Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool Indonesia

Mark Schreiner

16 December 2012

This document is available at `SimplePovertyScorecard.com`

Abstract

The Simple Poverty Scorecard®-brand poverty-assessment tool uses ten low-cost indicators from Indonesia's July (non-panel/core) 2010 National Social Economic Survey to estimate the likelihood that a household has expenditure below a given poverty line. Field workers can collect responses in about ten minutes. The scorecard's accuracy is reported for a range of poverty lines. The scorecard is a practical way for pro-poor programs in Indonesia to measure poverty rates, to track changes in poverty rates over time, and to segment clients for targeted services.

Note

This paper updates Chen and Schreiner (2009a), using data from 2010 instead of 2007. Estimates from the two scorecards are compatible if they use the legacy poverty lines. The new lines are better than the legacy ones, so they should be used from now on.

Acknowledgements

This paper was funded by Grameen Foundation (GF). Data are from Indonesia's *Badan Pusat Statistik*. Thanks go to Zaenal Abidin, Ida Fariana, Ricky Hermawan, Mary Jo Kochendorfer, Cristopher Lomboy, Marni, Slamet Riyadi, Erlyn Shukmadewi, Ahmad Sibwan, Obi Suteja, Rose Syafi'ie, Teguh Iman Harry Tjahyadi, and Ani Winarti. Thanks also go to Amri Ilmma and Matthew Wai-Poi for resolving key questions unaddressed by other sources. This Simple Poverty Scorecard tool was re-branded by Grameen Foundation (GF) as the Progress out of Poverty Index® tool. The PPI® is a performance-management tool that GF promotes to help organizations achieve their social objectives more effectively. Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) and the PPI Alliance funded the 2011 PPP poverty lines. "Progress out of Poverty Index" and "PPI" are Registered Trademarks of IPA. "Simple Poverty Scorecard" is a Registered Trademark of Microfinance Risk Management, L.L.C. for its brand of poverty-assessment tools.

Author

Mark Schreiner directs Microfinance Risk Management, L.L.C. He is also a Senior Scholar at the Center for Social Development in Washington University in Saint Louis.

Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool

			Name	Identifier
Interview ID:				
Interview date:		Participant:		
Country:	IDN	Field agent:		
Scorecard:	002	Service point:		
Sampling wgt.:		Number of household members:		

Indicator	Response	Points	Score
1. How many household members are there?	A. Six or more	0	
	B. Five	5	
	C. Four	11	
	D. Three	18	
	E. Two	24	
	F. One	37	
2. Do all household members ages 6 to 18 go to school?	A. No members ages 6 to 18	0	
	B. No	0	
	C. Yes	2	
3. What is the highest level of education that the female head/spouse has completed?	A. None	0	
	B. Grade school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal)	3	
	C. Junior-high school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal)	4	
	D. No female head/spouse	4	
	E. Vocational school (high-school level)	4	
	F. High school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal)	6	
	G. Diploma (one-year or higher), or higher	18	
4. What was the employment status of the male head/spouse in the past week in his main job?	A. No male head/spouse	0	
	B. Not working, or unpaid worker	0	
	C. Self-employed	1	
	D. Business owner with only temporary or unpaid workers	3	
	E. Wage or salary employee	3	
	F. Business owner with some permanent or paid workers	6	
5. What is the main material of the floor?	A. Earth or bamboo	0	
	B. Others	5	
6. What type of toilet arrangement does the household have?	A. None, or latrine	0	
	B. Non-flush to a septic tank	1	
	C. Flush	4	
7. What is the main cooking fuel?	A. Firewood, charcoal, or coal	0	
	B. Gas/LPG, kerosene, electricity, others, or does not cook	5	
8. Does the household have a gas cylinder of 12kg or more?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	6	
9. Does the household have a refrigerator or freezer?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	8	
10. Does the household have a motorcycle, scooter, or motorized boat?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	9	

Score:

Back-page Worksheet:
Household Roster, Age, and School Attendance

At the start of the interview, read the following to the respondent:

Please tell me their names of all the members in your household, their ages, and whether they currently attend school. Household members *are all persons who have lived and eaten together in the same residence for the last six months or who intend to live and eat together from now on. Household members do not need to have a blood relationship with the household head and may include adults, children, or infants.*

Write the names and ages all household members. For each member 6-years-old or older, record whether that member goes to school.

Name	**Age in years**	**Goes to school?**
1.		No Yes
2.		No Yes
3.		No Yes
4.		No Yes
5.		No Yes
6.		No Yes
7.		No Yes
8.		No Yes
9.		No Yes
10.		No Yes
11.		No Yes
12.		No Yes
13.		No Yes
14.		No Yes
Total number of members:		**Number "Yes":**

After finishing, write the total number of household members next to "Household size" on the right side of the header of the scorecard. Also, use this number to mark the appropriate response to Question 1. Then use the information about members' ages and school attendance to mark Question 2. Remember, if there are no household members ages 6 to 18, then mark response option A ("No members ages 6 to 18").

Look-up table for converting scores to poverty likelihoods

	Poverty likelihood (%)										
	New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
	National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
Score	100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
0–4	66.3	96.1	99.0	49.8	74.2	99.6	52.5	94.9	53.5	77.4	99.5
5–9	60.0	93.3	98.3	38.4	68.9	99.0	43.0	92.1	44.3	72.1	99.0
10–14	48.4	87.9	97.0	28.3	57.7	98.3	31.9	85.9	33.9	61.8	98.5
15–19	34.1	81.8	95.1	18.0	45.5	96.5	20.1	78.7	22.3	49.9	97.0
20–24	25.2	76.2	93.4	12.6	35.3	95.2	14.2	72.1	15.6	40.1	95.6
25–29	17.3	65.5	88.1	7.3	24.7	91.5	8.6	60.6	9.6	28.8	92.0
30–34	10.3	54.0	82.6	4.0	16.2	87.7	4.7	48.9	5.3	19.7	88.2
35–39	5.8	40.7	72.9	1.9	9.4	79.7	2.3	35.5	2.6	12.0	80.8
40–44	3.2	27.9	60.6	1.1	5.3	68.4	1.2	23.7	1.4	6.8	69.6
45–49	1.4	17.4	46.1	0.5	2.6	54.7	0.6	14.3	0.7	3.5	56.2
50–54	0.6	9.9	32.4	0.1	1.3	40.1	0.2	7.8	0.3	1.7	42.0
55–59	0.2	5.2	20.7	0.0	0.5	26.9	0.1	4.1	0.1	0.9	28.3
60–64	0.1	2.9	12.8	0.0	0.1	17.6	0.0	2.4	0.1	0.4	19.4
65–69	0.0	1.3	6.4	0.0	0.1	9.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.1	10.7
70–74	0.0	0.9	4.8	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.1	8.1
75–79	0.0	0.4	2.5	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1	4.0
80–84	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.3
85–89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note on measuring changes in poverty rates using both the legacy 2007 scorecard and new 2010 scorecard

This paper uses data from Indonesia's July (non-panel/core) 2010 SUSENAS to update Chen and Schreiner's (2009a) earlier work with July (non-panel/core) 2007 data.

There are errors in the poverty lines that were calibrated to the 2007 scorecard. These errors are fixed for the new poverty lines calibrated to the 2010 scorecard here.

Some organizations in Indonesia have already used the 2007 scorecard and would like to measure changes in poverty rates over time with their existing baseline estimates from the 2007 scorecard and a follow-up estimate from the 2010 scorecard. Such legacy users can switch to the 2010 scorecard and still salvage existing estimates from the 2007 scorecard because the 2010 scorecard is calibrated to "legacy" poverty lines that repeat the mistakes in the original 2007 lines. Hybrid estimates of change based on the two scorecards are valid as long as they use the same (mistaken) legacy line. These hybrid estimates are also compatible with future estimates of change based solely on the new (corrected) poverty lines and the 2010 scorecard.

From now on, both first-time and legacy users should use the 2010 scorecard and the new (corrected) poverty lines. Looking forward, this establishes a baseline with the correct poverty lines. Looking backward, legacy users can salvage existing estimates and measure change in poverty rates over time using the legacy lines.

Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool Indonesia

1. Introduction

Pro-poor programs in Indonesia can use the Simple Poverty Scorecard poverty-assessment tool to estimate the likelihood that a household has expenditure below a given poverty line, to measure groups' poverty rates at a point in time, to track changes in groups' poverty rates over time, and to segment clients for targeted services.

The scorecard here uses 2010 data to update Chen and Schreiner's (2009a) scorecard that used 2007 data. For now on, only the new 2010 scorecard should be used, because it is calibrated to correct poverty lines. Still, estimates of poverty rates based on poverty lines that were calibrated to the 2007 scorecard are compatible across the two scorecards, so organizations who have already started with the 2007 scorecard do not need to start over from scratch.

The scorecard may be attractive to local, pro-poor organizations because the direct approach to poverty measurement via surveys is difficult and costly, asking households about a lengthy list of expenditure items. As a case in point, Indonesia's July (non-panel/core) 2010 National Socio-Economic Survey (*Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional*, SUSENAS) runs 8 pages and asks more than 100 questions.

In contrast, the indirect approach via the scorecard is simple, quick, and inexpensive. It uses ten verifiable indicators (such as "What is the highest level of education that the female head/spouse has completed?" or "What is the main material of the floor?") to get a score that is highly correlated with poverty status as measured by the exhaustive survey.

The scorecard differs from "proxy means tests" (Coady, Grosh, and Hoddinott, 2004) in that it is tailored to the capabilities and purposes not of national governments but rather of local, pro-poor organizations. The feasible poverty-measurement options for these organizations are typically subjective and relative (such as participatory wealth ranking by skilled field workers) or blunt (such as rules based on land-ownership or housing quality). Measurements from these approaches are not comparable across organizations, they may be costly, and their bias and precision are unknown.

Indonesia's scorecard can be used to measure the share of a pro-poor organization's participants who are below a given poverty line, such as the Millennium Development Goals' $1.25/day poverty line at 2005 purchase-power parity. USAID microenterprise partners can use scoring with the new $1.25/day 2005 PPP line to report how many of their participants are "very poor".[1] It can also be used to measure movement across a poverty line over time. In all these cases, the scorecard provides an

[1] USAID defines households as "very poor" if their per-capita expenditure is below the highest of the new $1.25/day 2005 PPP line (IND7,983 for Indonesia, Figure 1) or the new USAID "extreme" line (IND6,895) that divides people in households below Indonesia's new national poverty line into two equal-size groups.

expenditure-based, objective tool with known accuracy. While expenditure surveys are costly even for governments, some small, local organizations may be able to implement a less-expensive poverty-assessement tool that can serve for monitoring and targeting.

The statistical approach here aims to be understood by non-specialists. After all, if managers are to adopt the scorecard on their own and apply it to inform their decisions, they must first trust that it works. Transparency and simplicity build trust. Getting "buy-in" matters; proxy means tests and regressions on the "determinants of poverty" have been around for three decades, but they are rarely used to inform decisions at the local level, not because they do not work, but because they are presented (when they are presented at all) as tables of regression coefficients incomprehensible to non-specialists (for example, with cryptic indicator names such as "`LGHHSZ_2`", negative values, and many decimal places). Thanks to the predictive-modeling phenomenon known as the "flat maximum", simple poverty-assessment tools can be about as accurate as complex ones.

The technical approach here is innovative in how it associates scores with poverty likelihoods, in the extent of its accuracy tests, and in how it derives formulas for standard errors. Although these accuracy tests are simple and commonplace in statistical practice and in the for-profit field of credit-risk scoring, they have rarely been applied to poverty-assessment tools.

The scorecard is based on the July 2010 (non-panel/core) SUSENAS conducted by Indonesia's *Badan Pusat Statistik* (BPS).[2] Indicators are selected to be:

- Inexpensive to collect, easy to answer quickly, and simple to verify
- Strongly correlated with poverty
- Liable to change over time as poverty status changes

All points in the scorecard are non-negative integers, and total scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line). Non-specialists can collect data and tally scores on paper in the field in five to ten minutes.

The scorecard can be used to estimate three basic quantities. First, it can estimate a particular household's "poverty likelihood", that is, the probability that the household has per-capita expenditure below a given poverty line.

Second, the scorecard can estimate the poverty rate of a group of households at a point in time. This estimate is the average poverty likelihood among the households in the group.

[2] There are two SUSENAS surveys. The first (the "non-panel/core") covers a large, cross-section sample each July and has a short expenditure module. Poverty status is determined by this condensed measure of expenditure and district-level poverty lines specifically designed for the July data. BPS publishes district- and provincial-level poverty rates from this survey, but not national poverty rates. Both the 2010 scorecard here and the 2007 scorecard are based on the July data. The second SUSENAS survey (the "panel") has a longer expenditure module and interviews each March—year after year—the same set of households. Poverty status comes from this superior measure of expenditure and provincial urban/rural poverty lines specifically designed for the March data. Indonesia's official poverty rate is based on this data.

Third, the scorecard can estimate changes in the poverty rate for a group of households (or for two independent samples of households that are representative of the same population) between two points in time. This estimate is the change in the average poverty likelihood of the group(s) of households over time.

When measuring change over time, the same poverty line—but not necessarily the same scorecard—must be used at both baseline and follow-up. Organizations that have used the 2007 scorecard can measure change with a baseline from the 2007 scorecard and a follow-up from the 2010 scorecard as long as they apply a legacy poverty line with the 2010 scorecard.

The scorecard can also be used for targeting. To help managers choose the most appropriate targeting cut-off for their purposes, this paper reports several measures of targeting accuracy for a range of possible cut-offs.

This paper presents a single scorecard whose indicators and points are derived from household expenditure data in the July 2010 SUSENAS and Indonesia's new national poverty line. Scores from this one scorecard are calibrated to poverty likelihoods for six new poverty lines (without mistakes)[3] and three legacy lines (with mistakes).

The scorecard is constructed and calibrated using half of the data from the July 2010 SUSENAS, and its accuracy is validated on the rest of the data.

[3] The "new" lines are new only in that they correct the mistakes in the lines that were calibrated to the 2007 scorecard.

While all three scoring estimators are *unbiased* (that is, they match the true value on average in repeated samples when applied to the same population from which the scorecard was built), they are—like all predictive models—biased to some extent when applied to a different population.[4]

Thus, while the indirect scoring approach is less costly than the direct survey approach, in practice it is also biased to an unknown degree. (The survey approach is unbiased by definition.) There is bias because scoring must assume that the future relationships between indicators and poverty will be the same as in the data used to build the scorecard. Of course, this assumption—ubiquitous and inevitable in predictive modeling—holds only partly.

When applied to the validation sample with bootstraps of $n = 16{,}384$, the average difference between scorecard estimates of groups' poverty rates and the true rates at a point in time is –0.5 percentage points for the new 2010 national line. The average absolute difference across all six new 2010 lines is about 0.6 percentage points. These differences are due to sampling variation and not bias; the average difference would be zero if the whole July 2010 SUSENAS were to be repeatedly redrawn and divided into sub-samples before repeating the entire process of building and validating scorecards.

[4] Important examples include nationally representative samples at a different point in time or sub-groups that are not nationally representative (Tarozzi and Deaton, 2009).

The 90-percent confidence intervals for these estimates are ±0.6 percentage points or less. For $n = 1{,}024$, the 90-percent intervals are ±2.5 percentage points or less.

Section 2 below documents data and poverty lines. Sections 3 and 4 describe scorecard construction and offer guidelines for use in practice. Sections 5 and 6 detail the estimation of households' poverty likelihoods and of groups' poverty rates at a point in time. Section 7 discusses estimating changes in poverty rates through time, and Section 8 covers targeting. Section 9 places the new scorecard here in the context of several existing exercises for Indonesia. Section 10 is a summary.

2. Data and poverty lines

This section discusses the data used to construct and validate the scorecard. It also presents the poverty lines to which scores are calibrated.

2.1 Data

The scorecard is based on data from 293,715 households in the nationally representative July (non-panel/core) 2010 SUSENAS. This is Indonesia's most recent available national expenditure survey.[5]

For the purposes of the scorecard, the households in the July 2010 SUSENAS are randomly divided into two sub-samples:

- *Construction and calibration* for selecting indicators and points and for associating scores with poverty likelihoods
- *Validation* for measuring accuracy with data not used in construction or calibration

2.2 Poverty rates

A *poverty rate* is the share of units in households in which total household expenditure (divided by the number of household members) is below a given poverty line. The unit is either the household itself or a person in the household. By definition,

[5] The July (non-panel/core) SUSENAS differs from the March (panel) SUSENAS in that it has a larger sample, it interviews different households each year (rather than the same set of households year after year), and it has a condensed expenditure module (rather than a more-detailed one). Due their different expenditure modules, the July and March SUSENAS have different sets of poverty lines.

each household member has the same poverty status (or estimated poverty likelihood) as does the household as a whole.

Suppose a pro-poor organization serves two households. The first is poor (its per-capita expenditure is less than the poverty line), and it has three members, one of whom is a participant with the organization. The second household is non-poor and has four members, two of whom are participants.

Poverty rates are at either the household-level or the person-level. If the organization defines its participants as households (say, because all household members are affected by any member's being a participant), then the household level is relevant. The estimated household-level poverty rate is the equal-weighted average of poverty statuses (or estimated poverty likelihoods) for households with participants. In the example here, this is $\frac{1 \cdot 1 + 1 \cdot 0}{1 + 1} = \frac{1}{2} = 0.5 = 50$ percent. In the "$1 \cdot 1$" term in the numerator, the first "1" is the first household's weight, and the second "1" is the first household's poverty status (poor). In the "$1 \cdot 0$" term in the numerator, the "1" is the second household's weight, and the "0" is the second household's poverty status (non-poor). The "$1 + 1$" in the denominator is the sum of the weights. Each household has a weight of one (1) because the unit of analysis is the household.

Alternatively, a person-level rate is relevant if an organization defines as *participants* all people in households that benefit from its services. In the example here, the person-level rate is the household-size-weighted average of poverty statuses for

households with participants, or $\frac{3 \cdot 1 + 4 \cdot 0}{3 + 4} = \frac{3}{7} = 0.43 = 43$ percent. In the "$3 \cdot 1$" term in the numerator, the "3" is the first household's weight because it has three members, and the "1" is its poverty status (poor). In the "$4 \cdot 0$" term in the numerator, the "4" is the second household's weight because it has four members, and the zero is its poverty status (non-poor). The "$4 + 3$" in the denominator is the sum of the weights. A household's weight is its number of members because the unit of analysis is the household member.

As a final (common) example, an organization may count as participants only those with whom it deals directly. For the example here, this means that some—but not all—household members are counted. The person-level rate is now the participant-weighted average of the poverty statuses of households with clients, or $\frac{1 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 0}{1 + 2} = \frac{1}{3} = 0.33 = 33$ percent. The first "1" in the "$1 \cdot 1$" in the numerator is the first household's weight because it has one participant, and the second "1" is its poverty status (poor). In the "$2 \cdot 0$" term in the numerator, the "2" is the second household's weight because it has two participants, and the zero is its poverty status (non-poor). The "$2 + 1$" in the denominator is the sum of the weights. Each household's weight is its number of participants because the unit of analysis is the participant.

In sum, estimated poverty rates are weighted averages of households' poverty statuses (or estimated poverty likelihoods), where the weights are the number of relevant units in the household. When reporting, organizations should explain who they have counted as a participant and why.

Figure 1 reports poverty rates and poverty lines for Indonesia as a whole at both the household-level and the person-level. Figure 2 is similar, covering Indonesia's 497 districts (*kota*/*kabupaten*) across 34 provinces.

Figures 1 and 2 report person-level poverty rates because these are the rates reported by governments and used in most policy discussions. Household-level poverty rates are also reported because household-level poverty likelihoods can be straightforwardly converted into poverty rates for other units of analysis. This is also why the scorecard is calibrated to household-level poverty likelihoods and why accuracy is measured at the household level.

2.3 Poverty lines

2.3.1 National lines (new and legacy)

The new national poverty line used here with Indonesia's July 2010 SUSENAS comes from BPS (2010). Each of Indonesia's districts—the administrative level below the province—has its own poverty line.[6] Districts are either *kota* (urban) or *kabupaten* (rural).

BPS derives Indonesia's new national poverty line (sometimes called here "100% of the new national poverty line") following Ravallion's (1998) "basic-needs" approach. It starts by defining a food poverty line as the cost of a 52-item food bundle that provides 2,100 Calories (BPS, 2008a).

The new national line is then defined as the food line plus the expenditure on a 46-item non-food bundle (BPS, 2008b) observed for a reference group whose total expenditure is close to the food line.[7] This "minimum non-food expenditure" is probably[8] the food line multiplied by the ratio of non-food expenditure to total expenditure by the reference group. The new national line is then the food line, plus minimum non-food expenditure. The lines are derived by district and so account for differences in the cost-of-living across districts.

---

[6] When district-level poverty lines are aggregated up to the province level with the sampling weights (field `weind10r`) in the July 2010 data, they do not match those in BPS (2010) even though the district- and province-level poverty rates do match.
[7] Pradhan *et al.* (2001) is probably used to derive the reference group, which is poorer than Indonesia overall.
[8] Documentation of this in English has not been found.

Applying these district-level lines to the July 2010 data, the average all-Indonesia new national line is IDR7,983 per person per day (Figure 1),[9] giving a household-level poverty rate of 10.1 percent and a person-level poverty rate of 13.0 percent. Figure 2 for all-Indonesia shows an average *kota* (urban) new national line of IDR9,903 and urban poverty rates of 5.1 percent (households) and 7.3 percent (people). For *kabupaten* (rural) areas, the new national line is IDR7,440, and the poverty rates are 11.4 percent (households) and 14.7 percent (people).

For the 2010 scorecard, the 497 district-level lines in BPS (2010) are appropriate, being derived specifically for the July (non-core/panel) 2010 data. In the 2007 scorecard, Chen and Schreiner (2009a) use the July (non-panel/core) 2007 data, but they mistakenly apply the 65 urban/rural province-level lines derived specifically for the March (panel) 2007 SUSENAS (BPS, 2012).[10]

Although the new national line fixes this mistake, legacy users may still want to measure changes in estimated poverty rates over time from an existing baseline that used the mistaken national line and the 2007 scorecard. Thus, the new 2010 scorecard here is calibrated to a legacy national line that repeats Chen and Schreiner's (2009a) mistake with the 2010 data. Estimates of changes in poverty rates over time are valid when measured at baseline with the mistaken national line calibrated to the 2007 scorecard and measured at follow-up with the (purposely also mistaken) legacy national

[9] BPS' poverty lines are converted from monthly to daily by dividing by 365/12.
[10] Chen and Schreiner (2009a) were unaware that there were two sets of poverty lines.

line calibrated to the new 2010 scorecard. Furthermore, this hybrid estimate of change is also compatible with future estimates of change based solely on the new national line calibrated to the new 2010 scorecard because poverty rates by the two lines move in tandem.[11]

The new 2010 scorecard is constructed using the legacy national line. Because local pro-poor organizations in Indonesia may want to use different or various poverty lines, this paper calibrates scores from its single 2010 scorecard to poverty likelihoods for six new lines:

- National
- 150% of national
- 200% of national
- USAID "extreme"
- $1.25/day 2005 PPP
- $2.50/day 2005 PPP

The 2005 PPP poverty lines are discussed below. The USAID "extreme" line is defined as the median expenditure of people (not households) below the new national line (U.S. Congress, 2004).

[11] When lines derived for the July (non-panel/core) data are correctly applied, the all-Indonesia person-level poverty rate decreases from July 2007 to July 2010 by 3.5 percentage points, that is, from 16.5 percent (BPS, 2007a) to 13.0 percent (Figure 1). When lines derived for the March (panel) data are misapplied to the July (non-panel/core data) for 2007 and 2010, the decrease in the all-Indonesia person-level poverty rate is 3.6 percentage points (from 11.6 percent to 8.0 percent).

To allow hybrid measures of change across the 2007 and 2010 scorecards, the 2010 scorecard is also calibrated to three legacy lines that reproduce mistakes in Chen and Schreiner (2009a):

- National
- $1.25/day 2005 PPP
- $2.50/day 2005 PPP

The 2007 scorecard was also calibrated to a food line, a USAID "extreme" line, and a $1.75/day 2005 PPP line. There are no corresponding legacy lines for the 2010 scorecard because the food line is too low to be relevant, measures of change are not valid for the USAID "extreme" line, and the $1.75/day line is not commonly used.

2.3.2 $1.25/day 2005 PPP line (new and legacy)

The new $1.25/day 2005 PPP line for 2010 is derived from:

- 2005 PPP exchange rate for "individual consumption expenditure by households" (World Bank, 2008): IDR4,192.83 per $1.00
- July 2010 all-Indonesia implicit Consumer Price Index for the poverty-line reference group, taken as the all-Indonesia average of national poverty lines at the district level for the July (non-panel/core) 2010 data (IDR7,983, Figure 1)
- Average 2005 all-Indonesia implicit CPI for the poverty-line reference group, taken as the all-Indonesia average of national poverty lines at the district level for the July (non-panel/core) 2005 data (BPS, 2007b)[12] of IDR4,849

[12] July is about half-way through the calendar year, and the July line is assumed to be the same as the average of monthly lines in 2005, if they existed.

The implied inflation rate faced by Indonesia's poverty-line reference group from July 2005 to July 2010 is $\left(\frac{7{,}983 - 4{,}849}{4{,}849}\right) = +64.6$ percent. The new \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line for Indonesia as a whole for July 2010 is (Sillers, 2006):

$$(\text{2005 PPP exchange rate}) \cdot \$1.25 \cdot \left(\frac{\text{CPI}_{\text{July 2010}}}{\text{CPI}_{\text{2005 average}}}\right) =$$

$$\left(\frac{\text{IDR}4{,}193}{\$1.00}\right) \cdot \$1.25 \cdot \left(\frac{7{,}983}{4{,}849}\right) = \text{IDR}8{,}629.$$

The new \$2.50/day 2005 PPP line is twice the new \$1.25/day line.

These 2005 PPP lines apply to Indonesia as a whole. They are adjusted for differences in cost-of-living across districts using:

- L, the all-Indonesia new \$1.25/day 2005 PPP poverty line (IDR8,629)
- i, an index to a district
- π_i, the national poverty line for district i
- π, the all-Indonesia average national poverty line (IDR7,983)

The cost-of-living-adjusted 2005 PPP poverty line L_i for district i is then:

$$L_i = L \cdot \frac{\pi_i}{\pi}.$$

For example, for the district (*kota*) of Banda Aceh in the province of Nangroe Aceh Darussalam (Figure 2), the new national line is IDR14,308. Given the all-Indonesia average new national line of IDR7,983, the all-Indonesia average new \$1.25/day line of IDR8,629, the new \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line for Banda Aceh is $8{,}629 \cdot \left(\frac{14{,}308}{7{,}983}\right) = \text{IDR}15{,}465$ (Figure 2).

The $1.25/day 2005 PPP line that was calibrated to the 2007 scorecard was derived differently. Chen and Schreiner (2009a) did not realize that Indonesia updates poverty lines over time based on the inflation faced by a poverty-line reference group, so they mistakenly updated the 2005 PPP factor from 2005 to July 2007 using Indonesia's overall inflation rate of $\left(\frac{126.6 - 105.5}{105.5}\right) = +20.0$ percent.[13] The resulting $1.25/day line of IDR6,308 applied to the July (non-panel/core) 2007 data gives poverty rates of 20.7 percent (households) and 25.0 percent (people) (Chen and Schreiner, 2009a).

This $1.25/day 2005 PPP line that was calibrated to the 2007 scorecard cannot be changed. The task now is to derive a legacy $1.25/day line that—when used with the 2010 scorecard—produces hybrid estimates of poverty rates that (looking backward) are compatible with those from the mistaken line and the 2007 scorecard and that (looking forward) are compatible with future estimates of change based solely on the new $1.25/day line with the 2010 scorecard.

Replicating the original mistake (that is, updating the $1.25/day line using inflation for Indonesia overall) is not the answer. This is because the all-Indonesia inflation rate from July 2007 to July 2010 is $\left(\frac{144.2 - 126.6}{126.6}\right) = +13.9$ percent, which is much lower than inflation rate for Indonesia's poverty-line reference group of $\left(\frac{7{,}983 - 5{,}705}{5{,}705}\right) = +39.9$ percent as implied by the change in the district-level national

[13] Base January 2005, derived from `bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=03&notab=6`, retrieved 12 December 2012.

poverty lines designed for the 2010 and 2007 July (non-panel/core) SUSENAS (BPS, 2012 and 2008a). With the all-Indonesia inflation rate, a legacy $1.25/day line is too low and thus understates poverty in 2010 and overstates decreases in poverty between 2007 and 2010.

Instead, the legacy $1.25/day line should be the (mistaken) $1.25/day line (IDR6,308) that was calibrated to the 2007 scorecard, updated by the rate of inflation (+39.9 percent) faced by Indonesia's poverty-line reference group between July 2007 and July 2010. The resulting line is IDR8,827 (Figure 1) with corresponding poverty rates of 16.4 percent for households and 20.4 percent for people.

The decrease in the household-level poverty rate for the legacy $1.25/day line for Indonesia overall from July 2007 to July 2010 is 4.3 percentage points (20.7 – 16.4, Figure 1 and Chen and Schreiner, 2009a). Given that the legacy $1.25/day line of IDR8,827 is almost the same as the new (correct) $1.25/day line of IDR8,628, hybrid estimates of change using the mistaken line in the baseline and the legacy line in the follow-up will move in tandem with estimates of change based only on the new (correct) $1.25/day line and the 2010 scorecard.

3. Scorecard construction

For Indonesia, about 80 potential indicators are initially prepared in the areas of:

- Family composition (such as the number of household members)
- Education (such as the education of the female head/spouse)
- Housing (such as the main material of the floor)
- Ownership of durable goods (such as refrigerators or motorcycles)
- Employment (such as the employment status of the male head/spouse)

Figure 3 lists the potential indicators, ordered by the entropy-based "uncertainty coefficient" that measures how well a given indicator predicts poverty on its own (Goodman and Kruskal, 1979).

The scorecard also aims to measure *changes* in poverty through time. This means that, when selecting indicators and holding other considerations constant, preference is given to more sensitive indicators. For example, the main cooking fuel is probably more likely to change in response to changes in poverty than is the age of the male head/spouse.

The scorecard itself is built using the new national poverty line and Logit regression on the construction sub-sample. Indicator selection uses both judgment and statistics. The first step is to use Logit to build one scorecard for each candidate indicator. Each scorecard's statistical power is taken as "c", a measure of ability to rank by poverty status (SAS Institute Inc., 2004).

One of these one-indicator scorecards is then selected based on several factors (Schreiner *et al.*, 2004; Zeller, 2004), including improvement in accuracy, likelihood of acceptance by users (determined by simplicity, cost of collection, and "face validity" in

terms of experience, theory, and common sense), sensitivity to changes in poverty status, variety among indicators, robustness across geographic regions, and verifiability.

A series of two-indicator scorecards are then built, each based on the one-indicator scorecard selected from the first step, with a second candidate indicator added. The best two-indicator scorecard is then selected, again based on "c" and judgment. These steps are repeated until the scorecard has 10 indicators.

The final step is to transform the Logit coefficients into non-negative integers such that total scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line).

This algorithm is the Logit analogue to the common R^2-based stepwise least-squares regression. It differs from naïve stepwise in that the criteria for selecting indicators include not only statistical accuracy but also judgment and non-statistical factors. The use of non-statistical criteria can improve robustness through time and helps ensure that indicators are simple, sensible, and acceptable to users.

The single scorecard here applies to all of Indonesia. Evidence from India and Mexico (Schreiner, 2006 and 2005a), Sri Lanka (Narayan and Yoshida, 2005), and Jamaica (Grosh and Baker, 1995) suggests that segmenting poverty-assessment tools by urban/rural does not improve targeting accuracy much, although it may improve the bias and precision of estimates of poverty rates (Tarozzi and Deaton, 2009). For Indonesia, results in World Bank (2011) suggest there is little benefit from going from

an all-Indonesia scorecard to all-urban and all-rural scorecards, although the World Bank does conclude that accuracy improves with district-level scorecards.

4. Practical guidelines for scorecard use

The main challenge of scorecard design is not to maximize statistical accuracy but rather to improve the chances that scoring is actually used in practice (Schreiner, 2005b). When scoring projects fail, the reason is not usually statistical inaccuracy but rather the failure of an organization to decide to do what is needed to integrate scoring in its processes and to learn to use it properly (Schreiner, 2002). After all, most reasonable scorecards have similar targeting accuracy, thanks to the empirical phenomenon known as the "flat maximum" (Hand, 2006; Baesens *et al.*, 2003; Lovie and Lovie, 1986; Kolesar and Showers, 1985; Stillwell, Barron, and Edwards, 1983; Dawes, 1979; Wainer, 1976; Myers and Forgy, 1963). The bottleneck is less technical and more human, not statistics but organizational-change management. Accuracy is easier to achieve than adoption.

The scorecard here is designed to encourage understanding and trust so that users will adopt it and use it properly. Of course, accuracy matters, but it is balanced against simplicity, ease-of-use, and "face validity". Programs are more likely to collect data, compute scores, and pay attention to the results if, in their view, scoring does not imply much additional work and if the whole process generally seems to make sense.

To this end, the scorecard here fits on one page. The construction process, indicators, and points are simple and transparent. Additional work is minimized; non-specialists can compute scores by hand in the field because the scorecard has:

- Only 10 indicators
- Only categorical indicators
- Simple weights (non-negative integers, and no arithmetic beyond addition)

A field worker using the paper scorecard would:

- Record participant identifiers
- Use the back-page worksheet to record the names of household members, their ages, and whether they attend school
- Record—based on the back-page worksheet—the number of household members in the scorecard header and mark the responses to questions 1 and 2
- Read each remaining question from the scorecard
- Circle the response and its points
- Write the points in the far-right column
- Add up the points to get the total score
- Implement targeting policy (if any)
- Deliver the paper scorecard to a central office for data entry and filing

Of course, field workers must be trained. The quality of outputs depends on the quality of inputs. If organizations or field workers gather their own data and believe that they have an incentive to exaggerate poverty rates (for example, if they are rewarded for higher poverty rates), then it is wise to do on-going quality control via data review and random audits (Matul and Kline, 2003).[14] IRIS Center (2007a) and

[14] If an organization does not want field workers to know the points associated with indicators, then it can use a version of the scorecard without points and apply the points later in a spreadsheet or database at the central office. Schreiner (2011a) argues that experience in Colombia (Camacho and Conover, 2011) suggests that hiding points does little to deter cheating and that cheating by an organization's central office can be more likely and more damaging than cheating by field agents and respondents.

Toohig (2008) are useful nuts-and-bolts guides for budgeting, training field workers and supervisors, logistics, sampling, interviewing, piloting, recording data, and controlling quality.

In particular, while collecting scorecard indicators is relatively easier than alternatives, it is still absolutely difficult. Training and explicit definitions of terms and concepts in the scorecard is essential, and field workers should study and follow the "Guidelines to the Interpretation of Indicators" that appear after the "References" section in this document.

For the example of Nigeria, Onwujekwe, Hanson, and Fox-Rushby (2006) found distressingly low inter-rater and test-retest correlations for indicators as seemingly simple and obvious as whether a household owns an automobile. Nevertheless, Grosh and Baker (1995) find that gross underreporting of assets does not affect targeting. For the first stage of targeting in a conditional cash-transfer program in Mexico, Martinelli and Parker (2007) find that "underreporting [of asset ownership] is widespread but not overwhelming, except for a few goods . . . [and] overreporting is common for a few goods, which implies that self-reporting may lead to the exclusion of deserving households" (pp. 24–25). Still, as is done in Mexico in the second stage of its targeting process, most false self-reports can be corrected by field agents who verify responses with a home visit, and this is the suggested procedure for the scorecard in Indonesia.

In terms of sampling design, an organization must make choices about:

- Who will do the scoring
- How scores will be recorded
- What participants will be scored
- How many participants will be scored
- How frequently participants will be scored
- Whether scoring will be applied at more than one point in time
- Whether the same participants will be scored at more than one point in time

In general, the sampling design should follow from the organization's goals for the exercise, the questions to be answered, and the budget.

The non-specialists who apply the scorecard with participants in the field can be:

- Employees of the organization
- Third-party contractors

Responses, scores, and poverty likelihoods can be recorded:

- On paper in the field and then filed at an office
- On paper in the field and then keyed into a database or spreadsheet at an office
- On portable electronic devices in the field and downloaded to a database

Given a population relevant for a particular business question, the participants to be scored can be:

- All participants in the relevant population
- A representative sample of all participants in the relevant population
- All participants in the relevant population in a representative sample of relevant field offices
- A representative sample of all participants in the relevant population in a representative sample of relevant field offices

If not determined by other factors, the number of participants to be scored can be derived from sample-size formulas (presented later) for a desired level of confidence and a desired confidence interval.

Frequency of application can be:

- As a once-off project (precluding measuring change)
- Once a year (or at some other fixed time interval, allowing measuring change)
- Each time a field worker visits a participant at home (allowing measuring change)

When the scorecard is applied more than once in order to measure change in poverty rates over time, it can be applied:

- With a different set of participants
- With the same set of participants

An example set of choices are illustrated by BRAC and ASA, two microlenders in Bangladesh who each have more than 7 million participants and who are applying the Simple Poverty Scorecard tool for Bangladesh (Chen and Schreiner, 2009b). Their design is that loan officers in a random sample of branches score all participants each time they visit the homestead (about once a year) as part of their standard due diligence prior to loan disbursement. Responses are recorded on paper in the field before being sent to a central office to be entered into a database. ASA's and BRAC's sampling plans cover 50,000–100,000 participants each, far more than most pro-poor organizations would need to interview.

5. Estimates of household poverty likelihoods

The sum of scorecard points for a household is called the *score*. For Indonesia, scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line). While higher scores indicate less likelihood of being below a line, the scores themselves have only relative units. For example, doubling the score increases the likelihood of being above a given poverty line, but it does not double the likelihood.

To get absolute units, scores must be converted to *poverty likelihoods*, that is, probabilities of being below a poverty line. This is done via simple look-up tables. For the example of the new national line, scores of 25–29 have a poverty likelihood of 17.3 percent, and scores of 30–34 have a poverty likelihood of 10.3 percent (Figure 4).

The poverty likelihood associated with a score varies by poverty line. For example, scores of 25–29 are associated with a poverty likelihood of 17.3 percent for the new national line but 24.7 percent for the new $1.25/day 2005 PPP line.[15]

5.1 Calibrating scores with poverty likelihoods

A given score is associated ("calibrated") with a poverty likelihood by defining the poverty likelihood as the share of households in the calibration sub-sample who have the score and who are below a given poverty line.

[15] Starting with Figure 4, many figures have nine versions, one for each of the six new poverty lines and the three legacy lines. To keep them straight, they are grouped by poverty line. Single tables pertaining to all poverty lines are placed with the tables for the new national line.

For the example of the new national line (Figure 5), there are 10,449 (normalized) households in the calibration sub-sample with a score of 25–29, of whom 1,812 (normalized) are below the poverty line. The estimated poverty likelihood associated with a score of 25–29 is then 17.3 percent, because 1,812 ÷ 10,449 = 17.3 percent.

To illustrate with the new national line and a score of 30–34, there are 12,114 (normalized) households in the calibration sample, of whom 1,249 (normalized) are below the line (Figure 5). Thus, the poverty likelihood for this score is 1,249 ÷ 12,114 = 10.3 percent.

The same method is used to calibrate scores with estimated poverty likelihoods for the other eight poverty lines.[16]

Even though the scorecard is constructed partly based on judgment, the calibration process produces poverty likelihoods that are objective, that is, derived from survey data on expenditure and quantitative poverty lines. The poverty likelihoods would be objective even if indicators and/or points were selected without any data at all. In fact, objective poverty-assessment tools of proven accuracy are often constructed using only expert judgment (Fuller, 2006; Caire, 2004; Schreiner *et al.*, 2004). Of course, the scorecard here is constructed with both data and judgment. The fact that this paper

[16] To ensure that poverty likelihoods never increase as scores increase, it is sometimes necessary to iteratively average likelihoods across series of adjacent scores before grouping scores into ranges. This preserves unbiasedness, and it keeps users from balking when sampling variation in score ranges with few households leads to higher scores being linked with higher poverty likelihoods.

acknowledges that some choices in scorecard construction—as in any statistical analysis—are informed by judgment in no way impugns the objectivity of the poverty likelihoods, as this depends on using data in score calibration, not on using data (and nothing else) in scorecard construction.

Although the points in the Indonesia scorecard are transformed coefficients from a Logit regression, scores are not converted to poverty likelihoods via the Logit formula of $2.718281828^{\text{score}}$ x $(1+ 2.718281828^{\text{score}})^{-1}$. This is because the Logit formula is esoteric and difficult to compute by hand. Non-specialists find it more intuitive to define the poverty likelihood as the share of households with a given score in the calibration sample who are below a poverty line. Going from scores to poverty likelihoods in this way requires no arithmetic at all, just a look-up table. This non-parametric calibration can also improve accuracy, especially with large samples.

5.2 Accuracy of estimates of households' poverty likelihoods

As long as the relationships between indicators and poverty do not change and as long as the scorecard is applied to households that are representative of the same population from which the scorecard was constructed, then this calibration process produces unbiased estimates of poverty likelihoods. *Unbiased* means that in repeated samples from the same population, the average estimate matches the true poverty

likelihood. The scorecard also produces unbiased estimates of poverty rates at a point in time and unbiased estimates of changes in poverty rates between two points in time.[17]

Of course, the relationship between indicators and poverty does change to some unknown extent with time and also across sub-groups in Indonesia's population. Therefore, the scorecard will generally be biased when applied after July 2010 (the month of fieldwork for the July 2010 SUSENAS) or when applied with sub-groups who are not nationally representative.

How accurate are estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, given the assumption of constant relationships between indicators and poverty through time and the assumption of a sample that is representative of Indonesia overall? To measure, the scorecard is applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of size $n = 16{,}384$ from the validation sub-sample. Bootstrapping entails (Efron and Tibshirani, 1993):

- Score each household in the validation sample
- Draw a new bootstrap sample *with replacement* from the validation sample
- For each score, compute the true poverty likelihood in the bootstrap sample, that is, the share of households with the score and expenditure below a poverty line
- For each score, record the difference between the estimated poverty likelihood (Figure 4) and the true poverty likelihood in the bootstrap sample
- Repeat the previous three steps 1,000 times
- For each score, report the average difference between estimated and true poverty likelihoods across the 1,000 bootstrap samples
- For each score, report the two-sided interval containing the central 900, 950, or 990 differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods

[17] This follows because these estimates of groups' poverty rates are linear functions of the unbiased estimates of households' poverty likelihoods.

For each score range and for $n = 16{,}384$, Figure 7 shows the average difference between estimated and true poverty likelihoods as well as confidence intervals for the differences.

For the new national line, the average poverty likelihood across bootstrap samples for scores of 25–29 in the validation sample is too high by 0.2 percentage points. For scores of 30–34, the estimate is too low by 0.8 percentage points.[18]

The 90-percent confidence interval for the differences for scores of 25–29 is ±1.6 percentage points (Figure 7). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps, the difference between the estimate and the true value is between –1.4 and +1.8 percentage points (because +0.2 – 1.6 = –1.4, and +0.2 + 1.6 = +1.8). In 950 of 1,000 bootstraps (95 percent), the difference is +0.2 ±2.0 percentage points, and in 990 of 1,000 bootstraps (99 percent), the difference is +0.2 ±2.6 percentage points.

Figure 7 shows large differences between estimated poverty likelihoods and true values only for scores of 0–4 and 5–9, ranges that cover about 1.2 percent of all households in Indonesia. In general, Figure 7 shows differences because the validation sub-sample is a single sample that—thanks to sampling variation—differs in distribution from the construction/calibration sub-samples and from Indonesia's population. For targeting, however, what matters is less the difference in all score

[18] These differences are not zero, despite the estimator's unbiasedness, because the scorecard comes from a single sample. The average difference by score range would be zero if samples were repeatedly drawn from the population and split into sub-samples before repeating the entire process of scorecard construction/calibration and validation.

ranges and more the difference in score ranges just above and below the targeting cut-off. This mitigates the effects of bias and sampling variation on targeting (Friedman, 1997). Section 8 below looks at targeting accuracy in detail.

In addition, if estimates of groups' poverty rates are to be usefully accurate, then errors for individual households must mostly balance out. This is generally the case, as discussed in the next section.

Another possible source of differences between estimates and true values is overfitting. The scorecard here is unbiased, but it may still be *overfit* when applied after the end of the fieldwork in July 2010. That is, it may fit the data from the July 2010 SUSENAS so closely that it captures not only some timeless patterns but also some random patterns that, due to sampling variation, show up only in the this particular survey's data. Or the scorecard may be overfit in the sense that it is not robust to changes in the relationships between indicators and poverty over time or when it is applied to samples that are not nationally representative.

Overfitting can be mitigated by simplifying the scorecard and by not relying only on data but rather also considering experience, judgment, and theory. Of course, the scorecard here does this. Combining scorecards can also reduce overfitting, at the cost of greater complexity.

Most errors in individual households' likelihoods do cancel out in the estimates of groups' poverty rates (see later sections). Furthermore, at least some of the differences will come from non-scorecard sources such as changes in the relationships between

indicators and poverty, sampling variation, changes in poverty lines, inconsistencies in data quality across time, and imperfections in cost-of-living adjustments across time and regions. These factors can be addressed only by improving data quantity and quality (which is beyond the scope of the scorecard) or by reducing overfitting (which likely has limited returns, given the scorecard's parsimony).

6. Estimates of a group's poverty rate at a point in time

A group's estimated poverty rate at a point in time is the average of the estimated poverty likelihoods of the individual households in the group.

To illustrate, suppose a program samples three households on Jan. 1, 2013 and that they have scores of 20, 30, and 40, corresponding to poverty likelihoods of 25.2, 10.3, and 3.2 percent (new national line, Figure 4). The group's estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of $(25.2 + 10.3 + 3.2) \div 3 = 12.9$ percent.

Be careful; the group's poverty rate is *not* the poverty likelihood associated with the average score. Here, the average score is 30, which corresponds to a poverty likelihood of 10.3 percent. This differs from the 12.9 percent found as the average of the three individual poverty likelihoods associated with each of the three scores. Unlike poverty likelihoods, scores are ordinal symbols like letters in the alphabet or colors in a spectrum. Because scores are not cardinal numbers, they cannot be added up or averaged across households. Only two operations are valid for scores: conversion to poverty likelihoods and comparison—if desired—with a cut-off for targeting (Schreiner, 2012). Always analyze poverty likelihoods, never scores.

6.1 Accuracy of estimated poverty rates at a point in time

For the Indonesia scorecard applied to the validation sample with $n = 16{,}384$, the average absolute differences between estimated poverty rates at a point in time and the true rates are 0.9 percentage points or less (Figure 9, summarizing Figure 8 across

poverty lines). The average absolute difference across the six new poverty lines is about 0.6 percentage points. At least part of these differences is due to sampling variation in the division of the July 2010 SUSENAS into two sub-samples.

When estimating poverty rates at a point in time, the average difference between scorecard estimates and true rates reported in Figure 9 should be subtracted from the average poverty likelihood to make the estimate unbiased. For Indonesia's scorecard and the new national line, bias is –0.5 percentage points, so the unbiased estimate in the three-household example above is 12.9 – (–0.5) = 13.4 percent.

In terms of precision, the 90-percent confidence interval for a group's estimated poverty rate at a point in time with n = 16,384 is ±0.6 percentage points or less (Figure 9). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps of this size, the estimate (after subtracting off bias) is within 0.6 percentage points of the true value.

For example, if the average poverty likelihood in a sample of n = 16,384 with the Indonesia scorecard and the new national line is 12.9 percent, then estimates in 90 percent of samples of n = 16,384 would be expected to fall in the range of 12.9 – (–0.5) – 0.4 = 13.0 percent to 12.9 – (–0.5) + 0.4 = 13.8 percent, with the most likely true value being the unbiased estimate in the middle of this range (12.9 – (–0.5) = 13.4 percent). This is because the original (biased) estimate is 12.9 percent, bias is –0.5 percentage points, and the 90-percent confidence interval for the new national line is ±0.4 percentage points (Figure 9).

6.2 Formula for standard errors for estimates of poverty rates

How precise are the point-in-time estimates? Because they are averages, the estimates (in "large" samples) have a Normal distribution and can be characterized by their average difference vis-à-vis true values together with the standard error of the average difference.

To derive a formula for the standard errors of estimated poverty rates at a point in time from indirect measurement via scorecards (Schreiner, 2008a), first note that the textbook formula (Cochran, 1977) that relates confidence intervals with standard errors in the case of direct measurement of rates is $\pm c = \pm z \cdot \sigma$, where:

$\pm c$ is a confidence interval as a proportion (*e.g.*, 0.02 for ±2 percentage points),

z is from the Normal distribution and is $\begin{cases} 1.04 \text{ for confidence levels of 70 percent} \\ 1.28 \text{ for confidence levels of 80 percent} \\ 1.64 \text{ for confidence levels of 90 percent} \end{cases}$,

σ is the standard error of the estimated poverty rate, that is, $\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \phi$,

$\hat{p}$ is the estimated proportion of households below the poverty line in the sample,

ϕ is the finite population correction factor of $\sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}}$,

N is the population size, and

n is the sample size.

For example, Indonesia's July (non-panel/core) 2010 data and the new national poverty line give an estimated a household-level poverty rate of $\hat{p} = 10.1$ percent (Figure 1) by direct measurement. If this estimate came from a sample of $n = 16{,}384$ households from a population N of 62,263,769 households (Indonesia's actual number of households), then the finite population correction ϕ is $\sqrt{\frac{62{,}263{,}769 - 16{,}384}{62{,}263{,}769 - 1}} = 0.99986$, which can be taken as one (1). If the desired confidence level is 90-percent ($z = 1.64$), then the confidence interval $\pm c$ is

$$\pm z \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}} = \pm 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101)}{16{,}384}} \cdot 1 = \pm 0.386 \text{ percentage points.}$$

The scorecard, however, does not measure poverty directly, so this formula is not immediately applicable. To derive a formula for the Indonesia scorecard, consider Figure 8, which reports empirical confidence intervals c for the differences for the scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of various sample sizes from the validation sample. For example, with $n = 16{,}384$ and the new national line, the 90-percent confidence interval is 0.385 percentage points.[19]

Thus, the 90-percent confidence interval with $n = 16{,}384$ is 0.385 percentage points for the Indonesia scorecard and 0.386 percentage points for direct measurement. The ratio of the two intervals is $0.385 \div 0.386 = 1.00$.

[19] Due to rounding, Figure 8 displays 0.4, not 0.385.

Now consider the same case, but with n = 8,192. The confidence interval under direct measurement is $\pm 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101)}{8{,}192}} \cdot 1 = \pm 0.546$ percentage points. The empirical confidence interval with the Indonesia scorecard (Figure 8) is 0.550 percentage points. Thus for n = 8,192, the ratio of the two intervals is 0.550 ÷ 0.546 = 1.01.

This ratio of 1.01 for n = 8,192 is not far from the ratio of 1.00 for n = 16,384. Across all sample sizes of 256 or more in Figure 8, the average ratio turns out to be 0.99, implying that confidence intervals for indirect estimates of poverty rates via the Indonesia scorecard and the new national poverty line are about the same as confidence intervals for direct estimates via the July 2010 SUSENAS. This 0.99 appears in Figure 9 as the "α factor" for the new national line because if $\alpha = 0.99$, then the formula for confidence intervals c for the Indonesia scorecard is $\pm c = \pm z \cdot \alpha \cdot \sigma$. That is, the formula for the standard error σ for point-in-time estimates of poverty rates via scoring is

$$\alpha \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}}.$$

In general, α can be more or less than 1.00. When α is less than 1.00, it means that the scorecard is more precise than direct measurement. This occurs for four of the six new poverty lines in Figure 9.

The formula relating confidence intervals with standard errors for the scorecard can be rearranged to give a formula for determining sample size before measurement. If $\tilde{p}$ is the expected poverty rate before measurement, then the formula for sample size n from a population of size N that is based on the desired confidence level that

corresponds to z and the desired confidence interval $\pm c$ is

$n = N \cdot \left(\frac{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p})}{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p}) + c^2 \cdot (N - 1)} \right)$. If the population N is "large" relative to the sample size n, then the finite population correction factor ϕ can be taken as one and the formula becomes $n = \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p})$.

To illustrate how to use this, suppose the population N is 62,263,769 (as for Indonesia overall), suppose $c = 0.03170$, $z = 1.64$ (90-percent confidence), and the relevant poverty line is the new national line so that the most sensible expected poverty rate $\widetilde{p}$ for Indonesia overall for the new national line is 10.1 percent and the α factor is 0.99. Then the sample-size formula gives

$$n = 62{,}263{,}769 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64^2 \cdot 0.99^2 \cdot 0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101)}{1.64^2 \cdot 0.99^2 \cdot 0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101) + 0.03170^2 \cdot (62{,}263{,}769 - 1)} \right) = 239,$$

which is not too far from the sample size of 256 observed for these parameters in Figure 8 for the new national line. Taking the finite population correction factor ϕ as one gives the same answer, as $n = \left(\frac{0.99 \cdot 1.64}{0.03170} \right)^2 \cdot 0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101) = 239.$

Of course, the α factors in Figure 9 are specific to Indonesia, its poverty lines, its poverty rates, and this scorecard. The derivation of the formulas, however, is valid for any poverty-assessment tool following the approach in this paper.

