BOTSWANA INSTITUTE FOR
DEVELOPMENT POLICY ANALYSIS

WORKING PAPER

Abstract

This paper is part of a larger study of poverty and poverty alleviation in Botswana, undertaken by BIDPA for the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning. The paper presents revised estimates of the Poverty Datum Line (PDL) for Botswana, needed to analyse the Household Income and Expenditure Surveys for 1993/94 and 1985/86 in terms of poverty. The PDL revisions are fully documented, including details of assumptions used and estimates derived.

Keywords

Restricted

A revised Poverty Datum Line for Botswana Revised Poverty Datum Line Estimates for Botswana, for the Analysis of Household Income and Expenditure Data for 1993/94 and 1985/86

By Per Granberg
BIDPA Working Paper No. 5
June 1996

[1]BOTSWANA INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY ANALYSIS (BIDPA)
4th. Floor, Tshomarelo House
Broadhurst Mall
Private Bag BR-29
Gaborone, Botswana
Tel: + (267) 37 17 50
Fax:+ (267) 37 17 48
Website: www.bidpa.bw

A revised poverty datum line for Botswana

1. Introduction

1.   This paper forms part of a major study by BIDPA, analysing the nature and extent of poverty in Botswana. The quantification of the incidence of poverty, in terms of its present level and changes over time, represents an important step in this exercise. For this purpose, the poverty datum line for Botswana has been recalculated to assist in the analysis of household income and expenditure data collected by the Central Statistics Office.

2.   The purpose of the present paper is to present this recalculation exercise, and in particular, to put on record the various assumptions applied and estimates resulting. The latter are given in considerable detail, in order that this paper may serve the dual purpose of:

- properly documenting the work undertaken for the poverty study;
- making these estimates available to the wider audience, in the hope that they may equally serve alternative purposes.

2. The poverty datum line

3.   The poverty datum line (PDL) for Botswana represents a theoretical "consumption basket", the content of which is assumed to correspond to the minimum amounts of goods and services required by Batswana households to maintain an acceptable minimum standard of living. The practical purpose of constructing such a "basket" is to establish a benchmark against which actual household incomes or expenditures may be compared, with a view to establishing the prevalence of poverty throughout the country.

4.   In technical terms, the PDL is constructed as the product of two separate sets of variables:

- one depicting the minimum *quantity* requirements of various goods and services (as measured in "physical" units, i.e. in kilos, litres etc.);
- another representing the *prices* of the defined goods and services.

5.   The minimum requirements are detailed with respect to individual households, reflecting the geographical location of the household, as well as the number, age and sex of its members. The product of the above two sets of variables therefore represents the cost of maintaining a minimum standard of living, in respect of household *location and composition*. There is consequently not *one* but *many* PDLs for Botswana, *each* household having its individual PDL.

6.   The price data used in these calculations are, of necessity, specified with respect to a particular point in time. The relevance of any set of PDL estimates is consequently limited to a specific period. In order to obtain the PDLs for any other period, one will have to recalculate the PDL estimates, using prices relating to that specific period.

7.   The PDL estimates hitherto available refer to November 1989 (PDL89). These estimates are detailed in a publication issued by the Central Statistics Office (CSO).[1] They will not be discussed here, except when necessary to explain revisions made in them, or comparisons made with them.

3.   Updating the PDL

8.   The purpose of the present exercise is to construct the foundation upon which an analysis of the incidence of poverty during the periods 1993/94 and 1985/86 may be based, essentially employing the following data:

-   the income data of the Household Income and Expenditure Surveys for 1993/94 and 1985/86 (HIES93/94 and HIES85/86);[2]

-   the PDL89 data.

9.   We are consequently faced with the problem that the income data and PDLs refer to different periods. Broadly speaking, this problem may be addressed in two alternative ways; either by revising the income data, or by revising the PDL cost estimates. We may describe these alternatives, which we will call "the income approach" and "the cost approach", as follows:

-   "The income approach" implies that all household incomes recorded in the HIES85/86 and HIES93/94 are inflated or deflated to the November 1989 price level, and then analysed against the existing PDL89 data. Under this alternative, therefore, the existing PDL data do not need to be revised at all; only the income data do.

-   "The cost approach" implies that the PDL89 estimates are revised so as to correspond to the reference periods for HIES93/94 and HIES85/86, and then analysed against the observed HIES93/94 and HIES85/86 income data. Under this alternative, therefore, the existing income data are left unchanged, while the PDLs have to be revised so as to correspond to each of the new reference periods in question.[3]

10.   The CSO publication referred to above includes an analysis of the HIES85/86 data against the PDL89 according to "the income approach". As explained in footnote 3 below, this approach implicitly reflects the assumption that all prices have changed uniformly over the period in question. For the present purpose it was felt inadvisable to adopt an *a priori* assumption to this effect. "The cost approach" was consequently adopted, and as a result, two new PDLs had to be constructed.

---

[1]   A Poverty Datum Line for Botswana, November 1989. Published March 1991, by the Central Statistics Office.

[2]   Household Income and Expenditure Survey: 1985/86, published by the Central Statistics Office, November, 1988; and Household Income and Expenditure Survey: 1993/94, published by the Central Statistics Office, December, 1995.

[3]   The two approaches will yield identical results if one employs a single, uniform inflation factor. Thus, if INC(t) and PDL(t) are the incomes and PDLs valued at year-t-prices (where t may take the value 1 or 2), and K is the general inflation factor for the period in question, then: INC(2) = INC(1)*K and PDL(2) = PDL(1)*K. The poverty rate for year 1, defined as: PR(1) = INC(1)/PDL(1), may then be calculated either as: INC(1)/[PDL(2)/K], or as: [INC(1)*K]/PDL(2).

The difference between the two approaches is essentially that the former does in practice only allow for such a single, uniform inflator, whereas the latter allows for a more disaggregated, item specific treatment of inflation.

2

11.   In principle this may involve a substantial amount of work, but in practise it need not necessarily do so. Assuming that the "table of physical requirements" remains fairly constant over time, the recalculation exercise may be limited to a revision of the relevant price data. This is the option adopted in the present case.

4.   Price revisions

12.   The price data used for the calculation of the PDL89 estimates corresponded to a set of price-averages for each of the products included in the "basket of requirements". These price-averages were however not equal to the direct averages of *all* prices observed throughout the country for any specific product. Rather, they represented the average of *the lowest* ones observed within *each* of the six geographical regions defined below.

13.   **The six regions defined for the PDL89**

Region	Description
Urban	
Gaborone	The city of Gaborone (including Tlokweng).
Other towns	The other towns of Botswana, i.e.: Francistown, Jwaneng, Lobatse, Palapye and Selibe-Phikwe. (Orapa, being a closed town, is not included.)
Rural	
Area A	The rural south-east, including all of SE and Kgatleng Districts, and the eastern parts of Kweneng and Ngwaketse.
Area B	The rural north-east, including all of NE and Central Districts.
Area C	The rural north-west, including all of Chobe and Ngamiland Districts.
Area D	The rural south-west, including all of Ghanzi and Kgalagadi Districts, and the western parts of Kweneng and Ngwaketse.

Source: Central Statistics Office: A Poverty Datum Line for Botswana, November 1989.

14.   There are consequently six such sets of price estimates, all calculated from primary price observations made especially for the purpose of the PDL89. These price averages have been accepted as a basis for the present recalculation exercise without any revision or alterations, except for the urban rents of larger households, as described later.

15.   Corresponding price data are not available for the present exercise. However, there seems ample reason for assuming that the *relative price movements* of individual products are on the whole fairly uniform, both throughout the country and across high- and low-price outlets. If so, we may update the minimum prices of the PDL89 by way of multiplying them with price increase factors based on the relevant sub-group indices of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for Botswana. Such CPI-based inflation factors were consequently applied for the present purpose, except for housing costs, where relevant rent data were supplied directly by the CSO.

16.   It should be noted that the CPI used is the overall national one. Ideally, one ought to have used specific urban and rural indices for low-income households, rather than the overall CPI referring to all households within the country. This, however, did not prove a practical

3

possibility, as the complete set of sub-indices required were not available for the periods under review. Even if they had been available, however, it seems doubtful if the corresponding PDL estimates would have been significantly different from the ones presently calculated. As far as can be judged from available evidence, the relevant CPI alternatives tended to move fairly uniformly over the periods in question.

17.   The following periods had to be covered by CPI estimates:

- HIES93/94 : November 1993 - January 1995
- PDL89 :   November 1989
- HIES85/86 : June 1985 - August 1986

18.   The Botswana CPI index has been revised twice since June 1985. Thus, although CPI data were available for above periods, they referred to three different indices, varying in their degree of sub-group classification. Except for the early HIES85/86 period, however, the CPI data were reasonably detailed. A unified index, including relevant sub-group indices, was constructed from these individual CPIs, covering the whole period under review, although only approximately so with respect to the sub-group indices of the early HIES85/86 period.

19.   As far as could be ascertained from these data, the mid-period sub-group indices for each of the two HIES periods corresponded closely to the parallel averages for the entire periods. CSO's HIES93/94 publication includes a recommendation to the effect that the former set of indices might be used for the present purpose. Having ascertained that the actual price movements did not invalidate such an approach, we adopted this recommendation.

20.   The price indices used to calculate PDL estimates relating to the two HIESs are therefore:

- for HIES93/94 : June 1994[4]
- for HIES85/86 : January 1986

21.   The CPI data in question are given in Table PRI-1 of the statistical annex.

5.   Revisions of requirements

22.   In principle, it may be argued that the "true basket" of goods and services, corresponding to a given minimum standard of living, will change continuously in reaction to changes in relative prices, product availability and other market conditions. This argument is essentially the same as the one usually advanced in favour of frequently updating the weights of a consumer price index. Thus, assuming that consumers are optimising their welfare by substituting products that have become relatively expensive with those that have become relatively cheap, any basket of consumption items which is fixed over a substantial period will tend to misrepresent the effective cost increase faced by these consumers. Similar effects will arise if market conditions change in other respects, for instance if new products become available to the consumers, or old ones become unavailable.

---

[4]   CSO's HIES93/94 publication does in fact specify July 1994 as the mid-month. This has been corrected in consultation with the CSO.

4

23.   The above conclusion is equally relevant in the present case. The PDLs for various points in time may in fact be interpreted as a consumer price index, with weights given by the stipulated minimum requirements.

24.   In practice, however, there will be limits both to the magnitude of the misrepresentation, and to the amount of effort that may usefully be made to correct it. In the present case it is felt that such changes as may have occurred in the PDL requirements during the period 1985/86 to 1993/94 will be too marginal to warrant our intervention. An intimate knowledge would be required of the conditions facing the poor, and since these conditions are likely to be quite variable, one would probably end up spending considerable time to effect revisions which in the final analysis would remain essentially rough and arbitrary in nature, and, in most cases, minor in extent.

25.   The option of adopting the same table of requirements as defined for the PDL89 therefore has the advantage of simplicity and economy. It has for that reason been adopted for the present purpose, except for urban housing requirements. According to the PDL89 the level of urban housing costs is the same in all urban centres, but *decreases* with increasing household size. This seems intuitively implausible. A preliminary analysis of the HIES data also seems to suggest that housing costs are in fact higher for the larger households, and higher in the major urban centres.

26.   A revised set of urban requirements has consequently been established, in consultation with the CSO, according to which the cost of a simple, single room in Gaborone is established as a benchmark, to which all urban housing requirements relate by the following percentages:

- Gaborone :   100 % of above defined benchmark for households of size: 2.5 and below, and 180 % for households of size: 3.0 and above.[5]
- Francistown : 90 % of the corresponding requirements for Gaborone.
- Other towns : 80 % of the corresponding requirements for Gaborone.

27.   A comprehensive specification of requirements adopted for the present study is given by Tables REQ-1 to REQ-5 of the statistical annex.[6]

6.   The PDL estimates

28.   The PDL estimates relating to the HIES93/94 and HIES85/86 periods, and reflecting the above described requirement and price specifications, are set out in the statistical annex (see tables PDL94-1 to PDL94-8 and tables PDL86-1 to PDL86-8). The corresponding PDL89-tables, incorporating the above mentioned housing revisions, are also given (see tables PDL89-1 to PDL89-8).

---

[5]   Household size is measured in terms of the total number of adult equivalents, the latter being calculated as defined in table REQ-5 of the Statistical Annex.

[6]   Most of these tables are nearly identical to the corresponding CSO tables. They are provided here for ease of reference, and because some of the CSO tables were not comprehensively specified with respect to age groups etc.

29.   The formats of these tables are the same as for the corresponding tables in the CSO publication, except in one minor respect. The exception concerns the last three columns of each table, representing the overall urban, rural and national averages. The present estimates are specified in terms of weighted averages of relevant area-specific PDL estimates, with weights reflecting the relative number of households represented by the HIES data. The nature of the CSO estimates, which cover urban and rural aggregates only, are not defined in the PDL publication, but they obviously reflect some kind of weighted averages of minimum prices for the aggregated areas in question, with weights quite different from those presently employed. The difference between the two sets of estimates is however small, and of little importance, especially to the current study which do not rely on them at all. They are nevertheless included for the benefit of readers who may find such ready illustrations of the overall PDL averages useful.

30.   It should be noted that the estimates given in the tables referred to above do not represent the final PDL estimates, but merely the various sub-group cost elements. In order to calculate the final PDL estimates we shall have to aggregate these cost elements. Such aggregation can only be undertaken by applying them to concrete households defined both in terms of location and the age and sex of each household member.

31.   Table ARE-1 of the statistical annex illustrates the PDLs for a representative selection of household types. For ease of comparison we have adopted the same household types as did the corresponding table of the original CSO publication.

32.   The following pattern emerges from the table:

- Gaborone has the highest PDLs for small size households, implying that Gaborone is the most expensive place to live for households which are both small and poor. This basically reflects the housing cost, which constitutes a high proportion of total expenditures for such households.

- As the household size increases, the relative weight of the housing cost decreases, allowing other requirements to have greater influence. In consequence, the PDLs of rural area D and C overtake Gaborone's, indicating that non-housing costs in the former are higher than in the latter.

Some tentative analytical results

33.   The focus of this paper is not to provide an analysis of the incidence of poverty in Botswana as such, but merely to describe the "foundation" laid for such an analysis. A limited data analysis was however undertaken as part of this work. This was necessary in order to assess the nature and implications of the new PDL estimates, not least in respect of their comparability to previously published poverty data. Although both preliminary and tentative, the estimated poverty rates etc. resulting from this exercise may be of some general interest. In the following we shall consequently summarise and discuss them.

7.   The income concept

34.   The analysis was essentially confined to the calculation of poverty rates, defined as the relative number of households with incomes below or equal to their respective PDLs. Total household incomes were consequently compared to total household PDLs, and the results depended equally upon both. A description of the income concept used is therefore in order.

35.   Total household income may in principle be defined as the sum of a number of diverse elements, such as:

- total incomes *earned,* in the form of wages, salaries, income-in-kind, interests etc.,
- total incomes *received,* in the form of transfers, remittances etc.,
- total incomes *imputed,* to account for owner-occupation of dwellings etc.

36.   With such a number and variety of possible income elements, some of which may only be indirectly imputed through their associated consumption value etc., it is often difficult to measure total incomes accurately. Yet, the correct measurement of total household incomes is of crucial importance for any analysis of poverty.

37.   Poorer households may tend to derive the larger part of their incomes from sources other than regular wage employment, a major share of their incomes often arising from non-monetary sources. Given the problem of measuring such earnings, the most efficient way of determining the incomes of such households may often be to relate them more directly to their expenditure-equivalents. The problem of measuring *incomes earned* is then by-passed, the focus being on *incomes used*, on the assumption that the two will correspond closely, and that the latter is easier to observe accurately.

38.   This approach is adopted for the present analysis. Hence, we have chosen to measure the households' total incomes in terms of their *total consumption expenditures*, not because this represents a theoretically ideal income concept, but because it *a priori* seems to be the most reliable proxy for the incomes in question.[7]

39.   The use of consumption expenditure does, of course, have its limitations. It ignores the existence of saving and investment, and may for that reason be quite inappropriate for the better-off households, which, on the one hand, may have sufficient incomes to allow for both consumption and saving (or investment), and on the other hand may have sufficient savings to finance consumption in excess of their incomes during certain periods. In the present case, however, we are not concerned with such relatively better-off households, our focus being solely upon the poorer segment of society, which presumably has few if any such options.

40.   The use of total consumption expenditure may also give a wrong impression of a household's total incomes in a particular month if this household tends to buy its provisions in bulk; i.e. if it for instance buys a bag of maize meal one month, and none the next. If so, the HIES data will overstate the real consumption expenditures of the former month and understate those of the latter. Given that the HIES observation period was only one month for each household, this will not automatically "even out". However, while this may be true for

---

[7]   The effect of adopting alternative income measures is nevertheless discussed in a later chapter.

individual households during individual months, these effects will presumably balance out within the limits of the HIES samples, provided that one does not divide the HIES data into too small sub-samples, thus risking to capture the distortions within certain sub-groups.

8.   A profile of poverty, 1993/94

41.   Table ARE-2 of the statistical annex illustrates the incidence of poverty in 1993/94, by comparing household incomes with corresponding PDL estimates. The table gives estimates of the overall degree of poverty in various geographical regions, as well as its breakdown into two sub-group categories: moderate and severe.

42.   *Overall* poverty is measured by the percentage share of households with incomes on or below the PDL line, i.e. by the total number of households with insufficient, or barely sufficient, incomes to cover their PDL basket, relative to all households irrespective of income level.

43.   *Moderate* and *severe* poverty relate to the food requirements of the households. A food requirement line is defined, representing the approximate weight of food items in the total PDL for the average household. The food requirement line equals 70 % of the total PDL for rural households, and 50 % for urban, the lower urban percentage reflecting the fact that the food content of the typical urban PDL basket is "diluted" by the relatively high urban housing costs.[8] Thus:

- Moderate poverty is measured by the percentage share of all households that have incomes on or below the PDL line, but *above* the PDL food requirement line. It consequently comprises households that *are* poor, but *not* so poor as to be unable to cover all their PDL food requirements.

- Severe poverty is measured by the percentage share of all households that have incomes *on or below* the PDL food requirement line. It consequently comprises households that are so poor that they have insufficient (or barely sufficient) incomes to cover their PDL food requirements.

44.   The table below summarises some results given in table ARE-2 (section II). A word of warning may however be in order before proceeding to interpret these estimates: these results are preliminary and tentative, based on a fairly rough analysis, without any testing of statistical validity. They should consequently be treated with caution.[9]

45.   The table indicates that slightly more than a third of all households could be classified as poor in 1993/94, and that the majority of these were very poor (i.e. on or below the food requirement line). Rural households were considerably worse off than urban; not only was their overall poverty rate almost twice the urban rate, but the majority of rural households

---

[8]   The above cited food requirement weights indicate that the Botswana PDL may possibly be a little generous by international standards. The corresponding poverty lines for the Indian sub-continent typically reflect a food requirement of approx. 80 % of the PDL.

