

Simple Poverty Scorecard[®] Poverty-Assessment Tool Philippines

Mark Schreiner

6 February 2013

This document and related tools are at SimplePovertyScorecard.com

Abstract

The Simple Poverty Scorecard[®]-brand poverty-assessment tool uses ten low-cost indicators from the Philippines' 2004 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey to estimate the likelihood that a household has income 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 the Philippines to measure poverty rates, to track changes in poverty rates over time, and to segment clients for targeted services.

Version note

This paper updates Schreiner (2002a), using data from 2004 instead of 2002. Estimates from the two scorecards are compatible because they use the same definition of *poverty*, so users of the old scorecard can (and should) switch to the new one here.

Acknowledgements

This paper was funded by the Ford Foundation through a grant to Grameen Foundation. Data were provided by the National Statistics Office of the Philippines. Thanks go to Aniceta Alip, Malika Anand, Nigel Biggar, Cecilia del Castillo, Shiyuan Chen, Ron Chua, Melany Grecia-Viajante, Gretel Guzmán, Lalaine Joyas, Gilbert Maramba, Lourdes Medina, Vincent Morris D. Olaivar, Luca David Opramolla, Don Sillers, and Jeff Toohig.

Author

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

Simple Poverty Scorecard[®] Poverty-Assessment Tool

Interview ID: _____	<u>Name</u>	<u>Identifier</u>
Interview date: _____	Participant: _____	_____
Country: <u>PHL</u>	Field agent: _____	_____
Scorecard: <u>002</u>	Service point: _____	_____
Sampling wgt.: _____	Number of household members: _____	

Indicator	Value	Points	Total
1. How many people in the family are aged 0 to 14?	A. Five or more	0	
	B. Four	4	
	C. Three	9	
	D. Two	15	
	E. One	20	
	F. None	26	
2. Do all children in the family of ages 6 to 14 currently go to school?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	2	
	C. No children ages 6 to 14	4	
3. What is the highest educational attainment completed by the female head/spouse?	A. Graduate elementary or less	0	
	B. First- to fourth-year secondary	3	
	C. Graduate secondary	6	
	D. First-year post-secondary or higher, or first-year college or higher, or no female head/spouse	11	
4. In their primary occupation or business in the past week, did any family members work for a private household, private enterprise, or government or government corporation?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	5	
5. What are the house's outer walls made of?	A. Light materials (<i>cogon</i> , <i>nipa</i> , or <i>sawali</i> , bamboo, <i>anahaw</i> , or salvaged/makeshift)	0	
	B. Strong materials (iron, aluminum, tile, concrete, brick, stone, wood, asbestos)	4	
6. What is the house's roof made of?	A. Light materials (Salvaged/makeshift, <i>cogon</i> , <i>nipa</i> , or <i>anahaw</i>)	0	
	B. Strong materials (Galvanized iron, aluminum tile, concrete, brick, stone, or asbestos)	2	
7. What kind of toilet facility does the family use?	A. No toilet/field/bush, open or closed pit/latrine, drop/overhang, pail system, or other	0	
	B. Flush toilet	7	
8. Does the family own a refrigerator/freezer?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	10	
9. How many television sets does the family own?	A. None	0	
	B. One	6	
	C. Two or more	21	
10. Does the family own a washing machine?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	10	

Simple Poverty Scorecard[®] Poverty-Assessment Tool Philippines

1. Introduction

This paper presents the Simple Poverty Scorecard poverty-assessment tool.

Local, pro-poor programs in the Philippines can use it to estimate the likelihood that a household has income 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 direct approach to poverty measurement via surveys is difficult and costly, asking households about a lengthy list of income categories. In contrast, the indirect approach via the scorecard is simple, quick, and inexpensive. It uses ten verifiable indicators (such as “What is the house’s roof made out of?” or “What type of toilet facility does the family use?”) 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, 2002) 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). Results from these approaches are not comparable across

organizations nor across countries, they may be costly, and their accuracy and precision are unknown.

If an organization wants to know what share of its participants are below a poverty line (say, USD1.25/day at 2005 purchase-power parity for the Millennium Development Goals, or the poorest half of people below the national poverty line as required of USAID microenterprise partners), or if it wants to measure movement across a poverty line (for example, to report to the Microcredit Summit Campaign), then it needs an income-based, objective tool with known accuracy. While income surveys are costly even for governments, many small, local organizations can implement an inexpensive scorecard that can serve for monitoring, management, 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, not because they do not work, but because they are presented (when they are presented at all) as tables of regression coefficients incomprehensible to lay people (with cryptic indicator names such as “HHSIZE_2”, negative values, many decimal places, and standard errors). Thanks to the predictive-modeling phenomenon known as the “flat max”, simple scorecards are about accurate as complex ones.

The technical approach here is also innovative in how it associates scores with poverty likelihoods, in the extent of its accuracy tests, and in how it derives sample-size formulas. Although these techniques are simple and/or standard, they have rarely or never been applied to poverty-assessment tools.

The scorecard is based on the 2004 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey conducted by the Philippines' National Statistics Office. 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 income below a given poverty line.

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

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

The scorecard can also be used for targeting. To help managers choose a targeting cut-off, 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 income data and the Philippines’s national poverty line. Scores from this scorecard are calibrated to poverty likelihoods for eight poverty lines.

The scorecard is constructed and calibrated using a sub-sample of the data from the 2004 APIS. Its accuracy is validated on a different sub-sample from the 2004 APIS as well as on the entire 2002 APIS. While all three scoring estimators are unbiased when applied to the population from which they were derived (that is, they match the true value on average in repeated samples from 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.¹

Thus, while the indirect scoring approach is less costly than the direct survey approach, it is also biased. (The survey approach is unbiased by assumption.) There is bias because scoring must assume that the future relationship between indicators and

¹ In the context of the scorecard, examples of “different populations” include a nationally representative sample at a different point in time or a non-representative sub-group (Tarozzi and Deaton, 2007).

poverty will be the same as in the data used to build the scorecard.² Of course, this assumption—ubiquitous and inevitable in predictive modeling—holds only partly.

When applied to the 2004 validation sample for the Philippines with $n = 16,384$, the difference between scorecard estimates of groups' poverty rates and the true rates at a point in time is +0.6 percentage points for the national line, and the average absolute difference is 0.4 percentage points across all eight lines. These differences are due to sampling variation and not bias; the average difference would be zero if the whole 2004 APIS were to be repeatedly redrawn and divided into sub-samples before repeating the entire scorecard-building process.

When the scorecard built from the 2004 construction and calibration samples is applied to the 2004 validation sample and the entire 2002 APIS with $n = 16,384$, the difference between scorecard estimates of changes in groups' poverty rates and the true changes is -0.5 percentage points (national line). Across all eight lines, the average absolute difference is 1.4 percentage points. These differences are due to sampling variation, changes in poverty lines over time, changes in data quality, and changes in the relationship between indicators and poverty.

The 90-percent confidence intervals for these estimates are ± 0.5 percentage points or less for estimates of a poverty rate at a point in time, and ± 0.7 percentage

² Bias may also result from changes in the quality of data collection, from changes over time to the national poverty lines, from imperfect adjustment of poverty lines to account for differences in cost-of-living across time or geographic regions, or from sampling variation across income surveys.

points or less for estimates of changes in a poverty rate between two points in time. For $n = 1,024$, the 90-percent intervals are ± 2.0 and ± 1.7 percentage points or less.

Section 2 below describes data and poverty lines. Section 3 places the new scorecard here in the context of existing exercises for the Philippines. Sections 4 and 5 describe scorecard construction and offer practical guidelines for use. Sections 6 and 7 detail the estimation of households' poverty likelihoods and of groups' poverty rates at a point in time. Section 8 discusses estimating changes in poverty rates. Section 9 covers targeting. The final section is a summary.

2. Data and poverty lines

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

2.1 Data

The scorecard is based on data from the 2004 APIS. This is the best, most recent national survey that is available and that collects income or expenditure. Households are randomly divided into three sub-samples (Figure 2):

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

In addition, the 2002 APIS is used in the validation of estimates of changes in poverty rates for two independent representative samples between two points in time.

2.2 Poverty rates and poverty lines

2.2.1 Rates

As a general definition, the poverty rate is the share of people in a given group who live in households whose total household income (divided by the number of household members) is below a given poverty line.

Beyond this general definition, there two special cases, *household-level poverty rates* and *person-level poverty rates*. With household-level rates, each household is

counted as if it had only one person, regardless of true household size, so all households are counted equally. With person-level rates (the “head-count index”), each household is weighted by the number of people in it, so larger households count more.

For example, consider a group of two households, the first with one member and the second with two members. Suppose further that the first household has per-capita income above a poverty line (it is “non-poor”) and that the second household has per-capita income below a poverty line (it is “poor”). The household-level rate counts both households as if they had only one person and so gives a poverty rate of $1 / (1 + 1) = 50$ percent. In contrast, the person-level rate weighs each household by the number of people in it and so gives a poverty rate of $2 / (1 + 2) = 67$ percent.

Whether the household-level rate or the person-level rate is relevant depends on the situation. If an organization’s “participants” include all the people in a household, then the person-level rate is relevant. Governments, for example, are concerned with the well-being of people, regardless of how those people are arranged in households, so governments typically report person-level poverty rates.

If an organization has only one “participant” per household, however, then the household-level rate is relevant. For example, if a microlender has only one borrower in a household, then it might prefer to report household-level poverty rates.

This paper reports poverty rates and poverty lines at both the household-level and the person-level, by urban/rural for all provinces in the Philippines, for both 2002

and 2004 (Figures A1 to A89).³ The scorecard is constructed using the 2004 APIS and household-level lines, scores are calibrated to household-level poverty likelihoods, and accuracy is measured for household-level rates. This use of household-level rates reflects the belief that they are relevant for most pro-poor organizations.

Organizations can estimate person-level poverty rates by taking a household-size-weighted average of the household-level poverty likelihoods. It is also possible to construct a scorecard based on person-level lines, calibrate scores to person-level likelihoods, and measure accuracy for person-level rates, but it is not done here.

2.2.2 Poverty lines

The national poverty line (PHP39.52 per person per day, Figure A1) is defined as the food poverty line (PHP25.72) plus the income required to cover average non-food expenditure for households whose food expenditure per capita is within ± 10 percent of the food poverty line.⁴ The scorecard here is constructed using the national line.

The poverty lines are based on data from the triennial Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES). For the 2002 APIS, this paper applies the 2002 lines

³ Many of the estimated poverty rates in Figures A2 to A89 are not very precise because they are based on small samples.

⁴ The food line is based on “regional menus priced at the provincial level . . . using low-cost, nutritionally adequate food items satisfying basic food requirements of 2,000 calories, which are 100-percent adequate for the Recommended Energy and Nutrient Intake (RENI) for energy and protein and 80 percent adequate for the RENI for vitamins, minerals, and other nutrients” (National Statistical Coordination Board, 2007, p. 1).

derived from the 2000 FIES by the National Statistical Coordination Board (NSCB), and for the 2004 APIS, it applies the 2004 lines set by the NSCB from the 2003 FIES.⁵

In strict terms, FIES lines should not be applied to APIS data. As noted by Schelzig (2005, p. 131), FIES and APIS use different income and consumption modules and different reference periods (FIES makes two visits and covers the whole year, APIS makes one visit and covers July). There are no official poverty rates based on APIS, “most likely because they would conflict with the FIES results”. Given this paper uses the APIS data, however, the FIES poverty lines are the best available.

For the Philippines as a whole, the household-level poverty rates in the 2004 APIS are 31.4 percent for the national line and 15.4 percent for the food line (Figure 2). Compared with the 2002 APIS, these are reductions of 0.4 and 0.3 percentage points.

As an imperfect comparison, the 2003 FIES household-level poverty rates are 24.4 percent (national) and 10.2 percent (food). Compared with the 2000 FIES, these are reductions of 3.1 and 2.1 percentage points.⁶

In the end, both the levels and changes in poverty rates differ between APIS and FIES, although the changes are in the same direction.

⁵ <http://www.nscb.gov.ph/poverty/2002/2002povTreshold.asp>, <http://www.nscb.gov.ph/poverty/2002/2002foodTreshold.asp>, http://www.nscb.gov.ph/poverty/2004/pov_th.asp, and http://www.nscb.gov.ph/poverty/2004/food_th.asp, all accessed January 27, 2009.

⁶ http://www.nscb.gov.ph/poverty/2004/table_1.asp, and http://www.nscb.gov.ph/poverty/2004/table_3.asp, both accessed February 6, 2009

Because local pro-poor organizations may want to use different or various poverty lines, this paper calibrates scores from its single scorecard to poverty likelihoods for eight lines:

- National
- Food
- USAID “extreme”
- USD1.25/day 2005 PPP
- USD2.50/day 2005 PPP
- USD3.75/day 2005 PPP
- USD5.00/day 2005 PPP
- USD4.32/day 1993 PPP⁷

The USAID “extreme” line is defined as the median income of people (not households) below the national line (U.S. Congress, 2002).

The USD1.25/day line (2005 PPP) is derived from:

- 2005 PPP exchange rate for “individual consumption expenditure by households”:⁸ PHP24.18 per USD1.00
- National Consumer Price Index (CPI) for July 2002 (110.2) and July 2004 (121.8)⁹
- Average national CPI in 2005: 129.8

⁷ The USD4.32/day 1993 PPP line is presented to provide backward compatibility with an earlier paper in which this was the main international line.

⁸ <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ICPINT/Resources/icp-final-tables.pdf>, accessed February 6, 2009.

⁹ <http://www.census.gov.ph/data/sectordata/tscpimon.htm>, accessed January 27, 2009.

Given this, the USD1.25/day 2005 PPP line for the Philippines as a whole for the 2004 APIS is:¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{2005 PPP exchange rate}) \cdot \text{USD1.25} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{CPI}_{\text{July 2004}}}{\text{CPI}_{\text{2005 average}}} \right) = \\ & \left(\frac{\text{PHP24.18}}{\text{USD1.00}} \right) \cdot \text{USD1.25} \cdot \left(\frac{121.8}{129.8} \right) = \text{PHP28.36}. \end{aligned}$$

The USD2.50/day, USD3.75/day, and USD5.00/day 2005 PPP lines are multiples of the USD1.25/day line. The \$4.32/day 1993 PPP line uses a PPP exchange rate of PHP6.241 per USD1.00 (Sillers, 2006) and an average 1993 CPI of 63.306. This 1993 PPP line provides backward compatibility with an earlier Philippine scorecard.

The lines just discussed apply to the Philippines as a whole. For each APIS round, they are adjusted for provincial and urban/rural differences in prices using:

- L , a given all-Philippines poverty line
- p_i , population proportion by urban/rural in each province (I = number of areas)
- π_i , the national poverty line by area (used as a price deflator)

The cost-of-living-adjusted poverty line L_i for area i is then:

$$L_i = \frac{L \cdot \pi_i}{\sum_{j=1}^I p_j \cdot \pi_j}.$$

The all-Philippines line L is the person-weighted average of local lines L_i . The differences in local lines reflect the differences in local prices.

¹⁰ Silbers (2006) provides this formula.

3. Context of poverty-assessment tools in the Philippines

This section discusses existing poverty-assessment tools in terms of their goals, methods, relative/absolute poverty estimation, poverty lines, indicators, accuracy, precision, and costs.

3.1 Reyes

Reyes (2006) has a concrete purpose: to construct a poverty-assessment tool as “an alternative means-testing option for identifying [the 5 million] beneficiaries of the Philhealth Indigent Program” (p. 1) using data collected on all households as part of the Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS). As of 2006, CBMS covered 6,000 *barangays* in 20 provinces, with plans for nationwide coverage by 2010. Much like this paper, Reyes aims for a simple, inexpensive system that can be implemented by non-specialists in local government and that can be used to update beneficiary status over time for households that cannot establish income via pay stubs or tax returns.

Reyes builds a tool using the 2000 FIES, choosing indicators by eyeballing cross-tabulations with poverty status and then deriving their points via a logit regression on poverty status. The indicators are:

- Ownership of consumer durables:
 - Television
 - VCD/VHS/DVD
 - Refrigerator
 - Washing machine
 - Air conditioner
 - Car/jeep/motor vehicle
 - Telephone
 - Computer
 - Microwave oven
- Residence characteristics:
 - Whether housing is makeshift
 - Whether the household is an informal settler
 - Use of sanitary toilet facilities
 - Use of electricity
 - Use of safe water supply
- Whether the household head is engaged in agriculture¹¹

As in this paper, Reyes' indicators are few, simple, verifiable, and easy-to-collect. They differ in number (15 versus 10) and in that Reyes' asset indicators tend to characterize households far above the poverty line. Also, Reyes' tool is presented as a table of regression coefficients with negative values, seven decimal places, and names like "hvwtr" and "hmkshft"; this format, while mathematically correct, may frighten the local government officials who are expected to implement it.

As in this paper, Reyes tests targeting accuracy for a range of cut-offs. For example, targeting those with poverty likelihoods of 50 percent or more would cover

¹¹ Reyes found that an urban/rural indicator was not statistically significant.

55.3 percent of the poor while targeting 25.8 percent of all households. For cut-offs of 70 and 80 percent, coverage is 83.7 and 91.3 percent, while 46.5 and 55.7 percent of all households are targeted.

For equivalent cut-offs, the scorecard here covers 62, 87, and 93 percent of the poor, so it is more accurate. The difference more pronounced than this comparison suggests, because Reyes tests *in-sample* (using the same data used in tool construction), while this paper tests *out-of-sample* (using data not used in tool construction). Out-of-sample testing mimics how scoring is used in practice, and it generally shows less accuracy than in-sample tests; comparisons for poverty-assessment tools in Copestake *et al.* (2005) and Hentschel *et al.* (2000) suggests reductions of 15–17 percent.

Overall, the tool in Reyes (2006) is similar to the one here, except it is based on the 2000 FIES, less user-friendly, and less accurate for targeting. Reyes does not address estimating poverty rates nor changes in poverty rates.

3.2 Haslett and Jones

Haslett and Jones (2005) use “poverty mapping” (Elbers, Lanjouw, and Lanjouw, 2003) to estimate poverty rates for Philippines’ municipalities. They first construct a poverty-assessment tool based on income in the 2000 FIES, using only indicators found both in the 2000 FIES and in the 2000 Census of Population and Housing. The tool is then applied to the census data to estimate poverty rates for smaller areas than would be possible with only the 2000 FIES. Finally, they make “poverty maps” that quickly

show how estimated poverty rates vary across areas in a way that makes sense to lay people.

The poverty mapping in Haslett and Jones has much in common with the the scorecard here in that they both:

- Build poverty-assessment tools with nationally representative survey data and then apply them to other data on groups that may not be nationally representative
- Use simple, verifiable indicators that are quick and inexpensive to collect
- Provide unbiased estimates
- Report standard errors for their estimates (or, equivalently, confidence intervals)
- Estimate poverty likelihoods for individual households or persons
- Estimate poverty rates for groups as averages of individual poverty likelihoods
- Seek to be useful in practice and so aim to be understood by non-specialists

Poverty mapping has advantages over the scorecard in that it:

- Has formally established theoretical properties
- Can be applied straightforwardly to measures of well-being beyond poverty rates
- Requires less data to construct and calibrate a tool
- Uses only indicators that appear in a census

The scorecard has advantages over poverty mapping in that it:

- Is simpler in terms of both construction and application
- Tests accuracy empirically
- Associates poverty likelihoods with scores non-parametrically
- Reports sample-size formulas (or equivalently, standard-error formulas)

The basic difference between the two approaches is that poverty mapping seeks to help governments design pro-poor policies, while the scorecard seeks to help small, local pro-poor organizations to manage their outreach when implementing policies.¹²

¹² Poverty mapping also appears to differ in that its developers say that it is inappropriate for targeting individual households or persons, while this paper supports targeting as a legitimate, potentially useful application (Schreiner, 2008a).

For the Philippines, Haslett and Jones' 21 indicators are:

- Demographics:
 - Household size (and its mean-adjusted square)
 - Proportion of household members who are children of the head
 - Proportion of household members who are 61-years-old or older
- Proportion of household members 10-years-old or older with only:
 - Elementary education
 - High-school education
 - College education
 - Education level for households in ARMM
- Residence:
 - Type of house
 - Type of roof
 - Type of wall
 - Floor area
- Presence of domestic help
- Urban/rural area by region
- Municipality characteristics (percentages):
 - Dwellings built in 1996–2000
 - Heads who are Muslim
 - Residents 5-years-old or older who speak English
 - Households who use electricity of LPG for cooking
 - Households who have a refrigerator
 - Households who have a telephone
 - Persons who work for a private household
 - Persons employed in retail trade

While Haslett and Jones report standard errors for estimated poverty rates, they do not report standard-error formula nor enough information to enable the derivation of a standard-error formula, so the precision of their poverty mapping cannot be compared to that of the the scorecard here.

3.3 Gwatkin *et al.*

Gwatkin *et al.* (2000) apply Principal Components Analysis to make a “wealth index” from simple, low-cost indicators available for the 62,932 households in the Philippines’ 1998 DHS. This same approach is used by USAID in 56 countries with Demographic and Health Surveys (Rutstein and Johnson, 2004).

Gwatkin *et al.*’s PCA-based index is close kin to the scorecard here except that, because the DHS does not measure expenditure, the index can only be assumed to be correlated with socio-economic status.¹³ Examples of the PCA-index approach are Stifel and Christiaensen (2007), Zeller *et al.* (2006), Sahn and Stifle (2003 and 2000), and Filmer and Pritchett (2001).

A strength of PCA-based indices is that, because they do not require income data, they can be applied to a wide array of “light” surveys such as censuses, Demographic and Health Surveys, Welfare Monitoring Surveys, and Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaires. Of course, the flip side is that, without expenditure data, they can only rank households and thus provide only relative—not absolute—measures of poverty. Thus, while PCA-based indices can be used for targeting, they cannot estimate households’ poverty likelihoods or groups’ poverty rates.

¹³ Still, because their indicators are so similar, the PCA-based index and income-based poverty-assessment tools probably pick up the same underlying construct (such as “permanent income”, see Bollen, Glanville, and Stecklov, 2007) and rank households much the same. Filmer and Pritchett (2001) and Montgomery *et al.* (2000) test how well PCA-based indices predict expenditure.

The 15 indicators in Gwatkin *et al.* are similar to those here:

- Characteristics of the residence:
 - Presence of electricity
 - Source of drinking water
 - Type of toilet facility
 - Type of floor
 - Household members per sleeping room
- Whether household members work their own or their family's agricultural land
- Ownership of consumer durables:
 - Radio
 - Television
 - Refrigerator
 - Bicycle
 - Motorcycle
 - Car
 - Telephone
 - Boat
 - Tractor

Gwatkin *et al.* have three basic goals for their wealth index:

- Segment people by quintiles in order to see how health, population, and nutrition vary with socio-economic status
- Monitor (via exit surveys) how well health-service points reach the poor
- Measure coverage of services via small-scale local surveys

Of course, these last two goals are the same as the monitoring and targeting goals of this paper, and the first goal of ranking household by quintiles is akin to targeting. As here, Gwatkin *et al.* present the index in a format that could be photocopied and taken to the field, although their index cannot be computed by hand because the points have 4 decimal places and are sometimes negative.

The central contrast between the PCA-based index and the scorecard here is that because the scorecard is linked to an absolute line, it not only can rank households but also link them to quantitative levels of income. Without being based on data that

includes income, the PCA index cannot do this and so cannot estimate of poverty rates. Furthermore, relative accuracy (that is, targeting accuracy) is tested more completely here than in Gwatkin *et al.* (where it is not explicitly tested at all); generally, discussion of the accuracy of PCA-based indices rests on how well they produce segments that are correlated with health or education.

4. Scorecard construction

About 60 potential indicators are initially prepared in the areas of:

- Family composition (such as household size and female headship)
- Education (such as school attendance of children)
- Housing (such as the type of roofing material)
- Ownership of durable goods (such as televisions and refrigerators)

Each indicator is first screened with the entropy-based “uncertainty coefficient” (Goodman and Kruskal, 1979) that measures how well the indicator predicts poverty on its own. Figure 3 lists the candidate indicators, ranked by uncertainty coefficient.

Responses for each indicator in Figure 3 are ordered starting with those most strongly associated with poverty.

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, ownership of a television set is probably more likely to change in response to changes in poverty than is the education of the male head/spouse.

The scorecard itself is built using the national poverty line and Logit regression on the construction sub-sample (Figure 2). Indicator selection uses both judgment and statistics (forward stepwise, based on “c”). The first step is to use Logit to build one scorecard for each candidate indicator. Each scorecard’s accuracy 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, 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 familiar R^2 -based stepwise with 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 and make sense to users.

The single scorecard here applies to all of the Philippines. Evidence from India and Mexico (Schreiner, 2006a and 2005a), Sri Lanka (Narayan and Yoshida, 2005), and Jamaica (Grosh and Baker, 1995) suggests that segmenting scorecards by urban/rural does not improve accuracy much.

5. Practical guidelines for scorecard use

The main challenge of scorecard design is not to squeeze out the last drops of accuracy but rather to improve the chances that scoring is actually used (Schreiner, 2005b). When scoring projects fail, the reason is not usually technical 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, 2002b). After all, most reasonable scorecards predict tolerably well, thanks to the empirical phenomenon known as the “flat max” (Hand, 2006; Baesens *et al.*, 2003; Lovie and Lovie, 1986; Kolesar and Showers, 1985; Stillwell, Hutton, 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 make a lot of “extra” 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. “Extra” 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, no arithmetic beyond addition)

A field worker using the paper scorecard would:

- Record participant identifiers
- Read each 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 filing or data entry

Of course, field workers must be trained. Quality outputs depend on quality inputs. If organizations or field workers gather their own data and have an incentive to exaggerate poverty rates (for example, if funders reward them 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 Toohig (2007) 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. For the example of Nigeria, Onwujekwe, Hanson, and Fox-Rushby (2006) find distressingly low inter-rater and test-retest correlations for indicators as seemingly simple and obvious as whether the household owns an automobile. In Mexico, however, Martinelli and Parker (2007) find that errors by

¹⁴ If an organization does not want field workers to know the points associated with indicators, then they can use the version of Figure 1 without points and apply the points later in a spreadsheet or database at the central office.

interviewers and lies by respondents have negligible effects on targeting accuracy. For now, it is unknown whether these results are universal or country-specific.

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

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

The subjects to be scored can be:

- All participants (or all new participants)
- A representative sample of all participants (or of all new participants)
- All participants (or all new participants) in a representative sample of branches
- A representative sample of all participants (or of all new participants) in a representative sample of branches

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:

- At in-take of new clients only (precluding measuring change in poverty rates)
- As a once-off project for current participants (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, it can be applied:

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

An example set of choices were made by BRAC and ASA, two microlenders in Bangladesh (each with 7 million participants) who are applying the Simple Poverty Scorecard tool for Bangladesh (Schreiner, 2006b). Their design is that loan officers in a random sample of branches will score all participants each time they visit a 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.

6. Estimates of household poverty likelihoods

The sum of scorecard points for a household is called the *score*. For the Philippines, 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 poverty line, the scores themselves have only relative units. For example, doubling the score does not double the likelihood of being above a poverty line.

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 national line, scores of 10–14 have a poverty likelihood of 91.5 percent, and scores of 40–44 have a poverty likelihood of 36.8 percent (Figure 4).

The poverty likelihood associated with a score varies by poverty line. For example, scores of 40–44 are associated with a poverty likelihood of 36.8 percent for the national line but 12.4 percent for the food line.¹⁵

¹⁵ Starting with Figure 4, most figures have sixteen versions, one for each of the eight poverty lines for the scorecard applied to the validation sample, and one for each of the eight poverty lines for the scorecard applied to the entire 2002 APIS. To keep them straight, they are grouped by poverty line. Single tables that pertain to all poverty lines are placed with the tables for the national line.

6.1 Calibrating scores with poverty likelihoods

A given score is non-parametrically 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.

For the example of the national line (Figure 5), there are 5,198 (normalized) households in the calibration sub-sample with a score of 20–24, of whom 4,205 (normalized) are below the poverty line. The estimated poverty likelihood associated with a score of 20–24 is then 80.9 percent, because $4,205 \div 5,198 = 80.9$ percent.

To illustrate with the national line and a score of 40–44, there are 8,846 (normalized) households in the calibration sample, of whom 3,257 (normalized) are below the line (Figure 5). Thus, the poverty likelihood for this score is $3,257 \div 8,846 = 36.8$ percent.

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

Figure 6 shows, for all scores, the likelihood that income falls in a range demarcated by two adjacent poverty lines. For example, the daily income of someone with a score of 35–39 falls in the following ranges with probability:

- 18.6 percent below the food line
- 30.3 percent between the food and national lines
- 26.1 percent between the national and USD2.50/day 2005 PPP lines
- 17.2 percent between the USD2.50/day 2005 PPP and USD3.75/day lines
- 4.6 percent between the USD3.75/day 2005 PPP and USD5.00/day lines
- 3.1 percent above the USD5.00/day 2005 PPP line

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 income and quantitative poverty lines. The poverty likelihoods would be objective even if indicators and/or points are selected without any data at all. In fact, objective scorecards of proven accuracy are often based only on 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 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 Philippines' scorecard are transformed coefficients from a Logit regression, scores are not converted to poverty likelihoods via the Logit formula of $2.718281828^{\text{score}} \times (1 + 2.718281828^{\text{score}})^{-1}$. 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. In the field, converting scores to poverty likelihoods requires no arithmetic at all, just a look-up table. This non-parametric calibration can also improve accuracy, especially with large calibration samples.

6.2 Accuracy of estimates of households' poverty likelihoods

As long as the relationship between indicators and poverty does not change and the scorecard is applied to households from the same population from which it was constructed, 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, as well as unbiased estimates of changes in poverty rates between two points in time.¹⁶

Of course, the relationship between indicators and poverty does change with time and also across sub-groups in the Philippines' population, so the scorecard will generally be biased when applied after the July 2004 end date of the 2004 APIS (as it must be in practice) or when applied with non-nationally representative groups.

¹⁶ This follows because these estimates of groups' poverty rates are linear functions of the unbiased estimates of households' poverty likelihoods.

How accurate are estimates of households' poverty likelihoods? To measure, the scorecard is applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of size $n = 16,384$ from the validation sub-sample. Bootstrapping entails:¹⁷

- 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 income 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

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 national line in the validation sample, the average poverty likelihood across bootstrap samples for scores of 20–24 in the validation sample is too high by 1.4 percentage points (Figure 7). For scores of 25–29, the estimate is too low by 1.3 percentage points.¹⁸

¹⁷ Efron and Tibshirani, 1993.

¹⁸ These differences are not zero, in spite of the estimator's unbiasedness, because the scorecard comes from a single sample. The average difference by score would be zero if samples were repeatedly drawn from the population and split into sub-samples before repeating the entire scorecard-building process.

The 90-percent confidence interval for the differences for scores of 20–24 is ± 2.4 percentage points (Figure 7).¹⁹ This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps, the difference between the estimate and the true value is between -1.0 and 3.8 percentage points (because $1.4 - 2.4 = -1.0$, and $1.4 + 2.4 = 3.8$). In 950 of 1,000 bootstraps (95 percent), the difference is 1.4 ± 2.8 percentage points, and in 990 of 1,000 bootstraps (99 percent), the difference is 1.4 ± 3.5 percentage points.

For almost all score ranges, Figure 7 shows differences—sometimes large ones—between estimated poverty likelihoods and true values. This is 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 the Philippines’ population. For targeting, however, what matters is less the difference in all score 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 9 below looks at targeting accuracy in detail.

Of course, if estimates of groups’ poverty rates are to be usefully accurate, then errors for individual households must largely cancel out. This is generally the case, as discussed in the next section.

Another possible source of bias is overfitting. By construction, the scorecard here is unbiased, but it may still be *overfit* when applied after July 2004 (the end date of the 2004 APIS). That is, it may fit the 2004 APIS data so closely that it captures not only

¹⁹ Confidence intervals are a standard, widely understood measure of precision.

some timeless patterns but also some random patterns that, due to sampling variation, show up only in the 2004 APIS. Or the scorecard may be overfit in the sense that it becomes biased as the relationships between indicators and poverty change or when it is applied to non-nationally representative samples.

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. Bootstrapping can also mitigate overfitting by reducing (but not eliminating) dependence on a single sampling instance. Combining scorecards can also help, at the cost of greater complexity.

Most errors in individual households' likelihoods, however, cancel out in the estimates of groups' poverty rates (see later sections). Furthermore, much of the differences may come from non-scorecard sources such as changes in the relationship between indicators and poverty, sampling variation, changes in poverty lines, inconsistencies in data quality across time, and inconsistencies/imperfections in cost-of-living adjustments across time and space. 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).

7. 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, 2009 and that they have scores of 20, 30, and 40, corresponding to poverty likelihoods of 80.9, 59.6, and 36.8 percent (national line, Figure 4). The group's estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of $(80.9 + 59.6 + 36.8) \div 3 = 59.1$ percent.²⁰

7.1 Accuracy of estimated poverty rates at a point in time

For the Philippines' scorecard applied to the validation sample with $n = 16,384$, the absolute differences between the estimated poverty rate at a point in time and the true rate are 0.7 percentage points or less (Figure 8, which summarizes Figure 9 across poverty lines). The average absolute difference across the eight poverty lines is 0.4 percentage points. At least part of these differences is due to sampling variation in the validation sample and in the random division of the 2004 APIS into three sub-samples.

In terms of precision, the 90-percent confidence interval for a group's estimated poverty rate at a point in time and with $n = 16,384$ is 0.5 percentage points or less (Figure 8). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps of this size, the difference

²⁰ The group's poverty rate is *not* the poverty likelihood associated with the average score. Here, the average score is $(20 + 30 + 40) \div 3 = 30$, and the poverty likelihood associated with the average score is 59.6 percent. This is not the 59.1 percent found as the average of the three poverty likelihoods associated with each of the three scores.

between the estimate and the true value is within 0.5 percentage points of the average difference. In the specific case of the national line and the validation sample, 90 percent of all samples of $n = 16,384$ produce estimates that differ from the true value in the range of $0.6 - 0.4 = 0.2$ to $0.6 + 0.4 = 1.0$ percentage points. This follows because 0.6 is the average difference, and ± 0.4 is its 90-percent confidence interval. The average difference is 0.6 because the average scorecard estimate is too high by 0.6 percentage points; it estimates a poverty rate of 32.3 percent for the validation sample, but the true value is 31.7 percent (Figure 2).

7.2 Sample-size formula for estimates of poverty rates at a point in time

How precise are these point-in-time estimates? For a range of sample sizes, Figure 9 reports average differences between estimated and true poverty rates at a point in time as well as precision (confidence intervals for the differences) for the scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples from the validation sample.

A related question is, How many households should an organization sample if it wants to estimate their poverty rate at a point in time for a desired confidence interval and confidence level? This practical question was first addressed in Schreiner (2008).²¹

As in the previous paragraph, the answer lies in Figure 9.

²¹ IRIS Center (2007a and 2007b) says that $n = 300$ is sufficient for USAID reporting. If a poverty-assessment tool is as precise as direct measurement, if the expected (before measurement) poverty rate is 50 percent, and if the confidence level is 90 percent, then

To derive a sample-size formula (or equivalently, a formula for standard errors), note first that under direct measurement, the poverty rate can be estimated as the number of households observed to be below the poverty line, divided by the number of all observed households. The formula for sample size n in this case is (Cochran, 1977):

$$n = \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}), \quad (1)$$

where

$$z \text{ is } \begin{cases} 1.64 \text{ for confidence levels of 90 percent} \\ 1.96 \text{ for confidence levels of 95 percent} \\ 2.58 \text{ for confidence levels of 99 percent} \end{cases},$$

c is the confidence interval as a proportion
(for example, 0.02 for an interval of ± 2 percentage points), and

\hat{p} is the expected (before measurement) proportion of households
below the poverty line.

The scorecard, however, does not measure poverty directly, so this formula is not applicable. To derive a similar sample-size formula for the Philippine scorecard, consider the scorecard applied to the validation sample. Figure 2 shows that the expected (before measurement) poverty rate \hat{p} for the national line is 31.3 percent (that is, the average poverty rate in the construction and calibration sub-samples). In turn, a sample size n of 16,384 and a 90-percent confidence level correspond to a confidence

$n = 300$ implies a confidence interval of ± 2.2 percentage points. In fact, USAID has not specified confidence levels or intervals. Furthermore, the expected poverty rate may not be 50 percent, and the poverty-assessment tool could be more or less precise than direct measurement.

interval of ± 0.44 percentage points (Figure 9).²² Plugging these into the direct-measurement sample-size formula (1) above gives not $n = 16,384$ but rather

$$n = \left(\frac{1.64}{0.0044} \right)^2 \cdot 0.313 \cdot (1 - 0.313) = 29,874. \text{ The ratio of the sample size for scoring}$$

(derived empirically) to the sample size for direct measurement (derived from theory) is $16,384 \div 29,874 = 0.55$.

Applying the same method to $n = 8,192$ (confidence interval of ± 0.62 percentage points) gives $n = \left(\frac{1.64}{0.0062} \right)^2 \cdot 0.313 \cdot (1 - 0.313) = 15,046$. This time, the ratio of the sample size using scoring to the sample size using direct measurement is $8,192 \div 15,046 = 0.54$. This ratio for $n = 8,192$ is close to that for $n = 16,384$. Indeed, applying this same procedure for all $n \geq 256$ in Figure 9 gives ratios that average to 0.55.

This approach can be used to define a sample-size formula for the scorecard applied to the population in the validation sample:

$$n = \alpha \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}), \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha = 0.55$ and z , c , and \hat{p} are defined as in (1) above. It is this α that appears in Figure 8 as “ α for sample size”.

To illustrate the use of (2), suppose $c = 0.0359$ (confidence interval of ± 3.59 percentage points) and $z = 1.64$ (90-percent confidence). Then (2) gives

²² Due to rounding, Figure 9 displays 0.4, not 0.44.

$$n = 0.55 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64}{0.0359} \right)^2 \cdot 0.313 \cdot (1 - 0.313) = 247, \text{ which is close to the sample size of 256}$$

for these parameters in Figure 9.

