
Contents

Abbreviations	xv
Acknowledgments	xvii
Executive Summary	xxi
Part I The Nature of Poverty in the Russian Federation	1
1 Improving the Methodology for Measuring Poverty in Russia	2
2 The Profile of the Poor	24
3 The Regional Dimension of Poverty	46
Part II Economic Recovery and Poverty Reduction	67
4 The Post-1998 Economic Recovery	69
5 The Effect of Economic Recovery on Labor Earnings	84
6 Poverty, Growth, and Inequality in Russia	99
7 The Impact of Accession to the World Trade Organization on Living Standards and Poverty	114
Part III Reforming Sectoral Policies for Alleviating Poverty	127
8 Improving the Targeting of Social Transfers	129
9 Reforming Housing and Utility Services and Protecting the Poor	150

10	Improving the Poor's Access to Good-Quality Education. . .	165
11	Restructuring Health Care to Decrease the Vulnerability of the Poor	181
Part IV	Poverty Monitoring	201
12	Using the Household Budget Survey to Monitor Poverty. . .	202
Appendixes		
A	Price Indexes, Poverty Lines, and Incidence of Poverty, by Region and Territory.	213
B	Inequality Measures	222
C	A Tale of Two Regions	224
D	Trends in Real Wages	235
E	The Poverty Growth Curve and Poverty Equivalent Growth Rates.	237
F	Overview of Social Protection Programs in the Russian Federation	243
G	Methodology for Constructing the Benchmark Scenario and Making Welfare Inferences	245
	References	254
	Index	265
Boxes		
1.1	International practice is to measure poverty in terms of consumption	11
1.2	How should durable goods be treated when their use value cannot be estimated?	13
1.3	Delinking poverty monitoring and eligibility criteria for social assistance in the United States.	21
2.1	Rich data sources are available for measuring poverty in Russia	25
2.2	How should poverty be measured?	27

2.3	Are Household Budget Survey data accurate enough to fully capture the extent of inequality?	43
3.1	A significant number of Russia's villages have been abandoned.	54
4.1	The government's reform strategy has helped spur growth	79
5.1	A growing gender gap in wages	94
6.1	Overview of the model and dataset	118
6.1	How much does the Russian Federation spend on social protection?	131
6.2	Targeting methods in selected countries	145
7.1	Determination of the housing allowance.	153
12.1	Activities implemented during Stage I of the Enhancing Measurement, Monitoring, and Analysis of Poverty in Russia Project	203

Figures

A	The incidence of poverty peaked in 1999.	xxiii
B	Russia's social welfare programs are not as well targeted as programs in other countries	xxvi
1.1	Pakistan's household survey demonstrates the unreliability of estimating household net savings from changes in financial assets	7
1.2	Income and expenditure do not appear to deviate from each other in Russia, as they do in Vietnam.	8
1.3	Cash expenditures and the recommended consumption aggregate measure yield different levels and trends in inequality	20
2.1	Poverty map of the Russian Federation, 2002: Regional headcount index of poverty	30
2.2	Poverty map of the Russian Federation, 2002: Distribution of the Poor.	32
2.3	The risk of poverty changes over the life cycle.	33
2.4	Estimates of inequality differ from survey to survey, primarily due to methodological differences	39
2.5	Rural households have less access to modern housing amenities than urban households	42
3.1	Regional inequality in Russia is comparable to that in other large low- and middle-income countries	48
3.2	As expected, regional production and consumption in Russia exhibited a logarithmic relationship in 2002	49
3.3	Per capita GRP rose in all but one region between 1999 and 2002.	52

3.4	Interregional differences in per capita GRP and consumption declined between 1999 and 2002	53
3.5	The incidence of poverty is higher where unemployment is high	57
3.6	The incidence of poverty is lower where wages are high	58
3.7	Many of the poor live in regions with average poverty incidence, particularly in 2002	59
3.8	The relationship between regional output per capita and poverty is negative	60
3.9	Higher regional inequality is correlated with higher poverty	61
3.10	Poverty is higher in rural areas, and poor regions have more rural residents	63
3.11	Although the majority of the poor everywhere are working families, in poor regions fewer households have multiple earners	64
4.1	Real GDP in Russia grew rapidly between 1998 and 2003	70
4.2	All sectors declined during the recession, with construction and industrial output particularly hard hit	71
4.3	Sectors that were precrisis “losers” led the recovery	72
4.4	Growth rates in manufacturing and natural resource industries	72
4.5	Most regions contracted in 1998	73
4.6	All but one region grew between 1999 and 2001	73
4.7	Postcrisis recovery was stronger in Russia than in many other postcrisis countries	75
4.8	Devaluation and lower utility tariffs contributed to postcrisis recovery in the Russian Federation	77
4.9	Utilization of spare industrial capacity catalyzed the postcrisis increase in production	78
4.10	Perceptions of Russia’s business climate improved between 1999 and 2002	80
5.1	Average working time has increased since 1997	87
5.2	Labor productivity began to increase in 1999, after declining during the transitional recession	89
5.3	GDP, wage, profit, and household income dynamics, 1996–2002	90
5.4	After the 1998 crisis, a sharp decline in real wages allowed industrial enterprises to survive and retain more of their employees	91
5.5	Wage arrears have plummeted since 1999	92
5.6	The gap between skilled and unskilled labor increased in 2000 and 2001	93
5.7	Both the minimum wage tariff and the minimum wage have increased since 2000	96

