Simple Poverty Scorecard[®] Poverty-Assessment Tool India

Mark Schreiner

7 May 2016

This document is at SimplePovertyScorecard.com.

Abstract

The Simple Poverty Scorecard-brand poverty-assessment tool uses ten low-cost indicators from India's 2011/12 Socio-Economic Survey to estimate the likelihood that a household has consumption below a given poverty line. Field workers can collect responses in about ten minutes. The scorecard works with 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 differentiated services.

Version note

This paper uses 2011/12 data. It replaces Schreiner (2007, 2008a, and 2012a) which use data from 2003, 2005/6, and 2009/10. The new 2011/12 scorecard here should be used from now on. Existing users of an older scorecard can still measure change over time using supported poverty lines with a baseline from the old scorecard and a follow-up from the new scorecard.

Acknowledgements

This paper was funded by Grameen Foundation (GF). Data are from India's National Sample Survey Office. Thanks go to Priyanka Bhagat, Devahuti Choudhury, Monojit Das, Julie Peachey, and Sharada Ramanathan. This scorecard was re-branded by GF as a Progress out of Poverty Index[®] tool. The PPI[®] is a performance-management tool that GF promotes to help organizations achieve their social objectives more effectively. PPI learning materials and resources are at progressoutofpoverty.org. "Progress out of Poverty Index" and "PPI" are Registered Trademarks of Innovations for Poverty Action. "Simple Poverty Scorecard" is a Registered Trademark of Microfinance Risk Management, L.L.C. for its brand of poverty-assessment tools.

Simple Po	verty S	corecard [®] Poverty-	Assessi	ment T	lool
Interview ID:		Nar	Identifier		
Interview date:		Participant:			
Country:	IND	Field agent:			
Scorecard:	004	Service point:			
Sampling wgt.:		Number of household	members:		
Indicat	tor	Response	Points	Score	
1. How many hous	sehold	A. Eight or more		0	
members ar	e there?	B. Seven		4	
		C. Six		7	
		D. Five		11	
		E. Four		19	
		F. Three		26	
		G. Two		34	
		H. One		41	
2. What is the gen	eral	A. Primary or below, or not	0		
education le	evel of the	B. Middle	3		
female head	l/spouse?	C. Secondary or higher	5		
		D. No female head/spouse		5	
3. Does the house	old possess	a refrigerator?	A. No	0	
			B. Yes	11	
4. Does the house	old possess	a stove/gas burner?	A. No	0	
	_		B. Yes	2	
5. Does the house	old possess	a pressure cooker/pressure	A. No	0	
pan?			B. Yes	4	
6. Does the house	old possess	a television?	A. No	0	
			B. Yes	5	
7. Does the house	old possess	s an electric fan?	A. No	0	
			B. Yes	3	
8. Does the house	old possess	s an almirah/dressing table?	A. No	0	
			B. Yes	4	
9. Does the house	old possess	a chair, stool, bench, or	A. No	0	
table?			B. Yes	6	
10. Does the house	ehold posses	ss a motorcycle, scooter,	A. No	0	
motor car, e	or jeep?		B. Yes	19	
SimplePovertySco	recard.com	1		Score:	

Back-page Worksheet: Household Members

In the scorecard header, write the interview's unique identifier (if known), the interview date, and the sampling weight of the participant (if known). Then record the name and unique identification number of the participant, of yourself as the field agent, and of the service point that the participant uses. The respondent need not be the participant with your program.

Then read to the respondent: Please tell me the first name or nickname of each member of your household. A household is a group of people who normally live together under the same roof and who ordinarily take food from the same kitchen. Include temporary stay-aways (those whose total expected absence is six months or less). Exclude temporary visitors and guests (those whose total expected stay is six months or less). Also include resident employees and paying guests.

Leave the determination of household membership to the judgment of the head of the household, while keeping in mind the full definition of *household* found in the "Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators".

Write down the first name or nickname of each household member, noting for your own use who is the female head/spouse (if she exists). Then record the total number of members in the scorecard header next to "Number of household members:", and mark the response to the first scorecard indicator. Then ask the rest of the questions.

First name or nickname
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
household members:

	Poverty likelihood (%)									
	L	egacy R59)	Legacy R62						Legacy R66
	Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Int	il. 1993 P	PP		National
Score	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
0–4	56.3	73.1	99.2	50.2	66.4	25.9	86.0	94.5	98.8	74.3
5 - 9	44.0	61.7	98.7	37.6	52.9	21.8	76.7	89.9	98.0	61.5
10 - 14	34.5	53.2	98.4	28.7	44.2	12.9	70.9	86.9	97.7	53.5
15 - 19	21.8	42.8	96.9	18.7	31.9	8.9	61.9	80.7	95.9	42.4
20 - 24	17.3	35.2	95.7	15.0	26.7	6.2	53.5	75.9	94.1	35.8
25 - 29	12.8	26.8	92.2	11.5	19.6	3.7	45.3	66.3	88.8	27.8
30 - 34	8.0	18.8	88.6	7.2	12.8	2.3	34.7	58.9	83.7	19.2
35 - 39	5.9	12.5	82.4	5.1	9.0	1.6	25.4	45.5	76.2	13.1
40 - 44	4.0	9.1	75.1	3.8	5.8	1.0	18.5	35.3	68.3	9.9
45 - 49	3.1	6.1	60.7	2.8	3.6	0.5	12.6	23.9	53.8	7.1
50 - 54	1.5	3.3	50.6	1.4	1.8	0.2	7.7	16.5	42.5	4.5
55 - 59	0.8	1.2	36.5	0.9	0.6	0.1	4.0	10.0	29.4	1.7
60 - 64	0.3	0.3	30.4	0.3	0.2	0.0	1.3	5.6	22.5	0.5
65 - 69	0.1	0.3	22.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	1.0	3.4	15.5	0.5
70 - 74	0.1	0.1	15.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.4	10.2	0.2
75 - 79	0.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5	4.9	0.1
80-84	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	3.7	0.1
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.0	0.0
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Conversion of scores to poverty likelihoods: R59, R62, and R66 legacy poverty lines using MRP consumption

	Poverty likelihood (%)							
	Legacy R66							
	National Tendulkar			Int	Intl. 2005 PPP			
Score	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50		
0–4	57.7	93.6	99.0	79.5	98.6	99.6		
5 - 9	47.3	90.8	98.3	74.3	97.5	99.4		
10 - 14	38.5	85.8	97.1	64.8	95.5	99.0		
15 - 19	29.0	78.4	94.8	55.7	92.3	98.1		
20 - 24	21.2	71.5	92.0	45.2	87.7	97.0		
25 - 29	17.5	63.8	89.1	38.1	83.4	95.7		
30 - 34	12.6	57.8	85.5	32.5	79.3	93.9		
35 - 39	7.4	46.3	77.7	21.9	70.6	89.4		
40 - 44	5.7	37.1	68.6	16.6	60.9	84.9		
45 - 49	3.9	24.8	55.9	11.2	46.4	75.1		
50 - 54	2.2	18.4	45.9	6.4	36.6	66.4		
55 - 59	1.0	10.8	33.3	2.9	25.1	51.5		
60 - 64	0.7	7.2	26.9	1.7	19.5	44.7		
65 - 69	0.3	4.8	21.6	0.6	14.3	39.4		
70 - 74	0.1	2.2	13.1	0.4	7.7	28.2		
75 - 79	0.0	1.3	8.6	0.1	4.5	18.5		
80 - 84	0.0	0.7	5.1	0.0	2.9	13.2		
85 - 89	0.0	0.1	3.0	0.0	0.8	7.9		
90 - 94	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.7		
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Conversion of scores to poverty likelihoods: R66 legacy national and 2005 PPP legacy poverty lines using MMRP consumption

	Poverty likelihood (%)									
	R68									
	Natio	nal Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPP		RI	BI
Score	100%	150%	200%	<100% Natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
0–4	76.4	98.1	99.5	58.0	32.2	89.6	95.8	96.5	99.8	86.0
5 - 9	70.9	97.3	99.3	48.3	21.1	82.9	94.0	95.7	99.5	86.0
10 - 14	61.8	93.8	98.8	41.2	18.3	75.2	90.0	92.3	96.7	85.2
15 - 19	51.7	90.6	97.2	30.0	13.7	66.1	86.8	89.7	94.3	84.4
20 - 24	44.6	85.8	97.0	20.8	11.1	59.4	79.3	83.0	93.8	84.4
25 - 29	37.5	81.5	95.4	17.6	7.9	50.3	75.1	79.2	93.0	84.4
30 - 34	31.5	77.1	93.2	12.6	5.9	45.1	69.5	74.1	93.0	84.4
35 - 39	22.9	69.5	88.6	6.9	3.5	34.6	59.9	65.7	89.2	83.7
40 - 44	16.9	60.8	84.2	5.3	2.6	26.8	52.2	57.3	88.8	80.5
45 - 49	11.2	46.8	75.4	3.5	1.6	20.1	37.5	42.9	88.7	78.0
50 - 54	8.0	39.1	67.7	1.8	1.2	14.2	30.8	35.2	84.5	71.9
55 - 59	5.1	28.2	55.8	0.7	0.6	8.8	22.0	25.9	76.3	63.2
60 - 64	3.1	21.9	48.1	0.5	0.2	5.7	16.4	19.2	73.4	58.6
65 - 69	1.8	18.6	43.3	0.1	0.1	4.2	13.6	16.8	66.6	50.9
70 - 74	0.9	11.9	33.9	0.0	0.1	2.0	7.8	10.7	62.1	46.9
75 - 79	0.5	7.8	26.8	0.0	0.1	1.2	4.2	6.6	56.0	40.1
80-84	0.1	4.1	17.9	0.0	0.0	0.7	3.0	3.8	54.0	38.1
85 - 89	0.0	3.1	11.7	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.9	2.5	54.0	36.3
90 - 94	0.0	0.5	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	54.0	36.3
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	48.9	36.3

Conversion of scores to poverty likelihoods: R68 national and 2011 PPP poverty lines using MMRP consumption

	Poverty likelihood (%)							
	R68							
	R	elative (p	ercentile-	based) lin	es			
Score	20^{th}	40^{th}	50^{th}	60^{th}	80^{th}			
0-4	68.5	91.9	95.1	98.3	99.6			
5 - 9	62.2	87.3	93.0	97.3	99.5			
10 - 14	52.1	81.7	88.8	94.0	99.2			
15 - 19	40.9	71.9	84.6	91.4	98.4			
20 - 24	31.2	63.6	75.5	86.1	97.5			
25 - 29	25.0	54.5	69.0	80.7	96.6			
30 - 34	18.0	46.5	62.4	75.9	94.7			
35 - 39	10.8	35.4	50.4	66.2	90.0			
40 - 44	8.2	27.1	41.1	54.8	85.3			
45 - 49	5.6	17.6	26.2	39.9	73.3			
50 - 54	2.7	10.9	18.0	29.3	65.9			
55 - 59	1.1	4.9	10.5	18.2	50.1			
60 - 64	0.8	2.8	6.6	13.2	41.8			
65 - 69	0.2	1.5	3.7	8.4	36.2			
70 - 74	0.1	0.7	1.6	4.6	24.9			
75 - 79	0.0	0.1	0.5	2.1	14.3			
80-84	0.0	0.1	0.2	1.2	10.5			
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	6.8			
90 - 94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3			
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			

Conversion of scores to poverty likelihoods: R68 relative (percentile-based) poverty lines using MMRP consumption

Note on measuring changes in poverty rates over time with the old R59, R62, or R66 scorecards and the new R68 scorecard

This paper uses data from India's 2011/12 (R68) Socio-Economic Survey (SES). It replaces Schreiner (2007, 2008a, and 2012a), which use SES data from 2003 (R59), 2005/6 (R62), and 2009/10 (R66). The new 2011/12 (R68) scorecard here should be used from now on.

Some pro-poor programs in India already use an old scorecard. Even after they switch to the new R68 scorecard, these legacy users can still estimate changes in poverty rates over time with existing baseline estimates from an old scorecard and follow-up estimates from the new scorecard. This is possible because the new scorecard is calibrated to the definitions of *poverty* used with the old scorecards. Given a poverty line, estimates of change can be found as the difference between estimated poverty rates from a baseline with the old scorecard and from a follow-up with the new scorecard.

In sum, both first-time and legacy users in India should use the new R68 scorecard from now on. Looking forward, this establishes the best baseline. Looking backward, legacy users of any of India's three old scorecards can still use existing estimates when measuring change. India's definition of *poverty* changed between the 2009/10 (R66) SES and the 2011/12 (R68) SES. In particular, India adopted the national poverty line recommended by Planning Commission (2014, the "Rangarajan Committee Report"). The new national (Rangarajan) poverty line replaces the previous national (Tendulkar) line recommended by Planning Commission (2009, the "Tendulkar Committee Report") that was used with the 2009/10 (R66) SES.

The new R68 scorecard here supports both the national (Rangarajan) lines as well as the national (Tendulkar) lines. The Rangarajan lines are recommended to programs using the scorecard from now on. Of course, programs can use the scorecard to estimate poverty rates for multiple definitions of *poverty*.

The new R68 scorecard also supports poverty definitions based on \$1.90/day/person 2011 PPP, the World Bank's newest international benchmark for extreme poverty.

Finally, the new R68 scorecard supports relative (percentile-based) poverty lines. This means that programs in health and other sectors that traditionally analyze distributions of wealth indexes can now do the same types of analyses with the scorecard.

Simple Poverty Scorecard[®] Poverty-Assessment Tool India

1. Introduction

Pro-poor programs in India can use the Simple Poverty Scorecard povertyassessment tool to estimate the likelihood that a household has consumption below a given poverty line, to measure groups' poverty rates at a point in time, to track changes in groups' poverty rates over time, and to segment participants for differentiated services.

The new scorecard uses the most recent available data for India. It replaces three older scorecards for India (Schreiner, 2007, 2008a, and 2012a) that use older data.

The direct approach to poverty measurement is difficult and costly, using a survey to ask households about a long list of consumption items. As a case in point, the Consumer Expenditure Module of India's 2011/12 (Round 68) Socio-Economic Survey runs 21 pages and covers about 375 items, many of which must be asked for each household member or have multiple sub-questions. As an example, one such item is: "How much home-produced gram (split) has the household consumed during the last 30 days? What is its value in rupees? How much total gram (split) has the household consumed during the last 30 days? What is its value in rupees? Now then, how much home-produced gram (whole) has the household consumed during the last 30 days? . . ."

1

In comparison, the indirect approach of the scorecard is quick and low-cost. It uses ten verifiable indicators (such as "Does the household possess a television?" and "What is the general education level of the female head/spouse?") to get a score that is highly correlated with poverty status as measured by the exhaustive survey.

The scorecard differs from "proxy-means tests" (Coady, Grosh, and Hoddinott, 2004) in that it is transparent, it is freely available,¹ and it is tailored to the capabilities and purposes not of national governments but rather of local, pro-poor programs. The feasible poverty-measurement options for local programs are typically blunt (such as rules based on land ownership or housing quality) or subjective and relative (such as participatory wealth ranking facilitated by skilled field workers). Poverty measures from these approaches may be costly, their accuracy is unknown, and they are not comparable across places, programs, nor time.

The scorecard can be used to measure the share of a program's participants who are below a given poverty line (for example, India's national line). USAID microenterprise partners in India can use scoring with the line that marks the poorest half of people with consumption below 100% of the national poverty line to report how many of their participants are "very poor".² Scoring can also be used to measure net

¹ The Simple Poverty Scorecard tool for India is not, however, in the public domain. Copyright is held by the sponsor and by Microfinance Risk Management, L.L.C. ² USAID defines a household as *very poor* if its daily per-capita consumption is less than the highest of the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line (INR25.13 for India on average) or the line (INR28.16) that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line (Table 1).

movement across a poverty line over time. In all these applications, the scorecard provides a consumption-based, objective tool with known accuracy. While consumption surveys are costly even for governments, some local pro-poor programs may be able to implement a low-cost scorecard to help with monitoring poverty and (if desired) segmenting clients for differentiated services.

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, then 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 decades, but they are rarely used to inform decisions by local, pro-poor programs. This is not because they do not work, but because they are often presented (when they are presented at all) as tables of regression coefficients incomprehensible to non-specialists (with cryptic indicator names such as "LGHHSZ_2" and with points with negative values and many decimal places). Thanks to the predictive-modeling phenomenon known as the "flat maximum", simple, transparent approaches are usually about as accurate as complex, opaque ones (Schreiner, 2012b; Caire and Schreiner, 2012).

Beyond its low cost and transparency, the technical approach of the scorecard is innovative in how it associates scores with poverty likelihoods, in the extent of its accuracy tests, and in how it derives formulas for standard errors. Although the accuracy tests are simple and commonplace in statistical practice and in the for-profit field of credit-risk scoring, they have rarely been applied to poverty measurement via scorecards.

The scorecard is based on the 2011/12 (Round 68) Consumer Expenditure Module of the Socio-Economic Survey conducted by India's National Sample Survey Office (NSSO).³ 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
- Applicable in all regions and ways of life in India

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). Nonspecialists can collect data and tally scores on paper in the field in about ten minutes.

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

³ Before R66, Office in "National Sample Survey Office" was Organisation.

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

Third, the scorecard can estimate the annual rate of change in the poverty rate. With two independent samples from the same population, this is the difference in the average poverty likelihood in the baseline sample versus the average likelihood in the follow-up sample, divided by the difference (in years) between the average interview date in the baseline sample and the average interview date in the follow-up sample. With one sample in which each household is scored twice, the estimate is the sum of each household's change in its poverty likelihood from baseline to follow-up, divided by the sum the years that passed between each household's two interviews (Schreiner, 2014a).

The scorecard can also be used to segment participants for differentiated services. To help managers choose appropriate targeting cut-offs for their purposes, several measures of targeting accuracy are reported for a range of possible cut-offs.

This paper presents a single scorecard whose indicators and points are derived from household consumption data and India's national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line.⁴ Scores from this one scorecard are calibrated to poverty likelihoods for 31 poverty lines. In particular, it is calibrated to all the absolute lines used in earlier scorecards (Schreiner, 2007, 2008a, and 2012a). Thus, users of those scorecards can

 $^{^{\}scriptscriptstyle 4}$ The distinction between MMRP versus MRP consumption is discussed later.

switch to the new scorecard here and measure change over time by combining existing estimates from an old scorecard with estimates from the new scorecard.

The new R68 scorecard is constructed using data on half of the households for whom MMRP consumption was collected in R68. That same data—along with data on half of the households for whom MRP consumption was collected in R68—is used to calibrate scores to poverty likelihoods for 31 poverty lines. Data on all other R68 households is used to validate the scorecard's accuracy for estimating households' poverty likelihoods, for estimating groups' poverty rates at a point in time, and for segmenting participants.

Furthermore, the accuracy of estimates of changes in poverty rates over time is measured using an R68 validation samples (baseline) and a validation sample from R59, R62, or R66 (follow-up).

All three scoring-based estimators (the poverty likelihood of a household, the poverty rate of a group of households at a point in time, and the annual rate of change in the poverty rate over time) are *unbiased*. That is, they match the true value on average in repeated samples when constructed from (and applied to) a single, unchanging population in which the relationship between scorecard indicators and poverty is unchanging. Like all predictive models, the scorecard here is constructed from a single sample and so misses the mark to some unknown extent when applied (as in this paper) to validation samples. Furthermore, it makes errors when applied (in

 $\mathbf{6}$

practice) to a different population or when applied before or after 2011/12 (because the relationships between indicators and poverty change over time).⁵

Thus, while the indirect scoring approach is less costly than the direct survey approach, it makes errors when applied in practice. (Estimates from the direct survey approach are error-free by definition.) There are errors because scoring necessarily assumes that future relationships between indicators and poverty in all possible groups of households will be the same as in the construction data. Of course, this assumption inevitable in predictive modeling—holds only partly.

When applied to the R68 validation samples for India with 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 16,384, the average difference (error) between scorecard estimates of groups' poverty rates and the true rates at a point in time for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line is +1.3 percentage points (Table 7). The average absolute difference across all 29 non-RBI lines⁶ is 0.9 percentage points, and largest absolute difference for any poverty line is 2.6 percentage points.⁷

⁵ Important cases include nationally representative samples at a later point in time or sub-groups that are not nationally representative (Diamond *et al.*, 2016; Tarozzi and Deaton, 2009).

⁶ As discussed in the appendix, the two RBI poverty lines are non-standard.

⁷ These differences reflect estimation errors due to sampling variation, not bias; the average difference would be zero if the whole R68 SES survey were to be repeatedly refielded and divided into sub-samples before repeating the entire process of constructing and validating scorecards.

With n = 16,384, the 90-percent confidence intervals for these estimates (again excluding RBI lines) are ± 1.0 percentage points or less. For n = 1,024, the 90-percent intervals are ± 4.0 percentage points or less.

To check the accuracy of estimates of changes in poverty rates over time, the new R68 scorecard is applied to data—corresponding to a given definition of *poverty* from the R68 validation samples (as a baseline) and to validation samples from R59, R62, or R66 (as a follow-up).

Across 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384, the average absolute error across the 43 year-pairs with comparable definitions of poverty is about 3.0 percentage points. For comparison, the average absolute true change is about 9.6 percentage points. Thus, the average absolute error is about one-third of the true change.

In terms of precision, the 90-percent confidence interval (with n = 1,024) of the estimated change includes the true value for 33 of 43 estimates (about three in four). The 90-percent confidence intervals with n = 1,024 are fairly wide, so the estimated direction of change matches the true direction and is "statistically significant" (the confidence interval does not include zero) for 26 of 43 estimates (about three in five). Whether this accuracy is adequate depends on the specific purpose and context. The largest errors for estimates of change are negative and are for MRP definitions between R68 to R66, consistent with the idea (Narayan and Murgai, 2016) that droughts in R66 depressed the measured reduction in poverty (but not the real reduction) between R62 and R66, with the missed reduction then showing up in the estimate between R66 and R68.

Section 2 below documents data and the definition of *poverty*. Sections 3 and 4 describe scorecard construction and offer guidelines for implementation. Sections 5 and 6 tell how to estimate households' poverty likelihoods and groups' poverty rates at a point in time. Section 7 discusses estimating changes in poverty rates over time. Section 8 covers targeting. Section 9 places the scorecard here in the context of related exercises for India. The last section is a summary.

The "Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators" tells how to ask questions (and how to interpret responses) so as to mimic practice in India's SES as closely as possible. These "Guidelines" (and the "Back-page Worksheet") are integral parts of the Simple Poverty Scorecard tool.

The appendix documents the definitions of *poverty* supported for the new R68 scorecard.

2. Data, and definitions of *poverty*

This section discusses the data used to construct and validate the scorecard. It also documents the definitions of *poverty* used here as well as the 31 poverty lines to which scores are calibrated. The appendix "Definitions of *Poverty*: Lines and Consumption" goes into these topics in more detail.

2.1 Data and definitions of consumption

	$\overline{\mathbf{Fiel}}$	ldwork	n by consu	<u>imption def.</u>
Round	Start	\mathbf{End}	MRP	MMRP
59	1jan2003	31 dec 2003	41,013	
62	1jul2005	30jun 2006	$39,\!436$	
66	1jul2009	30jun 2010	$100,\!855$	100,794
68	1jul2011	30jun 2012	$101,\!662$	$101,\!651$

This paper uses data from four rounds of the SES:

As suggested by the table, India uses two definitions of consumption:

- MRP: Mixed Reference Period
- MMRP: Modified Mixed Reference Period

The *reference period* refers to the time frame for which households report

consumption. The two definitions differ in that frequently purchased staple foods have a

reference period of seven days under MMRP but 30 days under MRP.

MRP consumption was collected for all households in R59 and R62 and for about

half of households in R66 and R68. MMRP consumption was collected for about half of

households in R66 and R68 (and not at all in R59 and R62). MMRP consumption is

more in line with international practice, and India's national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP)

poverty line uses MMRP. Thus, MMRP consumption (and its corresponding poverty

lines) will likely be the most relevant in India from now on.

For the purposes of the scorecard, data from the four SES rounds is divided into

a number of sub-samples (Table 1):

- *Construction* for selecting indicators and points. This uses data on half of the R68 households from whom MMRP consumption was collected
- *Calibration* for associating scores with poverty likelihoods:
 - For MMRP-based definitions of *poverty*, the calibration sub-sample is the same as the construction sub-sample
 - For MRP-based definitions of *poverty*, the calibration sub-sample uses data on half of the R68 households for whom MRP consumption was collected
- *Validation* for testing accuracy *out-of-sample* (on data not used in construction nor calibration) and *out-of-time* (on data collected in a different SES round than that used in construction and calibration):
 - For MMRP-based definitions of *poverty*:
 - The R68 MMRP validation sub-sample includes R68 households for whom MMRP consumption was collected and who are not in the construction nor calibration sub-samples
 - The R66 MMRP validation sub-sample includes all R66 households for whom MMRP consumption was collected
 - For MRP-based definitions of *poverty*:
 - The R68 MRP validation sub-sample has data from all R68 households for whom MRP consumption was collected who are not in the R68 calibration sub-sample
 - The R66 MRP validation sub-sample has data from all R66 households for whom MRP consumption was collected
 - The R62 MRP validation sub-sample has data from all R62 households
 - The R59 MRP validation sub-sample has data from all R59 households

2.2 Poverty rates at the household, person, or participant level

A *poverty rate* is the share of units in households in which total household consumption (divided by the number of household members) is below a given poverty line. The unit of analysis is either the household itself or a person in the household. By assumption, each household member has the same poverty status (or estimated poverty likelihood) as the other members in that same household.

To illustrate, suppose a program serves two households. The first household is poor (its per-capita consumption is less than a given poverty line), and it has three members, one of whom is a program participant. The second household is non-poor and has four members, two of whom are program participants.

Poverty rates are in terms of either households or people. If the program defines its *participants* as households, then the household level is relevant. The estimated household-level poverty rate is the weighted⁸ average of poverty statuses (or estimated poverty likelihoods) across households with participants. This is

 $\frac{1 \cdot 1 + 1 \cdot 0}{1 + 1} = \frac{1}{2} = 0.5 = 50$ percent. In the "1 · 1" term in the numerator, the first "1" is

the first household's weight, and the second "1" is the first household's poverty status (poor). In the " $1 \cdot 0$ " term in the numerator, the "1" is the second household's weight, and the "0" is the second household's poverty status (non-poor). The "1 + 1" in the

⁸ The example here assumes simple random sampling at the household level. This means that each household has the same weight, taken here to be one (1).

denominator is the sum of the weights of the two households. Household-level weights are used because the unit of analysis is the household.

Alternatively, a person-level rate is relevant if a program defines all people in households that benefit from its services as *participants*. In the example here, the person-level rate is the household-size-weighted⁹ average of poverty statuses for households with participants, or $\frac{3 \cdot 1 + 4 \cdot 0}{3 + 4} = \frac{3}{7} = 0.43 = 43$ percent. In the "3 · 1" term in the numerator, the "3" is the first household's weight because it has three members, and the "1" is its poverty status (poor). In the "4 · 0" term in the numerator, the "4" is the second household's weight because it has four members, and the zero is its poverty status (non-poor). The "3 + 4" in the denominator is the sum of the weights of the two households. A household's weight is its number of members because the unit of analysis is the household member.

As a final example, a program might count as *participants* only those household members with whom it deals with directly. For the example here, this means that some—but not all—household members are counted. The person-level rate is now the participant-weighted average¹⁰ of the poverty statuses of households with participants,

or $\frac{1 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 0}{1 + 2} = \frac{1}{3} = 0.33 = 33$ percent. The first "1" in the "1 \cdot 1" in the numerator is the

⁹ Given simple random sampling at the household level, a household's person-level weight is the number of people in the household.

¹⁰ Given simple random sampling at the household level, a household's participant-level weight is the number of participants in the household.

first household's weight because it has one participant, and the second "1" is its poverty status (poor). In the " $2 \cdot 0$ " term in the numerator, the "2" is the second household's weight because it has two participants, and the zero is its poverty status (non-poor). The "1 + 2" in the denominator is the sum of the weights of the two households. Each household's weight is its number of participants because the unit of analysis is the participant.

To sum up, estimated poverty rates are weighted averages of households' poverty statuses (or estimated poverty likelihoods), where—assuming simple random sampling—the weights are the number of relevant units in the household. When reporting, programs should make explicit the unit of analysis—household, household member, or participant—and explain why that unit is relevant.

Table 1 (spanning four pages) reports 31 poverty lines and their corresponding poverty rates for households and people in the four SES rounds for India as a whole, for the construction/calibration samples, and for the validation samples. For the example of 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line in R68, Table 1 reports an average all-India poverty line of INR36.39 per person per day, giving a householdlevel poverty rate of 24.0 percent and a person-level poverty rate of 29.2 percent.

The unnumbered tables at the end of this paper report these same things for India as a whole and also for each state/Union Territory at the levels of urban, rural, and the given entity as a whole. For the all-India case, 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line in R68 in urban areas is INR46.35 per person per day,

14

corresponding with poverty rates of 19.8 percent (households) and 26.4 percent (people). In rural areas, the line is INR32.41, with poverty rates of 25.9 percent (households) and 30.4 percent (people). For India as a whole, the figures of course match those in Table 1: a line of INR36.39, a household-level poverty rate of 24.0 percent, and a person-level poverty rate of 29.2 percent.

Household-level poverty rates are reported because—as shown above—householdlevel poverty likelihoods can be straightforwardly converted into poverty rates for other units of analysis. This is also why the scorecard is constructed, calibrated, and validated with household weights. Person-level poverty rates are also included in Table 1 and in the unnumbered tables at the end of this paper because these are the rates reported by the government of India. Furthermore, popular discussions and policy discourse usually proceed in terms of person-level rates.

2.3 Definitions of *poverty*, and the national poverty line

A household's *poverty status* as poor or non-poor depends on whether its percapita consumption (either MRP or MMRP) is below a poverty line. Thus, a definition of *poverty* is the combination of a poverty line with a measure of consumption.

Because local pro-poor programs in India may want to use different or various definitions of *poverty*, and because measuring changes in poverty rates between two points in time requires that the same definition of *poverty* be used at both baseline and follow-up, scores from the new R68 scorecard are calibrated with 31 definitions of

poverty:

- R59 legacy MRP definitions:
 - National (R59 legacy Saxena MRP)
 - $\$1.08/{\rm day}$ 1993 PPP R59 legacy MRP
 - \$2.16/day 1993 PPP R59 legacy MRP
- R62 legacy MRP definitions:
 - National (R62 legacy Saxena MRP)
 - 1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP
 - 0.81/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP
 - 1.35/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP
 - 1.62/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP
 - \$2.16/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP
- R66 legacy MRP definition:
 - National (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP)
- R66 legacy MMRP definitions:
 - 100% of national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP)
 - 150% of national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP)
 - 200% of national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP)
 - 1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP
 - 1.88/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP
 - $2.50/{\rm day}$ 2005 PPP R
66 legacy MMRP
- R68 MMRP definitions:
 - 100% of national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP)
 - 150% of national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP)
 - 200% of national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP)
 - Line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line
 - \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP
 - \$3.10/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP
 - \$3.80/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP
 - \$4.00/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP
 - RBI urban R68 MMRP
 - RBI rural R68 MMRP
- R68 MMRP definitions of (percentile-based) lines:
 - First-quintile (20th-percentile) R68 MMRP line
 - Second-quintile (40^{th} -percentile) R68 MMRP line
 - Median (50th-percentile) R68 MMRP line
 - Third-quintile (60^{th} -percentile) R68 MMRP line
 - Fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) R68 MMRP line

The appendix "Definitions of *Poverty*: Lines and Consumption" gives details for each of the 31 definitions of *poverty*. An overview follows.

R59 legacy MRP definitions

The R59 legacy MRP definitions of *poverty* are calibrated to scores from the old R59 and R66 scorecards, but not scores from the old R62 scorecard (Schreiner, 2007, 2008a, and 2012a). Calibrating the R59 legacy MRP definitions now to scores from the new R68 scorecard allows measuring changes in poverty rates between two points in time in which the baseline comes from an old R59 or R66 scorecard and the follow-up comes from the new R68 scorecard. This allows current users of an old R59 or R66 scorecard to switch to the new R68 scorecard without having to start from scratch when measuring change over time.

The R59 legacy MRP definitions will not be supported in future updates of the scorecard, so anyone still using them should switch to the new R68 scorecard and its R68 definitions of *poverty*.

<u>R62 legacy MRP definitions</u>

R62 legacy MRP definitions of *poverty* were calibrated to scores from the old R62 and R66 scorecards (Schreiner, 2008a and 2012a). Calibrating these now to the new R68 scorecard lets existing users of the R62 legacy definitions move to the new scorecard and still be able to measure change over time with a baseline estimate from an old R62 or R66 scorecard and a follow-up estimate from the new R68 scorecard.¹¹

The R62 legacy MRP definitions of *poverty* will not be supported in future updates of the scorecard, so anyone still using them should switch to the new R68 scorecard and its R68 definitions of *poverty*.

<u>R66 legacy MRP definition</u>

The national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line is calibrated to scores from the old R66 scorecard and the new R68 scorecard (Schreiner, 2012a). This is India's official poverty line for R66.

Calibrating this now to the new R68 scorecard lets existing users of the R66 legacy MRP Tendulkar definition move to the new R68 scorecard and still be able to measure change over time with a baseline estimate from the old R66 scorecard and a follow-up estimate from the new R68 scorecard.

<u>R66 legacy MMRP definitions</u>

R66 legacy MMRP definitions are calibrated to scores from the old R66 scorecard (Schreiner, 2012a) and from the new R68 scorecard here.¹² Because the R66 legacy definitions use MMRP consumption, and because MMRP consumption was

¹¹ The R59 legacy MRP definitions of *poverty* are not comparable with the R62 legacy MRP definitions. Thus, changes in poverty over time cannot be estimated with a baseline from the old R59 scorecard and a follow-up from the old R62 scorecard. ¹² The R66 line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line is not supported for the new R68 scorecard as it is not constant in real terms over time and so cannot be used to estimated changes over time.

collected only in R66 and R68, they cannot be calibrated to scores from the old R59 and R62 scorecards (Schreiner, 2007 and 2008a).¹³

The R66 legacy MMRP definitions of *poverty* are based on Planning Commission (2009, also known as the "Tendulkar Committee Report"). They replace the Saxena (Lakdawala) lines. Planning Commission (2009) presents the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line for R61 and documents its derivation. Planning Commission (2014) presents the Tendulkar lines for R66 and R68. The R66 Tendulkar lines in Planning Commission (2014) are used in this paper. They differ slightly from those used by Schreiner (2012a) with the old R66 scorecard.

The 1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 MMRP legacy line is most often used to compare (or aggregate) estimates of consumption-based poverty across countries. Among other things,¹⁴ it assumes that:

- PPP factors are accurate (Deaton, 2010)
- Each country measures consumption (and not income)
- Each country measures consumption in the same way

The appendix discusses the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line in detail. The line is partly based on the the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line in that the area- and state-specific price adjustments implied by the Tendulkar lines are applied to the \$1.25/day lines.

¹³ The national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line is not MMRP, but it did not exist until R66 and so it is not calibrated with scores from the old R59 and R62 scorecards. ¹⁴ Ferreira *et al.* (2015) discuss the many assumptions and challenges involved in trying to aggregate or compare a measure of consumption-based poverty across countries.

<u>R68 MMRP definitions</u>

From now on, users of the scorecard should use R68 definitions of *poverty* except when they want to measure change over time with a baseline estimate from an old scorecard and a follow-up estimate from the new R68 scorecard. For all other purposes, R68 definitions are both technically better and more relevant for most purposes and discussions in India.

R68 definitions of *poverty* are calibrated to scores from the old R66 scorecard (Schreiner, 2012a) and to scores from the new R68 scorecard here.¹⁵ Because the R68 definitions use MMRP consumption, and because MMRP consumption was collected only in R66 and R68, they are not calibrated to scores from the old R59 and R62 scorecards (Schreiner, 2007 and 2008a).

All R68 definitions of *poverty* are based (completely or partly) on the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) lines in Planning Commission (2014, also known as the "Rangarajan Committee Report").¹⁶ The Rangarajan lines replace the Tendulkar lines as the most relevant poverty lines in India.

According to Planning Commission (2014), the Tendulkar and Rangarajan approaches adjust for price differences across areas, states, and survey rounds in about

¹⁵ R68 definitions that are not in constant in real terms over time—and that thus cannot be used to estimate changes over time—are calibrated only to the new R68 scorecard and not to the old R66 scorecard. These time-varying definitions include the R68 line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line and all five relative (percentile-based) MMRP lines. ¹⁶ The national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line did not exist until R68, so it is not calibrated with scores from the old R59 and R62.

the same way. As argued in the appendix, however, the Rangarajan lines represent a technical and normative improvement over the Tendulkar lines. In technical terms, Rangarajan follows a cost-of-basic-needs approach that is closer to international practice. Furthermore, Rangarajan uses two (urban and rural) consumption baskets, rather than applying a single (urban) basket in both areas. And finally, Rangarajan uses MMRP consumption, while Tendulkar uses MRP consumption.¹⁷ In normative terms, the Rangarajan lines give higher poverty rates and thus are closer to what poverty rates would be by a common-sense/colloquial standard.

In R68, 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line on average for India as a whole is INR36.39 per person per day (Table 1).¹⁸ The corresponding householdlevel poverty rate is 24.0 percent, and the person-level poverty rate is 29.2 percent. Given that the R66 person-level poverty rate for this line was 37.9 percent, this is a decrease between R66 and R68 of about 8.7 percentage points. In two year's time, the number of people below this poverty line decreased by about 90 million, an unprecendented combination of improvement and scale.

¹⁷ The old R66 scorecard and the new R68 scorecard support both Tendulkar MRP lines as well as Tendulkar MMRP lines. The Tendulkar MMRP lines, however, are recommended over the Tendulkar MRP line.

 $^{^{18}}$ 150% and 200% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) lines are also supported here for use by pro-poor programs for whom a higher poverty line is more relevant.

Microenterprise programs in India who use the scorecard to report the number of their participants who are "very poor" to USAID should use the line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line. This is because USAID defines the "very poor" as those people in households whose daily per-capita consumption is below the highest of the following two poverty lines:

- The line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line (INR28.16 in R68, with a person-level poverty rate of 14.6 percent, Table 1)
- \$1.25/day 2005 PPP (INR25.13 in R68, with a person-level poverty rate of 7.2 percent)

The line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line is defined as the median aggregate household per-capita consumption of people (not households) below 100% of the national line (U.S. Congress, 2004). The derivation puts area- and state-specific price adjustments in consumption, rather than the poverty line (see appendix). USAID (2014, p. 8) has approved the scorecard—when re-branded as a Progress Out of Poverty Index[®]—for use by its microenterprise partners.

The \$1.90/day 2005 PPP R68 MMRP line is the current "international extreme poverty line" used by the World Bank and PovcalNet (Ferreira *et al.*, 2015) to compare (or aggregate) estimates of consumption-based poverty across countries. Other than the use of newer and better PPP factors, newer and better country-level data, and data for more countries, the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP MMRP line is like the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line in its derivation, assumptions, and challenges.

22

The appendix discusses the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line in detail. It is partly based on the the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in that the area- and state-specific price adjustments implied by the Rangarajan lines are also applied with the \$1.90/day lines.

Finally, microlenders in India can apply the RBI urban and rural lines to determine whether their loan portfolios qualify for priority-sector funding (Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation 2011; Planning Commission, 2011). As detailed in the appendix, the definition of *poverty* implied by the RBI lines has little justification and probably creates incentives that serve to reduce financial inclusion for the poor (the opposite of the stated purpose for tying the RBI lines to eligibility for subsidies). The only reason to use the scorecard with the RBI lines is to check a box in order to qualify for subsidies. They do not produce quality estimates of poverty.

The appendix details the drawbacks of the RBI lines. If the RBI is going to require microlenders to prove their poverty outreach to qualify for subsidized funding, then it should certify the use of the scorecard and replace the RBI lines with some multiple of the national (R68 Rangarjan MMRP) line.

23

<u>R68 definitions (percentile-based) lines that use MMRP consumption</u>

The new R68 scorecard is the first in India to support relative (percentile-based) poverty lines. Relative lines allow scoring to be used in a number of types of analyses more straightforwardly than before. The appendix details their derivation.

For example, the second-quintile (40th-percentile) line might be used to help track India's progress toward the World Bank's (2013) goal of "shared prosperity/inclusive economic growth", defined as income growth among the bottom 40 percent of the world's people.

The five quintile lines, analyzed together, can be used to look at the relationship of consumption with health outcomes (or anything else related with the distribution of consumption). Until now, such health-equity analyses often used a "wealth index" such as that supplied with the data from the Demographic and Health Surveys (Rutstein and Johnson, 2004) to compare some aggregation of wealth with health outcomes.

Of course, analysts could always do (and still can do) relative-wealth analyses with scores from the scorecard. But support for relative consumption lines now allows a more straightforward use of a single tool (the scorecard) to analyze any or all of:

- Relative wealth (via scores)
- Absolute consumption (via poverty likelihoods and absolute poverty lines)
- Relative consumption (via poverty likelihoods and percentile-based poverty lines)

Unlike the scorecard, wealth indexes only serve to analyze relative wealth. Furthermore, the scorecard—unlike wealth indexes based on Principal Component Analysis or similar approaches—is tied to a straightforward, well-understood standard (consumption related to a poverty line defined in monetary terms) whose definition is external to the scorecard itself.

In contrast, a wealth index opaquely defines *poverty* in terms of its own indicators and points, without reference to a transparent, external standard. Two wealth indexes with different indicators or different points—both based on the same data for a given country—imply two different definitions of *poverty*. In the same set-up, two scorecards would both measure a single definition of *poverty*.

3. Scorecard construction

For India, about 75 candidate indicators are initially prepared in the areas of:

- Household composition (such as the number of members)
- Education (such as the general education level of the female head/spouse)
- Housing (such as the main type of cooking fuel)
- Ownership of durable assets (such as refrigerators or televisions)
- Employment (such as the household's labour type)
- Agriculture (such as hectares of land owned)

Table 2 lists the candidate indicators, ordered by the entropy-based "uncertainty coefficient" (Goodman and Kruskal, 1979) that measures how well a given indicator predicts poverty status on its own.¹⁹

The scorecard itself is built using 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line and Logit regression on the construction sub-sample. Indicator selection uses both judgment and statistics. The first step is to use Logit to build one scorecard for each candidate indicator. Each scorecard's power to rank households by poverty status is measured as "c" (SAS Institute Inc., 2004).

One of these one-indicator scorecards is then selected based on several factors (Schreiner *et al.*, 2014; Zeller, 2004). These include 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, variety among indicators, applicability across regions, tendency to have a slow-changing

¹⁹ The uncertainty coefficient is not used to help select scorecard indicators; it is just a way to order the candidate indicators listed in Table 2.

relationship with poverty over time, relevance for distinguishing among households at the poorer end of the distribution of consumption, and verifiability.

A series of two-indicator scorecards are then built, each adding a second indicator to the one-indicator scorecard selected from the first round. The best twoindicator scorecard is then selected, again using judgment to balance statistical accuracy with the non-statistical criteria. These steps are repeated until the scorecard has 10 indicators that work well together.²⁰

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 similar to common R^2 -based stepwise least-squares regression. It differs from naïve stepwise in that the selection of indicators considers both statistical²¹ and non-statistical criteria. The use of non-statistical criteria can improve robustness through time and helps ensure that indicators are simple, common-sense, and acceptable to users.

The single scorecard here applies to all of India. Tests for Indonesia (World Bank, 2012), Bangladesh (Sharif, 2009), India and Mexico (Schreiner, 2006 and 2005a), Sri Lanka (Narayan and Yoshida, 2005), and Jamaica (Grosh and Baker, 1995) suggest

²⁰ For India, indicator selection was also informed by feedback from a field test by Grameen Foundation India and Cashpor Micro Credit.

²¹ The statistical criterion for selecting an indicator is not the p values of its coefficients but rather the indicator's contribution to the ranking of households by poverty status.
that segmenting scorecards by urban/rural does not improve targeting accuracy much. In general, segmenting scorecards may improve the accuracy of estimates of poverty rates (Diamond *et al.*, 2016; Tarozzi and Deaton, 2009), but it may also increase the risk of overfitting (Haslett, 2012).

Nevertheless, India is a huge country, and it may be difficult to believe that a single all-India scorecard can work well in all regions. Thus, Schreiner (2012a) tested segmented scorecards (and discussed the results with key users) for four regions:

- South and west urban
- South and west rural
- North, central, and east urban
- North, central, and east rural

Two types of segmentation were tested:

- Calibrate scores from the single all-India R66 scorecard to segment-specific poverty likelihoods
- Construct and calibrate region-specific scorecards from scratch

For several reasons, it was decided to stay with a single all-India scorecard with a single set of all-India poverty likelihoods. First, all other countries covered by the scorecard have only a single all-country scorecard. Second, having a single scorecard simplifies implementation and management. Third, while segmentation usually improves accuracy, the improvement is not dramatic and is not large enough to usually make a material difference for the most common uses of the scorecard. Fourth, segmentation is less accurate in some regions for some definitions of *poverty*. This suggests that the possible improvement available from segmentation is limited by the types of poverty indicators available in the SES data. Fifth and finally, even though segmentation generally improves accuracy a little, the key difficulty in using the scorecard to improve social-performance management in practice is not accuracy but rather run-of-the-mill issues such as getting a representative sample of participants, recording scorecard results in a form that can be analyzed, doing the math to estimate poverty rates correctly, placing results in a context that is meaningful for addressing business questions, and generally managing the process of organizational change involved in the adoption and proper implementation of the scorecard (Schreiner, 2014a).

4. Practical guidelines for scorecard use

The main challenge of scorecard design is not to maximize statistical accuracy but rather to improve the chances that the scorecard is actually used (Schreiner, 2005b). When scoring projects fail, the reason is not usually statistical inaccuracy but rather the failure of a program to decide to do what is needed to integrate scoring in its processes and to train and convince its employees to use the scorecard properly (Schreiner, 2002). After all, most reasonable scorecards have similar targeting accuracy, thanks to the empirical phenomenon known as the "flat maximum" (Caire and Schreiner, 2012; Hand, 2006; Baesens *et al.*, 2003; Lovie and Lovie, 1986; Kolesar and Showers, 1985; Stillwell, Barron, 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 want to adopt it on their own and use it properly. Of course, accuracy matters, but it must be balanced with 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 imply a lot of additional work and if the whole process generally seems to them to make sense. To this end, India's new R68 scorecard fits on one page. The construction process, indicators, and points are simple and transparent. Additional work is minimized; non-specialists can compute scores by hand in the field because the scorecard has:

- Only 10 indicators
- Only "multiple-choice" indicators
- Only simple points (non-negative integers, and no arithmetic beyond addition)

The scorecard (and its back-page worksheet) is ready to be photocopied. A field

worker using India's new R68 scorecard would:

- Record the interview identifier, interview date, county code ("IND"), scorecard code ("004") and the sampling weight assigned by the program's survey design to the household of the participant
- Record the names and identifiers of the participant (who may not be the same as the respondent), field agent, and relevant program service point
- Complete the back-page worksheet with each household member's first name
- Record household size in the scorecard header next to "Number of household members:", and record the response to the first scorecard indicator based on the number of household members listed on the back-page worksheet
- Read each of the remaining nine questions one-by-one from the scorecard, drawing a circle around the relevant responses and their points, and writing each point value in the far right-hand column
- Add up the points to get a total score
- Implement targeting policy (if any)
- Deliver the paper scorecard to a central office for data entry and filing

Of course, field workers must be trained. The quality of outputs depends on the

quality of inputs. If programs or field workers gather their own data and believe that

they have an incentive to exaggerate poverty rates (for example, if managers or funders

reward them for higher poverty rates), then it is wise to do on-going quality control via

data review and random audits (Matul and Kline, 2003).²² IRIS Center (2007a) and Toohig (2008) are useful nuts-and-bolts guides for budgeting, training field workers and supervisors, logistics, sampling, interviewing, piloting, recording data, and controlling quality.

In particular, while collecting scorecard indicators is relatively easier than alternative ways of measuring poverty, it is still absolutely difficult. Training and explicit definitions of terms and concepts in the scorecard are essential, and field workers should scrupulously study and follow the "Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators" found at the end of this paper, as the "Guidelines"—along with the "Back-page Worksheet"—are integral parts of the Simple Poverty Scorecard tool.²³

For the example of Nigeria, one study (Onwujekwe, Hanson, and Fox-Rushby, 2006) found distressingly low inter-rater and test-retest correlations for indicators as seemingly simple as whether a household owns an automobile. At the same time, Grosh and Baker (1995) suggest that gross underreporting of assets does not affect targeting. For the first stage of targeting in a conditional cash-transfer program in Mexico,

²² If a program does not want field workers and respondents to know the points associated with responses, then it can use a version of the scorecard that does not display the points and then apply the points and compute scores later at a central office. Even if points are hidden, however, field workers and respondents can apply common sense to guess how response options are linked with poverty. Schreiner (2012d) argues that hiding points in Colombia (Camacho and Conover, 2011) did little to deter cheating and that, in any case, cheating by the user's central office was more damaging than cheating by field workers and respondents.

²³ The guidelines here are the only ones that programs should give to field workers. All other issues of interpretation should be left to the judgment of field workers and respondents, as this seems to be what India's NSSO does in the SES.

Martinelli and Parker (2007, pp. 24–25) find that "underreporting [of asset ownership] is widespread but not overwhelming, except for a few goods . . . [and] overreporting is common for a few goods". Still, as is done in Mexico in the second stage of its targeting process, most false self-reports can be corrected (or avoided in the first place) by field workers who make a home visit. This is the recommended procedure for programs who use scoring for targeting in India.

In terms of implementation and sampling design, a program must make choices about:

- Who will do the interviews
- How responses and scores will be recorded
- What participants will be interviewed
- How many participants will be interviewed
- How frequently participants will be interviewed
- 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

In general, the sampling design should follow from the program's goals for the exercise, the questions to be answered, and the budget. The main goal should be to make sure that the sample is representative of a well-defined population and that the scorecard will inform an issue that matters to the program.

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

- Employees of the program
- Third parties

Responses, scores, and poverty likelihoods can be recorded on:

- Paper in the field, and then filed at a central office
- Paper in the field, and then keyed into a database or spreadsheet at a central office
- Portable electronic devices in the field, and then uploaded to a database

Given a population of participants relevant for a particular business question,

the participants to be scored can be:

- All relevant participants (a census)
- A representative sample of relevant participants
- All relevant participants in a representative sample of relevant field offices and/or in a representative sample of relevant field agents
- A representative sample of relevant participants in a representative sample of relevant field offices in a representative sample of relevant field agents

If not determined by other factors, the number of participants to be scored can

be derived from sample-size formulas (presented later) to achieve a desired confidence

level and a desired confidence interval. To have the best chance to meaningfully inform

questions that matter to the program, however, the focus should not be on having a

sample size large enough to achieve some arbitrary level of statistical significance but

rather on having a representative sample from a well-defined population that is relevant

for a issue that matters to the program.

The frequency of application can be:

- As a once-off project (precluding measuring change)
- Every two years (or at any other fixed or variable time interval, allowing measuring change)
- Each time a field worker visits a participant at home (allowing measuring change)

When a scorecard is applied more than once in order to measure change in poverty rates, it can be applied:

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

An example set of choices is illustrated by BRAC and ASA, two microfinance organizations in Bangladesh who each have about 7 million participants and who declared their intention to apply the Simple Poverty Scorecard tool for Bangladesh (Schreiner, 2013a) with a sample of about 25,000. Their design is that all loan officers in a random sample of branches score participants in their portfolios each time they visit a participant's homestead (about once a year) as part of their standard due diligence prior to loan disbursement. They record responses on paper in the field before sending the forms to a central office to be entered into a database and converted to poverty likelihoods.

5. Estimates of a household's poverty likelihood

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 poor, the scores themselves have only relative units. For example, doubling the score decreases the likelihood of being below a given poverty line, but it does not cut it in half.

To get absolute units, scores are 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 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, scores of 20–24 have a poverty likelihood of 44.6 percent, and scores of 25–29 have a poverty likelihood of 37.5 percent (Table 3).

The poverty likelihood associated with a score varies by poverty line. For example, scores of 20–24 are associated with a poverty likelihood of 44.6 percent for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line but 11.1 percent for the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line.²⁴

 $^{^{24}}$ From Table 3 on, many tables have 31 versions, one for each of the 31 definitions of *poverty*. To keep them straight, they are grouped by definition. Single tables pertaining to all definitions appear (in four versions) with the first group of tables for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line.

5.1 Calibrating scores with poverty likelihoods

A given score is associated ("calibrated") with a poverty likelihood by defining the poverty likelihood as the share of households in the calibration sub-sample who have the score and who have per-capita consumption below a given poverty line.

For the example of 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line (Table 4), there are 6,257 (normalized) households in the calibration sub-sample with a score of 20–24. Of these, 2,789 (normalized) are below the poverty line. The estimated poverty likelihood associated with a score of 20–24 is then 44.6 percent, because $2,789 \div 6,257 = 44.6$ percent.

To illustrate with 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line and a score of 25–29, there are 9,265 (normalized) households in the calibration sub-sample, of whom 3,476 (normalized) are below the line (Table 4). The poverty likelihood for this score range is then $3,476 \div 9,265 = 37.5$ percent.

The same method is used to calibrate scores with estimated poverty likelihoods for all 31 poverty lines.²⁵

Even though the scorecard is constructed partly based on judgment related to non-statistical criteria, the calibration process produces poverty likelihoods that are objective, that is, derived from quantitative poverty lines and from survey data on

²⁵ To ensure that poverty likelihoods never increase as scores increase, likelihoods across series of adjacent scores are sometimes iteratively averaged before grouping scores into ranges. This preserves unbiasedness while keeping users from balking when sampling variation in score ranges with few households would otherwise lead to higher scores being linked with higher poverty likelihoods.

consumption. The calibrated poverty likelihoods would be objective even if the process of selecting indicators and points did not use any data at all. In fact, objective scorecards of proven accuracy are often constructed using only expert judgment to select indicators and points (Fuller, 2006; Caire, 2004; Schreiner *et al.*, 2014). Of course, the scorecard here is constructed with both data and judgment. 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 their objectivity depends on using data in score calibration, not on using data (and nothing else) in scorecard construction.

Although the points in the India scorecard are transformed coefficients from a Logit regression, (untransformed) scores are not converted to poverty likelihoods via the Logit formula of $2.718281828^{\text{score}} \ge (1 + 2.718281828^{\text{score}})^{-1}$. 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. Going from scores to poverty likelihoods in this way requires no arithmetic at all, just a look-up table. This approach to calibration can also improve accuracy, especially with large samples.

5.2 Accuracy of estimates of households' poverty likelihoods

As long as the relationships between indicators and poverty do not change over time, and as long as the scorecard is applied to households who are representative of the same population from which the scorecard was originally constructed, then 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 value. Given the assumptions above, the scorecard also produces unbiased estimates of poverty rates at a point in time and unbiased estimates of changes in poverty rates between two points in time.²⁶

Of course, the relationships between indicators and poverty do change to some unknown extent over time and also across sub-national groups in India's population. Thus, the scorecard will generally be biased when applied after June 2012 (the last month of fieldwork for the 2011/12 (R68) SES) or when applied with sub-groups that are not nationally representative.

²⁶ This is because these estimates of groups' poverty rates are linear functions of the unbiased estimates of households' poverty likelihoods.

How accurate are estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, given the

assumption of unchanging relationships between indicators and poverty over time and the assumption of a sample that is representative of India as a whole? To find out, the scorecard is applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of size n = 16,384 with the R68 MMRP validation sample and also separately—for MRP definitions of *poverty*—with the R68

MRP validation sample. Bootstrapping means to:

- Score each household in the given validation sample
- Draw a bootstrap sample *with replacement* from the given 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 consumption below a poverty line
- For each score, record the difference between the estimated poverty likelihood (Table 3) 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 two-sided intervals containing the central 900, 950, and 990 differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods

For each score range and for n = 16,384, Table 5 shows the average difference

between estimated and true poverty likelihoods. It also shows confidence intervals for

the differences.

For the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, the average poverty likelihood

across bootstrap samples for scores of 20-24 in the R68 MMRP validation sample is too

high by 2.3 percentage points. For scores of 15-19, the estimate is too high by 0.1

percentage points.²⁷

²⁷ These differences are not zero, in spite of the estimator's unbiasedness, because the scorecard comes from a single sample. The average difference by score would be zero if

The 90-percent confidence interval for the differences for scores of 20–24 is ± 4.4 percentage points (Table 5). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps, the average difference between the estimate and the true value for households in this score range is between -2.1 and +6.7 percentage points (because +2.3 – 4.4 = -2.1, and +2.3 + 4.4 = +6.7). In 950 of 1,000 bootstraps (95 percent), the difference is +2.3 \pm 5.4 percentage points, and in 990 of 1,000 bootstraps (99 percent), the difference is +2.3 \pm 7.6 percentage points.

None of the absolute differences between estimated poverty likelihoods and true values in Table 5 for the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line exceed 3.3 percentage points. There are differences because the R68 MMRP validation sample is a single sample that—thanks to sampling variation—differs in distribution from the construction/calibration sub-samples and from India's population. For targeting, however, what matters is less the difference in all score ranges and more the differences in the score ranges just above and below the targeting cut-off. This mitigates the effects of bias and sampling variation on targeting (Friedman, 1997). Section 8 below looks at targeting accuracy in detail.

samples were repeatedly drawn from the population and split into sub-samples before repeating the entire process of scorecard construction/calibration and validation.

In addition, if estimates of groups' poverty rates are to be usefully accurate, then errors for individual households' poverty likelihoods must largely balance out. As discussed in the next section, this is generally the case for nationally representative samples, although it holds less well for sub-national groups.

Another possible source of differences between estimates and true values is overfitting. The scorecard here is unbiased, but it may still be *overfit* when applied after the end of the 2011/12 (R68) SES fieldwork in June 2012. That is, the scorecard may fit the data from R68 so closely that it captures not only some real patterns but also some random patterns that, due to sampling variation, show up only in the R68 data but not in the overall population of India. Or the scorecard may be overfit in the sense that it is not robust when relationships between indicators and poverty change over time or when the scorecard is applied to samples that are not nationally representative.

Overfitting can be mitigated by simplifying the scorecard and by not relying only on data but rather also considering theory, experience, and judgment. Of course, the scorecard here does this. Combining scorecards can also reduce overfitting, at the cost of greater complexity.

42

Most errors in individual households' likelihoods do balance out in the estimates of groups' poverty rates for nationally representative samples (see the next two sections). Furthermore, at least some of the differences in change-over-time estimates come from non-scorecard sources such as changes in the relationships between indicators and poverty, sampling variation, changes in poverty lines, inconsistencies in data quality across time, and imperfections in price adjustments across time and across geographic regions. These factors can be addressed only by improving the availability, frequency, quantity, and quality of data from national consumption surveys (which is beyond the scope of the scorecard) or by reducing overfitting (which likely has limited returns, given the scorecard's parsimony).

6. 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 1 January 2016 and that they have scores of 20, 30, and 40, corresponding to poverty likelihoods of 44.6, 31.5, and 16.9 percent (100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, Table 3). The group's estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of $(44.6 + 31.5 + 16.9) \div 3 = 31.0$ percent.

Be careful; the group's poverty rate is *not* the poverty likelihood associated with the average score. Here, the average score is 30, which corresponds to a poverty likelihood of 31.5 percent. This differs from the 31.0 percent found as the average of the three individual poverty likelihoods associated with each of the three scores. Unlike poverty likelihoods, scores are ordinal symbols, like letters in the alphabet or colors in the spectrum. Because scores are not cardinal numbers, they cannot meaningfully be added up or averaged across households. Only three operations are valid for scores: conversion to poverty likelihoods, analysis of distributions (Schreiner, 2012b), or comparison—if desired—with a cut-off for targeting. The safest rule to follow is: if you are not sure what to do, then use poverty likelihoods, not scores.

44

Scores from the new R68 scorecard are calibrated with data from the 2011/12 (R68) SES for all 31 definitions of *poverty*. The process of calibrating scores to poverty likelihoods and the approach to estimating poverty rates is exactly the same for all definitions of *poverty*. For users, the only difference is in the specific look-up table used to convert scores to poverty likelihoods.

6.1 Accuracy of estimated poverty rates at a point in time

For the new R68 scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384 from the R68 MMRP validation sample and 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line, the average difference between the estimated poverty rate at a point in time versus the true rate is +1.3 percentage points (Table 7, summarizing Table 6 across all poverty lines). Across all 29 poverty lines (excluding RBI lines) in the R68 MRP and MMRP validation samples, the maximum absolute difference is 2.6 percentage points, and the average absolute difference is about 0.9 percentage points. At least part of these differences is due to sampling variation in the division of the 2011/12 (R68) SES into sub-samples.

When estimating poverty rates at a point in time for a given definition of *poverty*, the average error reported in Table 7 should be subtracted from the average poverty likelihood to give a corrected estimate. For the example of the new R68 scorecard and 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in the R68 MMRP

45

validation sample, the error is +1.3 percentage points, so the corrected estimate in the three-household example above is 31.0 - (+1.3) = 29.7 percent.

In terms of precision, the 90-percent confidence interval for a group's estimated poverty rate at a point in time with n = 16,384 is ± 1.0 percentage points or better for all non-RBI poverty lines (Table 7). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps of this size, the estimate (after correcting for the known average error) is within 1.0 percentage points of the true value.

For example, suppose that the (uncorrected) average poverty likelihood in a sample of n = 16,384 with the new R68 scorecard and 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line is 31.0 percent. Then estimates in 90 percent of such samples would be expected to fall in the range of 31.0 - (+1.3) - 0.9 = 28.8 percent to 31.0 - (+1.3) + 0.9 = 30.6 percent, with the most likely true value being the corrected estimate in the middle of this range, that is, 31.0 - (+1.3) = 29.7 percent. This is because the original (uncorrected) estimate is 31.0 percent, the average error is +1.3 percentage points, and the 90-percent confidence interval for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in the R68 MMRP validation sample with this sample size is ± 0.9 percentage points (Table 7).

6.2 Formula for standard errors for estimates of poverty rates

How precise are the point-in-time estimates? Because these estimates are averages, they have (in "large" samples) a Normal distribution and can be characterized by their average difference vis-à-vis true values (*error*), together with their standard error (*precision*).

Schreiner (2008b) proposes an approach to deriving a formula for the standard errors of estimated poverty rates at a point in time from indirect measurement via scorecards. It starts with Cochran's (1977) textbook formula of $\pm c = \pm z \cdot \sigma$ that relates confidence intervals with standard errors in the case of direct measurement of ratios, where:

 $\pm c$ is a confidence interval as a proportion (e.g., 0.02 for ± 2 percentage points),

z is from the Normal distribution and is $\begin{cases}
1.04 \text{ for confidence levels of } 70 \text{ percent} \\
1.28 \text{ for confidence levels of } 80 \text{ percent} \\
1.64 \text{ for confidence levels of } 90 \text{ percent}
\end{cases}$

 σ is the standard error of the estimated poverty rate, that is, $\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \cdot (1-\hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \phi$,

 \hat{p} is the estimated proportion of households below the poverty line in the sample,

 ϕ is the finite population correction factor $\sqrt{\frac{N-n}{N-1}}$,

N is the population size, and

n is the sample size.

For example, India's 2011/12 (R68) SES gives a direct-measurement estimate of the household-level poverty rate for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in the R68 MMRP validation sample of $\hat{p} = 24.0$ percent (Table 1). If this estimate came from a sample of n = 16,384 households from a population N of 250,562,395 (the number of households in India in 2011/12 according to the SES sampling weights), then the finite population correction ϕ is $\sqrt{\frac{250,562,395-16,384}{250,562,395-1}} = 0.999967$, which very close

to $\phi = 1$. If the desired confidence level is 90-percent (z = 1.64), then the confidence interval $\pm c$ is

$$\pm z \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \cdot (1-\hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N-n}{N-1}} = \pm 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{0.240 \cdot (1-0.240)}{16,384}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{250,562,395-16,384}{250,562,395-1}} = \pm 0.547$$

percentage points. (If ϕ were taken as 1, then the interval is still ± 0.547 percentage points.)

Unlike the 2011/12 (R68) SES, however, the scorecard does not measure poverty directly, so this formula is not applicable. To derive a formula for the new R68 scorecard, consider Table 6, which reports empirical confidence intervals $\pm c$ for the differences for the scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of various sizes from the R68 MRP and MMRP validation samples. For example, with n = 16,384 and 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in the R68 MMRP validation sample, the 90percent confidence interval is ± 0.940 percentage points.²⁸

²⁸ Due to rounding, Table 6 displays 0.9, not 0.940.

Thus, the 90-percent confidence interval with n = 16,384 is ± 0.940 percentage points for India's new R68 scorecard and ± 0.547 percentage points for direct measurement. The ratio of the two intervals is $0.940 \div 0.547 = 1.72$.

Now consider the same exercise, but with n = 8,192. The confidence interval under direct measurement and 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in the R68 MMRP validation sample is

$$\pm 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{0.240 \cdot (1 - 0.240)}{8,192}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{250,562,395 - 8,192}{250,562,395 - 1}} = \pm 0.774$$
 percentage points. The

empirical confidence interval with India's new R68 scorecard (Table 6) is ± 1.269 percentage points. Thus for n = 8,192, the ratio of the two intervals is $1.269 \div 0.774 = 1.64$.

This ratio of 1.64 for n = 8,192 is close to the ratio of 1.72 for n = 16,384. Across all sample sizes of 256 or more in Table 6, these ratios are generally close to each other, and the average of these ratios in the R68 MMRP validation sample turns out to be 1.69, implying that confidence intervals for indirect estimates of poverty rates via India's new R68 scorecard and 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line are—for a given sample size—about 69-percent wider than confidence intervals for direct estimates via the 2011/12 (R68) SES. This 1.69 appears in Table 7 as the " α factor for precision" because if $\alpha = 1.69$, then the formula for confidence intervals c for the new R68 scorecard is $\pm c = \pm z \cdot \alpha \cdot \sigma$. That is, the formula for the standard error σ

for point-in-time estimates of poverty rates via scoring is $\alpha \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p} \cdot (1-\hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N-n}{N-1}}$.

In general, α can be more or less than 1.00. When α is greater than 1.00, it means that the scorecard is less precise than direct measurement. It turns out that α is more than 1.00 for all definitions of *poverty* in Table 7.²⁹

The formula relating confidence intervals with standard errors for the scorecard can be rearranged to give a formula for determining sample size before measurement. If \tilde{p} is the expected poverty rate before measurement, then the formula for sample size nfrom a population of size N that is based on the desired confidence level that corresponds to z and the desired confidence interval $\pm c$ is

$$n = N \cdot \left(\frac{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p})}{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p}) + c^2 \cdot (N - 1)} \right).$$
 If the population N is "large" relative to the

sample size n, then the finite-population correction factor ϕ can be taken as one (1),

and the formula becomes $n = \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p}).$

To illustrate how to use this, suppose the population N is 250,562,395 (the number of households in India in 2011/12), suppose c = 0.07275, z = 1.64 (90-percent confidence), and the relevant poverty line is 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line so that the most sensible expected poverty rate \tilde{p} is India's overall

²⁹ This is much worse than for other scorecards, for which the average across lines and countries is roughly 1.00. This may be because eight of ten indicators in India's new R68 scorecard are for asset ownership, or it may be because this paper—unlike Schreiner 2007, 2008a, and 2012a—does not break households with extremely high sampling weights into multiple replicates with proportionally smaller weights. This matters because bootstrap estimates have a low "breakdown point" so that a few households with very high sampling weights can lead to high variability (Singh, 1998).

poverty rate for that line in 2011/12 (24.0 percent at the household level, Table 1). The α factor is 1.69 (Table 7). Then the sample-size formula gives

$$n = 250,562,395 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64^2 \cdot 1.69^2 \cdot 0.240 \cdot (1 - 0.240)}{1.64^2 \cdot 1.69^2 \cdot 0.240 \cdot (1 - 0.240) + 0.07275^2 \cdot (250,562,395 - 1)}\right) = 265,$$

which is close to the sample size of 256 observed for these parameters in Table 6 for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line. Taking the finite population correction factor ϕ as one (1) gives the same result, as

$$n = \left(\frac{1.69 \cdot 1.64}{0.07275}\right)^2 \cdot 0.240 \cdot (1 - 0.240) = 265.^{30}$$

Of course, the α factors in Table 7 are specific to India, its poverty lines, its poverty rates, and its scorecard. The derivation of the formulas for standard errors using the α factors, however, is valid for any poverty-measurement tool following the approach in this paper.

In practice after the end of fieldwork for the SES in June 2012, a program would select a poverty line (say, 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line), note its participants' population size (for example, N = 10,000 participants), select a desired

³⁰ Although USAID has not specified confidence levels nor intervals, IRIS Center (2007a and 2007b) says that a sample size of n = 300 is sufficient for USAID reporting. USAID microenterprise partners in India should report using the line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line. Given the α factor of 1.84 for this line in 2011/12 (Table 7), an expected before-measurement household-level poverty rate of 11.7 percent (the all-India rate for this line in 2011/12, Table 1), and a confidence level of 90 percent (z = 1.64), then n = 300 implies a confidence line interval of $\pm 1.64 \cdot 1.84 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{0.117 \cdot (1 - 0.117)}{300}} = \pm 5.6$ percentage points.

confidence level (say, 90 percent, or z = 1.64), select a desired confidence interval (say, ±2.0 percentage points, or $c = \pm 0.02$), make an assumption about \tilde{p} (perhaps based on a previous measurement such as the household-level poverty rate for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line for India of 24.0 percent in the 2011/12 (R68) SES in Table 1), look up α (here, 1.69 in Table 7), assume that the scorecard will still work in the future and for sub-groups that are not nationally representative,³¹ and then compute the required sample size. In this illustration,

$$n = 10,000 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64^2 \cdot 1.69^2 \cdot 0.240 \cdot (1 - 0.240)}{1.64^2 \cdot 1.69^2 \cdot 0.240 \cdot (1 - 0.240) + 0.02^2 \cdot (10,000 - 1)}\right) = 2,595$$

^{31} This paper reports accuracy for the scorecard applied to its validation samples, but it cannot test accuracy for later years or for sub-groups. Performance after June 2012 will resemble that in the 2011/12 (R68) SES with deterioration over time to the extent that the relationships between indicators and poverty status change.

7. 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.

When measuring change, the same definition of *poverty* must be used at both baseline and follow-up, but it is not necessary to use same scorecard at both points. For example, the baseline estimate could be from the old R59 scorecard and poverty likelihoods for the national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) line, and the follow-up estimate could be based on that same line with the new R68 scorecard.

To give an idea of how accurate the new R68 scorecard might be when used to measure changes in poverty rates over time from now on, this section looks at how accurate the scorecard would have been, had it been applied with a baseline from the new R68 scorecard applied with the R68 MRP and MMRP validation samples and a follow-up with that same new R68 scorecard applied with the:

- R66 MRP and MMRP validation samples
- R62 MRP validation sample
- R59 MRP validation sample

The tests here are stringent because:

- They compare scorecard estimates with known, true values from the SES
- Poverty rates in India fell sharply between R68 (as baseline) and each of R59, R62, and R66 (as follow-ups)
- The long time frame (about nine years between R59 and R68) increases the risk of inaccuracy due to greater changes in the relationships between indicators and poverty
- The tests are *out-of-sample* in that they use—in both baseline and follow-up—only SES data on households that is not also used in construction nor calibration of the new R68 scorecard
- The tests are *out-of-time* in that the follow-up is from a different SES round (R59, R62, or R66) than the baseline (R68)

Of course, these backward-looking tests—the only ones possible for estimates of changes in poverty rates—can only give a rough idea of how accurate the scorecard might be when used from now on. After all, the factors that mattered in the past will differ in type and degree from the factors that will matter in the future. This is the unfortunate-but-inevitable nature of scorecards.

Because estimates from the scorecard are unbiased when applied to an unchanging population in which there are unchanging relationships between indicators and poverty, inaccuracies in estimates of change between two given SES rounds must be due to:

- Sampling variation
- Inconsistent data quality
- Inconstancy in the definitions of *poverty* over time
- Imperfections in how well a definition of *poverty* captures a household's true poverty
- Changes in the relationships between indicators and poverty
- Changes in the composition of India's population

Of course, the more resistent a scorecard's estimates are to deviations from its assumptions, the better. A scorecard whose real-world inaccuracies are too much to be useful for measuring change in a given context for a given purpose can take no consolation in how well it would work in a (non-existent) world in which all of its assumptions hold.

7.1 Warning: Change is not necessarily 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 participation in a program requires knowing what would have happened to participants if they had not been participants. 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 the impact of participation only if there is some way to know—or explicit assumptions about—what would have happened in the absence of participation. And that information must come from beyond the scorecard.

7.2 Calculating estimated changes in poverty rates over time

Consider the illustration begun in the previous section. On 1 January 2016, a program samples three households who score 20, 30, and 40 and so have poverty likelihoods of 44.6, 31.5, and 16.9 percent (100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, Table 3). Correcting for the known average error of this line in the R68 MMRP validation sample of +1.3 percentage points (Table 7), the group's corrected baseline estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of [(44.6 + $31.5 + 16.9) \div 3$] – (+1.3) = 29.7 percent.

55

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

- Score a new, independent sample from the same population
- Score the same sample that was scored at baseline

By way of illustration, suppose that two years later on 1 January 2018, the program samples three additional households who are in the same population as the three original households and finds that their scores are 25, 35, and 45 (poverty likelihoods of 37.5, 22.9, and 11.2 percent, 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, Table 3). Adjusting for the known average error, the average poverty likelihood at follow-up is $[(37.5 + 22.9 + 11.2) \div 3] - (+1.3) = 22.6$ percent, an improvement of 29.7 - 22.6 = 7.1 percentage points.³² Supposing that exactly two years passed between the average baseline interview and the average follow-up interview, the estimated annual rate of decrease in poverty is $7.1 \div 2 = 3.6$ percentage points per year. About one in 14 participants in this hypothetical example cross the poverty line in 2016/8.³³ Among those who start below the line, about one in four ($7.1 \div 29.7 = 23.9$ percent) on net end up above the line.³⁴

Alternatively, suppose that the three original households who were scored at baseline are scored again on 1 January 2018. Given follow-up scores of 25, 35, and 45, their follow-up poverty likelihoods are 37.5, 22.9, and 11.2 percent. The average across

³² Of course, such a huge reduction in poverty in two years is highly unlikely (although it similar to the actual estimate for India between R66 and R68 by the national Tendulkar or Rangarajan lines), but this is just an example to show how the scorecard can be used to estimate change.

³³ This is a net figure; some start above the line and end below it, and vice versa.

³⁴ The scorecard does not reveal the reasons for this change.

households of the difference in each given household's baseline poverty likelihood and its follow-up poverty likelihood is $[(44.6 - 37.5) + (31.5 - 22.9) + (16.9 - 11.2)] \div 3 = 7.1$ percentage points. Assuming in this example that there are exactly two years between each household's interviews, the estimated annual decrease in poverty is (again) $7.1 \div 2 = 3.6$ percentage points per year.

Both approaches to estimating change through time are unbiased. In general (and unlike in the simple example here), however, they will give different estimates due to differences in the timing of interviews, in the composition of the samples, and in the nature of two samples being scored once versus one sample being scored twice (Schreiner, 2014a).

7.3 Accuracy for estimated change in two independent samples

The accuracy of scoring's estimates of changes in poverty rates over time is checked using SES data from R59, R62, R66, and R68. While one cannot "drive by looking in the rear-view mirror", historical accuracy is the best-available—but inevitably imperfect—indicator of future accuracy. There are 43 estimates of change for the 23 poverty lines for which change over time can be estimated³⁵ and the three time frames:

- R68 to R59 (10 MRP definitions of *poverty*
- R68 to R62 (10 MRP definitions)
- R68 to R66 (10 MRP definitions and 13 MMRP definitions)

The average absolute error across the 43 estimates is about 3.0 percentage points, while the average absolute true change is about 9.6 percentage points. Thus, the average absolute error is about one-third of the average absolute true change. This is not perfect, but it is likely good enough for many purposes.

For 33 of 43 estimates (about three in four), the true value is in the estimate's 90-percent confidence interval (given n = 1,024). Of course, if all of scoring's assumptions held, then nine in ten estimates would contain the true value in their 90-percent confidence intervals. Furthermore, the estimates' confidence intervals contain the true values in part because the confidence intervals are—on average—about 88 percent wider than those of direct estimates. That is, the average α factor across the 43 estimates of 1.88.

Scoring's estimates of the direction of change (that is, whether poverty increased or decreased, regardless of *how much* it increased or decreased) match the true direction of change in all 43 cases. The estimated direction is "statistically significant" in that it matches the true direction of change and in that zero is not in the estimate's 90-percent

³⁵ Changes are not estimated for eight lines whose real value is not constant over time. These include the five relative (percentile-based) lines, the two RBI lines, and the line that marks the poorest half of people below the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line.

confidence interval (given n = 1,024) for 26 of 43 cases (about three in five). This is encouraging for the hope that the scorecard can usefully estimate change over time, but it is not a very challenging test. After all, most people on the street probably can also estimate changes of direction correctly without much thought. Nevertheless, it is useful to know that scoring is not horribly off.

In sum, the scorecard almost always has the *sign* of change correct. The absolute error in the estimated *size* of change averages about one-third of the absolute true change, and about three-fifths of the true changes are in the 90-percent confidence interval of the estimated changes. Scoring's confidence intervals are about 88-percent wider than those of direct measurement. Compared with the other 12 countries with similar tests of accuracy for estimates of change over time (Schreiner, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2013a, 2013b, 2012c, 2010, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d; Schreiner and Woller (2010); and Chen and Schreiner, 2009), India's new R68 scorecard is more or less in the middle of the pack. Of course, accuracy might be worse (or better) from now on in India.

Are these estimates of change for India "accurate enough"? The answer depends, of course, on the context and purpose of a given analysis task. Sometimes scoring is adequate, sometimes not. While greater accuracy is always preferred and sought, a strength of the scorecard is that its accuracy is known, allowing transparent and intentional judgments about how much trust to put in scoring's estimates.

7.4 Precision for estimates of change in two samples

Beyond errors in the size and the sign of estimated magnitudes, another formal aspect of accuracy is the standard statistical concept of *precision*. Table 8 reports precision as 90-percent confidence intervals (given n = 16,384) and more generally as the α factor used in formulas for standard errors.

For two equal-sized independent samples, the same logic as in the previous section can be used to derive a formula relating the confidence interval $\pm c$ with the standard error σ of a scorecard's estimate of the change in poverty rates over time:

$$\pm c = \pm z \cdot \sigma = \pm z \cdot \alpha \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2 \cdot \hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{N - 1}}.$$

Here, z, c, \hat{p} and N are defined as above, n is the sample size at both baseline and follow-up,³⁶ and α is the average (across a range of bootstrapped sample sizes) of the ratio of the observed confidence interval from a scorecard and the theoretical confidence interval under direct measurement.

Given n = 16,384, the 90-percent confidence intervals for estimates of change over time are ± 2.3 percentage points or less, with an average of across the 43 cases of about ± 1.3 percentage points (Table 8).

³⁶ This means that—for a given level of precision—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.

Seen another way, the average α factor across the 43 cases in Table 8 is 1.88; scoring's standard errors for estimates of change are on average about 88-percent wider than standard errors under direct measurement.

Is this precise enough? There can be no general, once-and-for-all answer as to whether the estimation errors or standard errors of the scorecard are small enough to be useful for measuring change over time. After all, accuracy requirements vary by context and purpose. The scorecard's precision is a lot worse than that of direct measurement. As noted above, the estimated direction of change is always correct, and it is "statistically significant" (n = 1,024) in about three of five cases. The average absolute error is about one-third of the average absolute true change, and about three-fifths of estimates include the true value in their 90-percent confidence interval (n = 1,024).

Is the scorecard better than feasible alternatives for measuring change over time? This question also has no general, once-and-for-all to answer. A central strength of scoring is that its accuracy is known, while the accuracy of most alternatives is unknown or unreported (or the tool is defined so as always to be perfectly accurate). As before, the formula for standard errors can be rearranged to give a formula for sample size before indirect measurement via a scorecard, where \tilde{p} is based on previous measurements and is assumed equal at both baseline and follow-up:

$$n = 2 \cdot N \cdot \left(\frac{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p})}{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p}) + c^2 \cdot (N - 1)} \right).$$
 If ϕ can be taken as one, then the

formula becomes $n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \tilde{p} \cdot (1 - \tilde{p}).$

To illustrate the use of this formula 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 ($\pm c = \pm 0.02$), the poverty line is 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, $\alpha = 1.77$ (Table 8 for this line with R68 and R66), $\hat{p} = 0.240$ (the household-level poverty rate in 2011/12 (R68) for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in Table 1), and the population N is large enough relative to the expected sample size n that the finite population correction ϕ can be taken as one

(1). Then the baseline sample size is $n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.77 \cdot 1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 \cdot 0.240 \cdot (1 - 0.240) \cdot 1 = 7,685,$

and the follow-up sample size is also 7,685.

7.5 Precision for estimated change for one sample, scored twice

Analogous to previous derivations, the general formula relating the confidence interval $\pm c$ to the standard error σ when using a scorecard to estimate change for a single group of households, all of whom are scored at two points in time, is:³⁷

$$\pm c = \pm z \cdot \sigma = \pm z \cdot \alpha \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_{12} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{12}) + \hat{p}_{21} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{21}) + 2 \cdot \hat{p}_{12} \cdot \hat{p}_{21}}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N - n}{n - 1}},$$

where z, c, α , N, and n are defined as usual, \hat{p}_{12} is the share of all sampled households that move from below the poverty line to above it, and \hat{p}_{21} is the share of all sampled households that move from above the line to below it.

Because the SES data for India does not cover the same households in more than one round (except by pure chance, and even then, there is no way to identify such households), it is not possible to estimate values of α for the new R68 scorecard.

The formula for confidence intervals can be rearranged to give a formula for sample size before measurement. This requires an estimate (based on information available before measurement) of the expected shares of all households who cross the poverty line \tilde{p}_{12} and \tilde{p}_{21} . Before measurement, a conservative assumption is that the change in the poverty rate will be zero, which implies $\tilde{p}_{12} = \tilde{p}_{21} = \tilde{p}_*$, giving:

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \tilde{p}_* \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N-n}{n-1}}.$$

³⁷ See McNemar (1947) and Johnson (2007). John Pezzullo helped find this formula.
Because \tilde{p}_* could be anything between 0 and 0.5, more information is needed to apply this formula. Suppose that the observed relationship between \tilde{p}_* , the number of years y between baseline and follow-up, and $p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot (1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}})$ is—as in Peru (Schreiner, 2009a)—close to:

$$\tilde{p}_* = -0.02 + 0.016 \cdot y + 0.47 \cdot [p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot (1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}})].$$

Given this, a sample-size formula for a group of households to whom the new R68 scorecard is applied twice (once after June 2012 and then again later) is

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c}\right)^2 \cdot \left\{ \left[-0.02 + 0.016 \cdot y + 0.47 \cdot \left[p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot \left(1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}}\right)\right] \right\} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{N-n}{n-1}} \, .$$

In Peru (the only source of a data-based estimate, Schreiner, 2009a), the average α across years and poverty lines is about 1.30.

To illustrate the use of this formula, suppose the desired confidence level is 90 percent (z = 1.64), the desired confidence interval is ± 2.0 percentage points ($\pm c = \pm 0.02$), the poverty line is 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, the sample will first be scored in 2016 and then again in 2019 (y = 3), and the population Nis so large relative to the expected sample size n that the finite population correction ϕ can be taken as one (1). The pre-baseline poverty rate p_{2016} is taken as 24.0 percent (Table 1), and α is assumed to be 1.30. Then the baseline sample size is

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.30 \cdot 1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 \cdot \left\{-0.02 + 0.016 \cdot 3 + 0.47 \cdot [0.240 \cdot (1 - 0.240)]\right\} \cdot 1 = 2,585.$$
 The

same group of 2,585 households is scored at follow-up as well.

8. Targeting

When a program uses scoring for segmenting clients for differentiated services (*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 labeled *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* (having consumption below a poverty line). Poverty status is a fact that is defined by whether consumption 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.

Households who score at or below a given cut-off should be labeled as *targeted*,³⁸ not as *poor*. After all, unless all targeted households have poverty likelihoods of 100 percent, some of them are non-poor (their consumption is above a given poverty line). With scoring, the terms *poor* and *non-poor* have specific definitions. Using these same terms for targeting status is incorrect and misleading.

³⁸ A label is acceptable as long as it describes the segment and does not confuse targeting status (having a score below a program-selected cut-off) with poverty status (having consumption below an externally-defined poverty line). Examples of acceptable labels include *Groups A, B, and C*; *Households scoring 29 or less, 30 to 69, or 70 or more*; and *Households who qualify for reduced fees, or do not qualify for reduced fees.*

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*).

Table 9 depicts these four possible targeting outcomes. Targeting accuracy varies by the cut-off score; a higher cut-off has better inclusion (but worse leakage), while a lower cut-off has better exclusion (but worse undercoverage).

Programs 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).

Table 10 shows the distribution of households by targeting outcome for India. For an example cut-off of 24 or less, outcomes for 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in the R68 MMRP validation sample are:

- Inclusion: 12.0 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 12.0 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 9.3 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 66.7 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

Increasing the cut-off to 29 or less improves inclusion and undercoverage but

worsens leakage and exclusion:

- Inclusion: 15.5 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 8.5 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 15.3 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 60.7 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	х	Households correctly included	_
Cost per household mistakenly not covered	х	Households mistakenly not covered	_
Cost per household mistakenly leaked	х	Households mistakenly leaked	+
Benefit per household correctly excluded	х	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 Table 10 for a given poverty line
- Select the cut-off with the highest total net benefit

The most difficult step is assigning benefits and costs to targeting outcomes. A

program that uses targeting—with or without scoring—should thoughtfully consider

how it values successful inclusion and 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 the "hit rate", where total net benefit is the number of households correctly included or correctly excluded:

1	х	Households correctly included	_
0	х	Households mistakenly undercovered	_
0	х	Households mistakenly leaked	+
1	х	Households correctly excluded.	
	$egin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{array}$	1 x 0 x 0 x 1 x	1xHouseholds correctly included0xHouseholds mistakenly undercovered0xHouseholds mistakenly leaked1xHouseholds correctly excluded.

Table 10 shows the hit rate for all cut-offs for the new R68 scorecard. For 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in the R68 MMRP validation sample, total net benefit—under the hit rate—is greatest (79.3) for a cut-off of 19 or less, with about four in five households in India correctly classified.

The hit rate weighs successful inclusion of households below the line the same as successful exclusion of households above the line. If a program values inclusion more (say, twice as much) than exclusion, then it can reflect this by setting the benefit for inclusion to 2 and the benefit for exclusion to 1. Then the chosen cut-off will maximize $(2 \times \text{Households correctly included}) + (1 \times \text{Households correctly excluded}).³⁹$

³⁹ Table 10 also reports BPAC, the Balanced Poverty Accuracy Criteria adopted by USAID for certifying poverty-assessment tools. IRIS Center (2005) made BPAC to consider accuracy in terms of the bias of estimated poverty rates and in terms of targeting inclusion. BPAC = (Inclusion – |Undercoverage – Leakage|) x [100 ÷ (Inclusion + Undercoverage)]. Schreiner (2014b) explains why BPAC does not add any useful information over-and-above that provided by the other, more-standard measures here.

As an alternative to assigning benefits and costs to targeting outcomes and then choosing a cut-off to maximize total net benefits, a program could set a cut-off to achieve a desired poverty rate among targeted households. The third column of Table 11 ("% targeted HHs who are poor") shows, for the new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample, the expected poverty rate among households who score at or below a given cut-off. For the example of 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, targeting households in the R68 MMRP validation sample who score 24 or less would target 21.3 percent of all households (second column) and would be associated with a poverty rate among those targeted of 56.2 percent (third column).

Table 11 also reports two other measures of targeting accuracy. The first is a version of coverage ("% poor HHs who are targeted"). For the example of 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line with the R68 MMRP validation sample and a cut-off of 24 or less, 50.0 percent of all poor households are covered.

The final targeting measure in Table 11 is the number of successfully targeted poor households for each non-poor household mistakenly targeted (right-most column). For 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line with the R68 MMRP validation sample and a cut-off of 24 or less, covering 1.3 poor households means leaking to 1 non-poor household.

9. The context of poverty measurement tools in India

This section discusses six existing poverty-measurement tools for India in terms

of their goals, methods, definitions of *poverty*, data, indicators, bias, precision, and

cost. In general, the advantages of the scorecard are its:

- Use of data from the most recent available nationally representative consumption survey
- Fewer and lower-cost indicators
- Use of a consumption-based definition of *poverty* that is widely understood and that is used by government of India
- Applicability for a variety of types of analyses:
 - Absolute consumption (via poverty likelihoods and absolute poverty lines)
 - Relative consumption (via poverty likelihoods and percentile-based poverty lines)
 - Relative wealth (via scores)
- Reporting of errors and precision for estimates of poverty rates at a point in time from out-of-sample tests, including formulas for standard errors
- Reporting of errors and precision for estimates of changes in poverty rates over time, including formulas for standard errors
- Targeting accuracy that is likely similar to that of alternative approaches
- Feasibility for pro-poor programs in India, due to its low cost and transparency

9.1 Gwatkin et al.

Gwatkin *et al.* (2007) construct a poverty-measurement tool for India with an approach that they use in 56 countries with Demographic and Health Surveys (Rutstein and Johnson, 2004). They use Principal Components Analysis to make an asset index from simple, low-cost indicators available for the 91,196 households in India's 1998/9 DHS.⁴⁰ The PCA index is like the scorecard here except that, because the DHS does not collect data on consumption, the index is based on a different conception of *poverty*, its accuracy vis-à-vis consumption-based poverty is unknown, and it can only be assumed to be a proxy for long-term wealth/economic status.⁴¹ Well-known examples of the PCA asset-index approach include Stifel and Christiaensen (2007), Zeller *et al.* (2006), Sahn and Stifel (2003 and 2000), Henry *et al.* (2003), and Filmer and Pritchett (2001).

⁴⁰ All DHS datasets for India since 1992/3 include each household's asset-index score (dhsprogram.com/topics/wealth-index/Wealth-Index-Construction.cfm, retrieved 1 May 2016).

⁴¹ Nevertheless, the indicators are similar and the "flat maximum" is important, so carefully built PCA indexes and consumption-based scorecards may pick up the same underlying construct (perhaps "permanent income", see Bollen, Glanville, and Stecklov, 2007), and they may rank households much the same. Comparisons of rankings by PCA indexes, directly-measured consumption, and consumption-based scorecards include Filmer and Scott (2012), Howe *et al.* (2009), Lindelow (2006), Sahn and Stifel (2003 and 2000), Wagstaff and Watanabe (2003), and Montgomery *et al.* (2000).

