

COMMITTEE FOR PLANNING AND COOPERATION  
NATIONAL STATISTICAL CENTRE

# THE HOUSEHOLD OF LAO PDR

Social and economic indicators

Lao Expenditure and Consumption Survey 2002/03

LECS 3

March, 2004

## FOREWORD

The Lao Expenditure and Consumption Survey (LECS) is the largest and most important survey that the National Statistical Centre (NSC) undertakes. It is not only large in sample size, it also covers a wide range of subject matter areas related to household living situation, and it is conducted during a period of 12 months. The current survey is the third one; the first was conducted in 1992/93 and the second one in 1997/98.

The results in this report are based on data obtained from sample villages and blown up to be an estimate of all households in Lao PDR. This survey is far more comprehensive in contents and details than the previous ones. In particular, it includes large modules on education and health. Data on household production have also been expanded and the 2002/03 survey therefore gives a more complete picture of household economy. With this wealth of information available, it means that analysis potentials are great.

We would like to take this opportunity to express our thanks to all persons engaged on different levels in the survey preparations and operations, and further to the sample villages, village chiefs and households, for their cooperation throughout the time of the survey. We would also like to express our gratitude to the Swedish International Development Agency, Sida, which has funded this survey. Sida has also offered technical assistance through its executing agency, Statistics Sweden.

This report only encompasses an overall picture of some results. Poverty analysis will be carried out and published separately and other reports are expected as well. NSC currently prepares a large revision of the national accounts calculations. Estimates of private consumption and household investment as well as a major part of the production accounts will be based on the survey

LRCS data are stored in our SQL database and accessible for further uses and analyses. It is our strong belief that the survey will become a major input to government policy making and to analyses of effects of policy implementation concerning poverty eradication and the welfare of Lao people.

The National Statistical Centre welcomes suggestions and comments on the report for future improvements of our databases.

The National Statistical Centre (NSC)

Samaychanh Boupma  
Director General

## CONTENTS

<b>1. SURVEY METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY .....	1
1.2. SAMPLE DESIGN AND SELECTION .....	1
1.3. SURVEY OPERATIONS AND MAIN CONTENTS .....	2
1.4. TERMS, CONCEPTS - A GUIDE INTO USES AND OUTPUTS OF THE SURVEY .....	4
1.5. RELIABILITY OF DATA .....	5
<b>2. THE HOUSEHOLDS IN LAO PDR .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. CONSUMPTION AND RICE INTAKE .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1. CONSUMPTION .....	9
3.2. DAILY INTAKE OF RICE AND SOME CERTAIN FOOD ITEMS .....	19
<b>4. ACCESS TO AND USAGE OF RESOURCES AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1. HEALTH ENVIRONMENT AND PREVENTION .....	21
4.2. HEALTH SERVICES .....	22
4.3. HEALTH ASSESSMENTS AND HEALTH SEEKING BEHAVIOR .....	24
4.4. EDUCATIONAL SERVICES .....	27
4.5. KNOWLEDGE .....	29
4.6. LAND AND PRODUCTIVE ASSETS .....	32
4.7. INFRASTRUCTURE .....	33
<b>5. ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSEHOLDS .....</b>	<b>35</b>
5.1. ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND EMPLOYMENT .....	35
5.2. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION .....	38
5.3. HOUSEHOLD BUSINESSES .....	47
5.4. PRODUCTIVITY .....	49
5.5. RESTRICTIONS .....	50
5.6. HOUSEHOLD INVESTMENTS/CONSTRUCTION .....	51
5.7. POSSESSION OF GOODS .....	53
5.8. SUSTAINABLE USE OF LAND .....	55
<b>6. TIME USE .....</b>	<b>56</b>

# **1. Survey methodology**

## **1.1. Scope and purpose of the survey**

The Lao Expenditure and Consumption Survey (LECS III) covers the whole of Lao PDR. The statistical unit is the households and the survey covers economic transactions of households to estimate household income, consumption and production and a number of social indicators.

The survey was undertaken from March 2002 to February 2003 (12 months) and it is a survey that NSC plans to conduct every 5 years. The first and second LECS were conducted in 1992/93 and 1997/98.

LECS is a multi- purpose survey. Such surveys can be designed in various ways with emphasis on particular issues. In 1992/93 the LECS was combined with a large module of social indicators, Lao Social Indicator Survey (LSIS). The 1997/98 and 2002/03 versions focused on economic activities of the households. The objectives of the LECS are basically to provide,

- macro estimates for the National Accounts, both private consumption and household investments and income from agriculture and businesses
- the consumption structure (weighing system) for the Consumer Price Index (CPI)
- estimates of labor force
- statistics on access to services
- statistics on nutrition
- statistics on poverty and income distribution

The LECS 3 sample was made up of 8,100 households from 540 villages, 15 households from each, enumerated over 12 months starting 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2002 and ending 28<sup>th</sup> of February 2003. The sample was selected using the NSC village list as a sampling frame.

## **1.2. Sample design and selection**

A two-stage sampling scheme was used. At the first stage a sample of villages was selected by PPS sampling. The villages were stratified in the following way. Firstly the villages were divided by province, and secondly into urban villages, rural villages with access to road and rural villages without access to road. In all, the village population was divided into 18 (provinces) x 3 (urban/rural classes) = 54 sampling strata. In LECS 2 the sample was allocated equally over the provinces (25 villages in each village). In LECS 3 the allocation was somewhere in between equal allocation and proportional allocation, the number of sample villages in the province ranging from 12 to 48. The sample size in each stratum is shown in table *i*.

The sample of villages in each province was allocated randomly to a survey month so that each survey month had approximately the same number of sample villages.

In the second stage a systematic sample of 15 households was selected in each sample village. The selection was based on a updated list of households in the villages at the time of the survey. The total number of households was less than 15 in four villages. In those villages all households were selected for the survey.

Data were entered into a database continuously. Data screening and editing were also done on a continuous basis as well as after all the data were entered. Table *i* and and table *ii* show the final survey status, i.e. the number of villages and households enumerated during March 2002 – February 2003, and the number of persons encountered in these households.

**Table i: Number of sample villages in each stratum.**

Province	Urban villages	Rural villages with access to road	Rural villages without access to road	Total
Vientiane C.	36	12	.	48
Phongsaly	3	6	15	24
Luangnamtha	4	11	9	24
Oudomxay	4	8	12	24
Bokeo	3	18	3	24
Luangprabang	4	19	13	36
Huaphanh	2	16	18	36
Xayabury	6	25	5	36
Xiengkhuang	5	8	11	24
Vientiane	4	29	3	36
Borikhamxay	5	11	8	24
Khammuane	6	26	4	36
Savannakhet	9	27	12	48
Saravane	3	12	21	36
Sekong	4	7	7	18
Champasack	6	27	3	36
Attapeu	2	9	7	18
Xaysomboun SR	1	11	.	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>540</b>

**Table ii: Sample allocation over survey months**

	MONTH	Villages	Households	Persons
2002	March	46	688	4285
	April	44	660	4018
	May	44	660	4028
	June	46	690	4362
	July	45	675	4326
	August	44	660	3871
	September	45	675	4108
	October	45	674	4185
	November	45	671	4198
	December	45	675	4217
2003	January	46	689	4207
	February	45	675	3985
	<b>Total</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>8092</b>	<b>49790</b>

### 1.3. Survey operations and main contents

The statistical provincial offices were in charge of the field operations with supervision from NSC. Data on expenditure and income were collected for a whole month based on daily notation of all transaction divided into consumption, agriculture production and household businesses. Interviews with household heads or other household members were held during various parts of the month. At

the end of the month households were asked about purchases of durable goods, e.g. furniture, TV, cars, motorcycles, etc., during the preceding 12 months. In the middle of the month one 24 hour period was selected to record data on time use for all persons in the household ten years and above.

LECS III contains six modules, a diary to record household transactions, household questionnaire and household time use, prices from markets, village questionnaire to village head and a primary school survey. These modules have the following basic structure:

Module	Contents	Data specified for:
Diary	All household transactions during sampled months. Transactions coded to consumption/expenditure, household business, agriculture and investment outlays	Household
Household questionnaire	Household composition Parents Education Labour force participation Victimization Nutrition Health check, measurements of heights and weights Possession of durables and assets values Housing conditions - household Construction activities - household Household business Agriculture - household Health – evaluation of health, use of health services, health seeking behavior, health costs Purchases and selling of durables during the last 12 months Income and transfers – by all members of household Borrowing and lending – by household	All household members Non-household member 6 years and above 10 years and above Household All household members Children 4 years and below Household Household Household By business Household All household members, costs for household Household All household members Household
Time use	Time spent recorded for a period of 24 hours in a sampled day for 22 activities	10 years and above
Prices	Prices for 92 basic goods and services recorded in nearest local market	
Village questionnaire	Data provided by village heads on situations in the village concerning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- demography</li> <li>- access to services</li> <li>- agriculture</li> <li>- general economic conditions</li> <li>- wages and prices</li> </ul>	Village
Primary school module	Covers 470 primary schools in or close to the selected villages	Primary school

## 1.4. Terms, concepts - a guide into uses and outputs of the survey

A household is a group of people making common arrangements for food, shelter and other acts of daily living. A household usually consists of relatives such as a husband, a wife, children and parents, but sometimes includes unrelated people such as live-in household or farm workers.

Goods and services purchased or bartered on markets make up household expenditure, while household consumption is defined as household expenditure plus the value of own produced goods taken out from households ' own production. The difference in the two concepts is basically caused by own produced food, free collected firewood and the user value of own occupied houses. Thus

$\text{CONSUMPTION} = \text{EXPENDITURE} + \text{VALUE of OWN PRODUCED GOODS taken out.}$

Expenditure and consumption are presented in value terms and in per cent of total. Changes in consumption patterns over time may be caused both by changes in volume and relative prices. Similarly, changes of values over time can also be caused both of changes in the volume consumed and changes in prices.

Quantities consumed have been captured as well, but quantities are not so easy to add together as the unit of quantities (kg, liter, bag, bundle, etc) varies a lot. For nutrition analysis quantities of consumption (or eating) are essential. Household food consumption is not exactly the same as "eating", but more or less the same for a period of a year. The amount "eating" is measured for rice (table 2.16 rice intake in grams per persons), meat, fish and vegetables. Changes in consumption volumes can also be obtained by deflating values with proper prices. Prices were therefore collected for basic goods and services.

Household consumption is only one part of all household transactions captured in the diary. Other transactions measured separately refer to household businesses, agricultural operation and household investments.

Household income is the sum of all income sources household members have. It contains wages and social benefits, pensions, dividend and royalties received, transfers from abroad in cash or kind, entrepreneurial income from household businesses and agriculture, fishery and forestry.

Entrepreneurial income is defined as income less current operational costs. This income is supposed to cover owners' remuneration, payments for work done by other household members, financing of investments and profit.

Household savings is defined as household total income less expenditure and less the value of own produced food.

Household production is captured both in the diary and the household survey modules but in different ways. The recording of transactions provides estimates of production values, the running costs and entrepreneurial income. The entrepreneurial income should be large enough (if profitable) to cover investments and remuneration for the owner and other unpaid household members, interest and repayments of loans taken for the operations and profit. Tables 5.13 and 5.3 provides estimates of entrepreneurial income for household business and agriculture.

Production in agriculture is also captured in the household module in terms of farming area operated, main output planted, harvested and output, livestock by number and disposition of livestock, poultry, etc.

Household businesses in the household module are classified according to activity.

Household asset value was captured for the first time in LECS III. The households have provided data of the value of their land, buildings, and durables such as motor vehicles, etc. and the value of specific agriculture assets such as livestock.

A person is an employee if he/she work for someone else outside the own household and get a salary for that. People working in own business or agriculture are self-employed and do not get a salary but take a share of the entrepreneurial income.

## 1.5. Reliability of data

The data in this report are based on a sample and are therefore subject to sampling errors. Sampling errors have been calculated for some important variables and are included in some tables in the form of 95 % confidence intervals (“margin of error”). All confidence intervals are in absolute figures. For the total monthly household consumption (1091.3 thousand KIP) the confidence interval is  $\pm 50.5$ , which means that there is a 95 % confidence that the true value lies between 1040.8 and 1141.8.

Because of the sample design used, sampling errors on regional and provincial estimates are generally small for main aggregates (such as total consumption or food consumption) but can be rather high for detailed estimates.

Data quality is also dependent on measurement errors, data entry errors and coding errors. Although a lot of efforts to “clean “ data from various errors, there may still be some left, but they will not influence the results more than marginally. When judging the quality, it has to be remembered that the survey in many aspects touches upon concepts of household economy that are difficult to assess, not immediately clear and therefore subject to different interpretation. With high degree of self-employment the question of working in the last 7 days may not be obvious. When a household uses its own agricultural products for consumption these products have to be valued. This means that the household must have a good notion of both the quantity used and the price. The use of a diary to record transactions and assistance from interviewers in that process has certainly helped.

When do a household operate a business? Do we require that there should be some regularity or do we mean that any temporary activity will be enough? Although rules have been set up there is always room for interpretation. As always, some data are quite sensitive and not so easy to answer, e.g. the value of household assets. For the assumed (imputed) rent value of own houses, households make an assessment of the “market” value of renting such a house. Missing data have been adjusted by modeling using data on the characteristics of the house and housing condition as a base.

Questions in the village questionnaire are answered by the village chiefs. His or her knowledge of the situation in the village may differ and can affect the results. It can not be excluded that he/she may be inclined to report data that tends to make the situation better, e.g. to be better compliance with planning goals or make it look worse if believed benefiting the village.

