania	2001	53	54	53	77	74 (North-East)	53 (Bucharest)
Romania	2002	46	52	51	75	70 (North-East)	46 (Bucharest)
Romania	2003	41	47	45	72	64 (North-East)	41 (Bucharest)
Russian Fed.	1997	19	41	39	47	84 (Ingushetiya Rep.)	18 (Belgorod oblast)
Russian Fed.	1998	25	48	46	48	91 (Ingushetiya Rep.)	22 (Belgorod oblast)
Russian Fed.	1999	51	58	58	63	89 (Chita oblast)	33 (Tumen oblast)
Russian Fed.	2000	51	52	52	58	92 (Ingushetiya Rep.)	25 (Tumen oblast)
Russian Fed.	2001	37	44	43	56	82 (Dagestan Rep.)	14 (Khanty-Mansiyskiy Aut. Reg.)
Russian Fed.	2002	36	37	37	53	79 (Ingushetiya Rep.)	10 (Yamalo-Nenetskiy Aut. Reg.)
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	36	37	35	51	56 (South-East Serbia)	36 (Belgrade)
Tajikistan	1999	98	99	99	100	—	—
Tajikistan	2003	89	96	93	97	—	—
Ukraine	2002	18	30	29	37	63 (Zakarpatska)	12 (Sevastopol)
Ukraine	2003	11	20	20	28	32 (Rivnenska)	10 (Mykolaivska)
Uzbekistan	2000/01	70	86	82	93	99 (Kashkadarya)	70 (Tashkent city)
Uzbekistan	2002	51	83	75	92	95 (Syrdarya)	51 (Tashkent city)
Uzbekistan	2003	39	83	73	93	99 (Syrdarya)	39 (Tashkent city)
Colombia	2003	8	17	15	47	43 (Pacific)	3 (San Andres & Providencia)
Turkey	2002	34	57	52	67	77 (Eastern Anatolia)	41 (Aegean)
Vietnam	1998	45	71	63	91	96 (Rur. N. Central Coast)	45 (Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City)

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: Latvia, FYR Macedonia, Poland (1998), Romania, Serbia and Montenegro.

Lithuania: column "Capital" contains estimates for the five largest cities.

Poland (1999–2002): column "Capital" includes urban dwellings of Mazowieckie wojewodship, which contains five urban counties—Warsaw, Radom, Plock, Siedlce, Ostroleka.

Russian Fed.: data for Ingushetiya Republic are not available for 1999.

Turkey: "Capital" contains estimates for Ankara and Istanbul, and includes some rural dwellings.

Vietnam: column "Capital" contains estimates for Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City.

— = not available.

Country	Year	Contribution to poverty (%), \$PPP 4.30/day				Regional contributions poverty (%), \$PPP 4.30/day	
		Capital	Other urban	All urban	Rural	Maximum	Minimum
Macedonia, FYR	2002	31	31	62	39	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	29	38	67	33	—	—
Moldova	1998	15	19	34	66	—	—
Moldova	1999	16	19	36	64	—	—
Moldova	2000	17	20	36	64	—	—
Moldova	2001	16	19	35	65	—	—
Moldova	2002	15	19	35	65	—	—
Moldova	2003	16	19	35	65	—	—
Poland	1998	2	44	46	54	7 (Katowice)	1 (Chelmno)
Poland	1999	4	41	45	55	10 (Wielkopolskie)	3 (Lubuskie)
Poland	2000	5	43	47	53	10 (Mazowieckie)	3 (Lubuskie)
Poland	2001	5	43	48	52	10 (Mazowieckie)	3 (Opolskie)
Poland	2002	6	42	48	52	12 (Mazowieckie)	3 (Lubuskie)
Romania	1998	8	41	49	51	20 (North-East)	8 (Bucharest)
Romania	1999	8	41	49	51	19 (North-East)	8 (Bucharest)
Romania	2000	8	42	50	50	19 (North-East)	8 (Bucharest)
Romania	2001	8	38	46	54	20 (North-East)	8 (Bucharest)
Romania	2002	7	38	46	54	19 (North-East)	7 (Bucharest)
Romania	2003	7	36	43	57	19 (North-East)	7 (Bucharest)
Russian Fed.	1997	3	67	69	31	5 (Moscow oblast)	0 (Magadan oblast)
Russian Fed.	1998	3	69	72	28	5 (Moscow oblast)	0 (Magadan oblast)
Russian Fed.	1999	5	66	71	29	5 (Moscow)	0 (Krasnoyarsk territory)
Russian Fed.	2000	6	66	71	29	6 (Moscow)	0 (Krasnoyarsk territory)
Russian Fed.	2001	5	63	68	32	5 (Moscow)	0 (Evenkiyskiy Aut. Reg.)
Russian Fed.	2002	5	60	66	34	5 (Moscow)	0 (Evenkiyskiy Aut. Reg.)
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	19	35	54	46	25 (Vojvodina)	9 (East Serbia)
Tajikistan	1999	6	15	22	78	—	—
Tajikistan	2003	9	18	26	74	—	—
Ukraine	2002	3	58	61	39	8 (Donetska)	0 (Sevastopol)
Ukraine	2003	3	55	58	42	8 (Donetska)	0 (Sevastopol)
Uzbekistan	2000/01	7	28	35	65	12 (Samarkand)	10 (Bukhara)
Uzbekistan	2002	5	27	32	68	11 (Samarkand)	3 (Navoi)
Uzbekistan	2003	4	28	32	68	12 (Fergana)	3 (Navoi)
Colombia	2003	5	42	48	52	27 (Atlantica)	0 (San Andres & Providencia)
Turkey	2002	9	46	55	45	19 (Marmara)	9 (Aegean)
Vietnam	1998	4	13	17	83	18 (Rur. Mekong River Delta)	4 (Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City)

**TABLE 4**  
**Poverty Profile: Demographic Dimension**

Country	Year	Poverty rate by age (%), \$PPP 2.15/day			Poverty rate by gender of HH head (%), \$PPP 2.15/day		Poverty rate by number of children in HH (%), \$PPP 2.15/day		
		Children (<16 y.o.)	Adults (17–65)	Elderly (>65 y.o.)	Male	Female	No children	One or two	Three
Albania	2002	30	21	19	18	13	5	17	43
Armenia	1998/99	62	56	54	52	54	40	56	67
Armenia	2001	64	58	57	54	55	43	59	70
Armenia	2002	59	53	52	50	51	41	55	63
Armenia	2003	54	49	47	46	42	34	48	65
Azerbaijan	2002	6	5	5	4	3	1	4	8
Azerbaijan	2003	5	4	4	3	2	1	4	6
Belarus	1998	11	7	6	6	8	7	10	26
Belarus	1999	9	6	5	6	6	5	8	22
Belarus	2000	8	4	3	4	5	4	7	28
Belarus	2001	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	15
Belarus	2002	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	10
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	6	4	5	4	2	3	4	10
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	4	3	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	6	3	3	2	3	2	2	26
Bulgaria	2001	13	7	5	5	5	3	7	36
Bulgaria	2003	8	4	2	3	3	2	5	28
Estonia	2000	6	4	3	3	4	3	5	11
Estonia	2001	6	4	3	3	4	3	5	10
Estonia	2002	6	4	3	3	4	3	6	8
Estonia	2003	6	5	4	4	5	4	5	8
Georgia	1997	49	43	44	41	37	33	44	57
Georgia	1998	49	40	41	38	35	30	43	59
Georgia	1999	56	48	48	43	42	37	48	72
Georgia	2000	60	51	51	48	46	38	53	74
Georgia	2001	62	53	53	50	47	39	55	79
Georgia	2002	55	47	50	44	45	38	50	66
Georgia	2003	57	49	53	46	45	39	51	71
Hungary	1998	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	7
Hungary	1999	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	5
Hungary	2000	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	5
Hungary	2001	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	4
Hungary	2002	1	0	0	—	—	0	0	42
Kazakhstan	2001	38	29	18	26	18	9	25	54
Kazakhstan	2002	33	24	14	22	14	7	21	49
Kazakhstan	2003	28	19	11	18	10	5	17	46
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	85	74	71	75	55	40	72	93
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	82	70	62	72	55	37	69	90
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	81	68	53	70	50	29	69	91
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	80	66	51	67	36	20	64	90
Latvia	2002	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	7
Latvia	2003	5	3	2	2	2	1	3	13
Lithuania	1998	4	2	1	1	2	1	3	8
Lithuania	1999	6	3	2	2	3	1	3	13
Lithuania	2000	7	3	2	3	3	1	4	17
Lithuania	2001	7	4	2	3	3	2	4	14

Country	Year	Structure of poverty by age (%), \$PPP 2.15/day			Structure of poverty by gender of HH head (%), \$PPP 2.15/day		Structure of poverty by number of children in HH (%), \$PPP 2.15/day		
		Children (<16 y.o.)	Adults (17–65)	Elderly (>65 y.o.)	Male	Female	No children	One or two	Three
Albania	2002	41	52	7	91	9	9	48	43
Armenia	1998/99	34	59	8	72	28	27	49	24
Armenia	2001	30	61	9	73	27	34	49	17
Armenia	2002	29	62	9	72	28	33	52	15
Armenia	2003	29	63	8	73	27	31	53	16
Azerbaijan	2002	37	57	7	79	21	13	48	39
Azerbaijan	2003	34	58	8	87	13	12	55	33
Belarus	1998	31	56	13	39	61	72	27	1
Belarus	1999	30	55	15	40	60	72	26	1
Belarus	2000	30	56	14	39	61	73	26	1
Belarus	2001	26	59	15	46	54	76	24	1
Belarus	2002	27	57	16	41	59	76	23	1
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	27	60	13	84	16	50	35	15
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	77	23	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	33	56	12	73	27	48	31	21
Bulgaria	2001	31	58	11	77	23	40	41	18
Bulgaria	2003	30	63	7	72	28	43	46	11
Estonia	2000	28	61	11	41	59	53	38	9
Estonia	2001	28	62	10	43	57	52	41	7
Estonia	2002	27	62	11	47	53	52	42	6
Estonia	2003	22	63	15	44	56	63	34	4
Georgia	1997	25	62	13	67	33	45	44	10
Georgia	1998	25	61	14	68	32	47	43	10
Georgia	1999	24	63	13	66	34	50	41	9
Georgia	2000	26	62	12	65	35	42	48	10
Georgia	2001	24	62	13	67	33	42	48	10
Georgia	2002	22	63	15	66	34	47	45	8
Georgia	2003	24	62	14	69	31	45	45	10
Hungary	1998	44	52	4	76	24	25	41	34
Hungary	1999	44	50	6	81	19	39	31	30
Hungary	2000	46	53	1	88	12	20	48	32
Hungary	2001	48	50	1	95	5	4	59	37
Hungary	2002	66	56	2	—	—	19	24	57
Kazakhstan	2001	37	58	4	63	37	18	52	30
Kazakhstan	2002	37	59	5	61	39	17	54	29
Kazakhstan	2003	37	59	4	63	37	14	54	31
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	42	53	5	73	27	16	48	36
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	42	53	4	70	30	14	49	36
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	41	55	4	72	28	13	54	33
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	41	55	4	79	21	11	54	36
Latvia	2002	27	63	10	38	62	55	35	10
Latvia	2003	31	61	8	35	65	41	46	13
Lithuania	1998	36	58	6	41	59	30	56	15
Lithuania	1999	41	52	7	47	53	25	54	21
Lithuania	2000	39	54	7	46	54	32	47	20
Lithuania	2001	36	59	5	48	52	37	47	16

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 4 (continued)

## Poverty Profile: Demographic Dimension

Country	Year	Poverty rate by age (%), \$PPP 2.15/day			Poverty rate by gender of HH head (%), \$PPP 2.15/day		Poverty rate by number of children in HH (%), \$PPP 2.15/day		
		Children (<16 y.o.)	Adults (17–65)	Elderly (>65 y.o.)	Male	Female	No children	One or two	Three
Lithuania	2002	7	4	3	3	3	2	4	17
Lithuania	2003	6	3	2	2	3	2	3	14
Macedonia, FYR	2002	6	4	2	3	1	1	4	9
Macedonia, FYR	2003	6	4	2	3	2	1	4	9
Moldova	1998	74	65	64	63	58	52	68	83
Moldova	1999	85	76	79	77	68	66	80	94
Moldova	2000	84	74	77	74	65	64	79	92
Moldova	2001	78	67	71	67	58	57	73	87
Moldova	2002	66	52	54	51	45	39	60	80
Moldova	2003	53	40	38	38	32	27	47	68
Poland	1998	3	1	0	1	1	0	1	6
Poland	1999	4	1	1	1	1	0	1	7
Poland	2000	4	2	1	1	1	0	2	7
Poland	2001	5	2	1	2	1	0	2	9
Poland	2002	5	2	1	2	2	0	2	9
Romania	1998	22	12	7	9	8	4	12	43
Romania	1999	29	17	11	13	12	7	18	55
Romania	2000	32	18	10	14	12	7	20	61
Romania	2001	27	14	9	11	10	6	14	58
Romania	2002	26	14	8	11	9	5	14	54
Romania	2003	21	11	7	8	7	4	11	47
Russian Fed.	1997	13	9	8	10	7	4	10	25
Russian Fed.	1998	18	12	11	12	9	6	14	32
Russian Fed.	1999	26	19	20	19	16	12	22	43
Russian Fed.	2000	21	15	17	15	12	9	17	40
Russian Fed.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2002	13	8	8	9	6	4	9	27
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	7	5	8	6	5	5	5	18
Tajikistan	1999	92	90	89	88	87	61	84	92
Tajikistan	2003	76	72	72	69	61	39	61	78
Ukraine	2002	6	3	1	2	2	1	4	19
Ukraine	2003	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	5
Uzbekistan	2000/01	58	51	48	50	39	20	42	63
Uzbekistan	2002	45	40	35	38	27	15	33	49
Uzbekistan	2003	50	45	40	43	29	15	38	56
Colombia	2003	8	4	5	4	4	2	3	11
Turkey	2002	29	16	14	14	16	5	12	41
Vietnam	1998	49	36	37	38	30	20	32	59

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: — = not available.

