Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool India

Mark Schreiner

July 7, 2008

This document is at `SimplePovertyScorecard.com`.

Abstract

The Simple Poverty Scorecard-brand poverty-assessment tool uses ten low-cost indicators from India's 2005/6 Socio-Economic Survey to estimate the likelihood that a household has expenditure below a given poverty line. Field workers can collect responses in about ten minutes. The scorecard's accuracy is reported for a range of poverty lines. The scorecard is a practical way for pro-poor programs in India to measure poverty rates, to track changes in poverty rates over time, and to segment clients for targeted services.

Version note

This paper uses 2005/6 data, replacing Schreiner (2007), which uses 2003 data. The new 2005/6 scorecard here should be used from now on. The new 2005/6 scorecard does not support any of the poverty lines supported for the old 2003 scorecard, so existing users of Schreiner (2007) *cannot* measure change over time with a baseline from the old 2003 scorecard and a follow-up from the new 2005/6 scorecard.

Acknowledgements

This paper was funded by the Microcredit Summit Campaign. Data was provided by India's National Sample Survey Organisation. Thanks go to Malika Anand, Nigel Bigger, Dean Caire, Fielding Chen, Angus Deaton, Frank DeGiovanni, Rob Driscoll, Christiaan Grootaert, Shiva Makki, Brian McConnell, Geetha Nagarajan, DSK Rao, Tony Sheldon, Don Sillers, Frances Sinha, Jeff Toohig, and Manfred Zeller.

Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool

			Name	Identifier
Interview ID:				
Interview date:		Participant:		
Country:	IND	Field agent:		
Scorecard:	002	Service point:		
Sampling wgt.:		Number of household members:		

Indicator	Value	Points	Score
1. How many people aged 0 to 17 are in the household?	A. Five or more	0	
	B. Four	4	
	C. Three	8	
	D. Two	13	
	E. One	20	
	F. None	27	
2. What is the household's principal occupation?	A. Labourers (agricultural, plantation, other farm), hunters, tobacco preparers and tobacco product makers, and other labourers	0	
	B. Others	8	
	C. Professionals, technicians, clerks, administrators, managers, executives, directors, supervisors, and teachers	14	
3. Is the residence all *pucca* (burnt bricks, stone, cement, concrete, jackboard/cement-plastered reeds, timber, tiles, galvanised tin or asbestos cement sheets)?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	4	
4. What is the household's primary source of energy for cooking?	A. Firewood and chips, charcoal, or none	0	
	B. Others	5	
	C. LPG	17	
5. Does the household own a television?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	6	
6. Does the household own a bicycle, scooter, or motor cycle?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	5	
7. Does the household own an *almirah*/dressing table?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	3	
8. Does the household own a sewing machine?	A. No	0	
	B. Yes	6	
9. How many pressure cookers or pressure pans does the household own?	A. None	0	
	B. One	6	
	C. Two or more	9	
10. How many electric fans does the household own?	A. None	0	
	B. One	5	
	C. Two or more	9	

Score:

Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool India

1. Introduction

The Simple Poverty Scorecard poverty-assessment tool is a low-cost way for pro-poor programs in India to monitor groups' poverty rates at a point in time, track changes in groups' poverty rates between two points in time, and target services to households.

The direct approach to poverty measurement via expenditure surveys is difficult and costly, asking households about a lengthy list of consumption items ("How many carrots did you eat last week? If you bought carrots, what price did you pay? If you grew carrots yourself, what price would they have sold for? Now then, how many cabbages did you eat last week? . . .").

In contrast, the indirect approach via the scorecard is simple, quick, and inexpensive. It uses 10 verifiable indicators (such as "Does the household own a television?" or "What is the household's primary source of energy for cooking?") to get a score that is highly correlated with poverty status as measured by the exhaustive expenditure survey.

The scorecard here differs from "proxy means tests" (Coady, Grosh, and Hoddinott, 2002) in that it is tailored to the capabilities and purposes not of national governments but rather of local, pro-poor organizations. The feasible poverty-

measurement options for these organizations are typically subjective and relative (such as participatory wealth ranking by skilled field workers) or blunt (such as rules based on land-ownership or housing quality). Results from these approaches are not comparable across organizations nor across countries, they may be costly, and their accuracy is unknown.

If an organization wants to know what share of its participants are below a poverty line (say, $1/day for the Millenium Development Goals, or what share are among the poorest half below the national poverty line as required of USAID microenterprise grantees), or if it wants to measure movement across a poverty line (for example, to report to the Microcredit Summit Campaign), then it needs an expenditure-based, objective tool with known accuracy. While expenditure surveys are costly even for governments, many small, local organizations can implement an inexpensive scorecard that can serve for monitoring, management, and targeting.

The statistical approach here aims to be understood by non-specialists. After all, if managers are to adopt the scorecard on their own and apply it to inform their decisions, they must first trust that it works. Transparency and simplicity build trust. Getting "buy-in" matters; proxy means tests and regressions on the "determinants of poverty" have been around for three decades, but they are rarely used to inform decisions, not because they do not work, but because they are presented (when they are presented at all) as tables of regression coefficients incomprehensible to lay people (with cryptic indicator names such as "`HHSIZE_2`", negative values, many decimal places, and

standard errors). Thanks to the predictive-modeling phenomenon known as the "flat max", the scorecard can be almost as accurate as complex tools.

The technical approach here is also innovative in how it associates scores with poverty likelihoods, in the extent of its accuracy tests, and in how it derives sample-size formulas. Although these techniques are simple and/or standard, they have rarely or never been applied to proxy means tests.

The scorecard is based on Schedule 1.0 of Round 62 (July 2005 to June 2006) of India's Socio-Economic Survey (SES) conducted by the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO, 2008). Indicators are selected to be:

- Inexpensive to collect, easy to answer quickly, and simple to verify
- Strongly correlated with poverty
- Liable to change over time as poverty status changes

All points in the scorecard are non-negative integers, and total scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line). Non-specialists can collect data and tally scores on paper in the field in less than 5 minutes.

The scorecard can be used to estimate three basic quantities. First, it can estimate a household's "poverty likelihood", that is, the probability that the household has per-capita expenditure below a given poverty line.

Second, the scorecard can estimate the poverty rate of a group of households at a point in time. This is simply the average poverty likelihood among the households in the group.

Third, the scorecard can estimate changes in the poverty rate for a group of households between two points in time. This estimate is simply the change in the average poverty likelihood of the households in the group over time.

The scorecard can also be used for targeting. To help managers choose a targeting cut-off, this paper reports the share of India's households who are below a given poverty line and who are also at or below a given score cut-off.

This paper presents a single scorecard whose indicators and points were derived from Indian household expenditure data and the international $1/person/day poverty line. Scores from this scorecard are calibrated to poverty likelihoods for seven poverty lines.

The scorecard is built using a sub-sample of the data from Round 62. Its accuracy is tested on a different sub-sample from Round 62 and also on Round 60 (January 2004 to June 2004). While all three scoring estimators are unbiased when applied to Round 62 (that is, they match the true value on average in repeated samples from the same population from which the scorecard was built), they are—like all predictive models—biased to some extent when applied to a different population.

Thus, while the indirect scoring approach is less costly than the direct survey approach, it is also biased. (The survey approach is unbiased by assumption.) There is bias because scoring must assume that the future relationship between indicators and

poverty will be the same as in the data used to build the scorecard.[1] Of course, this assumption—ubiquitous and inevitable in predictive modelling—holds only partly.

When applied to Round 62, the difference between scorecard estimates of groups' poverty rates and the true rates is –1.2 percentage points for the national poverty line, –0.4 percentage points for $1/day, and 0.7 percentage points on average across all seven lines. This difference is due to sampling variation and not bias because, if Round 62 were to be repeatedly divided into sub-samples and if the entire scorecard-building process were repeated, the average difference would be zero.

For sample sizes of n = 16,384, the 90-percent confidence intervals for these estimates are +/–0.8 percentage points or less. For n = 1,024, the 90-percent intervals are +/–3.2 percentage points or less.

When applied to Round 60, the differences between the estimates and the true values result from a combination of bias (because the relationship between indicators and poverty changes with time) and sampling variation. The average difference is a bit higher, about 0.9 percentage points.

Section 2 below describes data and poverty lines. Section 3 places the new scorecard here in the context of existing tools for India. Sections 4 and 5 describe scorecard construction and offer practical guidelines for use. Sections 6 and 7 detail the estimation of households' poverty likelihoods and of groups' poverty rates at a point in

[1] Bias may also result from changes in the quality of data collection, from imperfect adjustment of poverty lines across time or geographic regions, or from sampling variation across expenditure surveys.

time. Section 8 discusses estimating changes in poverty rates. Section 9 covers targeting. The final section is a summary.

2. Data and poverty lines

This section discusses the data used to construct and test the scorecard. It also presents the poverty lines to which scores are calibrated.

2.1 Data

The scorecard is based on data from the consumer expenditure module (Schedule 1.0) of Round 62 (July 2005 to June 2006) of NSSO's SES. The data is randomly divided into three sub-samples (Figure 2):[2]

- *Construction* for selecting indicators and points
- *Calibration* for associating scores with poverty likelihoods
- *Validation* for testing accuracy on data not used in construction or calibration

In addition to the validation sample from Round 62, all households from Round 60 (January 2004 to June 2004) are used as a second validation sample.

Why use Round 60 instead of Round 61? In principle, Round 61 would be preferred because it is the source of India's five-year update to the official poverty rate,

[2] The average household in Round 62 represents about 5,300 households. Before random assignment to sub-samples, households representing more than 10,000 households are replicated—and their weights evenly divided among their replicates—until each replicate represents less than 10,000 households. Of course, the newly replicated households together represent the same number of households as the original heavily weighted household. This replication helps spread heavily weighted households across the construction, calibration, and validation sub-samples, which in turn reduces the influence of any single heavily weighted household on scorecard construction or testing. This does not affect the unbiasedness of scoring estimators in repeated samples, but it does increase precision and thus decreases the average difference between estimates and true values in any given sample (such as the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60). It also helps prevent bootstrap estimates from breaking down (see Singh, 1998).

because it is larger (n = 124,643), and because it is closer to Round 62. But Round 61 omits four scorecard indicators that appear in all other rounds since at least Round 57:

- Is the residence all *pucca*?
- Does the household own an *almirah*/dressing table?
- How many electric fans does the household own?
- How many pressure pans or pressure cookers does the household own?

Furthermore, poverty rates from Round 61 are implausible. Indeed, all year-to-year changes in poverty rates across Rounds 55–61 are implausible (Figure 2). In Rounds 57–58, poverty rates fall by an average of 12 percent. Then in Rounds 58–60, they are almost flat (except for the USAID "extreme" line). In Rounds 60–61, poverty rates *increase* by 13 percent, only to plummet 18 percent in Rounds 61–62.

This down/flat/up/down pattern is inconsistent with steady real GDP per capita annual growth in the national accounts of about 5–7 percent per year (Heston, Summers, and Aten, 2006; World Bank, 2006). It also does not fit the pattern prior to Round 55, when macroeconomic growth was consistently associated with reductions in the official poverty rate (Datt and Ravallion, 2002; Deaton and Drèze, 2002).[3]

The reasons for these inconsistencies are unknown. Each round is nationally representative, sample size varies but is always large, and nothing changes in the expenditure module nor in its documented manner of application.

Still, the six-year change for the national line in Rounds 57–62 is about 6 percentage points, consistent with the 1-percentage-point-per-year pattern in the 1980s

[3] Rounds 51–54 also had implausible rates until Round 55 produced an official figure consistent with past trends and non-expenditure evidence (Deaton and Drèze, 2002).

and 1990s (Datt and Ravallion, 2002; Deaton and Drèze, 2002). Thus, Round 62 (and Round 60, with average rates about 2.6 percentage points higher than Round 62) may be fine. In contrast, Rounds 58 and 59 have implausible poverty rates. Round 57 has a plausible poverty rate, but it has other severe problems, including a household that represents 15 million people and indicators whose distributions are inconsistent with other rounds. Thus, scorecard building and testing here use Rounds 62 and 60.

2.2 Poverty lines

Depending on the poverty line, India has 100–900 million poor people. There is an entire literature—but little agreement—about Indian poverty lines (Deaton and Kozel, 2005). The government's official lines were originally based on caloric benchmarks (2400/day for adult males in rural areas, 2100 in urban). The average official poverty line for all-India in Round 61 is 13.37 rupees/person/day, producing a poverty rate of 17.0 percent for households (Figure 2) and 27.5 percent for individuals (Figure A1).[4] The official line, however, is problematic because its cost-of-living adjustments are based on long-outdated figures (Deaton, 2008 and 2003).

By most common-sense standards, the official line is also probably too high, leading to a poverty rate that is too low. For example, Abraham's (2005) "basic needs" approach estimates a poverty rate of 90 percent. Sengupta, Kannan, and Raveendran

[4] The rate for individuals is higher than the rate for households because larger households are more likely to be poor. The individual rates here are computed from the data and may differ slightly from official ones because the official ones sometimes extrapolate from large states to small ones.

(2008) state that about three in four Indians are "poor and vulnerable". Furthermore, less than half of Indians usually eat three meals per day.[5] Thus, the official estimate that about one in four Indians are poor is probably too low.

The scorecard here is constructed using the international $1/day poverty line, adjusted for state-wise and urban/rural cost-of-living using Deaton's (2003) updated price indices. This produces a Round 61 household poverty rate of 32.5 percent (25.4 percent in Round 62), higher than the official lines (but perhaps still not high enough).

Because local pro-poor organizations may want to use different or various poverty lines, this paper calibrates scores from its single scorecard to poverty likelihoods for seven lines (figures in parentheses are Round 62, all-India per capita, per day poverty lines and household poverty rates from Figure A1):

- National line (Rs14.25, 17.0 percent)
- USAID "extreme" line (Rs11.94, 8.4 percent)
- $0.75/day (Rs11.53, 9.5 percent)
- $1/day (Rs15.38, 25.4 percent)
- $1.25/day (Rs19.22, 42.6 percent)
- $1.50/day (Rs23.07, 56.9 percent)
- $2/day (Rs30.75, 74.9 percent)

The national poverty line is defined by state and, within states, by urban/rural by Saxena (2001, Round 55) and Planning Commission (2007, Round 61). These are updated using the consumer price indices for rural labourers (`http://labourbureau.nic.in/indtab.html`) and industrial workers

[5] From Round 59, the last time this question was asked.

(`http://labourbureau.nic.in/indtab.html`). Tables A1 to A35 display poverty lines and poverty rates by state, urban/rural, and survey round.

The USAID "extreme" line (U.S. Congress, 2002) is the median expenditure of households below the national line, for each state and by urban/rural within states.

The all-urban and all-rural $1/day lines for Round 62 are derived from this data:

- 1993 purchase-power parity exchange rate: Rs7.0162 per $1 (Sillers, 2006)
- 1993 CPI (average) for industrial workers: 252.08
- July 2005 to June 2006 CPI (average) for industrial workers: 550.74
- 1993 CPI (average) for rural labourers: 184.75
- July 2005 to June 2006 CPI (average) for rural labourers: 360.25

The all-urban and all-rural $1/day lines for Round 62 are then (Sillers, 2006):

Urban:	7.0162 x 550.74) 252.08 x 1.08 = Rs16.56
Rural:	7.0162 x 360.25) 184.75 x 1.08 = Rs14.78

All-urban and all-rural lines for other rounds are found in the same way.

For a given round, the all-urban and all-rural $1/day lines are adjusted for state-level differences in cost-of-living (and for urban/rural differences within states) using the following data (Figure A36):

- L_i, where $i = u$ or r, for all-urban or all-rural $1/day lines
- p_{ij}, where $j = 1$ to 35, for urban/rural-specific population proportions by state
- π_{ij}, where $j = 1$ to 35, for urban/rural-specific price indices by state (Deaton, 2003)

L_{ij} is then the $1/day line adjusted for cost-of-living in area i, state j:

$$L_{ij} = \frac{L_i \cdot \pi_{ij}}{\sum_{k=1}^{35} p_{ik} \cdot \pi_{ij}}.$$

The lines for $0.75/day, $1.25/day, $1.50/day, and $2/day are multiples of the $1/day lines L_{ij}.

3. The context of poverty-measurement tools for India

There are at least four existing poverty-measurement tools for India. The new one here adds value because it tests accuracy on data not used in construction and because it reports bias, precision, and sample-size formulas for a range of scoring purposes. Also, the new scorecard is based on the most recent nationally representative data. While comparisons are difficult, the new scorecard is probably about as accurate as the others.

3.1 Kijima and Lanjouw

Kijima and Lanjouw ("KL", 2003) use Round 50 data to build two poverty tools to apply to Round 55. Their goal is to provide comparable estimates for measuring change in poverty rates, as the two rounds measure expenditure differently. KL estimate that poverty fell less than estimated by Deaton and Drèze (2003).

Both tools use least-squares regression on the logarithm of per-capita expenditure and control for clustered disturbances and heteroskedasticity. Poverty rates are estimated by comparing estimated per-capita expenditure to the national poverty line, which KL adjust, as in this paper, using price indices from Deaton (2003).

For the first tool, KL run state-specific and region-specific (within states) regressions,[6] each with the same 14 indicators:

- Income during the last 365 days from:
    - — Cultivation
    - — Other agricultural enterprises
    - — Wage/salary employment
    - — Non-agricultural enterprises
    - — Pension (presence)
- Number of household members (and its square)
- Proportion of boys aged less than six years
- Whether the household is a scheduled caste
- Land owned per capita
- Proportion of cultivated land that is irrigated
- Whether LPG is the primary source of energy for cooking
- Whether electricity is the primary source of energy for lighting
- Highest educational attainment of any household member
- District of residence

This tool, while appropriate for KL's purposes, cannot be applied in five minutes by non-specialists. Five indicators are simple and similar to those in this paper, but the five income indicators are difficult to collect. Three other indicators require division or squaring a number. Finally, points vary by region and district, complicating paper implementation.[7]

[6] Sample sizes range from 300 to "more than 3,000".

[7] If there are few households in a region or district, this could also cause overfitting. Also, the SES does not cover all districts in all rounds.

KL's second tool, however, is even simpler than the new one here, using indicators for district, household size, and ownership of 10 consumer durables:

- *Almirah*/dressing tables
- Chairs
- Radios
- Televisions or VCRs
- Electric fans
- Stoves
- Bicycles
- Motor cycles
- Clocks/watches
- Pressure cookers

Like the first, more complex tool, estimates from this simple second tool again suggest that Deaton and Drèze (2003) overestimate the fall in poverty between Rounds 50–55.

The need to multiply and take logarithms and exponents preclude the use of this second tool on paper in the field, but it could be implemented in a simple spreadsheet and so help local pro-poor organizations to monitor, manage, and target. KL note that its "wholesale application" would be "very appealing" (p. 22).

In terms of accuracy, KL's estimates of poverty rates are biased—unlike the new scorecard—because they use a discontinuous function. Also, KL cannot test accuracy, as the true values of expenditure in Round 55 are unknown. Like this paper, they must assume that the relationship between indicators and poverty is constant over time.

KL carefully derive standard errors, in particular accounting for survey stratification and multi-stage clustering. In contrast, standard errors in this paper do not account for sample design (beyond household weights) and so are understated.

Overall, the KL tools are solid, and the second could be used by local, pro-poor organizations. Compared with this paper, they measure standard errors better but do not test accuracy or report sample-size formulas. Also, they are now out-dated.

3.2 Jalan and Murgai

Jalan and Murgai ("JM", 2007) use Round 55 to assess targeting in rural areas with the poverty-measurement tool that the Indian government prescribed for classifying households as Below Poverty Line for purposes of public assistance.[8] Beyond this "BPL poverty-assessment tool", JM test an "augmented poverty-assessment tool". With a cut-off that targets 27.0 percent of people (the share below the national line in Round 55), the BPL tool fails to target 49 percent of the poor, while the augmented one fails to target 34 percent.

Like Grosh and Baker (1995), JM analyze who is mistargeted and how far they are from the poverty line. They conclude that, compared with direct measurement, targeting via a poverty-assessment tool leads to high undercoverage of the poor and that "with a high density of the population with income close to the poverty line, arriving at an effective proxy means test is an inherently problematic and difficult exercise" (p. 1).[9]

[8] Implementation of the BPL scorecard has been slow and uneven.

[9] Of course, direct measurement of expenditure to establish BPL status for, say, the poorest 25 percent of Indian households (supposing this group could be costlessly identified in the first place), is not feasible. Nor is it clear what alternative is more

The BPL tool has 14 indicators, three of them present in the NSSO data:

- Highest educational attainment of an adult
- Means of livelihood
- Educational and labour status of children ages 5–14

The other 11 indicators do not have matches in the NSSO data, the last six of which are difficult to verify:

- Ownership of consumer durables (radio, television, electric fan, pressure cookers or pans, refrigerators, electric heating appliances, other appliances, motor cycles or scooters, and motor cars or jeeps)
- Whether the house is temporary, semi-permanent, or permanent
- Sanitation facilities
- Labour-force status
- Reasons for migration
- Indebtedness
- Size of operational land-holding
- Pieces of normal-wear clothing per person
- Food security (annual pattern of number of meals per day)
- Forms of public assistance currently received

JM match these BPL indicators with Round 55 indicators to the extent possible. Each indicator has five responses, with points of 0/1/2/3/4, from poorest to least poor.

JM test whether undercoverage by the BPL tool is caused by the simple 0/1/2/3/4 point scheme. As the "flat max" phenomenon (discussed later) would suggest, the point scheme does not turn out to be an issue.

To test whether indicator selection and geographic segmentation mater, JM construct an augmented tool for each of the 16 major states using least-squares

---

accurate than scoring and yet not prohibitively costly. For example, JM find that their augmented scorecard is more accurate than low-cost geographical targeting.

regression of per-capita expenditure on indicators for rural households in Round 55.[10]

Five of the indicators are in the BPL tool, and the last three are difficult to verify:

- Means of livelihood
- Ownership of consumer durables
- Size of operational land-holding
- Pieces of normal-wear clothing per person
- Forms of public assistance received

The augmented tool also includes 11 indicators not in the BPL tool:

- Primary source of energy for cooking
- Primary source of energy for lighting
- Principle industry of the household's main occupation
- Sex of the household head
- Highest educational attainment of an adult male
- Highest educational attainment of an adult female
- Social group (caste)
- Household size (and its square)
- Share of children in the household
- Source of income
- Region of residence

While these augmented indicators are verifiable, computing indexes requires multiplication, division, and adjusting points by region. Thus, if BPL tools are to be handed out on the spot, the augmented tool would be difficult to use. Use is also difficult because JM do not report points, as their purpose is solely to test targeting accuracy. In line with this, they do not report bias or precision for estimating poverty rates, nor sample-size formulas.

[10] Of course, the Indian government could have done this in the first place instead of making its BPL scorecard without data and then mandating its use without testing.

Compared with the augmented tool, the one here is simpler, shorter, and based on more recent data. (And it is available for use.) Accuracy is measured not only for targeting but also for groups' poverty rates, and sample-size formulas are provided.

Which tool targets better? When the cut-off is set to target 27.0 percent of rural people (that is, the share below the national line in Round 55), the augmented tool misses 34.5 percent of those below the line in Round 55. When the scorecard here is used in the same way in the Round 62 validation sample (and when the national line is increased until the poverty rate is 27.0), undercoverage is 41.8 percent.

Some factors contributing to the augmented tool's lower undercoverage are:

- It is tested on different data
- It is more complex, as it includes:
    - More difficult-to-collect indicators (5 versus 0)
    - More indicators (16 versus 10)
    - More tools (16 versus 1)
- It overstates accuracy because it is tested on the same data used for construction

3.3 IRIS Center

IRIS Center ("IRIS", 2007a) is a poverty-measurement tool built with data from a 1997/8 Living Standards Measurement Survey in rural north and central Bihar and rural south and eastern Uttar Pradesh (n = 2,250). USAID commissioned the tool for use by their microenterprise partners for reporting on their participants' poverty rates.

IRIS tests several statistical methods.[11] Their preferred one is quantile regression (Koenker and Hallock, 2001) relating the log of per capita expenditure with 17 indicators[12] (selected using stepwise based on R^2) that are simple to collect and verify:

- Household size
- Age of household head
- Marital status of household head
- Number of household members (excluding the head) whose level of education is:
    - — Illiterate or without formal schooling
    - — Matriculate or intermediate
- Number of rooms the household occupies
- Type of latrine used
- Quality of residential structure
- Whether the household head worked as a casual labourer in the past 12 months
- Ownership of durable goods:
    - — Radio
    - — Pressure lamp/petromax
    - — Watch
    - — Television
    - — Camera
    - — Thresher
    - — Buffalo
    - — Cows

Poverty status is determined by whether estimated expenditure is below the $1/day line. IRIS focuses on estimating poverty rates at a point in time, but they also consider targeting accuracy is terms of successful "hits" (*coverage* when someone truly below a poverty line is predicted to have per capita expenditure below the line, or *exclusion* when someone truly above a line is predicted to be above) versus unsuccessful "misses" (*undercoverage* when someone truly below a line is predicted to be above, or

[11] All methods give roughly the same results, thanks to the "flat max".
[12] There may be a few more or less indicators, as the scorecard questionnaire has been published, but not the scorecard itself.

leakage when someone truly above a line is predicted to be below). The same data is used for both testing and construction, and bias, precision, and sample-size formulas are not reported.

IRIS' preferred measure of accuracy is the Balanced Poverty Assessment Criteria, and USAID has adopted BPAC as its criterion for certifying poverty-assessment tools for use by its microenterprise partners (IRIS Center, 2005a). BPAC considers accuracy both in terms of the poverty rate at a point in time and in terms of targeting (the exact formula is discussed later). A higher BPAC means more accuracy; BPAC for IRIS is 89.7. This BPAC, however, cannot be compared to those here, as it comes from a smaller, older, non-representative sample and because it is tested on the same data used to build the tool.

3.4 Zeller, Sharma, Henry, and Lapenu

Zeller *et al.* (2006) seek to develop a practical, low-cost, accurate way to assess the poverty of participants in local pro-poor programs relative to other households in the area. They use principal component analysis to combine indicators into an index that is assumed to be related to poverty. The relative indexes cannot be converted to absolute measures based on a quantitative poverty line, so the results are not comparable across countries or across areas within a country.

Zeller *et al.* pilot the approach with microfinance organizations in India, Kenya, Madagascar, and Nicaragua. In each country, they survey a random sample of 200 program participants and a comparison group of 300 non-participants. In India, the survey is in Andhra Pradesh.

Before applying principal components, Zeller *et al.* narrow down a long list of potential indicators based on their correlation with expenditure on clothing. From the shortened list they select 20 indicators that are statistically significant in the principal components model. The loadings of the first principal component become the tool's points. For India, the 20 indicators are:

- Highest level of education of anyone in the household
- Level of education of the household head
- Whether the roof is made of permanent material
- Whether the walls are made of permanent material
- Quality of flooring material
- Presence of an electrical connection
- Source of cooking fuel
- Toilet arrangements
- Ownership of irrigated land
- Number of radios owned
- Number of fans owned
- Percentage of adults who are wage labourers
- Number of rooms per person
- Number of meals served in the past two days
- Episodes of hunger in the past 30 days
- Episodes of hunger in the past 12 months
- Number of days in the past week eating luxury food 1
- Number of days in the past week eating luxury food 2
- Number of days in the past week eating an inferior food
- Value of dwelling

The last 10 indicators in this list require performing division, deal with the past and so cannot be verified, or require "marking to market" the household's dwelling.

The approach of Zeller *et al.* shares many of the strengths of the approach here in that it ranks households by relative poverty and in that it is adaptable to diverse contexts. It differs in that it does not require expenditure data and thus can be applied even in the absence of national household expenditure survey (because it does its own special-purpose survey). Its limitations include:

- The measure of poverty is relative
- Accuracy is not tested, so bias, precision, and sample-size formulas are unknown
- Tools are built from small samples
- The quality of expenditure on clothing as a proxy for poverty is not tested
- The identification of the first principal component with poverty is not tested
- Some indicators are not simple

3.5 The scorecard

What is the value added by the scorecard? In terms of data, it uses the most recent nationally representative expenditure survey. In terms of testing, it measures accuracy with data not used for construction, and it reports bias, precision, and sample-size formulas for estimates of individual households' poverty likelihoods, poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, and changes in the poverty rates for groups of households between two points in time. It also reports targeting accuracy for a range of possible cut-offs. In terms of simplicity and ease-of-use, the new scorecard is eclipsed only by KJ's asset tool. And in terms of accuracy, it is probably close to the others, although data differences prevent clean comparisons.

4. Scorecard construction

About 100 potential indicators are initially prepared in the areas of:

- Family composition (such as female headship and number of children)
- Employment (such as principal occupation)
- Housing (such as type of dwelling and type of construction)
- Ownership of durable goods (such as land, televisions, and automobiles)

Each indicator is first screened with the entropy-based "uncertainty coefficient" (Goodman and Kruskal, 1979) that measures how well it predicts poverty on its own. Figure 3 lists the best indicators, ranked by uncertainty coefficient. Responses for each indicator are ordered starting with those most strongly associated with poverty.

The scorecard also aims to measure *changes* in poverty through time. Thus, some powerful indicators (such as the highest grade completed by a household member) that are relatively insensitive to changes in poverty are omitted in favor of less-powerful indicators (such as ownership of fans or pressure cookers) that are more sensitive.

The scorecard itself is built using Logit regression on the construction sub-sample from Round 62 (Figure 2). Indicator selection uses both judgment and statistics (forward stepwise based on "c"). The first step is to build one scorecard for each candidate indicator, using Logit to derive points. Each scorecard's accuracy is taken as "c", a measure of ability to rank by poverty status (SAS Institute Inc., 2004).

One of these one-indicator scorecards is then selected based on several factors (Schreiner *et al.*, 2004; Zeller, 2004), including improvement in accuracy, likelihood of

acceptance by users (determined by simplicity, cost of collection, and "face validity" in terms of experience, theory, and common sense), sensitivity to changes in poverty status, variety among indicators, and verifiability.

A series of two-indicator scorecards are then built, each based on the one-indicator scorecard selected from the first step, with a second candidate indicator added. The best two-indicator scorecard is then selected, again based on "c" and judgment. These steps are repeated until the scorecard has 10 indicators.

The final step is to transform the Logit coefficients into non-negative integers such that total scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line).

This algorithm is the Logit analogue to the R^2-based stepwise used by IRIS Center (2005a and 2005b). Like R^2 in a least-squares regression on expenditure, "c" in a Logit regression on poverty status is a good measure of global accuracy. The procedure here differs from naïve stepwise in that the criteria for selecting indicators include not only statistical accuracy but also judgment and non-statistical factors. The use of non-statistical criteria can improve robustness through time and, more important, helps ensure that indicators are simple and make sense to users.

The scorecard here applies to all of India. Evidence from India and Mexico (Schreiner, 2006a and 2005a), Sri Lanka (Narayan and Yoshida, 2005), and Jamaica (Grosh and Baker, 1995) suggests that segmenting scorecards by rural/urban does not improve accuracy much.

5. Practical guidelines for scorecard use

The main challenge of scorecard design is not to squeeze out the last drops of accuracy but rather to improve the chances that scoring is actually used (Schreiner, 2005b). When scoring projects fail, the reason is not usually technical inaccuracy but rather the failure of an organization to decide to do what is needed to integrate scoring in its processes and to learn to use it properly (Schreiner, 2002). After all, most reasonable scorecards predict tolerably well, thanks to the empirical phenomenon known as the "flat max" (Hand, 2006; Baesens *et al.*, 2003; Lovie and Lovie, 1986; Kolesar and Showers, 1985; Stillwell, Hutton, and Edwards, 1983; Dawes, 1979; Wainer, 1976; Myers and Forgy, 1963). The bottleneck is less technical and more human, not statistics but organizational change management. Accuracy is easier to achieve than adoption.

The scorecard here is designed to encourage understanding and trust so that users will adopt it and use it properly. Of course, accuracy matters, but it is balanced against simplicity, ease-of-use, and "face validity". Programs are more likely to collect data, compute scores, and pay attention to the results if, in their view, scoring does not make a lot of "extra" work and if the whole process generally seems to make sense.

To this end, the scorecard here fits on one page. The construction process, indicators, and points are simple and transparent. "Extra" work is minimized; non-specialists can compute scores by hand in the field because the scorecard has:

- Only 10 indicators
- Only categorical indicators
- Simple weights (non-negative integers, no arithmetic beyond addition)

A field worker using the paper scorecard would:

- Record participant identifiers
- Read each question from the scorecard
- Circle the response and its points
- Write the points in the far-right column
- Add up the points to get the total score
- Implement targeting policy (if any)
- Deliver the paper scorecard to a central office for filing or data entry

Of course, field workers must be trained. Quality results depend on quality inputs. If organizations or field workers gather their own data and have an incentive to exaggerate poverty rates (for example, if they are rewarded for higher poverty rates), then it is wise to do on-going quality control via data review and random audits (Matul and Kline, 2003).[13] IRIS Center (2007b) and Toohig (2007) are useful nuts-and-bolts guides for budgeting, training field workers and supervisors, logistics, sampling, interviewing, piloting, recording data, and quality control.

In terms of sampling design, an organization must make choices about:

- Who will do the scoring
- How scores will be recorded
- What participants will be scored
- How many participants will be scored
- How frequently participants will be scored
- Whether scoring will be applied at more than one point in time
- Whether the same participants will be scored at more than one point in time

The non-specialists who apply the scorecard with participants in the field can be:

- Employees of the organization

[13] If an organization does not want field workers to know the points associated with indicators, then they can make a version without points and apply them later in a spreadsheet or database at the central office.

- Third-party contractors

Responses, scores, and poverty likelihoods can be recorded:

- On paper in the field and then filed at an office
- On paper in the field and then keyed into a database or spreadsheet at an office
- In portable electronic devices in the field and downloaded to a database

The subjects to be scored can be:

- All participants (or all new participants)
- A representative sample of all participants (or of all new participants)
- All participants (or all new participants) in a representative sample of branches
- A representative sample of all participants (or all new participants) in a representative sample of branches

If not determined by other factors, the number of participants to be scored can be derived from sample-size formulas (presented later) for a desired level of confidence and a desired confidence interval.

Frequency of application can be:

- At in-take only (precluding measuring change in poverty rates)
- As a once-off project for current participants (precluding measuring change)
- Once a year (or at some other fixed interval, allowing measuring change)
- Each time a field worker visits a participant at home (allowing measuring change)

When the scorecard is applied more than once so as to measure change in poverty rates, it can be applied:

- With a different set of participants
- With the same set of participants

An example set of choices were made by BRAC and ASA, two microlenders in Bangladesh (each with 7 million participants) who are applying the Simple Poverty Scorecard tool for Bangaldesh (Schreiner, 2006b). Their design is that loan officers in a

random sample of branches score all participants each time they visit a homestead as part of their standard due diligence prior to loan disbursement (about once a year). Responses are recorded on paper in the field before being sent to a central office to be entered into a database. ASA's and BRAC's sampling plans cover 50,000–100,000 participants each.

