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Abstract

The authors calibrate two static computable general-equilibrium (CGE) models with 16 and 5999 representative households. Aggregated and disaggregated household categories are consistently embedded in a 2000 social accounting matrix (SAM) for Vietnam, mapping on a one-to-one basis. Distinct differences in poverty assessments emerge when the impact of trade liberalization is analyzed in the two models. This highlights the importance of modeling micro-household behavior and related income and expenditure distributions endogenously within a static CGE model framework. The simulations indicate that poverty will rise following a revenue-neutral lowering of trade taxes. This is interpreted as a worst-case scenario, which suggests that the government should be proactive in combining trade liberalization measures with a pro-poor fiscal response to avoid increasing poverty in the short to medium term.

1. Introduction

Vietnam has come a long way since the doi moi reforms were initiated in 1986. Wide-ranging institutional changes have been initiated, and Vietnam has, in parallel with domestic reforms, started a process of opening up its economy to regional and global economic forces. Openness to trade as measured by the share of imports and exports to gross domestic product (GDP) grew considerably during the 1990s. Nevertheless, average tariff rates increased from 10.7% in 1992 to 16.2% in 2000 as discussed by Niimi et al. (2003), and this is not consistent with Vietnam’s commitment to continuing and deepening the process of trade liberalization. Vietnam is a major world market actor in several important agricultural sectors including coffee, pepper, and rice, but is not yet a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Membership has, however, become a priority since China joined the WTO as its 143rd member in 2001, and Vietnam will no doubt face stern demands for trade liberalization before it can join the WTO. Yet, it is also becoming clear that Vietnam is willing to pay the price in terms of policy choices. Proactive integration in the international economy emerged as an overriding goal at the Ninth Party Congress as pointed out by the Central Institute of Economic Management (2003). Thus, there is in Vietnam an increasing need to understand how impending trade liberalization, including reduced trade taxes, may affect the wellbeing of poor people throughout the country. This need is further alluded to by Rama et al. (2004), who provide an encyclopedic picture of poverty in Vietnam.
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Measuring the poverty impact of macro policy interventions within a CGE model framework has recently been studied by Decaluwé et al. (1999) and Azis et al. (2001). Decaluwé et al. used a specific statistical distribution function as an approximation to the distribution of income within aggregate household categories. They argued, in particular, that the beta distribution represents a sufficiently flexible functional form so as to provide a more appropriate functional specification for within-household income distribution than the log-normal and Pareto distributions, which have previously been studied by Adelman and Robinson (1979) and de Janvry et al. (1991). Azis et al. also rely on a top-down modeling approach, but in contrast they used actual (nonparametric) income and expenditure distributions based on household survey data.

In this paper we aim at moving the existing methodology one step forward by solving a disaggregate CGE model for the entire distribution of income and consumption among a representative set of 5999 micro-households. By modeling micro-household behavior individually, we capture potentially important feedback effects from changes in the micro-level distribution of income and expenditures to macro-level variables. In addition, we allow for detailed assessments of the poverty impact of macro policies without having to rely on distributional approximations regarding intra-household income, and assumptions to shift these distributions in relation to changes in macro variables. To assess the importance of these feedback effects, we compare our results with poverty estimates derived from a top-down approach involving an aggregate CGE model with 16 household categories along the lines pursued by Decaluwé et al. and Azis et al.

2. Data and Model Framework

The data underlying the current analysis is the 1998 Vietnam Living Standards Survey (VLSS98) and the 2000 Vietnam Social Accounting Matrix (VSAM) established by Tarp et al. (2002). The VSAM includes accounts for 97 activities and commodities, 14 factors, 16 households, and three enterprises, as well as accounts for the current government budget, capital accumulation, inventories, and the balance of payments. The factors include capital and land in addition to 12 different kinds of labor categorized according to gender (male/female), location (rural/urban) and educational level (low/medium/high). Similarly, households are categorized according to location (rural/urban), gender of the head of household (male/female), and employment status of the head of household (farmer/self-employed/wage-worker/non-employed).

The disaggregation of the VSAM household account into 16 separate household categories was based on information from VLSS98. This survey includes 5999 households making up a countrywide representative sample. The first step was to categorize the micro-households into the aggregate categories in VSAM. Based on a mapping, which allocated each micro-household to one and only one aggregate category, income and expenditure patterns of the micro-households were aggregated to derive priors for the income and expenditure patterns of the 16 aggregate categories. This information was subsequently used in deriving the consistent VSAM matrix.

The mapping between the aggregate household categories from VSAM and the micro-households from VLSS98 was in turn used to establish a consistent economy-wide Vietnamese SAM with 5999 micro-households. Since each aggregate household category was made up of a unique set of micro-households, the problem of disaggregating household categories into micro-households consisted of 16 sub-problems, each representing a standard problem in achieving consistency among SAM data accounts.
Consistency was achieved for each of the micro-household accounts by applying minimum cross entropy as proposed by Golan et al. (1994).

To make the above calculations feasible, the dimensions of the production and goods sectors were reduced, so the original 97 activity and commodity accounts were aggregated into 10 accounts. They consist of three agricultural accounts (rice, other agricultural crops, and livestock and fishery), three industrial accounts (mining and oil, food processing, and manufacturing), and four service sectors (water and gas, construction, trade, and other services). Altogether, the fully consistent micro-household SAM dataset used in this paper contains 10 activities, 10 commodities, 14 factors, 5999 households, and three enterprises, in addition to accounts for the current government budget, capital accumulation, inventories, and the balance of payments.

From a methodological point of view, the creation of the full SAM dataset can be seen as a two-step procedure, whereby a consistent SAM with 16 aggregate household categories is established in the first step, whereas the full disaggregation into 5999 micro-households is left to a second step. The two-step procedure is useful in the current case, since it breaks one large statistical balancing problem into 16 smaller and more manageable tasks. Another important aspect of our procedure is that it allows for reconciling micro-household income and expenditure information with available macro totals.