When the sample-size factor α is less than 1.0, it means that the scorecard is more precise than direct measurement. This occurs for all of eight poverty lines in Figure 8.

Of course, the sample-size formulas here are specific to the Philippines, its poverty lines, its poverty rates, and this scorecard. The derivation method, however, is valid for any scorecard following the approach in this paper.

In practice after July 2004 (the end date of the 2004 APIS), an organization would select a poverty line (say, the national line), 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 \hat{p} (perhaps based on a previous measurement such as the 31.4 percent national average for the 2004 APIS in Figure 2), look up α (here, 0.55 for the national line), assume that the scorecard will still work in the future and/or for non-nationally representative sub-groups,²³ and then compute the required sample size. In this illustration,

$$n = 0.55 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64}{0.02} \right)^2 \cdot 0.314 \cdot (1 - 0.314) = 797.$$

²³ The next sub-section discusses accuracy when applied out-of-sample and out-of-time to the 2002 APIS. In general, performance after the 2004 APIS will probably resemble that in the 2004 APIS, with some deterioration as time passes.

The standard error σ of estimates of poverty rates at a point in time is

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}}. \text{ If the scorecard has already been applied to a sample } n, \text{ then } \hat{p} \text{ is}$$

the scorecard's estimated poverty rate, and the confidence interval $c = +/- z \cdot \sigma$.

8. 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 households in the group.

8.1 Warning: Change is not impact

Scoring can estimate change. Of course, change could be for the better or for the 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 (Moffitt, 1991). Knowing this requires either strong assumptions or a control group that resembles participants in all ways except participation. To belabor 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. Even measuring simple change usually requires assuming that the population is constant over time and that program drop-outs do not differ from non-drop-outs.

8.2 Calculating estimated changes in poverty rates over time

Consider the illustration begun in the previous section. On Jan. 1, 2009, a program samples three households who score 20, 30, and 40 and so have poverty

likelihoods of 80.9, 59.6, and 36.8 percent (national line, Figure 4). The group's baseline estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of $(80.9 + 59.6 + 36.8) \div 3 = 59.1$ 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, 2010, 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 68.5, 48.9, and 21.1 percent, national line, Figure 4). Their average poverty likelihood at follow-up is now $(68.5 + 48.9 + 21.1) \div 3 = 46.2$ percent, an improvement of $59.1 - 46.2 = 12.9$ percentage points.

This suggests that about one of eight participants crossed the poverty line in 2009.²⁴ Among those who started below the line, about one in five ($12.9 \div 59.1 = 21.8$ percent) ended up above the line.²⁵

8.3 Accuracy for estimated change in two independent samples

Given the scorecard built from the construction and calibration samples with the 2004 APIS, an estimate of the change in the poverty rate between 2004 and 2002 in the

²⁴ This is a net figure; some people start above the line and end below it, and vice versa.

²⁵ The scorecard does not reveal the reasons for this change.

Philippines is the difference between the estimated poverty rate in the validation sample and the estimated poverty rate in the entire 2002 APIS. Across the eight poverty lines in Figure 10, the absolute differences between this estimate and the true value is always 2.4 percentage points or less, and the average absolute difference is 1.4 percentage points. These are not far from those in the other tests of estimates of change over time (Schreiner, 2008b; Mathiassen, 2008).

The difference between the estimated and true poverty rates are consistently negative and are similar to the decrease in the poverty rate between the 2002 and 2004 APIS in Figure 2. This means that the scorecard estimated essentially no change in poverty between 2002 and 2004.

What explains this? Estimated poverty rates are affected by changes in the distribution of responses to the scorecard indicators from 2004 to 2002 as follows:

- Decreases in poverty are indicated by:
 - Decrease in the number of children aged 0 to 14
 - Increase in the education of the female head/spouse
 - Improvement in the quality of toilet facilities
- Increases in poverty are indicated by:
 - Decrease in the presence of family members with salaried employment
 - Decrease in the share of families owning a refrigerator
 - Decrease in the number of television sets owned

Also, the number of households in the Philippines increased by 6 percent. These clues suggest that the scorecard missed the decrease in poverty from 2002 to 2004 because it was driven largely by the massive formation of young households. In these new households, the female head/spouse has more education than did her mother, there are few children, and although the new household probably have a better toilet than its

parents, it is less likely to own a refrigerator, one or more televisions, or have a salaried job. Because scoring must assume that the future is exactly like the past, it cannot capture such rapid change well.

Under direct measurement, the sample-size formula for the estimate of change in poverty rates between two points in time with two independent samples. is:

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}), \quad (3)$$

where z , c , and \hat{p} are defined as in (1). Before measurement, \hat{p} is assumed equal at both baseline and follow-up. n is the sample size at both baseline and follow-up.²⁶

The method developed in the previous section can be used again to derive a sample-size formula for indirect measurement via the scorecard:

$$n = \alpha \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}). \quad (4)$$

The corresponding formula for the standard error σ of scoring's estimate of change in two independent group's poverty rate is $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}}$.

As before, α is the average across sample sizes ≥ 256 of the ratio between the empirical sample size required by scoring for a given precision and the theoretical sample size required under direct measurement. For the Philippines' scorecard, α ranges

²⁶ 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 measurements (not twice as many) as does estimating a poverty rate at a point in time.

from 0.63 to 0.77 (Figure 10), suggesting that the indirect measurement of change with scoring is more precise than direct measurement with full-blown income surveys.

To illustrate the use of (4) 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 national line, the baseline is 2004 and the follow-up is 2002, $\alpha = 0.63$ (from Figure 10), and $\hat{p} = 0.313$ (from Figure 2). Then the baseline sample size is

$n = 0.63 \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 \cdot 0.313 \cdot (1 - 0.313) = 1,822$, and the follow-up sample size is also 1,822.

8.4 Accuracy for estimated change for one sample, scored twice

In general, the direct-measurement sample-size formula for this case is:²⁷

$$n = \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot [\hat{p}_{12} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{12}) + \hat{p}_{21} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{21}) + 2 \cdot \hat{p}_{12} \cdot \hat{p}_{21}], \quad (5)$$

where z and c are defined as in (1), \hat{p}_{12} is the expected (before measurement) share of all sampled cases that move from below the poverty line to above it, and \hat{p}_{21} is the expected share of all sampled cases that move from above the line to below it.

How can a user set \hat{p}_{12} and \hat{p}_{21} ? Before measurement, a reasonable assumption is that the change in the poverty rate is zero. Then $\hat{p}_{12} = \hat{p}_{21} = \hat{p}_*$ and (5) becomes:

²⁷ See McNemar (1947) and Johnson (2007). John Pezzullo helped find this formula.

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \hat{p}_*. \quad (6)$$

Still, \hat{p}_* could be anything between 0–1, so (6) is not enough to compute sample size. The estimate of \hat{p}_* must be based on data available before baseline measurement.

Suppose that the observed relationship between \hat{p}_* and the variance of the baseline poverty rate $p_{baseline} \cdot (1 - p_{baseline})$ is—as in Peru, see Schreiner (2008b)—close to $\hat{p}_* = 0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [p_{baseline} \cdot (1 - p_{baseline})]$. Of course, $p_{baseline}$ is not known before baseline measurement, but it is reasonable to use as its expected value a previously observed poverty rate. Given this and a poverty line, a sample-size formula for a single sample directly measured twice for the Philippines (once after July 2004 and then again later) is:

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \{0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [p_{2004} \cdot (1 - p_{2004})]\}. \quad (7)$$

As usual, (7) is multiplied by α to get scoring’s sample-size formula:

$$n = \alpha \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \{0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [p_{2004} \cdot (1 - p_{2004})]\}. \quad (8)$$

The formula for the standard error of scoring’s estimate of change in a single group’s poverty rate is then $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \{0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [\hat{p}_{2004} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{2004})]\}}{n}}$.

In Peru (the only other country for which there is an estimate, Schreiner, 2008b), the average α across years and poverty lines is about 1.8.

To illustrate the use of (8), 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 national line, and the sample will first be scored in 2009. The before-baseline poverty rate is 31.4 percent ($p_{2004} = 0.314$, Figure 2), and suppose $\alpha = 1.8$. Then the

$$\text{baseline sample size is } n = 1.8 \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 \cdot \{0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [0.314 \cdot (1 - 0.314)]\} =$$

1,280. Of course, the same group of 1,280 households is scored at follow-up as well.

For a given confidence level and confidence interval, sample sizes are generally smaller when one sample is scored twice than when there are two independent samples.

9. 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* (income below a poverty line). Poverty status is a fact that depends on whether income 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, no scorecard is 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 11 depicts these four possible targeting outcomes. Targeting accuracy varies by cut-off; a higher cut-off has better inclusion (but greater leakage), while a lower cut-off has better exclusion (but higher undercoverage).

A program 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 12 shows the distribution of households by targeting outcome for the scorecard applied to the validation sample and the 2002 APIS. For an example cut-off of 35–39, outcomes for the national line are:

- Inclusion: 23.8 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 7.9 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 10.8 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 57.6 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

Increasing the cut-off to 40–44 improves inclusion and undercoverage but worsens leakage and exclusion:

- Inclusion: 26.9 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 4.8 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 16.5 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 51.8 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 values and mission
- Tally total net benefits for each cut-off using Figure 12 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. Any program 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:

$$\begin{array}{rclcl}
 \text{Total Accuracy} = & 1 & \times & \text{Households correctly included} & - \\
 & 0 & \times & \text{Households mistakenly undercovered} & - \\
 & 0 & \times & \text{Households mistakenly leaked} & + \\
 & 1 & \times & \text{Households correctly excluded.} &
 \end{array}$$

Figure 12 shows “Total Accuracy” for all cut-offs for the Philippines’ scorecard. For the national line in the validation sample, total net benefit is greatest (81.5) for a cut-off of 30–34, with about four in five Filipino households correctly classified.

“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 $(2 \times \text{Households correctly included}) + (1 \times \text{Households correctly excluded})$.²⁸

²⁸ Figure 12 also reports “BPAC”, the Balanced Poverty Accuracy Criteria adopted by USAID as its criterion for certifying poverty-assessment tools. IRIS Center (2005) says that BPAC considers accuracy both in terms of the estimated poverty rate and in terms of targeting inclusion. After normalizing by the number of people below the poverty line, the formula is:

$$\text{BPAC} = (\text{Inclusion} - |\text{Undercoverage} - \text{Leakage}|) \times [100 \div (\text{Inclusion} + \text{Undercoverage})].$$

As an alternative 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. The third column of Figure 13 (“% targeted who are poor”) shows, for the Philippines’ scorecard applied to the validation sample, the expected poverty rate among households who score at or below a given cut-off. For the example of the national line, targeting households who score 35–39 or less would target 34.5 percent of all Filipino households and produce a poverty rate among those targeted of 68.8 percent.

Figure 13 also reports two other measures of targeting accuracy. The first is a version of coverage (“% of poor who are targeted”). For the example of the national line and a cut-off of 35–39, 75.0 percent of all poor households are covered.

The final targeting measure in Figure 13 is the number of successfully targeted poor households for each non-poor household mistakenly targeted (right-most column). For the national line and a cut-off of 35–39, covering 2.2 poor households means leaking to 1 non-poor household.

Although inclusion (and therefore targeting accuracy) appears in the BPAC formula, BPAC is in fact maximized (for a given poverty line and a single-step tool) when the difference between the estimated poverty rate and its true value is minimized, regardless of inclusion. Thus, selecting a tool on the basis of BPAC is equivalent to selecting on the basis of the difference between the estimated poverty rate and its true value (what IRIS calls “PIE”). It would therefore be clearer to drop the BPAC nomenclature and simply discuss directly the accuracy and precision of the estimated poverty rate.

10. Conclusion

Pro-poor programs in the Philippines can use the Simple Poverty Scorecard tool to estimate the likelihood that a household has income below a given poverty line, to estimate the poverty rate of a group of households at a point in time, and to estimate changes in the poverty rate of a group of households between two points in time. The scorecard can also be used for targeting.

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 in order to speed up their participants' progress out of poverty.

The scorecard is built with a sub-sample of data from the 2004 APIS, tested on a different sub-sample from the 2004 APIS and on the entire 2002 APIS, and calibrated to eight poverty lines (national, food, USAID "extreme", USD1.25/day 2005 PPP, USD2.50/day 2005 PPP, USD3.75/day 2005 PPP, USD5.00/day 2005 PPP, and USD4.32/day 1993 PPP).

Accuracy and sample-size formulas 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 in poverty rates are not the same as estimates of program impact. Targeting accuracy is also reported.

When the scorecard is applied to the validation sample with $n = 16,384$, the absolute difference between estimates versus true poverty rates for groups of households

at a point in time is always less than 0.7 percentage points and averages—across the eight poverty lines—about 0.4 percentage points. For $n = 16,384$ and 90-percent confidence, the precision of these differences is ± 0.5 percentage points or less, and for $n = 1,024$, precision is ± 2.1 percentage points or less. In general, the scorecard is more precise than direct measurement.

When used to measure change across independent samples of $n = 16,384$ in the 2004 and 2002 APIS, the average absolute difference between estimates and true changes is 1.4 percentage points, with a 90-percent confidence interval of ± 0.7 percentage points or less.

For targeting, programs can use the results reported here to select a cut-off that fits their values and mission.

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 programs 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, using 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 sum, the scorecard is a practical, objective way for pro-poor programs in the Philippines to monitor poverty rates, track changes in poverty rates over time, and target services. The same approach can be applied to any country with similar data from a national income survey.

References

- Adams, N.M.; and D.J. Hand. (2000) “Improving the Practice of Classifier Performance Assessment”, *Neural Computation*, Vol. 12, pp. 305–311.
- Baesens, B.; Van Gestel, T.; Viaene, S.; Stepanova, M.; Suykens, J.; and J. Vanthienen. (2003) “Benchmarking State-of-the-Art Classification Algorithms for Credit Scoring”, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, Vol. 54, pp. 627–635.
- 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, accessed February 5, 2009.
- 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*.
- Copestake, James G.; Dawson, Peter.; Fanning, J.-P.; McKay, Andrew; and Katie Wright-Revollo. (2005) “Monitoring the Diversity of the Poverty Outreach and Impact of Microfinance: A Comparison of Methods Using Data from Peru”, *Development Policy Review*, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp. 703–723.
- Dawes, Robyn M. (1979) “The Robust Beauty of Improper Linear Models in Decision Making”, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 34, No. 7, pp. 571–582.
- Elbers, Chris; Lanjouw, Jean Olsen; and Peter Lanjouw. (2003) “Micro-Level Estimation of Poverty and Inequality”, *Econometrica*, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 355–364.
- Efron, Bradley; and Robert J. Tibshirani. (1993) *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*.
- 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.
- 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, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Goodman, L.A.; and Kruskal, W.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, dx.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-1942, retrieved 15 May 2016.
- 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/W90WN57PDO, retrieved 13 May 2016.
- Gwatkin, Davidson R.; Rutstein, Shea; Johnson, Kiersten; Pande, Rohini; and Adam Wagstaff. (2000) “Socio-Economic Differences in Health, Nutrition, and Population in the Philippines”, siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPAH/Resources/Publications/Country-Reports/philippines.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Hand, David J. (2006) “Classifier Technology and the Illusion of Progress”, *Statistical Science*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 1–15.
- Haslett, Stephen; and Geoffrey Jones. (2005) “Estimation of Local Poverty in the Philippines”, Manila: National Statistical Coordination Board, www.nscb.gov.ph/poverty/sae/NSCB_LocalPovertyPhilippines.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Hentschel, Jesko; Lanjouw, Jean Olsen; Lanjouw, Peter; and Javier Poggi. (2000) “Combining Census and Survey Data to Trace the Spatial Dimensions of Poverty: A Case Study of Ecuador”, *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 147–165.
- 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. (2007a) “Manual for the Implementation of USAID Poverty Assessment Tools”, povertytools.org/training_documents/Manuals/USAID_PAT_Manual_Eng.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.

- (2007b) “Introduction to Sampling for the Implementation of PATs”, povertytools.org/training_documents/Sampling/Introduction_Sampling.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- (2005) “Notes on Assessment and Improvement of Tool Accuracy”, povertytools.org/other_documents/AssessingImproving_Accuracy.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Johnson, Glenn. (2007) “Lesson 3: Two-Way Tables—Dependent Samples”, www.stat.psu.edu/online/development/stat504/03_2way/53_2way_compare.htm, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Kolesar, Peter; and Janet L. Showers. (1985) “A Robust Credit Screening Model Using Categorical Data”, *Management Science*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 124–133.
- 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”, ciep.itam.mx/~martinel/lies4.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Mathiassen, Astrid. (2008) “The Predictive Ability of Poverty Models: Empirical Evidence from Uganda”, Statistics Norway Discussion Paper No. 560, www.ssb.no/publikasjoner/DP/pdf/dp560.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- 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, www.mfc.org.pl/doc/Research/ImpAct/SN/MFC_SN04_eng.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- McNemar, Quinn. (1947) “Note on the Sampling Error of the Difference between Correlated Proportions or Percentages”, *Psychometrika*, Vol. 17, pp. 153–157.
- Moffitt, Robert. (1991) “Program Evaluation with Non-experimental Data”, *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 291–314.
- Montgomery, Mark; Gagnolati, 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.
- National Statistical Coordination Board. (2007) “FAQs on Official Poverty Statistics of the Philippines”, www.nscb.gov.ph/poverty/2007/NSCB_FAQsOnPovertyStatistics.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- 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.
- Reyes, Celia M. (2006) “Alternative Means Testing Options Using CBMS”, PIDS Discussion Paper No. 2006–22, dirp4.pids.gov.ph/ris/dps/pidsdps0622.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Rutstein, Shea Oscar; and Kiersten Johnson. (2004) “The DHS Wealth Index”, DHS Comparative Reports No. 6, measuredhs.com/pubs/pdf/CR6/CR6.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Sahn, David E.; and David 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*, Cary, NC.
- Schelzig, Karin. (2005) *Poverty in the Philippines: Income, Assets, and Access*, www.adb.org/Documents/Books/Poverty-in-the-Philippines/Poverty-in-the-Philippines.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.

- Schreiner, Mark. (2008a) “Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Ecuador”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/ECU_2005_ENG.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- (2008b) “Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Peru”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2003_ENG.pdf, accessed 13 January 2016.
- (2006a) “Is One Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool Enough for India?”, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_India_Segments.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- (2006b) “Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Bangladesh”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/BGD_2000_ENG.pdf, accessed 13 January 2016.
- (2005a) “Herramienta Índice de Calificación de la Pobreza™: México”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2002_SPA.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- (2005b) “IRIS Questions on the Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool”, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Response_to_IRIS.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- (2002a) “Simple Poverty Scorecard®: Philippines”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PHL_2002_ENG.pdf, accessed 12 January 2016.
- (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, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Sillers, Don. (2006) “National and International Poverty Lines: An Overview”, pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadh069.pdf, retrieved 13 May 2016.
- 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.
- Tarozzi, Alessandro; and Angus Deaton. (2007) “Using Census and Survey Data to Estimate Poverty and Inequality for Small Areas”, princeton.edu/~deaton/downloads/20080301SmallAreas_FINAL.pdf, accessed February 5, 2009.
- Toohig, Jeff. (2007) “PPI Pilot Training Guide”, progressoutofpoverty.org/toolkit, accessed February 5, 2009.
- United States Congress. (2004) “Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 (HR 3818 RDS)”, November 20, smith4nj.com/laws/108-484.pdf, retrieved 13 May 2016.
- Wainer, Howard. (1976) “Estimating Coefficients in Linear Models: It Don’t Make No Nevermind”, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 83, pp. 223–227.
- 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 comes from:

National Statistics Office. (2004) “Interviewer’s Manual: 2004 Annual Poverty Indicators Survey”, Manila. [the *APIS Manual*],

National Statistics Office. (2006) “Enumerator Manual: 2006 Family Income and Expenditure Survey”,
census.gov.ph/nsoda/index.php/catalog/83/download/715, retrieved 29 January 2014. [the *FIES Manual*], and

National Statistics Office. (2008) “Enumerator’s Manual: July 2008 Labor Force Survey”, unsiap.or.jp/ematerial/ematerial_other/SM_10_003_Questionnaire_Design/link_LFSMAN_Jul08.pdf, retrieved 29 January 2014. [the *LFS Manual*],

General Guidelines:

Whom to Interview

According to p. 9 of the *APIS Manual*, the *respondent* “should be any capable and knowledgeable adult [family] member.”

The following is from the *APIS Manual*, pp. 9–14:

“Successful interviewing is an art and should not be treated as a mechanical process. Each interview is a new source of information, so make it interesting and pleasant. The art of interviewing is developed with practice, but there are certain basic principles which should be followed to have a successful interview.

Build rapport with the respondent

“Your first contact with a sample family is during the interview proper. Your respondent should be any capable and knowledgeable adult member.

“The interviewer and the respondent are strangers to each other. One of the main tasks of an interviewer is to establish rapport. The respondent’s first impression of you will influence his/her willingness to cooperate with the survey. Be sure that your appearance is neat and that your manner is friendly as you introduce yourself.

Make a good first impression

When approaching the respondent, do your best to make him/her feel at ease. With a few well-chosen words, you can put the respondent in the right frame of mind for the interview. Open the interview with a smile and salutation (such as ‘Good morning’ or ‘Good afternoon’), and then proceed with your introduction.

“A good introduction may be like ‘My name is [your name]. I am an employee [your organization]. We are conducting a survey [to learn more about our participants]. I would like to talk to you and ask some questions.’

Always have a positive approach

“Never adopt an apologetic manner, and do not use words such as ‘Are you too busy?’ or ‘Would you mind answering some questions?’. Such questions invite refusal to be interviewed. Rather, tell the respondent courteously, ‘I would appreciate very much your answering the questions in this undertaking.’

When necessary, stress the confidentiality of responses

If the respondent is hesitant in responding to the interview, or he/she is asking what the data will be used for, explain to him/her that the information that you will collect in this survey will remain confidential, that is, no individual names will be used for any purpose, and that all information will be produced in computer-generated tables. In this case, to prove to him/her that you are true to your word, you should never mention other interviews to him/her or show any completed questionnaires to other interviewers or supervisors in front of him/her or in front of any other respondents.

Answer any questions from the respondent pleasantly and directly

“Before agreeing to be interviewed, the respondent may ask you some questions about the survey or how he/she was selected to be interviewed. Be direct and pleasant when you answer.

“The respondent may also be concerned about the length of the interview. If he/she asks, tell him that the interview usually takes about [10 to 15 minutes]. . . .

Be neutral throughout the interview

“Most people are polite and will tend to give answers that they think you want to hear. It is therefore very important that you remain absolutely neutral as you ask the questions. Never—whether by the expression on your face or by the tone of your voice—allow the respondent to think that he/she has given a ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answer to the question. Never appear to approve or disapprove of any respondent’s responses.

“The questions are carefully worded to be neutral. They do not suggest that one answer is more likely or preferable to another answer.

If the respondent gives an ambiguous answer, try to probe in neutral way by asking questions such as ‘Can you explain a little more?’, ‘I did not quite hear you, could you please tell me again?’, or ‘There is no hurry. Take a moment to think about it.’

Never suggest answers to the respondent

If a respondent’s answer is not relevant to a question, do not prompt him/her by saying something like ‘I suppose you mean that Is that right?’ In many cases, he/she will agree with your interpretation of his answer, even when that is not what he meant. Rather, you should probe in such a manner that the respondent him/herself comes up with the relevant answer.

Do not change the wording or sequence of questions

“The wording of the questions and their sequence in the questionnaire must be maintained. If the respondent has misunderstood the question, you should repeat the question slowly and clearly. If he still does not understand, you may reword the question but be careful not to alter the meaning of the original question. Provide only the minimum information required to get an appropriate response.

Handle hesitant respondents tactfully

“There will be situations where the respondent simply says, ‘I don’t know’, gives an irrelevant answer, acts very bored or indifferent, contradicts something he/she has already said, or simply refuses to answer the question. In cases like these, you must try to bring his/her interest back to the conversation. Spend a few moments talking about things unrelated to the interview (for example, his/her home town or village, the weather, daily activities, etc.).

“If the respondent is giving irrelevant answers, do not stop him/her abruptly or rudely, but listen to what he/she is saying. Then try to steer him/her gently back to the original question. A good atmosphere must be maintained throughout the interview. The best atmosphere for an interview is one in which the respondent sees the interviewer as a friendly, sympathetic, and responsive person who does not intimidate him/her and to whom he/she can say anything without feeling shy or embarrassed.

If the respondent is reluctant or unwilling to answer a question, try to overcome his/her reluctance by explaining once again that the same question is being asked for all respondents of sample families and that their answers will be merged together. If he/she still refuses, simply write ‘REFUSED’ next to the question and proceed as if nothing had happened. Once you have completed the interview, you may try to obtain the missing information at the end, but do not push too hard for an answer. Remember, the respondent cannot be forced to give an answer.

Make the respondent at ease and comfortable

“You must not form expectations as to the ability and knowledge of respondent. Remember that differences between you and the respondent can influence the interview. The respondent may be afraid in trusting you. You should always behave and speak in such a way that he/she is at ease and comfortable talking to you.

Do not be in a hurry in conducting the interview

“Ask the questions slowly to ensure that the respondent understands what is being asked. Do not make the respondent feel that you are in a hurry to finish the interview for he/she may formulate his/her own opinion and may respond with ‘I don’t know’ or give an inaccurate answer. On the other hand, if you feel the respondent is answering without thinking just to speed up the interview, politely say to the respondent that his/her response is very important and that you need to be careful in asking each question.

Know the objectives of the survey and the purpose of each item

“Be knowledgeable to explain the objectives of the survey and be prepared to answer the respondent if he/she asks you why you are asking certain questions which he/she thinks are not necessary. If you are authoritative and if you can explain properly the purpose of the question, then the respondent can give you readily his/her response.

Ask the questions as they are written

“It is very important that you ask each question exactly as it is written in the questionnaire. When asking a question, be sure to speak slowly and clearly so that the respondent whom you are interviewing will have no difficulty in hearing or understanding the question. At times, you may need to repeat the question in order to be sure the respondent understands it. In those cases, do not paraphrase the question but repeat it exactly as it is written.

“If, after you have repeated the question, and if the respondent still does not understand it, then you may have to restate the question. Be very careful when you change the wording. However, do not alter the meaning of the original question.

“In some cases, you may have to ask additional questions to obtain a complete answer from a respondent. This is called *probing*. If you do this, you must ensure that your probes are ‘neutral’ and that they do not suggest an answer to the respondent. Probing requires both tact and skill.”

According to p. 18 of the *APIS Manual*, “After you have completed an interview, you must review the questionnaire by carefully checking the answer to each question. . . . [Do this] before you leave the residence, so that if you need to ask further questions to the respondent, he/she will still be available. You should write any comments about the interview that you feel would clarify the answers which you recorded or that would be of interest to your supervisor.”

Guidelines for specific indicators in the scorecard

1. How many people in the family are aged 0 to 14?
 - A. Five or more
 - B. Four
 - C. Three
 - D. Two
 - E. One
 - F. None

According to p. 25 of the *APIS Manual*, “A *family* is an aggregate of persons bound by ties of kinship, which live together under the same roof and eat together or share in common the family food. It covers both the nuclear family and the extended family.

“In cases where persons not related with each other by blood, marriage, or adoption are in the same household, only the head of the household is considered. This case is a single person family.

“As you ask this question be sure to explain to the respondent what we mean by a *family*.”

According to p. 26 of the *APIS Manual*, “For purposes of this survey, the overseas worker who is a member of the sample family shall be excluded from the list of family members.”

2. Do all children in the family of ages 6 to 14 currently go to school?
 - A. No
 - B. Yes
 - C. No children ages 6 to 14

Please see the definition of *family* above.

According to p. 34 of the *APIS Manual*, “*School* here refers to formal schools including vocational/technical schools offering post-secondary courses. . . .

“Attendance in these schools leads to a higher grade and ultimately, to an academic title/degree. It also includes attendance in night classes.

“Include school attendance that is leading to a high school diploma in a vocational high school such as a school of arts and trades, a technical high school, or rural or agricultural high schools. Also include attendance in post-secondary vocational/technical schools which are within the regular system of education such as universities and colleges like San Carlos Rural High School, Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology (EARIST), etc.

“Exclude, however, attendance in vocational schools outside the regular system of education, such as short courses in dressmaking, beauty culture, hair science, auto mechanic, motor-vehicle driving, typing, stenography, bookkeeping, etc. Also exclude day care centers which teach the children nursery rhymes and alphabet just to make them busy. Examples of these schools are A-1 Driving School, CWL Vocational Center, Twinkle, Twinkle Little Star Day Care Center, etc.”

According to p. 37 of the *LFS Manual*, “the term *currently* refers to [the current school year] for elementary and secondary education and to the [current semester] of the current school year for post-secondary, college, or higher.

“A student who was enrolled in the current school year but has dropped out of school is considered not to be *currently attending school*.

“Please also note that schooling at home and attendance at other non-regular educational institutions such as music and sport schools are not considered as *school attendance* in the present context. Pre-primary schooling—if part of the regular educational system—is considered as *schooling*.

“During school vacation, a person is considered to be *currently attending school* if he/she attended and completed school in the previous school year. College students on semestral/term break are considered to be *currently attending school* if they attended and completed the previous semester.”

3. What is the highest educational attainment completed by the female head/spouse?
 - A. Graduate elementary or less
 - B. First- to fourth-year secondary
 - C. Graduate secondary
 - D. First-year post-secondary or higher, or first-year college or higher, or no female head/spouse

According to p. 35 of the *APIS Manual*, the educational levels are:

- *Elementary* is the first level of formal education, consisting of the primary (Grades I to IV) and the intermediate (Grades V to VI or VII) levels
- *Secondary [high-school]* is the stage of formal education following elementary, concerned generally with four years of continuing basic education, including the learning of enjoyable/learning skills
- *Post-secondary* is the stage of formal education following secondary, covering non-degree programs that may last for at least three months to three years. It is concerned primarily with developing strong and appropriately trained middle-level skilled manpower possessing capabilities supportive of national development
- *College* is the stage of formal education following secondary, covering the programs on all courses of study leading to a bachelor degree

According to p. 36 in the *APIS Manual*, “*Highest educational attainment* refers to the highest grade or year completed in school.”

According to p. 37 of the *APIS Manual*, “If the answer given is in terms of the level of the school only and not the specific grade or year completed, determine the specific grade or year by asking the respondent additional questions. For example, the answer “Elementary” or “High School” [“Secondary”] is insufficient. It is necessary to know the highest grade or year of elementary school or high school attended and passed.”

“If the respondent mentions ‘first year’, ‘second year’ or ‘third year’ college as the highest grade completed, then probe further whether this is a post-secondary or a college course. Include under post-secondary education those vocational/technical courses offered in school, college, and university requiring completion of a high school education. However, courses taken in Technical Education and Skills Authority (TESDA) and other schools that are not within the regular system of education are not considered post-secondary education.”

According to p. 36 of the *LFS Manual*, “Do not consider any vocational or technical courses which a household member may have taken. What is asked here is the person’s highest attainment in the formal educational system.

“For persons who still go to school, be sure to record the highest educational level that he/she has attained and not the level that he/she is currently enrolled in. For example, a person who is currently a freshman high-school student should be reported as *Graduate elementary or less*.

“Note that Elementary Teacher’s Certificate (ETC) and Associate in Arts (AA) are not Bachelor’s degrees.”

According to p. 9 of the *LFS Manual*, the *household head* is “the adult member of the household who is responsible for the care and organization of the household or the one who is regarded as the head by the members of the household. The following may be considered as the *household head*:

- The household member who is responsible for the care and organization of the household, or
- The household member who makes the final decisions even if he/she does not contribute to the finances of the household, or
- The oldest member of the household (if he/she is regarded as the head)”

According to p. 10 of the *LFS Manual*, a household member who is working abroad (OCW/OFW) is not to be regarded as the household head.

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

- The household head, if the head is female
- The spouse/partner/companion of the household head, if the head is male
- Non-existent, if the head is male and if he does not have a spouse/partner/companion who is also a member of the household

4. In their primary occupation or business in the past week, did any family members work for a private household, private enterprise, or government or government corporation?
- A. No
 - B. Yes

Please see the definition of *family* above.

According to pp. 18–20 of the *LFS Manual* and p. 46 of the *APIS Manual*, this question refers to “the relationship of the worker to the establishment where he/she works. This is sometimes referred to as *industrial status*.” The three types of relationships that count for the purposes of this question are:

- “Worker for private household. If a person works in a private household for pay (in-cash or in-kind). Examples include domestic helper, household cook, gardener, family driver, etc. This includes launderers who work full-time in the household, launderers who work for different households, tutors, housekeepers, cooks, babysitters, home-based nurses, personal-care and related workers (not elsewhere classified), bodyguards, security guards (not hired by a security agency), family drivers, domestic helpers, and caretakers. It does not include carpenters, launderers who work in an establishment and at the same time accept laundry jobs at home, nor launderers who accept laundry jobs at home using his/her own pail, basin, and water
- Worker in a private establishment. If a person works in a private establishment for pay (in-cash or in-kind). This class includes not only persons working for a private business but also those working for a religious group (priest, acolyte), missionary (nuns, sisters, etc.), unions, or non-profit organizations. This category includes:
 - Persons working in public-works projects on private contracts
 - Public-transport drivers who do not own the vehicle but drive them on a boundary basis
 - Dock hands or stevedores
 - Cargo handlers in railroad stations or piers
 - *Palay* harvesters getting a fixed share of harvested *palay*
 - Filipinos working in embassies, legations, chancelleries, or consulates of foreign government in the Philippines
 - Filipinos working in international organizations of sovereign states of governments like the United Nations or the World Health Organization

- Worker for a government/government corporation. If a person works for the Philippine government or a government corporation or any of its instrumentalities. Examples are:
 - Employees of national government agencies and local government units
 - Employees of government-owned/controlled corporations and financial institutions, for example GSIS, SSS, NPC, or BSP
 - Civilian and military personnel of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (including chaplains, doctors, nurses, and dentists)”

The following four types of relationships (based on pp. 18–20 of the *LFS Manual*) are *not* referred to in this question and are not counted for the purposes of this question:

- “Self-employed without any paid employees. If a person works for profit or fees in his/her own business, farm, profession, or trade without any paid employees. Examples include bookkeepers, CPAs, doctors, etc.
- Worker with pay on own family-operated farm or business. If a person works in his/her own family-operated farm or business and receives cash or a fixed share of the produce as payment for his/her services. He/she must be a member of the household
- Worker without pay on own family-operated farm or business. If a member of the household works without pay in a farm or business operated by another member living in the same household. The room and board and any cash allowance given as incentives are not counted as compensation for these household workers. A household member who works in an exchange-labor arrangement on the farm of another is included under this category”
- Employer in own family-operated farm or business. If a person, working in his/her own business, farm, profession, or trade, has one or more regular paid employees, including paid family members. A farmer who hires laborers during harvesting/planting season or for similar activities in other periods is considered an *employer* as long as the activity falls during the reference week. Domestic helpers, family drivers, and other household helpers who assist in a family-operated business (regardless of the time spent in this activity) are not hired employees in the enterprise/business. Hence, a farm or business proprietor who is assisted purely by such domestic help is not considered an *employer*. A retail-store operator who is wholly assisted in the operation of his store by unpaid relatives living with him and who employs carpenters to construct a new building for his store (with the store operator supervising the work) is not an *employer*. However, if an operator happens to be the owner or partner of a big firm which has its own construction unit to take care of its needs, then the operator is an *employer*. A farmer who works on the farm of another in an exchange-labor arrangement in the representation of his own farm in the pooling of resources during the height of planting and harvesting operations will be considered as working on his own farm as an operator”

p. 46 of the *LFS Manual* gives the example case of a household head who is a corn farmer and whose children work on the farm without pay and who has no other paid employees. The household head is counted as *self-employed without any paid employees*, while the children are counted as *working without pay on own family-operated farm or business*.

If the children are paid, however, then they are counted as *working for a private establishment*, and the household head is counted as an *employer in own family-operated farm or business*.

According to p. 17 of the *LFS Manual*, an *occupation* is “the specific kind of work a person does.”

According to p. 22 of the *FIES Manual*, “*occupation* refers to the type of work, trade, or profession performed by the individual such as *palay* farmer, typist, physician, beautician, etc.

“A person operating his/her own farm is a farmer-owner, while the person hired to manage or oversee a farm is a farm manager or farm overseer. Paid laborers or unpaid family workers assisting in the farm operation are considered as farm workers.”

According to p. 44 of the *APIS Manual*, “a *primary occupation or job/business* is any gainful activity of a person which is a permanent and full-time job, lasting for one (1) year or longer or had lasted or expected to last for one year or longer, regardless of whether the had a job/business at work or not during the [the past week].”

According to p. 39 of the *LFS Manual*, “the following are considered when identifying the *primary occupation*:

- If a person has only one occupation, regardless of permanency, full-time or part-time, consider this as his/her *primary occupation*
- If a person has two or more jobs, consider as *primary* the one that is permanent, whether full-time or part-time:
 - If a person has two permanent jobs, consider the one where he/she works more hours as his/her primary job. If, however, these two permanent jobs have equal hours of work, consider as primary the one where he/she derives more income
 - If a person has three or more permanent jobs, use the same rule as above”

According to p. 40 of the *LFS Manual*, students, housekeepers, retired people, or other people occupied in non-gainful activities are not counted as having an *occupation*.

