



Simple Poverty Scorecard[®] Tool Indonesia

Mark Schreiner

8 November 2019

Dokumen dan instrumen pengumpulan data ini tersedia dalam Bahasa Indonesia di scoroCS.com

This document and a data-collection tool are in English at scoroCS.com

The ScoroCS Simple Poverty Scorecard-brand poverty-assessment tool is a low-cost, transparent way for pro-poor programs in Indonesia to prove and improve their social performance by getting to know their participants better. Responses to the scorecard's 10 questions can be collected in about 10 minutes and then used to estimate participants' consumption-based poverty rates, to track changes in poverty rates, or to segment participants for differentiated treatment.

Version note

This new, field-tested scorecard for Indonesia is based on data from 2018. It should be used from now on, replacing the old scorecards in Schreiner (2012a and 2009a) that are based on data from 2007 and 2010. Indonesia changed its definition of *poverty* after 2010, so users are warned *not* to estimate changes in poverty rates over time with a baseline from an old scorecard and a follow-up from the new scorecard.

Acknowledgements

This paper was commissioned by Palladium International Pty. Ltd. and funded by Australia's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) through the Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Promoting Rural Income through Support for Markets in Agriculture (AIP-PRISMA). Data were collected by Indonesia's *Badan Pusat Statistik*. Thanks go to Yuni Chairani, Liongky Christanto, Khaled Khan, Irma Nababan, and Zulkarnaen Nasution.

Scorocs[®] Simple Poverty Scorecard[®] Tool

Interview ID: _____	<u>Name</u>	<u>Identifier</u>
Interview date: _____	Participant: _____	_____
Country: _____ IDN	Field agent: _____	_____
Scorecard: _____ 003	Service point: _____	_____
Sampling weight: _____	Number of household members: _____	

Question	Response	Points
1. In what province does the household live?	A. Jawa Timur, Jawa Tengah, Lampung, Sumatera Selatan, Nusa Tenggara Barat, DI Yogyakarta, Kepulauan Riau, Gorontalo, or Kepulauan Bangka Belitung	0
	B. Bali, Jawa Barat, or Bengkulu	2
	C. DKI Jakarta, Riau, Kalimantan Barat, Kalimantan Timur, or Papua Barat	4
	D. Banten, Sulawesi Selatan, Aceh, Jambi, Kalimantan Selatan, Sulawesi Tengah, Sulawesi Barat	7
	E. Sumatera Utara, Sumatera Barat, Nusa Tenggara Timur, Papua, Kalimantan Tengah, Sulawesi Tenggara, Sulawesi Utara, Maluku, Maluku Utara, or Kalimantan Utara	12
2. How many members does the household have?	A. Six or more	0
	B. Five	6
	C. Four	11
	D. Three	19
	E. Two	27
	F. One	37
3. How many household members 10-years-old or older worked in the past week or, if they did not work, nevertheless are only temporarily not working and have a regular or permanent job to which they plan to return?	A. None	0
	B. One	3
	C. Two	7
	D. Three or more	10
4. How many household members 10-years-old or older worked in the past week and in their main job were permanent, paid employees or were self-employed business owners with permanent, paid employees?	A. None	0
	B. One	2
	C. Two or more	4
5. In the last three months, has the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head) owned a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone?	A. No	0
	B. No female head (nor wife of the male head)	5
	C. Yes	5
6. What is the main material of the greatest part of the floor of the residence? (<i>Response options can be read aloud</i>)	A. Dirt, bamboo, or other	0
	B. Cement/red brick, or wood/planks	2
	C. Tiles/terrazzo, or parquet/vinyl/carpet	4
	D. Ceramic tile, or marble/granite	8
7. What is the main type of fuel used for cooking?	A. Firewood, coal, charcoal/briquettes, LPG (3 kg bottle), or other	0
	B. Kerosene, electricity, gas piped from public network, biogas, Blue Gaz LPG (5.5 or 12 kg bottle), or does not cook at home	4
8. Does the household have any refrigerators or freezers?	A. No	0
	B. Yes	7
9. Does the household have any motorbikes, motorized boats, or automobiles?	A. No	0
	B. Yes	10
10. In the past 4 months, has the household purchased/received Poor Rice (<i>Raskin</i> Program) or Prosperous Rice (<i>Rastra</i> Program)?	A. Yes	0
	B. No	3

Back-page Worksheet: Household Members, Age, Work Status, and Permanent, Paid Employment

Fill out the scorecard header first. Include the interview's unique identifier (if known), the interview date, and the sampling weight of the participant (if known). Then record the full name and the unique identification number of the participant (who may differ from the respondent), of the participant's field agent (who may differ from you the enumerator), and of the service point that the participant uses (if known). Circle the response to the first scorecard question based on the province where the household lives.

Then read to the respondent: *Please tell me the first names (or nicknames) and ages of all the members of your household, starting with the head and his/her (eldest) spouse (if there is one). A household is a single person or a group of people (regardless of blood or marital relationships) who normally live together and eat from the same kitchen.*

Write down the first name/nickname and age of each member, beginning with the head and the (eldest) spouse of the head (if there is one). Mark the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head, if she exists). Record the number of household members in the scorecard header next to "Number of household members:". Then circle the response to the second scorecard question about the number of household members.

For each household member 10-years-old or older, ask whether he/she worked in the past week. Ask each member who worked whether, in his/her main job, he/she was a permanent, paid employee or a self-employed business owner with permanent, paid employees. Then mark the corresponding responses to the third and fourth scorecard questions.

Finally, read the remaining six questions aloud, marking the respondent's answers. Always keep in mind and apply the detailed instructions in the "Interview Guide".

First name/nickname	Age	Head or spouse of head?	If [NAME] is 10-years-old or older, then did he/she work in the past week or, if [NAME] did not work, nevertheless is only temporarily not working and has a regular or permanent job to which he/she plans to return?			If [NAME] works, then was he/she in his/her main job a permanent, paid employee, or a self-employed business owner with permanent, paid employees?		
1.		Head (male) Head (female)	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
2.		Eldest wife of male head Husband of female head Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
3.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
4.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
5.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
6.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
7.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
8.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
9.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
10.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
11.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
12.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
13.		Other	Not ≥ 10	No	Yes	Did not work	No	Yes
No. HH members:		—	Number workers:			#Paid employees/owners:		

Look-up table to convert scores to poverty likelihoods for all poverty lines

Score	Poverty likelihood (%)																
	National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
0–28	36.1	72.7	89.3	21.4	64.9	82.0	98.9	18.8	66.2	94.4	100.0	41.1	62.5	85.5	91.5	95.7	99.5
29–33	22.3	58.5	80.5	11.3	49.8	69.9	97.1	9.5	51.5	88.2	100.0	26.7	47.7	75.1	84.2	90.5	98.3
34–36	17.1	51.3	75.0	8.2	42.8	63.1	94.9	6.7	44.5	84.1	99.9	21.5	40.9	69.0	78.6	86.6	96.4
37–39	12.7	44.3	68.8	6.0	35.0	55.7	93.7	4.9	36.6	80.5	99.9	16.0	32.8	62.5	74.0	83.6	95.9
40–41	9.9	39.2	65.7	4.6	30.3	51.8	92.0	3.6	32.4	76.6	99.9	12.8	27.9	58.4	70.4	79.8	95.0
42–43	8.4	34.1	60.5	3.6	26.0	46.1	90.2	3.0	27.5	73.1	99.8	10.9	24.1	52.7	66.1	76.7	93.3
44–45	7.3	30.4	56.4	3.2	22.9	41.9	88.2	2.5	24.1	68.9	99.6	9.6	21.6	48.4	61.8	73.1	92.3
46–47	5.5	27.1	51.2	1.9	20.6	37.2	85.2	1.6	21.9	64.4	99.6	7.5	19.0	43.7	56.8	68.8	89.9
48–49	4.3	22.6	44.9	1.8	16.2	31.3	81.0	1.5	17.2	58.0	99.0	5.8	14.6	37.6	50.6	62.5	86.3
50–51	3.2	18.0	39.3	1.2	13.1	26.8	76.8	0.9	14.0	52.8	99.0	4.1	11.7	32.4	44.5	57.7	82.3
52–53	2.4	14.6	33.4	0.8	10.4	22.1	72.3	0.7	11.2	47.1	98.8	3.3	9.3	27.1	38.5	51.7	78.3
54–55	1.5	11.8	29.0	0.6	7.7	18.3	67.7	0.4	8.4	41.3	98.3	2.1	6.8	22.8	33.7	45.8	74.2
56–57	1.2	9.4	24.4	0.3	6.1	15.1	63.1	0.3	6.5	36.5	98.0	1.7	5.4	19.1	28.9	41.0	70.2
58–59	0.9	7.2	19.9	0.3	4.6	11.7	57.3	0.3	5.0	31.6	97.1	1.2	3.9	15.0	24.3	35.9	64.9
60–61	0.6	5.9	16.2	0.2	3.7	9.6	51.9	0.2	4.0	26.8	96.1	0.8	3.3	12.1	20.2	30.7	59.6
62–63	0.4	4.6	13.7	0.1	3.0	7.6	48.8	0.1	3.2	23.5	95.8	0.6	2.6	10.2	17.5	27.6	56.3
64–66	0.2	2.8	11.0	0.1	1.6	6.0	43.6	0.1	1.8	19.3	95.4	0.3	1.4	7.9	14.0	23.1	51.6
67–71	0.1	1.8	6.4	0.1	0.9	3.1	30.9	0.0	1.1	12.2	91.4	0.2	0.8	4.3	8.5	15.0	39.0
72–100	0.0	0.6	2.4	0.0	0.4	1.0	16.8	0.0	0.4	4.7	82.5	0.0	0.3	1.6	3.1	5.9	22.4

Scorocs[®] Simple Poverty Scorecard[®] Tool Indonesia

1. Introduction

The Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard poverty-assessment tool for Indonesia is a low-cost, transparent way for pro-poor programs to get know their participants better and so to prove and improve their social performance.

The scorecard can be used to estimate the likelihood that a participant has consumption below a given poverty line, to estimate participants' poverty rate at a point in time, to estimate the change in participants' poverty rate over time, and to segment participants for differentiated treatment.

The direct approach to poverty assessment via consumption surveys is difficult and costly. A case in point is Indonesia's 2018 *Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional* (SUSENAS) by Indonesia's *Badan Pusat Statistik* (BPS). The 2018 SUSENAS runs about 60 pages and covers more than 500 top-level questions, many of which have several follow-up questions or are repeated several times (for example, for each household member). Interviewed households also completed a seven-day consumption diary.

In comparison, the scorecard's indirect approach is quick and low-cost. It uses 10 verifiable questions drawn from the 2018 SUSENAS such as "What is the main material of the greatest part of the floor of the residence?" and "Does the household have any

refrigerators or freezers?”. Responses to the questions are used to get a score that is correlated with consumption-based poverty status as measured by the exhaustive SUSENAS survey.

The scorecard differs from “proxy-means tests” (Coady, Grosh, and Hoddinott, 2004) in that it is transparent, it is freely available,¹ and it is tailored to the capabilities and purposes not of national governments but rather of local pro-poor organizations in Indonesia. The feasible poverty-assessment options for such organizations are typically blunt (such as rules based on land ownership or housing quality) or subjective and relative (such as participatory wealth ranking facilitated by skilled field workers). Poverty estimates from these approaches may be costly, their accuracy is unknown, and they are not comparable across places, programs, nor time.

The scorecard is a low-cost, consumption-based, quantitative way to estimate the share of a program’s participants who are below a given poverty line. Examples of such poverty lines include Indonesia’s national line and the World Bank’s “international extreme poverty line” of \$1.90 per person per day 2011 PPP. The scorecard can also be used to estimate changes in poverty rates. While consumption surveys are costly even for governments, some pro-poor programs may be able to implement the low-cost scorecard to help with monitoring poverty and (if desired) segmenting clients for differentiated treatment.

¹ Indonesia’s scorecard is not in the public domain; it is copyright © 2019 Scorocs.

The scorecard’s technical approach aims to be understood by non-specialists. After all, if program managers are to adopt the scorecard on their own and apply it to inform their decisions, then they must first trust that it works. Transparency and straightforwardness build trust. Getting “buy-in” matters; proxy-means tests and regressions on the “determinants of poverty” have been around for decades, but they are rarely used to inform decisions by pro-poor organizations. This is not because these tools do not work, but because they are often presented (when they are presented at all) as tables of regression coefficients incomprehensible to non-specialists (with cryptic question names such as “LGHHSZ_2” and with points with negative values and many decimal places). Thanks to the predictive-modeling phenomenon known as the “flat maximum”, approaches that are straightforward and transparent are usually about as accurate as approaches that are complex and opaque (Schreiner, 2012b; Caire and Schreiner, 2012).

Beyond its low cost and transparency, the scorecard’s technical approach is innovative in how it associates scores with poverty likelihoods, in the extent of its accuracy tests, and in how it derives formulas for standard errors. Although the accuracy tests are straightforward and commonplace in statistical practice and in the for-profit field of credit-risk scorecards, the tests are rarely applied to poverty-assessment tools.

The scorecard is based on data from Indonesia's 2018 SUSENAS. Questions are selected to be:

- Inexpensive to collect, easy to answer quickly, and straightforward to verify
- Strongly correlated with socio-economic status
- Liable to change over time as socio-economic status changes
- Applicable in all provinces of Indonesia

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 or [on hand-held devices](#) in the field in about ten minutes.

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

Second, the scorecard can estimate the poverty rate of a population of participants' households at a point in time. This estimate is the average of the estimated poverty likelihoods among a representative sample of participants' households from the population. Person-level (head-count) poverty rates can also be easily estimated, and these in turn can provide estimates of the number of poor people in households that include participants in a program.

Third, the scorecard can estimate annual changes in poverty rates. With two independent samples of participants' households from the same population, this is the difference in the average estimated poverty likelihood in the baseline sample versus the average estimated likelihood in the follow-up sample, divided by the difference (in

years) between the average interview date in the baseline sample and the average interview date in the follow-up sample.

With one sample in which each participant's household is scored twice, the estimate of the annual change in a poverty rate is the sum of the changes in each household's estimated poverty likelihood from baseline to follow-up, divided by the sum of years between each household's pair of interviews (Schreiner, 2014).

Estimates of the annual rate of change in person-level (head-count) poverty rates can also be easily estimated, and these in turn can provide estimates of the annual net number of poor people in households that include participants in a program who move from below a poverty line to above it.

The scorecard can also be used to segment participants for differentiated treatment. To help pro-poor programs choose appropriate targeting cut-offs for their purposes, targeting accuracy is reported for a range of possible cut-offs.

This paper presents a single scorecard whose questions and points are based on 150% of the national poverty line and data from a random sample of about three-fifths of households in the 2018 SUSENAS. Scores from this one scorecard are calibrated with this same three-fifths of households from the SUSENAS to poverty likelihoods for 17 poverty lines. Data from the other two-fifths of households in the 2018 SUSENAS is used to validate the scorecard's accuracy for estimating households' poverty likelihoods, for estimating poverty rates for a population of participant's households at a point in time, and for segmenting participants.

Given their assumptions, all three scorecard-based estimators are *unbiased* (the poverty likelihood of a participant’s household, the poverty rate at a point in time of a population of participants’ households, and the change in the poverty rate over time of a population of participants’ households). That is, the true value matches the average of estimates in repeated samples from a single, unchanging population in which the relationship between scorecard questions and socio-economic status is unchanging. Like all predictive models, the scorecard has estimation errors when applied (as in this paper) to a validation sample. Furthermore, it makes errors to some unknown extent when applied (in practice) to a different population or when applied after 2018 (because the relationships between questions and poverty change over time and across populations).² As warned in the “Version Note” on the title page, hybrid estimates of change over time for Indonesia with a baseline from an old scorecard and a follow-up from the new scorecard should *not* be used.

Thus, while the indirect-scorecard approach is less costly than the direct-survey approach, the scorecard has estimation errors when applied in practice. (Observed values from the direct-survey approach are taken as correct, ignoring sampling variation.) There are errors because the scorecard incorrectly acts as if future relationships between questions and socio-economic status in all populations will be the

² Examples include nationally representative samples at a later point in time and sub-populations that are not nationally representative (Diamond *et al.*, 2016; Tarozzi and Deaton, 2009).

same as in the construction data. Of course, this inevitable assumption holds only partly.

The average error in the scorecard's estimated poverty rate at a point in time (that is, the average of differences between estimated and observed values across 1,000 bootstrap samples of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample) for 100% of the national poverty line at the household level is +0.0 percentage points. The average across all 17 poverty lines of the absolute values of the average error is about 0.2 percentage points, and the maximum of the absolute values of the average error is 0.7 percentage points. These estimation errors are due to sampling variation, not bias; the average error would be zero if the whole 2018 SUSENAS were to be repeatedly re-fielded and re-divided into sub-samples before repeating the entire process of constructing and validating the resulting scorecards.

With $n = 16,384$, the 90-percent confidence intervals are ± 0.7 percentage points or smaller. For $n = 1,024$, the 90-percent intervals are ± 3.0 percentage points or smaller.

Section 2 below documents data and poverty lines. It also explains how to estimate person-level (head-count) poverty rates. Sections 3 and 4 describe scorecard construction and offer guidelines for implementation. Sections 5 and 6 tell how to estimate poverty likelihoods for individual households and poverty rates at a point in time for a population of participants' households. Section 7 discusses estimating changes in a poverty rate for a population of participants' households. Section 8 covers targeting. The last section is a summary.

The “Interview Guide” (found after the “References”) tells how to ask questions—and how to interpret responses—so as to mimic practice in Indonesia’s 2018 SUSENAS as closely as possible. The “Interview Guide” (and the “Back-page Worksheet”) are integral parts of the scorecard for Indonesia.

2. Data and poverty lines

This section presents the data used to construct and validate the scorecard. It also describes how to estimate person-level (head-count) poverty rates, the definition of *poverty*, and the 17 poverty lines to which scores are calibrated.

2.1 Data

Questions and points for the scorecard are selected (*constructed*) based on data from a random three-fifths of the 295,155 households in the 2018 SUSENAS, Indonesia's most-recent available national household consumption survey. These same three-fifths of households are also used to associate (*calibrate*) scores with poverty likelihoods for all poverty lines.

Data from the other two-fifths of households from the 2018 SUSENAS is used to test (*validate*) the scorecard's accuracy for point-in-time estimates of poverty rates *out-of-sample*, that is, with data that is not used in construction or calibration. Data from those same two-fifths of households are also used for out-of-sample tests of targeting accuracy.

The SUSENAS was fielded in March 2018. Consumption is in prices for Indonesia as a whole³ in March 2018.

³ This is a guess; documentation of the place-units of prices has not been found.

2.2 Poverty rates at the household, person, and participant level

A *poverty rate* is the share of units in households in which total household consumption (divided by the number of household members) is below a given poverty line. The unit of analysis is either the household itself or a person in the household. It is assumed that all members in a given household have the same poverty status and the same estimated poverty likelihood.

For most pro-poor programs, the most-relevant unit of analysis is the person. People suffer from poverty; households are not conscious entities, and households do not suffer except inasmuch as their human members do. As explained below, person-level estimates are a weighted average of households' poverty likelihoods, where each household's weight is the number of members in the household.

Point-in-time estimates of poverty rates are usually more relevant for newly-participating households that join a pro-poor program in a time period than for on-going participants who joined in past periods. This is because a pro-poor mission implies serving a clientele with some desired minimum poverty rate among new participants. At the same time, a pro-poor mission also implies reducing poverty, for which estimates of changes in poverty rates for on-going participants are relevant.

While estimates of poverty rates (at a point in time for new participants, or for change over time for on-going participants) matter, estimates of the *number of poor people* (for new participants) and the *annual net number of people who exit poverty* (for on-going participants) matter even more. This is because—for given levels or changes in poverty rates—a larger pro-poor program does more good than a smaller pro-poor program. After all, the end goal of a pro-poor program is not to have a high poverty rate among new participants nor a high rate of exit from poverty among on-going participants but rather to have many new participants who are poor and then to reduce the poverty of many participants who were poor when they joined. Schreiner (2014) discusses how to report and analyze scorecard estimates in more detail.

To illustrate the calculation of scorecard estimates, suppose that a brand-new pro-poor program in its first year enrolls participants from 1,000 households that encompass a total of 5,000 household members. The program applies the scorecard to a simple random sample of two households.⁴

The first sampled household has three members, one of whom is a program participant. For a given a scorecard and poverty line, the first household's estimated poverty likelihood is 60.0 percent.

⁴ Of course, such a small sample gives unreliable estimates, but it simplifies the math.

The second sampled household has four members, two of whom are program participants. With the same scorecard and poverty line, the second household's estimated poverty likelihood is 40.0 percent.

2.2.1 Household-level estimates

Poverty rates are in terms of either households or people. In the uncommon case that a program defines its *participants* as households, the household level is relevant.

The estimated household-level poverty rate is the weighted⁵ average of estimated poverty likelihoods across households with participants. In the example here, this is

$$\frac{1 \cdot 0.600 + 1 \cdot 0.400}{1 + 1} = \frac{1}{2} = 0.5 = 50 \text{ percent.}$$

In the “ $1 \cdot 0.600$ ” term in the numerator, 1 is the first household's household-level sampling weight, and 0.600 is the first household's estimated poverty likelihood from the scorecard of 60.0 percent.

In the “ $1 \cdot 0.400$ ” term in the numerator, 1 is the second household's household-level sampling weight, and 0.400 is the second household's poverty likelihood of 40.0 percent.

The “ $1 + 1$ ” in the denominator is the sum of the household-level sampling weights of the two households. Household-level sampling weights are used because the unit of analysis is the household.

⁵ The examples here assume simple random sampling at the household level. This means that each household has the same selection probability and thus the same household-level sampling weight, taken here to be one (1).

With an estimated household-level poverty rate of 50.0 percent and a population of 1,000 newly-participating households, the estimated number of newly-participating poor households is $0.500 \cdot 1,000 = 500$.

Suppose that another representative sample of the same population of formerly-new, now on-going participants⁶ is scored exactly two years later and that the resulting household-level estimated poverty rate is 45.0 percent. Then the *annual net number of households who exit poverty* is $(0.500 - 0.450) \cdot 1,000 \div 2 = 25$. Here, $(0.500 - 0.450)$ is the reduction in the household-level poverty rate in the period from baseline (50.0 percent) to follow-up (45.0 percent), 1,000 is the number of on-going households in the population in the period, and 2 is the number of years in the period.

2.2.2 Person-level estimates

Alternatively, a person-level (head-count) poverty rate is relevant if all members of a participating household are affected by any household member's participation. This is usually the relevant case.

In the example here, the person-level rate is the household-size-weighted⁷ average of estimated poverty likelihoods for households with participants, that is,

$$\frac{3 \cdot 0.600 + 4 \cdot 0.400}{3 + 4} = \frac{3.4}{7} = 0.486 = 48.6 \text{ percent.}$$

⁶ This example assumes no attrition. In practice, some participants do leave the program, and this attrition does not happen at random. In general, there is no way to eliminate bias in scorecard estimates due to non-random attrition, but in some cases it can be mitigated.

⁷ Given simple random sampling at the household level, a household's person-level weight is the number of people in the household.

In the “ $3 \cdot 0.600$ ” term in the numerator, 3 is the first household’s person-level sampling weight because the first household has three members, and 0.600 is the first household’s estimated poverty likelihood.

In the “ $4 \cdot 0.400$ ” term in the numerator, 4 is the second household’s person-level sampling weight because the second household has four members, and “0.400” is the second household’s poverty likelihood. The “ $3 + 4$ ” in the denominator is the sum of the person-level sampling weights of the two households. Person-level sampling weights are used because the unit of analysis is the household member.

With an estimated household-level poverty rate of 50.0 percent and a population of 5,000 people who are members newly-participating households, the estimated number of newly-participating poor people is $0.500 \cdot 5,000 = 2,500$.

If the scorecard is applied to a representative sample of the same population of formerly-new, now on-going participants exactly two years later, and if the resulting person-level estimated poverty rate is 45.0 percent, then the *annual net number of people who exit poverty* is $(0.486 - 0.450) \cdot 5,000 \div 2 = 90$. Here, $(0.486 - 0.450)$ is the reduction in the person-level poverty rate in the period from baseline (48.6 percent) to follow-up (45.0 percent), 5,000 is the number of on-going people in the population in the period, and 2 is the number of years in the period.

Because greater household size both causes poverty and is caused by poverty, person-level poverty rates almost always exceed household-level poverty rates. And

because people (not households) experience poverty, person-level estimates are almost always more relevant than household-level estimates.

2.2.3 Participant-level estimates

Finally, a pro-poor program might count as *participants* only those household members who directly participate in the program. In practice, this case is seldom relevant.

For the example here, this means that some—but not all—household members are counted. The estimated person-level poverty rate is then the participant-weighted average⁸ of the estimated poverty likelihoods of households with participants, that is,

$$\frac{1 \cdot 0.600 + 2 \cdot 0.400}{1 + 2} = \frac{1.4}{3} = 0.467 = 46.7 \text{ percent.}$$

The 1 in the “1 · 0.600” in the numerator is the first household’s participant-level sampling weight because the first household has one participant, and 0.600 is the first household’s poverty likelihood.

The 2 in the “2 · 0.400” in the numerator is the second household’s participant-level sampling weight because the second household has two participants, and 0.400 is the second household’s poverty likelihood.

The “1 + 2” in the denominator is the sum of the participant-level sampling weights of the two households. Participant-level sampling weights are used because the unit of analysis is the participant.

⁸ Given simple random sampling at the household level, a household’s participant-level weight is the number of participants in that household.

In almost all cases, either only one household member participates (in which case the calculations are the same as for household-level estimates) or all household members participate (in which case the calculations are the same as for person-level analysis).

To sum up, estimated poverty rates from a scorecard are weighted averages of households' estimated poverty likelihoods, where—assuming simple random sampling at the household level—the weights are the number of relevant units in the household. People matter more than households; estimates of the number of newly-participating poor units matters more than estimates of poverty rates at a point in time; and estimates of the annual reduction in the net number of on-going poor units matters more than estimates of changes in poverty rates.

When reporting scorecard-based estimates, pro-poor programs should clearly state the unit of analysis—whether households, household members, or participants—and explain why that unit is relevant. In most cases, the unit of analysis is household members because participation in a pro-poor program by any member of the household usually affects all the people who are members of the household and because poverty is experienced by people, not households.

To help with benchmarking, Table 1 reports poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people in the 2018 SUSENAS. There is a version of Table 1 for Indonesia as a whole and for each of Indonesia's 34 provinces. Each province-level

version reports poverty lines and rates for households and people in each *kota* and *kabupaten* in the province as well as aggregated by *perkotaan/perdesaan* (urban/rural), by *kota/kabupaten*, and for the province as a whole.

Household-level poverty rates are reported because—as shown above— sampling is almost always done at the level of households and because household-level poverty likelihoods can be straightforwardly converted into poverty rates for other units of analysis. This is also why the scorecard is constructed, calibrated, and validated with household weights. Person-level poverty rates are also included in Table 1 because these are the rates reported by the government of Indonesia and are usually the most-relevant for pro-poor programs. Furthermore, popular discussions and policy discourse usually proceed in terms of person-level rates, and the goal of pro-poor programs is to help people (not households) to improve their well-being.

2.3 Definition of *poverty*, and poverty lines

A household's *poverty status* as poor or non-poor depends on whether its per-capita consumption (IDR per person per day) is below a given poverty line. Thus, a definition of *poverty* is a poverty line together with a measure of consumption.

Documentation of Indonesia's definition of consumption has not been found.

Because pro-poor programs in Indonesia may want to use different or various poverty lines, this paper calibrates scores from its single scorecard to poverty likelihoods for 17 lines:

- 100% of the national line
- 150% of the national line
- 200% of the national line
- \$1.25/day 2005 PPP
- \$2.00/day 2005 PPP
- \$2.50/day 2005 PPP
- \$5.00/day 2005 PPP
- \$1.90/day 2011 PPP
- \$3.20/day 2011 PPP
- \$5.50/day 2011 PPP
- \$21.70/day 2011 PPP
- First-decile (10th-percentile) line
- First-quintile (20th-percentile) line
- Second-quintile (40th-percentile) line
- Median (50th-percentile) line
- Third-quintile (60th-percentile) line
- Fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) line

2.3.1 National poverty lines

Indonesia's national poverty line is the sum of a minimum food standard and a minimum non-food standard (BPS, 2018). For a given *kota* or *kabupaten*, the BPS first defines a reference group as the 20 percent of people in the population whose observed total (food-plus-non-food) consumption in the 2018 SUSENAS is the lowest among those in the *kota* or *kabupaten* whose total consumption is above the poverty line that was used with the 2017 SUSENAS (adjusted for inflation in the *kota* or *kabupaten* between March 2017 and March 2018). The minimum food standard is the cost of a

food basket with 52 items that provides 2,100 Calories and in which the items' shares and prices are those observed for the reference group in the 2018 SUSENAS.

The minimum non-food standard is based on a selected group of non-food consumption items in the sub-groups of housing, clothing, education, and health care. The weight of each sub-group is its share of total consumption across all the sub-groups in the more-detailed consumption data from Indonesia's 2004 *Survei Paket Komoditi Kebutuhan Dasar* (Survey of the Basic-Needs Commodity Basket). The minimum non-food standard in a given *kota* or *kabupaten* is the weighted sum of observed average consumption observed in the four sub-groups for the reference group in the 2018 SUSENAS.

The national poverty line (usually called here "100% of the national line") for a given *kota* or *kabupaten* is the the minimum food standard, plus the minimum non-food standard. Averaged across people for Indonesia as a whole, 100% of the national line in March 2018 is IDR13,052 per person per day, giving a household-level poverty rate of 6.6 percent and a person-level (head-count) poverty rate of 8.1 percent (Table 1).⁹

⁹ BPS (2018, p. xiii) reports 9.8 percent, much higher than the 8.1 percent here. Such discrepancies have occurred in the past and may stem from BPS' using data that differs from the public-use data (email from Matthew Wai-Poi, 3 December 2012).

2.3.2 International 2005 PPP poverty lines

International 2005 PPP lines are derived from:

- 2005 PPP exchange rate for Indonesia for “individual consumption expenditure by households”:¹⁰ IDR4,192.83 per \$1.00
- All-Indonesia person-level average for 100% of the national line in the 2018 SUSENAS: IDR13,052 per person per day (Table 1)
- 100% of the national line in the 2018 SUSENAS data for each *kota* and *kabupaten*
- Average all-Indonesia Consumer Price Index (CPI) in calendar-year 2005: 68.69
- Average all-Indonesia CPI in calendar-year 2011: 105.36
- Average all-Indonesia CPI in March 2018: 145.66

The regional price deflator for a given *kota* or *kabupaten* is taken as the ratio of 100% of the national line for that *kota* or *kabupaten*, divided by the all-Indonesia average line. This implies that the person-weighted average deflator for Indonesia as a whole is 1.0000.

Given this, the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line for a given *kota* or *kabupaten* in the 2018 SUSENAS is $\$1.25 \cdot 2005 \text{ PPI factor} \cdot \frac{\text{Natl. line}_{\text{Kota/Kabu}}}{\text{Natl. line}_{\text{All-IDN}}} \cdot \frac{\text{CPI}_{\text{March2018}}}{\text{CPI}_{2005}}$.

For the example of Kabupaten Aceh Barat (the first *kabupaten* in Table 1 for Aceh province), 100% of the national line is IDR14,699. The \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line is

then $\$1.25 \cdot 4,192.83 \cdot \frac{14,699}{13,052} \cdot \frac{145.66}{68.69} = \text{IDR}12,516$ (Table 1).

¹⁰ iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNetPPP2005/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=IDN_1&PPP0=4192.83&PL0=1.25&Y0=2010&NumOfCountries=1, retrieved 29 August 2019.

The lines and rates for \$1.25/day here cannot be compared with those of the World Bank’s PovcalNet¹¹ because PovcalNet does not report \$1.25/day figures for the 2018 SUSENAS.

The 2005 PPP poverty lines for \$2.00/day, \$2.50/day, and \$5.00/day are multiples of the \$1.25/day line.

2.3.3 International 2011 PPP poverty lines

International 2011 PPP lines are derived from the parameters listed above, along with the 2011 PPP exchange rate for Indonesia for “individual consumption expenditure by households”¹² of IDR4091.94 per \$1.00.

Analogous to the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line, the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP line for a given *kota* or *kabupaten* in the 2018 SUSENAS is

$$\$1.90 \cdot 2011 \text{ PPI factor} \cdot \frac{\text{Natl. line}_{\text{Kota/Kabu}}}{\text{Natl. line}_{\text{All-IDN}}} \cdot \frac{\text{CPI}_{\text{March2018}}}{\text{CPI}_{2011}}.$$

For the example of Kabupaten Aceh Barat, the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP line is:

$$\$1.90 \cdot 4,091.94 \cdot \frac{14,699}{13,052} \cdot \frac{145.66}{105.36} = \text{IDR}12,105 \text{ (Table 1).}$$

The lines and rates for \$1.90/day here cannot be compared with those of the World Bank’s PovcalNet¹³ because PovcalNet does not report \$1.90/day figures for the 2018 SUSENAS.

¹¹ iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNetPPP2005/, retrieved 29 August 2019.

¹² iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&CO=IDN_1&PPP0=4091.94&PL0=1.90&Y0=2017&NumOfCountries=1, retrieved 29 August 2019.

¹³ iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/povOnDemand.aspx, retrieved 29 August 2019.

The 2011 PPP poverty lines for \$3.20/day, \$5.50/day, and \$21.70/day are multiples of the \$1.90/day line.¹⁴

2.3.4 Percentile-based poverty lines

The scorecard for Indonesia also supports percentile-based poverty lines.¹⁵ This facilitates a number of types of analyses. For example, the second-quintile (40th-percentile) line might be used to help track Indonesia’s progress toward the World Bank’s (2013) goal of “shared prosperity/inclusive economic growth”, defined as income growth among the bottom 40 percent of the world’s people.

The four quintile lines, analyzed together, can also be used to look at the relationship of consumption with health outcomes (or anything else related with the distribution of consumption). The scorecard thus offers an alternative for health-equity analyses that typically have used an asset index such as that supplied with the data from the Demographic and Health Surveys to compare an estimate of socio-economic status with health outcomes (Rutstein and Johnson, 2004).

¹⁴ Jolliffe and Prydz (2016) discuss the World Bank’s choice of the four 2011 PPP lines.

¹⁵ Following the asset index associated with the Demographic and Health Surveys, percentiles are defined in terms of people (not households) for Indonesia as a whole. For example, the all-Indonesia person-level poverty rate for the first-quintile (20th-percentile) poverty line is 20 percent (Table 1). The household-level poverty rate for that same line is not 20 percent but rather 16.9 percent.

Of course, relative-wealth analyses were always possible (and still are possible) with scores from the scorecard. But support for relative consumption lines allows for a more straightforward use of a single tool to analyze any or all of:

- Relative wealth (via scores)
- Absolute consumption (via poverty likelihoods and absolute poverty lines)
- Relative consumption (via poverty likelihoods and percentile-based poverty lines)

Unlike the scorecard, asset indexes serve only to analyze relative wealth.

Furthermore, the scorecard—unlike asset indexes based on Principal Component Analysis or similar approaches—uses a straightforward, well-understood standard for socio-economic status whose definition is external to the tool itself (consumption relative to a poverty line defined in monetary units).

In contrast, an asset index opaquely defines *poverty* in terms of its own questions and points, without reference to an external standard. This means that two asset indexes with different questions or different points—even if derived from the same data for a given country—imply two different definitions of *poverty*. In the same set-up, two scorecards would provide comparable estimates under a single definition of *poverty*.

3. Scorecard construction

For Indonesia, about 60 candidate questions are initially prepared in the areas of:

- Household composition (such as the number of household members)
- Education (such as the highest educational level and grade completed by the male head (or the husband of the female head))
- Housing (such as the main material of the floor)
- Ownership of consumer durables (such as motorbikes or refrigerators)
- Location of residence (such as province)
- Agriculture (such as the number of household members who work in agriculture)
- Employment (such as the number of household members who are permanent, paid employees or are self-employed business owners with permanent, paid employees)

One possible application of the scorecard is to estimate changes in poverty rates over time. Thus, when selecting questions—and holding other considerations constant—preference is given to questions whose responses are more sensitive to changes in poverty. For example, the ownership of a cellular phone by the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head) is probably more likely to change in response to changes in socio-economic status than is the literacy of the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head).

The scorecard itself is built using 150% of the national poverty line and Logit regression on the construction sub-sample. Question selection is based on both judgment and statistics. The first step is to use Logit to build one scorecard for each candidate question. The power of each one-question scorecard to rank households by poverty status is assessed via the concentration index (Ravallion, 2009).

One of these one-question scorecards is then selected based on several factors (Schreiner *et al.*, 2014; Zeller, 2004). These include 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 consumption, variety among types of questions, applicability across regions, tendency to have a slow-changing relationship with socio-economic status over time, relevance for distinguishing among households at the poorer end of the distribution of consumption, and verifiability.

A series of two-question scorecards are then built, each adding a second question to the one-question scorecard selected from the first stage. The best two-question scorecard is then selected, again using judgment to balance statistical accuracy with the non-statistical criteria. These steps are repeated until the scorecard has 10 questions that work well together.

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 similar to common R^2 -based stepwise least-squares regression. It differs from naïve stepwise in that the selection of questions considers both statistical¹⁶ and non-statistical criteria. The use of non-statistical criteria can improve robustness through time and across non-nationally representative groups. It also helps ensure that questions are straightforward, common-sense, inexpensive-to-collect, and acceptable to users.

The single scorecard here applies to all of Indonesia. Segmenting poverty-assessment tools by urban/rural does not improve targeting accuracy much. This is reported for nine countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (Brown, Ravallion, and van de Walle, 2018)¹⁷, Indonesia (World Bank, 2012), Bangladesh (Sharif, 2009), India and Mexico (Schreiner, 2006 and 2005a), Sri Lanka (Narayan and Yoshida, 2005), and Jamaica (Grosh and Baker, 1995). In general, segmenting poverty-assessment tools may improve the accuracy of estimates of poverty rates (Diamond *et al.*, 2016; Tarozzi and Deaton, 2009), but it may also increase the risk of overfitting (Haslett, 2012).

¹⁶ The statistical criterion for selecting a question is not the p values of its coefficients but rather the question's contribution to the ranking of households by poverty status in the context of a scorecard with nine other questions.

¹⁷ Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda. On average across these countries when targeting people in the lowest quintile or in the lowest two quintiles of scores and when 20 or 40 percent of people are poor, segmenting by urban/rural increases the number of poor people successfully targeted by about one per 200 or one per 400 poor people.

4. Practical guidelines for scorecard use

The main challenge of scorecard design is not to maximize statistical accuracy but rather to improve the chances that the scorecard is actually used and properly used (Schreiner, 2005b). When scorecard projects fail, the reason is not usually statistical inaccuracy but rather the failure of an organization to decide to do what is needed to integrate the scorecard in its processes and to train and convince its employees to use the scorecard properly (Schreiner, 2002). After all, most reasonable poverty-assessment tools have similar targeting accuracy, thanks to the empirical phenomenon known as the “flat maximum”.¹⁸ The relevant bottleneck is less technical and more human, not statistics but organizational-change management. Accuracy is easier to achieve than adoption.

The scorecard for Indonesia is designed to encourage understanding and trust so that users will want to adopt it on their own and use it properly. Of course, accuracy matters, but it must be balanced with cost, ease-of-use, and “face validity”. Programs are more likely to collect data, compute scores, and pay careful attention to the results if, in their view, the scorecard does not imply a lot of additional work and if the whole process generally make sense to them.

¹⁸ Dupriez, 2018; Caire and Schreiner, 2012; Hand, 2006; Baesens *et al.*, 2003; Lovie and Lovie, 1986; Kolesar and Showers, 1985; Stillwell, Barron, and Edwards, 1983; Dawes, 1979; Wainer, 1976; Myers and Forgy, 1963.

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

- Ten questions
- Multiple-choice responses
- Simple points (non-negative integers, and no arithmetic beyond addition)

4.1 How to apply the scorecard in the field

The scorecard (and its “Back-page Worksheet”) is ready to be photocopied. A field worker using Indonesia’s scorecard would:

- Record the interview identifier, interview date, country code (“IDN”), scorecard code (“003”) and the sampling weight assigned to the household of the participant by the program’s survey design (if known)
- Record the names and identifiers of the participant (who is not necessarily the same as the respondent), of the field agent (if there is one) who is the participant’s main point of contact with the program (and who is not necessarily the same as the enumerator), and of the program service point that is relevant for the participant (if there is such a service point)
- Mark the response to the first scorecard question (“In what province does the household live?”) based on what is known about where the interviewed household lives
- Complete the “Back-page Worksheet” with each household member’s first name (or nickname), marking the female head (or the eldest wife of the female head), if she exists
- For every household member 10-years-old or older, ask about work status, recording the responses on the “Back-page Worksheet”

- For every household member who works, ask about status as a paid, permanent employee or as a self-employed business owner with paid, permanent employees, recording the responses on the “Back-page Worksheet”
- Based on the “Back-page Worksheet”, record the number of household members in the scorecard header next to “Number of household members:”
- Based on the “Back-page Worksheet”, mark the response to the second scorecard question (“How many members does the household have?”)
- Based on the “Back-page Worksheet”, mark the response to the third scorecard question (“How many household members 10-years-old or older worked in the past week or, if they did not work, nevertheless are only temporarily not working and have a regular or permanent job to which they plan to return?”)
- Based on the “Back-page Worksheet”, mark the response to the fourth scorecard question (“How many household members 10-years-old or older worked in the past week and in their main job were permanent, paid employees or were self-employed business owners with permanent, paid employees?”)
- Read the rest of the questions aloud one-by-one, marking the respondent’s answers
- For all questions, write each point value in the far right-hand column, and circle the pre-printed response, the pre-printed points, and the hand-written points
- Add up the points to get a total score (if desired)
- Implement targeting policy (if any) based on the score
- Upload the data with a [mobile data-collection tool](#), or deliver the paper scorecard to a central office for data entry and analysis

Of course, field workers must be trained. The quality of outputs depends on the quality of inputs. The training of field workers should be based solely on the “Interview Guide” found after the “References” in this document.

If organizations or field workers gather their own data and if they believe that they have an incentive to exaggerate poverty rates (for example, if managers or 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).¹⁹ IRIS Center (2007) and Toohig (2008) are useful nuts-and-bolts guides for logistics, budgeting, training field workers and supervisors, sampling, interviewing, piloting, recording data, and controlling quality. Schreiner (2014) explains how to compute estimates and analyze them.

While collecting scorecard questions is relatively easier than alternative ways of assessing poverty, it is still absolutely difficult. Training and explicit definitions of the terms and concepts in the scorecard are essential, and field workers should scrupulously study and follow the “Interview Guide” found after the “References” section in this paper, as this “Interview Guide”—along with the “Back-page Worksheet”—is an integral part of the scorecard.²⁰

¹⁹ If a program does not want field workers or respondents to know the points associated with responses, then it can use a [mobile data-collection tool](#) or provide a version of the paper scorecard that does not display the points and then apply the points and compute scores later at a central office. Even if points are hidden, however, field workers and respondents can use common sense to guess how answers are linked with poverty. Schreiner (2012c) argues that hiding points in Colombia (Camacho and Conover, 2011) did little to deter cheating and that, in any case, cheating by the user’s central office was more damaging than cheating by field workers and respondents.

²⁰ The guidelines here are the only ones that organizations should give to enumerators. All other issues of interpretation should be left to the judgment of enumerators and respondents, as this seems to be what Indonesia’s BPS did in the 2018 SUSENAS.

For the example of Nigeria, one study (Onwujekwe, Hanson, and Fox-Rushby, 2006) found distressingly low inter-rater and test-retest correlations for questions as seemingly incontrovertible as whether a household owns an automobile. Yet Grosh and Baker (1995) suggest that gross underreporting of assets does not affect targeting. For the first stage of targeting in a conditional cash-transfer program in Mexico, Martinelli and Parker (2007, pp. 24–25) find that “under-reporting [of asset ownership] is widespread but not overwhelming, except for a few goods . . . [and] over-reporting is common for a few goods”. Still, as is done in Mexico in the second stage of its targeting process, most false self-reports can be corrected (or avoided in the first place) by field workers who make a home visit. This is the recommended procedure for programs that use the scorecard for targeting in Indonesia.

4.2 Survey-design choices

In terms of implementation and sampling design, a program must make choices about:

- Who will do the interviews
- Where interviews will be done
- How responses and scores will be recorded
- Which participants' households will be interviewed
- How many participants' households will be interviewed
- How frequently participants' households will be interviewed
- Whether the scorecard will be applied at more than one point in time
- Whether the same participants' households will be scored more than once

In general, the sampling design should follow from the program's goals for the survey, the questions to be answered, and the budget. The broad goals are:

- To make sure that the sample is representative of a well-defined population
- To inform issues that matter to the program

The non-specialists who apply the scorecard in the field with the households of a program's participants can be:

- Employees of the program
- Third parties

There is only one correct, recommended way to do interviews: in-person, at the sampled household's residence, with an enumerator trained to follow the "Interview Guide". This is how the BPS did interviews in Indonesia's 2018 SUSENAS, and this provides the most-accurate and most-consistent data (and thus the best estimates).

Of course, it is possible to do interviews in other ways such as:

- Without an enumerator (for example, by asking respondents to fill out paper or web forms on their own or to answer questions sent via e-mail, text messaging, or automated voice-response systems)
- Away from the residence (for example, at an organizational service point or at a group-meeting place)
- Not in-person (for example, with an enumerator interviewing by phone)

While such non-recommended methods may reduce costs, they also affect responses (Schreiner, 2015b) and thus reduce the accuracy of scorecard estimates. This is why interviewing by a trained enumerator at the residence is recommended and why other methods are not recommended.

In some contexts—such as when a program’s field agents do not already visit participants periodically at home anyway as part of their normal work—a program might judge that the lower costs of a non-recommended approach compensate for less-accurate estimates. The business wisdom of non-recommended methods depends on context-specific factors that each program must judge for itself. To judge carefully, a program that is considering a non-recommended method should do a small test to see how responses differ with the non-recommended method versus with a trained enumerator at the residence. Furthermore, any reporting should note the use of the non-recommended method and discuss its possible consequences.

Responses, scores, and poverty likelihoods can be recorded by enumerators on:

- Paper in the field, and then filed at a central office
- Paper in the field, and then keyed into a database or spreadsheet at a central office
- [Mobile devices in the field](#), and then uploaded to a database²¹

Given a population of participants relevant for a particular business question, the participants whose households will be interviewed can be:

- All relevant participants (a census)
- A representative sample of relevant participants
- All relevant participants in a representative sample of relevant field offices and/or in a representative sample of relevant field agents
- A representative sample of relevant participants in a representative sample of relevant field offices and/or in a representative sample of relevant field agents

If not determined by other factors, the number of participants whose households are to be interviewed can be derived from sample-size formulas (presented later) to achieve a desired confidence level and a desired confidence interval. To have the best chance to meaningfully inform questions that matter to the program, however, the focus should be less on having a sample size large enough to achieve some arbitrary level of statistical significance and more on having a representative sample from a well-defined population that is relevant for informing issues that matter to the program. In practice, errors due to implementation issues and due to interviewing a non-representative sample can easily swamp errors due to having a somewhat smaller sample size.

²¹ [Scorocs](#) can help set up a system to collect data with mobile devices or to capture data in a database at the office once paper forms come in. Support is also available for calculating estimates as well as for reporting and analysis.

The frequency of application can be:

- As a once-off project (precluding estimating change)
- Every three years (or at any other fixed or variable time interval, allowing estimating change)
- Each time a field agent visits a participant at home (allowing estimating change)

If a scorecard is applied more than once in order to estimate changes in poverty rates over time, then it can be applied:

- With two independent samples of participants from the same population, with the first sample scored at baseline and the second sample scored at follow-up
- With a single sample of participants, all of whom are scored at both baseline and follow-up

An example set of choices is illustrated by BRAC and ASA, two microfinance organizations in Bangladesh who each have about 7 million participants and who declared their intention to apply the scorecard for Bangladesh (Schreiner, 2013a) with a sample of about 25,000 participants each. Their design is that all loan officers in a random sample of branches score all participants each time the loan officers visit a homestead (about once a year) as part of their standard due diligence prior to loan disbursement. The loan officers record responses on paper in the field before sending the forms to a central office to be entered into a database and converted to poverty likelihoods.

5. Estimates of a household's poverty likelihood

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

To get absolute units, scores are converted to *poverty likelihoods*, that is, probabilities of being below a poverty line. This is done via easy-to-use look-up tables. For the example of 100% of the national poverty line, scores of 44–45 have a poverty likelihood of 7.3 percent, and scores of 46–47 have a poverty likelihood of 5.5 percent (Table 2).

The poverty likelihood associated with a score varies by poverty line. For example, scores of 44–45 are associated with a poverty likelihood of 7.3 percent for 100% of the national poverty line but of 68.9 percent for the \$5.50/day 2011 PPP line.²²

²² From Table 2 on, many tables have 17 versions, one for each of the 17 supported poverty lines. To keep them straight, tables are grouped by line. Single tables relevant for all lines appear with the first group of tables for 100% of the national poverty line.

5.1 Calibrating scores with poverty likelihoods

A given score is associated (“calibrated”) with an estimated *poverty likelihood* that is defined as the share of households in the construction sub-sample who have the score and who have per-capita consumption below a given poverty line.

For the example of 100% of the national poverty line and a score of 44–45 (Table 3), there are 5,084 (normalized) households in the construction sample. Of these, 371 (normalized) are below the poverty line. The estimated poverty likelihood associated with a score of 44–45 is then 7.3 percent, because $371 \div 5,084 = 0.073 = 7.3$ percent.

To illustrate with 100% of the national poverty line and a score of 46–47, there are 5,220 (normalized) households in the construction sub-sample, of whom 288 (normalized) are below the line (Table 3). The poverty likelihood for this score range is then $288 \div 5,220 = 0.055 = 5.5$ percent.

The same method is used to calibrate scores with estimated poverty likelihoods for all 17 poverty lines.²³

Even though the scorecard is constructed partly based on judgment related to non-statistical criteria, the calibration process produces poverty likelihoods that are objective, that is, derived from monetary poverty lines and from survey data on consumption. The calibrated poverty likelihoods would be objective even if the process

²³ To ensure that poverty likelihoods never increase as scores increase, likelihoods across pairs of adjacent scores may be iteratively averaged before grouping scores into ranges. This preserves unbiasedness while keeping users from balking when sampling variation in score ranges with few households would otherwise lead to higher scores being linked with higher poverty likelihoods.

of selecting questions and points did not use any data at all. In fact, objective scorecards of proven accuracy are often constructed using only expert judgment to select questions and points.²⁴ 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 their objectivity depends on using data in score calibration, not on using data (and nothing else) in scorecard construction.

Although the points in Indonesia’s scorecard are transformed coefficients from a Logit regression, (untransformed) 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. It is more intuitive to define the poverty likelihood as the share of households with a given score in the construction sample who are below a poverty line. Going from scores to poverty likelihoods in this way requires no arithmetic at all, just a look-up table. This approach to calibration can also improve accuracy, especially with large samples.

²⁴ Fuller, 2006; Caire, 2004; Schreiner *et al.*, 2014.

5.2 Accuracy of estimates of households' poverty likelihoods

As long as the relationships between questions and poverty do not change over time, and as long as the scorecard is applied to samples of households who are representative of the same population as that from which the scorecard was originally constructed, then this calibration process produces unbiased estimates of poverty likelihoods. *Unbiased* means that in repeated samples from the same population, the average of the estimates matches the population's true value. Given the assumptions above, the scorecard also produces unbiased estimates of poverty rates at a point in time and unbiased estimates of changes in poverty rates between two points in time.²⁵

Of course, the relationships between questions and poverty do change to some unknown extent over time, and they also vary across sub-national groups in Indonesia's population. Thus, scorecard estimates will generally have errors when applied after March 2018 (the period of field work for the 2018 SUSENAS) or when applied with sub-groups that are not nationally representative.

²⁵ This is because these estimates of populations' poverty rates are linear functions of the unbiased estimates of households' poverty likelihoods.

How accurate are estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, given the assumption of unchanging relationships between questions and poverty over time and the assumption of a sample that is representative of Indonesia as a whole? To find out, the scorecard is applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of size $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample. Bootstrapping means to:

- Score each household in the validation sample
- Draw a bootstrap sample *with replacement* from the validation sample, accounting for household-level sampling weights
- For each score range, compute the observed poverty likelihood in the bootstrap sample, that is, the share of households with the score and with consumption below a poverty line
- For each score range, record the difference between the estimated poverty likelihood (Table 2) and the observed poverty likelihood in the bootstrap sample
- Repeat the previous three steps 1,000 times
- For each score range, report the average difference between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods across the 1,000 bootstrap samples
- For each score range, report the intervals containing the central 900, 950, and 990 differences between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods

For each score range and for $n = 16,384$, Table 4 shows the errors in the estimates of poverty likelihoods, that is, the average of differences between estimates and observed values. It also shows confidence intervals for the errors.

For 100% of the national line and on average across bootstrap samples from the validation sample, the estimated poverty likelihood for scores of 44–45 (7.3 percent, Table 2) is too high by 0.5 percentage points. For scores of 46–47, the estimate is too low by 0.3 percentage points.²⁶

²⁶ These differences are not zero, in spite of the estimator's unbiasedness, because the scorecard is based on a single sample. The average difference by score would be zero if

The 90-percent confidence interval for the differences for scores of 44–45 is ± 1.9 percentage points (Table 4). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps, the average difference between the estimate and the observed value for households in this score range is between -1.4 and $+2.4$ percentage points (because $+0.5 - 1.9 = -1.4$, and $+0.5 + 1.9 = +2.4$). In 950 of 1,000 bootstraps (95 percent), the difference is $+0.5 \pm 2.3$ percentage points, and in 990 of 1,000 bootstraps (99 percent), the difference is $+0.5 \pm 2.9$ percentage points.

None of the absolute errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods in Table 4 for 100% of the national line are large. The differences are at least partly due to the fact that the validation sample is a single sample that—thanks to sampling variation—differs in distribution from the construction sub-sample and from the population of Indonesia. For targeting, however, what matters is less the difference in all score ranges and more the differences in the score ranges just above and just below the targeting cut-off. This mitigates the effects of error and sampling variation on targeting (Friedman, 1997). Section 8 below looks at targeting accuracy in detail.

samples were repeatedly drawn from the population and split into sub-samples before repeating the entire process of scorecard construction/calibration and validation.

In addition, if estimates of populations' poverty rates are to be usefully accurate, then errors across individual households' poverty likelihoods must largely balance out. As discussed in the next section, this is generally the case for nationally representative samples in 2018 in Indonesia, although it will hold less well for samples from sub-national populations and in other time periods.

Another possible source of errors between estimates and observed values is overfitting. The scorecard here is unbiased, but it may still be *overfit* when applied after the end of the SUSENAS field work in March 2018. That is, the scorecard may fit the construction data from 2018 so closely that it captures not only some real patterns that exist in the population of Indonesia but also some random patterns that, due to sampling variation, show up only in the 2018 SUSENAS construction sample. Or the scorecard may be overfit in the sense that its accuracy decreases when relationships between questions and poverty change over time or when the scorecard is applied to sub-groups that are not nationally representative.

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

Most errors in individual households' likelihoods do balance out in the estimates of poverty rates for nationally representative samples (see the next two sections). Furthermore, at least some of the differences in change-over-time estimates come from non-scorecard sources such as changes in the relationships between questions and poverty, sampling variation, changes in poverty lines, inconsistencies in data quality over time, and imperfections in price adjustments over time and across geographic regions. These factors can be addressed only by improving the availability, frequency, quantity, and quality of data from national consumption surveys (which is beyond the scope of the scorecard) or by reducing overfitting (which likely has limited returns, given the scorecard's parsimony).