In 2004 NSC is also publishing a report from a different household survey, the so called “Head Count”, that was undertaken in July-August 2003. Some tables in the two reports, the LECS 3 and the Head Count, cover the same areas but do not give exactly the same result. The reason is that the two surveys are conducted during somewhat different periods of time and using different methodology. In some cases there might also be differences in definitions.

The LECS survey is a sample survey, and as such afflicted with deficiencies. The concept of “sampling errors” is briefly discussed in the beginning of this paragraph. However, the information in the household module is given by the households themselves and thereby up-to-date and mirroring the actual situation. The Head Count is based on information given by the Village-chief, and some data concerning the households may not be updated lately, but is rather showing older circumstances.



## 2. The Households in Lao PDR

The estimated number of households in Lao PDR is 867 000 and the average household size is 6.1 with a margin of error of  $\pm 0.1$ . The household size is significantly lower in LECS 3 as compared to LECS 2. There is no good explanation to this. However, the LECS 3 estimates seem to be better in line with estimates from the 1995 Census and the population headcounts that have been conducted in 2000 and 2003.

The households are generally larger in the rural areas, the average household size is 6.2 persons in the rural areas whereas urban areas have an average household size of 5.8 persons. Xiengkhuang and Huaphanh provinces have the largest average household size (table 2.1). Within rural areas there is a significantly higher average household size in villages without access to road. (table 2.2).


**Table 2.1. Household size and number of households by provinces and regions in 2002/03**

	Number of households 2002/03 1000	Number of households 1997/98 1000	House- hold size LECS 2002/03	Confidence interval (margin of error)	Household size LECS 1997/98
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>867</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b><math>\pm 0.1</math></b>	<b>6.5</b>
Urban	240	135	5.8	$\pm 0.2$	6.3
Rural	627	649	6.2	$\pm 0.1$	6.5
<b>North</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b><math>\pm 0.2</math></b>	<b>6.4</b>
Phongsaly	25	26	6.5	$\pm 0.4$	6.0
Luangnamtha	23	20	6.0	$\pm 0.3$	6.0
Oudomxay	38	34	6.5	$\pm 0.5$	6.6
Bokeo	25	21	5.4	$\pm 0.4$	5.8
Luangprabang	61	63	6.3	$\pm 0.4$	6.3
Huaphanh	37	38	7.3	$\pm 0.3$	7.3
Xayaboury	58	50	5.6	$\pm 0.3$	6.3
<b>Center</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b><math>\pm 0.1</math></b>	<b>6.6</b>
Vientiane C.	111	92	5.7	$\pm 0.2$	6.3
Xiengkhuang	30	32	7.4	$\pm 0.4$	7.4
Vientiane P.	62	50	5.9	$\pm 0.3$	6.7
Borikhamxay	38	28	5.6	$\pm 0.4$	6.2
Khammuane	55	51	5.8	$\pm 0.3$	6.5
Savannakhet	122	112	6.3	$\pm 0.2$	6.7
Xaysomboon SR	6	9	5.8	$\pm 0.6$	6.7
<b>South</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b><math>\pm 0.2</math></b>	<b>6.4</b>
Saravane	51	43	6.0	$\pm 0.3$	6.7
Sekong	12	11	6.4	$\pm 0.5$	6.7
Champasack	97	89	5.9	$\pm 0.2$	6.2
Attapeu	17	16	5.9	$\pm 0.4$	6.5

Note: For explanation of confidence interval see page 8

**Table 2.2: Average household size by type of area in 2002/03**

	Urban	Rural with access to road	Rural with- out access to road	Total
Lao PDR	5.8	6.0	6.6	6.1
North	5.8	6.0	7.0	6.2
Center	5.8	6.1	6.4	6.0
South	5.6	6.0	6.1	5.9



72 % of the households are located in rural areas. In most provinces the proportion is above 80 %, only in Vientiane Capital just 19% of the households are in rural areas (table 2.3).

**Table 2.3: Number of households by province and type of area in 2002/03, 1000 households**

	Urban areas	Rural areas with access to road	Rural areas without access to road	Total	% Rural areas
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>867</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>North</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>82</b>
Phongsaly	4	8	13	25	85
Luangnamtha	5	11	7	23	80
Oudomxay	7	18	13	38	81
Bokeo	2	21	2	25	92
Luangprabang	12	34	14	61	80
Huaphanh	6	18	13	37	84
Xayaboury	12	42	4	58	79
<b>Center</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>62</b>
Vientiane C.	90	21	-	111	19
Xiengkhuang	6	11	13	30	80
Vientiane P.	12	47	3	62	80
Borikhamxay	10	19	10	38	74
Khammuane	10	41	4	55	81
Savannakhet	33	70	19	122	73
Xaysomboon SR	1	5	-	6	82
<b>South</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>83</b>
Saravane	4	19	28	51	93
Sekong	2	7	3	12	83
Champasack	23	68	6	97	77
Attapeu	2	11	4	17	87

Table 2.4 shows dependency ratios<sup>1</sup> and the average number of consumption units<sup>2</sup>. There is a slight decrease in the dependency ratios in most provinces since 1997/98.

**Table 2.4: Dependency rates and average number of consumption units, by province and region, 1997/98 and 2002/03.**

	Dependency ratio 2002/03	Average no. of consumption unit 2002/03	Dependency ratio 1997/98	Average no. of consumption unit 1997/98
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>5.0</b>
Urban	0.6	4.5	0.7	5.0
Rural	0.9	4.6	1.0	5.0
<b>North</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Phongsaly	0.9	4.8	1.0	4.6
Luangnamtha	0.7	4.5	0.8	4.6
Oudomxay	0.9	4.8	1.0	4.9
Bokeo	0.8	4.0	0.9	4.4
Luangprabang	0.9	4.6	1.0	4.8
Huaphanh	1.1	5.3	1.1	5.4
Xayaboury	0.7	4.3	1.0	4.9
<b>Center</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>5.1</b>
Vientiane C.	0.5	4.5	0.7	5.0
Xiengkhuang	1.1	5.3	1.2	5.5
Vientiane P.	0.8	4.4	0.9	5.2
Borikhamxay	0.8	4.3	1.0	4.7
Khammuane	0.9	4.3	0.9	4.9
Savannakhet	0.8	4.7	1.0	5.1
Xaysomboon SR	1.2	4.1	1.3	4.9
<b>South</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>
Saravane	0.9	4.4	1.0	5.0
Sekong	1.0	4.6	0.9	5.1
Champasack	0.8	4.4	0.9	4.8
Attapeu	0.9	4.3	0.9	5.0

<sup>1</sup> The dependency ratio is the number of children below age 15 plus the number of people above 64 years of age divided by the number of persons in the household age 15-64. It indicates the burden of those of working age to be responsible for the children and aging population.

<sup>2</sup> Average number of consumption unit is calculated as 1 for the first adult in the household, 0.9 for other adults, 0.4 for children below age 7 and 0.7 for children aged 7-15. The consumption unit approach reflects the fact that members of a household can share some expenses and that small children needs less food than an adult or a teenager.


### 3. Consumption and Rice intake

#### 3.1. Consumption

Consumption pattern in a country changes with changing income and relative prices. With increasing income people tend (or need) to spend less on food relatively non-food items and as a result food consumption as share of total consumption decreases. Changes in relative prices for a group (e.g. the price for electricity goes up more than for other goods and services) may have the effect that people tend to cut down the use of these items (save electricity) to be able to consume other necessities. The changes we see in consumption pattern between 1997/98 and 2002/03 are the combined effect of changes in income and relative prices. Consumption of food as per cent of total consumption has declined steadily, and among food the consumption of rice has gone down quite a lot, and meat, in particular, takes a larger share. Lower relative prices for rice explain most of the declining share of rice consumption. The quantity of rice consumed is almost unchanged since 1997/98.

Housing and transport and communications take a larger share of the total consumption in 2002/03 (but for housing this may partly be an effect of a change in measurement method).

Provinces with the highest food share also have the highest percent of consumption emanating from own production.



**Table 3.1 Household consumption by group of goods and services. Monthly average consumption in thousand Kip**

Group of products and services	Monthly consumption (1000Kip)	Share of total Per cent
Food expenditure	288.2 (± 16.9)	26.4
Consumption of own produced food	312.2 (± 9.6)	28.6
Clothing and footwear	26.7 (± 2.7 )	2.4
Housing	138.0 (± 11.7 )	12.6
Household utensils and operations	44.6 (± 4.6 )	4.1
Medical care	19.0 (± 2.1 )	1.7
Transport and communications	128.8 (± 25.8 )	11.8
Education	11.0 (± 2.4 )	1.0
Personal care	24.5 (± 2.6 )	2.2
Recreation	40.3 (± 7.0 )	3.7
Alcohol and tobacco	27.5 (± 2.4 )	2.5
Others	30.5 (± 7.4 )	2.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1091.3 (± 50.5 )</b>	<b>100.0</b>

On average, a household in Lao PDR consumes goods and services for a value of 1.1 million Kip per month. Food products make up more than half of the consumption. In table 3.2 the consumption pattern is compared over the three LECS-surveys.

**Table 3.2: Percent of total consumption by groups of goods and services in 1992/93, 1997/98 and 2002/03**

Group of products and services	Consumption, percent of total 1992/93	Consumption, percent of total 1997/98	Consumption, percent of total 2002/03 and confidence interval of estimate	Comparison 1997/98 and 2002/03
Food expenditure	26.3	26.9	26.4 (± 1.1)	
Own produced food	38.0	33.9	28.6 (± 1.7)	Significantly lower 2002/03
<b>Total food</b>	<b>64.3</b>	<b>60.9</b>	<b>55.0 (± 2.0)</b>	Significantly lower 2002/03
Clothing and footwear	4.1	2.8	2.4 (± 0.2)	
Housing	7.1	7.1	12.7 (± 0.9)	Significantly higher 2002/03 *
Household utensils and operations	4.0	5.1	4.1 (± 0.4)	Significantly lower 2002/03
Medical care	2.4	2.2	1.7 (± 0.2)	
Transport and communications	6.7	10.6	11.8 (± 2.0)	
Education	0.8	0.5	1.0 (± 0.2)	Significantly higher 2002/03
Personal care	3.1	0.8	2.2 (± 0.2)	Significantly higher 2002/03
Recreation	3.8	6.1	3.7 (± 0.6)	Significantly lower 2002/03
Alcohol and tobacco	3.0	2.9	2.5 (± 0.2)	
Others	0.7	1.1	2.8 (± 0.6)	Significantly higher 2002/03
<b>Total non-food</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>39.1</b>	<b>45.0</b>	Significantly higher 2002/03
<b>Total consumption</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

\* Part of the difference is due to different measurement methods of imputed rent in the two surveys

Food now takes 55 % of the overall consumption compared to 61 % in 1997/98 and 64 % in 1992/93. Housing takes a larger part of total consumption now, 13 %, up from 7 % 1992/93 and 1997/98. To some extent this is an effect of different measurement methods of imputed rent. There are statistically significant increases in the proportions for Education, Personal care and “Others”. There are significant decreases in the proportions for Own produced food, Household utensils and operations and recreation. The share of transport costs is increasing, from 7 and 11 % in the previous surveys to 12 % in 2002/03. The change between 1997/98 and 2002/03 is however not significant. Other changes are not significant. Another observation to make is a shift from own production to expenditure (purchases). The share of own production of food items was 53 % in 2002/03 against 56 % in 1997/98 and 59 % in 1992/93.

In table 3.3 we compare the food consumption pattern over the three LECS surveys. Meat and fruit take a larger part of the food consumption in 2002/03 as compared to 1997/98. The part of the total food consumption spent on rice and other food has decreased. Other changes are not statistically significant.

**Table 3.3: Percent of food consumption by kind of products in 1992/93, 1997/98 and 2002/03**

Product	1992/93	1997/98	2002/03	Comparison 1997/98 and 2002/03
Rice	42.8	46.2	35.4 ( $\pm 0.9$ )	Significantly lower 2002/03
Other cereals and bread	1.9	2.3	2.3 ( $\pm 0.2$ )	
Meat	18.4	16.1	22.3 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	Significantly higher 2002/03
Fish	10.7	12.9	13.3 ( $\pm 0.5$ )	
Milk, cheese and eggs	1.1	0.9	1.1 ( $\pm 0.1$ )	Significantly higher 2002/03
Oils and fats	0.2	0.2	0.3 ( $\pm 0.04$ )	
Fruits	1.7	1.7	5.6 ( $\pm 0.3$ )	Significantly higher 2002/03
Vegetables and potatoes	9.0	9.1	8.6 ( $\pm 0.4$ )	
Sugar and sweets	1.6	1.0	1.3 ( $\pm 0.1$ )	Significantly higher 2002/03
Non-alcoholic beverage coffee & tea	1.6	1.4	1.5 ( $\pm 0.2$ )	
Meals	3.7	4.1	4.8 ( $\pm 0.5$ )	Significantly higher 2002/03
Other food	7.5	4.1	3.5 ( $\pm 0.2$ )	
<b>All food products</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	

The food consumption takes a larger share of household consumption in rural areas than in urban areas. In the rural areas the food consumption to a larger extent consists of own produced food. In rural areas without access to road the proportion of food consumption that is own products is as high as 82 % (figure 2).




Table 3.4 shows the most significant differences in consumption between urban and rural areas.. Access to road (and markets) seems to have a significant importance for the consumption pattern. The share of food becomes higher with less access to markets and the dependence on own products.