Key features of the Vietnamese economy can be derived from VSAM. The overall structure of the economy, including the composition of value-added, exports, and imports, as well as measures of international trade, is presented in Table 1. The composition of value-added confirms the continuing importance of primary agriculture sectors in the Vietnamese economy. The combined value-added of rice, other agricultural crops, and livestock and fish accounts for more than 26% of total value-added, while food processing accounts for more than 7%. In contrast, the manufacturing sector contributes a mere 11%, so Vietnam is still at the beginning of her economic transformation to a more developed economy. This is so in spite of the impressive growth rates recorded over the last decade in combination with successful policy to change the demographic structure of the population and reduce the dependency ratios.

### Table 1. Structure of the Economy (percentages)

| Category                    | VA  | E   | M   | E/X  | M/Q  |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|------|------|
| Rice                        | 9.3 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 2.9  | 0.3  |
| Other agriculture crops     | 10.1| 8.6 | 2.7 | 37.6 | 12.5 |
| Livestock and fish          | 7.2 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 16.4 | 0.9  |
| Oil, gas, and mining        | 8.7 | 17.5| 2.2 | 77.1 | 9.4  |
| Food processing             | 7.3 | 16.3| 5.4 | 33.4 | 10.6 |
| Manufacturing               | 11.1| 27.0| 76.0| 41.4 | 53.1 |
| Water, gas and electricity  | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0  | 1.3  |
| Construction                | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0  | 0.0  |
| Trade                       | 12.8| 8.2 | 0.0 | 27.5 | 0.0  |
| Other services              | 25.0| 18.0| 13.3| 24.6 | 16.1 |
| Totals                      | 100.0| 100.0| 100.0| 28.3 | 29.3 |

VA, value-added; E, exports; M, imports; X, production; Q, demand.
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The importance of the primary agricultural sector in value-added creation is not directly mirrored in export performance. Primary agricultural goods account for less than 13% of total exports. However, export trade shares of production are very high for the primary extraction industries, and other agricultural crops (excluding rice paddy) also export more than a third of their production. These relatively high trade shares are a reflection of the focused export strategy, which the Vietnamese government has pursued over the last decade. A strong state focus on reallocating resources towards the expansion of key export cash crops such as coffee and pepper has, in combination with appropriate economic policy, made Vietnam a key player in several world commodity markets. Moreover, processing industries account for more than 16% of total exports, indicating that agricultural goods are increasingly being processed before they are sold on export markets. This is encouraging from a development perspective. It suggests that Vietnam is on the way towards a more diversified economic structure, but Vietnam continues of course to be vulnerable to international price shocks.

The vulnerability to international events is highlighted by the fact that imports are completely dominated by manufactured goods. They account for more than 75% of total imports. This reflects that while import shares are relatively low in most sectors, Vietnam is strongly dependent on imports of capital goods for the development of the food processing and manufacturing sectors. It is fortunate that the steady performance of the Vietnamese macro economy in recent years has strengthened her international creditworthiness. In particular, domestic political stability combined with improved opportunities for foreign investors have certainly helped promote foreign direct investment, and other capital inflows are high. Exposure to international terms of trade is gradually becoming less of a problem.

The structure of indirect taxes, including trade taxes, which are in focus in the current paper, is presented in Table 2. VSAM includes three sets of indirect taxes: value-added taxes (VAT), export taxes (TE), and import tariffs (TM), and VAT rates range from around 3% in food processing, manufacturing, and construction sectors to 6–8% in the remaining seven primary production and service sectors. The structure of production taxes therefore seems to provide a small incentive bias in favor of food processing and

### Table 2. Structure of Indirect Taxes (percentages)

|          | VAT/X | TE/E | TM/M |
|----------|-------|------|------|
| Rice     | 7.3   | 22.1 | 5.5  |
| Other agriculture crops | 8.0   | 4.1  | 5.0  |
| Livestock and fish | 6.0   | 4.1  | 6.4  |
| Oil, gas, and mining | 7.0   | 1.8  | 3.0  |
| Food processing | 2.6   | 0.3  | 13.8 |
| Manufacturing | 3.0   | 3.0  | 6.6  |
| Water, gas and electricity | 6.4   | 0.0  | 0.5  |
| Construction | 2.9   | 0.0  | 0.0  |
| Trade     | 7.5   | 0.0  | 0.0  |
| Other services | 6.1   | 0.0  | 0.0  |
| Totals    | 5.1   | 1.8  | 6.0  |

VAT, value-added taxes; X, production; E, exports; TE, export taxes; M, imports; TM, import taxes.
manufacturing. This incentive bias is mirrored in the structure of export taxes, which are consistently higher for primary agricultural exports as compared to food processing and manufacturing exports. The export tax rate is particularly high on rice paddy, indicating a significant bias against domestic producers of paddy. At the same time, this creates a significant implicit subsidy for domestic producers of processed rice, which promotes exports of processed rice. The strategy of protection and promotion of processed food sectors, including processed rice, is further underlined by the relatively high import tariffs levied on this sector. All this helps explain the export performance referred to above.

The differential economic characteristics across the three geographical regions (North, Center, and South) are clearly of interest in interpreting the simulation results in this paper. Overall, the VSAM dataset indicates that respectively 46% and 33% of total household income is generated in the South and in the North, while 21% is generated in the Center. This distribution reflects in part that the industrially developed South has higher average wages than other regions of Vietnam. At the same time, Table 3 shows that household income in the South stems mainly from low-skilled labor sources for both rural and urban people. This confirms that low-skilled labor wages are significantly higher in the South as compared to the Center and North. At the same time, transfers from the state account for significant proportions of household income in the North and Center, but less so in the South. Urban households in the northern region are particularly dependent on state transfers.