6. Estimates of a poverty rate at a point in time

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

To illustrate, suppose a program samples three households on 1 January 2021 and that they have scores of 30, 40, and 50, corresponding to estimated poverty likelihoods of 22.3, 9.9, and 3.2 percent (100% of the national line, Table 2). The population's estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of $(22.3 + 9.9 + 3.2) \div 3 = 11.8$ percent.²⁷

Be careful; the population's estimated poverty rate is *not* the poverty likelihood associated with the average score. Here, the average score is 40, which corresponds to an estimated poverty likelihood of 9.9 percent. This differs from the 11.8 percent found as the average of the three individual poverty likelihoods associated with each of the three scores. Unlike poverty likelihoods, scores are ordinal symbols, like letters in the alphabet, colors in the spectrum, or syllables in a solfège scale. Because scores are not cardinal numbers, they cannot meaningfully be added up or averaged across households. Only three operations are valid for scores: conversion to poverty likelihoods, analysis of distributions (Schreiner, 2012b), or comparison—if desired—with a cut-off for segmentation. There are a few contexts in which the analysis of scores is

²⁷ This example assumes simple random sampling (or a census) and analysis at the level of households so that each household's household-level sampling weight is one (1). Weights would differ by household if there were stratified sampling or—as discussed in Section 2—if the analysis were at the level of the person or of the participant.

appropriate, but, in general, the safest rule to follow is: If you are not completely sure what to do, then use poverty likelihoods, not scores.

Scores from the scorecard are calibrated with data from the construction sample of the 2018 SUSENAS for all 17 poverty lines. The process of calibrating scores to poverty likelihoods and the approach to estimating poverty rates is exactly the same for all poverty lines. For users, the only difference in terms of what they do with one poverty line versus with another has to do with the values in the look-up table used to convert scores to poverty likelihoods.

6.1 Accuracy of estimated poverty rates at a point in time

For the scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ for 100% of the national line, the average error (average difference between the estimate and observed value in the validation sample) for a poverty rate at a point in time is +0.0 percentage points (Table 6, which summarizes Table 5 across all poverty lines). For the 17 poverty lines, the maximum of the absolute values of the error in the validation sample is 0.7 percentage points, and the average of the absolute values of the average errors is about 0.2 percentage points. At least part of these differences is due to sampling variation in the division of the 2018 SUSENAS into two sub-samples.

When estimating poverty rates at a point in time for a given poverty line, the error reported in Table 6 should be subtracted from the average poverty likelihood to give a corrected estimate. For the example of the scorecard and 100% of the national

line in the validation sample, the error happens to be +0.0 percentage points, so the corrected estimate in the three-household example above is $11.8 - (+0.0) = 11.8$ percent. Most errors in Table 6 are not 0.0 percentage points, so the corrected estimate will usually differ from the uncorrected estimate.

In terms of precision, the 90-percent confidence interval for a population's estimated poverty rate at a point in time with $n = 16,384$ is ± 0.7 percentage points or smaller for all poverty lines (Table 6). Given the scorecard's standard assumptions, this means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps of this size, the estimate (after correcting for the known average error) is within 0.7 percentage points of the observed value.

For example, suppose that the (uncorrected) average poverty likelihood in a sample of $n = 16,384$ with the scorecard and 100% of the national line is 11.8 percent. Then estimates in 90 percent of such samples would be expected to fall in the range of $11.8 - (+0.0) - 0.3 = 11.5$ percent to $11.8 - (+0.0) + 0.3 = 12.1$ percent, with the most likely observed value being the corrected estimate in the middle of this range, that is, $11.8 - (+0.0) = 11.8$ percent. This is because the original (uncorrected) estimate is 11.8 percent, the average error is +0.0 percentage points, and the 90-percent confidence interval for 100% of the national line in the validation sample with this sample size is ± 0.3 percentage points (Table 6).

6.2 Formula for standard errors for estimates of poverty rates

How precise are the point-in-time estimates? Because these estimates are averages, they have (in “large” samples) a Normal distribution and can be characterized by their error (average difference vis-à-vis observed values), together with their standard error (precision, taken as the square root of the sum of the squared differences).

Schreiner (2008) proposes an approach to deriving a formula for the standard errors of estimated poverty rates at a point in time from indirect estimation via a scorecard. It starts with Cochran’s (1977) textbook formula of $\pm c = \pm z \cdot \sigma$ that relates confidence intervals with standard errors in the case of the direct measurement of ratios, where:

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

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

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

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

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

N is the population size, and

n is the sample size.

For example, Indonesia’s 2018 SUSENAS gives a direct-measure household-level poverty rate for 100% of the national line of $\hat{p} = 6.6$ percent (Table 1).²⁸ If this measure came from a sample of $n = 16,384$ households from a population N of 70,102,195 (the number of households in Indonesia in 2018 according to the SUSENAS sampling

weights), then the finite population correction ϕ is $\sqrt{\frac{70,102,195 - 16,384}{70,102,195 - 1}} = 0.9999$,

which is very close to $\phi = 1$. If the desired confidence level is 90-percent ($z = 1.64$), then the confidence interval $\pm c$ is

$$\pm z \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}} = \pm 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.066)}{16,384}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{70,102,195 - 16,384}{70,102,195 - 1}} = \pm 0.318$$

percentage points. If ϕ were taken as 1, then the interval is still ± 0.318 percentage points.

Unlike the 2018 SUSENAS, however, the scorecard does not measure poverty directly, so this formula is not applicable. To derive a formula for the scorecard, consider Table 5, which reports empirical confidence intervals $\pm c$ for the errors for the scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of various sizes from the validation sample. For example, with $n = 16,384$ and 100% of the national line in the validation sample, the 90-percent confidence interval is ± 0.346 percentage points.²⁹

²⁸ This analysis ignores that poverty-rate estimates from SUSENAS are themselves based on a sample and so have their own sampling distribution.

²⁹ Due to rounding, Table 6 displays 0.3, not 0.346.

Thus, the scorecard’s 90-percent confidence interval with $n = 16,384$ is ± 0.346 percentage points, while the interval for direct measurement is ± 0.318 percentage points. The ratio of the two intervals is $0.346 \div 0.318 = 1.09$.

Now consider the same exercise, but with $n = 8,192$. The confidence interval under direct measurement and 100% of the national line in the validation sample is

$$\pm 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.066)}{8,192}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{70,102,195 - 8,192}{70,102,195 - 1}} = \pm 0.450 \text{ percentage points.}$$

The empirical confidence interval with the scorecard (Table 5) is ± 0.492 percentage points.

Thus for $n = 8,192$, the ratio of the two intervals is $0.492 \div 0.450 = 1.09$.

This ratio of 1.09 is the same for both $n = 8,192$ and $n = 16,384$. Across all sample sizes of 256 or more in Table 5, these ratios are generally close to each other, and the average of these ratios in the validation sample turns out to be 1.11. This implies that confidence intervals for indirect estimates of poverty rates via Indonesia’s scorecard with 100% of the national line are—for a given sample size—about 11 percent wider than the confidence intervals for direct estimates via the 2018 SUSENAS. This 1.1 appears in Table 6 as the “ α factor for precision” because if $\alpha = 1.11$, then the formula for approximate confidence intervals $\pm c$ for the scorecard is $\pm c = \pm z \cdot \alpha \cdot \sigma$.

That is, the formula for the approximate standard error σ for point-in-time estimates of

poverty rates via the scorecard is $\alpha \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}}$.

In general, α can be greater than or less than 1.00. When α is greater than 1.00, it means that the scorecard is has larger standard errors than direct measurement. It

turns out that α is greater than 1.00 for all 17 poverty lines in Table 6, and its highest value is 1.30.

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

and the desired confidence interval $\pm c$ is $n = N \cdot \left(\frac{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p})}{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p}) + c^2 \cdot (N - 1)} \right)$. If

the population N is “large” relative to the sample size n , then the finite-population correction factor ϕ can be taken as one (1), and the formula becomes

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

To illustrate how to use this, suppose the population N of 70,102,195 (the number of households in Indonesia in 2018), suppose $c = 0.02866$, $z = 1.64$ (90-percent confidence), and the relevant poverty line is 100% of the national line so that the most sensible expected poverty rate \tilde{p} is Indonesia’s overall poverty rate for that line in 2018 (6.6 percent at the household level, Table 1). The α factor is 1.11 (Table 6). Then the sample-size formula gives

$$n = 70,102,195 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64^2 \cdot 1.11^2 \cdot 0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.066)}{1.64^2 \cdot 1.11^2 \cdot 0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.066) + 0.02866^2 \cdot (70,102,195 - 1)} \right) = 249,$$

which is close to the sample size of 256 observed for these parameters in Table 5 for

100% of the national line. Taking the finite population correction factor ϕ as one (1)

gives the same result, as $n = \left(\frac{1.11 \cdot 1.64}{0.02866} \right)^2 \cdot 0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.066) = 249$.

Of course, the α factors in Table 6 are specific to Indonesia, its poverty lines, its poverty rates, and this scorecard. The derivation of the formulas for approximate standard errors using the α factors, however, can be used for any poverty-assessment tool following the approach in this paper.

In practice after the end of field work for the SUSENAS in March 2018, a program would select a poverty line (say, 100% of the national line), note its participants' population size (for example, $N = 10,000$ participants), select a desired confidence level (say, 90 percent, or $z = 1.64$), select a desired confidence interval (say, ± 2.0 percentage points, or $c = \pm 0.02$), make an assumption about \tilde{p} (perhaps based on a previous estimate such as the household-level poverty rate for 100% of the national line for Indonesia of 6.6 percent in the 2018 SUSENAS in Table 1), look up α (here, 1.11 in Table 6), assume that the scorecard will still work in the future and for sub-groups that are not nationally representative,³⁰ and then compute the required sample size. In

this illustration, $n = 10,000 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64^2 \cdot 1.11^2 \cdot 0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.066)}{1.64^2 \cdot 1.11^2 \cdot 0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.666) + 0.02^2 \cdot (10,000 - 1)} \right) = 486$.

³⁰ This paper reports accuracy for the scorecard applied to its validation sample, but it does not test accuracy for later years nor for sub-populations that are not nationally representative. Performance after March 2018 will resemble that in the 2018 SUSENAS with deterioration over time and across non-nationally representative sub-groups to the extent that the relationships between questions and poverty status change.

7. Estimates of changes in poverty rates over time

The change in a population's poverty rate between two points in time is estimated as the change in the average poverty likelihood of a sample of households from the population.

It is not possible to test here the accuracy of estimates of change over time in which both baseline and follow-up estimates are from the new Indonesia scorecard. Therefore, this paper can only suggest approximate formulas for standard errors. Nonetheless, the relevant concepts are discussed because in practice pro-poor organizations in Indonesia can apply the new scorecard to collect their own data and measure change over time.

7.1 Warning: *Change is not necessarily impact*

The scorecard can estimate change. Of course, poverty could get better or worse, and the scorecard does not indicate what caused change. This point is often forgotten or confused, so it bears repeating: the scorecard merely estimates change, and it does not, in and of itself, indicate the causes of change. In particular, estimating the impact on poverty of participation in a pro-poor program requires knowledge or assumptions about what would have happened to participants if they had not been participants. Making judgments or drawing conclusions about causality 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 the impact of

participation on poverty only if there is some way to know—or explicit assumptions about—what would have happened in the absence of participation. And that must come from beyond the scorecard.

7.2 Estimating changes in poverty rates

Consider the illustration begun in the previous section. On 1 January 2021, a pro-poor program samples three households who score 30, 40, and 50 and so have poverty likelihoods of 22.3, 9.9, and 3.2 percent (100% of the national line, Table 2). Given the known average error for this line in the validation sample of +0.0 percentage points (Table 6), the corrected baseline estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of $[(22.3 + 9.9 + 3.2) \div 3] - (+0.0) = 11.8$ percent.

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

- *Two independent samples:* Score a new, independent sample from the same population that was sampled from at baseline
- *One sample scored twice:* Score the same sample that was scored at baseline

7.2.1 Estimating change with two independent samples

By way of illustration, suppose that three years later on 1 January 2024, the pro-poor program draws a new, independent sample of three additional households who are in the same population as the three original households and finds that their scores are 35, 45, and 55 (poverty likelihoods of 17.1, 7.3, and 1.5 percent, 100% of the national line, Table 2). Adjusting for the known average error, the average poverty likelihood at follow-up is $[(17.1 + 7.3 + 1.5) \div 3] - (+0.0) = 8.6$ percent. The three-year reduction in

the poverty rate is then $11.8 - 8.6 = 3.2$ percentage points.³¹ If exactly three years passed between the average baseline interview and the average follow-up interview, then the estimated annual decrease in the poverty rate is $3.2 \div 3 = 1.1$ percentage points per year. That is, about one in 91 participants in this hypothetical example cross the poverty line each year.³² Among those who started below the line, about one in 11 ($1.1 \div 11.8 = 9.3$ percent) on net ended up above the line each year.³³

7.2.2 Estimating change with one sample scored twice

Alternatively, suppose that the same three original households who were scored at baseline are scored again on 1 January 2024. Given scores of 35, 45, and 55, their follow-up poverty likelihoods are 17.1, 7.3, and 1.5 percent. The average across households of the difference in each given household's baseline poverty likelihood and its follow-up poverty likelihood is $[(22.3 - 17.1) + (9.9 - 7.3) + (3.2 - 1.5)] \div 3 = 3.2$ percentage points.³⁴ If there are exactly three years between each household's interviews, then the estimated annual decrease in the poverty rate is (again) $3.2 \div 3 = 1.1$ percentage points per year.

³¹ Of course, such a large reduction in poverty in three years may be unlikely, but this is just an example to show how the scorecard can be used to estimate change.

³² This is a net figure; some start above the line and end below it, and vice versa.

³³ The scorecard does not reveal the reasons for this change.

³⁴ With one sample scored twice, the error for this line from Table 6 should *not* be subtracted off.

Given the assumptions of the scorecard, both approaches give unbiased estimates of the annual change in poverty rates. In general and in practice, however, they will give different estimates due to differences in the timing of interviews, in the composition of samples, and in the nature of two independent samples (each scored once) versus the nature of one sample scored twice (Schreiner, 2014).

7.3 Precision for estimated changes

7.3.1 Precision when scoring two independent samples

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

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

Here, z , c , \hat{p} and N are defined as above, n is the sample size at both baseline and follow-up,³⁵ and α is the average (across a range of bootstrapped sample sizes) of the ratio of the observed confidence interval from a scorecard divided by the theoretical confidence interval under direct measurement.

³⁵ This means that—for a given level of precision—estimating the change in a poverty rate between two points in time requires four times as many interviews (not twice as many) as does estimating a poverty rate at a point in time.

As before, the formula for standard errors can be rearranged to give a formula for sample sizes before indirect estimation via a scorecard, where \tilde{p} is based on previous estimates and is assumed equal at both baseline and follow-up:

$$n = 2 \cdot N \cdot \left(\frac{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p})}{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p}) + c^2 \cdot (N - 1)} \right). \text{ If } \phi \text{ can be taken as one (1), then the}$$

$$\text{formula becomes } n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p}).$$

With two independent samples, α has been estimated for scorecards for 19 countries (Schreiner 2018, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, 2016d, 2015a, 2015c, 2015d, 2015e, 2013a, 2013b, 2012d, 2010, 2009b, 2009c, and Chen and Schreiner, 2009). The unweighted average of α across the 27 scorecards for these 19 countries—after averaging α across poverty lines and pairs of survey rounds for each scorecard—is 1.10.³⁶ This rough figure is as reasonable as any to use for the new Indonesia scorecard from now on when both baseline and follow-up are from the new 2018 scorecard.

To illustrate the use of this formula to determine sample size for estimating changes in poverty rates with two independent samples, suppose the desired confidence level is 90 percent ($z = 1.64$), the desired confidence interval is ± 2 percentage points ($\pm c = \pm 0.02$), the poverty line is 100% of the national line, $\alpha = 1.10$, $\tilde{p} = 0.066$ (the household-level poverty rate in 2018 for 100% of the national line in Table 1), and the population N is large enough relative to the expected sample size n that the finite population correction ϕ can be taken as one (1). Then the baseline sample size is

³⁶ The average absolute error is 3.2 percentage points.

$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.10 \cdot 1.64}{0.02} \right)^2 \cdot 0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.066) \cdot 1 = 1,004$ and the follow-up sample size is also 1,004.

7.3.2 Precision with one sample scored twice

Analogous to previous derivations, the general formula relating the confidence interval $\pm c$ to the standard error σ when using a scorecard to estimate change for one sample scored twice is:³⁷

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

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

The formula for confidence intervals can be re-arranged to give a formula for sample size before estimation. This requires an estimate (based on information available before sampling) of the expected shares of all households who will cross the poverty line \tilde{p}_{12} and \tilde{p}_{21} . Before sampling, an agnostic assumption is that the change in the poverty rate will be zero, which implies $\tilde{p}_{12} = \tilde{p}_{21} = \tilde{p}_*$, giving:

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

Because \tilde{p}_* could be anything between 0 and 0.5, more information is needed to apply this formula. The average observed relationship in Niger (Schreiner, 2018) and

³⁷ See McNemar (1947) and Johnson (2007). John Pezzullo helped identify this formula.

Peru (Schreiner, 2009d) between \tilde{p}_* , the number of years y between baseline and follow-up, and $p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot (1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}})$ is close to:

$$\tilde{p}_* = -0.01 + 0.016 \cdot y + 0.56 \cdot [p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot (1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}})].$$

Given this approximate result, a sample-size formula for a sample of households to whom the scorecard for Indonesia is applied twice (once after March 2018 and then again later) is

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot [-0.01 + 0.016 \cdot y + 0.56 \cdot p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot (1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}})] \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{n - 1}}.$$

The average α across poverty lines for Niger and Peru is about 1.14. This 1.14 figure for α is as reasonable as any other for the new Indonesia scorecard (as well as for other scorecards in general).

To illustrate the use of this formula, suppose the desired confidence level is 90 percent ($z = 1.64$), the desired confidence interval is ± 2.0 percentage points ($\pm c = \pm 0.02$), the poverty line is 100% of the national line, the sample will first be scored in 2021 and then again in 2024 ($y = 3$), and the population N is so large relative to the expected sample size n that the finite population correction ϕ can be taken as one (1).

The pre-baseline household-level poverty rate p_{2021} is taken as 6.6 percent (Table 1), and α is assumed to be 1.14. Then the baseline sample size is

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.14 \cdot 1.64}{0.02} \right)^2 \cdot \{-0.01 + 0.016 \cdot 3 + [0.56 \cdot 0.066 \cdot (1 - 0.066)]\} \cdot 1 = 1,268. \text{ The same}$$

group of 1,268 households is scored at follow-up as well.

8. Targeting

When a program uses the scorecard for segmenting participants for differentiated treatment (*targeting*), households with scores at or below a cut-off are labeled *targeted* and given one type of treatment by the program. Households with scores above a cut-off are labeled *non-targeted* and given another type of treatment.

There is a distinction between *targeting status* (having a score at or below a targeting cut-off) and *poverty status* (having consumption below a poverty line). Poverty status is a fact that is defined by whether consumption 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.

Households that score at or below a given cut-off should be labeled as *targeted*,³⁸ not as *poor*. After all, unless all targeted households have poverty likelihoods of 100 percent, it is likely that some of them are non-poor (their consumption is above a given poverty line). In the context of the scorecard, the terms *poor* and *non-poor* have specific definitions. Using these same terms for targeting status is incorrect and misleading.

³⁸ Other labels can be meaningful as long as they describe the segment and do not confuse targeting status (having a score below a program-selected cut-off) with poverty status (having consumption below an externally-defined poverty line). Examples include: *Groups A, B, and C*; *Households with scores of 29 or less, 30 to 69, or 70 or more*; and *Households that qualify for reduced fees, or that do not qualify*.

Targeting is successful to the extent to which households truly below a poverty line are targeted (*inclusion*) or households truly above a poverty line are not targeted (*exclusion*). Of course, no poverty-assessment tool is perfect, and targeting is unsuccessful to the extent to which households truly below a poverty line are not targeted (*undercoverage*) or households truly above a poverty line are targeted (*leakage*).

Table 7 depicts these four possible targeting outcomes. Targeting accuracy varies by the cut-off score. A higher cut-off has better inclusion and better undercoverage (but worse exclusion and worse leakage), while a lower cut-off has worse inclusion and worse undercoverage (but better exclusion and better leakage).

Programs should weigh these trade-offs when setting a cut-off. A formal way to do this is to assign net benefits—based on a program’s values and mission—to each of the four possible targeting outcomes and then to choose the cut-off that maximizes the sum of net benefits.³⁹

Table 8 shows targeting outcomes by cut-off for households in Indonesia. For an example cut-off of 45 or less, outcomes for 100% of the national line in the validation sample are:

- Inclusion: 5.4 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 1.2 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 28.0 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 65.4 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

³⁹ Adams and Hand, 2000; Hoadley and Oliver, 1998.

Increasing the cut-off to 47 or less improves inclusion and undercoverage but worsens leakage and exclusion:

- Inclusion: 5.7 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 0.9 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 33.2 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 60.2 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

Which cut-off is preferred depends on the sum of net benefits. 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 Table 8 for a chosen poverty line
- Select the cut-off with the highest total net benefit

The most difficult step is assigning benefits and costs to targeting outcomes. A program that uses targeting—with or without the scorecard—should thoughtfully consider how it values successful inclusion and 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 the “hit rate”, where total net benefit is the number of households correctly included or correctly excluded:

Hit rate =	1	x	Households correctly included	–
	0	x	Households mistakenly undercovered	–
	0	x	Households mistakenly leaked	+
	1	x	Households correctly excluded.	

Table 8 shows the hit rate for all cut-offs for the scorecard. For the example of 100% of the national line in the validation sample, total net benefit under the hit rate for a cut-off of 45 or less is 70.8 percent, with about seven in ten households in Indonesia correctly classified.

The hit rate weighs successful inclusion of households below the poverty line the same as successful exclusion of households above the line. If a program values inclusion more (say, twice as much) than exclusion, then it can reflect this by setting the benefit for inclusion to 2 and the benefit for exclusion to 1. Then the chosen cut-off will maximize (2 x Households correctly included) + (1 x Households correctly excluded).

As an alternative to assigning benefits and costs to targeting outcomes and then choosing a cut-off to maximize total net benefits, a program could set a cut-off to achieve a desired poverty rate among targeted households. The third column of Table 9 (“% targeted HHs who are poor”) shows, for the scorecard applied to the validation sample, the estimated poverty rate among households who score at or below a given cut-off. For the example of 100% of the national line, targeting households who score 45 or less would target 33.4 percent of all households (second column) and would be

associated with an estimated poverty rate among targeted households of 16.2 percent (third column).

Table 9 also reports two other measures of targeting accuracy. The first is a version of coverage (“% poor HHs who are targeted”). For the example of 100% of the national line with the validation sample and a cut-off of 45 or less, 81.9 percent of all poor households are covered.

The final targeting measure in Table 9 is the number of successfully targeted poor households for each non-poor household mistakenly targeted (right-most column). For 100% of the national line with the validation sample and a cut-off of 45 or less, covering about 0.2 poor households means leaking to 1 non-poor household.

9. Summary

The scorecard helps pro-poor programs in Indonesia to get to know their participants better so as to prove and improve the programs' social performance.

The scorecard can segment clients for differentiated treatment as well as estimate:

- The likelihood that a participant's household has consumption below a given poverty line
- The poverty rate of a population of participants' households at a point in time
- The change in the poverty rate of a population of participants' households

Household-level estimates can be straightforwardly converted into the person-level (head-count) estimates that are usually more relevant.

The scorecard is inexpensive to use and can be understood by non-specialists. It is designed to be practical for pro-poor programs in Indonesia that want to monitor and manage their social performance.

The scorecard is constructed with data from about three-fifths of the households in Indonesia's 2018 SUSENAS. Those households' scores are then calibrated to poverty likelihoods for 17 poverty lines. The scorecard's accuracy (errors and standard errors) is tested out-of-sample on data that was not used to make the scorecard.

When the scorecard is applied to 17 poverty lines in the validation sample, the maximum of the absolute values of the average error for point-in-time estimates of poverty rates is 0.7 percentage points, and the average of the absolute values of the average error across the 17 lines is about 0.2 percentage points. Corrected estimates may be found by subtracting the known error for a given poverty line from original, uncorrected estimates.

For $n = 16,384$ and 90-percent confidence, the confidence intervals for point-in-time estimates of poverty rates are ± 0.7 percentage points or narrower. With $n = 1,024$, the 90-percent confidence intervals are ± 3.0 percentage points or narrower.

Because Indonesia's BPS changed its definition of *poverty* between 2010 and 2018, it is not possible to estimate changes in poverty rates over time with a baseline from an old scorecard and with a follow-up from the new scorecard. Of course, it is still possible to estimate of change when both baseline and follow-up are from the new scorecard.

If a program wants to use the scorecard for segmenting clients for differentiated treatment, then this paper provides useful information for selecting a targeting cut-off that fits the program's values and mission.

Although the statistical technique is innovative, and although technical accuracy is important, the design of the scorecard focuses on low-cost, transparency, and ease-of-use. After all, accuracy is irrelevant if a program's managers feel so daunted by a tool's complexity or by its cost that they do not even try to use it.

For this reason, the scorecard uses 10 questions that are straightforward, low-cost, and verifiable. Points are all zeros or positive integers, and scores range from 0 to 100. Scores are converted to poverty likelihoods via look-up tables, and targeting cut-offs are likewise straightforward to apply. The design attempts to facilitate voluntary adoption by helping program managers to understand and to trust the scorecard and by allowing non-specialists to add up scores quickly in the field.

In summary, the scorecard is a low-cost, practical, objective, transparent way for pro-poor programs in Indonesia to estimate consumption-based poverty rates, track changes in poverty rates over time, and segment participants for differentiated treatment. A scorecard can be made for any country with similar data.

References

- Adams, Niall M.; and David J. Hand. (2000) “Improving the Practice of Classifier Performance Assessment”, *Neural Computation*, Vol. 12, pp. 305–311.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2018) *Penghitungan dan Analisis Kemiskinan Makro Indonesia: Tahun 2018*, www.bps.go.id/publication/2018/12/21/78d449eddaad892e383b7fd9/penghitungan-dan-analisis-kemiskinan-makro-dan-indonesia-tahun-2018.html, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Baesens, Bart; Van Gestel, Tony; Viaene, Stijn; Stepanova, Maria; Suykens, Johan A.K.; and Jan Vanthienen. (2003) “Benchmarking State-of-the-Art Classification Algorithms for Credit Scoring”, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, Vol. 54, pp. 627–635.
- Brown, Caitlin; Ravallion, Martin; and Dominique van de Walle. (2018) “A Poor Means Test? Econometric Targeting in Africa”, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 134, pp. 109–124.
- Caire, Dean. (2004) “Building Credit Scorecards for Small-Business Lending in Developing Markets”, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_SMEs_Hybrid.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- ; and Mark Schreiner. (2012) “Cross-Tab Weighting for Credit Scorecards in Developing Markets”, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Cross_Tab_Weights_for_Scoring.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Camacho, Adriana; and Emily Conover. (2011) “Manipulation of Social-Program Eligibility”, *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 41–65.
- Chen, Shiyuan; and Mark Schreiner. (2009) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Vietnam”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/VNM_2006_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Coady, David; Grosh, Margaret; and John Hoddinott. (2004) *Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries*, hdl.handle.net/10986/14902, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Cochran, William G. (1977) *Sampling Techniques, Third Edition*.
- Dawes, Robyn M. (1979) “The Robust Beauty of Improper Linear Models in Decision Making”, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 34, No. 7, pp. 571–582.

- Diamond, Alexis; Gill, Michael; Rebolledo Dellepiane, Miguel Angel; Skoufias, Emmanuel; Vinha, Katja; and Yiqing Xu. (2016) “Estimating Poverty Rates in Target Populations: An Assessment of the Simple Poverty Scorecard and Alternative Approaches”, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7793, hdl.handle.net/10986/25038, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Dupriez, Olivier. (2018) “An Empirical Comparison of Machine-Learning Classification Algorithms”, pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/666731519844418182/PRT-OD-presentation-V2.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Friedman, Jerome H. (1997) “On Bias, Variance, 0–1 Loss, and the Curse-of-Dimensionality”, *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, Vol. 1, pp. 55–77.
- Fuller, Rob. (2006) “Measuring the Poverty of Microfinance Clients in Haiti”, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Haiti_Fuller.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- 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 29 August 2019.
- Hand, David J. (2006) “Classifier Technology and the Illusion of Progress”, *Statistical Science*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 1–15.
- Haslett, Stephen. (2012) “Practical Guidelines for the Design and Analysis of Sample Surveys for Small-Area Estimation”, *Journal of the Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics*, Vol. 66, No. 1, pp. 203–212.
- 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. (2007) “Manual for the Implementation of USAID Poverty-Assessment Tools”, povertytools.org/training_documents/Manuals/USAID_PAT_Manual_Eng.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Johnson, Glenn. (2007) “Lesson 3: Two-Way Tables—Dependent Samples”, onlinecourses.science.psu.edu/stat504/node/96, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Jolliffe, Dean; and Espen Beer Prydz. (2016) “Estimating International Poverty Lines from Comparable National Thresholds”, *Journal of Economic Inequality*, Vol. 14, pp. 185–198.

- 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”, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 4, No. 6, pp. 886–908.
- Matul, Michal; and Sean Kline. (2003) “Scoring Change: Prizma’s Approach to Assessing Poverty”, Microfinance Centre for Central and Eastern Europe and the New Independent States Spotlight Note No. 4, mfc.org.pl/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/spotlight4.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- McNemar, Quinn. (1947) “Note on the Sampling Error of the Difference between Correlated Proportions or Percentages”, *Psychometrika*, Vol. 17, pp. 153–157.
- 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 29 August 2019.
- Onwujekwe, Obinna; Hanson, Kara; and Julia Fox-Rushby. (2006) “Some Indicators of Socio-Economic Status May Not Be Reliable and Use of Indexes with These Data Could Worsen Equity”, *Health Economics*, Vol. 15, pp. 639–644.
- Ravallion, Martin. (2009) “How Relevant Is Targeting to the Success of an Anti-Poverty Program?”, *World Bank Research Observer*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 205–231.
- Rutstein, Shea Oscar; and Kiersten Johnson. (2004) “The DHS Wealth Index”, DHS Comparative Reports No. 6, measuredhs.com/pubs/pdf/CR6/CR6.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Schreiner, Mark. (2018) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Niger”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/NER_2014_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2017a) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Zambia”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/ZMB_2015_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.

- (2017b) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Mexico”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2014_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2017c) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: El Salvador”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/SLV_2014_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2016a) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Guatemala”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/GTM_2014_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2016b) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: India”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/IND_2011_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2016c) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Sri Lanka”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/LKA_2012_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2016d) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Cameroon”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/CMR_2014_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2015a) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Malawi”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MWI_2010_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2015b) “There’s No Place Like Home? How the Interview Method Affects Results with the Progress out of Poverty Index[®]”, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Interview_Method_Effects_EN.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2015c) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Ghana”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/GHA_2012_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2015d) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Bolivia”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/BOL_2013_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2015e) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Cambodia”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/KHM_2011_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2014) “The Process of Poverty-Scoring Analysis”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/Process_Poverty_Scoring_Analysis.pdf,
retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2013a) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Bangladesh”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/BGD_2010_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2013b) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Nicaragua”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/NIC_2009_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.

- (2012a) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Indonesia”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/IDN_2010_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2012b) “An Expert-Based Poverty Scorecard for Rural China”,
microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_China_EN.pdf, retrieved
 29 August 2019.
- (2012c) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Colombia”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/COL_2009_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2012d) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Peru”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2010_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2010) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Honduras”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/HND_2007_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2009a) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Indonesia”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/IDN_2007_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2009b) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Philippines”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PHL_2004_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2009c) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Pakistan”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PAK_2005_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2009d) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Peru”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2007_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2008) “Scorocs Simple Poverty Scorecard Tool: Peru”,
SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2003_ENG.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2006) “Is One Simple Poverty Scorecard Enough for India?”,
microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_India_Segments.pdf,
 retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2005a) “La Herramienta del Índice de Calificación de la PobrezaTM de Scorocs:
 México”, SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2002_SPA.pdf, retrieved 29 August
 2019.
- (2005b) “IRIS Questions on the Simple Poverty Scorecard”,
microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Response_to_IRIS.pdf,
 retrieved 29 August 2019.

- (2002) *Scoring: The Next Breakthrough in Microfinance?* CGAP Occasional Paper No. 7, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Breakthrough_CGAP.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- ; Matul, Michal; Pawlak, Ewa; and Sean Kline. (2014) “Poverty Scoring: Lessons from a Microlender in Bosnia-Herzegovina”, *Poverty and Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 407–428.
- Sharif, Iffath Anwar. (2009) “Building a Targeting System for Bangladesh Based on Proxy-Means Testing”, World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0914, siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Safety-Nets-DP/0914.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- 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. (2009) “Using Census and Survey Data to Estimate Poverty and Inequality for Small Areas”, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 91, No. 4, pp. 773–792.
- Toohig, Jeff. (2008) “PPI Pilot Training Guide”, <https://www.findevgateway.org/library/progress-out-poverty-index-ppi-pilot-training>, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Wainer, Howard. (1976) “Estimating Coefficients in Linear Models: It Don’t Make No Nevermind”, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 83, pp. 223–227.
- World Bank. (2013) “Shared Prosperity: A New Goal for a Changing World”, worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2013/05/08/shared-prosperity-goal-for-changing-world, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- (2012) *Targeting Poor and Vulnerable Households in Indonesia*, documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2012/01/15879773/targeting-poor-vulnerable-households-indonesia, retrieved 29 August 2019.
- Zeller, Manfred. (2004) “Review of Poverty Assessment Tools”, povertytools.org/other_documents/Review%20of%20PAT%20Tools.pdf, retrieved 29 August 2019.

Interview Guide

The excerpts quoted here are from:

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2017) “Konsep dan Definisi: Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional [SUSENAS Maret 2017], Buku 4”, sirusa.bps.go.id/webadmin/pedoman/2017_1558_ped_Buku%20Konsep%20Definisi.pdf, retrieved 31 August 2019 [the *Manual*].

Basic interview instructions

The scorecard can be filled out on paper in the field, with responses entered later in a spreadsheet or in your own database. Alternatively, Scorocs’ cloud-based data-collection tool works in a web browser or as an Android phone app, allowing data entry in the field or in the office. If there is no connection, then data is stored locally until there is a connection. <https://enketo.ona.io/x/#GYqSxsIc> the data-collection tool, or [ask about a private account](#).

The scorecard should be administered by an enumerator trained to follow this Guide.

Fill out the scorecard header and the “Back-page Worksheet” first, following the directions on the “Back-page Worksheet”.

In the scorecard header, fill in the number of household members based on the list you the enumerator made as part of the “Back-page Worksheet”.

Do not directly ask the first scorecard question (“In what province does the household live?”). Instead, fill in the answer based on your knowledge of the province where the household lives.

In the same way, do not directly ask the second scorecard question (“How many members does the household have?”). Instead, mark the response based on the number of household members that you listed on the “Back-page Worksheet”.

Likewise, do not directly ask the third scorecard question (“How many household members 10-years-old or older worked in the past week or, if they did not work, nevertheless are only temporarily not working and have a regular or permanent job to which they plan to return?”). Instead, mark the response based on the number of household members who work that you listed on the “Back-page Worksheet”.

Finally, do not directly ask the fourth scorecard question (“How many household members 10-years-old or older worked in the past week and in their main job were permanent, paid employees or self-employed business owners with permanent, paid employees?”). Instead, mark the response based on the number of household members who fit these criteria that you listed on the “Back-page Worksheet”.

Ask all of the remaining questions directly of the respondent.

General interviewing guidance

Study this Guide carefully, and carry it with you while you work. Follow the instructions in this Guide (including this one).

Remember that the respondent for the interview need not be the household member who is a participant with your program.

Likewise, the field agent to be recorded in the scorecard header is not necessarily the same as you the enumerator who does the interview. Rather, the field agent is the employee of the pro-poor program with whom the participant has an on-going relationship. If there is no such field agent, then leave those spaces in the scorecard header blank.

Read each question word-for-word, in the order presented in the scorecard.

When you mark a response to a scorecard question, write the point value in the “Score” column and then circle the spelled-out response option, the pre-printed point value, and the hand-written points, like this:

5. In the last three months, has the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head) owned a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone?	A. No	0	
	B. No female head (nor wife of the male head)	5	5
	C. Yes	5	

To help to reduce errors, you should:

- Write the points that correspond to the response in the far right-hand column
- Circle the pre-printed response, the pre-printed points, and the hand-written points

When an issue comes up that is not addressed in this Guide, its resolution should be left to the unaided judgment of the enumerator and the respondent, as that apparently was the practice of Indonesia’s BPS in the 2018 SUSENAS. That is, a program that uses the scorecard should not promulgate any definitions or rules (other than those in this Guide) to be used by all its enumerators. Anything not explicitly addressed in this Guide is to be left to the unaided judgment of each individual enumerator and the respondent.

Do not read the response options to the respondent. (You may, however, read the response options for the sixth question “What is the main material of the greatest part of the floor of the residence?”). Instead, read the question, and then stop; wait for a response. If the respondent asks for clarification or otherwise hesitates or seems confused, then read the question again or provide additional assistance based on this Guide or as you the enumerator deem appropriate.

In general, you should accept the responses given by the respondent. Nevertheless, if the respondent says something—or if you see or sense something—that suggests that the response may not be accurate, that the respondent is uncertain, or that the respondent desires assistance in figuring out how to respond, then you should read the question again and provide whatever help you deem appropriate based on this Guide.

While most responses to questions in the scorecard are verifiable, in most cases you do not need to verify responses. You should verify only if something suggests to you that a response may be inaccurate and thus that verification might improve data quality. For example, you might choose to verify if the respondent hesitates, seems nervous, or otherwise gives signals that he/she may be lying, confused, or uncertain. Likewise, verification is probably appropriate if a child in the interviewed household or if a neighbor says something that does not square with a respondent’s answer. Verification is also a good idea if you can see something yourself that suggests that a response may be inaccurate, such as a consumer durable that the respondent claims not to possess, or a child eating in the room who has not been counted as a member of the household.

In general, the application of the scorecard should mimic as closely as possible the application of the 2018 SUSENAS by Indonesia’s BPS. For example, interviews should be done in-person by a trained enumerator at the participant’s residence because that is what BPS did in the 2018 SUSENAS.

Translation:

As of this writing, the scorecard itself, the “Back-page Worksheet”, and this Guide are available only in English and Bahasa Indonesia. There are not yet official, professional translations to other major languages spoken in Indonesia such as Javanese, Malay, and Sundanese. Users should check scorocs.com to see what translations have been done since this writing.

If there is not yet an official, professional translation to a desired language, then users should contact Scorocs for help in creating such a translation.

Who should be the respondent?

Remember that the respondent does not need to be the household member who is a participant with your program (although the respondent may be that person).

Who is the head of the household?

Note that the head of the household may or may not be the household member who is a participant with your program (although the head may be that person).

According to p. 11 of the *Manual*, the *head of the household* is “the household member who is responsible for meeting the daily needs of the household.

“A husband who has more than one wife is considered to be a member of the household of the wife with whom he spends the most time. If the husband splits his time equally among his wives, then he is considered to be a member of the household of his [eldest] wife.”

A wife in a polygamous marriage who lives in a household in which her husband is not a member is considered to be the head of her household.

Each person is a member of one (and only one) household.

According to p. 3 of the 2018 SUSENAS *Core Questionnaire*, “The *head of the household* is the household member who is responsible for meeting the daily needs of the household.

“If a group of students live in a residence together [and eat from the same kitchen], then the head of the household is the person whom the students consider to be the head.”

General interview guidance

According to p. 1 of the 2018 SUSENAS *Core Questionnaire*, you should introduce yourself to the household to be interviewed as follows: “Good morning/afternoon/evening. I am from <your program>, and I am collecting data/information on the social and economic conditions of households [of participants in <your program>] relating to work, education, housing and [so on]. To do this, I would like to interview [your household]. All of the data that you provide will be kept confidential and will only be used for [helping <your program> to get to know its participants better]. May I start the interview now?”

According to p. 2 of the 2018 SUSENAS *Core Questionnaire*, “Keep the following in mind when interviewing:

- You must master the concepts, definitions, purposes, and objectives of the [scorecard]
- Before submitting, check all responses, and correct any errors.”

Guidelines for each question in the scorecard

1. In what province does the household live?
 - A. Jawa Timur, Jawa Tengah, Lampung, Sumatera Selatan, Nusa Tenggara Barat, DI Yogyakarta, Kepulauan Riau, Gorontalo, or Kepulauan Bangka Belitung
 - B. Bali, Jawa Barat, or Bengkulu
 - C. DKI Jakarta, Riau, Kalimantan Barat, Kalimantan Timur, or Papua Barat
 - D. Banten, Sulawesi Selatan, Aceh, Jambi, Kalimantan Selatan, Sulawesi Tengah, Sulawesi Barat
 - E. Sumatera Utara, Sumatera Barat, Nusa Tenggara Timur, Papua, Kalimantan Tengah, Sulawesi Tenggara, Sulawesi Utara, Maluku, Maluku Utara, or Kalimantan Utara

Unless you have to, do not directly ask this question of the respondent. Instead, fill in the answer based on your knowledge of the province where the household lives.

2. How many members does the household have?
 - A. Six or more
 - B. Five
 - C. Four
 - D. Three
 - E. Two
 - F. One

Do not directly ask this question of the respondent. Instead, mark the response based on the number of household members that you listed on the “Back-page Worksheet”.

According to pp. 3–4 of the *Manual*, a *household* is “person or group of people who usually live together in all or part a physical building and who eat from the same kitchen. Households generally consist of mothers, fathers, and children. [The scorecard] applies to households.

“Examples of households:

- A person who rents a room or part of a physical building and provides for his/her own meals by his/herself
- Several people who live separately in two physical buildings but who all eat from the same kitchen
- People who live in a boarding house with less than 10 boarders that provides meals are considered to be members of a single household that includes the people who provide the lodging and meals
- If a boarding house has 10 or more boarders, then the boarders are not considered to be part of the household that includes the people who provide the lodging and meals. In this case, the boarders are not considered to be members of any household for the purposes of [the scorecard survey]
- The owner or manager of a boarding house, orphanage, correctional institution, and so on who lives apart with his/her spouse, children, and other household members is considered to be a household apart from the collective lodging that he/she owns or manages
- Persons who live together in a physical building are each considered to be separate households if each person provides for his/her own meals by him/herself”

According to pp. 6–7 of the *Manual*, “The *total number of household members* includes all people who usually live in the household (the household head, husband/wife of the head, children, daughters- or sons-in-laws, grandchildren, parents or parents-in-law, other relatives, domestic helpers, and other household members) who have lived there for 6 months or more or who have lived there for less than 6 months but intend to stay there for a total duration of at least six months.

“Household members include:

- Newborn babies
- Guests who have stayed 6 months or more, even if they do not intend to stay permanently
- Guests who have not stayed 6 months or more but who have been away from their own homes for 6 months or more
- People who have lived with the interviewed household for less than 6 months but who intend to remain with the interviewed household permanently
- Domestic helpers, gardeners, or drivers who live and eat in the household in which they are employed
- Boarders who receive both food and lodging from the interviewed household (as long as the number of boarders is less than 10)

“If the head of a household works in another place (for example, as a sailor, pilot, inter-island trader, or miner) and does not return home every day but rather returns periodically (that is, less frequently than every 6 months), then such a head is still to be considered to be a member of the interviewed household.

“The following are not counted as members of the interviewed household:

- People who live in another place (not in the residence of the interviewed household), for example for school or work, even though they may return to visit the interviewed household once a week or when they have time off from school or work. Such people are considered to have formed their own household or to have joined another household where they usually live, even if he/she still gets money from (or sends money to) the members of the interviewed household
- A person who has been away from the interviewed household for 6 months or more, even if it is not yet known whether the absence will be permanent, even if he/she still gets money from (or sends money to) the members of the interviewed household
- A person who has been away from the interviewed household for less than 6 months but who expects the absence to be permanent, even if he/she still gets money from (or sends money to) the members of the interviewed household
- Domestic employees who does not live and eat with their employer’s household
- Boarders who do not also receive meals from the household that runs the boarding house
- Boarders who receive meals in a boarding house with 10 or more boarders”

According to the BPS, if two groups of people live in the same residence (for example, a son or a daughter with his/her spouse, along with the parents of the son or daughter), and if both groups cook in the same physical kitchen, and if each group acquires the ingredients for their meals independently of the other group, then each group is considered to be a distinct household. On the other hand, if the two groups acquire the ingredients for their meals together, then they are considered to be a single household.

According to p. 2 of the 2018 SUSENAS *Core Questionnaire*, you should “record the names of household members, that is, everyone who usually lives in the household and who eats from the same kitchen. Start with the head of the household and his/her spouse/conjugal partner (if he/she has one). Then record unmarried children of the head, married children of the head, in-laws, grandchildren, parents/parents-in-law, domestic helpers, other relatives, and any other household members.

“Make sure that all household members are recorded and that no one is left out. Double check that all people listed as members of the household eat from the same kitchen. Remove anyone from the list who does not eat from the same kitchen as the interviewed household.”

According to pp. 10–11 of the *Manual*, “Record household members in this order:

- The head of the household
- The spouse of the head of household. If a household head has more than one wife and if two or more wives live in the same household, then record the household head first, then [the eldest] wife, and then the other wife/wives [in order by age]
- Unmarried children. Record unmarried children from oldest to youngest
- Married children [whether biological children, step-children, or adopted children] with their spouse and their unmarried children. Record first any children of the head who are unmarried. Then record the names of children of the unmarried child of the head, from oldest to youngest. After that, record the names of the married children of the head, following each married child with his/her spouse and the names of the couple’s children, from oldest to youngest
- Other household members and their spouses/conjugal partners. This includes, for example, parents or parents-in-law, other relatives, domestic employees, and so on

“Read out the names of all household members once they have been recorded. Then ask again to check for people who were not recorded because they were forgotten or were not considered to be a household member, such as:

- Babies or toddlers
- Domestic employees
- Friends/guests who have lived with the interviewed household for 6 months or more
- Nieces/nephews, boarders, and so on who usually live [and eat] with the interviewed household
- Someone who has been away for less than 6 months but who usually lives [and eats] with the interviewed household
- Someone who usually lives [and eats] with the interviewed household [and who does not have another household to which he/she returns] and who returns periodically to the interviewed household but who, for work-related reasons, is usually away for 6 months or more”

According to pp. 10–11 of the *Manual* “A wife in a polygamous marriage who lives in a household in which her husband is not a member is considered to be the head of her household.

Each person is a member of some household, and no person is a member of more than one household. That is, each person is a member of one (and only one) household.

3. How many household members 10-years-old or older worked in the past week or, if they did not work, nevertheless are only temporarily not working and have a regular or permanent job to which they plan to return?
- A. None
 - B. One
 - C. Two
 - D. Three or more

Do not directly ask this question of the respondent. Instead, mark the response based on the number of household members that you listed on the “Back-page Worksheet” as having worked in the past week.

According to pp. 50–52 of the *Manual*: “*Working* means doing work for at least one hour in the past week for the purpose of earning (or helping to earn) income or profit. The one hour of work must be uninterrupted.

“*Work* is an economic activity that produces goods or services.

“*Income or profit* includes wage/salary income and any worker/employee benefits and bonuses, as well as any business income—whether in-cash or in-kind—received by a business owner or by a self-employed person as rent, interest, or profit.

“A household member who helps with the work of the head of the household or of another household member—for example working in rice fields, gardens, food stalls/shops, and so on—is counted as doing work even though he/she is unpaid, that is, he/she does not receive a wage/salary.

Other special cases include:

- People who perform work in their particular occupation and who use the goods/services produced directly for the consumption of their own households. Such people are counted as having worked. For example, doctors who treat their own household members, builders who repair their own homes, or tailors who sew their own clothes are counted as working
- A person who rents out machinery/agricultural equipment, industrial machinery, party equipment, transportation equipment, and so on is counted as working
- Domestic employees are counted as working, regardless of whether they qualify as a member of their employer’s household
- A person who rents agricultural land to another person in a share-cropping arrangement counts as working if he/she also bears the risks involved in production or if he/she is involved in managing the agricultural business
- A professional boxer or singer who is training in his/her profession is counted as working

“Who is not counted as working: If someone does work but does not intend to earn (or to help earn) income or profit, then that person is not counted as working.

“A person who grows crops, all of which are then consumed by the producing household and none of which are sold for income nor profit, is not counted as working, with the exception of those who grow staple food crops (rice, corn, sago, cassava, sweet potatoes, or potatoes).

“Casual workers (day laborers) who are waiting for work either in the agricultural or non-agricultural sectors are not counted as working.

“Going to school means being enrolled and actively participating in learning in either a formal or non-formal educational program, including programs (such as the A/B/C programs) that are under the Ministry of Education and Culture (*Kemdikbud*) or other ministries. A person is considered to be actively participating in the learning in an A/B/C program if he/she participated in the past month. [Going to school does not count as work.]

“Managing a household includes taking care of a household or helping to manage a household without being paid a wage/salary. Housewives or children doing household activities such as cooking, washing, and so on are counted as managing a household [not as working]. Domestic helpers who do this same work but who are paid a wage/salary are not counted as managing a household but rather as working.

“Other non-personal activities covers activities other than work, school, and managing a household. Examples are sports, courses, picnics, social activities (such as being in a local organization or doing community service), and religious worship (such as *majelis ta’lim*/religious teachings/recitation). *Personal activities* such as sleeping, relaxing, playing, or not doing anything are not counted as non-personal activities.”

According to p. 8 of the 2018 SUSENAS *Core Questionnaire*, you the enumerator should count a member of the household as working even if he/she did not work for at least one hour in the past week as long as he/she has a regular or permanent job and is only temporarily not working. Examples include:

- A farmer who did not work in the past week because it is the dry season or because there is no farm work to be done but who will nevertheless start working again once there is farm work to be done. Such a farmer is to be considered to be working because he/she has a regular or permanent job and is only temporarily not working
- A casual worker (day laborer) who is waiting for work—whether agricultural or non-agricultural—for the the past week but has not worked at least one hour is to be counted as not working
- A worker of any kind who worked only one hour in the past week is to be counted as working

According to p. 3 of the 2018 SUSENAS *Core Questionnaire*, “*Working* means doing work for at least one hour in the past week for the purpose of earning (or helping to earn) income or profit. The one hour of work must be uninterrupted.

“*Managing a household* means managing or helping to manage a household without pay. Household members who do household activities such as cooking, washing, and so on are considered to be managing a household [and not working].”

According to p. 14 of the *Manual*, “Age is recorded in completed years.”

According to p. 9 of the *Manual*, “The *past week* is the seven-day period that ended the day before the day of the interview.”

4. How many household members 10-years-old or older worked in the past week and in their main job were permanent, paid employees or self-employed business owners with permanent, paid employees?
 - A. None
 - B. One
 - C. Two or more

Do not directly ask this question directly of the respondent. Instead, mark the response based on the number of household members that you listed on the “Back-page Worksheet” as having worked in the past week as permanent, paid employees or as self-employed business owners with permanent, paid employees.

According to pp. 59–62 of the *Manual*, “A *permanent, paid employee* is someone who works for another individual person or for a business/enterprise/company on a permanent basis and receives remuneration in-cash or in-kind.

“A person is counted as a permanent, paid employee if he/she has had the same employer for the past 30 days. (In the case of the construction sector, the requirement is to have had the same employer for the past 90 days.)

“For example, suppose that Anto is a construction worker who has been repairing Mr. Mardi’s house for 4 months. Anto counts as a permanent, paid employee of Mr. Mardi.”

“If the employer is an agency that supplies temporary employees to other businesses, then the person may do work for more than one of these other businesses while still being a permanent employee of the agency that supplies temporary employees.

“A *self-employed business owner with permanent, paid employees* is someone who bears the economic risks of a business or economic activity and who also employs one or more permanent, paid employees. A *permanent, paid employee* is someone who works for another individual person or for a business/enterprise/company on a permanent basis and receives remuneration in-cash or in-kind.”

“Examples include:

- A shop owner with one or more permanent employees
- A cigarette manufacturer with permanent employees”

According to pp. 59–62 of the *Manual*, the following types of work status do not qualify as permanent, paid employment.

“Self-employed without temporary casual workers/day laborers or unpaid household workers: These people bear the economic risks of a business or economic activity and do *not* have help from anyone else at all, whether permanent, paid employees; casual workers/day laborers; nor unpaid household members. Such businesses do not hire help even when they need technical or specialized expertise.

“Examples include freelance drivers of taxis or trucks who do not earn a salary, pedicab drivers, carpenters, masons, electricians, masseurs/masseuses, well diggers, newspaper agents, motorcycle taxi drivers, self-employed traders, doctors/midwives/birth attendants who have their own practice, ticket brokers, land/property brokers, and so on.

“Self-employed with temporary casual workers/day laborers or unpaid household workers: These people bear the economic risks of a business or economic activity. While they *do not* have help from permanent, paid employees, they *do* receive help from casual workers/day laborers or from unpaid household members.

“Temporary casual workers/day laborers/piece-workers/unpaid household workers: These people work for another individual person or for a business/enterprise/company on a temporary basis and receive remuneration in-cash or in-kind that is based on the time worked or on the volume of work completed. This status also encompasses someone who works in a business or economic activity of a member of the same household without being remunerated.

“A person is a *temporary employee* if he/she has not had the same employer for the past 30 days. (In the case of the construction sector, a person is a temporary employee if he/she has not had the same employer for the past 90 days.)

“Examples of businesses that employ temporary casual workers/day laborers/piece-workers/unpaid household workers include:

- The owner of food stall/shop and who is assisted by an unpaid household member or by someone who is temporarily paid based on the days worked
- A ambulatory trader who is temporarily assisted by unpaid household members or others who are only paid when they work
- A farmer who grow crops with temporary help from unpaid workers (be they household members or others). Even if the farmer shares part of the harvest, the workers are considered to be unpaid

“*Temporary casual workers/day laborers/piece-workers*: These people work temporarily for another person/employer/institution. He/she may have had more than one employer in the past month for which he/she received remuneration in-cash or in-kind which was paid daily or once a specified task was completed.

“There are two types of *temporary casual workers/day laborers/piece-workers*:

- *Agricultural* (food crops, plantations, forestry, livestock, fisheries, or hunting businesses, as well as agricultural services). Examples include rice harvesters, field/rice paddy laborers, rubber tappers, shrimp harvesters (on a shrimp farm), coffee, coconut, or clove pickers, and so on
- *Non-agricultural*. Examples include porters at a market, station, or other location who do not have a permanent employer; brokers for public transport; traveling laundries; scavengers; unskilled construction workers; freelance parking attendants, and so on

“An *employer* is a person or entity that receives work in exchange for an agreed payment.

“An employer is *permanent* if he/she has had the same employee for the past 30 days. (In the case of the construction sector, the requirement is 90 days.) If the employer is an agency that supplies temporary employees to other businesses, then the employer is still permanent even if the employees do work for more than one of these other businesses while still being permanent employees of the agency.

“Examples of employers include:

- A rice farmer who hires farm laborers to cultivate rice fields, paying a daily wage
- A plantation that hires people to pick coconuts in exchange for a wage

“An *unpaid worker* helps someone else (perhaps another household member) in his/her business or economic activity but does not receive any remuneration in-cash nor in-kind.

“Examples of unpaid workers include:

- A household member who assists another household member without explicit remuneration, such as a wife who helps her husband work in the household’s rice fields
- A relative who, while not being a member of the same household as the person whose business or economic activity is being assisted, is nevertheless a relative, such as a cousin of the owner of a food stall who helps to serve customers but who does not receive remuneration
- Someone who is not a relative nor a member of the household of the person whose business or economic activity is being assisted, such as someone who helps weave hats in a neighbor’s home but who does not receive remuneration”

According to pp. 50–52 of the *Manual*: “*Working* means doing work for at least one hour in the past week for the purpose of earning (or helping to earn) income or profit. The one hour of work must be uninterrupted.

“*Work* is an economic activity that produces goods or services.

“*Income or profit* includes wage/salary income and any worker/employee benefits and bonuses, as well as any business income—whether in-cash or in-kind—received by a business owner or by a self-employed person as rent, interest, or profit.

“A household member who helps with the work of the head of the household or of another household member—for example working in rice fields, gardens, food stalls/shops, and so on—is counted as doing work even though he/she is unpaid, that is, he/she does not receive a wage/salary.

Other special cases include:

- People who perform work in their particular occupation and who use the goods/services produced directly for the consumption of their own households. Such people are counted as having worked. For example, doctors who treat their own household members, builders who repair their own homes, or tailors who sew their own clothes are counted as working
- A person who rents out machinery/agricultural equipment, industrial machinery, party equipment, transportation equipment, and so on is counted as working
- Domestic employees are counted as working, regardless of whether they qualify as a member of their employer’s household
- A person who rents agricultural land to another person in a share-cropping arrangement counts as working if he/she also bears the risks involved in production or if he/she is involved in managing the agricultural business
- A professional boxer or singer who is training in his/her profession is counted as working

“*Who is not counted as working*: If someone does work but does not intend to earn (or to help earn) income or profit, then that person is not counted as working.