[9]   This warning does, of course, apply equally to the estimates of table ARE-2 itself, as well as to the corresponding estimates of subsequent tables. Indeed, since these tables contain estimates pertaining to the disaggregated regional level, it should be emphasised that *no* test has been made establishing their statistical validity. It may be suspected that some of the estimates are invalid, especially for rural areas C and D, where the number of sample observations was fairly small.

were facing severe poverty. The rate of such poverty in rural areas was more than four times higher than the urban. Moderate poverty, on the other hand, was more evenly distributed, with approximately the same rate applying for all types of households.

46. **Average rates of poverty, 1993/94**

Rate of poverty	Overall	Moderate	Severe
A : Average rates with respect to households			
Urban	23%	16%	7%
Rural	44%	14%	30%
Total	37%	15%	23%
B : Average rates with respect to population			
Urban	30%	20%	10%
Rural	52%	16%	36%
Total	46%	17%	30%

47.   The above discussion refers to poverty rates calculated with reference to *households*. This corresponds to the poverty measure presented in the original CSO publication. In the past these rates have sometimes been used as a general indicator of the level of poverty faced by the *population* of Botswana. This reflects a somewhat imprecise interpretation of the concept involved. An alternative measure, referring more directly to the population dimension, may however be constructed, by counting the number of household *members* instead of the number of households.[10] The two measures will be fairly similar in nature, but not necessarily in magnitude. Unless average household size is the same for poor and non-poor households, the two measures will be different.

48.   Section B of the above table shows the poverty rates with respect to population, i.e. for the individuals making up the households. The general pattern is similar to that for households, but the rates of poverty are in each case higher, implying that poor households were on average larger than are the non-poor ones. Hence, the overall poverty rate of 37 % for all households translates into an overall rate of 46 % for all individuals. More than 50 % of the rural population was living in poverty, and more than 35 % in severe poverty. In the urban areas, the picture was less bleak; the overall rate of poverty was 30 %, which, although high, was still below the rate of severe poverty in the rural areas.

9.   A profile of poverty, 1985/86

49.   Table ARE-3 of the statistical annex illustrates the degree of poverty in 1985/86. The table is directly comparable to table ARE-2, giving the same types of estimates and reflecting the same definitions. The table below summarises some results from table ARE-3 (section II), corresponding to those given above.

---

[10]   Note that the population-specific poverty rates thus resulting are calculated by "inflating" the corresponding household rates by the household size. If a household has been classified as poor (or non-poor), *all* its members are regarded as poor (or non-poor); i.e. these rates reflect an assumption to the effect that all members of a household are equally bad (or well) off. Our population-specific poverty rates do consequently *not* take into account possible income or consumption differences *within* the households.

50.   **Average rates of poverty, 1985/86**

Rate of poverty	Overall	Moderate	Severe
A : Average rates with respect to households			
Urban	24%	16%	8%
Rural	58%	16%	41%
Total	49%	16%	33%
B : Average rates with respect to population			
Urban	33%	21%	12%
Rural	66%	18%	48%
Total	59%	18%	40%

51.   The general picture emerging from these estimates is seen to be much the same as for 1993/94, the main difference being that the overall occurrence of poverty was higher in 1985/86. Almost half of all households were poor in 1985/86. Poverty was higher in rural areas; approximately six out of every ten rural households were poor, against one out of every four urban households. The type of poverty in urban areas was largely moderate, two thirds of urban poverty being of this category. Rural poverty, on the other hand, was overwhelmingly of the severe type; out of every ten poor rural household seven were severely poor. Severe poverty was indeed predominantly a rural phenomenon, the rural rate being 5 times the urban one. The total rural poverty rate being much higher than the urban, the national poverty was therefore also mostly severe in character, some two thirds of the overall national poverty being of this description.

52.   Looking at the poverty rates for individuals the scale changes, but the same general picture again emerges. Thus, almost 60 % of the total population were classified as poor in 1985/86, with two thirds of the rural population being poor, versus one third for the urban population. Rural poverty was again largely severe in nature, almost half of the rural population being severely poor, while urban poverty was largely of the moderate kind.

10.   Changes in poverty rates

53.   Above we have described the poverty profiles for 1993/94 and 1985/86, and in doing so have already indicated that a general decline of overall poverty rates seems to have occurred during the period. In the current chapter we shall look at these changes in some more detail.

54.   The changes in question are summarised in table ARE-4 of the statistical annex. The first six data-columns of the table contain the poverty rates for various regions, as calculated for the HIES85/86 and HIES93/94 periods and as already presented in tables ARE-2 and ARE-3, while the next three columns present the direct difference between these estimates, presented in terms of decline from1985/86 to 1993/94. Some aggregate results are summarised below.

55.   A substantial decline of 11 % was recorded in the poverty rate for the nation's households as a whole, from 49 % in 1985/86 to 37 % in 1993/94. This overall decline was essentially a reflection of one development: a significant reduction in the rate of *rural, severe*

poverty (from 41 % to 30 %). All other types of poverty, both urban and moderate, declined only marginally.

56.   **Average household rates of poverty, 1985/86 & 1993/94**

	Overall	Moderate	Severe
A : Average Urban Rates			
A : 1985/86	24%	16%	8%
B : 1993/94	23%	16%	7%
C : Decline (B-A)	1%	0%	1%
B : Average Rural Rates			
A : 1985/86	58%	16%	41%
B : 1993/94	44%	14%	30%
C : Decline (B-A)	14%	2%	12%
C : Average National Rates			
A : 1985/86	49%	16%	33%
B : 1993/94	37%	15%	23%
C : Decline (B-A)	11%	1%	10%

(NB : Figures are rounded.)

57.   Further details in respect of individual geographical areas may be found in Table ARE-4, where it is seen that the overall poverty rates for households declined for all areas except Gaborone. For the latter an increase of 3 %, concentrated on the moderate type of poverty, was recorded, bringing its overall rate of poverty from 15 % to 18 %. The latter, however, was still far below the corresponding rate of any other region of the country.

58.   For rural area C the changes recorded in the overall and severe poverty rates are entirely out of proportion with any other changes recorded in the table. Thus, the overall household rate dropped from 71 % in 1985/86 to 27 % in 1993/94, and the corresponding rate of severe poverty from 59 % to 14 %. Such results are scarcely believable, and may serve to illustrate the limitations of our data more than anything else. Thus, as seen from the last two columns of table ARE-4, the sample size for this area was very small, and the result hardly statistically valid.[11]

59.   The poverty rates discussed above referred to households. Section B of table ARE-4 gives the corresponding rates for the individuals making up these households. These rates are, as previously explained, higher than the corresponding household ones for both periods studied, the poor households being on average larger than the non-poor ones. However, the direct *changes* implied by these rates need not necessarily follow the same pattern, because the average household size of poor households in various regions may have changed over the

[11]   A detailed investigation of the HIES records show that the only locality in area C included in both the 1985/86 and 1993/94 samples was Maun. In 1985/86 Maun, with a significantly lower poverty rate than the rest of area C, had a weight of approx. 10 % in the sample. In 1993/94 Maun, with approx. the same poverty rate as in 1985/86, accounted for some 30 % of the sample. Furthermore, in the 1993/94 sample, Gumare, with a weight of more than 40 %, recorded an extremely low poverty rate. Thus, one may safely assume that the data for area C are not truly representative of the real situation. Note, however, that this is not to imply that the HIES sample is "wrong", merely to suggest that one should be extremely cautious in drawing conclusions in respect of smaller sub-sets of sample data, such as for area C and D.

period. Thus, the changes recorded in section III.B of table ARE-4 are seen *not* to be uniformly higher than the corresponding changes recorded in section III,A, suggesting that uneven changes in household size may indeed have occurred over the period.[12]

11. Sensitivity analysis

60.   Tables ARE-2 and ARE-3 of the statistical annex include a crude sensitivity analyses of the poverty rates estimated for 1993/94 and 1985/86. These analyses illustrate the changes in the overall household poverty rates that result when all PDLs or incomes are increased or decreased by a uniform 10 %. The changes produced by such a variation in the PDL levels are summarised in the table below.

61.   <u>Sensitivity analysis: direct, additional changes in the overall poverty rates</u>

<u>(for households) resulting from given PDL changes</u>

		1993/94		1985/86
PDL changes:	-10%	+10%	-10%	+10%
Urban				
Gaborone	-1.8%	+3.2%	-2.6%	+3.9%
Other	-2.7%	+3.6%	-5.4%	+5.5%
Rural				
Area A	-4.7%	+3.9%	-4.8%	+3.2%
Area B	-3.5%	+4.3%	-3.5%	+3.7%
Area C	-3.6%	+9.9%	-3.2%	+7.3%
Area D	-2.8%	+4.3%	-4.0%	+2.2%
Overall averages				
Urban	-2.4%	+3.4%	-4.1%	+4.8%
Rural	-3.8%	+4.5%	-4.0%	+3.7%
Total	-3.3%	+4.2%	-4.0%	+4.0%

62.   A reduction (or increase) in all PDL estimates by 10 % would in most cases result in a corresponding change in the poverty rates of no more than 3-5 %[13], indicating that our estimates are not very sensitive with respect to the level of the PDLs. This conclusion may serve to give some comfort; essentially it means that our conclusions in respect of the poverty rates may be fairly robust, even allowing for the fact that they are based on a set of PDL specifications that are, of necessity, somewhat imprecise and arbitrary in nature. Similar conclusions may be drawn with respect to changes in the income level.[14]

---

[12]   The statistical validity problem may be quite serious for such an analysis of the "marginal differences" between estimates derived from different data sources, especially when the said estimates are themselves subject to uncertainty. Above referred results should therefore be interpreted with *great* caution, as should the results presented in table ARE-4 in general.

[13]   These changes are direct, additional ones; i.e. if the original poverty rate is 20 %, and the change 4 %, the revised poverty rate is: 20 % + 4 % = 24 %.

[14]   These conclusions refer to the specific PDLs, incomes and poverty rates under investigation. It does not follow that they will hold equally true for alternatively defined and measured variables and rates, especially if these are substantially different from those here adopted.

63.   Gaborone and rural area C are seen to represent the main exception to above "3-5 % rule". Thus:

- A 10 % reduction of the PDLs for households in Gaborone would result in a corresponding reduction of the overall poverty rate of around 2 %, indicating that relatively fewer households may have incomes equal to 90-100 % of their PDL in Gaborone than elsewhere.

- The major exception is however rural area C, where a 10 % increase in the PDL would result in an increased in the poverty rate of almost the same magnitude. Thus, relatively many households in area C may have incomes just above their PDL.[15]

12. New versus original poverty estimates

64.   The central concern of the above chapters was the analysis of how our revised PDL estimates translated into poverty indicators. Below we will compare these indicators with the poverty rates already published by the CSO, in order to learn whether or not the two are in agreement, and if not, to establish the reasons why they are not.

65.   Such an undertaking is, of course, limited to, and by, the format of CSO's original estimates. Hence, the present comparison refers exclusively to overall poverty rates, as defined for households and calculated with respect to HIES85/86 household characteristics and income data. Table ARE-5 of the statistical annex details the relevant data, the central part of which is summarised below.

66.   **New versus original 1985/86 poverty rates for households**

		A: New estimates	B: CSO estimates	C: Direct difference (B-A)
Urban				
	Gaborone	15%	21%	6%
	Other	32%	37%	5%
Rural				
	Area A	57%	56%	-1%
	Area B	54%	68%	14%
	Area C	71%	83%	12%
	Area D	62%	64%	2%
Overall averages				
	Urban	24%	30%	6%
	Rural	58%	64%	6%
	Total	49%	55%	6%

67.   The picture is seen to be somewhat mixed in detail, but on the whole quite clear: the original CSO rates are in general significantly higher than our new rates. The two sets of estimates can therefore hardly be said to be in agreement.

---

[15]   Note however earlier comments concerning the probable statistical invalidity of estimates for this area.

68. One reason for this deviation is the fact that the two sets of data reflect different calculation approaches. Thus, as earlier explained, our new poverty rates reflect PDL estimates calculated by "the cost approach", while the original CSO rates reflect "the income approach". However, although this explanation has its merits, it seems difficult to accept that it may account for such large differences as identified above. Further investigation has justified this doubt; the effect of the difference in calculation approach is relatively minor.

69. The major factor explaining the above differences appears to be the fact that the two sets of estimates relate to different income concepts. The income concept used for our new estimates is defined above. As will be evident from the arguments presented in its favour, it was chosen for its own intrinsic merits, not because it would correspond to CSO's original concept. The latter was in fact a somewhat "special construction", not corresponding intimately to other "reasonable" income concepts, in so far as it appears to ignore part of the households' total incomes.

70. The above differences may therefore serve to illustrate the crucial importance of the income concept adopted, and of scrutinising the alternative income measures available, in order to select an "optimal" income concept for the poverty analysis. This issue is addressed below.

13. Poverty measured by alternative income concepts

71. Above we have illustrated how sensitive the poverty rates are with respect to minor variations in the level of household incomes, given a specific definition of these incomes. Below we will present a somewhat related analysis, but with respect to alternative income *concepts*; i.e. we will illustrate the importance of the adopted income concept itself.

72. Table ARE-6 (part I) of the statistical annex details alternative sets of poverty rates referring to HIES85/86. Poverty rates, representing the share of households with incomes on or below the PDL, are calculated for four alternative income concepts, and compared to the corresponding rates given in the CSO publication. The four alternative concepts are:

- a1 : total consumption expenditures, as defined in HIES
- a2 : total disposable income, as defined in HIES
- a3 : total gross income, as defined in HIES
- a4 : total income, as calculated for CSO's original PDL89 analysis.[16]

73. Comparing the estimates of the first four data-columns of the table, representing the poverty rates presently estimated for these four income concepts, it is seen that the rates of the first three alternatives (a1, a2 and a3) differ somewhat. The picture is not quite clear-cut, but the a1-estimates are on the whole the highest and the a3-estimates the lowest. The differences are not, however, very large. The rates estimated for alternative a4, on the other hand, are all significantly higher. Since these rates are calculated by dividing above income-alternatives by the same PDLs, this implies that household incomes recorded under alternatives a1, a2 and a3 are fairly equal in magnitude, while those of alternative a4 are

---

[16] The original PDL89 analysis calculated these total income as the sum of gross cash earnings (exc. business profits etc.), plus total income-in-kind. This corresponds to: total gross incomes (ref.: alt. C above), minus: business profits etc.

significantly lower. Thus, it seems clear that the type of incomes excluded by the latter represents a significant source of income for the poorer households.

74. Comparing the data of the last two columns of the table, containing poverty rates referring to income concept a4, as presently estimated and as originally published, it is furthermore seen that the former are in general higher than the latter, except in section A of the table, where the two are in most cases equal.

75. Thus, in sections A of the table, the presently estimated rates (column 4) are in general identical to the corresponding published ones (column 5), except for rural area A (and for the totals including this area). The exception is somewhat surprising. The presently estimated rates have all been calculated using CSO's original formulas and income data; the two sets of estimates consequently ought to be identical throughout. Further investigation has however indicated that the rate of poverty in rural area A was significantly under-reported by the published estimates. This came about because it was based on household incomes that had been increased by a factor of 50 % over and above the corresponding (inflated) income data,[17] thus reducing the number of households with incomes on or below the PDL line.

76. In sections B and C of the table, the presently estimated poverty rates are all higher than the corresponding published ones. The differences are fairly large for rural area A, for reasons discussed above, but smaller in all other areas. The latter may be seen to represent the "real underlying" differences between the two sets of estimates, reflecting the following factors:

- The relatively minor increases in the poverty rates for rural areas B, C and D may be attributed to the fact that the income-inflator used for the calculation of the published estimates was approx. 13 % higher than the implied cost-inflator used for our new estimates. This is considerably more than may be associated with the direct price effects of employing alternative calculation approaches. Thus, the published CSO estimates were, as above explained, calculated by increasing all HIES85/86 incomes to the November 1989 level by applying a general inflation factor of 1.571. This factor does however not tally with available CPI statistics, which imply an inflation factor of approx. 1.43 for the period in question. The 10 % difference between the two is unexplained, but may possibly reflect an assumed increase in the *real* income levels over the period.[18] Consequently, 10 % of the above 13 % deviation is caused by this factor, only the last 3 % may be associated more directly with the price effects of employing "the cost approach" versus "the income approach".

---

[17] In the CSO analysis, all HIES85/86 household incomes were inflated by a general factor of 57.1 % in order to make them directly comparable to the PDL89 cost estimates. In *addition*, however, all households in rural area A, and in rural A *only*, had their incomes further increased by 50 %. The justification for this addition is unknown, but it probably reflects a calculation error. It has consequently been ignored in the present analysis, on the advise of the CSO.

[18] It should be noted, however, that the introduction of such a real income change would have fundamental implications for the nature of the estimates resulting. Thus, in principle, one would no longer be dealing with 1985/86 income data, but with income estimates for 1989 based upon the structure of the 1985/86 data. The resulting poverty rates would consequently refer to 1989, not to 1985/86. This is at variance with the CSO publication, in which these rates are described as 1985/86 rates.

- The differences for urban areas are somewhat larger than those discussed above. This is due to the fact that the urban PDL estimates reflect a revision of the housing requirements. Thus, the new PDLs for urban areas are based on a higher rent allowance than originally allowed for. They are therefore on average higher than the published ones, implying that a larger number of households will have incomes below the PDL line.

77.   Part II of table ARE-6 details the poverty rates for 1993/94, calculated in the same way as the 1985/86 estimates of section I,C. Inspecting these 1993/94 estimates it is seen that they give largely the same picture as the latter, with the highest poverty rates recorded for total consumption expenditures, and the lowest for total gross income. The overall differences between the three sets of estimates are, again, not too large, although somewhat larger than for the 1985/86 ones, implying that the selection of an income concept is a slightly more crucial issue for the analysis of the HIES93/94 data than for the HIES85/86 one.

14. A final note

78.   Before concluding this presentation of analytical results, it may be useful to make a few observations with respect to their likely correspondence, or non-correspondence, to such analytical findings as may result from a more comprehensive analysis of these issues.

79.   *Firstly*, it should be emphasised that the above presented results are those of a tentative and preliminary analysis, not undertaken in order to provide final or comprehensive results as such, but merely to reveal the fundamentals of the issue faced, as well as for reasons of data control and comparison.

80.   *Secondly*, it should be noted that our results refer to geographical regions that may not be particularly well suited for such an analysis. Thus, the areas used are those a priori defined for the specific purpose of calculating the PDL estimates, reflecting basic variations in requirements, price levels and similar, rather than anything else.

81.   The use of these geographical regions reflects no more than a matter of convenience adopted in the present case. Although the PDLs are calculated with reference to these areas, there is no logical necessity to base the subsequent poverty analysis on these same areas. Neither is it to be expected that they are necessarily the ones best suited for such an analysis; our observations about the statistically validity of the results for rural areas C and D may serve as an illustration to the contrary. Consequently, the final analysis may well adopt an alternative set of geographical areas.