According to pp. 15–17 of the *LFS Manual* and pp. 38–41 of the *APIS Manual*, *work* is “any economic activity that a person does for pay (in-cash or in-kind), in any establishment, office, farm, private home, or for profit or without pay on a family farm or enterprise. It includes:

- Work for pay. A person works for an employer, whether in an establishment, office, farm, or private residence (other than his own) and receives salary/wages, commissions, tips, in cash or in kind or other forms of compensation such as free meals, free living quarters, support in school, etc.
- Work for profit. A self-employed person works for profit in his/her own business such as *sari-sari* store, farm, dress shop, or for fees in the practice of his/her profession or trade. Making a single article for sale is considered a work for profit. The following activities are considered as work for profit:
 - Gardening in at least 100 square meters of solid patches (the plants not scattered all around) whether the produce is mainly for sale or for family consumption
 - Gardening in less than 100 square meters if the produce is mainly for sale
 - Fishing or occasional gathering of forest or marine products mainly for sale
 - Cultivation of at least 300 square meters of land for temporary, annual, or biennial crops or shrubs, or the maintenance of an orchard of at least the same area even though the time spent is minimal
 - Growing of ornamental plants and flowers, seedlings, black pepper (pimienta) or betel leaf for sale even if the area is less than 100 square meters
 - Raising the following number of fowls or animals during the past week (this may not be done as a regular business):²⁹
 - Fowls of at least 1-month-old :
 - 30 or more chickens or ducks
 - 10 or more turkeys or geese
 - 50 or more pigeons
 - 100 or more quail (*pugo*)
 - A proportional combination of the above as in the case of raising 40 pigeons and 6 chickens or ducks; or 80 quails and 10 pigeons

²⁹ “If the produce from raising fowls or animals is intended for home consumption, then the activity can only be considered as *work* if there was harvest of crops or disposal of fowls or animals (either through own consumption, barter, gifts, or sale) during the past week. If the household member is engaged in fishing mainly for home consumption, then the activity is not considered *work*.”

- Animals:
 - 3 or more pigs at least 3-months-old
 - 3 or more goats
 - 10 or more rabbits
 - 1 cattle, *carabao*, or horse
 - A proportional combination of the above, for example, 7 rabbits and 1 pig or goat; or 4 rabbits, 1 pig, and 1 goat
- Work without pay on a family farm or enterprise. If a person works without pay on a farm or enterprise that is being operated by another member in the same household. Examples include:
 - A daughter who works without pay as salesgirl in a store operated by her mother
 - A wife typing at home without pay for her husband who is an independent practicing lawyer
 - A nephew who works without pay in the clinic of his uncle with whom he lives
- Work by farm operator/household member on another's farm on exchange labor. If a farm operator or a member of the household works on a farm being operated by another household in an exchange-labor arrangement. This is usually practiced by agricultural workers during the height of rice planting and harvesting seasons. . . . In such a case, he/she will be considered as *working* on his/her own farm as an operator. The same rule will apply to a member of his household who works in an exchange-labor arrangements on the farm of another. This class of worker will be that of unpaid family worker.

“The following are examples of activities which are not considered as *work*:

- Housekeeping in one's own home
- Building, repairing, or painting one's own house
- Volunteer work (for example, packing of relief goods)
- Begging or gambling

5. What are the house's outer walls made of?
 - A. Light materials (*cogon*, *nipa*, or *sawali*, bamboo, *anahaw*, or salvaged/makeshift)
 - B. Strong materials (iron, aluminum, tile, concrete, brick, stone, wood, asbestos)

According to p. 67 of the *FIES Manual* and p. 50 of the *APIS Manual*, "You need not ask this question if you can classify the construction materials used in the outer walls of the house by observation.

"Strong materials include galvanized iron/aluminum, tile, concrete, brick, stone, and asbestos. *Cogon/nipa* and *anahaw* [and *sawali*] are considered as light materials. Examples of salvaged/makeshift materials for building use are scrap GI sheets and planks of wood or pieces of *lawanit*, dilapidated boxes, etc. which are usually salvaged from a burnt or condemned structure.

"If, for example, the outer walls are made of a combination of the three types of materials stated above, encircle the code for the most predominant materials used."

6. What is the house's roof made of?
- A. Light materials (Salvaged/makeshift, *cogon*, *nipa*, or *anahaw*)
 - B. Strong materials (Galvanized iron, aluminum tile, concrete, brick, stone, or asbestos)

According to p. 67 of the *FIES Manual* and p. 50 of the *APIS Manual*, "You need not ask this question if you can classify the construction materials used in the roof of the house by observation.

"Strong materials include galvanized iron/aluminum, tile, concrete, brick, stone, and asbestos. *Cogon/nipa* and *anahaw* are considered as light materials. Examples of salvaged/makeshift materials for building use are scrap GI sheets and planks of wood or pieces of *lawanit*, dilapidated boxes, etc. which are usually salvaged from a burnt or condemned structure.

"If, for example, the roof is made of a combination of the three types of materials stated above, encircle the code for the most predominant materials used."

7. What kind of toilet facility does the family use?
- A. No toilet/field/bush, open or closed pit/latrine, drop/overhang, pail system, or other
 - B. Flush toilet

According to pp. 53–54 of the *APIS Manual*, “This question is intended to determine the type of toilet that the members of the family use and not necessarily what they have in their house because in some cases, these two may be different. There are instances, especially in rural areas, that a separate toilet is constructed in the backyard.

“A *flush toilet* (water-sealed) is the type of toilet where after water is flushed or poured into the bowl, a small amount of water is left in the bowl and seals the bottom of the bowl from the pipe leading to the depository. Examples of this are flush type with septic tank (commonly known as *poso negro*) or pour-flush type connected to a pit. . . .

“A *closed pit/latrine* (sanitary pit or privy) is a non-water-carriage type of toilet facility where a pit is dug to a depth of 4–6 feet that is large enough to hold wastes for several years. A floor cover at the top of the pit is provided together with a riser, seat, and self-closing lid, all made as fly-tight as possible. Vents maybe provided. An example of this is ‘Antipolo’.

“An *open pit/latrine* is a squat-type of toilet over a pit with no provision for fly prevention.

“A *drop toilet* has enclosures or roofing but no pit is made (pig system). An *overhang toilet* is constructed over a body of water (either sea or river).

“A *pail system* is when human waste is accumulated in a pail to be picked up for disposal from time to time, or any other kind of toilet not belonging to the preceding types.

“*No toilet/field/bush* is the response for households which do not have toilet facilities and who may resort to defecating along the railway, river/canal, in the field, behind the bushes, etc.

“*Other* toilet facilities covers all kinds of toilet facilities not belonging to the preceding types.

“If there are two or more toilet facilities, consider the one which is more sanitary.”

8. Does the family own a refrigerator/freezer?
- A. No
 - B. Yes

According to p. 54 of the *APIS Manual*, “This question asks about refrigerator/freezers that the family owns. . . . Do not rely on what you see because some refrigerator/freezers may be inside the bedrooms. Do not include refrigerator/freezers which are out-of-order or which are being rented.”

According to p. 72 of the *FIES Manual*, “The concept of *refrigerator* includes a refrigerator-freezer combination unit, which may have two exterior doors with separate refrigeration and freezing compartments (side-by-side or one above the other). A freezer may be upright or chest-type. A freezer as a separate unit counts as a refrigerator/freezer. An icebox is neither a refrigerator nor a freezer and therefore should not be counted.”

9. How many television sets does the family own?
- A. None
 - B. One
 - C. Two or more

According to p. 54 of the *APIS Manual*, “This question asks about television sets that the family owns. . . . Do not rely on what you see because some television sets may be inside the bedrooms. Do not include television sets which are out-of-order or which are being rented.”

According to p. 72 of the *FIES Manual*, “*Television set* includes both black-and-white and color TV sets.”

10. Does the family own a washing machine?

A. No

B. Yes

According to p. 54 of the *APIS Manual*, “This question asks about washing machines that the family owns. . . . Do not rely on what you see because some washing machines may be inside the bedrooms. Do not include washing machines which are out-of-order or which are being rented.”

“*Washing machine* includes all brands of washing machines with or without clothes spin dryer.”

Figure 2: Sample sizes and household poverty rates by sub-sample and poverty line

Sub-sample	Year	Households	% with income below a poverty line							
			National	National Food	USAID 'Extreme'	International				
						2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
					\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day	
All Philippines	2004	42,789	31.4	15.4	14.2	18.2	47.5	65.2	75.5	43.5
	2002	38,014	31.8	17.5	14.8	19.4	49.5	66.7	76.7	45.5
Construction										
Selecting indicators and weights	2004	14,321	31.3	15.3	14.2	18.1	47.2	65.1	75.1	43.2
Calibration										
Associating scores with likelihoods	2004	14,372	31.3	15.3	14.0	18.2	47.3	65.0	75.2	43.3
Validation										
Measuring accuracy	2004	14,096	31.7	15.5	14.5	18.1	47.9	65.7	76.0	43.9
Change in poverty rate (percentage points)										
From construction/calibration to validation in 2004			-0.4	-0.3	-0.4	+0.0	-0.7	-0.6	-0.9	-0.6
From 2004 to 2002, all Philippines			-0.4	-2.1	-0.6	-1.3	-2.1	-1.4	-1.2	-2.0

Source: 2002 and 2004 APIS. Poverty rates at the household level.

Figure 3: Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

<u>Uncertainty coefficient</u>	<u>Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly indicative of poverty)</u>
1764	How many telephones (landline and cellular) does the family own? (None or no data; One; Two or more)
1573	Does the family own any cellular telephones? (No; Yes)
1537	How many television sets does the family own? (None; One; Two or more)
1529	Does the family own a refrigerator/freezer? (No; Yes)
1316	Is there any electricity in the building/house? (No; Yes)
1316	What is the main source of water supply for the family? (Spring, river, stream, dug well, rain, shared-use from a tubed/piped well, or shared-use faucet from a community water system; Own-use from a tubed/piped well, own-use faucet from a community water system, peddler, or others)
1316	What kind of toilet facility does the family use? (No toilet/field/bush, open or closed pit/latrine, drop/overhang, pail system, or other; Flush toilet)
1279	Does the family own a washing machine (No; Yes)
1205	What kind of business/industry does the male head/spouse engage in? (Agriculture, fishing, or forestry; Construction; Manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, and all others, including no male head/spouse; Community, social, and personal services)
1175	What is the education level of the male head/spouse? (Did not complete any grade or only completed kindergarten/prep/nursery; Elementary grades one to five; Elementary grade six to secondary graduate; All others, including no male head/spouse; One or more years of post-secondary)
1130	Does the family own any CD/VCD/DVD players? (No; Yes)
1114	Does the family own any <i>sala</i> sets? (No; Yes)
1100	How many family members are of ages 0 to 15? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One; None)
1094	How many family members are of ages 0 to 16? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One or none)
1093	How many family members are of ages 0 to 14? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One; None)
1082	How many family members are of ages 0 to 17? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One or none)
1082	How many family members are of ages 0 to 18? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One or none)
1061	What are the house's outer walls made of? (Light materials (<i>cogon</i> , <i>nipa</i> , or <i>sawali</i> , bamboo, <i>anahaw</i> , or salvaged/makeshift); Strong materials (iron, aluminum, tile, concrete, brick, stone, wood, or asbestos))

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

<u>Uncertainty coefficient</u>	<u>Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly indicative of poverty)</u>
1041	How many family members are of ages 0 to 19? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One or none)
1027	How many family members are of ages 0 to 13? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
1013	What is the primary occupation/business of the male head/spouse? (Farmer or laborer; Clerk, plant and machine operator, service worker, trade, special occupation, occupation not elsewhere classified, including no male head/spouse; Professional)
1011	How many family members are of ages 0 to 20? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One or none)
983	How many family members are of ages 0 to 12? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
943	3. What is the highest educational attainment completed by the female head/spouse? (Graduate elementary or less; First- to fourth-year secondary; Graduate secondary; First-year post-secondary or higher, or first-year college or higher, or no female head/spouse)
922	How many family members are of ages 0 to 11? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
905	Does the household own any gas stoves/gas ranges? (No; Yes)
870	How many family members are of ages 0 to 25? (Six or more; Five; Four; Three; Two; One or none)
856	What is the house's roof made of? (Light materials (salvaged/makeshift, <i>cogon</i> , <i>nipa</i> , or <i>anahaw</i> ; strong materials (galvanized iron, aluminum tile, concrete, brick, stone, or asbestos))
747	How many family members are of ages 0 to 35? (Six or more; Five; Four; Three, two, one, or none)
718	What is the highest education level attained by any household member? (Secondary graduate or less; More than secondary graduate)
716	Does the family own any components? (No; Yes)
678	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 15 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 15)
667	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 13 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 13)
661	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 14 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 14)
653	How many family members are of ages 0 to 99? (Seven or more; Six; Five; Four; Three, two, or one)
648	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 11 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 11)
647	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 12 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 12)
647	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 16 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 16)

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

<u>Uncertainty coefficient</u>	<u>Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly indicative of poverty)</u>
606	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 17 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 17)
553	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 18 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 18)
553	Does the family own any landline telephones? (No; Yes)
525	What is the primary occupation/business of the female head/spouse? (Farmer or laborer; All others, including no female head/spouse; Service worker, trade, special occupation, or occupation not elsewhere classified; Professionals, clerk, plant and machine operator, Technician, or official of government or special-interest organizations)
509	What kind of business/industry does the female head/spouse engage in? (Agriculture, fishing, or forestry; All others, including no female head/spouse; Construction, manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, or community, social, and personal services)
469	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 19 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 19)
436	What is the tenure status of the housing unit and lot occupied by the family? (Own house, with rent-free lot (with or without consent of owner); Rent-free house and lot (with or without consent of owner); Own house and lot, or owner-like possession of house and lot; Rent room/house including lot)
408	How many family members are of ages 0 to 5? (Two or more; One; None)
402	Does the household own any vehicles (cars, jeeps, motorcycles, or motorboats)? (No; Yes)
402	Do all children in the household ages 6 to 20 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 20)
315	Does the family own any karaokes? (No; Yes)
297	Does the family own any personal computers (No; Yes)
294	Does the family own any aircons? (No; Yes)
222	Are any household members self-employed? (Yes; No)
218	What is the structure of household headship? (Both male and female spouses; Only male head/spouse; Only female head/spouse)
204	Do all members in the household ages 6 to 25 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No children ages 6 to 25)
173	What is the marital status of the male head/spouse? (Married or widowed; Single, divorced/separated, unknown, or no male head/spouse)

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

<u>Uncertainty coefficient</u>	<u>Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly indicative of poverty)</u>
167	In their primary occupation or business in the past week, did any family members work for a private household, private enterprise, or government or government corporation? (No; Yes)
151	What is the marital status of the female head/spouse? (Married; Single, divorced/separated, widowed, unknown, or no female head/spouse)
143	What is the age of the female head/spouse? (34 or younger; 35 to 44; 45 or older, no data, or no female head/spouse)
119	What is the age of the male head/spouse? (44 or younger; 45 to 54; 55 or older, no data, or no male head/spouse)
26	Does the family own any radios? (No; Yes)

Source: 2004 APIS and the national poverty line.

National Poverty Line Tables
(and Tables Pertaining to All Eight Poverty Lines)
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2004 Validation Sample

Figure 4 (National poverty 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	96.6
5–9	93.7
10–14	91.5
15–19	87.8
20–24	80.9
25–29	68.5
30–34	59.6
35–39	48.9
40–44	36.8
45–49	21.1
50–54	14.8
55–59	7.2
60–64	5.0
65–69	3.2
70–74	1.4
75–79	1.4
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	1.5
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.
Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 5 (National poverty line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0-4	818	÷	848	=	96.6
5-9	1,687	÷	1,801	=	93.7
10-14	2,263	÷	2,475	=	91.5
15-19	2,985	÷	3,400	=	87.8
20-24	4,205	÷	5,198	=	80.9
25-29	3,628	÷	5,295	=	68.5
30-34	4,173	÷	7,006	=	59.6
35-39	4,168	÷	8,519	=	48.9
40-44	3,257	÷	8,846	=	36.8
45-49	1,984	÷	9,401	=	21.1
50-54	1,260	÷	8,517	=	14.8
55-59	565	÷	7,909	=	7.2
60-64	370	÷	7,417	=	5.0
65-69	231	÷	7,230	=	3.2
70-74	76	÷	5,449	=	1.4
75-79	57	÷	4,104	=	1.4
80-84	0	÷	2,177	=	0.0
85-89	0	÷	2,921	=	0.0
90-94	10	÷	710	=	1.5
95-100	0	÷	777	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

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

Figure 6 (All poverty lines): Distribution of household poverty likelihoods across income ranges demarcated by poverty lines

Score	Likelihood of having income in range demarcated by poverty lines per day per capita					
	<Food	=>Food and <National	=>National and <\$2.50/day	=>\$2.50/day and <\$3.75/day	=>\$3.75/day and <\$5.00/day	=>\$5.00/day
	<PHP25.72	=>PHP25.72 and <PHP39.52	=>PHP39.52 and <PHP51.02	=>PHP51.02 and <PHP76.54	=>PHP76.54 and <PHP102.05	=>PHP102.05
0-4	86.6	10.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
5-9	77.3	16.4	5.2	0.8	0.3	0.0
10-14	62.0	29.4	5.8	2.7	0.0	0.0
15-19	59.8	28.0	8.2	3.0	0.9	0.2
20-24	46.7	34.2	13.2	4.9	0.8	0.3
25-29	32.8	35.7	19.9	8.8	1.5	1.3
30-34	27.2	32.3	25.6	10.8	2.7	1.4
35-39	18.6	30.3	26.1	17.2	4.6	3.1
40-44	12.4	24.5	27.1	23.4	7.1	5.6
45-49	5.8	15.3	25.7	30.1	12.7	10.4
50-54	2.7	12.1	20.5	30.3	15.8	18.7
55-59	2.1	5.1	17.7	28.9	17.8	28.5
60-64	0.6	4.4	13.1	25.5	19.5	37.0
65-69	0.4	2.8	6.5	19.8	17.2	53.3
70-74	0.2	1.2	4.5	16.4	18.4	59.4
75-79	0.2	1.2	2.7	7.7	14.9	73.3
80-84	0.0	0.0	2.6	7.5	14.3	75.7
85-89	0.0	0.0	0.4	4.0	4.9	90.8
90-94	0.0	1.5	0.8	1.3	4.7	91.7
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.5	95.6

Note: All poverty likelihoods in percentage units.

The USAID 'extreme' line and the \$1.25/day (2005 PPP) line are omitted because they are very close to the national food line.

Likewise, the \$4.32/day (1993 PPP) line is omitted because it is very close to the \$2.50/day (2005 PPP) line.

Figure 7 (National poverty line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+1.9	3.3	3.8	5.2
5-9	-3.9	2.7	2.8	3.0
10-14	+3.3	2.9	3.4	4.7
15-19	+1.3	2.6	3.1	4.0
20-24	+1.4	2.4	2.8	3.5
25-29	-1.3	2.6	3.1	4.4
30-34	+1.8	2.6	3.0	4.1
35-39	+0.5	2.3	2.8	3.8
40-44	+3.5	2.1	2.5	3.1
45-49	-0.9	1.7	2.0	2.8
50-54	+0.1	1.6	2.0	2.5
55-59	+0.7	1.1	1.3	1.9
60-64	-0.0	1.0	1.2	1.6
65-69	+0.5	0.7	0.9	1.2
70-74	+0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
75-79	+0.6	0.5	0.7	0.9
80-84	-0.7	0.7	0.8	1.0
85-89	-0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
90-94	+1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	-1.4	1.8	1.9	2.3

Figure 8 (All poverty lines): Differences, precision of differences, and sample-size α for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

	Poverty line							
	National	National Food	USAID 'Extreme'	International				
				2005 PPP				1993 PPP
				\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
<u>Estimate minus true value</u>								
2004 applied to 2004 validation	+0.6	+0.5	-0.4	+0.7	+0.3	-0.1	-0.5	+0.4
2004 applied to 2002 APIS	+0.0	-2.0	-0.5	-0.9	-1.7	-1.7	-1.6	-1.7
<u>Precision of difference</u>								
2004 applied to 2004 validation	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
2004 applied to 2002 APIS	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
<u>α for sample size</u>								
2004 applied to 2004 validation	0.55	0.57	0.63	0.57	0.61	0.72	0.78	0.62
2004 applied to 2002 APIS	0.73	0.87	0.89	0.98	0.69	0.66	0.69	0.67

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 bootstrap samples of $n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, \text{ and } 16,384$.

Figure 9 (National poverty line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+2.4	61.4	76.9	91.8
4	+0.9	28.7	35.3	45.5
8	+0.2	21.0	24.7	33.6
16	+0.6	14.0	17.0	22.2
32	+0.7	10.3	11.8	15.6
64	+0.7	7.0	8.8	11.6
128	+0.6	5.0	5.8	8.1
256	+0.6	3.6	4.2	5.8
512	+0.6	2.5	2.9	3.9
1,024	+0.5	1.7	2.1	2.8
2,048	+0.5	1.3	1.5	2.0
4,096	+0.6	0.9	1.0	1.3
8,192	+0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9
16,384	+0.6	0.4	0.5	0.7

Figure 10 (All poverty lines): Differences, precision of differences, and sample-size α for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for independent groups of households at two points in time for the 2004 scorecard applied to the validation sample in 2004 and the entire sample in 2002

	National	National Food	USAID 'Extreme'	International				
				2005 PPP				1993 PPP
				\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
<u>Estimate minus true value</u>								
2004 minus 2002	-0.5	-2.4	-0.1	-1.6	-2.0	-1.6	-1.1	-2.1
<u>Precision of difference</u>								
2004 minus 2002	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
<u>α for sample size</u>								
2004 minus 2002	0.63	0.75	0.77	0.70	0.64	0.68	0.71	0.65

Scorecard is based on 2004 APIS and applied to households in 2004 validation sample and all households in 2002 APIS.

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 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Figure 11 (All poverty lines): Possible types of outcomes from targeting by poverty score

		<u>Targeting segment</u>	
		<u>Targeted</u>	<u>Non-targeted</u>
<u>True poverty status</u>	<u>Below poverty line</u>	<u>Inclusion</u> Under poverty line Correctly Targeted	<u>Undercoverage</u> Under poverty line Mistakenly Non-targeted
	<u>Above poverty line</u>	<u>Leakage</u> Above poverty line Mistakenly Targeted	<u>Exclusion</u> Above poverty line Correctly Non-targeted

Figure 12 (National poverty line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	<u>Inclusion:</u>	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	<u>Leakage:</u>	<u>Exclusion:</u>	<u>Total Accuracy</u>	<u>BPAC</u>
	< poverty line correctly targeted	< poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	=> poverty line mistakenly targeted	=> poverty line non-targeted	Inclusion + Exclusion	See text
0-4	0.8	30.9	0.0	68.3	69.1	-94.8
5-9	2.6	29.1	0.1	68.2	70.8	-83.6
10-14	4.8	26.9	0.4	68.0	72.7	-68.8
15-19	7.7	24.0	0.8	67.5	75.2	-48.8
20-24	11.8	19.9	1.9	66.4	78.2	-19.4
25-29	15.5	16.1	3.5	64.9	80.4	+9.1
30-34	19.6	12.1	6.4	61.9	81.5	+44.1
35-39	23.8	7.9	10.8	57.6	81.3	+66.0
40-44	26.9	4.8	16.5	51.8	78.7	+47.8
45-49	29.0	2.6	23.8	44.6	73.6	+25.0
50-54	30.3	1.3	31.0	37.4	67.7	+2.2
55-59	30.9	0.8	38.3	30.0	60.9	-21.0
60-64	31.3	0.4	45.3	23.0	54.3	-43.1
65-69	31.5	0.1	52.3	16.0	47.5	-65.2
70-74	31.6	0.1	57.7	10.6	42.2	-82.2
75-79	31.6	0.0	61.8	6.5	38.2	-95.1
80-84	31.7	0.0	63.9	4.4	36.0	-101.9
85-89	31.7	0.0	66.9	1.5	33.1	-111.1
90-94	31.7	0.0	67.6	0.8	32.4	-113.3
95-100	31.7	0.0	68.3	0.0	31.7	-115.8

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

Figure 13 (National poverty line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage) , 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	94.7	2.5	17.8:1
5-9	2.6	96.7	8.1	29.0:1
10-14	5.1	92.9	15.0	13.2:1
15-19	8.5	90.3	24.3	9.3:1
20-24	13.7	86.0	37.3	6.2:1
25-29	19.0	81.7	49.1	4.5:1
30-34	26.0	75.4	61.9	3.1:1
35-39	34.5	68.8	75.0	2.2:1
40-44	43.4	61.9	84.8	1.6:1
45-49	52.8	55.0	91.7	1.2:1
50-54	61.3	49.5	95.8	1.0:1
55-59	69.2	44.7	97.6	0.8:1
60-64	76.6	40.9	98.9	0.7:1
65-69	83.9	37.6	99.6	0.6:1
70-74	89.3	35.4	99.8	0.5:1
75-79	93.4	33.9	99.9	0.5:1
80-84	95.6	33.1	99.9	0.5:1
85-89	98.5	32.1	100.0	0.5:1
90-94	99.2	31.9	100.0	0.5:1
95-100	100.0	31.7	100.0	0.5:1

National Food Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2004 Validation Sample

Figure 4 (National food poverty 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	86.6
5–9	77.3
10–14	62.0
15–19	59.8
20–24	46.7
25–29	32.8
30–34	27.2
35–39	18.6
40–44	12.4
45–49	5.8
50–54	2.7
55–59	2.1
60–64	0.6
65–69	0.4
70–74	0.2
75–79	0.2
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 5 (National food poverty line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0-4	734	÷	848	=	86.6
5-9	1,391	÷	1,801	=	77.3
10-14	1,535	÷	2,475	=	62.0
15-19	2,032	÷	3,400	=	59.8
20-24	2,427	÷	5,198	=	46.7
25-29	1,737	÷	5,295	=	32.8
30-34	1,908	÷	7,006	=	27.2
35-39	1,585	÷	8,519	=	18.6
40-44	1,094	÷	8,846	=	12.4
45-49	543	÷	9,401	=	5.8
50-54	233	÷	8,517	=	2.7
55-59	164	÷	7,909	=	2.1
60-64	44	÷	7,417	=	0.6
65-69	25	÷	7,230	=	0.4
70-74	9	÷	5,449	=	0.2
75-79	7	÷	4,104	=	0.2
80-84	0	÷	2,177	=	0.0
85-89	0	÷	2,921	=	0.0
90-94	0	÷	710	=	0.0
95-100	0	÷	777	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

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

Figure 7 (National food poverty line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	-1.8	4.5	5.3	7.3
5-9	-4.3	3.9	4.4	6.1
10-14	-6.3	5.2	5.5	6.4
15-19	-0.0	3.7	4.4	5.7
20-24	+1.1	2.9	3.5	4.7
25-29	-0.1	2.6	3.1	4.2
30-34	+3.9	2.1	2.5	3.0
35-39	+1.8	1.6	1.9	2.5
40-44	+2.7	1.3	1.5	2.0
45-49	+0.3	0.9	1.1	1.5
50-54	-0.4	0.8	1.0	1.3
55-59	+0.9	0.5	0.5	0.7
60-64	-0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7
65-69	-0.2	0.4	0.4	0.6
70-74	+0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
75-79	+0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
80-84	-0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
85-89	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90-94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	-1.4	1.8	1.9	2.3

Figure 9 (National food poverty line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.1	56.9	64.0	82.7
4	+1.0	21.8	26.4	35.8
8	+0.7	15.7	19.3	26.8
16	+0.4	10.7	13.1	18.1
32	+0.4	7.6	9.2	13.1
64	+0.5	5.9	6.9	8.5
128	+0.6	3.9	4.5	6.8
256	+0.5	2.8	3.3	4.3
512	+0.5	2.0	2.3	3.1
1,024	+0.5	1.4	1.7	2.0
2,048	+0.5	1.0	1.2	1.7
4,096	+0.5	0.7	0.8	1.1
8,192	+0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8
16,384	+0.5	0.4	0.4	0.6

Figure 12 (National food poverty line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.7	14.8	0.1	84.3	85.1
5–9	2.2	13.3	0.4	84.0	86.2	–68.7
10–14	3.9	11.6	1.2	83.3	87.2	–41.7
15–19	6.0	9.6	2.5	81.9	87.9	–6.7
20–24	8.4	7.2	5.3	79.1	87.5	+42.2
25–29	10.2	5.3	8.8	75.6	85.8	+43.3
30–34	12.0	3.6	14.1	70.4	82.4	+9.6
35–39	13.5	2.1	21.1	63.4	76.9	–35.5
40–44	14.4	1.1	29.0	55.5	69.9	–86.2
45–49	15.0	0.5	37.8	46.7	61.7	–143.0
50–54	15.3	0.3	46.0	38.4	53.7	–196.0
55–59	15.4	0.1	53.8	30.6	46.0	–246.1
60–64	15.5	0.1	61.2	23.3	38.8	–293.3
65–69	15.5	0.0	68.3	16.1	31.6	–339.5
70–74	15.5	0.0	73.8	10.7	26.2	–374.5
75–79	15.5	0.0	77.9	6.6	22.1	–400.9
80–84	15.5	0.0	80.1	4.4	19.9	–414.8
85–89	15.5	0.0	83.0	1.5	17.0	–433.6
90–94	15.5	0.0	83.7	0.8	16.3	–438.2
95–100	15.5	0.0	84.5	0.0	15.5	–443.1

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

Figure 13 (National food poverty line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage) , 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	87.6	4.8	7.1:1
5-9	2.6	83.5	14.2	5.1:1
10-14	5.1	76.8	25.3	3.3:1
15-19	8.5	70.3	38.5	2.4:1
20-24	13.7	61.1	53.9	1.6:1
25-29	19.0	53.7	65.6	1.2:1
30-34	26.0	46.0	76.9	0.9:1
35-39	34.5	39.0	86.7	0.6:1
40-44	43.4	33.3	92.8	0.5:1
45-49	52.8	28.4	96.5	0.4:1
50-54	61.3	24.9	98.3	0.3:1
55-59	69.2	22.2	99.0	0.3:1
60-64	76.6	20.2	99.5	0.3:1
65-69	83.9	18.5	99.8	0.2:1
70-74	89.3	17.4	99.9	0.2:1
75-79	93.4	16.6	99.9	0.2:1
80-84	95.6	16.3	99.9	0.2:1
85-89	98.5	15.8	99.9	0.2:1
90-94	99.2	15.7	99.9	0.2:1
95-100	100.0	15.5	100.0	0.2:1

USAID “Extreme” Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2004 Validation Sample

Figure 4 (USAID “Extreme” poverty 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	83.8
5–9	70.9
10–14	56.0
15–19	54.8
20–24	40.7
25–29	28.9
30–34	23.1
35–39	16.9
40–44	12.5
45–49	5.8
50–54	3.5
55–59	2.1
60–64	1.1
65–69	0.4
70–74	0.3
75–79	0.0
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	1.5
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 5 (USAID “Extreme” poverty line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	710	÷	848	=	83.8
5–9	1,277	÷	1,801	=	70.9
10–14	1,386	÷	2,475	=	56.0
15–19	1,862	÷	3,400	=	54.8
20–24	2,115	÷	5,198	=	40.7
25–29	1,531	÷	5,295	=	28.9
30–34	1,619	÷	7,006	=	23.1
35–39	1,437	÷	8,519	=	16.9
40–44	1,103	÷	8,846	=	12.5
45–49	545	÷	9,401	=	5.8
50–54	296	÷	8,517	=	3.5
55–59	162	÷	7,909	=	2.1
60–64	79	÷	7,417	=	1.1
65–69	29	÷	7,230	=	0.4
70–74	18	÷	5,449	=	0.3
75–79	0	÷	4,104	=	0.0
80–84	0	÷	2,177	=	0.0
85–89	0	÷	2,921	=	0.0
90–94	10	÷	710	=	1.5
95–100	0	÷	777	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

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

Figure 7 (USAID “Extreme” poverty line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+0.0	5.2	6.3	7.6
5-9	-4.4	4.2	4.7	6.4
10-14	-9.0	6.6	7.0	7.7
15-19	+0.9	3.6	4.1	5.3
20-24	-3.1	2.9	3.3	4.5
25-29	-2.5	2.6	3.1	4.0
30-34	+0.9	2.1	2.4	3.1
35-39	-1.5	1.8	2.1	2.8
40-44	+2.6	1.4	1.6	2.0
45-49	-0.1	1.0	1.2	1.6
50-54	-0.3	1.0	1.1	1.4
55-59	+0.8	0.5	0.6	0.7
60-64	-0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9
65-69	-0.7	0.6	0.7	0.8
70-74	+0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
75-79	-0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4
80-84	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
85-89	-0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
90-94	+1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	-1.4	1.8	1.9	2.3

Figure 9 (USAID “Extreme” poverty line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.6	55.9	69.0	83.1
4	-0.4	22.5	28.2	40.4
8	-0.5	16.1	20.6	27.1
16	-0.5	11.2	14.1	17.7
32	-0.3	8.0	9.6	12.9
64	-0.5	5.7	6.7	9.1
128	-0.3	3.9	4.7	6.2
256	-0.3	2.7	3.3	4.5
512	-0.4	2.0	2.4	3.0
1,024	-0.4	1.4	1.7	2.2
2,048	-0.4	1.0	1.2	1.6
4,096	-0.4	0.7	0.9	1.1
8,192	-0.4	0.5	0.6	0.8
16,384	-0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6

Figure 12 (USAID “Extreme” poverty line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.7	13.8	0.1	85.4	86.1
5–9	2.0	12.4	0.6	84.9	87.0	–67.5
10–14	3.7	10.8	1.5	84.1	87.7	–39.3
15–19	5.5	9.0	3.0	82.5	88.0	–3.1
20–24	7.7	6.8	6.0	79.5	87.2	+48.2
25–29	9.3	5.1	9.7	75.9	85.2	+33.1
30–34	10.9	3.6	15.1	70.4	81.3	–4.6
35–39	12.4	2.0	22.1	63.4	75.8	–53.0
40–44	13.3	1.2	30.1	55.4	68.7	–108.3
45–49	13.8	0.6	39.0	46.6	60.4	–169.5
50–54	14.1	0.3	47.2	38.4	52.5	–226.3
55–59	14.2	0.2	55.0	30.6	44.8	–280.3
60–64	14.3	0.1	62.3	23.3	37.6	–330.9
65–69	14.4	0.0	69.4	16.1	30.5	–380.3
70–74	14.4	0.0	74.9	10.7	25.1	–418.0
75–79	14.4	0.0	79.0	6.6	21.0	–446.3
80–84	14.4	0.0	81.2	4.4	18.8	–461.3
85–89	14.4	0.0	84.1	1.5	15.9	–481.5
90–94	14.4	0.0	84.8	0.8	15.2	–486.4
95–100	14.5	0.0	85.5	0.0	14.5	–491.7

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

Figure 13 (USAID “Extreme” poverty line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage) , 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	82.8	4.9	4.8:1
5-9	2.6	77.3	14.2	3.4:1
10-14	5.1	71.4	25.3	2.5:1
15-19	8.5	64.3	37.9	1.8:1
20-24	13.7	56.1	53.2	1.3:1
25-29	19.0	49.1	64.6	1.0:1
30-34	26.0	41.9	75.4	0.7:1
35-39	34.5	36.0	85.9	0.6:1
40-44	43.4	30.6	91.8	0.4:1
45-49	52.8	26.2	95.7	0.4:1
50-54	61.3	23.0	97.7	0.3:1
55-59	69.2	20.6	98.5	0.3:1
60-64	76.6	18.7	99.2	0.2:1
65-69	83.9	17.2	99.8	0.2:1
70-74	89.3	16.2	99.8	0.2:1
75-79	93.4	15.5	99.9	0.2:1
80-84	95.6	15.1	99.9	0.2:1
85-89	98.5	14.7	99.9	0.2:1
90-94	99.2	14.6	99.9	0.2:1
95-100	100.0	14.5	100.0	0.2:1

USD1.25/Day 2005 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2004 Validation Sample

Figure 4 (USD1.25/day 2005 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	88.8
5-9	82.6
10-14	68.9
15-19	67.8
20-24	51.8
25-29	40.2
30-34	34.2
35-39	23.6
40-44	16.2
45-49	7.8
50-54	4.2
55-59	2.9
60-64	1.2
65-69	0.6
70-74	0.4
75-79	0.3
80-84	0.0
85-89	0.0
90-94	1.5
95-100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 5 (USD1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0-4	753	÷	848	=	88.8
5-9	1,487	÷	1,801	=	82.6
10-14	1,704	÷	2,475	=	68.9
15-19	2,306	÷	3,400	=	67.8
20-24	2,695	÷	5,198	=	51.8
25-29	2,131	÷	5,295	=	40.2
30-34	2,398	÷	7,006	=	34.2
35-39	2,012	÷	8,519	=	23.6
40-44	1,429	÷	8,846	=	16.2
45-49	731	÷	9,401	=	7.8
50-54	359	÷	8,517	=	4.2
55-59	228	÷	7,909	=	2.9
60-64	88	÷	7,417	=	1.2
65-69	41	÷	7,230	=	0.6
70-74	24	÷	5,449	=	0.4
75-79	11	÷	4,104	=	0.3
80-84	0	÷	2,177	=	0.0
85-89	0	÷	2,921	=	0.0
90-94	10	÷	710	=	1.5
95-100	0	÷	777	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

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

Figure 7 (USD1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	-0.9	4.2	5.2	6.6
5-9	-2.6	3.3	4.0	5.3
10-14	-6.7	5.2	5.6	6.3
15-19	+4.1	3.5	4.3	5.5
20-24	-0.8	3.0	3.5	4.7
25-29	+0.7	2.8	3.3	4.1
30-34	+6.1	2.2	2.7	3.5
35-39	+0.7	1.9	2.2	2.8
40-44	+3.5	1.5	1.8	2.3
45-49	+0.2	1.1	1.3	1.8
50-54	-0.3	1.0	1.2	1.6
55-59	+1.3	0.5	0.7	0.9
60-64	-0.6	0.6	0.8	1.1
65-69	-0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7
70-74	+0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2
75-79	+0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
80-84	-0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
85-89	-0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
90-94	+1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	-1.4	1.8	1.9	2.3

Figure 9 (USD1.25/day 2005 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, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.5	58.8	64.1	85.8
4	+1.4	22.6	28.7	42.8
8	+0.9	17.1	20.5	30.2
16	+0.8	11.5	14.6	19.4
32	+0.8	8.3	9.8	13.2
64	+0.7	5.9	7.3	9.7
128	+0.8	4.2	4.9	6.8
256	+0.8	3.0	3.4	4.6
512	+0.7	2.2	2.5	3.2
1,024	+0.7	1.5	1.7	2.2
2,048	+0.7	1.1	1.3	1.6
4,096	+0.7	0.7	0.9	1.2
8,192	+0.7	0.5	0.7	0.9
16,384	+0.7	0.4	0.5	0.6