In practice after the end of fieldwork for the July 2010 SUSENAS, an organization would select a poverty line (say, the new national line), note their

population size (say, $N = 10{,}000$ participants), select a desired confidence level (say, 90 percent, or $z = 1.64$), select a desired confidence interval (say, ±2.0 percentage points, or $c = 0.02$), make an assumption about $\widetilde{p}$ (perhaps based on a previous measurement such as the 10.1-percent national average in the July 2010 SUSENAS in Figure 1), look up α (here, 0.99), assume that the scorecard will still work in the future and/or for subgroups that are not nationally representative,[20] and then compute the required sample size. In this illustration,

$$n = 10{,}000 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64^2 \cdot 0.99^2 \cdot 0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101)}{1.64^2 \cdot 0.99^2 \cdot 0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101) + 0.02^2 \cdot (10{,}000 - 1)} \right) = 565.$$ [21]

[20] This paper reports accuracy for the scorecard applied to the validation sample, but it cannot test accuracy for later years or for other groups. Performance after July 2010 will resemble that in the non-panel/core SUSENAS, with deterioration to the extent that the relationships between indicators and poverty status change over time.

[21] Although USAID has not specified confidence levels nor intervals, IRIS Center (2007a and 2007b) says that a sample $n = 300$ is sufficient for USAID reporting. In Indonesia, USAID microenterprise partners should report using the new $1.25/day 2005 PPP line. Given the α factor of 1.01 for this line (Figure 9), an expected before-measurement household-level poverty rate of 14.1 percent (the all-Indonesia rate for July 2010, Figure 1), and a confidence level of 90 percent (so $z = 1.64$), then $n = 300$ implies a confidence interval of $\pm 1.01 \cdot 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{0.141 \cdot (1 - 0.141)}{300}} = \pm 3.3$ percentage points.

7. Estimates of changes in group poverty rates over time

The change in a group's poverty rate between two points in time is estimated as the change in the average poverty likelihood of the units in the group. With data from the July 2007 and July 2010 SUSENAS, this paper cannot test estimates of change over time for Indonesia with the new 2010 scorecard,[22] and it can only suggest approximate formulas for standard errors. Nevertheless, the relevant concepts are presented here because, in practice, pro-poor organizations can apply the scorecard to collect their own data and measure change through time.

7.1 Warning: Change is not impact

Scoring can estimate change. Of course, poverty could get better or worse, and scoring does not indicate what caused change. This point is often forgotten or confused, so it bears repeating: the scorecard simply estimates change, and it does not, in and of itself, indicate the reason for the change. In particular, estimating the impact of program participation requires knowing what would have happened to participants if they had not been participants. Knowing this requires either strong assumptions or a control group that resembles participants in all ways except participation. To belabor

[22] The 2010 scorecard cannot be applied to the July 2007 data used by Chen and Schreiner (2009a) to test estimates of changes in poverty rates because the July 2007 SUSENAS did not ask about having a gas cylinder of 12kg or more. The 2007 survey also had different sets of response options for the educational attainment of the female head/spouse and for the employment status of the male head/spouse.

the point, the scorecard can help estimate program impact only if there is some way to know what would have happened in the absence of the program. And that information must come from somewhere beyond the scorecard.

7.2 Calculating estimated changes in poverty rates over time

Consider the illustration begun in the previous section. On Jan. 1, 2013, a program samples three households who score 20, 30, and 40 and so have poverty likelihoods of 25.2, 10.3, and 3.2 percent (new national line, Figure 4). Adjusting for the known bias of –0.5 percentage points (Figure 9),[23] the group's baseline estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of [(25.2 + 10.3 + 3.2) ÷ 3] – (–0.5) = 13.4 percent.

After baseline, two sampling approaches are possible for the follow-up round:

- Score a new, independent sample, measuring change by cohort across samples
- Score the same sample at follow-up as at baseline

By way of illustration, suppose that a year later on Jan. 1, 2014, the program samples three additional households who are in the same cohort as the three households originally sampled (or suppose that the program scores the same three original households a second time) and finds that their scores are 25, 35, and 45 (poverty likelihoods of 17.3, 5.8, and 1.4 percent, new national line, Figure 4). Correcting for

[23] When measuring change, it is not necessary to correct baseline and follow-up estimates for their known bias; the result is the same with or without the correction. Nevertheless, it is done here to avoid confusion with the point-in-time bias adjustment.

bias, their average poverty likelihood at follow-up is [(17.3 + 5.8 + 1.4) ÷ 3] – (–0.5) = 8.7 percent, an improvement of 13.4 – 8.7 = 4.7 percentage points.[24]

Thus, about one in 20 participants in this hypothetical example crossed the poverty line in 2013.[25] Among those who started below the line, about one in three (4.7 ÷ 13.4 = 35.1 percent) on net ended up above the line.[26]

7.3 Accuracy for estimated change in two independent samples

With the July 2007 and July 2010 data and the 2010 scorecard, it is not possible to measure the accuracy of scorecard estimates of changes in groups' poverty rates over time. In practice, of course, local pro-poor organizations can still apply the Indonesia scorecard to estimate change. The rest of this section suggests approximate formulas for standard errors that may be used until there is additional data.

For two equal-sized independent samples, the same logic as above can be used to derive a formula relating the confidence interval $\pm c$ with the standard error σ of a scorecard's estimate of the change in poverty rates over time:

$$\pm c = \pm z \cdot \sigma = \pm z \cdot \alpha \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}}.$$

z, c, $\hat{p}$ and N are defined as above, n is the sample size at both baseline and follow-up,[27] and α is the average (across a range of bootstrapped sample sizes) of the

[24] Of course, such a huge reduction in poverty in one year is unlikely, but this is just an example to show how the scorecard can be used to estimate change.
[25] This is a net figure; some people start above the line and end below it, and vice versa.
[26] The scorecard does not reveal the reasons for this change.

ratio of the observed confidence interval from a scorecard and the theoretical confidence interval under direct measurement.

As before, the formula for standard errors can be rearranged to give a formula for sample sizes before indirect measurement via a scorecard, where $\widetilde{p}$ is based on previous measurements and is assumed equal at both baseline and follow-up: $n = 2 \cdot N \cdot \left(\frac{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p})}{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p}) + c^2 \cdot (N - 1)} \right)$. If ϕ can be taken as one, then the formula becomes $n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p})$.

For countries for which this α has been measured (Schreiner, 2010, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d, 2009e, and 2008b; Schreiner and Woller, 2010a and 2010b; and Chen and Schreiner, 2009b and 2009c), the simple average of α across poverty lines and years for a given country and then across countries is 1.19. This is as reasonable a figure as any to use for Indonesia.

To illustrate the use of the formula above to determine sample size for estimating changes in poverty rates across two independent samples, suppose the desired confidence level is 90 percent ($z = 1.64$), the desired confidence interval is ± 2 percentage points ($c = 0.02$), the poverty line is the new national line, $\alpha = 1.19$, $\hat{p} = 0.101$ (from Figure 1), and the population N is large enough relative to the expected

[27] This means that, for a given precision and with direct measurement, estimating the change in a poverty rate between two points in time requires four times as many total measurements (not twice as many) as does estimating a poverty rate at a point in time.

sample size n that the finite population correction factor ϕ can be taken as one. Then the baseline sample size is $n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.19 \cdot 1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 \cdot 0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101) \cdot 1 = 1{,}730$, and the follow-up sample size is also 1,730.

7.4 Accuracy for estimated change for one sample, scored twice

Analogous to previous derivations, the general formula relating the confidence interval c to the standard error σ when using a scorecard to estimate change for a single group of units, all of whom are scored at two points in time, is:[28]

$$\pm c = \pm z \cdot \sigma = \pm z \cdot \alpha \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_{12} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{12}) + \hat{p}_{21} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{21}) + 2 \cdot \hat{p}_{12} \cdot \hat{p}_{21}}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{n - 1}},$$

where z, c, α, N, and n are defined as usual, $\hat{p}_{12}$ is the share of all sampled units that move from below the poverty line to above it, and $\hat{p}_{21}$ is the share of all sampled units that move from above the line to below it.

The formula for confidence intervals can be rearranged to give a formula for sample size before measurement. This requires an estimate (based on information available before measurement) of the expected shares of all units who cross the poverty

[28] See McNemar (1947) and Johnson (2007). John Pezzullo helped find this formula.

line $\widetilde{p}_{12}$ and $\widetilde{p}_{21}$. Before measurement, it is reasonable to assume that the change in the poverty rate will be zero, which implies $\widetilde{p}_{12} = \widetilde{p}_{21} = \widetilde{p}_{*}$, giving:

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot \widetilde{p}_{*} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{n - 1}}.$$

Because $\widetilde{p}_{*}$ could be anything between 0 to 0.5, more information is needed to apply this formula. Suppose that the observed relationship between $\widetilde{p}_{*}$, the number of years y between baseline and follow-up, and $p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot \left(1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}}\right)$ is—as in Peru (Schreiner, 2009a)—close to:

$$\widetilde{p}_{*} = -0.02 + 0.016 \cdot y + 0.47 \cdot \left[p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot \left(1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}}\right) \right].$$

Given this, a sample-size formula for a group of households to whom the Indonesia scorecard is applied twice (once after July 2010 and then again later) is

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot \left\{ -0.02 + 0.016 \cdot y + 0.47 \cdot \left[p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot \left(1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}}\right) \right] \right\} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{n - 1}}.$$

In Peru (the only other country for which there is an estimate, Schreiner 2009a), the average α across years and poverty lines is about 1.30.

To illustrate the use of this formula, suppose the desired confidence level is 90 percent ($z = 1.64$), the desired confidence interval is ±2.0 percentage points ($c = 0.02$), the poverty line is the new national line, the sample will be scored first in 2013 and then again in 2016 ($y = 3$), the unit is the household, and the population N is so large relative to the expected sample size that the finite population correction factor ϕ can be taken as one. The pre-baseline poverty rate is 10.1 percent ($p_{2010} = 0.101$, Figure 1), and

suppose $\alpha = 1.30$. Then the baseline sample size is

$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.30 \cdot 1.64}{0.02} \right)^2 \cdot \left\{ - 0.02 + 0.016 \cdot 3 + 0.47 \cdot \left[0.101 \cdot (1 - 0.101) \right] \right\} \cdot 1 = 1{,}607$. The same group of 1,607 households is scored at follow-up as well.

8. Targeting

When a program uses the scorecard for targeting, households with scores at or below a cut-off are labeled *targeted* and treated—for program purposes—as if they are below a given poverty line. Households with scores above a cut-off are labeled *non-targeted* and treated—for program purposes—as if they are above a given poverty line.

There is a distinction between *targeting status* (scoring at or below a targeting cut-off) and *poverty status* (having expenditure below a poverty line). Poverty status is a fact that depends on whether expenditure is below a poverty line as directly measured by a survey. In contrast, targeting status is a program's policy choice that depends on a cut-off and on an indirect estimate from a scorecard.

Targeting is successful when households truly below a poverty line are targeted (*inclusion*) and when households truly above a poverty line are not targeted (*exclusion*). Of course, scoring is not perfect, and targeting is unsuccessful when households truly below a poverty line are not targeted (*undercoverage*) or when households truly above a poverty line are targeted (*leakage*). Figure 10 depicts these four possible targeting outcomes.

Targeting accuracy varies by the cut-off score; a higher cut-off has better inclusion (but greater leakage), while a lower cut-off has better exclusion (but higher undercoverage). Programs should weigh these trade-offs when setting a cut-off. A formal way to do this is to assign net benefits—based on a program's values and

mission—to each of the four possible targeting outcomes and then to choose the cut-off that maximizes total net benefits (Adams and Hand, 2000; Hoadley and Oliver, 1998).

Figure 11 shows the distribution of households by targeting outcome for Indonesia. For an example cut-off of 25–29, outcomes for the new national line in the validation sample are:

- Inclusion: 7.4 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 2.8 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 19.1 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 70.7 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

Increasing the cut-off to 30–34 improves inclusion and undercoverage but worsens leakage and exclusion:

- Inclusion: 8.8 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 1.4 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 29.9 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 59.9 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

Which cut-off is preferred depends on total net benefit. If each targeting outcome has a per-household benefit or cost, then total net benefit for a given cut-off is:

Benefit per household correctly included	x	Households correctly included	–
Cost per household mistakenly not covered	x	Households mistakenly not covered	–
Cost per household mistakenly leaked	x	Households mistakenly leaked	+
Benefit per household correctly excluded	x	Households correctly excluded.	

To set an optimal cut-off, a program would:

- Assign benefits and costs to possible outcomes, based on its mission and values
- Tally total net benefits for each cut-off using Figure 11 for a given poverty line
- Select the cut-off with the highest total net benefit

The most difficult step is assigning benefits and costs to targeting outcomes. An organization that uses targeting—with or without scoring—should thoughtfully consider how it values successful inclusion or exclusion versus errors of undercoverage and leakage. It is healthy to go through a process of thinking explicitly and intentionally about how possible targeting outcomes are valued.

A common choice of benefits and costs is "Total Accuracy" (IRIS Center, 2005; Grootaert and Braithwaite, 1998). With "Total Accuracy", total net benefit is the number of households correctly included or correctly excluded:

Total Accuracy =	1	x	Households correctly included	–
	0	x	Households mistakenly undercovered	–
	0	x	Households mistakenly leaked	+
	1	x	Households correctly excluded.	

Figure 11 shows "Total Accuracy" for all cut-offs for the Indonesia scorecard. For the new national line in the validation sample, total net benefit is greatest (90.0) for a cut-off of 9 or less, with nine in ten households in Indonesia correctly classified. Of course, simply not targeting anyone gives almost the same "Total Accuracy" (89.9 percent).

"Total Accuracy" weighs successful inclusion of households below the line the same as successful exclusion of households above the line. If a program valued inclusion more (say, twice as much) than exclusion, it could reflect this by setting the benefit for

inclusion to 2 and the benefit for exclusion to 1. Then the chosen cut-off would maximize (2 x Households correctly included) + (1 x Households correctly excluded).[29]

As an alternative—or as an additional criterion—to assigning benefits and costs to targeting outcomes and then choosing a cut-off to maximize total net benefit, a program could set a cut-off to achieve a desired poverty rate among targeted households. For the Indonesia scorecard applied to the validation sample, the third column of Figure 12 ("% targeted who are poor") shows the expected poverty rate among households who score at or below a given cut-off. For the example of the new national line, targeting households who score 29 or less would target 26.5 percent of all households (second column) and produce a poverty rate among those targeted of 28.0 percent (third column).

Figure 12 also reports two other measures of targeting accuracy that may be used as criteria for setting a cut-off. The first is a version of coverage ("% of poor who are targeted"). For the example of the new national line in the validation sample and a cut-off of 29 or less, 72.9 percent of all poor households are covered.

The final targeting measure in Figure 12 is the number of successfully targeted poor households for each non-poor household mistakenly targeted (right-most column). For the national line in the validation sample and a cut-off of 29 or less, covering 0.4 poor households means leaking to 1 non-poor household.

[29] Figure 11 also reports "BPAC", discussed in Section 9 below.

9. Context of Indonesia poverty-assessment tools

This section discusses seven[30] existing poverty-assessment tools for Indonesia in terms of their goals, methods, definitions of poverty status, indicators, costs, and accuracy. In general, the advantages of the new scorecard here are its use of the latest available nationally representative data, its known accuracy, its focus on feasibility for local, pro-poor organizations, and its providing of formulas for standard errors.

9.1 Gwatkin *et al.*

Gwatkin *et al.* (2007) construct a poverty-assessment tool for Indonesia with an approach that they use in 56 countries with Demographic and Health Surveys (Rutstein and Johnson, 2004). They use Principal Components Analysis to make an asset index from simple, low-cost indicators available for the 33,088 households in Indonesia's 2002/3 DHS.[31] The PCA index is like the scorecard here except that, because the DHS does not collect data on expenditure, it is based on a different conception of poverty, its accuracy vis-à-vis expenditure-based poverty is unknown, and it can only be assumed to be a proxy for long-term wealth/economic status.[32] Well-known examples of the PCA

[30] Lanjouw, Luoto, and McKenzie (2009) build a poverty-assessment tool in the spirit of poverty mapping using the 1997 and 2000 Indonesia Family Life Surveys. It is not discussed here because its purpose is far from that of providing a tool that local, pro-poor organizations can use to improve their management of poverty outreach.
[31] Gwatkin *et al.* (2000) make a similar asset index using Indonesia's 1997 DHS.
[32] Nevertheless, the indicators are similar and the "flat maximum" is important, so carefully built PCA indices and expenditure-based scorecards may pick up the same underlying construct (perhaps "permanent income", see Bollen, Glanville, and Stecklov,

asset-index approach include Filmer and Scott (2012), Stifel and Christiaensen (2007), Zeller *et al.* (2006), Ferguson *et al.* (2003), and Sahn and Stifel (2000 and 2003).

The 16 indicators in Gwatkin *et al.* are similar to those in the scorecard here in terms of their simplicity, low cost, and verifiability:

- Characteristics of the residence:
  - Type of walls
  - Type of roof
  - Type of floors
  - Floor area
  - Source of drinking water
  - Toilet arrangement
  - Fuel for cooking
  - Presence of electricity
- Ownership of consumer durables:
  - Radios
  - Televisions
  - Refrigerators
  - Bicycles or rowboats
  - Motorcycles or motorboats
  - Cars
  - Telephones
- Whether members of the household work their own or family's agricultural land

Gwatkin *et al.* suggest three possible uses for their index:

- Segmenting households by quintiles to see how health, population, and nutrition vary with socio-economic status
- Monitoring (via exit surveys) how well local health-service posts reach the poor
- Measuring coverage of health services via local, small-scale surveys

The first goal is akin to targeting, and the last two goals resemble the monitoring goals here, so the uses of the PCA index are similar to those of the scorecard.

2007), and they may rank households much the same. Tests of how well rankings correspond between PCA indexes and expenditure-based scorecards include Lindelow (2006), Wagstaff and Watanabe (2003), and Montgomery *et al.* (2000).

Still, the Gwatkin *et al.* index is more difficult and costly because it cannot be computed by hand in the field, as getting a household's score requires adding up 110 point values, half of which are negative and all of which have five decimal places.

Unlike the PCA index, the scorecard here is linked directly to an absolute, expenditure-based poverty line. Thus, while both approaches can rank households, only a scorecard can estimate expenditure-based poverty rates.

In essence, Gwatkin *et al.*—like all PCA asset indexes—define poverty in terms of the indicators in their index. Thus, the index is not a proxy standing in for something else (such as expenditure) but rather a direct measure of a non-expenditure-based definition of poverty. There is nothing wrong—and a lot right—about defining poverty in this way, but it is not as common as a expenditure-based definition.

The asset-index approach defines people as *poor* if their assets (physical, human, financial, and social) fall below a threshold. Arguments for the asset-based view include Carter and Barrett (2006), Schreiner and Sherraden (2006), Sahn and Stifel (2003), and Sherraden (1991). The main points in its favor are that:

- Asset ownership is easier to measure accurately than expenditure
- Access to resources in the long term—and thus capacity to produce income and to consume—depends on the control of assets
- Assets get at capability more directly, the difference between, say, "Can you afford adequate sanitation?" versus "Does your toilet have a septic tank?"

While the asset view and the income/consumption view are distinct, they are also tightly linked. After all, income/consumption are flows of resources received/consumed from the use of stocks of assets. Both views are low-dimensional

simplifications—due to practical limits on definitions and measurement—of a higher-dimensional and more complete conception of the production of human well-being.

9.2 Filmer and Pritchett

Like Gwatkin *et al.* (2007), Filmer and Pritchett (FP, 2001) use a PCA asset index as a proxy for long-term wealth/economic status. Their goal is to relate economic status to school enrollment in India (not Indonesia). They conclude that their index predicts enrollment as least as well as current expenditure predicts enrollment.

To support their method, FP want to compare households' rankings by their index with rankings by expenditure, but their India data lacks expenditure. They thus build an analogous index with Indonesia's 1994 DHS, which has a SUSENAS-like expenditure module. FP do not report the indicators in this index.

To compare ranks, FP order households in Indonesia's 1994 DHS twice, once by their index and a second time by expenditure. For each ranking, they classify households as bottom-40 percentile, middle-40 percentile, or top 20-percentile. They judge the coherence of the rankings by comparing how households are classified across these three classes by the index versus by expenditure.

Which is the best proxy for expenditure, the asset index or the scorecard? On the one hand, the comparison favors the scorecard in that—unlike the index—it is designed as a proxy for expenditure. On the other hand, FP build their index and test it with the same data, and such in-sample testing overstates accuracy. This puts the scorecard—tested out-of-sample—at a disadvantage.

The results favor the scorecard. About 28 percent of all households in the validation sample from the July 2010 SUSENAS are in the bottom-40 percentiles by both poverty scores and expenditure, versus 26 percent for the FP asset index and the 1994 DHS. Likewise, 22 percent of all households coincide on poverty scores and expenditure in the middle-40 percentiles, against 20 percent for the index. Finally, 12 percent of all households are in the top-20 percentiles on both poverty scores and expenditure, versus 10 percent for the index.

9.3 IRIS Center

USAID commissioned IRIS Center (2011) to build a "Poverty Assessment Tool" (PAT) so that USAID's microenterprise partners in Indonesia could report on their participants' poverty rates. There are two versions of the PAT for Indonesia, one done in 2007 for the USAID "extreme" poverty line (household-level poverty rate of 7.7 percent) and another done in 2011 for the \$1.25/day and \$2.50/day 2005 PPP lines (household-level poverty rates of 28.1 and 74.9 percent). Both versions are derived from the 2002 SUSENAS.

In general, the IRIS PAT is like the scorecard here, except that it:

- Uses older data
- Estimates expenditure quantiles (rather than estimating poverty likelihoods)
- Does not support estimates based on the national poverty line
- Does not report the source of its poverty lines
- Hides PAT points from end-users
- Uses in-sample tests
- Does not report standard errors

After comparing several statistical approaches,[33] IRIS settles on quantile regression. The PAT estimates the expected value of the 40th percentile of the logarithm of per-capita household expenditure, conditional on tool responses. IRIS calls the household "poor" if this estimate is less than a given poverty line.

In the 2011 version, IRIS' 14 indicators are simple and verifiable:[34]

- Household demographics:
  - — Number of household members (and its square)
  - — Age of the household head (and its square)
  - — Marital status of the household head
- Education:
  - — Education of the household head
  - — Share of household members who have no education
  - — Share of household members who have completed high school
- Characteristics of the residence:
  - — Geographic region
  - — Tenancy status
  - — Type of walls
  - — Type of floor
  - — Source of drinking water
  - — Type of toilet arrangement
  - — Source of lighting
- Whether any household members own a store

IRIS reports accuracy in terms of bias, targeting (coverage, undercoverage, and leakage), and the Balanced Poverty Accuracy Criterion, the standard USAID adopted for certifying PATs. BPAC's formula (IRIS Center, 2005) considers accuracy in terms

[33] All methods have roughly the same accuracy, thanks to the "flat max".
[34] The 2011 version drops difficult questions from the 2007 version such as the area of the floor of the residence in square meters, the past receipt of government subsidies, and having purchased a new set of clothes in the past year.

of bias (undercoverage – leakage) and in terms of targeting (inclusion). The formula is

$$\text{BPAC} = 100 \cdot \frac{\text{Inclusion} - |\text{Undercoverage} - \text{Leakage}|}{\text{Inclusion} + \text{Undercoverage}}.$$ A higher BPAC is preferred.

How does accuracy compare for the PAT versus the scorecard? Both are unbiased. In terms of targeting, a fair comparison requires a poverty line (132% of the new national line) that gives a household-level poverty rate in the July 2010 SUSENAS that matches the 28.1 percent reported for the PAT's $1.25/day 2005 PPP line in 2002. Without adjusting for the PAT's use of in-sample tests, the two tools target about equally well; holding exclusion at about 61 percent (the figure for exclusion that IRIS reports), the PAT has inclusion of 17.0 percent, and the scorecard has inclusion of 16.5 percent. The PAT's BPAC is 61.0, while the scorecard's BPAC—when targeting the same share of households as the PAT—is 59.7.[35] Thus, the two tools have about the same targeting accuracy. Of course, the relationships between indicators and poverty have changed to some unknown extent from 2002 to 2010, so the 2010 scorecard here should be more accurate in applications from now on. Nevertheless, the choice of a tool should hinge on factors other than accuracy (such as cost and the chances of winning the acceptance and support of front-line workers).

[35] The PAT has an advantage in this comparison because it is tuned to a poverty line giving a household-level poverty rate of 28.1 percent and to the BPAC criterion.

Even though IRIS reports targeting accuracy for the PAT and even though the BPAC formula considers targeting accuracy, IRIS says that the PAT should not be used for targeting.[36] IRIS also doubts that the PAT can be useful for measuring changes in poverty rates, noting that "it is unclear that the tools will be able to identify real changes in poverty over time due to their inherent measurement errors. Unless the changes in the poverty rate are exceptionally large and the tools exceptionally accurate, the changes identified are likely to be contained within the margin of error."[37] In contrast, these possible uses are supported for the scorecard, and this paper reports targeting accuracy as well as margins of error for measures of change over time so that users can decide for themselves whether accuracy is adequate for their purposes.

9.4 Sumarto, Suryadarma, and Suryahadi

Sumarto, Suryadarma, and Suryahadi ("SSS", 2007) compare three approaches to building poverty-assessment tools:

- Regression on poverty status (as in this paper)
- Regression on expenditure (as in IRIS)
- Principal Components Analysis (as in Filmer and Pritchett)

[36] `http://www.povertytools.org/faq/faq.html#11`, retrieved 19 February 2009.
[37] `http://www.povertytools.org/faq/faq2.html`, retrieved 7 December 2012.

"The purpose is to use these alternatives for rapid monitoring and appraisal of social welfare as an early-warning system" (p. 543) to alert the government to sudden deterioration in welfare.[38]

Their data comes from the 1999 SUSENAS.[39] For each of the three approaches, they build urban and rural tools, each of which includes most of the following 48 indicators:

- Demographics:
  - Age of the head (and its square)
  - Age of the spouse of the head (and its square)
  - Number of household members (and its square)
  - Marital status of head
  - Dependency ratio
- Education:
  - Highest level completed by the head
  - Highest level completed by the spouse of the head
  - Whether all children ages 6–15 attend school
- Employment:
  - Who works:
    - Head
    - Spouse of the head
    - Any child ages 5–16
  - Whether the head works in the formal sector
  - Whether the main source of household income is agriculture
- Characteristics of the residence:
  - Province of residence
  - Type of roof
  - Type of walls
  - Type of floor
  - Type of toilet arrangement
  - Source of drinking water
  - Presence of electrical connection

[38] Despite this stated purpose—which involves estimating poverty rates—SSS focus on accuracy in terms of targeting.
[39] In 1999, there was just a single annual SUSENAS survey.

- Asset ownership:
  - Radio
  - Television
  - Jewelry
  - Bicycle or boat
  - Sewing machine
  - Refrigerator
  - Motorcycle
  - Satellite dish
  - Car
  - House
  - Land
- Animal husbandry:
  - Chickens
  - Goats
  - Cows
  - Other animals
- Non-food consumption:
  - Whether each household member has different clothes for different activities
  - Whether modern medicine is used to treat illnesses
- Food consumption:
  - Whether each household member eats at least twice a day
  - Whether in the past week, the household ate:
    - Fresh cassava (*gaplek*)
    - Dried cassava (*tiwul*)
    - Bananas
    - Bread
    - Biscuits
    - Eggs
    - Milk
    - Beef

In the regression on expenditure, SSS classify households as *poor* if their estimated per-capita household expenditure is below the national poverty line in Pradhan *et al.* (2001). These lines are specific to urban/rural areas by province, giving an all-Indonesia person-level poverty rate of 27.1 percent (16.3 percent urban, 34.1 percent rural). Stepwise least-squares is used to select statistically significant indicators.

In the stepwise Probit, SSS select indicators based on statistical significance. Scores are converted to poverty likelihoods using the Probit formula, and households are called *poor* if their estimated likelihood exceeds the arbitrary cut-off of 50 percent.

The PCA of SSS follows Filmer and Pritchett. Households are called *poor* if their index is below a cut-off set so that the percentage of people who are targeted matches the expenditure-based poverty rate in the 1999 SUSENAS.

Based on the share of people correctly classified ("Total Accuracy", see Section 8), SSS conclude that the regression on expenditure is the most accurate. This might be overturned, however, if the Probit used a cut-off other than 50 percent.

It turns out that the scorecard here is about as accurate for trageting as those in SSS. This holds even though the scorecard is at a disadvantage because it uses:

- The new national line for construction, producing an all-Indonesia person-level poverty rate of 13.0 percent (not 27.1 percent), so it is not as closely tuned to the 1999 line as is SSS[40]
- Household-level weights in construction but person-level weights (for comparability with SSS) for the comparison with SSS
- A single scorecard for all of Indonesia, not separate urban and rural tools
- Ten simple, inexpensive-to-collect indicators, whereas SSS use 48 indicators, some non-verifiable (such as using modern medicine or having eaten a certain food in the past week), or complex (requiring computing squares or ratios)
- Out-of-sample tests, rather than in-sample tests

To compare targeting accuracy, people in households in the validation sample from the July 2010 SUSENAS are placed in three groups (bottom-30 percentiles, middle-40 percentiles, and top-30 percentiles) both by poverty scores and by per-capita

[40] For the comparison, the new national line is proportionally increased across districts so that the all-urban (or all-rural) person-level poverty rates match those in SSS.

expenditure. These two rankings are then cross-tabbed and compared to the same exercise reported in SSS.

In urban areas, 19.4 percent of people are in the bottom-30 percentiles by both the poverty score and by expenditure. This is slightly less than for the SSS expenditure regression (20.2 percent) and more than for the SSS asset index (15.3). This pattern holds for the middle-40 percentiles (20.8 percent for the scorecard, 22.6 percent for SSS's expenditure regression, and 18.3 percent for the asset index) and for the top-30 percentiles (19.0 percent for the scorecard, 20.9 percent for the expenditure regression, and 16.4 percent for the asset index).

The same pattern holds in rural areas. About 17.3 percent of people are in the bottom-30 percentiles by both the poverty score and by expenditure. This is less than for the SSS expenditure regression (19.0 percent) and more than for the SSS asset index (14.2). For the middle-40 percentiles, the scorecard hits 19.4 percent, versus 21.4 percent for the expenditure regression and 15.1 percent for the asset index. Finally, the scorecard matches on 17.8 percent for the top-30 percentiles, compared with 19.7 percent for the expenditure regression and 15.1 percent for the asset index.

Overall in this three-bin case—ignoring the disadvantages faced by the scorecard—SSS's expenditure regression is better, and their asset index is worse.

SSS also check targeting accuracy via exclusion and inclusion. To compare with the scorecard here, inclusion is compared with exclusion held constant.

For SSS's expenditure regression and with exclusion held at 78 percent in urban areas, inclusion is 8 percent for SSS and 7 percent for the scorecard. In rural areas with exclusion at 61 percent, inclusion is 16 percent for SSS and 12 percent for the scorecard.

For SSS's Probit and with exclusion at 81 percent in urban areas, inclusion is 6 percent for SSS and 4 percent for the scorecard. In rural areas with exclusion at 60 percent, inclusion is 18 percent for SSS and 14 percent for the scorecard.

Finally, for SSS's PCA asset index and with exclusion at 75 percent in urban areas, inclusion is 8 percent for both tools. In rural areas with exclusion at 51 percent, inclusion is 16 percent for SSS and 22 percent for the scorecard.

Similar to the previous targeting measures, SSS is better—ignoring all the biases in its favor in the comparison—for the expenditure regression and the Probit, but worse for the asset index.

9.5 Suryahadi *et al.*

Suryahadi *et al.* (2005) use "poverty mapping" (Elbers, Lanjouw, and Lanjouw, 2003) to estimate poverty rates down to the level of Indonesia's villages.[41] They seek to help with "practical program targeting or budget allocation" (p. 1).

[41] In parallel with Suryahadi *et al.*, the World Bank made a poverty map with the same data and methods. According to Ahmad and Goh (2007, which plagiarizes several pages from Suryahadi *et al.*), having two poverty maps does not make sense. According to Ahmad and Goh, Suryahadi *et al.* is more widely known and used in the Indonesia government and policy community because—unlike the World Bank's poverty map—it is available on CD and via internet.

They first construct 59 expenditure-based poverty-assessment tools (one per urban/rural by province) using only household-level indicators found both in the February 1999 SUSENAS and in the June 2000 Population Census. They also include village-level indicators from the September/October 1999 PODES village survey. Their regressions predict the logarithm of per-capita household expenditure found in the 1999 SUSENAS expenditure module given to a subset of households in the 1999 SUSENAS. The scorecards are then applied to the household-level census data to estimate poverty status for all people in Indonesia. These are then aggregated up to the village level to give estimates of poverty rates with smaller standard errors than would be possible with only the 1999 SUSENAS. Finally, Suryahadi *et al.* make "poverty maps" that quickly show how estimated poverty rates vary across geographic areas in a way that makes sense to non-specialists.

Poverty mapping by Suryahadi *et al.* (and poverty mapping in general) is similar to the scorecard in this paper in that they both:

- Build tools with nationally representative survey data and then apply them to data on sub-groups that may not be nationally representative
- Use simple, verifiable indicators that are quick and inexpensive to collect
- Provide unbiased estimates when their assumptions hold
- Are used to estimate poverty rates for groups
- Seek to be useful in practice and so aim to be understood by non-specialists

Strengths of poverty mapping include that it:

- Has formally established theoretical properties
- Can be applied straightforwardly to measures of well-being (such as the poverty gap or measures of food security) that go beyond just head-count poverty rates
- Requires data on fewer households for tool construction and calibration
- Includes community-level indicators, which increases accuracy and precision

- Uses only indicators that appear in a census or other existing data sources
- Reports standard errors (albeit without general formulas)

Strengths of the scorecard include that it:

- Is simpler and easier to understand and so is more likely to be adopted and used
- Tests accuracy empirically
- Associates poverty likelihoods with scores non-parametrically
- Uses judgment and theory in scorecard construction to reduce overfitting[42]
- Reports both bias and simple formulas for standard errors

The basic difference between the two approaches is that poverty mapping seeks to help governments to design and target pro-poor policies, while the scorecard seeks to help local pro-poor organizations to manage their social performance.[43] On a technical level, Suryahadi *et al.* estimate households' expenditure, whereas the scorecard here estimates households' poverty likelihoods. Also, the Indonesia scorecard uses the most recent available data.

The specific volume in which Suryahadi *et al.* report their indicators is not available on the internet. Also, the precision of their poverty map's estimates of poverty

[42] A scorecard is *overfit* if it is tailored too closely to the construction sample and any random patterns it may have, leading to bias when applied at later times or with different populations. Suryahadi *et al.* risk overfitting by using stepwise regression and by dividing the subset of households who answered the detailed consumption module in the 1999 SUSENAS among 59 tools.

[43] Another apparent difference is that the developers of poverty mapping (Demombynes *et al.*, 2008; Elbers, Lanjouw, and Lanjouw, 2003) say that it is too inaccurate to be used for targeting individual households. In contrast, Schreiner (2008c) supports such targeting as a legitimate, potentially useful application of the scorecard. The developers of poverty mapping may recently have taken a small step away from their original position (Elbers *et al.*, 2007).

rates cannot be compared with those of the scorecard here because the standard errors of estimated poverty rates are reported without sample sizes.

9.6 Alatas *et al.*

Alatas *et al.* (2012) use regression to build 12 district-level poverty-assessment tools (called "proxy means tests", PMT) using data from the July 2007 SUSENAS and the 2007 World Bank Urban Poverty Project. They work with BPS to help the government of Indonesia in the context of the Direct Cash Assistance program (*Bantuan Langsung Tunai*) which transfers about $10 per month to vulnerable households in periods of crisis. They seek a tool that is not only accurate but that is also viewed as legitimate.[44]

Alatas *et al.* compare ranks by the PMT against ranks by a direct measure of per-capita household expenditure and also against qualitative ranks by community members. While PMT is the most congruent with expenditure, targeting with PMT produces poverty outcomes that are not materially different than targeting with community-based ranks. Villagers and sub-village heads are more satisfied with—and give greater legitimacy to—community ranks.[45]

[44] This explains why Alatas *et al.* do not report points or indicators. This prevents local, pro-poor organizations from using their tool. In practice, users can infer what the indicators are and how they relate with poverty ranks.

[45] Alatas *et al.* also test a hybrid that uses community-based ranks to disqualify the wealthiest, with PMT applied to the rest. This reduces leakage, but tools' biggest errors are often in missing some very poor households (undercoverage), so an alternative

Their poverty line (IDR11,111 in end-of-2008 prices) corresponds to $2.00/day 2005 PPP and a household-level poverty rate of about 30 percent. They use 49 indicators, of which 38 are indirectly reported:

- Demographics:
  - Number of household members (and its square)
  - Number of household members 4-years-old or younger
  - Age of the head (and its square)
  - Sex of the head
  - Marital status of the head
  - Dependency ratio
- Education:
  - Educational attainment of the head
  - Number of members in elementary school
  - Number of members in junior high school
  - Number of members in senior high school
  - Highest educational attainment of any household member
- Sector of employment of the head
- Characteristics of the residence:
  - Tenancy status
  - Type of floor
  - Type of wall
  - Type of roof
  - Source of drinking water
  - Type of toilet arrangement
  - Type of cooking fuel
  - Presence of electricity
  - Floor area per capita

---

hybrid approach might use community-based ranking to qualify the poorest and to disqualify the wealthiest, with PMT applied to the rest.

- Asset ownership:
  - Radio/cassette player
  - Television
  - DVD/VCD player
  - Gas stove
  - Refrigerator
  - Air conditioner
  - Computer
  - Satellite dish
  - Bicycle
  - Motorcycle
  - Car/minibus/truck
  - Cellular telephone
- Animal husbandry:
  - Chicken
  - Buffalo/cow
- Whether the household has ever received a (formal) loan

All of these are simple and verifiable, except for the dependency ratio, floor area per capita, and having ever received a formal loan.

Alatas *et al.* estimate the cost of applying the PMT to be about IDR7,000 per household, which happens to be about $1.25 2005 PPP at end-of-2008 prices. They do not report bias or precision for estimated poverty rates, but they do report targeting accuracy for a cut-off that targets 30 percent of households in their sample (inclusion of 14.1 percent, and exclusion of 56 percent). For 135% of the new national poverty line (corresponding to a household-level poverty rate of 30.0 percent), the 2010 scorecard here for the validation sample has—when targeting the lowest-scoring 30 percent of households—inclusion of 18.5 percent and exclusion of 58.5 percent. Of course, the comparison is imperfect, as Alatas *et al.* and the scorecard here are applied to different populations.

9.7 World Bank

Like Alatas *et al.*, World Bank (2011 and 2012) seek to improve the targeting of social transfers in Indonesia. Their main recommendations are to establish a unified national targeting system and to apply a targeting tool—regardless of what exactly that tool is—more comprehensively, as many households who would qualify for social transfers have been excluded in the past because they were never interviewed.

World Bank (2011 and 2012) examines the targeting accuracy of the government's poverty-assessment tool (*Pendataan Program Lindungan Sosial*, PPLS, Data Collection for Targeting Programs) and test some alternatives for improving it. The PPLS is a set of district-level tools that estimate the logarithm of per-capita household expenditure based on the indicators used in Indonesia's 2008 PPLS (World Bank, 2012, pp. 142–154). These indicators are essentially the same as those reported above for Alatas *et al.*, less the asset indicators, and with an additional set of community-level indicators from the 2008 PODES survey:

- Type of road
- Distance to district capital
- Population density
- Whether a doctor is available
- Whether there is a semi-permanent market place
- Whether there is a lender
- Whether there is an SD
- Whether there is an SLTP
- Whether there is a *Puskesmas*/*Pustu*
- Whether there is a *Polindes*
- Whether there is a *Posyandu*
- Whether a *Bidan* is available

World Bank (2011) uses data from the July (non-panel/core) 2010 SUSENAS to test some changes to the PPLS:

- Adding five asset indicators new in the July 2010 SUSENAS
- Constructing the tool from the poorest 60, 30, or 10 percent of households
- Segmenting the tool by national, urban/rural, province, or district

The largest gains come from adding the five new asset indicators. There are also gains from constructing tools based only on the poorest 60 percent of households and from constructing tools at the district level. The government's 2011 PPLS includes the five new asset indicators, and uses—as it did before—district-level tools.

How does targeting with the 2008 PPLS (with the five new asset indicators) compare with the new scorecard here when applied to the July 2010 SUSENAS? The 2008 PPLS would seem to have a head start because it:

- Uses more indicators (about 40 rather than 10)
- Tests in-sample rather than out-of-sample[46]
- Has more tools (more than 400 versus one)

In particular, in-sample tests of tools that were constructed with small samples may overstate PPLS accuracy. The average district has about 600 households in the July 2010 data, and none exceed 1,400. Making tools with many indicators with this much data may risk overfitting, especially if stepwise regression was used. That is, the estimated relationships between indicators and poverty may be well-matched with those

[46] The PLSS tests are in-sample because, with district-level tools, there is not enough data for both a construction sample and a validation sample.

in a district's sample but not with those in its overall population because—due to luck-of-the-draw—the specific sample is not completely representative of the population.

World Bank (2011, Figure 3.1) reports accuracy when targeting the 10 percent of households under the new national poverty line. The 2008 PPLS (with the five new asset indicators) has inclusion of 5.7 percent and exclusion of 85.4 percent. The new scorecard fares worse; inclusion is 3.6 percent, and exclusion is 85.1 percent (cut-off of 19 or less).

When targeting the lowest-scoring 30 percent of households, the new scorecard is also worse, with inclusion of 18.5 percent (versus 22.2 percent for the 2011 PPLS) and exclusion of 58.5 percent (versus 61.0).

Ignoring possible sanguine bias from in-sample testing and overfitting, the 2011 PPLS targets better than the scorecard here. Yet the scorecard may still be useful to local, pro-poor organizations in Indonesia because it:

- Publishes the full scorecard with indicators and points
- Reports bias, precision, and formulas for standard errors for estimated poverty rates
- Reports targeting accuracy for a range of cut-offs
- Is transparent and simple to implement

10. Conclusion

Pro-poor programs in Indonesia can use the scorecard to segment clients for targeted services as well as to estimate:

- The likelihood that a household has expenditure below a given poverty line
- The poverty rate of a population at a point in time
- The change in the poverty rate of a population between two points in time

The scorecard is inexpensive to use and can be understood by non-specialists. It is designed to be practical for local pro-poor organizations who want to improve how they monitor and manage their social performance.

The scorecard is built with half of the data from Indonesia's July (non-panel/core) 2010 SUSENAS, tested on the other half, and calibrated to six new poverty lines and three legacy poverty lines. Existing users of Indonesia's 2007 scorecard can use the three legacy lines to switch to the new 2010 scorecard without having to start over from scratch when measuring changes in poverty rates over time.

Bias and precision are reported for estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, groups' poverty rates at a point in time, and changes in groups' poverty rates over time. Of course, the scorecard's estimates of changes are not the same as estimates of program impact. Targeting accuracy is also reported.

When the scorecard is applied to the validation sample with $n = 16{,}384$ and with the new poverty lines, the absolute difference between estimates versus true poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time is 0.9 percentage points or less and averages—across the six new poverty lines—about 0.6 percentage points. Unbiased

estimates may be had by subtracting this known bias from original poverty-rate estimates. For $n = 16{,}384$ and 90-percent confidence, the precision of these differences is ± 0.6 percentage points or better.

If an organization wants to use the scorecard for targeting, then the results here provide useful information for selecting a cut-off that fits its mission and values.

Although the statistical technique is innovative, and although technical accuracy is important, the design of the scorecard here focuses on transparency and ease-of-use. After all, a perfectly accurate scorecard is worthless if organizations feel so daunted by its complexity or its cost that they do not even try to use it. For this reason, the scorecard is kept simple, with ten indicators that are inexpensive to collect and that are straightforward to verify. Points are all zeros or positive integers, and scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line). Scores are related to poverty likelihoods via simple look-up tables, and targeting cut-offs are likewise simple to apply. The design attempts to facilitate adoption by helping managers understand and trust scoring and by allowing non-specialists to generate scores quickly in the field.

In summary, the scorecard is a practical, objective way for pro-poor programs in Indonesia to estimate expenditure-based poverty rates, track changes in poverty rates over time, and target services. The same approach can be applied to any country with similar data.

References

Adams, Niall M.; and David J. Hand. (2000) "Improving the Practice of Classifier Performance Assessment", *Neural Computation*, Vol. 12, pp. 305–311.

Ahmad, Yusuf; and Chor-Ching Goh. (2007) "Indonesia's Poverty Maps: Impacts and Lessons", pp. 177–187 in Tara Bedi, Aline Coudouel, and Kenneth Simler (eds.) *More Than a Pretty Picture: Using Poverty Maps to Design Better Policies and Interventions*.

Alatas, Vivi; Banerjee, Abhijit; Hanna, Rema; Olken, Benjamin A.; and Julia Tobias. (2012) "Targeting the Poor: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 104, No. 4, pp. 1206–1240.

Baesens, Bart; Van Gestel, Tony; Viaene, Stijn; Stepanova, Maria; Suykens, Johan A. K.; and Jan Vanthienen. (2003) "Benchmarking State-of-the-Art Classification Algorithms for Credit Scoring", *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, Vol. 54, pp. 627–635.

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2012) "Number and Percentage of Poor People, Poverty Lines, Poverty-Gap Index, and Poverty-Severity Index by Province", `bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=23&notab=1`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2010) *Data Dan Informasi Kemiskinan Kabupaten/Kota 2010*, Jakarta, `bps.go.id/hasil_publikasi/flip_2011/3205014/index11.php?pub=Data dan Informasi Kemiskinan Kabupaten/Kota Tahun 2010`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2008a) *Analisis dan Penghitungan Tingkat Kemiskinan Tahun 2008*, Jakarta, `daps.bps.go.id/File%20Pub/Analisis%20Kemiskinan%202008.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 20122.

_____. (2008b) *Statistik Indonesia 2008 (Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia 2008)*.

_____. (2007a) *Data Dan Informasi Kemiskinan Tahun 2007*.

_____. (2007b) *Data Dan Informasi Kemiskinan Tahun 2006–6*.

Bollen, Kenneth A.; Glanville, Jennifer L.; and Guy Stecklov. (2007) "Socio-Economic Status, Permanent Income, and Fertility: A Latent-Variable Approach", *Population Studies*, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 15–34.

Caire, Dean. (2004) "Building Credit Scorecards for Small Business Lending in Developing Markets", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_SMEs_Hybrid.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Camacho, Adriana; and Emily Conover. (2011) "Manipulation of Social-Program Eligibility", *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 41–65.

Carter, Michael R.; and Christopher B. Barrett. (2006) "The Economics of Poverty Traps and Persistent Poverty: An Asset-Based Approach", *Journal of Development Studies,* Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 178–199.

Chen, Shiyuan; and Mark Schreiner. (2009a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Indonesia", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/IDN_2007_ENG.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2009b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Bangladesh", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/BGD_2005_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2009c) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Vietnam", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/VNM_2006_ENG.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Coady, David; Grosh, Margaret; and John Hoddinott. (2004) *Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries*, hdl.handle.net/10986/14902, retrieved 13 May 2016.

Cochran, William G. (1977) *Sampling Techniques, Third Edition*.

Dawes, Robyn M. (1979) "The Robust Beauty of Improper Linear Models in Decision Making", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 34, No. 7, pp. 571–582.

Demombynes, Gabriel; Elbers, Chris; and Peter Lanjouw. (2008) "How Good a Map? Putting Small-Area Estimation to the Test", *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, Vol. 116, No. 4, pp. 465–494.

Efron, Bradley; and Robert J. Tibshirani. (1993) *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*.

Elbers, Chris; Lanjouw, Jean O.; and Peter Lanjouw. (2003) "Micro-Level Estimation of Poverty and Inequality", *Econometrica*, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 355–364.

Elbers, Chris; Fujii, Tomoki; Lanjouw, Peter; Özler, Berk; and Wesley Yin. (2007) "Poverty Alleviation through Geographic Targeting: How Much Does Disaggregation Help?", *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 83, pp. 198–213.

Ferguson, Brodie D.; Tandon, Ajay; Gakidou, Emmanuela; and Christopher J.L. Murray. (2003) "Estimating Permanent Income Using Indicator Variables", pp. 747–760 in Christopher J.L. Murray and David B. Evans (eds) *Health Systems Performance Assessment: Debates, Methods, and Empiricism*.

Filmer, Deon; and Lant Pritchett. (2001) "Estimating Wealth Effects without Expenditure Data—or Tears: An Application to Educational Enrollments in States of India", *Demography*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 115–132.

_____; and Kinnon Scott. (2012) "Assessing Asset Indices", *Demography*, Vol. 49, pp. 359–392.

Friedman, Jerome H. (1997) "On Bias, Variance, 0–1 Loss, and the Curse-of-Dimensionality", *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, Vol. 1, pp. 55–77.

Fuller, Rob. (2006) "Measuring the Poverty of Microfinance Clients in Haiti", `microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Haiti_Fuller.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Goodman, Leo A.; and Kruskal, William H. (1979) *Measures of Association for Cross Classification*.

Grootaert, Christiaan; and Jeanine Braithwaite. (1998) "Poverty Correlates and Indicator-Based Targeting in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 1942, `go.worldbank.org/VPMWVLU8E0`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Grosh, Margaret; and Judy L. Baker. (1995) "Proxy Means Tests for Targeting Social Programs: Simulations and Speculation", World Bank LSMS Working Paper No. 118, `go.worldbank.org/W9OWN57PD0`, retrieved 28 December 2011.

Gwatkin, Davidson R.; Rutstein, Shea; Johnson, Kiersten; Suliman, Eldaw; Wagstaff, Adam; and Agbessi Amouzou. (2007) "Socio-Economic Differences in Health, Nutrition, and Population: Indonesia", World Bank Country Reports on HNP and Poverty, `go.worldbank.org/T6LCN5A340`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____; Rutstein, Shea; Johnson, Kiersten; Pande, Rohini; and Adam Wagstaff. (2000) "Socio-Economic Differences in Health, Nutrition, and Population in Indonesia", `siteresources.worldbank.org/INTINDONESIA/Resources/Human/socio-economic.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Hand, David J. (2006) "Classifier Technology and the Illusion of Progress", *Statistical Science*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 1–15.

Hoadley, Bruce; and Robert M. Oliver. (1998) "Business Measures of Scorecard Benefit", *IMA Journal of Mathematics Applied in Business and Industry*, Vol. 9, pp. 55–64.

IRIS Center. (2011) "Poverty Assessment Tool Accuracy Submission: Addendum for New Poverty Lines, USAID/IRIS Tool for Indonesia", 15 September, `povertytools.org/countries/Indonesia/USAID_PAT_Indonesia_certification_15Sept2011.doc`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2007a) "Manual for the Implementation of USAID Poverty Assessment Tools", `povertytools.org/training_documents/Manuals/USAID_PAT_Manual_Eng.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2007b) "Introduction to Sampling for the Implementation of PATs", `povertytools.org/training_documents/Sampling/Introduction_Sampling.ppt`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2005) "Notes on Assessment and Improvement of Tool Accuracy", `povertytools.org/other_documents/AssessingImproving_Accuracy.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Johnson, Glenn. (2007) "Lesson 3: Two-Way Tables—Dependent Samples", `onlinecourses.science.psu.edu/stat504/node/96`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Kolesar, Peter; and Janet L. Showers. (1985) "A Robust Credit-Screening Model Using Categorical Data", *Management Science*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 124–133.

Lanjouw, Peter; Luoto, Jill; and David McKenzie. (2009) "Using Repeated Cross-Sections to Explore Movements In and Out of Poverty", `papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1750750`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Lindelow, Magnus. (2006) "Sometimes More Equal Than Others: How Health Inequalities Depend on the Choice of Welfare Indicator", *Health Economics*, Vol. 15, pp. 263–279.

Lovie, Alexander D.; and Patricia Lovie. (1986) "The Flat-Maximum Effect and Linear Scoring Models for Prediction", *Journal of Forecasting*, Vol. 5, pp. 159–168.

Martinelli, César; and Susan W. Parker. (2007) "Deception and Misreporting in a Social Program", *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 4, No. 6, pp. 886–908.

Matul, Michal; and Sean Kline. (2003) "Scoring Change: Prizma's Approach to Assessing Poverty", Microfinance Centre for Central and Eastern Europe and the New Independent States Spotlight Note No. 4, `microfinancegateway.org/p/site/m/template.rc/1.9.29798/`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

McNemar, Quinn. (1947) "Note on the Sampling Error of the Difference between Correlated Proportions or Percentages", *Psychometrika*, Vol. 17, pp. 153–157.

Montgomery, Mark; Gragnolati, Michele; Burke, Kathleen A.; and Edmundo Paredes. (2000) "Measuring Living Standards with Proxy Variables", *Demography*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 155–174.

Myers, James H.; and Edward W. Forgy. (1963) "The Development of Numerical Credit-Evaluation Systems", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 58, No. 303, pp. 779–806.

Narayan, Ambar; and Nobuo Yoshida. (2005) "Proxy Means Tests for Targeting Welfare Benefits in Sri Lanka", World Bank Report No. SASPR–7, `documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2005/07/6209268/proxy-means-test-targeting-welfare-benefits-sri-lanka`, retrieved 5 May 2016.

Onwujekwe, Obinna; Hanson, Kara; and Julia Fox-Rushby. (2006) "Some Indicators of Socio-Economic Status May Not Be Reliable and Use of Indices with These Data Could Worsen Equity", *Health Economics*, Vol. 15, pp. 639–644.

Pradhan, Menno; Suryahadi, Asep; Sumarto, Sudarno; and Lant Pritchett. (2001) "Eating Like which 'Joneses'? An Iterative Solution to the Choice of a Poverty Line 'Reference Group'", *Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 47, No. 4, pp. 473–487.

Ravallion, Martin. (1998) "Poverty Lines in Theory and Practice", World Bank LSMS Working Paper No. 133, `go.worldbank.org/8P3IBJPQS1`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Rutstein, Shea Oscar; and Kiersten Johnson. (2004) "The DHS Wealth Index", DHS Comparative Reports No. 6, `measuredhs.com/pubs/pdf/CR6/CR6.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Sahn, David E.; and David C. Stifel. (2003) "Exploring Alternative Measures of Welfare in the Absence of Expenditure Data", *Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 49, No. 4, pp. 463–489.