Country	Year	Structure of poverty by age (%), \$PPP 2.15/day			Structure of poverty by gender of HH head (%), \$PPP 2.15/day		Structure of poverty by number of children in HH (%), \$PPP 2.15/day		
		Children (<16 y.o.)	Adults (17–65)	Elderly (>65 y.o.)	Male	Female	No children	One or two	Three
Lithuania	2002	35	57	8	49	51	39	42	18
Lithuania	2003	35	56	9	41	59	45	38	16
Macedonia, FYR	2002	34	61	6	92	8	16	55	28
Macedonia, FYR	2003	34	60	6	87	13	18	55	27
Moldova	1998	31	60	9	66	34	44	46	10
Moldova	1999	29	60	11	67	33	48	44	8
Moldova	2000	28	60	12	66	34	52	40	7
Moldova	2001	28	59	13	65	35	53	41	6
Moldova	2002	29	58	13	62	38	50	44	7
Moldova	2003	28	60	12	63	37	47	45	7
Poland	1998	51	46	3	69	31	14	37	49
Poland	1999	51	46	4	63	37	10	40	50
Poland	2000	46	51	3	61	39	15	44	40
Poland	2001	46	52	2	65	35	17	42	42
Poland	2002	43	55	2	58	42	17	46	37
Romania	1998	38	57	5	78	22	29	46	25
Romania	1999	35	59	7	77	23	34	46	20
Romania	2000	35	59	6	79	21	32	49	20
Romania	2001	35	59	7	77	23	33	46	21
Romania	2002	35	58	7	76	24	33	47	20
Romania	2003	35	58	7	76	24	34	45	21
Russian Fed.	1997	34	60	6	38	62	28	60	12
Russian Fed.	1998	32	61	7	35	65	32	58	10
Russian Fed.	1999	29	63	8	32	68	38	56	6
Russian Fed.	2000	29	63	9	32	68	38	55	8
Russian Fed.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2002	30	63	8	32	68	34	58	8
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	14	55	31	64	36	81	16	3
Tajikistan	1999	48	48	4	83	17	5	26	69
Tajikistan	2003	45	51	4	82	18	8	30	62
Ukraine	2002	38	57	5	48	52	20	62	18
Ukraine	2003	34	57	8	42	58	27	63	10
Uzbekistan	2000/01	45	52	4	81	19	7	37	56
Uzbekistan	2002	42	54	4	82	18	8	40	52
Uzbekistan	2003	42	55	4	83	17	7	44	49
Colombia	2003	49	46	5	71	29	13	36	51
Turkey	2002	47	49	4	89	11	12	38	50
Vietnam	1998	45	49	6	78	22	13	43	44

**TABLE 5**  
**Poverty Profile: Education Dimension**

Country	Year	Poverty rate by education (%), \$PPP 2.15/day (adults, >15 y.o.)				
		None/ unfinished primary	Primary/ basic	Secondary general	Secondary special	Tertiary
Albania	2002	12	27	14	11	3
Armenia	1998/99	56	58	57	55	41
Armenia	2001	69	62	61	56	44
Armenia	2002	48	57	58	51	40
Armenia	2003	63	58	52	47	35
Azerbaijan	2002	8	6	4	5	4
Azerbaijan	2003	8	5	4	4	3
Belarus	1998	7	11	10	8	4
Belarus	1999	6	9	8	7	3
Belarus	2000	4	6	6	5	2
Belarus	2001	4	5	4	3	1
Belarus	2002	2	3	2	2	0
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	5	6	4	2	5
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	7	4	1	0	1
Bulgaria	2001	16	9	2	3	1
Bulgaria	2003	14	5	2	1	0
Estonia	2000	8	6	4	4	1
Estonia	2001	4	6	4	4	1
Estonia	2002	6	6	4	4	1
Estonia	2003	8	7	3	5	1
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	44	48	44	38	30
Georgia	1999	54	55	51	51	38
Georgia	2000	59	59	55	53	41
Georgia	2001	62	62	57	55	40
Georgia	2002	61	57	51	49	33
Georgia	2003	66	62	56	48	33
Hungary	1998	2	1	0	1	0
Hungary	1999	2	1	0	0	0
Hungary	2000	2	1	0	0	0
Hungary	2001	1	1	0	0	0
Hungary	2002	1	0	0	0	0
Kazakhstan	2001	25	32	36	24	13
Kazakhstan	2002	23	27	31	19	9
Kazakhstan	2003	19	22	26	14	7
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	80	75	80	69	56
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	67	71	75	67	49
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	66	72	74	62	48
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	92	65	74	57	41
Latvia	2002	14	4	3	1	0
Latvia	2003	7	5	3	2	0
Lithuania	1998	4	4	3	...	1
Lithuania	1999	4	4	4	...	1
Lithuania	2000	5	4	4	...	1
Lithuania	2001	7	5	5	...	1
Lithuania	2002	7	6	4	...	1
Lithuania	2003	8	5	2	4	0

Country	Year	Structure of Poverty by Education (%), \$PPP 2.15/day (adults, >15 y.o.)				
		None/ unfinished primary	Primary/ basic	Secondary general	Secondary special	Tertiary
Albania	2002	1	77	13	8	1
Armenia	1998/99	2	23	44	19	12
Armenia	2001	3	15	44	26	13
Armenia	2002	2	14	48	25	12
Armenia	2003	2	14	49	25	11
Azerbaijan	2002	3	20	47	21	10
Azerbaijan	2003	2	21	47	21	10
Belarus	1998	16	13	27	37	7
Belarus	1999	8	18	32	35	6
Belarus	2000	8	16	32	38	6
Belarus	2001	12	17	28	37	6
Belarus	2002	8	24	29	35	3
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	32	7	46	5	11
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	61	24	7	4	4
Bulgaria	2001	51	28	5	14	2
Bulgaria	2003	41	39	6	12	2
Estonia	2000	2	35	17	41	4
Estonia	2001	1	40	19	36	4
Estonia	2002	1	40	18	38	3
Estonia	2003	1	38	14	43	4
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	5	11	43	30	11
Georgia	1999	5	11	42	22	20
Georgia	2000	6	11	42	22	20
Georgia	2001	5	12	43	21	18
Georgia	2002	6	11	45	20	18
Georgia	2003	6	14	45	18	16
Hungary	1998	25	43	3	28	1
Hungary	1999	30	46	1	23	0
Hungary	2000	26	49	1	24	0
Hungary	2001	24	56	2	18	1
Hungary	2002	35	33	5	28	0
Kazakhstan	2001	7	15	43	29	7
Kazakhstan	2002	8	17	43	27	5
Kazakhstan	2003	7	16	45	26	5
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	2	13	54	22	9
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	1	14	52	24	9
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	2	15	56	18	10
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	1	16	56	18	9
Latvia	2002	7	52	22	18	0
Latvia	2003	2	55	22	19	2
Lithuania	1998	49	34	11	...	11
Lithuania	1999	44	37	14	...	14
Lithuania	2000	39	42	14	...	14
Lithuania	2001	40	42	14	...	14
Lithuania	2002	47	37	11	...	11
Lithuania	2003	6	49	27	16	3

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 5 (continued)

## Poverty Profile: Education Dimension

Country	Year	Poverty rate by education (%), \$PPP 2.15/day (adults, >15 y.o.)				
		None/ unfinished primary	Primary/ basic	Secondary general	Secondary special	Tertiary
Macedonia, FYR	2002	0	5	2	0	1
Macedonia, FYR	2003	2	4	3	2	1
Moldova	1998	70	75	68	58	40
Moldova	1999	83	84	79	73	53
Moldova	2000	81	81	77	70	54
Moldova	2001	72	76	70	63	41
Moldova	2002	59	61	55	46	28
Moldova	2003	46	47	42	33	18
Poland	1998	1	2	0	1	0
Poland	1999	2	2	0	1	0
Poland	2000	2	3	1	2	0
Poland	2001	1	3	0	2	0
Poland	2002	2	3	1	2	0
Romania	1998	17	15	8	9	1
Romania	1999	23	22	12	14	1
Romania	2000	24	23	13	15	1
Romania	2001	23	20	8	11	1
Romania	2002	22	19	7	11	1
Romania	2003	18	16	5	8	1
Russian Fed.	1997	...	7	8	6	3
Russian Fed.	1998	...	14	17	13	8
Russian Fed.	1999	...	17	19	15	10
Russian Fed.	2000	...	14	15	12	7
Russian Fed.	2001	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2002	...	7	8	6	3
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	11	7	1	4	1
Tajikistan	1999	91	91	91	88	79
Tajikistan	2003	75	76	75	63	50
Ukraine	2002	2	3	3	...	9
Ukraine	2003	2	2	1	...	0
Uzbekistan	2000/01	57	51	58	43	30
Uzbekistan	2002	46	40	45	33	20
Uzbekistan	2003	48	44	52	37	24
Colombia	2003	13	7	2	0	0
Turkey	2002	29	17	7	6	1
Vietnam	1998	43	37	31	...	50

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: Kyrgyz Rep.: individuals reporting incomplete higher education are included in "secondary general" category. Lithuania 1998–2002; Ukraine, Vietnam: separation of secondary education into secondary general and secondary special was not possible. Russian Federation 1997–2000: "Primary/basic" includes individuals with none/unfinished primary education; 2002: only 5 people reported to have "none/unfinished primary" education.  
 — = not available.  
 ... = negligible.

Country	Year	Structure of Poverty by Education (%), \$PPP 2.15/day (adults, >15 y.o.)				
		None/ unfinished primary	Primary/ basic	Secondary general	Secondary special	Tertiary
Macedonia, FYR	2002	0	76	22	0	1
Macedonia, FYR	2003	0	63	32	2	2
Moldova	1998	17	24	34	19	6
Moldova	1999	16	24	34	20	7
Moldova	2000	15	26	35	18	7
Moldova	2001	14	26	36	17	6
Moldova	2002	14	28	38	15	5
Moldova	2003	14	30	40	10	5
Poland	1998	3	46	3	48	1
Poland	1999	3	47	2	47	0
Poland	2000	3	47	3	46	1
Poland	2001	1	49	2	47	1
Poland	2002	1	49	3	46	1
Romania	1998	26	32	23	18	1
Romania	1999	25	34	22	19	1
Romania	2000	23	33	23	21	0
Romania	2001	27	36	17	20	1
Romania	2002	27	38	15	20	1
Romania	2003	26	39	14	20	0
Russian Fed.	1997	...	7	43	40	11
Russian Fed.	1998	...	7	40	40	13
Russian Fed.	1999	...	6	38	40	16
Russian Fed.	2000	...	6	40	40	14
Russian Fed.	2001	...	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2002	...	5	46	38	12
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	41	28	2	28	1
Tajikistan	1999	13	18	46	17	6
Tajikistan	2003	7	20	58	9	6
Ukraine	2002	2	34	6	—	6
Ukraine	2003	3	35	5	—	5
Uzbekistan	2000/01	5	16	57	16	5
Uzbekistan	2002	4	16	56	19	5
Uzbekistan	2003	3	15	59	18	5
Colombia	2003	25	57	18	0	0
Turkey	2002	33	60	5	1	0
Vietnam	1998	50	11	0	...	0

TABLE 6

## Poverty Profile: Labor Market

Country	Year	Poverty rate by labor market status (%), \$PPP 2.15/day (adults, >15 y.o.)					
		Wage employee	Self-employed	Unemployed	Retired	Student	Inactive in working age
Albania	2002	13	24	31	16	12	23
Armenia	1998/99	49	45	67	60	50	60
Armenia	2001	47	52	69	59	53	62
Armenia	2002	45	51	63	52	45	57
Armenia	2003	38	53	51	49	43	54
Azerbaijan	2002	4	...	3	5	4	7
Azerbaijan	2003	3	...	3	5	4	6
Belarus	1998	7	6	17	7	8	13
Belarus	1999	6	6	13	6	7	10
Belarus	2000	5	4	12	4	5	9
Belarus	2001	3	3	7	3	4	7
Belarus	2002	2	2	5	2	2	4
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	2	3	8	4	2	6
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	1	0	10	3	0	10
Bulgaria	2001	2	4	16	4	2	17
Bulgaria	2003	2	2	12	3	2	11
Estonia	2000	2	2	12	4	5	7
Estonia	2001	3	2	11	3	4	9
Estonia	2002	2	1	12	3	5	8
Estonia	2003	3	2	10	4	6	8
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1999	38	47	56	56	44	54
Georgia	2000	45	51	58	58	46	60
Georgia	2001	44	54	61	59	47	61
Georgia	2002	39	49	49	52	40	53
Georgia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	2000	1	0	0	1	0	1
Hungary	2001	0	0	3	0	1	3
Hungary	2002	0	0	1	0	0	1
Kazakhstan	2001	19	35	39	19	29	37
Kazakhstan	2002	16	29	37	15	25	33
Kazakhstan	2003	12	24	31	13	21	30
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	56	80	75	54	69	75
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	49	81	69	54	67	76
Latvia	2002	1	3	9	2	2	6
Latvia	2003	1	3	9	2	2	8
Lithuania	1998	2	...	6	1	2	4
Lithuania	1999	2	...	8	2	2	6
Lithuania	2000	3	...	8	2	2	5
Lithuania	2001	3	...	11	2	3	7
Lithuania	2002	3	...	6	4	4	8
Lithuania	2003	1	6	9	2	3	7