9.1	The crisis had a severe impact on the poor	101
9.2	Economic growth in 1999–2000 was pro-poor	102
9.3	All indexes of poverty rose until 1999 and declined thereafter ..	103
9.4	Inequality in consumption peaked in 1998	106
9.5	Consumption share of the bottom quintile has increased steadily since 1998	107
9.6	Uniform consumption would have to grow 5 percent a year to cut poverty in half by 2007	111
9.7	Rapid growth in consumption would have a dramatic effect on the poverty gap and poverty severity indexes	112
10.1	Distribution of estimated welfare gains from Russian WTO accession	123
10.2	Utilization of occupational privileges is highly regressive	140
10.3	Rich households receive higher benefits than poor households, except in the case of the child allowance	143
10.4	Compared with other countries, targeting of programs in Russia is poor	144
9.1	Cost coverage of housing and utility services rose between 1992 and 2000	151
9.2	Poor households spend a higher share of total expenditures on housing and utility services	152
9.3	Although the level of housing expenditures is higher for richer households, the share of housing in total expenditures is greater for poor households; the housing subsidy significantly reduces that expenditure share for the bottom quintile	157
9.4	Housing and utility subsidies appear to be regressive	158
10.1	Net secondary enrollment rate in Russia is lower than in other transition economies	167
10.2	Enrollment in noncompulsory education is lower among the poor	168
10.3	The poor spend less on education than the nonpoor	172
10.4	Education expenditures as a percentage of GDP fell until 2000, before rising	173
10.5	As a percentage of GDP, Russia spends less on education than other countries in Eastern Europe and OECD countries	174
10.6	Budget expenditure per student is positively correlated with regional per capita income	175
10.7	The share of household spending on education is positively correlated with regional per capita income	176
11.1	Life expectancy is much lower in Russia than elsewhere in Europe	183
11.2	The number of officially reported cases of HIV is rising rapidly in Russia	185
11.3	Total public expenditures on health care fell during the 1990s ..	188

11.4	Regional differences in per capita health expenditures are huge in Russia	189
11.5	Public spending on pharmaceuticals has fallen, while out-of-pocket payments have been rising	191
11.6	The poor spend a higher share of consumption on all types of medical services	193
11.7	Both official and unofficial payments for medical services represent a larger share of consumption for the poor than the nonpoor.	194
D.1	Average nominal hourly wage, by industry, 1996–2002	236
E.1	Poverty growth curve, 1997–98	238
E.2	Poverty growth curve, 1998–99	239
E.3	Poverty growth curve, 1999–2000	239
E.4	Poverty growth curve, 2000–01	240
E.5	Poverty growth curve, 2001–02	240
E.6	Poverty growth curve, 1997–2002	241

Tables

A	Sectoral policy recommendations	xxviii
1.1	Calorie cost rises with consumption	15
1.2	Average nonfood poverty line, by component, 2002	17
1.3	The recommended consumption aggregate is lower than the official money income measure currently used by Goskomstat ..	18
1.4	The recommended poverty line is significantly lower than the official subsistence minimum level	19
1.5	The recommended methodology can yield a higher or lower headcount index than the official methodology	19
2.1	Poverty in Russia has a rural face	29
2.2	Poverty is pervasive in small urban communities as well	29
2.3	Children are at greatest risk of poverty	31
2.4	Poverty by employment status	33
2.5	Households facing cumulative vulnerabilities face the highest risk of poverty	34
2.6	The majority of the poor live in working households	35
2.7	The incidence and depth of poverty are greatest among households with three or more children	36
2.8	Education and poverty status are negatively correlated	37
2.9	Many workers earn less than the official subsistence minimum, especially in agriculture and public services	38
2.10	Gini coefficients and annual income and consumption in selected countries	40
2.11	Estimated inequality is lower for consumption-based indexes than income-based ones and for real versus nominal consumption	41