Figure 12 (USD1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	17.4	0.1	81.8	82.5
5–9	2.3	15.8	0.4	81.5	83.8	–72.7
10–14	4.2	13.9	0.9	80.9	85.1	–48.6
15–19	6.4	11.8	2.1	79.7	86.1	–17.8
20–24	9.1	9.0	4.6	77.2	86.3	+25.8
25–29	11.3	6.9	7.8	74.1	85.4	+57.3
30–34	13.3	4.8	12.7	69.2	82.5	+30.1
35–39	15.4	2.8	19.2	62.7	78.1	–5.7
40–44	16.6	1.6	26.8	55.0	71.6	–47.8
45–49	17.4	0.8	35.4	46.4	63.8	–95.3
50–54	17.7	0.4	43.6	38.3	56.0	–140.1
55–59	17.9	0.2	51.3	30.5	48.4	–182.9
60–64	18.0	0.1	58.6	23.3	41.3	–223.0
65–69	18.1	0.0	65.8	16.1	34.2	–262.4
70–74	18.1	0.0	71.2	10.7	28.8	–292.4
75–79	18.1	0.0	75.3	6.6	24.7	–315.0
80–84	18.1	0.0	77.5	4.4	22.5	–326.9
85–89	18.1	0.0	80.4	1.5	19.6	–343.0
90–94	18.1	0.0	81.1	0.8	18.9	–346.9
95–100	18.1	0.0	81.9	0.0	18.1	–351.1

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

Figure 13 (USD1.25/day 2005 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage) , 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	89.3	4.2	8.4:1
5-9	2.6	86.8	12.7	6.6:1
10-14	5.1	81.9	23.1	4.5:1
15-19	8.5	74.9	35.2	3.0:1
20-24	13.7	66.4	50.2	2.0:1
25-29	19.0	59.2	62.1	1.5:1
30-34	26.0	51.3	73.5	1.1:1
35-39	34.5	44.5	84.7	0.8:1
40-44	43.4	38.2	91.3	0.6:1
45-49	52.8	32.9	95.6	0.5:1
50-54	61.3	28.9	97.8	0.4:1
55-59	69.2	25.9	98.6	0.3:1
60-64	76.6	23.5	99.4	0.3:1
65-69	83.9	21.6	99.8	0.3:1
70-74	89.3	20.3	99.8	0.3:1
75-79	93.4	19.4	99.9	0.2:1
80-84	95.6	19.0	99.9	0.2:1
85-89	98.5	18.4	99.9	0.2:1
90-94	99.2	18.3	99.9	0.2:1
95-100	100.0	18.1	100.0	0.2:1

USD2.50/Day 2005 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2004 Validation Sample

Figure 4 (USD2.50/day 2005 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	100.0
5-9	98.9
10-14	97.3
15-19	95.9
20-24	94.1
25-29	88.4
30-34	85.2
35-39	75.1
40-44	63.9
45-49	46.8
50-54	35.3
55-59	24.8
60-64	18.1
65-69	9.7
70-74	5.9
75-79	4.1
80-84	2.6
85-89	0.4
90-94	2.3
95-100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 5 (USD2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	848	÷	848	=	100.0
5–9	1,781	÷	1,801	=	98.9
10–14	2,408	÷	2,475	=	97.3
15–19	3,262	÷	3,400	=	95.9
20–24	4,889	÷	5,198	=	94.1
25–29	4,680	÷	5,295	=	88.4
30–34	5,966	÷	7,006	=	85.2
35–39	6,395	÷	8,519	=	75.1
40–44	5,650	÷	8,846	=	63.9
45–49	4,400	÷	9,401	=	46.8
50–54	3,006	÷	8,517	=	35.3
55–59	1,962	÷	7,909	=	24.8
60–64	1,339	÷	7,417	=	18.1
65–69	702	÷	7,230	=	9.7
70–74	320	÷	5,449	=	5.9
75–79	169	÷	4,104	=	4.1
80–84	56	÷	2,177	=	2.6
85–89	12	÷	2,921	=	0.4
90–94	16	÷	710	=	2.3
95–100	0	÷	777	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

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

Figure 7 (USD2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+2.3	2.1	2.7	3.2
5-9	-0.8	0.6	0.6	0.7
10-14	-0.3	1.3	1.5	2.0
15-19	-1.3	1.2	1.3	1.7
20-24	+1.6	1.5	1.7	2.3
25-29	-2.7	2.1	2.3	2.6
30-34	+2.0	2.0	2.4	3.0
35-39	-1.2	2.0	2.3	3.0
40-44	+2.7	2.3	2.7	3.5
45-49	-1.9	2.1	2.4	3.6
50-54	-0.2	2.2	2.6	3.5
55-59	+1.7	2.0	2.4	3.3
60-64	+2.0	1.9	2.2	3.1
65-69	-0.7	1.8	2.1	2.8
70-74	+1.4	1.1	1.4	1.8
75-79	+0.4	1.2	1.4	1.7
80-84	-0.2	1.3	1.6	2.1
85-89	-0.7	0.8	0.9	1.2
90-94	+1.5	1.0	1.2	1.5
95-100	-2.8	2.8	3.1	3.7

Figure 9 (USD2.50/day 2005 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, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.5	64.3	75.1	94.1
4	+0.8	31.1	38.9	48.3
8	-0.0	22.5	25.5	33.9
16	+0.3	15.6	18.5	24.7
32	+0.3	11.7	13.7	17.8
64	+0.2	8.1	10.2	13.1
128	+0.2	5.6	6.7	8.9
256	+0.3	3.8	4.7	6.6
512	+0.3	2.8	3.4	4.5
1,024	+0.3	2.0	2.4	3.3
2,048	+0.3	1.4	1.7	2.2
4,096	+0.3	1.0	1.2	1.6
8,192	+0.3	0.8	0.9	1.2
16,384	+0.3	0.5	0.6	0.8

Figure 12 (USD2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	Total Accuracy	BPAC
	< poverty line correctly targeted	< poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	=> poverty line mistakenly targeted	=> poverty line correctly non-targeted	Inclusion + Exclusion	See text
0–4	0.8	47.1	0.0	52.0	52.9	–96.5
5–9	2.6	45.3	0.0	52.0	54.7	–89.0
10–14	5.0	42.9	0.1	52.0	57.0	–78.8
15–19	8.3	39.6	0.2	51.9	60.2	–64.8
20–24	13.1	34.8	0.6	51.5	64.6	–44.0
25–29	17.9	30.0	1.1	51.0	68.9	–22.9
30–34	23.8	24.1	2.2	49.8	73.6	+3.9
35–39	30.3	17.7	4.3	47.8	78.1	+35.2
40–44	35.8	12.1	7.6	44.5	80.3	+65.2
45–49	40.5	7.4	12.3	39.8	80.3	+74.4
50–54	43.5	4.4	17.8	34.3	77.8	+62.9
55–59	45.4	2.5	23.8	28.3	73.7	+50.4
60–64	46.7	1.2	29.9	22.1	68.8	+37.5
65–69	47.4	0.6	36.5	15.6	63.0	+23.9
70–74	47.6	0.3	41.7	10.4	58.0	+13.1
75–79	47.8	0.1	45.6	6.5	54.3	+4.9
80–84	47.9	0.1	47.7	4.3	52.2	+0.5
85–89	47.9	0.0	50.6	1.5	49.4	–5.5
90–94	47.9	0.0	51.3	0.8	48.7	–7.0
95–100	47.9	0.0	52.1	0.0	47.9	–8.6

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

Figure 13 (USD2.50/day 2005 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage) , 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	97.7	1.7	42.5:1
5-9	2.6	99.0	5.5	101.3:1
10-14	5.1	98.3	10.5	59.5:1
15-19	8.5	97.8	17.4	44.1:1
20-24	13.7	95.8	27.4	22.8:1
25-29	19.0	94.4	37.4	16.8:1
30-34	26.0	91.4	49.6	10.7:1
35-39	34.5	87.6	63.2	7.1:1
40-44	43.4	82.6	74.7	4.7:1
45-49	52.8	76.7	84.5	3.3:1
50-54	61.3	71.0	90.8	2.5:1
55-59	69.2	65.6	94.8	1.9:1
60-64	76.6	60.9	97.4	1.6:1
65-69	83.9	56.5	98.8	1.3:1
70-74	89.3	53.3	99.4	1.1:1
75-79	93.4	51.2	99.7	1.0:1
80-84	95.6	50.1	99.9	1.0:1
85-89	98.5	48.6	99.9	0.9:1
90-94	99.2	48.3	100.0	0.9:1
95-100	100.0	47.9	100.0	0.9:1

USD3.75/Day 2005 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2004 Validation Sample

Figure 4 (USD3.75/day 2005 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	100.0
5-9	99.7
10-14	100.0
15-19	98.9
20-24	98.9
25-29	97.2
30-34	95.9
35-39	92.2
40-44	87.3
45-49	76.9
50-54	65.5
55-59	53.7
60-64	43.5
65-69	29.5
70-74	22.2
75-79	11.8
80-84	10.1
85-89	4.4
90-94	3.5
95-100	0.9

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 5 (USD3.75/day 2005 PPP line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	848	÷	848	=	100.0
5–9	1,796	÷	1,801	=	99.7
10–14	2,475	÷	2,475	=	100.0
15–19	3,363	÷	3,400	=	98.9
20–24	5,142	÷	5,198	=	98.9
25–29	5,145	÷	5,295	=	97.2
30–34	6,721	÷	7,006	=	95.9
35–39	7,857	÷	8,519	=	92.2
40–44	7,718	÷	8,846	=	87.3
45–49	7,234	÷	9,401	=	76.9
50–54	5,582	÷	8,517	=	65.5
55–59	4,249	÷	7,909	=	53.7
60–64	3,228	÷	7,417	=	43.5
65–69	2,135	÷	7,230	=	29.5
70–74	1,211	÷	5,449	=	22.2
75–79	486	÷	4,104	=	11.8
80–84	219	÷	2,177	=	10.1
85–89	128	÷	2,921	=	4.4
90–94	25	÷	710	=	3.5
95–100	7	÷	777	=	0.9

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

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

Figure 7 (USD3.75/day 2005 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+0.7	1.0	1.2	1.5
5-9	-0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1
10-14	+0.9	0.8	1.0	1.2
15-19	-0.6	0.5	0.6	0.7
20-24	+0.0	0.6	0.7	0.9
25-29	-1.1	0.9	0.9	1.1
30-34	+0.5	1.0	1.2	1.7
35-39	-1.3	1.2	1.3	1.8
40-44	+1.3	1.6	1.9	2.4
45-49	-0.7	1.8	2.2	2.8
50-54	+0.8	2.2	2.7	3.5
55-59	+1.4	2.4	2.8	3.8
60-64	+0.7	2.5	3.0	4.0
65-69	-3.2	2.8	3.1	3.6
70-74	+3.3	2.2	2.6	3.6
75-79	-1.8	2.3	2.7	3.7
80-84	-0.3	2.8	3.3	4.4
85-89	-1.2	1.8	2.1	2.7
90-94	-0.7	2.8	3.4	4.2
95-100	-4.9	4.2	4.8	5.4

Figure 9 (USD3.75/day 2005 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, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.7	61.0	73.7	90.6
4	+0.4	30.6	37.5	50.9
8	-0.2	21.1	25.2	37.3
16	+0.1	15.8	19.0	24.2
32	-0.2	11.3	13.3	17.5
64	-0.1	7.9	9.2	12.2
128	-0.2	5.5	6.7	8.9
256	-0.1	4.0	4.8	6.4
512	-0.1	2.9	3.4	4.6
1,024	-0.0	2.1	2.5	3.3
2,048	-0.1	1.5	1.7	2.2
4,096	-0.1	1.0	1.2	1.6
8,192	-0.1	0.7	0.9	1.1
16,384	-0.1	0.5	0.6	0.8

Figure 12 (USD3.75/day 2005 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	64.8	0.0	34.3	35.2
5–9	2.6	63.0	0.0	34.3	37.0	–91.9
10–14	5.1	60.6	0.0	34.3	39.4	–84.4
15–19	8.5	57.2	0.0	34.3	42.8	–74.1
20–24	13.6	52.1	0.1	34.2	47.8	–58.4
25–29	18.8	46.9	0.2	34.1	52.9	–42.4
30–34	25.5	40.2	0.5	33.8	59.3	–21.6
35–39	33.5	32.2	1.1	33.2	66.7	+3.5
40–44	41.1	24.6	2.3	32.0	73.0	+28.6
45–49	48.4	17.3	4.4	29.9	78.3	+54.0
50–54	53.9	11.8	7.4	26.9	80.9	+75.4
55–59	58.1	7.5	11.1	23.2	81.4	+83.1
60–64	61.3	4.4	15.3	19.0	80.3	+76.6
65–69	63.6	2.1	20.3	14.1	77.6	+69.1
70–74	64.6	1.0	24.7	9.6	74.3	+62.4
75–79	65.2	0.5	28.2	6.1	71.3	+57.0
80–84	65.4	0.2	30.2	4.2	69.6	+54.1
85–89	65.6	0.1	32.9	1.4	67.0	+49.9
90–94	65.6	0.0	33.6	0.7	66.4	+48.9
95–100	65.7	0.0	34.3	0.0	65.7	+47.7

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

Figure 13 (USD3.75/day 2005 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage) , 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	99.3	1.3	139.9:1
5-9	2.6	99.8	4.0	439.1:1
10-14	5.1	99.5	7.8	189.2:1
15-19	8.5	99.4	12.9	175.1:1
20-24	13.7	99.2	20.7	120.6:1
25-29	19.0	98.9	28.6	91.0:1
30-34	26.0	98.0	38.8	47.8:1
35-39	34.5	96.9	50.9	30.8:1
40-44	43.4	94.6	62.5	17.6:1
45-49	52.8	91.6	73.7	10.9:1
50-54	61.3	87.9	82.1	7.3:1
55-59	69.2	84.0	88.5	5.2:1
60-64	76.6	80.0	93.3	4.0:1
65-69	83.9	75.8	96.8	3.1:1
70-74	89.3	72.4	98.4	2.6:1
75-79	93.4	69.8	99.3	2.3:1
80-84	95.6	68.4	99.6	2.2:1
85-89	98.5	66.6	99.9	2.0:1
90-94	99.2	66.1	99.9	2.0:1
95-100	100.0	65.7	100.0	1.9:1

**USD5.00/Day 2005 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2004 Validation Sample**

Figure 4 (USD5.00/day 2005 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	100.0
5-9	100.0
10-14	100.0
15-19	99.8
20-24	99.7
25-29	98.7
30-34	98.6
35-39	96.9
40-44	94.4
45-49	89.6
50-54	81.3
55-59	71.5
60-64	63.0
65-69	46.7
70-74	40.6
75-79	26.8
80-84	24.3
85-89	9.3
90-94	8.3
95-100	4.4

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.
Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 5 (USD5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	848	÷	848	=	100.0
5–9	1,801	÷	1,801	=	100.0
10–14	2,475	÷	2,475	=	100.0
15–19	3,394	÷	3,400	=	99.8
20–24	5,181	÷	5,198	=	99.7
25–29	5,225	÷	5,295	=	98.7
30–34	6,909	÷	7,006	=	98.6
35–39	8,253	÷	8,519	=	96.9
40–44	8,348	÷	8,846	=	94.4
45–49	8,425	÷	9,401	=	89.6
50–54	6,927	÷	8,517	=	81.3
55–59	5,653	÷	7,909	=	71.5
60–64	4,672	÷	7,417	=	63.0
65–69	3,379	÷	7,230	=	46.7
70–74	2,213	÷	5,449	=	40.6
75–79	1,098	÷	4,104	=	26.8
80–84	530	÷	2,177	=	24.3
85–89	270	÷	2,921	=	9.3
90–94	59	÷	710	=	8.3
95–100	34	÷	777	=	4.4

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.

Based on the 2004 APIS.

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

Figure 7 (USD5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+0.7	1.0	1.2	1.5
5-9	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10-14	+0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7
15-19	-0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
20-24	-0.0	0.3	0.4	0.4
25-29	-0.8	0.6	0.6	0.7
30-34	+0.5	0.7	0.8	1.1
35-39	-0.3	0.7	0.9	1.3
40-44	-0.3	1.0	1.2	1.5
45-49	+0.5	1.4	1.7	2.1
50-54	-2.3	2.0	2.1	2.5
55-59	-0.5	2.1	2.4	3.5
60-64	-1.9	2.4	2.8	3.7
65-69	-3.1	2.8	3.0	4.1
70-74	+1.7	2.7	3.3	4.3
75-79	+3.2	2.8	3.4	4.4
80-84	+1.4	3.8	4.7	5.6
85-89	-3.8	3.2	3.4	4.0
90-94	-3.7	4.9	6.0	7.9
95-100	-1.6	3.4	4.4	5.4

Figure 9 (USD5.00/day 2005 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, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-0.6	58.1	70.4	88.8
4	-0.7	28.6	35.4	45.7
8	-0.5	21.2	25.2	32.8
16	-0.3	15.5	18.1	24.5
32	-0.5	10.5	12.4	17.2
64	-0.4	7.5	9.0	11.5
128	-0.5	5.2	6.2	7.7
256	-0.5	3.6	4.2	5.6
512	-0.5	2.6	3.2	4.3
1,024	-0.5	2.0	2.3	3.0
2,048	-0.5	1.4	1.6	2.1
4,096	-0.5	1.0	1.2	1.4
8,192	-0.5	0.7	0.8	1.1
16,384	-0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8

Figure 12 (USD5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	Total Accuracy	BPAC
	< poverty line correctly targeted	< poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	=> poverty line mistakenly targeted	=> poverty line correctly non-targeted	Inclusion + Exclusion	See text
0–4	0.8	75.2	0.0	23.9	24.8	–97.8
5–9	2.6	73.4	0.0	23.9	26.6	–93.0
10–14	5.1	70.9	0.0	23.9	29.1	–86.5
15–19	8.5	67.5	0.0	23.9	32.4	–77.6
20–24	13.7	62.4	0.0	23.9	37.6	–64.0
25–29	19.0	57.1	0.1	23.9	42.8	–50.1
30–34	25.8	50.2	0.2	23.8	49.6	–31.8
35–39	34.1	42.0	0.5	23.5	57.6	–9.7
40–44	42.5	33.6	0.9	23.0	65.5	+12.9
45–49	50.9	25.2	1.9	22.0	72.9	+36.3
50–54	58.0	18.1	3.3	20.6	78.6	+56.8
55–59	63.7	12.4	5.5	18.4	82.1	+74.8
60–64	68.4	7.7	8.3	15.7	84.0	+89.1
65–69	71.9	4.1	11.9	12.0	83.9	+84.3
70–74	74.1	2.0	15.2	8.7	82.8	+79.9
75–79	75.1	1.0	18.3	5.6	80.7	+75.9
80–84	75.5	0.5	20.0	3.9	79.5	+73.6
85–89	75.9	0.1	22.6	1.4	77.3	+70.3
90–94	76.0	0.0	23.2	0.7	76.7	+69.5
95–100	76.0	0.0	24.0	0.0	76.0	+68.5

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

Figure 13 (USD5.00/day 2005 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	99.3	1.1	139.9:1
5-9	2.6	99.8	3.5	439.1:1
10-14	5.1	99.7	6.7	380.4:1
15-19	8.5	99.8	11.2	484.8:1
20-24	13.7	99.7	18.0	383.4:1
25-29	19.0	99.7	24.9	284.9:1
30-34	26.0	99.2	34.0	126.5:1
35-39	34.5	98.7	44.8	75.5:1
40-44	43.4	97.9	55.8	45.5:1
45-49	52.8	96.3	66.9	26.3:1
50-54	61.3	94.5	76.2	17.3:1
55-59	69.2	92.0	83.7	11.5:1
60-64	76.6	89.2	89.9	8.3:1
65-69	83.9	85.8	94.6	6.0:1
70-74	89.3	82.9	97.4	4.9:1
75-79	93.4	80.4	98.7	4.1:1
80-84	95.6	79.0	99.3	3.8:1
85-89	98.5	77.1	99.8	3.4:1
90-94	99.2	76.6	99.9	3.3:1
95-100	100.0	76.0	100.0	3.2:1

**USD4.32/Day 1993 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2004 Validation Sample**

Figure 4 (USD4.32/day 1993 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	99.5
5–9	98.2
10–14	96.5
15–19	94.5
20–24	91.4
25–29	84.9
30–34	79.6
35–39	69.7
40–44	57.7
45–49	40.4
50–54	29.0
55–59	18.7
60–64	14.2
65–69	7.4
70–74	4.4
75–79	3.0
80–84	1.1
85–89	0.4
90–94	1.5
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.
Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 5 (USD4.32/day 1993 PPP line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0-4	843	÷	848	=	99.5
5-9	1,768	÷	1,801	=	98.2
10-14	2,388	÷	2,475	=	96.5
15-19	3,215	÷	3,400	=	94.5
20-24	4,749	÷	5,198	=	91.4
25-29	4,493	÷	5,295	=	84.9
30-34	5,578	÷	7,006	=	79.6
35-39	5,936	÷	8,519	=	69.7
40-44	5,105	÷	8,846	=	57.7
45-49	3,795	÷	9,401	=	40.4
50-54	2,470	÷	8,517	=	29.0
55-59	1,475	÷	7,909	=	18.7
60-64	1,052	÷	7,417	=	14.2
65-69	538	÷	7,230	=	7.4
70-74	241	÷	5,449	=	4.4
75-79	121	÷	4,104	=	3.0
80-84	24	÷	2,177	=	1.1
85-89	12	÷	2,921	=	0.4
90-94	10	÷	710	=	1.5
95-100	0	÷	777	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent households in the Philippines.
Based on the 2004 APIS.

Figure 7 (USD4.32/day 1993 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+2.5	2.5	2.8	3.8
5-9	-1.5	0.9	0.9	0.9
10-14	-0.4	1.4	1.7	2.1
15-19	-1.6	1.4	1.6	2.1
20-24	+1.1	1.7	1.9	2.4
25-29	-2.0	2.0	2.4	3.0
30-34	+0.4	2.1	2.5	3.3
35-39	+0.4	2.1	2.5	3.3
40-44	+4.3	2.2	2.6	3.3
45-49	-0.1	2.1	2.5	3.7
50-54	-1.1	2.1	2.5	3.5
55-59	+0.6	1.7	2.1	2.7
60-64	+1.4	1.6	2.0	2.7
65-69	-1.0	1.7	2.0	2.7
70-74	+1.1	1.0	1.2	1.5
75-79	+0.6	0.9	1.1	1.4
80-84	-0.3	0.9	1.1	1.5
85-89	-0.4	0.7	0.8	1.1
90-94	+0.7	1.0	1.2	1.5
95-100	-1.4	1.8	1.9	2.3

Figure 9 (USD4.32/day 1993 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, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.8	67.5	80.5	92.0
4	+0.6	29.5	36.5	48.7
8	+0.0	21.4	25.5	36.1
16	+0.2	15.1	18.3	23.8
32	+0.2	11.2	13.2	17.4
64	+0.2	7.9	9.7	13.1
128	+0.3	5.5	6.7	8.7
256	+0.3	3.9	4.7	6.8
512	+0.4	2.8	3.4	4.4
1,024	+0.4	1.9	2.3	3.3
2,048	+0.3	1.4	1.7	2.3
4,096	+0.4	1.0	1.2	1.6
8,192	+0.4	0.8	0.9	1.1
16,384	+0.4	0.5	0.6	0.8

Figure 12 (USD4.32/day 1993 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to validation sample

Score	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	Total Accuracy	BPAC
	< poverty line correctly targeted	< poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	=> poverty line mistakenly targeted	=> poverty line correctly non-targeted	Inclusion + Exclusion	See text
0–4	0.8	43.1	0.0	56.1	56.9	–96.2
5–9	2.6	41.3	0.0	56.1	58.7	–88.0
10–14	5.0	38.9	0.1	56.0	61.0	–76.9
15–19	8.3	35.6	0.3	55.9	64.1	–61.7
20–24	13.0	30.9	0.8	55.3	68.3	–39.2
25–29	17.6	26.3	1.4	54.7	72.2	–16.6
30–34	23.1	20.8	2.9	53.2	76.4	+12.0
35–39	29.1	14.8	5.5	50.6	79.7	+44.9
40–44	34.0	9.9	9.4	46.7	80.6	+76.2
45–49	37.9	6.0	14.9	41.2	79.1	+66.1
50–54	40.5	3.4	20.8	35.3	75.8	+52.6
55–59	42.0	1.9	27.2	28.9	70.9	+38.0
60–64	43.0	0.9	33.6	22.5	65.5	+23.4
65–69	43.5	0.4	40.3	15.8	59.3	+8.1
70–74	43.7	0.2	45.6	10.5	54.2	–3.9
75–79	43.8	0.1	49.6	6.5	50.3	–13.0
80–84	43.9	0.0	51.7	4.4	48.2	–17.9
85–89	43.9	0.0	54.6	1.5	45.3	–24.5
90–94	43.9	0.0	55.3	0.8	44.7	–26.1
95–100	43.9	0.0	56.1	0.0	43.9	–27.8

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

Figure 13 (USD4.32/day 1993 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage) , 2004 scorecard applied to 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	0.8	97.0	1.9	32.0:1
5-9	2.6	98.8	6.0	81.5:1
10-14	5.1	97.9	11.4	46.0:1
15-19	8.5	97.0	18.8	32.5:1
20-24	13.7	94.5	29.5	17.0:1
25-29	19.0	92.4	40.0	12.2:1
30-34	26.0	88.9	52.7	8.0:1
35-39	34.5	84.1	66.2	5.3:1
40-44	43.4	78.3	77.4	3.6:1
45-49	52.8	71.8	86.3	2.5:1
50-54	61.3	66.1	92.3	1.9:1
55-59	69.2	60.7	95.6	1.5:1
60-64	76.6	56.1	97.9	1.3:1
65-69	83.9	51.9	99.2	1.1:1
70-74	89.3	48.9	99.6	1.0:1
75-79	93.4	46.9	99.8	0.9:1
80-84	95.6	45.9	99.9	0.8:1
85-89	98.5	44.5	100.0	0.8:1
90-94	99.2	44.2	100.0	0.8:1
95-100	100.0	43.9	100.0	0.8:1

National Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2002 APIS

Figure 7 (National line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	-1.8	2.0	2.3	2.8
5-9	-1.9	2.0	2.5	3.3
10-14	-2.4	2.2	2.5	3.2
15-19	+1.7	2.6	3.1	4.1
20-24	+0.7	2.5	2.9	3.5
25-29	+0.6	2.9	3.5	4.5
30-34	+0.9	2.6	3.0	4.0
35-39	+3.0	2.5	2.9	3.7
40-44	+1.2	2.3	2.7	3.6
45-49	-3.2	2.6	2.8	3.3
50-54	-0.1	1.8	2.2	2.8
55-59	-1.4	1.5	1.8	2.2
60-64	-0.6	1.3	1.5	2.0
65-69	+0.9	0.8	1.0	1.2
70-74	-0.2	0.7	1.0	1.3
75-79	+0.5	0.7	0.8	1.0
80-84	-0.4	0.5	0.5	0.7
85-89	-0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
90-94	+0.4	1.5	1.7	2.4
95-100	-0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4

Figure 9 (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, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.6	65.3	74.6	91.4
4	+0.4	33.0	39.0	50.7
8	-0.1	23.3	28.7	34.9
16	-0.3	16.9	20.1	26.6
32	+0.1	11.8	13.4	18.6
64	+0.1	8.3	9.7	12.8
128	+0.1	6.0	7.0	9.3
256	-0.0	4.2	4.9	6.5
512	+0.1	2.8	3.5	4.4
1,024	+0.1	2.1	2.4	3.2
2,048	+0.1	1.4	1.7	2.1
4,096	+0.1	1.0	1.2	1.5
8,192	+0.1	0.7	0.8	1.1
16,384	+0.1	0.5	0.6	0.8

Figure 12 (National line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.7	31.1	0.0	68.1	68.9	-95.3
5-9	2.6	29.2	0.1	68.0	70.7	-83.1
10-14	4.9	27.0	0.3	67.8	72.7	-68.5
15-19	8.1	23.7	0.9	67.3	75.4	-46.3
20-24	12.2	19.6	2.0	66.2	78.4	-17.0
25-29	15.8	16.0	3.7	64.4	80.2	+10.9
30-34	19.9	12.0	6.6	61.5	81.4	+45.7
35-39	23.7	8.1	11.2	57.0	80.7	+64.9
40-44	27.1	4.7	17.2	51.0	78.1	+46.1
45-49	29.3	2.6	24.0	44.1	73.4	+24.5
50-54	30.5	1.4	31.0	37.1	67.6	+2.6
55-59	31.1	0.7	37.8	30.4	61.5	-18.6
60-64	31.5	0.3	44.5	23.7	55.2	-39.7
65-69	31.7	0.2	50.9	17.3	49.0	-59.7
70-74	31.8	0.1	56.5	11.6	43.4	-77.5
75-79	31.8	0.0	60.7	7.4	39.2	-90.8
80-84	31.8	0.0	63.2	5.0	36.8	-98.4
85-89	31.8	0.0	66.1	2.1	33.9	-107.5
90-94	31.8	0.0	66.9	1.2	33.1	-110.2
95-100	31.8	0.0	68.2	0.0	31.8	-114.1

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

Figure 13 (National line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	98.1	2.3	51.6:1
5-9	2.7	95.7	8.3	22.4:1
10-14	5.2	93.9	15.2	15.4:1
15-19	9.0	90.2	25.5	9.2:1
20-24	14.2	86.0	38.4	6.1:1
25-29	19.5	80.9	49.6	4.2:1
30-34	26.5	75.0	62.4	3.0:1
35-39	34.9	68.0	74.5	2.1:1
40-44	44.3	61.2	85.1	1.6:1
45-49	53.3	54.9	91.9	1.2:1
50-54	61.5	49.6	95.7	1.0:1
55-59	68.9	45.2	97.7	0.8:1
60-64	76.0	41.5	99.0	0.7:1
65-69	82.5	38.4	99.5	0.6:1
70-74	88.3	36.0	99.8	0.6:1
75-79	92.6	34.4	99.9	0.5:1
80-84	95.0	33.5	100.0	0.5:1
85-89	97.9	32.5	100.0	0.5:1
90-94	98.8	32.2	100.0	0.5:1
95-100	100.0	31.8	100.0	0.5:1

**National Food Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2002 APIS**

Figure 7 (Food line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	-2.0	5.5	6.3	7.7
5-9	-6.3	5.0	5.3	5.9
10-14	-8.9	6.4	6.7	7.5
15-19	-1.2	3.7	4.4	5.8
20-24	-5.0	4.1	4.4	5.2
25-29	-3.6	3.2	3.6	4.8
30-34	-4.5	3.5	3.7	4.2
35-39	-2.3	2.1	2.4	3.1
40-44	-0.9	1.6	1.9	2.7
45-49	-2.7	2.0	2.1	2.4
50-54	-1.6	1.3	1.4	1.6
55-59	-0.6	0.8	1.0	1.3
60-64	-0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9
65-69	-0.7	0.7	0.7	0.9
70-74	-0.2	0.4	0.4	0.5
75-79	-0.0	0.2	0.3	0.3
80-84	-0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
85-89	-0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
90-94	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 9 (Food line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-2.8	64.0	73.7	83.6
4	-2.6	30.1	35.8	48.1
8	-2.3	20.0	24.2	31.4
16	-2.3	14.4	16.6	21.7
32	-2.2	10.0	12.1	15.4
64	-2.0	7.0	8.4	11.7
128	-2.0	5.0	5.9	7.8
256	-2.0	3.5	4.1	5.5
512	-2.0	2.4	2.9	3.9
1,024	-1.9	1.7	2.0	2.8
2,048	-2.0	1.2	1.4	2.0
4,096	-2.0	0.9	1.0	1.4
8,192	-2.0	0.6	0.7	1.0
16,384	-2.0	0.5	0.5	0.7

Figure 12 (Food line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.7	16.8	0.1	82.5	83.1	–91.9
5–9	2.3	15.2	0.5	82.1	84.3	–71.2
10–14	3.9	13.5	1.2	81.3	85.2	–47.9
15–19	6.2	11.3	2.8	79.7	85.9	–13.1
20–24	8.8	8.7	5.4	77.1	85.9	+31.9
25–29	10.7	6.7	8.8	73.7	84.5	+49.6
30–34	12.9	4.5	13.6	69.0	81.9	+22.2
35–39	14.7	2.8	20.2	62.3	77.0	–15.8
40–44	16.0	1.5	28.3	54.2	70.2	–62.2
45–49	16.7	0.7	36.6	46.0	62.7	–109.5
50–54	17.1	0.4	44.4	38.1	55.2	–154.5
55–59	17.3	0.2	51.6	30.9	48.2	–195.7
60–64	17.3	0.1	58.7	23.9	41.2	–236.0
65–69	17.4	0.0	65.1	17.4	34.8	–273.0
70–74	17.4	0.0	70.9	11.7	29.1	–305.9
75–79	17.4	0.0	75.1	7.4	24.9	–330.3
80–84	17.5	0.0	77.5	5.0	22.4	–344.2
85–89	17.5	0.0	80.4	2.1	19.6	–360.8
90–94	17.5	0.0	81.3	1.2	18.7	–365.8
95–100	17.5	0.0	82.5	0.0	17.5	–372.8

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

Figure 13 (Food line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	88.3	3.8	7.5:1
5-9	2.7	82.9	13.0	4.8:1
10-14	5.2	76.1	22.5	3.2:1
15-19	9.0	68.8	35.4	2.2:1
20-24	14.2	61.9	50.4	1.6:1
25-29	19.5	54.9	61.5	1.2:1
30-34	26.5	48.8	74.0	1.0:1
35-39	34.9	42.1	84.1	0.7:1
40-44	44.3	36.1	91.5	0.6:1
45-49	53.3	31.4	95.8	0.5:1
50-54	61.5	27.8	97.8	0.4:1
55-59	68.9	25.1	98.9	0.3:1
60-64	76.0	22.8	99.4	0.3:1
65-69	82.5	21.1	99.8	0.3:1
70-74	88.3	19.7	99.9	0.2:1
75-79	92.6	18.9	99.9	0.2:1
80-84	95.0	18.4	100.0	0.2:1
85-89	97.9	17.8	100.0	0.2:1
90-94	98.8	17.7	100.0	0.2:1
95-100	100.0	17.5	100.0	0.2:1

**USAID “Extreme” Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2002 APIS**

Figure 7 (USAID “extreme” line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+2.7	6.5	7.6	9.8
5-9	-2.4	4.6	5.5	6.9
10-14	-6.3	5.3	5.8	7.5
15-19	+3.5	3.7	4.2	5.9
20-24	-2.5	3.2	3.8	5.0
25-29	-0.0	2.8	3.3	4.4
30-34	-1.7	2.4	2.8	3.6
35-39	+0.3	1.8	2.3	3.0
40-44	+1.4	1.4	1.7	2.4
45-49	-1.8	1.5	1.7	1.9
50-54	-0.8	1.0	1.3	1.7
55-59	-0.4	0.8	0.9	1.3
60-64	-0.7	0.7	0.9	1.2
65-69	-0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7
70-74	-0.1	0.4	0.5	0.6
75-79	-0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
80-84	-0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
85-89	-0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
90-94	+1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 9 (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, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-0.6	58.8	71.2	84.4
4	-0.7	27.4	33.5	46.0
8	-1.0	19.5	23.6	31.6
16	-0.8	13.9	16.8	21.6
32	-0.6	9.7	11.2	14.7
64	-0.6	6.8	8.4	10.1
128	-0.6	5.0	5.8	7.4
256	-0.5	3.5	4.0	5.4
512	-0.5	2.4	2.8	3.8
1,024	-0.5	1.7	2.1	2.7
2,048	-0.5	1.2	1.4	2.0
4,096	-0.5	0.8	1.0	1.3
8,192	-0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9
16,384	-0.5	0.4	0.5	0.7

Figure 12 (USAID “extreme” line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.6	14.2	0.2	85.1	85.7	–90.8
5–9	2.0	12.8	0.7	84.5	86.5	–67.7
10–14	3.5	11.3	1.7	83.5	87.1	–41.4
15–19	5.4	9.4	3.6	81.6	87.0	–2.7
20–24	7.6	7.2	6.6	78.6	86.2	+47.6
25–29	9.2	5.6	10.4	74.8	84.0	+29.9
30–34	10.9	3.9	15.6	69.6	80.5	–5.6
35–39	12.3	2.5	22.6	62.6	74.9	–52.8
40–44	13.4	1.4	30.9	54.3	67.7	–108.8
45–49	14.1	0.7	39.2	46.0	60.0	–165.3
50–54	14.4	0.4	47.1	38.1	52.5	–218.5
55–59	14.6	0.2	54.3	30.9	45.5	–267.3
60–64	14.7	0.1	61.3	23.9	38.6	–314.6
65–69	14.8	0.0	67.8	17.4	32.2	–358.4
70–74	14.8	0.0	73.5	11.7	26.5	–397.2
75–79	14.8	0.0	77.8	7.4	22.2	–425.9
80–84	14.8	0.0	80.2	5.0	19.8	–442.5
85–89	14.8	0.0	83.1	2.1	16.9	–462.0
90–94	14.8	0.0	84.0	1.2	16.0	–467.9
95–100	14.8	0.0	85.2	0.0	14.8	–476.2

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

Figure 13 (USAID “extreme” line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	79.9	4.1	4.0:1
5-9	2.7	74.1	13.8	2.9:1
10-14	5.2	67.8	23.7	2.1:1
15-19	9.0	60.1	36.5	1.5:1
20-24	14.2	53.5	51.5	1.2:1
25-29	19.5	46.9	62.0	0.9:1
30-34	26.5	41.1	73.7	0.7:1
35-39	34.9	35.2	83.2	0.5:1
40-44	44.3	30.3	90.6	0.4:1
45-49	53.3	26.4	95.1	0.4:1
50-54	61.5	23.4	97.4	0.3:1
55-59	68.9	21.2	98.6	0.3:1
60-64	76.0	19.3	99.4	0.2:1
65-69	82.5	17.9	99.8	0.2:1
70-74	88.3	16.7	99.9	0.2:1
75-79	92.6	16.0	100.0	0.2:1
80-84	95.0	15.6	100.0	0.2:1
85-89	97.9	15.1	100.0	0.2:1
90-94	98.8	15.0	100.0	0.2:1
95-100	100.0	14.8	100.0	0.2:1