Most of the 23 indicators in Gwatkin et al. are similar to those in the scorecard

in terms of their simplicity, low cost, and verifiability:

- Characteristics of the residence:
 - Presence of electricity
 - Type of kitchen
 - Type of floor
 - Type of wall
 - Type of roof
 - Type of cooking fuel
 - Source of drinking water
 - Frequency with which piped drinking water is available in the residence
 - Time to travel to the source of drinking water
 - Type of toilet arrangement
 - Method of disposal of solid waste
 - Number of rooms
 - Number of household members per sleeping room
- Ownership of consumer durables:
 - Radios
 - Televisions
 - Refrigerators
 - Electric water pumps
 - Land-line telephones
 - Cellular telephones
 - Computers
 - Bicycles
 - Motorcycles or scooters
 - Cars or trucks

Gwatkin *et al.* suggest three possible uses for their index:

- Segmenting households by the quintile of their index to see how health varies with socio-economic status
- Monitoring (via exit surveys) how well local health-service posts reach the poor
- Measuring local coverage of health services via small-scale surveys

The first goal is akin to targeting, and the last two goals deal with performance

monitoring, so the asset index would be used much like the scorecard here. For

example, support for relative (percentile-based) poverty lines allows users of the

scorecard to segment households by quintile to see how health (or other things) vary with consumption.

Still, the Gwatkin *et al.* index is more costly and difficult-to-use than the scorecard. The index has 23 indicators (versus 10), and while the scorecard requires adding up 10 integers (some of them usually zeroes), Gwatkin *et al.*'s index requires adding up 135 numbers, each with five decimal places and half with negative signs.

A strength of asset indexes is that, because they do not require consumption data, they can be constructed from data from a wide array of "light" surveys such as censuses, Demographic and Health Surveys, Welfare Monitoring Surveys, and Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaires. In comparison, the scorecard is linked directly to a consumption-based poverty line. Thus, while both approaches can rank households, only the scorecard can estimate consumption-based poverty status. Like an asset index, the scorecard can be applied to data from a "light" survey that does not collect consumption as long as the "light" survey collects indicators that match those in the scorecard (Schreiner, 2011).

In essence, Gwatkin *et al.*—like all asset indexes—define *poverty* in terms of the indicators and the points in the index itself. Thus, the index is not a proxy standing in for something else (such as consumption); rather, it is a direct measure of a nonconsumption-based definition of *poverty*. There is nothing wrong—and a lot right about defining *poverty* in this way, but it is not as common as a consumption-based definition. It also means that ranks from different asset indexes are not comparable, because the definition of *poverty* is based on an index's indicators and points. The asset-based approach defines people as *poor* if their assets (physical, human, financial, and social) fall below a threshold. Arguments for an asset-based view of development include Carter and Barrett (2006), Schreiner and Sherraden (2006), Sahn and Stifel (2003), and Sherraden (1991). The main advantages of the asset-based view are that:

- Asset ownership is easier to measure accurately than consumption
- Access to resources in the long term—and thus capacity to produce income and to consume—depends on the control of assets
- Assets get at capability more directly, the difference between, say, "Would income allow for adequate sanitation?" versus "Does the toilet drain to a septic tank?"

While the asset view and the income/consumption view are distinct, they are also tightly linked. After all, income and consumption are flows of resources received/consumed from the use of stocks of assets. Both views are low-dimensional simplifications—due to practical limits on definitions and measurement—of a higherdimensional and more complete conception of the production of human well-being.

9.2 Filmer and Pritchett

Filmer and Pritchett's (2001) asset index for India is the most well-known index of any country. It is based older DHS data than Gwatkin *et al.* (1992/3 instead of 1998/9). Filmer and Pritchett use the index as a proxy not for consumption but rather for long-term wealth for the purpose of predicting educational outcomes in order to inform governments and donors about education policy, not to provide a tool to help local pro-poor programs manage their social performance. While Filmer and Pritchett cannot test the accuracy of the India index directly, they test the PCA asset-index approach with consumption data from Indonesia, Nepal, and Pakistan. They find that "the asset index predicts enrollments as accurately as consumption, or more so" (p. 115).

The 16 indicators in Filmer and Pritchett are similar to those in the scorecard here in terms of their simplicity, low cost, and verifiability:

- Characteristics of the residence:
 - Number of rooms
 - Type of kitchen
 - Quality of material of construction of the residence
 - Source of energy for lighting
 - Fuel for cooking
 - Source of drinking water
 - Type of toilet arrangement
- Ownership of consumer durables:
 - Radio
 - Television
 - Clock or watch
 - Refrigerator
 - Sewing machine
 - Bicycle
 - Motorcycle or scooter
 - Automobile
- Hectares of land owned

Filmer and Pritchett's asset index for India shares many of the strengths of Gwatkin *et al.*'s index in that it can be used for targeting and in that it is flexible, lowcost, and adaptable to diverse contexts. Because it does not require price adjustments over time or between regions or countries—or even consumption data—it is more adaptable in those dimensions than the scorecard here. At the same time, Filmer and Pritchett is simpler and thus more feasible in practice than Gwatkin *et al.* because it has fewer indicators and only 21 point values (although some are negative and all have three decimal places).

Filmer and Pritchett share with Gwatkin *et al.* the disadvantages of using a lesscommon, self-referential definition of *poverty* and of not reporting standard errors nor formula for standard errors.

9.3 Zeller et al.

Like this paper and like Gwatkin *et al.*, Zeller *et al.* (2006) seek to develop a practical, low-cost, accurate way to assess the poverty of participants in local, pro-poor programs. Their benchmark for comparison is not absolute poverty status by a consumption-based poverty line but rather relative poverty compared with other households in the area.

Like Gwatkin *et al.* and like Filmer and Pritchett, Zeller *et al.* use PCA to combine indicators into an index. They pilot their approach with microfinance organizations in four countries, one of which is India. They apply a special-purpose survey to a random sample of 200 program participants and a comparison group of 300 non-participants in the credit program SHARE in rural areas of Andhra Pradesh, comparing the indexes' distribution by terciles to see whether program participants tend to be poorer. Zeller *et al.* start the construction process with a long list of potential indicators and narrow it down based on the indicators' correlation with the value of the household's consumption of clothing. In the PCA analysis, they select 20 indicators based on the statistical significance of their coefficients:

- Characteristics of the residence:
 - Presence of electricity
 - Type of floor
 - Type of wall
 - Type of roof
 - Type of cooking fuel
 - Type of toilet arrangement
 - Number of rooms per person
 - Value of the dwelling
- Education:
 - Highest educational attainment by a household member
 - Educational attainment of the household head
- Employment: Share of adults who are wage laborers
- Assets:
 - Number of radios
 - Number of fans
 - Ownership of irrigated land
- Food security and resilience:
 - 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 with luxury food 1
 - Number of days with luxury food 2
 - Number of days with inferior food

Like all asset indexes (and like the scorecard here), Zeller et al.'s index can rank

households and can be applied in diverse contexts. Its small sample, however, is not

nationally representative, so a local comparison group of non-participants must be

surveyed with each application. Furthermore, it uses a less-common, self-referential

definition of *poverty*.

Most important, many of the specific indicators for India are difficult and costly to collect. For example, most households cannot easily estimate the value of their dwelling. Also, the food-security indicators relate to historical events and so are inherently non-verifiable. Even if all these indicators could be collected accurately, they would probably not rank households much better—thanks to the "flat maximum"—than indexes using only easier-to-collect indicators.

Finally, Zeller *et al.* do not report the precise wording of their indicators (for example, the specific types of luxury and inferior foods) nor do they report points. As a consequence, a pro-poor program in India cannot simply pick up their tool and use it.

9.4 Kijima and Lanjouw

Kijima and Lanjouw (2003) use R50 data to build a poverty-measurement tool to apply to R55.⁴² They seek comparable estimates for measuring change in poverty rates over time, as R50 collects URP consumption while R55 collects both URP and MRP consumption, and collecting both from the same households is suspected to have led to contamination. Kijima and Lanjouw estimate that poverty fell less from R50 to R55 than estimated by Deaton and Drèze (2003).

Kijima and Lanjouw construct their tool with least-squares regression on the logarithm of per-capita consumption, controlling for clustered disturbances and heteroskedasticity. To get poverty rates, estimated per-capita consumption is compared to the national (R50 Saxena/Lakdawala URP or MRP) poverty line, which is adjusted for cost-of-living as in Deaton (2003). Because the data on ownership of consumer durables seems obviously inaccurate for many states in R50, one tool is built for each of the seven states of Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, and Madhya Pradesh.

⁴² This is the "poverty mapping" approach of Elbers, Lanjouw, and Lanjouw (2003). Similar exercises for other countries are Christiaensen *et al.* (2012) and Stifel and Christiaensen (2007). Also related are the 12 scorecards cited in Section 7 which test the acccuracy of estimates of change in poverty rates over time.

Kijima and Lanjouw's 12-indicator tool⁴³ is as simple as the new R68 scorecard:

- Number of household members
- District of residence
- Ownership of consumer durables:
 - Almirah/dressing table
 - Chair
 - Radio
 - Television or VCR
 - Clock or watch
 - Electric fan
 - Stove
 - Pressure cooker
 - Bicycle
 - Motorcycle

Kijima and Lanjouw state that the "wholesale application" of their tool would be "very appealing" (p. 22), although its use (as they present it) would require multiplication, logarithms, and exponentiation. Still, it could be presented in a simple format (like the scorecard) or implemented in a simple spreadsheet that would allow pro-poor programs in India to use it for monitoring and targeting.

In terms of accuracy, Kijima and Lanjouw's estimates of poverty rates are biased (Coudouel, Hentschel, and Wodon, 2002; Hentschel *et al.*, 2000). Also, they cannot test accuracy, as the true (uncontaminated) values of consumption in R55 are unknown. Like this paper, Kijima and Lanjouw must assume that the relationship between indicators and poverty is constant over time.

⁴³ Kijima and Lanjouw build two other scorecards, but they are not relevant here. The first uses components of consumption to predict total consumption, and the second uses several indicators that would be infeasible to collect from households.

Kijima and Lanjouw derive standard errors that account for survey stratification, multi-stage clustering, and the sampling variability of their estimated points. In contrast, the standard errors in this paper do not account for sample design (beyond household weights) nor the sampling variability of its estimated points, and so they are understated. This paper's standard errors do not account for these things because there is no way to know what sample designs will be used when the scorecard is applied by pro-poor programs in India.

9.5 Jalan and Murgai

Jalan and Murgai (2007) use data from R55 to assess targeting in rural areas by the "Below Poverty Line" poverty-assessment tool that the government of India prescribed for classifying households for purposes of qualifying for public assistance.⁴⁴ Jalan and Murgai also test an "augmented" poverty-assessment tool that shores up several of the weaknesses of the BPL tool. With a cut-off that targets 27.3 percent of rural people (the share below the national (R55 Lakdawala URP) poverty line), the BPL tool targets 51 percent of the poor, while Jalan and Murgai's augmented tool targets 65.5 percent.

Jalan and Murgai also analyze who is mistargeted and how far they are from the poverty line. They conclude that—compared with direct measurement—targeting via their tool leads to "high" undercoverage and that "with a high density of the population with [consumption] close to the poverty line, arriving at an effective proxy-means test is an inherently problematic and difficult exercise" (p. 1).⁴⁵

The BPL tool has 21 indicators, three of them present in R55 data:

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

 $^{^{\}scriptscriptstyle 44}$ Implementation of the BPL scorecard has been slow and uneven.

⁴⁵ Of course, a census that measures consumption directly to establish BPL status may not be feasible. Nor is there an obvious low-cost alternative that is more accurate. For example, Jalan and Murgai show that low-cost geographical targeting is also less accurate than their augmented tool.

The other 18 indicators do not have matches in R55, and the last six are difficult

to verify:

- Whether the house is temporary (*katcha*), semi-permanent, or permanent (*pucca*)
- Type of toilet arrangement
- Labour-force status
- Ownership of consumer durables:
 - Radio
 - Television
 - Electric fan
 - Pressure cooker or pan
 - Refrigerator
 - Electric heating appliance
 - Other appliance
 - Motorcycle or scooter
 - Automobile
- 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

Jalan and Murgai match these BPL indicators with R55 indicators to the extent

possible. Each indicator has five responses, with points of 0/1/2/3/4, from poorest to

least poor.

Jalan and Murgai test whether undercoverage by the BPL tool is caused by the

simple 0/1/2/3/4 point scheme. As the "flat maximum" phenomenon would suggest, the

simple point scheme turns out to be a minor driver of undercoverage.

To test whether indicator selection and geographic segmentation matter, Jalan

and Murgai construct an augmented tool for each of 16 major states using least-squares regression of per-capita consumption on indicators for rural households in R55.⁴⁶ Five of the indicators are in the BPL tool, the last three of which 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:

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

While these augmented indicators are verifiable, computing scores requires

multiplication, division, and adjusting points by region. Thus, if BPL cards are to be

handed out on the spot, the augmented tool would be difficult to use. In addition, Jalan

and Murgai do not report points, as their purpose is solely to test targeting accuracy,

not to actually help anyone to target. In line with their targeting purpose, they do not

report bias or standard errors for estimated poverty rates.

⁴⁶ It is not clear why the government of India did not do this in the first place instead of making its BPL tool without data and then mandating its use without testing.

Compared with Jalan and Murgai's augmented tool, the one here is simpler, shorter, based on more-recent data, and more feasible in practice. Targeting accuracy is reported, as are the bias and standard errors of estimates of poverty rates.

Which approach targets better? When the cut-off is set to target 27.3 percent of rural people (that is, the share below the national line in R55), Jalan and Murgai's augmented tool includes 65.5 percent of those below the line in R55. When Schreiner (2012a) uses the old R66 scorecard in the same way with the R66 MRP validation sample (using the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R59 legacy MRP definition of *poverty* because its poverty rate for people of 25.5 percent is the closest to the 27.3 percent used by Jalan and Murgai), 72.4 percent of poor people are targeted.

The better targeting performance by the old R66 scorecard is remarkable

because:

- It uses fewer scorecards (1 for all of India, versus one for each of 16 major states)
- It uses fewer indicators (10 versus 16)
- It uses fewer difficult-to-collect indicators (zero versus five)
- It covers both urban and rural, while Jalan and Murgai cover only rural. Targeting the urban poor is more difficult because:
 - A lower share of urban households are poor
 - Most of India is rural, so scorecard indicators, responses, and points are more tuned for rural
- It is built with household weights, but it is applied in this test to people, reducing accuracy vis-à-vis construction and application with person weights, as in Jalan and Murgai
- It is tested *out-of-sample*, that is, using different data for testing than for scorecard construction/calibration. In contrast, Jalan and Murgai's test is *in-sample*, using the same data in both testing and construction. In-sample tests are known to overstate accuracy

Despite facing an uphill climb, the old R66 scorecard is about 10 percent more accurate than the tool of Jalan and Murgai. This may serve to soften their conclusion that effective targeting by poverty-measurement tools is inherently problematic.

9.6 Dang and Lanjouw

Dang and Lanjouw (2015) create "synthetic panels" from the R61, R66, and R68 cross sections to look at poverty dynamics and vulnerability in India. As part of this, they use the approach in Dang, Lanjouw, and Serajuddin (2014) to construct two poverty-assessment tools, one made with data from R61 (to estimate poverty rates in R66), and another made with data from R66 (to estimate poverty rates in R68). Because their predicted poverty rate for R68 is close to the direct-measure estimate from the SES, Dang and Lanjouw infer that "the observation of a sharply accelerated poverty decline after [R66] . . . seems robust . . . [and] is not severely over-estimated" (pp. 5 and 26). Dang and Lanjouw construct five poverty-assessment tools,⁴⁷ progressively

adding more indicators in the following sequence:

- 1. Household demographics and characteristics of the head of the household:
 - Demographics:
 - Number of household members
 - Caste
 - Religion
 - Characteristics of the head:
 - Age (and its square)
 - Sex
 - Literacy
 - Highest education level completed
- 2. Distribution of household members by age:
 - Share of members ages 0 to 14
 - Share of members ages 15 to 24
 - Share of members ages 25 to 59
- 3. Type of employment providing the most income
- 4. Tenancy of the household in its residence
- 5. Cooking fuel and ownership of consumer durables:
 - Type of cooking fuel
 - Consumer durables:
 - Radio
 - Television
 - Electric fan
 - Sewing machine
 - Freezer
 - Air conditioner
 - Bicycle
 - Motorcycle
 - Automobile

Most of these 22 indicators are like those in the scorecard. The scorecard

deliberately omits "Type of employment providing the most income" because it is difficult to collect. In particular, the SES' "Instructions to Interviewers" for this question

are incomplete, so the recorded response depends heavily on enumerator judgment. The

⁴⁷ They make five tools with linear random-effects regression and five with randomeffects Probit. The Probit estimates of poverty rates are closer to the SES values.

scorecard also omits religion and caste. These two contribute little to ranking households by poverty, and they may be embarrassing to ask or answer. Finally, the scorecard omits the distribution of household members by age so as to avoid requiring enumerators to compute shares and because users tend to dislike scorecards that seem to be dominated by aspects of household size.

As the definition of *poverty*, Dang and Lanjouw use 100% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line. This gives person-level poverty rates of 29.9 percent in R66 and of 22.0 percent in R68 (Table 1). For their preferred R66 tool (Probit with the first four sets of indicators) applied forward in time to R68, the estimate is 0.9 percentage points too high. For comparison, applying the new R68 scorecard applied backward in time to R66 gives an estimate that is 3.4 percentage points too low. While the comparison is not completely apples-to-apples, it does suggest that Dang and Lanjouw's tool is more accurate for this pair of survey rounds and for this definition of *poverty*.

Dang and Lanjouw (2015) and Dang, Lanjouw, and Serajuddin (2014) conclude that poverty-assessment tools following their approach are accurate enough to be useful for estimating poverty rates out-of-sample and out-of-time. While the approach of the scorecard differs in a number of ways, the results for the "synthetic panel" approach encourage the hope that the scorecard's estimates of change over time can also be usefully accurate.

10. Conclusion

Pro-poor programs in India can use the scorecard to segment clients for differentiated services as well as to estimate:

- The likelihood that a household has consumption below a given poverty line
- The poverty rate of a population at a point in time
- The change in the poverty rate of a population between two points in time

The scorecard is inexpensive to use and can be understood by non-specialists. It is designed to be practical for pro-poor programs in India that want to improve how they monitor and manage their social performance.

The scorecard is built with a sub-sample of data from the Consumer Expenditure Module of India's 2011/12 (R68) SES, tested out-of-sample and out-of-time with a number of different sub-samples from R59, R62, R66, and R68, and calibrated to 31 poverty lines. Existing users of India's old R59, R62, or R66 scorecards can switch to the new R68 scorecard without having to start over from scratch when measuring change in poverty rates between two points in time.

Errors and precision are reported for estimates of households' poverty likelihoods, populations' poverty rates at a point in time, and changes in populations' poverty rates over time. Of course, the scorecard's estimates of change are not necessarily the same as estimates of the impact of program participation. Targeting accuracy is also reported. When applied to the R68 MRP and MMRP validation samples for India with 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 16,384, the average absolute difference (error) between scorecard estimates of groups' poverty rates and the true rates at a point in time across all 39 non-RBI lines is about 0.9 percentage points.

With n = 16,384, the 90-percent confidence intervals for these estimates (again excluding RBI lines) are ± 1.0 percentage points or less. For n = 1,024, the 90-percent intervals are ± 4.0 percentage points or less.

Accuracy is also reported for estimates of changes in poverty rates over time. Across 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384, the average absolute error across the 43 cases of pairs of survey rounds for which change can be estimated for some definition of *poverty* is about 3.0 percentage points. The average absolute true change is about 9.6 percentage points, so the average absolute error is about one-third of the average absolute true change.

Looking at all year-pairs and definitions of *poverty*, the 90-percent confidence interval (with n = 1,024) of the estimated change includes the true value for 33 of 43 cases (about three in four). On average, the 90-percent confidence intervals for scoring's estimates are about 88-percent wider than those under direct measurement, so while the estimated direction of change matches the true direction in all cases, the estimated direction is both correct and "statistically significant" (the confidence interval excludes zero) for 26 of 43 cases (about three in five). Are these estimates of change accurate enough? The answer naturally depends on the accuracy required for a given purpose

91

and context. A strength of the scorecard is that its accuracy and precision is documented.

If a program wants to use the scorecard for segmenting clients for differentiated services, then the results here provide useful information for selecting a targeting cut-off that fits its values and mission.

Although the statistical technique is innovative, and although technical accuracy is important, the design of the scorecard focuses on transparency and ease-of-use. After all, accuracy is irrelevant if a program's managers feel so daunted by a scorecard's complexity or its cost that they do not even try to use it.

For this reason, the scorecard uses 10 indicators that are straightforward, lowcost, and verifiable. 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 converted to poverty likelihoods via simple look-up tables, and targeting cut-offs are likewise straightforward to apply. The design attempts to facilitate voluntary adoption by helping managers to understand and trust scoring and by allowing non-specialists to add up scores quickly in the field.

In summary, the scorecard is a practical, objective way for pro-poor programs in India to estimate consumption-based poverty rates, track changes in poverty rates over time, and target services. The same approach can be applied to any country with similar data.

References

- Adams, Niall M.; and David J. Hand. (2000) "Improving the Practice of Classifier Performance Assessment", *Neural Computation*, Vol. 12, pp. 305–311.
- Baesens, Bart; Van Gestel, Tony; Viaene, Stijn; Stepanova, Maria; Suykens, Johan A. K.; and Jan Vanthienen. (2003) "Benchmarking State-of-the-Art Classification Algorithms for Credit Scoring", Journal of the Operational Research Society, Vol. 54, pp. 627–635.
- Bollen, Kenneth A.; Glanville, Jennifer L.; and Guy Stecklov. (2007) "Socio-Economic Status, Permanent Income, and Fertility: A Latent-Variable Approach", *Population Studies*, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 15–34.
- Caire, Dean. (2004) "Building Credit Scorecards for Small-Business Lending in Developing Markets", microfinance.com/English/Papers/ Scoring_SMEs_Hybrid.pdf, retrieved 4 May 2016.
-; and Mark Schreiner. (2012) "Cross-Tab Weighting for Credit Scorecards in Developing Markets", business-school.ed.ac.uk/crc/conferences/ conference-archive?a=46055, retrieved 4 May 2016.
- Camacho, Adriana; and Emily Conover. (2011) "Manipulation of Social-Program Eligibility", American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 41–65.
- Carter, Michael R.; and Christopher B. Barrett. (2006) "The Economics of Poverty Traps and Persistent Poverty: An Asset-Based Approach", *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 178–199.
- Chen, Shaohua; and Martin Ravallion. (2010) "The Developing World is Poorer Than We Thought, but No Less Successful in the Fight against Poverty", Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 125, No. 4, pp. 1577–1625.
- Chen, Shiyuan; and Mark Schreiner. (2009b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Vietnam", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/VNM_2006_ENG.pdf, retrieved 4 May 2016.
- Christiaensen, Luc; Lanjouw, Peter; Luoto, Jill; and David Stifel. (2012) "The Reliability of Small-Area-Estimation Prediction Methods to Track Poverty", Journal of Economic Inequality, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 267–297.

Coady, David; Grosh, Margaret; and John Hoddinott. (2002) Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries, hdl.handle.net/10986/14902, retrieved 4 May 2016.

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

- Coudouel, Aline; Hentschel, Jesko S.; and Quentin T. Wodon. (2002) "Poverty Measurement and Analysis", pp. 27-74 in *The PRSP Sourcebook*, siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/ 383606-1205334112622/5467_chap1.pdf, retrieved 4 May 2016.
- Dang, Hai-Anh H.; and Peter F. Lanjouw. (2015) "Poverty Dynamics in India between 2004 and 2012: Insights from Longitudinal Analysis Using Synthetic Panel Data", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7270, documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2015/05/24513589/povertydynamics-india-between-2004-2012-insights-longitudinal-analysisusing-synthetic-panel-data, retrieved 4 May 2016.
-; and Umar Serajuddin. (2014) "Updating Poverty Estimates at Frequent Intervals in the Absence of Consumption Data: Methods and Illustration with References to a Middle-Income Country", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7043, documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2014/09/20230001/updatingpoverty-estimates-frequent-intervals-absence-consumption-datamethods-illustration-reference-middle-income-country, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- 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. (2010) "Price Indexes, Inequality, and the Measurement of World Poverty", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 100, No. 1, pp. 5–34.

-; and Jean Drèze. (2002) "Poverty and Inequality in India: A Re-Examination", Economic and Political Weekly, September 7, pp. 3729–3748.
-; and Jean Drèze. (2014) "Squaring the poverty circle", The Hindu, July 25, pp. 9-12, thehindu.com/opinion/lead/squaring-the-povertycircle/article6246084.ece, retrieved 6 May 2016.

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

-; and Alessandro Tarozzi. (2000) "Prices and Poverty in India", econ.duke.edu/~taroz/DeatonTarozzi.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Diamond, Alexis; Gill, Michael; Rebolledo Dellepiane, Miguel Angel; Skoufias,
 Emmanuel; Vinha, Katja; and Yiqing Xu. (2016) "Estimating Poverty Rates in
 Target Populations: An Assessment of the Simple Poverty Scorecard and
 Alternative Approaches", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7793,
 hdl.handle.net/10986/25038, retrieved 11 January 2017.
- Elbers, Chris; Lanjouw, Jean O.; and Peter Lanjouw. (2003) "Micro-Level Estimation of Poverty and Inequality", *Econometrica*, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 355–364.
- Ferreira, Francisco H.G.; Chen, Shaohua; Dabalen, Andrew L.; Dikhanov, Yuri M.; Hamadeh, Nada; Jolliffe, Dean Mitchell; Narayan, Ambar; Prydz, Espen Beer; Revenga, Ana L.; Sangraula, Prem; Serajuddin, Umar; and Nobuo Yoshida. (2015) "A Global Count of the Extreme Poor in 2012: Data Issues, Methodology, and Initial Results", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7432, documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2015/10/25114899/global-countextreme-poor-2012-data-issues-methodology-initial-results, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Filmer, Deon; and Lant Pritchett. (2001) "Estimating Wealth Effects without Expenditure Data—or Tears: An Application to Educational Enrollments in States of India", *Demography*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 115–132.
- Filmer, Deon; and Kinnon Scott. (2012) "Assessing Asset Indices", *Demography*, Vol. 49, pp. 359–392.
- 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 the Poverty of Microfinance Clients in Haiti", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Haiti_Fuller.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Goodman, Leo A.; and Kruskal, William H. (1979) Measures of Association for Cross Classification.

- Grosh, Margaret; and Judy L. Baker. (1995) "Proxy Means Tests for Targeting Social Programs: Simulations and Speculation", World Bank LSMS Working Paper No. 118, go.worldbank.org/W90WN57PD0, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Gwatkin, Davidson R.; Rutstein, Shea; Johnson, Kiersten; Suliman, Eldaw; Wagstaff, Adam; and Agbessi Amouzou. (2007) "Socio-Economic Differences in Health, Nutrition, and Population in India", go.worldbank.org/T6LCN5A340, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Hand, David J. (2006) "Classifier Technology and the Illusion of Progress", Statistical Science, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 1–15.
- Haslett, Stephen. (2012) "Practical Guidelines for the Design and Analysis of Sample Surveys for Small-Area Estimation", Journal of the Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics, Vol. 66, No. 1, pp. 203–212.
- Henry, Carla; Sharma, Manohar; Lapenu, Cecile; and Manfred Zeller. (2003) "Microfinance Poverty Assessment Tool", CGAP Technical Tool No. 5, cgap.org/publications/microfinance-poverty-assessment-tool, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Hentschel, Jesko; Lanjouw, Jean Olson; Lanjouw, Peter; and Javier Poggi. (2000)
 "Combining Census and Survey Data to Trace the Spatial Dimensions of Poverty: A Case Study of Ecuador", World Bank Economic Review, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 147–165.
- Himanshu. (2011) "Re: Has Someone (You?) Computed Poverty Lines Based on Tendulkar Committee Report for India's R66 NSSO Expenditure Survey?", message to mark@microfinance.com, August 20, 4:59 p.m.
- 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.
- Howe, Laura D.; Hargreaves, James R.; Gabrysch, Sabine; and Sharon R.A. Huttly. (2009) "Is the Wealth Index a Proxy for Consumption Expenditure? A Systematic Review", *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, Vol. 63, pp. 871–880.

- IRIS Center. (2007a) "Manual for the Implementation of USAID Poverty Assessment Tools", povertytools.org/training_documents/Manuals/ USAID_PAT_Manual_Eng.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.

Jain, Jayesh Kr. (2011) "Serving Poor People: In Words or Action?".

- Jalan, Jyotsna; and Rinku Murgai. (2007) "An Effective 'Targeting Shortcut'? An Assessment of the 2002 Below-Poverty Line Census Method", ctrpfp.ac.in/WP-2011-08.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Johnson, Glenn. (2007) "Lesson 3: Two-Way Tables—Dependent Samples", https://onlinecourses.science.psu.edu/stat504/node/96, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Kijima, Yoko; and Peter Lanjouw. (2003) "Poverty in India during the 1990s: A Regional Perspective", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3141, http://dx.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-3141, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Kolesar, Peter; and Janet L. Showers. (1985) "A Robust Credit-Screening Model Using Categorical Data", Management Science, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 124–133.
- Lindelow, Magnus. (2006) "Sometimes More Equal Than Others: How Health Inequalities Depend on the Choice of Welfare Indicator", *Health Economics*, Vol. 15, pp. 263–279.
- Lovie, Alexander D.; and Patricia Lovie. (1986) "The Flat-Maximum Effect and Linear Scoring Models for Prediction", *Journal of Forecasting*, Vol. 5, pp. 159–168.
- Martinelli, César; and Susan W. Parker. (2007) "Deception and Misreporting in a Social Program", Journal of the European Economic Association, Vol. 4, No. 6, pp. 886–908.

- 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, mfc.org.pl/sites/ mfc.org.pl/files/spotlight4.PDF, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- McNemar, Quinn. (1947) "Note on the Sampling Error of the Difference between Correlated Proportions or Percentages", *Psychometrika*, Vol. 17, pp. 153–157.
- Mishra, Srijit. (2014) "Reading between the Poverty Lines", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 27 September, pp. 123–127.
- Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2011) "Key Indicators of Household Consumer Expenditure in India, 2009–10", National Sample Survey Office, July 8, pib.nic.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=73098, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Montgomery, Mark; Gragnolati, Michele; Burke, Kathleen A.; and Edmundo Paredes. (2000) "Measuring Living Standards with Proxy Variables", *Demography*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 155–174.
- 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 Rinku Murgai. (2016) "Looking Back on Two Decades of Poverty and Well-Being in India", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7626, documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2016/04/26189868/looking-backtwo-decades-poverty-well-being-india, retrived 5 May 2016.
- 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-testtargeting-welfare-benefits-sri-lanka, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- National Sample Survey Organisation. (2001) "Concepts and Definitions Used in NSS: Golden Jubilee Publication", mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/upload/concepts_golden.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Onwujekwe, Obinna; Hanson, Kara; and Julia Fox-Rushby. (2006) "Some Indicators of Socio-Economic Status May Not Be Reliable and Use of Indexes with These Data Could Worsen Equity", *Health Economics*, Vol. 15, pp. 639–644.

- Planning Commission. (2014) "Report of the Expert Group to Review the Methodology for the Measurement of Poverty", planningcommission.nic.in/reports/ genrep/pov_rep0707.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Planning Commission. (2012) "Poverty Estimates for 2009-10", 19 March, pib.nic.in/ newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=81151 (text) and tables at: pib.nic.in/ archieve/others/2012/mar/d2012031902.pdf (tables), retrieved 5 May 2016.
- ----- (2011) "Press Note on Poverty Estimates", planningcommission.nic.in/ reports/genrep/Press_pov_27Jan11.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- -----. (2007) "Poverty Estimates for 2004-5", planningcommission.gov.in/news/prmar07.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Ravallion, Martin. (2008) "A Global Perspective on Poverty in India", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 43, pp. 31–37.
- Reserve Bank of India. (2015) "RBI/2014-15/544: DNBR.CC.PD.No.027/03.10.01/2014-15", 8 April, https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/Notification/ PDFs/544CRLMFIA070415.PDF, retrieved 24 April 2016.
- -----. (2011a) "Circular RBI/2010-11/505, RPCD.CO.PLAN. 66 /04.09.01/2010-11",
 https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/Notification/PDFs/CIMAC030511.pdf,
 retrieved 4 May 2016.
- Rutstein, Shea Oscar; and Kiersten Johnson. (2004) "The DHS Wealth Index", DHS Comparative Reports No. 6, measuredhs.com/pubs/pdf/CR6/CR6.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Sahn, David E.; and David C. Stifel. (2003) "Exploring Alternative Measures of Welfare in the Absence of Expenditure Data", *Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 49, No. 4, pp. 463–489.
- SAS Institute Inc. (2004) "The LOGISTIC Procedure: Rank Correlation of Observed Responses and Predicted Probabilities", in SAS/STAT User's Guide, Version 9, Cary, NC, support.sas.com/documentation/cdl/en/statug/63033/HTML/ default/viewer.htm#statug_logistic_sect035.htm, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Saxena, N.C. (2001) "Poverty Estimates for 1999-00", planningcommission.nic.in/ reports/articles/ncsxna/ar_pvrty.htm, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Schreiner, Mark. (2016) "Discrepancies in Poverty Rates, Rangarajan Committee Report versus Data Distributed by NSSO for R66 and R68 SES", message of 22 January, 1:27 p.m.

- ____. (2005b) "IRIS Questions on the Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool", microfinance.com/English/Papers/ Scoring_Poverty_Response_to_IRIS.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
-; Matul, Michal; Pawlak, Ewa; and Sean Kline. (2014) "Poverty Scoring: Lessons from a Microlender in Bosnia-Herzegovina", *Poverty and Public Policy*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 407–428.
-; and Michael Sherraden. (2006) Can the Poor Save? Saving and Asset Accumulation in Individual Development Accounts.
- -----; and Gary Woller. (2010) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Guatemala", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/GTM_2006_ENG.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Sharif, Iffath Anwar. (2011) "Targeting for Effective Social Protection in Bangladesh: Evidence from Household Surveys", siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Safety-Nets-DP/0914.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.

Sherraden, Michael. (1991) Assets and the Poor: A New American Welfare Policy.

- Sillers, Don. (2006) "National and International Poverty Lines: An Overview", USAID, pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadh069.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Singh, Kesar. (1998) "Breakdown Theory for Bootstrap Quantiles", Annals of Statistics, Vol. 26, pp. 1719–1732.
- Stifel, David; and Luc Christiaensen. (2007) "Tracking Poverty over Time in the Absence of Comparable Consumption Data", World Bank Economic Review, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 317–341.

- 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.
- Tarozzi, Alessandro; and Angus Deaton. (2009) "Using Census and Survey Data to Estimate Poverty and Inequality for Small Areas", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 91, No. 4, pp. 773–792.
- Toohig, Jeff. (2008) "Progress Out of Poverty Index: Training Guide", microfinancegateway.org/sites/default/files/mfg-en-paper-progressout-of-poverty-index-ppi-pilot-training-mar-2008.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- United States Congress. (2004) "Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 (HR 3818 RDS)", November 20, smith4nj.com/laws/108-484.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- USAID. (2014) Microenterprise Results Reporting: Annual Report to Congress, Fiscal Year 2013, https://mrr.usaid.gov/docs/MRR_Annual_Report_FY2013.pdf, retrieved 5 May 2016.
- Wagstaff, Adam; and Naoko Watanabe. (2003) "What Difference Does the Choice of SES Make in Health-Inequality Measurement?", *Health Economics*, Vol. 12, No. 10, pp. 885–890.
- Wainer, Howard. (1976) "Estimating Coefficients in Linear Models: It Don't Make No Nevermind", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 83, pp. 223–227.
- World Bank. (2015) Development Goals in an Era of Demographic Change: Global Monitoring Report 2015/2016, hdl.handle.net/10986/22547, retrieved 5 May 2016.

- Zeller, Manfred. (2004) "Review of Poverty Assessment Tools", pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADH120.pdf, retrieved 5 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.

Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators

The following is taken from:

National Sample Survey Office. (2011) "Instructions to Field Staff, Volume I: Design, Concepts, Definitions, and Procedures, Socio-Economic Survey, 68th Round (July 2011 to June 2012)", catalog.ihsn.org/index.php/catalog/ 3281/download/48296, retrieved 5 May 2016. (the Manual)

Train enumerators and promulgate rules only from these "Guidelines"

When an issue comes up that is not addressed in these "Guidelines", its resolution should be left to the unaided judgment of the enumerator, as that seems to have been what India's National Sample Survey Office did in the 2011/12 (R68) SES.

That is, a program using the scorecard should not establish any definitions nor rules (other than those in these "Guidelines") to be used by all its enumerators. Anything not explicitly addressed in these "Guidelines" is to be left to the unaided judgment of each individual enumerator.

General guidelines for asking scorecard questions

Fill out the scorecard header and the "Back-page Worksheet" first, following the directions on the "Back-page Worksheet".

Do not ask the first scorecard indicator directly ("How many household members are there?"). Instead, use the information recorded on the "Back-page Worksheet" to determine the response to mark. You must also record the number of household members in the scorecard header next to "Number of household members:".

Do not read the response options to the respondent. Just read the question, and then stop; wait for a response. If the respondent asks for clarification or otherwise hesitates or seems confused, then read the question again or provide additional assistance based on these "Guidelines" or as you, the enumerator, deem appropriate. In general, you should accept the responses given by the respondent. Nevertheless, if the respondent says something—or if you see or sense something—that suggests that the response may not be accurate, that the respondent is uncertain, or that the respondent desires assistance in figuring out how to respond, then you should read the question again and provide whatever help you deem appropriate based on these "Guidelines".

While most indicators in the scorecard are verifiable, you do not—in general—need to verify responses. You should verify a response only if something suggests to you that the response may not be accurate and thus that verification might improve data quality.

For example, you might choose to verify if the respondent hesitates, seems nervous, or otherwise gives signals that he/she may be lying or be confused. Likewise, verification is probably appropriate if a child in the household or a neighbor says something that does not square with the respondent's answer.

Verification is also a good idea if you happen to see something yourself—such as a consumer durable that the respondent avers not to possess, or a child eating in the room who has not been counted as a member of the household—that suggests that the response may not be accurate.

In general, your application of the scorecard should mimic as closely as possible how the NSSO applied the 2011/12 (R68) SES. For example, poverty-scoring interviews should take place in respondents' homesteads because the 2011/12 SES took place in respondents' homesteads.

Read the questions word-for-word exactly as they are written and in the order that they appear in the scorecard.

When you mark a response to a scorecard indicator, circle the spelled-out response option and its point value, and write the point value in the "Score" column, like this:

2. What is the general	A. Primary or below, or not literate	0	
education level of the	B. Middle	3	2
female head/spouse?	C. Secondary or higher	5	3
, 1	D. No female head/spouse	5	

Confidentiality:

Keep a household's responses strictly confidential. Do not share them with anyone outside of your program's team that has a reason to have the data.

Questionnaire translation:

The 2011/12 SES left translation of the survey instrument to languages other than English to each individual enumerator (perhaps with the help of local translators). When translation was needed, it was done on the fly.

While the application of the scorecard should, in general, mimic the application of the 2011/12 SES, it nevertheless makes sense to have a standard, well-done, checked translation to languages that are common in India (such as Hindi and Bengali, among several others).

Without a standard translation, the variation in translations and interpretations across enumerators could greatly harm data quality. Of course, any translation should reflect the meaning in the original English SES survey instrument as closely as possible. Ideally, programs using the scorecard in a given dialect or language in India would coordinate to produce and use a single, high-quality translation.

Who should be the respondent?

According to pp. C-77 and C-78 of the *Manual*, "Information has to be collected from one of the household members. In an extreme case, information may be collected from a person who is not a household member but who knows all the requisite information."

The respondent need not be the same person as the household member who is a participant with your program.

Guidelines for specific scorecard indicators

- 1. How many household members are there?
 - A. Eight or more
 - B. Seven
 - C. Six
 - D. Five
 - E. Four
 - F. Three
 - G. Two
 - H. One

Do not ask this question directly. That is, do not ask the respondent, "How many members does the household have?". Instead, mark the response based on the total number of household members that you listed on the "Back-page Worksheet".

According to p. A–8 of the *Manual*, a *household* is "a group of persons normally living together and [ordinarily] taking food from a common kitchen. It includes temporary stay-aways (those whose expected total period of absence from the household is six months or less), but it excludes temporary visitors and guests (those whose expected total stay with the household is six months or less).

"The determination of the actual composition of a household is to be left to the judgment of the head of the household. Nevertheless, use the following as guidelines.

- Each inmate (including residential staff) of a hostel, mess, hotel, boarding and lodging house, etc., is a single-member household. If, however, a group of persons normally pool their income, they will together be treated as a single household. For example, a family living in a hotel will be treated as a single household
- In deciding the composition of a household, more emphasis is to be placed on 'normally living together' than on 'ordinarily taking food from a common kitchen'. If a person's place of residence differs from his/her place of boarding, then he/she is counted as a member of the household with which he/she resides
- A resident employee, domestic servant, or paying guest (but not just a tenant in the household) will be considered as a member of the household with which he/she resides even though he/she is not a member of the same family
- When a person sleeps in one place (say, in a shop or in a room in another house because of a shortage of space) but usually takes food with his/her family, then he/she should be treated not as a single-member household but rather as a member of the household with which the other members of his/her family stay
- If a member of a family (say, a son or a daughter of the head of the family) stays elsewhere (say, in hostel for studies or for any other reason), he/she will not be considered as a member of his/her parent's household"

According to p. 18 of the *Jubilee Glossary*, "A household may have one or more members. Members of a household may or may not be related to one another by blood, marriage, or adoption."

Pages B-27 to B-28 of the *Manual* give guidelines for determining whether someone is a household member in a few specific cases.

- A elderly person who stays in an old-age home paid for by his/her child is counted as a household member in that child's household. He/she does not count as a household member in a child's household if he/she has been deserted and lives in a destitute home like an orphan
- Two brothers who live together in a single room of a hostel and who pool their income are counted as a single household. If they do not pool their income, then they count as two distinct households
- A household with 10 paying guests staying there and taking food from the same kitchen is like a mess or hostel, so each paying guest is a single-person household
- A married daughter who is staying with her parents and who has stayed there (or expects to stay there) for more than six months is to be counted as part of her parents' household
- A truck driver who stays away from home for more than six months continuously or otherwise is not to be counted as a household member [of another household]
- Due to drought, some household members may temporarily go out of the village/town in search of employment. If they expect to be away for six months or less, then they count as household members

- 2. What is the general education level of the female head/spouse?
 - A. Primary or below, or not literate
 - B. Middle
 - C. Secondary or higher
 - D. No female head/spouse

According to p. 20 of the *Jubilee Glossary*, "The person who is formally in-charge of the management of the household is the *head of the household*. He/she need not necessarily be the principal earning member of the household, but rather he/she could be the customary head of the household decided on the basis of tradition. For example, if an aged father does nothing but has an adult son who actually manages the household, the old father might still be deemed the formal head. It should be left to the members of a household to decide whom they consider to be the head of the household."

According to p. C–15 of the *Manual*, "Only consider courses successfully completed. For instance, for a person who has studied up to say, first-year B.A., educational attainment will be considered as 'higher secondary'. For a person who has studied up to 12^{th} standard but who has not sat for the final examination or who has failed the final examination, educational attainment will be considered as 'secondary'."

"A person who can both read and write a simple message with understanding in at least one language is to be considered *literate*. A person who is not able to do so is to be considered not *literate*.

"Those who achieved literacy through formal schooling but who are yet to pass the primary standard examination count as 'Literate with formal schooling (below primary)'.

"The criteria for deciding primary, middle, secondary, etc. levels will be that followed in the concerned states/union territories. Persons who have attained proficiency in Oriental languages (e.g., Sanskrit, Persian, and so on) through formal but not through the general type of education will be classified at the equivalent level of general education standard. Those who have completed some diploma or certificate course in general, technical education, or vocational education which is equivalent to below-graduation level are counted as 'diploma/certificate course'. On the other hand, those who have obtained a degree, diploma, or certificate in general, technical education, or vocational education which is equivalent to graduation level are counted as 'graduate'. Those who have obtained a degree, diploma, or certificate in general or technical education which is equivalent to post-graduation level and above are counted as 'postgraduate and above'." For the purposes of the scorecard, the *female head/spouse* is defined as:

- The household head, if the head is female
- The spouse/conjugal partner of the household head, if the head is male
- Non-existent, if the head is male and if he does not have a spouse/conjugal partner who is a member of the interviewed household

Remember that you already know the name of the female head/spouse (and whether she exists) from the notes you took for your own use while compiling the "Back-page Worksheet". Thus, if there is a female head/spouse, do not mechanically ask, "What is the general education level of the female head/spouse?". Instead, use the actual name of the female head/spouse, for example: "What is the general education level of Saanvi?". If there is no female head/spouse, then do not read the question at all; just mark "D. No female head/spouse" and proceed to the next indicator. 3. Does the household possess a refrigerator?

- A. No
- B. Yes

According to p. C–43 of the *Manual*, "Do not count out-of-order and likely-to-bediscarded refrigerators. But do count items currently out-of-order which are likely to be put into use after repair."

According to p. B–30 of the *Manual*, a refrigerator that was received as a gift or that was acquired via hire-purchase counts as being "possessed".

If the household has owner-like possession of a refrigerator, then it counts as being "possessed", even if the legal owner is not a household member (for example, if the owner used to be a household member but left to work elsewhere and has been away—or is expected to be away—for more than six months). Conversely, a household that is the legal owner of a refrigerator that is held in owner-like possession by another household is not considered to possess the item.

Sections 3.11.19 and 3.11.25 of pp. C–45 and C–46 of the *Manual* imply that a refrigerator that is used both for household purposes and in an enterprise run by the household should be counted only if it is mainly used for household purposes. Do not count refrigerators if they are mainly used in an enterprise run by the household.

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "The idea is that a [refrigerator] that has been—or is expected to be—in the possession of the sample household for a considerable period (and not just for a short time) is 'possessed', even if it has been purchased with a loan from a household or enterprise. Conversely, a [refrigerator] loaned out by the sample household for a considerable period is not regarded as 'possessed'. . . . Thus, a [refrigerator] that is being paid for in installments will be considered as 'possessed' from the day on which it comes into the household's possession."

- 4. Does the household possess a stove/gas burner?
 - A. No
 - B. Yes

According to p. C-45 of the Manual, "This includes both oil stoves and gas burners."

According to p. C–43 of the *Manual*, "Do not count out-of-order and likely-to-bediscarded stoves/gas burners. But do count items currently out-of-order which are likely to be put into use after repair."

According to p. B–30 of the *Manual*, a stove/gas burner that was received as a gift or that was acquired via hire-purchase counts as being "possessed".

If the household has owner-like possession of a stove/gas burner, then it counts as being "possessed", even if the legal owner is not a household member (for example, if the owner used to be a household member but left to work elsewhere and has been away—or is expected to be away—for more than six months). Conversely, a household that is the legal owner of a stove/gas burner that is held in owner-like possession by another household is not considered to possess the item.

Sections 3.11.19 and 3.11.25 of pp. C–45 and C–46 of the *Manual* imply that a stove/gas burner that is used both for household purposes and in an enterprise run by the household should be counted only if it is mainly used for household purposes. Do not count stoves/gas burners if they are mainly used in an enterprise run by the household.

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "The idea is that a [stove/gas burner] that has been—or is expected to be—in the possession of the sample household for a considerable period (and not just for a short time) is 'possessed', even if it has been purchased with a loan from a household or enterprise. Conversely, a [stove/gas burner] loaned out by the sample household for a considerable period is not regarded as 'possessed'. . . . Thus, a [stove/gas burner] that is being paid for in installments will be considered as 'possessed' from the day on which it comes into the household's possession." 5. Does the household possess a pressure cooker/pressure pan?

- A. No
- B. Yes

According to p. C–43 of the *Manual*, "Do not count out-of-order and likely-to-bediscarded pressure cookers/pressure pans. But do count items currently out-of-order which are likely to be put into use after repair."

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "Pressure pans serve the same function as pressure cookers but are shallower."

According to p. B–30 of the *Manual*, a pressure cooker/pressure pan that was received as a gift or that was acquired via hire-purchase counts as being "possessed".

If the household has owner-like possession of a pressure cooker/pressure pan, then it counts as being "possessed", even if the legal owner is not a household member (for example, if the owner used to be a household member but left to work elsewhere and has been away—or is expected to be away—for more than six months). Conversely, a household that is the legal owner of a pressure cooker/pressure pan that is held in owner-like possession by another household is not considered to possess the item.

Sections 3.11.19 and 3.11.25 of pp. C-45 and C-46 of the *Manual* imply that a pressure cooker/pressure pan that is used both for household purposes and in an enterprise run by the household should be counted only if it is mainly used for household purposes. Do not count pressure cookers/pressure pans if they are mainly used in an enterprise run by the household.

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "The idea is that a [pressure cooker/pressure pan] that has been—or is expected to be—in the possession of the sample household for a considerable period (and not just for a short time) is 'possessed', even if it has been purchased with a loan from a household or enterprise. Conversely, a [pressure cooker/pressure pan] loaned out by the sample household for a considerable period is not regarded as 'possessed'. . . . Thus, a [pressure cooker/pressure pan] that is being paid for in installments will be considered as 'possessed' from the day on which it comes into the household's possession."

6. Does the household possess a television?

- A. No
- B. Yes

According to p. C–43 of the *Manual*, "Do not count out-of-order and likely-to-bediscarded televisions. But do count items currently out-of-order which are likely to be put into use after repair."

According to p. B–30 of the *Manual*, a television that was received as a gift or that was acquired via hire-purchase counts as being "possessed".

If the household has owner-like possession of a television, then it counts as being "possessed", even if the legal owner is not a household member (for example, if the owner used to be a household member but left to work elsewhere and has been away or is expected to be away—for more than six months). Conversely, a household that is the legal owner of a television that is held in owner-like possession by another household is not considered to possess the item.

Sections 3.11.19 and 3.11.25 of pp. C–45 and C–46 of the *Manual* imply that a television that is used both for household purposes and in an enterprise run by the household should be counted only if it is mainly used for household purposes. Do not count televisions if they are mainly used in an enterprise run by the household.

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "The idea is that a [television] that has been or is expected to be—in the possession of the sample household for a considerable period (and not just for a short time) is 'possessed', even if it has been purchased with a loan from a household or enterprise. Conversely, a [television] loaned out by the sample household for a considerable period is not regarded as 'possessed'. . . . Thus, a [television] that is being paid for in installments will be considered as 'possessed' from the day on which it comes into the household's possession."

- 7. Does the household possess an electric fan?
 - A. No
 - B. Yes

According to p. C–43 of the *Manual*, "Do not count out-of-order and likely-to-bediscarded electric fans. But do count items currently out-of-order which are likely to be put into use after repair."

Do not count electric air coolers nor air conditioners as electric fans.

According to p. B–30 of the *Manual*, an electric fan that was received as a gift or that was acquired via hire-purchase counts as being "possessed".

If the household has owner-like possession of an electric fan, then it counts as being "possessed", even if the legal owner is not a household member (for example, if the owner used to be a household member but left to work elsewhere and has been away—or is expected to be away—for more than six months). Conversely, a household that is the legal owner of an electric fan that is held in owner-like possession by another household is not considered to possess the item.

Sections 3.11.19 and 3.11.25 of pp. C–45 and C–46 of the *Manual* imply that an electric fan that is used both for household purposes and in an enterprise run by the household should be counted only if it is mainly used for household purposes. Do not count electric fans if they are mainly used in an enterprise run by the household.

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "The idea is that an [electric fan] that has been—or is expected to be—in the possession of the sample household for a considerable period and not just for a short time is 'possessed', even if it has been purchased with a loan from a household or enterprise. Conversely, an [electric fan] loaned out by the sample household for a considerable period is not regarded as 'possessed'. . . . Thus, an [electric fan] that is being paid for in installments will be considered as 'possessed' from the day on which it comes into the household's possession."

- 8. Does the household possess an almirah/dressing table?
 - A. No
 - B. Yes

According to p. C–45 of the *Manual*, "Full-size wardrobes will be included against this item." Waist-high (usually wooden) almirahs are not to be counted.

According to p. C–43 of the *Manual*, "Do not count out-of-order and likely-to-bediscarded almirahs/dressing tables. But do count items currently out-of-order which are likely to be put into use after repair."

According to p. B–30 of the *Manual*, an almirah/dressing table that was received as a gift or that was acquired via hire-purchase counts as being "possessed".

If the household has owner-like possession of an almirah/dressing table, then it counts as being "possessed", even if the legal owner is not a household member (for example, if the owner used to be a household member but left to work elsewhere and has been away—or is expected to be away—for more than six months). Conversely, a household that is the legal owner of an almirah/dressing table that is held in owner-like possession by another household is not considered to possess the item.

Sections 3.11.19 and 3.11.25 of pp. C–45 and C–46 of the *Manual* imply that an almirah/dressing table that is used both for household purposes and in an enterprise run by the household should be counted only if it is mainly used for household purposes. Do not count almirahs/dressing tables if they are mainly used in an enterprise run by the household.

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "The idea is that an [almirah/dressing table] that has been—or is expected to be—in the possession of the sample household for a considerable period (and not just for a short time) is 'possessed', even if it has been purchased with a loan from a household or enterprise. Conversely, an [almirah/dressing table] loaned out by the sample household for a considerable period is not regarded as 'possessed'. . . . Thus, an [almirah/dressing table] that is being paid for in installments will be considered as 'possessed' from the day on which it comes into the household's possession."

9. Does the household possess a chair, stool, bench, or table?

- A. No
- B. Yes

Mark "B. Yes" if the household possesses one or more of any of the four types of items. That is, to mark "B. Yes", it is not necessary to possess all four of the items, just at least one of the iems.

According to p. C–43 of the *Manual*, "Do not count out-of-order and likely-to-bediscarded chairs, stools, benches, or tables. But do count items currently out-of-order which are likely to be put into use after repair."

According to p. B–30 of the *Manual*, a chair, stool, bench, or table that was received as a gift or that was acquired via hire-purchase counts as being "possessed".

If the household has owner-like possession of a chair, stool, bench, or table, then it counts as being "possessed", even if the legal owner is not a household member (for example, if the owner used to be a household member but left to work elsewhere and has been away—or is expected to be away—for more than six months). Conversely, a household that is the legal owner of a chair, stool, bench, or table that is held in ownerlike possession by another household is not considered to possess the item.

Sections 3.11.19 and 3.11.25 of pp. C–45 and C–46 of the *Manual* imply that a chair, stool, bench, or table that is used both for household purposes and in an enterprise run by the household should be counted only if it is mainly used for household purposes. Do not count chairs, stools, benches, or tables if they are mainly used in an enterprise run by the household.

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "The idea is that a [chair, stool, bench, or table] that has been—or is expected to be—in the possession of the sample household for a considerable period (and not just for a short time) is 'possessed', even if it has been purchased with a loan from a household or enterprise. Conversely, a [chair, stool, bench, or table] loaned out by the sample household for a considerable period is not regarded as 'possessed'. . . . Thus, a [chair, stool, bench, or table] that is being paid for in installments will be considered as 'possessed' from the day on which it comes into the household's possession." 10. Does the household possess a motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep?

- A. No
- B. Yes

According to p. C-43 of the *Manual*, "Do not count out-of-order and likely-to-bediscarded motorcycles, scooters, motor cars, or jeeps. But do count items currently outof-order which are likely to be put into use after repair."

According to p. B–30 of the *Manual*, a motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep that was received as a gift or that was acquired via hire-purchase counts as being "possessed".

If the household has owner-like possession of a motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep, then it counts as being "possessed", even if the legal owner is not a household member (for example, if the owner used to be a household member but left to work elsewhere and has been away—or is expected to be away—for more than six months). Conversely, a household that is the legal owner of a motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep that is held in owner-like possession by another household is not considered to possess the item.

Sections 3.11.19 and 3.11.25 of pp. C-45 and C-46 of the *Manual* imply that a motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep that is used both for household purposes and in an enterprise run by the household should be counted only if it is mainly used for household purposes. Do not count motorcycles, scooters, motor cars, or jeeps if they are mainly used in an enterprise run by the household.

According to Monojit Das of the NSSO, "The idea is that a [motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep] that has been—or is expected to be—in the possession of the sample household for a considerable period (and not just for a short time) is 'possessed', even if it has been purchased with a loan from a household or enterprise. Conversely, a [motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep] loaned out by the sample household for a considerable period is not regarded as 'possessed'. . . . Thus, a [motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep] that is being paid for in installments will be considered as 'possessed' from the day on which it comes into the household's possession."

Appendix:

Definitions of *Poverty*: Lines and Consumption

The *poverty status* of a household (poor or non-poor) derives from a definition of *poverty* that in turn, depends on definitions of a poverty line and of consumption. This appendix documents the definitions of *poverty* supported for India's new R68 scorecard. This is useful because:

- India has added definitions of national poverty lines over time
- India has added definitions of consumption over time
- There are some errors in the implementation of the legacy definitions of *poverty* used with the old R59 and R62 scorecards
- When measuring changes in poverty rates for a group, the same definitions of poverty lines and of consumption—that is, the same definition of *poverty*—must be used at both baseline and follow-up

The following rounds of data from the Consumption Expenditure Module of the NSSO's Socio-Economic Survey are used for constructing scorecards, validating their accuracy, and assigning poverty statuses to households:

Round	Start	End	Purpose	Source
59	1jan2003	31 dec 2003	Original scorecard	Schreiner, 2007
62	1jul2005	30jun2006	First update	Schreiner, 2008a
66	1jul2009	30jun2010	Second update	Schreiner, 2012a
68	1jul2011	30jun2012	Third update	This paper

Price indexes are also used for the periods that the following rounds were in the field:

- R55 (1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000)
- R61 (1 July 2004 to 30 June 2005)

In the recent past, the NSSO applied the Consumer Expenditure Module with the SES and a larger ("thick") sample every five years, mostly recently in R61 and R66. The inbetween rounds traditionally have had smaller ("thin") samples. After R66, controversy about its poverty estimates led to pressure for new estimates and a "thick" sample for the R68 SES, rather than waiting until R71 for the next "thick" sample.

Definitions of consumption

Since 1999, the NSSO has measured consumption using three definitions:

- URP: Uniform Reference Period
- MRP: Mixed Reference Period
- MMRP: Modified Mixed Reference Period

The *reference period* is the time frame over which a household is asked to report consumption. Reference periods are defined for four broad groups of items:

- Frequently purchased staple foods (edible oil, eggs, fish, meat, vegetables, fruit, beverages, *pan*, tobacco, and intoxicants)
- Infrequently purchased staple foods (cereals, pulses, milk and dairy, sugar, and salt)
- Non-food consumables, fuel, toiletries, services, transport, and rent
- Durable goods, clothing, education, and health care

URP defines the reference period for all four categories as 30 days. None of the poverty lines here use the URP definition of consumption.

Under MRP, the reference period for durable goods, clothing, education, and health care is changed to 365 days, and the reference period for the other three categories is left at 30 days. The switch from URP to MRP led to non-comparable estimates of consumption between R50 (1 July 1993 to 30 June 1994) and R55 and thus bedeviled estimates of changes in poverty rates for that period (Deaton and Kozel, 2005). Consumption by the MRP definition was collected for the entire sample in R59 and R62 and for half the sample in R66 and R68.

The MMRP definition changes MRP so that the reference period for frequently purchased staple foods is 7 days (Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, 2011). This is in line with international practice for consumption surveys, and MMRP was endorsed by Planning Commision (2009). Consumption by the MMRP definition was collected for half the sample in R66 and R68. When it was first used in R66, MMRP was considered experimental (Himanshu, 2011). In R68, India's new national (Rangarajan) poverty line is applied with MMRP consumption, so MMRP is now the preferred definition of consumption.

As noted above, the NSSO split the R66 and R68 samples between the MRP and MMRP definitions of consumption to enable measurement of changes in poverty rates between R66 and the past (when only MRP was used) and between R66 and the future (when MMRP is recognized as the preferred definition).

<u>Calibration to legacy definitions of *poverty* to enable measuring <u>change with estimates from both old and new scorecards</u></u>

The new R68 scorecard here is calibrated to definitions of *poverty* associated with MRP consumption (for "MRP legacy" lines originally used with the old R59, R62, and R66 scorecards) and MMRP consumption (for "MMRP legacy" lines used with the old R66 scorecard and for new MMRP lines used with the new R68 scorecard).

The new R68 scorecard is calibrated to legacy MRP and legacy MMRP definitions so that existing users of the old scorecards can measure changes in poverty rates using a baseline from an old scorecard and a follow-up from the new scorecard. Such measures of change are valid, apples-to-apples comparisons as long as both the baseline and follow-up use the same definition of *poverty* (that is, the same poverty line⁴⁸ and the same definition of consumption) and as long as the standard assumptions⁴⁹ required by the scorecard hold. This works regardless of whether the baseline uses the old R59, R62, or R66 scorecard; the comparability of legacy estimates from old scorecards with estimates from the new scorecard depends on using the same definition of *poverty*, not on using a single scorecard. Therefore, users of the old R59, R62, or R66 scorecards without having to start from scratch when measuring change over time.

Future updates to the scorecard will not support legacy MRP definitions of *poverty*. Thus, all current users of old R59, R63, or R68 scorecards should switch now to the new R68 scorecard and from now on record estimates based on MMRP definitions of *poverty* (in addition to estimates based on any legacy MRP definitions that they have used in the past and want to use as baseline estimates of change in the next few years).

For a given definition of *poverty* (that is, a definition of a poverty line and a definition of consumption) and the standard assumptions of the scorecard, estimates of poverty rates with any scorecard following the approach in this paper are unbiased.⁵⁰ This means that the difference between estimates (the estimate of change) is also unbiased. The precision (standard error) of multi-scorecard estimates of change can, in principle, be measured, although it is not done here and has not been done elsewhere.

⁴⁸ In constant real terms, that is, adjusted for changes in prices over time.

⁴⁹ The assumptions are that the relationships between indicators and poverty do not change over time and that the scorecard is applied to households at both baseline and follow-up who are representative of the same population from which the scorecard was originally constructed.

⁵⁰ Unbiased means that the average estimate in repeated samples equals the true value.

The new R68 scorecard is constructed with a single definition of *poverty*: 100% of the national (Rangarajan) poverty line with MMRP consumption. Nevertheless, scores from the new R68 scorecard are calibrated to multiple definitions of *poverty* (including legacy R59, R62, and R68 lines with MRP or MMRP consumption). This is possible because the scorecard serves only to rank households by score. This ranking is separate from the calibration that relates scores to poverty likelihoods for a given definition of *poverty*.

The rest of this appendix documents five classes of definitions of *poverty*:

- Legacy lines introduced with the old R59 scorecard that use MRP consumption
- Legacy lines introduced with the old R62 scorecard that use MRP consumption
- A legacy line introduced with the old R66 scorecard that uses MRP consumption
- Legacy lines introduced with the old R66 scorecard that use MMRP consumption
- New lines introduced with the new R68 scorecard that use MMRP consumption

All legacy definitions supported for the old R59, R62, and R66 scorecards (Schreiner 2007, 2008a, and 2012a) are also supported here for the new R68 scorecard. Thus, change can be measured with a baseline from an old R59, R62, or R66 scorecard and a follow-up from the new R68 scorecard. The legacy lines from the old R59 and R62 scorecards, however, are not comparable with each other, so change cannot be measured with a baseline from the old R59 scorecard and a follow-up from the old R62 scorecard.

Legacy MRP poverty definitions for the old R59 scorecard

The scorecard that uses data from R59 (Schreiner, 2007) is calibrated to three poverty lines. These legacy R59 MRP lines are calibrated with the R68 MRP data for the new R68 scorecard to allow existing users of the old R59 scorecard to measure change over time with the new R68 scorecard without having to start over from scratch.

National (R59 Saxena MRP) poverty line

India's poverty lines are defined at the level of states/union territories and—within states—by urban/rural areas. For the national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) line with the old R59 scorecard, smaller states and union territories are grouped with larger neighboring states as follows (Deaton, 2003):

- Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Pondicherry are grouped with Tamil Nadu
- Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim, and Tripura are grouped with Assam
- Chandigarh is grouped with Punjab
- Chhattisgarh is grouped with Madhya Pradesh
- Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, and Gao are grouped with Maharashtra
- Rural Delhi is grouped with rural Haryana
- Jammu and Kashmir is grouped with Himachal Pradesh
- Jharkhand is grouped with Bihar
- Lakshadweep is grouped with Kerala
- Uttaranchal/Uttarakhand is grouped with Uttar Pradesh

Saxena (2001) gives the national (Saxena MRP) poverty lines for R55.⁵¹ They are adjusted here for changes in prices between R55 and R59 using the price index for industrial workers (urban areas) and the price index for rural labourers (rural areas).⁵² The national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) poverty lines are the R55 area- and state-specific lines multiplied by the R59 area (urban or rural) price index and divided by the R55 area price index.

⁵¹ The Saxena lines use the Lakdawala Committee's definition of *poverty* (Planning Commission, 2014) and so are sometimes called here "Saxena/Lakdawala" lines.

⁵² http://labourbureaunew.gov.in/showdetail.aspx?pr_id=wAuUJUC4dxc%3d and http://labourbureaunew.gov.in/showdetail.aspx?pr_id=XUfg01%2f%2b%2fIk%3d, retrieved 19apr2016. The price index is for *rural* labourers, not *agricultural* labourers.

Consumption data from the NSSO is not adjusted for changes in prices over the twelve months of survey fieldwork. This means that the price deflator for a given survey round is the average monthly price index (urban or rural) while the survey was in the field.

R55 ran from 1 July 1999 to 30 June 2000, so the price index for R55 should be the average monthly price index from July 1999 to June 2000 (433.33 urban and 309.75 rural). The old R59 scorecard, however, incorrectly uses the average price index from 1 January to 30 December 2000. These indexes—rounded to the nearest integer—are 441 (urban) and 307 (rural).

For R59, the old scorecard used rounded price indexes of 496 (urban) and 328 (rural). The rural index mistakenly comes from the price index for *agricultural* laborers (not *rural* labourers), so better, non-rounded indexes are 495.50 (urban) and 330.50 (rural).

This means that the factor used for converting urban R55 Saxena MRP lines to urban R59 legacy Saxena MRP lines is $496 \div 441 = 1.124717$ instead of $495.50 \div 433.33 = 1.142316$. Thus, the R59 urban lines are too low by 1.54 percent. In the same way, the R59 rural lines are too high by 0.132 percent. Still, the lines are not too far off, and the effects of the mistakes may not be material.

The national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) line has mistakes, but the national (R62 legacy Saxena MRP) line does not. For example, for R59 in urban areas, the mistaken line is INR17.11, while the correct line is INR16.96. This leads to the estimated poverty rate (at the household level) being 16.9 percent instead of the correct 16.3 percent. For R62, R66, and R68 in urban areas, the poverty rates differ by 0.1 percentage points. Differences in rural areas are about 1 to 2 percentage points.

To ensure comparability when measuring change across scorecards, the errors in the national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) line have been replicated when updating to R68.

In any case, the national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) line is not calibrated to the old R59 scorecard, and Schreiner (2007) does not report poverty likelihoods for this line. Thus, no one in India has used a scorecard to estimate poverty rates based on this line. It is discussed here only because it is used in the derivation of the next two lines.

In R68 in urban areas, 10.9 percent of people (and 7.8 percent of households) had per-capita consumption below the national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) line (tables at the end of the paper). The rural figures are 12.8 and 10.2 percent, and the all-India figures are 12.3 and 9.4 percent.

	Urban price index	Rural price index	Urban	Rural	
Round	(industrial labourer)	(rural labourer)	pop. (%)	pop. (%)	
55	441.00 (mistaken)	307.00	28.45	71.54	
55	433.33 (correct)	309.75	20.40	11.04	
59	496.00 (mistaken)	328.00	25.18	74.89	
59	495.50 (correct)	330.50	23.18	14.02	
61	524.58	344.08	25.32	74.68	
62	550.77	360.25	23.65	76.35	
66	777.47	529.58	27.10	72.90	
68	920.41	621.08	28.57	71.43	
1993 ave.	252.08	184.75			
2005 ave.	536.00	348.33			
2011 ave.	884.33	600.33			

The following price indexes and populations shares are used for urban and rural areas with the national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) lines:

<u>\$1.08/day 1993 PPP legacy R59 MRP poverty line</u>

The documentation for the old R59 scorecard presents what it labels a "\$1.00/day" poverty line, but in fact—and in line with its international definition—the line is based on \$1.08/day (Sillers, 2006). For clarity, it is called here "\$1.08/day".

The all-India 1.08/day 1993 purchasing-power parity (PPP) legacy R59 MRP poverty line is derived from:

- 1993 PPP exchange rate of INR7.02 per \$1.00 (Sillers, 2006)
- Average monthly price index in 1993 of 252 for both urban and rural
- Average monthly price index for R59 of 496 for both urban and rural

Given this, the all-India \$1.08/day 1993 PPP legacy R59 MRP line is (Sillers,

2006):

$$\begin{array}{l} \left(2005 \ \mathrm{PPP} \ \mathrm{exchange} \ \mathrm{rate}\right) \cdot \$1.08 \cdot \left(\frac{\mathrm{Price} \ \mathrm{index}_{\mathrm{Ave} \ \mathrm{R59}}}{\mathrm{Price} \ \mathrm{index}_{\mathrm{Ave} \ \mathrm{1993}}}\right), \mathrm{or} \\ \left(\frac{\mathrm{Rs}7.02}{\$1.00}\right) \cdot \$1.08 \cdot \left(\frac{496}{252}\right) = \mathrm{Rs}14.9225. \end{array}$$

Unfortunately, this derivation has errors because it:

- Applies the urban price index to all of India, rather than a population-weighted average of the urban and rural price indexes
- Uses a rounded price index for 1993 (252) rather than 252.08
- Uses a rounded price index for R59 (496) rather than 495.50
- Uses a rounded 1993 PPP factor of 7.02 instead of 7.0162

Of the four errors, the first (using only the urban price index) has the largest effect.

All-rural and all-urban 1.08/day 1993 PPP legacy R59 MRP lines are derived in three steps. The first step assumes that the ratio between the all-urban and all-rural 1.08/day lines is the same as the ratio between the all-urban and all-rural lines in Deaton (2003, Table 5, column "Recalculated Using New Prices", PL₅₅). These lines adjust for weaknesses that Deaton documents in the national (Saxena/Lakdawala) lines for R55, so they are the best indexes of relative prices across states and by urban/rural in India. The all-urban and all-rural Deaton lines for R55 are 11.641972 and 10.169424. This implies:

$$\frac{\text{All - urban \$1.08/day 1993 PPP}}{\text{All - rural \$1.08/day 1993 PPP}} = \frac{\text{Deaton All - urban line}}{\text{Deaton All - rural line}} = \frac{11.641972}{10.169424} = 1.144802.$$

The second step asserts that the population-weighted average of the all-urban \$1.08/day line and the all-rural \$1.08/day line should give the all-India \$1.08/line. Given that 25.18 percent of people in R59 live in urban areas, this implies:

 $0.2518 \cdot \text{All-urban } 1.08/\text{day} + (1 - 0.2518) \cdot \text{All-rural } 1.08/\text{day} = 14.9225.$

The third step is to solve these two equations, giving (in average INR in 2003):

- All-rural \$1.08/day 1993 PPP legacy R59 MRP line of INR14.40
- All-urban \$1.08/day 1993 PPP legacy R59 MRP line of INR16.48

The ratio between the all-urban 1.08/day line for R59 and the all-urban Deaton line for R55 is $16.48 \div 11.641972 = 1.416$. Likewise, the ratio for the all-rural lines is $14.40 \div 10.169424 = 1.416$. Thus, multiplying Deaton's R55 lines by 1.416 gives 1.08/day 1993 PPP legacy R59 MRP lines that adjust for regional differences in the prices and that produce the appropriate all-urban, all-rural, and all-India lines.

Like the national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) line, the errors in the calculation of the \$1.08/day legacy R59 MRP line have been replicated when updating the line to R68 for comparability when measuring change over time.

R68 in urban areas, 10.0 percent of people (and 7.0 percent of households) had per-capita consumption below the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP legacy R59 MRP line (tables at the end of this paper). The rural figures are 25.6 and 21.5 percent, and the all-India figures are 21.1 and 17.0 percent.

\$2.16/day 1993 PPP R59 legacy MRP poverty line

For an urban or rural area in a given state, the \$2.16/day 1993 PPP R59 legacy MRP line for R59 is twice the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R59 legacy MRP line. In Schreiner (2007), this is labeled "\$2.00/day", but it is really \$2.16/day.

MRP legacy definitions of poverty for the old R62 scorecard

The old R62 scorecard (Schreiner, 2008a) is calibrated to six legacy MRP definitions of *poverty*. As for the R59 legacy MRP lines, the R62 legacy MRP lines are calibrated with the R68 data for the new R68 scorecard to allow existing users of the old R62 scorecard to measure change over time with the new R68 scorecard without having to start over from scratch.

As noted above, the R59 legacy MRP poverty lines and the R62 legacy MRP lines are not comparable. That is, the national (R59 legacy Saxena MRP) line has a different definition (thanks to errors in Schreiner, 2007) than the national (R62 legacy Saxena MRP) line. Likewise, the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R59 legacy MRP line (and its multiples) has a different definition (thanks to errors in Schreiner, 2007) than the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line (and its multiples). Thus, estimated changes in poverty rates cannot be measured with a baseline from the old R59 scorecard and a follow-up from the old R62 scorecard. The old R62 scorecard could be calibrated to R59 legacy lines, but it has not been done (and it will not be done).

National (R62 legacy Saxena MRP) poverty line

The national (R62 legacy Saxena MRP) poverty line is based on the R61 lines in Planning Commission (2007). These R61 lines are the lines in Saxena (2001), updated by the government of India using the price indexes cited earlier. Smaller states and union territories are grouped as before, except that Chhattisgarh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, rural Delhi, Goa, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, and

Uttaranchal/Uttarakhand are no longer grouped with a larger neighboring state.

Here, the R61 poverty lines are converted to real, constant units as of R59, R62, R66, and R68 using:

Round	Price index		
	Urban	Rural	
59	495.50	330.50	
61	524.58	344.08	
62	550.77	360.25	
66	777.47	529.58	
68	920.41	621.08	

For example, the R62 lines are the R61 lines, multiplied by the relevant R62 area-specific price index and divided by the relevant R61 area-specific index. The resulting poverty lines and poverty rates are reported in the tables at the end of this paper. These differ slightly from those in Schreiner (2008a); the figures here correctly use the full sample, but the R62 documentation uses the construction sample after splitting up heavily-weighted cases.

In R68 in urban areas, 11.0 percent of people (and 7.9 percent of households) had per-capita consumption below the national (R62 legacy Saxena MRP) line (tables at the end of this paper). The rural figures are 10.5 and 8.2 percent, and the all-India figures are 10.6 and 8.1 percent.

\$1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP poverty line

Like the documentation of the old R59 scorecard, the documentation of the old R62 scorecard presents a "\$1.00/day" poverty line when the line is actually \$1.08/day. The correspondence between the old and new (more accurate) names of the 1993 PPP legacy MRP poverty lines calibrated to the old R62 scorecard are:

Old name	New name
\$1.00	$1.08 (= 1.00 \ge 1.08)$
0.75	$0.81 (= 0.75 \ge 1.08)$
\$1.25	$1.35 (= 1.25 \ge 1.08)$
\$1.50	$1.62 (= 1.50 \ge 1.08)$
\$2.00	$2.16 (= 2.00 \ge 1.08)$

The all-India \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP poverty line is the population-weighted average of the all-urban and all-rural lines. The derivation uses:

- 1993 PPP exchange rate of INR7.0162 per \$1.00 (Sillers, 2006)
- Average urban price index in calendar-year 1993 of 252.08
- Average rural price index in calendar-year 1993 of 184.75
- Average urban price index during R62 of 550.77
- Average rural price index during R62 of 360.25

Applying the formula in Sillers (2006) separately to urban and rural areas in R62 gives an all-urban \$1.08/day line of INR16.56 and an all-rural line of INR14.78. With an urban population share of 23.6495 percent, the all-India \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 MRP legacy poverty line is INR15.20/day.

To adjust for state-level differences in prices (with smaller states and union territories grouped with larger neighboring states as in Table 4a in Deaton, 2003), the all-area line (urban or rural) is multiplied by the Törnqvist index for the state from Deaton (2003, Table 4a) and divided by the average Törnqvist index for the area (urban or rural). The population-weighted area averages of the Törnqvist indexes are:

Dound	Törnqvist index		
Round	Urban	Rural	
59	101.2744	102.1038	
62	102.0348	101.0028	
66	102.0532	101.4538	
68	101.4425	101.9361	

In R62, the urban poverty rates by the 1.08/day R62 legacy MRP line are 13.6 percent for people and 10.0 percent for households. The rural figures are 34.8 and 30.8 percent.

An error in this is that the Törnqvist index for Chhattisgarh is taken from Punjab (97.3 urban, 104.3 rural) instead of Madhya Pradesh (92.7 urban, 95.2 rural).

A larger error is that the process above takes the starting point of the all-urban and all-rural lines as being the same in 1993, rather than recognizing that the all-urban line should be higher. The correct formula for the all-India \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line multiplies \$1.08 by the PPP factor (IND7.0162 per \$1) and by the population-weighted average ratios of the urban and rural price indexes from 1993 to R62:

$$\$1.08 \cdot 7.0162 \cdot \left[(1 - 0.7635) \cdot \left(\frac{550.77}{252.08} \right) + 0.7635 \cdot \left(\frac{360.25}{184.75} \right) \right] = \text{Rs}15.20$$

This gives the same all-India line as above, but now the all-urban and all-rural lines are (as in R59) the solution to two equations. The first equates the ratio of the area \$1.08/day lines to the ratio of Deaton's all-urban and all-rural lines after bringing them to R62:

$$\frac{\$1.08/\text{day all - urban}}{\$1.08/\text{day all - rural}} = \frac{\text{Deaton}_{\text{R55}} \text{ all - urban} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{Urban } \text{CPI}_{\text{R62}}}{\text{Urban } \text{CPI}_{\text{R55}}}\right)}{\text{Deaton}_{\text{R55}} \text{ all - rural} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{Rural } \text{CPI}_{\text{R62}}}{\text{Rural } \text{CPI}_{\text{R55}}}\right)} = \frac{11.64 \cdot \left(\frac{550.77}{433.33}\right)}{10.18 \cdot \left(\frac{360.25}{309.75}\right)} = 1.250283.$$

The second equation relates the population-weighted average of the area lines to the all-India line:

 $(1 - 0.7635) \cdot \$1.08/\text{day}$ all-urban + $0.7635 \cdot \$1.08/\text{day}$ all-rural = INR15.20.

Solving these two equations gives the correct area lines:

- All-urban 1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP = INR17.94
- All-rural 1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP = INR14.35

These correct urban/rural figures should then be adjusted for state-wise cost-ofliving by multiplying by the area- and state-specific Deaton line for R62 and dividing by the population-weighted average area (all-urban or all-rural) Deaton line for R62, rather than the Törnqvist procedure outlined above.

Compared with the incorrect lines actually used, the correct lines for R62 are higher for urban and lower for rural. Nevertheless, the errors are deliberately repeated when updating to R68 to allow measuring change over time. The figures in the R62 documentation (Schreiner, 2008a) differs the figures here because Schreiner (2008a) incorrectly reports using the construction sub-sample after splitting heavily-weighted cases.

In R68 in urban areas, 6.5 percent of people (and 4.5 percent of households) had per-capita consumption below the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line (tables at the end of this paperx). The rural figures are 20.4 and 16.8 percent, and the all-India figures are 16.4 and 13.0 percent.

The \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line is adjusted to R59, R66, and R68 using the urban and rural price indexes documented in the section above for the national (R62 legacy Saxena MRP) line.

\$0.81/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP poverty line

For an urban or rural area in a given state, the \$0.81/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line is the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line, multiplied by 0.75.

\$1.35/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP poverty line

The $1.35/{\rm day}$ 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line is the $1.08/{\rm day}$ 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line, multiplied by 1.25.

\$1.62/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP poverty line

The $1.62/{\rm day}$ 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line is the $1.08/{\rm day}$ 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line, multiplied by 1.50.

\$2.16/day 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP poverty line

The $2.16/{\rm day}$ 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line is the $1.08/{\rm day}$ 1993 PPP R62 legacy MRP line, multiplied by 2.00.

Legacy MRP definition of *poverty* for the old R66 scorecard

National (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) poverty line

Before R66, Planning Commission (2009)⁵³—also known as the "Tendulkar Committee Report"—recommended a new national poverty line for India and provided estimates of person-level poverty rates for R50 and R61 based on the MRP definition of consumption. The Tendulkar line addressed the concern that rural poverty rates by the Saxena/Lakdawala lines seemed too low as well as other critiques in Deaton (2008 and 2003) and Deaton and Tarozzi (2000).

Each state and union territory has its own Tendulkar line, except:

- Andaman and Nicobar Islands is grouped with Tamil Nadu
- Chandigarh is grouped with Punjab
- Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu are grouped with Maharashtra
- Lakshadweep is grouped with Kerala

This line is not reported for the old R62 scorecard in Schreiner (2008a) because it did not exist at that time, and until Schreiner (2012a) presented the old R66 scorecard, no programs in India had used the Tendulkar line with a scorecard. It was supported for the old R66 scorecard as a benchmark and to allow the application of that scorecard with the Tendulkar line and MRP consumption.

As for the legacy lines already discussed, the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line is calibrated with the R68 data for the new R68 scorecard to allow existing users of the old R66 scorecard to measure change over time with a baseline from the old R66 scorecard and a follow-up from the new R68 scorecard without having to start over from scratch.

In R68 in urban areas, 13.7 percent of people (and 9.7 percent of households) had per-capita consumption below the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line (tables at the end of this paper). The rural figures are 25.4 and 21.1 percent, and the all-India figures are 22.0 and 17.5 percent.

⁵³ Himanshu (2010) is a clear exposition of the technical and normative issues.

The figures for this line in Schreiner (2012a) for R66 do not match those here for R66. This is because at the time, I was unaware that official Tendulkar MRP lines for R66 had recently been published (Planning Commission, 2012). I therefore used R61 lines adjusted for changes in the urban and rural price indexes between R61 and R66 (documented above in the section for the national (R62 legacy Saxena MRP) line), rather than the preferred derivation-from-scratch approach in Planning Commission (2009). This paper here for the new R68 scorecard reports the official lines and rates for the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line in R66. For all-India, this means an R66 line of INR24.10 (instead of INR24.36), a person-level poverty rate of 29.9 percent (instead of 31.4 percent), and a household-level poverty rate of 24.2 percent (instead of 25.6 percent). These differences mean that, in order to compensate for known bias, users should subtract off about 1.4 percentage points from estimates of changes in household-level poverty rates that use a baseline with the old R66 scorecard and a follow-up with the new R68 scorecard. The national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line for R68 comes from Planning Commission (2014).

Legacy MMRP definition of *poverty* for the old R66 scorecard

In R66 (and then again in R68), MRP consumption was collected for half the sample, and MMRP consumption was collected for the other half. The NSSO did this to permit backward-looking estimates of changes based on MRP definitions of consumption with a baseline in the past (such as R59 or R62) and a follow-up in R66 or after, as well as forward-looking estimates of changes based on MMRP definitions of consumption with a baseline in R66 and a follow-up in some later round.

Definitions of *poverty* based on MMRP consumption exist only for R66 and R68, as MMRP consumption was not collected before R66. MMRP is closer than MRP to international practice, and Planning Commision (2009, p. 31) suggested that MMRP should be the standard for later NSSO consumption surveys.

In R66, MMRP consumption is higher (INR65.24 per person per day on average for urban, INR34.64 for rural) than MRP consumption (INR61.02 urban, INR31.33 rural). Thus with all else constant, MMRP poverty rates are lower than MRP poverty rates. For example, the person-level poverty rate for the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line in R66 in India as a whole is 21.8 percent, while that same rate for the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line is 29.9 percent.

National (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) poverty line

The proper way to adjust the R61 Tendulkar lines to R66 (or to R68) is a complex procedure described at a high level in Planning Commission (2009). A developer of this procedure (Himanshu, 2011) said that the R66 adjustments are "in process, but it will be a while before they are officially accepted." In the meantime, "an easier way would be to simply extend the R61 poverty lines to R66 by using the relevant price indexes in rural and urban areas. While they may not be accurate, they will not be [far] off the mark. The final poverty line is expected to be close to the one arrived at using this simplification."

As already discussed above, Schreiner (2012a) followed this advice for R66. Thus, the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) lines for R66 are derived from the R61 lines by multiplying them by (777.47 \div 524.58) for urban and by (529.58 \div 344.08) for rural.

The present paper, however, reports instead the official national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) lines for R66 and R68 from Planning Commission (2009 and 2012). The lines are extended back to R59 and R62 using the urban and rural price indexes documented in the earlier discussion of the national (Saxena/Lakdawala) lines.

In R68 in urban areas, 10.2 percent of people (and 7.2 percent of households) had per-capita consumption below the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line of INR33.69 (tables at the end of this paper). The rural figures are INR27.63, 16.6 percent, and 13.7 percent, and the all-India figures are INR29.36, 14.8 percent, and 11.7 percent.
The national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line is sometimes referred to here as "100% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line".

150% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) poverty line

150% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line is 100% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line, multiplied by 1.50.

200% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) poverty line

200% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line is 100% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line, multiplied by 2.00.

<u>\$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP poverty line</u>

The all-India \$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP poverty line is the populationweighted average of the all-urban and all-rural lines. The derivation of this poverty line in Schreiner (2012a) uses:

- 2005 PPP exchange rate for "individual consumption expenditure by households" (World Bank, 2008) of INR15.60 per \$1.00
- Average monthly urban price index for R61 of 524.58
- Average monthly urban price index for R66 of 777.47
- Average monthly urban price index in 2005 of 536.00
- Average monthly rural price index for R61 of 344.08
- Average monthly rural price index for R66 of 529.58
- Average monthly rural price index in 2005 of 348.33
- Rural population share in R66 of 0.7290
- Average all-urban national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line of INR28.40 from Schreiner (2012a), not the INR28.79 from Planning Commission (2012)
- Average all-rural national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line of INR22.86 from Schreiner (2012a), not the INR22.35 from Planning Commission (2012)

The all-India \$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line is:

$$\$1.25 \cdot 15.60 \cdot \left[(1 - 0.7290) \cdot \left(\frac{777.47}{536.00} \right) + 0.7290 \cdot \left(\frac{529.58}{348.33} \right) \right] = \text{Rs}29.29.$$

Given this all-India line, the all-urban and all-rural lines are—as usual—the solution to two equations. The first equates the ratio of the urban and rural \$1.25/day lines to the ratio of the Tendulkar all-urban and all-rural lines in R66 terms:

$$\frac{\$1.25/\text{day all - urban}}{\$1.25/\text{day all - rural}} = \frac{\text{Tendulkar}_{\text{R61}} \text{ all - urban} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{Urban } \text{CPI}_{\text{R66}}}{\text{Urban } \text{CPI}_{\text{R61}}}\right)}{\text{Tendulkar}_{\text{R61}} \text{ all - rural} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{Rural } \text{CPI}_{\text{R66}}}{\text{Rural } \text{CPI}_{\text{R61}}}\right)} = \frac{20.04 \cdot \left(\frac{777.47}{524.58}\right)}{15.56 \cdot \left(\frac{529.58}{344.08}\right)} = 1.240189.$$

The second equation relates the population-weighted average of the area lines to the all-India line:

 $(1 - 0.7290) \cdot \$1.25/day$ all-urban + $0.7290 \cdot \$1.25/day$ all-rural = INR29.29.

Solving these two equations gives the area lines:

- All-urban \$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line = INR34.09
- All-rural 1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line = INR27.50

These urban/rural figures are adjusted for state-wise price differences by multiplying by the area-and-state-specific Tendulkar line for R61 (updated to R66 by the change in the area-specific price index) and dividing by the population-weighted average area (all-urban or all-rural) Tendulkar line for R66. The results are urban poverty rates of 25.7 percent for people and 19.5 percent for households, and rural figures of 43.1 and 36.8 percent.⁵⁴

For R68, the urban and rural 1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP lines are the corresponding R66 lines, multiplied by the change in the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) lines. These changes are is $33.69 \div 28.79 = 1.17020$ in urban areas and $27.63 \div 22.35 = 1.23624$ in rural areas. Thus, the 1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP lines for R68 are INR39.89 (urban), INR33.98 (rural), and INR35.67 (all-India). The corresponding poverty rates in R68 are 17.6 percent for people and 12.9 percent for households in urban areas, 34.0 and 29.2 percent in rural areas, and 29.3 and 24.1 percent in all-India.

⁵⁴ These poverty rates differ from Schreiner (2012a) by 0.1 or 0.2 percentage points.

The World Bank's PovcalNet⁵⁵ reports an R66 person-level poverty rate by the 1.25/day 2005 PPP line of 32.64 percent (versus 38.4 percent of people in R66 for the 1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line here). PovcalNet does not report its R66 urban and rural poverty lines in INR, and it does not report lines or rates for R68. As discussed in Schreiner (2014b), the estimates here are to be preferred because they are based on a fully documented definition of *poverty* and because this paper adjusts for price differences not only by urban and rural overall but also by urban and rural in each state.

\$1.88/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP poverty line

The \$1.88/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line is the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line, multiplied by 1.504.

\$2.50/day 2005 PPP legacy MMRP poverty line

The \$2.50/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line is the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line, multiplied by 2.00.

⁵⁵ iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNetPPP2005/index.htm?0, retrieved 24 April 2016.

New MMRP definitions of *poverty* for the new R68 scorecard

Planning Commission (2014)—also known as the "Rangarajan Committee Report"— proposes new national poverty lines for R68 in place of the Tendulkar lines that were introduced with R66 (Planning Commission, 2009).