6. Estimates of household poverty likelihoods

The sum of scorecard points for a household is called the *score*. For India, scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line). While higher scores indicate less likelihood of being below a poverty line, the scores themselves have only relative units. For example, doubling the score does not double the likelihood of being above a poverty line.

To get absolute units, scores must be converted to *poverty likelihoods*, that is, probabilities of being below a poverty line. This is done via simple look-up tables. For the example of the national line, scores of 0–4 have a poverty likelihood of 77.0 percent, and scores of 45–49 have a poverty likelihood of 4.5 percent (Figure 4).

The poverty likelihood associated with a score varies by poverty line. For example, scores of 45–49 are associated with a poverty likelihood of 4.5 percent for the national line but 5.8 percent for the $1/day line.[14]

6.1 Calibrating scores with poverty likelihoods

A given score is non-parametrically associated ("calibrated") with a poverty likelihood by defining the poverty likelihood as the share of households in the Round 62 calibration sub-sample who have the score and who are below a given poverty line.

[14] Starting with Figure 5, most figures have seven versions, one for each poverty line. To keep them straight, they are grouped by poverty line. Single tables that pertain to all poverty lines are placed with the tables for the national line.

For the example for the national line (Figure 5), there are 931 households in the calibration sub-sample with a score of 0–4, of whom 716 are below the poverty line. The estimated poverty likelihood associated with a score of 0–4 is then 77.0 percent, because 716 ÷ 931 = 77.0 percent.

To illustrate with the national line and a score of 45–49, there are 7,116 households in the calibration sample, of whom 322 are below the line (Figure 5). Thus, the poverty likelihood for this score is 322 ÷ 7,116 = 4.5 percent.

The same method is used to calibrate scores with estimated poverty likelihoods for the other poverty lines.

Figure 6 shows, for all scores, the likelihood that expenditure falls in a range demarcated by two adjacent poverty lines. For example, the daily expenditure of someone with a score of 35–39 falls in the following ranges with probability:

- 7.9 percent below $0.75/day
- 7.0 percent between $0.75/day and the national line
- 8.2 percent between the national line and $1/day
- 22.3 percent between $1/day and $1.25/day
- 17.4 percent between $1.25/day and $1.50/day
- 21.9 percent between $1.50/day and $2/day
- 15.3 percent above $2/day

Even though the scorecard is constructed partly based on judgment, the calibration process produces poverty likelihoods that are objective, that is, derived from data on expenditure-based poverty lines. The poverty likelihoods are objective even if indicators and/or points are selected without any data at all. In fact, objective scorecards of proven accuracy are often based only on judgment (Fuller, 2006; Caire,

2004; Schreiner *et al.*, 2004). Of course, the scorecard here was constructed with both data and judgement. The fact that this paper acknowledges that some choices in scorecard construction—as in any statistical analysis—are informed by judgment in no way impugns the objectivity of the poverty likelihoods, as this depends on using data in score calibration, not on using data (and nothing else) in scorecard construction.

Although the points in India's scorecard are transformed coefficients from a Logit regression, scores are not converted to poverty likelihoods via the Logit formula of 2.718281828^{score} x $(1+ 2.718281828^{score})^{-1}$. This is because the Logit formula is esoteric and difficult to compute by hand. Non-specialists find it more intuitive to define the poverty likelihood as the share of households with a given score in the calibration sample who are below a poverty line. In the field, converting scores to poverty likelihoods requires no arithmetic at all, just a look-up table. This non-parametric calibration can also improve accuracy, especially with large calibration samples.

6.2 Accuracy of estimates of poverty likelihoods

As long as the relationship between indicators and poverty does not change, this calibration process produces unbiased estimates of poverty likelihoods. *Unbiased* means that in repeated samples from the same population, the average estimate matches the

true poverty likelihood. The scorecard also produces unbiased estimates of poverty rates at a point in time and of changes in poverty rates between two points in time.[15]

Of course, the relationship between indicators and poverty changes as time pases, so the scorecard applied after Round 62 (as all are in practice) will generally be biased. This is especially relevant in India, where growth is strong and poverty rates are falling. Still, unbiasedness is a desirable quality for an estimator.

How accurate are estimates of poverty likelihoods? To measure, the scorecard is applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of size $n = 16{,}384$ from the Round 62 validation sub-sample and, separately, from Round 60 (Figure 2). Bootstrapping entails:[16]

- Score each household in the Round 62 validation sample (or in Round 60)
- Draw a new sample *with replacement* from the relevant validation sample
- For each score, compute the true poverty likelihood in the bootstrap sample, that is, the share of households with the score and with expenditure below a poverty line
- For each score, record the difference between the estimated poverty likelihood (Figure 4) and the true poverty likelihood in the bootstrap sample
- Repeat the previous three steps 1,000 times
- For each score, report the average difference between estimated and true poverty likelihoods across the 1,000 bootstrap samples
- For each score, report the average two-sided interval containing the central 900, 950, or 990 differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods

For each of the 20 score ranges, Figure 7 shows the average difference between estimated and true poverty likelihoods as well as average confidence intervals around the differences.

[15] This follows because these estimates of groups' poverty rates are linear functions of the unbiased estimates of households' poverty likelihoods. IRIS also produces unbiased estimates, but KL and JM do not.

[16] Efron and Tibshirani, 1993.

For the national line, the average poverty likelihood across bootstrap samples for scores of 0–4 in the Round 62 validation sample is too high by 5.3 percentage points (Figure 7). For scores of 5–9, the estimate is too low by 4.6 percentage points. When applied to Round 60, estimates for scores of 0–4 and 5–9 were too high by 8.3 percentage points and too low by 1.4 percentage points.[17]

For the Round 62 validation sample, the 90-percent confidence interval for the differences for scores of 0–4 is +/–8.9 percentage points (Figure 7).[18] This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps, the difference between the estimate and the true value is between –3.6 and 14.2 percentage points (because 5.3 – 8.9 = –3.6, and 5.3 + 8.9 = 14.2). In 950 of 1,000 bootstraps (95 percent), the difference is 5.3 +/–9.6 percentage points, and in 990 of 1,000 bootstraps (99 percent), the difference is 5.3 +/–10.7 percentage points.

For almost all score ranges, Figure 7 shows differences—sometimes large ones—between estimated poverty likelihoods and true values. This is because the Round 62 validation sub-sample and Round 60 are single samples that—thanks to sampling variation—differ in distribution from the construction/calibration sub-samples and from India's population. In the case of Round 60, the relationship between indicators and poverty also changes over time and so differs from the relationship in Round 62, leading to bias that does not vanish in repeated samples. For targeting, however, what matters

[17] There are differences in Round 62, in spite of the estimator's unbiasedness, because the estimates come from a single validation sample. If repeated validation samples could be drawn from India's population, their average difference would be zero.
[18] Confidence intervals are a standard, widely understood measure of precision.

is less the bias in all score ranges and more the bias in score ranges just above and below the targeting cut-off. This fact mitigates the effects of bias and sampling variation on targeting (Friedman, 1997). Section 9 below looks at targeting accuracy in detail.

Of course, if estimates of groups' poverty rates are to be usefully accurate, then errors for individual households must largely cancel out. As discussed later, this is generally what happens.

Figure 8 (summarizing Figures 9 and 10 across poverty lines) shows that differences, when averaged across score ranges for a given poverty line, are typically less than 1.0 percentage point for the Round 62 validation sample and 1.6 percentage points for Round 60. The Round 62 differences are due to sampling variation, while the Round 60 differences are due to sampling variation plus bias due to changes in the relationship between indicators and poverty. The differences across rounds average about 0.5 percentage points, and this can function as an estimate of the bias due to changes in the relationship between indicators and poverty in the two years between Rounds 62 and 60.

There are three approaches to mitigating these differences between estimated and true values. First, poverty likelihoods in application could be adjusted to compensate for estimated bias derived from Figure 7. For the example of the national line and a given score, the estimated bias is the difference between the difference in Round 60 and the difference in Round 62. For the example of scores of 0–4, this is 8.3 – 5.3 = 3.0

percentage points. Thus, rather than associating scores of 0–4 with Figure 4's poverty likelihood of 77.0 percent, the bias-adjusted poverty likelihood would be 77.0 – 3.0 = 74.0 percent. This would then give an unbiased estimate for Round 60.

Of course, this approach is not helpful when applying the scorecard after Round 62, which of course is precisely how it is applied in practice. If Round 62 represents future reality better than does Round 60 (a safe assumption), then the adjustment process above is not needed and a better practice is simply to use the Round 62 results, updating the scorecard as new rounds of data become available.

A second approach to mitigating differences between estimates and true values is to increase the fineness of the points (for example, by making them 0–200 instead of 0–100) or to increase the number of ranges into which scores are grouped (for example, 40 instead of 20). But this adds complexity, and experiments suggest that while grouping scores and rounding points do matter, they are not the main sources of differences.

By construction, the scorecard here is unbiased when applied to Round 62 data. But it may still be *overfit* when applied after Round 62. That is, it may fit the Round 62 data so closely that it captures not only some timeless patterns but also some random patterns that, due to sampling variation, show up only in Round 62. Or the scorecard may be overfit in that becomes biased as the relationship between indicators and poverty changes over time.

Overfitting can be mitigated by simplifying the scorecard and by not relying only on data but rather also considering experience, judgment, and theory. Of course, the

scorecard here does this. Bootstrapping can also mitigate overfitting by reducing (but not eliminating) dependence on a single sampling instance. Combining scorecards can also help, but that would increase complexity too much in this context.

The third approach is to do nothing. After all, most errors in individual households' likelihoods cancel out in the estimates of groups' poverty rates (see later sections). Furthermore, up to 80 percent of differences may come from non-scorecard sources such as changes in the relationship between indicators and poverty, sampling variation, changes in poverty lines, inconsistencies data quality across time, and inconsistencies in cost-of-living adjustments. These factors can be addressed only by improving data quantity and quality (which is beyond the scope of the scorecard) or by reducing overfitting (which likely has limited returns, given the scorecard's parsimony).

7. Estimates of a group's poverty rate at a point in time

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

To illustrate, suppose a program samples three households on Jan. 1, 2008 and that they have scores of 20, 30, and 40, corresponding to poverty likelihoods of 28.7, 18.9, and 10.0 percent (national line, Figure 4). The group's estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of $(28.7 + 18.9 + 10.0) \div 3 = 19.2$ percent.[19]

7.1 Accuracy of estimated poverty rates at a point in time

How accurate is this estimate? For a range of sample sizes, Figure 12 reports average differences between estimated and true poverty rates as well as precision (average confidence intervals for the differences) for the scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples from the Round 62 validation sample. For the national line, the scorecard is too low by about 1.0 percentage points; it estimates a poverty rate of 16.3 percent for the Round 62 validation sample, but the true value 17.3 percent (Figure 2). For all poverty lines, differences for the Round 62 validation sample are 1.2 percentage points or less, with an average of about 0.7 percentage points (Figure 11).[20]

[19] The group's poverty rate is *not* the poverty likelihood associated with the average score. Here, the average score is $(20 + 30 + 40) \div 3 = 30$, and the poverty likelihood associated with the average score is 18.9 percent. This is not the 19.2 percent found as the average of the three poverty likelihoods associated with each of the three scores.
[20] Figure 11 summarizes Figures 12 and 13.

As before, differences between estimates and true values for groups' poverty rates are due, in the Round 62 validation sample, to sampling variation, and, in Round 60, to sampling variation plus bias due to changing relationships for indicators and poverty.

In terms of precision, the 90-percent confidence interval for a group's estimated poverty rate at a point in time and $n = 16{,}384$ is 0.8 percentage points or less (Figure 11). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps of this size, the difference between the estimate and the true value is within 0.8 percentage points of the average difference. In the specific case of the national line and the Round 62 validation sample, 90 percent of all samples of $n = 16{,}384$ produce estimates that differ from the true value in the range of –1.0 – 0.7 = –1.7 to –1.0 + 0.7 = –0.3 percentage points. (–1.0 is the average difference, and +/–0.7 is its 90-percent confidence interval.)

7.2 Sample-size formula for estimates of poverty rates at a point in time

How many households should an organization sample if it wants to estimate their poverty rate at a point in time for a desired confidence interval and confidence level? This practical question was first addressed in Schreiner (2008).[21]

[21] IRIS Center (2007b and 2007c) says that $n = 300$ is sufficient for USAID reporting. If a scorecard is as precise as direct measurement, if the expected (before measurement) poverty rate is 50 percent, and if the confidence level is 90 percent, then $n = 300$ implies a confidence interval of +/– 2.2 percentage points. In fact, USAID has not specified confidence levels or intervals. Furthermore, the expected poverty rate may not be 50 percent, and the scorecard could be more or less precise than direct measurement.

With direct measurement, the poverty rate can be estimated as the number of households observed to be below the poverty line, divided by the number of all observed households. The formula for sample size n in this case is (Cochran, 1977):

$$n = \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}), \qquad (1)$$

where

z is $\begin{cases} 1.64 \text{ for confidence levels of 90 percent} \\ 1.96 \text{ for confidence levels of 95 percent} \\ 2.58 \text{ for confidence levels of 99 percent} \end{cases}$,

c is the confidence interval as a proportion (for example, 0.02 for an interval of +/–2 percentage points), and

$\hat{p}$ is the expected (before measurement) proportion of households below the poverty line.

Scorecards, however, do not measure poverty directly, so this formula is not applicable. To derive a similar sample-size formula for the India scorecard, consider the scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample. Figure 2 shows that the expected (before measurement) poverty rate $\hat{p}$ for the national line is 0.168 (that is, the poverty rate in the construction and calibration sub-samples). In turn, a sample size n of 16,384 and a 90-percent confidence level correspond to a confidence interval of +/–0.69 percentage points (Figure 12).[22] Plugging these into the direct-measurement sample-size formula (1) above gives not n = 16,384 but rather $n = \left(\frac{1.64}{0.0069}\right)^2 \cdot 0.168 \cdot (1 - 0.168) =$

[22] Due to rounding, Figure 12 displays 0.7, not 0.69.

7,897. The ratio of the sample size for scoring (derived empirically) to the sample size for direct measurement (derived from theory) is 16,384 ÷ 7,897 = 2.07.

Applying the same method to n = 8,192 (confidence interval of +/–0.96 percentage points) gives $n = \left(\frac{1.64}{0.0096}\right)^2 \cdot 0.168 \cdot (1 - 0.168)$ = 4,080. This time, the ratio of the sample size using scoring to the sample size using direct measurement is 8,192 ÷ 4,080 = 2.01. This ratio of 2.01 for n = 8,192 is close to the ratio of 2.07 for n = 16,384. Indeed, applying this same procedure for all $n \geq 256$ in Figure 12 gives ratios that average to 1.98. This can be used to define a sample-size formula for the Round 62 India scorecard applied to the Round 62 population:

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

where α = 1.98 and z, c, and $\hat{p}$ are defined as in (1) above. It is this α that appears in Figure 11 under "α for sample size".

To illustrate the use of (2), suppose c = 0.055 (confidence interval of +/– 5.5 percentage points) and z = 1.64 (90-percent confidence). Then (2) gives $n = 1.98 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64}{0.055}\right)^2 \cdot 0.168 \cdot (1 - 0.168) = 247$, which is close to the sample size of 256 for these parameters in Figure 12.

When the sample-size factor α is less than 1.0, it means that the scorecard is more precise than direct measurement. This occurs in two of the 14 cases in Figure 12.

Of course, the sample-size formulas here are specific to India, its poverty lines, its poverty rates, and this scorecard. The derivation method, however, is valid for any poverty-assessment tool following the approach in this paper.

In practice after Round 62, an organization would select a poverty line (say, \$1/day), select a desired confidence level (say, 90 percent, or $z = 1.64$), select a desired confidence interval (say, +/– 2 percentage points, or $c = 0.02$), make an assumption about $\hat{p}$ (perhaps based on a previous measurement such as the 25.4 percent national average for Round 62), look up α (here, 1.67 for \$1/day), assume that the scorecard will still work in the future,[23] and then compute the required sample size. In this illustration,

$$n = 1.67 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 0.254 \cdot (1 - 0.254) = 2{,}128.$$

If the scorecard has already been applied to a sample n, then $\hat{p}$ is the scorecard's estimated poverty rate and the confidence interval c is $+/- z \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\alpha \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}}$.

[23] This paper reports accuracy for the scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample, but it cannot test accuracy for later years. Still, performance after Round 62 will probably resemble that in Round 62, with some deterioriation as time passes.

8. Estimates of changes in group poverty rates over time

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

8.1 Warning: Change is not impact

Scoring can estimate change. Of course, poverty could get better or worse, and scoring does not indicate what caused change. This point is often forgotten or confused, so it bears repeating: the scorecard simply estimates change, and it does not, in and of itself, indicate the reason for the change. In particular, estimating the impact of program participation requires knowing what would have happened to participants if they had not been participants (Moffitt, 1991). Knowing this requires either strong assumptions or a control group that resembles participants in all ways except participation. To belabor the point, the scorecard can help estimate program impact only if there is some way to know what would have happened in the absence of the program. And that information must come from somewhere beyond the scorecard. Even measuring simple change usually requires the strong assumptions that the population is constant over time and that program drop-outs do not differ from others.

8.2 Calculating estimated changes in poverty rates over time

Consider the illustration begun in the previous section. On Jan. 1, 2008, a program samples three households who score 20, 30, and 40 and so have poverty

likelihoods of 28.7, 18.9, and 10.0 percent (national line, Figure 4). The group's baseline estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of (28.7 + 18.9 + 10.0) ÷ 3 = 19.2 percent.

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

- Score a new, independent sample, measuring change by cohort across the samples
- Score the same sample at follow-up as at baseline

By way of illustration, suppose that a year later on Jan. 1, 2009, the program samples three additional households who are in the same cohort as the three households originally sampled (or suppose that the program scores the same three original households a second time) and finds that their scores are 25, 35, and 45 (poverty likelihoods of 21.3, 14.9, and 4.5 percent, national line, Figure 4). Their average poverty likelihood at follow-up is now (21.3 + 14.9 + 4.5) ÷ 3 = 13.6 percent, an improvement of 19.2 – 13.6 = 5.6 percentage points.

This suggests that about 56 of 1,000 participants crossed the poverty line in 2008.[24] Among those who started below the line, about three in ten (5.6 ÷ 19.2 = 29.2 percent) ended up above the line.[25]

8.3 Accuracy for estimated change in two independent samples

Figures 14–15 report differences between estimates and true values, along with precision, for 1,000 bootstraps of the application of the scorecard to the change in the

[24] This is a net figure; some people start above the line and end below it, and vice versa.
[25] The scorecard does not reveal the reasons for this change.

poverty rate between the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60. In each bootstrap, one sample is drawn from each round.

8.3.1 Differences between estimates and true values

Differences range from 0.5 to 2.1 percentage points, averaging 0.9 across poverty lines (Figure 14). As an example, the true change for $1/day was 25.4 – 27.7 = –2.3 percentage points (Figure 2), but the scorecard's estimate was –3.8 percentage points, or 1.5 percentage points too low. This difference is partly due to sampling variation and partly due to bias from changes in the relationship between indicators and poverty.

8.3.2 Precision

The 90-percent confidence intervals for $n = 16{,}384$ are always +/–1.0 percentage points or less (Figure 14). The 90-percent intervals for $n = 4{,}096$ in Figure 15 are about twice the intervals for $n = 16{,}384$, and the intervals for $n = 4{,}096$ are themselves about half the intervals for $n = 1{,}024$. This is a general property of all the estimators presented here; quadrupling sample size cuts confidence intervals in half.

8.3.3 Sample-size formula

Under direct measurement, the sample-size formula for estimates of changes in poverty rates in two equal-sized independent samples is:

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}) \,, \tag{3}$$

where z, c, and $\hat{p}$ are defined as in (1). Before measurement, $\hat{p}$ is assumed equal at both baseline and follow-up. n is the sample size at both baseline and follow-up.[26]

The method developed in the previous section can be used again to derive a sample-size formula for indirect measurement via the scorecard:

$$n = \alpha \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}) \,. \tag{4}$$

As before, α is the average across sample sizes ≥ 256 of the ratio between the empirical sample size required by scoring for a given precision and the theoretical sample size required under direct measurement. In Figure 14, α is less than 1.0 in one of seven cases, so scoring is again usually less precise than direct measurement.

To illustrate the use of (4) to determine sample size for estimating changes in poverty rates across two independent samples, suppose the desired confidence level is 90 percent ($z = 1.64$), the desired confidence interval is 2 percentage points ($c = 0.02$), the poverty line is \$1/day, and the results from Round 62 are used (so $\alpha = 1.55$ from Figure 14, and $\hat{p} = 0.254$ from Figure 2). Then baseline sample size is

$n = 1.55 \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 \cdot 0.254 \cdot (1 - 0.254) = 3{,}950$, and follow-up sample size is also 3,950.

[26] This means that, for a given precision and with direct measurement, estimating the change in a poverty rate between two points in time requires four times as many measurements (not twice as many) as does estimating a poverty rate at a point in time.

8.4 Accuracy for estimated change for one sample, scored twice

India's SES does not visit the same set of households in two consecutive rounds. Thus, for changes in poverty rates for a single sample, scored twice, it is not possible to measure differences between estimates and true values, nor precision.

In general, the direct-measurement sample-size formula for this case is:[27]

$$n = \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \left[\hat{p}_{12} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{12}) + \hat{p}_{21} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{21}) + 2 \cdot \hat{p}_{12} \cdot \hat{p}_{21}\right], \quad (5)$$

where z and c are defined as in (1), $\hat{p}_{12}$ is the expected (before measurement) share of all sampled cases that move from below the poverty line to above it, and $\hat{p}_{21}$ is the expected share of all sampled cases that move from above the line to below it.

How can a user set $\hat{p}_{12}$ and $\hat{p}_{21}$? Before measurement, a reasonable assumption is that the change in the poverty rate is zero. Then $\hat{p}_{12} = \hat{p}_{21}$ and (5) becomes:

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \hat{p}_*, \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{p}_* = \hat{p}_{12} = \hat{p}_{21}$.

Still, $\hat{p}_*$ could be anything between 0–1, so (6) is not enough to compute sample size. The estimate of $\hat{p}_*$ must be based on data available before baseline measurement.

[27] See McNemar (1947) and Johnson (2007). John Pezzullo helped find this formula.

Suppose that the observed relationship between $\hat{p}_*$ and the variance of the baseline poverty rate $p_{baseline} \cdot (1 - p_{baseline})$ is—as in Peru, see Schreiner (2008)—close to $\hat{p}_* = 0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [p_{baseline} \cdot (1 - p_{baseline})]$. Of course, $p_{baseline}$ is not known before baseline measurement, but it is reasonable to use as its expected value a previously observed poverty rate. Given this and a poverty line, a sample-size formula for a single sample directly measured twice for India in Round 62 and then again later is:

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \{0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [p_{R60} \cdot (1 - p_{R60})]\}. \quad (7)$$

As usual, (7) is multiplied by α to get scoring's sample-size formula:

$$n = \alpha \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \{0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [p_{R60} \cdot (1 - p_{R60})]\}. \quad (8)$$

To illustrate the use of (8), suppose the desired confidence level is 90 percent (z = 1.64), the desired confidence interval is 2 percentage points (c = 0.02), the poverty line is \$1/day, and the sample will first be scored in Round 62. The before-baseline poverty rate is 27.7 percent (p_{R60} =0.277, Figure 2), and suppose α = 1.55 (as it is in India for estimates of poverty rates at a point in time for the \$1/day line, Figure 14). Then baseline sample size is $n = 1.55 \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 \cdot \{0.0085 + 0.206 \cdot [0.277 \cdot (1 - 0.277)]\} =$ 1,038. Of course, the same group of 1,038 households are scored at follow-up as well.

For a given confidence level and confidence interval, sample sizes are smaller when one sample is scored twice than when there are two different samples.

9. Targeting

When a program uses the scorecard for targeting, households with scores at or below a cut-off are labeled *targeted* and treated—for program purposes—as if they are below a given poverty line. Households with scores above a cut-off are *non-targeted* and treated—for program purposes—as if they are above a given poverty line.

There is a distinction between *targeting status* (scoring at or below a targeting cut-off) and *poverty status* (expenditure below a poverty line). Poverty status is a fact that depends on whether expenditure is below a poverty line as directly measured by a survey. In contrast, targeting status is a program's policy choice that depends on a cut-off and on an indirect estimate from a scorecard.

Targeting is successful when households truly below a poverty line are targeted (*inclusion*) and when households truly above a poverty line are not targeted (*exclusion*). Of course, no scorecard is perfect, and targeting is unsuccessful when households truly below a poverty line are not targeted (*undercoverage*) or when households truly above a poverty line are targeted (*leakage*). Figure 16 depicts these four possible targeting outcomes. Targeting accuracy varies by cut-off; a higher cut-off has better inclusion (but greater leakage), while a lower cut-off has better exclusion (but higher undercoverage).

A program should weigh these trade-offs when setting a cut-off. A formal way to do this is to assign net benefits—based on a program's values and mission—to each of

the four possible targeting outcomes and then to choose the cut-off that maximizes total net benefits (Adams and Hand, 2000; Hoadley and Oliver, 1998).

Figures 17 and 18 show the distribution of households by targeting outcome for India's scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60. For an example cut-off of 15–19, outcomes for the national line and the Round 62 validation sample are:

- Inclusion: 7.0 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 10.3 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 6.6 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 76.0 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

Increasing the cut-off to 20–24 improves inclusion and undercoverage but worsens leakage and exclusion:

- Inclusion: 9.4 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 7.9 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 11.7 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 70.9 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

Which cut-off is preferred depends on total net benefit. If each targeting outcome has a per-household benefit or cost, then total net benefit for a given cut-off is:

Benefit per household correctly included	x	Households correctly included	+
Cost per household mistakenly not covered	x	Households mistakenly not covered	+
Cost per household mistakenly leaked	x	Households mistakenly leaked	+
Benefit per household correctly excluded	x	Households correctly excluded.	

To set an optimal cut-off, a program would:

- Assign benefits and costs to possible outcomes, based on its values and mission
- Tally total net benefits for each cut-off using Figure 17 or 18 for a poverty line
- Select the cut-off with the highest total net benefit

The most difficult step is assigning benefits and costs to targeting outcomes. Any program that uses targeting—with or without scoring—should thoughtfully consider how it values successful inclusion or exclusion versus errors of undercoverage and leakage. It is healthy to go through a process of thinking explicitly and intentionally about how possible targeting outcomes are valued.

A common choice of benefits and costs is "Total Accuracy" (IRIS, 2005a).[28] With this, total net benefit is the number of households correctly included or excluded:

Total Accuracy =	1	x	Households correctly included	+
	0	x	Households mistakenly undercovered	+
	0	x	Households mistakenly leaked	+
	1	x	Households correctly excluded.	

Figures 17–18 show "Total Accuracy" for all cut-offs for the India scorecard. For the national line in the Round 62 validation sample, total net benefit is greatest (84.1) for a cut-off of 10–14, with more than four in five Indian households correctly classified.

"Total Accuracy" weighs successful inclusion of households below the poverty line the same as successful exclusion of households above the line. If a program valued inclusion more (say, twice as much) than exclusion, it could reflect this by setting the benefit for inclusion to 2 and the benefit for exclusion to 1. Then the chosen cut-off would maximize (2 x Households correctly included) + (1 x Households correctly excluded).

[28] Grootaert and Braithwaite (1998) use this criterion.

Beyond "Total Accuracy", IRIS (2005a) proposes a new yardstick called the "Balanced Poverty Accuracy Criterion". BPAC considers two goals:[29]

- Inclusion
- Unbiasedness of the estimated poverty rate

For scorecards that estimate expenditure rather than poverty likelihood, the second goal is optimized by minimizing the absolute value of the difference between undercoverage and leakage. After normalizing by the number of households below the poverty line, the BPAC formula is

(Inclusion + |Undercoverage – Leakage|) x [100 ÷ (Inclusion + Undercoverage)].

BPAC is mostly relevant for poverty-assessment tools—like KL, JM, and IRIS—that estimate expenditure rather than poverty likelihood. In this case, the difference between an estimated poverty rate and the true value is equal to the difference between undercoverage and leakage.

BPAC is less relevant, however, for scorecards (like the one here) that estimate poverty likelihoods. In this case, a group's estimated poverty rate is the average of its members' poverty likelihoods, and this is independent of undercoverage and leakage (which in any case depend on a program-selected cut-off). BPAC for the new scorecard is not comparable with that of IRIS (the only other scorecard to report it) because IRIS' data set is smaller, older, and not nationally representative, and also because IRIS measures BPAC for people, not households, using the same data as for construction.

[29] A criterion must consider at least two outcomes among inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion. If not, it would imply targeting everyone or no one.

As an alternative to assigning benefits and costs to targeting outcomes and then choosing a cut-off to maximize total net benefit, a program could set a cut-off to achieve a desired poverty rate among targeted households. Figures 19 and 20 show, for the new India scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60, the expected poverty rate among households who score at or below a given cut-off. For the example of the national line and the Round 62 validation sample, targeting households who score 15–19 or less would target 13.6 of all Indian households and produce a poverty rate among those targeted of 51.5 percent .[30]

[30] If potential participants are not representative of all of India, then Figures 19–20 are valid only if selection into potential participation—whether by the program or potential participant—is unrelated with poverty in any way not captured by the scorecard.

10. Conclusion

This paper presents the scorecard, a low-cost tool that pro-poor programs in India can use to estimate the likelihood that a household has expenditure below a given poverty line, to estimate the poverty rate of a group of households at a point in time, and to estimate changes in the poverty rate of a group of households between two points in time. The scorecard can also be used for targeting.

The scorecard is inexpensive to use and can be understood by non-specialists. It is designed to be practical for local pro-poor organizations who want to improve how they monitor and manage their social performance so as to speed up their participants' progress out of poverty.

The scorecard is built with a sub-sample of data from Round 62 of India's SES, tested with a different sub-sample from Round 62 and also with data from Round 60, and calibrated to seven poverty lines (national, USAID "extreme", \$0.75/day, \$1/day, \$1.25/day, \$1.50/day, and \$2/day).

Accuracy and sample-size formulas are reported for estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, groups' poverty rates at a point in time, and changes in groups' poverty rates over time. Of course, the scorecard's estimates of changes in poverty rates are not the same as estimates of program impact. When measuring change, it is more efficient in terms of sample size to score a single sample twice than to score two independent samples.

When the scorecard is applied to the Round 62 validation sample, the difference between estimates versus true poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time is less than 1.2 percentage points and averages—across the seven poverty lines—about 0.7 percentage points. For $n = 16{,}384$ and 90-percent confidence, the precision of these differences is are +/–0.8 percentage points or less, and for $n = 1{,}024$, precision is +/–3.2 percentage points or less. The accuracy of the new India scorecard probably is comparable with that of existing alternatives.

For targeting, programs can use the results reported here to select a cut-off that fits their values and mission.

Although the statistical technique is innovative, and although technical accuracy is important, the design of the scorecard here focuses on transparency and ease-of-use. After all, a perfectly accurate scorecard is worthless if programs feel so daunted by its complexity or its cost that they do not even try to use it. For this reason, the scorecard is kept simple, using 10 indicators that are inexpensive to collect and that are straightforward to verify. Points are all zeros or positive integers, and scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line). Scores are related to poverty likelihoods via simple look-up tables, and targeting cut-offs are likewise simple to apply. The design attempts to facilitate adoption by helping managers understand and trust scoring and by allowing non-specialists to generate scores quickly in the field.

In sum, the scorecard is a practical, objective way for pro-poor programs in India to monitor poverty rates, track changes in poverty rates over time, and target services. The same approach can be applied to any country with similar data from a national expenditure survey.

References

Abraham, Ronald Joseph. (2005) "Tripping over the Poverty Line", `cpasindia.org/articles/ot-05-09-15-tripping-over-poverty-line.html`, accessed July 7, 2008.

Adams, N.M.; and D.J. Hand. (2000) "Improving the Practice of Classifier Performance Assessment", *Neural Computation*, Vol. 12, pp. 305–311.

Baesens, B.; Van Gestel, T.; Viaene, S.; Stepanova, M.; Suykens, J.; and J. Vanthienen. (2003) "Benchmarking State-of-the-Art Classification Algorithms for Credit Scoring", *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, Vol. 54, pp. 627–635.

Caire, Dean. (2004) "Building Credit Scorecards for Small Business Lending in Developing Markets", `microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_SMEs_Hybrid.pdf`, accessed July 7, 2008.

Coady, David; Grosh, Margaret; and John Hoddinott. (2004) *Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries*, `hdl.handle.net/10986/14902`, retrieved 13 May 2016.

Cochran, William G. (1977) *Sampling Techniques, Third Edition*.

Datt, Gaurav; and Martin Ravallion. (2002) "Is India's Economic Growth Leaving the Poor Behind?", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 89–108.

Dawes, Robyn M. (1979) "The Robust Beauty of Improper Linear Models in Decision Making", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 34, No. 7, pp. 571–582.

Deaton, Angus. (2008) "Price Trends in India and Their Implications for Measuring Poverty", `ssrn.com/abstract=1085876`, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2003) "Prices and Poverty in India, 1987–2000", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Jan. 25, pp. 362–368.

_____; and Jean Drèze. (2002) "Poverty and Inequality in India: A Re-Examination", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Sept. 7, pp. 3729–3748.

_____; and Valerie Kozel. (2005) *The Great Indian Poverty Debate*.

Efron, Bradley; and Robert J. Tibshirani. (1993) *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*.

Friedman, Jerome H. (1997) "On Bias, Variance, 0–1 Loss, and the Curse-of-Dimensionality", *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, Vol. 1, pp. 55–77.

Fuller, Rob. (2006) "Measuring Poverty of Microfinance Clients in Haiti", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Haiti_Fuller.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

Goodman, L.A.; and Kruskal, W.H. (1979) *Measures of Association for Cross Classification*.

Grootaert, Christiaan; and Jeanine Braithwaite. (1998) "Poverty Correlates and Indicator-Based Targeting in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 1942, dx.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-1942, retrieved 15 May 2016.

Grosh, Margaret; and Judy L. Baker. (1995) "Proxy Means Tests for Targeting Social Programs: Simulations and Speculation", LSMS Working Paper No. 118, poverty2.forumone.com/library/view/5496/, accessed July 7, 2008.

Hand, David J. (2006) "Classifier Technology and the Illusion of Progress", *Statistical Science*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 1–15.

Heston, Alan; Summers, Robert; and Bettina Aten. (2006) *Penn World Table Version 6.2*, pwt.econ.upenn.edu/php_site/pwt62/pwt62_form.php, accessed July 7, 2008.

