Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool Mexico

Mark Schreiner

16 May 2017

Consultar este documento en Castellano en `SimplePovertyScorecard.com`.
This document in English is at `SimplePovertyScorecard.com`.

Abstract

The Simple Poverty Scorecard-brand poverty-assessment tool uses 11 low-cost indicators from Mexico's 2014 National Household Income and Expenditure 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's accuracy is reported for a range of poverty lines. The scorecard is a practical way for pro-poor programs in Mexico to measure poverty rates, to track changes in poverty rates over time, and to segment clients for targeted services.

Version note

This paper uses data from 2014, replacing scorecards in Schreiner (2009a, 2009b, and 2006a) that use data from 2008, 2006, and 2002. The new 2014 scorecard should be used from now on. Existing users should *not* estimate change over time with a baseline from an old scorecard and a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard, such estimates would be very inaccurate. Instead, legacy users can estimate change with both baseline and follow-up from an old scorecard, looking at changes in the distribution of scores (not in the averages of poverty likelihoods) for an asset-based (not consumption-based) definition of *poverty*. Users can estimate changes in consumption-based poverty from now on with both a baseline and a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard.

Acknowledgements

Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool

Interview ID: _____		**Name**	**Identifier**
Interview date: _____	Participant: _____		
Country: MEX	Field agent: _____		
Scorecard: 004	Service point: _____		
Sampling wgt.: _____	Number of household members: _____		

Indicator		Response	Points	Score
1. How many household members are 17-years-old or younger?		A. Three or more	0	
		B. Two	10	
		C. One	18	
		D. None	27	
2. What is the highest educational level and grade completed by the male head/spouse?	A. None, pre-school/kindergarten, or primary grade 1		0	
	B. Primary grades 2 or 3		2	
	C. Primary grades 4, 5, or 6, or middle grade 1		6	
	D. Middle grades 2 or 3		9	
	E. No male head/spouse		11	
	F. High school/college prep. (any grade), or post-secondary technical/trade school (any grade)		11	
	G. College/university (any year), teacher's college (any year), or post-graduate (any year)		24	
3. What is the main material of the floor of the residence?		A. Dirt, cement, or pavement	0	
		B. Wood, tile, or other covering	5	
4. Does the residence have a kitchen sink (*fregadero* or *tarja*) for washing dishes?		A. No	0	
		B. Yes	3	
5. Does the household have a gas or electric stove, or a microwave?	A. None		0	
	B. Gas or electric stove, without microwave		2	
	C. Microwave (regardless of gas or electric stove)		6	
6. Does the residence have a toilet arrangement with a piped water supply?		A. No	0	
		B. Yes	2	
7. Does the household have a clothes-washing machine?		A. No	0	
		B. Yes	4	
8. How many fans does the household have?		A. None	0	
		B. One	2	
		C. Two or more	5	
9. Does the household have an automobile (car, van, minivan, or SUV) or truck (pickup or larger)?		A. No	0	
		B. Yes	9	
10. Does the household have a computer?		A. No	0	
		B. Yes	9	
11. Does the household have a mobile phone?		A. No	0	
		B. Yes	6	

Score:

Back-page Worksheet: Household Members and Their Ages

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 names and the unique identification numbers of the participant, of yourself as the field agent, and of the service point that the participant uses. The respondent does not need to be a participant with your organization.

Read to the respondent: *What are the first names and ages of the members of your household, starting with the head? (Be sure to include small children, the elderly, lodgers, and domestic servants and their family members if they sleep in the residence). A* household *is a group of one or more people—regardless of blood or marital relationship—who usually live together in a given residence and who share expenses (in particular, for food).*

A *usual resident* is anyone who usually lives, sleeps, cooks, eats, and takes shelter in a given residence.

For your own future use, note which household member is the male head/spouse (if he exists).

Count the number of household members, and write it in the scorecard header by "Number of household members:".

Then count the number of household members 17-years-old or younger, and mark the corresponding response option for the first scorecard indicator.

Keep in mind the full definitions in the "Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators" for *household*, *household member*, and *usual resident*.

First name	Age	Is <NAME> ≤ 17-years-old?	
1.		No	Yes
2.		No	Yes
3.		No	Yes
4.		No	Yes
5.		No	Yes
6.		No	Yes
7.		No	Yes
8.		No	Yes
9.		No	Yes
10.		No	Yes
11.		No	Yes
12.		No	Yes
13.		No	Yes
14.		No	Yes
15.		No	Yes
—	—	# members ≤ 17:	

Look-up table to convert scores to poverty likelihoods:
New-definition national poverty lines

	Poverty likelihood (%)			
	National lines (new definition)			
Score	Minimum	100%	150%	200%
0–4	75.3	94.6	100.0	100.0
5–9	62.6	92.3	98.4	99.3
10–14	54.7	89.7	97.7	99.2
15–19	47.4	85.6	96.6	98.9
20–24	40.6	82.9	94.6	98.1
25–29	36.0	79.1	93.1	97.4
30–34	29.8	72.9	89.4	95.9
35–39	25.2	68.2	86.6	94.4
40–44	20.2	59.8	83.0	91.9
45–49	16.6	53.8	77.7	88.4
50–54	12.9	46.3	70.7	84.2
55–59	9.5	36.4	63.8	80.3
60–64	6.8	31.3	55.0	72.2
65–69	5.2	24.1	47.0	63.7
70–74	4.3	20.3	37.2	54.1
75–79	2.5	13.2	30.3	44.4
80–84	2.0	9.1	19.9	31.7
85–89	1.4	6.2	15.6	27.8
90–94	1.3	4.5	12.0	20.0
95–100	0.8	3.2	7.5	13.4

Look-up table to convert scores to poverty likelihoods:
New-definition international 2005 and 2011 PPP lines

| | Poverty likelihood (%) | | | | | |
| | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
Score	$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
0–4	36.6	63.5	72.9	95.0	52.9	75.6
5–9	22.5	43.5	57.3	91.8	36.5	63.5
10–14	16.7	35.2	47.8	87.4	27.0	54.8
15–19	9.1	26.3	39.8	82.9	18.0	47.2
20–24	6.9	20.0	32.0	78.7	13.4	39.3
25–29	6.6	18.0	28.3	72.9	11.9	33.2
30–34	6.1	15.0	21.8	63.4	10.4	26.8
35–39	4.4	11.7	17.8	57.0	8.3	21.8
40–44	3.3	8.3	13.4	48.3	5.6	16.9
45–49	2.8	7.1	11.3	41.1	4.8	13.9
50–54	2.4	6.1	8.6	34.3	4.3	10.5
55–59	1.9	4.5	6.0	24.7	3.3	7.5
60–64	1.5	3.1	4.4	18.9	2.4	5.6
65–69	1.0	2.1	3.6	15.3	1.5	4.6
70–74	0.9	2.1	3.1	11.1	1.5	3.6
75–79	0.7	1.5	1.9	7.1	1.1	2.3
80–84	0.5	0.9	1.3	5.0	0.7	1.4
85–89	0.5	0.8	1.1	4.1	0.6	1.2
90–94	0.5	0.8	1.1	2.6	0.6	1.2
95–100	0.2	0.4	0.7	1.7	0.3	0.7

Look-up table to convert scores to poverty likelihoods:
New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines

	Poverty likelihood (%)					
	Poorest half of people	Percentile-based lines				
Score	below 100% Natl. line	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
0–4	91.1	86.9	96.6	99.4	100.0	100.0
5–9	84.7	77.6	94.5	96.7	98.4	100.0
10–14	77.5	64.3	89.9	95.7	98.3	99.9
15–19	67.5	52.0	84.6	92.1	96.7	99.4
20–24	54.5	41.4	76.7	87.2	93.6	98.9
25–29	50.5	39.0	70.1	82.0	90.0	98.1
30–34	40.2	29.9	61.3	74.7	86.1	97.2
35–39	33.1	23.9	54.5	67.6	80.5	95.7
40–44	25.9	17.3	42.6	58.7	70.6	92.8
45–49	19.9	13.2	34.7	47.7	61.3	86.6
50–54	14.2	10.3	26.6	38.1	51.3	82.0
55–59	10.0	7.3	19.2	28.5	39.8	75.4
60–64	6.6	3.9	13.3	21.6	33.5	65.6
65–69	4.9	2.8	10.0	15.8	25.5	57.2
70–74	3.9	2.7	8.1	11.4	19.8	46.3
75–79	2.3	1.8	3.9	6.5	13.0	36.1
80–84	1.5	1.1	3.0	5.2	8.7	25.2
85–89	1.2	1.0	2.6	3.4	5.5	18.8
90–94	1.2	1.0	2.3	2.5	4.2	16.1
95–100	0.8	0.7	1.4	1.6	2.9	9.1

Look-up table to convert scores to poverty likelihoods: Old-definition national poverty lines

Score	Food	Lower	Poverty likelihood (%) 100%	Upper 125%	150%
0–4	84.5	92.7	98.6	100.0	100.0
5–9	77.0	86.2	97.4	100.0	100.0
10–14	66.6	75.1	96.5	99.5	99.8
15–19	58.1	70.5	92.0	98.0	99.5
20–24	45.9	58.3	89.7	96.0	98.0
25–29	35.7	49.9	84.7	93.1	95.4
30–34	28.6	41.7	76.2	89.0	94.4
35–39	21.6	34.1	71.3	83.4	91.3
40–44	13.1	27.6	59.8	75.9	85.1
45–49	10.2	18.7	49.6	68.7	79.0
50–54	8.5	14.5	42.2	61.3	72.9
55–59	5.8	10.0	30.4	47.2	63.8
60–64	3.1	6.4	25.1	37.7	51.2
65–69	2.3	4.3	20.6	31.0	42.6
70–74	1.0	2.4	10.5	18.9	31.1
75–79	0.9	1.6	7.0	14.0	23.4
80–84	0.4	1.0	5.5	11.3	17.9
85–89	0.4	0.9	4.9	8.3	12.3
90–94	0.3	0.7	2.9	5.3	8.9
95–100	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.7	4.1

Look-up table to convert scores to poverty likelihoods: Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines

| Score | Poverty likelihood (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines | |
	$1.25	$2.50
0–4	25.2	69.5
5–9	14.8	55.3
10–14	7.4	45.8
15–19	4.9	36.3
20–24	2.6	24.6
25–29	2.2	15.9
30–34	2.2	12.8
35–39	0.9	9.1
40–44	0.8	5.7
45–49	0.6	3.7
50–54	0.6	3.2
55–59	0.4	2.5
60–64	0.1	1.2
65–69	0.1	0.5
70–74	0.1	0.4
75–79	0.1	0.4
80–84	0.0	0.3
85–89	0.0	0.3
90–94	0.0	0.2
95–100	0.0	0.0

Note on estimating changes in poverty rates over time using an old scorecard with the new 2014 scorecard

The new scorecard here uses data from Mexico's 2014 National Household Income and Expenditure Survey (*Encuesta Nacional de Ingresos y Gastos de los Hogares*, ENIGH). It replaces old scorecards using data from the 2008, 2006, and 2002 ENIGH (Schreiner 2009a, 2009b, and 2006a). The new 2014 scorecard should be used from now on.

Some pro-poor programs in Mexico already use an old scorecard. When these legacy users switch to the new 2014 scorecard, they should be careful *not* to estimate changes in consumption-based poverty rates over time that combine a baseline from an old scorecard with a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard. Legacy users should avoid such hybrid estimates even for the seven poverty lines which are supported for both old and new scorecards.[1] Such estimates will be very inaccurate because the standard assumptions of the scorecard—that the population is constant and that the relationship between indicators and poverty is constant—do not hold well in Mexico between 2008 and 2014. Users should not combine estimates from old and new scorecards.

---

[1] None of the definitions of *poverty* supported for the old 2002 scorecard are supported for the new 2014 scorecard.

To estimate some form of change in poverty over time, users have two options. The first is to use the new 2014 scorecard for a baseline estimate now and then again for a follow-up estimate later. The second option—available only to legacy users—is to measure change with both a baseline and a follow-up from an old scorecard. In this case, the relevant estimate is the direction of change rather than the magnitude of change. Such analysis looks at changes in the distribution of households' scores (not changes in their average poverty likelihoods) to estimate an asset-based (not consumption-based) definition of *poverty.*

If the standard assumptions of the scorecard hold after 2014, then the new 2014 scorecard should be about as accurate as the typical scorecard when used from now on for most common purposes.

In sum, both first-time and legacy users should use the new 2014 scorecard from now on. Looking forward, this establishes the best consumption-based baseline. If legacy users already have a baseline from an old scorecard, and if such legacy users cannot wait to estimate change until they have used the new 2014 scorecard long enough to have both baseline and follow-up estimates from it, then for a while they should apply both an old scorecard and the new 2014 scorecard, enabling both the estimation of the sign of the change in asset-based poverty (looking backward with an old scorecard) as well as the estimation of both the sign and the size of the change in consumption-based poverty (looking forward with the new 2014 scorecard).

Simple Poverty Scorecard® Poverty-Assessment Tool Mexico

1. Introduction

Pro-poor programs in Mexico can use the Simple Poverty Scorecard poverty-assessment tool to estimate the likelihood that a household has consumption below a given poverty line, to estimate a population's poverty rate at a point in time, to estimate changes in a population's poverty rate over time, and to segment participants for differentiated treatment.

1.1   Caveat on measuring change over time in Mexico

As discussed in the note above, the new scorecard here uses data from Mexico's 2014 National Household Income and Expenditure Survey (*Encuesta Nacional de Ingresos y Gastos de los Hogares*, ENIGH). It replaces three older scorecards (Schreiner, 2009a, 2009b, and 2006a) that use data from the 2002, 2006, and 2008 ENIGH. Only the new 2014 scorecard should be used from now on, as it is more accurate.

Even though seven poverty lines that are supported for the old 2006 and 2008 scorecards are also supported for the new 2014 scorecard,[2] legacy users of an old

---

[2] None of the poverty lines supported for the old 2002 scorecard are supported for the new 2014 scorecard, so it is impossible to estimate the change in consumption-based poverty over time by combining a baseline estimate from the old 2002 scorecard with a follow-up estimate from the new 2014 scorecard.

scorecard should *not* create hybrid estimates of change over time by combining a baseline from an old scorecard with a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard. Tests with historical data show that such estimates would be very inaccurate.

As long as the standard assumptions of the scorecard hold, however, estimates of change from now on that are based only on the new 2014 scorecard can be expected to have accuracy similar to that of most other scorecards (that is, better accuracy than that of the new 2014 scorecard between 2008 and 2014). Thus users can wait to estimate changes in consumption-based poverty until they have both a baseline and a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard. If existing users also have a legacy estimate from an old scorecard that they want to salvage, then they can apply both an old scorecard and the new 2014 scorecard for a time, providing both a follow-up (looking backward with a baseline from an old scorecard) and a baseline (looking forward with a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard). An old scorecard can provide estimates of the direction of change in asset-based poverty based on changes in the distribution of scores. In contrast, the new 2014 scorecard provides estimates of both the direction and magnitude of change in consumption-based poverty based on changes in the averages of poverty likelihoods.

1.2 Why use a scorecard?

The direct approach to poverty measurement via consumption surveys is difficult and costly. A case in point is the 2014 ENIGH by Mexico's *Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía* (INEGI). Its runs 224 pages and includes about 1,300 questions, many of which have a series of sub-questions which may be asked multiple times (for example, for each household member, each crop, or each consumption item). Households also kept a diary of their spending on food and public transport for seven days. Enumerators in the 2014 ENIGH spent an average of about 11 hours with each interviewed household.

In comparison, the indirect approach of the scorecard is quick and low-cost. It uses 11 verifiable indicators drawn from the 2014 ENIGH (such as "What is the main material of the floor of the residence?" and "How many fans does the household have?") to get a score that is correlated with consumption-based poverty status as measured by the exhaustive ENIGH survey.

The scorecard differs from "proxy-means tests" (Coady, Grosh, and Hoddinott, 2004) in that it is transparent, it is freely available,[3] and it is tailored to the capabilities and purposes not of national governments but rather of local, pro-poor programs. The feasible poverty-assessment options for local programs are typically blunt (such as rules based on land ownership or housing quality) or subjective and relative (such as

---

[3] The Simple Poverty Scorecard tool for Mexico is not, however, in the public domain. Copyright is held by Microfinance Risk Management, L.L.C. and by the sponsor.

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 periods of time.

The scorecard can be used to measure the share of a program's participants who are below a given poverty line (for example, Mexico's new-definition national line, the *línea de bienestar*). USAID microenterprise partners in Mexico can use the scorecard with the new-definition line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national poverty line to report how many of their participants are "very poor".[4] The scorecard can also be used to measure net movement across a poverty line over time. In all these applications, the scorecard provides a consumption-based, objective tool with accuracy that has been tested to the extent possible. While consumption surveys are costly even for governments, some local pro-poor programs may be able to implement a low-cost poverty-assessment tool to help with monitoring poverty and (if desired) with segmenting clients for differentiated treatment.

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

---

[4] USAID defines a household as *very poor* if its daily per-capita consumption is less than the highest of the new-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line in 2014 (MXN19.64, Table 1) or the new-definition line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line (MXN38.36).

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) only in English and only 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", straighforward, transparent approaches are usually about as accurate as complex, opaque ones (Schreiner, 2012a; 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 common sense and commonplace in statistical practice and in the for-profit field of credit-risk scoring, they have rarely been applied to poverty-assessment tools.

The scorecard is based on data from the 2014 ENIGH by Mexico's INEGI. Indicators are selected to be:

- Inexpensive to collect, easy to answer quickly, and straightforward to verify
- Strongly correlated with poverty
- Liable to change over time as poverty status changes
- Applicable in all regions in Mexico

All points in the scorecard are non-negative integers, and total scores range from 0 (most likely below a poverty line) to 100 (least likely below a poverty line). Non-specialists can collect data and tally scores on paper in the field in 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 or per-adult-equivalent consumption below a given poverty line.

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

Third, the scorecard can estimate the annual rate of change in the poverty rate of a population (Schreiner, 2014a). With two independent samples that are representative of 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 of the annual rate of change is the sum of the changes in each household's poverty likelihoods from baseline to follow-up, divided by the sum of years between each household's pair of interviews.

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

This paper presents a single scorecard whose indicators and points are derived for Mexico's new-definition national poverty line (*línea de bienestar*) with data for half of the households in the 2014 ENIGH. Scores from this one scorecard are calibrated data from this same half of households to poverty likelihoods for 23 poverty lines. Seven of these 23 lines are also supported by the old 2006 and 2008 scorecards (Schreiner 2009a and 2009b).[5] Nevertheless, legacy users—after switching to the new 2014 scorecard—should *not* measure change over time by combining an existing estimate of consumption-based poverty from an old scorecard (baseline) with an estimate from the new 2014 scorecard (follow-up), as tests show that such estimates would be very inaccurate.

The new 2014 scorecard is constructed using data from half of the households in the 2014 ENIGH. Data from that same half of households is also used to calibrate scores to poverty likelihoods for 23 poverty lines. Data from the other half of households is used to validate the scorecard's accuracy for estimating households' poverty likelihoods, for estimating populations' poverty rates at a point in time, and for segmenting participants. Furthermore, the accuracy of estimates of changes in poverty rates over time is tested using the validation sample from the 2014 ENIGH (baseline) and data on all households from the 2008, 2010, or 2012 ENIGHs (follow-ups).

---

[5] Data are available under both the old and new definitions of *poverty* for the 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014 ENIGHs. For a given definition, the ENIGH poverty-rate estimates are comparable across survey rounds because they use the same measure of consumption and the same constant-value poverty lines.

Given the scorecard's standard assumptions, all three scorecard-based estimators (a household's poverty likelihood, a population's poverty rate at a point in time, and a population's annual rate of change in its poverty rate) are *unbiased*. That is, they match the observed 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 is constructed from a single sample and so misses the mark when applied (as in this paper) to a validation sample. Furthermore, it makes errors when applied (in practice) to a different population or when applied before or after 2014 (because the relationships between indicators and poverty change over time).[6]

Thus, while the indirect-scorecard approach is less costly than the direct-survey approach, it makes errors when applied in practice.[7] The scorecard makes errors because it assumes that future relationships between indicators and poverty in all populations will be the same as in the construction data. Of course, this assumption—inevitable in predictive modeling—holds only partly.

On average across 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16{,}384$ from the 2014 validation sample, the average error (that is, the difference between the new 2014 scorecard's estimate of a poverty rate versus the observed rate in the ENIGH) at a point in time for

---

[6] Important cases include nationally representative samples at a later point in time or sub-national populations that are not nationally representative (Schreiner, forthcoming; Diamond *et al.*, 2016; Tarozzi and Deaton, 2007).

[7] Observed values from the direct-survey approach are taken as-is, ignoring sampling variation and any other sources of error.

100% of the new-definition national poverty line is +1.7 percentage points. Across all 23 poverty lines, the average of the average absolute errors is about 1.8 percentage points, and the maximum average absolute error is 4.6 percentage points. These estimation errors are due to sampling variation, not bias; the average difference would be zero if the whole 2014 ENIGH were to be repeatedly re-fielded and divided into sub-samples before repeating the entire process of scorecard construction and validation.

With $n = 16{,}384$, the 90-percent confidence intervals are ±0.8 percentage points or less. For $n = 1{,}024$, the 90-percent intervals are ±3.3 percentage points or less.

To check the accuracy of estimates of changes in poverty rates over time, the new 2014 scorecard is applied to data from the 2014 validation sample (as a baseline) and to all data from the 2008, 2010, or 2012 ENIGHs (as follow-ups).

With 1,000 bootstraps with $n = 16{,}384$ and across the 51 estimates of change from the 17 absolute poverty lines and the three sets of pairs of ENIGH rounds (2014 to 2012, 2014 to 2010, and 2014 to 2008), the average of the average absolute errors is about 5.3 percentage points. For comparison, the average absolute observed change is about 1.6 percentage points. Thus, the average of the average absolute errors is more than three times the average absolute observed change.

The most-extreme example is for 100% of the new-definition national line between 2014 (baseline) and 2010 (follow-up). The scorecard's estimate of the change in the household-level poverty rate is +25.6 percentage points. That is, poverty is estimated to have decreased from 46.6 percent in 2010 (Table 1) to $46.6 - (+25.6) =$

21.0 percent in 2014. But the observed change in the ENIGH in the 2014 and 2010

validation samples is 46.6 – 47.7 = –1.1 percentage points; that is, the observed poverty

rate increased by 1.1 percentage points. The scorecard's error is +25.6 – (–1.1) = +26.7

percentage points.[8] Thus, the scorecard gets the four-year direction of change wrong,

and the error is about 23 times as large as the observed change. This is the most

extreme case, but the scorecard gets also the direction of change wrong for 26 of 27

year-pairs for old- or new-definition national lines.

The standard errors of estimated changes are about ±9.2 percentage points or

less ($n = 1,024$). The 90-percent confidence intervals (with $n = 1,024$) of the estimated

changes include the observed changes in about half of cases (25 of 51). The correct

cases are again mostly for low international PPP lines and not for national lines. The

estimated direction of change matches the observed direction and is "statistically

significant" (the confidence interval of the estimate does not include zero) in about one

in 10 (five of 51) cases.

Overall, the scorecard's estimates of change for Mexico are highly inaccurate,

worse than in any of the 16 other countries with such tests.

Why is this? Of course, scorecards are always inaccurate to some extent. As

noted above, the scorecard assumes a constant population and constant relationships

between scorecard indicators and poverty. In general, neither assumption holds

perfectly, and while the two assumptions may sometimes hold well enough to permit

---

[8] This differs from the +26.6 percentage points in Table 9 due to rounding.

usefully accurate estimates, the large errors here suggest that these assumptions hold less well in Mexico in the time periods tested than they usually seem to do in other countries.

In particular, poverty rates in Mexico increased consistently from 2008 to 2014.[9] For the scorecard to reflect this, responses to the scorecard's indicators would have to shift towards those linked with greater poverty. The scorecard has four classes of indicators: household size, education, basic features of the residence, and asset ownership. To reflect Mexico's worsening consumption-based poverty, the scorecard would thus require that households have more members 17-years-old or younger, that male head/spouses have less education, that residences have fewer basic features, and/or households have fewer assets. In fact, none of the four classes of scorecard indicators show any such deterioration; from 2008 to 2014 in Mexico, the number of members 17-years-old or younger decreased, the education of male head/spouses increased, the features of residences improved, and asset ownership increased. Evidently, the relationships between indicators and consumption-based poverty changed. The scorecard, however, ignores this, and so it incorrectly estimates a decrease in consumption-based poverty from 2008 to 2014 (or equivalently, an increase from 2014 going back to 2008).

In general for Mexico and elsewhere, the scorecard probably tracks decreases in consumption-based poverty better than increases, given that it is based on indicators

_____

[9] Poverty rates decreased only for the lower international PPP lines.

that are unlikely to change quickly when consumption-based poverty worsens. Household membership, education, basic features of the residence, and asset ownership all respond slower to increased consumption-based poverty than they do to decreased poverty. Furthermore, scorecard indicators may improve—as they do in Mexico from 2008 to 2014—even as consumption-based poverty worsens if the prices, quality, and/or availability of assets, education, and housing features change or simply if households save more (perhaps by consuming less) and use the savings to accumulate more of the assets that make up scorecard indicators.

Said another way, the deterioration that began with the worldwide financial crisis in 2008 reduced per-capita or per-adult-equivalent consumption in Mexico, but it did not reduce other, non-consumption aspects of well-being proportionately (or even at all). Most scorecard indicators probably have ratchet effects, being more sensitive to increases in consumption than to decreases. That is, when consumption decreases, households are slower to sell off assets (or move to a less-expensive and smaller/lower-quality residence) than they are to acquire assets or to improve their residence when consumption increases. Likewise, education (once acquired) cannot be sold off, given away, nor lost. The scorecard estimates reductions in consumption-based poverty after 2008 because non-consumption indicators of consumption improved even as consumption decreased. The relationship between poverty and scorecard indicators in 2008 (and 2010, and 2012) is not the same as in 2014, even though the scorecard must act as if it is.

It is also possible that some of the scorecard's inaccuracy is due to ENIGH's measure of consumption-based poverty being off. The scorecard assumes that data is collected consistently across rounds, that samples are representative, and that poverty lines are perfectly adjusted for changes in prices.

In any case, scorecard users in Mexico should not estimate change with a baseline from an old scorecard and a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard. Such estimates would be very inaccurate because the indicator/poverty relationships represented in the old scorecards differ greatly from those represented in the new 2014 scorecard.

Of course, new users starting with the new 2014 scorecard can estimate change once they have both a baseline and a follow-up from the new scorecard, assuming that the relationships between indicators and poverty do not change much from 2014 onward.

Existing legacy users can also switch to the new 2014 scorecard and then wait to estimate change until they have both a baseline and a follow-up from the new scorecard. If desired, legacy users can also apply both an old scorecard and the new 2014 scorecard for a time, creating a follow-up to compare with an existing baseline from an old scorecard (looking backward) as well as a baseline to compare with a future follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard (looking forward).

The large changes in the relationships between indicators and poverty before 2014 that damage the accuracy of the new 2014 scorecard when applied between 2008

and 2012 also probably severely damage the accuracy of the old 2006 and 2008 scorecards as they have been applied up through the present. To estimate changes in poverty in spite of these inaccuracies, legacy users who have both a baseline and a follow-up from an old scorecard should use an alternate approach to estimate the *sign* of change (whether estimated poverty increased or decreased) under an asset-based definition of *poverty* by looking at changes in the distributions of scores.[10] This stands in contrast to the scorecard's standard approach of estimating the direction and magnitude of change under a consumption-based definition of *poverty* by looking at changes in the averages of poverty likelihoods. The alternate approach is less satisfactory than the standard approach, but it the best alternative available given the inaccuracy of consumption-based estimates of change.

Are estimates based on the new 2014 scorecard from now on likely to be unusually inaccurate? Yes, if poverty continues to increase in Mexico; No, if poverty starts to decrease. Out-of-sample/in-time tests of the new 2014 scorecard applied to 2014 data that was not used to construct the new 2014 scorecard show errors whose magnitudes are typical of the scorecard in other countries. While errors will grow as time passes, extreme inaccuracy probably will reappear only if the scorecard for Mexico is not updated for a long time or if—as will be the case if poverty continues to worsen—household membership, education, features of the residence, and asset ownership continue to move out-of-step with consumption-based poverty. Scorecard accuracy is—

---

[10] Schreiner (2012a) discusses how to analyze distributions of scores.

on average—a lot better in the other 16 countries that have similar backward-looking tests for change over time during periods of falling poverty, and that evidence should be a good predictor of the accuracy of the new 2014 scorecard from now on in Mexico as long as poverty is falling.

Section 2 below documents data and poverty lines. Sections 3 and 4 describe scorecard construction and offer guidelines for implementation. Sections 5 and 6 tell how to estimate households' poverty likelihoods and populations' 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 Mexico. The last section is a summary.

The "Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators" (found after the "References") tells how to ask questions—and how to interpret responses—so as to mimic INEGI's practice in Mexico's 2014 ENIGH as closely as possible. These "Guidelines" (and the "Back-page Worksheet") are integral parts of the scorecard.

2. Data and poverty lines

This section presents the data used to construct and validate the scorecard. It also documents the 23 poverty lines to which scores are calibrated.

2.1 Data

Indicators and points for the scorecard are selected (*constructed*) based on data from a random half of the 58,125 households in the 2014 ENIGH. This is Mexico's most-recent national consumption survey.

The data that is used to construct the scorecard is also used to associate (*calibrate*) scores with poverty likelihoods for all poverty lines.

Data from the other half of households in the 2014 ENIGH is used to test (*validate*) scorecard accuracy for point-in-time estimates of poverty rates *out-of-sample* (that is, with data that is not used in construction/calibration). To test scorecard accuracy for estimates of changes in consumption-based poverty rates from 2014 to 2012, 2014 to 2010, and 2014 to 2008, the 2014 validation sample is also paired with data from all 57,274 households in the 2012 ENIGHI, data from all 61,847 households in the 2010 ENIGH, or data from all 60,161 households in the 2008 ENIGH. These tests are *out-of-sample* and *out-of-time* because they use data not used in construction/calibration that also come from a different time period than does the data used in construction/calibration.

ENIGH fieldwork ran from:

- 2014: 11 August to 28 November
- 2012: 27 August to 21 November
- 2010: 21 August to 28 November
- 2008: 21 August to 28 November

Consumption is in units of MXN per person or per adult equivalent per day in average prices for Mexico as a whole in August of a given ENIGH's fieldwork.

2.2   Definitions of *poverty* in the MCS-ENIGH

In 2004, Mexico passed a law that led to the establishment of a two-part, multi-dimensional definition of *poverty* with a non-consumption component that is a variant of the Multi-dimensional Poverty Index (*Índice de privación social*, Alkire and Santos, 2010) and a new-definition consumption component (*pobreza monetaria*, CONEVAL, 2010a). By Mexico's official definition of *poverty*, a person is *poor* if he or she is below the standards both for the multi-dimensional index and for consumption. INEGI first applied the new definition with the 2010 ENIGH and has since applied it back to 2002 and forward to 2014. INEGI has also generated poverty data under the old definition through 2014.

For old-definition poverty, the sampling weights applied to ENIGH households come from the 2000 Census, and *rural areas* are defined as those with less than 15,000 people. For new-definition poverty, the sampling weights come from the 2010 Census, and *rural areas* are defined as those with less than 2,500 people. The ENIGH data come with both old- and new-definition sampling weights. This paper uses old-definition

weights in calculations with old-definition poverty, and it uses new-definition weights in calculations with new-definition poverty. Furthermore, the new definition of *poverty* is in terms of per-adult-equivalent consumption, while the old definition is in terms of per-capita consumption (CONEVAL, 2010a).

To collect the data required for the new definition of *poverty*, the 2008 ENIGH and later rounds include a "Living-Standards Module" (*Módulo de Condiciones Socio-económicas*). The MCS collects the non-consumption indicators used in the multi-dimensional index as well as new-definition consumption.[11] From 2008 on, the ENIGH collects the same items as it did before—including old-definition consumption—for about 9,000 to 30,000 households per round. The MCS is then applied to the ENIGH households as well as to more or less 40,000 additional MCS-only households.[12]

Mexico's official national poverty lines are defined in terms of what it calls *income* (*ingreso corriente*, Comité Técnico para la Medición de la Pobreza, 2002). Usually, consumption expenditure—not income—is preferred for assessing poverty (Deaton and Zaidi, 2002). In Mexico, however, both income and consumption expenditure (hereafter, "consumption") lead to about the same poverty rates and imply about the same changes in poverty rates over time (de la Torre, 2005). Furthermore, de la Torre says that income tracks consumption closely for households in the poorest four

---

[11] The ENIGH with the MCS is often called the MCS-ENIGH.

[12] The MCS sample size is much larger that of the ENIGH proper because old-definition poverty has precision requirements only at the urban/rural level while new-definition poverty has such requirements at the level of each of Mexico's 32 federal entities.

deciles. Finally, both the old and new definitions of income in Mexico include the value of self-produced/self-consumed goods, and the old definition—but not the new definition[13]—includes the rental value of owner-occupied housing. These two values are usually omitted from income, and their usual inclusion in consumption is a driving factor behind the preference for consumption. All in all, the INEGI measures of income are more or less equivalent to consumption for poverty assessment in Mexico.

2.3 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 or by the number of adult equivalents) is below a given poverty line. The unit of analysis is either the household itself or a person in the household. By assumption, each member of a given household has the same poverty status (or estimated poverty likelihood) as the other members in that household.

To illustrate, suppose that a program serves two households. The first household is poor (its per-capita or per-adult-equivalent 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.

---

[13] New-definition consumption excludes the cash or implicit costs of housing both from the measure of consumption and from the poverty lines, probably because basic standards for housing are covered in the multi-dimensional index.