Country	Year	Structure of poverty by labor market status (%), \$PPP 2.15/day (adults, >15 y.o.)					
		Wage employee	Self-employed	Unemployed	Retired	Student	Inactive in working age
Albania	2002	12	41	11	13	3	20
Armenia	1998/99	23	21	17	17	5	17
Armenia	2001	20	14	21	21	6	18
Armenia	2002	21	15	20	21	6	17
Armenia	2003	20	18	15	20	7	20
Azerbaijan	2002	54	...	0	17	3	29
Azerbaijan	2003	46	...	0	21	6	27
Belarus	1998	50	5	10	21	6	8
Belarus	1999	50	6	8	21	5	10
Belarus	2000	51	5	9	20	5	11
Belarus	2001	46	4	8	22	5	14
Belarus	2002	44	5	11	21	7	13
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	9	7	10	24	4	47
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	21	2	30	29	0	18
Bulgaria	2001	10	3	41	23	2	21
Bulgaria	2003	17	10	24	16	3	30
Estonia	2000	28	2	23	20	11	17
Estonia	2001	30	1	22	16	10	20
Estonia	2002	27	1	23	17	14	19
Estonia	2003	35	1	15	19	14	16
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1999	20	41	10	15	7	7
Georgia	2000	20	44	8	13	7	8
Georgia	2001	18	46	9	12	7	7
Georgia	2002	17	38	9	12	6	18
Georgia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	2002	46	2	0	0	1	51
Hungary	2001	16	0	21	6	9	48
Hungary	2002	17	0	31	19	6	28
Kazakhstan	2001	22	27	20	11	11	10
Kazakhstan	2002	23	28	17	11	12	10
Kazakhstan	2003	25	27	13	11	13	10
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	28	38	5	9	13	7
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	24	37	4	10	15	9
Latvia	2002	19	5	34	25	7	10
Latvia	2003	23	7	31	19	5	14
Lithuania	1998	61	...	15	8	5	11
Lithuania	1999	53	...	20	11	5	11
Lithuania	2000	56	...	20	10	6	8
Lithuania	2001	50	...	23	9	7	10
Lithuania	2002	47	...	18	11	10	13
Lithuania	2003	18	19	17	16	11	19

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 6 (continued)

## Poverty Profile: Labor Market

Country	Year	Poverty rate by labor market status (%), \$PPP 2.15/day (adults, >15 y.o.)					
		Wage employee	Self-employed	Unemployed	Retired	Student	Inactive in working age
Macedonia, FYR	2002	2	1	6	2	...	6
Macedonia, FYR	2003	2	2	5	2	...	6
Moldova	1998	62	67	72	65	62	76
Moldova	1999	74	81	78	79	71	80
Moldova	2000	71	82	85	76	68	76
Moldova	2001	63	74	71	70	65	67
Moldova	2002	47	59	71	54	46	52
Moldova	2003	38	45	57	40	37	33
Poland	1998	1	1	4	1	1	3
Poland	1999	1	1	5	1	1	3
Poland	2000	1	1	7	1	2	4
Poland	2001	1	2	6	1	2	3
Poland	2002	1	2	7	1	2	3
Romania	1998	6	17	23	9	23	6
Romania	1999	7	25	28	13	29	9
Romania	2000	8	25	30	15	34	10
Romania	2001	10	21	23	10	26	7
Romania	2002	9	21	24	10	26	7
Romania	2003	7	16	21	8	20	5
Russian Fed.	1997	8	10	17	8	9	—
Russian Fed.	1998	10	11	20	11	13	—
Russian Fed.	1999	17	17	29	19	21	—
Russian Fed.	2000	14	10	24	15	17	—
Russian Fed.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2002	7	7	16	7	8	—
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	3	6	10	5	2	12
Tajikistan	1999	91	88	93	90	85	90
Tajikistan	2003	72	68	79	74	61	74
Ukraine	2002	2	1	5	2	4	6
Ukraine	2003	1	1	2	1	3	0
Uzbekistan	2000/01	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colombia	2003	3	5	5	0	3	7
Turkey	2002	12	21	13	5	11	18
Vietnam	1998	28	40	30	33	17	28

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: Azerbaijan, Lithuania 1998-2002: "Wage employee" contains data for both wage employee and self-employed (disaggregation was not possible).

FYR Macedonia 2002-2003: "Inactive in working age" includes students (disaggregation was not possible).

Moldova, Poland, and Romania: ILO definition of labor force is used.

Russian Federation 1997-2000, 2002: Working pensioners were assumed to be wage employees. Not possible to estimate inactive in working age.

— = not available; ... = negligible.

Country	Year	Structure of poverty by labor market status (%), \$PPP 2.15/day (adults, >15 y.o.)					
		Wage employee	Self-employed	Unemployed	Retired	Student	Inactive in working age
Macedonia, FYR	2002	13	5	25	9	...	49
Macedonia, FYR	2003	15	9	19	6	...	47
Moldova	1998	45	10	4	28	4	9
Moldova	1999	43	15	3	29	4	6
Moldova	2000	40	18	3	30	4	5
Moldova	2001	37	21	2	31	5	4
Moldova	2002	33	25	3	31	4	3
Moldova	2003	32	25	2	29	5	8
Poland	1998	24	16	17	13	9	20
Poland	1999	21	19	19	14	11	18
Poland	2000	20	10	27	12	11	19
Poland	2001	21	13	27	9	11	19
Poland	2002	20	10	29	9	14	17
Romania	1998	17	39	13	6	15	11
Romania	1999	15	43	13	6	12	11
Romania	2000	15	40	14	6	14	11
Romania	2001	27	31	11	5	16	10
Romania	2002	27	29	11	5	17	11
Romania	2003	28	29	10	6	16	11
Russian Fed.	1997	55	1	21	14	9	—
Russian Fed.	1998	53	1	20	17	9	—
Russian Fed.	1999	54	0	17	19	10	—
Russian Fed.	2000	54	0	17	18	11	—
Russian Fed.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2002	53	2	18	16	11	—
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	17	7	17	31	2	27
Tajikistan	1999	31	16	9	8	6	29
Tajikistan	2003	31	20	3	8	5	34
Ukraine	2002	31	0	25	18	12	13
Ukraine	2003	34	20	8	2	36	0
Uzbekistan	2000/01	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colombia	2003	17	38	7	0	4	33
Turkey	2002	18	37	1	2	4	39
Vietnam	1998	10	77	1	6	3	4

TABLE 7

## Poverty Profile: Health Dimension

Country	Year	Morbidity rate (%)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Albania	2002	4	12	16	14	15	14
Armenia	1998/99	19	17	17	21	18	18
Armenia	2001	17	13	12	15	15	14
Armenia	2002	18	11	13	16	14	14
Armenia	2003	14	10	10	14	10	11
Azerbaijan	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Azerbaijan	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	14	24	26	26	24	23
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	17	20	18	18	17	18
Bulgaria	1995	6	10	13	9	9	10
Bulgaria	2001	10	15	15	14	14	15
Bulgaria	2003	20	14	12	17	12	14
Estonia	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	2000	25	18	17	22	18	19
Georgia	2001	14	14	11	16	10	13
Georgia	2002	10	9	8	11	7	9
Georgia	2003	11	7	9	12	8	9
Hungary	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kazakhstan	2001	18	17	11	20	9	14
Kazakhstan	2002	14	13	7	16	6	10
Kazakhstan	2003	9	13	8	15	7	11
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Latvia	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Latvia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—

Country	Year	Health care utilization rate (%)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Albania	2002	28	39	34	40	29	35
Armenia	1998/99	40	38	33	43	31	37
Armenia	2001	34	37	32	37	28	34
Armenia	2002	30	35	33	37	34	32
Armenia	2003	38	31	31	39	23	33
Azerbaijan	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Azerbaijan	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	51	33	24	25	27	31
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	56	66	55	71	48	61
Bulgaria	2001	73	66	53	68	51	62
Bulgaria	2003	79	84	85	81	85	83
Estonia	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	2000	69	71	83	76	77	75
Georgia	2001	85	85	85	84	82	85
Georgia	2002	90	89	87	89	88	88
Georgia	2003	92	93	93	95	89	93
Hungary	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kazakhstan	2001	50	59	47	59	47	55
Kazakhstan	2002	61	56	54	59	50	56
Kazakhstan	2003	54	55	56	56	55	55
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Latvia	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Latvia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 7 (continued)

## Poverty Profile: Health Dimension

Country	Year	Morbidity rate (%)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Macedonia, FYR	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2003	15	10	13	19	8	13
Poland	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Romania	1998	14	13	10	15	8	12
Romania	1999	12	14	11	16	8	12
Romania	2000	11	14	10	15	7	12
Romania	2001	10	13	10	14	8	12
Romania	2002	11	13	10	13	8	12
Romania	2003	12	15	11	15	8	13
Russian Fed.	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1998	43	37	32	38	35	36
Russian Fed.	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2000	46	38	36	39	34	38
Russian Fed.	2001	42	39	35	42	35	38
Russian Fed.	2002	37	39	33	42	33	37
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tajikistan	1999	10	10	8	9	7	8
Tajikistan	2003	6	9	6	8	6	7
Ukraine	2002	87	71	63	73	66	69
Ukraine	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2000/01	10	7	4	8	4	5
Uzbekistan	2002	7	4	2	6	2	3
Uzbekistan	2003	11	4	2	7	2	4
Colombia	2003	9	13	10	12	9	11
Turkey	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vietnam	1998	38	39	43	37	50	42

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: Latvia, FYR Macedonia, Poland (1998), Romania, and Serbia and Montenegro: column "Capital" includes some rural dwellings.

Lithuania: column "Capital" contains estimates for the five largest cities.

Poland (1999–2002): column "Capital" includes urban dwellings of Mazowieckie vojvodship, which contains five urban counties—Warsaw, Radom, Plock, Siedlce, Ostroleka.

Russian Federation: data for Ingushetiya Republic is not available for 1999.

Turkey: "Capital" contains estimates for Ankara and Istanbul and includes some rural dwellings.

Vietnam: column "Capital" contains estimates for Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City.

Morbidity rate reference periods are: 1 month for Albania, Armenia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Colombia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam; and 12 months for Ukraine.

— = not available.

Country	Year	Health care utilization rate (%)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Macedonia, FYR	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2003	67	54	45	53	52	51
Poland	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Romania	1998	22	19	21	21	23	20
Romania	1999	57	56	54	55	52	55
Romania	2000	64	60	59	62	53	60
Romania	2001	68	62	59	66	54	61
Romania	2002	77	63	60	66	57	63
Romania	2003	78	67	60	68	60	65
Russian Fed.	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1998	42	42	40	45	34	41
Russian Fed.	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2000	42	37	37	42	36	37
Russian Fed.	2001	31	27	28	27	29	28
Russian Fed.	2002	33	29	27	31	28	29
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tajikistan	1999	48	47	46	50	41	46
Tajikistan	2003	57	52	53	53	50	53
Ukraine	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ukraine	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2000/01	49	68	72	65	67	67
Uzbekistan	2002	55	69	70	65	69	67
Uzbekistan	2003	53	65	72	60	63	65
Colombia	2003	73	70	65	78	66	69
Turkey	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vietnam	1998	37	37	38	33	41	37

**TABLE 8**  
**Poverty Profile: Access to Education Dimension**

Country	Year	Primary enrollment rate, age 7–14 (%)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Albania	2002	90	92	92	93	90	92
Armenia	1998/99	98	98	98	99	96	98
Armenia	2001	98	98	98	99	96	98
Armenia	2002	99	99	98	99	99	99
Armenia	2003	98	99	98	98	98	98
Azerbaijan	2002	99	98	98	99	98	98
Azerbaijan	2003	98	99	97	99	98	98
Belarus	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	96	97	97	99	96	97
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	90	92	87	94	77	91
Bulgaria	2001	97	96	89	99	77	93
Bulgaria	2003	99	97	94	100	90	96
Estonia	2000	99	96	96	97	95	97
Estonia	2001	95	97	97	97	96	97
Estonia	2002	98	98	97	97	96	98
Estonia	2003	99	99	99	99	99	99
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	2000	97	98	99	99	97	98
Georgia	2001	98	97	98	99	97	98
Georgia	2002	99	96	97	97	95	97
Georgia	2003	100	99	99	100	99	99
Hungary	1998	94	94	94	97	92	94
Hungary	1999	94	94	95	94	93	94
Hungary	2000	96	94	94	97	93	94
Hungary	2001	100	100	100	100	100	100
Hungary	2002	100	100	100	100	100	100
Kazakhstan	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kazakhstan	2002	91	93	92	95	91	93
Kazakhstan	2003	96	91	92	93	90	92
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	100	99	99	99	98	99
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	91	97	97	96	97	96
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	99	98	96	95	96	97
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	95	92	91	92	94	92
Latvia	2002	99	99	98	99	98	99
Latvia	2003	99	100	100	98	99	100
Lithuania	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2002	98	98	97	99	97	98
Lithuania	2003	98	98	99	96	99	99

Country	Year	Secondary enrollment rate, age 15-17 (%)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Albania	2002	84	75	39	69	34	53
Armenia	1998/99	80	74	69	77	70	73
Armenia	2001	80	76	72	81	72	75
Armenia	2002	72	78	74	86	69	75
Armenia	2003	75	74	78	84	72	76
Azerbaijan	2002	93	85	84	86	89	87
Azerbaijan	2003	96	88	81	90	85	87
Belarus	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	97	92	88	96	80	91
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	92	83	50	93	44	77
Bulgaria	2001	95	90	56	94	40	83
Bulgaria	2003	100	90	61	100	56	85
Estonia	2000	98	97	98	98	96	98
Estonia	2001	98	99	97	100	95	98
Estonia	2002	100	99	98	100	97	99
Estonia	2003	92	99	98	100	93	97
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	2000	96	87	83	90	83	87
Georgia	2001	91	90	90	93	87	90
Georgia	2002	98	94	92	98	89	94
Georgia	2003	96	93	86	94	85	90
Hungary	1998	93	95	90	96	87	93
Hungary	1999	95	97	93	100	88	95
Hungary	2000	100	98	93	99	92	96
Hungary	2001	100	100	100	100	100	100
Hungary	2002	100	100	100	100	100	100
Kazakhstan	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kazakhstan	2002	100	99	99	100	98	99
Kazakhstan	2003	100	99	100	100	100	99
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	92	81	72	85	68	76
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	97	82	80	88	80	83
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	98	86	89	91	89	90
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	97	76	88	85	83	87
Latvia	2002	94	97	98	98	94	96
Latvia	2003	97	96	96	98	91	96
Lithuania	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2002	99	98	96	97	96	98
Lithuania	2003	100	100	98	100	98	99

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 8 (continued)

## Poverty Profile: Access to Education Dimension

Country	Year	Primary enrollment rate, age 7–14 (%)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Macedonia, FYR	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	1998	93	90	95	92	94	94
Moldova	1999	94	96	94	93	94	95
Moldova	2000	96	94	96	93	96	96
Moldova	2001	95	94	95	100	93	95
Moldova	2002	96	96	96	99	97	96
Moldova	2003	99	98	97	99	96	98
Poland	1998	99	98	98	98	98	98
Poland	1999	98	98	98	98	98	98
Poland	2000	97	98	98	98	98	98
Poland	2001	99	97	98	98	98	98
Poland	2002	98	98	98	98	98	98
Romania	1998	96	96	93	98	90	95
Romania	1999	94	94	92	96	89	93
Romania	2000	96	95	92	96	90	94
Romania	2001	93	94	91	94	89	93
Romania	2002	96	95	92	96	90	93
Romania	2003	94	95	92	96	89	93
Russian Fed.	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	100	98	98	99	97	98
Tajikistan	1999	91	94	96	97	92	95
Tajikistan	2003	88	90	91	91	87	90
Ukraine	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ukraine	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2000/01	94	87	88	89	89	88
Uzbekistan	2002	97	96	97	97	97	97
Uzbekistan	2003	99	99	99	99	99	99
Colombia	2003	97	96	86	99	86	93
Turkey	2002	97	92	90	96	88	92
Vietnam	1998	95	96	92	95	85	92

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: Latvia, FYR Macedonia, Poland (1998), Romania, and Serbia and Montenegro: column "Capital" includes some rural dwellings.