“A person who grows crops, all of which are then consumed by the producing household and none of which are sold for income nor profit, is not counted as working, with the exception of those who grow staple food crops (rice, corn, sago, cassava, sweet potatoes, or potatoes).

“Casual workers (day laborers) who are waiting for work either in the agricultural or non-agricultural sectors are not counted as working.

“*Going to school* means being enrolled and actively participating in learning in either a formal or non-formal educational program, including programs (such as the A/B/C programs) that are under the Ministry of Education and Culture (*Kemdikbud*) or other ministries. A person is considered to be actively participating in the learning in an A/B/C program if he/she participated in the past month. [Going to school does not count as work.]

“*Managing a household* includes taking care of a household or helping to manage a household without being paid a wage/salary. Housewives or children doing household activities such as cooking, washing, and so on are counted as managing a household [not as working]. Domestic helpers who do this same work but who are paid a wage/salary are not counted as managing a household but rather as working.

“*Other non-personal activities* covers activities other than work, school, and managing a household. Examples are sports, courses, picnics, social activities (such as being in a local organization or doing community service), and religious worship (such as *majelis ta’lim*/religious teachings/recitation). *Personal activities* such as sleeping, relaxing, playing, or not doing anything are not counted as non-personal activities.”

According to p. 8 of the 2018 SUSENAS *Core Questionnaire*, you the enumerator should count a member of the household as working even if he/she did not work for at least one hour in the past week as long as he/she has a regular or permanent job and is only temporarily not working. Examples include:

- A farmer who did not work in the past week because it is the dry season or because there is no farm work to be done but who will nevertheless start working again once there is farm work to be done. Such a farmer is to be considered to be working because he/she has a regular or permanent job and is only temporarily not working
- A casual worker (day laborer) who is waiting for work—whether agricultural or non-agricultural—for the the past week but has not worked at least one hour is to be counted as not working
- A worker of any kind who worked only one hour in the past week is to be counted as working

According to p. 3 of the 2018 SUSENAS *Core Questionnaire*, “*Working* means doing work for at least one hour in the past week for the purpose of earning (or helping to earn) income or profit. The one hour of work must be uninterrupted.

“*Managing a household* means managing or helping to manage a household without pay. Household members who do household activities such as cooking, washing, and so on are considered to be managing a household [and not working].”

5. In the last three months, has the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head) owned a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone?
- A. No
 - B. No female head (nor wife of the male head)
 - C. Yes

This question asks whether the female head (or the wife of the male head) *owns* a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone. That is, the key concept is *ownership*.

If the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head) owns a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone, then mark “C. Yes”, regardless of whether the female head (or the wife of the male head):

- Knows how to operate the phone
- Uses the phone to make or receive calls or SMS text messages
- Only calls relatives
- Shares the phone with anyone else

If the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head) does not own a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone but nevertheless uses a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone owned by someone else, then mark “A. No” because she does not own a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone.

According to p. 9 of the *Manual*, “*The past three months* is the 91-day period that ended the day before the day of the interview.”

According to p. 11 of the *Manual*, the *head of the household* is “the household member who is responsible for meeting the daily needs of the household.

“A husband who has more than one wife is considered to be a member of the household of the wife with whom he spends the most time. If the husband splits his time equally among his wives, then he is considered to be a member of the household of his [eldest] wife.”

A wife in a polygamous marriage who lives in a household in which her husband is not a member is considered to be the head of her household.

Each person is a member of one (and only one) household.

Remember that you already know the name of the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head) from compiling the “Back-page Worksheet”. Thus, do not mechanically ask, “In the last three months, has the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head) owned a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone?”. Instead, use the actual first name or nickname of the female head (or the eldest wife of the male head), for example: “In the last three months, has Puspita owned a cellular phone or a fixed wireless-access phone?”

If there is no female head (and no wife of the male head) in the interviewed household, then do not read the question at all. Instead, mark “B. No female head (or no wife of the male head)” and continue with the next question.

For the purposes of the scorecard, the *female head (or the eldest wife of the male head)* is defined as:

- The household head, if the head is female
- The eldest wife/conjugal partner of the household head, if the head is male
- Non-existent, if the head is male and if he does not have a wife/conjugal partner who is a member of his household

According to pp. 45–46 of the *Manual*, “*Cellular telephones* are electronic telecommunication devices that have the same basic capacity as land-line telephones, except that they are portable/mobile and so can be taken anywhere. They do not need to be connected to a wired telecommunication network. Apart from serving as a telephone, modern cellular phones support additional services such as text messaging (SMS), multimedia message services (MMS), e-mail, internet access, business and game applications, and photography.

“*Fixed wireless phone or fixed wireless access (FWA)* refers to local wireless transmission networks that use cellular, microwave, or radio technology to connect signals to customers in locations that all connect to a local hub. A FWA license uses Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) technology that uses a normal telephone number with a certain area code that does not work outside of its area, except by temporarily changing the area code of the local area.

“Cellular phones include flip phones and smart phones, but they do not include tablets (even though tablets can be used to make telephone calls).

“To count for the purposes of [the scorecard], the cellular phone must be used for communication. Thus, you the enumerator should not count cellular phones that are only used for telling the time, playing music, or playing games.

“You should not count a cellular phone that someone uses if the user does not own it or did not buy/pay for it.

“*Owning a cell phone in the past three months* means that at least one SIM card has been active in the last three months.

“If a cell phone is damaged and non-functional on the day of the interview, then you should still count it as being owned if it will be repaired or replaced within the next 30 days.

“Esia or Flexi products work both as cell phones as well as landlines. For the purposes of [the scorecard], these products count as cell phones.

“If there is no signal at the residence of the interviewed household but if the cell phone still works in areas that do have signal, then count the cell phone as owned by the interviewed household.”

6. What is the main material of the greatest part of the floor of the residence?

(*Response options can be read aloud*)

- A. Dirt, bamboo, or other
- B. Cement/red brick, or wood/planks
- C. Tiles/terrazzo, or parquet/vinyl/carpet
- D. Ceramic tile, or marble/granite

According to pp. 108–109 of the *Manual*: “A *floor* is the base of a room that people walk on. It may be made of marble, ceramic, granite, tiles, terrazzo, cement, wood, dirt or other materials.

“A *dirt floor* consists of the surface of the earth (such as sand, soil, or rock) without anything covering it.

“*Bamboo* is a plant with nodes along its segmented stem. Many types of bamboo are used as flooring material. Other names for bamboo include *reeds*, *aur*, and *eru*.

“*Other* covers all types of flooring not covered by the other response options.”

“A *cement floor* is made of cement mortar that may have sand added.

“A *red brick floor* is made of red bricks.

“*Tile* is thin blocks made from cement.

“*Terrazzo* is flooring made from small natural stones, mixed with lime and sand, then ground up and poured into a rock base.

“*Parquet* (hard-wood floors) is flooring made of small, interlocked pieces of wood.

“*Vinyl* is a floor covering made from a mixture of rubber and plastic. It may have a design or pattern on its surface.

“*Carpet* is a durable floor covering that is usually made of thick, woven yarn or other fibers.

“*Wood/planks* are parts of old trees that are usually aged more than 5 years. The main trunk and branches are commonly used for building materials, including plywood.

“*Ceramic* is fired clay that is mixed with other minerals.

“*Marble* is metamorphic limestone. It can be used for floors, walls, and so on. Marble is also called alabaster.

“*Granite* is a hard, whitish rock. When used for flooring, it lasts longer than marble or ceramic.

7. What is the main type of fuel used for cooking?
- A. Firewood, coal, charcoal/briquettes, LPG (3 kg bottle), or other
 - B. Kerosene, electricity, gas piped from public network, biogas, Blue Gaz LPG (5.5 or 12 kg bottle), or does not cook at home

According to the BPS, the *main fuel* is the fuel that is most-often used.



Electricity



LPG 5.5 kg/Blue Gas



LPG 12 kg



LPG 3 Kg



Gas from public system



Biogas



Kerosene



Charcoal/briquettes



Coal



Firewood

8. Does the household have any refrigerators or freezers?
- A. No
 - B. Yes

According to p. 151 of the *Manual*, “A household is counted as having a refrigerator or freezer even if it was bought on credit or via rent-to-own and still is in the process of being paid-off, even if it has been pawned, and even if it is currently being used by someone who is not a member of the interviewed household.

“If the interviewed household says that it has a refrigerator or freezer but that it is not in good working condition, then ask how long it has been non-functional and whether it can still be repaired. If the refrigerator or freezer is expected to be only temporarily non-functional, then it is to be counted as being had by the household. If the refrigerator or freezer cannot be repaired, then it is not counted as being had by the household.”

Do not count a refrigerator or freezer that the interviewed household has or uses but that is owned by someone who is not a member of the interviewed household.

According to the BPS, a refrigerator or freezer counts for the purposes of this question as long as it is in good working order, even if it is not being used to keep food cold. For example, a new refrigerator that is still in the box in which it was delivered still counts, as does a refrigerator that is not turned on or not plugged in (but that would work if it were plugged in and turned on) that is instead—for example—being used to store uncooked rice.

9. Does the household have any motorbikes, motorized boats, or automobiles?
- A. No
 - B. Yes

According to p. 151 of the *Manual*, “A household is counted as having a motorbike, motorized boat, or automobile even if it was bought on credit or via rent-to-own and still is in the process of being paid-off, even if it has been pawned, and even if it is currently being used by someone who is not a member of the interviewed household.

“If the interviewed household says that it has a motorbike, motorized boat, or automobile but that it is not in good working condition, then ask how long it has been non-functional and whether it can still be repaired. If the motorbike, motorized boat, or automobile is expected to be only temporarily non-functional, then it is to be counted as being had by the household. If the motorbike, motorized boat, or automobile cannot be repaired, then it is not counted as being had by the household.”

Do not count a motorbike, motorized boat, or automobile that the interviewed household has or uses but that is owned by someone who is not a member of the interviewed household.

10. In the past 4 months, has the household purchased/received Poor Rice (*Raskin* Program) or Prosperous Rice (*Rastra* Program)?
- A. Yes
 - B. No

According to p. 138 of the *Manual*, “*Raskin (Poor Rice)/Rastra (Prosperous Rice)* are government-assistance programs that distribute rice to be sold at a subsidized price to poor households.

According to p. 9 of the *Manual*, “*The past four months* is the 121-day period that ended the day before the day of the interview.”

If the respondent says that he/she does not know what the *Raskin (Poor Rice)/Rastra (Prosperous Rice)* program is (or if you, the enumerator, perceive that the respondent does not to know), then explain what the program is to him/her so that he/she can give an accurate response.

Table 1 (Indonesia): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people by *perkotaan/perdesaan, kota/kabupaten*, and overall in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	<i>n</i>	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
All Perkotaan	Line	People		14,065	21,097	28,129	11,976	19,162	23,953	47,906	11,583	19,508	33,529	132,287	14,901	18,686	25,766	30,199	35,743	53,142
	Rate	HHs	126,566	5.1	19.6	35.6	2.4	15.1	26.3	64.0	2.0	15.9	45.4	96.1	6.4	14.0	30.5	39.5	48.8	69.0
	Rate	People		6.4	23.3	41.0	3.0	18.2	31.0	69.6	2.5	19.2	51.3	97.1	8.0	17.0	35.6	45.2	54.7	74.3
All Perdesaan	Line	People		11,829	17,743	23,658	10,072	16,116	20,145	40,290	9,741	16,407	28,199	111,257	12,532	15,716	21,670	25,398	30,060	44,694
	Rate	HHs	168,589	8.4	27.4	46.2	4.2	21.7	35.7	78.5	3.6	22.7	57.4	99.0	10.4	20.4	40.5	50.7	61.3	83.8
	Rate	People		10.1	31.4	51.2	5.2	25.1	40.3	82.3	4.4	26.2	62.5	99.2	12.4	23.7	45.3	55.8	66.4	86.9
All Kota	Line	People		16,758	25,137	33,516	14,270	22,832	28,540	57,080	13,801	23,244	39,950	157,620	17,755	22,265	30,700	35,982	42,587	63,319
	Rate	HHs	58,579	4.0	16.2	30.3	2.0	12.3	22.0	59.2	1.7	13.1	39.8	95.3	5.1	11.4	25.8	34.1	43.1	65.0
	Rate	People		5.4	20.4	36.4	2.8	15.7	27.2	65.7	2.4	16.7	46.6	96.5	6.8	14.7	31.4	40.5	50.0	71.2
All Kabupaten	Line	People		11,971	17,957	23,943	10,194	16,310	20,388	40,776	9,859	16,604	28,539	112,598	12,683	15,905	21,931	25,705	30,423	45,233
	Rate	HHs	236,576	7.4	25.1	43.3	3.5	19.7	33.1	73.9	3.0	20.7	54.0	98.0	9.1	18.5	37.7	47.6	57.8	78.8
	Rate	People		8.9	28.9	48.3	4.4	23.0	37.6	78.1	3.7	24.0	59.2	98.5	10.9	21.6	42.5	52.8	62.9	82.6
All Indonesia	Line	People		13,052	19,578	26,103	11,114	17,782	22,228	44,455	10,748	18,103	31,114	122,759	13,828	17,340	23,910	28,024	33,168	49,315
	Rate	HHs	295,155	6.6	23.1	40.4	3.2	18.1	30.6	70.6	2.7	19.0	50.8	97.4	8.2	16.9	35.0	44.6	54.5	75.7
	Rate	People		8.1	27.0	45.6	4.0	21.3	35.2	75.3	3.4	22.4	56.3	98.1	10.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Bali): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP			Intl. 2011 PPP			Percentile-based lines							
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Badung	Line	People		17,558	26,338	35,117	14,951	23,922	29,903	59,806	14,460	24,354	41,858	165,148	18,603	23,328	32,166	37,701	44,621	66,343
	Rate	HHs	680	2.9	13.0	24.9	1.3	10.2	17.8	53.0	1.0	11.1	32.9	95.8	3.6	9.2	20.7	27.3	37.4	60.2
	Rate	People		3.6	15.8	30.3	1.6	13.0	21.6	59.9	1.3	13.7	38.5	97.2	4.3	11.7	24.5	32.9	43.1	66.8
Kabupaten Bangli	Line	People		10,773	16,159	21,545	9,173	14,677	18,346	36,693	8,872	14,942	25,681	101,323	11,413	14,313	19,735	23,131	27,377	40,704
	Rate	HHs	560	1.1	12.0	29.0	0.3	7.6	18.2	61.4	0.3	8.0	39.7	97.6	1.4	6.9	24.1	31.9	43.1	68.2
	Rate	People		1.0	13.7	32.2	0.3	9.0	20.2	66.1	0.3	9.3	43.4	98.3	1.3	7.9	27.3	35.2	47.0	72.4
Kabupaten Buleleng	Line	People		13,009	19,513	26,017	11,077	17,723	22,154	44,309	10,713	18,043	31,011	122,354	13,782	17,283	23,831	27,932	33,059	49,152
	Rate	HHs	720	7.4	30.4	50.8	3.7	23.6	40.6	78.0	3.2	24.2	60.7	98.9	10.3	22.3	46.5	54.5	64.9	83.4
	Rate	People		9.5	34.6	55.5	4.0	27.6	45.8	81.8	3.3	28.2	65.6	98.8	13.0	26.1	51.6	59.2	68.9	86.5
Kota Denpasar	Line	People		17,930	26,894	35,859	15,267	24,428	30,535	61,070	14,766	24,868	42,742	168,638	18,996	23,821	32,846	38,498	45,564	67,745
	Rate	HHs	793	1.6	10.4	22.0	0.8	7.0	15.2	52.7	0.6	7.6	31.4	95.5	2.0	6.0	18.4	26.1	34.3	57.1
	Rate	People		2.1	13.4	27.7	1.0	9.4	19.5	61.0	0.7	10.0	37.7	97.0	2.7	8.1	23.5	31.8	41.6	64.7
Kabupaten Gianyar	Line	People		12,446	18,669	24,892	10,598	16,957	21,196	42,392	10,250	17,262	29,670	117,061	13,186	16,536	22,800	26,723	31,629	47,026
	Rate	HHs	640	0.3	9.0	22.8	0.0	5.7	14.0	61.0	0.0	6.3	34.9	97.7	0.7	3.9	17.5	27.5	39.2	67.5
	Rate	People		0.4	10.5	25.9	0.0	7.1	16.0	67.1	0.0	8.0	40.9	98.1	0.9	4.6	19.5	31.9	45.5	74.0
Kabupaten Jembrana	Line	People		12,689	19,034	25,378	10,805	17,288	21,610	43,220	10,450	17,600	30,250	119,348	13,444	16,859	23,246	27,245	32,247	47,945
	Rate	HHs	560	3.8	24.8	46.3	0.8	16.7	35.6	75.9	0.5	17.1	58.0	98.4	4.8	14.9	39.9	51.8	61.4	80.6
	Rate	People		4.9	29.1	52.6	1.1	20.6	41.0	79.5	0.4	21.0	63.6	98.8	6.3	18.3	45.9	58.0	66.8	83.3
Kabupaten Karang Asem	Line	People		10,235	15,353	20,470	8,716	13,945	17,431	34,862	8,429	14,196	24,400	96,268	10,844	13,598	18,750	21,977	26,011	38,673
	Rate	HHs	640	8.4	27.3	45.8	3.0	21.8	36.3	74.0	2.9	23.2	57.0	98.9	10.1	19.9	39.9	49.0	61.0	78.8
	Rate	People		10.0	31.3	51.4	3.9	25.6	41.5	79.4	3.8	27.2	62.9	99.2	11.8	23.8	45.2	54.8	66.9	83.2
Kabupaten Klungkung	Line	People		10,217	15,325	20,434	8,700	13,920	17,400	34,800	8,414	14,171	24,356	96,096	10,824	13,574	18,717	21,937	25,964	38,604
	Rate	HHs	520	2.2	15.1	32.5	1.0	10.9	21.9	60.9	0.8	11.6	43.7	93.1	3.5	10.0	26.1	35.8	46.1	65.9
	Rate	People		1.9	16.9	35.5	0.9	11.7	24.1	65.1	0.8	12.7	47.1	94.3	3.3	10.6	29.5	39.2	49.8	70.0
Kabupaten Tabanan	Line	People		13,885	20,828	27,771	11,824	18,918	23,647	47,295	11,435	19,259	33,101	130,600	14,711	18,448	25,437	29,814	35,287	52,464
	Rate	HHs	640	2.0	15.8	33.6	0.9	12.4	23.2	66.6	0.4	13.2	46.0	98.0	2.9	11.1	27.2	39.3	50.5	72.9
	Rate	People		2.1	17.9	38.1	0.8	14.2	26.0	72.1	0.3	15.2	52.5	98.8	3.3	12.8	30.8	45.1	57.0	77.0
All Perkotaan	Line	People		15,228	22,842	30,457	12,967	20,748	25,934	51,869	12,541	21,122	36,303	143,231	16,134	20,232	27,897	32,698	38,700	57,539
	Rate	HHs	3,513	3.3	16.0	30.0	1.2	11.9	22.2	59.1	1.0	12.7	39.9	96.3	4.3	10.7	26.0	34.0	43.5	64.3
	Rate	People		4.3	18.8	34.8	1.5	14.5	26.0	65.7	1.2	15.2	45.3	97.5	5.4	13.0	30.3	39.0	49.4	70.6
All Perdesaan	Line	People		12,387	18,580	24,773	10,548	16,876	21,095	42,190	10,201	17,180	29,529	116,504	13,123	16,457	22,692	26,596	31,478	46,802
	Rate	HHs	2,240	3.6	19.7	38.9	1.9	14.5	28.0	72.0	1.6	15.2	50.0	98.7	5.0	13.1	32.3	42.6	54.1	78.3
	Rate	People		3.9	22.4	43.3	2.0	16.9	31.4	76.3	1.7	17.9	55.8	98.7	5.5	15.2	36.1	47.8	59.4	81.7
All Kota	Line	People		17,930	26,894	35,859	15,267	24,428	30,535	61,070	14,766	24,868	42,742	168,638	18,996	23,821	32,846	38,498	45,564	67,745
	Rate	HHs	793	1.6	10.4	22.0	0.8	7.0	15.2	52.7	0.6	7.6	31.4	95.5	2.0	6.0	18.4	26.1	34.3	57.1
	Rate	People		2.1	13.4	27.7	1.0	9.4	19.5	61.0	0.7	10.0	37.7	97.0	2.7	8.1	23.5	31.8	41.6	64.7
All Kabupaten	Line	People		13,258	19,887	26,516	11,290	18,063	22,579	45,158	10,918	18,389	31,606	124,701	14,047	17,615	24,288	28,467	33,693	50,095
	Rate	HHs	4,960	4.0	19.4	36.4	1.7	14.6	26.9	66.7	1.4	15.4	47.0	97.6	5.3	13.2	31.2	40.2	51.0	72.7
	Rate	People		4.7	21.9	40.4	1.8	17.0	30.2	71.6	1.5	17.8	51.9	98.2	6.2	15.3	34.7	44.8	55.9	77.0
All Bali	Line	People		14,269	21,404	28,538	12,151	19,441	24,301	48,602	11,751	19,791	34,016	134,210	15,118	18,958	26,140	30,638	36,262	53,915
	Rate	HHs	5,753	3.4	17.2	32.9	1.4	12.8	24.1	63.3	1.2	13.5	43.2	97.1	4.5	11.5	28.1	36.8	47.0	68.9
	Rate	People		4.2	20.0	37.7	1.7	15.3	27.8	69.3	1.3	16.1	48.8	97.9	5.4	13.8	32.2	42.0	52.8	74.4

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Banten): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kota Cilegon	Line	People		14,100	21,150	28,199	12,006	19,210	24,013	48,025	11,612	19,556	33,612	132,616	14,938	18,733	25,830	30,274	35,832	53,275
	Rate	HHs	581	1.4	8.6	24.0	0.9	6.4	13.8	50.8	0.7	7.0	34.4	95.3	2.3	5.8	19.1	27.2	36.3	57.4
	Rate	People		2.3	10.6	28.1	1.7	8.3	16.6	56.3	1.2	9.1	39.2	96.6	3.4	7.4	22.3	31.9	41.5	62.8
Kabupaten Lebak	Line	People		9,334	14,001	18,667	7,948	12,717	15,896	31,792	7,687	12,946	22,251	87,789	9,889	12,401	17,099	20,041	23,720	35,267
	Rate	HHs	816	1.1	10.6	27.8	0.4	6.0	16.9	63.1	0.3	6.4	39.3	98.2	1.6	5.7	19.7	32.6	43.7	69.6
	Rate	People		0.9	13.0	31.5	0.3	7.3	19.8	67.9	0.2	7.9	44.0	98.4	1.5	6.9	22.9	35.9	48.3	74.3
Kabupaten Pandeglang	Line	People		10,220	15,330	20,440	8,703	13,924	17,405	34,810	8,417	14,175	24,364	96,125	10,828	13,578	18,722	21,944	25,972	38,615
	Rate	HHs	829	2.0	20.3	41.7	1.0	13.8	29.1	74.7	0.7	15.0	54.6	98.2	4.0	12.2	34.5	47.0	59.5	80.1
	Rate	People		2.8	25.8	50.0	1.4	17.9	36.2	80.5	1.0	19.5	62.1	98.4	5.4	15.6	41.8	55.3	66.4	85.0
Kabupaten Serang	Line	People		9,693	14,540	19,386	8,254	13,206	16,508	33,015	7,982	13,444	23,107	91,169	10,269	12,878	17,757	20,812	24,633	36,624
	Rate	HHs	835	0.7	6.2	22.0	0.4	3.4	11.7	59.4	0.4	4.1	33.2	98.1	0.9	3.2	16.1	25.4	38.4	65.8
	Rate	People		0.9	7.3	27.3	0.6	4.2	14.2	65.2	0.6	4.9	38.8	98.9	1.1	4.1	20.3	31.2	44.0	71.1
Kota Serang	Line	People		11,515	17,272	23,029	9,805	15,688	19,610	39,220	9,483	15,971	27,450	108,302	12,199	15,298	21,094	24,724	29,262	43,507
	Rate	HHs	660	0.7	12.1	30.0	0.3	7.7	18.8	61.4	0.1	8.4	39.8	95.3	2.0	7.1	23.2	35.2	43.9	67.0
	Rate	People		1.1	18.1	38.4	0.4	12.1	26.1	69.6	0.1	13.0	48.6	97.0	3.2	11.4	31.1	43.5	53.2	74.6
Kabupaten Tangerang	Line	People		14,838	22,257	29,676	12,635	20,216	25,270	50,540	12,220	20,580	35,373	139,561	15,720	19,714	27,182	31,860	37,708	56,064
	Rate	HHs	1,067	4.1	19.8	37.6	2.0	14.2	27.5	72.2	1.6	14.9	51.4	97.7	5.6	13.3	31.8	42.3	55.2	76.6
	Rate	People		5.4	23.5	42.8	2.9	17.3	31.8	77.0	2.3	18.2	56.9	98.1	7.3	16.3	36.5	47.7	60.7	81.4
Kota Tangerang	Line	People		18,305	27,458	36,610	15,587	24,940	31,175	62,349	15,075	25,389	43,638	172,171	19,394	24,320	33,534	39,304	46,519	69,164
	Rate	HHs	956	2.7	14.2	28.6	1.4	9.7	19.4	56.3	1.1	10.8	37.9	97.6	3.8	8.5	23.8	31.7	41.1	62.2
	Rate	People		3.8	17.9	33.7	1.8	12.7	23.6	62.9	1.4	13.9	43.7	98.2	5.1	11.3	28.3	37.3	47.0	68.0
Kota Tangerang Selatan	Line	People		18,054	27,081	36,108	15,374	24,598	30,747	61,494	14,868	25,041	43,040	169,811	19,128	23,987	33,074	38,765	45,881	68,216
	Rate	HHs	844	0.9	6.6	19.4	0.3	4.8	11.3	49.5	0.3	5.5	28.6	91.8	1.2	4.4	15.1	22.8	31.3	55.5
	Rate	People		1.1	8.8	23.0	0.3	6.5	14.5	53.6	0.3	7.5	32.8	92.3	1.5	6.0	18.3	26.7	35.7	59.2
All Perkotaan	Line	People		15,471	23,207	30,942	13,174	21,078	26,348	52,696	12,741	21,458	36,882	145,515	16,391	20,555	28,342	33,219	39,317	58,456
	Rate	HHs	4,341	2.5	14.1	29.7	1.3	9.9	20.2	60.9	1.0	10.8	41.0	95.9	3.6	9.1	24.4	33.6	44.4	65.9
	Rate	People		3.4	17.6	35.2	1.8	12.8	24.6	66.7	1.4	13.9	47.1	96.6	4.7	11.8	29.2	39.5	50.5	71.3
All Perdesaan	Line	People		10,531	15,797	21,062	8,968	14,348	17,935	35,870	8,673	14,607	25,105	99,052	11,157	13,992	19,293	22,612	26,763	39,791
	Rate	HHs	2,247	1.7	13.3	32.0	0.6	8.2	20.4	67.8	0.5	8.7	43.6	99.0	2.6	7.6	24.9	36.7	48.5	74.7
	Rate	People		2.1	15.8	36.3	0.7	9.8	23.8	72.4	0.6	10.5	48.3	99.4	3.3	9.1	28.9	41.0	53.1	79.1
All Kota	Line	People		16,932	25,398	33,864	14,418	23,069	28,836	57,672	13,944	23,485	40,364	159,256	17,939	22,496	31,019	36,356	43,029	63,976
	Rate	HHs	3,041	1.8	10.9	25.3	0.9	7.5	16.1	54.1	0.7	8.4	34.7	95.2	2.6	6.7	20.4	28.7	37.7	60.1
	Rate	People		2.4	14.2	30.2	1.1	10.1	20.2	60.1	0.8	11.2	40.3	95.9	3.5	9.2	24.8	34.1	43.6	65.5
All Kabupaten	Line	People		12,175	18,263	24,350	10,367	16,588	20,735	41,470	10,027	16,887	29,025	114,515	12,899	16,176	22,304	26,142	30,941	46,003
	Rate	HHs	3,547	2.6	15.8	33.7	1.3	10.7	23.0	68.7	1.0	11.5	46.5	97.9	3.8	10.0	27.3	38.3	50.8	74.0
	Rate	People		3.4	18.9	39.0	1.7	13.1	27.0	73.7	1.4	14.1	52.0	98.3	4.8	12.2	31.9	43.7	56.2	78.8
All Banten	Line	People		14,044	21,066	28,088	11,959	19,134	23,918	47,836	11,566	19,479	33,480	132,094	14,879	18,659	25,728	30,155	35,691	53,065
	Rate	HHs	6,588	2.3	13.8	30.3	1.1	9.4	20.3	62.8	0.9	10.2	41.8	96.8	3.3	8.7	24.5	34.5	45.6	68.4
	Rate	People		3.0	17.1	35.5	1.5	12.0	24.4	68.4	1.2	12.9	47.4	97.4	4.3	11.0	29.1	39.9	51.2	73.5

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (DI Yogyakarta): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	<i>n</i>	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Bantul	Line	People		12,147	18,221	24,295	10,344	16,550	20,687	41,375	10,004	16,848	28,958	114,252	12,870	16,139	22,253	26,082	30,870	45,897
	Rate	HHs	782	10.9	29.1	45.0	4.0	25.1	34.9	67.0	3.2	25.7	52.4	94.3	12.3	23.9	39.7	47.0	54.8	70.6
	Rate	People		12.1	31.8	48.6	4.3	27.6	37.8	69.9	3.5	28.2	56.5	95.9	13.4	26.2	42.6	50.9	58.4	74.2
Kabupaten Gunung Kidul	Line	People		9,493	14,240	18,986	8,084	12,934	16,167	32,334	7,818	13,167	22,631	89,288	10,058	12,613	17,391	20,383	24,125	35,869
	Rate	HHs	755	4.3	18.8	40.0	1.6	14.5	25.0	68.4	1.3	15.4	50.4	97.9	7.0	13.9	34.0	43.8	53.1	74.4
	Rate	People		4.2	20.2	42.3	1.7	15.2	26.8	71.5	1.5	16.4	53.2	98.3	6.8	14.5	36.2	46.2	56.0	77.7
Kabupaten Kulon Progo	Line	People		10,623	15,934	21,245	9,045	14,473	18,091	36,182	8,748	14,734	25,323	99,912	11,254	14,113	19,460	22,809	26,995	40,137
	Rate	HHs	634	7.5	32.0	54.5	2.8	25.0	43.4	77.7	2.2	26.4	64.1	97.9	11.5	23.1	48.8	58.0	67.0	83.0
	Rate	People		7.3	35.5	58.1	2.6	27.1	47.3	80.3	1.8	28.7	68.1	97.3	11.8	24.8	52.1	62.3	70.7	85.1
Kabupaten Sleman	Line	People		12,169	18,253	24,337	10,362	16,579	20,724	41,447	10,021	16,878	29,009	114,453	12,892	16,167	22,292	26,128	30,924	45,978
	Rate	HHs	867	1.4	11.4	23.9	0.0	7.9	15.7	47.6	0.0	8.6	31.7	87.6	1.9	7.1	19.7	26.7	33.8	52.5
	Rate	People		1.3	13.8	29.6	0.0	9.2	19.4	56.0	0.0	9.8	38.8	91.6	2.1	8.3	23.9	32.9	41.0	61.1
Kota Yogyakarta	Line	People		15,355	23,033	30,711	13,076	20,921	26,151	52,302	12,646	21,298	36,606	144,427	16,269	20,401	28,130	32,971	39,023	58,019
	Rate	HHs	659	6.2	16.9	23.9	4.1	14.2	20.7	44.5	4.1	14.8	30.6	93.2	7.9	13.5	22.2	26.9	32.1	51.3
	Rate	People		10.4	24.1	32.1	6.4	21.2	28.6	57.2	6.4	21.9	41.4	95.4	12.4	20.5	30.3	36.7	42.9	64.4
All Perkotaan	Line	People		12,478	18,717	24,956	10,625	17,000	21,250	42,501	10,276	17,307	29,746	117,361	13,220	16,578	22,859	26,792	31,710	47,146
	Rate	HHs	2,543	5.7	19.3	32.3	2.3	15.5	24.4	54.6	2.0	16.1	39.9	91.3	6.9	14.7	28.4	35.1	42.1	59.3
	Rate	People		6.7	22.7	37.9	2.7	18.2	28.8	62.0	2.4	18.9	46.9	93.8	8.0	17.2	32.9	41.3	48.9	66.9
All Perdesaan	Line	People		10,079	15,118	20,158	8,583	13,732	17,165	34,330	8,300	13,980	24,027	94,799	10,678	13,391	18,464	21,641	25,614	38,083
	Rate	HHs	1,154	5.8	23.2	45.2	1.9	18.4	30.6	72.8	1.4	19.5	55.3	98.2	8.8	17.1	38.4	48.4	57.8	78.7
	Rate	People		5.7	25.3	47.7	1.8	19.6	32.8	75.2	1.4	21.0	58.0	98.6	8.8	18.1	40.9	51.3	60.5	81.4
All Kota	Line	People		15,355	23,033	30,711	13,076	20,921	26,151	52,302	12,646	21,298	36,606	144,427	16,269	20,401	28,130	32,971	39,023	58,019
	Rate	HHs	659	6.2	16.9	23.9	4.1	14.2	20.7	44.5	4.1	14.8	30.6	93.2	7.9	13.5	22.2	26.9	32.1	51.3
	Rate	People		10.4	24.1	32.1	6.4	21.2	28.6	57.2	6.4	21.9	41.4	95.4	12.4	20.5	30.3	36.7	42.9	64.4
All Kabupaten	Line	People		11,383	17,075	22,767	9,693	15,509	19,387	38,773	9,375	15,789	27,137	107,068	12,060	15,124	20,854	24,442	28,929	43,011
	Rate	HHs	3,038	5.6	20.8	37.4	1.9	16.6	26.8	61.6	1.5	17.4	45.9	93.1	7.3	15.6	32.3	40.3	48.3	66.4
	Rate	People		5.9	23.3	41.6	2.0	18.3	30.0	66.6	1.6	19.1	50.9	95.0	7.7	17.1	35.7	44.9	53.2	71.7
All DI Yogyakarta	Line	People		11,830	17,745	23,660	10,073	16,118	20,147	40,294	9,742	16,408	28,201	111,267	12,533	15,717	21,672	25,401	30,063	44,698
	Rate	HHs	3,697	5.7	20.3	35.7	2.2	16.3	26.1	59.4	1.8	17.0	44.0	93.1	7.4	15.3	31.0	38.6	46.3	64.4
	Rate	People		6.4	23.4	40.6	2.5	18.6	29.9	65.6	2.1	19.4	49.8	95.1	8.2	17.5	35.1	44.0	52.1	70.8

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (DKI Jakarta): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	<i>n</i>	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
<u>Kota Jakarta Barat</u>	Line	People		16,120	24,181	32,241	13,727	21,963	27,454	54,908	13,276	22,359	38,430	151,623	17,079	21,418	29,532	34,613	40,967	60,910
	Rate	HHs	982	0.9	4.5	20.6	0.1	2.6	9.4	53.1	0.0	2.8	31.6	93.3	0.9	2.3	15.4	25.0	36.4	58.9
	Rate	People		1.3	6.1	26.4	0.2	3.5	11.9	61.0	0.0	3.9	39.0	94.9	1.3	3.1	19.5	31.5	44.2	66.5
<u>Kota Jakarta Pusat</u>	Line	People		19,071	28,607	38,142	16,240	25,983	32,479	64,958	15,706	26,452	45,464	179,375	20,205	25,338	34,937	40,949	48,465	72,059
	Rate	HHs	758	1.6	10.5	24.1	1.0	6.3	16.4	56.8	0.9	6.8	35.4	96.2	1.8	5.7	20.2	28.3	39.9	62.0
	Rate	People		2.5	13.4	30.3	1.6	8.0	20.9	64.8	1.5	8.8	42.3	97.7	2.7	7.3	25.5	35.1	47.6	70.4
<u>Kota Jakarta Selatan</u>	Line	People		22,362	33,542	44,723	19,041	30,466	38,083	76,166	18,416	31,016	53,308	210,325	23,691	29,710	40,965	48,014	56,828	84,492
	Rate	HHs	979	5.0	21.2	36.3	2.4	16.8	28.8	62.3	2.0	17.7	45.9	93.7	7.5	16.0	32.1	40.1	49.8	66.4
	Rate	People		7.0	26.9	42.6	3.4	21.7	35.3	67.9	2.7	22.8	52.1	95.5	10.1	20.8	38.6	46.7	55.7	71.6
<u>Kota Jakarta Timur</u>	Line	People		16,509	24,764	33,018	14,058	22,493	28,116	56,232	13,596	22,898	39,356	155,278	17,491	21,934	30,244	35,448	41,955	62,378
	Rate	HHs	1,068	1.2	11.7	25.7	0.1	7.6	16.6	54.5	0.0	8.6	36.9	93.9	1.6	6.8	19.5	30.0	40.1	59.7
	Rate	People		1.8	15.2	30.9	0.1	10.1	20.8	59.3	0.0	11.1	42.5	94.5	2.3	8.9	23.9	35.3	45.9	64.4
<u>Kota Jakarta Utara</u>	Line	People		16,856	25,283	33,711	14,353	22,965	28,706	57,412	13,881	23,379	40,182	158,536	17,858	22,394	30,878	36,192	42,835	63,687
	Rate	HHs	905	1.3	10.7	24.9	0.4	7.4	17.1	53.3	0.4	7.9	35.5	90.3	2.2	6.9	20.3	28.2	38.5	57.9
	Rate	People		1.9	13.8	30.4	0.6	10.0	22.0	59.4	0.6	10.4	41.9	91.4	3.4	9.5	25.4	34.2	45.1	64.0
<u>Kabupaten Kepulauan Seribu</u>	Line	People		18,960	28,441	37,921	16,145	25,832	32,291	64,581	15,615	26,298	45,200	178,334	20,088	25,191	34,734	40,711	48,184	71,640
	Rate	HHs	231	0.9	8.5	34.0	0.3	4.7	16.4	74.6	0.0	5.1	50.6	99.8	0.9	2.9	21.4	40.9	55.9	80.1
	Rate	People		1.4	10.7	39.4	0.6	5.8	20.4	80.7	0.0	6.3	58.1	99.9	1.4	3.9	25.8	48.0	64.1	85.6
<u>All Perkotaan</u>	Line	People		17,962	26,943	35,924	15,295	24,472	30,590	61,180	14,792	24,913	42,819	168,942	19,030	23,864	32,905	38,567	45,647	67,867
	Rate	HHs	4,923	2.0	11.7	26.5	0.7	8.2	17.5	55.9	0.6	8.8	37.2	93.4	2.8	7.5	21.4	30.5	41.0	60.9
	Rate	People		2.8	15.1	32.2	1.1	10.8	21.9	62.1	0.8	11.5	43.6	94.6	4.0	10.0	26.4	36.6	47.6	67.0
<u>All Kota</u>	Line	People		17,960	26,939	35,919	15,293	24,469	30,586	61,172	14,790	24,910	42,814	168,920	19,027	23,861	32,901	38,562	45,641	67,859
	Rate	HHs	4,692	2.0	11.7	26.5	0.7	8.2	17.5	55.8	0.6	8.8	37.2	93.3	2.8	7.6	21.4	30.5	41.0	60.9
	Rate	People		2.8	15.1	32.2	1.1	10.8	21.9	62.1	0.8	11.6	43.6	94.5	4.0	10.0	26.4	36.6	47.6	66.9
<u>All Kabupaten</u>	Line	People		18,960	28,441	37,921	16,145	25,832	32,291	64,581	15,615	26,298	45,200	178,334	20,088	25,191	34,734	40,711	48,184	71,640
	Rate	HHs	231	0.9	8.5	34.0	0.3	4.7	16.4	74.6	0.0	5.1	50.6	99.8	0.9	2.9	21.4	40.9	55.9	80.1
	Rate	People		1.4	10.7	39.4	0.6	5.8	20.4	80.7	0.0	6.3	58.1	99.9	1.4	3.9	25.8	48.0	64.1	85.6
<u>All DKI Jakarta</u>	Line	People		17,962	26,943	35,924	15,295	24,472	30,590	61,180	14,792	24,913	42,819	168,942	19,030	23,864	32,905	38,567	45,647	67,867
	Rate	HHs	4,923	2.0	11.7	26.5	0.7	8.2	17.5	55.9	0.6	8.8	37.2	93.4	2.8	7.5	21.4	30.5	41.0	60.9
	Rate	People		2.8	15.1	32.2	1.1	10.8	21.9	62.1	0.8	11.5	43.6	94.6	4.0	10.0	26.4	36.6	47.6	67.0

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Gorontalo): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Boalemo	Line	People		12,127	18,190	24,254	10,326	16,522	20,653	41,305	9,987	16,820	28,909	114,061	12,848	16,112	22,216	26,038	30,818	45,820
	Rate	HHs	479	24.3	44.7	57.3	18.7	39.9	50.2	85.7	18.5	39.9	66.0	98.9	26.9	38.1	54.7	62.1	69.1	89.6
	Rate	People		28.8	50.1	62.5	22.8	45.4	55.4	89.4	22.6	45.4	70.9	99.1	31.9	43.6	59.6	67.3	74.2	92.0
Kabupaten Bone Bolango	Line	People		11,967	17,950	23,933	10,190	16,304	20,380	40,759	9,855	16,598	28,527	112,552	12,678	15,899	21,922	25,694	30,411	45,215
	Rate	HHs	519	11.6	22.8	36.2	8.1	20.2	28.0	68.2	7.8	20.5	45.1	98.7	12.6	20.0	31.8	39.2	48.5	74.0
	Rate	People		14.5	27.6	43.1	10.8	24.7	34.1	74.7	10.4	24.9	52.1	99.1	15.7	24.5	38.5	46.2	55.2	79.3
Kabupaten Gorontalo	Line	People		13,452	20,179	26,905	11,455	18,328	22,910	45,820	11,079	18,659	32,069	126,528	14,252	17,873	24,644	28,885	34,187	50,829
	Rate	HHs	600	27.0	47.6	60.7	19.6	43.3	53.8	82.8	18.9	44.0	67.8	98.9	30.4	42.0	56.5	63.0	69.0	86.7
	Rate	People		33.0	54.2	67.0	25.2	50.0	59.8	86.0	24.4	50.7	73.2	99.4	36.5	48.5	62.8	69.0	74.4	89.2
Kota Gorontalo	Line	People		15,866	23,799	31,732	13,510	21,616	27,020	54,040	13,066	22,006	37,823	149,227	16,809	21,079	29,065	34,066	40,320	59,948
	Rate	HHs	502	11.9	26.2	39.5	6.0	23.4	31.8	63.7	5.9	24.1	46.9	97.3	13.7	22.2	35.1	43.0	48.9	72.4
	Rate	People		16.4	33.2	49.2	8.8	30.3	39.4	71.8	8.5	30.9	56.5	98.7	18.5	28.9	43.5	52.5	58.1	78.5
Kabupaten Gorontalo Utara	Line	People		8,805	13,207	17,609	7,497	11,996	14,995	29,989	7,251	12,212	20,989	82,812	9,328	11,698	16,129	18,905	22,375	33,267
	Rate	HHs	435	14.5	32.9	45.8	8.0	28.5	37.9	71.6	6.9	28.8	54.1	97.7	18.1	27.8	42.7	50.8	58.7	73.7
	Rate	People		17.6	37.6	51.1	10.4	32.7	42.7	74.4	9.0	32.9	58.3	98.1	21.3	32.4	47.9	55.8	62.5	76.5
Kabupaten Pohuwato	Line	People		8,667	13,000	17,334	7,380	11,808	14,760	29,520	7,137	12,021	20,661	81,517	9,182	11,515	15,877	18,609	22,025	32,747
	Rate	HHs	480	4.1	22.2	35.1	0.6	19.2	27.1	61.8	0.3	19.8	42.5	96.1	6.6	17.6	29.6	38.8	47.1	66.4
	Rate	People		5.5	28.2	42.8	1.1	24.8	33.7	69.5	0.5	25.6	50.4	98.0	9.0	22.8	36.9	46.5	55.7	74.0
All Perkotaan	Line	People		13,869	20,804	27,739	11,810	18,896	23,620	47,240	11,422	19,237	33,063	130,450	14,694	18,427	25,408	29,780	35,246	52,404
	Rate	HHs	1,020	11.0	26.8	40.3	6.0	22.8	32.3	65.1	5.6	23.7	49.0	96.9	12.8	21.7	36.6	44.7	51.2	71.9
	Rate	People		14.3	33.1	48.5	8.1	28.7	39.3	72.2	7.6	29.5	57.2	98.4	16.3	27.4	44.0	52.9	58.9	77.3
All Perdesaan	Line	People		11,515	17,273	23,031	9,806	15,689	19,611	39,223	9,483	15,972	27,452	108,310	12,200	15,299	21,096	24,726	29,264	43,510
	Rate	HHs	1,995	21.8	40.5	53.5	15.6	37.1	46.2	79.5	15.0	37.3	60.6	98.9	24.9	35.9	49.0	56.2	63.5	83.3
	Rate	People		26.6	46.4	59.4	19.9	42.9	51.8	83.4	19.2	43.1	66.0	99.2	30.0	41.6	55.0	62.0	69.2	86.7
All Kota	Line	People		15,866	23,799	31,732	13,510	21,616	27,020	54,040	13,066	22,006	37,823	149,227	16,809	21,079	29,065	34,066	40,320	59,948
	Rate	HHs	502	11.9	26.2	39.5	6.0	23.4	31.8	63.7	5.9	24.1	46.9	97.3	13.7	22.2	35.1	43.0	48.9	72.4
	Rate	People		16.4	33.2	49.2	8.8	30.3	39.4	71.8	8.5	30.9	56.5	98.7	18.5	28.9	43.5	52.5	58.1	78.5
All Kabupaten	Line	People		11,665	17,498	23,331	9,933	15,893	19,867	39,733	9,607	16,180	27,809	109,720	12,359	15,499	21,370	25,047	29,645	44,077
	Rate	HHs	2,513	18.9	37.3	50.3	13.1	33.4	42.8	76.2	12.6	33.8	58.1	98.3	21.6	32.2	46.2	53.7	61.0	80.3
	Rate	People		23.0	43.0	56.5	16.8	39.0	48.6	80.7	16.1	39.4	63.9	98.9	26.1	37.7	52.3	59.8	66.8	84.1
All Gorontalo	Line	People		12,426	18,640	24,853	10,581	16,930	21,163	42,326	10,234	17,235	29,623	116,878	13,165	16,510	22,764	26,682	31,579	46,952
	Rate	HHs	3,015	17.5	35.2	48.3	11.8	31.5	40.7	73.8	11.3	32.0	56.0	98.1	20.1	30.3	44.1	51.6	58.7	78.8
	Rate	People		21.8	41.2	55.2	15.3	37.4	47.0	79.1	14.7	37.9	62.6	98.9	24.7	36.1	50.7	58.5	65.2	83.1

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Jawa Barat): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																	
				National						Infl. 2008 PPP			Infl. 2011 PPP			Percentile-based lines					
				100%	160%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th	
Kabupaten Bandung	Line	People		11,011	16,517	22,023	9,376	15,002	18,753	37,206	9,088	15,273	20,250	103,968	11,666	14,630	20,172	23,643	27,983	41,665	
	Rate	HHs	1,079	4.9	20.1	39.5	1.7	15.7	27.7	61.3	0.9	16.4	47.6	96.1	6.0	14.4	34.2	41.8	50.7	68.6	
	Rate	People		6.2	24.0	44.9	2.2	18.9	32.3	68.2	1.1	19.6	52.7	96.6	7.9	17.5	39.5	46.9	55.9	72.5	
Kota Bandung	Line	People		14,758	22,138	29,517	12,567	20,107	25,134	50,269	12,154	20,470	35,183	138,812	15,636	19,608	27,037	31,689	37,506	55,763	
	Rate	HHs	997	5.6	14.5	22.6	4.1	12.4	18.6	43.4	4.1	13.2	29.4	88.9	6.5	11.3	20.6	25.2	30.6	48.3	
	Rate	People		7.5	18.5	28.3	5.6	16.1	23.5	51.4	5.6	17.3	36.4	92.1	8.6	14.9	26.0	31.7	37.7	56.6	
Kabupaten Bandung Barat	Line	People		10,830	16,245	21,660	9,222	14,755	18,444	36,888	8,919	15,021	25,818	101,863	11,474	14,389	19,840	23,254	27,523	40,921	
	Rate	HHs	950	12.4	28.5	48.7	5.2	23.9	36.6	73.6	4.7	24.7	57.7	97.5	14.3	23.1	41.6	52.9	60.4	77.7	
	Rate	People		14.8	32.4	52.9	6.2	28.0	40.5	77.0	5.6	28.6	61.7	98.1	16.9	27.1	45.6	56.8	64.5	81.0	
Kota Banjar	Line	People		10,684	16,025	21,367	9,097	14,556	18,195	36,389	8,798	14,818	25,469	100,485	11,319	14,194	19,572	22,939	27,150	40,367	
	Rate	HHs	515	0.6	8.3	27.8	0.3	3.3	14.8	65.4	0.0	4.8	42.8	97.8	0.8	3.2	20.8	34.3	47.5	72.0	
	Rate	People		1.1	10.8	33.0	0.7	4.6	19.1	70.0	0.0	6.8	49.4	98.2	1.3	4.5	25.6	40.4	53.7	76.2	
Kabupaten Bekasi	Line	People		15,239	22,858	30,477	12,976	20,762	25,952	51,904	12,549	21,136	36,327	143,328	16,145	20,246	27,916	32,720	38,726	57,578	
	Rate	HHs	1,049	4.4	19.0	31.8	2.1	15.3	24.7	61.5	2.1	15.6	41.5	97.9	4.8	14.0	27.7	35.4	44.7	66.7	
	Rate	People		5.8	23.3	37.9	2.7	18.7	30.4	68.0	2.7	19.0	47.9	98.0	6.5	17.5	33.7	41.5	51.3	72.9	
Kota Bekasi	Line	People		19,158	28,737	38,316	16,314	26,102	32,627	65,254	15,777	26,572	45,671	180,193	20,297	25,453	35,096	41,135	48,686	72,387	
	Rate	HHs	999	3.2	15.8	27.4	1.6	12.3	20.4	59.0	1.4	13.2	36.7	97.3	4.5	11.2	23.7	31.2	39.7	67.0	
	Rate	People		3.7	17.5	29.5	1.9	13.6	22.7	62.7	1.7	14.6	39.6	97.7	5.2	12.4	26.0	33.9	42.6	70.1	
Kabupaten Bogor	Line	People		11,829	17,743	23,657	10,072	16,116	20,475	40,289	9,741	16,406	28,198	111,255	12,532	15,715	21,669	25,398	30,060	44,693	
	Rate	HHs	1,155	3.9	18.1	33.5	1.1	13.6	25.0	61.8	1.0	14.9	43.0	95.5	4.2	12.6	29.2	36.8	46.8	66.8	
	Rate	People		5.1	21.9	38.8	1.6	16.8	30.0	66.8	1.4	18.2	48.3	96.1	5.5	15.8	34.5	42.2	52.3	71.5	
Kota Bogor	Line	People		15,805	23,708	31,611	13,459	21,534	26,917	53,835	13,016	21,922	37,679	148,660	16,745	20,999	28,955	33,937	40,166	59,720	
	Rate	HHs	757	6.0	21.8	37.7	2.7	17.2	29.6	63.3	2.2	17.9	46.5	95.7	6.6	16.5	33.4	42.4	49.2	68.8	
	Rate	People		8.2	27.0	43.3	3.6	21.4	35.3	68.9	2.9	22.3	53.0	96.4	9.2	20.7	39.1	48.8	55.6	74.4	
Kabupaten Ciamis	Line	People		11,750	17,624	23,499	10,005	16,008	20,010	40,020	9,676	16,297	28,010	110,511	12,448	15,610	21,524	25,228	29,859	44,395	
	Rate	HHs	956	4.9	21.4	41.9	1.7	15.7	31.6	73.8	1.2	16.8	53.4	99.4	5.9	14.4	36.5	46.8	56.6	80.7	
	Rate	People		5.2	23.7	45.1	1.7	17.0	34.4	76.1	1.2	18.5	56.2	99.5	6.1	15.7	40.0	49.6	59.4	82.9	
Kabupaten Cianjur	Line	People		11,207	16,811	22,414	9,543	15,269	19,086	38,172	9,229	15,544	26,717	105,409	11,873	14,890	20,531	24,063	28,481	42,345	
	Rate	HHs	994	13.3	33.9	54.1	7.7	27.9	42.5	77.2	6.3	28.9	64.4	98.5	15.5	26.2	48.5	58.2	66.3	80.4	
	Rate	People		15.1	37.5	59.2	8.9	31.5	47.5	81.5	7.4	32.6	69.2	98.8	17.4	28.9	53.8	63.3	71.2	84.2	
Kota Cimahi	Line	People		15,221	22,831	30,442	12,961	20,738	25,922	51,844	12,535	21,111	36,285	143,162	16,126	20,222	27,884	32,682	38,681	57,511	
	Rate	HHs	712	3.4	15.9	31.7	1.6	11.7	22.2	63.2	1.4	12.5	40.8	97.3	4.7	10.3	26.8	34.9	43.5	70.0	
	Rate	People		4.6	19.8	36.7	2.1	14.6	26.6	68.0	1.9	15.8	45.9	97.9	6.2	12.9	31.7	40.3	48.9	75.1	
Kabupaten Cirebon	Line	People		12,189	18,283	24,378	10,379	16,607	20,758	41,517	10,038	16,906	29,057	114,644	12,914	16,194	22,329	26,172	30,976	46,055	
	Rate	HHs	994	8.6	32.1	53.0	4.4	24.6	43.7	80.8	4.1	25.9	65.3	98.2	11.6	22.1	48.1	57.9	68.6	85.6	
	Rate	People		10.3	37.9	59.5	5.6	29.8	50.2	85.4	5.2	31.5	71.3	98.5	14.2	26.6	54.5	64.2	74.1	87.5	
Kota Cirebon	Line	People		14,030	21,045	28,059	11,947	19,115	23,893	47,787	11,554	19,459	33,446	131,958	14,864	18,640	25,702	30,124	35,651	53,090	
	Rate	HHs	582	12.3	33.2	47.5	8.3	26.4	40.3	69.1	6.4	28.3	55.0	97.8	15.5	25.7	43.5	50.5	57.7	72.7	
	Rate	People		16.9	40.4	56.0	11.8	33.2	48.0	75.4	9.1	35.1	62.7	98.4	21.2	32.4	51.2	58.9	65.1	78.1	
Kota Depok	Line	People		20,228	30,341	40,455	17,224	27,559	34,449	68,897	16,658	28,056	48,221	190,252	21,430	26,874	37,056	43,432	51,404	76,428	
	Rate	HHs	951	5.4	19.6	33.3	2.0	17.0	28.7	66.9	2.0	18.4	47.7	97.2	7.9	16.1	33.2	41.8	52.2	74.7	
	Rate	People		6.4	23.0	37.6	2.0	17.0	28.7	66.9	2.0	18.4	47.7	97.2	7.9	16.1	33.2	41.8	52.2	74.7	
Kabupaten Garut	Line	People		9,294	13,941	18,587	7,914	12,662	15,828	31,655	7,654	12,800	22,155	87,413	9,846	12,348	17,025	19,955	23,618	35,113	
	Rate	HHs	1,032	2.5	14.9	33.8	0.8	10.4	22.5	68.7	0.8	11.2	47.1	96.3	3.9	9.1	27.7	39.7	50.8	72.9	
	Rate	People		3.1	17.5	38.8	0.9	12.3	26.5	73.5	0.9	13.0	52.7	97.2	4.9	11.1	32.0	44.8	56.8	77.5	
Kabupaten Indramayu	Line	People		14,708	22,062	29,417	12,524	20,309	25,019	50,038	12,113	20,400	35,063	138,341	15,583	19,541	26,945	31,581	37,378	55,574	
	Rate	HHs	952	9.2	33.1	54.8	4.3	25.2	43.4	86.4	3.7	27.1	65.9	99.2	10.8	22.8	49.4	59.4	71.3	89.9	
	Rate	People		11.8	37.2	60.3	6.2	29.5	48.5	89.9	5.6	31.5	70.3	99.4	13.7	26.7	55.0	64.5	75.6	92.8	
Kabupaten Karawang	Line	People		14,268	21,401	28,535	12,149	19,439	24,298	48,597	11,750	19,789	34,013	134,195	15,116	18,956	26,137	30,635	36,258	53,909	
	Rate	HHs	1,032	5.3	21.6	36.0	2.4	16.6	26.8	65.3	2.4	17.8	46.1	98.4	7.0	14.1	30.8	41.2	50.2	71.3	
	Rate	People		7.6	25.7	41.3	3.1	20.0	31.3	70.6	3.1	21.5	51.4	99.0	9.1	17.4	35.7	46.2	55.8	76.0	
Kabupaten Kuningas	Line	People		10,931	16,396	21,862	9,308	14,893	18,616	37,232	9,002	15,161	26,058	102,812	11,581	14,523	20,025	23,471	27,779	41,302	
	Rate	HHs	752	6.1	26.8	46.5	2.1	19.4	36.1	73.0	1.6	20.9	55.1	98.8	8.6	18.6	42.3	51.0	58.8	77.7	
	Rate	People		7.9	30.9	51.8	3.0	23.5	41.4	76.3	2.4	24.9	60.0	97.2	11.4	22.7	47.7	56.2	63.9	80.2	
Kabupaten Majalengka	Line	People		14,491	21,737	28,983	12,340	19,743	24,679	49,359	11,934	20,099	34,546	136,299	15,353	19,253	26,547	31,115	36,827	54,754	
	Rate	HHs	832	14.7	40.0	57.4	8.3	31.8	48.2	83.2	7.7	33.2	67.1	98.5	18.3	30.1	51.6	60.9	69.1	86.9	
	Rate	People		16.2	43.7	60.9	9.4	35.2	51.8	85.0	8.5	36.7	70.3	98.9	20.7	33.5	55.6	64.4	72.1	88.4	
Kabupaten Pangandaran	Line	People		11,867	17,801	23,734	10,105	16,108	20,210	40,421	9,773	16,460	28,290	111,618	12,573	15,767	21,740	25,481	30,158	44,839	
	Rate	HHs	679	1.7	13.0	34.8	0.3	8.6	20.4	70.7	0.3	9.6	46.7	98.1	2.7	7.5	25.7	40.1	50.1	75.3	
	Rate	People		2.4	14.4	37.8	0.4	10.0	22.0	73.4	0.4	10.9	50.3	98.6	3.3	8.7	26.9	43.0	54.0	78.0	
Kabupaten Purwakarta	Line	People		11,575	17,362	23,149	9,856	15,770	19,712	39,424	9,532	16,054	27,593	108,866	12,263	15,378	21,204	24,853	29,415	43,734	
	Rate	HHs	743	11.3	25.2	38.4	6.7	22.0	29.7	60.6	6.2	22.5	46.3	96.8	12.1	21.2	33.4	41.6	48.7	67.2	
	Rate	People																			