USD1.25/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2002 APIS

Figure 7 (USD1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+1.2	5.5	6.5	8.8
5-9	-1.6	3.7	4.5	5.8
10-14	-5.7	4.7	4.9	6.0
15-19	+3.1	3.6	4.2	5.7
20-24	-4.0	3.6	3.7	4.8
25-29	-0.2	3.1	3.7	4.6
30-34	-0.8	2.6	3.1	4.1
35-39	+0.1	2.0	2.4	3.2
40-44	-0.1	1.8	2.1	2.7
45-49	-3.4	2.4	2.6	2.8
50-54	-1.3	1.2	1.4	2.0
55-59	-0.8	1.0	1.2	1.6
60-64	-0.5	0.7	0.9	1.2
65-69	-0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9
70-74	-0.2	0.5	0.6	0.8
75-79	+0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
80-84	-0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
85-89	-0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
90-94	+1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
95-100	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 9 (USD1.25/day 2005 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, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-1.4	58.3	80.0	83.0
4	-1.5	30.8	37.0	50.3
8	-1.3	21.2	25.5	32.7
16	-1.3	15.2	17.6	24.1
32	-1.2	10.6	12.6	15.9
64	-1.0	7.3	8.9	12.3
128	-1.0	5.3	6.4	8.0
256	-1.0	3.6	4.4	5.6
512	-0.9	2.5	3.0	3.8
1,024	-0.9	1.8	2.1	3.0
2,048	-0.9	1.3	1.6	2.0
4,096	-0.9	0.9	1.0	1.4
8,192	-0.9	0.6	0.8	1.0
16,384	-0.9	0.5	0.6	0.7

Figure 12 (USD1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	Total Accuracy	BPAC
	< poverty line correctly targeted	< poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	=> poverty line mistakenly targeted	=> poverty line correctly non-targeted	Inclusion + Exclusion	See text
0–4	0.7	18.7	0.1	80.5	81.2	–92.7
5–9	2.3	17.1	0.4	80.1	82.5	–74.0
10–14	4.1	15.4	1.1	79.5	83.5	–52.5
15–19	6.5	12.9	2.5	78.1	84.5	–20.4
20–24	9.3	10.1	4.9	75.7	85.0	+21.1
25–29	11.4	8.0	8.1	72.5	84.0	+58.4
30–34	13.9	5.5	12.6	68.0	81.9	+35.0
35–39	15.9	3.5	19.0	61.6	77.5	+2.1
40–44	17.5	1.9	26.8	53.8	71.2	–38.2
45–49	18.4	1.0	34.9	45.7	64.2	–79.6
50–54	18.9	0.5	42.6	38.0	56.9	–119.6
55–59	19.2	0.3	49.7	30.9	50.0	–156.3
60–64	19.3	0.1	56.7	23.9	43.1	–192.3
65–69	19.4	0.1	63.2	17.4	36.8	–225.5
70–74	19.4	0.0	68.9	11.7	31.1	–255.1
75–79	19.4	0.0	73.2	7.4	26.8	–276.9
80–84	19.4	0.0	75.6	5.0	24.4	–289.5
85–89	19.4	0.0	78.5	2.1	21.5	–304.4
90–94	19.4	0.0	79.4	1.2	20.6	–308.9
95–100	19.4	0.0	80.6	0.0	19.4	–315.3

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

Figure 13 (USD1.25/day 2005 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	87.7	3.4	7.1:1
5-9	2.7	83.9	11.9	5.2:1
10-14	5.2	78.5	20.9	3.7:1
15-19	9.0	71.8	33.3	2.6:1
20-24	14.2	65.4	47.9	1.9:1
25-29	19.5	58.6	59.0	1.4:1
30-34	26.5	52.4	71.6	1.1:1
35-39	34.9	45.5	81.9	0.8:1
40-44	44.3	39.4	90.0	0.7:1
45-49	53.3	34.6	95.0	0.5:1
50-54	61.5	30.7	97.3	0.4:1
55-59	68.9	27.8	98.7	0.4:1
60-64	76.0	25.4	99.3	0.3:1
65-69	82.5	23.4	99.7	0.3:1
70-74	88.3	22.0	99.9	0.3:1
75-79	92.6	21.0	99.9	0.3:1
80-84	95.0	20.4	100.0	0.3:1
85-89	97.9	19.8	100.0	0.2:1
90-94	98.8	19.7	100.0	0.2:1
95-100	100.0	19.4	100.0	0.2:1

USD2.50/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2002 APIS

Figure 7 (USD2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5-9	-0.3	0.9	1.1	1.4
10-14	-1.3	1.1	1.2	1.6
15-19	-0.6	1.3	1.6	2.1
20-24	-1.2	1.2	1.4	1.9
25-29	-1.4	1.8	2.2	2.8
30-34	+1.9	2.0	2.5	3.1
35-39	-1.6	2.2	2.5	3.3
40-44	-2.0	2.2	2.7	3.7
45-49	-6.6	4.5	4.8	5.3
50-54	-4.5	3.6	3.8	4.2
55-59	-2.2	2.5	2.9	3.7
60-64	-0.0	2.1	2.5	3.4
65-69	-0.5	1.7	2.0	2.7
70-74	-2.3	2.0	2.2	2.6
75-79	-0.7	1.5	1.8	2.3
80-84	+0.1	1.4	1.7	2.1
85-89	-0.9	0.9	1.0	1.4
90-94	+0.9	1.7	2.0	2.5
95-100	-0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7

Figure 9 (USD2.50/day 2005 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, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-1.2	64.3	75.1	91.7
4	-2.5	34.0	40.3	55.5
8	-1.8	22.8	28.6	35.4
16	-1.7	17.3	20.9	26.7
32	-1.6	11.9	13.9	18.8
64	-1.8	8.7	10.0	13.2
128	-1.8	6.4	7.6	9.8
256	-1.8	4.2	5.0	6.8
512	-1.7	3.0	3.5	4.8
1,024	-1.7	2.1	2.5	3.3
2,048	-1.7	1.5	1.7	2.1
4,096	-1.7	1.0	1.2	1.5
8,192	-1.7	0.7	0.9	1.2
16,384	-1.7	0.5	0.6	0.9

Figure 12 (USD2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	48.8	0.0	50.5	51.2
5–9	2.7	46.8	0.0	50.4	53.2	–89.0
10–14	5.1	44.4	0.1	50.4	55.5	–79.3
15–19	8.8	40.8	0.2	50.2	59.0	–64.2
20–24	13.7	35.9	0.5	49.9	63.6	–43.7
25–29	18.4	31.1	1.1	49.4	67.8	–23.4
30–34	24.2	25.3	2.3	48.2	72.4	+2.4
35–39	30.6	18.9	4.3	46.2	76.8	+32.2
40–44	36.8	12.7	7.5	43.0	79.8	+63.7
45–49	41.5	8.0	11.8	38.7	80.2	+76.3
50–54	44.8	4.8	16.7	33.7	78.5	+66.2
55–59	46.7	2.8	22.1	28.3	75.1	+55.3
60–64	48.1	1.5	27.9	22.5	70.6	+43.6
65–69	48.8	0.8	33.8	16.7	65.4	+31.8
70–74	49.2	0.3	39.1	11.4	60.6	+21.1
75–79	49.4	0.1	43.1	7.3	56.7	+12.9
80–84	49.5	0.1	45.5	4.9	54.4	+8.1
85–89	49.5	0.0	48.4	2.1	51.6	+2.4
90–94	49.5	0.0	49.2	1.2	50.8	+0.6
95–100	49.5	0.0	50.5	0.0	49.5	–1.8

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

Figure 13 (USD2.50/day 2005 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	100.0	1.5	Only poor targeted
5-9	2.7	99.3	5.5	142.3:1
10-14	5.2	98.7	10.3	76.9:1
15-19	9.0	97.6	17.7	40.3:1
20-24	14.2	96.3	27.6	26.2:1
25-29	19.5	94.4	37.2	16.7:1
30-34	26.5	91.4	48.9	10.6:1
35-39	34.9	87.7	61.8	7.2:1
40-44	44.3	83.1	74.3	4.9:1
45-49	53.3	77.9	83.9	3.5:1
50-54	61.5	72.8	90.3	2.7:1
55-59	68.9	67.9	94.4	2.1:1
60-64	76.0	63.3	97.1	1.7:1
65-69	82.5	59.1	98.4	1.4:1
70-74	88.3	55.7	99.3	1.3:1
75-79	92.6	53.4	99.7	1.1:1
80-84	95.0	52.1	99.9	1.1:1
85-89	97.9	50.6	100.0	1.0:1
90-94	98.8	50.2	100.0	1.0:1
95-100	100.0	49.5	100.0	1.0:1

USD3.75/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2002 APIS

Figure 7 (USD3.75/day 2005 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5-9	-0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1
10-14	+0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4
15-19	-1.0	0.6	0.6	0.6
20-24	-0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5
25-29	-0.5	1.0	1.2	1.5
30-34	+0.4	1.1	1.4	1.9
35-39	-0.6	1.2	1.4	1.9
40-44	+0.1	1.6	2.0	2.5
45-49	-3.9	2.9	3.0	3.3
50-54	-3.6	2.9	3.2	3.7
55-59	-3.8	3.2	3.5	3.9
60-64	-1.9	2.9	3.4	4.3
65-69	-1.9	2.7	3.2	4.5
70-74	-3.7	3.3	3.5	4.2
75-79	-2.9	2.8	3.1	4.0
80-84	-1.0	3.1	3.5	4.4
85-89	-0.2	1.7	2.0	2.8
90-94	-2.2	3.7	4.3	5.3
95-100	-0.4	1.0	1.2	1.7

Figure 9 (USD3.75/day 2005 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, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-1.3	61.0	75.5	90.2
4	-1.5	32.5	38.9	51.2
8	-1.6	22.8	27.7	34.5
16	-1.8	16.5	20.2	27.0
32	-1.8	11.5	14.0	18.6
64	-1.8	8.2	9.7	12.5
128	-1.8	5.9	6.8	8.5
256	-1.6	4.3	4.8	6.3
512	-1.6	2.9	3.5	4.7
1,024	-1.6	2.0	2.6	3.2
2,048	-1.7	1.5	1.8	2.3
4,096	-1.7	1.1	1.2	1.6
8,192	-1.7	0.7	0.8	1.0
16,384	-1.7	0.5	0.6	0.7

Figure 12 (USD3.75/day 2005 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	Total Accuracy	BPAC
	< poverty line correctly targeted	< poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	=> poverty line mistakenly targeted	=> poverty line correctly non-targeted	Inclusion + Exclusion	See text
0–4	0.8	65.9	0.0	33.3	34.1	–97.7
5–9	2.7	63.9	0.0	33.3	36.1	–91.8
10–14	5.2	61.5	0.0	33.3	38.5	–84.5
15–19	9.0	57.7	0.0	33.3	42.2	–73.1
20–24	14.1	52.5	0.1	33.2	47.4	–57.5
25–29	19.3	47.4	0.2	33.1	52.4	–41.7
30–34	26.0	40.7	0.5	32.8	58.8	–21.3
35–39	33.7	32.9	1.2	32.2	65.9	+2.9
40–44	41.9	24.7	2.3	31.0	72.9	+29.3
45–49	49.1	17.6	4.2	29.1	78.2	+53.5
50–54	54.7	11.9	6.8	26.6	81.3	+74.3
55–59	58.9	7.8	10.0	23.3	82.3	+85.0
60–64	62.1	4.5	13.9	19.5	81.6	+79.2
65–69	64.2	2.5	18.4	14.9	79.1	+72.4
70–74	65.6	1.1	22.7	10.6	76.2	+65.9
75–79	66.2	0.5	26.4	7.0	73.2	+60.5
80–84	66.5	0.2	28.5	4.8	71.3	+57.2
85–89	66.6	0.1	31.3	2.0	68.7	+53.1
90–94	66.7	0.0	32.1	1.2	67.9	+51.9
95–100	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	+50.1

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

Figure 13 (USD3.75/day 2005 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	100.0	1.1	Only poor targeted
5-9	2.7	100.0	4.1	2,333.3:1
10-14	5.2	99.8	7.7	536.5:1
15-19	9.0	99.7	13.4	355.6:1
20-24	14.2	99.5	21.2	205.8:1
25-29	19.5	99.0	29.0	98.2:1
30-34	26.5	98.1	39.0	50.7:1
35-39	34.9	96.7	50.6	29.3:1
40-44	44.3	94.7	62.9	18.0:1
45-49	53.3	92.1	73.6	11.7:1
50-54	61.5	89.0	82.1	8.1:1
55-59	68.9	85.5	88.4	5.9:1
60-64	76.0	81.8	93.2	4.5:1
65-69	82.5	77.7	96.2	3.5:1
70-74	88.3	74.3	98.3	2.9:1
75-79	92.6	71.5	99.3	2.5:1
80-84	95.0	70.0	99.7	2.3:1
85-89	97.9	68.1	99.9	2.1:1
90-94	98.8	67.5	100.0	2.1:1
95-100	100.0	66.7	100.0	2.0:1

USD5.00/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2002 APIS

Figure 7 (USD5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5-9	+0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
10-14	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
15-19	-0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
20-24	-0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
25-29	-0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9
30-34	+0.1	0.7	0.8	1.1
35-39	-0.9	0.8	0.9	1.1
40-44	+0.2	1.2	1.4	1.8
45-49	-1.8	1.6	1.7	1.9
50-54	-2.6	2.3	2.5	3.0
55-59	-3.0	2.6	2.8	3.6
60-64	-4.3	3.5	3.7	4.1
65-69	-4.1	3.5	3.7	4.8
70-74	-1.0	3.0	3.7	5.0
75-79	-3.5	3.5	4.0	5.4
80-84	+1.8	3.9	4.8	6.2
85-89	-5.6	4.3	4.6	5.3
90-94	-3.6	4.8	5.8	7.9
95-100	+1.2	1.8	2.2	2.8

Figure 9 (USD5.00/day 2005 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, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-0.8	58.1	65.4	83.8
4	-1.0	28.9	35.9	47.1
8	-1.5	20.5	24.6	34.2
16	-1.6	14.9	17.7	22.6
32	-1.5	10.4	12.2	16.8
64	-1.5	7.5	8.7	11.5
128	-1.7	5.3	6.5	8.3
256	-1.6	3.7	4.3	6.1
512	-1.6	2.6	3.3	4.6
1,024	-1.6	1.9	2.3	2.9
2,048	-1.6	1.3	1.6	2.2
4,096	-1.6	1.0	1.1	1.7
8,192	-1.6	0.7	0.8	1.1
16,384	-1.6	0.5	0.6	0.7

Figure 12 (USD5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	Total Accuracy	BPAC
	< poverty line correctly targeted	< poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	=> poverty line mistakenly targeted	=> poverty line correctly non-targeted	Inclusion + Exclusion	See text
0–4	0.8	75.9	0.0	23.3	24.1	–98.0
5–9	2.7	74.0	0.0	23.3	26.0	–92.8
10–14	5.2	71.5	0.0	23.3	28.5	–86.5
15–19	9.0	67.7	0.0	23.3	32.3	–76.6
20–24	14.2	62.5	0.0	23.3	37.5	–63.0
25–29	19.4	57.2	0.1	23.2	42.7	–49.2
30–34	26.3	50.4	0.2	23.1	49.5	–31.1
35–39	34.5	42.2	0.4	22.9	57.4	–9.5
40–44	43.4	33.3	0.9	22.4	65.8	+14.3
45–49	51.5	25.1	1.7	21.6	73.1	+36.7
50–54	58.4	18.3	3.1	20.2	78.6	+56.4
55–59	63.9	12.8	5.0	18.3	82.2	+73.1
60–64	68.6	8.1	7.4	15.9	84.5	+88.5
65–69	71.9	4.8	10.6	12.7	84.6	+86.1
70–74	74.3	2.4	14.0	9.3	83.6	+81.7
75–79	75.5	1.2	17.0	6.3	81.8	+77.8
80–84	76.1	0.6	18.9	4.4	80.5	+75.4
85–89	76.5	0.2	21.4	1.9	78.5	+72.2
90–94	76.6	0.1	22.1	1.2	77.8	+71.2
95–100	76.7	0.0	23.3	0.0	76.7	+69.6

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

Figure 13 (USD5.00/day 2005 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	100.0	1.0	Only poor targeted
5-9	2.7	100.0	3.6	2,333.3:1
10-14	5.2	99.9	6.7	1,570.6:1
15-19	9.0	99.9	11.7	1,074.0:1
20-24	14.2	99.8	18.5	470.3:1
25-29	19.5	99.6	25.4	252.8:1
30-34	26.5	99.3	34.3	148.9:1
35-39	34.9	98.9	45.0	91.1:1
40-44	44.3	98.0	56.6	48.6:1
45-49	53.3	96.7	67.2	29.5:1
50-54	61.5	95.0	76.2	18.9:1
55-59	68.9	92.7	83.3	12.7:1
60-64	76.0	90.3	89.4	9.3:1
65-69	82.5	87.1	93.7	6.8:1
70-74	88.3	84.1	96.9	5.3:1
75-79	92.6	81.6	98.5	4.4:1
80-84	95.0	80.1	99.2	4.0:1
85-89	97.9	78.2	99.8	3.6:1
90-94	98.8	77.6	99.9	3.5:1
95-100	100.0	76.7	100.0	3.3:1

USD4.32/day 1993 PPP Poverty Line Tables
for 2004 Scorecard Applied to 2002 APIS

Figure 7 (USD4.32/day 1993 PPP line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample ($n = 16,384$) from the validation sample, with confidence intervals, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0-4	+0.5	1.5	1.8	2.3
5-9	-0.9	0.9	1.1	1.5
10-14	-1.8	1.5	1.5	1.8
15-19	-1.0	1.5	1.8	2.5
20-24	-2.0	1.7	1.9	2.2
25-29	-0.9	2.1	2.5	3.2
30-34	-0.5	2.2	2.7	3.4
35-39	-0.7	2.3	2.8	3.5
40-44	-1.6	2.3	2.7	3.7
45-49	-5.2	3.8	4.0	4.8
50-54	-3.3	2.8	3.0	3.5
55-59	-2.6	2.4	2.7	3.5
60-64	-0.6	2.0	2.4	3.1
65-69	-0.6	1.6	1.9	2.4
70-74	-2.0	1.8	2.0	2.5
75-79	-0.8	1.4	1.6	2.1
80-84	+0.0	0.8	0.9	1.1
85-89	-0.9	0.9	1.0	1.5
90-94	+0.1	1.7	2.0	2.5
95-100	-0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7

Figure 9 (USD4.32/day 1993 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, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and true value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-1.2	70.3	80.5	90.2
4	-2.2	33.5	39.3	51.0
8	-1.8	23.7	27.5	35.6
16	-1.9	17.6	21.4	27.8
32	-1.5	12.1	14.3	19.2
64	-1.7	8.8	10.3	12.8
128	-1.7	6.5	7.7	10.3
256	-1.7	4.1	5.0	7.5
512	-1.6	3.0	3.7	4.6
1,024	-1.6	2.1	2.6	3.2
2,048	-1.6	1.5	1.7	2.2
4,096	-1.7	1.0	1.2	1.6
8,192	-1.7	0.7	0.9	1.2
16,384	-1.7	0.5	0.6	0.8

Figure 12 (USD4.32/day 1993 PPP line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with “Total Accuracy” and BPAC, 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

Score	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	Total Accuracy	BPAC
	< poverty line correctly targeted	< poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	=> poverty line mistakenly targeted	=> poverty line correctly non-targeted	Inclusion + Exclusion	See text
0–4	0.7	44.7	0.0	54.5	55.3	–96.7
5–9	2.7	42.8	0.0	54.5	57.2	–88.0
10–14	5.1	40.4	0.1	54.4	59.5	–77.5
15–19	8.7	36.8	0.3	54.2	63.0	–61.1
20–24	13.5	32.0	0.7	53.8	67.3	–39.0
25–29	18.0	27.4	1.5	53.0	71.1	–17.4
30–34	23.6	21.9	2.9	51.6	75.2	+10.1
35–39	29.4	16.0	5.5	49.1	78.5	+41.5
40–44	35.0	10.5	9.3	45.2	80.2	+74.3
45–49	39.1	6.4	14.2	40.3	79.3	+68.7
50–54	41.7	3.8	19.8	34.7	76.4	+56.5
55–59	43.3	2.2	25.6	28.9	72.2	+43.7
60–64	44.4	1.1	31.6	22.9	67.3	+30.4
65–69	44.9	0.6	37.6	16.9	61.8	+17.2
70–74	45.2	0.3	43.1	11.5	56.7	+5.3
75–79	45.4	0.1	47.2	7.3	52.7	–3.7
80–84	45.4	0.1	49.6	4.9	50.4	–9.0
85–89	45.5	0.0	52.4	2.1	47.5	–15.3
90–94	45.5	0.0	53.3	1.2	46.7	–17.2
95–100	45.5	0.0	54.5	0.0	45.5	–19.9

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

Figure 13 (USD4.32/day 1993 PPP line): For a given score cut-off, the percentage of all households who are targeted (that is, have a score equal to or less than 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 successful targeted (coverage) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2004 scorecard applied to 2002 APIS

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	0.8	99.3	1.6	139.5:1
5-9	2.7	98.9	6.0	93.9:1
10-14	5.2	98.3	11.2	59.5:1
15-19	9.0	96.9	19.2	31.3:1
20-24	14.2	95.1	29.7	19.3:1
25-29	19.5	92.4	39.7	12.1:1
30-34	26.5	89.0	51.9	8.1:1
35-39	34.9	84.3	64.7	5.4:1
40-44	44.3	79.0	76.9	3.8:1
45-49	53.3	73.3	85.9	2.7:1
50-54	61.5	67.8	91.7	2.1:1
55-59	68.9	62.8	95.2	1.7:1
60-64	76.0	58.4	97.6	1.4:1
65-69	82.5	54.4	98.7	1.2:1
70-74	88.3	51.2	99.4	1.0:1
75-79	92.6	49.0	99.8	1.0:1
80-84	95.0	47.8	99.9	0.9:1
85-89	97.9	46.4	100.0	0.9:1
90-94	98.8	46.0	100.0	0.9:1
95-100	100.0	45.5	100.0	0.8:1

**Poverty Lines and Poverty Rates,
by Province,
by Year,
by Urban/Rural, and
by Household-Level/Person-Level**

Figure A1: All-Philippines, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round

Round	Line/rate	International							
		National	National	USAID	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
		National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
2002	Line	35.03	23.30	24.35	25.66	51.32	76.98	102.64	46.93
	Rate (households)	31.8	17.5	14.8	19.4	49.5	66.7	76.7	45.5
	Rate (people)	36.9	21.0	18.2	23.3	55.0	71.7	80.9	51.0
2004	Line	39.52	25.72	27.59	28.36	56.72	85.09	113.45	51.87
	Rate (households)	31.4	15.4	14.2	18.2	47.5	65.2	75.5	43.5
	Rate (people)	37.5	19.6	18.5	22.8	54.0	71.2	80.4	49.9

Figure A2: All-urban Philippines and All-rural Philippines, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	38.49	24.68	28.82	28.19	56.39	84.58	112.78	51.57
		Rate (households)	17.3	7.2	8.2	9.1	32.9	52.1	65.3	28.8
		Rate (people)	21.2	9.0	10.4	11.3	38.7	58.6	71.3	34.4
	2004	Line	39.61	25.75	30.39	28.43	56.86	85.29	113.72	52.00
		Rate (households)	13.4	4.9	6.2	5.9	27.4	47.9	61.7	23.5
		Rate (people)	17.5	6.7	8.5	8.0	33.5	55.1	68.5	29.2
Rural	2002	Line	31.59	21.93	19.91	23.14	46.29	69.43	92.57	42.33
		Rate (households)	46.4	27.7	21.4	29.7	66.2	81.2	88.1	62.1
		Rate (people)	52.5	32.8	25.9	35.1	71.3	84.6	90.5	67.5
	2004	Line	39.43	25.70	24.85	28.30	56.59	84.89	113.19	51.75
		Rate (households)	49.7	26.0	22.4	30.6	67.8	82.8	89.4	63.7
		Rate (people)	57.0	32.2	28.2	37.3	73.9	87.0	92.1	70.1

Figure A3: Abra, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.17	23.01	23.60	26.49	52.99	79.48	105.97	48.46
		Rate (households)	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.1	15.0	25.8	45.3	12.8
		Rate (people)	7.5	0.0	0.0	4.3	17.3	24.4	46.2	15.1
	2004	Line	42.64	27.54	0.00	30.60	61.20	91.81	122.41	55.97
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	18.8	50.0	6.3
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	24.6	56.5	5.8
Rural	2002	Line	38.16	24.50	20.85	27.95	55.91	83.86	111.81	51.12
		Rate (households)	58.2	36.2	27.2	42.5	72.1	80.6	85.8	69.9
		Rate (people)	68.1	45.6	33.9	53.0	79.2	85.4	89.5	76.8
	2004	Line	42.64	27.54	25.35	30.60	61.20	91.81	122.41	55.97
		Rate (households)	42.5	23.7	17.7	25.1	62.5	75.6	83.4	56.4
		Rate (people)	50.6	32.2	24.9	33.7	69.0	81.1	86.8	63.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	47.5	29.0	21.8	34.5	60.7	69.7	77.8	58.6
		Rate (people)	57.7	37.8	28.1	44.6	68.6	74.9	82.1	66.3
	2004	Rate (households)	39.6	22.1	16.5	23.4	58.6	71.7	81.1	52.9
		Rate (people)	47.6	30.3	23.5	31.7	65.2	77.8	85.0	60.4

Figure A4: Agusan del Norte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.98	22.87	20.35	25.62	51.25	76.87	102.49	46.86
		Rate (households)	36.4	21.1	17.3	25.0	54.4	71.8	79.1	50.2
		Rate (people)	44.1	27.0	22.0	31.0	60.7	77.8	84.9	57.1
	2004	Line	32.82	23.15	25.68	23.56	47.12	70.68	94.23	43.09
		Rate (households)	15.5	6.2	7.5	6.2	32.0	55.7	66.7	26.2
		Rate (people)	18.9	7.5	9.0	7.5	37.6	63.6	74.5	31.1
Rural	2002	Line	29.02	20.76	15.45	21.26	42.52	63.78	85.05	38.89
		Rate (households)	54.4	38.8	24.1	39.7	73.1	86.1	92.2	70.0
		Rate (people)	58.2	43.7	28.9	44.6	74.7	85.6	92.6	72.4
	2004	Line	38.30	25.97	21.05	27.49	54.97	82.46	109.95	50.27
		Rate (households)	58.3	34.7	25.3	37.4	72.2	82.5	91.1	68.9
		Rate (people)	66.3	43.9	33.1	46.6	77.6	86.9	93.7	75.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	46.9	31.5	21.2	33.6	65.3	80.1	86.7	61.8
		Rate (people)	52.4	36.8	26.1	39.0	68.9	82.4	89.4	66.1
	2004	Rate (households)	41.0	23.2	18.2	24.8	56.0	71.7	81.3	51.7
		Rate (people)	47.5	29.5	23.6	31.1	61.7	77.6	86.1	57.6

Figure A5: Agusan del Sur, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.85	23.50	23.56	24.80	49.59	74.39	99.18	45.35
		Rate (households)	35.7	18.2	18.2	19.3	56.3	71.3	83.0	53.1
		Rate (people)	33.4	16.6	16.6	17.5	56.5	71.5	84.0	53.7
	2004	Line	34.37	23.99	22.15	24.67	49.33	74.00	98.66	45.11
		Rate (households)	32.2	17.8	13.3	18.7	57.4	71.0	76.5	50.2
		Rate (people)	38.8	23.3	17.7	24.2	60.9	73.3	79.4	54.8
Rural	2002	Line	30.42	21.28	14.74	22.28	44.57	66.85	89.14	40.76
		Rate (households)	63.1	41.9	27.2	44.2	80.3	93.2	95.4	78.1
		Rate (people)	69.7	50.6	34.7	52.1	84.4	94.0	95.7	82.9
	2004	Line	43.25	28.42	22.93	31.04	62.09	93.13	124.18	56.78
		Rate (households)	64.0	41.1	26.7	46.5	79.3	89.3	93.5	75.7
		Rate (people)	72.4	52.0	35.8	56.7	85.1	92.4	95.9	82.4
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	56.1	35.9	24.9	37.9	74.2	87.6	92.3	71.7
		Rate (people)	60.7	42.1	30.2	43.5	77.4	88.4	92.8	75.6
	2004	Rate (households)	56.3	35.5	23.4	39.7	74.0	84.8	89.4	69.4
		Rate (people)	64.4	45.1	31.5	48.9	79.3	87.8	91.9	75.8

Figure A6: Aklan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.47	23.91	26.32	25.25	50.50	75.75	101.00	46.18
		Rate (households)	16.1	6.9	8.3	6.9	34.4	52.4	66.8	33.5
		Rate (people)	19.2	7.5	9.3	7.5	41.2	59.2	71.2	40.4
	2004	Line	33.92	24.00	26.13	24.34	48.68	73.02	97.36	44.52
		Rate (households)	15.6	3.1	3.1	3.1	37.5	50.0	68.8	28.1
		Rate (people)	21.5	8.7	8.7	8.7	40.9	54.4	73.8	34.2
Rural	2002	Line	32.71	22.65	17.95	23.96	47.92	71.88	95.84	43.82
		Rate (households)	42.2	27.9	18.9	29.0	65.0	81.7	86.8	59.6
		Rate (people)	48.3	32.5	23.8	34.3	71.2	86.9	90.2	65.8
	2004	Line	42.86	25.15	27.57	30.76	61.52	92.28	123.04	56.26
		Rate (households)	64.4	18.4	28.2	40.2	75.9	89.1	94.2	73.0
		Rate (people)	73.3	24.6	35.9	49.1	83.3	92.3	96.6	81.6
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	35.9	22.8	16.3	23.7	57.6	74.6	81.9	53.3
		Rate (people)	40.5	25.8	19.9	27.1	63.2	79.5	85.1	59.1
	2004	Rate (households)	56.8	16.0	24.2	34.4	69.9	83.0	90.3	66.0
		Rate (people)	65.3	22.1	31.6	42.9	76.7	86.4	93.0	74.2

Figure A7: Albay, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	41.75	26.52	25.10	30.58	61.17	91.75	122.33	55.94
		Rate (households)	43.8	19.5	18.2	27.6	60.6	72.6	79.7	56.0
		Rate (people)	51.3	26.3	25.3	35.2	66.4	78.3	83.6	62.4
	2004	Line	35.77	23.95	28.45	25.67	51.34	77.01	102.68	46.95
		Rate (households)	18.5	6.4	7.8	7.1	35.0	61.6	72.3	31.5
		Rate (people)	23.9	9.8	11.4	10.6	41.4	67.2	78.3	37.9
Rural	2002	Line	32.23	22.44	18.09	23.61	47.22	70.82	94.43	43.18
		Rate (households)	51.1	30.6	22.6	35.8	67.3	78.6	83.7	65.0
		Rate (people)	55.8	36.7	27.0	40.5	71.8	81.0	86.2	69.8
	2004	Line	44.85	29.45	24.60	32.19	64.38	96.57	128.76	58.87
		Rate (households)	61.7	37.0	27.1	42.0	77.5	86.7	92.6	74.8
		Rate (people)	69.6	46.0	34.7	51.7	82.5	89.8	94.6	80.7
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	49.2	27.7	21.5	33.7	65.6	77.0	82.6	62.7
		Rate (people)	54.6	33.9	26.6	39.1	70.4	80.3	85.6	67.9
	2004	Rate (households)	51.3	29.7	22.5	33.6	67.3	80.7	87.7	64.4
		Rate (people)	58.9	37.5	29.2	42.0	72.9	84.5	90.8	70.7

Figure A8: Antique, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	32.82	22.19	20.68	24.05	48.09	72.14	96.18	43.98
		Rate (households)	24.0	12.3	10.2	13.8	44.9	58.0	64.2	39.6
		Rate (people)	25.9	15.7	12.7	17.2	49.3	64.6	70.5	43.1
	2004	Line	32.32	23.53	27.95	23.20	46.40	69.60	92.79	42.43
		Rate (households)	29.4	8.8	11.8	8.8	41.2	58.8	70.6	41.2
		Rate (people)	29.6	11.8	14.2	11.8	43.8	62.7	72.2	43.8
Rural	2002	Line	30.05	22.02	17.36	22.01	44.03	66.04	88.06	40.26
		Rate (households)	57.6	38.8	24.5	38.8	76.9	86.6	94.2	74.2
		Rate (people)	62.9	45.9	31.3	45.9	80.2	87.4	94.9	77.4
	2004	Line	33.52	23.16	21.25	24.06	48.12	72.18	96.24	44.00
		Rate (households)	49.6	29.2	22.5	32.2	68.9	82.7	87.5	65.3
		Rate (people)	60.9	37.2	30.2	40.8	77.5	86.9	90.1	75.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	48.9	31.9	20.8	32.3	68.6	79.2	86.4	65.2
		Rate (people)	53.4	38.1	26.5	38.5	72.2	81.5	88.6	68.5
	2004	Rate (households)	46.2	25.7	20.7	28.3	64.3	78.7	84.6	61.3
		Rate (people)	55.4	32.7	27.4	35.6	71.5	82.6	86.9	70.1

Figure A9: Basilan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	32.58	22.84	24.47	23.86	47.73	71.59	95.46	43.65
		Rate (households)	43.2	18.8	20.8	20.8	62.8	82.6	85.7	59.7
		Rate (people)	50.3	21.4	24.4	24.4	70.2	88.4	90.8	67.3
	2004	Line	30.23	20.19	23.25	21.70	43.39	65.09	86.79	39.68
		Rate (households)	32.5	10.7	14.8	13.6	65.1	86.4	92.3	57.4
		Rate (people)	39.0	14.3	18.6	17.0	74.0	90.3	93.2	65.1
Rural	2002	Line	25.62	19.51	20.37	18.76	37.53	56.29	75.06	34.32
		Rate (households)	37.3	15.0	16.9	12.0	67.9	85.5	92.7	61.2
		Rate (people)	43.6	19.9	21.3	16.0	72.8	88.3	94.1	66.7
	2004	Line	36.20	24.13	25.02	25.98	51.96	77.94	103.92	47.52
		Rate (households)	44.7	17.1	19.3	23.5	85.1	93.6	97.9	85.1
		Rate (people)	54.1	23.3	25.6	32.1	90.7	98.6	99.5	90.7
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	39.2	16.2	18.2	14.9	66.3	84.5	90.4	60.7
		Rate (people)	45.8	20.4	22.4	18.8	71.9	88.3	93.0	66.9
	2004	Rate (households)	36.8	13.0	16.4	17.1	72.2	89.0	94.3	67.3
		Rate (people)	44.4	17.5	21.1	22.4	79.9	93.3	95.5	74.3

Figure A10: Bataan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.56	23.67	28.52	26.78	53.56	80.34	107.12	48.98
		Rate (households)	15.1	3.5	7.0	5.7	29.2	56.4	71.2	25.3
		Rate (people)	21.4	5.4	10.2	8.2	37.3	64.3	77.7	33.5
	2004	Line	36.32	23.65	29.48	26.06	52.13	78.19	104.25	47.67
		Rate (households)	13.5	4.8	7.5	4.8	28.9	49.2	67.4	24.2
		Rate (people)	15.7	5.1	7.7	5.1	33.1	55.3	73.5	28.2
Rural	2002	Line	32.07	22.16	27.95	23.49	46.99	70.48	93.97	42.97
		Rate (households)	16.4	2.6	7.7	2.6	33.0	60.3	73.7	28.6
		Rate (people)	19.4	3.4	9.5	3.4	36.3	61.2	75.3	31.8
	2004	Line	41.16	25.42	32.95	29.54	59.08	88.62	118.16	54.03
		Rate (households)	24.6	6.5	11.7	7.6	42.9	61.1	72.0	37.5
		Rate (people)	29.7	8.3	14.6	9.2	48.6	65.9	76.9	42.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	15.6	3.2	7.3	4.7	30.4	57.7	72.0	26.4
		Rate (people)	20.7	4.8	10.0	6.7	37.0	63.3	76.9	32.9
	2004	Rate (households)	17.8	5.5	9.1	5.9	34.3	53.8	69.2	29.4
		Rate (people)	21.0	6.3	10.4	6.6	39.0	59.3	74.8	33.6

Figure A11: Batanes, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	42.44	29.01	31.92	31.09	62.17	93.26	124.35	56.86
		Rate (households)	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.2	42.2	51.9	10.4
		Rate (people)	8.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.1	52.8	59.9	15.3
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	2002	Line	33.93	22.62	26.16	24.86	49.72	74.57	99.43	45.46
		Rate (households)	20.7	9.8	12.7	9.8	33.3	56.8	77.0	25.8
		Rate (people)	28.7	11.5	13.7	11.5	43.2	66.8	83.3	36.3
	2004	Line	41.75	29.31	28.75	29.97	59.93	89.90	119.87	54.81
		Rate (households)	27.8	11.1	5.6	11.1	50.0	50.0	66.7	50.0
		Rate (people)	29.8	15.5	7.1	15.5	52.4	52.4	69.0	52.4
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	15.0	6.2	8.1	6.2	27.1	51.5	67.9	20.2
		Rate (people)	21.3	7.4	8.8	7.4	35.3	61.8	74.9	28.7
	2004	Rate (households)	27.8	11.1	5.6	11.1	50.0	50.0	66.7	50.0
		Rate (people)	29.8	15.5	7.1	15.5	52.4	52.4	69.0	52.4