**Table 3.4: Share in percent of total consumption by areas in 2002/03.**

Product	Urban areas	Rural areas with access to road	Rural areas without access to road
Food consumption	44.9	60.5	71.4
Transport	16.8	9.0	3.9
Rice	10.4	24.3	34.9
Meat	11.2	12.6	14.8
Fish	5.6	9.0	6.7
% of own products in food	20.0	65.8	82.1

Comparisons between provinces in the North, Center and the South reveal differences in the consumption patterns, the main ones are presented in table 3.5.

**Table 3.5: Share in percent of total consumption by region in 2002/03**

Product	North	Center	South	Comments
Food consumption	57.7 ± 2.4	52.1 ± 1.8	60.3 ± 1.7	Center significantly lower
Transport	11.5 ± 2.8	12.9 ± 1.9	8.6 ± 1.1	South significantly lower
Rice	23.9 ± 1.3	16.5 ± 0.8	22.1 ± 1.1	Center significantly lower
Meat	13.5 ± 0.7	11.7 ± 0.7	12.2 ± 0.6	North significantly higher
Fish	5.8 ± 0.3	7.7 ± 0.3	8.4 ± 0.4	North significantly lower
% of own products in food	67.3 ± 1.3	43.8 ± 1.5	51.5 ± 2.0	Significant differences

The food consumption in the Center is significantly lower than in the other two regions. This is mainly a reflection of the larger proportion of urban population in the Center, the urban households spending relatively less on food. The North spends relatively less on meat and fish. In tables 3.6 to 3.8 the composition of consumption is further broken down into urban and rural areas.

**Table 3.6: Share in percent of total consumption in urban areas in 2002/03.**

Product	North	Center	South	Comments
Food consumption	41.8 ± 6.3	44.9 ± 2.9	50.7 ± 3.4	North significantly lower
Transport	21.4 ± 10.0	16.6 ± 3.7	9.5 ± 2.2	
Rice	11.0 ± 2.1	10.2 ± 0.9	11.2 ± 1.3	
Meat	11.6 ± 2.0	10.9 ± 0.9	12.9 ± 1.3	
Fish	3.9 ± 0.8	6.0 ± 0.5	6.5 ± 0.6	
% of own products in food	29.9 ± 3.0	18.2 ± 1.6	15.2 ± 2.5	North significantly higher

**Table 3.7: Share in percent of total consumption in rural areas with access to road in 2002/03**

Product	North	Center	South	Comments
Food consumption	62.0 ± 1.9	59.2 ± 1.7	61.6 ± 1.8	North significantly higher
Transport	8.5 ± 2.0	9.3 ± 1.4	9.3 ± 1.7	
Rice	26.8 ± 1.1	22.8 ± 0.9	24.0 ± 1.2	
Meat	13.8 ± 0.6	12.3 ± 1.1	11.6 ± 0.9	
Fish	7.4 ± 0.4	9.9 ± 0.4	9.5 ± 0.5	
% of own products in food	74.4 ± 1.2	64.3 ± 1.9	56.5 ± 2.5	Significant differences

**Table 3.8: Share in percent of total consumption in rural areas without access to road in 2002/03.**

Product	North	Center	South	Comments
Food consumption	73.4 ± 2.2	68.7 ± 2.3	71.5 ± 3.9	North significantly higher
Transport	3.1 ± 2.2	4.7 ± 1.2	4.3 ± 1.2	
Rice	37.8 ± 1.5	31.7 ± 1.7	34.0 ± 2.2	
Meat	16.1 ± 0.9	14.2 ± 1.3	13.2 ± 1.2	
Fish	4.6 ± 0.3	8.7 ± 0.6	7.7 ± 0.8	North significantly lower
% of own products in food	87.0 ± 1.4	77.1 ± 2.2	79.5 ± 1.9	North significantly higher

An interesting finding is that the share of own products among food items in urban strata in the North is almost the double of those in the Center and the South. Either “urban areas” in the North are less developed or they provide fewer opportunities for marketing of products.

**Table 3.9: Household consumption, by provinces and regions. Total monthly household averages and percent own production.**

	Total monthly consumption (1000 Kip)	Percent own production
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>1,091 ± 50</b>	<b>28.6 ± 1.7</b>
Urban	1,707 ± 165	9.0 ± 1.7
Rural	855 ± 30	43.6 ± 1.9
<b>North</b>	<b>977 ± 94</b>	<b>38.8 ± 4.2</b>
Phongsaly	763 ± 175	57.4 ± 16.5
Luangnamtha	1,029 ± 186	41.2 ± 9.4
Oudomxay	804 ± 105	49.2 ± 8.5
Bokeo	833 ± 95	49.8 ± 7.5
Luangprabang	1,118 ± 365	25.0 ± 9.1
Huaphanh	939 ± 177	50.0 ± 11.4
Xayabury	1,102 ± 111	32.6 ± 4.4
<b>Central</b>	<b>1,239 ± 80</b>	<b>22.8 ± 2.0</b>
Vientiane C.	1,900 ± 241	6.1 ± 1.7
Xiengkhuang	1,062 ± 124	41.6 ± 5.3
Vientiane	1,212 ± 214	23.1 ± 4.8
Borikhamxay	963 ± 246	36.8 ± 13.7
Khammuane	873 ± 107	43.1 ± 6.8
Savannakhet	965 ± 96	33.9 ± 5.2
Xaysomboun SR	899 ± 199	39.0 ± 7.6
<b>South</b>	<b>910 ± 64</b>	<b>31.1 ± 3.2</b>
Saravane	684 ± 93	47.7 ± 8.4
Sekong	804 ± 131	46.5 ± 7.8
Champasack	1,054 ± 104	22.9 ± 3.9
Attapeu	838 ± 107	38.3 ± 3.6



**Table 3.10: Household consumption, by provinces and regions. Percent consumption per main group of goods and services**

	Food exp.	Clothing and footwear	Housing	Hhs utensils operations	Medical care	Transport and comm.	Education	Personal care	Recreation	Alcohol and tobacco	Others	Total
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>
Urban	45	2	17	5	1	17	1	2	5	2	3	100
Rural	63	3	10	4	2	8	1	2	3	3	3	100
<b>North</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>
Phongsaly	69	1	13	1	0	11	0	1	2	2	0	100
Luangnamtha	58	2	12	3	1	16	0	2	2	3	1	100
Oudomxay	65	3	18	2	1	4	1	1	2	2	1	100
Bokeo	67	1	11	3	1	5	2	2	4	2	2	100
Luangprabang	52	3	9	4	2	16	0	2	7	2	2	100
Huaphanh	65	3	10	2	1	9	1	2	2	1	3	100
Xayabury	50	3	13	6	2	12	1	3	4	2	4	100
<b>Central</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>
Vientiane C.	42	2	20	5	1	17	1	2	5	2	2	100
Xiengkhuang	60	3	12	4	1	10	1	2	3	2	3	100
Vientiane	50	3	14	3	2	10	3	2	3	3	8	100
Borikhamxay	62	3	5	3	1	17	1	3	2	2	1	100
Khammuane	64	2	9	4	2	9	1	2	2	3	3	100
Savannakhet	60	3	9	4	2	9	1	2	4	2	3	100
Xaysomboun	65	5	7	4	3	8	1	1	2	2	2	100
<b>South</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>
Saravane	66	2	8	4	3	9	0	2	3	2	2	100
Sekong	68	2	10	7	1	4	0	3	2	4	1	100
Champasack	58	3	9	5	2	9	0	3	3	5	3	100
Attapeu	57	1	19	5	2	6	0	3	3	2	2	100

Note: "0" does not mean that there is no consumption, only that it is less than 0.5 per cent of the province total

**Table 3.11: Household consumption by group of goods and services. Total and monthly household averages. Percentages**

Group of goods and services	LECS 1992/93		LECS 1997/98		LECS 2002/03		
	Percent of grand total	Percent of group total	Percent of grand total	Percent of group total	Percent of grand total	Percent of group total	Monthly consumption per household (1000 kip)
<b>Food expenditure</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>288.2</b>
Rice	5	17	7	27	4	15	43.5
Other cereals and bread	1	5	1	5	1	5	13.1
Meat	8	29	7	25	8	31	88.1
Fish	3	11	3	10	3	12	33.9
Milk, cheese and eggs	1	3	1	2	1	2	6.8
Oils and fats	0	1	0	1	0	1	1.7
Fruits	1	3	1	3	3	11	30.8
Vegetables and potatoes	3	10	2	8	1	4	10.5
Sugar and sweets	1	4	1	2	1	3	7.8
Non-alcoholic beverage coffee & tea	1	4	1	3	1	3	8.8
Other food	1	6	1	5	1	5	14.7
Meals	2	9	3	9	3	10	28.5
<b>Own produced food</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>312.2</b>
Own produced rice	23	60	21	61	16	54	169.3
Own produced other grains	.	.	0	0	0	0	1.0
Own produced meat	4	11	3	9	4	15	45.9
Own produced fish	4	11	5	16	4	15	45.9
Own produced fruits	0	1	0	1	0	1	2.5
Own produced vegetables	3	8	3	10	4	13	41.1
Other own produced	3	9	1	4	1	2	6.5
<b>Clothing and footwear</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26.7</b>
<b>Housing</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>138.0</b>
Rent of houses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2
Imputed rent	5	66	5	67	9	68	93.9
Firewood collected	1	18	1	15	3	20	27.3
Water, electricity	1	15	1	18	2	12	16.9
<b>Household utensils and operations</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44.6</b>
<b>Medical care</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>19.0</b>
<b>Transport and communications</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>128.8</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>11.0</b>
<b>Personal care</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24.5</b>
<b>Recreation</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40.3</b>
<b>Alcohol and tobacco</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27.5</b>
<b>Others</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>30.5</b>
<b>Total consumption</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1091.3</b>

**Table 3.12: Household consumption by group of goods and services in 2002/03. Monthly averages (1000 Kip) and percentages of total consumption, by region.**

Group of goods and services	Urban		Rural		Rural		Total	
			with access		Without access			
	Average	%	Average	%	Average	%	Average	%
<b>Food expenditure</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>26</b>
Rice	86	5	30	3	18	3	44	4
Other cereals and bread	26	2	9	1	4	1	13	1
Meat	176	10	62	7	31	4	88	8
Fish	72	4	23	3	8	1	34	3
Milk, cheese and eggs	16	1	4	0	1	0	7	1
Oils and fats	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
Fruits	70	4	19	2	8	1	31	3
Vegetables	26	2	5	1	2	0	10	1
Sugar and sweets	16	1	6	1	2	0	8	1
Non-alcoholic beverages, coffee & tea	22	1	4	0	1	0	9	1
Other foods	20	1	14	2	9	1	15	1
Meals	80	5	11	1	4	1	29	3
<b>Own produced food</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>29</b>
Rice own produced	92	5	191	21	221	32	169	16
Other own grain products	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Meat own produced	16	1	53	6	71	10	46	4
Fish own produced	25	1	59	7	38	6	46	4
Fruits own produced	1	0	3	0	3	1	3	0
Vegetables own produced	17	1	48	5	57	8	41	4
Other own products	3	0	7	1	10	2	7	1
<b>Clothing, footwear, tailoring</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Housing</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>13</b>
Rent of houses	1	0	0	0			0	0
Imputed rent	219	13	52	6	29	4	94	9
Fetches firewood	18	1	30	3	32	5	27	2
Water, electricity, etc	44	3	7	1	3	0	17	2
<b>Household utensils and operations</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Medical care</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Transport and communications</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Personal care</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Recreation</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Alcohol and tobacco</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Others</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total consumption</b>	<b>1707</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>912</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>686</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1091</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 3.13: Household consumption by region and group of goods and services in 2002/03.**  
**Percentages of total.**

Group of goods and services	North			Center			South		
	Urban	Rural with access to road	Rural without access to road	Urban	Rural with access to road	Rural without access to road	Urban	Rural with access to road	Rural without access to road
<b>Food expenditure</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>15</b>
Rice	3	3	2	5	2	4	6	6	2
Other cereals and bread	2	1	0	2	1	1	2	1	0
Meat	10	6	4	10	7	5	12	7	5
Fish	2	2	1	5	3	1	6	4	2
Milk, cheese and eggs	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Oils and fats	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fruits	4	1	1	4	2	1	5	3	2
Vegetables	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	0
Sugar and sweets	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
Non-alcoholic beverages, coffee & tea	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0
Other foods	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2
Meals	3	1	0	5	1	0	6	1	1
<b>Own produced food</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>57</b>
Rice own produced	8	24	36	5	20	28	5	18	32
Other own grain products	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meat own produced	1	8	12	1	5	10	1	4	8
Fish own produced	2	6	4	1	7	7	1	6	6
Fruits own produced	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Vegetables own produced	1	7	9	1	4	7	1	5	8
Other own products	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	2
<b>Clothing, footwear, tailoring</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Housing</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Rent of houses	0	0		0	0		0		
Imputed rent	10	6	3	14	6	5	13	5	5
Fetches firewood	2	5	7	1	3	3	1	2	2
Water, electricity, etc	1	0	1	3	1	0	2	1	0
<b>Household utensils and operations</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Medical care</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Transport and communications</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Personal care</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Recreation</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Alcohol and tobacco</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Others</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total consumption</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 3.14: Household Consumption by region and group of goods and services in 2002/03**