Lithuania: column "Capital" contains estimates for the five largest cities.

Poland (1999–2002): column "Capital" includes urban dwellings of Mazowieckie vojvodship, which contains five urban counties—Warsaw, Radom, Plock, Siedlce, Ostroleka.

Russian Federation: data for Ingushetiya Republic is not available for 1999.

Turkey: "Capital" contains estimates for Ankara and Istanbul and includes some rural dwellings.

Vietnam: column "Capital" contains estimates for Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City.

— = not available.

Country	Year	Secondary enrollment rate, age 15-17 (%)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Macedonia, FYR	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	1998	72	75	62	55	54	67
Moldova	1999	68	78	60	62	54	65
Moldova	2000	82	80	60	80	64	69
Moldova	2001	71	72	73	87	73	72
Moldova	2002	67	85	76	89	74	77
Moldova	2003	94	90	76	97	68	81
Poland	1998	100	98	95	99	94	97
Poland	1999	97	98	96	100	94	97
Poland	2000	98	98	95	99	92	97
Poland	2001	100	99	97	100	95	98
Poland	2002	99	99	98	99	97	99
Romania	1998	90	85	54	89	53	74
Romania	1999	90	91	65	95	61	81
Romania	2000	92	94	68	98	66	83
Romania	2001	95	93	68	98	61	83
Romania	2002	90	95	68	97	62	83
Romania	2003	98	95	70	96	63	84
Russian Fed.	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1998	91	88	64	98	80	79
Russian Fed.	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2000	90	90	77	85	88	86
Russian Fed.	2001	81	87	77	93	79	84
Russian Fed.	2002	76	86	76	91	66	82
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	100	98	97	99	98	98
Tajikistan	1999	65	61	64	63	58	64
Tajikistan	2003	61	64	67	73	60	66
Ukraine	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ukraine	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2000/01	76	58	54	64	46	57
Uzbekistan	2002	84	66	71	78	67	70
Uzbekistan	2003	87	78	78	82	75	79
Colombia	2003	81	73	48	81	52	67
Turkey	2002	63	61	49	78	39	57
Vietnam	1998	77	78	56	75	42	60

**TABLE 9**  
**Poverty Profile: Infrastructure Dimension**

Country	Year	Household access to water					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Albania	2002	100	98	98	99	96	98
Armenia	1998/99	99	96	77	87	91	89
Armenia	2001	100	95	81	93	90	91
Armenia	2002	99	95	73	88	88	87
Armenia	2003	100	98	78	90	88	90
Azerbaijan	2002	92	76	32	68	62	62
Azerbaijan	2003	96	84	42	75	69	69
Belarus	1998	99	91	46	78	81	78
Belarus	1999	100	88	47	78	78	77
Belarus	2000	99	89	48	79	79	78
Belarus	2001	99	91	52	80	80	80
Belarus	2002	98	89	55	79	79	80
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	100	100	100	100	100	100
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	99	99	99	100	99	99
Bulgaria	1995	100	100	99	100	99	100
Bulgaria	2001	100	100	99	100	98	99
Bulgaria	2003	99	97	80	98	78	92
Estonia	2000	99	94	71	95	80	89
Estonia	2001	100	95	70	95	81	88
Estonia	2002	99	94	70	96	82	88
Estonia	2003	99	93	74	94	83	89
Georgia	1997	96	81	69	80	72	79
Georgia	1998	92	68	69	75	69	75
Georgia	1999	97	82	79	90	79	84
Georgia	2000	94	78	74	85	75	80
Georgia	2001	98	85	72	89	73	82
Georgia	2002	99	86	70	89	71	81
Georgia	2003	99	85	54	82	56	72
Hungary	1998	100	95	89	99	82	93
Hungary	1999	100	95	90	99	83	94
Hungary	2000	100	96	90	99	85	95
Hungary	2001	100	100	100	100	100	100
Hungary	2002	100	100	100	100	100	100
Kazakhstan	2001	100	96	86	95	89	92
Kazakhstan	2002	100	96	89	97	88	93
Kazakhstan	2003	100	96	87	97	89	92
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	92	96	77	91	79	83
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	92	96	73	88	70	81
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	92	96	72	91	75	80
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	87	97	77	95	82	83
Latvia	2002	97	85	56	95	64	81
Latvia	2003	98	87	59	95	66	83
Lithuania	1998	96	94	60	93	67	84
Lithuania	1999	97	93	61	93	66	84
Lithuania	2000	96	92	59	94	64	83
Lithuania	2001	98	93	62	95	69	85
Lithuania	2002	97	94	63	95	66	85
Lithuania	2003	97	91	56	95	61	82

Country	Year	Use of clean fuels for heating					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Albania	2002	80	60	24	56	30	41
Armenia	1998/99	58	31	7	31	28	28
Armenia	2001	51	29	16	42	24	30
Armenia	2002	54	21	17	36	24	29
Armenia	2003	61	22	13	44	19	30
Azerbaijan	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Azerbaijan	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Belarus	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	48	8	5	22	10	14
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bulgaria	1995	90	62	9	62	40	49
Bulgaria	2001	84	46	3	57	16	37
Bulgaria	2003	95	49	9	59	26	43
Estonia	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Estonia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Georgia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungary	1998	96	84	63	93	54	78
Hungary	1999	95	85	63	92	55	79
Hungary	2000	94	83	63	91	57	78
Hungary	2001	95	84	63	91	55	79
Hungary	2002	95	83	63	89	56	78
Kazakhstan	2001	98	89	64	91	63	78
Kazakhstan	2002	98	93	73	94	70	85
Kazakhstan	2003	98	93	75	94	72	85
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Latvia	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Latvia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lithuania	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 9 (continued)

## Poverty Profile: Infrastructure Dimension

Country	Year	Household access to water					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Macedonia, FYR	2002	94	99	89	96	90	94
Macedonia, FYR	2003	97	99	85	97	90	94
Moldova	1998	99	54	2	46	15	29
Moldova	1999	98	55	1	50	16	29
Moldova	2000	99	56	2	49	22	30
Moldova	2001	99	57	3	46	21	30
Moldova	2002	99	52	3	48	18	29
Moldova	2003	100	54	3	43	22	30
Poland	1998	98	99	90	98	90	95
Poland	1999	98	99	91	98	92	96
Poland	2000	98	99	91	99	91	96
Poland	2001	98	99	93	99	93	97
Poland	2002	97	99	94	99	93	97
Romania	1998	85	89	18	76	36	57
Romania	1999	85	90	19	78	34	58
Romania	2000	83	89	20	78	36	58
Romania	2001	96	90	21	82	33	60
Romania	2002	85	90	20	82	31	58
Romania	2003	85	90	19	80	31	57
Russian Fed.	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1998	99	89	44	84	72	77
Russian Fed.	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2000	100	90	42	87	65	77
Russian Fed.	2001	100	90	49	90	68	80
Russian Fed.	2002	100	90	49	89	68	80
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	96	98	79	96	82	90
Tajikistan	1999	95	96	91	93	93	92
Tajikistan	2003	100	93	56	78	57	67
Ukraine	2002	100	83	23	74	56	64
Ukraine	2003	100	86	22	76	54	66
Uzbekistan	2000/01	99	85	55	78	57	68
Uzbekistan	2002	100	89	57	82	64	70
Uzbekistan	2003	100	90	60	85	65	72
Colombia	2003	99	97	52	96	70	86
Turkey	2002	97	99	85	99	84	94
Vietnam	1998	99	78	57	78	52	63

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Romania, Serbia & Montenegro, Ukraine, and Turkey: running/piped water.

Latvia, FYR Macedonia, Poland (1998), Romania, Serbia and Montenegro: column "Capital" includes some rural dwellings.

Lithuania: column "Capital" contains estimates for the five largest cities.

Poland (1999–2002): column "Capital" includes urban dwellings of Mazowieckie vojevodship, which contains 5 urban counties—Warsaw, Radom, Plock, Siedlce, Ostroleka.

Russian Federation: data for Ingushetiya Republic is not available for 1999.

Turkey: "Capital" contains estimates for Ankara and Istanbul and includes some rural dwellings.

Vietnam: column "Capital" contains estimates for Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City.

— = not available.

Country	Year	Use of clean fuels for heating					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Macedonia, FYR	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Macedonia, FYR	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moldova	2003	100	70	7	48	27	36
Poland	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Romania	1998	77	81	9	67	27	49
Romania	1999	78	81	9	69	25	49
Romania	2000	79	82	10	70	27	50
Romania	2001	94	82	13	74	26	53
Romania	2002	82	77	11	72	21	48
Romania	2003	82	76	11	71	20	47
Russian Fed.	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2000	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2001	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tajikistan	1999	77	38	4	28	10	14
Tajikistan	2003	88	56	7	33	19	24
Ukraine	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ukraine	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2000/01	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2002	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uzbekistan	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Colombia	2003	—	—	—	—	—	—
Turkey	2002	43	9	1	27	3	11
Vietnam	1998	—	—	—	—	—	—

TABLE 10

## Poverty Profile: Housing Dimension

Country	Year	Tenancy rights					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Albania	2002	88	90	97	94	94	94
Armenia	1998/99	94	86	93	93	91	92
Armenia	2001	94	90	94	94	92	93
Armenia	2002	89	93	94	92	92	92
Armenia	2003	88	90	95	92	91	91
Azerbaijan	2002	79	89	97	87	90	89
Azerbaijan	2003	80	93	97	89	92	90
Belarus	1998	30	49	75	63	45	54
Belarus	1999	36	50	77	64	47	56
Belarus	2000	58	62	78	75	56	67
Belarus	2001	59	63	75	72	56	66
Belarus	2002	58	70	75	77	62	69
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	75	75	84	83	66	79
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	86	83	89	87	78	86
Bulgaria	1995	91	93	96	95	89	93
Bulgaria	2001	91	90	92	88	89	91
Bulgaria	2003	77	87	90	86	82	87
Estonia	2000	79	86	88	85	78	84
Estonia	2001	86	88	88	87	84	87
Estonia	2002	86	88	88	91	81	87
Estonia	2003	83	89	91	91	81	88
Georgia	1997	88	77	97	91	89	89
Georgia	1998	91	80	97	92	90	91
Georgia	1999	92	81	96	91	90	91
Georgia	2000	94	92	99	96	96	96
Georgia	2001	94	95	99	97	96	97
Georgia	2002	92	93	98	95	95	95
Georgia	2003	91	89	99	94	94	95
Hungary	1998	77	89	95	93	82	89
Hungary	1999	78	90	95	93	82	89
Hungary	2000	80	89	96	93	81	90
Hungary	2001	83	89	95	92	82	90
Hungary	2002	83	89	95	93	83	90
Kazakhstan	2001	93	93	97	96	94	95
Kazakhstan	2002	90	94	98	95	96	96
Kazakhstan	2003	92	95	98	96	97	96
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	83	92	99	94	97	95
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	87	95	98	96	95	96
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	88	96	98	96	96	96
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	84	98	97	94	95	95
Latvia	2002	79	66	81	85	62	75
Latvia	2003	82	70	80	85	62	78
Lithuania	1998	88	89	85	90	81	87
Lithuania	1999	87	88	85	89	79	87
Lithuania	2000	89	88	87	91	81	88
Lithuania	2001	88	87	84	88	79	86
Lithuania	2002	85	86	84	85	79	85
Lithuania	2003	85	86	83	85	80	85

Country	Year	Overcrowded housing (more than 3 per room or less than 6 sq m per person)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Albania	2002	10	16	19	4	35	17
Armenia	1998/99	23	17	14	7	31	18
Armenia	2001	19	11	6	7	24	11
Armenia	2002	20	10	8	9	18	12
Armenia	2003	19	15	8	10	18	13
Azerbaijan	2002	7	4	11	4	14	8
Azerbaijan	2003	5	3	6	2	8	5
Belarus	1998	11	11	7	4	19	10
Belarus	1999	14	9	9	4	17	10
Belarus	2000	12	9	6	3	18	9
Belarus	2001	12	9	6	3	15	9
Belarus	2002	11	8	7	3	17	8
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2001	5	13	6	2	17	8
Bosnia & Herzegovina	2004	4	4	2	2	3	3
Bulgaria	1995	5	3	4	1	10	4
Bulgaria	2001	3	4	7	1	21	5
Bulgaria	2003	5	6	8	2	15	6
Estonia	2000	1	1	1	1	3	1
Estonia	2001	1	1	1	0	3	1
Estonia	2002	1	0	2	0	3	1
Estonia	2003	1	1	1	0	2	1
Georgia	1997	27	16	10	12	19	16
Georgia	1998	20	12	5	6	13	11
Georgia	1999	19	9	4	5	13	9
Georgia	2000	16	12	6	7	11	10
Georgia	2001	16	13	4	7	11	9
Georgia	2002	16	11	6	7	13	10
Georgia	2003	15	13	5	6	13	9
Hungary	1998	2	1	1	0	3	1
Hungary	1999	2	1	1	0	4	1
Hungary	2000	1	0	1	0	2	0
Hungary	2001	1	0	0	0	2	0
Hungary	2002	1	1	1	0	3	1
Kazakhstan	2001	8	11	16	4	27	13
Kazakhstan	2002	13	9	14	4	25	11
Kazakhstan	2003	13	8	11	3	19	9
Kyrgyz Rep.	2000	25	22	14	9	28	17
Kyrgyz Rep.	2001	24	20	14	9	27	17
Kyrgyz Rep.	2002	28	23	14	10	33	18
Kyrgyz Rep.	2003	28	20	13	7	30	17
Latvia	2002	2	2	3	0	8	3
Latvia	2003	2	1	3	0	6	2
Lithuania	1998	4	3	6	1	12	4
Lithuania	1999	4	3	5	1	8	4
Lithuania	2000	3	3	3	1	7	3
Lithuania	2001	3	3	4	0	8	3
Lithuania	2002	3	2	4	1	7	3
Lithuania	2003	3	2	3	0	7	3

(Table continues on the following page.)