82.   *Thirdly*, it should be remembered that our preliminary results are based on the defined income variable, as measured by the HIES data. Any further analysis is, of course, free to adopt an alternative definition of household incomes. And even if it should adopt the same income *definition*, it does not follow that it will also have to adopt the corresponding HIES income *observations* without any kind of adjustments. Some such adjustments may indeed be required, although none have, for practical reasons, been attempted for the current exercise.

83.   The most likely such adjustment concerns the rental value of owner-occupied dwellings. The nature and rationale for such adjustments may be described as follows:

- The PDL does, as already explained, include an allowance for housing costs. For rural households these allowances are fairly small, representing the imputed cost of maintaining a rural hut. For urban households, on the other hand, these allowances are fairly substantial, representing the cost of renting a simple urban dwelling. They consequently account for a significant part of the PDL of urban households, especially for small sized ones.

- Such costs are not necessarily reported in the HIES data, a number of households being owner-occupiers, receiving free shelter from relatives or similar. Even though the fact may not be directly observable in terms of rent payments etc., however, all households will in general consume housing services. The correct National Accounts treatment of such "free" services is to impute their rental value, and to add them, on the one hand to the households' expenditures, and on the other to their incomes. The former imputation has already been accounted for in our analysis through the inclusion of the general housing allowance in the PDLs. Thus, adopting the above procedure, the latter imputation should also be effected, by a corresponding revision of the household income data.

STATISTICAL ANNEX

TABLE OF PRICE INDICES

TABLES OF REQUIREMENTS

TABLES OF POVERTY DATUM LINE COST ELEMENTS

PDL-89 tables:

PDL-94 tables:

PDL-86 tables:

TABLES OF ANALYTICAL RESULTS ETC.

Table PRI-1
Price indices used to update the original PDL-89 price estimates

I : Original Cost of Living Index data   (Base: November 1991 = 100)   1)

A : Old Cost of Living Index data 2)

Period:	Food	Drink & Tobacco	Cloth. & Footwear	Housing, Light & Fuel		Hh Goods & Operations		Medical Care	Trans- port etc	Other			All Items Index
1986, Jan.	55.4	51.4	47.7	61.6	na	47.5	na	63.1	58.3	79.8	na	na	55.2
1989, Nov.	79.0	77.0	76.9	81.4	na	78.1	na	86.1	82.0	80.9	na	na	79.0

B : Present Cost of Living Index data 3)

Period:	Food	Alcohol & Tobacco	Cloth. & Footwear	Housing	Fuel & Power	Furniture etc.	Household Operations	Health & Pers.Care	Trans- port etc	Leisure	Education	Other	All Items Index
1994, June	140.2	133.0	150.6	144.8	114.9	132.8	136.3	172.5	141.5	124.2	147.7	138.5	140.3

II : Price indices used to update CSO's original PDL-89 price estimates

Reference- period	Food	Clothing, Footwear	Housing	Fuel, Power	Furniture etc.	Househ. Operat.	Health, Pers.Care	Educat.	Other	Overall Index 7)
A : As directly copied from original data (Base: November 1991 = 100)										
PDL-86 4)	55.4	47.7	61.6	61.6	47.5	63.1	79.8	79.8	57.2	
PDL-89 5)	79.0	76.9	81.4	81.4	78.1	78.1	86.1	80.9	80.9	79.3
PDL-94 6)	140.2	150.6	144.8	114.9	132.8	136.3	172.5	147.7	138.5	142.1
B : As recalculated to a PDL89 base (i.e.: Base: November 1989 = 100)										
PDL-86 4)	70.1	62.0	75.7	75.7	60.8	60.8	73.4	98.6	98.6	72.1
PDL-89 5)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
PDL-94 6)	177.5	195.8	177.9	141.2	170.1	174.6	200.5	182.5	171.1	179.3

Notes:
1) Original CPI data, as supplied by the Central Statistics Office.
2) Old Cost of Living Index, used up to November 1991, as recalculated to November 1991 base.
3) Present Cost of Living Index, used from November 1991, with same month used as base.
4) The reference-period for PDL-86 is January 1986, this being the mid-month of the period covered by the HIES85/86 observations (Jun.1985 - Aug.1986).
5) The reference-period for PDL-89 is November 1989.
6) The reference-period for PDL-94 is June 1994, this being the mid-month of the period covered by the HIES93/94 observations (Nov.1993 - Jan.1995).
7) All Items excluding: Drink & Tobacco and Transport.

Table REQ-1
Food requirements (per month) *)

	Sex:			Male & Female			Male
	Age:	0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19
Meal	Kilos	4.20	6.20	8.40	9.00	10.00	12.00
Bread & Flour	Kilos	0.75	1.00	1.50	2.25	2.25	2.25
Sugar	Kilos	0.25	0.50	0.75	0.75	1.00	1.00
Vegetables	Kilos	1.10	2.40	2.60	2.60	3.50	3.50
Greens	Kilos	0.50	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.50
Pulses	Kilos	0.25	0.25	0.50	0.75	0.75	1.00
Fat	Kilos	0.25	0.38	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.75
Salt	Kilos	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.50
Meat	Kilos	0.65	1.35	1.60	1.20	1.20	2.40
Tea/Coffee	Kilos	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.13	0.25
Fresh Milk	Litres	10.30	8.20	8.20	5.70	5.70	3.90

	Sex:	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	Age:	15-19	20-64	20-64	65+	65+
Meal	Kilos	12.00	12.60	11.40	10.80	9.70
Bread & Flour	Kilos	2.25	2.25	2.25	1.90	1.90
Sugar	Kilos	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.85	0.85
Vegetables	Kilos	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.00	3.00
Greens	Kilos	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.30	1.30
Pulses	Kilos	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Fat	Kilos	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.64	0.64
Salt	Kilos	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.43
Meat	Kilos	2.25	2.40	2.25	2.00	1.80
Tea/Coffee	Kilos	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.21	0.21
Fresh Milk	Litres	3.90	3.90	3.90	3.30	3.30

*) This table corresponds to table C1 of the original PDL89 publication. Note that most of above
specified requirements do in reality represent food-requirement-aggregates, reflecting calorific
needs etc., and that these may be satisfied by alternative "baskets" of food items, depending
on local tastes and product availability. Above data do therefore not translate directly into the
corresponding food cost estimates of tables PDL86-1, PDL89-1 and PDL-94-1. These estimates
are all based upon the corresponding estimates of table F1 in the original PDL89 publication,
which seem to reflect a rather varied specification of food-requirement-items in respect of age
and region, as well as deductions made for food provided through school meals, and a
respecification of the milk allowance for breast-fed infants (age 0-1).

Table REQ-2
Clothing requirements *)

Item	Quantity Required	Life of Item (years)	Item	Quantity Required	Life of Item (years)
Adult Males (age: 18+)			*Boys (age: 2-6)*		
Shoes	2	2	Play Shoes	2	2
Trousers	2	3	Shorts	2	1.5
Shorts	1	3	Jersey	2	3
Underwear	2	2	Shirt	1	1
Shirts	2	2	T-shirts	2	1
T-shirts	2	2	*Girls (age: 2-6)*		
Jersey	2	4	Play Shoes	2	2
Jacket	1	8	Dresses	2	1
Hat (for age: 55+)	1	10	Jersey	2	3
Adult Females (age: 18+)			Panties	4	1
Shoes	2	2	T-shirts	2	1
Dresses	2	2	*Infants (age: 0-1)*		
Full Slip	1	2	Nappies	12	1.5
Half Slip	1	2	Plastic Pants	2	0.5
Panties	4	2	Vests	2	2
Jersey	2	4	Rompers	2	2.5
Jacket	1	8	Jersey	2	2.5
Bra	2	2	Knitted Hat	2	1
Headscarf	1	1	Bootees	2	1
Boys (age: 7-17)			Blanket	2	5
Leather Shoes	1	2	Shawl	1	4
Canvas Shoes	1	2			
Trousers (14+)	1	2			
Shorts	2	2			
Jersey	2	4			
Shirts	2	2			
T-shirts	2	2			
Underwear (14+)	2	2			
School Socks	2	1			
Girls (age: 7-17)					
Leather Shoes	1	2			
Canvas Shoes	1	2			
School Tunic	1	2			
School Blouse	2	2			
Dresses	2	2			
Jersey	2	4			
Panties (14+)	4	2			
Panties (7-13)	4	1			
Half Slip (14+)	2	2			
Bra (14+)	2	2			
T-shirt	2	2			

*) This table corresponds to table C2 of the original PDL89 publication

Table REQ-3
Other personal requirements *)

Item	Quantity Required	Life of Item (years)	Item	Quantity Required	Life of Item (years)
Old-Aged Persons (age: 55+)			*Children (age: 2-6)*		
Toilet Soap 150g	12	1	Toilet Soap 150g	12	1
Toothbrush	1	1	Toothbrush	1	1
Toothpaste 50ml	7.5	1	Toothpaste 50ml	7.5	1
Vaseline 50g	6	1	Vaseline 50g	6	1
Aspirin Pack of 2	12	1	Aspirin Pack of 2	12	1
Cough Mixture 150ml	2	1	Cough Mixture 150ml	2	1
Clinic Visit	2	1	Clinic Visit	2	1
Trad. Medicine	1	1	Trad. Medicine	1	1
Mug	1	8	Mug	1	8
Spoon	1	5	Spoon	1	5
Bowl	1	8	Bowl	1	8
Washing Rag	2	2	Washing Rag	2	2
Adult Males (age: 18-54)			*Infants (age: 0-1)*		
Toilet Soap 150g	12	1	Toilet Soap 150g	6	1
Toothbrush	1	1	Extra Soap Powder 500g	12	1
Toothpaste 50ml	7.5	1	Baby Powder 100g	12	1
Vaseline 50g	6	1	Vaseline 50g	6	1
Aspirin Pack of 2	12	1	Aspirin Pack of 2	12	1
Cough Mixture 150ml	2	1	Cough Mixture 150ml	2	1
Clinic Visit	2	1	Clinic Visit	2	1
Trad. Medicine	1	1	Trad. Medicine	1	1
Mug	1	8	Mug	1	8
Spoon	1	5	Spoon	1	5
Bowl	1	8	Bowl	1	8
Washing Rag	2	2	Washing Rag	2	2
Adult Females (age: 18-54)					
Toilet Soap 150g	12	1			
Toothbrush	1	1			
Toothpaste 50ml	7.5	1			
Vaseline 50g	6	1			
Aspirin Pack of 2	12	1			
Cough Mixture 150ml	2	1			
Sanitary Towels 12 pack	11	1			
Contraceptives (year)	1	1			
Clinic Visit	2	1			
Trad. Medicine	1	1			
Mug	1	8			
Spoon	1	5			
Bowl	1	8			
Washing Rag	2	2			
Children (age: 14-17)					
Toilet Soap 150g	12	1			
Toothbrush	1	1			
Toothpaste 50ml	7.5	1			
Vaseline 50g	6	1			
Aspirin Pack of 2	12	1			
Cough Mixture 150ml	2	1			
Clinic Visit	2	1			
Trad. Medicine	1	1			
Mug	1	8			
Spoon	1	5			
Bowl	1	8			
Washing Rag	2	2			

*) This table corresponds to table C3 of the original PDL89 publication,
but with the following revision: old-aged persons are separately specified.
(NB: Although not specified as such in the original C3 table, the subsequent PDL-
estimates were in fact calculated according to above specified requirements).

Table REQ-4
Household goods requirements *)

Items required by each household,
irrespective of household size

Item	Quantity Required	Life of Item (years)
All Households		
Bench	1	15
Sitting Mat	1	6
Bathtub	1	20
Small Tub	1	10
Bucket	1	15
Grass Broom	2	1
Scissors	1	10
Iron	1	30
Suitcase	1	10
Needle	1	1
Reel of Thread	1	1
Food Trunk	1	15
Teapot	1	15
Kitchen Knife	1	5
Stirrer	1	2
Bowl	1	15
Urban Households only		
Saucepan	2	10
Primus	1	10
Hoe	1	10
Matches (Box)	48	1
Rural Households only		
3 Leg Pot	2	30
Basket	2	3
Pestle	2	5
Mortar	1	10
Winnowing Fan	1	5
Axe	1	30
Pick	1	30
Matches (Box)	36	1
Paraffin (Litres)	18	1

Items required by each household,
depending on household size

Item	House-hold size	Require-ment
All Households		Kilos per month
Soap Powder	1	0.5
	2-3	1.0
	4-6	1.5
	7+	2.0
		Litres per
Urban Households only		month
Paraffin	1	5
	2-6	10
	7-12	15
	13+	20
		Headloads
Rural Households only		per month
Firewood	1	0.6
	2-6	0.8
	7-12	1.2
	13+	1.6

*) This table corresponds to table C4 of the original PDL89 publication,
but with the following revisions:
        - firewood is allowed for rural households;
        - blankets are specified in table R5 below.
(NB: Although not specified as such in the original C4 table, the subsequent PDL-estimates
were in fact calculated according to above specified firewood requirements).

Table REQ-5
Other requirements *)

Item	Variable	Requirement

Blankets
  Adults (age: 18+) — 3 for each single person, 4 for each couple
  Infants (age: 0-1) — None 1)
  Children (age: 2-17) — 3 for each single person, 4 for each couple

Education
  Children (age: 7-14) — Basic school fees

Shelter
  Total household size 2)

Number of	Urban 3)			Rural 4)
adult equiv.	Gaborone	Frc.town	Other	All areas
1.0	100%	90%	80%	100%
1.5-2.5	100%	90%	80%	133%
3.0-4.0	180%	162%	144%	267%
4.5+	180%	162%	144%	400%

*) This table has no directly corresponding table in the original PDL89 publication.

1) Infants (age: 0-1) are excluded above because they have been given an individual allocation of blankets as part of their clothing requirements. (NB: The published PDL89 estimates do in fact include infants of age: 1, but this must be due to an oversight, and is not adopted for the present purpose.)

2) Total household size is measured in terms of adult equivalents, which is calculated using the following weights for various household members:

$$\text{Adult (age: 18+)} = 1.0$$
$$\text{Child (age: 2-17)} = 0.5$$
$$\text{Child (age: 0-1)} = 0.0$$

3) Urban requirements represent the cost of renting simple accommodation. The cost of a single room in Gaborone is taken as the benchmark, and the above percentages represent the escalation of the housing costs, as a function of location and household size, relative to this benchmark. Note that these escalation factors are different from those of the PDL89 publication, the latter being:

No.of ad.equiv.	All urban
1.0-2.5	100%
3.0+	69%

4) The rural housing requirements reflect the cost of maintaining (re-thatching) a typical rural dwelling. The percentages given in above table, which are based directly on the corresponding data of the PDL89 publication, represent the escalation of these costs, as a function of household size.

Table ARE-6, cont.

II : Overall 1993/94 poverty rates,
as calculated by alternative income concepts
(i.e. as calculated by measuring the original HIES93/94 household incomes
against the PDL94 estimates (ref.: tables PDL94-1 to PDL94-6)

| | | Income concept used: 1) | | |
		Consum.	Dispos.	Gross
Urban	Gaborone	18%	12%	11%
	Other	27%	23%	22%
Rural	Area A	38%	31%	31%
	Area B	45%	47%	46%
	Area C	27%	35%	28%
	Area D	58%	51%	50%
Average	Urban	23%	19%	18%
	Rural	44%	42%	40%
	Total	37%	35%	33%

Note:
1) Definition of income concepts:
    Consum. : total consumption expenditure
    Dispos. : total disposable income
    Gross : total gross income
    Orig. : total income (TI) as defined for CSO's *original PDL89* analysis
    (TI = gross cash earnings (exc. business profits etc.) + total income in kind)

Table PDL89-1
Food costs, by region, age and sex #)   (Pula per month)

| Age | Sex | URBAN | | RURAL | | | | AVERAGE *) | | |
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	10.92	11.26	11.64	11.81	13.04	13.87	11.12	12.14	11.84
	F	10.92	11.26	11.64	11.81	13.04	13.87	11.12	12.14	11.84
1	M	20.18	21.13	22.02	22.21	24.38	26.03	20.73	22.86	22.24
	F	20.18	21.13	22.02	22.21	24.38	26.03	20.73	22.86	22.24
2	M	24.51	26.61	27.95	28.36	31.83	33.63	25.72	29.24	28.22
	F	24.51	26.61	27.95	28.36	31.83	33.63	25.72	29.24	28.22
3	M	24.51	26.61	27.95	28.36	31.83	33.63	25.72	29.24	28.22
	F	24.51	26.61	27.95	28.36	31.83	33.63	25.72	29.24	28.22
4	M	28.97	30.91	32.34	32.87	36.84	38.92	30.09	33.86	32.76
	F	28.97	30.91	32.34	32.87	36.84	38.92	30.09	33.86	32.76
5	M	28.97	30.91	32.34	32.87	36.84	38.92	30.09	33.86	32.76
	F	28.97	30.91	32.34	32.87	36.84	38.92	30.09	33.86	32.76
6	M	28.97	30.91	32.34	32.87	36.84	38.92	30.09	33.86	32.76
	F	28.97	30.91	32.34	32.87	36.84	38.92	30.09	33.86	32.76
7	M	26.06	28.36	29.71	30.15	33.61	35.52	27.39	31.03	29.98
	F	26.06	28.36	29.71	30.15	33.61	35.52	27.39	31.03	29.98
8	M	26.06	28.36	29.71	30.15	33.61	35.52	27.39	31.03	29.98
	F	26.06	28.36	29.71	30.15	33.61	35.52	27.39	31.03	29.98
9	M	26.06	28.36	29.71	30.15	33.61	35.52	27.39	31.03	29.98
	F	26.06	28.36	29.71	30.15	33.61	35.52	27.39	31.03	29.98
10	M	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
	F	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
11	M	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
	F	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
12	M	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
	F	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
13	M	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
	F	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
14	M	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
	F	25.13	26.81	27.69	28.07	30.84	33.00	26.10	28.86	28.06
15	M	38.36	39.17	40.87	41.55	45.77	48.32	38.83	42.61	41.51
	F	35.62	35.96	37.37	37.99	41.62	44.02	35.82	38.91	38.02
16	M	38.36	39.17	40.87	41.55	45.77	48.32	38.83	42.61	41.51
	F	35.62	35.96	37.37	37.99	41.62	44.02	35.82	38.91	38.02
17	M	38.36	39.17	40.87	41.55	45.77	48.32	38.83	42.61	41.51
	F	35.62	35.96	37.37	37.99	41.62	44.02	35.82	38.91	38.02
18	M	38.36	39.17	40.87	41.55	45.77	48.32	38.83	42.61	41.51
	F	35.62	35.96	37.37	37.99	41.62	44.02	35.82	38.91	38.02
19	M	38.36	39.17	40.87	41.55	45.77	48.32	38.83	42.61	41.51
	F	35.62	35.96	37.37	37.99	41.62	44.02	35.82	38.91	38.02
20-54	M	36.66	36.93	38.42	39.00	42.63	45.12	36.82	39.95	39.04
	F	35.27	35.61	37.01	37.62	41.23	43.62	35.47	38.54	37.65
55-64	M	36.66	36.93	38.42	39.00	42.63	45.12	36.82	39.95	39.04
	F	35.27	35.61	37.01	37.62	41.23	43.62	35.47	38.54	37.65
65+	M	31.35	31.54	32.76	33.36	36.63	38.68	31.46	34.16	33.38
	F	29.79	30.07	31.17	31.83	35.09	37.01	29.95	32.59	31.82

#) This table corresponds to table F1 of the original PDL89 publication, with the exception of the three last columns.
*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per average of HIES85/86 & HIES93/94).