1.1	Most measures of inequality between regions declined in Russia between 1997 and 2002	50
1.2	Decomposition of inequality by regions for survey-based indexes, 1997–2002	55
1.3	Best- and worst-performing regions in 1998 and 1999–2001	74
1.4	The boom in oil prices spurred growth	78
1.5	Social spending has risen since the crisis	81
1.6	Employment rose for the first time in 1999, following a decade of decline	85
1.7	Unemployment peaked in 1998	85
1.8	Net employment in manufacturing grew for the first time since transition in 1999	86
1.9	The private sector employs a growing share of Russia's workforce	87
1.10	Two-thirds of the increase in nonagricultural output between 1999 and 2002 was due to increased productivity	88
1.11	Average real monthly wages began to rise in 1999	90
1.12	The percentage of low-paying jobs is higher in the public sector	95
1.13	Consumption of nonfood items fluctuated more than consumption of food	100
1.14	Poverty soared between 1997 and 1999 but has since declined to below precrisis levels	103
1.15	Various measures of poverty show the same trend: Steadily rising poverty followed by a steady decline during the recovery	104
1.16	Inequality has declined since 1999	105
1.17	Changes in poverty can be decomposed into growth and redistribution components	108
1.18	The gap in welfare between urban and rural areas has increased since 1997	109
1.19	Inequality between urban and rural areas declined during the crisis years but increased during the recovery period	109
1.20	Poverty has fallen among all demographic groups since the crisis, but the incidence of child poverty remains high	110
2.1	Foreign direct investment in Russia is much lower than in other emerging economies	115
2.2	The impact of WTO accession can be decomposed into various types of effects	117
2.3	The impact of WTO accession on Russian households	124
3.1	Pensions represent half of all public spending on social protection	132
3.2	Coverage and type of privileges	133
3.3	Coverage of selected social protection programs	135

8.4	Importance of social protection transfers in household consumption	135
8.5	Impact of social protection on poverty reduction	137
8.6	Enlarged budget expenditures as percentage of GDP, 1997–2002	138
8.7	Reduction in the fiscal and quasi-fiscal cost of transport privileges	141
8.8	Beneficiary incidence, by type of social protection program	142
8.9	Simulated targeting performance using proxy means test	146
8.10	Distribution of proxy means test beneficiaries by quintiles	146
9.1	Coverage of social protection programs, by type	155
9.2	The size of the housing subsidy rises with income	158
9.3	Description of the simulations	159
9.4	Budgetary effects of simulations	159
9.5	Effect of simulated reforms on poverty and inequality	160
9.6	Simulations of a change in living standards, by decile	160
10.1	Mean years of schooling for adults rises with consumption	169
10.2	The nonpoor have higher education attainment than the poor	170
10.3	A substantial fraction of the nonpoor receive scholarships	176
11.1	Self-reported health status is better among the nonpoor	182
11.2	Alcohol use is higher among the poor	182
11.3	Economic and health status indicators are lower in Russia than in most comparable countries	184
11.4	Regional mortality rates vary dramatically in Russia	186
11.5	Regional differences in infant mortality rates in Russia are huge	186
11.6	Regional differences in average life expectancy at birth are large across the Russian Federation	186
11.7	Social spending, including spending on health, suffered as a result of the 1998 crisis and postcrisis fiscal consolidation	188
11.8	Wealthier people spend more on outpatient and hospital care than the poor	192
11.9	Lack of specialists and inability to pay for services are the leading reasons why the poor do not seek care	195
11.10	Problems with affordability of pharmaceuticals affect the treatment of the poor more than the nonpoor	195
A.1	Spatial price indexes by region and territory, 2002	213
A.2	Average poverty line, by region and territory, 2002	216
A.3	Incidence of poverty, by region and territory, 2002	219
C.1	Economic indicators by region, 1997–2002	226
C.2	Poverty indexes by region, 1997–2002	229

3	Inequality by region, 1997–2002	232
3	Real wage trends by industry, 1998–2002	235
3	Poverty equivalent growth rates, 1998–2002	242
3	Components of the housing cost	245
3	Variables in the Household Budget Survey related to housing costs	246
3	Households that do not record expenditures but do report using an amenity	247
3	Criteria used to determine whether housing cost was calculated from the bill formula or from recorded expenditures	250
3	Determining whether a household is privileged or receives an allowance	253