Table 1 (Kalimantan Selatan): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Balangan	Line	People	478	12,586	18,880	25,173	10,718	17,148	21,435	42,870	10,365	17,457	30,005	118,382	13,335	16,722	23,057	27,025	31,986	47,556
Rate	HHs	2.6		14.4	35.0	0.8	10.6	23.1	71.9	0.3	11.2	49.8	97.8	3.4	9.5	29.3	39.4	54.1	78.0	
Rate	People	3.6		18.4	41.9	1.4	13.7	28.3	76.2	0.5	14.6	56.3	98.3	4.9	12.4	34.9	45.6	60.5	81.8	
Kabupaten Banjar	Line	People	675	13,153	19,730	26,307	11,200	17,921	22,401	44,802	10,832	18,244	31,356	123,715	13,935	17,476	24,096	28,242	33,427	49,699
Rate	HHs	2.8		18.8	41.2	1.2	13.8	28.3	74.4	0.7	14.7	53.1	97.5	3.4	12.8	33.6	45.0	56.4	79.7	
Rate	People	3.5		20.9	44.6	1.6	15.4	31.1	76.6	0.9	16.6	56.0	98.3	3.9	14.2	36.6	47.9	59.1	82.1	
Kota Banjar Baru	Line	People	508	18,812	28,218	37,624	16,019	25,630	32,038	64,075	15,492	26,092	44,846	176,937	19,931	24,993	34,462	40,392	47,807	71,079
Rate	HHs	6.1		27.1	42.1	3.2	20.6	32.2	70.6	2.2	22.8	52.7	97.1	7.3	19.0	36.8	46.2	55.7	76.9	
Rate	People	8.3		32.1	47.7	4.0	24.2	37.2	75.8	2.7	27.0	57.9	97.6	9.7	22.3	42.1	51.3	60.6	80.8	
Kota Banjarmasin	Line	People	680	15,689	23,534	31,378	13,360	21,375	26,719	53,439	12,920	21,761	37,401	147,565	16,622	20,845	28,741	33,687	39,871	59,280
Rate	HHs	2.8		14.5	33.1	1.8	11.1	23.8	59.6	1.6	11.5	42.0	96.1	4.2	10.5	27.3	36.2	45.5	64.5	
Rate	People	4.0		18.3	39.0	2.8	14.4	28.8	65.7	2.6	15.0	48.8	97.3	5.9	13.7	32.9	42.4	52.3	70.3	
Kabupaten Barito Kuala	Line	People	599	9,771	14,656	19,542	8,320	13,312	16,640	33,281	8,047	13,552	23,293	91,901	10,352	12,982	17,900	20,980	24,831	36,919
Rate	HHs	1.4		8.5	19.7	0.5	7.4	11.5	61.4	0.5	7.6	35.3	96.3	2.0	6.7	15.4	27.5	39.8	66.5	
Rate	People	1.9		10.7	23.6	0.7	9.4	14.3	66.1	0.7	9.6	41.0	97.3	3.0	8.8	18.8	32.7	45.2	71.1	
Kabupaten Hulu Sungai Selatan	Line	People	557	14,612	21,918	29,224	12,443	19,908	24,885	49,771	12,034	20,267	34,834	137,437	15,481	19,414	26,769	31,375	37,134	55,211
Rate	HHs	6.0		31.6	51.8	2.7	22.3	40.3	81.1	2.0	23.1	63.3	99.1	7.4	20.1	45.3	56.5	68.1	84.7	
Rate	People	8.8		36.2	57.8	4.1	27.2	46.0	85.3	3.1	28.0	69.3	99.1	10.7	24.2	50.9	62.9	74.3	87.9	
Kabupaten Hulu Sungai Tengah	Line	People	594	11,645	17,468	23,291	9,916	15,866	19,833	39,665	9,590	16,152	27,762	109,532	12,338	15,472	21,334	25,005	29,594	44,001
Rate	HHs	2.8		18.0	42.9	0.7	11.2	29.9	76.5	0.5	11.8	56.1	98.4	3.5	10.3	36.9	49.5	59.1	80.6	
Rate	People	3.4		22.3	48.0	0.9	14.3	35.0	79.6	0.8	14.9	61.0	98.8	4.3	13.2	42.9	54.4	63.5	83.8	
Kabupaten Hulu Sungai Utara	Line	People	519	13,834	20,751	27,668	11,780	18,848	23,560	47,120	11,393	19,188	32,979	130,117	14,657	18,380	25,343	29,704	35,156	52,270
Rate	HHs	4.4		24.0	47.5	2.2	16.1	32.4	80.0	1.4	17.4	61.8	98.1	5.1	15.4	38.9	52.5	65.3	85.1	
Rate	People	5.2		26.5	52.2	2.5	18.2	35.5	83.4	1.4	19.8	65.5	98.7	5.9	17.5	42.3	57.2	69.1	87.3	
Kabupaten Kota Baru	Line	People	594	13,193	19,790	26,387	11,235	17,975	22,469	44,938	10,865	18,299	31,452	124,092	13,978	17,529	24,170	28,328	33,528	49,850
Rate	HHs	2.6		12.0	26.7	0.8	9.5	18.6	58.3	0.6	9.5	36.1	95.5	3.2	8.5	21.0	30.9	39.7	65.3	
Rate	People	4.1		16.8	34.1	0.9	13.5	24.1	65.0	0.7	13.5	44.2	97.4	4.9	12.1	26.9	38.9	47.6	71.1	
Kabupaten Tabalong	Line	People	559	14,688	22,032	29,376	12,507	20,012	25,015	50,029	12,096	20,372	35,015	138,151	15,562	19,515	26,908	31,538	37,327	55,498
Rate	HHs	3.5		20.9	41.1	1.8	13.0	31.4	78.5	1.6	13.8	53.8	98.1	3.8	11.9	35.4	46.4	60.3	84.3	
Rate	People	4.5		25.1	46.1	2.5	15.8	36.8	82.9	2.3	16.5	59.7	98.9	5.0	14.7	40.3	51.4	66.3	87.7	
Kabupaten Tanah Bumbu	Line	People	597	14,851	22,276	29,702	12,646	20,233	25,292	50,583	12,230	20,598	35,403	139,681	15,734	19,731	27,206	31,887	37,741	56,113
Rate	HHs	1.6		12.6	29.7	0.7	10.2	18.4	68.1	0.5	10.7	41.8	96.8	2.4	9.6	24.2	36.0	46.1	73.6	
Rate	People	2.6		17.2	35.2	1.2	14.1	23.3	74.2	0.8	14.9	48.0	97.5	3.8	13.4	29.1	42.4	53.0	78.7	
Kabupaten Tanah Laut	Line	People	598	14,703	22,054	29,406	12,520	20,032	25,040	50,079	12,108	20,393	35,050	138,289	15,577	19,534	26,935	31,569	37,364	55,554
Rate	HHs	1.5		15.4	40.1	0.7	8.9	26.4	88.2	0.7	10.3	57.4	99.4	2.0	7.6	32.1	46.1	65.2	91.7	
Rate	People	1.7		17.7	44.1	0.6	10.8	30.3	90.4	0.6	12.4	61.4	99.5	2.5	9.0	36.6	51.0	68.4	93.4	
Kabupaten Tapin	Line	People	519	13,334	20,002	26,669	11,355	18,167	22,709	45,419	10,981	18,495	31,788	125,419	14,127	17,716	24,428	28,631	33,887	50,383
Rate	HHs	1.3		11.0	27.8	0.4	7.4	19.4	67.7	0.4	8.0	40.3	99.0	1.4	6.3	23.6	33.2	46.1	74.7	
Rate	People	1.5		13.3	31.6	0.2	8.8	22.7	70.8	0.2	9.4	43.9	99.5	1.5	7.2	27.4	36.9	49.2	77.0	
All Perkotaan	Line	People	2,973	14,977	22,465	29,953	12,753	20,405	25,506	51,012	12,334	20,773	35,703	140,864	15,867	19,898	27,436	32,157	38,060	56,588
Rate	HHs	2.9		14.2	31.5	1.6	11.0	22.3	60.3	1.2	11.6	41.4	95.4	3.9	10.4	26.2	35.3	44.8	65.6	
Rate	People	4.0		17.7	37.1	2.3	14.0	26.7	66.2	1.7	14.7	47.5	96.8	5.2	13.2	31.1	41.1	50.9	71.0	
All Perdesaan	Line	People	4,504	13,241	19,862	26,483	11,275	18,041	22,551	45,101	10,905	18,366	31,566	124,543	14,029	17,592	24,257	28,431	33,650	50,031
Rate	HHs	2.9		19.6	40.6	1.1	13.4	28.2	79.7	0.8	14.2	54.9	99.1	3.6	12.0	33.7	46.5	59.9	84.9	
Rate	People	3.9		23.1	45.2	1.4	16.1	32.4	82.8	1.1	17.2	59.4	99.4	4.8	14.4	38.1	51.3	64.3	87.4	
All Kota	Line	People	1,188	16,521	24,782	33,042	14,068	22,509	28,136	56,272	13,606	22,915	39,385	155,390	17,503	21,950	30,266	35,473	41,985	62,423
Rate	HHs	3.6		17.8	35.4	2.2	13.5	26.0	62.5	1.8	14.4	44.8	96.3	5.0	12.7	29.7	38.8	48.1	67.7	
Rate	People	5.2		22.0	41.3	3.2	17.0	31.0	68.4	2.6	18.2	51.2	97.4	6.9	16.0	35.3	44.7	54.5	73.1	
All Kabupaten	Line	People	6,289	13,317	19,975	26,634	11,340	18,144	22,679	45,359	10,967	18,471	31,746	125,254	14,109	17,693	24,396	28,594	33,842	50,317
Rate	HHs	2.7		16.9	36.7	1.1	11.9	25.3	73.2	0.8	12.6	49.7	97.7	3.3	10.8	30.4	42.0	54.3	78.4	
Rate	People	3.6		20.2	41.5	1.5	14.5	29.4	77.1	1.0	15.4	54.7	98.4	4.4	13.3	34.7	47.1	59.1	81.8	
All Kalimantan Selatan	Line	People	7,477	14,049	21,074	28,099	11,963	19,142	23,927	47,854	11,570	19,487	33,493	132,144	14,885	18,666	25,738	30,166	35,704	53,085
Rate	HHs	2.9		17.1	36.4	1.3	12.3	25.5	70.7	1.0	13.0	48.6	97.4	3.7	11.2	30.2	41.3	52.9	75.9	
Rate	People	4.0		20.6	41.4	1.9	15.1	29.8	75.1	1.4	16.0	53.9	98.2	5.0	13.9	34.9	46.5	58.1	79.8	

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Kalimantan Timur): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan, kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	<i>n</i>	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP			Intl. 2011 PPP			Percentile-based lines							
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kota Balikpapan	Line	People		17,950	26,925	35,899	15,285	24,455	30,569	61,139	14,782	24,896	42,790	168,828	19,017	23,848	32,883	38,541	45,616	67,822
	Rate	HHs	617	0.9	7.7	19.9	0.7	4.5	12.6	48.8	0.7	4.9	29.2	94.7	1.0	4.2	15.6	23.7	31.8	54.7
	Rate	People		1.6	10.4	26.5	1.2	6.5	17.0	57.4	1.2	7.0	36.7	96.3	1.7	6.2	20.8	30.6	39.2	64.0
Kabupaten Berau	Line	People		16,523	24,784	33,045	14,069	22,511	28,139	56,278	13,607	22,917	39,388	155,405	17,505	21,952	30,269	35,477	41,989	62,429
	Rate	HHs	470	0.6	8.7	19.6	0.3	5.0	13.2	59.7	0.3	5.8	31.4	96.4	1.2	4.6	16.2	24.2	37.0	68.5
	Rate	People		0.7	10.4	21.8	0.3	6.6	15.5	64.7	0.3	7.4	35.2	97.5	1.5	6.1	18.7	27.0	40.6	72.8
Kota Bontang	Line	People		18,077	27,115	36,153	15,393	24,628	30,785	61,571	14,887	25,072	43,093	170,021	19,151	24,017	33,115	38,813	45,938	68,301
	Rate	HHs	500	1.8	11.1	24.3	1.1	6.5	16.5	58.9	0.8	7.1	33.4	92.1	2.5	4.9	19.1	28.1	36.3	63.0
	Rate	People		2.8	14.4	31.4	1.9	8.4	21.5	67.2	1.1	9.0	41.2	95.4	3.8	6.5	24.6	35.2	44.1	71.1
Kabupaten Kutai Barat	Line	People		17,018	25,527	34,035	14,491	23,186	28,982	57,964	14,015	23,604	40,569	160,061	18,030	22,610	31,175	36,540	43,247	64,300
	Rate	HHs	457	5.3	22.6	43.1	2.4	18.6	31.1	77.8	1.6	19.4	55.0	98.5	7.0	17.1	36.0	45.9	60.1	80.7
	Rate	People		5.5	26.1	48.6	2.4	21.8	35.7	81.7	1.4	22.7	60.2	99.0	7.6	19.8	40.9	51.1	65.8	84.4
Kabupaten Kutai Kartanegara	Line	People		15,960	23,939	31,919	13,590	21,744	27,180	54,360	13,143	22,136	38,046	150,109	16,909	21,204	29,237	34,268	40,558	60,302
	Rate	HHs	634	2.8	21.1	41.6	1.1	15.0	31.4	76.1	0.8	15.8	50.5	99.2	3.8	13.4	36.5	44.8	56.1	81.7
	Rate	People		4.6	26.8	48.4	1.5	19.4	38.2	82.0	1.3	20.6	57.5	99.4	5.8	17.3	43.0	52.2	63.1	87.0
Kabupaten Kutai Timur	Line	People		17,867	26,800	35,733	15,214	24,342	30,428	60,855	14,714	24,781	42,592	168,046	18,929	23,738	32,731	38,362	45,404	67,507
	Rate	HHs	544	2.1	11.2	26.0	0.7	8.3	18.8	64.3	0.3	9.1	41.0	97.7	2.3	8.2	21.8	32.0	43.3	70.7
	Rate	People		3.4	15.4	31.8	1.4	11.7	23.9	70.0	0.7	12.6	48.7	98.5	3.7	11.6	27.0	38.3	51.0	76.0
Kabupaten Mahakam Hulu	Line	People		18,639	27,959	37,279	15,872	25,395	31,744	63,487	15,350	25,853	44,434	175,313	19,748	24,764	34,146	40,021	47,368	70,427
	Rate	HHs	187	11.0	27.2	41.9	1.4	24.4	35.3	78.5	0.0	25.1	60.8	99.0	13.9	22.8	38.6	52.3	66.5	82.4
	Rate	People		18.1	41.3	56.7	2.6	37.3	49.3	87.5	0.0	38.5	71.9	99.7	22.1	35.7	52.8	65.5	76.7	90.4
Kabupaten Paser	Line	People		14,980	22,470	29,960	12,756	20,409	25,511	51,023	12,336	20,777	35,710	140,894	15,871	19,902	27,442	32,164	38,068	56,600
	Rate	HHs	500	1.4	16.4	40.9	0.4	9.7	24.6	74.6	0.4	10.6	52.5	97.7	2.2	9.1	31.8	44.9	57.4	80.3
	Rate	People		1.9	19.9	45.7	0.6	12.1	28.7	80.5	0.6	13.4	57.9	98.9	3.1	11.4	36.7	49.6	62.9	85.2
Kabupaten Penajam Paser Utara	Line	People		14,714	22,070	29,427	12,529	20,046	25,058	50,116	12,117	20,408	35,076	138,390	15,589	19,548	26,954	31,593	37,392	55,594
	Rate	HHs	473	1.3	14.9	33.7	0.6	10.4	22.0	74.1	0.6	12.3	45.9	97.4	2.6	9.7	29.8	39.2	51.5	79.6
	Rate	People		1.9	18.6	39.6	1.2	13.0	26.6	79.4	1.2	15.5	52.7	97.9	3.8	12.0	36.0	45.0	58.2	83.9
Kota Samarinda	Line	People		20,264	30,396	40,528	17,255	27,609	34,511	69,021	16,688	28,106	48,308	190,596	21,469	26,923	37,123	43,510	51,497	76,566
	Rate	HHs	701	4.1	22.3	43.0	1.5	16.6	30.5	75.5	1.0	17.4	54.8	98.6	6.4	15.6	35.9	48.5	58.2	80.9
	Rate	People		5.3	26.9	50.3	1.9	20.3	36.5	82.1	1.3	21.1	62.0	99.1	7.9	19.2	42.0	55.7	65.6	86.8
All Perkotaan	Line	People		18,209	27,313	36,417	15,505	24,808	31,010	62,020	14,995	25,255	43,408	171,263	19,291	24,192	33,357	39,097	46,274	68,800
	Rate	HHs	3,132	2.4	14.8	31.1	0.9	10.5	21.6	63.2	0.7	11.0	41.6	96.5	3.5	9.7	25.6	35.7	44.9	69.0
	Rate	People		3.5	18.8	37.4	1.3	13.5	26.7	70.2	1.1	14.3	48.4	97.7	4.8	12.6	31.0	42.2	51.8	76.0
All Perdesaan	Line	People		16,322	24,484	32,645	13,899	22,238	27,798	55,596	13,442	22,639	38,911	153,523	17,293	21,686	29,902	35,047	41,480	61,673
	Rate	HHs	1,951	2.7	19.0	39.8	1.1	13.3	28.3	77.6	0.7	14.4	51.8	99.2	3.6	12.0	34.1	43.9	57.2	82.9
	Rate	People		3.8	23.7	46.2	1.6	17.0	34.2	83.1	1.1	18.2	58.9	99.4	5.1	15.4	40.3	50.7	64.3	87.5
All Kota	Line	People		19,146	28,719	38,292	16,303	26,086	32,607	65,214	15,768	26,556	45,643	180,082	20,285	25,438	35,075	41,110	48,656	72,342
	Rate	HHs	1,818	2.6	15.3	32.0	1.1	10.8	22.0	63.3	0.8	11.4	42.5	96.4	3.9	10.0	26.2	36.6	45.6	68.7
	Rate	People		3.6	19.2	39.2	1.6	13.8	27.5	71.0	1.3	14.4	50.1	97.7	5.1	12.8	32.1	43.9	53.2	76.4
All Kabupaten	Line	People		16,250	24,375	32,500	13,837	22,140	27,675	55,350	13,383	22,539	38,739	152,843	17,217	21,590	29,769	34,892	41,297	61,400
	Rate	HHs	3,265	2.4	16.9	35.7	0.9	11.9	25.4	72.0	0.6	12.8	47.1	98.2	3.2	10.9	30.4	40.0	52.0	77.8
	Rate	People		3.6	21.4	41.3	1.3	15.4	30.7	77.4	0.9	16.6	53.4	98.8	4.7	14.2	35.8	45.9	58.3	82.7
All Kalimantan Timur	Line	People		17,583	26,375	35,166	14,973	23,956	29,945	59,890	14,480	24,388	41,917	165,381	18,629	23,361	32,211	37,754	44,684	66,437
	Rate	HHs	5,083	2.5	16.2	34.0	1.0	11.4	23.8	68.0	0.7	12.2	45.0	97.4	3.5	10.5	28.4	38.4	49.0	73.6
	Rate	People		3.6	20.4	40.3	1.4	14.6	29.2	74.5	1.1	15.6	51.9	98.3	4.9	13.6	34.1	45.0	56.0	79.8

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Kalimantan Utara): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	<i>n</i>	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Bulungan	Line	People		13,588	20,382	27,175	11,570	18,512	23,141	46,281	11,190	18,846	32,392	127,801	14,396	18,053	24,892	29,175	34,531	51,340
	Rate	HHs	422	0.6	7.6	19.8	0.0	4.7	12.7	56.8	0.0	4.7	32.0	97.6	1.1	4.1	15.8	26.0	37.4	63.2
	Rate	People		0.6	10.7	26.4	0.0	6.0	17.7	65.0	0.0	6.0	39.3	98.7	1.3	5.4	21.4	33.2	46.0	70.6
Kabupaten Malinau	Line	People		17,745	26,617	35,490	15,110	24,176	30,220	60,441	14,614	24,612	42,302	166,902	18,800	23,576	32,508	38,101	45,095	67,048
	Rate	HHs	396	4.1	15.4	31.9	0.8	12.6	21.5	66.9	0.5	12.7	42.5	97.3	5.6	11.9	25.1	35.1	47.4	71.8
	Rate	People		5.9	19.7	40.1	1.4	15.5	27.5	76.8	1.0	15.8	52.4	99.2	7.2	14.6	31.3	44.3	57.9	80.6
Kabupaten Nunukan	Line	People		13,251	19,876	26,502	11,283	18,053	22,567	45,133	10,912	18,379	31,589	124,632	14,039	17,605	24,275	28,452	33,674	50,067
	Rate	HHs	471	1.5	11.3	26.6	0.6	8.6	17.5	66.3	0.5	9.4	38.9	97.6	2.2	7.7	22.2	33.1	44.1	71.4
	Rate	People		1.7	15.4	31.9	0.7	11.9	22.5	73.5	0.5	13.0	45.2	98.7	2.6	10.8	27.4	39.3	50.6	78.1
Kabupaten Tana Tidung	Line	People		12,390	18,586	24,781	10,551	16,881	21,102	42,203	10,204	17,186	29,538	116,540	13,127	16,462	22,699	26,604	31,488	46,816
	Rate	HHs	237	0.0	0.1	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.8	42.7	0.0	0.0	12.4	91.6	0.0	0.0	1.9	6.4	14.2	52.7
	Rate	People		0.0	0.1	10.0	0.0	0.1	1.0	52.5	0.0	0.1	18.7	94.3	0.0	0.0	2.4	11.2	20.3	63.7
Kota Tarakan	Line	People		20,173	30,259	40,346	17,178	27,484	34,355	68,711	16,613	27,980	48,090	189,738	21,372	26,802	36,956	43,315	51,265	76,222
	Rate	HHs	508	2.0	15.4	37.5	1.0	9.1	24.3	72.8	1.0	10.9	48.1	98.1	2.6	9.1	30.9	41.6	53.5	77.3
	Rate	People		3.1	22.1	46.3	1.4	13.3	31.5	80.6	1.4	15.8	57.1	99.4	4.0	13.3	39.6	50.2	62.5	84.5
All Perkotaan	Line	People		17,657	26,485	35,313	15,035	24,056	30,070	60,140	14,541	24,490	42,091	166,070	18,706	23,458	32,346	37,911	44,871	66,714
	Rate	HHs	1,009	1.3	12.4	30.5	0.6	7.8	19.9	64.9	0.6	9.0	40.8	96.9	2.0	7.6	25.3	34.4	46.3	69.4
	Rate	People		2.2	17.3	38.6	0.8	11.0	26.0	73.3	0.8	12.8	49.3	98.7	3.1	10.8	32.6	42.6	55.4	77.4
All Perdesaan	Line	People		14,566	21,848	29,131	12,403	19,845	24,806	49,612	11,995	20,203	34,723	136,999	15,432	19,352	26,683	31,275	37,016	55,035
	Rate	HHs	1,025	2.4	11.9	27.2	0.7	8.7	17.6	67.7	0.5	9.2	39.9	98.5	3.1	7.9	21.6	33.7	44.5	74.1
	Rate	People		2.8	16.2	33.1	0.9	11.6	22.8	75.1	0.7	12.1	46.8	99.1	3.6	10.6	26.9	40.3	51.7	80.5
All Kota	Line	People		20,173	30,259	40,346	17,178	27,484	34,355	68,711	16,613	27,980	48,090	189,738	21,372	26,802	36,956	43,315	51,265	76,222
	Rate	HHs	508	2.0	15.4	37.5	1.0	9.1	24.3	72.8	1.0	10.9	48.1	98.1	2.6	9.1	30.9	41.6	53.5	77.3
	Rate	People		3.1	22.1	46.3	1.4	13.3	31.5	80.6	1.4	15.8	57.1	99.4	4.0	13.3	39.6	50.2	62.5	84.5
All Kabupaten	Line	People		14,164	21,246	28,328	12,061	19,298	24,122	48,245	11,665	19,646	33,766	133,222	15,006	18,818	25,948	30,413	35,995	53,518
	Rate	HHs	1,526	1.6	10.2	24.2	0.4	7.6	15.7	62.0	0.3	7.9	35.8	97.2	2.4	6.9	19.5	29.6	40.8	67.8
	Rate	People		2.1	13.9	30.5	0.6	10.1	20.7	70.3	0.4	10.6	43.2	98.6	2.9	9.2	24.8	36.7	48.8	75.4
All Kalimantan Utara	Line	People		16,362	24,544	32,725	13,933	22,293	27,866	55,732	13,475	22,695	39,007	153,899	17,335	21,739	29,975	35,133	41,582	61,824
	Rate	HHs	2,034	1.8	12.2	29.2	0.6	8.2	19.0	66.1	0.6	9.1	40.4	97.5	2.4	7.7	23.8	34.2	45.6	71.3
	Rate	People		2.4	16.9	36.3	0.9	11.3	24.7	74.1	0.8	12.5	48.3	98.9	3.3	10.7	30.2	41.7	53.8	78.7

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Kepulauan Bangka Belitung): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	<i>n</i>	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Bangka	Line	People		16,345	24,518	32,690	13,918	22,269	27,837	55,673	13,461	22,671	38,965	153,736	17,317	21,716	29,943	35,096	41,538	61,759
	Rate	HHs	560	0.4	9.0	30.6	0.4	6.0	17.2	68.9	0.4	6.8	44.2	99.2	1.0	5.2	21.5	36.8	50.8	75.9
	Rate	People		0.8	10.6	36.0	0.8	7.6	20.6	72.8	0.8	8.6	49.6	99.5	1.3	6.4	25.5	42.2	56.0	79.4
Kabupaten Bangka Barat	Line	People		17,117	25,675	34,234	14,576	23,321	29,151	58,302	14,096	23,741	40,805	160,996	18,135	22,742	31,357	36,753	43,499	64,675
	Rate	HHs	516	2.2	14.3	38.0	0.9	10.0	22.6	79.1	0.6	10.9	51.8	99.1	2.9	7.2	29.1	43.2	59.0	86.1
	Rate	People		3.1	17.9	45.2	1.0	12.5	28.1	83.7	0.8	13.7	58.3	99.6	4.0	9.2	34.7	50.2	66.0	89.0
Kabupaten Bangka Selatan	Line	People		15,907	23,860	31,813	13,545	21,672	27,090	54,179	13,100	22,062	37,920	149,610	16,852	21,133	29,140	34,154	40,423	60,101
	Rate	HHs	479	0.2	6.8	32.9	0.0	3.4	14.4	81.6	0.0	4.1	50.3	99.5	0.6	2.9	24.3	40.0	59.5	85.5
	Rate	People		0.3	8.3	37.7	0.0	4.3	17.0	85.9	0.0	5.3	55.5	99.7	0.6	3.5	28.6	45.2	64.7	89.4
Kabupaten Bangka Tengah	Line	People		22,386	33,579	44,772	19,062	30,500	38,124	76,249	18,436	31,049	53,366	210,554	23,717	29,742	41,010	48,066	56,890	84,584
	Rate	HHs	520	10.8	45.3	66.8	4.9	37.5	54.7	92.5	3.4	39.5	79.0	99.3	13.2	35.8	59.9	72.1	80.9	95.5
	Rate	People		12.2	50.9	71.5	5.1	43.2	60.5	94.2	3.6	45.2	83.0	99.7	15.2	40.6	65.2	76.7	84.7	96.6
Kabupaten Belitung	Line	People		23,173	34,760	46,347	19,733	31,572	39,465	78,931	19,084	32,141	55,243	217,959	24,551	30,788	42,452	49,757	58,890	87,558
	Rate	HHs	518	3.7	26.6	51.4	0.6	19.4	38.0	89.1	0.2	20.0	65.8	99.0	6.6	17.7	44.6	56.3	71.9	92.2
	Rate	People		5.3	31.3	56.7	0.8	23.8	42.6	91.7	0.4	24.5	69.8	99.3	9.5	21.4	49.9	61.2	75.1	94.4
Kabupaten Belitung Timur	Line	People		20,462	30,694	40,925	17,424	27,879	34,848	69,697	16,851	28,381	48,780	192,460	21,679	27,186	37,486	43,936	52,001	77,315
	Rate	HHs	477	5.1	23.6	45.8	2.4	16.2	32.7	85.4	1.8	16.7	61.7	99.1	5.9	14.7	38.7	52.1	66.9	90.7
	Rate	People		6.1	27.2	50.5	2.5	18.4	37.8	88.1	1.5	19.0	67.1	99.2	7.2	16.9	44.1	57.3	72.2	93.1
Kota Pangkal Pinang	Line	People		23,045	34,567	46,090	19,623	31,397	39,247	78,493	18,978	31,963	54,937	216,751	24,415	30,617	42,217	49,481	58,564	87,073
	Rate	HHs	514	3.4	18.2	37.4	1.4	14.6	26.4	75.1	1.3	15.4	50.8	97.4	4.3	13.0	30.0	43.0	56.8	80.4
	Rate	People		4.9	23.0	45.1	1.6	19.0	32.7	80.2	1.5	19.9	57.7	97.9	6.0	16.9	36.7	50.4	63.9	85.2
All Perkotaan	Line	People		20,035	30,053	40,071	17,061	27,297	34,121	68,243	16,500	27,789	47,763	188,445	21,227	26,619	36,704	43,019	50,916	75,702
	Rate	HHs	1,785	3.0	16.4	36.4	0.8	12.8	24.5	74.1	0.7	13.4	48.2	98.2	4.0	11.3	28.9	41.1	53.3	80.4
	Rate	People		4.1	19.9	43.0	1.0	16.1	29.6	78.7	0.8	16.6	54.5	98.8	5.4	13.8	34.3	47.7	59.8	84.4
All Perdesaan	Line	People		18,611	27,917	37,223	15,848	25,357	31,696	63,392	15,327	25,814	44,368	175,051	19,718	24,727	34,095	39,962	47,297	70,321
	Rate	HHs	1,799	3.5	21.9	47.5	1.9	15.5	31.5	87.0	1.4	16.8	64.7	99.8	4.8	14.2	39.0	54.6	72.1	90.9
	Rate	People		4.3	25.5	52.6	2.1	18.4	35.8	89.8	1.5	20.1	69.2	99.8	5.9	16.9	44.1	59.7	76.3	93.0
All Kota	Line	People		23,045	34,567	46,090	19,623	31,397	39,247	78,493	18,978	31,963	54,937	216,751	24,415	30,617	42,217	49,481	58,564	87,073
	Rate	HHs	514	3.4	18.2	37.4	1.4	14.6	26.4	75.1	1.3	15.4	50.8	97.4	4.3	13.0	30.0	43.0	56.8	80.4
	Rate	People		4.9	23.0	45.1	1.6	19.0	32.7	80.2	1.5	19.9	57.7	97.9	6.0	16.9	36.7	50.4	63.9	85.2
All Kabupaten	Line	People		18,765	28,147	37,529	15,979	25,566	31,957	63,914	15,453	26,027	44,733	176,493	19,880	24,931	34,376	40,291	47,687	70,901
	Rate	HHs	3,070	3.2	19.1	42.3	1.3	14.0	28.0	81.0	0.9	14.9	56.7	99.2	4.4	12.6	34.2	48.2	63.0	86.1
	Rate	People		4.1	22.4	47.8	1.5	16.9	32.4	84.4	1.1	18.0	61.9	99.5	5.6	14.9	39.2	53.7	68.0	88.9
All Kepulauan Bangka Belitung	Line	People		19,376	29,064	38,752	16,499	26,399	32,998	65,997	15,957	26,875	46,191	182,243	20,528	25,743	35,496	41,603	49,240	73,211
	Rate	HHs	3,584	3.2	19.0	41.6	1.3	14.1	27.7	80.1	1.0	15.0	55.9	99.0	4.4	12.6	33.6	47.4	62.1	85.3
	Rate	People		4.2	22.5	47.4	1.5	17.2	32.4	83.8	1.1	18.2	61.3	99.3	5.6	15.2	38.8	53.2	67.4	88.4

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Kepulauan Riau): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	<i>n</i>	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kota Batam	Line	People		21,383	32,075	42,766	18,208	29,133	36,417	72,833	17,610	29,659	50,976	201,122	22,655	28,410	39,173	45,913	54,341	80,795
	Rate	HHs	760	4.4	19.8	36.0	2.4	14.4	25.7	69.0	2.0	15.4	45.8	98.9	5.6	14.0	31.1	41.1	49.4	73.1
	Rate	People		5.9	25.1	42.5	3.1	18.6	31.9	74.6	2.6	19.9	53.0	99.4	7.7	18.2	37.6	48.1	56.8	78.5
Kabupaten Bintan	Line	People		12,075	18,113	24,151	10,283	16,452	20,565	41,130	9,944	16,749	28,787	113,577	12,793	16,043	22,121	25,928	30,687	45,626
	Rate	HHs	504	1.5	11.8	25.9	1.2	8.5	15.8	61.2	1.2	9.0	38.6	96.6	1.9	7.2	19.9	29.4	42.7	67.4
	Rate	People		2.5	15.1	32.1	1.9	10.7	20.6	70.1	1.9	11.3	46.3	98.0	3.0	8.9	25.3	36.1	51.4	75.6
Kabupaten Karimun	Line	People		11,838	17,758	23,677	10,081	16,129	20,161	40,323	9,749	16,420	28,222	111,348	12,542	15,729	21,687	25,419	30,085	44,731
	Rate	HHs	551	0.7	7.6	21.1	0.0	4.7	11.8	51.8	0.0	4.7	31.5	94.7	0.7	3.7	15.9	26.9	34.6	59.9
	Rate	People		0.9	10.4	25.7	0.0	6.9	15.3	57.8	0.0	6.9	37.6	96.2	0.9	5.3	20.0	32.9	41.2	66.1
Kabupaten Kepulauan Anambas	Line	People		12,063	18,095	24,126	10,272	16,435	20,544	41,088	9,934	16,731	28,757	113,460	12,780	16,027	22,099	25,901	30,656	45,579
	Rate	HHs	317	0.3	4.8	14.5	0.0	3.3	6.9	52.1	0.0	3.3	25.7	96.5	0.6	3.0	11.0	19.8	31.1	59.5
	Rate	People		0.4	5.2	16.8	0.0	3.6	8.1	58.7	0.0	3.6	30.1	98.0	0.7	3.3	12.6	23.4	36.3	65.4
Kabupaten Lingga	Line	People		13,525	20,288	27,050	11,517	18,427	23,034	46,068	11,138	18,759	32,242	127,211	14,329	17,969	24,777	29,040	34,371	51,103
	Rate	HHs	437	3.8	17.2	39.4	1.6	12.0	24.5	76.5	1.3	12.9	52.8	99.0	5.5	11.4	31.3	43.9	57.1	81.4
	Rate	People		5.5	22.2	46.2	2.0	15.7	31.2	82.2	1.5	17.0	59.0	99.6	7.3	14.9	38.7	51.1	63.8	85.7
Kabupaten Natuna	Line	People		11,918	17,878	23,837	10,149	16,238	20,298	40,595	9,815	16,531	28,412	112,100	12,627	15,835	21,834	25,591	30,288	45,033
	Rate	HHs	431	1.0	7.7	20.3	0.6	5.3	13.0	54.4	0.3	5.6	31.7	95.7	1.1	5.1	16.0	25.0	35.2	61.6
	Rate	People		1.3	9.4	24.6	0.8	6.8	15.8	58.6	0.2	7.2	37.1	96.7	1.4	6.5	19.1	30.2	40.4	65.5
Kota Tanjung Pinang	Line	People		20,563	30,845	41,127	17,510	28,016	35,021	70,041	16,935	28,522	49,021	193,412	21,786	27,321	37,671	44,153	52,258	77,697
	Rate	HHs	496	8.3	30.7	46.3	5.4	24.6	37.0	79.9	3.1	25.0	58.1	99.3	11.1	22.6	40.9	51.9	63.3	84.3
	Rate	People		11.1	37.1	53.1	7.6	31.4	43.8	85.0	4.4	31.8	64.9	99.6	14.7	29.0	47.5	58.9	70.3	87.9
All Perkotaan	Line	People		19,476	29,214	38,952	16,584	26,535	33,168	66,337	16,039	27,013	46,429	183,183	20,634	25,876	35,679	41,818	49,494	73,588
	Rate	HHs	2,589	3.9	18.0	33.0	2.3	13.2	23.5	66.2	1.8	13.9	43.2	98.0	5.1	12.6	28.2	38.0	47.0	70.7
	Rate	People		5.3	22.9	39.2	3.1	17.2	29.1	72.2	2.4	18.0	50.2	98.7	7.1	16.5	34.2	44.8	54.4	76.4
All Perdesaan	Line	People		14,142	21,213	28,284	12,042	19,268	24,084	48,169	11,646	19,615	33,713	133,013	14,983	18,789	25,907	30,365	35,939	53,434
	Rate	HHs	907	4.1	18.4	39.1	1.6	13.6	25.4	72.9	1.2	15.0	51.8	98.9	4.5	12.8	31.9	44.4	55.0	80.5
	Rate	People		5.5	22.7	44.2	2.2	16.7	30.8	76.9	1.5	18.9	57.5	99.3	6.0	15.5	37.3	50.2	61.0	83.9
All Kota	Line	People		21,271	31,907	42,542	18,113	28,981	36,226	72,452	17,517	29,503	50,708	200,068	22,536	28,261	38,967	45,673	54,056	80,371
	Rate	HHs	1,256	4.9	21.1	37.3	2.7	15.6	27.2	70.4	2.1	16.6	47.4	98.9	6.3	15.1	32.3	42.4	51.1	74.5
	Rate	People		6.6	26.7	43.9	3.8	20.3	33.6	76.0	2.9	21.5	54.6	99.4	8.6	19.7	39.0	49.6	58.6	79.8
All Kabupaten	Line	People		12,180	18,270	24,360	10,372	16,595	20,743	41,487	10,031	16,894	29,036	114,562	12,904	16,183	22,313	26,153	30,954	46,022
	Rate	HHs	2,240	1.4	10.0	24.7	0.7	6.9	14.7	58.6	0.6	7.2	36.4	96.1	1.8	6.0	19.1	29.6	40.2	65.5
	Rate	People		2.0	12.9	29.7	0.9	9.0	18.7	64.9	0.8	9.4	42.5	97.4	2.5	7.7	23.6	35.5	46.9	71.4
All Kepulauan Riau	Line	People		18,718	28,077	37,436	15,939	25,502	31,878	63,755	15,415	25,962	44,622	176,054	19,831	24,869	34,290	40,191	47,568	70,724
	Rate	HHs	3,496	3.9	18.1	33.9	2.2	13.2	23.7	67.2	1.7	14.0	44.4	98.2	5.1	12.6	28.7	38.9	48.1	72.0
	Rate	People		5.3	22.8	39.9	3.0	17.2	29.4	72.9	2.3	18.1	51.2	98.8	6.9	16.3	34.7	45.6	55.3	77.4

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Lampung): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates										Percentile-based lines						
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP			10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th	
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50							\$21.70
Kota Bandar Lampung	Line	People		18,486	27,729	36,972	15,741	25,186	31,482	62,964	15,224	25,640	44,068	173,870	19,585	24,560	33,865	39,692	46,978	69,847
	Rate	HHs	707	7.3	26.4	43.2	3.2	22.0	33.9	75.7	2.4	22.4	53.9	98.2	9.0	20.6	38.3	46.8	57.2	80.6
	Rate	People		9.4	31.0	50.2	4.3	26.4	39.5	80.9	3.4	26.7	61.2	98.8	11.6	25.0	44.7	53.7	64.7	84.8
Kabupaten Lampung Barat	Line	People		12,869	19,304	25,739	10,959	17,534	21,917	43,834	10,598	17,850	30,679	121,044	13,635	17,098	23,576	27,633	32,705	48,626
	Rate	HHs	519	3.5	24.8	45.7	0.6	18.3	34.9	79.9	0.6	20.0	57.1	98.8	5.6	17.3	39.0	49.4	60.6	84.3
	Rate	People		4.0	28.4	52.2	0.6	21.2	40.1	83.7	0.6	23.1	63.7	98.9	6.5	19.9	44.4	57.0	67.5	87.1
Kabupaten Lampung Selatan	Line	People		12,357	18,536	24,715	10,523	16,836	21,045	42,090	10,177	17,140	29,459	116,228	13,092	16,418	22,638	26,533	31,404	46,691
	Rate	HHs	758	11.9	31.5	50.4	5.2	26.3	39.8	83.6	4.3	27.2	60.3	98.3	13.7	25.6	44.4	54.4	63.7	87.4
	Rate	People		13.9	35.8	55.2	5.7	30.0	44.5	85.7	4.9	31.2	64.5	98.6	15.9	29.2	49.2	59.2	68.0	89.3
Kabupaten Lampung Tengah	Line	People		12,662	18,993	25,324	10,782	17,251	21,564	43,128	10,427	17,562	30,185	119,092	13,415	16,823	23,196	27,187	32,178	47,842
	Rate	HHs	797	14.4	37.6	54.9	6.3	29.8	44.9	87.1	4.5	31.3	67.0	99.1	16.6	28.7	49.4	59.2	70.9	91.5
	Rate	People		16.0	41.3	58.3	7.2	33.2	48.9	89.7	5.1	34.6	69.4	99.3	19.1	32.1	53.0	62.2	73.1	93.2
Kabupaten Lampung Timur	Line	People		11,578	17,367	23,157	9,859	15,775	19,718	39,437	9,535	16,059	27,602	108,901	12,267	15,383	21,211	24,860	29,424	43,748
	Rate	HHs	797	7.9	28.1	50.9	3.7	22.4	40.7	79.8	2.9	23.1	60.2	98.6	10.1	20.1	46.3	55.0	63.5	84.2
	Rate	People		8.8	31.7	55.2	4.2	25.6	44.9	82.9	3.6	26.4	64.8	99.0	11.6	22.9	50.6	59.9	68.2	86.8
Kabupaten Lampung Utara	Line	People		12,852	19,279	25,705	10,944	17,511	21,888	43,776	10,584	17,826	30,639	120,884	13,617	17,076	23,545	27,596	32,662	48,562
	Rate	HHs	680	15.3	47.3	64.7	4.9	37.6	56.3	88.6	4.2	39.8	75.7	99.6	18.3	35.0	59.9	68.0	79.0	92.1
	Rate	People		19.2	52.6	70.0	6.4	43.4	61.7	91.1	5.7	45.2	80.5	99.8	22.9	40.8	65.0	72.9	83.1	94.0
Kabupaten Mesuji	Line	People		12,181	18,271	24,361	10,372	16,595	20,744	41,489	10,031	16,895	29,038	114,567	12,905	16,183	22,314	26,154	30,955	46,024
	Rate	HHs	508	2.1	20.1	37.8	0.1	12.9	28.0	79.0	0.0	14.4	51.2	99.5	2.5	11.4	31.6	43.2	55.8	84.9
	Rate	People		2.7	24.4	41.9	0.1	15.8	31.8	82.1	0.0	17.4	55.4	99.4	3.0	13.9	35.6	47.3	60.2	87.4
Kota Metro	Line	People		11,857	17,786	23,714	10,097	16,155	20,193	40,387	9,765	16,446	28,266	111,524	12,562	15,753	21,722	25,459	30,133	44,801
	Rate	HHs	508	1.2	11.0	26.3	0.3	6.5	17.1	56.7	0.2	7.1	36.2	96.2	2.4	5.8	21.6	31.3	40.4	64.9
	Rate	People		1.5	11.9	28.3	0.3	7.2	18.2	59.6	0.1	8.0	39.2	96.5	2.9	6.5	22.6	34.4	43.2	68.2
Kabupaten Pesawaran	Line	People		11,866	17,798	23,731	10,104	16,166	20,208	40,415	9,772	16,457	28,286	111,602	12,571	15,764	21,737	25,477	30,154	44,833
	Rate	HHs	597	12.1	34.1	58.1	5.8	27.2	44.2	84.1	5.3	28.6	69.2	99.2	15.1	25.9	52.8	64.5	72.3	89.1
	Rate	People		14.4	38.2	62.2	7.2	31.0	48.8	86.8	6.4	32.5	72.4	99.2	17.4	29.7	57.4	68.0	75.6	91.0
Kabupaten Pesisir Barat	Line	People		12,930	19,396	25,861	11,011	17,617	22,021	44,042	10,649	17,935	30,825	121,619	13,699	17,179	23,688	27,764	32,860	48,857
	Rate	HHs	240	11.7	35.8	53.5	5.8	28.7	42.2	83.0	4.7	29.4	66.5	99.2	12.9	26.6	46.8	58.4	71.2	86.9
	Rate	People		13.6	39.9	57.0	6.9	33.0	46.8	85.8	5.5	33.8	71.1	99.6	15.0	31.0	51.2	62.9	75.7	88.3
Kabupaten Pringsewu	Line	People		13,419	20,129	26,839	11,427	18,283	22,854	45,708	11,051	18,613	31,991	126,218	14,217	17,829	24,584	28,814	34,103	50,704
	Rate	HHs	639	13.5	43.0	61.0	7.1	34.6	51.3	87.3	5.7	37.2	70.3	99.4	16.1	32.0	54.8	65.5	75.0	90.1
	Rate	People		15.7	47.1	64.9	8.8	38.0	55.0	89.7	7.1	41.3	74.5	99.6	18.6	35.3	58.5	70.0	79.0	91.9
Kabupaten Tanggamus	Line	People		11,545	17,318	23,090	9,831	15,730	19,662	39,324	9,508	16,013	27,523	108,590	12,232	15,339	21,150	24,789	29,340	43,623
	Rate	HHs	677	6.0	25.2	45.1	3.1	19.1	36.2	81.4	2.4	19.7	56.6	99.5	8.5	16.9	40.4	49.7	61.3	86.0
	Rate	People		7.1	29.3	50.4	3.6	21.9	40.8	84.9	2.9	22.5	62.4	99.6	9.9	19.6	44.9	55.3	67.2	88.9
Kabupaten Tulang Bawang Barat	Line	People		12,655	18,983	25,311	10,776	17,242	21,553	43,105	10,422	17,553	30,169	119,031	13,408	16,814	23,184	27,173	32,161	47,817
	Rate	HHs	560	16.3	43.0	63.1	6.1	34.0	53.3	90.0	5.3	35.4	70.3	98.5	17.4	32.4	56.2	67.5	72.3	92.7
	Rate	People		18.8	48.6	68.2	7.3	39.1	59.0	92.4	6.4	40.4	75.0	99.3	20.2	37.4	62.2	72.5	76.6	94.7
Kabupaten Tulangbawang	Line	People		12,640	18,960	25,280	10,763	17,221	21,526	43,053	10,409	17,532	30,132	118,886	13,392	16,793	23,156	27,140	32,122	47,759
	Rate	HHs	625	6.6	29.1	47.6	1.5	20.3	37.3	80.5	1.2	22.2	58.9	97.3	7.9	19.0	42.4	51.6	62.6	85.2
	Rate	People		7.8	31.3	51.3	1.8	22.0	40.6	83.1	1.5	24.3	63.3	97.4	9.0	21.0	45.9	55.9	66.5	87.0
Kabupaten Way Kanan	Line	People		10,949	16,424	21,898	9,323	14,917	18,647	37,293	9,017	15,186	26,101	102,982	11,600	14,547	20,058	23,509	27,825	41,370
	Rate	HHs	633	2.4	18.4	42.1	0.7	13.4	30.3	75.8	0.6	14.7	53.9	98.7	3.2	12.6	34.9	46.2	56.9	82.3
	Rate	People		3.3	21.7	47.0	0.9	16.1	34.9	79.3	0.7	17.5	59.3	98.6	4.2	15.2	39.6	51.3	62.2	84.8
All Perkotaan	Line	People		14,908	22,362	29,816	12,694	20,311	25,389	50,777	12,277	20,677	35,539	140,217	15,794	19,806	27,310	32,009	37,885	56,328
	Rate	HHs	2,332	6.5	25.3	44.9	2.1	20.3	34.7	74.8	1.6	20.9	55.3	98.1	8.6	19.2	39.0	48.3	58.8	79.7
	Rate	People		8.3	29.6	50.6	2.8	24.3	40.1	79.4	2.2	24.9	61.2	98.5	10.9	23.1	44.6	54.3	65.0	83.5
All Perdesaan	Line	People		12,243	18,364	24,485	10,425	16,680	20,850	41,699	10,082	16,980	29,185	115,148	12,970	16,265	22,428	26,287	31,112	46,257
	Rate	HHs	6,913	11.0	34.0	53.2	4.9	26.7	43.1	84.8	3.9	28.1	64.1	99.0	13.0	25.0	47.9	57.7	67.7	89.1
	Rate	People		12.8	37.9	57.5	5.8	30.2	47.3	87.4	4.7	31.7	68.2	99.2	15.1	28.3	52.1	62.1	71.7	91.0
All Kota	Line	People		17,572	26,358	35,143	14,963	23,940	29,926	59,851	14,471	24,372	41,889	165,273	18,617	23,346	32,190	37,729	44,655	66,393
	Rate	HHs	1,215	6.4	24.2	40.8	2.8	19.8	31.5	73.0	2.1	20.2	51.4	97.9	8.1	18.5	35.9	44.5	54.8	78.4
	Rate	People		8.3	28.3	47.1	3.8	23.7	36.6	78.0	2.9	24.2	58.1	98.4	10.4	22.4	41.7	51.0	61.7	82.5
All Kabupaten	Line	People		12,273	18,409	24,546	10,451	16,721	20,901	41,803	10,107	17,023	29,257	115,434	13,003	16,306	22,483	26,352	31,189	46,372
	Rate	HHs	8,030	10.3	32.7	52.4	4.3	25.7	42.1	83.4	3.4	27.0	63.2	98.8	12.3	24.1	46.8	56.7	66.8	87.7
	Rate	People		12.0	36.7	56.9	5.1	29.2	46.6	86.2	4.1	30.6	67.5	99.1	14.4	27.5	51.2	61.3	71.1	89.8
All Lampung	Line	People		13,031	19,546	26,061	11,096	17,753	22,192	44,383	10,731	18,073	31,064	122,560	13,805	17,312	23,871	27,979	33,115	49,235
	Rate	HHs	9,245	9.8	31.5	50.9	4.1	24.9	40.7	82.0	3.3	26.1	61.7	98.7	11.8	23.4	45.4	55.1	65.3	86.5
	Rate	People		11.5	35.5	55.5	4.9	28.4	45.2	85.0	4.0	29.7	66.2	99.0	13.9	26.8	49.9	59.8	69.7	88.8