Group of goods and services	North		Center		South	
	Monthly average (1000 Kip)	% of total	Monthly average (1000 Kip)	% of total	Monthly average (1000 Kip)	% of total
<b><i>Food expenditure</i></b>	<b>185</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>29</b>
Rice	28	3	51	4	48	5
Other cereals and bread	10	1	16	1	12	1
Meat	67	7	107	9	74	8
Fish	16	2	45	4	35	4
Milk, cheese and eggs	5	1	9	1	5	1
Oils and fats	2	0	2	0	1	0
Fruits	17	2	40	3	29	3
Vegetables	6	1	14	1	9	1
Sugar and sweets	6	1	10	1	6	1
Non-alcoholic beverages, coffee & tea	3	0	12	1	10	1
Other foods	11	1	17	1	16	2
Meals	14	1	40	3	22	2
<b><i>Own produced food</i></b>	<b>380</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>31</b>
Rice own produced	205	21	153	12	154	17
Other own grain products	2	0	0	0	1	0
Meat own produced	65	7	38	3	36	4
Fish own produced	41	4	51	4	42	5
Fruits own produced	3	0	2	0	3	0
Vegetables own produced	55	6	33	3	40	4
Other own products	9	1	5	0	6	1
<b><i>Clothing, footwear, tailoring</i></b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2</b>
<b><i>Housing</i></b>	<b>117</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>10</b>
Rent of houses	0	0	0	0	0	0
Imputed rent	64	7	125	10	63	7
Fetches firewood	45	5	21	2	14	2
Water, electricity, etc	7	1	26	2	10	1
<b><i>Household utensils and operations</i></b>	<b>36</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5</b>
<b><i>Medical care</i></b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>
<b><i>Transport and communications</i></b>	<b>113</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>9</b>
<b><i>Education</i></b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
<b><i>Personal care</i></b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3</b>
<b><i>Recreation</i></b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3</b>
<b><i>Alcohol and tobacco</i></b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>4</b>
<b><i>Others</i></b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>
<b><i>Total consumption</i></b>	<b>977</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1239</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3.2. Daily intake of rice and some certain food items

The daily rice intake has been estimated to 575 gram per person. This was measured by counting number of rice balls eaten during a day, and the weight reflects cooked rice. The equivalent amount of dry rice is roughly 60 per cent of the weight of cooked rice. There is a clear urban/rural differential, the urban population consumes 15 % less rice than the rural population, while there is little difference between rural areas with access to road and without access to road.

People in the north eat more rice than people in the center and in the south. They also eat more vegetables but less fish and fruit.

A comparison with the estimates from 1997/98 shows that the overall levels and the geographical and urban/rural patterns of rice intake are stable.





Table 3.15: Daily rice intake in grams per person by urban/rural in 2002/03 and 1997/98

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-49	50+	All	Urban areas	Rural areas with road access	Rural areas without road access
<b>Lao PDR 2002/03</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>591</b>
Urban	260	404	505	567	556	566	510	509			
Rural	304	476	600	698	721	713	591	594			
<b>Lao PDR 1997/98</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>608</b>
Urban	237	392	503	577	568	572	481	493			
Rural	277	473	621	725	750	755	602	600			

**Table 3.16: Daily rice intake in grams per person by province and region in 2002/03**

	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-49	50+	All	Urban areas	Rural areas with road access	Rural areas without road access
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>591</b>
Urban	260	404	505	567	556	566	510	509			
Rural	304	476	600	698	721	713	591	594			
<b>North</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>774</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>667</b>	<b>635</b>
Phongsaly	340	502	587	688	709	707	539	592	541	629	585
Luangnamtha	299	491	685	839	830	869	703	702	785	735	594
Oudomxay	368	554	657	729	782	757	654	644	545	658	666
Bokeo	293	485	635	707	760	776	627	637	684	643	521
Luangprabang	286	499	601	728	773	739	632	608	476	601	662
Huaphanh	332	537	681	768	784	793	621	649	689	634	654
Xayaboury	324	525	688	790	778	841	679	704	544	759	645
<b>Center</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>536</b>
Vientiane C.	239	359	477	518	504	528	486	478	442	589	
Xiengkhuang	331	557	705	825	796	824	657	672	676	712	637
Vientiane P.	264	440	600	677	651	669	549	573	584	569	599
Borikhamxay	332	462	549	569	610	614	463	532	521	542	535
Khammuane	369	572	706	839	882	839	731	717	646	733	714
Savannakhet	255	363	449	519	534	531	469	452	475	455	415
Xaysomboon SR	373	563	788	925	992	905	883	740	519	762	
<b>South</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>645</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>569</b>
Saravane	309	496	595	688	759	706	632	597	600	597	596
Sekong	287	414	594	684	657	645	531	533	563	545	495
Champasack	272	385	497	610	625	587	499	502	433	514	513
Attapeu	252	418	585	703	738	695	586	573	637	571	551

**Table 3.17: Weekly intake in grams per person of meat, fish, vegetables and fruits, by region in 2002/03**

Region/area	Meat	Fish	Vegetables	Fruit
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>872</b>	<b>535</b>
North	457	366	1211	476
Center	413	534	751	550
South	428	535	655	588
Urban	483	460	771	650
Rural with road access	416	530	871	514
Rural without road access	389	377	1028	422

## 4. Access to and usage of resources and institutional services


### 4.1. Health environment and prevention

Safe water is defined as piped water in/outside, protected well/borehole and purified water. Sometimes water from streams can be clean.

Water and sanitation is still a big problem in Lao PDR. However, access to piped water or water from protected wells/boreholes has doubled since 1995. 50% of the Lao population has access to safe water in the village according to village heads. In the rural areas without access to road only 24% of the population has access to safe water in the village. The population in the north has less access to safe water than the population in the center and south.

Half the population do not have any toilet, still a large improvement since 1995 (population census) when 71 per cent of the population did not have toilet.

Almost all of the Lao population has now been covered by the immunization programs. Anti-malaria programs have been carried out in villages covering 72 % of the population.



**Table 4.1: Health environment and prevention by provinces and regions in 2002/03**

	% of population having:		% of population without:	% of population covered by:	
	Safe water in the village	Mosquito net		Immunization program	Anti-malaria program
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>72</b>
<i>Urban</i>	82	90	15	100	81
<i>Rural with road</i>	47	92	54	99	74
<i>Rural without road</i>	24	85	83	98	66
<b>North</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>79</b>
Phongsaly	30	88	79	100	83
Luangnamtha	57	85	47	96	89
Oudomxay	17	93	58	100	78
Bokeo	59	90	32	100	73
Luangprabang	42	81	60	100	79
Huaphanh	22	94	51	96	71
Xayaboury	46	92	15	100	82
<b>Center</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>65</b>
Vientiane C.	91	84	5	99	82
Xiengkhuang	27	88	44	95	75
Vientiane P.	50	91	23	100	62
Borikhamxay	39	92	40	100	78
Khammuane	41	92	78	100	57
Savannakhet	55	91	70	100	59
Xaysomboon SR	74	98	26	77	69
<b>South</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>73</b>
Saravane	54	93	84	100	52
Sekong	76	95	65	91	62
Champasack	50	98	61	100	90




## 4.2. Health services

5% of the total population has 8 hours or more to the nearest hospital. In rural areas without access to road 20 per cent of the population have 8 hours or more to come to nearest hospital, and 20 per cent the same time to nearest health center. (table 4.3)

30% of the population has access to a pharmacy in the village.

Of the people with temporary health problems during the last 4 weeks 15 per cent sought treatment at health facilities or provider, with variation from 20 per cent in urban areas to 10 per cent in rural areas without access to road. The overwhelming reason for not seeking help was that the illness was minor. Difficulty to get to the facility or provider was also an important reason in some provinces. The cost of treatment was a reason only among 4 per cent of those having temporary health problems.



**Table 4.2: Access to health services by province and region in 2002/03.**

Province/ region	Per cent of population with access in village to:						
	Pharmacy	Licensed pharmacy	Medical kit	Midwife	Traditional practitioner	Health volunteer	Medical staff as caretaker
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>36</b>
Urban	62	60	21	41	40	40	81
Rural with road	26	20	43	64	48	67	28
Rural without road	10	6	36	37	37	54	12
<b>North</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>30</b>
Phongsaly	24	20	44	15	30	41	14
Luangnamtha	16	16	43	63	54	59	20
Oudomxay	4	4	19	22	19	44	39
Bokeo	24	16	35	47	33	46	23
Luangprabang	24	17	31	49	45	68	41
Huaphanh	20	15	35	45	56	35	15
Xayaboury	47	37	64	98	51	84	35
<b>Center</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>44</b>
Vientiane C.	63	60	19	30	34	34	77
Xiengkhuang	27	19	54	21	52	68	24
Vientiane P.	49	42	29	42	47	32	51
Borikhamxay	31	31	81	51	38	85	46
Khammuane	33	28	33	62	33	53	32
Savannakhet	8	8	37	70	55	74	28
Xaysomboun SR	27	27	44	67	48	25	30
<b>South</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>26</b>
Saravane	25	22	47	55	43	72	20
Sekong	15	8	43	48	27	44	19
Champasack	37	29	25	69	44	65	29
Attapeu	27	37	63	97	65	74	33

**Table 4.3: Access to health services in villages**

	Per cent of people by distance to nearest hospital			Per cent of people by distance to nearest health center			Per cent of people having 8+ hours to:	
	-10 KM	11-30 KM	31 KM-	-10 KM	11-30 KM	31 KM-	Nearest hospital	Nearest health center
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
Urban	94	6	0	100	0	0	0	0
Rural with road	47	39	14	76	21	3	1	1
Rural without road	28	37	35	56	27	16	20	11
<b>North</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>
Phongsaly	37	23	40	37	30	33	17	9
Luangnamtha	48	27	25	63	28	9	14	8
Oudomxay	51	13	36	53	36	11	16	9
Bokeo	39	34	28	80	13	7	2	7
Luangprabang	43	35	22	63	33	4	0	0
Huaphanh	51	21	29	62	17	21	19	16
Xayaboury	55	24	22	90	10	0	5	0
<b>Center</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Vientiane C.	86	12	2	100	0	0	0	0
Xiengkhuang	35	33	32	77	13	10	12	5
Vientiane P.	61	33	6	80	16	4	2	0
Borikhamxay	61	26	14	77	19	3	6	6
Khammuane	46	43	11	73	27	0	2	2
Savannakhet	47	43	9	83	12	6	0	0
Xaysomboon SR	83	7	10	83	7	10	0	0
<b>South</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
Saravane	40	58	2	72	28	0	3	0
Sekong	47	32	21	85	12	4	33	8
Champasack	62	31	8	86	14	0	0	0
Attapeu	63	29	8	79	16	5	6	3


### 4.3. Health assessments and health seeking behavior

Sickness and death limits the welfare, and it also restricts the resources to create welfare.

Approximately 14 per cent of the people stated that they had temporary health problems in the past 4 weeks. There was no difference between male and female. Health problems were significantly more in the south than in other regions both among male and female. These temporary problems caused disruption in work, schooling and other activities in 56 % of the cases, i.e. about 8 per cent of the population had temporary health problems that disrupt work. Of these 14 per cent with temporary health problems, only 2 per cent sought treatment at a health facility or health provider (table 3.5 combined with table 3.6)

5% of the population has a long-term illness or disability, slightly more in rural than in urban areas. The South has a somewhat higher prevalence than North and Center.

The data in this section are provided by households.




**Table 4.4 : Temporary health problems in the past 4 weeks by Provinces and regions in 2002/03**

	Per cent of population with temporary health problems			Per cent of people with temp. health problems disrupting work, etc.		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>56</b>
Urban	12	14	13	43	42	43
Rural w road	14	15	15	58	59	59
Rural wo road	13	13	13	62	65	63
<b>North</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>55</b>
Phongsaly	7	8	7	75	70	72
Luangnamtha	17	19	18	60	64	62
Oudomxay	15	15	15	62	69	65
Bokeo	14	16	15	8	4	6
Luangprabang	16	17	16	70	67	69
Huaphanh	13	13	13	47	44	45
Xayaboury	15	16	15	52	42	47
<b>Center</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>
Vientiane C.	13	14	14	33	34	34
Xiengkhuang	8	9	9	59	66	63
Vientiane P.	8	9	8	56	60	58
Borikhamxay	9	10	9	45	55	50
Khammuane	11	11	11	57	55	56
Savannakhet	14	13	13	57	57	57
Xaysomboon SR	10	10	10	82	64	73
<b>South</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>65</b>
Saravane	14	15	14	63	64	64
Sekong	18	19	19	78	85	82
Champasack	23	25	24	64	69	66
Attapeu	14	14	14	34	41	38

**Table 4.5: Per cent of people with long term illness or disability**

	Men	Women	Total
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.1</b>
Urban	4.5	4.7	4.6
Rural with access to road	5.7	5.4	5.5
Rural without access to road	4.7	4.2	4.4
<b>North</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Phongsaly	4.9	4.2	4.5
Luangnamtha	6.5	4.1	5.1
Oudomxay	6.1	3.8	4.9
Bokeo	1.0	0.7	0.9
Luangprabang	6.2	5.5	6.0
Huaphanh	4.3	3.6	3.9
Xayaboury	2.9	2.7	2.8
<b>Center</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>
Vientiane C.	3.8	4.5	4.3
Xiengkhuang	5.0	3.8	4.3
Vientiane P.	3.6	2.7	3.0
Borikhamxay	2.8	3.2	3.2
Khammuane	7.2	6.9	7.1
Savannakhet	5.3	4.9	5.1
Xaysombone	5.8	6.4	5.7
<b>South</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>7.5</b>
Saravane	7.3	7.0	7.1
Sekong	6.2	6.6	6.5
Champasack	8.2	9.4	8.6
Attapeu	2.6	3.3	3.0




**Table 4.6: Visits to health care facilities to obtain health care in the past 4 weeks**

Type of health facility or provider	Visits per 1000 inhabitants:						Total country
	North	Center	South	Urban	Rural with road	Rural without road	
Health care facilities	195	263	257	296	261	116	240
Private doctor, commune health volunteer or trained midwife	94	135	160	138	144	64	126
Traditional health practitioner or birth attendant	44	58	71	46	65	41	57

**Table 4.7: Health seeking behavior**

Region/province	Per cent of people with health problems seeking treatment	Per cent distribution of people with health problems in the past 4 weeks not seeking treatment at health facilities or providers by reason				
		Not serious enough	Difficult to get there	Too expensive	Not good quality	No cure possible
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
Urban	20	88	4	3	1	4
Rural with road	15	75	15	4	1	7
Rural without road	10	69	21	5	0	5
<b>North</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
Phongsaly	10	64	33	1	.	1
Luangnamtha	17	73	20	1	.	5
Oudomxay	9	68	28	3	.	1
Bokeo	5	97	3	0	.	0
Luangprabang	10	67	13	7	.	14
Huaphanh	7	78	15	1	0	6
Xayaboury	23	90	7	1	1	3
<b>Center</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
Vientiane C.	21	90	4	0	.	6
Xiengkhuang	25	68	18	7	2	6
Vientiane P.	21	72	17	4	4	4
Borikhamxay	14	65	16	2	.	17
Khammuane	18	69	15	5	0	11
Savannakhet	21	75	16	7	0	2
Xaysomboon SR	20	72	1	1	.	26
<b>South</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
Saravane	11	74	15	9	0	2
Sekong	18	59	30	5	.	7
Champasack	12	77	14	3	1	5
Attapeu	10	89	7	1	.	4




## 4.4. Educational services

Most villages (79%) have their own primary school and 8 % have a lower secondary school.