The regional structure of poverty reported in Table 4 shows that poverty is mainly a rural phenomenon in Vietnam, and poverty is clearly most severe in the Center and

| Table 3. Regional Structure of Household Income Sources (percentages) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Northern region** | **Central region** | **Southern region** |
| **Rural** | **Urban** | **Rural** | **Urban** | **Rural** | **Urban** |
| Low-skill labor | 59 | 35 | 55 | 47 | 75 | 64 |
| Medium-skill labor | 15 | 22 | 19 | 22 | 10 | 16 |
| High-skill labor | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Land | 4 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 6 |
| Capital | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| State | 18 | 31 | 16 | 12 | 6 | 6 |
| Domestic income | 64 | 36 | 71 | 29 | 46 | 54 |

| Table 4. Regional Structure of Poverty and Population |
|-----------------------------------------------------|
| **Northern region** | **Central region** | **Southern region** |
| **Rural** | **Urban** | **Rural** | **Urban** | **Rural** | **Urban** |
| Poverty headcount (%) | 41 | 6 | 46 | 5 | 30 | 2 |
| Poverty gap (billion VND) | 5601 | 128 | 4908 | 42 | 2767 | 81 |
| Poor (million people) | 9.4 | 0.3 | 8.3 | 0.1 | 6.0 | 0.2 |
| Population (million people) | 22.9 | 5.4 | 18.0 | 3.0 | 20.1 | 8.3 |
North where 41–46% of rural people are poor, as compared to a national headcount index of 31.3%. Rural monetary poverty gaps are also very high in the North and Center, amounting to between VND 4900 and 5600 billion (US$ 350–400 million). Turning to the number of poor, there are 8.3 million rural poor in the Center and 9.4 million in the North, whereas 6.0 million people are poor in the South. Finally, corresponding to the poverty headcounts, the total population is relatively equally distributed from North to South, although the Center is clearly the smallest region. Urbanization is relatively high in the South and relatively low in the Center.

Our model framework is similar to the model put forward by Arndt et al. (2000). We use this basis to construct two Vietnamese CGEs, which differ only in the level of disaggregation of the household sector; in all other respects, the two models are similar. We rely on Cobb–Douglas specifications for production of value-added and Leontief specifications for determining intermediate demand. In addition, a linear expenditure system (LES) is relied on for household consumption, including home consumption of goods at the activity level, and marketed consumption of goods at the commodity level. Savings and tax rates are calibrated from VSAM, and most rates are kept fixed throughout the simulations. Finally, constant elasticity of transformation (CET) functions determine the supply of goods for the export market, and Armington (CES) specifications establish the demand for imported goods.

The LES was implemented by assuming zero minimum consumption levels. The CET and CES functional relationships were implemented by assuming that transformation and substitution elasticities for the 10 Vietnamese commodities are similar to estimates derived in Arndt et al. (2002). In general, the closures of the two models include full employment of factor resources, savings-driven investment, as well as a flexible real exchange rate, and fixed foreign savings inflows. The assumption of full employment of factors is justified by the fact that we are conducting a short- to medium-term analysis of trade reforms, and a closure rule with a flexible exchange rate and fixed foreign capital inflows seems reasonable due to the focus of the Vietnamese government on domestic and external macroeconomic balance. The closure of the government budget varies with the set of experiments. Most experiments use a standard revenue-neutral closure, where uniform variation in household tax rates make up for lost revenue from reduced trade taxes. The general focus on a revenue-neutral government closure is also consistent with the focus on domestic macroeconomic balance. Moreover, the use of lump-sum income taxes allows for the proper measurement of efficiency loses due to trade taxation. Finally, the consumer price index for marketed goods is used as price numéraire.

The current static model setup assumes a relatively simple specification of the factor market. Labor is perfectly mobile between production sectors, but cannot upgrade skills or migrate between rural and urban areas. Thus, different labor skill categories are treated as separate production factors, as is typical in a static short- to medium-term analysis. Nevertheless, the disaggregation of the labor market makes it possible to capture the importance of heterogeneity in the composition of initial factor endowments among micro-households within aggregate household categories. Similarly, we capture the significance of differences in consumption patterns of micro-households. The macroeconomic significance of disaggregating household categories in relation to reductions in trade taxes and tariffs therefore arises from: (i) the supply side where changes in the relative protection/taxation of domestic production sectors feed through to relative factor prices and the distribution of household income, and (ii) the demand side where changes in relative consumer price indices affect the distribution of consumption among individual micro-households.
The model framework was implemented on the basis of the VSAM dataset with 16 aggregated household categories and with 5999 disaggregated micro-households. In applying the aggregate model, a top-down approach was used to study the distributional impact at micro level. The top-down approach covers two ways of calculating poverty indices based on macro-prices, including (i) the simple application of representative household consumption growth rates to derive consumption and poverty indices for all micro-households in the respective categories, and (ii) the application of aggregate factor prices to initial factor endowments for each of the 5999 micro-households to derive the impact on micro-household income, and the subsequent application of (new) tax and savings rates to derive micro-household consumption and poverty.6

Different dimensions of poverty can be analyzed using the traditional Foster–Greer–Thorbecke (FGT) measures of poverty. These measures are convenient since they allow for simple additive decompositions among household groupings with different characteristics. In the present analysis, we use the FGT poverty headcount \( P_0 \) to measure the relative number of poor individuals within a specific household grouping (region). We do not, however, rely on the poverty gap measure \( P_1 \), which is a measure of average poverty per individual—poor or nonpoor. Instead we use the monetary poverty gap \( \text{POVGAP} \), which relates specifically to poor individuals, and which is defined as the total amount of money necessary to raise the income of all poor households to the poverty line. Our poverty indices are calculated on the basis of an updated poverty line for 2000, derived from the “cost of basic needs” (CBN) methodology. The updated poverty line for 2000, which accounts for basic food and nonfood expenditures, amounts to 1.68 million Vietnamese dong (VND) or approximately US$120 per year. The poverty line updates the official poverty line for 1998 of 1.65 million VND based on official price changes for food and nonfood items.7