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Maluku): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kota Ambon	Line	People		17,514	26,271	35,028	14,914	23,862	29,827	59,655	14,423	24,292	41,752	164,730	18,555	23,269	32,085	37,606	44,508	66,175
	Rate	HHs	536	3.0	11.9	29.4	2.1	7.3	20.2	68.9	2.1	8.1	42.5	99.1	3.1	6.6	23.4	34.5	47.0	75.2
	Rate	People		5.6	17.1	38.7	4.0	11.6	27.7	76.3	4.0	12.5	52.1	99.4	5.9	11.1	31.3	43.9	57.1	81.3
Kabupaten Buru	Line	People		13,811	20,716	27,622	11,760	18,817	23,521	47,041	11,374	19,156	32,924	129,900	14,632	18,349	25,301	29,654	35,098	52,183
	Rate	HHs	435	3.6	22.7	43.3	0.3	17.1	32.0	81.9	0.1	18.0	56.8	99.3	6.3	15.1	35.0	48.1	61.8	86.5
	Rate	People		4.6	29.3	52.2	0.5	21.9	40.3	87.7	0.1	23.2	65.6	99.3	7.7	18.9	43.1	57.0	70.8	91.3
Kabupaten Buru Selatan	Line	People		17,844	26,766	35,687	15,194	24,311	30,389	60,777	14,695	24,749	42,538	167,831	18,905	23,707	32,689	38,313	45,346	67,421
	Rate	HHs	349	43.2	74.0	86.9	30.4	69.3	80.9	98.2	28.1	70.7	93.1	100.0	48.2	67.4	82.2	90.0	94.4	98.8
	Rate	People		51.8	82.3	92.5	38.4	78.3	88.3	99.3	35.6	79.7	96.7	100.0	57.1	76.5	88.9	94.5	97.7	99.4
Kabupaten Kepulauan Aru	Line	People		13,567	20,351	27,134	11,553	18,484	23,105	46,211	11,173	18,818	32,343	127,606	14,374	18,025	24,854	29,131	34,478	51,262
	Rate	HHs	433	19.5	40.2	54.9	11.1	35.2	46.8	78.6	9.2	36.6	61.1	97.7	22.2	34.1	48.3	58.0	65.1	84.0
	Rate	People		29.6	50.7	64.6	17.7	45.9	56.9	86.7	14.9	47.1	69.8	99.1	31.9	45.1	57.8	67.6	73.2	90.9
Kabupaten Maluku Barat Daya	Line	People		14,506	21,758	29,011	12,352	19,763	24,704	49,407	11,946	20,119	34,580	136,434	15,368	19,272	26,573	31,146	36,863	54,808
	Rate	HHs	392	20.6	54.7	72.5	12.0	47.4	63.6	93.1	10.3	49.5	84.0	100.0	25.8	46.0	66.1	76.4	87.1	95.5
	Rate	People		29.4	65.2	81.3	18.7	58.8	74.1	96.8	16.2	60.9	90.2	100.0	35.6	57.8	76.0	85.0	93.1	97.6
Kabupaten Maluku Tengah	Line	People		14,187	21,280	28,373	12,080	19,328	24,161	48,321	11,683	19,677	33,820	133,434	15,030	18,848	25,989	30,461	36,053	53,603
	Rate	HHs	585	7.6	25.5	52.2	2.9	20.9	38.7	88.6	2.4	22.0	66.0	99.7	9.7	18.3	43.2	57.5	71.6	91.2
	Rate	People		10.7	33.7	62.6	4.4	27.7	48.4	92.5	3.4	29.2	75.6	99.9	13.3	25.0	53.1	67.8	79.7	94.6
Kabupaten Maluku Tenggara	Line	People		14,365	21,547	28,729	12,232	19,571	24,464	48,928	11,830	19,924	34,244	135,109	15,219	19,085	26,315	30,843	36,505	54,276
	Rate	HHs	430	13.8	39.8	61.4	5.8	32.9	49.3	89.8	5.0	35.2	76.7	99.6	17.1	30.5	52.2	66.7	78.1	92.2
	Rate	People		20.0	52.8	72.6	8.6	45.1	61.3	93.7	7.4	47.7	85.3	99.9	24.8	42.7	63.7	77.5	86.3	95.1
Kabupaten Maluku Tenggara Barat	Line	People		13,109	19,663	26,218	11,163	17,860	22,325	44,650	10,796	18,182	31,250	123,297	13,888	17,416	24,015	28,147	33,314	49,531
	Rate	HHs	416	19.7	42.7	60.3	11.4	35.1	50.8	88.0	9.9	36.2	70.5	98.9	21.6	33.2	53.3	63.6	75.3	90.6
	Rate	People		28.6	53.9	70.8	17.8	46.0	62.1	92.9	15.8	46.9	79.4	99.6	31.6	43.9	64.3	73.6	83.5	94.4
Kabupaten Seram Bagian Barat	Line	People		11,806	17,708	23,611	10,053	16,084	20,105	40,211	9,722	16,374	28,143	111,038	12,508	15,685	21,627	25,348	30,001	44,606
	Rate	HHs	473	10.8	43.1	62.2	4.7	35.9	53.1	90.1	4.3	37.4	74.3	99.1	15.6	33.5	58.5	68.6	77.0	92.3
	Rate	People		15.6	52.8	72.2	7.5	45.0	63.3	93.8	6.8	47.2	82.3	99.7	21.4	42.4	68.9	77.5	84.3	95.3
Kabupaten Seram Bagian Timur	Line	People		11,220	16,829	22,439	9,554	15,286	19,107	38,215	9,240	15,562	26,746	105,526	11,887	14,906	20,554	24,090	28,512	42,392
	Rate	HHs	431	3.4	26.8	50.7	1.8	19.7	38.1	77.9	1.4	20.6	59.6	98.5	5.5	17.8	44.4	55.6	63.2	83.2
	Rate	People		5.3	36.3	62.0	2.8	27.4	49.5	85.9	2.2	28.6	70.6	99.3	8.1	25.2	55.5	67.0	74.1	90.2
Kota Tual	Line	People		16,775	25,162	33,549	14,284	22,855	28,568	57,136	13,815	23,267	39,989	157,776	17,772	22,287	30,730	36,018	42,630	63,382
	Rate	HHs	351	16.6	39.2	62.5	9.2	34.0	46.0	86.8	5.9	35.1	72.1	100.0	18.7	31.2	54.5	66.8	75.1	90.9
	Rate	People		25.7	49.9	74.1	14.2	44.2	58.4	92.7	9.7	45.7	82.3	100.0	28.0	41.5	66.3	77.5	84.6	95.6
All Perkotaan	Line	People		16,108	24,163	32,217	13,717	21,947	27,434	54,867	13,266	22,342	38,401	151,510	17,066	21,402	29,510	34,588	40,936	60,864
	Rate	HHs	1,645	3.0	13.2	31.8	1.8	9.1	21.0	71.5	1.8	9.7	45.1	99.0	3.6	8.3	24.3	37.1	50.1	77.3
	Rate	People		5.5	19.1	41.7	3.4	13.9	29.0	79.0	3.3	14.9	55.0	99.4	6.3	13.2	32.6	47.2	60.2	83.8
All Perdesaan	Line	People		13,787	20,681	27,574	11,740	18,784	23,480	46,961	11,354	19,123	32,867	129,677	14,607	18,318	25,257	29,603	35,038	52,094
	Rate	HHs	3,186	14.7	40.9	62.8	7.6	34.2	51.9	90.1	6.5	35.8	74.0	99.5	18.0	31.8	56.2	67.3	77.5	92.7
	Rate	People		21.0	51.6	73.1	11.7	44.3	63.1	94.2	9.9	46.0	82.7	99.8	25.1	41.5	67.0	77.1	85.4	95.9
All Kota	Line	People		17,412	26,118	34,824	14,827	23,723	29,654	59,307	14,339	24,151	41,509	163,772	18,448	23,134	31,898	37,387	44,249	65,790
	Rate	HHs	887	4.5	15.0	33.2	2.9	10.3	23.1	71.0	2.5	11.1	45.8	99.2	4.9	9.4	26.9	38.2	50.2	77.0
	Rate	People		8.4	21.6	43.6	5.4	16.1	31.9	78.5	4.8	17.1	56.2	99.5	8.9	15.3	36.2	48.5	60.9	83.3
All Kabupaten	Line	People		13,616	20,424	27,232	11,594	18,551	23,189	46,377	11,213	18,885	32,459	128,066	14,426	18,090	24,943	29,236	34,602	51,446
	Rate	HHs	3,944	12.0	35.3	56.9	6.1	29.4	45.7	87.1	5.3	30.7	68.7	99.3	15.0	27.3	49.6	61.7	72.8	90.3
	Rate	People		17.2	45.1	67.0	9.4	38.3	56.1	91.8	8.1	39.8	77.5	99.7	20.9	35.9	59.8	71.5	80.9	94.1
All Maluku	Line	People		14,756	22,134	29,512	12,565	20,104	25,130	50,261	12,152	20,467	35,177	138,790	15,634	19,605	27,032	31,684	37,500	55,755
	Rate	HHs	4,831	9.7	28.9	49.4	5.1	23.4	38.6	82.0	4.4	24.5	61.5	99.3	11.8	21.6	42.4	54.3	65.7	86.1
	Rate	People		14.5	38.0	60.0	8.2	31.6	48.9	87.8	7.1	33.0	71.1	99.6	17.3	29.7	52.7	64.6	74.9	90.8

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Maluku Utara): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Halmahera Barat	Line	People		10,402	15,602	20,803	8,857	14,171	17,714	35,429	8,566	14,427	24,796	97,833	11,020	13,820	19,055	22,334	26,434	39,301
	Rate	HHs	390	0.9	8.2	26.5	0.0	5.0	16.3	72.3	0.0	5.5	43.1	99.0	1.1	4.0	20.0	31.9	48.7	79.6
	Rate	People		1.8	11.6	33.0	0.0	6.7	21.1	79.6	0.0	7.5	51.7	99.7	2.2	5.5	25.2	39.3	57.9	85.4
Kabupaten Halmahera Selatan	Line	People		9,555	14,332	19,110	8,136	13,018	16,272	32,545	7,869	13,253	22,778	89,869	10,123	12,695	17,504	20,516	24,282	36,102
	Rate	HHs	459	0.5	7.8	24.5	0.0	2.2	13.0	70.8	0.0	2.6	40.3	98.7	0.7	2.2	17.8	31.6	46.7	77.6
	Rate	People		0.9	11.5	33.7	0.0	3.1	18.7	77.5	0.0	3.6	50.2	99.3	1.3	3.1	25.2	41.5	56.8	83.2
Kabupaten Halmahera Tengah	Line	People		14,131	21,196	28,261	12,033	19,252	24,065	48,130	11,637	19,599	33,686	132,906	14,971	18,774	25,886	30,341	35,910	53,391
	Rate	HHs	315	5.9	25.9	48.5	2.8	21.4	35.6	77.8	2.2	22.2	58.6	98.6	8.4	20.1	40.8	52.4	62.4	81.0
	Rate	People		10.8	35.9	58.0	4.1	30.0	45.8	84.2	3.3	31.1	67.3	99.6	13.9	28.8	49.9	61.5	70.7	86.3
Kabupaten Halmahera Timur	Line	People		16,797	25,195	33,593	14,303	22,884	28,606	57,211	13,833	23,297	40,042	157,983	17,795	22,316	30,771	36,065	42,685	63,465
	Rate	HHs	393	11.3	37.1	63.8	7.6	28.5	49.7	91.9	6.5	30.0	80.5	100.0	14.8	27.3	56.6	70.1	83.8	95.2
	Rate	People		15.4	44.4	70.9	10.8	36.0	58.2	94.8	9.1	37.4	86.1	100.0	19.5	34.5	64.3	76.6	88.9	97.0
Kabupaten Halmahera Utara	Line	People		7,499	11,248	14,998	6,386	10,217	12,771	25,542	6,176	10,401	17,877	70,532	7,945	9,963	13,738	16,101	19,057	28,334
	Rate	HHs	459	0.0	1.5	12.4	0.0	1.0	5.3	57.2	0.0	1.0	22.8	95.4	0.0	0.2	8.2	16.7	28.8	66.2
	Rate	People		0.0	1.9	16.8	0.0	1.4	7.5	65.7	0.0	1.4	28.9	96.7	0.0	0.4	11.7	22.7	36.3	73.8
Kabupaten Kepulauan Sula	Line	People		11,097	16,646	22,195	9,450	15,119	18,899	37,798	9,139	15,392	26,455	104,377	11,757	14,744	20,330	23,828	28,202	41,930
	Rate	HHs	439	2.9	20.4	47.6	0.7	15.8	29.4	80.3	0.7	16.1	60.4	98.9	4.6	14.4	39.1	52.9	64.1	83.9
	Rate	People		4.3	27.5	58.0	1.0	22.2	38.6	85.2	1.0	22.7	69.1	99.4	7.0	20.6	49.8	62.5	72.7	88.8
Kabupaten Pulau Morotai	Line	People		8,194	12,291	16,389	6,978	11,164	13,955	27,910	6,748	11,365	19,534	77,072	8,682	10,887	15,011	17,594	20,824	30,961
	Rate	HHs	349	0.2	2.8	14.6	0.0	2.2	7.8	54.4	0.0	2.2	27.4	97.7	0.5	2.2	10.3	18.4	32.1	63.9
	Rate	People		0.4	4.4	19.0	0.0	3.4	10.9	61.6	0.0	3.4	34.1	98.8	1.0	3.4	13.8	23.3	39.0	70.0
Kabupaten Pulau Taliabu	Line	People		11,867	17,801	23,734	10,105	16,168	20,210	40,420	9,773	16,460	28,290	111,616	12,573	15,766	21,740	25,480	30,158	44,838
	Rate	HHs	318	7.0	27.1	54.9	2.0	20.7	40.9	88.2	1.4	21.1	68.1	99.0	8.8	17.7	50.4	59.3	72.0	92.4
	Rate	People		10.7	36.3	65.9	3.4	28.5	51.8	92.6	2.7	28.9	78.0	99.8	14.0	25.1	61.5	69.9	80.5	96.3
Kota Ternate	Line	People		17,672	26,508	35,344	15,048	24,077	30,096	60,193	14,553	24,511	42,128	166,216	18,723	23,479	32,374	37,945	44,910	66,772
	Rate	HHs	505	0.4	6.8	17.6	0.2	4.1	11.2	60.2	0.2	4.2	31.8	97.9	0.7	3.8	13.3	23.5	38.3	67.2
	Rate	People		0.5	9.9	22.9	0.3	6.6	15.3	70.0	0.3	6.8	39.2	98.5	0.8	6.2	17.8	29.9	47.6	77.2
Kota Tidore Kepulauan	Line	People		13,306	19,959	26,612	11,330	18,128	22,661	45,321	10,958	18,455	31,720	125,150	14,097	17,678	24,376	28,570	33,814	50,275
	Rate	HHs	439	2.5	15.6	33.9	0.3	11.1	22.2	71.8	0.0	12.5	47.5	98.9	3.3	10.0	27.5	40.2	55.0	77.8
	Rate	People		4.4	22.4	42.5	0.4	16.5	30.5	78.0	0.0	18.5	55.2	99.5	5.4	14.7	36.0	48.8	62.6	82.4
All Perkotaan	Line	People		14,668	22,003	29,337	12,491	19,985	24,981	49,962	12,080	20,345	34,968	137,965	15,541	19,488	26,872	31,495	37,277	55,423
	Rate	HHs	1,018	1.7	9.4	20.6	1.2	7.1	14.4	57.0	1.1	7.4	32.2	96.2	2.3	6.1	17.3	25.5	37.3	63.4
	Rate	People		2.3	12.5	25.5	1.6	9.8	18.5	65.7	1.5	10.3	39.2	97.4	2.9	8.5	21.8	31.7	45.7	71.9
All Perdesaan	Line	People		10,948	16,422	21,896	9,323	14,916	18,645	37,291	9,016	15,185	26,100	102,975	11,599	14,546	20,057	23,508	27,823	41,367
	Rate	HHs	3,048	2.4	13.2	32.8	0.8	8.8	20.6	74.9	0.6	9.3	47.7	99.0	3.2	8.1	26.0	38.7	53.5	81.4
	Rate	People		3.7	17.7	40.6	1.2	11.8	26.7	80.9	0.9	12.5	55.5	99.5	4.9	11.1	32.8	46.6	61.4	86.4
All Kota	Line	People		16,328	24,491	32,655	13,903	22,245	27,807	55,613	13,446	22,646	38,923	153,571	17,298	21,693	29,911	35,058	41,493	61,692
	Rate	HHs	944	1.0	9.4	22.4	0.2	6.2	14.5	63.7	0.2	6.7	36.5	98.2	1.5	5.6	17.6	28.5	43.3	70.3
	Rate	People		1.7	13.7	29.0	0.4	9.7	20.0	72.4	0.2	10.4	44.1	98.8	2.2	8.8	23.4	35.7	52.2	78.8
All Kabupaten	Line	People		10,456	15,684	20,912	8,904	14,246	17,807	35,614	8,611	14,503	24,926	98,346	11,078	13,892	19,155	22,451	26,572	39,507
	Rate	HHs	3,122	2.6	13.1	31.9	1.2	9.1	20.5	71.9	1.0	9.5	45.7	98.2	3.6	8.2	25.7	37.3	50.8	78.3
	Rate	People		3.8	17.1	38.9	1.7	11.9	25.9	78.1	1.4	12.4	53.2	98.9	5.1	10.9	31.9	44.8	58.6	83.6
All Maluku Utara	Line	People		12,013	18,019	24,025	10,229	16,367	20,458	40,916	9,893	16,662	28,637	112,986	12,727	15,960	22,006	25,793	30,528	45,389
	Rate	HHs	4,066	2.2	12.1	29.2	0.9	8.3	18.8	69.6	0.8	8.7	43.1	98.2	3.0	7.5	23.4	34.8	48.7	76.1
	Rate	People		3.3	16.2	36.3	1.3	11.3	24.4	76.6	1.1	11.9	50.8	98.9	4.3	10.4	29.7	42.4	56.9	82.3

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Nusa Tenggara Barat): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Bima	Line	People		10,149	15,223	20,298	8,642	13,827	17,284	34,568	8,358	14,076	24,194	95,456	10,752	13,484	18,592	21,791	25,791	38,347
	Rate	HHs	633	15.8	43.6	59.8	6.8	36.1	51.6	79.9	5.2	37.7	67.9	99.1	19.4	34.6	55.3	63.6	69.9	83.6
	Rate	People		21.1	48.7	64.4	9.3	41.9	55.7	83.6	6.7	43.3	72.2	99.2	24.9	40.4	60.0	68.2	74.0	86.7
Kota Bima	Line	People		10,625	15,938	21,251	9,048	14,476	18,095	36,191	8,750	14,737	25,330	99,938	11,257	14,117	19,465	22,814	27,002	40,147
	Rate	HHs	469	12.8	21.9	38.5	6.2	18.8	27.9	55.0	5.4	19.1	44.9	93.4	15.2	18.0	32.4	41.0	46.4	60.6
	Rate	People		16.7	26.4	45.5	8.8	22.9	33.3	60.5	7.8	23.3	51.5	95.1	19.6	22.1	38.2	47.6	53.1	65.8
Kabupaten Dompu	Line	People		9,343	14,015	18,686	7,956	12,729	15,912	31,824	7,694	12,959	22,273	87,878	9,899	12,413	17,116	20,061	23,744	35,302
	Rate	HHs	552	1.4	17.5	44.6	0.0	9.5	28.2	75.2	0.0	10.8	59.1	98.5	2.2	7.9	35.9	50.4	63.1	79.3
	Rate	People		1.8	21.7	51.1	0.0	12.8	33.7	80.4	0.0	14.3	65.8	98.9	2.9	10.2	41.9	56.9	69.3	83.9
Kabupaten Lombok Barat	Line	People		13,561	20,342	27,122	11,548	18,476	23,095	46,191	11,168	18,809	32,329	127,551	14,368	18,017	24,843	29,118	34,463	51,240
	Rate	HHs	720	7.2	29.6	52.9	4.6	19.9	39.5	86.3	4.3	22.1	64.9	99.1	8.6	18.2	46.3	58.5	69.9	90.3
	Rate	People		7.4	32.3	55.6	4.4	21.4	42.0	87.5	4.0	23.9	67.5	99.3	8.9	19.4	48.8	61.7	72.0	91.5
Kabupaten Lombok Tengah	Line	People		12,713	19,069	25,425	10,825	17,320	21,650	43,300	10,469	17,632	30,306	119,570	13,469	16,890	23,289	27,296	32,307	48,034
	Rate	HHs	799	12.7	35.9	54.1	7.5	29.3	44.9	82.7	5.7	30.3	64.0	99.4	15.2	28.5	49.2	57.5	66.1	87.2
	Rate	People		13.1	38.2	56.7	7.4	30.7	47.7	84.6	5.6	31.8	66.8	99.6	15.7	29.8	51.9	59.9	68.4	88.4
Kabupaten Lombok Timur	Line	People		13,635	20,452	27,269	11,610	18,576	23,220	46,441	11,229	18,911	32,504	128,242	14,445	18,115	24,978	29,276	34,650	51,517
	Rate	HHs	834	24.2	52.3	67.2	19.1	45.2	59.9	87.7	17.4	46.4	73.9	99.4	27.8	42.7	63.4	70.4	76.3	90.3
	Rate	People		27.4	55.5	70.0	21.8	49.1	62.8	88.7	19.8	50.1	75.9	99.5	31.3	46.5	66.2	72.7	78.1	90.9
Kabupaten Lombok Utara	Line	People		13,700	20,550	27,400	11,666	18,665	23,332	46,663	11,282	19,002	32,659	128,856	14,515	18,202	25,097	29,416	34,816	51,764
	Rate	HHs	519	12.1	36.3	54.1	7.6	28.1	43.7	86.2	6.8	28.9	63.5	99.5	14.0	26.8	49.0	58.5	67.2	89.7
	Rate	People		14.9	41.6	59.8	9.7	32.5	49.4	89.3	8.7	33.4	68.3	99.5	17.0	31.1	54.7	63.6	71.8	91.8
Kota Mataram	Line	People		15,056	22,584	30,112	12,820	20,513	25,641	51,282	12,399	20,883	35,892	141,610	15,951	20,003	27,581	32,327	38,262	56,887
	Rate	HHs	627	8.8	25.3	35.0	7.4	20.8	30.5	56.7	7.4	21.2	42.0	95.6	10.5	19.2	32.8	37.3	43.4	62.6
	Rate	People		10.8	29.6	41.5	9.1	24.9	36.2	64.5	9.1	25.3	49.0	96.9	13.1	22.8	39.1	44.2	50.5	69.8
Kabupaten Sumbawa	Line	People		10,541	15,811	21,082	8,976	14,361	17,952	35,903	8,681	14,620	25,128	99,143	11,168	14,005	19,310	22,633	26,787	39,828
	Rate	HHs	632	5.5	18.3	31.9	1.7	14.6	23.8	58.9	1.1	14.8	40.8	96.4	7.7	13.7	28.8	34.5	44.4	64.2
	Rate	People		7.2	22.0	36.5	2.6	17.8	28.0	64.1	1.6	18.1	46.0	97.1	10.1	16.8	33.5	39.1	49.8	69.7
Kabupaten Sumbawa Barat	Line	People		15,093	22,639	30,185	12,852	20,563	25,703	51,407	12,429	20,933	35,979	141,954	15,990	20,052	27,649	32,406	38,355	57,026
	Rate	HHs	476	7.5	26.0	39.6	2.7	22.1	33.1	69.3	2.5	23.0	49.8	98.2	10.8	20.4	36.1	43.3	52.5	73.5
	Rate	People		9.5	31.7	46.9	3.7	26.6	40.0	74.3	3.5	27.5	56.3	98.3	14.2	24.3	43.2	50.5	58.9	78.2
All Perkotaan	Line	People		13,221	19,831	26,442	11,258	18,012	22,516	45,031	10,888	18,337	31,517	124,349	14,007	17,565	24,220	28,387	33,598	49,954
	Rate	HHs	2,725	14.1	36.3	51.1	10.7	29.1	43.5	72.5	9.4	30.4	59.5	97.4	16.3	26.8	47.3	54.6	61.7	76.3
	Rate	People		15.7	39.2	54.9	12.0	31.6	46.6	75.6	10.6	32.9	63.1	98.1	18.3	29.2	50.9	58.3	65.1	79.2
All Perdesaan	Line	People		12,248	18,372	24,497	10,430	16,688	20,859	41,719	10,087	16,988	29,199	115,202	12,977	16,273	22,438	26,299	31,127	46,279
	Rate	HHs	3,536	13.0	35.6	54.1	7.5	29.3	44.1	83.2	6.6	30.2	63.6	99.3	15.9	28.2	48.9	57.9	66.8	87.5
	Rate	People		14.9	38.8	57.7	8.2	32.3	47.5	85.7	7.1	33.4	67.1	99.4	18.0	31.0	52.4	61.3	70.0	89.4
All Kota	Line	People		13,894	20,841	27,788	11,831	18,930	23,663	47,325	11,442	19,271	33,122	130,683	14,720	18,460	25,453	29,833	35,309	52,498
	Rate	HHs	1,096	9.7	24.5	35.8	7.1	20.3	29.9	56.3	6.9	20.7	42.7	95.1	11.6	18.9	32.7	38.2	44.1	62.1
	Rate	People		12.4	28.8	42.5	9.0	24.4	35.4	63.5	8.8	24.8	49.7	96.4	14.8	22.6	38.8	45.1	51.2	68.7
All Kabupaten	Line	People		12,524	18,786	25,047	10,664	17,063	21,329	42,657	10,314	17,370	29,855	117,793	13,268	16,639	22,943	26,890	31,827	47,320
	Rate	HHs	5,165	14.0	37.6	55.2	9.3	30.4	45.8	81.5	8.0	31.7	64.4	99.0	16.7	28.8	50.4	59.0	67.4	85.2
	Rate	People		15.7	40.5	58.4	10.1	33.1	48.8	83.6	8.7	34.4	67.5	99.1	18.6	31.3	53.6	62.1	70.2	87.0
All Nusa Tenggara Barat	Line	People		12,700	19,050	25,401	10,815	17,303	21,629	43,258	10,459	17,615	30,276	119,454	13,456	16,874	23,266	27,270	32,275	47,987
	Rate	HHs	6,261	13.5	35.9	52.8	9.0	29.2	43.8	78.3	7.9	30.3	61.7	98.5	16.0	27.6	48.2	56.4	64.4	82.3
	Rate	People		15.3	39.0	56.4	10.0	32.0	47.1	81.0	8.7	33.1	65.2	98.8	18.1	30.2	51.7	59.9	67.8	84.7

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Nusa Tenggara Timur): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each kota or kabupaten and by overall by perkotaan/perdesaan, kota/kabupaten, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Inti. 2005 PPP				Inti. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Alor	Line	People		10,055	15,083	20,111	8,562	13,700	17,125	34,250	8,281	13,947	23,971	94,577	10,653	13,360	18,421	21,591	25,554	37,994
	Rate	HHs	475	15.6	43.1	63.3	6.9	34.9	51.4	85.5	5.2	36.9	73.1	99.7	19.2	34.0	57.9	67.4	76.2	88.2
	Rate	People		20.7	51.4	72.1	10.6	42.4	60.9	90.0	8.2	44.2	80.3	99.9	25.0	41.4	67.2	75.5	82.7	92.3
Kabupaten Belu	Line	People		10,880	16,321	21,761	9,265	14,824	18,530	37,060	8,960	15,091	25,938	102,336	11,527	14,456	19,932	23,362	27,650	41,110
	Rate	HHs	518	25.0	48.3	61.0	13.7	41.0	56.1	83.0	11.8	43.0	68.7	99.2	26.8	39.0	58.2	65.2	72.1	86.5
	Rate	People		31.0	56.1	67.7	17.4	48.4	63.0	86.3	15.2	50.3	73.9	99.4	33.4	46.2	65.2	71.0	76.8	89.6
Kabupaten Ende	Line	People		11,802	17,703	23,605	10,050	16,080	20,100	40,200	9,720	16,370	28,136	111,007	12,504	15,680	21,621	25,341	29,993	44,594
	Rate	HHs	518	11.2	34.9	54.1	6.3	30.3	44.6	82.1	4.9	30.7	61.3	99.4	12.5	28.5	48.8	56.6	65.9	85.7
	Rate	People		16.0	43.3	63.9	9.0	38.3	53.9	88.6	7.3	38.7	70.3	99.8	17.1	36.2	58.5	65.9	74.4	91.3
Kabupaten Flores Timur	Line	People		9,263	13,895	18,526	7,888	12,621	15,776	31,551	7,629	12,848	22,083	87,126	9,814	12,307	16,970	19,890	23,541	35,000
	Rate	HHs	517	13.3	33.2	50.3	4.4	29.6	41.8	78.8	3.6	30.5	59.5	98.2	16.5	28.5	46.5	54.2	63.1	84.7
	Rate	People		18.5	42.2	59.2	6.2	37.8	51.6	84.2	5.1	38.9	67.7	99.3	22.2	36.4	55.7	62.8	70.6	88.7
Kabupaten Kupang	Line	People		11,079	16,618	22,158	9,434	15,094	18,868	37,736	9,124	15,366	26,411	104,204	11,738	14,719	20,298	23,788	28,155	41,861
	Rate	HHs	555	27.8	50.2	64.2	18.0	44.7	55.0	88.0	15.9	45.9	72.9	99.5	29.3	41.1	59.4	67.9	75.4	90.5
	Rate	People		35.2	58.8	72.8	23.1	52.9	63.8	91.1	20.0	54.0	79.9	99.8	37.2	49.6	68.4	75.7	81.8	93.8
Kota Kupang	Line	People		17,033	25,550	34,067	14,504	23,207	29,008	58,017	14,027	23,625	40,606	160,208	18,046	22,630	31,204	36,573	43,287	64,359
	Rate	HHs	588	7.5	22.3	38.1	3.7	16.5	28.5	67.1	3.7	17.3	47.4	97.8	8.8	16.0	32.6	42.3	51.0	73.4
	Rate	People		11.4	29.6	48.9	5.2	22.9	38.0	77.5	5.2	23.7	58.8	99.0	12.9	22.3	42.8	53.2	62.9	82.5
Kabupaten Lembata	Line	People		11,637	17,455	23,274	9,909	15,855	19,818	39,637	9,583	16,140	27,741	100,452	12,329	15,461	21,318	24,986	29,573	43,969
	Rate	HHs	435	30.3	55.2	70.2	20.4	51.1	60.8	89.0	18.9	51.1	76.7	99.1	34.0	50.4	63.7	71.4	79.9	92.1
	Rate	People		40.1	64.1	77.5	27.9	60.3	68.7	91.3	26.3	60.4	82.0	99.3	44.6	59.7	71.5	78.7	84.9	93.9
Kabupaten Malaka	Line	People		10,879	16,318	21,758	9,264	14,822	18,527	37,054	8,959	15,089	25,934	102,322	11,526	14,454	19,929	23,359	27,646	41,105
	Rate	HHs	394	13.4	38.5	58.9	4.8	29.4	48.0	91.1	4.0	31.2	72.7	99.9	14.5	27.9	51.7	63.3	76.6	92.1
	Rate	People		17.2	46.4	67.4	6.6	36.7	56.8	94.4	5.6	38.8	80.5	99.9	18.3	34.9	61.5	72.0	83.6	94.9
Kabupaten Manggarai	Line	People		10,252	15,378	20,504	8,730	13,968	17,460	34,919	8,443	14,220	24,440	96,427	10,862	13,621	18,781	22,013	26,054	38,736
	Rate	HHs	557	4.1	26.7	48.7	1.4	18.0	37.1	83.5	1.1	19.2	61.3	99.7	6.5	17.2	43.9	55.5	64.4	87.5
	Rate	People		5.0	32.5	57.3	1.7	22.1	45.0	87.8	1.4	23.5	69.6	99.9	8.3	21.2	52.1	63.8	72.5	91.2
Kabupaten Manggarai Barat	Line	People		10,303	15,454	20,606	8,773	14,037	17,546	35,093	8,485	14,290	24,561	96,905	10,916	13,688	18,874	22,122	26,183	38,929
	Rate	HHs	477	2.3	14.5	36.5	0.8	9.2	26.9	76.3	0.4	9.2	47.9	98.2	4.1	9.0	30.3	41.7	53.8	82.4
	Rate	People		3.3	17.6	41.4	1.1	11.6	31.4	80.0	0.5	11.6	52.2	99.0	5.5	11.4	35.3	46.3	57.7	84.9
Kabupaten Manggarai Timur	Line	People		10,310	15,465	20,620	8,779	14,047	17,558	35,117	8,491	14,300	24,578	96,971	10,923	13,698	18,887	22,137	26,201	38,955
	Rate	HHs	479	11.5	44.0	66.9	3.6	34.0	52.8	95.0	2.2	35.8	78.0	99.9	16.0	31.6	60.4	72.4	83.8	96.1
	Rate	People		15.3	51.5	75.0	5.4	40.4	60.3	97.3	3.6	42.5	84.1	100.0	21.2	38.2	68.1	79.6	88.8	97.8
Kabupaten Nageao	Line	People		10,630	15,944	21,259	9,051	14,482	18,103	36,205	8,754	14,743	25,340	99,977	11,262	14,122	19,473	22,823	27,013	40,163
	Rate	HHs	480	10.4	32.3	46.7	4.3	26.1	38.1	80.7	3.9	26.1	57.8	99.0	13.1	25.1	41.0	50.9	64.0	86.3
	Rate	People		13.0	38.8	55.3	5.7	31.6	46.1	85.0	5.2	31.6	65.2	99.7	15.9	30.7	49.3	58.9	71.0	90.3
Kabupaten Ngada	Line	People		10,891	16,336	21,782	9,274	14,838	18,548	37,096	8,969	15,106	25,963	102,436	11,539	14,470	19,952	23,385	27,677	41,150
	Rate	HHs	440	6.3	26.2	41.2	3.2	19.6	33.2	78.9	3.0	21.4	53.1	98.7	7.0	19.0	38.0	45.8	60.0	84.9
	Rate	People		7.8	31.9	48.5	4.0	24.7	39.2	84.7	3.8	27.0	59.8	99.0	8.7	24.0	45.1	53.1	66.9	89.5
Kabupaten Rote Ndao	Line	People		9,464	14,196	18,928	8,059	12,894	16,118	32,236	7,794	13,127	22,562	89,016	10,027	12,574	17,298	20,321	24,051	35,759
	Rate	HHs	434	7.5	35.1	54.9	2.3	26.3	44.5	80.9	1.2	28.2	65.6	97.9	10.9	24.5	49.7	61.1	68.1	83.8
	Rate	People		9.9	43.6	65.0	2.7	33.4	54.1	85.6	1.4	35.1	74.1	98.8	14.1	30.7	59.6	71.2	76.1	87.6
Kabupaten Sabu Raijua	Line	People		12,105	18,157	24,210	10,308	16,492	20,615	41,230	9,969	16,789	28,857	113,853	12,825	16,082	22,175	25,991	30,762	45,737
	Rate	HHs	399	23.6	48.0	65.8	15.8	42.0	54.1	92.5	13.9	43.4	76.0	99.6	29.0	39.3	59.5	69.8	82.0	95.0
	Rate	People		33.1	61.3	78.0	22.9	54.2	67.5	95.2	20.8	55.4	85.1	99.8	38.7	51.0	72.2	81.3	89.2	96.7
Kabupaten Sikka	Line	People		9,809	14,713	19,618	8,353	13,364	16,705	33,410	8,078	13,605	23,384	92,259	10,392	13,032	17,969	21,062	24,928	37,062
	Rate	HHs	560	11.4	30.4	47.1	4.0	24.0	38.2	79.7	3.5	24.6	58.0	98.3	13.0	23.0	42.9	51.7	62.0	82.8
	Rate	People		16.3	38.7	56.4	5.9	31.7	46.6	86.1	5.3	32.3	66.9	99.2	18.6	30.3	52.1	60.8	70.7	88.7
Kabupaten Sumba Barat	Line	People		10,729	16,093	21,458	9,136	14,617	18,272	36,543	8,835	14,881	25,576	100,911	11,367	14,254	19,655	23,036	27,265	40,538
	Rate	HHs	436	22.3	47.3	62.5	9.2	42.2	54.3	87.8	7.3	42.7	73.8	98.7	25.0	40.4	58.7	66.5	76.9	89.5
	Rate	People		26.8	55.2	69.4	11.9	49.9	62.4	91.4	8.7	50.5	78.5	99.3	29.7	48.2	66.3	72.1	81.9	92.9
Kabupaten Sumba Barat Daya	Line	People		11,537	17,305	23,073	9,824	15,718	19,647	39,295	9,501	16,001	27,502	108,509	12,223	15,328	21,134	24,771	29,318	43,590
	Rate	HHs	519	36.6	60.3	76.2	25.1	56.2	67.8	94.0	23.8	57.4	84.0	99.2	38.7	54.4	72.0	79.1	86.6	95.0
	Rate	People		43.4	67.4	80.6	31.6	63.2	73.7	95.7	30.4	64.5	87.8	99.9	45.7	61.4	76.7	83.9	90.3	96.5
Kabupaten Sumba Tengah	Line	People		9,219	13,829	18,439	8,751	12,561	15,701	31,402	7,593	12,787	21,978	86,714	9,768	12,249	16,889	19,796	23,429	34,835
	Rate	HHs	399	7.3	36.7	61.4	1.5	31.1	49.6	88.4	0.6	33.4	72.2	98.9	9.8	27.4	56.1			

Table 1 (Papua): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	RIs or People	n	National		Poverty lines and poverty rates					Per capita-based lines									
				100%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$3.00	\$3.50	\$4.00	10th	20th	40th	80th					
				Inst. 2008 PPP	Inst. 2011 PPP	Inst. 2008 PPP	Inst. 2011 PPP	Inst. 2008 PPP	Inst. 2011 PPP	Inst. 2008 PPP	Inst. 2011 PPP	Inst. 2008 PPP	Inst. 2011 PPP	Inst. 2008 PPP	Inst. 2011 PPP					
Kabupaten Aesop	Line	People	11,634	17,421	23,308	9,421	15,278	19,947	39,055	15,397	16,161	22,782	109,613	12,347	13,884	21,359	29,023	29,047	41,094	
	Rate	HHs	386	27.6	51.3	65.5	13.2	47.7	59.5	80.3	11.3	48.5	72.5	98.4	31.8	46.7	63.2	68.0	74.7	82.6
	Rate	People		41.4	62.7	74.0	22.8	60.4	68.6	87.2	20.1	61.0	81.0	99.2	45.9	59.4	72.0	76.1	82.4	88.2
Kabupaten Biak Numfor	Line	People	17,375	26,063	34,751	14,795	23,673	29,591	59,182	14,309	24,100	41,421	163,425	18,408	23,085	31,830	37,308	44,156	63,651	
	Rate	HHs	425	31.6	46.8	60.0	27.1	42.9	54.0	83.3	24.7	43.7	69.4	97.8	34.2	42.4	57.6	62.4	71.5	87.1
	Rate	People		39.1	56.8	70.3	33.4	53.0	64.5	90.6	31.0	53.6	79.8	98.8	42.3	52.5	68.7	72.6	82.2	93.3
Kabupaten Boven Digoel	Line	People	14,884	22,326	29,768	12,674	20,279	25,348	50,696	12,257	20,644	35,482	139,963	15,760	19,775	27,267	31,958	37,825	56,238	
	Rate	HHs	359	15.1	25.7	32.3	7.1	24.1	28.6	50.9	6.5	24.2	38.6	92.9	16.9	20.9	29.5	34.9	41.0	54.6
	Rate	People		22.8	38.8	46.0	13.0	36.9	41.8	65.7	11.9	37.1	53.3	96.7	25.3	30.9	42.6	49.2	55.8	68.6
Kabupaten Dairi	Line	People	18,472	27,708	36,944	15,729	25,167	31,459	62,917	15,212	25,621	44,036	173,740	19,370	24,542	33,840	39,662	46,943	69,795	
	Rate	HHs	359	36.0	53.6	63.6	29.4	49.8	58.9	85.9	26.8	50.5	68.4	100.0	36.7	48.0	61.4	65.6	68.8	90.6
	Rate	People		54.4	73.1	81.1	46.5	68.8	77.8	94.8	42.9	69.6	84.5	100.0	55.2	67.1	79.5	82.5	84.8	96.7
Kabupaten Dogiyai	Line	People	15,704	23,557	31,409	13,373	21,396	26,745	53,491	12,933	21,782	37,438	147,709	16,638	20,865	28,769	33,720	39,909	59,338	
	Rate	HHs	248	41.9	64.1	70.2	30.1	60.3	66.3	82.9	26.1	61.8	74.5	100.0	44.9	58.1	68.7	71.4	74.7	86.4
	Rate	People		52.6	76.1	82.0	40.5	71.7	78.1	91.2	35.9	73.4	85.7	100.0	55.2	69.2	80.6	83.4	85.9	93.1
Kabupaten Intan Jaya	Line	People	19,928	29,892	39,856	16,969	27,150	33,938	67,576	16,411	27,640	47,566	187,433	21,113	26,470	36,507	42,788	50,643	73,296	
	Rate	HHs	268	24.8	43.6	54.9	15.6	40.2	47.4	80.2	13.5	40.5	68.9	100.0	29.2	39.5	51.3	60.9	70.5	82.9
	Rate	People		36.3	60.3	70.9	24.7	56.2	63.8	89.9	22.4	56.6	81.9	100.0	38.3	54.3	67.5	76.5	83.0	91.2
Kabupaten Jayapura	Line	People	18,065	27,098	36,131	15,383	24,613	30,766	61,532	14,877	25,057	43,066	169,916	19,140	24,092	33,095	38,789	45,910	68,259	
	Rate	HHs	368	21.4	32.6	49.5	17.7	30.5	39.6	81.4	17.0	30.6	61.8	99.6	22.3	29.6	44.3	55.3	67.6	86.4
	Rate	People		29.1	42.9	60.9	24.1	40.7	51.4	89.7	23.0	40.9	73.3	99.9	30.3	39.7	56.1	66.6	78.2	92.6
Kota Jayapura	Line	People	31,051	46,577	62,103	26,441	42,306	52,882	105,764	25,572	43,068	74,024	292,057	32,898	41,255	56,884	66,672	78,911	##	
	Rate	HHs	476	13.4	39.4	58.3	7.9	33.0	48.8	87.2	6.8	33.4	66.1	99.2	18.9	32.2	53.1	61.6	71.0	99.9
	Rate	People		19.7	50.0	68.4	12.7	44.0	59.4	92.0	11.4	44.6	75.4	99.7	28.9	43.3	63.2	71.2	80.3	94.6
Kabupaten Jayawijaya	Line	People	18,474	20,212	26,949	11,474	18,358	22,948	45,895	11,097	18,689	32,122	126,755	14,276	17,902	24,684	28,932	34,242	50,912	
	Rate	HHs	442	5.4	19.9	29.0	0.6	16.5	23.6	53.0	0.5	17.3	34.6	98.7	7.3	15.9	25.4	30.7	37.5	58.4
	Rate	People		8.0	26.3	39.3	0.9	21.2	31.7	65.5	0.8	22.5	45.3	99.4	10.7	20.9	34.8	41.2	48.6	71.1
Kabupaten Keerom	Line	People	19,635	29,452	39,270	16,720	26,751	33,439	66,879	16,170	27,234	46,808	184,679	20,803	26,087	35,970	42,159	49,898	74,189	
	Rate	HHs	317	46.0	58.2	70.4	41.5	56.0	63.3	91.4	39.3	57.4	77.2	100.0	47.7	55.0	65.1	72.0	79.8	96.4
	Rate	People		55.5	67.2	77.4	50.5	65.0	71.6	95.0	49.1	66.3	83.7	100.0	57.3	64.3	73.6	78.6	85.5	98.7
Kabupaten Kepulauan Yapen	Line	People	19,731	29,597	39,463	16,802	26,883	33,603	67,207	16,249	27,367	47,038	185,585	20,905	26,215	36,147	42,366	50,143	74,553	
	Rate	HHs	388	31.6	50.8	63.4	27.5	47.4	59.0	88.1	26.3	47.9	73.5	99.1	33.4	46.7	60.2	66.2	77.5	91.2
	Rate	People		37.7	57.3	71.6	32.9	53.7	67.1	92.9	31.9	54.4	80.6	99.6	39.2	53.1	68.2	73.9	84.8	94.9
Kabupaten Lanny Jaya	Line	People	14,854	22,281	29,708	12,648	20,237	25,297	50,593	12,233	20,602	35,410	139,709	15,737	19,735	27,211	31,893	37,748	56,124	
	Rate	HHs	428	9.7	13.6	17.4	5.1	13.0	14.9	64.5	4.7	13.0	27.3	100.0	10.7	13.0	16.5	22.1	29.7	79.4
	Rate	People		18.1	16.3	24.9	8.4	15.7	17.9	71.9	7.8	15.7	27.7	100.0	15.9	17.2	28.8	35.4	54.1	
Kabupaten Mamberamo Raya	Line	People	21,925	32,888	43,860	18,670	29,871	37,339	74,679	18,056	30,410	52,267	206,218	23,229	29,130	40,165	47,077	55,718	82,842	
	Rate	HHs	158	81.7	88.3	90.9	80.3	87.6	88.3	95.4	80.3	87.6	90.9	100.0	84.4	87.6	89.8	90.9	91.6	95.4
	Rate	People		85.8	90.0	94.2	84.6	89.8	90.0	97.7	84.6	89.8	94.2	100.0	88.0	89.8	91.3	94.2	95.1	97.7
Kabupaten Mamberamo Tengah	Line	People	12,354	18,530	24,707	10,519	16,831	21,039	42,077	10,174	17,134	29,450	116,192	13,988	16,413	22,631	26,525	31,394	46,677	
	Rate	HHs	274	1.7	19.4	35.9	0.1	14.6	25.5	74.5	0.1	14.6	51.5	100.0	2.5	14.2	34.1	42.4	59.6	83.9
	Rate	People		2.3	23.8	45.3	0.2	17.4	32.2	78.7	0.2	17.4	59.5	100.0	2.8	17.1	42.8	51.4	66.9	87.8
Kabupaten Mappi	Line	People	9,904	14,856	19,807	8,433	13,493	16,866	33,733	8,156	13,736	23,609	93,150	10,493	13,158	18,143	21,265	25,168	37,220	
	Rate	HHs	397	13.0	40.5	49.9	7.6	33.8	45.1	71.7	6.1	35.5	58.7	95.9	16.0	31.3	47.9	54.4	59.3	72.6
	Rate	People		22.2	56.1	65.4	13.6	48.7	60.6	84.4	10.9	50.6	73.7	98.0	26.5	45.4	63.0	70.4	74.3	84.9
Kabupaten Merauke	Line	People	11,374	17,061	22,748	9,685	15,497	19,371	38,742	9,367	15,776	27,115	106,981	12,051	15,112	20,887	24,422	28,905	42,976	
	Rate	HHs	419	3.9	17.6	25.1	1.6	14.7	20.0	46.5	1.1	14.8	30.3	93.9	5.1	12.8	21.6	26.8	32.0	51.2
	Rate	People		6.0	23.5	33.8	2.2	19.1	25.9	56.1	1.8	19.2	39.5	95.5	7.0	16.1	27.8	35.7	41.8	60.1
Kabupaten Mimika	Line	People	25,058	37,587	50,116	21,338	34,140	42,675	85,350	20,636	34,756	59,736	235,686	26,548	33,292	45,905	53,804	63,680	94,680	
	Rate	HHs	449	6.4	18.2	37.1	5.1	15.0	23.4	80.4	5.1	15.9	52.5	99.5	6.4	14.5	28.8	45.1	59.9	85.7
	Rate	People		7.0	21.6	42.6	5.9	18.1	28.8	85.4	5.9	18.9	58.3	99.8	7.1	17.4	34.4	50.2	66.7	90.1
Kabupaten Nabira	Line	People	19,051	28,577	38,102	16,222	25,956	32,445	64,890	15,689	26,424	45,416	179,187	20,184	25,311	34,900	40,906	48,415	71,983	
	Rate	HHs	380	24.8	35.4	51.5	18.7	32.3	42.0	79.9	18.1	32.3	60.8	100.0	25.5	31.9	48.6	55.9	63.1	85.4
	Rate	People		29.2	42.1	59.2	23.1	39.4	49.4	85.8	22.7	39.4	60.9	100.0	29.9	39.0	57.0	64.8	72.0	91.0
Kabupaten Nggas	Line	People	10,897	16,345	21,794	9,279	14,846	18,558	37,116	8,974	15,114	25,977	102,491	11,545	14,478	19,962	23,397	2		

Table 1 (Papua Barat): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Fakfak	Line	People		16,379	24,568	32,757	13,947	22,315	27,894	55,787	13,488	22,717	39,045	154,051	17,353	21,761	30,005	35,168	41,623	61,885
	Rate	HHs	349	19.1	32.5	47.2	11.3	30.1	40.8	70.2	10.2	30.2	54.9	98.3	21.1	29.1	44.2	50.9	56.8	74.3
	Rate	People		26.3	41.6	56.4	17.1	38.8	49.8	80.4	15.1	39.1	66.9	99.1	28.7	37.8	53.6	62.0	69.4	84.1
Kabupaten Kaimana	Line	People		12,709	19,064	25,419	10,822	17,316	21,645	43,289	10,467	17,628	30,298	119,539	13,465	16,886	23,283	27,289	32,298	48,021
	Rate	HHs	314	22.6	29.9	36.2	17.8	27.4	31.5	55.7	14.4	27.8	41.0	96.9	23.2	27.3	34.3	37.6	43.7	58.0
	Rate	People		29.4	36.3	43.4	22.4	34.1	37.9	64.5	19.0	34.5	49.3	98.1	30.1	33.8	40.3	44.5	52.7	66.1
Kabupaten Manokwari	Line	People		18,908	28,362	37,816	16,100	25,761	32,201	64,402	15,571	26,225	45,075	177,840	20,032	25,121	34,638	40,598	48,051	71,442
	Rate	HHs	410	21.2	34.8	47.0	17.5	32.8	39.9	73.0	17.2	33.0	55.3	98.6	24.2	32.4	42.5	50.6	58.1	77.0
	Rate	People		28.8	45.2	58.2	24.1	43.0	51.0	81.4	23.9	43.5	65.9	99.6	32.5	42.5	53.4	62.1	68.2	84.0
Kabupaten Manokwari Selatan	Line	People		19,027	28,540	38,054	16,202	25,923	32,404	64,807	15,669	26,390	45,358	178,959	20,158	25,279	34,856	40,854	48,353	71,891
	Rate	HHs	216	29.2	44.8	57.6	21.3	39.6	51.2	79.5	19.1	40.5	67.4	99.1	30.4	37.6	55.5	59.8	68.5	82.8
	Rate	People		36.5	58.5	70.4	26.5	51.9	64.6	89.3	24.2	53.1	79.0	99.6	37.9	48.0	68.0	72.0	79.7	91.1
Kabupaten Maybrat	Line	People		11,044	16,566	22,087	9,404	15,046	18,808	37,616	9,095	15,318	26,327	103,872	11,700	14,673	20,231	23,713	28,065	41,728
	Rate	HHs	223	7.9	20.0	28.6	2.5	16.2	22.9	47.7	2.1	16.2	33.1	90.2	8.8	16.2	26.0	30.5	38.7	51.1
	Rate	People		13.6	28.4	39.2	3.5	24.1	31.8	63.1	2.8	24.1	46.6	95.9	15.0	24.1	36.2	41.6	54.2	66.3
Kabupaten Pegunungan Arfak	Line	People		19,370	29,055	38,740	16,494	26,390	32,988	65,976	15,952	26,866	46,176	182,186	20,522	25,735	35,485	41,590	49,225	73,188
	Rate	HHs	214	66.1	77.9	81.8	57.4	77.2	79.6	98.1	53.1	77.6	89.9	100.0	69.2	76.7	80.4	83.5	89.9	98.2
	Rate	People		72.2	83.7	86.1	66.2	83.5	85.5	97.9	62.3	83.6	91.2	100.0	75.5	83.2	85.7	86.6	91.2	97.9
Kabupaten Raja Ampat	Line	People		10,719	16,079	21,439	9,128	14,605	18,256	36,511	8,828	14,868	25,554	100,823	11,357	14,242	19,637	23,016	27,241	40,503
	Rate	HHs	274	2.9	18.3	29.1	1.1	14.6	23.8	54.3	0.8	15.8	37.1	92.6	4.1	13.4	26.2	30.6	41.4	59.6
	Rate	People		4.6	25.9	38.6	2.1	21.6	32.8	63.3	1.7	23.0	47.4	96.7	6.0	20.3	35.4	40.1	52.2	68.9
Kabupaten Sorong	Line	People		11,151	16,727	22,303	9,496	15,193	18,991	37,983	9,183	15,467	26,584	104,885	11,814	14,816	20,429	23,944	28,339	42,134
	Rate	HHs	400	4.0	19.4	28.4	1.8	16.3	21.8	54.6	1.8	17.3	34.9	96.3	5.8	15.3	23.6	31.5	41.0	57.7
	Rate	People		5.2	25.4	36.5	2.5	21.1	28.3	63.5	2.5	22.6	43.2	98.3	7.7	20.0	30.6	39.8	50.0	67.0
Kota Sorong	Line	People		21,979	32,969	43,958	18,716	29,945	37,432	74,863	18,101	30,485	52,396	206,727	23,286	29,201	40,265	47,193	55,856	83,046
	Rate	HHs	456	8.8	27.0	46.8	2.9	21.7	36.3	78.2	2.9	22.7	56.9	98.0	9.7	20.2	41.3	50.6	60.4	81.8
	Rate	People		14.2	35.9	58.5	4.0	29.8	45.8	85.3	4.0	31.5	67.8	99.2	15.4	28.3	51.3	61.8	70.7	87.5
Kabupaten Sorong Selatan	Line	People		10,087	15,130	20,173	8,589	13,742	17,178	34,356	8,307	13,990	24,046	94,871	10,686	13,401	18,478	21,658	25,633	38,112
	Rate	HHs	228	13.4	23.8	29.0	5.2	22.8	25.9	50.8	4.1	23.0	37.6	94.5	15.0	22.6	27.6	31.8	39.8	52.9
	Rate	People		23.1	37.3	42.8	10.7	35.9	39.5	63.7	8.7	36.3	51.6	97.6	25.9	35.7	41.3	45.7	52.8	65.9
Kabupaten Tambrau	Line	People		10,840	16,260	21,679	9,230	14,768	18,461	36,921	8,927	15,035	25,841	101,954	11,484	14,402	19,858	23,275	27,547	40,957
	Rate	HHs	187	20.8	59.4	73.4	14.2	55.2	65.5	88.3	12.1	55.3	75.6	96.0	23.8	52.9	69.1	74.4	78.5	92.1
	Rate	People		28.8	71.7	83.6	22.0	67.5	77.1	94.7	19.1	67.6	85.2	98.5	34.5	65.9	79.6	84.4	87.3	97.0
Kabupaten Teluk Bintuni	Line	People		19,324	28,986	38,648	16,455	26,328	32,910	65,819	15,914	26,802	46,066	181,753	20,473	25,674	35,400	41,492	49,108	73,014
	Rate	HHs	375	10.5	24.3	41.6	7.2	20.2	30.7	70.5	6.5	21.8	49.8	94.8	11.5	18.7	36.6	44.0	51.7	76.5
	Rate	People		14.4	31.3	53.2	10.4	27.0	39.0	81.2	9.6	28.7	60.8	98.0	15.7	25.9	47.4	55.4	62.9	86.1
Kabupaten Teluk Wondama	Line	People		16,713	25,069	33,425	14,231	22,770	28,463	56,925	13,763	23,181	39,842	157,193	17,707	22,204	30,617	35,885	42,472	63,148
	Rate	HHs	271	16.5	35.1	50.4	8.3	32.6	46.5	74.0	5.9	32.8	56.3	96.6	19.1	30.8	48.7	54.5	56.9	78.7
	Rate	People		25.3	49.0	65.1	11.9	46.2	61.2	83.0	8.2	46.5	70.5	97.7	28.9	44.2	63.6	68.7	71.0	88.0
All Perkotaan	Line	People		20,081	30,122	40,163	17,100	27,360	34,200	68,399	16,538	27,853	47,872	188,878	21,276	26,680	36,788	43,118	51,033	75,876
	Rate	HHs	1,216	7.3	22.3	40.2	2.6	17.9	30.5	71.2	2.5	18.8	50.6	97.4	8.3	16.7	35.2	43.9	53.8	75.4
	Rate	People		11.9	30.6	51.2	3.8	25.3	39.5	79.5	3.7	26.8	61.1	98.8	13.3	23.9	44.8	54.7	64.1	82.4
All Perdesaan	Line	People		14,993	22,490	29,987	12,767	20,427	25,534	51,069	12,347	20,796	35,743	141,021	15,885	19,920	27,467	32,193	38,103	56,651
	Rate	HHs	2,701	20.9	35.7	46.1	15.4	33.0	40.4	68.5	14.1	33.6	52.6	96.7	23.0	32.2	42.9	48.8	55.6	71.7
	Rate	People		27.2	45.0	56.1	20.2	42.1	49.9	77.0	18.6	42.7	62.8	98.6	29.8	41.3	52.6	58.9	66.0	79.9
All Kota	Line	People		21,979	32,969	43,958	18,716	29,945	37,432	74,863	18,101	30,485	52,396	206,727	23,286	29,201	40,265	47,193	55,856	83,046
	Rate	HHs	456	8.8	27.0	46.8	2.9	21.7	36.3	78.2	2.9	22.7	56.9	98.0	9.7	20.2	41.3	50.6	60.4	81.8
	Rate	People		14.2	35.9	58.5	4.0	29.8	45.8	85.3	4.0	31.5	67.8	99.2	15.4	28.3	51.3	61.8	70.7	87.5
All Kabupaten	Line	People		15,309	22,963	30,618	13,036	20,857	26,072	52,143	12,607	21,233	36,495	143,989	16,219	20,339	28,045	32,871	38,904	57,843
	Rate	HHs	3,461	17.8	31.6	42.7	12.9	28.9	36.4	66.5	11.8	29.4	50.0	96.6	19.7	28.1	39.3	45.5	52.9	70.1
	Rate	People		23.3	40.3	52.5	16.9	37.2	45.6	75.4	15.6	37.9	60.1	98.5	25.8	36.4	48.8	55.5	63.2	78.6
All Papua Barat	Line	People		17,064	25,596	34,129	14,531	23,249	29,061	58,123	14,053	23,668	40,680	160,500	18,079	22,672	31,261	36,640	43,366	64,476
	Rate	HHs	3,917	15.4	30.4	43.8	10.3	27.0	36.4	69.6	9.5	27.7	51.8	97.0	17.1	26.0	39.8	46.8	54.9	73.2
	Rate	People		20.9	39.1	54.1	13.5	35.3	45.7	78.0	12.5	36.3	62.1	98.7	23.1	34.2	49.4	57.2	65.2	80.9