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 weighted[14] average of poverty statuses (or estimated

poverty likelihoods) across households with participants. This is

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

the first household's weight, and the second "1" represents the first household's poverty

status (poor) or its estimated poverty likelihood. In the "$1 \cdot 0$" term in the numerator,

the "1" is the second household's weight, and the "0" represents the second household's

poverty status (non-poor) or its estimated poverty likelihood. The "$1 + 1$" in the

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-weighted[15] average of poverty statuses (or

estimated poverty likelihoods) for households with participants, or

$\dfrac{3 \cdot 1 + 4 \cdot 0}{3 + 4} = \dfrac{3}{7} = 0.43 = 43$ percent. In the "$3 \cdot 1$" term in the numerator, the "3" is the

first household's weight because it has three members, and the "1" represents its

---

[14] The examples assume simple random sampling at the household level. This means
that each household has the same household-level weight, taken here to be one (1).
[15] Given simple random sampling at the household level, a household's person-level
weight is the number of people in the household.

poverty status (poor) or its estimated poverty likelihood. In the "$4 \cdot 0$" term in the numerator, the "4" is the second household's weight because it has four members, and the zero represents its poverty status (non-poor) or its estimated poverty likelihood. 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 who directly participate in the program. For the example here, this means that some—but not all—household members are counted. The person-level rate is now the participant-weighted average[16] of the poverty statuses (or estimated poverty likelihoods) of households with participants, or $\dfrac{1 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 0}{1 + 2} = \dfrac{1}{3} = 0.33 = 33$ percent. The first "1" in the "$1 \cdot 1$" in the numerator is the first household's weight because it has one participant, and the second "1" represents its poverty status (poor) or its estimated poverty likelihood. 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 represents its poverty status (non-poor) or its estimated poverty likelihood. 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.

---

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

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

Table 1 reports poverty lines and poverty rates for households and people in the 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008 ENIGH for Mexico as a whole, for the 2014 construction/calibration sample, and for the 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008 validation samples.

For all of Mexico and for each of Mexico's 32 federal entities, Table 2 reports poverty lines and poverty rates for households and for people by urban/rural/all.

Household-level poverty rates are reported because—as shown above—household-level poverty likelihoods can be straightforwardly converted into poverty rates for other units of analysis and because sampling is almost always done at the level of households. This is also why the scorecard is constructed, calibrated, and validated with household weights. Person-level poverty rates are also included in Tables 1 and 2 because these are the rates reported by the government of Mexico. Furthermore, popular discussions and policy discourse usually proceed in terms of person-level rates, and the goal of pro-poor programs is to help people (not households) to improve their well-being.

2.4   Poverty lines under the new and old definitions of *poverty*

A household's *poverty status* as poor or non-poor depends on whether its per-capita or per-adult-equivalent consumption is below a given poverty line. Thus, a definition of *poverty* has two parts: a poverty line, and a measure of consumption.

Poverty-rate estimates based on old-definition lines are comparable across the 2008 to 2014 ENIGH rounds, as are poverty-rate estimates based on new-definition lines. Each definition is consistent across ENIGH rounds in that it has the same constant-price poverty lines and the same measure of consumption.

At the same time, poverty-rate estimates based on poverty lines under the old definition of *poverty* that is used with the old scorecards are not comparable with poverty-rate estimates based on poverty lines under the new definition of consumption-based *poverty* that is used with the new 2014 scorecard. The two definitions derive poverty lines differently and measure consumption differently.

The two definitions are not comparable even though their observed poverty rates from 2008 to 2014 in the ENIGH are close in magnitude and move roughly in parallel. For example, the observed person-level poverty rates for 100% of the old-definition upper national line in the ENIGH from 2008 to 2014 are 47.4, 51.1, 52.3, and 55.1 percent, while the rates for 100% of the new-definition national line are 49.0, 52.0, 51.6, and 53.2 percent (Table 1).

Because pro-poor programs in Mexico may want to use different or various poverty lines, this paper calibrates scores from its single new 2014 scorecard to poverty likelihoods for 23 lines:

- New-definition national lines:
  — Food (*línea de bienestar mínima*)
  — 100% of national (*100% de la línea de bienestar*)
  — 150% of national (*150% de la línea de bienestar*)
  — 200% of national (*200% de la línea de bienestar*)
- New-definition international PPP lines:
  — 2005 PPP:
    ▪ $1.25/day
    ▪ $2.00/day
    ▪ $2.50/day
    ▪ $5.00/day
  — 2011 PPP:
    ▪ $1.90/day
    ▪ $3.10/day
- New-definition relative- and percentile-based lines:
  — Line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line
  — First-quintile (20th-percentile) line
  — Second-quintile (40th-percentile) line
  — Median (50th-percentile) line
  — Third-quintile (60th-percentile) line
  — Fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) line
- Old-definition national lines:
  — Food (*Línea alimentaria*)[*]
  — Lower national (*Línea de capacidades*)[*]
  — 100% of upper national (*100% de la línea de patrimonio*)[*]
  — 125% of upper national (*125% de la línea de patrimonio*)[*]
  — 150% of upper national (*150% de la línea de patrimonio*)[*]
- Old-definition international 2005 PPP lines:
  — $1.25/day[*]
  — $2.50/day[*]

The seven lines marked with astericks are old-definition lines supported both for the old 2006 and 2008 scorecards and for the new 2014 scorecard. Even though these seven lines are supported for both the old and new scorecards—and as noted in the introductory note, in the introduction, and in Section 7—legacy users should *not* make hybrid estimates of changes in poverty rates over time by these lines with a baseline from an old scorecard and a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard. The tests reported in this paper suggest that such hybrid estimates would be very inaccurate.

2.4.1 Old-definition national lines

Mexico's old-definition national lines are derived with Ravallion's (1998) cost-of-basic-needs method. The old-definition food line (*línea alimentaria*) is defined separately for urban and rural areas and is the cost of a basic food basket whose items (and their shares) are based on 1989 data and then adjusted for changes in food prices over time (Comité Técnico para la Medición de la Pobreza, 2002; Rascón Ramírez, 2002). In 2014, the average old-definition food line in all of Mexico is MXN39.05 per person per day, implying a household-level poverty rate of 15.9 percent and a person-level poverty rate of 20.5 percent (Table 1).

The old-definition food line—like all poverty lines in this paper—is adjusted for price differences across urban and rural areas. For 2014, the old-definition food line in urban areas is MXN43.22 per person per day (with poverty rates of 11.2 percent for households and 14.7 percent for people, Table 2). In rural areas, the line is MXN32.13 (with poverty rates of 24.5 percent for households and 30.0 percent for people).

The old-definition lower national poverty line (*línea de capacidades*) is the old-definition food line, plus the consumption implied by a basic standard of education and health care. For a given ENIGH round and separately for urban and rural areas, this line is the cost of the area's food basket, divided by the ratio of per-capita food consumption to per-capita food, education, and health-care consumption for the 10 percent of people in ENIGH households whose per-capita total consumption is centered around the area's old-definition food line (Rascón Ramírez, 2002). In 2014, the old-definition lower national line is MXN47.36 per person per day, giving all-Mexico poverty rates of 23.4 percent (households) and 29.1 percent (people, Table 1).

Finally, 100% of the old-definition upper national line (*línea de patrimonio*) is the old-definition food line, plus the consumption implied by a basic standard of education, health care, clothing/shoes, energy for lighting/cooking, housing, and transportation. The value of this standard is derived as is that of education and health care for the old-definition lower line. In 2014, this line is MXN76.03 per person per day, with all-Mexico poverty rates of 47.0 percent (households) and 55.1 percent (people, Table 1).

The lines for 125% and 150% of the old-definition upper national line are multiples of 100% of the old-definition national line.

From 2008 to 2014, observed poverty rates in the ENIGH increased for all five old-definition national lines.[17]

---

[17] The person-level poverty rates for the old-definition food line, lower national line, and the upper national line in Table 1 match those for 2010, 2012, and 2014 reported by CONEVAL (`www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/Documents/Datos_Abiertos/Pobreza_ingresos_1992_2010_nac/Pobreza_dimension_ingreso_nacional_1992_2014_DA.csv` and `dgeiawf.semarnat.gob.mx:8080/ibi_apps/WFServlet?IBIF_ex=D1_POBREZA00_05&IBIC_user=dgeia_mce&IBIC_pass=dgeia_mce`, both retrieved 14 May 2017). For 2008, the person-level poverty rates in Table 1 are 0.4 percentage points lower than those reported in the two sources above. It appears that the 2008 ENIGH data was revised after it received by this author in 2009, as the rates in Table 1 match earlier reports by CONEVAL (2011, p. 10; 2010b, p. 13; and 2009, p. 6). CONEVAL has not reported poverty rates by the old-definition lower national line for 2014. The matching of rates with CONEVAL suggests that this paper uses the same data (except for 2008) and has calculated poverty correctly.

2.4.2   Old-definition international 2005 PPP lines

The old-definition international $1.25/day and $2.50/day 2005 PPP lines are

derived from:

- 2005 PPP exchange rate for "individual consumption expenditure by households" in Mexico:[18] MXN7.648 per USD
- Average all-Mexico basic-food-basket (*canasta básica*) Consumer Price Index (CPI):[19]
  — 2005 calendar-year average: 118.562
  — 2011 calendar-year average: 156.564
  — August 2008:   138.362
  — August 2010:   149.785
  — August 2012:   165.151
  — August 2014:   181.062
- Area-price deflators (shown here for 2014):[20]
  — Urban: 1.1068
  — Rural: 0.8228
  — All-Mexico: 1.0000

---

[18] World Bank, 2008.

[19] The basic-food-basket CPI here is rebased to 100 in January 2002. It comes from `www.banxico.org.mx/SieInternet/consultarDirectorioInternetAction.do?sector=8&accion=consultarCuadro&idCuadro=CP154&locale=es`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

[20] For old-definition 2005 PPP lines, the area-price deflator is an area's old-definition food line divided by the all-Mexico person-weighted average old-definition food line. For 2014, the urban food line is MXN43.22, the rural food line is MXN32.13, and the all-Mexico food line is MXN39.05 (Table 2). The urban deflator is then $43.22 \div 39.05 = 1.1068$, and the rural deflator is $32.13 \div 39.05 = 0.8228$. The resulting all-Mexico person-weighted average deflator is 1.0000. The deflators for old-definition 2005 PPP lines are based on old-definition food lines because the food line is closer to the 2005 PPP lines than are the other (higher) old-definition national lines.

A given area's old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line in average prices in all of Mexico in August of a given ENIGH year is

$$\frac{\text{MXN7.648} \cdot 1.25 \cdot \left(\dfrac{\text{CPI}_{\text{Year}}}{\text{CPI}_{2005}}\right) \cdot \text{Area - price deflator in Year}}{\text{Average of area - price deflators in Year}}.$$

For the example of rural areas in 2014, the old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line is

$$\frac{\text{MXN7.648} \cdot 1.25 \cdot \left(\dfrac{181.062}{118.562}\right) \cdot 0.8228}{1.0000} = \text{MXN12.01 (Table 2)}.$$

Old-definition 2005 PPP lines for 2008, 2010, and 2012 are found the same way. The all-Mexico old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line in a given year is the person-weighted average of the urban and rural lines. For 2014, the old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line for Mexico as a whole is MXN14.60 per person per day, giving a household-level poverty rate of 1.5 percent and a person-level poverty rate of 2.0 percent (Table 1).

The old-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line is twice the old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line.

The World Bank's PovcalNet[21] does not report 2005 PPP figures for Mexico in 2014. For 2008, 2010, and 2012, PovcalNet reports consumption-based person-level

---

[21] `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNetPPP2005/`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

poverty rates of 1.2, 0.7, and 1.0 percent.[22] These are lower than the rates here (2.1, 2.5,

and 2.3 percent, Table 1). One factor in the difference is that PovcalNet uses grouped

data (not household-level data) for 2008 and 2010. The influence of other possible

factors cannot be checked here because PovcalNet does not report:

- The value of PovcalNet's $1.25/day 2005 PPP lines in MXN
- Whether PovcalNet uses the same measure of consumption as INEGI (and if so, whether it is old- or new-definition)
- Whether PovcalNet counts months—as it usually does—as having $365 \div 12 = 30.42$ days or as having 30 days (to match the definition of consumption in CONEVAL (2010a, p. 89)
- How (or whether) PovcalNet adjusts for area-price differences
- The time and place of PovcalNet's price units
- How PovcalNet deflates PPP factors over time

This paper provides better documentation and also adjusts for urban/rural price

differences, so its $1.25/day 2005 PPP figures (and its $1.90/day 2011 PPP figures) are

to be preferred (Schreiner, 2014b).

[22] For 2008: `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNetPPP2005/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=MEX_3&PPP0=7.65&PL0=1.25&Y0=2008&NumOfCountries=1`.
For 2010: `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNetPPP2005/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=MEX_3&PPP0=7.65&PL0=1.25&Y0=2010&NumOfCountries=1`.
For 2012: `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNetPPP2005/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=MEX_3&PPP0=7.65&PL0=1.25&Y0=2012&NumOfCountries=1`.
All three retrieved 14 May 2017.

2.4.3 New-definition national lines

Like the old-definition national poverty lines, Mexico's new-definition national lines use Ravallion's (1998) cost-of-basic-needs method. The two definitions differ mainly in that the new definition uses more recent data and a different derivation of the basic baskets of food and non-food items.

The new-definition food line (*línea de bienestar mínima*) is derived with data from households in the 2006 ENIGH. A household's nutritional standard depends on its area of residence and on its number of members by age-sex group (CONEVAL, 2012 and 2010a). The standard covers not only calories but also protein, iron, zinc, and vitamins A and C. An area's reference group is the quintile of per-adult-equivalent consumption in which the average ratio of the caloric standard to calories consumed (as observed in the 2006 ENIGH) is about 1.00.[23]

The process then identifies food items in the 2006 ENIGH that are eaten by at least 10 percent of people in an area's reference group and that are at least 0.5 percent of the reference group's food consumption. Using expert judgment, the shares of items in the food basket are then scaled up or down to more closely meet the nutritional standard as well as to balance four food groups better.[24]

---

[23] These are the 41st to 60th percentiles (urban) and the 32nd to 51st percentiles (rural).
[24] The food groups are fruits and vegetables; grains and tubers; legumes and animal products; and beverages, oil, sugar, and take-out/meals-away-from-home.

The new-definition food line is then the cost of an area's food basket with the prices for the reference group in the 2006 ENIGH. For later ENIGHs, the price of each food item is inflated based on its official price index. For 2014, the new-definition food line is MXN38.53 per adult equivalent per day (Table 1), giving all-Mexico poverty rates of 18.1 percent (households) and 20.6 percent (people).

100% of the new-definition national line (*línea de bienestar*) is the new-definition food line, plus the consumption implied by a basic standard of non-food goods and services (CONEVAL, 2012 and 2010a). An item appears in the basic non-food basket if it fulfills at least one of three pairs of criteria:

- First criterion:
    — Its income elasticity is less than one (economists call it a "necessity"), and
    — Most households in a special-purpose survey consider it a necessity
- Second criterion:
    — It is consumed by at least 20 percent of households, and
    — It is at least 0.16 percent of non-food consumption
- Third criterion:
    — It is a basic aspect of education, or
    — It is a basic aspect of health care

An area's basic non-food standard is then the average value of consumption implied by items in the non-food basket with the prices faced by the reference group in the 2006 ENIGH.[25] In a given area and year, 100% of the new-definition national line is the new-definition food line, divided by the ratio of the average observed food consumption in the reference group in the 2006 ENIGH to the sum of the reference group's average observed food-plus-non-food consumption. For 2014, the all-Mexico line

---

[25] For later ENIGHs, each non-food item's price is inflated using its official price index.

30

is MXN77.57 per adult equivalent per day, giving poverty rates of 47.7 percent (households) and 53.2 percent (people).

In urban areas, 100% of the new-definition national line is MXN84.74 per adult equivalent per day (with poverty rates of 44.9 percent for households and 50.5 percent for people, Table 2). In rural areas, the line is MXN53.82 (with poverty rates of 57.7 percent for households and 62.4 percent for people).

The lines for 150% and 200% of the new-definition national line are multiples of 100% of the new-definition national line.[26] For the three new-definition national (food-plus-non-food) lines, observed poverty rates in the ENIGH increased from 2008 to 2010, decreased from 2010 to 2012, and increased from 2012 to 2014 (Table 1).

---

[26] All the person-level poverty rates in Table 1 for the new-definition food line and 100% of the new-definition national line match CONEVAL (`www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/ Documents/Datos_Abiertos/Pobreza_ingresos_1992_2010_nac/Pobreza_dimension_ ingreso_nacional_1992_2014_DA.csv`, retrieved 14 May 2017).

2.4.4 New-definition international 2005 PPP lines

New-definition international 2005 PPP lines are derived in the same way as old-definition international 2005 PPP lines. All differences stem from differences in the old and new definitions of *poverty*:

- Area-price deflators are based on the new-definition food line rather than the old-definition food line
- New-definition consumption (which excludes explicit and implicit expenditure on housing) is used rather than old-definition consumption (which includes housing expenditure)
- Sampling weights are based on the 2010 Census rather than the 2000 Census
- Rural areas have less than 2,500 people rather than less than 15,000 people

The new-definition 2005 PPP lines are derived with these parameters:

- 2005 PPP exchange rate for "individual consumption expenditure by households" in Mexico: MXN7.648 per USD
- Average all-Mexico basic-food-basket (*canasta básica*) Consumer Price Index (CPI):
  — 2005 calendar-year average: 118.562
  — 2011 calendar-year average: 156.564
  — August 2008:   138.362
  — August 2010:   149.785
  — August 2012:   165.151
  — August 2014:   181.062
- Area price deflators (shown here for 2014):
  — Urban: 1.0750
  — Rural: 0.7511
  — All-Mexico: 1.0000

A given area's new-definition \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line in average prices in all of Mexico in August of a given ENIGH year is

$$\frac{\text{MXN7.648} \cdot 1.25 \cdot \left(\dfrac{\text{CPI}_{\text{Year}}}{\text{CPI}_{2005}}\right) \cdot \text{Area - price deflator in Year}}{\text{Average of area - price deflators in Year}}.$$

For the example of rural areas in 2014, the new-definition \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line is

$$\frac{\text{MXN7.648} \cdot 1.25 \cdot \left(\dfrac{181.062}{118.562}\right) \cdot 0.7511}{1.0000} = \text{MXN10.97 (Table 2)}.$$

New-definition 2005 PPP lines for 2008, 2010, and 2012 are derived in the same way. The all-Mexico new-definition \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line in a given year is the person-weighted average of the urban and rural lines. For 2014, the all-Mexico new-definition \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line is MXN14.60 per person per day, giving a household-level poverty rate of 3.7 percent and a person-level poverty rate of 4.4 percent (Table 1).

The new-definition 2005 PPP lines for \$2.00/day, \$2.50/day, and \$5.00/day are multiples of the new-definition \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line.

PovcalNet does not report \$1.25/day 2005 PPP figures for Mexico in 2014. For 2008, 2010, and 2010, PovcalNet reports consumption-based head-count poverty rates of 1.2, 0.7, and 1.0 percent. These are much lower than the rates here (4.9, 5.5, and 4.9 percent, Table 1). One factor in the difference is PovcalNet's use of grouped data (not

household-level data) for 2008 and 2010. Other possible contributors that are not

covered in PovcalNet's documentation include:

- Whether PovcalNet uses the same measure of consumption as INEGI (and if so, whether it is old- or new-definition)
- Whether PovcalNet uses per-adult-equivalent consumption (the form of consumption shipped with the ENIGH data and incorrectly labeled as being "per capita") or whether it uses (as it should) per-capita consumption
- Whether PovcalNet counts months—as it usually does—as having $365 \div 12 = 30.42$ days or as having 30 days (to match the definition of consumption in CONEVAL (2010a, p. 89)
- How (or whether) PovcalNet adjusts for area-price differences
- The time and place of PovcalNet's price units
- How PovcalNet deflates PPP factors over time

The international PPP poverty lines here are to be preferred, as they are better

documented and are adjusted for area-price differences (Schreiner, 2014b).

2.4.5 New-definition international 2011 PPP lines

New-definition international 2011 PPP lines are derived like new-definition

international 2005 PPP lines except that the 2005 PPP conversion factor (MXN7.648

per USD) is replaced with a 2011 PPP conversion factor (MXN8.94021 per USD).[27]

A given area's new-definition \$1.90/day 2011 PPP line in average prices in all of

Mexico in August of a given ENIGH year is

$$
\frac{\text{MXN8.94021} \cdot 1.90 \cdot \left(\dfrac{\text{CPI}_{\text{Year}}}{\text{CPI}_{2011}} \right) \cdot \text{Area - price deflator in Year}}{\text{Average of area - price deflators in Year}} \, .
$$

---

[27] `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=MEX_3&` `PPP0=8.94021&PL0=1.90&Y0=2014&NumOfCountries=1`, retrieved 15 May 2017.

For the example of rural areas in 2014, the new-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line is

$$\frac{\text{MXN8.94021} \cdot 1.90 \cdot \left(\frac{181.062}{156.564}\right) \cdot 0.7511}{1.0000} = \text{MXN14.76 (Table 2)}.$$

New-definition 2011 PPP lines for 2008, 2010, and 2012 are derived in the same way. The all-Mexico new-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line in a given year is the person-weighted average of the urban and rural lines. For 2014, this is MXN19.64 per person per day, with a household-level poverty rate of 6.6 percent and a person-level rate of 7.7 percent (Table 1).

The new-definition $3.10/day 2011 PPP line is a multiple of the new-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line.

For $1.90/day 2011 PPP with the 2008 to 2014 ENIGH, PovcalNet reports lines of MXN15.02, 16.37, 17.70, and 19.07 per person per day, with person-level poverty rates of 3.8, 3.8, 2.7, and 3.0 percent.[28] These are much lower than those here (8.0, 8.7, 6.3, and 7.7 percent, Table 1). As discussed above, PovcalNet's documentation is too incomplete to determine the factors behind the differences, favoring a preference for the figures here.

---

[28] For 2014: `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=MEX_3&PPP0=8.94021&PL0=1.90&Y0=2014&NumOfCountries=1`. For 2012: `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=MEX_3&PPP0=8.94021&PL0=1.90&Y0=2012&NumOfCountries=1`. For 2010: `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=MEX_3&PPP0=8.94021&PL0=1.90&Y0=2010&NumOfCountries=1`. For 2008: `iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/Detail.aspx?Format=Detail&C0=MEX_3&PPP0=8.94021&PL0=1.90&Y0=2008&NumOfCountries=1`. All retrieved 14 May 2017.

2.4.6 USAID "very poor" line

The new-definition line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line is defined as the median of the aggregate household per-capita consumption of people (not households) below 100% of the new-definition national line (U.S. Congress, 2004). Unlike all the previous (non-relative) lines, this line (and the percentile-based lines below) is derived by:

- Applying area-price adjustments to consumption rather than to the poverty line
- Deriving a single line for all of Mexico rather than area-specific lines for urban/rural
- Reversing area-price adjustments out of consumption and putting them back in the poverty line[29]

---

[29] This corrects how the scorecard derived this line prior to 2016 (in particular, in Schreiner 2006a, 2009a, and 2009b). Formerly, area-price adjustments remained in the poverty line. Each area's poverty line was compared with nominal consumption to find a line in each poverty-line area that marked the poorest half of people below 100% of the national line in that particular poverty-line area. Both approaches produce an all-country person-level poverty rate that is half that of 100% of the national line, but the set of people who are identified as *poor* differs. 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 now used here) is correct (although IRIS Center still incorrectly derives this line based on households instead of people).

Microenterprise programs in Mexico who use the scorecard to report the number

of their participants who are "very poor" to USAID should use the new-definition line

that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national 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 in a

given ENIGH round:

- The new-definition line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line (MXN38.36 in 2014, with a person-level poverty rate of 26.6 percent, Table 1)
- New-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP (MXN19.64 in 2014, with a person-level poverty rate of 7.7 percent)

2.4.7   New-definition percentile-based poverty lines

The scorecard also supports new-definition percentile-based poverty lines for

Mexico (Table 1).[30] This facilitates a number of types of analyses. For example, the

second-quintile (40th-percentile) line might be used to help track Mexico's progress

towards 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 four quintile lines, analyzed together, could also be used to look at the

relationship of consumption with health outcomes (or anything else related with the

distribution of consumption). The scorecard thus offers an alternative for health-equity

analyses that have typically used a "wealth index" such as that supplied with the data

from the Demographic and Health Surveys (Rutstein and Johnson, 2004) to compare

some estimate of wealth with health outcomes.

Of course, analysts could always do (and can still do) asset-based, relative-

wealth analyses with scores from the scorecard. But support for relative consumption

lines 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)

---

[30] Following practice in the DHS wealth indexes, the percentile-based lines here are
based on person-level quintiles. For example, the first-quintile (20th-percentile) new-
definition line is set so that the all-Mexico person-level (not household-level) poverty
rate is 20 percent (Table 1).

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

In contrast, a wealth index opaquely defines *poverty* in terms of its own indicators and points, without reference to an external standard (Ravaillon, 2012). This means that two wealth indexes with different indicators or different points—even if derived from the same data for a given country—imply two different definitions of *poverty.* In the same set-up, two scorecards would both apply a single definition of consumption-based poverty.

3. Scorecard construction

For Mexico, about 100 candidate indicators are initially prepared in the areas of:

- Household composition (such as the number of members 17-years-old or younger)
- Education (such as the highest level and grade completed by the male head/spouse)
- Housing (such as the main material of the floor)
- Ownership of durable assets (such as clothes-washing machines or fans)

Table 3 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.[31]

One possible application of the scorecard is to measure *changes* in poverty through time. Thus, when selecting indicators—and holding other considerations constant—preference is given to more sensitive indicators. For example, the ownership of a gas or electric stove, or a microwave is probably more likely to change in response to changes in poverty than is the age of the male head/spouse.

The scorecard itself is constructed using 100% of the new-definition national poverty line and Logit regression on the construction sub-sample from the 2014 ENIGH. Indicator selection uses both judgment and statistics. The first step is to use Logit to build one scorecard for each candidate indicator. The power of each one-indicator scorecard to rank households by poverty status is measured as "c" (SAS Institute Inc., 2004).

---

[31] The uncertainty coefficient is *not* used when selecting scorecard indicators. It is just a way to order the candidate indicators listed in Table 3.

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 relationship with poverty, 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 two-indicator scorecard is then selected, again using judgment to balance statistical accuracy with the non-statistical criteria. These steps are repeated until the scorecard has 11 indicators that work well together.[32]

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).

---

[32] For Mexico, indicator selection was informed by feedback from a user review and from field tests by Habitat for Humanity Mexico and by VisionFund Mexico.

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 statistical[33] and non-statistical criteria. The use of non-statistical criteria can improve robustness through time and across non-nationally representative groups. It also helps ensure that indicators are simple, common-sense, and acceptable to users.

The single scorecard here applies to all of Mexico. Segmenting poverty-assessment tools by urban/rural does not improve targeting accuracy much as shown for nine countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (Brown, Ravaillon, and van de Walle, 2016)[34], Indonesia (World Bank, 2012), Bangladesh (Sharif, 2009), India and Mexico (Schreiner, 2006b and 2005a), Sri Lanka (Narayan and Yoshida, 2005), and Jamaica (Grosh and Baker, 1995). In general, segmentation may improve the accuracy of estimates of poverty rates (Schreiner, forthcoming; Diamond *et al.*, 2016; Tarozzi and Deaton, 2009), but it may also increase the risk of overfitting (Haslett, 2012).

---

[33] 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.

[34] The nine countries are Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda. On average across these countries when targeting people in the lowest quintile or in the lowest two quintiles of scores and when 20 or 40 percent of people are poor, segmenting by urban/rural increased the number of poor people correctly targeted by one per 200 or 400 poor people.

4. Guidelines for scorecard use in practice

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 scorecard projects fail, the reason is not usually statistical inaccuracy but rather the failure of an organization to decide to do what is needed to integrate the scorecard 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 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, the scorecard does not imply a lot of additional work and if the whole process generally seems to them to make sense.

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

- Only 11 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 the new 2014 scorecard in Mexico would:

- Record the interview identifier, interview date, country code ("MEX"), scorecard code ("004"), and the sampling weight assigned by the program's survey design to the household of the participant (if known)
- Record the names and identifiers of the participant (who need not be the same as the respondent), of the field agent, and of the relevant program service point
- Complete the "Back-page Worksheet" with each household member's first name or nickname, age, and whether the member is 17-years-old or younger
- Based on what has already been recorded on the "Back-page Worksheet", record the number of household members in the scorecard header next to the heading "Number of household members:"
- Based on what has already been recorded on the "Back-page Worksheet", mark the response to the first scorecard indicator ("How many household members are 17-years-old or younger?")
- Read the rest of the scorecard indicators to the respondent one-by-one
- Draw circles around the relevant responses and their points. Then write 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).[35] 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. Schreiner (2014a) explains how to compute estimates and analyze them.

In particular, while collecting indicators for a scorecard is relatively easier than alternative ways of assessing 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 after the "References" section in this paper, as these "Guidelines"—

---

[35] If a program does not want field workers and respondents to know the points associated with responses, then it can give them 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 use common sense to guess how response options are linked with poverty. Schreiner (2012b) 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.

along with the "Back-page Worksheet"—are integral parts of the Simple Poverty Scorecard tool.[36]

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 straightforward 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 household's self-reported responses to indicators in a poverty-assessment tool in the first stage of targeting in Mexico's conditional cash-transfer program *Oportunidades*, 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 Mexico does 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 the scorecard for targeting in Mexico.

---

[36] The guidelines here are the only ones that organizations 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 Mexico's INEGI did in the ENIGH.

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

- Who will do the interviews
- How interviews will be done
- How responses and scores will be recorded
- Which participants will be interviewed
- How many participants will be interviewed
- How frequently participants will be interviewed
- Whether the scorecard 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

There is only one correct, on-label way to do interviews: in-person at the sampled household's residence with an enumerator trained to follow the "Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators". This is how Mexico's INEGI did interviews in the 2014 ENIGH, and this provides the most-accurate data and thus the best poverty estimates. Of course, it is possible to do interviews in other ways such as without an enumerator (for example, respondents fill out paper or web forms on their own or answer questions sent via e-mail, text messaging, or automated interactive voice-response systems), away from the residence (for example, at an organizational service

point or at a group-meeting place), or not in-person (for example, an enumerator

interviewing by phone). While such off-label methods may reduce costs, they also affect

responses (Schreiner, 2015a) and thus reduce the accuracy of scorecard estimates. Thus,

interviewing by a trained enumerator at the residence is recommended; off-label

methods are not recommended. In some contexts—such as when field agents do not

already visit participants periodically at home anyway—an organization might judge

that the lower costs an off-label approach are enough to compensate for less-accurate

estimates. The business wisdom of off-label methods depends on context-specific factors

that organizations must judge for themselves. To judge carefully, organizations who are

considering off-label methods should test how responses differ with an off-label method

versus with a trained enumerator at the residence.

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[37]

---

[37] The author of this paper can help organizations set up a system to collect data with portable electronic devices in the field or to capture data in a database at the office once paper forms come in from the field.

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 and/or 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 be less on having a sample size large enough to achieve some arbitrary level of statistical significance and more on having a representative sample from a well-defined population that is relevant for issues that matter to the program.

The frequency of application can be:

- As a once-off project (precluding measuring change)
- Every three 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 changes 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 will score all participants each time they visit a 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 Mexico, 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 reduce it by half.

To get absolute units, scores are converted to *poverty likelihoods*, that is, probabilities of being below a poverty line. This is done via straightforward look-up tables. For the example of 100% of the new-definition national line, scores of 45–49 have a poverty likelihood of 53.8 percent, and scores of 50–54 have a poverty likelihood of 46.3 percent (Table 4).

The poverty likelihood associated with a score varies by poverty line. For example, scores of 45–49 are associated with a poverty likelihood of 53.8 percent for 100% of the new-definition national line but 4.8 percent for the new-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line.[38]

---

[38] From Table 4 on, many tables have 23 versions, one for each of the 23 poverty lines. To keep them straight, they are grouped by line. Single tables pertaining to all lines appear with the first group of tables for 100% of the new-definition national 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 or per-adult-equivalent consumption below a given poverty line.

For the example of 100% of the new-definition national line (Table 5), there are 8,836 (normalized) households in the calibration sub-sample with a score of 45–49. Of these, 4,753 (normalized) are below the poverty line. The estimated poverty likelihood associated with a score of 45–49 is then 53.8 percent, because 4,753 ÷ 8,836 = 53.8 percent.

To illustrate with 100% of the new-definition national line and a score of 50–54, there are 8,330 (normalized) households in the calibration sub-sample, of whom 3,860 (normalized) are below the line (Table 5). The poverty likelihood for this score range is then 3,860 ÷ 8,330 = 46.3 percent.

The same method is used to calibrate scores with estimated poverty likelihoods for all 23 poverty lines.[39]

---

[39] 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.

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 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 Mexico scorecard are transformed coefficients from a Logit regression, (untransformed) scores are not converted to poverty likelihoods via the Logit formula of $2.718281828^{\text{score}}$ x $(1 + 2.718281828^{\text{score}})^{-1}$. 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.[40]

Of course, the relationships between indicators and poverty do change to some unknown extent over time, and they also vary across sub-national groups in Mexico's population. Thus, the scorecard will generally be biased when applied after November 2014 (the last month of fieldwork for the 2014 ENIGH) or when applied with sub-groups that are not nationally representative.

---

[40] This is because these estimates of populations' 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 Mexico as a whole? To find out,

the scorecard is applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of size $n = 16,384$ with the 2014

validation sample. Bootstrapping means to:

- Score each household in a validation sample
- Draw a bootstrap sample *with replacement* from a validation sample
- For each score range, compute the observed 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 range, record the difference between the estimated poverty likelihood (Table 4) and the poverty likelihood observed in the bootstrap sample
- Repeat the previous three steps 1,000 times
- For each score range, report the average difference between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods across the 1,000 bootstrap samples
- For each score range, report the two-sided intervals containing the central 900, 950, and 990 differences between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods

For each score range and for $n = 16,384$, Table 6 shows the average errors, that

is, the average differences between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods. It also

shows confidence intervals for the differences.