3. Results

Our set of trade policy experiments is outlined in Table 5. They include a base-run experiment, which replicates the underlying 2000 Vietnam SAM dataset. Experiment 1 measures the impact of eliminating export taxes, while we eliminate all import tariffs in experiment 2. Finally, experiment 3 brings out the combined effect of removing all trade taxes. In what follows we first use this set of experiments to address various methodological issues and the impact on (spatial) poverty more narrowly. Subsequently, we discuss the impact of our trade policy experiments in greater detail, including a review of macroeconomic indicators and other dimensions of poverty. This more elaborate analysis of the impact of trade liberalization on the distribution of welfare and poverty in Vietnam is based on results from the model with 5999 endogenous micro-households, assuming a revenue-neutral government budget closure.

| Table 5. Trade Tax Experiments |
|--------------------------------|
| Base run | Calibrated 2000 SAM values |
| Experiment 1 | Elimination of export taxes |
| Experiment 2 | Elimination of import tariffs |
| Experiment 3 | Experiments 1 and 2 |
Endogenous Micro-households and Government Budget Closure

Table 6 presents the impact of trade liberalization on monetary poverty gaps, when the income distribution of micro-households is (i) modeled endogenously using the model with 5999 micro-households, and (ii) derived from top-down procedures without feedback effects using the model with 16 representative households. Two top-down approaches are distinguished including (a) the application of representative household consumption growth rates to micro-household consumption, and (b) the application of aggregate factor prices to initial micro-household factor endowments and the subsequent derivation of micro-household consumption and poverty.

The elimination of export taxes in experiment 1 has a relatively small impact on regional poverty, regardless of the treatment of micro-households. However, poverty declines with endogenous micro-households and increases with the aggregate consumption top-down approach, while it remains (virtually) unchanged with the disaggregate factor income top-down approach. The fact that the overall impact switches sign when micro-households are modeled endogenously is an important methodological observation. Moreover, since the direction of impact is the same across regions, for each of the three approaches, it appears that the differential impacts are due to household characteristics, which are similar across regions.

Poverty is mainly a rural phenomenon, and we know that poor rural households have (i) relatively high agricultural consumption propensities, and (ii) relatively high factor endowments of unskilled rural labor. This suggests both that increasing agricultural terms of trade should have a relatively direct beneficial impact on poor households in all three regions, and that there may be positive feedback effects on poverty as the poor are predominantly consuming goods, which are produced by the poor themselves. The elimination of export taxes does indeed increase agricultural terms of trade as well as relative unskilled rural (male) wages, as can be seen from Tables 8 and 11. We will return to discussion of these tables later, but argue here that the model with endogenous households captures positive feedback effects of increasing rural incomes, on which the other top-down approaches miss out.

Table 6. Monetary Poverty Gaps and Income Distribution (percentage changes)

| Income distribution | Region          | Base run (10^3 VND) | Exp. 1 | Exp. 2 | Exp. 3 |
|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Endogenous          | North           | 5.729               | −0.3   | 1.1    | 0.9    |
|                     | Center          | 4.949               | −0.1   | 1.1    | 1.0    |
|                     | South           | 2.848               | −0.2   | 1.9    | 1.8    |
|                     | Total           | 13.526              | −0.2   | 1.3    | 1.1    |
| Top-down            | North           | 5.729               | 0.3    | 1.6    | 2.0    |
| (aggregate consumption) | Center    | 4.949               | 0.3    | 1.6    | 2.0    |
|                     | South           | 2.848               | 0.4    | 2.2    | 2.7    |
|                     | Total           | 13.526              | 0.3    | 1.7    | 2.2    |
| Top-down            | North           | 5.729               | 0.0    | 1.1    | 1.3    |
| (disaggregate factor income) | Center    | 4.949               | 0.1    | 1.0    | 1.2    |
|                     | South           | 2.848               | 0.0    | 1.6    | 1.7    |
|                     | Total           | 13.526              | 0.0    | 1.2    | 1.3    |
The “aggregate consumption” top-down approach only captures aggregate consumption growth among the representative households. Increasing household taxes introduced to compensate for lower export tax revenues therefore lead to an increase in poverty. The in-between “disaggregate factor income” top-down approach captures the relative increase in rural unskilled wages. This relative increase in the income of poor rural households is (just) enough to compensate for increasing household tax rates. This approach therefore predicts, as shown in Table 6, that poverty remains unchanged. In contrast, the “endogenous household” approach captures both the relative increase in rural unskilled wages (following from the change in the terms of trade) as well as the positive feedback effects, and they more than compensate for increasing household tax rates. In this case, we therefore obtain that the elimination of export taxes will lower poverty uniformly across all regions of Vietnam.

In sum, the general intuition behind the above result is that agricultural exports are taxed disproportionately, and lower taxation therefore lowers the bias against poor agriculture-dependent households. Moreover, the methodological importance of the above observations on export taxes is that they demonstrate that poverty impacts can change sign depending on whether the income distribution is modeled endogenously or not. Moreover, it is not sufficient to account for relative factor endowments of micro-households. Feedback effects from the endogenous modeling of the income distribution among micro-households may be essential when focus is on capturing both the direction and the full poverty impact of trade liberalization and other policy interventions.

Turning to experiment 2, the elimination of import tariffs has a significant adverse impact on poverty, regardless of whether the income distribution is modeled endogenously or not. High industrial protection is concentrated in food processing sectors, and while food processing is an industrial sector, the intensive use of primary agricultural inputs in this sector means that the import tariffs are implicitly protecting agricultural production. It therefore comes as no surprise that elimination of the import tariff structure lowers the agricultural terms of trade and relative rural unskilled wages. This in combination with increasing household taxes increases poverty.