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Riau): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Bengkalis	Line	People		16,722	25,083	33,444	14,239	22,783	28,479	56,957	13,771	23,194	39,864	157,282	17,717	22,217	30,634	35,905	42,496	63,183
	Rate	HHs	626	4.4	30.4	55.5	1.3	22.4	39.7	86.4	1.0	23.5	68.4	99.6	6.2	20.6	48.1	61.4	71.1	89.8
	Rate	People		5.9	35.7	62.2	1.8	26.5	44.9	90.1	1.4	28.0	74.6	99.8	8.1	24.5	54.5	67.7	76.7	92.8
Kota Dumai	Line	People		13,762	20,643	27,524	11,719	18,750	23,438	46,875	11,334	19,088	32,808	129,441	14,580	18,284	25,211	29,549	34,974	51,999
	Rate	HHs	548	2.3	12.0	31.0	0.8	8.4	19.3	63.5	0.8	8.4	42.2	96.6	4.3	7.5	24.3	34.2	45.4	69.4
	Rate	People		3.6	16.2	38.5	1.4	12.5	25.5	69.8	1.4	12.5	49.3	97.6	7.4	11.4	31.1	41.7	53.0	74.9
Kabupaten Indragiri Hilir	Line	People		14,308	21,462	28,616	12,184	19,494	24,367	48,734	11,783	19,845	34,109	134,575	15,159	19,010	26,211	30,722	36,361	54,062
	Rate	HHs	696	9.0	30.8	50.4	4.5	23.3	41.0	83.8	4.2	24.0	61.7	99.4	11.6	22.2	45.0	54.0	66.7	87.0
	Rate	People		11.9	36.4	57.2	5.9	28.6	48.2	86.8	5.5	29.3	68.7	99.6	14.8	27.2	52.2	60.3	72.8	89.2
Kabupaten Indragiri Hulu	Line	People		15,053	22,580	30,107	12,818	20,509	25,636	51,273	12,397	20,879	35,886	141,585	15,948	20,000	27,577	32,322	38,255	56,878
	Rate	HHs	595	4.0	23.2	41.8	1.7	17.4	30.2	81.9	1.2	17.8	57.4	98.1	5.5	15.7	36.7	47.5	62.1	88.3
	Rate	People		5.3	29.3	48.1	2.3	22.4	36.5	85.5	1.7	22.8	63.1	98.5	7.6	20.8	42.7	53.5	67.1	90.7
Kabupaten Kampar	Line	People		13,785	20,678	27,571	11,739	18,782	23,477	46,954	11,353	19,120	32,863	129,660	14,605	18,315	25,254	29,599	35,033	52,087
	Rate	HHs	697	4.5	17.7	40.5	1.7	13.6	28.5	78.1	1.2	14.2	53.8	98.2	5.6	12.2	35.2	46.8	58.8	82.8
	Rate	People		6.1	21.7	47.2	2.2	17.3	34.7	83.3	1.6	17.9	60.6	99.0	7.6	15.8	41.9	53.8	65.4	87.4
Kabupaten Kepulauan Meranti	Line	People		15,207	22,810	30,413	12,949	20,718	25,898	51,795	12,523	21,092	36,251	143,027	16,111	20,204	27,858	32,651	38,645	57,457
	Rate	HHs	514	4.8	27.3	49.3	1.4	20.1	36.9	89.3	0.8	21.1	65.1	99.9	6.2	18.9	42.4	57.9	70.0	92.3
	Rate	People		5.9	33.5	56.2	1.9	25.3	43.8	92.1	1.4	26.1	71.0	99.9	8.0	23.8	49.6	64.1	76.1	94.4
Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi	Line	People		17,148	25,722	34,296	14,602	23,363	29,204	58,408	14,122	23,785	40,880	161,289	18,168	22,783	31,414	36,820	43,579	64,793
	Rate	HHs	554	9.5	32.2	49.2	4.6	25.3	39.7	84.0	3.6	27.1	63.5	98.3	11.3	23.7	44.5	56.2	68.0	88.2
	Rate	People		13.1	39.0	56.2	5.8	31.4	47.4	88.4	4.6	33.3	70.2	98.7	15.6	29.6	52.2	62.9	74.9	92.0
Kota Pekanbaru	Line	People		16,433	24,650	32,867	13,994	22,390	27,987	55,974	13,533	22,793	39,176	154,567	17,411	21,834	30,105	35,285	41,762	62,093
	Rate	HHs	748	1.7	12.6	27.5	0.8	9.1	18.2	57.8	0.5	9.7	36.5	96.1	1.9	8.4	21.6	30.3	38.8	65.6
	Rate	People		2.2	15.9	33.7	1.2	11.6	22.2	65.3	0.7	12.4	43.9	97.1	2.4	10.7	26.6	37.2	46.3	72.8
Kabupaten Pelalawan	Line	People		16,951	25,426	33,901	14,434	23,094	28,868	57,735	13,959	23,511	40,409	159,431	17,959	22,521	31,053	36,396	43,077	64,046
	Rate	HHs	585	1.2	16.5	39.2	0.3	10.9	22.8	77.0	0.3	11.2	54.1	98.5	1.8	9.4	29.5	45.9	57.8	81.5
	Rate	People		1.6	21.7	46.3	0.3	14.6	29.2	83.2	0.3	15.0	62.1	99.0	2.4	12.7	36.1	53.8	65.4	86.5
Kabupaten Rokan Hilir	Line	People		12,199	18,299	24,399	10,388	16,621	20,776	41,553	10,047	16,921	29,082	114,743	12,925	16,208	22,349	26,194	31,003	46,095
	Rate	HHs	666	2.1	16.0	33.9	0.5	10.5	23.0	71.6	0.5	11.3	46.8	97.6	3.0	10.4	28.8	38.9	50.8	78.9
	Rate	People		2.8	20.4	41.2	0.6	14.3	28.9	78.2	0.6	15.2	54.3	98.2	3.9	14.2	35.1	46.2	58.2	84.3
Kabupaten Rokan Hulu	Line	People		15,365	23,047	30,729	13,083	20,933	26,167	52,334	12,653	21,311	36,628	144,514	16,278	20,414	28,147	32,991	39,046	58,054
	Rate	HHs	669	3.8	22.6	43.1	1.6	15.8	29.5	80.9	1.6	17.1	57.2	98.7	4.7	14.4	36.0	48.4	62.3	85.4
	Rate	People		4.7	26.7	49.0	2.0	19.5	34.7	84.9	2.0	20.8	62.8	99.1	6.0	17.8	41.5	54.4	68.2	88.8
Kabupaten Siak	Line	People		14,197	21,295	28,393	12,089	19,342	24,178	48,355	11,691	19,691	33,843	133,528	15,041	18,862	26,007	30,482	36,078	53,641
	Rate	HHs	594	1.9	13.9	33.1	0.9	9.8	21.6	73.8	0.7	10.6	46.9	98.5	3.0	9.0	26.3	39.3	50.5	80.6
	Rate	People		2.4	17.4	39.8	1.3	12.8	26.2	80.3	1.0	13.8	54.2	99.0	3.7	11.4	31.5	46.2	57.6	85.2
All Perkotaan	Line	People		15,449	23,173	30,898	13,155	21,048	26,310	52,620	12,723	21,428	36,829	145,305	16,367	20,525	28,301	33,171	39,260	58,372
	Rate	HHs	2,814	2.9	17.7	34.9	1.0	13.0	24.6	65.6	0.9	13.7	45.0	97.0	4.0	12.0	29.5	39.0	47.8	72.0
	Rate	People		4.0	22.2	41.9	1.5	16.7	30.2	72.7	1.3	17.6	52.6	97.9	5.4	15.6	35.8	46.3	55.4	78.3
All Perdesaan	Line	People		14,751	22,126	29,502	12,561	20,097	25,122	50,243	12,148	20,460	35,165	138,742	15,628	19,598	27,023	31,673	37,487	55,735
	Rate	HHs	4,678	4.6	22.1	43.3	2.0	16.1	30.6	82.0	1.7	16.9	57.8	98.9	5.9	14.8	36.6	49.1	62.4	86.8
	Rate	People		6.0	26.8	49.8	2.6	20.2	36.5	86.1	2.2	21.0	64.2	99.2	7.7	18.7	42.8	55.5	68.6	90.1
All Kota	Line	People		15,863	23,794	31,725	13,507	21,612	27,015	54,030	13,063	22,001	37,815	149,197	16,806	21,075	29,059	34,060	40,312	59,936
	Rate	HHs	1,296	1.8	12.5	28.2	0.8	9.0	18.4	58.9	0.6	9.5	37.7	96.2	2.4	8.2	22.2	31.1	40.1	66.4
	Rate	People		2.5	15.9	34.7	1.3	11.8	22.9	66.3	0.9	12.4	45.1	97.2	3.5	10.8	27.5	38.1	47.7	73.3
All Kabupaten	Line	People		14,814	22,221	29,628	12,614	20,183	25,229	50,458	12,200	20,547	35,315	139,334	15,695	19,682	27,138	31,808	37,647	55,973
	Rate	HHs	6,196	4.5	22.5	43.1	1.9	16.4	30.8	79.8	1.6	17.3	56.7	98.6	5.9	15.2	36.9	48.8	61.0	84.7
	Rate	People		5.9	27.3	49.8	2.4	20.6	36.9	84.5	2.1	21.5	63.3	99.1	7.7	19.2	43.2	55.4	67.4	88.5
All Riau	Line	People		15,033	22,549	30,065	12,801	20,481	25,601	51,202	12,380	20,850	35,836	141,390	15,926	19,972	27,539	32,277	38,202	56,799
	Rate	HHs	7,492	3.9	20.3	39.9	1.6	14.8	28.2	75.4	1.4	15.6	52.6	98.1	5.1	13.7	33.7	45.0	56.5	80.8
	Rate	People		5.2	24.9	46.6	2.2	18.8	33.9	80.7	1.8	19.6	59.5	98.7	6.8	17.4	40.0	51.8	63.3	85.3

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Sulawesi Barat): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	<i>n</i>	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Majene	Line	People		11,491	17,237	22,982	9,785	15,656	19,570	39,140	9,463	15,938	27,394	108,081	12,174	15,267	21,051	24,673	29,202	43,418
	Rate	HHs	434	10.7	39.4	59.7	6.2	33.5	48.6	80.4	5.2	34.9	67.6	98.3	14.0	30.8	53.7	62.6	70.7	82.3
	Rate	People		12.9	43.7	67.0	7.8	37.9	53.8	85.5	6.6	39.7	74.1	99.1	15.7	35.0	60.1	69.9	77.4	87.2
Kabupaten Mamasa	Line	People		8,190	12,285	16,379	6,974	11,158	13,947	27,895	6,744	11,359	19,523	77,029	8,677	10,881	15,003	17,585	20,812	30,944
	Rate	HHs	472	4.4	27.2	46.3	1.8	21.2	37.6	73.7	1.6	21.6	54.7	95.3	7.9	18.0	40.7	50.0	59.0	75.3
	Rate	People		6.3	31.4	51.2	3.0	25.0	42.5	78.1	2.8	25.6	59.1	97.0	10.4	21.6	45.4	54.4	63.8	79.6
Kabupaten Mamuju	Line	People		8,299	12,449	16,598	7,067	11,307	14,134	28,267	6,835	11,511	19,784	78,057	8,793	11,026	15,203	17,819	21,090	31,357
	Rate	HHs	586	1.9	16.7	35.6	0.5	12.6	24.3	64.4	0.4	12.6	45.3	96.0	3.0	11.2	29.0	38.8	48.0	67.9
	Rate	People		2.8	21.1	41.1	0.8	16.9	29.6	69.2	0.5	16.9	50.8	96.3	4.1	15.4	34.6	44.2	54.0	72.4
Kabupaten Mamuju Tengah	Line	People		7,782	11,673	15,564	6,626	10,602	13,253	26,506	6,409	10,793	18,551	73,193	8,245	10,339	14,256	16,709	19,776	29,403
	Rate	HHs	309	0.4	6.4	21.2	0.2	3.8	12.0	53.0	0.2	3.8	29.5	93.9	0.4	3.8	14.6	24.0	34.8	60.8
	Rate	People		0.7	8.7	26.4	0.5	5.3	16.1	59.3	0.5	5.4	35.9	96.1	0.7	5.3	19.4	29.5	41.9	66.7
Kabupaten Mamuju Utara	Line	People		10,857	16,285	21,713	9,245	14,792	18,490	36,979	8,941	15,058	25,881	102,114	11,502	14,424	19,889	23,311	27,590	41,021
	Rate	HHs	475	3.6	10.1	21.8	1.4	7.7	15.8	56.5	1.4	8.1	31.3	95.8	4.1	7.5	17.8	25.8	35.1	62.5
	Rate	People		5.0	14.7	29.0	2.1	11.0	22.0	64.5	2.0	11.5	39.9	97.0	5.6	10.8	24.3	34.0	43.8	70.3
Kabupaten Polewali Mandar	Line	People		12,045	18,067	24,089	10,256	16,410	20,512	41,025	9,919	16,706	28,713	113,286	12,761	16,002	22,065	25,862	30,609	45,509
	Rate	HHs	635	13.7	41.3	62.2	7.5	33.6	50.5	86.3	6.3	34.4	72.4	98.8	16.5	31.6	56.1	65.6	74.9	88.8
	Rate	People		17.4	46.8	67.1	9.8	38.9	56.2	88.6	7.7	39.7	77.1	99.1	20.6	36.7	61.3	70.0	79.1	90.6
All Perkotaan	Line	People		10,826	16,239	21,652	9,218	14,749	18,437	36,874	8,915	15,015	25,808	101,823	11,470	14,383	19,832	23,245	27,512	40,904
	Rate	HHs	581	6.3	27.4	42.8	3.7	22.9	34.8	61.4	2.4	23.4	49.0	93.0	7.8	21.1	39.6	45.8	51.2	63.3
	Rate	People		8.8	32.1	49.3	5.4	27.4	40.7	67.4	3.1	27.7	55.3	94.7	10.2	25.0	46.1	52.1	57.9	68.8
All Perdesaan	Line	People		9,969	14,954	19,939	8,489	13,583	16,978	33,957	8,210	13,827	23,766	93,768	10,562	13,245	18,263	21,406	25,335	37,668
	Rate	HHs	2,330	7.3	26.3	45.6	3.7	20.8	34.8	75.4	3.3	21.3	55.9	98.0	9.5	19.2	38.8	49.0	59.5	79.5
	Rate	People		9.4	31.3	51.6	4.9	25.3	40.5	80.0	4.4	26.0	62.0	98.6	11.9	23.6	44.6	55.0	65.6	83.7
All Kabupaten	Line	People		10,172	15,258	20,344	8,662	13,859	17,323	34,646	8,377	14,108	24,249	95,672	10,777	13,514	18,634	21,841	25,850	38,433
	Rate	HHs	2,911	7.1	26.6	44.9	3.7	21.3	34.8	72.2	3.1	21.8	54.2	96.8	9.1	19.6	39.0	48.3	57.6	75.7
	Rate	People		9.3	31.5	51.0	5.0	25.8	40.5	77.0	4.1	26.4	60.4	97.7	11.5	24.0	45.0	54.3	63.8	80.2
All Sulawesi Barat	Line	People		10,172	15,258	20,344	8,662	13,859	17,323	34,646	8,377	14,108	24,249	95,672	10,777	13,514	18,634	21,841	25,850	38,433
	Rate	HHs	2,911	7.1	26.6	44.9	3.7	21.3	34.8	72.2	3.1	21.8	54.2	96.8	9.1	19.6	39.0	48.3	57.6	75.7
	Rate	People		9.3	31.5	51.0	5.0	25.8	40.5	77.0	4.1	26.4	60.4	97.7	11.5	24.0	45.0	54.3	63.8	80.2

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Sulawesi Selatan): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	Hs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Bantaeng	Line	People		8,557	12,835	17,113	7,286	11,658	14,572	29,145	7,047	11,868	20,398	80,480	9,065	11,368	15,675	18,372	21,745	32,330
	Rate	HHS	520	3.3	12.6	28.5	1.1	9.8	20.6	63.7	0.5	10.2	37.7	95.4	4.2	9.4	23.9	31.2	41.9	67.3
	Rate	People		4.6	14.6	31.0	1.6	11.5	22.8	67.8	0.9	12.1	41.3	96.8	5.5	10.8	26.1	34.2	45.2	72.0
Kabupaten Barru	Line	People		10,123	15,184	20,246	8,620	13,170	17,240	34,479	8,337	14,040	24,132	95,212	10,725	13,449	18,544	21,735	25,725	38,248
	Rate	HHS	518	7.4	23.1	37.0	3.9	23.9	27.6	68.1	3.6	21.5	48.3	95.7	8.8	18.8	31.7	42.4	52.7	73.0
	Rate	People		9.0	28.2	42.8	4.5	25.4	32.8	75.3	4.2	26.0	54.6	97.0	10.8	23.0	36.9	48.4	59.5	80.1
Kabupaten Bone	Line	People		10,161	15,242	20,323	8,653	13,844	17,305	34,611	8,368	14,094	24,224	95,574	10,766	13,500	18,615	21,818	25,823	38,394
	Rate	HHS	720	21.9	44.4	58.7	13.2	38.8	50.7	77.7	11.3	38.9	65.9	98.2	25.4	37.4	53.6	60.9	68.6	81.7
	Rate	People		26.1	50.3	64.6	15.2	44.7	56.7	82.0	12.9	44.9	71.2	98.7	30.1	43.6	59.8	67.0	73.9	85.3
Kabupaten Bulukumba	Line	People		10,217	15,325	20,433	8,700	13,919	17,399	34,799	8,414	14,170	24,355	96,093	10,824	13,574	18,716	21,937	25,963	38,602
	Rate	HHS	600	7.2	22.8	37.9	3.5	19.2	28.9	70.3	2.8	19.3	49.4	97.2	9.4	18.4	33.1	42.9	54.0	76.7
	Rate	People		8.9	27.0	43.1	5.0	23.6	34.0	75.7	3.4	23.6	55.0	98.0	12.1	22.7	38.7	48.5	59.9	81.1
Kabupaten Enrekang	Line	People		10,280	15,420	20,559	8,753	14,005	17,507	35,014	8,466	14,258	24,506	96,687	10,891	13,658	18,832	22,072	26,121	38,841
	Rate	HHS	513	15.2	35.8	49.1	8.4	30.4	42.5	74.6	7.3	31.0	58.0	97.9	17.9	29.4	45.9	52.1	59.9	79.4
	Rate	People		17.1	41.4	56.8	10.3	34.8	49.7	78.9	9.0	35.6	65.1	98.6	20.6	33.8	53.7	59.3	66.6	83.4
Kabupaten Gowa	Line	People		12,017	18,025	24,033	10,232	16,372	20,465	40,929	9,896	16,667	28,646	113,023	12,731	16,667	22,014	25,801	30,538	45,403
	Rate	HHS	679	12.7	27.9	43.7	7.6	24.4	35.1	71.4	7.2	25.2	52.4	97.7	14.1	23.0	38.1	48.9	56.9	76.1
	Rate	People		14.4	30.7	47.6	8.2	26.7	38.1	75.0	7.8	27.5	56.4	98.0	16.1	24.9	41.5	53.0	60.7	79.2
Kabupaten Jeneponto	Line	People		11,715	17,572	23,429	9,975	15,960	19,951	39,901	9,647	16,248	27,927	110,183	11,411	15,564	21,600	25,153	29,770	44,263
	Rate	HHS	600	17.5	40.9	61.4	9.7	37.5	52.3	88.3	9.6	38.3	71.8	99.5	19.2	36.7	57.7	66.8	74.2	92.6
	Rate	People		19.8	44.5	66.1	12.5	41.3	56.4	90.6	12.3	41.7	76.5	99.5	21.9	40.6	62.3	71.8	78.4	94.3
Kabupaten Kepulauan Selayar	Line	People		11,461	17,192	22,922	9,759	15,615	19,519	39,038	9,439	15,897	27,322	107,798	12,143	15,227	20,996	24,609	29,126	43,305
	Rate	HHS	480	7.4	21.3	39.6	4.8	18.2	29.4	68.9	4.0	18.2	52.1	98.6	7.7	16.0	35.0	42.3	56.0	75.3
	Rate	People		9.4	25.3	45.2	6.5	22.0	33.9	74.1	5.1	22.0	57.9	99.3	9.8	19.4	39.5	48.8	61.8	80.1
Kabupaten Luwu	Line	People		10,051	15,077	20,102	8,559	13,694	17,118	34,235	8,277	13,941	23,961	94,537	10,649	13,354	18,413	21,581	25,543	37,977
	Rate	HHS	600	9.7	24.4	36.6	4.6	19.9	28.6	61.9	3.8	20.9	45.2	98.6	11.0	18.6	31.9	39.4	48.4	68.0
	Rate	People		12.4	30.0	42.6	5.9	24.4	34.8	69.2	4.9	25.4	52.3	99.2	14.0	22.7	37.8	46.0	55.8	74.2
Kabupaten Luwu Timur	Line	People		10,372	15,558	20,744	8,832	14,131	17,664	35,328	8,542	14,386	24,726	97,554	10,989	13,780	19,001	22,270	26,358	39,189
	Rate	HHS	557	4.6	20.1	33.2	2.3	15.1	24.7	60.7	1.7	15.9	43.5	95.5	6.0	14.0	28.5	38.5	46.3	66.4
	Rate	People		5.4	23.7	38.7	2.4	17.7	29.1	66.3	1.8	18.6	48.8	97.3	6.9	16.5	33.4	43.7	52.0	71.9
Kabupaten Luwu Utara	Line	People		10,848	16,272	21,696	9,238	14,780	18,475	36,950	8,934	15,047	25,861	102,034	11,493	14,413	19,873	23,293	27,569	40,989
	Rate	HHS	560	5.4	23.3	38.3	3.1	17.7	29.8	69.7	2.7	18.0	49.6	97.6	7.4	15.0	33.8	43.0	53.5	74.8
	Rate	People		6.6	27.8	44.4	3.9	21.8	34.9	75.9	3.5	22.2	56.7	98.4	9.3	19.8	39.5	49.5	60.5	80.2
Kota Makassar	Line	People		12,708	19,062	25,417	10,821	17,314	21,643	43,286	10,466	17,628	30,295	119,529	13,464	16,884	23,281	27,287	32,296	48,017
	Rate	HHS	824	4.4	14.2	21.6	2.7	11.6	17.2	43.8	2.5	11.6	28.7	91.7	5.5	10.8	18.7	24.3	31.9	50.0
	Rate	People		6.2	17.6	25.8	3.9	14.8	20.8	50.6	3.7	14.8	33.3	94.9	7.5	13.8	22.4	29.1	36.8	56.9
Kabupaten Maros	Line	People		12,386	18,579	24,773	10,547	16,876	21,094	42,189	10,200	17,180	29,528	116,500	13,123	16,456	22,691	26,595	31,477	46,800
	Rate	HHS	600	6.3	23.0	37.3	4.7	20.7	30.2	69.9	4.3	20.7	46.9	98.5	7.7	19.1	34.6	41.7	51.3	72.4
	Rate	People		7.7	26.6	41.3	5.6	24.1	33.9	74.6	4.5	24.1	51.4	98.8	9.0	22.2	38.8	46.1	56.0	82.3
Kota Palopo	Line	People		9,620	14,430	19,240	8,191	13,106	16,383	32,766	7,922	13,343	22,933	90,480	10,192	12,781	17,623	20,655	24,447	36,348
	Rate	HHS	477	0.3	4.3	12.8	0.0	2.6	8.5	39.8	0.0	3.1	20.4	90.9	0.5	2.6	10.6	15.5	23.3	43.6
	Rate	People		0.4	6.1	17.2	0.1	4.1	12.0	47.2	0.0	4.7	27.3	94.4	0.6	4.1	14.5	20.3	30.4	51.7
Kabupaten Pangkajene Dan Kepulauan	Line	People		9,870	14,805	19,740	8,405	13,448	16,809	33,619	8,128	13,690	23,530	92,835	10,457	13,114	18,082	21,193	25,083	37,294
	Rate	HHS	600	2.3	11.6	26.0	0.3	9.5	18.4	56.8	0.1	9.6	35.7	97.1	3.4	8.5	22.4	32.2	39.6	63.3
	Rate	People		2.9	13.1	30.1	0.2	10.9	20.9	61.6	0.2	10.6	39.7	97.7	4.0	9.6	26.4	36.4	45.1	68.7
Kota Parepare	Line	People		10,137	15,206	20,274	8,632	13,811	17,264	34,528	8,348	14,060	24,166	95,346	10,740	13,468	18,571	21,766	25,761	38,302
	Rate	HHS	476	5.2	16.8	29.0	2.1	13.1	22.4	56.5	1.1	13.9	37.4	94.2	5.6	12.5	24.3	32.6	40.0	60.8
	Rate	People		7.3	22.1	37.0	3.4	17.7	29.8	64.8	1.8	18.8	45.3	96.0	8.0	16.5	31.9	40.6	48.2	69.4
Kabupaten Pinrang	Line	People		9,230	13,845	18,460	7,860	12,575	15,719	31,438	7,601	12,802	22,003	86,814	9,779	12,263	16,909	19,818	23,456	34,875
	Rate	HHS	600	5.9	17.6	29.4	1.9	13.6	22.8	56.4	1.3	14.2	37.6	93.2	6.9	13.0	25.3	33.2	39.7	63.0
	Rate	People		7.9	23.6	36.6	2.4	18.3	29.9	62.9	1.7	18.9	44.7	98.2	9.5	17.5	32.2	40.1	46.8	69.9
Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang	Line	People		9,841	14,762	19,682	8,380	13,408	16,760	33,520	8,104	13,650	23,460	92,561	10,426	13,075	18,028	21,130	25,089	37,184
	Rate	HHS	595	4.3	13.9	27.1	1.6	10.9	19.2	58.0	1.4	12.1	37.7	96.3	4.5	9.6	22.0	32.3	39.9	65.4
	Rate	People		5.0	15.8	29.7	2.2	12.5	21.5	62.8	2.0	13.9	41.7	97.1	5.2	11.2	24.6	35.6	43.9	69.8
Kabupaten Sijai	Line	People		9,248	13,872	18,497	7,875	12,600	15,750	31,500	7,616	12,827	22,047	86,985	9,798	12,287	16,942	19,857	23,503	34,944
	Rate	HHS	520	8.1	27.2	38.4	3.4	20.6	31.6	69.0	2.7	22.1	51							

Table 1 (Sulawesi Tengah): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Banggai	Line	People	599	12,286	18,429	24,572	10,462	16,739	20,923	41,847	10,118	17,040	29,288	115,556	13,016	16,323	22,507	26,380	31,222	46,421
	Rate	HHs		4.0	17.6	35.9	1.9	11.7	26.8	72.5	1.9	12.8	47.7	98.5	4.9	10.7	30.9	41.7	51.1	78.5
	Rate	People		5.0	21.8	42.2	2.2	15.4	31.9	77.9	2.2	16.6	54.2	98.9	6.4	13.9	37.1	48.1	57.9	84.0
Kabupaten Banggai Kepulauan	Line	People	440	10,438	15,656	20,875	8,888	14,220	17,776	35,551	8,596	14,477	24,882	98,171	11,058	13,867	19,121	22,411	26,255	39,437
	Rate	HHs		6.2	24.5	49.4	2.2	17.0	35.7	80.3	1.3	18.5	59.5	98.7	8.0	15.9	42.6	53.5	63.4	84.8
	Rate	People		9.0	32.1	57.3	3.0	23.0	44.3	84.5	1.9	24.9	66.7	99.2	11.3	21.3	50.7	60.9	70.1	87.8
Kabupaten Banggai Lant	Line	People	199	10,676	16,014	21,352	9,091	14,546	18,182	36,364	8,792	14,808	25,451	100,416	11,311	14,184	19,558	22,924	27,131	40,339
	Rate	HHs		3.7	18.3	36.9	1.1	16.0	24.3	77.3	0.7	16.0	48.2	99.5	8.0	15.4	30.0	41.1	53.1	83.6
	Rate	People		4.6	21.9	43.4	1.1	19.3	29.1	82.6	0.8	19.3	56.0	99.4	10.2	18.8	35.0	48.4	60.3	87.9
Kabupaten Buol	Line	People	436	10,920	16,381	21,841	9,299	14,878	18,598	37,196	8,993	15,147	26,033	102,713	11,570	14,509	20,006	23,448	27,752	41,262
	Rate	HHs		7.1	29.1	47.3	1.5	22.6	37.5	82.2	1.5	23.2	60.1	97.6	9.5	20.4	42.8	53.5	64.9	84.6
	Rate	People		9.4	36.4	56.1	2.3	28.9	46.6	86.5	2.3	29.8	68.2	98.4	12.7	26.8	51.9	62.0	72.0	88.6
Kabupaten Donggala	Line	People	553	10,133	15,199	20,266	8,628	13,806	17,257	34,514	8,345	14,054	24,156	95,307	10,736	13,463	18,563	21,757	25,751	38,287
	Rate	HHs		9.4	28.9	47.6	3.9	22.6	36.2	80.6	3.6	23.8	60.7	100.0	12.1	22.1	41.5	54.2	64.8	87.5
	Rate	People		12.3	34.3	54.8	4.9	27.7	42.5	86.1	4.5	28.7	67.9	100.0	15.0	27.0	48.6	61.4	72.2	91.6
Kabupaten Morowali	Line	People	396	13,226	19,839	26,452	11,262	18,020	22,525	45,409	10,892	18,345	31,530	124,399	14,013	17,572	24,229	28,398	33,611	49,973
	Rate	HHs		1.3	10.1	22.7	0.6	7.1	14.5	56.0	0.4	7.8	31.2	96.4	2.1	6.9	17.1	26.1	33.5	64.2
	Rate	People		1.5	11.3	25.5	0.7	8.2	16.9	62.1	0.5	8.8	35.5	97.8	2.6	8.0	19.5	29.5	38.1	69.9
Kabupaten Morowali Utara	Line	People	355	13,576	20,364	27,152	11,560	18,497	23,121	46,242	11,180	18,830	32,364	127,692	14,383	18,037	24,871	29,150	34,501	51,296
	Rate	HHs		2.9	26.3	44.2	1.5	19.2	34.2	81.0	1.1	21.5	56.5	99.0	5.7	17.3	37.9	49.1	62.0	86.2
	Rate	People		4.0	31.9	51.9	2.3	24.2	41.5	85.7	1.6	26.2	62.8	99.2	7.1	22.0	45.8	56.2	69.7	90.0
Kota Palu	Line	People	520	16,178	24,267	32,356	13,776	22,042	27,552	55,104	13,323	22,439	38,567	152,165	17,140	21,494	29,637	34,737	41,114	61,128
	Rate	HHs		7.2	22.1	35.2	4.3	15.8	26.6	61.7	3.7	16.8	44.4	97.4	7.9	15.0	31.0	37.8	47.3	67.3
	Rate	People		10.2	28.3	44.0	6.6	20.5	34.2	69.8	5.9	21.9	53.0	98.4	11.3	19.8	39.4	46.9	56.1	75.7
Kabupaten Parigi Moutong	Line	People	633	12,771	19,156	25,541	10,874	17,399	21,749	43,498	10,517	17,713	30,444	120,115	13,530	16,967	23,395	27,421	32,454	48,253
	Rate	HHs		13.1	37.2	56.0	5.8	29.2	45.3	86.4	4.8	30.5	67.8	99.9	14.5	27.5	50.6	61.9	71.6	89.7
	Rate	People		17.3	45.8	64.7	7.4	37.4	54.4	90.3	5.8	38.5	75.6	99.9	18.5	35.4	59.4	70.4	78.4	92.4
Kabupaten Poso	Line	People	518	14,789	22,184	29,578	12,593	20,149	25,186	50,373	12,179	20,512	35,256	139,100	15,668	19,649	27,093	31,755	37,583	55,879
	Rate	HHs		6.1	26.1	49.5	2.3	19.1	34.8	82.9	2.0	21.3	61.1	98.2	6.8	17.7	42.0	55.7	64.0	86.6
	Rate	People		7.6	32.5	56.7	2.5	24.0	42.3	87.1	2.1	27.2	67.8	99.2	8.4	22.4	49.5	62.8	70.4	89.9
Kabupaten Sigi	Line	People	560	10,420	15,630	20,840	8,873	14,197	17,746	35,492	8,581	14,453	24,841	98,009	11,040	13,844	19,089	22,374	26,481	39,372
	Rate	HHs		2.6	16.7	36.7	0.5	11.4	25.3	74.6	0.3	12.9	50.5	99.0	3.0	11.4	30.4	43.5	54.6	79.4
	Rate	People		3.8	21.2	44.9	0.7	15.2	30.9	80.6	0.5	17.1	58.7	99.2	4.4	15.2	36.9	51.6	62.4	84.5
Kabupaten Tojo Una-Una	Line	People	440	14,538	21,806	29,075	12,379	19,807	24,758	49,517	11,972	20,164	34,656	136,735	15,402	19,315	26,632	31,215	36,944	54,929
	Rate	HHs		13.4	41.2	59.1	9.4	35.2	49.9	87.7	8.0	35.6	70.7	99.3	15.8	32.9	54.2	62.8	75.0	90.2
	Rate	People		19.6	49.6	68.4	13.6	43.8	58.8	91.5	11.7	44.2	79.0	99.8	22.5	41.4	63.5	71.5	82.2	93.3
Kabupaten Toli-Toli	Line	People	511	9,832	14,748	19,664	8,372	13,395	16,744	33,488	8,097	13,637	23,438	92,474	10,416	13,063	18,011	21,111	24,986	37,149
	Rate	HHs		4.0	16.1	35.0	2.2	13.5	23.1	69.8	1.4	14.0	46.8	96.2	5.2	13.2	27.0	39.7	50.2	73.8
	Rate	People		5.8	20.5	41.5	3.3	17.4	28.3	75.9	2.3	18.0	53.9	97.5	7.2	17.2	32.8	46.0	57.3	79.2
All Perkotaan	Line	People	1,347	13,794	20,690	27,587	11,746	18,793	23,491	46,982	11,359	19,132	32,882	129,736	14,614	18,326	25,269	29,617	35,053	52,118
	Rate	HHs		5.5	19.3	31.5	2.9	14.0	24.0	61.0	2.4	14.8	41.0	96.5	6.4	12.9	27.9	35.7	43.4	66.9
	Rate	People		8.0	25.6	40.7	4.3	19.2	31.8	68.7	3.8	20.0	50.3	97.8	9.0	17.9	36.5	44.7	52.9	74.6
All Perdesaan	Line	People	4,813	12,052	18,078	24,104	10,263	16,420	20,525	41,050	9,925	16,716	28,731	113,356	12,769	16,012	22,079	25,878	30,628	45,537
	Rate	HHs		7.5	27.2	48.0	3.3	20.8	36.0	82.4	2.8	22.1	60.4	99.3	9.2	19.8	41.3	53.6	64.6	86.7
	Rate	People		10.1	33.2	55.1	4.4	26.3	42.8	86.8	3.7	27.8	67.2	99.5	12.1	25.1	48.4	60.7	71.0	90.2
All Kota	Line	People	520	16,178	24,267	32,356	13,776	22,042	27,552	55,104	13,323	22,439	38,567	152,165	17,140	21,494	29,637	34,737	41,114	61,128
	Rate	HHs		7.2	22.1	35.2	4.3	15.8	26.6	61.7	3.7	16.8	44.4	97.4	7.9	15.0	31.0	37.8	47.3	67.3
	Rate	People		10.2	28.3	44.0	6.6	20.5	34.2	69.8	5.9	21.9	53.0	98.4	11.3	19.8	39.4	46.9	56.1	75.7
All Kabupaten	Line	People	5,640	12,004	18,006	24,008	10,222	16,355	20,443	40,887	9,886	16,649	28,616	112,904	12,718	15,948	21,990	25,774	30,506	45,356
	Rate	HHs		6.9	25.3	44.5	3.1	19.3	33.5	78.4	2.6	20.5	56.4	98.7	8.4	18.2	38.5	50.0	60.2	83.1
	Rate	People		9.4	31.5	52.1	4.1	24.9	40.6	83.5	3.4	26.2	63.8	99.1	11.2	23.6	45.9	57.6	67.4	87.3
All Sulawesi Tengah	Line	People	6,160	12,539	18,808	25,077	10,677	17,083	21,354	42,708	10,326	17,391	29,891	117,933	13,284	16,659	22,970	26,922	31,864	47,376
	Rate	HHs		6.9	24.9	43.3	3.2	18.9	32.6	76.3	2.7	20.0	54.9	98.5	8.4	17.8	37.5	48.5	58.6	81.1
	Rate	People		9.5	31.1	51.1	4.4	24.3	39.7	81.7	3.7	25.6	62.5	99.0	11.2	23.1	45.1	56.2	66.0	85.9

Source: 2018 SUSENAS. Poverty rates are percentages. Poverty lines are IDR per-person, per-day in average prices in Indonesia as a whole in March 2018.

Table 1 (Sulawesi Tenggara): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kota Baubau	Line	People		10,241	15,362	20,483	8,721	13,953	17,442	34,883	8,434	14,205	24,415	96,326	10,850	13,607	18,762	21,990	26,026	38,696
	Rate	HHs	438	9.0	25.2	36.0	3.9	20.1	29.8	58.0	3.0	20.1	42.8	93.1	10.3	19.1	33.7	38.9	45.1	61.4
	Rate	People		12.0	31.0	43.1	5.4	25.4	35.8	64.4	4.4	25.4	50.0	94.4	13.4	23.8	40.6	45.9	52.6	67.0
Kabupaten Bombana	Line	People		9,475	14,213	18,950	8,068	12,909	16,137	32,273	7,803	13,142	22,588	89,119	10,039	12,589	17,358	20,345	24,079	35,801
	Rate	HHs	440	5.6	17.3	30.3	2.5	12.8	21.2	59.1	2.1	14.1	42.6	97.6	5.8	12.2	23.8	37.1	43.7	64.5
	Rate	People		7.5	22.9	36.6	3.9	17.2	27.2	67.6	3.3	19.0	51.4	98.5	7.8	16.2	29.5	44.7	52.6	72.1
Kabupaten Buton	Line	People		7,667	11,500	15,334	6,529	10,446	13,057	26,114	6,314	10,634	18,277	72,112	8,123	10,186	14,045	16,462	19,484	28,969
	Rate	HHs	170	9.3	33.0	52.7	3.9	26.7	41.0	77.3	3.9	27.8	61.6	97.4	11.0	24.5	45.7	57.8	64.2	79.7
	Rate	People		11.5	40.1	59.9	4.6	31.3	47.6	83.9	4.6	32.2	67.9	98.4	13.7	29.1	53.8	64.1	71.1	86.3
Kabupaten Buton Selatan	Line	People		7,064	10,596	14,128	6,015	9,624	12,030	24,060	5,817	9,798	16,840	66,440	7,484	9,385	12,941	15,167	17,951	26,690
	Rate	HHs	130	6.7	29.6	44.7	5.5	25.2	37.5	77.5	5.5	25.2	60.9	100.0	11.2	24.8	42.3	51.7	64.9	78.5
	Rate	People		9.7	38.2	57.0	8.6	33.4	46.4	89.1	8.6	33.4	75.2	100.0	14.1	33.0	51.2	62.5	79.7	89.7
Kabupaten Buton Tengah	Line	People		7,604	11,406	15,208	6,475	10,360	12,950	25,900	6,262	10,547	18,127	71,520	8,056	10,103	13,910	16,327	19,324	28,731
	Rate	HHs	180	1.7	24.3	44.5	0.3	19.7	31.5	69.2	0.3	19.8	58.7	83.6	2.6	19.7	42.2	45.5	59.4	69.6
	Rate	People		2.5	26.2	50.7	0.4	23.6	35.5	73.1	0.4	23.9	61.5	84.6	3.6	23.6	48.0	52.0	61.9	73.3
Kabupaten Buton Utara	Line	People		10,075	15,112	20,149	8,579	13,726	17,158	34,315	8,297	13,974	24,017	94,758	10,674	13,385	18,456	21,632	25,603	38,066
	Rate	HHs	399	11.7	31.5	46.7	6.8	24.8	37.9	72.5	6.0	25.2	55.8	99.2	14.0	23.0	41.3	50.8	59.4	75.2
	Rate	People		16.2	37.9	53.8	9.5	31.1	45.0	78.3	8.5	31.4	62.2	99.6	18.9	29.5	48.2	57.4	65.9	80.6
Kota Kendari	Line	People		10,783	16,174	21,566	9,182	14,691	18,364	36,727	8,880	14,956	25,705	101,418	11,424	14,326	19,753	23,152	27,402	40,742
	Rate	HHs	512	0.9	6.1	15.9	0.9	4.5	9.2	38.0	0.9	4.8	21.8	87.8	1.3	4.5	12.1	18.9	23.5	44.2
	Rate	People		1.2	9.2	20.1	1.2	6.9	12.4	46.3	1.2	7.4	28.2	91.4	1.8	6.9	15.2	24.4	29.7	52.2
Kabupaten Kolaka	Line	People		11,487	17,230	22,973	9,781	15,650	19,562	39,125	9,460	15,932	27,383	108,040	12,170	15,261	21,043	24,664	29,191	43,402
	Rate	HHs	520	6.1	19.4	33.9	3.4	16.0	24.1	66.9	3.1	16.4	44.5	97.9	7.0	14.0	27.5	36.8	47.5	73.7
	Rate	People		7.3	23.7	40.1	3.9	19.8	29.1	74.5	3.4	20.2	51.9	98.6	8.5	16.8	32.9	43.2	55.2	80.4
Kabupaten Kolaka Timur	Line	People		11,350	17,024	22,699	9,664	15,463	19,329	38,658	9,347	15,742	27,056	106,749	12,024	15,079	20,792	24,369	28,843	42,883
	Rate	HHs	360	7.6	23.6	32.0	4.8	20.1	26.7	62.6	4.6	20.7	45.8	95.8	8.3	17.6	29.0	36.7	49.3	69.1
	Rate	People		10.4	28.6	37.7	7.1	24.8	32.3	69.9	6.7	25.3	54.6	98.6	11.2	21.5	34.8	40.1	58.1	76.6
Kabupaten Kolaka Utara	Line	People		14,926	22,389	29,852	12,710	20,336	25,419	50,839	12,292	20,702	35,582	140,386	15,813	19,830	27,343	32,048	37,931	56,396
	Rate	HHs	434	16.3	41.2	58.5	9.7	35.4	48.5	89.0	8.6	35.4	69.5	98.8	17.4	33.3	54.1	63.4	73.2	91.1
	Rate	People		19.4	47.0	64.1	12.1	40.9	53.8	92.4	10.9	40.9	74.2	99.5	20.5	38.9	60.0	68.2	77.8	93.9
Kabupaten Konawe	Line	People		9,308	13,962	18,615	7,926	12,681	15,851	31,703	7,665	12,910	22,189	87,544	9,861	12,366	17,051	19,985	23,654	35,168
	Rate	HHs	480	2.0	13.5	25.2	0.5	11.0	17.9	53.0	0.5	11.5	32.4	95.3	3.2	9.5	21.1	26.4	35.3	59.3
	Rate	People		2.8	17.6	30.9	1.0	14.6	23.3	58.7	1.0	15.1	38.0	96.9	4.6	12.9	26.9	32.0	40.8	64.9
Kabupaten Konawe Kepulauan	Line	People		9,667	14,500	19,334	8,232	13,171	16,463	32,926	7,961	13,408	23,045	90,923	10,242	12,843	17,709	20,756	24,567	36,526
	Rate	HHs	200	10.5	21.0	32.2	5.5	15.1	25.3	60.0	5.5	18.2	45.9	98.8	10.7	14.8	28.5	37.7	47.8	66.6
	Rate	People		13.8	26.1	38.3	7.8	19.3	30.4	63.8	7.8	23.0	51.0	99.3	14.1	19.0	33.6	44.4	52.3	72.2
Kabupaten Konawe Selatan	Line	People		7,232	10,848	14,464	6,158	9,853	12,317	24,634	5,956	10,031	17,241	68,023	7,662	9,609	13,249	15,529	18,379	27,326
	Rate	HHs	519	2.1	12.5	22.7	0.6	10.6	16.4	51.2	0.6	10.6	29.0	94.2	3.2	10.6	18.6	26.9	33.0	57.9
	Rate	People		2.9	15.5	25.9	1.0	13.4	19.6	58.0	1.0	13.4	33.9	96.2	4.2	13.4	22.1	31.3	38.4	65.8
Kabupaten Konawe Utara	Line	People		8,576	12,864	17,153	7,303	11,685	14,606	29,212	7,063	11,895	20,445	80,665	9,086	11,394	15,711	18,415	21,795	32,405
	Rate	HHs	400	4.1	15.3	25.1	1.1	12.3	18.2	51.3	0.7	12.3	35.0	95.5	4.7	11.5	21.1	28.1	37.3	55.7
	Rate	People		5.8	19.0	30.3	1.9	15.5	22.2	57.6	1.2	15.5	40.3	96.6	6.6	14.5	26.3	33.1	42.1	62.2
Kabupaten Muna	Line	People		10,354	15,531	20,708	8,817	14,106	17,633	35,266	8,527	14,361	24,682	97,384	10,969	13,756	18,968	22,231	26,312	39,121
	Rate	HHs	390	19.8	40.2	49.9	10.6	34.3	44.7	75.8	9.6	35.0	61.3	98.6	21.3	33.9	48.4	55.5	64.8	83.4
	Rate	People		24.7	47.4	56.4	13.2	40.8	51.4	79.9	12.3	41.6	67.0	99.3	26.4	40.4	54.7	62.2	69.7	86.9
Kabupaten Muna Barat	Line	People		10,356	15,535	20,713	8,819	14,110	17,638	35,275	8,529	14,364	24,689	97,409	10,972	13,760	18,972	22,237	26,319	39,131
	Rate	HHs	130	29.7	55.8	72.7	14.7	49.6	64.9	84.0	13.7	50.9	78.8	98.9	35.0	48.9	71.2	75.6	79.7	85.0
	Rate	People		35.4	59.6	76.3	19.4	53.8	68.3	86.0	18.8	54.3	81.7	99.2	40.2	53.1	74.0	78.9	82.0	86.5
Kabupaten Wakatobi	Line	People		8,427	12,640	16,853	7,175	11,481	14,351	28,702	6,940	11,688	20,088	79,257	8,928	11,196	15,437	18,093	21,414	31,839
	Rate	HHs	439	5.2	17.7	29.8	2.0	13.8	20.9	56.1	1.3	15.0	38.1	96.9	6.7	12.8	25.2	32.7	40.9	63.6
	Rate	People		7.3	24.1	38.4	2.8	19.3	28.1	65.7	1.8	20.9	46.6	97.8	9.2	17.6	32.8	41.6	50.3	72.7
All Perkotaan	Line	People		10,188	15,282	20,376	8,675	13,880	17,350	34,701	8,390	14,131	24,287	95,823	10,794	13,536	18,664	21,875	25,890	38,494
	Rate	HHs	1,559	2.9	14.6	24.9	1.3	11.0	17.9	49.5	1.1	11.3	34.0	90.9	3.6	10.9	21.6	28.8	35.5	54.8
	Rate	People		3.9	18.5	30.2	1.8	14.4	22.4	57.1	1.6	14.8	40.6	93.6	4.7	14.1	26.5	34.9	41.9	62.5
All Perdesaan	Line	People		9,675	14,513	19,351	8,239	13,182	16,478	32,955	7,968	13,420	23,065	91,003	10,251	12,855	17,725	20,775	24,588	36,558
	Rate	HHs	4,582	9.9	26.1	39.4	5.3	22.1	31.5	67.3	4.8	22.8	48.8	97.4	11.4	20.7	35.1	43.2	52.2	72.7
	Rate	People		12.7	31.7	46.0	7.1	27.3	37.4	73.8	6.6	27.9	55.8	98.3	14.5	25.5	41.3	49.9	59.4	78.6
All Kota	Line	People		10,618	15,926	21,235	9,041	14,466	18,082	36,165	8,744	14,727	25,311	99,865	11,249	14,107	19,451	22,798	26,983	40,118
	Rate	HHs	950	3.2	11.7	21.8	1.8	9.1	15.3	43.9	1.5	9.3	27.9	89.4	3.9	8.8	18.4	24.7	29.8	49.3
	Rate	People		4.5	15.8	27.1	2.5	12.6	19.5	51.8	2.2	12.9	34.8	92.3	5.4	12.1	23.0	31.0	36.7	56.7
All Kabupaten	Line	People		9,678	14,516	19,355	8,241	13,185	16,482	32,963	7,970	13,423	23,071	91,024	10,253	12,858	17,729	20,779	24,594	36,566
	Rate	HHs	5,191	8.3	24.3	37.0	4.3	20.2	29.2	64.8	3.9	20.8	47.1	96.4	9.6	19.1	32.9	41.1	50.0	70.2
	Rate	People		10.6	29.5	43.3	5.7	24.9	34.8	71.5	5.3	25.5	53.9	97.6	12.2	23.5	38.9	47.		