Why revise so soon? Planning Commission (2014, p. 1) says that "the poverty lines estimated using the [Tendulkar] methodology did not reflect the changing times and aspirations of the people of India", but this does not really explain anything. The Tendulkar approach is more closely linked with what was used in R61 (it matches the person-level poverty rate in urban areas in R61), but the Rangarajan approach—while not starting completely from scratch—is more closely linked to the previous Lakdawala definition. In technical and normative terms, the Ragaranajan approach is probably a little better: technically, because it follows a cost-of-basic-needs approach that is closer to international practice. and normatively, because it leads to higher poverty rates and thus is closer (while still falling short) to what poverty rates would be by a commonsense/colloquial standard. While both approaches adjust for price differences across regions and survey rounds in about the same way (according to Planning Commission, 2014), Rangarajan aligns better with international practice in that it:

- Follows a cost-of-basic-needs approach (Ravallion, 1988)
- Defines two consumption baskets (urban and rural) rather than one (urban)
- Uses MMRP consumption

The national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) lines differ from the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) lines in that the Rangarajan lines define two (urban and rural) food-plus-non-food consumption baskets rather than a single all-India basket. The single Tendulkar all-India basket is the basket for urban areas in R61 under the previous (Lakdawala) definition of *poverty*, whereas the two (urban and rural) Rangarajan baskets are derived anew with R68 data. In particular, the Rangarajan baskets have three components:

- Cost of a food basket that meets daily per-person nutrition norms for:
 - Calories (2,090 urban, and 2,155 rural)
 - Protein (28 grams urban, and 48 grams rural)
 - Fat (26 grams urban, and 50 grams rural)
- Cost of non-food necessities (education, clothing, transport, and housing)
- Cost of non-food non-necessities

The Rangarajan Committee found that, on average, R68 households in the 15^{th} to 19^{th} percentile (urban) and 25^{th} to 29^{th} percentile (rural) of per-capita *total* consumption had per-capita *food* consumption that matched the cost of their area's food basket. The Rangarajan Committee also set the value for the cost of non-food necessities as the observed consumption expenditure on these items for R68 households in the 45^{th} to 49^{th} percentiles of *total* consumption. Finally, the cost of non-food non-necessities was taken as the average consumption expenditure on these items by the reference groups used to define the food component.

Within a given area, the value of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line is adjusted for state-level price differences. This paper reports an average urban line in R68 of INR46.35, giving a person-level poverty rate of 26.4 percent and a household-level poverty rate of 19.8 percent. In rural areas, the line is INR32.41, with poverty rates of 30.4 percent (people) and 25.9 percent (households). The all-India figures are INR36.39, 29.2 percent, and 24.0 percent. These figures differ slightly from those in Planning Commission (2014):

		Poverty line <u>Poverty rate (%)</u>		<u>y rate (%)</u>
Area	Source	$({ m INR/person/day})$	People	Households
Urban	Rangarajan	46.26	26.4	Not reported
Urban	R68 data	46.35	26.4	19.8
Rural	Rangarajan	31.96	30.9	Not reported
Rural	R68 data	32.41	30.4	25.9
All-India	Rangarajan	36.07	29.6	Not reported
All-India	R68 data	36.39	29.2	24.0

The R68 all-urban figures match exactly, as do the urban figures state-by-state. Yet the rural figures differ for about half the states. Given that the urban figures match, it is unlikely that this paper made a mistake in data handling. Rather, the public-use data distributed by the NSSO for R68 probably differs from that used by the Rangarajan Committee and reported in Planning Commission (2014), most likely by omitting some rural households or by including different sampling weights.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ Schreiner (2016) requests assistance with this issue from Rangarajan and some other Committee members and their collaborators, without a response.

Planning Commision (2014) also reports poverty lines and rates for R66 by the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line. These imply extremely large decreases in poverty rates in the 24 months between R66 and R68, from 37.9 percent of people in R66 to 29.2 percent in R68, or -8.7 percentage points. Planning Commission (2014, p. 5) notes, almost in passing, that this implies that about 92 million people crossed from below to above the poverty line in two years. The change by the national (R66 Tendulkar MRP) line is of the same order of magnitude (-7.9 percentage points, or about 84 million people.

This rould be the headline of Planning Comission (2014): For two years, India reduced the number of poor people by about 40–45 million per year.

Could this be true? Planning Commission (2014) reports this and moves on without one more word of discussion. But either India is doing something so right on such a scale as to be unprecendented in human history, or there is something very wrong with its poverty estimates.

	Househ	olds (%)	
Asset owned	R66	R68	Change (% points)
Refrigerator	17	20	+3
Stove/gas burner	46	55	+9
Pressure cooker/pressure pan	42	49	+7
Television	51	59	+8
Electric fan	65	72	+7
Almirah/dressing table	50	56	+6
Chair, stool, bench, or table	72	78	+6
Motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep	$\overline{20}$	$\overline{26}$	+6

Do these estimates jibe with other data or perspectives? Changes in asset ownership covered by the indicators in the new R68 scorecard between R66 and R68 are consistent with a rapid decrease in poverty:

Narayan and Murgai (2016) say that the "sharp and unprecendented" reduction appears to be real while noting that perhaps some poverty reduction that happened before R66 shows up spuriously between R66 and R68 (p. 3). They note that 2009/10 (corresponding with R66) was "a year of particularly severe droughts, which is likely to have dampened the gains between 2005 and 2010 and, conversely, to have accentuated the apparent progress from 2010 to 2012 as the economy rebounded to its 'trend'." Narayan and Murgai also note that the India Human Development Survey—an independent, unrelated data source—shows similar improvements.

Dang and Lanjouw (2015) also support the idea that the large fall in poverty is real. They build two econometric poverty-assessment models, one based on R61 data to estimate poverty rates with R66 data, and another based on R66 data to estimate poverty rates with R68 data. Using PovcalNet's definition of *poverty*—URP consumption and national (Saxena/Lakdawala MRP) poverty lines—they find that the

"sharply accelerated poverty decline . . . is reasonably captured by [the R66 and R68 data]" (pp. 5 and 16).

Dang and Lanjouw (2015) flip the typical approach (used in this paper) in which the data is taken as true/correct and the adequacy of an econometric model built with one data set (here, R68) is judged based on its performance in a second data set (here, R59, R62, and R66). In contrast, Dang and Lanjouw take their econometric model (built with R66 data) as true/correct—because their econometric model based on R61 data performed well when applied to R66 data—and then judge the adequacy of the R68 data based on its performance with their model in terms of whether the 95-percent confidence intervals of the SES-based estimates incude their model's estimated all-India person-level poverty rates. This paper assumes (and then tests) the assumptions of a constant relationship between indicators and poverty and of a constant population. Thus, to the extent that the Dang and Lanjouw results support the validity of the fall in poverty between R66 and R68, then the results here concur, although more strongly for MMRP definitions of *poverty* than for MRP definitions.

150% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line

150% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line is 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, multiplied by 1.50.

200% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line

200% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line is 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, multiplied by 2.00.

Line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line

The line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line is defined as the median aggregate household per-capita consumption of people (not households) below 100% of the national line (U.S. Congress, 2004).

Unlike all previous lines documented here for India (but like the relative percentile-based lines discussed below), this line is derived by putting all area- and state-specific price adjustments in the measure of consumption, rather than in the poverty line.⁵⁷ Thus, this poverty line in R68 is INR28.16, regardless of area (urban or rural). The corresponding poverty rates in R68 are 5.0 percent for people and 3.4 percent for households in urban areas, 18.5 and 15.4 percent in rural areas, and 14.6 and 11.7 percent in all-India. By definition, the all-India person-level poverty rate for this line in R68 (14.6 percent) is exactly half of the all-India person-level poverty rate for the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line (29.2 percent).

For the purposes of meeting reporting requirements by USAID's microenterprise partners in India, USAID defines a household as *very poor* if its daily per-capita consumption is less than the highest of:

- The \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line (INR25.13 in R68), or
- The line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line (INR28.16 in R68)

⁵⁷ This corrects how the scorecard derived this line in work prior to 2016 (in particular, for India in Schreiner 2007, 2008a, and 2012a). Formerly, price adjustments were left in the poverty line and compared with nominal consumption to find a line in each poverty-line region (for India, urban and rural in each state) that marked the poorest half of people below 100% of the national line in that particular poverty-line region. Both approaches produce a poverty rate that is half that of 100% of the national line, but the people who are identified as *poor* differ. Unlike the former approach, the current approach correctly identifies as *poor* the poorest half of all people in the country whose price-adjusted consumption is below the single, all-country national line. This implies that the correction in Schreiner (2014b) of the derivation used for this line by IRIS Center for its Poverty-Assessment Tool is itself wrong, and IRIS Center's approach (the one adopted here now) is correct (although IRIS Center still incorrectly derives this line based on households instead of people).

USAID microenterprise partners in India who use the scorecard to report the number of their participants who are "very poor" to USAID should use the line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line. USAID (2014, p. 8) has approved the scorecard—when re-branded as a Progress Out of Poverty Index[®]—for use by its microenterprise partners.

Schreiner (2007, 2008a, and 2012a) presents similar lines for the old R59, R62, and R66 scorecards. In R59, this line is based on the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R59 legacy MRP line. In R62, it is based on 100% of the national (R62 legacy Saxena MRP) line. In R66, it is based on 100% of the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line. Data from R68 is not used to calibrate these legacy lines to scores from the new R68 scorecard because the real value of the line marking the poorest half of people under the national line changes over time, so it cannot be used to measure changes in poverty rates. This is because the line depends on the number of people below the national poverty line and the distribution of their consumption, two things that change over time. Apples-to-apples comparisons over time are not possible with this line.

\$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP poverty line

The all-India \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP poverty line is derived differently than the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP R59 and R62 legacy MRP lines and differently than the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP R66 legacy MMRP line. It is also derived differently than by the World Bank's PovcalNet. The approach here follows that in Ferreira *et al.* (2015) except that:

- This paper uses MMRP consumption rather than URP consumption
- This paper uses the overall urban-to-rural price ratio implied by the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line rather than the overall urban-to-rural price ratio implied by the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line
- This paper adjusts for price differences by urban and rural in each state rather than only at the all-urban and all-rural levels for India as a whole

Each of these differences favors the 1.90/day 2011 PPP lines and poverty-rate estimates here. In particular:

- MMRP consumption is more accurate than URP consumption
- Compared with the R66 Tendulkar lines, the R68 Rangarajan lines are more recent as well as better technically and normatively
- If it makes sense to adjust the national (Saxena, Tendulkar, and Rangarajan) lines for price differences by urban and rural in each state, and if it makes sense to adjust for price differences by country around the world (the purpose of the 2011 PPP lines in the first place), then it also makes sense to adjust 2011 PPP lines for price differences by urban and rural in each state of a given country (here, India)

The derivation of the 1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP poverty line uses:

- MMRP consumption
- 2011 PPP factor for "individual consumption expenditure by households" of INR14.9752 per 1.00^{58}
- Share λ of urban locations in the 2011 PPP price survey in India (Ferreira et al., 2015): 0.74
- Share of India's population in R68 that is rural: 0.7143
- Average monthly urban price index for R68 of 920.41
- Average monthly urban price index for calendar-year 2011 of 884.33
- Average monthly rural price index for R68 of 621.08
- Average monthly rural price index for calendar-year 2011 of 600.33
- Average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in urban areas in R66 of INR39.62
- Average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in urban areas in R68 of INR46.35
- Average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in rural areas in R66 of INR26.23
- Average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in rural areas in R68 of INR32.41
- ω , the ratio of the all-urban national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line to the all-rural national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in R68: 46.35 ÷ 32.41 = 1.43035

⁵⁸ iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&CO=IND_1& PPP0=14.98&PL0=1.90&Y0=2011.5&NumOfCountries=1, retrieved 24 April 2016.

Ferreira *et al.* (2015) draw on Chen and Ravallion (2010) and Ravallion (2008) to decompose the all-India 2011 PPP factor of INR14.975 per \$1 into a rural PPP factor (PPP_R) and an urban PPP factor (PPP_U).⁵⁹ Based on the formula in Ferreira *et al.* (2015) and on the data and assumptions here, PPP_{R} is:

$$PPP_{R} = \frac{PPP}{\omega \cdot \lambda + 1 - \lambda} = \frac{14.9752}{1.43035 \cdot 0.74 + 1 - 0.74} = 11.3581.$$

 PPP_{U} is then:

$$PPP_{U} = \omega \cdot PPP_{R} = 1.43035 \cdot 11.3581 = 16.2461$$

Following Sillers (2006), the all-urban 1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line in R68 (1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012) is:

$$\begin{aligned} \$1.90 \cdot \text{Urban 2011 PPP} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{Ave. urban price index R68}}{\text{Ave. urban price index 2011}}\right) = \\ \$1.90 \cdot 16.2461 \cdot \left(\frac{920.41}{884.33}\right) = \text{IND32.127.} \end{aligned}$$

In the same way, the all-rural \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line in R68 is:

$$\begin{aligned} \$1.90 \cdot \text{Rural 2011 PPP} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{Ave. rural price index R68}}{\text{Ave. rural price index 2011}}\right) = \\ \$1.90 \cdot 11.3571 \cdot \left(\frac{621.08}{600.33}\right) = \text{IND22.326.} \end{aligned}$$

Weighing the urban and rural \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP lines by their population shares gives the all-India \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line:

$$(1 - 0.7143) \cdot 32.127 + 0.7143 \cdot 22.326 = IND25.126.$$

For an urban or rural area in a given state, the area- and state-specific \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line is the all-urban or all-rural line above, multiplied by the area- and state-specific national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line for R68, and

⁵⁹ This seems to be necessary because the calculation of the published 2011 PPP factor of INR14.9752 per \$1 apparently is a simple (unweighted) average across locations covered in the price survey, even though about three-fourths of these were urban while about three-fourths of India's population is rural.

divided by the area's person-weighted average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line for R68.

For example, the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line in rural Andhra Pradesh (since 2014, in rural Andhra Pradesh and rural Telangana) in R68 is the all-rural \$1.90/day line in R68 of INR22.326, multiplied by the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in rural Andhra Pradesh in R68 of INR33.92, and divided by the average all-rural national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line in R68 of INR32.41. This gives a \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line of 22.326 x $33.92 \div 32.41 = INR23.36$.

For R66 (the only other round that collected MMRP consumption), the areaand state-specific 1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line is:

All-area \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MRP line for R68 x (All-area person-weighted average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line for R66 \div All-area person-weighted average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line for R68) x (Area- and state-specific national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line for R66 \div All-area person-weighted average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line for R66 \div

For the example of rural Andhra Pradesh in R66 (after cancelling the second and fifth terms), the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line is the all-rural \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line for R68 of INR22.33, multiplied by the rural Andhra Pradesh national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line for R66 of INR27.36, divided by the all-rural person-weighted average national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) MMRP line for R68 of INR32.41. This gives a \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line in rural Andhra Pradesh in R66 of 22.33 x $27.36 \div 32.41 = INR18.85$.

The appraoch outlined above gives the following \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP lines and poverty rates for all of India in R66 and R68:

		R	.66		$\mathbf{R68}$				
	Line	Pov. ra	ate (%)		Line	Pov. ra			
Area	(INR)	HH	People	\boldsymbol{n}	(INR)	HH	People	n	
Urban	27.46	10.5	14.4	$41,\!697$	32.13	6.2	8.8	42,811	
Rural	18.07	8.3	10.5	$59,\!097$	22.33	5.4	6.6	$65,\!283$	
All	20.62	8.9	11.6	100,794	25.13	5.6	7.2	108,094	

\$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP lines and rates, approach followed here

As explained above, these estimates are based on a sensible approach. In particular, it uses the most-recent definition of national poverty lines (R68 Rangarajan MMRP), adopts the urban- and rural-specific PPP factors used by PovcalNet, and adjusts for urban and rural price differences state-by-state.

Nevertheless, rural person-level poverty rates in R68 are lower (6.6 percent) than urban rates (8.8 percent). As noted later in the context of the RBI lines, this contrasts with the pattern of urban/rural poverty-rate estimates in India (except for RBI lines and except for some states with the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) lines)⁶⁰ and in all other countries. In developing countries, it is unheard of that rural is poorer than urban. The R68 all-India person-level rate for \$1.90/day is also 14.0 percentage points lower than PovcalNet (7.2 versus 21.2 percent), a difference of about 180 million people.⁶¹

As noted above, these estimates differ from PovcalNet due to the use of:

- MMRP consumption instead of URP consumption⁶²
- Rangarajan lines instead of Tendulkar lines
- Area- and state-specific price adjustments instead of only area-specific

Each of the three factors serves to reduce the estimated poverty rate. Of the three, the main driver is the choice of the definition of consumption. PovcalNet uses its approach to estimate a person-level 1.90/day poverty rate in 2012 for India of 21.2 percent with URP consumption versus 12.4 percent with MMRP consumption (Ferreira *et al.*, 2015).

The second choice—the definition of the national line—matters because the ratio of the all-urban line to the all-rural line in R68 is about twice as high for Rangarajan (1.43035) as for Tendulkar (1.21932).⁶³ This is presumably because Rangarajan uses separate urban and rural poverty-line baskets, while Tendulkar uses a single basket (the urban basket under the Saxena/Lakdawala definition). Given that about threefourths of people in India are rural, making the urban/rural 2011 PPP factor ratio match this urban/rural national-line ratio pushes $PPP_{\rm U}$ up a little (from 14.9752 to 16.2461) and pushes $PPP_{\rm R}$ down a lot (from 14.9752 to 11.3581). The slightly higher urban line increases the estimated urban poverty rate for one-fourth of India's people, and the much lower rural line decreases the estimated rural poverty rate for threefourths of India's people. As shown in the table below, the effect in R68 of keeping the

population/india-population/, retrieved 27 April 2016.

⁶⁰ See Mishra (2014). Deaton and Drèze (2014) point out that urban person-level poverty rates exceed rural rates in half of India's major states by the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) lines. Planning Commission (2014) does not mention this anomaly.
⁶¹ Given a 2012 population of 1,263,589,639, see worldometers.info/world-

 $^{^{62}}$ World Bank (2015) indicates that the World Bank plans to switch its \$1.90/day 2011 PPP estimates from URP to MMRP consumption from now on.

⁶³ It might also matter if the relative lines among states differ by definition. Planning Commission (2014, p. 63) says that its derivation of the price adjustments for the Rangarajan lines are "broadly similar" to that of the Tendulkar lines.

same approach as adopted in this paper—but using the Tendulkar ratio (like PovcalNet and Ferreira *et al.*, 2015) instead of the Rangarajan ratio—is to increase the all-India person-level poverty rate from 7.2 percent to 8.4 percent. This is a non-trivial difference—corresponding to about 15 million people—but this choice is not the main driver of the differences between this paper and PovcalNet, nor does it explain why estimates of rural poverty rates are higher than urban.

\$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP lines and rates, this paper's approach but using the Tendulkar urban/rural ratio of 1.21932 instead of the Rangarajan ratio of 1.43035

		$\mathbf{R66}$		R68			
	Line	Pov. ra	ate (%)	Line	Pov. rate $(\%)$		
Area	(INR)	HH	People	(INR)	HH	People	
Urban	26.55	9.4	13.0	31.07	5.3	7.7	
Rural	20.50	14.8	18.1	25.33	9.8	11.9	
All	22.15	13.2	16.7	26.97	8.4	10.7	

Going one more step and dropping state-level price adjustments (while using PovcalNet's Tendulkar ratio and this paper's MMRP consumption) leads to an increase in the estimated person-level poverty rate in R68 for India from 8.4 percent to 9.8 percent. More important, rural poverty rates now exceed urban rates. This paper's all-India person-level estimates of 14.0 percent for R66 and 9.8 percent for R68 bracket PovcalNet's estimate for 2012 of 12.4 percent based on the same choices as here and with MMRP consumption. There is still a small unexplained difference, but the estimates are not very different.

\$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP lines and rates, this paper's use of PovcalNet's approach but with MMRP (not URP) consumption

		$\mathbf{R66}$		R68			
	Line	Pov. ra	ate (%)	Line	Pov. rate $(\%)$		
Area	(INR)	HH	People	(INR)	HH	People	
Urban	26.56	9.9	13.7	31.07	6.0	8.6	
Rural	20.50	15.7	19.1	25.33	11.5	14.0	
All	22.14	14.0	17.7	26.97	9.8	12.5	

The above implies that adjusting for urban and rural price differences state-by-state—based on the relative state-by-state differences in the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) lines—is the main factor cauasing rural poverty rates to exceed urban rates. This result does not make sense, even though it does make sense to adjust for price

differences state-by-state. Likewise, PovcalNet's main reason (and it is a good reason) for using URP consumption and Tendulkar lines is consistency with past estimates. The estimates here are not completely satisfactory, nor are the estimates of PovcalNet, and no one pretends that either is "truth". Like much of the discussion in Ferreira *et al.* (2015), the discussion here highlights the difficulties and the non-cut-and-dried choices that sometimes must be made to measure a consumption-based definition of *poverty*. This paper presents its choices, the details of its derivations, and the strengths and weaknesses of its results, without making any stronger claim than having tried to do its best.

It seems that the approach used to adjust the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) lines for state-by-state differences in prices is not similar—in spite of the assertions by Planning Commission (2014)—to the approach used with the national (R66 Tendulkar MMRP) lines, and that there is some problem with the Rangarajan adjustment, or perhaps with the R68 data used to make the adjustment.

<u>\$3.10/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP poverty line</u>

The \$3.10/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line is the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line, multiplied by 1.63157. Ferreira *et al.* (2015) note that this line has "been proposed as the comparable equivalent to the \$2 dollar-a-day poverty line in 2005 PPPs, commonly used as a poverty line for middle-income countries."

\$3.80/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP poverty line

The 3.80/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line is the 1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line, multiplied by 2.00.

\$4.00/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP poverty line

The 4.00/day 2011 PPP R68 line is the 1.90/day 2011 PPP R68 MMRP line, multiplied by 2.10526.

R68 RBI urban and rural MMRP poverty lines

The Reserve Bank of India (RBI, 2015) defines the R68 urban and rural RBI MMRP lines as:

- INR160,000 per year per household in urban areas
- INR100,000 per year per household in rural areas⁶⁴

The R66 legacy urban and rural RBI lines were defined by an RBI committee chaired by Shri Y.H. Malegam (RBI, 2011a and 2011b) as:

- INR120,000 per year per household in urban areas
- INR60,000 per year per household in rural areas

The 2015 update increased the urban RBI line by 33.3 percent and the rural RBI line by 66.7 percent. This is just one way in which the RBI lines (set by decree) are not *poverty lines* in the same sense as any of the other 29 lines discussed here. In particular, the RBI lines are not derived as the cost of a basket of goods and services determined via economic theory, logic, and analysis of NSSO data. There derivation is not documented, and they appear to be set "by hand".

Non-banking financial companies who make microloans can receive below-market-rate "priority-sector" funding from the RBI only if 85 percent of their loans are "qualifying assets" that—besides fulfilling other criteria—go to households below the relevant RBI line. According to Jain (2011), the policy responds to a perception that microlenders had shifted their focus away from the poor: "The objective of this guideline is to push microfinance institutions to reach poor people (who also tend to be financially excluded) instead of serving better-off (so-called low-hanging fruit) clients who are usually lower-cost and lower-risk for the microfinance institutions to serve but who do not advance the agenda of poverty alleviation or financial inclusion" (p. 1).

⁶⁴ For the precise definitions of *urban* and *rural* to be used with the RBI lines, see Section 2.1.6 of National Sample Survey Organisation (2001).

But the RBI lines may have unintended consequences. While their focus on meeting explicit goals for outreach to the poor may or may not turn out to serve its stated purpose, several aspects of the lines' definition tend to promote outreach to those who are under the RBI line but who would not be under a poverty line that produces the same overall poverty rate but is defined following international practice. This is because:

- The RBI lines are defined in terms of (cash) income, not consumption. Relative to consumption, (cash) income understates the resources used up by households (such as small-scale farmers) that consume some of their own production. Some households in these groups would be non-poor by consumption but are poor by income, while there is no expected compensating net shift of those who would be poor by consumption to being non-poor by income. This aspect of the RBI lines weakens the incentives for microlenders to deepen their poverty outreach
- The RBI lines are defined in terms of *total* household income rather than *per-capita* household income. Thus, the share of all poor households who have below-average household size—and who are less likely to be poor with a per-capita definition—increases, weakening incentives to reach those who would be under non-RBI lines that produce the same overall poverty rate
- The RBI lines define urban cost-of-living as 60-percent higher than rural. In contrast, the Rangarajan line suggests that urban cost-of-living is about 43 percent higher than rural. This increases the share of India's poor who are urban and who fall below the RBI lines vis-à-vis a more standard definition, again working against RBI's stated purpose
- The RBI lines do not adjust for price differences by state. This means that the RBI line is too high in rural areas and in poorer states because those places have both higher poverty rates (by other poverty lines) and lower prices. The opposite holds for urban areas and for less-poor states. The net effect of these countervailing forces on incentives for poverty outreach is ambiguous
- The RBI lines do not have an established process to regularly adjust for changes in prices over time. As time passes, more households will qualify as poor who would not be poor if the line were adjusted for inflation, again weakening outreach those who are below standard poverty lines

The RBI lines for R68 appear in the tables at the end of the paper.⁶⁵ The urban line is INR438.36 per *household* (not per-capita) per day (INR160,000 per household per year), giving a poverty rate (with MMRP consumption) of 71.1 percent for people and of 76.5 percent for households. For rural areas, the line is INR273.97 per household (not per-

⁶⁵ In this paper, MMRP consumption is substituted for income, as income is not measured in the NSSO expenditure module.

capita) per day (INR100,000 per household per year), and the corresponding poverty rates are 71.1 percent (people) and 78.2 percent (households).⁶⁶

Among all the poverty lines in the more than 60 countries with scorecards, the RBI lines are unique in that they:

- Imply that urban poverty rates are about the same as rural poverty rates
- Produce household-level poverty rates that are higher than person-level rates
- Ignore changes in prices over time
- Ignore the composition of the household

Calibration of the new R68 scorecard here to the RBI lines does not constitute an endorsement of the RBI policy nor of the RBI poverty lines themselves. Rather, it recognizes that if the RBI policy is to be taken seriously, then microlenders need an inexpensive, standardized tool that can measure poverty objectively and transparently so as to facilitate comparisons and audits (Jain, 2011). The scorecard is well-suited to this task.⁶⁷ No poverty tool—other than the NSSO expenditure module—can determine a household's poverty status with certainty. Nevertheless, the scorecard gives databased estimates of poverty rates for groups of households with known accuracy. With the scorecard, proving compliance with the RBI mandate should be as simple as showing that a representative sample of a microlender's clients have an estimated household-level poverty rate⁶⁸ by the RBI lines of 85 percent or higher, with (say) an 80-percent confidence interval of ± 5 percentage points.

 $^{^{\}rm 66}$ Perhaps RBI set the urban and rural lines give the same person-level poverty rate.

⁶⁷ For the RBI rural line, however, only scores of 14 or less have poverty likelihoods above 85 percent. Only about 12 percent of all households in India in R68 scored this low, so a microlender with only rural clients would be highly unlikely to qualify for priority-sector funding if it measured the poverty of its clients with the scorecard. This is not a defect of the scorecard; rather, it reflects the RBI lines' birth by decree rather than via standard international practice. For the RBI urban line, scores of 54 or less do have poverty likelihoods above 85 percent, and 42.6 percent of urban households score 54 or less, so urban lenders could use the scorecard and still reasonably hope to qualify for priority-sector funding. This creates strong incentives for microlenders to focus on urban borrowers or to use some other non-scoring, more-inaccurate method to measure poverty.

 $^{^{\}rm 68}$ The relevant rate is for households rather than people because RBI defines the line in household terms.

The RBI has not specified how microlenders can prove compliance, other than to require that any methods be certified by a chartered accountant (Jain, 2011). It is unclear, however, how such certification will itself be certified, as few tools other than the scorecard have known accuracy. Jain (2011) reports that microfinance stakeholders have discussed the following approaches:

- Count households as *poor* if they have a ration card or a "Below Poverty Line" card. Such markers are not very accurate (Jalan and Murgai, 2007). In R68 in urban areas, all households with a ration card or who are "BPL" were poor by the RBI urban line, while 80 percent of those without a ration card and who were not "BPL" were still poor by the RBI urban line. In rural areas, the figures were 77.1 percent and 83.2 percent (so those with a ration card or BPL status were less likely to be poor than others in rural areas, based on the RBI line). Thus, BPL status or holding a ration card is not a good indicator of poverty status by the RBI lines
- Idiosyncratic mechanisms designed by microlenders themselves, although such tools would be non-standardized, non-comparable, and of unknown accuracy
- Replicating the NSSO consumption module, although it is very costly
- Self-declaration by clients, although they may perceive incentives to lie
- Declaration by community leaders, although they may also perceive incentives to lie

Jain (2011) argues that the scorecard is a good, feasible alternative, and this paper concurs. If the RBI is going to require microlenders to prove their poverty outreach to qualify for subsidized funding, then it should certify the use of the scorecard and also replace the RBI lines with some multiple of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line.

Like the line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line, and like the relative (percentile-based) lines discussed below, the RBI lines do not have a constant value through time. Thus, they cannot be used to measure changes in poverty rates over time.

New relative (percentile-based) R68 MMRP definition of poverty

India is the second country for which the scorecard supports relative (percentile-based) poverty lines. These lines allow scoring to be used in a number of types of analyses more straightforwardly than otherwise.

For example, the second-quintile (40th-percentile) line—as well as the firstquintile (20th-percentile) line—might be used to help track progress toward the World Bank's (2013) goal of "shared prosperity/inclusive economic growth", defined as income growth among the bottom 40 percent of the world's people.

Also, the five quintile lines can be used together to analyze the relationship of the distribution of consumption with health outcomes (or anything else related with the distribution of consumption). Until now, such health-equity analyses often used a "wealth index" such as that supplied with the data from USAID's Demographic and Health Surveys (Rutstein and Johnson, 2004; Henry *et al.*, 2003; Sahn and Stifel, 2003).

Of course, analysts could always do (and still can do) relative-wealth analyses with scores from the scorecard. But support for relative consumption lines now allows the use of a single tool (the scorecard) to analyze any or all of:

- Relative wealth (via scores)
- Absolute consumption (via poverty likelihoods and absolute poverty lines)
- Relative consumption (via poverty likelihoods and percentile-based poverty lines)

Unlike the scorecard, wealth indexes are relevant only for analyzing relative wealth. Furthermore, the scorecard—unlike wealth indexes based on Principal Component Analysis or similar approaches—is tied to a straightforward, wellunderstood standard (consumption related to a poverty line defined in monetary terms) whose definition is external to the scorecard itself.

In contrast, a wealth index defines *poverty* in terms of the index's own indicators and points, without reference to any standard external to the index itself. This means that two wealth indexes with different indicators or different points—both constructed with the same data for the same country—imply two different (opaque) definitions of *poverty*. In contrast, two scorecards in that same situation still measure a single, externally-defined (and transparent) definition of *poverty*.⁶⁹

Unlike all previous lines supported here for India (except the line that marks the poorest half of people under 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line), the relative (percentile-based) lines are derived by putting all area- and state-specific price adjustments in the measure of consumption, rather than in the poverty line. Once a given relative (percentile-based) line has been derived, the price adjustments are taken

⁶⁹ Relative definitions of *poverty* have the drawback of being unable to measure the *size* of change over time; they can only sometimes indicate the sign (direction) of change.

out of the measure of consumption and put back in the poverty line. The result is that, for a given percentile-based line, the all-urban and all-rural lines are the same as the all-India line, although the urban and rural percentile-based lines in a given state differ from each other.

For example, the person-weighted average first-quintile (20th-percentile) poverty line in R68 across all of India is INR30.57 for both urban and rural. In the state of Andhra Pradesh, however, the urban first-quintile (20th-percentile) line is INR29.72, while the rural line is INR32.00, and the all-state line is INR31.26.

Following the convention for wealth indexes, the percentiles used when setting relative percentile-based lines are person-level, not household-level. For example, the first-quintile (20^{th} -percentile) poverty line gives a person-level poverty rate for all of India of 20 percent (and a household level rate of 16.1 percent). Likewise, the median (50^{th} -percentile) poverty line is that which gives a person-level poverty rate for all of India of 50 percent.

First-quintile (20th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line:

The first-quintile (20th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line is that single line that, when compared with area- and state-specific price-adjusted MMRP consumption, gives an all-India person-level poverty rate of 20 percent.

Second-quintile (40th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line:

The second-quintile (40th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line is that single line that, when compared with area- and state-specific price-adjusted MMRP consumption, gives an all-India person-level poverty rate of 40 percent.

Median (50th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line:

The median (50th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line is that single line that, when compared with area- and state-specific price-adjusted MMRP consumption, gives an all-India person-level poverty rate of 50 percent.

Third-quintile (60th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line:

The third-quintile (60th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line is that single line that, when compared with area- and state-specific price-adjusted MMRP consumption, gives an all-India person-level poverty rate of 60 percent.

Fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line:

The fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line is that single line that, when compared with area- and state-specific price-adjusted MMRP consumption, gives an all-India person-level poverty rate of 80 percent.

There is no explicit support for a fifth-quintile (100th-percentile) R68 MMRP poverty line because all people (and all households) are poor by such a line. Thus, no measurement is required to determine the poverty status of a household or the poverty rate of a group by this line.

					% with MRP consumption below a poverty line								
	Line	\mathbf{HHs}		L	egacy R59)			Legacy	7 R62			Legacy R66
	or	or	$\mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{s}$	Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Int	il. 1993 P	PP		National
Year	Rate	People	Surveyed	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
All of I	<u>ndia</u>												
2003	Line	People		12.93	14.93	29.85	12.74	13.89	10.42	17.37	20.84	27.79	15.22
R59	Rate	HHs	41,013	18.9	31.3	78.8	17.5	26.2	9.3	44.2	58.1	75.1	31.6
	Rate	People		23.7	37.2	83.9	22.0	31.4	11.7	50.7	64.9	80.6	37.9
2005/6	Line	People		14.11	16.39	32.77	13.89	15.20	11.40	19.00	22.79	30.39	16.62
R62	Rate	HHs	$39,\!436$	18.5	30.3	78.4	17.0	25.4	9.5	42.6	56.9	74.9	29.9
	Rate	People		22.3	35.2	83.5	20.4	29.8	11.1	48.5	63.2	80.2	35.2
2009/10	Line	People		20.77	23.95	47.90	20.46	22.17	16.63	27.71	33.25	44.34	24.10
R66	Rate	HHs	100,855	15.1	26.1	73.9	13.5	20.9	6.6	37.9	52.2	70.1	24.2
	Rate	People		19.1	31.4	80.0	17.3	25.5	8.4	44.3	59.1	76.5	29.9
2011/12	Line	People		24.60	28.20	56.41	24.25	26.10	19.58	32.63	39.15	52.20	29.37
R68	Rate	HHs	$101,\!662$	9.4	17.0	65.8	8.1	13.0	3.3	27.1	40.7	61.2	17.5
	Rate	People		12.3	21.1	72.8	10.6	16.4	4.2	32.8	47.6	68.3	22.0
Constru	uction a	nd calibra	ation (Selectin	g indicators	and points,	and associa	ating scores	with pover	ty likelihoo	ods)			
2011/12	Rate	HHs	54,315	_						, 		_	
Validat	ion (Me	asuring acc	uracy)										
2003	Rate	HHs	41,013	18.9	31.3	78.8	17.5	26.2	9.3	44.2	58.1	75.1	31.6
2005/6	Rate	HHs	39,436	18.5	30.3	78.4	17.0	25.4	9.5	42.6	56.9	74.9	29.9
2009/10	Rate	HHs	100,855	15.1	26.1	73.9	13.5	20.9	6.6	37.9	52.2	70.1	24.2
2011/12	Rate	HHs	54,106	9.4	16.8	65.6	8.1	12.9	3.2	26.9	40.4	61.1	17.4

Table 1: Sample sizes, R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines, and poverty rates for all of India in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

Source: SES of 2003 (R59), 2005/6 (R62), 2009/10 (R66), and 2011/12 (R68).

Poverty lines are in units of daily per-capita INR in average prices for all of India during a given SES round's fieldwork.

SES fieldwork ran for 365 days, starting on 1 January (R59) or 1 July (R62, R66, and R68).

Figures for the national (R66 legacy Tendulkar MRP) line are based on Planning Commission (2012), not Schreiner (2012a).

				% with	MMRP	consump	tion belo	w a pove	rty line	
	Line	\mathbf{HHs}				Legac	y R66			
	or	or	HHs	Natio	onal Tend	lulkar	Intl. 2005 PPP			
Year	Rate	People	Surveyed	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50	
All of I	<u>ndia</u>									
2003	Line	People								
R59	Rate	HHs								
	Rate	People								
2005/6	Line	People								
R62	Rate	HHs		_						
	Rate	People								
2009/10	Line	People		24.10	36.15	48.20	29.28	44.03	58.56	
R66	Rate	HHs	100,794	17.3	48.4	68.9	31.7	63.3	79.3	
	Rate	People		21.8	56.0	76.0	38.4	70.8	85.1	
2011/12	Line	People		29.36	44.04	58.73	35.67	53.64	71.33	
R68	Rate	HHs	$101,\!651$	11.7	40.6	62.6	24.1	56.6	74.2	
	Rate	People		14.8	47.9	70.0	29.3	64.2	80.7	
Constru	uction a	nd calibra	ation							
2011/12	Rate	HHs					—	—	—	
Validat	ion (M	easuring a	<u>ccuracy)</u>							
2003	Rate	HHs								
2005/6	Rate	HHs						_		
2009/10	Rate	HHs	100,794	17.3	48.4	68.9	31.7	63.3	79.3	
2011/12	Rate	HHs	53,779	11.7	40.5	62.5	24.0	56.5	74.2	

Table 1: Sample sizes, R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines, and poverty rates for all of India in R66 and R68 for people and households

Source: SES of 2003 (R59), 2005/6 (R62), 2009/10 (R66), and 2011/12 (R68).

Poverty lines are daily per-capita INR in average prices for all of India during an SES round. SES fieldwork ran for 365 days, starting on 1 January (R59) or 1 July (R62, R66, and R68). The SES did not collect MMRP consumption in R59 nor R62.

					% with MMRP consumption below a poverty line								
	Line	HHs						R68					
	or	or	HHs	Natio	nal Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPP		R	BI
Year	Rate	People	Surveyed	100%	150%	200%	<100% Natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
All of I	<u>ndia</u>												
2003	Line	People		—				—	—			—	—
R59	Rate	HHs		—		_		—	—	—		—	—
	Rate	People		—		—	—	—	—	—	—		—
2005/6	Line	People				—							
R62	Rate	HHs		—				—	—	—		—	—
	Rate	People											
2009/10	Line	People		29.87	44.80	59.74		20.62	33.65	41.25	43.42	_	
R66	Rate	HHs	100,794	31.5	63.6	80.3		8.9	41.0	57.6	61.4	—	—
	Rate	People		37.9	70.9	85.8		11.6	48.3	65.1	68.7		
2011/12	Line	People		36.39	54.58	72.78	28.16	25.13	41.00	50.25	52.90	160,000	100,000
R68	Rate	HHs	$101,\!651$	24.0	56.9	75.3	11.7	5.6	33.0	50.3	54.3	76.5	78.2
	Rate	People		29.2	64.4	81.6	14.6	7.2	39.4	57.9	61.9	71.1	71.1
Constru	uction a	and calibra	ation (Select	ing indica	tors and	points, a	nd associating sco	ores with	poverty	likelihood	<u>ls)</u>		
2011/12	Rate	HHs	54,315	24.0	56.9	75.2	11.7	11.1	46.7	62.6	66.1	76.5	78.1
Validat	ion (M	easuring a	ccuracy)										
2003	Rate	HHs	_										
2005/6	Rate	HHs		_	—	—	_		—	_	_	_	_
2009/10	Rate	HHs	100,794	31.5	63.6	80.3	_	8.9	41.0	57.6	61.4		
2011/12	Rate	HHs	53,779	24.0	56.8	75.4	11.7	5.7	32.9	50.1	54.3	76.4	78.4

Table 1: Sample sizes, MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, intl. 2011 PPP, and RBI), and poverty rates for all of India in R66 and R68 for people and households

Source: SES of 2003 (R59), 2005/6 (R62), 2009/10 (R66), and 2011/12 (R68).

Poverty lines (except RBI lines) are in units of daily per-capita INR in average prices for all of India during a given SES round's fieldwork.

SES fieldwork ran for 365 days, starting on 1 January (R59) or 1 July (R62, R66, and R68).

The SES did not collect MMRP consumption in R59 nor R62.

RBI lines and the line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the national (Rangarajan) line are not constant in real terms across rounds so they are displayed only for R68. The sample size for RBI lines is 41,697 (urban) and 59,097 (rural).

RBI lines are in units of annual per-household INR income (not consumption) in nominal prices for anywhere in India on any date.

Table 1: Sample sizes, R68 MMRP relative (percentile-based) poverty lines, and poverty rates for all of India in R68 for people and households

				% with MMRP consumption below a poverty line							
	Line	HHs		R68							
	or	or	HHs		Relative (percentile-based) lines						
Year	Rate	People	Surveyed	$20^{ ext{th}}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ ext{th}}$	60^{th}	80^{th}			
All of I	ndia										
2003	Line	People				—					
R59	Rate	HHs				—					
	Rate	People					—				
2005/6	Line	People			—	—	—				
R62	Rate	HHs									
	Rate	People			—	—	—				
2009/10	Line	People			—	—	—				
R66	Rate	HHs				—					
	Rate	People			—	—	—				
2011/12	Line	People		30.57	39.27	44.11	50.34	72.13			
R68	Rate	HHs	$101,\!651$	16.1	33.6	42.8	52.5	73.6			
	Rate	People		20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0			
Constru	uction a	nd calibra	ation								
2011/12	Rate	HHs	$54,\!315$	16.1	33.7	43.0	52.6	73.6			
Validat	ion (Me	asuring a	<u>iccuracy)</u>								
2003	Rate	HHs									
2005/6	Rate	HHs									
2009/10	Rate	HHs									
2011/12	Rate	HHs	$53,\!779$	16.1	33.5	42.6	52.4	73.6			

Source: SES of 2003 (R59), 2005/6 (R62), 2009/10 (R66), and 2011/12 (R68).

Poverty lines are daily per-capita INR in average prices for India during an SES round's fieldwork. SES fieldwork ran for 365 days, starting on 1 January (R59) or 1 July (R62, R66, and R68). The SES did not collect MMRP consumption in R59 nor R62.

Percentile lines are not constant in real terms across rounds and so are displayed only for R68. Percentile lines are derived at the level of people, not households.

<u>Uncertainty</u>	
<u>coefficient</u>	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
824	How many household members are 18-years-old or younger? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
814	How many household members are 17-years-old or younger? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
808	How many household members are 16-years-old or younger? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
777	How many household members are 15-years-old or younger? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
756	How many household members are 14-years-old or younger? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
727	Does the household possess a television, and a VCR/VCD/DVD player? (None; Television only;
	VCR/VCD/DVD player (regardless of television))
717	How many household members are 13-years-old or younger? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
711	Does the household possess a motorcycle, scooter, motor car, or jeep? (No; Yes)
704	How many household members are there? (Eight or more; Seven; Six; Five; Four; Three; Two; One)
678	Does the household possess a motorcycle or scooter? (No; Yes)
676	How many household members are 12-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
649	How many household members are 11-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
646	Does the household possess a washing machine, refrigerator, or a PC/laptop/other peripherals, including
	software? (No; Yes)
639	Does the household possess a refrigerator or a PC/laptop/other peripherals, including software? (No; Yes)
638	Does the household possess a washing machine or a refrigerator? (No; Yes)
626	Does the household possess a refrigerator? (No; Yes)
620	Does the household possess a television? (No; Yes)
602	Does the household possess a stove/gas burner? (No; Yes)
587	Does the household possess a mobile handset or a telephone instrument (landline) (No; Yes)

<u>Uncertainty</u>	
<u>coefficient</u>	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
581	What is the general education level of the male head/spouse? (Not literate, or literate without formal
	schooling (through EGS/NFEC/AEC, TLC, or others); Literate with formal schooling (below
	primary); Literate with formal schooling (primary); Literate with formal schooling (middle); No male
	head/spouse; Literate with formal schooling (secondary); Literate with formal schooling (higher
	secondary); Literate with formal schooling (diploma/certificate course, graduate, or postgraduate and
	above))
566	What is the general education level of the female head/spouse? (Primary or below, or not literate; Middle;
	Secondary or higher; No female head/spouse)
564	Does the household possess an electric fan? (No; Yes)
526	Does the household possess a pressure cooker/pressure pan? (No; Yes)
524	Does the household possess an almirah/dressing table? (No; Yes)
492	What is the household type? (Urban, casual labour; Urban, self-employed; Urban, regular wage/salary-
	earning; Urban, others; Rural, casual labour in agriculture; Rural, casual labour in non-agriculture;
	Rural, self-employed in non-agriculture; Rural, self-employed in agriculture; Rural, regular
	wage/salary-earning, or others)
480	Does the household possess any casseroles, thermos, or thermoware? (No; Yes)
473	Does the household possess a mobile handset? (No; Yes)
439	What is the household's primary source of energy for lighting? (Kerosene, other oil, gas, candle, other, or no
	lighting arrangement; Electricity)
418	How many household members are 6-years-old or younger? (Two or more; One; None)
392	What is the principal occupation of the household? (Elementary occupations, craft and related trades
	workers, or plant and machine operators and assemblers; Skilled agriculture and fishery workers;
	Service workers, and shop and market-sales workers; Does not work; Legislators, senior officials,
	managers, professionals, technicians and associate professionals, or clerks)
376	Does the household possess a washing machine or a PC/laptop/other peripherals, including software? (No;
	Yes)

<u>Uncertainty</u>	
<u>coefficient</u>	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
346	Does the household possess a VCR/VCD/DVD player? (No; Yes)
338	Is the household type "casual labour (in agriculture or non-agriculture)"? (Yes; No)
338	If the household possesses a ration card, then what type is it? (BPL, or Antyodaya; No ration card; Other)
333	Does the household possess a radio, tape recorder, or 2-in-1, or a CD, DVD, etc.? (None; Only radio, tape
	recorder, or 2-in-1; Only CD, DVD, etc.; Both a radio, tape recorder, or 2-in-1, and a CD, DVD etc.)
331	What is the social group of the household? (Scheduled tribe; Scheduled caste; Other backward class; Other)
328	Does the household possess a chair, stool, bench, or table? (No; Yes)
327	Does the household possess a washing machine? (No; Yes)
326	Does the household possess a CD, DVD, etc.? (No; Yes)
322	What is the principal industry of the household? (Construction, and supply of electricity, gas, and water;
	Agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying; Other services (sanitation, private
	households with employed persons); Manufacturing; Hotels, restaurants, transport, storage, or
	communication; Wholesale or retail trade, or repair/maintenance of vehicles; Does not work; Public
	administration, defence, education, health, social work, financial intermediation, real estate, or
	business activities)
282	Is any member of the household a regular salary earner? (No; Yes)
265	In what region does the household live? (North and Central and East (urban); South and West (urban)
	North and Central and East (rural); South and West (rural))
256	Is the household type "regular wage/salary-earning"? (No; Yes)
247	Does the household possess a clock or watch? (No; Yes)
235	Does the household possess an air conditioner or air cooler? (No; Yes)
213	Does the household possess a water purifier? (No; Yes)
205	Does the household possess a PC/laptop/other peripherals, including software? (No; Yes)
203	Does the household possess a camera and photographic equipment? (No; Yes)

<u>Uncertainty</u>							
<u>coefficient</u>	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)						
173	If the principle industry of the household is agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, then						
	how many hectares of land does the household possess (owned, leased-in, lease-out, or otherwise						
	possessed)? (Less than 0.01; 0.01 to 0.20; 0.21 to 0.40; 0.41 to 1.00; 1.01 to 2.00; 2.01 or more; Not in						
	agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and possesses less than 0.01 hectares;						
	Not in agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and possesses 0.01 hectares or						
	more)						
165	If the principle industry of the household is agriculture, then—in the past 12 months—did it possess						
	(owned, leased-in, lease-out, or otherwise possessed) any irrigated land? (Not in agriculture, hunting,						
	forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and does not possess any irrigated land; In agriculture,						
	hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, but does not possess any irrigated land; In						
	agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and possesses some irrigated land; Not in						
	agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and possesses some irrigated land)						
165	Does the household possess an inverter? (No; Yes)						
160	If the principle industry of the household is agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, then						
	does the household possess any land (owned, leased-in, lease-out, or otherwise possessed)? (In						
	agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and possesses some land; In agriculture,						
	hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, but does not possess any land; Not in agriculture,						
	hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and possesses some land; Not in agriculture, hunting,						
	forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, but does not possess any land)						
154	What is the tenancy status of the household in its dwelling unit? (Owned; No dwelling unit, other, or hired)						
154	What is the household's primary source of energy for cooking in the last 30 days? (Firewood and chips, coke						
	or coal, or others; Dung cakes, kerosene, or gobar gas; LPG, electricity, or no cooking arrangement)						
151	Does the household possess a sewing machine? (No; Yes)						
150	Does the household possess a telephone instrument (landline)? (No; Yes)						
127	Does the household possess a motor car or jeep? (No; Yes)						

<u>Uncertainty</u>							
<u>coefficient</u>	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)						
127	If the principle industry of the household is agriculture, thenin the past 12 monthsdid it possess (owned,						
	leased-in, lease-out, or otherwise possessed) any cultivated land? (In agriculture, hunting, forestry,						
	fishing, mining, or quarrying, but does not possess any cultivated land; Not in agriculture, hunting,						
	forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and possesses some cultivated land; Not in agriculture,						
	hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and does not possess any cultivated land; In						
	agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying, and possesses some cultivated land)						
107	Does the household own any land? (Yes; No)						
89	If the household lives in a rural area, then how many hectares of land does the household possess (owned,						
	leased-in, lease-out, or otherwise possessed)? (Urban (regardless of hectares of land possessed); Less						
	than 0.01 ; 0.01 to 0.20 ; 0.21 to 0.40 ; 0.41 to 1.00 ; 1.01 to 2.00 ; 2.01 or more)						
74	What is the marital status of the female head/spouse? (Currently married; Widowed, or						
	divorced/separated; No female head/spouse; Never-married)						
71	Is the household type "agricultural"? (Yes; No)						
64	What is the structure of household headship? (Both male and female heads/spouses; Female head/spouse						
	only; Male head/spouse only)						
62	What is the marital status of the male head/spouse? (Currently married; Widowed, or divorced/separated;						
	No male head/spouse; Never-married)						
59	In the past 12 months, did the household possess (owned, leased-in, lease-out, or otherwise possessed) any						
	irrigated land? (Urban (regardless of hectares of irrigated land possessed); Rural, did not possess						
	irrigated land; Rural, did possess irrigated land)						
50	What is the religion of the household? (Islam; Buddhism; Others; Hinduism; Christianity, Sikhism, Jainism,						
	or Zoroastrianism)						
50	Does the household possess a musical instrument? (No; Yes)						
47	Does the household possess a bicycle? (No; Yes)						

<u>Uncertainty</u>	
<u>coefficient</u>	Indicator (Answers ordered starting with those most strongly linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
44	If the household lives in a rural area, thenin the past 12 monthsdid it possess (owned, leased-in, lease-
	out, or otherwise possessed) any cultivated land? (Urban (regardless of hectares of cultivated land
	possessed); Rural, did not possess cultivated land; Rural, did possess cultivated land)
26	Does the household possess a ration card? (Yes; No)
22	Does the household possess a radio, tape recorder, or 2-in-1? (No; Yes)
13	Does the household possess a bedstead? (No; Yes)
4	Is the household type "self-employed in non-agriculture"? (No; Yes)

Source: R68 Socio-Economic Survey and the national (Rangarajan MMRP) poverty line

Tables for100% of the National (R68 Rangarajan MMRP)Poverty Line

(and tables pertaining to the other 30 poverty lines)

	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being			
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:			
0-4	76.4			
5 - 9	70.9			
10–14	61.8			
15 - 19	51.7			
20 - 24	44.6			
25 - 29	37.5			
30 - 34	31.5			
35 - 39	22.9			
40-44	16.9			
45 - 49	11.2			
50 - 54	8.0			
55 - 59	5.1			
60 - 64	3.1			
65 - 69	1.8			
70 - 74	0.9			
75 - 79	0.5			
80-84	0.1			
85 - 89	0.0			
90–94	0.0			
95–100	0.0			

Table 3 (100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line):Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

50165					
	Households in range	lds in range All households			Poverty
Score	and $<$ poverty line		in range		likelihood (%)
0–4	$1,\!182$	÷	$1,\!546$	=	76.4
5 - 9	1,733	÷	$2,\!445$	=	70.9
10 - 14	$3,\!354$	÷	$5,\!427$	=	61.8
15 - 19	$3,\!452$	÷	$6,\!683$	=	51.7
20 - 24	2,737	÷	$6,\!141$	=	44.6
25 - 29	$3,\!415$	÷	$9,\!102$	=	37.5
30 - 34	2,596	÷	$8,\!236$	=	31.5
35 - 39	1,918	÷	$8,\!391$	=	22.9
40 - 44	1,559	÷	9,252	=	16.9
45 - 49	921	÷	$8,\!194$	=	11.2
50 - 54	615	÷	7,722	=	8.0
55 - 59	335	÷	$6{,}537$	=	5.1
60 - 64	142	÷	$4,\!550$	=	3.1
65 - 69	87	÷	$4,\!678$	=	1.8
70 - 74	30	÷	$3,\!530$	=	0.9
75 - 79	18	÷	$3,\!469$	=	0.5
80 - 84	1	÷	$1,\!137$	=	0.1
85 - 89	1	÷	$1,\!925$	=	0.0
90-94	0	÷	912	=	0.0
95 - 100	0	÷	122	=	0.0

Table 4 (100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Table 5 (100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	+3.1	8.9	10.5	13.9		
5 - 9	+2.0	6.8	8.0	10.5		
10 - 14	+3.3	5.2	6.3	8.1		
15 - 19	+0.1	4.5	5.4	7.2		
20 - 24	+2.3	4.4	5.4	7.6		
25 - 29	+1.5	3.7	4.5	6.0		
30 - 34	+1.6	3.7	4.5	5.9		
35 - 39	+1.8	3.3	3.9	5.3		
40 - 44	+0.1	2.9	3.5	4.4		
45 - 49	+1.5	2.4	2.8	3.7		
50 - 54	+1.3	1.8	2.2	3.0		
55 - 59	+1.7	1.2	1.4	1.8		
60 - 64	+1.1	1.2	1.4	1.8		
65 - 69	+0.8	0.7	0.9	1.2		
70 - 74	-0.1	1.0	1.1	1.4		
75 - 79	-0.1	0.8	0.9	1.1		
80-84	+0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3		
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
90 - 94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Table 6 (100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value						
Size		<u>Confidence i</u>	$nterval (\pm percention)$	<u>ntage points)</u>			
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	-2.4	64.4	72.5	87.3			
4	+0.2	53.5	64.4	82.9			
8	+1.1	40.9	48.9	69.9			
16	+1.8	29.2	33.9	46.4			
32	+1.7	20.8	24.8	31.9			
64	+1.4	14.9	17.3	22.5			
128	+1.4	10.6	12.4	16.2			
256	+1.3	7.3	8.8	11.4			
512	+1.4	5.3	6.1	8.0			
1,024	+1.3	3.6	4.3	5.6			
2,048	+1.3	2.7	3.3	4.6			
4,096	+1.3	1.9	2.3	2.9			
$8,\!192$	+1.3	1.3	1.5	2.0			
16,384	+1.3	0.9	1.1	1.5			

Table 7 (R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines): Average differences between estimates and true values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Errc	ors (percer	ntage poin	ts), precisio	on (\pm per	centage p	points), a	nd the a f	factor for	precision
	L	egacy R59)	Legacy R62						Legacy R66
	Natl.	Intl. 1993 PPP		Natl.	Intl. 1993 PPP					National
	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
Estimate minus true value	+1.3	+1.2	+2.6	+1.6	+1.2	+0.8	+0.4	+1.2	+1.7	+1.3
Precision of difference	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.8
α factor for precision	1.68	1.73	1.59	1.67	1.73	1.67	1.63	1.49	1.54	1.74

Results pertain to the new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample.

Differences between estimates and true values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of \pm percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Table 7 (R66 legacy MMRP national and 2005 PPP poverty lines): Average differences between estimates and true values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Error	s ($\%$ points	s), precisior	$1 (\pm \% point)$	nts), and α	factor
			Legac	y R66		
	Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PH	Р
	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
Estimate minus true value	+0.6	+0.6	+0.8	+0.4	+0.3	+0.7
Precision of difference	0.7	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9
α factor for precision	1.81	1.51	1.53	1.68	1.48	1.53

Results pertain to the new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample.

Differences between estimates and true values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of \pm percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Table 7 (R68 national and 2011 PPP MMRP poverty lines): Average differences between estimates and true values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Eri	Errors (percentage points), precision (\pm percentage points), and the α factor for precision								
					R68					
	Natio	nal Rang	arajan	Poorest half	Intl. 2011 PPP				RBI	
	100%	150%	200%	${<}100\%$ Natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
Estimate minus true value	+1.3	+0.8	+1.0	-0.4	+1.1	+0.9	+1.3	+0.8	+0.4	-4.1
Precision of difference	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.9	1.0
α factor for precision	1.69	1.54	1.63	1.84	1.54	1.59	1.54	1.53	3.58	1.84

Results pertain to the new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample.

Differences between estimates and true values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of \pm percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Table 7 (R68 MMRP percentile poverty lines): Average differences between estimates and true values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Errors	(% points), p	recision (\pm %	points), and	α factor
			R68		
		Relative	(percentile-ba	used) lines	
	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	50^{th}	$60^{ ext{th}}$	$80^{ m th}$
Estimate minus true value	-0.3	-0.9	-0.3	-0.7	+0.7
Precision of difference	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9
α factor for precision	1.78	1.57	1.45	1.43	1.60

Results pertain to the new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample.

Differences between estimates and true values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of \pm percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Table 8 (R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines): Average differences between estimates and true values for changes poverty rates of a group of households between two rounds, precision, and the α factor for precision, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample (baselines) and separately with the R59, R62, and R66 MRP validation samples (follow-ups)

		Erro	Errors (percentage points), precision (\pm percentage points), and the α factor						factor for	precision	
		L	egacy R59)		Legacy R62					Legacy R66
		Natl.	Natl. Intl. 1993 PPP		Natl.		Int	zl. 1993 P	PP		National
	Follow-up	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
Estimate min	us true value										
	2003 (R59)	+2.9	+3.3	-4.4	+1.3	+1.9	-1.1	+5.0	-0.9	-4.4	+4.1
	2005/6 (R62)	-1.1	-0.4	-0.1	-2.2	-2.9	-3.9	-0.9	-1.4	+0.1	+0.2
	2009/10 (R66)	-4.3	-8.8	-4.1	-4.2	-8.0	-3.7	-9.0	-9.1	-5.0	-4.7
Precision of d	ifference										
	2003 (R59)	1.5	2.1	1.1	1.4	1.9	0.9	2.3	1.7	1.1	2.0
	2005/6 (R62)	1.0	1.3	1.1	0.9	1.1	0.7	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.2
	2009/10 (R66)	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.0	1.2	0.8	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3
α factor for p	recision										
	2003 (R59)	2.75	2.89	1.21	2.74	2.91	2.72	2.83	1.86	1.22	2.79
	2005/6 (R62)	1.85	1.83	1.30	1.91	1.86	2.19	1.61	1.43	1.26	1.80
	2009/10 (R66)	1.99	2.08	1.48	2.00	2.04	2.36	1.76	1.51	1.46	1.90
New R68 scorec	ard applied to the R	.68 MRP valie	dation sam	ple (baselin	nes) and to th	e R59, R6	52, and R66	5 MRP val	idation san	nples (folle	ow-ups).
Differences betw	veen estimates and t	rue values are	e displayed	in units of	percentage p	oints.					
Precision is mea	asured as 90-percent	confidence in	tervals in u	units of \pm p	ercentage poi	nts.					
Differences and	precision estimated	from 1,000 bc	otstraps w	ith $n = 16$,	384.						
α is estimated fi	rom 1,000 bootstrap	samples of n	$=256, 5\overline{12}$	$, 1,024, \overline{2,0}$	$48, 4,096, \overline{8,19}$	92, and $\overline{16}$	5,384.				

Table 8 (R66 legacy national and 2005 PPP MMRP poverty lines): Average differences between estimates and true values for changes poverty rates of a group of households between two rounds, precision, and the α factor for precision, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample (baseline) and separately with the R66 MMRP validation sample (follow-up)

	Errors (% points), precision (\pm % points), and α factor								
		Legacy R66							
	Nat	ional Tend	ulkar	I	Intl. 2005 PPP				
Follow-up	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50			
Estimate minus true value									
2003 (R59)									
2005/6 (R62)									
2009/10 (R66)	-3.7	-3.6	-0.4	-4.3	-1.1	+0.6			
Precision of difference									
2003 (R59)									
2005/6 (R62)									
2009/10 (R66)	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2			
α factor for precision									
2003 (R59)									
2005/6 (R62)									
2009/10 (R66)	1.98	1.59	1.47	1.72	1.45	1.53			
New R68 scorecard applied to R68 M	IMRP validat	tion sample a	and R66 MM	RP validatio	n sample.				
Differences between estimates and true values are displayed in units of percentage points.									
Precision is measured as 90-percent of	confidence int	ervals in uni	ts of \pm perce	ntage points.					
Differences and precision estimated f	rom 1,000 boo	otstraps with	n n = 16,384.						
α is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap s	samples of n =	$=2\overline{56, 512, 1}$	$,02\overline{4,\ 2,04}8,\ 4$	$1,09\overline{6},\ 8,192,\ a$	and 16,384.				

Table 8 (R68 national and 2011 PPP MMRP poverty lines): Average differences between estimates and true values for changes poverty rates of a group of households between two rounds, precision, and the α factor for precision, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample (baseline) and the R66 MMRP validation sample (follow-up)

		Erı	Errors (percentage points), precision (\pm percentage points), and the α factor for precision								
			$\mathbf{R68}$								
		Natio	nal Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPP		R	BI
	Follow-up	100%	150%	200%	<100% Natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
Estimate minu	<u>s true value</u>										
	2003 (R59)		—						—		
	2005/6 (R62)										
	2009/10 (R66)	-4.0	-0.6	+0.4		-2.4	-3.0	-1.9	-1.2		
Precision of di	fference										
	2003 (R59)										
	2005/6 (R62)										
	2009/10 (R66)	1.4	1.4	1.3		0.8	1.4	1.3	1.3		
α factor for pre-	ecision										
	2003 (R59)		_								
	2005/6 (R62)		_								
	2009/10 (R66)	1.77	1.50	1.62		1.90	1.67	1.52	1.53		
New R68 scoreca	rd applied to the R6	8 MMRP	validation	sample (ba	aseline) and to the	R66 MMR	P validatio	on sample	(follow-up).	
Differences betwe	een estimates and tru	ie values a	are display	ved in units	of percentage poin	ts.					
Precision is meas	sured as 90-percent c	onfidence	intervals i	n units of =	\vdash percentage points	3.					
Differences and p	precision estimated fr	om 1,000	bootstraps	s with $n =$	16,384.						
α is estimated from	om 1,000 bootstrap sa	$\overline{\text{of}}$	n = 256, 3	$512, 1,02\overline{4}, 2$	2,048, 4,096, 8,192,	and 16,384	4.				

		Targeting	<u>g segment</u>
		$\underline{\text{Targeted}}$	<u>Non-targeted</u>
SL		Inclusion	<u>Undercoverage</u>
atı	Below	Below poverty line	Below poverty line
' st	poverty	correctly	mistakenly
rty	line	targeted	non-targeted
OVe	ſ	<u>Leakage</u>	Exclusion
bd	<u>Above</u>	Above poverty line	Above poverty line
rue	poverty	mistakenly	correctly
Ē	line	targeted	non-targeted

Table 9 (All poverty lines): Possible targeting outcomes

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.0	23.0	0.3	75.7	76.7	-90.3
≤ 9	2.8	21.2	1.1	74.9	77.7	-72.4
≤ 14	5.9	18.1	3.0	73.0	78.9	-38.6
≤ 19	9.1	14.9	5.8	70.2	79.3	+0.4
≤ 24	12.0	12.0	9.3	66.7	78.7	+38.9
≤ 29	15.5	8.5	15.3	60.7	76.2	+36.3
≤ 34	18.1	5.9	21.1	54.9	73.0	+12.1
≤ 39	20.1	3.9	27.8	48.3	68.3	-15.7
≤ 44	21.7	2.3	35.4	40.6	62.3	-47.4
≤ 49	22.7	1.3	42.5	33.5	56.1	-77.3
≤ 54	23.3	0.7	49.6	26.4	49.7	-106.7
≤ 59	23.7	0.3	56.0	20.0	43.7	-133.5
≤ 64	23.8	0.2	60.2	15.8	39.7	-150.8
≤ 69	23.9	0.1	64.8	11.2	35.1	-170.0
≤ 74	24.0	0.0	68.4	7.7	31.6	-184.9
≤ 79	24.0	0.0	71.8	4.2	28.2	-199.4
$\leq\!\!84$	24.0	0.0	72.9	3.1	27.1	-204.0
$\leq\!\!89$	24.0	0.0	74.9	1.1	25.1	-212.4
≤ 94	24.0	0.0	75.8	0.2	24.2	-216.0
≤ 100	24.0	0.0	76.0	0.0	24.0	-216.8

Table 10 (100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

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

Table 11 (100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting	% all HHs who are	% targeted HHs who are	% poor HHs who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-off	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
≤ 4	1.3	75.5	4.2	3.1:1
≤ 9	3.8	72.2	11.6	2.6:1
≤ 14	8.9	66.2	24.5	2.0:1
≤ 19	15.0	61.1	38.1	1.6:1
≤ 24	21.3	56.2	50.0	1.3:1
≤ 29	30.8	50.3	64.5	1.0:1
≤ 34	39.2	46.1	75.3	0.9:1
≤ 39	47.8	42.0	83.6	$0.7{:}1$
≤ 44	57.0	38.0	90.4	0.6:1
≤ 49	65.2	34.7	94.4	$0.5{:}1$
≤ 54	72.9	32.0	97.2	$0.5{:}1$
≤ 59	79.7	29.7	98.7	0.4:1
≤ 64	84.0	28.4	99.3	0.4:1
≤ 69	88.7	27.0	99.7	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 74	92.3	26.0	99.9	0.4:1
≤ 79	95.8	25.0	100.0	0.3:1
$\leq \!\!84$	96.9	24.8	100.0	0.3:1
≤ 89	98.9	24.2	100.0	0.3:1
≤ 94	99.8	24.0	100.0	0.3:1
≤ 100	100.0	24.0	100.0	0.3:1

Tables for150% of the National (R68 Rangarajan MMRP)Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	98.1
5 - 9	97.3
10 - 14	93.8
15 - 19	90.6
20 - 24	85.8
25 - 29	81.5
30–34	77.1
35 - 39	69.5
40 - 44	60.8
45 - 49	46.8
50 - 54	39.1
55 - 59	28.2
60 - 64	21.9
65 - 69	18.6
70 - 74	11.9
75 - 79	7.8
80-84	4.1
85 - 89	3.1
90–94	0.5
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (150% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line):Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (150% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	+0.1	2.4	2.6	3.0		
5 - 9	-0.5	1.7	2.0	2.6		
10 - 14	+0.1	2.5	2.9	4.0		
15 - 19	-0.4	2.4	3.0	3.9		
20 - 24	-2.0	2.8	3.4	4.6		
25 - 29	+0.9	2.8	3.4	4.3		
30 - 34	+0.8	3.4	4.0	5.4		
35 - 39	+0.1	4.1	4.7	5.8		
40-44	-0.5	3.9	4.7	6.3		
45 - 49	+5.4	4.4	5.3	6.7		
50 - 54	+7.8	4.4	5.2	6.3		
55 - 59	+0.6	4.7	5.4	7.2		
60 - 64	+6.0	3.8	4.5	6.0		
65 - 69	-6.3	6.0	6.8	9.4		
70 - 74	-9.4	8.9	9.4	11.7		
75 - 79	+0.9	3.0	3.7	4.7		
80-84	+1.6	2.6	3.1	4.0		
85-89	+2.0	1.2	1.4	1.8		
90–94	+0.1	0.8	1.0	1.4		
95-100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7		

Table 6 (150% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+1.0	69.0	79.8	89.3		
4	+1.3	56.8	69.7	86.0		
8	+2.5	42.6	52.4	69.7		
16	+1.9	30.3	36.1	49.4		
32	+1.4	22.2	26.1	35.6		
64	+1.0	15.2	18.5	25.8		
128	+0.7	11.2	13.2	17.1		
256	+0.8	7.6	9.3	12.1		
512	+0.8	5.7	6.6	8.3		
1,024	+0.8	3.9	4.5	5.9		
2,048	+0.8	2.8	3.2	4.3		
4,096	+0.8	1.9	2.3	3.0		
8,192	+0.9	1.4	1.7	2.1		
16,384	+0.8	1.0	1.2	1.5		

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	mistakenly	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	55.5	0.0	43.1	44.4	-95.4
≤ 9	3.7	53.1	0.1	43.1	46.8	-86.7
≤ 14	8.5	48.4	0.4	42.8	51.2	-69.5
≤ 19	14.0	42.8	1.0	42.2	56.2	-49.0
≤ 24	19.5	37.3	1.8	41.4	60.9	-28.1
≤ 29	27.1	29.7	3.7	39.5	66.6	+1.8
≤ 34	33.6	23.2	5.6	37.6	71.2	+28.0
≤ 39	39.7	17.2	8.2	35.0	74.7	+53.9
≤ 44	45.3	11.5	11.8	31.4	76.7	+79.3
≤ 49	49.1	7.7	16.1	27.1	76.1	+71.6
≤ 54	52.1	4.8	20.9	22.3	74.4	+63.3
≤ 59	53.9	2.9	25.8	17.4	71.3	+54.7
≤ 64	54.9	1.9	29.1	14.1	69.0	+48.8
≤ 69	55.9	0.9	32.8	10.4	66.3	+42.3
≤ 74	56.4	0.4	35.9	7.3	63.7	+36.9
≤ 79	56.7	0.1	39.1	4.1	60.8	+31.2
$\leq\!\!84$	56.8	0.1	40.2	3.0	59.8	+29.3
$\leq\!\!89$	56.8	0.0	42.1	1.1	57.9	+25.9
≤ 94	56.8	0.0	43.0	0.2	57.0	+24.3
≤ 100	56.8	0.0	43.2	0.0	56.8	+24.0

Table 10 (150% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

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

Table 11 (150% of the national (R68 Rangarajan R68 MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cutoff), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

The second barries of	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	Description description of the second
Largeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
≤ 4	1.3	97.7	2.3	43.0:1
≤ 9	3.8	97.1	6.6	33.5:1
≤ 14	8.9	95.5	14.9	21.1:1
≤ 19	15.0	93.6	24.6	14.7:1
≤ 24	21.3	91.6	34.4	10.9:1
≤ 29	30.8	88.1	47.7	7.4:1
≤ 34	39.2	85.8	59.1	6.0:1
≤ 39	47.8	82.9	69.8	4.9:1
≤ 44	57.0	79.4	79.7	3.9:1
≤ 49	65.2	75.3	86.4	3.0:1
≤ 54	72.9	71.4	91.6	2.5:1
≤ 59	79.7	67.7	94.9	2.1:1
≤ 64	84.0	65.4	96.6	1.9:1
≤ 69	88.7	63.1	98.4	1.7:1
≤ 74	92.3	61.1	99.3	1.6:1
≤ 79	95.8	59.2	99.8	1.5:1
$\leq \!\!84$	96.9	58.6	99.9	$1.4{:}1$
≤ 89	98.9	57.4	100.0	1.3:1
≤ 94	99.8	56.9	100.0	1.3:1
≤100	100.0	56.8	100.0	1.3:1

Tables for200% of the National (R68 Rangarajan MMRP)Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	99.5
5 - 9	99.3
10 - 14	98.8
15 - 19	97.2
20 - 24	97.0
25 - 29	95.4
30 - 34	93.2
35 - 39	88.6
40 - 44	84.2
45 - 49	75.4
50 - 54	67.7
55 - 59	55.8
60 - 64	48.1
65 - 69	43.3
70 - 74	33.9
75 - 79	26.8
80-84	17.9
85 - 89	11.7
90–94	4.1
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (200% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line):Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (200% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval ($\pm percent$	<u>ntage points)</u>		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-0.4	0.2	0.3	0.5		
5 - 9	-0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4		
10 - 14	+0.6	1.3	1.5	2.0		
15 - 19	-0.8	1.2	1.5	1.9		
20 - 24	-0.3	1.6	1.9	2.5		
25 - 29	+0.7	1.5	1.9	2.4		
30 - 34	+2.1	2.3	2.7	3.7		
35 - 39	-2.4	2.3	2.6	3.4		
40 - 44	+0.4	3.0	3.8	4.7		
45 - 49	+2.9	4.0	4.9	6.3		
50 - 54	+6.1	5.9	6.9	9.0		
55 - 59	+2.7	4.9	5.7	7.3		
60 - 64	+7.4	5.9	7.1	8.8		
65 - 69	-6.5	6.2	7.3	9.9		
70 - 74	-3.2	8.5	9.7	12.2		
75 - 79	+3.9	4.8	6.1	8.0		
80 - 84	+9.6	4.6	5.5	7.5		
85 - 89	+1.3	4.6	5.4	7.1		
90–94	-1.1	5.2	5.9	7.7		
95 - 100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7		

Table 6 (200% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value				
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
1	-3.4	62.2	70.7	83.2	
4	-1.4	50.0	62.2	80.9	
8	-0.2	36.6	47.2	65.7	
16	+0.8	27.0	31.6	42.8	
32	+0.8	18.7	23.5	30.8	
64	+1.1	14.4	16.8	22.2	
128	+1.0	9.9	11.9	16.1	
256	+0.9	7.1	8.2	10.6	
512	+0.9	5.0	6.1	8.2	
1,024	+1.0	3.8	4.5	5.8	
2,048	+1.0	2.6	3.0	3.7	
4,096	+1.0	1.8	2.1	2.7	
8,192	+1.0	1.2	1.5	2.0	
16,384	+1.0	0.9	1.1	1.5	

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	74.1	0.0	24.6	25.9	-96.5
≤ 9	3.8	71.6	0.0	24.5	28.4	-89.8
≤ 14	8.8	66.7	0.1	24.5	33.2	-76.6
≤ 19	14.7	60.7	0.2	24.3	39.1	-60.6
≤ 24	20.9	54.5	0.4	24.2	45.1	-44.0
≤ 29	29.9	45.6	0.9	23.7	53.6	-19.6
≤ 34	37.6	37.8	1.5	23.0	60.6	+1.8
≤ 39	45.5	30.0	2.4	22.2	67.6	+23.6
≤ 44	53.2	22.2	3.8	20.7	73.9	+46.2
≤ 49	59.3	16.2	5.9	18.7	77.9	+65.0
≤ 54	64.8	10.7	8.2	16.4	81.2	+82.5
≤ 59	68.5	6.9	11.2	13.4	81.9	+85.2
≤ 64	70.6	4.8	13.4	11.2	81.8	+82.3
≤ 69	72.9	2.6	15.8	8.7	81.6	+79.0
≤ 74	74.1	1.4	18.2	6.3	80.4	+75.8
≤ 79	74.9	0.5	20.9	3.7	78.6	+72.4
$\leq\!\!84$	75.1	0.3	21.8	2.8	77.9	+71.1
≤ 89	75.4	0.1	23.6	1.0	76.4	+68.8
≤ 94	75.4	0.0	24.4	0.2	75.6	+67.7
≤ 100	75.4	0.0	24.6	0.0	75.4	+67.4

Table 10 (200% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

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

Table 11 (200% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤ 4	1.3	99.8	1.8	471.4:1
≤ 9	3.8	99.7	5.1	362.7:1
≤ 14	8.9	98.9	11.6	93.9:1
≤ 19	15.0	98.6	19.5	68.6:1
≤ 24	21.3	98.2	27.8	54.5:1
≤ 29	30.8	97.1	39.6	33.9:1
≤ 34	39.2	96.1	49.9	24.3:1
≤ 39	47.8	95.1	60.2	19.2:1
≤ 44	57.0	93.3	70.5	13.9:1
≤ 49	65.2	90.9	78.6	10.0:1
≤ 54	72.9	88.8	85.8	7.9:1
≤ 59	79.7	86.0	90.8	6.1:1
≤ 64	84.0	84.1	93.6	5.3:1
≤ 69	88.7	82.1	96.6	4.6:1
≤ 74	92.3	80.2	98.2	4.1:1
≤ 79	95.8	78.2	99.3	3.6:1
≤ 84	96.9	77.5	99.6	3.4:1
≤ 89	98.9	76.2	99.9	3.2:1
≤ 94	99.8	75.6	100.0	3.1:1
≤100	100.0	75.4	100.0	3.1:1

Tables for The Line Marking the Poorest Half of People below 100% of the National (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soore is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0-4	58.0
5 - 9	48.3
10 - 14	41.2
15 - 19	30.0
20 - 24	20.8
25 - 29	17.6
30 - 34	12.6
35 - 39	6.9
40-44	5.3
45 - 49	3.5
50 - 54	1.8
55 - 59	0.7
60 - 64	0.5
65 - 69	0.1
70 - 74	0.0
75 - 79	0.0
80-84	0.0
85 - 89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95-100	0.0

Table 3 (Line marking poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (Line marking poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	+1.0	9.7	11.6	15.3		
5 - 9	+4.0	7.2	8.9	11.1		
10 - 14	+1.3	5.0	5.7	7.3		
15 - 19	-1.8	4.2	4.9	6.9		
20 - 24	-3.6	4.0	4.8	6.5		
25 - 29	+0.5	3.0	3.5	4.8		
30 - 34	-2.1	3.0	3.6	4.5		
35 - 39	+0.9	1.7	2.0	2.6		
40 - 44	-0.2	1.7	2.0	2.7		
45 - 49	-0.8	1.8	2.3	2.9		
50 - 54	-1.0	1.4	1.7	2.2		
55 - 59	+0.1	0.6	0.7	0.9		
60 - 64	+0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5		
65 - 69	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0		
70 - 74	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
75 - 79	-0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5		
80-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
85-89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (Line marking poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value						
Size		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	-0.6	61.8	64.3	77.2			
4	-1.3	50.0	59.9	68.4			
8	-0.1	34.3	44.3	60.2			
16	-0.3	23.8	31.2	44.6			
32	-0.1	17.4	21.5	29.0			
64	-0.2	13.0	15.0	18.3			
128	-0.4	9.0	10.6	13.8			
256	-0.3	5.9	7.6	9.4			
512	-0.2	4.2	4.9	6.3			
1,024	-0.3	3.0	3.5	4.7			
2,048	-0.4	2.1	2.6	3.3			
4,096	-0.4	1.5	1.8	2.4			
8,192	-0.4	1.1	1.3	1.7			
16,384	-0.4	0.8	1.0	1.2			

Table 10) (Line marking poorest half of people below 100% of the national (Rangarajan R68
MN	(IRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification,
alo	ng with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP
val	idation sample

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤4	0.8	10.9	0.5	87.8	88.6	-81.8
≤ 9	2.0	9.7	1.8	86.5	88.5	-50.1
≤ 14	4.1	7.6	4.8	83.5	87.6	+10.6
≤ 19	6.0	5.7	9.0	79.4	85.4	+23.3
≤ 24	7.5	4.2	13.9	74.5	81.9	-18.6
≤ 29	9.0	2.7	21.7	66.6	75.6	-86.2
≤ 34	10.1	1.6	29.1	59.2	69.3	-148.9
≤ 39	10.6	1.0	37.2	51.1	61.8	-218.2
≤ 44	11.1	0.5	45.9	42.4	53.6	-292.9
≤ 49	11.4	0.2	53.7	34.6	46.0	-360.1
≤ 54	11.6	0.1	61.3	27.0	38.6	-424.9
≤ 59	11.7	0.0	68.0	20.3	32.0	-482.4
≤ 64	11.7	0.0	72.3	16.0	27.7	-519.2
≤ 69	11.7	0.0	77.0	11.3	23.0	-559.4
≤ 74	11.7	0.0	80.6	7.7	19.4	-590.4
≤ 79	11.7	0.0	84.1	4.2	15.9	-620.2
≤ 84	11.7	0.0	85.2	3.1	14.8	-629.8
$\leq\!\!89$	11.7	0.0	87.3	1.1	12.7	-647.0
≤ 94	11.7	0.0	88.1	0.2	11.9	-654.5
≤100	11.7	0.0	88.3	0.0	11.7	-656.1

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

Table 11 (Line marking poorest half of people below 100% of the national (R68 Rangarajan MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

The second issues	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	Description description of the second
Largeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.3	60.2	6.8	1.5:1
≤ 9	3.8	51.9	17.0	1.1:1
≤ 14	8.9	45.7	34.7	0.8:1
≤ 19	15.0	40.1	51.3	$0.7{:}1$
≤ 24	21.3	35.0	64.0	0.5:1
≤ 29	30.8	29.3	77.1	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 34	39.2	25.8	86.4	0.3:1
≤ 39	47.8	22.3	91.1	0.3:1
≤ 44	57.0	19.5	95.4	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 49	65.2	17.5	97.9	0.2:1
≤ 54	72.9	15.9	99.5	0.2:1
≤ 59	79.7	14.6	99.9	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 64	84.0	13.9	99.9	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 69	88.7	13.2	100.0	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 74	92.3	12.6	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 79	95.8	12.2	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 84	96.9	12.1	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 89	98.9	11.8	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 94	99.8	11.7	100.0	0.1:1
≤100	100.0	11.7	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for the \$1.90/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	32.2
5 - 9	21.1
10 - 14	18.3
15 - 19	13.7
20 - 24	11.1
25 - 29	7.9
30 - 34	5.9
35 - 39	3.5
40 - 44	2.6
45 - 49	1.6
50 - 54	1.2
55 - 59	0.6
60 - 64	0.2
65 - 69	0.1
70 - 74	0.1
75 - 79	0.1
80-84	0.0
85 - 89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (1.90/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-0.3	8.9	10.2	13.7		
5 - 9	+3.6	4.6	5.6	7.8		
10 - 14	+3.1	3.3	3.8	5.4		
15 - 19	+1.3	3.0	3.7	5.0		
20 - 24	+3.2	2.2	2.5	3.2		
25 - 29	+1.8	1.7	2.0	2.7		
30 - 34	+2.0	1.2	1.4	1.8		
35 - 39	+0.9	1.1	1.3	1.7		
40-44	-0.5	1.3	1.5	2.1		
45 - 49	+0.8	0.5	0.6	0.7		
50 - 54	+0.1	0.9	1.0	1.3		
55 - 59	+0.1	0.5	0.5	0.7		
60 - 64	+0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1		
65 - 69	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2		
70 - 74	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2		
75 - 79	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1		
80-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	-0.6	48.6	56.6	65.3		
4	+0.4	28.4	44.6	60.0		
8	+1.1	19.5	28.0	40.3		
16	+1.1	13.7	18.3	25.3		
32	+1.0	10.5	12.3	17.5		
64	+1.1	7.1	8.7	12.7		
128	+1.1	5.2	6.1	8.5		
256	+1.2	3.6	4.3	5.9		
512	+1.2	2.6	3.2	4.4		
1,024	+1.2	1.8	2.2	2.8		
2,048	+1.1	1.3	1.6	2.1		
4,096	+1.1	1.0	1.1	1.5		
8,192	+1.1	0.7	0.8	1.0		
16,384	+1.1	0.5	0.6	0.7		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	0.5	5.2	0.9	93.5	93.9	-68.3
≤ 9	1.0	4.6	2.8	91.5	92.6	-14.1
≤ 14	2.0	3.7	6.9	87.4	89.4	-20.9
≤ 19	2.9	2.8	12.1	82.3	85.2	-112.2
≤ 24	3.6	2.1	17.8	76.6	80.1	-212.7
≤ 29	4.3	1.4	26.5	67.8	72.1	-365.9
≤ 34	4.8	0.9	34.4	59.9	64.7	-505.0
≤ 39	5.1	0.6	42.7	51.6	56.7	-651.9
≤ 44	5.4	0.3	51.6	42.7	48.1	-808.9
≤ 49	5.5	0.2	59.7	34.7	40.2	-949.9
≤ 54	5.6	0.1	67.3	27.0	32.6	-1,084.6
≤ 59	5.7	0.0	74.0	20.3	25.9	-1,202.9
≤ 64	5.7	0.0	78.3	16.0	21.7	$-1,\!278.4$
≤ 69	5.7	0.0	83.0	11.3	17.0	-1,361.1
≤ 74	5.7	0.0	86.6	7.7	13.4	$-1,\!424.8$
≤ 79	5.7	0.0	90.1	4.2	9.9	$-1,\!486.1$
$\leq\!\!84$	5.7	0.0	91.2	3.1	8.8	-1,505.8
$\leq \!\!89$	5.7	0.0	93.3	1.1	6.7	$-1,\!541.2$
≤ 94	5.7	0.0	94.1	0.2	5.9	$-1,\!556.5$
≤100	5.7	0.0	94.3	0.0	5.7	$-1,\!559.8$

Table 10 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

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

Table 11 (\$1.90/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Townsting	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	Deer IIIIs terreted area
Largeting	who are HHs w		who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.3	35.8	8.4	0.6:1
≤ 9	3.8	27.2	18.4	0.4:1
<u>≤</u> 14	8.9	22.6	35.2	0.3:1
≤ 19	15.0	19.4	51.0	0.2:1
≤ 24	21.3	16.7	62.7	0.2:1
≤ 29	30.8	13.9	75.4	0.2:1
≤ 34	39.2	12.2	84.2	0.1:1
≤ 39	47.8	10.7	89.6	0.1:1
≤ 44	57.0	9.5	95.0	0.1:1
≤ 49	65.2	8.5	97.3	0.1:1
≤ 54	72.9	7.7	98.9	0.1:1
≤ 59	79.7	7.1	99.7	0.1:1
≤ 64	84.0	6.8	99.8	0.1:1
≤ 69	88.7	6.4	99.9	0.1:1
≤ 74	92.3	6.2	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 79	95.8	5.9	100.0	$0.1{:}1$
$\leq \!\!84$	96.9	5.9	100.0	$0.1{:}1$
≤ 89	98.9	5.7	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 94	99.8	5.7	100.0	0.1:1
≤100	100.0	5.7	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for the \$3.10/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP) Poverty Line
	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	89.6	
5 - 9	82.9	
10 - 14	75.2	
15 - 19	66.1	
20 - 24	59.4	
25 - 29	50.3	
30 - 34	45.1	
35 - 39	34.6	
40 - 44	26.8	
45 - 49	20.1	
50 - 54	14.2	
55 - 59	8.8	
60 - 64	5.7	
65 - 69	4.2	
70 - 74	2.0	
75 - 79	1.2	
80-84	0.7	
85 - 89	0.2	
90 - 94	0.0	
95–100	0.0	

Table 3 (\$3.10/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (3.10/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	+0.4	5.3	6.1	7.9		
5 - 9	-6.8	5.0	5.4	5.7		
10-14	-2.2	4.2	5.1	6.5		
15 - 19	+1.5	4.4	5.2	7.0		
20 - 24	-0.5	4.4	5.3	7.2		
25 - 29	+0.5	3.7	4.6	6.3		
30 - 34	-0.5	4.0	4.8	6.6		
35 - 39	+1.0	3.8	4.6	5.8		
40-44	+1.8	3.4	4.0	5.3		
45 - 49	+4.5	2.9	3.4	4.6		
50 - 54	+2.3	2.6	3.1	4.1		
55 - 59	+2.8	1.8	2.0	2.8		
60 - 64	+2.4	1.5	1.8	2.3		
65 - 69	+1.6	1.3	1.5	1.8		
70 - 74	-0.5	1.7	1.9	2.5		
75 - 79	+0.2	1.0	1.3	1.5		
80-84	+0.5	0.3	0.3	0.5		
85 - 89	+0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5		
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95 - 100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7		

Table 6 (\$3.10/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value						
Size		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	-2.0	66.3	75.9	89.4			
4	+0.1	54.7	63.5	83.2			
8	+0.8	42.7	51.1	69.1			
16	+1.6	29.5	35.5	49.0			
32	+1.5	21.1	25.3	31.5			
64	+0.9	15.2	17.9	23.1			
128	+0.8	10.6	12.5	16.8			
256	+0.8	7.4	8.6	11.5			
512	+0.8	5.2	6.2	8.5			
1,024	+0.9	3.9	4.6	6.3			
2,048	+0.8	2.8	3.3	4.6			
4,096	+0.9	1.9	2.3	3.0			
8,192	+0.9	1.3	1.6	2.1			
16,384	+0.9	1.0	1.2	1.5			

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.1	31.8	0.2	66.9	68.0	-92.5
≤ 9	3.3	29.6	0.6	66.5	69.8	-78.4
≤ 14	7.1	25.8	1.7	65.3	72.5	-51.4
≤ 19	11.2	21.7	3.8	63.3	74.5	-20.6
≤ 24	15.0	17.9	6.3	60.7	75.7	+10.3
≤ 29	19.7	13.2	11.1	56.0	75.7	+53.2
≤ 34	23.5	9.4	15.7	51.4	74.9	+52.5
≤ 39	26.6	6.3	21.2	45.8	72.4	+35.5
≤ 44	29.0	3.9	28.0	39.0	68.1	+14.9
≤ 49	30.5	2.4	34.7	32.4	63.0	-5.2
≤ 54	31.7	1.2	41.2	25.9	57.6	-25.2
≤ 59	32.3	0.6	47.4	19.7	52.0	-43.9
≤ 64	32.6	0.4	51.4	15.6	48.2	-56.2
≤ 69	32.7	0.2	56.0	11.1	43.9	-69.9
≤ 74	32.9	0.1	59.5	7.6	40.5	-80.5
≤ 79	32.9	0.0	62.9	4.2	37.1	-91.0
$\leq\!\!84$	32.9	0.0	64.0	3.1	36.0	-94.4
$\leq \!\!89$	32.9	0.0	66.0	1.1	34.0	-100.5
≤ 94	32.9	0.0	66.9	0.2	33.1	-103.1
≤ 100	32.9	0.0	67.1	0.0	32.9	-103.7

Table 10 (\$3.10/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$3.10/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

The second issues	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	
Largeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.3	86.6	3.5	6.4:1
≤ 9	3.8	85.6	10.0	6.0:1
≤ 14	8.9	80.4	21.7	4.1:1
≤ 19	15.0	74.8	34.0	3.0:1
≤ 24	21.3	70.3	45.5	2.4:1
≤ 29	30.8	64.0	59.8	1.8:1
≤ 34	39.2	60.0	71.4	1.5:1
≤ 39	47.8	55.6	80.7	1.3:1
≤ 44	57.0	50.9	88.1	1.0:1
≤ 49	65.2	46.8	92.7	$0.9{:}1$
≤ 54	72.9	43.5	96.3	0.8:1
≤ 59	79.7	40.5	98.1	$0.7{:}1$
≤ 64	84.0	38.8	98.9	0.6:1
≤ 69	88.7	36.9	99.5	0.6:1
≤ 74	92.3	35.6	99.8	0.6:1
≤ 79	95.8	34.4	100.0	0.5:1
≤ 84	96.9	34.0	100.0	$0.5{:}1$
≤ 89	98.9	33.3	100.0	0.5:1
≤ 94	99.8	33.0	100.0	0.5:1
≤100	100.0	32.9	100.0	0.5:1

Tables for the \$3.80/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP) Poverty Line