_____. (2000) "Poverty Comparisons over Time and across Countries in Africa", *World Development*, Vol. 28, No. 12, pp. 2123–2155.

SAS Institute Inc. (2004) "The LOGISTIC Procedure: Rank Correlation of Observed Responses and Predicted Probabilities", in *SAS/STAT User's Guide, Version 9*, `support.sas.com/documentation/cdl/en/statug/63033/HTML/default/statug_logistic_sect035.htm`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Schreiner, Mark. (2012) "An Expert-Based Poverty Scorecard for Rural China".

_____. (2011a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Colombia", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/COL_2009_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2010) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Honduras", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/HND_2007_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2009a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Peru", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2007_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2009b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Philippines", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PHL_2002_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2009c) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Pakistan", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PAK_2005_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2009d) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Bolivia", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/BOL_2007_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2009e) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Mexico", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2008_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2008a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Peru", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2003_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2008b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: India", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/IND_2005_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2008c) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Ecuador", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/ECU_2005_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2006) "Is One Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool Enough for India?", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_India_Segments.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2005a) "Herramienta Índice de Calificación de la Pobreza™: México", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2002_SPA.pdf, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____. (2005b) "IRIS Questions on the Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Response_to_IRIS.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____. (2002) *Scoring: The Next Breakthrough in Microfinance?* CGAP Occasional Paper No. 7, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Breakthrough_CGAP.pdf, retrieved 13 May 2016.

_____; Matul, Michal; Pawlak, Ewa; and Sean Kline. (2004) "Poverty Scoring: Lessons from a Microlender in Bosnia-Herzegovina", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_in_BiH_Short.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

_____; and Michael Sherraden. (2006) *Can the Poor Save? Saving and Asset Accumulation in Individual Development Accounts.*

_____; and Gary Woller. (2010a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Ghana", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/GHA_2005_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 February 2016.

_____; and Gary Woller. (2010b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Guatemala", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/GTM_2006_ENG.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Sherraden, Michael. (1991) *Assets and the Poor: A New American Welfare Policy.*

Sillers, Don. (2006) "National and International Poverty Lines: An Overview", pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadh069.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Stifel, David; and Luc Christiaensen. (2007) "Tracking Poverty over Time in the Absence of Comparable Consumption Data", *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 317–341.

Stillwell, William G.; Barron, F. Hutton; and Ward Edwards. (1983) "Evaluating Credit Applications: A Validation of Multi-Attribute Utility-Weight Elicitation Techniques", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 32, pp. 87–108.

Sumarto, Sudarno; Suryadarama, Daniel; and Asep Suryahadi. (2007) "Predicting Consumption Poverty Using Non-Consumption Indicators: Experiments Using Indonesian Data", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 81, pp. 543–578.

Suryahadi, Asep; Widyanti, Wenefrida; Artha, Rima Prama; Perwira, Daniel; and Sudarno Sumarto. (2005) "Developing a Poverty Map for Indonesia: A Tool for Better Targeting in Poverty Reduction and Social Protection Programs, Book I: Technical Report", `smeru.or.id/report/research/povertymapping1/buku%20satu%20poverty%20mapping.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Tarozzi, Alessandro; and Angus Deaton. (2009) "Using Census and Survey Data to Estimate Poverty and Inequality for Small Areas", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 91, No. 4, pp. 773–792.

Toohig, Jeff. (2008) "PPI Pilot Training Guide", `progressoutofpoverty.org/toolkit`, retrieved 27 December 2011.

United States Congress. (2004) "Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 (HR 3818 RDS)", November 20, `smith4nj.com/laws/108-484.pdf`, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Wagstaff, Adam; and Naoko Watanabe. (2003) "What Difference Does the Choice of SES Make in Health Inequality Measurement?", *Health Economics*, Vol. 12, No. 10, pp. 885–890.

Wainer, Howard. (1976) "Estimating Coefficients in Linear Models: It Don't Make No Nevermind", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 83, pp. 223–227.

World Bank. (2012) *Targeting Poor and Vulnerable Households in Indonesia*, `www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2012/03/01/000386194_20120301004533/Rendered/PDF/672180WP00PUBL0T00English000PUBLIC0.pdf`, retrieved 13 December 2012.

_____. (2011) "Optimal Proxy Means Tests in Indonesia", World Bank Targeting in Indonesia Series No. T3, Jakarta.

_____. (2008) “International Comparison Project: Tables of Results”, siteresources.worldbank.org/ICPINT/Resources/icp-final-tables.pdf, retrieved 10 December 2012.

Zeller, Manfred. (2004) “Review of Poverty Assessment Tools”, pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADH120.pdf, retrieved 13 May 2016.

_____; Sharma, Manohar; Henry, Carla; and Cécile Lapenu. (2006) “An Operational Method for Assessing the Poverty Outreach Performance of Development Policies and Projects: Results of Case Studies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America”, *World Development*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 446–464.

Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators

The following is taken from:

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2010) *Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional (SUSENAS Juli 2010), Buku 3: Pedoman Pencacahan Kor (Untuk Pencacah dan Kortim)*, Jakarta ("2010 Core Enumerator Manual"),

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2007) *Statistik Kesejahteraan Rakyet* Welfare Statistics 2007, Jakarta. ("2007 Welfare Statistics").

and

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2007) *Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional (SUSENAS Juli 2007), Buku 4: Pedoman Modul Perumahan Dan Permukiman*, Jakarta. ("2007 Housing Enumerator Manual").

1. How many household members are there?
    A. Six or more
    B. Five
    C. Four
    D. Three
    E. Two
    F. One

According to pp. 24–25 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, household members are those who have lived and eaten together in the same residence for the past six months. It may include:

- Adults and babies
- Household head
- Wife/husband of the household head
- Children, including step-children or adopted children
- Sons-in-law and daughters-in-law, including in-laws who are married to step-children or adopted children
- Grandchildren, including grandchildren who are the children of step-children or adopted children

- Parents-in-law of the household head or of his/her wife/husband
- Other blood relatives who are family relations of the household head or of his/her wife/husband, such as brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, etc.
- Maids that live in the house and eat there
- Others people who are not blood relatives with family relations to the household head or of his/her wife/husband. Examples include maids, guests, friends, or tenants who are provided with meals and who have lived and eaten with the household for the past six months

According to p. 15 of "2007 Welfare Statistics", *household member* is defined "to include all persons who usually live in a household, regardless of whether they were present or temporarily absent at the time of enumeration. However, a person who was on a journey for six months or longer—or less than six months but with the intention to be away for six months or longer—are not regarded as household members. On the other hand, a person is still considered a household member even if he/she has stayed away for more than six months (or if he/she has stayed for less than six months) as long as he/she intends to return or to continue staying in the household."

To sum up, a *household member* is anyone—regardless of blood relationship and regardless of presence in the residence on the day of the interview—who have lived and eaten together in the same residence for the last six months. This includes adults, children, and infants, and it include live-in servants, guests, visitors, and tenants as long as they live and eat in the household. It also includes all those who intend to continue living in the household, even if they have not been present in all or any of the six previous months.

2. Do all household members ages 6 to 18 go to school?
    A. No members ages 6 to 18
    B. No
    C. Yes

According to pp. 24–25 and p. 53 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, "a person is classified as *going to school* only if he/she is currently enrolled and still actively studying in a formal or non-formal educational level (*Paket* A, B, or C) that is regulated by the Ministry of National Education or other ministries. He/she is classified as an active student who is going to school in *Paket* A, B or C if he/she has attended class in the past one month."

Formal and *non-formal* education is defined as:

- Elementary schools or schools of similar levels, including:
    - — Informal elementary schools (community- or teacher-run schools)
    - — Special elementary schools
    - — Islamic primary schools
- Junior-high schools or schools of similar level, including:
    - — Vocational junior-high schools
    - — Open junior-high schools
    - — Technical junior-high schools
    - — Girl's vocational schools
    - — Islamic junior-higher schools
- Senior-high schools or schools of similar level, including:
    - — Islamic senior-high schools
    - — Vocational senior-high schools
    - — Technical senior-high schools
    - — Tourism vocational schools
    - — Teacher-training schools
    - — Vocational schools run by government ministries other than the Ministry of National Education
- Higher education, including:
    - — Degree programs at the baccalaureate level, including bachelor's degree (S1), master's degree (S2), and doctoral degree (S3)
    - — Non-degree programs including one-year diploma (D1), two-year diploma, three-year diploma (D3), four-year diploma (D4), specialist education 1 (SP1), specialist education 2 (SP2)
- Non-formal education, which includes:
    - — Package A equivalents to elementary school or Islamic primary school
    - — Package B equivalents to junior-high school or Islamic junior-high school
    - — Package C equivalents to senior-high school or Islamic senior-high school

According to pp. 24–25 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, household members are those who have lived and eaten together in the same residence for the past six months. It may include:

- Adults and babies
- Household head
- Wife/husband of the household head
- Children, including step-children or adopted children
- Sons-in-law and daughters-in-law, including in-laws who are married to step-children or adopted children
- Grandchildren, including grandchildren who are the children of step-children or adopted children
- Parents-in-law of the household head or of his/her wife/husband
- Other blood relatives who are family relations of the household head or of his/her wife/husband, such as brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, etc.
- Maids that live in the house and eat there
- Others people who are not blood relatives with family relations to the household head or of his/her wife/husband. Examples include maids, guests, friends, or tenants who are provided with meals and who have lived and eaten with the household for the past six months

According to p. 15 of "2007 Welfare Statistics", *household member* is defined "to include all persons who usually live in a household, regardless of whether they were present or temporarily absent at the time of enumeration. However, a person who was on a journey for six months or longer—or less than six months but with the intention to be away for six months or longer—are not regarded as household members. On the other hand, a person is still considered a household member even if he/she has stayed away for more than six months (or if he/she has stayed for less than six months) as long as he/she intends to return or to continue staying in the household."

To sum up, a *household member* is anyone—regardless of blood relationship and regardless of presence in the residence on the day of the interview—who have lived and eaten together in the same residence for the last six months. This includes adults, children, and infants, and it include live-in servants, guests, visitors, and tenants as long as they live and eat in the household. It also includes all those who intend to continue living in the household, even if they have not been present in all or any of the six previous months.

3. What is the highest level of education that the female head/spouse has completed?
    A. None
    B. Grade school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal)
    C. Junior-high school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal)
    D. No female head/spouse
    E. Vocational school (high-school level)
    F. High school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal)
    G. Diploma (one-year or higher), or higher

According to p. 15 of "2007 Welfare Statistics", the *household head* "is defined as one of the household members who is responsible for fulfilling everyday needs for the household or the one who is regarded or appointed as the head"

For the purposes of the scorecard, the *female head/spouse* is defined as:

- The household head, if the head is a woman
- The spouse/partner/companion of the household head, if the head is a man
- Non existent, if neither of the previous two criteria are met

4. What was the employment status of the male head/spouse in the past week in his main job?
   A. No male head/spouse
   B. Not working, or unpaid worker
   C. Self-employed
   D. Business owner with only temporary or unpaid workers
   E. Wage or salary employee
   F. Business owner with some permanent or paid workers

According to p. 15 of "2007 Welfare Statistics", the *household head* "is defined as one of the household members who is responsible for fulfilling everyday needs for the household or the one who is regarded or appointed as the head"

For the purposes of the scorecard, the *male head/spouse* is defined as:

- The household head, if the head is a man
- The spouse/partner/companion of the household head, if the head is a woman
- Non existent, if neither of the previous two criteria are met

According to pp. 75–78 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, the following definitions are to be used:

"A person is *self-employed* if he/she works and is economically responsible for risks (such as the inability to recover the production costs) and does not use paid workers and unpaid workers. A person may be self-employed even if the task performed requires technology or special expertise. Examples of professions that are often filled by self-employed people include: Occasional/freelance drivers (non-regular salary) paid in proportion to the fares received each day, trishaw/pedicab drivers, carpenters, masons/bricklayers, electricians, masseurs, well-diggers, newspaper agents, motorcycle-taxi drivers, petty traders, doctors/midwives/healers who operate from their own clinics, ticket touts, real estate agents etc.

"A person is a *wage/salary worker*, regardless of the type of work performed and whether the position is permanent or temporary, if remuneration (salary or wages) is provided by an employer in the form of money or goods.

A person is a *business owner with only temporary or unpaid workers* if he/she provides employment to another person but they are both non-permanent and unpaid.

A person is a *business owner with some permanent or paid workers* if he/she provides employment to another one other permanent or paid employee.

5. What is the main material of the floor?
    A. Earth or bamboo
    B. Others

According to p. 87 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, "If the dwelling has more than one type of flooring, each of which covers the same total area, then the type of flooring that has the highest value is to be recorded."

6. What type of toilet arrangement does the household have?
    A. None, or latrine
    B. Non-flush to a septic tank
    C. Flush

According to p. 93 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, the following definitions are to be used:

"A toilet bowl (*kloset*) may be of the squat or seated type." The response options are:

- *Flush* (*leher angsa*, swan neck): Toilet with a U-shaped drainage pipe to trap water and to keep odors out of the air. Flush and squat are included in here.
- *Non-flush to a septic tank* (*plengsengan*): a traditional toilet with a septic tank but no water system to wash waste away
- *Latrine-over-water* (*cemplung/cubluk*): A traditional toilet without a water system to wash waste away and in which the waste goes directly to a pond
- *None*: Household members do not use any type of toilet but rather urinate and defecate at the side of a river or in open fields or forest.

7. What is the main cooking fuel?

A. Firewood, charcoal, or coal

B. Gas/LPG, kerosene, electricity, others, or does not cook

According to pp. 95–96 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, "compressed sawdust that is used as a fuel/energy source for household cooking and lighting is not to be categorized as firewood."

8. Does the household have a gas cylinder of 12kg or more?

A. No

B. Yes

According to p. 30 of the *2007 Housing Enumerator Manual* and pp. 103 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, the indicator asks about the ownership of a working gas cylinders of 12kg or more.

If the gas cylinder of 12kg or more is currently broken but could be repaired, then it is to be counted as *working*. It is counted as not working only if it is permanently broken.

If the household is currently making payments on a loan used to purchase a gas cylinder of 12kg or more, or if the household is currently making rent-to-own payments on it, then it is still counted as owned. In general, if a gas cylinder of 12kg or more is possessed by the household (that is, it physically at the homestead and is being used by the household), then it is to be counted, regardless of how it was acquired (owned, rented, pawned-in. received as a gift, held as a loan, etc.). A gas cylinder of 12kg is also to be counted even it is no longer being used for its intended purpose (for example if it is used to prop up a table with a broken leg, rather than storing gas). It is not to be counted if it is not physically at the homestead or if the household is not using it (for example, if it is loaned out, rented out, pawned out, given away, etc.).

9. Does the household have a refrigerator or freezer?

A. No

B. Yes

According to p. 30 of the *2007 Housing Enumerator Manual* and pp. 103 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, the indicator asks about the ownership of a working refrigerator or freezer.

If the refrigerator or freezer is currently broken but could be repaired, then it is to be counted as *working*. It is counted as not working only if it is permanently broken.

If the household is currently making payments on a loan used to purchase a refrigerator or freezer, or if the household is currently making rent-to-own payments on it, then it is still counted as owned. In general, if a refrigerator or freezer is possessed by the household (that is, it physically at the homestead and is being used by the household), then it is to be counted, regardless of how it was acquired (owned, rented, pawned-in. received as a gift, held as a loan, etc.). A refrigerator or freezer is also to be counted even it is no longer being used for its intended purpose (for example if it is used as a closet to store clothes, rather than chilling food). It is not to be counted if it is not physically at the homestead or if the household is not using it (for example, if it is loaned out, rented out, pawned out, given away, etc.).

10. Does the household have a motorcycle, scooter, or motorized boat?

A. No

B. Yes

According to p. 30 of the *2007 Housing Enumerator Manual* and pp. 103 of the *2010 Core Enumerator Manual*, the indicator asks about the ownership of a working motorcycle, scooter, or motorized boat.

If the motorcycle, scooter, or motorized boat is currently broken but could be repaired, then it is to be counted as *working*. It is counted as not working only if it is permanently broken.

If the household is currently making payments on a loan used to purchase a motorcycle, scooter, or motorized boat, or if the household is currently making rent-to-own payments on it, then it is still counted as owned. In general, if a motorcycle, scooter, or motorized boat is possessed by the household (that is, it physically at the homestead and is being used by the household), then it is to be counted, regardless of how it was acquired (owned, rented, pawned-in. received as a gift, held as a loan, etc.). A motorcycle, scooter, or motorized boat is also to be counted even it is no longer being used for its intended purpose (for example if it is used as a television stand rather than for transport). It is not to be counted if it is not physically at the homestead or if the household is not using it (for example, if it is loaned out, rented out, pawned out, given away, etc.).

Figure 1: Sample sizes, poverty lines, and poverty rates for all of Indonesia by sub-sample, poverty line, and household-level/person-level

			Poverty rates (% with expenditure below a poverty line) and poverty lines (IDR/person/day)										
			New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
			National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
	Level	Sample size	100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Poverty lines:													
All Indonesia		293,715	7,983	11,974	15,966	6,895	8,629	17,257	7,043	11,491	6,997	8,827	17,653
Poverty Rates:													
All Indonesia	HHS	293,715	10.1	38.6	61.8	4.8	14.1	67.1	5.4	35.1	6.1	16.4	68.2
	People		13.0	44.5	67.2	6.4	17.9	72.2	7.3	40.9	8.0	20.4	73.2
Construction and calibration: (Selecting indicators and points, and associating scores with likelihoods)													
	HHS	147,067	9.9	38.5	61.6	4.7	14.0	67.0	5.4	35.0	5.9	16.3	68.0
Validation: (Measuring accuracy)													
	HHS	146,648	10.2	38.8	61.9	4.8	14.3	67.2	5.5	35.3	6.2	16.5	68.3

Source: July (non-panel/core) 2010 SUSENAS and *Badan Pusat Statistik* (2011), pp. 7-24. For the legacy lines, see scorecard documentation.

Figure 2 (Indonesia): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
All Kota		Line	62,138	9,903	14,855	19,806	8,516	10,704	21,408	8,737	14,256	9,903	10,704	21,408
		Rate (HH)		5.1	22.3	42.7	2.4	7.3	48.3	2.8	19.9	2.2	6.4	45.2
		Rate (people)		7.3	28.1	50.2	3.5	10.1	55.9	4.1	25.3	3.3	9.0	52.6
All Kabupaten		Line	231,577	7,440	11,160	14,879	6,437	8,041	16,083	6,564	10,709	7,440	8,041	16,083
		Rate (HH)		11.4	43.1	67.0	5.4	16.0	72.2	6.2	39.4	7.1	19.1	74.5
		Rate (people)		14.7	49.1	72.0	7.2	20.1	76.8	8.2	45.2	9.4	23.6	79.0
All Indonesia		Line	293,715	7,983	11,974	15,966	6,895	8,628	17,257	7,043	11,491	6,997	8,827	17,653
		Rate (HH)		10.1	38.6	61.8	4.8	14.1	67.1	5.4	35.1	6.1	16.4	68.2
		Rate (people)		13.0	44.5	67.2	6.4	17.9	72.2	7.3	40.9	8.0	20.4	73.2

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Nangroe Aceh Darussalam): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Banda Aceh	Line	441	14,308	21,462	28,616	12,067	15,465	30,930	12,623	20,596	10,136	12,786	25,571
		Rate (HH)		6.1	24.5	47.6	2.7	8.2	54.6	3.4	22.4	1.1	3.9	37.0
		Rate (people)		9.2	30.3	55.1	4.2	11.8	62.7	5.2	28.0	1.9	5.8	44.5
Kota	Sabang	Line	371	13,189	19,784	26,379	11,026	14,256	28,512	11,637	18,986	9,611	12,123	24,246
		Rate (HH)		17.6	54.0	76.2	8.1	22.4	80.9	10.7	50.4	5.1	11.1	71.7
		Rate (people)		21.7	63.9	83.9	10.7	28.2	87.5	13.2	60.0	7.2	14.7	79.7
Kota	Langsa	Line	581	8,883	13,325	17,767	7,626	9,602	19,203	7,838	12,788	9,917	12,509	25,018
		Rate (HH)		12.1	36.8	58.0	5.8	16.6	63.6	7.1	33.0	16.7	31.0	81.7
		Rate (people)		15.0	42.3	62.3	7.4	20.0	67.5	8.9	38.5	19.8	36.5	86.2
Kota	Lhokseumawe	Line	580	8,821	13,231	17,642	7,429	9,534	19,069	7,782	12,698	9,799	12,361	24,722
		Rate (HH)		10.6	32.6	54.4	5.5	12.8	60.2	6.8	29.0	12.9	27.5	78.7
		Rate (people)		14.1	39.0	60.9	6.8	16.7	66.5	8.8	35.0	17.4	33.0	82.9
Kota	Subulussalam	Line	396	7,197	10,795	14,394	5,795	7,779	15,558	6,350	10,360	9,015	11,371	22,742
		Rate (HH)		18.3	49.3	66.8	8.1	22.1	72.8	10.7	45.0	31.9	51.0	88.1
		Rate (people)		24.3	57.4	73.6	11.9	29.2	78.5	15.1	53.5	39.4	59.3	91.3
All Kota		Line	2,369	10,797	16,195	21,594	9,101	11,670	23,340	9,526	15,542	10,797	11,670	23,340
		Rate (HH)		10.4	33.2	55.0	4.9	13.3	61.2	6.2	30.1	10.8	20.9	64.5
		Rate (people)		14.0	39.8	61.6	6.8	17.6	67.7	8.4	36.5	14.4	26.1	70.9
Kabupaten	Simeulue	Line	367	9,140	13,711	18,281	7,455	9,880	19,759	8,064	13,158	9,010	11,365	22,731
		Rate (HH)		19.0	52.2	70.0	9.1	22.2	74.6	11.7	49.0	15.4	33.4	81.0
		Rate (people)		23.6	58.8	75.2	11.7	27.5	78.7	15.0	55.7	20.0	39.2	84.3
Kabupaten	Aceh Singkil	Line	394	9,223	13,835	18,446	8,011	9,969	19,938	8,137	13,277	9,076	11,449	22,897
		Rate (HH)		13.0	48.0	70.6	6.3	17.5	75.9	6.8	43.0	11.4	28.0	82.5
		Rate (people)		19.4	55.8	75.7	9.5	24.2	80.3	10.2	51.4	17.1	36.8	86.8
Kabupaten	Aceh Selatan	Line	493	8,470	12,706	16,941	7,084	9,155	18,311	7,473	12,193	8,959	11,301	22,602
		Rate (HH)		13.2	39.3	63.3	6.7	19.0	67.4	9.0	37.5	15.0	33.3	81.6
		Rate (people)		15.9	45.1	69.0	7.8	22.5	73.0	10.8	43.4	17.6	39.3	85.0
Kabupaten	Aceh Tenggara	Line	467	6,103	9,154	12,206	5,479	6,596	13,193	5,384	8,785	8,981	11,328	22,656
		Rate (HH)		13.7	43.6	67.1	6.9	17.0	70.8	6.4	40.5	41.3	61.7	92.4
		Rate (people)		16.8	51.4	73.4	8.4	21.7	77.2	7.6	48.2	49.1	68.7	94.3
Kabupaten	Aceh Timur	Line	599	9,470	14,205	18,939	8,200	10,236	20,471	8,355	13,632	8,920	11,252	22,504
		Rate (HH)		14.3	45.5	70.0	6.7	19.6	74.2	7.5	42.6	11.3	26.4	80.5
		Rate (people)		18.4	55.3	78.6	9.0	24.8	82.2	10.0	51.5	14.9	33.7	87.4
Kabupaten	Aceh Tengah	Line	454	10,935	16,402	21,869	9,590	11,819	23,638	9,647	15,741	9,118	11,502	23,003
		Rate (HH)		17.5	50.3	68.7	9.0	22.3	74.5	9.7	47.0	5.3	19.0	74.1
		Rate (people)		20.1	54.0	71.8	10.0	25.5	77.0	10.8	50.6	6.0	22.2	77.2
Kabupaten	Aceh Barat	Line	544	12,222	18,333	24,445	10,190	13,211	26,422	10,783	17,594	9,158	11,552	23,103
		Rate (HH)		21.3	56.8	76.3	9.9	28.6	80.8	12.6	53.3	4.4	14.9	75.1
		Rate (people)		24.4	60.0	78.4	12.2	31.9	82.3	15.1	56.6	6.1	18.2	77.5
Kabupaten	Aceh Besar	Line	465	10,655	15,983	21,310	8,846	11,517	23,034	9,401	15,338	9,142	11,532	23,064
		Rate (HH)		16.3	44.9	67.9	7.4	22.3	73.0	10.8	42.1	7.7	22.5	73.4
		Rate (people)		18.8	50.2	73.1	9.1	26.0	77.3	13.1	47.4	9.5	26.4	78.3
Kabupaten	Pidie	Line	531	10,795	16,192	21,589	9,317	11,668	23,335	9,524	15,539	8,963	11,306	22,612
		Rate (HH)		17.4	63.4	86.3	8.1	23.9	90.1	10.1	58.5	5.5	22.6	88.8
		Rate (people)		23.8	74.3	92.7	11.6	33.3	95.1	14.2	70.4	8.0	31.5	94.4
Kabupaten	Bireuen	Line	472	8,679	13,019	17,358	6,952	9,381	18,762	7,657	12,494	9,078	11,451	22,901
		Rate (HH)		16.5	55.9	81.0	8.0	23.3	85.3	10.9	53.2	18.2	41.6	91.2
		Rate (people)		19.5	62.9	85.5	9.7	27.1	88.8	13.0	60.2	21.8	49.0	94.1
Kabupaten	Aceh Utara	Line	589	8,213	12,320	16,427	6,931	8,878	17,755	7,246	11,823	8,997	11,349	22,698
		Rate (HH)		19.4	60.4	81.7	9.9	24.5	85.5	12.0	57.0	24.9	51.1	94.4
		Rate (people)		23.4	68.7	86.3	11.7	30.4	88.5	14.3	65.4	30.7	60.7	96.2
Kabupaten	Aceh Barat Daya	Line	495	8,292	12,438	16,584	7,095	8,963	17,925	7,316	11,936	9,020	11,378	22,756
		Rate (HH)		16.2	64.4	85.8	8.2	26.1	89.4	9.6	61.5	24.5	53.9	95.9
		Rate (people)		19.9	71.2	88.5	10.0	31.7	91.9	11.7	68.6	30.2	61.2	97.0
Kabupaten	Gayo Lues	Line	472	8,318	12,477	16,636	7,289	8,991	17,981	7,339	11,974	8,991	11,342	22,683
		Rate (HH)		18.8	56.6	78.7	9.5	24.1	83.4	9.7	51.8	24.4	47.0	91.7
		Rate (people)		23.9	63.5	84.1	11.9	30.4	88.0	12.0	58.9	30.6	54.4	94.9
Kabupaten	Aceh Tamiang	Line	589	9,814	14,721	19,628	8,677	10,608	21,215	8,659	14,127	9,204	11,609	23,219
		Rate (HH)		13.8	51.5	76.3	6.5	19.1	81.8	6.4	46.9	9.6	25.0	87.4
		Rate (people)		18.0	59.6	81.9	8.8	23.8	86.3	8.6	55.0	13.3	30.8	90.6
Kabupaten	Nagan Raya	Line	554	10,537	15,805	21,073	8,773	11,389	22,778	9,296	15,167	8,889	11,212	22,424
		Rate (HH)		21.0	58.5	79.7	9.9	27.8	84.3	13.2	53.8	10.0	25.9	84.0
		Rate (people)		24.1	64.7	84.5	11.9	32.1	88.6	15.9	60.0	12.3	29.8	88.3
Kabupaten	Aceh Jaya	Line	539	8,780	13,170	17,560	7,532	9,490	18,980	7,746	12,639	8,852	11,166	22,333
		Rate (HH)		14.6	41.6	64.2	6.6	18.1	68.7	8.4	38.7	14.6	27.6	77.6
		Rate (people)		20.2	49.6	71.9	10.0	24.2	76.1	12.3	46.7	20.1	34.8	84.3
Kabupaten	Bener Meriah	Line	590	9,823	14,735	19,647	8,718	10,618	21,236	8,667	14,141	9,032	11,393	22,786
		Rate (HH)		21.7	67.2	86.4	10.0	30.1	89.8	9.6	63.3	12.4	38.1	91.8
		Rate (people)		26.2	73.9	90.3	13.0	36.1	92.9	12.5	69.8	16.1	44.7	94.3
Kabupaten	Pidie Jaya	Line	411	11,086	16,630	22,173	9,633	11,983	23,966	9,781	15,959	8,859	11,175	22,350
		Rate (HH)		18.5	56.2	81.6	8.6	24.0	86.4	9.9	50.3	4.0	18.7	81.4
		Rate (people)		26.1	65.7	86.2	12.9	32.4	90.0	14.6	59.0	6.1	26.0	86.2
All Kabupaten		Line	9,025	9,476	14,213	18,951	8,064	10,242	20,484	8,360	13,640	9,476	10,242	20,484
		Rate (HH)		17.0	53.7	76.3	8.2	22.8	80.7	9.9	50.2	14.3	33.1	85.4
		Rate (people)		20.9	61.0	81.4	10.3	28.0	84.9	12.4	57.5	18.2	40.1	89.2
All Aceh		Line	11,394	9,665	14,497	19,329	8,213	10,446	20,893	8,527	13,912	9,143	11,533	23,065
		Rate (HH)		16.1	50.9	73.4	7.7	21.5	78.0	9.4	47.4	13.8	31.4	82.5
		Rate (people)		19.9	58.0	78.6	9.8	26.5	82.4	11.8	54.5	17.6	38.1	86.6

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Bali): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Denpasar	Line	651	10,181	15,271	20,362	9,610	11,004	22,009	8,982	14,656	7,327	9,242	18,485
		Rate (HH)		1.7	11.8	30.1	0.8	2.9	36.1	0.6	10.4	0.0	0.6	25.2
		Rate (people)		2.2	14.4	34.7	0.9	3.8	41.2	0.8	12.7	0.0	0.8	29.3
All Kota		Line	651	10,181	15,271	20,362	9,610	11,004	22,009	8,982	14,656	10,181	11,004	22,009
		Rate (HH)		1.7	11.8	30.1	0.8	2.9	36.1	0.6	10.4	0.0	0.6	25.2
		Rate (people)		2.2	14.4	34.7	0.9	3.8	41.2	0.8	12.7	0.0	0.8	29.3
Kabupaten	Jembrana	Line	602	8,019	12,028	16,037	7,155	8,667	17,334	7,075	11,543	6,725	8,482	16,965
		Rate (HH)		6.3	31.4	57.4	3.3	8.6	63.8	3.2	27.3	1.8	8.3	62.0
		Rate (people)		8.1	36.5	63.3	4.1	10.6	69.7	3.8	32.2	2.2	10.5	67.5
Kabupaten	Tabanan	Line	637	8,873	13,310	17,746	7,646	9,591	19,181	7,828	12,773	6,621	8,352	16,703
		Rate (HH)		5.5	33.6	62.0	2.7	9.9	69.1	3.2	29.3	1.4	4.6	57.7
		Rate (people)		7.0	37.3	66.7	3.3	12.5	73.6	4.2	32.3	1.6	6.2	62.8
Kabupaten	Badung	Line	638	10,277	15,416	20,555	8,986	11,108	22,217	9,067	14,794	7,117	8,978	17,955
		Rate (HH)		2.3	18.0	37.8	1.1	4.0	43.5	1.2	15.7	0.0	0.7	28.3
		Rate (people)		3.2	22.0	43.5	1.6	5.4	49.5	1.7	19.4	0.0	0.8	33.5
Kabupaten	Gianyar	Line	634	7,822	11,732	15,643	6,834	8,454	16,908	6,901	11,259	6,967	8,789	17,577
		Rate (HH)		5.5	30.7	58.3	2.7	7.9	63.1	3.1	27.7	3.2	10.1	65.3
		Rate (people)		6.7	36.7	65.8	3.2	9.8	70.3	3.7	33.7	3.6	12.6	72.3
Kabupaten	Klungkung	Line	605	6,795	10,193	13,591	5,912	7,345	14,690	5,995	9,782	6,770	8,540	17,079
		Rate (HH)		6.5	30.3	55.3	2.7	9.3	62.3	3.0	27.5	4.8	15.7	74.1
		Rate (people)		7.6	35.1	61.8	3.7	10.9	68.7	4.0	32.3	6.1	17.9	80.4
Kabupaten	Bangli	Line	602	7,088	10,633	14,177	6,285	7,662	15,323	6,254	10,204	6,428	8,109	16,218
		Rate (HH)		4.6	27.7	54.7	1.9	7.0	63.3	1.9	24.6	2.3	9.4	68.4
		Rate (people)		6.4	35.9	64.3	2.9	9.7	72.0	2.9	31.7	3.5	13.0	77.0
Kabupaten	Karang Asem	Line	635	6,768	10,152	13,536	5,957	7,315	14,631	5,971	9,743	6,441	8,124	16,248
		Rate (HH)		5.8	34.8	59.3	2.5	8.6	65.4	2.7	31.1	4.3	13.6	73.9
		Rate (people)		8.0	43.8	67.2	3.8	12.2	72.6	4.1	39.4	6.2	18.9	80.3
Kabupaten	Buleleng	Line	659	7,826	11,739	15,652	6,843	8,459	16,917	6,904	11,265	6,694	8,444	16,887
		Rate (HH)		5.2	31.7	58.8	2.2	8.8	64.7	2.7	28.5	1.7	7.9	62.8
		Rate (people)		7.3	39.0	66.4	3.5	11.7	71.6	4.1	35.5	2.4	10.9	70.2
All Kabupaten		Line	5,012	8,172	12,258	16,344	7,151	8,833	17,665	7,210	11,763	8,172	8,833	17,665
		Rate (HH)		5.0	29.4	55.0	2.3	7.9	61.2	2.5	26.2	2.1	7.8	58.8
		Rate (people)		6.6	35.4	61.8	3.1	10.2	67.6	3.5	31.7	2.8	10.3	65.1
All Bali		Line	5,663	8,580	12,870	17,160	7,651	9,274	18,548	7,570	12,351	6,872	8,668	17,337
		Rate (HH)		4.3	25.6	49.5	2.0	6.8	55.7	2.1	22.7	1.7	6.2	51.5
		Rate (people)		5.7	31.1	56.3	2.7	8.9	62.3	3.0	27.9	2.2	8.3	57.9

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Bangka Belitung): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Pangkal Pinang	Line	577	10,992	16,488	21,984	9,458	11,881	23,762	9,698	15,823	9,509	11,994	23,989
		Rate (HH)		4.4	24.0	48.3	2.2	5.9	53.7	2.4	20.8	2.4	6.3	54.5
		Rate (people)		6.0	29.1	55.7	2.7	7.7	61.5	3.1	25.7	3.1	8.2	62.2
All Kota		Line	577	10,992	16,488	21,984	9,458	11,881	23,762	9,698	15,823	10,992	11,881	23,762
		Rate (HH)		4.4	24.0	48.3	2.2	5.9	53.7	2.4	20.8	2.4	6.3	54.5
		Rate (people)		6.0	29.1	55.7	2.7	7.7	61.5	3.1	25.7	3.1	8.2	62.2
Kabupaten	Bangka	Line	464	9,208	13,812	18,415	8,327	9,952	19,905	8,124	13,255	9,416	11,877	23,753
		Rate (HH)		5.3	28.6	52.9	2.5	7.1	59.1	2.3	25.9	5.5	15.6	70.6
		Rate (people)		7.8	36.1	62.0	3.7	10.0	68.4	3.4	32.8	8.0	20.4	77.5
Kabupaten	Belitung	Line	566	12,095	18,142	24,190	10,885	13,073	26,146	10,671	17,410	9,435	11,901	23,803
		Rate (HH)		7.3	38.2	66.9	3.4	9.7	72.4	2.9	33.3	1.0	6.3	64.5
		Rate (people)		10.1	43.3	72.2	4.9	13.3	78.2	4.2	38.8	1.2	8.9	70.0
Kabupaten	Bangka Barat	Line	472	8,935	13,402	17,869	6,992	9,657	19,314	7,883	12,861	9,402	11,860	23,720
		Rate (HH)		4.1	22.9	50.8	1.8	4.9	60.4	2.6	18.1	4.7	12.5	77.6
		Rate (people)		5.2	26.9	57.8	2.4	6.1	66.8	3.3	21.7	5.9	15.9	83.5
Kabupaten	Bangka Tengah	Line	474	11,271	16,907	22,543	10,097	12,183	24,366	9,945	16,225	9,365	11,813	23,626
		Rate (HH)		6.2	36.4	61.2	2.7	11.0	66.2	1.5	32.8	1.4	9.3	64.3
		Rate (people)		8.1	42.0	65.7	3.8	12.9	71.1	2.1	38.2	1.9	11.2	68.8
Kabupaten	Bangka Selatan	Line	459	9,012	13,518	18,025	7,764	9,741	19,482	7,951	12,973	9,361	11,808	23,615
		Rate (HH)		3.7	26.4	60.1	1.5	6.4	68.3	2.0	22.4	5.1	15.3	82.2
		Rate (people)		6.2	33.5	67.7	2.7	10.3	75.4	3.8	28.9	8.2	21.1	88.1
Kabupaten	Belitung Timur	Line	562	11,074	16,612	22,149	9,883	11,970	23,940	9,771	15,942	9,436	11,903	23,806
		Rate (HH)		7.9	33.3	57.8	4.1	10.1	64.0	4.1	30.1	3.2	10.1	63.8
		Rate (people)		10.4	41.4	65.9	5.2	12.9	71.7	5.2	37.7	4.0	12.9	71.6
All Kabupaten		Line	2,997	10,066	15,099	20,132	8,822	10,880	21,760	8,881	14,490	10,066	10,880	21,760
		Rate (HH)		5.6	30.4	57.6	2.5	7.9	64.4	2.5	26.6	3.8	12.1	71.1
		Rate (people)		7.8	36.7	64.7	3.7	10.6	71.5	3.6	32.5	5.3	15.9	77.2
All Bangka Belitung		Line	3,574	10,198	15,297	20,397	8,913	11,023	22,046	8,998	14,680	9,417	11,878	23,757
		Rate (HH)		5.4	29.5	56.2	2.5	7.6	62.8	2.5	25.8	3.6	11.3	68.6
		Rate (people)		7.5	35.6	63.5	3.5	10.2	70.1	3.5	31.5	5.0	14.8	75.1

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Banten): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Tangerang	Line	767	9,980	14,970	19,960	9,089	10,787	21,574	8,805	14,366	7,258	9,156	18,311
		Rate (HH)		4.4	25.9	49.9	2.0	6.5	56.3	1.3	21.8	0.5	2.2	41.3
		Rate (people)		6.9	32.8	57.7	3.1	10.2	63.9	2.3	28.4	1.1	3.6	49.6
Kota	Cilegon	Line	631	8,109	12,164	16,219	6,552	8,765	17,531	7,155	11,674	7,218	9,105	18,209
		Rate (HH)		2.7	14.8	37.2	1.2	4.3	43.1	1.7	13.6	1.6	4.9	45.9
		Rate (people)		4.5	19.6	45.0	2.2	6.8	51.2	2.8	18.6	2.7	7.6	53.5
Kota	Serang	Line	814	6,494	9,741	12,988	5,476	7,019	14,038	5,729	9,348	6,985	8,811	17,622
		Rate (HH)		4.1	16.4	30.2	1.9	5.8	35.5	2.3	14.9	4.9	10.7	48.4
		Rate (people)		7.0	22.9	38.2	3.4	9.6	44.4	4.1	21.3	8.3	16.0	57.4
Kota	Tangerang Selatan	Line	889	9,062	13,593	18,124	7,618	9,795	19,590	7,995	13,045	7,258	9,156	18,311
		Rate (HH)		1.1	9.0	24.2	0.4	1.9	30.5	0.8	7.4	0.4	1.3	25.1
		Rate (people)		1.7	11.6	29.0	0.7	2.8	35.9	1.2	9.7	0.7	2.1	30.1
All Kota		Line	3,101	9,016	13,524	18,032	7,867	9,745	19,490	7,955	12,978	9,016	9,745	19,490
		Rate (HH)		3.2	18.3	38.0	1.4	4.7	44.2	1.3	15.5	1.1	3.2	37.3
		Rate (people)		5.0	23.3	44.5	2.3	7.4	50.9	2.2	20.5	2.1	5.2	44.8
Kabupaten	Pandeglang	Line	752	6,657	9,985	13,314	6,132	7,195	14,391	5,873	9,583	6,497	8,195	16,390
		Rate (HH)		8.1	47.7	75.1	4.1	14.0	80.5	2.5	44.2	6.5	25.3	87.7
		Rate (people)		11.1	54.3	79.8	5.5	18.6	84.3	3.6	51.0	9.1	31.4	90.5
Kabupaten	Lebak	Line	764	6,101	9,152	12,202	5,377	6,594	13,189	5,383	8,782	6,351	8,011	16,023
		Rate (HH)		7.4	45.6	73.1	3.0	12.7	78.6	3.2	40.7	8.5	31.0	87.6
		Rate (people)		10.4	51.2	78.5	4.8	16.1	83.1	5.3	46.2	11.9	36.6	90.8
Kabupaten	Tangerang	Line	947	8,487	12,731	16,975	7,267	9,174	18,347	7,488	12,217	7,069	8,917	17,835
		Rate (HH)		4.4	24.6	47.2	1.9	6.6	53.3	2.8	21.6	1.6	5.8	50.9
		Rate (people)		7.2	31.6	55.9	3.5	10.7	62.4	4.7	28.4	3.1	9.7	60.0
Kabupaten	Serang	Line	802	6,317	9,475	12,633	5,722	6,827	13,655	5,573	9,093	6,528	8,234	16,469
		Rate (HH)		3.4	21.8	44.1	1.7	5.4	50.7	1.5	19.5	4.0	11.3	64.9
		Rate (people)		6.3	29.5	53.3	3.0	8.9	60.2	2.7	27.0	7.1	17.0	73.8
All Kabupaten		Line	3,265	7,273	10,910	14,547	6,397	7,862	15,723	6,417	10,470	7,273	7,862	15,723
		Rate (HH)		5.4	32.1	56.4	2.5	8.8	62.4	2.6	28.8	4.3	15.2	67.3
		Rate (people)		8.3	38.7	63.6	4.0	12.7	69.5	4.2	35.2	6.6	19.9	73.8
All Banten		Line	6,366	7,937	11,906	15,875	6,957	8,579	17,159	7,003	11,426	6,911	8,718	17,436
		Rate (HH)		4.5	26.7	49.3	2.0	7.2	55.3	2.1	23.6	3.1	10.5	55.6
		Rate (people)		7.0	32.8	56.4	3.3	10.7	62.4	3.4	29.6	4.9	14.3	62.7

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Bengkulu): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Bengkulu Tengah	Line	603	8,113	12,170	16,226	7,425	8,769	17,538	7,158	11,679	6,994	8,822	17,645
		Rate (HH)		5.2	33.4	62.5	2.4	8.9	70.2	1.5	30.0	1.3	9.0	70.6
		Rate (people)		6.4	37.7	67.3	3.1	10.5	74.2	1.9	34.2	1.5	10.7	74.6
Kota	Bengkulu	Line	546	12,120	18,179	24,239	9,987	13,100	26,199	10,693	17,446	8,349	10,531	21,063
		Rate (HH)		13.1	33.7	56.5	6.5	16.0	62.0	8.5	31.1	2.6	7.5	46.0
		Rate (people)		17.7	39.3	64.2	8.6	20.7	70.0	11.3	36.8	3.1	10.1	53.0
All Kota		Line	1,149	11,153	16,729	22,305	9,369	12,055	24,109	9,840	16,054	11,153	12,055	24,109
		Rate (HH)		11.3	33.6	57.9	5.6	14.3	64.0	6.9	30.8	2.3	7.9	51.8
		Rate (people)		15.0	38.9	65.0	7.3	18.2	71.0	9.0	36.2	2.7	10.2	58.2
Kabupaten	Bengkulu Selatan	Line	585	7,846	11,769	15,692	6,760	8,480	16,961	6,922	11,294	7,353	9,274	18,549
		Rate (HH)		17.6	52.2	73.1	8.4	23.7	77.5	9.7	48.5	10.8	28.6	83.0
		Rate (people)		22.6	58.4	77.9	11.1	29.3	81.8	12.6	55.2	13.9	34.8	87.1
Kabupaten	Rejang Lebong	Line	592	8,911	13,367	17,823	7,492	9,632	19,264	7,862	12,828	7,478	9,432	18,864
		Rate (HH)		11.3	46.6	69.2	5.4	17.3	74.5	6.9	42.5	4.0	11.9	74.5
		Rate (people)		15.1	52.0	73.2	7.5	21.6	78.5	10.0	48.0	5.9	16.0	79.1
Kabupaten	Bengkulu Utara	Line	586	7,740	11,611	15,481	6,620	8,366	16,733	6,829	11,142	7,048	8,890	17,780
		Rate (HH)		11.7	50.5	76.8	5.4	17.8	82.6	6.2	46.2	7.2	22.2	85.8
		Rate (people)		14.8	56.2	80.9	7.4	21.2	86.2	8.2	52.0	9.6	25.9	89.1
Kabupaten	Kaur	Line	592	7,063	10,594	14,126	5,912	7,634	15,268	6,231	10,167	6,943	8,758	17,517
		Rate (HH)		15.9	49.0	69.9	6.8	21.4	73.9	8.9	46.0	14.2	32.2	80.8
		Rate (people)		21.2	57.0	77.2	10.5	28.3	80.8	12.7	54.1	19.4	40.0	86.2
Kabupaten	Seluma	Line	586	8,049	12,074	16,099	6,797	8,700	17,401	7,102	11,587	6,919	8,727	17,455
		Rate (HH)		16.4	53.7	77.5	7.9	22.4	79.7	9.3	50.9	8.8	22.5	80.0
		Rate (people)		20.8	60.0	82.2	10.4	27.5	84.1	12.2	56.8	11.7	27.5	84.4
Kabupaten	Muko Muko	Line	589	8,004	12,005	16,007	6,445	8,651	17,302	7,061	11,521	7,016	8,850	17,700
		Rate (HH)		11.6	43.0	66.3	4.9	16.2	72.4	8.0	38.8	6.9	16.8	73.8
		Rate (people)		14.1	48.9	70.9	6.8	19.6	76.2	10.4	44.6	9.4	20.0	77.5
Kabupaten	Lebong	Line	581	7,367	11,050	14,734	6,421	7,963	15,925	6,500	10,605	7,061	8,907	17,815
		Rate (HH)		10.5	44.4	71.6	4.5	16.2	75.7	5.5	39.4	8.2	22.9	82.2
		Rate (people)		13.0	49.9	77.5	6.5	19.3	81.1	7.8	44.5	10.7	26.8	86.3
Kabupaten	Kepahiang	Line	584	7,562	11,343	15,124	6,483	8,174	16,347	6,672	10,886	7,265	9,164	18,328
		Rate (HH)		11.7	49.5	70.6	5.6	17.3	76.1	7.3	44.3	10.5	24.1	81.6
		Rate (people)		14.8	56.1	76.5	7.2	21.3	81.3	9.4	51.1	13.3	29.4	86.5
All Kabupaten		Line	4,695	7,944	11,916	15,888	6,716	8,587	17,173	7,009	11,436	7,944	8,587	17,173
		Rate (HH)		13.1	48.8	72.3	6.1	18.9	77.1	7.6	44.8	8.1	21.4	80.1
		Rate (people)		16.8	54.9	77.1	8.3	23.2	81.5	10.3	50.9	10.9	26.1	84.3
All Bengkulu		Line	5,844	8,707	13,060	17,414	7,346	9,411	18,822	7,682	12,534	7,361	9,285	18,569
		Rate (HH)		12.7	45.3	68.9	5.9	17.8	74.0	7.4	41.5	6.8	18.2	73.5
		Rate (people)		16.4	51.1	74.2	8.1	22.1	79.0	10.0	47.4	8.9	22.3	78.1

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (DI Yogyakarta): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Yogyakarta	Line	644	9,544	14,315	19,087	8,973	10,315	20,631	8,420	13,738	7,900	9,965	19,929
		Rate (HH)		5.3	18.0	35.2	2.8	7.1	38.0	2.0	15.8	1.7	6.5	37.3
		Rate (people)		9.7	27.8	48.6	4.8	12.6	52.2	3.7	24.7	3.2	11.7	51.2
All Kota		Line	644	9,544	14,315	19,087	8,973	10,315	20,631	8,420	13,738	9,544	10,315	20,631
		Rate (HH)		5.3	18.0	35.2	2.8	7.1	38.0	2.0	15.8	1.7	6.5	37.3
		Rate (people)		9.7	27.8	48.6	4.8	12.6	52.2	3.7	24.7	3.2	11.7	51.2
Kabupaten	Kulon Progo	Line	633	7,399	11,099	14,798	6,315	7,998	15,995	6,528	10,651	6,752	8,516	17,033
		Rate (HH)		19.0	52.6	75.1	8.8	23.3	79.4	11.0	48.4	12.3	28.4	83.0
		Rate (people)		23.2	58.8	79.6	11.5	27.9	83.7	14.4	54.5	15.7	33.6	87.0
Kabupaten	Bantul	Line	686	8,075	12,113	16,151	6,927	8,728	17,457	7,125	11,624	7,656	9,658	19,316
		Rate (HH)		13.3	47.3	64.6	6.2	18.0	68.7	6.4	41.9	9.7	25.4	74.6
		Rate (people)		16.1	51.9	69.6	8.0	22.1	73.5	8.4	45.7	12.1	29.5	79.7
Kabupaten	Gunung Kidul	Line	695	6,703	10,054	13,405	5,888	7,245	14,489	5,914	9,648	6,561	8,276	16,552
		Rate (HH)		18.3	54.4	77.4	9.0	23.6	81.7	9.2	51.3	15.6	33.7	88.2
		Rate (people)		22.1	58.5	78.7	11.0	27.6	82.9	11.3	55.6	18.7	38.3	88.6
Kabupaten	Sleman	Line	720	8,143	12,215	16,286	7,166	8,802	17,603	7,184	11,722	7,771	9,802	19,605
		Rate (HH)		7.7	26.3	41.7	3.9	10.6	46.7	4.2	23.7	6.1	14.2	50.8
		Rate (people)		10.7	34.4	53.6	5.3	14.6	59.4	5.8	31.1	8.5	19.3	63.9
All Kabupaten		Line	2,734	7,712	11,568	15,425	6,706	8,336	16,672	6,804	11,102	7,712	8,336	16,672
		Rate (HH)		12.9	41.6	60.0	6.3	17.1	64.5	6.7	37.8	9.9	23.3	69.5
		Rate (people)		16.4	48.0	67.2	8.1	21.4	71.8	8.8	43.8	12.7	28.3	77.0
All DI Yogyakarta		Line	3,378	7,918	11,877	15,836	6,961	8,558	17,116	6,986	11,398	7,405	9,340	18,680
		Rate (HH)		12.0	38.6	56.9	5.8	15.8	61.2	6.2	35.1	8.9	21.2	65.5
		Rate (people)		15.6	45.7	65.1	7.7	20.4	69.6	8.3	41.7	11.7	26.4	74.1

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (DKI Jakarta): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Jakarta Selatan	Line	1,154	13,066	19,599	26,131	10,796	14,122	28,245	11,528	18,808	10,888	13,734	27,468
		Rate (HH)		2.6	15.3	34.7	1.0	3.7	41.1	1.4	12.3	1.2	3.5	39.3
		Rate (people)		3.8	19.0	40.9	1.8	5.5	47.8	2.3	15.3	2.1	5.2	45.8
Kota	Jakarta Timur	Line	1,209	10,717	16,076	21,434	9,459	11,584	23,168	9,455	15,427	10,888	13,734	27,468
		Rate (HH)		2.6	18.6	38.8	1.2	4.1	43.9	1.2	16.5	2.8	10.2	56.7
		Rate (people)		3.4	23.1	45.2	1.6	5.4	50.5	1.6	20.6	3.7	12.9	62.9
Kota	Jakarta Pusat	Line	1,191	11,296	16,944	22,592	9,272	12,210	24,419	9,966	16,261	10,888	13,734	27,468
		Rate (HH)		2.4	13.8	29.9	1.1	3.7	35.3	1.8	11.4	2.0	5.8	43.2
		Rate (people)		4.0	19.6	39.2	1.9	6.0	44.8	2.9	16.4	3.3	9.1	53.1
Kota	Jakarta Barat	Line	1,200	10,523	15,784	21,046	8,914	11,374	22,748	9,284	15,148	10,888	13,734	27,468
		Rate (HH)		2.3	16.5	35.2	1.2	3.7	41.3	1.5	13.8	2.9	9.0	56.2
		Rate (people)		3.8	22.3	43.0	1.9	6.1	48.9	2.2	19.2	5.0	13.2	63.0
Kota	Jakarta Utara	Line	1,187	10,411	15,617	20,822	9,229	11,253	22,506	9,185	14,987	10,888	13,734	27,468
		Rate (HH)		3.6	18.5	38.8	1.8	6.1	44.8	1.7	15.9	4.7	11.2	56.8
		Rate (people)		5.6	24.2	46.4	2.8	9.1	51.9	2.7	21.5	7.2	15.6	62.3
All Kota		Line	5,941	11,178	16,766	22,355	9,559	12,081	24,163	9,862	16,090	11,178	12,081	24,163
		Rate (HH)		2.7	16.9	36.2	1.3	4.2	42.0	1.5	14.4	2.8	8.3	51.6
		Rate (people)		4.0	21.9	43.4	2.0	6.3	49.2	2.2	18.9	4.2	11.4	58.2
Kabupaten	Kepulauan Seribu	Line	317	12,129	18,193	24,257	11,549	13,110	26,219	10,701	17,459	10,888	13,734	27,468
		Rate (HH)		9.5	47.3	74.4	4.7	14.5	81.7	1.9	42.9	2.5	18.0	83.6
		Rate (people)		13.0	55.4	80.0	6.3	19.4	86.4	2.2	51.2	3.3	24.1	87.9
All Kabupaten		Line	317	12,129	18,193	24,257	11,549	13,110	26,219	10,701	17,459	12,129	13,110	26,219
		Rate (HH)		9.5	47.3	74.4	4.7	14.5	81.7	1.9	42.9	2.5	18.0	83.6
		Rate (people)		13.0	55.4	80.0	6.3	19.4	86.4	2.2	51.2	3.3	24.1	87.9
All DKI Jakarta		Line	6,258	11,180	16,769	22,359	9,564	12,084	24,167	9,863	16,093	10,888	13,734	27,468
		Rate (HH)		2.7	17.0	36.3	1.3	4.3	42.1	1.5	14.4	2.8	8.3	51.7
		Rate (people)		4.0	22.0	43.5	2.0	6.3	49.3	2.2	19.0	4.2	11.5	58.3