Hoadley, Bruce; and Robert M. Oliver. (1998) "Business Measures of Scorecard Benefit", *IMA Journal of Mathematics Applied in Business and Industry*, Vol. 9, pp. 55–64.

IRIS Center. (2007a) "Client Assessment Survey—India", povertytools.org/USAID_documents/Tools/Current_Tools/USAID_PAT_India_8-2007.xls, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2007b) "Manual for the Implementation of USAID Poverty Assessment Tools", povertytools.org/training_documents/Manuals/USAID_PAT_Manual_Eng.pdf, see also povertytools.org/implementation.html, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2007c) "Introduction to Sampling for the Implementation of PATs", povertytools.org/training_documents/Sampling/Introduction_Sampling.ppt, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2005a) "Notes on Assessment and Improvement of Tool Accuracy", povertytools.org/other_documents/AssessingImproving_Accuracy.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2005b) "Accuracy Results for 12 Poverty Assessment Tool Countries", povertytools.org/other_documents/Accuracy%20Results%2012.pdf, accessed 6 March 2017.

Jalan, Jyotsna; and Rinku Murgai. (2007) "An Effective 'Targeting Shortcut'? An Assessment of the 2002 Below-Poverty Line Census Method", www.ihdindia.org/ourcontrol/rinku_murgai.doc, accessed July 7, 2008.

Johnson, Glenn. (2007) "Lesson 3: Two-Way Tables—Dependent Samples", http://www.stat.psu.edu/online/development/stat504/03_2way/53_2way_compare.htm, accessed July 7, 2008.

Kijima, Yoko; and Peter Lanjouw. (2003) "Poverty in India during the 1990s: A Regional Perspective", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3141, ideas.repec.org/p/wbk/wbrwps/3141.html, accessed July 7, 2008.

Koenker, Roger; and Kevin F. Hallock. (2001) "Quantile Regression", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 143–156.

Kolesar, Peter; and Janet L. Showers. (1985) "A Robust Credit Screening Model Using Categorical Data", *Management Science*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 124–133.

Lovie, A.D.; and P. Lovie. (1986) "The Flat Maximum Effect and Linear Scoring Models for Prediction", *Journal of Forecasting*, Vol. 5, pp. 159–168.

Matul, Michal; and Sean Kline. (2003) "Scoring Change: Prizma's Approach to Assessing Poverty", Microfinance Centre for Central and Eastern Europe and the New Independent States Spotlight Note No. 4, www.mfc.org.pl/doc/Research/ImpAct/SN/MFC_SN04_eng.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

McNemar, Quinn. (1947) "Note on the Sampling Error of the Difference between Correlated Proportions or Percentages", *Psychometrika*, Vol. 17, pp. 153–157.

Moffitt, Robert. (1991) "Program Evaluation with Non-experimental Data", *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 291–314.

Myers, James H.; and Edward W. Forgy. (1963) "The Development of Numerical Credit Evaluation Systems", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 58, No. 303, pp. 779–806.

Narayan, Ambar; and Nobuo Yoshida. (2005) "Proxy Means Tests for Targeting Welfare Benefits in Sri Lanka", World Bank Report No. SASPR–7, documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2005/07/6209268/proxy-means-test-targeting-welfare-benefits-sri-lanka, retrieved 5 May 2016.

National Sample Survey Organisation. (2008) "Household Consumer Expenditure in India: 2005–06", Report No. 523, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, mospi.nic.in/rept%20_%20pubn/ftest.asp?rept_id=523&type=NSSO, accessed July 7, 2008.

Planning Commission. (2007) "Poverty Estimates for 2004–05", Government of India Press Information Bureau, planningcommission.nic.in/news/prmar07.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

SAS Institute Inc. (2004) "The LOGISTIC Procedure: Rank Correlation of Observed Responses and Predicted Probabilities", in *SAS/STAT User's Guide, Version 9.*

Saxena, N.C. (2001) "Poverty Estimates for 1999–00", Government of India Press Information Bureau, planningcommission.nic.in/reports/articles/ncsxna/ar_pvrty.htm, accessed July 7, 2008.

Schreiner, Mark. (2008) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Peru", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2003_ENG.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2006a) "Is One Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool Enough for India?", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_India_Segments.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2006b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Bangladesh", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/BGD_2000_ENG.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2005a) "La Herramienta del Índice de Calificación de la Pobreza™: México", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2002_SPA.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2005b) "IRIS Questions on the Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Response_to_IRIS.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

_____. (2002) *Scoring: The Next Breakthrough in Microfinance?* CGAP Occasional Paper No. 7, microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Breakthrough_CGAP.pdf, retrieved 13 May 2016.

_____; Matul, Michal; Pawlak, Ewa; and Sean Kline. (2004) "Poverty Scoring: Lessons from a Microlender in Bosnia-Herzegovina", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_in_BiH_Short.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

Sengupta, Arjun; Kanna, K.P.; and G Raveendran. (2008) "India's Common People: Who Are They, How Many Are They, and How Do They Live?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, March 15, pp. 49–63, sanhati.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/04/arjunepw.pdf, accessed July 7, 2008.

Sillers, Don. (2006) "National and International Poverty Lines: An Overview", pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadh069.pdf, retrieved 13 May 2016.

Singh, Kesar. (1998) "Breakdown Theory for Bootstrap Quantiles", *Annals of Statistics*, Vol. 26, pp. 1719–1732.

Stillwell, William G.; Barron, F. Hutton; and Ward Edwards. (1983) "Evaluating Credit Applications: A Validation of Multi-Attribute Utility Weight Elicitation Techniques", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 32, pp. 87–108.

Toohig, Jeff. (2007) "Progress Out of Poverty Index: Training Guide", progressoutofpoverty.org/toolkit, accessed July 7, 2008.

United States Congress. (2004) "Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 (HR 3818 RDS)", November 20, smith4nj.com/laws/108-484.pdf, retrieved 13 May 2016.

Wainer, Howard. (1976) "Estimating Coefficients in Linear Models: It Don't Make No Nevermind", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 83, pp. 223–227.

World Bank. (2006) *World Development Indicators Database.*

Zeller, Manfred. (2004) "Review of Poverty Assessment Tools", pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADH120.pdf, retrieved 13 May 2016.

_____; Sharma, Manohar; Henry, Carla; and Cécile Lapenu. (2006) "An Operational Method for Assessing the Poverty Outreach Performance of Development Policies and Projects: Results of Case Studies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America", *World Development*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 446–464.

Figure 2: Sample sizes and household poverty rates by sub-sample, round, and poverty line

Sub-sample	Round of Survey	Households	% households with expenditure below a poverty line						
				USAID		International			
			National	'Extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Construction									
Selecting indicators and weights	62	13,103	16.7	8.4	9.5	25.5	42.6	56.9	75.0
Calibration									
Associating scores with likelihoods	62	13,309	16.9	8.2	9.4	25.3	42.7	56.9	75.0
Validation									
Test scorecard accuracy	62	13,024	17.3	8.6	9.5	25.4	42.4	56.9	74.8
	60	29,631	19.6	9.4	9.6	27.7	44.9	58.6	75.0
Change in overall poverty rate (percentage points)									
From 62 to 60	62 to 60	13,024 and 29,631	-2.3	-0.8	-0.1	-2.3	-2.6	-1.7	0.0
All-India	57	62,628	23.0	10.5	12.4	31.3	47.8	61.1	76.8
	58	32,669	19.4	9.4	9.3	26.3	44.2	58.4	74.9
	59	41,013	19.4	9.4	9.3	26.2	44.2	58.1	75.1
	60	29,631	19.6	12.0	9.6	27.7	44.9	58.6	75.0
	61	124,643	23.0	11.1	13.4	32.5	49.9	62.8	77.5
	62	39,436	17.0	8.4	9.5	25.4	42.6	56.9	74.9

India Socio-Economic Survey by NSSO, Schedule 1.0: Round 57 (July 2001 to June 2002), R58 (July to Dec., 2002), R59 (Jan. to Dec., 2003), R60 (Jan. to June, 2004), R61 (July 2004 to June 2005), and R62 (July 2005 to June 2006).

Figure 3: Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly indicative of poverty)
1163	How many electric fans does the household own? (None; One; Two or more)
1086	Does the household own a television? (No; Yes)
1073	How many pressure cookers or pressure pans does the household own? (None; One; Two or more)
1069	What is the household's primary energy source for cooking? (Firewood and chips, charcoal, or none; Others; LPG)
882	What is the highest education level completed by any household member? (Primary or less or no data; Middle; Secondary; Higher secondary; More than higher secondary)
763	Does the household own a stove? (No; Yes)
741	How many people aged 0 to 14 are in the household? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
731	What is the household's principle occupation? (Labourers (agricultural, plantation, other farm), hunters, tobacco preparers and tobacco product makers, and other labourers; Others; Professionals, technicians, clerks, administrators, managers, executives, directors, supervisors, and teachers)
712	How many people aged 0 to 13 are in the household? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
709	Does the household own an *almirah*/dressing table? (No; Yes)
693	How many people aged 0 to 12 are in the household? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
690	What is the household's primary energy source for lighting? (Kerosene, oil other than kerosene, candles, no lighting arrangement, or no data; Electricity, gas, or others)
680	What is the household's principle type of employment? (Agricultural labor; Non-agricultural labour; Self-employed, others, or unknown)
674	How many people aged 0 to 15 are in the household? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One; None)
648	How many people aged 0 to 16 are in the household? (Five or more; Four; Three; Two; One; None)
642	What is the highest education level completed by the male head/spouse? (Not literate or no data; Literate with less than middle; Middle or higher)

Source: Schedule 1.0, construction sub-sample of Round 62, India's Socio-Economic Survey, $1/day poverty line.

Figure 3 (continued): Poverty indicators by uncertainty coefficient

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly associated with poverty)
630	Is the residence all *pucca* (burnt bricks, stone, cement, concrete, jackboard/cement-plastered reeds, timber, tiles, galvanised tin, or asbestos cement sheets)? (No; Yes)
603	How many people aged 0 to 17 are in the household? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
548	How many people aged 0 to 18 are in the household? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
514	What is the household's social group? (Scheduled tribe; Scheduled caste; Other backward class; Others)
506	What is the highest education level completed by the female head/spouse? (Not literate, literate without any formal schooling, or no data; Literate and with some formal schooling)
455	Does the household own a tape player or a CD player? (No; Yes)
415	Does the household own a sewing machine? (No; Yes)
405	How many people aged 0 to 5 are in the household? (Four or more; Two or three; One; None)
369	What is principle industry of the household? (Agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or construction; Manufacturing, wholesale or retail trade, transport, storage, communications, other, or no data; Education, health, social work, public administration, or defense)
350	How many people are in the household? (Eight or more; Seven; Six; Five: Four; Three, two, or one)
305	Does the household own a VCR/VCP/DVD? (No; Yes)
240	What is the household's tenancy of its dwelling? (Owned, others, or no dwelling unit; Hired)
181	Does the household own a bicycle, scooter, or motor cycle? (No; Yes)
136	What type of structure is the residence? (Independent house, none, or no data; Flat; Others)
131	Does the household own a radio? (No; Yes)
130	How large is the residence in meters squared? (29 or less; 30 to 47; 48 to 79; 80 or more)
123	Does the household own a bedstead? (No; Yes)
64	How old is the male spouse/head? (25 or younger, or no male spouse/head; 26 to 32; 33 to 40; 41 or older)
58	How old is the female spouse/head? (28 or younger, or no female spouse/head; 29 to 35; 36 or older)

Source: Schedule 1.0, construction sub-sample of Round 62, India's Socio-Economic Survey, $1/day poverty line.

National Poverty Line Tables

(and tables pertaining to all poverty lines)

Figure 4 (National poverty line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If an household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	77.0
5–9	58.5
10–14	51.2
15–19	35.5
20–24	28.7
25–29	21.3
30–34	18.9
35–39	14.9
40–44	10.0
45–49	4.5
50–54	5.1
55–59	5.7
60–64	6.1
65–69	3.7
70–74	1.5
75–79	1.6
80–84	0.7
85–89	1.2
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 5 (National poverty line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	716	÷	931	=	77.0
5–9	1,458	÷	2,491	=	58.5
10–14	2,402	÷	4,688	=	51.2
15–19	1,960	÷	5,528	=	35.5
20–24	2,171	÷	7,554	=	28.7
25–29	2,262	÷	10,636	=	21.3
30–34	1,980	÷	10,491	=	18.9
35–39	1,478	÷	9,910	=	14.9
40–44	896	÷	8,947	=	10.0
45–49	322	÷	7,116	=	4.5
50–54	237	÷	4,672	=	5.1
55–59	242	÷	4,278	=	5.7
60–64	228	÷	3,764	=	6.1
65–69	120	÷	3,292	=	3.7
70–74	56	÷	3,765	=	1.5
75–79	62	÷	3,853	=	1.6
80–84	23	÷	3,073	=	0.7
85–89	30	÷	2,544	=	1.2
90–94	0	÷	1,998	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	469	=	0.0

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 6 (All poverty lines): Distribution of poverty likelihoods across poverty ranges, by score

	Likelihood of expenditure being in range demarcated by daily per capita poverty lines						
Score	<$0.75/day	=>$0.75/day and <National	=>National and <$1/day	=>$1/day and <$1.25/day	=>$1.25/day and <$1.50/day	=>$1.50/day and <$2/day	=>$2/day
0–4	54.3	22.7	16.8	4.8	1.5	0.0	0.0
5–9	43.5	15.0	20.2	14.0	2.8	3.6	0.9
10–14	32.2	19.0	17.2	19.7	7.3	2.2	2.5
15–19	20.8	14.7	22.6	24.0	13.3	3.6	1.1
20–24	18.0	10.7	24.6	25.4	11.5	7.8	2.0
25–29	11.8	9.5	16.3	27.7	19.1	10.6	5.1
30–34	9.3	9.6	10.9	26.1	18.5	19.4	6.3
35–39	7.9	7.0	8.2	22.3	17.4	21.9	15.3
40–44	4.0	6.0	4.8	18.1	17.6	27.3	22.2
45–49	1.0	3.5	1.3	18.2	24.0	31.0	21.0
50–54	1.0	4.1	0.0	12.3	17.2	29.5	36.0
55–59	1.0	4.6	0.0	10.4	22.6	31.3	30.1
60–64	1.2	4.9	0.0	6.1	10.5	32.5	44.8
65–69	0.0	3.6	0.0	4.8	13.4	28.2	50.0
70–74	0.1	1.4	0.0	4.9	10.0	26.6	57.1
75–79	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.5	5.8	19.3	72.8
80–84	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.8	11.9	84.5
85–89	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.7	2.2	8.8	87.1
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.6	6.6	91.7
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	3.6	95.6

All poverty likelihoods in percentage units.

The USAID "extreme" poverty line is omitted because it is similar to the $0.75/day.

Figure 7 (National poverty line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384), with confidence intervals, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60

	R62 scorecard applied to R62 validation sample, difference between estimate and true value				R62 applied to R60, difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)				Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	5.3	8.9	9.6	10.7	8.3	5.8	7.7	9.2
5–9	-4.6	-1.2	-0.5	1.0	-1.4	3.9	4.7	6.3
10–14	-5.8	-3.0	-2.6	-1.4	3.7	3.3	3.9	5.2
15–19	4.0	5.7	6.0	6.9	-5.5	4.2	4.5	5.1
20–24	-7.4	-4.6	-4.0	-3.2	-3.9	3.2	3.4	3.7
25–29	1.6	3.3	3.6	4.1	-1.8	2.0	2.3	3.1
30–34	-1.9	-0.1	0.2	0.8	-1.2	2.1	2.5	3.4
35–39	0.2	1.2	1.4	1.7	-0.3	1.7	2.0	2.5
40–44	2.5	3.3	3.5	3.8	0.5	1.6	1.9	2.6
45–49	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.5	-12.8	8.6	9.2	10.0
50–54	1.6	3.0	3.2	3.5	-3.4	2.8	3.1	3.5
55–59	0.8	1.9	2.0	2.3	-2.0	2.1	2.4	3.2
60–64	0.3	0.8	0.9	1.1	-0.9	1.9	2.3	3.2
65–69	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.6	-0.8	1.7	2.1	2.8
70–74	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	-1.8	1.6	1.8	2.3
75–79	0.4	1.0	1.1	1.2	-0.5	1.2	1.4	1.8
80–84	-0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
85–89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
90–94	-9.5	-0.8	1.0	4.9	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2
95–100	-7.9	-2.3	-1.3	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 8 (All poverty lines): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods from the Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60

	Poverty line						
Year scorecard applied	National	USAID 'Extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Differences between estimates and true values							
Round 62 validation sample	-1.2	-1.4	-0.3	-0.4	0.6	-0.4	0.4
Round 60	-1.3	-1.4	-0.4	-1.5	-1.0	-0.3	0.6
Precision of differences							
Round 62 validation sample	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7
Round 60	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of +/− percentage points.
Differences and precision are estimated from 1,000 bootstraps of size $n = 16{,}384$.

Figure 9 (National poverty line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-0.4	44.7	53.7	64.7
4	-0.3	34.9	42.1	55.4
8	-1.4	27.6	32.7	43.4
16	-1.6	21.3	25.7	33.8
32	-1.5	16.3	19.1	26.9
64	-1.3	11.7	14.4	17.3
128	-1.0	8.1	9.6	12.0
256	-1.3	5.8	6.8	9.8
512	-1.2	3.8	4.4	5.7
1,024	-1.2	2.8	3.2	4.1
2,048	-1.2	1.9	2.3	2.9
4,096	-1.2	1.3	1.6	2.1
8,192	-1.2	0.9	1.1	1.4
16,384	-1.2	0.6	0.8	1.0

Figure 10 (National poverty line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-1.5	48.1	58.7	72.0
4	-2.1	34.4	41.7	56.8
8	-1.6	24.8	31.7	45.5
16	-1.8	18.7	23.5	35.8
32	-1.7	14.6	18.5	28.2
64	-1.5	10.9	13.7	20.4
128	-1.4	8.5	11.1	14.5
256	-1.3	6.2	7.6	10.9
512	-1.3	3.9	4.9	6.5
1,024	-1.3	2.6	3.2	4.3
2,048	-1.3	1.9	2.3	3.1
4,096	-1.2	1.3	1.5	2.0
8,192	-1.3	0.9	1.1	1.5
16,384	-1.3	0.6	0.8	1.0

Figure 11 (All poverty lines): Differences, precision of differences, and sample-size α for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time for the Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60

	Poverty line						
Year scorecard applied	National	USAID 'Extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Differences between estimates and true values							
Round 62 validation sample	-1.0	-1.2	-0.7	-0.4	1.1	0.3	0.1
Round 60	-1.8	-1.1	0.0	-1.9	-1.0	-0.4	0.6
Precision of differences							
Round 62 validation sample	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6
Round 60	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5
α for sample size							
Round 62 validation sample	1.98	2.71	2.71	1.67	1.41	1.28	1.04
Round 60	1.66	2.24	1.81	1.34	1.00	0.91	0.87

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of +/− percentage points.
Differences and precision are estimated from 1,000 bootstraps of size n = 16,384.
α is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Figure 12 (National poverty line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-0.4	44.7	53.7	64.7
4	-0.2	34.7	41.6	55.7
8	-1.4	28.4	32.5	42.0
16	-1.5	20.6	23.5	31.3
32	-1.5	15.0	17.4	23.7
64	-1.3	10.8	12.9	16.9
128	-1.0	7.8	9.5	11.7
256	-1.2	5.5	6.3	9.6
512	-1.0	3.8	4.5	5.7
1,024	-0.9	2.6	3.1	4.2
2,048	-1.0	2.0	2.3	2.9
4,096	-0.9	1.3	1.6	2.0
8,192	-0.9	1.0	1.1	1.4
16,384	-1.0	0.7	0.8	1.0

Figure 13 (National poverty line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates for groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-1.5	48.1	58.7	72.0
4	-2.1	35.3	40.4	56.9
8	-1.9	24.4	30.6	43.4
16	-1.9	18.0	23.0	31.1
32	-1.8	13.8	16.5	22.6
64	-1.7	9.7	11.5	13.9
128	-1.7	6.9	8.0	11.0
256	-1.7	4.8	5.7	7.8
512	-1.8	3.5	4.0	4.9
1,024	-1.7	2.4	3.0	3.8
2,048	-1.8	1.8	2.2	2.8
4,096	-1.7	1.3	1.5	1.9
8,192	-1.8	0.9	1.1	1.4
16,384	-1.8	0.6	0.8	1.0

Figure 14 (All poverty lines): Differences, precision of differences, sample-size α, and mean-squared error for bootstrapped estimates of changes in poverty rates for groups of households between two points in time from the Round 62 scorecard applied to the change from the Round 62 validation sample to Round 60

	Poverty line						
		USAID					
Year scorecard applied	**National**	**'Extreme'**	**$0.75/day**	**$1/day**	**$1.25/day**	**$1.50/day**	**$2/day**
Differences between estimates and true values							
From R62 validation to R60	-0.8	0.1	0.7	-1.5	-2.1	-0.6	0.5
Precision of differences							
From R62 validation to R60	0.9	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8
α for sample size							
From R62 validation to R60	1.84	2.46	2.09	1.55	1.22	1.11	0.93

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of +/− percentage points.
Differences and precision are estimated from 1,000 bootstraps of size n = 16,384.
α is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Figure 15 (National poverty line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of changes in poverty rates for groups of households between two points in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the change between the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-1.1	74.3	89.4	106.5
4	-1.9	51.7	62.4	81.3
8	-0.5	38.8	45.7	59.5
16	-0.3	26.8	32.5	39.3
32	-0.4	20.7	24.9	32.0
64	-0.4	14.9	18.0	22.6
128	-0.7	10.2	12.5	16.6
256	-0.5	7.5	8.8	12.9
512	-0.8	5.1	6.2	7.7
1,024	-0.8	3.7	4.5	5.6
2,048	-0.8	2.7	3.2	4.1
4,096	-0.8	1.8	2.1	3.0
8,192	-0.8	1.3	1.6	2.0
16,384	-0.8	0.9	1.2	1.5

Figure 16 (All poverty lines): Possible types of outcomes from targeting by poverty score

True poverty status	Targeting segment: Targeted	Targeting segment: Non-targeted
Below poverty line	**Inclusion** Under poverty line Correctly targeted	**Undercoverage** Under poverty line Mistakenly non-targeted
Above poverty line	**Leakage** Above poverty line Mistakenly targeted	**Exclusion** Above poverty line Correctly non-targeted

Figure 17 (National poverty line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.8	16.6	0.2	82.5	83.3	-90.2
5–9	2.4	14.9	1.0	81.6	84.0	-66.4
10–14	4.8	12.6	3.3	79.3	84.1	-25.6
15–19	7.0	10.3	6.6	76.0	83.1	19.1
20–24	9.4	7.9	11.7	70.9	80.4	32.3
25–29	11.6	5.8	20.3	62.4	74.0	-16.8
30–34	13.5	3.8	28.8	53.9	67.4	-65.9
35–39	15.0	2.4	37.3	45.4	60.4	-114.8
40–44	15.9	1.4	45.3	37.4	53.3	-160.9
45–49	16.4	1.0	51.9	30.7	47.1	-199.3
50–54	16.6	0.7	56.4	26.3	42.9	-224.9
55–59	16.8	0.5	60.4	22.2	39.0	-248.4
60–64	17.0	0.3	64.0	18.7	35.7	-268.8
65–69	17.2	0.2	67.1	15.5	32.7	-287.0
70–74	17.3	0.1	70.8	11.8	29.1	-308.2
75–79	17.3	0.0	74.6	8.0	25.3	-330.1
80–84	17.3	0.0	77.7	5.0	22.3	-347.8
85–89	17.3	0.0	80.2	2.5	19.8	-362.3
90–94	17.3	0.0	82.2	0.5	17.8	-373.8
95–100	17.3	0.0	82.7	0.0	17.3	-376.5

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 18 (National poverty line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.8	18.8	0.3	80.0	80.9	-89.8
5–9	2.7	16.9	1.5	78.9	81.6	-64.4
10–14	5.2	14.4	3.9	76.5	81.7	-26.4
15–19	7.8	11.8	7.5	72.8	80.7	18.2
20–24	10.9	8.8	13.8	66.6	77.4	29.6
25–29	13.5	6.1	21.9	58.5	72.0	-11.7
30–34	15.4	4.2	29.7	50.7	66.1	-51.4
35–39	17.0	2.7	38.7	41.7	58.6	-97.4
40–44	17.7	1.9	45.6	34.8	52.5	-132.4
45–49	18.3	1.3	50.4	29.9	48.2	-157.1
50–54	18.7	1.0	54.5	25.8	44.5	-178.1
55–59	19.0	0.6	58.3	22.1	41.1	-197.0
60–64	19.2	0.4	61.7	18.7	37.9	-214.5
65–69	19.4	0.2	65.1	15.2	34.7	-232.1
70–74	19.5	0.1	68.8	11.6	31.1	-250.7
75–79	19.6	0.0	72.1	8.3	27.9	-267.4
80–84	19.6	0.0	75.4	4.9	24.6	-284.6
85–89	19.6	0.0	78.1	2.3	21.9	-298.3
90–94	19.6	0.0	79.9	0.5	20.1	-307.2
95–100	19.6	0.0	80.4	0.0	19.6	-309.8

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 19 (National poverty line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	82.4	82.4	0.9	0.9
5–9	65.5	70.1	2.5	3.4
10–14	51.1	59.1	4.7	8.1
15–19	40.3	51.5	5.5	13.6
20–24	32.1	44.6	7.6	21.2
25–29	19.9	36.3	10.6	31.8
30–34	18.8	32.0	10.5	42.3
35–39	14.4	28.7	9.9	52.2
40–44	10.6	26.0	8.9	61.2
45–49	6.5	24.0	7.1	68.3
50–54	4.8	22.8	4.7	73.0
55–59	4.7	21.8	4.3	77.2
60–64	6.0	21.0	3.8	81.0
65–69	4.3	20.4	3.3	84.3
70–74	2.3	19.6	3.8	88.1
75–79	1.1	18.8	3.9	91.9
80–84	0.2	18.2	3.1	95.0
85–89	1.1	17.8	2.5	97.5
90–94	0.5	17.4	2.0	99.5
95–100	0.0	17.3	0.5	100.0

Figure 20 (National poverty line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 60 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	71.1	71.1	1.2	1.2
5–9	61.8	64.4	3.1	4.2
10–14	51.0	57.2	4.9	9.2
15–19	41.5	50.9	6.2	15.4
20–24	32.7	44.0	9.3	24.7
25–29	24.8	38.2	10.8	35.5
30–34	19.3	34.1	9.6	45.1
35–39	14.8	30.5	10.6	55.7
40–44	10.0	28.0	7.6	63.3
45–49	10.0	26.6	5.4	68.7
50–54	8.6	25.5	4.5	73.2
55–59	7.9	24.6	4.0	77.2
60–64	7.4	23.8	3.7	80.9
65–69	4.5	23.0	3.6	84.6
70–74	3.0	22.1	3.8	88.3
75–79	1.9	21.4	3.3	91.7
80–84	0.6	20.6	3.4	95.0
85–89	0.1	20.1	2.7	97.7
90–94	0.1	19.7	1.7	99.5
95–100	0.0	19.6	0.5	100.0

USAID "Extreme" Poverty Line Tables

Figure 4 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If an household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	41.7
5–9	34.3
10–14	24.7
15–19	21.0
20–24	14.0
25–29	9.2
30–34	9.2
35–39	7.6
40–44	4.5
45–49	1.3
50–54	1.3
55–59	1.3
60–64	2.2
65–69	0.7
70–74	0.2
75–79	0.4
80–84	0.2
85–89	0.5
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 5 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	388	÷	931	=	41.7
5–9	854	÷	2,491	=	34.3
10–14	1,157	÷	4,688	=	24.7
15–19	1,159	÷	5,528	=	21.0
20–24	1,058	÷	7,554	=	14.0
25–29	975	÷	10,636	=	9.2
30–34	962	÷	10,491	=	9.2
35–39	756	÷	9,910	=	7.6
40–44	403	÷	8,947	=	4.5
45–49	90	÷	7,116	=	1.3
50–54	59	÷	4,672	=	1.3
55–59	56	÷	4,278	=	1.3
60–64	84	÷	3,764	=	2.2
65–69	21	÷	3,292	=	0.7
70–74	7	÷	3,765	=	0.2
75–79	15	÷	3,853	=	0.4
80–84	5	÷	3,073	=	0.2
85–89	12	÷	2,544	=	0.5
90–94	0	÷	1,998	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	469	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 7 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384), with confidence intervals, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60

	R62 scorecard applied to R62 validation sample, difference between estimate and true value				R62 applied to R60, difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)				Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Score	**Diff.**	**90-percent**	**95-percent**	**99-percent**	**Diff.**	**90-percent**	**95-percent**	**99-percent**
0–4	-9.5	-0.8	1.0	4.9	-13.2	9.8	10.2	11.6
5–9	-7.9	-2.3	-1.3	0.8	0.1	3.7	4.4	6.0
10–14	1.0	3.8	4.3	5.4	0.3	2.7	3.1	4.1
15–19	4.2	6.6	6.9	7.8	2.8	2.4	2.8	3.7
20–24	-1.5	0.6	1.1	1.8	-4.4	3.2	3.5	3.9
25–29	2.4	3.4	3.6	4.0	0.4	1.1	1.4	1.9
30–34	-10.6	-7.8	-7.4	-6.1	-2.3	2.1	2.3	2.8
35–39	2.0	3.0	3.2	3.7	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.9
40–44	-2.4	-0.8	-0.5	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.7
45–49	-0.2	0.5	0.6	0.8	-12.4	8.6	9.0	9.9
50–54	0.0	0.6	0.7	0.8	-1.2	1.2	1.4	2.0
55–59	0.9	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.1	0.7	0.8	1.1
60–64	0.4	1.3	1.5	1.8	0.9	0.7	0.9	1.1
65–69	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.5	-0.2	0.7	0.8	0.9
70–74	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	-0.7	0.8	1.0	1.1
75–79	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	-0.2	0.6	0.7	0.9
80–84	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3
85–89	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 9 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-1.0	38.4	47.1	61.1
4	-0.5	29.6	35.6	49.9
8	-1.4	22.5	29.2	40.1
16	-1.7	18.4	23.7	29.7
32	-2.0	14.0	17.6	22.4
64	-1.6	10.8	13.4	17.2
128	-1.4	8.1	10.1	13.4
256	-1.5	6.3	7.8	9.8
512	-1.3	4.5	5.5	7.3
1,024	-1.3	3.3	3.8	4.8
2,048	-1.4	2.3	2.7	3.5
4,096	-1.4	1.6	1.9	2.4
8,192	-1.4	1.1	1.3	1.7
16,384	-1.4	0.8	0.9	1.2

Figure 10 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	0.7	37.0	44.7	60.6
4	-0.1	24.5	32.3	47.6
8	-0.6	18.8	22.6	38.5
16	-0.9	13.7	17.8	30.1
32	-1.4	11.3	15.9	24.0
64	-1.6	9.3	14.1	18.6
128	-1.7	7.4	9.8	14.1
256	-1.6	5.8	7.1	9.5
512	-1.6	3.7	4.6	6.1
1,024	-1.5	2.4	2.9	4.0
2,048	-1.5	1.8	2.0	2.7
4,096	-1.4	1.1	1.4	1.9
8,192	-1.5	0.8	1.0	1.3
16,384	-1.4	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 12 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-1.0	38.4	47.1	61.1
4	-0.5	29.5	35.6	50.0
8	-1.3	22.0	28.4	39.2
16	-1.6	16.9	20.9	27.5
32	-1.8	12.4	14.9	18.4
64	-1.5	9.4	11.2	13.9
128	-1.3	6.5	7.9	10.8
256	-1.4	4.6	5.3	7.8
512	-1.3	3.3	3.8	5.1
1,024	-1.2	2.3	2.6	3.5
2,048	-1.2	1.7	2.0	2.6
4,096	-1.2	1.2	1.4	1.8
8,192	-1.2	0.8	0.9	1.4
16,384	-1.2	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 13 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	0.7	37.0	44.7	60.6
4	-0.1	24.6	33.0	47.8
8	-0.6	18.4	23.7	35.9
16	-0.8	13.1	17.1	27.5
32	-1.2	10.9	14.3	18.8
64	-1.1	8.0	9.4	13.4
128	-1.1	6.0	7.0	9.8
256	-1.1	4.2	4.9	6.6
512	-1.1	2.9	3.5	4.5
1,024	-1.1	2.1	2.4	3.3
2,048	-1.1	1.6	1.8	2.2
4,096	-1.1	1.1	1.3	1.6
8,192	-1.1	0.8	0.9	1.1
16,384	-1.1	0.5	0.6	0.8

Figure 15 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of changes in poverty rates of groups of households between two points in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the change between the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	1.6	64.6	78.1	97.5
4	0.4	43.7	55.4	79.4
8	0.7	30.9	39.1	63.3
16	0.8	22.5	27.8	43.0
32	0.6	17.0	21.7	27.3
64	0.4	12.3	15.5	20.0
128	0.2	9.0	10.8	14.7
256	0.3	6.3	7.7	11.1
512	0.2	4.4	5.3	6.9
1,024	0.2	3.0	3.7	4.8
2,048	0.1	2.4	2.8	3.5
4,096	0.1	1.6	1.8	2.4
8,192	0.1	1.1	1.2	1.7
16,384	0.1	0.8	0.9	1.2

Figure 17 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.5	8.1	0.5	91.0	91.5	-83.5
5–9	1.6	7.0	1.8	89.6	91.2	-41.6
10–14	2.8	5.7	5.3	86.1	89.0	27.6
15–19	3.9	4.7	9.7	81.7	85.6	-13.7
20–24	5.1	3.5	16.1	75.3	80.4	-88.0
25–29	6.0	2.6	25.8	65.6	71.6	-201.5
30–34	7.1	1.5	35.2	56.2	63.3	-311.4
35–39	7.7	0.8	44.5	46.9	54.7	-419.4
40–44	8.2	0.4	53.0	38.4	46.6	-518.5
45–49	8.3	0.3	60.0	31.4	39.7	-600.3
50–54	8.4	0.2	64.6	26.9	35.3	-653.7
55–59	8.4	0.1	68.8	22.6	31.1	-703.1
60–64	8.5	0.1	72.5	18.9	27.5	-746.2
65–69	8.6	0.0	75.7	15.7	24.2	-784.1
70–74	8.6	0.0	79.5	11.9	20.5	-828.0
75–79	8.6	0.0	83.3	8.1	16.6	-872.9
80–84	8.6	0.0	86.4	5.0	13.6	-908.8
85–89	8.6	0.0	89.0	2.5	11.0	-938.5
90–94	8.6	0.0	91.0	0.5	9.0	-961.8
95–100	8.6	0.0	91.4	0.0	8.6	-967.3