	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	95.8	
5 - 9	94.0	
10 - 14	90.0	
15 - 19	86.8	
20 - 24	79.3	
25 - 29	75.1	
30 - 34	69.5	
35 - 39	59.9	
40 - 44	52.2	
45 - 49	37.5	
50 - 54	30.8	
55 – 59	22.0	
60 - 64	16.4	
65 - 69	13.6	
70 - 74	7.8	
75 - 79	4.2	
80-84	3.0	
85 - 89	1.9	
90 - 94	0.4	
95–100	0.0	

Table 3 (\$3.80/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (3.80/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-1.9	2.5	2.7	3.3		
5 - 9	-2.7	2.3	2.5	3.2		
10-14	-0.5	3.0	3.5	4.5		
15 - 19	+0.2	2.8	3.4	4.5		
20 - 24	-0.8	3.5	4.2	5.5		
25 - 29	+2.1	3.4	3.9	5.3		
30 - 34	+1.8	3.9	4.7	6.1		
35 - 39	+2.1	4.1	4.8	6.4		
40 - 44	-1.4	3.9	4.7	6.0		
45 - 49	+5.9	3.9	4.6	5.9		
50 - 54	+7.9	3.5	4.2	5.3		
55 - 59	+0.2	4.5	5.4	6.9		
60 - 64	+4.2	3.4	3.8	5.3		
65 - 69	+0.4	3.7	4.4	5.5		
70 - 74	-9.2	8.7	9.3	12.2		
75 - 79	-1.4	2.8	3.5	4.5		
80-84	+2.5	0.7	0.9	1.3		
85 - 89	+1.1	1.0	1.1	1.5		
90–94	+0.2	0.6	0.8	1.1		
95 - 100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7		

Table 6 (\$3.80/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value						
Size		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	+2.2	66.0	76.5	91.1			
4	+1.8	55.2	68.4	86.6			
8	+2.7	43.6	51.8	69.5			
16	+2.0	31.7	38.2	48.8			
32	+2.1	22.3	26.7	36.5			
64	+1.6	15.1	18.7	25.9			
128	+1.4	11.3	13.7	18.0			
256	+1.3	7.7	9.4	12.0			
512	+1.2	5.7	6.8	8.6			
1,024	+1.3	4.0	4.7	6.4			
2,048	+1.3	2.8	3.4	4.3			
4,096	+1.3	1.9	2.4	3.0			
8,192	+1.3	1.4	1.7	2.1			
16,384	+1.3	1.0	1.2	1.6			

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	48.8	0.0	49.8	51.1	-94.8
≤ 9	3.7	46.4	0.2	49.7	53.4	-85.0
≤ 14	8.2	41.9	0.6	49.3	57.5	-65.8
≤ 19	13.5	36.6	1.4	48.4	61.9	-43.2
≤ 24	18.6	31.5	2.7	47.2	65.8	-20.3
≤ 29	25.6	24.5	5.2	44.7	70.3	+12.5
≤ 34	31.4	18.7	7.8	42.1	73.5	+40.7
≤ 39	36.6	13.6	11.3	38.6	75.2	+68.3
≤ 44	41.4	8.7	15.6	34.2	75.6	+68.8
≤ 49	44.4	5.7	20.8	29.1	73.5	+58.5
≤ 54	46.7	3.4	26.2	23.6	70.3	+47.7
≤ 59	48.1	2.0	31.6	18.3	66.4	+36.9
≤ 64	48.8	1.3	35.2	14.7	63.5	+29.8
≤ 69	49.5	0.6	39.2	10.7	60.2	+21.8
≤ 74	49.9	0.3	42.5	7.4	57.3	+15.3
≤ 79	50.1	0.0	45.7	4.1	54.2	+8.7
$\leq\!\!84$	50.1	0.0	46.8	3.0	53.1	+6.6
$\leq\!\!89$	50.1	0.0	48.8	1.1	51.2	+2.6
≤ 94	50.1	0.0	49.7	0.2	50.3	+0.9
≤ 100	50.1	0.0	49.9	0.0	50.1	+0.5

Table 10 (\$3.80/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$3.80/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

The second second	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	
Largeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
≤4	1.3	97.0	2.6	32.2:1
≤ 9	3.8	95.8	7.3	22.6:1
≤ 14	8.9	93.0	16.5	13.3:1
≤ 19	15.0	90.3	27.0	$9.4{:}1$
≤ 24	21.3	87.3	37.1	6.9:1
≤ 29	30.8	83.2	51.1	5.0:1
≤ 34	39.2	80.1	62.6	4.0:1
≤ 39	47.8	76.4	72.9	3.2:1
≤ 44	57.0	72.6	82.6	2.6:1
≤ 49	65.2	68.1	88.5	2.1:1
≤ 54	72.9	64.0	93.2	1.8:1
≤ 59	79.7	60.3	96.0	1.5:1
≤ 64	84.0	58.1	97.4	1.4:1
≤ 69	88.7	55.8	98.8	1.3:1
≤ 74	92.3	54.0	99.5	1.2:1
≤ 79	95.8	52.3	99.9	1.1:1
≤ 84	96.9	51.7	99.9	1.1:1
≤ 89	98.9	50.7	100.0	1.0:1
≤ 94	99.8	50.2	100.0	1.0:1
≤100	100.0	50.1	100.0	1.0:1

Tables for the \$4.00/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	96.5	
5 - 9	95.7	
10 - 14	92.3	
15 - 19	89.7	
20 - 24	83.0	
25 - 29	79.2	
30 - 34	74.1	
35 - 39	65.7	
40 - 44	57.3	
45 - 49	42.9	
50 - 54	35.2	
55 - 59	25.9	
60 - 64	19.2	
65 - 69	16.8	
70 - 74	10.7	
75 - 79	6.6	
80-84	3.8	
85 - 89	2.5	
90–94	0.4	
95–100	0.0	

Table 3 (\$4.00/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (\$4.00/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-1.2	2.5	2.7	3.2		
5 - 9	-1.5	1.9	2.3	2.9		
10 - 14	+0.1	2.8	3.2	4.6		
15 - 19	-0.3	2.7	3.2	4.2		
20 - 24	-2.3	3.1	3.7	5.0		
25 - 29	+0.5	2.9	3.4	4.4		
30 - 34	+1.1	3.6	4.3	5.8		
35 - 39	+0.3	4.1	5.0	6.3		
40 - 44	-0.8	3.9	4.7	6.3		
45 - 49	+4.9	4.3	5.1	6.2		
50 - 54	+7.5	4.0	4.7	6.1		
55 - 59	+0.6	4.7	5.5	7.0		
60 - 64	+5.1	3.6	4.2	5.6		
65 - 69	-1.6	4.3	5.1	6.4		
70 - 74	-10.0	9.3	9.8	11.8		
75 - 79	0.0	2.9	3.7	4.7		
80-84	+2.5	1.5	2.0	2.5		
85 - 89	+1.6	1.1	1.2	1.6		
90–94	0.0	0.8	1.0	1.4		
95 - 100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7		

Table 6 (\$4.00/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

\mathbf{Sample}	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval ($\pm percent$	<u>ntage points)</u>		
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+1.9	65.6	80.0	89.5		
4	+1.5	58.2	69.5	86.4		
8	+2.4	42.2	51.4	69.2		
16	+1.9	31.3	35.9	47.7		
32	+1.6	21.1	25.9	35.6		
64	+1.1	15.5	18.7	26.3		
128	+0.8	11.1	13.2	17.5		
256	+0.8	7.9	9.4	13.1		
512	+0.7	5.8	6.8	8.5		
1,024	+0.7	3.9	4.5	6.3		
2,048	+0.8	2.7	3.3	4.4		
4,096	+0.8	1.9	2.3	2.9		
8,192	+0.8	1.4	1.7	2.1		
16,384	+0.8	1.0	1.1	1.5		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	53.1	0.0	45.6	46.9	-95.2
≤ 9	3.7	50.6	0.1	45.5	49.2	-86.1
≤ 14	8.4	46.0	0.5	45.1	53.5	-68.3
≤ 19	13.8	40.5	1.1	44.5	58.4	-47.0
≤ 24	19.2	35.1	2.1	43.5	62.8	-25.4
≤ 29	26.6	27.8	4.2	41.5	68.1	+5.5
≤ 34	32.8	21.5	6.4	39.3	72.1	+32.4
≤ 39	38.5	15.8	9.3	36.4	74.9	+58.9
≤ 44	43.9	10.5	13.2	32.5	76.4	+75.8
≤ 49	47.4	7.0	17.8	27.8	75.2	+67.2
≤ 54	50.1	4.3	22.8	22.8	72.9	+58.0
≤ 59	51.8	2.6	27.9	17.7	69.5	+48.6
≤ 64	52.6	1.7	31.4	14.3	66.9	+42.3
≤ 69	53.6	0.8	35.2	10.5	64.1	+35.3
≤ 74	54.0	0.3	38.3	7.3	61.4	+29.5
≤ 79	54.3	0.1	41.5	4.1	58.4	+23.6
$\leq\!\!84$	54.3	0.0	42.6	3.0	57.3	+21.6
$\leq \!\!89$	54.3	0.0	44.6	1.1	55.4	+17.9
≤ 94	54.3	0.0	45.5	0.2	54.5	+16.4
≤ 100	54.3	0.0	45.7	0.0	54.3	+16.0

Table 10 (\$4.00/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$4.00/day 2011 PPP (R68 MMRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

T a	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	
Targeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-off	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.3	97.4	2.4	37.3:1
≤ 9	3.8	96.5	6.8	27.2:1
≤ 14	8.9	94.3	15.4	16.7:1
≤ 19	15.0	92.5	25.4	12.3:1
≤ 24	21.3	90.1	35.4	9.2:1
≤ 29	30.8	86.4	48.9	6.4:1
≤ 34	39.2	83.8	60.4	5.2:1
≤ 39	47.8	80.6	70.9	4.2:1
≤ 44	57.0	76.9	80.7	3.3:1
≤ 49	65.2	72.7	87.2	2.7:1
≤ 54	72.9	68.7	92.2	2.2:1
≤ 59	79.7	64.9	95.2	1.9:1
≤ 64	84.0	62.7	96.8	1.7:1
≤ 69	88.7	60.4	98.5	1.5:1
≤ 74	92.3	58.5	99.4	1.4:1
≤ 79	95.8	56.7	99.9	1.3:1
$\leq \!\!84$	96.9	56.0	99.9	1.3:1
≤ 89	98.9	54.9	100.0	1.2:1
≤ 94	99.8	54.5	100.0	1.2:1
≤100	100.0	54.3	100.0	1.2:1

Tables forthe RBI Urban (R68 MMRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0-4	99.8
5 - 9	99.5
10 - 14	96.7
15 - 19	94.3
20 - 24	93.8
25 - 29	93.0
30 - 34	93.0
35 - 39	89.2
40 - 44	88.8
45 - 49	88.7
50 - 54	84.5
55 - 59	76.3
60 - 64	73.4
65 - 69	66.6
70 - 74	62.1
75 - 79	56.0
80-84	54.0
85 - 89	54.0
90–94	54.0
95–100	48.9

 Table 3 (RBI Urban (R68 MMRP) line): Estimated poverty

 likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (RBI Urban (R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	<u>nterval (±perce</u> i	<u>ntage points)</u>		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1		
5 - 9	+1.2	2.9	4.2	6.8		
10 - 14	-0.3	5.0	6.1	8.3		
15 - 19	-4.6	2.9	2.9	4.1		
20 - 24	+7.9	13.0	14.6	16.7		
25 - 29	-0.2	5.6	6.7	9.1		
30 - 34	-0.3	4.6	5.4	7.0		
35 - 39	+0.5	5.5	6.4	8.2		
40 - 44	-0.7	4.7	5.5	7.1		
45 - 49	-1.3	5.0	6.1	7.7		
50 - 54	+3.4	5.4	6.5	8.6		
55 - 59	+5.0	6.8	8.0	10.2		
60 - 64	-8.2	6.8	7.2	9.7		
65 - 69	+3.1	7.2	8.6	11.9		
70 - 74	-10.5	8.7	9.2	12.3		
75 - 79	+7.9	7.4	8.6	11.4		
80-84	+8.6	19.5	22.4	30.1		
85 - 89	+2.3	9.5	11.6	15.5		
90–94	-10.2	12.4	15.0	19.3		
95 - 100	-20.2	25.9	30.3	40.8		

Table 6 (RBI Urban (R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

\mathbf{Sample}	Difference between estimate and true value						
\mathbf{Size}		<u>Confidence</u> i	nterval ($\pm percent$	ntage points)			
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	+2.9	61.1	69.5	72.0			
4	+0.2	59.7	65.3	72.0			
8	-0.8	56.2	61.1	69.9			
16	-0.6	50.0	57.3	63.3			
32	+0.4	40.9	46.1	58.0			
64	0.0	29.4	34.2	40.5			
128	+0.4	21.6	25.5	33.2			
256	+0.5	15.7	19.0	23.7			
512	+0.5	11.1	13.0	16.4			
1,024	+0.4	8.0	9.2	12.6			
2,048	+0.4	5.6	6.8	8.8			
4,096	+0.4	4.1	4.8	6.0			
8,192	+0.4	2.9	3.4	4.2			
16,384	+0.4	1.9	2.4	3.2			

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	mistakenly	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	0.2	76.3	0.0	23.6	23.7	-99.5
≤ 9	0.8	75.7	0.0	23.5	24.3	-97.9
≤ 14	1.9	74.6	0.1	23.5	25.4	-95.0
≤ 19	3.3	73.1	0.1	23.5	26.8	-91.2
≤ 24	6.1	70.4	0.4	23.2	29.3	-83.7
≤ 29	10.0	66.5	0.6	23.0	32.9	-73.2
≤ 34	14.5	62.0	0.9	22.7	37.2	-61.0
≤ 39	20.5	55.9	1.6	22.0	42.5	-44.3
≤ 44	26.6	49.8	2.4	21.2	47.8	-27.3
≤ 49	35.1	41.3	3.3	20.3	55.4	-3.8
≤ 54	42.6	33.8	5.1	18.5	61.1	+18.2
≤ 59	51.3	25.2	8.0	15.5	66.8	+44.6
≤ 64	56.5	19.9	9.7	13.9	70.4	+60.5
≤ 69	61.8	14.6	12.5	11.1	72.9	+78.1
≤ 74	66.5	10.0	15.3	8.2	74.7	+80.0
≤ 79	70.4	6.1	19.7	3.9	74.2	+74.3
$\leq\!\!84$	72.0	4.5	20.2	3.3	75.3	+73.5
$\leq\!\!89$	74.7	1.8	22.6	1.0	75.7	+70.5
≤ 94	76.1	0.3	23.4	0.2	76.3	+69.4
≤100	76.4	0.0	23.6	0.0	76.4	+69.2

Table 10 (RBI Urban (R68 MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (RBI Urban (R68 MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

The second beauty	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	
Largeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
≤ 4	0.2	100.0	0.2	Only poor targeted
≤ 9	0.8	96.4	1.0	26.6:1
≤ 14	2.0	97.0	2.5	32.1:1
≤ 19	3.4	97.4	4.4	37.2:1
≤ 24	6.4	94.5	7.9	17.0:1
≤ 29	10.5	94.6	13.0	17.4:1
≤ 34	15.3	94.4	18.9	16.7:1
≤ 39	22.1	92.8	26.8	12.9:1
≤ 44	29.0	91.9	34.8	11.3:1
≤ 49	38.4	91.5	46.0	10.7:1
≤ 54	47.7	89.4	55.8	8.4:1
≤ 59	59.3	86.4	67.1	6.4:1
≤ 64	66.2	85.4	73.9	5.8:1
≤ 69	74.3	83.2	80.9	4.9:1
≤ 74	81.8	81.3	87.0	4.3:1
≤ 79	90.0	78.2	92.0	3.6:1
$\leq \!\!84$	92.2	78.0	94.1	3.6:1
≤ 89	97.3	76.8	97.7	3.3:1
≤ 94	99.5	76.5	99.6	3.3:1
≤100	100.0	76.4	100.0	3.2:1

Tables forthe RBI Rural (R68 MMRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0-4	86.0
5 - 9	86.0
10 - 14	85.2
15 - 19	84.4
20 - 24	84.4
25 - 29	84.4
30 - 34	84.4
35 - 39	83.7
40 - 44	80.5
45 - 49	78.0
50 - 54	71.9
55 - 59	63.2
60 - 64	58.6
65 - 69	50.9
70 - 74	46.9
75 - 79	40.1
80-84	38.1
85 - 89	36.3
90–94	36.3
95–100	36.3

Table 3 (RBI Rural (R68 MMRP) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (RBI Rural (R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval ($\pm percent$	<u>ntage points)</u>		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-2.7	5.5	6.2	7.8		
5 - 9	+0.8	4.7	5.5	7.5		
10 - 14	-6.6	4.5	4.7	5.0		
15 - 19	-1.9	3.3	3.9	4.8		
20 - 24	-1.4	2.9	3.6	4.8		
25 - 29	-3.3	2.8	3.0	3.7		
30 - 34	-7.3	4.7	4.9	5.2		
35 - 39	-0.9	3.3	3.8	5.1		
40 - 44	-3.2	3.0	3.5	4.6		
45 - 49	-4.8	4.3	4.6	5.7		
50 - 54	-6.5	5.5	5.9	7.9		
55 - 59	-6.5	6.3	7.3	8.8		
60 - 64	-3.6	7.7	9.2	12.1		
65 - 69	-16.9	12.6	13.3	14.5		
70 - 74	-4.0	11.3	13.5	16.9		
75 - 79	+3.7	12.7	15.0	19.0		
80-84	-20.1	18.4	20.4	27.2		
85 - 89	+2.4	18.5	21.9	27.9		
90 - 94	+1.2	27.4	32.6	41.3		
95-100	-41.5	50.0	50.0	50.0		

Table 6 (RBI Rural (R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

\mathbf{Sample}	Difference between estimate and true value						
\mathbf{Size}		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval (\pm percer	<u>ntage points)</u>			
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	-2.7	66.8	66.8	74.8			
4	-3.0	58.6	65.7	72.5			
8	-3.3	45.5	58.0	69.3			
16	-3.6	30.4	38.2	56.7			
32	-4.4	20.7	24.6	34.4			
64	-4.3	15.1	18.1	22.8			
128	-4.3	10.8	13.0	16.8			
256	-4.2	7.8	9.4	12.0			
512	-4.1	5.4	6.5	8.6			
1,024	-4.0	3.7	4.5	6.2			
2,048	-4.1	2.7	3.2	4.4			
4,096	-4.1	2.0	2.3	3.0			
8,192	-4.1	1.4	1.7	2.2			
16,384	-4.1	1.0	1.2	1.5			

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	mistakenly	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.6	76.8	0.3	21.3	22.9	-95.6
≤ 9	4.4	74.0	0.9	20.7	25.1	-87.7
≤ 14	10.4	68.0	1.6	20.0	30.4	-71.3
≤ 19	17.4	61.0	2.9	18.7	36.1	-52.0
≤ 24	23.9	54.5	4.3	17.3	41.1	-33.6
≤ 29	34.0	44.4	6.1	15.5	49.5	-5.5
≤ 34	42.9	35.5	7.2	14.4	57.3	+18.6
≤ 39	50.7	27.7	8.9	12.6	63.4	+40.8
≤ 44	58.9	19.5	11.0	10.6	69.5	+64.4
≤ 49	64.9	13.5	12.6	9.0	73.9	+81.7
≤ 54	70.0	8.4	14.6	7.0	77.0	+81.4
≤ 59	72.9	5.5	16.2	5.4	78.3	+79.4
≤ 64	74.6	3.8	17.6	4.0	78.7	+77.6
≤ 69	76.4	2.0	18.9	2.7	79.0	+75.8
≤ 74	77.3	1.1	19.9	1.7	78.9	+74.6
≤ 79	77.7	0.7	20.8	0.8	78.6	+73.5
$\leq\!\!84$	78.0	0.4	21.1	0.5	78.6	+73.1
$\leq \!\!89$	78.3	0.1	21.4	0.2	78.4	+72.7
≤ 94	78.4	0.0	21.6	0.0	78.4	+72.5
≤ 100	78.4	0.0	21.6	0.0	78.4	+72.5

Table 10 (RBI Rural (R68 MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (RBI Rural (R68 MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Townsting	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted	
cut-off	who are	HHs who are	who are		
	targeted	poor	targeted		
≤ 4	1.9	85.2	2.0	5.7:1	
≤ 9	5.2	83.5	5.6	5.1:1	
≤ 14	12.1	86.4	13.3	6.4:1	
≤ 19	20.3	85.7	22.2	6.0:1	
≤ 24	28.2	84.6	30.4	5.5:1	
≤ 29	40.1	84.8	43.4	5.6:1	
≤ 34	50.1	85.6	54.7	5.9:1	
≤ 39	59.7	85.0	64.7	5.7:1	
≤ 44	70.0	84.2	75.2	5.3:1	
≤ 49	77.5	83.8	82.8	5.2:1	
≤ 54	84.6	82.8	89.3	4.8:1	
≤ 59	89.1	81.8	93.0	4.5:1	
≤ 64	92.2	81.0	95.2	4.3:1	
≤ 69	95.3	80.1	97.4	4.0:1	
≤ 74	97.2	79.5	98.5	$3.9{:}1$	
≤ 79	98.5	78.9	99.1	$3.7{:}1$	
$\leq \!\!84$	99.1	78.8	99.5	$3.7{:}1$	
≤ 89	99.7	78.5	99.8	3.7:1	
≤ 94	100.0	78.4	100.0	3.6:1	
≤100	100.0	78.4	100.0	3.6:1	

Tables forthe 20th-Percentile (First-Quintile R68 MMRP)Poverty Line

If a household's soore is	then the likelihood (%) of being		
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:		
0–4	68.5		
5 - 9	62.2		
10 - 14	52.1		
15 - 19	40.9		
20 - 24	31.2		
25 - 29	25.0		
30 - 34	18.0		
35 - 39	10.8		
40-44	8.2		
45 - 49	5.6		
50 - 54	2.7		
55 - 59	1.1		
60 - 64	0.8		
65 - 69	0.2		
70 - 74	0.1		
75 - 79	0.0		
80-84	0.0		
85 - 89	0.0		
90–94	0.0		
95-100	0.0		

Table 3 (20th-percentile (first-quintile R68 MMRP) line):Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (20th-percentile (first-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	D	Difference between estimate and true value				
		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	+1.6	9.2	10.7	14.0		
5 - 9	+6.4	7.2	8.7	11.8		
10 - 14	+2.9	5.1	6.0	7.7		
15 - 19	-2.3	4.5	5.3	6.9		
20 - 24	+0.1	4.2	5.0	6.8		
25 - 29	-1.4	3.4	4.3	5.4		
30 - 34	-2.5	3.4	3.9	5.2		
35 - 39	+0.4	2.2	2.6	3.3		
40 - 44	-1.0	2.1	2.4	3.2		
45 - 49	-0.2	2.1	2.5	3.3		
50 - 54	-1.1	1.6	1.9	2.5		
55 - 59	+0.1	0.7	0.9	1.1		
60 - 64	+0.1	0.8	0.8	1.1		
65 - 69	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.5		
70 - 74	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2		
75 - 79	-0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5		
80-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (20th-percentile (first-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value				
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
1	-1.7	61.5	70.7	82.9	
4	-0.7	53.3	62.0	75.7	
8	0.0	37.6	47.5	64.5	
16	+0.1	27.1	33.2	45.8	
32	-0.1	19.8	22.9	31.0	
64	-0.2	14.1	16.4	22.7	
128	-0.3	9.9	11.7	15.8	
256	-0.3	6.7	7.7	10.5	
512	-0.1	4.7	5.4	7.2	
1,024	-0.2	3.3	3.9	5.0	
2,048	-0.2	2.5	2.8	3.7	
4,096	-0.3	1.7	2.1	2.7	
8,192	-0.3	1.2	1.5	1.9	
16,384	-0.3	0.8	1.1	1.4	

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	0.9	15.2	0.4	83.5	84.4	-86.1
≤ 9	2.4	13.7	1.4	82.5	84.9	-61.4
≤ 14	5.0	11.1	3.9	80.0	85.0	-14.1
≤ 19	7.6	8.5	7.3	76.6	84.2	+39.9
≤ 24	9.6	6.5	11.7	72.2	81.8	+27.5
≤ 29	12.0	4.2	18.8	65.1	77.1	-16.5
≤ 34	13.5	2.6	25.6	58.3	71.8	-58.9
≤ 39	14.5	1.6	33.3	50.6	65.1	-106.6
≤ 44	15.3	0.8	41.7	42.1	57.4	-158.8
≤ 49	15.7	0.4	49.5	34.4	50.1	-206.8
≤ 54	16.0	0.1	56.9	26.9	42.9	-253.1
≤ 59	16.1	0.0	63.6	20.3	36.3	-294.6
≤ 64	16.1	0.0	67.9	16.0	32.1	-321.0
≤ 69	16.1	0.0	72.6	11.3	27.4	-350.2
≤ 74	16.1	0.0	76.2	7.7	23.8	-372.6
≤ 79	16.1	0.0	79.7	4.2	20.3	-394.2
$\leq\!\!84$	16.1	0.0	80.8	3.1	19.2	-401.1
$\leq\!\!89$	16.1	0.0	82.8	1.1	17.2	-413.6
≤ 94	16.1	0.0	83.7	0.2	16.3	-419.0
≤ 100	16.1	0.0	83.9	0.0	16.1	-420.2

Table 10 (20th-percentile (first-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (20th-percentile (first-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤ 4	1.3	68.3	5.6	2.2:1
≤ 9	3.8	62.8	14.9	1.7:1
≤ 14	8.9	56.3	30.9	1.3:1
≤ 19	14.9	51.0	47.2	1.0:1
≤ 24	21.3	45.1	59.7	0.8:1
≤ 29	30.8	38.9	74.2	0.6:1
≤ 34	39.2	34.6	84.0	0.5:1
≤ 39	47.8	30.3	89.9	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 44	57.0	26.8	94.9	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 49	65.2	24.1	97.5	0.3:1
≤ 54	72.9	21.9	99.2	0.3:1
≤ 59	79.7	20.2	99.7	0.3:1
≤ 64	84.0	19.2	99.9	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 69	88.7	18.2	99.9	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 74	92.3	17.5	100.0	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 79	95.8	16.8	100.0	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 84	96.9	16.6	100.0	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 89	98.9	16.3	100.0	0.2:1
≤ 94	99.8	16.2	100.0	0.2:1
≤100	100.0	16.1	100.0	0.2:1

Tables forthe 40th-Percentile (Second-Quintile R68 MMRP)Poverty Line
If a household's soors is	then the likelihood (%) of being	
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	91.9	
5 - 9	87.3	
10 - 14	81.7	
15 - 19	71.9	
20 - 24	63.6	
25 - 29	54.5	
30 - 34	46.5	
35 - 39	35.4	
40 - 44	27.1	
45 - 49	17.6	
50 - 54	10.9	
55 - 59	4.9	
60 - 64	2.8	
65 - 69	1.5	
70 - 74	0.7	
75 - 79	0.1	
80 - 84	0.1	
85 - 89	0.0	
90–94	0.0	
95–100	0.0	

Table 3 (40th-Percentile (second-quintile R68 MMRP) line):Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (40th-Percentile (second-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage poi</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-0.5	4.4	5.2	6.8		
5 - 9	-3.5	3.6	4.3	5.6		
10-14	-1.5	3.8	4.4	5.4		
15 - 19	0.0	4.1	5.1	6.7		
20 - 24	-4.3	4.2	5.0	6.6		
25 - 29	-0.7	3.6	4.5	6.3		
30 - 34	-2.1	4.0	5.0	6.5		
35 - 39	-0.1	4.1	4.8	6.4		
40 - 44	-2.1	3.7	4.4	5.6		
45 - 49	+0.4	3.3	3.8	5.1		
50 - 54	0.0	2.5	3.0	3.7		
55 - 59	+0.1	1.8	2.1	2.8		
60 - 64	+0.1	1.8	2.2	2.9		
65 - 69	+0.2	0.9	1.1	1.4		
70 - 74	+0.2	0.7	0.8	1.0		
75 - 79	-0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5		
80-84	+0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1		
85 - 89	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1		
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (40th-Percentile (second-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	-1.2	63.7	77.1	91.2		
4	+0.6	54.0	63.3	81.2		
8	+0.3	43.4	50.3	71.3		
16	-0.5	30.3	35.0	45.5		
32	-0.3	21.8	25.5	33.0		
64	-0.9	15.4	18.5	23.7		
128	-0.9	11.0	13.2	16.4		
256	-0.9	7.4	8.6	11.6		
512	-0.9	5.2	6.4	8.7		
1,024	-0.9	3.8	4.6	6.7		
2,048	-1.0	2.8	3.5	4.2		
4,096	-0.9	1.8	2.2	2.8		
8,192	-0.9	1.3	1.6	2.0		
16,384	-0.9	1.0	1.1	1.4		

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	mistakenly	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.2	32.3	0.1	66.3	67.5	-92.5
≤ 9	3.4	30.1	0.4	66.0	69.5	-78.4
≤ 14	7.5	26.0	1.3	65.1	72.6	-51.1
≤ 19	11.9	21.6	3.0	63.4	75.4	-19.8
≤ 24	16.1	17.5	5.2	61.2	77.3	+11.5
≤ 29	21.2	12.4	9.6	56.9	78.1	+54.8
≤ 34	25.1	8.4	14.1	52.4	77.5	+58.1
≤ 39	28.1	5.5	19.7	46.7	74.8	+41.2
≤ 44	30.6	2.9	26.4	40.0	70.6	+21.2
≤ 49	32.0	1.6	33.2	33.2	65.2	+1.0
≤ 54	32.9	0.6	40.0	26.4	59.3	-19.3
≤ 59	33.3	0.3	46.4	20.0	53.3	-38.3
≤ 64	33.4	0.1	50.6	15.9	49.3	-50.7
≤ 69	33.5	0.0	55.2	11.3	44.8	-64.5
≤ 74	33.5	0.0	58.8	7.7	41.2	-75.2
≤ 79	33.5	0.0	62.3	4.2	37.7	-85.6
$\leq\!\!84$	33.5	0.0	63.4	3.1	36.6	-88.9
$\leq\!\!89$	33.5	0.0	65.4	1.1	34.6	-94.9
≤ 94	33.5	0.0	66.3	0.2	33.7	-97.5
≤ 100	33.5	0.0	66.5	0.0	33.5	-98.1

Table 10 (40th-Percentile (second-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (40th-Percentile (second-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤4	1.3	90.5	3.6	9.5:1
≤ 9	3.8	89.1	10.2	8.2:1
≤ 14	8.9	84.9	22.4	5.6:1
≤ 19	15.0	79.9	35.6	4.0:1
≤ 24	21.3	75.4	48.0	3.1:1
≤ 29	30.8	68.9	63.1	2.2:1
≤ 34	39.2	64.1	74.8	1.8:1
≤ 39	47.8	58.8	83.7	1.4:1
≤ 44	57.0	53.7	91.2	1.2:1
≤ 49	65.2	49.1	95.3	1.0:1
≤ 54	72.9	45.1	98.1	0.8:1
≤ 59	79.7	41.8	99.3	$0.7{:}1$
≤ 64	84.0	39.8	99.7	$0.7{:}1$
≤ 69	88.7	37.8	99.9	0.6:1
≤ 74	92.3	36.3	100.0	0.6:1
≤ 79	95.8	35.0	100.0	$0.5{:}1$
≤ 84	96.9	34.6	100.0	$0.5{:}1$
≤ 89	98.9	33.9	100.0	0.5:1
≤ 94	99.8	33.6	100.0	0.5:1
≤100	100.0	33.5	100.0	0.5:1

Tables forthe 50th-Percentile (Median R68 MMRP)Poverty Line

	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	95.1	
5 - 9	93.0	
10 - 14	88.8	
15 - 19	84.6	
20 - 24	75.5	
25 - 29	69.0	
30 - 34	62.4	
35 - 39	50.4	
40 - 44	41.1	
45 - 49	26.2	
50 - 54	18.0	
55 - 59	10.5	
60 - 64	6.6	
65 - 69	3.7	
70 - 74	1.6	
75 - 79	0.5	
80-84	0.2	
85–89	0.1	
90–94	0.0	
95–100	0.0	

Table 3 (50th-percentile (median R68 MMRP) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (50th-percentile (median R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>			
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	-2.4	2.5	2.8	3.3	
5 - 9	-2.3	2.6	3.2	3.9	
10 - 14	-0.8	3.1	3.7	4.6	
15 - 19	+0.5	3.2	3.8	5.2	
20 - 24	-2.3	3.7	4.3	5.4	
25 - 29	+0.5	3.6	4.1	5.7	
30 - 34	0.0	4.1	4.8	5.8	
35 - 39	-0.6	4.1	5.0	6.7	
40 - 44	-4.2	4.1	4.7	6.1	
45 - 49	+2.7	3.6	4.3	5.4	
50 - 54	+1.7	3.1	3.6	4.7	
55 - 59	+1.5	2.3	2.6	3.4	
60 - 64	+0.5	2.7	3.2	3.9	
65 - 69	-2.7	3.0	3.5	4.7	
70 - 74	+0.6	1.0	1.1	1.4	
75 - 79	0.0	0.6	0.7	0.9	
80-84	+0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	
85 - 89	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (50th-percentile (median R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+1.8	63.9	78.8	92.5		
4	+1.8	56.0	63.9	87.1		
8	+1.9	41.7	50.4	72.1		
16	+0.5	31.1	35.8	45.8		
32	+0.5	21.4	26.7	32.7		
64	-0.1	14.8	18.2	24.8		
128	-0.2	10.6	12.6	16.5		
256	-0.3	7.3	8.4	11.6		
512	-0.3	5.3	6.2	8.1		
1,024	-0.3	3.8	4.7	5.9		
2,048	-0.3	2.8	3.3	4.3		
4,096	-0.3	1.8	2.2	2.8		
8,192	-0.3	1.3	1.6	2.0		
16,384	-0.3	0.9	1.1	1.5		

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	41.3	0.0	57.4	58.6	-93.9
≤ 9	3.6	39.0	0.2	57.2	60.8	-82.4
≤ 14	8.1	34.5	0.7	56.7	64.8	-60.1
≤ 19	13.3	29.3	1.7	55.7	69.0	-33.8
≤ 24	18.1	24.5	3.2	54.2	72.3	-7.4
≤ 29	24.6	18.0	6.2	51.2	75.8	+29.9
≤ 34	29.7	12.9	9.4	48.0	77.7	+61.7
≤ 39	34.0	8.6	13.9	43.5	77.5	+67.5
≤ 44	37.8	4.8	19.2	38.2	76.0	+54.9
≤ 49	39.8	2.8	25.3	32.1	71.9	+40.5
≤ 54	41.3	1.3	31.7	25.7	67.0	+25.7
≤ 59	42.0	0.6	37.7	19.7	61.7	+11.5
≤ 64	42.3	0.3	41.7	15.7	58.0	+2.1
≤ 69	42.5	0.1	46.2	11.2	53.7	-8.4
≤ 74	42.6	0.0	49.8	7.6	50.2	-16.8
≤ 79	42.6	0.0	53.2	4.2	46.8	-24.9
$\leq\!\!84$	42.6	0.0	54.3	3.1	45.7	-27.5
$\leq \!\!89$	42.6	0.0	56.3	1.1	43.7	-32.3
≤ 94	42.6	0.0	57.2	0.2	42.8	-34.3
≤ 100	42.6	0.0	57.4	0.0	42.6	-34.7

Table 10 (50th-percentile (median R68 MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (50th-percentile (median R68 MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤ 4	1.3	96.5	3.0	27.9:1
≤ 9	3.8	94.9	8.6	18.5:1
≤14	8.9	91.8	19.1	11.2:1
≤ 19	15.0	88.7	31.1	7.9:1
≤ 24	21.3	84.9	42.5	5.6:1
≤ 29	30.8	79.9	57.7	4.0:1
≤ 34	39.2	75.9	69.7	3.1:1
≤ 39	47.8	71.0	79.7	2.5:1
≤ 44	57.0	66.3	88.8	2.0:1
≤ 49	65.2	61.1	93.5	1.6:1
≤ 54	72.9	56.6	96.9	1.3:1
≤ 59	79.7	52.7	98.6	1.1:1
≤ 64	84.0	50.3	99.2	1.0:1
≤ 69	88.7	47.9	99.8	0.9:1
≤ 74	92.3	46.1	99.9	$0.9{:}1$
≤ 79	95.8	44.5	100.0	0.8:1
≤ 84	96.9	43.9	100.0	0.8:1
≤ 89	98.9	43.1	100.0	0.8:1
≤ 94	99.8	42.7	100.0	$0.7{:}1$
≤100	100.0	42.6	100.0	0.7:1

Tables forthe 60th-Percentile (Third-Quintile R68 MMRP)Poverty Line

If a household's soore is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	98.3	
5 - 9	97.3	
10 - 14	94.0	
15 - 19	91.4	
20 - 24	86.1	
25 - 29	80.7	
30 - 34	75.9	
35 - 39	66.2	
40 - 44	54.8	
45 - 49	39.9	
50 - 54	29.3	
55 - 59	18.2	
60 - 64	13.2	
65 - 69	8.4	
70 - 74	4.6	
75 - 79	2.1	
80-84	1.2	
85 - 89	0.1	
90–94	0.0	
95–100	0.0	

Table 3 (60th-percentile (third-quintile R68 MMRP) line):Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (60th-percentile (third-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	<u>ntage points)</u>			
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-0.8	1.3	1.6	1.9		
5 - 9	+0.1	2.2	2.5	3.3		
10 - 14	-0.4	2.5	2.8	3.6		
15 - 19	-2.1	2.2	2.5	3.1		
20 - 24	-1.6	2.9	3.4	4.4		
25 - 29	-0.8	2.8	3.3	4.3		
30 - 34	+0.6	3.5	4.2	5.5		
35 - 39	-0.6	4.0	4.7	6.1		
40-44	-4.0	3.9	4.6	6.5		
45 - 49	+1.7	4.4	5.2	6.4		
50 - 54	+1.0	4.0	4.8	6.3		
55 - 59	+3.0	2.9	3.7	4.7		
60 - 64	+0.7	3.7	4.5	5.8		
65 - 69	-9.6	7.8	8.5	9.9		
70 - 74	-0.2	3.0	3.7	4.7		
75 - 79	+0.1	1.7	2.1	2.8		
80-84	-0.2	1.9	2.3	2.9		
85 - 89	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3		
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (60th-percentile (third-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval ($\pm percent$	<u>ntage points)</u>		
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	-1.2	68.0	83.7	88.9		
4	-0.3	52.2	67.2	88.9		
8	+1.4	41.1	51.0	70.5		
16	+0.6	29.1	34.8	45.3		
32	0.0	21.4	24.8	33.0		
64	-0.6	14.2	17.9	23.6		
128	-0.7	10.2	12.1	16.5		
256	-0.7	7.2	8.8	11.4		
512	-0.7	5.0	6.1	7.9		
1,024	-0.7	3.7	4.4	5.7		
2,048	-0.7	2.5	3.0	4.1		
4,096	-0.7	1.8	2.2	2.7		
8,192	-0.7	1.3	1.5	2.0		
16,384	-0.7	0.9	1.1	1.5		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	51.1	0.0	47.6	48.9	-95.0
≤ 9	3.7	48.7	0.1	47.5	51.2	-85.5
≤ 14	8.5	43.9	0.4	47.2	55.7	-66.9
≤ 19	14.1	38.3	0.8	46.8	60.9	-44.5
≤ 24	19.7	32.8	1.7	45.9	65.6	-21.8
≤ 29	27.2	25.2	3.5	44.0	71.2	+10.6
≤ 34	33.5	18.9	5.7	41.9	75.4	+38.6
≤ 39	39.1	13.3	8.7	38.9	78.0	+65.8
≤ 44	44.2	8.2	12.8	34.8	79.0	+75.6
≤ 49	47.4	5.0	17.7	29.8	77.3	+66.2
≤ 54	49.8	2.6	23.1	24.5	74.3	+56.0
≤ 59	51.1	1.4	28.6	18.9	70.0	+45.4
≤ 64	51.7	0.8	32.3	15.2	66.9	+38.3
≤ 69	52.1	0.3	36.6	11.0	63.2	+30.3
≤ 74	52.3	0.1	40.0	7.6	59.9	+23.7
≤ 79	52.4	0.0	43.4	4.2	56.6	+17.2
$\leq\!\!84$	52.4	0.0	44.5	3.1	55.5	+15.1
$\leq\!\!89$	52.4	0.0	46.5	1.1	53.5	+11.3
≤ 94	52.4	0.0	47.4	0.2	52.6	+9.6
≤ 100	52.4	0.0	47.6	0.0	52.4	+9.3

Table 10 (60th-percentile (third-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (60th-percentile (third-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤ 4	1.3	98.8	2.5	85.3:1
≤ 9	3.8	97.5	7.1	39.7:1
≤ 14	8.9	95.9	16.2	23.3:1
≤ 19	15.0	94.5	27.0	17.3:1
≤ 24	21.3	92.1	37.5	11.7:1
≤ 29	30.8	88.5	51.9	7.7:1
≤ 34	39.2	85.5	63.9	5.9:1
≤ 39	47.8	81.8	74.6	4.5:1
≤ 44	57.0	77.5	84.4	3.5:1
≤ 49	65.2	72.8	90.5	2.7:1
≤ 54	72.9	68.3	95.1	2.2:1
≤ 59	79.7	64.1	97.4	1.8:1
≤ 64	84.0	61.5	98.5	1.6:1
≤ 69	88.7	58.8	99.5	1.4:1
≤ 74	92.3	56.7	99.8	1.3:1
≤ 79	95.8	54.7	100.0	1.2:1
≤ 84	96.9	54.1	100.0	1.2:1
≤ 89	98.9	53.0	100.0	1.1:1
≤ 94	99.8	52.5	100.0	1.1:1
≤100	100.0	52.4	100.0	1.1:1

Tables forthe 80th-Percentile (Fourth-Quintile R68 MMRP)Poverty Line

If a household's soore is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a flousefiold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	99.6
5 - 9	99.5
10 - 14	99.2
15 - 19	98.4
20 - 24	97.5
25 - 29	96.6
30 - 34	94.7
35 - 39	90.0
40 - 44	85.3
45 - 49	73.3
50 - 54	65.9
55 - 59	50.1
60 - 64	41.8
65 - 69	36.2
70 - 74	24.9
75 - 79	14.3
80 - 84	10.5
85 - 89	6.8
90 - 94	1.3
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (80th-percentile (fourth-quintile R68 MMRP) line):Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (80th-percentile (fourth-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value						
		<u>Confidence i</u>	<u>nterval (±perce</u> i	<u>ntage points)</u>			
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
0–4	-0.3	0.2	0.3	0.5			
5 - 9	-0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3			
10 - 14	0.0	1.0	1.1	1.2			
15 - 19	-1.0	0.7	0.8	0.8			
20 - 24	+0.2	1.6	1.9	2.4			
25 - 29	+0.5	1.3	1.5	2.3			
30 - 34	-0.7	1.5	1.8	2.3			
35 - 39	+1.7	3.3	4.0	4.9			
40-44	-1.9	2.7	3.4	4.2			
45 - 49	+6.7	4.8	5.6	7.7			
50 - 54	+5.0	6.0	7.2	8.7			
55 - 59	+4.3	4.8	5.6	7.1			
60 - 64	+3.6	5.7	6.9	8.9			
65 - 69	-9.5	7.8	8.5	10.2			
70 - 74	-3.2	8.1	9.8	12.0			
75 - 79	-3.2	5.0	6.1	8.0			
80-84	+2.4	5.3	6.5	8.6			
85 - 89	+0.9	4.5	5.1	6.9			
90–94	+0.3	1.5	1.7	2.3			
95-100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7			

Table 6 (80th-percentile (fourth-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval ($\pm percent$	<u>ntage points)</u>		
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+0.2	65.8	68.6	90.2		
4	-0.8	45.4	61.5	81.6		
8	0.0	35.0	43.4	62.8		
16	+0.5	26.9	35.1	44.8		
32	+0.2	19.2	23.0	34.0		
64	+0.5	13.4	17.3	22.6		
128	+0.5	9.4	12.2	16.4		
256	+0.5	7.0	8.3	9.9		
512	+0.4	4.9	5.8	7.8		
1,024	+0.6	3.6	4.4	5.6		
2,048	+0.7	2.5	2.9	3.8		
4,096	+0.7	1.8	2.1	2.6		
8,192	+0.7	1.3	1.5	2.0		
16,384	+0.7	0.9	1.1	1.4		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	72.3	0.0	26.4	27.7	-96.4
≤ 9	3.8	69.8	0.0	26.4	30.2	-89.6
≤ 14	8.8	64.8	0.0	26.4	35.2	-76.0
≤ 19	14.9	58.7	0.1	26.3	41.2	-59.5
≤ 24	21.1	52.5	0.3	26.1	47.2	-42.4
≤ 29	30.1	43.5	0.6	25.8	55.9	-17.3
≤ 34	38.1	35.5	1.1	25.3	63.4	+4.9
≤ 39	45.9	27.7	2.0	24.4	70.3	+27.3
≤ 44	53.8	19.8	3.3	23.1	76.9	+50.6
≤ 49	59.6	14.0	5.6	20.8	80.5	+69.6
≤ 54	64.9	8.7	8.1	18.3	83.2	+87.2
≤ 59	68.1	5.5	11.6	14.8	82.8	+84.2
≤ 64	69.9	3.7	14.1	12.3	82.3	+80.9
≤ 69	71.8	1.8	16.9	9.5	81.4	+77.1
≤ 74	72.7	0.9	19.6	6.8	79.5	+73.4
≤ 79	73.3	0.3	22.5	3.9	77.2	+69.4
$\leq\!\!84$	73.5	0.1	23.5	2.9	76.4	+68.1
$\leq\!\!89$	73.6	0.0	25.4	1.0	74.6	+65.5
≤ 94	73.6	0.0	26.2	0.2	73.8	+64.4
≤ 100	73.6	0.0	26.4	0.0	73.6	+64.1

Table 10 (80th-percentile (fourth-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (80th-percentile (fourth-quintile R68 MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤ 4	1.3	99.8	1.8	471.4:1
≤ 9	3.8	99.7	5.2	350.7:1
≤ 14	8.9	99.5	12.0	200.5:1
≤ 19	15.0	99.4	20.2	154.1:1
≤ 24	21.3	98.8	28.6	82.5:1
≤ 29	30.8	97.9	40.9	47.5:1
≤ 34	39.2	97.2	51.7	34.7:1
≤ 39	47.8	95.9	62.3	23.3:1
≤ 44	57.0	94.3	73.1	16.4:1
≤ 49	65.2	91.5	81.0	10.7:1
≤ 54	72.9	88.9	88.1	8.0:1
≤ 59	79.7	85.4	92.5	5.8:1
≤ 64	84.0	83.3	95.0	5.0:1
≤ 69	88.7	81.0	97.6	4.3:1
≤ 74	92.3	78.8	98.8	$3.7{:}1$
≤ 79	95.8	76.5	99.6	3.3:1
≤ 84	96.9	75.8	99.8	3.1:1
≤ 89	98.9	74.4	100.0	2.9:1
≤ 94	99.8	73.7	100.0	2.8:1
≤100	100.0	73.6	100.0	2.8:1

Tables forthe National (R59 Legacy Saxena MRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soore is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousenoid's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	56.3
5 - 9	44.0
10–14	34.5
15 - 19	21.8
20 - 24	17.3
25 - 29	12.8
30 - 34	8.0
35 - 39	5.9
40 - 44	4.0
45 - 49	3.1
50 - 54	1.5
55 - 59	0.8
60 - 64	0.3
65 - 69	0.1
70 - 74	0.1
75 - 79	0.0
80-84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95 - 100	0.0

Table 3 (National (R59 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (National (R59 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	<u>nterval (±perce</u> i	<u>ntage points)</u>		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	+1.1	10.1	12.4	16.6		
5 - 9	+6.9	6.7	7.8	10.0		
10 - 14	-0.4	4.7	5.5	7.2		
15 - 19	+3.1	3.1	3.9	5.1		
20 - 24	+4.5	2.6	3.1	4.4		
25 - 29	+1.4	2.2	2.6	3.2		
30 - 34	-1.0	2.4	2.9	4.0		
35 - 39	+2.5	1.3	1.6	2.1		
40 - 44	+1.5	0.9	1.1	1.4		
45 - 49	+1.3	0.9	1.1	1.4		
50 - 54	+0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9		
55 - 59	+0.5	0.3	0.3	0.4		
60 - 64	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.5		
65 - 69	-0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7		
70 - 74	-0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3		
75 - 79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
80-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
90 - 94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (National (R59 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval ($\pm percent$	<u>ntage points)</u>		
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+0.8	43.7	60.8	76.6		
4	+1.1	33.9	49.6	69.3		
8	+1.0	28.6	36.4	56.7		
16	+1.2	19.5	24.4	34.6		
32	+0.9	13.9	17.1	23.6		
64	+0.9	9.8	11.9	16.2		
128	+1.1	7.0	8.2	11.5		
256	+1.1	5.1	5.9	8.0		
512	+1.1	3.7	4.2	5.8		
1,024	+1.3	2.5	2.9	4.0		
2,048	+1.3	1.7	2.1	2.8		
4,096	+1.3	1.3	1.5	2.1		
8,192	+1.3	0.9	1.0	1.3		
16,384	+1.3	0.6	0.7	0.9		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	0.9	8.6	0.7	89.8	90.7	-74.6
≤ 9	1.8	7.7	2.2	88.3	90.1	-38.9
≤ 14	3.7	5.8	5.7	84.8	88.5	+38.4
≤ 19	5.2	4.3	10.9	79.6	84.7	-15.4
≤ 24	6.2	3.3	16.1	74.4	80.6	-69.7
≤ 29	7.4	2.1	23.9	66.6	74.0	-152.3
≤ 34	8.2	1.2	31.3	59.2	67.4	-230.6
≤ 39	8.7	0.8	39.3	51.2	59.9	-314.5
≤ 44	9.0	0.4	48.2	42.3	51.4	-408.2
≤ 49	9.3	0.2	56.2	34.4	43.6	-492.3
≤ 54	9.4	0.1	63.8	26.8	36.1	-572.4
≤ 59	9.4	0.0	70.2	20.3	29.7	-640.9
≤ 64	9.5	0.0	74.8	15.8	25.2	-688.6
≤ 69	9.5	0.0	79.4	11.1	20.6	-737.8
≤ 74	9.5	0.0	83.0	7.6	17.0	-774.9
≤ 79	9.5	0.0	86.4	4.1	13.6	-811.5
$\leq\!\!84$	9.5	0.0	87.6	3.0	12.4	-823.5
$\leq \!\!89$	9.5	0.0	89.5	1.0	10.5	-843.8
≤ 94	9.5	0.0	90.4	0.1	9.6	-853.4
≤ 100	9.5	0.0	90.5	0.0	9.5	-854.7

Table 10 (National (R59 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (National (R59 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.5	55.9	9.1	1.3:1
≤ 9	4.0	45.0	19.0	0.8:1
≤ 14	9.4	39.4	39.1	0.6:1
≤ 19	16.1	32.1	54.4	0.5:1
≤ 24	22.2	27.7	64.9	0.4:1
≤ 29	31.3	23.7	78.3	0.3:1
≤ 34	39.6	20.8	86.9	0.3:1
≤ 39	48.0	18.1	91.5	0.2:1
≤ 44	57.2	15.8	95.3	0.2:1
≤ 49	65.4	14.2	97.7	0.2:1
≤ 54	73.1	12.8	99.0	0.1:1
≤ 59	79.7	11.8	99.5	0.1:1
≤ 64	84.2	11.2	99.8	0.1:1
≤ 69	88.9	10.7	99.9	0.1:1
≤ 74	92.4	10.3	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 79	95.9	9.9	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 84	97.0	9.8	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 89	99.0	9.6	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 94	99.9	9.5	100.0	0.1:1
≤100	100.0	9.5	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP) Poverty Line

	then the likelihood (%) of being			
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:			
0–4	73.1			
5 - 9	61.7			
10 - 14	53.2			
15 - 19	42.8			
20 - 24	35.2			
25 - 29	26.8			
30 - 34	18.8			
35 - 39	12.5			
40 - 44	9.1			
45 - 49	6.1			
50 - 54	3.3			
55 - 59	1.2			
60 - 64	0.3			
65 - 69	0.3			
70 - 74	0.1			
75 - 79	0.0			
80-84	0.0			
85 - 89	0.0			
90–94	0.0			
95 - 100	0.0			

Table 3 (\$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (1.08/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>			
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	+4.3	9.7	11.6	14.6	
5 - 9	+6.7	6.8	8.2	10.2	
10 - 14	-1.1	4.8	5.7	7.8	
15 - 19	+6.0	4.3	5.2	6.8	
20 - 24	+8.8	3.8	4.5	6.2	
25 - 29	+0.5	3.5	4.3	5.6	
30 - 34	-3.1	3.6	4.3	5.8	
35 - 39	+3.2	2.4	2.9	3.7	
40 - 44	-0.8	2.4	2.9	3.6	
45 - 49	-0.2	2.2	2.6	3.4	
50 - 54	-0.1	1.5	1.9	2.5	
55 - 59	+0.9	0.2	0.3	0.4	
60 - 64	-0.2	0.5	0.6	0.7	
65 - 69	-0.1	0.5	0.6	0.8	
70 - 74	+0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	
75 - 79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
80 - 84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
90 - 94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (\$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value				
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
1	+2.3	58.0	67.2	77.8	
4	+0.9	46.0	57.1	72.1	
8	+1.6	35.9	44.2	64.7	
16	+1.5	26.3	33.0	40.4	
32	+1.3	18.9	23.2	29.3	
64	+1.0	13.8	16.3	20.5	
128	+1.2	9.1	11.0	15.2	
256	+1.3	6.8	7.8	9.8	
512	+1.2	4.7	5.7	7.4	
1,024	+1.2	3.3	4.0	5.5	
2,048	+1.2	2.4	2.9	3.7	
4,096	+1.2	1.7	2.0	2.7	
8,192	+1.2	1.2	1.4	1.9	
16,384	+1.2	0.8	1.0	1.3	

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.1	15.7	0.4	82.7	83.8	-84.3
≤ 9	2.5	14.3	1.5	81.7	84.2	-61.5
≤ 14	5.4	11.4	4.0	79.2	84.6	-11.6
≤ 19	8.1	8.7	8.0	75.2	83.3	+44.1
≤ 24	10.0	6.8	12.2	71.0	81.0	+27.4
≤ 29	12.5	4.3	18.8	64.4	76.9	-11.9
≤ 34	14.2	2.6	25.3	57.8	72.1	-50.8
≤ 39	15.1	1.7	32.8	50.3	65.5	-95.4
≤ 44	16.0	0.8	41.3	41.9	57.9	-145.4
≤ 49	16.4	0.4	49.0	34.2	50.6	-191.4
≤ 54	16.7	0.1	56.5	26.7	43.4	-235.8
≤ 59	16.7	0.1	62.9	20.3	37.0	-274.4
≤ 64	16.8	0.0	67.4	15.7	32.5	-301.2
≤ 69	16.8	0.0	72.1	11.1	27.9	-328.9
≤ 74	16.8	0.0	75.6	7.6	24.4	-349.9
≤ 79	16.8	0.0	79.1	4.1	20.9	-370.5
$\leq\!\!84$	16.8	0.0	80.2	3.0	19.8	-377.3
$\leq\!\!89$	16.8	0.0	82.2	1.0	17.8	-388.7
≤ 94	16.8	0.0	83.1	0.1	16.9	-394.1
≤100	16.8	0.0	83.2	0.0	16.8	-394.9

Table 10 (\$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting	% all HHs who are	% targeted HHs who are	% poor HHs who are	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted	
cut-off	targeted	poor	targeted		
<u>≤</u> 4	1.5	71.1	6.5	2.5:1	
≤ 9	4.0	62.2	14.8	1.6:1	
≤ 14	9.4	57.7	32.3	1.4:1	
≤ 19	16.1	50.5	48.3	1.0:1	
≤ 24	22.2	45.1	59.7	0.8:1	
≤ 29	31.3	40.0	74.5	0.7:1	
≤ 34	39.6	36.0	84.7	0.6:1	
≤ 39	48.0	31.5	90.0	0.5:1	
≤ 44	57.2	27.9	95.0	0.4:1	
≤ 49	65.4	25.1	97.7	0.3:1	
≤ 54	73.1	22.8	99.2	0.3:1	
≤ 59	79.7	21.0	99.6	0.3:1	
≤ 64	84.2	19.9	99.8	0.2:1	
≤ 69	88.9	18.9	100.0	0.2:1	
≤ 74	92.4	18.2	100.0	0.2:1	
≤ 79	95.9	17.5	100.0	0.2:1	
≤ 84	97.0	17.3	100.0	0.2:1	
≤ 89	99.0	17.0	100.0	0.2:1	
≤ 94	99.9	16.8	100.0	0.2:1	
≤100	100.0	16.8	100.0	0.2:1	

Tables for the \$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP) Poverty Line
If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	99.2	
5 - 9	98.7	
10 - 14	98.4	
15 - 19	96.9	
20 - 24	95.7	
25 - 29	92.2	
30 - 34	88.6	
35 - 39	82.4	
40 - 44	75.1	
45 - 49	60.7	
50 - 54	50.6	
55 - 59	36.5	
60 - 64	30.4	
65 - 69	22.0	
70 - 74	15.5	
75 - 79	8.2	
80-84	5.4	
85 - 89	2.4	
90 - 94	0.3	
95–100	0.0	

Table 3 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	-0.3	0.6	0.7	1.0	
5 - 9	+1.3	2.5	3.0	3.6	
10 - 14	0.0	1.1	1.3	1.7	
15 - 19	-0.7	1.1	1.4	1.8	
20 - 24	+2.5	3.0	3.5	4.6	
25 - 29	+0.1	2.1	2.6	3.2	
30 - 34	+0.3	2.7	3.3	4.3	
35 - 39	+2.2	3.6	4.3	5.3	
40 - 44	-0.9	3.5	4.2	5.7	
45 - 49	+11.4	4.8	5.9	7.7	
50 - 54	-1.0	4.4	5.0	6.9	
55 - 59	+9.4	4.1	4.7	6.4	
60 - 64	+10.6	5.5	6.5	8.8	
65 - 69	+3.7	4.1	4.9	6.5	
70 - 74	-3.6	5.3	6.2	8.4	
75 - 79	+4.0	2.0	2.3	2.8	
80 - 84	+0.1	5.7	6.6	8.4	
85 - 89	+0.2	2.1	2.6	3.2	
90 - 94	-0.1	0.7	0.9	1.4	
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+2.3	73.0	79.1	90.1		
4	+0.5	46.5	60.1	83.3		
8	+1.9	36.3	47.2	67.2		
16	+1.5	26.9	32.4	42.2		
32	+2.0	19.8	24.1	30.6		
64	+2.4	14.3	17.0	23.0		
128	+2.3	10.3	12.6	17.4		
256	+2.3	7.7	9.2	12.2		
512	+2.5	5.3	6.2	7.9		
1,024	+2.5	4.0	4.7	6.2		
2,048	+2.5	2.6	3.2	4.0		
4,096	+2.6	1.8	2.2	3.1		
8,192	+2.5	1.4	1.6	2.0		
16,384	+2.6	1.0	1.1	1.5		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.5	64.1	0.0	34.4	35.9	-95.3
≤ 9	3.9	61.7	0.1	34.3	38.2	-87.9
≤ 14	9.3	56.4	0.2	34.2	43.5	-71.5
≤ 19	15.7	49.9	0.4	34.0	49.8	-51.5
≤ 24	21.6	44.1	0.7	33.7	55.2	-33.3
≤ 29	29.9	35.7	1.4	33.0	62.9	-6.6
≤ 34	37.2	28.4	2.3	32.0	69.3	+17.1
≤ 39	44.2	21.5	3.8	30.6	74.7	+40.4
≤ 44	51.2	14.4	6.0	28.4	79.6	+65.3
≤ 49	55.7	9.9	9.7	24.7	80.4	+84.6
≤ 54	59.9	5.7	13.3	21.1	81.0	+79.8
≤ 59	62.2	3.4	17.5	16.9	79.1	+73.3
≤ 64	63.6	2.1	20.7	13.7	77.3	+68.5
≤ 69	64.7	0.9	24.2	10.1	74.8	+63.1
≤ 74	65.3	0.3	27.2	7.2	72.5	+58.6
≤ 79	65.5	0.1	30.4	4.0	69.5	+53.7
$\leq\!\!84$	65.6	0.1	31.5	2.9	68.5	+52.0
$\leq\!\!89$	65.6	0.0	33.3	1.0	66.6	+49.2
≤ 94	65.6	0.0	34.3	0.1	65.7	+47.8
≤ 100	65.6	0.0	34.4	0.0	65.6	+47.6

Table 10 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R59 Legacy MRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.5	98.9	2.3	87.2:1
≤ 9	4.0	98.3	6.0	58.4:1
≤ 14	9.4	98.4	14.1	60.7:1
≤ 19	16.1	97.7	24.0	43.4:1
≤ 24	22.2	96.9	32.8	31.4:1
≤ 29	31.3	95.5	45.6	21.3:1
≤ 34	39.6	94.1	56.8	16.0:1
≤ 39	48.0	92.1	67.3	11.6:1
≤ 44	57.2	89.5	78.1	8.5:1
≤ 49	65.4	85.2	84.9	5.8:1
≤ 54	73.1	81.9	91.3	4.5:1
≤ 59	79.7	78.0	94.8	3.6:1
≤ 64	84.2	75.5	96.9	3.1:1
≤ 69	88.9	72.7	98.6	2.7:1
≤ 74	92.4	70.6	99.5	2.4:1
≤ 79	95.9	68.3	99.8	2.2:1
≤ 84	97.0	67.6	99.9	2.1:1
≤ 89	99.0	66.3	100.0	2.0:1
≤ 94	99.9	65.7	100.0	1.9:1
≤100	100.0	65.6	100.0	1.9:1

Tables forthe National (R62 Legacy Saxena MRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soore is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	50.2	
5 - 9	37.6	
10–14	28.7	
15 - 19	18.7	
20 - 24	15.0	
25 - 29	11.5	
30 - 34	7.2	
35 - 39	5.1	
40 - 44	3.8	
45 - 49	2.8	
50 - 54	1.4	
55 - 59	0.9	
60 - 64	0.3	
65 - 69	0.2	
70 - 74	0.1	
75 - 79	0.0	
80-84	0.0	
85–89	0.0	
90–94	0.0	
95 - 100	0.0	

Table 3 (National (R62 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (National (R62 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
	Confidence interval (\pm percentage points)				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	+0.4	10.7	12.5	16.4	
5 - 9	+9.7	6.4	7.3	9.3	
10 - 14	-1.1	4.5	5.4	6.7	
15 - 19	+3.4	2.9	3.4	4.8	
20 - 24	+4.8	2.4	2.9	4.0	
25 - 29	+2.7	1.9	2.2	2.8	
30 - 34	+0.6	2.1	2.5	3.2	
35 - 39	+2.1	1.3	1.5	2.0	
40 - 44	+1.6	0.9	1.0	1.4	
45 - 49	+1.1	0.9	1.1	1.4	
50 - 54	+0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9	
55 - 59	+0.6	0.3	0.4	0.5	
60 - 64	+0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5	
65 - 69	-0.1	0.4	0.5	0.7	
70 - 74	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	
75 - 79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
80-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
85-89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (National (R62 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+1.2	50.0	58.6	73.7		
4	+1.1	33.4	45.9	67.2		
8	+1.3	25.4	33.3	55.7		
16	+1.3	17.6	22.5	33.7		
32	+1.1	13.0	16.0	21.5		
64	+1.2	9.3	11.0	14.3		
128	+1.4	6.3	7.6	10.2		
256	+1.5	4.8	5.7	7.4		
512	+1.5	3.3	3.9	5.3		
1,024	+1.6	2.3	2.8	3.6		
2,048	+1.6	1.6	2.0	2.6		
4,096	+1.6	1.2	1.4	1.9		
8,192	+1.6	0.8	0.9	1.3		
16,384	+1.6	0.6	0.7	0.9		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	0.8	7.3	0.8	91.1	91.9	-71.4
≤ 9	1.5	6.5	2.5	89.5	91.0	-31.6
≤ 14	3.2	4.9	6.3	85.7	88.8	+22.4
≤ 19	4.4	3.7	11.7	80.2	84.5	-45.5
≤ 24	5.2	2.9	17.0	74.9	80.1	-111.2
≤ 29	6.2	1.8	25.1	66.8	73.0	-211.1
≤ 34	6.9	1.2	32.7	59.3	66.2	-304.8
≤ 39	7.3	0.8	40.7	51.2	58.5	-404.0
≤44	7.6	0.5	49.6	42.3	49.9	-514.6
≤ 49	7.8	0.2	57.6	34.4	42.2	-613.3
≤ 54	8.0	0.1	65.2	26.8	34.7	-707.4
≤ 59	8.0	0.1	71.7	20.3	28.3	-787.8
≤ 64	8.0	0.0	76.2	15.8	23.8	-843.8
≤ 69	8.1	0.0	80.8	11.1	19.1	-901.6
≤ 74	8.1	0.0	84.4	7.6	15.6	-945.2
≤ 79	8.1	0.0	87.8	4.1	12.2	-988.2
$\leq\!\!84$	8.1	0.0	89.0	3.0	11.0	-1,002.3
$\leq \!\!89$	8.1	0.0	90.9	1.0	9.1	$-1,\!026.1$
≤ 94	8.1	0.0	91.8	0.1	8.2	-1,037.4
≤ 100	8.1	0.0	91.9	0.0	8.1	-1,039.0

Table 10 (National (R62 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (National (R62 Legacy Saxena MRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

The second time of	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	
Largeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.5	49.1	9.4	1.0:1
≤ 9	4.0	38.2	18.9	0.6:1
≤ 14	9.4	33.5	39.1	0.5:1
≤ 19	16.1	27.1	54.0	0.4:1
≤ 24	22.2	23.4	64.4	0.3:1
≤ 29	31.3	19.9	77.2	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 34	39.6	17.5	85.6	0.2:1
≤ 39	48.0	15.2	90.3	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 44	57.2	13.3	94.4	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 49	65.4	12.0	97.2	0.1:1
≤ 54	73.1	10.9	98.7	0.1:1
≤ 59	79.7	10.1	99.4	0.1:1
≤ 64	84.2	9.6	99.7	0.1:1
≤ 69	88.9	9.1	99.9	0.1:1
≤ 74	92.4	8.7	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 79	95.9	8.4	100.0	0.1:1
$\leq \!\!84$	97.0	8.3	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 89	99.0	8.2	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 94	99.9	8.1	100.0	0.1:1
≤100	100.0	8.1	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for the \$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0-4	66.4
5 - 9	52.9
10 - 14	44.2
15 - 19	31.9
20 - 24	26.7
25 - 29	19.6
30 - 34	12.8
35 - 39	9.0
40 - 44	5.8
45 - 49	3.6
50 - 54	1.8
55 - 59	0.6
60-64	0.2
65 - 69	0.1
70 - 74	0.0
75 - 79	0.0
80-84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (\$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R62 MRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (1.08/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	+6.0	10.0	11.7	15.8	
5 - 9	+4.2	6.7	8.0	10.5	
10 - 14	+0.2	4.8	5.7	7.4	
15 - 19	+2.9	3.9	4.7	5.9	
20 - 24	+5.9	3.5	4.2	5.6	
25 - 29	+1.0	2.7	3.2	4.1	
30 - 34	-2.2	3.1	3.9	4.7	
35 - 39	+2.3	2.0	2.6	3.3	
40 - 44	+1.2	1.5	1.8	2.4	
45 - 49	+0.6	1.4	1.7	2.3	
50 - 54	+0.2	0.9	1.1	1.4	
55 - 59	+0.5	0.1	0.2	0.2	
60 - 64	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.4	
65 - 69	-0.2	0.5	0.5	0.7	
70 - 74	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	
75 - 79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
80-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (\$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value						
Size		<u>Confidence interval ($\pm percentage points)$</u>					
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	+1.1	52.6	65.7	80.3			
4	+0.9	42.9	54.6	74.6			
8	+1.3	31.8	40.8	61.9			
16	+1.1	23.2	28.8	37.3			
32	+0.7	16.8	21.0	28.6			
64	+0.9	12.3	14.9	18.0			
128	+1.0	8.4	10.0	13.2			
256	+1.2	6.2	7.5	9.7			
512	+1.1	4.2	5.0	6.6			
1,024	+1.1	2.9	3.4	4.3			
2,048	+1.1	2.0	2.4	3.4			
4,096	+1.2	1.5	1.8	2.4			
8,192	+1.2	1.0	1.2	1.6			
16,384	+1.2	0.7	0.8	1.1			

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.0	11.9	0.6	86.5	87.5	-80.4
≤ 9	2.2	10.7	1.8	85.3	87.5	-52.0
≤ 14	4.7	8.2	4.8	82.3	87.0	+9.1
≤ 19	6.8	6.1	9.3	77.8	84.6	+28.1
≤ 24	8.3	4.6	13.9	73.1	81.4	-8.1
≤ 29	10.2	2.7	21.2	65.9	76.1	-64.1
≤ 34	11.4	1.5	28.2	58.9	70.2	-118.7
≤ 39	12.0	1.0	36.0	51.1	63.0	-179.1
≤ 44	12.4	0.5	44.8	42.3	54.8	-247.0
≤ 49	12.7	0.2	52.7	34.4	47.1	-308.3
≤ 54	12.8	0.1	60.3	26.8	39.6	-367.2
≤ 59	12.9	0.0	66.8	20.3	33.2	-417.6
≤ 64	12.9	0.0	71.3	15.8	28.7	-452.7
≤ 69	12.9	0.0	76.0	11.1	24.0	-488.9
≤ 74	12.9	0.0	79.5	7.6	20.5	-516.2
≤ 79	12.9	0.0	83.0	4.1	17.0	-543.1
$\leq\!\!84$	12.9	0.0	84.1	3.0	15.9	-551.9
$\leq\!\!89$	12.9	0.0	86.1	1.0	13.9	-566.8
≤ 94	12.9	0.0	87.0	0.1	13.0	-573.9
≤100	12.9	0.0	87.1	0.0	12.9	-574.8

Table 10 (\$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$1.08/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤4	1.5	63.5	7.6	1.7:1
≤ 9	4.0	55.2	17.1	1.2:1
≤ 14	9.4	49.5	36.1	1.0:1
≤ 19	16.1	42.3	52.8	0.7:1
≤ 24	22.2	37.3	64.3	0.6:1
≤ 29	31.3	32.4	78.8	0.5:1
≤ 34	39.6	28.7	88.0	0.4:1
≤ 39	48.0	24.9	92.6	0.3:1
≤ 44	57.2	21.7	96.4	0.3:1
≤ 49	65.4	19.4	98.5	0.2:1
≤ 54	73.1	17.6	99.5	0.2:1
≤ 59	79.7	16.2	99.7	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 64	84.2	15.3	99.9	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 69	88.9	14.5	100.0	0.2:1
≤ 74	92.4	14.0	100.0	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 79	95.9	13.5	100.0	$0.2{:}1$
≤ 84	97.0	13.3	100.0	0.2:1
≤ 89	99.0	13.0	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 94	99.9	12.9	100.0	0.1:1
≤100	100.0	12.9	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for the \$0.81/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	25.9
5 - 9	21.8
10 - 14	12.9
15 - 19	8.9
20 - 24	6.2
25 - 29	3.7
30 - 34	2.3
35 - 39	1.6
40 - 44	1.0
45 - 49	0.5
50 - 54	0.2
55 - 59	0.1
60 - 64	0.0
65 - 69	0.0
70 - 74	0.0
75 - 79	0.0
80-84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95 - 100	0.0

Table 3 (\$0.81/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (0.81/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	<u>nterval (±perce</u> i	<u>ntage points)</u>		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	+6.1	6.7	7.9	10.5		
5 - 9	+4.7	5.3	6.3	7.9		
10 - 14	+1.9	2.8	3.3	4.4		
15 - 19	+1.6	2.2	2.6	3.7		
20 - 24	+2.1	1.6	1.9	2.4		
25 - 29	+0.9	1.1	1.3	1.6		
30 - 34	+0.6	0.9	1.0	1.3		
35 - 39	+1.2	0.4	0.4	0.5		
40 - 44	-0.3	0.7	0.8	1.1		
45 - 49	-0.6	0.8	0.9	1.2		
50 - 54	+0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1		
55 - 59	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2		
60 - 64	-0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3		
65 - 69	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
70 - 74	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
75 - 79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
80 - 84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
90 - 94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (\$0.81/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value						
Size		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	+0.5	6.5	43.5	58.5			
4	+0.6	15.3	31.0	54.4			
8	+0.2	17.5	25.7	44.8			
16	+0.4	12.8	16.7	25.6			
32	+0.3	9.1	11.1	14.9			
64	+0.5	5.9	7.2	10.1			
128	+0.6	4.4	5.1	7.4			
256	+0.7	3.0	3.7	4.8			
512	+0.7	2.1	2.4	3.4			
1,024	+0.8	1.5	1.8	2.3			
2,048	+0.8	1.1	1.3	1.7			
4,096	+0.8	0.8	0.9	1.1			
8,192	+0.8	0.5	0.6	0.8			
16,384	+0.8	0.4	0.4	0.6			

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	0.4	2.8	1.1	95.7	96.1	-38.8
≤ 9	0.8	2.4	3.2	93.6	94.5	+0.3
≤ 14	1.5	1.7	7.9	88.9	90.5	-147.7
≤ 19	2.1	1.1	14.0	82.8	84.9	-340.4
≤ 24	2.4	0.8	19.9	76.9	79.3	-523.8
≤ 29	2.7	0.5	28.6	68.2	70.9	-799.5
≤ 34	2.9	0.3	36.7	60.1	63.0	$-1,\!052.1$
≤ 39	2.9	0.2	45.0	51.8	54.7	$-1,\!313.7$
≤ 44	3.1	0.1	54.1	42.7	45.8	$-1,\!599.9$
≤ 49	3.2	0.0	62.3	34.6	37.7	-1,854.5
≤ 54	3.2	0.0	70.0	26.8	30.0	$-2,\!096.9$
≤ 59	3.2	0.0	76.5	20.3	23.5	-2,301.8
≤ 64	3.2	0.0	81.0	15.8	19.0	$-2,\!444.5$
≤ 69	3.2	0.0	85.7	11.1	14.3	$-2,\!591.3$
≤ 74	3.2	0.0	89.2	7.6	10.8	-2,702.2
≤ 79	3.2	0.0	92.7	4.1	7.3	$-2,\!811.1$
$\leq\!\!84$	3.2	0.0	93.9	3.0	6.1	$-2,\!846.8$
$\leq \!\!89$	3.2	0.0	95.8	1.0	4.2	$-2,\!907.2$
≤ 94	3.2	0.0	96.7	0.1	3.3	$-2,\!935.9$
≤100	3.2	0.0	96.8	0.0	3.2	$-2,\!939.7$

Table 10 (\$0.81/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$0.81/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.5	26.1	12.7	0.4:1
≤ 9	4.0	20.4	25.6	0.3:1
≤14	9.4	16.2	48.0	0.2:1
≤ 19	16.1	12.9	65.2	0.1:1
≤ 24	22.2	10.7	74.6	0.1:1
≤ 29	31.3	8.6	84.6	0.1:1
≤ 34	39.6	7.3	90.6	0.1:1
≤ 39	48.0	6.1	92.5	0.1:1
≤ 44	57.2	5.4	96.8	0.1:1
≤ 49	65.4	4.8	99.4	$0.1{:}1$
≤ 54	73.1	4.3	99.5	0.0:1
≤ 59	79.7	4.0	99.8	0.0:1
≤ 64	84.2	3.8	100.0	0.0:1
≤ 69	88.9	3.6	100.0	0.0:1
≤ 74	92.4	3.4	100.0	0.0:1
≤ 79	95.9	3.3	100.0	0.0:1
≤ 84	97.0	3.3	100.0	0.0:1
≤ 89	99.0	3.2	100.0	0.0:1
≤ 94	99.9	3.2	100.0	0.0:1
≤100	100.0	3.2	100.0	0.0:1

Tables for the \$1.35/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP) Poverty Line

	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0-4	86.0
5 - 9	76.7
10 - 14	70.9
15 - 19	61.9
20 - 24	53.5
25 - 29	45.3
30 - 34	34.7
35 - 39	25.4
40 - 44	18.5
45 - 49	12.6
50 - 54	7.7
55 - 59	4.0
60 - 64	1.3
65 - 69	1.0
70 - 74	0.3
75 - 79	0.1
80-84	0.1
85–89	0.0
90 - 94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (\$1.35/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (1.35/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	D	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	<u>nterval (±perce</u> i	<u>ntage points)</u>			
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
0–4	+5.3	8.2	9.5	12.4			
5 - 9	+2.6	6.2	7.4	9.5			
10 - 14	-3.0	4.2	4.9	6.5			
15 - 19	+1.4	4.5	5.2	7.1			
20 - 24	+0.4	4.7	5.7	7.8			
25 - 29	+2.4	3.8	4.5	5.7			
30 - 34	-4.3	4.2	4.9	5.8			
35 - 39	+4.1	3.1	3.7	5.0			
40 - 44	-1.2	3.1	3.7	5.0			
45 - 49	+0.4	2.8	3.2	4.1			
50 - 54	+1.0	1.9	2.4	3.0			
55 - 59	+1.9	1.1	1.2	1.6			
60 - 64	-0.7	1.5	1.8	2.4			
65 - 69	+0.4	0.7	0.8	1.0			
70 - 74	-0.3	0.7	0.8	1.1			
75 - 79	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0			
80-84	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0			
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			

Table 6 (\$1.35/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value							
Size		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>						
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent				
1	+3.3	68.3	71.7	84.5				
4	+1.1	50.8	59.4	79.1				
8	+0.9	40.2	49.5	66.3				
16	+1.0	30.0	34.9	46.7				
32	+0.9	20.4	24.4	31.9				
64	+0.5	14.4	17.3	22.3				
128	+0.3	10.0	12.3	16.2				
256	+0.3	7.5	8.9	11.2				
512	+0.4	5.0	6.1	8.5				
1,024	+0.4	3.6	4.3	5.6				
2,048	+0.4	2.6	3.1	3.8				
4,096	+0.4	1.8	2.2	3.0				
8,192	+0.4	1.3	1.6	2.0				
16,384	+0.4	0.9	1.1	1.5				

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	25.6	0.2	72.8	74.1	-89.4
≤ 9	3.1	23.8	0.9	72.2	75.3	-73.5
≤ 14	7.0	19.9	2.4	70.7	77.7	-39.0
≤ 19	11.1	15.8	5.0	68.1	79.2	+1.0
≤ 24	14.3	12.6	7.9	65.2	79.5	+35.8
≤ 29	18.4	8.6	13.0	60.1	78.5	+51.9
≤ 34	21.4	5.6	18.2	54.9	76.3	+32.5
≤ 39	23.3	3.7	24.7	48.3	71.6	+8.3
≤ 44	25.0	2.0	32.2	40.8	65.8	-19.7
≤ 49	26.0	1.0	39.4	33.6	59.6	-46.3
≤ 54	26.5	0.4	46.6	26.5	53.0	-72.9
≤ 59	26.8	0.2	52.9	20.1	46.9	-96.4
≤ 64	26.9	0.1	57.4	15.7	42.6	-112.9
≤ 69	26.9	0.0	62.0	11.1	38.0	-130.1
≤ 74	26.9	0.0	65.5	7.6	34.5	-143.1
≤ 79	26.9	0.0	69.0	4.1	31.0	-155.9
$\leq\!\!84$	26.9	0.0	70.1	3.0	29.9	-160.2
$\leq\!\!89$	26.9	0.0	72.0	1.0	28.0	-167.3
≤ 94	26.9	0.0	72.9	0.1	27.1	-170.7
≤100	26.9	0.0	73.1	0.0	26.9	-171.1

Table 10 (\$1.35/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$1.35/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤4	1.5	83.9	4.8	5.2:1
≤ 9	4.0	78.6	11.6	3.7:1
≤ 14	9.4	74.5	26.0	2.9:1
≤ 19	16.1	69.0	41.2	2.2:1
≤ 24	22.2	64.5	53.2	1.8:1
≤ 29	31.3	58.7	68.2	1.4:1
≤ 34	39.6	54.0	79.4	1.2:1
≤ 39	48.0	48.5	86.3	0.9:1
≤ 44	57.2	43.7	92.7	0.8:1
≤ 49	65.4	39.7	96.4	$0.7{:}1$
≤ 54	73.1	36.3	98.5	0.6:1
≤ 59	79.7	33.6	99.3	0.5:1
≤ 64	84.2	31.9	99.7	0.5:1
≤ 69	88.9	30.3	99.9	0.4:1
≤ 74	92.4	29.1	100.0	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 79	95.9	28.1	100.0	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 84	97.0	27.8	100.0	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 89	99.0	27.2	100.0	0.4:1
≤ 94	99.9	27.0	100.0	0.4:1
≤100	100.0	26.9	100.0	0.4:1

Tables for the \$1.62/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being		
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:		
0–4	94.5		
5 - 9	89.9		
10 - 14	86.9		
15 - 19	80.7		
20 - 24	75.9		
25 - 29	66.3		
30 - 34	58.9		
35 - 39	45.5		
40-44	35.3		
45 - 49	23.9		
50 - 54	16.5		
55 – 59	10.0		
60 - 64	5.6		
65 - 69	3.4		
70 - 74	1.4		
75 - 79	0.5		
80-84	0.4		
85 - 89	0.2		
90 - 94	0.0		
95–100	0.0		

Table 3 (\$1.62/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (1.62/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>			
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	-2.2	2.7	3.3	4.3	
5 - 9	+1.2	4.4	5.4	6.7	
10 - 14	-0.5	2.8	3.4	5.2	
15 - 19	+1.8	3.9	4.6	5.9	
20 - 24	+1.4	4.1	4.9	6.7	
25 - 29	+2.8	3.9	4.4	5.8	
30 - 34	-1.7	4.0	4.6	6.3	
35 - 39	+5.8	3.9	4.7	6.4	
40 - 44	-2.1	3.7	4.6	6.1	
45 - 49	+4.5	3.1	3.8	4.8	
50 - 54	-0.1	3.1	3.6	4.7	
55 - 59	+3.2	1.9	2.3	2.9	
60 - 64	+1.0	2.1	2.5	3.2	
65 - 69	-0.2	2.0	2.5	3.1	
70 - 74	-0.9	1.6	1.9	2.3	
75 - 79	+0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	
80-84	+0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	
85 - 89	+0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
95-100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (\$1.62/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value				
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
1	+3.0	70.3	78.4	91.7	
4	+0.8	56.1	65.5	82.1	
8	+1.4	42.3	49.8	71.6	
16	+1.1	31.0	37.1	48.9	
32	+1.4	21.2	26.5	32.6	
64	+1.2	14.1	17.2	22.8	
128	+1.2	10.2	12.0	15.9	
256	+1.3	7.6	8.8	11.7	
512	+1.3	5.1	6.2	8.2	
1,024	+1.2	3.6	4.3	5.7	
2,048	+1.3	2.7	3.2	3.9	
4,096	+1.2	1.9	2.2	2.7	
8,192	+1.2	1.3	1.6	2.1	
16,384	+1.2	0.9	1.1	1.5	

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.5	39.0	0.1	59.5	61.0	-92.5
≤ 9	3.6	36.8	0.3	59.2	62.9	-81.1
≤ 14	8.3	32.1	1.1	58.4	66.8	-56.2
≤ 19	13.7	26.7	2.4	57.2	70.9	-26.3
≤ 24	18.3	22.2	4.0	55.6	73.8	+0.2
≤ 29	24.2	16.2	7.1	52.5	76.7	+37.5
≤ 34	29.0	11.4	10.6	49.0	78.0	+69.6
≤ 39	32.6	7.8	15.4	44.2	76.8	+62.0
≤ 44	36.0	4.4	21.2	38.3	74.3	+47.5
≤ 49	37.8	2.6	27.6	32.0	69.8	+31.8
≤ 54	39.2	1.2	33.9	25.6	64.8	+16.0
≤ 59	39.8	0.6	39.9	19.7	59.5	+1.4
≤ 64	40.1	0.3	44.1	15.5	55.6	-9.0
≤ 69	40.3	0.1	48.6	11.0	51.3	-20.2
≤ 74	40.4	0.0	52.0	7.5	48.0	-28.7
≤ 79	40.4	0.0	55.5	4.1	44.5	-37.2
$\leq\!\!84$	40.4	0.0	56.6	3.0	43.4	-40.0
$\leq \!\!89$	40.4	0.0	58.5	1.0	41.5	-44.8
≤ 94	40.4	0.0	59.4	0.1	40.6	-47.0
≤ 100	40.4	0.0	59.6	0.0	40.4	-47.3

Table 10 (\$1.62/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$1.62/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted	
cut-off	targeted	poor	targeted		
<u>≤</u> 4	1.5	95.2	3.6	19.7:1	
≤ 9	4.0	91.3	9.0	10.5:1	
≤ 14	9.4	88.2	20.5	7.4:1	
≤ 19	16.1	85.1	33.9	5.7:1	
≤ 24	22.2	82.1	45.2	4.6:1	
≤ 29	31.3	77.3	59.9	$3.4{:}1$	
≤ 34	39.6	73.3	71.7	2.7:1	
≤ 39	48.0	68.0	80.6	2.1:1	
≤ 44	57.2	62.9	89.0	1.7:1	
≤ 49	65.4	57.8	93.6	1.4:1	
≤ 54	73.1	53.6	96.9	1.2:1	
≤ 59	79.7	50.0	98.5	1.0:1	
≤ 64	84.2	47.7	99.3	0.9:1	
≤ 69	88.9	45.4	99.7	0.8:1	
≤ 74	92.4	43.7	99.9	0.8:1	
≤ 79	95.9	42.2	100.0	0.7:1	
≤ 84	97.0	41.7	100.0	0.7:1	
≤ 89	99.0	40.9	100.0	0.7:1	
≤ 94	99.9	40.5	100.0	0.7:1	
≤100	100.0	40.4	100.0	0.7:1	

Tables for the \$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP) Poverty Line
If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:	
0–4	98.8	
5 - 9	98.0	
10 - 14	97.7	
15 - 19	95.9	
20 - 24	94.1	
25 - 29	88.8	
30 - 34	83.7	
35 - 39	76.2	
40 - 44	68.3	
45 - 49	53.8	
50 - 54	42.5	
55 - 59	29.4	
60 - 64	22.5	
65 - 69	15.5	
70 - 74	10.2	
75 - 79	4.9	
80-84	3.7	
85 - 89	1.0	
90–94	0.1	
95–100	0.0	

Table 3 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	-0.8	0.6	0.7	1.0	
5 - 9	+1.1	2.6	3.1	3.9	
10 - 14	-0.4	1.2	1.4	1.8	
15 - 19	-1.0	1.2	1.5	2.1	
20 - 24	+3.5	3.4	4.0	5.0	
25 - 29	0.0	2.5	3.0	4.1	
30 - 34	-0.7	3.1	3.6	4.7	
35 - 39	+2.0	3.6	4.4	5.7	
40 - 44	-0.5	3.7	4.5	5.9	
45 - 49	+9.3	4.8	5.7	8.0	
50 - 54	-2.3	4.3	5.2	6.6	
55 - 59	+6.4	3.7	4.3	5.8	
60 - 64	+8.0	4.1	5.1	6.6	
65 - 69	+1.9	3.5	4.3	6.0	
70 - 74	-5.2	5.3	5.9	8.0	
75 - 79	+2.6	1.2	1.5	1.9	
80-84	-1.3	5.6	6.5	8.1	
85 - 89	0.0	1.3	1.5	2.0	
90 - 94	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.6	
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+0.4	66.9	83.2	92.0		
4	+0.1	50.4	62.9	85.4		
8	+1.4	39.3	47.6	69.1		
16	+1.1	28.8	34.6	46.3		
32	+1.4	21.2	24.7	30.9		
64	+1.8	14.7	17.2	23.3		
128	+1.6	10.5	12.6	17.4		
256	+1.6	7.7	8.9	11.2		
512	+1.7	5.3	6.2	8.2		
1,024	+1.7	3.8	4.4	6.2		
2,048	+1.7	2.6	3.1	4.2		
4,096	+1.7	1.8	2.1	2.9		
8,192	+1.7	1.4	1.6	2.1		
16,384	+1.7	1.0	1.1	1.5		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.5	59.5	0.0	38.9	40.4	-95.0
≤ 9	3.9	57.2	0.1	38.8	42.7	-87.1
≤ 14	9.2	51.9	0.2	38.7	47.9	-69.5
≤ 19	15.6	45.5	0.5	38.4	54.1	-48.1
≤ 24	21.3	39.8	1.0	38.0	59.3	-28.7
≤ 29	29.4	31.7	1.9	37.0	66.4	-0.5
≤ 34	36.3	24.7	3.2	35.7	72.0	+24.3
≤ 39	42.7	18.3	5.2	33.7	76.4	+48.5
≤ 44	49.2	11.9	8.1	30.9	80.0	+74.2
≤ 49	53.1	8.0	12.3	26.6	79.8	+79.9
≤ 54	56.6	4.4	16.5	22.4	79.1	+73.0
≤ 59	58.5	2.6	21.2	17.8	76.3	+65.3
≤ 64	59.6	1.5	24.6	14.3	73.9	+59.7
≤ 69	60.4	0.7	28.5	10.4	70.8	+53.3
≤ 74	60.9	0.2	31.6	7.3	68.2	+48.3
≤ 79	61.0	0.1	34.9	4.0	65.0	+42.9
$\leq\!\!84$	61.0	0.0	36.0	2.9	64.0	+41.1
$\leq\!\!89$	61.1	0.0	37.9	1.0	62.1	+38.0
≤ 94	61.1	0.0	38.8	0.1	61.2	+36.5
≤100	61.1	0.0	38.9	0.0	61.1	+36.3

Table 10 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$2.16/day 1993 PPP (R62 Legacy MRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.5	98.8	2.5	83.4:1
≤ 9	4.0	97.9	6.4	47.2:1
≤14	9.4	97.8	15.1	45.4:1
≤ 19	16.1	97.0	25.6	32.7:1
≤ 24	22.2	95.7	34.9	22.3:1
≤ 29	31.3	93.8	48.1	15.2:1
≤ 34	39.6	91.8	59.5	11.2:1
≤ 39	48.0	89.1	70.0	8.2:1
≤ 44	57.2	85.9	80.5	6.1:1
≤ 49	65.4	81.2	87.0	4.3:1
≤ 54	73.1	77.4	92.7	$3.4{:}1$
≤ 59	79.7	73.4	95.8	2.8:1
≤ 64	84.2	70.8	97.6	$2.4{:}1$
≤ 69	88.9	67.9	98.9	2.1:1
≤ 74	92.4	65.8	99.6	1.9:1
≤ 79	95.9	63.6	99.9	$1.7{:}1$
≤ 84	97.0	62.9	100.0	$1.7{:}1$
≤ 89	99.0	61.7	100.0	1.6:1
≤ 94	99.9	61.2	100.0	1.6:1
≤100	100.0	61.1	100.0	1.6:1