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Gorontalo): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Gorontalo	Line	628	7,825	11,737	15,650	6,691	8,458	16,915	6,904	11,264	5,923	7,471	14,941
		Rate (HH)		4.2	23.2	43.6	2.0	6.4	48.2	2.6	20.5	1.1	3.3	40.0
		Rate (people)		5.5	29.2	51.0	2.7	8.5	56.0	3.4	25.7	1.3	4.4	47.3
All Kota		Line	628	7,825	11,737	15,650	6,691	8,458	16,915	6,904	11,264	7,825	8,458	16,915
		Rate (HH)		4.2	23.2	43.6	2.0	6.4	48.2	2.6	20.5	1.1	3.3	40.0
		Rate (people)		5.5	29.2	51.0	2.7	8.5	56.0	3.4	25.7	1.3	4.4	47.3
Kabupaten	Boalemo	Line	648	6,999	10,498	13,997	5,915	7,565	15,129	6,175	10,074	5,537	6,984	13,968
		Rate (HH)		16.7	49.2	70.3	7.7	22.6	74.5	10.3	46.8	4.6	16.3	70.2
		Rate (people)		19.8	55.2	75.9	9.8	26.6	79.8	12.5	52.4	6.3	19.5	75.6
Kabupaten	Gorontalo	Line	669	7,421	11,132	14,843	6,507	8,022	16,043	6,548	10,683	5,624	7,094	14,189
		Rate (HH)		15.1	56.4	74.4	7.9	22.2	78.2	8.5	51.8	3.5	12.9	72.5
		Rate (people)		18.9	63.4	80.0	9.4	27.6	83.1	10.1	58.8	4.5	16.0	78.5
Kabupaten	Pohuwato	Line	643	6,389	9,584	12,778	5,242	6,906	13,812	5,637	9,197	5,563	7,017	14,034
		Rate (HH)		13.5	41.9	66.8	6.3	18.1	71.6	7.5	38.8	6.8	18.9	72.7
		Rate (people)		18.7	50.2	73.5	9.3	24.1	77.9	10.9	47.1	9.9	25.2	78.8
Kabupaten	Bone Bolango	Line	650	6,651	9,977	13,302	5,621	7,189	14,378	5,868	9,574	5,619	7,088	14,176
		Rate (HH)		13.6	38.1	59.4	6.9	18.3	65.0	8.9	36.1	6.4	16.2	64.7
		Rate (people)		17.6	43.8	64.9	8.8	23.1	69.9	11.8	41.9	8.4	20.9	69.8
Kabupaten	Gorontalo Utara	Line	465	6,225	9,338	12,450	5,433	6,729	13,457	5,492	8,961	5,517	6,960	13,919
		Rate (HH)		15.3	51.3	74.4	6.7	19.6	78.8	8.7	46.8	8.7	20.9	80.8
		Rate (people)		19.6	57.5	79.1	9.4	24.4	83.6	11.6	52.7	11.6	25.9	85.3
All Kabupaten		Line	3,075	6,930	10,396	13,861	5,951	7,491	14,982	6,115	9,976	6,930	7,491	14,982
		Rate (HH)		14.9	49.5	70.1	7.3	20.7	74.6	8.7	45.9	5.3	15.8	71.9
		Rate (people)		18.9	56.2	75.8	9.3	25.8	79.7	11.0	52.6	7.1	19.9	77.5
All Gorontalo		Line	3,703	7,086	10,628	14,171	6,080	7,659	15,317	6,251	10,200	5,646	7,122	14,244
		Rate (HH)		13.0	44.7	65.3	6.4	18.1	69.8	7.6	41.3	4.5	13.5	66.1
		Rate (people)		16.6	51.6	71.5	8.2	22.8	75.6	9.7	47.9	6.1	17.2	72.3

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Jambi): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Jambi	Line	587	9,594	14,391	19,188	7,727	10,370	20,740	8,465	13,811	8,571	10,811	21,622
		Rate (HH)		7.4	30.7	52.8	3.5	11.3	60.1	4.6	29.1	4.9	13.4	62.6
		Rate (people)		9.9	36.1	59.0	4.9	14.6	66.8	6.4	34.8	6.8	17.2	69.7
Kota	Sungai Penuh	Line	464	7,412	11,118	14,825	6,634	8,012	16,023	6,540	10,670	7,840	9,889	19,779
		Rate (HH)		3.0	20.3	44.5	1.5	4.4	51.9	1.5	16.8	4.5	11.1	65.4
		Rate (people)		3.6	23.6	49.1	1.6	5.3	57.1	1.6	19.5	5.5	13.2	71.5
All Kota		Line	1,051	9,303	13,954	18,606	7,581	10,055	20,111	8,208	13,391	9,303	10,055	20,111
		Rate (HH)		6.8	29.2	51.6	3.2	10.3	58.9	4.2	27.3	4.9	13.0	63.0
		Rate (people)		9.1	34.4	57.7	4.4	13.4	65.5	5.7	32.8	6.6	16.7	69.9
Kabupaten	Kerinci	Line	592	7,659	11,489	15,318	6,805	8,279	16,557	6,757	11,025	6,570	8,287	16,574
		Rate (HH)		6.6	36.1	66.5	3.5	9.4	74.7	2.9	32.3	3.3	9.9	74.3
		Rate (people)		7.8	41.3	70.6	3.8	11.1	78.8	3.1	36.9	3.8	11.6	78.2
Kabupaten	Merangin	Line	599	7,843	11,765	15,687	7,118	8,478	16,956	6,920	11,291	6,677	8,423	16,846
		Rate (HH)		5.5	26.2	55.3	2.6	7.8	62.9	2.3	22.6	1.7	8.0	59.9
		Rate (people)		8.1	33.3	62.2	3.7	11.2	68.8	3.1	29.3	2.4	11.4	66.7
Kabupaten	Sarolangun	Line	583	9,768	14,652	19,536	8,275	10,558	21,116	8,618	14,061	6,642	8,378	16,756
		Rate (HH)		7.6	40.1	66.4	3.4	11.3	71.4	3.8	36.0	1.0	4.1	52.1
		Rate (people)		9.7	45.1	70.8	4.8	14.2	75.1	5.4	41.1	1.5	5.9	57.4
Kabupaten	Batang Hari	Line	584	8,462	12,693	16,924	7,864	9,146	18,293	7,466	12,181	6,755	8,521	17,042
		Rate (HH)		7.4	33.1	62.5	3.5	11.1	69.6	2.8	29.6	1.2	6.8	61.2
		Rate (people)		10.2	40.7	69.7	4.8	15.3	75.9	4.1	36.9	1.6	9.3	69.1
Kabupaten	Muaro Jambi	Line	584	6,877	10,316	13,754	6,406	7,433	14,867	6,068	9,900	6,488	8,184	16,368
		Rate (HH)		4.0	34.0	63.8	1.8	6.5	68.8	1.2	29.3	2.5	10.3	74.1
		Rate (people)		5.3	40.7	70.1	2.5	9.3	74.4	1.7	35.8	3.4	14.1	79.3
Kabupaten	Tjg Jabung Timur	Line	593	8,027	12,041	16,054	7,502	8,676	17,353	7,082	11,555	6,863	8,657	17,315
		Rate (HH)		8.6	46.8	73.9	4.3	12.8	80.5	2.7	43.0	3.1	11.9	78.5
		Rate (people)		12.4	57.0	80.3	6.1	17.9	85.6	4.0	52.9	4.3	16.9	84.7
Kabupaten	Tjg Jabung Barat	Line	579	7,634	11,450	15,267	6,566	8,251	16,502	6,735	10,989	7,150	9,018	18,037
		Rate (HH)		9.7	37.7	59.4	4.7	14.1	65.1	5.0	34.4	6.9	18.4	69.2
		Rate (people)		11.1	42.9	64.3	5.5	16.3	69.8	5.9	39.2	8.6	22.1	74.6
Kabupaten	Tebo	Line	584	8,117	12,176	16,234	6,947	8,774	17,547	7,161	11,684	6,608	8,336	16,671
		Rate (HH)		4.1	26.7	55.5	2.0	6.2	63.6	2.2	22.6	0.9	4.7	56.7
		Rate (people)		6.4	33.3	62.7	3.1	8.9	70.3	3.3	28.6	1.6	7.1	64.0
Kabupaten	Bungo	Line	578	7,376	11,064	14,752	6,784	7,973	15,945	6,508	10,618	6,797	8,574	17,148
		Rate (HH)		4.2	25.0	49.3	2.2	5.7	57.0	1.9	21.1	2.3	8.3	61.8
		Rate (people)		5.7	31.4	56.7	2.8	7.8	64.3	2.4	27.1	3.1	11.7	69.4
All Kabupaten		Line	5,276	7,911	11,867	15,823	7,086	8,551	17,103	6,980	11,389	7,911	8,551	17,103
		Rate (HH)		6.2	33.2	60.7	3.0	9.1	67.4	2.7	29.3	2.6	9.1	65.2
		Rate (people)		8.2	39.7	66.8	4.0	12.1	72.9	3.6	35.5	3.4	12.2	71.2
All Jambi		Line	6,327	8,186	12,280	16,373	7,184	8,849	17,697	7,223	11,784	7,067	8,914	17,828
		Rate (HH)		6.3	32.4	59.0	3.0	9.3	65.8	3.0	28.9	3.0	9.9	64.8
		Rate (people)		8.4	38.7	65.0	4.1	12.3	71.5	4.0	35.0	4.0	13.1	70.9

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Jawa Barat): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)											
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines			
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP		
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50	
Kota	Bogor	Line	565	9,157	13,736	18,314	7,993	9,898	19,795	8,079	13,182	6,977	8,800	17,601	
		Rate (HH)		6.7	27.1	49.7	3.4	10.1	54.9	3.7	24.4	1.8	5.7	46.2	
		Rate (people)		9.5	32.7	55.1	4.6	13.8	60.3	5.0	29.5	2.5	8.2	51.9	
Kota	Sukabumi	Line	445	9,348	14,022	18,696	8,432	10,104	20,208	8,248	13,457	6,977	8,800	17,601	
		Rate (HH)		6.7	31.2	53.5	3.1	10.1	59.6	2.9	28.5	1.6	3.6	49.2	
		Rate (people)		9.2	38.0	59.5	4.4	13.4	65.6	4.1	35.5	2.4	5.1	56.0	
Kota	Bandung	Line	869	9,198	13,798	18,397	7,665	9,942	19,885	8,115	13,241	6,977	8,800	17,601	
		Rate (HH)		3.1	17.1	33.5	1.6	4.9	39.0	2.1	14.7	1.2	2.6	32.0	
		Rate (people)		4.9	22.4	41.2	2.4	7.5	47.4	3.0	19.6	1.7	4.2	39.4	
Kota	Cirebon	Line	449	8,264	12,397	16,529	6,879	8,933	17,866	7,291	11,897	6,977	8,800	17,601	
		Rate (HH)		8.2	32.1	50.1	3.6	10.7	53.9	5.6	29.2	4.2	10.2	53.2	
		Rate (people)		12.0	39.9	57.6	5.7	15.3	61.3	8.4	36.5	6.9	14.7	60.6	
Kota	Bekasi	Line	789	10,943	16,414	21,886	9,671	11,828	23,656	9,655	15,752	6,977	8,800	17,601	
		Rate (HH)		4.1	23.1	48.8	1.8	6.0	54.0	1.8	20.3	0.6	1.3	29.7	
		Rate (people)		6.3	29.9	57.3	2.9	9.1	62.2	2.9	26.5	1.2	2.3	37.1	
Kota	Depok	Line	670	10,201	15,301	20,402	8,405	11,026	22,052	9,000	14,684	6,977	8,800	17,601	
		Rate (HH)		1.8	17.8	37.3	0.7	3.3	41.5	1.0	14.8	0.3	0.9	27.6	
		Rate (people)		2.8	22.3	42.5	1.3	4.9	46.6	1.8	18.7	0.5	1.6	32.5	
Kota	Cimahi	Line	763	9,211	13,816	18,421	7,712	9,955	19,911	8,126	13,259	6,977	8,800	17,601	
		Rate (HH)		5.0	24.2	46.1	2.4	8.3	53.1	2.8	21.6	1.3	4.6	42.5	
		Rate (people)		7.4	31.2	55.0	3.6	11.7	62.6	4.3	28.0	2.0	6.8	51.1	
Kota	Tasikmalaya	Line	790	8,652	12,979	17,305	6,981	9,352	18,704	7,634	12,455	6,897	8,700	17,401	
		Rate (HH)		17.3	41.7	61.4	7.9	20.9	65.7	11.5	39.4	6.8	16.9	62.1	
		Rate (people)		20.7	47.3	67.5	10.3	24.8	71.8	14.3	44.8	9.0	20.5	68.2	
Kota	Banjar	Line	776	6,355	9,533	12,710	5,582	6,869	13,738	5,607	9,148	6,716	8,471	16,942	
		Rate (HH)		7.1	32.0	57.0	3.4	10.2	62.8	3.6	27.7	8.6	21.4	74.0	
		Rate (people)		8.5	35.2	60.5	4.1	11.9	65.7	4.2	30.7	10.1	24.6	77.2	
All Kota		Line	6,116	9,703	14,554	19,406	8,255	10,488	20,975	8,561	13,967	9,703	10,488	20,975	
		Rate (HH)		5.0	23.1	43.9	2.3	7.2	49.0	2.9	20.4	1.6	4.1	36.9	
		Rate (people)		7.0	28.8	50.9	3.4	10.0	56.1	4.0	25.6	2.3	5.6	43.3	
Kabupaten	Bogor	Line	1,128	7,047	10,570	14,093	6,078	7,617	15,233	6,217	10,144	6,791	8,566	17,132	
		Rate (HH)		7.2	24.0	42.7	3.6	9.8	47.7	4.3	21.7	5.1	12.6	55.1	
		Rate (people)		10.0	29.2	48.7	5.0	13.2	53.8	5.7	26.5	7.3	16.5	61.3	
Kabupaten	Sukabumi	Line	903	6,053	9,080	12,107	5,505	6,543	13,086	5,341	8,714	6,463	8,153	16,306	
		Rate (HH)		7.6	41.8	68.0	3.4	12.0	74.9	3.1	37.9	10.3	29.6	86.1	
		Rate (people)		10.6	49.9	75.1	5.2	16.1	81.3	4.7	45.5	14.5	37.1	91.0	
Kabupaten	Cianjur	Line	904	6,655	9,983	13,311	5,902	7,194	14,387	5,872	9,581	6,394	8,066	16,131	
		Rate (HH)		10.9	51.8	76.7	5.4	15.7	80.4	5.2	48.5	8.7	25.7	85.0	
		Rate (people)		14.3	56.7	80.4	7.0	19.5	84.0	6.8	53.1	11.8	31.0	87.9	
Kabupaten	Bandung	Line	1,392	7,149	10,724	14,298	6,415	7,727	15,455	6,307	10,291	6,837	8,624	17,247	
		Rate (HH)		7.1	33.6	58.0	3.6	10.2	64.0	2.8	30.4	4.9	17.0	71.2	
		Rate (people)		9.3	39.5	63.8	4.6	13.4	69.6	3.5	36.0	6.3	21.5	76.4	
Kabupaten	Garut	Line	869	5,931	8,897	11,862	5,208	6,411	12,822	5,233	8,538	6,476	8,169	16,338	
		Rate (HH)		10.2	44.6	68.8	5.1	15.0	74.8	5.4	40.2	14.0	34.7	86.1	
		Rate (people)		13.9	52.4	74.0	6.9	19.8	79.3	7.4	48.0	18.5	42.5	89.0	
Kabupaten	Tasikmalaya	Line	913	6,119	9,179	12,238	5,450	6,614	13,228	5,399	8,809	6,316	7,967	15,933	
		Rate (HH)		9.4	44.1	72.9	4.2	14.2	78.5	3.9	39.5	10.4	29.4	87.4	
		Rate (people)		12.8	51.1	77.2	6.3	18.5	81.8	6.0	46.3	14.3	36.4	89.4	
Kabupaten	Ciamis	Line	850	6,870	10,305	13,740	6,071	7,426	14,851	6,061	9,889	6,353	8,014	16,027	
		Rate (HH)		8.5	39.2	69.6	4.1	11.6	76.6	3.9	35.3	5.6	15.4	81.0	
		Rate (people)		10.3	43.6	73.4	5.1	14.1	79.9	5.0	39.4	7.2	18.8	84.1	
Kabupaten	Kuningan	Line	625	6,581	9,871	13,162	5,934	7,113	14,226	5,806	9,473	6,463	8,153	16,306	
		Rate (HH)		11.7	50.0	76.2	5.7	18.1	81.0	4.9	44.8	9.4	29.5	86.8	
		Rate (people)		14.7	56.8	80.3	7.2	22.5	84.1	6.2	51.7	11.8	36.3	89.7	
Kabupaten	Cirebon	Line	837	7,573	11,360	15,146	6,602	8,185	16,371	6,681	10,901	6,772	8,542	17,083	
		Rate (HH)		11.4	47.2	72.9	5.3	15.7	77.2	6.2	41.6	6.8	18.4	79.9	
		Rate (people)		16.1	55.4	78.6	8.0	21.2	82.1	9.3	49.6	10.0	24.9	84.3	
Kabupaten	Majalengka	Line	689	8,659	12,988	17,318	7,556	9,359	18,718	7,640	12,465	6,496	8,194	16,388	
		Rate (HH)		12.6	44.9	69.3	6.6	18.2	76.0	6.8	41.1	3.2	9.2	65.2	
		Rate (people)		15.5	49.8	73.6	7.6	21.2	79.4	7.8	45.8	3.3	10.7	70.1	
Kabupaten	Sumedang	Line	624	7,583	11,374	15,165	6,579	8,196	16,392	6,690	10,915	6,466	8,157	16,313	
		Rate (HH)		9.3	35.6	60.9	4.3	12.3	66.9	4.8	31.8	3.7	12.0	66.1	
		Rate (people)		12.9	42.1	66.3	6.4	16.8	71.7	7.1	38.2	5.3	16.2	71.6	
Kabupaten	Indramayu	Line	811	8,698	13,048	17,397	7,768	9,402	18,804	7,674	12,521	6,461	8,151	16,301	
		Rate (HH)		12.6	51.8	76.7	6.4	19.0	81.4	5.8	47.8	1.4	8.6	70.7	
		Rate (people)		16.6	59.7	82.5	8.2	24.4	86.0	7.5	56.2	2.1	11.1	77.0	
Kabupaten	Subang	Line	753	7,720	11,579	15,439	6,417	8,344	16,688	6,811	11,112	6,372	8,037	16,074	
		Rate (HH)		10.7	44.6	70.2	5.4	14.8	77.2	6.4	40.5	4.7	12.5	73.2	
		Rate (people)		13.5	50.5	76.0	6.7	18.8	81.6	7.9	46.0	5.7	16.1	78.7	
Kabupaten	Purwakarta	Line	714	7,434	11,151	14,868	5,997	8,035	16,070	6,559	10,701	6,569	8,286	16,572	
		Rate (HH)		8.0	31.4	53.2	3.4	10.9	60.1	4.5	29.1	4.3	11.1	62.9	
		Rate (people)		10.6	37.8	60.6	5.0	14.2	67.2	6.4	35.0	6.1	14.4	70.4	
Kabupaten	Karawang	Line	830	8,765	13,147	17,530	7,398	9,474	18,947	7,733	12,617	6,619	8,349	16,698	
		Rate (HH)		9.2	37.4	60.5	4.3	13.1	66.3	5.7	33.9	2.6	7.0	56.6	
		Rate (people)		12.2	43.6	66.4	6.0	16.7	72.0	8.3	40.0	3.6	9.8	63.1	
Kabupaten	Bekasi	Line	794	8,939	13,409	17,878	7,807	9,662	19,324	7,887	12,868	6,801	8,579	17,158	
		Rate (HH)		4.5	19.7	41.3	2.3	6.2	46.3	2.6	17.7	0.8	3.2	38.1	
		Rate (people)		6.1	23.8	46.5	2.9	8.3	50.8	3.6	21.5	1.0	4.6	43.3	
Kabupaten	Bandung Barat	Line	789	7,114	10,671	14,228	6,104	7,689	15,379	6,277	10,241	6,643	8,379	16,758	
		Rate (HH)		10.6	34.4	58.0	4.4	13.6	64.2	5.3	30.8	7.4	18.0	69.7	
		Rate (people)		14.7	41.7	63.7	7.2	18.4	69.6	8.3	37.5	11.1	23.6	74.7	
All Kabupaten		Line	14,425	7,300	10,950	14,600	6,376	7,890	15,781	6,441	10,508	7,300	7,890	15,781	
		Rate (HH)		9.1	38.3	62.5	4.4	12.9	68.1	4.6	34.7	6.1	17.3	70.5	
		Rate (people)		12.0	44.0	67.3	5.9	16.7	72.4	6.3	40.3	8.3	21.8	74.9	
All Jawa Barat		Line	20,541	7,823	11,735	15,647	6,785	8,456	16,912	6,902	11,262	6,674	8,418	16,837	
		Rate (HH)		8.2	35.0	58.5	3.9	11.7	64.0	4.2	31.6	5.1	14.5	63.4	
		Rate (people)		10.9	40.7	63.8	5.4	15.2	68.9	5.8	37.1	7.0	18.3	68.0	

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Jawa Tangah): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Magelang	Line	580	8,512	12,769	17,025	7,457	9,201	18,402	7,510	12,254	6,760	8,527	17,053
		Rate (HH)		9.0	28.1	48.1	4.3	11.9	53.1	4.7	26.4	2.2	9.1	48.4
		Rate (people)		10.5	33.1	56.2	5.2	14.1	61.4	5.7	31.2	2.9	10.9	56.5
Kota	Surakarta	Line	612	10,079	15,119	20,159	8,957	10,895	21,789	8,893	14,509	6,760	8,527	17,053
		Rate (HH)		9.6	33.0	51.8	4.4	13.2	55.1	4.4	31.5	1.1	4.1	41.0
		Rate (people)		14.0	43.1	62.7	6.8	19.3	66.2	6.8	41.3	1.6	6.6	51.9
Kota	Salatiga	Line	583	7,931	11,896	15,861	7,059	8,572	17,144	6,997	11,416	6,760	8,527	17,053
		Rate (HH)		6.0	22.5	42.5	2.9	8.6	47.9	2.9	20.9	1.9	8.6	47.3
		Rate (people)		8.3	29.7	50.8	4.1	11.9	56.3	4.1	28.0	2.4	11.9	55.7
Kota	Semarang	Line	776	8,094	12,141	16,188	7,079	8,749	17,497	7,141	11,651	6,741	8,503	17,006
		Rate (HH)		3.6	19.9	43.7	1.8	5.5	49.0	2.0	17.9	1.6	4.7	48.0
		Rate (people)		5.1	24.4	50.2	2.3	7.9	56.0	2.6	22.2	2.0	6.8	55.1
Kota	Pekalongan	Line	598	8,283	12,425	16,567	7,380	8,953	17,907	7,308	11,924	6,740	8,502	17,003
		Rate (HH)		5.7	22.4	50.2	2.7	7.4	57.2	2.3	20.1	1.2	6.4	51.7
		Rate (people)		9.4	29.7	58.8	4.6	11.7	66.3	4.2	27.4	2.0	10.3	60.6
Kota	Tegal	Line	568	8,903	13,354	17,805	7,738	9,623	19,245	7,855	12,815	6,760	8,527	17,053
		Rate (HH)		7.2	35.6	62.9	3.2	10.4	69.2	3.9	30.6	1.6	5.5	59.2
		Rate (people)		10.6	44.9	70.4	5.1	15.2	75.9	6.2	39.3	2.5	8.3	67.0
All Kota		Line	3,717	8,534	12,802	17,069	7,506	9,225	18,449	7,530	12,285	8,534	9,225	18,449
		Rate (HH)		5.6	24.4	47.5	2.7	7.9	52.7	2.8	22.2	1.5	5.2	47.9
		Rate (people)		8.0	30.6	55.2	3.8	11.4	60.7	4.0	28.2	2.0	7.7	56.2
Kabupaten	Cilacap	Line	817	6,796	10,194	13,592	5,879	7,346	14,691	5,996	9,783	6,209	7,832	15,665
		Rate (HH)		14.0	56.4	78.6	6.5	21.8	82.6	7.3	50.9	8.9	26.1	84.5
		Rate (people)		18.1	62.6	82.9	9.0	27.1	86.3	9.9	57.3	11.8	32.3	88.1
Kabupaten	Banyumas	Line	818	7,415	11,123	14,830	6,246	8,015	16,030	6,542	10,674	6,355	8,016	16,032
		Rate (HH)		15.1	45.6	67.3	7.1	19.7	71.5	8.3	42.2	7.6	17.6	71.5
		Rate (people)		20.2	52.4	73.1	9.9	25.5	76.8	11.3	49.1	10.5	23.4	77.3
Kabupaten	Purbalingga	Line	693	6,916	10,373	13,831	6,048	7,475	14,950	6,101	9,955	6,179	7,795	15,589
		Rate (HH)		21.0	57.9	77.5	10.0	27.3	80.8	10.7	54.1	11.6	30.3	84.0
		Rate (people)		24.6	63.7	82.2	12.3	31.5	84.9	13.0	60.1	14.3	34.6	87.6
Kabupaten	Banjarnegara	Line	697	5,700	8,550	11,401	4,872	6,161	12,323	5,029	8,206	6,118	7,717	15,433
		Rate (HH)		15.5	53.4	75.7	6.8	21.9	79.8	8.6	48.5	19.7	42.8	88.8
		Rate (people)		19.2	58.4	78.8	9.5	25.9	82.9	11.6	53.1	23.6	48.0	90.4
Kabupaten	Kebumen	Line	733	6,953	10,430	13,907	5,916	7,516	15,031	6,135	10,009	6,142	7,748	15,495
		Rate (HH)		17.7	55.5	81.2	8.1	24.4	83.5	10.1	51.5	9.6	27.3	85.2
		Rate (people)		22.7	62.6	85.5	11.2	30.4	87.3	13.6	58.5	12.7	33.4	88.6
Kabupaten	Purworejo	Line	662	6,950	10,425	13,900	5,938	7,512	15,024	6,132	10,005	6,157	7,766	15,532
		Rate (HH)		12.5	42.1	65.4	5.9	16.5	70.4	7.3	39.0	6.0	17.7	74.0
		Rate (people)		16.6	47.5	70.3	8.3	20.7	74.8	10.0	44.5	8.5	22.6	78.5
Kabupaten	Wonosobo	Line	646	6,681	10,022	13,362	5,664	7,221	14,443	5,895	9,617	6,114	7,712	15,423
		Rate (HH)		18.8	56.1	75.1	8.8	25.1	79.1	10.5	51.7	12.1	30.2	83.3
		Rate (people)		23.2	60.6	77.9	11.4	29.3	81.3	13.4	56.4	15.6	35.2	86.1
Kabupaten	Magelang	Line	723	6,051	9,077	12,102	5,333	6,540	13,081	5,339	8,710	6,149	7,757	15,513
		Rate (HH)		10.6	49.6	73.6	4.8	15.9	78.7	5.1	46.2	11.3	32.3	86.7
		Rate (people)		14.1	56.8	78.8	7.0	20.5	83.3	7.3	53.1	14.7	38.5	90.1
Kabupaten	Boyolali	Line	720	6,888	10,331	13,775	5,971	7,445	14,889	6,077	9,915	6,194	7,813	15,626
		Rate (HH)		11.0	42.0	67.2	5.2	15.6	71.8	5.5	39.6	6.0	17.1	74.6
		Rate (people)		13.7	46.8	70.9	6.8	18.9	75.2	7.1	44.5	8.0	20.6	78.6
Kabupaten	Klaten	Line	787	8,510	12,765	17,021	7,217	9,199	18,397	7,508	12,251	6,483	8,178	16,356
		Rate (HH)		14.8	50.4	78.1	6.9	20.5	81.6	8.6	47.4	4.1	11.2	75.0
		Rate (people)		17.5	54.7	80.4	8.7	24.3	83.3	10.6	52.0	5.0	13.5	77.7
Kabupaten	Sukoharjo	Line	672	7,465	11,197	14,930	6,605	8,069	16,137	6,586	10,746	6,562	8,278	16,556
		Rate (HH)		8.2	38.4	63.4	3.9	12.0	68.7	3.9	35.0	3.7	13.0	70.7
		Rate (people)		10.9	44.6	68.4	5.3	15.5	73.3	5.3	41.0	5.0	16.9	75.2
Kabupaten	Wonogiri	Line	720	6,414	9,620	12,827	5,370	6,932	13,865	5,659	9,232	6,090	7,682	15,363
		Rate (HH)		12.1	44.5	71.1	5.9	18.9	74.6	7.8	40.8	9.7	26.0	79.4
		Rate (people)		15.7	51.5	76.7	7.8	23.9	79.3	10.0	47.8	12.5	31.7	83.3
Kabupaten	Karanganyar	Line	657	7,133	10,699	14,265	6,412	7,710	15,419	6,293	10,268	6,346	8,005	16,010
		Rate (HH)		10.6	41.2	67.3	5.2	14.9	71.5	4.7	36.5	5.1	17.4	73.7
		Rate (people)		14.0	46.0	70.7	6.9	19.1	74.7	6.3	41.4	7.1	22.3	76.7
Kabupaten	Sragen	Line	723	6,782	10,172	13,563	5,738	7,330	14,660	5,983	9,762	6,189	7,806	15,612
		Rate (HH)		14.6	47.8	70.2	6.5	19.7	75.8	8.5	43.8	8.6	23.5	80.0
		Rate (people)		17.5	52.7	74.3	8.7	23.5	79.2	11.0	49.0	11.3	28.0	83.6
Kabupaten	Grobogan	Line	791	7,350	11,025	14,700	6,444	7,944	15,889	6,485	10,580	6,055	7,638	15,276
		Rate (HH)		15.7	52.2	74.5	7.3	22.1	78.8	7.5	48.9	4.7	16.5	76.4
		Rate (people)		17.9	55.6	76.3	8.8	24.7	80.6	9.2	53.1	5.6	18.8	78.3
Kabupaten	Blora	Line	726	6,258	9,387	12,517	5,524	6,764	13,529	5,522	9,009	6,115	7,713	15,426
		Rate (HH)		13.0	54.4	73.4	6.1	19.8	78.3	6.1	49.6	9.9	31.1	84.3
		Rate (people)		16.3	58.4	76.5	8.0	24.0	81.2	8.0	53.3	12.7	35.6	86.6
Kabupaten	Rembang	Line	662	7,162	10,743	14,324	6,293	7,741	15,483	6,319	10,310	6,154	7,762	15,524
		Rate (HH)		19.3	64.8	86.3	9.4	27.0	90.1	9.7	60.7	8.5	25.5	90.6
		Rate (people)		23.4	68.8	88.6	11.6	32.0	91.7	11.9	65.1	10.8	31.0	92.3
Kabupaten	Pati	Line	789	8,027	12,040	16,054	6,942	8,676	17,352	7,082	11,555	6,200	7,821	15,641
		Rate (HH)		11.4	50.8	74.1	5.3	16.4	80.3	5.6	45.2	3.2	8.8	71.6
		Rate (people)		14.5	57.3	79.2	7.1	20.4	84.8	7.7	51.9	4.5	11.6	76.9
Kabupaten	Kudus	Line	667	7,813	11,719	15,626	7,258	8,445	16,890	6,893	11,247	6,568	8,284	16,569
		Rate (HH)		6.9	36.5	66.7	3.7	9.6	71.9	2.6	31.4	2.0	8.4	69.8
		Rate (people)		9.0	41.5	70.5	4.4	12.4	75.5	3.1	36.4	2.3	11.1	73.6
Kabupaten	Jepara	Line	734	7,389	11,083	14,777	6,804	7,986	15,972	6,519	10,636	6,421	8,100	16,199
		Rate (HH)		8.0	47.6	76.4	3.8	14.6	81.6	2.4	43.4	2.5	15.6	82.2
		Rate (people)		10.2	53.0	79.9	5.1	18.0	84.8	3.1	48.9	3.3	19.8	85.0
Kabupaten	Demak	Line	735	7,521	11,282	15,043	6,225	8,130	16,259	6,636	10,827	6,235	7,865	15,729
		Rate (HH)		16.1	54.9	80.9	7.6	22.3	84.1	10.6	49.8	7.8	18.3	82.5
		Rate (people)		18.8	59.8	84.2	9.2	26.0	86.9	12.7	55.6	9.7	21.7	85.6
Kabupaten	Semarang	Line	725	6,783	10,174	13,565	5,983	7,331	14,663	5,984	9,764	6,253	7,887	15,775
		Rate (HH)		8.6	32.7	55.4	4.5	10.5	61.5	4.6	28.7	4.8	14.4	66.1
		Rate (people)		10.5	38.4	61.9	5.2	12.9	67.7	5.4	34.1	5.7	17.4	72.1
Kabupaten	Temanggung	Line	664	5,879	8,818	11,758	5,257	6,354	12,709	5,187	8,463	6,128	7,730	15,459
		Rate (HH)		11.3	48.1	71.2	5.7	16.9	75.6	5.4	43.6	13.3	33.1	86.3
		Rate (people)		13.5	54.2	76.2	6.7	20.7	80.2	6.3	49.9	16.0	38.9	89.7
Kabupaten	Kendal	Line	731	7,119	10,679	14,239	5,746	7,695	15,390	6,281	10,248	6,305	7,953	15,905
		Rate (HH)		11.9	40.7	64.0	5.7	15.6	71.0	7.8	35.8	7.7	15.9	73.2
		Rate (people)		14.5	45.8	69.0	7.2	18.8	75.9	9.6	40.5	9.7	19.5	78.0
Kabupaten	Batang	Line	663	5,565	8,347	11,129	4,812	6,015	12,029	4,909	8,010	6,259	7,895	15,790
		Rate (HH)		12.5	51.5	76.7	6.1	19.6	81.6	6.9	47.2	21.9	44.1	94.0
		Rate (people)		14.7	55.5	79.2	7.3	22.9	83.4	8.4	50.9	25.7	48.4	95.2
Kabupaten	Pekalongan	Line	661	7,518	11,277	15,036	6,531	8,126	16,252	6,633	10,822	6,353	8,013	16,027
		Rate (HH)		11.3	46.2	71.0	4.7	16.4	77.3	5.1	42.0	4.5	14.8	75.8
		Rate (people)		16.3	54.0	77.0	8.0	22.4	82.6	8.5	49.7	7.2	20.7	81.4
Kabupaten	Pemalang	Line	764	7,113	10,670	14,227	6,114	7,689	15,377	6,276	10,240	6,343	8,000	16,001
		Rate (HH)		14.4	51.6	75.1	6.5	19.0	80.8	8.0	47.7	8.1	22.0	82.7
		Rate (people)		20.0	60.4	81.7	9.8	26.0	86.4	11.6	57.0	11.8	29.6	87.4
Kabupaten	Tegal	Line	798	6,710	10,065	13,420	5,854	7,253	14,505	5,920	9,659	6,407	8,082	16,164
		Rate (HH)		9.5	40.1	63.7	4.4	13.2	67.8	4.7	36.8	6.7	22.0	74.2
		Rate (people)		13.1	47.8	70.1	6.6	17.8	74.3	7.1	44.4	9.6	28.0	80.0
Kabupaten	Brebes	Line	838	7,860	11,791	15,721	6,505	8,496	16,992	6,935	11,315	6,281	7,923	15,845

Figure 2 (Jawa Timur): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Kediri	Line	629	8,809	13,213	17,618	7,840	9,521	19,043	7,772	12,680	7,015	8,849	17,698
		Rate (HH)		7.2	30.2	57.1	3.3	9.2	63.1	3.2	26.2	1.6	7.2	57.1
		Rate (people)		9.3	35.2	64.9	4.4	11.6	70.9	4.1	31.4	2.2	9.3	64.9
Kota	Blitar	Line	629	7,658	11,488	15,317	6,765	8,278	16,556	6,757	11,024	7,015	8,849	17,698
		Rate (HH)		5.7	25.9	44.2	2.9	7.9	50.2	2.9	22.7	3.3	10.8	55.5
		Rate (people)		7.6	32.0	51.2	3.7	11.2	57.5	3.7	29.0	4.3	14.7	62.5
Kota	Malang	Line	719	9,037	13,555	18,073	7,783	9,767	19,535	7,973	13,008	7,015	8,849	17,698
		Rate (HH)		3.9	17.7	35.3	1.8	4.9	41.3	2.6	16.1	1.3	3.5	33.4
		Rate (people)		5.9	22.9	43.0	2.9	7.1	49.4	4.2	21.0	2.1	5.5	40.9
Kota	Probolinggo	Line	635	12,714	19,071	25,428	10,982	13,742	27,484	11,217	18,301	6,931	8,743	17,486
		Rate (HH)		16.3	54.3	79.4	7.9	25.4	84.5	8.7	51.2	0.5	2.6	47.1
		Rate (people)		19.0	60.6	83.1	9.5	30.1	87.8	10.5	58.0	0.7	3.2	53.4
Kota	Pasuruan	Line	606	8,036	12,054	16,072	6,758	8,686	17,372	7,090	11,568	7,015	8,849	17,698
		Rate (HH)		6.8	35.8	60.9	3.1	12.4	66.2	4.3	31.8	4.1	13.4	67.0
		Rate (people)		9.0	41.3	68.2	4.5	15.2	73.5	6.1	37.0	5.9	16.3	74.3
Kota	Mojokerto	Line	622	8,047	12,071	16,095	6,856	8,698	17,397	7,100	11,584	7,015	8,849	17,698
		Rate (HH)		5.3	27.5	48.9	2.4	8.7	55.8	2.9	24.9	2.7	9.2	57.2
		Rate (people)		7.4	33.2	55.3	3.6	11.0	62.5	4.3	30.5	4.1	11.6	63.8
Kota	Madiun	Line	627	7,940	11,910	15,880	6,939	8,582	17,164	7,005	11,429	7,015	8,849	17,698
		Rate (HH)		4.5	23.1	40.7	2.2	7.3	45.0	2.6	20.4	2.6	9.3	47.7
		Rate (people)		6.1	28.5	46.9	3.0	9.6	51.1	3.6	25.1	3.6	12.0	53.7
Kota	Surabaya	Line	1,120	9,290	13,936	18,581	7,820	10,042	20,084	8,197	13,374	7,015	8,849	17,698
		Rate (HH)		5.3	18.6	38.0	2.4	6.7	43.0	2.8	17.2	1.3	4.2	35.0
		Rate (people)		7.1	23.0	46.2	3.5	8.6	51.7	3.9	21.5	2.1	5.6	42.8
Kota	Batu	Line	928	8,314	12,471	16,628	7,487	8,987	17,973	7,335	11,968	6,924	8,734	17,467
		Rate (HH)		3.4	27.7	55.6	1.6	5.0	63.6	1.2	23.2	0.9	4.5	59.9
		Rate (people)		5.1	32.7	60.9	2.4	7.0	68.4	2.0	27.3	1.6	6.4	65.1
All Kota		Line	6,515	9,166	13,748	18,331	7,819	9,907	19,814	8,087	13,194	9,166	9,907	19,814
		Rate (HH)		5.6	22.1	42.4	2.6	7.6	47.8	3.0	20.2	1.5	5.0	40.1
		Rate (people)		7.5	27.1	50.1	3.7	9.8	55.9	4.3	25.0	2.4	6.8	47.7
Kabupaten	Pacitan	Line	694	5,829	8,744	11,658	4,993	6,300	12,601	5,143	8,391	6,241	7,873	15,745
		Rate (HH)		14.1	46.2	72.0	6.4	17.6	76.6	7.5	42.1	16.4	36.0	86.3
		Rate (people)		19.5	52.5	75.9	9.6	23.6	79.9	11.1	48.8	22.0	43.2	89.3
Kabupaten	Ponorogo	Line	763	6,347	9,520	12,694	5,520	6,860	13,720	5,600	9,136	6,355	8,017	16,033
		Rate (HH)		10.1	46.8	71.4	4.9	15.2	76.8	5.9	42.3	9.1	28.0	85.2
		Rate (people)		13.2	54.0	76.3	6.4	19.2	81.6	8.0	49.5	12.1	34.6	89.1
Kabupaten	Trenggalek	Line	735	6,426	9,638	12,851	5,553	6,945	13,890	5,669	9,250	6,369	8,034	16,067
		Rate (HH)		13.1	49.9	73.8	6.2	19.1	78.3	7.0	46.3	13.3	33.5	85.1
		Rate (people)		16.0	54.6	77.4	8.0	23.0	81.2	9.0	51.4	16.5	38.2	86.4
Kabupaten	Tulungagung	Line	762	7,048	10,571	14,095	6,204	7,617	15,235	6,218	10,145	6,525	8,231	16,461
		Rate (HH)		7.8	39.0	61.9	3.7	10.9	68.2	3.8	34.4	4.5	14.5	73.6
		Rate (people)		10.6	46.2	68.0	5.1	14.2	73.4	5.4	41.6	6.3	18.6	77.9
Kabupaten	Blitar	Line	782	6,329	9,494	12,658	5,400	6,841	13,682	5,584	9,111	6,453	8,140	16,281
		Rate (HH)		9.9	41.6	70.8	4.7	13.9	74.9	5.5	36.6	11.6	24.2	83.8
		Rate (people)		12.1	46.5	74.6	6.0	17.0	78.7	7.0	41.5	13.9	28.1	86.8
Kabupaten	Kediri	Line	849	6,583	9,875	13,166	5,852	7,116	14,231	5,808	9,476	6,522	8,227	16,455
		Rate (HH)		12.3	47.0	72.9	5.6	16.9	78.2	5.3	43.6	10.7	28.2	84.9
		Rate (people)		15.5	53.1	77.8	7.7	21.0	81.9	7.3	49.8	14.0	34.2	88.0
Kabupaten	Malang	Line	993	6,481	9,721	12,962	5,706	7,005	14,010	5,718	9,329	6,541	8,251	16,501
		Rate (HH)		10.5	38.9	63.1	5.1	14.4	69.6	5.2	34.7	10.6	23.4	79.3
		Rate (people)		12.5	42.9	67.2	6.2	16.7	73.1	6.3	38.7	12.8	27.5	82.3
Kabupaten	Lumajang	Line	796	6,093	9,139	12,185	5,419	6,585	13,171	5,375	8,770	6,363	8,027	16,053
		Rate (HH)		10.8	52.8	78.5	5.6	16.5	82.8	5.6	49.2	12.6	35.9	90.6
		Rate (people)		14.0	59.4	82.3	7.0	20.5	86.1	7.0	56.0	16.0	42.1	92.4
Kabupaten	Jember	Line	1,008	6,641	9,962	13,283	5,846	7,179	14,357	5,860	9,560	6,506	8,206	16,412
		Rate (HH)		10.5	48.6	74.6	5.2	16.1	80.4	5.3	44.2	9.2	27.1	86.2
		Rate (people)		13.3	54.7	78.7	6.6	19.6	84.0	6.7	50.4	11.8	32.1	89.3
Kabupaten	Banyuwangi	Line	928	7,234	10,851	14,468	6,295	7,819	15,638	6,382	10,413	6,590	8,313	16,626
		Rate (HH)		9.8	49.0	74.2	4.7	13.9	78.3	5.1	44.8	5.5	19.3	80.8
		Rate (people)		11.3	53.6	78.0	5.4	16.3	81.7	6.1	49.3	6.6	22.7	84.0
Kabupaten	Bondowoso	Line	760	7,553	11,330	15,107	6,772	8,164	16,328	6,664	10,873	6,403	8,077	16,154
		Rate (HH)		14.5	60.5	84.5	7.4	22.0	88.5	6.4	55.2	6.0	20.6	88.1
		Rate (people)		17.9	65.8	86.2	8.9	26.6	89.9	7.7	60.6	7.4	25.2	89.5
Kabupaten	Situbondo	Line	730	6,341	9,511	12,681	5,403	6,853	13,707	5,594	9,127	6,513	8,216	16,432
		Rate (HH)		13.2	47.8	76.3	6.4	18.8	79.9	7.7	44.3	14.3	33.5	88.8
		Rate (people)		16.2	52.3	78.3	8.0	22.2	81.5	9.7	49.0	17.3	38.0	89.8
Kabupaten	Probolinggo	Line	794	8,408	12,613	16,817	7,299	9,088	18,177	7,419	12,104	6,412	8,088	16,176
		Rate (HH)		21.8	67.9	85.4	10.9	29.7	88.3	12.7	63.7	4.9	18.7	84.0
		Rate (people)		25.2	71.2	87.5	12.5	34.1	90.0	14.6	67.8	5.9	21.6	86.5
Kabupaten	Pasuruan	Line	849	7,181	10,772	14,363	6,212	7,762	15,524	6,336	10,337	6,503	8,203	16,406
		Rate (HH)		11.3	44.2	68.6	5.3	17.0	74.1	6.2	40.3	6.5	19.9	78.5
		Rate (people)		13.2	49.1	73.5	6.3	19.4	78.6	7.7	44.6	8.2	23.0	82.5
Kabupaten	Sidoarjo	Line	915	8,182	12,272	16,363	7,359	8,843	17,686	7,218	11,777	6,931	8,743	17,485
		Rate (HH)		5.5	30.2	58.9	2.5	8.5	64.9	1.9	26.2	1.7	7.7	64.3
		Rate (people)		7.5	35.7	65.9	3.6	10.9	71.1	2.9	31.2	2.5	10.0	70.7
Kabupaten	Mojokerto	Line	764	7,235	10,853	14,470	6,316	7,820	15,640	6,383	10,415	6,551	8,264	16,527
		Rate (HH)		10.3	44.8	70.8	5.0	14.7	75.4	5.6	41.1	6.5	18.3	79.2
		Rate (people)		12.2	49.1	73.2	5.9	17.2	77.3	6.7	45.2	7.7	21.3	81.1
Kabupaten	Jombang	Line	816	7,561	11,341	15,122	6,691	8,172	16,345	6,671	10,884	6,663	8,404	16,809
		Rate (HH)		11.5	51.8	75.2	5.4	18.0	79.9	5.4	47.8	5.9	19.3	80.6
		Rate (people)		13.8	57.3	78.7	6.8	21.4	83.0	6.8	53.2	7.5	23.4	83.0
Kabupaten	Nganjuk	Line	792	7,636	11,455	15,273	6,792	8,254	16,508	6,737	10,993	6,436	8,118	16,236
		Rate (HH)		12.7	48.6	74.6	6.5	17.8	80.4	6.5	42.8	5.2	16.9	78.3
		Rate (people)		14.9	53.1	78.6	7.4	20.5	83.2	7.4	47.3	6.0	19.6	81.5
Kabupaten	Madiun	Line	731	6,769	10,154	13,539	6,055	7,317	14,634	5,973	9,745	6,375	8,042	16,083
		Rate (HH)		11.5	49.6	73.2	5.3	17.5	78.7	4.9	45.9	8.2	25.9	83.3
		Rate (people)		15.4	54.5	76.4	7.7	22.5	81.3	7.1	50.8	11.3	31.4	85.3
Kabupaten	Magetan	Line	699	6,685	10,027	13,369	5,604	7,225	14,450	5,898	9,622	6,456	8,143	16,286
		Rate (HH)		9.9	43.4	69.2	4.3	14.3	74.2	5.4	39.1	8.8	22.6	80.1
		Rate (people)		12.9	50.9	74.0	6.4	18.6	78.7	8.1	46.3	11.6	28.0	83.1
Kabupaten	Ngawi	Line	763	6,284	9,427	12,569	5,493	6,793	13,585	5,545	9,046	6,272	7,911	15,823
		Rate (HH)		14.7	59.1	81.7	7.4	23.4	86.3	8.3	53.2	14.6	40.2	92.3
		Rate (people)		18.3	65.5	85.7	8.9	28.4	88.9	10.0	59.5	18.2	46.9	94.2
Kabupaten	Bojonegoro	Line	826	6,944	10,416	13,888	5,964	7,506	15,011	6,126	9,996	6,279	7,921	15,842
		Rate (HH)		15.6	56.2	79.7	7.6	22.4	83.6	9.3	51.2	9.6	26.5	85.7
		Rate (people)		18.8	60.4	82.3	9.3	26.2	85.6	11.2	55.4	11.9	30.6	87.8
Kabupaten	Tuban	Line	760	6,793	10,190	13,587	5,740	7,343	14,686	5,994	9,779	6,327	7,981	15,962
		Rate (HH)		16.8	53.9	78.1	8.1	21.7	83.3	10.0	49.7	12.6	27.7	86.9
		Rate (people)		20.2	58.8	81.0	10.0	25.5	85.3	12.3	54.7	15.3	32.7	88.8
Kabupaten	Lamongan	Line	789	7,279	10,919	14,559	6,259	7,868	15,736	6,422	10,479	6,298	7,944	15,889
		Rate (HH)		15.5	54.5	79.5	7.2	21.9	83.7	8.7	49.9	6.5	21.7	85.2
		Rate (people)		18.7	58.2	82.0	9.3	25.6	85.9	11.0	53.8	8.4	25.4	87.3
Kabupaten	Gresik	Line	762	8,499	12,748	16,997	7,686	9,186	18,372	7,498	12,234	6,650	8,389	16,778
		Rate (HH)		14.1	52.1	74.7	6.9	21.1	80.1	6.1	48.4	1.3	12.6	74.9
		Rate (people)		16.4	57.6	79.4	8.1	24.2	84.2	7.2	53.6	1.9	14.9	79.5
Kabupaten	Bangkalan	Line	717	7,504	11,255	15,007	6,292	8,110	16,221	6,620	10,801	6,322	7,974	15,948

Figure 2 (Kalimantan Barat): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Pontianak	Line	582	7,982	11,972	15,963	6,275	8,627	17,254	7,042	11,489	6,835	8,621	17,242
		Rate (HH)		4.8	21.1	37.5	2.1	6.0	40.7	3.1	18.4	2.7	6.0	40.7
		Rate (people)		6.6	25.6	44.6	3.1	7.8	47.7	4.4	22.5	3.9	7.8	47.7
Kota	Singkawang	Line	582	7,800	11,700	15,600	7,168	8,431	16,861	6,882	11,228	6,573	8,292	16,583
		Rate (HH)		5.3	20.8	43.6	2.8	6.9	50.8	2.0	17.6	1.5	6.1	48.5
		Rate (people)		6.1	25.3	50.3	3.0	8.3	57.5	2.3	21.4	1.6	7.2	55.7
All Kota		Line	1,164	7,936	11,904	15,871	6,500	8,577	17,155	7,001	11,423	7,936	8,577	17,155
		Rate (HH)		4.9	21.1	39.0	2.3	6.2	43.2	2.8	18.2	2.4	6.0	42.7
		Rate (people)		6.5	25.5	46.0	3.1	8.0	50.2	3.9	22.2	3.4	7.7	49.7
Kabupaten	Sambas	Line	593	6,685	10,027	13,369	5,798	7,225	14,451	5,898	9,623	6,145	7,751	15,502
		Rate (HH)		8.6	39.8	66.7	4.0	15.3	72.5	4.6	36.5	5.4	18.0	77.1
		Rate (people)		10.1	45.0	71.1	4.9	18.0	76.0	5.6	41.4	6.7	21.2	80.3
Kabupaten	Bengkayang	Line	575	6,110	9,165	12,220	5,303	6,604	13,208	5,391	8,795	6,063	7,648	15,296
		Rate (HH)		5.5	22.0	48.2	2.3	8.4	57.4	2.9	19.3	4.7	12.2	68.9
		Rate (people)		7.8	27.9	55.1	3.9	11.6	65.0	4.7	24.6	6.8	16.5	76.0
Kabupaten	Landak	Line	603	6,182	9,272	12,363	5,384	6,681	13,363	5,454	8,898	6,064	7,649	15,297
		Rate (HH)		10.8	42.1	64.3	5.0	14.8	71.1	5.6	37.1	8.8	21.2	79.2
		Rate (people)		14.1	49.4	71.3	6.9	18.7	77.1	7.6	44.2	11.6	26.5	84.1
Kabupaten	Pontianak	Line	623	5,928	8,893	11,857	5,234	6,408	12,816	5,230	8,534	6,185	7,802	15,604
		Rate (HH)		4.1	25.0	50.0	2.0	5.8	59.2	2.0	22.3	4.8	14.2	72.5
		Rate (people)		6.4	31.3	58.6	3.0	8.7	66.7	3.0	28.5	7.4	19.6	78.4
Kabupaten	Sanggau	Line	596	5,508	8,261	11,015	4,893	5,953	11,906	4,859	7,928	6,160	7,771	15,541
		Rate (HH)		3.2	14.5	27.8	1.6	4.9	34.5	1.6	13.8	5.0	11.3	55.1
		Rate (people)		5.0	18.2	32.9	2.3	7.2	39.5	2.3	17.4	7.2	14.8	60.9
Kabupaten	Ketapang	Line	597	7,415	11,123	14,830	6,283	8,015	16,030	6,542	10,674	6,188	7,806	15,611
		Rate (HH)		10.1	39.0	62.7	5.0	14.9	68.5	6.3	34.7	3.5	12.1	66.4
		Rate (people)		13.7	45.2	69.1	6.7	19.9	74.1	8.9	40.8	5.0	16.4	72.7
Kabupaten	Sintang	Line	591	8,346	12,519	16,692	7,573	9,021	18,042	7,363	12,014	6,118	7,718	15,435
		Rate (HH)		7.1	41.6	63.6	3.5	13.9	70.7	3.3	38.1	0.9	3.6	56.9
		Rate (people)		9.8	47.8	70.4	4.6	17.7	77.2	4.3	44.4	1.3	4.8	64.6
Kabupaten	Kapuas Hulu	Line	552	7,295	10,942	14,590	6,721	7,885	15,770	6,436	10,501	6,063	7,648	15,297
		Rate (HH)		8.6	31.9	56.6	4.1	11.8	61.6	3.6	29.5	2.4	10.3	58.9
		Rate (people)		11.4	36.5	62.7	5.6	15.0	67.3	4.9	34.2	3.1	13.2	65.3
Kabupaten	Sekadau	Line	604	5,701	8,552	11,402	5,274	6,162	12,325	5,030	8,207	6,056	7,639	15,279
		Rate (HH)		4.7	30.3	55.5	2.4	8.0	60.1	2.0	26.9	7.3	19.9	73.4
		Rate (people)		6.8	37.6	62.7	3.3	11.5	66.5	2.9	33.8	10.4	25.9	78.9
Kabupaten	Melawi	Line	587	8,312	12,468	16,624	7,138	8,984	17,968	7,333	11,965	6,113	7,711	15,422
		Rate (HH)		10.1	39.8	64.5	4.7	13.2	70.4	5.5	33.9	0.6	6.6	58.2
		Rate (people)		13.8	46.7	70.1	6.7	17.7	75.3	7.6	40.3	0.7	9.1	64.5
Kabupaten	Kayong Utara	Line	400	5,223	7,834	10,446	4,613	5,645	11,290	4,608	7,518	6,078	7,667	15,334
		Rate (HH)		8.6	37.3	64.0	3.9	11.5	69.8	3.9	34.9	15.9	35.5	84.8
		Rate (people)		11.7	42.7	68.6	5.5	15.4	73.7	5.5	41.0	20.7	41.6	88.2
Kabupaten	Kubu Raya	Line	581	6,465	9,697	12,929	5,700	6,987	13,975	5,704	9,306	6,244	7,876	15,752
		Rate (HH)		4.8	24.7	49.5	2.1	6.6	56.2	2.3	21.9	3.1	9.7	66.6
		Rate (people)		7.1	29.8	54.0	3.5	9.1	60.9	3.7	27.3	5.0	13.6	70.6
All Kabupaten		Line	6,902	6,676	10,014	13,352	5,879	7,216	14,432	5,890	9,610	6,676	7,216	14,432
		Rate (HH)		7.1	32.3	55.6	3.4	11.0	62.1	3.7	29.1	4.5	13.1	67.2
		Rate (people)		9.6	37.9	61.4	4.7	14.3	67.5	5.1	34.6	6.3	17.0	72.8
All Kalimantan Barat		Line	8,066	6,888	10,332	13,776	5,984	7,445	14,890	6,077	9,915	6,246	7,879	15,757
		Rate (HH)		6.8	30.5	52.9	3.2	10.2	59.1	3.5	27.3	4.1	11.9	63.2
		Rate (people)		9.1	35.8	58.8	4.4	13.2	64.6	4.9	32.5	5.8	15.5	68.9