Table PDL89-2
Cost of personal items, by region, age and sex #)

(Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN Gaborone	O/Towns	RURAL Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	AVERAGE *) Urban	Rural	National
0	M	4.55	4.83	5.10	5.32	5.65	5.67	4.71	5.32	5.14
	F	4.55	4.83	5.10	5.32	5.65	5.67	4.71	5.32	5.14
1	M	4.55	4.83	5.10	5.32	5.65	5.67	4.71	5.32	5.14
	F	4.55	4.83	5.10	5.32	5.65	5.67	4.71	5.32	5.14
2	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
3	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
4	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
5	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
6	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
7	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
8	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
9	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
10	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
11	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
12	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
13	M	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
	F	2.53	2.71	2.76	2.97	3.12	3.23	2.63	2.94	2.85
14	M	2.60	2.78	2.83	3.04	3.18	3.29	2.70	3.01	2.92
	F	2.60	2.78	2.83	3.04	3.18	3.29	2.70	3.01	2.92
15	M	2.60	2.78	2.83	3.04	3.18	3.29	2.70	3.01	2.92
	F	2.60	2.78	2.83	3.04	3.18	3.29	2.70	3.01	2.92
16	M	2.60	2.78	2.83	3.04	3.18	3.29	2.70	3.01	2.92
	F	2.60	2.78	2.83	3.04	3.18	3.29	2.70	3.01	2.92
17	M	2.60	2.78	2.83	3.04	3.18	3.29	2.70	3.01	2.92
	F	2.60	2.78	2.83	3.04	3.18	3.29	2.70	3.01	2.92
18	M	2.76	2.95	2.99	3.21	3.35	3.46	2.87	3.18	3.09
	F	4.20	5.11	5.00	5.25	5.17	5.61	4.73	5.20	5.06
19	M	2.76	2.95	2.99	3.21	3.35	3.46	2.87	3.18	3.09
	F	4.20	5.11	5.00	5.25	5.17	5.61	4.73	5.20	5.06
20-54	M	2.76	2.95	2.99	3.21	3.35	3.46	2.87	3.18	3.09
	F	4.20	5.11	5.00	5.25	5.17	5.61	4.73	5.20	5.06
55-64	M	2.76	2.95	2.99	3.21	3.35	3.46	2.87	3.18	3.09
	F	2.76	2.95	2.99	3.21	3.35	3.46	2.87	3.18	3.09
65+	M	2.76	2.95	2.99	3.21	3.35	3.46	2.87	3.18	3.09
	F	2.76	2.95	2.99	3.21	3.35	3.46	2.87	3.18	3.09

#) This table corresponds to table F2 of the original PDL89 publication, with the exception of the three last columns.
*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per average of HIES85/86 & HIES93/94).

Table PDL89-3
Cost of food and personal items, by region, age and sex #)

(Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN Gaborone	O/Towns	RURAL Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	AVERAGE *) Urban	Rural	National
0	M	15.47	16.09	16.74	17.13	18.69	19.54	15.83	17.46	16.98
	F	15.47	16.09	16.74	17.13	18.69	19.54	15.83	17.46	16.98
1	M	24.73	25.96	27.12	27.53	30.03	31.70	25.44	28.18	27.38
	F	24.73	25.96	27.12	27.53	30.03	31.70	25.44	28.18	27.38
2	M	27.04	29.32	30.71	31.33	34.95	36.86	28.36	32.18	31.07
	F	27.04	29.32	30.71	31.33	34.95	36.86	28.36	32.18	31.07
3	M	27.04	29.32	30.71	31.33	34.95	36.86	28.36	32.18	31.07
	F	27.04	29.32	30.71	31.33	34.95	36.86	28.36	32.18	31.07
4	M	31.50	33.62	35.10	35.84	39.96	42.15	32.73	36.80	35.62
	F	31.50	33.62	35.10	35.84	39.96	42.15	32.73	36.80	35.62
5	M	31.50	33.62	35.10	35.84	39.96	42.15	32.73	36.80	35.62
	F	31.50	33.62	35.10	35.84	39.96	42.15	32.73	36.80	35.62
6	M	31.50	33.62	35.10	35.84	39.96	42.15	32.73	36.80	35.62
	F	31.50	33.62	35.10	35.84	39.96	42.15	32.73	36.80	35.62
7	M	29.26	31.74	33.14	33.79	37.40	39.42	30.69	34.65	33.50
	F	29.26	31.74	33.14	33.79	37.40	39.42	30.69	34.65	33.50
8	M	29.26	31.74	33.14	33.79	37.40	39.42	30.69	34.65	33.50
	F	29.26	31.74	33.14	33.79	37.40	39.42	30.69	34.65	33.50
9	M	29.26	31.74	33.14	33.79	37.40	39.42	30.69	34.65	33.50
	F	29.26	31.74	33.14	33.79	37.40	39.42	30.69	34.65	33.50
10	M	28.33	30.19	31.12	31.71	34.63	36.90	29.41	32.47	31.58
	F	28.33	30.19	31.12	31.71	34.63	36.90	29.41	32.47	31.58
11	M	28.33	30.19	31.12	31.71	34.63	36.90	29.41	32.47	31.58
	F	28.33	30.19	31.12	31.71	34.63	36.90	29.41	32.47	31.58
12	M	28.33	30.19	31.12	31.71	34.63	36.90	29.41	32.47	31.58
	F	28.33	30.19	31.12	31.71	34.63	36.90	29.41	32.47	31.58
13	M	28.33	30.19	31.12	31.71	34.63	36.90	29.41	32.47	31.58
	F	28.33	30.19	31.12	31.71	34.63	36.90	29.41	32.47	31.58
14	M	28.40	30.26	31.19	31.78	34.69	36.96	29.48	32.54	31.65
	F	28.40	30.26	31.19	31.78	34.69	36.96	29.48	32.54	31.65
15	M	40.96	41.95	43.70	44.59	48.95	51.61	41.53	45.62	44.43
	F	38.22	38.74	40.20	41.03	44.80	47.31	38.52	41.92	40.94
16	M	40.96	41.95	43.70	44.59	48.95	51.61	41.53	45.62	44.43
	F	38.22	38.74	40.20	41.03	44.80	47.31	38.52	41.92	40.94
17	M	40.96	41.95	43.70	44.59	48.95	51.61	41.53	45.62	44.43
	F	38.22	38.74	40.20	41.03	44.80	47.31	38.52	41.92	40.94
18	M	41.12	42.12	43.86	44.76	49.12	51.78	41.70	45.78	44.60
	F	39.82	41.07	42.37	43.24	46.79	49.63	40.54	44.12	43.08
19	M	41.12	42.12	43.86	44.76	49.12	51.78	41.70	45.78	44.60
	F	39.82	41.07	42.37	43.24	46.79	49.63	40.54	44.12	43.08
20-54	M	39.42	39.88	41.41	42.21	45.98	48.58	39.69	43.13	42.13
	F	39.47	40.72	42.01	42.87	46.40	49.23	40.19	43.75	42.71
55-64	M	39.42	39.88	41.41	42.21	45.98	48.58	39.69	43.13	42.13
	F	38.03	38.56	40.00	40.83	44.58	47.08	38.34	41.72	40.74
65+	M	34.11	34.49	35.75	36.57	39.98	42.14	34.33	37.34	36.46
	F	32.55	33.02	34.16	35.04	38.44	40.47	32.82	35.76	34.91

#) This table corresponds to table F3 of the original PDL89 publication, with the exception of the three last columns.
Note that an allowance for school fees (P 0.67 per month) has been added for each child aged: 7 to 14.
*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per average of HIES85/86 & HIES93/94).

Table PDL89-4
Clothing costs, by region, age and sex #)   (Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	4.06	3.69	4.38	4.99	4.89	6.10	3.85	4.91	4.60
	F	4.06	3.69	4.38	4.99	4.89	6.10	3.85	4.91	4.60
1	M	4.06	3.69	4.38	4.99	4.89	6.10	3.85	4.91	4.60
	F	4.06	3.69	4.38	4.99	4.89	6.10	3.85	4.91	4.60
2	M	2.17	2.60	3.12	3.73	2.98	3.68	2.42	3.44	3.14
	F	3.38	3.28	3.62	4.20	4.13	5.31	3.32	4.14	3.90
3	M	2.17	2.60	3.12	3.73	2.98	3.68	2.42	3.44	3.14
	F	3.38	3.28	3.62	4.20	4.13	5.31	3.32	4.14	3.90
4	M	2.17	2.60	3.12	3.73	2.98	3.68	2.42	3.44	3.14
	F	3.38	3.28	3.62	4.20	4.13	5.31	3.32	4.14	3.90
5	M	2.17	2.60	3.12	3.73	2.98	3.68	2.42	3.44	3.14
	F	3.38	3.28	3.62	4.20	4.13	5.31	3.32	4.14	3.90
6	M	2.17	2.60	3.12	3.73	2.98	3.68	2.42	3.44	3.14
	F	3.38	3.28	3.62	4.20	4.13	5.31	3.32	4.14	3.90
7	M	4.00	4.05	3.89	4.68	4.91	4.85	4.03	4.43	4.31
	F	5.70	5.72	5.85	6.43	7.26	7.60	5.71	6.45	6.24
8	M	4.00	4.05	3.89	4.68	4.91	4.85	4.03	4.43	4.31
	F	5.70	5.72	5.85	6.43	7.26	7.60	5.71	6.45	6.24
9	M	4.00	4.05	3.89	4.68	4.91	4.85	4.03	4.43	4.31
	F	5.70	5.72	5.85	6.43	7.26	7.60	5.71	6.45	6.24
10	M	4.00	4.05	3.89	4.68	4.91	4.85	4.03	4.43	4.31
	F	5.70	5.72	5.85	6.43	7.26	7.60	5.71	6.45	6.24
11	M	4.00	4.05	3.89	4.68	4.91	4.85	4.03	4.43	4.31
	F	5.70	5.72	5.85	6.43	7.26	7.60	5.71	6.45	6.24
12	M	4.00	4.05	3.89	4.68	4.91	4.85	4.03	4.43	4.31
	F	5.70	5.72	5.85	6.43	7.26	7.60	5.71	6.45	6.24
13	M	4.00	4.05	3.89	4.68	4.91	4.85	4.03	4.43	4.31
	F	5.70	5.72	5.85	6.43	7.26	7.60	5.71	6.45	6.24
14	M	4.95	4.30	5.16	5.46	4.99	6.23	4.57	5.42	5.17
	F	4.70	4.19	4.97	5.15	4.92	6.32	4.41	5.23	4.99
15	M	4.95	4.30	5.16	5.46	4.99	6.23	4.57	5.42	5.17
	F	4.70	4.19	4.97	5.15	4.92	6.32	4.41	5.23	4.99
16	M	4.95	4.30	5.16	5.46	4.99	6.23	4.57	5.42	5.17
	F	4.70	4.19	4.97	5.15	4.92	6.32	4.41	5.23	4.99
17	M	4.95	4.30	5.16	5.46	4.99	6.23	4.57	5.42	5.17
	F	4.70	4.19	4.97	5.15	4.92	6.32	4.41	5.23	4.99
18	M	5.92	6.08	6.28	7.57	7.49	9.32	6.01	7.34	6.95
	F	5.93	5.52	6.14	6.68	7.00	7.84	5.69	6.67	6.39
19	M	5.92	6.08	6.28	7.57	7.49	9.32	6.01	7.34	6.95
	F	5.93	5.52	6.14	6.68	7.00	7.84	5.69	6.67	6.39
20-54	M	5.92	6.08	6.28	7.57	7.49	9.32	6.01	7.34	6.95
	F	5.93	5.52	6.14	6.68	7.00	7.84	5.69	6.67	6.39
55-64	M	6.12	6.31	6.48	7.79	7.61	9.47	6.23	7.53	7.15
	F	5.93	5.52	6.14	6.68	7.00	7.84	5.69	6.67	6.39
65+	M	6.12	6.31	6.48	7.79	7.61	9.47	6.23	7.53	7.15
	F	5.93	5.52	6.14	6.68	7.00	7.84	5.69	6.67	6.39

#) This table corresponds to table F4 of the original PDL89 publication, with the exception of the three last columns.
*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per average of HIES85/86 & HIES93/94).

Table PDL89-5   (Pula per month)
Individual total costs, by region, age and sex #)

| Age | Sex | URBAN | | RURAL | | | | AVERAGE *) | | |
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	19.53	19.78	21.12	22.12	23.58	25.64	19.67	22.37	21.59
	F	19.53	19.78	21.12	22.12	23.58	25.64	19.67	22.37	21.59
1	M	28.79	29.65	31.50	32.52	34.92	37.80	29.29	33.09	31.99
	F	28.79	29.65	31.50	32.52	34.92	37.80	29.29	33.09	31.99
2	M	29.21	31.92	33.83	35.06	37.93	40.54	30.78	35.62	34.21
	F	30.42	32.60	34.33	35.53	39.08	42.17	31.68	36.32	34.97
3	M	29.21	31.92	33.83	35.06	37.93	40.54	30.78	35.62	34.21
	F	30.42	32.60	34.33	35.53	39.08	42.17	31.68	36.32	34.97
4	M	33.67	36.22	38.22	39.57	42.94	45.83	35.14	40.24	38.76
	F	34.88	36.90	38.72	40.04	44.09	47.46	36.05	40.94	39.52
5	M	33.67	36.22	38.22	39.57	42.94	45.83	35.14	40.24	38.76
	F	34.88	36.90	38.72	40.04	44.09	47.46	36.05	40.94	39.52
6	M	33.67	36.22	38.22	39.57	42.94	45.83	35.14	40.24	38.76
	F	34.88	36.90	38.72	40.04	44.09	47.46	36.05	40.94	39.52
7	M	33.26	35.79	37.03	38.47	42.31	44.27	34.72	39.08	37.81
	F	34.96	37.46	38.99	40.22	44.66	47.02	36.41	41.10	39.73
8	M	33.26	35.79	37.03	38.47	42.31	44.27	34.72	39.08	37.81
	F	34.96	37.46	38.99	40.22	44.66	47.02	36.41	41.10	39.73
9	M	33.26	35.79	37.03	38.47	42.31	44.27	34.72	39.08	37.81
	F	34.96	37.46	38.99	40.22	44.66	47.02	36.41	41.10	39.73
10	M	32.33	34.24	35.01	36.39	39.54	41.75	33.43	36.90	35.89
	F	34.03	35.91	36.97	38.14	41.89	44.50	35.12	38.92	37.81
11	M	32.33	34.24	35.01	36.39	39.54	41.75	33.43	36.90	35.89
	F	34.03	35.91	36.97	38.14	41.89	44.50	35.12	38.92	37.81
12	M	32.33	34.24	35.01	36.39	39.54	41.75	33.43	36.90	35.89
	F	34.03	35.91	36.97	38.14	41.89	44.50	35.12	38.92	37.81
13	M	32.33	34.24	35.01	36.39	39.54	41.75	33.43	36.90	35.89
	F	34.03	35.91	36.97	38.14	41.89	44.50	35.12	38.92	37.81
14	M	33.35	34.56	36.35	37.24	39.68	43.19	34.05	37.96	36.82
	F	33.10	34.45	36.16	36.93	39.61	43.28	33.88	37.77	36.64
15	M	45.91	46.25	48.86	50.05	53.94	57.84	46.11	51.04	49.60
	F	42.92	42.93	45.17	46.18	49.72	53.63	42.93	47.16	45.93
16	M	45.91	46.25	48.86	50.05	53.94	57.84	46.11	51.04	49.60
	F	42.92	42.93	45.17	46.18	49.72	53.63	42.93	47.16	45.93
17	M	45.91	46.25	48.86	50.05	53.94	57.84	46.11	51.04	49.60
	F	42.92	42.93	45.17	46.18	49.72	53.63	42.93	47.16	45.93
18	M	47.04	48.20	50.14	52.33	56.61	61.10	47.71	53.12	51.55
	F	45.75	46.59	48.51	49.92	53.79	57.47	46.24	50.79	49.47
19	M	47.04	48.20	50.14	52.33	56.61	61.10	47.71	53.12	51.55
	F	45.75	46.59	48.51	49.92	53.79	57.47	46.24	50.79	49.47
20-54	M	45.34	45.96	47.69	49.78	53.47	57.90	45.70	50.46	49.08
	F	45.40	46.24	48.15	49.55	53.40	57.07	45.89	50.42	49.10
55-64	M	45.54	46.19	47.89	50.00	53.59	58.05	45.92	50.66	49.28
	F	43.96	44.08	46.14	47.51	51.58	54.92	44.03	48.39	47.12
65+	M	40.23	40.80	42.23	44.36	47.59	51.61	40.56	44.87	43.62
	F	38.48	38.54	40.30	41.72	45.44	48.31	38.51	42.44	41.30

\#) This table corresponds to table F5 of the original PDL89 publication, with the exception of the three last columns.
*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per average of HIES85/86 & HIES93/94).

Table PDL89-6
Cost of blankets, by region and number of people #)   (Pula per month)

Number of adults or children	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
1	0.63	0.65	0.79	0.98	1.22	1.04	0.64	0.94	0.85
2	0.83	0.87	1.05	1.31	1.62	1.39	0.85	1.25	1.14
3	1.46	1.52	1.84	2.29	2.84	2.44	1.50	2.19	1.99
4	1.67	1.74	2.11	2.62	3.25	2.78	1.71	2.50	2.27
5	2.29	2.39	2.90	3.60	4.46	3.83	2.35	3.44	3.13
6	2.50	2.61	3.16	3.93	4.87	4.18	2.56	3.76	3.41
7	3.13	3.27	3.95	4.91	6.09	5.22	3.21	4.70	4.26
8	3.33	3.48	4.21	5.24	6.49	5.57	3.42	5.01	4.55

#) This table corresponds to table F6 of the original PDL89 publication, but with the following revision: the cost estimates for larger households have been corrected, as the original ones did not correspond to the requirements specified in table C4.

Table PDL89-7
Other household costs, by region and household size #)   (Pula per month)

Household size	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
1	6.34	7.10	6.70	7.10	7.20	8.19	6.78	7.11	7.02
2	10.43	11.81	8.85	9.30	9.37	10.68	11.23	9.34	9.89
3	10.43	11.81	8.85	9.30	9.37	10.68	11.23	9.34	9.89
4	11.72	13.21	10.52	11.02	11.06	12.70	12.58	11.08	11.52
5	11.72	13.21	10.52	11.02	11.06	12.70	12.58	11.08	11.52
6	11.72	13.21	10.52	11.02	11.06	12.70	12.58	11.08	11.52
7-12	15.81	17.92	13.16	13.71	13.71	15.68	17.03	13.79	14.73
13+	18.61	21.24	14.12	14.67	14.67	16.64	20.13	14.75	16.31

#) This table corresponds to table F8 of the original PDL89 publication, but includes the addition of firewood described under table C4.