Primary schools are well spread over the country, even in villages without access to road there is a school in the village in 76% of the villages.

Enrolment rates are generally a bit higher among boys, especially in the age group 11-15. Compared with 1995 population census, the enrolment rate for girls, in particular, has improved.

The percentage of people “never been to school” has dropped from 38 % 1995 to 23 %.



**Table 4.8: Educational services and quality.**

Region/ Province	Primary school in village  %	Lower sec- ondary school in village  %	Pupils per teacher  Number	Textbooks available  %	Primary schools Regularly operating  %	Operating mixed classes  %	Operating half day classes  %
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>8</b>
Urban	80	19	24	81	79	16	12
Rural with road	81	11	21	78	72	48	8
Rural without	76	0	23	75	64	59	8
<b>North</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>9</b>
Phongsaly	95	0	15	95	95	60	8
Luangnamtha	75	4	18	75	71	63	12
Oudomxay	78	16	14	76	70	33	0
Bokeo	56	5	31	56	45	9	14
Luangprabang	78	4	29	78	61	52	9
Huaphanh	88	3	16	88	74	62	20
Xayaboury	94	10	15	94	79	39	5
<b>Center</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>9</b>
Vientiane C.	88	26	19	89	91	28	7
Xiengkhuang	88	9	18	88	71	59	44
Vientiane P.	73	14	23	73	71	21	2
Borikhamxay	88	6	37	88	81	67	1
Khammuane	84	7	25	84	72	68	6
Savannakhet	75	9	25	70	73	45	2
Xaysomboon SR	91	6	24	91	83	66	0
<b>South</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>6</b>
Saravane	63	7	27	58	52	42	11
Sekong	65	7	15	65	58	39	6
Champasack	77	5	32	69	65	59	2
Attapeu	89	22	22	87	89	44	7

**Table 4.9: Net school enrolment (%) among children 6-15 years old by sex and by province and urban/rural areas.**

Region/province	Age 6-10			Age 11-15		
	Girls	Boys	Total	Girls	Boys	Total
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>76</b>
Urban	91	88	89	87	90	88
Rural with access to road	72	75	74	71	82	76
Rural without access to road	50	56	53	49	71	60
<b>North</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>71</b>
Phongsaly	48	55	52	56	70	63
Luangnamtha	43	49	46	54	64	59
Oudomxay	53	56	54	59	81	69
Bokeo	59	58	59	64	82	72
Luangprabang	66	73	69	67	83	74
Huaphanh	57	68	62	65	83	74
Xayaboury	82	87	85	66	82	74
<b>Center</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>82</b>
Vientiane C.	96	92	94	85	95	90
Xiengkhuang	73	70	72	71	88	79
Vientiane P.	89	91	90	85	91	88
Borikhamxay	86	90	88	82	90	86
Khammuane	70	73	71	74	80	77
Savannakhet	69	67	68	70	77	74
Xaysomboon SR	83	80	81	78	96	88
<b>South</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>71</b>
Saravane	48	54	51	49	66	58
Sekong	60	63	62	69	86	77
Champasack	84	86	85	71	76	74
Attapeu	63	68	65	82	89	86

Net school enrolment is defined as the number of children in a certain age group that go to school, related to the total number of children in the same age group.

## 4.5. Knowledge

Table 4.10, below, presents the distribution of the population aged six years and above by school attendance and comparisons with data from the 1995 Population Census. The share of population “never been to school” has decreased from 38 to 23 percent. Although school attendance has increased both for female and male, the gap between them remains. More than 30 percent has never been to school among female compared to 15 percent among male. For the population in school ages (6-20), the difference between gender is less marked.

In 1995, as estimated in the Population Census, 60 % of the Lao people 15 years and above could read and write, 74 per cent among the male and 48 per cent among the female population. The summary table 4.12 below shows that at present, as estimated in LECS III, 79 % of the male and 57 per cent of the female population can write and read without difficulty. Including those who can read and write with some difficulty the literacy rates go up to 85 % for male and 64 per cent for female.

**Table 4.10: Time for Education by Provinces and regions in 2002/03**

	No. of schooling years				Time used for education hours/day				Literacy rate 15+	
	Female	Male	F 15-19	M 15-19	F -14	M -14	F 15-19	M 15-19	Female	Male
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>86</b>
Urban	7	7	8	8	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	86	96
Rural	7	7	8	8	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9		
<b>North</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>80</b>
Phongsaly	4	4	4	4	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.3	38	57
Luangnamtha	4	5	6	6	3.4	3.7	3.6	3.7	37	60
Oudomxay	3	4	5	5	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	45	78
Bokeo	4	4	5	6	2.5	2.6	2.9	2.6	49	78
Luangprabang	4	5	5	6	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.4	54	84
Huaphanh	4	5	6	6	3.4	3.2	2.8	3.2	54	85
Xayaboury	5	6	6	7	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.7	81	91
<b>Center</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>89</b>
Vientiane C.	7	8	8	8	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	91	97
Xiengkhuang	4	5	6	6	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.2	60	85
Vientiane P.	5	6	7	7	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.5	77	93
Borikhamxay	5	5	6	7	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.3	82	90
Khammuane	4	5	6	6	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	57	85
Savannakhet	5	5	6	6	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	58	83
Xaysomboon SR	4	5	5	6	2.8	2.7	3.2	2.7	54	84
<b>South</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>88</b>
Saravane	4	4	5	5	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.3	47	79
Sekong	3	4	4	5	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.3	55	82
Champasack	5	5	6	6	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	74	93
Attapeu	4	5	5	6	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.6	71	91
<b>1997/98</b>										
Lao PDR	3	4	4	5	3.1	3.7	1.8	2.4	55	82
Urban	5	6	7	7	4.3	6.3	3.9	5.4	82	96
Rural	2	4	4	5	2.9	3.3	1.5	1.9	49	79




**Table 4.11: School attendance, population 6+ years of age. Percentages**

	Never been to school		At school		Left school	
	Census 95	LECS III	Census 95	LECS III	Census 95	LECS III
All	38	23	25	31	37	46
Female	47	31	21	28	32	41
Male	28	15	29	34	43	51
Age group, all						
06-20	32	17	56	63	12	19
20-	42	29	2	1	57	70
Age group, Female						
06-20	36	21	50	58	14	22
21-	55	40	1	1	44	59
Age group, Male						
06-20	28	14	62	69	11	17
21-	28	17	2	2	70	82

**Table 4.12: LECS III estimation of literacy rate, population 15 +**

Region	Read and write without or with some difficulty			Can not read and write			Can either write or read with some difficulty or with difficulty	
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Urban area	95	85	90	4	14	9	1	1
Rural with road	86	63	74	13	35	25	1	2
Rural without road	69	39	54	29	60	45	2	1
North	79	54	66	20	44	32	2	2
Center	89	71	79	10	28	19	1	1
South	87	63	75	11	35	24	1	1



**Table 4.13: Highest level of education completed by sex and region, population 6+**

	None		Completed Primary school		Completed Lower secondary school		Completed Upper secondary school	
	Census 95	LECS 2002/03	Census 95	LECS 2002/03	Census 95	LECS 2002/03	Census 95	LECS 2002/03
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
-Female	52	31	9	14	3	6	2	2
- Male	33	15	13	17	5	9	3	4

**Table 4.14. Highest level of education completed by region and sex. Population aged 6 +. 2002/03**

Region/ Province	None	Primary school		Lower secondary school		Upper secondary school	
		Not completed	Completed	Not completed.	Completed	Not completed	Completed
<b>All people</b>							
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>
<i>Urban</i>	8.5	25.2	15.8	11.6	12.8	5.8	9.1
<i>Rural with road</i>	13.0	37.2	16.7	8.6	6.8	2.2	2.1
<i>Rural without road</i>	42.6	36.0	11.4	4.4	2.4	0.7	0.7
North	30.3	34.7	15.8	7.0	5.9	2.0	1.6
Center	18.5	31.3	15.8	9.5	9.1	3.6	5.4
South	23.2	38.8	14.0	8.7	5.9	2.2	2.2
<b>Male</b>							
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>
<i>Urban</i>	4.7	24.9	14.6	12.1	13.4	6.4	10.1
<i>Rural with road</i>	14.8	38.2	18.0	10.4	8.6	2.8	2.9
<i>Rural without road</i>	30.6	41.3	14.7	5.9	3.3	0.9	1.1
North	20.9	37.2	18.0	8.5	7.4	2.6	2.0
Center	12.0	32.3	16.0	10.7	10.2	3.9	6.7
South	14.7	40.0	15.4	10.5	7.6	3.0	2.6
<b>Female</b>							
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>31.0</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.7</b>
<i>Urban</i>	12.4	25.5	17.0	11.1	12.1	5.1	8.1
<i>Rural with road</i>	30.9	36.2	15.4	6.9	5.0	1.7	1.2
<i>Rural without road</i>	54.2	30.9	8.3	2.9	1.4	0.5	0.4
North	39.5	32.3	13.7	7.2	4.4	1.4	1.2
Center	25.1	30.4	15.6	8.4	7.9	3.3	4.1
South	31.2	37.7	12.6	7.0	4.4	1.4	1.9


## 4.6. Land and productive assets

The land is well distributed in Lao PDR. Almost 90% of the households own land. In the North the percentage is slightly lower, 85%.

The presence other of productive agricultural assets is rather scarce. Tractors are owned by 19% of the households and 6% of the households own a cart.

The household average value of own land was estimated, by the households, to 25 million KIP. If this country average value is set to 100, the relative value for the regions were:

North	38
Center	161
South	43
Urban areas	247
Rural with access to road	53
Rural without access to road	28
Vientiane C	427



**Table 4.15: Households with access to land, and productive assets by provinces and regions in 2002/03. Percentage.**

	Access to land	Owning land	Owning business building	Access to Agric. building	Two-wheeled tractor	Four-wheeled tractor	Cart	Boat	Fishing net
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>58</b>
<i>Urban</i>	87	85	11	4	11	3	6	11	40
<i>Rural with road</i>	94	92	4	5	19	5	7	21	66
<i>Rural without road</i>	89	83	1	4	8	2	4	10	58
<b>North</b>	89	85	2	2	12	4	5	9	55
Phongsaly	97	97	2	.	2	3	2	4	58
Luangnamtha	69	66	3	1	22	5	4	8	52
Oudomxay	88	76	1	11	5	3	1	2	52
Bokeo	96	94	1	0	25	6	4	8	59
Luangprabang	87	83	1	0	4	2	1	14	44
Huaphanh	83	77	3	0	6	2	16	8	73
Xayaboury	97	94	4	2	23	8	5	9	56
<b>Center</b>	92	90	8	6	20	4	6	18	58
Vientiane C.	86	84	14	8	17	5	6	10	38
Xiengkhuang	96	92	4	6	10	3	9	3	51
Vientiane P.	97	97	10	25	22	5	5	14	60
Borikhamxay	91	91	6	.	29	2	2	30	65
Khammuane	93	89	3	1	20	5	6	31	76
Savannakhet	95	93	4	1	24	3	8	23	64
Xaysomboon SR	97	95	5	.	10	1	14	15	75
<b>South</b>	94	92	4	4	6	4	7	26	65
Saravane	96	95	3	14	7	4	9	10	65
Sekong	87	86	2	0	5	3	2	4	57
Champasack	93	91	4	1	5	4	7	33	64
Attapeu	96	96	8	.	6	2	8	42	76


## 4.7. Infrastructure

One third of the villages in Lao PDR have electricity. Almost all urban villages have electricity but only 13% of the villages without access to road have electricity.