TABLE 10 (continued)

## Poverty Profile: Housing Dimension

Country	Year	Tenancy rights					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Macedonia, FYR	2002	100	100	100	100	100	100
Macedonia, FYR	2003	100	100	100	100	100	100
Moldova	1998	47	78	98	80	90	85
Moldova	1999	53	81	99	80	89	87
Moldova	2000	55	82	98	80	89	87
Moldova	2001	57	80	99	83	89	88
Moldova	2002	67	86	100	87	91	91
Moldova	2003	70	91	99	90	93	92
Poland	1998	56	49	89	68	64	65
Poland	1999	56	50	89	69	65	66
Poland	2000	63	55	90	74	65	70
Poland	2001	60	53	89	73	60	68
Poland	2002	59	54	89	74	63	69
Romania	1998	93	93	95	95	90	94
Romania	1999	92	93	96	95	91	94
Romania	2000	91	94	96	95	91	95
Romania	2001	94	94	97	96	92	95
Romania	2002	94	95	97	96	93	96
Romania	2003	93	94	97	96	93	95
Russian Fed.	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1998	94	90	92	91	89	91
Russian Fed.	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2000	92	90	92	92	90	91
Russian Fed.	2001	90	90	92	89	91	90
Russian Fed.	2002	91	92	93	91	94	92
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	87	85	92	86	88	88
Tajikistan	1999	86	83	94	91	87	92
Tajikistan	2003	82	86	97	93	92	94
Ukraine	2002	74	80	97	87	81	86
Ukraine	2003	74	79	97	87	84	85
Uzbekistan	2000/01	94	91	96	94	94	95
Uzbekistan	2002	97	93	97	96	96	96
Uzbekistan	2003	95	95	98	96	96	97
Colombia	2003	55	55	64	63	60	57
Turkey	2002	62	66	89	73	77	74
Vietnam	1998	77	93	98	93	96	96

Source: World Bank staff estimates using the ECA Household Surveys Archive.

Note: Latvia, FYR Macedonia, Poland (1998), Romania, and Serbia and Montenegro: column "Capital" includes some rural dwellings.

Lithuania: column "Capital" contains estimates for the five largest cities.

Poland (1999–2002): column "Capital" includes urban dwellings of Mazowieckie vojvodship, which contains five urban counties—Warsaw, Radom, Plock, Siedce, Ostroleka.

Turkey: "Capital" contains estimates for Ankara and Istanbul and includes some rural dwellings.

Vietnam: column "Capital" contains estimates for Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City.

— = not available.

Country	Year	Overcrowded housing (more than 3 per room or less than 6 sq m per person)					
		Capital	Other urban	Rural	Top quintile	Bottom quintile	Average
Macedonia, FYR	2002	11	7	12	4	22	10
Macedonia, FYR	2003	9	8	7	2	19	8
Moldova	1998	17	13	7	6	15	10
Moldova	1999	18	12	5	10	11	9
Moldova	2000	16	10	5	7	13	8
Moldova	2001	17	9	5	6	12	8
Moldova	2002	16	7	5	5	12	7
Moldova	2003	18	7	4	5	13	7
Poland	1998	6	5	10	1	18	7
Poland	1999	6	5	10	1	18	7
Poland	2000	6	5	9	1	20	7
Poland	2001	6	5	9	1	18	6
Poland	2002	7	5	8	1	18	6
Romania	1998	7	8	14	2	29	10
Romania	1999	7	8	15	1	32	11
Romania	2000	7	9	14	1	33	11
Romania	2001	6	7	14	1	31	10
Romania	2002	8	9	14	1	32	11
Romania	2003	8	8	14	1	30	10
Russian Fed.	1997	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	1998	9	13	11	8	19	12
Russian Fed.	1999	—	—	—	—	—	—
Russian Fed.	2000	8	12	12	7	21	12
Russian Fed.	2001	16	12	8	8	18	11
Russian Fed.	2002	18	10	10	7	18	11
Serbia & Montenegro	2002	4	3	2	2	6	3
Tajikistan	1999	37	36	42	26	57	40
Tajikistan	2003	36	33	32	17	50	32
Ukraine	2002	3	3	3	0	8	3
Ukraine	2003	5	4	4	1	9	4
Uzbekistan	2000/01	10	14	11	7	20	12
Uzbekistan	2002	9	10	9	7	13	9
Uzbekistan	2003	13	9	7	7	11	8
Colombia	2003	5	6	15	0	22	8
Turkey	2002	1	6	7	0	19	5
Vietnam	1998	14	21	27	20	31	25



## Bibliography

- Adams, R. 2002. "Economic Growth, Inequality and Poverty: Findings from a New Data Set." Policy Research Working Paper 2972, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Andren, Daniela, John S. Earle, and Dana Sapatoru. 2004. "The Wage Effects of Schooling under Socialism and in Transition: Evidence from Romania, 1950–2000." Staff Working Paper 04-108, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo.
- Andrienko, Yuri, and Sergei Guriev. 2004. "Determinants of Interregional Mobility in Russia: Evidence from Panel Data." *Economics of Transition* 12 (1): 1–27.
- Aslund, Anders. 2001. "The Myth of Output Collapse after Communism." Working Paper 18, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Washington, DC.
- Atkinson, Anthony B., Eric Marlier, and Brian Nolan. 2004. "Indicators and Targets for Social Inclusion in the European Union." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 42 (March): 47–75.
- Atkinson, Anthony B., and John Micklewright. 1992. *Economic Transformation in Eastern Europe and the Distribution of Income*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Atkinson, Tony, Bea Cantillon, Eric Marlier, and Brian Nolan. 2002. *Social Indicators: The EU and Social Inclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Babetskii, Ian, Alexandre Kolev, and Mathilde Maurel. 2003. "Kyrgyz Labour Market in the Late 1990s: The Challenge of Formal Job Creation." *Comparative Economic Studies* 45 (4, December): 493–519.

- Bartelsman, Eric, John Haltiwanger, and Stefano Scarpetta. 2004. "Microeconomic Evidence of Creative Destruction in Industrial and Developing Countries." Discussion Paper 1374, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn.
- Bashmakov, I. 2004. "Analysis of Situation with Collectability of Payments for Housing and Public Utility Services." Photocopy, Center for Energy Efficiency, Moscow.
- Bazen, Stephen, and Patrick Moyes. 2003. "International Comparisons of Income Distribution." Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper No. 341, Luxembourg.
- Blackstone Corporation (Canada) and Agency of Socioeconomic Analysis (Bulgaria). 2004. "The Economic and Social Impact of Farm Restructuring in ECA: Bulgaria." An input to Nora Dudwick, Karin Fock, and David Sedick: "A Stocktaking of Land Reform and Farm Restructuring in Bulgaria, Moldova, Azerbaijan, and Kazakhstan." Social Development Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Bloem, Adriaan M., Paul Cotterell, and Terry Gigantes. 1998. "National Accounts in Transition Countries: Balancing the Biases?" *Review of Income and Wealth* 44 (1): 1–24.
- Boldrin, Michele, and Fabio Canova. 2001. "Inequality and Convergence in Europe's Regions: Reconsidering European Regional Policies." *Economic Policy* 16 (32, April): 205–53.
- Bonilla-Chacin, Maria E., Edmundo Murrugarra, and Moukim Temourov. 2002. "Health Care during Transition and Health Systems Reform: Evidence from the Poorest CIS Countries." Human Development Department, Europe and Central Asia Region, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Borak, Neven, and Lovrenc Pfajfar. 2002. "Inequalities in Income Distribution in Slovenia." *Post-Communist Economies* 14 (4): 455–68.
- Bornhorst, Fabian, and Simon Commander. 2004. "Regional Unemployment and its Persistence in Transition Countries." Discussion Paper 1074, IZA, Bonn.
- Bos, E., A. Ryskulova, S. Patel, and M. Hiraga. 2002. "Infant and Child Mortality Rates in Eastern Europe and Central Asia: What's Wrong with the Data?" Photocopy, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Bourguignon, F. 2003. "The Growth Elasticity of Poverty Reduction: Explaining Heterogeneity across Countries and Time Periods." In *Inequality and Growth: Theory and Policy Implications*, ed. T. Eicher and S. Turnovsky. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Brainerd, Elizabeth, and David M. Cutler. 2005. "Autopsy on an Empire: Understanding Mortality in Russia and the Former Soviet Union." Discussion Paper 1472, IZA, Bonn.
- Briceño, C., A. Estache, and N. Shafik. 2004. "Infrastructure Services in Developing Countries: Access, Quality, Costs, and Policy Reform." Policy Research Working Paper 3468, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Brown, J. David, and John S. Earle. 2004a. "Economic Reforms and Productivity-Enhancing Reallocation in the Post-Soviet Transition." Discussion Paper 1044, IZA, Bonn.

- . 2004b. "Job Reallocation and Productivity Growth in the Ukrainian Transition." Discussion Paper 1349, IZA, Bonn.
- Campos, Nauro F., and Dean Jolliffe. 2003. "After, Before and During: Returns to Education in Hungary (1986–1998)." *Economic Systems* 27: 377–90.
- Caselli, Francesco, and Silvana Tenreyro. 2004. "Is Poland the Next Spain?" Federal Reserve Board of Boston Public Policy Paper No. 04-8 (June). Boston, MA.
- Cazes, Sandrine, and Alena Nesporova. 2003. *Labour Markets in Transition: Balancing Flexibility & Security in Central and Eastern Europe*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Chen, Shaohua, and Martin Ravallion. 2001. "How Did the World's Poorest Fare in the 1990s?" *Review of Income and Wealth* 47 (3, September): 283–300.
- Chernetsky, Taras. Forthcoming. "Magnitudes and Distribution of Remittances in Eastern Europe: Evidence from Household Surveys Data and Balance of Payment Statistics." World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Clert, C., and E. Gomart. 2004. "Human Trafficking in South Eastern Europe: Beyond Crime Control, an Agenda for Social Inclusion and Development." Photocopy, Social Development Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Coady, David, Margaret Grosh, and John Hoddinott. 2004. *The Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries: Review of Experience and Lessons*. Regional and Sectoral Studies Series. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Commander, Simon, and Janos Köllő. 2004. "The Changing Demand for Skills: Evidence from the Transition." Discussion Paper 1073, IZA, Bonn.
- Commander, Simon, and Yulia Rodionov. 2005. "A Model of the Informal Economy with an Application to Ukraine." IZA-EBRD Conference on Labour Market Dynamics, Role of Institutions and Internal Labour Markets, University of Bologna, May 5–8, 2005.
- Corak, M. 2005. "Principles and Practicalities in Measuring Child Poverty for the Rich Countries." Working Paper 2005-01, UNICEF, Innocenti Research Centre, Florence.
- Council of the European Union. 2004. *Joint Report by the Commission and the Council on Social Inclusion*. Brussels, Belgium: Council of the European Union.
- Davidow, S. 1996. "Observations on Health Care Issues in the Former Soviet Union." *Journal of Community Health* 21 (1, February): 51–60.
- Deaton, A. 2004. "Measuring Poverty in a Growing World (or Measuring Growth in a Poor World)." Revised version of the Review of Economics and Statistics Lecture, presented at Harvard University, April 15, 2003. [http://www.wws.princeton.edu/%7Erpds/downloads/deaton\\_measuring\\_poverty\\_204.pdf](http://www.wws.princeton.edu/%7Erpds/downloads/deaton_measuring_poverty_204.pdf).
- Deaton, A., and S. Zaidi. 2002. "Guidelines for Constructing Consumption Aggregates for Welfare Analysis." LSMS Working Paper 135, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Delteil, Violaine, Ariane Pailhé, and Dominique Redor. 2004. "Comparing Individual Wage Determinants in Western and Central Europe: On the

- Way to Convergence? The Cases of France and Hungary." *Journal of Comparative Economics* 32 (3, September): 482–99.
- Dennis, Ian, and Anne-Catherine Guio. 2003. "Monetary Poverty in EU Acceding and Candidate Countries." *Statistics In Focus*. Theme 3: 21/2003. Luxembourg: European Commission, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- . 2004. "Poverty and Social Exclusion in the EU." *Statistics In Focus*. Population and Social Conditions: 16/2004. Luxembourg: European Commission, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Dikhanov, Yuri. 1996. "Decomposition of Inequality Based on Incomplete Information." Paper presented at the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth (IARIW) 24th General Conference, Lillehammer, Norway, August 18–24, 1996.
- Dolado, Juan José, and Vanesa Llorens. 2004. "Gender Wage Gaps by Education in Spain: Glass Floors versus Glass Ceilings." Discussion Paper 4203, Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR), London.
- Dudwick, N., K. Fock, D. Sedik, and J. Swinnen. 2004. "The Economic and Social Impacts of Farm Restructuring in Eastern Europe and Central Asia." Social Development Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Dudwick, N., and H. Shahriari. 2000. "Education in Albania: Changing Attitudes and Expectations." Photocopy, Social Development Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region, World Bank, Tirana.
- Dutz, Mark, Celine Kauffmann, Serineh Najarian, Peter Sanfey, and Ruslan Yemtsov. 2001. "Labour Market States, Mobility and Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies." Working Paper 66, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), London.
- Epaulard, Anne. 2003. "Macroeconomic Performance and Poverty Reduction." Working Paper 03/72, International Monetary Fund Institute, Washington, DC.
- Eriksson, Tor, and Mariola Pytlikova. 2004. "Firm-Level Consequences of Large Minimum-Wage Increases in the Czech and Slovak Republics." *Labour: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations* 18 (1, March): 75–103.
- Eurelectric. 2003. "Electricity Tariffs as of 1 January 2003 (Published Tariffs)." Brussels: Eurelectric. Web site: <http://public.eurelectric.org/>.
- European Commission (EC). 2002. "Health Statistics: Key Data on Health 2002." Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- . 2003. "Employment in Europe 2003: Recent Trends and Prospects." Directorate-General for Employment and Social Affairs, Unit EMPL/A.1, Employment and European Social Fund. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- . 2004. "Household Budget Survey in the Candidate Countries: Methodological Analysis 2003." Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