Table PDL89-8
Cost of housing, by region and size of household #)   (Pula per month)

Number of adult equivalent	URBAN			RURAL	AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	Frc.town	Other	All Areas	Urban	Rural	National
1.0	35.00	31.50	28.00	1.44	31.67	1.44	10.22
1.5 to 2.5	35.00	31.50	28.00	1.92	31.67	1.92	10.56
3.0 to 4.0	63.00	56.70	50.40	3.84	57.00	3.84	19.28
4.5 +	63.00	56.70	50.40	5.76	57.00	5.76	20.64

#) This table corresponds to table F9 of the original PDL89 publication, but has been significantly revised with respect to urban housing costs. The original table F9, given below, implies that these costs decrease with increasing household size, and that they are the same in all urban centres. This seems implausible; the housing "allowances" have consequently been revised (in consultation with the Central Statistics Office).

Original table F9:	Number of adult equiv.	(Pula per month) Urban	Rural
	1.0	35.00	1.44
	1.5 to 2.5	35.00	1.92
	3.0 to 4.0	24.00	3.84
	4.5 +	24.00	5.76

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per average of HIES85/86 & HIES93/94).

Table PDL94-1
Food costs, by region, age and sex

(Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	19.38	19.99	20.66	20.96	23.15	24.62	19.75	21.69	21.09
	F	19.38	19.99	20.66	20.96	23.15	24.62	19.75	21.69	21.09
1	M	35.82	37.50	39.08	39.42	43.27	46.20	36.83	40.83	39.59
	F	35.82	37.50	39.08	39.42	43.27	46.20	36.83	40.83	39.59
2	M	43.50	47.23	49.61	50.34	56.50	59.69	45.74	52.25	50.23
	F	43.50	47.23	49.61	50.34	56.50	59.69	45.74	52.25	50.23
3	M	43.50	47.23	49.61	50.34	56.50	59.69	45.74	52.25	50.23
	F	43.50	47.23	49.61	50.34	56.50	59.69	45.74	52.25	50.23
4	M	51.42	54.86	57.40	58.34	65.39	69.08	53.49	60.50	58.32
	F	51.42	54.86	57.40	58.34	65.39	69.08	53.49	60.50	58.32
5	M	51.42	54.86	57.40	58.34	65.39	69.08	53.49	60.50	58.32
	F	51.42	54.86	57.40	58.34	65.39	69.08	53.49	60.50	58.32
6	M	51.42	54.86	57.40	58.34	65.39	69.08	53.49	60.50	58.32
	F	51.42	54.86	57.40	58.34	65.39	69.08	53.49	60.50	58.32
7	M	46.26	50.34	52.73	53.51	59.66	63.05	48.71	55.44	53.35
	F	46.26	50.34	52.73	53.51	59.66	63.05	48.71	55.44	53.35
8	M	46.26	50.34	52.73	53.51	59.66	63.05	48.71	55.44	53.35
	F	46.26	50.34	52.73	53.51	59.66	63.05	48.71	55.44	53.35
9	M	46.26	50.34	52.73	53.51	59.66	63.05	48.71	55.44	53.35
	F	46.26	50.34	52.73	53.51	59.66	63.05	48.71	55.44	53.35
10	M	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
	F	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
11	M	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
	F	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
12	M	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
	F	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
13	M	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
	F	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
14	M	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
	F	44.60	47.59	49.15	49.82	54.74	58.57	46.40	51.56	49.96
15	M	68.09	69.53	72.54	73.75	81.24	85.77	68.95	76.08	73.87
	F	63.22	63.83	66.33	67.43	73.87	78.13	63.59	69.49	67.66
16	M	68.09	69.53	72.54	73.75	81.24	85.77	68.95	76.08	73.87
	F	63.22	63.83	66.33	67.43	73.87	78.13	63.59	69.49	67.66
17	M	68.09	69.53	72.54	73.75	81.24	85.77	68.95	76.08	73.87
	F	63.22	63.83	66.33	67.43	73.87	78.13	63.59	69.49	67.66
18	M	68.09	69.53	72.54	73.75	81.24	85.77	68.95	76.08	73.87
	F	63.22	63.83	66.33	67.43	73.87	78.13	63.59	69.49	67.66
19	M	68.09	69.53	72.54	73.75	81.24	85.77	68.95	76.08	73.87
	F	63.22	63.83	66.33	67.43	73.87	78.13	63.59	69.49	67.66
20-54	M	65.07	65.55	68.19	69.22	75.67	80.09	65.36	71.33	69.48
	F	62.60	63.21	65.69	66.77	73.18	77.42	62.97	68.82	67.01
55-64	M	65.07	65.55	68.19	69.22	75.67	80.09	65.36	71.33	69.48
	F	62.60	63.21	65.69	66.77	73.18	77.42	62.97	68.82	67.01
65+	M	55.64	55.98	58.15	59.21	65.02	68.66	55.85	61.00	59.40
	F	52.88	53.37	55.33	56.50	62.28	65.69	53.17	58.20	56.65

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES93/94).

Table PDL94-2
Cost of personal items, by region, age and sex

(Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	8.75	9.27	9.76	10.18	10.85	10.79	9.06	10.20	9.85
	F	8.75	9.27	9.76	10.18	10.85	10.79	9.06	10.20	9.85
1	M	8.75	9.27	9.76	10.18	10.85	10.79	9.06	10.20	9.85
	F	8.75	9.27	9.76	10.18	10.85	10.79	9.06	10.20	9.85
2	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
3	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
4	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
5	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
6	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
7	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
8	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
9	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
10	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
11	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
12	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
13	M	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
	F	5.04	5.40	5.50	5.92	6.20	6.42	5.25	5.89	5.69
14	M	5.17	5.53	5.63	6.05	6.34	6.55	5.39	6.03	5.83
	F	5.17	5.53	5.63	6.05	6.34	6.55	5.39	6.03	5.83
15	M	5.17	5.53	5.63	6.05	6.34	6.55	5.39	6.03	5.83
	F	5.17	5.53	5.63	6.05	6.34	6.55	5.39	6.03	5.83
16	M	5.17	5.53	5.63	6.05	6.34	6.55	5.39	6.03	5.83
	F	5.17	5.53	5.63	6.05	6.34	6.55	5.39	6.03	5.83
17	M	5.17	5.53	5.63	6.05	6.34	6.55	5.39	6.03	5.83
	F	5.17	5.53	5.63	6.05	6.34	6.55	5.39	6.03	5.83
18	M	5.50	5.87	5.96	6.39	6.67	6.88	5.72	6.36	6.16
	F	8.38	10.21	9.99	10.48	10.33	11.20	9.48	10.44	10.14
19	M	5.50	5.87	5.96	6.39	6.67	6.88	5.72	6.36	6.16
	F	8.38	10.21	9.99	10.48	10.33	11.20	9.48	10.44	10.14
20-54	M	5.50	5.87	5.96	6.39	6.67	6.88	5.72	6.36	6.16
	F	8.38	10.21	9.99	10.48	10.33	11.20	9.48	10.44	10.14
55-64	M	5.50	5.87	5.96	6.39	6.67	6.88	5.72	6.36	6.16
	F	5.50	5.87	5.96	6.39	6.67	6.88	5.72	6.36	6.16
65+	M	5.50	5.87	5.96	6.39	6.67	6.88	5.72	6.36	6.16
	F	5.50	5.87	5.96	6.39	6.67	6.88	5.72	6.36	6.16

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES93/94).

Table PDL94-3
Cost of food and personal items, by region, age and sex #)

(Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	28.13	29.26	30.42	31.14	34.00	35.41	28.81	31.89	30.93
	F	28.13	29.26	30.42	31.14	34.00	35.41	28.81	31.89	30.93
1	M	44.57	46.77	48.85	49.60	54.13	57.00	45.89	51.03	49.44
	F	44.57	46.77	48.85	49.60	54.13	57.00	45.89	51.03	49.44
2	M	48.54	52.63	55.11	56.26	62.70	66.11	51.00	58.14	55.92
	F	48.54	52.63	55.11	56.26	62.70	66.11	51.00	58.14	55.92
3	M	48.54	52.63	55.11	56.26	62.70	66.11	51.00	58.14	55.92
	F	48.54	52.63	55.11	56.26	62.70	66.11	51.00	58.14	55.92
4	M	56.46	60.26	62.90	64.26	71.59	75.50	58.74	66.39	64.02
	F	56.46	60.26	62.90	64.26	71.59	75.50	58.74	66.39	64.02
5	M	56.46	60.26	62.90	64.26	71.59	75.50	58.74	66.39	64.02
	F	56.46	60.26	62.90	64.26	71.59	75.50	58.74	66.39	64.02
6	M	56.46	60.26	62.90	64.26	71.59	75.50	58.74	66.39	64.02
	F	56.46	60.26	62.90	64.26	71.59	75.50	58.74	66.39	64.02
7	M	52.51	56.96	59.45	60.66	67.08	70.69	55.19	62.55	60.27
	F	52.51	56.96	59.45	60.66	67.08	70.69	55.19	62.55	60.27
8	M	52.51	56.96	59.45	60.66	67.08	70.69	55.19	62.55	60.27
	F	52.51	56.96	59.45	60.66	67.08	70.69	55.19	62.55	60.27
9	M	52.51	56.96	59.45	60.66	67.08	70.69	55.19	62.55	60.27
	F	52.51	56.96	59.45	60.66	67.08	70.69	55.19	62.55	60.27
10	M	50.86	54.21	55.87	56.97	62.17	66.21	52.87	58.67	56.87
	F	50.86	54.21	55.87	56.97	62.17	66.21	52.87	58.67	56.87
11	M	50.86	54.21	55.87	56.97	62.17	66.21	52.87	58.67	56.87
	F	50.86	54.21	55.87	56.97	62.17	66.21	52.87	58.67	56.87
12	M	50.86	54.21	55.87	56.97	62.17	66.21	52.87	58.67	56.87
	F	50.86	54.21	55.87	56.97	62.17	66.21	52.87	58.67	56.87
13	M	50.86	54.21	55.87	56.97	62.17	66.21	52.87	58.67	56.87
	F	50.86	54.21	55.87	56.97	62.17	66.21	52.87	58.67	56.87
14	M	51.00	54.34	56.00	57.10	62.30	66.35	53.01	58.80	57.01
	F	51.00	54.34	56.00	57.10	62.30	66.35	53.01	58.80	57.01
15	M	73.26	75.06	78.17	79.80	87.58	92.32	74.34	82.11	79.70
	F	68.39	69.36	71.96	73.48	80.21	84.68	68.98	75.51	73.49
16	M	73.26	75.06	78.17	79.80	87.58	92.32	74.34	82.11	79.70
	F	68.39	69.36	71.96	73.48	80.21	84.68	68.98	75.51	73.49
17	M	73.26	75.06	78.17	79.80	87.58	92.32	74.34	82.11	79.70
	F	68.39	69.36	71.96	73.48	80.21	84.68	68.98	75.51	73.49
18	M	73.59	75.39	78.51	80.14	87.91	92.65	74.67	82.44	80.03
	F	71.61	74.04	76.32	77.91	84.20	89.33	73.07	79.93	77.80
19	M	73.59	75.39	78.51	80.14	87.91	92.65	74.67	82.44	80.03
	F	71.61	74.04	76.32	77.91	84.20	89.33	73.07	79.93	77.80
20-54	M	70.57	71.42	74.16	75.61	82.34	86.97	71.08	77.69	75.64
	F	70.98	73.42	75.68	77.25	83.51	88.62	72.45	79.27	77.15
55-64	M	70.57	71.42	74.16	75.61	82.34	86.97	71.08	77.69	75.64
	F	68.11	69.07	71.65	73.16	79.85	84.31	68.69	75.18	73.17
65+	M	61.15	61.85	64.11	65.60	71.69	75.54	61.57	67.36	65.57
	F	58.38	59.24	61.29	62.88	68.96	72.58	58.90	64.56	62.81

#) An allowance for school fees has been added for each child aged 7 to 14.
*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES93/94).

Table PDL94-4　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Pula per month)
Clothing costs, by region, age and sex

		URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
Age	Sex	Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	7.95	7.23	8.58	9.77	9.58	11.94	7.51	9.77	9.07
	F	7.95	7.23	8.58	9.77	9.58	11.94	7.51	9.77	9.07
1	M	7.95	7.23	8.58	9.77	9.58	11.94	7.51	9.77	9.07
	F	7.95	7.23	8.58	9.77	9.58	11.94	7.51	9.77	9.07
2	M	4.25	5.09	6.11	7.30	5.84	7.21	4.76	6.80	6.16
	F	6.62	6.42	7.09	8.22	8.09	10.40	6.50	8.25	7.71
3	M	4.25	5.09	6.11	7.30	5.84	7.21	4.76	6.80	6.16
	F	6.62	6.42	7.09	8.22	8.09	10.40	6.50	8.25	7.71
4	M	4.25	5.09	6.11	7.30	5.84	7.21	4.76	6.80	6.16
	F	6.62	6.42	7.09	8.22	8.09	10.40	6.50	8.25	7.71
5	M	4.25	5.09	6.11	7.30	5.84	7.21	4.76	6.80	6.16
	F	6.62	6.42	7.09	8.22	8.09	10.40	6.50	8.25	7.71
6	M	4.25	5.09	6.11	7.30	5.84	7.21	4.76	6.80	6.16
	F	6.62	6.42	7.09	8.22	8.09	10.40	6.50	8.25	7.71
7	M	7.83	7.93	7.62	9.16	9.61	9.50	7.89	8.75	8.48
	F	11.16	11.20	11.46	12.59	14.22	14.88	11.19	12.75	12.27
8	M	7.83	7.93	7.62	9.16	9.61	9.50	7.89	8.75	8.48
	F	11.16	11.20	11.46	12.59	14.22	14.88	11.19	12.75	12.27
9	M	7.83	7.93	7.62	9.16	9.61	9.50	7.89	8.75	8.48
	F	11.16	11.20	11.46	12.59	14.22	14.88	11.19	12.75	12.27
10	M	7.83	7.93	7.62	9.16	9.61	9.50	7.89	8.75	8.48
	F	11.16	11.20	11.46	12.59	14.22	14.88	11.19	12.75	12.27
11	M	7.83	7.93	7.62	9.16	9.61	9.50	7.89	8.75	8.48
	F	11.16	11.20	11.46	12.59	14.22	14.88	11.19	12.75	12.27
12	M	7.83	7.93	7.62	9.16	9.61	9.50	7.89	8.75	8.48
	F	11.16	11.20	11.46	12.59	14.22	14.88	11.19	12.75	12.27
13	M	7.83	7.93	7.62	9.16	9.61	9.50	7.89	8.75	8.48
	F	11.16	11.20	11.46	12.59	14.22	14.88	11.19	12.75	12.27
14	M	9.69	8.42	10.10	10.69	9.77	12.20	8.93	10.72	10.17
	F	9.20	8.20	9.73	10.08	9.63	12.38	8.60	10.37	9.82
15	M	9.69	8.42	10.10	10.69	9.77	12.20	8.93	10.72	10.17
	F	9.20	8.20	9.73	10.08	9.63	12.38	8.60	10.37	9.82
16	M	9.69	8.42	10.10	10.69	9.77	12.20	8.93	10.72	10.17
	F	9.20	8.20	9.73	10.08	9.63	12.38	8.60	10.37	9.82
17	M	9.69	8.42	10.10	10.69	9.77	12.20	8.93	10.72	10.17
	F	9.20	8.20	9.73	10.08	9.63	12.38	8.60	10.37	9.82
18	M	11.59	11.91	12.30	14.82	14.67	18.25	11.78	14.62	13.74
	F	11.61	10.81	12.02	13.08	13.71	15.35	11.13	13.20	12.56
19	M	11.59	11.91	12.30	14.82	14.67	18.25	11.78	14.62	13.74
	F	11.61	10.81	12.02	13.08	13.71	15.35	11.13	13.20	12.56
20-54	M	11.59	11.91	12.30	14.82	14.67	18.25	11.78	14.62	13.74
	F	11.61	10.81	12.02	13.08	13.71	15.35	11.13	13.20	12.56
55-64	M	11.98	12.36	12.69	15.25	14.90	18.54	12.21	15.00	14.14
	F	11.61	10.81	12.02	13.08	13.71	15.35	11.13	13.20	12.56
65+	M	11.98	12.36	12.69	15.25	14.90	18.54	12.21	15.00	14.14
	F	11.61	10.81	12.02	13.08	13.71	15.35	11.13	13.20	12.56

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES93/94).