We also note that the endogenous modeling of micro-households’ income and expenditure decisions shows a milder poverty impact as compared to the “aggregate consumption” top-down approach. This suggests that taking account of relative micro-household factor endowments and feedback effects from the endogenous modeling of income distribution has an important dampening effect on the negative poverty impact. Comparing the “endogenous household” approach to the “disaggregate factor income” approach shows that this dampening effect is mostly the result of accounting for differences in micro-household factor endowments. Accordingly, the endogenous income distribution method seems to have negative feedback effects on poverty, consistent with the fact that the elimination of import tariffs lowers agricultural terms of trade. In any case, feedback effects from changes in the distribution of income and consumption appear once again as potentially very important in determining the direction and overall poverty impact of trade liberalization. This conclusion is reinforced when looking at the combined third experiment, where all trade taxes are eliminated simultaneously. Here the “endogenous household” approach implies an increase in the monetary poverty gap of 1.1% as compared to 1.3% with the “disaggregate factor income” top-down approach and 2.2% with the “aggregate consumption” top-down approach.

The regional ranking in Table 6 also seems to depend on the modeling approach. The South sees the largest increase in relative terms, while the North experiences the
The largest increase in absolute terms. The underlying intuition is that the burden of trade taxes is partly borne by enterprises while the incidence of household taxes is strictly on households. The lowering of agricultural terms of trade combined with increasing household tax levels therefore increases poverty gaps across regions. The large number of poor households in the North leads to a strong absolute increase in the monetary poverty gap here, while the smaller (average) poverty gap in the South leads to a stronger relative increase. Overall monetary poverty gaps increase the least with endogenous micro-households, but there are some households in the South which are loosing out due to feedback effects from the endogenous income distribution. Accordingly, poverty increases by 1.7% in the South with the “disaggregate factor income” approach, as compared to 1.8% with the “endogenous household” approach. This demonstrates that the endogenous income distribution approach can affect poverty of subgroups in opposite directions.

Table 7 summarizes simulation results from the model with endogenous micro-households, using two different choices of government budget closure including (i) a nonrevenue neutral closure where household tax rates are kept fixed (flexible revenues), and (ii) a revenue-neutral closure where household tax rates are allowed to vary uniformly (fixed revenues). The latter set of results mirror the results presented in Table 6, but Table 7 demonstrates that the government fiscal response is very important in determining the poverty impact of full trade liberalization in the short to medium term (experiment 3). When the government neutralizes the revenue impact of declining trade tax revenues by resorting to (lump-sum) household taxation, regional monetary poverty gaps generally tend to increase. In contrast, if tax rates remain the same and the Vietnamese government resorts to deficit financing, the overall monetary poverty gap decreases by almost 9%.

The regional ranking of poverty is also affected by the government closure. Poverty increases relatively strongly in the more developed South when household taxes are raised in response to declining revenue. In contrast, when no taxes are raised, poverty declines relatively strongly in the South. Nevertheless, when no taxes are raised the largest absolute decrease in poverty occurs in the North, indicating that trade liberalization will, as a standalone measure, reduce poverty the most in the North. The regional impact patterns of the two scenarios with and without flexible tax rates are consistent with the fact that households in the South have higher average income and that poor southern households are generally located closer to the poverty line.
As already indicated, agricultural terms of trade tend to decline as a result of full trade liberalization (experiment 3). Declining poverty in the scenario with fixed tax rates therefore follows mainly from increased overall efficiency in resource allocation and reduced indirect taxation of rural households, rather than from improved relative price incentives for rural agricultural production. On the other hand, the results also show that replenishment of government income through direct household taxation will put large burdens on households and thereby lead to uniformly increasing poverty among households in all regions of Vietnam.

The Economic Impact of Trade Liberalization

Having analyzed the importance of modeling methodology, we now turn to an in-depth analysis of how trade liberalization will affect the Vietnamese economy. Tables 8–11 summarize the macroeconomic effects of trade liberalization in Vietnam, and the indicators in Table 8 show that the elimination of trade taxes in a comparative static framework with full employment will have little macroeconomic impact. Real GDP expands marginally due to improved efficiency in the allocation of otherwise fixed factor stocks, while nominal GDP declines marginally due to changes in relative (factor) prices. Moreover, nominal absorption declines marginally, suggesting that the overall welfare level of the Vietnamese people will decrease slightly from trade liberalization in the short to medium term.

Table 8 also shows how the elimination of export taxes leads to higher export prices as perceived by domestic producers, while the elimination of import tariffs leads to lower import prices as perceived by domestic consumers. Higher export prices and lower prices on (imported) intermediate inputs drive domestic producer and value-added prices up, while declining import prices drive domestic demand prices down. The intuition behind the increase in value-added prices is that trade liberalization with compensatory direct taxation leads to a change in the composition of GDP at market prices. Thus, lower indirect tax revenues lead to an expansion of GDP at factor cost through higher factor prices.

The real exchange rate tends to depreciate slightly in all experiments. Nevertheless, the real depreciation is the result of different underlying effects. In experiment 1, the

| Table 8. Macroeconomic Indicators (percentage changes) |
|------------------------------------------------------|
| Base run | Exp. 1 | Exp. 2 | Exp. 3 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Real GDP (10^12 VND) | 444.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Absorption (10^12 VND) | 455.1 | -0.1 | 0.0 | -0.1 |
| Value-added price index | 100 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 4.7 |
| Export producer price index | 100 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 4.1 |
| Import purchaser price index | 100 | -0.9 | -2.6 | -3.5 |
| Cost-of-living index (rural) | 100 | -0.2 | -0.8 | -1.0 |
| Cost-of-living index (urban) | 100 | -0.4 | -0.8 | -1.3 |
| Real exchange rate index | 100 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Ag. terms of trade: Producer | 100 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| Ag. terms of trade: Value-added | 100 | 0.2 | -0.5 | -0.3 |
| Ag. terms of trade: Export | 100 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
| Ag. terms of trade: Import | 100 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 |

Note: Base-run price values are index values unless otherwise indicated.
real exchange rate depreciates slightly as increasing export prices due to lower export
taxes are partially offset by a nominal exchange rate appreciation of 0.8%. In experi-
ment 2, the real exchange rate depreciation reflects that declining import prices due
to lower tariffs are more than offset by a nominal exchange rate depreciation of 3.2%.
Both the former nominal appreciation and the latter nominal depreciation tend to
offset the pressures for movements of the current account balance. The (real and
nominal) exchange rate impact in experiment 3 is basically the sum of the impacts in
experiments 1 and 2.