Accessibility to the villages is generally lower in the North than in central or southern parts of the country, and villages in Phongsaly the most disadvantaged. Only a third of the villages can be reached by truck in the dry season.

Small changes seem to have taken place since 1997/98 and comparisons are difficult to make as the allocation of the sample affects the results.

Data on infrastructure have been supplied by village chiefs.




**Table 4.16: Selected indicators by provinces and regions in 2002/03. % of villages or KM**

	Electricity	Average distance to nearest road KM	Reachable in dry season	Reachable in rainy season	Distance to post office KM	Bus stop in village	Average distance to public transport KM
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>
<i>Urban</i>	95	0	100	97	5	96	0
<i>Rural with road</i>	33	2	84	65	22	54	6
<i>Rural without road</i>	13	12	35	17	32	11	22
<b>North</b>	22	9	52	39	27	36	14
Phongsaly	23	16	32	27	38	19	19
Luangnamtha	6	16	47	34	30	34	23
Oudomxay	9	7	51	26	29	26	15
Bokeo	14	8	76	44	23	46	10
Luangprabang	34	10	53	51	23	45	11
Huaphanh	26	9	41	28	31	23	19
Xayaboury	28	2	77	71	17	68	4
<b>Center</b>	49	2	89	66	22	52	7
Vientiane C.	100	0	100	100	9	98	0
Xiengkhuang	41	8	83	41	26	18	18
Vientiane P.	54	2	93	92	18	74	4
Borikhamxay	54	5	74	63	16	53	5
Khammuane	48	1	78	54	29	48	5
Savannakhet	35	1	96	64	22	44	7
Xaysomboon SR	14	-	-	54	52	47	22
<b>South</b>	25	3	73	57	18	49	9
Saravane	18	1	83	65	22	52	8
Sekong	42	12	74	58	20	46	21
Champasack	26	2	64	52	16	50	3
Attapeu	16	3	85	53	16	38	25

**Table 4.17: Percent villages having electricity in 1997/98 and 2002/03**

	1997/98	2002/03
Lao PDR	31	33
Urban	91	95
Rural	19	26
North	14	22
Central	50	49
South	17	25



## 5. Economic Activities of the Households


### 5.1. Economic activity and employment

The Lao society is highly dependent on agriculture. 71 % of all hours worked concern work on own operated farm. There are small differences between the provinces, except of course for Vientiane Capital.

Another important characteristic of the labor market is that employment almost entirely is dependent on self-employment. Employment outside the own household (paid employee) exists in larger numbers only in Vientiane C (22% of total hours worked in the last 7 days), but is close to zero or around 5 % at most in centers such as Luangprabang, Xayaboury, Vientiane P., Savannaketh and Champasack.

Unemployment and/or underemployment have not been measured. However, the time use statistics shed some lights on this issue.


Similar employment data are obtained from the time use module. Table 5.4 provides data on average number of hours per day for income generating activities.




**Table 5.1: Main economic activities for population 10+, by Provinces and regions 2002/03.**

Region/province	% of population 10+ working			Main activity last 7 days, % of total hours worked			
	Female	Male	Total	Paid employee	Self-employed Non-farm activity	Own operated farm	Total
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>
Urban	73	76	75	17	49	34	100
Rural with road	83	86	85	3	16	81	100
Rural without road	86	87	87	1	11	88	100
<b>North</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100</b>
Phongsaly	90	91	90	0	7	92	100
Luangnamtha	82	84	83	3	15	82	100
Oudomxay	81	84	83	3	3	94	100
Bokeo	72	80	76	1	15	84	100
Luangprabang	78	82	80	5	12	84	100
Huaphanh	88	88	88	1	18	81	100
Xayaboury	83	84	84	5	19	76	100
<b>Center</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100</b>
Vientiane C.	74	76	75	22	47	31	100
Xiengkhuang	71	72	72	2	16	82	100
Vientiane P.	73	79	76	5	26	69	100
Borikhamxay	85	82	84	3	34	63	100
Khammuane	85	88	86	3	21	76	100
Savannakhet	79	83	81	5	22	73	100
Xaysomboon SR	77	78	78	5	15	80	100
<b>South</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100</b>
Saravane	98	99	98	0	11	88	100
Sekong	89	90	89	3	14	83	100
Champasack	83	88	85	5	32	63	100
Attapeu	81	83	82	2	30	68	100

**Figure 8. % working hours,urban**



**Figure 9. % working hours, rural**



**Table 5.2: Total hours worked in different sectors as percent of total hours**

Production in/of:	Per cent of total		
	Male	Female	Total
Agriculture, forestry, fishing	72.6	69.8	71.3
Mining	0.1	0.1	0.1
Food processing, beverage, tobacco	0.8	1.0	0.9
Textile, leather production	0.5	5.5	2.9
Wood, paper, chemicals, plastics	2.0	1.9	1.9
Production of equipment, motor vehicles	0.3	0.1	0.2
Electricity, water	0.2	0.0	0.1
Construction	5.2	0.9	3.1
Wholesale, retail, hotel and restaurants	5.3	15.5	10.3
Transport	2.5	0.1	1.3
Other services	10.4	5.1	7.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The population at the age of 10 and higher is deemed to be the economically active part of population – the presumptive workforce. Figure 10 illustrates the activities of the workforce during the last 7 days before the survey-day.

**Figure 10. Population aged 10 years and above. Activities during the last 7 days**

Working last 7 days		Unknown	Not working last seven days				
88.6%		0.5%	17.9%				

↓

Reasons for not working, % of economically not active population							
Students	Home duties	Too old/ retired	Handicapped	Sick, family illness	Waiting for recall by employer	Waiting for busy season	Other
52	12	18	2	3	1	9	3

With high dependence on self-employment, the concept of unemployment will become blurred. Underemployment is believed to be high but it is difficult to measure. According to LECS III estimate, about 100 000 persons (the last 3 columns in the last row in the figure) may be defined as unemployed and they represent 2.4 % of the workforce. However about the same number of people, although not working the past seven days, were saying they had a permanent job to go to. Very few (about 2 %) of those not working had been looking for job in the past 7 days.



## 5.2. Agricultural production

Income from grain stands for about 50% of the agricultural production, 48% in urban households and 51% in rural households. The output consists of production for own final use and market sale. Out of the total gross output, just below 37 % of the production values are for the market. For most products less than one third of the production is sold at the market.

The entrepreneurial income from agriculture (income less running costs) is generally higher in the North and in particular high in Xayabury compared to other parts of the country. However when these figures have been adjusted with number of hours worked the differences are not so large. The income level is overall rather low – less than 50 USD per month.

Different price levels may explain why income differs between provinces and regions. According to village head data lowland paddy prices were on average 30 % higher in the North than in the South and 10 % above the level in the Center.

**Table 5.3: Agricultural production, by province and region in 2002/03. Annual income and costs, 1000 Kip/household**

	Income						Costs				Entrepreneurial income
	Grain	Vegetables and Fruits	Meat	Fish	Forestry	Others	Seed and fodder	Equipment	Wages	Others	
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>3,129</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>1,234</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>5,404</b>
Urban	1,696	379	543	508	37	375	222	151	308	233	2,624
Rural	3,598	797	1,460	805	41	292	170	132	149	227	6,316
<b>North</b>	<b>4,128</b>	<b>867</b>	<b>1,149</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>6,900</b>
Phongsaly	3,127	888	950	529	0	144	2	10	3	55	5,568
Luangnamtha	3,479	968	1,281	461	70	448	34	33	166	36	6,438
Oudomxay	2,971	872	1,154	534	19	313	31	370	166	229	5,067
Bokeo	2,626	1,034	2,162	829	0	539	26	110	203	112	6,740
Luangprabang	2,376	678	1,615	425	87	142	143	78	151	96	4,854
Huaphanh	3,934	776	1,194	715	73	217	399	16	21	52	6,422
Xayabury	8,112	990	1,833	657	19	302	144	32	229	211	11,298
<b>Central</b>	<b>2,745</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>1,227</b>	<b>837</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>4,866</b>
Vientiane M	2,224	231	511	435	50	557	298	217	484	424	2,587
Xiengkhuang	3,957	976	1,867	602	21	291	644	460	277	252	6,082
Vientiane	2,673	553	1,767	811	152	752	402	166	308	369	5,464
Borikhamxay	2,471	934	917	1539	33	98	19	110	155	87	5,621
Khammuane	2,804	740	1,277	1,254	35	327	243	325	165	222	5,483
Savannakhet	2,948	609	1,374	807	10	338	55	77	135	391	5,429
Xaysomboun SR	2,259	881	1,710	761	61	233	455	65	129	151	5,106
<b>South</b>	<b>2,498</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>4,376</b>
Saravane	2,719	761	836	469	5	169	250	27	46	48	4,589
Sekong	2,217	1,079	2,003	466	1	141	43	50	4	59	5,751
Champasack	2,441	573	664	786	29	91	124	125	139	244	3,954

Attapeu	2,355	510	1,139	1,221	8	97	17	59	133	18	5,105
---------	-------	-----	-------	-------	---	----	----	----	-----	----	-------

LECS 3 has captured economic activities within the households, and can provide estimates on household production by activity. If an activity entirely takes place within the households, LECS 3 gives a total estimate of the production of that activity. Households do most of the agriculture production, although some important cash crops such as tobacco and coffee are produced by other institutional units. The figures presented here are thus not the entire agricultural production, but production confined to the household sector.


In the time use module of the LECS, there are a number of income-generating activities that household members take part in. The following table shows how the percentage of time that an average Lao household spend on those activities:

**Table 5.4: Income generating activities (persons 10+ years of age)**

Activity	Average number of hours per day	Percent
Work as employed	0.5	11
Own business work	0.7	14
Agriculture work	2.4	49
Collecting firewood/fetching water	0.3	7
Hunting/fishing	0.5	11
Construction	0.1	1
Handicraft	0.3	7
<b>Total: Income generating activities</b>	4.8	100

The table indicates that a household in Lao PDR on average spends half of its working time (on income generating activities) on agriculture. The time used on hunting and fishing is of the same size as the time spent on business activities and work as employed. Agriculture, hunting and fishing use 60 percent of the total number of hours worked – one way of measuring the size of the sector.

Figure 11 shows the proportion of the total production for each product group.





As the chart illustrates, grain is the most important product group. Meat also includes wild animals. The group “others” includes cash crops such as cardamom but also agriculture services, for example land clearing or ploughing for others.

The output consists of production for own final use and market sale. Out of the total gross output, just below 37 % of the production value is for the market. For most products less than one third of the production is sold at the market.

**Table 5.5: Proportion of total production sold at the market (%)**

	Grain	Vegetables and Fruits	Meat	Fish	Poultry	Forestry	Others	Total
Lao PDR	32	22	62	21	30	100	76	37
Urban	23	37	72	32	42	100	91	39
Rural	33	19	62	19	28	100	70	36

Figures 12 and 13 show the product groups proportion of the total production for sale at the market and for own use respectively.



The structure of the market output is somewhat more diversified than the output for own final use. The product group meat takes a much larger part of the production for the market than it does in the production for own use. For fish and vegetables and fruits it is the other way around.

Tables 5.6 to 5.11 are about operated land in the last agricultural season and number of livestock. The estimate of operated area of land (table 5.6) is slightly higher than in the agricultural census 1998/99. The figures for the dry season plots can not be added to the wet season plots to become a total, as some plots are irrigated and used in both dry and wet season, others not.

The estimate of harvested area of rice is higher than, but rice production well in line with, the official estimates.

**Table 5.6 Agricultural operated land in last agricultural season, 1000 hectares**

	Operated land	
	Wet season plots	Dry season plots
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>1170</b>	<b>115</b>
North	340	20
Center	560	80
South	270	20
Urban	150	30
Rural with road	760	70
Rural without to road	260	20

**Table 5.7 Harvested hectares of rice and production of paddy rice in last agricultural season**

	Wet season				Dry season			
	Glutinous rice		Ordinary rice		Glutinous rice		Ordinary rice	
	Harvested area, 1000 Ha	Production in 1000 ton	Harvested area, 1000 Ha	Production in 1000 ton	Harvested area, 1000 Ha	Production in 1000 ton	Harvested area, 1000 Ha	Production in 1000 ton
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>792</b>	<b>1730</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>
North	205	490	40	90	10	20	4	7
Center	422	910	20	40	63	170	3	7
South	164	310	20	30	13	30	2	3
Urban	118	280	10	20	17	50	2	6
Rural with road	515	1150	40	80	56	140	4	7
Rural without road	159	310	30	60	13	30	3	4

Table 5.8 shows the total number of livestock owned by the Lao households. The estimates are considerably higher than the numbers found in the Laos Agricultural Census. To some extent this could be explained by the fact that the census was restricted to “agricultural households” while the LECS covers all households.