For 100% of the new-definition national line, the average poverty likelihood

across bootstrap samples for scores of 45–49 in the 2014 validation sample is too high

by 10.7 percentage points. For scores of 50–54, the estimate is too high by 9.7

percentage points.

The 90-percent confidence interval for the differences for scores of 45–49 is ±3.8

percentage points (Table 6). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps, the average

difference between the estimate and the observed value for households in this score

55

range is between $+6.9$ and $+14.5$ percentage points (because $+10.7 - 3.8 = +6.9$, and $+10.7 + 3.8 = 14.5$). In 950 of 1,000 bootstraps (95 percent), the difference is $+10.7 \pm 4.5$ percentage points, and in 990 of 1,000 bootstraps (99 percent), the difference is $+10.7 \pm 6.1$ percentage points.

Several of the absolute differences between estimated poverty likelihoods and observed values in Table 6 for 100% of the new-definition national line are large. In addition, errors tend to be positive (estimated poverty is too high) for higher scores and negative (estimated poverty is too low) for lower scores. There are differences because the 2014 validation sample is a single sample that—thanks to sampling variation— differs in distribution from the construction/calibration sub-sample and from Mexico's population. For targeting, however, what matters is less the difference in all score ranges and more the difference 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.

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 in 2014, although it holds less well for samples from sub-national populations or in other time periods.

Another possible source of differences between estimates and observed values is overfitting. The scorecard here is unbiased, but it may still be *overfit* when applied after

the end of the ENIGH fieldwork in November 2014. That is, the scorecard may fit the construction/calibration data from 2014 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 2014 ENIGH construction/calibration data but not in the overall population of Mexico. 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.

Most errors in individual households' likelihoods do balance out in the estimates of 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, and imperfections in price adjustments. 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 poverty rate at a point in time

A population's estimated poverty rate at a point in time is the average of the estimated poverty likelihoods of households in a representative sample from the population.

To illustrate, suppose a program samples three households on 1 January 2018 and that they have scores of 20, 30, and 40, corresponding to poverty likelihoods of 82.9, 72.9, and 59.8 percent (100% of the new-definition national line, Table 4). The group's estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of (82.9 + 72.9 + 59.8) ÷ 3 = 71.9 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 72.9 percent. This differs from the 71.9 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, 2012a), or comparison—if desired—with a cut-off for targeting. There are a few contexts in which

the analysis of scores is appropriate,[41] but, in general, the safest rule to follow is: If you are not completely sure what to do, then use poverty likelihoods, not scores.

Scores from the new 2014 scorecard are calibrated with data from the 2014 ENIGH for all 23 poverty lines. The process of calibrating scores to poverty likelihoods and the approach to estimating poverty rates is exactly the same for all poverty lines. For users, the only difference in terms of what they do with one poverty line versus with another is 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 2014 scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$ from the 2014 validation sample and 100% of the new-definition national poverty line, the average error (difference between estimates and observed values in the 2014 validation sample) for a poverty rate at a point in time is +1.7 percentage points (Table 8, summarizing Table 7 across all poverty lines). Across all 23 poverty lines in the 2014 validation sample, the maximum average absolute error is 4.6 percentage points, and the average of the average absolute errors is about 1.8 percentage points. At least part of these differences is due to sampling variation in the division of the 2014 ENIGH into sub-samples.

---

[41] As discussed elsewhere in this paper, the analysis of scores is appropriate when estimating the direction of change over time with a baseline and a follow-up from an old 2006 or 2008 scorecard.

When estimating poverty rates at a point in time for a given poverty line, the average error reported in Table 8 should be subtracted from the average poverty likelihood to give a corrected estimate. For the example of the new 2014 scorecard and 100% of the new-definition national line in the 2014 validation sample, the error is +1.7 percentage points, so the corrected estimate in the three-household example above is 71.9 − (+1.7) = 70.2 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 ±0.8 percentage points or better for all poverty lines (Table 8). This means that in 900 of 1,000 bootstraps of this size with the scorecard's standard assumptions, the estimate (after correcting for the known average error) is within 0.8 percentage points of the observed value.

For example, suppose that the (uncorrected) average poverty likelihood in a sample of $n = 16,384$ with the new 2014 scorecard and 100% of the new-definition national line is 71.9 percent. Then estimates in 90 percent of such samples would be expected to fall in the range of 71.9 − (+1.7) − 0.8 = 69.4 percent to 71.9 − (+1.7) + 0.8 = 71.0 percent, with the most likely observed value being the corrected estimate in the middle of this range, that is, 71.9 − (+1.7) = 70.2 percent. This is because the original (uncorrected) estimate is 71.9 percent, the average error is +1.7 percentage points, and the 90-percent confidence interval for 100% of the new-definition national line in the 2014 validation sample with this sample size is ±0.8 percentage points (Table 8).

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 error (average difference vis-à-vis observed values), together with their standard error (precision).

Schreiner (2008) proposes an approach to deriving a formula for the standard errors of estimated poverty rates at a point in time from indirect measurement via poverty-assessment tools. 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 the 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 $\begin{cases} 1.04 \text{ for confidence levels of 70 percent} \\ 1.28 \text{ for confidence levels of 80 percent} \\ 1.64 \text{ for confidence levels of 90 percent} \end{cases}$,

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

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

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

N is the population size, and

n is the sample size.

For example, Mexico's 2014 ENIGH gives a direct-measurement estimate of the

household-level poverty rate for 100% of the new-definition national line in the 2014

validation sample of $\hat{p}$ = 47.7 percent (Table 1).[42] If this estimate came from a sample

of n = 16,384 households from a population N of 32,150,400 (the number of households

in Mexico in 2014 according to ENIGH's new-definition sampling weights), then the

finite population correction ϕ is $\sqrt{\dfrac{32,150,400 - 16,384}{32,150,400 - 1}}$ = 0.9997, which very close to $\phi =$

1. If the desired confidence level is 90-percent (z = 1.64), then the confidence interval

$\pm c$ is $\pm z \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{\hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{N - n}{N - 1}} = \pm 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{0.477 \cdot (1 - 0.477)}{16,384}} \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{32,150,400 - 16,384}{32,150,400 - 1}} =$

± 0.640 percentage points. If ϕ were taken as 1, then the interval is still ± 0.640

percentage points.

Unlike the 2014 ENIGH, however, the scorecard does not measure poverty

directly, so this formula is not applicable. To derive a formula for the new 2014

scorecard, consider Table 7, which reports empirical confidence intervals $\pm c$ for the

errors for the scorecard applied to 1,000 bootstrap samples of various sizes from the

2014 validation sample. For example, with n = 16,384 and 100% of the new-definition

national line in the 2014 validation sample, the 90-percent confidence interval is ± 0.797

percentage points.[43]

---

[42] The analysis here ignores that poverty-rate estimates from the ENIGH are themselves
based on samples and so have their own sampling distribution.
[43] Due to rounding, Table 7 displays 0.8, not 0.797.

Thus, the 90-percent confidence interval with $n = 16{,}384$ is ±0.797 percentage

points for the new 2014 scorecard and ±0.640 percentage points for direct measurement.

The ratio of the two intervals is $0.797 \div 0.640 = 1.25$.

Now repeat with exercise with $n = 8{,}192$. The confidence interval under direct

measurement and 100% of the new-definition national line in the 2014 validation sample

is $\pm 1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{0.477 \cdot (1 - 0.477)}{8{,}192}} \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{32{,}150{,}400 - 8{,}192}{32{,}150{,}400 - 1}} = \pm0.905$ percentage points. The

empirical confidence interval with the new 2014 scorecard (Table 7) is ±1.177

percentage points. Thus for $n = 8{,}192$, the ratio of the two intervals is $1.177 \div 0.905 =$

1.30.

This ratio of 1.30 for $n = 8{,}192$ is close to the ratio of 1.25 for $n = 16{,}384$. Across

all sample sizes of 256 or more in Table 7, these ratios are generally close to each other,

and the average of these ratios in the 2014 validation sample turns out to be 1.23,

implying that confidence intervals for indirect estimates of poverty rates via Mexico's

new 2014 scorecard and 100% of the new-definition national line are—for a given

sample size—about 23-percent wider than confidence intervals for direct estimates via

the 2014 ENIGH. This 1.23 appears in Table 8 as the "α factor for precision" because if

$\alpha = 1.23$, then the formula for confidence intervals c for the new 2014 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 the scorecard is $\alpha \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{\hat{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p})}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{N - n}{N - 1}}$.

In general, α can be more or less than 1.00. When α is more than 1.00, it means that the scorecard is has larger standard errors than direct measurement. It turns out that α is more than 1.00 for 16 of the 23 poverty lines in Table 8, with a range from 0.89 to 1.52.

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 $\widetilde{p}$ is the expected poverty rate before measurement, then the formula for sample size n from 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

$$n = N \cdot \left(\frac{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p})}{z^2 \cdot \alpha^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p}) + c^2 \cdot (N - 1)} \right).$$ 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 $n = \left(\frac{\alpha \cdot z}{c} \right)^2 \cdot \widetilde{p} \cdot (1 - \widetilde{p})$.

To illustrate how to use this, suppose the population N is 32,150,400 (the number of households in Mexico in 2014), suppose $c = 0.06216$, $z = 1.64$ (90-percent confidence), and the relevant poverty line is 100% of the new-definition national line so that the most sensible expected poverty rate $\widetilde{p}$ is Mexico's overall poverty rate for that line in 2014 (47.7 percent at the household level, Table 1). The α factor is 1.23 (Table 8). Then the sample-size formula gives

$$n = 32{,}150{,}400 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64^2 \cdot 1.23^2 \cdot 0.477 \cdot (1 - 0.477)}{1.64^2 \cdot 1.23^2 \cdot 0.477 \cdot (1 - 0.477) + 0.06216^2 \cdot (32{,}150{,}400 - 1)} \right) = 264,$$

which is close to the sample size of 256 observed for these parameters in Table 7 for

100% of the new-definition national line. Taking the finite population correction factor

ϕ as one (1) gives almost the same result, as $n = \left(\dfrac{1.23 \cdot 1.64}{0.06216} \right)^2 \cdot 0.477 \cdot (1 - 0.477) =$

263.[44]

Of course, the α factors in Table 8 are specific to Mexico, its poverty lines, its

poverty rates, and the new 2014 scorecard. The derivation of the formulas for standard

errors using the α factors, however, is valid for any poverty-assessment tool following

the approach in this paper.

---

[44] 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's microenterprise partners in Mexico should report using the new-definition poverty line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line. Given the α factor of 1.10 for this line (Table 8), an expected before-measurement household-level poverty rate of 23.0 percent (the all-Mexico rate for this line in 2014, Table 1), and a confidence level of 90 percent ($z = 1.64$), then $n = 300$ implies a confidence interval of $\pm\, 1.64 \cdot 1.10 \cdot \sqrt{\dfrac{0.230 \cdot (1 - 0.230)}{300}} = \pm 4.4$ percentage points.

In practice after the end of ENIGH fieldwork in November 2014, a program would select a poverty line (say, 100% of the new-definition national line), note its participants' population size (for example, $N = 10{,}000$ participants), select a desired 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 new-definition national line for Mexico of 47.7 percent in the 2014 ENIGH in Table 1), look up α (here, 1.23 in Table 8), assume that the scorecard will still work in the future and for sub-groups that are not nationally representative,[45] and then compute the required sample size. In this illustration,

$$ n = 10{,}000 \cdot \left(\frac{1.64^2 \cdot 1.23^2 \cdot 0.477 \cdot (1 - 0.477)}{1.64^2 \cdot 1.23^2 \cdot 0.477 \cdot (1 - 0.477) + 0.02^2 \cdot (10{,}000 - 1)} \right) = 2{,}025. $$

---

[45] This paper reports accuracy for the scorecard applied to its validation samples, but it does not test accuracy for later years nor for sub-populations that are not nationally representative. Performance after November 2014 will resemble that in the 2014 ENIGH with deterioration over time to the extent that the relationships between indicators and poverty status change.

7. Estimates of changes in poverty rates over time

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

To give an idea of how accurate the new 2014 scorecard might be when used to measure changes in poverty rates over time from now on, this section looks at how accurate this scorecard would have been if it had been applied with a baseline from the 2014 validation sample and follow-ups from the 2008, 2010, or 2012 validation samples.[46]

The tests here are stringent because:

- They compare scorecard estimates with observed values from the ENIGH
- The tests are *out-of-sample* in that they use—in both baseline and follow-up—only ENIGH data from households that is not used in construction nor calibration of the new 2014 scorecard
- The tests are *out-of-time* in that the follow-up data is from a different time (2008, 2010, or 2012) than the data used to construct the scorecard (2014)

---

[46] In actual use, of course, the baseline data is collected before the follow-up data. The 2014 data is used as a baseline for the tests here (with data from 2008, 2010, and 2012 used as follow-ups) for two reasons. First, the old 2008 scorecard will not be used from now on to estimate consumption-based poverty, so tests with it as the baseline are not relevant. Second, tests with the new 2014 scorecard cannot use 2014 data as a baseline with later data as a follow-up because there is no later data. In any case, such tests are merely indicative—not definitive—as there is no way to know for certain how well the new 2014 scorecard will work in, say, 2018. Also, if the 2014 scorecard is (in)accurate looking backwards from 2014 to 2008, then it implies that the 2008 scorecard is also (in)accurate looking forwards from 2008 to 2014 because it means that the population of Mexico changed and/or that the relationships between indicators and poverty changed.

Of course, these necessarily backward-looking tests can only give—at best—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. The issue of the expected accuracy of the old 2006 and 2008 scorecards (in the past) and the new 2014 scorecard (in the past and in the future) is discussed more below.

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 a pair of ENIGH rounds must be due to some combination of:

- Changes in the relationships between indicators and poverty
- Changes in the composition of Mexico's population
- Sampling variation
- Differences in how scorecard indicators were asked across ENIGH rounds
- Inconsistent data quality
- Inconstant definitions of *poverty*
- Imperfections in how well a definition of *poverty* captures a household's consumption-based poverty

Of course, the more resistent a scorecard's estimates are to deviations from its assumptions, the better. If a scorecard's real-world inaccuracies render it useless for measuring change in a given context for a given purpose, then it 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*

The scorecard can estimate change. Of course, poverty could get better or worse, and the scorecard does not indicate what caused change. This point is often forgotten or confused, so it bears repeating: the scorecard merely estimates change, and it does not, in and of itself, indicate the causes of change. In particular, estimating the impact of participation requires knowing what would have happened to participants if they had not been participants. Making judgments or drawing conclusions about causality 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   Warning: Estimate change over time only with a baseline and a follow-up from the same scorecard

When estimating changes in poverty rates for Mexico, the same scorecard should be used at both baseline and follow-up. This is because there are large errors when the new 2014 scorecard is applied to estimate changes over time with the validation samples from 2008, 2010, and 2012. Most of the errors probably stem from large changes in the relationships between indicators and poverty. This sub-section discusses the implications for estimating change over time in Mexico with the scorecard.

As noted in the introduction, it seems that the standard assumptions of the scorecard do not hold well in Mexico across the past four ENIGH. In particular, tests (discussed below) show that the new 2014 scorecard is very inaccurate when measuring change between 2014 and 2008, 2010, or 2012.

In Mexico, per-capita or per-adult-equivalent consumption worsened a little from 2008 to 2014. At the same time, the distribution of responses to scorecard indicators— number of children, education of the male head/spouse, basic features of the residence, and asset ownership—either improved or stayed the same. Thus, the scorecard estimates a large decrease in poverty when, in fact, poverty increased a little. It follows that the link between indicators and consumption-based poverty must have changed a lot from 2008 to 2014.

Table 13 shows how the household-level distribution of scorecard indicators changed in the ENIGH from 2008 to 2014. Households had fewer members 17-years-old or younger, and the education of the male head/spouse went up, both signals of lower consumption-based poverty. More residences had a higher-quality floor, a kitchen sink for washing dishes, and a toilet arrangement with a piped water supply, again signalling lower consumption-based poverty. Likewise, more households had clothes-washing machines, computers, and mobile phones. The three remaining indicators (having a gas or electric stove, or a microwave; having an automobile; and the number of fans) stayed the same. If scorecard indicators improve or remain the same while consumption-based

poverty worsens, then it means that the relationship between indicators and poverty

has changed, violating a basic scorecard assumption.[47]

For similar reasons, the old 2006 and 2008 scorecards are inaccurate for

measuring change in consumption-based poverty between 2006 (or 2008) and 2014. If

the scorecard's assumptions do not hold going back from 2014 to 2008, then they also

do not hold going forward from 2006 (or 2008) to 2014. Given the large errors in

estimates of change in consumption-based poverty (for both the old and new scorecards

between 2006 and 2014), legacy users who want to salvage baseline data from an old

scorecard should pair it only with follow-up data from the same old scorecard,

analyzing only changes in the distribution of scores (not changes in the averages of

poverty likelihoods) to estimate the direction (but not the magnitude) of changes in an

asset-based definition of *poverty* (as opposed to a consumption-based definition). This

---

[47] Data collection or sampling frames may also change. For example, the 2008 ENIGH
asks about *automatic* clothes-washing machines even though other rounds omit the
word *automatic* and so ask about both automatic (electric) and non-automatic (hand-
cranked) machines. According to INEGI's Customer Service Department, this 2008-only
wording change had no effect. But the share of households (old-definition weights) who
report having a clothes-washing machine dips unrealistically sharply in 2008:

Year	% with clothes-washing machine	Includes word "automatic"?
2002	54	No
2004	65	No
2005	62	No
2006	64	No
2008	54	Yes
2010	65	No
2012	65	No
2014	67	No

This causes some of the observed inaccuracy in the estimates of changes in
poverty rates between 2014 and 2008, but of course it does not affect other year-pairs.

approach is completely accurate by definition, as it defines *poverty* in terms of the scorecard's own indicators and points, rather than in terms of a consumption-based poverty line outside of the scorecard.

What about the accuracy of the new 2014 scorecard from now on? If poverty in Mexico falls after 2014 and if the new 2014 scorecard is used to estimate change over short periods, then the new 2014 scorecard should be about as accurate from now on as is typical among the other 16 countries for which there are similar tests. Under these assumptions, users from now on can estimate consumption-based changes over time with both a baseline and a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard without expecting unusual inaccuracy.

7.3   Estimating changes in poverty rates over time

The rest of this section documents the out-of-sample/out-of-time tests of the accuracy of scorecard estimates of change over time.

Consider the illustration begun in the previous section. On 1 January 2018, a program samples three households who score 20, 30, and 40 and so have poverty likelihoods of 82.9, 72.9, and 59.8 percent (100% of the new-definition national line, Table 4). Correcting for the known average error for this line in the 2014 validation sample of +1.7 percentage points (Table 8), the corrected baseline estimated poverty rate is the households' average poverty likelihood of $[(82.9 + 72.9 + 59.8) ÷ 3] − (+1.7)$ = 70.2 percent.

After baseline, two sampling approaches are possible at follow-up:

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

By way of illustration, suppose that three years later on 1 January 2021, 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 79.1, 68.2, and 53.8 percent, 100% of the new-definition national line, Table 4). Adjusting for the known average error, the average poverty likelihood at follow-up is $[(79.1 + 68.2 + 53.8) \div 3] - (+1.7) = 65.3$ percent, an improvement of $70.2 - 65.3 = 4.9$ percentage points.[48] Supposing that exactly three years passed between the average baseline interview and the average follow-up interview, the estimated annual rate of decrease in poverty is $4.9 \div 3 = 1.6$ percentage points per year. About one in 20 participants in this hypothetical example cross the poverty line between 2018 and 2021.[49] Among those who start below the line, about one in 14 ($4.9 \div 70.2 = 7.0$ percent) on net end up above the line.[50]

---

[48] Of course, such a huge reduction in poverty in three years is unlikely, but this is just an example to show how the scorecard can be used to estimate change.

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

[50] The scorecard does not reveal the reasons for this change.

Alternatively, suppose that the same three original households who were scored at baseline are scored again on 1 January 2021. Given scores of 25, 35, and 45, their follow-up poverty likelihoods are 79.1, 68.2, and 53.8 percent. The average across households of the difference in each given household's baseline poverty likelihood and its follow-up poverty likelihood is $[(82.9 - 79.1) + (72.9 - 68.2) + (59.8 - 53.8)] \div 3 = 4.8$ percentage points.[51] Assuming in this example that there are exactly three years between each household's interviews, the estimated annual decrease in poverty is $4.8 \div 3 = 1.6$ percentage points per year.

Given the assumptions of the scorecard, both approaches to estimating change through time are unbiased. In general, 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).

---

[51] In this second approach, the error for this line in Table 8 should *not* be subtracted off. The 4.8 percentage points here differs from the 4.9 percentage points in the first approach because rounding takes place at different stages in the two calculations.

7.4 Accuracy for estimated change in two independent samples

The accuracy of the scorecard's estimates of changes in poverty rates over time is checked using data from the 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014 ENIGH. While one cannot "drive by looking in the rear-view mirror", historical accuracy is the best-available—but inevitably imperfect—indicator of future accuracy.

Change between 2014 (baseline) and 2008, 2010, or 2012 (follow-ups) can be estimated for the 17 non-relative poverty lines supported for the new 2014 scorecard.[52] The average of the average absolute errors across the 51 estimates of change (17 for 2014 to 2012, 17 for 2014 to 2010, and 17 for 2014 to 2008) is about 5.3 percentage points (Table 9), while the average of the average absolute changes observed in the ENIGH is about 1.6 percentage points. Thus, the average absolute error is more than triple the average absolute observed change. This is not good enough, even for government work.

For the example of 100% of the new-definition national line, the error from 2014 to 2012 is +2.2 percentage points, the error from 2014 to 2010 is +26.6 percentage points, and the error from 2014 to 2008 is +9.6 percentage points.

In the case of 2014 to 2012, the observed change was –1.2 percentage points (the household-level poverty rate decreased from 47.7 percent in 2014 to 46.5 percent in

---

[52] Change cannot be estimated for relative lines because their value is not constant over time. The relative lines are the five new-definition percentile-based lines and the new-definition line that marks the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line.

2012, that is, a decrease of 1.2 percentage points, Table 1). But the scorecard estimates that poverty increased by 1.0 percentage point (from 47.7 percent to 48.7 percent). The error is thus the estimated change minus the observed change, that is $+1.0 - (-1.2) = +2.2$ percentage points.[53]

For 25 of the 51 estimates, the observed value is in the estimate's 90-percent confidence interval (given $n = 1,024$). Of course, if the scorecard's assumptions held, then more or less 46 of the 51 90-percent confidence intervals would contain the observed value. This is inadequate accuracy.

The estimated direction of change (that is, whether poverty increased or decreased) matches the observed direction of change for 16 of 51 cases. Of the 16 cases that get the direction right, only one is for a national poverty line; the rest are for international PPP lines, generally lower ones that are associated with lower poverty rates.

Five of the 51 estimates of the direction of change are "statistically significant" in that the estimated direction matches the observed direction and in that zero is not in the estimate's 90-percent confidence interval (given $n = 1,024$). Even for this lowest of hurdles, accuracy for Mexico is worse than in the other 16 countries for which such tests

---

[53] When pro-poor programs estimate change over time for their participants, they must estimate poverty rates for both for baseline and follow-up. In contrast, when a government or the World Bank estimates change for a country's population between a baseline year with a national consumption survey and a follow-up year without a national consumption survey, they only need to estimate the follow-up poverty rate.

have been done (Schreiner 2017a, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, 2016d, 2015b, 2015c, 2015d, 2015e, 2013a, 2013b, 2012c, 2010, 2009c, 2009d; and Chen and Schreiner, 2009).

These results are not encouraging for the hope that the scorecard can usefully estimate change over time in Mexico, at least when the baseline or follow-up estimate is taken between 2006 (or 2008) and 2014. Of course, accuracy might be better (or worse) from now on with the new 2014 scorecard.

In sum, the new 2014 scorecard for Mexico is very inaccurate for estimating change between 2014 (baseline) and 2008, 2010, or 2012 (follow-ups). As discussed above, users should therefore avoid estimating changes in consumption-based poverty that involve a baseline or a follow-up from the old 2006 or 2008 scorecards. From now on, it is reasonable to assume that estimates of change that use only the new 2014 scorecard will be about as accurate as they typically are in other countries as long as poverty is decreasing in Mexico.

7.5 Precision for estimates of change in two samples

For two equal-sized independent samples (and maintaining the standard assumptions of the scorecard), 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 poverty-assessment tool'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,[54] 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.

For Mexico, the average α across the 51 cases of estimated change with historical data in Table 9 is about 1.23. For $n = 16{,}384$, the 90-percent confidence intervals are ± 9.2 percentage points or better.

---

[54] 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 total interviews (not twice as many) as does estimating a poverty rate at a point in time.

As before, the formula for standard errors can be rearranged to give a formula for sample sizes before indirect measurement via a poverty-assessment tool, where $\widetilde{p}$ is based on previous measurements and is assumed equal at both baseline and follow-up:

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

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

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 new-definition national line, $\alpha = 1.13$ (Table 9 for 2014 to 2008), $\hat{p} = 0.477$ (the household-level poverty rate in 2014 for 100% of the new-definition national 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

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.13 \cdot 1.64}{0.02} \right)^2 \cdot 0.477 \cdot (1 - 0.477) \cdot 1 \ = \ 4{,}284,$$ and the follow-up sample size is also

4,284.

7.6 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:[55]

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

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. With the available data for Mexico, it is not possible to estimate values of α here.

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, an agnostic assumption is that the change in the poverty rate will be zero, which implies $\tilde{p}_{12} = \tilde{p}_{21} = \tilde{p}_*$, giving:

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

---

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

Because $\widetilde{p}_*$ could be anything between 0 and 0.5, more information is needed to apply this formula. Suppose that the observed relationship between $\widetilde{p}_*$, the number of years y between baseline and follow-up, and $p_{\text{pre-baseline}} \cdot \left(1 - p_{\text{pre-baseline}}\right)$ is—as in Peru (Schreiner, 2009e)—close to:

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

Given this, a sample-size formula for a group of households to whom the new 2014 scorecard is applied twice (once after November 2014 and then again later) is

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

In Peru (the only source of a data-based estimate, Schreiner, 2009e), 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 new-definition national line, the sample will first be scored in 2018 and then again in 2021 ($y = 3$), and the population N is 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_{2018} is taken as 47.7 percent (Table 1), and α is assumed to be 1.30. Then the baseline sample size is

$$n = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{1.30 \cdot 1.64}{0.02}\right)^2 \cdot \left[-0.02 + 0.016 \cdot 3 + 0.47 \cdot 0.477 \cdot \left(1 - 0.477\right)\right] \cdot 1 = 3{,}302. \text{ The same}$$

group of 3,302 households is scored at follow-up as well.

8. Targeting

When a program uses the scorecard for segmenting clients for differentiated treatment (*targeting*), households with scores at or below a cut-off are labeled *targeted* and given one type of treatment by the program. Households with scores above a cut-off are labeled *non-targeted* and given another type of treatment.

There is a distinction between *targeting status* (having a score 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 poverty-assessment tool.

Households who score at or below a given cut-off should be labeled as *targeted*,[56] 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 the scorecard, the terms *poor* and *non-poor* have specific definitions. Using these same terms for targeting status is incorrect and misleading.

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*).

---

[56] Other labels are acceptable as long as they describe the segment and do not confuse targeting status (having a score at or below a program-selected cut-off) with poverty status (having consumption at or below an externally-defined poverty line). Examples of acceptable labels include *Groups A, B, and C*; *Households with scores of 29 or less, 30 to 69, or 70 or more*; and *Households who qualify for reduced fees, or do not*.

Of course, no poverty-assessment tool 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 10 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 11 shows the distribution of households by targeting outcome for Mexico. For an example cut-off of 49 or less, outcomes for 100% of the new-definition national line in the 2014 validation sample are:

- Inclusion: 34.8 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 12.8 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 15.1 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 37.3 percent are above the line and correctly not targeted

Increasing the cut-off to 54 or less improves inclusion and undercoverage but worsens leakage and exclusion:

- Inclusion: 38.6 percent are below the line and correctly targeted
- Undercoverage: 9.0 percent are below the line and mistakenly not targeted
- Leakage: 19.7 percent are above the line and mistakenly targeted
- Exclusion: 32.7 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   x   Households correctly included   –
Cost per household mistakenly not covered   x   Households mistakenly not covered   –
Cost per household mistakenly leaked   x   Households mistakenly leaked   +
Benefit per household correctly excluded   x   Households correctly excluded.

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

- Assign benefits and costs to possible outcomes, based on its values and mission
- Tally total net benefits for each cut-off using Table 11 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 a scorecard—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:

Hit rate =   1   x   Households correctly included   –
            0   x   Households mistakenly undercovered   –
            0   x   Households mistakenly leaked   +
            1   x   Households correctly excluded.

Table 11 shows the hit rate for all cut-offs for the new 2014 scorecard. For 100%

of the new-definition national line in the 2014 validation sample, total net benefit—

under the hit rate—is greatest (72.1) for a cut-off of 49 or less, with more than two in

three households in Mexico 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 x Households correctly included) + (1 x Households correctly excluded).[57]

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 12 ("% targeted HHs who are poor") shows, for the new 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample, the expected poverty rate among households who score at or below a given cut-off. For the example of 100% of the new-definition national line, targeting households in the 2014 validation sample who score 49 or less would target 49.9 percent of all households (second column) and would be associated with an expected poverty rate among targeted households of 69.8 percent (third column).

Table 12 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 new-definition national line with the 2014 validation sample and a cut-off of 49 or less, 73.2 percent of all poor households are covered.

---

[57] Table 11 also reports BPAC, the Balanced Poverty Accuracy Criteria adopted by USAID for certifying poverty-assessment tools. Section 9 explains why BPAC does not add useful information beyond that in the more-standard measures used here.

The final targeting measure in Table 12 is the number of successfully targeted poor households for each non-poor household mistakenly targeted (right-most column). For 100% of the new-definition national line with the 2014 validation sample and a cut-off of 49 or less, covering 2.3 poor households means leaking to 1 non-poor household.

9. Context of poverty-assessment tools in Mexico

This section discusses a poverty-assessment tool for Mexico in terms of its goals, methods, definition of *poverty*, data, indicators, errors, bias, precision, and cost. In addition, Schreiner (2009b) reviews poverty-mapping tools for Mexico and their implications for users of the scorecard. That comparison/contrast is still relevant, covering poverty maps for Mexico by Bellon *et al.* (2004), López Calva *et al.* (2005), Demombynes, Elbers, and Lanjouw (2008), and Tarozzi and Deaton (2009).[58]

In general, the advantages of the scorecard are its:

- Using data from the most-recent nationally representative consumption survey
- Having fewer and lower-cost indicators
- Using a consumption-based definition of *poverty* that is widely understood and that is used by the government of Mexico
- Reporting errors and precision for estimates of poverty rates at a point in time from out-of-sample tests, including formulas for standard errors
- Reporting errors and precision for estimates of changes in poverty rates over time from out-of-sample and out-of-time tests, including formulas for standard errors
- 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 lines)
    — Relative wealth (via scores)
- Reporting targeting accuracy, and having targeting accuracy that is similar to that of alternative approaches
- Being feasible for pro-poor programs in Mexico due to its low cost and transparency

USAID commissioned IRIS Center (2010) to construct the "Poverty Assessment Tool" (PAT) to help its microenterprise partners fulfill a mandate to report the share of

---

[58] Schreiner (2009b, p. 25) notes that "Deaton has a chance at a future Nobel Prize", and indeed he later became the 2015 laureate in economics.

their participants who are "very poor", defined for Mexico at the time as having

consumption below the old-definition line that marks the poorest half of people below

100% of the old-definition upper national line (U.S. Congress, 2004).

In general, the PAT for Mexico is like the scorecard except that it:

- Estimates consumption itself (not whether a household's consumption is below a poverty line) and then converts estimated consumption to a poverty likelihood of either 0 or 100 percent (rather than a poverty likelihood between 0 and 100)
- Uses data from the 2008 ENIGH (rather than from the 2014 ENIGH. The old 2008 scorecard in Schreiner, 2009b, uses the 2008 ENIGH)
- Has more indicators (19 rather than 11)
- Does not report errors nor standard errors for estimates of changes in poverty rates
- Does not report sample-size formula for point-in-time nor change-over-time estimates

The PAT supports five old-definition poverty lines:

- Line marking the poorest half of people under 100% of the upper national line
- Food line (*línea alimentaria*)
- Lower national line (*línea de capacidades*)
- 100% of the upper national line (*línea de patrimonio*)
- 150% of the upper national line

IRIS tests four regression-based approaches in both one-stage and two-stage

versions (IRIS, 2005), settling on a one-step quantile regression that estimates the 37th

percentile of the logarithm of per-capita household consumption, conditional on the

household's responses to the PAT's 19 indicators (IRIS, 2010):

- Demographics:
    — Number of household members (and its square)
    — Age of the head (and its square)
- Characteristics of the residence:
    — Number of rooms
    — Type of floor
    — Source of drinking water
    — Method of garbage disposal
- Consumer durables:

- — Presence of a toaster
- — Presence of a microwave oven
- — Presence of a refrigerator
- — Presence of a clothes-washing machine
- — Presence of a television
- — Presence of a VCR or DVD player
- — Presence of a vacuum cleaner
- — Presence of a computer
- — Presence of a automobile other than a van or a pick-up truck
- — Presence of a van
- — Presence of a pick-up truck
- Location of residence:
  - — Urban/rural
  - — Federal entity

For Mexico, Schreiner (2014b) reports an apples-to-apple comparison of the PAT (IRIS, 2010) versus the old 2008 scorecard (Schreiner, 2009b). In out-of-sample tests, the absolute values of the average error for the old-definition line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the old-definition upper national line is about the same for the scorecard (–0.8 percentage points) as for the PAT (+0.4 percentage points).[59] The PAT is less precise (its α factor for standard errors is 1.61 versus 1.03 for the scorecard). For targeting, the scorecard classifies one more household per 1,000 correctly than does the PAT. To sum up, the PAT and the scorecard are about tied in terms of accuracy.