Figure A12: Batangas, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	43.82	26.32	32.38	32.10	64.19	96.29	128.39	58.70
		Rate (households)	18.6	5.6	8.9	8.6	37.4	53.3	66.7	34.3
		Rate (people)	22.3	6.4	10.9	10.5	44.0	60.6	72.6	40.3
	2004	Line	45.52	28.36	32.47	32.67	65.34	98.01	130.68	59.75
		Rate (households)	21.5	6.4	10.2	10.9	32.5	54.1	66.6	28.9
		Rate (people)	27.0	8.7	13.1	14.2	38.8	61.2	72.7	35.6
Rural	2002	Line	41.10	25.77	30.90	30.11	60.22	90.32	120.43	55.07
		Rate (households)	23.6	6.4	11.2	10.2	50.1	69.6	81.5	46.2
		Rate (people)	26.5	7.8	13.0	11.8	53.7	74.3	86.0	50.3
	2004	Line	47.57	28.12	31.48	34.14	68.28	102.42	136.56	62.44
		Rate (households)	34.4	11.2	15.9	19.0	50.7	72.1	80.9	48.0
		Rate (people)	41.2	13.9	20.4	24.1	57.1	77.9	84.8	54.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	21.3	6.0	10.1	9.5	44.3	62.2	74.8	40.8
		Rate (people)	24.6	7.1	12.1	11.2	49.2	68.0	79.8	45.7
	2004	Rate (households)	29.8	9.5	13.9	16.1	44.2	65.7	75.8	41.2
		Rate (people)	36.1	12.0	17.8	20.5	50.6	71.9	80.5	48.0

Figure A13: Benguet, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	41.92	23.46	35.25	30.71	61.41	92.12	122.82	56.16
		Rate (households)	5.1	0.7	2.4	1.5	16.3	35.9	52.6	12.9
		Rate (people)	8.0	1.0	3.9	2.6	21.6	42.9	60.5	17.8
	2004	Line	41.65	26.60	26.96	29.89	59.78	89.67	119.56	54.67
		Rate (households)	8.5	3.8	3.8	4.4	17.7	32.9	48.9	15.6
		Rate (people)	11.5	5.7	5.7	6.3	23.6	41.3	57.0	20.4
Rural	2002	Line	36.46	23.50	22.08	26.71	53.42	80.13	106.84	48.85
		Rate (households)	32.8	17.5	14.7	23.5	52.1	67.9	80.4	50.5
		Rate (people)	39.0	22.4	18.7	29.0	58.0	75.0	86.2	56.2
	2004	Line	44.17	25.93	26.74	31.70	63.40	95.10	126.80	57.98
		Rate (households)	38.1	17.8	18.2	23.5	55.4	71.6	82.7	50.8
		Rate (people)	46.7	22.5	22.9	29.6	64.7	78.8	87.8	59.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	15.7	7.1	7.1	9.9	30.0	48.1	63.3	27.3
		Rate (people)	19.8	9.1	9.5	12.6	35.4	55.1	70.3	32.4
	2004	Rate (households)	19.5	9.0	9.1	11.5	31.7	47.3	61.4	28.7
		Rate (people)	25.3	12.3	12.4	15.4	39.8	56.0	69.1	35.9

Figure A14: Bohol, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	30.33	21.26	18.50	22.22	44.43	66.65	88.87	40.63
		Rate (households)	42.4	27.9	20.7	28.6	56.3	65.7	77.5	53.3
		Rate (people)	47.6	32.9	23.5	33.4	63.8	72.8	83.1	59.7
	2004	Line	30.11	22.36	21.37	21.61	43.22	64.82	86.43	39.52
		Rate (households)	21.3	11.7	9.0	9.6	45.2	58.9	66.4	37.7
		Rate (people)	24.1	14.7	12.0	12.8	52.2	64.1	72.0	43.4
Rural	2002	Line	27.56	19.20	14.79	20.19	40.38	60.57	80.76	36.93
		Rate (households)	64.0	40.0	28.3	46.3	78.7	92.0	94.3	74.5
		Rate (people)	69.7	46.8	34.8	52.3	83.3	93.2	95.2	79.4
	2004	Line	33.47	24.44	18.77	24.02	48.04	72.06	96.08	43.93
		Rate (households)	61.6	45.8	27.7	45.1	76.6	87.8	93.0	72.4
		Rate (people)	67.3	52.5	33.6	51.6	81.4	90.1	93.8	77.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	59.1	37.2	26.6	42.2	73.5	86.0	90.5	69.6
		Rate (people)	64.6	43.5	32.2	47.9	78.7	88.4	92.4	74.8
	2004	Rate (households)	51.0	36.9	22.8	35.8	68.4	80.2	86.1	63.3
		Rate (people)	55.6	42.3	27.7	41.1	73.5	83.1	87.9	68.1

Figure A15: Bukidnon, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	30.48	21.47	16.13	22.33	44.65	66.98	89.31	40.84
		Rate (households)	32.8	23.0	14.1	23.5	47.8	61.0	67.4	45.0
		Rate (people)	40.3	29.6	19.6	30.6	55.2	67.0	71.9	52.9
	2004	Line	31.13	21.69	22.26	22.34	44.69	67.03	89.37	40.86
		Rate (households)	21.4	7.5	9.1	9.7	40.9	54.4	62.0	35.5
		Rate (people)	25.6	10.4	12.8	13.6	48.4	61.1	68.1	40.1
Rural	2002	Line	26.44	19.60	15.82	19.36	38.73	58.09	77.46	35.42
		Rate (households)	55.6	35.1	24.4	35.1	69.5	83.1	87.8	67.1
		Rate (people)	58.0	38.9	28.5	38.9	70.2	83.5	88.5	68.0
	2004	Line	35.15	23.99	22.27	25.23	50.45	75.68	100.90	46.14
		Rate (households)	54.7	27.8	23.7	30.7	72.7	86.6	91.8	69.1
		Rate (people)	64.5	37.3	32.2	39.8	78.8	89.8	93.9	76.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	48.4	31.3	21.2	31.5	62.7	76.2	81.4	60.2
		Rate (people)	52.6	36.1	25.8	36.4	65.6	78.4	83.4	63.3
	2004	Rate (households)	45.0	21.9	19.4	24.6	63.4	77.2	83.1	59.3
		Rate (people)	53.6	29.8	26.7	32.5	70.3	81.8	86.7	66.0

Figure A16: Bulacan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	<u>2005 PPP</u>			<u>1993 PPP</u>	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	40.61	25.25	30.17	29.75	59.49	89.24	118.99	54.41
		Rate (households)	10.7	3.2	5.3	5.2	27.4	48.9	68.0	22.4
		Rate (people)	12.7	3.8	6.3	6.1	32.3	55.1	73.5	26.7
	2004	Line	41.20	27.15	31.19	29.57	59.14	88.70	118.27	54.08
		Rate (households)	11.6	3.1	5.4	4.2	29.2	51.6	68.9	23.2
		Rate (people)	15.3	4.2	7.6	5.6	34.3	59.0	74.5	27.5
Rural	2002	Line	36.34	24.74	25.36	26.62	53.24	79.87	106.49	48.69
		Rate (households)	16.9	7.0	7.0	8.6	39.6	65.2	73.8	37.3
		Rate (people)	21.3	9.5	9.5	12.1	44.6	72.5	79.4	42.5
	2004	Line	44.53	28.45	40.11	31.96	63.91	95.87	127.83	58.45
		Rate (households)	9.4	1.6	4.2	1.6	33.6	61.5	78.4	20.4
		Rate (people)	11.9	2.0	5.2	2.0	41.2	69.4	85.5	26.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	12.2	4.1	5.7	6.0	30.3	52.8	69.3	25.9
		Rate (people)	14.7	5.2	7.1	7.6	35.2	59.3	74.9	30.6
	2004	Rate (households)	11.3	2.9	5.3	3.9	29.7	52.8	70.0	22.9
		Rate (people)	14.9	4.0	7.3	5.1	35.2	60.2	75.8	27.3

Figure A17: Cagayan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	<u>2005 PPP</u>			<u>1993 PPP</u>	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.27	23.20	24.74	25.10	50.20	75.30	100.40	45.91
		Rate (households)	27.8	12.7	13.4	14.2	45.4	67.9	79.3	44.6
		Rate (people)	33.5	15.5	16.7	17.8	52.6	73.8	83.9	51.9
	2004	Line	28.81	21.40	15.71	20.68	41.35	62.03	82.70	37.82
		Rate (households)	17.2	10.3	7.7	10.3	25.2	47.0	61.1	22.5
		Rate (people)	21.3	13.6	10.6	13.6	28.7	51.0	66.1	26.8
Rural	2002	Line	27.75	19.90	20.51	20.32	40.65	60.97	81.30	37.17
		Rate (households)	27.7	13.6	14.0	14.0	55.8	74.5	85.1	49.0
		Rate (people)	33.3	16.0	16.6	16.6	61.7	80.2	88.7	54.9
	2004	Line	37.24	25.06	27.60	26.72	53.45	80.17	106.90	48.88
		Rate (households)	31.8	11.9	15.0	13.4	50.4	71.1	81.2	47.2
		Rate (people)	38.2	15.1	19.1	16.9	57.2	76.3	84.8	54.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	27.7	13.5	13.9	14.0	54.2	73.5	84.2	48.4
		Rate (people)	33.4	15.9	16.6	16.8	60.3	79.2	88.0	54.5
	2004	Rate (households)	29.3	11.7	13.8	12.9	46.2	67.1	77.8	43.1
		Rate (people)	35.2	14.8	17.6	16.3	52.2	71.9	81.5	49.3

Figure A18: Camarines Norte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	38.17	24.93	23.25	27.96	55.92	83.88	111.83	51.13
		Rate (households)	44.7	24.4	19.6	27.9	60.8	72.7	83.3	59.4
		Rate (people)	52.5	31.1	24.9	34.8	67.7	79.4	88.7	66.0
	2004	Line	34.23	23.67	17.65	24.57	49.13	73.70	98.26	44.93
		Rate (households)	32.4	21.0	11.4	21.0	48.5	61.5	69.6	48.5
		Rate (people)	38.4	29.7	18.0	29.7	56.1	69.2	76.5	56.1
Rural	2002	Line	30.85	21.75	17.83	22.60	45.19	67.79	90.38	41.33
		Rate (households)	52.7	35.1	23.8	37.2	68.4	81.0	84.5	63.5
		Rate (people)	63.7	44.9	31.2	46.8	75.9	85.4	87.8	72.8
	2004	Line	44.48	28.33	23.48	31.93	63.85	95.78	127.70	58.39
		Rate (households)	71.1	44.5	29.4	49.7	83.2	90.8	92.5	78.0
		Rate (people)	79.9	57.3	39.7	62.8	88.8	95.0	95.6	85.4
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	50.6	32.3	22.7	34.8	66.4	78.8	84.2	62.4
		Rate (people)	60.8	41.3	29.6	43.7	73.8	83.8	88.0	71.1
	2004	Rate (households)	60.7	38.2	24.6	42.0	73.9	82.9	86.4	70.1
		Rate (people)	68.7	49.8	33.8	53.9	80.0	88.0	90.4	77.5

Figure A19: Camarines Sur, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	35.75	24.23	21.75	26.19	52.38	78.57	104.75	47.90
		Rate (households)	33.6	18.8	15.3	21.0	51.7	68.4	78.4	49.0
		Rate (people)	39.6	23.6	19.1	25.9	59.0	73.0	83.3	56.7
	2004	Line	33.40	23.04	25.77	23.97	47.94	71.91	95.88	43.84
		Rate (households)	17.5	7.0	8.2	7.6	32.6	58.3	69.8	27.8
		Rate (people)	22.1	9.0	10.9	9.8	40.4	65.2	74.1	34.9
Rural	2002	Line	28.46	20.73	16.26	20.85	41.70	62.55	83.40	38.13
		Rate (households)	61.0	42.0	28.5	42.4	82.2	89.5	93.1	77.8
		Rate (people)	68.8	48.2	34.3	49.3	86.8	92.0	94.5	82.4
	2004	Line	43.50	28.32	27.15	31.22	62.43	93.65	124.87	57.09
		Rate (households)	58.2	29.9	26.4	35.5	75.1	88.6	93.0	71.6
		Rate (people)	67.0	37.5	33.3	43.8	81.8	91.6	95.5	79.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	51.9	34.3	24.1	35.3	72.1	82.5	88.2	68.3
		Rate (people)	59.3	40.2	29.3	41.6	77.7	85.8	90.8	74.0
	2004	Rate (households)	49.3	24.9	22.4	29.4	65.9	82.0	87.9	62.0
		Rate (people)	57.0	31.2	28.3	36.3	72.6	85.8	90.8	69.4

Figure A20: Camiguin, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	38.98	24.75	21.37	28.55	57.11	85.66	114.22	52.22
		Rate (households)	70.9	38.4	29.9	46.9	80.7	86.1	93.7	79.5
		Rate (people)	79.5	50.7	39.6	58.4	85.8	89.1	95.9	84.7
	2004	Line	37.56	23.83	24.12	26.96	53.92	80.87	107.83	49.31
		Rate (households)	50.0	19.4	19.4	30.6	66.7	77.8	80.6	63.9
		Rate (people)	56.0	26.4	26.4	42.5	68.4	82.9	83.9	67.4
Rural	2002	Line	32.72	22.18	18.63	23.97	47.94	71.91	95.88	43.84
		Rate (households)	51.1	31.3	24.0	36.5	70.1	85.0	90.4	65.9
		Rate (people)	56.7	36.5	28.0	42.4	74.0	87.3	93.0	70.7
	2004	Line	34.05	26.19	23.29	24.44	48.88	73.32	97.77	44.70
		Rate (households)	40.0	28.6	20.0	28.6	57.1	91.4	94.3	57.1
		Rate (people)	42.9	30.6	20.0	30.6	60.0	91.2	95.9	60.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	61.2	34.9	27.0	41.8	75.4	85.6	92.1	72.8
		Rate (people)	68.3	43.7	33.9	50.5	80.0	88.2	94.4	77.8
	2004	Rate (households)	45.1	23.9	19.7	29.6	62.0	84.5	87.3	60.6
		Rate (people)	49.9	28.4	23.4	36.9	64.5	86.8	89.5	63.9

Figure A21: Capiz, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.85	21.90	22.38	24.79	49.59	74.38	99.17	45.35
		Rate (households)	25.7	10.9	12.2	14.8	40.4	54.6	63.7	39.2
		Rate (people)	30.3	12.5	14.8	18.3	46.6	60.8	69.1	45.1
	2004	Line	32.90	22.89	31.36	23.62	47.23	70.85	94.46	43.19
		Rate (households)	5.7	0.0	1.4	0.0	22.6	46.6	60.6	18.4
		Rate (people)	5.7	0.0	1.6	0.0	27.6	52.2	62.8	22.9
Rural	2002	Line	29.54	20.42	22.61	21.64	43.27	64.91	86.55	39.57
		Rate (households)	42.8	14.7	19.4	16.7	70.0	84.3	86.9	65.3
		Rate (people)	46.6	17.5	23.2	19.5	73.6	86.3	89.1	69.0
	2004	Line	35.45	22.26	24.53	25.44	50.89	76.33	101.78	46.54
		Rate (households)	31.6	10.2	13.8	16.7	57.8	76.7	86.2	54.1
		Rate (people)	41.3	14.8	20.7	24.0	67.9	82.6	89.5	64.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	37.6	13.5	17.2	16.1	60.9	75.2	79.7	57.2
		Rate (people)	41.6	16.0	20.6	19.1	65.3	78.6	83.0	61.7
	2004	Rate (households)	26.2	8.1	11.2	13.3	50.5	70.5	80.9	46.8
		Rate (people)	34.3	11.8	16.9	19.2	59.9	76.6	84.2	56.5

Figure A22: Catanduanes, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	<u>2005 PPP</u>			<u>1993 PPP</u>	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	37.05	24.63	26.14	27.14	54.28	81.42	108.56	49.64
		Rate (households)	28.8	13.4	13.4	17.3	45.0	62.5	73.6	41.3
		Rate (people)	34.8	15.9	15.9	21.1	51.9	71.0	81.4	47.5
	2004	Line	33.86	23.21	24.41	24.30	48.61	72.91	97.21	44.45
		Rate (households)	9.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	12.2	27.1	33.2	9.1
		Rate (people)	14.6	6.5	6.5	6.5	18.7	34.6	41.8	14.6
Rural	2002	Line	29.19	20.74	17.11	21.38	42.76	64.14	85.52	39.10
		Rate (households)	58.6	42.1	27.7	42.1	78.1	90.2	93.6	75.9
		Rate (people)	63.0	46.3	31.2	46.3	82.3	92.3	95.5	79.0
	2004	Line	51.40	28.46	23.79	36.89	73.78	110.68	147.57	67.47
		Rate (households)	67.3	38.6	28.4	51.9	83.7	92.8	95.9	79.6
		Rate (people)	74.5	48.6	36.4	59.5	88.6	97.0	98.3	84.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	51.1	34.9	24.2	35.9	69.8	83.2	88.6	67.2
		Rate (people)	55.8	38.6	27.3	39.9	74.6	86.9	91.9	71.0
	2004	Rate (households)	52.9	29.8	22.1	39.8	65.9	76.5	80.3	62.1
		Rate (people)	63.3	40.8	30.8	49.6	75.6	85.3	87.7	71.7

Figure A23: Cavite, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	40.69	26.31	33.80	29.80	59.61	89.41	119.22	54.51
		Rate (households)	9.5	1.4	5.1	3.1	25.6	46.2	60.7	20.0
		Rate (people)	12.2	1.7	6.1	3.6	30.4	52.4	66.8	24.7
	2004	Line	47.77	30.10	39.32	34.29	68.57	102.86	137.15	62.71
		Rate (households)	11.3	2.9	5.5	3.4	25.5	48.7	61.2	20.7
		Rate (people)	16.1	4.3	8.0	5.1	33.2	58.3	69.5	27.5
Rural	2002	Line	44.49	27.91	34.11	32.59	65.19	97.78	130.37	59.61
		Rate (households)	18.3	4.9	8.3	6.1	38.1	61.8	79.0	34.1
		Rate (people)	21.9	6.2	9.6	7.4	43.5	65.1	83.0	39.3
	2004	Line	44.26	27.76	30.60	31.77	63.54	95.30	127.07	58.10
		Rate (households)	21.9	10.0	10.4	11.4	37.2	53.6	67.1	33.4
		Rate (people)	26.9	12.3	13.0	14.9	44.5	63.5	77.1	40.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	11.7	2.3	5.9	3.8	28.7	50.1	65.3	23.5
		Rate (people)	14.5	2.8	6.9	4.5	33.5	55.3	70.6	28.1
	2004	Rate (households)	13.4	4.3	6.5	5.0	27.8	49.6	62.4	23.2
		Rate (people)	18.2	5.8	9.0	7.0	35.4	59.3	71.0	29.9

Figure A24: Cebu, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	30.00	20.77	22.19	21.98	43.95	65.93	87.90	40.19
		Rate (households)	15.3	6.5	7.9	7.9	33.0	52.5	66.5	28.0
		Rate (people)	18.3	7.5	9.1	9.1	37.7	58.7	72.1	32.7
	2004	Line	28.04	20.19	19.21	20.12	40.24	60.36	80.49	36.80
		Rate (households)	6.1	3.3	2.9	3.3	16.3	33.8	47.4	12.8
		Rate (people)	7.7	4.4	3.8	4.4	20.5	40.6	55.1	15.9
Rural	2002	Line	26.90	18.54	17.80	19.70	39.40	59.11	78.81	36.03
		Rate (households)	45.7	25.2	22.8	27.9	63.4	81.8	88.0	59.5
		Rate (people)	51.4	28.6	25.2	31.8	68.6	85.0	89.8	64.9
	2004	Line	34.11	23.39	21.99	24.48	48.97	73.45	97.93	44.78
		Rate (households)	47.1	24.5	21.5	27.4	65.8	82.9	88.8	60.8
		Rate (people)	54.4	30.7	27.1	33.7	72.7	88.1	93.0	68.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	28.4	14.5	14.3	16.5	46.0	65.1	75.7	41.5
		Rate (people)	31.7	16.0	15.6	18.3	50.2	69.3	79.2	45.7
	2004	Rate (households)	21.6	11.3	9.9	12.4	35.0	52.3	63.0	30.9
		Rate (people)	25.2	14.2	12.5	15.4	40.0	58.4	69.3	35.5

Figure A25: Davao del Norte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	31.91	22.61	22.88	23.38	46.75	70.13	93.51	42.75
		Rate (households)	25.6	10.2	10.8	12.8	50.3	64.8	76.7	43.7
		Rate (people)	31.2	14.9	15.6	18.0	57.4	72.0	83.4	52.0
	2004	Line	35.89	25.20	30.11	25.76	51.51	77.27	103.03	47.11
		Rate (households)	16.7	4.8	8.2	4.8	31.8	51.3	62.7	28.1
		Rate (people)	22.0	6.1	10.8	6.1	39.6	58.2	67.4	35.4
Rural	2002	Line	31.24	21.27	19.33	22.88	45.76	68.64	91.52	41.85
		Rate (households)	49.2	25.5	22.5	28.1	66.8	86.0	93.4	61.0
		Rate (people)	56.3	31.6	28.1	33.6	72.6	88.4	94.6	68.1
	2004	Line	42.19	26.96	24.62	30.28	60.56	90.84	121.13	55.38
		Rate (households)	53.1	28.9	23.1	35.7	75.4	91.0	94.9	69.6
		Rate (people)	60.3	36.4	29.6	43.3	80.0	93.8	96.3	74.7
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	42.5	21.1	19.2	23.7	62.1	80.0	88.6	56.1
		Rate (people)	49.1	26.8	24.5	29.1	68.2	83.7	91.4	63.4
	2004	Rate (households)	39.6	19.9	17.6	24.2	59.1	76.2	82.9	54.1
		Rate (people)	46.2	25.2	22.7	29.6	65.1	80.7	85.6	60.2

Figure A26: Davao del Sur, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.13	22.42	24.81	25.00	50.00	75.00	100.00	45.72
		Rate (households)	17.0	6.4	8.6	8.9	33.2	55.3	66.2	29.3
		Rate (people)	21.2	7.2	10.3	10.7	39.5	61.6	71.6	35.7
	2004	Line	30.94	22.32	21.85	22.21	44.41	66.62	88.82	40.61
		Rate (households)	9.9	5.1	4.9	5.1	20.7	41.4	57.8	17.2
		Rate (people)	13.2	6.7	6.4	6.7	25.8	47.2	63.2	21.5
Rural	2002	Line	27.16	20.26	17.56	19.89	39.79	59.68	79.57	36.38
		Rate (households)	42.0	23.8	18.8	23.8	59.2	76.6	84.4	56.4
		Rate (people)	44.9	27.2	22.4	27.2	62.8	79.2	85.8	59.9
	2004	Line	41.69	26.10	23.72	29.92	59.85	89.77	119.69	54.73
		Rate (households)	48.6	26.7	22.9	32.4	64.1	81.5	88.1	59.6
		Rate (people)	54.9	31.5	27.4	37.8	69.5	85.9	91.4	65.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	29.7	15.2	13.8	16.5	46.4	66.1	75.5	43.1
		Rate (people)	33.1	17.2	16.4	19.0	51.2	70.5	78.7	47.8
	2004	Rate (households)	30.5	16.6	14.5	19.6	43.8	62.7	73.9	39.8
		Rate (people)	36.0	20.3	17.9	23.7	49.7	68.4	78.6	45.3

Figure A27: Davao Oriental, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.59	23.90	27.64	25.34	50.67	76.01	101.34	46.34
		Rate (households)	33.5	12.9	16.4	15.0	53.9	67.9	77.6	48.3
		Rate (people)	36.2	14.1	17.9	16.3	57.5	71.8	81.3	52.0
	2004	Line	29.79	22.39	15.63	21.38	42.76	64.15	85.53	39.11
		Rate (households)	8.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	24.3	36.3	48.1	20.3
		Rate (people)	8.7	8.7	0.0	8.7	27.1	38.9	49.0	23.2
Rural	2002	Line	28.19	20.53	19.76	20.65	41.30	61.95	82.60	37.77
		Rate (households)	33.5	16.3	14.2	16.3	60.4	79.5	88.8	55.2
		Rate (people)	39.5	21.3	18.5	21.3	68.7	86.7	93.4	62.6
	2004	Line	35.88	25.94	21.63	25.75	51.51	77.26	103.01	47.10
		Rate (households)	62.0	37.4	25.6	36.4	80.6	91.6	95.8	74.2
		Rate (people)	71.0	48.0	35.2	46.9	86.2	93.8	96.7	81.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	33.5	15.4	14.8	16.0	58.6	76.3	85.8	53.3
		Rate (people)	38.5	19.1	18.3	19.8	65.3	82.2	89.7	59.4
	2004	Rate (households)	56.4	34.4	22.9	33.5	74.8	85.9	90.8	68.6
		Rate (people)	64.4	43.9	31.5	42.9	79.9	88.0	91.7	75.1

Figure A28: Eastern Samar, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	29.09	20.76	18.89	21.31	42.62	63.92	85.23	38.97
		Rate (households)	35.3	22.2	17.6	22.6	47.1	62.4	72.1	43.2
		Rate (people)	41.2	25.3	20.5	25.9	54.2	70.2	79.7	49.9
	2004	Line	31.88	22.88	24.45	22.88	45.77	68.65	91.54	41.85
		Rate (households)	31.1	13.3	15.2	13.3	48.5	66.3	75.1	46.6
		Rate (people)	37.1	16.4	18.3	16.4	56.3	72.1	81.0	53.7
Rural	2002	Line	26.55	21.12	16.89	19.45	38.89	58.34	77.79	35.57
		Rate (households)	65.5	50.0	27.7	42.6	88.7	95.1	97.6	86.4
		Rate (people)	73.6	59.5	36.1	51.5	91.4	97.3	98.8	90.7
	2004	Line	28.61	22.45	24.40	20.53	41.07	61.60	82.14	37.56
		Rate (households)	37.0	16.0	17.9	12.8	58.6	81.5	87.8	51.5
		Rate (people)	47.5	20.7	22.8	17.7	66.7	86.7	91.3	60.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	56.1	41.4	24.6	36.4	75.8	85.0	89.7	73.0
		Rate (people)	63.1	48.4	31.0	43.2	79.3	88.5	92.6	77.4
	2004	Rate (households)	34.7	14.9	16.8	13.0	54.6	75.4	82.8	49.5
		Rate (people)	43.5	19.0	21.1	17.2	62.7	81.1	87.4	58.1

Figure A29: Ifugao, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.58	24.64	22.63	26.80	53.60	80.40	107.19	49.01
		Rate (households)	16.9	9.3	7.3	12.6	24.2	39.1	52.9	21.1
		Rate (people)	16.6	10.4	8.0	13.0	23.2	38.9	53.5	20.4
	2004	Line	38.37	25.79	33.56	27.54	55.08	82.62	110.16	50.37
		Rate (households)	18.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	35.9	53.5	59.3	32.9
		Rate (people)	16.9	0.0	6.2	0.0	37.7	59.6	67.3	33.1
Rural	2002	Line	33.78	24.27	15.95	24.75	49.49	74.24	98.98	45.26
		Rate (households)	70.2	53.9	33.5	53.9	79.0	89.0	93.4	76.8
		Rate (people)	74.0	57.6	36.3	57.6	82.1	90.6	93.3	80.1
	2004	Line	63.92	26.75	28.32	45.87	91.74	137.62	183.49	83.90
		Rate (households)	79.1	28.0	32.4	62.4	87.8	92.7	97.6	85.3
		Rate (people)	80.3	36.2	39.8	66.7	88.3	93.0	98.3	85.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	64.2	48.9	30.5	49.2	72.8	83.4	88.8	70.5
		Rate (people)	67.3	52.1	33.0	52.4	75.2	84.6	88.7	73.2
	2004	Rate (households)	68.4	23.1	28.3	51.5	78.7	85.8	90.9	76.1
		Rate (people)	68.4	29.4	33.5	54.2	78.8	86.7	92.4	76.0

Figure A30: Ilocos Norte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.10	25.07	25.70	26.44	52.88	79.32	105.77	48.36
		Rate (households)	24.6	12.8	12.8	13.9	35.1	46.6	58.0	34.0
		Rate (people)	26.5	12.3	12.3	13.2	36.5	51.9	63.9	35.0
	2004	Line	36.55	27.23	28.09	26.23	52.47	78.70	104.93	47.98
		Rate (households)	17.0	6.1	7.1	5.1	30.9	46.8	63.7	26.8
		Rate (people)	21.2	8.7	10.0	7.6	34.0	50.2	69.0	30.5
Rural	2002	Line	37.50	25.47	25.27	27.47	54.94	82.41	109.88	50.24
		Rate (households)	37.3	18.8	18.1	25.5	61.3	74.9	85.6	55.5
		Rate (people)	37.5	19.4	18.6	25.5	63.1	76.2	87.0	57.8
	2004	Line	41.92	26.70	27.08	30.09	60.17	90.26	120.35	55.03
		Rate (households)	38.0	16.8	17.2	22.2	60.7	81.8	90.1	54.2
		Rate (people)	47.4	22.1	23.1	30.0	70.2	88.9	94.5	64.4
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	33.8	17.1	16.7	22.3	54.1	67.0	78.0	49.5
		Rate (people)	34.6	17.6	17.0	22.3	56.2	69.9	81.0	51.8
	2004	Rate (households)	31.8	13.7	14.2	17.2	51.9	71.5	82.3	46.1
		Rate (people)	39.8	18.2	19.3	23.5	59.6	77.6	87.1	54.5

Figure A31: Ilocos Sur, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.98	23.78	25.71	25.62	51.25	76.87	102.50	46.87
		Rate (households)	21.0	9.6	9.6	9.6	33.1	52.8	66.0	28.8
		Rate (people)	23.7	11.2	11.2	11.2	37.0	55.3	69.4	33.1
	2004	Line	37.47	26.77	16.71	26.89	53.79	80.68	107.57	49.19
		Rate (households)	16.1	11.0	6.1	12.3	36.6	53.6	70.2	35.4
		Rate (people)	18.9	13.2	9.2	13.8	41.6	59.6	77.5	40.4
Rural	2002	Line	39.36	26.13	22.81	28.84	57.67	86.51	115.34	52.74
		Rate (households)	38.8	25.0	19.2	28.4	61.7	78.5	84.8	56.1
		Rate (people)	43.6	27.9	21.4	32.4	66.6	82.7	89.0	60.5
	2004	Line	37.61	26.29	27.18	26.99	53.99	80.98	107.97	49.37
		Rate (households)	28.8	12.4	14.0	14.0	52.5	77.0	83.8	45.0
		Rate (people)	35.5	15.3	17.1	17.1	58.0	79.1	85.1	51.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	34.8	21.6	17.1	24.2	55.3	72.8	80.6	50.0
		Rate (people)	39.5	24.5	19.3	28.0	60.5	77.1	84.9	54.9
	2004	Rate (households)	25.8	12.1	12.1	13.6	48.7	71.4	80.5	42.7
		Rate (people)	31.5	14.8	15.3	16.4	54.1	74.4	83.3	48.7

Figure A32: Iloilo, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	35.47	23.61	25.69	25.99	51.97	77.96	103.94	47.53
		Rate (households)	13.4	4.6	6.0	6.5	28.9	47.6	58.0	24.0
		Rate (people)	15.3	6.0	7.3	7.9	31.7	50.7	61.0	26.5
	2004	Line	38.08	24.61	29.50	27.33	54.66	81.99	109.32	49.98
		Rate (households)	12.4	4.8	5.8	5.5	32.9	55.2	68.0	29.1
		Rate (people)	15.0	5.7	7.4	6.9	36.3	58.0	70.4	32.7
Rural	2002	Line	33.78	23.00	21.53	24.74	49.48	74.22	98.97	45.25
		Rate (households)	48.6	25.8	22.1	30.5	70.3	83.9	89.7	66.4
		Rate (people)	55.8	32.1	27.8	37.5	75.5	87.0	91.7	72.0
	2004	Line	38.45	23.92	23.01	27.59	55.19	82.78	110.37	50.47
		Rate (households)	51.1	24.2	21.9	30.8	69.9	84.3	89.1	65.4
		Rate (people)	58.7	31.4	29.2	38.6	75.0	86.9	91.2	71.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	35.5	17.9	16.1	21.6	54.9	70.4	77.9	50.6
		Rate (people)	40.7	22.4	20.2	26.5	59.2	73.5	80.3	55.1
	2004	Rate (households)	39.6	18.4	17.1	23.3	58.9	75.6	82.8	54.6
		Rate (people)	45.9	23.9	22.8	29.3	63.7	78.5	85.1	60.0

Figure A33: Isabela, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	40.78	24.16	25.52	29.87	59.74	89.61	119.48	54.63
		Rate (households)	19.7	7.3	9.0	11.3	32.4	53.5	69.3	30.2
		Rate (people)	24.0	9.9	11.6	14.8	36.3	56.6	73.8	34.5
	2004	Line	32.71	22.65	26.29	23.47	46.95	70.42	93.90	42.93
		Rate (households)	13.7	5.6	6.9	6.0	27.4	47.4	60.3	24.9
		Rate (people)	17.7	7.2	8.4	7.3	32.9	52.6	65.4	29.8
Rural	2002	Line	31.01	21.42	20.44	22.71	45.42	68.14	90.85	41.54
		Rate (households)	35.7	19.5	16.6	20.8	55.3	71.8	79.5	51.2
		Rate (people)	40.7	23.2	20.3	24.6	60.1	75.9	82.5	55.5
	2004	Line	37.01	26.28	24.91	26.56	53.12	79.68	106.24	48.58
		Rate (households)	34.0	17.2	15.2	17.3	56.7	73.2	82.3	50.8
		Rate (people)	40.3	22.2	20.0	22.4	63.2	78.3	86.5	57.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	32.0	16.7	14.9	18.7	50.1	67.7	77.2	46.4
		Rate (people)	36.8	20.1	18.3	22.3	54.6	71.5	80.5	50.7
	2004	Rate (households)	29.0	14.3	13.2	14.5	49.4	66.8	76.9	44.4
		Rate (people)	34.7	18.5	17.1	18.7	55.7	72.0	81.3	50.9

Figure A34: Kalinga, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.23	22.02	22.11	24.34	48.68	73.02	97.36	44.52
		Rate (households)	20.1	9.1	9.1	13.6	48.3	63.4	67.4	39.2
		Rate (people)	19.7	8.6	8.6	12.6	49.3	66.6	70.7	40.2
	2004	Line	39.87	26.01	21.84	28.62	57.23	85.85	114.46	52.34
		Rate (households)	30.7	17.6	12.4	23.1	44.6	58.2	76.9	44.6
		Rate (people)	41.7	24.1	18.5	30.2	53.2	65.7	80.1	53.2
Rural	2002	Line	31.42	22.50	17.81	23.02	46.04	69.05	92.07	42.10
		Rate (households)	45.3	35.4	21.1	35.4	60.4	72.8	79.5	55.2
		Rate (people)	47.2	37.5	22.9	37.5	63.0	74.7	81.1	58.4
	2004	Line	41.37	26.33	22.48	29.69	59.38	89.07	118.77	54.30
		Rate (households)	63.6	42.9	29.7	49.5	81.8	93.1	96.9	78.2
		Rate (people)	69.7	49.3	34.6	57.2	84.9	94.7	97.8	80.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	40.2	30.1	18.7	31.0	58.0	70.9	77.1	52.0
		Rate (people)	41.4	31.4	19.9	32.3	60.1	73.1	78.9	54.6
	2004	Rate (households)	57.2	37.9	26.3	44.3	74.5	86.3	93.0	71.6
		Rate (people)	64.5	44.6	31.6	52.1	79.0	89.3	94.5	75.7

Figure A35: La Union, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.75	23.80	26.52	26.92	53.85	80.77	107.69	49.24
		Rate (households)	15.9	6.7	6.7	7.2	27.1	46.1	57.0	24.3
		Rate (people)	20.1	9.0	9.0	10.1	31.5	52.8	61.9	28.2
	2004	Line	39.79	26.98	30.93	28.56	57.11	85.67	114.23	52.23
		Rate (households)	22.0	7.1	10.4	8.4	35.7	55.7	71.3	34.4
		Rate (people)	27.3	10.5	13.4	11.3	43.2	61.9	77.3	41.9
Rural	2002	Line	36.12	24.37	21.10	26.46	52.91	79.37	105.83	48.39
		Rate (households)	44.5	27.1	22.2	31.5	61.9	78.6	85.0	59.3
		Rate (people)	47.6	29.9	23.8	34.6	65.3	83.0	88.2	63.3
	2004	Line	41.00	27.03	29.32	29.42	58.85	88.27	117.70	53.81
		Rate (households)	36.4	13.5	17.4	17.8	54.7	74.0	84.5	51.6
		Rate (people)	45.1	18.5	22.3	22.8	61.9	79.3	87.8	58.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	37.6	22.2	18.5	25.6	53.5	70.8	78.2	50.8
		Rate (people)	41.1	24.9	20.3	28.8	57.2	75.8	81.9	54.9
	2004	Rate (households)	30.6	10.9	14.6	14.0	47.0	66.6	79.2	44.7
		Rate (people)	37.7	15.2	18.7	18.0	54.2	72.1	83.4	51.8

Figure A36: Laguna, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	38.76	25.46	30.68	28.39	56.78	85.18	113.57	51.93
		Rate (households)	10.7	2.7	5.0	4.0	24.8	44.6	58.9	21.4
		Rate (people)	12.7	3.7	6.3	5.0	28.7	49.0	63.4	24.8
	2004	Line	37.84	25.47	30.68	27.16	54.31	81.47	108.63	49.67
		Rate (households)	8.0	2.1	3.7	2.8	19.6	39.7	53.3	15.2
		Rate (people)	10.9	3.3	5.3	4.3	24.0	45.5	59.0	19.3
Rural	2002	Line	33.73	23.65	23.88	24.71	49.42	74.13	98.84	45.19
		Rate (households)	20.5	10.0	10.0	10.3	37.3	63.1	86.6	35.5
		Rate (people)	26.3	12.6	12.6	13.3	43.9	68.0	88.2	42.3
	2004	Line	41.95	26.80	33.45	30.11	60.22	90.32	120.43	55.07
		Rate (households)	19.3	2.1	9.5	7.1	38.8	62.9	78.7	35.3
		Rate (people)	22.1	2.5	10.8	7.9	44.2	69.6	83.4	40.4
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	12.8	4.3	6.1	5.3	27.5	48.6	64.9	24.4
		Rate (people)	15.7	5.7	7.7	6.8	32.0	53.2	68.8	28.6
	2004	Rate (households)	10.5	2.1	5.0	3.7	23.8	44.8	58.9	19.6
		Rate (people)	13.3	3.1	6.5	5.1	28.4	50.7	64.3	23.9