**Table 5.8: Total Number of livestock by type and by province in 1000 heads**

Number of livestock in 2002/03 in 1000 heads					
	Cattle	Buffaloes	Pigs	Goats	Other
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>1,365</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>1,499</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>URBAN</b>					
	191	111	118	25	2
Rural	1,174	1,090	1,381	161	34
<b>North</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>22</b>
Phongsaly	19	39	85	2	2
Luangnamtha	25	32	56	7	0
Oudomxay	22	60	100	18	1
Bokeo	66	34	79	5	-
Luangprabang	66	55	145	42	11
Huaphanh	54	64	138	14	6
Xayabury	109	81	133	1	1
<b>Central</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>12</b>
Vientiane C.	89	25	19	3	-
Xiengkhuang	109	73	76	9	11
Vientiane	116	81	87	7	0
Borikhamxay	38	39	38	5	-
Khammuane	80	100	67	7	0
Savannakhet	276	204	200	49	1
Xaysomboun SR	16	11	12	1	0
<b>South</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>
Saravane	82	81	110	4	0
Sekong	9	24	32	5	1
Champasack	168	137	80	3	1
Attapeu	19	60	39	4	-

**Table 5.9: Average number of livestock per household by type and by province.**

	Number of livestock per household in 2002/03				
	Cattle	Buffaloes	Pigs	Goats	Other
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.1</b>
Urban	1.7	1.0	0.9	0.2	0.0
Rural	2.0	1.9	2.3	0.3	0.1
<b>North</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.1</b>
Phongsaly	0.8	1.6	3.6	0.1	0.1
Luangnamtha	1.2	1.6	2.7	0.4	0.0
Oudomxay	0.6	1.7	2.8	0.5	0.0
Bokeo	2.8	1.5	3.3	0.2	-
Luangprabang	1.4	1.2	3.0	0.9	0.2
Huaphanh	1.6	1.9	4.0	0.4	0.2
Xayabury	2.1	1.5	2.5	0.0	0.0
<b>Central</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Vientiane C.	2.1	0.6	0.1	0.1	-
Xiengkhuang	4.0	2.7	2.8	0.3	0.4
Vientiane	2.4	1.7	1.5	0.1	0.0
Borikhamxay	1.5	1.5	1.3	0.2	-
Khammuane	1.8	2.2	1.2	0.2	0.0
Savannakhet	2.7	2.0	1.9	0.5	0.0
Xaysomboun SR	2.9	2.0	2.1	0.2	0.0
<b>South</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Saravane	1.8	1.8	2.3	0.1	0.0
Sekong	0.8	2.1	2.7	0.4	0.0
Champasack	2.2	1.8	0.7	0.0	0.0
Attapeu	1.2	3.7	2.0	0.2	-

Table 5.10 shows the total number of poultry raised by Lao households. The estimates are considerably higher than the numbers found in the Lao Agricultural Census. As is the case with livestock estimates, this could to some extent be explained by the fact that the census was restricted to “agricultural households” while the LECS covers all households.

**Table 5.10: Total number of poultry raised during last 4 weeks, 1000 heads**



	Poultry by type							Total
	Local chicken	Commercial chicken	Turkeys	Small breed	Large breed	Geese	Other	Total
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>9,561</b>	<b>789</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>1,312</b>	<b>1,567</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>13,706</b>
Urban	2,152	689	89	243	628	20	124	3,946
Rural	7,409	100	177	1,069	939	7	58	9,760
<b>North</b>	<b>3,857</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4,788</b>
Phongsaly	203	-	5	50	7	-	0	266
Luangnamtha	342	3	10	31	22	-	1	409
Oudomxay	418	9	21	54	12	-	4	517
Bokeo	756	2	8	32	20	0	0	818
Luangprabang	593	3	19	75	54	-	1	746
Huaphanh	612	1	6	108	38	1	1	768
Xayabury	934	8	52	129	128	1	12	1,264
<b>Central</b>	<b>4,307</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>6,806</b>
Vientiane C.	968	655	13	98	355	9	123	2,222
Xiengkhuang	340	0	24	71	25	2	3	466
Vientiane	669	27	33	76	197	2	14	1,019
Borikhamxay	410	7	10	36	72	1	-	536
Khammuane	602	-	1	31	63	1	1	698
Savannakhet	1,281	9	30	211	258	9	13	1,811
Xaysomboun SR	37	-	3	7	4	-	4	55
<b>South</b>	<b>1,397</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2,112</b>
Saravane	379	1	7	93	54	0	2	536
Sekong	96	6	0	11	11	0	0	125
Champasack	699	55	19	176	204	1	3	1,158
Attapeu	223	2	4	22	43	0	-	293



**Table 5.11: Average number of poultry per household raised during last 4 weeks.**

	Poultry by type							Total
	Local chicken	Commercial chicken	Turkeys	Small breed	Large breed	Geese	Other	Total
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>
Urban	15	52	4	7	9	2	12	13
Rural	14	3	4	6	6	0	4	10
<b>North</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>
Phongsaly	10	-	5	11	6	.	3	10
Luangnamtha	17	2	4	5	6	-	22	12
Oudomxay	13	6	4	5	3	-	4	10
Bokeo	32	4	4	6	5	2	4	23
Luangprabang	13	1	4	6	5	-	0	9
Huaphanh	18	1	5	7	8	2	2	14
Xayabury	19	2	5	8	7	0	4	12
<b>Central</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>
Vientiane C.	15	89	2	7	9	1	15	15
Xiengkhuang	12	0	5	7	6	1	5	10
Vientiane	14	10	5	6	7	1	13	10
Borikhamxay	15	3	3	6	6	0	-	10
Khammuane	13	-	2	5	6	1	2	10
Savannakhet	13	1	7	8	7	3	9	10
Xaysomboun SR	9	-	3	5	3	-	16	6
<b>South</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
Saravane	9	0	3	5	4	0	1	6
Sekong	9	6	1	7	5	0	0	7
Champasack	9	6	3	6	6	0	1	7
Attapeu	17	2	4	6	8	0	-	11

Almost 30% of the households use chemical fertilizers in the production. There are large differences between the regions, in the North only 9% of the households use chemical fertilizers. 15% of the households use insecticides and/or pesticides.




### 5.3. Household businesses

28 % of the Lao households operate at least one household business. It is more common among urban households to operate a business, 63% of the urban households operate a business whereas only 17 % of the rural households operate a business.

Some households have registered business incomes without having a household business. This is mainly the case in rural households where home-made textiles are produced for sale. If we include those households we find that 46 % of the households have household business activities (68% of the urban households and 38% of the rural households).

Household businesses are small scale operations. The average turnover is less than 3 million KIP per month, a bit over 5 million in urban and 1 million in rural areas.



**Table 5.12: Per cent of households operating a business**

	Households operating busi- ness %	Households operating one business %	Households operating two businesses %	Households operating three or more businesses %
<b>Total country</b>	28	23	4	1
Urban	63	50	12	2
Rural	17	14	2	0
<b>North</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>
Phongsaly	5	4	1	0
Luangnamtha	14	13	1	0
Oudomxay	7	6	1	0
Bokeo	16	13	2	0
Luangprabang	39	27	10	2
Huaphanh	10	9	0	0
Xayaboury	36	30	6	1
<b>Center</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
Vientiane C.	63	49	12	2
Xiengkhuang	20	17	3	0
Vientiane P.	31	27	4	1
Borikhamxay	17	15	3	0
Khammuane	26	21	4	1
Savannakhet	23	18	4	1
Xaysombone	12	11	1	0
<b>South</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Saravane	11	10	2	0
Sekong	13	11	1	0
Champasack	31	28	2	1
Attapeu	23	21	2	0

**Table 5.13: Household business, by region , 1000 Kip/business household per month**

	HH with business* %	Revenues from:					Costs for:						Entrepreneurial income
		Trade	Production	Comm work	Services	Others	Materials	Goods resale	OP cost	Wages	Tools	Other costs	
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>28,272</b>	<b>2,735</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>1,987</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>3,350</b>	<b>20,085</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>9,019</b>
Urban	68	54,341	5,109	440	2,943	1,333	7,387	38,481	1,053	1,003	218	450	15,573
Rural	38	10,336	1,101	320	1,329	227	572	7,429	451	265	49	36	4,510
North	46	17,272	3,077	360	1,784	558	2,622	10,018	811	511	135	55	8,899
Central	51	35,776	2,991	434	2,216	879	4,047	27,195	692	725	100	306	9,231
South	36	23,999	1,230	168	1,604	231	2,396	15,369	491	141	145	150	8,541

\* Households that have business incomes and/or business costs in the diary

**Table 5.14: Household businesses, in charge of operation**

	Men %	Women %	Total %
<b>Total country</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>
Urban	38	62	100
Rural	57	43	100

**Table 5.15: Household businesses by number of employees and number of household members usually working in the business**

	Percent of household businesses having:				Percent of household businesses having:			
	No employees	One employee	Two to four employees	5 or more employees	No Hh members	One hh member	Two to four Hh members	5 or more hh members
Lao PDR	78	12	8	2	5	59	35	1
Urban	76	12	10	2	6	56	37	2
Rural	81	11	6	2	4	65	31	0

## 5.4. Productivity

Productivity is here defined as the gross revenue per hour of work. The return is to cover costs for inputs into the business and the owner's remuneration and profit. The figures for agriculture cannot be compared with other business as this mainly is trade with high gross revenue compared to net revenue.

In agriculture the productivity is highest in Xayabury province. Somewhat surprisingly the North is slightly better off than the Center and much better off than the South. This is partly due to a very high productivity in Bokeo province.

Household businesses in urban areas have on average much better productivity than household businesses in rural areas.

**Table 5.16: Productivity (revenue per hours of work) by sector and by provinces and regions. Revenue and hours in millions per month. (Persons 10+)**

	Agriculture			Household business		
	Revenue	Hours	Rev. Kip/hrs	Revenue	Hours	Rev Kip/hrs
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>439,242</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>1,392</b>	<b>1,160,835</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>13,701</b>
Urban	62,513	42	1,506	898,295	56	16,042
Rural	376,729	274	1,375	262,540	29	9,139
<b>North</b>	<b>165,468</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>1,473</b>	<b>260,446</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16,034</b>
Phongsaly	11,618	13	882	1,158	1	986
Luangnamtha	13,110	11	1,242	13,162	2	8,151
Oudomxay	19,386	19	1,033	12,774	1	11,510
Bokeo	15,023	6	2,455	4,716	1	7,436
Luangprabang	27,300	21	1,280	113,719	5	21,122
Huaphanh	21,337	19	1,099	14,201	1	10,644
Xayabury	57,694	23	2,513	100,717	5	20,174
<b>Central</b>	<b>202,452</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>1,464</b>	<b>754,840</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>13,978</b>
Vientiane C.	32,291	19	1,674	335,180	25	13,415
Xiengkhuang	19,104	12	1,535	21,201	2	12,362
Vientiane	36,200	21	1,715	82,436	7	11,474
Borikhamxay	20,227	16	1,227	75,344	8	8,969
Khammuane	29,635	19	1,570	31,406	3	11,544
Savannakhet	61,984	48	1,299	208,246	9	23,618
Xaysomboun SR	3,010	2	1,294	1,026	0	5,755
<b>South</b>	<b>71,323</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1,098</b>	<b>145,549</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10,053</b>
Saravane	21,161	25	858	30,507	2	14,345
Sekong	5,882	5	1,160	6,717	1	10,695
Champasack	36,482	30	1,202	72,939	10	6,995
Attapeu	7,797	5	1,592	35,387	1	27,315


## 5.5. Restrictions

The most important restrictions for earning more money were insects, lack of irrigation and lack of credits. Lack of jobs in urban areas was likewise important, and lack of knowledge and markets, particularly in rural areas was also ranked high. Flooding was an important restriction in some of the provinces in the center and south.

Lack of land was ranked high in provinces like Vientiane C., Sekong, Champasack and Xayabury but otherwise not so high. Also lack of fertile soil was considered a problem in some provinces (Sekong, Attapeu, Savannaketh and Phongsaly).

Lack of transport is high ranked restriction in rural areas without access to road

The data were supplied by the village chiefs.



**Table 5.17: Most important restrictions for not earning more money, by provinces and regions in 2002/03. Percent of villages having the restriction**

	Lack of jobs	Lack of credits	Lack of irrigation	Lack of knowledge	Lack of market	Insects	Animal disease
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>59</b>
Urban	62	46	50	50	21	40	33
Rural with road	39	63	66	56	63	69	66
Rural without road	29	72	63	61	71	68	68
<b>North</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>61</b>
Phongsaly	14	38	35	19	54	62	38
Luangnamtha	25	51	86	55	38	69	75
Oudomxay	32	71	72	46	74	68	71
Bokeo	85	83	69	53	64	55	51
Luangprabang	11	68	40	60	49	62	75
Huaphanh	21	60	59	57	45	52	47
Xayaboury	52	52	64	40	54	69	54
<b>Center</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>
Vientiane C.	57	61	42	61	40	43	33
Xiengkhuang	20	59	61	53	62	41	58
Vientiane P.	46	61	64	58	66	65	76
Borikhamxay	29	37	73	57	49	52	37
Khammuane	50	74	68	48	49	61	58
Savannakhet	43	64	75	62	63	62	72
Xaysomboon SR	33	60	62	47	10	68	49
<b>South</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>60</b>
Saravane	46	63	68	71	61	74	61
Sekong	33	61	69	54	44	88	53
Champasack	63	64	65	61	67	86	61
Attapeu	35	37	55	40	41	66	55

## 5.6. Household investments/construction

Eleven out of one hundred households were investing in new houses or made extension of old houses. These households invested on average almost 1.2 million kip/year. Almost 98% of the investments concern residential buildings.

Construction activity is substantially larger in urban areas than in rural areas.

Household's investments in buildings of approximately 950,000 million KIP are roughly 5 percent of the value of all goods and services produced in Lao PDR. It is thus a very important factor of the economy in the country.