Cost-of-living indices for rural and urban households, including the impact of
changes in the value of home consumption, show little variation across households.9
Trade liberalization affects urban costs of living by less than 0.1%, but has slightly
larger numerical effects on rural costs of living. The lower costs of living for rural
households reflect that reduced export taxes lead to a decline in costs of home
consumption. In contrast, the elimination of import tariffs raises both agricultural
producer prices and the implicit cost of home consumption, and therefore leads to
increases in the cost of living for rural households. This is due to a strong nominal
exchange rate depreciation which outweighs the reduction in agriculturally related
protection afforded by the import tariffs. Finally, experiment 3 shows that full trade
liberalization increases rural costs of living by an amount which equals the net effect
of reducing export taxes and import tariffs separately.

Finally, agricultural price indices are presented in Table 8 to assess the transmission
of relative price changes through the economy. The elimination of export taxes and
import tariffs leads to increases in relative agricultural export and import prices. Relative
agricultural export prices increase in experiment 1 since agricultural exports are
more heavily taxed than other exports. Similarly, relative agricultural import prices
increase in experiment 2, since direct agricultural trade protection is lower than for
other nonagricultural sectors. The former increase in export prices leads to increasing
relative value-added prices for agricultural output, while the latter increase in relative
import prices leads to declining relative value-added prices. Accordingly, high export
taxes are biasing price incentives against agricultural production, while high tariff pro-
tection of food processing industries is implicitly subsidizing agricultural production.
The net impact can be judged from experiment 3, and it shows that value-added prices
decline by 0.3%. This indicates that the overall Vietnamese trade tax structure is
biasing price incentives slightly in favor of agricultural production and against non-
agricultural production.

Table 9 presents measures of equivalent variation for each of the 16 aggregate house-
hold categories.10 It appears that no households gain from the combined elimination
of trade taxes in experiment 3, and the small number of households with unemployed
heads experience particularly strong losses. Accordingly, this group of households does
not share in the income expansion following from increasing factor prices. All other
households loose welfare in the range of 0.7–1.9%. Urban (farm) households are the
main losers since the relative factor price of their main factor endowment, which is
urban unskilled labor, is declining. This can be seen from Table 11. In contrast, the
welfare loss of rural (farm) households is relatively mild since rural (male) labor wages
are increasing in relative terms.

Table 10 shows how the composition of real GDP changes with trade liberalization.
The two consumption items, including home and marketed consumption, decline, while
investment and trade aggregates expand. The simultaneous reductions in consumption
and increases in investment come about as household tax income replaces the tax
revenue of the government lost due to trade liberalization. The burden of trade taxes
is partly borne by enterprises through reduced returns to capital. The sole reliance on household taxes to make up for lost revenue therefore releases funds for enterprises—funds which are partly used to increase savings and accordingly investment. In contrast, household consumption has to be reduced along with household disposable income since the increased tax burden more than outweighs increased factor income. Trade aggregates expand in parallel due to trade-tax induced changes in relative export and import prices, and the need to maintain a fixed balance of payments.

Table 11 shows that factor prices generally change in parallel, but also that some variation occurs due to differences in relative factor intensities among production activities. Agricultural production activities and construction have relatively high male factor intensities, while food processing, manufacturing, trade, and other services have relatively high female factor intensities. Capital intensities are relatively low in agricultural production activities and relatively high in oil production/mining and in the supply of water and gas, while land is used exclusively in agricultural production. The elimination of relatively high agricultural export tax rates leads to increasing

Table 9. Equivalent Variation for Households (percentage changes)

| Household                  | Base run | Exp. 1 | Exp. 2 | Exp. 3 |
|----------------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Rural male farm            | 0.0      | -0.1   | -1.0   | -1.1   |
| Rural male self-employed   | 0.0      | 0.0    | -0.6   | -0.7   |
| Rural male wage            | 0.0      | -0.1   | -0.8   | -0.9   |
| Rural male unemployed      | 0.0      | -1.3   | -2.1   | -3.4   |
| Rural female farm          | 0.0      | -0.2   | -1.1   | -1.4   |
| Rural female self-employed | 0.0      | -0.6   | -0.9   | -1.5   |
| Rural female wage          | 0.0      | -0.3   | -0.9   | -1.2   |
| Rural female unemployed    | 0.0      | -1.5   | -1.0   | -2.6   |
| Urban male farm            | 0.0      | -0.4   | -1.5   | -1.9   |
| Urban male self-employed   | 0.0      | -0.3   | -0.9   | -1.3   |
| Urban male wage            | 0.0      | -0.4   | -0.8   | -1.2   |
| Urban male unemployed      | 0.0      | -1.3   | -2.5   | -3.8   |
| Urban female farm          | 0.0      | -0.3   | -1.6   | -1.9   |
| Urban female self-employed | 0.0      | -0.5   | -0.8   | -1.4   |
| Urban female wage          | 0.0      | -0.5   | -0.7   | -1.2   |
| Urban female unemployed    | 0.0      | -1.7   | -1.2   | -2.9   |

Table 10. Components of Real GDP (percentage changes)

|                      | Base run (10^12 VND) | Exp. 1 | Exp. 2 | Exp. 3 |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Home consumption     | 23.4                 | 0.0    | -2.0   | -2.0   |
| Marketed consumption | 272.5                | -0.3   | -0.8   | -1.1   |
| Recurrent government | 28.2                 | 0.0    | 0.0    | 0.0    |
| Investment and stocks| 130.9                | 0.7    | 2.3    | 3.0    |
| Exports              | 241.4                | 0.6    | 1.6    | 2.2    |
| Imports              | -251.7               | 0.5    | 1.6    | 2.1    |
| Real GDP             | 444.7                | 0.0    | 0.1    | 0.1    |
agricultural terms of trade. This spills over into relative increases in wages for rural and urban males with low education, and returns to land, which are all used relatively intensively in agricultural production. The expansion of real investment due to increased enterprise savings also benefits male wages, while (urban) female wage increases are below average, since the female factor intensity is particularly low in construction.