Tables for100% of the National (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MRP)Poverty Line

If a household's soore is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being	
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:	
0-4	74.3	
5 - 9	61.5	
10–14	53.5	
15 - 19	42.4	
20 - 24	35.8	
25 - 29	27.8	
30 - 34	19.2	
35 - 39	13.1	
40 - 44	9.9	
45 - 49	7.1	
50 - 54	4.5	
55 - 59	1.7	
60 - 64	0.5	
65 - 69	0.5	
70 - 74	0.2	
75 - 79	0.1	
80-84	0.1	
85–89	0.0	
90–94	0.0	
95 - 100	0.0	

Table 3 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MRP)line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage point</u>			<u>ntage points)</u>		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	+4.8	9.6	11.7	14.4		
5 - 9	+7.7	6.8	8.2	10.5		
10 - 14	-1.3	5.1	6.0	7.5		
15 - 19	+3.8	4.4	5.1	6.7		
20 - 24	+7.9	4.0	4.9	6.3		
25 - 29	+1.8	3.4	4.2	5.3		
30 - 34	-4.7	4.3	4.6	5.7		
35 - 39	+3.2	2.4	3.0	3.7		
40 - 44	+0.1	2.4	2.8	3.6		
45 - 49	+0.8	2.1	2.6	3.3		
50 - 54	+1.0	1.5	1.7	2.4		
55 - 59	+1.0	0.4	0.5	0.8		
60 - 64	-0.1	0.5	0.6	0.9		
65 - 69	+0.1	0.5	0.6	0.8		
70 - 74	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.6		
75 - 79	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1		
80 - 84	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0		
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+2.3	57.3	67.1	77.2		
4	+1.0	47.0	57.3	73.2		
8	+1.3	36.6	44.4	61.0		
16	+1.2	26.8	33.6	42.0		
32	+1.2	18.6	23.5	30.4		
64	+1.0	13.7	16.6	20.5		
128	+1.2	9.5	10.8	14.7		
256	+1.4	6.8	7.9	10.3		
512	+1.2	4.7	5.6	7.4		
1,024	+1.3	3.4	4.2	5.6		
2,048	+1.3	2.4	2.8	3.8		
4,096	+1.3	1.7	2.0	2.8		
8,192	+1.3	1.2	1.4	1.9		
16,384	+1.3	0.8	1.0	1.3		

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	mistakenly	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.1	16.2	0.4	82.2	83.3	-84.6
≤ 9	2.5	14.9	1.5	81.1	83.6	-62.7
≤ 14	5.4	11.9	4.0	78.6	84.1	-14.5
≤ 19	8.1	9.2	8.0	74.7	82.8	+39.5
≤ 24	10.1	7.2	12.1	70.5	80.7	+30.3
≤ 29	12.6	4.7	18.7	63.9	76.6	-7.7
≤ 34	14.5	2.9	25.1	57.5	72.0	-44.4
≤ 39	15.5	1.9	32.5	50.1	65.6	-87.2
≤ 44	16.4	1.0	40.9	41.8	58.1	-135.2
≤ 49	16.9	0.5	48.5	34.1	51.0	-179.5
≤ 54	17.2	0.2	56.0	26.7	43.8	-222.2
≤ 59	17.3	0.1	62.4	20.2	37.5	-259.3
≤ 64	17.3	0.0	66.9	15.7	33.1	-285.1
≤ 69	17.4	0.0	71.6	11.1	28.4	-311.9
≤ 74	17.4	0.0	75.1	7.6	24.9	-332.2
≤ 79	17.4	0.0	78.5	4.1	21.5	-352.1
$\leq\!\!84$	17.4	0.0	79.7	3.0	20.3	-358.7
$\leq\!\!89$	17.4	0.0	81.6	1.0	18.4	-369.8
≤ 94	17.4	0.0	82.5	0.1	17.5	-375.0
≤100	17.4	0.0	82.6	0.0	17.4	-375.7

Table 10 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Table 11 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MRP validation sample

Targeting	% all HHs who are	% targeted HHs who are	% poor HHs who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-off	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.5	72.5	6.5	2.6:1
≤ 9	4.0	62.4	14.3	1.7:1
≤14	9.4	57.6	31.3	1.4:1
≤ 19	16.1	50.5	46.8	1.0:1
≤ 24	22.2	45.6	58.4	0.8:1
≤ 29	31.3	40.3	72.8	$0.7{:}1$
≤ 34	39.6	36.6	83.5	0.6:1
≤ 39	48.0	32.2	89.0	0.5:1
≤ 44	57.2	28.6	94.2	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 49	65.4	25.8	97.1	0.3:1
≤ 54	73.1	23.5	98.9	0.3:1
≤ 59	79.7	21.7	99.4	0.3:1
≤ 64	84.2	20.6	99.8	0.3:1
≤ 69	88.9	19.5	99.9	0.2:1
≤ 74	92.4	18.8	100.0	0.2:1
≤ 79	95.9	18.1	100.0	0.2:1
≤ 84	97.0	17.9	100.0	0.2:1
≤ 89	99.0	17.6	100.0	0.2:1
≤ 94	99.9	17.4	100.0	0.2:1
≤100	100.0	17.4	100.0	0.2:1

Tables for100% of the National (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP)Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	57.7
5 - 9	47.3
10 - 14	38.5
15 - 19	29.0
20 - 24	21.2
25 - 29	17.5
30 - 34	12.6
35 - 39	7.4
40 - 44	5.7
45 - 49	3.9
50 - 54	2.2
55 - 59	1.0
60 - 64	0.7
65 - 69	0.3
70 - 74	0.1
75 - 79	0.0
80-84	0.0
85–89	0.0
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP)line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	+0.8	9.8	11.8	15.6	
5 - 9	+7.8	6.8	8.2	10.5	
10 - 14	+5.2	4.4	5.5	7.0	
15 - 19	+1.6	3.9	4.6	5.6	
20 - 24	-1.1	3.6	4.3	6.3	
25 - 29	+0.4	3.2	3.7	4.6	
30 - 34	-1.4	2.9	3.3	4.3	
35 - 39	+2.2	1.5	1.8	2.2	
40 - 44	-1.0	2.0	2.5	3.5	
45 - 49	-0.4	1.8	2.2	2.8	
50 - 54	-0.1	1.2	1.4	1.8	
55 - 59	+0.1	0.6	0.8	0.9	
60 - 64	+0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6	
65 - 69	+0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	
70 - 74	+0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	
75 - 79	-0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	
80-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
85 - 89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	-0.9	60.5	67.3	76.9		
4	-0.3	47.1	58.7	69.9		
8	+1.3	32.4	42.1	57.3		
16	+0.9	23.4	29.2	42.5		
32	+0.7	17.3	21.2	28.2		
64	+0.9	11.7	14.8	18.5		
128	+0.5	8.7	10.5	13.7		
256	+0.6	6.0	7.1	8.9		
512	+0.8	4.2	4.9	6.6		
1,024	+0.7	3.0	3.5	4.6		
2,048	+0.6	2.1	2.6	3.3		
4,096	+0.6	1.5	1.8	2.5		
8,192	+0.6	1.1	1.3	1.6		
16,384	+0.6	0.7	0.9	1.1		

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	mistakenly	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	0.8	10.9	0.5	87.8	88.6	-81.8
≤ 9	1.9	9.8	1.9	86.4	88.3	-50.7
≤14	3.8	7.9	5.1	83.2	87.0	+8.4
≤ 19	5.6	6.0	9.3	79.0	84.6	+20.2
≤ 24	7.1	4.5	14.2	74.1	81.3	-21.5
≤ 29	8.7	3.0	22.0	66.3	75.0	-88.7
≤ 34	9.9	1.8	29.3	59.0	68.9	-151.0
≤ 39	10.4	1.2	37.4	50.9	61.4	-220.0
≤ 44	11.0	0.6	46.0	42.3	53.3	-294.0
≤ 49	11.4	0.3	53.8	34.5	45.9	-360.9
≤ 54	11.6	0.1	61.4	27.0	38.5	-425.5
≤ 59	11.6	0.0	68.1	20.3	31.9	-482.8
≤ 64	11.7	0.0	72.3	16.0	27.7	-519.4
≤ 69	11.7	0.0	77.0	11.3	23.0	-559.6
≤ 74	11.7	0.0	80.6	7.7	19.3	-590.6
≤ 79	11.7	0.0	84.1	4.2	15.9	-620.4
$\leq\!\!84$	11.7	0.0	85.2	3.1	14.8	-630.0
$\leq\!\!89$	11.7	0.0	87.3	1.1	12.7	-647.2
≤ 94	11.7	0.0	88.1	0.2	11.9	-654.7
≤100	11.7	0.0	88.3	0.0	11.7	-656.3

Table 10 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (100% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤4	1.3	60.1	6.8	1.5:1
≤ 9	3.8	49.8	16.4	1.0:1
≤ 14	8.9	42.8	32.5	$0.7{:}1$
≤ 19	15.0	37.7	48.3	0.6:1
≤ 24	21.3	33.5	61.2	0.5:1
≤ 29	30.8	28.3	74.7	0.4:1
≤ 34	39.2	25.2	84.4	0.3:1
≤ 39	47.8	21.8	89.4	0.3:1
≤ 44	57.0	19.3	94.5	0.2:1
≤ 49	65.2	17.4	97.3	0.2:1
≤ 54	72.9	15.9	99.0	0.2:1
≤ 59	79.7	14.6	99.7	0.2:1
≤ 64	84.0	13.9	99.9	0.2:1
≤ 69	88.7	13.2	99.9	0.2:1
≤ 74	92.3	12.6	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 79	95.8	12.2	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 84	96.9	12.0	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 89	98.9	11.8	100.0	0.1:1
≤ 94	99.8	11.7	100.0	0.1:1
≤100	100.0	11.7	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for150% of the National (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP)Poverty Line

	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	93.6
5 - 9	90.8
10 - 14	85.8
15 - 19	78.4
20 - 24	71.5
25 - 29	63.8
30 - 34	57.8
35 - 39	46.3
40 - 44	37.1
45 - 49	24.8
50 - 54	18.4
55 - 59	10.8
60 - 64	7.2
65 - 69	4.8
70 - 74	2.2
75 - 79	1.3
80-84	0.7
85 - 89	0.1
90 - 94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (150% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP)line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (150% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	<u>nterval (±perce</u> i	ntage points)		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-2.1	3.4	4.0	5.0		
5 - 9	-3.5	3.1	3.4	4.6		
10 - 14	-0.5	3.5	4.1	5.2		
15 - 19	+1.0	3.9	4.6	6.3		
20 - 24	-2.4	3.7	4.6	6.0		
25 - 29	+1.3	3.7	4.4	6.0		
30 - 34	+1.1	4.1	5.1	6.6		
35 - 39	+1.2	4.2	5.1	6.5		
40 - 44	-1.1	3.9	4.6	6.0		
45 - 49	+2.9	3.6	4.1	5.6		
50 - 54	+2.7	2.9	3.5	4.4		
55 - 59	+2.4	2.1	2.5	3.1		
60 - 64	+1.4	2.5	2.9	3.7		
65 - 69	-0.9	2.7	3.1	4.1		
70 - 74	0.0	1.5	1.8	2.5		
75 - 79	+0.4	0.9	1.1	1.3		
80-84	+0.5	0.3	0.3	0.5		
85 - 89	+0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3		
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		

Table 6 (150% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value						
Size		<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	+0.6	63.3	80.0	90.5			
4	+0.4	55.8	63.8	83.8			
8	+1.1	42.0	50.4	71.7			
16	+1.0	29.6	35.1	44.7			
32	+1.0	21.5	26.0	32.9			
64	+0.6	14.9	17.4	23.0			
128	+0.6	11.0	12.7	16.5			
256	+0.7	7.4	8.7	11.4			
512	+0.6	5.4	6.3	8.3			
1,024	+0.6	4.0	4.9	6.1			
2,048	+0.6	2.7	3.3	4.4			
4,096	+0.6	1.9	2.2	2.8			
8,192	+0.6	1.3	1.6	2.0			
16,384	+0.6	1.0	1.1	1.5			

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	mistakenly	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	39.2	0.1	59.4	60.7	-93.6
≤ 9	3.6	36.9	0.3	59.2	62.8	-81.7
≤ 14	7.9	32.6	0.9	58.5	66.5	-58.5
≤ 19	12.7	27.8	2.3	57.2	69.9	-31.8
≤ 24	17.3	23.2	4.0	55.5	72.8	-4.5
≤ 29	23.3	17.2	7.5	52.0	75.3	+33.4
≤ 34	28.1	12.4	11.1	48.4	76.5	+66.1
≤ 39	32.1	8.4	15.7	43.8	75.8	+61.1
≤ 44	35.5	5.0	21.5	38.0	73.4	+46.8
≤ 49	37.5	3.0	27.7	31.8	69.3	+31.6
≤ 54	39.0	1.5	33.9	25.6	64.6	+16.2
≤ 59	39.7	0.8	40.0	19.5	59.3	+1.3
≤ 64	40.1	0.4	43.9	15.6	55.6	-8.5
≤ 69	40.3	0.2	48.4	11.1	51.5	-19.4
≤ 74	40.4	0.1	51.9	7.6	48.1	-28.1
≤ 79	40.5	0.0	55.3	4.2	44.7	-36.6
$\leq\!\!84$	40.5	0.0	56.4	3.1	43.6	-39.3
$\leq \!\!89$	40.5	0.0	58.4	1.1	41.6	-44.3
≤ 94	40.5	0.0	59.3	0.2	40.7	-46.4
≤100	40.5	0.0	59.5	0.0	40.5	-46.9

Table 10 (150% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (150% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting	% all HHs who are	% targeted HHs who are	% poor HHs who are	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
	targeted	poor	targeted	
≤ 4	1.3	94.7	3.1	17.7:1
≤ 9	3.8	93.2	8.8	13.6:1
≤ 14	8.9	89.3	19.6	8.3:1
≤ 19	15.0	84.7	31.3	5.6:1
≤ 24	21.3	81.2	42.8	4.3:1
≤ 29	30.8	75.7	57.5	3.1:1
≤ 34	39.2	71.7	69.4	2.5:1
≤ 39	47.8	67.1	79.2	2.0:1
≤ 44	57.0	62.2	87.6	1.6:1
≤ 49	65.2	57.5	92.6	1.4:1
≤ 54	72.9	53.5	96.3	1.1:1
≤ 59	79.7	49.9	98.1	1.0:1
≤ 64	84.0	47.7	98.9	0.9:1
≤ 69	88.7	45.5	99.6	0.8:1
≤ 74	92.3	43.8	99.9	0.8:1
≤ 79	95.8	42.3	100.0	0.7:1
≤ 84	96.9	41.8	100.0	0.7:1
≤ 89	98.9	40.9	100.0	0.7:1
≤ 94	99.8	40.6	100.0	0.7:1
≤100	100.0	40.5	100.0	0.7:1

Tables for200% of the National (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP)Poverty Line

	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	99.0
5 - 9	98.3
10 - 14	97.1
15 - 19	94.8
20 - 24	92.0
25 - 29	89.1
30 - 34	85.5
35 - 39	77.7
40 - 44	68.6
45 - 49	55.9
50 - 54	45.9
55 – 59	33.3
60 - 64	26.9
65 - 69	21.6
70 - 74	13.1
75 - 79	8.6
80-84	5.1
85 - 89	3.0
90 - 94	0.8
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (200% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP)line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (200% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value					
		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval ($\pm percent$	<u>ntage points)</u>		
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
0–4	-0.9	0.5	0.5	0.5		
5 - 9	-0.5	1.4	1.5	1.8		
10 - 14	-0.3	1.5	1.8	2.3		
15 - 19	-1.4	1.7	2.0	2.3		
20 - 24	-1.3	2.3	2.6	3.3		
25 - 29	+1.0	2.4	2.9	3.6		
30 - 34	+3.1	3.3	3.9	4.8		
35 - 39	-0.5	3.8	4.3	5.6		
40 - 44	-1.2	3.6	4.4	5.5		
45 - 49	+6.5	4.7	5.5	7.2		
50 - 54	+5.4	4.9	5.9	8.0		
55 - 59	+1.6	4.7	5.7	7.4		
60 - 64	+5.2	4.5	5.3	6.8		
65 - 69	-7.9	6.9	7.6	9.1		
70 - 74	-9.0	8.7	9.6	12.2		
75 - 79	+0.6	3.3	3.9	5.1		
80-84	+2.6	2.6	3.1	3.9		
85 - 89	+2.0	1.1	1.3	1.6		
90–94	+0.3	0.9	1.1	1.4		
95 - 100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7		

Table 6 (200% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value					
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>					
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent		
1	+0.3	61.4	79.3	88.0		
4	+0.3	50.0	63.6	83.8		
8	+1.1	42.0	50.9	67.3		
16	+1.5	28.5	35.0	48.5		
32	+1.1	21.0	26.0	36.5		
64	+0.9	14.8	18.5	24.6		
128	+0.8	10.8	12.6	16.2		
256	+0.8	7.3	8.8	11.7		
512	+0.7	5.5	6.5	8.4		
1,024	+0.7	3.8	4.6	6.0		
2,048	+0.7	2.6	3.2	4.0		
4,096	+0.8	1.8	2.1	2.8		
8,192	+0.8	1.4	1.6	2.1		
16,384	+0.8	1.0	1.2	1.5		

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	61.2	0.0	37.5	38.8	-95.8
≤ 9	3.8	58.7	0.0	37.4	41.2	-87.8
≤ 14	8.7	53.9	0.2	37.3	46.0	-71.9
≤ 19	14.5	48.0	0.5	37.0	51.5	-52.9
≤ 24	20.4	42.1	0.9	36.6	57.0	-33.2
≤ 29	28.7	33.8	2.0	35.4	64.2	-4.8
≤ 34	35.8	26.8	3.4	34.1	69.8	+19.8
≤ 39	42.6	20.0	5.3	32.2	74.7	+44.5
≤ 44	48.9	13.6	8.1	29.4	78.3	+69.5
≤ 49	53.3	9.2	11.8	25.6	79.0	+81.1
≤ 54	57.1	5.5	15.9	21.6	78.6	+74.6
≤ 59	59.2	3.3	20.5	17.0	76.2	+67.2
≤ 64	60.4	2.1	23.6	13.9	74.3	+62.3
≤ 69	61.6	0.9	27.1	10.3	71.9	+56.6
≤ 74	62.1	0.4	30.2	7.3	69.4	+51.7
≤ 79	62.4	0.1	33.4	4.1	66.5	+46.6
$\leq\!\!84$	62.5	0.0	34.4	3.0	65.5	+44.9
$\leq\!\!89$	62.5	0.0	36.4	1.1	63.6	+41.8
≤ 94	62.5	0.0	37.3	0.2	62.7	+40.4
≤100	62.5	0.0	37.5	0.0	62.5	+40.1

Table 10 (200% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MRP) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (200% of the national (R66 Legacy Tendulkar MMRP) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
≤4	1.3	99.6	2.1	274.3:1
≤ 9	3.8	98.8	6.1	85.9:1
≤ 14	8.9	97.9	13.9	45.9:1
≤ 19	15.0	96.9	23.2	31.7:1
≤ 24	21.3	95.8	32.7	22.6:1
≤ 29	30.8	93.5	46.0	14.3:1
≤ 34	39.2	91.3	57.2	10.5:1
≤ 39	47.8	89.0	68.0	8.1:1
≤ 44	57.0	85.8	78.3	6.0:1
≤ 49	65.2	81.8	85.3	4.5:1
≤ 54	72.9	78.2	91.2	3.6:1
≤ 59	79.7	74.3	94.7	2.9:1
≤ 64	84.0	71.9	96.6	2.6:1
≤ 69	88.7	69.4	98.5	2.3:1
≤ 74	92.3	67.3	99.4	2.1:1
≤ 79	95.8	65.2	99.8	1.9:1
≤ 84	96.9	64.5	99.9	1.8:1
≤ 89	98.9	63.2	100.0	1.7:1
≤ 94	99.8	62.7	100.0	1.7:1
≤100	100.0	62.5	100.0	1.7:1

Tables for the \$1.25/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP) Poverty Line

If a household's soons is	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being		
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:		
0-4	79.5		
5 - 9	74.3		
10–14	64.8		
15 - 19	55.7		
20 - 24	45.2		
25 - 29	38.1		
30-34	32.5		
35 - 39	21.9		
40 - 44	16.6		
45 - 49	11.2		
50 - 54	6.4		
55 - 59	2.9		
60 - 64	1.7		
65 - 69	0.6		
70 - 74	0.4		
75 - 79	0.1		
80-84	0.0		
85–89	0.0		
90–94	0.0		
95–100	0.0		

Table 3 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (1.25/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value				
	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
0–4	+0.8	7.7	9.5	12.3	
5 - 9	+0.8	6.4	7.6	10.2	
10 - 14	-2.5	4.8	5.8	7.5	
15 - 19	+0.5	4.6	5.5	7.4	
20 - 24	+2.5	4.5	5.4	7.2	
25 - 29	-0.2	3.8	4.5	6.2	
30 - 34	+0.4	3.8	4.7	6.2	
35 - 39	+1.3	3.2	3.8	5.0	
40 - 44	0.0	2.9	3.6	4.5	
45 - 49	+1.5	2.5	2.9	3.9	
50 - 54	+0.5	1.9	2.3	3.1	
55 - 59	+0.6	1.1	1.2	1.7	
60 - 64	+0.6	0.9	1.1	1.5	
65 - 69	-0.1	0.7	0.8	1.0	
70 - 74	-0.1	0.7	0.8	1.1	
75 - 79	-0.1	0.3	0.3	0.5	
80-84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
85 - 89	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
95 - 100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table 6 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value				
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>				
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent	
1	-2.1	66.9	74.1	84.0	
4	+0.3	53.6	62.8	79.9	
8	+1.0	40.5	48.4	70.4	
16	+0.8	29.7	35.8	47.5	
32	+0.7	21.0	24.6	32.0	
64	+0.5	14.8	17.6	22.1	
128	+0.5	10.7	12.8	16.7	
256	+0.4	7.1	8.6	11.0	
512	+0.5	5.2	6.3	8.1	
1,024	+0.4	3.6	4.3	5.6	
2,048	+0.4	2.6	3.2	4.7	
4,096	+0.4	1.8	2.2	3.0	
8,192	+0.4	1.2	1.5	2.0	
16,384	+0.4	0.9	1.1	1.4	

	Inclusion:	<u>Undercoverage:</u>	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.0	22.9	0.3	75.7	76.8	-90.1
≤ 9	2.9	21.1	0.9	75.1	78.0	-71.9
≤ 14	6.3	17.7	2.6	73.4	79.7	-36.8
≤ 19	9.7	14.3	5.2	70.8	80.5	+2.9
≤ 24	12.6	11.4	8.7	67.3	79.9	+41.6
≤ 29	16.2	7.8	14.6	61.4	77.6	+39.1
≤ 34	18.8	5.2	20.3	55.7	74.5	+15.1
≤ 39	20.7	3.3	27.1	48.9	69.6	-13.2
≤ 44	22.2	1.8	34.8	41.2	63.4	-45.3
≤ 49	23.1	0.9	42.1	33.9	56.9	-75.7
≤ 54	23.6	0.4	49.3	26.7	50.3	-105.7
≤ 59	23.8	0.2	55.9	20.1	44.0	-133.0
≤ 64	23.9	0.1	60.1	15.9	39.8	-150.6
≤ 69	23.9	0.0	64.8	11.3	35.2	-170.1
≤ 74	24.0	0.0	68.4	7.7	31.6	-185.0
≤ 79	24.0	0.0	71.8	4.2	28.2	-199.5
$\leq\!\!84$	24.0	0.0	72.9	3.1	27.1	-204.2
$\leq \!\!89$	24.0	0.0	75.0	1.1	25.0	-212.6
≤ 94	24.0	0.0	75.8	0.2	24.2	-216.2
≤100	24.0	0.0	76.0	0.0	24.0	-217.0

Table 10 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Percentages of households by cutoff score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Table 11 (\$1.25/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Targeting cut-off	% all HHs who are targeted	% targeted HHs who are poor	% poor HHs who are targeted	Poor HHs targeted per non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.3	78.9	4.4	3.8:1
≤ 9	3.8	75.5	12.1	3.1:1
≤14	8.9	70.7	26.2	2.4:1
≤ 19	15.0	65.1	40.6	1.9:1
≤ 24	21.3	59.2	52.6	1.4:1
≤ 29	30.8	52.5	67.4	1.1:1
≤ 34	39.2	48.0	78.5	0.9:1
≤ 39	47.8	43.2	86.2	0.8:1
≤ 44	57.0	38.9	92.6	0.6:1
≤ 49	65.2	35.4	96.2	0.5:1
≤ 54	72.9	32.4	98.4	$0.5{:}1$
≤ 59	79.7	29.9	99.4	0.4:1
≤ 64	84.0	28.5	99.7	0.4:1
≤ 69	88.7	27.0	99.9	0.4:1
≤ 74	92.3	26.0	100.0	$0.4{:}1$
≤ 79	95.8	25.0	100.0	0.3:1
≤ 84	96.9	24.7	100.0	0.3:1
≤ 89	98.9	24.2	100.0	0.3:1
≤ 94	99.8	24.0	100.0	0.3:1
≤100	100.0	24.0	100.0	0.3:1

Tables for the \$1.88/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP) Poverty Line
	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousenoid's score is	below the poverty line is:
0-4	98.6
5 - 9	97.5
10 - 14	95.5
15 - 19	92.3
20 - 24	87.7
25 - 29	83.4
30 - 34	79.3
35 - 39	70.6
40 - 44	60.9
45 - 49	46.4
50 - 54	36.6
55 - 59	25.1
60 - 64	19.5
65 - 69	14.3
70 - 74	7.7
75 - 79	4.5
80-84	2.9
85 - 89	0.8
90–94	0.0
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (\$1.88/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (1.88/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value								
		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval (\pm percer	<u>ntage points)</u>					
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent					
0–4	-0.6	1.3	1.5	1.9					
5 - 9	-1.0	1.4	1.7	2.0					
10 - 14	+0.4	2.2	2.7	3.5					
15 - 19	-1.1	2.3	2.6	3.3					
20 - 24	-2.3	2.5	3.1	4.2					
25 - 29	-0.1	2.7	3.3	4.0					
30 - 34	+1.5	3.5	4.0	5.4					
35 - 39	-0.2	4.0	4.7	5.8					
40 - 44	-1.4	3.8	4.6	6.0					
45 - 49	+5.1	4.4	5.3	6.6					
50 - 54	+5.4	4.3	5.0	6.5					
55 - 59	-0.9	4.6	5.7	7.6					
60 - 64	+3.8	4.0	4.6	6.1					
65 - 69	-8.5	7.3	7.8	9.3					
70 - 74	-1.3	3.7	4.4	5.9					
75 - 79	+0.5	2.2	2.5	3.3					
80-84	+1.0	2.2	2.6	3.2					
85 - 89	+0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7					
90–94	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					
95 - 100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7					

Table 6 (\$1.88/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value								
Size	<u>Confidence interval (\pmpercentage points)</u>								
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent					
1	+0.3	71.3	79.9	90.0					
4	+0.5	55.0	68.2	89.0					
8	+1.4	41.8	51.7	71.8					
16	+1.1	29.7	35.0	48.1					
32	+0.7	21.3	25.5	32.9					
64	+0.4	14.8	17.5	23.8					
128	+0.3	10.2	12.2	15.5					
256	+0.3	7.4	8.7	11.6					
512	+0.3	5.4	6.2	7.7					
1,024	+0.3	3.7	4.3	5.9					
2,048	+0.3	2.6	3.0	3.9					
4,096	+0.3	1.8	2.2	2.8					
8,192	+0.4	1.4	1.6	2.1					
16,384	+0.3	0.9	1.1	1.6 、					

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	55.2	0.0	43.4	44.8	-95.3
≤ 9	3.8	52.8	0.1	43.4	47.2	-86.5
≤ 14	8.6	48.0	0.3	43.2	51.7	-69.2
≤ 19	14.2	42.3	0.7	42.7	57.0	-48.4
≤ 24	19.9	36.6	1.4	42.1	62.0	-27.0
≤ 29	27.8	28.8	3.0	40.5	68.2	+3.5
≤ 34	34.4	22.2	4.8	38.7	73.0	+30.0
≤ 39	40.5	16.0	7.3	36.1	76.6	+56.2
≤44	46.1	10.4	10.9	32.5	78.6	+80.6
≤ 49	49.8	6.8	15.4	28.0	77.8	+72.7
≤ 54	52.6	3.9	20.3	23.2	75.8	+64.1
≤ 59	54.3	2.2	25.4	18.1	72.4	+55.1
≤ 64	55.2	1.4	28.8	14.6	69.8	+49.0
≤ 69	56.0	0.6	32.7	10.7	66.7	+42.1
≤ 74	56.3	0.2	36.0	7.5	63.8	+36.3
≤ 79	56.5	0.1	39.3	4.1	60.6	+30.4
$\leq\!\!84$	56.5	0.0	40.4	3.1	59.6	+28.5
$\leq \!\!89$	56.5	0.0	42.4	1.1	57.6	+25.0
≤ 94	56.5	0.0	43.3	0.2	56.7	+23.5
≤ 100	56.5	0.0	43.5	0.0	56.5	+23.1

Table 10 (\$1.88/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Percentages of households by cutoff score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

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

Table 11 (\$1.88/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

T	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	De la IIII de la contra la contra
Targeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.3	99.0	2.3	100.4:1
≤ 9	3.8	98.2	6.7	54.6:1
≤ 14	8.9	96.5	15.1	27.7:1
≤ 19	15.0	95.1	25.2	19.5:1
≤ 24	21.3	93.4	35.3	14.2:1
≤ 29	30.8	90.3	49.1	9.3:1
≤ 34	39.2	87.7	60.8	7.2:1
≤ 39	47.8	84.7	71.6	5.5:1
≤ 44	57.0	80.8	81.5	4.2:1
≤ 49	65.2	76.3	88.0	3.2:1
≤ 54	72.9	72.2	93.1	2.6:1
≤ 59	79.7	68.1	96.0	2.1:1
≤ 64	84.0	65.7	97.6	1.9:1
≤ 69	88.7	63.1	99.0	1.7:1
≤ 74	92.3	61.0	99.6	1.6:1
≤ 79	95.8	59.0	99.9	1.4:1
$\leq \!\!84$	96.9	58.3	100.0	1.4:1
≤ 89	98.9	57.1	100.0	1.3:1
≤ 94	99.8	56.6	100.0	1.3:1
≤100	100.0	56.5	100.0	1.3:1

Tables for the \$2.50/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP) Poverty Line

	\ldots then the likelihood (%) of being
If a nousehold's score is	below the poverty line is:
0–4	99.6
5 - 9	99.4
10 - 14	99.0
15 - 19	98.1
20 - 24	97.0
25 - 29	95.7
30 - 34	93.9
35 - 39	89.4
40 - 44	84.9
45 - 49	75.1
50 - 54	66.4
55 - 59	51.5
60 - 64	44.7
65 - 69	39.4
70 - 74	28.2
75 - 79	18.5
80-84	13.2
85–89	7.9
90–94	1.7
95–100	0.0

Table 3 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Table 5 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Average differences between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

	Difference between estimate and true value									
		<u>Confidence i</u>	nterval ($\pm percent$	ntage points)						
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent						
0–4	-0.3	0.2	0.3	0.5						
5 - 9	-0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3						
10-14	0.0	1.0	1.2	1.3						
15 - 19	-0.1	1.2	1.5	1.8						
20 - 24	-0.2	1.6	2.0	2.5						
25 - 29	+0.3	1.5	1.7	2.3						
30 - 34	-0.3	1.8	2.1	2.8						
35 - 39	-1.7	2.2	2.7	3.5						
40-44	-0.3	3.0	3.6	4.4						
45 - 49	+3.0	4.0	4.7	6.2						
50 - 54	+6.2	6.0	7.0	8.8						
55 - 59	+4.0	5.1	5.8	7.1						
60 - 64	+5.8	5.9	6.8	8.7						
65 - 69	-6.5	6.1	7.2	10.4						
70 - 74	-3.4	8.4	9.7	11.7						
75 - 79	+0.6	4.6	5.4	6.8						
80-84	+7.6	3.8	4.5	5.9						
85 - 89	+2.8	3.0	3.7	4.7						
90–94	-2.0	4.4	5.3	6.8						
95 - 100	-0.4	1.3	1.7	2.7						

Table 6 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Average differences between estimated poverty rates and true values for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

Sample	Difference between estimate and true value						
Size	$\underline{\text{Confidence interval } (\pm \text{percentage points})}$						
\boldsymbol{n}	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent			
1	-2.2	63.5	73.5	90.3			
4	-1.1	44.8	59.9	79.7			
8	-0.2	35.0	43.2	62.3			
16	+0.4	26.2	31.4	43.0			
32	+0.3	18.2	21.5	31.4			
64	+0.7	13.7	17.2	22.1			
128	+0.5	9.7	11.9	15.8			
256	+0.6	6.8	8.1	10.2			
512	+0.6	4.8	5.8	7.6			
1,024	+0.6	3.5	4.4	5.3			
2,048	+0.7	2.5	2.8	3.8			
4,096	+0.7	1.8	2.0	2.7			
8,192	+0.7	1.2	1.5	1.9			
16,384	+0.7	0.9	1.0	1.4			

	Inclusion:	Undercoverage:	Leakage:	Exclusion:	<u>Hit rate</u>	BPAC
	< poverty line	< poverty line	\geq poverty line	\geq poverty line	Inclusion	
	correctly	${f mistakenly}$	${f mistakenly}$	correctly	+	See text
Score	targeted	non-targeted	targeted	non-targeted	Exclusion	
≤ 4	1.3	72.9	0.0	25.8	27.1	-96.4
≤ 9	3.8	70.4	0.0	25.8	29.6	-89.7
≤ 14	8.8	65.4	0.1	25.7	34.5	-76.2
≤ 19	14.8	59.4	0.2	25.6	40.4	-59.9
≤ 24	21.0	53.2	0.3	25.4	46.4	-43.0
≤ 29	30.0	44.2	0.8	25.0	55.0	-18.1
≤ 34	37.9	36.4	1.3	24.5	62.3	+3.8
≤ 39	45.7	28.5	2.1	23.7	69.4	+26.0
≤ 44	53.5	20.7	3.5	22.3	75.8	+49.0
≤ 49	59.5	14.7	5.7	20.1	79.7	+68.0
≤ 54	64.9	9.3	8.1	17.7	82.6	+85.7
≤ 59	68.3	6.0	11.4	14.3	82.6	+84.6
≤ 64	70.2	4.0	13.8	12.0	82.3	+81.5
≤ 69	72.2	2.0	16.5	9.3	81.5	+77.8
≤ 74	73.2	1.0	19.1	6.7	79.9	+74.3
≤ 79	73.9	0.3	21.9	3.9	77.8	+70.5
$\leq\!\!84$	74.0	0.2	22.9	2.9	76.9	+69.2
$\leq\!\!89$	74.2	0.0	24.7	1.0	75.2	+66.7
≤ 94	74.2	0.0	25.6	0.2	74.4	+65.5
≤ 100	74.2	0.0	25.8	0.0	74.2	+65.3

Table 10 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Percentages of households by cutoff score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

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

Table 11 (\$2.50/day 2005 PPP (R66 Legacy MMRP)): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), share of poor households who are targeted, and number of poor households successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), new R68 scorecard applied to the R68 MMRP validation sample

T	% all HHs	% targeted	% poor HHs	De la IIII de la contra la contra
Targeting	who are	HHs who are	who are	Poor HHs targeted per
cut-on	targeted	poor	targeted	non-poor HH targeted
<u>≤</u> 4	1.3	99.8	1.8	461.8:1
≤ 9	3.8	99.7	5.2	329.6:1
≤ 14	8.9	99.3	11.9	151.1:1
≤ 19	15.0	98.9	19.9	92.6:1
≤ 24	21.3	98.4	28.3	63.4:1
≤ 29	30.8	97.5	40.4	39.1:1
≤ 34	39.2	96.7	51.0	29.0:1
≤ 39	47.8	95.6	61.6	21.6:1
≤ 44	57.0	93.9	72.1	15.3:1
≤ 49	65.2	91.3	80.2	10.5:1
≤ 54	72.9	89.0	87.4	8.1:1
≤ 59	79.7	85.7	92.0	6.0:1
≤ 64	84.0	83.6	94.6	5.1:1
≤ 69	88.7	81.4	97.3	4.4:1
≤ 74	92.3	79.3	98.7	3.8:1
≤ 79	95.8	77.2	99.6	3.4:1
$\leq \!\!84$	96.9	76.4	99.8	3.2:1
≤ 89	98.9	75.0	100.0	3.0:1
≤ 94	99.8	74.4	100.0	2.9:1
≤100	100.0	74.2	100.0	2.9:1

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates						tes (%)			
n	q		Le	egacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
ŝic	un		Natl.	<u>Intl. 19</u>	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.11	16.48	32.97	16.96	14.89	11.17	18.62	22.34	29.79	18.08
		Rate (HHs)	16.9	14.4	56.6	16.3	10.0	3.0	21.4	31.0	50.2	19.3
		Rate (people)	22.4	19.4	65.4	21.5	13.7	4.3	28.0	39.2	59.1	25.6
	62	Line	18.63	18.25	36.51	18.77	16.56	12.42	20.69	24.83	33.11	20.04
		Rate (HHs)	15.3	14.2	55.4	15.4	10.0	3.3	19.7	30.3	48.9	18.0
oan		Rate (people)	20.4	18.8	64.0	20.5	13.6	4.5	25.9	38.1	57.3	23.9
Url	66	Line	26.39	25.89	51.77	26.61	23.37	17.53	29.21	35.05	46.74	28.79
		Rate (HHs)	12.2	11.3	48.8	12.3	7.8	2.1	16.8	26.2	42.6	15.6
		Rate (people)	16.5	15.3	58.0	16.7	10.7	3.2	22.3	33.6	51.6	20.9
	68	Line	31.27	30.65	61.29	31.54	27.67	20.75	34.59	41.51	55.34	33.72
		Rate (HHs)	7.8	7.0	40.8	7.9	4.5	0.9	10.8	18.6	34.8	9.7
		Rate (people)	10.9	10.0	50.3	11.0	6.5	1.3	15.0	24.9	43.7	13.7
	59	Line	11.52	14.40	28.80	11.32	13.56	10.17	16.94	20.33	27.11	14.26
		Rate (HHs)	19.7	37.7	87.1	17.9	32.3	11.7	52.7	68.2	84.5	36.2
		Rate (people)	24.1	43.2	90.2	22.1	37.3	14.2	58.4	73.5	87.9	42.1
	62	Line	12.71	15.81	31.62	12.38	14.78	11.08	18.47	22.16	29.55	15.56
		Rate (HHs)	19.6	36.0	86.6	17.5	30.8	11.6	50.6	66.2	84.1	34.1
ral		Rate (people)	22.9	40.2	89.5	20.4	34.8	13.2	55.5	70.9	87.3	38.8
Ru	66	Line	18.68	23.23	46.47	18.17	21.72	16.29	27.16	32.59	43.45	22.36
		Rate (HHs)	16.3	32.3	84.4	14.1	26.5	8.5	46.7	63.0	81.6	27.9
		Rate (people)	20.1	37.3	88.1	17.5	31.0	10.4	52.5	68.6	85.7	33.3
	68	Line	21.94	27.23	54.45	21.34	25.47	19.11	31.84	38.21	50.95	27.63
		Rate (HHs)	10.2	21.5	77.2	8.2	16.8	4.4	34.5	50.7	73.2	21.1
		Rate (people)	12.8	25.6	81.8	10.5	20.4	5.4	39.9	56.7	78.2	25.4
	59	Line	12.93	14.93	29.85	12.74	13.89	10.42	17.37	20.84	27.79	15.22
		Rate (HHs)	18.9	31.3	78.8	17.5	26.2	9.3	44.2	58.1	75.1	31.6
		Rate (people)	23.7	37.2	83.9	22.0	31.4	11.7	50.7	64.9	80.6	37.9
	62	Line	14.11	16.39	32.77	13.89	15.20	11.40	19.00	22.79	30.39	16.62
		Rate (HHs)	18.5	30.3	78.4	17.0	25.4	9.5	42.6	56.9	74.9	29.9
IT		Rate (people)	22.3	35.2	83.5	20.4	29.8	11.1	48.5	63.2	80.2	35.2
A	66	Line	20.77	23.95	47.90	20.46	22.17	16.63	27.71	33.25	44.34	24.10
		Rate (HHs)	15.1	26.1	73.9	13.6	20.9	6.6	37.9	52.2	70.1	24.2
		Rate (people)	19.1	31.4	80.0	17.3	25.5	8.4	44.3	59.1	76.5	29.9
	68	Line	24.60	28.20	56.41	24.25	26.10	19.58	32.63	39.15	52.20	29.37
		Rate (HHs)	9.4	17.0	65.8	8.1	13.0	3.3	27.1	40.7	61.2	17.5
_		Rate (people)	12.3	21.1	72.8	10.6	16.4	4.2	32.8	47.6	68.3	22.0

<u>All India</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day i	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	ates (%)
n	p				R66]	Legacy		
ŝ	uno		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	<u>PP</u>
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)	—					
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)	—					
oan		Rate (people)		—			_	
$\overline{\mathrm{Url}}$	66	Line	28.79	43.19	57.58	34.09	51.27	68.18
		Rate (HHs)	12.0	32.2	50.2	19.5	42.7	60.5
		Rate (people)	16.4	40.6	59.6	25.7	51.9	69.5
	68	Line	33.69	50.54	67.38	39.89	60.00	79.79
		Rate (HHs)	7.2	23.8	41.3	12.9	34.0	53.0
		Rate (people)	10.2	31.4	50.8	17.6	42.9	62.7
	59	Line	_			_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				
	62	Line	_	_				
		Rate (HHs)						
ral		Rate (people)	—					
Ru	66	Line	22.35	33.53	44.71	27.48	41.34	54.97
		Rate (HHs)	19.6	55.2	76.7	36.8	71.9	87.2
		Rate (people)	23.8	61.8	82.1	43.1	77.8	90.9
	68	Line	27.63	41.45	55.27	33.98	51.10	67.95
		Rate (HHs)	13.7	48.2	72.3	29.2	66.8	83.8
		Rate (people)	16.6	54.5	77.7	34.0	72.8	87.9
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line	_			_		
		Rate (HHs)						
Π		Rate (people)						
A	66	Line	24.10	36.15	48.20	29.28	44.04	58.56
		Rate (HHs)	17.3	48.4	68.9	31.7	63.3	79.3
		Rate (people)	21.8	56.0	76.0	38.4	70.8	85.1
	68	Line	29.36	44.05	58.73	35.67	53.64	71.33
		Rate (HHs)	11.7	40.6	62.6	24.1	56.6	74.2
		Rate (people)	14.8	47.9	70.0	29.3	64.2	80.7

<u>All India</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

ч	7		100	erty inte		ison, day in wiiv	R68	bumpt	ion) un		ly rates (/0)
gio	nnc		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	011 PP	P	R	BI
${ m Re}_{ m e}$	Ro	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	${<}100\%$ natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
oan	-	Rate (people)										
$\overline{\mathrm{Ur}}$	66	Line	39.62	59.43	79.24		27.46	44.81	54.93	57.82		
		Rate (HHs)	27.6	52.1	69.0		10.5	34.7	47.3	50.5		
		Rate (people)	35.3	61.4	77.0		14.4	43.3	56.6	59.7		
	68	Line	46.35	69.53	92.70	28.16	32.13	52.42	64.25	67.64	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	19.8	43.8	62.3	3.4	6.2	26.1	38.6	41.9	76.5	
		Rate (people)	26.4	53.3	71.4	5.0	8.8	33.9	47.9	51.4	71.1	
	59	Line			_	_	-					
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
<u>ral</u>		Rate (people)										
Ru	66	Line	26.23	39.35	52.47	_	18.07	29.49	36.15	38.05		
		Rate (HHs)	33.1	68.4	85.1		8.3	43.6	61.9	65.9		
		Rate (people)	38.9	74.4	89.1		10.5	50.1	68.3	72.1		
	68	Line	32.41	48.61	64.81	28.16	22.33	36.43	44.65	47.00		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	25.9	62.8	81.3	15.4	5.4	36.1	55.6	60.0		78.2
		Rate (people)	30.4	68.8	85.7	18.5	6.6	41.5	61.8	66.1		71.1
	59	Line			_	_	-					
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				—						
	62	Line				—						
		Rate (HHs)										
П		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	29.87	44.80	59.74	_	20.62	33.65	41.25	43.42		
		Rate (HHs)	31.5	63.6	80.3		8.9	41.0	57.6	61.4		
		Rate (people)	37.9	70.9	85.8		11.6	48.3	65.1	68.7		
	68	Line	36.39	54.58	72.78	28.16	25.13	40.99	50.25	52.90	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	24.0	56.9	75.3	11.7	5.6	33.0	50.3	54.3	76.5	78.2
		Rate (people)	29.2	64.4	81.6	14.6	7.2	39.4	57.9	61.9	71.1	71.1

<u>All India</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households Poverty lines (Bs/person/day in MMBP consumption) and poverty rates (%)

			MMRP p	overty lines (l	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	rates (%)
nc	рı				R68		
ŝ	unc]	Percentile line	s	
Re	Rc	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	60^{th}	80^{th}
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ban		Rate (people)					
$\overline{\mathrm{Ur}}$	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	30.57	39.27	44.11	50.34	72.13
		Rate (HHs)	4.9	12.3	17.3	23.7	46.2
		Rate (people)	7.1	16.9	23.3	31.2	55.9
	59	Line					_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
ral		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
Ru	66	Line			_		
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	30.57	39.27	44.11	50.34	72.13
		Rate (HHs)	21.2	43.3	54.4	65.6	86.0
		Rate (people)	25.2	49.2	60.7	71.5	89.6
	59	Line	_				_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line			_		
		Rate (HHs)					
II		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	30.57	39.27	44.11	50.34	72.13
		Rate (HHs)	16.1	33.6	42.8	52.5	73.6
		Rate (people)	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0

<u>All India</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/per	·son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption)	and po	verty ra	tes (%)
u	p		Le	egacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
ği	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Int}	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.59	17.04	34.08	17.00	15.38	11.54	19.23	23.08	30.77	17.38
		Rate (HHs)	3.1	1.5	44.1	1.5	0.0	0.0	5.5	12.6	35.3	1.5
		Rate (people)	4.2	2.0	55.9	2.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	18.4	45.8	2.0
	62	Line	19.21	18.92	37.85	18.90	17.14	12.86	21.43	25.72	34.29	19.32
		Rate (HHs)	2.7	2.7	15.5	2.7	0.0	0.0	2.7	2.7	15.5	2.7
oan		Rate (people)	3.8	3.8	26.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.8	26.5	3.8
Url	66	Line	27.11	26.71	53.43	26.67	24.09	18.07	30.12	36.14	48.19	26.33
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	14.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	2.9	11.6	0.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.6	17.4	0.0
	68	Line	32.10	31.62	63.25	31.58	28.53	21.40	35.66	42.79	57.06	30.81
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.5	0.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.8	0.0
	59	Line	10.81	15.67	31.33	11.11	14.72	11.04	18.40	22.08	29.45	13.95
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	7.2	60.4	0.0	6.1	0.0	22.1	29.2	44.5	5.3
		Rate (people)	0.0	9.7	64.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	27.8	34.9	50.8	7.0
	62	Line	11.88	17.21	34.41	12.11	16.06	12.04	20.07	24.08	32.11	15.20
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	4.3	44.7	0.0	3.0	0.0	10.3	23.8	43.1	1.2
ral		Rate (people)	0.0	4.1	52.3	0.0	2.6	0.0	12.6	31.4	51.1	2.2
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	17.47	25.29	50.59	17.80	23.62	17.71	29.52	35.42	47.23	21.01
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	2.6	45.6	0.0	1.6	0.0	4.7	11.8	37.5	1.6
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.8	50.8	0.0	0.4	0.0	4.4	13.0	43.1	0.4
	68	Line	20.49	29.66	59.33	20.88	27.71	20.79	34.64	41.57	55.43	28.93
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.9	31.2	0.0	0.9	0.0	3.1	8.6	28.4	0.9
_		Rate (people)	0.0	1.6	36.9	0.0	1.6	0.0	4.9	12.9	34.0	1.6
	59	Line	12.82	16.08	32.15	12.86	14.92	11.19	18.65	22.38	29.84	14.97
		Rate (HHs)	1.1	5.2	54.8	0.5	4.0	0.0	16.4	23.5	41.3	4.0
		Rate (people)	1.3	7.4	61.8	0.6	5.8	0.0	21.8	30.0	49.3	5.5
	62	Line	13.42	17.57	35.13	13.53	16.28	12.21	20.36	24.43	32.57	16.07
		Rate (HHs)	0.6	3.9	37.9	0.6	2.3	0.0	8.5	18.9	36.7	1.5
Ħ		Rate (people)	0.8	4.0	46.9	0.8	2.0	0.0	10.8	25.6	46.0	2.5
A	66	Line	21.08	25.82	51.65	21.12	23.79	17.85	29.74	35.69	47.59	23.00
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	1.6	33.7	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	8.3	27.4	1.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.5	39.8	0.0	0.2	0.0	3.0	9.9	33.5	0.2
	68	Line	24.81	30.39	60.79	24.86	28.02	21.01	35.02	42.03	56.03	29.63
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.6	20.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.9	5.2	17.6	0.6
		Rate (people)	0.0	1.0	25.1	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.1	8.1	22.0	1.0

Andaman and Nicobar Islands: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day ii	n MMRP) and	d poverty r	ates~(%)
n	рı	-			R66	Legacy		
ŝić	unc	_	Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)	_					
an		Rate (people)		—				
Urł	66	Line	26.33	39.49	52.66	31.18	46.89	62.35
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	3.8	11.3	0.2	7.1	19.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	6.5	16.9	0.3	12.1	26.5
	68	Line	30.81	46.21	61.61	36.48	54.86	72.95
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.2	3.6	0.0	2.4	7.9
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.3	5.7	0.0	4.0	9.8
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)	—					
Tr		Rate (people)	_					
	62	Line		_	_	_		_
		Rate (HHs)						
ral		Rate (people)			—			—
Ru	66	Line	21.01	31.51	42.02	25.83	38.85	51.66
		Rate (HHs)	0.8	3.3	17.0	0.8	11.2	41.9
		Rate (people)	0.2	2.6	19.1	0.2	12.2	49.1
	68	Line	28.93	43.40	57.86	35.57	53.50	71.15
		Rate (HHs)	0.3	5.3	24.0	1.6	17.9	42.4
		Rate (people)	0.5	6.8	28.6	2.3	21.3	49.6
	59	Line	_	_	_			
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)	—	—	—		—	
	62	Line	_	_		—		
		Rate (HHs)	—					
П		Rate (people)	—	—	—		—	
A	66	Line	23.03	34.54	46.06	27.86	41.90	55.72
		Rate (HHs)	0.5	3.5	14.8	0.6	9.6	33.0
		Rate (people)	0.1	4.1	18.3	0.2	12.2	40.5
	68	Line	29.60	44.40	59.20	35.90	53.99	71.79
		Rate (HHs)	0.2	3.3	15.9	1.0	11.7	28.6
		Rate (people)	0.3	4.5	20.4	1.5	15.2	35.5

<u>Andaman and Nicobar Islands</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

Andaman and Nicobar Islands: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	rson/day in MN	<u>ARP</u> cor	nsumpti	ion) an	d pover	ty rates (%)
n	q						R68					
ĝi	un		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	P	R	BI
${f Re}$	\mathbf{R}_{0}	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)			_							
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
nau		Rate (people)										
Urł	66	Line	38.79	58.18	77.58	_	26.88	43.86	53.77	56.60		
		Rate (HHs)	2.9	15.2	39.7		0.0	5.1	12.0	13.6		
		Rate (people)	4.7	22.0	49.9		0.0	9.1	17.6	20.0		
	68	Line	59.10	88.65	118.20	35.90	40.96	66.84	81.93	86.24	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	3.1	21.8	42.7	0.0	0.0	4.9	15.4	19.7	54.2	
		Rate (people)	4.9	27.7	48.3	0.0	0.0	7.7	19.6	24.5	45.7	
	59	Line	_	—	_	_	_	_		_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)			_							
ral		Rate (people)										
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	25.83	38.74	51.66	—	17.80	29.04	35.59	37.46		
		Rate (HHs)	0.8	11.2	41.9		0.0	0.8	8.1	9.7		
		Rate (people)	0.2	12.2	49.1		0.0	0.2	9.0	10.1		
	68	Line	43.23	64.85	86.46	37.56	29.79	48.60	59.57	62.71		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	4.9	35.8	57.8	1.8	0.3	9.4	26.3	32.1		37.3
		Rate (people)	6.4	42.0	66.8	2.5	0.5	10.7	32.3	38.2		28.4
	59	Line				—						
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)			_							
Ħ		Rate (people)				—						
A	66	Line	30.75	46.13	61.51		21.25	34.67	42.50	44.74		
		Rate (HHs)	1.6	12.8	41.0		0.0	2.5	9.6	11.3		
		Rate (people)	1.9	15.9	49.4		0.0	3.6	12.2	13.8		—
	68	Line	48.88	73.32	97.76	36.97	33.76	55.09	67.53	71.08	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	4.2	30.2	51.7	1.1	0.2	7.6	21.9	27.1	54.2	37.3
_		Rate (people)	5.8	36.9	60.2	1.6	0.3	9.7	27.8	33.3	45.7	28.4

			MMRP po	overty lines (R	Rs/person/day	7) and poverty	γ rates (%)
no	pı				R68		
ŝ	unc			I	Percentile line	s	
R	R	Line/rate	$20^{ ext{th}}$	40^{th}	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	80 th
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line		—			
đ		Rate (HHs)					
bar		Rate (people)					
IJ	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			
		Rate (people)		—			
	68	Line	38.98	50.07	56.24	64.19	91.97
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	1.4	2.4	3.8	24.1
		Rate (people)	0.0	2.4	4.0	6.1	29.7
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)				—	
ura		Rate (people)					
Ч	66	Line		—			
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	40.78	52.39	58.84	67.16	96.22
		Rate (HHs)	4.7	14.8	25.5	38.9 44 5	66.1
		Rate (people)	0.1	18.0	31.7	44.0	(0.3
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line Data (IIIIa)		—			
		Rate (HHs)					
АП		nate (people)					
ч	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
	<i>a</i> -	nate (people)					
	68	Line	40.14	51.57	57.92	66.11	94.71
		Rate (HHS)	2.8	9.5 19 F	10.3 91.0	24.9	49.3 50.1
		rate (people)	3.9	12.5	21.9	30.9	59.1

<u>Andaman and Nicobar Islands</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	rson/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
ŝi.	uno		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993]	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	16.91	16.05	32.10	16.86	14.37	10.78	17.96	21.55	28.74	17.49
		Rate (HHs)	20.4	18.0	59.0	20.3	11.3	3.6	24.0	32.2	54.1	21.8
		Rate (people)	23.0	19.5	63.7	22.9	11.5	3.2	26.9	36.3	58.0	24.3
	62	Line	18.47	17.82	35.64	18.74	16.01	12.01	20.02	24.02	32.03	19.44
		Rate (HHs)	15.6	14.6	56.1	16.4	10.6	4.4	20.6	29.2	47.5	18.5
an		Rate (people)	18.7	17.4	60.9	19.7	12.8	5.0	24.8	34.8	52.8	22.4
Urb	66	Line	26.08	25.16	50.31	26.45	22.51	16.88	28.13	33.76	45.01	30.46
		Rate (HHs)	8.8	7.5	42.6	9.3	4.6	1.1	11.4	18.9	36.9	14.4
		Rate (people)	11.2	9.3	51.0	11.8	6.1	1.6	14.1	23.5	44.2	17.7
	68	Line	30.87	29.78	59.57	31.32	26.65	19.98	33.31	39.97	53.29	33.17
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	2.9	32.6	3.8	1.3	0.3	5.3	10.7	26.0	5.0
		Rate (people)	4.0	3.5	39.0	4.4	1.4	0.3	6.1	12.7	31.3	5.8
	59	Line	9.24	14.41	28.83	9.25	13.54	10.16	16.93	20.31	27.08	13.69
		Rate (HHs)	7.8	37.0	88.6	7.8	31.2	11.4	52.2	67.4	85.4	32.3
		Rate (people)	10.4	42.3	91.0	10.4	35.2	14.2	57.2	71.3	87.7	36.3
	62	Line	10.16	15.83	31.66	10.08	14.77	11.08	18.46	22.15	29.54	14.92
		Rate (HHs)	8.7	32.9	85.9	8.7	28.1	10.7	46.1	65.6	83.9	29.1
ral		Rate (people)	7.6	35.3	87.1	7.5	30.3	9.9	49.0	67.7	85.4	31.4
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	14.93	23.27	46.54	14.82	21.72	16.29	27.15	32.58	43.44	22.81
		Rate (HHs)	3.8	20.9	76.7	3.6	16.8	4.9	32.9	50.4	73.2	19.3
		Rate (people)	4.6	24.5	82.4	4.5	19.9	6.1	37.6	56.3	79.2	22.7
	68	Line	17.51	27.29	54.59	17.38	25.49	19.12	31.86	38.23	50.98	28.27
		Rate (HHs)	0.2	7.0	64.0	0.2	5.1	0.5	14.2	28.0	57.4	9.0
		Rate (people)	0.3	8.4	69.4	0.3	6.2	0.7	17.2	32.2	62.9	11.0
	59	Line	11.26	14.84	29.69	11.26	13.76	10.32	17.20	20.64	27.52	14.69
		Rate (HHs)	11.1	32.0	80.8	11.1	26.0	9.4	44.8	58.2	77.2	29.6
		Rate (people)	13.7	36.3	83.8	13.7	28.9	11.3	49.2	62.1	79.9	33.2
	62	Line	12.16	16.31	32.62	12.17	15.07	11.30	18.84	22.60	30.14	16.01
		Rate (HHs)	10.4	28.5	78.7	10.5	23.8	9.1	39.9	56.8	75.1	26.6
≓		Rate (people)	10.3	31.0	80.8	10.5	26.1	8.7	43.1	59.8	77.6	29.2
A	66	Line	18.06	23.80	47.60	18.09	21.94	16.46	27.43	32.91	43.88	24.96
		Rate (HHs)	5.2	17.0	66.9	5.2	13.3	3.8	26.7	41.3	62.7	17.9
		Rate (people)	6.5	20.2	73.6	6.5	16.0	4.9	31.0	47.1	69.3	21.3
	68	Line	21.89	28.11	56.22	21.95	25.87	19.40	32.34	38.80	51.74	29.88
		Rate (HHs)	1.2	5.7	53.6	1.4	3.8	0.5	11.2	22.2	47.0	7.7
_		Rate (people)	1.5	6.8	59.5	1.6	4.6	0.5	13.6	25.8	52.5	9.3

Andhra Pradesh: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

<u>Andhra Pradesh</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

		-	Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	ates (%)
u	p	-			R66 1	Legacy		
Gić	uno	-	Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	ntl. 2005 PF	P
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line			—			
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line				_		
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)						
Urł	66	Line	30.46	45.69	60.91	36.06	54.24	72.13
		Rate (HHs)	10.4	30.8	49.6	17.7	41.8	58.1
		Rate (people)	12.3	37.5	57.6	22.2	49.8	66.4
	68	Line	33.17	49.76	66.35	39.28	59.08	78.56
		Rate (HHs)	3.7	16.8	34.8	8.8	27.1	47.9
		Rate (people)	4.3	20.2	41.8	10.7	33.4	56.2
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)			—		—	
	62	Line			_			
		Rate (HHs)						
ral		Rate (people)			—		—	—
Ru	66	Line	22.81	34.21	45.62	28.05	42.18	56.09
		Rate (HHs)	12.7	43.7	67.9	26.0	62.6	82.0
		Rate (people)	13.9	48.1	72.3	29.0	66.9	86.0
	68	Line	28.27	42.41	56.55	34.77	52.29	69.53
		Rate (HHs)	4.3	28.6	57.3	12.3	50.9	75.0
		Rate (people)	4.9	32.5	62.5	14.6	55.6	78.9
	59	Line		_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)			—		—	
	62	Line		—			—	—
		Rate (HHs)						
П		Rate (people)			—		—	
A	66	Line	24.99	37.49	49.99	30.34	45.63	60.67
		Rate (HHs)	12.0	40.0	62.6	23.6	56.6	75.1
		Rate (people)	13.4	45.1	68.1	27.1	62.0	80.4
	68	Line	29.86	44.79	59.72	36.23	54.49	72.46
		Rate (HHs)	4.1	24.7	49.8	11.1	43.0	66.0
		Rate (people)	4.7	28.5	55.8	13.4	48.4	71.6

ч	F		1.00	erty inte	s (ns/pe	ison/day in wiiv	R68	isumpu	ion) and	u pover	ty lates (/0)
<u>.</u>	ŭ		Nation	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI)	RJ	BI
Re	Ro	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
nac		Rate (people)										
Urł	66	Line	41.36	62.04	82.72		28.67	46.77	57.34	60.35		
		Rate (HHs)	24.8	50.3	65.2		8.2	32.4	45.6	49.2		
		Rate (people)	30.4	58.4	73.4		10.0	39.5	53.7	57.3		
	68	Line	45.07	67.60	90.14	27.38	31.24	50.97	62.47	65.76	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	12.9	36.2	57.1	1.0	2.5	17.9	31.2	34.1	81.4	
		Rate (people)	15.6	43.6	65.4	1.1	2.8	21.6	38.0	41.2	74.7	
	59	Line	_	_	_		_		_	_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	27.36	41.04	54.72		18.85	30.76	37.70	39.69		
		Rate (HHs)	24.0	60.6	81.3		4.7	34.4	53.7	58.0		
		Rate (people)	26.7	64.9	85.4		5.6	37.9	58.0	62.5		
	68	Line	33.92	50.88	67.84	29.47	23.37	38.13	46.74	49.20		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	10.8	47.2	72.5	5.3	1.6	19.0	37.9	42.7		79.5
		Rate (people)	12.7	52.1	76.8	6.3	1.8	22.0	42.8	47.8		73.0
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Π		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	31.36	47.04	62.72		21.66	35.33	43.31	45.59		
		Rate (HHs)	24.2	57.6	76.6		5.7	33.8	51.4	55.5		
		Rate (people)	27.8	63.0	82.0		6.8	38.4	56.7	61.0		
	68	Line	37.53	56.30	75.07	28.79	25.92	42.29	51.84	54.57	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	11.5	43.6	67.4	3.8	1.9	18.6	35.7	39.8	81.4	79.5
_		Rate (people)	13.6	49.4	73.1	4.6	2.1	21.8	41.2	45.7	74.7	73.0

Andhra Pradesh: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

<u>Andhra Pradesh</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	$v ext{ rates } (\%)$
n	p				$\mathbf{R68}$		
. <u>6</u>	un]	Percentile line	s	
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—		—		
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)	—	—	—		
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—	—	—		
	68	Line	29.72	38.18	42.89	48.95	70.13
		Rate (HHs)	1.8	7.6	11.4	15.8	38.7
		Rate (people)	2.2	9.1	13.8	19.0	46.1
	59	Line	_		_	_	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—				
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			
		Rate (people)	—				
	68	Line	32.00	41.11	46.17	52.70	75.50
		Rate (HHs)	8.0	25.6	36.3	51.6	80.7
		Rate (people)	9.4	29.2	40.9	56.4	84.2
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			
		Rate (people)	—				
	62	Line	—				
		Rate (HHs)					
Ξ		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line	—				
A		Rate (HHs)	—	—	—		
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.26	40.16	45.10	51.48	73.76
		Rate (HHs)	5.9	19.6	28.0	39.7	66.7
_		Rate (people)	7.1	22.7	32.1	44.3	71.8

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	rson/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	p		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			R66
ği	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Intl}	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	12.72	17.64	35.29	11.76	15.87	11.90	19.84	23.80	31.74	19.21
		Rate (HHs)	2.7	9.9	66.1	1.3	7.4	1.3	13.9	27.4	57.8	13.3
		Rate (people)	3.4	12.8	72.4	1.9	10.7	1.9	18.5	33.0	66.7	18.4
	62	Line	13.89	19.59	39.18	13.08	17.69	13.26	22.11	26.53	35.37	21.35
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	3.9	68.8	0.0	0.3	0.0	10.9	25.1	60.6	10.1
nac		Rate (people)	0.0	3.7	71.7	0.0	0.5	0.0	11.3	25.0	61.6	10.2
Url	66	Line	19.61	27.65	55.31	18.46	24.85	18.64	31.07	37.28	49.71	30.42
		Rate (HHs)	4.0	15.0	58.8	2.9	11.6	3.0	21.0	32.5	52.7	20.2
		Rate (people)	4.7	19.4	63.6	3.4	14.5	3.6	25.7	37.9	56.9	24.9
	68	Line	23.22	32.74	65.48	21.85	29.43	22.07	36.79	44.14	58.86	34.85
		Rate (HHs)	4.5	14.0	49.5	3.9	9.7	3.9	19.1	24.2	41.1	17.5
		Rate (people)	5.3	16.3	54.3	4.5	11.1	4.5	22.2	27.9	45.6	20.3
	59	Line	12.84	15.83	31.65	12.24	14.87	11.15	18.59	22.30	29.74	17.28
		Rate (HHs)	6.6	14.9	70.8	5.1	11.1	3.8	25.3	42.9	68.1	20.1
		Rate (people)	8.7	18.6	76.5	6.8	14.2	5.1	31.6	49.7	73.4	24.8
	62	Line	14.12	17.38	34.76	13.34	16.22	12.16	20.27	24.32	32.43	18.83
		Rate (HHs)	7.9	21.1	74.6	6.0	13.8	3.7	35.2	48.9	69.0	26.2
ral		Rate (people)	11.9	27.7	81.7	8.8	19.7	5.1	44.9	57.3	76.4	35.4
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	20.75	25.55	51.10	19.62	23.85	17.89	29.81	35.77	47.70	25.44
		Rate (HHs)	10.2	21.2	72.1	8.0	16.6	5.1	33.4	48.0	68.9	20.6
		Rate (people)	13.5	26.6	79.7	10.8	21.1	6.9	40.0	55.7	77.3	26.1
	68	Line	24.34	29.97	59.93	23.00	27.99	20.99	34.99	41.98	55.98	30.58
		Rate (HHs)	18.9	32.5	67.8	16.4	29.1	11.0	40.5	51.5	63.7	32.9
		Rate (people)	22.2	38.5	73.6	19.5	34.4	14.1	47.1	58.4	69.7	38.9
	59	Line	12.82	16.01	32.03	12.19	14.97	11.23	18.72	22.46	29.95	17.48
		Rate (HHs)	6.1	14.3	70.2	4.6	10.6	3.4	23.8	40.8	66.7	19.2
		Rate (people)	8.2	18.0	76.1	6.3	13.9	4.8	30.2	47.9	72.7	24.1
	62	Line	14.08	17.71	35.41	13.30	16.43	12.32	20.54	24.65	32.86	19.20
		Rate (HHs)	6.4	17.9	73.6	4.9	11.3	3.0	30.8	44.6	67.5	23.3
⊐		Rate (people)	10.1	24.2	80.2	7.5	16.8	4.4	39.9	52.6	74.2	31.7
A	66	Line	20.52	25.98	51.95	19.38	24.05	18.04	30.07	36.08	48.10	26.44
		Rate (HHs)	8.8	19.7	69.0	6.8	15.4	4.7	30.5	44.4	65.1	20.5
		Rate (people)	11.7	25.2	76.4	9.3	19.8	6.2	37.1	52.1	73.1	25.9
	68	Line	24.12	30.51	61.02	22.78	28.27	21.20	35.34	42.41	56.54	31.42
		Rate (HHs)	15.8	28.5	63.9	13.7	25.0	9.5	36.0	45.7	58.8	29.6
		Rate (people)	18.8	34.2	69.8	16.6	29.8	12.2	42.2	52.4	65.0	35.3

<u>Arunachal Pradesh</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

<u>Arunachal Pradesh</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

		_	Poverty	lines $(Rs/p$	erson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	ates $(\%)$
n	q	-			$\mathbf{R66}$	Legacy		
010-	nn	-	Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	P
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}_{0}	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line					_	
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)	—	—				
Urb	66	Line	30.42	45.63	60.84	36.02	54.17	72.04
		Rate (HHs)	12.8	34.6	54.6	19.6	45.6	63.3
		Rate (people)	16.3	40.2	59.0	23.9	50.2	67.9
	68	Line	34.85	52.27	69.70	41.27	62.06	82.53
		Rate (HHs)	14.5	28.4	45.5	19.2	38.4	56.7
		Rate (people)	17.4	34.2	50.4	23.3	43.9	60.3
	59	Line			_			
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
al		Rate (people)		—	—			
Ruı	66	Line	25.44	38.16	50.87	31.28	47.04	62.55
		Rate (HHs)	13.8	38.8	56.5	25.0	51.2	68.1
		Rate (people)	17.1	46.1	64.2	30.0	59.4	75.4
	68	Line	30.58	45.86	61.15	37.59	56.54	75.19
		Rate (HHs)	19.1	44.9	60.2	32.0	57.2	69.6
		Rate (people)	24.0	52.7	67.5	38.6	64.6	76.4
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				
A	66	Line	26.43	39.65	52.86	32.22	48.46	64.45
		Rate (HHs)	13.6	37.8	56.1	23.8	49.9	67.0
		Rate (people)	16.9	44.9	63.1	28.8	57.5	73.9
	68	Line	31.38	47.07	62.77	38.29	57.59	76.58
		Rate (HHs)	18.1	41.4	57.1	29.3	53.2	66.9
_		Rate (people)	22.7	49.2	64.3	35.7	60.7	73.4

_			R68										
țion	pur		Nation	alBang	araian	Poorest half	100	Intl 20	11 PPI	D	RI	RI	
Seg	Roi	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	< 100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Bural	
<u> </u>	59	Line				<u>(10070 IIatii</u>	—	~ 0.10		<i>•</i> 1.00			
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
	02	Rate (HHs)											
an		Rate (people)											
Jrb	66	Line	42.54	63.82	85.09		29.49	48.11	58.97	62.08			
Ī	00	Rate (HHs)	28.2	57.1	72.2		10.4	39.7	53.0	55.9			
		Rate (people)	33.7	61.8	77.0		14.3	44.1	57.3	60.5			
	68	Line	48 75	73 13	97 51	29.61	33 79	55 13	67 58	71 14	438 36		
	00	Bate (HHs)	25.2	48.8	65.7	9.1	13.0	30.4	43.6	47.6	400.00 73.7		
		Rate (people)	30.9	53.8	69.3	11.4	15.2	36.4	49.0	52.9	68.0		
	59	Line											
	00	Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
	02	Rate (HHs)											
al		Rate (people)											
Sur	66	Line	31 47	47.20	62 03		21.68	35-37	13 36	45.64			
-	00	Bate (HHs)	25.1	51 5	68.2		6 0	34.2	47.3	49.9			
		Rate (people)	30.1	59.6	75.6		8.5	40.6	55.2	58.1			
	68	Line	37.84	56 76	75.68	32.88	26.07	42 54	52 14	54 89		273.97	
	00	Rate (HHs)	32.8	57.3	70.1	24.3	12.1	40.6	52.14 52.9	55.9		63.9	
		Rate (people)	39.3	64.8	76.8	30.4	15.3	48.3	60.3	63.1		56.6	
	59	Line											
	00	Bate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
	02	Bate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
ЧП	66	Lino (1 1 /	22.68	50 52	67.36		<u>92 94</u>	37 09	16 18	48.02			
	00	Line Rate (HHs)	55.00 25.8	52.8	60.1		23.24	35.5	40.40	40.92 51-3			
		Rate (people)	$\frac{20.8}{30.8}$	60.0	75.9		9.7	41.3	$\frac{40.0}{55.6}$	51.5 58.6			
	60	Lino	20.00	50.95	70.91	20.06	97 59	44.00	55.06	57.06	120 26	972 07	
	00	Lille Bate (HHg)	39.90 31-9	99.89 55 5	19.81 60 9	52.20 91-1	⊿7.03 19 २	44.92 38-1	51 0	57.90 57.1	408.00 73 7	∠13.91 63.0	
		Rate (neople)	31.2 37.7	62.7	09.2 75.4	21.1	12.0 15.2	46 0	58 9	61 9	68 D	56 6	
		reau (heopie)	91.1	04.1	10.4	20.0	10.0	40.0	00.4	01.4	00.0	0.00	

<u>Arunachal Pradesh</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	verty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates $(\%)$
u	p				$\mathbf{R68}$		
ĝi.	uno			I	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	40^{th}	$50^{\mathtt{th}}$	60^{th}	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line		—			—
		Rate (HHs)	—	—			—
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)				—	
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	32.15	41.31	46.39	52.95	75.86
		Rate (HHs)	12.1	19.2	23.3	29.0	51.6
		Rate (people)	14.4	23.3	27.9	34.9	56.4
	59	Line				_	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)	—				
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)				—	
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	35.70	45.86	51.51	58.79	84.22
		Rate (HHs)	28.0	44.9	52.5	58.3	74.4
_		Rate (people)	34.8	52.7	59.8	65.6	80.5
	59	Line	—		—	—	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line	—				
		Rate (HHs)		—			
Щ		Rate (people)	—				
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	35.03	45.00	50.54	57.69	82.64
		Rate (HHs)	24.6	39.4	46.3	52.1	69.6
		Rate (people)	31.0	47.2	53.8	59.8	76.0

<u>Arunachal Pradesh</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates									tes (%)			
ц	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
ŝić	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{e}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	12.72	17.64	35.29	11.76	15.87	11.90	19.84	23.80	31.74	18.63
		Rate (HHs)	6.4	16.1	72.8	4.0	12.1	4.0	23.3	35.5	68.0	18.7
		Rate (people)	9.2	20.7	82.4	6.2	16.4	6.2	28.2	45.1	78.2	22.9
	62	Line	13.89	19.59	39.18	13.08	17.69	13.26	22.11	26.53	35.37	20.71
		Rate (HHs)	1.6	6.2	45.2	1.5	4.0	1.5	9.2	17.8	37.1	7.3
<u>an</u>		Rate (people)	2.8	8.5	61.5	2.5	6.2	2.5	12.8	28.8	50.9	9.9
Urt	66	Line	19.61	27.65	55.31	18.46	24.85	18.64	31.07	37.28	49.71	28.64
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	20.6	58.3	4.1	15.1	4.8	26.4	34.9	49.5	22.8
		Rate (people)	6.9	23.4	66.4	5.1	17.7	5.9	30.4	40.5	57.4	25.9
	68	Line	23.22	32.74	65.48	21.85	29.43	22.07	36.79	44.14	58.86	33.14
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	15.7	56.5	2.1	11.1	2.1	20.7	28.3	50.1	16.7
		Rate (people)	4.2	19.7	66.6	2.6	14.4	2.7	25.6	34.4	59.3	20.6
	59	Line	12.84	15.83	31.65	12.24	14.87	11.15	18.59	22.30	29.74	15.09
		Rate (HHs)	19.8	42.0	94.6	16.9	35.3	12.9	60.3	79.6	93.4	37.2
		Rate (people)	23.4	48.2	97.1	20.3	41.3	15.6	67.0	84.8	96.1	43.3
	62	Line	14.12	17.38	34.76	13.34	16.22	12.16	20.27	24.32	32.43	16.45
		Rate (HHs)	16.9	38.1	92.3	14.4	29.7	9.7	54.7	71.9	89.6	30.9
ral		Rate (people)	18.9	40.9	94.1	16.0	32.2	10.7	57.8	74.3	91.6	33.5
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	20.75	25.55	51.10	19.62	23.85	17.89	29.81	35.77	47.70	22.74
		Rate (HHs)	26.0	47.6	93.2	20.9	40.5	12.4	62.5	75.5	90.7	36.3
		Rate (people)	29.1	51.1	94.6	23.4	44.0	14.2	66.2	78.1	92.5	39.9
	68	Line	24.34	29.97	59.93	23.00	27.99	20.99	34.99	41.98	55.98	27.22
		Rate (HHs)	17.8	39.7	93.0	13.7	32.7	8.0	58.9	74.8	91.2	29.2
_		Rate (people)	21.1	44.9	94.6	16.5	37.6	9.8	64.4	78.9	92.8	33.9
	59	Line	12.82	16.01	32.02	12.19	14.97	11.23	18.71	22.46	29.94	15.46
		Rate (HHs)	18.4	39.2	92.2	15.5	32.7	12.0	56.2	74.8	90.6	35.2
		Rate (people)	21.9	45.4	95.6	18.8	38.8	14.6	63.0	80.7	94.2	41.2
	62	Line	14.10	17.57	35.15	13.32	16.34	12.26	20.43	24.51	32.69	16.82
		Rate (HHs)	15.0	34.2	86.5	12.8	26.6	8.7	49.0	65.3	83.1	28.0
Ħ		Rate (people)	17.5	38.1	91.3	14.9	30.0	10.0	53.9	70.3	88.1	31.4
A	66	Line	20.64	25.77	51.53	19.50	23.95	17.96	29.94	35.93	47.91	23.34
		Rate (HHs)	23.5	44.3	88.9	18.8	37.4	11.4	58.0	70.5	85.6	34.6
		Rate (people)	26.8	48.3	91.7	21.5	41.3	13.4	62.5	74.3	88.9	38.4
	68	Line	24.22	30.26	60.51	22.88	28.14	21.10	35.17	42.21	56.28	27.84
		Rate (HHs)	16.0	36.7	88.4	12.2	30.0	7.3	54.1	69.0	86.0	27.6
_		Rate (people)	19.3	42.3	91.7	15.0	35.1	9.1	60.4	74.3	89.3	32.5

Assam: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

		_	Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day ii	n MMRP) and	d poverty r	ates (%)
nc	ы				R66	Legacy		
ŝ	JINO		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line					—	
		Rate (HHs)					—	
		Rate (people)	_	_				
	62	Line	—	—		—		
		Rate (HHs)		—				
oan		Rate (people)					—	
\mathbf{Url}	66	Line	28.64	42.95	57.27	33.91	51.00	67.82
		Rate (HHs)	17.3	36.3	51.1	23.9	46.7	68.3
		Rate (people)	20.7	44.0	59.7	28.7	55.1	75.1
	68	Line	33.14	49.71	66.28	39.24	59.02	78.48
		Rate (HHs)	15.6	31.6	50.1	20.7	40.9	63.2
		Rate (people)	17.6	37.9	56.9	24.9	48.3	71.0
	59	Line	_	_			_	
		Rate (HHs)					—	
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line	_	—				
		Rate (HHs)						
ral		Rate (people)						
Ru	66	Line	22.74	34.11	45.48	27.96	42.05	55.92
		Rate (HHs)	21.7	58.0	81.9	40.8	77.1	92.0
		Rate (people)	24.7	61.5	84.5	44.4	79.8	93.4
	68	Line	27.22	40.83	54.44	33.47	50.34	66.94
		Rate (HHs)	17.7	58.4	81.4	38.2	75.4	90.4
		Rate (people)	21.4	64.4	85.6	44.0	80.3	93.0
	59	Line	_	_				_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line						_
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
П		Rate (people)		—			—	—
A	66	Line	23.35	35.02	46.70	28.58	42.98	57.15
		Rate (HHs)	21.1	55.3	78.1	38.7	73.4	89.1
		Rate (people)	24.2	59.7	82.0	42.7	77.2	91.5
	68	Line	27.88	41.82	55.75	34.11	51.30	68.22
		Rate (HHs)	17.4	55.0	77.4	36.0	71.0	86.9
		Rate (people)	21.0	61.5	82.4	41.9	76.8	90.5

<u>Assam</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)			
n	q						R68					
	uno		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	RI	BI
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urt	66	Line	40.51	60.77	81.02		28.08	45.81	56.16	59.11		
		Rate (HHs)	34.7	56.5	75.5		17.1	40.3	50.1	52.7		
		Rate (people)	42.2	65.2	81.7		20.5	48.0	58.7	61.6		
	68	Line	46.69	70.03	93.38	28.36	32.36	52.80	64.72	68.13	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	28.1	54.4	70.7	8.3	13.8	35.4	47.6	51.6	81.5	
		Rate (people)	34.2	61.4	79.0	9.7	15.3	41.6	54.6	58.3	74.3	
	59	Line	_				_		_	_		_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
Ru	66	Line	27.65	41.47	55.29		19.05	31.08	38.09	40.10		
		Rate (HHs)	39.9	76.4	91.5		9.1	49.7	69.6	73.8		
		Rate (people)	43.4	79.1	93.0		10.5	53.6	72.9	76.9		
	68	Line	33.10	49.64	66.19	28.75	22.80	37.20	45.60	48.00		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	36.3	74.8	90.2	21.9	6.9	48.8	69.0	72.6		86.3
		Rate (people)	41.9	79.8	92.7	26.2	9.0	54.7	74.6	77.8		82.0
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				—						
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ξ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	28.97	43.46	57.95		19.98	32.60	39.96	42.06		
		Rate (HHs)	39.2	74.0	89.5		10.1	48.6	67.2	71.2		
		Rate (people)	43.3	77.6	91.8		11.6	53.1	71.4	75.3		
	68	Line	34.60	51.90	69.20	28.71	23.86	38.93	47.72	50.23	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	35.2	72.2	87.7	20.2	7.8	47.1	66.3	69.9	81.5	86.3
		Rate (people)	41.1	77.7	91.2	24.3	9.7	53.3	72.4	75.6	74.3	82.0

Assam: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	verty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
n	р				R68		
Gi	un			I	Percentile line	s	
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ ext{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)					
Urt	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—		—	
	68	Line	30.79	39.56	44.43	50.71	72.65
		Rate (HHs)	11.3	21.0	25.7	32.8	58.4
		Rate (people)	12.5	25.2	30.7	39.1	65.8
	59	Line	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—	—	—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			—
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.22	40.11	45.05	51.42	73.66
		Rate (HHs)	28.8	55.5	67.6	77.6	93.5
		Rate (people)	33.8	61.1	73.2	82.1	95.2
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Ħ		Rate (people)					
Α	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)				—	
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.17	40.05	44.98	51.34	73.55
		Rate (HHs)	26.6	51.1	62.4	71.9	89.1
_		Rate (people)	31.5	57.1	68.5	77.3	92.0

<u>Assam</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty respectively.						æs (%)
ų	q		Le	gacy R59	Ð			Legacy	R62			R66
ği	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Int}	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	14.04	14.97	29.95	13.51	13.44	10.08	16.80	20.16	26.88	16.34
		Rate (HHs)	23.1	25.3	69.3	19.3	18.8	4.8	33.6	45.1	63.6	32.5
		Rate (people)	33.9	36.4	82.9	26.8	26.4	8.2	46.0	58.7	77.9	44.8
	62	Line	15.34	16.63	33.25	15.02	14.98	11.24	18.73	22.47	29.96	18.16
		Rate (HHs)	27.9	35.1	76.7	25.8	25.7	10.4	44.3	57.1	71.7	43.2
an		Rate (people)	38.0	45.1	85.6	33.7	33.7	14.5	55.0	67.4	81.6	54.1
Urt	66	Line	21.65	23.47	46.94	21.20	21.05	15.79	26.32	31.58	42.11	25.49
		Rate (HHs)	21.6	24.8	69.8	20.6	19.8	6.3	34.6	46.8	64.1	30.8
		Rate (people)	28.4	31.8	81.0	27.2	26.4	9.0	43.2	56.7	75.9	39.3
	68	Line	25.63	27.79	55.57	25.09	24.93	18.70	31.16	37.39	49.86	30.35
		Rate (HHs)	14.2	18.0	68.0	13.5	13.5	3.1	26.3	35.8	60.8	24.3
		Rate (people)	19.2	23.8	77.1	18.5	18.4	4.3	33.4	44.7	70.5	31.2
	59	Line	11.70	13.82	27.64	11.19	12.98	9.74	16.23	19.48	25.97	13.69
		Rate (HHs)	36.7	54.2	96.0	32.5	47.1	18.1	69.9	83.6	94.4	53.6
		Rate (people)	43.0	61.5	97.8	38.5	54.0	22.8	75.8	88.5	96.9	60.8
	62	Line	12.87	15.18	30.36	12.20	14.16	10.62	17.70	21.24	28.32	14.92
		Rate (HHs)	32.1	51.3	96.2	28.0	44.9	17.7	69.1	82.4	95.0	50.4
ral		Rate (people)	35.3	56.7	97.9	30.6	49.5	20.1	73.9	86.7	97.1	55.7
$\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	18.91	22.31	44.63	17.93	20.83	15.62	26.03	31.24	41.65	21.55
		Rate (HHs)	34.4	52.1	94.4	29.6	43.7	17.3	66.2	80.2	93.1	48.3
		Rate (people)	41.5	59.3	96.4	36.3	50.5	22.2	72.7	85.4	95.5	55.3
	68	Line	22.18	26.17	52.34	21.03	24.44	18.33	30.55	36.66	48.88	25.58
		Rate (HHs)	17.0	31.9	91.3	12.4	24.4	5.5	49.0	69.6	88.4	28.8
_		Rate (people)	20.9	37.8	93.8	15.4	29.8	6.9	55.5	75.0	91.5	34.4
	59	Line	11.95	13.94	27.89	11.44	13.03	9.77	16.29	19.55	26.07	13.97
		Rate (HHs)	35.2	51.0	93.0	31.1	44.0	16.6	65.9	79.3	91.0	51.3
		Rate (people)	42.0	58.8	96.2	37.2	51.0	21.2	72.6	85.4	94.8	59.1
	62	Line	13.08	15.30	30.61	12.44	14.23	10.67	17.79	21.35	28.46	15.20
		Rate (HHs)	31.7	49.8	94.4	27.8	43.2	17.1	66.9	80.1	93.0	49.7
≓		Rate (people)	35.5	55.7	96.8	30.8	48.2	19.6	72.3	85.0	95.8	55.5
A	66	Line	19.19	22.43	44.86	18.26	20.85	15.64	26.06	31.27	41.70	21.95
		Rate (HHs)	33.0	49.0	91.6	28.6	41.0	16.1	62.7	76.4	89.9	46.4
		Rate (people)	40.2	56.5	94.8	35.4	48.1	20.9	69.7	82.5	93.5	53.7
	68	Line	22.51	26.32	52.65	21.42	24.49	18.37	30.61	36.73	48.97	26.04
		Rate (HHs)	16.7	30.5	89.0	12.5	23.4	5.3	46.7	66.2	85.6	28.3
		Rate (people)	20.8	36.5	92.2	15.7	28.7	6.6	53.4	72.1	89.5	34.1

Bihar: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) and	d poverty r	rates (%)
n	рq				R66 1	Legacy		
egic	Jino		\mathbf{Nati}	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)		—				
		Rate (people)		_			_	
	62	Line		—	—	—		
		Rate (HHs)						
oan		Rate (people)						
Ur	66	Line	25.49	38.23	50.98	30.18	45.39	60.36
		Rate (HHs)	24.0	50.5	67.9	37.4	63.5	73.2
		Rate (people)	31.3	61.4	79.4	46.8	75.1	83.5
	68	Line	30.35	45.52	60.69	35.93	54.04	71.86
		Rate (HHs)	17.8	48.5	66.8	30.2	59.3	76.6
		Rate (people)	24.0	60.3	76.6	38.7	70.0	84.2
	59	Line	_	_			_	
		Rate (HHs)		_			_	
		Rate (people)		—	—	—	—	
	62	Line		_	_	—	_	
		Rate (HHs)		—				
ral		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—		
Ru	66	Line	21.55	32.33	43.11	26.50	39.86	53.00
		Rate (HHs)	34.2	74.8	89.4	56.5	86.7	96.0
		Rate (people)	40.4	81.2	93.5	63.8	91.5	97.9
	68	Line	25.58	38.37	51.16	31.45	47.30	62.90
		Rate (HHs)	15.4	58.6	82.2	33.9	77.4	91.9
		Rate (people)	18.4	65.0	86.5	38.4	82.5	94.4
	59	Line	_	_			_	
		Rate (HHs)		—				
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)		—				
Π		Rate (people)						
A	66	Line	21.97	32.96	43.95	26.90	40.45	53.79
		Rate (HHs)	33.0	72.1	87.0	54.4	84.1	93.4
		Rate (people)	39.4	79.1	92.0	62.0	89.8	96.4
	68	Line	26.05	39.08	52.10	31.89	47.97	63.79
		Rate (HHs)	15.7	57.6	80.7	33.6	75.5	90.4
		Rate (people)	19.0	64.5	85.5	38.5	81.2	93.4

<u>Bihar</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption)									ion) and	d pover	ty rates (%)
n	q						R68					
Bio	um		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	RI	BI
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{e}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urb	66	Line	33.96	50.93	67.91	_	23.53	38.40	47.07	49.55		
		Rate (HHs)	45.5	67.9	81.9		18.9	50.6	64.8	67.5		
		Rate (people)	55.5	79.4	88.6		25.5	61.7	76.5	79.0		
	68	Line	40.42	60.62	80.83	24.55	28.01	45.70	56.02	58.97	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	39.7	66.7	80.8	8.4	14.0	48.8	61.5	64.8	89.8	
		Rate (people)	50.8	76.5	87.6	11.4	18.8	60.6	72.2	74.9	87.2	
	59	Line	_	_	_		_			_		_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)				_						—
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	26.92	40.38	53.84		18.55	30.26	37.09	39.04		
		Rate (HHs)	57.7	87.6	96.2		20.5	69.6	83.3	85.6		
		Rate (people)	65.2	92.2	98.0	_	25.4	76.7	88.7	90.7		
	68	Line	31.93	47.90	63.86	27.74	22.00	35.89	44.00	46.32		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	35.4	78.4	92.4	21.3	6.3	51.3	71.8	75.5		86.9
		Rate (people)	40.0	83.3	94.8	25.1	8.1	57.3	77.3	80.7		81.0
	59	Line						_	_			_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Π		Rate (people)				_						
A	66	Line	27.67	41.51	55.34		19.08	31.13	38.16	40.17		
		Rate (HHs)	56.3	85.4	94.6		20.3	67.5	81.2	83.5		
		Rate (people)	64.1	90.8	97.0		25.4	75.1	87.4	89.4		
	68	Line	32.77	49.16	65.54	27.43	22.60	36.87	45.19	47.57	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	35.8	77.2	91.3	20.0	7.1	51.0	70.8	74.4	89.8	86.9
_		Rate (people)	41.1	82.7	94.1	23.7	9.1	57.7	76.8	80.1	87.2	81.0