Table PDL94-5
Individual total costs, by region, age and sex

<div style="text-align:right">(Pula per month)</div>

Age	Sex	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	36.08	36.48	39.00	40.91	43.58	47.36	36.32	41.66	40.01
	F	36.08	36.48	39.00	40.91	43.58	47.36	36.32	41.66	40.01
1	M	52.52	54.00	57.43	59.37	63.70	68.94	53.41	60.80	58.51
	F	52.52	54.00	57.43	59.37	63.70	68.94	53.41	60.80	58.51
2	M	52.79	57.72	61.21	63.56	68.54	73.31	55.75	64.93	62.09
	F	55.16	59.06	62.19	64.48	70.79	76.51	57.50	66.38	63.63
3	M	52.79	57.72	61.21	63.56	68.54	73.31	55.75	64.93	62.09
	F	55.16	59.06	62.19	64.48	70.79	76.51	57.50	66.38	63.63
4	M	60.71	65.36	69.01	71.57	77.43	82.70	63.50	73.19	70.18
	F	63.07	66.69	69.99	72.49	79.68	85.90	65.25	74.64	71.73
5	M	60.71	65.36	69.01	71.57	77.43	82.70	63.50	73.19	70.18
	F	63.07	66.69	69.99	72.49	79.68	85.90	65.25	74.64	71.73
6	M	60.71	65.36	69.01	71.57	77.43	82.70	63.50	73.19	70.18
	F	63.07	66.69	69.99	72.49	79.68	85.90	65.25	74.64	71.73
7	M	60.35	64.89	67.07	69.82	76.70	80.18	63.08	71.30	68.75
	F	63.68	68.16	70.91	73.25	81.30	85.57	66.37	75.30	72.53
8	M	60.35	64.89	67.07	69.82	76.70	80.18	63.08	71.30	68.75
	F	63.68	68.16	70.91	73.25	81.30	85.57	66.37	75.30	72.53
9	M	60.35	64.89	67.07	69.82	76.70	80.18	63.08	71.30	68.75
	F	63.68	68.16	70.91	73.25	81.30	85.57	66.37	75.30	72.53
10	M	58.70	62.14	63.48	66.13	71.78	75.71	60.77	67.42	65.35
	F	62.02	65.41	67.32	69.56	76.38	81.10	64.06	71.42	69.14
11	M	58.70	62.14	63.48	66.13	71.78	75.71	60.77	67.42	65.35
	F	62.02	65.41	67.32	69.56	76.38	81.10	64.06	71.42	69.14
12	M	58.70	62.14	63.48	66.13	71.78	75.71	60.77	67.42	65.35
	F	62.02	65.41	67.32	69.56	76.38	81.10	64.06	71.42	69.14
13	M	58.70	62.14	63.48	66.13	71.78	75.71	60.77	67.42	65.35
	F	62.02	65.41	67.32	69.56	76.38	81.10	64.06	71.42	69.14
14	M	60.69	62.76	66.10	67.79	72.07	78.55	61.94	69.52	67.17
	F	60.20	62.55	65.73	67.18	71.93	78.72	61.61	69.17	66.83
15	M	82.95	83.48	88.28	90.49	97.35	104.52	83.27	92.83	89.87
	F	77.60	77.57	81.69	83.57	89.85	97.06	77.58	85.88	83.31
16	M	82.95	83.48	88.28	90.49	97.35	104.52	83.27	92.83	89.87
	F	77.60	77.57	81.69	83.57	89.85	97.06	77.58	85.88	83.31
17	M	82.95	83.48	88.28	90.49	97.35	104.52	83.27	92.83	89.87
	F	77.60	77.57	81.69	83.57	89.85	97.06	77.58	85.88	83.31
18	M	85.18	87.30	90.80	94.96	102.58	110.90	86.45	97.06	93.78
	F	83.22	84.85	88.35	90.99	97.91	104.68	84.20	93.13	90.36
19	M	85.18	87.30	90.80	94.96	102.58	110.90	86.45	97.06	93.78
	F	83.22	84.85	88.35	90.99	97.91	104.68	84.20	93.13	90.36
20-54	M	82.17	83.32	86.45	90.43	97.00	105.22	82.86	92.31	89.38
	F	82.60	84.22	87.71	90.33	97.22	103.97	83.57	92.46	89.71
55-64	M	82.56	83.77	86.85	90.87	97.24	105.51	83.29	92.69	89.78
	F	79.72	79.88	83.68	86.24	93.56	99.66	79.82	88.38	85.73
65+	M	73.13	74.21	76.80	80.85	86.59	94.08	73.78	82.36	79.70
	F	69.99	70.05	73.31	75.97	82.66	87.93	70.03	77.76	75.36

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES93/94).

Table PDL94-6
Cost of blankets, by region and number of people   (Pula per month)

Number of adults or children	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
1	1.05	1.11	1.34	1.67	2.08	1.77	1.09	1.61	1.44
2	1.41	1.48	1.79	2.23	2.76	2.37	1.45	2.14	1.93
3	2.48	2.59	3.13	3.90	4.83	4.15	2.55	3.75	3.38
4	2.84	2.96	3.59	4.46	5.53	4.73	2.91	4.29	3.86
5	3.90	4.07	4.93	6.13	7.59	6.52	4.00	5.90	5.31
6	4.25	4.44	5.38	6.67	8.29	7.11	4.37	6.43	5.79
7	4.95	5.19	6.28	7.79	9.66	8.29	5.09	7.51	6.76
8	5.31	5.56	6.72	8.34	10.34	8.88	5.46	8.04	7.24

Table PDL94-7
Other household costs, by region and household size   (Pula per month)

Household size	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
1	10.04	11.19	11.35	11.99	12.17	13.76	10.73	12.12	11.69
2	16.24	18.31	15.14	15.86	15.98	18.15	17.49	16.06	16.50
3	16.24	18.31	15.14	15.86	15.98	18.15	17.49	16.06	16.50
4	18.50	20.75	18.06	18.87	18.93	21.67	19.85	19.13	19.35
5	18.50	20.75	18.06	18.87	18.93	21.67	19.85	19.13	19.35
6	18.50	20.75	18.06	18.87	18.93	21.67	19.85	19.13	19.35
7-12	24.70	27.87	22.70	23.61	23.60	26.91	26.60	23.93	24.76
13+	28.65	32.55	24.42	25.33	25.32	28.63	30.99	25.65	27.30

Table PDL94-8
Cost of housing, by region and size of household   (Pula per month)

Number of adult equivalent	URBAN			RURAL	AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	Frc.town	Other	All Areas	Urban	Rural	National
1.0	77.20	69.48	61.76	2.58	69.88	2.58	23.44
1.5 to 2.5	77.20	69.48	61.76	3.44	69.88	3.44	24.03
3.0 to 4.0	138.96	125.06	111.17	6.88	125.79	6.88	43.74
4.5 +	138.96	125.06	111.17	10.33	125.79	10.33	46.11

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES93/94)

ood costs, by region, age and sex (Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	7.66	7.90	8.16	8.28	9.14	9.73	7.79	8.45	8.27
	F	7.66	7.90	8.16	8.28	9.14	9.73	7.79	8.45	8.27
1	M	14.15	14.82	15.44	15.57	17.10	18.25	14.51	15.91	15.54
	F	14.15	14.82	15.44	15.57	17.10	18.25	14.51	15.91	15.54
2	M	17.19	18.66	19.60	19.89	22.32	23.58	17.99	20.34	19.72
	F	17.19	18.66	19.60	19.89	22.32	23.58	17.99	20.34	19.72
3	M	17.19	18.66	19.60	19.89	22.32	23.58	17.99	20.34	19.72
	F	17.19	18.66	19.60	19.89	22.32	23.58	17.99	20.34	19.72
4	M	20.32	21.68	22.68	23.05	25.83	27.29	21.05	23.55	22.89
	F	20.32	21.68	22.68	23.05	25.83	27.29	21.05	23.55	22.89
5	M	20.32	21.68	22.68	23.05	25.83	27.29	21.05	23.55	22.89
	F	20.32	21.68	22.68	23.05	25.83	27.29	21.05	23.55	22.89
6	M	20.32	21.68	22.68	23.05	25.83	27.29	21.05	23.55	22.89
	F	20.32	21.68	22.68	23.05	25.83	27.29	21.05	23.55	22.89
7	M	18.27	19.89	20.83	21.14	23.57	24.91	19.15	21.59	20.94
	F	18.27	19.89	20.83	21.14	23.57	24.91	19.15	21.59	20.94
8	M	18.27	19.89	20.83	21.14	23.57	24.91	19.15	21.59	20.94
	F	18.27	19.89	20.83	21.14	23.57	24.91	19.15	21.59	20.94
9	M	18.27	19.89	20.83	21.14	23.57	24.91	19.15	21.59	20.94
	F	18.27	19.89	20.83	21.14	23.57	24.91	19.15	21.59	20.94
10	M	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
	F	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
11	M	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
	F	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
12	M	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
	F	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
13	M	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
	F	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
14	M	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
	F	17.62	18.80	19.42	19.68	21.63	23.14	18.26	20.07	19.59
15	M	26.90	27.47	28.66	29.14	32.10	33.88	27.21	29.65	29.01
	F	24.98	25.22	26.21	26.64	29.19	30.87	25.11	27.09	26.56
16	M	26.90	27.47	28.66	29.14	32.10	33.88	27.21	29.65	29.01
	F	24.98	25.22	26.21	26.64	29.19	30.87	25.11	27.09	26.56
17	M	26.90	27.47	28.66	29.14	32.10	33.88	27.21	29.65	29.01
	F	24.98	25.22	26.21	26.64	29.19	30.87	25.11	27.09	26.56
18	M	26.90	27.47	28.66	29.14	32.10	33.88	27.21	29.65	29.01
	F	24.98	25.22	26.21	26.64	29.19	30.87	25.11	27.09	26.56
19	M	26.90	27.47	28.66	29.14	32.10	33.88	27.21	29.65	29.01
	F	24.98	25.22	26.21	26.64	29.19	30.87	25.11	27.09	26.56
20-54	M	25.71	25.90	26.94	27.35	29.89	31.64	25.81	27.81	27.28
	F	24.73	24.97	25.95	26.38	28.91	30.59	24.86	26.83	26.31
55-64	M	25.71	25.90	26.94	27.35	29.89	31.64	25.81	27.81	27.28
	F	24.73	24.97	25.95	26.38	28.91	30.59	24.86	26.83	26.31
65+	M	21.98	22.12	22.97	23.39	25.69	27.12	22.06	23.78	23.32
	F	20.89	21.09	21.86	22.32	24.61	25.95	21.00	22.68	22.23

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES85/86)

Table PDL86-2
Cost of personal items, by region, age and sex

(Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	3.16	3.35	3.52	3.67	3.92	3.88	3.26	3.65	3.55
	F	3.16	3.35	3.52	3.67	3.92	3.88	3.26	3.65	3.55
1	M	3.16	3.35	3.52	3.67	3.92	3.88	3.26	3.65	3.55
	F	3.16	3.35	3.52	3.67	3.92	3.88	3.26	3.65	3.55
2	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
3	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
4	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
5	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
6	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
7	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
8	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
9	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
10	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
11	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
12	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
13	M	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
	F	1.84	1.97	2.01	2.16	2.27	2.35	1.91	2.13	2.07
14	M	1.89	2.02	2.06	2.21	2.32	2.39	1.96	2.17	2.12
	F	1.89	2.02	2.06	2.21	2.32	2.39	1.96	2.17	2.12
15	M	1.89	2.02	2.06	2.21	2.32	2.39	1.96	2.17	2.12
	F	1.89	2.02	2.06	2.21	2.32	2.39	1.96	2.17	2.12
16	M	1.89	2.02	2.06	2.21	2.32	2.39	1.96	2.17	2.12
	F	1.89	2.02	2.06	2.21	2.32	2.39	1.96	2.17	2.12
17	M	1.89	2.02	2.06	2.21	2.32	2.39	1.96	2.17	2.12
	F	1.89	2.02	2.06	2.21	2.32	2.39	1.96	2.17	2.12
18	M	2.01	2.15	2.18	2.34	2.44	2.52	2.08	2.30	2.24
	F	3.07	3.73	3.66	3.83	3.78	4.09	3.43	3.78	3.68
19	M	2.01	2.15	2.18	2.34	2.44	2.52	2.08	2.30	2.24
	F	3.07	3.73	3.66	3.83	3.78	4.09	3.43	3.78	3.68
20-54	M	2.01	2.15	2.18	2.34	2.44	2.52	2.08	2.30	2.24
	F	3.07	3.73	3.66	3.83	3.78	4.09	3.43	3.78	3.68
55-64	M	2.01	2.15	2.18	2.34	2.44	2.52	2.08	2.30	2.24
	F	2.01	2.15	2.18	2.34	2.44	2.52	2.08	2.30	2.24
65+	M	2.01	2.15	2.18	2.34	2.44	2.52	2.08	2.30	2.24
	F	2.01	2.15	2.18	2.34	2.44	2.52	2.08	2.30	2.24

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES85/86)

Table PDL86-3
Cost of food and personal items, by region, age and sex #)

<div style="text-align:right">(Pula per month)</div>

Age	Sex	URBAN Gaborone	O/Towns	RURAL Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	AVERAGE *) Urban	Rural	National
0	M	10.82	11.24	11.68	11.95	13.06	13.61	11.05	12.10	11.82
	F	10.82	11.24	11.68	11.95	13.06	13.61	11.05	12.10	11.82
1	M	17.31	18.16	18.96	19.24	21.01	22.14	17.77	19.56	19.09
	F	17.31	18.16	18.96	19.24	21.01	22.14	17.77	19.56	19.09
2	M	19.03	20.63	21.61	22.05	24.59	25.93	19.90	22.46	21.79
	F	19.03	20.63	21.61	22.05	24.59	25.93	19.90	22.46	21.79
3	M	19.03	20.63	21.61	22.05	24.59	25.93	19.90	22.46	21.79
	F	19.03	20.63	21.61	22.05	24.59	25.93	19.90	22.46	21.79
4	M	22.16	23.65	24.69	25.21	28.10	29.64	22.97	25.68	24.96
	F	22.16	23.65	24.69	25.21	28.10	29.64	22.97	25.68	24.96
5	M	22.16	23.65	24.69	25.21	28.10	29.64	22.97	25.68	24.96
	F	22.16	23.65	24.69	25.21	28.10	29.64	22.97	25.68	24.96
6	M	22.16	23.65	24.69	25.21	28.10	29.64	22.97	25.68	24.96
	F	22.16	23.65	24.69	25.21	28.10	29.64	22.97	25.68	24.96
7	M	20.78	22.52	23.50	23.97	26.50	27.92	21.72	24.38	23.67
	F	20.78	22.52	23.50	23.97	26.50	27.92	21.72	24.38	23.67
8	M	20.78	22.52	23.50	23.97	26.50	27.92	21.72	24.38	23.67
	F	20.78	22.52	23.50	23.97	26.50	27.92	21.72	24.38	23.67
9	M	20.78	22.52	23.50	23.97	26.50	27.92	21.72	24.38	23.67
	F	20.78	22.52	23.50	23.97	26.50	27.92	21.72	24.38	23.67
10	M	20.12	21.44	22.09	22.51	24.56	26.15	20.84	22.86	22.32
	F	20.12	21.44	22.09	22.51	24.56	26.15	20.84	22.86	22.32
11	M	20.12	21.44	22.09	22.51	24.56	26.15	20.84	22.86	22.32
	F	20.12	21.44	22.09	22.51	24.56	26.15	20.84	22.86	22.32
12	M	20.12	21.44	22.09	22.51	24.56	26.15	20.84	22.86	22.32
	F	20.12	21.44	22.09	22.51	24.56	26.15	20.84	22.86	22.32
13	M	20.12	21.44	22.09	22.51	24.56	26.15	20.84	22.86	22.32
	F	20.12	21.44	22.09	22.51	24.56	26.15	20.84	22.86	22.32
14	M	20.17	21.48	22.14	22.56	24.60	26.20	20.89	22.91	22.37
	F	20.17	21.48	22.14	22.56	24.60	26.20	20.89	22.91	22.37
15	M	28.79	29.49	30.72	31.35	34.41	36.28	29.17	31.83	31.13
	F	26.87	27.24	28.26	28.85	31.50	33.26	27.07	29.26	28.68
16	M	28.79	29.49	30.72	31.35	34.41	36.28	29.17	31.83	31.13
	F	26.87	27.24	28.26	28.85	31.50	33.26	27.07	29.26	28.68
17	M	28.79	29.49	30.72	31.35	34.41	36.28	29.17	31.83	31.13
	F	26.87	27.24	28.26	28.85	31.50	33.26	27.07	29.26	28.68
18	M	28.91	29.61	30.84	31.47	34.54	36.40	29.29	31.95	31.25
	F	28.04	28.95	29.86	30.47	32.96	34.96	28.54	30.86	30.25
19	M	28.91	29.61	30.84	31.47	34.54	36.40	29.29	31.95	31.25
	F	28.04	28.95	29.86	30.47	32.96	34.96	28.54	30.86	30.25
20-54	M	27.72	28.04	29.12	29.68	32.33	34.16	27.90	30.11	29.52
	F	27.80	28.71	29.61	30.21	32.69	34.68	28.29	30.60	29.99
55-64	M	27.72	28.04	29.12	29.68	32.33	34.16	27.90	30.11	29.52
	F	26.75	27.12	28.13	28.72	31.35	33.11	26.95	29.13	28.55
65+	M	24.00	24.26	25.15	25.73	28.13	29.64	24.14	26.07	25.56
	F	22.90	23.23	24.04	24.66	27.05	28.47	23.08	24.98	24.47

#) An allowance for school fees has been added for each child aged 7 to 14.
*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES85/86)

Table PDL86-4
Clothing costs, by region, age and sex

(Pula per month)

Age	Sex	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
		Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
0	M	2.52	2.29	2.71	3.09	3.03	3.78	2.39	2.99	2.83
	F	2.52	2.29	2.71	3.09	3.03	3.78	2.39	2.99	2.83
1	M	2.52	2.29	2.71	3.09	3.03	3.78	2.39	2.99	2.83
	F	2.52	2.29	2.71	3.09	3.03	3.78	2.39	2.99	2.83
2	M	1.34	1.61	1.93	2.31	1.85	2.28	1.49	2.10	1.94
	F	2.09	2.03	2.24	2.60	2.56	3.29	2.06	2.51	2.39
3	M	1.34	1.61	1.93	2.31	1.85	2.28	1.49	2.10	1.94
	F	2.09	2.03	2.24	2.60	2.56	3.29	2.06	2.51	2.39
4	M	1.34	1.61	1.93	2.31	1.85	2.28	1.49	2.10	1.94
	F	2.09	2.03	2.24	2.60	2.56	3.29	2.06	2.51	2.39
5	M	1.34	1.61	1.93	2.31	1.85	2.28	1.49	2.10	1.94
	F	2.09	2.03	2.24	2.60	2.56	3.29	2.06	2.51	2.39
6	M	1.34	1.61	1.93	2.31	1.85	2.28	1.49	2.10	1.94
	F	2.09	2.03	2.24	2.60	2.56	3.29	2.06	2.51	2.39
7	M	2.48	2.51	2.41	2.90	3.04	3.01	2.50	2.72	2.66
	F	3.53	3.54	3.63	3.98	4.50	4.71	3.54	3.95	3.84
8	M	2.48	2.51	2.41	2.90	3.04	3.01	2.50	2.72	2.66
	F	3.53	3.54	3.63	3.98	4.50	4.71	3.54	3.95	3.84
9	M	2.48	2.51	2.41	2.90	3.04	3.01	2.50	2.72	2.66
	F	3.53	3.54	3.63	3.98	4.50	4.71	3.54	3.95	3.84
10	M	2.48	2.51	2.41	2.90	3.04	3.01	2.50	2.72	2.66
	F	3.53	3.54	3.63	3.98	4.50	4.71	3.54	3.95	3.84
11	M	2.48	2.51	2.41	2.90	3.04	3.01	2.50	2.72	2.66
	F	3.53	3.54	3.63	3.98	4.50	4.71	3.54	3.95	3.84
12	M	2.48	2.51	2.41	2.90	3.04	3.01	2.50	2.72	2.66
	F	3.53	3.54	3.63	3.98	4.50	4.71	3.54	3.95	3.84
13	M	2.48	2.51	2.41	2.90	3.04	3.01	2.50	2.72	2.66
	F	3.53	3.54	3.63	3.98	4.50	4.71	3.54	3.95	3.84
14	M	3.07	2.66	3.20	3.38	3.09	3.86	2.85	3.32	3.19
	F	2.91	2.60	3.08	3.19	3.05	3.92	2.74	3.19	3.07
15	M	3.07	2.66	3.20	3.38	3.09	3.86	2.85	3.32	3.19
	F	2.91	2.60	3.08	3.19	3.05	3.92	2.74	3.19	3.07
16	M	3.07	2.66	3.20	3.38	3.09	3.86	2.85	3.32	3.19
	F	2.91	2.60	3.08	3.19	3.05	3.92	2.74	3.19	3.07
17	M	3.07	2.66	3.20	3.38	3.09	3.86	2.85	3.32	3.19
	F	2.91	2.60	3.08	3.19	3.05	3.92	2.74	3.19	3.07
18	M	3.67	3.77	3.89	4.69	4.64	5.78	3.72	4.45	4.25
	F	3.68	3.42	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.86	3.54	4.08	3.94
19	M	3.67	3.77	3.89	4.69	4.64	5.78	3.72	4.45	4.25
	F	3.68	3.42	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.86	3.54	4.08	3.94
20-54	M	3.67	3.77	3.89	4.69	4.64	5.78	3.72	4.45	4.25
	F	3.68	3.42	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.86	3.54	4.08	3.94
55-64	M	3.79	3.91	4.02	4.83	4.72	5.87	3.86	4.57	4.38
	F	3.68	3.42	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.86	3.54	4.08	3.94
65+	M	3.79	3.91	4.02	4.83	4.72	5.87	3.86	4.57	4.38
	F	3.68	3.42	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.86	3.54	4.08	3.94