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Kalimantan Selatan): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)											
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines			
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP		
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50	
Kota	Banjarmasin	Line	579	8,805	13,207	17,609	7,926	9,517	19,033	7,768	12,674	7,562	9,539	19,079	
		Rate (HH)		3.1	17.7	40.5	1.4	3.7	47.9	0.8	15.4	0.8	3.7	47.9	
		Rate (people)		5.0	24.1	48.8	2.4	5.9	56.4	1.5	21.0	1.5	5.9	56.3	
Kota	Banjar Baru	Line	546	10,021	15,032	20,043	7,560	10,832	21,664	8,842	14,426	7,544	9,515	19,031	
		Rate (HH)		4.8	19.3	35.7	2.2	6.7	40.3	3.5	18.1	2.3	3.7	33.0	
		Rate (people)		6.0	23.1	41.1	2.8	8.5	46.0	4.5	21.7	3.0	4.8	38.3	
All Kota		Line	1,125	9,100	13,650	18,200	7,837	9,836	19,672	8,029	13,099	9,100	9,836	19,672	
		Rate (HH)		3.5	18.1	39.3	1.6	4.4	46.0	1.4	16.0	1.2	3.7	44.3	
		Rate (people)		5.3	23.8	46.9	2.5	6.5	53.9	2.2	21.2	1.9	5.6	51.9	
Kabupaten	Tanah Laut	Line	584	8,107	12,160	16,213	7,347	8,762	17,525	7,152	11,670	6,733	8,494	16,987	
		Rate (HH)		3.9	25.6	48.9	2.0	5.9	56.1	1.8	23.3	0.6	4.2	53.4	
		Rate (people)		5.1	29.9	54.3	2.5	7.8	61.3	2.3	27.7	0.7	5.6	59.3	
Kabupaten	Kota Baru	Line	579	7,580	11,370	15,160	6,532	8,193	16,386	6,688	10,912	6,732	8,492	16,984	
		Rate (HH)		3.7	18.0	37.2	1.6	5.3	43.0	2.3	15.4	1.8	5.8	44.4	
		Rate (people)		5.4	23.7	44.5	2.5	8.0	50.9	3.9	20.6	3.0	8.5	52.8	
Kabupaten	Banjar	Line	592	7,587	11,380	15,173	6,421	8,200	16,400	6,693	10,921	6,809	8,589	17,178	
		Rate (HH)		2.2	16.7	39.7	0.6	3.6	46.0	1.2	14.5	0.9	3.7	49.8	
		Rate (people)		3.3	20.1	44.3	1.3	5.0	51.0	2.1	17.4	1.9	5.1	55.1	
Kabupaten	Barito Kuala	Line	586	6,092	9,139	12,185	5,627	6,585	13,170	5,375	8,770	6,707	8,460	16,920	
		Rate (HH)		4.0	28.3	55.8	1.9	8.1	61.6	1.1	25.3	7.7	22.5	81.0	
		Rate (people)		5.7	34.3	62.0	2.8	10.9	67.5	1.5	31.5	10.3	28.8	84.3	
Kabupaten	Tapin	Line	586	7,254	10,881	14,509	6,194	7,841	15,682	6,400	10,443	6,625	8,357	16,714	
		Rate (HH)		3.5	21.1	42.5	1.4	6.0	48.8	1.6	17.4	1.9	8.6	53.5	
		Rate (people)		5.6	27.6	50.9	2.6	9.0	56.9	2.9	23.3	3.2	12.2	61.7	
Kabupaten	Hulu Sungai Selatan	Line	592	8,445	12,668	16,891	7,515	9,128	18,257	7,451	12,157	6,744	8,507	17,014	
		Rate (HH)		5.5	30.4	60.4	2.4	7.4	65.4	2.3	26.8	1.0	4.3	60.4	
		Rate (people)		7.7	37.6	67.5	3.7	9.7	72.0	3.6	33.9	1.6	5.7	67.8	
Kabupaten	Hulu Sungai Tengah	Line	595	6,880	10,320	13,760	6,059	7,437	14,873	6,070	9,904	6,671	8,415	16,831	
		Rate (HH)		4.6	30.0	57.6	2.2	7.0	63.7	2.4	26.2	3.6	11.4	72.5	
		Rate (people)		6.3	36.6	64.6	3.1	9.5	69.7	3.6	32.2	5.0	15.1	77.9	
Kabupaten	Hulu Sungai Utara	Line	591	8,081	12,122	16,163	7,499	8,735	17,470	7,130	11,633	6,777	8,548	17,097	
		Rate (HH)		5.5	39.9	64.8	2.7	10.8	71.5	1.5	36.1	1.4	7.4	68.1	
		Rate (people)		7.8	47.0	71.0	3.8	14.8	77.3	1.9	43.3	1.6	10.2	74.1	
Kabupaten	Tabalong	Line	576	8,259	12,389	16,518	7,378	8,927	17,854	7,287	11,889	6,760	8,527	17,053	
		Rate (HH)		4.6	26.4	51.8	2.1	7.8	56.0	1.9	23.7	0.8	4.6	53.0	
		Rate (people)		6.5	32.6	58.4	3.2	10.4	62.5	2.8	30.0	1.4	6.4	59.5	
Kabupaten	Tanah Bumbu	Line	555	8,212	12,318	16,423	7,016	8,876	17,752	7,245	11,821	6,965	8,785	17,570	
		Rate (HH)		4.6	19.1	37.1	2.2	5.9	42.9	2.4	17.8	1.1	5.0	41.3	
		Rate (people)		6.5	24.4	44.0	2.9	7.9	49.7	3.2	22.8	1.5	7.0	48.0	
Kabupaten	Balangan	Line	595	7,444	11,166	14,888	6,418	8,046	16,092	6,567	10,715	6,580	8,300	16,601	
		Rate (HH)		6.6	31.3	59.0	3.2	9.6	65.4	3.6	26.5	3.6	10.2	67.7	
		Rate (people)		7.7	36.2	63.9	3.8	11.8	69.3	4.4	31.8	4.4	12.5	71.9	
All Kabupaten		Line	6,431	7,622	11,432	15,243	6,703	8,238	16,476	6,724	10,971	7,622	8,238	16,476	
		Rate (HH)		4.1	24.8	48.8	1.8	6.5	54.8	1.9	21.9	2.1	7.6	57.4	
		Rate (people)		5.8	30.2	54.9	2.7	8.9	60.8	2.8	27.1	3.0	10.1	63.3	
All Kalimantan Selatan		Line	7,556	7,958	11,937	15,916	6,961	8,602	17,203	7,021	11,456	6,937	8,751	17,502	
		Rate (HH)		4.0	23.2	46.6	1.8	6.0	52.8	1.8	20.5	1.9	6.7	54.3	
		Rate (people)		5.6	28.7	53.1	2.7	8.3	59.2	2.7	25.8	2.8	9.1	60.7	

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Kalimantan Tengah): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Palangka Raya	Line	559	7,336	11,003	14,671	6,687	7,929	15,858	6,472	10,560	7,231	9,121	18,242
		Rate (HH)		3.6	14.1	29.7	1.7	4.5	34.4	1.6	11.9	2.8	7.5	44.0
		Rate (people)		5.3	19.2	36.6	2.5	6.7	42.1	2.3	16.6	4.3	10.3	52.6
All Kota		Line	559	7,336	11,003	14,671	6,687	7,929	15,858	6,472	10,560	7,336	7,929	15,858
		Rate (HH)		3.6	14.1	29.7	1.7	4.5	34.4	1.6	11.9	2.8	7.5	44.0
		Rate (people)		5.3	19.2	36.6	2.5	6.7	42.1	2.3	16.6	4.3	10.3	52.6
Kabupaten	Kotawaringin Barat	Line	570	7,857	11,786	15,714	6,365	8,493	16,985	6,932	11,310	7,114	8,974	17,948
		Rate (HH)		5.9	23.2	51.2	2.3	8.9	58.6	3.6	20.1	3.6	10.4	64.0
		Rate (people)		7.0	28.0	56.7	3.3	10.7	64.7	5.1	23.7	5.1	12.5	69.5
Kabupaten	Kotawaringin Timur	Line	585	8,118	12,177	16,236	7,439	8,775	17,549	7,162	11,686	7,088	8,941	17,882
		Rate (HH)		5.5	33.7	61.7	2.6	8.5	67.1	2.2	29.9	2.0	8.8	69.2
		Rate (people)		8.4	42.0	69.0	4.2	12.8	73.8	3.4	38.0	3.1	13.2	75.8
Kabupaten	Kapuas	Line	562	6,413	9,620	12,826	5,193	6,932	13,863	5,658	9,232	7,051	8,894	17,788
		Rate (HH)		5.1	17.5	38.0	2.2	5.9	43.5	2.8	15.7	6.5	13.9	61.4
		Rate (people)		7.1	21.7	43.0	3.3	7.8	48.7	4.5	19.5	8.8	17.7	66.0
Kabupaten	Barito Selatan	Line	618	8,603	12,904	17,206	7,187	9,299	18,597	7,590	12,384	7,059	8,904	17,808
		Rate (HH)		6.1	22.8	42.6	3.0	8.5	47.5	3.5	20.5	2.8	6.8	44.4
		Rate (people)		8.6	29.0	50.6	4.1	11.2	55.9	4.9	25.9	3.8	9.4	52.8
Kabupaten	Barito Utara	Line	570	8,798	13,197	17,596	8,208	9,509	19,019	7,762	12,665	7,068	8,915	17,830
		Rate (HH)		5.0	27.9	54.8	2.3	7.5	60.4	1.5	24.8	0.9	5.0	55.8
		Rate (people)		7.2	36.0	63.8	3.4	11.0	69.1	2.5	32.6	1.6	7.2	64.9
Kabupaten	Sukamara	Line	577	8,894	13,341	17,788	8,072	9,614	19,227	7,847	12,803	7,070	8,919	17,837
		Rate (HH)		4.6	20.8	45.4	2.2	6.4	49.5	1.8	18.4	0.7	4.4	45.6
		Rate (people)		6.6	27.6	54.9	3.2	9.1	59.0	2.7	24.6	1.0	6.2	55.1
Kabupaten	Lamandau	Line	518	8,115	12,172	16,230	7,487	8,771	17,542	7,159	11,681	7,045	8,886	17,773
		Rate (HH)		5.1	22.3	46.0	2.4	5.5	53.2	2.2	19.8	1.8	5.5	53.5
		Rate (people)		5.8	26.8	52.2	2.8	6.4	59.5	2.5	23.2	2.0	6.4	59.8
Kabupaten	Seruyan	Line	558	8,362	12,543	16,724	7,583	9,038	18,076	7,377	12,037	7,046	8,888	17,775
		Rate (HH)		5.6	24.3	47.3	2.5	8.0	54.0	2.3	21.2	2.0	8.2	53.1
		Rate (people)		10.0	35.1	60.6	4.8	13.6	67.1	4.4	31.7	3.9	14.0	66.2
Kabupaten	Katingan	Line	565	8,692	13,038	17,383	7,003	9,395	18,789	7,668	12,512	7,059	8,904	17,808
		Rate (HH)		4.8	18.1	37.1	2.2	6.6	41.4	3.2	15.6	2.0	5.0	38.5
		Rate (people)		7.6	24.0	44.8	3.7	9.7	50.0	5.4	20.8	3.4	7.9	46.4
Kabupaten	Pulang Pisau	Line	584	7,971	11,956	15,941	7,283	8,615	17,231	7,032	11,474	7,029	8,866	17,733
		Rate (HH)		4.4	31.6	57.5	2.0	8.4	63.4	0.9	28.2	1.0	9.8	65.6
		Rate (people)		6.2	36.4	61.6	2.9	12.2	67.2	1.3	33.1	1.4	14.1	69.1
Kabupaten	Gunung Mas	Line	538	8,212	12,318	16,424	7,296	8,876	17,753	7,245	11,821	7,050	8,893	17,785
		Rate (HH)		5.6	27.4	47.6	2.6	7.0	52.7	2.4	23.7	1.7	7.2	51.9
		Rate (people)		8.1	33.3	54.0	4.0	10.1	59.4	3.8	29.6	2.5	10.3	58.2
Kabupaten	Barito Timur	Line	618	9,504	14,257	19,009	8,272	10,273	20,546	8,386	13,682	7,062	8,908	17,816
		Rate (HH)		7.6	27.2	47.9	3.7	10.0	52.1	3.9	24.6	1.6	4.8	42.5
		Rate (people)		10.5	33.1	55.2	5.1	13.1	59.3	5.3	30.2	2.4	7.1	49.5
Kabupaten	Murung Raya	Line	593	8,969	13,454	17,938	8,635	9,694	19,389	7,913	12,911	7,034	8,873	17,745
		Rate (HH)		4.3	35.7	62.6	1.9	8.7	66.7	0.9	31.2	0.0	3.3	61.4
		Rate (people)		7.0	45.6	72.2	3.1	13.6	75.8	1.4	40.8	0.0	5.7	70.8
All Kabupaten		Line	7,456	8,057	12,086	16,114	7,048	8,709	17,417	7,109	11,598	8,057	8,709	17,417
		Rate (HH)		5.4	25.6	49.6	2.4	7.8	55.2	2.5	22.6	2.7	8.5	57.8
		Rate (people)		7.8	32.2	56.9	3.7	11.0	62.5	3.9	28.8	3.9	11.8	64.8
All Kalimantan Tengah		Line	8,015	7,985	11,977	15,970	7,012	8,631	17,261	7,045	11,494	7,082	8,934	17,867
		Rate (HH)		5.2	24.4	47.6	2.4	7.4	53.1	2.4	21.5	2.7	8.4	56.4
		Rate (people)		7.5	30.9	54.9	3.6	10.5	60.4	3.7	27.5	3.9	11.7	63.6

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Kalimantan Timur): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Balikpapan	Line	685	10,306	15,460	20,613	9,149	11,140	22,280	9,093	14,836	10,002	12,617	25,234
		Rate (HH)		2.6	16.0	33.5	1.2	3.9	39.9	1.2	14.0	1.6	6.7	49.9
		Rate (people)		4.1	21.2	41.8	2.0	5.5	48.4	2.0	18.9	2.6	9.8	58.7
Kota	Samarinda	Line	816	11,085	16,627	22,170	9,835	11,981	23,962	9,780	15,957	9,997	12,610	25,220
		Rate (HH)		3.0	13.5	30.0	1.5	3.8	35.5	1.5	10.9	1.5	5.2	40.7
		Rate (people)		5.2	19.1	38.2	2.6	6.4	44.0	2.6	15.8	2.6	8.0	49.5
Kota	Tarakan	Line	472	10,680	16,020	21,360	8,533	11,544	23,088	9,423	15,374	9,962	12,566	25,132
		Rate (HH)		5.8	27.4	48.1	2.1	7.7	54.5	2.8	25.5	4.3	9.9	61.0
		Rate (people)		10.2	35.0	57.6	4.8	13.3	63.0	5.8	32.7	8.0	15.8	69.2
Kota	Bontang	Line	486	10,314	15,471	20,628	9,295	11,148	22,296	9,100	14,847	10,061	12,691	25,383
		Rate (HH)		5.0	21.7	39.1	2.4	6.8	44.7	2.1	18.4	4.1	9.6	54.8
		Rate (people)		6.7	27.1	44.6	3.2	9.5	50.2	2.9	23.3	5.5	12.4	60.3
All Kota		Line	2,459	10,701	16,051	21,401	9,396	11,566	23,132	9,441	15,404	10,701	11,566	23,132
		Rate (HH)		3.3	16.7	34.1	1.5	4.6	40.0	1.6	14.3	2.1	6.7	47.5
		Rate (people)		5.5	22.4	42.3	2.7	7.2	48.4	2.8	19.5	3.5	9.9	56.0
Kabupaten	Pasir	Line	627	8,180	12,269	16,359	6,559	8,841	17,682	7,217	11,774	8,853	11,167	22,335
		Rate (HH)		6.4	21.7	43.1	2.5	8.9	47.4	4.0	18.9	6.6	15.2	64.2
		Rate (people)		9.5	28.2	48.7	4.6	12.8	52.9	6.5	24.9	9.8	20.4	70.5
Kabupaten	Kutai Barat	Line	515	9,003	13,505	18,007	7,374	9,731	19,463	7,943	12,960	8,522	10,750	21,500
		Rate (HH)		7.7	30.2	51.7	3.1	12.3	57.5	4.5	28.4	6.6	16.0	65.9
		Rate (people)		9.9	37.0	59.8	4.7	15.5	64.8	6.1	34.5	8.9	19.9	73.4
Kabupaten	Kutai	Line	752	8,970	13,455	17,940	7,554	9,695	19,391	7,914	12,912	8,804	11,105	22,210
		Rate (HH)		6.0	26.9	45.1	2.6	8.2	51.5	3.7	23.2	5.7	14.0	62.2
		Rate (people)		8.7	31.4	50.7	4.2	11.5	57.2	5.5	27.7	8.2	18.1	68.3
Kabupaten	Kutai Timur	Line	527	9,867	14,800	19,733	8,103	10,665	21,329	8,705	14,203	8,972	11,317	22,634
		Rate (HH)		6.9	26.5	46.3	2.6	8.8	52.0	3.8	24.3	3.0	8.9	55.6
		Rate (people)		11.4	35.4	55.3	5.4	13.9	60.1	7.4	33.1	6.1	14.1	64.6
Kabupaten	Berau	Line	464	9,933	14,899	19,865	9,209	10,736	21,472	8,763	14,298	9,139	11,528	23,056
		Rate (HH)		4.8	20.5	45.3	2.2	7.0	50.0	2.0	18.1	1.5	7.4	54.4
		Rate (people)		6.6	25.6	51.3	3.2	9.3	55.9	2.8	23.4	2.2	10.1	61.0
Kabupaten	Malinau	Line	397	10,464	15,696	20,928	9,114	11,310	22,620	9,232	15,063	8,641	10,899	21,799
		Rate (HH)		10.7	40.7	61.5	4.7	17.2	66.3	5.8	38.9	2.4	11.9	65.9
		Rate (people)		15.3	48.6	68.3	7.3	23.6	73.1	8.7	46.6	3.6	16.4	73.1
Kabupaten	Bulungan	Line	433	8,175	12,262	16,350	7,203	8,836	17,672	7,212	11,768	8,947	11,286	22,572
		Rate (HH)		10.2	32.4	48.8	4.7	14.4	53.1	5.2	29.8	11.3	24.2	66.5
		Rate (people)		14.6	40.9	56.8	6.7	19.3	60.1	7.6	38.3	15.9	32.1	73.0
Kabupaten	Nunukan	Line	412	7,529	11,294	15,058	6,405	8,138	16,276	6,643	10,838	8,915	11,245	22,490
		Rate (HH)		8.7	32.5	49.9	3.9	12.1	55.9	5.2	28.1	16.9	30.5	76.2
		Rate (people)		12.4	41.9	60.3	6.0	17.1	65.9	7.9	36.4	23.7	38.8	84.6
Kabupaten	Penajam Paser Utara	Line	597	8,587	12,880	17,174	7,330	9,281	18,563	7,576	12,361	8,880	11,201	22,403
		Rate (HH)		8.4	27.6	52.1	3.8	10.5	58.3	5.1	26.5	7.8	19.0	73.3
		Rate (people)		10.5	32.5	58.6	5.2	12.9	64.1	6.8	31.3	9.9	23.5	79.4
Kabupaten	Tana Tidung	Line	333	7,969	11,953	15,938	6,594	8,613	17,227	7,031	11,471	8,173	10,309	20,618
		Rate (HH)		9.9	32.1	50.8	4.5	12.9	55.6	5.4	29.4	10.2	20.1	67.0
		Rate (people)		13.9	40.6	61.1	6.5	17.3	65.2	7.9	37.6	14.2	26.7	76.3
All Kabupaten		Line	5,057	8,946	13,419	17,892	7,567	9,670	19,339	7,893	12,878	8,946	9,670	19,339
		Rate (HH)		7.0	27.1	47.2	3.0	9.7	52.8	4.0	24.3	6.3	15.1	63.3
		Rate (people)		10.1	33.5	54.2	4.8	13.5	59.5	6.2	30.4	9.2	20.0	70.4
All Kalimantan Timur		Line	7,516	9,746	14,619	19,492	8,401	10,534	21,068	8,598	14,029	9,375	11,825	23,650
		Rate (HH)		5.3	22.4	41.3	2.3	7.4	47.0	2.9	19.8	4.4	11.3	56.2
		Rate (people)		8.0	28.5	48.8	3.9	10.6	54.4	4.6	25.5	6.6	15.4	63.8

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Kepulauan Riau): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Batam	Line	620	13,211	19,817	26,423	11,500	14,280	28,560	11,656	19,018	10,523	13,274	26,548
		Rate (HH)		4.9	23.0	47.6	2.3	7.7	56.7	2.7	19.4	1.4	4.8	49.1
		Rate (people)		7.3	29.1	56.2	3.6	10.5	65.5	4.0	25.6	2.1	7.0	57.9
Kota	Tanjung Pinang	Line	659	14,329	21,494	28,658	11,851	15,488	30,976	12,642	20,627	10,479	13,218	26,436
		Rate (HH)		8.6	34.5	56.4	4.1	13.7	61.9	5.6	29.6	1.6	6.2	50.8
		Rate (people)		12.6	42.2	64.2	6.2	19.2	69.0	8.1	36.5	2.6	9.3	59.0
All Kota		Line	1,279	13,395	20,092	26,789	11,558	14,478	28,956	11,818	19,282	13,395	14,478	28,956
		Rate (HH)		5.5	24.9	49.1	2.6	8.7	57.5	3.2	21.1	1.5	5.0	49.4
		Rate (people)		8.1	31.2	57.5	4.0	11.9	66.1	4.7	27.4	2.2	7.4	58.0
Kabupaten	Karimun	Line	581	8,377	12,565	16,753	7,406	9,054	18,108	7,390	12,058	9,859	12,436	24,871
		Rate (HH)		5.3	24.7	50.3	2.6	8.6	58.6	2.6	22.4	10.1	22.5	78.1
		Rate (people)		7.2	31.4	57.4	3.3	11.9	66.1	3.3	28.2	14.0	28.9	84.2
Kabupaten	Bintan	Line	653	9,032	13,548	18,064	7,597	9,762	19,525	7,969	13,001	9,850	12,425	24,851
		Rate (HH)		4.8	21.7	44.5	2.2	7.6	50.2	2.9	18.9	7.5	16.2	68.8
		Rate (people)		7.3	27.2	51.0	3.4	11.2	56.6	4.5	24.3	10.6	21.1	74.8
Kabupaten	Natuna	Line	449	7,146	10,719	14,292	6,227	7,724	15,448	6,305	10,287	9,549	12,045	24,090
		Rate (HH)		3.8	16.8	33.6	1.8	4.5	42.1	2.0	15.0	9.6	19.5	74.7
		Rate (people)		4.8	20.8	38.6	2.2	5.8	47.9	2.6	18.6	12.3	24.1	80.8
Kabupaten	Lingga	Line	468	10,208	15,312	20,416	8,551	11,033	22,067	9,006	14,694	9,431	11,896	23,793
		Rate (HH)		12.2	35.4	58.4	5.5	16.1	64.9	7.7	33.4	8.8	19.1	69.3
		Rate (people)		15.8	41.2	65.0	7.8	19.9	70.9	10.5	39.3	12.1	23.0	75.2
Kabupaten	Kepulauan Anambas	Line	474	8,057	12,086	16,115	6,671	8,709	17,418	7,109	11,599	9,448	11,918	23,836
		Rate (HH)		3.4	25.7	47.1	1.5	5.9	51.4	1.7	22.3	8.0	23.4	71.0
		Rate (people)		4.8	31.7	53.2	2.3	7.5	57.1	2.4	27.7	10.1	29.3	75.8
All Kabupaten		Line	2,625	8,657	12,985	17,313	7,436	9,357	18,714	7,638	12,461	8,657	9,357	18,714
		Rate (HH)		6.0	24.7	47.7	2.8	8.9	54.8	3.4	22.3	9.0	20.0	73.3
		Rate (people)		8.1	30.5	54.3	3.8	11.9	61.5	4.6	27.7	12.3	25.4	79.3
All Kepulauan Riau		Line	3,904	11,861	17,792	23,723	10,224	12,821	25,642	10,465	17,075	10,259	12,941	25,882
		Rate (HH)		5.7	24.8	48.6	2.7	8.8	56.7	3.2	21.5	3.9	9.7	56.9
		Rate (people)		8.1	31.0	56.5	3.9	11.9	64.6	4.7	27.5	5.5	13.2	64.9

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Lampung): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Bandar Lampung	Line	669	10,470	15,705	20,940	8,836	11,317	22,633	9,237	15,071	7,747	9,772	19,544
		Rate (HH)		11.3	39.2	61.6	5.1	15.6	66.7	6.8	36.0	3.1	8.8	55.0
		Rate (people)		14.6	44.4	66.0	7.2	19.3	71.4	9.3	41.4	4.3	12.0	59.4
Kota	Metro	Line	562	7,284	10,926	14,569	6,209	7,873	15,747	6,427	10,486	7,733	9,755	19,510
		Rate (HH)		10.7	36.1	57.4	5.1	15.3	65.2	5.9	33.2	14.8	28.1	76.8
		Rate (people)		13.8	41.8	63.4	6.9	19.2	71.0	8.1	39.0	18.6	33.4	81.5
All Kota		Line	1,231	10,018	15,027	20,036	8,463	10,828	21,656	8,839	14,421	10,018	10,828	21,656
		Rate (HH)		11.2	38.7	60.9	5.1	15.6	66.5	6.6	35.6	4.9	11.7	58.3
		Rate (people)		14.5	44.1	65.6	7.1	19.3	71.3	9.1	41.0	6.3	15.0	62.5
Kabupaten	Lampung Barat	Line	610	7,813	11,720	15,627	6,993	8,445	16,891	6,894	11,247	6,362	8,025	16,050
		Rate (HH)		13.8	49.5	73.2	7.1	17.8	78.9	6.7	45.1	4.1	15.6	74.6
		Rate (people)		17.1	56.5	77.9	8.4	21.9	82.4	8.1	52.6	5.1	19.4	79.2
Kabupaten	Tanggamus	Line	722	7,315	10,973	14,630	6,413	7,907	15,814	6,454	10,530	6,477	8,171	16,341
		Rate (HH)		15.2	56.4	78.5	7.5	22.9	82.3	8.2	51.8	7.2	25.0	83.8
		Rate (people)		18.3	62.9	83.1	9.0	26.7	86.3	9.7	58.0	8.3	28.9	87.6
Kabupaten	Lampung Selatan	Line	781	7,467	11,200	14,933	6,292	8,071	16,141	6,588	10,748	6,636	8,370	16,741
		Rate (HH)		16.7	49.0	73.0	7.7	21.1	76.4	9.7	45.6	9.7	24.1	78.3
		Rate (people)		20.6	54.0	77.2	10.2	25.2	80.3	12.5	50.8	12.7	28.8	82.1
Kabupaten	Lampung Timur	Line	756	7,486	11,229	14,972	6,344	8,091	16,183	6,605	10,776	6,359	8,022	16,043
		Rate (HH)		17.6	57.5	79.8	8.6	24.3	87.3	10.4	54.3	8.9	23.4	85.7
		Rate (people)		21.1	61.7	82.6	10.5	28.1	89.3	12.6	58.4	10.9	27.4	88.0
Kabupaten	Lampung Tengah	Line	779	7,865	11,798	15,730	6,904	8,501	17,002	6,939	11,322	6,408	8,084	16,167
		Rate (HH)		14.4	51.5	76.9	6.8	21.1	82.1	7.1	46.9	4.6	15.2	78.5
		Rate (people)		16.9	55.8	79.2	8.4	24.3	84.1	8.8	51.2	5.4	17.9	80.9
Kabupaten	Lampung Utara	Line	619	7,949	11,924	15,898	6,672	8,592	17,184	7,013	11,443	6,564	8,280	16,559
		Rate (HH)		22.2	59.1	78.8	9.8	29.2	83.8	12.9	54.9	8.6	22.3	82.2
		Rate (people)		28.2	64.5	82.2	14.0	36.0	87.1	17.6	60.9	13.0	28.3	85.8
Kabupaten	Way Kanan	Line	587	6,863	10,294	13,726	6,156	7,418	14,836	6,055	9,879	6,309	7,958	15,916
		Rate (HH)		14.8	52.0	75.2	7.0	19.0	80.9	6.3	47.1	8.2	24.8	84.2
		Rate (people)		18.8	57.7	80.0	9.1	23.7	85.3	8.4	52.6	10.6	30.3	88.2
Kabupaten	Tulang Bawang	Line	688	7,337	11,006	14,675	6,345	7,931	15,862	6,474	10,562	6,435	8,117	16,233
		Rate (HH)		9.0	36.8	59.7	4.5	12.4	65.0	5.4	32.4	4.5	12.6	66.2
		Rate (people)		10.8	41.0	63.6	5.3	15.0	68.4	6.6	36.9	5.7	15.2	69.8
Kabupaten	Pesawaran	Line	779	7,451	11,176	14,902	6,058	8,053	16,107	6,574	10,726	6,367	8,031	16,062
		Rate (HH)		17.3	58.5	82.3	7.4	25.2	85.6	11.4	54.5	9.7	23.2	85.1
		Rate (people)		20.5	63.3	84.9	10.1	29.3	87.8	14.5	59.5	12.9	27.0	87.4
Kabupaten	Pringsewu	Line	475	7,820	11,730	15,641	6,641	8,453	16,906	6,900	11,257	6,774	8,545	17,090
		Rate (HH)		9.8	40.4	66.6	5.1	14.2	71.5	6.4	37.4	5.8	12.8	73.0
		Rate (people)		12.4	46.2	71.5	6.2	17.1	76.1	8.0	43.3	6.9	15.7	77.6
Kabupaten	Mesuji	Line	467	7,497	11,245	14,994	6,780	8,103	16,206	6,614	10,792	6,286	7,930	15,859
		Rate (HH)		7.0	33.4	62.8	3.1	10.2	67.2	2.6	29.2	1.5	9.4	66.3
		Rate (people)		8.7	38.0	66.1	4.0	13.2	70.1	3.5	34.0	2.4	12.4	69.3
Kabupaten	Tulangbawang Barat	Line	475	7,449	11,173	14,897	6,134	8,051	16,102	6,572	10,722	6,382	8,050	16,100
		Rate (HH)		5.5	30.0	59.4	2.5	7.7	67.5	4.0	26.6	3.1	8.9	67.1
		Rate (people)		7.6	34.2	64.0	3.6	9.8	71.4	5.6	30.8	4.6	11.4	71.5
All Kabupaten		Line	7,738	7,567	11,350	15,133	6,505	8,179	16,357	6,676	10,892	7,567	8,179	16,357
		Rate (HH)		14.9	50.5	74.3	7.1	20.6	79.6	8.3	46.5	6.9	19.4	78.9
		Rate (people)		18.3	55.6	78.0	9.0	24.5	82.7	10.5	51.7	8.8	23.3	82.3
All Lampung		Line	8,969	7,898	11,846	15,795	6,769	8,536	17,073	6,968	11,369	6,632	8,365	16,731
		Rate (HH)		14.5	49.1	72.7	6.8	19.9	78.0	8.1	45.2	6.6	18.4	76.4
		Rate (people)		17.8	54.1	76.3	8.8	23.8	81.1	10.3	50.3	8.5	22.2	79.6

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Maluku): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Ambon	Line	372	10,035	15,053	20,071	8,906	10,847	21,694	8,854	14,446	8,134	10,260	20,520
		Rate (HH)		5.1	25.7	46.2	2.0	8.2	52.7	2.0	22.8	1.1	5.2	48.7
		Rate (people)		7.7	36.8	59.1	3.5	12.7	65.5	3.5	33.1	1.8	8.1	61.7
Kota	Tual	Line	358	7,701	11,551	15,402	5,415	8,324	16,647	6,794	11,085	7,663	9,667	19,333
		Rate (HH)		23.0	51.1	71.9	10.7	28.3	76.6	19.7	48.3	24.2	39.7	84.5
		Rate (people)		32.0	63.4	82.8	15.9	38.7	86.9	26.9	59.7	34.1	51.1	92.4
All Kota		Line	730	9,687	14,531	19,374	8,385	10,470	20,941	8,547	13,945	9,687	10,470	20,941
		Rate (HH)		7.2	28.8	49.3	3.1	10.6	55.5	4.1	25.9	3.9	9.3	53.0
		Rate (people)		11.3	40.8	62.7	5.4	16.6	68.7	7.0	37.1	6.6	14.5	66.2
Kabupaten	Maluku Tenggara Barat	Line	375	7,230	10,845	14,459	5,790	7,814	15,629	6,379	10,407	7,425	9,365	18,731
		Rate (HH)		24.1	52.7	71.4	9.9	29.6	76.0	14.8	49.6	23.4	41.0	84.7
		Rate (people)		33.9	63.8	80.8	16.9	39.9	85.0	22.7	60.9	33.5	53.0	91.8
Kabupaten	Maluku Tenggara	Line	364	7,630	11,445	15,260	6,548	8,247	16,495	6,732	10,984	7,415	9,353	18,706
		Rate (HH)		19.8	48.9	70.9	9.4	24.4	75.9	10.7	44.7	15.0	34.4	80.6
		Rate (people)		30.7	61.8	81.6	15.0	35.4	85.3	17.1	57.6	23.0	46.9	88.3
Kabupaten	Maluku Tengah	Line	467	9,419	14,128	18,838	8,007	10,181	20,361	8,310	13,559	7,452	9,400	18,800
		Rate (HH)		20.8	52.1	73.2	9.6	27.2	79.8	11.7	49.0	7.2	18.5	74.5
		Rate (people)		28.4	61.3	80.4	14.2	35.6	85.8	16.8	57.9	11.3	25.5	82.2
Kabupaten	Buru	Line	333	9,096	13,644	18,192	7,368	9,832	19,663	8,025	13,094	7,434	9,377	18,754
		Rate (HH)		18.4	55.5	79.3	8.6	24.5	82.6	11.3	52.4	8.3	19.9	81.9
		Rate (people)		24.8	63.0	84.7	12.2	31.4	87.2	16.4	59.8	11.9	27.2	87.1
Kabupaten	Kepulauan Aru	Line	441	7,620	11,430	15,241	6,070	8,237	16,473	6,723	10,969	7,561	9,537	19,074
		Rate (HH)		27.7	63.6	78.9	12.0	34.7	80.5	19.3	61.5	25.0	48.5	88.2
		Rate (people)		35.0	75.1	88.0	17.4	44.7	89.2	26.3	72.8	33.8	61.7	94.5
Kabupaten	Seram Bagian Barat	Line	463	7,859	11,789	15,718	6,239	8,495	16,989	6,934	11,313	7,202	9,084	18,168
		Rate (HH)		21.4	52.0	72.8	10.4	27.9	75.4	14.5	48.4	16.2	31.2	79.3
		Rate (people)		30.1	63.8	81.4	15.0	38.0	83.0	20.9	58.9	23.5	41.9	85.9
Kabupaten	Seram Bagian Timur	Line	460	7,706	11,558	15,411	5,962	8,329	16,657	6,798	11,092	7,196	9,077	18,155
		Rate (HH)		24.3	51.7	70.4	11.5	29.2	74.2	17.3	49.0	21.2	34.6	78.1
		Rate (people)		31.4	63.0	79.7	15.5	37.3	82.7	22.9	60.0	28.1	43.3	86.2
Kabupaten	Maluku Barat Daya	Line	368	7,716	11,574	15,432	6,587	8,340	16,680	6,807	11,107	7,299	9,207	18,415
		Rate (HH)		29.0	73.5	87.6	14.1	38.1	88.6	19.1	70.7	25.3	50.1	91.3
		Rate (people)		39.2	84.2	94.4	19.4	49.8	94.8	26.1	82.0	33.8	63.2	96.4
Kabupaten	Buru Selatan	Line	345	10,959	16,439	21,918	7,066	11,845	23,691	9,669	15,775	7,172	9,046	18,093
		Rate (HH)		19.7	55.8	85.3	9.4	26.0	87.8	13.4	50.9	9.7	13.1	63.6
		Rate (people)		21.8	62.8	91.7	10.8	30.1	93.9	14.8	57.6	11.0	14.2	71.3
All Kabupaten		Line	3,616	8,498	12,747	16,996	6,913	9,185	18,370	7,497	12,233	8,498	9,185	18,370
		Rate (HH)		22.0	54.4	75.0	10.2	28.3	79.2	13.8	51.2	14.2	28.8	79.1
		Rate (people)		30.1	64.7	83.0	14.9	37.4	86.4	19.6	61.2	20.6	38.4	86.2
All Maluku		Line	4,346	8,801	13,201	17,601	7,288	9,512	19,025	7,765	12,669	7,548	9,521	19,042
		Rate (HH)		18.0	47.3	67.9	8.2	23.4	72.7	11.1	44.2	11.4	23.4	71.9
		Rate (people)		25.3	58.6	77.8	12.5	32.1	81.9	16.4	55.1	17.1	32.3	81.1

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Maluku Utara): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Ternate	Line	419	11,046	16,569	22,092	10,251	11,939	23,879	9,746	15,901	7,667	9,671	19,341
		Rate (HH)		2.7	17.8	34.3	1.3	4.9	44.4	0.8	15.9	0.0	0.4	27.1
		Rate (people)		4.5	26.0	45.1	2.2	8.8	55.7	1.4	24.1	0.0	0.8	38.2
Kota	Tidore Kepulauan	Line	309	8,838	13,257	17,676	7,480	9,553	19,105	7,798	12,722	7,101	8,957	17,913
		Rate (HH)		4.9	30.2	59.3	2.1	7.7	64.3	2.8	26.2	0.6	4.1	58.1
		Rate (people)		7.1	37.0	68.1	3.2	10.7	73.4	4.0	32.6	0.7	5.7	67.6
All Kota		Line	728	10,328	15,492	20,656	9,350	11,163	22,327	9,112	14,867	10,328	11,163	22,327
		Rate (HH)		3.4	21.9	42.6	1.5	5.8	51.0	1.4	19.3	0.2	1.6	37.4
		Rate (people)		5.4	29.6	52.6	2.5	9.4	61.5	2.2	26.8	0.2	2.4	47.8
Kabupaten	Halmahera Barat	Line	503	6,820	10,229	13,639	5,704	7,371	14,742	6,017	9,817	6,736	8,496	16,993
		Rate (HH)		10.4	32.9	49.3	5.0	13.6	53.9	6.9	30.1	9.6	21.4	63.3
		Rate (people)		13.3	39.4	57.7	6.6	16.5	62.5	9.1	36.8	12.2	25.7	71.3
Kabupaten	Halmahera Tengah	Line	343	9,020	13,530	18,039	7,629	9,749	19,498	7,958	12,984	6,708	8,461	16,923
		Rate (HH)		18.1	50.5	68.7	8.6	24.3	72.6	10.7	46.9	3.0	13.9	66.2
		Rate (people)		24.6	62.1	79.6	11.8	31.7	82.8	15.6	58.5	4.1	19.2	77.2
Kabupaten	Kepulauan Sula	Line	444	6,998	10,497	13,995	6,413	7,564	15,127	6,174	10,073	6,785	8,559	17,117
		Rate (HH)		6.1	24.2	41.4	2.9	7.7	45.3	2.4	21.8	4.5	10.7	50.7
		Rate (people)		9.0	29.9	48.2	4.4	11.3	52.2	3.7	27.2	6.7	14.9	57.5
Kabupaten	Halmahera Selatan	Line	462	6,264	9,396	12,528	5,484	6,770	13,541	5,526	9,017	6,720	8,477	16,954
		Rate (HH)		6.7	22.7	43.2	3.3	7.8	49.4	3.6	21.1	7.9	17.2	68.5
		Rate (people)		9.5	31.1	53.4	4.7	10.9	59.7	5.1	28.8	11.1	23.8	77.2
Kabupaten	Halmahera Utara	Line	456	5,348	8,022	10,696	4,766	5,780	11,561	4,718	7,698	6,915	8,723	17,446
		Rate (HH)		5.5	38.3	61.8	2.4	11.5	65.9	2.1	33.2	22.2	45.6	85.3
		Rate (people)		7.8	45.3	68.1	3.8	15.7	71.9	3.4	39.4	27.7	52.2	89.5
Kabupaten	Halmahera Timur	Line	305	9,965	14,948	19,931	7,358	10,771	21,543	8,792	14,345	6,785	8,559	17,117
		Rate (HH)		13.1	40.7	59.5	5.5	17.4	66.1	10.2	36.0	3.9	10.3	48.0
		Rate (people)		19.3	50.9	68.0	9.6	24.9	73.8	16.4	47.0	7.8	16.5	57.9
Kabupaten	Pulau Morotai	Line	461	5,474	8,211	10,948	4,310	5,917	11,834	4,830	7,880	6,802	8,580	17,160
		Rate (HH)		7.4	28.7	53.4	3.2	10.7	60.1	5.2	25.1	16.1	30.8	81.2
		Rate (people)		10.6	36.3	62.5	5.3	14.6	68.8	7.7	32.3	21.8	39.0	87.4
All Kabupaten		Line	2,974	6,716	10,074	13,432	5,734	7,259	14,518	5,925	9,668	6,716	7,259	14,518
		Rate (HH)		8.2	31.6	51.7	3.8	11.5	56.8	4.7	28.4	10.6	22.9	66.9
		Rate (people)		11.4	39.1	59.8	5.6	15.5	64.7	6.8	35.5	14.1	28.8	74.6
All Maluku Utara		Line	3,702	7,674	11,511	15,347	6,693	8,294	16,589	6,770	11,046	6,972	8,794	17,588
		Rate (HH)		6.9	29.1	49.3	3.2	10.0	55.3	3.9	26.0	7.8	17.3	59.2
		Rate (people)		9.8	36.5	57.9	4.8	13.9	63.9	5.6	33.2	10.5	21.8	67.5

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Nusa Tenggara Barat): Poverty lines and rates

Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
			New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
			National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
			100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Mataram	Line	577	9,183	13,775	18,367	7,908	9,926	19,852	8,102	13,219	7,357	9,280	18,561
	Rate (HH)		10.4	36.9	54.8	5.0	15.4	60.3	5.9	33.8	3.3	11.3	55.5
	Rate (people)		14.4	43.8	61.6	7.1	20.1	67.0	8.2	40.7	5.2	15.4	62.2
Bima	Line	576	7,394	11,092	14,789	6,177	7,992	15,985	6,524	10,644	7,023	8,859	17,718
	Rate (HH)		10.1	39.5	61.6	5.1	13.6	65.0	6.8	35.8	7.2	18.7	69.7
	Rate (people)		12.8	44.5	66.8	6.4	16.6	70.4	8.4	40.6	9.9	22.9	76.0
	Line	1,153	8,715	13,073	17,431	7,455	9,420	18,841	7,689	12,546	8,715	9,420	18,841
	Rate (HH)		10.3	37.5	56.5	5.1	15.0	61.5	6.1	34.3	4.3	13.1	59.0
	Rate (people)		14.0	44.0	63.0	6.9	19.2	67.9	8.3	40.7	6.4	17.3	65.8
Lombok Barat	Line	625	8,061	12,091	16,121	6,822	8,713	17,425	7,112	11,603	6,541	8,250	16,500
	Rate (HH)		18.2	58.5	79.8	8.5	25.8	85.1	9.6	54.8	5.9	19.0	81.0
	Rate (people)		21.6	62.8	82.1	10.7	29.9	86.9	11.8	58.7	7.9	22.3	84.2
Lombok Tengah	Line	665	7,999	11,998	15,998	6,885	8,646	17,292	7,057	11,514	6,244	7,876	15,753
	Rate (HH)		16.7	54.3	80.3	8.3	22.9	84.7	9.7	50.2	5.9	17.0	78.2
	Rate (people)		19.9	60.0	83.2	9.9	26.8	86.6	11.7	55.8	6.8	19.9	81.3
Lombok Timur	Line	676	8,297	12,445	16,593	7,225	8,968	17,935	7,320	11,943	6,580	8,300	16,600
	Rate (HH)		19.0	64.8	84.8	9.0	26.4	87.2	10.2	60.0	6.4	17.0	83.9
	Rate (people)		23.8	69.4	86.6	11.8	33.1	88.7	13.1	65.4	8.8	21.5	86.7
Sumbawa	Line	613	7,296	10,945	14,593	5,883	7,887	15,773	6,437	10,503	6,276	7,917	15,834
	Rate (HH)		17.6	41.2	62.6	8.4	20.9	67.6	11.8	37.7	9.7	20.4	66.2
	Rate (people)		21.7	47.4	68.4	10.8	25.5	73.0	14.9	43.8	12.5	25.1	72.1
Dompu	Line	593	6,553	9,829	13,105	5,909	7,083	14,165	5,781	9,433	6,096	7,689	15,378
	Rate (HH)		17.1	53.5	73.4	8.7	21.8	77.4	8.1	50.3	9.7	26.8	82.3
	Rate (people)		19.9	58.0	78.7	9.8	25.1	82.7	9.3	55.3	11.8	31.1	87.4
Bima	Line	621	6,833	10,249	13,665	5,593	7,385	14,770	6,028	9,835	5,918	7,465	14,929
	Rate (HH)		16.1	49.2	69.2	7.9	21.8	73.1	10.4	46.2	9.4	22.0	73.6
	Rate (people)		19.4	55.9	74.8	9.6	26.7	78.6	12.5	52.6	11.5	26.9	79.0
Sumbawa Barat	Line	603	10,211	15,317	20,422	8,400	11,037	22,074	9,009	14,699	6,252	7,887	15,773
	Rate (HH)		17.6	42.7	58.4	8.7	22.1	60.9	11.8	40.1	3.0	6.5	43.0
	Rate (people)		21.8	48.4	63.6	10.9	26.6	66.1	14.8	45.9	4.0	8.1	49.4
Lombok Utara	Line	476	8,608	12,912	17,215	6,843	9,304	18,608	7,594	12,391	6,057	7,640	15,281
	Rate (HH)		36.3	75.1	87.0	16.4	48.2	90.3	26.2	72.5	7.7	25.6	83.9
	Rate (people)		43.1	79.9	89.6	21.5	55.9	92.7	32.5	77.9	10.6	31.9	87.3
	Line	4,872	7,903	11,855	15,807	6,710	8,542	17,085	6,973	11,377	7,903	8,542	17,085
	Rate (HH)		18.7	56.9	78.1	9.0	25.3	81.9	10.9	53.0	7.0	18.8	78.2
	Rate (people)		22.6	61.8	81.0	11.2	30.2	84.4	13.5	58.1	9.0	22.9	81.7
	Line	6,025	8,002	12,003	16,004	6,800	8,649	17,298	7,060	11,519	6,446	8,132	16,263
	Rate (HH)		17.7	54.7	75.6	8.5	24.1	79.6	10.4	50.9	6.7	18.2	76.0
	Rate (people)		21.6	59.7	78.8	10.7	28.9	82.4	12.9	56.0	8.7	22.2	79.8

Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Nusa Tenggara Timur): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Kupang	Line	584	10,168	15,252	20,336	8,338	10,990	21,981	8,971	14,637	7,788	9,823	19,646
		Rate (HH)		6.3	19.7	32.2	3.1	8.0	37.8	4.2	18.6	1.9	5.4	30.3
		Rate (people)		10.6	27.7	41.5	5.1	12.6	48.1	7.3	26.6	3.1	9.2	39.5
All Kota		Line	584	10,168	15,252	20,336	8,338	10,990	21,981	8,971	14,637	10,168	10,990	21,981
		Rate (HH)		6.3	19.7	32.2	3.1	8.0	37.8	4.2	18.6	1.9	5.4	30.3
		Rate (people)		10.6	27.7	41.5	5.1	12.6	48.1	7.3	26.6	3.1	9.2	39.5
Kabupaten	Sumba Barat	Line	589	6,487	9,730	12,974	5,254	7,011	14,023	5,723	9,338	5,769	7,277	14,555
		Rate (HH)		26.0	58.6	71.2	12.2	31.7	74.7	16.7	56.3	14.2	31.3	76.9
		Rate (people)		31.7	63.5	74.9	15.8	37.2	78.3	21.2	61.5	18.1	37.4	81.1
Kabupaten	Sumba Timur	Line	599	6,566	9,849	13,132	5,636	7,097	14,194	5,793	9,452	5,878	7,415	14,829
		Rate (HH)		25.3	62.0	77.7	11.5	32.0	79.9	14.0	58.1	9.5	30.4	83.1
		Rate (people)		32.4	69.0	82.5	16.1	39.8	85.0	18.8	65.9	13.7	38.6	88.0
Kabupaten	Kupang	Line	586	6,230	9,345	12,460	5,357	6,734	13,467	5,496	8,968	5,375	6,780	13,559
		Rate (HH)		16.0	47.2	66.6	7.6	22.4	70.7	8.6	44.0	7.7	22.0	70.8
		Rate (people)		20.8	57.0	76.0	10.3	28.9	79.1	11.4	54.0	10.6	28.7	79.5
Kabupaten	Timor Tengah Selatan	Line	600	5,913	8,870	11,827	4,724	6,392	12,783	5,217	8,512	5,498	6,935	13,870
		Rate (HH)		21.3	51.7	68.9	9.5	25.4	72.3	15.4	49.4	16.7	28.4	76.6
		Rate (people)		28.7	60.2	75.8	14.2	33.5	78.8	22.1	58.0	23.8	37.5	83.3
Kabupaten	Timor Tengah Utara	Line	549	6,457	9,685	12,914	5,367	6,979	13,958	5,697	9,295	5,565	7,020	14,040
		Rate (HH)		16.4	46.2	67.7	8.0	22.3	70.9	9.9	42.6	8.0	19.6	71.4
		Rate (people)		22.7	52.9	73.0	11.3	29.5	76.1	14.2	49.9	11.3	27.3	77.6
Kabupaten	Belu	Line	604	6,137	9,205	12,273	5,105	6,633	13,266	5,414	8,834	5,814	7,333	14,667
		Rate (HH)		11.0	35.8	58.3	4.3	13.9	63.1	6.9	33.1	7.1	16.0	66.9
		Rate (people)		15.5	44.1	65.3	7.4	19.4	69.5	10.3	41.3	11.2	23.0	73.7
Kabupaten	Alor	Line	594	5,772	8,657	11,543	4,698	6,238	12,477	5,092	8,308	5,841	7,368	14,737
		Rate (HH)		14.6	42.9	64.6	6.6	18.2	67.9	9.8	41.0	14.0	28.1	74.9
		Rate (people)		21.2	52.4	73.9	10.4	25.0	76.8	14.6	50.3	20.2	37.1	83.2
Kabupaten	Lembata	Line	591	6,586	9,880	13,173	5,217	7,119	14,238	5,811	9,481	5,732	7,230	14,461
		Rate (HH)		21.1	46.4	64.8	10.0	25.9	69.3	15.3	43.2	11.5	23.7	69.4
		Rate (people)		26.7	53.4	72.5	13.2	32.2	76.3	19.4	50.4	15.5	30.1	77.6
Kabupaten	Flores Timur	Line	603	5,471	8,207	10,942	4,741	5,914	11,827	4,827	7,876	5,803	7,319	14,639
		Rate (HH)		6.3	44.0	71.0	2.8	9.3	75.3	3.0	39.9	8.0	23.5	85.4
		Rate (people)		9.6	52.8	77.4	4.8	13.9	80.5	5.1	48.4	12.8	31.4	89.5
Kabupaten	Sikka	Line	599	5,752	8,627	11,503	4,547	6,217	12,434	5,075	8,279	5,772	7,281	14,562
		Rate (HH)		10.6	34.7	54.7	4.3	14.1	59.6	6.7	31.3	8.3	18.6	69.3
		Rate (people)		13.4	41.7	62.1	6.6	17.2	67.2	9.4	37.8	11.2	23.5	76.6
Kabupaten	Ende	Line	602	6,803	10,205	13,606	5,784	7,353	14,706	6,002	9,793	6,169	7,781	15,562
		Rate (HH)		16.6	50.1	71.7	7.9	23.2	75.9	10.0	46.9	7.3	19.0	78.6
		Rate (people)		21.6	57.4	77.0	10.6	29.8	81.1	13.7	54.3	10.1	25.4	85.2
Kabupaten	Ngada	Line	599	6,084	9,126	12,168	5,382	6,576	13,152	5,368	8,758	5,611	7,078	14,156
		Rate (HH)		8.8	36.3	58.6	4.0	13.0	63.6	4.0	31.8	3.7	13.9	68.6
		Rate (people)		12.0	43.5	65.4	6.0	17.1	69.5	6.0	38.6	5.8	18.1	74.2
Kabupaten	Manggarai	Line	600	6,285	9,428	12,570	5,435	6,794	13,587	5,545	9,048	5,933	7,484	14,967
		Rate (HH)		17.4	52.4	73.2	8.4	23.2	76.2	9.0	49.1	9.0	27.4	82.3
		Rate (people)		22.9	60.5	79.1	11.4	29.9	81.6	12.0	56.6	12.8	35.4	87.9
Kabupaten	Rote Ndao	Line	599	5,878	8,816	11,755	4,816	6,353	12,706	5,186	8,461	5,417	6,833	13,665
		Rate (HH)		25.2	51.0	65.9	12.5	31.9	68.7	15.6	48.4	16.6	34.9	71.4
		Rate (people)		32.8	59.1	72.0	16.3	40.3	74.3	19.9	57.3	21.4	43.8	77.1
Kabupaten	Manggarai Barat	Line	588	6,019	9,028	12,037	5,344	6,505	13,011	5,310	8,664	5,477	6,908	13,816
		Rate (HH)		15.3	52.0	73.8	7.3	21.8	77.8	7.3	47.6	7.8	24.8	82.0
		Rate (people)		20.4	59.7	79.0	10.0	28.1	82.5	10.0	55.5	10.6	31.4	86.5
Kabupaten	Sumba Tengah	Line	406	5,408	8,112	10,816	4,741	5,845	11,690	4,771	7,785	5,285	6,666	13,332
		Rate (HH)		28.3	69.0	88.4	13.8	34.0	91.4	15.0	64.8	25.4	49.3	93.6
		Rate (people)		34.0	75.0	92.7	17.0	40.1	94.8	18.6	70.8	30.7	57.6	96.0
Kabupaten	Sumba Barat Daya	Line	405	6,855	10,282	13,709	5,965	7,409	14,818	6,048	9,867	5,441	6,863	13,726
		Rate (HH)		25.8	71.3	89.1	12.6	34.8	89.9	13.2	68.3	7.8	23.0	89.4
		Rate (people)		29.9	77.2	92.1	14.8	40.1	92.6	15.7	74.8	8.7	27.0	92.7
Kabupaten	Nagekeo	Line	413	5,966	8,950	11,933	4,883	6,449	12,898	5,264	8,589	5,311	6,699	13,397
		Rate (HH)		9.7	37.0	60.6	4.2	15.0	66.3	5.8	33.3	6.0	16.8	68.7
		Rate (people)		12.7	46.6	70.4	6.1	20.6	75.8	8.3	41.8	8.5	22.7	77.9
Kabupaten	Manggarai Timur	Line	601	6,005	9,007	12,009	4,953	6,490	12,981	5,298	8,644	5,285	6,666	13,332
		Rate (HH)		21.5	51.1	72.9	10.1	25.5	76.7	13.8	49.1	13.6	27.5	77.5
		Rate (people)		25.9	56.3	76.0	12.9	30.4	79.1	17.1	54.3	16.9	33.0	80.0
Kabupaten	Sabu Raijua	Line	476	6,348	9,522	12,697	4,910	6,862	13,723	5,601	9,138	5,392	6,802	13,604
		Rate (HH)		31.1	61.9	78.2	14.4	38.5	81.3	21.2	58.4	19.0	37.4	81.7
		Rate (people)		41.1	71.9	84.5	20.5	49.9	86.5	28.9	67.9	26.0	48.7	87.3
All Kabupaten		Line	11,203	6,165	9,248	12,331	5,165	6,664	13,328	5,439	8,875	6,165	6,664	13,328
		Rate (HH)		17.2	48.6	68.8	8.0	22.4	72.5	10.4	45.5	10.3	24.2	76.2
		Rate (people)		22.6	56.8	75.4	11.2	28.8	78.7	14.2	53.6	14.1	31.2	82.5
All Nusa Tenggara Timur		Line	11,787	6,453	9,679	12,906	5,393	6,975	13,950	5,693	9,289	5,799	7,315	14,630
		Rate (HH)		16.4	46.4	66.0	7.6	21.3	69.8	10.0	43.4	9.7	22.7	72.7
		Rate (people)		21.8	54.7	73.0	10.8	27.7	76.5	13.7	51.7	13.3	29.6	79.4

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Papau): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National				Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	Poorest 1/2 < 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Jayapura	Line	448	16,578	24,866	33,155	14,079	17,918	35,837	14,626	23,863	9,661	12,187	24,373
		Rate (HH)		11.3	27.5	45.4	5.6	14.2	49.9	7.2	25.5	0.5	2.4	26.5
		Rate (people)		17.3	36.9	56.2	8.5	20.7	60.7	11.4	34.4	0.8	3.7	35.7
All Kota		Line	448	16,578	24,866	33,155	14,079	17,918	35,837	14,626	23,863	16,578	17,918	35,837
		Rate (HH)		11.3	27.5	45.4	5.6	14.2	49.9	7.2	25.5	0.5	2.4	26.5
		Rate (people)		17.3	36.9	56.2	8.5	20.7	60.7	11.4	34.4	0.8	3.7	35.7
Kabupaten	Merauke	Line	413	7,586	11,378	15,171	5,886	8,199	16,398	6,693	10,919	8,875	11,195	22,390
		Rate (HH)		10.2	22.2	38.8	5.0	11.7	45.0	7.5	20.4	12.8	18.6	64.0
		Rate (people)		14.5	28.5	45.3	7.2	16.5	52.0	10.7	26.7	17.9	24.9	71.5
Kabupaten	Jayawijaya	Line	314	7,978	11,967	15,955	6,370	8,623	17,246	7,039	11,484	8,473	10,688	21,376
		Rate (HH)		37.4	80.4	91.7	17.6	43.7	92.8	25.1	79.3	40.4	70.1	97.7
		Rate (people)		41.8	83.8	93.9	20.9	47.9	94.9	29.1	82.8	45.0	74.8	98.7
Kabupaten	Jayapura	Line	256	10,384	15,575	20,767	8,394	11,223	22,447	9,161	14,947	8,902	11,229	22,457
		Rate (HH)		13.7	35.6	56.7	6.4	18.7	65.0	7.6	32.4	7.0	14.2	63.6
		Rate (people)		18.6	45.0	66.4	9.2	25.2	73.8	10.6	41.0	10.3	19.9	73.3
Kabupaten	Nabire	Line	176	10,986	16,480	21,973	8,639	11,875	23,750	9,693	15,815	8,934	11,269	22,538
		Rate (HH)		27.9	50.9	66.0	12.0	33.8	69.3	17.8	48.3	10.4	24.4	69.4
		Rate (people)		33.7	56.3	72.5	16.5	39.0	75.6	24.1	54.2	15.0	30.8	75.7
Kabupaten	Yapen Waropen	Line	191	10,979	16,468	21,957	8,316	11,867	23,733	9,686	15,804	8,895	11,221	22,441
		Rate (HH)		25.8	51.8	64.1	12.1	30.4	69.4	20.8	48.7	14.3	26.7	68.4
		Rate (people)		33.5	62.6	75.7	16.7	38.3	81.1	26.0	59.9	18.9	34.5	79.9
Kabupaten	Biak Numfor	Line	254	11,356	17,034	22,712	7,371	12,274	24,548	10,019	16,347	8,906	11,234	22,469
		Rate (HH)		24.8	51.0	65.3	11.6	30.3	70.1	17.0	49.5	12.7	22.2	68.5
		Rate (people)		33.6	62.1	76.7	15.6	39.8	80.5	23.3	60.7	18.0	29.8	79.8
Kabupaten	Paniai	Line	288	9,312	13,967	18,623	7,043	10,065	20,129	8,215	13,404	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		36.5	63.9	78.8	17.7	42.4	82.3	28.1	61.1	27.4	43.1	82.3
		Rate (people)		43.5	73.0	87.3	21.3	51.1	89.9	34.1	70.3	33.4	51.6	89.9
Kabupaten	Puncak Jaya	Line	96	10,933	16,399	21,865	6,328	11,817	23,633	9,646	15,737	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		42.7	76.0	91.7	17.7	45.8	93.8	36.5	70.8	24.0	37.5	87.5
		Rate (people)		43.8	81.8	93.1	21.6	48.7	95.4	37.8	76.9	27.4	38.3	90.8
Kabupaten	Mimika	Line	394	12,666	18,999	25,333	9,152	13,691	27,381	11,175	18,233	9,280	11,705	23,411
		Rate (HH)		19.0	43.3	65.0	8.9	21.8	70.3	13.2	40.9	8.6	14.2	58.6
		Rate (people)		22.6	52.6	74.5	10.2	25.7	79.4	16.2	49.7	10.9	17.4	68.5
Kabupaten	Boven Digoel	Line	190	8,401	12,602	16,803	7,340	9,081	18,162	7,412	12,094	8,519	10,746	21,492
		Rate (HH)		15.7	50.9	69.1	6.5	23.8	72.2	7.8	48.3	12.7	35.2	78.5
		Rate (people)		25.8	63.8	78.2	12.1	37.6	81.6	14.6	61.8	22.3	50.6	86.5
Kabupaten	Mappi	Line	178	6,589	9,883	13,177	5,618	7,121	14,243	5,813	9,484	8,325	10,501	21,002
		Rate (HH)		23.8	56.1	72.6	11.5	26.5	74.1	14.9	55.4	41.6	59.2	81.4
		Rate (people)		33.1	68.9	81.7	15.2	37.8	82.8	20.1	68.0	54.3	71.5	89.7
Kabupaten	Asmat	Line	192	7,288	10,932	14,576	4,955	7,877	15,754	6,430	10,491	8,409	10,607	21,215
		Rate (HH)		27.9	46.0	63.8	11.8	29.1	66.3	19.7	42.6	32.1	40.6	78.9
		Rate (people)		35.4	54.9	70.7	17.7	36.5	72.6	27.8	50.5	39.6	48.5	83.8
Kabupaten	Yahukimo	Line	296	7,098	10,647	14,196	6,391	7,672	15,344	6,262	10,218	8,177	10,314	20,628
		Rate (HH)		40.9	75.7	85.3	19.1	53.2	86.8	16.8	74.6	61.2	74.6	94.2
		Rate (people)		46.2	78.3	87.5	23.0	57.1	89.1	20.4	77.1	64.0	77.1	96.0
Kabupaten	Pegunungan Bintang	Line	239	10,157	15,235	20,313	8,600	10,978	21,956	8,961	14,620	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		30.5	62.8	80.3	14.6	34.7	81.6	18.4	57.3	9.6	31.4	80.8
		Rate (people)		40.1	72.6	85.7	19.7	44.8	86.6	24.6	68.5	13.5	40.9	86.1
Kabupaten	Tolikara	Line	192	5,556	8,334	11,113	4,591	6,006	12,011	4,902	7,998	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		35.9	77.1	90.1	17.2	42.7	93.2	23.4	72.4	74.5	87.5	99.0
		Rate (people)		41.2	82.9	93.0	20.5	47.3	95.1	28.0	79.6	81.1	91.3	99.6
Kabupaten	Sarmi	Line	191	8,482	12,723	16,965	7,737	9,168	18,336	7,484	12,210	8,463	10,675	21,350
		Rate (HH)		14.1	33.5	56.2	6.7	17.8	61.0	4.9	31.0	9.8	21.2	72.4
		Rate (people)		21.1	47.0	71.3	9.8	26.5	75.9	7.0	44.7	15.2	29.9	85.7
Kabupaten	Keerom	Line	256	10,691	16,036	21,381	8,666	11,555	23,111	9,432	15,389	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		15.6	39.1	59.4	7.0	20.7	64.8	10.5	37.1	5.9	14.1	55.9
		Rate (people)		24.1	52.7	73.1	11.6	30.7	77.0	17.3	50.1	10.1	21.7	69.1
Kabupaten	Waropen	Line	224	11,083	16,624	22,166	7,665	11,979	23,958	9,778	15,954	8,221	10,371	20,741
		Rate (HH)		28.3	60.8	78.5	11.4	35.1	80.2	20.5	59.2	13.2	25.5	76.9
		Rate (people)		39.9	73.5	87.5	19.5	45.5	88.9	30.9	72.2	22.2	35.4	86.9
Kabupaten	Supiori	Line	191	8,197	12,296	16,395	5,161	8,860	17,721	7,232	11,800	8,183	10,322	20,643
		Rate (HH)		38.0	58.6	78.9	18.8	41.5	79.5	33.6	55.3	39.0	49.2	84.1
		Rate (people)		45.7	68.6	87.0	22.7	50.8	87.5	42.0	64.4	46.6	58.4	91.0
Kabupaten	Mamberamo Raya	Line	205	11,559	17,339	23,119	7,772	12,494	24,988	10,198	16,640	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		33.2	63.4	77.6	15.1	38.5	82.0	24.9	59.5	16.6	24.9	71.2
		Rate (people)		40.0	73.1	84.5	19.9	45.9	88.7	31.5	68.7	21.6	31.5	79.6
Kabupaten	Nduga	Line	192	6,960	10,440	13,919	6,028	7,523	15,045	6,140	10,018	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		36.5	90.6	99.5	17.7	46.9	99.5	21.4	90.1	58.9	90.6	100.0
		Rate (people)		42.5	92.3	99.9	20.9	52.1	99.9	25.3	91.7	64.0	92.3	100.0
Kabupaten	Lanny Jaya	Line	190	8,364	12,547	16,729	4,339	9,041	18,082	7,380	12,041	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		42.1	84.2	94.7	18.4	48.9	95.3	34.2	79.5	39.5	61.1	97.4
		Rate (people)		46.6	86.3	95.4	22.9	53.8	96.0	37.9	82.6	43.8	64.6	97.5
Kabupaten	Mamberamo Tengah	Line	164	7,837	11,755	15,673	7,454	8,470	16,941	6,914	11,281	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		33.5	91.5	99.4	15.2	56.1	100.0	3.7	89.0	46.3	82.9	100.0
		Rate (people)		43.2	96.3	99.3	21.3	66.5	100.0	5.5	95.0	56.8	90.7	100.0
Kabupaten	Yalimo	Line	192	6,630	9,945	13,260	5,505	7,166	14,333	5,850	9,544	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		36.5	80.2	95.8	19.3	46.9	96.9	23.4	75.5	60.9	82.3	100.0
		Rate (people)		44.1	86.5	98.0	21.9	55.2	98.7	27.6	82.6	69.2	87.9	100.0
Kabupaten	Puncak	Line	192	11,265	16,898	22,531	9,196	12,176	24,353	9,939	16,216	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		35.4	78.1	92.7	16.7	44.3	93.8	28.1	75.5	10.9	30.7	89.1
		Rate (people)		44.6	85.4	95.6	22.3	54.0	96.7	36.5	83.0	14.8	39.3	92.9
Kabupaten	Dogiyai	Line	192	9,959	14,938	19,918	7,064	10,764	21,528	8,786	14,336	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		26.6	48.4	67.7	12.5	32.3	72.9	21.4	46.4	19.3	27.6	68.8
		Rate (people)		34.0	57.9	75.6	16.8	41.1	80.6	28.3	56.2	25.5	35.4	76.5
Kabupaten	Intan Jaya	Line	288	9,683	14,524	19,366	6,953	10,466	20,932	8,543	13,939	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		37.8	69.4	87.2	16.7	45.8	89.6	29.9	65.3	25.0	44.8	89.2
		Rate (people)		47.8	79.2	91.7	23.7	56.6	93.4	39.1	75.3	33.9	55.5	93.3
Kabupaten	Deiyai	Line	288	9,392	14,088	18,784	8,112	10,152	20,303	8,286	13,520	8,139	10,267	20,533
		Rate (HH)		37.2	78.8	93.7	16.7	46.9	95.5	20.8	75.7	17.0	47.9	95.5
		Rate (people)		49.6	87.7	96.9	24.5	59.7	98.3	30.2	85.6	25.1	60.6	98.3
All Kabupaten		Line	6,434	9,144	13,716	18,289	6,937	9,884	19,768	8,068	13,163	9,144	9,884	19,768
		Rate (HH)		29.5	60.9	76.0	13.6	35.7	79.2	19.8	58.2	27.8	43.4	81.0
		Rate (people)		35.8	68.1	81.8	17.5	42.4	84.7	24.6	65.6	33.1	49.7	86.5
All Papua		Line	6,882	9,824	14,735	19,647	7,590	10,618	21,236	8,667	14,141	8,575	10,816	21,633
		Rate (HH)		27.8	57.7	73.1	12.9	33.6	76.3	18.6	55.1	25.2	39.4	75.7
		Rate (people)		34.1	65.3	79.5	16.7	40.4	82.5	23.4	62.8	30.2	45.5	81.8

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Papau Barat): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Sorong	Line	334	14,428	21,643	28,857	11,505	15,595	31,190	12,730	20,770	10,097	12,736	25,472
		Rate (HH)		10.5	34.4	50.0	4.5	15.0	55.1	6.0	32.6	2.4	6.0	41.5
		Rate (people)		14.0	42.9	58.4	7.0	20.5	63.5	8.7	40.8	3.7	8.7	50.7
All Kota		Line	334	14,428	21,643	28,857	11,505	15,595	31,190	12,730	20,770	14,428	15,595	31,190
		Rate (HH)		10.5	34.4	50.0	4.5	15.0	55.1	6.0	32.6	2.4	6.0	41.5
		Rate (people)		14.0	42.9	58.4	7.0	20.5	63.5	8.7	40.8	3.7	8.7	50.7
Kabupaten	Fakfak	Line	224	10,551	15,826	21,102	8,563	11,404	22,808	9,309	15,188	9,762	12,314	24,628
		Rate (HH)		23.5	51.9	69.1	10.4	28.7	73.3	15.3	50.0	16.7	32.7	75.8
		Rate (people)		33.3	61.2	77.7	16.0	38.5	81.6	21.6	59.2	24.1	42.8	84.1
Kabupaten	Kaimana	Line	288	8,279	12,418	16,558	6,636	8,948	17,897	7,304	11,917	9,922	12,515	25,030
		Rate (HH)		13.9	43.3	63.6	6.7	19.2	67.0	10.6	39.5	26.3	43.9	81.4
		Rate (people)		20.9	56.0	75.6	9.9	28.6	79.6	16.1	52.3	38.4	57.2	91.3
Kabupaten	Teluk Wondama	Line	242	10,829	16,244	21,658	7,656	11,705	23,410	9,554	15,588	9,452	11,923	23,847
		Rate (HH)		31.4	58.7	77.7	14.5	38.8	79.8	25.2	56.2	24.8	39.3	80.2
		Rate (people)		44.2	71.8	87.4	22.0	51.6	89.4	36.5	69.5	36.0	51.9	89.5
Kabupaten	Teluk Bintuni	Line	225	12,803	19,204	25,606	9,023	13,838	27,676	11,296	18,430	9,726	12,269	24,538
		Rate (HH)		36.9	66.4	78.4	15.4	43.2	82.3	30.1	62.1	18.5	34.0	77.4
		Rate (people)		47.5	76.2	86.8	23.7	53.5	90.9	40.6	71.8	27.9	44.4	86.3
Kabupaten	Manokwari	Line	335	12,454	18,682	24,909	9,509	13,462	26,923	10,988	17,928	9,705	12,242	24,483
		Rate (HH)		29.3	54.6	71.6	14.2	32.6	75.6	22.1	52.7	14.4	28.0	70.9
		Rate (people)		34.0	59.7	77.2	16.8	37.0	80.9	26.8	58.2	18.2	32.4	77.3
Kabupaten	Sorong Selatan	Line	169	7,495	11,242	14,990	6,220	8,101	16,202	6,612	10,789	9,452	11,923	23,847
		Rate (HH)		16.0	32.0	45.0	7.1	21.3	49.1	8.9	29.6	24.9	33.7	64.5
		Rate (people)		23.0	38.4	51.2	11.4	28.8	55.1	13.4	36.6	32.4	39.5	69.1
Kabupaten	Sorong	Line	190	8,007	12,011	16,015	6,342	8,655	17,310	7,065	11,526	9,595	12,104	24,208
		Rate (HH)		26.0	56.3	77.3	10.6	30.4	83.4	16.1	52.6	38.0	55.4	94.8
		Rate (people)		33.4	63.4	83.3	16.3	38.5	88.1	23.1	60.7	46.9	63.4	96.9
Kabupaten	Raja Ampat	Line	177	7,941	11,912	15,882	6,574	8,583	17,167	7,006	11,431	9,452	11,923	23,847
		Rate (HH)		14.7	37.9	53.1	6.8	19.8	57.1	8.5	34.5	28.2	37.9	76.8
		Rate (people)		23.6	50.9	65.1	11.5	30.0	68.9	14.0	47.2	39.7	50.9	84.9
Kabupaten	Tambrauw	Line	191	8,057	12,085	16,114	6,157	8,708	17,417	7,108	11,598	9,452	11,923	23,847
		Rate (HH)		30.9	62.3	81.7	13.6	36.6	84.3	22.0	58.1	43.5	61.8	92.7
		Rate (people)		44.7	75.0	90.6	22.0	50.7	92.1	33.5	71.2	57.6	74.5	96.9
Kabupaten	Maybrat	Line	164	8,177	12,265	16,353	6,278	8,838	17,676	7,214	11,770	9,452	11,923	23,847
		Rate (HH)		27.4	50.6	64.6	11.6	31.7	65.2	17.7	47.0	34.1	48.8	72.6
		Rate (people)		40.1	63.0	74.8	19.7	45.1	75.7	27.8	59.7	47.8	61.3	81.4
All Kabupaten		Line	2,205	10,336	15,503	20,671	7,981	11,172	22,343	9,119	14,878	10,336	11,172	22,343
		Rate (HH)		25.7	52.1	69.1	11.6	30.3	73.0	18.4	49.3	22.8	37.2	77.0
		Rate (people)		33.5	60.4	76.6	16.4	38.4	80.3	24.9	57.9	30.5	45.5	83.5
All Papua Barat		Line	2,539	11,362	17,042	22,723	8,864	12,280	24,561	10,024	16,355	9,764	12,317	24,633
		Rate (HH)		22.0	47.8	64.4	9.9	26.6	68.7	15.4	45.2	17.8	29.7	68.4
		Rate (people)		28.6	56.0	72.0	14.1	33.9	76.1	20.8	53.6	23.8	36.3	75.3

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Riau): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Pekan Baru	Line	627	10,740	16,110	21,480	8,642	11,608	23,217	9,475	15,460	9,071	11,442	22,883
		Rate (HH)		3.0	16.5	36.5	1.5	4.4	42.4	1.7	14.3	1.6	4.2	41.4
		Rate (people)		4.2	21.0	42.6	2.1	6.3	49.0	2.3	18.8	2.2	5.8	48.1
Kota	Dumai	Line	556	9,468	14,202	18,935	8,106	10,233	20,467	8,353	13,629	8,666	10,932	21,863
		Rate (HH)		3.7	21.5	47.1	1.6	5.9	54.0	1.9	17.7	2.4	7.9	61.1
		Rate (people)		6.5	27.5	54.5	3.2	9.5	61.5	3.6	23.1	4.6	11.8	69.3
All Kota		Line	1,183	10,461	15,691	20,921	8,525	11,307	22,613	9,229	15,058	10,461	11,307	22,613
		Rate (HH)		3.2	17.5	38.8	1.5	4.7	44.9	1.7	15.0	1.8	5.0	45.6
		Rate (people)		4.7	22.5	45.2	2.3	7.0	51.7	2.6	19.8	2.7	7.1	52.7
Kabupaten	Kuantan Senggigi	Line	590	10,687	16,030	21,374	9,307	11,551	23,102	9,429	15,384	7,926	9,997	19,995
		Rate (HH)		10.1	39.3	65.8	4.6	15.7	70.3	5.6	36.1	1.4	7.9	60.8
		Rate (people)		12.6	44.8	72.1	6.2	19.4	76.1	7.6	41.4	1.7	10.4	67.3
Kabupaten	Indragiri Hulu	Line	592	9,620	14,430	19,240	8,690	10,398	20,796	8,488	13,848	8,053	10,158	20,316
		Rate (HH)		5.4	18.4	37.0	2.6	6.8	45.6	2.2	16.2	1.4	6.1	42.6
		Rate (people)		8.9	22.8	43.3	4.3	10.4	51.8	3.8	20.6	2.3	9.7	49.0
Kabupaten	Indragiri Hilir	Line	658	7,848	11,772	15,696	6,260	8,483	16,965	6,924	11,297	7,946	10,023	20,047
		Rate (HH)		6.1	29.9	60.6	2.8	7.5	66.7	3.9	26.2	6.7	14.2	78.3
		Rate (people)		9.4	37.4	67.8	4.6	10.8	73.8	6.2	33.7	10.0	19.1	83.9
Kabupaten	Pelalawan	Line	562	11,817	17,725	23,634	9,698	12,773	25,545	10,426	17,010	8,036	10,137	20,274
		Rate (HH)		9.7	35.3	56.1	4.4	13.7	63.5	5.9	31.2	0.6	4.7	45.1
		Rate (people)		14.5	44.0	65.9	7.0	18.8	72.2	9.0	39.3	1.2	7.5	55.3
Kabupaten	Siak	Line	589	8,852	13,278	17,704	7,878	9,568	19,135	7,810	12,742	8,310	10,482	20,965
		Rate (HH)		4.2	19.6	43.1	1.8	6.1	49.1	1.6	17.2	2.0	8.6	56.2
		Rate (people)		6.5	24.7	49.3	3.0	8.9	55.3	2.7	21.7	3.2	12.1	62.5
Kabupaten	Kampar	Line	624	9,193	13,789	18,385	8,180	9,936	19,872	8,110	13,233	8,051	10,155	20,311
		Rate (HH)		8.5	39.7	63.7	4.4	10.5	70.1	4.0	35.8	3.0	10.9	72.2
		Rate (people)		10.5	47.3	71.4	5.1	13.5	76.9	4.6	43.4	3.6	14.1	79.0
Kabupaten	Rokan Hulu	Line	599	10,469	15,703	20,938	8,903	11,316	22,631	9,237	15,070	7,924	9,995	19,991
		Rate (HH)		9.6	32.1	57.5	4.1	14.0	61.8	4.6	29.9	1.9	7.0	53.0
		Rate (people)		13.0	38.9	64.8	6.1	18.5	68.8	7.1	37.0	2.7	10.2	60.3
Kabupaten	Bengkalis	Line	668	10,701	16,051	21,402	8,794	11,566	23,133	9,441	15,404	8,415	10,615	21,229
		Rate (HH)		6.5	31.2	54.7	3.2	9.1	61.0	4.2	28.9	2.3	5.3	54.9
		Rate (people)		8.3	36.7	61.8	4.1	11.6	68.4	5.4	34.3	2.9	6.8	62.0
Kabupaten	Rokan Hilir	Line	625	8,228	12,342	16,456	7,248	8,893	17,787	7,259	11,844	8,039	10,141	20,282
		Rate (HH)		6.2	33.9	59.2	3.3	8.8	66.5	3.4	28.1	4.9	14.0	74.9
		Rate (people)		9.3	41.3	66.9	4.6	12.4	72.8	5.0	35.5	7.7	18.8	80.6
Kabupaten	Kepulauan Meranti	Line	594	11,156	16,734	22,312	8,439	12,058	24,116	9,843	16,059	8,180	10,318	20,637
		Rate (HH)		35.1	75.7	88.5	15.7	44.3	91.5	25.8	72.3	12.6	29.4	86.1
		Rate (people)		42.6	83.3	93.2	21.1	53.3	95.2	32.7	80.5	17.5	36.7	91.8
All Kabupaten		Line	6,101	9,544	14,317	19,089	8,128	10,316	20,633	8,421	13,739	9,544	10,316	20,633
		Rate (HH)		8.3	33.2	57.6	3.9	11.2	63.7	4.7	29.8	3.5	10.2	63.4
		Rate (people)		11.4	40.0	64.8	5.6	15.0	70.5	6.7	36.5	5.0	13.9	70.2
All Riau		Line	7,284	9,736	14,604	19,472	8,211	10,523	21,047	8,590	14,015	8,268	10,429	20,859
		Rate (HH)		7.3	30.0	53.7	3.4	9.9	59.8	4.1	26.7	3.1	9.1	59.7
		Rate (people)		10.0	36.3	60.7	4.9	13.3	66.6	5.8	33.0	4.6	12.4	66.5

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Sulawesi Barat): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kabupaten	Majene	Line	596	7,235	10,852	14,470	6,412	7,820	15,640	6,383	10,414	5,676	7,159	14,318
		Rate (HH)		13.3	43.4	66.6	6.4	17.0	71.5	6.4	40.0	2.8	12.1	66.3
		Rate (people)		18.4	52.4	74.5	9.1	22.6	78.4	9.1	48.7	4.0	16.7	74.4
Kabupaten	Polewali Mamasa	Line	625	7,562	11,342	15,123	6,680	8,173	16,346	6,671	10,885	5,599	7,062	14,125
		Rate (HH)		17.2	60.5	81.0	8.2	25.9	85.3	8.2	56.8	2.4	11.3	76.2
		Rate (people)		21.2	67.3	84.6	10.5	31.9	88.3	10.5	63.5	3.2	14.7	81.3
Kabupaten	Mamasa	Line	580	5,587	8,380	11,173	5,009	6,039	12,077	4,929	8,042	5,473	6,903	13,807
		Rate (HH)		11.7	50.8	73.0	5.4	16.7	77.1	4.9	47.6	10.2	27.8	81.5
		Rate (people)		16.2	56.8	77.5	7.8	22.1	80.9	7.1	53.4	14.1	33.4	84.8
Kabupaten	Mamuju	Line	612	5,220	7,830	10,440	3,928	5,642	11,285	4,606	7,515	5,581	7,040	14,081
		Rate (HH)		6.7	22.1	43.5	3.0	8.9	50.3	4.6	20.3	7.8	16.3	64.9
		Rate (people)		8.2	26.3	47.7	4.0	10.5	53.9	5.8	24.4	9.2	19.5	68.5
Kabupaten	Mamuju Utara	Line	604	6,963	10,445	13,927	6,125	7,526	15,053	6,143	10,024	5,500	6,938	13,876
		Rate (HH)		4.5	30.1	57.1	2.2	7.0	62.2	2.4	26.6	1.4	4.2	57.3
		Rate (people)		6.2	37.8	65.4	2.9	9.1	70.3	3.2	34.2	1.8	5.7	65.6
All Kabupaten		Line	3,017	6,529	9,793	13,058	5,577	7,057	14,114	5,760	9,398	6,529	7,057	14,114
		Rate (HH)		11.4	42.2	64.3	5.3	16.4	69.5	5.8	39.2	4.9	14.1	70.1
		Rate (people)		14.7	48.7	69.5	7.2	20.6	74.0	7.7	45.6	6.2	17.6	75.3
All Sulawesi Barat		Line	3,017	6,529	9,793	13,058	5,577	7,057	14,114	5,760	9,398	5,577	7,035	14,070
		Rate (HH)		11.4	42.2	64.3	5.3	16.4	69.5	5.8	39.2	4.9	14.1	70.1
		Rate (people)		14.7	48.7	69.5	7.2	20.6	74.0	7.7	45.6	6.2	17.6	75.3

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Sulawesi Selatan): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Makassar	Line	657	7,687	11,531	15,374	6,583	8,309	16,617	6,782	11,066	6,132	7,734	15,469
		Rate (HH)		4.4	18.8	36.3	2.1	6.5	40.5	2.8	17.5	1.4	4.7	36.7
		Rate (people)		5.9	23.9	44.4	2.9	9.0	48.9	3.5	22.1	1.9	6.3	44.9
Kota	Pare Pare	Line	564	6,569	9,853	13,137	6,059	7,100	14,200	5,795	9,456	6,102	7,697	15,394
		Rate (HH)		5.2	25.4	45.9	2.2	7.2	51.8	2.0	22.7	2.6	8.6	58.2
		Rate (people)		6.5	31.0	53.7	3.0	9.4	60.2	2.8	27.6	3.7	11.1	66.9
Kota	Palopo	Line	583	6,569	9,854	13,138	5,966	7,100	14,201	5,796	9,456	5,892	7,432	14,863
		Rate (HH)		8.2	27.3	43.9	4.1	11.2	49.4	3.6	25.0	3.3	10.4	52.2
		Rate (people)		11.3	33.9	52.6	5.6	14.7	58.6	5.1	31.8	4.4	14.2	62.1
All Kota		Line	1,804	7,495	11,242	14,990	6,484	8,101	16,202	6,613	10,789	7,495	8,101	16,202
		Rate (HH)		4.8	20.1	37.7	2.3	7.0	42.1	2.8	18.6	1.7	5.4	39.7
		Rate (people)		6.4	25.4	45.9	3.2	9.6	50.7	3.6	23.4	2.3	7.4	48.2
Kabupaten	Selayar	Line	584	6,698	10,047	13,396	5,681	7,240	14,479	5,909	9,642	5,193	6,550	13,101
		Rate (HH)		10.9	40.1	67.8	5.2	14.7	75.3	6.3	36.4	3.1	8.6	64.9
		Rate (people)		15.0	47.0	73.8	7.1	19.8	80.9	8.6	43.2	4.1	11.9	71.6
Kabupaten	Bulukumba	Line	610	6,605	9,908	13,210	5,912	7,139	14,279	5,828	9,508	5,236	6,605	13,210
		Rate (HH)		6.1	33.7	58.8	2.7	10.8	65.2	2.3	30.7	1.4	5.6	59.9
		Rate (people)		9.0	40.0	63.9	4.0	14.7	70.3	3.7	36.9	2.2	8.3	65.7
Kabupaten	Bantaeng	Line	589	5,310	7,964	10,619	4,532	5,739	11,478	4,684	7,643	5,311	6,700	13,400
		Rate (HH)		7.1	32.1	55.4	3.2	10.2	61.7	3.8	29.3	5.6	17.9	70.8
		Rate (people)		10.2	37.4	60.1	5.1	14.1	65.2	5.9	34.7	8.4	23.0	73.8
Kabupaten	Jeneponto	Line	628	7,009	10,513	14,018	6,146	7,576	15,152	6,184	10,089	5,130	6,471	12,942
		Rate (HH)		14.7	54.8	76.6	6.8	20.3	79.9	7.5	51.4	2.4	8.6	71.3
		Rate (people)		19.1	63.1	81.8	9.4	25.7	84.5	10.4	59.8	3.5	11.8	77.5
Kabupaten	Takalar	Line	631	6,684	10,027	13,369	5,778	7,225	14,450	5,898	9,622	5,213	6,576	13,152
		Rate (HH)		9.6	38.2	64.3	4.8	12.0	70.0	5.2	34.5	2.5	7.8	61.8
		Rate (people)		11.2	42.1	67.6	5.6	13.5	72.3	6.1	38.5	2.7	9.2	64.7
Kabupaten	Gowa	Line	645	7,259	10,888	14,517	6,705	7,846	15,691	6,404	10,449	5,398	6,809	13,619
		Rate (HH)		7.7	35.0	56.7	3.9	9.7	64.1	3.3	32.3	0.5	3.5	51.1
		Rate (people)		9.5	39.2	59.4	4.6	11.9	66.0	4.2	36.5	0.7	4.7	55.0
Kabupaten	Sinjai	Line	593	6,214	9,321	12,428	5,705	6,716	13,433	5,482	8,945	5,228	6,595	13,190
		Rate (HH)		8.2	39.6	64.2	4.0	12.4	70.0	3.5	35.2	2.2	10.1	67.7
		Rate (people)		10.7	45.7	69.1	5.3	15.6	74.1	4.9	40.9	3.4	13.1	72.6
Kabupaten	Maros	Line	627	7,796	11,694	15,591	6,553	8,426	16,852	6,878	11,222	5,356	6,756	13,513
		Rate (HH)		12.0	38.9	65.2	5.7	16.1	69.6	7.3	36.0	0.4	4.4	50.2
		Rate (people)		14.6	43.3	69.5	7.2	19.9	73.3	8.7	40.5	0.7	5.8	55.4
Kabupaten	Pangkajene Kepulauan	Line	615	6,819	10,229	13,639	6,003	7,371	14,742	6,016	9,816	5,226	6,592	13,185
		Rate (HH)		14.6	47.4	71.2	6.6	20.3	76.4	6.8	43.3	3.0	10.4	67.8
		Rate (people)		19.3	54.2	76.2	9.3	25.3	81.0	9.7	50.0	4.3	14.0	73.7
Kabupaten	Barru	Line	593	7,121	10,681	14,241	6,474	7,696	15,393	6,282	10,250	5,313	6,701	13,403
		Rate (HH)		7.5	42.2	70.6	3.5	12.0	75.5	3.4	37.5	1.0	5.9	64.5
		Rate (people)		10.7	48.8	75.3	5.2	15.9	79.6	5.0	43.6	1.5	8.1	70.3
Kabupaten	Bone	Line	652	6,224	9,336	12,448	5,403	6,728	13,455	5,491	8,960	5,193	6,550	13,100
		Rate (HH)		12.3	48.9	69.7	6.8	18.9	74.4	7.9	43.9	5.8	14.6	73.1
		Rate (people)		14.1	54.8	75.1	6.9	22.8	79.8	7.8	49.6	6.0	17.0	78.5
Kabupaten	Soppeng	Line	622	5,929	8,894	11,859	5,075	6,409	12,818	5,231	8,535	5,252	6,625	13,249
		Rate (HH)		8.2	39.7	62.9	3.7	12.3	69.7	4.4	34.1	4.8	14.6	70.9
		Rate (people)		10.4	46.6	69.5	5.1	15.5	75.9	5.8	39.8	6.1	18.4	76.8
Kabupaten	Wajo	Line	625	6,848	10,272	13,696	5,947	7,402	14,804	6,042	9,858	5,247	6,618	13,236
		Rate (HH)		6.6	36.5	65.0	3.2	9.9	70.8	3.8	33.4	2.0	5.4	59.7
		Rate (people)		9.0	43.5	70.1	4.4	12.9	75.4	5.2	40.3	2.7	7.3	66.1
Kabupaten	Sidenreng Rappang	Line	652	6,457	9,686	12,915	5,483	6,980	13,959	5,697	9,295	5,310	6,698	13,396
		Rate (HH)		4.6	27.7	55.5	2.1	6.7	62.4	2.7	24.7	1.8	5.7	57.7
		Rate (people)		7.0	34.4	63.4	3.5	9.8	70.4	4.2	31.3	3.3	8.4	66.1
Kabupaten	Pinrang	Line	622	6,145	9,218	12,291	5,479	6,642	13,285	5,422	8,846	5,270	6,647	13,294
		Rate (HH)		6.1	34.8	59.5	2.8	9.9	65.5	2.8	29.6	2.0	9.8	64.6
		Rate (people)		9.0	42.3	65.3	4.1	14.3	70.5	4.1	37.0	3.0	14.0	70.3
Kabupaten	Enrekang	Line	590	6,735	10,103	13,470	5,895	7,280	14,560	5,942	9,695	5,171	6,523	13,045
		Rate (HH)		12.2	45.1	69.8	5.6	16.5	74.8	6.1	41.4	1.7	8.8	68.2
		Rate (people)		16.8	54.7	77.4	8.3	23.2	81.6	9.1	50.4	2.8	12.7	76.6
Kabupaten	Luwu	Line	604	6,521	9,781	13,041	5,905	7,048	14,096	5,753	9,386	5,117	6,454	12,909
		Rate (HH)		11.3	47.6	69.6	5.5	16.4	75.0	5.1	43.3	2.8	10.3	69.1
		Rate (people)		15.4	56.6	77.9	7.6	21.6	82.8	7.2	52.1	4.4	14.0	77.2
Kabupaten	Tana Toraja	Line	626	6,108	9,162	12,216	5,004	6,602	13,204	5,389	8,792	5,147	6,492	12,984
		Rate (HH)		12.5	38.8	66.0	6.1	14.6	75.0	8.0	34.6	6.4	14.1	71.6
		Rate (people)		14.6	46.7	74.7	7.2	17.5	83.1	9.2	41.8	7.7	17.1	80.6
Kabupaten	Luwu Utara	Line	622	6,804	10,205	13,607	5,698	7,354	14,708	6,003	9,794	5,091	6,422	12,845
		Rate (HH)		12.6	43.0	69.2	5.9	16.1	74.6	7.5	39.5	3.0	9.4	64.3
		Rate (people)		16.2	48.7	73.2	8.1	20.5	78.4	10.2	45.0	4.1	12.6	68.6
Kabupaten	Luwu Timur	Line	592	6,526	9,789	13,052	5,839	7,054	14,107	5,758	9,394	5,212	6,574	13,148
		Rate (HH)		6.8	31.7	52.0	3.2	9.4	56.5	2.8	28.3	1.6	5.5	51.6
		Rate (people)		9.2	36.5	57.7	4.3	12.3	62.1	3.9	33.4	2.4	7.5	57.4
Kabupaten	Toraja Utara	Line	468	8,190	12,285	16,380	6,585	8,852	17,705	7,226	11,789	5,235	6,604	13,208
		Rate (HH)		12.3	37.4	62.0	5.5	16.5	66.5	8.7	33.6	0.0	4.6	41.2
		Rate (people)		19.1	46.1	69.3	9.4	24.1	73.7	14.3	42.5	0.0	7.9	49.6
All Kabupaten		Line	12,790	6,690	10,034	13,379	5,853	7,231	14,461	5,902	9,630	6,690	7,231	14,461
		Rate (HH)		9.6	40.0	64.2	4.7	13.6	70.0	5.2	36.2	2.6	8.7	62.8
		Rate (people)		12.7	46.5	69.7	6.2	17.6	75.0	6.8	42.6	3.4	11.4	68.6
All Sulawesi Selatan		Line	14,594	6,852	10,278	13,704	5,980	7,406	14,812	6,045	9,863	5,412	6,827	13,654
		Rate (HH)		8.7	36.0	58.9	4.2	12.3	64.4	4.7	32.7	2.4	8.0	58.1
		Rate (people)		11.4	42.3	64.9	5.6	16.0	70.1	6.2	38.7	3.2	10.6	64.5

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Sulawesi Tangah): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Palu	Line	557	9,601	14,401	19,202	8,122	10,377	20,755	8,471	13,820	7,513	9,477	18,954
		Rate (HH)		6.9	23.6	37.9	2.9	8.4	43.7	4.5	21.8	1.6	6.1	37.0
		Rate (people)		10.0	31.6	48.8	4.9	12.1	54.5	7.1	29.7	2.4	9.2	47.9
All Kota		Line	557	9,601	14,401	19,202	8,122	10,377	20,755	8,471	13,820	9,601	10,377	20,755
		Rate (HH)		6.9	23.6	37.9	2.9	8.4	43.7	4.5	21.8	1.6	6.1	37.0
		Rate (people)		10.0	31.6	48.8	4.9	12.1	54.5	7.1	29.7	2.4	9.2	47.9
Kabupaten	Banggai Kepulauan	Line	624	6,587	9,881	13,174	5,608	7,120	14,240	5,812	9,482	6,519	8,223	16,446
		Rate (HH)		15.0	37.6	59.8	6.8	19.4	67.6	9.0	35.5	13.9	28.9	76.8
		Rate (people)		19.5	44.7	67.6	9.6	24.7	75.1	12.6	42.5	18.1	35.6	82.7
Kabupaten	Banggai	Line	626	7,467	11,201	14,934	6,139	8,071	16,142	6,588	10,749	6,701	8,453	16,906
		Rate (HH)		10.0	45.1	68.0	4.2	15.6	73.6	6.4	40.2	6.0	17.4	76.1
		Rate (people)		12.1	51.5	74.6	5.8	19.9	79.6	8.0	46.5	8.2	22.3	82.2
Kabupaten	Morowali	Line	573	8,172	12,258	16,344	6,681	8,833	17,666	7,210	11,764	6,532	8,240	16,480
		Rate (HH)		14.9	43.3	63.5	6.5	19.5	69.7	8.9	38.6	5.5	14.5	64.3
		Rate (people)		20.3	50.2	69.9	9.9	25.1	76.1	12.5	46.1	8.5	19.7	70.8
Kabupaten	Poso	Line	591	8,645	12,967	17,289	7,314	9,344	18,688	7,627	12,444	6,680	8,426	16,852
		Rate (HH)		16.2	46.4	68.0	7.9	22.0	72.1	9.6	42.8	4.2	13.1	67.1
		Rate (people)		21.4	54.7	75.1	10.6	27.7	78.6	13.0	50.9	5.8	17.0	74.4
Kabupaten	Donggala	Line	648	6,235	9,352	12,469	5,092	6,739	13,478	5,501	8,975	6,543	8,253	16,506
		Rate (HH)		15.6	48.9	74.3	7.3	20.6	78.8	10.0	43.1	18.2	33.9	88.8
		Rate (people)		19.4	57.5	80.4	9.5	25.2	83.6	12.7	51.6	22.3	42.1	91.3
Kabupaten	Toli Toli	Line	584	6,266	9,399	12,532	5,600	6,773	13,546	5,528	9,020	6,725	8,483	16,965
		Rate (HH)		11.8	38.6	60.9	5.3	15.5	67.2	5.1	37.0	14.1	31.3	82.2
		Rate (people)		16.2	47.5	69.1	7.8	21.1	74.6	7.5	45.8	18.9	39.1	87.2
Kabupaten	Buol	Line	593	6,732	10,098	13,464	5,862	7,276	14,553	5,939	9,691	6,641	8,377	16,754
		Rate (HH)		13.6	45.5	69.2	6.4	19.8	74.2	6.6	42.1	11.9	28.2	81.0
		Rate (people)		18.7	55.1	76.7	9.0	26.4	81.1	9.4	51.0	16.5	36.3	87.0
Kabupaten	Parigi Moutong	Line	585	7,625	11,438	15,250	6,433	8,242	16,484	6,727	10,976	6,545	8,256	16,511
		Rate (HH)		15.1	47.7	73.6	7.3	21.1	77.5	9.5	43.2	7.9	20.1	78.6
		Rate (people)		20.1	56.5	79.7	10.0	27.8	83.1	12.8	52.2	10.7	26.5	84.6
Kabupaten	Tojo Una-Una	Line	592	8,457	12,686	16,915	6,940	9,141	18,283	7,462	12,174	6,598	8,323	16,645
		Rate (HH)		19.0	46.9	65.6	9.0	24.1	70.6	11.9	43.8	5.8	17.1	64.4
		Rate (people)		24.1	54.3	72.8	12.0	29.9	77.0	15.5	50.8	7.5	22.1	71.8
Kabupaten	Sigi	Line	455	6,314	9,471	12,628	5,374	6,824	13,649	5,570	9,089	6,584	8,305	16,611
		Rate (HH)		11.9	44.7	68.7	5.6	16.8	72.4	6.6	41.6	13.2	34.0	84.1
		Rate (people)		15.1	52.3	74.3	7.4	20.9	77.8	9.1	48.8	16.7	40.9	87.5
All Kabupaten		Line	5,871	7,252	10,878	14,504	6,094	7,838	15,677	6,398	10,439	7,252	7,838	15,677
		Rate (HH)		14.0	44.9	68.0	6.5	19.2	73.1	8.3	40.9	9.9	23.4	77.0
		Rate (people)		18.3	52.9	74.8	9.0	24.7	79.3	11.2	48.9	13.1	29.8	82.7
All Sulawesi Tengah		Line	6,428	7,551	11,326	15,102	6,352	8,161	16,323	6,662	10,869	6,720	8,477	16,954
		Rate (HH)		13.1	42.1	64.1	6.0	17.8	69.3	7.8	38.5	8.8	21.2	71.9
		Rate (people)		17.2	50.2	71.5	8.5	23.1	76.1	10.7	46.4	11.7	27.2	78.2

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Sulawesi Tenggara): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Kendari	Line	657	7,429	11,143	14,857	6,100	8,029	16,059	6,554	10,694	5,798	7,314	14,628
		Rate (HH)		5.5	18.1	33.8	2.8	7.8	38.4	3.3	16.4	1.7	4.3	32.9
		Rate (people)		8.0	24.3	41.7	4.0	11.0	46.2	4.8	22.1	2.7	6.2	40.8
Kota	Baubau	Line	736	7,631	11,446	15,262	6,152	8,248	16,496	6,732	10,984	5,727	7,224	14,447
		Rate (HH)		9.2	31.8	49.3	4.2	12.0	53.4	6.0	29.1	2.2	6.8	46.4
		Rate (people)		12.1	39.7	57.9	5.9	15.9	61.9	8.3	36.9	3.5	9.4	55.1
All Kota		Line	1,393	7,494	11,240	14,987	6,116	8,100	16,199	6,611	10,787	7,494	8,100	16,199
		Rate (HH)		6.6	22.3	38.6	3.2	9.1	43.0	4.1	20.3	1.8	5.1	37.0
		Rate (people)		9.3	29.2	46.9	4.6	12.6	51.2	5.9	26.8	2.9	7.2	45.4
Kabupaten	Buton	Line	790	5,798	8,697	11,595	4,987	6,267	12,533	5,115	8,346	5,353	6,752	13,504
		Rate (HH)		11.6	39.6	67.9	5.4	15.4	75.8	5.9	35.7	7.6	19.9	81.2
		Rate (people)		17.9	49.1	76.8	8.9	22.8	82.5	9.8	45.2	12.2	28.3	87.0
Kabupaten	Muna	Line	687	7,637	11,455	15,273	6,573	8,254	16,509	6,738	10,993	5,393	6,802	13,604
		Rate (HH)		12.2	41.6	65.1	5.7	16.3	69.9	6.9	37.6	1.1	7.1	55.9
		Rate (people)		17.4	49.6	71.0	8.6	22.4	75.8	10.1	45.5	1.6	10.4	63.8
Kabupaten	Kendari	Line	735	7,147	10,720	14,293	5,963	7,724	15,449	6,305	10,287	5,394	6,803	13,607
		Rate (HH)		13.8	47.4	71.6	5.9	18.4	76.9	7.4	43.7	4.1	10.2	67.9
		Rate (people)		17.5	53.0	75.5	8.6	22.1	80.5	10.2	49.2	6.4	13.9	72.6
Kabupaten	Kolaka	Line	718	8,004	12,006	16,008	7,146	8,651	17,302	7,062	11,522	5,438	6,860	13,719
		Rate (HH)		14.1	52.1	75.9	7.1	20.5	79.3	6.5	49.0	0.7	4.7	65.5
		Rate (people)		18.9	59.2	81.8	9.4	26.5	84.7	8.7	56.2	1.0	6.8	72.2
Kabupaten	Konawe Selatan	Line	733	5,301	7,951	10,601	4,731	5,729	11,459	4,677	7,630	5,340	6,736	13,473
		Rate (HH)		9.9	47.0	69.9	4.4	14.7	76.2	4.1	43.4	10.3	28.4	83.8
		Rate (people)		13.5	54.7	74.8	6.6	19.0	80.6	6.2	51.4	13.9	35.2	87.3
Kabupaten	Bombana	Line	452	6,912	10,367	13,823	6,127	7,470	14,941	6,098	9,949	5,368	6,771	13,541
		Rate (HH)		12.2	48.6	74.9	6.0	17.5	80.7	5.7	46.4	2.6	10.5	73.2
		Rate (people)		15.7	57.3	81.7	7.6	22.3	85.3	7.4	55.1	3.6	13.7	80.5
Kabupaten	Wakatobi	Line	474	6,296	9,444	12,592	5,472	6,805	13,610	5,555	9,063	5,370	6,774	13,548
		Rate (HH)		12.8	43.6	67.3	6.4	20.9	72.7	7.5	40.7	5.3	18.9	72.6
		Rate (people)		18.5	53.0	76.5	9.2	28.3	80.8	11.5	49.7	7.5	25.2	80.8
Kabupaten	Kolaka Utara	Line	460	9,453	14,179	18,905	8,670	10,217	20,434	8,340	13,607	5,360	6,761	13,522
		Rate (HH)		13.9	54.5	77.3	6.7	20.8	81.1	4.9	48.6	0.0	0.8	47.8
		Rate (people)		20.0	63.1	83.8	9.9	29.0	86.7	7.4	57.4	0.0	1.5	56.6
Kabupaten	Buton Utara	Line	536	7,335	11,002	14,670	6,461	7,928	15,856	6,471	10,559	5,365	6,768	13,535
		Rate (HH)		15.7	55.7	79.4	7.2	21.1	83.2	7.5	51.7	1.7	9.0	74.2
		Rate (people)		18.8	60.5	83.0	9.3	25.3	86.2	9.7	56.2	2.1	11.5	78.7
Kabupaten	Konawe Utara	Line	459	6,046	9,069	12,092	5,320	6,535	13,070	5,334	8,703	5,322	6,714	13,427
		Rate (HH)		10.1	38.9	66.4	4.8	13.5	72.1	5.2	35.4	4.6	15.7	74.4
		Rate (people)		13.7	46.2	73.2	6.7	18.0	78.0	7.1	42.6	6.5	20.5	80.2
All Kabupaten		Line	6,044	6,976	10,464	13,952	6,109	7,540	15,081	6,155	10,042	6,976	7,540	15,081
		Rate (HH)		12.5	46.7	71.1	5.9	17.7	76.4	6.1	43.0	4.0	12.7	69.4
		Rate (people)		17.2	54.3	77.3	8.5	23.3	81.7	8.8	50.7	6.0	17.1	75.8
All Sulawesi Tenggara		Line	7,437	7,075	10,613	14,150	6,110	7,647	15,295	6,242	10,185	5,455	6,881	13,762
		Rate (HH)		11.4	41.9	64.8	5.4	16.0	69.9	5.7	38.6	3.6	11.2	63.1
		Rate (people)		15.7	49.5	71.5	7.8	21.3	75.9	8.3	46.1	5.4	15.2	70.0