Figure A37: Lanao del Norte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.95	22.83	21.77	24.87	49.74	74.62	99.49	45.49
		Rate (households)	26.4	15.2	12.8	16.2	44.5	61.8	71.5	38.1
		Rate (people)	30.4	18.3	15.2	19.3	50.2	67.1	76.1	44.3
	2004	Line	34.01	23.66	21.83	24.41	48.82	73.23	97.64	44.64
		Rate (households)	31.1	19.3	13.8	22.1	49.0	62.5	69.0	47.2
		Rate (people)	35.3	22.7	17.1	25.4	52.4	64.6	70.3	50.5
Rural	2002	Line	31.86	21.57	16.82	23.34	46.68	70.02	93.36	42.69
		Rate (households)	56.8	40.6	25.6	44.7	72.6	82.7	89.5	69.6
		Rate (people)	60.1	45.2	29.9	49.1	73.8	83.7	91.4	71.3
	2004	Line	40.25	27.34	19.42	28.89	57.78	86.67	115.56	52.84
		Rate (households)	62.3	46.0	27.5	48.2	74.0	83.8	89.5	71.2
		Rate (people)	68.5	53.6	34.0	55.5	79.3	87.7	92.3	76.5
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	49.6	34.6	22.6	37.9	65.9	77.7	85.2	62.2
		Rate (people)	53.0	38.8	26.4	42.0	68.2	79.7	87.7	64.9
	2004	Rate (households)	54.2	39.1	23.9	41.4	67.5	78.3	84.2	64.9
		Rate (people)	59.6	45.3	29.5	47.4	72.1	81.5	86.4	69.5

Figure A38: Lanao del Sur, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.87	24.56	23.73	27.01	54.02	81.03	108.05	49.40
		Rate (households)	34.0	19.0	16.4	20.3	55.0	70.8	84.8	50.5
		Rate (people)	37.8	21.5	18.5	23.2	59.5	74.8	87.9	55.2
	2004	Line	37.87	25.50	22.03	27.18	54.35	81.53	108.71	49.70
		Rate (households)	40.6	22.7	16.5	25.4	54.0	73.0	85.1	50.7
		Rate (people)	42.3	26.2	20.6	29.2	57.2	77.0	87.3	53.8
Rural	2002	Line	40.34	24.31	27.00	29.55	59.10	88.66	118.21	54.05
		Rate (households)	57.2	20.7	27.1	32.8	74.8	87.2	94.0	72.5
		Rate (people)	61.4	23.3	30.4	36.8	78.6	90.1	95.4	76.1
	2004	Line	41.38	27.52	28.13	29.70	59.39	89.09	118.79	54.31
		Rate (households)	47.2	20.3	21.2	24.5	65.8	84.5	89.2	64.0
		Rate (people)	55.1	26.1	27.2	30.4	72.9	89.3	92.6	69.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	48.7	20.1	23.1	28.2	67.5	81.1	90.6	64.4
		Rate (people)	52.9	22.6	26.1	31.9	71.7	84.6	92.7	68.5
	2004	Rate (households)	44.6	21.3	19.3	24.9	61.1	79.9	87.6	58.8
		Rate (people)	50.0	26.2	24.6	29.9	66.6	84.4	90.5	63.4

Figure A39: Leyte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	29.15	21.11	19.90	21.35	42.70	64.06	85.41	39.05
		Rate (households)	21.1	10.0	9.2	10.2	37.3	51.0	60.8	34.4
		Rate (people)	23.9	12.6	11.8	12.8	42.8	58.3	66.9	39.4
	2004	Line	30.99	22.07	22.35	22.24	44.49	66.73	88.97	40.68
		Rate (households)	19.2	8.9	9.1	9.1	35.0	52.0	63.5	31.2
		Rate (people)	24.7	12.0	12.1	12.1	43.2	59.5	69.0	39.6
Rural	2002	Line	28.66	21.03	16.99	20.99	41.99	62.98	83.97	38.39
		Rate (households)	55.6	36.9	26.0	36.9	77.0	87.2	91.6	73.0
		Rate (people)	63.0	45.4	31.5	45.4	82.2	90.0	93.8	78.1
	2004	Line	33.66	23.16	21.14	24.16	48.31	72.47	96.62	44.18
		Rate (households)	48.5	27.7	22.3	28.9	68.9	84.3	90.6	63.8
		Rate (people)	57.8	35.2	28.8	36.8	76.2	89.1	93.4	72.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	43.7	27.6	20.3	27.7	63.4	74.8	81.0	59.8
		Rate (people)	50.1	34.5	24.9	34.6	69.1	79.5	84.9	65.3
	2004	Rate (households)	38.1	21.0	17.6	21.9	56.8	72.8	80.9	52.2
		Rate (people)	46.1	27.0	22.9	28.0	64.5	78.6	84.7	60.5

Figure A40: Maguindanao, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	<u>2005 PPP</u>			<u>1993 PPP</u>	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	39.03	24.78	24.69	28.59	57.19	85.78	114.37	52.29
		Rate (households)	32.1	15.9	15.6	20.9	51.3	66.9	78.7	44.2
		Rate (people)	37.1	18.7	18.6	25.0	56.3	70.2	82.1	50.0
	2004	Line	35.57	24.48	23.77	25.53	51.05	76.58	102.11	46.69
		Rate (households)	62.2	31.7	30.7	31.7	82.7	90.4	97.1	79.7
		Rate (people)	68.3	34.8	33.9	34.8	85.9	92.6	96.8	84.1
Rural	2002	Line	32.87	23.21	17.63	24.08	48.15	72.23	96.30	44.03
		Rate (households)	64.8	44.0	29.5	45.9	83.6	93.0	96.8	80.8
		Rate (people)	69.3	49.8	34.4	52.1	86.1	93.7	97.4	83.6
	2004	Line	37.88	26.94	22.58	27.18	54.37	81.55	108.74	49.72
		Rate (households)	71.5	45.7	33.5	46.5	87.2	94.9	96.6	83.3
		Rate (people)	77.7	52.4	38.8	53.4	90.9	96.5	97.6	88.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	53.7	34.5	24.8	37.4	72.7	84.2	90.7	68.4
		Rate (people)	58.4	39.2	29.0	42.9	76.0	85.8	92.2	72.2
	2004	Rate (households)	69.8	43.1	33.0	43.8	86.4	94.0	96.7	82.7
		Rate (people)	75.8	48.9	37.8	49.6	89.9	95.7	97.4	87.2

Figure A41: 1st District (Manila), poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	45.19	26.69	36.40	33.11	66.21	99.32	132.43	60.55
		Rate (households)	7.6	0.9	3.4	2.3	20.0	42.6	55.7	16.3
		Rate (people)	11.0	1.3	5.2	3.6	25.0	50.2	64.3	21.8
	2004	Line	49.54	28.85	42.21	35.55	71.11	106.66	142.22	65.03
		Rate (households)	3.6	0.5	1.5	1.1	10.9	30.1	46.0	8.4
		Rate (people)	6.0	0.9	2.8	2.2	16.0	37.1	55.0	12.1
Rural	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	7.6	0.9	3.4	2.3	20.0	42.6	55.7	16.3
		Rate (people)	11.0	1.3	5.2	3.6	25.0	50.2	64.3	21.8
	2004	Rate (households)	3.6	0.5	1.5	1.1	10.9	30.1	46.0	8.4
		Rate (people)	6.0	0.9	2.8	2.2	16.0	37.1	55.0	12.1

Figure A42: Marinduque, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.70	23.96	23.25	24.69	49.37	74.06	98.75	45.15
		Rate (households)	24.0	12.0	10.8	13.1	42.3	53.1	66.4	35.7
		Rate (people)	30.9	16.3	14.7	17.2	49.3	59.5	69.9	43.3
	2004	Line	35.48	24.79	32.20	25.46	50.92	76.39	101.85	46.57
		Rate (households)	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	18.8	50.0	6.3
		Rate (people)	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	27.9	57.4	10.3
Rural	2002	Line	31.89	22.42	21.63	23.36	46.72	70.08	93.43	42.72
		Rate (households)	46.7	25.6	21.6	27.7	74.9	87.3	94.4	69.2
		Rate (people)	55.7	31.8	27.3	34.8	81.0	88.7	95.2	76.1
	2004	Line	35.48	24.79	23.51	25.46	50.92	76.39	101.85	46.57
		Rate (households)	53.6	28.9	23.0	30.1	77.7	87.6	90.0	72.9
		Rate (people)	60.5	36.3	29.9	37.6	83.7	91.3	92.5	79.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	43.2	23.5	20.0	25.4	69.9	82.0	90.1	64.1
		Rate (people)	52.0	29.5	25.4	32.2	76.3	84.3	91.4	71.1
	2004	Rate (households)	49.5	26.4	21.0	27.5	71.5	81.7	86.5	67.2
		Rate (people)	56.5	33.4	27.5	34.6	77.8	86.2	89.7	73.8

Figure A43: Masbate, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	37.76	26.12	21.37	27.66	55.33	82.99	110.65	50.60
		Rate (households)	48.3	35.2	22.7	36.8	65.0	80.2	84.9	61.7
		Rate (people)	52.2	38.1	25.3	40.1	71.3	83.8	88.5	67.6
	2004	Line	36.42	24.96	26.73	26.14	52.27	78.41	104.55	47.80
		Rate (households)	17.9	6.7	7.8	7.8	39.3	58.3	80.8	34.8
		Rate (people)	26.1	11.3	12.7	12.7	47.3	66.3	81.7	43.0
Rural	2002	Line	29.87	22.41	18.30	21.88	43.76	65.64	87.53	40.02
		Rate (households)	63.3	42.3	27.6	39.0	80.3	92.3	96.6	79.4
		Rate (people)	70.7	50.3	34.8	46.8	85.3	94.9	98.2	84.7
	2004	Line	41.15	27.85	20.84	29.53	59.06	88.59	118.12	54.01
		Rate (households)	66.8	47.4	29.0	49.9	80.9	90.0	93.6	79.1
		Rate (people)	76.7	58.9	38.0	60.8	87.4	93.2	95.6	86.4
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	60.4	40.9	26.6	38.6	77.3	89.9	94.3	75.9
		Rate (people)	67.0	47.8	32.9	45.4	82.5	92.7	96.2	81.3
	2004	Rate (households)	54.8	37.5	23.8	39.6	70.7	82.3	90.5	68.3
		Rate (people)	65.4	48.3	32.4	50.1	78.5	87.2	92.5	76.7

Figure A44: Misamis Occidental, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	32.60	22.77	19.64	23.88	47.76	71.64	95.51	43.67
		Rate (households)	37.8	21.3	17.8	23.4	48.3	64.0	72.5	44.9
		Rate (people)	40.3	24.4	19.8	26.7	51.0	68.1	76.5	47.4
	2004	Line	32.32	22.24	25.45	23.19	46.39	69.58	92.78	42.42
		Rate (households)	33.7	9.3	14.3	11.3	48.0	62.2	71.4	42.9
		Rate (people)	40.5	12.8	19.3	15.3	55.3	67.8	77.2	50.4
Rural	2002	Line	27.62	20.21	17.26	20.23	40.46	60.70	80.93	37.00
		Rate (households)	53.2	33.1	23.1	33.1	75.9	85.9	92.5	71.5
		Rate (people)	57.2	38.4	28.4	38.4	78.6	87.3	93.6	73.8
	2004	Line	39.60	25.61	21.78	28.42	56.84	85.26	113.68	51.98
		Rate (households)	66.7	41.4	30.5	47.4	82.3	89.0	94.2	79.2
		Rate (people)	75.3	50.7	37.6	57.1	88.0	92.9	96.8	84.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	49.2	30.0	21.7	30.5	68.7	80.1	87.3	64.6
		Rate (people)	52.6	34.6	26.1	35.2	71.1	82.0	88.9	66.6
	2004	Rate (households)	57.0	32.0	25.8	36.8	72.3	81.2	87.6	68.6
		Rate (people)	65.4	39.9	32.4	45.3	78.7	85.8	91.2	74.6

Figure A45: Misamis Oriental, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.65	22.73	23.15	25.39	50.77	76.16	101.54	46.43
		Rate (households)	26.7	12.8	13.0	15.7	43.8	59.6	70.2	40.2
		Rate (people)	31.1	15.4	15.5	18.6	49.4	65.3	74.5	45.1
	2004	Line	31.75	22.46	22.54	22.79	45.57	68.36	91.14	41.67
		Rate (households)	21.7	10.3	10.3	10.5	34.4	51.4	63.2	31.1
		Rate (people)	25.3	12.4	12.4	12.8	39.0	55.8	68.8	36.2
Rural	2002	Line	31.53	21.13	19.23	23.10	46.19	69.29	92.38	42.24
		Rate (households)	60.1	33.5	27.9	41.8	82.1	88.6	94.2	76.6
		Rate (people)	65.3	38.3	32.1	47.3	84.4	91.3	94.8	79.2
	2004	Line	36.87	24.74	22.51	26.46	52.92	79.38	105.84	48.40
		Rate (households)	63.0	36.7	28.0	42.1	79.3	88.8	92.7	75.2
		Rate (people)	70.7	44.8	34.9	50.3	85.9	92.7	94.7	82.7
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	38.2	19.9	18.2	24.7	57.0	69.6	78.5	52.7
		Rate (people)	42.6	23.0	21.1	28.2	61.1	74.0	81.3	56.5
	2004	Rate (households)	36.6	19.9	16.7	21.9	50.7	64.9	73.8	47.0
		Rate (people)	41.9	24.2	20.6	26.5	56.1	69.2	78.3	53.1

Figure A46: Mountain Province, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	46.70	27.93	27.27	34.21	68.41	102.62	136.82	62.56
		Rate (households)	29.2	16.7	12.5	25.0	38.3	55.7	81.8	29.2
		Rate (people)	30.6	21.0	11.3	24.2	40.3	58.0	85.1	30.6
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	2002	Line	40.72	26.99	17.35	29.83	59.66	89.49	119.32	54.56
		Rate (households)	68.3	49.2	29.5	53.3	76.8	83.7	90.7	74.0
		Rate (people)	73.6	55.7	35.9	59.5	79.9	84.3	91.1	77.7
	2004	Line	37.81	29.30	15.86	27.14	54.27	81.41	108.55	49.63
		Rate (households)	55.0	44.1	21.9	41.8	69.2	77.7	83.8	66.2
		Rate (people)	64.1	53.6	31.7	52.0	75.6	82.5	88.5	72.6
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	66.5	47.7	28.8	52.0	75.0	82.4	90.3	71.9
		Rate (people)	71.4	53.9	34.6	57.7	77.8	82.9	90.8	75.2
	2004	Rate (households)	55.0	44.1	21.9	41.8	69.2	77.7	83.8	66.2
		Rate (people)	64.1	53.6	31.7	52.0	75.6	82.5	88.5	72.6

Figure A47: Negros Occidental, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	International				
						2005 PPP	1993 PPP			
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	31.53	22.22	21.68	23.09	46.19	69.28	92.38	42.24
		Rate (households)	23.5	12.2	10.9	14.1	40.2	60.2	70.9	36.2
		Rate (people)	28.7	15.9	14.3	17.9	46.7	66.6	76.5	42.3
	2004	Line	35.92	25.19	24.66	25.78	51.56	77.35	103.13	47.15
		Rate (households)	19.9	10.0	9.1	10.6	36.0	55.4	69.7	32.8
		Rate (people)	26.3	14.3	13.1	15.2	44.1	62.8	75.0	40.6
Rural	2002	Line	31.41	22.76	21.63	23.01	46.01	69.02	92.02	42.08
		Rate (households)	48.6	24.9	21.9	24.9	68.0	86.5	90.9	63.9
		Rate (people)	58.2	32.1	28.8	32.1	76.1	89.9	93.0	72.2
	2004	Line	33.46	23.50	24.09	24.02	48.03	72.05	96.07	43.93
		Rate (households)	37.6	16.5	17.9	17.9	61.7	80.1	88.0	56.9
		Rate (people)	46.2	21.3	23.0	23.0	69.0	85.3	90.8	64.4
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	36.7	18.9	16.7	19.8	54.9	74.1	81.4	50.8
		Rate (people)	43.9	24.2	21.8	25.2	61.8	78.6	84.9	57.7
	2004	Rate (households)	28.3	13.1	13.3	14.1	48.2	67.2	78.5	44.2
		Rate (people)	36.1	17.7	17.9	19.0	56.3	73.8	82.7	52.2

Figure A48: Negros Oriental, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	31.75	20.90	20.77	23.25	46.51	69.76	93.02	42.53
		Rate (households)	24.9	11.6	10.9	13.9	47.0	61.6	68.8	41.2
		Rate (people)	29.8	15.8	14.3	17.7	50.0	64.1	70.8	45.8
	2004	Line	28.10	20.79	21.39	20.17	40.33	60.50	80.67	36.88
		Rate (households)	12.5	4.6	5.8	4.6	26.4	48.7	59.9	23.1
		Rate (people)	13.0	5.3	6.4	5.3	28.9	52.5	63.9	24.9
Rural	2002	Line	22.90	17.71	14.25	16.77	33.55	50.32	67.10	30.68
		Rate (households)	44.5	32.0	19.4	28.3	61.6	77.4	85.3	59.9
		Rate (people)	50.9	38.4	25.4	35.3	67.2	81.6	88.0	65.9
	2004	Line	30.13	22.01	16.90	21.62	43.25	64.87	86.49	39.55
		Rate (households)	59.7	42.7	26.6	41.6	74.9	87.1	92.5	71.2
		Rate (people)	65.3	48.3	32.6	47.1	79.0	89.5	94.2	76.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	38.8	26.1	17.0	24.1	57.3	72.8	80.5	54.5
		Rate (people)	45.1	32.2	22.4	30.5	62.4	76.8	83.3	60.3
	2004	Rate (households)	44.0	30.0	19.7	29.3	58.7	74.3	81.7	55.2
		Rate (people)	48.5	34.5	24.2	33.7	62.9	77.6	84.5	59.7

Figure A49: North Cotabato, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	International				
						2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	30.61	22.09	20.30	22.42	44.84	67.26	89.69	41.01
		Rate (households)	29.5	16.8	12.7	17.4	47.8	71.2	77.8	45.0
		Rate (people)	36.4	22.5	16.9	23.6	54.0	76.6	82.5	51.2
	2004	Line	31.88	22.17	17.39	22.88	45.77	68.65	91.54	41.85
		Rate (households)	27.5	20.3	13.0	20.3	34.9	56.0	64.7	32.4
		Rate (people)	36.0	27.2	17.4	27.2	42.2	64.2	73.9	40.7
Rural	2002	Line	26.74	19.26	16.76	19.59	39.18	58.77	78.36	35.83
		Rate (households)	45.2	31.4	22.3	31.8	67.3	81.3	85.5	60.7
		Rate (people)	54.6	38.6	27.3	38.8	75.0	85.4	88.7	69.8
	2004	Line	38.25	25.55	21.13	27.45	54.90	82.35	109.80	50.20
		Rate (households)	54.9	36.3	24.2	39.4	74.1	85.6	90.7	71.8
		Rate (people)	60.5	43.8	30.0	46.8	78.3	89.5	93.7	75.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	41.8	28.2	20.2	28.7	63.1	79.1	83.8	57.3
		Rate (people)	50.9	35.3	25.1	35.7	70.6	83.6	87.4	65.9
	2004	Rate (households)	51.0	34.0	22.6	36.7	68.5	81.4	87.0	66.2
		Rate (people)	57.2	41.6	28.3	44.2	73.5	86.1	91.0	71.1

Figure A50: Northern Samar, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	26.65	19.47	17.75	19.52	39.04	58.56	78.08	35.70
		Rate (households)	31.2	18.3	14.4	18.3	45.8	63.8	74.4	43.3
		Rate (people)	36.1	22.0	17.9	22.0	49.3	64.5	74.9	47.0
	2004	Line	30.11	22.24	24.23	21.61	43.22	64.83	86.44	39.52
		Rate (households)	15.7	3.7	7.2	3.7	26.7	49.5	62.7	23.0
		Rate (people)	22.1	5.3	9.6	5.3	33.3	59.0	71.4	30.9
Rural	2002	Line	26.04	19.55	16.17	19.07	38.14	57.22	76.29	34.88
		Rate (households)	49.3	33.0	22.7	30.4	76.0	85.3	91.2	70.3
		Rate (people)	57.6	40.5	28.8	36.4	81.7	88.3	92.4	77.0
	2004	Line	31.47	22.58	24.31	22.59	45.18	67.77	90.36	41.31
		Rate (households)	38.9	15.4	17.6	15.4	64.8	84.0	91.2	62.0
		Rate (people)	48.9	21.6	24.0	21.6	73.4	88.3	93.1	71.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	44.5	29.1	20.5	27.2	67.9	79.6	86.7	63.1
		Rate (people)	51.9	35.6	25.9	32.6	73.1	82.0	87.8	69.1
	2004	Rate (households)	31.6	11.7	14.4	11.7	52.8	73.1	82.2	49.8
		Rate (people)	40.4	16.5	19.5	16.5	60.8	79.1	86.3	58.4

Figure A51: Nueva Ecija, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	43.97	27.03	32.98	32.21	64.41	96.62	128.83	58.91
		Rate (households)	23.8	6.9	11.7	11.6	44.8	63.8	74.4	41.1
		Rate (people)	27.9	8.4	13.7	13.5	51.5	69.5	80.1	46.8
	2004	Line	38.64	25.71	29.82	27.73	55.47	83.20	110.94	50.73
		Rate (households)	12.5	3.4	5.2	4.6	29.4	55.3	72.3	24.3
		Rate (people)	16.8	5.2	7.5	6.8	36.0	59.5	75.5	30.9
Rural	2002	Line	38.85	24.49	26.85	28.46	56.92	85.39	113.85	52.06
		Rate (households)	36.0	12.7	16.9	19.9	63.0	78.0	86.0	57.0
		Rate (people)	40.6	15.1	20.2	23.4	66.7	81.6	88.0	61.6
	2004	Line	41.25	26.94	31.02	29.60	59.21	88.81	118.42	54.15
		Rate (households)	35.1	10.5	16.1	13.8	58.8	78.9	86.8	52.6
		Rate (people)	39.5	13.4	19.7	17.1	64.1	82.0	89.2	59.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	32.7	11.1	15.5	17.6	58.1	74.1	82.8	52.6
		Rate (people)	37.4	13.4	18.5	20.9	62.8	78.5	86.0	57.8
	2004	Rate (households)	29.7	8.8	13.5	11.6	51.8	73.3	83.3	45.9
		Rate (people)	34.2	11.5	16.9	14.7	57.6	76.8	86.0	52.5

Figure A52: Nueva Vizcaya, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	37.55	23.15	25.24	27.51	55.02	82.53	110.04	50.31
		Rate (households)	19.2	8.0	8.0	9.0	28.0	49.1	61.2	28.0
		Rate (people)	21.2	10.2	10.2	11.6	35.7	58.9	69.0	35.7
	2004	Line	32.91	21.98	27.76	23.62	47.23	70.85	94.47	43.20
		Rate (households)	6.6	0.0	1.6	0.0	22.1	35.7	55.6	20.4
		Rate (people)	6.8	0.0	1.9	0.0	23.1	40.9	62.7	21.9
Rural	2002	Line	29.40	21.09	22.50	21.53	43.07	64.60	86.14	39.39
		Rate (households)	28.6	10.1	13.6	10.1	48.4	69.5	77.5	43.2
		Rate (people)	32.2	12.0	16.1	12.0	51.9	72.0	81.2	46.2
	2004	Line	40.32	26.03	30.45	28.94	57.88	86.82	115.76	52.93
		Rate (households)	12.7	3.0	5.6	4.1	35.8	64.9	84.0	30.8
		Rate (people)	14.8	3.6	7.2	5.0	40.4	70.8	88.0	35.5
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	25.9	9.5	12.1	9.8	42.7	63.8	72.9	38.9
		Rate (people)	29.4	11.5	14.6	11.9	47.7	68.6	78.0	43.5
	2004	Rate (households)	11.3	2.3	4.7	3.1	32.6	58.3	77.5	28.4
		Rate (people)	13.0	2.8	6.0	3.9	36.5	64.1	82.3	32.4

Figure A53: Occidental Mindoro, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.62	23.17	23.04	24.63	49.25	73.88	98.51	45.04
		Rate (households)	32.3	16.3	15.6	21.3	51.7	64.9	70.9	46.7
		Rate (people)	34.8	17.7	16.7	23.0	54.0	68.5	74.8	49.1
	2004	Line	34.42	23.52	28.18	24.70	49.41	74.11	98.82	45.18
		Rate (households)	24.1	5.5	12.3	7.6	39.4	58.0	65.6	35.2
		Rate (people)	32.0	7.7	15.8	10.4	51.0	69.3	73.9	45.4
Rural	2002	Line	33.77	21.80	18.95	24.74	49.48	74.22	98.96	45.25
		Rate (households)	62.3	38.5	27.5	47.7	75.0	88.1	91.4	72.1
		Rate (people)	67.9	46.6	33.3	55.6	79.9	89.8	93.1	76.7
	2004	Line	38.10	23.85	24.19	27.34	54.69	82.03	109.37	50.01
		Rate (households)	46.9	20.0	21.7	30.0	69.8	87.2	90.7	65.0
		Rate (people)	55.9	24.9	27.5	38.1	73.7	89.4	92.6	70.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	48.6	28.4	22.1	35.7	64.3	77.5	82.1	60.5
		Rate (people)	52.4	33.1	25.6	40.3	67.8	79.8	84.5	63.8
	2004	Rate (households)	36.3	13.2	17.3	19.5	55.6	73.6	79.0	51.1
		Rate (people)	45.2	17.2	22.3	25.7	63.5	80.4	84.2	59.2

Figure A54: Oriental Mindoro, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	41.36	25.30	28.55	30.29	60.59	90.88	121.18	55.41
		Rate (households)	44.9	14.7	23.1	30.4	61.5	76.1	83.3	57.4
		Rate (people)	53.7	18.6	26.3	36.8	71.4	82.1	88.9	68.0
	2004	Line	39.26	25.99	29.32	28.18	56.35	84.53	112.71	51.53
		Rate (households)	32.9	13.2	15.4	14.3	49.4	61.5	71.4	47.2
		Rate (people)	37.8	15.2	18.0	16.3	56.1	68.2	78.5	54.4
Rural	2002	Line	38.19	23.78	24.04	27.97	55.95	83.92	111.89	51.16
		Rate (households)	45.6	20.0	21.4	28.5	65.6	78.4	88.7	60.6
		Rate (people)	55.0	24.9	26.8	35.5	72.3	84.6	92.1	67.9
	2004	Line	42.34	26.88	25.39	30.39	60.77	91.16	121.54	55.57
		Rate (households)	54.0	28.8	25.6	35.6	68.0	84.8	91.0	64.5
		Rate (people)	61.8	34.7	30.8	42.9	75.6	89.4	94.1	72.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	45.5	19.2	21.7	28.8	65.0	78.0	87.9	60.1
		Rate (people)	54.8	23.9	26.7	35.7	72.2	84.2	91.6	67.9
	2004	Rate (households)	50.4	26.2	23.9	32.0	64.9	80.9	87.8	61.6
		Rate (people)	57.7	31.4	28.7	38.4	72.3	85.8	91.5	69.0

Figure A55: Palawan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	37.10	24.48	24.70	27.18	54.35	81.53	108.70	49.70
		Rate (households)	31.5	13.7	15.4	18.0	48.3	64.8	72.4	44.4
		Rate (people)	39.7	18.0	19.7	24.6	55.3	71.9	79.0	51.9
	2004	Line	32.64	22.32	26.36	23.42	46.85	70.27	93.69	42.84
		Rate (households)	15.8	3.5	6.9	6.9	35.9	54.4	65.5	31.6
		Rate (people)	21.7	5.9	10.6	10.6	44.9	63.2	73.4	41.1
Rural	2002	Line	29.39	20.54	18.93	21.53	43.06	64.60	86.13	39.38
		Rate (households)	44.8	22.1	20.3	24.7	67.8	84.8	90.9	62.1
		Rate (people)	54.1	28.7	26.1	31.7	74.3	89.0	94.4	69.9
	2004	Line	35.69	23.37	21.15	25.62	51.23	76.85	102.47	46.85
		Rate (households)	58.3	32.9	27.1	38.1	75.7	90.0	95.1	71.0
		Rate (people)	66.5	39.9	33.2	45.2	80.8	93.5	97.1	77.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	39.9	19.0	18.5	22.3	60.7	77.5	84.1	55.7
		Rate (people)	48.9	24.8	23.8	29.1	67.4	82.7	88.8	63.3
	2004	Rate (households)	45.7	24.2	21.1	28.8	63.9	79.4	86.3	59.3
		Rate (people)	53.9	30.4	26.8	35.5	70.8	85.0	90.5	67.0

Figure A56: Pampanga, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	<u>2005 PPP</u>			<u>1993 PPP</u>	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	42.35	27.34	32.80	31.03	62.05	93.08	124.10	56.74
		Rate (households)	15.6	3.5	7.4	5.5	36.0	60.9	75.9	31.6
		Rate (people)	19.4	4.4	9.5	7.2	42.5	67.1	80.9	37.9
	2004	Line	39.02	25.99	34.39	28.00	56.01	84.01	112.02	51.22
		Rate (households)	7.7	1.0	3.9	1.5	23.9	48.7	63.8	19.5
		Rate (people)	10.4	1.2	5.1	1.8	30.4	58.0	72.2	25.4
Rural	2002	Line	38.66	24.57	31.99	28.32	56.64	84.96	113.28	51.80
		Rate (households)	9.6	0.0	5.3	3.2	41.4	60.5	83.9	33.9
		Rate (people)	15.5	0.0	7.0	4.3	48.4	64.9	86.8	40.8
	2004	Line	43.49	27.44	34.33	31.21	62.42	93.63	124.85	57.08
		Rate (households)	24.4	4.3	12.5	9.8	45.9	76.7	87.3	39.1
		Rate (people)	29.1	4.8	14.5	11.4	52.4	81.2	89.3	44.6
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	13.7	2.4	6.7	4.8	37.7	60.8	78.4	32.4
		Rate (people)	18.1	2.9	8.7	6.2	44.5	66.4	82.8	38.9
	2004	Rate (households)	11.6	1.8	6.0	3.4	29.1	55.2	69.4	24.1
		Rate (people)	15.2	2.1	7.5	4.3	36.0	63.9	76.5	30.3

Figure A57: Pangasinan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.85	24.74	26.58	26.99	53.98	80.97	107.96	49.37
		Rate (households)	27.4	11.9	13.7	14.7	45.1	63.7	78.4	40.3
		Rate (people)	33.3	14.8	16.6	17.9	50.7	69.5	82.4	46.1
	2004	Line	38.38	24.92	29.83	27.55	55.09	82.64	110.18	50.38
		Rate (households)	18.4	4.7	8.8	6.4	31.6	54.8	68.5	27.7
		Rate (people)	23.0	6.5	11.5	8.3	37.0	61.2	74.7	33.6
Rural	2002	Line	34.90	23.74	21.82	25.56	51.12	76.69	102.25	46.75
		Rate (households)	41.7	23.4	20.3	26.2	62.8	81.6	88.6	58.5
		Rate (people)	48.3	27.2	23.8	31.3	68.6	85.6	91.0	64.1
	2004	Line	40.18	26.08	27.12	28.84	57.68	86.52	115.36	52.75
		Rate (households)	46.1	19.6	21.6	25.7	64.2	79.6	88.7	60.1
		Rate (people)	52.4	24.3	26.2	31.0	70.9	84.8	91.7	66.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	36.3	19.1	17.8	21.9	56.2	74.9	84.8	51.7
		Rate (people)	42.5	22.5	21.0	26.2	61.7	79.5	87.7	57.2
	2004	Rate (households)	36.4	14.4	17.2	19.0	52.8	70.9	81.7	48.8
		Rate (people)	42.6	18.3	21.3	23.5	59.6	76.9	86.1	55.8

Figure A58: Quezon, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.79	23.27	25.96	26.95	53.91	80.86	107.81	49.30
		Rate (households)	18.7	6.6	8.6	11.0	31.9	53.3	66.8	26.6
		Rate (people)	24.7	9.4	11.8	15.5	39.0	59.7	73.3	33.8
	2004	Line	37.66	25.25	29.44	27.03	54.06	81.09	108.12	49.43
		Rate (households)	16.4	5.0	8.0	6.3	32.7	61.4	72.8	27.7
		Rate (people)	20.5	6.2	9.9	8.1	38.6	68.7	81.2	32.8
Rural	2002	Line	34.53	23.79	22.47	25.30	50.59	75.89	101.19	46.27
		Rate (households)	42.4	22.5	20.3	25.5	61.8	77.6	84.9	58.0
		Rate (people)	50.8	27.8	25.0	31.6	70.7	83.9	89.3	67.8
	2004	Line	43.25	24.36	28.14	31.04	62.09	93.13	124.18	56.78
		Rate (households)	61.7	20.2	27.8	36.4	79.1	90.2	94.9	75.8
		Rate (people)	69.8	26.5	34.7	43.6	85.0	94.2	97.4	82.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	34.3	17.0	16.3	20.6	51.6	69.3	78.8	47.3
		Rate (people)	41.8	21.5	20.5	26.1	59.8	75.6	83.8	56.2
	2004	Rate (households)	50.7	16.5	23.0	29.1	67.9	83.2	89.6	64.1
		Rate (people)	57.7	21.6	28.6	34.9	73.6	88.0	93.4	70.2

Figure A59: Quirino, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.07	22.00	26.28	24.23	48.46	72.68	96.91	44.31
		Rate (households)	17.6	6.2	9.3	8.2	34.4	48.2	58.7	30.3
		Rate (people)	19.3	4.7	9.4	7.7	38.3	51.4	61.9	33.2
	2004	Line	35.17	22.87	25.97	25.24	50.48	75.72	100.96	46.16
		Rate (households)	15.1	2.9	6.1	2.9	24.3	48.3	54.2	21.1
		Rate (people)	17.5	3.9	7.4	3.9	27.0	51.7	60.2	25.6
Rural	2002	Line	29.23	20.04	16.68	21.41	42.83	64.24	85.66	39.17
		Rate (households)	37.2	21.6	16.6	25.2	58.6	74.2	80.6	51.4
		Rate (people)	41.2	25.3	20.4	29.5	61.6	76.6	83.1	55.4
	2004	Line	43.46	25.98	28.05	31.19	62.38	93.57	124.76	57.04
		Rate (households)	44.5	11.7	19.3	27.0	62.2	76.8	85.6	57.8
		Rate (people)	49.6	15.5	23.8	32.0	66.8	81.4	88.3	62.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	32.6	18.0	14.8	21.2	52.9	68.0	75.4	46.5
		Rate (people)	36.1	20.5	17.9	24.4	56.2	70.7	78.2	50.2
	2004	Rate (households)	36.6	9.3	15.8	20.6	52.1	69.2	77.3	48.0
		Rate (people)	41.4	12.5	19.6	24.8	56.7	73.8	81.2	52.8

Figure A60: Rizal, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	39.08	24.58	31.60	28.63	57.25	85.88	114.51	52.36
		Rate (households)	7.8	1.6	3.9	3.2	20.2	44.1	59.4	16.0
		Rate (people)	10.2	2.0	4.6	3.8	25.6	50.0	64.0	20.5
	2004	Line	40.64	25.90	30.37	29.16	58.33	87.49	116.66	53.34
		Rate (households)	7.0	1.4	3.1	2.8	20.0	42.5	57.9	16.0
		Rate (people)	10.0	2.2	4.9	4.4	24.4	48.9	64.6	20.0
Rural	2002	Line	37.15	24.23	27.22	27.22	54.43	81.65	108.86	49.78
		Rate (households)	36.0	12.1	14.9	16.2	59.0	75.3	83.3	50.7
		Rate (people)	40.2	15.6	18.8	20.9	65.0	79.3	88.0	57.2
	2004	Line	40.61	25.71	32.00	29.15	58.30	87.45	116.59	53.31
		Rate (households)	26.6	3.4	10.1	5.6	48.0	69.0	85.5	41.2
		Rate (people)	32.1	5.6	14.1	8.3	54.6	73.6	86.5	48.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	10.4	2.6	4.9	4.3	23.7	46.9	61.5	19.1
		Rate (people)	13.5	3.5	6.1	5.7	29.9	53.2	66.6	24.4
	2004	Rate (households)	9.2	1.6	3.9	3.1	23.2	45.5	61.0	18.9
		Rate (people)	12.7	2.6	6.0	4.9	28.1	51.9	67.2	23.4

Figure A61: Romblon, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.99	23.62	19.22	25.63	51.26	76.89	102.51	46.87
		Rate (households)	41.3	26.8	17.6	27.5	53.4	65.5	74.1	50.6
		Rate (people)	45.5	32.1	22.2	32.6	56.8	69.5	77.7	54.2
	2004	Line	32.76	23.70	21.22	23.51	47.02	70.53	94.04	43.00
		Rate (households)	42.9	24.5	16.4	24.5	61.3	71.5	77.6	61.3
		Rate (people)	50.1	33.1	24.6	33.1	68.0	75.1	80.3	68.0
Rural	2002	Line	30.78	23.06	17.12	22.55	45.09	67.64	90.18	41.24
		Rate (households)	60.2	37.8	25.8	36.3	76.2	89.6	93.7	71.3
		Rate (people)	65.6	44.2	32.5	42.7	79.1	89.2	92.5	74.9
	2004	Line	35.50	24.97	20.31	25.48	50.96	76.44	101.92	46.60
		Rate (households)	56.9	32.9	24.3	34.0	76.6	88.8	91.8	73.5
		Rate (people)	65.5	41.4	32.2	42.9	82.2	91.7	93.6	79.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	56.7	35.8	24.3	34.7	72.1	85.2	90.1	67.6
		Rate (people)	62.1	42.1	30.8	41.0	75.3	85.8	90.0	71.4
	2004	Rate (households)	54.2	31.3	22.7	32.1	73.6	85.4	89.1	71.1
		Rate (people)	62.7	39.9	30.8	41.0	79.6	88.6	91.1	77.1