- Feldmann, Horst. 2004. "How Flexible Are Labour Markets in the EU Accession Countries Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic?" *Comparative Economic Studies* 46: 272–310.
- Fidrmuc, Jan. 2004. "Migration and Regional Adjustment to Asymmetric Shocks in Transition Economies." *Journal of Comparative Economics* 32: 230–47.
- Fiszbein, Ariel, ed. 2001. *Decentralizing Education in Transition Societies: Case Studies from Central and Eastern Europe*. Washington, DC: World Bank Institute (WBI).
- Fleisher, Belton, ed. 2005. "Symposium on Returns to Schooling in Transition: The Chinese, European, and Russian Experiences." *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 33 (June): 223–370.
- Fleisher, Belton, Klara Sabirianova Peter, and Xiaojun Wang. 2004. "Returns to Skills and the Speed of Reforms: Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe, China, and Russia." Discussion Paper 1182, IZA, Bonn. June.
- Förster, M., D. K. Jesuit, and T. M. Smeeding. 2005. "Regional Poverty and Income Inequality in Central and Eastern Europe: Evidence from the Luxembourg Income Study." In *Spatial Inequality and Development*, ed. R. Kanbur and A. J. Venables. UNU-WIDER Studies in Development Economics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foster, James, Joel Greer, and Erik Thorbecke. 1984. "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures." *Econometrica* 52 (3): 761–66.
- Funck, Bernard, and Lodovico Pizzati, ed. 2003. *European Integration, Regional Policy, and Growth*. Washington, DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, World Bank.
- Geweke, J., G. Gowrisankaran, and R. Town. 2003. "Bayesian Inference for Hospital Quality in a Selection Model." *Econometrica* 71(4, July): 1215–1238.
- Godinho, Joana, Adrian Renton, Viatcheslav Vinogradov, Thomas Novotny, George Gotsadze, Mary-Jane Rivers, and Mario Bravo. 2005. "Reversing the Tide: Priorities for HIV/AIDS Prevention in Central Asia." Working Paper 54, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Gomart, E. 2000. "Social Assessment of Poverty in Croatia, December 1999–March 2000." Photocopy, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Gorodnichenko, Yuri, and Klara Sabirianova Peter. 2004. "Returns to Schooling in Russia and Ukraine: A Semiparametric Approach to Cross-Country Comparative Analysis." Discussion Paper 1325, IZA, Bonn.
- Gottschalk, Peter, and Timothy M. Smeeding. 1997. "Cross-National Comparisons of Earnings and Income Inequality." *Journal of Economic Literature* 35 (June): 633–87.
- Grammenos, Stefanos. 2003. *Illness, Disability and Social Inclusion*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Centre for European Social and Economic Policy. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Gregory, Paul R., and Valery Lazarev. 2004. "Structural Change in Russian Transition." Discussion Paper 896, Yale University Economic Growth Center, New Haven.

- Haltiwanger, John, Harmut Lehmann, and Katherine Terell. 2003. "Symposium on Job Creation and Job Destruction in Transition Economies." *Economics of Transition* 11: 205–19.
- Hamilton, Ellen, Deniz Baharoglu, Bill Denning, Christine Kessides, Alexandre Kolev, and Maka Lomaia. 2004. "Dimensions of Urban Poverty in ECA." Photocopy. Europe and Central Asia Region, Energy and Infrastructure Unit. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Hinnosaar, Marit, and Tairi Rõõm. 2003. "The Impact of Minimum Wage on the Labor Market in Estonia: An Empirical Analysis." Working Paper 8, Eesti Pank (Bank of Estonia), Tallinn, Estonia.
- Holtzman, S. B., and T. Nezam. 2004. "Living in Limbo. Conflict-Induced Displacement in Europe and Central Asia." Social Development Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- International Labour Organization (ILO). 2003. *Key Indicators of the Labour Market*. CD-ROM, Geneva: ILO.
- . 2004. *World Employment Report 2004–05: Employment, Productivity, and Poverty Reduction*. Geneva: ILO.
- Ivaschenko, Oleksiy. 2005. "The Patterns and Determinants of Longevity in Russia's Regions: Evidence from Panel Data." Photocopy, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Jurajda, Štípan, and Katarína Matherňová. 2004. "How to Overhaul the Labor Market: Political Economy of Recent Czech and Slovak Reforms." Background Paper prepared for the *World Development Report 2005*, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Kakwani N., and Z. Sajaia. 2004. "Internationally Comparable Poverty Lines for CIS Countries." Photocopy. World Bank, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region, DFID, United Kingdom.
- Kapsos, Steven. 2004. "Estimating Growth Requirements for Reducing Working Poverty: Can the World Halve Working Poverty by 2015?" Employment Strategy Paper 2004/14, ILO, Geneva.
- Kertesi, Gábor, and János Köllő. 2001. "Economic Transformation and the Revaluation of Human Capital – Hungary, 1986–1999." Working Paper on the Labour Market 2001/4, Institute of Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest.
- . 2003. "The Employment Effects of Nearly Doubling the Minimum Wage: The Case of Hungary." Working Paper on the Labour Market 2003/06, Institute of Economics, Budapest University of Economics, Budapest.
- Kolenikov, Stanislav, and Anthony Shorrocks. 2003. "A Decomposition Analysis of Regional Poverty in Russia." UNU/WIDER Discussion Paper 2003/74, Helsinki.
- Kolev, Alexandre. 2003. "Joblessness and Precarious Work in Bulgaria: Addressing the Multiple Aspects of Vulnerability in the Labour Market." SP Discussion Paper 0303, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Kolev, Alexandre, and Sabine Bernabe. 2003. "Identifying Vulnerable Groups in the Kyrgyz Labour Market: Some Implications for the National Poverty

- Reduction Strategy." CASE Paper 71, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE), London School of Economics, London.
- Lehmann, Hartmut, and Jonathan Wadsworth. 2001. "Wage Arrears and the Distribution of Earnings in Russia." William Davidson Institute Working Paper 421, University of Michigan, Stephen M. Ross Business School, Ann Arbor.
- Lekhan, Valery, Volodymyr Rudi, and Ellen Nolte. 2004. *Health Care Systems in Transition: Ukraine*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe on behalf of the European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies.
- Macours, Karen, and Johan F. M. Swinnen. 2004. "Rural Poverty in ECA." Background Paper for the present study, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Marshall, Martin, Sheila Leatherman, Soeren Mattke, and the Members of the OECD Health Promotion, Prevention, and Primary Care Panel. 2004. "Selecting Indicators for the Quality of Health Promotion, Prevention and Primary Care at the Health Systems Level in OECD Countries." Health Technical Paper 16, OECD, Paris.
- Mencini, L., and G. Redmond. *Child Income Poverty in CIS and SEE*. Innocenti Social Monitor 2005. Florence: UNICEF, Innocenti Research Centre.
- Mete, Cem, and Shirley H. Liu. 2005. "Predictors and Implications of Sickness in a Transition Economy." Photocopy, World Bank, Washington DC.
- Mincer, J. 1974. *Schooling, Experience and Earnings*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mullis, Ina V. S., Michael O. Martin, Eugenio J. Gonzalez, and Stephen J. Chrostowski. 2004. *TIMSS 2003 International Mathematics Report*. International Association for the Evaluation of Education Achievement. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS and PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College.
- Munich, Daniel. 2003. *Human Capital in Transition: Czech Students and Workers Adapting to the Market*. Center for Economics Research and Graduate Education (CERGE), Charles University, Economics Institute. Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (ASCR).
- Munich, Daniel, Jan Svejnar, and Katherine Terrell. 2005. "Returns to Human Capital under the Communist Wage Grid and during the Transition to a Market Economy." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 87 (1, February): 100–123.
- Murrugarra, E., and A. Sethi. 2005. "Quality of Education in Transition Economies: Household, Teachers, and School Factors across the Educational Achievement Distribution." Background Paper for the present study, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Murthi, Mamta, and Erwin Tiongson. Forthcoming. "Attitudes to Equality: The Socialist Legacy Revisited." World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Narayan, Deepa, Raj Patel, Kai Schafft, Anne Rademacher, and Sarah Koch-Schulte. 2000. *Voices of the Poor: Can Anyone Hear Us?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nesperova, Alena. 2002. "Why Unemployment Remains So High in Central and Eastern Europe." Employment Paper 2002/43, International Labour Organization, Geneva.

- Newell, Andrew, and Barry Reilly. 1997. "Rates of Return to Educational Qualifications in the Transitional Economies." Discussion Paper in Economics 03/97, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom.
- Newell, Andrew, and Mieczyslaw W. Socha. 2005. "The Distribution of Wages in Poland, 1992–2002." Discussion Paper 1485, IZA, Bonn.
- Nolte, Ellen, Martin McKee, and Anna Gilmore. 2004. "Morbidity and Mortality in Transition Countries in the European Context." Paper prepared for the European Population Forum 2004: Population Challenges and Policy Responses, January 12–14, 2004, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), Geneva.
- OECD. 2003. "Summary Results of ECP 2000: A Note by the OECD Secretariat." Working Paper 6, Statistical Commission and Economic Commission for Europe, Conference of European Statisticians, Joint Consultation on the European Comparison Programme, Geneva, March 31–April 2, 2003.
- O'Higgins, Niall. 2003. "Trends in the Youth Labour Market in Developing and Transition Countries." Social Protection Discussion Paper 0321, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Paci, Pierella. 2002. *Gender in Transition*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Paci, Pierella, and Barry Reilly. 2004. "Does Economic Liberalization Reduce Gender Inequality in the Labor Market? The Experience of the Transition Economies of Europe and Central Asia." Photocopy, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Parkin, D. M., S. R. Whelan, J. Ferlay, and H. Storm. 2005. *Cancer Incidence in Five Continents*. Vols. I–VII. IARC CancerBase No. 7. IARC: Lyon.
- Peter, Klara Sabirianova. 2003. "Skill-Biased Transition: The Role of Markets, Institutions, and Technological Change." Discussion Paper 893, IZA, Bonn.
- Raiser, Martin, Mark Schaffer, and Johannes Schuchhardt. 2004. "Benchmarking Structural Change in Transition." *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 15 (1): 47–81.
- Rashid, Mansoor, and Jan Rutkoswki. 2001. "Labor Markets in Transition Economies: Recent Developments and Future Challenges." Social Protection Discussion Paper 0111, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Ravallion, Martin. 1994. *Poverty Comparisons*. Fundamentals of Pure and Applied Economics 56. Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Press.
- . 2001a. "Growth, Inequality, and Poverty: Looking Beyond Averages." Policy Research Working Paper 2558, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- . 2001b. "Measuring Aggregate Welfare in Developing Countries: How Well Do National Accounts and Surveys Agree?" Policy Research Working Paper 2665, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- . 2004. "Pro-Poor Growth: A Primer." Policy Research Working Paper 3242, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Ravallion, Martin, and Shaohua Chen. 1997. "What Can New Survey Data Tell Us about Recent Changes in Distribution and Poverty?" *World Bank Economic Review* 11 (2): 357–82.
- Ravallion, Martin, and Michael Lokshin. 1999. "Subjective Economic Welfare." Policy Research Working Paper 2106, World Bank, Washington, DC.

- Reventa, A., D. Ringold, and W. M. Tracy. 2002. "Poverty and Ethnicity: A Cross-Country Study of Roma Poverty in Central Europe." Technical Paper 531, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Ringold, Dena, Mitchell A. Orenstein, and Erika Wilkens. 2003. "Roma in an Expanding Europe: Breaking the Poverty Cycle." Conference Edition. IBRD. World Bank: Washington, DC.
- Rozelle, Scott, and Johan F. M. Swinnen. 2004. "Success and Failure of Reform: Insights from the Transition of Agriculture." *Journal of Economic Literature* 42 (June): 404–56.
- Rutkowski, Jan. 2001. "Earnings Inequality in Transition Economies of Central Europe: Trends and Patterns during the 1990s." Social Protection Discussion Paper 0117, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- . 2003a. "Does Strict Employment Protection Discourage Job Creation? Evidence from Croatia." Policy Research Paper 3104, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- . 2003b. "Firms, Jobs, and Employment in Moldova." Policy Research Paper 3253, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Sanfey, Peter, Elisabetta Falcetti, Anita Taci, and Sladjana Tepic. 2004. "Spotlight on South-Eastern Europe: An Overview of Private Sector Activity and Investment." EBRD Publications Desk, London.
- Sanfey, Peter, and Utku Teksoz. 2005. "Does Transition Make You Happy?" Working Paper 91, EBRD, London.
- Schneider, Friedrich. 2002. "The Size and Development of the Shadow Economies of 22 Transition and 21 OECD Countries." Discussion Paper 514, IZA, Bonn.
- Schneider, Friedrich, and Robert Klinglmaier. 2004. "Shadow Economies around the World: What Do We Know?" Discussion Paper 1043, IZA, Bonn.
- Schreyer, Paul, and Dirk Pilat. 2001. "Measuring Productivity." *OECD Economic Studies* 33: 127–70.
- Shore-Sheppard, Lara D. 2005. "Stemming the Tide? The Effect of Expanding Medicaid Eligibility on Health Insurance." Working Paper 11091, National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), Cambridge, MA.
- Sierminska, Eva, and Thesia Garner. 2002. "A Comparison of Income, Expenditures, and Home Market Value Distributions Using Luxembourg Income Study Data from the 1990s." Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper No. 343, Luxembourg.
- Signoret, Jose, and Edmundo Murrugarra. 2003. "Vulnerability in Consumption, Education, and Health: Evidence from Moldova during the Russian Crisis." Policy Research Working Paper 3010, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Sullivan, Dennis H., and Timothy M. Smeeding. 1997. "Educational Attainment and Earnings Inequality in Eight Nations." Discussion Paper, Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper 164 (July), Luxembourg.
- Szalai, Julia. 2002. "Social Outcasts in 21st Century Hungary." *Review of Sociology of the Hungarian Sociological Association* 8 (2, December): 35–52.