Table 1 (Sulawesi Utara): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kota Bitung	Line	People	513	12,118	18,176	24,235	10,318	16,509	20,637	41,273	9,979	16,807	28,887	113,972	12,838	16,099	22,199	26,018	30,794	45,785
Rate	HHS	5.1		16.4	28.8	2.6	13.9	21.2	62.7	2.4	15.3	40.0	97.9	5.9	13.1	25.1	33.7	43.4	67.7	
Rate	People	6.7		21.1	34.8	4.0	18.3	26.7	69.4	3.7	19.8	47.2	98.6	7.8	17.4	31.0	40.8	50.5	74.2	
Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow	Line	People	552	9,726	14,589	19,452	8,282	13,251	16,564	33,128	8,010	13,490	23,186	91,479	10,304	12,922	17,818	20,883	24,717	36,749
Rate	HHS	3.2		16.1	28.6	1.1	12.2	21.8	60.2	0.9	12.9	39.5	97.9	4.3	11.3	24.6	33.8	42.9	66.9	
Rate	People	4.2		20.2	34.8	1.2	15.5	26.8	67.5	1.0	16.5	46.8	98.6	5.6	14.6	30.3	40.9	50.4	73.6	
Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow Selatan	Line	People	397	9,727	14,591	19,455	8,283	13,253	16,566	33,132	8,011	13,492	23,189	91,492	10,306	12,924	17,820	20,886	24,720	36,754
Rate	HHS	5.9		28.0	47.5	1.6	21.3	36.4	77.2	0.9	22.3	60.1	97.0	8.7	19.9	42.4	55.5	64.7	80.0	
Rate	People	7.8		33.2	54.3	2.1	24.8	42.7	82.9	1.2	26.4	66.9	98.0	11.2	23.5	49.1	61.9	70.9	85.4	
Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow Timur	Line	People	397	9,959	14,939	19,918	8,480	13,569	16,961	33,922	8,202	13,813	23,742	93,672	10,551	13,232	18,245	21,384	25,309	37,630
Rate	HHS	2.8		15.7	26.5	1.2	11.6	19.7	57.3	1.2	12.2	36.6	97.9	3.2	10.9	23.6	30.6	40.0	62.6	
Rate	People	3.5		19.4	32.2	1.4	15.2	24.1	64.1	1.4	16.0	42.7	99.0	4.0	14.3	28.3	36.5	46.2	68.7	
Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow Utara	Line	People	431	7,846	11,769	15,692	6,681	10,690	13,362	26,724	6,461	10,882	18,704	73,795	8,312	10,424	14,373	16,846	19,939	29,645
Rate	HHS	1.3		13.8	30.0	0.0	9.4	21.5	62.8	0.0	10.6	43.5	94.3	1.9	7.3	25.5	35.8	46.5	68.1	
Rate	People	1.7		17.4	34.8	0.0	11.9	25.4	67.8	0.0	13.4	49.3	96.1	2.5	9.7	30.3	41.6	52.6	73.0	
Kabupaten Kepulauan Sangihe	Line	People	517	8,235	12,352	16,470	7,012	11,219	14,024	28,049	6,782	11,422	19,631	77,453	8,724	10,941	15,086	17,681	20,927	31,114
Rate	HHS	0.6		7.6	15.7	0.0	6.8	10.2	46.5	0.0	6.8	24.3	90.3	0.9	6.7	13.1	19.1	29.8	52.3	
Rate	People	1.2		12.0	21.7	0.0	11.1	15.3	56.8	0.0	11.1	31.8	94.2	1.6	10.8	18.5	25.5	38.5	62.3	
Kabupaten Kepulauan Talaud	Line	People	433	8,740	13,110	17,480	7,442	11,908	14,884	29,769	7,198	12,122	20,835	82,204	9,260	11,612	16,011	18,766	22,211	33,023
Rate	HHS	2.5		15.0	28.2	0.6	11.3	20.7	59.7	0.6	11.9	41.1	98.0	4.0	10.3	22.9	33.4	45.3	66.4	
Rate	People	3.6		20.6	34.9	0.9	15.4	26.6	65.1	0.9	16.4	47.0	98.3	5.9	14.4	29.2	40.0	51.2	71.8	
Kota Kotamobagu	Line	People	468	9,822	14,732	19,643	8,363	13,381	16,727	33,453	8,088	13,623	23,414	92,379	10,406	13,049	17,993	21,089	24,960	37,110
Rate	HHS	4.4		16.0	27.1	1.9	11.7	21.0	52.0	1.3	12.7	36.4	92.5	5.6	11.5	24.1	30.6	39.3	58.5	
Rate	People	6.6		21.2	33.4	3.3	15.4	26.7	58.9	2.4	16.8	42.3	95.5	8.2	15.2	30.3	37.0	45.0	65.7	
Kota Manado	Line	People	592	11,994	17,991	23,988	10,213	16,341	20,426	40,853	9,878	16,636	28,593	112,812	12,707	15,935	21,972	25,753	30,481	45,319
Rate	HHS	2.6		11.7	17.4	1.0	8.2	13.9	40.7	0.7	8.8	25.2	88.7	3.5	7.5	15.0	20.0	27.1	44.7	
Rate	People	3.8		16.0	23.7	1.6	11.7	19.6	49.3	1.3	12.6	32.8	92.6	5.6	10.5	20.8	27.2	34.6	53.2	
Kabupaten Minahasa	Line	People	597	8,594	12,890	17,187	7,318	11,708	14,635	29,271	7,077	11,919	20,486	80,828	9,105	11,417	15,743	18,452	21,839	32,470
Rate	HHS	0.7		5.8	14.0	0.0	4.2	9.4	37.8	0.0	4.6	21.2	87.6	1.2	3.8	12.2	18.1	24.0	42.5	
Rate	People	1.4		9.5	20.1	0.0	7.1	14.1	46.0	0.0	7.6	28.7	90.7	2.0	6.4	17.9	24.3	31.6	51.1	
Kabupaten Minahasa Selatan	Line	People	520	9,986	14,979	19,972	8,503	13,605	17,006	34,013	8,224	13,850	23,805	93,923	10,580	13,267	18,294	21,441	25,377	37,731
Rate	HHS	6.0		24.2	38.6	3.2	19.0	29.8	64.7	2.9	19.7	50.4	96.1	7.7	17.3	34.5	42.4	54.1	68.9	
Rate	People	7.5		29.8	47.6	4.1	23.0	36.9	72.9	3.8	24.0	59.4	96.6	9.3	20.9	42.0	51.5	63.8	76.0	
Kabupaten Minahasa Tenggara	Line	People	438	10,058	15,086	20,115	8,564	13,703	17,129	34,257	8,283	13,950	23,976	94,598	10,656	13,363	18,425	21,595	25,559	38,002
Rate	HHS	4.3		17.5	31.7	0.8	13.8	22.5	55.9	0.8	14.2	37.7	98.3	5.2	12.6	26.9	33.8	41.4	65.3	
Rate	People	5.0		19.8	38.0	0.9	15.4	25.9	62.5	0.9	15.8	44.5	98.9	6.2	13.9	32.3	40.1	47.9	71.6	
Kabupaten Minahasa Utara	Line	People	508	9,888	14,832	19,776	8,420	13,472	16,840	33,680	8,143	13,715	23,572	93,004	10,476	13,137	18,114	21,231	25,129	37,361
Rate	HHS	4.2		12.6	24.9	2.6	11.3	17.6	52.3	3.2	14.2	37.7	97.0	5.7	10.5	20.9	27.5	35.2	59.7	
Rate	People	5.4		16.2	30.4	3.4	14.1	21.9	58.2	2.4	14.2	37.7	97.0	7.6	13.1	25.7	33.0	40.2	66.2	
Kabupaten Siau Tagulandang Biaro	Line	People	436	9,338	14,007	18,675	7,951	12,722	15,903	31,805	7,690	12,951	22,260	87,826	9,893	12,406	17,106	20,050	23,730	35,282
Rate	HHS	0.9		8.4	22.5	0.3	5.2	14.0	53.7	0.3	5.5	30.8	95.1	1.1	5.2	17.2	24.3	33.2	62.4	
Rate	People	1.4		11.6	28.6	0.4	7.8	18.2	60.7	0.4	8.3	37.9	97.5	1.7	7.8	22.6	30.7	40.3	69.5	
Kota Tomohon	Line	People	477	11,962	17,944	23,925	10,186	16,298	20,373	40,745	9,851	16,592	28,517	112,513	12,674	15,893	21,914	25,685	30,400	45,199
Rate	HHS	1.6		8.0	18.3	0.4	6.1	11.9	46.0	0.4	6.1	26.4	93.7	1.9	5.6	15.1	21.3	29.5	50.3	
Rate	People	2.4		10.7	23.5	0.6	7.9	15.8	52.9	0.6	7.9	32.4	95.0	2.8	7.3	19.9	26.8	36.2	57.0	
All Perkotaan	Line	People	2,929	10,783	16,175	21,567	9,182	14,692	18,365	36,730	8,881	14,957	25,707	101,425	11,425	14,327	19,755	23,154	27,404	40,745
Rate	HHS	2.9		11.6	20.2	1.1	8.9	15.2	44.6	0.9	9.3	28.2	89.5	3.7	8.3	17.5	23.1	30.9	49.8	
Rate	People	4.2		15.9	26.7	1.8	12.5	20.6	53.2	1.5	13.1	35.6	93.0	5.5	11.7	23.4	30.0	38.3	58.6	
All Perdesaan	Line	People	4,347	9,503	14,255	19,006	8,092	12,948	16,184	32,369	7,826	13,181	22,655	89,383	10,068	12,626	17,409	20,405	24,150	35,907
Rate	HHS	3.1		15.4	28.4	1.4	11.8	20.5	58.8	1.2	12.6	38.7	97.2	4.2	10.8	24.3	33.0	42.4	64.6	
Rate	People	4.1		19.7	34.9	1.7	15.1	25.8	65.8	1.5	16.1	46.0	98.0	5.5	14.0	30.3	40.0	49.8	71.1	
All Kota	Line	People	2,050	11,709	17,564	23,419	9,971	15,953	19,942	39,883	9,643	16,241	27,914	110,133	12,406	15,557	21,451	25,142	29,757	44,243
Rate	HHS	3.3		12.9	21.5	1.4	9.7	16.3	48.0	1.1	10.5	30.3	92.0	4.1	9.1	18.6	24.7	32.8	52.6	
Rate	People	4.7		17.4	27.8	2.3	13.4	21.9	56.0	1.9	14.4	37.6	94.8	6.2	12.5	24.6	31.9	40.2	60.6	
All Kabupaten	Line	People	5,226	9,290	13,935	18,580	7,910	12,657	15,821	31,642	7,650	12,885	22,146	87,376	9,842	12,342	17,018	19,947	23,608	35,101
Rate	HHS	2.9		13.8	25.8	1.1	10.7	18.7	53.7	1.0	11.2	35.1	94.0	3.8	9.8	22.2	29.8	38.6	59.6	
Rate	People	3.8		18.0	32.4	1.4	14.0	23.9	61.4	1.3	14.7	42.5	95.9	5.2	13.0	28.1	36.7	46.2	67.1	
All Sulawesi Utara	Line	People	7,276	10,146	15,219	20,292	8,639	13,823	17											

Table 1 (Sumatera Barat): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, <i>kota/kabupaten</i> , or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Agam	Line	People		11,223	16,835	22,446	9,557	15,291	19,114	38,227	9,243	15,567	26,755	105,561	11,891	14,911	20,560	24,098	28,522	42,406
	Rate	HHs	667	1.4	9.9	25.8	0.7	6.8	14.5	66.2	0.6	7.7	42.6	98.2	2.0	6.2	20.5	32.5	47.0	73.1
	Rate	People		1.9	12.9	31.2	1.0	8.6	18.3	72.6	0.9	9.7	50.9	99.0	2.6	8.0	25.6	38.7	54.9	78.6
Kota Bukittinggi	Line	People		15,103	22,654	30,205	12,860	20,576	25,720	51,441	12,437	20,947	36,003	142,049	16,001	20,065	27,667	32,428	38,380	57,064
	Rate	HHs	451	2.1	11.3	26.2	0.3	5.8	17.8	57.4	0.3	6.3	35.0	94.8	3.6	5.4	21.7	29.5	39.6	63.4
	Rate	People		3.4	17.0	35.7	0.4	9.2	26.1	67.5	0.4	9.9	45.4	96.6	6.4	8.6	30.5	38.6	49.9	72.8
Kabupaten Dharmasraya	Line	People		13,614	20,421	27,228	11,593	18,548	23,185	46,371	11,212	18,883	32,455	128,049	14,424	18,088	24,940	29,232	34,598	51,440
	Rate	HHs	551	1.2	9.6	25.7	0.4	6.3	16.5	72.3	0.3	6.4	41.0	99.1	1.5	5.7	21.4	30.9	48.8	78.7
	Rate	People		1.2	12.5	31.3	0.4	8.5	21.2	77.2	0.3	8.7	47.7	99.4	1.4	7.9	26.8	36.2	54.8	83.0
Kabupaten Kepulauan Mentawai	Line	People		9,675	14,513	19,350	8,239	13,182	16,477	32,954	7,968	13,419	23,065	91,000	10,250	12,854	17,724	20,774	24,587	36,557
	Rate	HHs	436	0.6	9.8	25.0	0.0	4.3	15.9	63.6	0.0	4.6	37.2	98.4	1.1	3.5	19.7	28.6	41.9	70.7
	Rate	People		1.1	12.5	29.2	0.0	5.7	19.3	68.6	0.0	6.0	42.6	98.7	1.9	4.9	23.4	32.7	48.1	75.4
Kabupaten Lima Puluh Kota	Line	People		12,779	19,168	25,558	10,881	17,410	21,763	43,526	10,524	17,724	30,464	120,192	13,539	16,978	23,410	27,438	32,475	48,284
	Rate	HHs	593	2.1	16.9	37.6	0.8	10.8	26.0	81.1	0.8	11.4	54.1	98.4	2.7	9.0	32.3	45.1	59.7	86.6
	Rate	People		2.5	19.4	41.4	1.0	12.6	28.9	84.0	1.0	13.2	59.2	99.1	3.4	10.4	35.9	49.7	64.3	89.0
Kota Padang	Line	People		16,670	25,005	33,340	14,195	22,712	28,390	56,779	13,728	23,121	39,739	156,790	17,661	22,148	30,538	35,793	42,363	62,986
	Rate	HHs	746	2.0	12.8	25.6	0.5	8.7	18.3	58.3	0.5	10.2	37.1	96.3	2.3	7.4	20.4	29.7	40.4	66.1
	Rate	People		2.6	16.7	33.1	0.6	11.6	23.7	67.4	0.6	13.4	46.5	97.3	3.0	9.6	26.4	37.8	50.7	74.0
Kota Padang Panjang	Line	People		14,402	21,604	28,805	12,264	19,622	24,528	49,056	11,861	19,976	34,334	135,464	15,259	19,135	26,384	30,924	36,601	54,418
	Rate	HHs	355	1.5	8.1	24.2	0.4	5.6	16.0	61.6	0.0	6.4	40.4	98.8	2.3	5.3	19.7	31.9	43.6	66.8
	Rate	People		2.1	10.4	28.8	0.5	7.4	20.0	70.0	0.0	8.3	48.0	98.6	2.8	6.9	23.9	38.1	51.8	74.2
Kabupaten Padang Pariaman	Line	People		13,248	19,872	26,496	11,281	18,050	22,562	45,124	10,910	18,375	31,582	124,605	14,036	17,601	24,270	28,445	33,667	50,056
	Rate	HHs	591	2.5	17.2	39.2	0.8	11.3	27.4	74.1	0.5	12.5	51.8	98.4	3.7	9.4	32.3	43.5	57.0	79.8
	Rate	People		3.3	20.8	46.1	0.7	13.9	33.5	79.3	0.6	15.3	58.5	98.9	4.7	11.2	38.9	50.8	63.5	84.1
Kota Pariaman	Line	People		14,182	21,273	28,364	12,076	19,322	24,153	48,305	11,679	19,670	33,808	133,390	15,025	18,842	25,981	30,451	36,041	53,585
	Rate	HHs	439	0.7	13.6	29.7	0.3	8.7	19.9	64.7	0.3	9.9	42.0	97.3	2.1	8.4	23.4	34.8	47.2	72.0
	Rate	People		1.2	17.1	35.7	0.5	11.1	25.3	72.3	0.5	13.2	48.7	98.3	2.8	10.7	29.4	41.2	54.4	77.8
Kabupaten Pasaman	Line	People		11,007	16,511	22,014	9,373	14,997	18,746	37,491	9,065	15,267	26,240	103,529	11,662	14,624	20,164	23,634	27,972	41,589
	Rate	HHs	554	1.8	15.4	40.8	0.5	9.6	22.8	82.2	0.5	9.8	57.4	99.5	1.9	9.0	29.1	47.5	63.7	85.5
	Rate	People		2.1	19.7	47.1	0.7	12.1	28.1	86.2	0.7	12.6	63.8	99.7	2.2	11.3	34.8	54.6	69.3	88.2
Kabupaten Pasaman Barat	Line	People		13,245	19,868	26,491	11,279	18,046	22,557	45,115	10,908	18,371	31,575	124,580	14,033	17,598	24,265	28,440	33,660	50,046
	Rate	HHs	588	5.5	21.6	43.4	2.8	14.7	32.2	79.7	2.6	15.6	56.5	99.1	6.6	13.7	37.0	47.7	61.0	85.3
	Rate	People		6.5	26.2	48.8	3.5	17.9	37.9	84.4	3.2	19.0	62.2	99.3	7.9	16.6	42.6	53.7	66.7	89.5
Kota Payakumbuh	Line	People		15,197	22,706	30,394	12,941	20,705	25,881	51,763	12,515	21,078	36,228	142,937	16,101	20,191	27,840	32,630	38,620	57,421
	Rate	HHs	462	2.1	12.0	33.6	0.3	7.8	19.8	68.6	0.3	9.0	45.4	98.3	2.2	6.8	26.1	37.0	47.9	73.2
	Rate	People		2.6	15.5	39.0	0.3	10.0	25.0	74.2	0.3	11.7	51.7	99.2	2.7	8.7	31.7	42.7	54.3	79.3
Kabupaten Pesisir Selatan	Line	People		13,476	20,213	26,951	11,475	18,360	22,950	45,899	11,098	18,691	32,125	126,746	14,277	17,904	24,686	28,934	34,245	50,916
	Rate	HHs	635	1.3	16.0	40.7	0.1	10.7	27.4	82.5	0.1	11.3	55.4	99.0	2.2	8.7	31.9	46.2	60.5	88.2
	Rate	People		1.6	18.7	45.9	0.1	12.9	30.9	89.6	0.1	13.6	61.8	99.3	2.8	10.9	36.3	51.8	66.4	91.3
Kota Sawah Lunto	Line	People		11,660	17,490	23,320	9,929	15,886	19,858	39,716	9,603	16,173	27,797	109,671	12,354	15,492	21,361	25,036	29,632	44,057
	Rate	HHs	396	0.3	6.5	22.2	0.3	4.4	12.7	59.0	0.3	4.4	34.4	97.9	0.3	3.6	15.7	27.7	39.7	68.8
	Rate	People		0.5	8.8	26.9	0.5	5.9	16.7	64.5	0.5	5.9	40.1	98.6	0.5	4.7	19.6	32.7	45.6	74.0
Kabupaten Sijunjung	Line	People		12,462	18,693	24,924	10,612	16,978	21,223	42,446	10,263	17,285	29,708	117,211	13,203	16,557	22,829	26,757	31,669	47,086
	Rate	HHs	513	3.9	15.5	37.0	1.2	11.0	23.2	73.5	0.9	12.2	47.2	99.0	5.6	10.3	29.9	40.7	52.3	79.4
	Rate	People		3.5	17.3	39.6	0.9	12.9	25.2	77.4	0.7	14.3	51.1	99.4	6.0	11.9	32.0	43.5	56.1	83.4
Kabupaten Solok	Line	People		13,432	20,149	26,865	11,438	18,301	22,876	45,752	11,062	18,631	32,022	126,340	14,231	17,846	24,607	28,842	34,136	50,753
	Rate	HHs	596	5.7	23.4	41.9	1.5	16.7	30.3	77.6	1.1	17.7	54.6	98.5	7.3	15.5	34.9	46.7	59.5	82.4
	Rate	People		6.3	26.3	46.3	1.5	19.0	33.5	81.2	1.3	20.0	58.6	98.7	8.2	17.7	38.5	51.2	64.2	85.8
Kota Solok	Line	People		13,633	20,450	27,266	11,609	18,574	23,218	46,436	11,227	18,909	32,500	128,227	14,444	18,113	24,975	29,272	34,646	51,511
	Rate	HHs	396	1.1	7.2	23.0	0.2	5.8	12.5	63.1	0.2	6.1	33.0	97.1	1.3	4.4	18.2	27.5	38.9	69.9
	Rate	People		1.5	8.6	27.9	0.2	7.2	14.6	68.4	0.2	7.4	38.9	98.0	1.8	5.5	22.0	33.1	45.1	75.6
Kabupaten Solok Selatan	Line	People		11,983	17,975	23,967	10,204	16,327	20,408	40,817	9,869	16,621	28,568	112,712	12,696	15,921	21,953	25,731	30,454	45,279
	Rate	HHs	468	1.1	13.1	31.9	0.4	8.6	20.0	68.5	0.4	8.6	43.7	97.1	3.0	7.7	25.8	36.8	49.8	74.4
	Rate	People		1.4	14.8	36.6	0.6	10.8	22.0	73.6	0.6	10.8	50.0	98.4	3.5	9.6	29.0	41.6	56.7	79.2
Kabupaten Tanah Datar	Line	People		12,159	18,238	24,318	10,354	16,566	20,707	41,414	10,013	16,864	28,986	114,362	12,882	16,154	22,274	26,107	30,899	45,941
	Rate	HHs	595	1.9	10.9	32.7	0.2	7.2	20.7	73.3	0.1	7.7	47.2	99.0	2.8	6.3	27.6	39.4	52.5	77.4
	Rate	People		2.2	12.6	38.9	0.3	8.1	24.3	78.5	0.1	8.7	53.6	99.1	3.4	7.1	33.6	45.5	59.8	81.9
All Perkotaan	Line	People		14,485	21,727	28,969	12,334	19,735	24,668	49,336	11,929	20,090	34,530	136,237	15,346	19,244	26,535	31,101	36,810	54,729
	Rate	HHs	4,046	1.8	11.5	27.5	0.4	7.4	18.3	62.7	0.4	8.5	39.6	97.0	2.4	6.3	22.4	31.7	44.1	68.8
	Rate	People		2.4	15.1	34.2	0.5	9.8	23.5	70.4	0.4	11.1	47.9	97.9	3.2	8.4	28.4	38.9	52.9	75.9
All Perdesaan	Line	People		12,657	18,985	25,314	10,778	17,244	21,555	43,111	10,423	17,555	30,173	119,046	13,410	16,816	23,187	27,177	32,165	47,823
	Rate	HHs	5,986	2.8	16.9	38.0	1.0	11.5	25.4	78.0	0.9	12.2	52.7	99.0	3.8	10.3	30.8	44.0	57.7	83.8
	Rate	People		3.3	19.9	43.2	1.2	13.8	29.3	82.0</										

Table 1 (Sumatera Selatan): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates																
				National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
				100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Kabupaten Banyuasin	Line	People		12,540	18,811	25,081	10,678	17,086	21,357	42,714	10,327	17,394	29,895	117,950	13,286	16,661	22,973	26,926	31,869	47,383
	Rate	HHs	718	14.7	32.2	47.9	10.6	27.8	39.3	80.4	10.2	29.2	57.6	99.5	18.1	26.8	43.0	53.1	61.6	84.7
	Rate	People		16.5	36.4	52.4	12.5	30.8	43.8	83.5	12.2	32.9	62.4	99.3	20.5	30.0	47.4	58.1	66.4	87.2
Kabupaten Empat Lawang	Line	People		10,078	15,117	20,156	8,582	13,731	17,164	34,327	8,300	13,979	24,026	94,792	10,678	13,390	18,463	21,640	25,612	38,080
	Rate	HHs	472	4.8	23.9	48.9	2.2	16.6	33.5	77.0	1.9	18.1	61.5	98.8	7.4	15.1	41.9	54.0	65.1	80.6
	Rate	People		6.6	30.2	55.8	3.2	22.0	41.2	81.8	2.9	23.5	67.6	98.9	10.2	20.2	49.3	60.6	70.8	84.5
Kabupaten Lahat	Line	People		13,797	20,695	27,594	11,748	18,798	23,497	46,994	11,362	19,136	32,891	129,769	14,617	18,331	25,275	29,624	35,062	52,131
	Rate	HHs	640	13.9	40.7	57.3	8.4	34.9	49.7	87.8	7.0	35.9	70.0	99.6	17.1	33.0	53.7	62.2	72.3	91.0
	Rate	People		17.4	47.3	63.9	10.5	41.1	56.9	90.5	8.6	42.2	75.4	99.6	21.1	39.2	60.7	68.5	77.3	93.2
Kota Lubuklinggau	Line	People		15,482	23,222	30,963	13,183	21,093	26,366	52,732	12,750	21,473	36,907	145,613	16,402	20,569	28,361	33,241	39,343	58,496
	Rate	HHs	519	6.9	31.9	49.6	4.2	27.9	39.7	80.2	3.0	28.9	61.1	99.3	10.4	25.9	44.2	54.0	65.3	83.5
	Rate	People		8.0	37.0	55.8	5.2	32.9	45.7	85.1	3.7	34.0	67.6	99.6	12.6	30.8	50.5	60.2	71.5	87.5
Kabupaten Muara Enim	Line	People		11,606	17,409	23,212	9,883	15,812	19,765	39,531	9,558	16,097	27,667	109,160	12,296	15,420	21,261	24,920	29,494	43,852
	Rate	HHs	720	12.2	30.3	46.4	5.7	24.2	37.8	75.7	4.4	25.3	55.7	98.6	14.6	22.5	41.8	49.9	59.1	81.1
	Rate	People		15.7	36.1	53.1	7.3	29.4	44.2	80.2	5.8	30.5	62.2	99.3	18.9	27.6	48.3	56.9	65.3	85.5
Kabupaten Musi Banyuasin	Line	People		15,348	23,021	30,695	13,069	20,910	26,138	52,275	12,639	21,287	36,587	144,353	16,260	20,391	28,116	32,954	39,003	57,989
	Rate	HHs	634	11.9	37.1	53.4	6.4	29.2	43.0	86.5	6.4	31.7	65.2	99.5	15.5	28.6	48.3	57.7	68.9	89.6
	Rate	People		16.4	43.0	60.1	9.3	35.5	49.3	89.6	9.2	37.8	71.6	99.6	20.7	34.7	54.6	64.0	74.6	92.0
Kabupaten Musi Rawas	Line	People		14,058	21,087	28,116	11,971	19,153	23,941	47,883	11,577	19,498	33,513	132,223	14,894	18,677	25,753	30,185	35,725	53,117
	Rate	HHs	519	9.2	45.7	67.5	5.2	36.3	56.9	93.9	3.9	38.9	76.6	99.8	11.9	34.0	62.0	71.9	80.1	95.5
	Rate	People		11.0	51.9	72.6	6.0	42.1	62.6	95.2	4.5	45.0	81.3	99.8	14.5	40.1	67.6	76.6	84.1	96.2
Kabupaten Musi Rawas Utara	Line	People		15,020	22,529	30,039	12,789	20,463	25,579	51,158	12,369	20,832	35,805	141,268	15,913	19,955	27,515	32,249	38,169	56,750
	Rate	HHs	358	12.8	45.9	62.6	9.6	36.8	54.4	91.9	9.6	39.1	73.3	99.9	14.1	35.0	58.1	65.0	79.2	94.8
	Rate	People		14.0	49.3	66.4	10.3	40.2	58.6	93.6	10.3	42.6	76.5	99.9	15.5	38.2	61.8	69.0	82.5	95.9
Kabupaten Ogan Ilir	Line	People		13,680	20,520	27,360	11,649	18,638	23,298	46,595	11,266	18,974	32,612	128,668	14,493	18,175	25,061	29,373	34,765	51,688
	Rate	HHs	599	13.3	38.0	55.4	7.2	31.6	47.4	85.6	6.6	32.9	64.0	99.8	16.2	29.9	50.3	58.7	66.6	89.6
	Rate	People		17.3	44.7	63.6	9.8	38.3	55.2	88.5	9.0	39.5	71.2	99.9	20.7	36.4	58.4	66.5	73.3	92.0
Kabupaten Ogan Komering Ilir	Line	People		10,965	16,447	21,929	9,337	14,939	18,673	37,346	9,030	15,208	26,138	103,128	11,617	14,567	20,086	23,543	27,864	41,429
	Rate	HHs	707	8.2	22.8	38.1	2.2	18.2	31.0	66.7	2.0	18.8	46.3	98.3	10.0	17.5	33.6	42.1	49.6	76.2
	Rate	People		9.5	26.8	42.9	2.6	21.8	35.2	71.2	2.3	22.5	51.0	98.4	11.8	20.7	38.1	47.1	54.3	79.8
Kabupaten Ogan Komering Ulu	Line	People		13,670	20,504	27,339	11,640	18,624	23,280	46,560	11,257	18,960	32,587	128,571	14,482	18,161	25,042	29,351	34,739	51,650
	Rate	HHs	600	6.8	28.1	46.8	4.0	22.8	36.4	80.8	3.2	24.4	57.8	99.1	8.8	21.2	40.9	51.6	61.5	85.3
	Rate	People		8.8	33.0	51.7	5.3	27.8	41.6	84.1	4.5	29.4	63.1	99.4	11.1	26.1	46.1	56.4	66.2	88.1
Kabupaten Ogan Komering Ulu Selatan	Line	People		10,215	15,323	20,431	8,699	13,918	17,397	34,794	8,413	14,169	24,352	96,081	10,823	13,572	18,714	21,934	25,960	38,598
	Rate	HHs	514	7.8	26.9	47.0	2.1	21.4	36.9	75.3	1.6	22.1	58.2	99.3	11.9	19.3	41.4	51.7	60.6	81.9
	Rate	People		9.3	31.6	52.5	2.7	25.9	42.0	79.8	1.9	26.7	62.8	99.5	14.2	23.4	47.0	57.2	65.0	86.0
Kabupaten Ogan Komering Ulu Timur	Line	People		10,269	15,403	20,537	8,744	13,990	17,488	34,976	8,457	14,243	24,480	96,583	10,879	13,643	18,812	22,049	26,096	38,799
	Rate	HHs	640	2.1	15.8	38.7	0.5	11.4	25.1	70.9	0.1	11.9	50.5	98.2	2.9	9.7	34.7	43.4	54.5	78.2
	Rate	People		2.7	19.1	44.0	0.6	13.6	29.8	74.6	0.2	14.3	55.8	98.5	3.7	11.6	39.8	48.3	60.1	81.0
Kota Pagar Alam	Line	People		10,653	15,979	21,306	9,071	14,514	18,142	36,285	8,773	14,776	25,395	100,197	11,286	14,153	19,515	22,873	27,072	40,251
	Rate	HHs	478	4.1	23.8	42.3	1.0	16.9	34.3	74.0	0.6	18.1	53.1	99.7	5.4	15.3	38.4	47.8	56.9	79.1
	Rate	People		4.6	26.1	46.8	0.7	18.2	38.3	78.0	0.5	19.5	57.3	99.7	6.1	16.6	42.6	52.3	60.6	83.2
Kota Palembang	Line	People		16,800	25,200	33,600	14,305	22,889	28,611	57,222	13,835	23,301	40,049	158,012	17,799	22,320	30,776	36,072	42,693	63,477
	Rate	HHs	784	11.9	29.4	44.8	6.4	25.5	34.6	68.8	5.2	26.3	52.8	97.5	14.2	24.2	39.5	48.5	56.4	76.4
	Rate	People		14.5	34.8	50.7	7.7	30.0	40.4	73.5	6.3	31.2	58.6	98.1	16.9	28.7	45.3	54.1	62.1	80.6
Kabupaten Penuk Abab Lematang III	Line	People		12,400	18,600	24,800	10,559	16,894	21,117	42,235	10,212	17,199	29,560	116,627	13,137	16,474	22,716	26,624	31,512	46,852
	Rate	HHs	320	15.3	37.1	57.1	7.4	28.2	45.3	84.4	6.9	31.4	67.7	100.0	19.2	27.6	53.4	63.1	69.1	90.7
	Rate	People		20.2	43.1	62.6	9.7	34.0	51.4	88.8	9.2	36.7	74.1	100.0	23.5	33.2	58.8	69.5	75.7	94.0
Kota Prabumulih	Line	People		17,449	26,174	34,898	14,858	23,774	29,717	59,434	14,370	24,202	41,597	164,121	18,487	23,183	31,966	37,466	44,344	65,930
	Rate	HHs	510	24.6	48.6	58.8	17.1	42.6	52.8	82.4	15.9	42.9	69.8	98.8	28.9	42.0	55.6	63.8	71.6	86.4
	Rate	People		28.5	52.0	61.6	19.9	46.2	56.1	85.0	17.8	46.5	72.9	98.6	32.4	45.5	58.9	66.4	74.6	88.8
All Perkotaan	Line	People		15,187	22,781	30,374	12,932	20,691	25,864	51,729	12,507	21,064	36,205	142,843	16,090	20,178	27,822	32,609	38,595	57,383
	Rate	HHs	3,089	10.8	29.2	44.7	5.5	24.6	35.1	70.6	4.7	25.6	53.7	98.0	13.6	23.5	39.7	48.6	57.2	76.7
	Rate	People		13.4	34.4	50.6	6.9	29.4	40.9	75.3	5.9	30.5	59.4	98.5	16.5	28.2	45.5	54.3	62.7	80.8
All Perdesaan	Line	People		12,441	18,661	24,882	10,594	16,950	21,187	42,375	10,245	17,255	29,658	117,014	13,181	16,529	22,791	26,713	31,616	47,007
	Rate	HHs	6,643	10.5	32.0	50.5	5.8	25.8	40.7	81.4	5.2	27.2	61.0	99.3	12.9	24.3	45.7	55.0	64.4	86.6
	Rate	People		12.8	37.0	56.1	7.3	30.2	46.2	84.6	6.4	31.9	66.3	99.4	15.7	28.6	51.2	60.6	69.6	89.2
All Kota	Line	People		16,330	24,495	32,661	13,906	22,249	27,811	55,623	13,449	22,650	38,930	153,596	17,301	21,696	29,916	35,064	41,500	61,703
	Rate	HHs	2,291	12.0	31.0	46.4	6.8	26.7	36.7	71.6	5.6	27.5	55.2	97.9	14.5	25.4	41.4	50.4	58.8	78.2
	Rate	People		14.4	35.9	51.9	8.0	30.9	42.1	76.0	6.7	32.0	60.6	98.4	17.1	29.5	46.8	55.7	64.1	82.1
All Kabupaten	Line	People		12,444	18,666	24,889	10,597	16,955	21,193	42,386	10,248	17,260	29,666	117,046	13,184	16,533	22,797	26,720	31,625	47,020
	Rate	HHs	7,441	10.1	31.0	49.1	5.4	25.0	39.4	79.5	4.8	26.								

Table 1 (Sumatera Utara): Poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people for each *kota* or *kabupaten* and by overall by *perkotaan/perdesaan*, *kota/kabupaten*, and province in March 2018

Urban/rural, kota/kabupaten, or province	Line or Rate	Type of People	n	National				Poverty lines and poverty rates														
				100%		20%		Ind. 2018 PPP					Ind. 2011 PPP					Personnel-based lines				
				\$2.00	\$2.50	\$1.25	\$1.50	\$1.90	\$2.20	\$2.50	\$1.90	\$2.20	\$2.50	10th	20th	40th	60th	80th				
Kabupaten Asahan	Line	People	10,370	15,555	20,740	8,880	14,128	17,661	35,321	8,540	14,383	24,721	97,536	10,987	13,778	18,997	22,266	26,353	30,182			
	Rate	HHs	0.2	6.1	20.9	0.0	3.6	8.8	63.4	0.0	3.7	33.0	97.8	0.4	3.4	12.7	25.0	39.5	70.9			
	Rate	People	0.2	8.0	25.6	0.0	4.6	11.6	69.8	0.0	4.8	38.7	98.7	0.6	4.5	16.3	30.5	46.3	76.6			
Kabupaten Batu Bara	Line	People	12,547	18,821	25,095	10,684	17,095	21,369	42,738	10,333	17,403	29,912	118,016	13,294	16,070	22,986	26,941	31,887	47,409			
	Rate	HHs	3.1	21.3	48.3	1.1	15.2	31.4	83.7	0.9	16.1	47.2	99.6	5.8	13.8	30.7	34.7	48.7	89.3			
	Rate	People	4.7	26.3	56.7	1.6	19.0	42.7	90.4	1.0	20.4	72.1	99.9	7.6	17.4	48.3	63.8	76.2	92.6			
Kota Binjai	Line	People	12,519	18,779	25,038	10,669	17,067	21,321	42,642	10,310	17,364	29,845	117,750	13,264	16,033	22,934	26,881	31,815	47,303			
	Rate	HHs	2.6	22.6	41.1	0.4	15.2	31.9	71.1	0.4	16.3	52.0	99.1	3.4	15.0	37.5	45.6	56.2	77.8			
	Rate	People	3.2	26.3	46.8	0.8	17.6	36.7	75.6	0.8	19.1	58.1	99.1	4.1	17.4	43.2	51.7	61.7	81.3			
Kabupaten Deli	Line	People	10,691	16,036	21,381	9,103	14,565	18,207	36,414	8,804	14,828	25,486	100,553	11,326	14,204	19,585	22,955	27,108	40,394			
	Rate	HHs	2.3	9.6	28.1	0.9	5.6	14.6	72.1	0.9	5.7	41.1	98.5	2.3	5.4	21.1	33.1	46.9	77.0			
	Rate	People	3.0	12.9	36.5	1.1	7.3	19.5	79.4	1.1	7.4	61.8	99.1	3.0	6.8	28.2	42.7	57.0	84.0			
Kabupaten Deli Serdang	Line	People	12,532	18,798	25,063	10,671	17,074	21,342	42,684	10,320	17,381	29,874	117,868	13,277	16,050	22,957	26,908	31,847	47,350			
	Rate	HHs	3.1	16.0	35.2	1.6	11.9	23.3	72.2	1.4	12.6	48.8	98.9	4.3	10.9	28.4	39.9	54.3	79.3			
	Rate	People	4.1	19.3	40.9	2.2	14.4	27.8	77.4	1.9	15.3	55.0	99.3	5.4	13.2	33.8	45.9	60.0	83.4			
Kota Gunungrejo	Line	People	10,761	16,141	21,521	9,163	14,601	18,236	36,652	8,862	14,925	25,652	101,210	11,401	14,297	19,713	23,105	27,346	40,658			
	Rate	HHs	1.7	22.0	47.5	0.9	14.7	30.9	73.5	0.7	15.1	57.3	95.7	2.8	13.2	38.3	53.0	60.1	77.2			
	Rate	People	2.2	28.7	56.3	1.2	20.5	38.1	79.8	1.0	21.1	65.9	97.1	3.5	18.7	45.6	61.7	68.4	83.1			
Kabupaten Humbang Mamak	Line	People	10,823	16,234	21,645	9,210	14,745	18,431	36,863	8,913	15,011	25,801	101,794	11,166	14,379	19,826	23,238	27,504	40,892			
	Rate	HHs	1.5	14.8	34.2	0.6	9.3	23.2	74.1	0.5	10.8	47.3	98.6	2.2	8.8	28.2	38.9	50.9	79.0			
	Rate	People	2.4	20.8	44.4	0.8	13.1	31.0	81.2	0.6	15.4	58.6	98.5	3.6	12.5	36.3	49.1	62.0	85.2			
Kabupaten Karo	Line	People	14,390	21,585	28,780	12,254	19,006	24,507	49,014	11,851	19,959	34,305	135,348	15,246	19,119	26,362	30,898	36,570	54,372			
	Rate	HHs	0.6	9.5	24.3	0.1	6.1	14.3	63.3	0.0	7.4	35.4	98.0	0.8	4.7	19.5	29.6	40.6	72.3			
	Rate	People	1.0	12.3	30.1	0.1	7.8	18.3	72.3	0.0	9.5	43.9	99.0	1.4	6.2	24.3	37.0	49.9	80.4			
Kabupaten Labuhan Batu	Line	People	12,110	18,166	24,221	10,312	16,300	20,625	41,249	9,973	16,797	28,570	113,935	12,830	16,060	22,185	26,903	30,776	45,758			
	Rate	HHs	0.8	11.9	28.3	0.0	8.1	20.2	66.4	0.0	9.9	44.9	98.4	1.0	6.9	24.4	36.8	48.1	72.1			
	Rate	People	1.2	16.5	35.0	0.0	11.4	26.0	72.4	0.0	11.7	52.6	99.1	3.2	9.7	29.8	39.7	55.7	77.8			
Kabupaten Labuhan Batu Selatan	Line	People	11,988	17,532	23,776	9,953	15,924	19,906	39,811	9,626	16,212	27,864	109,935	12,383	15,529	21,412	25,097	29,703	44,163			
	Rate	HHs	0.2	7.0	25.5	0.0	4.1	13.1	71.7	0.0	4.5	40.5	99.7	0.9	3.8	16.3	31.2	46.2	81.4			
	Rate	People	0.3	9.4	31.7	0.0	5.8	17.2	77.3	0.0	6.1	48.3	99.9	1.3	5.4	20.8	38.3	53.8	85.3			
Kabupaten Labuhan Batu Utara	Line	People	13,009	19,514	26,018	11,078	17,724	22,155	44,311	10,713	18,044	31,013	122,139	13,781	17,284	23,822	27,933	33,660	49,154			
	Rate	HHs	3.1	20.3	49.7	1.0	13.4	28.7	88.3	0.4	14.7	67.6	99.4	3.5	11.1	31.8	58.8	71.9	91.6			
	Rate	People	7.6	33.5	57.0	2.2	25.2	45.9	89.6	1.9	26.7	72.6	99.3	9.3	24.1	49.4	63.7	75.3	92.8			
Kabupaten Langkat	Line	People	12,577	18,865	25,153	10,709	17,135	21,418	42,837	10,357	17,444	29,981	118,290	13,324	16,709	23,039	27,004	31,961	47,519			
	Rate	HHs	4.4	25.0	50.1	2.0	18.9	36.4	86.5	1.9	20.1	68.2	99.7	5.7	16.6	42.5	56.0	71.6	89.4			
	Rate	People	5.9	30.2	56.5	2.7	22.6	42.5	90.2	2.4	24.1	74.2	99.9	7.4	19.6	48.8	62.6	77.4	92.6			
Kabupaten Mandailing Natal	Line	People	11,074	16,610	22,147	9,429	15,087	18,859	37,718	9,119	15,359	26,398	104,153	11,782	14,712	20,286	23,777	28,141	41,840			
	Rate	HHs	2.1	14.8	42.6	0.6	9.3	23.6	83.3	0.3	10.5	58.8	98.7	2.3	7.7	33.2	50.0	62.9	87.3			
	Rate	People	3.1	20.3	49.7	1.0	13.4	28.7	88.3	0.4	14.7	67.6	99.4	3.5	11.1	31.8	58.8	71.9	91.6			
Kota Medan	Line	People	17,044	25,566	34,088	14,513	23,221	29,027	58,003	14,006	23,660	40,631	160,398	18,057	22,645	31,223	36,596	43,314	64,399			
	Rate	HHs	4.0	18.9	34.1	2.3	13.7	25.4	69.6	1.6	14.7	44.5	98.9	4.9	12.5	29.9	38.3	49.2	74.1			
	Rate	People	5.4	24.2	41.7	3.3	17.8	32.2	76.4	2.3	19.0	52.4	99.4	6.8	16.2	37.0	46.2	57.1	80.0			
Kabupaten Nias	Line	People	11,610	17,415	23,230	9,886	15,818	19,773	39,545	9,561	16,103	27,677	109,200	12,300	15,425	21,269	24,929	29,505	43,868			
	Rate	HHs	2.0	5.7	18.0	1.2	3.8	9.5	47.1	1.1	4.2	14.2	99.6	2.5	4.2	13.8	19.1	24.4	43.8			
	Rate	People	2.6	7.0	21.7	1.6	5.4	14.4	52.8	1.8	5.8	20.0	99.7	3.2	4.1	12.4	18.0	23.2	40.1			
Kabupaten Nias Barat	Line	People	12,705	19,057	25,409	10,818	17,309	21,637	43,273	10,463	17,621	30,267	119,494	13,460	16,879	23,274	27,279	32,286	48,043			
	Rate	HHs	2.4	5.5	18.1	1.4	4.4	10.2	49.7	1.2	4.8	16.1	99.6	3.0	4.9	14.1	19.1	24.4	41.8			
	Rate	People	3.3	7.0	21.7	2.1	6.5	17.3	69.9	1.8	6.4	21.1	99.9	4.0	5.8	16.3	22.4	28.1	45.3			
Kabupaten Nias Selatan	Line	People	8,584	12,876	17,168	7,310	11,095	14,619	29,239	7,069	11,906	20,464	80,740	9,095	11,405	15,736	18,432	21,815	32,435			
	Rate	HHs	5.1	28.4	45.9	2.3	20.6	33.9	79.2	2.1	23.0	62.5	98.6	6.2	20.0	38.6	53.5	64.7	83.5			
	Rate	People	6.4	35.2	55.0	2.7	26.1	42.1	84.8	2.3	29.1	70.7	99.1	8.0	25.5	47.0	61.5	72.9	88.0			
Kabupaten Nias Utara	Line	People	12,610	18,915	25,230	10,738	17,180	21,475	42,951	10,385	17,490	30,161	118,604	13,360	16,754	23,101	27,076	32,046	47,646			
	Rate	HHs	0.5	9.9	32.3	0.0	5.6	16.4	70.9	0.1	8.6	47.0	97.7	0.6	4.8	15.5	24.2	33.6	57.1			
	Rate	People	24.0	61.6	87.1	12.7	53.7	79.0	98.1	11.7	55.5	92.0	100.0	29.2	50.3	82.8	89.2	93.7	98.7			
Kabupaten Padang Lawas	Line	People	10,210	15,316	20,421	8,694	13,911	17,389	34,778	8,409	14,162	24,341	96,036	10,818	13,566	18,705	21,924	25,948	38,579			
	Rate	HHs	0.2	7.3	23.6	0.2	4.0	13.1	68.5	0.2	4.8	37.9	97.8	0.6	3.7	17.2	29.7	47.6	75.8			
	Rate	People	0.3	10.3	28.3	0.3	5.7	17.2	74.1	0.3	6.6	44.7	98.1	0.8	5.4	22.4	35.3	54.9	80.3			
Kabupaten Padang Lawas Utara	Line	People	10,556	15,834	21,112	8,989	14,382	17,977	35,564	8,693	14,641	25,164	99,285	11,184	14,025	19,338	22,665	26,826	39,885			

**Tables for
100% of the National Poverty Line
(and Tables Pertaining to All Poverty Lines)**

Table 2 (100% of national line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0-28	36.1
29-33	22.3
34-36	17.1
37-39	12.7
40-41	9.9
42-43	8.4
44-45	7.3
46-47	5.5
48-49	4.3
50-51	3.2
52-53	2.4
54-55	1.5
56-57	1.2
58-59	0.9
60-61	0.6
62-63	0.4
64-66	0.2
67-71	0.1
72-100	0.0

Table 3 (100% of national line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods

Score	Households in range and < poverty line		All households in range		Poverty likelihood (%)
0-28	1,715	÷	4,750	=	36.1
29-33	1,120	÷	5,030	=	22.3
34-36	752	÷	4,402	=	17.1
37-39	697	÷	5,491	=	12.7
40-41	417	÷	4,217	=	9.9
42-43	393	÷	4,689	=	8.4
44-45	371	÷	5,084	=	7.3
46-47	288	÷	5,220	=	5.5
48-49	247	÷	5,741	=	4.3
50-51	195	÷	6,114	=	3.2
52-53	157	÷	6,434	=	2.4
54-55	92	÷	6,295	=	1.5
56-57	66	÷	5,676	=	1.2
58-59	50	÷	5,584	=	0.9
60-61	30	÷	5,013	=	0.6
62-63	17	÷	4,168	=	0.4
64-66	10	÷	5,074	=	0.2
67-71	6	÷	6,233	=	0.1
72-100	0	÷	4,786	=	0.0

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

Table 4 (100% of national line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+0.9	3.7	4.4	5.6
29–33	+1.0	3.0	3.5	4.6
34–36	0.0	2.8	3.3	4.5
37–39	-1.1	2.4	2.8	4.0
40–41	+0.7	2.0	2.4	3.4
42–43	-0.9	2.1	2.4	3.0
44–45	+0.5	1.9	2.3	2.9
46–47	-0.3	1.5	1.9	2.3
48–49	0.0	1.4	1.7	2.2
50–51	+0.6	1.0	1.1	1.4
52–53	+0.2	0.9	1.1	1.4
54–55	-0.1	0.8	1.0	1.1
56–57	-0.8	1.1	1.2	1.6
58–59	-0.2	0.7	0.8	1.0
60–61	+0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5
62–63	+0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4
64–66	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3
67–71	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
72–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the validation sample.

Table 5 (100% of national line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.9	43.1	61.7	66.8
4	+1.1	19.2	25.6	38.3
8	+0.9	14.0	18.2	26.4
16	+0.6	10.7	12.7	17.4
32	+0.4	7.2	8.9	12.6
64	+0.3	5.3	6.5	8.2
128	+0.1	3.8	4.6	5.9
256	+0.2	2.9	3.5	4.4
512	+0.1	2.0	2.4	3.1
1,024	0.0	1.5	1.7	2.2
2,048	0.0	1.0	1.1	1.5
4,096	0.0	0.7	0.8	1.1
8,192	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.8
16,384	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.5

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 6: Errors in estimated poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision

	Poverty lines																
	National			Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP				Percentile-based lines					
	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.50	\$5.00	\$1.90	\$3.20	\$5.50	\$21.70	10th	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Error (estimate minus observed value)	0.0	-0.2	+0.1	+0.1	+0.1	-0.3	+0.6	0.0	+0.1	+0.1	+0.2	+0.2	0.0	-0.3	+0.2	0.0	+0.7
Precision of estimate of change	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.2	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6
Alpha factor for precision	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.11	1.08	1.09	1.15	1.14	1.07	1.10	1.30	1.08	1.08	1.09	1.11	1.12	1.16

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Errors (differences between estimates and observed values) are in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of \pm percentage points.

Errors and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with $n = 16,384$.

Alpha is based on 1,000 bootstrap samples of $n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, \text{ and } 16,384$.

Table 7 (All poverty lines): Possible targeting outcomes

		<u>Targeting segment</u>	
		<u>Targeted</u>	<u>Non-targeted</u>
<u>Observed poverty status</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Inclusion</u> Poor correctly targeted	<u>Undercoverage</u> Poor mistakenly not targeted
	<u>Non-poor</u>	<u>Leakage</u> Non-poor mistakenly targeted	<u>Exclusion</u> Non-poor correctly not targeted

Table 8 (100% of national line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	1.7	4.9	3.0	90.4	92.1
<=33	2.8	3.8	6.9	86.5	89.3
<=36	3.5	3.1	10.7	82.7	86.2
<=39	4.2	2.4	15.3	78.1	82.3
<=41	4.7	1.9	19.2	74.2	78.9
<=43	5.1	1.5	23.4	70.0	75.1
<=45	5.4	1.2	28.0	65.4	70.8
<=47	5.7	0.9	33.2	60.2	65.9
<=49	6.0	0.6	38.9	54.5	60.4
<=51	6.1	0.5	44.8	48.6	54.7
<=53	6.3	0.3	51.0	42.4	48.7
<=55	6.4	0.2	57.1	36.3	42.7
<=57	6.5	0.1	62.7	30.7	37.2
<=59	6.6	0.1	68.3	25.1	31.6
<=61	6.6	0.0	73.3	20.1	26.7
<=63	6.6	0.0	77.4	16.0	22.6
<=66	6.6	0.0	82.4	11.0	17.6
<=71	6.6	0.0	88.7	4.7	11.3
<=100	6.6	0.0	93.4	0.0	6.6

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (100% of national line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	36.1	25.5	0.6:1
<=33	9.6	28.8	42.0	0.4:1
<=36	14.2	24.8	53.2	0.3:1
<=39	19.6	21.7	64.2	0.3:1
<=41	23.8	19.6	70.6	0.2:1
<=43	28.5	17.9	76.9	0.2:1
<=45	33.4	16.2	81.9	0.2:1
<=47	38.9	14.7	86.7	0.2:1
<=49	44.9	13.3	90.4	0.2:1
<=51	50.9	12.1	92.9	0.1:1
<=53	57.3	11.0	95.3	0.1:1
<=55	63.5	10.1	96.9	0.1:1
<=57	69.2	9.4	98.2	0.1:1
<=59	74.9	8.8	99.1	0.1:1
<=61	79.9	8.2	99.5	0.1:1
<=63	84.0	7.9	99.8	0.1:1
<=66	89.0	7.4	99.9	0.1:1
<=71	95.3	6.9	100.0	0.1:1
<=100	100.0	6.6	100.0	0.1:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
150% of the National Poverty Line**

Table 2 (150% of national line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	72.7
29–33	58.5
34–36	51.3
37–39	44.3
40–41	39.2
42–43	34.1
44–45	30.4
46–47	27.1
48–49	22.6
50–51	18.0
52–53	14.6
54–55	11.8
56–57	9.4
58–59	7.2
60–61	5.9
62–63	4.6
64–66	2.8
67–71	1.8
72–100	0.6

Table 4 (150% of national line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+1.0	3.5	4.1	5.9
29–33	+1.3	3.6	4.4	5.7
34–36	–1.8	3.5	4.4	5.7
37–39	+1.7	3.3	4.0	5.4
40–41	+0.4	3.8	4.6	5.9
42–43	0.0	3.3	3.9	4.9
44–45	–0.2	3.4	4.1	5.3
46–47	+0.3	3.1	3.6	4.8
48–49	+1.2	3.2	3.7	4.7
50–51	–2.4	3.3	3.9	4.8
52–53	+0.9	2.0	2.4	3.2
54–55	+0.1	2.1	2.5	3.2
56–57	–3.1	2.8	3.1	3.5
58–59	–0.2	1.6	1.9	2.5
60–61	–0.1	1.7	2.0	2.5
62–63	–0.5	1.8	2.1	2.7
64–66	–1.1	1.5	1.8	2.3
67–71	0.0	0.8	0.9	1.2
72–100	+0.1	0.5	0.6	0.7

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the validation sample.

Table 5 (150% of national line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.4	64.4	71.9	84.0
4	+1.2	37.6	42.2	56.9
8	+0.7	25.1	29.4	38.8
16	+0.6	18.9	22.2	29.8
32	+0.2	13.8	16.5	21.3
64	+0.3	9.9	11.5	15.2
128	+0.2	6.7	7.9	10.9
256	+0.1	5.0	6.0	7.6
512	+0.1	3.4	4.2	5.5
1,024	0.0	2.3	2.8	3.7
2,048	-0.1	1.6	1.9	2.7
4,096	-0.1	1.2	1.4	2.0
8,192	-0.1	0.8	1.0	1.4
16,384	-0.2	0.6	0.8	0.9

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (150% of national line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	3.4	19.7	1.3	75.6	79.0
<=33	6.2	16.9	3.4	73.5	79.7
<=36	8.6	14.5	5.6	71.3	79.8
<=39	10.9	12.2	8.7	68.2	79.2
<=41	12.6	10.5	11.2	65.7	78.3
<=43	14.2	8.9	14.3	62.6	76.8
<=45	15.7	7.4	17.7	59.2	74.9
<=47	17.2	5.9	21.8	55.1	72.3
<=49	18.4	4.7	26.5	50.4	68.8
<=51	19.6	3.5	31.4	45.5	65.1
<=53	20.5	2.6	36.8	40.1	60.6
<=55	21.2	1.9	42.2	34.7	55.9
<=57	21.8	1.3	47.3	29.5	51.4
<=59	22.3	0.8	52.6	24.3	46.6
<=61	22.6	0.5	57.3	19.6	42.2
<=63	22.8	0.3	61.2	15.7	38.5
<=66	23.0	0.1	66.1	10.8	33.8
<=71	23.1	0.0	72.2	4.7	27.7
<=100	23.1	0.0	76.9	0.0	23.1

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (150% of national line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	72.2	14.6	2.6:1
<=33	9.6	64.4	26.9	1.8:1
<=36	14.2	60.4	37.1	1.5:1
<=39	19.6	55.8	47.3	1.3:1
<=41	23.8	52.9	54.6	1.1:1
<=43	28.5	49.9	61.6	1.0:1
<=45	33.4	47.1	68.0	0.9:1
<=47	38.9	44.1	74.4	0.8:1
<=49	44.9	41.0	79.7	0.7:1
<=51	50.9	38.4	84.7	0.6:1
<=53	57.3	35.8	88.7	0.6:1
<=55	63.5	33.5	91.9	0.5:1
<=57	69.2	31.6	94.6	0.5:1
<=59	74.9	29.8	96.5	0.4:1
<=61	79.9	28.3	97.8	0.4:1
<=63	84.0	27.1	98.7	0.4:1
<=66	89.0	25.8	99.4	0.3:1
<=71	95.3	24.2	99.9	0.3:1
<=100	100.0	23.1	100.0	0.3:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
200% of the National Poverty Line**

Table 2 (200% of national line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	89.3
29–33	80.5
34–36	75.0
37–39	68.8
40–41	65.7
42–43	60.5
44–45	56.4
46–47	51.2
48–49	44.9
50–51	39.3
52–53	33.4
54–55	29.0
56–57	24.4
58–59	19.9
60–61	16.2
62–63	13.7
64–66	11.0
67–71	6.4
72–100	2.4

Table 4 (200% of national line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+0.1	2.2	2.7	3.5
29–33	+0.8	2.9	3.4	4.3
34–36	+0.6	3.3	3.8	5.1
37–39	–0.4	3.1	3.7	5.0
40–41	+2.7	3.9	4.7	6.1
42–43	+3.0	3.5	4.2	5.8
44–45	–0.8	3.5	4.1	5.8
46–47	+2.3	3.6	4.1	5.5
48–49	+2.5	3.6	4.3	5.4
50–51	–1.0	3.5	4.1	5.7
52–53	+2.9	2.9	3.5	4.5
54–55	+1.1	2.8	3.4	4.6
56–57	–5.5	4.3	4.6	5.3
58–59	–0.1	2.6	3.2	4.2
60–61	–0.1	2.7	3.1	4.2
62–63	–2.2	2.9	3.5	4.7
64–66	–0.4	2.2	2.7	3.6
67–71	–2.4	2.2	2.4	3.0
72–100	–0.3	1.2	1.4	1.8

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the validation sample.