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 18 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.7	8.8	0.5	90.1	90.7	-80.6
5–9	1.8	7.6	2.5	88.1	89.9	-35.9
10–14	3.1	6.3	6.1	84.5	87.7	30.8
15–19	4.3	5.1	11.1	79.5	83.8	-18.0
20–24	5.9	3.5	18.8	71.8	77.7	-99.7
25–29	7.0	2.4	28.5	62.1	69.1	-202.6
30–34	7.9	1.5	37.2	53.4	61.3	-295.3
35–39	8.5	0.9	47.2	43.4	52.0	-401.4
40–44	8.8	0.6	54.5	36.1	44.9	-479.5
45–49	9.1	0.3	59.6	31.0	40.0	-534.1
50–54	9.2	0.2	64.0	26.6	35.8	-580.6
55–59	9.2	0.2	68.0	22.6	31.9	-622.8
60–64	9.3	0.1	71.6	19.0	28.3	-661.5
65–69	9.4	0.1	75.2	15.4	24.8	-699.5
70–74	9.4	0.0	78.9	11.7	21.0	-739.3
75–79	9.4	0.0	82.3	8.3	17.7	-774.5
80–84	9.4	0.0	85.6	5.0	14.4	-810.5
85–89	9.4	0.0	88.3	2.3	11.7	-839.2
90–94	9.4	0.0	90.1	0.5	9.9	-857.7
95–100	9.4	0.0	90.6	0.0	9.4	-863.2

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 19 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	51.6	51.6	0.9	0.9
5–9	44.0	46.1	2.5	3.4
10–14	26.6	34.8	4.7	8.1
15–19	19.4	28.6	5.5	13.6
20–24	15.8	24.0	7.6	21.2
25–29	8.5	18.8	10.6	31.8
30–34	10.3	16.7	10.5	42.3
35–39	6.6	14.8	9.9	52.2
40–44	5.1	13.4	8.9	61.2
45–49	1.6	12.2	7.1	68.3
50–54	2.0	11.5	4.7	73.0
55–59	1.0	10.9	4.3	77.2
60–64	2.0	10.5	3.8	81.0
65–69	1.2	10.1	3.3	84.3
70–74	0.2	9.7	3.8	88.1
75–79	0.2	9.3	3.9	91.9
80–84	0.0	9.0	3.1	95.0
85–89	0.0	8.8	2.5	97.5
90–94	0.0	8.6	2.0	99.5
95–100	0.0	8.6	0.5	100.0

Figure 20 (USAID "Extreme" Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 60 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	55.9	55.9	1.2	1.2
5–9	36.5	41.9	3.1	4.2
10–14	27.2	34.0	4.9	9.2
15–19	18.6	27.8	6.2	15.4
20–24	17.3	23.9	9.3	24.7
25–29	10.3	19.7	10.8	35.5
30–34	9.5	17.6	9.6	45.1
35–39	5.8	15.3	10.6	55.7
40–44	3.6	13.9	7.6	63.3
45–49	5.0	13.2	5.4	68.7
50–54	2.5	12.5	4.5	73.2
55–59	1.5	12.0	4.0	77.2
60–64	1.9	11.5	3.7	80.9
65–69	1.0	11.1	3.6	84.6
70–74	0.6	10.6	3.8	88.3
75–79	0.6	10.3	3.3	91.7
80–84	0.2	9.9	3.4	95.0
85–89	0.0	9.6	2.7	97.7
90–94	0.0	9.5	1.7	99.5
95–100	0.0	9.4	0.5	100.0

$0.75/Day Poverty Line Tables

Figure 4 ($0.75/Day Line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If an household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	54.3
5–9	43.5
10–14	32.2
15–19	20.8
20–24	18.0
25–29	11.8
30–34	9.3
35–39	7.9
40–44	4.0
45–49	1.0
50–54	1.0
55–59	1.0
60–64	1.2
65–69	0.0
70–74	0.1
75–79	0.0
80–84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 5 ($0.75/Day Line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	506	÷	931	=	54.3
5–9	1,084	÷	2,491	=	43.5
10–14	1,509	÷	4,688	=	32.2
15–19	1,150	÷	5,528	=	20.8
20–24	1,360	÷	7,554	=	18.0
25–29	1,253	÷	10,636	=	11.8
30–34	971	÷	10,491	=	9.3
35–39	785	÷	9,910	=	7.9
40–44	358	÷	8,947	=	4.0
45–49	73	÷	7,116	=	1.0
50–54	46	÷	4,672	=	1.0
55–59	43	÷	4,278	=	1.0
60–64	43	÷	3,764	=	1.2
65–69	1	÷	3,292	=	0.0
70–74	5	÷	3,765	=	0.1
75–79	0	÷	3,853	=	0.0
80–84	0	÷	3,073	=	0.0
85–89	0	÷	2,544	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	1,998	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	469	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 7 ($0.75/Day Line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384), with confidence intervals, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60

	R62 scorecard applied to R62 validation sample, difference between estimate and true value				R62 applied to R60, difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)				Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Score	**Diff.**	**90-percent**	**95-percent**	**99-percent**	**Diff.**	**90-percent**	**95-percent**	**99-percent**
0–4	-6.7	8.6	10.5	13.5	-3.0	6.3	7.5	9.4
5–9	7.4	4.9	5.7	8.4	0.7	3.9	4.9	6.2
10–14	0.3	3.1	3.6	5.0	5.0	2.7	3.5	4.6
15–19	2.6	2.4	2.9	3.9	-1.4	2.5	2.9	3.9
20–24	-0.5	2.1	2.5	3.1	-1.4	2.2	2.6	3.4
25–29	2.3	1.2	1.5	2.1	2.1	1.2	1.4	1.9
30–34	-9.2	6.1	6.3	6.8	0.1	1.6	1.9	2.4
35–39	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.9	1.5	1.1	1.3	1.7
40–44	-3.6	2.7	2.9	3.4	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.7
45–49	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-10.3	7.5	8.0	8.8
50–54	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.4	-0.1	0.6	0.8	1.0
55–59	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6
60–64	-0.1	0.9	1.0	1.4	1.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
65–69	-0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	-0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5
70–74	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
75–79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
80–84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
85–89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 9 ($0.75/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-1.1	39.6	49.7	64.8
4	-0.4	31.0	38.8	53.1
8	-0.7	22.2	29.7	43.7
16	-1.1	18.6	25.0	30.6
32	-1.0	14.0	17.9	23.6
64	-0.4	11.0	13.5	17.4
128	-0.2	8.0	10.2	13.0
256	-0.2	6.2	7.4	9.5
512	-0.2	4.5	5.5	7.5
1,024	-0.1	3.4	3.9	5.0
2,048	-0.2	2.3	2.8	3.4
4,096	-0.2	1.5	1.7	2.3
8,192	-0.2	1.1	1.3	1.8
16,384	-0.3	0.8	0.9	1.2

Figure 10 ($0.75/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	1.2	39.3	49.2	63.0
4	0.7	25.9	32.2	50.1
8	0.5	18.8	23.9	40.2
16	0.4	14.3	19.0	31.5
32	-0.3	12.0	16.2	24.4
64	-0.3	9.2	14.0	19.4
128	-0.3	7.7	10.0	13.5
256	-0.4	5.6	6.8	9.9
512	-0.4	3.6	4.6	6.2
1,024	-0.3	2.4	2.9	3.8
2,048	-0.4	1.7	2.0	2.6
4,096	-0.3	1.1	1.4	1.9
8,192	-0.4	0.8	1.0	1.3
16,384	-0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 12 ($0.75/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-1.1	39.6	49.7	64.8
4	-0.4	30.1	38.3	53.3
8	-0.7	22.2	29.7	40.4
16	-1.1	17.2	21.6	28.8
32	-1.2	12.6	15.1	19.6
64	-0.9	9.5	11.4	14.1
128	-0.7	6.7	8.2	10.6
256	-0.8	4.6	5.5	7.8
512	-0.7	3.3	4.0	5.4
1,024	-0.6	2.3	2.7	3.6
2,048	-0.7	1.6	2.0	2.5
4,096	-0.6	1.2	1.4	1.8
8,192	-0.7	0.8	0.9	1.3
16,384	-0.7	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 13 ($0.75/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	1.2	39.3	49.2	63.0
4	0.7	25.7	32.2	50.2
8	0.6	18.8	24.6	38.0
16	0.4	13.4	18.1	28.8
32	0.0	11.1	14.1	18.8
64	0.1	7.6	9.7	13.7
128	0.2	5.7	7.1	9.3
256	0.1	3.9	4.7	6.2
512	0.1	2.7	3.5	4.6
1,024	0.1	2.0	2.3	3.2
2,048	0.0	1.5	1.7	2.2
4,096	0.0	1.0	1.3	1.6
8,192	0.0	0.7	0.8	1.1
16,384	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.8

Figure 15 ($0.75/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of changes in poverty rates of groups of households between two points in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the change between the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	2.3	66.5	78.3	98.5
4	1.1	43.1	53.3	77.3
8	1.3	30.6	40.0	57.1
16	1.4	22.2	28.9	39.9
32	1.2	17.7	21.4	27.1
64	1.0	12.8	15.1	20.8
128	0.9	9.1	11.0	14.9
256	0.9	6.1	7.5	10.0
512	0.8	4.3	5.3	7.3
1,024	0.7	3.1	3.7	4.7
2,048	0.7	2.2	2.7	3.4
4,096	0.7	1.5	1.8	2.4
8,192	0.7	1.1	1.2	1.7
16,384	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.2

Figure 17 ($0.75/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.6	8.9	0.3	90.1	90.7	-84.1
5–9	1.7	7.8	1.7	88.8	90.6	-45.7
10–14	3.4	6.1	4.7	85.8	89.2	21.2
15–19	4.7	4.8	8.9	81.6	86.3	6.2
20–24	6.1	3.4	15.1	75.4	81.5	-59.0
25–29	7.2	2.3	24.6	65.9	73.1	-158.6
30–34	8.3	1.2	34.0	56.5	64.8	-257.9
35–39	9.0	0.5	43.2	47.3	56.3	-354.5
40–44	9.4	0.1	51.8	38.7	48.1	-444.4
45–49	9.4	0.1	58.9	31.6	41.0	-519.2
50–54	9.4	0.1	63.5	27.0	36.4	-568.1
55–59	9.5	0.0	67.8	22.7	32.2	-612.9
60–64	9.5	0.0	71.5	19.0	28.5	-652.1
65–69	9.5	0.0	74.8	15.7	25.2	-686.6
70–74	9.5	0.0	78.6	11.9	21.4	-726.2
75–79	9.5	0.0	82.4	8.1	17.6	-766.8
80–84	9.5	0.0	85.5	5.0	14.5	-799.1
85–89	9.5	0.0	88.0	2.5	12.0	-825.9
90–94	9.5	0.0	90.0	0.5	10.0	-846.9
95–100	9.5	0.0	90.5	0.0	9.5	-851.8

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 18 ($0.75/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.7	8.9	0.5	89.9	90.6	-80.6
5–9	2.0	7.5	2.2	88.2	90.2	-34.4
10–14	3.5	6.1	5.6	84.8	88.3	32.6
15–19	4.9	4.7	10.5	79.9	84.8	-9.6
20–24	6.6	3.0	18.1	72.3	78.8	-89.0
25–29	7.7	1.9	27.7	62.7	70.4	-189.2
30–34	8.5	1.1	36.6	53.8	62.3	-281.8
35–39	9.1	0.5	46.6	43.8	52.9	-385.8
40–44	9.3	0.2	54.0	36.4	45.8	-463.0
45–49	9.5	0.1	59.2	31.2	40.7	-517.8
50–54	9.5	0.1	63.7	26.7	36.3	-564.0
55–59	9.6	0.0	67.7	22.7	32.3	-605.8
60–64	9.6	0.0	71.4	19.0	28.6	-644.4
65–69	9.6	0.0	75.0	15.4	25.0	-682.0
70–74	9.6	0.0	78.7	11.7	21.3	-721.2
75–79	9.6	0.0	82.1	8.3	17.9	-755.9
80–84	9.6	0.0	85.5	5.0	14.5	-791.3
85–89	9.6	0.0	88.2	2.3	11.8	-819.5
90–94	9.6	0.0	89.9	0.5	10.1	-837.6
95–100	9.6	0.0	90.4	0.0	9.6	-843.0

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 19 ($0.75/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	62.5	62.5	0.9	0.9
5–9	46.6	50.9	2.5	3.4
10–14	35.7	42.1	4.7	8.1
15–19	23.5	34.6	5.5	13.6
20–24	18.0	28.7	7.6	21.2
25–29	10.9	22.7	10.6	31.8
30–34	10.1	19.6	10.5	42.3
35–39	7.3	17.3	9.9	52.2
40–44	4.5	15.4	8.9	61.2
45–49	0.1	13.8	7.1	68.3
50–54	0.6	12.9	4.7	73.0
55–59	0.2	12.2	4.3	77.2
60–64	1.0	11.7	3.8	81.0
65–69	0.3	11.3	3.3	84.3
70–74	0.0	10.8	3.8	88.1
75–79	0.0	10.3	3.9	91.9
80–84	0.0	10.0	3.1	95.0
85–89	0.0	9.7	2.5	97.5
90–94	0.0	9.6	2.0	99.5
95–100	0.0	9.5	0.5	100.0

Figure 20 ($0.75/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 60 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	58.9	58.9	1.2	1.2
5–9	43.9	48.1	3.1	4.2
10–14	30.3	38.5	4.9	9.2
15–19	21.4	31.6	6.2	15.4
20–24	18.2	26.6	9.3	24.7
25–29	11.0	21.8	10.8	35.5
30–34	7.9	18.8	9.6	45.1
35–39	5.9	16.4	10.6	55.7
40–44	3.0	14.8	7.6	63.3
45–49	2.6	13.8	5.4	68.7
50–54	1.3	13.0	4.5	73.2
55–59	0.6	12.4	4.0	77.2
60–64	0.2	11.8	3.7	80.9
65–69	0.3	11.3	3.6	84.6
70–74	0.1	10.8	3.8	88.3
75–79	0.2	10.5	3.3	91.7
80–84	0.0	10.1	3.4	95.0
85–89	0.0	9.8	2.7	97.7
90–94	0.0	9.6	1.7	99.5
95–100	0.0	9.6	0.5	100.0

$1/Day Poverty Line Tables

Figure 4 ($1/Day Line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If an household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	93.7
5–9	78.8
10–14	68.4
15–19	58.0
20–24	53.3
25–29	37.5
30–34	29.7
35–39	23.1
40–44	14.8
45–49	5.8
50–54	5.0
55–59	3.0
60–64	3.3
65–69	0.8
70–74	0.3
75–79	1.1
80–84	0.2
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 5 ($1/Day Line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	873	÷	931	=	93.7
5–9	1,961	÷	2,491	=	78.8
10–14	3,207	÷	4,688	=	68.4
15–19	3,206	÷	5,528	=	58.0
20–24	4,028	÷	7,554	=	53.3
25–29	3,991	÷	10,636	=	37.5
30–34	3,118	÷	10,491	=	29.7
35–39	2,287	÷	9,910	=	23.1
40–44	1,324	÷	8,947	=	14.8
45–49	415	÷	7,116	=	5.8
50–54	235	÷	4,672	=	5.0
55–59	127	÷	4,278	=	3.0
60–64	126	÷	3,764	=	3.3
65–69	26	÷	3,292	=	0.8
70–74	9	÷	3,765	=	0.3
75–79	43	÷	3,853	=	1.1
80–84	7	÷	3,073	=	0.2
85–89	0	÷	2,544	=	0.0
90–94	0	÷	1,998	=	0.0
95–100	0	÷	469	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 7 ($1/Day Line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384), with confidence intervals, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60

	R62 scorecard applied to R62 validation sample, difference between estimate and true value				R62 applied to R60, difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)				Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	-5.6	3.1	3.1	3.1	7.1	4.1	4.8	6.6
5–9	-1.0	4.9	5.6	7.4	-2.7	3.0	3.5	4.8
10–14	-0.4	3.8	4.4	5.8	-1.0	3.1	3.8	4.7
15–19	4.2	3.8	4.6	6.0	-4.1	3.5	3.8	4.5
20–24	-5.2	4.1	4.3	4.9	-1.2	2.5	3.1	4.0
25–29	6.7	2.2	2.6	3.5	-5.9	4.2	4.5	4.7
30–34	-8.0	5.5	5.7	6.3	-0.3	2.3	2.8	3.6
35–39	1.1	2.0	2.4	3.1	0.5	1.8	2.2	2.9
40–44	-1.5	2.1	2.5	3.3	1.6	1.8	2.1	2.7
45–49	-1.2	1.6	2.0	2.4	-13.0	8.8	9.2	9.9
50–54	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.8	-2.6	2.3	2.4	2.9
55–59	1.7	0.5	0.6	0.8	-1.8	1.7	1.9	2.4
60–64	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.6	0.2	1.2	1.4	1.8
65–69	0.1	0.5	0.6	0.7	-1.4	1.4	1.5	1.9
70–74	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	-1.2	1.1	1.2	1.5
75–79	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.6
80–84	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
85–89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 9 ($1/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-0.3	50.2	57.3	69.2
4	-0.6	38.0	45.6	57.5
8	-1.5	30.3	35.8	45.5
16	-1.0	22.2	27.2	37.3
32	-1.0	16.4	20.2	27.2
64	-0.7	11.7	13.9	18.7
128	-0.4	7.7	9.0	12.5
256	-0.5	5.4	6.5	8.5
512	-0.5	3.2	4.0	5.3
1,024	-0.4	2.3	2.7	3.5
2,048	-0.4	1.6	1.9	2.6
4,096	-0.4	1.2	1.4	1.7
8,192	-0.4	0.8	0.9	1.3
16,384	-0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 10 ($1/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-0.9	51.6	60.5	77.9
4	-1.5	36.2	43.9	58.9
8	-1.2	27.0	32.7	43.8
16	-1.7	19.9	23.5	36.0
32	-1.8	14.7	19.1	30.5
64	-2.0	11.3	14.6	20.6
128	-1.9	8.1	10.6	14.7
256	-1.8	5.6	6.7	9.7
512	-1.7	3.5	4.5	6.2
1,024	-1.6	2.5	3.0	3.9
2,048	-1.5	1.8	2.1	2.8
4,096	-1.5	1.2	1.4	2.0
8,192	-1.5	0.8	1.0	1.4
16,384	-1.5	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 12 ($1/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-0.3	50.2	57.3	69.2
4	-0.6	37.8	45.6	58.3
8	-1.8	30.2	35.3	45.1
16	-1.1	22.1	25.6	33.9
32	-1.2	16.0	18.8	24.2
64	-1.0	11.4	13.9	18.1
128	-0.6	8.4	9.8	12.8
256	-0.7	5.8	7.1	9.3
512	-0.5	4.0	4.8	6.1
1,024	-0.4	2.9	3.3	4.3
2,048	-0.4	2.1	2.5	3.1
4,096	-0.4	1.4	1.8	2.2
8,192	-0.4	1.0	1.2	1.5
16,384	-0.4	0.8	0.9	1.1

Figure 13 ($1/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-0.9	51.6	60.5	77.9
4	-1.6	36.7	43.2	59.8
8	-1.3	26.2	31.3	42.5
16	-1.5	19.6	23.6	31.3
32	-1.6	14.0	17.3	24.1
64	-1.8	10.4	12.7	17.3
128	-1.8	7.4	8.8	11.8
256	-1.8	5.2	6.2	8.1
512	-1.9	3.5	4.3	5.5
1,024	-1.9	2.6	3.1	3.9
2,048	-1.9	1.9	2.1	2.9
4,096	-1.9	1.3	1.5	1.9
8,192	-1.9	0.9	1.1	1.4
16,384	-1.9	0.7	0.8	1.0

Figure 15 ($1/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of changes in poverty rates of groups of households between two points in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the change between the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-0.6	76.9	89.7	107.6
4	-1.0	54.0	63.7	81.1
8	0.5	40.1	47.2	62.9
16	-0.4	29.0	34.4	45.4
32	-0.4	22.2	25.1	34.1
64	-0.8	15.8	18.0	24.5
128	-1.2	11.0	13.6	16.8
256	-1.1	7.9	9.4	11.5
512	-1.3	5.4	6.4	8.1
1,024	-1.5	4.0	4.7	6.0
2,048	-1.5	2.8	3.3	4.6
4,096	-1.5	2.0	2.3	2.8
8,192	-1.5	1.4	1.6	2.1
16,384	-1.5	1.0	1.2	1.5

Figure 17 ($1/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.9	24.5	0.0	74.6	75.5	-92.8
5–9	2.9	22.5	0.5	74.1	77.1	-74.9
10–14	6.4	19.0	1.7	72.9	79.3	-42.9
15–19	9.7	15.7	4.0	70.6	80.3	-8.2
20–24	13.8	11.6	7.4	67.2	81.0	37.8
25–29	17.6	7.8	14.3	60.3	77.9	43.8
30–34	20.8	4.6	21.6	53.0	73.8	15.1
35–39	23.0	2.4	29.2	45.4	68.5	-15.0
40–44	24.3	1.1	36.9	37.7	62.1	-45.2
45–49	24.8	0.6	43.5	31.1	55.9	-71.3
50–54	25.1	0.3	47.9	26.7	51.8	-88.5
55–59	25.2	0.2	52.0	22.6	47.8	-104.9
60–64	25.3	0.1	55.7	18.9	44.3	-119.2
65–69	25.4	0.0	58.9	15.7	41.1	-132.0
70–74	25.4	0.0	62.7	11.9	37.3	-146.8
75–79	25.4	0.0	66.5	8.1	33.5	-162.0
80–84	25.4	0.0	69.6	5.0	30.4	-174.1
85–89	25.4	0.0	72.1	2.5	27.9	-184.1
90–94	25.4	0.0	74.1	0.5	25.9	-192.0
95–100	25.4	0.0	74.6	0.0	25.4	-193.8

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 18 ($1/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	1.0	26.7	0.2	72.1	73.1	-92.1
5–9	3.5	24.2	0.7	71.5	75.0	-72.0
10–14	7.0	20.7	2.2	70.1	77.0	-41.7
15–19	10.7	17.0	4.7	67.6	78.3	-6.0
20–24	15.7	12.1	9.0	63.3	78.9	45.5
25–29	20.0	7.7	15.5	56.8	76.8	44.2
30–34	22.9	4.9	22.2	50.0	72.9	19.7
35–39	25.2	2.5	30.5	41.8	67.0	-10.0
40–44	26.3	1.4	37.0	35.2	61.5	-33.7
45–49	26.9	0.8	41.8	30.4	57.3	-51.0
50–54	27.2	0.5	46.0	26.3	53.5	-65.9
55–59	27.4	0.3	49.8	22.5	49.9	-79.8
60–64	27.6	0.2	53.4	18.9	46.5	-92.6
65–69	27.6	0.1	56.9	15.4	43.0	-105.4
70–74	27.7	0.0	60.6	11.7	39.3	-118.8
75–79	27.7	0.0	63.9	8.3	36.0	-130.8
80–84	27.7	0.0	67.3	5.0	32.7	-143.0
85–89	27.7	0.0	70.0	2.3	30.0	-152.7
90–94	27.7	0.0	71.8	0.5	28.2	-159.0
95–100	27.7	0.0	72.3	0.0	27.7	-160.9

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 19 ($1/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	97.5	97.5	0.9	0.9
5–9	81.7	86.0	2.5	3.4
10–14	73.8	78.9	4.7	8.1
15–19	59.1	70.9	5.5	13.6
20–24	54.9	65.2	7.6	21.2
25–29	35.3	55.2	10.6	31.8
30–34	30.4	49.1	10.5	42.3
35–39	23.0	44.1	9.9	52.2
40–44	14.3	39.7	8.9	61.2
45–49	6.7	36.3	7.1	68.3
50–54	6.3	34.4	4.7	73.0
55–59	3.2	32.7	4.3	77.2
60–64	3.0	31.3	3.8	81.0
65–69	1.3	30.1	3.3	84.3
70–74	0.2	28.8	3.8	88.1
75–79	0.2	27.6	3.9	91.9
80–84	0.0	26.7	3.1	95.0
85–89	0.0	26.0	2.5	97.5
90–94	0.0	25.5	2.0	99.5
95–100	0.0	25.4	0.5	100.0

Figure 20 ($1/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 60 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	86.1	86.1	1.2	1.2
5–9	81.1	82.5	3.1	4.2
10–14	70.3	75.9	4.9	9.2
15–19	59.9	69.5	6.2	15.4
20–24	53.6	63.5	9.3	24.7
25–29	40.2	56.4	10.8	35.5
30–34	29.7	50.7	9.6	45.1
35–39	22.1	45.2	10.6	55.7
40–44	14.2	41.5	7.6	63.3
45–49	11.0	39.1	5.4	68.7
50–54	7.9	37.2	4.5	73.2
55–59	5.0	35.5	4.0	77.2
60–64	3.7	34.1	3.7	80.9
65–69	2.0	32.7	3.6	84.6
70–74	1.3	31.3	3.8	88.3
75–79	0.6	30.2	3.3	91.7
80–84	0.3	29.2	3.4	95.0
85–89	0.0	28.4	2.7	97.7
90–94	0.0	27.9	1.7	99.5
95–100	0.0	27.7	0.5	100.0

$1.25/Day Poverty Line Tables

Figure 4 ($1.25/Day Line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If an household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	98.5
5–9	92.7
10–14	88.1
15–19	82.0
20–24	78.7
25–29	65.2
30–34	55.8
35–39	45.4
40–44	32.9
45–49	24.0
50–54	17.4
55–59	16.0
60–64	12.2
65–69	8.5
70–74	6.4
75–79	2.1
80–84	0.7
85–89	1.9
90–94	0.1
95–100	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 5 ($1.25/Day Line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	917	÷	931	=	98.5
5–9	2,310	÷	2,491	=	92.7
10–14	4,129	÷	4,688	=	88.1
15–19	4,533	÷	5,528	=	82.0
20–24	5,946	÷	7,554	=	78.7
25–29	6,938	÷	10,636	=	65.2
30–34	5,854	÷	10,491	=	55.8
35–39	4,499	÷	9,910	=	45.4
40–44	2,943	÷	8,947	=	32.9
45–49	1,707	÷	7,116	=	24.0
50–54	813	÷	4,672	=	17.4
55–59	685	÷	4,278	=	16.0
60–64	459	÷	3,764	=	12.2
65–69	279	÷	3,292	=	8.5
70–74	240	÷	3,765	=	6.4
75–79	81	÷	3,853	=	2.1
80–84	22	÷	3,073	=	0.7
85–89	48	÷	2,544	=	1.9
90–94	2	÷	1,998	=	0.1
95–100	0	÷	469	=	0.0

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 7 ($1.25/Day Line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384), with confidence intervals, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60

	R62 scorecard applied to R62 validation sample, difference between estimate and true value				R62 applied to R60, difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)				Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Score	**Diff.**	**90-percent**	**95-percent**	**99-percent**	**Diff.**	**90-percent**	**95-percent**	**99-percent**
0–4	-0.9	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.8	1.8	2.2	3.0
5–9	-2.6	2.0	2.1	2.4	-0.1	2.0	2.4	3.1
10–14	-2.0	2.1	2.4	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.6	4.5
15–19	8.3	3.8	4.7	6.1	-2.7	2.3	2.6	3.2
20–24	-3.4	2.8	2.9	3.2	-1.1	2.0	2.3	3.0
25–29	7.0	2.5	2.9	4.2	-4.0	3.1	3.3	3.7
30–34	2.3	2.6	3.3	4.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	3.8
35–39	-1.7	2.6	3.1	4.0	0.9	2.3	2.6	3.4
40–44	2.8	2.5	3.0	3.9	2.2	2.4	2.9	3.7
45–49	-3.7	3.3	3.6	4.5	-12.9	8.7	8.9	9.5
50–54	2.0	2.3	2.9	3.6	-2.9	2.8	3.5	4.3
55–59	2.8	2.8	3.3	4.2	-3.4	3.5	4.2	5.6
60–64	-5.0	4.2	4.7	5.6	-1.0	2.5	3.0	3.8
65–69	-2.3	3.1	3.7	4.9	-0.7	2.5	2.9	4.1
70–74	1.1	1.9	2.2	2.9	2.1	1.5	1.8	2.4
75–79	1.1	0.6	0.7	0.9	-1.8	1.7	1.8	2.3
80–84	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	-0.9	1.0	1.1	1.5
85–89	1.1	0.6	0.8	1.0	1.8	0.1	0.1	0.1
90–94	-0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Figure 9 ($1.25/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	1.7	53.7	61.4	76.9
4	0.5	40.5	47.0	61.6
8	0.1	32.4	38.5	49.9
16	0.4	23.1	28.4	36.8
32	0.6	17.0	20.7	28.4
64	0.5	11.4	14.3	18.2
128	0.7	8.0	9.8	13.0
256	0.5	5.0	6.0	8.9
512	0.5	3.5	4.1	5.8
1,024	0.6	2.4	2.7	3.5
2,048	0.6	1.6	1.9	2.5
4,096	0.6	1.1	1.3	1.7
8,192	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.2
16,384	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.8

Figure 10 ($1.25/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-2.8	52.0	59.5	75.0
4	-1.5	38.7	46.2	58.4
8	-1.1	27.7	33.9	45.2
16	-0.9	20.4	23.8	34.5
32	-0.8	15.3	19.8	26.8
64	-1.2	10.5	13.2	20.1
128	-1.2	7.8	9.8	14.8
256	-1.1	5.1	6.4	10.0
512	-1.0	3.4	4.1	5.8
1,024	-1.0	2.4	2.9	4.0
2,048	-1.0	1.7	2.1	2.7
4,096	-1.0	1.2	1.4	2.0
8,192	-1.0	0.8	1.0	1.4
16,384	-1.0	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 12 ($1.25/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	1.7	53.7	61.4	76.9
4	0.4	40.8	47.2	60.0
8	-0.1	31.4	37.2	49.7
16	0.4	22.7	27.2	33.1
32	0.6	16.3	19.3	24.9
64	0.6	11.6	13.6	17.4
128	0.9	8.6	10.0	14.2
256	0.7	5.9	7.4	10.5
512	0.9	4.5	5.4	7.3
1,024	1.0	3.0	3.6	4.5
2,048	1.1	2.2	2.6	3.4
4,096	1.1	1.5	1.8	2.3
8,192	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.6
16,384	1.1	0.7	0.9	1.2

Figure 13 ($1.25/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-2.8	52.0	59.5	75.0
4	-1.6	38.0	45.7	57.2
8	-1.0	27.3	33.2	42.6
16	-0.7	19.4	23.7	32.0
32	-0.7	14.4	17.8	24.6
64	-0.9	10.6	12.5	16.6
128	-1.0	7.6	8.7	11.9
256	-0.9	5.0	5.9	8.0
512	-0.9	3.5	4.2	5.3
1,024	-1.0	2.5	3.0	4.2
2,048	-1.0	1.8	2.2	2.8
4,096	-1.0	1.3	1.5	2.2
8,192	-1.0	0.9	1.1	1.5
16,384	-1.0	0.7	0.8	1.0

Figure 15 ($1.25/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of changes in poverty rates of groups of households between two points in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the change between the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-4.6	79.4	92.3	106.0
4	-2.0	55.5	66.5	85.7
8	-0.9	40.5	49.5	64.8
16	-1.2	30.8	36.5	44.7
32	-1.3	22.0	27.3	36.3
64	-1.5	15.0	18.7	25.1
128	-1.9	11.3	14.3	18.2
256	-1.7	8.0	9.4	12.7
512	-1.8	5.7	7.0	8.8
1,024	-2.0	4.2	4.9	6.2
2,048	-2.0	2.7	3.3	4.5
4,096	-2.1	2.0	2.3	3.0
8,192	-2.1	1.3	1.6	2.2
16,384	-2.1	1.0	1.2	1.6

Figure 17 ($1.25/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.9	41.5	0.0	57.6	58.5	-95.6
5–9	3.2	39.2	0.2	57.4	60.6	-84.3
10–14	7.4	34.9	0.7	57.0	64.4	-63.3
15–19	12.0	30.4	1.7	56.0	68.0	-39.5
20–24	17.9	24.5	3.3	54.3	72.2	-7.7
25–29	24.6	17.7	7.2	50.4	75.1	33.3
30–34	30.1	12.3	12.3	45.4	75.4	70.8
35–39	34.9	7.5	17.4	40.3	75.2	59.0
40–44	37.7	4.7	23.5	34.1	71.8	44.5
45–49	39.5	2.8	28.8	28.9	68.4	32.1
50–54	40.5	1.9	32.5	25.1	65.6	23.3
55–59	41.1	1.2	36.1	21.5	62.6	14.7
60–64	41.7	0.7	39.3	18.3	60.0	7.2
65–69	42.0	0.4	42.3	15.3	57.3	0.1
70–74	42.2	0.2	45.8	11.8	54.0	-8.2
75–79	42.3	0.1	49.6	8.0	50.3	-17.1
80–84	42.3	0.0	52.7	5.0	47.3	-24.3
85–89	42.4	0.0	55.2	2.5	44.8	-30.2
90–94	42.4	0.0	57.2	0.5	42.8	-34.9
95–100	42.4	0.0	57.6	0.0	42.4	-36.0

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 18 ($1.25/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	1.1	43.8	0.1	55.0	56.1	-94.9
5–9	4.0	41.0	0.3	54.8	58.8	-81.7
10–14	8.3	36.7	0.9	54.2	62.4	-61.2
15–19	13.4	31.5	1.9	53.1	66.6	-35.9
20–24	20.7	24.2	3.9	51.1	71.9	1.1
25–29	28.0	16.9	7.5	47.6	75.6	41.2
30–34	33.3	11.7	11.8	43.2	76.5	73.7
35–39	37.9	7.0	17.8	37.3	75.2	60.5
40–44	40.4	4.5	22.9	32.2	72.6	49.0
45–49	42.0	2.9	26.7	28.4	70.4	40.6
50–54	43.0	1.9	30.2	24.9	67.9	32.8
55–59	43.7	1.2	33.5	21.5	65.3	25.4
60–64	44.3	0.7	36.7	18.4	62.6	18.4
65–69	44.6	0.4	40.0	15.1	59.7	11.0
70–74	44.7	0.2	43.6	11.5	56.2	3.0
75–79	44.9	0.1	46.8	8.3	53.2	-4.1
80–84	44.9	0.0	50.1	4.9	49.9	-11.5
85–89	44.9	0.0	52.8	2.3	47.2	-17.5
90–94	44.9	0.0	54.6	0.5	45.4	-21.4
95–100	44.9	0.0	55.1	0.0	44.9	-22.6