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Sulawesi Utara): Poverty lines and rates

Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
			New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
			National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
			100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Manado	Line	599	8,147	12,221	16,294	7,037	8,806	17,612	7,188	11,728	6,638	8,373	16,746
	Rate (HH)		3.7	20.3	41.6	1.9	5.2	46.1	2.1	17.7	1.4	4.1	44.0
	Rate (people)		6.2	27.4	51.1	3.0	8.2	55.5	3.3	24.2	2.3	6.7	53.3
Bitung	Line	507	8,960	13,441	17,921	7,274	9,685	19,370	7,905	12,898	6,575	8,294	16,587
	Rate (HH)		7.2	28.3	48.8	3.4	10.1	55.0	4.1	25.1	1.8	4.8	41.7
	Rate (people)		9.5	34.4	55.1	4.2	12.5	61.7	5.3	30.8	2.1	6.6	48.0
Tomohon	Line	653	8,737	13,105	17,474	8,011	9,443	18,887	7,708	12,577	6,500	8,199	16,398
	Rate (HH)		5.1	25.7	46.9	2.6	8.8	53.8	2.1	22.9	0.9	3.2	42.4
	Rate (people)		7.4	32.3	53.3	3.6	12.2	60.2	3.0	29.4	1.4	4.5	49.5
Kotamobagu	Line	458	7,295	10,942	14,590	6,467	7,885	15,769	6,436	10,501	6,490	8,186	16,372
	Rate (HH)		5.2	28.8	53.9	2.2	8.4	59.3	2.2	25.7	2.4	10.2	61.2
	Rate (people)		7.6	35.3	61.3	3.5	12.1	66.5	3.5	31.7	3.9	13.9	68.9
	Line	2,217	8,293	12,440	16,586	7,129	8,964	17,927	7,317	11,938	8,293	8,964	17,927
	Rate (HH)		4.9	23.8	45.4	2.3	7.1	50.6	2.6	20.9	1.6	4.9	45.4
	Rate (people)		7.3	30.7	53.7	3.4	10.2	59.0	3.7	27.4	2.4	7.4	53.7
Bolaang Mongondow	Line	625	7,420	11,131	14,841	6,447	8,021	16,041	6,547	10,682	6,199	7,820	15,640
	Rate (HH)		7.1	40.5	69.2	3.5	12.5	77.2	3.7	37.1	2.3	10.3	74.9
	Rate (people)		9.7	48.6	75.6	4.7	16.2	82.7	5.1	45.1	3.3	13.6	80.6
Minahasa	Line	594	6,689	10,034	13,378	5,907	7,230	14,460	5,902	9,629	6,411	8,087	16,175
	Rate (HH)		6.5	28.8	51.7	2.9	8.7	57.8	2.9	25.4	4.2	14.2	68.4
	Rate (people)		9.0	34.4	57.5	4.3	11.8	63.7	4.3	30.9	5.8	18.6	73.5
Kep. Sangihe Talaud	Line	591	6,264	9,396	12,529	5,183	6,771	13,542	5,527	9,017	6,315	7,966	15,931
	Rate (HH)		9.3	32.5	57.8	4.1	13.7	66.6	5.8	29.9	9.0	22.2	77.1
	Rate (people)		13.2	41.1	65.8	6.5	19.1	73.2	8.6	38.2	13.0	29.9	82.7
Kep. Talaud	Line	581	6,562	9,843	13,124	5,562	7,093	14,185	5,789	9,446	6,245	7,877	15,755
	Rate (HH)		7.3	36.5	62.3	3.3	12.7	69.1	3.8	34.0	5.8	19.2	76.5
	Rate (people)		11.4	46.5	71.3	5.6	18.9	77.4	6.2	43.7	9.0	26.4	83.7
Minahasa Selatan	Line	612	7,589	11,383	15,178	6,665	8,203	16,405	6,695	10,924	6,265	7,903	15,806
	Rate (HH)		7.6	39.5	65.6	3.4	11.3	71.7	3.6	34.3	2.3	9.7	68.6
	Rate (people)		10.7	46.8	73.0	5.2	14.9	78.4	5.5	41.4	3.8	13.5	75.8
Minahasa Utara	Line	562	7,477	11,215	14,954	6,745	8,081	16,163	6,597	10,763	6,399	8,072	16,144
	Rate (HH)		6.2	35.5	61.6	3.2	9.8	66.8	2.3	31.4	1.6	9.4	66.4
	Rate (people)		8.4	41.7	67.2	4.2	12.6	71.8	3.1	37.7	2.3	12.7	71.5
Bolaang Mongondow Utara	Line	468	6,035	9,052	12,069	5,199	6,523	13,045	5,324	8,687	6,195	7,814	15,628
	Rate (HH)		7.3	34.8	59.7	3.4	9.7	66.3	3.9	31.6	9.0	22.6	80.2
	Rate (people)		10.2	41.5	67.4	4.9	13.4	73.9	5.6	38.1	12.5	28.4	85.6
Kep. Sitaro	Line	404	7,238	10,857	14,477	6,354	7,824	15,647	6,386	10,420	6,287	7,930	15,860
	Rate (HH)		7.7	36.9	58.3	3.4	11.5	64.9	3.7	33.3	2.8	11.4	66.0
	Rate (people)		11.8	46.0	66.8	5.7	16.9	72.2	6.2	42.4	4.7	16.7	73.1
Minahasa Tenggara	Line	467	7,958	11,937	15,915	6,806	8,601	17,202	7,021	11,455	6,188	7,805	15,611
	Rate (HH)		13.7	48.3	71.9	6.4	18.0	75.5	7.5	44.7	4.4	12.3	70.4
	Rate (people)		17.6	55.2	77.4	8.6	22.1	80.2	10.3	51.3	5.8	16.0	75.9
Bolaang Mongondow Selatan	Line	470	7,365	11,048	14,730	6,075	7,961	15,921	6,498	10,602	6,192	7,811	15,621
	Rate (HH)		15.5	48.5	73.8	7.2	21.1	79.4	9.3	44.8	8.3	19.0	77.9
	Rate (people)		18.8	53.7	78.7	9.0	24.6	84.0	12.1	50.3	10.6	22.2	82.6
Bolaang Mongondow Timur	Line	469	7,334	11,001	14,668	6,484	7,927	15,854	6,471	10,557	6,226	7,853	15,706
	Rate (HH)		5.0	34.8	61.5	1.8	6.6	69.0	1.8	29.1	0.8	6.7	68.7
	Rate (people)		7.8	41.7	67.9	3.5	9.7	75.2	3.5	36.2	1.8	9.9	75.0
	Line	5,843	7,105	10,657	14,209	6,190	7,679	15,359	6,268	10,227	7,105	7,679	15,359
	Rate (HH)		7.8	36.4	61.7	3.6	11.5	68.1	3.9	32.7	4.0	13.4	71.2
	Rate (people)		10.8	43.6	68.4	5.3	15.4	74.3	5.7	39.8	5.8	17.8	77.1
	Line	8,060	7,522	11,283	15,043	6,519	8,130	16,260	6,636	10,827	6,397	8,069	16,139
	Rate (HH)		6.8	32.0	55.9	3.2	10.0	62.0	3.4	28.5	3.2	10.4	62.1
	Rate (people)		9.6	39.1	63.2	4.6	13.6	68.9	5.0	35.4	4.6	14.2	68.9

AS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Sumatera Barat): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Padang	Line	709	10,064	15,096	20,128	8,785	10,878	21,755	8,879	14,487	8,555	10,792	21,584
		Rate (HH)		5.1	21.1	40.6	2.2	6.5	46.5	2.4	18.2	1.8	6.1	45.7
		Rate (people)		6.3	27.5	49.7	3.1	8.6	55.0	3.3	24.3	2.5	7.9	54.2
Kota	Solok	Line	414	9,151	13,727	18,303	8,224	9,891	19,783	8,074	13,173	8,595	10,842	21,684
		Rate (HH)		4.8	24.6	45.1	2.4	7.0	52.5	2.4	22.1	3.2	9.6	59.8
		Rate (people)		7.0	29.8	52.2	3.5	9.5	59.8	3.5	27.0	5.0	12.4	66.5
Kota	Sawahlunto	Line	444	6,836	10,254	13,671	6,307	7,389	14,777	6,031	9,840	8,030	10,129	20,257
		Rate (HH)		1.5	16.4	36.4	0.7	3.4	41.8	0.7	14.4	5.3	14.9	70.1
		Rate (people)		2.5	20.8	43.1	1.0	5.1	48.5	1.0	18.7	8.2	18.9	75.7
Kota	Padang Panjang	Line	396	9,035	13,553	18,070	8,010	9,766	19,531	7,971	13,006	8,543	10,776	21,552
		Rate (HH)		6.4	27.2	44.8	2.9	9.9	49.1	2.9	23.1	3.5	13.3	57.6
		Rate (people)		7.6	32.8	52.5	3.8	12.2	57.7	3.8	27.9	4.3	16.5	66.3
Kota	Bukit Tinggi	Line	459	9,516	14,274	19,031	8,948	10,285	20,570	8,395	13,698	8,619	10,872	21,745
		Rate (HH)		4.6	16.6	34.0	2.2	6.8	41.2	1.3	15.3	1.5	8.3	46.0
		Rate (people)		6.8	21.9	42.5	3.2	9.5	50.4	2.0	20.4	2.3	11.5	56.1
Kota	Payakumbuh	Line	457	9,527	14,291	19,054	8,598	10,298	20,595	8,406	13,714	8,276	10,439	20,878
		Rate (HH)		8.8	36.8	60.9	4.3	14.1	66.5	4.2	33.6	3.2	12.1	67.5
		Rate (people)		10.6	40.6	65.5	5.0	16.7	71.4	4.9	37.4	4.0	14.0	72.7
Kota	Pariaman	Line	573	8,840	13,260	17,679	7,654	9,555	19,109	7,799	12,725	8,236	10,389	20,778
		Rate (HH)		4.5	26.6	50.5	2.4	7.1	58.5	2.5	23.1	3.1	8.8	65.6
		Rate (people)		5.9	33.4	59.0	2.9	9.3	66.9	3.1	29.5	4.3	11.6	74.2
All Kota		Line	3,452	9,676	14,513	19,351	8,552	10,458	20,916	8,536	13,928	9,676	10,458	20,916
		Rate (HH)		5.2	22.5	42.5	2.4	7.2	48.5	2.4	19.7	2.3	7.8	50.9
		Rate (people)		6.6	28.5	51.0	3.2	9.4	56.9	3.3	25.4	3.1	10.0	59.2
Kabupaten	Kep. Mentawai	Line	444	6,128	9,191	12,255	4,554	6,623	13,246	5,406	8,821	7,195	9,075	18,151
		Rate (HH)		15.1	31.0	48.5	7.0	17.8	55.3	11.1	30.5	21.0	31.9	79.1
		Rate (people)		19.7	35.6	54.5	9.6	22.5	61.4	14.7	35.2	25.6	36.6	84.1
Kabupaten	Pesisir Selatan	Line	628	8,253	12,380	16,506	7,103	8,920	17,841	7,281	11,880	7,207	9,091	18,182
		Rate (HH)		8.6	29.4	62.5	4.0	11.1	70.2	4.2	26.1	4.0	11.7	72.0
		Rate (people)		10.2	35.5	70.1	5.0	13.2	77.4	5.2	31.8	5.0	14.1	79.0
Kabupaten	Solok	Line	656	8,614	12,921	17,228	7,551	9,311	18,621	7,600	12,400	7,135	8,999	17,999
		Rate (HH)		8.4	36.4	64.2	4.6	12.5	69.4	4.8	32.1	2.9	11.6	67.0
		Rate (people)		11.7	42.9	69.8	5.6	17.0	75.5	6.0	38.4	3.9	15.6	73.0
Kabupaten	Sawahlunto/Sijunjung	Line	539	8,018	12,027	16,036	6,299	8,666	17,333	7,074	11,542	7,281	9,185	18,369
		Rate (HH)		8.3	36.4	60.7	3.4	10.8	65.6	5.1	32.9	5.3	13.4	69.7
		Rate (people)		10.4	41.6	66.7	4.8	13.6	71.7	6.8	37.6	7.0	16.2	75.6
Kabupaten	Tanah Datar	Line	581	8,019	12,028	16,037	6,981	8,667	17,334	7,075	11,543	7,401	9,336	18,672
		Rate (HH)		4.8	30.3	59.3	2.1	8.2	66.7	2.5	27.5	2.9	10.8	73.2
		Rate (people)		6.9	37.5	66.9	3.0	11.0	73.4	3.7	34.0	4.2	13.6	78.8
Kabupaten	Padang Pariaman	Line	619	8,556	12,834	17,112	7,653	9,248	18,496	7,549	12,317	7,564	9,541	19,082
		Rate (HH)		7.5	33.6	61.1	3.4	11.5	67.4	3.2	30.1	2.9	14.8	69.0
		Rate (people)		11.9	42.8	69.9	5.9	16.4	75.2	5.4	39.1	4.5	20.7	76.2
Kabupaten	Agam	Line	597	7,431	11,146	14,861	6,605	8,032	16,063	6,556	10,696	7,565	9,543	19,085
		Rate (HH)		7.6	36.1	59.4	3.5	12.8	66.4	3.5	33.0	8.3	23.2	77.9
		Rate (people)		9.8	43.9	66.4	4.8	17.1	73.1	4.8	40.6	11.2	30.3	83.8
Kabupaten	Lima Puluh Koto	Line	598	8,220	12,330	16,440	6,871	8,885	17,770	7,252	11,833	7,205	9,088	18,176
		Rate (HH)		8.7	41.3	69.2	4.2	13.6	74.2	5.4	37.5	5.0	14.5	75.8
		Rate (people)		10.5	48.5	76.1	5.1	16.0	80.7	6.7	44.0	6.3	17.3	82.4
Kabupaten	Pasaman	Line	696	7,482	11,222	14,963	6,864	8,087	16,173	6,601	10,770	7,252	9,148	18,296
		Rate (HH)		8.9	42.2	67.8	4.6	14.2	73.0	4.1	37.6	6.9	22.0	79.6
		Rate (people)		11.0	48.6	73.6	5.4	18.1	78.5	4.9	44.2	8.4	27.2	84.0
Kabupaten	Solok Selatan	Line	589	7,243	10,865	14,486	6,539	7,829	15,658	6,390	10,426	7,395	9,329	18,657
		Rate (HH)		8.6	36.5	61.8	4.2	12.4	67.7	3.3	33.0	9.5	22.9	76.4
		Rate (people)		11.1	43.7	69.7	5.5	16.2	75.0	4.5	39.8	12.1	29.4	82.6
Kabupaten	Dharmasraya	Line	589	8,469	12,704	16,939	7,434	9,154	18,308	7,472	12,192	7,637	9,633	19,266
		Rate (HH)		7.7	31.5	55.5	3.7	11.0	62.1	4.0	28.6	4.5	13.7	65.4
		Rate (people)		10.6	37.9	64.2	5.1	14.3	70.1	5.7	34.8	6.7	17.4	72.8
Kabupaten	Pasaman Barat	Line	588	8,487	12,731	16,975	7,469	9,174	18,347	7,488	12,217	7,288	9,194	18,387
		Rate (HH)		7.1	38.4	68.9	3.0	12.4	74.0	3.2	34.5	3.5	10.9	74.4
		Rate (people)		9.6	44.1	74.0	4.6	16.2	78.2	4.9	40.3	5.2	14.4	79.0
All Kabupaten		Line	7,124	8,071	12,106	16,142	7,024	8,724	17,447	7,121	11,618	8,071	8,724	17,447
		Rate (HH)		7.9	35.5	62.8	3.7	12.0	68.9	4.1	31.9	5.2	15.5	73.1
		Rate (people)		10.5	42.2	69.6	5.1	15.6	75.4	5.5	38.5	6.9	19.7	79.1
All Sumatera Barat		Line	10,576	8,503	12,754	17,006	7,435	9,190	18,381	7,502	12,240	7,658	9,660	19,320
		Rate (HH)		7.2	32.0	57.3	3.4	10.7	63.4	3.6	28.7	4.4	13.4	67.2
		Rate (people)		9.4	38.5	64.6	4.6	13.9	70.4	4.9	34.9	5.9	17.1	73.7

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Sumatera Selatan): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Palembang	Line	722	10,377	15,566	20,754	8,834	11,216	22,432	9,155	14,938	8,472	10,687	21,374
		Rate (HH)		12.5	36.1	56.8	5.9	16.2	62.7	7.1	33.5	4.9	13.8	60.0
		Rate (people)		15.0	40.6	61.0	7.4	19.4	66.5	9.2	38.0	6.2	16.5	64.3
Kota	Prabumulih	Line	490	10,472	15,708	20,944	9,388	11,319	22,638	9,239	15,074	7,998	10,089	20,178
		Rate (HH)		10.9	48.4	73.6	5.2	15.6	79.3	4.5	43.4	2.6	10.6	68.9
		Rate (people)		12.9	54.5	79.9	6.4	18.4	85.3	5.6	49.1	3.2	12.5	75.4
Kota	Pagar Alam	Line	490	7,022	10,532	14,043	6,400	7,589	15,179	6,195	10,108	7,738	9,761	19,522
		Rate (HH)		7.2	31.1	60.3	3.5	11.9	66.0	2.8	28.6	11.3	22.8	81.3
		Rate (people)		9.8	36.8	65.6	4.9	15.6	71.1	4.1	34.3	15.5	28.9	85.1
Kota	Lubuk Linggau	Line	464	9,489	14,233	18,977	8,062	10,256	20,512	8,371	13,659	8,075	10,185	20,370
		Rate (HH)		13.1	35.5	57.8	6.1	16.1	61.8	7.4	32.4	5.6	12.3	61.8
		Rate (people)		15.3	40.3	63.2	7.5	18.3	67.0	9.2	36.8	7.2	14.7	67.5
All Kota		Line	2,166	10,075	15,112	20,150	8,642	10,890	21,779	8,889	14,503	10,075	10,890	21,779
		Rate (HH)		12.0	36.7	58.6	5.7	15.8	64.2	6.6	33.9	5.2	14.0	62.5
		Rate (people)		14.5	41.5	63.1	7.2	19.0	68.4	8.6	38.6	6.7	16.8	66.9
Kabupaten	Ogan Komering Ulu	Line	700	8,328	12,492	16,656	6,983	9,001	18,003	7,347	11,988	7,280	9,183	18,366
		Rate (HH)		9.2	30.6	55.3	4.1	12.5	62.2	5.2	28.1	3.9	10.4	63.8
		Rate (people)		12.3	36.7	60.8	5.9	16.1	67.1	7.2	33.7	5.5	13.6	69.6
Kabupaten	Ogan Komering Ilir	Line	690	7,021	10,531	14,041	5,776	7,588	15,177	6,194	10,106	6,701	8,453	16,906
		Rate (HH)		12.2	41.7	68.6	5.4	16.7	73.4	7.3	36.1	10.3	22.0	80.3
		Rate (people)		16.0	48.5	75.6	7.6	22.1	79.6	10.0	42.7	14.1	28.3	86.0
Kabupaten	Muara Enim	Line	590	7,424	11,136	14,848	6,561	8,024	16,048	6,550	10,687	6,913	8,720	17,441
		Rate (HH)		11.0	49.0	75.1	5.2	18.0	79.2	5.1	44.6	7.1	22.0	84.9
		Rate (people)		14.5	56.5	80.5	7.1	22.9	83.8	6.9	52.1	9.3	27.5	88.9
Kabupaten	Lahat	Line	582	8,555	12,833	17,111	7,029	9,247	18,495	7,548	12,315	7,020	8,855	17,710
		Rate (HH)		15.3	48.5	69.1	7.2	19.9	73.2	9.7	45.1	6.3	15.8	72.1
		Rate (people)		19.0	54.8	75.3	9.5	24.7	78.8	12.3	51.6	7.9	19.3	78.6
Kabupaten	Musi Rawas	Line	625	8,819	13,229	17,639	7,540	9,533	19,065	7,781	12,696	6,594	8,318	16,636
		Rate (HH)		15.2	50.5	77.1	7.0	20.6	81.3	7.9	47.7	3.9	11.0	73.8
		Rate (people)		19.4	57.7	81.9	9.7	25.1	85.0	11.0	54.3	5.6	14.6	79.3
Kabupaten	Musi Banyuasin	Line	691	9,068	13,601	18,135	7,934	9,801	19,602	8,000	13,053	6,770	8,540	17,080
		Rate (HH)		15.5	56.5	76.0	7.2	22.8	80.8	7.8	54.3	1.5	10.6	73.4
		Rate (people)		20.1	63.5	81.7	10.0	28.5	85.5	10.8	61.3	2.4	14.5	79.3
Kabupaten	Banyuasin	Line	497	7,740	11,610	15,480	6,777	8,366	16,732	6,829	11,142	7,006	8,837	17,674
		Rate (HH)		8.9	42.8	72.8	4.7	11.0	77.5	4.9	36.2	4.8	12.5	81.8
		Rate (people)		12.4	50.8	78.3	5.8	15.1	82.4	6.2	44.0	6.6	16.7	87.2
Kabupaten	OKU Selatan	Line	575	6,551	9,826	13,102	5,776	7,081	14,162	5,780	9,430	6,692	8,441	16,882
		Rate (HH)		7.1	36.5	61.4	3.2	10.6	68.8	3.4	33.4	8.0	23.0	79.2
		Rate (people)		11.5	45.0	69.3	5.6	15.8	75.2	5.8	41.7	12.8	30.2	83.9
Kabupaten	OKU Timur	Line	586	6,287	9,431	12,574	5,301	6,796	13,591	5,547	9,050	6,707	8,460	16,920
		Rate (HH)		8.6	39.0	65.5	4.0	13.1	70.3	5.3	34.4	13.3	26.6	83.2
		Rate (people)		9.8	43.1	70.7	4.7	15.4	74.8	6.0	38.3	15.7	30.1	86.4
Kabupaten	Ogan Ilir	Line	591	8,320	12,480	16,640	7,414	8,993	17,986	7,341	11,977	6,915	8,722	17,444
		Rate (HH)		11.3	46.6	73.3	5.5	15.1	77.7	5.3	42.2	3.5	13.2	77.2
		Rate (people)		14.0	53.6	78.7	6.9	18.6	82.9	6.7	49.1	4.6	16.3	82.4
Kabupaten	Empat Lawang	Line	408	6,617	9,925	13,234	5,700	7,152	14,304	5,838	9,525	6,666	8,408	16,816
		Rate (HH)		10.5	36.5	61.9	4.7	15.9	68.0	5.6	33.7	9.9	24.4	78.7
		Rate (people)		14.7	46.1	70.5	7.0	21.5	75.9	8.1	43.0	14.0	32.5	85.7
All Kabupaten		Line	6,535	7,698	11,547	15,396	6,617	8,320	16,641	6,792	11,081	7,698	8,320	16,641
		Rate (HH)		11.5	44.5	70.1	5.4	16.2	75.0	6.2	40.3	6.7	17.4	78.2
		Rate (people)		14.9	51.5	76.0	7.2	20.7	80.2	8.3	47.1	9.0	22.1	83.4
All Sumatera Selatan		Line	8,701	8,318	12,477	16,636	7,145	8,990	17,981	7,339	11,973	7,229	9,119	18,238
		Rate (HH)		11.6	42.6	67.2	5.5	16.1	72.3	6.3	38.7	6.3	16.6	74.3
		Rate (people)		14.8	48.9	72.7	7.2	20.2	77.1	8.3	44.9	8.4	20.7	79.1

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and Badan Pusat Statistik (2011), pp. 7-24. See documentation for legacy lines.

Figure 2 (Sumatera Utara): Poverty lines and rates

Kubupaten, Kota, or All	Name of Region	Line or Rate	HHs surveyed (n)	Poverty lines (IDR/person/day) and poverty rates (%)										
				New (2010) lines								Legacy (2007) lines		
				National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP	
				100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10	100%	$1.25	$2.50
Kota	Sibolga	Line	548	9,430	14,145	18,860	8,475	10,192	20,385	8,320	13,574	8,139	10,266	20,532
		Rate (HH)		9.9	37.8	59.7	4.6	14.2	65.9	4.4	33.2	4.0	14.4	66.4
		Rate (people)		13.9	45.9	69.1	6.9	19.0	74.1	6.5	40.8	6.2	19.3	74.5
Kota	Tanjung Balai	Line	589	8,543	12,814	17,085	7,475	9,233	18,467	7,537	12,297	8,139	10,266	20,532
		Rate (HH)		10.9	40.2	65.4	4.9	16.6	71.6	5.4	36.3	8.0	24.1	78.1
		Rate (people)		16.3	50.3	74.6	7.9	23.9	80.3	8.6	46.3	12.2	32.8	85.8
Kota	Pematang Siantar	Line	585	10,432	15,648	20,864	9,233	11,276	22,551	9,204	15,017	8,139	10,266	20,532
		Rate (HH)		8.5	34.5	60.3	4.1	12.1	64.4	4.1	30.4	1.7	7.9	59.1
		Rate (people)		11.7	42.7	69.2	5.7	16.1	72.4	5.7	37.9	2.6	10.9	68.2
Kota	Tebing Tinggi	Line	591	9,283	13,925	18,567	8,067	10,034	20,068	8,190	13,363	8,139	10,266	20,532
		Rate (HH)		9.0	33.7	57.2	3.7	13.2	62.3	4.2	30.5	4.2	14.4	64.3
		Rate (people)		13.0	41.5	66.1	6.3	18.1	70.7	7.0	38.1	7.0	19.6	72.5
Kota	Medan	Line	904	10,904	16,356	21,808	9,733	11,786	23,571	9,620	15,696	8,139	10,266	20,532
		Rate (HH)		7.0	24.8	47.9	3.4	8.7	53.8	3.1	22.6	1.5	5.2	43.9
		Rate (people)		10.1	31.1	55.0	5.0	12.3	60.7	4.6	28.8	2.5	7.6	51.3
Kota	Binjai	Line	604	8,417	12,626	16,835	7,650	9,098	18,196	7,426	12,117	8,073	10,183	20,366
		Rate (HH)		5.4	33.6	64.5	2.8	8.6	70.1	2.7	29.2	4.5	15.3	75.9
		Rate (people)		7.3	40.5	70.2	3.6	11.5	75.4	3.6	36.4	6.1	19.9	80.5
Kota	Padang Sidempuan	Line	714	8,252	12,378	16,503	7,014	8,919	17,838	7,280	11,878	7,710	9,725	19,450
		Rate (HH)		8.1	31.1	53.6	4.1	11.0	59.1	4.4	28.8	5.5	13.6	64.7
		Rate (people)		10.5	37.1	59.8	5.2	14.3	65.3	5.6	34.4	7.7	17.6	71.3
Kota	Gunungsitoli	Line	578	8,172	12,259	16,345	5,338	8,833	17,667	7,210	11,764	7,060	8,905	17,810
		Rate (HH)		29.5	54.6	69.2	14.0	34.2	72.5	24.8	51.8	22.1	33.6	73.8
		Rate (people)		33.9	59.1	74.5	16.8	38.8	77.7	29.4	56.4	26.6	39.0	78.1
All Kota		Line	5,113	10,205	15,307	20,410	9,003	11,030	22,060	9,003	14,690	10,205	11,030	22,060
		Rate (HH)		8.1	29.0	52.6	3.9	10.7	58.2	4.1	26.3	3.2	9.1	52.7
		Rate (people)		11.4	35.8	60.0	5.6	14.6	65.2	6.0	32.9	4.8	12.5	60.0
Kabupaten	Nias	Line	586	7,689	11,534	15,378	6,166	8,311	16,622	6,784	11,068	6,653	8,392	16,784
		Rate (HH)		16.1	38.7	59.4	7.7	19.6	65.3	10.8	35.1	10.2	20.2	66.3
		Rate (people)		20.0	44.9	66.6	9.9	23.8	72.0	13.3	40.9	12.5	24.5	72.9
Kabupaten	Mandailing Natal	Line	628	7,539	11,308	15,078	6,787	8,149	16,297	6,651	10,852	6,876	8,674	17,348
		Rate (HH)		9.4	42.9	69.3	4.4	14.8	73.4	3.8	39.6	4.3	17.5	76.6
		Rate (people)		12.6	51.2	77.9	6.2	18.7	81.1	5.2	47.5	5.9	22.5	83.8
Kabupaten	Tapanuli Selatan	Line	697	7,949	11,924	15,899	7,309	8,592	17,184	7,013	11,443	6,703	8,455	16,910
		Rate (HH)		8.2	46.3	75.0	4.0	12.8	80.5	3.0	39.8	1.5	11.4	80.0
		Rate (people)		12.0	58.2	82.7	5.9	18.2	87.1	4.6	51.9	2.2	16.6	86.7
Kabupaten	Tapanuli Tengah	Line	588	7,905	11,858	15,811	6,692	8,545	17,090	6,975	11,380	7,016	8,850	17,700
		Rate (HH)		12.4	37.2	59.7	6.0	15.3	65.3	6.9	33.6	6.4	15.8	68.2
		Rate (people)		16.7	45.7	68.5	8.3	20.1	73.4	9.5	41.2	8.8	20.6	76.1
Kabupaten	Tapanuli Utara	Line	616	7,738	11,607	15,475	6,574	8,364	16,727	6,827	11,138	6,792	8,567	17,134
		Rate (HH)		8.6	39.3	61.7	4.1	14.5	66.8	5.3	35.6	4.7	15.2	68.3
		Rate (people)		12.5	49.8	70.7	6.1	20.6	75.2	7.7	46.0	7.0	21.6	76.8
Kabupaten	Toba Samosir	Line	618	7,804	11,706	15,608	6,565	8,435	16,870	6,885	11,234	7,004	8,835	17,669
		Rate (HH)		7.2	28.4	48.7	3.4	10.6	54.3	4.7	24.7	3.9	11.5	57.4
		Rate (people)		10.2	36.3	58.0	5.0	15.2	62.7	6.9	31.9	5.9	16.1	66.5
Kabupaten	Labuhan Batu	Line	583	8,037	12,055	16,074	6,204	8,687	17,374	7,091	11,569	7,238	9,129	18,259
		Rate (HH)		7.2	30.7	63.5	2.7	9.3	71.0	4.8	27.7	5.6	10.8	73.2
		Rate (people)		10.7	38.7	70.9	5.1	13.1	77.8	7.8	35.3	8.6	15.2	79.9
Kabupaten	Asahan	Line	731	7,378	11,067	14,756	6,573	7,975	15,950	6,509	10,621	7,228	9,117	18,234
		Rate (HH)		8.9	41.2	68.3	4.1	13.0	74.4	4.1	37.3	6.8	22.5	82.8
		Rate (people)		11.4	47.8	73.6	5.6	16.2	78.9	5.6	43.4	8.9	27.2	86.2
Kabupaten	Simalungun	Line	731	7,673	11,510	15,346	6,824	8,294	16,587	6,770	11,045	7,110	8,968	17,936
		Rate (HH)		6.9	33.7	57.2	3.3	9.9	65.2	3.3	30.3	4.6	13.8	69.9
		Rate (people)		10.7	41.5	65.3	5.2	14.3	72.5	5.2	37.3	6.8	18.7	77.4
Kabupaten	Dairi	Line	591	7,172	10,757	14,343	6,300	7,752	15,503	6,327	10,324	6,905	8,710	17,420
		Rate (HH)		6.5	35.1	60.2	2.6	10.0	66.7	2.8	31.2	4.2	16.4	75.8
		Rate (people)		10.0	47.2	71.3	4.7	15.0	76.6	5.0	42.1	7.2	24.7	85.0
Kabupaten	Karo	Line	627	9,409	14,114	18,818	8,177	10,170	20,340	8,301	13,544	7,022	8,858	17,715
		Rate (HH)		7.9	37.1	64.4	3.8	12.2	69.6	4.6	33.9	1.0	6.0	56.0
		Rate (people)		11.0	47.1	72.7	5.3	16.9	77.7	6.5	43.6	1.3	8.3	65.5
Kabupaten	Deli Serdang	Line	936	7,932	11,898	15,865	7,439	8,574	17,148	6,998	11,419	7,773	9,805	19,610
		Rate (HH)		3.7	22.0	50.1	1.6	4.7	60.4	0.9	19.2	2.3	8.7	71.6
		Rate (people)		5.3	26.5	57.1	2.5	6.5	67.1	1.4	23.1	3.4	10.8	77.2
Kabupaten	Langkat	Line	757	8,124	12,185	16,247	6,820	8,780	17,561	7,167	11,694	7,129	8,993	17,986
		Rate (HH)		8.4	40.3	67.3	4.0	11.3	74.3	4.8	36.6	4.4	12.8	75.4
		Rate (people)		10.8	47.1	72.3	5.3	14.8	78.4	6.4	43.3	5.9	16.3	79.7
Kabupaten	Nias Selatan	Line	663	6,109	9,164	12,219	5,510	6,603	13,207	5,390	8,794	6,683	8,430	16,860
		Rate (HH)		17.8	59.2	75.8	8.7	25.5	79.6	7.2	55.7	25.9	51.2	88.2
		Rate (people)		20.7	67.0	81.4	10.2	30.2	85.0	8.3	63.8	30.8	59.3	92.1
Kabupaten	Humbang Hasundutan	Line	627	6,866	10,298	13,731	6,122	7,421	14,841	6,057	9,883	6,826	8,610	17,220
		Rate (HH)		7.2	41.5	61.9	3.5	12.1	67.4	3.1	38.6	7.6	24.6	75.4
		Rate (people)		10.6	52.5	72.3	5.2	17.3	77.2	4.8	49.3	11.1	33.1	84.0
Kabupaten	Pakpak Bharat	Line	410	5,814	8,720	11,627	5,310	6,284	12,568	5,129	8,369	6,700	8,452	16,904
		Rate (HH)		9.1	38.5	64.3	4.6	12.8	67.8	3.1	35.4	18.0	35.4	82.8
		Rate (people)		13.8	50.2	75.4	6.8	19.4	78.8	4.8	46.5	25.8	46.6	90.3
Kabupaten	Samosir	Line	631	6,628	9,942	13,256	5,713	7,164	14,328	5,848	9,541	6,781	8,554	17,108
		Rate (HH)		11.3	45.6	64.5	5.3	17.8	69.0	6.7	42.6	11.7	32.5	81.1
		Rate (people)		16.5	58.3	75.4	7.9	26.0	78.6	10.0	55.5	17.3	44.7	87.3
Kabupaten	Serdang Bedagai	Line	622	8,165	12,248	16,331	6,942	8,826	17,651	7,204	11,754	7,187	9,065	18,130
		Rate (HH)		8.2	31.8	62.7	4.0	12.3	70.1	4.7	28.8	4.9	11.6	70.3
		Rate (people)		10.6	37.5	68.6	5.2	15.2	75.1	6.2	34.4	6.2	14.8	75.5
Kabupaten	Batu Bara	Line	467	8,346	12,518	16,691	7,132	9,021	18,041	7,363	12,013	7,116	8,976	17,951
		Rate (HH)		8.7	48.2	76.9	3.9	13.2	81.9	4.5	44.0	4.0	12.1	81.5
		Rate (people)		12.3	56.6	82.7	5.9	17.9	86.6	6.8	52.2	5.7	16.1	86.7
Kabupaten	Padang Lawas Utara	Line	675	6,871	10,306	13,742	5,879	7,427	14,853	6,062	9,891	6,717	8,473	16,947
		Rate (HH)		8.4	39.8	68.1	4.2	11.9	74.7	4.9	35.5	7.4	20.9	83.8
		Rate (people)		11.2	49.6	75.6	5.6	16.3	81.1	6.7	44.9	10.0	28.1	88.6
Kabupaten	Padang Lawas	Line	681	6,868	10,301	13,735	6,116	7,423	14,846	6,059	9,886	6,798	8,575	17,149
		Rate (HH)		7.4	38.7	64.7	3.6	12.3	71.0	3.2	35.6	7.1	22.9	78.0
		Rate (people)		11.1	49.2	73.9	5.3	17.2	79.4	4.8	46.1	10.7	31.3	84.4
Kabupaten	Labuhan Batu Selatan	Line	579	8,148	12,221	16,295	7,041	8,807	17,613	7,188	11,728	6,927	8,737	17,475
		Rate (HH)		11.9	38.8	63.9	5.6	17.6	70.0	6.7	35.8	4.6	15.4	70.2
		Rate (people)		15.6	46.3	71.7	7.7	21.7	77.1	9.2	42.5	6.6	19.9	77.7
Kabupaten	Labuhan Batu Utara	Line	600	8,677	13,015	17,353	7,553	9,378	18,757	7,655	12,490	6,838	8,626	17,251
		Rate (HH)		9.8	37.9	65.8	4.6	12.5	71.9	5.0	33.6	2.8	8.2	65.6
		Rate (people)		12.3	43.0	71.2	6.0	15.2	76.5	6.6	38.3	3.6	10.3	70.8
Kabupaten	Nias Utara	Line	600	8,505	12,757	17,009	7,384	9,192	18,385	7,503	12,242	6,672	8,416	16,833
		Rate (HH)		24.7	63.8	81.9	12.1	31.2	85.1	13.7	59.7	7.7	23.2	81.5
		Rate (people)		31.9	72.0	86.4	15.9	39.1	89.1	18.1	68.3	10.2	29.7	86.2
Kabupaten	Nias Barat	Line	602	8,365	12,547	16,730	6,739	9,041	18,083	7,380	12,041	6,635	8,369	16,738
		Rate (HH)		24.4	60.8	77.6	11.1	32.4	82.9	16.3	58.6	10.6	24.4	77.7
		Rate (people)		30.9	69.1	83.7	15.4	40.3	87.5	21.6	67.3	14.9	30.9	83.8
All Kabupaten		Line	15,846	7,826	11,739	15,652	6,862	8,459	16,917	6,904	11,265	7,826	8,459	16,917
		Rate (HH)		8.2	36.2	62.4	3.8	11.7	69.4	4.1	32.7	5.1	14.9	73.3
		Rate (people)		11.3	43.8	69.8	5.5	15.7	76.0	5.9	40.0	7.2	19.6	79.6
All Sumatera Utara		Line	20,959	8,429	12,643	16,857	7,404	9,110	18,220	7,436	12,133	7,374	9,302	18,604

Figure 3: Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
7,082	How many active cell-phone numbers and/or land-line telephones do members of the household have? (None; One cell, and no land-lines; Two cells, and no land-lines; Three cells, and no land-lines; Four cells, or any land-lines)
6,945	How many household members are there? (Six or more; Five; Four; Three; Two; One)
6,792	How many active cell-phone numbers do members of the household have? (None; One; Two; Three; Four or more)
6,749	What is the main cooking fuel? (Firewood, charcoal, or coal; Gas/LPG, kerosene, electricity, others, or does not cook)
6,190	How many household members are 0 to 18-years-old? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
5,849	Does the household have a refrigerator or freezer? (No; Yes)
5,804	How many household members are 0 to 15-years-old? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
5,790	How many household members are 0 to 14-years-old? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
5,760	What is the highest level and year of education that the male head/spouse has completed? (None, or grade-school level 1 (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Grade-school level 2 (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Grade-school level 3 (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Grade-school level 4 (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Grade-school level 5 (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Grade-school level 6 or higher (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Junior-high school (any level) or high school, any level before 8 (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); No male head/spouse; Vocational high school, any level; High school, level 8 or higher (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Diploma (one-year or higher), or higher)
5,735	How many household members are 0 to 16-years-old? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
5,710	Has the household bought subsidized rice in the past three months? (Yes; No)

Figure 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
5,705	What is the highest level of education that the female head/spouse has completed? (None; Grade school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Junior-high school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); No female head/spouse; Vocational school (high-school level); High school (incl. disabled, Islamic, or non-formal); Diploma (one-year or higher), or higher)
5,684	How many household members are 0 to 17-years-old? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
5,620	How many household members are 0 to 13-years-old? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
5,601	What type of toilet arrangement does the household have? (None, or latrine; Non-flush to a septic tank; Flush)
5,445	How many household members are 0 to 12-years-old? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
5,026	What is the main source of drinking water? (Unprotected spring, river, rainwater, or others; Unprotected well; Protected spring; Protected well; Retail tap; Artesian well/pump; Metered tap; Refilled bottles; Brand-new bottles)
4,977	What is the most valuable form of transport (bicycle, non-motorized boat, motorized boat, or motorcycle/scooter) owned by the household? (None; Bicycle only; Non-motorized or motorized boat only; Motorcycle or scooter (regardless of any bicycles or boats))
4,952	Does the household have a motorcycle, scooter, or motorized boat? (No; Yes)
4,949	Does the household have a motorcycle or scooter? (No; Yes)
4,940	How does the household dispose of its sewage? (Beach/countryside, or others; Hole in the ground; River/lake/ocean; Pond or rice field; Septic tank)
4,895	If the household has government-provided electricity, what is the wattage of your electrical meter? (Does not have government-provided electricity; No meter installed; 450; 900; 1,300 or more)

Figure 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
4,501	What type of business activity provides the largest share of income to the household? (Agriculture and crops, including rice planting; Horticulture, plantation, fishing, ranching and animal husbandry, forestry, hunting and other agriculture, or mining and quarrying; Manufacturing, electricity and gas, construction, others; Retail and wholesale commerce, hotels and restaurants, transportation and logistics, community and individual services, recipients of pensions, or not working; Real estate, finance and insurance, education, or health care)
4,479	How many household members, in the business activity of their main job in the past week, worked in agriculture and farming (including rice planting) horticulture, plantation, fishing, ranching, animal husbandry, forestry, hunting, other agriculture, or mining and quarrying? (Two or more; One; None)
4,321	How many household members are 0 to 11-years-old? (Two or more; One; None)
3,811	Does the household share a toilet arrangement with others? (No toilet arrangement/Not available; Yes, with the public; Yes, with specific households; No)
3,727	If the household does not use bottled or tap water, does it share its source of drinking water with others? (Yes, with the public; Yes, with specific households; Not available; No; Uses bottled or tap water)
3,671	Do all children ages 6 to 16 go to school? (No; Yes; No children in this age range)
3,632	In what type of business activity did the male head/spouse work in the past week? (Agriculture and crops, including rice planting, horticulture, plantation, fishing, ranching and animal husbandry, forestry, hunting or other agriculture; Mining and quarrying, construction, or others; Not working; No male head/spouse; Transportation and logistics; Manufacturing; Community and individual services; Retail and wholesale commerce; Electricity and gas, hotels and restaurants, real estate, finance and insurance, education, or health care)
3,631	Do all children ages 6 to 17 go to school? (No; Yes; No children in this age range)
3,578	What is the main material of the wall? (Bamboo, or others; Wood; Brick and concrete)

Figure 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
3,520	Do all children ages 6 to 15 go to school? (No; Yes; No children in this age range)
3,446	Do all children ages 6 to 18 go to school? (No; Yes; No children in this age range)
3,398	In what type of business activity did the female head/spouse work in the past week? (Agriculture and crops, including rice planting, horticulture, plantation, fishing, ranching and animal husbandry, forestry, hunting and other agriculture, mining and quarrying, construction, or others; Not working; Manufacturing; Community and individual services; Transportation and logistics, retail and wholesale commerce; No female head/spouse; Electricity and gas, hotels and restaurants, real estate, finance and insurance, education, or health care)
3,252	Do all children ages 6 to 14 go to school? (No; Yes; No children in this age range)
3,220	How many household members are 0 to 6-years-old? (Two or more; One; None)
3,216	How many household members are 0 to 6-years-old? (Two or more; One; None)
3,001	Do all children ages 6 to 13 go to school? (No; Yes; No children in this age range)
2,974	Does the household have a gas cylinder of 12kg or more? (No; Yes)
2,954	What is the main material of the floor? (Earth or bamboo; Others)
2,894	Does the household have a computer (desktop or laptop)? (No; Yes)
2,740	Do all children ages 6 to 12 go to school? (No; Yes; No children in this age range)
2,664	Does the household buy most of its drinking water? (No; Yes)
2,606	If you use a pump, well, or spring, how far is it from a septic tank/sewage area? (Does not know; 10m or more; Less than 10m; Does not use a pump, well, or spring)
2,546	Do all children ages 6 to 11 go to school? (No; Yes; No children in this age range)

Figure 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
2,430	What was the employment status of the male head/spouse in the past week in his main job? (No male head/spouse; Not working, or unpaid worker; Self-employed; Business owner with only temporary or unpaid workers; wage or salary employee; Business owner with some permanent or paid workers)
2,315	What was the employment status of the female head/spouse in the past week in her main job? (Self-employed; Unpaid worker; Business owner with only temporary or unpaid workers; Not working; Self-employed; Business owner with some permanent or paid workers, or wage or salary employee; No female head/spouse)
2,090	How many household members, in the business activity of their main job in the past week, worked, but not in agriculture and farming (including rice planting) horticulture, plantation, fishing, ranching, animal husbandry, forestry, hunting, other agriculture, or mining and quarrying? (None; One; Two; Three or more)
1,952	Can the female head/spouse read and write? (No; Yes; No female head/spouse)
1,762	Does the household have a land-line telephone? (No; Yes)
1,485	How many household members, in their main job in the past week, were self-employed? (None; One or more; Two)
1,485	How many household members, in their main job in the past week, were wage or salary employees? (None; One; Two or more)
1,384	What is the area of the residence in meters squared? (20 or less; 21 to 30; 31 to 60; 61 to 90; 91 or more)
1,356	What is the main material of the roof? (Fibers/thatch, or others; Tile; Zinc; Shingles; Concrete, or asbestos)
1,348	Can the male head/spouse read and write? (No male head/spouse; No; Yes)
1,139	What is the tenancy status of the household in its residence? (Owner-occupied, or others; Rent-free, or provided by parents or relatives; Rented (with or without a contract, or provided by employer or government)

Figure 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
968	How many household members did any work in the past week? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
944	How many household members, in their main job in the past week, were unpaid workers? (One or more; None)
835	What is the marital status of the female head/spouse? (Married; Divorced, separated, or widowed; No female head/spouse; Single, never-married)
815	How many household members, in their main job in the past week, were business owners with only temporary or unpaid workers? (One or more; None)
731	How many household members, in the business activity of their main job in the past week, worked in retail or wholesale trade? (None; One or more)
727	How old is the female head/spouse? (No female head/spouse; 20 or younger; 21 to 25; 26 to 30; 31 to 35; 36 to 40; 41 to 45; 46 to 50; 51 to 55; 56 to 60; 61 to 66; 66 or older)
613	What is the structure of household headship? (Both male and female heads/spouses; Female head/spouse only; Male head/spouse only)
537	Did the female head/spouse do any work in the past week? (Yes; No; No female head/spouse)
491	How many household members, in the business activity of their main job in the past week, worked in manufacturing, electricity and gas, construction, hotels and restaurants, real estate, finance and insurance, education, health care, or others? (None; One or more)
484	What is the marital status of the male head/spouse? (Married; No male head/spouse; Single, never-married, divorced/separated, or widowed)
482	How many household members, in their main job in the past week, were business owners (with or without any kind of workers) or self-employed? (None; One; Two or more)
458	What is the employment status of the main income earner? (Self-employed; Laborer or employee; Wage or salary worker)

Figure 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
393	How old is the male head/spouse? (No male head/spouse, or 25 or younger; 26 to 30; 31 to 35; 36 to 40; 41 to 45; 46 to 50; 51 to 55; 56 to 60; 61 to 66; 66 or older)
302	How many household members, in the business activity of their main job in the past week, worked in community and personal service? (None; One or more)
287	How many household members, in their main job in the past week, were business owners with some permanent or paid workers? (None; One or more)
183	How many household members 18-years-old or older can read and write in Latin letters? (None; One or more)
108	How many household members 18-years-old or older can read and write in Arabic letters? (None; One or more)
72	How many household members 18-years-old or older can read and write in non-Latin, non-Arabic letters? (None; One or more)
68	Does the household have a bicycle? (No; Yes)
54	Did the male head/spouse do any work in the past week? (No; Yes; No male head/spouse)
27	Does the household have a motorized boat? (No; Yes)
14	Does the household have a non-motorized boat? (No; Yes)
4	How many household members, in their main job in the past week, were not working? (One or more; None)

Source: 2010 SUSENAS and the national poverty line

Tables for 100% of the New National Poverty Line

(and tables pertaining to all nine overty lines)

Figure 4 (100% of the new national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	66.3
5–9	60.0
10–14	48.4
15–19	34.1
20–24	25.2
25–29	17.3
30–34	10.3
35–39	5.8
40–44	3.2
45–49	1.4
50–54	0.6
55–59	0.2
60–64	0.1
65–69	0.0
70–74	0.0
75–79	0.0
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (100% of the new national line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	119	÷	179	=	66.3
5–9	610	÷	1,017	=	60.0
10–14	1,295	÷	2,674	=	48.4
15–19	1,560	÷	4,579	=	34.1
20–24	1,923	÷	7,636	=	25.2
25–29	1,812	÷	10,449	=	17.3
30–34	1,249	÷	12,114	=	10.3
35–39	767	÷	13,148	=	5.8
40–44	389	÷	12,148	=	3.2
45–49	152	÷	10,911	=	1.4
50–54	53	÷	8,884	=	0.6
55–59	11	÷	6,613	=	0.2
60–64	2	÷	3,799	=	0.1
65–69	0	÷	2,933	=	0.0
70–74	0	÷	1,513	=	0.0
75–79	0	÷	1,015	=	0.0
80–84	0	÷	312	=	0.0
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	0.0

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (100% of the new national line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–10.0	14.6	17.1	22.1
5–9	+6.6	8.1	9.5	12.3
10–14	–0.3	5.0	6.1	7.5
15–19	–4.7	4.1	4.6	5.8
20–24	–2.0	2.5	2.9	3.8
25–29	+0.2	1.6	2.0	2.6
30–34	–0.8	1.4	1.7	2.0
35–39	–0.6	1.0	1.2	1.5
40–44	+0.2	0.7	0.9	1.0
45–49	–0.1	0.6	0.6	0.9
50–54	+0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5
55–59	–0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5
60–64	–0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
65–69	–0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2
70–74	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
75–79	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80–84	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (100% of the new national line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	–0.1	50.0	61.9	72.0
4	–0.6	24.7	30.6	41.3
8	–0.5	17.2	20.4	29.1
16	–0.8	11.5	14.3	19.1
32	–0.6	8.6	10.2	12.9
64	–0.6	6.1	7.3	10.1
128	–0.5	4.4	5.3	7.1
256	–0.5	3.2	3.7	4.8
512	–0.5	2.1	2.6	3.3
1,024	–0.5	1.5	1.9	2.6
2,048	–0.5	1.1	1.3	1.7
4,096	–0.5	0.8	0.9	1.2
8,192	–0.5	0.6	0.6	0.9
16,384	–0.5	0.4	0.5	0.6

Figure 9 (All poverty lines): Differences, precision of differences, and the α factor for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Poverty line																	
	New (2010) lines														Legacy (2007) lines			
	National			Poorest 1/2	Intl. 2005 PPP		Intl. 2011 PPP				Natl.	Intl. 2005 PPP						
	100%	150%	200%	< 100% Natl.	$1.25	$2.50	$1.90	$3.10			100%	$1.25	$2.50					
Estimate minus true value	–0.5	–0.9	–0.8	–0.3	–0.5	–0.5	–0.2	–0.8			–0.5	–0.8	–0.4					
Precision of difference	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.6			0.3	0.5	0.6					
α factor	0.99	0.99	0.98	1.04	1.01	0.98	1.00	0.98			1.05	0.99	0.96					
All estimates are for the scorecard applied to the validation sample.																		
Differences between estimates and true values are in units of percentage points.																		
Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.																		
Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps of size n = 16,384.																		
α is estimated from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.																		