Table 5 (200% of national line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-0.4	68.3	79.4	91.5
4	+1.3	41.8	48.8	60.5
8	+1.1	30.2	35.1	44.6
16	+0.5	22.5	26.4	36.2
32	+0.3	15.6	19.0	25.8
64	+0.2	11.1	13.1	18.3
128	+0.2	7.9	9.8	12.7
256	+0.2	5.7	6.7	8.9
512	+0.3	3.9	4.7	6.3
1,024	+0.2	2.7	3.2	4.2
2,048	+0.1	1.8	2.2	3.0
4,096	+0.1	1.4	1.6	2.2
8,192	+0.1	1.0	1.1	1.5
16,384	+0.1	0.7	0.8	1.0

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (200% of national line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	4.1	36.1	0.5	59.2	63.4
<=33	8.1	32.2	1.5	58.2	66.3
<=36	11.5	28.8	2.7	57.0	68.5
<=39	15.2	25.1	4.4	55.4	70.6
<=41	18.0	22.3	5.9	53.9	71.8
<=43	20.7	19.6	7.8	52.0	72.7
<=45	23.4	16.8	10.0	49.8	73.2
<=47	26.2	14.1	12.8	47.0	73.1
<=49	28.7	11.6	16.2	43.5	72.2
<=51	31.1	9.2	19.9	39.9	71.0
<=53	33.1	7.1	24.2	35.6	68.7
<=55	34.9	5.4	28.6	31.1	66.0
<=57	36.4	3.8	32.7	27.0	63.4
<=59	37.6	2.6	37.2	22.5	60.2
<=61	38.5	1.8	41.4	18.3	56.8
<=63	39.1	1.1	44.9	14.8	54.0
<=66	39.7	0.6	49.3	10.4	50.1
<=71	40.2	0.1	55.2	4.6	44.7
<=100	40.3	0.0	59.7	0.0	40.3

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (200% of national line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	88.8	10.3	7.9:1
<=33	9.6	83.9	20.1	5.2:1
<=36	14.2	80.8	28.5	4.2:1
<=39	19.6	77.7	37.8	3.5:1
<=41	23.8	75.4	44.6	3.1:1
<=43	28.5	72.7	51.4	2.7:1
<=45	33.4	70.1	58.2	2.3:1
<=47	38.9	67.2	65.0	2.0:1
<=49	44.9	63.9	71.2	1.8:1
<=51	50.9	61.0	77.2	1.6:1
<=53	57.3	57.8	82.3	1.4:1
<=55	63.5	55.0	86.6	1.2:1
<=57	69.2	52.7	90.5	1.1:1
<=59	74.9	50.3	93.5	1.0:1
<=61	79.9	48.2	95.5	0.9:1
<=63	84.0	46.6	97.2	0.9:1
<=66	89.0	44.6	98.6	0.8:1
<=71	95.3	42.1	99.7	0.7:1
<=100	100.0	40.3	100.0	0.7:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line**

Table 2 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	21.4
29–33	11.3
34–36	8.2
37–39	6.0
40–41	4.6
42–43	3.6
44–45	3.2
46–47	1.9
48–49	1.8
50–51	1.2
52–53	0.8
54–55	0.6
56–57	0.3
58–59	0.3
60–61	0.2
62–63	0.1
64–66	0.1
67–71	0.1
72–100	0.0

Table 4 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	–0.2	3.1	3.8	5.1
29–33	+0.9	2.1	2.6	3.4
34–36	–0.4	2.2	2.7	3.5
37–39	–0.6	1.6	2.0	2.6
40–41	+0.6	1.3	1.5	2.1
42–43	–0.7	1.4	1.8	2.4
44–45	+0.7	1.1	1.3	1.8
46–47	+0.1	0.8	0.9	1.2
48–49	+0.3	0.6	0.7	1.0
50–51	+0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6
52–53	–0.5	0.7	0.8	1.1
54–55	+0.1	0.4	0.5	0.6
56–57	–0.1	0.4	0.4	0.6
58–59	+0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
60–61	+0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
62–63	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3
64–66	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3
67–71	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
72–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.3	5.6	50.0	59.3
4	+0.6	12.6	17.8	31.9
8	+0.5	9.8	13.5	20.3
16	+0.3	7.3	9.5	14.0
32	+0.2	5.2	6.3	8.9
64	+0.2	3.5	4.6	6.3
128	+0.1	2.6	3.1	4.2
256	+0.1	2.0	2.4	2.9
512	+0.1	1.4	1.7	2.3
1,024	+0.1	1.0	1.2	1.6
2,048	+0.1	0.7	0.8	1.1
4,096	+0.1	0.5	0.6	0.8
8,192	+0.1	0.4	0.4	0.5
16,384	+0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	1.0	2.2	3.7	93.2	94.2
<=33	1.6	1.6	8.1	88.7	90.3
<=36	1.9	1.3	12.3	84.5	86.5
<=39	2.3	0.9	17.3	79.5	81.8
<=41	2.4	0.7	21.4	75.4	77.9
<=43	2.6	0.5	25.9	71.0	73.6
<=45	2.7	0.4	30.7	66.2	68.9
<=47	2.8	0.3	36.1	60.7	63.6
<=49	3.0	0.2	41.9	54.9	57.8
<=51	3.0	0.2	47.9	48.9	51.9
<=53	3.1	0.1	54.2	42.6	45.7
<=55	3.1	0.1	60.4	36.5	39.6
<=57	3.1	0.0	66.1	30.8	33.9
<=59	3.2	0.0	71.7	25.1	28.3
<=61	3.2	0.0	76.7	20.1	23.3
<=63	3.2	0.0	80.9	16.0	19.1
<=66	3.2	0.0	85.9	11.0	14.1
<=71	3.2	0.0	92.1	4.7	7.9
<=100	3.2	0.0	96.8	0.0	3.2

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	21.6	31.8	0.3:1
<=33	9.6	16.1	49.0	0.2:1
<=36	14.2	13.5	60.4	0.2:1
<=39	19.6	11.5	71.0	0.1:1
<=41	23.8	10.3	77.0	0.1:1
<=43	28.5	9.2	82.7	0.1:1
<=45	33.4	8.2	86.4	0.1:1
<=47	38.9	7.3	89.9	0.1:1
<=49	44.9	6.6	93.4	0.1:1
<=51	50.9	5.9	94.8	0.1:1
<=53	57.3	5.4	97.2	0.1:1
<=55	63.5	4.9	98.1	0.1:1
<=57	69.2	4.5	99.0	0.0:1
<=59	74.9	4.2	99.4	0.0:1
<=61	79.9	4.0	99.5	0.0:1
<=63	84.0	3.8	99.7	0.0:1
<=66	89.0	3.6	100.0	0.0:1
<=71	95.3	3.3	100.0	0.0:1
<=100	100.0	3.2	100.0	0.0:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the \$2.00/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line**

Table 2 (\$2.00/day 2005 PPP): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	64.9
29–33	49.8
34–36	42.8
37–39	35.0
40–41	30.3
42–43	26.0
44–45	22.9
46–47	20.6
48–49	16.2
50–51	13.1
52–53	10.4
54–55	7.7
56–57	6.1
58–59	4.6
60–61	3.7
62–63	3.0
64–66	1.6
67–71	0.9
72–100	0.4

Table 4 (\$2.00/day 2005 PPP): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+2.4	3.6	4.4	6.2
29–33	+2.0	3.6	4.4	5.8
34–36	–0.6	3.7	4.4	6.2
37–39	–0.8	3.3	3.9	5.5
40–41	–0.1	3.5	4.2	5.4
42–43	+0.3	3.2	3.8	4.8
44–45	–0.5	3.1	3.6	4.7
46–47	–0.5	2.8	3.4	4.5
48–49	+2.5	2.2	2.7	3.4
50–51	+1.1	2.0	2.4	3.0
52–53	+0.5	1.8	2.2	3.0
54–55	–0.3	1.8	2.1	2.7
56–57	–3.2	2.7	2.9	3.2
58–59	–0.2	1.3	1.6	2.0
60–61	+0.2	1.2	1.4	2.0
62–63	–0.1	1.4	1.6	2.3
64–66	–0.7	1.1	1.4	1.8
67–71	+0.1	0.5	0.6	0.8
72–100	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.6

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (\$2.00/day 2005 PPP): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.9	62.9	68.4	80.6
4	+1.1	33.6	41.2	55.9
8	+0.6	23.4	27.7	37.8
16	+0.5	16.3	19.1	26.9
32	+0.3	11.9	13.5	18.0
64	+0.4	8.5	10.1	12.7
128	+0.3	6.0	7.0	8.9
256	+0.3	4.4	5.2	6.6
512	+0.3	2.9	3.5	4.8
1,024	+0.2	2.0	2.5	3.3
2,048	+0.1	1.5	1.7	2.3
4,096	+0.1	1.1	1.2	1.7
8,192	+0.1	0.8	0.9	1.2
16,384	+0.1	0.6	0.7	0.8

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (\$2.00/day 2005 PPP): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	3.0	15.0	1.7	80.3	83.3
<=33	5.4	12.7	4.3	77.7	83.1
<=36	7.3	10.7	6.9	75.1	82.3
<=39	9.2	8.8	10.4	71.6	80.8
<=41	10.5	7.5	13.3	68.7	79.2
<=43	11.8	6.3	16.7	65.2	77.0
<=45	12.9	5.1	20.5	61.5	74.3
<=47	14.0	4.0	24.9	57.0	71.1
<=49	14.9	3.1	30.0	51.9	66.8
<=51	15.7	2.4	35.3	46.7	62.4
<=53	16.3	1.7	41.0	41.0	57.3
<=55	16.8	1.2	46.7	35.3	52.1
<=57	17.3	0.8	51.9	30.0	47.3
<=59	17.6	0.5	57.3	24.7	42.2
<=61	17.7	0.3	62.1	19.8	37.6
<=63	17.9	0.2	66.2	15.8	33.7
<=66	18.0	0.1	71.1	10.9	28.9
<=71	18.0	0.0	77.3	4.7	22.7
<=100	18.0	0.0	82.0	0.0	18.0

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (\$2.00/day 2005 PPP): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	63.9	16.5	1.8:1
<=33	9.6	55.8	29.8	1.3:1
<=36	14.2	51.3	40.4	1.1:1
<=39	19.6	47.1	51.1	0.9:1
<=41	23.8	44.2	58.4	0.8:1
<=43	28.5	41.3	65.2	0.7:1
<=45	33.4	38.6	71.5	0.6:1
<=47	38.9	36.0	77.7	0.6:1
<=49	44.9	33.1	82.5	0.5:1
<=51	50.9	30.8	86.9	0.4:1
<=53	57.3	28.5	90.5	0.4:1
<=55	63.5	26.5	93.3	0.4:1
<=57	69.2	24.9	95.7	0.3:1
<=59	74.9	23.5	97.4	0.3:1
<=61	79.9	22.2	98.4	0.3:1
<=63	84.0	21.3	99.1	0.3:1
<=66	89.0	20.2	99.6	0.3:1
<=71	95.3	18.9	99.9	0.2:1
<=100	100.0	18.0	100.0	0.2:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the \$2.50/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line**

Table 2 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	82.0
29–33	69.9
34–36	63.1
37–39	55.7
40–41	51.8
42–43	46.1
44–45	41.9
46–47	37.2
48–49	31.3
50–51	26.8
52–53	22.1
54–55	18.3
56–57	15.1
58–59	11.7
60–61	9.6
62–63	7.6
64–66	6.0
67–71	3.1
72–100	1.0

Table 4 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+0.1	2.8	3.3	4.6
29–33	+1.0	3.3	3.9	4.9
34–36	–0.7	3.6	4.3	5.5
37–39	0.0	3.4	4.0	5.2
40–41	+2.3	4.0	4.8	6.5
42–43	+0.6	3.4	4.3	5.7
44–45	+0.4	3.7	4.4	5.8
46–47	+0.2	3.5	4.0	5.2
48–49	+0.3	3.4	4.0	5.2
50–51	–2.3	3.5	4.0	5.2
52–53	+1.6	2.6	3.0	4.1
54–55	+2.2	2.4	2.8	3.5
56–57	–4.7	3.8	4.1	4.8
58–59	–1.2	2.1	2.5	3.3
60–61	–0.6	2.1	2.5	3.5
62–63	–1.8	2.3	2.7	3.6
64–66	–1.2	2.0	2.3	3.1
67–71	–1.1	1.3	1.6	2.0
72–100	0.0	0.7	0.9	1.2

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.1	66.8	76.6	87.2
4	+1.1	40.3	47.5	62.3
8	+0.6	28.7	32.3	43.6
16	+0.4	20.1	24.2	30.6
32	0.0	14.5	17.1	22.3
64	0.0	10.2	12.6	15.8
128	-0.1	7.5	9.2	11.4
256	0.0	5.3	6.2	7.8
512	0.0	3.7	4.4	5.9
1,024	-0.2	2.5	3.1	3.9
2,048	-0.3	1.7	2.1	2.7
4,096	-0.3	1.3	1.5	2.0
8,192	-0.3	0.9	1.1	1.4
16,384	-0.3	0.7	0.8	1.0

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	3.8	26.8	0.9	68.5	72.3
<=33	7.2	23.4	2.4	66.9	74.1
<=36	10.1	20.6	4.1	65.2	75.3
<=39	13.1	17.5	6.5	62.9	76.0
<=41	15.2	15.4	8.6	60.8	76.0
<=43	17.4	13.2	11.1	58.3	75.7
<=45	19.4	11.2	14.0	55.4	74.8
<=47	21.4	9.2	17.5	51.9	73.3
<=49	23.3	7.4	21.7	47.7	71.0
<=51	25.0	5.7	26.0	43.4	68.3
<=53	26.3	4.3	31.0	38.4	64.7
<=55	27.4	3.2	36.1	33.3	60.7
<=57	28.4	2.2	40.8	28.6	57.0
<=59	29.2	1.5	45.7	23.7	52.8
<=61	29.7	1.0	50.2	19.1	48.8
<=63	30.0	0.6	54.0	15.4	45.4
<=66	30.3	0.3	58.7	10.7	41.0
<=71	30.6	0.1	64.7	4.6	35.2
<=100	30.6	0.0	69.4	0.0	30.6

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	81.5	12.4	4.4:1
<=33	9.6	74.7	23.5	3.0:1
<=36	14.2	70.8	32.8	2.4:1
<=39	19.6	66.8	42.7	2.0:1
<=41	23.8	63.9	49.7	1.8:1
<=43	28.5	61.0	56.8	1.6:1
<=45	33.4	58.1	63.4	1.4:1
<=47	38.9	55.1	70.0	1.2:1
<=49	44.9	51.8	75.9	1.1:1
<=51	50.9	49.0	81.5	1.0:1
<=53	57.3	45.9	86.0	0.8:1
<=55	63.5	43.2	89.5	0.8:1
<=57	69.2	41.0	92.7	0.7:1
<=59	74.9	39.0	95.2	0.6:1
<=61	79.9	37.1	96.9	0.6:1
<=63	84.0	35.7	98.0	0.6:1
<=66	89.0	34.1	99.1	0.5:1
<=71	95.3	32.1	99.8	0.5:1
<=100	100.0	30.6	100.0	0.4:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the \$5.00/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line**

Table 2 (\$5.00/day 2005 PPP): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	98.9
29–33	97.1
34–36	94.9
37–39	93.7
40–41	92.0
42–43	90.2
44–45	88.2
46–47	85.2
48–49	81.0
50–51	76.8
52–53	72.3
54–55	67.7
56–57	63.1
58–59	57.3
60–61	51.9
62–63	48.8
64–66	43.6
67–71	30.9
72–100	16.8

Table 4 (\$5.00/day 2005 PPP): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	0.0	0.7	0.9	1.1
29–33	+0.6	1.2	1.4	2.0
34–36	–1.7	1.4	1.5	1.9
37–39	–0.7	1.5	1.8	2.5
40–41	–0.3	2.0	2.4	3.1
42–43	+0.5	2.3	2.7	3.7
44–45	+0.6	2.2	2.8	3.7
46–47	+0.8	2.5	3.0	3.7
48–49	+3.0	2.8	3.3	4.2
50–51	+1.5	2.9	3.6	4.4
52–53	+5.4	3.0	3.6	4.8
54–55	–0.6	3.0	3.5	4.7
56–57	–2.5	3.2	3.9	5.1
58–59	+0.5	3.5	4.2	5.5
60–61	+1.5	3.6	4.2	5.6
62–63	–3.8	4.0	4.8	6.2
64–66	+2.7	3.4	4.2	5.6
67–71	+0.4	2.9	3.5	4.6
72–100	+0.8	2.9	3.4	4.2

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the validation sample.

Table 5 (\$5.00/day 2005 PPP): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-1.2	64.4	75.0	88.0
4	+0.5	37.9	44.5	56.8
8	+1.4	28.8	34.7	42.9
16	+0.7	21.2	25.4	34.8
32	+0.6	14.7	17.0	22.3
64	+0.5	10.0	12.8	16.7
128	+0.5	7.8	9.1	11.5
256	+0.6	5.5	6.4	8.4
512	+0.7	3.8	4.5	5.7
1,024	+0.7	2.7	3.1	4.2
2,048	+0.6	1.8	2.2	3.0
4,096	+0.6	1.4	1.6	2.0
8,192	+0.6	0.9	1.1	1.4
16,384	+0.6	0.7	0.8	1.0

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (\$5.00/day 2005 PPP): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	4.6	66.0	0.1	29.3	34.0
<=33	9.4	61.2	0.2	29.2	38.6
<=36	13.8	56.8	0.4	29.0	42.8
<=39	18.9	51.7	0.7	28.7	47.6
<=41	22.8	47.8	1.0	28.4	51.2
<=43	27.0	43.6	1.5	27.9	54.9
<=45	31.3	39.3	2.1	27.3	58.6
<=47	36.0	34.6	2.9	26.5	62.5
<=49	40.8	29.8	4.1	25.3	66.0
<=51	45.4	25.2	5.5	23.9	69.3
<=53	49.9	20.7	7.4	22.0	71.9
<=55	54.1	16.5	9.4	20.0	74.1
<=57	57.8	12.8	11.4	18.0	75.7
<=59	61.1	9.5	13.8	15.6	76.7
<=61	63.7	7.0	16.2	13.2	76.8
<=63	65.8	4.8	18.3	11.1	76.9
<=66	67.9	2.7	21.2	8.2	76.1
<=71	69.8	0.8	25.5	3.9	73.7
<=100	70.6	0.0	29.4	0.0	70.6

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (\$5.00/day 2005 PPP): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	98.8	6.5	80.5:1
<=33	9.6	97.6	13.3	40.2:1
<=36	14.2	97.1	19.5	33.8:1
<=39	19.6	96.4	26.7	26.6:1
<=41	23.8	95.7	32.3	22.0:1
<=43	28.5	94.8	38.3	18.2:1
<=45	33.4	93.8	44.4	15.0:1
<=47	38.9	92.5	51.0	12.3:1
<=49	44.9	90.8	57.7	9.8:1
<=51	50.9	89.2	64.3	8.2:1
<=53	57.3	87.0	70.7	6.7:1
<=55	63.5	85.2	76.6	5.8:1
<=57	69.2	83.5	81.8	5.1:1
<=59	74.9	81.6	86.5	4.4:1
<=61	79.9	79.7	90.2	3.9:1
<=63	84.0	78.3	93.1	3.6:1
<=66	89.0	76.2	96.1	3.2:1
<=71	95.3	73.3	98.9	2.7:1
<=100	100.0	70.6	100.0	2.4:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP Poverty Line**

Table 2 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	18.8
29–33	9.5
34–36	6.7
37–39	4.9
40–41	3.6
42–43	3.0
44–45	2.5
46–47	1.6
48–49	1.5
50–51	0.9
52–53	0.7
54–55	0.4
56–57	0.3
58–59	0.3
60–61	0.2
62–63	0.1
64–66	0.1
67–71	0.0
72–100	0.0

Table 4 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	–0.4	3.1	3.7	5.1
29–33	+0.8	2.0	2.4	2.9
34–36	–0.7	2.1	2.6	3.5
37–39	–0.8	1.6	1.9	2.5
40–41	+0.1	1.2	1.5	2.0
42–43	–0.7	1.4	1.6	2.1
44–45	+0.4	1.0	1.3	1.7
46–47	+0.1	0.7	0.9	1.2
48–49	+0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8
50–51	+0.5	0.3	0.4	0.5
52–53	–0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
54–55	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.6
56–57	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.4
58–59	+0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
60–61	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
62–63	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3
64–66	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
67–71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
72–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the validation sample.

Table 5 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.2	4.8	29.7	58.2
4	+0.5	11.2	16.5	31.2
8	+0.3	8.7	12.6	20.0
16	+0.2	6.8	8.9	13.7
32	+0.2	4.9	6.0	8.2
64	+0.2	3.3	4.1	5.5
128	0.0	2.6	2.9	4.0
256	0.0	1.9	2.2	2.8
512	0.0	1.4	1.6	2.0
1,024	0.0	1.0	1.1	1.5
2,048	0.0	0.7	0.8	1.0
4,096	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.7
8,192	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.5
16,384	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.4

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	0.9	1.8	3.8	93.5	94.4
<=33	1.3	1.3	8.3	89.0	90.4
<=36	1.6	1.0	12.5	84.8	86.4
<=39	1.9	0.8	17.6	79.7	81.6
<=41	2.1	0.6	21.7	75.6	77.7
<=43	2.2	0.4	26.2	71.1	73.3
<=45	2.3	0.3	31.1	66.3	68.6
<=47	2.4	0.2	36.5	60.8	63.3
<=49	2.5	0.2	42.4	54.9	57.5
<=51	2.6	0.1	48.4	48.9	51.5
<=53	2.6	0.1	54.7	42.6	45.2
<=55	2.6	0.0	60.8	36.5	39.1
<=57	2.7	0.0	66.5	30.8	33.4
<=59	2.7	0.0	72.2	25.1	27.8
<=61	2.7	0.0	77.2	20.1	22.8
<=63	2.7	0.0	81.3	16.0	18.7
<=66	2.7	0.0	86.3	11.0	13.7
<=71	2.7	0.0	92.6	4.7	7.4
<=100	2.7	0.0	97.3	0.0	2.7

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	18.8	32.8	0.2:1
<=33	9.6	13.9	50.0	0.2:1
<=36	14.2	11.6	61.4	0.1:1
<=39	19.6	9.9	72.0	0.1:1
<=41	23.8	8.8	78.3	0.1:1
<=43	28.5	7.9	83.8	0.1:1
<=45	33.4	7.0	87.4	0.1:1
<=47	38.9	6.3	91.0	0.1:1
<=49	44.9	5.6	93.9	0.1:1
<=51	50.9	5.0	95.3	0.1:1
<=53	57.3	4.6	97.4	0.0:1
<=55	63.5	4.2	98.4	0.0:1
<=57	69.2	3.8	99.1	0.0:1
<=59	74.9	3.6	99.5	0.0:1
<=61	79.9	3.3	99.7	0.0:1
<=63	84.0	3.2	99.9	0.0:1
<=66	89.0	3.0	100.0	0.0:1
<=71	95.3	2.8	100.0	0.0:1
<=100	100.0	2.7	100.0	0.0:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the \$3.20/day 2011 PPP Poverty Line**

Table 2 (\$3.20/day 2011 PPP): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	66.2
29–33	51.5
34–36	44.5
37–39	36.6
40–41	32.4
42–43	27.5
44–45	24.1
46–47	21.9
48–49	17.2
50–51	14.0
52–53	11.2
54–55	8.4
56–57	6.5
58–59	5.0
60–61	4.0
62–63	3.2
64–66	1.8
67–71	1.1
72–100	0.4

Table 4 (\$3.20/day 2011 PPP): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+2.0	3.5	4.4	6.2
29–33	+2.1	3.6	4.2	5.9
34–36	–1.6	3.7	4.4	6.1
37–39	–0.7	3.2	3.9	5.6
40–41	+0.8	3.5	4.3	5.6
42–43	+0.6	3.2	3.8	4.7
44–45	–0.4	3.1	3.7	4.9
46–47	–0.6	3.0	3.5	4.6
48–49	+2.1	2.5	3.0	4.0
50–51	+1.2	2.1	2.5	3.0
52–53	+0.5	1.9	2.2	3.2
54–55	–0.1	1.9	2.2	2.8
56–57	–3.2	2.8	2.9	3.3
58–59	–0.1	1.4	1.6	2.0
60–61	+0.3	1.3	1.5	2.1
62–63	–0.1	1.4	1.7	2.4
64–66	–0.9	1.3	1.5	2.0
67–71	+0.1	0.5	0.7	0.8
72–100	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.7

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (\$3.20/day 2011 PPP): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.1	61.3	68.8	81.1
4	+1.1	34.7	41.5	57.4
8	+0.7	24.2	28.4	38.0
16	+0.6	16.6	20.0	27.5
32	+0.3	12.0	14.0	19.0
64	+0.4	8.8	10.6	12.8
128	+0.3	6.0	7.2	9.1
256	+0.3	4.3	5.2	6.9
512	+0.3	3.0	3.5	5.0
1,024	+0.2	2.1	2.7	3.5
2,048	+0.1	1.5	1.8	2.3
4,096	+0.1	1.1	1.3	1.7
8,192	+0.1	0.8	0.9	1.2
16,384	+0.1	0.6	0.7	0.9

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (\$3.20/day 2011 PPP): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	3.1	15.9	1.6	79.4	82.5
<=33	5.5	13.4	4.1	77.0	82.5
<=36	7.5	11.4	6.7	74.4	81.9
<=39	9.6	9.4	10.0	71.0	80.6
<=41	10.9	8.0	12.9	68.2	79.1
<=43	12.2	6.7	16.3	64.8	77.0
<=45	13.4	5.5	20.0	61.1	74.5
<=47	14.6	4.3	24.3	56.7	71.3
<=49	15.5	3.4	29.4	51.7	67.2
<=51	16.4	2.6	34.6	46.5	62.9
<=53	17.1	1.9	40.2	40.8	57.9
<=55	17.6	1.3	45.9	35.2	52.8
<=57	18.1	0.9	51.1	30.0	48.0
<=59	18.4	0.5	56.4	24.6	43.0
<=61	18.6	0.3	61.3	19.8	38.4
<=63	18.7	0.2	65.3	15.8	34.5
<=66	18.9	0.1	70.2	10.9	29.7
<=71	18.9	0.0	76.4	4.7	23.6
<=100	18.9	0.0	81.1	0.0	18.9

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (\$3.20/day 2011 PPP): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	65.5	16.2	1.9:1
<=33	9.6	57.5	29.3	1.4:1
<=36	14.2	53.1	39.8	1.1:1
<=39	19.6	48.8	50.4	1.0:1
<=41	23.8	45.9	57.7	0.8:1
<=43	28.5	42.9	64.5	0.8:1
<=45	33.4	40.2	70.8	0.7:1
<=47	38.9	37.5	77.1	0.6:1
<=49	44.9	34.6	82.1	0.5:1
<=51	50.9	32.2	86.5	0.5:1
<=53	57.3	29.8	90.2	0.4:1
<=55	63.5	27.8	93.0	0.4:1
<=57	69.2	26.1	95.5	0.4:1
<=59	74.9	24.6	97.2	0.3:1
<=61	79.9	23.3	98.3	0.3:1
<=63	84.0	22.3	98.9	0.3:1
<=66	89.0	21.2	99.6	0.3:1
<=71	95.3	19.9	99.9	0.2:1
<=100	100.0	18.9	100.0	0.2:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the \$5.50/day 2011 PPP Poverty Line**

Table 2 (\$5.50/day 2011 PPP): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	94.4
29–33	88.2
34–36	84.1
37–39	80.5
40–41	76.6
42–43	73.1
44–45	68.9
46–47	64.4
48–49	58.0
50–51	52.8
52–53	47.1
54–55	41.3
56–57	36.5
58–59	31.6
60–61	26.8
62–63	23.5
64–66	19.3
67–71	12.2
72–100	4.7

Table 4 (\$5.50/day 2011 PPP): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	0.0	1.5	1.8	2.6
29–33	+0.8	2.4	2.8	3.8
34–36	–0.3	2.8	3.2	4.2
37–39	+0.4	2.8	3.1	4.5
40–41	+1.2	3.4	4.2	5.4
42–43	+2.5	3.4	3.9	5.3
44–45	+0.7	3.3	4.0	5.0
46–47	+2.2	3.4	4.0	5.1
48–49	+2.5	3.4	4.1	5.3
50–51	–1.0	3.4	4.1	5.6
52–53	+4.1	3.1	3.7	5.0
54–55	–1.9	3.3	3.9	5.5
56–57	–4.2	3.7	4.1	5.5
58–59	+0.4	3.1	3.6	5.1
60–61	+1.3	3.1	3.7	4.9
62–63	–1.5	3.6	4.1	5.3
64–66	–1.5	3.0	3.6	4.6
67–71	–2.0	2.3	2.8	3.8
72–100	–0.5	1.6	1.9	2.5

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the validation sample.

Table 5 (\$5.50/day 2011 PPP): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-1.3	71.1	78.6	88.0
4	+0.9	43.5	50.1	61.3
8	+1.2	31.9	37.5	46.7
16	+0.3	22.7	27.2	34.3
32	+0.2	15.8	19.2	24.6
64	+0.1	11.4	13.6	17.8
128	+0.2	7.9	9.4	13.7
256	+0.2	5.8	7.0	10.0
512	+0.3	4.1	4.8	6.3
1,024	+0.2	2.9	3.5	4.6
2,048	+0.2	2.0	2.4	3.1
4,096	+0.1	1.4	1.6	2.2
8,192	+0.1	1.0	1.1	1.5
16,384	+0.1	0.7	0.8	1.1

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (\$5.50/day 2011 PPP): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	4.4	46.4	0.3	48.9	53.3
<=33	8.7	42.0	0.9	48.3	57.0
<=36	12.6	38.2	1.6	47.6	60.2
<=39	16.9	33.9	2.7	46.5	63.4
<=41	20.1	30.6	3.7	45.5	65.7
<=43	23.5	27.3	5.0	44.2	67.7
<=45	26.8	24.0	6.6	42.6	69.5
<=47	30.3	20.5	8.6	40.6	70.9
<=49	33.6	17.1	11.3	38.0	71.6
<=51	36.9	13.9	14.1	35.1	72.0
<=53	39.7	11.0	17.6	31.6	71.4
<=55	42.3	8.5	21.2	28.1	70.4
<=57	44.5	6.2	24.7	24.6	69.1
<=59	46.4	4.4	28.5	20.8	67.2
<=61	47.7	3.1	32.2	17.0	64.7
<=63	48.7	2.0	35.3	13.9	62.7
<=66	49.7	1.1	39.3	9.9	59.6
<=71	50.5	0.2	44.8	4.5	55.0
<=100	50.8	0.0	49.2	0.0	50.8

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (\$5.50/day 2011 PPP): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	93.9	8.6	15.3:1
<=33	9.6	90.6	17.2	9.6:1
<=36	14.2	88.6	24.8	7.8:1
<=39	19.6	86.3	33.3	6.3:1
<=41	23.8	84.5	39.7	5.5:1
<=43	28.5	82.4	46.3	4.7:1
<=45	33.4	80.3	52.8	4.1:1
<=47	38.9	77.8	59.7	3.5:1
<=49	44.9	74.9	66.2	3.0:1
<=51	50.9	72.4	72.6	2.6:1
<=53	57.3	69.3	78.3	2.3:1
<=55	63.5	66.7	83.3	2.0:1
<=57	69.2	64.4	87.7	1.8:1
<=59	74.9	62.0	91.4	1.6:1
<=61	79.9	59.7	94.0	1.5:1
<=63	84.0	58.0	96.0	1.4:1
<=66	89.0	55.9	97.9	1.3:1
<=71	95.3	53.0	99.5	1.1:1
<=100	100.0	50.8	100.0	1.0:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the \$21.70/day 2011 PPP Poverty Line**

Table 2 (\$21.70/day 2011 PPP): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	100.0
29–33	100.0
34–36	99.9
37–39	99.9
40–41	99.9
42–43	99.8
44–45	99.6
46–47	99.6
48–49	99.0
50–51	99.0
52–53	98.8
54–55	98.3
56–57	98.0
58–59	97.1
60–61	96.1
62–63	95.8
64–66	95.4
67–71	91.4
72–100	82.5

Table 4 (\$21.70/day 2011 PPP): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
29–33	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
34–36	–0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
37–39	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2
40–41	–0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
42–43	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.3
44–45	–0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
46–47	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.5
48–49	–0.2	0.6	0.7	0.9
50–51	+0.9	1.1	1.4	1.7
52–53	+0.5	0.8	1.0	1.3
54–55	+0.7	1.1	1.3	1.7
56–57	+0.9	1.1	1.4	1.9
58–59	+0.7	1.3	1.5	1.9
60–61	+1.0	1.7	1.9	2.5
62–63	–0.4	1.6	1.9	2.5
64–66	+0.8	1.7	2.1	2.6
67–71	+0.4	1.8	2.2	3.0
72–100	–3.1	2.8	3.0	4.3

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (\$21.70/day 2011 PPP): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-0.6	4.3	8.7	57.0
4	+0.3	15.8	22.9	34.7
8	+0.3	11.4	16.8	23.1
16	+0.3	8.7	10.6	14.0
32	+0.2	5.9	7.2	9.4
64	+0.2	4.2	4.9	7.1
128	+0.2	3.2	3.9	5.0
256	+0.2	2.1	2.5	3.2
512	+0.2	1.5	1.8	2.5
1,024	+0.2	1.1	1.2	1.6
2,048	+0.2	0.7	0.9	1.2
4,096	+0.2	0.5	0.6	0.8
8,192	+0.2	0.4	0.4	0.6
16,384	+0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (\$21.70/day 2011 PPP): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	4.7	92.7	0.0	2.6	7.3
<=33	9.6	87.7	0.0	2.6	12.3
<=36	14.2	83.2	0.0	2.6	16.8
<=39	19.6	77.8	0.0	2.6	22.2
<=41	23.8	73.6	0.0	2.6	26.4
<=43	28.5	68.9	0.0	2.6	31.1
<=45	33.4	64.0	0.0	2.6	36.0
<=47	38.9	58.5	0.0	2.6	41.5
<=49	44.8	52.6	0.1	2.5	47.3
<=51	50.8	46.6	0.2	2.4	53.2
<=53	57.0	40.3	0.3	2.3	59.4
<=55	63.1	34.3	0.4	2.2	65.3
<=57	68.7	28.7	0.5	2.1	70.7
<=59	74.1	23.2	0.7	1.9	76.1
<=61	79.0	18.4	0.9	1.7	80.7
<=63	83.0	14.4	1.1	1.5	84.5
<=66	87.7	9.7	1.3	1.3	89.0
<=71	93.4	3.9	1.9	0.7	94.2
<=100	97.4	0.0	2.6	0.0	97.4

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (\$21.70/day 2011 PPP): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	100.0	4.8	Only poor targeted
<=33	9.6	100.0	9.9	6,856.3:1
<=36	14.2	100.0	14.6	9,527.6:1
<=39	19.6	100.0	20.1	2,818.9:1
<=41	23.8	100.0	24.5	2,025.8:1
<=43	28.5	99.9	29.2	1,501.8:1
<=45	33.4	99.9	34.3	1,262.7:1
<=47	38.9	99.9	39.9	807.6:1
<=49	44.9	99.8	46.0	491.1:1
<=51	50.9	99.7	52.1	305.0:1
<=53	57.3	99.5	58.6	212.8:1
<=55	63.5	99.4	64.8	163.4:1
<=57	69.2	99.2	70.5	129.8:1
<=59	74.9	99.1	76.1	104.8:1
<=61	79.9	98.8	81.1	85.6:1
<=63	84.0	98.7	85.2	77.8:1
<=66	89.0	98.5	90.1	66.0:1
<=71	95.3	98.0	96.0	50.0:1
<=100	100.0	97.4	100.0	37.3:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the First-Decile (10th-Percentile) Poverty Line**

Table 2 (First-decile line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	41.1
29–33	26.7
34–36	21.5
37–39	16.0
40–41	12.8
42–43	10.9
44–45	9.6
46–47	7.5
48–49	5.8
50–51	4.1
52–53	3.3
54–55	2.1
56–57	1.7
58–59	1.2
60–61	0.8
62–63	0.6
64–66	0.3
67–71	0.2
72–100	0.0

Table 4 (First-decile line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+0.9	3.8	4.6	5.9
29–33	+1.6	3.1	3.7	5.0
34–36	+0.1	3.2	3.8	4.9
37–39	+0.3	2.5	3.0	3.9
40–41	+0.2	2.5	3.0	3.8
42–43	+0.1	2.2	2.6	3.4
44–45	+0.9	2.1	2.5	3.2
46–47	+0.1	1.7	2.0	2.5
48–49	+0.2	1.6	1.9	2.5
50–51	+0.5	1.1	1.3	1.7
52–53	+0.5	1.0	1.2	1.5
54–55	+0.2	0.9	1.0	1.3
56–57	–1.1	1.3	1.4	1.8
58–59	–0.2	0.7	0.8	1.1
60–61	+0.1	0.5	0.6	0.8
62–63	–0.1	0.5	0.6	0.8
64–66	–0.2	0.5	0.6	0.7
67–71	+0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
72–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (First-decile line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.3	42.8	64.6	69.2
4	+1.3	22.3	27.9	39.0
8	+0.9	15.2	19.8	27.8
16	+0.7	11.3	13.4	19.2
32	+0.5	8.0	9.9	13.2
64	+0.5	5.8	6.9	9.7
128	+0.3	4.2	5.0	6.2
256	+0.3	3.0	3.5	4.6
512	+0.3	2.2	2.5	3.3
1,024	+0.2	1.6	1.9	2.4
2,048	+0.2	1.0	1.2	1.6
4,096	+0.2	0.7	0.9	1.2
8,192	+0.2	0.5	0.6	0.9
16,384	+0.2	0.4	0.5	0.6

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (First-decile line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	1.9	6.2	2.7	89.1	91.0
<=33	3.2	4.9	6.4	85.4	88.7
<=36	4.2	4.0	10.0	81.8	86.0
<=39	5.0	3.1	14.5	77.3	82.3
<=41	5.6	2.6	18.2	73.6	79.2
<=43	6.1	2.1	22.4	69.5	75.6
<=45	6.5	1.6	26.9	65.0	71.5
<=47	7.0	1.2	32.0	59.9	66.8
<=49	7.3	0.9	37.6	54.2	61.5
<=51	7.5	0.6	43.4	48.4	55.9
<=53	7.7	0.5	49.6	42.2	49.9
<=55	7.8	0.3	55.6	36.2	44.0
<=57	8.0	0.2	61.2	30.6	38.6
<=59	8.0	0.1	66.8	25.0	33.1
<=61	8.1	0.1	71.8	20.0	28.1
<=63	8.1	0.0	75.9	16.0	24.1
<=66	8.2	0.0	80.9	11.0	19.1
<=71	8.2	0.0	87.2	4.7	12.8
<=100	8.2	0.0	91.8	0.0	8.2

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (First-decile line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	41.5	23.7	0.7:1
<=33	9.6	33.5	39.6	0.5:1
<=36	14.2	29.4	51.1	0.4:1
<=39	19.6	25.7	61.8	0.3:1
<=41	23.8	23.5	68.6	0.3:1
<=43	28.5	21.4	74.8	0.3:1
<=45	33.4	19.6	80.1	0.2:1
<=47	38.9	17.9	85.2	0.2:1
<=49	44.9	16.2	89.1	0.2:1
<=51	50.9	14.7	92.1	0.2:1
<=53	57.3	13.5	94.5	0.2:1
<=55	63.5	12.4	96.1	0.1:1
<=57	69.2	11.5	97.6	0.1:1
<=59	74.9	10.8	98.6	0.1:1
<=61	79.9	10.1	99.2	0.1:1
<=63	84.0	9.7	99.6	0.1:1
<=66	89.0	9.2	99.9	0.1:1
<=71	95.3	8.6	100.0	0.1:1
<=100	100.0	8.2	100.0	0.1:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the First-Quintile (20th-Percentile) Poverty Line**

Table 2 (First-quintile line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	62.5
29–33	47.7
34–36	40.9
37–39	32.8
40–41	27.9
42–43	24.1
44–45	21.6
46–47	19.0
48–49	14.6
50–51	11.7
52–53	9.3
54–55	6.8
56–57	5.4
58–59	3.9
60–61	3.3
62–63	2.6
64–66	1.4
67–71	0.8
72–100	0.3

Table 4 (First-quintile line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+1.6	3.7	4.5	6.0
29–33	+2.7	3.7	4.3	5.8
34–36	+0.4	3.6	4.5	5.8
37–39	–1.2	3.3	3.9	5.4
40–41	0.0	3.4	3.8	5.4
42–43	0.0	3.1	3.8	4.9
44–45	–0.5	3.0	3.5	4.7
46–47	–0.3	2.7	3.1	4.4
48–49	+2.0	2.2	2.6	3.3
50–51	+0.7	1.9	2.3	2.9
52–53	+0.3	1.7	2.1	2.8
54–55	–0.3	1.7	2.0	2.6
56–57	–3.4	2.9	3.0	3.3
58–59	–0.5	1.3	1.5	2.0
60–61	+0.1	1.2	1.4	1.9
62–63	+0.3	1.1	1.3	1.8
64–66	–0.5	1.0	1.2	1.6
67–71	+0.1	0.5	0.5	0.7
72–100	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.6

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (First-quintile line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.6	64.3	68.0	79.6
4	+0.8	32.9	40.9	55.3
8	+0.6	22.6	27.8	36.2
16	+0.4	16.4	19.2	26.1
32	+0.2	11.8	13.6	17.3
64	+0.3	8.2	9.8	12.7
128	+0.2	5.8	6.9	8.3
256	+0.2	4.2	4.9	6.5
512	+0.2	2.8	3.3	4.5
1,024	+0.1	2.0	2.4	3.3
2,048	0.0	1.5	1.7	2.3
4,096	0.0	1.0	1.2	1.6
8,192	0.0	0.8	0.9	1.2
16,384	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.8

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (First-quintile line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	2.9	14.0	1.8	81.3	84.2
<=33	5.2	11.7	4.5	78.7	83.8
<=36	7.0	9.9	7.2	75.9	82.9
<=39	8.8	8.1	10.8	72.3	81.1
<=41	10.0	6.9	13.8	69.3	79.3
<=43	11.2	5.7	17.3	65.8	76.9
<=45	12.2	4.7	21.2	61.9	74.2
<=47	13.3	3.6	25.7	57.4	70.7
<=49	14.0	2.8	30.9	52.3	66.3
<=51	14.7	2.1	36.2	46.9	61.7
<=53	15.3	1.5	42.0	41.1	56.5
<=55	15.8	1.1	47.7	35.4	51.2
<=57	16.2	0.7	53.0	30.1	46.3
<=59	16.5	0.4	58.4	24.7	41.2
<=61	16.6	0.3	63.3	19.9	36.5
<=63	16.7	0.1	67.3	15.8	32.6
<=66	16.8	0.1	72.2	10.9	27.7
<=71	16.9	0.0	78.5	4.7	21.5
<=100	16.9	0.0	83.1	0.0	16.9

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (First-quintile line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	62.0	17.2	1.6:1
<=33	9.6	53.6	30.6	1.2:1
<=36	14.2	49.1	41.3	1.0:1
<=39	19.6	44.9	52.1	0.8:1
<=41	23.8	42.0	59.4	0.7:1
<=43	28.5	39.2	66.1	0.6:1
<=45	33.4	36.6	72.4	0.6:1
<=47	38.9	34.0	78.5	0.5:1
<=49	44.9	31.2	83.2	0.5:1
<=51	50.9	28.9	87.4	0.4:1
<=53	57.3	26.8	90.9	0.4:1
<=55	63.5	24.9	93.5	0.3:1
<=57	69.2	23.4	95.9	0.3:1
<=59	74.9	22.0	97.5	0.3:1
<=61	79.9	20.8	98.5	0.3:1
<=63	84.0	19.9	99.1	0.2:1
<=66	89.0	18.9	99.6	0.2:1
<=71	95.3	17.7	99.9	0.2:1
<=100	100.0	16.9	100.0	0.2:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the Second-Quintile (20th-Percentile) Poverty Line**

Table 2 (Second-quintile line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	85.5
29–33	75.1
34–36	69.0
37–39	62.5
40–41	58.4
42–43	52.7
44–45	48.4
46–47	43.7
48–49	37.6
50–51	32.4
52–53	27.1
54–55	22.8
56–57	19.1
58–59	15.0
60–61	12.1
62–63	10.2
64–66	7.9
67–71	4.3
72–100	1.6

Table 4 (Second-quintile line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+0.8	2.7	3.2	4.4
29–33	+0.9	3.2	3.9	4.8
34–36	–0.4	3.4	4.2	5.5
37–39	+0.1	3.4	4.0	5.4
40–41	+3.4	4.1	4.7	6.3
42–43	+1.8	3.6	4.3	5.6
44–45	–0.4	3.7	4.3	5.4
46–47	+0.9	3.4	4.1	5.4
48–49	+1.0	3.5	4.1	5.5
50–51	–2.0	3.5	4.1	5.5
52–53	+1.7	2.7	3.2	4.5
54–55	+1.3	2.7	3.1	4.3
56–57	–5.7	4.3	4.7	5.4
58–59	–0.5	2.4	2.8	3.7
60–61	0.0	2.3	2.7	3.8
62–63	–1.9	2.6	3.0	4.3
64–66	–1.1	2.1	2.5	3.4
67–71	–2.4	2.1	2.3	2.6
72–100	0.0	0.9	1.1	1.3

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (Second-quintile line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.6	67.7	80.0	88.8
4	+1.0	41.0	47.9	62.8
8	+0.7	29.4	34.8	45.9
16	+0.3	21.2	26.0	33.1
32	0.0	15.6	18.7	24.3
64	-0.1	10.8	12.6	16.9
128	-0.1	7.9	9.5	12.0
256	0.0	5.5	6.4	8.4
512	0.0	3.9	4.6	5.9
1,024	-0.1	2.6	3.2	4.0
2,048	-0.2	1.8	2.2	3.1
4,096	-0.2	1.3	1.6	2.2
8,192	-0.2	0.9	1.1	1.5
16,384	-0.3	0.7	0.8	1.0

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (Second-quintile line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	4.0	31.1	0.7	64.2	68.2
<=33	7.6	27.4	2.0	62.9	70.6
<=36	10.8	24.3	3.4	61.5	72.3
<=39	14.1	21.0	5.5	59.5	73.6
<=41	16.5	18.5	7.3	57.6	74.2
<=43	19.0	16.1	9.5	55.4	74.4
<=45	21.3	13.7	12.1	52.9	74.2
<=47	23.7	11.4	15.2	49.7	73.4
<=49	25.8	9.2	19.1	45.9	71.7
<=51	27.9	7.2	23.1	41.8	69.7
<=53	29.6	5.5	27.8	37.2	66.7
<=55	30.9	4.1	32.5	32.4	63.3
<=57	32.2	2.9	37.0	27.9	60.1
<=59	33.1	1.9	41.7	23.2	56.3
<=61	33.7	1.3	46.1	18.8	52.5
<=63	34.2	0.8	49.8	15.1	49.4
<=66	34.7	0.4	54.4	10.5	45.2
<=71	35.0	0.1	60.3	4.6	39.6
<=100	35.1	0.0	64.9	0.0	35.1

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (Second-quintile line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	84.9	11.3	5.6:1
<=33	9.6	79.2	21.8	3.8:1
<=36	14.2	75.8	30.7	3.1:1
<=39	19.6	72.1	40.3	2.6:1
<=41	23.8	69.4	47.1	2.3:1
<=43	28.5	66.6	54.1	2.0:1
<=45	33.4	63.9	60.8	1.8:1
<=47	38.9	60.9	67.6	1.6:1
<=49	44.9	57.6	73.7	1.4:1
<=51	50.9	54.7	79.4	1.2:1
<=53	57.3	51.6	84.3	1.1:1
<=55	63.5	48.7	88.2	1.0:1
<=57	69.2	46.5	91.8	0.9:1
<=59	74.9	44.2	94.4	0.8:1
<=61	79.9	42.2	96.2	0.7:1
<=63	84.0	40.7	97.6	0.7:1
<=66	89.0	38.9	98.8	0.6:1
<=71	95.3	36.7	99.8	0.6:1
<=100	100.0	35.1	100.0	0.5:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the Median (50th-Percentile) Poverty Line**

Table 2 (Median line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	91.5
29–33	84.2
34–36	78.6
37–39	74.0
40–41	70.4
42–43	66.1
44–45	61.8
46–47	56.8
48–49	50.6
50–51	44.5
52–53	38.5
54–55	33.7
56–57	28.9
58–59	24.3
60–61	20.2
62–63	17.5
64–66	14.0
67–71	8.5
72–100	3.1

Table 4 (Median line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	+0.4	2.1	2.5	3.1
29–33	+0.5	2.7	3.1	4.4
34–36	+0.1	3.0	3.6	4.8
37–39	+0.4	3.0	3.5	4.6
40–41	+3.2	3.9	4.7	5.7
42–43	+3.1	3.6	4.2	6.0
44–45	-0.4	3.5	4.1	5.3
46–47	+2.5	3.5	4.1	5.1
48–49	+2.2	3.5	4.2	5.5
50–51	-1.4	3.6	4.3	5.7
52–53	+2.9	3.1	3.6	4.7
54–55	+0.6	3.0	3.6	4.8
56–57	-5.2	4.1	4.4	5.2
58–59	+0.1	2.8	3.4	4.6
60–61	+1.3	2.8	3.3	4.3
62–63	-2.4	3.2	3.8	5.5
64–66	-0.9	2.6	3.0	4.2
67–71	-1.7	1.9	2.3	3.2
72–100	-0.2	1.3	1.5	1.9

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the validation sample.

Table 5 (Median line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-0.4	68.6	78.2	91.5
4	+1.5	42.2	50.0	59.7
8	+1.5	31.0	36.3	44.7
16	+0.7	23.2	26.8	35.7
32	+0.4	15.7	18.9	25.5
64	+0.1	11.4	13.7	17.8
128	+0.3	7.9	9.7	13.3
256	+0.3	5.9	7.0	8.7
512	+0.4	4.1	4.8	6.3
1,024	+0.3	2.9	3.4	4.1
2,048	+0.2	2.0	2.4	3.1
4,096	+0.2	1.4	1.6	2.0
8,192	+0.2	1.0	1.1	1.5
16,384	+0.2	0.7	0.8	1.1

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (Median line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	4.2	40.3	0.4	55.1	59.3
<=33	8.4	36.1	1.2	54.3	62.6
<=36	12.0	32.5	2.2	53.3	65.3
<=39	15.9	28.6	3.6	51.9	67.8
<=41	18.9	25.6	4.9	50.6	69.5
<=43	21.9	22.6	6.6	48.9	70.9
<=45	24.9	19.6	8.5	47.0	71.9
<=47	28.0	16.5	11.0	44.5	72.5
<=49	30.8	13.7	14.1	41.4	72.3
<=51	33.6	10.9	17.4	38.1	71.7
<=53	35.9	8.6	21.4	34.1	70.1
<=55	38.0	6.5	25.5	30.0	68.0
<=57	39.8	4.7	29.4	26.1	65.9
<=59	41.3	3.2	33.6	21.9	63.2
<=61	42.3	2.2	37.6	17.9	60.2
<=63	43.1	1.4	41.0	14.5	57.6
<=66	43.8	0.7	45.2	10.3	54.0
<=71	44.4	0.2	51.0	4.5	48.9
<=100	44.5	0.0	55.5	0.0	44.5

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (Median line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	90.9	9.5	10.0:1
<=33	9.6	87.1	18.9	6.7:1
<=36	14.2	84.4	26.9	5.4:1
<=39	19.6	81.5	35.8	4.4:1
<=41	23.8	79.3	42.5	3.8:1
<=43	28.5	77.0	49.3	3.3:1
<=45	33.4	74.6	56.0	2.9:1
<=47	38.9	71.8	62.8	2.5:1
<=49	44.9	68.7	69.3	2.2:1
<=51	50.9	65.9	75.4	1.9:1
<=53	57.3	62.7	80.8	1.7:1
<=55	63.5	59.9	85.4	1.5:1
<=57	69.2	57.5	89.5	1.4:1
<=59	74.9	55.2	92.8	1.2:1
<=61	79.9	52.9	95.0	1.1:1
<=63	84.0	51.3	96.8	1.1:1
<=66	89.0	49.2	98.4	1.0:1
<=71	95.3	46.5	99.7	0.9:1
<=100	100.0	44.5	100.0	0.8:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the Third-Quintile (60th-Percentile) Poverty Line**

Table 2 (Third-quintile line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	95.7
29–33	90.5
34–36	86.6
37–39	83.6
40–41	79.8
42–43	76.7
44–45	73.1
46–47	68.8
48–49	62.5
50–51	57.7
52–53	51.7
54–55	45.8
56–57	41.0
58–59	35.9
60–61	30.7
62–63	27.6
64–66	23.1
67–71	15.0
72–100	5.9

Table 4 (Third-quintile line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	–0.1	1.4	1.7	2.2
29–33	+1.0	2.2	2.6	3.6
34–36	–1.2	2.2	2.7	3.7
37–39	+1.1	2.5	2.9	4.1
40–41	+0.3	3.0	3.6	4.9
42–43	+0.5	3.2	3.9	4.8
44–45	+0.8	3.1	3.8	4.9
46–47	+1.5	3.0	3.7	4.8
48–49	+2.7	3.3	3.9	5.5
50–51	–0.3	3.4	4.0	5.4
52–53	+4.3	3.2	3.8	5.2
54–55	–1.8	3.2	4.0	5.8
56–57	–4.0	3.7	4.0	5.1
58–59	–0.9	3.5	4.3	5.9
60–61	+1.0	3.3	3.8	5.0
62–63	–1.5	3.6	4.3	5.7
64–66	–1.3	3.1	3.7	4.9
67–71	–1.7	2.5	2.9	3.9
72–100	–0.9	1.9	2.3	2.9

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the validation sample.

Table 5 (Third-quintile line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-1.9	71.2	76.8	87.8
4	+0.7	42.5	49.2	61.8
8	+1.3	31.3	37.1	46.5
16	+0.4	22.6	26.5	35.0
32	+0.1	16.1	18.7	24.7
64	0.0	11.4	13.3	18.4
128	0.0	7.9	9.6	14.0
256	0.0	6.0	7.1	10.1
512	+0.1	4.1	4.9	6.4
1,024	+0.1	3.0	3.5	4.2
2,048	0.0	2.0	2.3	3.1
4,096	0.0	1.5	1.7	2.2
8,192	0.0	1.0	1.2	1.5
16,384	0.0	0.7	0.8	1.1

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (Third-quintile line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	4.5	50.0	0.2	45.3	49.8
<=33	8.9	45.5	0.7	44.8	53.7
<=36	12.9	41.6	1.3	44.2	57.1
<=39	17.4	37.1	2.2	43.3	60.7
<=41	20.8	33.7	3.1	42.5	63.2
<=43	24.3	30.1	4.2	41.4	65.7
<=45	27.9	26.6	5.5	40.0	67.9
<=47	31.6	22.9	7.3	38.2	69.8
<=49	35.2	19.2	9.7	35.9	71.1
<=51	38.7	15.7	12.2	33.3	72.0
<=53	41.9	12.6	15.4	30.1	72.0
<=55	44.7	9.7	18.7	26.8	71.6
<=57	47.2	7.3	22.0	23.6	70.8
<=59	49.3	5.2	25.6	20.0	69.3
<=61	50.8	3.6	29.1	16.5	67.3
<=63	52.0	2.4	32.0	13.6	65.6
<=66	53.2	1.3	35.8	9.7	62.9
<=71	54.2	0.3	41.2	4.4	58.5
<=100	54.5	0.0	45.5	0.0	54.5

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (Third-quintile line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	95.5	8.2	21.2:1
<=33	9.6	92.5	16.4	12.3:1
<=36	14.2	90.8	23.7	9.9:1
<=39	19.6	88.7	31.9	7.8:1
<=41	23.8	87.1	38.1	6.8:1
<=43	28.5	85.4	44.7	5.8:1
<=45	33.4	83.4	51.2	5.0:1
<=47	38.9	81.1	58.0	4.3:1
<=49	44.9	78.4	64.7	3.6:1
<=51	50.9	76.0	71.1	3.2:1
<=53	57.3	73.1	76.9	2.7:1
<=55	63.5	70.5	82.2	2.4:1
<=57	69.2	68.2	86.7	2.1:1
<=59	74.9	65.9	90.5	1.9:1
<=61	79.9	63.6	93.3	1.7:1
<=63	84.0	61.9	95.6	1.6:1
<=66	89.0	59.7	97.7	1.5:1
<=71	95.3	56.8	99.5	1.3:1
<=100	100.0	54.5	100.0	1.2:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

**Tables for
the Fourth-Quintile (80th-Percentile) Poverty Line**

Table 2 (Fourth-quintile line): Scores and their corresponding estimates of poverty likelihoods

If a household's score is then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–28	99.5
29–33	98.3
34–36	96.4
37–39	95.9
40–41	95.0
42–43	93.3
44–45	92.3
46–47	89.9
48–49	86.3
50–51	82.3
52–53	78.3
54–55	74.2
56–57	70.2
58–59	64.9
60–61	59.6
62–63	56.3
64–66	51.6
67–71	39.0
72–100	22.4

Table 4 (Fourth-quintile line): Errors in poverty likelihoods for a participant’s household (average of differences between estimated and observed values) by score range, with confidence intervals

Score	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–28	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.7
29–33	+0.3	0.9	1.1	1.4
34–36	–1.5	1.2	1.3	1.5
37–39	–0.7	1.2	1.4	1.8
40–41	–0.3	1.5	1.8	2.2
42–43	–0.6	1.7	2.2	2.7
44–45	+1.1	2.0	2.3	3.1
46–47	+1.3	2.2	2.7	3.3
48–49	+3.2	2.5	3.0	4.0
50–51	+2.2	2.9	3.4	4.5
52–53	+4.1	2.8	3.4	4.4
54–55	–0.1	2.8	3.4	4.6
56–57	–2.0	3.0	3.5	4.7
58–59	+0.7	3.5	4.0	5.2
60–61	+1.7	3.7	4.3	5.4
62–63	–5.1	4.5	4.8	6.4
64–66	+5.3	3.6	4.2	5.6
67–71	+0.6	3.1	3.7	4.9
72–100	+0.2	3.2	3.7	4.9

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the validation sample.

Table 5 (Fourth-quintile line): Errors in poverty rates for a sample of a population of participants' households at a point in time (average of differences between estimated and observed values), by sample size and with confidence intervals

Sample Size <i>n</i>	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Error	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	-1.2	61.3	71.7	85.9
4	+0.6	36.5	43.7	56.0
8	+1.5	27.3	33.1	42.6
16	+0.7	20.3	24.1	30.9
32	+0.8	14.6	17.2	21.8
64	+0.6	10.2	12.1	15.6
128	+0.6	7.5	8.5	11.3
256	+0.7	5.0	6.2	8.2
512	+0.8	3.6	4.3	5.6
1,024	+0.7	2.5	3.0	4.1
2,048	+0.7	1.8	2.2	2.9
4,096	+0.7	1.3	1.5	1.8
8,192	+0.7	0.9	1.0	1.3
16,384	+0.7	0.6	0.7	0.9

Scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps from the validation sample.

Table 8 (Fourth-quintile line): Percentages of participants' households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion
<=28	4.6	71.1	0.0	24.2	28.9
<=33	9.5	66.2	0.1	24.1	33.7
<=36	14.0	61.8	0.2	24.0	38.0
<=39	19.2	56.6	0.4	23.9	43.0
<=41	23.2	52.5	0.6	23.6	46.8
<=43	27.6	48.2	0.9	23.4	50.9
<=45	32.1	43.7	1.3	22.9	55.0
<=47	37.0	38.7	1.9	22.3	59.3
<=49	42.0	33.7	2.9	21.4	63.5
<=51	47.0	28.7	3.9	20.3	67.3
<=53	51.9	23.8	5.4	18.9	70.8
<=55	56.5	19.2	7.0	17.3	73.8
<=57	60.6	15.1	8.6	15.7	76.3
<=59	64.3	11.4	10.6	13.7	78.0
<=61	67.3	8.4	12.6	11.7	79.0
<=63	69.8	6.0	14.3	10.0	79.8
<=66	72.2	3.5	16.8	7.4	79.6
<=71	74.7	1.1	20.7	3.6	78.3
<=100	75.7	0.0	24.3	0.0	75.7

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100. Scorecard applied to the validation sample.

Table 9 (Fourth-quintile line): Share of all participants' households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor, share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted per non-poor household mistakenly targeted

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<=28	4.7	99.4	6.1	175.1:1
<=33	9.6	98.7	12.6	76.2:1
<=36	14.2	98.4	18.4	60.3:1
<=39	19.6	97.9	25.3	45.6:1
<=41	23.8	97.3	30.6	36.7:1
<=43	28.5	96.8	36.4	30.0:1
<=45	33.4	96.0	42.3	24.0:1
<=47	38.9	95.0	48.9	19.1:1
<=49	44.9	93.6	55.5	14.7:1
<=51	50.9	92.3	62.1	11.9:1
<=53	57.3	90.6	68.5	9.6:1
<=55	63.5	89.0	74.6	8.1:1
<=57	69.2	87.6	80.0	7.1:1
<=59	74.9	85.9	84.9	6.1:1
<=61	79.9	84.2	88.9	5.3:1
<=63	84.0	83.0	92.1	4.9:1
<=66	89.0	81.1	95.3	4.3:1
<=71	95.3	78.3	98.6	3.6:1
<=100	100.0	75.7	100.0	3.1:1

Scorecard applied to the validation sample.