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 19 ($1.25/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	98.0	98.0	0.9	0.9
5–9	92.4	93.9	2.5	3.4
10–14	89.9	91.6	4.7	8.1
15–19	82.5	87.9	5.5	13.6
20–24	78.2	84.4	7.6	21.2
25–29	63.3	77.4	10.6	31.8
30–34	51.7	71.0	10.5	42.3
35–39	48.7	66.8	9.9	52.2
40–44	31.2	61.6	8.9	61.2
45–49	26.2	57.9	7.1	68.3
50–54	19.7	55.4	4.7	73.0
55–59	15.7	53.2	4.3	77.2
60–64	15.0	51.5	3.8	81.0
65–69	9.2	49.8	3.3	84.3
70–74	5.9	47.9	3.8	88.1
75–79	2.1	46.0	3.9	91.9
80–84	0.8	44.6	3.1	95.0
85–89	1.3	43.4	2.5	97.5
90–94	0.5	42.6	2.0	99.5
95–100	0.0	42.4	0.5	100.0

Figure 20 ($1.25/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 60 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	95.7	95.7	1.2	1.2
5–9	92.6	93.5	3.1	4.2
10–14	87.0	90.0	4.9	9.2
15–19	83.7	87.5	6.2	15.4
20–24	78.5	84.1	9.3	24.7
25–29	67.2	78.9	10.8	35.5
30–34	54.6	73.8	9.6	45.1
35–39	44.0	68.1	10.6	55.7
40–44	32.8	63.8	7.6	63.3
45–49	29.7	61.2	5.4	68.7
50–54	21.9	58.8	4.5	73.2
55–59	17.5	56.6	4.0	77.2
60–64	14.8	54.7	3.7	80.9
65–69	8.5	52.7	3.6	84.6
70–74	4.7	50.7	3.8	88.3
75–79	3.8	49.0	3.3	91.7
80–84	1.6	47.3	3.4	95.0
85–89	0.2	46.0	2.7	97.7
90–94	0.1	45.2	1.7	99.5
95–100	0.0	44.9	0.5	100.0

$1.50/Day Poverty Line Tables

Figure 4 ($1.50/Day Line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If an household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	100.0
5–9	95.5
10–14	95.3
15–19	95.3
20–24	90.2
25–29	84.4
30–34	74.3
35–39	62.8
40–44	50.5
45–49	48.0
50–54	34.5
55–59	38.7
60–64	22.7
65–69	21.8
70–74	16.3
75–79	7.9
80–84	3.6
85–89	4.0
90–94	1.7
95–100	0.7

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 5 ($1.50/Day Line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	931	÷	931	=	100.0
5–9	2,379	÷	2,491	=	95.5
10–14	4,470	÷	4,688	=	95.3
15–19	5,269	÷	5,528	=	95.3
20–24	6,816	÷	7,554	=	90.2
25–29	8,972	÷	10,636	=	84.4
30–34	7,797	÷	10,491	=	74.3
35–39	6,223	÷	9,910	=	62.8
40–44	4,522	÷	8,947	=	50.5
45–49	3,416	÷	7,116	=	48.0
50–54	1,614	÷	4,672	=	34.5
55–59	1,653	÷	4,278	=	38.7
60–64	855	÷	3,764	=	22.7
65–69	719	÷	3,292	=	21.8
70–74	615	÷	3,765	=	16.3
75–79	306	÷	3,853	=	7.9
80–84	110	÷	3,073	=	3.6
85–89	103	÷	2,544	=	4.0
90–94	33	÷	1,998	=	1.7
95–100	3	÷	469	=	0.7

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 7 ($1.50/Day Line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384), with confidence intervals, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60

	R62 scorecard applied to R62 validation sample, difference between estimate and true value				R62 applied to R60, difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)				Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.6
5–9	-1.3	1.2	1.4	2.0	-1.6	1.4	1.6	2.1
10–14	-2.8	1.7	1.8	1.9	-1.3	1.2	1.3	1.8
15–19	1.3	1.4	1.7	2.2	0.7	1.1	1.4	1.9
20–24	-2.6	1.9	2.1	2.3	-0.2	1.3	1.6	2.1
25–29	7.1	2.4	2.9	3.8	-0.4	1.6	1.9	2.5
30–34	3.3	2.5	3.0	3.9	1.8	2.4	2.9	3.7
35–39	-0.7	2.6	3.1	4.0	0.9	2.2	2.7	3.6
40–44	-2.0	2.8	3.3	4.3	-4.3	3.5	3.8	4.6
45–49	0.0	3.1	3.6	4.7	-3.4	3.8	4.6	6.1
50–54	0.7	3.4	4.0	5.3	-1.9	3.5	4.3	5.3
55–59	-11.7	8.2	8.8	9.3	7.2	3.9	4.6	5.9
60–64	-9.2	6.9	7.3	8.0	-7.9	5.7	6.1	6.7
65–69	0.3	4.1	4.8	5.9	1.1	3.2	3.8	5.1
70–74	4.4	2.6	3.1	4.2	1.2	2.9	3.5	4.4
75–79	3.0	1.5	1.9	2.4	-3.7	3.3	3.6	4.4
80–84	-0.5	1.7	2.0	2.7	-0.9	1.7	2.0	2.9
85–89	2.8	0.8	1.0	1.2	2.1	1.3	1.5	1.9
90–94	0.2	1.0	1.2	1.6	1.1	0.6	0.7	0.9
95–100	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.1	1.3	1.5	2.0

Figure 9 ($1.50/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	1.4	51.5	59.7	75.7
4	-0.4	39.6	46.1	58.0
8	-0.7	28.7	34.9	45.7
16	-1.0	22.8	27.2	35.3
32	-0.4	17.4	20.9	26.2
64	-0.6	11.9	14.7	20.2
128	-0.7	8.5	10.0	12.9
256	-0.7	5.5	6.5	8.4
512	-0.6	3.8	4.6	5.7
1,024	-0.5	2.6	3.0	4.0
2,048	-0.5	1.9	2.2	2.8
4,096	-0.4	1.3	1.6	2.0
8,192	-0.4	1.0	1.1	1.5
16,384	-0.4	0.7	0.8	1.1

Figure 10 ($1.50/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-2.5	47.4	56.2	76.5
4	-1.3	38.0	43.9	57.5
8	-0.6	26.8	31.8	40.0
16	-0.5	19.4	23.9	31.1
32	-0.2	14.7	17.1	23.8
64	-0.4	10.4	12.7	17.0
128	-0.5	7.6	9.5	13.0
256	-0.3	5.3	6.4	8.2
512	-0.3	3.5	4.1	5.7
1,024	-0.3	2.3	2.9	4.0
2,048	-0.3	1.7	2.0	2.5
4,096	-0.3	1.2	1.4	1.9
8,192	-0.3	0.8	1.0	1.2
16,384	-0.3	0.5	0.7	0.8

Figure 12 ($1.50/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	1.4	51.5	59.7	75.7
4	-0.5	38.2	46.0	57.8
8	-1.0	28.7	35.1	44.0
16	-1.1	22.0	26.0	32.9
32	-0.1	16.5	19.3	24.0
64	-0.1	11.6	14.5	19.4
128	0.2	8.1	9.4	12.3
256	0.1	5.6	6.8	9.0
512	0.2	4.0	5.0	6.4
1,024	0.2	2.8	3.5	4.6
2,048	0.2	2.1	2.5	3.1
4,096	0.3	1.5	1.7	2.2
8,192	0.3	1.0	1.2	1.6
16,384	0.3	0.7	0.9	1.1

Figure 13 ($1.50/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-2.5	47.4	56.2	76.5
4	-1.3	37.4	43.0	56.6
8	-0.5	25.6	30.1	40.6
16	-0.4	18.0	21.9	28.8
32	-0.1	13.4	15.9	21.1
64	-0.3	9.8	11.5	14.6
128	-0.4	7.1	8.8	11.8
256	-0.2	4.9	5.8	7.4
512	-0.3	3.4	4.0	5.2
1,024	-0.3	2.5	2.9	4.0
2,048	-0.4	1.6	2.1	2.7
4,096	-0.4	1.2	1.5	1.9
8,192	-0.4	0.9	1.1	1.5
16,384	-0.4	0.6	0.7	1.0

Figure 15 ($1.50/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of changes in poverty rates of groups of households between two points in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the change between the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-3.8	73.0	85.3	104.1
4	-0.8	52.5	64.6	84.0
8	0.5	39.8	46.9	58.9
16	0.7	29.6	35.6	44.6
32	0.0	21.7	25.2	34.3
64	-0.2	15.5	18.7	25.0
128	-0.6	10.9	12.7	17.1
256	-0.4	7.7	8.9	11.9
512	-0.5	5.2	6.3	7.9
1,024	-0.5	3.8	4.4	6.0
2,048	-0.6	2.7	3.1	3.9
4,096	-0.7	1.9	2.1	2.9
8,192	-0.7	1.3	1.6	2.2
16,384	-0.6	1.0	1.2	1.5

Figure 17 ($1.50/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.9	55.9	0.0	43.1	44.1	-96.7
5–9	3.3	53.6	0.1	43.0	46.3	-88.2
10–14	7.9	49.0	0.2	42.9	50.8	-71.9
15–19	13.0	43.9	0.6	42.5	55.5	-53.1
20–24	19.9	37.0	1.3	41.8	61.7	-27.8
25–29	28.6	28.3	3.3	39.9	68.5	6.2
30–34	36.2	20.7	6.2	37.0	73.1	38.0
35–39	42.7	14.1	9.5	33.7	76.4	67.0
40–44	47.4	9.5	13.8	29.3	76.7	75.7
45–49	50.7	6.1	17.6	25.6	76.3	69.1
50–54	52.6	4.3	20.4	22.8	75.3	64.1
55–59	54.1	2.7	23.1	20.0	74.2	59.4
60–64	55.2	1.7	25.8	17.3	72.5	54.6
65–69	55.8	1.0	28.5	14.7	70.5	50.0
70–74	56.3	0.5	31.7	11.4	67.7	44.2
75–79	56.6	0.2	35.3	7.9	64.5	37.9
80–84	56.8	0.1	38.2	4.9	61.7	32.8
85–89	56.8	0.0	40.7	2.4	59.2	28.4
90–94	56.9	0.0	42.7	0.5	57.3	24.9
95–100	56.9	0.0	43.1	0.0	56.9	24.1

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 18 ($1.50/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	1.2	57.4	0.0	41.4	42.5	-96.0
5–9	4.1	54.5	0.1	41.3	45.4	-85.7
10–14	8.9	49.7	0.3	41.1	50.0	-69.2
15–19	14.7	43.9	0.7	40.7	55.4	-48.7
20–24	23.0	35.6	1.7	39.7	62.8	-18.6
25–29	32.1	26.5	3.4	38.0	70.1	15.2
30–34	39.3	19.3	5.8	35.6	74.9	44.0
35–39	45.9	12.7	9.8	31.6	77.5	73.4
40–44	50.0	8.6	13.3	28.1	78.1	77.3
45–49	52.5	6.0	16.2	25.2	77.8	72.4
50–54	54.3	4.3	18.9	22.5	76.8	67.7
55–59	55.6	3.0	21.7	19.7	75.3	63.0
60–64	56.7	1.9	24.2	17.2	73.9	58.6
65–69	57.4	1.2	27.1	14.3	71.7	53.7
70–74	58.0	0.6	30.3	11.1	69.1	48.3
75–79	58.4	0.2	33.3	8.1	66.5	43.2
80–84	58.5	0.1	36.5	4.9	63.4	37.7
85–89	58.6	0.0	39.2	2.2	60.8	33.1
90–94	58.6	0.0	40.9	0.5	59.1	30.2
95–100	58.6	0.0	41.4	0.0	58.6	29.3

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 19 ($1.50/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	100.0	100.0	0.9	0.9
5–9	95.0	96.4	2.5	3.4
10–14	97.4	96.9	4.7	8.1
15–19	93.0	95.4	5.5	13.6
20–24	90.7	93.7	7.6	21.2
25–29	81.9	89.8	10.6	31.8
30–34	72.4	85.4	10.5	42.3
35–39	66.4	81.8	9.9	52.2
40–44	51.8	77.4	8.9	61.2
45–49	47.2	74.3	7.1	68.3
50–54	39.5	72.1	4.7	73.0
55–59	36.6	70.1	4.3	77.2
60–64	28.1	68.1	3.8	81.0
65–69	19.3	66.2	3.3	84.3
70–74	12.9	64.0	3.8	88.1
75–79	8.0	61.6	3.9	91.9
80–84	4.3	59.8	3.1	95.0
85–89	2.1	58.3	2.5	97.5
90–94	1.9	57.1	2.0	99.5
95–100	0.1	56.9	0.5	100.0

Figure 20 ($1.50/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 60 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	98.3	98.3	1.2	1.2
5–9	97.2	97.5	3.1	4.2
10–14	96.1	96.8	4.9	9.2
15–19	93.6	95.5	6.2	15.4
20–24	89.6	93.3	9.3	24.7
25–29	83.8	90.4	10.8	35.5
30–34	75.0	87.1	9.6	45.1
35–39	62.4	82.4	10.6	55.7
40–44	54.2	79.0	7.6	63.3
45–49	46.8	76.5	5.4	68.7
50–54	38.6	74.2	4.5	73.2
55–59	31.5	71.9	4.0	77.2
60–64	31.0	70.1	3.7	80.9
65–69	20.6	67.9	3.6	84.6
70–74	14.7	65.7	3.8	88.3
75–79	10.9	63.7	3.3	91.7
80–84	4.4	61.6	3.4	95.0
85–89	2.2	59.9	2.7	97.7
90–94	1.0	58.9	1.7	99.5
95–100	1.3	58.6	0.5	100.0

$2/Day Poverty Line Tables

Figure 4 ($2/Day Line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If an household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	100.0
5–9	99.1
10–14	97.5
15–19	98.9
20–24	98.0
25–29	94.9
30–34	93.7
35–39	84.7
40–44	77.8
45–49	79.0
50–54	64.0
55–59	69.9
60–64	55.2
65–69	50.0
70–74	42.9
75–79	27.3
80–84	15.5
85–89	12.9
90–94	8.3
95–100	4.4

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 5 ($2/Day Line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Households below poverty line		All households at score		Poverty likelihood (estimated, %)
0–4	931	÷	931	=	100.0
5–9	2,467	÷	2,491	=	99.1
10–14	4,572	÷	4,688	=	97.5
15–19	5,468	÷	5,528	=	98.9
20–24	7,405	÷	7,554	=	98.0
25–29	10,098	÷	10,636	=	94.9
30–34	9,832	÷	10,491	=	93.7
35–39	8,390	÷	9,910	=	84.7
40–44	6,961	÷	8,947	=	77.8
45–49	5,620	÷	7,116	=	79.0
50–54	2,991	÷	4,672	=	64.0
55–59	2,990	÷	4,278	=	69.9
60–64	2,077	÷	3,764	=	55.2
65–69	1,646	÷	3,292	=	50.0
70–74	1,616	÷	3,765	=	42.9
75–79	1,050	÷	3,853	=	27.3
80–84	477	÷	3,073	=	15.5
85–89	328	÷	2,544	=	12.9
90–94	166	÷	1,998	=	8.3
95–100	20	÷	469	=	4.4

Surveyed cases weighted to represent India's households.
Based on Schedule 1.0, Round 62 of India's SES by NSSO.

Figure 7 ($2/Day Line): Bootstrapped differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households in a large sample (n = 16,384), with confidence intervals, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample and to Round 60

	R62 scorecard applied to R62 validation sample, difference between estimate and true value				R62 applied to R60, difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)				Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7
5–9	0.2	0.8	0.9	1.1	-0.4	0.4	0.6	0.7
10–14	-1.4	1.0	1.0	1.1	-2.1	1.2	1.2	1.2
15–19	0.6	0.8	0.9	1.3	-0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
20–24	-0.9	0.6	0.7	0.7	-0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
25–29	1.2	1.3	1.6	2.2	-1.3	1.0	1.1	1.2
30–34	0.4	1.1	1.3	1.7	2.4	1.3	1.5	2.0
35–39	3.2	2.5	3.0	3.7	3.3	1.8	2.1	2.7
40–44	-3.3	2.8	3.0	3.3	0.4	2.4	2.8	3.9
45–49	1.5	3.0	3.4	4.6	2.9	2.8	3.4	4.5
50–54	-6.4	4.9	5.2	5.7	-5.6	4.4	4.8	5.2
55–59	-4.2	3.7	4.1	5.4	5.5	3.8	4.4	5.9
60–64	-2.4	4.7	5.3	7.3	-2.3	4.0	4.9	6.3
65–69	-5.4	5.0	5.3	6.8	1.4	4.0	4.9	6.5
70–74	2.0	4.5	5.1	6.5	4.5	4.4	5.1	7.3
75–79	5.6	3.9	4.5	6.3	-0.4	3.7	4.5	6.0
80–84	2.3	3.1	3.6	4.6	-2.3	3.2	3.7	5.2
85–89	7.6	1.6	1.9	2.3	2.7	2.7	3.3	4.2
90–94	4.2	1.5	1.9	2.5	1.1	3.0	3.7	4.8
95–100	3.4	1.1	1.3	1.7	-5.5	6.0	7.4	10.1

Figure 9 ($2/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	0.4	45.1	55.0	74.7
4	-0.5	31.4	38.5	57.2
8	-1.1	24.5	30.5	40.8
16	-0.9	19.0	23.6	30.0
32	-0.4	15.2	18.1	23.0
64	-0.1	10.9	13.2	16.3
128	0.1	7.7	9.1	11.5
256	0.2	5.4	6.5	8.5
512	0.3	3.8	4.5	6.0
1,024	0.4	2.8	3.2	4.2
2,048	0.4	1.9	2.3	2.9
4,096	0.4	1.3	1.6	2.1
8,192	0.4	0.9	1.1	1.4
16,384	0.4	0.7	0.8	1.0

Figure 10 ($2/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	0.1	42.5	54.9	73.3
4	0.0	30.8	38.4	52.7
8	0.3	22.9	27.4	37.3
16	0.5	17.7	21.1	26.7
32	0.5	13.7	16.5	20.9
64	0.5	10.6	12.0	15.9
128	0.6	7.7	9.3	12.8
256	0.8	5.6	6.8	8.8
512	0.8	3.9	4.7	5.9
1,024	0.7	2.7	3.1	4.3
2,048	0.6	1.8	2.1	2.9
4,096	0.6	1.3	1.6	2.2
8,192	0.6	1.0	1.1	1.3
16,384	0.6	0.6	0.8	1.0

Figure 12 ($2/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	0.4	45.1	55.0	74.7
4	-0.5	31.3	38.1	54.7
8	-1.1	23.1	29.2	38.3
16	-0.9	17.2	20.8	28.1
32	-0.3	13.0	15.6	20.4
64	-0.1	9.1	10.8	13.9
128	0.0	6.3	7.5	9.5
256	0.0	4.4	5.2	6.9
512	0.1	3.2	3.8	4.9
1,024	0.1	2.3	2.8	3.9
2,048	0.1	1.6	1.9	2.6
4,096	0.1	1.1	1.4	1.8
8,192	0.1	0.8	0.9	1.2
16,384	0.1	0.6	0.7	0.9

Figure 13 ($2/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of poverty rates of groups of households at a point in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	0.1	42.5	54.9	73.3
4	0.2	30.8	38.2	52.9
8	0.4	21.9	27.0	33.7
16	0.6	16.2	18.9	25.7
32	0.7	11.8	13.9	17.4
64	0.6	8.1	9.5	13.1
128	0.6	5.9	6.9	9.5
256	0.7	4.0	4.9	6.6
512	0.7	3.0	3.6	4.6
1,024	0.7	2.1	2.6	3.1
2,048	0.6	1.4	1.7	2.2
4,096	0.6	1.0	1.2	1.6
8,192	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.1
16,384	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.7

Figure 15 ($2/Day Line): Differences and precision of differences for bootstrapped estimates of changes in poverty rates of groups of households between two points in time, by sample size, Round 62 scorecard applied to the change between the Round 62 validation sample and Round 60

	Difference between estimate and true value			
		Confidence interval (+/- percentage points)		
Sample size (n)	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
2	-0.3	66.7	78.1	104.2
4	0.7	46.6	57.6	79.9
8	1.5	32.9	40.6	56.5
16	1.5	23.0	27.8	37.3
32	1.0	17.1	20.7	28.1
64	0.7	12.1	14.8	19.0
128	0.6	8.5	10.1	12.8
256	0.7	6.0	7.3	9.7
512	0.6	4.2	4.9	6.7
1,024	0.6	3.1	3.6	4.9
2,048	0.5	2.1	2.5	3.2
4,096	0.5	1.5	1.8	2.3
8,192	0.5	1.1	1.3	1.7
16,384	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.2

Figure 17 ($2/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	0.9	73.9	0.0	25.2	26.1	-97.5
5–9	3.4	71.5	0.0	25.1	28.5	-90.9
10–14	8.0	66.8	0.1	25.1	33.1	-78.5
15–19	13.4	61.4	0.2	25.0	38.4	-63.8
20–24	20.9	54.0	0.3	24.8	45.7	-43.8
25–29	31.0	43.9	0.9	24.3	55.3	-16.1
30–34	40.7	34.2	1.7	23.5	64.2	10.9
35–39	49.2	25.6	3.0	22.2	71.4	35.6
40–44	56.3	18.6	4.9	20.3	76.5	56.9
45–49	61.6	13.2	6.6	18.5	80.2	73.6
50–54	64.9	9.9	8.1	17.1	82.0	84.2
55–59	67.7	7.1	9.6	15.6	83.3	87.2
60–64	69.8	5.0	11.2	14.0	83.8	85.0
65–69	71.5	3.4	12.8	12.3	83.8	82.8
70–74	72.9	1.9	15.2	10.0	82.9	79.7
75–79	74.0	0.9	18.0	7.2	81.2	76.0
80–84	74.4	0.4	20.6	4.6	79.0	72.5
85–89	74.7	0.2	22.9	2.3	77.0	69.4
90–94	74.8	0.0	24.7	0.5	75.3	67.0
95–100	74.8	0.0	25.2	0.0	74.8	66.4

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 18 ($2/Day Line): Households by targeting classification and score, along with "Total Accuracy" and BPAC, Round 62 scorecard applied to Round 60

Score	Inclusion: < poverty line correctly targeted	Undercoverage: < poverty line mistakenly non-targeted	Leakage: => poverty line mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: => poverty line correctly non-targeted	Total Accuracy Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
0–4	1.2	73.9	0.0	25.0	26.1	-96.9
5–9	4.2	70.8	0.0	25.0	29.2	-88.7
10–14	9.1	65.9	0.1	24.9	34.1	-75.6
15–19	15.2	59.8	0.1	24.9	40.1	-59.2
20–24	24.4	50.7	0.3	24.7	49.0	-34.7
25–29	34.7	40.3	0.8	24.2	58.9	-6.5
30–34	43.4	31.6	1.7	23.3	66.7	18.0
35–39	52.1	22.9	3.6	21.4	73.6	43.7
40–44	58.1	16.9	5.2	19.7	77.8	61.8
45–49	62.0	13.0	6.7	18.2	80.2	74.2
50–54	65.1	9.9	8.1	16.9	82.0	84.3
55–59	67.6	7.4	9.7	15.3	82.9	87.1
60–64	69.7	5.4	11.3	13.7	83.3	85.0
65–69	71.4	3.6	13.1	11.9	83.3	82.5
70–74	72.9	2.1	15.4	9.5	82.4	79.4
75–79	73.9	1.2	17.8	7.2	81.0	76.3
80–84	74.5	0.5	20.6	4.4	78.9	72.6
85–89	74.8	0.2	22.9	2.1	76.9	69.4
90–94	75.0	0.0	24.5	0.5	75.4	67.3
95–100	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	66.7

Inclusion, undercoverage, leakage, and exclusion normalized to sum to 100.

Figure 19 ($2/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 62 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	100.0	100.0	0.9	0.9
5–9	98.3	98.7	2.5	3.4
10–14	98.7	98.7	4.7	8.1
15–19	98.2	98.5	5.5	13.6
20–24	98.2	98.4	7.6	21.2
25–29	95.2	97.3	10.6	31.8
30–34	92.3	96.1	10.5	42.3
35–39	86.4	94.2	9.9	52.2
40–44	78.6	92.0	8.9	61.2
45–49	75.7	90.3	7.1	68.3
50–54	69.9	89.0	4.7	73.0
55–59	64.9	87.6	4.3	77.2
60–64	56.2	86.2	3.8	81.0
65–69	50.4	84.8	3.3	84.3
70–74	38.5	82.8	3.8	88.1
75–79	27.4	80.5	3.9	91.9
80–84	14.7	78.3	3.1	95.0
85–89	10.0	76.6	2.5	97.5
90–94	7.3	75.2	2.0	99.5
95–100	3.0	74.8	0.5	100.0

Figure 20 ($2/Day Line): Households below the poverty line and all households, at a given score or at or below a given score cut-off, Round 62 scorecard applied to the Round 60 validation sample

	Households below poverty line (%)		All households (%)	
Score	At score	At or below score	At score	At or below score
0–4	99.5	99.5	1.2	1.2
5–9	99.2	99.3	3.1	4.2
10–14	99.5	99.4	4.9	9.2
15–19	98.8	99.2	6.2	15.4
20–24	97.9	98.7	9.3	24.7
25–29	95.8	97.8	10.8	35.5
30–34	90.6	96.3	9.6	45.1
35–39	82.3	93.6	10.6	55.7
40–44	77.9	91.7	7.6	63.3
45–49	72.4	90.2	5.4	68.7
50–54	69.2	88.9	4.5	73.2
55–59	61.7	87.5	4.0	77.2
60–64	56.1	86.1	3.7	80.9
65–69	49.2	84.5	3.6	84.6
70–74	38.3	82.5	3.8	88.3
75–79	29.5	80.6	3.3	91.7
80–84	18.2	78.4	3.4	95.0
85–89	12.8	76.5	2.7	97.7
90–94	9.1	75.4	1.7	99.5
95–100	8.6	75.0	0.5	100.0

APPENDIX

Poverty Lines and Household Poverty Rates By Round, and Urban/Rural, for All-India, All-Urban, All-Rural, and Each State and Union Territory

Poverty lines are in units of rupees/person/day.

There are two poverty rates, person-level and household-level. The person-level rate ("head-count index") is the share of people in a given group who live in households whose per-capita expenditure (that is, total household expenditure divided by the number of household members) is below a given poverty line.

The household-level poverty rate is the share of households in a given group whose per-capita expenditure is below a given poverty line.

Wheras governments report person-level poverty rates, local pro-poor development organizations typically report household poverty rates. This is because they want to know the poverty rate of their clients, not the poverty rate of all people who live in households with their clients. Thus, the household-level rate will typically be the benchmark when comparing the poverty rate of an organization's clients with the overall rate in a state or union territory.

Given household-level poverty likelihoods, the person-level poverty rate for all people in the group of households is simply the average of the household-level poverty likelihoods, weighted by the number of people in each household. Larger households are more likely to be poor, so the person-level rate usually exceeds the household-level rate.

National poverty lines come from Planning Commission (2007) and Saxena (2001). States and Union Territories are grouped as in these documents. The person-level poverty rates for all-India, all-urban, and all-rural match Planning Commission (2007) for the uniform recall period except inasmuch as the Planning Commission sometimes extrapolates rates from large states to nearby small states, whereas this paper reports actual poverty rates from the NSSO data.

National urban and rural lines in rounds 57, 58, 59, 60, and 62 are adjusted for inflation using the consumer price index for industrial labourers (`http://labourbureau.nic.in/indtab.html`) and the CPI for rural labourers (`http://labourbureau.nic.in/indtab.html`).

The USAID "extreme" poverty line is the median per capita expenditure of households below the national line.

The international poverty lines are adjusted for purchase-power parity (Sillers (2006) and adjusted for state and rural/urban cost-of-living using price indices from Deaton (2003). These international lines are then adjusted for inflation after Round 55 using the CPI for industrial labourers and the CPI for rural labourers.

Figure A1: All-India, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
			USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
57	Line	12.24	10.02	9.85	13.14	16.42	19.70	26.27
	Rate (people)	28.1	14.0	14.9	36.8	54.4	67.8	82.1
	Rate (households)	23.0	10.5	12.4	31.3	47.8	61.1	76.8
58	Line	12.77	10.61	10.20	13.59	16.99	20.39	27.19
	Rate (people)	23.9	12.0	11.5	31.2	50.7	65.0	80.7
	Rate (households)	19.4	9.4	9.3	26.3	44.2	58.4	74.9
59	Line	13.01	10.91	10.42	13.89	17.37	20.84	27.79
	Rate (people)	24.1	12.0	11.7	31.4	50.7	64.9	80.6
	Rate (households)	19.4	9.4	9.3	26.2	44.2	58.1	75.1
60	Line	13.25	10.96	10.58	14.11	17.64	21.17	28.22
	Rate (people)	24.1	12.0	11.9	33.1	51.8	65.5	81.1
	Rate (households)	19.6	9.4	9.6	27.7	44.9	58.6	75.0
61	Line	13.37	10.95	10.90	14.53	18.16	21.80	29.06
	Rate (people)	27.5	13.7	16.0	37.5	55.9	68.7	82.4
	Rate (households)	23.0	11.1	13.4	32.5	49.9	62.8	77.5
62	Line	14.25	11.94	11.53	15.38	19.22	23.07	30.75
	Rate (people)	19.74	9.72	10.38	28.24	46.32	60.73	78.27
	Rate (households)	17.0	8.4	9.5	25.4	42.6	56.9	74.9

Figure A2: All-Urban and All-Rural, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.40	12.88	10.56	14.08	17.60	21.12	28.16
		Rate (people)	24.0	12.0	5.1	15.6	28.7	41.8	59.7
		Rate (households)	19.0	9.3	4.0	11.9	22.5	33.9	51.4
	58	Line	16.96	13.71	10.93	14.58	18.22	21.87	29.16
		Rate (people)	22.8	11.4	3.5	14.1	27.4	39.9	58.6
		Rate (households)	17.7	8.5	2.7	10.5	21.6	32.8	49.6
	59	Line	17.35	14.16	11.17	14.89	18.62	22.34	29.79
		Rate (people)	23.0	11.4	4.3	13.7	28.0	39.2	59.1
		Rate (households)	17.5	8.4	3.0	10.0	21.4	31.0	50.2
	60	Line	17.73	14.12	11.41	15.21	19.01	22.82	30.42
		Rate (people)	23.2	11.6	4.6	14.6	27.3	40.2	60.1
		Rate (households)	17.7	8.5	3.3	10.9	21.0	31.8	49.8
	61	Line	17.96	14.16	11.83	15.77	19.71	23.65	31.54
		Rate (people)	25.8	12.8	6.2	18.4	32.1	44.1	62.0
		Rate (households)	20.3	9.8	4.6	14.1	25.6	36.2	53.8
	62	Line	18.70	15.21	12.39	16.52	20.65	24.78	33.04
		Rate (people)	20.9	10.4	4.7	13.8	26.5	38.7	58.2
		Rate (households)	15.4	7.4	3.3	10.0	19.7	30.3	48.9
Rural	57	Line	10.96	9.13	9.63	12.84	16.06	19.27	25.69
		Rate (people)	29.3	14.6	17.9	43.4	62.4	75.8	89.1
		Rate (households)	24.4	10.9	15.3	38.0	56.5	70.5	85.5
	58	Line	11.29	9.51	9.94	13.25	16.56	19.87	26.49
		Rate (people)	24.3	12.1	14.3	37.3	59.0	73.8	88.5
		Rate (households)	20.1	9.7	11.9	32.5	53.2	68.5	84.9
	59	Line	11.55	9.81	10.17	13.56	16.94	20.33	27.11
		Rate (people)	24.5	12.3	14.2	37.3	58.4	73.5	87.9
		Rate (households)	20.1	9.7	11.7	32.3	52.7	68.2	84.5
	60	Line	11.73	9.89	10.30	13.74	17.17	20.61	27.48
		Rate (people)	24.4	12.1	14.4	39.3	60.0	74.1	88.1
		Rate (households)	20.4	9.8	12.0	34.2	54.2	69.0	84.8
	61	Line	11.81	9.86	10.58	14.11	17.64	21.17	28.22
		Rate (people)	28.0	14.0	19.3	43.9	64.0	77.1	89.3
		Rate (households)	24.0	11.7	16.7	39.5	59.2	72.9	86.5
	62	Line	12.41	10.59	11.18	14.91	18.63	22.36	29.81
		Rate (people)	19.3	9.4	12.7	34.2	54.5	69.8	86.5
		Rate (households)	17.5	8.7	11.6	30.8	50.6	66.2	84.1

Figure A3: Andaman and Nicobar Islands, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rates (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.90	13.11	10.94	14.59	18.23	21.88	29.18
		Rate (people)	1.6	1.4	0.0	1.4	1.6	15.2	36.0
		Rate (households)	2.0	1.3	0.0	1.3	2.0	10.9	24.2
	58	Line	17.50	14.26	11.31	15.07	18.84	22.61	30.15
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	36.5
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	25.3
	59	Line	17.88	17.49	11.54	15.38	19.23	23.08	30.77
		Rate (people)	4.2	2.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	18.4	45.8
		Rate (households)	3.1	1.5	0.0	0.0	5.5	12.6	35.3
	60	Line	18.26	15.36	11.77	15.69	19.62	23.54	31.38
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	27.0
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	17.9
	61	Line	18.00	17.38	12.20	16.26	20.33	24.39	32.52
		Rate (people)	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	9.1	27.3
		Rate (households)	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.0	7.9	21.6
	62	Line	18.89	18.85	12.86	17.14	21.43	25.72	34.29
		Rate (people)	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.8	26.5
		Rate (households)	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	2.7	15.5
Rural	57	Line	10.23	9.09	10.50	14.00	17.50	21.00	27.99
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	19.4	47.2	70.5
		Rate (households)	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.9	10.8	36.0	55.2
	58	Line	10.54	9.31	10.79	14.39	17.99	21.59	28.78
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.2	32.5	53.9	64.4
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	23.7	42.0	50.7
	59	Line	10.79	8.91	11.04	14.72	18.40	22.08	29.45
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	27.8	34.9	50.8
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	22.1	29.2	44.5
	60	Line	10.94	9.17	11.18	14.91	18.64	22.37	29.82
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	11.8	32.2	65.0
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	9.9	27.6	56.1
	61	Line	11.57	11.33	11.50	15.34	19.17	23.01	30.68
		Rate (people)	0.4	0.0	0.4	7.2	21.6	34.6	60.2
		Rate (households)	0.2	0.0	0.2	5.0	18.9	31.2	54.9
	62	Line	12.11	10.62	12.04	16.06	20.07	24.08	32.11
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	12.6	31.4	51.1
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	10.3	23.8	43.1