IRIS also reports accuracy in terms of the Balanced Poverty Accuracy Criterion. IRIS Center (2005) introduced BPAC, and USAID adopted it as its criterion for approving poverty-assessment tools for use by its microenterprise partners. BPAC

---

[59] In any case, the average error is known and so can be removed, making both the PAT and the scorecard unbiased.

considers accuracy in terms of inclusion and in terms of the absolute difference between

undercoverage and leakage (which under the PAT's approach—but not under the

scorecard's approach—is equal to the absolute error of the estimated poverty rate):

$$\text{BPAC} = 100 \cdot \left(\frac{\text{Inclusion} - |\,\text{Undercoverage} - \text{Leakage}\,|}{\text{Inclusion} + \text{Undercoverage}} \right).$$

Because the error (in the PAT approach) is the difference between undercoverage

and leakage, and because the normalization term $\dfrac{100}{\text{Inclusion} + \text{Undercoverage}}$ may be

relevant only when comparing poverty-assessment tools across populations with

different poverty rates (but irrelevant when comparing alternative poverty-assessment

tools for a given country in a given year for a given poverty line), the cleaner formula of

$\text{BPAC} = \text{Inclusion} - |\,\text{Error}\,|$ ranks poverty-assessment tools the same as the more

complex formula.

Expressing BPAC as $\text{Inclusion} - |\,\text{Error}\,|$ helps to show why BPAC is not useful

for comparing the PAT with the scorecard (Schreiner, 2014b). Given the assumptions

discussed earlier,[60] scorecard estimates of poverty rates are unbiased, regardless of

whether undercoverage differs from leakage when (or if) targeting. While BPAC can be

used to compare alternatives that use the PAT's consumption-estimation approach, it

does not make sense to apply the BPAC formula to the scorecard's likelihood-

estimation approach. This is because the scorecard does not use a single consumption

---

[60] The unbiasedness of the PAT—or of any other poverty-assessment tool—also requires
these same assumptions.

cut-off to classify households as either 100-percent poor or 0-percent poor. Instead,

households have an estimated poverty likelihood somewhere between 0 to 100 percent. If

a scorecard user sets a targeting cut-off, then that cut-off matters only for rank-based

targeting, and it does not affect the estimation of poverty rates at all.

Although IRIS reports the PAT's targeting accuracy and although the BPAC

formula considers targeting accuracy in terms of inclusion, IRIS disavows the use of the

PAT for targeting.[61]

---

[61] FHI360 (2013) and `povertytools.org/faq/faq2.html` (retrieved 16 May 2017).

IRIS also disavows using the PAT to estimate change over time, saying "It is unclear that the tools will be able to identify real changes in poverty over time due to their inherent measurement errors. Unless the changes in the poverty rate are exceptionally large and unless the tools are exceptionally accurate, then the changes identified are likely to be contained within the margin of error."[62] Even though IRIS does not report accuracy for estimates of change over time for Mexico nor for any other country, it nevertheless asserts that the confidence interval for estimates of change—for some unstated confidence level and some unstated sample size—will usually include zero. For the new 2014 scorecard for Mexico applied with the validation samples for the 2008 to 2014 ENIGHs, 5 of 51 out-of-time/out-of-sample estimates of change are statistically different from zero with $n = 1,024$ and 90-percent confidence. This level of inaccuracy indeed supports not using the Mexico scorecard to estimate change over time, but it is not typical of the other 16 countries for which this type of accuracy has been measured.

In any case, the scorecard supports targeting and estimating changes over time by reporting accuracy for these possible uses. This allows users to decide for themselves whether the scorecard is adequate for their purposes.

---

[62] `povertytools.org/faq/faq2.html`, retrieved 16 May 2017.

10. Conclusion

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

- The likelihood that a household has consumption below a given poverty line
- A population's poverty rate at a point in time
- The change in a population's poverty rate over 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 Mexico that want to improve how they monitor and manage their social performance.

The new 2014 scorecard is constructed with data from half of the households in Mexico's 2014 ENIGH. Those households' scores are then calibrated to poverty likelihoods for 23 poverty lines. The accuracy (errors and precision) of the new 2014 scorecard is tested out-of-sample on data that is not used in scorecard construction for targeting, for estimates of household's poverty likelihoods at a point in time, and for estimates of a population's poverty rates a point in time.

When the scorecard is applied to the 23 poverty lines in the 2014 validation sample, the maximum average absolute error for point-in-time estimates of poverty rates is 4.6 percentage points, and the average of the average absolute errors across poverty lines is about 1.8 percentage points. Corrected estimates may be had by subtracting the known error for a given poverty line from the original, uncorrected estimates.

For $n = 16,384$ and 90-percent confidence, the precision of point-in-time estimates of poverty rates is ± 0.8 percentage points or better. With $n = 1,024$, the 90-percent confidence intervals are ± 3.3 percentage points or better.

The accuracy of estimates for changes in poverty rates over time is tested out-of-sample and out-of-time. Of course, the scorecard's estimates of change are not necessarily the same as estimates of program impact. It turns out that the errors of estimates of change over time for the new 2014 scorecard applied with the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and with all households from the 2008, 2010, or 2012 ENIGH (follow-ups) are very large. The factors driving these large errors also affect the accuracy of estimates of change over time based on the old 2006 and 2008 scorecards.

Users can avoid these inaccuracies when estimating change in two ways. First, all users should switch to the new 2014 scorecard from now on. As long as consumption in Mexico increases while scorecard indicators improve, and as long as the new 2014 scorecard is like those in the other 16 countries for which the accuracy of change over time has been tested, and as long as the new 2014 scorecard is updated in a reasonable time frame, then the new 2014 scorecard should not be expected to suffer from unusually large inaccuracies.

Second, users should not combine a baseline from an old scorecard with a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard. If legacy users insist, they can estimate change over time with both a baseline and a follow-up from an old 2006 or 2008 scorecard (but not with a follow-up from the new 2014 scorecard, even when using a poverty line supported

by both old and new scorecards).[63] They would estimate the direction of change in asset-based poverty based on changes in the distribution of scores (rather than estimating the direction and magnitude of the change in consumption-based poverty based on changes in the averages of poverty likelihoods). Such an asset-based approach is perfectly valid—and it has some advantages over a consumption-based approach—but asset-based estimates of poverty are more difficult to communicate, and they are not comparable with consumption-based estimates nor with asset-based estimates from other poverty-assessment tools. Nevertheless, the approach allows legacy users to salvage information on the direction of change from existing baseline estimates from an old scorecard.

If a program wants to use the scorecard for segmenting clients for differentiated treatment, 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.

---

[63] For a time, such legacy users would apply both an old scorecard and the new 2014 scorecard, creating a current follow-up corresponding to a past baseline from the old scorecard as well as a current baseline corresponding to a future follow-up from a new 2014 scorecard.

For this reason, the scorecard uses 11 indicators that are straightforward, low-cost, 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 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 to trust the scorecard 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 Mexico to estimate consumption-based poverty rates, to track changes in poverty rates over time, and to segment participants for differentiated treatment. 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.

Alkire, Sabina; and María Emma Santos. (2010) "Acute Multidimensional Poverty: A New Index for Developing Countries", Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative Working Paper No. 38, `www.ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ophi-wp38.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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.

Bellon, Mauricio R.; Hodson, David P.; Martínez-Romero, Y.; Montoya, Y.; Becceril, J.; and J.W. White. (2004) "Geospatial Dimensions of Poverty and Food Security: A Case Study for Mexico", `cimmyt.org/GIS/povertymexico/poverty_mapping_final_draft.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Brown, Caitlin; Ravallion, Martin; and Dominique van de Walle. (2016) "A Poor Means Test? Econometric Targeting in Africa", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7915, `documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/484991481639919564/pdf/WPS7915.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Caire, Dean. (2004) "Building Credit Scorecards for Small-Business Lending in Developing Markets", `microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_SMEs_Hybrid.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____; 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 5 February 2017.

Camacho, Adriana; and Emily Conover. (2011) "Manipulation of Social-Program Eligibility", *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 41–65.

Chen, Shiyuan; and Mark Schreiner. (2009) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Vietnam", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/VNM_2006_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Coady, David; Grosh, Margaret; and John Hoddinott. (2004) *Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries*, `hdl.handle.net/10986/14902`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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

Comité Técnico para la Medición de la Pobreza. (2002) "Medición de la Pobreza: Variantes Metodológicas y Estimación Preliminar", `alternativasycapacidades.org/sites/default/files/biblioteca_file/CTM Pjulio2002.pdf`, accessed 14 May 2017.

Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social. (2012) "Construcción de las líneas de bienestar: Documento Metodológico", `www.coneval.gob.mx/Informes/Coordinacion/INFORMES_Y_PUBLICACIONES_PDF/Construccion_lineas_bienestar.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2011) "Nota Técnica: Cambio de base del Índice Nacional de Precios al Consumidor y sus efectos en la medición de la pobreza", `internet.coneval.gob.mx/Informes/Pobreza%202010/Lineas%20de%20bienestar%20y%20canasta%20basica/Nota%20tecnica%20-%20Cambio%20de%20base%20INPC.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2010a) "Metodología para la medición multidimensional de la pobreza en México", `www.coneval.gob.mx/Informes/Coordinacion/INFORMES_Y_PUBLICACIONES_PDF/Metodologia_Multidimensional_web.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2010b) "La pobreza por ingresos en México", `www.coneval.gob.mx/rw/resource/coneval/info_public/PDF_PUBLICACIONES/POBREZA_INGRESOS_MEXICO_WEB.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2009) "Evolución de la pobreza en México", `www.coneval.gob.mx/rw/resource/coneval/med_pobreza/pobreza_ingresos/presentacion_evolucion_ingresos.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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

de la Torre, Rodolfo. (2005) "Ingreso y Gasto en la Medición de la Pobreza", SEDESOL Documentos de Investigación No. 22, `www.2006-2012.sedesol.gob.mx/work/models/SEDESOL/Resource/2155/1/images/Docu_22_2003.pdf`, accessed 14 May 2017.

Deaton, Angus; and Salman Zaidi. (2002) "Guidelines for Constructing Consumption Aggregates for Welfare Analysis", World Bank Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper No. 135, `hdl.handle.net/10986/14101`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Demombynes, Gabriel; Elbers, Chris; and Peter Lanjouw. (2008) "How Good a Map? Putting Small-Area Estimation to the Test", *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, Vol. 116, No. 4, pp. 465–494.

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 14 May 2017.

FHI360. (2013) "USAID Poverty Assessment Tool (PAT): Data-Analysis Guide", `povertytools.org/USAID_documents/Manual/PATDataAnalysisManual.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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 14 May 2017.

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/W9OWN57PD0`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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.

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

IRIS Center. (2010) "Poverty-Assessment Tool Accuracy Submission: USAID/IRIS Tool for Mexico", July 19, `povertytools.org/countries/Mexico/USAID_PAT_Mexico.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2007a) "Manual for the Implementation of USAID Poverty Assessment Tools", `povertytools.org/training_documents/Manuals/USAID_PAT_Manual_Eng.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2007b) "Introduction to Sampling for the Implementation of PATs", `povertytools.org/training_documents/Sampling/Introduction_Sampling.ppt`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2005) "Notes on Assessment and Improvement of Tool Accuracy", `povertytools.org/other_documents/AssessingImproving_Accuracy.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Johnson, Glenn. (2007) "Lesson 3: Two-Way Tables—Dependent Samples", `onlinecourses.science.psu.edu/stat504/node/96`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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

López-Calva, Luís F.; Meléndez, Álvaro; Rascón, Ericka G.; Rodríguez-Chammusy, Lourdes; and Miguel Székely Pardo. (2005) "Poniendo al ingreso de los hogares en el mapa de México", Tecnológico de Monterrey Documento de Trabajo EGAP–2005–04, `researchgate.net/publication/5011897_Poniendo_al_ingreso_de_los_hogares_en_el_mapa_de_Mexico`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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 14 May 2017.

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

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

Narayan, Ambar; and Nobuo Yoshida. (2005) "Proxy-Means Tests for Targeting Welfare Benefits in Sri Lanka", World Bank Report No. SASPR–7, `documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2005/07/6209268/proxy-means-test-targeting-welfare-benefits-sri-lanka`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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.

Rascón Ramírez, Erica Gabriela. (2002) "Nota técnica para la medición de la pobreza con base en los resultados de la ENIGH de 2002", `sedesol2006.sedesol.gob.mx/subsecretarias/prospectiva/medicion_pobreza/Nota_tecnica_pobreza_2002.pdf`, accessed 27 July 2009.

Ravallion, Martin. (2012) "Mash-Up Indices of Development", *World Bank Research Observer*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 1–32.

_____. (1998) "Poverty Lines in Theory and Practice", World Bank LSMS Working Paper No. 133, `go.worldbank.org/8P3IBJPQS1`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Rutstein, Shea Oscar; and Kiersten Johnson. (2004) "The DHS Wealth Index", `measuredhs.com/pubs/pdf/CR6/CR6.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

SAS Institute Inc. (2004) "The LOGISTIC Procedure: Rank Correlation of Observed Responses and Predicted Probabilities", *SAS/STAT User's Guide, Version 9*, `support.sas.com/documentation/cdl/en/statug/63033/HTML/default/viewer.htm#statug_logistic_sect035.htm`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Schreiner, Mark. (forthcoming) "How Accurate is the Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool for Sub-National Groups?"

_____. (2017a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: El Salvador", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/SLV_2014_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2016a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: India", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/IND_2011_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2016b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Guatemala", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/GTM_2014_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2016c) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Sri Lanka", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/LKA_2012_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2016d) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Cameroon", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/CMR_2014_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2015a) "There's No Place Like Home? How the Interview Method Affects Results with the Progress out of Poverty Index[®]", microfinance.com/English/ Papers/Scoring_Poverty_Interview_Method_Effects_EN.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2015b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Ghana", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/GHA_2012_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2015c) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Bolivia", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/BOL_2013_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2015d) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Malawi", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MWI_2010_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2015e) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Cambodia", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/KHM_2011_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2014a) "The Process of Poverty-Scoring Analysis", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/Process_Poverty_Scoring_Analysis.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2014b) "How Do the Simple Poverty Scorecard and the PAT Differ?", microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scorecard_versus_PAT.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2013a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Bangladesh", SimplePovertyScorecard.com/BGD_2010_ENG.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2013b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Nicaragua",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/NIC_2009_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2012a) "An Expert-Based Poverty Scorecard for Rural China",
    `microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Poverty_China_EN.pdf`, retrieved
    14 May 2017.

_____. (2012b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Colombia",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/COL_2009_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2012c) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Peru",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2010_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2010) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Honduras",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/HND_2007_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2009a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Mexico",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2008_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2009b) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Mexico",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2006_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2009c) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Philippines",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PHL_2004_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2009d) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Pakistan",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PAK_2005_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2009e) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Peru",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2007_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2008) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Peru",
    `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/PER_2003_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2006a) "Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool: Mexico",
    `simplepovertyscorecard.com/MEX_2006_ENG.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2006b) "Is One Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool Enough for
    India?", `microfinance.com/English/Papers/`
    `Scoring_Poverty_India_Segments.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2005a) "La Herramienta del Índice de Calificación de la Pobreza™: México", `SimplePovertyScorecard.com/MEX_2002_SPA.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2005b) "IRIS Questions on the Simple Poverty Scorecard Poverty-Assessment Tool", `microfinance.com/English/Papers/ Scoring_Poverty_Response_to_IRIS.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____. (2002) *Scoring: The Next Breakthrough in Microfinance?* CGAP Occasional Paper No. 7, `microfinance.com/English/Papers/Scoring_Breakthrough_CGAP.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

_____; 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.

Sharif, Iffath Anwar. (2009) "Building a Targeting System for Bangladesh Based on Proxy-Means Testing", World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0914, `siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Safety-Nets-DP/0914.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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) "PPI Pilot Training Guide", `microfinancegateway.org/ sites/default/files/mfg-en-paper-progress-out-of-poverty-index-ppi-pilot-training-mar-2008.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

United States Congress. (2004) "Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 (HR 3818 RDS)", November 20, `smith4nj.com/laws/108-484.pdf`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

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

World Bank. (2013) "Shared Prosperity: A New Goal for a Changing World", May 8, `worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2013/05/08/shared-prosperity-goal-for-changing-world`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

———. (2012) *Targeting Poor and Vulnerable Households in Indonesia*, documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2012/01/15879773/targeting-poor-vulnerable-households-indonesia, retrieved 14 May 2017.

———. (2008) "International Comparison Project: Tables of Results", siteresources.worldbank.org/ICPINT/Resources/icp-final-tables.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Zeller, Manfred. (2004) "Review of Poverty Assessment Tools", pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADH120.pdf, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Guidelines for the Interpretation of Scorecard Indicators

The excerpts quoted below come from:

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2013) "Manual del Entrevistador", [the *Manual*], `www3.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/proyectos/enchogares/ modulos/mcs/2014/doc/mcs14_entrevistador.pdf`, retrieved 4 May 2017.

and

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2014) "Cuestionario de la Encuesta Nacional de Ingresos y Gastos de los Hogares", [the *Questionnaire*], `www.inegi.org.mx/est/contenidos/proyectos/encuestas/hogares/regulare s/enigh/enigh2014/ncv/default.aspx`, retrieved 14 May 2017.

Only train enumerators and promulgate rules from these "Guidelines"

When an issue comes up that is not addressed here, its resolution should be left to the unaided judgment of the enumerator, as that seems to have been what Mexico's INEGI did in the 2014 ENIGH. That is, an organization using the scorecard should not promulgate any definitions nor rules (other than those in these "Guidelines") to be used by all its field agents. Anything not explicitly addressed in these "Guidelines" is to be left to the unaided judgment of each individual enumerator. This is meant to mimic the practice in the 2014 ENIGH.

General guidelines for asking scorecard questions

In an interview, the first thing the enumerator should do is fill out the scorecard header and the "Back-page Worksheet", following the directions on the "Back-page Worksheet".

Do not ask the first scorecard indicator directly ("How many household members are 17-years-old or younger?"). 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.

Read the questions word-for-word exactly as they are written and in the order in which they appear on 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:

1. How many household members are 17-years-old or younger?		
	A. Three or more	0
	B. Two	11 **11**
	C. One	19
	D. None	29

In general, you should accept the responses given by the respondent. Still, 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 a response may not be accurate.

In general, your application of the scorecard should mimic as closely as possible INEGI's application of the 2014 ENIGH. For example, scoring interviews should take place in respondents' homesteads because the 2014 ENIGH took place in respondents' homesteads.

Confidentiality:
According to p. 2 of the *Questionnaire*, "Data from respondents . . . will be kept strictly confidential. It will not be used for non-statistical purposes in any way for any reason."

Who should be the respondent?
The respondent need not be the same person as the household member who is a participant with your organization.

According to p. 7 of the *Manual*, "The preferred respondent is the head of the household, the spouse/conjugal partner of the head, or a member of the household who is 18-years-old or older and who knows the relevant information about the household as a whole."

According to p. 128 of the *Manual*, the *head of the household* is "the person whom the members of the household recognize as the head. . . . The head may be a male or a female. Every household has a head, and a household can have only one head. . . . The head may or may not contribute to the economic support of the household."

General guidelines:
Study these "Guidelines" slowly and carefully. Take a copy with you to all interviews.

According to p. 12 of the *Manual*, "Your work as an enumerator is vitally importance because it determines the quality of the data collected that then helps [your organization] to learn about how [its partipants] live.

"As an enumerator, your must:

* Find the [households of participants] who have been selected into the sample
* Identify appropriate respondents
* Record the responses supplied
* Respect the respondents' schedules
* Review and cross-check the consistency of the data collected

"To do this, you must:

- Master . . . the interviewing techniques and the process of filling out the
  questionnaire
- Be organized, disciplined, and systematic
- Be persuasive and convincing
- Be analytical
- Comply with the following ethical considerations:
  — Do not change or omit a response from a respondent
  — Do not make up responses for questions or questionnaires that have been
    left blank. In other words, do not report responses that do not actually
    come from the respondent
  — Do not suggest or imply responses to the respondent
  — Do not pressure or force a respondent to respond
  — Do not offer compensation or make false promises in order to convince a
    respondent to participate
  — Do not reveal, repeat, or talk about the responses from a respondent.
    Likewise, do not let non-household members see a household's responses
  — Always keep in mind that the data collected is strictly confidential"

According to p. 46 of the *Manual*, you should do the following when you first arrive on
the doorstep of a selected household:

- Request to speak with the head of the household or with the spouse/conjugal
  partner of the head
- If neither of these two people are available, then ask to speak with someone who is
  18-years-old or older who has full knowledge of the household. Make sure that this
  person is a member of the household
- Identify yourself by name, and show your identification badge. Explain that you
  represent [your organization] and that the reason for the visit is to [conduct a short
  survey to help your organization to learn more about how its participants live]"

According to pp. 73–82 of the *Manual*, "an *interview* is cordial, respectful meeting whose
purpose is to establish a conversation between the respondent and the enumerator so as
to obtain the desired information. . . .

"There are three stages to an interview:

- First contact
- The interview proper
- Closing

First contact:
"When you first meet a household, keep the following in mind:

- The respondent's trust and goodwill depends strongly on his or her first impression of you based on your appearance and your attitude as you begin to talk. Thus, you must be dressed appropriately for the area
- Introduce yourself in a simple, friendly way. This will promote acceptance and trust so that the respondent is comfortable answering your questions openly and honestly, giving accurate, high-quality data
- Create a relaxed, cordial atmosphere by exuding an attitude that signals that you are a serious, hard-working, friendly, down-to-earth person with whom the respondent can speak frankly. Try to show that you are sure of your interviewing skill. Do not act timid or insecure, as this may drain the respondent's confidence in you

The key elements of an effective introduction are:

- Speak with the preferred respondent, asking for the head of the household or for his/her spouse/conjugal partner. If neither of these two people is available, then ask to speak with a household member who is 18-years-old or older and who can knowledgably answer questions on behalf of the household
- State your first and last names, and show your ID card. Throughout the interview, keep the ID card in a place where the respondent can see it so as to encourage his or her confidence that the interview is serious and legitimate. Explain that you represent [your organization] and that you are doing a [short] survey to learn [how participants of your organization live]. Tell the respondent what you are will ask of him or her
- Note that all responses will be kept confidential. If the respondent is not convinced right away, then show him or her a few of the survey questions, saying, for example, 'Why don't we start with a few questions so that you can get an idea of what this is all about?'

An example of your introduction might be: "Good morning, my name is [your first and last names]. Here is my ID card an employee of [your organization]. We are doing a [short] survey to understand better [how participants in your organization live]. Would it be OK with you if I ask you a few questions?"

<u>Conducting the interview proper</u>:

"After the first meeting—and once you have created an atmosphere of trust and goodwill—be sure to maintain that trust throughout the entire interview. There are a variety of skills and habits that will help you to do the interview successfully.

<u>Attention</u>

"You must pay close attention to the respondent for the entire interview, as this shows proper respect and courtesy. Paying attention will help you to collect accurate, high-quality data and to avoid losing track of your place in the sequence of questions.

"You must also be attentive to when the respondent seems bored or annoyed. When that happens, ask whether he or she would like to continue or whether it would be better to schedule a later time to finish up.

<u>Managing the interview</u>

"At times, there will be unexpected interruptions or problems, such as crying children, visits by salespeople, or telephone calls (among others). Always remember that these vicissitudes are part of the respondent's every-day life. For your part, show self-control and manage the interview with the necessary wisdom and patience.

"Wait as long as needed to continue the interview. Do not show any annoyance with the interruptions. It is better that the respondent feels comfortable and responds with goodwill than for him or her to reject you (and the interview) for being impatient.

"If the respondent wanders off-topic, beats around the bush, or launches into lengthy justifications of opinions that go beyond just answering the question asked, do not rudely interrupt. Instead, listen to what he or she has to say, then gently guide the conversation back to the interview question.

"If you find yourself left alone for a moment, do not walk around looking at the household's stuff. Instead, take advantage of the break to review what you have already recorded. This will help to avoid having to come back again later to complete omissions or to correct mistakes.

<u>Rhythm</u>

"When reading questions, do what you can to be clear and to read at a more or less constant speed. Try to figure out how well the respondent understands, and adjust your reading speed accordingly. If you and the respondent pause to discuss something other than the survey, be brief so as not to lose much time on off-topic discussions.

<u>Neutrality</u>

"The questions in the [scorecard] have been carefully crafted to be neutral. That is, they seek to avoid suggesting that one response is better or preferred over another. Remember that the purpose of the survey is to collect objective, accurate information that reflects reality. To do this:

- Do not show surprise, approval, nor disapproval in any way, whether by your tone of voice, by your facial expression, or by your body language
- Avoid talking about your own opinions on a subject. If the respondent asks for your opinion, tell him or her that you are happy to discuss it once the interview is over. This will help to avoid influencing the respondent's responses
- Never express your judgments (whether pro or con) because they might bother or otherwise affect the respondent
- Do not make assumptions about the responses that a respondent might give based on his or her personal or socio-demographic characteristics

<u>Probing</u>

"Probing is an important skill. It helps you to check whether a response can be improved if the respondent does not remember something, is uncertain, or gives a response that you know—or have reason to suspect—is inaccurate. For example:

Enumerator: "How old is Daniel?"
Respondent: "I do not remember whether he is three or four."
Enumerator: "Do you recall any big event that was going on at the time of his birth?"
Respondent: "Oh yes! It was during the 2010 World Cup. So he must be 4-years-old."

"You can also probe to clarify ambiguous responses. For example, suppose that a woman states that she 'works at home'. When the enumerator asks about the specific tasks that she does at home, the woman says that she does only household chores.

"Probe with neutral words and phrases that do not suggest or favor any specific response. These are some examples of neutral probing questions:

- Could your explain that to me a little more?
- What are you referring to?
- How does that work?
- What do you mean by . . .?

"Probing can help to clarify incomplete or unclear responses. For example:

- 'What do you mean by *run the business*'?
- Repeat the respondent's words: 'Please let me see if I have understood correctly. You said that your husband farms corn. What does his work consist of?'
- Repeat an important question word-for-word: 'What type of tasks does he do?'
- Ask again. 'I beg your pardon, but I did not understand what you said. Could you repeat it for me please? Could you explain a little more?'

Avoid questions that implicitly suggest an answer to the respondent or that permit (or encourage) inaccurate responses. For example, avoid the following types of expressions:

- I guess you are married.
- You work, right?
- Therefore you also did not receive as payment . . .
- How much did you earn, more or less?
- How much did that cost, more or less?

Read the questions in the order given
"The questions in [the scorecard] were designed with a logical order, and the questions should always be asked in that order.

Repeating questions
"You should read each question slowly, clearly, and loud enough to be heard well. Then stop and listen. If the respondent hesitates, expresses uncertainty, says nothing, or says 'I do not know', then you should repeat the question again, word-for-word as it is written. If the respondent still does not give a clear, unequivocal answer, then re-word the question without changing its original meaning.

Use of synonyms or regional vocabulary
"If you read a question word-for-word as it is written and if you then notice that the respondent does not understand because the vocabulary is not common in that region of Mexico, then you may adjust the wording by using regional terms or idioms. Of course, you must not change the original meaning of the question nor suggest that a particular response is expected or preferred.
       The following example dialog illustrates this idea with an idiom in southeast Mexico:

Enumerator: "What is your relationship with the head of the household?"
Respondent: "I beg your pardon; I do not understand the question."
Enumerator: "How are you related to the household head?"
Respondent: "Oh! I am his daughter-in-law."

<u>Closing</u>

"Once you have asked all the questions in [the scorecard] and recorded answers for all of them, double-check that the information is complete. Then inform the respondent that the interview is over.

"It is important to leave a good 'last impression', so be certain to be friendly and grateful when you take your leave from the interviewed household. . . . Tell the respondent that if there turns out to be some question about the information collected, you may return or make a telephone call to clarify.

"Do not give the household any reward or other compensation for their participation. In particular, do not give them a copy of their completed questionnaire, nor a blank questionnaire, nor anything else that you are not authorized to leave with them.

"As an example, one possible way to say good-bye is: "Well Mrs. Tórres, the interview is complete. Thank you very much for the time you have given me. Have a nice day!"

Guidelines for specific scorecard indicators

1. How many household members are 17-years-old or younger?
   - A. Three or more
   - B. Two
   - C. One
   - D. None

Do not ask this question directly. Instead, use the information recorded on the "Back-page Worksheet" to determine the response to mark. Also, make sure that you have recorded the number of household members in the scorecard header next to "Number of household members:".

You need not insist on knowing the precise age of each household member. Precision matters only if the correct age may be close to 17.

According to p. 123 of the *Manual*, a *household* is "a group of one or more people—regardless of blood or marital relationship—who usually live together in a residence and who share expenses (in particular, for food).

According to p. 6 of the *Manual*, *habitual residents* are "all people who usually live together in a residence where they usually sleep, eat, and take shelter."

    Household members are "the habitual residents of a given residence who share expenses (in particular, for food)."

    According to pages 120–122 of the *Manual*, "*share expenses* means to use the economic resources available to the group of people to provide for the consumption—whether as a group or individually—of certain goods and services, the most important of which is food. The economic resources are provided by one or more of the household members.

    A *usual residence* is "a specific lodging place (residence or dwelling) that a person has in which he or she sleeps, eats, and takes shelter, and to which he or she can return whenever desired.

"If someone's status as a *usual resident* is uncertain, then take the following into consideration. *Usual residents* of a residence include:

- New-born babies, even if they have not yet stayed in the residence because they have not yet left the place of their birth
- Those who are temporarily absent due to vacation, hospitalization, business trips, schooling, or for any other reason
- Those who daily cross back and forth across a border to work in a neighboring country, as well as those who work in a neighboring country (and stay there) on weekdays but who return to Mexico on weekends
- Domestic servants (and their family members) who sleep in the residence
- Foriegners who usually live in the residence
- People who, on the day of the interview, are staying in the residence and who have no other permanent place where they live
- People who, because of their work or school arrangements, do not eat at the residence even though they do sleep at the residence
- Paying lodgers who sleep in the residence are considered to be usual residents if the respondent considers them as such
- Those who travel from place to place for work or school (whether daily or for more than one day) who return to the residence on weekends
- People who, because of the nature of their work, do not sleep in the residence or who are frequently away from the residence, but who nevertheless consider themselves to be usual residents, such as truck drivers, train conductors, tour guides, night nurses, and so on

"The following are *not* usual residents of the residence:

- Visitors who are staying in the residence on the day of the interview but who consider themselves to have a usual residence elsewhere
- People who have left the residence to live somewhere else in order to work, go to school, or for some other reason

"If the respondent is unable to determine whether a person is a usual resident in the residence, then apply the following two criteria in the order indicated below. That is, if the first criteria allows the person to be classified as a usual resident or not, then base the person's classification on the first criterion (without considering the second criterion). But if the person cannot be classified based on the first criterion, then classify him or her based on the second criterion.

First criterion: Hypothetical self-assessment. "Ask the respondent: *If I were to ask the person in question directly 'Where do you live?', what would he or she say?* If the respondent says that the person would say 'Here (in the residence of the household being interviewed)', then classify the person as a usual resident of the household being interviewed. If the respondent says that the person would say 'In another residence', then do not classify the person as a usual resident of the household being interviewed.

"If the respondent is unable to tell you how the person in question would respond to the hypothetical question, then apply the second criterion:

Second criterion: Length of absence. "Ask the respondent how long the person in question has been absent from the residence. If the absence has been less than six months, then count the person as a usual resident. If the absence has been six months or longer, then do not count the person as a usual resident.

The following example shows how to apply the two criteria.

Respondent: He goes away to work for a while, but then he returns.
Enumerator: If I were to ask him, 'Where do you live', then what would he say?
Respondent: Here.

"In this example, the absent person would be counted as a usual resident.

"If the respondent says the person would say 'There' or 'Somewhere else', then the person is not a usual resident.

"If the respondent says that the person would say 'I do not know' or 'I do not know how to answer that question', then apply the second criterion.

Respondent: He would not be able to say.
Enumerator: How long has it been since he left?
Respondent: A little more than six months.

"In this case, the person is not a usual resident.

"If the response instead is 'He left five months ago', then the person is classified as a usual resident.

To properly identify household members, keep the following in mind:

- [To qualify as a member of a household, it is necessary (but not sufficient) for a person to be a usual resident in the residence]
- A person who lives alone or who does not share in the expenses of the provision of food with other people is considered to be a separate, one-person household, even if he or she lives in the same residence with other people
- Sometimes people with blood or marital relationships can live in the same residence but not share in the expenses for the provision of food. In such cases, there are as many households as there are eating arrangements
- Sometimes people who do not have blood or marital relationships (such as students, workers, or friends) live in the same residence and share the expenses for the provision of food. Such a group is considered to be a household
- If domestic servants (and their family members) are usual residents of a residence, then they are considered to be members of the household for whom they work

"Lodgers may live with the household. These are people who pay for room and board (or only for shelter) who are recognized as lodgers. [Such lodgers are considered to be members of the household if they pay for both room and board, but they are not considered to be household members if they pay only for room but not also for board.]"

2. What is the highest educational level and grade completed by the male head/spouse?
    A. None, pre-school/kindergarten, or primary grade 1
    B. Primary grades 2 or 3
    C. Primary grades 4, 5, or 6, or middle grade 1
    D. Middle grades 2 or 3
    E. No male head/spouse
    F. High school/college prep. (any grade), or post-secondary technical/trade school (any grade)
    G. College/university (any year), teacher's college (any year), or post-graduate (any year)

According to p. 11 of the *Questionnaire*, the enumerator should read the question and then wait for a response. The response options should not be read to the respondent.

According to p. 128 of the *Manual*, the *head of the household* is "the person whom the members of the household recognize as the head. . . . The head may be a male or a female. Every household has a head, and a household can have only one head. . . . The head may or may not contribute to the economic support of the household."

Remember that you already know the name of the male head/spouse (and whether he exists) from the notes you took for your own use while compiling the "Back-page Worksheet". Thus, if there is a male head/spouse, do not mechanically ask, "What is the highest educational level and grade completed by the male head/spouse?". Instead, use the actual name of the male head/spouse, for example: "What is the highest educational level and grade completed by don José?"