Experiment 2 shows that the elimination of import tariffs has a similar differentiated impact on relative factor prices. Male wages again tend to increase relative to female wages. Import tariff collection is concentrated in food processing and manufacturing. The elimination of these tariffs has a negative effect on relative female wages, since it leads to reduced protection in these sectors. This effect is reinforced by the expansion of real investment, which leads to increasing demand for male factors and increasing relative male wages. Returns to highly educated male labor increases particularly strongly since construction has high factor intensity for this labor category. The factor price movements in the combined experiment 3 reflect the sum of the factor price movements in the two separate experiments 1 and 2. Male wages increase relative to female wages, and highly educated male wages increase the most. Returns to capital increase above average and returns to land increase below average, since the elimination of import tariffs raises relative nonagricultural value-added prices.

We now turn to the issue of assessing how trade policy affects the poor in our comparative static framework. Table 12 presents the impact on poverty headcount indices and monetary poverty gaps at the regional level. The experiments indicate that the elimination of export taxes and import tariffs per se will do little to raise people out of poverty, if the government responds with increased taxation at the household level. The elimination of export taxes will, by itself, lower monetary poverty gaps and raise a small number of individuals above the poverty line in the South. Nevertheless, the main impact will be to raise the number of poor people in the Center and, in particular the North. Moreover, the elimination of import tariffs will increase the poverty headcount by 1.3% and move an additional 320,000 people into poverty. The overall number of poor individuals does not change when export taxes are eliminated on top of import tariffs. Nevertheless, the overall decline in agricultural terms of trade will

| Factor                  | Base run | Exp. 1 | Exp. 2 | Exp. 3 |
|-------------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Rural male low education| 0.0      | 1.3    | 3.5    | 4.8    |
| Rural male med. education| 0.0    | 1.3    | 3.8    | 5.0    |
| Rural male high education| 0.0   | 1.2    | 4.1    | 5.3    |
| Rural female low education| 0.0  | 0.9    | 3.5    | 4.3    |
| Rural female med. education| 0.0 | 0.8    | 3.5    | 4.3    |
| Rural female high education| 0.0 | 0.9    | 3.4    | 4.3    |
| Urban male low education | 0.0   | 1.1    | 3.2    | 4.2    |
| Urban male med. education | 0.0 | 0.9    | 3.9    | 4.8    |
| Urban male high education | 0.0 | 0.7    | 4.2    | 5.0    |
| Urban female low education | 0.0 | 0.6    | 3.6    | 4.3    |
| Urban female med. education | 0.0 | 0.5    | 3.8    | 4.3    |
| Urban female high education | 0.0 | 0.5    | 3.8    | 4.3    |
| Capital                 | 0.0      | 1.0    | 4.2    | 5.2    |
| Land                    | 0.0      | 1.6    | 2.0    | 3.5    |
lead to strongly increasing poverty headcounts in the North, and a relative expansion of monetary poverty gaps in the South. The economy-wide impact shows a relatively strong 1.1% increase in the overall monetary poverty gap, equivalent to an increase of 153 billion VND (US$11 million).

Tables 13–14 present the FGT headcount and monetary poverty gap measures for micro-households defined by rural and urban location. As outlined in section 2, poverty is concentrated among households located in rural areas. Comparing rural headcount measures ($P_0$) to regional headcount totals in Table 12, rural poverty headcount measures are uniformly above average across all regions. The data indicate that the share of poverty-stricken individuals in rural areas amount to 41.1% in the North, 46.2% in the Center, and 29.8% in the South, while comparable figures for urban areas amount to respectively 5.6%, 4.9%, and 2.3%. Similarly, rural poverty gaps add up to 13,275 billion VND (US$950 million) while urban poverty gaps amount to a mere 250 billion VND (US$20 million).

The results on rural poverty presented in Table 13 are therefore very similar to the economy-wide poverty indicators presented in Table 12. While elimination of export taxes has relatively minor effects on rural poverty, elimination of import tariffs increases rural poverty more visibly. The combined third experiment shows that trade liberalization leads to increasing numbers of poverty-stricken rural inhabitants and increasing levels of rural monetary poverty, while the economy-wide average poverty gap among poor people is relatively unaffected. The impact on urban poverty

---

**Table 12. Regional Households, Poverty Indices, and Monetary Poverty Gaps (percentage changes)**

| Measure | Region | Base run (Rate/10^12 VND) | Exp. 1 | Exp. 2 | Exp. 3 |
|---------|--------|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| $P_0$   | North  | 0.343                    | 0.4    | 2.4    | 2.0    |
|         | Central| 0.404                    | 0.2    | 0.8    | 1.1    |
|         | South  | 0.217                    | -0.2   | 0.4    | 0.4    |
|         | Total  | 0.314                    | 0.2    | 1.3    | 1.3    |
| POVGAP  | North  | 5.729                    | -0.3   | 1.1    | 0.9    |
|         | Central| 4.949                    | -0.1   | 1.1    | 1.0    |
|         | South  | 2.848                    | -0.2   | 1.9    | 1.8    |
|         | Total  | 13.526                   | -0.2   | 1.3    | 1.1    |

**Table 13. Rural Households, Poverty Indices, and Monetary Poverty Gaps (percentage changes)**

| Measure | Region | Base run (Rate/10^12 VND) | Exp. 1 | Exp. 2 | Exp. 3 |
|---------|--------|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| $P_0$   | North  | 0.411                    | 0.4    | 2.4    | 2.0    |
|         | Central| 0.462                    | 0.2    | 0.8    | 1.1    |
|         | South  | 0.298                    | -0.2   | 0.4    | 0.4    |
|         | Total  | 0.389                    | 0.2    | 1.3    | 1.3    |
| POVGAP  | North  | 5.601                    | -0.3   | 1.1    | 0.9    |
|         | Central| 4.908                    | -0.1   | 1.0    | 1.0    |
|         | South  | 2.767                    | -0.2   | 1.9    | 1.8    |
|         | Total  | 13.275                   | -0.2   | 1.2    | 1.1    |
presented in Table 14 is different from the impact on rural poverty in the sense that the economy-wide poverty headcount increases modestly, while the monetary poverty gap increases strongly. The associated increase in the average poverty gap among the poor is particularly strong for urban areas in central provinces.