Figure 10 (All poverty lines): Types of possible targeting outcomes

True poverty status	Targeting segment: Targeted	Targeting segment: Non-targeted
Below poverty line	**Inclusion** Under poverty line Correctly Targeted	**Undercoverage** Under poverty line Mistakenly Non-targeted
Above poverty line	**Leakage** Above poverty line Mistakenly Targeted	**Exclusion** Above poverty line Correctly Non-targeted

Figure 11 (100% of the new national line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.1	10.1	0.1	89.8	89.9	–97.0
5–9	0.7	9.5	0.5	89.3	90.0	–81.4
10–14	2.0	8.2	1.9	87.9	89.9	–42.8
15–19	3.7	6.5	4.8	85.0	88.7	+18.7
20–24	5.7	4.5	10.4	79.4	85.1	–2.2
25–29	7.4	2.8	19.1	70.7	78.1	–87.4
30–34	8.8	1.4	29.9	59.9	68.7	–193.0
35–39	9.6	0.6	42.2	47.6	57.2	–314.1
40–44	10.0	0.2	54.0	35.8	45.8	–429.6
45–49	10.1	0.1	64.7	25.1	35.2	–535.0
50–54	10.2	0.0	73.6	16.2	26.4	–621.7
55–59	10.2	0.0	80.2	9.6	19.8	–686.4
60–64	10.2	0.0	84.0	5.8	16.0	–723.6
65–69	10.2	0.0	86.9	2.9	13.1	–752.3
70–74	10.2	0.0	88.4	1.4	11.6	–767.2
75–79	10.2	0.0	89.4	0.4	10.6	–777.1
80–84	10.2	0.0	89.7	0.1	10.3	–780.2
85–89	10.2	0.0	89.8	0.0	10.2	–780.6
90–94	10.2	0.0	89.8	0.0	10.2	–781.0
95–100	10.2	0.0	89.8	0.0	10.2	–781.0

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (100% of the new national line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below the cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	71.1	1.3	2.5:1
5–9	1.2	58.9	6.9	1.4:1
10–14	3.9	50.6	19.2	1.0:1
15–19	8.4	43.2	35.8	0.8:1
20–24	16.1	35.2	55.6	0.5:1
25–29	26.5	28.0	72.9	0.4:1
30–34	38.6	22.7	86.1	0.3:1
35–39	51.8	18.5	94.0	0.2:1
40–44	63.9	15.6	97.7	0.2:1
45–49	74.9	13.5	99.3	0.2:1
50–54	83.7	12.1	99.8	0.1:1
55–59	90.4	11.3	99.9	0.1:1
60–64	94.2	10.8	100.0	0.1:1
65–69	97.1	10.5	100.0	0.1:1
70–74	98.6	10.3	100.0	0.1:1
75–79	99.6	10.2	100.0	0.1:1
80–84	99.9	10.2	100.0	0.1:1
85–89	100.0	10.2	100.0	0.1:1
90–94	100.0	10.2	100.0	0.1:1
95–100	100.0	10.2	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for 150% of the New National Poverty Line

Figure 4 (150% of the new national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	96.1
5–9	93.3
10–14	87.9
15–19	81.8
20–24	76.2
25–29	65.5
30–34	54.0
35–39	40.7
40–44	27.9
45–49	17.4
50–54	9.9
55–59	5.2
60–64	2.9
65–69	1.3
70–74	0.9
75–79	0.4
80–84	0.2
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (150% of the new national line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	172	÷	179	=	96.1
5–9	949	÷	1,017	=	93.3
10–14	2,352	÷	2,674	=	87.9
15–19	3,744	÷	4,579	=	81.8
20–24	5,814	÷	7,636	=	76.2
25–29	6,840	÷	10,449	=	65.5
30–34	6,537	÷	12,114	=	54.0
35–39	5,347	÷	13,148	=	40.7
40–44	3,384	÷	12,148	=	27.9
45–49	1,903	÷	10,911	=	17.4
50–54	879	÷	8,884	=	9.9
55–59	345	÷	6,613	=	5.2
60–64	111	÷	3,799	=	2.9
65–69	38	÷	2,933	=	1.3
70–74	13	÷	1,513	=	0.9
75–79	4	÷	1,015	=	0.4
80–84	0	÷	312	=	0.2
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	0.0

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (150% of the new national line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–0.7	5.0	5.6	7.6
5–9	+3.9	6.0	6.9	8.9
10–14	–2.1	3.0	3.4	4.4
15–19	–2.1	2.9	3.4	4.2
20–24	–1.2	2.4	2.9	3.6
25–29	–1.6	2.2	2.6	3.5
30–34	–1.7	2.1	2.5	3.7
35–39	–1.1	2.1	2.5	3.2
40–44	–0.5	2.0	2.3	3.3
45–49	–1.1	1.7	1.9	2.5
50–54	–0.7	1.5	1.8	2.4
55–59	+0.8	1.1	1.3	1.9
60–64	+0.4	1.2	1.4	1.8
65–69	–0.4	1.0	1.2	1.4
70–74	–0.1	1.1	1.3	1.6
75–79	+0.1	0.7	0.7	1.1
80–84	+0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (150% of the new national line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	–0.6	68.8	79.4	91.4
4	–1.8	38.1	45.1	60.7
8	–1.4	26.7	32.3	43.8
16	–0.9	18.6	23.1	30.6
32	–0.8	13.7	15.9	21.0
64	–0.8	9.5	11.5	15.2
128	–0.8	7.0	8.2	10.6
256	–1.0	4.8	5.6	7.4
512	–0.9	3.4	4.0	5.0
1,024	–0.9	2.5	2.8	3.8
2,048	–0.9	1.8	2.1	2.8
4,096	–0.9	1.3	1.5	2.0
8,192	–0.9	0.9	1.1	1.4
16,384	–0.9	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 11 (150% of the new national line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.2	38.6	0.0	61.2	61.4	–99.1
5–9	1.1	37.7	0.1	61.1	62.2	–94.1
10–14	3.5	35.3	0.4	60.8	64.3	–81.1
15–19	7.3	31.5	1.2	60.0	67.3	–59.4
20–24	13.1	25.7	3.0	58.2	71.2	–24.9
25–29	19.9	18.9	6.6	54.6	74.4	+19.7
30–34	26.5	12.3	12.2	49.1	75.6	+67.9
35–39	31.9	6.9	19.9	41.3	73.2	+48.7
40–44	35.3	3.5	28.6	32.6	67.9	+26.2
45–49	37.3	1.5	37.5	23.7	61.0	+3.3
50–54	38.3	0.5	45.4	15.8	54.1	–17.1
55–59	38.6	0.2	51.7	9.5	48.1	–33.4
60–64	38.7	0.1	55.4	5.8	44.5	–42.9
65–69	38.8	0.0	58.3	2.9	41.7	–50.3
70–74	38.8	0.0	59.8	1.4	40.2	–54.2
75–79	38.8	0.0	60.8	0.4	39.2	–56.8
80–84	38.8	0.0	61.1	0.1	38.9	–57.6
85–89	38.8	0.0	61.2	0.0	38.8	–57.7
90–94	38.8	0.0	61.2	0.0	38.8	–57.8
95–100	38.8	0.0	61.2	0.0	38.8	–57.8

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (150% of the new national line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	95.6	0.4	21.6:1
5–9	1.2	92.1	2.8	11.6:1
10–14	3.9	89.8	9.0	8.8:1
15–19	8.4	86.2	18.8	6.2:1
20–24	16.1	81.2	33.7	4.3:1
25–29	26.5	75.0	51.3	3.0:1
30–34	38.6	68.6	68.3	2.2:1
35–39	51.8	61.6	82.2	1.6:1
40–44	63.9	55.2	91.0	1.2:1
45–49	74.9	49.9	96.2	1.0:1
50–54	83.7	45.7	98.7	0.8:1
55–59	90.4	42.7	99.5	0.7:1
60–64	94.2	41.1	99.8	0.7:1
65–69	97.1	39.9	100.0	0.7:1
70–74	98.6	39.3	100.0	0.6:1
75–79	99.6	38.9	100.0	0.6:1
80–84	99.9	38.8	100.0	0.6:1
85–89	100.0	38.8	100.0	0.6:1
90–94	100.0	38.8	100.0	0.6:1
95–100	100.0	38.8	100.0	0.6:1

Tables for 200% of the New National Poverty Line

Figure 4 (200% of the new national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	99.0
5–9	98.3
10–14	97.0
15–19	95.1
20–24	93.4
25–29	88.1
30–34	82.6
35–39	72.9
40–44	60.6
45–49	46.1
50–54	32.4
55–59	20.7
60–64	12.8
65–69	6.4
70–74	4.8
75–79	2.5
80–84	0.2
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (200% of the new national line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	177	÷	179	=	99.0
5–9	1,000	÷	1,017	=	98.3
10–14	2,594	÷	2,674	=	97.0
15–19	4,353	÷	4,579	=	95.1
20–24	7,132	÷	7,636	=	93.4
25–29	9,210	÷	10,449	=	88.1
30–34	10,002	÷	12,114	=	82.6
35–39	9,579	÷	13,148	=	72.9
40–44	7,359	÷	12,148	=	60.6
45–49	5,029	÷	10,911	=	46.1
50–54	2,877	÷	8,884	=	32.4
55–59	1,371	÷	6,613	=	20.7
60–64	486	÷	3,799	=	12.8
65–69	187	÷	2,933	=	6.4
70–74	73	÷	1,513	=	4.8
75–79	25	÷	1,015	=	2.5
80–84	1	÷	312	=	0.2
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	0.0

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (200% of the new national line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–0.4	1.5	1.7	2.6
5–9	–0.9	1.0	1.1	1.6
10–14	–1.3	1.1	1.2	1.6
15–19	–1.7	1.5	1.6	2.1
20–24	–0.1	1.4	1.8	2.3
25–29	–2.1	1.8	1.9	2.3
30–34	–1.4	1.6	1.9	2.6
35–39	–0.9	1.9	2.3	3.1
40–44	–0.1	2.1	2.7	3.4
45–49	–2.3	2.3	2.8	3.5
50–54	–0.1	2.5	2.9	3.8
55–59	+1.1	2.2	2.6	3.5
60–64	+0.3	2.5	3.0	3.9
65–69	–0.9	2.1	2.6	3.4
70–74	–1.3	2.8	3.4	4.2
75–79	+1.2	1.5	1.7	2.1
80–84	+0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (200% of the new national line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.1	72.7	80.9	91.9
4	–1.7	38.2	44.5	56.3
8	–1.6	27.1	31.5	41.5
16	–1.0	17.8	21.6	30.6
32	–1.0	13.3	15.4	19.8
64	–1.0	9.1	10.9	14.8
128	–1.1	6.8	8.3	10.8
256	–1.0	4.7	5.5	7.7
512	–0.9	3.4	4.1	5.5
1,024	–0.9	2.4	2.8	3.9
2,048	–0.8	1.7	2.1	2.7
4,096	–0.9	1.2	1.4	1.9
8,192	–0.8	0.9	1.1	1.3
16,384	–0.8	0.6	0.7	1.0

Figure 11 (200% of the new national line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.2	61.8	0.0	38.0	38.2	–99.4
5–9	1.2	60.8	0.0	38.0	39.2	–96.2
10–14	3.8	58.2	0.1	38.0	41.7	–87.6
15–19	8.2	53.8	0.3	37.8	46.0	–73.2
20–24	15.3	46.7	0.8	37.2	52.5	–49.4
25–29	24.6	37.4	2.0	36.1	60.7	–17.5
30–34	34.6	27.3	4.0	34.0	68.7	+18.3
35–39	44.2	17.7	7.6	30.5	74.7	+55.0
40–44	51.6	10.4	12.4	25.7	77.2	+80.0
45–49	56.8	5.2	18.1	20.0	76.7	+70.8
50–54	59.7	2.2	24.0	14.1	73.8	+61.3
55–59	61.1	0.9	29.3	8.8	69.9	+52.8
60–64	61.6	0.3	32.5	5.5	67.1	+47.5
65–69	61.8	0.1	35.3	2.8	64.6	+43.1
70–74	61.9	0.0	36.7	1.4	63.3	+40.8
75–79	61.9	0.0	37.7	0.4	62.3	+39.2
80–84	61.9	0.0	38.0	0.1	62.0	+38.7
85–89	61.9	0.0	38.0	0.0	62.0	+38.6
90–94	61.9	0.0	38.1	0.0	61.9	+38.6
95–100	61.9	0.0	38.1	0.0	61.9	+38.6

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (200% of the new national line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	98.3	0.3	59.3:1
5–9	1.2	98.4	1.9	62.5:1
10–14	3.9	97.8	6.1	43.6:1
15–19	8.4	96.7	13.2	29.8:1
20–24	16.1	94.9	24.7	18.7:1
25–29	26.5	92.6	39.7	12.6:1
30–34	38.6	89.6	55.9	8.6:1
35–39	51.8	85.4	71.4	5.8:1
40–44	63.9	80.6	83.2	4.2:1
45–49	74.9	75.8	91.6	3.1:1
50–54	83.7	71.3	96.4	2.5:1
55–59	90.4	67.6	98.6	2.1:1
60–64	94.2	65.4	99.4	1.9:1
65–69	97.1	63.7	99.8	1.8:1
70–74	98.6	62.8	100.0	1.7:1
75–79	99.6	62.2	100.0	1.6:1
80–84	99.9	62.0	100.0	1.6:1
85–89	100.0	62.0	100.0	1.6:1
90–94	100.0	61.9	100.0	1.6:1
95–100	100.0	61.9	100.0	1.6:1

Tables for New USAID "Extreme" Poverty Line

Figure 4 (New USAID "extreme" line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	49.8
5–9	38.4
10–14	28.3
15–19	18.0
20–24	12.6
25–29	7.3
30–34	4.0
35–39	1.9
40–44	1.1
45–49	0.5
50–54	0.1
55–59	0.0
60–64	0.0
65–69	0.0
70–74	0.0
75–79	0.0
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (New USAID "extreme" line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	89	÷	179	=	49.8
5–9	391	÷	1,017	=	38.4
10–14	756	÷	2,674	=	28.3
15–19	822	÷	4,579	=	18.0
20–24	961	÷	7,636	=	12.6
25–29	765	÷	10,449	=	7.3
30–34	487	÷	12,114	=	4.0
35–39	247	÷	13,148	=	1.9
40–44	129	÷	12,148	=	1.1
45–49	50	÷	10,911	=	0.5
50–54	12	÷	8,884	=	0.1
55–59	2	÷	6,613	=	0.0
60–64	0	÷	3,799	=	0.0
65–69	0	÷	2,933	=	0.0
70–74	0	÷	1,513	=	0.0
75–79	0	÷	1,015	=	0.0
80–84	0	÷	312	=	0.0
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	0.0

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (New USAID "extreme" line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–2.9	18.2	21.4	27.5
5–9	+6.3	7.0	8.5	11.0
10–14	–0.7	4.7	5.5	7.4
15–19	–2.7	2.9	3.6	4.7
20–24	–1.5	1.9	2.2	2.9
25–29	–0.3	1.2	1.4	1.8
30–34	–0.6	0.9	1.0	1.5
35–39	–0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
40–44	–0.2	0.4	0.5	0.6
45–49	+0.0	0.3	0.3	0.4
50–54	–0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3
55–59	–0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
60–64	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65–69	+0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
70–74	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
75–79	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80–84	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (New USAID "extreme" line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.4	9.0	55.2	67.2
4	–0.6	18.6	24.0	36.7
8	–0.5	13.2	16.7	23.2
16	–0.5	8.4	11.0	14.9
32	–0.4	6.2	7.5	9.9
64	–0.3	4.5	5.2	7.2
128	–0.3	3.2	3.7	4.9
256	–0.3	2.3	2.7	3.4
512	–0.3	1.6	2.0	2.4
1,024	–0.3	1.1	1.3	1.8
2,048	–0.3	0.8	1.0	1.3
4,096	–0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
8,192	–0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
16,384	–0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4

Figure 11 (New USAID "extreme" line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.1	4.7	0.1	95.1	95.2	–94.5
5–9	0.4	4.4	0.8	94.4	94.9	–66.1
10–14	1.1	3.7	2.7	92.5	93.6	+4.3
15–19	2.1	2.8	6.4	88.8	90.8	–33.1
20–24	3.0	1.8	13.0	82.2	85.2	–171.2
25–29	3.8	1.0	22.7	72.5	76.3	–372.8
30–34	4.3	0.5	34.3	60.9	65.2	–613.7
35–39	4.6	0.2	47.2	48.0	52.6	–881.5
40–44	4.7	0.1	59.2	36.0	40.7	–1,131.2
45–49	4.8	0.0	70.1	25.1	29.9	–1,357.1
50–54	4.8	0.0	78.9	16.3	21.1	–1,541.6
55–59	4.8	0.0	85.5	9.6	14.5	–1,679.1
60–64	4.8	0.0	89.3	5.8	10.7	–1,758.1
65–69	4.8	0.0	92.3	2.9	7.7	–1,819.0
70–74	4.8	0.0	93.8	1.4	6.2	–1,850.5
75–79	4.8	0.0	94.8	0.4	5.2	–1,871.6
80–84	4.8	0.0	95.1	0.1	4.9	–1,878.1
85–89	4.8	0.0	95.2	0.0	4.8	–1,878.9
90–94	4.8	0.0	95.2	0.0	4.8	–1,879.7
95–100	4.8	0.0	95.2	0.0	4.8	–1,879.7

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (New USAID "extreme" line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	48.8	1.8	1.0:1
5–9	1.2	36.2	9.0	0.6:1
10–14	3.9	29.5	23.8	0.4:1
15–19	8.4	24.3	42.6	0.3:1
20–24	16.1	18.9	63.3	0.2:1
25–29	26.5	14.3	79.0	0.2:1
30–34	38.6	11.2	90.0	0.1:1
35–39	51.8	8.9	95.7	0.1:1
40–44	63.9	7.4	98.6	0.1:1
45–49	74.9	6.4	99.6	0.1:1
50–54	83.7	5.7	99.9	0.1:1
55–59	90.4	5.3	100.0	0.1:1
60–64	94.2	5.1	100.0	0.1:1
65–69	97.1	5.0	100.0	0.1:1
70–74	98.6	4.9	100.0	0.1:1
75–79	99.6	4.8	100.0	0.1:1
80–84	99.9	4.8	100.0	0.1:1
85–89	100.0	4.8	100.0	0.1:1
90–94	100.0	4.8	100.0	0.1:1
95–100	100.0	4.8	100.0	0.1:1

Table for the New $1.25/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Figure 4 (New $1.25/day line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	74.2
5–9	68.9
10–14	57.7
15–19	45.5
20–24	35.3
25–29	24.7
30–34	16.2
35–39	9.4
40–44	5.3
45–49	2.6
50–54	1.3
55–59	0.5
60–64	0.1
65–69	0.1
70–74	0.0
75–79	0.0
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (New $1.25/day line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	133	÷	179	=	74.2
5–9	701	÷	1,017	=	68.9
10–14	1,544	÷	2,674	=	57.7
15–19	2,082	÷	4,579	=	45.5
20–24	2,695	÷	7,636	=	35.3
25–29	2,577	÷	10,449	=	24.7
30–34	1,958	÷	12,114	=	16.2
35–39	1,241	÷	13,148	=	9.4
40–44	646	÷	12,148	=	5.3
45–49	279	÷	10,911	=	2.6
50–54	114	÷	8,884	=	1.3
55–59	31	÷	6,613	=	0.5
60–64	5	÷	3,799	=	0.1
65–69	2	÷	2,933	=	0.1
70–74	0	÷	1,513	=	0.0
75–79	0	÷	1,015	=	0.0
80–84	0	÷	312	=	0.0
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	0.0

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (New $1.25/day line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–6.4	13.5	16.0	20.6
5–9	+4.7	8.4	9.7	12.7
10–14	–0.7	4.9	5.8	7.4
15–19	–3.1	3.6	4.2	5.8
20–24	–2.1	2.7	3.2	4.3
25–29	–0.9	2.0	2.3	2.9
30–34	–0.6	1.6	2.0	2.5
35–39	–0.8	1.3	1.5	1.9
40–44	–0.1	0.9	1.1	1.5
45–49	–0.2	0.8	0.9	1.2
50–54	+0.5	0.4	0.5	0.7
55–59	–0.1	0.4	0.5	0.6
60–64	–0.0	0.2	0.3	0.3
65–69	+0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2
70–74	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
75–79	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80–84	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (New $1.25/day line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.3	55.3	64.7	76.2
4	–0.9	28.7	36.6	44.9
8	–0.4	19.3	23.6	34.9
16	–0.6	13.4	16.7	23.1
32	–0.5	9.5	11.6	14.7
64	–0.5	7.0	8.3	10.6
128	–0.5	4.9	6.1	8.0
256	–0.6	3.7	4.5	5.6
512	–0.6	2.5	3.0	4.1
1,024	–0.6	1.8	2.2	2.9
2,048	–0.5	1.3	1.6	2.0
4,096	–0.5	0.9	1.1	1.4
8,192	–0.5	0.6	0.8	1.0
16,384	–0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7

Figure 11 (New $1.25/day line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.1	14.1	0.0	85.7	85.8	–97.8
5–9	0.8	13.4	0.4	85.4	86.2	–85.8
10–14	2.3	11.9	1.5	84.2	86.5	–56.5
15–19	4.5	9.8	3.9	81.8	86.3	–9.2
20–24	7.3	7.0	8.8	76.9	84.2	+38.4
25–29	9.9	4.4	16.6	69.1	79.0	–16.7
30–34	11.9	2.4	26.7	59.0	70.9	–87.4
35–39	13.2	1.1	38.6	47.1	60.3	–170.5
40–44	13.8	0.4	50.1	35.6	49.5	–251.1
45–49	14.1	0.1	60.7	25.0	39.2	–325.5
50–54	14.2	0.0	69.5	16.2	30.4	–387.2
55–59	14.3	0.0	76.1	9.6	23.9	–433.3
60–64	14.3	0.0	79.9	5.8	20.1	–459.9
65–69	14.3	0.0	82.8	2.9	17.2	–480.4
70–74	14.3	0.0	84.3	1.4	15.7	–491.0
75–79	14.3	0.0	85.3	0.4	14.7	–498.1
80–84	14.3	0.0	85.7	0.1	14.3	–500.3
85–89	14.3	0.0	85.7	0.0	14.3	–500.6
90–94	14.3	0.0	85.7	0.0	14.3	–500.8
95–100	14.3	0.0	85.7	0.0	14.3	–500.8

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (New $1.25/day line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	77.8	1.0	3.5:1
5–9	1.2	68.9	5.8	2.2:1
10–14	3.9	60.5	16.4	1.5:1
15–19	8.4	53.3	31.6	1.1:1
20–24	16.1	45.3	51.1	0.8:1
25–29	26.5	37.3	69.3	0.6:1
30–34	38.6	30.8	83.4	0.4:1
35–39	51.8	25.5	92.5	0.3:1
40–44	63.9	21.7	97.0	0.3:1
45–49	74.9	18.9	99.1	0.2:1
50–54	83.7	17.0	99.7	0.2:1
55–59	90.4	15.8	99.9	0.2:1
60–64	94.2	15.2	100.0	0.2:1
65–69	97.1	14.7	100.0	0.2:1
70–74	98.6	14.5	100.0	0.2:1
75–79	99.6	14.3	100.0	0.2:1
80–84	99.9	14.3	100.0	0.2:1
85–89	100.0	14.3	100.0	0.2:1
90–94	100.0	14.3	100.0	0.2:1
95–100	100.0	14.3	100.0	0.2:1

New $2.50/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Figure 4 (New $2.50/day line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	99.6
5–9	99.0
10–14	98.3
15–19	96.5
20–24	95.2
25–29	91.5
30–34	87.7
35–39	79.7
40–44	68.4
45–49	54.7
50–54	40.1
55–59	26.9
60–64	17.6
65–69	9.1
70–74	6.9
75–79	3.7
80–84	0.2
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (New 2010 $2.50/day line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	178	÷	179	=	99.6
5–9	1,007	÷	1,017	=	99.0
10–14	2,628	÷	2,674	=	98.3
15–19	4,419	÷	4,579	=	96.5
20–24	7,267	÷	7,636	=	95.2
25–29	9,557	÷	10,449	=	91.5
30–34	10,622	÷	12,114	=	87.7
35–39	10,475	÷	13,148	=	79.7
40–44	8,307	÷	12,148	=	68.4
45–49	5,964	÷	10,911	=	54.7
50–54	3,566	÷	8,884	=	40.1
55–59	1,776	÷	6,613	=	26.9
60–64	669	÷	3,799	=	17.6
65–69	267	÷	2,933	=	9.1
70–74	105	÷	1,513	=	6.9
75–79	38	÷	1,015	=	3.7
80–84	1	÷	312	=	0.2
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	0.0

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (New $2.50/day line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+0.2	1.4	1.7	2.5
5–9	–0.4	0.9	1.0	1.5
10–14	–0.7	0.8	0.9	1.2
15–19	–1.2	1.1	1.3	1.8
20–24	–0.6	1.2	1.4	1.8
25–29	–1.7	1.5	1.6	1.8
30–34	–0.8	1.4	1.7	2.2
35–39	–0.7	1.7	2.0	3.0
40–44	–0.2	2.1	2.6	3.2
45–49	–1.3	2.4	2.8	3.6
50–54	–0.5	2.6	3.0	3.9
55–59	+2.0	2.4	2.9	3.7
60–64	+1.1	2.7	3.5	4.6
65–69	–0.6	2.4	2.9	3.6
70–74	–1.1	3.1	3.8	5.0
75–79	+1.1	2.1	2.5	3.4
80–84	–0.1	0.7	0.9	1.3
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (New $2.50/day line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.2	69.8	80.4	90.9
4	–1.1	36.1	44.0	58.3
8	–0.9	25.2	30.7	41.6
16	–0.7	17.7	21.0	28.9
32	–0.6	13.0	15.3	20.1
64	–0.8	9.1	10.8	14.3
128	–0.8	6.3	7.6	10.8
256	–0.7	4.5	5.4	7.2
512	–0.7	3.2	4.0	5.1
1,024	–0.6	2.3	2.8	3.6
2,048	–0.6	1.7	2.0	2.7
4,096	–0.5	1.2	1.4	1.9
8,192	–0.5	0.9	1.0	1.4
16,384	–0.5	0.6	0.7	1.0

Figure 11 (New $2.50/day line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.2	67.0	0.0	32.8	33.0	–99.5
5–9	1.2	66.0	0.0	32.8	34.0	–96.5
10–14	3.8	63.4	0.1	32.8	36.6	–88.6
15–19	8.3	58.9	0.2	32.6	40.9	–75.1
20–24	15.5	51.7	0.6	32.3	47.8	–52.9
25–29	25.2	42.0	1.4	31.5	56.6	–23.0
30–34	35.8	31.4	2.9	30.0	65.7	+10.8
35–39	46.3	20.9	5.5	27.3	73.5	+45.9
40–44	54.5	12.6	9.4	23.4	78.0	+76.4
45–49	60.6	6.6	14.2	18.6	79.2	+78.8
50–54	64.3	2.9	19.4	13.4	77.7	+71.1
55–59	66.0	1.2	24.3	8.5	74.5	+63.8
60–64	66.7	0.5	27.4	5.4	72.1	+59.2
65–69	67.0	0.2	30.1	2.8	69.8	+55.3
70–74	67.2	0.0	31.4	1.4	68.5	+53.2
75–79	67.2	0.0	32.4	0.4	67.6	+51.7
80–84	67.2	0.0	32.7	0.1	67.3	+51.3
85–89	67.2	0.0	32.8	0.0	67.2	+51.2
90–94	67.2	0.0	32.8	0.0	67.2	+51.2
95–100	67.2	0.0	32.8	0.0	67.2	+51.2

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (New $2.50/day line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	98.4	0.3	63.3:1
5–9	1.2	98.8	1.8	85.0:1
10–14	3.9	98.5	5.7	67.1:1
15–19	8.4	97.8	12.3	44.1:1
20–24	16.1	96.6	23.1	28.0:1
25–29	26.5	94.9	37.5	18.6:1
30–34	38.6	92.6	53.3	12.5:1
35–39	51.8	89.3	68.8	8.3:1
40–44	63.9	85.3	81.2	5.8:1
45–49	74.9	81.0	90.2	4.3:1
50–54	83.7	76.8	95.7	3.3:1
55–59	90.4	73.1	98.3	2.7:1
60–64	94.2	70.9	99.3	2.4:1
65–69	97.1	69.0	99.8	2.2:1
70–74	98.6	68.1	100.0	2.1:1
75–79	99.6	67.5	100.0	2.1:1
80–84	99.9	67.2	100.0	2.1:1
85–89	100.0	67.2	100.0	2.1:1
90–94	100.0	67.2	100.0	2.0:1
95–100	100.0	67.2	100.0	2.0:1

New $1.90/day 2011 PPP Poverty Line

Figure 4 (New $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	52.5
5–9	43.0
10–14	31.9
15–19	20.1
20–24	14.2
25–29	8.6
30–34	4.7
35–39	2.3
40–44	1.2
45–49	0.6
50–54	0.2
55–59	0.1
60–64	0.0
65–69	0.0
70–74	0.0
75–79	0.0
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (New $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	94	÷	179	=	52.5
5–9	438	÷	1,017	=	43.0
10–14	854	÷	2,674	=	31.9
15–19	922	÷	4,579	=	20.1
20–24	1,080	÷	7,636	=	14.2
25–29	898	÷	10,449	=	8.6
30–34	566	÷	12,114	=	4.7
35–39	297	÷	13,148	=	2.3
40–44	148	÷	12,148	=	1.2
45–49	62	÷	10,911	=	0.6
50–54	17	÷	8,884	=	0.2
55–59	3	÷	6,613	=	0.1
60–64	0	÷	3,799	=	0.0
65–69	0	÷	2,933	=	0.0
70–74	0	÷	1,513	=	0.0
75–79	0	÷	1,015	=	0.0
80–84	0	÷	312	=	0.0
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	0.0

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (New $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–2.7	18.0	21.1	27.5
5–9	+7.1	7.5	9.4	11.5
10–14	–0.1	5.0	5.8	7.3
15–19	–2.7	3.0	3.6	4.7
20–24	–1.2	2.0	2.3	3.0
25–29	–0.0	1.3	1.6	2.0
30–34	–0.5	0.9	1.1	1.5
35–39	–0.2	0.6	0.7	0.9
40–44	+0.0	0.5	0.5	0.7
45–49	+0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4
50–54	+0.0	0.2	0.3	0.3
55–59	–0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
60–64	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65–69	+0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
70–74	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
75–79	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80–84	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (New $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.3	38.6	58.9	69.2
4	–0.7	19.6	25.7	40.5
8	–0.4	13.3	16.8	22.7
16	–0.3	8.5	11.2	15.7
32	–0.2	6.4	7.9	11.1
64	–0.2	4.6	5.3	7.8
128	–0.2	3.3	3.9	4.9
256	–0.2	2.3	2.7	3.7
512	–0.2	1.7	2.0	2.5
1,024	–0.2	1.2	1.4	1.8
2,048	–0.2	0.8	1.0	1.3
4,096	–0.2	0.6	0.7	1.0
8,192	–0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7
16,384	–0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5

Figure 11 (New $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.1	5.4	0.1	94.4	94.5	–95.0
5–9	0.5	5.0	0.7	93.8	94.3	–69.2
10–14	1.3	4.2	2.6	91.9	93.2	–5.9
15–19	2.3	3.2	6.1	88.4	90.7	–11.9
20–24	3.4	2.0	12.6	81.9	85.3	–130.6
25–29	4.3	1.2	22.2	72.3	76.6	–305.1
30–34	4.9	0.5	33.7	60.8	65.7	–514.8
35–39	5.3	0.2	46.5	48.0	53.2	–748.7
40–44	5.4	0.1	58.5	36.0	41.4	–967.7
45–49	5.5	0.0	69.4	25.1	30.6	–1,165.6
50–54	5.5	0.0	78.3	16.3	21.7	–1,327.3
55–59	5.5	0.0	84.9	9.6	15.1	–1,447.8
60–64	5.5	0.0	88.7	5.8	11.3	–1,517.1
65–69	5.5	0.0	91.6	2.9	8.4	–1,570.6
70–74	5.5	0.0	93.1	1.4	6.9	–1,598.2
75–79	5.5	0.0	94.1	0.4	5.9	–1,616.7
80–84	5.5	0.0	94.4	0.1	5.6	–1,622.4
85–89	5.5	0.0	94.5	0.0	5.5	–1,623.1
90–94	5.5	0.0	94.5	0.0	5.5	–1,623.8
95–100	5.5	0.0	94.5	0.0	5.5	–1,623.8

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (New $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	53.0	1.7	1.1:1
5–9	1.2	41.0	9.0	0.7:1
10–14	3.9	33.3	23.5	0.5:1
15–19	8.4	27.4	42.2	0.4:1
20–24	16.1	21.4	62.8	0.3:1
25–29	26.5	16.3	78.8	0.2:1
30–34	38.6	12.8	90.0	0.1:1
35–39	51.8	10.2	95.9	0.1:1
40–44	63.9	8.4	98.5	0.1:1
45–49	74.9	7.3	99.6	0.1:1
50–54	83.7	6.5	99.9	0.1:1
55–59	90.4	6.1	100.0	0.1:1
60–64	94.2	5.8	100.0	0.1:1
65–69	97.1	5.6	100.0	0.1:1
70–74	98.6	5.6	100.0	0.1:1
75–79	99.6	5.5	100.0	0.1:1
80–84	99.9	5.5	100.0	0.1:1
85–89	100.0	5.5	100.0	0.1:1
90–94	100.0	5.5	100.0	0.1:1
95–100	100.0	5.5	100.0	0.1:1

New $3.10/day 2011 PPP Poverty Line

Figure 4 (New $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	94.9
5–9	92.1
10–14	85.9
15–19	78.7
20–24	72.1
25–29	60.6
30–34	48.9
35–39	35.5
40–44	23.7
45–49	14.3
50–54	7.8
55–59	4.1
60–64	2.4
65–69	1.1
70–74	0.6
75–79	0.4
80–84	0.1
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (New $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	170	÷	179	=	94.9
5–9	936	÷	1,017	=	92.1
10–14	2,297	÷	2,674	=	85.9
15–19	3,603	÷	4,579	=	78.7
20–24	5,507	÷	7,636	=	72.1
25–29	6,331	÷	10,449	=	60.6
30–34	5,928	÷	12,114	=	48.9
35–39	4,661	÷	13,148	=	35.5
40–44	2,880	÷	12,148	=	23.7
45–49	1,557	÷	10,911	=	14.3
50–54	696	÷	8,884	=	7.8
55–59	270	÷	6,613	=	4.1
60–64	90	÷	3,799	=	2.4
65–69	31	÷	2,933	=	1.1
70–74	10	÷	1,513	=	0.6
75–79	4	÷	1,015	=	0.4
80–84	0	÷	312	=	0.1
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	#N/A

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (New $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–1.8	5.1	5.7	7.6
5–9	+4.1	6.3	7.1	9.3
10–14	–0.7	3.4	3.8	4.8
15–19	–1.9	3.0	3.6	4.7
20–24	–2.0	2.5	3.0	3.7
25–29	–1.8	2.3	2.6	3.1
30–34	–1.2	2.1	2.6	3.5
35–39	–1.3	2.1	2.5	3.0
40–44	+0.0	1.8	2.2	3.1
45–49	–1.4	1.5	1.9	2.4
50–54	–0.6	1.3	1.6	2.2
55–59	+0.6	1.0	1.2	1.7
60–64	+0.6	0.9	1.1	1.6
65–69	–0.4	0.9	1.1	1.4
70–74	–0.1	0.9	1.1	1.5
75–79	+0.0	0.7	0.7	1.1
80–84	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (New $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	–0.7	68.4	74.2	90.9
4	–2.1	38.3	44.3	57.9
8	–1.3	27.4	32.7	43.1
16	–0.8	19.1	23.2	31.7
32	–0.8	14.1	16.4	21.2
64	–0.7	9.7	11.5	14.9
128	–0.8	6.7	8.2	10.5
256	–1.0	4.8	5.9	7.6
512	–0.9	3.3	3.9	5.3
1,024	–0.9	2.4	2.9	3.7
2,048	–0.8	1.8	2.1	2.8
4,096	–0.8	1.2	1.5	1.9
8,192	–0.8	0.9	1.0	1.3
16,384	–0.8	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 11 (New $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.2	35.1	0.0	64.7	64.9	–99.0
5–9	1.1	34.2	0.1	64.6	65.7	–93.5
10–14	3.4	31.9	0.5	64.2	67.6	–79.5
15–19	7.0	28.3	1.4	63.3	70.3	–56.1
20–24	12.5	22.7	3.5	61.2	73.7	–18.9
25–29	18.9	16.4	7.7	57.1	75.9	+28.7
30–34	24.8	10.4	13.8	50.9	75.7	+60.9
35–39	29.6	5.7	22.2	42.5	72.1	+37.0
40–44	32.5	2.8	31.5	33.2	65.7	+10.8
45–49	34.1	1.2	40.7	24.0	58.1	–15.4
50–54	34.9	0.4	48.8	15.9	50.8	–38.4
55–59	35.1	0.1	55.2	9.5	44.7	–56.4
60–64	35.2	0.1	58.9	5.8	41.0	–67.0
65–69	35.3	0.0	61.8	2.9	38.2	–75.2
70–74	35.3	0.0	63.3	1.4	36.7	–79.4
75–79	35.3	0.0	64.3	0.4	35.7	–82.3
80–84	35.3	0.0	64.6	0.1	35.4	–83.2
85–89	35.3	0.0	64.7	0.0	35.3	–83.3
90–94	35.3	0.0	64.7	0.0	35.3	–83.4
95–100	35.3	0.0	64.7	0.0	35.3	–83.4

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (New $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	95.3	0.5	20.2:1
5–9	1.2	90.7	3.1	9.7:1
10–14	3.9	87.2	9.6	6.8:1
15–19	8.4	83.2	19.9	5.0:1
20–24	16.1	78.0	35.6	3.5:1
25–29	26.5	71.2	53.5	2.5:1
30–34	38.6	64.3	70.4	1.8:1
35–39	51.8	57.1	83.8	1.3:1
40–44	63.9	50.8	92.0	1.0:1
45–49	74.9	45.6	96.7	0.8:1
50–54	83.7	41.7	98.9	0.7:1
55–59	90.4	38.9	99.6	0.6:1
60–64	94.2	37.4	99.8	0.6:1
65–69	97.1	36.3	100.0	0.6:1
70–74	98.6	35.8	100.0	0.6:1
75–79	99.6	35.4	100.0	0.5:1
80–84	99.9	35.3	100.0	0.5:1
85–89	100.0	35.3	100.0	0.5:1
90–94	100.0	35.3	100.0	0.5:1
95–100	100.0	35.3	100.0	0.5:1

Tables for the Legacy National Poverty Line

Figure 4 (Legacy national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	53.5
5–9	44.3
10–14	33.9
15–19	22.3
20–24	15.6
25–29	9.6
30–34	5.3
35–39	2.6
40–44	1.4
45–49	0.7
50–54	0.3
55–59	0.1
60–64	0.1
65–69	0.0
70–74	0.0
75–79	0.0
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (Legacy 2007 national line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	96	÷	179	=	53.5
5–9	450	÷	1,017	=	44.3
10–14	907	÷	2,674	=	33.9
15–19	1,019	÷	4,579	=	22.3
20–24	1,189	÷	7,636	=	15.6
25–29	1,004	÷	10,449	=	9.6
30–34	647	÷	12,114	=	5.3
35–39	346	÷	13,148	=	2.6
40–44	170	÷	12,148	=	1.4
45–49	71	÷	10,911	=	0.7
50–54	28	÷	8,884	=	0.3
55–59	8	÷	6,613	=	0.1
60–64	3	÷	3,799	=	0.1
65–69	0	÷	2,933	=	0.0
70–74	0	÷	1,513	=	0.0
75–79	0	÷	1,015	=	0.0
80–84	0	÷	312	=	0.0
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	#N/A

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (Legacy 2007 national line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–4.8	18.0	20.9	28.7
5–9	+7.6	7.3	8.4	11.8
10–14	–1.1	5.0	5.8	7.9
15–19	–4.5	3.9	4.2	5.2
20–24	–1.8	2.1	2.5	3.4
25–29	–0.9	1.4	1.7	2.1
30–34	–0.8	1.0	1.2	1.5
35–39	–0.3	0.7	0.8	1.0
40–44	+0.0	0.5	0.6	0.7
45–49	+0.0	0.4	0.4	0.6
50–54	+0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3
55–59	+0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
60–64	–0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3
65–69	+0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
70–74	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
75–79	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
80–84	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (Legacy 2007 national line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.0	44.2	59.2	70.8
4	–1.0	20.2	26.6	35.6
8	–0.6	13.5	17.6	23.2
16	–0.6	9.5	11.6	16.3
32	–0.5	7.0	8.3	11.3
64	–0.5	5.0	6.1	8.0
128	–0.5	3.7	4.3	5.9
256	–0.5	2.6	3.2	4.0
512	–0.5	1.9	2.3	2.9
1,024	–0.5	1.3	1.6	2.1
2,048	–0.5	0.9	1.1	1.4
4,096	–0.5	0.6	0.8	1.0
8,192	–0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7
16,384	–0.5	0.3	0.4	0.5

Figure 11 (Legacy 2007 national line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.1	6.1	0.1	93.7	93.8	–95.5
5–9	0.5	5.7	0.7	93.1	93.6	–72.5
10–14	1.4	4.8	2.5	91.3	92.7	–15.2
15–19	2.5	3.7	5.9	87.9	90.4	+3.9
20–24	3.8	2.4	12.3	81.5	85.3	–99.2
25–29	4.8	1.4	21.7	72.1	76.9	–251.5
30–34	5.5	0.7	33.1	60.7	66.2	–435.7
35–39	5.9	0.3	45.9	47.9	53.8	–642.3
40–44	6.1	0.1	57.9	36.0	42.0	–836.0
45–49	6.2	0.0	68.7	25.1	31.3	–1,011.3
50–54	6.2	0.0	77.6	16.3	22.4	–1,154.6
55–59	6.2	0.0	84.2	9.6	15.8	–1,261.5
60–64	6.2	0.0	88.0	5.8	12.0	–1,322.9
65–69	6.2	0.0	90.9	2.9	9.1	–1,370.3
70–74	6.2	0.0	92.4	1.4	7.6	–1,394.8
75–79	6.2	0.0	93.4	0.4	6.6	–1,411.2
80–84	6.2	0.0	93.7	0.1	6.3	–1,416.3
85–89	6.2	0.0	93.8	0.0	6.2	–1,416.9
90–94	6.2	0.0	93.8	0.0	6.2	–1,417.5
95–100	6.2	0.0	93.8	0.0	6.2	–1,417.5

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (Legacy 2007 national line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	56.5	1.6	1.3:1
5–9	1.2	42.1	8.1	0.7:1
10–14	3.9	35.5	22.2	0.6:1
15–19	8.4	29.7	40.6	0.4:1
20–24	16.1	23.4	61.0	0.3:1
25–29	26.5	18.1	77.7	0.2:1
30–34	38.6	14.3	89.4	0.2:1
35–39	51.8	11.4	95.5	0.1:1
40–44	63.9	9.5	98.4	0.1:1
45–49	74.9	8.2	99.5	0.1:1
50–54	83.7	7.4	99.9	0.1:1
55–59	90.4	6.8	99.9	0.1:1
60–64	94.2	6.6	100.0	0.1:1
65–69	97.1	6.4	100.0	0.1:1
70–74	98.6	6.3	100.0	0.1:1
75–79	99.6	6.2	100.0	0.1:1
80–84	99.9	6.2	100.0	0.1:1
85–89	100.0	6.2	100.0	0.1:1
90–94	100.0	6.2	100.0	0.1:1
95–100	100.0	6.2	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for the Legacy $1.25/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Figure 4 (Legacy $1.25/day line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	77.4
5–9	72.1
10–14	61.8
15–19	49.9
20–24	40.1
25–29	28.8
30–34	19.7
35–39	12.0
40–44	6.8
45–49	3.5
50–54	1.7
55–59	0.9
60–64	0.4
65–69	0.1
70–74	0.1
75–79	0.1
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (Legacy $1.25/day line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	139	÷	179	=	77.4
5–9	733	÷	1,017	=	72.1
10–14	1,653	÷	2,674	=	61.8
15–19	2,286	÷	4,579	=	49.9
20–24	3,058	÷	7,636	=	40.1
25–29	3,013	÷	10,449	=	28.8
30–34	2,383	÷	12,114	=	19.7
35–39	1,577	÷	13,148	=	12.0
40–44	820	÷	12,148	=	6.8
45–49	376	÷	10,911	=	3.5
50–54	152	÷	8,884	=	1.7
55–59	62	÷	6,613	=	0.9
60–64	14	÷	3,799	=	0.4
65–69	3	÷	2,933	=	0.1
70–74	1	÷	1,513	=	0.1
75–79	1	÷	1,015	=	0.1
80–84	0	÷	312	=	0.0
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	#N/A

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (Legacy $1.25/day line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–6.2	13.9	16.3	20.1
5–9	+6.2	8.1	9.5	12.5
10–14	–1.2	4.9	5.8	8.4
15–19	–4.9	4.3	4.6	5.5
20–24	–3.2	3.1	3.4	4.3
25–29	–1.9	2.1	2.5	3.3
30–34	–1.1	1.7	2.1	2.9
35–39	–0.8	1.4	1.7	2.1
40–44	–0.5	1.1	1.3	1.8
45–49	–0.2	0.8	1.0	1.2
50–54	+0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
55–59	+0.4	0.4	0.4	0.6
60–64	–0.0	0.4	0.5	0.6
65–69	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
70–74	+0.0	0.2	0.2	0.4
75–79	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
80–84	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (Legacy $1.25/day line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.5	60.2	69.0	79.2
4	–1.1	31.6	38.5	51.2
8	–0.7	21.1	25.7	36.0
16	–0.9	14.5	17.3	23.2
32	–0.8	10.9	13.1	15.8
64	–0.9	7.6	9.2	12.3
128	–0.8	5.3	6.3	8.3
256	–0.9	3.7	4.4	5.5
512	–0.9	2.7	3.2	4.2
1,024	–0.9	1.8	2.2	3.0
2,048	–0.8	1.4	1.6	2.0
4,096	–0.9	1.0	1.2	1.5
8,192	–0.8	0.7	0.8	1.2
16,384	–0.8	0.5	0.5	0.8

Figure 11 (Legacy $1.25/day line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.1	16.4	0.0	83.5	83.6	–98.0
5–9	0.9	15.7	0.3	83.1	84.0	–87.6
10–14	2.5	14.0	1.4	82.1	84.6	–61.5
15–19	4.9	11.7	3.6	79.9	84.8	–19.4
20–24	8.0	8.5	8.1	75.4	83.3	+45.6
25–29	11.0	5.5	15.5	68.0	79.0	+6.0
30–34	13.5	3.1	25.2	58.3	71.8	–52.5
35–39	15.1	1.4	36.7	46.8	61.8	–122.3
40–44	15.9	0.6	48.0	35.5	51.4	–190.7
45–49	16.3	0.2	58.5	24.9	41.3	–254.4
50–54	16.5	0.1	67.3	16.2	32.6	–307.4
55–59	16.5	0.0	73.9	9.6	26.1	–347.2
60–64	16.5	0.0	77.6	5.8	22.4	–370.1
65–69	16.5	0.0	80.6	2.9	19.4	–387.8
70–74	16.5	0.0	82.1	1.4	17.9	–396.9
75–79	16.5	0.0	83.1	0.4	16.9	–403.1
80–84	16.5	0.0	83.4	0.1	16.6	–405.0
85–89	16.5	0.0	83.4	0.0	16.6	–405.2
90–94	16.5	0.0	83.5	0.0	16.5	–405.4
95–100	16.5	0.0	83.5	0.0	16.5	–405.4

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (Legacy $1.25/day line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	82.0	0.9	4.6:1
5–9	1.2	71.2	5.2	2.5:1
10–14	3.9	64.2	15.0	1.8:1
15–19	8.4	57.5	29.4	1.4:1
20–24	16.1	49.6	48.3	1.0:1
25–29	26.5	41.5	66.6	0.7:1
30–34	38.6	34.8	81.5	0.5:1
35–39	51.8	29.1	91.3	0.4:1
40–44	63.9	24.9	96.4	0.3:1
45–49	74.9	21.8	98.8	0.3:1
50–54	83.7	19.6	99.6	0.2:1
55–59	90.4	18.3	99.9	0.2:1
60–64	94.2	17.5	100.0	0.2:1
65–69	97.1	17.0	100.0	0.2:1
70–74	98.6	16.8	100.0	0.2:1
75–79	99.6	16.6	100.0	0.2:1
80–84	99.9	16.5	100.0	0.2:1
85–89	100.0	16.5	100.0	0.2:1
90–94	100.0	16.5	100.0	0.2:1
95–100	100.0	16.5	100.0	0.2:1

Tables for the legacy $2.50/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Figure 4 (Legacy $2.50/day line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	99.5
5–9	99.0
10–14	98.5
15–19	97.0
20–24	95.6
25–29	92.0
30–34	88.2
35–39	80.8
40–44	69.6
45–49	56.2
50–54	42.0
55–59	28.3
60–64	19.4
65–69	10.7
70–74	8.1
75–79	4.0
80–84	1.3
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Figure 5 (Legacy $2.50/day line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	178	÷	179	=	99.5
5–9	1,006	÷	1,017	=	99.0
10–14	2,633	÷	2,674	=	98.5
15–19	4,442	÷	4,579	=	97.0
20–24	7,298	÷	7,636	=	95.6
25–29	9,612	÷	10,449	=	92.0
30–34	10,684	÷	12,114	=	88.2
35–39	10,625	÷	13,148	=	80.8
40–44	8,457	÷	12,148	=	69.6
45–49	6,133	÷	10,911	=	56.2
50–54	3,730	÷	8,884	=	42.0
55–59	1,873	÷	6,613	=	28.3
60–64	737	÷	3,799	=	19.4
65–69	315	÷	2,933	=	10.7
70–74	122	÷	1,513	=	8.1
75–79	41	÷	1,015	=	4.0
80–84	4	÷	312	=	1.3
85–89	0	÷	39	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	37	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	0	=	#N/A

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Figure 7 (Legacy $2.50/day line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384) with confidence intervals, scorecard applied to the validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	–0.4	0.5	0.6	1.0
5–9	–0.7	0.7	0.8	1.0
10–14	–0.8	0.7	0.8	1.0
15–19	–1.1	1.0	1.1	1.3
20–24	–0.1	1.3	1.5	1.9
25–29	–1.6	1.4	1.5	1.8
30–34	–1.6	1.4	1.5	2.0
35–39	–0.4	1.7	2.0	2.7
40–44	–0.5	2.0	2.4	3.3
45–49	–1.6	2.3	2.7	3.2
50–54	–0.0	2.5	3.1	4.0
55–59	+2.4	2.5	2.8	3.9
60–64	+2.3	2.7	3.2	4.3
65–69	+0.4	2.5	2.9	3.8
70–74	–1.8	3.4	4.0	4.9
75–79	+0.9	2.2	2.7	3.6
80–84	+0.9	0.8	1.0	1.6
85–89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (Legacy $2.50/day line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.3	63.8	79.9	89.4
4	–1.2	34.3	43.0	58.8
8	–0.5	24.4	29.5	35.5
16	–0.6	17.5	20.7	26.9
32	–0.5	13.0	15.8	20.7
64	–0.7	9.1	11.1	14.2
128	–0.7	6.5	7.5	10.4
256	–0.6	4.6	5.5	7.1
512	–0.6	3.2	3.8	5.1
1,024	–0.5	2.3	2.6	3.2
2,048	–0.4	1.5	1.9	2.5
4,096	–0.5	1.1	1.3	1.8
8,192	–0.4	0.8	1.0	1.3
16,384	–0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 11 (Legacy $2.50/day line): Households by targeting outcome and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, scorecard applied to the validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.2	68.2	0.0	31.7	31.8	–99.5
5–9	1.2	67.2	0.0	31.6	32.8	–96.5
10–14	3.8	64.5	0.0	31.6	35.4	–88.7
15–19	8.3	60.1	0.2	31.5	39.8	–75.5
20–24	15.6	52.8	0.5	31.1	46.7	–53.7
25–29	25.2	43.1	1.3	30.4	55.6	–24.2
30–34	35.9	32.4	2.7	29.0	64.9	+9.1
35–39	46.5	21.8	5.3	26.4	72.9	+43.9
40–44	55.0	13.3	8.9	22.7	77.8	+74.1
45–49	61.3	7.0	13.5	18.1	79.4	+80.2
50–54	65.2	3.1	18.5	13.1	78.3	+72.9
55–59	67.0	1.3	23.3	8.3	75.4	+65.9
60–64	67.8	0.6	26.4	5.3	73.1	+61.4
65–69	68.1	0.2	29.0	2.7	70.8	+57.6
70–74	68.3	0.0	30.3	1.4	69.7	+55.7
75–79	68.3	0.0	31.3	0.4	68.7	+54.2
80–84	68.3	0.0	31.6	0.1	68.4	+53.8
85–89	68.3	0.0	31.6	0.0	68.4	+53.7
90–94	68.3	0.0	31.7	0.0	68.3	+53.7
95–100	68.3	0.0	31.7	0.0	68.3	+53.7

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 12 (Legacy $2.50/day line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score at or below a cut-off), the percentage of targeted households who are poor (that is, below the poverty line), the percentage of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), scorecard applied to the validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all households who are targeted	% targeted who are poor	% of poor who are targeted	Poor households targeted per non-poor household targeted
0–4	0.2	99.5	0.3	190.2:1
5–9	1.2	99.3	1.7	148.6:1
10–14	3.9	98.9	5.6	90.3:1
15–19	8.4	98.2	12.1	53.5:1
20–24	16.1	96.8	22.8	30.5:1
25–29	26.5	95.2	36.9	19.6:1
30–34	38.6	93.0	52.6	13.3:1
35–39	51.8	89.8	68.1	8.8:1
40–44	63.9	86.0	80.5	6.2:1
45–49	74.9	81.9	89.7	4.5:1
50–54	83.7	77.9	95.4	3.5:1
55–59	90.4	74.2	98.1	2.9:1
60–64	94.2	72.0	99.2	2.6:1
65–69	97.1	70.2	99.7	2.4:1
70–74	98.6	69.3	99.9	2.3:1
75–79	99.6	68.6	100.0	2.2:1
80–84	99.9	68.4	100.0	2.2:1
85–89	100.0	68.4	100.0	2.2:1
90–94	100.0	68.3	100.0	2.2:1
95–100	100.0	68.3	100.0	2.2:1