Bihar: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
u	p				$\mathbf{R68}$		
ĝi.	uno			I	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—	—		
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—		
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	26.66	34.24	38.46	43.90	62.89
		Rate (HHs)	11.6	26.7	34.0	45.3	70.5
		Rate (people)	15.9	34.8	43.4	56.7	78.6
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—		—	
		Rate (people)	_	—	—	—	
	62	Line				_	
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	30.12	38.70	43.46	49.61	71.07
		Rate (HHs)	30.0	59.8	70.5	80.6	95.2
		Rate (people)	34.2	66.1	76.3	85.1	97.1
	59	Line				—	—
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Π		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—		
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	29.78	38.26	42.97	49.04	70.26
		Rate (HHs)	28.1	56.5	66.9	77.1	92.7
		Rate (people)	32.4	63.0	73.0	82.3	95.3

<u>Bihar</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates ($\%$										tes (%)		
n	q		Le	egacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	14.35	16.32	32.64	14.48	14.31	10.73	17.89	21.46	28.62	19.95
		Rate (HHs)	2.0	2.6	28.7	2.2	2.0	0.5	2.6	4.4	22.4	4.2
		Rate (people)	2.3	3.0	41.5	2.7	2.3	0.1	3.0	5.3	31.1	5.0
	62	Line	15.68	18.12	36.24	16.09	15.95	11.96	19.94	23.92	31.90	22.18
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	9.6	18.1	3.3	3.3	0.3	10.8	11.7	16.8	11.1
an		Rate (people)	7.5	17.2	26.4	7.5	7.5	0.6	18.8	19.7	25.8	19.1
Urt	66	Line	22.13	25.58	51.16	22.71	22.41	16.81	28.02	33.62	44.83	31.59
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	2.7	16.8	1.2	1.2	0.0	4.5	7.0	12.4	5.6
		Rate (people)	1.8	4.5	25.4	2.3	2.3	0.0	7.2	11.5	18.8	9.1
	68	Line	26.20	30.28	60.56	26.89	26.54	19.90	33.17	39.81	53.07	37.97
		Rate (HHs)	1.9	5.0	26.9	1.9	1.9	1.3	8.2	16.3	22.2	13.8
		Rate (people)	3.0	7.2	38.3	3.0	3.0	2.3	12.6	25.3	32.9	22.3
_	59	Line	12.74	14.73	29.47	12.96	13.85	10.39	17.31	20.77	27.69	20.29
		Rate (HHs)	1.9	1.9	44.2	1.9	1.9	0.0	6.5	21.8	37.9	21.8
		Rate (people)	3.0	3.0	57.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	11.6	34.4	50.0	34.4
	62	Line	14.01	16.18	32.36	14.13	15.10	11.33	18.88	22.65	30.20	22.12
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	50.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.9	47.6	37.9
ral		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	56.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.2	53.5	38.2
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	20.60	23.79	47.58	20.77	22.21	16.66	27.76	33.31	44.42	31.59
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	5.9	7.5	5.9
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	14.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.2	11.8	10.2
	68	Line	24.15	27.90	55.80	24.35	26.06	19.55	32.58	39.10	52.13	37.97
		Rate (HHs)	0.5	0.5	25.4	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5	18.3	0.5
		Rate (people)	1.6	1.6	30.5	1.6	1.6	0.0	1.6	1.6	20.9	1.6
	59	Line	14.21	16.18	32.37	14.35	14.27	10.70	17.84	21.41	28.54	19.98
		Rate (HHs)	2.0	2.5	30.2	2.2	2.0	0.5	2.9	6.0	23.8	5.8
		Rate (people)	2.4	3.0	42.8	2.7	2.4	0.1	3.7	7.8	32.7	7.5
	62	Line	15.43	17.83	35.67	15.80	15.82	11.87	19.78	23.73	31.65	22.17
		Rate (HHs)	2.7	8.1	23.1	2.7	2.7	0.2	9.1	15.8	21.6	15.3
≓		Rate (people)	6.4	14.7	30.9	6.4	6.4	0.5	16.0	22.4	29.9	21.9
A	66	Line	21.90	25.31	50.62	22.42	22.38	16.79	27.98	33.57	44.76	31.59
		Rate (HHs)	0.8	2.2	15.5	1.0	1.0	0.0	4.8	6.8	11.6	5.7
		Rate (people)	1.6	3.9	23.8	1.9	1.9	0.0	7.6	11.3	17.8	9.2
	68	Line	26.05	30.11	60.22	26.71	26.50	19.88	33.13	39.75	53.01	37.97
		Rate (HHs)	1.8	4.6	26.8	1.8	1.8	1.2	7.6	15.0	21.8	12.7
_		Rate (people)	2.9	6.8	37.8	2.9	2.9	2.1	11.8	23.6	32.0	20.8

<u>Chandigarh</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households
			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day i	n MMRP) and	d poverty r	ates (%)
n	рı				R66 1	Legacy		
ŝ	unc		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)						
Urb	66	Line	31.59	47.38	63.18	37.40	56.26	74.81
·		Rate (HHs)	3.5	10.5	19.1	5.5	15.5	28.4
		Rate (people)	5.5	17.4	29.2	9.5	25.0	40.4
	68	Line	37.97	56.96	75.95	44.96	67.63	89.93
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	22.1	39.1	12.4	30.6	46.6
		Rate (people)	8.4	27.9	47.4	16.7	39.1	53.8
	59	Line						
	00	Bate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)	_			_		
	62	Line						
	02	Bate (HHs)						
<u>ral</u>		Rate (people)						_
Bur	66	Line	31 50	17 38	63 18	38.84	58 49	77 68
	00	Rate (HHs)	7.1	9.7	37.3	8.9	15.6	53.0
		Rate (people)	8.5	10.7	43.9	9.8	12.9	68.0
	69	Lino	27.07	56.06	75.05	46.60	70.22	02.28
	00	Line Rate (HHg)	03	00.90 01 0	75.95	40.09	10.22 32.0	95.30 60.1
		Rate (neonle)	0.3	$\frac{21.2}{33.4}$	40.9 57.5	10.2	52.9 45.6	74.3
		itale (people)	0.0	00.1	01.0	10.0	40.0	11.0
	59	Line Data (IIIIa)						
		Rate (HHS)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
ΔII		Rate (people)						
7	66	Line	31.59	47.38	63.18	37.62	56.57	75.23
		Rate (HHs)	4.0	10.4	22.1	6.1	15.5	32.5
		Rate (people)	5.9	16.4	31.4	9.5	23.2	44.5
	68	Line	37.97	56.96	75.95	45.10	67.83	90.20
		Rate (HHs)	5.3	22.0	39.3	12.2	30.8	47.7
		Rate (people)	7.8	28.4	48.2	16.9	39.7	55.4

<u>Chandigarh</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

c	7		Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	erson/day in Mix	$\frac{1 \text{RP con}}{\text{R68}}$	isumpti	ion) and	a pover	ty rates (70)
gio	nnc		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
\mathbf{Re}	${ m Ro}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				—						
	62	Line				—						
-		Rate (HHs)										
bar		Rate (people)										
ŋ	66	Line	40.46	60.69	80.92		28.04	45.75	56.09	59.04		
		Rate (HHs)	7.4	17.8	32.1		1.3	9.9	15.5	16.7		
		Rate (people)	13.1	27.9	44.5		2.3	16.5	25.0	26.2		
	68	Line	48.70	73.05	97.39	29.58	33.75	55.07	67.50	71.06	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	16.5	36.3	49.8	2.3	4.9	20.7	30.6	36.0	60.6	
	~ ~	Rate (people)	21.5	44.8	30.4	3.4	7.0	20.2	39.1	44.5	50.9	
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
ц		Rate (nns) Rate (neople)										
tura	<u> </u>	reate (people)	10 10	<u> </u>	00.00		07.00	45 40		F O CO		
щ	60	Line Poto (HHa)	40.46	60.69 16.0	80.92 53.0		27.88	45.48	55.75 15.6	58.68 15.6	_	
		Rate (neople)	9.8	10.0 14 2	68.3		8.5	9.7 10.7	13.0 12.7	13.0 12.9	_	_
	68	Lino	12.84	64.97	85.60	27 99	20.52	18 16	50.04	62.14		972.07
	08	Rate (HHs)	42.84 6.5	25.7	46.0	0.3	29.52	10.2	$\frac{59.04}{21.5}$	$\frac{02.14}{22.5}$	_	44.1
		Rate (people)	11.6	38.2	66.6	0.8	0.0	18.6	33.8	35.8		25.8
	59	Line	_									
	00	Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				_						
	-	Rate (HHs)										
⊐		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	40.46	60.69	80.92		28.02	45.71	56.04	58.99		
		Rate (HHs)	7.6	17.5	35.7		2.3	9.9	15.5	16.5		
		Rate (people)	12.6	25.9	48.0		3.2	15.6	23.2	24.2		
	68	Line	48.23	72.34	96.46	30.19	33.41	54.52	66.83	70.34	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	15.7	35.5	49.5	2.2	4.5	19.8	29.9	34.9	60.6	44.1
_		Rate (people)	20.7	44.2	57.2	3.2	6.4	25.6	38.7	43.8	56.9	25.8

<u>Chandigarh</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)

			MMRP pc	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	7 rates (%)
uc	pı				R68		
ŝ	unc			1	Percentile line	es	
R	R	Line/rate	$20^{ ext{th}}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)				—	
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	32.12	41.26	46.34	52.89	75.78
		Rate (HHs)	2.9	10.7	14.2	19.5	39.1
		Rate (people)	4.4	14.9	18.4	25.0	47.4
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)				—	
		Rate (people)	—	—		—	
	68	Line	40.42	51.92	58.31	66.56	95.36
		Rate (HHs)	0.7	13.5	21.5	25.7	60.7
		Rate (people)	1.4	22.0	33.8	38.2	75.1
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
⊒		Rate (people)		—	—	—	
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	68	Line	32.78	42.11	47.30	53.99	77.34
		Rate (HHs)	2.7	10.9	14.8	20.0	40.9
_		Rate (people)	4.1	15.5	19.7	26.0	49.6

<u>Chandigarh</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			R66
. <u>ö</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.81	14.96	29.91	17.39	14.31	10.73	17.89	21.46	28.62	15.95
		Rate (HHs)	44.3	28.1	63.4	42.8	26.9	11.6	45.8	50.7	60.9	33.7
		Rate (people)	54.0	36.1	70.8	51.3	34.2	15.2	55.7	60.2	69.0	41.1
	62	Line	19.45	16.61	33.22	19.33	15.95	11.96	19.94	23.92	31.90	17.73
		Rate (HHs)	18.9	13.9	52.4	18.9	12.5	2.0	20.2	29.8	49.6	15.4
an		Rate (people)	23.4	17.9	53.3	23.4	16.5	2.5	24.3	32.0	50.6	19.5
Urb	66	Line	27.46	23.44	46.89	27.29	22.41	16.81	28.02	33.62	44.83	26.52
		Rate (HHs)	24.6	17.1	57.8	23.3	15.6	5.4	26.8	40.1	55.2	22.2
		Rate (people)	25.0	18.5	64.1	24.5	16.9	5.4	27.6	43.9	60.6	23.6
	68	Line	32.51	27.76	55.51	32.30	26.54	19.90	33.17	39.81	53.07	27.91
		Rate (HHs)	30.1	19.4	59.4	29.9	16.9	4.5	31.2	44.8	58.2	19.6
		Rate (people)	34.6	23.7	65.1	34.1	20.5	6.2	36.0	49.7	63.6	23.9
	59	Line	10.94	13.45	26.90	10.18	13.85	10.39	17.31	20.77	27.69	12.60
		Rate (HHs)	32.4	55.5	94.1	23.6	57.5	25.9	78.0	87.9	94.1	48.2
		Rate (people)	40.1	64.0	95.9	28.4	65.8	31.7	84.2	91.5	95.9	57.8
	62	Line	12.03	14.77	29.54	11.10	15.10	11.33	18.88	22.65	30.20	13.73
		Rate (HHs)	39.9	57.2	97.7	33.0	57.6	33.7	80.0	91.0	97.7	50.8
ral		Rate (people)	44.2	62.7	99.0	37.3	63.2	38.1	81.8	91.9	99.0	55.2
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	17.68	21.71	43.43	16.31	22.21	16.66	27.76	33.31	44.42	20.29
		Rate (HHs)	34.2	57.2	94.1	23.8	58.0	25.6	76.1	84.6	94.5	49.6
		Rate (people)	39.4	63.2	95.4	28.6	63.9	30.6	78.9	86.2	95.7	56.1
	68	Line	20.74	25.47	50.93	19.13	26.06	19.55	32.58	39.10	52.13	24.26
		Rate (HHs)	20.5	45.5	90.6	16.0	47.8	16.4	70.4	79.3	91.7	39.4
		Rate (people)	23.9	49.6	92.1	18.7	51.6	19.2	73.1	81.6	93.1	44.6
	59	Line	11.90	13.66	27.32	11.19	13.91	10.43	17.39	20.87	27.82	13.07
		Rate (HHs)	34.2	51.3	89.4	26.6	52.8	23.7	73.0	82.1	89.0	45.9
		Rate (people)	42.1	60.1	92.4	31.6	61.4	29.4	80.2	87.1	92.1	55.4
	62	Line	13.15	15.05	30.10	12.35	15.23	11.42	19.04	22.84	30.46	14.34
		Rate (HHs)	36.3	49.8	90.0	30.6	49.9	28.2	69.8	80.5	89.5	44.7
≓		Rate (people)	41.0	55.9	92.0	35.2	56.1	32.7	73.1	82.8	91.6	49.8
A	66	Line	19.42	22.02	44.05	18.27	22.25	16.68	27.81	33.37	44.49	21.40
		Rate (HHs)	32.5	50.2	87.8	23.7	50.6	22.1	67.5	76.8	87.6	44.8
		Rate (people)	36.9	55.3	89.9	27.9	55.5	26.1	69.8	78.6	89.4	50.3
	68	Line	23.25	25.95	51.91	21.94	26.17	19.62	32.71	39.25	52.33	25.04
		Rate (HHs)	22.7	39.5	83.4	19.2	40.7	13.7	61.4	71.3	83.9	34.8
_		Rate (people)	26.2	44.1	86.3	22.0	45.0	16.4	65.2	74.8	86.8	40.2

<u>Chhattisgarh</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day i	n MMRP) an	d poverty n	rates (%)
uc	рц				R66]	Legacy		
ŝ	our		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line					—	
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)						
Urt	66	Line	26.52	39.78	53.04	31.40	47.23	62.81
		Rate (HHs)	16.4	35.1	58.0	22.3	47.8	66.3
		Rate (people)	17.9	37.7	64.6	24.6	52.2	72.4
	68	Line	27.91	41.87	55.82	33.05	49.71	66.10
		Rate (HHs)	16.2	41.1	55.3	23.2	49.0	64.5
		Rate (people)	19.2	45.6	60.9	27.3	54.6	70.8
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)			_			
	62	Line			_			_
		Rate (HHs)					_	
ıral		Rate (people)						
Run	66	Line	20.29	30.44	40.59	24.95	37.53	49.91
		Rate (HHs)	33.5	71.3	86.9	53.8	83.9	93.9
		Rate (people)	38.3	76.5	89.8	59.5	87.1	95.8
	68	Line	24.26	36.39	48.53	29.83	44.87	59.67
		Rate (HHs)	23.0	67.7	86.5	46.5	81.4	93.8
		Rate (people)	26.6	71.2	89.1	48.5	84.5	94.8
	59	Line		_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line			_			
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
A	66	Line	21.41	32.11	42.82	26.11	39.27	52.22
		Rate (HHs)	30.5	65.0	81.9	48.3	77.6	89.1
		Rate (people)	34.7	69.5	85.3	53.3	80.9	91.6
	68	Line	25.09	37.64	50.18	30.56	45.97	61.13
		Rate (HHs)	21.4	61.5	79.3	41.1	74.0	87.0
		Rate (people)	24.9	65.4	82.7	43.7	77.7	89.4

<u>Chhattisgarh</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

Chhattisgarh: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)

egion	Ч				· / -	, <u>-</u>	R68		,	_	· · · ·	,
gio	m		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	100%	150%	200%	${<}100\%$ natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line								_		
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urt	66	Line	38.39	57.59	76.79		26.61	43.42	53.22	56.02		
		Rate (HHs)	33.8	63.8	79.0		16.4	42.2	58.0	61.1		
		Rate (people)	36.8	70.0	82.3		18.0	45.4	64.6	67.3		
	68	Line	40.43	60.64	80.86	24.56	28.02	45.72	56.04	58.99	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	39.0	59.1	75.0	11.0	16.6	45.6	56.0	57.5	84.5	
		Rate (people)	43.7	65.1	79.9	13.1	19.7	49.9	62.1	63.5	79.8	
	59	Line	_			_	-			-		
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	25.07	37.61	50.14		17.27	28.18	34.54	36.36		
		Rate (HHs)	54.1	84.1	94.0		18.0	64.2	79.5	83.2		
		Rate (people)	59.7	87.3	95.8		21.6	70.3	83.3	86.6		
	68	Line	29.98	44.97	59.95	26.04	20.65	33.70	41.31	43.48		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	47.0	81.5	93.8	29.9	14.2	61.6	76.2	79.9		91.2
		Rate (people)	49.0	84.5	94.8	33.4	16.5	65.2	79.0	82.7		86.1
	59	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Π		Rate (people)					—					
A	66	Line	27.46	41.18	54.91		18.94	30.91	37.89	39.88		
		Rate (HHs)	50.5	80.6	91.4		17.7	60.4	75.7	79.3		
		Rate (people)	55.6	84.2	93.4		20.9	65.8	79.9	83.1		
	68	Line	32.35	48.52	64.70	25.71	22.32	36.42	44.65	47.00	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	45.1	76.3	89.5	25.5	14.7	57.9	71.5	74.7	84.5	91.2
		Rate (people)	47.8	80.1	91.4	28.8	17.2	61.7	75.2	78.3	79.8	86.1

<u>Chhattisgarh</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (R	ls/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
uc	рц				R68		
ŝ	unc			F	Percentile line	s	
R	R	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	$20^{ m th}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ ext{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	80^{th}
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)					
Url	66	Line	—				
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	26.66	34.25	38.47	43.91	62.91
		Rate (HHs)	14.2	25.4	34.7	42.1	60.6
		Rate (people)	16.9	29.5	39.6	46.5	66.9
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)	—	—		—	—
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	—	—		—	—
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					—
	68	Line	28.28	36.33	40.80	46.57	66.72
		Rate (HHs)	39.3	67.7	76.0	84.5	95.3
_		Rate (people)	41.5	71.2	78.9	87.7	96.1
	59	Line	—	—		—	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line	—			—	
		Rate (HHs)					
Ħ		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line		—			
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	68	Line	27.91	35.86	40.27	45.97	65.86
		Rate (HHs)	33.5	57.9	66.5	74.7	87.3
		Rate (people)	35.9	61.7	70.0	78.4	89.5

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/per	·son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
Gic	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	19.96	17.94	35.88	20.68	16.12	12.09	20.15	24.18	32.24	19.62
		Rate (HHs)	14.8	1.8	32.7	14.8	1.8	0.0	14.8	23.6	32.7	14.8
		Rate (people)	30.6	3.6	51.5	30.6	3.6	0.0	30.6	42.5	51.5	30.6
	62	Line	21.80	19.92	39.84	22.99	17.96	13.47	22.46	26.95	35.93	21.81
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	21.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0
oan		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	27.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.3	0.0
$\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{r}}$	66	Line	30.77	28.12	56.24	32.45	25.25	18.93	31.56	37.87	50.49	31.60
		Rate (HHs)	6.8	6.7	73.5	13.4	0.1	0.0	13.4	29.3	56.1	13.4
		Rate (people)	9.4	9.3	81.4	17.7	0.1	0.0	17.7	37.6	66.4	17.7
	68	Line	36.43	33.29	66.58	38.41	29.89	22.42	37.36	44.84	59.78	37.02
		Rate (HHs)	5.4	3.2	38.6	9.9	1.7	0.0	8.1	17.8	33.7	8.1
		Rate (people)	10.8	5.2	54.0	18.1	2.7	0.0	15.4	29.8	48.0	15.4
_	59	Line	11.19	14.89	29.78	11.44	13.99	10.49	17.49	20.99	27.99	15.31
		Rate (HHs)	9.0	26.8	59.6	9.0	16.8	6.9	38.0	46.0	52.1	26.8
		Rate (people)	17.6	40.2	76.1	17.6	26.6	14.8	53.3	60.9	68.5	40.2
	62	Line	12.31	16.35	32.71	12.47	15.26	11.45	19.08	22.89	30.52	16.69
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	21.0	64.4	0.0	19.8	0.0	49.7	53.0	64.4	21.0
ral		Rate (people)	0.0	40.9	76.8	0.0	39.2	0.0	63.3	67.3	76.8	40.9
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	18.09	24.04	48.08	18.33	22.44	16.83	28.06	33.67	44.89	24.45
		Rate (HHs)	18.3	44.7	91.1	18.3	38.7	13.1	64.4	73.4	90.3	51.0
		Rate (people)	19.1	50.3	92.9	19.1	40.3	13.9	67.6	75.8	92.0	55.6
	68	Line	21.22	28.20	56.39	21.50	26.34	19.75	32.92	39.51	52.68	31.79
		Rate (HHs)	8.5	49.2	73.7	9.6	44.6	6.5	57.5	68.0	73.2	54.8
		Rate (people)	14.0	54.7	83.9	16.2	49.6	11.2	65.7	77.5	83.3	62.6
	59	Line	11.95	15.16	30.31	12.24	14.18	10.63	17.72	21.27	28.36	15.69
		Rate (HHs)	9.6	24.4	57.0	9.6	15.3	6.3	35.7	43.9	50.2	25.7
		Rate (people)	18.7	37.0	73.9	18.7	24.6	13.5	51.3	59.3	67.0	39.4
	62	Line	13.08	16.64	33.29	13.32	15.48	11.61	19.35	23.22	30.96	17.11
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	18.8	59.8	0.0	17.7	0.0	44.3	47.3	59.1	18.8
≓		Rate (people)	0.0	37.5	72.8	0.0	36.0	0.0	58.2	61.8	71.8	37.5
A	66	Line	21.23	25.05	50.10	21.83	23.14	17.35	28.92	34.71	46.28	26.22
		Rate (HHs)	14.8	33.1	85.7	16.8	26.9	9.1	48.8	59.9	79.8	39.5
		Rate (people)	16.7	40.2	90.0	18.7	30.3	10.4	55.2	66.3	85.6	46.2
	68	Line	27.56	30.32	60.64	28.55	27.82	20.87	34.78	41.73	55.64	33.97
		Rate (HHs)	7.1	27.5	57.2	9.7	24.4	3.4	34.3	44.4	54.6	32.8
_		Rate (people)	12.7	34.1	71.5	17.0	30.0	6.5	44.7	57.6	68.6	42.9

Dadra and Nagar Haveli: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines $(Rs/p$	erson/day ii	n MMRP) and	d poverty r	ates (%)
n	р	-			R66]	Legacy		
ği	unc	_	Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line	_					
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)						
Jrb	66	Line	31.60	47.40	63.20	37.42	56.27	74.83
		Bate (HHs)	4 4	33.9	55.5	12.5	46.8	73.3
		Rate (people)	6.2	44.6	69.7	17.3	61.4	85.0
	69	Line	27.02	55 59	74.04	12 84	65.02	97.67
	00	Line Rate (HHg)	56	12.7	17.04	40.04	00.90	58 7
		Rate (mis)	0.0 10.0	10.7	47.7 54.4	11.5	20.4	56.7 71.1
	F 0	Hate (people)	10.0	22.0	04.4	11.0	00.4	11.1
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line					—	
<u>ural</u>		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
Ru	66	Line	24.45	36.68	48.90	30.06	45.22	60.13
		Rate (HHs)	42.7	73.3	84.1	62.4	81.3	93.5
		Rate (people)	49.3	78.1	88.6	69.3	85.5	96.3
	68	Line	31.79	47.69	63.58	39.09	58.79	78.18
		Rate (HHs)	46.6	76.4	82.5	63.4	82.5	92.5
		Rate (people)	49.9	81.5	89.1	66.3	89.1	96.8
	59	Line	_	_	_			
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)	_				—	
	62	Line						
	02	Rate (HHs)	_					
П		Rate (people)						_
A	66	Line	26.28	39.42	52.56	31.94	48.04	63.89
		Rate (HHs)	31.0	61.2	75.3	47.1	70.7	87.3
		Rate (people)	38.3	69.6	83.8	56.0	79.4	93.4
	68	Line	34.05	51.07	68.10	41.14	61.87	82.28
	-	Rate (HHs)	27.3	46.9	66.1	36.9	57.1	76.6
		Rate (people)	32.7	56.1	74.1	42.7	65.9	85.7

Dadra and Nagar Haveli: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

Dadra and Nagar Haveli: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	erson/day in MN	ARP con	nsumpti	ion) and	d pover	ty rates (%)
n	p						R68					
010	um		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	P	R	BI
${f Re}$	${ m R}_{ m 0}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	${<}100\%$ natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)				_						
Urt	66	Line	43.77	65.65	87.54	_	30.34	49.50	60.67	63.87		
		Rate (HHs)	29.0	57.1	80.4		2.2	35.9	51.6	55.5		
		Rate (people)	37.9	71.2	89.8		3.8	47.4	66.7	69.7		
	68	Line	50.66	75.99	101.31	30.77	35.11	57.29	70.22	73.92	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	9.2	50.8	60.5	2.0	3.5	15.6	41.4	47.7	77.2	
		Rate (people)	15.3	56.2	73.2	3.4	6.1	24.5	49.8	54.4	67.3	
	59	Line	_	_			_			_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	27.26	40.90	54.53		18.78	30.65	37.57	39.55		
		Rate (HHs)	57.0	79.3	92.2		2.9	62.4	73.3	79.0		
		Rate (people)	64.1	84.0	95.1	—	4.3	69.3	78.1	83.6		
	68	Line	33.15	49.73	66.31	28.80	22.84	37.27	45.68	48.09		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	52.8	76.4	90.0	42.6	14.1	58.8	73.9	76.4		89.2
		Rate (people)	54.8	81.5	94.7	45.2	18.1	60.7	78.8	81.5		84.9
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										—
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)			_							
Ħ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	31.48	47.23	62.97		21.74	35.47	43.48	45.76		
		Rate (HHs)	48.4	72.5	88.6		2.7	54.3	66.6	71.8		
		Rate (people)	57.4	80.7	93.7		4.2	63.7	75.2	80.0		—
	68	Line	40.71	61.06	81.41	29.65	28.14	45.91	56.27	59.23	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	32.3	64.3	76.2	23.5	9.1	38.5	58.6	62.9	77.2	89.2
_		Rate (people)	37.8	70.6	85.4	27.1	12.9	45.1	66.3	69.8	67.3	84.9

			MMRP po	verty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	v rates (%)
nc	ы				$\mathbf{R68}$		
ŝić	unc			1	Percentile line	s	
R	R	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	40^{th}	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	80^{th}
	59	Line		—			—
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—		—	—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—		—	—	
an		Rate (people)		—			
Urt	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	33.41	42.92	48.20	55.02	78.82
		Rate (HHs)	2.3	6.2	8.5	13.7	54.7
		Rate (people)	4.3	10.6	13.8	22.5	65.3
	59	Line			_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)					_
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
Rui	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.27	40.18	45.12	51.50	73.79
		Rate (HHs)	45.8	64.4	73.8	77.5	91.2
		Rate (people)	49.3	67.0	78.6	84.1	96.1
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—	—			_
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					_
Π		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—		—	—	_
	68	Line	32.20	41.36	46.45	53.02	75.96
		Rate (HHs)	25.3	37.0	43.0	47.5	74.1
		Rate (people)	29.9	42.7	50.6	57.5	82.8

Dadra and Nagar Haveli: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/per	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	p		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
. <u>ö</u>	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Intl}	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	19.96	17.94	35.88	20.68	16.12	12.09	20.15	24.18	32.24	20.84
		Rate (HHs)	12.5	5.2	50.8	12.5	5.2	0.0	12.5	27.8	38.6	12.5
		Rate (people)	20.0	8.3	76.1	20.0	8.3	0.0	20.0	42.8	53.0	20.0
	62	Line	21.80	19.92	39.84	22.99	17.96	13.47	22.46	26.95	35.93	23.17
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	71.6	11.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.1	60.1	11.6
<u>nac</u>		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	77.9	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.9	74.1	13.3
Urł	66	Line	30.77	28.12	56.24	32.45	25.25	18.93	31.56	37.87	50.49	33.71
		Rate (HHs)	15.5	5.0	55.8	22.5	4.3	0.3	19.9	30.4	50.3	24.9
		Rate (people)	18.6	6.5	64.3	28.9	5.9	0.3	25.9	39.4	59.1	32.7
	68	Line	36.43	33.29	66.58	38.41	29.89	22.42	37.36	44.84	59.78	37.28
		Rate (HHs)	6.6	5.5	46.2	6.6	5.3	0.0	6.6	16.4	31.3	6.6
		Rate (people)	12.6	8.7	57.9	12.6	8.1	0.0	12.6	26.8	46.4	12.6
	59	Line	11.19	14.89	29.78	11.44	13.99	10.49	17.49	20.99	27.99	19.22
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	2.4	37.8	0.0	2.4	0.0	15.5	19.7	33.2	19.7
		Rate (people)	0.0	3.6	55.7	0.0	3.6	0.0	21.5	29.0	49.3	29.0
	62	Line	12.31	16.35	32.71	12.47	15.26	11.45	19.08	22.89	30.52	20.95
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	27.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0
ral		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	42.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	0.0
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	18.09	24.04	48.08	18.33	22.44	16.83	28.06	33.67	44.89	30.61
		Rate (HHs)	0.5	2.2	42.7	0.5	0.6	0.5	23.8	31.5	40.8	23.8
		Rate (people)	0.9	4.0	55.8	0.9	1.1	0.9	32.0	42.1	53.2	32.0
	68	Line	21.22	28.20	56.39	21.50	26.34	19.75	32.92	39.51	52.68	35.84
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	10.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	8.4	0.0
_		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	22.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	16.9	0.0
	59	Line	13.98	15.86	31.72	14.37	14.67	11.00	18.34	22.00	29.34	19.74
		Rate (HHs)	4.1	3.3	42.1	4.1	3.3	0.0	14.5	22.4	35.0	17.3
		Rate (people)	6.4	5.1	62.2	6.4	5.1	0.0	21.0	33.4	50.5	26.2
	62	Line	15.31	17.48	34.96	15.80	16.12	12.09	20.14	24.17	32.23	21.65
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	41.8	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.7	29.1	3.7
Ħ		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	53.4	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.3	38.1	4.2
Ø	66	Line	23.75	25.86	51.72	24.63	23.69	17.77	29.62	35.54	47.39	31.99
		Rate (HHs)	6.9	3.4	48.3	9.9	2.1	0.4	22.1	31.1	44.9	24.3
		Rate (people)	8.8	5.1	59.6	13.4	3.3	0.6	29.3	40.9	55.8	32.3
	68	Line	27.11	30.17	60.34	28.05	27.72	20.79	34.64	41.57	55.43	36.40
		Rate (HHs)	1.8	1.5	20.5	1.8	1.4	0.0	1.8	4.8	14.6	1.8
_		Rate (people)	4.9	3.4	36.0	4.9	3.1	0.0	4.9	11.3	28.4	4.9

Daman and Diu: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

Daman and Diu: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

gion und			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates $(\%)$								
n	p				R66 I	Legacy					
ği	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	Ir	ntl. 2005 PF	PP			
Re	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50			
	59	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)									
	62	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
an		Rate (people)		_			_	_			
Urb	66	Line	33.71	50.57	67.42	39.92	60.04	79.84			
		Rate (HHs)	8.9	47.5	60.9	32.9	55.5	67.0			
		Rate (people)	8.1	65.1	78.2	45.2	73.4	82.0			
	68	Line	37.28	55.92	74.56	44.15	66.40	88.29			
		Rate (HHs)	6.6	21.5	44.2	10.4	30.0	69.5			
		Rate (people)	10.2	24.3	48.5	13.7	34.9	79.4			
	59	Line		_		_	_	_			
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)			—						
	62	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
ral		Rate (people)									
Ru	66	Line	30.61	45.91	61.22	37.64	56.60	75.27			
		Rate (HHs)	17.1	36.2	56.4	25.3	49.3	79.8			
		Rate (people)	20.9	46.0	63.6	32.9	59.3	84.5			
	68	Line	35.84	53.75	71.67	44.06	66.27	88.13			
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	15.4	30.0	0.0	29.0	52.0			
		Rate (people)	0.0	39.2	54.3	0.0	52.9	71.5			
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_			
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)		—	—		—				
	62	Line		_			_				
		Rate (HHs)									
Π		Rate (people)		—			—				
A	66	Line	31.94	47.91	63.88	38.62	58.08	77.23			
		Rate (HHs)	13.6	41.0	58.3	28.5	51.9	74.3			
		Rate (people)	15.4	54.2	69.9	38.2	65.4	83.4			
	68	Line	36.40	54.61	72.81	44.10	66.32	88.19			
		Rate (HHs)	1.8	17.0	33.8	2.8	29.3	56.7			
		Rate (people)	4.0	33.4	52.0	5.4	45.8	74.6			

d	77		FOV	erty inte	s (ns/pe	erson/day in wiw	R68	sumpu	on) and	u poven	y rates (/0)
gio	nnc		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
\mathbf{Re}	${ m Ro}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
oan		Rate (people)										
Url	66	Line	43.69	65.54	87.38		30.28	49.41	60.57	63.75		
		Rate (HHs)	41.3	57.7	67.0		5.4	47.5	57.7	57.7		
		Rate (people)	56.5	76.0	82.0		4.2	65.1	76.0	76.0		
	68	Line	47.18	70.76	94.35	28.66	32.70	53.35	65.40	68.84	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	13.3	34.3	71.5	3.4	4.6	18.6	27.1	31.8	84.3	
		Rate (people)	17.6	39.8	81.2	4.6	7.1	22.8	31.8	36.8	78.0	
	59	Line			—		_			—	_	_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
\mathbf{ral}		Rate (people)										
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	33.72	50.58	67.44		23.23	37.91	46.47	48.91		
		Rate (HHs)	20.5	43.6	70.1		7.3	25.3	36.2	43.6		
		Rate (people)	25.5	52.9	76.2		10.6	32.9	46.1	52.9		
	68	Line	39.47	59.21	78.94	34.29	27.19	44.37	54.39	57.25		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	16.5	46.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	15.4	16.4		85.1
		Rate (people)	0.0	42.7	67.9	0.0	0.0	0.9	39.3	42.6		59.7
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ħ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	38.01	57.01	76.02		26.26	42.85	52.53	55.29		
		Rate (HHs)	29.3	49.6	68.7		6.5	34.8	45.4	49.6		
		Rate (people)	38.8	62.8	78.7		7.9	46.7	58.9	62.8		
	68	Line	42.50	63.75	85.00	32.08	29.36	47.90	58.71	61.80	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	3.6	21.3	52.9	0.9	1.3	5.3	18.6	20.6	84.3	85.1
		Rate (people)	6.9	41.5	73.1	1.8	2.8	9.5	36.3	40.3	78.0	59.7

Daman and Diu: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

Daman and Diu: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	verty lines (F	ls/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates $(\%)$
n	ŋ				R68		
Gi	un			ŀ	Percentile line	s	
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	$20^{ ext{th}}$	$40^{ m th}$	${f 50}^{ ext{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
oan		Rate (people)					
\mathbf{Ur}	66	Line					—
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.11	39.97	44.89	51.24	73.41
		Rate (HHs)	4.6	6.6	10.4	18.6	41.3
_		Rate (people)	7.1	10.2	13.7	22.8	44.7
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					—
		Rate (HHs)					
ıral		Rate (people)					
R	66	Line		—		—	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	37.24	47.84	53.72	61.32	87.85
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	11.6	15.4	26.1	52.0
_		Rate (people)	0.0	29.9	39.2	47.9	71.5
	59	Line			_		
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ΔII		Rate (people)					
7	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		nate (people)					
	68	Line	34.83	44.75	50.26	57.36	82.18
		Rate (HHs)	1.3	10.2	14.0	24.1	49.1
		Rate (people)	2.8	22.1	29.2	38.0	61.0

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption)	and po	verty rat	æs (%)
ų	q		Le	gacy R59	Ð			Legacy	R62			R66
ği	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Int}	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	${f Line/rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	18.69	18.64	37.28	19.03	16.87	12.65	21.09	25.30	33.74	19.95
		Rate (HHs)	9.1	8.8	55.8	10.0	6.1	1.0	16.6	26.4	49.3	11.5
		Rate (people)	14.4	13.9	65.8	15.5	10.0	1.8	24.1	36.0	59.5	16.9
	62	Line	20.41	20.70	41.40	21.16	18.80	14.10	23.50	28.20	37.60	22.18
		Rate (HHs)	2.2	2.3	37.3	3.0	0.4	0.0	5.8	19.3	33.2	4.6
an		Rate (people)	3.2	3.3	44.4	4.2	0.6	0.0	7.2	22.5	41.2	6.5
Urt	66	Line	28.82	29.22	58.44	29.86	26.42	19.82	33.03	39.63	52.84	34.20
		Rate (HHs)	5.2	5.5	37.8	5.8	3.4	1.3	8.7	17.1	30.9	9.7
		Rate (people)	8.3	8.8	49.2	9.1	5.1	1.9	13.1	24.9	42.4	14.3
	68	Line	34.11	34.59	69.18	35.35	31.28	23.46	39.10	46.92	62.57	37.28
		Rate (HHs)	5.1	5.1	32.8	5.2	2.6	0.2	6.8	11.7	26.1	6.3
		Rate (people)	8.0	8.0	45.4	8.2	3.9	0.4	10.7	17.2	37.2	9.8
	59	Line	12.74	14.47	28.93	12.96	13.59	10.20	16.99	20.39	27.19	17.10
		Rate (HHs)	6.9	15.3	61.9	10.4	10.4	3.8	18.6	55.5	60.7	32.1
		Rate (people)	8.6	20.4	71.1	14.9	14.9	5.9	24.7	66.2	70.4	39.7
	62	Line	14.02	15.89	31.78	14.13	14.83	11.12	18.53	22.24	29.65	18.64
		Rate (HHs)	0.2	0.2	54.9	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.8	11.1	53.2	1.8
ral		Rate (people)	0.2	0.2	59.6	0.2	0.2	0.0	2.4	14.7	57.8	2.4
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	20.60	23.36	46.72	20.77	21.81	16.35	27.26	32.71	43.61	24.59
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	32.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	16.9	26.3	4.5
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	45.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	28.8	42.3	7.6
	68	Line	24.16	27.39	54.79	24.35	25.59	19.19	31.99	38.38	51.18	37.64
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.2	16.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	8.8	15.0	6.2
_		Rate (people)	0.0	0.3	26.6	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	17.5	25.5	12.9
	59	Line	17.76	17.99	35.98	18.09	16.36	12.27	20.45	24.54	32.72	19.51
		Rate (HHs)	8.8	9.8	56.7	10.0	6.7	1.4	16.9	30.7	51.0	14.5
		Rate (people)	13.5	14.9	66.6	15.4	10.8	2.5	24.2	40.7	61.2	20.5
	62	Line	19.57	20.07	40.13	20.23	18.28	13.71	22.85	27.42	36.55	21.71
		Rate (HHs)	2.0	2.0	39.2	2.7	0.4	0.0	5.3	18.4	35.4	4.3
≓		Rate (people)	2.8	2.9	46.4	3.7	0.5	0.0	6.6	21.4	43.4	6.0
A	66	Line	28.39	28.91	57.83	29.39	26.18	19.64	32.73	39.27	52.36	33.70
		Rate (HHs)	4.8	5.2	37.4	5.4	3.2	1.2	8.4	17.1	30.6	9.4
		Rate (people)	7.9	8.3	49.0	8.6	4.8	1.8	12.8	25.1	42.4	14.0
	68	Line	33.33	34.02	68.05	34.48	30.83	23.12	38.54	46.25	61.66	37.31
		Rate (HHs)	4.7	4.7	31.6	4.8	2.5	0.2	6.3	11.5	25.3	6.3
		Rate (people)	7.3	7.4	43.9	7.6	3.6	0.4	9.9	17.2	36.3	10.1

<u>Delhi</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

n			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) and	d poverty r	rates (%)
nc	рī				R66 1	Legacy		
ŝ	unc		\mathbf{Nat}	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)					_	
an		Rate (people)		—				
Urł	66	Line	34.20	51.30	68.40	40.50	60.91	81.00
		Rate (HHs)	4.9	23.7	42.6	12.4	33.3	53.1
		Rate (people)	7.9	30.9	49.3	17.3	40.3	59.2
	68	Line	37.28	55.92	74.56	44.15	66.40	88.29
		Rate (HHs)	2.4	15.5	31.4	7.2	25.3	44.3
		Rate (people)	3.9	21.7	41.8	11.1	35.2	56.3
	59	Line	_	_			_	
		Rate (HHs)		—				
Rural		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	66	Line	24.59	36.88	49.17	30.23	45.47	60.46
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	11.0	15.4	0.0	11.7	48.3
		Rate (people)	0.0	25.1	34.3	0.0	27.2	60.2
	68	Line	37.64	56.47	75.29	46.29	69.61	92.57
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	10.9	35.9	6.9	32.2	53.5
		Rate (people)	2.9	15.9	45.9	11.5	39.6	70.8
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)		—		—		
		Rate (people)		—		—		
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)		—				
П		Rate (people)		—				
A	66	Line	33.75	50.63	67.50	40.02	60.19	80.04
		Rate (HHs)	4.6	22.9	40.8	11.6	31.9	52.8
		Rate (people)	7.5	30.6	48.6	16.5	39.7	59.3
	68	Line	37.31	55.97	74.63	44.33	66.67	88.66
		Rate (HHs)	2.3	15.2	31.7	7.2	25.8	45.0
		Rate (people)	3.8	21.2	42.1	11.2	35.6	57.5

<u>Delhi</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	rson/day in MN	IRP con	sumpti	ion) an	d pover	ty rates ('	%)
ц	q						R68					
gi.	un		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	RI	BI
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}_{0}	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line			_							_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)									—	
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)				—						
Urt	66	Line	46.39	69.58	92.77		32.15	52.46	64.30	67.68		
		Rate (HHs)	17.7	42.7	61.2		4.3	24.2	38.8	41.8		
		Rate (people)	24.3	49.4	66.2	—	7.0	31.6	45.5	48.5		
	68	Line	50.57	75.85	101.13	30.72	35.05	57.18	70.10	73.79	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	10.9	33.8	52.4	1.3	2.0	17.3	28.5	31.1	65.3	
		Rate (people)	15.7	44.4	63.2	2.0	3.3	24.1	38.9	41.4	57.8	
	59	Line				_						_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)						—				
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	32.06	48.08	64.11	_	22.08	36.03	44.17	46.49		
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	15.4	48.3		0.0	11.0	11.4	12.3		
		Rate (people)	0.0	34.3	60.2		0.0	25.1	26.3	28.3		
	68	Line	49.07	73.60	98.13	42.63	33.81	55.16	67.61	71.17		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	6.9	33.6	53.8	1.0	0.0	10.9	26.3	33.5		21.8
		Rate (people)	11.5	42.2	71.1	2.9	0.0	15.9	33.4	42.1		10.2
	59	Line						—	_			—
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
Ξ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	45.71	68.57	91.43		31.68	51.69	63.36	66.69		
		Rate (HHs)	16.6	41.0	60.4		4.0	23.3	37.1	39.8		
		Rate (people)	23.2	48.7	65.9		6.7	31.2	44.6	47.5		
	68	Line	50.44	75.66	100.88	31.73	34.94	57.01	69.89	73.56	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	10.6	33.8	52.5	1.3	1.9	16.9	28.4	31.3	65.3	21.8
		Rate (people)	15.4	44.3	63.9	2.0	3.0	23.4	38.4	41.5	57.8	10.2

<u>Delhi</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
n	p				R68		
ĝi.	uno			I	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ ext{th}}$	$50^{ ext{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line		—			—
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—		
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	33.35	42.84	48.12	54.92	78.69
		Rate (HHs)	1.5	5.8	9.1	15.1	35.9
		Rate (people)	2.5	9.0	13.8	21.3	46.6
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—		
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—		
ral		Rate (people)					
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			—
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	46.29	59.46	66.78	76.23	109.21
		Rate (HHs)	6.9	11.0	23.5	35.9	54.0
		Rate (people)	11.5	15.9	31.1	45.9	71.3
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—	—	
Π		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)				—	
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	34.45	44.26	49.71	56.74	81.29
		Rate (HHs)	1.9	6.2	10.2	16.7	37.3
		Rate (people)	3.2	9.6	15.3	23.4	48.7

<u>Delhi</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and									tes (%)
ų	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
gio	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Int	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{e}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	19.96	17.94	35.88	20.68	16.12	12.09	20.15	24.18	32.24	20.84
		Rate (HHs)	14.2	11.2	56.0	15.2	11.2	2.5	15.2	27.8	54.9	15.2
		Rate (people)	16.7	13.9	65.3	18.6	13.9	2.1	18.6	32.3	65.0	18.6
	62	Line	21.80	19.92	39.84	22.99	17.96	13.47	22.46	26.95	35.93	23.17
		Rate (HHs)	8.0	8.0	27.5	8.0	8.0	2.1	8.0	12.7	21.9	8.0
an		Rate (people)	10.1	10.1	31.3	10.1	10.1	3.8	10.1	15.8	25.4	10.1
Urt	66	Line	30.77	28.12	56.24	32.45	25.25	18.93	31.56	37.87	50.49	33.71
		Rate (HHs)	3.7	2.1	27.5	4.6	1.0	0.2	3.8	6.2	19.7	4.6
		Rate (people)	5.3	3.9	37.6	6.4	1.9	0.5	5.4	9.3	27.3	6.4
	68	Line	36.43	33.29	66.58	38.41	29.89	22.42	37.36	44.84	59.78	37.28
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	1.5	26.1	3.4	1.1	0.6	3.3	7.9	20.9	3.3
		Rate (people)	4.1	1.5	32.5	4.4	1.0	0.6	4.1	11.4	27.4	4.1
	59	Line	11.19	14.89	29.78	11.44	13.99	10.49	17.49	20.99	27.99	19.22
		Rate (HHs)	12.4	13.8	52.6	12.4	13.8	7.2	13.9	26.6	45.1	18.9
		Rate (people)	17.0	19.0	63.8	17.0	19.0	10.1	19.0	37.6	55.1	26.0
	62	Line	12.31	16.35	32.71	12.47	15.26	11.45	19.08	22.89	30.52	20.95
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	20.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	8.5	15.9	5.7
ral		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	24.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.8	11.5	19.6	7.9
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	18.09	24.04	48.08	18.33	22.44	16.83	28.06	33.67	44.89	30.61
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	1.4	39.2	0.0	1.3	0.0	4.6	12.5	37.5	9.6
		Rate (people)	0.0	1.9	45.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	5.6	15.1	43.8	11.3
	68	Line	21.22	28.20	56.39	21.50	26.34	19.75	32.92	39.51	52.68	35.84
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.4	31.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	7.0	23.7	4.8
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.5	35.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	3.0	9.7	27.0	6.8
	59	Line	15.66	16.45	32.89	16.15	15.08	11.31	18.85	22.62	30.15	20.05
		Rate (HHs)	13.3	12.6	54.2	13.7	12.6	5.1	14.5	27.1	49.6	17.2
		Rate (people)	16.9	16.4	64.6	17.8	16.4	6.0	18.8	34.9	60.2	22.2
	62	Line	17.31	18.23	36.47	18.01	16.68	12.51	20.86	25.03	33.37	22.12
		Rate (HHs)	4.6	4.6	24.5	4.6	4.6	1.2	7.0	10.9	19.3	7.0
≓		Rate (people)	5.3	5.3	27.9	5.3	5.3	2.0	9.0	13.8	22.7	9.0
A	66	Line	21.70	25.20	50.40	22.35	23.24	17.43	29.05	34.86	46.48	31.49
		Rate (HHs)	1.1	1.6	35.6	1.4	1.2	0.1	4.3	10.6	32.1	8.1
		Rate (people)	1.5	2.4	42.9	1.8	1.8	0.1	5.5	13.4	39.1	9.9
	68	Line	28.98	30.80	61.59	30.13	28.15	21.11	35.19	42.23	56.31	36.57
		Rate (HHs)	1.7	1.0	28.6	1.8	0.6	0.3	2.7	7.5	22.3	4.0
_		Rate (people)	2.1	1.1	33.9	2.2	0.6	0.3	3.6	10.5	27.2	5.4

<u>Goa</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

		_	Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day i	n MMRP) and	d poverty r	ates $(\%)$
nc	Ы				R66]	Legacy		
ŝ	Junc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)	—					
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line	_	—				
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)	—	—				
Urt	66	Line	33.71	50.57	67.42	39.92	60.04	79.84
		Rate (HHs)	4.4	14.6	33.0	6.2	21.1	48.1
		Rate (people)	7.3	19.1	41.1	9.9	26.4	56.3
	68	Line	37.28	55.92	74.56	44.15	66.40	88.29
		Rate (HHs)	2.0	16.3	30.6	5.3	23.9	41.2
		Rate (people)	3.0	20.1	39.3	7.3	30.7	49.8
	59	Line	_	_				
		Rate (HHs)	_	_				
ral		Rate (people)		_	_			_
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)		—				
		Rate (people)	—	—				
Ru	66	Line	30.61	45.91	61.22	37.64	56.60	75.27
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	11.0	37.2	8.9	26.5	63.2
		Rate (people)	4.7	13.4	45.8	11.0	30.6	70.2
	68	Line	35.84	53.75	71.67	44.06	66.27	88.13
		Rate (HHs)	0.9	16.5	38.5	5.2	32.2	61.5
		Rate (people)	1.0	22.2	47.3	7.9	41.8	70.9
	59	Line	_	_	_			_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)	—	—				
	62	Line	—	—				
		Rate (HHs)	—	—			—	
П		Rate (people)	—	—				
A	66	Line	31.51	47.27	63.02	38.30	57.60	76.60
		Rate (HHs)	3.8	12.1	35.9	8.1	24.8	58.6
		Rate (people)	5.4	15.1	44.5	10.7	29.4	66.2
	68	Line	36.54	54.82	73.09	44.10	66.33	88.21
		Rate (HHs)	1.5	16.4	34.4	5.2	27.9	51.0
_		Rate (people)	2.0	21.2	43.4	7.6	36.3	60.6

<u>Goa</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	erson/day in MN	ARP con	$\mathbf{sumption}$	ion) and	d pover	ty rates (%)
ц	р						R68					
gio	un		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}_{0}	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
nac		Rate (people)										
$\mathbf{U}_{\mathbf{r}}$	66	Line	43.69	65.54	87.38		30.28	49.41	60.57	63.75		
		Rate (HHs)	8.3	32.1	54.8		2.9	13.1	21.1	28.9		
		Rate (people)	12.5	40.0	62.5		3.5	17.4	26.4	35.6		
	68	Line	48.33	72.50	96.66	29.36	33.50	54.66	67.00	70.52	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	6.9	30.1	45.4	1.7	1.7	14.7	23.9	27.7	75.6	
		Rate (people)	9.1	38.7	53.8	2.8	2.8	18.2	30.7	35.2	69.1	
	59	Line	_	—	—	_	_			—	_	
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)			—							
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	33.72	50.58	67.44		23.23	37.91	46.47	48.91		
		Rate (HHs)	4.7	19.0	53.0		1.4	8.9	12.5	18.4		
		Rate (people)	6.2	22.0	61.2		1.9	11.0	14.9	21.4		
	68	Line	39.47	59.21	78.94	34.29	27.19	44.37	54.39	57.25		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	1.2	26.0	50.0	0.8	0.0	5.2	18.6	25.9		40.7
		Rate (people)	1.3	36.4	60.3	0.9	0.1	7.9	26.0	36.4	_	27.6
	59	Line						_				
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
п		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	36.62	54.93	73.24		25.28	41.25	50.56	53.23		
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	23.0	53.5		1.9	10.2	15.1	21.6		
		Rate (people)	8.0	27.2	61.6		2.4	12.9	18.2	25.5		
	68	Line	43.81	65.72	87.62	31.88	30.28	49.41	60.57	63.75	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	4.1	28.1	47.7	1.3	0.9	10.1	21.3	26.8	75.6	40.7
		Rate (people)	5.1	37.5	57.1	1.8	1.4	13.0	28.3	35.8	69.1	27.6

<u>Goa</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	γ rates (%)
n	рі				R68		
ŝ	unc			I	Percentile line	s	
R	R	Line/rate	$20^{ ext{th}}$	40^{th}	$50^{ ext{th}}$	60^{th}	80^{th}
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
oan		Rate (people)					
\mathbf{Ur}	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	68	Line	31.88	40.95	45.99	52.49	75.21
		Rate (HHs)	1.7	3.7	5.8	10.5	31.1
		Rate (people)	2.8	5.7	7.9	13.3	40.0
	59	Line			—	—	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line		—	—	—	
		Rate (HHs)	—	—	—		
ral		Rate (people)		—			
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—	—	—
		Rate (people)		—			
	68	Line	37.24	47.84	53.72	61.32	87.85
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	14.3	16.5	26.8	60.2
		Rate (people)	1.1	19.6	22.2	36.9	69.9
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—	—	—		
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Π		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	34.61	44.46	49.94	57.00	81.66
		Rate (HHs)	1.4	8.8	11.0	18.4	45.2
		Rate (people)	1.9	12.8	15.2	25.3	55.3

<u>Goa</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/per	rson/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty ra	tes (%)
n	p		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
ŝi.	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.54	17.19	34.39	16.81	15.80	11.85	19.74	23.69	31.59	20.47
		Rate (HHs)	7.0	6.4	57.9	5.6	4.1	0.5	16.3	30.2	52.3	17.6
		Rate (people)	8.9	7.9	64.6	6.2	4.6	0.8	19.8	34.8	59.2	21.5
	62	Line	19.16	19.09	38.19	18.68	17.60	13.20	22.00	26.41	35.21	22.75
		Rate (HHs)	9.4	9.4	61.6	9.1	6.5	0.7	14.1	26.6	53.1	14.9
an		Rate (people)	13.4	13.3	69.0	12.9	10.1	1.5	19.6	33.2	58.2	20.5
Urb	66	Line	27.05	26.95	53.90	26.37	24.74	18.55	30.92	37.11	49.48	31.28
		Rate (HHs)	8.4	8.4	42.9	7.5	6.3	1.2	13.1	22.1	37.4	13.5
		Rate (people)	11.0	11.0	50.2	9.7	8.1	1.4	17.3	27.4	44.6	17.7
	68	Line	32.02	31.91	63.82	31.22	29.29	21.97	36.61	43.94	58.58	37.87
		Rate (HHs)	3.2	3.1	30.8	2.5	1.8	0.2	6.6	12.8	26.7	7.3
		Rate (people)	4.4	4.4	41.2	3.7	2.6	0.3	9.2	17.8	36.8	10.2
	59	Line	11.20	15.70	31.41	11.18	14.75	11.06	18.44	22.12	29.50	15.84
		Rate (HHs)	10.7	30.7	85.0	10.7	27.6	10.7	46.6	62.0	81.2	31.3
		Rate (people)	13.4	34.8	89.3	13.4	31.9	13.4	51.2	68.1	86.5	35.0
	62	Line	12.32	17.25	34.49	12.18	16.09	12.06	20.11	24.13	32.17	17.27
		Rate (HHs)	10.0	33.1	86.0	9.7	28.8	9.7	47.3	57.9	82.1	33.1
ral		Rate (people)	11.0	37.1	90.2	10.6	32.3	10.6	53.8	63.0	86.4	37.1
\mathbf{R}	66	Line	18.11	25.35	50.71	17.91	23.66	17.74	29.57	35.49	47.32	23.87
		Rate (HHs)	6.1	28.9	85.3	4.9	23.5	4.9	43.6	60.8	81.8	23.8
		Rate (people)	7.2	32.2	89.0	5.7	26.4	5.7	48.3	66.8	85.6	26.6
	68	Line	21.24	29.74	59.47	21.00	27.76	20.82	34.70	41.65	55.53	30.64
		Rate (HHs)	2.1	16.1	76.1	1.8	10.6	1.7	32.0	47.7	72.8	18.6
_		Rate (people)	2.8	19.1	80.8	2.2	12.7	2.1	36.5	53.3	78.1	21.5
	59	Line	13.29	16.19	32.39	13.03	15.09	11.32	18.87	22.64	30.19	17.36
		Rate (HHs)	9.4	22.0	75.2	8.8	19.1	7.0	35.8	50.6	70.8	26.4
		Rate (people)	11.9	26.0	81.2	11.0	23.0	9.2	40.8	57.1	77.5	30.6
	62	Line	14.44	17.82	35.64	14.20	16.56	12.42	20.69	24.83	33.11	18.97
		Rate (HHs)	9.8	24.8	77.5	9.5	21.0	6.6	35.7	47.0	72.0	26.7
≓		Rate (people)	11.7	29.7	83.6	11.3	25.4	7.8	43.2	53.8	77.6	32.0
A	66	Line	21.51	25.96	51.92	21.13	24.07	18.05	30.09	36.10	48.14	26.69
		Rate (HHs)	7.1	20.4	67.6	6.0	16.3	3.4	30.9	44.6	63.3	19.5
		Rate (people)	8.7	24.1	74.3	7.3	19.4	4.1	36.5	51.8	70.0	23.2
	68	Line	25.61	30.62	61.23	25.14	28.38	21.29	35.48	42.57	56.77	33.57
		Rate (HHs)	2.6	10.2	55.5	2.1	6.6	1.0	20.4	31.8	51.8	13.5
_		Rate (people)	3.5	13.1	64.7	2.8	8.6	1.4	25.4	38.9	61.4	17.0

<u>Gujarat</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates (%)									
n	рı				R66 1	Legacy						
ŝić	unc		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	ntl. 2005 PF	PP				
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50				
	59	Line		—			—					
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)		—			—					
oan		Rate (people)		—			—					
\mathbf{Ur}	66	Line	31.28	46.92	62.56	37.04	55.71	74.08				
		Rate (HHs)	11.8	34.5	51.8	21.9	44.5	63.9				
		Rate (people)	16.0	42.8	59.5	28.8	53.0	71.5				
	68	Line	37.87	56.81	75.75	44.85	67.45	89.69				
		Rate (HHs)	5.7	22.7	42.1	11.9	36.0	58.1				
		Rate (people)	7.9	30.5	51.1	16.8	44.1	66.6				
	59	Line	_	_			_	_				
		Rate (HHs)		—			—					
		Rate (people)		—			—					
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)		—								
ral		Rate (people)	—	—			—					
Ru	66	Line	23.87	35.80	47.73	29.34	44.13	58.69				
		Rate (HHs)	17.8	53.5	77.4	36.1	71.1	89.7				
		Rate (people)	20.3	59.1	82.4	41.5	76.2	92.8				
	68	Line	30.64	45.96	61.28	37.68	56.66	75.35				
		Rate (HHs)	12.6	49.4	72.0	28.0	65.8	84.9				
		Rate (people)	15.7	56.1	77.4	33.9	72.2	89.0				
	59	Line	_	_		_	_	_				
		Rate (HHs)		—			—					
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—				
	62	Line		—			—					
		Rate (HHs)		—			—					
П		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—	—				
A	66	Line	26.79	40.18	53.57	32.38	48.69	64.75				
		Rate (HHs)	15.3	45.6	66.7	30.2	60.0	78.9				
		Rate (people)	18.6	52.7	73.4	36.5	67.1	84.4				
	68	Line	33.53	50.29	67.05	40.54	60.97	81.07				
		Rate (HHs)	9.4	37.3	58.4	20.7	52.2	72.7				
		Rate (people)	12.6	45.9	66.9	27.1	61.0	80.0				

<u>Gujarat</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)									
n	q						R68					
. <u>6</u>	un		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	P	RI	BI
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line				_					_	
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)				—						
Urt	66	Line	40.92	61.39	81.85		28.37	46.28	56.73	59.72		
		Rate (HHs)	28.2	50.4	69.6		8.5	34.0	46.1	49.6		
		Rate (people)	36.0	58.3	77.1		11.7	42.2	54.3	57.6		
	68	Line	49.55	74.32	99.09	30.10	34.34	56.03	68.68	72.30	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	15.8	40.9	67.4	1.2	3.6	21.5	37.1	39.8	78.7	
		Rate (people)	22.2	49.9	74.2	1.9	5.2	29.1	45.6	48.4	70.7	
	59	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)									—	
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)				_						
Ru	66	Line	28.25	42.38	56.51	_	19.46	31.76	38.93	40.98		
		Rate (HHs)	32.7	69.4	88.4		6.8	43.5	62.4	66.4		
		Rate (people)	37.9	74.5	92.0		8.4	49.5	67.5	71.3		
	68	Line	36.26	54.39	72.51	31.50	24.98	40.76	49.96	52.59		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	25.8	63.5	83.6	14.0	4.7	36.4	57.6	60.9	—	68.8
		Rate (people)	31.2	70.5	88.0	17.3	5.8	42.3	65.3	68.0		60.0
	59	Line							_			_
		Rate (HHs)				—					—	
		Rate (people)									—	
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)									—	
Ħ		Rate (people)				—						
A	66	Line	33.25	49.87	66.49	_	22.97	37.48	45.95	48.36		
		Rate (HHs)	30.8	61.5	80.6		7.5	39.5	55.6	59.4		
		Rate (people)	37.2	68.1	86.1	_	9.7	46.6	62.3	65.9		
	68	Line	41.56	62.34	83.12	30.94	28.71	46.85	57.43	60.45	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	21.2	53.2	76.2	8.2	4.2	29.6	48.3	51.3	78.7	68.8
		Rate (people)	27.6	62.3	82.5	11.1	5.5	37.0	57.4	60.2	70.7	60.0

<u>Gujarat</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

MMRP poverty lines (Rs/person/day) and poverty rates (%) Region **R68** Round Percentile lines $20^{ ext{th}}$ 40^{th} 80^{th} 50^{th} 60^{th} Line/rate 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Urban Rate (people) 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 32.6847.1577.1041.9853.81Rate (HHs) 2.68.8 13.718.944.0Rate (people) 12.23.919.426.453.559 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) Rural 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 34.20 43.9449.3556.3380.70 Rate (HHs) 19.644.156.464.787.7 Rate (people) 23.750.263.971.490.7 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) All 66 Line Rate (HHs) ____ Rate (people) 68 Line 55.3379.26 33.60 43.1648.47Rate (HHs) 11.928.037.043.967.8 46.275.9 Rate (people) 15.835.053.5

<u>Gujarat</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates (%								tes (%)				
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	15.54	16.68	33.37	15.67	14.78	11.09	18.48	22.17	29.56	19.45
		Rate (HHs)	5.0	7.8	50.1	5.0	4.3	1.4	10.5	20.3	39.0	13.5
		Rate (people)	8.3	12.9	57.1	8.3	7.6	1.6	16.0	28.2	46.3	18.5
	62	Line	16.97	18.53	37.05	17.41	16.47	12.35	20.59	24.71	32.95	21.62
		Rate (HHs)	10.2	11.6	50.9	10.6	9.5	3.7	17.6	28.0	44.4	18.6
an		Rate (people)	13.5	15.3	56.6	14.0	12.3	5.1	22.6	34.2	50.8	23.7
Url	66	Line	23.96	26.15	52.30	24.58	23.15	17.36	28.94	34.73	46.30	32.07
		Rate (HHs)	4.5	9.3	44.9	4.8	4.2	0.8	14.6	22.5	40.0	18.3
		Rate (people)	5.5	11.7	53.7	5.9	5.0	1.0	18.2	28.6	48.5	23.0
	68	Line	28.36	30.96	61.92	29.10	27.41	20.56	34.26	41.11	54.82	38.43
		Rate (HHs)	1.4	2.6	26.5	2.2	1.2	0.1	4.5	8.9	18.7	7.3
		Rate (people)	2.4	4.1	32.8	3.6	2.1	0.1	6.6	12.2	23.8	10.3
	59	Line	12.74	14.47	28.93	13.10	13.59	10.20	16.99	20.39	27.19	16.72
		Rate (HHs)	4.9	9.2	64.2	5.1	5.5	1.1	18.1	37.3	55.3	17.1
		Rate (people)	5.7	11.3	73.3	5.9	6.5	1.3	22.1	44.3	64.0	21.0
	62	Line	14.02	15.89	31.78	14.28	14.83	11.12	18.53	22.24	29.65	18.22
		Rate (HHs)	19.7	21.2	78.5	19.7	20.1	4.3	34.8	48.8	76.0	33.8
ral		Rate (people)	20.6	22.0	82.0	20.6	21.1	5.1	36.0	52.0	79.3	35.0
\mathbf{R}	66	Line	20.60	23.36	46.72	20.99	21.81	16.35	27.26	32.71	43.61	26.03
		Rate (HHs)	7.0	10.9	57.7	7.6	8.6	1.6	18.5	30.1	53.1	16.3
		Rate (people)	8.3	12.6	60.2	9.0	10.1	2.0	21.0	32.9	55.7	18.6
	68	Line	24.16	27.39	54.79	24.61	25.59	19.19	31.99	38.38	51.18	33.37
		Rate (HHs)	1.9	4.7	39.4	1.9	2.2	0.3	7.8	15.1	34.3	9.0
		Rate (people)	2.4	6.1	46.2	2.4	2.9	0.3	10.1	18.7	41.1	11.6
	59	Line	13.44	15.02	30.03	13.73	13.89	10.42	17.36	20.83	27.78	17.40
		Rate (HHs)	4.9	8.8	60.3	5.0	5.2	1.1	16.0	32.5	50.8	16.1
		Rate (people)	6.3	11.7	69.3	6.5	6.8	1.4	20.5	40.3	59.6	20.4
	62	Line	14.75	16.54	33.09	15.05	15.23	11.43	19.04	22.85	30.47	19.07
		Rate (HHs)	17.1	18.6	71.0	17.2	17.2	4.2	30.2	43.2	67.5	29.7
Ħ		Rate (people)	18.9	20.3	75.7	19.0	18.9	5.1	32.7	47.6	72.2	32.2
A	66	Line	21.61	24.19	48.39	22.06	22.21	16.66	27.76	33.31	44.42	27.83
		Rate (HHs)	6.2	10.4	53.5	6.7	7.2	1.4	17.3	27.6	48.8	16.9
		Rate (people)	7.5	12.4	58.3	8.1	8.5	1.7	20.2	31.6	53.5	19.9
	68	Line	25.43	28.47	56.94	25.97	26.14	19.60	32.67	39.21	52.28	34.90
		Rate (HHs)	1.7	4.0	35.1	2.0	1.8	0.2	6.7	13.0	29.0	8.4
_		Rate (people)	2.4	5.5	42.2	2.7	2.6	0.2	9.1	16.8	35.9	11.2

Haryana: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates (%)									
n	р				R66 1	Legacy						
ŝ	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	ntl. 2005 PF	PP				
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50				
	59	Line		—			—					
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line	_									
		Rate (HHs)		—			—					
oan		Rate (people)		—			—					
\mathbf{Ur}	66	Line	32.07	48.10	64.14	37.97	57.11	75.94				
		Rate (HHs)	9.5	25.4	46.9	15.7	37.7	64.7				
		Rate (people)	13.1	31.6	55.9	20.2	44.4	69.2				
	68	Line	38.43	57.65	76.87	45.51	68.45	91.02				
		Rate (HHs)	4.4	15.5	33.4	6.8	25.8	44.4				
		Rate (people)	7.0	20.9	41.2	10.0	33.2	52.7				
	59	Line	_	_			_	_				
		Rate (HHs)		—			—					
		Rate (people)		—			—					
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)		—								
ral		Rate (people)	—	—			—	—				
Ru	66	Line	26.03	39.04	52.05	32.00	48.13	64.00				
		Rate (HHs)	12.0	40.5	59.9	23.8	55.3	76.4				
		Rate (people)	13.6	43.7	64.5	25.4	60.2	80.5				
	68	Line	33.37	50.05	66.74	41.03	61.71	82.06				
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	27.1	49.6	14.3	44.2	65.2				
		Rate (people)	6.7	31.1	55.3	16.9	49.8	71.6				
	59	Line	_	_			_	_				
		Rate (HHs)	_									
		Rate (people)	_	_			_					
	62	Line		_			_					
		Rate (HHs)		_			_					
Π		Rate (people)		_			_	_				
A	66	Line	27.77	41.66	55.55	33.73	50.73	67.46				
		Rate (HHs)	11.2	35.6	55.7	21.1	49.6	72.6				
		Rate (people)	13.4	40.2	62.0	23.9	55.7	77.2				
	68	Line	34.89	52.33	69.78	42.37	63.73	84.75				
		Rate (HHs)	5.4	23.2	44.1	11.8	38.0	58.2				
		Rate (people)	6.8	28.0	51.1	14.9	44.8	65.9				

<u>Haryana</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

ц			100	erty inte	s (ns/pe	15011/ day in wiw	R68	isumpu	UII) all	u poven	sy rates (/0)
610	nne		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
Re	$\mathbf{R}0$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)				—						
nac		Rate (people)										
Url	66	Line	41.93	62.90	83.87		29.06	47.42	58.13	61.19		
		Rate (HHs)	19.4	42.8	70.3		7.7	25.0	38.2	41.6		
		Rate (people)	24.8	49.7	73.8		10.8	31.1	44.8	48.5		
	68	Line	50.25	75.37	100.49	30.52	34.83	56.82	69.65	73.32	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	10.8	32.7	50.7	1.1	3.4	14.6	26.7	31.0	58.3	
		Rate (people)	15.3	40.5	60.7	1.6	5.7	19.7	34.1	38.5	51.2	
	59	Line	_	_	_			_		_	_	
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				—						
ral	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				—						
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{H}}$	66	Line	28.92	43.38	57.84		19.92	32.51	39.85	41.95		
		Rate (HHs)	17.2	49.2	68.9		3.2	24.9	42.6	46.3		
		Rate (people)	19.3	53.3	73.8	—	3.5	26.8	46.3	50.1		
	68	Line	37.08	55.62	74.16	32.22	25.55	41.68	51.09	53.78		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	9.5	34.1	58.8	5.3	1.0	15.0	28.2	32.6		42.5
		Rate (people)	11.0	39.0	64.6	6.1	1.4	17.7	32.2	37.2		33.3
	59	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)	—									
Ħ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	32.69	49.03	65.37	_	22.57	36.82	45.14	47.52		
		Rate (HHs)	17.9	47.1	69.3		4.6	24.9	41.2	44.7		
		Rate (people)	20.9	52.3	73.8	—	5.6	28.0	45.8	49.6		
	68	Line	41.03	61.54	82.06	31.71	28.33	46.22	56.66	59.64	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	9.9	33.6	56.1	3.9	1.8	14.9	27.7	32.0	58.3	42.5
		Rate (people)	12.3	39.5	63.4	4.7	2.7	18.3	32.8	37.6	51.2	33.3

Haryana: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP poverty lines (Rs/person/day) and poverty rates (%)									
n	pī				$\mathbf{R68}$							
ŝ	unc			I	Percentile line	es						
Re	Rc	Line/rate	20^{th}	40^{th}	$50^{ ext{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	80^{th}					
	59	Line		—								
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)					_					
Urb	66	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	68	Line	33.14	42.57	47.81	54.57	78.18					
		Rate (HHs)	2.6	6.1	9.2	12.6	34.2					
		Rate (people)	4.3	9.0	13.0	17.4	42.1					
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)					_					
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
[a]		Rate (people)										
Ruı	66	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	68	Line	34.98	44.94	50.47	57.60	82.53					
		Rate (HHs)	8.2	19.1	27.6	37.7	65.3					
		Rate (people)	9.4	22.1	31.6	42.8	71.6					
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)					_					
	62	Line					_					
		Rate (HHs)		—	—	—						
П		Rate (people)	—			—	—					
A	66	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	68	Line	34.43	44.23	49.67	56.69	81.22					
		Rate (HHs)	6.3	14.8	21.4	29.3	54.8					
_		Rate (people)	7.9	18.1	26.0	35.2	62.7					

<u>Haryana</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	erson/day in MRP consumption) and poverty r						tes (%)
E	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			R66
10.	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}_{0}	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	15.54	17.58	35.16	15.67	15.34	11.50	19.17	23.01	30.68	18.81
		Rate (HHs)	0.1	0.9	42.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	4.1	13.2	31.7	4.1
		Rate (people)	0.1	1.6	57.7	0.1	0.1	0.0	6.0	20.4	46.2	6.0
	62	Line	16.97	19.52	39.04	17.41	17.10	12.82	21.37	25.64	34.19	20.91
		Rate (HHs)	2.8	7.0	28.8	3.7	2.8	2.1	9.7	11.6	22.5	9.2
<u>an</u>		Rate (people)	1.5	6.7	34.8	2.8	1.5	0.6	10.1	13.2	29.9	9.7
Urł	66	Line	23.96	27.56	55.11	24.58	24.03	18.02	30.03	36.04	48.05	29.20
		Rate (HHs)	2.7	5.7	30.9	3.2	2.7	0.5	8.7	13.6	24.3	6.7
		Rate (people)	5.2	10.3	43.2	5.9	5.2	1.2	15.6	22.0	36.2	12.5
	68	Line	28.36	32.62	65.25	29.10	28.45	21.33	35.56	42.67	56.89	34.98
		Rate (HHs)	0.6	2.5	20.4	1.1	1.0	0.3	3.1	6.7	15.0	3.1
		Rate (people)	1.0	3.5	32.5	2.0	1.8	0.5	4.4	10.2	24.8	4.3
	59	Line	12.91	16.82	33.64	12.45	15.80	11.85	19.75	23.70	31.60	16.43
		Rate (HHs)	4.0	19.0	69.8	2.8	14.8	2.0	30.0	43.2	66.6	17.1
		Rate (people)	6.6	24.7	79.8	4.1	20.0	2.7	37.9	52.6	77.4	22.6
	62	Line	14.19	18.48	36.95	13.57	17.23	12.92	21.54	25.84	34.46	17.91
		Rate (HHs)	4.6	21.2	73.0	3.1	15.8	2.7	32.9	45.8	69.1	18.8
ral		Rate (people)	6.9	26.2	79.5	4.7	20.0	4.1	40.2	55.8	76.3	23.5
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{H}}$	66	Line	20.87	27.16	54.32	19.95	25.34	19.01	31.68	38.01	50.68	23.28
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	14.8	67.4	2.7	10.4	2.1	26.6	40.9	62.4	6.6
		Rate (people)	4.9	19.3	75.6	3.8	14.2	2.9	33.3	50.2	70.7	9.1
	68	Line	24.47	31.85	63.70	23.40	29.74	22.30	37.17	44.61	59.48	30.02
		Rate (HHs)	1.5	9.4	63.6	0.9	5.4	0.4	17.9	34.9	57.3	6.1
_		Rate (people)	2.0	13.2	71.6	1.3	7.5	0.6	23.7	42.8	66.2	8.5
	59	Line	13.16	16.89	33.79	12.76	15.75	11.82	19.69	23.63	31.51	16.66
		Rate (HHs)	3.6	16.9	66.6	2.5	13.1	1.8	27.0	39.8	62.6	15.6
		Rate (people)	5.9	22.5	77.6	3.7	18.1	2.4	34.8	49.5	74.4	21.0
	62	Line	14.41	18.56	37.12	13.87	17.22	12.91	21.52	25.83	34.44	18.15
		Rate (HHs)	4.4	19.6	68.1	3.2	14.3	2.6	30.3	42.0	63.9	17.7
≓		Rate (people)	6.4	24.7	76.0	4.6	18.5	3.8	37.9	52.4	72.6	22.4
A	66	Line	21.13	27.19	54.39	20.35	25.23	18.92	31.53	37.84	50.45	23.79
		Rate (HHs)	3.4	13.8	63.5	2.7	9.6	1.9	24.7	38.0	58.4	6.6
		Rate (people)	4.9	18.5	72.8	4.0	13.4	2.8	31.8	47.7	67.7	9.4
	68	Line	24.89	31.94	63.87	24.02	29.60	22.20	37.00	44.40	59.20	30.55
		Rate (HHs)	1.4	8.4	57.3	1.0	4.8	0.4	15.8	30.8	51.1	5.6
_		Rate (people)	1.9	12.1	67.3	1.4	6.9	0.6	21.6	39.3	61.7	8.0

<u>Himachal Pradesh</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

<u>Himachal Pradesh</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

		-	Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates (%)									
u	p				R66 1	Legacy						
Gić	uno		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	ntl. 2005 PF	P				
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50				
	59	Line			—							
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
oan		Rate (people)			—							
\mathbf{Url}	66	Line	29.20	43.81	58.41	34.58	52.01	69.16				
		Rate (HHs)	4.7	18.2	27.1	9.4	23.9	34.8				
		Rate (people)	8.1	30.1	42.2	14.8	37.6	50.4				
	68	Line	34.98	52.47	69.96	41.42	62.30	82.84				
		Rate (HHs)	2.3	7.0	17.0	3.3	13.3	29.0				
		Rate (people)	4.3	12.0	26.9	6.2	21.0	41.8				
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_				
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)			—	—						
	62	Line			—							
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)			—							
Ru	66	Line	23.28	34.92	46.55	28.62	43.05	57.24				
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	25.1	50.2	9.3	43.5	66.5				
		Rate (people)	4.5	31.5	58.4	11.9	51.7	74.3				
	68	Line	30.02	45.02	60.03	36.91	55.51	73.82				
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	23.4	46.7	11.2	41.0	65.5				
_		Rate (people)	4.9	30.2	55.6	14.8	49.6	73.9				
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)			—							
		Rate (people)			—							
	62	Line			—							
		Rate (HHs)										
П		Rate (people)		_	—		_					
A	66	Line	23.75	35.63	47.51	29.10	43.77	58.20				
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	24.3	47.8	9.3	41.4	63.1				
		Rate (people)	4.8	31.4	57.1	12.2	50.6	72.4				
	68	Line	30.56	45.85	61.13	37.41	56.26	74.81				
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	21.0	42.4	10.0	36.9	60.1				
		Rate (people)	4.8	28.2	52.4	13.9	46.4	70.4				

		/	Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	erson/day in MN	IRP cor	isumpti	ion) and	d pover	ty rates (%)
n	q						R68		,			
Bio	uno		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urt	66	Line	38.74	58.12	77.49		26.85	43.81	53.71	56.53		
		Rate (HHs)	13.2	26.2	43.6		3.3	18.2	24.8	25.2		
		Rate (people)	22.4	40.9	59.6		6.5	30.1	38.6	39.3		
	68	Line	46.41	69.61	92.82	28.19	32.17	52.48	64.33	67.72	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	5.0	16.9	38.9	0.0	1.0	7.0	14.0	15.7	81.8	
		Rate (people)	8.8	26.8	52.7	0.0	2.0	12.0	21.9	24.4	71.9	
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
al		Rate (people)				_						
Rur	66	Line	27.19	40.79	54.38		18.73	30.56	37.47	39.44		
		Rate (HHs)	7.3	39.7	62.7		0.6	15.3	31.4	35.9		
		Rate (people)	9.2	47.5	70.4		0.9	19.6	38.2	43.3		
	68	Line	35.07	52.60	70.13	30.47	24.16	39.42	48.32	50.86		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	8.3	36.5	61.2	3.5	1.0	14.2	29.8	33.6		56.7
		Rate (people)	11.0	44.9	69.9	4.9	1.5	19.2	37.6	41.8		47.2
	59	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
	-	Rate (HHs)										
_		Rate (people)										
Al	66	Line	28.12	42.18	56.24		19.39	31.63	38.77	40.81		
	00	Rate (HHs)	8.0	38.2	60.7		0.9	15.6	30.7	34.8		
		Rate (people)	10.2	47.0	69.6		1.3	20.4	38.2	43.0		
	68	Line	36.32	54.48	72,63	30.22	25.04	40.86	50.08	52.72	438.36	273.97
	50	Rate (HHs)	7.8	33.6	57.9	2.9	1.0	13.2	27.5	30.9	81.8	56.7
		Rate (people)	10.8	42.9	68.0	4.4	1.5	18.4	35.9	39.9	71.9	47.2

<u>Himachal Pradesh</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (R	ks/person/day	7) and poverty	γ rates (%)
n	рі				R68		
Si Si	uno			I	Percentile line	s	
Re	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	40^{th}	50^{th}	60^{th}	80^{th}
	59	Line	—		—		
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)					
Urt	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	_				
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	30.61	39.32	44.16	50.41	72.21
		Rate (HHs)	0.4	3.1	4.6	6.6	21.4
		Rate (people)	0.8	5.9	8.3	11.4	31.8
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)		—			
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—	—		
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	—
	68	Line	33.08	42.50	47.73	54.48	78.05
		Rate (HHs)	5.9	19.2	28.1	38.9	69.8
		Rate (people)	8.0	25.4	35.6	47.4	77.9
	59	Line	_				_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Π		Rate (people)					—
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—	—		—	—
	68	Line	32.81	42.15	47.33	54.03	77.40
		Rate (HHs)	5.1	16.9	24.7	34.2	62.7
		Rate (people)	7.2	23.3	32.6	43.4	72.8

<u>Himachal Pradesh</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	rson/day in	in MRP consumption) and poverty ra					tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
ği	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	15.54	17.58	35.16	17.20	15.74	11.80	19.67	23.60	31.47	18.72
		Rate (HHs)	3.8	6.2	40.8	6.2	3.8	2.9	8.2	13.0	34.3	6.6
		Rate (people)	7.6	10.5	46.0	10.5	7.6	6.4	14.4	20.6	39.8	11.2
	62	Line	16.97	19.52	39.04	19.11	17.54	13.15	21.92	26.31	35.08	20.81
		Rate (HHs)	1.8	3.2	52.4	3.2	2.1	0.1	7.6	16.5	40.5	5.4
nac		Rate (people)	2.1	4.1	60.1	4.1	2.7	0.2	9.1	21.3	48.4	6.7
Urł	66	Line	23.96	27.56	55.11	26.98	24.65	18.49	30.81	36.97	49.29	27.79
		Rate (HHs)	4.5	10.5	61.3	9.9	5.5	0.5	16.1	29.8	53.3	10.7
		Rate (people)	5.6	12.5	69.7	11.9	6.6	0.8	20.0	35.9	62.2	12.7
	68	Line	28.36	32.62	65.25	31.94	29.18	21.89	36.48	43.77	58.37	32.48
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	6.5	46.6	6.1	3.8	0.7	10.1	20.0	38.9	6.5
		Rate (people)	3.1	7.2	54.1	6.6	3.9	0.3	11.9	25.0	46.2	7.2
	59	Line	12.91	16.82	33.64	12.36	15.23	11.42	19.03	22.84	30.46	16.49
		Rate (HHs)	4.8	20.3	81.1	4.7	10.1	2.9	28.8	48.9	73.0	19.7
		Rate (people)	6.5	23.7	84.0	6.4	12.4	3.9	30.8	52.3	76.5	22.9
	62	Line	14.19	18.48	36.95	13.47	16.61	12.45	20.76	24.91	33.21	17.98
		Rate (HHs)	3.0	12.5	83.4	1.3	7.7	0.7	20.2	46.3	77.7	11.9
ral		Rate (people)	3.9	14.7	87.9	1.6	9.0	0.8	26.0	50.8	82.1	14.1
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	20.87	27.16	54.32	19.80	24.42	18.32	30.53	36.64	48.85	23.77
		Rate (HHs)	2.1	13.0	82.5	1.7	7.3	1.2	24.0	45.6	74.7	6.1
		Rate (people)	3.0	16.1	85.9	2.3	9.2	1.7	29.1	52.4	80.0	8.1
	68	Line	24.47	31.85	63.70	23.22	28.66	21.50	35.83	42.99	57.33	29.29
		Rate (HHs)	4.0	13.1	74.2	3.1	9.2	1.8	19.7	37.5	67.2	9.8
		Rate (people)	4.9	15.7	79.1	3.7	10.7	2.2	23.4	43.2	72.6	11.5
	59	Line	13.45	16.98	33.96	13.36	15.33	11.50	19.17	23.00	30.67	16.95
		Rate (HHs)	4.6	17.0	71.6	5.0	8.6	2.9	24.0	40.4	63.9	16.6
		Rate (people)	6.7	21.0	76.1	7.2	11.4	4.4	27.4	45.8	68.9	20.5
	62	Line	14.72	18.67	37.35	14.54	16.78	12.59	20.98	25.18	33.57	18.52
		Rate (HHs)	2.7	10.5	76.8	1.7	6.5	0.5	17.5	40.0	69.8	10.5
≓		Rate (people)	3.5	12.7	82.6	2.1	7.8	0.7	22.8	45.2	75.7	12.7
A	66	Line	21.59	27.25	54.50	21.47	24.48	18.36	30.60	36.71	48.95	24.71
		Rate (HHs)	2.7	12.4	77.1	3.8	6.8	1.1	22.0	41.6	69.3	7.2
		Rate (people)	3.6	15.3	82.1	4.5	8.6	1.5	27.0	48.5	75.8	9.2
	68	Line	25.34	32.03	64.05	25.17	28.78	21.58	35.97	43.17	57.56	30.01
		Rate (HHs)	3.8	11.5	67.4	3.8	7.9	1.5	17.3	33.2	60.3	9.0
_		Rate (people)	4.5	13.8	73.5	4.4	9.2	1.8	20.9	39.1	66.7	10.6

Jammu and Kashmir: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households
			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day i	n MMRP) and	d poverty r	ates (%)
n	p				$\mathbf{R66}$	Legacy		
ŝ	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	P
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line	—	—				
		Rate (HHs)		—				
an		Rate (people)		—				
Urł	66	Line	27.79	41.69	55.59	32.91	49.50	65.82
		Rate (HHs)	7.5	30.0	55.2	14.8	44.9	66.8
		Rate (people)	9.1	36.7	62.9	17.7	52.8	74.6
	68	Line	32.48	48.72	64.96	38.46	57.85	76.93
		Rate (HHs)	5.1	20.4	40.3	10.1	30.4	51.1
		Rate (people)	5.8	24.5	47.0	12.3	36.2	59.1
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		_	_			
ral		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
Ruı	66	Line	23.77	35.65	47.53	29.22	43.95	58.45
		Rate (HHs)	5.3	34.2	63.8	14.2	56.9	80.6
		Rate (people)	6.4	38.2	67.0	16.9	60.9	83.0
	68	Line	29.29	43.94	58.59	36.02	54.17	72.04
		Rate (HHs)	5.3	28.7	57.7	13.4	50.2	74.2
		Rate (people)	7.1	34.0	64.3	15.9	56.9	80.5
	59	Line		_	_			
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
Π		Rate (people)						
V	66	Line	24.72	37.08	49.43	30.09	45.26	60.19
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	33.1	61.6	14.4	53.9	77.1
		Rate (people)	7.0	37.8	66.0	17.1	59.0	81.0
	68	Line	30.02	45.04	60.05	36.58	55.02	73.16
		Rate (HHs)	5.2	26.6	53.4	12.5	45.3	68.5
_		Rate (people)	6.8	31.8	60.3	15.1	52.2	75.6

Jammu and Kashmir: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

г			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	erson/day in MIN	$\frac{1 \text{RP cor}}{1 \text{RP cor}}$	isumpti	ion) and	a poveri	ty rates (%)
rior	und		Nation	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI	D	B	BI
Reg	Roi	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urb	66	Line	39.46	59.20	78.93		27.35	44.63	54.71	57.59		
		Rate (HHs)	26.4	60.1	80.1		7.0	36.8	54.4	58.5		
		Rate (people)	32.7	68.0	84.7		8.4	43.7	61.9	66.6		
	68	Line	46.13	69.20	92.27	28.02	31.98	52.17	63.95	67.32	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	18.1	44.2	63.1	2.3	5.0	24.2	38.8	43.1	68.7	
		Rate (people)	21.6	51.9	71.6	2.3	5.8	29.3	45.7	50.6	62.5	
	59	Line	_	_	—		—	-	_	_	_	-
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	27.87	41.80	55.73		19.20	31.32	38.40	40.42		
		Rate (HHs)	12.1	51.6	76.1		1.2	21.7	41.9	47.4		
		Rate (people)	13.8	56.0	78.3		1.7	25.0	46.6	51.9		
	68	Line	34.34	51.51	68.68	29.83	23.66	38.60	47.32	49.81		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	10.3	45.3	72.0	5.6	1.7	17.4	35.4	41.8		51.1
_		Rate (people)	12.5	51.9	78.5	7.4	2.7	20.7	41.5	48.4		43.2
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)			—							
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
п		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	30.60	45.90	61.20	_	21.12	34.46	42.24	44.47		
		Rate (HHs)	15.7	53.7	77.1		2.7	25.5	45.1	50.2		
		Rate (people)	18.3	58.8	79.8		3.3	29.4	50.2	55.4		
	68	Line	37.05	55.57	74.09	29.42	25.57	41.71	51.13	53.82	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	12.2	45.0	69.8	4.8	2.5	19.1	36.2	42.1	68.7	51.1
		Rate (people)	14.6	51.9	76.9	6.2	3.4	22.6	42.4	48.9	62.5	43.2

Jammu and Kashmir: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	verty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	$v \ rates \ (\%)$
nc	р				R68		
gi	unc			1	Percentile line	s	
Re	Rc	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	40^{th}	$50^{ m th}$	60^{th}	80^{th}
	59	Line			—		
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—		
an		Rate (people)			—		
Urb	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	68	Line	30.43	39.09	43.90	50.11	71.79
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	11.0	16.4	21.5	46.8
		Rate (people)	3.9	13.5	19.3	25.7	54.9
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			_		
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			
		Rate (people)				—	
	68	Line	32.39	41.61	46.74	53.35	76.43
		Rate (HHs)	7.7	24.9	34.1	48.9	78.7
		Rate (people)	9.8	29.5	39.9	55.5	84.0
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—	—	—	—	_
		Rate (people)		—	—		
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Ħ		Rate (people)					
Α	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.94	41.03	46.09	52.60	75.36
		Rate (HHs)	6.7	21.5	29.8	42.2	70.8
_		Rate (people)	8.5	25.8	35.2	48.7	77.3