Figure A4: Andhra Pradesh, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.26	12.92	10.22	13.63	17.03	20.44	27.25
		Rate (people)	29.5	14.8	7.1	19.0	31.4	48.1	63.8
		Rate (households)	24.4	11.6	5.5	14.9	26.0	41.3	55.7
	58	Line	16.83	13.01	10.56	14.08	17.60	21.12	28.16
		Rate (people)	18.3	8.8	3.3	10.5	21.6	38.0	59.5
		Rate (households)	15.7	7.7	2.9	8.9	18.7	32.3	49.7
	59	Line	17.20	14.38	10.78	14.37	17.96	21.55	28.74
		Rate (people)	23.9	11.8	3.2	11.5	26.9	36.3	58.0
		Rate (households)	21.4	11.4	3.6	11.3	24.0	32.2	54.1
	60	Line	17.56	13.64	10.99	14.66	18.32	21.99	29.31
		Rate (people)	28.9	14.6	5.5	18.0	30.9	43.2	60.1
		Rate (households)	22.0	10.3	3.7	14.0	23.8	35.4	52.6
	61	Line	17.85	14.61	11.39	15.19	18.99	22.78	30.38
		Rate (people)	27.4	13.6	4.1	16.7	32.6	44.6	64.1
		Rate (households)	23.0	11.4	4.2	14.1	27.4	38.6	58.7
	62	Line	18.74	14.78	12.01	16.01	20.02	24.02	32.03
		Rate (people)	19.5	9.9	5.2	12.6	24.8	34.7	53.3
		Rate (households)	16.4	8.2	4.4	10.6	20.6	29.2	47.5
Rural	57	Line	8.74	7.99	9.66	12.87	16.09	19.31	25.75
		Rate (people)	4.6	2.2	10.3	33.0	57.4	72.5	86.0
		Rate (households)	4.4	2.3	9.4	32.2	56.2	70.6	83.3
	58	Line	9.01	7.85	9.93	13.24	16.54	19.85	26.47
		Rate (people)	8.5	4.3	11.6	32.9	52.8	69.1	83.3
		Rate (households)	6.9	3.7	9.3	26.7	46.1	62.8	79.7
	59	Line	9.22	7.94	10.16	13.54	16.93	20.31	27.08
		Rate (people)	10.4	5.2	14.2	35.2	57.2	71.3	87.7
		Rate (households)	7.8	4.0	11.4	31.2	52.2	67.4	85.4
	60	Line	9.35	8.21	10.29	13.72	17.14	20.57	27.43
		Rate (people)	9.6	4.8	15.5	41.1	62.8	76.0	89.2
		Rate (households)	7.7	4.0	12.5	35.0	56.3	70.3	86.5
	61	Line	9.63	8.30	10.58	14.11	17.63	21.16	28.22
		Rate (people)	10.5	5.2	16.0	37.5	58.6	72.7	87.5
		Rate (households)	9.7	5.5	14.5	34.0	54.5	68.8	84.5
	62	Line	10.08	9.07	11.08	14.77	18.46	22.15	29.54
		Rate (people)	6.9	3.1	10.0	30.6	49.7	67.6	85.9
		Rate (households)	8.7	6.1	10.7	28.1	46.1	65.6	83.9

Figure A5: Arunachal Pradesh, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	12.23	9.84	11.29	15.05	18.81	22.57	30.10
		Rate (people)	2.1	1.0	1.3	4.9	6.7	17.4	35.9
		Rate (households)	1.6	0.7	1.1	4.5	5.9	13.6	33.5
	58	Line	12.66	11.62	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	22.2	41.5	64.6
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	13.7	32.0	55.7
	59	Line	12.93	7.61	11.90	15.87	19.84	23.80	31.74
		Rate (people)	3.4	1.9	1.9	10.7	18.5	33.0	66.7
		Rate (households)	2.7	1.3	1.3	7.4	13.9	27.4	57.8
	60	Line	13.21	10.10	12.14	16.19	20.23	24.28	32.37
		Rate (people)	4.0	2.2	2.2	4.6	15.2	28.7	59.9
		Rate (households)	3.7	2.2	2.2	4.2	13.7	24.9	49.9
	61	Line	12.46	11.57	12.58	16.77	20.97	25.16	33.55
		Rate (people)	2.6	1.3	2.7	18.4	30.7	48.6	70.9
		Rate (households)	4.1	3.0	4.1	18.0	29.5	43.0	68.5
	62	Line	13.08	11.90	13.26	17.69	22.11	26.53	35.37
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	11.3	25.0	61.6
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	10.9	25.1	60.6
Rural	57	Line	12.15	9.45	10.60	14.14	17.67	21.20	28.27
		Rate (people)	5.6	3.2	3.4	7.6	22.2	37.6	50.2
		Rate (households)	6.1	3.5	3.8	7.5	18.3	30.4	47.4
	58	Line	12.52	10.64	10.90	14.53	18.17	21.80	29.07
		Rate (people)	12.7	7.7	7.7	21.3	48.8	69.3	87.6
		Rate (households)	9.2	5.6	5.8	15.4	39.4	58.1	79.1
	59	Line	12.82	10.64	11.15	14.87	18.59	22.30	29.74
		Rate (people)	8.7	4.5	5.1	14.2	31.6	49.7	73.4
		Rate (households)	6.6	3.1	3.8	11.1	25.3	42.9	68.1
	60	Line	12.99	11.66	11.29	15.06	18.82	22.59	30.12
		Rate (people)	14.5	7.5	6.2	26.4	50.5	61.1	76.7
		Rate (households)	9.5	5.1	4.3	19.2	39.1	50.0	65.9
	61	Line	12.74	10.96	11.62	15.49	19.36	23.24	30.98
		Rate (people)	10.9	5.4	6.9	22.0	41.1	56.9	76.0
		Rate (households)	8.0	4.1	5.1	17.5	33.8	49.0	70.2
	62	Line	13.34	11.71	12.16	16.22	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	8.8	3.6	5.1	19.7	44.9	57.3	76.4
		Rate (households)	6.0	2.8	3.7	13.8	35.2	48.9	69.0

Figure A6: Assam, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	12.23	11.04	11.29	15.05	18.81	22.57	30.10
		Rate (people)	5.1	2.5	2.9	11.5	25.8	35.6	61.5
		Rate (households)	3.3	1.6	1.7	8.4	18.4	26.2	48.6
	58	Line	12.66	11.62	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	2.0	1.5	1.5	13.0	28.4	43.3	64.1
		Rate (households)	1.2	1.0	1.0	10.1	22.9	34.4	55.2
	59	Line	12.93	11.50	11.90	15.87	19.84	23.80	31.74
		Rate (people)	11.9	6.2	6.2	16.4	28.2	45.1	78.2
		Rate (households)	8.0	4.0	4.0	12.1	23.3	35.5	68.0
	60	Line	13.21	8.89	12.14	16.19	20.23	24.28	32.37
		Rate (people)	7.4	4.6	4.6	9.3	20.8	35.3	61.2
		Rate (households)	4.1	2.4	2.4	5.3	13.4	23.6	47.0
	61	Line	12.46	11.57	12.58	16.77	20.97	25.16	33.55
		Rate (people)	3.6	2.0	3.7	18.3	26.9	41.1	65.4
		Rate (households)	2.8	1.3	2.9	14.9	21.7	33.4	56.4
	62	Line	13.08	11.90	13.26	17.69	22.11	26.53	35.37
		Rate (people)	2.6	1.1	2.6	6.3	13.1	29.4	52.0
		Rate (households)	1.5	0.8	1.5	4.0	9.2	17.8	37.1
Rural	57	Line	12.15	9.63	10.60	14.14	17.67	21.20	28.27
		Rate (people)	18.6	9.4	12.3	29.6	56.4	76.7	93.0
		Rate (households)	16.0	8.3	10.8	25.6	49.5	72.5	90.1
	58	Line	12.52	10.74	10.90	14.53	18.17	21.80	29.07
		Rate (people)	16.6	8.3	8.7	31.5	62.3	81.7	96.1
		Rate (households)	15.0	7.6	8.0	28.7	59.1	77.9	94.7
	59	Line	12.82	10.44	11.15	14.87	18.59	22.30	29.74
		Rate (people)	23.3	11.7	15.6	41.3	67.0	84.8	96.1
		Rate (households)	19.7	9.5	12.9	35.3	60.3	79.6	93.4
	60	Line	12.99	10.97	11.29	15.06	18.82	22.59	30.12
		Rate (people)	19.6	9.8	11.1	37.1	61.7	80.7	94.9
		Rate (households)	16.6	8.0	9.1	33.0	58.4	77.7	93.6
	61	Line	12.74	11.00	11.62	15.49	19.36	23.24	30.98
		Rate (people)	22.1	11.0	14.8	41.1	66.3	84.2	95.9
		Rate (households)	19.8	9.9	13.0	38.5	64.1	82.1	94.9
	62	Line	13.34	11.87	12.16	16.22	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	16.3	8.0	10.8	33.0	57.6	74.4	92.0
		Rate (households)	14.4	7.4	9.7	29.7	54.7	71.9	89.6

Figure A7: Bihar, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	13.50	10.28	9.56	12.75	15.93	19.12	25.49
		Rate (people)	29.3	14.5	11.8	25.7	48.0	66.6	79.3
		Rate (households)	23.0	10.1	8.0	20.0	37.3	52.0	66.7
	58	Line	13.97	11.89	9.88	13.17	16.46	19.76	26.34
		Rate (people)	35.2	18.1	5.8	26.3	45.6	58.8	74.4
		Rate (households)	25.3	13.9	4.5	20.5	33.2	47.8	61.0
	59	Line	14.28	11.96	10.08	13.44	16.80	20.16	26.89
		Rate (people)	33.9	16.2	8.2	26.4	46.0	58.7	77.9
		Rate (households)	23.1	10.9	4.8	18.8	33.6	45.1	63.6
	60	Line	14.58	11.86	10.28	13.71	17.14	20.57	27.42
		Rate (people)	31.6	17.1	8.2	29.8	37.2	55.4	80.7
		Rate (households)	22.3	9.9	5.0	21.0	28.0	44.9	67.4
	61	Line	14.30	11.61	10.66	14.21	17.76	21.31	28.42
		Rate (people)	36.1	18.0	12.3	35.5	49.4	60.6	76.9
		Rate (households)	26.5	13.4	9.1	26.1	37.3	48.3	64.8
	62	Line	15.01	12.28	11.24	14.98	18.73	22.47	29.96
		Rate (people)	32.4	16.8	14.3	32.3	54.4	66.6	81.5
		Rate (households)	25.8	12.3	10.4	25.7	44.3	57.1	71.7
Rural	57	Line	11.07	8.96	9.26	12.34	15.43	18.52	24.69
		Rate (people)	47.3	23.7	27.3	55.2	72.2	88.0	94.3
		Rate (households)	38.3	16.4	20.6	47.0	63.4	81.8	91.9
	58	Line	11.41	9.58	9.52	12.69	15.86	19.04	25.38
		Rate (people)	35.1	17.7	16.5	47.2	72.9	86.8	96.6
		Rate (households)	29.5	14.2	13.3	40.4	65.9	81.6	94.6
	59	Line	11.68	9.58	9.74	12.98	16.23	19.48	25.97
		Rate (people)	42.9	21.5	22.8	54.0	75.8	88.5	96.9
		Rate (households)	36.6	16.9	18.1	47.1	69.9	83.6	94.4
	60	Line	11.84	9.83	9.86	13.15	16.44	19.73	26.30
		Rate (people)	40.9	20.4	20.6	55.1	78.7	89.8	95.9
		Rate (households)	35.4	17.2	17.3	48.8	72.8	85.1	93.4
	61	Line	11.65	9.57	10.14	13.53	16.91	20.29	27.05
		Rate (people)	42.6	21.3	26.4	58.9	80.2	90.6	97.0
		Rate (households)	38.1	18.4	23.2	54.2	76.4	87.8	95.8
	62	Line	12.20	10.02	10.62	14.16	17.70	21.24	28.32
		Rate (people)	29.3	13.9	18.3	48.1	71.6	85.9	96.5
		Rate (households)	28.0	13.0	17.7	44.9	69.1	82.4	95.0

Figure A8: Chandigarh, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	13.79	12.38	10.18	13.57	16.96	20.35	27.14
		Rate (people)	3.9	0.2	0.0	3.9	7.6	9.5	15.3
		Rate (households)	2.8	0.6	0.0	2.8	5.5	7.0	11.3
	58	Line	14.28	13.73	10.52	14.02	17.53	21.03	28.04
		Rate (people)	2.9	0.7	0.4	2.9	6.5	12.0	23.9
		Rate (households)	1.7	0.4	0.2	1.7	3.9	7.5	16.1
	59	Line	14.59	12.51	10.73	14.31	17.89	21.47	28.62
		Rate (people)	2.7	1.4	0.1	2.3	3.0	5.3	31.1
		Rate (households)	2.2	1.3	0.5	2.0	2.6	4.4	22.4
	60	Line	14.90	12.53	10.95	14.60	18.25	21.90	29.19
		Rate (people)	2.2	2.0	0.1	2.2	3.6	7.1	12.8
		Rate (households)	1.7	1.3	0.4	1.7	2.6	5.6	8.4
	61	Line	15.33	13.46	11.34	15.13	18.91	22.69	30.25
		Rate (people)	3.8	1.3	1.0	3.8	9.4	16.2	32.4
		Rate (households)	2.7	1.2	0.8	2.7	6.5	12.1	26.5
	62	Line	16.09	15.26	11.96	15.95	19.94	23.92	31.90
		Rate (people)	7.5	2.0	0.6	7.5	18.8	19.7	25.8
		Rate (households)	3.3	1.0	0.3	3.3	10.8	11.7	16.8
Rural	57	Line	12.06	10.78	9.87	13.16	16.45	19.75	26.33
		Rate (people)	17.6	17.6	2.5	17.6	26.2	45.2	61.0
		Rate (households)	11.3	11.3	5.6	11.3	14.5	21.6	28.7
	58	Line	12.43	9.18	10.15	13.53	16.92	20.30	27.07
		Rate (people)	11.6	0.0	6.6	15.8	16.6	23.3	51.9
		Rate (households)	6.9	0.0	3.5	10.4	11.0	15.0	41.0
	59	Line	12.72	11.80	10.39	13.85	17.31	20.77	27.69
		Rate (people)	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	11.6	34.4	50.0
		Rate (households)	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.9	6.5	21.8	37.9
	60	Line	12.90	9.72	10.52	14.02	17.53	21.04	28.05
		Rate (people)	9.2	0.0	9.2	9.2	9.5	19.1	39.8
		Rate (households)	9.1	0.0	9.1	9.1	9.3	17.0	35.4
	61	Line	13.49	10.80	10.82	14.43	18.03	21.64	28.85
		Rate (people)	7.5	7.5	7.5	8.3	21.6	42.3	61.0
		Rate (households)	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.6	14.9	27.5	42.9
	62	Line	14.13	12.56	11.33	15.10	18.88	22.65	30.20
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.2	53.5
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.9	47.6

Figure A9: Chhattisgarh, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	13.79	11.38	10.18	13.57	16.96	20.35	27.14
		Rate (people)	26.4	13.2	7.2	25.8	48.9	60.3	76.7
		Rate (households)	20.9	10.9	5.4	19.9	39.6	52.9	71.5
	58	Line	14.28	11.82	10.52	14.02	17.53	21.03	28.04
		Rate (people)	23.8	12.0	6.6	21.9	28.9	36.8	66.4
		Rate (households)	22.7	10.6	6.2	21.1	27.7	36.5	64.8
	59	Line	14.59	10.97	10.73	14.31	17.89	21.47	28.62
		Rate (people)	36.1	17.6	15.2	34.2	55.7	60.2	69.0
		Rate (households)	28.1	13.4	11.6	26.9	45.8	50.7	60.9
	60	Line	14.90	12.76	10.95	14.60	18.25	21.90	29.19
		Rate (people)	22.9	10.8	9.7	20.8	36.2	51.0	70.7
		Rate (households)	19.7	9.2	8.0	18.4	34.7	48.3	65.1
	61	Line	18.41	13.20	11.34	15.13	18.91	22.69	30.25
		Rate (people)	42.2	21.4	13.1	28.3	43.2	49.5	65.8
		Rate (households)	35.5	16.9	9.5	22.6	36.8	43.7	61.1
	62	Line	19.33	15.03	11.96	15.95	19.94	23.92	31.90
		Rate (people)	23.9	9.8	2.6	16.8	24.8	31.8	50.7
		Rate (households)	18.9	7.3	2.0	12.5	20.2	29.8	49.6
Rural	57	Line	12.06	8.72	9.87	13.16	16.45	19.75	26.33
		Rate (people)	64.1	34.8	39.0	71.6	95.3	97.7	99.2
		Rate (households)	59.1	27.6	31.4	67.7	93.3	96.6	98.9
	58	Line	12.43	10.02	10.15	13.53	16.92	20.30	27.07
		Rate (people)	53.7	27.3	27.5	63.6	82.8	89.7	95.6
		Rate (households)	48.6	23.6	23.7	57.7	78.6	88.0	94.5
	59	Line	12.72	10.24	10.39	13.85	17.31	20.77	27.69
		Rate (people)	59.4	29.5	31.7	65.8	84.2	91.5	95.9
		Rate (households)	49.8	24.2	25.9	57.5	78.0	87.9	94.1
	60	Line	12.90	9.90	10.52	14.02	17.53	21.04	28.05
		Rate (people)	58.0	28.0	34.3	68.3	84.9	91.7	96.8
		Rate (households)	53.8	23.5	27.7	63.4	80.0	89.4	96.2
	61	Line	10.60	8.57	10.82	14.43	18.03	21.64	28.85
		Rate (people)	40.8	20.4	43.9	73.0	83.9	91.5	96.6
		Rate (households)	35.6	17.1	38.9	67.5	80.3	89.4	95.7
	62	Line	11.10	9.50	11.33	15.10	18.88	22.65	30.20
		Rate (people)	33.6	18.9	34.8	60.5	77.5	90.3	98.8
		Rate (households)	33.0	17.6	33.7	57.6	80.0	91.0	97.7

Figure A10: Dadra and Nagar Haveli, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	19.18	14.09	11.46	15.29	19.11	22.93	30.57
		Rate (people)	7.4	2.6	0.1	3.8	7.4	16.2	18.6
		Rate (households)	4.5	1.6	0.4	2.8	4.5	9.4	12.2
	58	Line	19.86	19.62	11.85	15.79	19.74	23.69	31.59
		Rate (people)	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	22.1	35.1
		Rate (households)	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	16.0	24.2
	59	Line	20.29	19.41	12.09	16.12	20.15	24.18	32.24
		Rate (people)	30.6	30.6	0.0	3.6	30.6	42.5	51.5
		Rate (households)	14.8	14.8	0.0	1.8	14.8	23.6	32.7
	60	Line	20.72	15.30	12.33	16.44	20.55	24.66	32.88
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	42.8
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	31.0
	61	Line	21.89	14.93	12.78	17.04	21.30	25.56	34.08
		Rate (people)	19.2	8.9	7.6	15.1	19.2	21.8	32.4
		Rate (households)	14.4	6.4	5.2	10.4	14.4	16.3	23.4
	62	Line	22.98	18.16	13.47	17.96	22.46	26.95	35.93
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.3
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0
Rural	57	Line	10.59	8.76	9.98	13.30	16.63	19.95	26.61
		Rate (people)	25.2	13.7	22.7	28.1	49.9	57.5	77.9
		Rate (households)	16.5	9.2	14.7	18.2	31.7	41.9	62.0
	58	Line	10.92	10.79	10.26	13.68	17.10	20.51	27.35
		Rate (people)	3.7	0.2	0.2	17.4	36.7	68.2	77.4
		Rate (households)	2.8	0.2	0.2	11.5	32.6	55.2	66.7
	59	Line	11.18	8.36	10.49	13.99	17.49	20.99	27.99
		Rate (people)	17.6	13.9	14.8	26.6	53.3	60.9	68.5
		Rate (households)	9.0	6.5	6.9	16.8	38.0	46.0	52.1
	60	Line	11.33	9.92	10.63	14.17	17.72	21.26	28.34
		Rate (people)	16.4	8.3	8.3	43.8	55.3	68.3	82.0
		Rate (households)	10.7	5.3	5.3	30.6	43.1	58.3	72.3
	61	Line	11.91	9.79	10.93	14.58	18.22	21.87	29.16
		Rate (people)	39.6	20.0	31.4	57.3	65.7	75.8	84.7
		Rate (households)	38.8	27.9	34.3	51.8	59.3	65.1	71.6
	62	Line	12.47	10.30	11.45	15.26	19.08	22.89	30.52
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.2	63.3	67.3	76.8
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.8	49.7	53.0	64.4

Figure A11: Daman and Diu, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	19.18	18.55	11.46	15.29	19.11	22.93	30.57
		Rate (people)	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.0	14.3	41.6
		Rate (households)	0.9	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.9	10.2	30.5
	58	Line	19.86	17.06	11.85	15.79	19.74	23.69	31.59
		Rate (people)	12.3	5.8	0.0	5.8	11.2	32.4	59.1
		Rate (households)	8.7	3.6	0.0	3.6	7.9	23.7	43.7
	59	Line	20.29	19.71	12.09	16.12	20.15	24.18	32.24
		Rate (people)	20.0	20.0	0.0	8.3	20.0	42.8	53.0
		Rate (households)	12.5	12.5	0.0	5.2	12.5	27.8	38.6
	60	Line	20.72	18.38	12.33	16.44	20.55	24.66	32.88
		Rate (people)	27.7	10.6	0.0	0.0	27.7	27.7	51.7
		Rate (households)	13.3	3.9	0.0	0.0	13.3	13.3	32.3
	61	Line	21.89	18.30	12.78	17.04	21.30	25.56	34.08
		Rate (people)	16.7	3.2	0.0	1.8	14.7	36.0	65.4
		Rate (households)	11.4	2.5	0.0	1.4	8.9	22.8	44.2
	62	Line	22.98	22.63	13.47	17.96	22.46	26.95	35.93
		Rate (people)	13.3	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.9	74.1
		Rate (households)	11.6	11.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.1	60.1
Rural	57	Line	10.59	8.86	9.98	13.30	16.63	19.95	26.61
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	18.4	37.3
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.4	12.8	22.5
	58	Line	10.92	9.23	10.26	13.68	17.10	20.51	27.35
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	9.0	16.1	51.1
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	5.3	10.4	38.6
	59	Line	11.18	9.89	10.49	13.99	17.49	20.99	27.99
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	21.5	29.0	49.3
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	15.5	19.7	33.2
	60	Line	11.33	9.31	10.63	14.17	17.72	21.26	28.34
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	7.2	30.8
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.8	17.0
	61	Line	11.91	9.57	10.93	14.58	18.22	21.87	29.16
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.4	6.5	38.2
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.6	5.1	31.2
	62	Line	12.47	10.30	11.45	15.26	19.08	22.89	30.52
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3

Figure A12: Delhi, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	17.96	13.12	12.00	16.00	20.00	23.99	31.99
		Rate (people)	19.2	10.0	3.7	16.5	23.4	31.9	49.8
		Rate (households)	12.1	5.9	2.8	10.0	15.2	23.2	39.9
	58	Line	18.60	16.43	12.40	16.53	20.66	24.79	33.06
		Rate (people)	21.4	13.4	0.5	13.4	23.6	39.9	57.8
		Rate (households)	15.7	10.0	0.3	10.0	17.8	31.5	47.7
	59	Line	19.00	16.03	12.65	16.87	21.09	25.30	33.74
		Rate (people)	15.3	7.5	1.8	10.0	24.1	36.0	59.5
		Rate (households)	9.9	4.8	1.0	6.1	16.6	26.4	49.3
	60	Line	19.40	16.35	12.91	17.21	21.51	25.81	34.42
		Rate (people)	16.8	8.2	1.5	11.6	20.2	35.8	55.2
		Rate (households)	11.3	5.3	1.0	7.7	14.0	25.8	44.3
	61	Line	20.15	17.42	13.37	17.83	22.29	26.75	35.66
		Rate (people)	16.3	8.1	1.8	8.9	20.7	32.4	53.4
		Rate (households)	12.4	6.0	1.5	6.6	15.9	24.9	45.0
	62	Line	21.16	19.93	14.10	18.80	23.50	28.20	37.60
		Rate (people)	5.9	4.3	0.0	0.8	9.1	20.7	41.5
		Rate (households)	3.0	2.1	0.0	0.4	5.8	19.3	33.2
Rural	57	Line	12.06	10.51	9.69	12.92	16.15	19.39	25.85
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	19.7
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	19.1
	58	Line	12.43	8.45	9.97	13.29	16.61	19.93	26.57
		Rate (people)	5.6	0.0	5.6	5.6	5.6	16.6	37.0
		Rate (households)	2.6	0.0	2.6	2.6	2.6	14.1	36.2
	59	Line	12.72	9.67	10.20	13.59	16.99	20.39	27.19
		Rate (people)	8.6	5.9	5.9	14.9	24.7	66.2	70.4
		Rate (households)	6.9	3.8	3.8	10.4	18.6	55.5	60.7
	60	Line	12.90	11.96	10.33	13.77	17.21	20.65	27.54
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5	26.8	37.9	71.9
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	20.4	31.7	64.6
	61	Line	13.49	12.89	10.62	14.16	17.70	21.24	28.33
		Rate (people)	6.9	6.9	0.0	6.9	23.4	43.6	54.8
		Rate (households)	5.7	5.7	0.0	5.7	20.3	37.7	54.1
	62	Line	14.13	13.00	11.12	14.83	18.53	22.24	29.65
		Rate (people)	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	2.6	9.7	57.0
		Rate (households)	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.8	11.1	53.2

Figure A13: Goa, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	19.18	16.12	11.46	15.29	19.11	22.93	30.57
		Rate (people)	21.9	6.3	4.1	4.4	21.9	23.4	34.7
		Rate (households)	15.4	3.4	2.2	2.4	15.4	16.6	25.0
	58	Line	19.86	11.45	11.85	15.79	19.74	23.69	31.59
		Rate (people)	7.7	4.0	4.0	7.3	7.7	7.7	15.9
		Rate (households)	6.1	4.5	4.5	5.6	6.1	6.1	18.6
	59	Line	20.29	14.33	12.09	16.12	20.15	24.18	32.24
		Rate (people)	18.6	6.4	2.1	13.9	18.6	32.3	65.0
		Rate (households)	15.2	7.6	2.5	11.2	15.2	27.8	54.9
	60	Line	20.72	19.46	12.33	16.44	20.55	24.66	32.88
		Rate (people)	13.2	11.3	0.0	6.0	13.2	16.6	47.4
		Rate (households)	11.5	9.0	0.0	3.9	11.5	14.4	46.1
	61	Line	21.89	17.70	12.78	17.04	21.30	25.56	34.08
		Rate (people)	19.7	9.9	3.2	8.7	17.3	30.7	54.9
		Rate (households)	16.7	7.3	2.0	6.1	14.4	27.1	51.4
	62	Line	22.98	16.03	13.47	17.96	22.46	26.95	35.93
		Rate (people)	10.1	7.0	3.8	10.1	10.1	15.8	25.4
		Rate (households)	8.0	6.4	2.1	8.0	8.0	12.7	21.9
Rural	57	Line	10.59	7.91	9.98	13.30	16.63	19.95	26.61
		Rate (people)	3.5	2.7	3.5	10.5	31.6	38.1	47.1
		Rate (households)	7.3	6.5	7.3	12.4	27.9	35.5	44.3
	58	Line	10.92	6.97	10.26	13.68	17.10	20.51	27.35
		Rate (people)	0.5	0.0	0.5	17.6	28.9	38.0	58.5
		Rate (households)	0.4	0.0	0.4	11.0	15.4	22.2	42.4
	59	Line	11.18	9.80	10.49	13.99	17.49	20.99	27.99
		Rate (people)	17.0	10.1	10.1	19.0	19.0	37.6	55.1
		Rate (households)	12.4	7.2	7.2	13.8	13.9	26.6	45.1
	60	Line	11.33	9.31	10.63	14.17	17.72	21.26	28.34
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	14.8
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	12.8
	61	Line	11.91	11.80	10.93	14.58	18.22	21.87	29.16
		Rate (people)	5.6	3.6	1.9	13.4	27.5	34.2	57.6
		Rate (households)	4.0	2.4	1.2	9.6	21.7	28.2	50.8
	62	Line	12.47	10.30	11.45	15.26	19.08	22.89	30.52
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.8	11.5	19.6
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	8.5	15.9

Figure A14: Gujarat, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.86	13.74	11.23	14.98	18.72	22.47	29.96
		Rate (people)	13.2	7.2	3.2	9.0	24.5	41.3	62.2
		Rate (households)	12.4	6.5	3.3	8.2	20.6	34.3	56.7
	58	Line	17.46	14.57	11.61	15.48	19.35	23.22	30.95
		Rate (people)	8.9	4.0	0.5	5.4	17.9	27.5	48.9
		Rate (households)	6.8	3.0	0.5	4.2	13.6	22.6	39.7
	59	Line	17.83	16.16	11.85	15.80	19.74	23.69	31.59
		Rate (people)	10.6	5.1	0.8	4.6	19.8	34.8	59.2
		Rate (households)	8.2	4.4	0.5	4.1	16.3	30.2	52.3
	60	Line	18.21	16.70	12.08	16.11	20.14	24.17	32.22
		Rate (people)	13.6	6.7	2.6	6.2	18.8	37.1	59.0
		Rate (households)	10.0	4.8	1.7	4.4	14.1	28.3	48.3
	61	Line	17.79	15.09	12.52	16.70	20.87	25.04	33.39
		Rate (people)	13.3	6.4	2.7	10.8	22.9	36.7	56.2
		Rate (households)	11.3	5.4	2.3	9.0	19.1	30.7	48.8
	62	Line	18.68	17.13	13.20	17.60	22.00	26.41	35.21
		Rate (people)	12.1	5.7	1.6	9.1	19.5	33.3	57.7
		Rate (households)	9.1	3.8	0.7	6.5	14.1	26.6	53.1
Rural	57	Line	10.60	10.14	10.52	14.02	17.53	21.03	28.04
		Rate (people)	9.3	3.7	7.4	29.1	43.7	63.6	86.3
		Rate (households)	7.4	3.6	5.9	24.1	39.2	62.7	82.2
	58	Line	10.93	9.73	10.81	14.42	18.02	21.62	28.83
		Rate (people)	18.9	9.3	17.5	41.0	56.7	70.3	86.5
		Rate (households)	13.9	7.0	13.2	34.0	49.8	64.0	82.0
	59	Line	11.19	9.69	11.06	14.75	18.44	22.12	29.50
		Rate (people)	13.4	6.7	13.4	31.9	51.2	68.1	86.5
		Rate (households)	10.7	5.7	10.7	27.6	46.6	62.0	81.2
	60	Line	11.34	10.08	11.20	14.94	18.67	22.41	29.88
		Rate (people)	15.9	7.8	15.5	41.9	62.0	73.3	87.1
		Rate (households)	12.6	6.5	12.3	34.7	53.6	65.7	81.4
	61	Line	11.64	9.93	11.52	15.37	19.21	23.05	30.73
		Rate (people)	18.9	9.4	18.2	42.3	62.3	75.1	88.9
		Rate (households)	14.7	7.2	14.1	34.7	54.1	68.4	83.8
	62	Line	12.18	10.71	12.06	16.09	20.11	24.13	32.17
		Rate (people)	9.5	4.8	9.4	30.8	52.3	62.7	86.7
		Rate (households)	9.7	5.7	9.7	28.8	47.3	57.9	82.1

Figure A15: Haryana, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	14.93	12.55	10.51	14.02	17.52	21.02	28.03
		Rate (people)	14.1	6.9	1.0	11.8	18.9	30.5	49.6
		Rate (households)	10.5	5.1	0.6	8.5	14.3	24.3	42.4
	58	Line	15.46	12.53	10.86	14.48	18.10	21.72	28.97
		Rate (people)	3.6	2.4	0.0	2.4	9.8	24.2	48.3
		Rate (households)	1.9	1.1	0.0	1.2	7.0	21.7	45.2
	59	Line	15.80	13.91	11.09	14.78	18.48	22.17	29.56
		Rate (people)	8.3	3.7	1.6	7.6	16.0	28.2	46.3
		Rate (households)	5.0	2.9	1.4	4.3	10.5	20.3	39.0
	60	Line	16.13	11.72	11.31	15.08	18.85	22.62	30.15
		Rate (people)	8.9	4.5	2.2	7.6	15.3	30.9	56.6
		Rate (households)	7.4	3.8	2.0	6.4	12.7	25.1	45.0
	61	Line	16.59	13.12	11.72	15.62	19.53	23.44	31.25
		Rate (people)	14.5	7.1	4.1	12.6	23.9	36.4	55.1
		Rate (households)	10.7	5.2	3.1	9.2	18.4	29.2	46.0
	62	Line	17.41	14.03	12.35	16.47	20.59	24.71	32.95
		Rate (people)	14.0	8.0	5.4	12.1	22.2	34.0	50.4
		Rate (households)	10.6	5.0	3.7	9.5	17.6	28.0	44.4
Rural	57	Line	12.06	10.51	9.69	12.92	16.15	19.39	25.85
		Rate (people)	8.9	3.8	1.8	10.0	23.9	46.6	68.7
		Rate (households)	6.5	3.6	1.9	7.2	18.7	38.3	61.0
	58	Line	12.43	10.74	9.97	13.29	16.61	19.93	26.57
		Rate (people)	7.9	3.9	3.3	12.6	29.1	44.8	70.7
		Rate (households)	7.2	3.2	2.6	11.9	27.0	40.7	68.6
	59	Line	12.73	11.25	10.20	13.59	16.99	20.39	27.19
		Rate (people)	5.7	2.5	1.3	6.5	22.1	44.3	64.0
		Rate (households)	4.9	2.4	1.1	5.5	18.1	37.3	55.3
	60	Line	12.90	11.96	10.33	13.77	17.21	20.65	27.54
		Rate (people)	5.3	2.6	1.7	7.2	25.8	39.9	67.7
		Rate (households)	4.7	2.6	1.7	6.7	21.9	34.9	62.0
	61	Line	13.64	11.70	10.62	14.16	17.70	21.24	28.33
		Rate (people)	13.2	6.7	4.9	15.4	30.2	47.3	69.2
		Rate (households)	11.2	5.7	3.9	13.3	26.4	42.2	64.1
	62	Line	14.28	12.43	11.12	14.83	18.53	22.24	29.65
		Rate (people)	15.8	6.7	3.5	16.5	31.1	48.6	73.6
		Rate (households)	19.7	9.8	4.3	20.1	34.8	48.8	76.0