- Toralieva, Gulnura, and Dina Maslova. 2004. "Kyrgyzstan: Disabled Workers Written Off." On Institute of War and Peace Web site: [http://www.iwpr.net/index.pl?archive/rca/rca\\_200401\\_255\\_2\\_eng.txt](http://www.iwpr.net/index.pl?archive/rca/rca_200401_255_2_eng.txt).
- Treisman, Daniel, and Vladimir Gimpelson. 2001. "Political Business Cycles and Russian Elections, or the Manipulations of 'Chudar.'" *British Journal of Political Science* 31: 225–46.
- United Nations. 2000. "Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development." Agreements, World Summit for Social Development, Geneva, June 2000. Document A/CONF 166/9, United Nations, New York.
- United Nations Millennium Project. 2005. *A Home in the City*. Task Force on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers. London and Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- van de Walle, Dominique. 2002. "The Static and Dynamic Incidence of Vietnam's Public Safety Net." Policy Research Working Paper 2791, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Vandycke, N. 2001. "Access to Education for the Poor in Europe and Central Asia: Preliminary Evidence and Policy Implications." Technical Paper 511, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Vecernik, Jiri. 2001. "Earnings Disparities in the Czech Republic: Evidence of the Past Decade and Cross-National Comparison." *Prague Economic Papers* 10 (3, September): 201–21.
- Vodopivec, Milan. 2004. "Labor Market Developments in the 1990s." In *Slovenia: From Yugoslavia to the European Union*, ed. Mojmir Mrak, Matija Rojec, and Carlos Silva-Jauregui. 292–314. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Wagstaff, Adam, and Eddy van Doorslaer. 2001. "Paying for Health Care: Quantifying Fairness, Catastrophe, and Impoverishment, with Applications to Vietnam, 1993–98." Policy Research Working Paper 2715. World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Weissman, Ellen M. 1996. "Using Performance Monitoring to Improve Community Health: Conceptual Framework and Community Experience." National Academy of Sciences. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. <http://books.nap.edu/html/concept>.
- World Bank. 1990. *World Development Report 1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2000a. *Making Transition Work for Everyone: Poverty and Inequality in Europe and Central Asia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2000b. *Republic of Latvia, The: Poverty Assessment*. 2 vols. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2001a. *Hungary: Long-Term Poverty, Social Protection, and the Labor Market*. 2 vols. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2001b. *Poland Labor Market Study: The Challenge of Job Creation*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2001c. *Slovak Republic: Living Standards, Employment, and Labor Market Study*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2001d. *World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

- . 2002a. *Armenia: Poverty Update*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2002b. *Bulgaria: Poverty Assessment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2002c. *Georgia: Poverty Update*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2002d. *Labor Market in Postwar Bosnia and Herzegovina: How to Encourage Businesses to Create Jobs and Increase Worker Mobility*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2002e. *Republic of Tajikistan: Poverty Assessment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2002f. *Russian Labor Market: Moving from Crisis to Recovery*. Europe and Central Asia Region, Human Development Sector Unit. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2002g. *Slovak Republic: Poverty and Welfare of Roma in the Slovak Republic*. Bratislava: World Bank, Foundation S.P.A.C.E., Ineko, and Open Society Institute.
- . 2002h. *Transition: The First Ten Years: Analysis and Lessons for Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2002i. *Turkmenistan: A Profile of Living Standards in Turkmenistan*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003a. *Albania: Poverty Assessment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003b. *Armenia: Poverty Assessment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003c. *Azerbaijan Republic: Poverty Assessment*. 2 vols. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003d. *Bosnia and Herzegovina: Poverty Assessment*. 2 vols. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003e. *FYR Macedonia: Country Economic Memorandum Tackling Unemployment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003f. *Guatemala: Poverty in Guatemala*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003g. *Inequality in Latin America and the Caribbean: Breaking with the Past?* Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003h. *Kosovo Labor Market Study: Policy Challenges of Formal and Informal Employment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003i. *Kyrgyz Republic: Enhancing Pro-Poor Growth*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003j. "Review of Parent-Community Participation in Schools in ECA." Background Paper for *Social Development in Europe and Central Asia Region: Issues and Directions*. ECA, Socially and Sustainable Development Department. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003k. *Romania: Poverty Assessment*. 2 vols. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003l. *Serbia and Montenegro: Poverty Assessment*. 2 vols. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2003m. *Tracking Nonincome Dimensions of Poverty in ECA*. Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit and Human Development Sector Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region. Washington, DC: World Bank.

- . 2003n. *Uzbekistan: Living Standards Assessment*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004a. "Azerbaijan Municipal Services Study." Photocopy, Infrastructure and Energy Services Department (ECSIE), World Bank, Washington, DC.
- . 2004b. *Belarus: Poverty Assessment*. 2 vols. Decision Draft. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004c. *Bosnia and Herzegovina: Country Economic Memorandum*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004d. *The Governance of Service Delivery in ECA: A Regional Study*. ECA Vice Presidency. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004e. *Kazakhstan: Living Standards Assessment in Kazakhstan*. 2 vols. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004f. *Latvia: Poverty Assessment*. Decision Draft. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004g. *Latvia: The Quest for Jobs and Growth: A World Bank Country Economic Memorandum*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004h. *Poland: Growth, Employment and Living Standards in Pre-Accession Poland*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004i. *Recession, Recovery, and Poverty in Moldova*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2004j. *World Development Report 2005*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2005a. *Dynamics of Vertical Coordination in Agri-Food Supply Chains in ECA*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2005b. *Global Economic Prospects 2005: Trade, Regionalism, and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2005c. *MDGs in Europe and Central Asia: Performance and Prospects*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2005d. *Operationalizing MDGs: How Effective Is the Long Route? A Case Study of Georgia*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2005e. "Poverty and Social Exclusion of the Roma in Serbia and Montenegro." Photocopy, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- . 2005f. "Pro-Poor Growth in the 1990s: Lessons and Insights from 14 Countries." Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2005g. *Russian Federation: Reducing Poverty through Growth and Social Policy Reform*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2005h. "Serbia: The Social Safety Net and the Poor." Photocopy, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- . 2005i. *World Development Indicators*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . 2005j. *World Development Report 2006: Equity and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . Forthcoming-a. *Enhancing Job Opportunities in Transition Countries: Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

- . Forthcoming-b. *Foundations for Sustainable Infrastructure in Europe and Central Asia: Tariffs, Safety Nets, Regulation, Commercialization*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . Forthcoming-c. *From Disintegration to Reintegration: Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union in International Trade*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . Forthcoming-d. *Doing Business 2006*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Health Organization (WHO). 2002. *Reducing Risks, Promoting Healthy Life: World Health Report 2002*. Geneva: UN, WHO.
- Wu, X., J. Lampietti, and A. S. Meyer. 2004. "Coping with the Cold: Space Heating and the Urban Poor in Developing Countries." *Energy Economics* 26: 345–57.
- Yemtsov, Ruslan, Cem Mete, and Stefania Rodica Cnoblach. 2005. "Evolution of the Predictors of Earnings during the Transition." Background Paper for the present study, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Yoon, Yang-Ro, Barry Reilly, Gorana Krstic, and Sabine Bernabe. 2003. "A Study of Informal Labour Market Activity in the CIS." Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Zeikate, S. 2004. "Decentralization of Service Delivery and the Access for the Impoverished People." Background Paper for the present study, World Bank, Washington, DC.



## Index

- accountability, 208, 209, 214
  - health care, 37–38
- age, 62, 76, 211
- agriculture
  - employment, 114, 115
  - growth and productivity, 35–36, 131–132, 144, 205–206, 213–214
  - promotion, 41
  - transition to market, role in, 116–118
  - value added per worker, 115
- Armenia
  - catastrophic health expenditures, 169
  - electricity, 180
  - growth rate and inequality, 198
  - health care spending, 167
  - health care utilization, 165, 166
  - utilities, 172–173
- Azerbaijan, utilities, 173
- Belarus
  - catastrophic health expenditures, 168–169
  - health care spending, 167
  - trends, 53
- birth control, 69
- Bulgaria
  - education, 156
  - health care utilization rates, 166
- catastrophic health expenditures, 168–169
- cervical cancer, 163, 187*n*.9
- children, 8, 9, 11, 56, 57, 62–64, 193
- mortality, 77*n*.9
  - see also* infant mortality

- chronic health conditions, 70
- CIS. *See* Commonwealth of Independent States
- cities, 3–4, 14
  - capital, 57, 59, 60, 93–94
  - capital vs secondary, 10, 14
  - secondary, dirty fuels and, 181–182
- climate, 4, 76
- Colombia, 48
  - health care utilization and spending, 166, 167
- Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)
  - defined, 43*n*.6
  - growth, 2
  - low income, 43*n*.5, 48, 51, 77*n*.3
  - middle income, 43*n*.4, 48, 51
- communicable diseases, 148
- consumption, 44*n*.12, 105*n*.12, 223
- changes, survey data and, 97–102
  - durables, 223–224
  - equivalence scales, 230–231
  - equivalent consumption, 235*n*.1
  - estimation, 98–100, 102
  - GDP vs, 195
  - goods and services, 223
  - growth rates and, 193–195
  - indicator of welfare, 220, 222
  - measurement, 222
  - per capita, 52, 82, 190
  - poor vs nonpoor, 134–136
  - private, 193–195
  - well-being and, 224
- consumption aggregates, 223, 226
  - structure of, 224–225
- consumption poverty, 51–66
  - water access, and health, 71
- credit market, 206
  - rural areas, 36
- Czech Republic, education, 155, 156, 157, 160
- data
  - availability, 212–213, 217–219, 220
  - benchmark countries, 216–217
  - consistency, 225–226
  - countries covered and not covered, 216
  - quality, 83, 101, 212–213, 217–219, 220, 222
  - regional household survey archive, 215–220
  - sources, 221
- database, income and nonincome poverty, 214
- data collection, 219–220
  - household survey, 42–43
  - nonincome dimensions, 213
- decentralization, 183, 187*n*.7
- delivery networks, 147
- demographics, 4, 76, 233, 250–253
  - health care and, 25–26, 162
- deprivation, absolute, 5, 6–7, 8
  - disabled persons, 65
  - displaced persons, internally (IDPs), 65
  - see also* migration
- distribution
  - changes in, 87–90
  - effect, 85
  - share, 20, 90
- doctor-patient contact per person by country, 186
- drug abuse, 25, 69
- earnings, 109, 134–135, 204
  - unexplained gap, 204

- earnings, (continued)  
  *see also* wages
- economic growth. *See* growth
- economic opportunities. *See* opportunities
- economically inactive poor. *See* nonworking poor
- economies of scale, 63
- education, 2, 22–23, 30, 37, 57, 59, 72, 135, 148, 149–161, 187*n*.4, 193, 200, 204, 207–208, 233, 235, 254–257, 266–269  
  coverage of, 149–154
- equity, 37, 208
- mathematics performance, 155
- performance, 156–157, 160–161, 187*n*.5
- primary, 150–151
- quality, 23, 37, 72, 154–161, 208
- returns to, 123, 145*n*.7
- secondary, 151–154
- subnational governments, 158
- teachers, 159
- test scores, 154–156
- see also* school enrollment; teachers
- elasticity, 45*n*.20, 85, 190
- inequality and, 85–87
- partial, poverty reduction and, 94–96
- poverty reduction, 85–86
- elderly, social protection, 211
- electricity, 26–27, 172
- household expenditure, 176
- quality of service, 174
- tariffs, 176–177, 178
- employment, 13, 57, 58, 109, 192
- discouragement, 140
- employment, (continued)
- growth, wage growth vs, 110–111
- low-productive, 140, 142
- productivity and, 142–145
- structure of, 111–113
- employment rate, 44*n*.16, 126
- survey data vs ILO statistics, 113
- women, 44*n*.15
- employment-to-population ratios, 3, 17, 18
- energy, 171–182
- enterprises, 35
- old, restructured, and new, 139, 204–205
- enterprise sector reform, 35, 41, 204–205, 213
- entrepreneurship, 89, 105*n*.10
- epidemics, 69
- equivalence scales, 230–231
- ethnicity, 11, 193
- see also* minorities
- EU-8, 2, 3, 48, 51
- Europe and Central Asia (ECA), 2
- European Union (EU)
- accession, 34, 192–193
- first members, 44*n*.10
- new members, 42–43*n*.2
- poverty reduction objectives, 192–193
- exchange, reciprocal, 225
- exchange rates, 16
- Expenditure and Income (EI) Surveys, 218
- families. *See* children
- farm, household 117
- financial sector, 38
- firms, 35
- old, restructured, and new, 139, 204–205

- food share, 226
- fuel, dirty, 27–28, 181–182
  - see also* heating; utility services
- full cost recovery, 210
- gas, tariffs, 178–179
- gender, 124, 136, 204
  - gap, 145*n*.6
  - inequality, 124
  - secondary education, 153
- Georgia, 51
  - consumption poverty, water
    - access, and health, 71
  - health care spending, 167
  - income, 44*n*.17
  - trends, 54
  - utilities, 173
- governance, 183
- gross domestic product (GDP),
  - 16, 80
  - growth rates, future, 33
  - private consumption vs, 195
- growth, 3, 32, 41, 51, 79–105,
  - 104*n*.4
  - accelerating, 203–207
  - connecting the poor to,
    - 107–110
  - distribution, 83–84, 90–91
  - effect, 84–85
  - elasticities, 81–87, 105*n*.7
  - elasticity averages, 82, 83
  - inequality and, 14
  - patterns, 108, 195–203
  - shared, 20, 90–91, 213–214
  - targets, 202–203
- growth rates, 17, 80, 81
  - global projections, 195
  - private consumption and ,
    - 193–195
  - shared, 34–37
- health care services, 23, 25–26,
  - 30, 37, 207–208
- health care services, (continued)
  - access to, 37–38, 161–171,
    - 208–209
  - catastrophic care, 168–169
  - cost, 187*n*.12, 209
  - efficiency, 209
  - expenditures, 28, 29, 187*n*.11
  - mechanisms to protect the
    - poor, 169–171
  - noncommunicable diseases, 4
  - paying for, 165–168
  - providers, 162
  - public funding, 170–171, 184
  - quality of, 37–38, 162, 164,
    - 208–209
  - service usage, 234–235
  - spending, 162, 166–168
  - utilization, 70, 164–171, 185,
    - 187*n*.10
  - tilization rates, 166
- health insurance, 170, 171
- health status, 2–3, 67–71, 125,
  - 262–265
  - indicators, 234–235
  - inequalities, 125
  - perceptions, 70
- heating, 73
  - dirty fuels, 181–182
  - district, 172–173, 182
  - household expenditure, 176
  - tariffs, 178–179
- high poverty, 5
- HIV/AIDS, 3, 25, 69–70, 148,
  - 186*n*.2, 199, 201, 202
- hospital utilization, 26, 164, 198,
  - 202
- Household Budget Surveys
 (HBS), 218, 219, 226
- household consumption, 102
  - measurement, 99, 101
- household data, variability,
  - 218–219
- households, 44*n*.12, 148–149