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES85/86)

Table PDL86-5 (Pula per month)
Individual total costs, by region, age and sex

Age	Sex	URBAN Gaborone	O/Towns	RURAL Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	AVERAGE *) Urban	Rural	National
0	M	13.33	13.53	14.40	15.04	16.09	17.39	13.44	15.08	14.65
	F	13.33	13.53	14.40	15.04	16.09	17.39	13.44	15.08	14.65
1	M	19.83	20.45	21.68	22.34	24.04	25.92	20.17	22.55	21.92
	F	19.83	20.45	21.68	22.34	24.04	25.92	20.17	22.55	21.92
2	M	20.37	22.25	23.54	24.36	26.44	28.21	21.39	24.57	23.73
	F	21.12	22.67	23.85	24.65	27.15	29.22	21.96	24.97	24.17
3	M	20.37	22.25	23.54	24.36	26.44	28.21	21.39	24.57	23.73
	F	21.12	22.67	23.85	24.65	27.15	29.22	21.96	24.97	24.17
4	M	23.50	25.26	26.62	27.53	29.95	31.92	24.46	27.78	26.90
	F	24.25	25.68	26.93	27.82	30.66	32.93	25.03	28.18	27.35
5	M	23.50	25.26	26.62	27.53	29.95	31.92	24.46	27.78	26.90
	F	24.25	25.68	26.93	27.82	30.66	32.93	25.03	28.18	27.35
6	M	23.50	25.26	26.62	27.53	29.95	31.92	24.46	27.78	26.90
	F	24.25	25.68	26.93	27.82	30.66	32.93	25.03	28.18	27.35
7	M	23.26	25.03	25.91	26.87	29.54	30.92	24.22	27.10	26.34
	F	24.31	26.07	27.13	27.95	31.00	32.63	25.26	28.33	27.52
8	M	23.26	25.03	25.91	26.87	29.54	30.92	24.22	27.10	26.34
	F	24.31	26.07	27.13	27.95	31.00	32.63	25.26	28.33	27.52
9	M	23.26	25.03	25.91	26.87	29.54	30.92	24.22	27.10	26.34
	F	24.31	26.07	27.13	27.95	31.00	32.63	25.26	28.33	27.52
10	M	22.60	23.95	24.50	25.41	27.60	29.15	23.33	25.58	24.98
	F	23.66	24.98	25.71	26.49	29.06	30.86	24.38	26.81	26.17
11	M	22.60	23.95	24.50	25.41	27.60	29.15	23.33	25.58	24.98
	F	23.66	24.98	25.71	26.49	29.06	30.86	24.38	26.81	26.17
12	M	22.60	23.95	24.50	25.41	27.60	29.15	23.33	25.58	24.98
	F	23.66	24.98	25.71	26.49	29.06	30.86	24.38	26.81	26.17
13	M	22.60	23.95	24.50	25.41	27.60	29.15	23.33	25.58	24.98
	F	23.66	24.98	25.71	26.49	29.06	30.86	24.38	26.81	26.17
14	M	23.24	24.15	25.33	25.94	27.70	30.06	23.73	26.23	25.57
	F	23.09	24.08	25.22	25.75	27.65	30.11	23.63	26.10	25.45
15	M	31.86	32.16	33.92	34.73	37.51	40.14	32.02	35.15	34.32
	F	29.78	29.84	31.34	32.05	34.55	37.18	29.81	32.46	31.76
16	M	31.86	32.16	33.92	34.73	37.51	40.14	32.02	35.15	34.32
	F	29.78	29.84	31.34	32.05	34.55	37.18	29.81	32.46	31.76
17	M	31.86	32.16	33.92	34.73	37.51	40.14	32.02	35.15	34.32
	F	29.78	29.84	31.34	32.05	34.55	37.18	29.81	32.46	31.76
18	M	32.58	33.38	34.73	36.16	39.18	42.18	33.02	36.40	35.50
	F	31.72	32.37	33.67	34.61	37.30	39.82	32.07	34.95	34.18
19	M	32.58	33.38	34.73	36.16	39.18	42.18	33.02	36.40	35.50
	F	31.72	32.37	33.67	34.61	37.30	39.82	32.07	34.95	34.18
20-54	M	31.39	31.81	33.01	34.38	36.98	39.93	31.62	34.56	33.78
	F	31.47	32.13	33.41	34.35	37.03	39.54	31.83	34.69	33.93
55-64	M	31.51	31.95	33.14	34.51	37.05	40.03	31.75	34.68	33.90
	F	30.42	30.54	31.94	32.86	35.69	37.96	30.48	33.21	32.49
65+	M	27.79	28.17	29.17	30.56	32.84	35.51	28.00	30.64	29.94
	F	26.58	26.65	27.84	28.80	31.38	33.33	26.62	29.06	28.41

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES85/86)

Table PDL86-6
Cost of blankets, by region and number of people   (Pula per month)

Number of adults or children	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
1	0.38	0.40	0.48	0.60	0.74	0.63	0.39	0.57	0.52
2	0.50	0.53	0.64	0.80	0.99	0.85	0.52	0.75	0.69
3	0.89	0.92	1.12	1.39	1.73	1.48	0.91	1.32	1.21
4	1.02	1.06	1.28	1.59	1.98	1.69	1.04	1.51	1.39
5	1.39	1.45	1.76	2.19	2.71	2.33	1.43	2.08	1.91
6	1.52	1.59	1.92	2.38	2.96	2.54	1.56	2.26	2.08
7	1.77	1.86	2.24	2.79	3.45	2.96	1.82	2.64	2.42
8	1.90	1.99	2.40	2.98	3.70	3.17	1.95	2.83	2.60

Table PDL86-7
Other household costs, by region and household size   (Pula per month)

Household size	URBAN		RURAL				AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	O/Towns	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D	Urban	Rural	National
1	4.27	4.81	4.37	4.63	4.70	5.35	4.56	4.59	4.58
2	7.17	8.17	5.73	6.03	6.08	6.92	7.71	5.99	6.44
3	7.17	8.17	5.73	6.03	6.08	6.92	7.71	5.99	6.44
4	7.96	9.02	6.75	7.08	7.10	8.15	8.53	7.04	7.43
5	7.96	9.02	6.75	7.08	7.10	8.15	8.53	7.04	7.43
6	7.96	9.02	6.75	7.08	7.10	8.15	8.53	7.04	7.43
7-12	10.86	12.38	8.46	8.82	8.83	10.06	11.68	8.78	9.55
13+	12.98	14.88	9.15	9.51	9.52	10.76	14.01	9.47	10.67

Table PDL86-8
Cost of housing, by region and size of household   (Pula per month)

Number of adult equivalent	URBAN			RURAL	AVERAGE *)		
	Gaborone	Frc.town	Other	All Areas	Urban	Rural	National
1.0	29.30	26.37	23.44	1.04	26.49	1.04	7.78
1.5 to 2.5	29.30	26.37	23.44	1.39	26.49	1.39	8.03
3.0 to 4.0	52.74	47.47	42.19	2.77	47.68	2.77	14.67
4.5 +	52.74	47.47	42.19	4.16	47.68	4.16	15.68

*) Weighted average, with weights equal to the total number of households (as per HIES85/86)

Table ARE-1
Complete PDL estimates for selected household types

I : PDL86 (ref.: HIES85/86)

(Pula per month)

H'hold type no:	URBAN			RURAL			
	Gaborone	Frc.town	Other	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D
I	65.3	63.4	60.5	38.9	40.6	43.5	47.0
II	81.7	80.6	77.7	55.1	57.1	61.0	65.5
III	99.8	99.0	96.1	74.2	76.9	82.5	88.6
IV	103.2	103.7	100.7	79.7	82.7	89.2	95.7
V	123.7	124.7	121.7	101.3	105.1	113.1	121.2
VI	138.3	141.7	138.8	119.3	123.5	134.1	143.2
VII	169.2	169.4	164.1	127.7	132.3	142.9	153.2
VIII	201.6	201.7	196.4	161.2	166.6	180.3	192.9
IX	228.5	228.7	223.5	190.9	197.4	213.8	228.3
X	236.6	238.8	233.5	198.9	205.6	222.7	237.8
XI	268.4	271.0	265.7	233.8	241.9	261.8	279.7
XII	292.3	296.7	291.4	260.9	270.1	292.5	312.3
XIII	320.2	325.0	319.7	290.2	300.8	325.6	348.0

II : PDL94 (ref.: HIES93/94)

(Pula per month)

H'hold type no:	URBAN			RURAL			
	Gaborone	Frc.town	Other	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D
I	170.5	165.1	157.4	101.7	106.7	113.8	123.3
II	213.2	209.6	201.9	145.8	151.4	161.4	173.8
III	259.6	256.8	249.1	194.5	202.3	216.4	233.1
IV	269.4	269.8	262.0	210.2	218.4	235.2	253.0
V	321.4	323.3	315.6	264.9	275.5	295.9	317.6
VI	359.7	368.0	360.2	312.2	323.8	351.1	375.3
VII	440.9	440.7	426.8	333.9	347.0	373.8	401.7
VIII	526.2	525.4	511.5	421.8	437.2	472.1	506.4
IX	597.3	596.5	582.6	499.9	518.3	560.3	599.5
X	617.4	621.4	607.5	521.8	540.5	584.2	625.0
XI	700.6	705.9	692.0	613.0	636.0	686.7	735.4
XII	762.4	772.3	758.4	683.4	709.3	766.2	819.9
XIII	835.9	846.9	833.0	760.6	790.7	853.5	914.6

III : PDL89 (as revised) 1)

(Pula per month)

H'hold type no:	URBAN			RURAL			
	Gaborone	Frc.town	Other	Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D
I	87.3	85.2	81.7	56.7	59.3	63.4	68.7
II	111.0	110.0	106.5	80.4	83.4	89.1	96.0
III	137.0	136.4	132.9	107.7	111.9	119.8	129.1
IV	142.0	143.2	139.7	116.0	120.4	129.9	139.7
V	171.3	173.3	169.8	146.7	152.5	164.0	175.9
VI	192.3	197.9	194.4	172.8	179.0	194.4	207.8
VII	231.2	232.7	226.4	184.9	192.0	207.1	222.4
VIII	278.1	279.3	273.0	233.3	241.6	261.2	279.9
IX	317.2	318.5	312.2	276.3	286.2	309.8	331.2
X	328.8	332.8	326.5	288.2	298.2	322.8	345.2
XI	374.7	379.5	373.2	338.6	350.9	379.4	406.1
XII	409.0	416.3	410.0	377.6	391.5	423.6	452.9
XIII	449.5	457.3	451.0	420.1	436.2	471.6	504.9

Table ARE-1 cont.

Memo I : PDL89 (original, ref.: table F10 of CSO publication) 1)

(Pula per month)

H'hold type no:	URBAN Gaborone	Frc.town	Other	RURAL Area A	Area B	Area C	Area D
I	87.3	88.7	88.7	56.7	59.3	63.4	68.7
II	111.0	113.5	113.5	80.9	83.9	89.6	96.4
III	137.0	139.9	139.9	107.7	111.9	119.8	129.1
IV	142.0	146.7	146.7	116.0	120.4	129.8	139.7
V	171.3	176.8	176.8	146.7	152.5	164.0	175.9
VI	192.3	201.4	201.4	172.8	179.0	194.4	207.8
VII	192.2	200.0	200.0	184.9	192.0	207.1	222.4
VIII	239.1	246.6	246.6	233.3	241.6	261.2	279.9
IX	278.2	285.8	285.8	276.3	286.2	309.8	331.2
X	289.8	300.1	300.1	290.1	300.2	324.7	347.1
XI	335.8	346.8	346.8	338.6	350.9	379.4	406.1
XII	370.1	383.6	383.6	377.6	391.5	423.6	453.0
XIII	410.5	424.7	424.7	420.1	436.2	471.6	504.9

Memo II : Definition of household types:

H'hold type no:	H'hold characteristics, in terms of size (number of members), sex and age	
	Size	Sex (age)
I	1	Male (20-54)
II	2	Female (20-54); Girl (0)
III	2	Male (20-54); Female (20-54)
IV	3	Female (20-54); Girl (2); Girl (0)
V	3	Male (20-54); Female (20-54); Boy (6)
VI	4	Female (20-54); Girl (10); Boy (6); Girl (2)
VII	4	Male (20-54); Female (20-54); Boy (6); Girl (2)
VIII	5	Male (20-54); Female (20-54); Boy (16); Girl (10); Girl (2)
IX	6	Female (65+); Male (20-54); Female (20-54); Boy (16); Girl (10); Girl (2)
X	7	Female (65+); Female (20-54); Boy (16); Girl (10); Boy (6); Girl (2); Girl (0)
XI	8	Female (65+); Male (20-54); Female (20-54); Boy (16); Girl (10); Boy (6); Girl (2); Girl (0)
XII	9	Female (65+); Male (20-54); Female (20-54); Boy (16); Girl (10); Boy (6); Boy (4); Girl (2); Girl (0)
XIII	10	Male (65+); Female (65+); Male (20-54); Female (20-54); Boy (16); Girl (10); Boy (6); Boy (4); Girl (2); Girl (0)

Note:

1) Comparing the two sets of PDL89 estimates given above one find that they differ as follows:
   - There are significant differences in the PDLs for urban households, except for smaller households in Gaborone. This reflects the revision of the urban housing requirements.
   - There are smaller differences in the PDLs for rural households of type II and X. This reflects a specification error of the housing costs in the original PDL89 estimates. The latter are based on incorrectly calculated household sizes, as measured by the number of adult equivalents. (Every child, incl. the infant of age: 0, has been assigned an adult equivalent weight of 0.5. The correct weight for the infant is 0.0.)

Table ARE-2
A profile of poverty, 1993/94 1)

I : Distribution of households & individuals by income/PDL ratios (IPR) 2)3)

	IPR-band: 4)			Sub-total		Total	Memo: H'hold sample 5)
	0.0 - 0.5	0.5 - 0.7	0.7 - 1.0	0.0 - 1.0	1.0 +	(all hh)	
A : Number of households							
Urban							
Gab.	1,609	2,447	2,538	6,594	29,466	36,060	695
Other	4,746	3,548	6,192	14,486	39,831	54,317	1,081
Rural							
Area A	9,072	6,368	9,851	25,291	41,028	66,319	676
Area B	12,407	12,182	12,950	37,539	46,776	84,315	775
Area C	1,158	669	1,622	3,450	9,447	12,897	139
Area D	12,666	4,982	4,035	21,682	16,019	37,701	242
Total							
Urban	6,355	5,995	8,730	21,080	69,297	90,377	1,776
Rural	35,303	24,201	28,459	87,963	113,270	201,233	1,832
Total	41,658	30,196	37,189	109,043	182,567	291,610	3,608
B : Corresponding percentage distribution (of households)							
Urban							
Gab.	4.5%	6.8%	7.0%	18.3%	81.7%	100.0%	19.3%
Other	8.7%	6.5%	11.4%	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%	30.0%
Rural							
Area A	13.7%	9.6%	14.9%	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%	18.7%
Area B	14.7%	14.4%	15.4%	44.5%	55.5%	100.0%	21.5%
Area C	9.0%	5.2%	12.6%	26.8%	73.2%	100.0%	3.9%
Area D	33.6%	13.2%	10.7%	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%	6.7%
Average							
Urban	7.0%	6.6%	9.7%	23.3%	76.7%	100.0%	49.2%
Rural	17.5%	12.0%	14.1%	43.7%	56.3%	100.0%	50.8%
Total	14.3%	10.4%	12.8%	37.4%	62.6%	100.0%	100.0%
C : Corresponding percentage distribution of individuals (household members)							
Urban							
Gab.	5.5%	6.9%	7.6%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%	
Other	12.1%	9.2%	14.6%	35.9%	64.1%	100.0%	
Rural							
Area A	16.4%	13.2%	18.0%	47.6%	52.4%	100.0%	
Area B	17.9%	17.3%	16.0%	51.2%	48.8%	100.0%	
Area C	9.4%	6.6%	13.8%	29.9%	70.1%	100.0%	
Area D	44.6%	13.8%	10.7%	69.1%	30.9%	100.0%	
Average							
Urban	9.7%	8.3%	12.0%	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%	
Rural	21.6%	14.7%	15.5%	51.9%	48.1%	100.0%	
Total	18.7%	13.1%	14.6%	46.5%	53.5%	100.0%	

Notes:
1) All estimates are based on HIES93/94 data, and the corresponding PDL estimates. Note that results are preliminary, and should be interpreted with due caution.
2) The income/PDL ratio (IPR) is defined as the ratio between a household's total income and its PDL. (Incomes are defined in terms of total consumption expenditure in the current table.)
3) The results of section I should be interpreted with caution. No test of statistical validity has been made, and it is suspected that some of above results may not pass such a test. Thus, a number of above disaggregated income-band estimates may be invalid, as may the estimates for rural area C and D in general, the number of sample observations for these being fairly small. The estimates of section I are essentially presented as the basis for the aggregates of sections II & III.
4) The IPR-bands (Income/PDL Ratio bands) are defined in terms of upper and lower IPR limits. These limits are set so as to roughly correspond to the weight of food items in the average urban and rural PDLs, the former being 50% and latter 70%. (The lower urban food-weight is largely a reflection of the fact that the urban PDL basket is "diluted" by the relatively high urban housing costs.)
5) Direct (unweighed) number of households included in the HIES sample.

Table ARE-2, cont.