Jammu and Kashmir: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/per	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
. <u>ö</u>	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Intl}	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	${f Line/rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	14.04	14.97	29.95	14.01	13.44	10.08	16.80	20.16	26.88	16.50
		Rate (HHs)	9.0	10.7	57.2	9.0	7.6	3.0	21.3	31.9	44.4	20.7
		Rate (people)	13.3	15.8	70.2	13.3	11.7	4.8	30.2	42.9	55.3	29.6
	62	Line	15.34	16.63	33.25	15.58	14.98	11.24	18.73	22.47	29.96	18.34
		Rate (HHs)	10.8	12.8	52.1	11.0	9.1	4.0	17.2	27.6	46.0	15.6
an		Rate (people)	16.1	18.3	65.2	16.3	13.5	6.4	24.0	39.6	58.4	21.9
Urt	66	Line	21.65	23.47	46.94	21.99	21.05	15.79	26.32	31.58	42.11	27.33
		Rate (HHs)	13.5	16.6	54.4	15.2	11.9	3.8	23.0	33.9	49.3	24.6
		Rate (people)	17.1	21.0	62.6	19.3	15.2	5.5	28.4	40.4	57.7	31.0
	68	Line	25.63	27.79	55.57	26.03	24.93	18.70	31.16	37.39	49.86	32.02
		Rate (HHs)	9.1	12.5	46.5	10.1	8.2	0.8	15.1	24.6	41.1	18.9
		Rate (people)	11.5	16.6	56.8	13.1	10.1	1.0	19.9	31.7	51.2	24.8
	59	Line	11.70	13.82	27.64	11.58	12.98	9.74	16.23	19.48	25.97	12.78
		Rate (HHs)	35.7	57.1	93.6	33.7	50.7	20.2	72.3	83.6	92.3	48.9
		Rate (people)	42.5	63.6	95.4	40.6	56.8	24.5	78.9	87.5	94.3	55.2
	62	Line	12.87	15.18	30.36	12.62	14.16	10.62	17.70	21.24	28.32	13.93
		Rate (HHs)	36.6	54.7	96.1	34.3	46.9	15.5	68.9	85.5	95.0	44.5
ral		Rate (people)	40.6	60.3	96.7	38.0	52.0	17.2	72.4	88.4	96.1	49.2
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	18.91	22.31	44.63	18.55	20.83	15.62	26.03	31.24	41.65	20.26
		Rate (HHs)	30.1	45.9	93.3	29.1	37.5	14.1	62.8	77.1	91.6	35.7
		Rate (people)	35.7	52.2	95.8	34.8	43.5	17.1	70.1	81.9	94.6	41.4
	68	Line	22.18	26.17	52.34	21.75	24.44	18.33	30.55	36.66	48.88	24.59
		Rate (HHs)	24.2	40.6	92.5	21.9	35.1	7.3	59.5	74.6	90.1	35.7
_		Rate (people)	27.2	46.1	95.0	25.1	40.3	8.4	65.3	79.9	93.4	40.8
	59	Line	12.14	14.04	28.08	12.04	13.07	9.80	16.34	19.61	26.14	13.49
		Rate (HHs)	30.3	47.7	86.2	28.7	42.0	16.7	62.0	73.1	82.6	43.1
		Rate (people)	37.0	54.5	90.6	35.4	48.2	20.8	69.7	79.1	86.9	50.3
	62	Line	13.31	15.44	30.88	13.15	14.31	10.73	17.88	21.46	28.61	14.72
		Rate (HHs)	31.4	46.3	87.2	29.6	39.2	13.2	58.5	73.8	85.1	38.6
₽		Rate (people)	36.2	52.8	91.0	34.1	45.1	15.3	63.8	79.6	89.3	44.4
A	66	Line	19.46	22.55	45.09	19.24	20.87	15.65	26.09	31.31	41.74	21.68
		Rate (HHs)	26.7	39.8	85.3	26.3	32.2	11.9	54.6	68.2	82.9	33.4
		Rate (people)	32.0	46.0	89.2	31.7	37.8	14.8	61.7	73.5	87.1	39.3
	68	Line	22.89	26.50	53.01	22.64	24.54	18.41	30.68	36.81	49.08	26.13
		Rate (HHs)	20.8	34.2	82.0	19.2	29.0	5.8	49.3	63.1	78.9	31.8
_		Rate (people)	24.0	40.0	87.1	22.6	34.0	6.8	56.0	69.9	84.7	37.5

<u>Jharkhand</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day i	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	rates (%)
uc	р				R66]	Legacy		
ègi	our		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	Ir	tl. 2005 PF	PP
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)		—			—	—
Urt	66	Line	27.33	40.99	54.65	32.36	48.67	64.72
		Rate (HHs)	23.7	44.7	63.1	29.5	54.3	72.5
		Rate (people)	28.3	50.9	69.6	35.2	59.5	78.7
	68	Line	32.02	48.03	64.04	37.92	57.03	75.84
		Rate (HHs)	12.9	29.8	47.4	20.3	39.0	60.0
		Rate (people)	17.7	38.6	57.4	26.7	48.7	71.2
	59	Line	_	_		_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				—
	62	Line						_
		Rate (HHs)						
<u>ral</u>		Rate (people)	—	—	_			_
Ruı	66	Line	20.26	30.39	40.52	24.91	37.47	49.83
		Rate (HHs)	29.2	67.5	84.4	51.1	80.7	91.8
		Rate (people)	33.8	73.3	87.2	56.8	84.4	92.8
	68	Line	24.59	36.89	49.18	30.24	45.48	60.48
		Rate (HHs)	21.7	67.7	87.1	43.3	83.8	94.5
		Rate (people)	25.2	72.8	91.0	47.7	88.3	96.3
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		_			_	
	62	Line		_				_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				—
A	66	Line	21.68	32.52	43.36	26.41	39.72	52.81
		Rate (HHs)	28.1	62.8	80.0	46.6	75.3	87.8
		Rate (people)	32.7	68.8	83.7	52.5	79.4	90.0
	68	Line	26.17	39.25	52.33	31.87	47.93	63.73
		Rate (HHs)	19.7	59.0	78.0	38.0	73.5	86.6
		Rate (people)	23.6	65.6	83.9	43.2	79.9	91.0

<u>Jharkhand</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

ц			1.00	erty inte	s (ns/pe	ison/day in wiw	R68	isumpu	ion) and	u poven	ty lates (/0)
gio	m		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
Re	$\mathbf{R}0$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	${<}100\%$ natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Dan		Rate (people)										
Urt	66	Line	35.71	53.56	71.41		24.75	40.38	49.50	52.10		
		Rate (HHs)	37.1	62.7	76.1		19.3	43.7	58.1	61.2		
		Rate (people)	42.6	69.5	81.7		23.5	49.8	65.3	67.9		
	68	Line	41.82	62.73	83.64	25.40	28.99	47.29	57.97	61.02	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	24.6	45.9	65.6	5.6	8.6	29.4	40.0	44.9	84.6	
_		Rate (people)	31.3	56.6	75.1	8.5	12.1	38.1	50.3	55.9	76.3	
	59	Line	_	_	—					—	—	_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	24.48	36.72	48.97		16.87	27.52	33.74	35.51		
		Rate (HHs)	49.9	79.4	91.6		10.4	59.8	75.5	76.9		
		Rate (people)	55.8	83.5	92.7		11.9	65.7	80.1	81.2		
	68	Line	29.72	44.58	59.44	25.82	20.48	33.41	40.95	43.11		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	41.3	81.8	94.2	26.3	9.3	55.4	77.9	80.4		91.6
_		Rate (people)	45.9	86.4	96.0	30.3	11.5	60.2	82.7	85.0		86.3
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ħ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	26.73	40.10	53.47		18.45	30.10	36.90	38.84		
		Rate (HHs)	47.3	75.9	88.4		12.3	56.5	71.9	73.7		
		Rate (people)	53.1	80.7	90.5		14.2	62.5	77.1	78.5		
	68	Line	32.29	48.43	64.57	25.73	22.28	36.35	44.56	46.91	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	37.5	73.6	87.7	21.5	9.2	49.4	69.2	72.3	84.6	91.6
_		Rate (people)	42.8	80.1	91.6	25.7	11.7	55.5	75.8	78.8	76.3	86.3

<u>Jharkhand</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP pc	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day) and poverty	v rates (%)
n	p				R68		
ğic	un			I	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	\mathbf{R}	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line			—		
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)	—		—		
Urb	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					_
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	27 58	35.43	39.80	45 42	65.08
	00	Bate (HHs)	7 2	16.1	22.0	28.0	48.3
		Rate (people)	10.5	21.5	28.5	36.1	58.7
	50	Lino					
	09	Bato (HHs)					
		Rate (neonle)					
	<u>co</u>	reate (people)					
	62	Line Data (IIIIa)					
-		Rate (nns)					
ura		reace (people)					
Ц	66	Line					
		Rate (HHS)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	28.04	36.02	40.45	46.17	66.15
		Rate (HHs)	36.3	63.8	77.0	84.4	96.0
		Rate (people)	41.0	69.5	81.9	88.9	97.5
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ц		Rate (people)				—	
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)				—	
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	27.94	35.89	40.31	46.01	65.92
		Rate (HHs)	29.7	52.9	64.4	71.5	85.1
		Rate (people)	34.5	59.4	70.6	77.7	89.3

<u>Jharkhand</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per)	person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty						tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	18.91	17.10	34.19	18.62	15.22	11.42	19.03	22.83	30.44	18.26
		Rate (HHs)	21.7	14.4	58.2	21.2	10.0	2.7	22.1	31.8	53.1	18.5
		Rate (people)	28.0	20.5	67.5	27.6	14.7	3.5	28.6	40.1	62.0	25.3
	62	Line	20.66	18.98	37.97	20.70	16.96	12.72	21.21	25.45	33.93	20.30
		Rate (HHs)	20.7	17.6	56.9	20.7	12.6	4.5	22.2	31.5	51.3	19.8
an		Rate (people)	26.0	21.4	63.4	26.0	16.0	5.9	27.2	37.0	57.0	24.8
Urb	66	Line	29.16	26.80	53.59	29.22	23.84	17.88	29.80	35.76	47.68	29.85
		Rate (HHs)	13.7	10.1	43.7	13.8	6.9	1.7	14.5	22.1	37.4	14.5
		Rate (people)	18.5	14.1	51.9	18.6	10.0	2.6	19.5	28.4	45.7	19.5
	68	Line	34.52	31.72	63.45	34.59	28.23	21.17	35.29	42.34	56.46	35.80
		Rate (HHs)	9.7	7.2	40.9	9.7	4.7	0.7	10.3	17.5	35.3	11.0
		Rate (people)	13.7	10.7	48.8	13.7	6.6	1.1	14.5	23.1	42.6	15.3
_	59	Line	10.87	15.02	30.04	10.24	14.11	10.58	17.64	21.17	28.23	13.20
		Rate (HHs)	9.5	36.2	89.9	5.8	32.0	7.9	53.8	69.2	87.8	26.2
		Rate (people)	11.9	42.8	92.3	7.4	38.9	9.7	59.8	73.7	90.8	31.7
	62	Line	11.96	16.49	32.99	11.16	15.39	11.54	19.24	23.09	30.78	14.38
		Rate (HHs)	16.3	47.1	89.4	13.7	40.0	14.5	65.1	75.3	88.8	32.4
ral		Rate (people)	18.7	52.1	92.2	16.0	44.9	16.8	69.7	78.9	91.6	36.3
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	17.58	24.25	48.50	16.40	22.64	16.98	28.29	33.95	45.27	20.69
		Rate (HHs)	11.3	36.9	88.9	6.7	28.5	8.9	54.2	70.1	86.8	20.8
		Rate (people)	14.4	43.2	92.0	8.4	34.8	11.1	59.8	75.5	90.1	26.1
	68	Line	20.62	28.44	56.88	19.24	26.56	19.92	33.21	39.85	53.13	29.65
		Rate (HHs)	1.7	14.8	77.6	0.8	10.2	1.0	28.6	45.6	73.7	18.3
		Rate (people)	2.0	19.7	82.5	0.8	14.5	1.2	36.6	53.7	78.9	24.5
	59	Line	13.33	15.65	31.31	12.80	14.45	10.84	18.06	21.68	28.90	14.74
		Rate (HHs)	13.5	29.0	79.4	10.9	24.7	6.1	43.3	56.8	76.3	23.7
		Rate (people)	16.8	36.0	84.7	13.6	31.5	7.8	50.3	63.4	82.0	29.7
	62	Line	14.42	17.20	34.40	13.86	15.84	11.88	19.80	23.75	31.67	16.06
		Rate (HHs)	17.7	37.9	79.2	15.9	31.4	11.4	51.7	61.6	77.1	28.5
Ħ		Rate (people)	20.8	43.4	84.0	18.8	36.7	13.7	57.7	67.0	81.8	33.0
Ø	66	Line	21.62	25.14	50.27	20.88	23.06	17.29	28.82	34.58	46.11	23.89
		Rate (HHs)	12.2	26.5	71.5	9.4	20.2	6.1	38.8	51.6	67.7	18.3
		Rate (people)	15.8	33.1	78.0	12.0	26.2	8.1	45.8	59.1	74.6	23.8
	68	Line	25.66	29.63	59.26	24.80	27.17	20.38	33.96	40.75	54.33	31.88
		Rate (HHs)	4.8	11.8	63.3	4.3	8.0	0.9	21.4	34.6	58.7	15.5
_		Rate (people)	6.2	16.4	70.3	5.5	11.6	1.2	28.6	42.6	65.7	21.2

Karnataka: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day ii	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	ates (%)
n	р				R66]	Legacy		
ģi	unc		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)		—				
Urb	66	Line	29.85	44.78	59.70	35.35	53.16	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	11.7	28.5	46.7	17.3	39.1	56.5
		Rate (people)	16.0	35.7	55.6	23.1	47.3	66.8
	68	Line	35.80	53.70	71.61	42.39	63.76	84.79
		Rate (HHs)	9.1	26.8	38.3	15.5	34.1	46.9
		Rate (people)	12.5	35.2	48.5	20.8	43.9	57.7
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)	—	—				—
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)		_		_	_	
ral		Rate (people)						—
Ruı	66	Line	20.69	31.04	41.39	25.44	38.27	50.89
		Rate (HHs)	13.1	52.2	73.7	30.9	68.6	85.6
		Rate (people)	15.6	56.6	77.2	36.1	72.2	88.8
	68	Line	29.65	44.48	59.31	36.46	54.84	72.93
		Rate (HHs)	11.3	47.1	74.0	24.5	69.7	83.6
		Rate (people)	14.6	53.3	79.1	29.5	75.0	87.6
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—			_	
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)						
Π		Rate (people)	_	_				_
A	66	Line	23.97	35.95	47.93	28.98	43.59	57.97
		Rate (HHs)	12.5	43.0	63.3	25.6	57.2	74.4
		Rate (people)	15.8	49.1	69.5	31.5	63.3	80.9
	68	Line	31.78	47.67	63.56	38.51	57.92	77.03
		Rate (HHs)	10.4	39.2	60.1	21.0	55.8	69.3
		Rate (people)	13.9	47.1	68.5	26.5	64.2	77.3

Karnataka: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

ч	F		1.00	erty inte	s (ns/pe	ison/day in wit	R68	isumpu	on) and	u poven	ty rates (/0)
gioi	unc		Nation	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	B	BI
Re	Ro	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
<u> </u>	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				—						
		Rate (HHs)										
nac		Rate (people)										
Urł	66	Line	37.66	56.49	75.32		26.10	42.59	52.21	54.95		
		Rate (HHs)	21.0	42.9	62.4		7.4	26.3	38.1	40.8		
		Rate (people)	27.3	51.2	71.4		10.6	33.3	46.4	48.8		
	68	Line	45.15	67.72	90.30	27.42	31.29	51.06	62.59	65.88	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	18.8	36.6	50.1	2.5	5.1	24.2	33.0	35.7	73.6	
		Rate (people)	25.1	46.5	61.1	3.6	7.3	32.2	42.6	45.7	70.9	
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	22.38	33.57	44.77		15.42	25.16	30.84	32.46		
		Rate (HHs)	19.5	58.6	79.2		2.3	29.6	50.8	56.0		
		Rate (people)	23.7	62.9	82.9		3.2	34.7	56.0	60.4		
	68	Line	32.07	48.10	64.14	27.86	22.09	36.05	44.19	46.51		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	15.0	54.2	77.5	7.3	0.5	22.6	46.1	50.8		76.3
_		Rate (people)	19.6	60.0	82.8	9.2	0.7	28.2	52.4	56.9		67.0
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ħ		Rate (people)										
4	66	Line	27.84	41.77	55.69		19.24	31.39	38.48	40.50		
		Rate (HHs)	20.1	52.5	72.7		4.2	28.3	45.9	50.1		
		Rate (people)	25.0	58.7	78.8		5.8	34.2	52.6	56.3		
	68	Line	36.59	54.88	73.18	27.71	25.27	41.23	50.55	53.21	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	16.5	47.3	66.8	5.5	2.3	23.2	41.0	44.9	73.6	76.3
		Rate (people)	21.5	55.3	75.3	7.2	3.0	29.6	49.0	53.0	70.9	67.0

<u>Karnataka</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP pc	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
uc	р				R68		
ŝ	unc			I	Percentile line	s	
R	Rc	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	40^{th}	50^{th}	60^{th}	80^{th}
	59	Line		—			
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—	—		—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	
	68	Line	29.78	38.25	42.96	49.04	70.25
		Rate (HHs)	4.0	10.3	16.3	22.3	37.6
		Rate (people)	5.6	14.1	21.7	29.8	47.8
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—	—	—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	
Rur	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	68	Line	30.25	38.86	43.65	49.82	71.38
		Rate (HHs)	12.0	31.3	44.7	59.1	82.6
		Rate (people)	15.6	37.0	51.0	65.0	86.9
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Ξ		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	
Α	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	30.09	38.65	43.41	49.55	70.99
		Rate (HHs)	8.9	23.1	33.6	44.7	65.0
		Rate (people)	12.2	29.1	40.9	52.9	73.4

Karnataka: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/per	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption)	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
ŝi.	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Intl}	l. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.64	17.98	35.96	17.37	15.96	11.97	19.95	23.94	31.91	18.16
		Rate (HHs)	10.0	10.2	52.5	9.4	5.2	1.2	14.6	26.1	42.7	10.9
		Rate (people)	15.3	15.7	60.5	14.6	8.7	2.5	21.1	34.3	51.3	16.9
	62	Line	19.27	19.97	39.93	19.31	17.78	13.34	22.23	26.68	35.57	20.18
		Rate (HHs)	11.3	12.6	51.6	11.3	7.2	3.8	14.7	27.9	45.5	12.9
an		Rate (people)	14.2	15.5	60.3	14.2	9.4	5.0	18.3	32.9	53.3	15.8
Urt	66	Line	27.20	28.18	56.37	27.26	24.99	18.74	31.24	37.49	49.99	27.31
		Rate (HHs)	8.8	10.6	44.9	8.8	5.9	1.1	15.5	23.7	38.0	8.9
		Rate (people)	11.9	14.0	53.6	12.0	8.4	2.2	20.3	30.1	46.3	12.1
	68	Line	32.20	33.37	66.73	32.27	29.59	22.19	36.99	44.39	59.18	32.45
		Rate (HHs)	3.4	4.3	37.0	3.5	2.4	0.7	6.8	14.5	29.8	3.5
		Rate (people)	4.9	6.1	47.0	5.0	3.1	0.8	10.1	20.5	39.3	5.0
	59	Line	13.16	17.41	34.82	13.58	16.36	12.27	20.45	24.53	32.71	16.97
		Rate (HHs)	6.6	18.2	66.4	7.0	13.6	5.2	28.3	39.3	60.7	16.0
		Rate (people)	9.1	23.6	71.6	9.6	17.6	7.0	34.2	46.1	66.3	20.8
	62	Line	14.48	19.12	38.24	14.81	17.84	13.38	22.30	26.76	35.67	18.50
		Rate (HHs)	7.0	16.2	65.5	7.3	12.5	4.7	27.6	40.2	61.8	14.6
ral		Rate (people)	9.1	20.4	71.9	9.6	16.6	6.3	31.9	45.6	67.6	18.9
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	21.28	28.11	56.21	21.76	26.23	19.68	32.79	39.35	52.47	25.49
		Rate (HHs)	3.9	13.1	61.0	4.2	9.6	2.5	22.0	35.8	56.8	8.6
		Rate (people)	5.6	17.2	67.7	6.3	13.1	3.9	27.0	42.3	63.7	12.0
	68	Line	24.96	32.96	65.93	25.53	30.79	23.09	38.48	46.18	61.57	33.47
		Rate (HHs)	2.2	7.1	53.1	2.3	5.3	1.2	14.2	26.7	47.7	7.7
_		Rate (people)	2.7	8.6	61.0	2.9	6.4	1.5	17.5	33.0	55.8	9.2
	59	Line	14.27	17.55	35.10	14.52	16.26	12.19	20.32	24.39	32.51	17.26
		Rate (HHs)	7.5	16.2	62.8	7.7	11.5	4.1	24.7	35.9	56.1	14.7
		Rate (people)	10.7	21.6	68.9	10.8	15.4	5.9	31.0	43.2	62.6	19.8
	62	Line	15.50	19.30	38.60	15.77	17.83	13.37	22.28	26.74	35.65	18.86
		Rate (HHs)	8.0	15.4	62.3	8.2	11.2	4.5	24.6	37.3	58.0	14.2
≓		Rate (people)	10.2	19.4	69.4	10.6	15.0	6.0	29.0	42.9	64.5	18.2
A	66	Line	22.82	28.13	56.25	23.19	25.91	19.43	32.39	38.87	51.82	25.96
		Rate (HHs)	5.2	12.4	56.7	5.4	8.6	2.2	20.3	32.6	51.8	8.6
		Rate (people)	7.3	16.4	64.0	7.8	11.9	3.5	25.3	39.2	59.2	12.0
	68	Line	26.86	33.07	66.14	27.30	30.47	22.85	38.09	45.71	60.95	33.20
		Rate (HHs)	2.5	6.3	48.6	2.6	4.5	1.1	12.1	23.3	42.7	6.6
		Rate (people)	3.3	7.9	57.3	3.4	5.5	1.3	15.5	29.7	51.5	8.1

Kerala: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	ates (%)
n	p				R66 1	Legacy		
ŝ	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	Ir	ntl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)		—				
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		—			—	
		Rate (HHs)		—		_	—	—
an		Rate (people)		—			—	
Urł	66	Line	27.31	40.97	54.62	32.34	48.64	64.68
		Rate (HHs)	7.2	21.4	37.3	11.7	29.2	48.7
		Rate (people)	10.0	29.3	46.7	16.2	38.0	58.2
	68	Line	32.45	48.67	64.90	38.42	57.79	76.85
		Rate (HHs)	3.0	16.0	30.8	5.3	23.6	40.0
		Rate (people)	4.0	21.0	39.3	7.1	30.9	49.2
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
ral		Rate (people)		—			—	
Ru	66	Line	25.49	38.23	50.98	31.34	47.14	62.68
		Rate (HHs)	5.6	26.6	48.1	14.0	41.9	62.6
		Rate (people)	6.7	32.2	55.7	17.1	49.0	69.7
	68	Line	33.47	50.20	66.94	41.15	61.89	82.30
		Rate (HHs)	4.5	24.3	44.5	12.4	39.2	60.8
		Rate (people)	6.0	30.0	51.4	16.0	46.2	67.7
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line	_					
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
Π		Rate (people)		—				
A	66	Line	25.96	38.95	51.93	31.60	47.53	63.20
		Rate (HHs)	6.0	25.2	45.2	13.4	38.5	58.9
		Rate (people)	7.6	31.4	53.3	16.8	46.1	66.7
	68	Line	33.20	49.80	66.40	40.43	60.81	80.86
		Rate (HHs)	4.1	22.0	40.7	10.4	34.9	55.0
		Rate (people)	5.5	27.6	48.2	13.7	42.1	62.8

Kerala: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)											
ц	р						R68							
Gio	um		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI		
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural		
	59	Line				_								
		Rate (HHs)												
		Rate (people)												
	62	Line												
		Rate (HHs)												
an		Rate (people)												
Urb	66	Line	37.47	56.21	74.95	_	25.97	42.38	51.95	54.68				
		Rate (HHs)	17.0	38.7	56.2		6.2	23.2	32.9	37.3				
		Rate (people)	23.9	48.5	65.3		8.6	31.3	41.8	46.7				
	68	Line	44.50	66.76	89.01	27.03	30.85	50.33	61.69	64.94	438.36			
		Rate (HHs)	11.6	32.2	50.4	1.3	2.5	17.2	27.7	30.8	69.2			
		Rate (people)	15.3	41.0	60.0	1.5	3.4	22.7	35.9	39.4	64.4			
	59	Line		_	_	_	_		_					
		Rate (HHs)												
		Rate (people)												
	62	Line												
		Rate (HHs)												
ral		Rate (people)				_								
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	26.40	39.60	52.80	_	18.19	29.68	36.38	38.29				
		Rate (HHs)	6.1	29.2	51.0		0.9	10.9	23.3	26.8				
		Rate (people)	7.4	35.1	58.7		1.2	13.3	28.5	32.4				
	68	Line	34.65	51.98	69.31	30.11	23.87	38.95	47.75	50.26		273.97		
		Rate (HHs)	5.5	26.3	47.4	3.0	0.8	10.8	20.3	24.3		49.3		
		Rate (people)	7.1	32.1	54.4	3.8	0.8	14.1	25.5	30.0		42.4		
	59	Line						_				_		
		Rate (HHs)												
		Rate (people)												
	62	Line												
		Rate (HHs)												
п		Rate (people)												
A	66	Line	29.29	43.94	58.58	_	20.22	32.99	40.44	42.57				
		Rate (HHs)	9.0	31.8	52.4		2.3	14.2	25.9	29.6				
		Rate (people)	11.7	38.6	60.4		3.1	18.0	32.0	36.1				
	68	Line	37.26	55.89	74.52	29.29	25.72	41.96	51.44	54.15	438.36	273.97		
		Rate (HHs)	7.2	28.0	48.3	2.5	1.3	12.6	22.3	26.1	69.2	49.3		
_		Rate (people)	9.3	34.5	55.9	3.2	1.5	16.3	28.2	32.5	64.4	42.4		

Kerala: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP pc	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
u	p				$\mathbf{R68}$		
.ö	uno			I	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ ext{th}}$	$50^{ ext{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line		—			—
		Rate (HHs)		—			—
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	29.35	37.71	42.35	48.34	69.25
		Rate (HHs)	2.1	5.0	9.6	15.4	34.0
		Rate (people)	2.5	6.6	12.6	20.1	42.8
	59	Line	_		_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—		—	—	
	68	Line	32.69	42.00	47.17	53.83	77.13
		Rate (HHs)	4.0	13.6	19.5	28.4	54.3
		Rate (people)	5.4	17.6	24.5	34.4	61.2
	59	Line	—		—	—	—
		Rate (HHs)		—			—
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Π		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.81	40.86	45.89	52.38	75.04
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	11.2	16.7	24.7	48.7
_		Rate (people)	4.6	14.7	21.4	30.6	56.3

Kerala: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and pover								verty ra	tes (%)			
n	p		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
. <u>ö</u>	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Intl}	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	${f Line/rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.64	17.98	35.96	17.37	15.96	11.97	19.95	23.94	31.91	18.16
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	40.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	22.0	37.5	0.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	50.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	25.0	43.8	0.0
	62	Line	19.27	19.97	39.93	19.31	17.78	13.34	22.23	26.68	35.57	20.18
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	5.8	39.9	3.5	2.6	1.6	9.3	15.1	25.1	5.8
an		Rate (people)	7.5	10.8	54.7	7.5	6.0	3.8	17.2	23.4	35.4	10.8
Urł	66	Line	27.20	28.18	56.37	27.26	24.99	18.74	31.24	37.49	49.99	27.31
		Rate (HHs)	0.4	1.1	36.4	0.4	0.4	0.0	1.8	6.5	27.3	0.4
		Rate (people)	1.0	1.8	47.4	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	11.7	38.2	1.0
	68	Line	32.20	33.37	66.73	32.27	29.59	22.19	36.99	44.39	59.18	32.45
		Rate (HHs)	2.1	2.4	28.9	2.1	1.4	0.0	4.5	9.5	20.0	2.1
		Rate (people)	3.4	4.1	40.6	3.4	2.1	0.0	8.1	16.5	30.6	3.4
	59	Line	13.16	17.41	34.82	13.58	16.36	12.27	20.45	24.53	32.71	16.97
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	69.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	14.5	47.3	0.0
	62	Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	81.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	11.9	60.6	0.0
		Line	14.48	19.12	38.24	14.81	17.84	13.38	22.30	26.76	35.67	18.50
		Rate (HHs)	0.8	0.8	20.4	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.9	19.3	20.4	0.8
ral		Rate (people)	1.6	1.6	37.4	1.6	1.6	1.6	4.5	35.8	37.4	1.6
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	21.28	28.11	56.21	21.76	26.23	19.68	32.79	39.35	52.47	25.49
		Rate (HHs)	0.4	8.4	56.4	0.4	8.4	0.0	18.8	21.9	49.6	8.4
		Rate (people)	0.9	20.6	77.2	0.9	20.6	0.0	34.3	38.1	69.2	20.6
	68	Line	24.96	32.96	65.93	25.53	30.79	23.09	38.48	46.18	61.57	33.47
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	33.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	5.8	29.4	0.0
_		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	42.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	4.5	36.9	0.0
	59	Line	15.37	17.69	35.38	15.45	16.16	12.12	20.20	24.24	32.32	17.55
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	53.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	18.6	41.9	0.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	66.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	18.4	52.4	0.0
	62	Line	16.82	19.53	39.07	17.01	17.81	13.36	22.26	26.72	35.62	19.32
		Rate (HHs)	2.0	3.1	29.4	2.0	1.6	1.2	5.3	17.4	22.6	3.1
Ħ		Rate (people)	4.5	6.1	45.9	4.5	3.7	2.6	10.7	29.7	36.4	6.1
A	66	Line	24.28	28.15	56.29	24.54	25.61	19.20	32.01	38.41	51.21	26.41
		Rate (HHs)	0.4	5.0	47.1	0.4	4.6	0.0	10.8	14.7	39.2	4.6
		Rate (people)	1.0	11.1	62.1	1.0	10.7	0.0	18.4	24.7	53.5	10.7
	68	Line	28.59	33.16	66.33	28.91	30.19	22.64	37.73	45.28	60.38	32.96
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	1.2	31.3	1.0	0.7	0.0	2.2	7.5	25.0	1.0
_		Rate (people)	1.7	2.0	41.3	1.7	1.1	0.0	4.1	10.5	33.7	1.7

Lakshadweep: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

National Tendulkar Intl. 2005 H Intl. Intl. Intl. In	PPP \$2.50
National Tendulkar Intl. 2005 H Angle Line/rate 100% 150% 200% \$1.25 \$1.88	PPP \$2.50
$\underline{\breve{\alpha}} \ \underline{\breve{\alpha}} \ \underline{\text{Line}/\text{rate}} \ 100\% \ 150\% \ 200\% \ \underline{\$1.25} \ \underline{\$1.88}$	\$2.50
50 Line	
9a rue — — — — — —	
Rate (HHs) — — — — — — — —	
Rate (people) — — — — — — — —	
62 Line — — — — — — —	
Rate (HHs) — — — — — — —	
Rate (people) — # # # <	—
$\stackrel{()}{=}$ 66 Line 27.31 40.97 54.62 32.34 48.64	64.68
Rate (HHs) 1.9 8.6 30.5 2.5 19.2	42.9
Rate (people) 3.1 13.3 37.9 3.9 22.6	50.1
68 Line 32.45 48.67 64.90 38.42 57.79	76.85
Rate (HHs) 0.0 5.8 19.8 1.4 14.9	34.6
Rate (people) 0.0 7.9 30.3 2.2 23.9	51.2
59 Line — — — — — —	
Rate (HHs)	
Rate (people) — — — — — — —	
62 Line — — — — — —	
Rate (HHs)	
Rate (people) — — — — — —	_
E 66 Line 25.49 38.23 50.98 31.34 47.14	62.68
Rate (HHs) 0.0 15.6 38.0 1.1 34.3	51.7
Rate (people) 0.0 18.9 51.9 2.1 46.9	64.4
68 Line 33.47 50.20 66.94 41.15 61.89	82.30
Rate (HHs) 0.4 5.3 22.4 0.4 16.7	43.2
Rate (people) 0.6 3.8 28.6 0.6 18.5	58.2
59 Line — — — — — —	
Rate (HHs)	
Rate (people) — — — — — — —	
62 Line — — — — — — —	
Rate (HHs)	
Rate (people) — — — — — —	
₹ 66 Line 26.33 39.49 52.65 31.80 47.83	63.60
Rate (HHs) 0.9 12.3 34.5 1.7 27.2	47.6
Rate (people) 1.4 16.3 45.4 2.9 35.7	57.8
68 Line 33.00 49.50 66.00 39.89 60.00	79.79
Rate (HHs) 0.2 5.6 21.2 0.9 15.8	39.1
Rate (people) 0.3 5.7 29.4 1.3 21.0	54.9

Lakshadweep: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

_			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	rson/day in MN	$\frac{1 \text{RP cor}}{1 \text{P68}}$	isumpti	ion) and	d povert	y rates (%)	
tior	pur		Nation	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1108	Intl 20	11 PPI	5	B	RBI	
Seg	Roi	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	< 100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
an		Rate (people)											
Urb	66	Line	37.47	56.21	74.95		25.97	42.38	51.95	54.68			
		Rate (HHs)	6.0	31.7	53.3		1.2	9.4	26.3	30.5			
		Rate (people)	9.5	39.5	60.1		1.9	14.7	29.7	37.9			
	68	Line	47.96	71.94	95.91	29.13	33.24	54.23	66.48	69.98	438.36		
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	28.9	47.2	0.0	0.0	12.6	24.4	28.4	52.8		
		Rate (people)	7.9	43.0	63.3	0.0	0.0	19.0	35.2	42.4	39.0		
	59	Line	_	_	_		_		_	_	_	_	
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
ral		Rate (people)				—							
Ru	66	Line	26.40	39.60	52.80		18.19	29.68	36.38	38.29			
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	16.9	38.6		0.0	0.0	15.6	16.9			
		Rate (people)	0.0	21.4	52.3	—	0.0	0.0	18.9	21.4			
	68	Line	43.65	65.48	87.31	37.93	30.07	49.07	60.15	63.32		273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	0.4	21.6	52.9	0.4	0.0	5.3	13.5	18.0		36.4	
		Rate (people)	0.6	28.1	67.7	0.6	0.0	3.8	14.2	20.9		18.4	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)			—								
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
Ħ		Rate (people)				—							
A	66	Line	31.50	47.24	62.99		21.77	35.52	43.54	45.83			
		Rate (HHs)	2.8	23.8	45.5		0.5	4.4	20.6	23.3			
		Rate (people)	4.4	29.7	55.9		0.9	6.8	23.9	29.0		—	
	68	Line	45.64	68.46	91.28	33.87	31.54	51.45	63.07	66.39	438.36	273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	3.0	25.1	50.2	0.2	0.0	8.8	18.7	22.9	52.8	36.4	
		Rate (people)	4.0	35.0	65.7	0.3	0.0	10.8	23.9	30.8	39.0	18.4	

Lakshadweep: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

Lakshadweep: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	v rates (%)
n	١d				R68		
Gi	uno			I	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	50^{th}	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			—
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	68	Line	31.63	40.63	45.63	52.09	74.62
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	1.4	5.8	9.2	32.1
		Rate (people)	0.0	2.2	7.9	12.3	48.5
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line		—			—
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)		—		—	—
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line		—			—
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	41.18	52.90	59.41	67.82	97.16
		Rate (HHs)	0.4	10.1	13.5	22.4	63.3
_	_	Rate (people)	0.6	8.3	14.2	28.6	78.1
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
L I		Rate (people)					
V	66	Line		—			—
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	36.77	47.24	53.06	60.56	86.76
		Rate (HHs)	0.2	6.0	9.9	16.1	48.5
		Rate (people)	0.3	5.5	11.3	21.1	64.4

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in								y in MRP consumption) and poverty rates $(\%)$				
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
ği	umo		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Intl}	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	${f Line/rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.81	14.96	29.91	17.71	13.63	10.23	17.04	20.45	27.27	16.53
		Rate (HHs)	31.1	19.2	55.4	30.9	15.3	3.2	27.5	38.8	52.5	26.5
		Rate (people)	36.7	23.4	61.8	36.6	19.2	4.8	33.3	44.0	58.9	31.8
	62	Line	19.45	16.61	33.22	19.68	15.19	11.40	18.99	22.79	30.39	18.37
		Rate (HHs)	25.2	16.3	62.9	25.6	11.7	3.3	23.8	36.1	58.6	21.9
nac		Rate (people)	30.8	19.7	72.4	31.2	14.2	4.5	28.9	42.7	67.7	26.7
Url	66	Line	27.46	23.44	46.89	27.78	21.35	16.02	26.69	32.03	42.71	25.37
		Rate (HHs)	23.0	14.6	53.6	23.6	11.5	3.9	21.8	31.6	47.5	18.0
		Rate (people)	28.8	19.2	62.7	29.8	15.3	5.5	27.6	39.4	56.7	22.9
	68	Line	32.51	27.76	55.51	32.89	25.28	18.96	31.60	37.92	50.57	29.49
		Rate (HHs)	22.3	14.6	56.8	22.8	8.9	1.7	20.6	31.6	51.0	17.0
		Rate (people)	27.1	18.0	65.8	27.7	11.2	1.9	25.5	38.3	59.5	21.0
	59	Line	10.94	13.45	26.90	10.35	12.64	9.48	15.80	18.96	25.28	12.90
		Rate (HHs)	25.5	42.7	92.5	20.9	37.8	14.6	57.0	75.7	91.6	39.0
		Rate (people)	29.1	47.2	94.7	24.3	42.4	17.2	61.3	80.9	93.9	43.5
	62	Line	12.03	14.77	29.54	11.28	13.78	10.34	17.23	20.67	27.57	14.06
		Rate (HHs)	29.3	48.8	92.1	24.3	44.4	17.3	64.0	78.6	90.1	45.0
ral		Rate (people)	33.6	54.2	94.8	27.7	49.7	19.7	70.5	83.3	93.1	50.3
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	17.68	21.71	43.43	16.59	20.27	15.20	25.34	30.41	40.54	20.77
		Rate (HHs)	25.3	43.0	88.8	20.8	36.5	15.8	57.0	71.7	86.2	38.1
		Rate (people)	29.2	47.2	90.9	24.4	40.4	18.5	61.4	75.5	88.8	42.0
	68	Line	20.74	25.47	50.93	19.45	23.79	17.84	29.74	35.69	47.58	25.35
		Rate (HHs)	17.3	32.7	83.8	13.4	26.1	9.2	48.6	63.1	81.3	32.1
_		Rate (people)	20.5	36.2	87.3	16.3	30.3	11.3	53.5	68.8	85.0	35.7
	59	Line	12.48	13.79	27.58	12.01	12.86	9.65	16.08	19.29	25.73	13.71
		Rate (HHs)	26.8	37.0	83.5	23.3	32.3	11.8	49.8	66.7	82.1	36.0
		Rate (people)	30.8	41.8	87.3	27.0	37.2	14.4	55.0	72.6	86.0	40.9
	62	Line	13.75	15.20	30.40	13.24	14.11	10.58	17.64	21.17	28.22	15.06
		Rate (HHs)	28.3	40.6	84.7	24.6	36.2	13.8	53.8	67.9	82.2	39.2
≓		Rate (people)	32.9	46.1	89.6	28.5	41.5	16.2	60.8	73.9	87.2	44.8
A	66	Line	20.06	22.14	44.27	19.31	20.54	15.40	25.67	30.80	41.07	21.89
		Rate (HHs)	24.7	35.9	80.1	21.5	30.3	12.8	48.3	61.8	76.6	33.1
		Rate (people)	29.1	40.4	84.0	25.7	34.3	15.3	53.1	66.7	81.0	37.3
	68	Line	23.74	26.05	52.10	22.88	24.17	18.13	30.21	36.26	48.34	26.40
		Rate (HHs)	18.6	28.0	76.8	15.9	21.6	7.3	41.3	54.9	73.5	28.2
		Rate (people)	22.2	31.6	81.8	19.2	25.4	8.9	46.4	61.0	78.5	32.0

Madhya Pradesh: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

<u>Madhya Pradesh</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates $(\%)$									
n	гq				R66 1	Legacy						
ŝ	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	ntl. 2005 PP	PP				
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50				
	59	Line					—					
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)			—							
an		Rate (people)		_			_					
Urb	66	Line	25.37	38.06	50.74	30.04	45.18	60.08				
		Rate (HHs)	16.4	37.3	54.0	24.2	46.4	61.9				
		Rate (people)	21.0	44.9	62.8	29.9	55.1	70.5				
	68	Line	29.49	44.24	58.98	34.92	52.52	69.84				
		Rate (HHs)	12.7	33.9	51.3	19.5	43.7	60.8				
		Rate (people)	15.4	42.4	59.8	24.4	52.2	69.2				
	59	Line		_	_	_	_	_				
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)		—								
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)	—	—				—				
Ru	66	Line	20.77	31.16	41.55	25.54	38.42	51.09				
		Rate (HHs)	29.7	62.7	79.8	47.8	75.6	88.2				
		Rate (people)	33.5	67.2	84.1	52.3	79.9	91.6				
	68	Line	25.35	38.02	50.70	31.17	46.88	62.33				
		Rate (HHs)	23.2	59.0	78.1	42.0	74.2	88.0				
		Rate (people)	26.6	63.7	82.0	46.2	78.4	91.4				
	59	Line		_	_		_	_				
		Rate (HHs)			—							
		Rate (people)		—	—	—						
	62	Line		_		_						
		Rate (HHs)			—							
Π		Rate (people)	—	—	—			—				
A	66	Line	21.87	32.80	43.73	26.61	40.02	53.22				
		Rate (HHs)	26.4	56.4	73.4	41.9	68.4	81.7				
		Rate (people)	30.5	61.9	79.0	47.0	74.1	86.6				
	68	Line	26.40	39.60	52.80	32.12	48.31	64.24				
		Rate (HHs)	20.5	52.5	71.2	36.2	66.3	80.9				
_		Rate (people)	23.7	58.3	76.3	40.6	71.8	85.7				

ч	Ŧ		1.00	erty inte	s (ns/pe	ison/day in wit	R68	isumpu	ion) and	u poven	ty rates (/0)
<u>.</u>	unc		Nation	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	RJ	BI
Re	Ro	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
<u> </u>	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urł	66	Line	37.93	56.89	75.85		26.29	42.89	52.57	55.34		
		Rate (HHs)	37.0	60.1	74.5		18.0	43.6	55.3	59.2		
		Rate (people)	44.3	68.6	81.9		23.0	52.4	64.0	67.5		
	68	Line	44.06	66.10	88.13	26.77	30.54	49.83	61.08	64.30	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	33.7	57.5	72.4	8.7	14.3	40.9	53.6	56.5	82.7	
		Rate (people)	42.1	65.8	79.9	10.4	17.3	49.1	62.3	64.9	79.0	
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)									—	
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ıral		Rate (people)										
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	25.39	38.09	50.78		17.49	28.54	34.99	36.83		
		Rate (HHs)	47.1	75.4	88.0		16.1	56.4	70.5	73.6		
		Rate (people)	51.6	79.7	91.4		19.0	61.0	75.3	78.0		
	68	Line	30.96	46.44	61.92	26.90	21.33	34.80	42.66	44.91		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	40.9	73.8	87.6	28.2	13.3	49.9	69.0	72.4		89.0
		Rate (people)	45.1	78.1	91.0	31.7	15.6	54.7	73.5	76.7		84.5
	59	Line			_	—						
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)									_	
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
T		Rate (people)			_							
Ч	66	Line	28.36	42.55	56.73		19.58	31.95	39.16	41.22		
		Rate (HHs)	44.6	71.6	84.7		16.6	53.3	66.7	70.1		
		Rate (people)	49.9	77.1	89.2		20.0	59.0	72.7	75.5		
	68	Line	34.29	51.44	68.59	26.86	23.67	38.62	47.35	49.84	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	39.0	69.6	83.7	23.2	13.5	47.6	65.0	68.3	82.7	89.0
_	_	Rate (people)	44.4	75.0	88.2	26.3	16.0	53.3	70.6	73.7	79.0	84.5

<u>Madhya Pradesh</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
nc	ы				$\mathbf{R68}$		
ŝ	Junc			1	Percentile line	s	
R	R	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	40^{th}	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	80^{th}
	59	Line		—			
		Rate (HHs)		—			
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—	—			
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—		—	
	68	Line	29.06	37.33	41.93	47.86	68.57
		Rate (HHs)	11.8	23.1	30.0	38.0	59.7
		Rate (people)	14.3	28.8	37.3	46.4	68.4
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—	—		—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ra.		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—	—			
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	29.21	37.52	42.14	48.10	68.91
		Rate (HHs)	36.0	58.0	68.0	75.5	91.5
		Rate (people)	40.0	62.7	72.5	79.8	94.0
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—		—	—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Ħ		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	29.17	37.47	42.09	48.04	68.82
		Rate (HHs)	29.7	48.9	58.1	65.8	83.2
		Rate (people)	33.5	54.1	63.5	71.3	87.5

<u>Madhya Pradesh</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	erson/day in MRP consumption) and poverty r						tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	19.96	17.94	35.88	20.68	16.12	12.09	20.15	24.18	32.24	19.62
		Rate (HHs)	18.3	14.2	49.3	20.0	9.3	3.1	18.9	26.0	42.5	18.1
		Rate (people)	25.5	20.6	61.4	27.4	13.8	4.9	26.1	35.1	54.1	25.3
	62	Line	21.80	19.92	39.84	22.99	17.96	13.47	22.46	26.95	35.93	21.81
		Rate (HHs)	16.8	12.6	50.3	18.6	8.9	3.3	17.9	26.0	41.4	16.8
an		Rate (people)	23.4	17.9	59.6	25.7	12.3	4.9	24.9	34.7	50.9	23.4
Urb	66	Line	30.77	28.12	56.24	32.45	25.25	18.93	31.56	37.87	50.49	31.60
		Rate (HHs)	12.2	8.7	43.1	13.7	6.1	1.9	12.9	20.0	36.1	13.0
		Rate (people)	17.0	12.3	52.3	19.1	8.7	2.8	18.1	27.2	45.1	18.3
	68	Line	36.43	33.29	66.58	38.41	29.89	22.42	37.36	44.84	59.78	37.02
		Rate (HHs)	6.0	4.1	35.0	7.3	2.2	0.5	6.6	12.2	28.3	6.4
		Rate (people)	8.7	5.9	44.4	10.6	3.3	0.7	9.5	16.9	36.5	9.1
	59	Line	11.19	14.89	29.78	11.44	13.99	10.49	17.49	20.99	27.99	15.31
		Rate (HHs)	14.1	34.7	87.0	15.6	27.8	9.4	49.3	66.2	85.1	37.1
		Rate (people)	17.5	40.5	89.6	19.2	32.9	11.7	55.4	71.5	87.6	43.0
	62	Line	12.31	16.35	32.71	12.47	15.26	11.45	19.08	22.89	30.52	16.69
		Rate (HHs)	11.4	28.7	82.9	11.8	23.3	7.9	41.0	55.4	79.1	29.8
ral		Rate (people)	11.7	32.1	85.4	12.0	26.2	8.3	46.3	60.9	82.6	33.1
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	18.09	24.04	48.08	18.33	22.44	16.83	28.06	33.67	44.89	24.45
		Rate (HHs)	6.0	24.4	81.5	6.6	19.4	3.4	37.2	55.1	78.2	25.5
		Rate (people)	7.9	28.2	85.0	8.6	23.0	4.4	42.8	59.9	82.1	29.5
	68	Line	21.22	28.20	56.39	21.50	26.34	19.75	32.92	39.51	52.68	31.79
		Rate (HHs)	3.6	12.4	73.3	3.8	8.8	3.0	23.0	40.1	67.2	20.6
		Rate (people)	4.6	14.3	78.2	4.7	10.7	3.9	26.7	45.7	72.5	24.2
	59	Line	14.78	16.14	32.28	15.22	14.86	11.15	18.58	22.29	29.73	17.08
		Rate (HHs)	15.9	25.9	70.8	17.5	19.9	6.7	36.3	48.9	66.8	28.9
		Rate (people)	20.8	32.3	78.1	22.5	25.1	8.9	43.4	56.6	73.9	35.8
	62	Line	15.88	17.70	35.39	16.43	16.28	12.21	20.35	24.42	32.55	18.62
		Rate (HHs)	13.5	22.4	70.1	14.5	17.7	6.1	31.9	43.8	64.3	24.7
≓		Rate (people)	16.1	26.8	75.7	17.2	20.9	7.0	38.3	51.0	70.7	29.5
A	66	Line	23.37	25.74	51.48	24.21	23.61	17.71	29.51	35.42	47.22	27.43
		Rate (HHs)	8.7	17.5	64.6	9.7	13.5	2.7	26.5	39.7	59.7	20.0
		Rate (people)	11.7	21.6	71.4	13.0	17.0	3.8	32.5	46.3	66.7	24.8
	68	Line	28.18	30.53	61.05	29.24	27.97	20.97	34.96	41.95	55.93	34.18
		Rate (HHs)	4.7	8.5	55.5	5.4	5.7	1.8	15.4	27.1	49.1	14.0
_		Rate (people)	6.5	10.4	62.8	7.4	7.3	2.4	18.8	32.5	56.0	17.3

Maharashtra: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines $(Rs/p$	erson/day i	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	ates (%)
uc	pt				R66]	Legacy		
ègi	our		\mathbf{Nati}	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	P
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)						
Urb	66	Line	31.60	47.40	63.20	37.42	56.27	74.83
		Rate (HHs)	9.5	27.7	45.5	15.5	38.3	56.6
		Rate (people)	13.1	36.0	55.0	20.9	47.6	65.6
	68	Line	37.02	55.53	74.04	43.84	65.93	87.67
		Rate (HHs)	3.7	16.3	35.6	7.1	27.7	47.2
		Rate (people)	5.2	21.4	44.0	10.0	34.9	57.3
	59	Line	_	_			_	
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						_
η		Rate (HHs)						
ral		Rate (people)		_				—
Ru	66	Line	24.45	36.68	48.90	30.06	45.22	60.13
		Rate (HHs)	15.1	51.2	78.3	31.1	72.5	89.3
		Rate (people)	18.6	57.0	82.8	36.4	77.7	92.1
	68	Line	31.79	47.69	63.58	39.09	58.79	78.18
		Rate (HHs)	11.8	49.2	74.3	27.2	68.9	84.7
		Rate (people)	13.9	55.1	79.1	31.3	74.4	88.4
	59	Line	_	_				_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)	—			_		—
	62	Line				_		
		Rate (HHs)						
Π		Rate (people)						
A	66	Line	27.47	41.21	54.94	33.17	49.89	66.34
		Rate (HHs)	12.6	40.9	63.9	24.3	57.5	74.9
		Rate (people)	16.2	48.1	71.1	29.9	65.0	80.9
	68	Line	34.15	51.23	68.31	41.24	62.02	82.47
		Rate (HHs)	8.1	33.9	56.3	17.9	49.7	67.3
		Rate (people)	10.0	39.9	63.3	21.7	56.5	74.3

<u>Maharashtra</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

		/	Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	rson/day in MN	ARP cor	sumpti	ion) and	d povert	y rates (%)
u	q				· · · -		R68		,			,
gio	uno		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urb	66	Line	43.77	65.65	87.54		30.34	49.50	60.67	63.87		
		Rate (HHs)	22.8	47.9	65.4		8.1	30.1	42.7	46.1		
		Rate (people)	30.1	57.7	73.4		11.3	39.3	52.2	55.7		
	68	Line	51.30	76.95	102.60	31.16	35.56	58.01	71.11	74.86	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	12.6	38.3	57.4	1.8	3.0	19.4	32.9	36.2	66.2	
		Rate (people)	17.0	47.1	67.2	2.6	4.2	25.2	41.1	44.8	60.0	
	59	Line					_			_		
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
,		Rate (HHs)										
al		Rate (people)										
Rur	66	Line	27.26	40.90	54.53		18.78	30.65	37.57	39.55		
		Rate (HHs)	22.9	62.8	85.3		4.9	33.5	53.9	59.7		
		Rate (people)	27.7	68.4	89.0		6.5	39.2	60.0	65.5		
	68	Line	35.45	53.18	70.90	30.80	24.43	39.85	48.85	51.42		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	19.0	60.4	81.0	9.8	2.9	29.1	52.2	57.3		75.5
		Rate (people)	22.5	66.0	85.1	11.8	3.7	33.1	57.6	62.5		67.2
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
_		Rate (people)										
AL	66	Line	34 24	51 36	68 49		23.67	38.62	47.34	49.83		
	00	Rate (HHs)	22.9	56.3	76.5		6.3	32.0	49.0	53.8		
		Rate (people)	28.7	63.9	82.4		8.6	39.2	56.7	61.3		
	68	Line	42.62	63 92	85.23	30.96	29 46	48.06	58 91	62.01	438 36	27397
	00	Rate (HHs)	16.0	50.02	70.0	6.1	2.9	24.6	43.2	47.5	66.2	75.5
		Rate (people)	20.0	57.5	77.0	7.6	3.9	29.5	50.2	54.5	60.0	67.2

<u>Maharashtra</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	verty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	$v ext{ rates } (\%)$
n	p				R68		
ŝ	unc			I	Percentile line	es	
Re	Rc	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	40^{th}	$50^{ ext{th}}$	60^{th}	80^{th}
	59	Line					—
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—		—	
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line				_	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	68	Line	33.83	43.46	48.82	55.72	79.83
		Rate (HHs)	2.4	6.8	10.3	16.6	40.5
		Rate (people)	3.4	9.5	14.2	21.9	49.8
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					_
ral		Rate (people)					
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—		—	—	_
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	33.44	42.96	48.25	55.08	78.91
		Rate (HHs)	14.8	38.1	50.1	63.8	85.4
		Rate (people)	17.7	43.3	55.9	69.2	89.0
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			
П		Rate (people)			—	—	_
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—		—	
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	33.62	43.19	48.51	55.37	79.32
		Rate (HHs)	9.0	23.5	31.6	41.8	64.5
		Rate (people)	11.3	28.0	37.1	47.8	71.3

<u>Maharashtra</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	(Rs/per)	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption)	and pov	verty rat	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}_{0}	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	12.72	17.64	35.29	11.76	15.87	11.90	19.84	23.80	31.74	19.91
		Rate (HHs)	2.5	21.7	88.0	1.4	6.1	1.4	27.1	50.7	73.3	27.4
		Rate (people)	3.8	26.2	89.7	2.4	8.2	2.4	32.3	55.2	77.3	32.6
	62	Line	13.89	19.59	39.18	13.08	17.69	13.26	22.11	26.53	35.37	22.13
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	10.7	84.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	32.0	66.1	81.4	32.0
$\overline{\mathrm{ban}}$		Rate (people)	0.0	13.8	90.2	0.0	3.8	0.0	36.0	72.6	87.4	36.0
Б	66	Line	19.61	27.65	55.31	18.46	24.85	18.64	31.07	37.28	49.71	31.40
		Rate (HHs)	7.9	26.9	90.7	3.1	15.9	3.4	41.4	67.0	86.0	43.0
		Rate (people)	8.6	29.3	93.5	3.7	17.6	4.1	44.8	71.0	89.1	46.4
	68	Line	23.22	32.74	65.48	21.85	29.43	22.07	36.79	44.14	58.86	38.47
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	14.2	83.8	0.6	10.9	0.8	24.0	46.7	78.1	28.4
		Rate (people)	1.3	16.7	87.1	0.8	13.1	1.1	27.3	50.7	81.5	32.4
	59	Line	12.84	15.83	31.65	12.24	14.87	11.15	18.59	22.30	29.74	18.26
		Rate (HHs)	3.6	16.6	91.2	2.5	13.5	0.9	33.4	55.4	86.4	30.5
		Rate (people)	4.2	18.8	93.3	2.9	15.2	1.0	39.2	61.0	89.8	35.9
	62	Line	14.12	17.38	34.76	13.34	16.22	12.16	20.27	24.32	32.43	19.90
		Rate (HHs)	1.8	22.5	95.3	1.3	4.4	0.0	36.3	70.9	94.1	35.0
ral		Rate (people)	1.9	25.4	95.6	1.3	4.7	0.0	40.2	73.9	94.6	38.9
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	20.75	25.55	51.10	19.62	23.85	17.89	29.81	35.77	47.70	28.64
		Rate (HHs)	4.7	26.2	95.0	2.7	18.1	0.2	51.6	75.6	93.0	44.5
		Rate (people)	5.4	28.1	95.8	3.1	19.9	0.4	54.6	78.0	94.2	47.4
	68	Line	24.34	29.97	59.93	23.00	27.99	20.99	34.99	41.98	55.98	36.76
		Rate (HHs)	1.9	13.9	84.8	0.6	9.4	0.1	30.8	53.4	81.2	35.4
_		Rate (people)	2.4	16.2	87.4	0.7	10.8	0.1	34.4	57.3	84.0	38.8
	59	Line	12.80	16.33	32.65	12.11	15.14	11.36	18.93	22.72	30.29	18.71
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	18.0	90.3	2.2	11.4	1.0	31.7	54.1	82.8	29.6
		Rate (people)	4.1	20.8	92.3	2.7	13.3	1.4	37.3	59.4	86.4	35.0
	62	Line	14.07	17.86	35.71	13.29	16.53	12.40	20.66	24.80	33.06	20.38
		Rate (HHs)	1.4	19.9	92.8	1.0	4.0	0.0	35.3	69.8	91.3	34.3
≓		Rate (people)	1.5	22.9	94.5	1.0	4.5	0.0	39.3	73.6	93.1	38.3
A	66	Line	20.46	26.09	52.19	19.32	24.11	18.08	30.14	36.16	48.22	29.35
		Rate (HHs)	5.6	26.4	93.8	2.8	17.5	1.1	48.8	73.2	91.1	44.1
		Rate (people)	6.3	28.4	95.2	3.3	19.3	1.3	52.1	76.2	92.9	47.1
	68	Line	24.04	30.71	61.41	22.70	28.37	21.28	35.47	42.56	56.75	37.21
		Rate (HHs)	1.6	14.0	84.5	0.6	9.8	0.3	28.9	51.5	80.4	33.5
_		Rate (people)	2.1	16.4	87.3	0.7	11.4	0.4	32.5	55.5	83.3	37.1

Manipur: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

		-	Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	rates (%)
n	ы				R66 1	Legacy		
ŝ	uno		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	Ir	ntl. 2005 PF	PP
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		—			—	
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
ban		Rate (people)		_			_	
Ur	66	Line	31.40	47.10	62.79	37.18	55.92	74.36
		Rate (HHs)	40.2	80.0	91.7	66.4	88.1	94.7
		Rate (people)	43.7	84.2	94.6	70.0	91.3	97.2
	68	Line	38.47	57.70	76.93	45.55	68.50	91.10
		Rate (HHs)	24.6	74.3	87.2	48.0	82.0	92.9
		Rate (people)	28.3	78.5	90.6	52.5	85.7	95.4
	59	Line	_					
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	—
ral		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line	—	—			—	
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		_			—	
Ru	66	Line	28.64	42.95	57.27	35.21	52.96	70.42
		Rate (HHs)	35.3	82.7	96.7	63.7	94.6	99.0
		Rate (people)	36.5	84.3	96.9	65.1	95.0	99.2
	68	Line	36.76	55.13	73.51	45.19	67.97	90.39
		Rate (HHs)	23.1	70.3	86.6	50.2	83.2	93.5
		Rate (people)	25.2	72.8	88.6	53.2	85.5	95.2
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line		_	_	_	_	
		Rate (HHs)					—	
п		Rate (people)	—	—			—	—
A	66	Line	29.37	44.05	58.73	35.73	53.74	71.46
		Rate (HHs)	36.7	81.9	95.3	64.5	92.8	97.8
		Rate (people)	38.4	84.3	96.3	66.4	94.1	98.7
	68	Line	37.22	55.83	74.44	45.29	68.12	90.58
		Rate (HHs)	23.5	71.4	86.8	49.6	82.9	93.3
		Rate (people)	26.0	74.4	89.1	53.0	85.6	95.2

<u>Manipur</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

c	7		Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	rson/day in Mik	$\frac{1 \text{RP con}}{\text{R.68}}$	isumpti	ion) and	a poveri	ty rates (70)
gio	nnc		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	${ m Ro}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				—						
	62	Line										
-		Rate (HHs)										
bar		Rate (people)										
Б	66	Line	41.90	62.84	83.79		29.04	47.38	58.08	61.13		
		Rate (HHs)	72.7	91.8	96.1	—	29.2	80.3	89.3	90.8		
		Rate (people)	76.6	94.8	97.9		31.7	84.4	92.5	93.7		
	68	Line	51.35	77.02	102.69	31.19	35.59	58.06	71.18	74.92	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	69.6 79.4	87.2	95.6 07.5	12.9	17.8	74.4	84.5	86.9	94.9	
		Rate (people)	73.4	90.7	97.5	15.0	21.2	78.0	88.2	90.4	93.2	
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
-		Rate (HHS) Rate (people)	_				_				_	
ura		itale (people)										
Ц	66	Line	30.36	45.55	60.73		20.92	34.13	41.84	44.04		
		Rate (HHS) Rate (people)	43.4	87.9 89.0	97.2 97.5		3.9 4.5	59.9 61-2	80.8 82.3	85.7 85.2	_	
	<u>co</u>	rate (people)	20.07	50.0	77.09	99. OF	4.0	42.00	52.0	50.2		079.07
	68	Line Bata (HHs)	38.97 31-7	58.45 74.5	77.93 80 5	33.85 17 5	26.85 5.8	43.80	53.69 68 3	56.52 79-1	_	273.97 67.1
		Rate (neople)	33.9	74.0 77 1	89.5 91.5	17.5	6.8	40.1 49.2	$\frac{08.3}{70.7}$	72.1 74 7		60.8
	50	Lino	00.0		0110	1010	0.0	10.1				0010
	59	Bate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				_						
	62	Line										
	02	Rate (HHs)										
_		Rate (people)										
AL	66	Line	$33 \ 42$	50 13	66 84		23.07	3764	46 14	4857		
	00	Rate (HHs)	51.5	88.9	96.9	_	10.9	65.5	83.1	85.6		
		Rate (people)	53.2	90.6	97.6		11.7	67.3	85.0	87.5		
	68	Line	42.31	63.47	84.63	33.13	29.21	47.66	58.42	61.49	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	42.3	78.1	91.2	16.2	9.2	54.0	72.9	76.2	94.9	67.1
		Rate (people)	44.6	80.8	93.2	18.4	10.7	57.1	75.5	78.9	93.2	60.8

<u>Manipur</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)

			MMRP po	verty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	v rates (%)
u	р				$\mathbf{R68}$		
ŝ	uno			I	Percentile line	es	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	R	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{\mathtt{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line		—	—		
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)		—	—		—
Urb	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	33.86	43.50	48.86	55.77	79.90
		Rate (HHs)	15.1	41.2	59.5	72.7	88.5
		Rate (people)	18.0	45.4	63.8	77.0	91.7
	59	Line					
	00	Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					_
	62	Lino					
	02	Bate (HHs)					
<u>lí</u>		Rate (people)					
Rura	66	Lino					
Ē	00	Bate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	60	Line	26 76	47 00	52.02	CO 52	96 79
	68	Line Data (IIIIa)	30.70	47.22	53.03	00.53 76 9	80.72
		Rate (nns)	23.1 25.2	04.0 58 1	69.7	70.8	92.7 94 5
		Rate (people)	20.2	56.1	09.1	19.0	54.0
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHS)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ЧП		Rate (people)					
7	66	Line			—	—	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	35.98	46.22	51.91	59.25	84.88
		Rate (HHs)	20.9	51.0	64.9	75.6	91.5
		Rate (people)	23.3	54.7	68.1	78.7	93.8

<u>Manipur</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	(Rs/per)	person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty					verty rat	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
Gic	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	12.72	17.64	35.29	11.76	15.87	11.90	19.84	23.80	31.74	23.16
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	1.1	44.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.1	12.6	37.8	8.2
		Rate (people)	0.0	1.7	51.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.7	14.7	44.8	10.7
	62	Line	13.89	19.59	39.18	13.08	17.69	13.26	22.11	26.53	35.37	25.74
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	1.7	32.8	0.0	1.7	0.0	3.1	7.9	26.2	7.8
ban		Rate (people)	0.0	2.8	47.1	0.0	2.7	0.0	4.8	13.7	39.4	13.6
Ы	66	Line	19.61	27.65	55.31	18.46	24.85	18.64	31.07	37.28	49.71	32.54
		Rate (HHs)	0.3	10.8	57.5	0.3	6.1	0.3	16.0	25.8	49.6	16.8
		Rate (people)	0.5	16.8	68.5	0.5	9.9	0.5	23.0	35.0	61.0	23.9
	68	Line	23.22	32.74	65.48	21.85	29.43	22.07	36.79	44.14	58.86	37.94
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	4.1	32.8	0.0	0.6	0.0	5.6	11.2	24.2	5.8
		Rate (people)	0.0	6.8	41.7	0.0	0.9	0.0	8.9	17.0	32.1	9.3
	59	Line	12.84	15.83	31.65	12.24	14.87	11.15	18.59	22.30	29.74	15.89
		Rate (HHs)	3.2	17.0	85.1	1.7	13.6	0.2	35.3	60.4	84.0	17.0
		Rate (people)	3.8	22.5	90.8	2.6	17.2	0.3	42.7	69.8	89.9	22.5
	62	Line	14.12	17.38	34.76	13.34	16.22	12.16	20.27	24.32	32.43	17.33
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	11.6	82.1	1.2	8.0	0.8	29.3	52.8	77.5	11.6
ıral		Rate (people)	5.1	12.6	87.7	1.8	9.2	1.1	34.5	60.6	84.0	12.6
R	66	Line	20.75	25.55	51.10	19.62	23.85	17.89	29.81	35.77	47.70	22.58
		Rate (HHs)	5.0	24.9	91.2	2.5	17.0	1.4	45.4	70.3	88.9	12.3
		Rate (people)	7.0	29.2	94.3	3.7	21.2	2.2	52.3	76.9	92.6	15.3
	68	Line	24.34	29.97	59.93	23.00	27.99	20.99	34.99	41.98	55.98	29.19
		Rate (HHs)	3.2	10.9	84.3	2.3	8.2	1.0	24.8	49.8	78.0	9.9
_		Rate (people)	4.2	13.9	90.0	3.1	10.2	1.1	29.5	56.8	84.6	12.5
	59	Line	12.82	16.06	32.12	12.18	15.00	11.25	18.75	22.50	30.00	16.83
		Rate (HHs)	2.7	14.5	78.8	1.5	11.5	0.2	29.9	53.0	76.8	15.6
		Rate (people)	3.3	19.8	85.7	2.2	15.1	0.3	37.4	62.7	84.1	21.0
	62	Line	14.09	17.67	35.35	13.31	16.41	12.31	20.51	24.61	32.82	18.44
		Rate (HHs)	3.0	10.1	74.4	1.0	7.0	0.7	25.2	45.8	69.5	11.0
Ħ		Rate (people)	4.4	11.3	82.4	1.6	8.4	1.0	30.6	54.4	78.2	12.7
Ā	66	Line	20.56	25.91	51.82	19.42	24.02	18.02	30.03	36.03	48.04	24.27
		Rate (HHs)	4.1	22.4	85.2	2.1	15.1	1.2	40.1	62.3	81.9	13.1
		Rate (people)	5.9	27.1	89.9	3.1	19.3	1.9	47.3	69.8	87.3	16.8
	68	Line	24.10	30.55	61.10	22.76	28.29	21.22	35.36	42.44	56.58	31.04
		Rate (HHs)	2.5	9.5	73.4	1.8	6.6	0.8	20.7	41.6	66.6	9.0
_		Rate (people)	3.3	12.4	79.8	2.4	8.2	0.8	25.1	48.4	73.6	11.8

Meghalaya: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day ii	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	rates (%)
n	р				R66]	Legacy		
ģi	unc		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)						
Urb	66	Line	32.54	48.81	65.08	38.53	57.95	77.07
		Rate (HHs)	12.2	41.7	65.6	19.8	56.2	83.4
		Rate (people)	16.9	51.5	74.3	26.5	65.6	88.2
	68	Line	37.94	56.91	75.88	44.93	67.57	89.85
		Rate (HHs)	6.0	15.7	44.5	8.8	32.0	64.5
		Rate (people)	9.2	21.7	52.3	13.2	39.3	72.5
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				—
	62	Line						_
le		Rate (HHs)						
al		Rate (people)	—					_
Ruı	66	Line	22.58	33.87	45.17	27.77	41.76	55.54
		Rate (HHs)	4.7	45.4	74.7	19.0	67.7	88.9
		Rate (people)	6.8	52.7	81.4	23.2	75.0	93.0
	68	Line	29.19	43.79	58.39	35.90	53.99	71.79
		Rate (HHs)	5.1	42.9	73.3	21.1	65.7	87.4
		Rate (people)	6.6	47.0	78.8	24.1	71.7	90.7
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—			_	
	62	Line	_	_				_
		Rate (HHs)			_			
		Rate (people)	—	—				—
A	66	Line	24.22	36.34	48.45	29.54	44.43	59.08
		Rate (HHs)	6.1	44.7	73.1	19.2	65.6	87.9
		Rate (people)	8.4	52.5	80.2	23.7	73.4	92.2
	68	Line	30.91	46.37	61.82	37.67	56.65	75.34
		Rate (HHs)	5.3	37.1	67.2	18.5	58.6	82.6
		Rate (people)	7.1	42.0	73.6	21.9	65.3	87.1

<u>Meghalaya</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

ч	77		FOV	erty inte	s (ns/pe	ison/day in Mix	R68	sumpu	on) and	u poven	y rates (/0)
gio	nnc		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	${ m Ro}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	100%	150%	200%	${<}100\%$ natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
oan		Rate (people)										
Url	66	Line	42.98	64.47	85.96		29.79	48.60	59.58	62.71		
		Rate (HHs)	29.0	65.6	86.8		11.3	40.7	58.4	64.1		
		Rate (people)	36.6	74.2	91.6		15.8	50.2	67.6	73.0		
	68	Line	50.12	75.17	100.23	30.44	34.74	56.67	69.47	73.13	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	11.4	43.5	70.8	0.6	4.6	15.7	34.4	38.7	70.6	
		Rate (people)	16.7	51.5	80.0	1.0	7.1	21.7	42.0	46.5	64.5	
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)				—						
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ıral		Rate (people)										
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	28.24	42.36	56.48		19.46	31.75	38.91	40.96		
		Rate (HHs)	20.9	67.9	89.0	—	0.4	36.7	61.8	66.4		
		Rate (people)	25.3	75.2	93.1		0.6	43.6	69.8	74.0		
	68	Line	36.52	54.77	73.03	31.73	25.16	41.05	50.31	52.96		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	22.7	67.1	87.9	8.4	2.1	32.3	59.6	63.8		65.5
_		Rate (people)	26.1	72.9	91.2	9.6	3.1	36.4	65.4	69.8		58.3
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ţ		Rate (people)										
ч	66	Line	30.67	46.01	61.34		21.16	34.52	42.32	44.55		
		Rate (HHs)	22.3	67.5	88.6		2.3	37.4	61.2	66.0		
		Rate (people)	27.2	75.0	92.9		3.1	44.7	69.4	73.8		
	68	Line	39.18	58.78	78.37	31.47	27.04	44.11	54.07	56.92	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	20.3	62.1	84.3	6.7	2.6	28.7	54.3	58.5	70.6	65.5
_		Rate (people)	24.3	68.7	89.0	7.9	3.9	33.5	60.8	65.2	64.5	58.3

<u>Meghalaya</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
uc	р				$\mathbf{R68}$		
ŝ	unc			I	Percentile line	s	
R	R	Line/rate	20^{th}	40^{th}	$50^{ ext{th}}$	60^{th}	80^{th}
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—			
		Rate (people)		—			
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)					
Urt	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	33.05	42.46	47.69	54.43	77.98
		Rate (HHs)	3.8	7.9	9.8	14.1	48.3
		Rate (people)	5.7	11.9	14.3	19.8	56.1
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	34.45	44.25	49.70	56.73	81.27
		Rate (HHs)	17.1	45.6	57.9	70.8	92.6
		Rate (people)	19.6	50.1	63.7	76.2	94.8
	59	Line					_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					—
	68	Line	34.17	43.90	49.31	56.28	80.63
		Rate (HHs)	14.3	37.6	47.7	58.8	83.3
		Rate (people)	16.8	42.6	54.0	65.1	87.2

<u>Meghalaya</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	rson/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	p		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			R66
. <u></u>	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993]	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	${f Line/rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	12.72	17.64	35.29	11.76	15.87	11.90	19.84	23.80	31.74	21.73
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.6	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	8.2	32.6	6.6
		Rate (people)	0.0	1.0	56.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	13.0	37.4	10.3
	62	Line	13.89	19.59	39.18	13.08	17.69	13.26	22.11	26.53	35.37	24.15
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.4	26.1	3.3
an		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	40.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.2	30.5	3.2
Urt	66	Line	19.61	27.65	55.31	18.46	24.85	18.64	31.07	37.28	49.71	30.88
		Rate (HHs)	0.5	6.7	46.6	0.4	3.5	0.5	10.6	18.1	36.0	10.6
		Rate (people)	0.5	7.3	50.1	0.4	3.9	0.5	11.6	20.3	37.7	11.5
	68	Line	23.22	32.74	65.48	21.85	29.43	22.07	36.79	44.14	58.86	37.97
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	1.5	39.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	4.4	12.6	30.5	6.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	1.7	41.7	0.0	0.5	0.0	4.6	13.5	32.6	6.4
	59	Line	12.84	15.83	31.65	12.24	14.87	11.15	18.59	22.30	29.74	20.19
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	6.3	74.8	0.8	4.6	0.7	19.5	35.2	70.1	27.4
		Rate (people)	1.3	8.1	81.0	1.1	5.9	1.1	23.7	41.9	78.0	31.9
	62	Line	14.12	17.38	34.76	13.34	16.22	12.16	20.27	24.32	32.43	22.00
		Rate (HHs)	0.5	2.5	72.2	0.5	1.2	0.0	10.6	24.9	63.6	18.3
ral		Rate (people)	0.7	3.2	78.8	0.7	1.6	0.0	12.6	28.4	70.2	21.1
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	20.75	25.55	51.10	19.62	23.85	17.89	29.81	35.77	47.70	27.95
		Rate (HHs)	5.4	17.4	86.0	2.0	14.2	1.0	33.3	56.0	81.5	28.4
		Rate (people)	6.9	19.5	88.4	2.4	16.2	1.1	36.5	59.8	83.8	31.1
	68	Line	24.34	29.97	59.93	23.00	27.99	20.99	34.99	41.98	55.98	35.05
		Rate (HHs)	7.3	18.1	80.0	5.1	14.5	3.0	31.6	52.7	77.0	31.6
		Rate (people)	9.0	21.1	82.5	6.6	16.7	4.0	35.4	56.3	79.6	35.4
	59	Line	12.80	16.45	32.91	12.08	15.22	11.41	19.02	22.82	30.43	20.72
		Rate (HHs)	0.6	4.1	65.4	0.5	2.9	0.5	13.0	24.9	55.9	19.5
		Rate (people)	0.8	5.7	72.5	0.7	3.9	0.7	17.1	31.9	63.9	24.4
	62	Line	14.02	18.37	36.73	13.22	16.87	12.65	21.09	25.31	33.74	22.96
		Rate (HHs)	0.3	1.4	56.4	0.3	0.7	0.0	6.7	15.2	46.8	11.6
⊨		Rate (people)	0.4	1.8	61.7	0.4	0.9	0.0	7.8	17.2	52.5	13.1
A	66	Line	20.23	26.51	53.03	19.09	24.31	18.23	30.39	36.46	48.62	29.29
		Rate (HHs)	3.2	12.7	68.5	1.3	9.4	0.8	23.2	39.2	61.3	20.5
		Rate (people)	4.0	13.9	70.8	1.5	10.6	0.8	25.1	41.7	62.7	22.1
	68	Line	23.82	31.25	62.49	22.47	28.65	21.49	35.82	42.98	57.31	36.40
		Rate (HHs)	3.9	10.5	61.1	2.8	8.0	1.6	19.1	34.2	55.6	19.8
		Rate (people)	4.9	12.2	63.7	3.6	9.2	2.2	21.2	36.6	57.9	22.0

Mizoram: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households
			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	oerson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	ates (%)
n	р				R66 1	Legacy		
ŝ	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	ntl. 2005 PF	P
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
ban		Rate (people)						
Ur	66	Line	30.88	46.32	61.76	36.57	55.00	73.13
		Rate (HHs)	9.9	22.8	48.7	12.1	34.8	70.3
		Rate (people)	11.5	25.6	53.2	13.9	38.4	74.1
	68	Line	37.97	56.96	75.95	44.96	67.63	89.93
		Rate (HHs)	5.7	20.5	43.0	12.7	33.2	63.5
		Rate (people)	6.1	22.3	45.6	13.9	36.0	65.3
	59	Line		_			_	
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		—			—	
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	—
ral		Rate (people)		—			—	
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	27.95	41.92	55.89	34.36	51.68	68.72
		Rate (HHs)	14.7	57.7	83.4	34.2	76.7	92.2
		Rate (people)	16.1	60.6	86.8	36.0	80.0	94.7
	68	Line	35.05	52.57	70.09	43.09	64.81	86.19
		Rate (HHs)	19.7	53.2	75.7	37.7	72.2	88.1
		Rate (people)	21.0	56.4	79.4	40.5	76.1	89.7
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line	_					
		Rate (HHs)	_	_			_	
П		Rate (people)						
A	66	Line	29.25	43.88	58.50	35.34	53.15	70.68
		Rate (HHs)	12.6	42.2	68.0	24.3	58.1	82.5
		Rate (people)	14.0	45.1	71.9	26.2	61.5	85.5
	68	Line	36.43	54.64	72.86	43.98	66.14	87.95
		Rate (HHs)	13.2	38.2	60.7	26.2	54.3	76.8
		Rate (people)	14.0	40.3	63.4	27.9	57.1	78.2

<u>Mizoram</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

c	7		100	erty inte	s (ns/pe		R.68	isumpu			sy rates (/0)
<u>.</u>	ŭ		Nation	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	RJ	BI
Re	Ro	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
nac		Rate (people)										
Urł	66	Line	45.56	68.34	91.12		31.58	51.52	63.15	66.48		
		Rate (HHs)	21.5	61.7	82.7		10.2	30.4	51.6	57.9		
		Rate (people)	24.4	65.1	86.4		11.7	33.8	56.2	62.1		
	68	Line	56.02	84.03	112.04	34.03	38.83	63.35	77.66	81.74	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	19.8	55.1	78.1	2.0	6.7	28.7	45.6	50.6	61.6	
		Rate (people)	21.5	57.1	79.9	2.3	7.1	30.9	48.2	52.8	54.2	
	59	Line		_	—					—	_	_
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
\mathbf{ral}		Rate (people)										
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	32.26	48.39	64.52		22.23	36.26	44.45	46.79		
		Rate (HHs)	28.1	70.0	90.3		4.3	42.2	62.7	66.8		
		Rate (people)	30.3	73.4	92.7		4.4	44.7	65.9	70.3		
	68	Line	40.47	60.71	80.94	35.16	27.88	45.49	55.77	58.70		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	31.2	67.5	85.8	19.7	7.3	43.6	60.6	64.0		66.8
		Rate (people)	33.4	71.1	87.8	21.0	8.1	45.4	64.3	67.7		59.8
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ħ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	38.18	57.26	76.35		26.39	43.05	52.77	55.55		
		Rate (HHs)	25.2	66.3	87.0		6.9	36.9	57.7	62.9		
		Rate (people)	27.7	69.7	89.9		7.6	39.9	61.6	66.6		
	68	Line	47.82	71.73	95.64	34.63	33.06	53.93	66.11	69.59	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	26.0	61.8	82.3	11.6	7.0	36.8	53.7	57.8	61.6	66.8
_	_	Rate (people)	27.8	64.5	84.0	12.1	7.6	38.6	56.7	60.6	54.2	59.8

<u>Mizoram</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
n	р				R68		
ği	uno			I	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—	—		
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	36.95	47.46	53.31	60.84	87.17
		Rate (HHs)	4.7	14.3	18.1	26.1	62.0
		Rate (people)	5.1	15.8	19.8	28.3	63.7
	59	Line	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)					
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	38.18	49.05	55.09	62.88	90.08
		Rate (HHs)	27.0	49.3	59.7	70.4	89.3
		Rate (people)	29.2	52.7	63.2	74.0	91.0
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)		—	—	—	
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
Ц		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	_		—	—	
	68	Line	37.60	48.30	54.24	61.92	88.70
		Rate (HHs)	16.8	33.2	40.6	50.1	76.8
_		Rate (people)	17.8	35.3	42.7	52.4	78.1

<u>Mizoram</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	rson/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty ra	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			R66
ŝi.	uno		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Intl}	. 1993]	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	${f Line/rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	12.72	17.64	35.29	11.76	15.87	11.90	19.84	23.80	31.74	24.31
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	5.7	28.5	0.0	5.7	0.0	5.7	5.7	16.6	5.7
		Rate (people)	0.0	5.5	31.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	5.5	5.5	18.0	5.5
	62	Line	13.89	19.59	39.18	13.08	17.69	13.26	22.11	26.53	35.37	27.03
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	13.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	12.0	4.6
oan		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	15.3	6.4
Url	66	Line	19.61	27.65	55.31	18.46	24.85	18.64	31.07	37.28	49.71	37.73
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.7	53.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	23.0	41.5	23.4
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.8	57.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.2	24.5	45.1	24.9
	68	Line	23.22	32.74	65.48	21.85	29.43	22.07	36.79	44.14	58.86	42.81
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	1.7	41.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	4.6	15.5	32.4	14.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	2.0	46.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	5.0	18.1	35.9	16.5
	59	Line	12.84	15.83	31.65	12.24	14.87	11.15	18.59	22.30	29.74	21.70
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	15.2	50.9	10.8
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	58.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	17.1	53.3	12.4
	62	Line	14.12	17.38	34.76	13.34	16.22	12.16	20.27	24.32	32.43	23.66
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	44.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	34.7	1.2
ral		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	49.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	39.3	2.0
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	20.75	25.55	51.10	19.62	23.85	17.89	29.81	35.77	47.70	33.43
		Rate (HHs)	0.6	2.6	71.3	0.5	1.9	0.0	6.9	26.8	63.0	16.9
		Rate (people)	0.8	3.4	74.5	0.7	2.4	0.0	8.0	30.1	67.2	19.2
	68	Line	24.34	29.97	59.93	23.00	27.99	20.99	34.99	41.98	55.98	41.75
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	4.1	61.8	1.0	1.8	0.9	9.3	17.6	51.7	17.6
_		Rate (people)	1.1	4.4	65.4	1.1	2.1	1.0	10.3	19.9	55.7	19.9
	59	Line	12.80	16.38	32.75	12.10	15.17	11.38	18.97	22.76	30.34	22.50
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	2.1	45.8	0.0	2.1	0.0	3.6	11.7	38.5	9.0
		Rate (people)	0.0	1.7	50.3	0.0	1.7	0.0	3.3	13.6	42.6	10.3
	62	Line	14.07	17.89	35.77	13.28	16.55	12.41	20.69	24.83	33.10	24.43
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.0	36.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	28.6	2.1
≓		Rate (people)	0.0	0.0	42.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	33.8	3.0
A	66	Line	20.44	26.12	52.24	19.30	24.12	18.09	30.15	36.18	48.24	34.59
		Rate (HHs)	0.4	2.1	66.4	0.3	1.3	0.0	6.2	25.7	56.9	18.8
		Rate (people)	0.6	2.7	69.9	0.5	1.8	0.0	7.2	28.5	61.2	20.8
	68	Line	23.94	30.95	61.89	22.60	28.50	21.37	35.62	42.75	56.99	42.13
		Rate (HHs)	0.6	3.2	54.3	0.6	1.1	0.6	7.5	16.8	44.5	16.3
_		Rate (people)	0.7	3.5	58.6	0.7	1.4	0.6	8.4	19.3	48.7	18.7

Nagaland: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

Source and definitions: See $\overline{\text{Figure 1}}$.