Figure A16: Himachal Pradesh, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	14.93	12.92	10.91	14.55	18.18	21.82	29.09
		Rate (people)	1.4	1.1	0.3	1.3	8.6	15.6	36.9
		Rate (households)	1.6	1.2	0.6	1.5	6.1	10.5	28.6
	58	Line	15.46	12.92	11.27	15.03	18.79	22.55	30.06
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.1	14.2	30.4
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.3	11.7	24.3
	59	Line	15.80	14.07	11.50	15.34	19.17	23.01	30.68
		Rate (people)	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	6.0	20.4	46.2
		Rate (households)	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	4.1	13.2	31.7
	60	Line	16.13	13.62	11.74	15.65	19.56	23.47	31.29
		Rate (people)	7.5	7.5	0.5	7.5	17.8	17.8	35.6
		Rate (households)	5.3	5.3	0.3	5.3	9.9	9.9	22.1
	61	Line	16.59	12.40	12.16	16.21	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	3.2	1.6	1.6	3.1	6.5	23.0	40.4
		Rate (households)	1.5	0.5	0.5	1.4	3.7	13.3	29.1
	62	Line	17.41	16.44	12.82	17.10	21.37	25.64	34.19
		Rate (people)	2.8	1.5	0.6	1.5	10.1	13.2	29.9
		Rate (households)	3.7	2.8	2.1	2.8	9.7	11.6	22.5
Rural	57	Line	12.21	10.60	11.26	15.02	18.77	22.53	30.04
		Rate (people)	3.2	1.5	1.8	11.4	39.1	52.8	75.7
		Rate (households)	3.5	2.5	2.8	9.4	30.4	45.1	68.8
	58	Line	12.59	11.25	11.58	15.44	19.30	23.16	30.88
		Rate (people)	6.2	3.1	4.4	17.8	38.8	56.8	78.7
		Rate (households)	4.1	2.1	2.9	13.2	30.8	48.1	70.2
	59	Line	12.89	11.93	11.85	15.80	19.75	23.70	31.60
		Rate (people)	6.6	3.3	2.7	20.0	37.9	52.6	77.4
		Rate (households)	4.0	2.4	2.0	14.8	30.0	43.2	66.6
	60	Line	13.07	10.93	12.00	16.00	20.00	24.00	32.00
		Rate (people)	10.7	5.2	6.9	19.6	41.2	56.3	77.0
		Rate (households)	8.6	4.1	5.5	15.7	34.3	49.1	69.8
	61	Line	12.96	11.15	12.34	16.46	20.57	24.69	32.92
		Rate (people)	10.5	5.3	8.4	26.2	48.8	64.2	81.4
		Rate (households)	7.9	3.9	6.2	21.4	41.5	56.5	74.9
	62	Line	13.57	12.33	12.92	17.23	21.54	25.84	34.46
		Rate (people)	4.8	2.2	4.1	20.2	40.7	56.3	76.1
		Rate (households)	3.1	1.7	2.7	15.8	32.9	45.8	69.1

Figure A17: Jammu and Kashmir, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	14.93	13.24	11.19	14.92	18.65	22.38	29.85
		Rate (people)	8.4	3.3	3.3	8.4	14.1	20.3	43.0
		Rate (households)	5.4	1.6	1.6	5.4	10.1	15.1	34.9
	58	Line	15.46	14.14	11.56	15.42	19.27	23.13	30.84
		Rate (people)	11.1	5.4	3.3	11.1	17.2	24.1	47.3
		Rate (households)	8.0	3.7	2.2	8.0	13.2	19.4	42.4
	59	Line	15.80	8.51	11.80	15.74	19.67	23.61	31.47
		Rate (people)	7.6	0.0	6.4	7.6	14.4	20.6	39.8
		Rate (households)	3.8	0.0	2.9	3.8	8.2	13.0	34.3
	60	Line	16.13	15.40	12.04	16.05	20.07	24.08	32.10
		Rate (people)	2.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	14.0	22.5	48.1
		Rate (households)	1.3	0.6	0.0	1.3	9.6	17.6	44.2
	61	Line	18.21	12.66	12.48	16.63	20.79	24.95	33.27
		Rate (people)	7.4	0.6	0.5	6.2	18.0	30.3	55.7
		Rate (households)	4.8	0.5	0.4	3.9	12.5	24.1	47.9
	62	Line	19.11	16.86	13.15	17.54	21.92	26.31	35.08
		Rate (people)	4.1	2.1	0.2	2.7	9.1	21.3	48.4
		Rate (households)	3.2	1.8	0.1	2.1	7.6	16.5	40.5
Rural	57	Line	12.21	10.58	10.86	14.48	18.10	21.71	28.95
		Rate (people)	0.7	0.4	0.4	3.7	19.0	49.5	69.5
		Rate (households)	0.4	0.2	0.2	2.4	16.3	43.2	62.5
	58	Line	12.59	11.11	11.16	14.88	18.60	22.32	29.77
		Rate (people)	4.2	2.2	2.2	11.2	22.4	42.7	76.0
		Rate (households)	3.4	2.0	2.0	9.9	20.4	37.8	71.6
	59	Line	12.89	11.25	11.42	15.23	19.03	22.84	30.46
		Rate (people)	6.5	3.9	3.9	12.4	30.8	52.3	76.5
		Rate (households)	4.8	2.9	2.9	10.1	28.8	48.9	73.0
	60	Line	13.07	11.67	11.57	15.42	19.28	23.13	30.85
		Rate (people)	8.6	3.8	3.8	16.8	38.0	55.7	76.1
		Rate (households)	7.4	3.0	3.0	14.3	33.1	50.7	70.1
	61	Line	12.86	11.34	11.90	15.86	19.83	23.80	31.73
		Rate (people)	4.3	2.1	2.7	13.8	38.8	57.2	76.9
		Rate (households)	3.3	1.5	2.1	11.4	34.6	53.2	74.6
	62	Line	13.47	11.87	12.45	16.61	20.76	24.91	33.21
		Rate (people)	1.7	0.8	0.9	9.5	27.4	50.0	81.3
		Rate (households)	1.3	0.6	0.7	7.7	20.2	46.3	77.7

Figure A18: Jharkhand, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	13.50	11.25	9.56	12.75	15.93	19.12	25.49
		Rate (people)	21.3	8.9	4.2	19.4	32.1	43.2	61.7
		Rate (households)	16.3	7.9	4.3	15.0	24.1	32.3	51.9
	58	Line	13.97	12.11	9.88	13.17	16.46	19.76	26.34
		Rate (people)	20.0	10.0	5.2	16.5	34.2	45.7	62.1
		Rate (households)	16.3	7.8	3.9	12.5	27.4	36.0	53.2
	59	Line	14.28	11.49	10.08	13.44	16.80	20.16	26.89
		Rate (people)	13.4	6.0	4.8	11.7	30.2	42.9	55.3
		Rate (households)	9.1	3.9	3.0	7.6	21.3	31.9	44.4
	60	Line	14.58	12.39	10.28	13.71	17.14	20.57	27.42
		Rate (people)	15.3	7.8	1.0	8.8	26.8	37.2	53.2
		Rate (households)	12.2	6.6	0.5	7.5	22.2	32.0	47.5
	61	Line	14.84	11.95	10.66	14.21	17.76	21.31	28.42
		Rate (people)	20.3	10.0	6.9	17.4	28.1	38.6	55.2
		Rate (households)	15.4	7.3	5.0	12.9	22.3	31.2	46.9
	62	Line	15.58	12.25	11.24	14.98	18.73	22.47	29.96
		Rate (people)	15.0	6.2	4.9	12.1	22.9	38.7	57.8
		Rate (households)	11.0	4.9	4.0	9.1	17.2	27.6	46.0
Rural	57	Line	11.07	9.32	9.26	12.34	15.43	18.52	24.69
		Rate (people)	41.4	20.4	20.4	56.5	82.6	93.2	97.9
		Rate (households)	36.0	15.6	15.6	50.0	76.6	87.9	96.5
	58	Line	11.41	9.02	9.52	12.69	15.86	19.04	25.38
		Rate (people)	46.7	23.1	27.1	61.7	80.3	88.8	97.0
		Rate (households)	39.0	19.7	23.1	56.2	75.2	84.1	93.5
	59	Line	11.68	9.29	9.74	12.98	16.23	19.48	25.97
		Rate (people)	42.5	21.4	24.5	56.8	78.9	87.5	94.3
		Rate (households)	35.7	17.6	20.2	50.7	72.3	83.6	92.3
	60	Line	11.84	9.45	9.86	13.15	16.44	19.73	26.30
		Rate (people)	48.6	24.0	29.9	59.9	77.3	90.8	97.6
		Rate (households)	41.7	19.1	24.0	52.7	70.5	85.7	95.0
	61	Line	12.05	9.62	10.14	13.53	16.91	20.29	27.05
		Rate (people)	46.2	23.0	28.5	59.4	78.5	88.5	96.3
		Rate (households)	40.8	19.2	24.1	53.9	74.0	85.2	95.2
	62	Line	12.62	10.84	10.62	14.16	17.70	21.24	28.32
		Rate (people)	37.7	17.7	16.1	51.7	71.5	87.0	95.5
		Rate (households)	34.3	17.2	15.5	46.9	68.9	85.5	95.0

Figure A19: Karnataka, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	18.18	12.59	10.83	14.43	18.04	21.65	28.87
		Rate (people)	23.3	11.6	5.0	14.9	23.2	31.6	52.1
		Rate (households)	20.2	8.8	5.0	11.6	20.2	27.1	47.8
	58	Line	18.82	14.10	11.19	14.92	18.64	22.37	29.83
		Rate (people)	32.1	15.6	5.7	18.4	31.1	47.0	62.0
		Rate (households)	25.0	11.0	4.8	13.4	24.2	38.8	51.5
	59	Line	19.23	15.08	11.42	15.22	19.03	22.83	30.44
		Rate (people)	28.8	14.4	3.5	14.7	28.6	40.1	62.0
		Rate (households)	22.4	9.8	2.7	10.0	22.1	31.8	53.1
	60	Line	19.63	15.07	11.65	15.53	19.41	23.29	31.05
		Rate (people)	36.5	17.9	6.9	19.3	34.3	44.8	64.2
		Rate (households)	29.9	15.9	8.0	17.1	28.3	37.4	54.7
	61	Line	19.71	14.89	12.07	16.09	20.11	24.14	32.18
		Rate (people)	32.6	16.3	8.2	20.6	33.3	47.2	63.2
		Rate (households)	26.3	12.6	6.5	15.9	27.0	39.0	54.2
	62	Line	20.70	16.09	12.72	16.96	21.21	25.45	33.93
		Rate (people)	27.4	13.7	5.9	16.6	28.7	39.6	59.5
		Rate (households)	20.7	10.3	4.5	12.6	22.2	31.5	51.3
Rural	57	Line	10.29	9.21	10.06	13.42	16.77	20.12	26.83
		Rate (people)	14.7	7.7	13.7	36.0	62.0	74.2	90.3
		Rate (households)	12.5	5.8	10.9	31.2	56.2	69.6	87.4
	58	Line	10.61	8.76	10.35	13.79	17.24	20.69	27.59
		Rate (people)	16.5	8.1	14.9	38.0	65.8	81.1	92.6
		Rate (households)	12.1	5.6	10.7	31.9	57.7	74.8	88.6
	59	Line	10.86	9.95	10.58	14.11	17.64	21.17	28.22
		Rate (people)	11.9	6.0	9.7	38.9	59.8	73.7	90.8
		Rate (households)	9.5	4.5	7.9	32.0	53.8	69.2	87.8
	60	Line	11.01	9.07	10.72	14.29	17.87	21.44	28.59
		Rate (people)	17.3	8.7	16.2	43.5	67.8	81.4	92.9
		Rate (households)	14.3	7.1	13.4	37.6	60.3	76.6	90.7
	61	Line	10.66	9.46	11.03	14.70	18.38	22.05	29.40
		Rate (people)	20.7	10.3	24.7	56.3	76.5	86.3	94.2
		Rate (households)	17.5	8.7	20.7	50.2	71.0	81.8	91.7
	62	Line	11.16	10.06	11.54	15.39	19.24	23.09	30.78
		Rate (people)	16.8	8.4	17.8	45.8	69.4	78.4	91.3
		Rate (households)	13.7	7.3	14.5	40.0	65.1	75.3	88.8

Figure A20: Kerala, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.95	12.35	11.35	15.13	18.91	22.70	30.26
		Rate (people)	13.3	5.9	3.7	10.9	15.8	35.2	47.8
		Rate (households)	8.0	3.2	1.9	6.7	9.9	27.0	37.6
	58	Line	17.55	14.32	11.73	15.64	19.54	23.45	31.27
		Rate (people)	19.6	9.3	5.8	16.4	24.5	36.2	49.3
		Rate (households)	14.2	7.1	3.7	10.9	18.2	28.0	41.0
	59	Line	17.93	15.42	11.97	15.96	19.95	23.94	31.91
		Rate (people)	15.5	8.1	2.5	8.7	21.1	34.3	51.3
		Rate (households)	10.1	4.7	1.2	5.2	14.6	26.1	42.7
	60	Line	18.31	13.59	12.21	16.28	20.35	24.42	32.55
		Rate (people)	20.6	11.0	5.9	14.3	27.6	40.0	56.1
		Rate (households)	17.2	7.7	4.1	11.1	23.3	32.3	47.2
	61	Line	18.39	14.52	12.65	16.87	21.08	25.30	33.74
		Rate (people)	20.0	10.0	5.9	15.0	27.7	40.0	56.5
		Rate (households)	14.6	6.8	3.9	10.7	20.8	32.5	47.6
	62	Line	19.31	15.12	13.34	17.78	22.23	26.68	35.57
		Rate (people)	14.3	7.3	5.1	9.7	18.2	32.6	52.8
		Rate (households)	11.3	5.5	3.8	7.2	14.7	27.9	45.5
Rural	57	Line	12.46	10.99	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	12.2	6.1	9.7	24.1	37.3	51.1	75.7
		Rate (households)	10.2	4.8	8.0	20.4	32.8	45.4	70.5
	58	Line	12.84	11.12	11.99	15.99	19.98	23.98	31.97
		Rate (people)	7.2	3.7	4.3	19.5	36.3	49.5	71.4
		Rate (households)	5.2	2.6	3.1	14.7	29.5	41.3	65.1
	59	Line	13.15	11.05	12.27	16.36	20.45	24.53	32.71
		Rate (people)	9.1	4.6	7.0	17.6	34.2	46.1	66.3
		Rate (households)	6.6	3.2	5.2	13.6	28.3	39.3	60.7
	60	Line	13.33	11.27	12.42	16.57	20.71	24.85	33.13
		Rate (people)	7.6	3.7	5.6	17.2	32.8	47.4	68.9
		Rate (households)	6.2	2.9	4.2	14.0	27.7	41.3	62.5
	61	Line	14.14	11.87	12.78	17.04	21.30	25.56	34.08
		Rate (people)	13.2	6.6	9.3	23.4	39.4	53.8	71.2
		Rate (households)	10.8	5.5	7.6	19.1	34.1	47.8	65.4
	62	Line	14.81	12.42	13.38	17.84	22.30	26.76	35.67
		Rate (people)	9.7	4.8	6.3	16.7	31.3	45.3	66.9
		Rate (households)	7.3	3.5	4.7	12.5	27.6	40.2	61.8

Figure A21: Lakshadweep, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.95	12.35	11.35	15.13	18.91	22.70	30.26
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	16.4	40.2
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	13.6	31.2
	58	Line	17.55	16.28	11.73	15.64	19.54	23.45	31.27
		Rate (people)	3.9	2.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	25.5	66.3
		Rate (households)	2.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	9.0	19.4	53.1
	59	Line	17.93	15.42	11.97	15.96	19.95	23.94	31.91
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	25.0	43.8
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	22.0	37.5
	60	Line	18.31	15.67	12.21	16.28	20.35	24.42	32.55
		Rate (people)	41.6	21.7	0.0	21.7	48.2	59.6	66.2
		Rate (households)	25.8	13.1	0.0	13.1	32.5	40.1	46.5
	61	Line	18.39	13.84	12.65	16.87	21.08	25.30	33.74
		Rate (people)	12.0	5.7	4.3	10.3	16.4	27.5	47.0
		Rate (households)	8.4	3.2	2.1	6.9	10.7	19.5	35.7
	62	Line	19.31	13.02	13.34	17.78	22.23	26.68	35.57
		Rate (people)	7.5	3.0	3.8	6.0	17.2	23.4	35.4
		Rate (households)	3.5	1.1	1.6	2.6	9.3	15.1	25.1
Rural	57	Line	12.46	10.99	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	3.6	14.3
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	4.7	14.4
	58	Line	12.84	11.12	11.99	15.99	19.98	23.98	31.97
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	40.9	69.4
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.3	34.1	57.5
	59	Line	13.15	11.05	12.27	16.36	20.45	24.53	32.71
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	11.9	60.6
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	14.5	47.3
	60	Line	13.33	10.30	12.42	16.57	20.71	24.85	33.13
		Rate (people)	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	30.7	37.0	47.6
		Rate (households)	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9	25.0	35.9	43.7
	61	Line	14.14	11.86	12.78	17.04	21.30	25.56	34.08
		Rate (people)	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.7	20.4	32.8	45.4
		Rate (households)	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.6	14.0	30.5	41.8
	62	Line	14.81	12.57	13.38	17.84	22.30	26.76	35.67
		Rate (people)	1.6	0.0	1.6	1.6	4.5	35.8	37.4
		Rate (households)	0.8	0.0	0.8	0.8	1.9	19.3	20.4

Figure A22: Madhya Pradesh, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	17.12	12.87	9.70	12.93	16.16	19.39	25.86
		Rate (people)	45.0	21.9	6.8	22.8	36.9	52.5	69.5
		Rate (households)	38.3	17.4	4.7	18.1	30.5	45.2	64.4
	58	Line	17.72	13.07	10.02	13.36	16.70	20.04	26.72
		Rate (people)	46.4	22.8	5.3	25.9	43.1	51.2	67.1
		Rate (households)	39.5	18.5	4.2	20.6	36.1	45.0	61.5
	59	Line	18.11	13.43	10.23	13.63	17.04	20.45	27.27
		Rate (people)	37.2	18.2	4.8	19.2	33.3	44.0	58.9
		Rate (households)	31.6	14.7	3.2	15.3	27.5	38.8	52.5
	60	Line	18.49	14.10	10.43	13.91	17.38	20.86	27.81
		Rate (people)	41.7	20.7	9.0	19.6	36.0	51.7	71.2
		Rate (households)	35.0	15.4	5.1	14.2	28.9	45.2	62.7
	61	Line	18.74	13.52	10.81	14.41	18.01	21.62	28.82
		Rate (people)	42.7	21.4	9.6	26.3	39.9	52.2	67.8
		Rate (households)	37.0	17.2	7.2	21.7	34.2	46.0	61.8
	62	Line	19.68	15.57	11.40	15.19	18.99	22.79	30.39
		Rate (people)	32.4	15.8	4.6	14.5	30.0	44.3	67.8
		Rate (households)	25.6	12.7	3.3	11.7	23.8	36.1	58.6
Rural	57	Line	10.35	8.64	9.01	12.02	15.02	18.02	24.03
		Rate (people)	37.5	18.7	27.0	55.9	74.3	84.4	93.4
		Rate (households)	32.4	16.2	22.8	50.1	69.7	80.6	90.8
	58	Line	10.67	8.43	9.26	12.35	15.44	18.53	24.71
		Rate (people)	33.4	16.6	21.9	46.2	67.4	81.5	92.4
		Rate (households)	28.1	13.3	18.0	40.5	60.8	76.4	89.8
	59	Line	10.92	8.99	9.48	12.64	15.80	18.96	25.28
		Rate (people)	29.1	14.7	17.2	42.4	61.3	80.9	93.9
		Rate (households)	25.5	12.2	14.6	37.8	57.0	75.7	91.6
	60	Line	11.07	9.06	9.60	12.80	16.00	19.20	25.60
		Rate (people)	35.2	17.6	22.7	52.5	70.4	84.0	96.0
		Rate (households)	29.5	13.5	17.5	45.1	63.5	79.5	94.2
	61	Line	10.78	8.56	9.88	13.17	16.46	19.75	26.33
		Rate (people)	36.8	18.5	28.7	55.8	73.8	84.4	93.1
		Rate (households)	33.1	15.3	25.0	51.6	69.5	81.2	91.4
	62	Line	11.28	9.40	10.34	13.78	17.23	20.67	27.57
		Rate (people)	26.2	13.7	19.2	48.0	68.4	81.8	93.2
		Rate (households)	24.3	12.1	17.3	44.4	64.0	78.6	90.1

Figure A23: Maharashtra, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	19.18	14.19	11.46	15.29	19.11	22.93	30.57
		Rate (people)	22.9	11.5	4.6	13.6	22.6	32.3	47.8
		Rate (households)	18.1	9.4	4.1	11.0	17.9	25.7	39.3
	58	Line	19.86	15.70	11.85	15.79	19.74	23.69	31.59
		Rate (people)	24.6	12.2	3.9	13.1	24.5	33.5	54.9
		Rate (households)	19.4	8.4	2.8	9.0	19.3	28.1	46.4
	59	Line	20.29	15.73	12.09	16.12	20.15	24.18	32.24
		Rate (people)	26.3	13.1	4.9	13.8	26.1	35.1	54.1
		Rate (households)	19.2	8.8	3.1	9.3	18.9	26.0	42.5
	60	Line	20.72	15.30	12.33	16.44	20.55	24.66	32.88
		Rate (people)	23.5	11.7	4.1	14.0	23.3	35.0	51.9
		Rate (households)	17.3	8.8	3.0	10.9	17.2	26.5	41.8
	61	Line	21.89	15.91	12.78	17.04	21.30	25.56	34.08
		Rate (people)	32.1	16.0	7.6	19.0	30.8	41.9	61.3
		Rate (households)	25.5	12.3	5.7	14.6	24.3	34.0	52.0
	62	Line	22.98	18.16	13.47	17.96	22.46	26.95	35.93
		Rate (people)	27.4	13.5	5.1	13.2	26.4	36.8	54.5
		Rate (households)	18.6	9.2	3.3	8.9	17.9	26.0	41.4
Rural	57	Line	10.59	8.86	9.98	13.30	16.63	19.95	26.61
		Rate (people)	17.2	9.3	13.9	36.6	53.9	67.8	83.0
		Rate (households)	14.1	7.4	10.9	31.3	49.2	63.0	79.5
	58	Line	10.92	9.23	10.26	13.68	17.10	20.51	27.35
		Rate (people)	17.9	9.0	13.6	35.5	58.5	73.1	90.5
		Rate (households)	14.7	7.2	11.1	30.8	52.9	68.1	86.9
	59	Line	11.18	9.89	10.49	13.99	17.49	20.99	27.99
		Rate (people)	17.3	8.5	11.7	32.9	55.4	71.5	87.6
		Rate (households)	14.0	6.8	9.4	27.8	49.3	66.2	85.1
	60	Line	11.33	9.31	10.63	14.17	17.72	21.26	28.34
		Rate (people)	17.4	8.7	13.8	38.0	54.3	69.0	87.0
		Rate (households)	14.4	6.9	11.1	32.1	48.8	63.6	83.9
	61	Line	11.91	9.57	10.93	14.58	18.22	21.87	29.16
		Rate (people)	29.6	14.8	23.0	46.8	65.0	77.1	88.6
		Rate (households)	25.0	12.3	19.4	41.3	59.6	72.7	86.0
	62	Line	12.47	10.30	11.45	15.26	19.08	22.89	30.52
		Rate (people)	13.6	6.3	9.6	28.4	48.3	63.6	84.0
		Rate (households)	11.8	5.6	7.9	23.3	41.0	55.4	79.1

Figure A24: Manipur, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	12.23	9.41	11.29	15.05	18.81	22.57	30.10
		Rate (people)	6.7	2.4	6.7	11.6	39.7	63.5	83.8
		Rate (households)	6.6	2.3	6.6	11.8	35.5	59.6	80.7
	58	Line	12.66	10.52	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	1.8	1.3	1.8	8.7	25.8	43.1	76.4
		Rate (households)	1.4	0.9	1.4	7.1	24.2	40.3	74.2
	59	Line	12.93	11.74	11.90	15.87	19.84	23.80	31.74
		Rate (people)	3.8	1.8	2.4	8.2	32.3	55.2	77.3
		Rate (households)	2.5	1.0	1.4	6.1	27.1	50.7	73.3
	60	Line	13.21	12.90	12.14	16.19	20.23	24.28	32.37
		Rate (people)	5.9	2.7	2.7	7.7	24.9	62.2	84.7
		Rate (households)	4.5	2.0	2.0	6.4	21.5	60.2	83.2
	61	Line	12.46	11.92	12.58	16.77	20.97	25.16	33.55
		Rate (people)	0.7	0.3	0.7	17.0	41.7	66.2	88.8
		Rate (households)	0.6	0.3	0.6	15.1	38.6	61.9	86.7
	62	Line	13.08	11.90	13.26	17.69	22.11	26.53	35.37
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	36.0	72.6	87.4
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	32.0	66.1	81.4
Rural	57	Line	12.15	11.02	10.60	14.14	17.67	21.20	28.27
		Rate (people)	13.1	6.4	6.3	26.6	45.2	64.3	90.4
		Rate (households)	10.3	5.0	4.9	23.0	40.2	61.9	87.7
	58	Line	12.52	11.08	10.90	14.53	18.17	21.80	29.07
		Rate (people)	3.5	2.0	0.9	12.1	39.8	67.6	88.3
		Rate (households)	3.3	1.7	0.9	12.1	36.7	64.2	88.3
	59	Line	12.82	11.49	11.15	14.87	18.59	22.30	29.74
		Rate (people)	4.2	1.3	1.0	15.2	39.2	61.0	89.8
		Rate (households)	3.6	1.2	0.9	13.5	33.4	55.4	86.4
	60	Line	12.99	12.09	11.29	15.06	18.82	22.59	30.12
		Rate (people)	5.3	2.5	1.9	19.6	46.5	69.3	89.4
		Rate (households)	3.6	1.6	1.1	15.4	41.3	64.3	88.3
	61	Line	12.74	11.63	11.62	15.49	19.36	23.24	30.98
		Rate (people)	4.2	2.3	2.1	18.0	55.7	79.0	94.4
		Rate (households)	4.0	2.0	1.9	16.6	51.6	75.8	93.1
	62	Line	13.34	12.68	12.16	16.22	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	1.3	0.5	0.0	4.8	38.3	73.1	94.5
		Rate (households)	1.3	0.6	0.0	4.4	36.3	70.9	94.1

Figure A25: Meghalaya, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	12.23	2.68	11.29	15.05	18.81	22.57	30.10
		Rate (people)	0.1	0.1	0.1	6.6	17.1	29.5	54.6
		Rate (households)	0.4	0.3	0.4	5.5	12.3	20.3	43.9
	58	Line	12.66	11.62	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	17.4	48.7
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	12.4	38.3
	59	Line	12.93	11.50	11.90	15.87	19.84	23.80	31.74
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.7	14.7	44.8
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.1	12.6	37.8
	60	Line	13.21	8.89	12.14	16.19	20.23	24.28	32.37
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	12.9	20.6	59.0
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	6.6	13.1	48.5
	61	Line	12.46	12.33	12.58	16.77	20.97	25.16	33.55
		Rate (people)	0.1	0.0	0.1	1.9	15.1	28.8	49.1
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	10.5	21.7	38.8
	62	Line	13.08	11.90	13.26	17.69	22.11	26.53	35.37
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	4.8	13.7	39.4
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	3.1	7.9	26.2
Rural	57	Line	12.15	11.22	10.60	14.14	17.67	21.20	28.27
		Rate (people)	1.4	0.7	0.0	5.9	35.0	79.6	94.1
		Rate (households)	1.1	0.4	0.0	4.7	28.5	72.1	90.5
	58	Line	12.52	11.24	10.90	14.53	18.17	21.80	29.07
		Rate (people)	2.5	1.1	0.3	12.2	45.7	68.2	94.3
		Rate (households)	2.3	1.0	0.3	10.5	40.0	61.0	90.9
	59	Line	12.82	11.85	11.15	14.87	18.59	22.30	29.74
		Rate (people)	3.8	1.7	0.3	17.2	42.7	69.8	89.9
		Rate (households)	3.2	1.1	0.2	13.6	35.3	60.4	84.0
	60	Line	12.99	11.90	11.29	15.06	18.82	22.59	30.12
		Rate (people)	3.5	3.0	0.3	15.7	49.6	75.5	93.5
		Rate (households)	2.6	2.1	0.1	11.6	41.1	66.4	90.0
	61	Line	12.74	11.79	11.62	15.49	19.36	23.24	30.98
		Rate (people)	3.6	1.7	1.5	13.3	43.2	71.0	91.5
		Rate (households)	2.8	1.2	1.1	10.9	36.8	63.8	87.3
	62	Line	13.34	12.06	12.16	16.22	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	1.8	1.1	1.1	9.2	34.5	60.6	84.0
		Rate (households)	1.2	0.8	0.8	8.0	29.3	52.8	77.5

Figure A26: Mizoram, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	12.23	11.04	11.29	15.05	18.81	22.57	30.10
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.6	4.3	31.1
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	3.4	26.1
	58	Line	12.66	11.62	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	35.0
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	33.4
	59	Line	12.93	11.50	11.90	15.87	19.84	23.80	31.74
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	13.0	37.4
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	8.2	32.6
	60	Line	13.21	8.89	12.14	16.19	20.23	24.28	32.37
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	2.2	10.1	26.9
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.6	7.7	22.5
	61	Line	12.46	11.57	12.58	16.77	20.97	25.16	33.55
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	8.7	22.9	47.5
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	7.1	18.7	41.5
	62	Line	13.08	11.90	13.26	17.69	22.11	26.53	35.37
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.2	30.5
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.4	26.1
Rural	57	Line	12.15	9.19	10.60	14.14	17.67	21.20	28.27
		Rate (people)	0.7	0.7	0.7	3.0	13.1	28.1	69.8
		Rate (households)	0.9	0.9	0.9	2.7	12.5	21.9	63.2
	58	Line	12.52	10.86	10.90	14.53	18.17	21.80	29.07
		Rate (people)	4.0	2.4	2.4	4.5	12.9	32.7	65.6
		Rate (households)	4.1	2.4	2.4	4.6	12.5	32.4	63.3
	59	Line	12.82	10.72	11.15	14.87	18.59	22.30	29.74
		Rate (people)	1.3	0.0	1.1	5.9	23.7	41.9	78.0
		Rate (households)	1.0	0.0	0.7	4.6	19.5	35.2	70.1
	60	Line	12.99	11.42	11.29	15.06	18.82	22.59	30.12
		Rate (people)	8.0	3.7	3.7	9.6	15.5	37.3	75.9
		Rate (households)	7.2	3.4	3.4	8.4	13.6	33.2	67.4
	61	Line	12.74	10.96	11.62	15.49	19.36	23.24	30.98
		Rate (people)	2.8	1.1	2.0	6.5	25.2	51.0	80.5
		Rate (households)	2.2	0.9	1.6	5.1	20.7	44.5	75.3
	62	Line	13.34	12.61	12.16	16.22	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.6	12.6	28.4	70.2
		Rate (households)	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.2	10.6	24.9	63.6

Figure A27: Nagaland, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	12.23	11.74	11.29	15.05	18.81	22.57	30.10
		Rate (people)	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	1.6	10.8	30.2
		Rate (households)	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	1.3	7.3	23.5
	58	Line	12.66	11.62	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	3.2	3.2	24.5
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	22.2
	59	Line	12.93	11.50	11.90	15.87	19.84	23.80	31.74
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	5.5	5.5	18.0
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	5.7	5.7	16.6
	60	Line	13.21	8.89	12.14	16.19	20.23	24.28	32.37
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	19.3
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	22.4
	61	Line	12.46	11.57	12.58	16.77	20.97	25.16	33.55
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	5.6	28.4
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	4.9	25.0
	62	Line	13.08	11.90	13.26	17.69	22.11	26.53	35.37
		Rate (people)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.43	15.26
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	12.0
Rural	57	Line	12.15	10.65	10.60	14.14	17.67	21.20	28.27
		Rate (people)	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.8	7.1	30.4	67.5
		Rate (households)	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.5	5.6	27.7	63.4
	58	Line	12.52	10.74	10.90	14.53	18.17	21.80	29.07
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	14.6	51.1
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	12.3	45.9
	59	Line	12.82	10.44	11.15	14.87	18.59	22.30	29.74
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	17.1	53.3
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	15.2	50.9
	60	Line	12.99	10.97	11.29	15.06	18.82	22.59	30.12
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	5.8	18.8	54.7
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	5.4	16.6	51.1
	61	Line	12.74	11.00	11.62	15.49	19.36	23.24	30.98
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	7.1	24.4	59.1
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	5.9	21.8	54.9
	62	Line	13.34	11.87	12.16	16.22	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.45	39.31
		Rate (households)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	34.7

Figure A28: Orissa, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.81	11.54	9.27	12.36	15.45	18.53	24.71
		Rate (people)	42.2	21.0	7.5	24.1	36.6	46.7	65.1
		Rate (households)	35.8	16.3	6.6	19.5	30.7	40.6	57.5
	58	Line	17.41	13.99	9.58	12.77	15.96	19.15	25.54
		Rate (people)	35.0	17.3	6.4	14.7	29.7	48.3	56.4
		Rate (households)	29.8	17.1	4.0	14.7	25.2	38.0	45.7
	59	Line	17.79	13.12	9.77	13.03	16.29	19.55	26.06
		Rate (people)	33.1	16.3	9.6	16.0	29.2	36.3	56.6
		Rate (households)	27.1	13.4	7.6	13.1	23.4	29.8	47.9
	60	Line	18.16	13.33	9.97	13.29	16.61	19.94	26.58
		Rate (people)	33.5	16.5	7.8	16.2	29.0	37.3	55.0
		Rate (households)	28.6	14.6	6.4	14.3	26.3	31.8	46.0
	61	Line	17.38	12.34	10.33	13.77	17.22	20.66	27.55
		Rate (people)	44.7	22.4	12.6	28.7	44.1	53.4	68.8
		Rate (households)	39.3	19.7	9.8	25.0	38.4	46.7	62.8
	62	Line	18.24	14.38	10.89	14.52	18.15	21.78	29.04
		Rate (people)	33.6	18.1	6.6	18.8	33.3	42.5	59.5
		Rate (households)	29.0	13.3	4.9	13.8	28.8	36.1	53.3
Rural	57	Line	10.77	6.35	9.37	12.49	15.62	18.74	24.99
		Rate (people)	70.1	35.0	63.3	76.5	86.2	91.7	97.0
		Rate (households)	69.3	24.4	62.4	75.1	84.6	90.1	96.4
	58	Line	11.10	8.08	9.63	12.85	16.06	19.27	25.69
		Rate (people)	52.5	26.3	40.4	61.9	76.5	85.0	95.1
		Rate (households)	50.6	23.4	37.1	60.9	74.3	83.8	93.8
	59	Line	11.36	8.72	9.86	13.14	16.43	19.71	26.29
		Rate (people)	53.1	26.7	38.4	65.6	79.0	88.6	94.0
		Rate (households)	49.5	23.3	35.4	62.7	77.6	87.1	93.9
	60	Line	11.52	9.03	9.98	13.31	16.64	19.97	26.62
		Rate (people)	49.2	24.3	33.1	61.5	77.4	86.6	95.1
		Rate (households)	44.0	21.0	29.6	57.6	73.9	83.7	93.7
	61	Line	10.71	8.04	10.27	13.69	17.12	20.54	27.39
		Rate (people)	46.9	23.4	42.8	68.1	81.5	88.5	95.6
		Rate (households)	45.0	21.9	40.6	67.0	80.4	87.8	94.7
	62	Line	11.21	9.04	10.75	14.33	17.92	21.50	28.67
		Rate (people)	38.0	19.0	32.1	63.1	79.5	87.1	94.1
		Rate (households)	34.9	17.2	31.0	56.3	73.3	81.0	90.6