II : Overall, moderate and severe poverty rates

| | Type of poverty rate: | | |
	Overall 1)	Mod.rt 2)	Severe 3)
A : Number of households			
Urban			
Gab.	6,594	4,985	1,609
Other	14,486	9,740	4,746
Rural			
Area A	25,291	9,851	15,440
Area B	37,539	12,950	24,589
Area C	3,450	1,622	1,828
Area D	21,682	4,035	17,648
Total			
Urban	21,080	14,725	6,355
Rural	87,963	28,459	59,504
Total	109,043	43,184	65,859

B : Corresponding percentage distribution (of households)			
Urban			
Gab.	18.3%	13.8%	4.5%
Other	26.7%	17.9%	8.7%
Rural			
Area A	38.1%	14.9%	23.3%
Area B	44.5%	15.4%	29.2%
Area C	26.8%	12.6%	14.2%
Area D	57.5%	10.7%	46.8%
Total			
Urban	23.3%	16.3%	7.0%
Rural	43.7%	14.1%	29.6%
Total	37.4%	14.8%	22.6%

C : Corresponding percentage distribution of individuals (household members)			
Urban			
Gab.	20.0%	14.5%	5.5%
Other	35.9%	23.8%	12.1%
Rural			
Area A	47.6%	18.0%	29.6%
Area B	51.2%	16.0%	35.2%
Area C	29.9%	13.8%	16.1%
Area D	69.1%	10.7%	58.4%
Total			
Urban	30.0%	20.3%	9.7%
Rural	51.9%	15.5%	36.3%
Total	46.5%	16.7%	29.8%

III : Sensitivity analysis 4)

A : Changes in the overall poverty ratios for given PDL changes

| | PDL changes: | | Memo: |
	-10%	+10%	Overall PR 5)
Urban			
Gab.	-1.8%	3.2%	18.3%
Other	-2.7%	3.6%	26.7%
Rural			
Area A	-4.7%	3.9%	38.1%
Area B	-3.5%	4.3%	44.5%
Area C	-3.6%	9.9%	26.8%
Area D	-2.8%	4.3%	57.5%
Total			
Urban	-2.4%	3.4%	23.3%
Rural	-3.8%	4.5%	43.7%
Total	-3.3%	4.2%	37.4%

B : Changes in the overall poverty ratios for given income changes

| | Income changes: | | Memo: |
	-10%	+10%	Overall PR 5)
Urban			
Gab.	3.5%	-1.8%	18.3%
Other	4.0%	-2.6%	26.7%
Rural			
Area A	4.3%	-4.2%	38.1%
Area B	4.4%	-3.3%	44.5%
Area C	10.4%	-2.9%	26.8%
Area D	4.5%	-2.3%	57.5%
Total			
Urban	3.8%	-2.3%	23.3%
Rural	4.8%	-3.4%	43.7%
Total	4.5%	-3.0%	37.4%

Notes:
1) Total degree of poverty, as indicated by the total number of households with income on or below the PDL line (i.e. IPR <=1.0).
2) Degree of moderate poverty, as measured by the number of poor households with income above the PDL food-requirement-line (i.e. urban households with: 1.0=>IPR>0.7, and rural with: 1.0=>IPR>0.5).
3) Degree of severe poverty, as measured by the number of households with income on or below the PDL food-requirement-line (i.e. urban households with: IPR <=0.7, and rural with: IPR <=0.5).
4) Rough sensitivity analysis, measuring the changes in the overall poverty ratio for households that would result if all household incomes, or all PDLs, were reduced, or increased, by a uniform 10% (relative to the "present" IPR=1.0 level). Note that all changes are direct, additional ones. Hence, a 10% reduction in the PDLs for Gaborone will change the poverty ratio from 18.3% to 16.5% (18.3-1.8).
5) Overall poverty ratios for households (for IPR-band. 0.0 - 1.0, ref. section: I)

Table ARE-3
A profile of poverty, 1985/86 1)

I : Distribution of households & individuals by income/PDL ratios (IPR) 2)3)

	IPR-band: 4)			Sub-total		Total	Memo: H'hold sample 5)
	0.0 - 0.5	0.5 - 0.7	0.7 - 1.0	0.0 - 1.0	1.0 +	(all hh)	

A : Number of households

	0.0-0.5	0.5-0.7	0.7-1.0	0.0-1.0	1.0+	(all hh)	sample
Urban							
Gab.	1,256	507	2,279	4,042	22,886	26,928	306
Other	3,706	1,953	4,587	10,246	21,723	31,969	371
Rural							
Area A	18,795	8,668	11,561	39,025	29,293	68,318	583
Area B	12,910	10,417	11,086	34,413	29,688	64,101	548
Area C	7,133	2,811	2,154	12,099	4,861	16,959	137
Area D	4,691	1,997	2,044	8,732	5,380	14,113	132
Total							
Urban	4,962	2,459	6,866	14,288	44,609	58,897	677
Rural	43,530	23,893	26,845	94,269	69,222	163,491	1,400
Total	48,492	26,353	33,711	108,556	113,831	222,388	2,077

B : Corresponding percentage distribution (of households)

	0.0-0.5	0.5-0.7	0.7-1.0	0.0-1.0	1.0+	(all hh)	sample
Urban							
Gab.	4.7%	1.9%	8.5%	15.0%	85.0%	100.0%	14.7%
Other	11.6%	6.1%	14.3%	32.0%	68.0%	100.0%	17.9%
Rural							
Area A	27.5%	12.7%	16.9%	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	28.1%
Area B	20.1%	16.3%	17.3%	53.7%	46.3%	100.0%	26.4%
Area C	42.1%	16.6%	12.7%	71.3%	28.7%	100.0%	6.6%
Area D	33.2%	14.2%	14.5%	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%	6.4%
Average							
Urban	8.4%	4.2%	11.7%	24.3%	75.7%	100.0%	32.6%
Rural	26.6%	14.6%	16.4%	57.7%	42.3%	100.0%	67.4%
Total	21.8%	11.8%	15.2%	48.8%	51.2%	100.0%	100.0%

C : Corresponding percentage distribution of individuals (household members)

	0.0-0.5	0.5-0.7	0.7-1.0	0.0-1.0	1.0+	(all hh)
Urban						
Gab.	6.0%	1.7%	13.0%	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%
Other	15.8%	9.7%	15.5%	41.0%	59.0%	100.0%
Rural						
Area A	36.0%	14.1%	18.0%	68.1%	31.9%	100.0%
Area B	22.5%	18.6%	19.1%	60.3%	39.7%	100.0%
Area C	48.3%	16.0%	13.2%	77.5%	22.5%	100.0%
Area D	40.3%	14.0%	14.8%	69.1%	30.9%	100.0%
Average						
Urban	11.8%	6.4%	14.4%	32.6%	67.4%	100.0%
Rural	32.0%	16.1%	17.7%	65.8%	34.2%	100.0%
Total	27.7%	14.1%	17.0%	58.7%	41.3%	100.0%

Notes:
1) All estimates are based on HIES93/94 data, and the corresponding PDL estimates. Note that results are preliminary, and should be interpreted with due caution.
2) The income/PDL ratio (IPR) is defined as the ratio between a household's total income and its PDL. (Incomes are defined in terms of total consumption expenditure in the current table.)
3) The results of section I should be interpreted with caution. No test of statistical validity has been made, and it is suspected that some of above results may not pass such a test. Thus, a number of above disaggregated income-band estimates may be invalid, as may the estimates for rural area C and D in general, the number of sample observations for these being fairly small. The estimates of section I are essentially presented as the basis for the aggregates of sections II & III.
4) The IPR-bands (Income/PDL Ratio bands) are defined in terms of upper and lower IPR limits. These limits are set so as to roughly correspond to the weight of food items in the average urban and rural PDLs, the former being 50% and latter 70%. (The lower urban food-weight is largely a reflection of the fact that the urban PDL basket is "diluted" by the relatively high urban housing costs.)
5) Direct (unweighed) number of households included in the HIES sample

Table ARE-3, cont.

II : Overall, moderate and severe poverty rates

| | Type of poverty rate: | | |
	Overall 1)	Mod.rt 2)	Severe 3)
A : Number of households			
Urban			
Gab.	4,042	2,786	1,256
Other	10,246	6,540	3,706
Rural			
Area A	39,025	11,561	27,463
Area B	34,413	11,086	23,327
Area C	12,099	2,154	9,944
Area D	8,732	2,044	6,689
Total			
Urban	14,288	9,326	4,962
Rural	94,269	26,845	67,423
Total	108,556	36,171	72,386
B : Corresponding percentage distribution (of households)			
Urban			
Gab.	15.0%	10.3%	4.7%
Other	32.0%	20.5%	11.6%
Rural			
Area A	57.1%	16.9%	40.2%
Area B	53.7%	17.3%	36.4%
Area C	71.3%	12.7%	58.6%
Area D	61.9%	14.5%	47.4%
Total			
Urban	24.3%	15.8%	8.4%
Rural	57.7%	16.4%	41.2%
Total	48.8%	16.3%	32.5%
C : Corresponding percentage distribution of individuals (household members)			
Urban			
Gab.	20.7%	14.7%	6.0%
Other	41.0%	25.2%	15.8%
Rural			
Area A	68.1%	18.0%	50.2%
Area B	60.3%	19.1%	41.1%
Area C	77.5%	13.2%	64.3%
Area D	69.1%	14.8%	54.3%
Total			
Urban	32.6%	20.9%	11.8%
Rural	65.8%	17.7%	48.1%
Total	58.7%	18.4%	40.4%

III : Sensitivity analysis 4)

A : Changes in the overall poverty ratios for given PDL changes

| | PDL changes: | | Memo: |
	-10%	+10%	Overall PR 5)
Urban			
Gab.	-2.6%	3.9%	15.0%
Other	-5.4%	5.5%	32.0%
Rural			
Area A	-4.8%	3.2%	57.1%
Area B	-3.5%	3.7%	53.7%
Area C	-3.2%	7.3%	71.3%
Area D	-4.0%	2.2%	61.9%
Total			
Urban	-4.1%	4.8%	24.3%
Rural	-4.0%	3.7%	57.7%
Total	-4.0%	4.0%	48.8%

B : Changes in the overall poverty ratios for given income changes

| | Income changes: | | Memo: |
	-10%	+10%	Overall PR 5)
Urban			
Gab.	4.2%	-2.6%	15.0%
Other	5.5%	-5.4%	32.0%
Rural			
Area A	3.8%	-4.2%	57.1%
Area B	4.4%	-3.5%	53.7%
Area C	7.3%	-3.2%	71.3%
Area D	2.7%	-4.0%	61.9%
Total			
Urban	4.9%	-4.1%	24.3%
Rural	4.3%	-3.8%	57.7%
Total	4.5%	-3.9%	48.8%

Notes:
1) Total degree of poverty, as indicated by the total number of households with income on or below the PDL line (i.e. IPR <=1.0).
2) Degree of moderate poverty, as measured by the number of poor households with income above the PDL food-requirement-line (i.e. urban households with. 1.0=>IPR>0.7, and rural with: 1.0=>IPR>0.5).
3) Degree of extreme poverty, as measured by the number of households with income on or below the PDL food-requirement-line (i.e. urban households with IPR <=0.7, and rural with: IPR <=0.5).
4) Rough sensitivity analysis, measuring the changes in the overall poverty ratio for households that would result if all household incomes, or all PDLs, were reduced. or increased, by a uniform 10% (relative to the "present" IPR=1.0 level). Note that all changes are direct. additional ones. Hence, a 10% reduction in the PDLs for Gaborone will change the poverty ratio from 15.0% to 12.4% (15.0-2.6).
5) Overall poverty ratios for households (for IPR-band: 0 0 - 1.0, ref. section: I)

Table ARE-4
Changes in poverty rates over the period: 1985/86 - 1993/94 1)

		I : Poverty rates, 1993/94 2)			II : Poverty rates, 1985/86 3)			III : Direct decline (II-I) 4)			Memo: Sample size 5)	
		Overall	Mod.rt	Severe	Overall	Mod.rt	Severe	Overall	Mod.rt	Severe	HIES85/86	HIES93/94
A : Poverty rate with respect to households												
Urban												
	Gab.	18%	14%	4%	15%	10%	5%	-3%	-3%	0%	306	695
	Other	27%	18%	9%	32%	20%	12%	5%	3%	3%	371	1,081
Rural												
	Area A	38%	15%	23%	57%	17%	40%	19%	2%	17%	583	676
	Area B	45%	15%	29%	54%	17%	36%	9%	2%	7%	548	775
	Area C	27%	13%	14%	71%	13%	59%	45%	0%	44%	137	139
	Area D	58%	11%	47%	62%	14%	47%	4%	4%	1%	132	242
Total												
	Urban	23%	16%	7%	24%	16%	8%	1%	-0%	1%	677	1,776
	Rural	44%	14%	30%	58%	16%	41%	14%	2%	12%	1,400	1,832
	Total	37%	15%	23%	49%	16%	33%	11%	1%	10%	2,077	3,608
B : Poverty rate with respect to individuals												Percentage distribution of above
Urban												
	Gab.	20%	14%	6%	21%	15%	6%	1%	0%	1%	14.7%	19.3%
	Other	36%	24%	12%	41%	25%	16%	5%	1%	4%	17.9%	30.0%
Rural												
	Area A	48%	18%	30%	68%	18%	50%	21%	-0%	21%	28.1%	18.7%
	Area B	51%	16%	35%	60%	19%	41%	9%	3%	6%	26.4%	21.5%
	Area C	30%	14%	16%	77%	13%	64%	48%	-1%	48%	6.6%	3.9%
	Area D	69%	11%	58%	69%	15%	54%	-0%	4%	-4%	6.4%	6.7%
Total												
	Urban	30%	20%	10%	33%	21%	12%	3%	1%	2%	32.6%	49.2%
	Rural	52%	16%	36%	66%	18%	48%	14%	2%	12%	67.4%	50.8%
	Total	46%	17%	30%	59%	18%	40%	12%	2%	11%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:
1) Note that all results given are preliminary, and should be interpreted with great caution. As explained elsewhere, some results may be statistically invalid, especially those for rural area C and D. Thus, for instance, the remarkable decline in poverty recorded for area C is almost certain to be invalid.
2) Poverty rates referring to HIES93/94, as given in table ARE-2, section II.
3) Poverty rates referring to HIES85/86, as given in table ARE-3, section II.
4) Direct decline in poverty rates over the period, calculated by deducting the HIES93/94-rates from the corresponding HIES85/86-rates.
5) Total (unweighed) number of households included in the HIES93/94 and HIES85/86 samples. (NB: All households, irrespective of income.)

Table ARE-5
Overall poverty, 1985/86,
as indicated by revised and original estimates 1)

		A Presently calculated estimates 2)	B CSO's original estimates 3)	C Direct difference (B-A)	D Relative difference (C/B)
A : Total number of poor households					
Urban					
	Gab.	4,042	5,528	1,486	27%
	Other	10,246	11,946	1,700	14%
Rural					
	Area A	39,025	38,115	(910)	-2%
	Area B	34,413	43,585	9,172	21%
	Area C	12,099	14,001	1,902	14%
	Area D	8,732	9,055	323	4%
Total					
	Urban	14,288	17,474	3,186	18%
	Rural	94,269	104,756	10,487	10%
	Total	108,556	122,230	13,674	11%
B : Poor households in % of all households					
Urban					
	Gab.	15%	21%	6%	29%
	Other	32%	37%	5%	13%
Rural					
	Area A	57%	56%	-1%	-2%
	Area B	54%	68%	14%	21%
	Area C	71%	83%	12%	14%
	Area D	62%	64%	2%	3%
Total					
	Urban	24%	30%	6%	19%
	Rural	58%	64%	6%	10%
	Total	49%	55%	6%	11%

Notes:
1) The table compares CSO's original estimates of HIES85/86 poverty rates to our new, revised ones, calculated as explained in the present paper. It is readily evident that the former are generally higher than the latter. As explained elsewhere, this is largely a a reflection of the fact that the two sets of estimates are based on different income concepts. the income concept adopted by CSO in general implying significantly higher rates of poverty than do alternative concepts. The exception to above "rule", i.e. rural area A, with a lower original rate than presently calculated, is also discussed elsewhere.
2) Estimates are directly copied from table ARE-3, section II.
3) Estimates are directly copied from CSO's PDL89 publication.

Table ARE-6
The share of households with incomes on or below the PDL,
as calculated for alternative income concepts

I : Overall 1985/86 poverty rates,
as calculated by alternative income concepts and estimation approaches

		Income concept used: 1)				Memo: CSO est.
		Consum.	Dispos.	Gross	Orig.	Orig.

A : The share of households with incomes on or below the PDL,
calculated as in CSO's PDL89 publication (i.e. by measuring the
HIES85/86 incomes, as inflated to November 1989 price level,
against CSO's original PDL89 estimates)

		Consum.	Dispos.	Gross	Orig.	Orig.
Urban	Gaborone	9%	13%	9%	21%	21%
	Other	23%	27%	25%	37%	37%
Rural	Area A	54%	51%	49%	69%	56%
	Area B	51%	49%	48%	68%	68%
	Area C	69%	76%	75%	83%	83%
	Area D	59%	56%	54%	64%	64%
Average	Urban	17%	20%	18%	30%	30%
	Rural	55%	53%	52%	69%	64%
	Total	45%	45%	43%	59%	55%

B : The share of households with incomes on or below the PDL,
as calculated by measuring the above inflated household incomes
against the revised PDL89 estimates (ref.: tables PDL89-1 to PDL89-6)

		Consum.	Dispos.	Gross	Orig.	Orig.
Urban	Gaborone	12%	14%	12%	22%	21%
	Other	28%	29%	28%	41%	37%
Rural	Area A	63%	61%	58%	75%	56%
	Area B	58%	55%	54%	74%	68%
	Area C	80%	81%	80%	88%	83%
	Area D	66%	61%	61%	69%	64%
Average	Urban	21%	22%	20%	32%	30%
	Rural	63%	61%	59%	76%	64%
	Total	52%	50%	49%	64%	55%

C : The share of households with incomes on or below the PDL,
as calculated by measuring the original HIES85/86 household incomes
against the PDL86 estimates (ref.: tables PDL86-1 to PDL86-6)

		Consum.	Dispos.	Gross	Orig.	Orig.
Urban	Gaborone	15%	17%	15%	25%	21%
	Other	32%	32%	30%	43%	37%
Rural	Area A	57%	54%	52%	71%	56%
	Area B	54%	51%	49%	70%	68%
	Area C	71%	78%	78%	85%	83%
	Area D	62%	58%	56%	67%	64%
Average	Urban	24%	25%	23%	34%	30%
	Rural	58%	56%	54%	72%	64%
	Total	49%	48%	46%	62%	55%

Table ARE-6, cont.

II : Overall 1993/94 poverty rates,
as calculated by alternative income concepts
(i.e. as calculated by measuring the original HIES93/94 household incomes
against the PDL94 estimates (ref.: tables PDL94-1 to PDL94-6)

		Income concept used: 1)		
		Consum.	Dispos.	Gross
Urban	Gaborone	18%	12%	11%
	Other	27%	23%	22%
Rural	Area A	38%	31%	31%
	Area B	45%	47%	46%
	Area C	27%	35%	28%
	Area D	58%	51%	50%
Average	Urban	23%	19%	18%
	Rural	44%	42%	40%
	Total	37%	35%	33%

Note:
1) Definition of income concepts:
    Consum. : total consumption expenditure
    Dispos. : total disposable income
    Gross : total gross income
    Orig. : total income (TI) as defined for CSO's original PDL89 analysis
    (TI = gross cash earnings (exc. business profits etc.) + total income in kind)