If there is no male head/spouse, mark "E. No male head/spouse" and go to the next question.

For the purposes of the scorecard, the *male head/spouse* is defined as:

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

According to pp. 148–151 of the *Manual*, this question seeks "to know the highest grade passed . . . in the highest level reached in the national educational system (SEN, for its acronym in Spanish). It includes studies in public or private schools in the SEN, regardless of the delivery method.

"The response options for the level completed are:

- *None.* People who have not completed any years of formal schooling. This includes people who have only taken literacy classes
- *Primary.* People who have completed a given number of years of grade school (grades 1 to 6)
- *Middle.* People who have completed a given number of years of middle school (grades 7 to 9)
- *Preparatoria* or *bachillerato.* People who have completed from one to three grades in *preparatoria* or *bachillerato.* The *Manual* list specific educational institutions in this category, and these are listed below in the original Spanish. The *Manual* also explains that a school counts as *preparatoria* or *bachillerato* if its course of studies is meant to prepare students for post-secondary education (college or university, in Spanish, *superior*). It includes college-preparatory schools that also provide job-skills training in an area of technology. CONALEP counts as *preparatoria* or *bachillerato* only if it is not providing a solely techical education focused on specific job skills. The following schools count as *preparatoria* or *bachillerato*:
    — Colegio de bachilleres
    — Escuelas preparatorias
    — Centro de Educación Artística (CEDART)
    — Colegio de Ciencias y Humanidades (CCH)
    — Centro de Bachillerato Tecnológico, Industrial, y de Servicios (CBTIS)
    — Centro de Bachillerato Tecnológico Agropecuario (CBTA)
    — Centro de Estudios Científicos y Tecnológicos (CECYT), antes vocacionales
    — Centro de Estudios del Mar (CETMAR)
    — Centro de Estudios Tecnológicos de Aguas Continentales (CETAC)
    — Centro de Bachillerato Tecnológico Forestal (CBTF)
    — Colegio Nacional de Educación Profesional Técnica (CONALEP). Incluye a los que ingresaron de 1996 a la fecha
    — Centro de Estudios Tecnológicos, Industrial, y Servicios (CETIS)
- *Teacher's college.* People who have completed 1 to 6 years at this level. Teacher's college prepare teachers for pre-school, primary school, and middle school

- *Technical/trade school.* People who have completed one to four years in technical/trade school. Example courses of study include secretary, computer technician, accounting assistant, electrician, dental assistant, dietitian, hospitality manager, and so on. Technical/trade school can follow the completion of primary school, middle school, *preparatoria*, or *bachillerato*
    — This level includes college-level technical courses of study whose pre-requisites include *preparatoria* or *bachillerato* but which are not for a licensed profession
    — This level excludes people who simultaneously study for the *bachillerato* as well as a technical skill in schools such as CETIS, CBTIS, CECTYE, or CONALEP. These people fall under *preparatoria* o *bachillerato*
    — This level includes people who enrolled in CONALEP before 1995
- *College/university.* People who have completed a year or more in degree-granting universities, technical colleges, polytechnical colleges, and other institutions of post-secondary education—whether public or private—for which a prerequisite for admission is *preparatoria* or *bachillerato*. Engineers are counted here
- *Post-graduate degree.* People who have completed one or more years for a master's degree after having received an undergraduate degree. Medical doctors whose specialist training lasts for two years are counted as if they have a master's degree. *Post-graduate* also includes people who have completed one or more years of doctoral training after having completed a master's degree. Medical doctors with a sub-speciality are counted as if they have a doctorate

Additional guidelines

"If the person has studied under the "open-schooling system" (*sistema de enseñanza abierta*), the adult-education system, or went to school in the United States of America, then record their level and grade according to what they say.

"Specialized or certificate courses (apart from medical specialties) are not counted for the purposes of this question, as they do not contribute to the completion of a grade and they have different and various academic prerequisites. If the respondent reports these types of courses, then ask him or her about the highest level and grade completed in the SEN.

"The only non-master's-degree courses of study that count as equivalent to a master's degree are the medical specialities (cardiology, neurology, pediatrics, geriatrics, psychiatry, hematology, oncology, and so on).

"If a person studied abroad, then ask for the equivalent level and grade in the Mexican system as described in the response options.

"Whenever a person studied (or is studying) in a technical/trade school, ask about the prerequisites and proceed as follows:

- If there were no prerequisites, then ask what level or grade the person completed in the SEN
- If the prerequisite was primary school or *preparatoria*, then record the level as 'technical/trade'
- If the prerequisite was middle school, then ask whether, while the person went to technical/trade school, he or she also studied for the *bachillerato*. If the person indeed did this, then record the level as *bachillerato*. If the person did not, then record the level as technical/trade school

"If the respondent just says the name of a school (for example, UNITEC, CONALEP, technical, university, or other) or the course of studies (for example, accountant, social worker, nurse, and so on), then ask if the studies are at the level of technical/trade or at the college level. Then mark the coresponding response option.

"If someone reports having studied fine arts (for example, dance, painting, sculpture, music, and so on), then ask if the level was technical/trade or college. Then mark the coresponding response option.

3. What is the main material of the floor of the residence?
    A. Dirt, cement, or pavement
    B. Wood, tile, or other covering

According to p. 11 of the *Questionnaire*, the enumerator should read the question and then wait for a response. The response options should not be read to the respondent.

According to pp. 105–6 of the *Manual*, "Residences that do not have any floor covering should be recorded under 'A. Dirt, cement, or pavement'.

"If the respondent says that the two main types of material both make up the same share of the floor's construction, then mark the response option with the material that appears first in the response options.

"If the respondent reports a material that does not appear in the response options, then ask the respondent to describe the material. Mark the response option corresponding to the material that is most similar to that described by the respondent."

According to p. 5 of the *Manual*, a *residence* is a place "surrounded by walls and covered by a roof where people usually eat, cook, sleep, and take shelter. It must have its own independent entrance by which its residents can enter and exit without having first to pass through the interior of another residence."

4. Does the residence have a kitchen sink (*fregadero* or *tarja*) for washing dishes?
   A. No
   B. Yes

According to p. 91 of the *Manual*, the enumerator should not read the response options to the respondent.

According to the Customer Service Department of INEGI, a *kitchen sink* (*fregadero* or *tarja*) is "a basin or container with a tap and a drain that is used mainly for washing dishes and kitchen utensils."

According to p. 110 of the *Manual*, "If the respondent lives in a *vivienda en vecindad*, then consider only the toilet arrangements to which the household has access. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that if the respondent lives in a *vivienda en vecindad* to consider, for the purposes of this question, whether the household has access to a kitchen sink (*fregadero* o *tarja*).

According to p. 5 of the *Manual*, a *residence* is a place "surrounded by walls and covered by a roof where people usually eat, cook, sleep, and take shelter. It has its own independent entrance by which its residents can enter and exit without having first to pass through the interior of a different residence."

5. Does the household have a gas or electric stove, or a microwave?
   A. None
   B. Gas or electric stove, without microwave
   C. Microwave (regardless of gas or electric stove)

According to p. 91 of the *Manual*, the enumerator should not read the response options to the respondent.

Ask this indicator in two parts:

- Does the household have a gas or electric stove?
- Does the household have a microwave?

Mark the response according to the combination the two responses to these two questions as follows:

Gas or electric stove?	Microwave?	Response
No	No	A
Yes	No	B
No	Yes	C
Yes	Yes	C

According to p. 170 of the *Manual* and INEGI's Customer Service Department, a gas or electric stove (or a microwave) is counted only if it is:

- Owned and used by the interviewed household. For example, a gas or electric stove (or a microwave) bought on credit is counted even if it has not been paid-off yet. Likewise, a gas or electric stove (or a microwave) received as a gift is to be counted
- In good working order. An out-of-order gas or electric stove (or a microwave) counts only if the interviewed household says that there are plans to repair it
- Is serving (or potentially could serve) for its designed purpose. For example, a gas or electric stove (or a microwave) counts even if the interviewed household only uses it to store dinner plates as if it were a cabinet because the household could choose at any time to use it to cook food

A gas or electric stove (or a microwave) does not count if it:

- Is not owned by the interviewed household, even if the household is using it. For example, do not count a gas or electric stove (or a microwave) that the interviewed household has rented-in or borrowed-in from someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not used by the household. For example, do not count a gas or electric stove (or a microwave) that the interviewed household owns but has lent-out or rented-out to someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not exclusively for the household's use because it is used part-time or full-time in a business. For example, do not count a gas or electric stove (or a microwave) that is used in a restaurant
- Is out-of-order (if the household says that there are no plans to repair it)
- Is in good working order but—for whatever reason—cannot serve for its designed purpose. For example, do not count a gas or electric stove (or a microwave) if the household lacks a source of electricity

6. Does the residence have a toilet arrangement with a piped water supply?
    A. No
    B. Yes

According to p. 91 of the *Manual*, the enumerator should not read the response options to the respondent.

According to the Questionnaire and the Customer Service Department of INEGI, a *toilet arrangement* is "a set-up for the disposal of human waste" and may consist of a toilet, a latrine, or a pit dug for such a purpose.

According to p. 110 of the *Manual*, "If the respondent lives in a *vivienda en vecindad*, then consider only the toilet arrangement to which the household has access."

According to p. 102 of the *Manual*, a *vivienda en vecindad* is "a permanent residence that is part of a group of residences on a single plot of land. Each residence in the group shares a wall, roof, or floor with at least one other residence in the group. The entrance to any given residence is through a common area (courtyard or hallway). Usually, the residences share a source of water and a toilet arrangement."

According to p. 5 of the *Manual*, a *residence* is a place "surrounded by walls and covered by a roof where people usually eat, cook, sleep, and take shelter. It has its own independent entrance by which its residents can enter and exit without having first to pass through the interior of another residence."

7. Does the household have a clothes-washing machine?
    A. No
    B. Yes

According to p. 91 of the *Manual*, you as the enumerator should not read the response options to the respondent.

According to p. 170 of the *Manual* and INEGI's Customer Service Department, a clothes-washing machine is counted only if it is:

- Owned and used by the interviewed household. For example, a clothes-washing machine bought on credit is counted even if it has not been paid-off yet. Likewise, a clothes-washing machine received as a gift is to be counted
- In good working order. An out-of-order clothes-washing machine counts only if the interviewed household says that there are plans to repair it
- Is serving (or potentially could serve) for its designed purpose. For example, a clothes-washing machine counts even if the interviewed household only uses it to store clothes as if it were a chest of drawers because the household could choose at any time to use it to wash clothes

A clothes-washing machine does not count if it:

- Is not owned by the interviewed household, even if the household is using it. For example, do not count a clothes-washing machine that the interviewed household has rented-in or borrowed-in from someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not used by the household. For example, do not count a clothes-washing machine that the interviewed household owns but has lent-out or rented-out to someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not exclusively for the household's use because it is also used part-time or full-time in a business. For example, do not count a clothes-washing machine that is used in a laundromat
- Is out-of-order (if the household says that there are no plans to repair it)
- Is in good working order but—for whatever reason—cannot serve for its designed purpose. For example, do not count an electric clothes-washing machine if the household lacks a source of electricity

8. How many fans does the household have?
   A. None
   B. One
   C. Two or more

According to p. 91 of the *Manual*, you as the enumerator should not read the response options to the respondent.

According to p. 170 of the *Manual* and INEGI's Customer Service Department, a fan is counted only if it is:

- Owned and used by the interviewed household. For example, a fan bought on credit is counted even if it has not been paid-off yet. Likewise, a fan received as a gift is to be counted
- In good working order. An out-of-order fan counts only if the interviewed household says that there are plans to repair it
- Is serving (or potentially could serve) for its designed purpose. For example, a fan counts even if the interviewed household only uses it to hang wet clothes on as if it were a clothes-line because the household could choose at any time to use it to blow cooling air

A fan does not count if it:

- Is not owned by the interviewed household, even if the household is using it. For example, do not count a fan that the interviewed household has rented-in or borrowed-in from someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not used by the household. For example, do not count a fan that the interviewed household owns but has lent-out or rented-out to someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not exclusively for the household's use because it is used part-time or full-time in a business. For example, do not count a fan that is used in to cool clients in a auto-repair shop's waiting room
- Is out-of-order (if the household says that there are no plans to repair it)
- Is in good working order but—for whatever reason—cannot serve for its designed purpose. For example, do not count a fan if the household lacks a source of electricity

9. Does the household have an automobile (car, van, minivan, or SUV) or truck (pickup or larger)?
    A. No
    B. Yes

According to p. 91 of the *Manual*, the enumerator should not read the response options to the respondent.

According to pp. 170–171 of the *Manual*, "Count only automobiles used as a means of transportation that are owned by household members.

Cars includes "sedans, hatchbacks, station wagons, jeeps, and so on.
Vans, minivans, or SUVs includes "Pickups with two rows of passenger seats, mini-buses, or any other type of mini-van or sport-utility vehicle.

Trucks (pickups or larger) includes "Pick-up trucks, cargo trucks, and flat-bed pick-up trucks.

"Count automobiles that the household owns that fall into one of these categories:

- Are inoperable but are expected to be repaired
- Are operable but are not being used due to some special circumstance
- Are loaned or rented out to a someone who is not a household member

"Do not count:

- Vehicles that cannot be repaired or vehicles that the household does not expect to repair
- Vehicles owned by a business or institution that employs a household member
- Vehicles that are not used as a means of transportation but rather only for recreation or entertainment

According to p. 170 of the *Manual* and INEGI's Customer Service Department, a motorized, four-wheel vehicle is counted only if it is:

- Owned and used by the interviewed household. For example, a motorized, four-wheel vehicle bought on credit is counted even if it has not been paid-off yet. Likewise, a motorized, four-wheel vehicle received as a gift is to be counted
- In good working order. An out-of-order motorized, four-wheel vehicle counts only if the interviewed household says that there are plans to repair it
- Is serving (or potentially could serve) for its designed purpose. For example, a motorized, four-wheel vehicle counts even if the interviewed household chooses to keep it unused in its garage in order to save money on gas and repairs because the household could choose at any time to use it for transport

A motorized, four-wheel vehicle does not count if it:

- Is not owned by the interviewed household, even if the household is using it. For example, do not count a motorized, four-wheel vehicle that the interviewed household has rented-in or borrowed-in from someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not used by the household. For example, do not count a motorized, four-wheel vehicle that the interviewed household owns but has lent-out or rented-out to someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not exclusively for the household's use because it is used part-time or full-time in a business. For example, do not count a motorized, four-wheel vehicle that is used as a taxi
- Is out-of-order (if the household says that there are no plans to repair it)
- Is in good working order but—for whatever reason—cannot serve for its designed purpose. For example, do not count a motorized, four-wheel vehicle if the household has lost the ignition keys

10. Does the household have a computer?
    A. No
    B. Yes

According to p. 91 of the *Manual*, you as the enumerator should not read the response options to the respondent.

According to p. 170 of the *Manual* and INEGI's Customer Service Department, a computer is counted only if it is:

- Owned and used by the interviewed household. For example, a computer bought on credit is counted even if it has not been paid-off yet. Likewise, a computer received as a gift is to be counted
- In good working order. An out-of-order computer counts only if the interviewed household says that it plans to repair it
- Is serving (or potentially could serve) for its designed purpose. For example, a computer counts even if the interviewed household only uses it as a paperweight because the household could choose at any time to use it to wash clothes

A computer does not count if it:

- Is not owned by the interviewed household, even if the household is using it. For example, do not count a computer that the interviewed household has rented-in or borrowed-in from someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not used by the household. For example, do not count a computer that the interviewed household owns but has lent-out or rented-out to someone else
- Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not exclusively for the household's use because it is used part-time or full-time in a business. For example, do not count a computer that is used to track inventory in a store
- Is out-of-order (if the household says that there are no plans to repair it)
- Is in good working order but—for whatever reason—cannot serve for its designed purpose. For example, do not count a computer if the household lacks a source of electricity

11. Does the household have a mobile phone?
   A. No
   B. Yes

According to p. 91 of the *Manual*, you as the enumerator should not read the response options to the respondent.

According to p. 170 of the *Manual* and INEGI's Customer Service Department, a mobile phone is counted only if it is:

* Owned and used by the interviewed household. For example, a mobile phone bought on credit is counted even if it has not been paid-off yet. Likewise, a mobile phone received as a gift is to be counted
* In good working order. An out-of-order mobile phone counts only if the interviewed household says that there are plans to repair it
* Is serving (or potentially could serve) for its designed purpose. For example, a mobile phone counts even if the interviewed household only uses it as a paperweight because the household could choose at any time to use it to make calls

A mobile phone does not count if it:

* Is not owned by the interviewed household, even if the household is using it. For example, do not count a mobile phone that the interviewed household has rented-in or borrowed-in from someone else
* Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not used by the household. For example, do not count a mobile phone that the interviewed household owns but has lent-out or rented-out to someone else
* Is owned by the interviewed household but that is not exclusively for the household's use because it is used part-time or full-time in a business. For example, do not count a mobile phone that is used in telephone kiosk
* Is out-of-order (if the household says that there are no plans to repair it)
* Is in good working order but—for whatever reason—cannot serve for its designed purpose. For example, do not count a mobile phone if the household does not have a service plan or lacks minutes

Table 1: New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) in all of Mexico and in the construction and validation samples for 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Year | Line or Rate | HHs or People | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
All of Mexico							
2014	Line	People		38.53	77.57	116.35	155.14
	Rate	HHs	58,125	18.1	47.7	66.4	77.1
	Rate	People		20.6	53.2	72.2	82.1
2012	Line	People		35.00	71.14	106.71	142.28
	Rate	HHs	57,274	17.9	46.5	65.5	76.7
	Rate	People		20.0	51.6	71.1	81.6
2010	Line	People		30.34	64.39	96.58	128.78
	Rate	HHs	61,847	16.6	46.6	66.0	76.6
	Rate	People		19.4	52.0	71.9	81.7
2008	Line	People		27.14	58.50	87.75	117.00
	Rate	HHs	60,161	14.4	43.6	63.0	74.6
	Rate	People		16.8	49.0	68.8	79.9
Construction and calibration:							
(Selecting indicators and points, and associating scores with poverty likelihoods)							
2014	Rate	HHs	29,030	18.1	47.7	66.3	77.0
Validation:							
(Measuring accuracy)							
2014	Rate	HHs	29,095	18.0	47.6	66.4	77.3
2012	Rate	HHs	57,274	17.9	46.5	65.5	76.7
2010	Rate	HHs	61,847	16.6	46.6	66.0	76.6
2008	Rate	HHs	60,161	14.4	43.6	63.0	74.6

Source: National Household Income and Expenditure Survey for 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014

Poverty lines are MXN per day per adult equivalent in ave. prices in all of Mexico in August of the respective year.

Sampling weights for new-definition lines are based on the 2010 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Sampling weights for old-definition lines are based on the 2000 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Table 1: New-definition international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) in all of Mexico and in the construction and validation samples for 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Year	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Intl. 2005 PPP $1.25	Intl. 2005 PPP $2.00	Intl. 2005 PPP $2.50	Intl. 2005 PPP $5.00	Intl. 2011 PPP $1.90	Intl. 2011 PPP $3.10
All of Mexico									
2014	Line	People		14.60	23.36	29.20	58.40	19.64	32.05
	Rate	HHs	58,125	3.7	9.2	13.5	38.9	6.6	16.1
	Rate	People		4.4	10.9	16.0	44.8	7.7	18.9
2012	Line	People		13.32	21.31	26.63	53.27	15.41	25.14
	Rate	HHs	57,274	4.4	9.7	14.1	37.8	5.6	12.9
	Rate	People		4.9	11.1	16.2	43.2	6.3	14.7
2010	Line	People		12.08	19.32	24.16	48.31	16.25	26.51
	Rate	HHs	61,847	4.6	9.7	14.0	38.4	7.2	16.4
	Rate	People		5.5	11.8	16.8	44.4	8.7	19.6
2008	Line	People		11.16	17.85	22.31	44.63	15.01	24.49
	Rate	HHs	60,161	4.1	8.9	13.1	36.4	6.6	15.2
	Rate	People		4.9	10.9	15.7	42.2	8.0	18.2
Construction and calibration:									
(Selecting indicators and points, and associating scores with poverty likelihoods)									
2014	Rate	HHs	29,030	3.8	9.2	13.6	39.0	6.5	16.3
Validation:									
(Measuring accuracy)									
2014	Rate	HHs	29,095	3.7	9.2	13.5	38.9	6.6	15.8
2012	Rate	HHs	57,274	4.4	9.7	14.1	37.8	5.6	12.9
2010	Rate	HHs	61,847	4.6	9.7	14.0	38.4	7.2	16.4
2008	Rate	HHs	60,161	4.1	8.9	13.1	36.4	6.6	15.2

Source: National Household Income and Expenditure Survey for 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014
Poverty lines are MXN per day per person in ave. prices in all of Mexico in August of the respective year.
Sampling weights for new-definition lines are based on the 2010 Census and its definition of urban/rural.
Sampling weights for old-definition lines are based on the 2000 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Table 1: New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) in all of Mexico and in the construction and validation samples for 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Year	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
All of Mexico									
2014	Line	People		38.36	29.40	52.44	66.39	83.26	146.26
	Rate	HHs	58,125	23.0	17.3	35.1	44.3	53.8	74.4
	Rate	People		26.6	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0
2012	Line	People		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
	Rate	HHs	57,274	22.7	17.6	35.4	44.6	54.1	74.5
	Rate	People		25.8	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0
2010	Line	People		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
	Rate	HHs	61,847	22.3	17.1	34.9	44.1	53.7	74.2
	Rate	People		26.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0
2008	Line	People		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
	Rate	HHs	60,161	21.0	17.0	34.8	44.0	53.7	74.4
	Rate	People		24.5	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0
Construction and calibration:									
(Selecting indicators and points, and associating scores with poverty likelihoods)									
2014	Rate	HHs	29,030	23.2	17.3	35.2	44.4	53.9	74.3
Validation:									
(Measuring accuracy)									
2014	Rate	HHs	29,095	22.9	17.3	35.0	44.2	53.6	74.4
2012	Rate	HHs	57,274	—	—	—	—	—	—
2010	Rate	HHs	61,847	—	—	—	—	—	—
2008	Rate	HHs	60,161	—	—	—	—	—	—

Source: National Household Income and Expenditure Survey for 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014

Poverty lines are MXN per day per person in ave. prices in all of Mexico in August of the respective year.

Sampling weights for new-definition lines are based on the 2010 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Sampling weights for old-definition lines are based on the 2000 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Table 1: Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) in all of Mexico and in the construction and validation samples for 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Year	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Food	Lower	100%	Upper 125%	150%
All of Mexico								
2014	Line	People		39.05	47.36	76.03	95.04	114.05
	Rate	HHs	19,479	15.9	23.4	47.0	58.3	67.0
	Rate	People		20.5	29.1	55.1	66.4	75.0
2012	Line	People		36.15	43.84	70.37	87.97	105.56
	Rate	HHs	9,002	15.6	22.8	44.9	56.7	64.7
	Rate	People		19.7	28.0	52.3	64.4	72.0
2010	Line	People		31.57	38.29	61.47	76.84	92.21
	Rate	HHs	27,655	14.7	21.3	43.5	54.7	63.6
	Rate	People		18.8	26.6	51.1	62.3	70.7
2008	Line	People		28.73	34.86	56.02	70.02	84.03
	Rate	HHs	29,468	14.3	20.1	40.2	51.2	59.9
	Rate	People		18.2	25.1	47.4	58.7	67.2

Construction and calibration:
(Selecting indicators and points, and associating scores with poverty likelihoods)

Year	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Food	Lower	100%	Upper 125%	150%
2014	Rate	HHs	9,791	16.2	23.6	46.7	58.4	66.9

Validation:
(Measuring accuracy)

Year	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Food	Lower	100%	Upper 125%	150%
2014	Rate	HHs	9,688	15.7	23.3	47.3	58.2	67.2
2012	Rate	HHs	9,002	15.6	22.8	44.9	56.7	64.7
2010	Rate	HHs	27,655	14.7	21.3	43.5	54.7	63.6
2008	Rate	HHs	29,468	14.3	20.1	40.2	51.2	59.9

Source: National Household Income and Expenditure Survey for 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014

Poverty lines are MXN per day per adult equivalent in ave. prices in all of Mexico in August of the respective year.

Sampling weights for new-definition lines are based on the 2010 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Sampling weights for old-definition lines are based on the 2000 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Table 1: Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) in all of Mexico and in the construction and validation samples for 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Year	Line or Rate	HHs or People	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP $1.25	$2.50
All of Mexico					
2014	Line	People		14.60	29.20
	Rate	HHs	19,479	1.5	8.2
	Rate	People		2.0	10.9
2012	Line	People		13.32	26.63
	Rate	HHs	9,002	1.6	8.6
	Rate	People		2.3	11.3
2010	Line	People		12.08	24.16
	Rate	HHs	27,655	1.8	8.6
	Rate	People		2.5	11.2
2008	Line	People		11.16	22.31
	Rate	HHs	29,468	1.5	8.3
	Rate	People		2.1	10.7
Construction and calibration:					
(Selecting indicators and points, and associating scores with poverty likelihoods)					
2014	Rate	HHs	9,791	1.4	8.3
Validation:					
(Measuring accuracy)					
2014	Rate	HHs	9,688	1.6	8.1
2012	Rate	HHs	9,002	1.6	8.6
2010	Rate	HHs	27,655	1.8	8.6
2008	Rate	HHs	29,468	1.5	8.3

Source: National Household Income and Expenditure Survey for 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014

Poverty lines are MXN per day per adult equivalent in ave. prices in all of Mexico in August of the respective year.

Sampling weights for new-definition lines are based on the 2010 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Sampling weights for old-definition lines are based on the 2000 Census and its definition of urban/rural.

Table 2 (All of Mexico): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	43,997	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		15.1	44.9	63.7	74.8
		Rate (people)		17.1	50.5	69.8	80.0
Rural	2014	Line	14,128	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		28.6	57.7	75.9	85.3
		Rate (people)		31.9	62.4	80.3	88.9
All	2014	Line	58,125	38.53	77.57	116.35	155.14
		Rate (HHs)		18.1	47.7	66.4	77.1
		Rate (people)		20.6	53.2	72.2	82.1
Urban	2012	Line	42,785	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		14.6	43.1	62.4	74.3
		Rate (people)		16.2	48.3	68.3	79.4
Rural	2012	Line	14,489	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		29.7	58.5	76.3	85.2
		Rate (people)		32.7	62.8	80.4	88.7
All	2012	Line	57,274	35.00	71.14	106.71	142.28
		Rate (HHs)		17.9	46.5	65.5	76.7
		Rate (people)		20.0	51.6	71.1	81.6
Urban	2010	Line	47,147	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		12.8	42.5	62.7	73.9
		Rate (people)		14.7	47.8	69.0	79.4
Rural	2010	Line	14,700	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		30.7	61.5	77.9	86.6
		Rate (people)		34.9	65.9	81.5	89.4
All	2010	Line	61,847	30.34	64.39	96.58	128.78
		Rate (HHs)		16.6	46.6	66.0	76.6
		Rate (people)		19.4	52.0	71.9	81.7
Urban	2008	Line	45,718	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		10.4	39.5	59.5	71.8
		Rate (people)		11.9	44.8	65.6	77.4
Rural	2008	Line	14,443	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		29.0	58.6	75.6	84.8
		Rate (people)		32.8	63.1	79.7	88.4
All	2008	Line	60,161	27.14	58.50	87.75	117.00
		Rate (HHs)		14.4	43.6	63.0	74.6
		Rate (people)		16.8	49.0	68.8	79.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (All of Mexico): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	43,997	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	7.1	10.8	34.9	5.0	13.2
		Rate (people)		2.9	8.1	12.7	40.6	5.5	15.6
Rural	2014	Line	14,128	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		7.4	16.4	23.1	53.1	12.2	26.1
		Rate (people)		9.2	19.9	26.8	58.7	15.1	30.1
All	2014	Line	58,125	14.60	23.36	29.20	58.40	19.64	32.05
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	9.2	13.5	38.9	6.6	16.1
		Rate (people)		4.4	10.9	16.0	44.8	7.7	18.9
Urban	2012	Line	42,785	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	7.5	11.2	33.5	4.2	10.1
		Rate (people)		3.6	8.3	12.7	38.5	4.5	11.4
Rural	2012	Line	14,489	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		7.9	17.4	24.3	53.2	10.4	22.5
		Rate (people)		9.3	20.2	27.7	58.4	12.2	25.8
All	2012	Line	57,274	13.32	21.31	26.63	53.27	15.41	25.14
		Rate (HHs)		4.4	9.7	14.1	37.8	5.6	12.9
		Rate (people)		4.9	11.1	16.2	43.2	6.3	14.7
Urban	2010	Line	47,147	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.0	6.8	10.5	33.3	4.9	12.5
		Rate (people)		3.1	7.8	12.3	38.8	5.4	14.8
Rural	2010	Line	14,700	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		10.5	20.7	27.1	57.3	16.0	30.4
		Rate (people)		13.2	25.1	31.8	62.8	19.7	35.5
All	2010	Line	61,847	12.08	19.32	24.16	48.31	16.25	26.51
		Rate (HHs)		4.6	9.7	14.0	38.4	7.2	16.4
		Rate (people)		5.5	11.8	16.8	44.4	8.7	19.6
Urban	2008	Line	45,718	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	6.0	9.4	31.2	4.3	11.2
		Rate (people)		2.9	7.0	11.0	36.4	4.9	13.3
Rural	2008	Line	14,443	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		9.7	19.6	26.6	55.6	15.2	29.8
		Rate (people)		11.6	23.7	31.1	61.4	18.4	34.5
All	2008	Line	60,161	11.16	17.85	22.31	44.63	15.01	24.49
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	8.9	13.1	36.4	6.6	15.2
		Rate (people)		4.9	10.9	15.7	42.2	8.0	18.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (All of Mexico): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	43,997	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		12.2	7.8	23.5	33.1	43.8	68.2
		Rate (people)		14.4	9.0	27.5	38.4	50.2	74.7
Rural	2014	Line	14,128	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		61.3	51.1	76.2	84.0	88.9	96.2
		Rate (people)		67.0	56.5	81.4	88.3	92.3	97.6
All	2014	Line	58,125	38.36	29.40	52.44	66.39	83.26	146.26
		Rate (HHs)		23.0	17.3	35.1	44.3	53.8	74.4
		Rate (people)		26.6	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0
Urban	2012	Line	42,785	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		11.9	8.2	23.6	33.3	44.1	68.3
		Rate (people)		13.6	9.1	27.2	38.3	50.1	74.7
Rural	2012	Line	14,489	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		61.2	51.0	77.7	84.9	89.7	96.4
		Rate (people)		66.4	55.9	82.5	88.8	92.7	97.6
All	2012	Line	57,274	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		22.7	17.6	35.4	44.6	54.1	74.5
		Rate (people)		25.8	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0
Urban	2010	Line	47,147	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		10.9	7.0	22.6	32.6	43.5	68.0
		Rate (people)		12.9	8.1	26.7	38.0	49.8	74.6
Rural	2010	Line	14,700	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		64.1	53.9	80.0	86.6	91.3	96.8
		Rate (people)		69.4	59.3	84.0	89.7	93.8	97.9
All	2010	Line	61,847	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		22.3	17.1	34.9	44.1	53.7	74.2
		Rate (people)		26.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0
Urban	2008	Line	45,718	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		9.6	6.9	22.5	32.4	43.4	68.2
		Rate (people)		11.2	8.0	26.7	37.8	49.7	74.5
Rural	2008	Line	14,443	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		62.7	53.9	79.6	86.5	91.1	97.2
		Rate (people)		68.4	59.7	84.2	90.3	94.0	98.2
All	2008	Line	60,161	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		21.0	17.0	34.8	44.0	53.7	74.4
		Rate (people)		24.5	20.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	80.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (All of Mexico): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		11.2	18.7	42.2	53.3	62.1
		Rate (people)		14.7	23.6	50.6	61.9	70.8
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		24.5	32.1	55.7	67.5	76.0
		Rate (people)		30.0	38.2	62.7	73.9	81.9
All	2014	Line	19,479	39.05	47.36	76.03	95.04	114.05
		Rate (HHs)		15.9	23.4	47.0	58.3	67.0
		Rate (people)		20.5	29.1	55.1	66.4	75.0
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		10.2	16.6	38.1	49.8	58.3
		Rate (people)		12.9	20.7	45.5	58.2	66.6
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		25.5	34.1	57.4	69.2	76.4
		Rate (people)		30.9	40.2	63.6	74.6	81.2
All	2012	Line	9,002	36.15	43.84	70.37	87.97	105.56
		Rate (HHs)		15.6	22.8	44.9	56.7	64.7
		Rate (people)		19.7	28.0	52.3	64.4	72.0
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		9.8	15.7	37.8	49.1	58.1
		Rate (people)		12.5	19.9	45.3	56.9	65.9
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		23.8	31.6	54.1	65.1	73.5
		Rate (people)		29.2	37.8	60.7	71.3	78.8
All	2010	Line	27,655	31.57	38.29	61.47	76.84	92.21
		Rate (HHs)		14.7	21.3	43.5	54.7	63.6
		Rate (people)		18.8	26.6	51.1	62.3	70.7
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	13.6	33.3	44.3	53.9
		Rate (people)		10.6	17.2	39.8	51.8	61.6
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		26.3	32.7	53.6	64.5	71.6
		Rate (people)		31.8	39.1	60.8	70.9	77.2
All	2008	Line	29,468	28.73	34.86	56.02	70.02	84.03
		Rate (HHs)		14.3	20.1	40.2	51.2	59.9
		Rate (people)		18.2	25.1	47.4	58.7	67.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