Figure A29: Pondicherry, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.90	13.80	10.94	14.59	18.23	21.88	29.18
		Rate (people)	12.8	7.4	2.4	9.9	15.0	23.0	41.8
		Rate (households)	12.4	7.8	2.0	10.1	13.6	19.4	33.7
	58	Line	17.50	14.24	11.31	15.07	18.84	22.61	30.15
		Rate (people)	8.3	4.1	1.6	6.0	18.8	28.8	45.3
		Rate (households)	8.0	5.2	3.5	6.0	12.8	23.8	40.3
	59	Line	17.88	14.81	11.54	15.38	19.23	23.08	30.77
		Rate (people)	15.1	7.9	5.8	8.1	16.5	25.8	53.3
		Rate (households)	14.0	7.6	4.8	7.8	15.5	24.5	46.5
	60	Line	18.26	12.39	11.77	15.69	19.62	23.54	31.38
		Rate (people)	13.4	4.1	4.1	9.6	15.3	31.8	66.9
		Rate (households)	12.8	3.2	3.2	9.6	14.6	27.7	59.8
	61	Line	18.00	15.47	12.20	16.26	20.33	24.39	32.52
		Rate (people)	21.2	10.6	2.2	12.1	30.9	44.0	62.1
		Rate (households)	19.2	9.2	2.1	10.5	26.8	38.4	54.4
	62	Line	18.89	11.69	12.86	17.14	21.43	25.72	34.29
		Rate (people)	25.7	1.1	25.0	25.0	30.9	47.3	66.0
		Rate (households)	20.7	4.3	19.8	19.8	24.0	33.6	56.4
Rural	57	Line	10.23	9.19	10.50	14.00	17.50	21.00	27.99
		Rate (people)	0.2	0.2	0.2	6.1	14.7	37.1	63.9
		Rate (households)	0.3	0.3	0.3	4.3	11.9	31.6	56.1
	58	Line	10.54	6.77	10.79	14.39	17.99	21.59	28.78
		Rate (people)	9.5	7.0	9.5	26.2	48.8	61.7	70.7
		Rate (households)	7.2	4.2	7.2	25.0	48.5	58.5	68.7
	59	Line	10.79	7.41	11.04	14.72	18.40	22.08	29.45
		Rate (people)	1.7	1.7	1.7	10.8	31.0	48.1	54.9
		Rate (households)	7.0	7.0	7.0	13.6	33.4	49.1	53.0
	60	Line	10.94	9.52	11.18	14.91	18.64	22.37	29.82
		Rate (people)	33.0	10.5	33.0	41.4	66.0	70.1	78.2
		Rate (households)	23.5	8.0	23.5	32.7	54.1	59.6	68.4
	61	Line	11.57	9.73	11.50	15.34	19.17	23.01	30.68
		Rate (people)	25.8	13.3	25.8	35.2	48.8	61.5	75.7
		Rate (households)	21.7	10.6	21.7	31.4	47.2	58.6	72.7
	62	Line	12.11	8.27	12.04	16.06	20.07	24.08	32.11
		Rate (people)	15.7	0.0	15.7	48.6	53.5	54.2	78.8
		Rate (households)	13.9	0.0	13.9	41.0	45.2	45.9	71.3

Figure A30: Punjab, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	13.79	12.11	10.18	13.57	16.96	20.35	27.14
		Rate (people)	6.6	3.4	0.4	6.3	13.8	23.0	44.8
		Rate (households)	4.8	2.6	0.5	4.6	9.7	16.8	37.3
	58	Line	14.28	11.69	10.52	14.02	17.53	21.03	28.04
		Rate (people)	5.0	3.2	1.0	5.0	12.2	25.2	45.3
		Rate (households)	3.8	2.3	0.7	3.8	9.2	20.0	40.5
	59	Line	14.59	12.61	10.73	14.31	17.89	21.47	28.62
		Rate (people)	3.2	1.8	0.6	3.2	10.8	22.7	43.5
		Rate (households)	2.1	1.3	0.5	2.1	8.1	16.4	35.2
	60	Line	14.90	11.80	10.95	14.60	18.25	21.90	29.19
		Rate (people)	4.2	2.0	1.6	4.2	20.1	27.1	51.3
		Rate (households)	2.3	0.9	0.6	2.3	13.2	18.4	40.2
	61	Line	15.33	14.14	11.34	15.13	18.91	22.69	30.25
		Rate (people)	6.3	3.0	0.3	5.9	17.9	28.3	49.1
		Rate (households)	4.6	2.1	0.2	4.4	12.5	21.1	39.2
	62	Line	16.09	13.86	11.96	15.95	19.94	23.92	31.90
		Rate (people)	3.1	1.3	0.1	2.8	9.1	14.7	36.5
		Rate (households)	2.5	0.9	0.0	2.2	6.8	10.8	30.7
Rural	57	Line	12.06	11.19	9.87	13.16	16.45	19.75	26.33
		Rate (people)	6.3	2.2	1.2	10.1	24.5	40.9	65.3
		Rate (households)	4.3	1.8	1.0	7.5	19.6	35.3	63.4
	58	Line	12.43	11.58	10.15	13.53	16.92	20.30	27.07
		Rate (people)	6.3	3.4	1.0	8.4	21.5	36.7	63.1
		Rate (households)	5.1	2.6	0.8	7.1	18.7	33.0	58.1
	59	Line	12.72	11.69	10.39	13.85	17.31	20.77	27.69
		Rate (people)	6.4	3.1	2.3	10.1	24.9	39.0	61.0
		Rate (households)	5.1	2.5	1.9	8.0	20.5	34.2	56.3
	60	Line	12.90	11.25	10.52	14.02	17.53	21.04	28.05
		Rate (people)	4.9	1.9	0.7	8.5	23.3	35.3	52.7
		Rate (households)	4.1	1.9	0.5	7.1	20.0	32.0	49.9
	61	Line	13.49	12.06	10.82	14.43	18.03	21.64	28.85
		Rate (people)	9.0	4.6	1.8	13.4	29.9	46.0	67.2
		Rate (households)	7.7	3.8	1.5	11.5	26.6	42.0	63.8
	62	Line	14.13	12.56	11.33	15.10	18.88	22.65	30.20
		Rate (people)	6.3	3.0	0.9	8.2	19.7	30.1	52.5
		Rate (households)	5.4	2.7	1.0	6.9	19.6	30.5	52.9

Figure A31: Rajasthan, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.56	13.72	10.37	13.82	17.28	20.73	27.64
		Rate (people)	23.7	11.9	2.2	12.0	26.0	43.9	70.9
		Rate (households)	19.3	9.4	1.7	9.6	20.9	36.2	62.0
	58	Line	17.14	14.17	10.71	14.28	17.85	21.42	28.56
		Rate (people)	31.0	16.0	1.4	16.7	35.5	49.2	73.1
		Rate (households)	22.8	10.6	0.9	11.1	27.2	39.6	61.4
	59	Line	17.52	15.08	10.93	14.58	18.22	21.86	29.15
		Rate (people)	27.4	13.3	3.5	12.2	30.3	45.5	65.9
		Rate (households)	21.6	11.0	3.2	9.7	23.9	36.8	56.1
	60	Line	17.89	13.34	11.15	14.87	18.58	22.30	29.73
		Rate (people)	21.1	9.4	2.9	13.8	24.3	39.7	62.9
		Rate (households)	16.9	7.3	2.3	10.2	19.6	32.0	52.3
	61	Line	18.40	14.53	11.55	15.41	19.26	23.11	30.81
		Rate (people)	32.3	16.2	4.7	19.4	36.8	49.0	68.6
		Rate (households)	25.7	12.8	3.7	15.0	29.8	40.7	58.8
	62	Line	19.32	16.20	12.18	16.24	20.30	24.36	32.49
		Rate (people)	22.2	11.4	2.7	11.4	29.8	44.9	64.2
		Rate (households)	17.1	8.6	1.8	8.6	23.2	35.4	54.6
Rural	57	Line	11.44	9.72	10.10	13.47	16.83	20.20	26.93
		Rate (people)	17.7	7.2	10.5	30.9	48.7	67.2	85.6
		Rate (households)	15.1	6.2	9.3	29.2	45.1	63.8	83.1
	58	Line	11.79	10.28	10.38	13.85	17.31	20.77	27.69
		Rate (people)	14.4	7.5	7.9	29.1	54.1	72.2	88.6
		Rate (households)	11.5	5.1	5.5	24.3	47.4	65.6	83.8
	59	Line	12.07	10.58	10.62	14.17	17.71	21.25	28.33
		Rate (people)	21.1	10.4	11.1	36.6	61.0	73.8	88.6
		Rate (households)	16.8	8.2	8.6	29.3	52.4	66.3	85.6
	60	Line	12.23	10.96	10.76	14.35	17.93	21.52	28.69
		Rate (people)	17.7	8.9	7.6	37.2	62.6	77.8	89.3
		Rate (households)	14.8	7.1	6.1	30.2	54.3	70.9	85.3
	61	Line	12.31	10.52	11.07	14.76	18.45	22.14	29.52
		Rate (people)	18.3	9.1	10.9	34.0	60.7	76.4	90.8
		Rate (households)	15.3	7.3	8.9	29.5	54.6	71.1	87.9
	62	Line	12.89	11.49	11.59	15.45	19.31	23.17	30.90
		Rate (people)	13.3	7.3	8.1	24.4	45.0	67.2	86.2
		Rate (households)	11.3	4.9	5.4	20.2	39.1	61.2	83.4

Figure A32: Sikkim, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	12.23	9.91	11.29	15.05	18.81	22.57	30.10
		Rate (people)	4.7	2.8	4.6	7.7	23.5	35.0	53.3
		Rate (households)	11.4	5.2	11.2	13.8	24.3	30.7	47.3
	58	Line	12.66	3.41	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	1.2	0.8	1.2	7.4	11.2	15.5	31.7
		Rate (households)	3.9	2.6	3.9	5.7	9.3	11.7	27.7
	59	Line	12.93	6.89	11.90	15.87	19.84	23.80	31.74
		Rate (people)	1.3	0.7	0.7	1.3	25.6	26.4	44.1
		Rate (households)	4.5	2.5	2.5	4.5	16.6	19.4	35.5
	60	Line	13.21	8.94	12.14	16.19	20.23	24.28	32.37
		Rate (people)	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.8	20.0	44.6
		Rate (households)	1.5	0.0	1.5	1.5	5.1	16.6	37.0
	61	Line	12.46	12.15	12.58	16.77	20.97	25.16	33.55
		Rate (people)	1.1	0.4	1.2	2.9	19.8	27.3	56.1
		Rate (households)	1.8	1.5	1.8	4.9	15.2	21.7	47.4
	62	Line	13.08	7.03	13.26	17.69	22.11	26.53	35.37
		Rate (people)	0.8	0.0	0.8	3.9	7.9	17.9	38.7
		Rate (households)	2.8	0.0	2.8	5.4	7.4	13.7	29.5
Rural	57	Line	12.15	7.39	10.60	14.14	17.67	21.20	28.27
		Rate (people)	15.1	1.3	11.0	15.5	54.1	68.6	83.4
		Rate (households)	14.4	4.3	11.4	14.7	53.8	66.2	76.3
	58	Line	12.52	10.20	10.90	14.53	18.17	21.80	29.07
		Rate (people)	14.4	7.3	8.9	21.8	50.9	68.7	84.5
		Rate (households)	11.7	5.3	6.7	18.6	41.3	59.4	76.8
	59	Line	12.82	11.01	11.15	14.87	18.59	22.30	29.74
		Rate (people)	19.0	9.3	10.5	31.6	52.7	69.4	85.5
		Rate (households)	13.8	6.5	7.2	23.3	41.7	58.5	76.1
	60	Line	12.99	11.82	11.29	15.06	18.82	22.59	30.12
		Rate (people)	14.2	6.1	1.5	27.0	57.1	73.5	91.6
		Rate (households)	10.6	4.2	1.0	21.6	48.4	63.2	81.9
	61	Line	12.74	11.21	11.62	15.49	19.36	23.24	30.98
		Rate (people)	16.0	8.0	9.9	31.0	53.0	66.3	81.4
		Rate (households)	11.3	5.3	6.7	23.5	44.2	57.6	75.1
	62	Line	13.34	12.24	12.16	16.22	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	3.2	1.8	0.8	23.7	47.6	60.3	90.1
		Rate (households)	1.9	1.1	0.5	20.2	44.9	56.1	83.0

Figure A33: Tamil Nadu, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	16.90	14.70	10.94	14.59	18.23	21.88	29.18
		Rate (people)	22.9	11.8	3.7	10.0	28.6	44.1	62.6
		Rate (households)	19.6	11.1	3.6	9.4	24.2	37.1	55.5
	58	Line	17.50	14.26	11.31	15.07	18.84	22.61	30.15
		Rate (people)	20.4	10.1	3.9	11.9	25.5	39.8	56.0
		Rate (households)	18.0	8.5	3.4	10.0	22.6	34.9	50.7
	59	Line	17.88	15.20	11.54	15.38	19.23	23.08	30.77
		Rate (people)	18.7	9.2	3.0	9.5	23.1	34.2	54.9
		Rate (households)	16.6	8.2	2.6	8.4	20.4	30.2	49.4
	60	Line	18.26	15.36	11.77	15.69	19.62	23.54	31.38
		Rate (people)	24.4	12.1	4.2	13.2	27.6	37.4	57.0
		Rate (households)	19.3	9.1	3.4	10.1	21.9	31.3	50.6
	61	Line	18.00	14.55	12.20	16.26	20.33	24.39	32.52
		Rate (people)	22.5	11.2	4.9	16.3	31.6	44.6	61.9
		Rate (households)	19.0	9.3	4.0	13.7	27.4	39.0	56.1
	62	Line	18.89	15.05	12.86	17.14	21.43	25.72	34.29
		Rate (people)	16.3	8.0	4.5	11.4	23.2	37.8	58.9
		Rate (households)	12.4	5.2	2.7	7.8	17.8	31.8	52.2
Rural	57	Line	10.23	8.64	10.50	14.00	17.50	21.00	27.99
		Rate (people)	12.3	6.3	13.5	36.2	59.8	72.8	90.7
		Rate (households)	9.7	4.8	10.5	32.8	54.8	68.0	88.2
	58	Line	10.54	9.31	10.79	14.39	17.99	21.59	28.78
		Rate (people)	17.3	8.6	18.4	44.3	63.5	76.8	88.3
		Rate (households)	13.8	7.0	14.9	38.2	57.7	72.3	85.6
	59	Line	10.79	8.91	11.04	14.72	18.40	22.08	29.45
		Rate (people)	15.1	7.6	17.2	37.7	57.3	71.9	86.2
		Rate (households)	11.8	6.0	13.1	31.5	51.6	66.7	83.2
	60	Line	10.94	9.17	11.18	14.91	18.64	22.37	29.82
		Rate (people)	15.3	7.5	16.4	43.2	62.4	73.5	86.9
		Rate (households)	13.1	6.4	14.1	38.7	58.1	70.4	85.1
	61	Line	11.57	9.93	11.50	15.34	19.17	23.01	30.68
		Rate (people)	23.0	11.5	22.4	49.4	68.1	80.1	90.4
		Rate (households)	20.1	10.2	19.7	45.5	64.2	77.1	88.6
	62	Line	12.11	10.62	12.04	16.06	20.07	24.08	32.11
		Rate (people)	16.6	7.7	16.5	37.9	55.8	68.1	84.2
		Rate (households)	13.6	6.3	13.5	32.4	48.5	62.1	82.5

Figure A34: Tripura, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	12.23	10.94	11.29	15.05	18.81	22.57	30.10
		Rate (people)	4.0	1.7	2.8	8.5	28.5	44.6	57.9
		Rate (households)	2.8	1.3	1.9	6.9	28.5	42.4	56.8
	58	Line	12.66	11.74	11.66	15.55	19.44	23.32	31.10
		Rate (people)	3.8	2.8	1.3	14.1	31.4	35.4	54.3
		Rate (households)	3.2	2.3	1.1	10.3	26.4	29.6	49.9
	59	Line	12.93	12.47	11.90	15.87	19.84	23.80	31.74
		Rate (people)	7.6	3.7	3.7	15.6	33.9	40.0	56.4
		Rate (households)	5.0	1.9	1.9	11.1	29.1	35.0	51.0
	60	Line	13.21	10.94	12.14	16.19	20.23	24.28	32.37
		Rate (people)	15.9	11.5	14.8	33.6	39.9	54.6	69.3
		Rate (households)	10.4	6.5	9.1	25.5	31.1	44.2	65.6
	61	Line	12.46	11.51	12.58	16.77	20.97	25.16	33.55
		Rate (people)	5.6	2.8	5.6	20.9	37.4	50.6	68.2
		Rate (households)	4.6	2.4	4.6	17.6	32.9	44.2	61.9
	62	Line	13.08	12.21	13.26	17.69	22.11	26.53	35.37
		Rate (people)	5.0	3.1	5.0	18.3	29.9	40.9	59.3
		Rate (households)	4.0	2.1	4.0	14.3	24.7	34.7	51.5
Rural	57	Line	12.15	11.03	10.60	14.14	17.67	21.20	28.27
		Rate (people)	57.5	27.1	24.7	62.8	67.0	73.9	93.2
		Rate (households)	51.4	28.9	25.7	57.3	62.5	71.1	92.1
	58	Line	12.52	10.57	10.90	14.53	18.17	21.80	29.07
		Rate (people)	30.0	15.0	17.1	44.7	64.1	78.3	90.3
		Rate (households)	28.6	14.2	16.3	42.1	60.8	75.3	88.6
	59	Line	12.82	10.80	11.15	14.87	18.59	22.30	29.74
		Rate (people)	20.7	10.4	11.2	36.0	62.8	80.3	92.6
		Rate (households)	18.5	8.9	9.5	33.0	58.4	76.4	89.8
	60	Line	12.99	10.79	11.29	15.06	18.82	22.59	30.12
		Rate (people)	28.8	13.8	16.4	43.5	74.2	89.2	96.6
		Rate (households)	25.8	11.9	14.5	40.2	69.4	85.8	95.8
	61	Line	12.74	10.49	11.62	15.49	19.36	23.24	30.98
		Rate (people)	34.6	17.4	26.0	56.0	79.8	88.9	96.0
		Rate (households)	31.3	15.5	23.5	52.3	75.9	86.1	94.5
	62	Line	13.34	11.16	12.16	16.22	20.27	24.32	32.43
		Rate (people)	31.2	16.0	22.9	57.4	80.2	88.8	97.9
		Rate (households)	29.1	15.0	21.1	57.2	80.0	87.6	97.2

Figure A35: Uttar Pradesh, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	14.79	11.90	9.86	13.15	16.44	19.73	26.30
		Rate (people)	31.5	15.9	7.8	22.6	39.1	53.5	68.5
		Rate (households)	24.5	12.4	6.1	17.2	31.1	45.3	61.0
	58	Line	15.32	12.55	10.19	13.59	16.99	20.38	27.18
		Rate (people)	27.1	13.2	4.6	18.0	34.9	47.9	63.8
		Rate (households)	20.3	9.2	3.0	13.6	28.0	38.8	53.3
	59	Line	15.65	12.70	10.40	13.87	17.34	20.80	27.74
		Rate (people)	32.2	16.1	7.4	22.1	39.0	51.4	70.2
		Rate (households)	24.4	11.6	4.9	16.5	30.2	41.1	61.5
	60	Line	15.98	12.81	10.61	14.15	17.68	21.22	28.29
		Rate (people)	27.2	13.7	5.9	20.3	37.3	50.0	70.9
		Rate (households)	20.8	9.7	4.4	15.0	28.7	41.0	59.3
	61	Line	15.89	12.43	11.00	14.66	18.33	21.99	29.32
		Rate (people)	30.1	15.1	9.1	25.2	41.0	52.6	69.5
		Rate (households)	22.5	10.6	6.3	18.3	32.4	42.2	60.3
	62	Line	16.68	13.27	11.59	15.46	19.32	23.18	30.91
		Rate (people)	27.1	14.0	5.9	21.3	36.8	49.5	67.6
		Rate (households)	20.1	9.7	4.1	15.8	28.0	39.0	56.7
Rural	57	Line	11.20	9.52	8.75	11.66	14.58	17.49	23.32
		Rate (people)	38.8	19.0	11.8	52.3	70.0	80.6	91.7
		Rate (households)	32.1	15.1	9.5	44.5	61.2	72.0	86.4
	58	Line	11.54	9.64	8.99	11.99	14.99	17.98	23.98
		Rate (people)	30.4	15.2	11.2	33.9	56.9	72.8	88.8
		Rate (households)	25.9	12.5	9.1	29.0	50.3	66.4	83.9
	59	Line	11.82	10.01	9.20	12.27	15.33	18.40	24.53
		Rate (people)	30.1	15.0	10.5	33.8	57.0	73.2	87.7
		Rate (households)	25.6	12.5	8.7	29.0	50.9	68.1	84.3
	60	Line	11.98	10.12	9.32	12.42	15.53	18.64	24.85
		Rate (people)	29.8	14.9	9.1	33.1	55.0	71.5	88.1
		Rate (households)	25.6	12.5	7.6	28.5	49.0	66.6	83.8
	61	Line	12.03	10.07	9.58	12.78	15.97	19.17	25.56
		Rate (people)	33.3	16.6	13.6	38.6	59.7	74.1	87.8
		Rate (households)	28.6	13.8	11.2	33.6	53.5	68.7	84.4
	62	Line	12.59	10.58	10.03	13.38	16.72	20.07	26.76
		Rate (people)	23.0	11.3	8.3	27.6	48.3	68.0	87.0
		Rate (households)	20.4	9.7	7.0	24.9	44.9	65.5	84.5

Figure A36: Uttaranchal, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round		Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
		Line/rate	National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	14.79	12.63	9.86	13.15	16.44	19.73	26.30
		Rate (people)	13.7	7.1	1.1	9.9	23.3	29.2	46.9
		Rate (households)	10.1	4.2	0.9	6.7	16.6	22.0	36.4
	58	Line	15.32	13.24	10.19	13.59	16.99	20.38	27.18
		Rate (people)	24.3	12.9	0.0	12.9	26.0	39.2	54.1
		Rate (households)	16.2	7.8	0.0	7.8	18.4	29.7	43.3
	59	Line	15.65	12.41	10.40	13.87	17.34	20.80	27.74
		Rate (people)	18.8	10.8	1.1	13.1	27.6	34.7	61.3
		Rate (households)	13.2	7.4	0.4	9.9	20.5	27.7	50.9
	60	Line	15.98	14.91	10.61	14.15	17.68	21.22	28.29
		Rate (people)	11.4	5.2	1.1	3.2	14.4	24.7	51.4
		Rate (households)	6.2	2.7	0.7	1.9	7.3	15.0	37.7
	61	Line	20.96	16.28	11.00	14.66	18.33	21.99	29.32
		Rate (people)	36.5	17.4	2.2	9.7	27.9	40.1	55.3
		Rate (households)	27.4	12.7	1.5	6.9	20.3	29.9	45.7
	62	Line	22.01	17.68	11.59	15.46	19.32	23.18	30.91
		Rate (people)	26.0	12.7	0.0	5.9	14.1	41.4	63.4
		Rate (households)	22.4	10.4	0.0	3.5	11.6	36.0	55.2
Rural	57	Line	11.20	10.87	8.75	11.66	14.58	17.49	23.32
		Rate (people)	17.5	11.1	1.1	17.5	44.2	50.9	75.6
		Rate (households)	13.1	8.0	0.7	13.1	34.8	40.0	61.4
	58	Line	11.54	10.37	8.99	11.99	14.99	17.98	23.98
		Rate (people)	8.7	4.0	0.0	10.0	27.3	51.6	76.2
		Rate (households)	7.9	3.6	0.0	9.1	22.3	41.6	66.4
	59	Line	11.82	10.52	9.20	12.27	15.33	18.40	24.53
		Rate (people)	18.0	8.4	3.7	20.0	34.8	55.4	77.7
		Rate (households)	12.3	5.6	2.5	15.1	27.0	46.7	66.9
	60	Line	11.98	10.64	9.32	12.42	15.53	18.64	24.85
		Rate (people)	5.7	2.7	0.1	7.5	31.5	58.6	83.6
		Rate (households)	5.1	2.3	0.6	6.4	29.3	53.0	78.8
	61	Line	15.72	13.03	9.58	12.78	15.97	19.17	25.56
		Rate (people)	40.6	20.3	2.4	18.8	42.0	58.4	81.3
		Rate (households)	35.7	17.8	2.5	16.5	36.9	53.5	76.8
	62	Line	16.45	14.32	10.03	13.38	16.72	20.07	26.76
		Rate (people)	17.6	8.8	2.2	6.5	18.0	38.1	63.5
		Rate (households)	12.8	6.4	1.2	4.8	13.4	35.6	56.1

Figure A37: West Bengal, poverty lines and poverty rates, by round and by urban/rural

Region	Round	Line/rate	Poverty line (nominal Rs/person/day) and poverty rate (%)						
				USAID	International purchase-power-parity lines				
			National	'extreme'	$0.75/day	$1/day	$1.25/day	$1.50/day	$2/day
Urban	57	Line	14.54	11.99	10.29	13.72	17.15	20.58	27.45
		Rate (people)	13.9	6.9	4.1	10.7	25.9	35.8	55.8
		Rate (households)	9.8	4.4	2.3	7.3	18.0	27.1	45.7
	58	Line	15.06	12.44	10.64	14.18	17.73	21.27	28.36
		Rate (people)	13.8	7.1	2.7	11.0	24.3	37.3	56.3
		Rate (households)	10.4	5.5	2.6	8.4	19.5	31.1	48.9
	59	Line	15.38	12.38	10.85	14.47	18.09	21.71	28.94
		Rate (people)	13.5	6.9	3.5	11.2	25.7	35.3	54.1
		Rate (households)	9.7	4.9	2.6	8.1	18.7	27.4	47.6
	60	Line	15.71	13.76	11.07	14.76	18.45	22.14	29.52
		Rate (people)	13.6	6.7	2.1	9.6	21.9	34.8	55.3
		Rate (households)	10.2	4.8	1.4	7.1	17.2	26.5	43.6
	61	Line	14.77	12.28	11.47	15.30	19.12	22.95	30.60
		Rate (people)	13.5	6.7	4.3	16.3	28.7	40.8	55.3
		Rate (households)	9.9	4.6	2.9	11.9	22.0	32.9	48.5
	62	Line	15.51	13.14	12.10	16.13	20.16	24.19	32.26
		Rate (people)	14.0	6.7	5.0	15.5	26.0	37.5	56.6
		Rate (households)	10.5	5.3	4.0	11.6	19.2	29.4	47.1
Rural	57	Line	11.64	9.65	9.57	12.76	15.95	19.14	25.52
		Rate (people)	22.9	11.3	11.1	30.8	55.1	74.7	90.1
		Rate (households)	19.8	9.9	9.7	26.9	50.9	71.1	87.4
	58	Line	12.00	10.19	9.84	13.12	16.40	19.68	26.24
		Rate (people)	28.3	14.2	12.0	38.1	62.8	79.4	92.6
		Rate (households)	24.1	11.8	10.1	33.4	58.0	75.7	90.4
	59	Line	12.28	10.65	10.07	13.42	16.78	20.13	26.84
		Rate (people)	23.6	11.9	8.6	32.8	57.2	73.7	89.4
		Rate (households)	20.2	9.6	6.8	28.7	51.7	68.9	86.0
	60	Line	12.45	10.37	10.20	13.59	16.99	20.39	27.19
		Rate (people)	22.1	10.9	10.2	30.8	53.6	69.7	86.9
		Rate (households)	19.4	9.4	8.7	26.8	49.4	65.4	84.2
	61	Line	12.59	10.41	10.49	13.98	17.48	20.97	27.97
		Rate (people)	28.4	14.1	14.8	38.8	60.7	76.4	90.3
		Rate (households)	24.3	11.3	11.8	34.2	56.1	72.7	88.3
	62	Line	13.18	10.61	10.98	14.64	18.30	21.96	29.27
		Rate (people)	22.3	10.6	12.2	31.4	57.3	73.2	88.1
		Rate (households)	18.9	9.5	10.6	27.9	53.7	69.4	86.7

Figure A38: Data items for cost-of-living adjustments for $1/day line, by round, state, and urban/rural area

Round:	57		58		59		60		61		62		All rounds	
Area:	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
	All-area $1/day line (Li)													
	14.08	12.84	14.58	13.25	14.89	13.56	15.21	13.74	15.77	14.11	16.56	14.78		
State/Union Territory	Population proportions (pij)												Price indices (πij)	
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	0.035	0.033	0.030	0.028	0.036	0.029	0.045	0.033	0.041	0.027	0.036	0.042	104.6	110.9
Andhra Pradesh	8.846	7.562	9.140	8.089	8.337	7.843	7.940	7.253	7.502	7.397	7.494	7.297	97.7	102.0
Arunachal Pradesh	0.027	0.071	0.033	0.071	0.033	0.097	0.038	0.115	0.040	0.105	0.053	0.096	107.9	112.0
Assam	0.823	3.006	0.685	2.826	0.976	2.871	0.903	2.907	0.940	3.125	0.969	3.168	107.9	112.0
Bihar	3.241	8.624	3.147	8.740	3.195	9.025	3.152	8.469	2.741	9.106	2.770	9.087	91.4	97.8
Chandigarh	0.335	0.007	0.418	0.016	0.471	0.015	0.238	0.016	0.319	0.012	0.279	0.015	97.3	104.3
Chhattisgarh	1.429	3.506	1.293	2.433	1.201	2.487	1.133	2.378	1.324	2.482	1.439	2.494	97.3	104.3
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	0.004	0.014	0.009	0.020	0.007	0.025	0.010	0.032	0.010	0.025	0.006	0.022	109.6	105.4
Daman and Diu	0.016	0.005	0.022	0.013	0.020	0.015	0.016	0.012	0.023	0.015	0.022	0.015	109.6	105.4
Delhi	3.672	0.131	4.174	0.506	3.955	0.245	3.956	0.235	4.659	0.115	2.788	0.131	114.7	102.4
Goa	0.153	0.074	0.085	0.078	0.302	0.098	0.212	0.149	0.162	0.091	0.290	0.081	109.6	105.4
Gujarat	6.317	4.385	6.751	3.968	6.394	4.389	6.788	4.360	6.553	4.220	6.364	4.388	107.4	111.1
Haryana	2.234	1.939	1.937	2.074	2.246	2.293	2.238	2.034	2.311	2.158	2.269	2.133	100.5	102.4
Himachal Pradesh	0.195	0.675	0.219	0.704	0.234	0.742	0.207	0.766	0.234	0.758	0.213	0.773	104.3	119.0
Jammu and Kashmir	0.448	0.526	0.631	0.848	0.643	0.831	0.513	0.832	0.686	0.691	0.578	0.763	107.0	114.7
Jharkhand	1.490	1.908	1.789	2.599	1.717	2.473	1.464	2.781	1.573	2.775	1.955	2.780	91.4	97.8
Karnataka	8.079	4.282	5.368	4.418	5.980	4.577	5.447	4.661	6.104	4.653	5.713	4.472	103.5	106.3
Kerala	1.849	3.192	2.710	3.150	2.870	2.932	3.360	3.155	2.910	3.215	2.889	3.300	108.5	123.2
Lakshadweep	0.012	0.001	0.012	0.003	0.010	0.004	0.015	0.003	0.012	0.004	0.010	0.003	108.5	123.2
Madhya Pradesh	6.453	5.695	6.376	6.061	5.901	6.840	5.987	6.335	5.662	6.277	6.091	6.228	92.7	95.2
Maharashtra	13.538	6.178	14.751	8.287	15.570	7.566	15.778	7.811	14.977	7.518	14.518	7.456	109.6	105.4
Manipur	0.190	0.194	0.174	0.181	0.225	0.199	0.225	0.206	0.189	0.198	0.188	0.214	107.9	112.0
Meghalaya	0.125	0.261	0.105	0.239	0.105	0.239	0.121	0.254	0.111	0.246	0.118	0.240	107.9	112.0
Mizoram	0.112	0.047	0.109	0.053	0.106	0.068	0.119	0.051	0.112	0.058	0.143	0.055	107.9	112.0
Nagaland	0.073	0.131	0.080	0.060	0.092	0.071	0.099	0.061	0.096	0.078	0.091	0.095	107.9	112.0
Orissa	2.112	6.950	1.579	4.150	1.895	4.084	1.803	4.231	2.045	4.380	2.244	4.095	88.6	99.0
Pondicherry	0.233	0.021	0.222	0.050	0.253	0.046	0.251	0.044	0.229	0.042	0.256	0.088	104.6	110.9
Punjab	2.988	1.644	2.944	2.210	2.900	2.141	3.090	2.130	2.998	2.143	3.175	2.093	97.3	104.3
Rajasthan	4.961	5.278	4.902	5.196	4.598	5.114	4.352	5.954	4.957	5.862	5.054	5.690	99.1	106.7
Sikkim	0.015	0.051	0.017	0.051	0.018	0.053	0.019	0.053	0.023	0.061	0.021	0.055	107.9	112.0
Tamil Nadu	9.078	5.430	8.564	5.585	8.286	5.877	8.532	5.569	8.677	4.707	9.528	4.783	104.6	110.9
Tripura	0.200	0.453	0.143	0.388	0.154	0.371	0.168	0.380	0.181	0.375	0.183	0.378	107.9	112.0
Uttar Pradesh	13.460	20.590	13.256	18.078	13.842	17.369	13.449	17.737	13.044	18.079	13.369	18.352	94.3	92.4
Uttaranchal/Uttarakhand	0.650	1.028	0.658	0.778	0.553	0.844	0.672	0.869	0.782	0.869	0.976	0.982	94.3	92.4
West Bengal	6.608	6.106	7.668	8.050	6.877	8.130	7.660	8.125	7.774	8.132	7.907	8.138	98.4	101.1

All-urban and all-rural lines are in units of rupees/person/day. Population proportions are in units of percentages. Price indices are unitless.