Comparing the poverty impact of trade liberalization between rural and urban areas, it appears that the number of poor expands more rapidly in rural areas compared to urban areas. Trade liberalization will therefore tend to worsen the rural poverty headcount bias in Vietnam in the short to medium term. On the other hand, the depth of poverty measured by average monetary poverty gaps will become more equally distributed among rural and urban areas after trade liberalization. This conclusion is supported by the relatively strong 3.5% increase in the urban monetary poverty gap compared to the more modest 1.1% increase in the rural monetary poverty gap. Looking at absolute numbers, it is, however, clear that the increase in rural poverty of 145 billion VND (US$10 million) completely dominates the 8 billion VND (US$0.6 million) increase in urban poverty.

4. Conclusion

This paper has applied a novel methodology for analyzing the poverty impact of macro policies within a CGE model framework, which does not rely on assumptions regarding intra-household distributions of income. Income distribution is modeled endogenously by disaggregating the household sector into 5999 micro-households. Each of the micro-households is characterized by a different composition of factor endowments, implying rich adjustments in response to changes in relative factor prices. Our results show that feedback effects from the micro-level distribution of income and expenditures to macro-level variables are important in determining the poverty impact of trade policy interventions in a comparative static framework.

We compared our model approach with 5999 micro-households to a top-down approach based on a model with 16 representative households. The top-down approach measured poverty by (i) applying aggregate consumption growth rates to micro-household consumption, and (ii) applying aggregate factor prices to derive micro-household factor income and consumption. This approach may be interpreted as a decomposition where the latter top-down approach is considered to be an intermediate step between the crude application of aggregate consumption growth rates, and the more sophisticated modeling of micro-household income and expenditure decisions. Our results show that endogenous modeling of the household income
distribution is important for properly assessing the size and direction of the poverty impact. In particular, a top-down approach, which relies on micro-household factor endowments, is not sufficient to mirror the results from the endogenous modeling of the income distribution.

Relying on headcount and monetary poverty gap measures, we also find that the poverty impact of eliminating trade taxes depends critically on the fiscal response of the government. In particular, the short- to medium-term impact on poverty levels among the poor are inversely related to changes in investment expenditures. Accordingly, our results indicate that poverty may increase within a static setting, where overall welfare as measured by total absorption remains unchanged. This suggests that the government can, and should, choose a combination of measures to make up for lost revenue from reduced trade taxes. At the one extreme, we find that poverty headcounts and monetary poverty will increase if the government decides to make up for lost revenues by relying solely on increased household taxation. At the other extreme, we find that a policy of pure deficit financing of the ensuing budgetary gap will lower the economy-wide monetary poverty gap by almost 9%.

All in all, we do not suggest that the government should allow trade liberalization to be accompanied by an unbalancing of the budget and crowding-out of private investment. Nevertheless, our analysis of the distributional implications of reductions in trade taxes and associated changes in tax incidence does suggest that great care should be exercised in formulating the fiscal response to trade liberalization so as to avoid increasing poverty in the short to medium term. On a methodological note, our results demonstrate the value of including disaggregated micro-households within analyses of poverty and income distribution. In particular, this kind of disaggregation allows for a functional impact of changes to the income distribution—a crucial element which is not captured in a simple top-down approach.
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Notes

1. VLSS98 surveyed 6002 households but three were dropped from our analysis owing to missing observations.

2. Value-added taxes are actually taxes on production value, so they are levied on total production value in the model underlying the results presented in section 3.

3. This is subject to the caveat that a single poverty line is used for respectively rural and urban areas. Due to higher urban prices and variations in the consumption basket, reported estimates are likely to underestimate urban poverty.

4. While the Arndt et al. (2002) study was concerned with Mozambique, the elasticity estimates are typical across developing-country CGE models. The only major exception is the relatively high import substitution elasticity for food crops. This reflects the particular history of Mozambique over the estimation period used in the Arndt et al. study. It was therefore decided to impose the more moderate import substitution elasticity estimate for cash crops, on both the rice and other agricultural crops sectors in the current study.

5. In the following, it is specifically noted when the government closure is not revenue-neutral.

6. In Table 6 in the results section, the label “Top-down (aggregate consumption)” refers to the top-down approach where representative household consumption growth rates are applied, whereas “Top-down (disaggregate factor income)” refers to the top-down approach where factor prices are applied to micro-household factor endowments. The label “Endogenous” refers to the model (with 5999 individual households) which captures feedback effects from changes in the distribution of income and consumption.

7. These poverty lines are measured in local currency terms and are not corrected to take account for possible systematic divergence from purchasing power parity. This might explain the very low level of the poverty lines. Moreover, it is noted that the estimates of the number of poor will differ slightly from official estimates. This is not due to the up-dating of the poverty line but follows from the statistical adjustments made here to attain consistency with macro accounts of VSAM.

8. See Jensen and Tarp (2003) for more elaborate analyses of poverty implications.

9. Cost-of-living indices vary little by construction because the consumer price index for marketed goods is used as price numéraire.

10. The equivalent variation measures are calculated from trade tax experiments with aggregate households; i.e. without endogenous micro-household behavior.