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day ii	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	rates (%)
n	p				R66]	Legacy		
ģi	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	ntl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—			—	
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		—			—	
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)		—			—	
\mathbf{Url}	66	Line	37.73	56.59	75.46	44.68	67.19	89.35
		Rate (HHs)	23.9	46.1	72.1	32.4	64.7	81.8
		Rate (people)	25.2	49.5	75.6	34.9	68.9	84.1
	68	Line	42.81	64.21	85.61	50.69	76.23	101.37
		Rate (HHs)	14.5	36.7	59.7	22.5	47.7	77.8
		Rate (people)	17.3	42.7	65.3	27.5	54.4	79.9
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	-	_
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
ral		Rate (people)	—	—			—	—
Ru	66	Line	33.43	50.14	66.86	41.10	61.82	82.21
		Rate (HHs)	11.7	60.8	86.8	35.8	81.6	93.1
		Rate (people)	13.9	65.5	90.0	39.2	85.2	95.7
	68	Line	41.75	62.63	83.51	51.34	77.21	102.68
		Rate (HHs)	7.0	53.8	78.9	22.4	73.5	91.2
		Rate (people)	7.9	56.1	81.1	24.2	75.6	92.3
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)		—			—	
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line		_		_	_	
		Rate (HHs)						
п		Rate (people)	—	—			—	—
A	66	Line	34.59	51.89	69.18	42.07	63.27	84.14
		Rate (HHs)	15.2	56.6	82.7	34.8	76.8	89.9
		Rate (people)	17.0	61.2	86.1	38.0	80.8	92.5
	68	Line	42.13	63.20	84.27	51.10	76.86	102.21
		Rate (HHs)	9.8	47.4	71.7	22.5	63.9	86.2
		Rate (people)	11.3	51.2	75.4	25.4	68.0	87.8

<u>Nagaland</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

ц			1.00	erty inte	s (ns/pe	ison/day in wiw	R68	isumpu	ion) and	u poven	ty lates (/0)
610	nne		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
Re	$\mathbf{R}0$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
nac		Rate (people)										
Url	66	Line	46.82	70.24	93.65		32.45	52.95	64.91	68.32		
		Rate (HHs)	35.3	67.2	83.2		9.3	41.5	62.0	66.3		
		Rate (people)	38.1	71.2	85.7		9.7	44.0	66.3	70.4		
	68	Line	53.12	79.68	106.24	32.27	36.82	60.07	73.64	77.51	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	26.7	53.8	82.3	0.0	6.5	32.9	46.5	50.1	73.7	
		Rate (people)	32.1	60.4	84.5	0.0	7.8	38.5	53.1	57.0	72.2	
	59	Line		_	_			_		_	_	
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)				—						
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{H}}$	66	Line	32.38	48.58	64.77		22.31	36.40	44.62	46.97		
		Rate (HHs)	8.9	56.2	85.2		0.0	18.7	44.0	52.2		
		Rate (people)	10.4	60.8	88.5		0.0	21.0	47.9	56.4		
	68	Line	40.43	60.65	80.87	35.13	27.86	45.45	55.71	58.65		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	5.1	49.2	77.2	0.7	0.0	11.6	37.2	43.8		31.6
		Rate (people)	6.0	51.2	79.4	0.8	0.0	13.4	38.8	45.5		27.3
	59	Line	_			_						
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Π		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	36.28	54.43	72.57		25.05	40.87	50.10	52.74		
		Rate (HHs)	16.4	59.3	84.6		2.7	25.1	49.1	56.2		
		Rate (people)	17.9	63.6	87.7		2.6	27.2	52.9	60.2		
	68	Line	45.02	67.53	90.04	34.09	31.10	50.74	62.19	65.47	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	13.2	50.9	79.1	0.4	2.4	19.6	40.7	46.2	73.7	31.6
		Rate (people)	15.4	54.6	81.3	0.5	2.8	22.5	44.0	49.6	72.2	27.3

Nagaland: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
nc	ы				R68		
ŝi.	unc			1	Percentile line	es	
R	R	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	40^{th}	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line				—	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)			—	—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)			—	—	
an		Rate (people)		—	—		
Urb	66	Line	_				
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	35.04	45.01	50.55	57.70	82.66
		Rate (HHs)	4.6	18.2	22.5	30.2	56.9
		Rate (people)	5.6	22.6	27.5	35.4	63.3
	59	Line		_	_	_	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
al		Rate (people)					
Rur	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			
	68	Line	38.14	49.00	55.03	62.81	89.99
		Rate (HHs)	2.3	17.6	33.3	54.5	85.4
		Rate (people)	2.8	19.5	35.1	56.7	87.1
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
	-	Rate (HHs)					
-		Rate (people)					
AJ	66	Line	_				_
		Rate (HHs)	—			—	—
		Rate (people)				—	
	68	Line	37.02	47.56	53.41	60.96	87.34
		Rate (HHs)	3.2	17.8	29.3	45.4	74.8
		Rate (people)	3.8	20.6	32.3	49.0	78.5

<u>Nagaland</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/per	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption)	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
ц	q		Le	gacy R5	Ð			Legacy	R62			R66
ģi	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Int}	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.49	14.54	29.08	16.41	13.03	9.77	16.29	19.55	26.06	15.44
		Rate (HHs)	27.1	18.8	53.2	23.6	13.1	7.6	23.4	29.8	47.9	19.9
		Rate (people)	33.1	23.0	61.3	29.5	16.0	9.6	29.2	36.3	56.6	24.5
	62	Line	19.11	16.15	32.29	18.24	14.52	10.89	18.15	21.78	29.04	17.17
		Rate (HHs)	31.5	21.0	60.7	29.0	13.8	4.9	28.8	36.1	53.3	26.4
an		Rate (people)	37.9	26.2	67.7	34.2	18.3	6.4	33.9	42.8	59.3	31.3
Urt	66	Line	26.97	22.79	45.58	25.75	20.41	15.31	25.51	30.61	40.82	24.20
		Rate (HHs)	26.1	16.7	55.8	24.7	10.3	3.7	24.1	34.0	49.2	20.1
		Rate (people)	34.0	21.6	65.7	32.7	13.5	5.8	32.1	42.5	59.3	25.9
	68	Line	31.93	26.98	53.96	30.49	24.16	18.12	30.21	36.25	48.33	28.31
		Rate (HHs)	19.7	10.8	50.1	17.8	7.4	1.4	17.5	27.7	45.4	13.5
		Rate (people)	24.1	14.3	59.7	22.1	9.8	2.0	21.8	35.0	54.4	17.3
	59	Line	11.38	13.98	27.96	10.29	13.14	9.86	16.43	19.72	26.29	12.88
		Rate (HHs)	49.5	66.4	94.6	38.9	62.7	35.4	77.6	87.1	93.9	61.8
		Rate (people)	53.1	69.2	94.4	41.8	65.6	38.4	79.0	88.6	94.0	64.7
	62	Line	12.51	15.36	30.71	11.21	14.33	10.75	17.92	21.50	28.67	14.04
		Rate (HHs)	43.6	62.0	93.8	34.9	56.3	31.0	73.3	81.0	90.6	54.2
ral		Rate (people)	48.2	68.0	95.1	38.2	61.8	32.9	78.6	86.8	93.8	59.5
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{H}}$	66	Line	18.39	22.57	45.15	16.49	21.08	15.81	26.35	31.62	42.16	18.64
		Rate (HHs)	34.4	55.0	93.5	25.9	47.3	21.9	69.3	80.8	91.7	35.4
		Rate (people)	37.9	58.6	95.2	28.6	51.8	24.2	72.2	83.2	93.6	39.2
	68	Line	21.57	26.48	52.95	19.33	24.74	18.55	30.92	37.11	49.48	22.85
		Rate (HHs)	27.3	47.8	91.9	17.6	40.0	15.3	61.9	76.5	89.2	32.3
_		Rate (people)	30.3	51.6	93.8	19.5	43.8	17.0	66.2	80.3	91.8	35.7
	59	Line	12.20	14.06	28.11	11.12	13.13	9.85	16.41	19.69	26.26	13.22
		Rate (HHs)	46.5	60.0	89.0	36.8	55.9	31.6	70.2	79.3	87.6	56.1
		Rate (people)	50.4	63.0	90.0	40.1	58.9	34.5	72.3	81.5	89.0	59.3
	62	Line	13.47	15.47	30.94	12.23	14.36	10.77	17.95	21.54	28.72	14.49
		Rate (HHs)	41.8	55.7	88.8	34.0	49.8	27.0	66.5	74.1	84.9	50.0
≓		Rate (people)	46.7	61.9	91.1	37.6	55.5	29.0	72.1	80.4	88.8	55.4
Ø	66	Line	19.62	22.61	45.21	17.81	20.99	15.74	26.23	31.48	41.97	19.44
		Rate (HHs)	33.2	49.4	87.9	25.7	41.9	19.2	62.7	73.9	85.5	33.2
		Rate (people)	37.3	53.3	90.9	29.2	46.3	21.6	66.5	77.4	88.7	37.3
	68	Line	23.14	26.55	53.10	21.02	24.65	18.49	30.82	36.98	49.31	23.67
		Rate (HHs)	26.1	41.6	84.9	17.7	34.6	13.0	54.5	68.3	81.9	29.1
_		Rate (people)	29.3	46.0	88.7	19.9	38.7	14.7	59.5	73.4	86.1	32.9

Orissa: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	ates (%)
n	рq				R66 1	Legacy		
egic	Jino		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	P
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)		—				
		Rate (people)	_	_				
	62	Line	—	—		—		
		Rate (HHs)						
ban		Rate (people)				—		
Ur	66	Line	24.20	36.30	48.39	28.65	43.09	57.30
		Rate (HHs)	13.8	37.6	53.8	23.8	47.5	66.0
		Rate (people)	18.1	45.8	63.7	30.2	57.1	74.9
	68	Line	28.31	42.46	56.61	33.52	50.41	67.04
		Rate (HHs)	13.3	32.1	49.8	20.4	44.3	59.8
		Rate (people)	17.2	40.8	59.7	26.0	54.5	69.0
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)	—	—				
	62	Line	_	_	_		_	
		Rate (HHs)	—	—				
ral		Rate (people)		—	—	—		
Ru	66	Line	18.64	27.97	37.29	22.92	34.48	45.85
		Rate (HHs)	24.0	60.8	79.7	42.5	75.6	88.6
		Rate (people)	27.4	65.6	83.2	47.4	79.3	91.8
	68	Line	22.85	34.27	45.70	28.10	42.26	56.19
		Rate (HHs)	21.8	60.3	82.5	41.1	78.0	91.4
		Rate (people)	24.4	65.5	85.9	45.3	81.7	93.5
	59	Line	_	_				_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)		_				
		Rate (people)						
A	66	Line	19.41	29.11	38.81	23.71	35.66	47.42
		Rate (HHs)	22.5	57.4	75.8	39.7	71.5	85.2
		Rate (people)	26.1	62.9	80.6	45.1	76.3	89.5
	68	Line	23.66	35.49	47.32	28.90	43.46	57.80
		Rate (HHs)	20.4	55.6	77.0	37.6	72.4	86.2
		Rate (people)	23.3	61.8	82.0	42.4	77.7	89.9

<u>Orissa</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	erson/day in MN	ARP cor	\mathbf{sumpti}	ion) an	d pover	ty rates (%)
n	p						R68					
G	uno		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line			_							
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)				—						
Urt	66	Line	33.89	50.83	67.77		23.49	38.32	46.97	49.44		
		Rate (HHs)	33.7	57.1	74.4		12.3	40.4	52.3	54.5		
		Rate (people)	41.4	67.0	82.3		15.9	49.2	62.0	64.3		
	68	Line	39.63	59.44	79.26	24.07	27.47	44.81	54.93	57.82	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	28.3	53.2	69.9	6.8	12.4	38.5	48.3	50.8	87.6	
		Rate (people)	36.3	63.1	76.7	8.4	16.3	48.0	58.6	61.1	85.6	
	59	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line				_						
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
Ru	66	Line	23.53	35.29	47.05		16.21	26.44	32.42	34.12		
		Rate (HHs)	44.9	76.9	89.1		14.6	56.0	72.2	75.2		
		Rate (people)	49.9	80.6	92.5		17.0	61.4	76.3	78.9		
	68	Line	28.81	43.22	57.63	25.03	19.85	32.39	39.70	41.79		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	43.5	79.0	91.7	28.9	12.3	55.3	73.0	76.8		94.1
		Rate (people)	47.8	82.7	93.8	32.3	13.7	60.4	77.2	80.6		90.9
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ħ		Rate (people)				—						
A	66	Line	24.95	37.42	49.89		17.21	28.07	34.41	36.22		
		Rate (HHs)	43.3	74.0	86.9		14.2	53.7	69.3	72.1		
		Rate (people)	48.8	78.7	91.1	—	16.9	59.7	74.3	76.9		
	68	Line	30.42	45.62	60.83	24.89	20.98	34.23	41.96	44.17	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	41.0	74.7	88.1	25.2	12.4	52.5	68.9	72.4	87.6	94.1
		Rate (people)	46.1	79.8	91.2	28.7	14.1	58.6	74.5	77.7	85.6	90.9

<u>Orissa</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

MMRP poverty lines (Rs/person/day) and poverty rates (%) Region **R68** Round Percentile lines $20^{ ext{th}}$ 40^{th} 80^{th} 50^{th} 60^{th} Line/rate 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Urban Rate (people) 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 26.1437.7143.0461.66 33.58Rate (HHs) 10.120.423.934.355.5Rate (people) 13.326.030.043.664.559 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) Rural 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) ____ 68 Line 27.1834.9239.22 44.76 64.13 Rate (HHs) 38.362.6 72.180.9 94.0Rate (people) 76.242.467.5 84.6 95.6 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) All 66 Line Rate (HHs) ____ Rate (people) 68 Line 63.77 27.0334.7238.9944.51Rate (HHs) 33.655.664.073.187.6 69.4 91.0 Rate (people) 38.161.4 78.5

<u>Orissa</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per)	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption)	and po	verty ra	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.59	17.04	34.08	17.00	15.38	11.54	19.23	23.08	30.77	15.72
		Rate (HHs)	12.3	12.1	57.5	12.1	7.8	4.8	15.5	24.5	46.5	10.9
		Rate (people)	13.3	13.1	64.2	13.1	8.1	5.8	16.5	25.8	53.3	12.0
	62	Line	19.21	18.92	37.85	18.90	17.14	12.86	21.43	25.72	34.29	17.47
		Rate (HHs)	20.7	20.7	64.2	20.7	19.8	19.8	24.0	33.6	56.4	19.8
an		Rate (people)	25.7	25.7	72.3	25.7	25.0	25.0	30.9	47.3	66.0	25.0
Urb	66	Line	27.11	26.71	53.43	26.67	24.09	18.07	30.12	36.14	48.19	25.57
		Rate (HHs)	2.0	1.7	32.9	1.7	0.4	0.1	3.3	10.4	27.3	1.5
		Rate (people)	2.1	1.8	38.8	1.8	0.3	0.0	4.1	10.8	33.4	1.6
	68	Line	32.10	31.62	63.25	31.58	28.53	21.40	35.66	42.79	57.06	43.04
		Rate (HHs)	0.8	0.8	19.9	0.8	0.6	0.1	1.2	4.9	13.5	5.0
		Rate (people)	1.0	1.0	26.7	1.0	0.7	0.1	1.4	6.3	18.5	6.3
	59	Line	10.81	15.67	31.33	11.11	14.72	11.04	18.40	22.08	29.45	12.17
		Rate (HHs)	7.0	13.6	56.5	7.0	13.6	7.0	33.4	49.1	53.0	7.0
		Rate (people)	1.7	10.8	58.4	1.7	10.8	1.7	31.0	48.1	54.9	1.7
	62	Line	11.88	17.21	34.41	12.11	16.06	12.04	20.07	24.08	32.11	13.27
		Rate (HHs)	13.9	44.8	72.8	13.9	41.0	13.9	45.2	45.9	71.3	21.5
ral		Rate (people)	15.0	50.7	81.4	15.0	46.4	15.0	51.1	51.8	79.7	26.5
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	17.47	25.29	50.59	17.80	23.62	17.71	29.52	35.42	47.23	21.07
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.8	62.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	8.1	23.9	55.2	0.1
		Rate (people)	0.0	0.8	66.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	8.7	25.5	59.4	0.0
	68	Line	20.49	29.66	59.33	20.88	27.71	20.79	34.64	41.57	55.43	42.77
		Rate (HHs)	2.1	3.7	25.4	2.1	3.7	2.1	4.9	14.7	22.9	14.8
		Rate (people)	1.9	3.8	30.0	1.9	3.8	1.9	5.3	16.7	26.4	17.1
	59	Line	15.21	16.56	33.12	14.94	15.15	11.36	18.94	22.73	30.30	14.48
		Rate (HHs)	10.4	12.6	57.2	10.2	9.9	5.6	22.1	33.5	48.9	9.5
		Rate (people)	9.2	12.3	62.2	9.1	9.1	4.4	21.6	33.6	53.9	8.4
	62	Line	15.35	18.02	36.04	15.32	16.57	12.43	20.71	24.86	33.14	15.26
		Rate (HHs)	17.4	32.4	68.4	17.4	30.1	16.9	34.3	39.6	63.6	20.6
Ħ		Rate (people)	20.0	38.8	77.1	20.0	36.3	19.7	41.5	49.7	73.2	25.8
Ø	66	Line	23.76	26.22	52.44	23.59	23.93	17.95	29.91	35.89	47.86	24.00
		Rate (HHs)	1.3	1.4	42.3	1.2	0.4	0.1	4.9	14.7	36.3	1.0
		Rate (people)	1.4	1.4	48.4	1.2	0.3	0.0	5.7	15.9	42.5	1.1
	68	Line	28.14	30.96	61.91	27.93	28.25	21.19	35.31	42.38	56.50	42.95
		Rate (HHs)	1.3	1.8	21.8	1.3	1.7	0.8	2.5	8.3	16.8	8.4
_		Rate (people)	1.3	1.9	27.8	1.3	1.7	0.7	2.7	9.8	21.2	10.0

Pondicherry: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day i	n MMRP) an	d poverty n	rates (%)
n	p				R66]	Legacy		
ģi	unc		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)					_	
	62	Line						_
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)						
Urb	66	Line	25.57	38.35	51.14	30.28	45.53	60.55
		Rate (HHs)	0.9	13.0	26.6	2.8	18.2	33.3
		Rate (people)	1.7	15.8	31.7	4.4	21.9	38.8
	68	Line	43.04	64.55	86.07	50.96	76.64	101.92
		Rate (HHs)	4.6	17.7	40.4	7.5	28.7	55.2
		Rate (people)	6.8	23.7	46.3	11.1	36.4	62.5
	59	Line	_					
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				—
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
al		Rate (people)		—				_
Ruı	66	Line	21.07	31.61	42.15	25.91	38.97	51.82
		Rate (HHs)	0.3	7.6	32.7	0.7	25.9	41.8
		Rate (people)	0.5	8.5	41.2	0.8	32.7	50.0
	68	Line	42.77	64.16	85.55	52.59	79.10	105.18
		Rate (HHs)	12.9	40.3	70.2	26.6	67.4	79.4
		Rate (people)	15.1	44.9	79.7	32.0	77.2	89.8
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				_
A	66	Line	23.98	35.96	47.95	28.73	43.21	57.46
		Rate (HHs)	0.7	11.3	28.5	2.1	20.7	36.0
		Rate (people)	1.3	13.3	35.1	3.1	25.7	42.8
	68	Line	42.94	64.41	85.88	51.56	77.54	103.12
		Rate (HHs)	7.5	25.6	50.8	14.2	42.2	63.7
		Rate (people)	9.9	31.5	58.6	18.7	51.4	72.5

<u>Pondicherry</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

г	-		Pov	erty line	s (Rs/pe	erson/day in MIN	$\frac{1 \text{RP cor}}{1 \text{R68}}$	isumpti	on) and	a pover	ty rates (%)
gioi	m		Nation	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI)	B	BI
Reg	Roi	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urb	66	Line	26.99	40.49	53.99		18.71	30.52	37.42	39.39		
		Rate (HHs)	1.5	14.8	28.5		0.3	3.1	11.8	13.9		
		Rate (people)	2.4	17.6	33.9		0.5	4.8	14.5	16.7		
	68	Line	45.45	68.17	90.89	27.60	31.50	51.39	63.00	66.31	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	21.6	44.3	0.5	0.8	7.5	16.5	19.6	75.7	
		Rate (people)	8.6	27.9	51.3	0.6	0.9	11.1	22.1	25.5	69.0	
	59	Line				-						
		Rate (HHs)										
T		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	18.31	27.47	36.63		12.62	20.59	25.24	26.56		
		Rate (HHs)	0.1	1.3	15.7		0.0	0.2	0.4	1.0		
		Rate (people)	0.1	1.7	20.8		0.0	0.4	0.6	1.4		
	68	Line	37.15	55.73	74.31	32.28	25.60	41.76	51.20	53.89		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	4.4	27.1	54.5	0.7	0.0	12.9	26.2	26.7		66.3
		Rate (people)	5.6	32.6	59.9	0.7	0.0	15.1	31.3	32.1		54.4
	59	Line	_			_				_	_	
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				_						
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ξ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	23.92	35.88	47.84		16.55	27.00	33.10	34.84		
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	10.5	24.4		0.2	2.2	8.1	9.7		
		Rate (people)	1.6	12.0	29.3		0.3	3.2	9.6	11.3		
	68	Line	42.40	63.61	84.81	29.32	29.33	47.86	58.67	61.75	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	5.3	23.5	47.9	0.5	0.5	9.4	19.9	22.1	75.7	66.3
		Rate (people)	7.5	29.6	54.5	0.6	0.6	12.5	25.5	27.9	69.0	54.4

<u>Pondicherry</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	v rates (%)
n	p				R68		
Gi	un			I	Percentile line	es	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line		—		—	
		Rate (HHs)		—		—	
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)		—		—	
Urb	66	Line					
-		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	29.97	38 50	43 24	49.36	70.72
	00	Bate (HHs)	0.6	2.2	4.6	7.1	23.7
		Rate (people)	0.7	3.1	6.9	10.3	30.5
	50	Lino					
	00	Bate (HHs)					
		Rate (neonle)					
	69	Line					
	02	Line \mathbf{D}_{ata} ($\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}_{a}$)					
		Rate (mis)					
ura		Rate (people)					
щ	66	Line Data (IIIIa)					
		Rate (HHS)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	35.05	45.03	50.57	57.72	82.69
		Rate (HHs)	3.1	17.0	26.2	28.6	69.9 70.4
		Rate (people)	4.2	18.0	31.3	34.5	79.4
	59	Line	—	—		—	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	62	Line		—	—	—	
		Rate (HHs)		—		—	
₫		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—	—		—	
		Rate (people)	—			—	
	68	Line	31.84	40.90	45.93	52.43	75.11
		Rate (HHs)	1.5	7.4	12.2	14.6	39.9
		Rate (people)	2.0	8.8	15.9	19.2	48.4

<u>Pondicherry</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per	rson/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and pov	verty ra	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993]	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	14.35	16.32	32.64	14.48	14.31	10.73	17.89	21.46	28.62	19.95
		Rate (HHs)	2.1	5.1	44.7	2.1	2.1	0.5	8.1	16.4	35.2	12.0
		Rate (people)	3.2	6.5	53.8	3.2	3.2	0.6	10.8	22.7	43.5	17.1
	62	Line	15.68	18.12	36.24	16.09	15.95	11.96	19.94	23.92	31.90	22.18
		Rate (HHs)	2.0	4.2	39.6	2.5	2.2	0.0	6.8	10.8	30.7	9.0
an		Rate (people)	2.4	5.2	44.3	3.0	2.7	0.1	8.8	14.2	36.5	11.7
Urt	66	Line	22.13	25.58	51.16	22.71	22.41	16.81	28.02	33.62	44.83	31.59
		Rate (HHs)	3.3	7.0	44.9	4.2	3.8	0.5	10.8	17.1	34.7	14.3
		Rate (people)	4.1	8.9	51.1	5.4	4.7	0.7	13.8	21.1	40.1	18.0
	68	Line	26.20	30.28	60.56	26.89	26.54	19.90	33.17	39.81	53.07	37.97
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	2.1	27.4	1.1	1.1	0.0	3.6	8.5	19.7	6.8
		Rate (people)	1.5	3.2	34.8	1.6	1.6	0.0	5.2	11.3	25.7	9.2
	59	Line	12.74	14.73	29.47	12.96	13.85	10.39	17.31	20.77	27.69	17.16
		Rate (HHs)	5.1	10.1	61.2	6.1	8.0	1.9	20.5	34.2	56.3	20.3
		Rate (people)	6.4	12.8	64.9	7.9	10.1	2.3	24.9	39.0	61.0	24.6
	62	Line	14.01	16.18	32.36	14.13	15.10	11.33	18.88	22.65	30.20	18.71
		Rate (HHs)	5.4	10.2	56.8	5.4	6.9	1.0	19.6	30.5	52.9	19.6
ral		Rate (people)	6.4	11.0	60.1	6.4	8.1	1.0	21.9	32.8	54.7	21.9
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	20.60	23.79	47.58	20.77	22.21	16.66	27.76	33.31	44.42	27.29
		Rate (HHs)	1.9	5.2	55.2	2.2	3.4	0.4	14.4	26.3	49.9	13.3
		Rate (people)	2.4	6.2	59.2	2.7	4.2	0.4	15.8	28.5	53.6	14.6
	68	Line	24.15	27.90	55.80	24.35	26.06	19.55	32.58	39.10	52.13	34.65
		Rate (HHs)	0.9	1.7	40.5	1.0	1.2	0.0	4.1	9.9	33.2	6.1
		Rate (people)	1.4	2.4	45.8	1.5	1.6	0.0	5.5	12.3	38.3	7.7
	59	Line	13.24	15.23	30.46	13.43	13.99	10.49	17.49	20.99	27.98	18.04
		Rate (HHs)	4.1	8.3	55.3	4.7	5.9	1.4	16.2	27.9	48.8	17.4
		Rate (people)	5.4	10.8	61.4	6.4	8.0	1.8	20.5	33.9	55.5	22.3
	62	Line	14.54	16.80	33.60	14.75	15.37	11.53	19.21	23.06	30.74	19.82
		Rate (HHs)	4.2	8.0	50.5	4.4	5.2	0.7	14.9	23.2	44.7	15.7
≓		Rate (people)	5.1	9.2	55.0	5.3	6.3	0.7	17.7	26.9	48.9	18.6
A	66	Line	21.13	24.42	48.83	21.45	22.28	16.71	27.85	33.42	44.56	28.80
		Rate (HHs)	2.4	5.9	51.3	2.9	3.5	0.4	13.0	22.9	44.2	13.7
		Rate (people)	3.0	7.1	56.4	3.7	4.4	0.5	15.1	25.9	48.9	15.8
	68	Line	24.89	28.76	57.53	25.27	26.24	19.68	32.79	39.35	52.47	35.86
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	1.9	35.3	1.0	1.1	0.0	3.9	9.4	27.8	6.3
_		Rate (people)	1.4	2.7	41.8	1.5	1.6	0.0	5.4	11.9	33.7	8.2

Punjab: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	rates (%)
nc	гq				R66 1	Legacy		
ŝ	Jino		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	Ir	tl. 2005 PF	PP
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		—			_	
а		Rate (HHs)		_			_	
bar		Rate (people)						
Ur	66	Line	31.59	47.38	63.18	37.40	56.26	74.81
		Rate (HHs)	10.3	31.7	49.1	17.9	41.2	61.0
		Rate (people)	14.0	39.6	59.1	23.4	50.4	70.0
	68	Line	37.97	56.96	75.95	44.96	67.63	89.93
		Rate (HHs)	4.8	21.2	42.8	9.6	33.1	53.9
		Rate (people)	7.1	28.1	52.0	13.5	42.0	63.0
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
Te	62	Line		—			_	
		Rate (HHs)						
ıral		Rate (people)		—				
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{I}}$	66	Line	27.29	40.93	54.58	33.55	50.46	67.10
		Rate (HHs)	8.9	37.1	60.7	20.7	54.2	73.9
		Rate (people)	11.0	41.5	66.5	24.3	59.8	79.0
	68	Line	34.65	51.98	69.30	42.61	64.08	85.22
		Rate (HHs)	3.9	27.0	50.6	13.5	44.7	67.5
		Rate (people)	5.0	31.0	55.4	16.3	49.4	71.6
	59	Line	—	—			—	
		Rate (HHs)		_				
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)		—				
ΓI		Rate (people)						
4	66	Line	28.74	43.11	57.47	34.85	52.41	69.70
		Rate (HHs)	9.4	35.0	56.3	19.6	49.4	69.1
		Rate (people)	12.0	40.9	64.0	24.0	56.6	75.9
	68	Line	35.87	53.81	71.74	43.47	65.38	86.95
		Rate (HHs)	4.3	24.6	47.5	11.9	40.1	62.1
		Rate (people)	5.8	29.9	54.1	15.2	46.7	68.4

<u>Punjab</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%										%)		
n	q						R68					
G	uno		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	RI	BI
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				—						
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)				—						
Urt	66	Line	40.46	60.69	80.92		28.04	45.75	56.09	59.04		
		Rate (HHs)	21.8	46.2	65.2		7.7	30.2	41.1	44.6		
		Rate (people)	28.3	55.6	73.6		10.7	37.8	50.2	53.8		
	68	Line	48.63	72.95	97.27	29.54	33.71	55.00	67.42	70.96	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	12.6	39.4	58.8	1.3	3.1	19.3	33.0	36.8	72.6	
		Rate (people)	17.6	48.7	67.5	2.2	4.8	25.9	41.9	45.5	63.5	
	59	Line	_	—	—	—	—			-	—	
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
Ţ		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)										
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	29.20	43.80	58.39	—	20.12	32.82	40.23	42.35		
		Rate (HHs)	12.5	43.2	64.9		1.2	19.5	35.7	40.0		
		Rate (people)	15.0	48.0	70.5		1.6	23.1	40.2	45.0		
	68	Line	37.07	55.60	74.14	32.21	25.54	41.67	51.08	53.76		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	5.9	33.1	55.6	2.3	0.0	12.2	24.8	29.7		45.3
		Rate (people)	7.2	37.1	60.3	3.1	0.0	14.8	28.6	33.8		34.7
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)	—									
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)									—	
Ħ		Rate (people)										
Ā	66	Line	32.99	49.49	65.99	—	22.79	37.18	45.57	47.97		
		Rate (HHs)	16.0	44.3	65.0		3.7	23.5	37.7	41.7		
		Rate (people)	19.4	50.5	71.6	—	4.7	28.1	43.6	48.0		
	68	Line	41.32	61.98	82.64	31.23	28.54	46.57	57.08	60.08	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	8.6	35.6	56.9	1.9	1.2	15.1	28.1	32.6	72.6	45.3
		Rate (people)	11.0	41.3	62.9	2.8	1.8	18.8	33.5	38.1	63.5	34.7

<u>Punjab</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	7) and poverty	$v ext{ rates } (\%)$
u	p				$\mathbf{R68}$		
ğic	un			I	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	\mathbf{R}	Line/rate	$20^{ ext{th}}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ ext{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line		—	—		
		Rate (HHs)	—		—		
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)					
Jrb	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Lino	22.08	41.91	16 28	50.80	75.68
	08	Bate (HHs)	52.08 2.2	67	40.28	17.02	42.0
		Rate (people)	3.7	9.9	10.4 14 6	23.1	42.0 51.4
	50	L'	0.1	0.0	11.0	20.1	01.1
	59	Line Data (IIIIa)					
		Rate (HHS)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ıral		Rate (people)		_			
Ri	66	Line		—		—	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	34.97	44.92	50.45	57.59	82.50
		Rate (HHs)	4.0	16.2	24.3	36.2	65.3
		Rate (people)	5.0	19.5	28.1	40.3	69.5
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—		—		
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
_		Rate (people)					
Al	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	33 91	43 56	48 92	55 84	79 99
	00	Rate (HHs)	3.3	12.4	18.8	28.5	56.0
		Rate (people)	4.5	16.0	23.1	34.0	62-8
		reace (bcobic)	1.0	10.0	20.1	01.0	02.0

<u>Punjab</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty lines	s (Rs/per)	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption)	and pov	verty rat	tes (%)
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.23	16.44	32.88	17.38	14.57	10.93	18.22	21.86	29.15	17.64
		Rate (HHs)	21.6	17.5	61.7	21.6	9.7	3.2	23.9	36.8	56.1	21.9
		Rate (people)	27.4	21.4	70.9	27.4	12.2	3.5	30.3	45.5	65.9	27.7
	62	Line	18.82	18.26	36.51	19.32	16.24	12.18	20.30	24.36	32.49	19.61
		Rate (HHs)	16.0	13.7	63.9	17.1	8.6	1.8	23.2	35.4	54.6	17.8
an		Rate (people)	20.5	18.2	74.0	22.3	11.4	2.6	29.8	45.1	63.9	23.3
Urb	66	Line	26.56	25.77	51.54	27.27	22.83	17.12	28.53	34.24	45.66	27.81
		Rate (HHs)	13.3	11.0	55.2	14.1	6.5	1.4	16.8	29.8	45.8	15.6
		Rate (people)	17.5	14.8	66.1	18.6	9.1	2.3	21.7	37.1	56.3	19.9
	68	Line	31.45	30.51	61.02	32.28	27.03	20.27	33.79	40.54	54.06	32.94
		Rate (HHs)	6.5	5.5	43.1	7.2	2.6	0.2	8.7	16.3	33.7	8.0
		Rate (people)	8.7	7.2	53.9	9.7	3.4	0.3	11.7	21.9	42.8	10.7
	59	Line	12.08	15.08	30.16	11.83	14.17	10.62	17.71	21.25	28.33	15.09
		Rate (HHs)	17.0	34.9	87.4	15.8	29.3	8.6	52.4	66.3	85.6	34.9
		Rate (people)	21.4	43.0	90.2	19.9	36.6	11.1	61.0	73.8	88.6	43.0
	62	Line	13.29	16.56	33.12	12.89	15.45	11.59	19.31	23.17	30.90	16.45
		Rate (HHs)	11.9	26.4	85.6	11.3	20.2	5.4	39.1	61.2	83.4	25.7
ral		Rate (people)	14.0	31.4	89.1	13.2	24.0	7.2	44.2	67.4	86.4	30.8
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	19.54	24.35	48.69	18.95	22.72	17.04	28.40	34.08	45.44	24.82
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	20.4	84.4	4.6	15.2	2.1	34.4	56.5	81.1	21.3
		Rate (people)	7.3	25.3	88.0	6.0	19.1	2.8	40.4	63.3	85.5	26.4
	68	Line	22.91	28.55	57.11	22.23	26.66	20.00	33.33	40.00	53.33	29.75
		Rate (HHs)	5.1	11.7	72.3	4.1	8.9	3.2	20.7	37.4	66.0	13.9
_		Rate (people)	6.2	13.7	76.5	5.2	10.4	4.1	23.6	41.6	71.0	16.1
	59	Line	13.28	15.40	30.79	13.12	14.26	10.70	17.83	21.39	28.52	15.69
		Rate (HHs)	18.1	30.8	81.3	17.2	24.7	7.3	45.6	59.3	78.6	31.8
		Rate (people)	22.8	38.0	85.7	21.6	31.0	9.3	53.9	67.2	83.4	39.4
	62	Line	14.48	16.93	33.86	14.28	15.62	11.71	19.52	23.43	31.24	17.13
		Rate (HHs)	12.8	23.6	80.9	12.6	17.7	4.6	35.6	55.6	77.1	24.0
Ħ		Rate (people)	15.4	28.6	85.8	15.2	21.3	6.2	41.1	62.6	81.5	29.2
Ø	66	Line	21.24	24.69	49.38	20.97	22.75	17.06	28.43	34.12	45.49	25.55
		Rate (HHs)	7.7	18.0	76.8	7.1	12.9	1.9	29.8	49.6	72.0	19.8
		Rate (people)	9.8	22.7	82.6	9.0	16.7	2.6	35.9	57.0	78.4	24.8
	68	Line	24.93	29.02	58.03	24.61	26.75	20.06	33.44	40.13	53.50	30.51
		Rate (HHs)	5.4	10.1	65.0	4.9	7.3	2.5	17.7	32.1	58.0	12.4
_		Rate (people)	6.8	12.2	71.2	6.2	8.8	3.2	20.8	36.9	64.3	14.8

Rajasthan: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day ii	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	rates (%)
n	pi				R66 1	Legacy		
ģi	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		—				
		Rate (HHs)		—				
an		Rate (people)		—			—	—
Urt	66	Line	27.81	41.72	55.63	32.93	49.53	65.87
		Rate (HHs)	13.0	35.3	55.6	21.3	47.3	65.3
		Rate (people)	18.1	44.3	66.2	28.2	57.4	75.0
	68	Line	32.94	49.41	65.88	39.01	58.67	78.02
		Rate (HHs)	5.2	21.2	40.3	10.3	32.5	53.7
		Rate (people)	7.6	28.2	51.6	14.1	42.6	65.6
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)	—	—			—	—
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)		_		_	_	
ral		Rate (people)	—					—
Run	66	Line	24.82	37.23	49.64	30.52	45.90	61.04
		Rate (HHs)	14.0	54.8	79.9	33.6	74.6	90.2
		Rate (people)	16.9	62.1	85.1	40.2	80.3	93.2
	68	Line	29.75	44.63	59.51	36.58	55.02	73.17
		Rate (HHs)	10.3	40.2	69.3	23.6	62.3	83.4
		Rate (people)	11.6	45.3	74.7	26.1	67.6	87.8
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—			—	—
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)						
Π		Rate (people)	_	_			_	_
A	66	Line	25.56	38.34	51.12	31.12	46.80	62.23
		Rate (HHs)	13.7	49.7	73.6	30.4	67.5	83.8
		Rate (people)	17.2	57.7	80.4	37.3	74.7	88.7
	68	Line	30.49	45.74	60.99	37.15	55.87	74.29
		Rate (HHs)	9.1	35.5	62.1	20.3	54.9	76.0
		Rate (people)	10.7	41.3	69.3	23.3	61.8	82.7

Rajasthan: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

г	pun		F00	erty inte	s (ns/pe	erson/day in wiw	$\frac{1}{R68}$	isumpu	ion) and	u poven	ty rates (/0)
i oi	unc		Nation	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI	5	B	BT
Reg	Roi	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line		_								
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
an		Rate (people)										
Urb	66	Line	39.02	58.52	78.03		27.04	44.12	54.08	56.93		
		Rate (HHs)	30.0	59.6	74.6		11.7	39.7	54.1	57.0		
		Rate (people)	37.9	70.0	83.3		16.3	48.9	64.9	67.4		
	68	Line	46.23	69.34	92.46	28.08	32.04	52.28	64.08	67.46	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	17.2	44.7	64.9	2.2	4.7	25.2	37.9	42.1	70.2	
		Rate (people)	22.5	55.9	76.8	3.4	6.9	32.8	48.7	53.2	63.6	
_	59	Line			_	_				_		
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
ıral		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)				_						
Ru	66	Line	28.42	42.63	56.84		19.58	31.95	39.16	41.22		
		Rate (HHs)	26.5	68.6	87.3	_	3.4	38.6	60.8	66.7		
		Rate (people)	31.9	75.3	91.0		4.4	45.5	68.1	73.4		
	68	Line	34.06	51.09	68.12	29.59	23.47	38.29	46.93	49.40		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	19.1	56.1	79.2	10.1	3.9	27.2	46.4	51.7		65.6
_		Rate (people)	21.3	61.5	84.1	11.4	4.4	30.2	52.0	57.4		54.6
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ħ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	31.03	46.55	62.07	_	21.42	34.95	42.84	45.10		
		Rate (HHs)	27.4	66.3	84.0		5.5	38.9	59.1	64.2		
		Rate (people)	33.4	74.0	89.1		7.3	46.4	67.3	71.9		
	68	Line	36.89	55.33	73.77	29.24	25.46	41.54	50.92	53.60	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	18.6	53.3	75.6	8.1	4.1	26.7	44.3	49.3	70.2	65.6
_		Rate (people)	21.6	60.2	82.4	9.5	5.0	30.8	51.2	56.4	63.6	54.6

Rajasthan: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (H	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
n	pī				$\mathbf{R68}$		
ŝ	unc]	Percentile line	28	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	Rc	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line		—	—		—
		Rate (HHs)	—	—	—	—	
		Rate (people)				—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)				—	
an		Rate (people)					
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)			—		
	68	Line	30.49	39.17	43.99	50.21	71.94
		Rate (HHs)	3.4	10.4	14.3	22.1	46.7
		Rate (people)	5.3	14.2	19.1	29.3	58.5
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—		—	—
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)				—	
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)				—	
		Rate (people)	—	—			—
	68	Line	32.13	41.28	46.36	52.91	75.81
		Rate (HHs)	14.3	33.1	44.7	59.5	85.0
		Rate (people)	16.0	37.1	50.3	64.9	89.2
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
⊒		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.75	40.79	45.81	52.28	74.91
		Rate (HHs)	11.6	27.5	37.1	50.2	75.4
		Rate (people)	13.5	31.8	43.0	56.6	82.0

Rajasthan: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Pov	erty line	s (Rs/per	son/day in	MRP o	consum	ption) a	and po	verty rat	tes (%)
n	p		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			R66
ŝi.	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	12.72	17.64	35.29	11.76	15.87	11.90	19.84	23.80	31.74	23.03
		Rate (HHs)	2.5	6.5	40.7	2.5	4.5	2.5	16.6	19.4	35.5	16.6
		Rate (people)	0.7	4.2	50.9	0.7	1.3	0.7	25.6	26.4	44.1	25.6
	62	Line	13.89	19.59	39.18	13.08	17.69	13.26	22.11	26.53	35.37	25.60
		Rate (HHs)	2.8	5.4	44.1	2.8	5.4	2.8	7.4	13.7	29.5	13.7
an		Rate (people)	0.8	3.9	55.2	0.8	3.9	0.8	7.9	17.9	38.7	17.9
Urb	66	Line	19.61	27.65	55.31	18.46	24.85	18.64	31.07	37.28	49.71	34.03
		Rate (HHs)	0.1	2.2	19.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.2	7.7	12.7	3.1
		Rate (people)	0.0	3.0	25.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	3.0	10.6	16.3	4.2
	68	Line	23.22	32.74	65.48	21.85	29.43	22.07	36.79	44.14	58.86	40.31
		Rate (HHs)	0.0	0.4	22.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.6	2.6	16.6	1.9
		Rate (people)	0.0	1.1	29.3	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.5	4.7	23.3	3.7
	59	Line	12.84	15.83	31.65	12.24	14.87	11.15	18.59	22.30	29.74	16.78
		Rate (HHs)	13.9	27.9	78.7	9.2	23.3	7.2	41.7	58.5	76.1	33.9
		Rate (people)	19.2	36.7	87.9	13.0	31.6	10.5	52.7	69.4	85.5	44.0
	62	Line	14.12	17.38	34.76	13.34	16.22	12.16	20.27	24.32	32.43	18.30
		Rate (HHs)	6.9	28.6	85.7	1.9	20.2	0.5	44.9	56.1	83.0	31.6
ral		Rate (people)	7.7	30.3	91.1	3.2	23.7	0.8	47.6	60.3	90.1	34.3
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	20.75	25.55	51.10	19.62	23.85	17.89	29.81	35.77	47.70	23.96
		Rate (HHs)	5.1	16.4	71.2	3.7	11.2	0.9	27.6	45.7	66.7	11.3
		Rate (people)	7.9	21.5	82.8	5.2	15.2	1.5	34.6	55.6	78.6	15.2
	68	Line	24.34	29.97	59.93	23.00	27.99	20.99	34.99	41.98	55.98	30.58
		Rate (HHs)	0.6	7.6	74.4	0.2	3.3	0.0	18.2	38.6	69.7	7.8
_		Rate (people)	1.0	9.6	83.0	0.5	4.8	0.0	24.0	49.6	79.3	9.9
	59	Line	12.82	16.01	32.02	12.19	14.97	11.23	18.71	22.46	29.94	17.42
		Rate (HHs)	12.3	24.9	73.4	8.2	20.7	6.5	38.2	53.0	70.4	31.5
		Rate (people)	17.3	33.4	84.1	11.7	28.5	9.5	49.9	65.0	81.3	42.2
	62	Line	14.09	17.61	35.23	13.32	16.37	12.28	20.46	24.56	32.74	19.06
		Rate (HHs)	6.4	25.7	80.4	2.0	18.3	0.7	40.2	50.7	76.2	29.4
≓		Rate (people)	7.0	27.6	87.3	3.0	21.6	0.8	43.4	55.9	84.7	32.6
A	66	Line	20.60	25.84	51.68	19.46	23.99	17.99	29.98	35.98	47.97	25.34
		Rate (HHs)	4.3	14.2	63.3	3.2	9.6	0.8	23.7	39.9	58.4	10.0
		Rate (people)	6.8	19.0	74.8	4.5	13.2	1.3	30.2	49.4	70.1	13.7
	68	Line	24.14	30.45	60.90	22.80	28.24	21.18	35.30	42.36	56.48	32.27
		Rate (HHs)	0.5	5.9	62.2	0.1	2.6	0.0	14.1	30.2	57.4	6.4
		Rate (people)	0.8	8.2	73.7	0.4	4.1	0.0	20.1	41.8	69.6	8.8

Sikkim: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	rates (%)
n	р				R66 1	Legacy		
ŝ	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	Ir	ntl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)		—			—	
Urb	66	Line	34.03	51.05	68.07	40.30	60.61	80.60
		Rate (HHs)	7.3	17.8	37.8	7.6	24.9	52.0
		Rate (people)	12.5	27.3	51.0	12.7	35.2	66.8
	68	Line	40.31	60.46	80.61	47.73	71.78	95.46
		Rate (HHs)	1.9	12.4	47.5	5.7	33.0	63.8
		Rate (people)	2.3	17.7	57.5	7.9	41.7	75.5
	59	Line		_			_	
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
ral	62	Line		_			_	
		Rate (HHs)		_				
		Rate (people)		—			—	—
Rur	66	Line	23.96	35.95	47.93	29.47	44.32	58.93
		Rate (HHs)	8.1	40.2	61.5	21.3	57.6	74.7
		Rate (people)	10.5	47.4	72.7	26.4	69.0	85.2
	68	Line	30.58	45.86	61.15	37.59	56.54	75.19
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	44.7	69.4	18.1	64.3	82.6
		Rate (people)	5.0	53.0	78.8	22.5	73.6	89.8
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)		_	_		_	
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)		_				
		Rate (people)		—			—	
Ā	66	Line	25.15	37.72	50.29	30.74	46.23	61.48
		Rate (HHs)	8.0	36.8	57.8	19.2	52.6	71.2
		Rate (people)	10.7	45.0	70.2	24.8	65.0	83.0
	68	Line	32.44	48.67	64.89	39.54	59.47	79.08
		Rate (HHs)	3.1	37.2	64.3	15.2	57.0	78.2
		Rate (people)	4.5	46.2	74.7	19.7	67.4	87.0

Sikkim: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)										
ц	q						R68						
	un		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	P	R	BI	
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	${<}100\%$ natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural	
	59	Line	_		_								
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
nac		Rate (people)											
Urł	66	Line	42.83	64.24	85.65		29.68	48.43	59.37	62.49			
		Rate (HHs)	10.0	37.0	75.8		2.2	10.7	24.6	32.7			
		Rate (people)	16.9	50.3	82.8	—	3.3	18.2	34.9	45.2			
	68	Line	50.72	76.08	101.44	30.81	35.15	57.35	70.31	74.01	438.36		
		Rate (HHs)	7.8	36.6	64.2	0.5	1.8	11.8	30.1	34.8	81.6		
		Rate (people)	11.7	44.7	75.8	0.5	2.2	17.1	37.4	43.3	70.5	—	
	59	Line	_	_	_		_		_				
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line				_							
		Rate (HHs)											
ral		Rate (people)											
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	29.01	43.52	58.03	_	19.99	32.61	39.98	42.08			
		Rate (HHs)	20.7	57.5	73.8		2.1	30.1	50.3	54.4			
		Rate (people)	25.6	68.8	84.3		2.5	36.8	59.5	64.3			
	68	Line	37.03	55.54	74.05	32.17	25.51	41.62	51.02	53.71		273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	15.8	62.4	81.4	5.9	0.3	30.1	55.5	59.6		80.7	
		Rate (people)	19.7	72.0	88.5	7.6	0.4	35.9	65.4	69.6		73.6	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
Ħ		Rate (people)											
Ā	66	Line	30.64	45.95	61.27		21.13	34.47	42.26	44.48			
		Rate (HHs)	19.1	54.3	74.1		2.1	27.1	46.3	51.0			
		Rate (people)	24.6	66.6	84.1	—	2.6	34.6	56.6	62.1			
	68	Line	39.66	59.48	79.31	31.91	27.36	44.64	54.72	57.60	438.36	273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	14.0	56.4	77.4	4.7	0.6	25.9	49.6	53.8	81.6	80.7	
		Rate (people)	18.2	66.8	86.1	6.2	0.8	32.3	60.0	64.5	70.5	73.6	

Sikkim: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP pc	overty lines (H	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	$v ext{ rates } (\%)$
n	p				R68		
ĝi.	uno]	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	20^{th}	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ m th}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line		_			_
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)				—	
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	33.45	42.97	48.26	55.09	78.92
		Rate (HHs)	1.1	4.1	5.8	9.7	42.7
		Rate (people)	1.5	5.9	8.0	14.1	52.4
	59	Line				_	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)	—	—	—	—	_
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
ral		Rate (people)	—			—	
Ru	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	34.93	44.87	50.40	57.52	82.41
		Rate (HHs)	11.4	43.2	53.9	65.6	87.1
		Rate (people)	14.1	51.3	63.6	75.0	93.3
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)	—		—		_
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line	—			—	
		Rate (HHs)					
Ħ		Rate (people)	—			—	
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	34.65	44.51	49.99	57.06	81.74
		Rate (HHs)	9.0	34.1	42.7	52.6	76.8
		Rate (people)	11.7	42.6	52.9	63.3	85.5

Sikkim: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates									tes (%)			
n	q		Le	egacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
. <u>6</u>	m		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	17.59	17.04	34.08	17.00	15.38	11.54	19.23	23.08	30.77	17.38
		Rate (HHs)	15.3	13.0	56.6	12.7	8.4	2.6	20.4	30.2	49.4	14.6
		Rate (people)	17.1	14.5	62.4	14.1	9.5	3.0	23.1	34.2	54.9	16.2
	62	Line	19.21	18.92	37.85	18.90	17.14	12.86	21.43	25.72	34.29	19.32
		Rate (HHs)	13.0	12.6	56.4	12.4	7.8	2.7	17.8	31.8	52.2	13.2
an		Rate (people)	16.7	16.0	63.6	15.7	10.7	4.2	22.6	38.2	59.5	16.9
Urb	66	Line	27.11	26.71	53.43	26.67	24.09	18.07	30.12	36.14	48.19	26.33
		Rate (HHs)	12.3	11.8	53.1	11.8	7.4	1.7	17.4	29.1	46.4	11.0
		Rate (people)	14.4	13.8	58.5	13.7	8.3	2.1	20.0	33.4	51.5	12.8
	68	Line	32.10	31.62	63.25	31.58	28.53	21.40	35.66	42.79	57.06	30.81
		Rate (HHs)	5.8	5.5	40.5	5.4	3.2	0.8	8.8	17.4	33.8	5.1
		Rate (people)	7.3	6.9	46.2	6.9	4.4	1.1	10.9	20.9	38.6	6.6
	59	Line	10.81	15.67	31.33	11.11	14.72	11.04	18.40	22.08	29.45	13.95
		Rate (HHs)	11.8	37.5	85.4	13.4	31.5	13.1	51.6	66.7	83.2	26.9
		Rate (people)	15.1	43.3	88.2	17.5	37.7	17.2	57.3	71.9	86.2	32.7
	62	Line	11.88	17.21	34.41	12.11	16.06	12.04	20.07	24.08	32.11	15.20
		Rate (HHs)	13.1	37.2	84.1	13.6	32.4	13.5	48.5	62.1	82.5	28.6
ral		Rate (people)	16.0	43.6	86.2	16.3	38.4	16.2	55.3	67.3	84.9	34.7
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	17.47	25.29	50.59	17.80	23.62	17.71	29.52	35.42	47.23	21.01
		Rate (HHs)	8.3	31.6	85.4	9.5	26.1	9.4	47.6	64.6	82.0	17.7
		Rate (people)	9.9	36.0	88.1	11.6	30.1	11.4	53.3	69.4	85.2	21.2
	68	Line	20.49	29.66	59.33	20.88	27.71	20.79	34.64	41.57	55.43	28.93
		Rate (HHs)	1.7	16.4	71.4	2.1	11.4	1.8	27.0	42.7	67.9	14.0
		Rate (people)	2.0	18.8	74.4	2.6	13.1	2.3	30.6	46.8	71.0	15.8
	59	Line	12.99	16.11	32.22	13.01	14.94	11.20	18.67	22.40	29.87	15.05
		Rate (HHs)	13.0	29.4	75.9	13.2	23.9	9.6	41.2	54.6	72.0	22.8
		Rate (people)	15.7	34.0	79.9	16.4	28.6	12.6	46.3	59.8	76.1	27.3
	62	Line	14.68	17.86	35.72	14.70	16.47	12.35	20.59	24.71	32.94	16.78
		Rate (HHs)	13.1	27.5	73.2	13.1	22.7	9.3	36.4	50.2	70.5	22.6
≓		Rate (people)	16.3	33.1	77.6	16.1	27.8	11.7	42.9	56.2	75.2	27.9
A	66	Line	21.76	25.93	51.85	21.75	23.83	17.87	29.79	35.74	47.66	23.38
		Rate (HHs)	10.1	22.6	70.7	10.5	17.6	5.9	33.8	48.4	65.8	14.7
		Rate (people)	11.9	26.1	74.9	12.5	20.4	7.3	38.5	53.3	70.2	17.4
	68	Line	25.66	30.54	61.08	25.65	28.08	21.06	35.10	42.12	56.15	29.77
		Rate (HHs)	3.5	11.4	57.1	3.6	7.6	1.4	18.6	31.1	52.2	9.9
_		Rate (people)	4.4	13.5	61.8	4.5	9.2	1.8	21.9	35.3	56.6	11.7

Tamil Nadu: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates $(\%)$								
n	p				R66 1	Legacy					
Si Si	uno		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP			
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50			
	59	Line									
		Rate (HHs)					_				
		Rate (people)						—			
	62	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
an		Rate (people)						—			
Urb	66	Line	26.33	39.49	52.66	31.18	46.89	62.35			
		Rate (HHs)	7.7	26.6	46.9	14.0	38.5	57.6			
		Rate (people)	9.2	30.7	52.6	16.5	43.3	63.2			
	68	Line	30.81	46.21	61.61	36.48	54.86	72.95			
		Rate (HHs)	3.4	17.0	35.1	7.7	26.8	48.9			
		Rate (people)	4.1	21.0	41.0	9.5	32.3	54.7			
	59	Line						_			
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)						—			
	62	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
<u>al</u>		Rate (people)						—			
Run	66	Line	21.01	31.51	42.02	25.83	38.85	51.66			
		Rate (HHs)	10.6	40.8	66.0	22.3	60.3	80.7			
		Rate (people)	12.4	46.0	70.5	25.4	65.4	84.1			
	68	Line	28.93	43.40	57.86	35.57	53.50	71.15			
		Rate (HHs)	11.4	36.1	62.1	21.3	54.3	75.9			
		Rate (people)	13.3	40.6	67.7	24.4	60.3	80.4			
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_	_			
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)	—	—				—			
	62	Line						_			
		Rate (HHs)									
П		Rate (people)									
A	66	Line	23.35	35.03	46.70	28.18	42.39	56.37			
		Rate (HHs)	9.3	34.3	57.3	18.5	50.4	70.2			
		Rate (people)	11.0	39.3	62.6	21.5	55.7	74.9			
	68	Line	29.77	44.65	59.54	35.98	54.11	71.96			
		Rate (HHs)	7.7	27.3	49.7	15.0	41.6	63.5			
		Rate (people)	9.2	31.8	55.8	17.7	47.8	68.9			

<u>Tamil Nadu</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

c	7		R68										
gioi	unc		Natior	al Rang	araian	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI)	R	BI	
Re	Ro	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
an		Rate (people)											
Urł	66	Line	38.79	58.18	77.58		26.88	43.86	53.77	56.60			
		Rate (HHs)	25.8	53.0	70.6		8.3	33.5	48.0	51.1			
		Rate (people)	29.9	58.7	76.1		9.8	38.1	53.7	56.9			
	68	Line	45.38	68.07	90.76	27.57	31.45	51.32	62.91	66.22	438.36		
		Rate (HHs)	16.4	44.0	63.4	1.8	3.7	23.1	37.2	41.6	83.7		
		Rate (people)	20.3	50.2	68.9	2.2	4.4	28.4	42.9	47.6	79.9		
	59	Line	_	—	_		_			_	_	_	
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
ral		Rate (people)											
Ru	66	Line	25.83	38.74	51.66		17.80	29.04	35.59	37.46			
		Rate (HHs)	22.3	59.9	80.7		4.8	33.4	52.0	57.1			
		Rate (people)	25.4	65.0	84.1		5.7	37.9	57.1	62.2			
	68	Line	35.57	53.36	71.14	30.90	24.51	39.98	49.01	51.59		273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	21.2	54.3	75.9	14.7	5.9	29.0	47.9	51.9		79.7	
		Rate (people)	24.3	60.3	80.4	16.8	7.0	33.6	53.3	57.7		74.2	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
п		Rate (people)											
A	66	Line	31.53	47.30	63.07		21.80	35.56	43.59	45.89			
		Rate (HHs)	23.9	56.7	76.1		6.4	33.5	50.2	54.4			
		Rate (people)	27.4	62.2	80.6	—	7.5	38.0	55.6	59.8			
	68	Line	39.96	59.94	79.92	29.41	27.61	45.06	55.23	58.14	438.36	273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	19.0	49.6	70.1	8.7	4.8	26.3	43.0	47.2	83.7	79.7	
_		Rate (people)	22.5	55.8	75.2	10.3	5.9	31.3	48.7	53.2	79.9	74.2	

Tamil Nadu: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	overty lines (F	Rs/person/day	y) and poverty	y rates (%)
uc	pı				R68		
egi(our			I	Percentile line	s	
R	R	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	40^{th}	$50^{ m th}$	60^{th}	80^{th}
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)		—		—	
Urł	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	29.93	38.45	43.18	49.29	70.62
		Rate (HHs)	3.0	10.0	14.2	20.8	46.9
		Rate (people)	3.7	12.5	17.7	25.6	53.0
	59	Line	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
al		Rate (people)					
Ruı	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)				—	
	68	Line	33.56	43.11	48.41	55.26	79.17
		Rate (HHs)	18.4	35.3	46.8	57.5	80.9
		Rate (people)	21.1	39.7	52.4	64.0	84.9
	59	Line		_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—	—	—	
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
⊒		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	31.93	41.02	46.07	52.59	75.34
		Rate (HHs)	11.3	23.6	31.8	40.6	65.2
		Rate (people)	13.3	27.5	36.9	46.8	70.6

<u>Tamil Nadu</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates									tes (%)				
n	q		Le	gacy R59	9		Legacy R62						
. <u>6</u>	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National	
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{e}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar	
	59	Line	12.72	17.64	35.29	11.76	15.87	11.90	19.84	23.80	31.74	17.26	
		Rate (HHs)	2.9	21.9	62.3	1.9	11.1	1.9	29.1	35.0	51.0	17.7	
		Rate (people)	5.6	26.3	67.3	3.7	15.6	3.7	33.9	40.0	56.4	21.4	
	62	Line	13.89	19.59	39.18	13.08	17.69	13.26	22.11	26.53	35.37	19.18	
		Rate (HHs)	8.2	17.9	57.4	4.0	14.3	4.0	24.7	34.7	51.5	17.7	
<u>an</u>		Rate (people)	11.0	22.5	65.0	5.0	18.3	5.0	29.9	40.9	59.3	22.3	
Urł	66	Line	19.61	27.65	55.31	18.46	24.85	18.64	31.07	37.28	49.71	25.73	
		Rate (HHs)	1.5	10.4	54.3	0.8	6.8	0.8	18.0	29.8	46.6	7.5	
		Rate (people)	2.1	13.2	60.7	1.0	8.9	1.0	21.7	35.4	52.1	9.5	
	68	Line	23.22	32.74	65.48	21.85	29.43	22.07	36.79	44.14	58.86	30.25	
		Rate (HHs)	2.0	7.6	50.7	1.4	4.7	1.4	15.5	29.9	46.6	5.0	
		Rate (people)	4.0	10.8	58.5	2.8	7.0	2.8	21.8	37.8	54.4	7.4	
	59	Line	12.84	15.83	31.65	12.24	14.87	11.15	18.59	22.30	29.74	14.23	
		Rate (HHs)	19.4	41.0	91.2	15.9	33.0	9.5	58.4	76.4	89.8	29.7	
		Rate (people)	21.6	44.6	93.5	17.9	36.0	11.2	62.8	80.3	92.6	32.6	
	62	Line	14.12	17.38	34.76	13.34	16.22	12.16	20.27	24.32	32.43	15.51	
		Rate (HHs)	33.9	62.4	97.7	29.1	57.2	21.1	80.0	87.6	97.2	50.7	
ral		Rate (people)	35.8	62.7	98.3	30.8	58.0	22.6	80.5	89.0	97.9	51.4	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{U}}$	66	Line	20.75	25.55	51.10	19.62	23.85	17.89	29.81	35.77	47.70	21.81	
		Rate (HHs)	12.4	29.1	92.1	8.2	23.2	3.8	45.2	67.6	89.5	16.9	
		Rate (people)	14.9	32.8	93.8	9.7	26.8	4.2	48.8	71.2	91.6	19.6	
	68	Line	24.34	29.97	59.93	23.00	27.99	20.99	34.99	41.98	55.98	26.24	
		Rate (HHs)	9.9	27.7	88.0	6.9	20.9	3.3	45.6	65.5	85.3	14.5	
_		Rate (people)	10.9	30.8	90.4	7.7	23.7	3.3	49.1	70.3	88.0	16.2	
	59	Line	12.82	16.05	32.10	12.18	14.99	11.24	18.74	22.49	29.98	14.60	
		Rate (HHs)	17.1	38.3	87.2	14.0	29.9	8.4	54.3	70.6	84.4	28.0	
		Rate (people)	19.7	42.3	90.2	16.1	33.5	10.3	59.3	75.4	88.1	31.2	
	62	Line	14.09	17.67	35.34	13.31	16.41	12.31	20.51	24.61	32.81	15.99	
		Rate (HHs)	30.0	55.6	91.5	25.2	50.6	18.4	71.5	79.4	90.2	45.6	
≓		Rate (people)	32.6	57.5	93.9	27.4	52.8	20.3	73.9	82.7	92.9	47.6	
Ø	66	Line	20.57	25.89	51.78	19.43	24.01	18.01	30.01	36.02	48.02	22.44	
		Rate (HHs)	10.4	25.6	84.9	6.8	20.1	3.2	40.1	60.5	81.4	15.2	
		Rate (people)	12.8	29.6	88.5	8.3	23.9	3.7	44.5	65.5	85.3	18.0	
	68	Line	24.16	30.39	60.79	22.83	28.21	21.16	35.26	42.32	56.42	26.85	
		Rate (HHs)	8.5	24.2	81.4	6.0	18.0	3.0	40.3	59.2	78.4	12.8	
_		Rate (people)	9.8	27.7	85.5	6.9	21.1	3.2	44.9	65.3	82.8	14.9	

<u>Tripura</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty	lines (Rs/p	erson/day in	n MMRP) an	d poverty r	rates (%)
n	р				R66 1	Legacy		
ģi	unc		Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	Ir	ntl. 2005 PF	PP
Re	Rc	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						—
		Rate (people)					—	
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)		—				
an		Rate (people)		—			—	
Urb	66	Line	25.73	38.60	51.47	30.47	45.83	60.94
		Rate (HHs)	6.4	27.4	46.7	13.8	38.4	56.9
		Rate (people)	7.8	31.0	53.4	16.2	45.4	64.1
	68	Line	30.25	45.37	60.49	35.82	53.87	71.63
		Rate (HHs)	3.7	25.5	43.3	12.4	38.3	52.6
		Rate (people)	4.6	31.3	52.5	15.8	47.4	62.1
	59	Line	_	_			_	
		Rate (HHs)		_				
		Rate (people)	—	—			—	
	62	Line		_			_	
		Rate (HHs)		_				
al		Rate (people)		—				
Ruı	66	Line	21.81	32.72	43.62	26.82	40.33	53.64
		Rate (HHs)	4.6	36.8	69.8	16.7	62.8	83.5
		Rate (people)	5.6	41.6	73.5	19.7	66.9	86.9
	68	Line	26.24	39.35	52.47	32.26	48.52	64.52
		Rate (HHs)	10.3	45.5	73.7	25.5	66.9	85.4
		Rate (people)	11.9	50.9	77.0	28.6	71.0	87.9
	59	Line	_	_			_	_
		Rate (HHs)		_				
		Rate (people)		—			—	
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)		_				
		Rate (people)		—			—	—
A	66	Line	22.46	33.70	44.93	27.43	41.25	54.85
		Rate (HHs)	5.0	35.0	65.4	16.1	58.2	78.5
		Rate (people)	5.9	39.8	70.1	19.1	63.3	83.1
	68	Line	26.87	40.31	53.74	32.82	49.36	65.64
		Rate (HHs)	9.1	42.0	68.3	23.2	61.8	79.6
		Rate (people)	10.8	47.8	73.1	26.5	67.2	83.8

<u>Tripura</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)										
n	q						R68						
Bio	uno		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20	11 PPI	P	R	BI	
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)				—							
an		Rate (people)				_							
Urt	66	Line	38.52	57.78	77.03		26.70	43.56	53.39	56.20			
		Rate (HHs)	27.4	52.1	73.7		6.6	34.5	47.9	50.7			
		Rate (people)	31.0	59.2	79.9	—	8.0	39.7	54.3	57.6			
	68	Line	45.26	67.88	90.51	27.49	31.37	51.18	62.74	66.04	438.36		
		Rate (HHs)	25.5	49.3	69.3	2.7	4.7	35.4	44.9	48.6	90.2		
		Rate (people)	31.3	58.6	76.7	3.4	6.4	43.9	54.0	57.7	87.6		
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_			_			
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
ral		Rate (people)											
\mathbf{Ru}	66	Line	25.56	38.34	51.12		17.61	28.73	35.22	37.07			
		Rate (HHs)	13.0	57.9	80.8		0.8	22.5	48.0	53.8			
		Rate (people)	15.8	62.4	84.4	—	1.0	26.5	53.6	58.7			
	68	Line	30.76	46.14	61.51	26.72	21.19	34.57	42.38	44.61		273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	19.8	62.4	83.2	11.3	3.2	31.1	54.3	58.5		88.5	
		Rate (people)	22.3	67.0	86.0	13.0	3.8	35.0	59.5	63.0		84.2	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)				—							
Π		Rate (people)											
A	66	Line	27.72	41.58	55.44	_	19.12	31.20	38.25	40.26			
		Rate (HHs)	15.7	56.8	79.5		1.9	24.8	47.9	53.2			
		Rate (people)	18.3	61.8	83.7	—	2.2	28.7	53.7	58.5			
	68	Line	33.05	49.58	66.11	26.84	22.80	37.20	45.61	48.01	438.36	273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	20.8	60.1	80.8	9.8	3.5	31.9	52.6	56.7	90.2	88.5	
_		Rate (people)	23.7	65.7	84.5	11.5	4.2	36.4	58.6	62.1	87.6	84.2	

<u>Tripura</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

MMRP poverty lines (Rs/person/day) and poverty rates (%) Region **R68** Round Percentile lines $20^{ ext{th}}$ 40^{th} 80^{th} 50^{th} 60^{th} Line/rate 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Urban Rate (people) 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 29.8549.1538.3443.0670.42 17.222.6 Rate (HHs) 3.432.051.9Rate (people) 4.420.628.440.561.359 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) Rural 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 29.01 37.27 41.8647.7868.46 Rate (HHs) 15.638.853.465.187.1 Rate (people) 17.643.558.569.689.5 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) All 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 42.05 48.0068.77 29.1537.44Rate (HHs) 13.435.047.959.380.9 Rate (people) 15.539.9 53.764.985.1

<u>Tripura</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates									tes (%)
u	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
ĝi.	uno		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		\mathbf{Intl}	. 1993	PPP		National
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	\mathbf{R}	${f Line/rate}$	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	15.39	14.92	29.83	15.01	13.87	10.40	17.34	20.80	27.74	16.52
		Rate (HHs)	23.3	21.5	66.0	21.9	16.5	4.9	30.2	41.1	61.5	26.9
		Rate (people)	30.7	28.3	74.4	28.9	22.1	7.4	39.0	51.4	70.2	35.4
	62	Line	16.81	16.56	33.13	16.68	15.46	11.59	19.32	23.18	30.91	18.37
		Rate (HHs)	20.4	20.0	61.0	20.1	15.8	4.1	28.0	39.0	56.7	25.9
oan		Rate (people)	28.0	27.5	71.3	27.6	21.8	5.6	37.2	49.6	67.3	34.8
Url	66	Line	23.73	23.38	46.76	23.55	21.72	16.29	27.15	32.58	43.44	26.30
		Rate (HHs)	18.2	17.3	56.4	17.7	13.1	3.7	25.2	35.8	52.8	23.5
		Rate (people)	24.9	23.8	67.6	24.3	18.6	5.6	34.0	46.8	63.7	31.7
	68	Line	28.10	27.68	55.36	27.88	25.72	19.29	32.15	38.58	51.44	30.94
		Rate (HHs)	14.6	13.9	55.7	14.3	10.2	2.1	21.4	34.6	52.2	19.2
		Rate (people)	20.2	19.3	65.8	19.9	14.5	3.0	28.8	44.5	62.7	26.2
	59	Line	11.83	13.06	26.12	11.55	12.27	9.20	15.33	18.40	24.53	13.74
		Rate (HHs)	25.6	34.5	87.4	23.3	29.0	8.7	50.9	68.1	84.3	39.3
		Rate (people)	30.1	39.8	90.2	27.7	33.8	10.5	57.0	73.2	87.7	45.0
	62	Line	13.01	14.34	28.68	12.59	13.38	10.03	16.72	20.07	26.76	14.98
		Rate (HHs)	23.4	29.7	87.7	20.4	24.9	7.0	44.9	65.5	84.5	34.1
ral		Rate (people)	28.6	33.9	91.6	24.8	29.9	9.1	50.4	71.0	88.8	39.0
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	19.13	21.08	42.17	18.51	19.68	14.76	24.59	29.51	39.35	21.82
		Rate (HHs)	21.1	29.7	86.5	18.3	23.8	5.7	46.2	64.1	83.4	33.2
		Rate (people)	25.3	35.4	90.2	21.7	28.5	6.8	52.9	70.4	87.7	39.3
	68	Line	22.44	24.73	49.45	21.71	23.09	17.32	28.86	34.64	46.18	25.25
		Rate (HHs)	16.2	24.2	82.1	13.7	18.4	4.3	38.6	57.5	78.9	25.8
_		Rate (people)	19.7	28.7	86.2	16.8	22.4	5.2	44.3	63.4	83.4	30.4
	59	Line	12.59	13.45	26.90	12.28	12.61	9.45	15.76	18.91	25.21	14.33
		Rate (HHs)	25.1	31.7	82.6	23.0	26.3	7.9	46.3	62.1	79.3	36.6
		Rate (people)	30.3	37.3	86.9	28.0	31.3	9.8	53.2	68.6	84.0	43.0
	62	Line	13.71	14.75	29.50	13.35	13.76	10.32	17.20	20.64	27.52	15.60
		Rate (HHs)	22.8	27.7	82.2	20.3	23.0	6.4	41.4	60.1	78.8	32.4
Ħ		Rate (people)	28.5	32.7	87.9	25.3	28.4	8.4	48.0	67.1	84.8	38.2
A	66	Line	20.06	21.55	43.09	19.53	20.09	15.07	25.11	30.13	40.18	22.72
		Rate (HHs)	20.5	27.0	79.9	18.2	21.5	5.3	41.5	57.9	76.6	31.1
		Rate (people)	25.2	33.1	85.7	22.3	26.5	6.6	49.1	65.7	82.9	37.8
	68	Line	23.64	25.36	50.71	23.03	23.65	17.74	29.56	35.48	47.30	26.46
		Rate (HHs)	15.9	21.8	75.9	13.8	16.5	3.8	34.6	52.1	72.7	24.3
_		Rate (people)	19.9	26.7	81.8	17.4	20.7	4.8	41.0	59.4	79.0	29.5

Uttar Pradesh: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households
<u>Uttar Pradesh</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

		-	Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates $(\%)$								
u	p	-			R66 1	Legacy					
Gić	uno	-	Nat	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	P			
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}	Line/rate	100%	150%	$\mathbf{200\%}$	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50			
	59	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)				_					
	62	Line		_	_	_		_			
		Rate (HHs)									
an		Rate (people)									
Urł	66	Line	26.30	39.45	52.60	31.14	46.83	62.28			
		Rate (HHs)	18.4	43.2	58.7	28.2	53.0	67.3			
		Rate (people)	25.7	54.4	70.6	37.4	65.1	78.6			
	68	Line	30.94	46.41	61.87	36.63	55.10	73.27			
		Rate (HHs)	15.1	40.2	56.3	23.9	50.3	65.7			
		Rate (people)	20.4	49.7	65.7	31.1	59.8	74.7			
	59	Line	_	_			_	_			
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)									
	62	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
ral		Rate (people)		—				—			
Ru	66	Line	21.82	32.73	43.64	26.83	40.35	53.66			
		Rate (HHs)	26.2	65.5	84.8	46.8	80.7	92.4			
		Rate (people)	30.5	71.6	89.8	53.1	86.0	95.0			
	68	Line	25.25	37.87	50.50	31.05	46.69	62.09			
		Rate (HHs)	19.8	57.4	79.3	38.7	74.3	88.3			
_		Rate (people)	23.1	63.7	84.1	43.8	79.9	91.6			
	59	Line		_	_						
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)		—				—			
	62	Line	—	—				—			
		Rate (HHs)									
П		Rate (people)		—				—			
A	66	Line	22.71	34.07	45.43	27.69	41.64	55.38			
		Rate (HHs)	24.5	60.6	79.1	42.7	74.6	86.8			
		Rate (people)	29.6	68.1	85.9	49.9	81.8	91.7			
	68	Line	26.47	39.71	52.94	32.25	48.50	64.49			
		Rate (HHs)	18.7	53.4	73.9	35.2	68.7	83.1			
		Rate (people)	22.5	60.6	80.2	41.1	75.6	88.0			

s n R68									ty rates (/0)			
gio	nnc		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half		Intl. 20)11 PPI	P	RBI		
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	\mathbf{Ro}	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
an		Rate (people)											
Urt	66	Line	37.18	55.76	74.35		25.77	42.04	51.53	54.25			
		Rate (HHs)	39.4	61.9	75.1		17.4	46.6	57.8	59.9			
		Rate (people)	50.2	73.7	85.0		24.4	58.1	69.9	71.7			
	68	Line	43.71	65.57	87.42	26.55	30.30	49.43	60.59	63.78	438.36		
		Rate (HHs)	36.7	60.0	73.7	8.6	14.0	43.6	55.0	58.1	79.5		
		Rate (people)	45.7	68.9	81.9	11.6	19.1	53.1	64.5	67.3	76.5		
	59	Line	_	-	_	—	_	_	-	—	_		
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
ral	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	25.27	37.91	50.54		17.41	28.41	34.82	36.65			
		Rate (HHs)	40.5	76.8	90.6		9.4	52.0	70.9	74.3			
		Rate (people)	46.2	82.6	93.8		11.4	58.5	77.0	80.2			
	68	Line	29.25	43.88	58.51	25.42	20.16	32.88	40.31	42.43		273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	33.0	70.4	85.6	20.4	7.0	43.9	63.2	67.9		80.2	
		Rate (people)	38.1	76.4	89.7	23.7	7.9	49.3	69.4	74.1		71.5	
	59	Line	_		_	_	_						
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)				—							
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
Ħ		Rate (people)				—							
A	66	Line	27.64	41.46	55.29		19.08	31.12	38.15	40.16			
		Rate (HHs)	40.2	73.5	87.2		11.1	50.9	68.0	71.1			
		Rate (people)	47.0	80.8	92.1		14.0	58.4	75.6	78.5			
	68	Line	32.36	48.54	64.72	25.66	22.33	36.44	44.67	47.02	438.36	273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	33.9	68.0	82.9	17.6	8.7	43.8	61.3	65.6	79.5	80.2	
		Rate (people)	39.7	74.7	88.0	21.1	10.3	50.1	68.4	72.6	76.5	71.5	

<u>Uttar Pradesh</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for <u>urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households</u>

MMRP poverty lines (Rs/person/day) and poverty rates (%) ${
m Region}$ **R68** Round Percentile lines 20^{th} 40^{th} 80^{th} 50^{th} 60^{th} Line/rate 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Urban Rate (people) 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 37.0347.4868.02 28.8341.5941.1Rate (HHs) 11.724.633.562.442.1Rate (people) 15.931.950.871.7 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) Rural 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 27.60 35.4539.82 45.4565.11Rate (HHs) 27.251.362.372.389.9 Rate (people) 31.757.468.678.393.0 59 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 62 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) All 66 Line Rate (HHs) Rate (people) 68 Line 65.7427.8635.7940.20 45.88Rate (HHs) 23.645.155.665.183.5 88.4 Rate (people) 28.351.963.072.4

<u>Uttar Pradesh</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates (%)								tes (%)				
n	q		Le	gacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
Gic	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	\mathbf{R}_{0}	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	15.39	14.92	29.83	19.80	13.87	10.40	17.34	20.80	27.74	18.71
		Rate (HHs)	13.2	12.3	53.4	27.0	9.9	0.4	20.5	27.7	50.9	26.0
		Rate (people)	18.8	16.4	63.7	33.1	13.1	1.1	27.6	34.7	61.3	31.5
	62	Line	16.81	16.56	33.13	22.01	15.46	11.59	19.32	23.18	30.91	20.79
		Rate (HHs)	10.3	10.3	57.9	22.4	3.5	0.0	11.6	36.0	55.2	22.4
ban		Rate (people)	12.6	12.6	67.0	25.5	5.2	0.0	14.0	40.1	64.7	25.5
Ur	66	Line	23.73	23.38	46.76	31.07	21.72	16.29	27.15	32.58	43.44	29.54
		Rate (HHs)	7.2	7.2	42.9	19.4	5.8	0.4	12.2	21.3	41.0	17.6
		Rate (people)	10.8	10.8	52.8	27.7	9.3	0.8	18.3	29.9	50.7	25.0
	68	Line	28.10	27.68	55.36	36.78	25.72	19.29	32.15	38.58	51.44	35.57
		Rate (HHs)	1.7	1.6	36.1	8.6	1.1	0.0	3.9	12.6	31.3	7.4
		Rate (people)	2.8	2.6	43.7	12.2	1.8	0.0	5.7	17.0	37.9	10.5
	59	Line	11.83	13.06	26.12	15.10	12.27	9.20	15.33	18.40	24.53	15.36
		Rate (HHs)	12.3	18.7	74.3	26.4	15.1	2.5	27.0	46.7	66.9	27.0
		Rate (people)	18.0	25.5	85.2	34.0	20.0	3.7	34.8	55.4	77.7	34.8
	62	Line	13.01	14.34	28.68	16.45	13.38	10.03	16.72	20.07	26.76	16.74
		Rate (HHs)	4.8	6.8	60.0	12.8	4.8	1.2	13.4	35.6	56.1	13.4
ral		Rate (people)	4.5	6.8	54.8	12.2	4.5	1.4	12.4	31.3	50.8	12.5
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	19.13	21.08	42.17	24.19	19.68	14.76	24.59	29.51	39.35	23.65
		Rate (HHs)	2.4	4.0	52.0	11.0	3.1	1.0	12.4	25.6	48.4	9.5
		Rate (people)	3.4	6.0	69.8	15.8	4.5	1.4	17.6	36.9	66.0	13.7
	68	Line	22.44	24.73	49.45	28.37	23.09	17.32	28.86	34.64	46.18	28.93
		Rate (HHs)	1.0	2.6	55.9	8.8	1.3	0.1	9.2	20.9	48.9	9.3
_		Rate (people)	1.4	3.3	63.6	11.2	1.7	0.1	11.6	27.0	56.6	11.7
	59	Line	12.48	13.39	26.79	15.95	12.56	9.42	15.70	18.83	25.11	15.96
		Rate (HHs)	12.5	17.4	70.0	26.5	14.1	2.1	25.7	42.8	63.6	26.8
		Rate (people)	18.2	23.8	81.3	33.9	18.8	3.2	33.5	51.7	74.8	34.2
	62	Line	13.91	14.86	29.73	17.76	13.87	10.40	17.33	20.80	27.73	17.69
		Rate (HHs)	6.1	7.6	59.5	15.2	4.5	0.9	13.0	35.7	55.9	15.6
Ħ		Rate (people)	6.4	8.1	57.6	15.3	4.7	1.0	12.8	33.4	54.1	15.5
A	66	Line	20.31	21.67	43.34	25.95	20.20	15.15	25.25	30.30	40.40	25.16
		Rate (HHs)	3.4	4.7	50.0	12.9	3.7	0.9	12.3	24.6	46.8	11.2
		Rate (people)	5.3	7.2	65.4	18.9	5.7	1.3	17.8	35.1	62.1	16.6
	68	Line	23.87	25.47	50.94	30.49	23.75	17.82	29.69	35.63	47.51	30.61
		Rate (HHs)	1.2	2.4	50.7	8.7	1.2	0.1	7.8	18.7	44.2	8.8
_		Rate (people)	1.7	3.1	58.6	11.4	1.7	0.1	10.1	24.5	51.9	11.4

<u>Uttaranchal</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates ($\%$								
uc	рц				R66]	Legacy		
-gi	our		\mathbf{Nati}	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	P
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50
	59	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)						
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
an		Rate (people)		—				
Urt	66	Line	29.54	44.31	59.09	34.98	52.61	69.97
		Rate (HHs)	15.3	35.9	53.3	22.7	45.1	64.2
		Rate (people)	21.0	45.1	64.5	29.8	55.7	74.4
	68	Line	35.57	53.36	71.15	42.12	63.35	84.24
		Rate (HHs)	8.6	29.5	46.9	18.0	38.0	58.7
		Rate (people)	11.8	36.7	57.1	22.9	47.2	70.4
	59	Line	_	_			_	
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		_				
	62	Line						
		Rate (HHs)						
[a]		Rate (people)						
Run	66	Line	23.65	35.48	47.31	29.09	43.74	58.17
		Rate (HHs)	7.0	34.5	53.7	18.6	49.1	65.8
		Rate (people)	10.4	49.6	71.9	27.9	67.3	84.2
	68	Line	28.93	43.40	57.86	35.57	53.50	71.15
		Rate (HHs)	4.2	33.2	60.0	13.8	53.0	74.1
		Rate (people)	5.5	39.4	66.3	17.3	59.9	80.0
	59	Line	_	_	_		_	_
		Rate (HHs)						
		Rate (people)		—				
	62	Line		_				
		Rate (HHs)						
П		Rate (people)						—
A	66	Line	25.10	37.65	50.20	30.53	45.92	61.07
		Rate (HHs)	8.8	34.8	53.6	19.5	48.2	65.4
		Rate (people)	13.0	48.5	70.1	28.4	64.5	81.8
	68	Line	30.71	46.07	61.42	37.33	56.14	74.66
		Rate (HHs)	5.4	32.2	56.5	14.9	49.0	70.0
_		Rate (people)	7.2	38.7	63.8	18.8	56.5	77.4

<u>Uttaranchal</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

ч	pun		POV	erty line	s (Rs/pe	ison/day in Mix	R68	isumpu	on) and	u poveri	y rates (70)
gioi	nnc		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI	2	R	BI
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}_{i}}$	${ m Ro}$	$\mathbf{Line}/\mathbf{rate}$	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
oan		Rate (people)										
Url	66	Line	38.46	57.69	76.92		26.66	43.49	53.31	56.12		
		Rate (HHs)	28.6	51.6	68.4		9.8	34.9	45.6	50.3		
		Rate (people)	36.6	63.0	78.4		14.4	44.0	56.2	61.9		
	68	Line	46.29	69.44	92.59	28.12	32.09	52.35	64.17	67.55	438.36	
		Rate (HHs)	24.0	45.8	64.2	4.5	6.5	28.4	39.0	44.7	74.2	
_		Rate (people)	29.5	56.0	74.8	6.4	8.8	35.4	48.4	54.9	67.9	
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
ral		Rate (people)									—	
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	27.29	40.94	54.58		18.80	30.68	37.60	39.58		
		Rate (HHs)	15.0	45.3	62.1		1.6	22.2	38.6	42.9		
		Rate (people)	22.7	63.3	80.4		2.5	32.6	55.1	60.5		
	68	Line	33.37	50.05	66.74	28.99	22.99	37.51	45.98	48.40		273.97
		Rate (HHs)	9.9	49.0	69.3	4.2	0.5	18.5	40.6	44.9		69.3
_		Rate (people)	12.4	56.1	75.8	5.5	0.6	22.5	48.0	52.6		61.2
	59	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
		Rate (people)										
	62	Line										
		Rate (HHs)										
Ħ		Rate (people)										
A	66	Line	30.03	45.05	60.06		20.73	33.82	41.46	43.64		
		Rate (HHs)	18.0	46.7	63.5		3.4	25.0	40.1	44.5		
		Rate (people)	26.1	63.2	79.9		5.4	35.4	55.4	60.8		—
	68	Line	36.83	55.25	73.67	28.76	25.43	41.49	50.86	53.53	438.36	273.97
		Rate (HHs)	13.6	48.1	67.9	4.3	2.1	21.1	40.2	44.8	74.2	69.3
_		Rate (people)	17.0	56.1	75.5	5.8	2.8	26.0	48.1	53.2	67.9	61.2

<u>Uttaranchal</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for <u>urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households</u>

_			MMRP poverty lines (Rs/person/day) and poverty rates (%)								
u	ыd				R68						
ŝ	unc]	Percentile line	es					
Re	Rc	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ ext{th}}$	60^{th}	$80^{ m th}$				
	59	Line		—							
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)					—				
	62	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
an		Rate (people)									
Urł	66	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)									
	68	Line	30.53	39.22	44.05	50.28	72.04				
		Rate (HHs)	5.6	13.9	19.9	26.2	48.7				
		Rate (people)	7.5	18.4	25.2	32.2	58.8				
	59	Line	_			_	_				
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)									
	62	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
ral		Rate (people)									
Ru	66	Line			—						
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)		—	—	—					
	68	Line	31.48	40.44	45.42	51.84	74.27				
		Rate (HHs)	7.2	24.7	40.1	50.9	77.7				
		Rate (people)	8.9	29.3	47.2	58.1	83.4				
	59	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)		—							
	62	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
П		Rate (people)									
A	66	Line									
		Rate (HHs)									
		Rate (people)									
	68	Line	31.22	40.11	45.05	51.42	73.67				
		Rate (HHs)	6.7	21.8	34.7	44.4	70.1				
		Rate (people)	8.5	26.4	41.3	51.1	76.8				

<u>Uttaranchal</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households

Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MRP consumption) and poverty rates ($\%$								tes (%)				
n	q		Le	egacy R5	9			Legacy	R62			$\mathbf{R66}$
Gic	un		Natl.	Intl. 19	93 PPP	Natl.		Intl	. 1993	PPP		National
\mathbf{Re}	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	Saxena	\$1.08	\$2.16	Saxena	\$1.08	\$0.81	\$1.35	\$1.62	\$2.16	Tendulkar
	59	Line	15.13	15.99	31.98	13.95	14.47	10.85	18.09	21.71	28.94	17.78
		Rate (HHs)	9.3	10.6	56.8	7.0	8.1	2.6	18.7	27.4	47.6	17.2
		Rate (people)	13.1	14.6	63.0	9.9	11.2	3.5	25.7	35.3	54.1	23.9
	62	Line	16.53	17.76	35.51	15.51	16.13	12.10	20.16	24.19	32.26	19.76
		Rate (HHs)	12.6	15.7	53.2	10.5	11.6	4.0	19.2	29.4	47.1	18.2
an		Rate (people)	15.8	19.7	61.5	13.2	14.5	4.9	24.2	36.6	54.6	23.3
Urb	66	Line	23.33	25.07	50.13	21.89	22.67	17.00	28.33	34.00	45.33	27.31
		Rate (HHs)	8.9	11.8	51.8	6.8	7.4	2.3	17.9	28.7	46.3	16.3
		Rate (people)	12.5	16.2	60.2	9.4	10.3	3.4	24.2	36.6	54.8	21.9
	68	Line	27.62	29.67	59.35	25.92	26.84	20.13	33.55	40.26	53.67	32.25
		Rate (HHs)	6.2	8.0	39.9	4.2	5.3	0.8	11.5	19.6	34.3	10.4
		Rate (people)	8.9	11.5	49.1	5.9	7.8	1.2	16.3	26.8	43.5	14.7
_	59	Line	12.30	14.28	28.57	12.09	13.42	10.07	16.78	20.13	26.84	14.06
		Rate (HHs)	20.2	35.9	89.2	19.0	28.7	6.8	51.7	68.9	86.0	34.3
		Rate (people)	23.6	40.7	92.0	22.4	32.8	8.6	57.2	73.7	89.4	39.0
	62	Line	13.53	15.69	31.38	13.18	14.64	10.98	18.30	21.96	29.27	15.33
		Rate (HHs)	21.5	33.8	88.9	18.9	27.9	10.6	53.7	69.4	86.7	32.8
ral		Rate (people)	25.7	39.3	91.3	23.2	32.3	13.4	59.2	74.4	89.3	37.8
$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$	66	Line	19.89	23.06	46.13	19.37	21.53	16.15	26.91	32.29	43.06	21.15
		Rate (HHs)	19.9	35.1	91.0	18.1	26.9	7.2	52.3	71.5	89.1	24.8
		Rate (people)	23.2	40.0	92.9	21.4	31.0	8.8	57.6	76.3	91.3	28.8
	68	Line	23.32	27.05	54.10	22.72	25.26	18.95	31.58	37.90	50.53	25.74
		Rate (HHs)	12.3	24.1	83.9	10.9	18.1	4.3	39.7	57.6	80.3	19.6
		Rate (people)	14.8	27.2	86.3	12.9	21.0	5.2	43.6	60.9	83.0	22.5
	59	Line	12.93	14.66	29.33	12.50	13.65	10.24	17.07	20.48	27.31	14.89
		Rate (HHs)	17.4	29.4	80.9	15.9	23.4	5.7	43.3	58.3	76.1	29.9
		Rate (people)	21.3	34.9	85.6	19.6	28.0	7.5	50.2	65.2	81.6	35.6
	62	Line	14.22	16.17	32.33	13.72	14.98	11.24	18.73	22.47	29.96	16.36
		Rate (HHs)	19.3	29.1	79.8	16.7	23.7	8.9	44.9	59.2	76.6	29.0
⊨		Rate (people)	23.4	34.8	84.4	20.9	28.2	11.4	51.1	65.7	81.3	34.4
A	66	Line	20.72	23.55	47.10	19.98	21.80	16.35	27.25	32.71	43.61	22.64
		Rate (HHs)	17.0	29.0	80.6	15.1	21.7	5.9	43.2	60.1	77.7	22.5
		Rate (people)	20.6	34.3	85.0	18.5	26.0	7.5	49.5	66.7	82.5	27.1
	68	Line	24.47	27.75	55.49	23.57	25.68	19.26	32.10	38.52	51.37	27.48
		Rate (HHs)	10.5	19.5	71.2	8.9	14.4	3.3	31.6	46.6	67.0	16.9
_		Rate (people)	13.3	23.0	76.4	11.1	17.5	4.2	36.3	51.8	72.5	20.4

<u>West Bengal</u>: R59, R62, and R66 legacy MRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R59, R62, R66, and R68 for people and households

			Poverty lines (Rs/person/day in MMRP) and poverty rates $(\%)$							
uc	pt				R66]	Legacy				
egi.	our		Nati	ional Tendu	ılkar	In	tl. 2005 PF	PP		
R	R	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	\$1.25	\$1.88	\$2.50		
	59	Line								
		Rate (HHs)								
		Rate (people)		—						
	62	Line								
		Rate (HHs)								
an		Rate (people)		—		—		—		
Url	66	Line	27.31	40.96	54.61	32.34	48.63	64.67		
		Rate (HHs)	12.8	33.9	50.7	20.6	43.2	61.1		
		Rate (people)	17.2	41.3	58.1	26.0	51.0	68.4		
	68	Line	32.25	48.38	64.50	38.19	57.44	76.38		
		Rate (HHs)	8.4	24.5	40.9	14.4	32.7	51.3		
		Rate (people)	12.0	32.7	50.7	19.8	41.3	60.8		
	59	Line		_		_		_		
		Rate (HHs)								
		Rate (people)						—		
	62	Line						—		
		Rate (HHs)								
ral		Rate (people)		_				—		
Rui	66	Line	21.15	31.72	42.29	26.00	39.11	52.00		
		Rate (HHs)	17.3	56.4	80.7	34.3	76.2	90.9		
		Rate (people)	21.6	62.0	84.8	40.6	81.1	92.8		
	68	Line	25.74	38.61	51.48	31.65	47.61	63.30		
		Rate (HHs)	11.3	50.1	76.5	30.2	71.3	87.0		
		Rate (people)	13.1	54.0	79.8	33.5	74.8	89.4		
	59	Line	_	_	_	_	_	_		
		Rate (HHs)								
		Rate (people)		—		—		—		
	62	Line		_				_		
		Rate (HHs)								
Π		Rate (people)								
A	66	Line	22.65	33.98	45.31	27.55	41.44	55.10		
		Rate (HHs)	16.1	50.4	72.8	30.7	67.4	83.0		
		Rate (people)	20.5	56.9	78.3	37.1	73.7	86.8		
	68	Line	27.51	41.27	55.02	33.43	50.28	66.86		
		Rate (HHs)	10.4	42.7	66.3	25.6	60.2	76.7		
_		Rate (people)	12.8	48.2	71.9	29.8	65.7	81.7		

<u>West Bengal</u>: R66 legacy MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

ч	F		1.00	erty inte	s (ns/pe	ison/day in wit	R68	sumpo	uii) air	u poven	ty rates (/0)	
<u>.</u>	ŭ		Nation	al Rang	arajan	Poorest half	1000	Intl. 20	11 PPI)	RBI		
Re	Ro	Line/rate	100%	150%	200%	<100% natl.	\$1.90	\$3.10	\$3.80	\$4.00	Urban	Rural	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
oan		Rate (people)											
Url	66	Line	38.20	57.31	76.41		26.48	43.20	52.96	55.75			
		Rate (HHs)	29.6	53.4	70.3		11.6	37.2	48.7	52.0			
		Rate (people)	36.5	60.6	76.7		15.6	44.5	56.2	59.3			
	68	Line	45.13	67.69	90.26	27.41	31.28	51.03	62.56	65.85	438.36		
		Rate (HHs)	21.6	43.3	62.2	4.3	7.6	26.8	38.4	41.7	80.6		
_		Rate (people)	29.0	53.0	70.9	6.2	10.7	35.3	48.0	51.3	76.0	_	
	59	Line				—							
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)				—							
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
ıral		Rate (people)											
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{I}}$	66	Line	25.22	37.83	50.45		17.38	28.35	34.76	36.58			
		Rate (HHs)	31.9	73.5	89.8		6.7	43.2	66.5	70.9			
		Rate (people)	38.1	78.8	92.0		9.0	49.4	72.0	76.3			
	68	Line	30.71	46.07	61.42	26.68	21.16	34.52	42.32	44.54		273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	26.9	68.0	85.5	13.8	3.5	38.1	60.2	65.4		87.9	
		Rate (people)	30.0	71.7	87.9	16.1	4.8	41.7	63.7	69.0		83.2	
	59	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
		Rate (people)											
	62	Line											
		Rate (HHs)											
All		Rate (people)											
1	66	Line	28.40	42.60	56.80		19.61	31.99	39.21	41.28			
		Rate (HHs)	31.3	68.1	84.7		8.0	41.6	61.8	65.9 79.1			
		Rate (people)	37.7	74.3	88.3		10.6	48.2	68.2	72.1			
	68	Line	34.63	51.94	69.25	26.88	23.91	39.01	47.81	50.33	438.36	273.97	
		Rate (HHs)	25.4	60.9	78.8	11.0	4.7	34.9	53.9	58.6	80.6	87.9	
		Rate (people)	29.7	66.7	83.3	13.4	6.4	40.0	59.5	64.2	76.0	83.2	

<u>West Bengal</u>: MMRP poverty lines (national Rangarajan, international 2011 PPP, and RBI) and poverty rates for urban/rural/all in R66 and R68 for people and households

			MMRP po	verty lines (H	Rs/person/day) and poverty	v rates (%)
n	p				R68		
ĝi.	uno]	Percentile line	s	
$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{e}}$	$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{C}}$	Line/rate	$20^{ m th}$	$40^{ m th}$	$50^{ ext{th}}$	$60^{ m th}$	$80^{ m th}$
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
an		Rate (people)		—			
Urb	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	29.76	38.24	42.94	49.02	70.22
		Rate (HHs)	5.4	14.5	19.2	25.1	45.9
		Rate (people)	7.7	19.9	26.1	33.4	55.5
	59	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
[a]		Rate (people)					
Ruı	66	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	28.97	37.22	41.80	47.71	68.35
		Rate (HHs)	20.5	45.9	58.9	71.4	90.3
		Rate (people)	23.8	49.6	62.5	74.9	92.2
	59	Line				_	
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)		—			_
	62	Line					
		Rate (HHs)					_
		Rate (people)					
A	66	Line					_
		Rate (HHs)					
		Rate (people)					
	68	Line	29.19	37.49	42.11	48.06	68.86
		Rate (HHs)	16.1	36.8	47.5	58.1	77.5
		Rate (people)	19.4	41.5	52.6	63.6	82.2

<u>West Bengal</u>: R68 relative (percentile-based) MMRP poverty lines and poverty rates for urban/rural/all of India in R68 for people and households