Figure A62: Western Samar, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	29.78	22.86	22.79	21.81	43.62	65.43	87.25	39.89
		Rate (households)	22.4	11.6	9.9	9.9	42.5	57.4	67.5	38.7
		Rate (people)	27.5	14.8	13.0	13.0	46.1	61.2	70.6	41.6
	2004	Line	32.13	23.36	26.30	23.06	46.13	69.19	92.25	42.18
		Rate (households)	18.6	5.6	9.3	5.6	26.0	46.4	55.6	26.0
		Rate (people)	22.2	5.8	10.9	5.8	29.9	49.7	57.4	29.9
Rural	2002	Line	28.83	21.65	17.55	21.12	42.24	63.36	84.48	38.63
		Rate (households)	52.4	34.0	23.9	32.5	69.8	85.9	89.5	66.8
		Rate (people)	62.3	42.8	31.1	41.5	76.8	89.2	91.9	74.1
	2004	Line	45.08	24.27	24.63	32.35	64.71	97.06	129.42	59.17
		Rate (households)	63.0	27.5	28.1	46.9	76.1	85.6	89.4	73.1
		Rate (people)	70.2	34.5	34.9	54.3	80.7	89.2	92.6	78.5
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	45.9	29.2	20.9	27.6	64.0	79.8	84.8	60.7
		Rate (people)	54.7	36.7	27.2	35.3	70.1	83.1	87.3	67.0
	2004	Rate (households)	57.0	24.5	25.6	41.3	69.2	80.2	84.8	66.7
		Rate (people)	64.1	30.8	31.8	48.1	74.2	84.1	88.1	72.3

Figure A63: Siquijor, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	32.39	21.64	19.18	23.73	47.46	71.18	94.91	43.40
		Rate (households)	22.2	15.4	6.5	17.4	41.0	55.0	73.1	36.6
		Rate (people)	23.7	18.1	10.0	21.9	47.2	60.1	76.2	41.2
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	2002	Line	25.65	18.94	15.61	18.79	37.57	56.36	75.15	34.36
		Rate (households)	47.9	36.9	23.6	36.9	65.2	83.8	88.2	60.8
		Rate (people)	54.0	40.2	26.4	40.2	67.8	85.9	88.9	65.7
	2004	Line	29.08	20.67	20.16	20.87	41.75	62.62	83.50	38.18
		Rate (households)	56.3	31.3	25.0	31.3	62.5	68.8	75.0	62.5
		Rate (people)	63.3	38.3	30.5	38.3	67.2	71.1	79.7	67.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	44.3	33.9	21.2	34.2	61.8	79.7	86.1	57.3
		Rate (people)	49.9	37.2	24.2	37.7	65.0	82.4	87.2	62.4
	2004	Rate (households)	56.3	31.3	25.0	31.3	62.5	68.8	75.0	62.5
		Rate (people)	63.3	38.3	30.5	38.3	67.2	71.1	79.7	67.2

Figure A64: Sorsogon, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	37.13	26.65	21.42	27.20	54.39	81.59	108.78	49.74
		Rate (households)	42.3	28.8	18.5	30.9	56.5	76.2	84.1	53.4
		Rate (people)	51.6	37.2	24.6	39.9	64.5	81.7	88.8	61.8
	2004	Line	34.42	25.02	25.65	24.70	49.41	74.11	98.82	45.18
		Rate (households)	22.2	11.1	11.8	11.1	40.5	60.8	77.1	37.9
		Rate (people)	29.2	13.5	14.2	13.5	51.7	68.6	81.9	48.6
Rural	2002	Line	30.86	23.04	19.49	22.61	45.21	67.82	90.42	41.35
		Rate (households)	54.5	37.6	24.6	35.6	76.2	89.2	92.1	71.2
		Rate (people)	63.0	45.9	31.4	43.8	83.1	93.0	94.6	78.9
	2004	Line	46.55	28.91	28.28	33.41	66.82	100.22	133.63	61.10
		Rate (households)	57.4	24.5	24.1	29.9	77.2	90.1	93.6	72.9
		Rate (people)	67.6	33.8	33.1	40.1	83.9	93.7	95.5	80.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	51.4	35.3	23.1	34.4	71.2	85.9	90.1	66.7
		Rate (people)	60.1	43.6	29.7	42.8	78.4	90.2	93.1	74.6
	2004	Rate (households)	44.5	19.6	19.6	23.0	63.7	79.3	87.5	60.1
		Rate (people)	53.7	26.5	26.3	30.5	72.2	84.6	90.5	69.2

Figure A65: South Cotabato, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	35.08	23.31	21.03	25.69	51.39	77.08	102.78	46.99
		Rate (households)	31.4	16.6	14.4	19.3	52.0	71.2	82.8	47.0
		Rate (people)	37.1	20.8	18.5	23.8	58.5	76.0	86.3	53.2
	2004	Line	31.41	22.38	24.94	22.54	45.08	67.62	90.16	41.22
		Rate (households)	16.5	6.0	7.6	6.2	27.6	47.4	62.5	24.4
		Rate (people)	21.0	8.7	10.5	9.0	33.6	55.9	69.6	30.5
Rural	2002	Line	31.94	20.76	15.76	23.40	46.80	70.20	93.60	42.80
		Rate (households)	60.1	37.3	28.3	43.4	77.0	88.2	96.3	74.0
		Rate (people)	64.2	41.4	32.1	48.3	80.8	90.3	97.0	77.9
	2004	Line	38.25	24.79	21.87	27.46	54.91	82.37	109.82	50.22
		Rate (households)	52.9	28.8	23.5	33.0	70.6	84.1	89.7	66.4
		Rate (people)	58.5	34.9	29.0	39.3	75.6	87.3	92.1	71.4
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	44.0	25.7	20.6	30.0	63.0	78.7	88.7	58.9
		Rate (people)	49.2	30.0	24.6	34.8	68.5	82.4	91.1	64.3
	2004	Rate (households)	34.2	17.1	15.3	19.2	48.5	65.3	75.8	44.8
		Rate (people)	39.7	21.8	19.7	24.1	54.5	71.6	80.8	50.9

Figure A66: Southern Leyte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP				1993 PPP
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	30.23	21.69	22.72	22.14	44.28	66.43	88.57	40.50
		Rate (households)	27.3	10.9	12.7	12.7	41.8	60.8	75.8	38.3
		Rate (people)	32.2	13.9	15.5	15.5	48.9	64.9	79.0	45.3
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	2002	Line	27.18	20.36	18.36	19.91	39.82	59.73	79.64	36.42
		Rate (households)	40.9	24.3	18.9	23.2	56.3	76.9	83.9	53.6
		Rate (people)	49.8	30.1	24.1	29.1	64.6	83.7	88.9	62.5
	2004	Line	31.90	21.39	23.25	22.90	45.79	68.69	91.58	41.88
		Rate (households)	31.7	11.7	14.6	14.1	50.6	69.4	81.5	45.7
		Rate (people)	41.6	17.5	20.8	20.2	59.0	74.6	84.1	53.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	38.3	21.7	17.7	21.2	53.5	73.8	82.3	50.7
		Rate (people)	46.6	27.2	22.6	26.7	61.8	80.3	87.1	59.4
	2004	Rate (households)	31.7	11.7	14.6	14.1	50.6	69.4	81.5	45.7
		Rate (people)	41.6	17.5	20.8	20.2	59.0	74.6	84.1	53.9

Figure A67: Sultan Kudarat, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	32.71	22.25	20.39	23.96	47.93	71.89	95.85	43.83
		Rate (households)	36.9	21.4	17.8	24.2	54.1	67.3	76.2	48.5
		Rate (people)	41.4	24.9	20.0	26.8	58.9	72.4	80.5	53.2
	2004	Line	32.20	25.66	23.20	23.11	46.22	69.33	92.44	42.27
		Rate (households)	25.0	16.3	9.8	9.8	44.7	64.5	79.9	39.3
		Rate (people)	30.0	22.6	13.8	13.8	51.4	67.1	84.0	44.3
Rural	2002	Line	28.95	20.71	18.20	21.20	42.41	63.61	84.81	38.78
		Rate (households)	50.5	31.4	21.7	34.4	69.8	83.8	86.0	67.5
		Rate (people)	55.6	37.4	26.3	40.2	75.5	88.0	89.4	73.9
	2004	Line	37.11	26.16	23.91	26.64	53.27	79.91	106.54	48.72
		Rate (households)	65.6	36.8	27.9	39.1	81.8	90.5	94.1	79.7
		Rate (people)	71.0	44.8	35.5	47.2	84.8	92.0	94.8	82.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	46.5	28.4	20.6	31.4	65.2	78.9	83.1	61.9
		Rate (people)	51.3	33.6	24.4	36.2	70.5	83.2	86.7	67.6
	2004	Rate (households)	55.5	31.8	23.4	31.9	72.6	84.1	90.6	69.7
		Rate (people)	60.4	39.1	29.9	38.6	76.2	85.6	92.0	72.9

Figure A68: Sulu, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.95	26.77	18.98	27.07	54.14	81.20	108.27	49.51
		Rate (households)	75.4	61.8	34.8	62.5	83.5	89.6	94.4	82.8
		Rate (people)	74.9	63.9	37.3	64.5	82.5	90.0	94.9	81.6
	2004	Line	32.40	22.76	20.47	23.25	46.51	69.76	93.01	42.53
		Rate (households)	43.5	24.8	18.6	27.2	71.3	89.9	97.7	60.5
		Rate (people)	54.4	34.1	26.5	37.0	77.3	93.5	98.5	68.4
Rural	2002	Line	34.53	25.74	20.27	25.29	50.58	75.87	101.17	46.26
		Rate (households)	72.7	51.4	34.2	50.7	85.8	94.2	98.0	82.7
		Rate (people)	73.3	53.0	35.8	52.3	86.8	94.7	98.3	83.2
	2004	Line	42.41	27.84	30.41	30.43	60.87	91.30	121.74	55.66
		Rate (households)	66.4	23.0	29.2	29.7	86.9	96.5	98.0	81.9
		Rate (people)	72.0	29.1	35.9	36.3	89.2	97.0	98.0	85.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	73.4	54.0	34.4	53.6	85.2	93.1	97.1	82.7
		Rate (people)	73.7	55.7	36.2	55.4	85.7	93.5	97.4	82.8
	2004	Rate (households)	60.8	23.5	26.6	29.1	83.1	94.9	97.9	76.7
		Rate (people)	67.5	30.4	33.5	36.5	86.2	96.1	98.2	80.8

Figure A69: Surigao del Norte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	37.84	26.06	22.47	27.72	55.44	83.17	110.89	50.70
		Rate (households)	56.8	34.6	26.0	37.5	73.0	82.4	87.8	69.3
		Rate (people)	62.8	39.8	30.6	43.2	77.9	85.1	89.7	73.9
	2004	Line	36.92	25.58	20.27	26.50	53.00	79.50	106.00	48.47
		Rate (households)	34.8	19.3	12.7	21.1	43.6	59.9	70.6	39.5
		Rate (people)	41.0	26.7	20.0	29.1	48.1	63.5	74.2	44.2
Rural	2002	Line	30.85	22.45	16.05	22.60	45.20	67.80	90.40	41.33
		Rate (households)	58.2	49.6	26.5	49.6	76.1	87.0	91.3	72.2
		Rate (people)	65.4	57.7	31.9	57.7	80.5	89.6	93.6	77.3
	2004	Line	44.85	29.72	23.72	32.19	64.38	96.57	128.76	58.87
		Rate (households)	69.9	47.4	30.2	50.6	79.1	87.7	90.9	78.1
		Rate (people)	74.5	55.4	37.1	58.1	81.4	89.2	92.6	80.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	57.7	44.0	26.3	45.1	74.9	85.2	90.0	71.1
		Rate (people)	64.4	50.9	31.4	52.2	79.5	87.9	92.1	76.0
	2004	Rate (households)	60.7	40.0	25.7	42.9	69.8	80.4	85.6	68.0
		Rate (people)	66.1	48.2	32.8	50.8	73.0	82.8	88.0	71.6

Figure A70: Surigao del Sur, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP				1993 PPP
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.03	24.54	21.72	24.93	49.86	74.79	99.72	45.60
		Rate (households)	36.0	20.5	16.1	22.6	48.9	63.3	76.2	45.6
		Rate (people)	40.4	24.5	19.7	26.5	53.7	67.2	79.9	51.0
	2004	Line	33.56	24.72	24.38	24.09	48.17	72.26	96.34	44.05
		Rate (households)	33.5	16.1	15.6	14.5	51.9	69.7	81.5	50.3
		Rate (people)	40.5	20.5	19.9	18.7	58.3	75.8	84.7	57.4
Rural	2002	Line	29.30	21.39	16.31	21.46	42.92	64.39	85.85	39.25
		Rate (households)	53.7	30.8	23.6	30.8	78.2	89.3	93.4	72.6
		Rate (people)	59.4	36.5	29.5	36.5	79.6	91.3	94.0	75.0
	2004	Line	40.47	28.43	26.40	29.04	58.09	87.13	116.17	53.12
		Rate (households)	58.1	34.7	26.2	36.2	76.6	89.3	95.7	71.6
		Rate (people)	66.9	43.7	33.4	45.3	82.3	92.6	96.8	78.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	46.6	26.7	20.6	27.5	66.4	78.9	86.5	61.8
		Rate (people)	52.1	31.9	25.7	32.7	69.7	82.0	88.6	65.8
	2004	Rate (households)	47.8	26.9	21.8	27.1	66.2	81.0	89.8	62.6
		Rate (people)	56.0	34.1	27.8	34.3	72.3	85.7	91.8	69.7

Figure A71: Tarlac, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	38.34	25.35	27.89	28.09	56.17	84.26	112.34	51.37
		Rate (households)	30.7	11.3	16.1	16.8	49.9	62.9	77.2	45.7
		Rate (people)	34.5	12.4	17.2	17.9	55.0	67.0	81.4	50.5
	2004	Line	37.16	24.67	32.77	26.67	53.33	80.00	106.67	48.77
		Rate (households)	9.0	1.1	3.4	2.3	22.5	41.7	52.9	18.0
		Rate (people)	12.8	1.4	4.4	2.8	27.9	45.8	54.6	23.9
Rural	2002	Line	34.00	23.09	21.45	24.90	49.81	74.71	99.62	45.55
		Rate (households)	31.4	17.1	14.8	20.0	49.3	73.5	85.5	45.6
		Rate (people)	35.2	19.5	17.2	23.6	54.5	80.0	89.7	50.8
	2004	Line	45.37	26.72	32.06	32.56	65.12	97.69	130.25	59.55
		Rate (households)	40.0	12.9	20.3	20.8	65.2	82.1	89.1	59.2
		Rate (people)	46.8	14.9	23.1	23.9	72.4	87.6	92.0	66.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	31.2	15.4	15.2	19.0	49.5	70.3	83.0	45.6
		Rate (people)	35.0	17.4	17.2	21.9	54.6	76.1	87.3	50.7
	2004	Rate (households)	33.8	10.5	16.9	17.1	56.6	74.0	81.8	50.9
		Rate (people)	39.9	12.2	19.3	19.7	63.4	79.2	84.5	57.7

Figure A72: Tawi-tawi, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	36.14	24.95	30.29	26.48	52.95	79.43	105.90	48.42
		Rate (households)	18.0	1.1	8.4	3.2	39.3	63.1	77.1	36.2
		Rate (people)	25.9	1.9	12.8	5.6	46.9	70.6	82.6	44.6
	2004	Line	33.50	23.20	17.51	24.04	48.08	72.13	96.17	43.97
		Rate (households)	69.0	40.7	33.0	40.7	89.7	97.5	100.0	84.5
		Rate (people)	72.5	42.6	35.4	42.6	90.6	97.5	100.0	86.3
Rural	2002	Line	36.33	23.29	27.66	26.61	53.22	79.83	106.44	48.67
		Rate (households)	44.7	12.9	22.2	20.0	74.3	86.4	92.7	69.1
		Rate (people)	49.3	13.3	24.6	22.2	77.9	89.4	93.7	73.5
	2004	Line	40.99	27.00	23.54	29.42	58.83	88.25	117.66	53.80
		Rate (households)	74.2	47.8	30.9	55.3	88.7	96.9	97.5	84.9
		Rate (people)	78.2	55.5	37.9	61.4	89.2	98.2	98.5	86.6
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	37.9	9.9	18.7	15.8	65.4	80.5	88.7	60.8
		Rate (people)	43.1	10.3	21.5	17.8	69.7	84.4	90.8	65.9
	2004	Rate (households)	73.2	46.4	31.3	52.4	88.9	97.0	98.0	84.9
		Rate (people)	77.0	52.6	37.3	57.2	89.5	98.1	98.8	86.5

Figure A73: Zambales, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	40.32	26.45	27.71	29.53	59.06	88.60	118.13	54.01
		Rate (households)	13.6	5.9	6.2	7.5	28.2	53.7	66.2	24.1
		Rate (people)	16.6	7.9	8.0	9.9	33.1	60.5	71.7	28.6
	2004	Line	34.30	26.43	22.78	24.62	49.23	73.85	98.47	45.02
		Rate (households)	16.7	10.6	7.6	10.6	27.4	46.4	67.1	25.1
		Rate (people)	21.2	14.4	10.2	14.4	34.4	53.4	73.4	32.0
Rural	2002	Line	34.80	23.97	23.65	25.49	50.98	76.47	101.96	46.62
		Rate (households)	29.7	12.4	10.9	14.6	48.9	76.8	81.1	42.1
		Rate (people)	33.1	17.5	15.0	18.8	54.3	80.9	85.4	46.5
	2004	Line	39.09	26.84	28.49	28.05	56.11	84.16	112.21	51.31
		Rate (households)	28.2	11.6	11.6	11.6	49.9	76.4	87.2	43.0
		Rate (people)	32.3	15.2	15.2	15.2	54.8	81.3	90.2	46.5
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	21.1	8.9	8.4	10.8	37.8	64.5	73.1	32.5
		Rate (people)	24.6	12.5	11.4	14.2	43.3	70.3	78.3	37.2
	2004	Rate (households)	21.8	11.0	9.3	11.0	37.2	59.5	75.9	33.0
		Rate (people)	26.1	14.8	12.4	14.8	43.5	65.8	80.8	38.4

Figure A74: Zamboanga del Norte, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	International				
						2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	32.10	21.76	20.09	23.51	47.02	70.53	94.04	43.00
		Rate (households)	30.2	17.5	12.6	20.4	45.9	58.2	68.5	41.7
		Rate (people)	34.0	21.6	16.6	24.2	48.5	61.4	71.4	44.9
	2004	Line	31.29	21.38	18.12	22.46	44.91	67.37	89.82	41.07
		Rate (households)	27.4	14.6	10.3	17.1	45.4	55.7	65.0	42.8
		Rate (people)	33.0	22.3	16.0	24.3	50.0	60.1	69.3	46.9
Rural	2002	Line	25.69	19.18	15.65	18.82	37.64	56.46	75.28	34.42
		Rate (households)	50.8	39.5	24.4	37.0	68.5	78.4	84.5	64.0
		Rate (people)	59.0	48.0	29.5	44.9	75.3	82.8	87.3	72.0
	2004	Line	34.54	24.42	13.45	24.79	49.58	74.37	99.16	45.34
		Rate (households)	76.2	62.9	33.9	63.8	87.3	93.2	95.3	84.9
		Rate (people)	80.5	69.7	40.1	70.5	89.4	94.6	96.2	87.6
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	47.3	35.8	22.5	34.2	64.7	75.0	81.8	60.3
		Rate (people)	55.1	43.9	27.5	41.7	71.1	79.5	84.9	67.8
	2004	Rate (households)	66.6	53.5	29.3	54.6	79.1	85.9	89.4	76.6
		Rate (people)	71.4	60.6	35.5	61.7	81.8	88.0	91.0	79.8

Figure A75: Zamboanga del Sur, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	29.25	20.02	19.77	21.43	42.85	64.28	85.70	39.19
		Rate (households)	24.7	11.9	11.3	13.6	40.7	60.3	71.8	37.9
		Rate (people)	30.1	15.6	14.9	17.2	46.6	64.4	75.4	44.2
	2004	Line	30.02	20.98	20.54	21.54	43.09	64.63	86.17	39.40
		Rate (households)	18.5	9.6	8.6	10.4	32.4	52.7	66.7	28.8
		Rate (people)	24.0	13.0	11.9	14.0	38.3	59.4	72.8	35.0
Rural	2002	Line	25.71	18.15	12.47	18.84	37.67	56.51	75.34	34.45
		Rate (households)	59.8	45.4	28.2	46.3	71.4	82.1	88.6	69.5
		Rate (people)	64.8	51.1	32.4	52.0	75.4	85.9	91.1	73.4
	2004	Line	36.80	23.21	19.76	26.41	52.83	79.24	105.65	48.31
		Rate (households)	62.4	38.4	29.8	44.8	76.1	85.1	92.1	73.5
		Rate (people)	67.6	42.8	33.7	50.2	79.9	87.8	93.5	77.5
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	46.7	33.0	21.9	34.2	60.0	74.0	82.3	57.8
		Rate (people)	51.9	37.9	25.9	39.1	64.7	77.9	85.3	62.5
	2004	Rate (households)	43.0	25.7	20.5	29.7	56.9	70.8	80.9	53.8
		Rate (people)	48.9	30.0	24.3	34.7	62.1	75.6	84.6	59.2

Figure A76: 2nd District, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	43.85	26.69	34.70	32.12	64.25	96.37	128.50	58.75
		Rate (households)	6.1	1.6	3.0	2.1	18.6	35.4	48.8	14.0
		Rate (people)	8.9	2.3	4.4	3.1	24.4	43.4	58.4	18.9
	2004	Line	48.42	28.85	37.85	34.75	69.51	104.26	139.02	63.56
		Rate (households)	7.5	1.2	3.4	2.6	19.0	40.5	54.6	15.8
		Rate (people)	10.1	1.6	5.0	3.7	24.3	46.6	60.8	20.6
Rural	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	6.1	1.6	3.0	2.1	18.6	35.4	48.8	14.0
		Rate (people)	8.9	2.3	4.4	3.1	24.4	43.4	58.4	18.9
	2004	Rate (households)	7.5	1.2	3.4	2.6	19.0	40.5	54.6	15.8
		Rate (people)	10.1	1.6	5.0	3.7	24.3	46.6	60.8	20.6

Figure A77: 3rd District, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	41.80	26.69	34.85	30.62	61.24	91.85	122.47	56.00
		Rate (households)	11.4	2.0	5.5	3.5	29.5	53.2	69.2	25.2
		Rate (people)	15.1	3.1	7.4	4.8	36.3	61.0	75.0	31.3
	2004	Line	47.12	28.85	37.60	33.82	67.63	101.45	135.27	61.85
		Rate (households)	10.1	1.7	5.1	3.1	27.6	51.0	67.4	23.3
		Rate (people)	14.3	2.6	7.2	4.2	35.0	60.0	75.5	29.7
Rural	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	11.4	2.0	5.5	3.5	29.5	53.2	69.2	25.2
		Rate (people)	15.1	3.1	7.4	4.8	36.3	61.0	75.0	31.3
	2004	Rate (households)	10.1	1.7	5.1	3.1	27.6	51.0	67.4	23.3
		Rate (people)	14.3	2.6	7.2	4.2	35.0	60.0	75.5	29.7

Figure A78: 4th District, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	45.63	26.69	37.33	33.42	66.85	100.27	133.69	61.13
		Rate (households)	7.1	1.4	3.4	2.8	18.6	38.4	54.0	15.7
		Rate (people)	10.0	1.9	4.9	4.0	24.7	46.0	61.7	21.1
	2004	Line	49.65	28.85	40.55	35.63	71.26	106.89	142.53	65.17
		Rate (households)	9.2	1.5	4.4	3.2	20.8	40.5	54.4	17.4
		Rate (people)	12.8	1.8	6.3	4.6	27.1	49.1	63.7	22.9
Rural	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	7.1	1.4	3.4	2.8	18.6	38.4	54.0	15.7
		Rate (people)	10.0	1.9	4.9	4.0	24.7	46.0	61.7	21.1
	2004	Rate (households)	9.2	1.5	4.4	3.2	20.8	40.5	54.4	17.4
		Rate (people)	12.8	1.8	6.3	4.6	27.1	49.1	63.7	22.9

Figure A79: Aurora, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.21	23.48	20.45	24.33	48.65	72.98	97.30	44.49
		Rate (households)	31.4	20.3	16.1	22.4	50.4	67.9	79.1	45.5
		Rate (people)	40.0	26.6	19.4	29.2	58.6	73.4	84.2	54.3
	2004	Line	38.16	26.24	27.76	27.39	54.78	82.17	109.56	50.09
		Rate (households)	39.4	12.1	15.2	15.2	60.6	75.8	78.8	60.6
		Rate (people)	47.6	19.0	22.6	22.6	69.0	81.5	83.9	69.0
Rural	2002	Line	31.42	23.16	19.54	23.02	46.04	69.05	92.07	42.10
		Rate (households)	40.7	27.5	17.3	26.8	56.2	72.3	79.5	51.2
		Rate (people)	46.8	33.5	23.2	32.7	60.0	74.9	82.1	55.8
	2004	Line	38.24	26.76	19.78	27.45	54.89	82.34	109.78	50.20
		Rate (households)	42.9	28.6	17.9	28.6	60.7	71.4	89.3	60.7
		Rate (people)	47.2	34.7	23.6	34.7	68.1	75.7	90.3	68.1
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	36.7	24.3	16.8	24.9	53.7	70.3	79.3	48.7
		Rate (people)	43.9	30.5	21.6	31.2	59.4	74.2	83.0	55.1
	2004	Rate (households)	41.1	20.1	16.5	21.7	60.7	73.7	83.9	60.7
		Rate (people)	47.4	26.7	23.1	28.5	68.6	78.7	87.0	68.6

Figure A80: Biliran, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	27.99	21.70	18.67	20.51	41.01	61.52	82.03	37.51
		Rate (households)	41.4	27.5	19.7	23.9	55.9	65.7	76.9	50.4
		Rate (people)	48.2	33.2	23.5	27.7	60.0	70.2	80.8	57.0
	2004	Line	29.32	21.22	21.32	21.04	42.08	63.12	84.16	38.48
		Rate (households)	38.3	15.8	15.8	15.8	52.8	65.9	72.5	44.9
		Rate (people)	46.5	22.6	22.6	22.6	64.2	75.9	80.8	54.3
Rural	2002	Line	29.16	21.37	15.76	21.36	42.72	64.09	85.45	39.07
		Rate (households)	53.6	31.8	20.1	31.8	61.8	80.0	88.3	59.1
		Rate (people)	62.4	44.3	29.6	44.3	69.4	81.4	89.5	67.5
	2004	Line	33.15	22.88	25.55	23.79	47.58	71.38	95.17	43.52
		Rate (households)	47.9	20.8	22.9	20.8	62.5	72.9	87.5	56.3
		Rate (people)	64.7	28.2	31.0	28.2	77.0	85.3	93.3	70.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	50.5	30.7	20.0	29.8	60.4	76.5	85.5	56.9
		Rate (people)	58.9	41.5	28.1	40.1	67.0	78.6	87.3	64.9
	2004	Rate (households)	42.0	17.7	18.6	17.7	56.6	68.7	78.4	49.3
		Rate (people)	53.7	24.8	26.0	24.8	69.3	79.7	85.8	60.7

Figure A81: Guimaras, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	33.68	23.90	20.70	24.67	49.34	74.01	98.68	45.12
		Rate (households)	26.7	22.5	13.8	22.5	38.1	60.5	73.7	31.4
		Rate (people)	33.0	27.6	16.1	27.6	48.7	66.4	75.7	37.5
	2004	Line	35.45	24.13	22.86	25.44	50.88	76.32	101.76	46.53
		Rate (households)	13.3	6.7	0.0	6.7	40.0	53.3	66.7	40.0
		Rate (people)	16.7	9.3	0.0	9.3	55.6	70.4	81.5	55.6
Rural	2002	Line	31.42	22.73	23.13	23.02	46.04	69.05	92.07	42.10
		Rate (households)	49.6	24.3	24.3	24.3	72.7	88.8	93.2	67.3
		Rate (people)	58.4	28.6	28.6	28.6	78.9	92.7	95.2	74.2
	2004	Line	34.58	24.30	23.01	24.82	49.64	74.46	99.28	45.39
		Rate (households)	64.7	33.4	24.6	33.4	78.8	91.2	93.0	75.3
		Rate (people)	77.3	45.4	34.4	45.4	85.7	94.5	95.3	83.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	46.6	24.0	22.9	24.0	68.1	85.0	90.6	62.5
		Rate (people)	55.1	28.5	27.0	28.5	74.9	89.3	92.7	69.4
	2004	Rate (households)	53.7	27.7	19.3	27.7	70.5	83.0	87.3	67.7
		Rate (people)	66.9	39.2	28.5	39.2	80.5	90.4	92.9	79.0

Figure A82: Saranggani, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	<u>International</u>							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	34.72	23.81	17.33	25.44	50.87	76.31	101.74	46.52
		Rate (households)	39.2	27.5	16.3	27.5	49.3	61.7	64.1	46.6
		Rate (people)	46.0	34.9	19.2	34.9	55.8	69.2	70.2	53.6
	2004	Line	30.44	22.63	16.52	21.85	43.69	65.54	87.38	39.95
		Rate (households)	54.3	47.3	25.9	47.3	73.3	85.2	87.7	68.6
		Rate (people)	66.9	61.3	33.2	61.3	84.4	91.1	92.6	79.3
Rural	2002	Line	32.11	21.88	12.99	23.52	47.04	70.56	94.08	43.02
		Rate (households)	74.6	64.9	35.1	67.0	87.4	93.2	95.6	81.2
		Rate (people)	80.6	70.9	40.2	72.8	89.4	94.7	97.3	84.7
	2004	Line	39.18	25.83	18.70	28.12	56.24	84.37	112.49	51.43
		Rate (households)	70.1	50.4	29.4	54.4	83.8	93.3	96.4	82.4
		Rate (people)	76.4	59.7	37.6	63.2	87.8	94.6	97.1	86.2
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	67.6	57.6	31.4	59.3	79.9	87.0	89.4	74.4
		Rate (people)	74.7	64.8	36.6	66.3	83.7	90.3	92.7	79.3
	2004	Rate (households)	67.5	49.9	28.8	53.2	82.1	92.0	95.0	80.2
		Rate (people)	74.8	59.9	36.9	62.9	87.2	94.0	96.3	85.1

Figure A83: Apayao, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	30.22	21.40	18.32	22.14	44.27	66.41	88.55	40.49
		Rate (households)	1.9	1.9	0.0	1.9	12.1	40.3	52.7	10.2
		Rate (people)	3.8	3.8	0.0	3.8	13.7	43.7	59.9	11.4
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	2002	Line	30.68	21.46	20.49	22.48	44.96	67.43	89.91	41.11
		Rate (households)	37.9	21.6	18.2	23.7	59.0	74.0	83.6	50.5
		Rate (people)	47.9	27.8	23.7	30.0	68.5	79.9	86.8	60.8
	2004	Line	44.39	26.54	24.58	31.86	63.72	95.59	127.45	58.27
		Rate (households)	63.4	32.5	27.7	45.6	80.5	92.7	95.1	77.3
		Rate (people)	66.1	37.8	32.8	51.3	82.5	92.3	94.2	78.9
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	34.2	19.6	16.3	21.4	54.1	70.5	80.4	46.3
		Rate (people)	43.3	25.3	21.3	27.2	62.8	76.1	84.0	55.6
	2004	Rate (households)	63.4	32.5	27.7	45.6	80.5	92.7	95.1	77.3
		Rate (people)	66.1	37.8	32.8	51.3	82.5	92.3	94.2	78.9

Figure A84: Compostela Valley, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	34.70	24.67	20.01	24.91	49.81	74.72	99.62	45.55
		Rate (households)	23.2	16.2	9.1	17.2	50.2	71.6	80.4	41.6
		Rate (people)	27.9	18.9	11.8	20.7	54.8	74.7	82.7	47.7
Rural	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	37.13	26.84	21.34	26.65	53.30	79.95	106.61	48.74
		Rate (households)	45.8	30.9	21.7	30.9	60.6	85.8	91.0	56.9
		Rate (people)	53.7	37.2	26.4	37.2	67.4	89.5	93.7	64.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Rate (households)	38.9	26.4	17.8	26.7	57.4	81.5	87.7	52.2
		Rate (people)	46.1	31.7	22.0	32.3	63.7	85.1	90.4	59.3

Figure A85: Zamboanga Sibugay, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	28.04	20.69	22.15	20.12	40.25	60.37	80.49	36.80
		Rate (households)	26.9	7.9	12.6	6.3	38.0	63.5	73.1	34.9
		Rate (people)	32.2	11.4	15.2	8.7	43.4	68.0	76.8	40.6
Rural	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	32.72	22.82	17.68	23.48	46.96	70.45	93.93	42.95
		Rate (households)	62.9	44.3	28.6	47.1	76.4	88.4	90.1	73.6
		Rate (people)	70.6	51.8	34.8	54.5	80.9	90.6	91.5	78.3
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Rate (households)	53.2	34.5	24.3	36.1	66.1	81.7	85.5	63.2
		Rate (people)	61.3	42.0	30.1	43.3	71.8	85.1	87.9	69.2

Figure A86: Shariff Kabunsuan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	39.03	24.78	24.69	28.59	57.19	85.78	114.37	52.29
		Rate (households)	32.1	15.9	15.6	20.9	51.3	66.9	78.7	44.2
		Rate (people)	37.1	18.7	18.6	25.0	56.3	70.2	82.1	50.0
	2004	Line	35.57	24.48	23.77	25.53	51.05	76.58	102.11	46.69
		Rate (households)	62.2	31.7	30.7	31.7	82.7	90.4	97.1	79.7
		Rate (people)	68.3	34.8	33.9	34.8	85.9	92.6	96.8	84.1
Rural	2002	Line	32.87	23.21	17.63	24.08	48.15	72.23	96.30	44.03
		Rate (households)	64.8	44.0	29.5	45.9	83.6	93.0	96.8	80.8
		Rate (people)	69.3	49.8	34.4	52.1	86.1	93.7	97.4	83.6
	2004	Line	37.88	26.94	22.58	27.18	54.37	81.55	108.74	49.72
		Rate (households)	71.5	45.7	33.5	46.5	87.2	94.9	96.6	83.3
		Rate (people)	77.7	52.4	38.8	53.4	90.9	96.5	97.6	88.0
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	53.7	34.5	24.8	37.4	72.7	84.2	90.7	68.4
		Rate (people)	58.4	39.2	29.0	42.9	76.0	85.8	92.2	72.2
	2004	Rate (households)	69.8	43.1	33.0	43.8	86.4	94.0	96.7	82.7
		Rate (people)	75.8	48.9	37.8	49.6	89.9	95.7	97.4	87.2

Figure A87: Dinagat Islands, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
			National	Food	'extreme'	\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	37.84	26.06	22.47	27.72	55.44	83.17	110.89	50.70
		Rate (households)	56.8	34.6	26.0	37.5	73.0	82.4	87.8	69.3
		Rate (people)	62.8	39.8	30.6	43.2	77.9	85.1	89.7	73.9
	2004	Line	36.92	25.58	20.27	26.50	53.00	79.50	106.00	48.47
		Rate (households)	34.8	19.3	12.7	21.1	43.6	59.9	70.6	39.5
		Rate (people)	41.0	26.7	20.0	29.1	48.1	63.5	74.2	44.2
Rural	2002	Line	30.85	22.45	16.05	22.60	45.20	67.80	90.40	41.33
		Rate (households)	58.2	49.6	26.5	49.6	76.1	87.0	91.3	72.2
		Rate (people)	65.4	57.7	31.9	57.7	80.5	89.6	93.6	77.3
	2004	Line	44.85	29.72	23.72	32.19	64.38	96.57	128.76	58.87
		Rate (households)	69.9	47.4	30.2	50.6	79.1	87.7	90.9	78.1
		Rate (people)	74.5	55.4	37.1	58.1	81.4	89.2	92.6	80.8
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	57.7	44.0	26.3	45.1	74.9	85.2	90.0	71.1
		Rate (people)	64.4	50.9	31.4	52.2	79.5	87.9	92.1	76.0
	2004	Rate (households)	60.7	40.0	25.7	42.9	69.8	80.4	85.6	68.0
		Rate (people)	66.1	48.2	32.8	50.8	73.0	82.8	88.0	71.6

Figure A88: Isabela City, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	28.11	20.19	0.00	20.17	40.34	60.52	80.69	36.89
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	44.4	55.6	16.7
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.5	49.4	62.4	23.5
Rural	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	37.24	24.13	24.56	26.73	53.46	80.18	106.91	48.88
		Rate (households)	40.4	19.1	21.3	25.5	70.2	83.0	85.1	63.8
		Rate (people)	46.6	20.6	23.0	29.4	75.0	86.3	87.7	69.6
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Rate (households)	29.2	13.8	15.4	18.5	60.0	72.3	76.9	50.8
		Rate (people)	32.9	14.5	16.3	20.8	63.7	75.4	80.3	56.1

Figure A89: Cotabato City, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by

Region	Round	Line/rate	International							
			National	National Food	USAID 'extreme'	2005 PPP			1993 PPP	
						\$1.25/day	\$2.50/day	\$3.75/day	\$5.00/day	\$4.32/day
Urban	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	41.14	25.32	19.08	29.53	59.05	88.58	118.10	54.00
		Rate (households)	43.8	28.8	18.3	35.7	60.3	77.2	85.4	58.0
		Rate (people)	54.7	37.6	26.1	46.3	69.2	84.5	90.2	67.1
Rural	2002	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Line	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Overall	2002	Rate (households)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	2004	Rate (households)	43.8	28.8	18.3	35.7	60.3	77.2	85.4	58.0
		Rate (people)	54.7	37.6	26.1	46.3	69.2	84.5	90.2	67.1