142

Table 2 (All of Mexico): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	4.9
		Rate (people)		0.8	6.4
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	14.2
		Rate (people)		4.1	18.4
All	2014	Line	19,479	14.60	29.20
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	8.2
		Rate (people)		2.0	10.9
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	4.9
		Rate (people)		0.9	6.5
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	15.3
		Rate (people)		4.5	19.1
All	2012	Line	9,002	13.32	26.63
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	8.6
		Rate (people)		2.3	11.3
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	5.3
		Rate (people)		1.2	6.6
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	14.8
		Rate (people)		4.9	18.9
All	2010	Line	27,655	12.08	24.16
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	8.6
		Rate (people)		2.5	11.2
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	4.1
		Rate (people)		0.8	5.2
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	16.6
		Rate (people)		4.5	20.6
All	2008	Line	29,468	11.16	22.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	8.3
		Rate (people)		2.1	10.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Aguascalientes): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,479	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		12.3	40.2	60.4	71.7
		Rate (people)		13.6	44.8	65.8	76.6
Rural	2014	Line	335	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		10.6	36.1	62.2	72.6
		Rate (people)		9.8	39.0	67.2	77.8
All	2014	Line	1,814	39.02	78.80	118.20	157.60
		Rate (HHs)		12.0	39.5	60.7	71.8
		Rate (people)		12.9	43.7	66.0	76.9
Urban	2012	Line	1,445	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		13.6	41.6	60.7	71.7
		Rate (people)		14.4	47.1	66.9	77.5
Rural	2012	Line	349	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		18.1	46.4	70.7	79.6
		Rate (people)		16.9	51.3	75.3	83.8
All	2012	Line	1,794	35.42	72.23	108.34	144.45
		Rate (HHs)		14.4	42.4	62.4	73.1
		Rate (people)		14.9	47.9	68.5	78.7
Urban	2010	Line	1,473	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		11.7	39.8	56.4	69.5
		Rate (people)		13.1	44.1	61.4	74.6
Rural	2010	Line	329	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		23.4	51.7	72.2	82.3
		Rate (people)		22.2	55.2	75.8	85.0
All	2010	Line	1,802	30.73	65.43	98.14	130.86
		Rate (HHs)		13.9	42.0	59.3	71.8
		Rate (people)		14.8	46.3	64.2	76.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,423	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		12.5	41.3	60.5	72.4
		Rate (people)		14.6	46.4	65.6	77.3
Rural	2008	Line	305	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	39.4	62.5	75.0
		Rate (people)		12.3	41.1	63.0	75.6
All	2008	Line	1,728	27.48	59.45	89.17	118.90
		Rate (HHs)		12.3	40.9	60.8	72.9
		Rate (people)		14.1	45.4	65.1	77.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Aguascalientes): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,479	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	6.3	9.9	29.9	4.6	11.5
		Rate (people)		3.4	6.8	11.4	34.5	4.7	13.1
Rural	2014	Line	335	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	7.1	9.1	34.8	4.9	10.3
		Rate (people)		1.6	6.6	8.5	37.5	4.4	9.7
All	2014	Line	1,814	14.79	23.66	29.58	59.15	19.90	32.46
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	6.4	9.8	30.8	4.7	11.3
		Rate (people)		3.1	6.7	10.8	35.1	4.6	12.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,445	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		4.3	8.5	11.0	33.9	5.3	10.2
		Rate (people)		4.1	9.1	12.0	39.4	5.4	11.0
Rural	2012	Line	349	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	8.1	14.6	42.1	5.5	11.8
		Rate (people)		3.5	7.1	14.3	47.2	4.9	11.5
All	2012	Line	1,794	13.48	21.57	26.97	53.94	15.60	25.45
		Rate (HHs)		4.2	8.5	11.6	35.4	5.4	10.5
		Rate (people)		4.0	8.7	12.4	40.9	5.3	11.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,473	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	6.7	9.6	31.7	5.1	11.4
		Rate (people)		3.8	7.1	11.4	36.3	5.0	13.3
Rural	2010	Line	329	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	14.2	20.1	48.0	11.3	22.5
		Rate (people)		7.6	13.6	20.0	52.7	10.9	22.4
All	2010	Line	1,802	12.23	19.57	24.47	48.93	16.46	26.86
		Rate (HHs)		4.5	8.1	11.5	34.7	6.2	13.4
		Rate (people)		4.5	8.3	13.0	39.4	6.2	15.1
Urban	2008	Line	1,423	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	7.1	11.1	32.5	5.2	13.0
		Rate (people)		4.1	8.3	13.3	37.3	6.2	15.7
Rural	2008	Line	305	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		5.1	9.1	10.7	35.9	7.7	12.9
		Rate (people)		4.8	9.2	11.9	38.7	7.6	14.0
All	2008	Line	1,728	11.30	18.08	22.60	45.19	15.20	24.80
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	7.5	11.0	33.1	5.6	12.9
		Rate (people)		4.2	8.5	13.0	37.5	6.5	15.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Aguascalientes): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,479	10.9	7.5	19.5	28.1	39.8	66.2
		Rate (people)		12.4	8.5	22.5	32.2	45.2	72.2
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	335	43.8	32.8	63.7	70.7	79.3	94.2
		Rate (people)		48.3	35.4	69.8	76.8	83.9	96.3
All	2014	Line		38.97	29.86	53.27	67.44	84.58	148.58
		Rate (HHs)	1,814	16.9	12.0	27.5	35.8	47.0	71.3
		Rate (people)		19.3	13.6	31.6	40.8	52.6	76.8
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,445	11.4	9.2	22.6	33.6	43.9	66.8
		Rate (people)		12.4	9.8	26.1	39.2	50.4	73.3
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	349	50.6	40.0	71.8	79.4	85.9	93.8
		Rate (people)		55.5	44.8	77.2	84.4	90.4	95.6
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,794	18.2	14.6	31.2	41.6	51.2	71.5
		Rate (people)		20.7	16.6	35.9	47.9	58.1	77.6
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,473	9.7	6.9	21.2	31.4	41.6	63.2
		Rate (people)		11.4	7.2	24.5	36.0	47.2	69.4
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	329	57.3	45.6	77.2	83.6	88.3	96.4
		Rate (people)		62.1	49.5	81.0	86.5	91.0	97.0
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,802	18.3	13.9	31.3	40.9	50.1	69.2
		Rate (people)		21.1	15.3	35.4	45.7	55.6	74.7
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,423	11.4	8.7	24.9	33.3	45.9	68.9
		Rate (people)		13.7	10.3	29.3	38.3	51.5	74.6
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	305	45.5	34.2	69.7	77.5	83.0	94.5
		Rate (people)		47.8	37.0	70.9	78.1	85.0	96.3
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,728	17.8	13.4	33.3	41.6	52.8	73.7
		Rate (people)		20.2	15.4	37.3	46.0	58.0	78.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Aguascalientes): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
				Food	Lower	100%	Upper 125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	11.7	18.9	40.8	52.4	62.3
		Rate (people)		14.9	24.0	48.7	59.8	69.6
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	14.6	19.4	45.3	61.5	65.3
		Rate (people)		17.0	23.1	53.8	69.8	72.9
All	2014	Line		40.16	48.86	78.87	98.58	118.30
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	12.5	19.0	42.0	54.9	63.1
		Rate (people)		15.5	23.7	50.1	62.6	70.5
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	9.3	20.0	38.9	47.7	56.4
		Rate (people)		11.3	24.3	44.8	54.8	64.5
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	19.8	30.7	53.7	66.0	73.4
		Rate (people)		20.1	33.3	58.1	71.3	78.7
All	2012	Line		36.45	44.25	71.14	88.93	106.72
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	12.5	23.2	43.4	53.3	61.6
		Rate (people)		14.4	27.4	49.4	60.5	69.4
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	5.1	9.6	36.9	46.4	55.5
		Rate (people)		6.7	13.6	44.6	53.7	63.0
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	20.9	26.9	46.8	63.9	78.4
		Rate (people)		23.2	29.3	49.9	67.5	80.7
All	2010	Line		32.32	39.30	63.39	79.23	95.08
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	9.2	14.1	39.5	51.0	61.5
		Rate (people)		11.5	18.2	46.1	57.7	68.2
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	9.3	11.7	27.6	37.2	48.9
		Rate (people)		12.2	15.1	35.2	44.4	56.4
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	16.8	24.7	45.3	56.2	60.8
		Rate (people)		18.0	27.5	46.2	60.4	63.9
All	2008	Line		29.42	35.80	57.79	72.24	86.69
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	11.1	14.9	31.9	41.9	51.8
		Rate (people)		13.8	18.5	38.3	48.8	58.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Aguascalientes): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.50**
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	0.8	4.8
		Rate (people)		1.0	6.9
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	0.7	4.6
		Rate (people)		0.8	4.4
All	2014	Line		15.01	30.03
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	0.7	4.7
		Rate (people)		1.0	6.3
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.4	3.6
		Rate (people)		0.4	3.8
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	2.0	9.2
		Rate (people)		1.4	8.9
All	2012	Line		13.43	26.86
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.9	5.3
		Rate (people)		0.7	5.6
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.7	1.2
		Rate (people)		0.9	1.8
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	2.6	13.1
		Rate (people)		3.4	15.9
All	2010	Line		12.36	24.73
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	1.2	4.3
		Rate (people)		1.6	5.9
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.8	4.5
		Rate (people)		1.2	5.7
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	3.0	10.1
		Rate (people)		4.5	11.0
All	2008	Line		11.43	22.85
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	1.3	5.9
		Rate (people)		2.1	7.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,663	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		8.5	30.3	51.5	66.7
		Rate (people)		10.0	36.3	58.9	72.9
Rural	2014	Line	144	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		6.4	19.0	45.4	61.4
		Rate (people)		6.7	21.2	50.2	67.4
All	2014	Line	1,807	40.46	82.35	123.53	164.70
		Rate (HHs)		8.3	29.4	51.0	66.3
		Rate (people)		9.7	35.2	58.2	72.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,643	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		9.6	34.4	53.1	67.5
		Rate (people)		11.1	39.3	59.9	73.1
Rural	2012	Line	124	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		9.4	28.9	59.2	74.1
		Rate (people)		8.8	32.7	69.3	82.3
All	2012	Line	1,767	36.67	75.46	113.19	150.92
		Rate (HHs)		9.6	34.0	53.5	68.0
		Rate (people)		10.9	38.8	60.6	73.8
Urban	2010	Line	1,616	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		8.5	31.4	51.3	63.5
		Rate (people)		9.8	37.9	58.2	70.6
Rural	2010	Line	151	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		7.9	32.5	61.2	72.6
		Rate (people)		10.2	37.7	66.6	78.8
All	2010	Line	1,767	31.86	68.44	102.66	136.88
		Rate (HHs)		8.5	31.5	51.9	64.1
		Rate (people)		9.8	37.9	58.9	71.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,544	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		7.0	27.5	48.3	62.9
		Rate (people)		7.7	31.8	54.7	69.5
Rural	2008	Line	153	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		6.5	22.8	30.9	48.4
		Rate (people)		6.9	26.6	35.3	57.9
All	2008	Line	1,697	28.48	62.21	93.31	124.42
		Rate (HHs)		7.0	27.2	46.9	61.7
		Rate (people)		7.6	31.4	53.2	68.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,663	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		1.1	3.2	5.2	22.4	2.5	7.1
		Rate (people)		0.9	3.6	6.2	27.8	2.5	8.8
Rural	2014	Line	144	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	2.8	4.2	16.9	1.4	5.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	3.2	4.1	20.3	1.6	4.9
All	2014	Line	1,807	15.33	24.53	30.66	61.32	20.63	33.66
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	3.2	5.1	22.0	2.4	6.9
		Rate (people)		0.9	3.6	6.1	27.2	2.4	8.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,643	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	5.0	7.3	25.8	3.3	6.8
		Rate (people)		3.1	5.9	9.1	30.6	3.7	8.4
Rural	2012	Line	124	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	2.3	5.1	24.2	1.4	3.8
		Rate (people)		0.5	2.2	4.7	27.7	0.5	3.2
All	2012	Line	1,767	13.98	22.37	27.96	55.93	16.18	26.39
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	4.8	7.1	25.7	3.2	6.6
		Rate (people)		2.9	5.6	8.7	30.4	3.4	8.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,616	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.0	5.0	6.9	23.1	4.4	8.6
		Rate (people)		3.1	5.5	8.0	29.6	4.5	10.2
Rural	2010	Line	151	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		4.7	7.5	7.9	31.2	5.4	7.9
		Rate (people)		6.5	9.7	10.2	37.3	7.0	10.2
All	2010	Line	1,767	12.68	20.29	25.37	50.73	17.07	27.84
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	5.2	7.0	23.6	4.5	8.5
		Rate (people)		3.4	5.8	8.2	30.2	4.7	10.2
Urban	2008	Line	1,544	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	3.9	5.8	21.7	3.0	7.2
		Rate (people)		2.2	4.3	6.5	25.5	3.3	8.2
Rural	2008	Line	153	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	4.9	5.8	21.1	4.6	6.5
		Rate (people)		3.1	5.7	6.7	25.6	5.4	6.9
All	2008	Line	1,697	11.71	18.74	23.42	46.84	15.76	25.71
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	4.0	5.8	21.7	3.1	7.2
		Rate (people)		2.3	4.4	6.5	25.5	3.4	8.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,663	6.1	3.5	14.2	21.2	30.3	56.5
		Rate (people)		7.4	4.2	17.7	26.2	36.8	64.4
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	144	24.7	15.5	46.8	62.1	74.4	91.2
		Rate (people)		29.8	18.3	54.5	70.1	81.3	95.0
All	2014	Line		40.72	31.21	55.67	70.49	88.39	155.28
		Rate (HHs)	1,807	7.5	4.4	16.6	24.2	33.6	59.0
		Rate (people)		9.1	5.3	20.5	29.6	40.3	66.7
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,643	7.6	5.5	16.6	25.5	35.4	59.8
		Rate (people)		9.5	6.7	19.4	30.2	41.7	67.4
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	124	35.5	22.5	64.1	72.5	80.1	93.1
		Rate (people)		42.9	25.5	74.4	81.3	87.6	96.2
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,767	9.5	6.7	19.8	28.7	38.4	62.1
		Rate (people)		12.1	8.1	23.7	34.2	45.2	69.6
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,616	7.4	5.2	15.9	22.7	31.1	56.9
		Rate (people)		8.8	5.7	20.1	29.2	38.8	65.0
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	151	37.0	27.7	63.9	73.1	78.4	89.0
		Rate (people)		43.2	33.5	69.4	79.5	84.8	94.0
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,767	9.4	6.7	19.1	26.2	34.4	59.1
		Rate (people)		11.4	7.8	23.9	33.1	42.3	67.2
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,544	6.2	4.5	14.3	22.6	32.0	59.2
		Rate (people)		6.9	5.1	17.2	26.5	37.9	66.6
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	153	23.5	20.4	37.1	52.5	69.4	86.9
		Rate (people)		27.4	25.0	42.9	62.6	77.0	90.1
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,697	7.5	5.8	16.1	25.0	35.0	61.4
		Rate (people)		8.5	6.6	19.1	29.3	41.0	68.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Upper | |
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		5.4	11.0	27.9	38.8	48.5
		Rate (people)		8.0	15.6	36.2	47.9	58.3
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		5.5	9.2	28.9	42.5	50.5
		Rate (people)		7.0	11.1	38.2	55.3	62.6
All	2014	Line	19,479	41.51	50.69	82.34	102.92	123.51
		Rate (HHs)		5.4	10.7	28.1	39.3	48.8
		Rate (people)		7.9	14.9	36.5	49.0	59.0
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		3.9	7.1	21.5	34.5	41.3
		Rate (people)		3.8	7.5	26.6	42.5	49.4
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		6.7	15.6	39.4	51.3	67.3
		Rate (people)		4.8	17.6	48.7	62.5	77.5
All	2012	Line	9,002	38.29	46.75	75.90	94.87	113.85
		Rate (HHs)		4.3	8.4	24.1	37.0	45.1
		Rate (people)		4.0	9.2	30.2	45.7	54.0
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		6.4	9.3	26.2	37.8	47.2
		Rate (people)		8.2	12.8	33.5	45.9	56.0
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		7.3	11.9	40.4	51.9	65.7
		Rate (people)		10.5	17.6	47.0	59.1	71.5
All	2010	Line	27,655	32.83	39.99	64.69	80.87	97.04
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	9.9	29.0	40.6	50.9
		Rate (people)		8.7	13.9	36.7	49.0	59.6
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		3.5	7.0	22.3	33.6	44.4
		Rate (people)		4.0	9.1	26.7	40.8	53.0
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		10.6	11.0	25.0	31.2	33.5
		Rate (people)		11.1	11.6	25.4	32.0	34.5
All	2008	Line	29,468	30.47	37.22	60.48	75.60	90.72
		Rate (HHs)		4.5	7.6	22.6	33.3	42.9
		Rate (people)		5.0	9.4	26.5	39.5	50.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.50**
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	0.2	2.2
		Rate (people)		0.3	3.4
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	0.0	1.8
		Rate (people)		0.0	2.0
All	2014	Line		15.52	31.04
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	0.2	2.2
		Rate (people)		0.2	3.2
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.6	1.6
		Rate (people)		0.5	1.5
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	0.0	1.4
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.3
All	2012	Line		14.12	28.25
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.5	1.6
		Rate (people)		0.4	1.3
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.9	4.4
		Rate (people)		0.8	5.4
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	1.3	2.1
		Rate (people)		2.0	2.9
All	2010	Line		12.56	25.12
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	1.0	3.9
		Rate (people)		1.1	4.8
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.5	1.6
		Rate (people)		0.5	1.6
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	0.0	6.3
		Rate (people)		0.0	7.0
All	2008	Line		11.83	23.66
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	0.4	2.3
		Rate (people)		0.4	2.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California Sur): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Minimum	National lines (new definition) 100%	150%	200%
					Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)		
Urban	2014	Line	1,568	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		9.0	31.5	51.4	65.2
		Rate (people)		10.6	36.9	58.4	72.2
Rural	2014	Line	220	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	24.1	50.3	65.6
		Rate (people)		10.3	29.2	58.7	73.2
All	2014	Line	1,788	39.69	80.45	120.67	160.89
		Rate (HHs)		8.9	30.5	51.2	65.3
		Rate (people)		10.6	35.9	58.5	72.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,501	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		11.7	33.2	49.8	63.0
		Rate (people)		12.3	37.2	55.8	69.3
Rural	2012	Line	254	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		15.3	36.9	54.7	68.4
		Rate (people)		17.6	42.8	62.3	75.9
All	2012	Line	1,755	35.99	73.70	110.55	147.40
		Rate (HHs)		12.2	33.7	50.4	63.7
		Rate (people)		13.1	38.0	56.7	70.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,385	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		9.3	30.5	49.8	63.3
		Rate (people)		11.3	35.7	57.4	70.2
Rural	2010	Line	401	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		9.0	29.8	53.3	63.7
		Rate (people)		11.0	34.7	61.1	71.5
All	2010	Line	1,786	31.26	66.84	100.26	133.68
		Rate (HHs)		9.3	30.4	50.2	63.4
		Rate (people)		11.2	35.5	57.9	70.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,303	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	23.5	40.2	55.8
		Rate (people)		7.1	25.9	44.3	61.2
Rural	2008	Line	464	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		11.3	25.9	42.8	52.3
		Rate (people)		11.3	27.0	47.7	58.7
All	2008	Line	1,767	27.95	60.74	91.11	121.48
		Rate (HHs)		7.3	23.9	40.6	55.3
		Rate (people)		7.7	26.1	44.8	60.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California Sur): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,568	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	5.0	7.4	23.5	3.5	8.2
		Rate (people)		2.5	5.5	8.6	28.7	3.8	9.8
Rural	2014	Line	220	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	4.5	7.4	20.2	3.0	7.8
		Rate (people)		3.4	6.0	9.7	25.7	4.0	10.1
All	2014	Line	1,788	15.04	24.06	30.08	60.16	20.24	33.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	4.9	7.4	23.1	3.4	8.2
		Rate (people)		2.6	5.6	8.8	28.3	3.8	9.8
Urban	2012	Line	1,501	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		4.3	7.1	9.5	25.5	4.9	8.8
		Rate (people)		4.0	7.0	10.0	28.7	5.2	9.0
Rural	2012	Line	254	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	5.1	7.6	33.0	2.1	7.2
		Rate (people)		1.5	5.6	8.7	40.3	1.8	8.6
All	2012	Line	1,755	13.71	21.94	27.42	54.84	15.86	25.88
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	6.8	9.2	26.4	4.5	8.6
		Rate (people)		3.6	6.8	9.9	30.3	4.7	9.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,385	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	5.7	8.4	23.2	4.4	9.2
		Rate (people)		2.8	7.0	10.2	28.3	5.3	11.1
Rural	2010	Line	401	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	5.2	8.0	28.2	3.7	10.0
		Rate (people)		3.8	6.3	9.7	33.0	4.7	13.0
All	2010	Line	1,786	12.44	19.91	24.89	49.77	16.74	27.32
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	5.6	8.3	23.8	4.3	9.3
		Rate (people)		2.9	6.9	10.2	28.9	5.2	11.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,303	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	4.4	5.9	18.8	3.6	6.9
		Rate (people)		2.6	4.6	6.3	21.0	3.8	7.5
Rural	2008	Line	464	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		3.9	7.4	10.9	24.5	6.1	12.4
		Rate (people)		3.3	7.3	11.5	26.0	5.7	12.9
All	2008	Line	1,767	11.49	18.39	22.98	45.96	15.46	25.23
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	4.8	6.6	19.6	4.0	7.6
		Rate (people)		2.7	5.0	7.0	21.7	4.1	8.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California Sur): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,568	7.9	5.4	14.6	21.1	31.2	57.8
		Rate (people)		9.3	6.1	17.7	25.8	37.3	66.2
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	220	31.7	19.2	48.9	63.9	72.0	88.5
		Rate (people)		40.5	24.0	58.6	71.9	79.9	92.0
All	2014	Line		39.78	30.49	54.38	68.85	86.35	151.69
		Rate (HHs)	1,788	11.2	7.3	19.4	27.1	36.9	62.1
		Rate (people)		13.6	8.6	23.4	32.2	43.2	69.8
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,501	10.2	7.6	17.6	25.2	34.0	56.2
		Rate (people)		11.2	7.6	19.4	28.4	38.9	63.1
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	254	39.9	31.8	57.3	67.6	74.0	89.6
		Rate (people)		47.6	39.0	66.4	77.1	81.9	93.7
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,755	14.0	10.7	22.7	30.6	39.1	60.5
		Rate (people)		16.3	12.0	26.0	35.2	44.9	67.4
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,385	8.4	5.9	15.8	22.6	32.0	55.7
		Rate (people)		10.2	7.3	19.6	27.6	38.1	63.1
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	401	33.3	25.7	55.1	64.7	74.2	85.8
		Rate (people)		38.6	30.7	63.4	73.0	81.3	89.2
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,786	11.7	8.5	20.9	28.1	37.5	59.6
		Rate (people)		14.2	10.5	25.6	33.8	44.1	66.7
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,303	6.1	4.7	12.4	19.3	26.8	52.6
		Rate (people)		6.6	4.9	13.9	21.5	30.2	58.5
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	464	31.4	23.6	47.7	56.0	67.1	83.8
		Rate (people)		34.5	25.0	54.0	63.4	73.6	88.6
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,767	9.6	7.4	17.4	24.5	32.5	57.0
		Rate (people)		10.5	7.7	19.5	27.3	36.2	62.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California Sur): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	8.6	25.7	42.3	52.9
		Rate (people)		4.9	11.3	31.7	50.3	62.0
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		7.7	11.3	28.6	40.3	46.4
		Rate (people)		9.8	14.4	36.2	48.8	55.8
All	2014	Line	19,479	39.83	48.42	78.03	97.54	117.05
		Rate (HHs)		5.0	9.4	26.6	41.7	50.9
		Rate (people)		6.4	12.3	33.1	49.9	60.1
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	5.1	20.0	30.2	40.6
		Rate (people)		3.5	8.5	28.5	39.4	48.4
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	7.5	21.3	30.8	35.1
		Rate (people)		8.9	12.0	25.1	35.6	40.1
All	2012	Line	9,002	36.14	43.82	70.35	87.93	105.52
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	6.0	20.5	30.4	38.5
		Rate (people)		5.5	9.8	27.2	38.0	45.2
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		6.2	9.0	26.5	38.4	49.1
		Rate (people)		7.2	11.2	32.6	45.1	54.8
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		7.6	7.6	15.3	20.8	33.0
		Rate (people)		10.1	10.1	18.9	26.1	39.9
All	2010	Line	27,655	32.12	39.03	62.88	78.60	94.32
		Rate (HHs)		6.7	8.6	22.8	32.7	43.8
		Rate (people)		8.1	10.9	28.3	39.1	50.1
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	7.2	16.9	24.6	34.1
		Rate (people)		3.7	10.8	21.4	31.5	40.3
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	5.5	11.6	17.3	26.8
		Rate (people)		4.2	6.1	12.8	18.7	29.7
All	2008	Line	29,468	29.51	35.92	58.01	72.52	87.02
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	6.8	15.5	22.6	32.2
		Rate (people)		3.8	9.6	19.1	28.1	37.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Baja California Sur): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.50**
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	0.3	2.6
		Rate (people)		0.6	3.5
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	1.2	5.1
		Rate (people)		1.6	6.2
All	2014	Line		14.89	29.78
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	0.6	3.4
		Rate (people)		0.9	4.3
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.0	0.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.0
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	0.5	2.4
		Rate (people)		0.1	7.0
All	2012	Line		13.31	26.63
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.2	0.9
		Rate (people)		0.1	2.6
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	2.0	3.0
		Rate (people)		1.7	2.5
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	0.0	4.4
		Rate (people)		0.0	5.9
All	2010	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	1.3	3.5
		Rate (people)		1.1	3.6
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.6	2.3
		Rate (people)		0.2	2.9
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	0.0	2.2
		Rate (people)		0.0	3.0
All	2008	Line		11.46	22.92
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	0.5	2.3
		Rate (people)		0.1	2.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Campeche): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Minimum	100%	150%	200%
				Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)			
				National lines (new definition)			
Urban	2014	Line	1,389	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		13.9	38.7	56.5	68.8
		Rate (people)		15.1	41.9	60.8	73.2
Rural	2014	Line	430	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		28.9	60.2	76.9	86.0
		Rate (people)		31.2	64.2	80.3	89.3
All	2014	Line	1,819	38.25	76.87	115.31	153.75
		Rate (HHs)		17.3	43.6	61.2	72.7
		Rate (people)		19.2	47.6	65.7	77.3
Urban	2012	Line	1,352	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		16.4	42.3	59.8	73.6
		Rate (people)		17.3	46.8	64.9	77.6
Rural	2012	Line	491	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		25.5	56.2	77.4	87.8
		Rate (people)		30.1	60.2	80.6	89.7
All	2012	Line	1,843	34.74	70.47	105.70	140.94
		Rate (HHs)		18.6	45.6	64.0	77.0
		Rate (people)		20.6	50.2	68.9	80.7
Urban	2010	Line	1,335	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		14.9	44.8	62.4	75.5
		Rate (people)		15.5	48.2	66.6	78.8
Rural	2010	Line	488	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		34.0	69.3	85.4	91.4
		Rate (people)		39.5	74.1	87.9	92.7
All	2010	Line	1,823	30.12	63.81	95.71	127.62
		Rate (HHs)		19.4	50.6	67.9	79.3
		Rate (people)		21.6	54.8	72.0	82.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,279	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		13.0	42.0	60.7	72.3
		Rate (people)		14.3	45.7	64.9	76.4
Rural	2008	Line	457	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		26.5	58.2	73.5	83.8
		Rate (people)		31.2	64.9	79.0	88.5
All	2008	Line	1,736	26.94	57.97	86.95	115.93
		Rate (HHs)		16.1	45.7	63.6	74.9
		Rate (people)		18.6	50.5	68.5	79.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Campeche): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines $1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	Intl. 2011 PPP lines $1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line		15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)	1,389	2.2	6.9	10.2	30.8	4.9	12.6
		Rate (people)		2.6	7.8	11.7	34.0	5.3	14.1
Rural	2014	Line		10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)	430	6.1	14.3	22.9	54.0	9.0	26.2
		Rate (people)		8.0	17.0	26.0	59.8	11.8	29.9
All	2014	Line		14.49	23.19	28.99	57.97	19.50	31.82
		Rate (HHs)	1,819	3.1	8.6	13.1	36.1	5.8	15.7
		Rate (people)		3.9	10.2	15.4	40.6	7.0	18.1
Urban	2012	Line		14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)	1,352	3.9	8.3	11.8	34.2	4.6	10.7
		Rate (people)		4.3	8.8	13.0	38.7	4.9	11.8
Rural	2012	Line		10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)	491	6.4	14.7	20.3	49.4	8.2	18.5
		Rate (people)		7.8	18.3	24.8	54.6	10.6	22.3
All	2012	Line		13.21	21.14	26.43	52.85	15.29	24.94
		Rate (HHs)	1,843	4.5	9.8	13.9	37.8	5.4	12.6
		Rate (people)		5.2	11.3	16.0	42.8	6.4	14.5
Urban	2010	Line		12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)	1,335	5.2	8.8	12.7	34.8	6.9	14.5
		Rate (people)		4.7	8.8	13.2	38.6	7.0	15.2
Rural	2010	Line		9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)	488	9.9	20.6	29.7	64.7	14.9	34.2
		Rate (people)		11.9	25.7	36.0	71.2	18.3	41.0
All	2010	Line		11.99	19.19	23.98	47.96	16.13	26.32
		Rate (HHs)	1,823	6.3	11.6	16.7	41.9	8.8	19.1
		Rate (people)		6.5	13.1	19.0	46.9	9.9	21.8
Urban	2008	Line		11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)	1,279	2.7	6.9	11.5	33.8	4.6	13.8
		Rate (people)		2.8	7.3	12.7	37.7	4.7	15.4
Rural	2008	Line		8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)	457	6.4	14.2	24.1	55.0	11.1	28.3
		Rate (people)		8.3	18.3	29.3	63.3	14.2	33.9
All	2008	Line		11.08	17.72	22.15	44.31	14.90	24.32
		Rate (HHs)	1,736	3.5	8.6	14.4	38.6	6.1	17.1
		Rate (people)		4.2	10.1	16.9	44.2	7.2	20.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Campeche): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,389	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	7.6	20.9	29.4	38.4	61.6
		Rate (people)		12.8	8.6	23.0	32.4	42.2	66.4
Rural	2014	Line	430	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		64.0	52.3	78.5	85.2	88.5	96.5
		Rate (people)		69.2	57.9	82.4	88.6	91.9	98.2
All	2014	Line	1,819	38.02	29.13	51.97	65.80	82.51	144.95
		Rate (HHs)		23.5	17.8	34.1	42.2	49.9	69.6
		Rate (people)		27.1	21.2	38.1	46.7	54.8	74.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,352	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		12.2	8.9	24.4	33.9	43.9	67.3
		Rate (people)		13.4	9.5	27.9	38.5	48.9	72.9
Rural	2012	Line	491	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		59.8	46.9	79.2	87.5	91.0	96.9
		Rate (people)		64.8	52.2	83.1	90.1	92.8	97.5
All	2012	Line	1,843	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		23.5	17.9	37.4	46.7	55.1	74.3
		Rate (people)		26.6	20.5	42.0	51.7	60.1	79.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,335	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		13.3	9.1	25.0	33.9	45.6	68.1
		Rate (people)		14.0	9.0	27.4	37.6	49.5	72.6
Rural	2010	Line	488	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		71.4	60.2	86.4	91.8	94.7	98.0
		Rate (people)		76.7	66.8	88.9	93.2	95.4	98.5
All	2010	Line	1,823	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		27.1	21.2	39.5	47.6	57.3	75.2
		Rate (people)		29.9	23.7	43.0	51.7	61.2	79.2
Urban	2008	Line	1,279	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		11.9	8.0	25.5	35.0	46.3	68.9
		Rate (people)		13.2	8.5	28.9	39.2	51.2	73.7
Rural	2008	Line	457	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		61.6	53.5	78.6	85.6	89.7	96.6
		Rate (people)		68.8	61.5	84.3	90.6	93.4	97.3
All	2008	Line	1,736	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		23.2	18.3	37.6	46.5	56.1	75.2
		Rate (people)		27.3	22.0	43.0	52.2	61.9	79.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Campeche): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	100%	Upper 125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	13.2	19.0	39.7	48.7	55.8
		Rate (people)		15.3	22.5	47.8	56.5	64.3
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	25.5	30.6	56.6	68.7	77.1
		Rate (people)		32.6	37.8	64.5	75.1	82.5
All	2014	Line		38.19	46.20	73.83	92.29	110.75
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	18.4	23.9	46.8	57.1	64.7
		Rate (people)		23.1	29.4	55.3	64.9	72.6
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	7.2	10.9	30.9	43.2	52.9
		Rate (people)		10.0	14.3	35.6	46.9	56.9
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	20.2	25.3	54.4	63.2	77.1
		Rate (people)		24.7	29.7	57.1	65.6	79.2
All	2012	Line		35.22	42.58	67.98	84.98	101.97
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	12.9	17.2	41.2	52.0	63.5
		Rate (people)		16.9	21.5	45.7	55.7	67.3
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	5.4	11.1	30.2	45.3	56.7
		Rate (people)		4.9	10.4	32.2	48.1	58.6
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	22.8	31.8	59.3	68.1	78.6
		Rate (people)		30.6	40.4	65.9	72.6	81.2
All	2010	Line		30.86	37.32	59.64	74.56	89.47
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	13.0	20.2	43.0	55.3	66.3
		Rate (people)		16.6	24.0	47.6	59.3	68.9
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	6.0	9.9	26.4	33.6	43.6