**Table 5.18 : Average investment/construction per household by type and by province, 1000 Kip**

	% of HH engaged	Cost for material + hired labor	Own labor	Total investment	Residential Building	Agr. building	Business building
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>1,095</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1,169</b>	<b>1,068</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>
Urban	13.3	2,367	136	2,503	2,315	11	42
Rural	9.8	607	51	658	590	13	4
<b>North</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>786</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>
Phongsaly	3.2	476	8	483	471	-	5
Luangnamtha	9.3	1,478	39	1,517	1,478	-	-
Oudomxay	13.2	1,020	27	1,047	987	32	1
Bokeo	1.6	28	3	31	28	-	-
Luangprabang	10.2	630	15	645	623	7	-
Huaphanh	9.6	765	134	900	762	4	-
Xayabury	16.1	994	80	1,074	960	31	3
<b>Central</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>1,322</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>1,414</b>	<b>1,283</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>26</b>
Vientiane C.	13.0	2,371	46	2,417	2,338	13	20
Xiengkhuang	8.2	495	38	534	461	28	6
Vientiane	15.0	1,578	101	1,680	1,556	17	5
Borikhamxay	13.5	672	75	747	648	24	-
Khammuane	7.5	1,041	229	1,269	907	8	126
Savannakhet	10.6	798	75	873	791	4	3
Xaysomboun SR	23.2	771	282	1,053	539	104	128
<b>South</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>1,014</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1,089</b>	<b>1,001</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Saravane	3.9	388	14	402	386	2	0
Sekong	8.1	619	89	708	594	-	24
Champasack	12.3	1,287	115	1,402	1,267	9	10
Attapeu	7.7	1,601	21	1,622	1,597	4	-

**Table 5.19: Total Investment in residential buildings, agriculture buildings and business buildings in 2002/03: Million Kip**


	Total household investment in:				Per cent investment in:		
	Residential building	Agricultural building	Business building	Total Investment	Residential building	Agricultural building	Business building
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>925,840</b>	<b>10,459</b>	<b>12,479</b>	<b>948,778</b>	<b>97.6</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Urban	555,815	2,544	10,061	568,419	97.8	0.4	1.8
Rural	370,026	7,915	2,418	380,359	97.3	2.1	0.6
<b>North</b>	<b>204,955</b>	<b>3,591</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>208,911</b>	<b>98.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.2</b>
Phongsaly	11,566	-	126	11,692	98.9	-	1.1
Luangnamtha	33,830	-	-	33,830	100.0	-	-
Oudomxay	37,803	1,234	48	39,085	96.7	3.2	0.1
Bokeo	708	-	-	708	100.0	-	-
Luangprabang	37,876	443	-	38,319	98.8	1.2	-
Huaphanh	27,895	134	-	28,029	99.5	0.5	-
Xayabury	55,279	1,779	191	57,248	96.6	3.1	0.3
<b>Central</b>	<b>542,780</b>	<b>5,813</b>	<b>10,818</b>	<b>559,411</b>	<b>97.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>
Vientiane C.	258,941	1,456	2,222	262,619	98.6	0.6	0.8
Xiengkhuang	13,639	828	184	14,651	93.1	5.7	1.3
Vientiane	95,732	1,045	325	97,101	98.6	1.1	0.3
Borikhamxay	24,582	898	-	25,480	96.5	3.5	-
Khammuane	50,190	433	6,948	57,571	87.2	0.8	12.1
Savannakhet	96,488	533	378	97,399	99.1	0.5	0.4
Xaysomboun SR	3,209	620	760	4,590	69.9	13.5	16.6
<b>South</b>	<b>178,105</b>	<b>1,055</b>	<b>1,296</b>	<b>180,456</b>	<b>98.7</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>
Saravane	19,651	112	5	19,786	99.4	0.6	0.0
Sekong	7,280	-	297	7,577	96.1	-	3.9
Champasack	123,417	868	994	125,278	98.5	0.7	0.8
Attapeu	27,758	75	-	27,833	99.7	0.3	-

## 5.7. Possession of goods

There is a significant difference in possession of durable goods between households in urban and rural areas. Cars, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines and mobile phones are more or less urban phenomena.

Motorbikes have become common all over the country except provinces in the very north and Xaysombon SR and Sekong.

Both urban and rural households have been able to increase their possession of most durable goods. Vientiane Capital is by far the most affluent province. The South is generally better off than the North.



**Table 5.20: Possession of durable goods, per cent of households by provinces and regions 2002/03.**

	Car	Motor bike	Bike	TV	Radio/video	Mobile phone	Refrigerator	Vacuum cleaner	Washing machine	Electric rice cooker
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>
Urban	11	54	71	76	53	10	59	3	11	58
Rural	1	11	48	30	43	1	10	0	1	9
<b>North</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>
Phongsaly	3	3	9	14	38	0	2	0	1	2
Luangnamtha	2	6	39	15	42	1	2	0	0	0
Oudomxay	1	6	22	14	35	2	8	0	1	9
Bokeo	2	9	28	29	49	1	7	1	1	6
Luangprabang	2	13	27	18	49	1	11	1	3	11
Huaphanh	0	13	40	19	58	1	8	0	1	11
Xayaboury	4	20	56	39	54	1	10	0	1	8
<b>Center</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>32</b>
Vientiane C.	15	65	69	86	53	14	77	4	17	74
Xiangkhuang	2	18	46	24	53	0	1	0	1	1
Vientiane P.	4	25	64	51	44	1	27	0	1	28
Borikhamxay	6	23	60	46	47	3	20	0	2	22
Khammuane	3	15	49	41	38	2	22	1	2	16
Savannakhet	2	18	72	45	46	1	20	1	1	19
Xaysomboon SR	0	7	27	11	62	1	1	0	0	1
<b>South</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>
Saravane	1	11	58	30	35	0	11	0	1	9
Sekong	0	6	35	21	34	1	8	0	0	7
Champasack	1	21	66	52	42	1	20	0	1	18
Attapeu	1	14	66	15	33	1	8	0	0	11



**Table 5.21: Possession of durable goods 1997/98 and 2002/03. Per cent of households.**


		Car	Motor bike	Bike	TV	Re- frig- erator	Va- cuum clean- er	Wash- ing ma- chine	Electric rice cooker
<b>2002/03</b>	<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>
	<i>Urban</i>	11	54	71	76	59	3	11	58
	<i>Rural</i>	1	11	48	30	10	0	1	9
<b>1997/98</b>	<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>
	<i>Urban</i>	12	49	80	72	48	3	8	47
	<i>Rural</i>	2	8	52	22	4	0	0	4

## 5.8. Sustainable use of land

Rotational (shifting) cultivation is the most common agricultural practice, but it seems to have increased substantially compared to 1997/98. The frequency of pioneering cultivation practice (slash and burn) has on the other hand been reduced to about half the level it was in 1997/98

Deforestation is mainly a problem in Xayabury and more in the South than in other parts of the country.

Assistance in implementation of government projects is quite evenly distributed among regions.



**Table 5.22: Agricultural practices, by provinces and regions 2002/03, % of villages**


	Agricultural practices mostly used in the villages		Villages with deforestation	Villages receiving agriculture extension workers	Land and forestry project implemented	Villages with development project
	Rotational (shifting cultivation)	Pioneering (slash and burn)				
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>46</b>
Urban	75	25	21	50	39	47
Rural with road	84	16	14	55	48	49
Rural without road	64	36	7	34	31	38
<b>North</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>36</b>
Phongsaly	65	35	0	19	38	64
Luangnamtha	40	60	5	50	34	52
Oudomxay	49	51	3	58	69	30
Bokeo	49	51	6	30	65	58
Luangprabang	83	17	7	61	30	23
Huaphanh	50	50	2	31	12	16
Xayaboury	100	0	53	87	100	56
<b>Center</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>52</b>
Vientiane C.	80	20	17	69	28	65
Xiengkhuang	70	30	8	25	9	43
Vientiane P.	97	3	29	74	59	61
Borikhamxay	92	8	21	45	80	44
Khammuane	97	3	10	45	24	65
Savannakhet	83	17	2	41	30	44
Xaysomboon SR	87	13	6	49	71	32
<b>South</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>51</b>
Saravane	60	40	34	63	31	58
Sekong	97	3	10	64	52	47
Champasack	81	19	25	34	54	51
Attapeu	66	34	0	48	81	30

## 6. Time use

On average a person 10 years and above spend 6.3 hours per day on economic activities. 5 hours are income generating and the rest refers to home activities.

There are significant urban/rural differences especially in work as employed, own business work and agricultural work.

Tables 6.2 and 6.3 demonstrate that women work more per day than their male peers. Working on income generating activities plus household work occupies women 7 hours per day compared to 5.8 hours for men.



**Table 6.1: Time use for economic activities, by provinces and regions in 2002/03, hours per day.**

	Work as employed	Own business work	Agricultural work	Collecting firewood	Fetching water	Hunting, fishing	Construction	Handicraft etc.	Cooking cleaning	Care	Total
<b>Lao PDR</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>
Urban	1.4	1.7	1.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.9	0.5	6.3
Rural with road	0.3	0.4	2.8	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.7	6.2
Rural without road	0.1	0.3	3.0	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.0	0.3	0.8	0.9	6.6
<b>North</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>6.3</b>
Phongsaly	0.1	0.3	3.5	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.9	7.1
Luangnamtha	0.4	0.5	2.9	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.8	6.5
Oudomxay	0.3	0.2	3.1	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.9	6.4
Bokeo	0.1	0.2	1.8	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.8	4.3
Luangprabang	0.5	0.7	2.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.5	0.8	0.7	6.5
Huaphanh	0.2	0.3	3.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.9	0.7	6.8
Xayaboury	0.3	0.7	2.8	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.4	5.9
<b>Center</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>6.4</b>
Vientiane C.	1.7	1.6	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.9	0.4	6.4
Xiengkhuang	0.2	0.4	2.7	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.7	6.0
Vientiane P.	0.6	0.9	2.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.9	0.6	6.2
Borikhamxay	0.3	1.8	2.6	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.8	7.9
Khammuane	0.4	0.4	2.0	0.2	0.2	1.0	0.1	0.3	0.8	0.8	6.1
Savannakhet	0.6	0.5	2.2	0.3	0.1	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.9	0.6	6.3
Xaysomboon SR	0.3	0.3	3.1	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.2	1.3	0.7	7.0
<b>South</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>6.2</b>
Saravane	0.1	0.3	3.1	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.7	6.6
Sekong	0.4	0.4	3.0	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.7	6.2
Champasack	0.6	0.8	2.0	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	1.1	0.6	6.2
Attapeu	0.3	0.6	1.5	0.2	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.3	5.0

**Table 6.2: Time use by sex, hours per day**

Activity	Male	Female	All
Sleeping	8.8	8.7	8.7
Eating, drinking, personal care	2.7	2.6	2.6
School	1.3	0.9	1.1
Work as employed	0.8	0.3	0.5
Own business work	0.6	0.8	0.7
Tending rice	1.3	1.3	1.3
Tending other crops	0.5	0.6	0.6
Tending animals	0.6	0.4	0.5
Collecting firewood	0.1	0.3	0.2
Fetching water	0.1	0.2	0.1
Hunting	0.2	0.0	0.1
Fishing	0.6	0.1	0.4
Buying/shopping	0.1	0.1	0.1
Construction	0.1	0.0	0.1
Weaving, sewing, textile care	0.0	0.4	0.2
Handicraft (not textile)	0.2	0.1	0.2
Cooking and baking	0.1	0.9	0.5
Washing, cleaning, do the dishes	0.1	0.4	0.3
Care for children/elderly	0.3	1.0	0.6
Travels	0.7	0.5	0.6
Leisure time	4.0	3.5	3.7
Others	0.9	0.7	0.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>

**Table 6.3: Time use on main activities by sex, hours per day**

Activity	Male	Female	All
Income generating activities	5.2	4.5	4.8
Work as employed	0.8	0.3	0.5
Own business work	0.6	0.8	0.7
Agricultural work	2.5	2.3	2.4
Collecting firewood/fetching water	0.2	0.5	0.3
Hunting/fishing	0.9	0.2	0.5
Construction	0.1	0.0	0.1
Handicraft	0.2	0.5	0.3
Household work	0.6	2.5	1.6
School	1.3	0.9	1.1
Sleeping, eating, leisure time	15.4	14.8	15.1
Travel, others	1.6	1.2	1.4

**Table 6.4: Time use by type of area, hours per day**

Activity	Urban	Rural with access to road	Rural without access to road	Total
Sleeping	8.5	8.8	8.9	8.7
Eating, drinking, personal care	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6
School	1.4	1.1	0.8	1.1
Work as employed	1.4	0.3	0.1	0.5
Own business work	1.7	0.4	0.2	0.7
Tending rice	0.5	1.5	1.7	1.3
Tending other crops	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.6
Tending animals	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5
Collecting firewood	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2
Fetching water	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1
Hunting	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1
Fishing	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4
Buying/shopping	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Construction	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Weaving, sewing, textile care	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Handicraft (not textile)	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2
Cooking and baking	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5
Washing, cleaning, do the dishes	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3
Care for children/elderly	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.6
Travels	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.6
Leisure time	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.7
Others	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>

**Table 6.5: Time use on main activities by type of area, hours per day**

Activity	Urban	Rural with access to road	Rural without access to road	Total
Income generating activities	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8
Work as employed	1.4	0.3	0.1	0.5
Own business work	1.7	0.4	0.2	0.7
Agricultural work	1.0	2.8	2.9	2.4
Collecting firewood/fetching water	0.1	0.4	0.6	0.3
Hunting/fishing	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.5
Construction	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Handicraft	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3
Household work	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.6
School	1.4	1.1	0.8	1.1
Sleeping, eating, leisure time	15.0	15.1	15.1	15.1
Travel, others	1.0	1.5	1.6	1.4