- households, (continued)  
heterogeneity, 160  
private consumption, 190  
regional survey archive,  
215–220  
utility services expenditures,  
175–179
- household surveys, 48  
data for this report, 42–43  
health care utilization, 165  
housing, 73–74, 192, 235,  
274–277  
labor mobility and, 206–207
- human capital  
characteristics, 134–136  
investment in, 207
- Hungary, 5  
health care spending, 167  
profile of the poor, 65
- illiteracy, 22, 72
- income, 18–19, 44*n*.12, 94–95,  
104*n*.5, 204  
distribution, 32, 190  
growth, 15–16, 84–85  
indicator of welfare, 220, 222  
inequality, 44*n*.12  
measurement, 15–16  
reporting, 222
- income poverty, 183
- inequality, 3, 18–20, 30, 78*n*.15,  
85, 86–87, 93, 102–104,  
104–105*n*.6, 125, 190, 206  
aversion, 74  
between-group, 89  
changes, 87–90, 105*n*.9  
decomposition, 89  
dynamics, 196–198  
elasticity and, 85  
factors, 103–104  
growth and, 195–203  
growth rate and, 197  
indicators, 238–241
- inequality, (continued)  
international perspective, 103  
measuring, 44*n*.13, 232  
pattern, 89  
perception of, 44*n*.14  
regional, 36–37, 206, 207,  
213  
transfers and, 22  
trends, 13–16
- infant mortality, 68–69, 148,  
186*n*.1, 198, 201  
goals, 44–45*n*.19  
*see also* maternal mortality
- informal employment, 133  
transition economies and,  
134–135
- infrastructure, 26–28, 38, 72–74,  
202, 235, 270–273  
heating, 182  
rural, 206, 207  
schools, 157–158, 160
- institutional factors, 136–140
- institutionalized populations,  
formerly, 65
- isolation, geographical, 196
- jobless, 109
- jobs, 124–125  
creation, 3, 17  
opportunities, enhancing, 141
- Kyrgyz Republic, 205  
growth rate and inequality,  
198  
trends, 53
- labor markets, 107–145,  
158–161, 205, 206,  
233–234  
enhancing job opportunities,  
141  
mobility, 36, 139–140,  
206–207

- labor markets, (continued)
  - profiles of the poor, 108
  - reallocation, 17–18, 112–114
- land reform, 35–36, 205, 206
- language, education and, 154
- Latvia, education and schools, 156, 160
- life expectancy, 67, 68, 77*n*.8, 148
- life satisfaction, 75, 78*n*.15
- literacy, 22, 72
- Lithuania, 51
  - education, 156
  - urban-rural gap, 92, 94
- Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS), 218–219, 226
- living standards, 215, 226
- low poverty, 5
  
- Macedonia, education, 156
- macroeconomic environment, 236–237
- Making Transition Work for Everyone*, data collection, 217, 223
- marginalized groups, 39, 211–212
- market-based incentives, 36–37
- markets, input and output, 206
- maternal mortality, 68–69, 77*n*.10, 186*n*.1, 198, 201, 202
  - goals, 44–45*n*.19
  - see also* infant mortality
- mathematics performance, 155, 156, 157, 187*n*.8
- migrants, 65, 193
- migration, 25, 69, 139–140, 153, 197, 206–207
  - ethnicity, education and, 154
- Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), 44–45*n*.19, 191–193, 199
  - Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), (continued)
    - prospects by region, 200–201
  - minimum wage, 40, 144
    - adequate, 212
  - minorities, 39, 193, 211–212
  - moderate poverty, 5
  - Moldova, 51
    - education, 59, 151, 156
    - growth rate, distribution, and inequality, 19, 84, 198
    - inequality, 90
    - trends, 53
    - urban-rural gap, 92
    - wage increases, productivity and, 143
    - water service, 175
  - morale, 31, 74
  - morbidity, 25, 163
  - mortality, 25, 67, 163, 198
    - see also* infant mortality;
    - maternal mortality
  - noncompetitive pressures, 142–144
  - nonemployment, 105*n*.10
  - nonincome dimensions
    - challenges, 33–34
    - data collection, 213
    - indicators, 234–235
    - of poverty, 32, 183, 198–202
    - of well-being (1998–2003), 22–29
  - nonworking poor, 66, 108, 123
  - opportunities, 59, 197
    - expansion, 110–119
    - the poor and, 119–129
    - promoting, 41, 206–207, 214
  - output, 16–18, 80
  - pay rate variations, 137
  - pension spending, 119

- Poland, 20, 51  
distribution changes, 91  
education, 59  
growth rate, distribution, and inequality, 19, 84, 197  
health care, 163  
inequality, 90, 197  
trends, 54  
wage increases, productivity and, 143
- policy, 183  
recommendations, 140–145  
reforms, targeting and, 130–131  
*see also* public policy
- politicians, health care and, 208–209
- poor people, composition, 11–12, 66  
*see also* poverty profile
- population  
distribution, 51  
poverty vs, 191
- Portugal, poverty line, 45*n*.21
- poverty, 4  
absolute vs relative, 227  
clusters, 54–55, 56–57, 76  
coping mechanisms, 225  
country-level trends, 51–55  
depth, 14, 51–55, 56  
distribution, 3, 77*n*.6, 86  
elasticity, 92–93, 190  
incidence, 51, 55, 77*n*.7, 190  
indexes, 231–232  
indicators, 236–277  
levels, 2  
material vs nonmaterial, 50  
measuring, 1–2, 231–232  
nonincome dimensions, 67–75  
trends, 4–16, 43–44*n*.7, 53–54  
variation, 11  
poverty line, 7–8, 44*nn*.9, 11, 48, 49–50, 54, 77*n*.1, 78*n*.12, 105*n*.8, 227–229  
absolute, 6–8  
arbitrariness, 228–229  
future, 191  
lowest, 45*n*.21  
poverty profile, 55–66  
characteristics, 232–234  
demography, 250–253  
education, 254–257, 266–269  
health status, 262–265  
housing, 274–277  
infrastructure, 270–273  
labor market, 158–261  
spatial dimension, 242–249  
poverty rates, 7, 30–31, 44*n*.8, 105*n*.11, 191–192  
projected, 189–190  
poverty reduction, 47, 51, 76, 200, 213  
challenges, 33, 40–41  
elasticity, 85–86  
factors contributing to (1998–2003), 16–22  
growth and, 20, 80–81, 90–91, 104*nn*.1–3, 193–195  
long-term, 190–195  
medium-term, 189–190  
monitoring progress, 40–41, 212–213  
private consumption and, 193–195  
prospects, 29–34, 189–214  
regional, 2–4  
trends, 31–32  
variability, 51, 55  
poverty risk, 8–9, 11, 12, 31, 41, 44*n*.11, 56  
age and, 62  
regional, 61  
poverty wage, 110, 145*n*.2

- power, full cost recovery, 210
- PPP. *See* purchasing power parity
- price indexes, 230
- prices, 229–230
- private consumption, GDP vs, 195
- private resources, 147
- private transfers, 119, 126–127, 129
- poverty reduction and, 21–22
- production, inefficiency, 4
- productivity, 131–132
- distribution, 139
- employment and, 142–145
- wage increases and, 140, 143
- public health
- activities, 162
- indicators, 69–70
- providers, 25–26
- public policy, 34–41
- role for, 203–213
- see also* policy
- public services, 4, 28–29, 37–38, 41–42, 202
- delivery, 207–210, 214
- public transfers, 20–21, 22, 118
- purchasing power parity (PPP), 4–5, 6, 7, 48, 49–50, 77*n.4*, 227–229
- errors, 228
- reform, structural, 16
- regions and subregions, 48
- characteristics, 233
- disparities, 61–62
- household survey archive, 215–220
- variation, 61, 138
- remittances, role of, 120
- resources, delivery and, 147
- Roma, 64
- education, 154
- social protections, 211
- Romania
- consumption poverty, water access, and health, 71
- education, 59, 156, 157, 160
- growth, 19, 84, 197
- health care spending, 167
- inequality, 90, 197
- urban poverty, 94
- wage increases, productivity and, 143
- rural areas, 57, 95–96, 205
- growth, 41
- infrastructure, 206, 207
- investment, 36
- opportunities, 36–37
- service delivery, 206
- populations, 9, 10, 11, 59–60
- rural-to-urban poverty rate, 92–96, 97, 118
- Russia
- financial crisis, 16, 30, 47, 104–105*n.6*
- growth, 80, 197
- heating, 173
- inequality, 90, 104, 197
- teachers and schools, 160
- trends, 53
- urban-rural gap, 92
- wages, 145*n.4*
- Russian Federation
- consumption poverty, 71
- education, 59
- growth, 19, 84
- health care, 71, 166
- productivity, 143
- urban poverty, 94
- wage increases, 143
- water access, 71
- safety nets, 107–145
- sanitation services, 73–74, 202
- household expenditure, 176

- school enrollment, 152–153,  
200  
primary, 22–23, 24  
secondary, 23, 24  
*see also* education
- schools  
autonomy, 158  
governance and manage-  
ment, 157–158, 161  
infrastructure, 157–158, 160  
performance outcomes,  
155–161
- SEE. *See* Southeastern Europe
- self-employment, 112, 132–133
- services and service delivery, 38,  
183  
access to quality services,  
147–187  
employment, 114  
rural, 206
- sewerage  
household expenditure, 176  
sanitation services, 73–74,  
202
- sexually transmitted infections  
(STIs), 25, 69, 70
- sex work, 69
- shortages, 147–148
- skills, 136
- Slovak Republic, 155, 156
- Slovenia, education, 155, 156
- social capital, opportunities and,  
196–197
- social exclusion, 193
- social protection, 39–40,  
127–131, 144–145, 192  
benefits, 20–21, 130  
enhancing, 210–212  
utility services, 180–181
- social safety net, 38, 214  
strengthening, 39, 210–211
- social services, 214
- socially excluded, 30
- Southeastern Europe (SEE), 2,  
3, 43*n.3*, 48, 51
- spatial dimension, 242–249
- spatial price differences,  
224–225
- spending levels, 183
- standard of living, 5–6
- structural reforms, 80
- subjective poverty, 74–75
- subregions. *See* regions and sub-  
regions
- subsistence activities, 105*n.10*
- survey data, 48, 216  
consumption changes and,  
97–102  
countries not covered, 77*n.2*  
need for, 212  
utilities, 172
- Tajikistan, 5, 51  
growth rate and inequality,  
198  
utilities, 173  
water service, 175
- targeting  
interventions, 211–212  
policy reforms and, 130–131
- tariffs  
household coping options,  
179–181  
utilities, 176–179, 210
- teachers, 160  
aging, 159  
*see also* education
- transfers, 125, 126–127, 129, 207  
changes in value and direc-  
tion, 118–119  
payments, 21, 131  
private, 21–22, 119, 126–127,  
129
- transition shock, 74, 76
- tuberculosis (TB), 25, 69, 148,  
201

- Turkey, 44*n*.8, 48, 77*n*.5  
 nonincome dimensions of  
 poverty, 32  
 wage growth vs employment  
 growth, 111  
 wage increases, productivity  
 and, 143
- Turkmenistan, 77*n*.3
- Ukraine, 80, 104*n*.2  
 unemployed poor, 108  
 unemployment, 9, 11, 12, 56,  
 57, 66, 125  
 incentives, 140  
 inequality among, 89–90  
 long-term, 30, 123–124  
 urban areas, 11, 94  
 opportunities, 36–37  
 poverty and growth, 92  
*see also* cities
- urban-rural gap, 60
- utility services, 171–182  
 access, quality, and affordabil-  
 ity, 172  
 consumption, 180  
 cost, 175–179  
 coverage rates, 172–173  
 expenditures, 28, 29  
 financial performance, 214*n*.2  
 nonpayment patterns, 180  
 quality, 174–179, 209  
 reform, 38, 209–210  
 social protection system,  
 180–181  
 tariffs, 210
- Uzbekistan, health care utiliza-  
 tion rates, 166
- Vietnam, 48  
 health care utilization rates,  
 166  
 wage growth vs employment  
 growth, 111
- Vietnam, (continued)  
 wage increases, productivity  
 and, 143  
 vulnerability, 32, 41, 183, 213  
 growth rate to eliminate, 194  
 variation in change, 52, 54  
*see also* poverty risk
- vulnerable groups, 51, 63–66
- wages, 110, 112, 139, 145*n*.2,  
 204  
 arrears, 19  
 changes, 121  
 determination, 138–139  
 dispersion, 137–138  
 distribution, 123  
 employment, 90, 105*n*.10  
 gap, poor vs nonpoor, 138,  
 139  
 growth, 16–18, 110–111,  
 120–123  
 employment growth and,  
 110–111  
 increases, productivity and,  
 140, 143  
 inequality, 44*n*.18, 90, 123  
 minimum, 40, 144, 212  
 poor vs nonpoor, 133  
 Russia, 145*n*.4  
*see also* earnings
- water, 172  
 access to, 27, 28, 71, 73, 201,  
 202  
 household expenditure, 176  
 quality of services, 174–175  
 tariffs, 176–178, 179
- women, 136  
 wages, 124  
*see also* gender; maternal mor-  
 tality
- working, 109
- working poor, 64–65, 108, 129  
 global trends, 132