		Rate (people)		5.9	10.9	30.7	38.4	49.7
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	20.2	27.1	54.8	65.3	71.8
		Rate (people)		22.7	31.3	61.0	69.9	74.8
All	2008	Line		28.19	34.13	54.63	68.29	81.95
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	11.9	17.1	38.2	46.8	55.4
		Rate (people)		13.1	19.6	43.7	51.9	60.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Campeche): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines $1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	1.2	6.6
		Rate (people)		1.2	7.9
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	2.8	14.2
		Rate (people)		4.5	19.2
All	2014	Line		14.28	28.56
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	1.9	9.7
		Rate (people)		2.7	13.0
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.7	2.0
		Rate (people)		1.0	3.7
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	1.0	6.9
		Rate (people)		1.3	8.3
All	2012	Line		12.97	25.93
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.8	4.1
		Rate (people)		1.1	5.8
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.2	0.8
		Rate (people)		0.2	0.6
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	2.5	13.5
		Rate (people)		4.3	19.7
All	2010	Line		11.80	23.61
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	1.2	6.4
		Rate (people)		2.1	9.3
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.2	3.3
		Rate (people)		0.6	2.7
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	2.8	12.9
		Rate (people)		2.8	15.8
All	2008	Line		10.95	21.89
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	1.3	7.3
		Rate (people)		1.6	8.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Coahuila): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Minimum	100%	150%	200%
					Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)		
					National lines (new definition)		
Urban	2014	Line	1,500	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		10.1	35.3	56.8	70.5
		Rate (people)		10.9	39.2	61.2	75.0
Rural	2014	Line	167	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		18.5	57.5	76.9	87.9
		Rate (people)		20.1	60.1	75.4	86.1
All	2014	Line	1,667	40.17	81.64	122.47	163.29
		Rate (HHs)		10.9	37.3	58.7	72.1
		Rate (people)		11.8	41.2	62.6	76.1
Urban	2012	Line	1,556	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		11.1	35.7	57.1	70.8
		Rate (people)		11.7	39.5	61.8	74.7
Rural	2012	Line	215	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		11.5	46.1	74.1	85.1
		Rate (people)		11.0	50.8	79.2	89.0
All	2012	Line	1,771	36.42	74.81	112.22	149.63
		Rate (HHs)		11.1	36.7	58.7	72.1
		Rate (people)		11.6	40.7	63.5	76.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,573	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		9.7	36.3	59.0	71.1
		Rate (people)		10.6	39.7	63.7	75.7
Rural	2010	Line	237	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		20.4	48.9	70.9	83.9
		Rate (people)		19.1	49.6	72.9	87.5
All	2010	Line	1,810	31.63	67.84	101.76	135.68
		Rate (HHs)		10.7	37.5	60.2	72.3
		Rate (people)		11.5	40.7	64.7	76.8
Urban	2008	Line	1,538	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		10.9	40.3	60.0	72.7
		Rate (people)		10.9	44.5	65.6	77.2
Rural	2008	Line	209	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		15.5	46.2	67.3	81.5
		Rate (people)		14.7	51.9	71.3	83.4
All	2008	Line	1,747	28.28	61.66	92.48	123.31
		Rate (HHs)		11.3	40.8	60.7	73.5
		Rate (people)		11.3	45.3	66.2	77.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Coahuila): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,500	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	4.9	7.2	26.7	3.4	9.0
		Rate (people)		2.2	5.6	8.2	30.4	3.9	10.2
Rural	2014	Line	167	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		5.0	8.5	13.1	52.0	6.1	16.9
		Rate (people)		5.8	9.6	14.5	54.8	6.7	19.8
All	2014	Line	1,667	15.22	24.36	30.45	60.89	20.48	33.42
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	5.2	7.8	29.0	3.6	9.7
		Rate (people)		2.5	6.0	8.9	32.8	4.2	11.1
Urban	2012	Line	1,556	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	6.6	8.8	27.0	3.5	8.0
		Rate (people)		2.2	7.1	9.7	31.2	3.2	8.7
Rural	2012	Line	215	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	5.1	11.0	38.0	2.7	9.7
		Rate (people)		1.4	5.3	10.7	43.4	2.6	9.5
All	2012	Line	1,771	13.88	22.21	27.77	55.53	16.06	26.20
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	6.4	9.1	28.1	3.4	8.1
		Rate (people)		2.1	6.9	9.8	32.4	3.2	8.8
Urban	2010	Line	1,573	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	4.5	7.2	27.4	3.3	9.5
		Rate (people)		2.1	4.6	8.0	31.6	3.1	10.9
Rural	2010	Line	237	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	13.1	18.4	45.3	9.3	20.5
		Rate (people)		6.1	10.9	16.6	47.5	7.9	20.0
All	2010	Line	1,810	12.59	20.15	25.19	50.37	16.94	27.65
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	5.4	8.3	29.1	3.9	10.6
		Rate (people)		2.5	5.2	8.9	33.2	3.6	11.8
Urban	2008	Line	1,538	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	5.8	9.3	32.5	4.1	11.5
		Rate (people)		2.5	5.7	9.9	37.0	3.6	12.5
Rural	2008	Line	209	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		6.7	11.2	14.4	41.7	8.7	15.4
		Rate (people)		6.7	10.6	13.9	46.5	7.9	15.1
All	2008	Line	1,747	11.63	18.60	23.26	46.51	15.65	25.53
		Rate (HHs)		3.5	6.3	9.8	33.4	4.5	11.9
		Rate (people)		2.9	6.2	10.3	37.9	4.1	12.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Coahuila): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line | Percentile-based lines | | | | |
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,500	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		8.3	5.4	16.4	24.9	34.9	63.1
		Rate (people)		9.5	6.2	18.6	28.4	39.7	68.8
Rural	2014	Line	167	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		61.7	48.6	76.9	85.3	89.1	99.4
		Rate (people)		64.5	51.5	76.7	84.0	87.9	99.9
All	2014	Line	1,667	40.37	30.94	55.19	69.88	87.63	153.95
		Rate (HHs)		13.2	9.4	21.9	30.4	39.9	66.4
		Rate (people)		15.0	10.8	24.4	34.0	44.5	71.9
Urban	2012	Line	1,556	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		9.3	7.2	18.3	26.8	37.1	64.6
		Rate (people)		10.2	7.7	20.4	30.9	41.7	70.0
Rural	2012	Line	215	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		51.3	33.9	74.6	83.8	90.2	97.2
		Rate (people)		57.3	37.9	80.5	88.7	93.8	98.8
All	2012	Line	1,771	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		13.2	9.7	23.6	32.2	42.1	67.7
		Rate (people)		15.0	10.8	26.4	36.8	47.0	72.9
Urban	2010	Line	1,573	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	4.6	17.7	26.6	38.4	66.5
		Rate (people)		9.3	4.6	20.6	30.9	42.8	71.5
Rural	2010	Line	237	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		53.3	40.9	73.8	83.6	90.5	95.8
		Rate (people)		56.4	41.5	77.4	87.0	94.5	97.3
All	2010	Line	1,810	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		12.5	8.1	23.1	32.1	43.4	69.3
		Rate (people)		14.0	8.3	26.3	36.5	48.0	74.1
Urban	2008	Line	1,538	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		9.5	6.7	22.4	33.4	44.2	68.7
		Rate (people)		10.0	6.8	24.9	38.2	49.2	74.2
Rural	2008	Line	209	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		50.4	39.0	71.9	84.6	88.9	95.6
		Rate (people)		56.9	44.1	76.2	86.9	90.3	96.5
All	2008	Line	1,747	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		13.4	9.8	27.1	38.3	48.4	71.2
		Rate (people)		14.7	10.6	30.1	43.1	53.4	76.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Coahuila): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	13.8	20.4	45.1	60.8	68.7
		Rate (people)		15.4	23.0	51.6	67.8	75.6
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	17.7	27.0	58.0	70.4	83.5
		Rate (people)		20.4	28.2	59.9	73.6	84.8
All	2014	Line		41.60	50.81	82.56	103.20	123.84
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	14.3	21.3	46.8	62.1	70.7
		Rate (people)		16.1	23.7	52.9	68.7	76.9
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	11.1	17.4	46.0	57.7	66.7
		Rate (people)		15.0	22.0	55.4	66.1	75.0
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	30.1	45.7	81.2	93.1	94.6
		Rate (people)		32.2	51.2	87.1	95.3	96.1
All	2012	Line		38.73	47.34	77.02	96.28	115.54
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	13.1	20.4	49.7	61.4	69.7
		Rate (people)		17.0	25.4	59.1	69.6	77.5
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	13.6	18.6	38.0	50.4	59.5
		Rate (people)		16.8	23.6	46.2	58.8	66.9
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	9.1	17.4	50.8	63.3	78.5
		Rate (people)		10.6	19.0	54.9	67.9	83.7
All	2010	Line		33.22	40.52	65.69	82.12	98.54
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	12.8	18.4	40.2	52.6	62.8
		Rate (people)		15.6	22.7	47.9	60.5	70.1
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	7.9	13.5	33.6	45.3	54.9
		Rate (people)		9.8	17.4	41.5	54.0	63.8
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	10.7	16.3	44.8	54.0	63.6
		Rate (people)		15.1	21.9	56.4	65.0	72.4
All	2008	Line		30.50	37.26	60.56	75.70	90.84
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	8.3	13.9	35.1	46.5	56.1
		Rate (people)		10.6	18.0	43.6	55.6	65.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Coahuila): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	1.4	6.3
		Rate (people)		1.5	6.9
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	1.4	6.9
		Rate (people)		1.4	8.2
All	2014	Line		15.55	31.10
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	1.4	6.4
		Rate (people)		1.4	7.1
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	1.3	3.7
		Rate (people)		1.6	5.5
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	2.0	14.6
		Rate (people)		2.0	15.0
All	2012	Line		14.29	28.58
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	1.3	4.9
		Rate (people)		1.7	6.6
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	2.1	6.7
		Rate (people)		1.9	8.7
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	0.4	4.2
		Rate (people)		0.3	5.2
All	2010	Line		12.71	25.42
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	1.8	6.3
		Rate (people)		1.6	8.0
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.3	3.4
		Rate (people)		0.3	3.9
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	0.0	6.5
		Rate (people)		0.0	7.2
All	2008	Line		11.84	23.69
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	0.2	3.9
		Rate (people)		0.2	4.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Colima): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | *n* | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,588	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		9.8	35.9	57.2	70.4
		Rate (people)		10.2	40.6	62.9	75.9
Rural	2014	Line	196	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		14.2	41.7	66.5	80.6
		Rate (people)		13.4	41.7	69.8	83.7
All	2014	Line	1,784	40.02	81.27	121.90	162.53
		Rate (HHs)		10.3	36.5	58.2	71.5
		Rate (people)		10.6	40.7	63.7	76.7
Urban	2012	Line	1,526	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		11.3	36.7	56.6	70.9
		Rate (people)		11.3	40.4	62.1	75.9
Rural	2012	Line	220	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		13.6	41.3	61.6	74.1
		Rate (people)		12.3	43.2	64.4	78.3
All	2012	Line	1,746	36.28	74.43	111.65	148.87
		Rate (HHs)		11.6	37.2	57.2	71.3
		Rate (people)		11.4	40.7	62.4	76.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,459	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		7.0	34.6	56.9	70.4
		Rate (people)		7.3	39.1	62.5	75.8
Rural	2010	Line	252	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		16.7	40.9	57.9	74.7
		Rate (people)		18.8	43.1	62.1	80.1
All	2010	Line	1,711	31.51	67.52	101.28	135.04
		Rate (HHs)		8.0	35.3	57.1	70.9
		Rate (people)		8.6	39.6	62.5	76.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,475	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		7.1	29.2	46.9	60.5
		Rate (people)		7.5	32.2	51.7	65.6
Rural	2008	Line	263	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		7.3	21.9	41.9	59.1
		Rate (people)		6.7	21.1	43.0	62.2
All	2008	Line	1,738	28.18	61.37	92.06	122.75
		Rate (HHs)		7.1	28.4	46.3	60.3
		Rate (people)		7.4	30.9	50.7	65.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Colima): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,588	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	4.2	7.3	26.1	2.8	8.8
		Rate (people)		1.6	3.8	7.3	31.0	2.3	9.1
Rural	2014	Line	196	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	5.5	9.5	34.8	3.9	10.9
		Rate (people)		1.1	5.1	8.9	36.8	3.8	10.8
All	2014	Line	1,784	15.17	24.26	30.33	60.66	20.41	33.29
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	4.3	7.5	27.0	2.9	9.0
		Rate (people)		1.6	4.0	7.5	31.6	2.5	9.3
Urban	2012	Line	1,526	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	5.9	8.1	26.5	3.6	7.5
		Rate (people)		2.8	5.4	8.0	30.2	3.3	7.3
Rural	2012	Line	220	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		5.8	7.3	10.5	33.3	6.4	8.9
		Rate (people)		5.0	6.8	10.1	36.2	5.9	8.5
All	2012	Line	1,746	13.82	22.12	27.65	55.30	15.99	26.09
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	6.0	8.4	27.3	3.9	7.7
		Rate (people)		3.0	5.6	8.2	30.9	3.6	7.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,459	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		2.1	3.7	5.8	25.4	2.7	6.9
		Rate (people)		1.7	3.7	6.1	29.8	2.3	7.3
Rural	2010	Line	252	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		5.1	9.9	15.1	37.0	7.2	16.7
		Rate (people)		5.0	10.9	16.8	40.4	7.6	18.8
All	2010	Line	1,711	12.55	20.07	25.09	50.18	16.88	27.54
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	4.4	6.9	26.7	3.2	8.0
		Rate (people)		2.1	4.5	7.3	31.0	2.9	8.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,475	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	3.5	6.4	22.6	2.6	6.8
		Rate (people)		1.8	3.8	7.0	26.1	2.8	7.4
Rural	2008	Line	263	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		3.5	4.9	6.6	22.3	4.3	7.5
		Rate (people)		3.6	4.6	6.3	22.2	3.9	7.3
All	2008	Line	1,738	11.59	18.54	23.17	46.34	15.59	25.43
		Rate (HHs)		2.1	3.7	6.4	22.6	2.8	6.9
		Rate (people)		2.0	3.9	6.9	25.7	2.9	7.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Colima): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines 20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,588	8.2	4.6	16.9	24.7	34.8	61.8
		Rate (people)		8.6	4.4	19.9	29.1	41.1	68.1
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	196	47.4	33.1	70.5	78.4	85.2	96.2
		Rate (people)		48.6	34.9	74.9	82.8	88.2	97.5
All	2014	Line		40.19	30.80	54.94	69.56	87.23	153.24
		Rate (HHs)	1,784	12.4	7.6	22.6	30.4	40.2	65.4
		Rate (people)		13.1	7.8	26.0	35.1	46.4	71.4
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,526	8.7	6.3	19.1	26.2	36.8	64.0
		Rate (people)		8.7	6.1	21.1	29.7	41.8	70.3
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	220	42.1	31.5	63.7	72.8	81.6	93.2
		Rate (people)		44.3	33.9	67.5	79.1	86.5	95.3
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,746	12.7	9.3	24.4	31.8	42.2	67.5
		Rate (people)		12.8	9.2	26.4	35.4	46.9	73.1
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,459	6.0	4.0	14.2	24.6	35.2	63.6
		Rate (people)		6.3	4.2	16.7	28.8	40.9	69.5
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	252	43.2	34.5	62.6	75.2	83.4	94.1
		Rate (people)		46.9	38.4	68.2	81.8	89.6	96.4
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,711	10.1	7.4	19.6	30.1	40.5	66.9
		Rate (people)		10.9	8.0	22.5	34.8	46.4	72.5
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,475	6.6	4.8	15.6	24.0	32.1	56.1
		Rate (people)		7.2	5.2	17.8	27.5	35.9	61.6
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	263	26.0	19.1	48.9	60.8	77.8	94.6
		Rate (people)		25.8	18.7	52.7	64.5	82.9	95.7
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,738	8.7	6.4	19.3	28.1	37.2	60.4
		Rate (people)		9.3	6.7	21.7	31.7	41.1	65.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Colima): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	7.4	17.1	38.3	50.2	59.8
		Rate (people)		10.4	23.4	48.1	60.4	70.6
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	10.5	17.5	39.4	52.4	63.2
		Rate (people)		11.1	21.8	48.0	61.1	73.4
All	2014	Line		40.42	49.22	79.54	99.43	119.31
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	8.1	17.2	38.6	50.7	60.6
		Rate (people)		10.5	23.0	48.1	60.6	71.3
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	12.9	18.4	35.0	44.7	53.6
		Rate (people)		19.8	26.9	45.9	56.1	66.6
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	9.4	16.6	39.0	48.8	60.4
		Rate (people)		12.9	20.5	48.6	59.6	72.3
All	2012	Line		37.87	46.18	74.82	93.53	112.23
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	12.2	18.0	35.9	45.6	55.1
		Rate (people)		18.4	25.6	46.4	56.8	67.8
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	5.4	6.9	27.2	36.3	46.0
		Rate (people)		7.9	10.1	33.2	42.6	52.0
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	10.5	16.8	33.8	55.9	66.6
		Rate (people)		11.7	19.6	39.1	65.3	75.2
All	2010	Line		32.31	39.29	63.37	79.21	95.05
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	6.8	9.6	29.0	41.7	51.7
		Rate (people)		9.0	12.9	34.9	49.2	58.8
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	3.8	9.4	23.1	30.6	41.4
		Rate (people)		5.5	11.7	28.8	36.6	48.1
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	8.7	12.3	37.3	47.7	54.5
		Rate (people)		11.3	16.1	41.9	57.8	64.8
All	2008	Line		29.44	35.82	57.83	72.29	86.74
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	5.1	10.2	26.9	35.2	44.9
		Rate (people)		7.1	12.9	32.4	42.4	52.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Colima): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	0.0	2.2
		Rate (people)		0.0	2.1
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	0.6	5.0
		Rate (people)		0.6	3.8
All	2014	Line		15.11	30.22
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	0.1	2.8
		Rate (people)		0.2	2.5
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	2.6	5.9
		Rate (people)		4.2	9.8
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	0.9	4.3
		Rate (people)		0.8	6.6
All	2012	Line		13.97	27.93
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	2.2	5.6
		Rate (people)		3.5	9.2
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.0	2.2
		Rate (people)		0.0	3.7
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	0.9	5.5
		Rate (people)		1.1	6.3
All	2010	Line		12.36	24.72
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	0.2	3.1
		Rate (people)		0.3	4.5
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.2	1.6
		Rate (people)		0.3	1.9
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	1.6	7.5
		Rate (people)		3.1	10.1
All	2008	Line		11.43	22.86
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	0.6	3.2
		Rate (people)		1.1	4.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chiapas): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	992	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		30.6	65.4	78.9	86.8
		Rate (people)		34.4	70.4	82.5	89.5
Rural	2014	Line	860	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		53.5	80.7	90.7	95.3
		Rate (people)		61.8	86.6	93.9	97.3
All	2014	Line	1,852	35.01	68.86	103.29	137.72
		Rate (HHs)		41.4	72.6	84.4	90.8
		Rate (people)		48.5	78.7	88.4	93.5
Urban	2012	Line	887	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		26.7	61.9	75.3	83.6
		Rate (people)		29.3	65.8	79.8	86.9
Rural	2012	Line	985	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		55.3	81.6	91.6	95.0
		Rate (people)		63.2	86.5	94.0	96.5
All	2012	Line	1,872	31.95	63.26	94.89	126.52
		Rate (HHs)		39.7	70.8	82.7	88.7
		Rate (people)		46.7	76.4	87.1	91.8
Urban	2010	Line	2,028	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		30.3	66.4	78.3	85.9
		Rate (people)		35.6	72.2	82.7	89.4
Rural	2010	Line	777	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		57.6	84.4	93.3	96.2
		Rate (people)		65.4	89.0	95.3	97.2
All	2010	Line	2,805	27.58	57.03	85.54	114.06
		Rate (HHs)		42.6	74.5	85.0	90.5
		Rate (people)		50.9	80.9	89.1	93.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,065	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		30.1	64.6	78.0	84.2
		Rate (people)		34.6	69.7	82.6	88.2
Rural	2008	Line	727	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		54.3	82.3	90.3	93.1
		Rate (people)		61.2	86.7	93.1	95.5
All	2008	Line	1,792	24.70	51.77	77.65	103.54
		Rate (HHs)		41.0	72.6	83.6	88.2
		Rate (people)		48.2	78.5	88.0	91.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chiapas): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	992	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		5.8	15.4	24.8	55.5	11.5	28.1
		Rate (people)		6.6	17.6	28.8	62.2	12.9	32.4
Rural	2014	Line	860	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		17.8	37.0	46.0	77.2	29.3	50.1
		Rate (people)		25.1	47.2	55.7	84.3	38.9	59.7
All	2014	Line	1,852	13.27	21.23	26.53	53.07	17.85	29.13
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	25.6	34.8	65.7	19.9	38.4
		Rate (people)		16.1	32.8	42.6	73.5	26.2	46.4
Urban	2012	Line	887	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		5.3	13.4	20.8	52.4	7.1	18.2
		Rate (people)		6.5	15.6	24.1	57.2	8.6	20.7
Rural	2012	Line	985	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		18.0	37.9	47.8	76.8	23.5	46.1
		Rate (people)		23.0	45.2	56.1	83.3	29.3	54.0
All	2012	Line	1,872	12.10	19.36	24.20	48.41	14.00	22.84
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	24.5	33.0	63.4	14.5	30.8
		Rate (people)		14.9	30.8	40.5	70.6	19.2	37.8
Urban	2010	Line	2,028	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		6.5	18.8	25.8	56.5	12.5	30.0
		Rate (people)		8.6	23.4	31.8	63.4	16.4	36.3
Rural	2010	Line	777	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		28.0	43.9	52.3	81.3	38.2	57.5
		Rate (people)		35.5	53.0	60.8	87.0	47.1	66.2
All	2010	Line	2,805	10.98	17.57	21.96	43.91	14.77	24.10
		Rate (HHs)		16.1	30.1	37.7	67.6	24.1	42.4
		Rate (people)		22.4	38.6	46.7	75.5	32.2	51.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,065	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		8.8	18.5	27.6	56.5	14.7	32.2
		Rate (people)		10.4	22.0	32.6	62.9	17.5	37.7
Rural	2008	Line	727	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		24.2	41.2	52.6	80.8	33.2	55.2
		Rate (people)		27.9	48.5	60.3	86.0	39.0	62.8
All	2008	Line	1,792	10.15	16.24	20.31	40.61	13.66	22.29
		Rate (HHs)		15.7	28.7	38.8	67.5	23.0	42.6
		Rate (people)		19.4	35.6	46.8	74.7	28.5	50.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chiapas): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	992	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		26.8	17.3	44.0	53.9	63.0	82.9
		Rate (people)		31.0	19.9	49.6	60.6	69.0	86.7
Rural	2014	Line	860	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		81.7	75.5	90.6	94.3	96.7	98.7
		Rate (people)		87.7	82.9	94.1	96.7	98.3	99.3
All	2014	Line	1,852	34.05	26.09	46.55	58.94	73.91	129.84
		Rate (HHs)		52.6	44.7	65.9	72.9	78.8	90.4
		Rate (people)		60.1	52.2	72.4	79.1	84.1	93.2
Urban	2012	Line	887	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		21.8	15.0	40.1	52.2	61.8	78.9
		Rate (people)		25.1	17.5	44.8	57.1	66.4	83.5
Rural	2012	Line	985	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		82.8	75.3	91.6	95.2	97.3	98.7
		Rate (people)		88.2	82.0	94.2	96.9	98.1	99.2
All	2012	Line	1,872	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		49.4	42.3	63.3	71.6	77.9	87.9
		Rate (people)		57.5	50.6	70.2	77.6	82.7	91.6
Urban	2010	Line	2,028	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		26.4	19.4	46.3	55.7	65.4	82.0
		Rate (people)		32.5	24.1	53.1	62.5	72.2	86.1
Rural	2010	Line	777	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		85.8	78.7	93.4	96.6	97.8	99.5
		Rate (people)		90.4	85.1	95.8	97.7	98.6	99.5
All	2010	Line	2,805	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		53.1	46.1	67.5	74.1	80.0	89.9
		Rate (people)		62.2	55.4	75.0	80.5	85.8	93.0
Urban	2008	Line	1,065	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		28.5	20.9	46.7	57.4	67.6	82.2
		Rate (people)		33.4	24.9	53.3	63.6	73.4	86.7
Rural	2008	Line	727	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		84.2	80.2	91.7	94.1	96.3	99.0
		Rate (people)		89.2	85.4	94.5	96.5	98.0	99.6
All	2008	Line	1,792	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		53.5	47.6	66.9	73.9	80.5	89.7
		Rate (people)		62.0	55.9	74.4	80.5	86.0	93.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chiapas): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		29.3	38.4	61.3	67.7	75.9
		Rate (people)		34.5	44.6	68.2	74.0	79.8
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		60.3	70.9	87.4	90.7	93.5
		Rate (people)		70.4	78.0	91.8	94.6	96.4
All	2014	Line	19,479	35.77	42.92	67.64	84.55	101.46
		Rate (HHs)		48.5	58.6	77.4	81.9	86.8
		Rate (people)		58.6	67.0	84.1	87.8	90.9
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		23.7	37.4	66.5	75.1	76.3
		Rate (people)		25.1	44.5	72.4	81.1	81.4
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		53.7	62.3	78.4	85.7	90.8
		Rate (people)		59.3	68.4	83.7	88.5	91.8
All	2012	Line	9,002	33.61	40.40	63.84	79.80	95.76
		Rate (HHs)		41.1	51.8	73.4	81.3	84.7
		Rate (people)		46.6	59.5	79.5	85.7	87.9
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		25.4	34.3	57.7	66.0	73.4
		Rate (people)		32.3	42.1	65.0	73.1	79.7
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		47.7	58.3	77.7	85.4	89.5
		Rate (people)		59.8	68.5	84.9	90.5	93.8
All	2010	Line	27,655	28.93	34.72	54.71	68.39	82.07
		Rate (HHs)		39.6	49.6	70.4	78.3	83.6
		Rate (people)		50.7	59.8	78.3	84.8	89.2
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		31.5	39.6	57.6	65.9	71.4
		Rate (people)		38.1	47.4	64.9	73.3	76.9
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		52.1	61.7	80.9	85.2	87.9
		Rate (people)		59.4	69.5	86.2	89.0	91.6
All	2008	Line	29,468	26.32	31.60	49.84	62.29	74.75
		Rate (HHs)		44.3	53.3	72.1	77.9	81.7
		Rate (people)		52.2	62.0	78.9	83.7	86.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chiapas): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	1.0	15.0
		Rate (people)		1.6	18.8
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	12.1	43.8
		Rate (people)		18.1	54.6
All	2014	Line		13.38	26.75
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	7.9	32.8
		Rate (people)		12.7	42.8
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	1.5	9.7
		Rate (people)		1.3	9.7
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	9.6	40.1
		Rate (people)		11.5	45.8
All	2012	Line		12.36	24.72
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	6.2	27.3
		Rate (people)		7.7	32.4
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	2.5	15.4
		Rate (people)		3.1	21.0
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	11.2	35.3
		Rate (people)		16.6	46.6
All	2010	Line		11.07	22.14
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	8.1	28.1
		Rate (people)		12.1	38.2
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	4.3	20.1
		Rate (people)		5.1	23.7
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	9.8	33.4
		Rate (people)		12.5	40.0
All	2008	Line		10.22	20.44
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	7.7	28.4
		Rate (people)		10.0	34.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chihuahua): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,519	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		14.3	43.4	62.6	75.1
		Rate (people)		15.1	45.3	65.5	78.0
Rural	2014	Line	276	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		29.8	51.0	68.5	79.0
		Rate (people)		33.4	52.2	72.7	83.6
All	2014	Line	1,795	39.52	80.04	120.06	160.08
		Rate (HHs)		16.6	44.6	63.5	75.7
		Rate (people)		17.8	46.4	66.6	78.8
Urban	2012	Line	1,559	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		13.8	42.3	60.4	70.8
		Rate (people)		15.1	45.6	64.5	74.4
Rural	2012	Line	278	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		19.4	44.6	67.9	76.0
		Rate (people)		20.7	48.1	73.6	82.0
All	2012	Line	1,837	35.86	73.37	110.06	146.74
		Rate (HHs)		14.7	42.6	61.6	71.6
		Rate (people)		15.9	46.0	65.9	75.5
Urban	2010	Line	1,420	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		13.2	47.2	66.0	76.9
		Rate (people)		15.1	51.7	70.7	81.2
Rural	2010	Line	323	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		21.3	46.6	67.3	79.4
		Rate (people)		24.5	52.1	73.8	83.4
All	2010	Line	1,743	31.12	66.49	99.73	132.98
		Rate (HHs)		14.4	47.1	66.2	77.2
		Rate (people)		16.6	51.8	71.2	81.5
Urban	2008	Line	1,475	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	31.5	54.5	67.4
		Rate (people)		7.6	35.3	60.8	73.4
Rural	2008	Line	292	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		28.6	55.3	74.1	81.9
		Rate (people)		33.5	62.6	79.2	86.4
All	2008	Line	1,767	27.83	60.42	90.63	120.83
		Rate (HHs)		9.6	34.8	57.2	69.4
		Rate (people)		11.5	39.4	63.6	75.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chihuahua): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,519	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	7.5	10.6	34.9	5.5	12.2
		Rate (people)		3.0	7.4	11.3	38.4	5.3	13.3
Rural	2014	Line	276	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		12.1	21.2	25.6	46.6	17.1	27.8
		Rate (people)		16.9	25.9	29.1	49.4	21.8	31.6
All	2014	Line	1,795	14.98	23.96	29.95	59.91	20.15	32.88
		Rate (HHs)		4.5	9.5	12.8	36.7	7.2	14.6
		Rate (people)		5.1	10.2	14.0	40.1	7.8	16.1
Urban	2012	Line	1,559	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	6.7	10.3	31.5	4.5	9.6
		Rate (people)		4.3	7.2	11.7	35.3	4.7	10.9
Rural	2012	Line	278	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		5.1	11.8	15.6	37.2	7.0	14.1
		Rate (people)		4.9	12.6	16.7	42.0	7.2	15.2
All	2012	Line	1,837	13.66	21.86	27.32	54.64	15.80	25.79
		Rate (HHs)		4.3	7.4	11.1	32.3	4.8	10.3
		Rate (people)		4.4	8.0	12.5	36.3	5.1	11.6
Urban	2010	Line	1,420	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	7.5	10.8	34.8	5.8	13.2
		Rate (people)		4.6	9.4	13.3	40.5	7.3	15.7
Rural	2010	Line	323	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		7.2	15.4	19.8	41.8	11.3	21.4
		Rate (people)		8.4	18.8	22.8	48.4	13.7	24.7
All	2010	Line	1,743	12.39	19.83	24.78	49.56	16.67	27.20
		Rate (HHs)		4.4	8.7	12.2	35.8	6.6	14.4
		Rate (people)		5.2	10.8	14.8	41.7	8.3	17.1
Urban	2008	Line	1,475	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	3.5	5.5	22.6	2.4	6.6
		Rate (people)		1.8	4.3	6.8	26.9	2.8	8.1
Rural	2008	Line	292	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		8.1	18.6	26.2	52.5	14.1	30.1
		Rate (people)		11.0	24.6	32.1	61.1	19.1	37.8
All	2008	Line	1,767	11.44	18.31	22.89	45.77	15.40	25.12
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	5.6	8.4	26.7	4.0	9.8
		Rate (people)		3.2	7.4	10.6	32.1	5.2	12.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chihuahua): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,519	11.5	8.0	22.5	33.3	42.7	68.3
		Rate (people)		12.7	8.1	24.9	36.8	45.8	72.1
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	276	55.4	45.5	70.9	78.3	83.6	93.2
		Rate (people)		58.8	48.4	76.0	83.7	88.2	95.0
All	2014	Line		39.58	30.33	54.11	68.51	85.91	150.92
		Rate (HHs)	1,795	18.1	13.6	29.8	40.1	48.9	72.1
		Rate (people)		19.7	14.2	32.6	43.9	52.3	75.6
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,559	11.1	7.5	22.1	31.2	42.6	65.0
		Rate (people)		12.7	8.4	25.3	35.0	47.0	69.6
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	278	45.8	35.2	68.1	75.4	83.6	94.6
		Rate (people)		51.3	40.2	75.3	81.2	88.0	97.3
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,837	16.3	11.7	29.0	37.8	48.8	69.4
		Rate (people)		18.6	13.2	32.9	42.0	53.2	73.8
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,420	11.1	7.8	23.6	34.2	46.6	70.2
		Rate (people)		13.6	9.8	28.3	39.9	52.0	75.2
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	323	50.5	40.3	70.0	78.4	85.1	93.4
		Rate (people)		58.1	46.3	76.6	83.0	88.6	94.8
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,743	17.0	12.7	30.5	40.8	52.3	73.7
		Rate (people)		20.4	15.3	35.7	46.4	57.6	78.2
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,475	5.7	4.0	15.5	24.1	37.8	63.7
		Rate (people)		7.0	4.9	18.1	28.3	43.8	70.4
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	292	59.1	52.1	76.5	83.3	88.5	94.4
		Rate (people)		67.0	60.7	82.4	88.1	92.2	96.4
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,767	13.0	10.6	23.8	32.2	44.7	67.9
		Rate (people)		16.1	13.4	27.9	37.4	51.2	74.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chihuahua): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | Upper | | |
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		9.4	16.2	40.5	54.4	64.8
		Rate (people)		12.6	20.2	47.5	60.9	70.0
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		24.0	26.4	39.5	47.9	60.0
		Rate (people)		32.3	34.3	47.1	54.9	68.3
All	2014	Line	19,479	40.84	49.78	80.62	100.77	120.93
		Rate (HHs)		12.2	18.2	40.3	53.1	63.9
		Rate (people)		16.8	23.2	47.4	59.6	69.7
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		8.1	14.5	44.3	55.5	64.7
		Rate (people)		11.5	21.3	53.3	64.2	72.7
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		16.1	23.9	42.7	60.3	66.5
		Rate (people)		22.3	29.0	52.6	69.8	74.5
All	2012	Line	9,002	38.22	46.66	75.72	94.65	113.58
		Rate (HHs)		9.4	16.0	44.0	56.2	65.0
		Rate (people)		13.3	22.6	53.2	65.1	73.0
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		13.6	20.1	42.6	55.3	62.9
		Rate (people)		19.5	28.8	52.8	64.6	72.3
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	18.0	34.9	46.9	54.6
		Rate (people)		12.7	22.2	41.6	53.5	60.4
All	2010	Line	27,655	33.20	40.49	65.64	82.05	98.46
		Rate (HHs)		13.1	19.7	41.2	53.7	61.3
		Rate (people)		18.2	27.5	50.6	62.4	70.0
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	6.8	24.5	38.3	49.0
		Rate (people)		5.1	10.0	32.2	48.7	59.0
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		22.4	29.2	46.6	59.2	65.6
		Rate (people)		32.8	39.7	55.6	67.0	72.2
All	2008	Line	29,468	30.07	36.68	59.46	74.32	89.19
		Rate (HHs)		7.0	11.0	28.7	42.3	52.2
		Rate (people)		10.5	15.8	36.8	52.2	61.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Chihuahua): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.50**
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	1.0	4.9
		Rate (people)		1.4	6.3
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	3.7	16.1
		Rate (people)		8.7	23.3
All	2014	Line		15.27	30.54
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	1.5	7.1
		Rate (people)		3.0	9.9
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.5	2.5
		Rate (people)		0.6	4.7
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	0.0	9.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	11.0
All	2012	Line		14.10	28.20
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.4	3.5
		Rate (people)		0.5	5.8
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	1.0	8.0
		Rate (people)		1.5	12.2
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	1.9	6.5
		Rate (people)		2.4	7.2
All	2010	Line		12.70	25.40
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	1.2	7.7
		Rate (people)		1.6	11.2
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.0	1.7
		Rate (people)		0.0	3.2
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	2.3	16.5
		Rate (people)		3.9	22.4
All	2008	Line		11.68	23.35
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	0.4	4.5
		Rate (people)		0.8	6.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Distrito Federal): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | *n* | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,719	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	30.0	48.3	59.7
		Rate (people)		8.2	36.4	56.7	67.8
Rural	2014	Line	39	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	24.8	50.3	70.9
		Rate (people)		0.0	29.6	56.6	78.3
All	2014	Line	1,758	41.36	84.59	126.89	169.19
		Rate (HHs)		6.5	30.0	48.3	59.8
		Rate (people)		8.2	36.4	56.7	67.8
Urban	2012	Line	1,823	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		5.5	29.0	50.0	64.4
		Rate (people)		6.9	35.5	58.5	72.4
Rural	2012	Line	1,823	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		5.5	29.0	50.0	64.4
		Rate (people)		6.9	35.5	58.5	72.4
All	2012	Line	2,725	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		4.6	27.7	47.5	60.8
		Rate (people)		6.0	34.0	55.9	68.3
Urban	2010	Line	74	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		4.4	18.5	50.1	73.8
		Rate (people)		6.5	23.3	57.1	78.9
Rural	2010	Line	2,799	32.57	70.34	105.51	140.68
		Rate (HHs)		4.6	27.7	47.5	60.9
		Rate (people)		6.0	34.0	55.9	68.3
All	2010	Line	2,449	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	26.7	46.4	58.9
		Rate (people)		5.3	32.7	54.1	67.3
Urban	2008	Line	93	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	16.6	39.4	57.2
		Rate (people)		3.5	21.4	47.6	63.1
Rural	2008	Line	2,542	29.11	63.95	95.92	127.89
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	26.7	46.4	58.9
		Rate (people)		5.3	32.6	54.1	67.3
All	2008	Line	1,265	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		17.1	49.0	69.6	80.1
		Rate (people)		18.6	53.8	75.8	84.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Distrito Federal): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,719	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		1.1	2.8	4.0	21.3	2.1	5.1
		Rate (people)		1.1	3.3	5.1	26.9	2.3	6.7
Rural	2014	Line	39	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	0.0	0.0	22.7	0.0	0.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.0	0.0	24.7	0.0	0.0
All	2014	Line	1,758	15.67	25.08	31.35	62.70	21.09	34.41
		Rate (HHs)		1.1	2.8	4.0	21.3	2.1	5.1
		Rate (people)		1.1	3.3	5.1	26.9	2.3	6.7
Urban	2012	Line	1,823	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	2.0	3.3	19.1	1.2	2.8
		Rate (people)		1.0	2.4	4.0	24.2	1.3	3.2
Rural	2012	Line	1,823	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	2.0	3.3	19.1	1.2	2.8
		Rate (people)		1.0	2.4	4.0	24.2	1.3	3.2
All	2012	Line	2,725	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	2.1	3.6	19.3	1.1	4.3
		Rate (people)		0.9	2.9	4.8	25.0	1.3	5.7
Urban	2010	Line	74	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	1.8	3.6	15.8	1.8	5.3
		Rate (people)		3.9	3.9	5.8	21.2	3.9	7.1
Rural	2010	Line	2,799	12.97	20.75	25.93	51.87	17.45	28.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	2.1	3.6	19.3	1.1	4.3
		Rate (people)		0.9	2.9	4.8	25.0	1.4	5.8
All	2010	Line	2,449	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		0.3	1.4	3.5	18.7	0.8	4.5
		Rate (people)		0.4	1.9	4.7	23.4	1.1	5.9
Urban	2008	Line	93	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	2.1	2.1	15.6	1.1	3.2
		Rate (people)		0.0	2.7	2.7	20.5	1.3	3.5
Rural	2008	Line	2,542	11.97	19.15	23.94	47.88	16.11	26.28
		Rate (HHs)		0.3	1.4	3.5	18.7	0.8	4.5
		Rate (people)		0.4	1.9	4.7	23.4	1.1	5.9
All	2008	Line	1,265	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	8.9	13.2	39.5	6.2	15.8
		Rate (people)		3.4	9.7	14.4	44.7	6.7	17.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Distrito Federal): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines 20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,719	4.7	3.0	12.4	19.7	29.0	52.4
		Rate (people)		6.1	3.6	15.9	25.0	35.8	61.8
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	39	33.0	17.6	54.5	67.9	77.3	94.8
		Rate (people)		40.3	17.9	60.9	77.6	83.7	98.7
All	2014	Line		41.83	32.06	57.19	72.40	90.80	159.51
		Rate (HHs)	1,758	4.8	3.1	12.6	19.9	29.2	52.5
		Rate (people)		6.3	3.6	16.1	25.2	36.1	61.9
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,823	3.6	2.2	11.1	19.1	29.4	56.5
		Rate (people)		4.7	2.6	14.5	24.2	36.4	65.6
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,823	3.6	2.2	11.1	19.1	29.4	56.5
		Rate (people)		4.7	2.6	14.5	24.2	36.4	65.6
All	2012	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	2,725	3.8	2.2	10.3	18.9	28.5	53.3
		Rate (people)		5.1	3.0	13.8	24.6	35.8	62.2
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	74	25.1	14.2	57.8	72.1	85.3	95.7
		Rate (people)		31.1	19.0	67.5	77.6	90.8	98.8
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	2,799	3.9	2.2	10.5	19.1	28.8	53.5
		Rate (people)		5.2	3.1	14.1	24.8	36.1	62.4
All	2010	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	2,449	3.6	2.0	11.7	19.7	29.2	54.3
		Rate (people)		4.8	2.6	15.1	24.6	36.1	62.8
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	93	22.3	15.6	46.0	64.2	82.6	97.3
		Rate (people)		28.1	20.5	53.1	71.4	87.4	98.4
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	2,542	3.6	2.1	11.8	19.9	29.4	54.5
		Rate (people)		4.9	2.7	15.2	24.8	36.3	63.0
All	2008	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,265	14.6	9.5	26.5	37.8	48.1	73.8
		Rate (people)		16.3	10.4	30.5	42.8	54.7	79.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Distrito Federal): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	5.3	10.1	28.9	38.7	47.2
		Rate (people)		7.6	14.9	38.0	49.0	58.8
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	0.0	1.1	11.1	17.4	48.1
		Rate (people)		0.0	1.5	11.6	19.0	50.2
All	2014	Line		43.06	52.79	86.30	107.88	129.45
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	5.2	10.0	28.7	38.5	47.2
		Rate (people)		7.5	14.7	37.6	48.5	58.7
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	3.0	5.9	23.0	32.8	41.7
		Rate (people)		4.2	8.2	30.9	42.5	51.9
Rural	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	3.0	5.9	23.0	32.8	41.7
		Rate (people)		4.2	8.2	30.9	42.5	51.9
All	2012	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	4.8	8.9	26.1	35.4	43.8
		Rate (people)		6.8	12.6	33.7	44.3	53.4
Urban	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	5.4	7.4	23.7	34.5	54.4
		Rate (people)		8.7	10.7	29.5	42.8	63.6
Rural	2010	Line		34.80	42.67	69.76	87.20	104.64
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	4.8	8.9	26.1	35.4	43.9
		Rate (people)		6.9	12.5	33.6	44.2	53.5
All	2010	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	5.1	9.3	25.6	35.4	44.1
		Rate (people)		7.0	12.3	32.2	43.8	52.9
Urban	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	5.1	9.6	21.6	32.7	46.8
		Rate (people)		7.6	13.5	26.2	36.5	54.1
Rural	2008	Line		31.52	38.65	63.18	78.97	94.77
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	5.1	9.3	25.5	35.4	44.2
		Rate (people)		7.0	12.3	32.1	43.7	52.9
All	2008	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	15.9	25.2	51.0	63.9	71.6
		Rate (people)		20.2	32.5	61.1	73.7	80.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Distrito Federal): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.50**
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	0.0	2.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	2.8
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	0.0	0.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.0
All	2014	Line		16.10	32.20
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	0.0	2.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	2.7
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.3	2.6
		Rate (people)		0.1	3.4
Rural	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	0.3	2.6
		Rate (people)		0.1	3.4
All	2012	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.3	2.3
		Rate (people)		0.4	3.2
Urban	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.6	1.2
		Rate (people)		1.3	1.9
Rural	2010	Line		13.31	26.63
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	0.3	2.2
		Rate (people)		0.5	3.2
All	2010	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	0.4	2.9
		Rate (people)		0.4	3.8
Urban	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.0	0.3
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.4
Rural	2008	Line		12.24	24.48
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	0.4	2.8
		Rate (people)		0.4	3.7
All	2008	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	2.0	7.5
		Rate (people)		1.8	9.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Durango): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,265	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		17.1	49.0	69.6	80.1
		Rate (people)		18.6	53.8	75.8	84.5
Rural	2014	Line	552	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		23.6	51.3	72.4	85.3
		Rate (people)		25.4	54.2	76.1	88.0
All	2014	Line	1,817	37.54	75.12	112.67	150.23
		Rate (HHs)		19.1	49.7	70.4	81.7
		Rate (people)		20.7	53.9	75.9	85.6
Urban	2012	Line	1,235	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		21.4	56.4	70.7	80.0
		Rate (people)		23.7	61.7	75.6	84.7
Rural	2012	Line	566	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		25.3	55.2	76.1	86.5
		Rate (people)		27.9	59.9	80.9	90.2
All	2012	Line	1,801	34.13	68.90	103.34	137.79
		Rate (HHs)		22.6	56.0	72.4	82.0
		Rate (people)		25.0	61.2	77.2	86.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,332	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		16.0	51.3	69.4	81.1
		Rate (people)		19.4	58.3	75.4	85.4
Rural	2010	Line	415	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		28.0	58.4	78.5	85.9
		Rate (people)		32.2	64.9	84.8	90.9
All	2010	Line	1,747	29.56	62.31	93.46	124.62
		Rate (HHs)		19.7	53.5	72.2	82.6
		Rate (people)		23.4	60.3	78.3	87.1
Urban	2008	Line	1,303	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		15.6	49.6	69.1	77.9
		Rate (people)		17.6	54.8	73.9	81.9
Rural	2008	Line	451	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		23.1	55.4	71.8	82.9
		Rate (people)		25.4	60.9	75.5	85.5
All	2008	Line	1,754	26.45	56.59	84.89	113.18
		Rate (HHs)		17.8	51.3	69.9	79.4
		Rate (people)		20.0	56.7	74.4	83.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Durango): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line		15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)	1,265	3.2	8.9	13.2	39.5	6.2	15.8
		Rate (people)		3.4	9.7	14.4	44.7	6.7	17.5
Rural	2014	Line		10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)	552	5.8	12.0	19.1	46.5	9.4	21.9
		Rate (people)		5.8	13.0	20.9	50.7	9.6	24.2
All	2014	Line		14.22	22.76	28.45	56.90	19.14	31.23
		Rate (HHs)	1,817	4.0	9.8	15.0	41.6	7.2	17.7
		Rate (people)		4.1	10.7	16.4	46.6	7.6	19.6
Urban	2012	Line		14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)	1,235	6.0	10.8	15.8	46.0	7.0	14.5
		Rate (people)		5.9	11.6	17.7	52.0	7.1	16.1
Rural	2012	Line		10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)	566	8.5	14.0	21.3	50.5	9.4	18.9
		Rate (people)		9.2	15.6	23.4	55.7	10.4	20.8
All	2012	Line		12.97	20.75	25.94	51.88	15.01	24.48
		Rate (HHs)	1,801	6.7	11.8	17.5	47.4	7.7	15.8
		Rate (people)		6.9	12.9	19.5	53.2	8.1	17.6
Urban	2010	Line		12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)	1,332	2.7	8.1	13.2	41.9	5.5	16.0
		Rate (people)		2.9	9.9	16.0	49.3	6.1	19.8
Rural	2010	Line		9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)	415	9.0	16.7	25.1	55.4	13.3	27.3
		Rate (people)		10.8	19.6	29.4	62.5	15.2	32.3
All	2010	Line		11.77	18.83	23.53	47.07	15.83	25.83
		Rate (HHs)	1,747	4.7	10.8	16.9	46.1	7.9	19.5
		Rate (people)		5.4	12.9	20.1	53.4	8.9	23.7
Urban	2008	Line		11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)	1,303	3.8	8.8	13.8	41.8	6.2	16.8
		Rate (people)		3.5	10.3	15.9	47.5	6.7	19.4
Rural	2008	Line		8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)	451	6.5	14.9	21.2	51.6	11.7	23.7
		Rate (people)		8.2	17.8	24.1	58.1	14.4	26.7
All	2008	Line		10.87	17.40	21.74	43.49	14.63	23.87
		Rate (HHs)	1,754	4.6	10.6	16.0	44.7	7.8	18.8
		Rate (people)		5.0	12.7	18.5	50.8	9.1	21.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Durango): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
					Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
					Percentile-based lines				
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,265	14.6	9.5	26.5	37.8	48.1	73.8
		Rate (people)		16.3	10.4	30.5	42.8	54.7	79.8
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	552	56.0	45.2	73.8	83.7	88.7	96.9
		Rate (people)		60.2	49.2	78.4	87.3	91.4	97.8
All	2014	Line		37.15	28.47	50.78	64.29	80.63	141.64
		Rate (HHs)	1,817	27.2	20.4	40.8	51.7	60.4	80.9
		Rate (people)		30.0	22.4	45.4	56.7	66.1	85.4
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,235	17.2	11.9	33.6	45.6	57.7	75.4
		Rate (people)		19.6	12.6	38.4	51.5	63.7	80.9
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	566	59.0	47.3	77.6	85.6	90.4	96.8
		Rate (people)		64.6	52.9	83.6	90.4	94.0	98.4
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,801	30.3	23.0	47.4	58.1	67.9	82.1
		Rate (people)		33.6	25.2	52.5	63.6	73.2	86.3
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,332	14.0	8.5	28.3	41.2	51.6	74.5
		Rate (people)		17.1	10.2	34.5	48.3	59.6	80.4
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	415	61.1	53.6	78.7	85.1	91.1	96.2
		Rate (people)		68.7	60.4	85.7	91.0	95.1	98.2
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,747	28.6	22.5	43.9	54.8	63.8	81.2
		Rate (people)		33.1	25.9	50.4	61.6	70.7	85.9
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,303	14.0	10.5	32.0	43.2	52.7	76.2
		Rate (people)		16.2	12.1	37.2	48.9	58.7	80.8
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	451	56.3	49.5	76.7	83.8	89.9	97.6
		Rate (people)		62.4	55.6	81.3	86.8	92.0	98.3
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,754	26.6	22.1	45.3	55.3	63.7	82.5
		Rate (people)		30.6	25.6	51.0	60.7	69.0	86.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Durango): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		15.9	25.2	51.0	63.9	71.6
		Rate (people)		20.2	32.5	61.1	73.7	80.9
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		18.2	24.8	47.2	61.2	71.8
		Rate (people)		21.2	28.1	53.1	67.2	76.3
All	2014	Line	19,479	38.50	46.62	74.63	93.29	111.95
		Rate (HHs)		16.9	25.0	49.4	62.8	71.7
		Rate (people)		20.6	30.6	57.7	71.0	78.9
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		15.7	30.1	56.0	64.1	72.9
		Rate (people)		22.0	35.7	68.7	72.9	80.5
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		27.4	35.9	61.4	71.0	80.0
		Rate (people)		31.8	41.1	68.5	78.2	86.5
All	2012	Line	9,002	35.59	43.08	68.93	86.16	103.39
		Rate (HHs)		20.4	32.5	58.2	66.9	75.8
		Rate (people)		26.2	38.0	68.6	75.1	83.1
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		9.9	16.4	45.7	54.4	65.5
		Rate (people)		12.4	20.0	55.0	63.7	74.6
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		21.8	28.3	49.0	63.1	72.1
		Rate (people)		26.3	33.4	55.4	69.3	77.3
All	2010	Line	27,655	30.49	36.83	58.72	73.40	88.07
		Rate (HHs)		15.2	21.7	47.2	58.3	68.4
		Rate (people)		19.3	26.6	55.2	66.5	75.9
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		15.8	22.9	49.3	60.1	68.4
		Rate (people)		19.1	27.7	56.1	66.6	73.6
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		26.2	31.9	51.7	60.9	72.3
		Rate (people)		28.9	35.9	55.8	65.6	76.1
All	2008	Line	29,468	28.26	34.22	54.80	68.50	82.21
		Rate (HHs)		20.1	26.6	50.3	60.4	70.0
		Rate (people)		23.2	31.2	56.0	66.2	74.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Durango): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.50**
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	2.0	7.5
		Rate (people)		1.8	9.3
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	1.2	9.1
		Rate (people)		0.5	10.9
All	2014	Line		14.40	28.79
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	1.7	8.2
		Rate (people)		1.2	10.0
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.0	7.5
		Rate (people)		0.0	10.4
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	2.4	16.2
		Rate (people)		2.9	17.1
All	2012	Line		13.11	26.21
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	1.0	11.0
		Rate (people)		1.3	13.3
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.4	5.1
		Rate (people)		0.4	5.6
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	2.9	10.0
		Rate (people)		5.1	13.0
All	2010	Line		11.67	23.33
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	1.5	7.3
		Rate (people)		2.7	9.2
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	1.3	7.7
		Rate (people)		1.6	9.8
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	4.5	13.7
		Rate (people)		4.6	15.5
All	2008	Line		10.97	21.95
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	2.7	10.2
		Rate (people)		2.8	12.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guanajuato): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,312	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		16.0	49.8	69.4	80.0
		Rate (people)		17.4	55.7	75.9	85.3
Rural	2014	Line	564	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		19.1	50.4	73.2	86.6
		Rate (people)		19.0	53.8	78.4	90.2
All	2014	Line	1,876	37.66	75.43	113.14	150.85
		Rate (HHs)		16.9	50.0	70.5	81.9
		Rate (people)		17.9	55.1	76.6	86.8
Urban	2012	Line	1,315	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		14.1	42.7	63.1	74.6
		Rate (people)		14.7	46.2	68.0	79.5
Rural	2012	Line	549	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		21.9	51.0	71.9	85.3
		Rate (people)		21.8	56.6	77.1	89.2
All	2012	Line	1,864	34.25	69.20	103.80	138.40
		Rate (HHs)		16.4	45.1	65.7	77.8
		Rate (people)		16.9	49.3	70.8	82.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,397	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		11.3	45.0	67.4	79.5
		Rate (people)		13.7	50.7	74.1	84.9
Rural	2010	Line	504	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		20.1	57.0	75.5	86.2
		Rate (people)		22.9	62.3	80.5	90.4
All	2010	Line	1,901	29.66	62.58	93.87	125.16
		Rate (HHs)		13.9	48.5	69.7	81.4
		Rate (people)		16.5	54.2	76.0	86.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,226	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		8.4	40.7	62.7	75.6
		Rate (people)		9.9	46.0	68.7	80.8
Rural	2008	Line	506	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		18.2	51.5	71.0	82.8
		Rate (people)		20.2	54.9	74.3	86.3
All	2008	Line	1,732	26.54	56.84	85.26	113.68
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	43.9	65.2	77.8
		Rate (people)		13.0	48.7	70.4	82.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guanajuato): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,312	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	8.0	11.8	38.3	4.9	14.4
		Rate (people)		2.9	8.9	13.3	44.2	5.4	16.5
Rural	2014	Line	564	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		3.6	7.2	13.6	45.6	5.4	16.8
		Rate (people)		3.4	7.3	14.1	49.4	5.1	17.6
All	2014	Line	1,876	14.27	22.83	28.54	57.09	19.20	31.33
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	7.8	12.3	40.4	5.0	15.1
		Rate (people)		3.0	8.4	13.6	45.8	5.3	16.8
Urban	2012	Line	1,315	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	6.5	10.5	33.3	3.3	9.3
		Rate (people)		1.9	6.4	11.2	36.7	2.7	9.8
Rural	2012	Line	549	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		6.1	13.2	17.6	46.3	7.9	16.4
		Rate (people)		5.7	12.9	17.4	52.1	7.9	16.4
All	2012	Line	1,864	13.02	20.83	26.03	52.07	15.06	24.57
		Rate (HHs)		3.5	8.5	12.6	37.2	4.6	11.4
		Rate (people)		3.0	8.3	13.1	41.4	4.3	11.8
Urban	2010	Line	1,397	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	5.4	9.1	33.9	3.8	12.0
		Rate (people)		1.8	6.7	11.3	39.9	4.3	14.9
Rural	2010	Line	504	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		5.0	13.2	17.6	51.0	8.4	20.5
		Rate (people)		6.3	15.5	20.3	57.4	10.5	23.9
All	2010	Line	1,901	11.81	18.89	23.62	47.23	15.89	25.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	7.7	11.6	38.9	5.1	14.5
		Rate (people)		3.2	9.4	14.0	45.2	6.2	17.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,226	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.2	4.5	7.4	31.4	2.3	9.3
		Rate (people)		1.2	5.4	9.2	36.5	2.9	11.2
Rural	2008	Line	506	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		4.7	11.4	16.9	48.7	8.9	19.0
		Rate (people)		4.9	13.7	19.4	54.3	10.6	21.5
All	2008	Line	1,732	10.91	17.46	21.82	43.64	14.68	23.95
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	6.5	10.3	36.7	4.3	12.2
		Rate (people)		2.3	7.9	12.3	41.8	5.2	14.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guanajuato): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
							Percentile-based lines		
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,312	13.3	8.8	26.2	36.3	48.9	74.2
		Rate (people)		15.3	9.9	30.3	41.8	55.8	80.9
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	564	56.1	43.8	74.5	84.7	91.3	97.1
		Rate (people)		61.3	47.2	80.5	89.8	94.4	98.4
All	2014	Line		37.30	28.58	50.99	64.56	80.96	142.22
		Rate (HHs)	1,876	25.5	18.8	39.9	50.1	61.0	80.7
		Rate (people)		29.1	21.1	45.4	56.2	67.4	86.2
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,315	11.2	7.0	24.3	33.3	44.4	69.3
		Rate (people)		11.9	6.9	26.5	36.7	49.0	74.9
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	549	55.6	43.5	75.8	84.9	89.8	96.9
		Rate (people)		62.2	48.5	81.4	89.5	93.3	98.2
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,864	24.3	17.8	39.5	48.5	57.8	77.5
		Rate (people)		27.1	19.5	43.0	52.6	62.3	81.9
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,397	9.4	5.5	22.7	33.1	47.4	73.4
		Rate (people)		11.6	6.8	27.2	38.9	54.7	80.3
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	504	60.9	46.7	77.8	85.8	89.9	96.0
		Rate (people)		67.0	52.5	83.5	90.1	93.7	97.4
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,901	24.4	17.5	38.8	48.5	59.8	80.0
		Rate (people)		28.3	20.6	44.2	54.3	66.4	85.4
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,226	7.8	5.1	21.3	33.2	45.6	71.8
		Rate (people)		9.6	6.2	25.2	38.4	52.1	77.6
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	506	56.3	46.4	76.0	85.5	91.6	98.5
		Rate (people)		60.3	52.2	79.8	88.9	94.1	98.8
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,732	22.5	17.6	37.9	49.0	59.5	79.9
		Rate (people)		24.8	20.0	41.6	53.6	64.7	84.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guanajuato): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	13.2	24.1	55.1	64.5	71.1
		Rate (people)		15.4	28.6	63.4	71.5	78.1
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	17.4	27.4	56.8	71.8	82.9
		Rate (people)		19.4	30.9	62.7	75.6	88.4
All	2014	Line		38.82	47.05	75.45	94.31	113.17
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	14.8	25.3	55.8	67.3	75.6
		Rate (people)		17.0	29.5	63.1	73.1	82.1
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	16.5	29.7	41.6	55.2	63.1
		Rate (people)		22.8	36.6	52.2	65.2	72.5
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	20.6	27.3	52.4	66.3	71.0
		Rate (people)		24.8	31.7	59.9	75.1	79.4
All	2012	Line		35.68	43.20	69.16	86.45	103.74
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	18.2	28.7	46.0	59.8	66.3
		Rate (people)		23.7	34.5	55.5	69.4	75.4
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	12.0	18.0	42.7	56.4	65.0
		Rate (people)		15.0	22.5	50.7	64.9	73.1
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	23.7	30.4	55.6	68.6	79.3
		Rate (people)		29.3	36.6	62.7	75.2	84.8
All	2010	Line		31.39	38.04	61.00	76.25	91.50
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	16.4	22.7	47.6	61.0	70.4
		Rate (people)		20.7	28.1	55.4	69.0	77.7
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	9.3	14.8	39.5	50.8	62.2
		Rate (people)		11.3	18.0	46.3	58.2	69.1
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	24.1	32.1	56.4	68.0	75.3
		Rate (people)		27.4	35.8	61.3	71.9	79.3
All	2008	Line		28.61	34.70	55.71	69.64	83.57
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	14.7	21.1	45.7	57.1	67.0
		Rate (people)		17.4	24.7	51.9	63.4	72.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guanajuato): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	6.4
		Rate (people)		0.7	7.2
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		0.9	8.1
		Rate (people)		0.9	10.1
All	2014	Line	19,479	14.51	29.03
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	7.1
		Rate (people)		0.8	8.4
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	9.5
		Rate (people)		1.2	12.7
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	11.6
		Rate (people)		3.5	14.8
All	2012	Line	9,002	13.14	26.28
		Rate (HHs)		1.1	10.4
		Rate (people)		2.2	13.6
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	6.1
		Rate (people)		0.8	7.6
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	14.8
		Rate (people)		3.7	18.2
All	2010	Line	27,655	12.01	24.01
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	9.4
		Rate (people)		2.0	11.8
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	4.2
		Rate (people)		0.6	5.2
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	13.4
		Rate (people)		3.2	15.0
All	2008	Line	29,468	11.11	22.22
		Rate (HHs)		1.3	7.5
		Rate (people)		1.6	8.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guerrero): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)			
				National lines (new definition)			
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,011	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		27.7	60.0	76.1	84.4
		Rate (people)		29.4	63.4	80.0	86.9
Rural	2014	Line	708	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		38.3	69.5	83.9	90.1
		Rate (people)		44.2	74.1	86.7	92.2
All	2014	Line	1,719	36.21	71.82	107.73	143.64
		Rate (HHs)		31.9	63.8	79.2	86.6
		Rate (people)		35.6	67.9	82.8	89.1
Urban	2012	Line	982	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		34.7	63.4	79.5	87.3
		Rate (people)		35.9	66.4	82.9	89.9
Rural	2012	Line	741	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		52.3	75.4	85.0	93.2
		Rate (people)		57.9	79.6	87.9	95.0
All	2012	Line	1,723	32.98	65.92	98.88	131.83
		Rate (HHs)		41.7	68.2	81.7	89.7
		Rate (people)		45.1	71.9	85.0	92.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,099	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		19.9	55.6	73.1	83.1
		Rate (people)		23.9	62.0	78.2	87.1
Rural	2010	Line	702	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		52.3	76.6	88.0	93.8
		Rate (people)		59.4	80.0	90.8	95.4
All	2010	Line	1,801	28.50	59.50	89.25	119.00
		Rate (HHs)		32.5	63.7	78.9	87.2
		Rate (people)		38.8	69.5	83.5	90.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,042	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		24.1	56.5	73.6	82.7
		Rate (people)		26.1	62.1	78.6	87.2
Rural	2008	Line	655	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		49.1	75.8	88.0	92.4
		Rate (people)		56.7	82.0	91.8	94.9
All	2008	Line	1,697	25.52	54.04	81.06	108.08
		Rate (HHs)		33.5	63.8	79.0	86.3
		Rate (people)		38.9	70.4	84.1	90.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guerrero): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.00**	**$2.50**	**$5.00**	**$1.90**	**$3.10**
Urban	2014	Line	1,011	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		4.7	15.0	21.5	49.6	11.1	24.9
		Rate (people)		5.0	16.3	24.0	53.8	11.7	27.3
Rural	2014	Line	708	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		13.1	26.1	32.8	64.4	20.6	36.5
		Rate (people)		16.0	32.3	39.1	70.6	26.1	43.1
All	2014	Line	1,719	13.72	21.95	27.44	54.88	18.46	30.12
		Rate (HHs)		8.0	19.4	25.9	55.4	14.9	29.4
		Rate (people)		9.6	23.0	30.3	60.8	17.7	33.9
Urban	2012	Line	982	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		10.3	20.9	28.5	55.7	13.5	25.9
		Rate (people)		10.3	22.3	30.4	59.5	14.4	27.9
Rural	2012	Line	741	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		16.1	36.8	45.6	71.7	22.8	43.0
		Rate (people)		19.3	43.9	52.9	77.0	28.3	50.5
All	2012	Line	1,723	12.51	20.02	25.02	50.05	14.47	23.62
		Rate (HHs)		12.6	27.2	35.3	62.1	17.2	32.7
		Rate (people)		14.1	31.4	39.8	66.8	20.2	37.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,099	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	11.1	17.7	45.2	8.6	21.0
		Rate (people)		5.5	13.3	21.6	52.4	10.2	25.6
Rural	2010	Line	702	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		21.0	37.8	47.9	73.4	32.1	52.5
		Rate (people)		26.1	46.1	56.6	78.5	38.8	61.3
All	2010	Line	1,801	11.35	18.16	22.69	45.39	15.27	24.91
		Rate (HHs)		11.1	21.4	29.4	56.2	17.7	33.2
		Rate (people)		14.1	27.0	36.3	63.3	22.2	40.5
Urban	2008	Line	1,042	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	16.4	22.7	48.1	13.3	25.6
		Rate (people)		8.7	18.2	25.0	55.0	14.3	28.6
Rural	2008	Line	655	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		23.4	39.3	46.2	73.2	32.5	49.9
		Rate (people)		28.3	47.6	54.9	80.8	38.6	58.7
All	2008	Line	1,697	10.49	16.79	20.98	41.97	14.12	23.03
		Rate (HHs)		13.9	25.0	31.5	57.6	20.5	34.7
		Rate (people)		16.9	30.5	37.5	65.8	24.5	41.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guerrero): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,011	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		23.1	16.4	36.5	47.5	58.9	79.8
		Rate (people)		25.7	18.2	40.0	51.5	63.2	83.5
Rural	2014	Line	708	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		71.3	62.6	83.5	89.9	94.0	98.5
		Rate (people)		76.0	68.9	87.0	92.5	95.8	99.1
All	2014	Line	1,719	35.52	27.22	48.55	61.47	77.09	135.42
		Rate (HHs)		42.1	34.6	55.0	64.2	72.7	87.2
		Rate (people)		46.7	39.4	59.6	68.6	76.8	90.0
Urban	2012	Line	982	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		29.9	21.8	45.5	55.7	64.7	83.1
		Rate (people)		31.8	23.6	48.3	59.5	68.7	86.4
Rural	2012	Line	741	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		76.6	70.5	85.2	92.8	95.0	97.7
		Rate (people)		81.5	75.7	88.5	95.2	96.8	98.4
All	2012	Line	1,723	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		48.5	41.2	61.3	70.5	76.8	89.0
		Rate (people)		52.6	45.4	65.2	74.4	80.4	91.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,099	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		18.2	11.6	32.3	44.6	56.4	77.7
		Rate (people)		22.2	14.0	38.3	51.9	63.9	83.3
Rural	2010	Line	702	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		78.3	70.7	89.5	94.2	96.1	99.4
		Rate (people)		82.6	75.9	92.8	95.9	97.2	99.7
All	2010	Line	1,801	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		41.5	34.5	54.5	63.9	71.8	86.1
		Rate (people)		47.5	39.9	61.1	70.3	77.9	90.2
Urban	2008	Line	1,042	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		23.0	17.8	40.0	49.5	59.6	80.9
		Rate (people)		25.4	19.7	45.5	56.4	65.5	85.8
Rural	2008	Line	655	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		78.6	72.3	90.1	93.4	95.3	98.4
		Rate (people)		85.7	80.2	93.9	96.2	97.2	99.2
All	2008	Line	1,697	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		43.9	38.3	58.9	66.0	73.0	87.5
		Rate (people)		50.6	45.0	65.7	73.1	78.7	91.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guerrero): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | |
				Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		16.6	25.6	55.0	64.3	70.8
		Rate (people)		20.1	29.0	62.7	72.9	79.0
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		34.7	41.6	69.2	80.4	85.7
		Rate (people)		43.6	51.1	77.2	86.0	90.2
All	2014	Line	19,479	36.73	44.22	70.10	87.62	105.15
		Rate (HHs)		26.4	34.3	62.8	73.1	78.9
		Rate (people)		33.8	41.9	71.1	80.5	85.6
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		22.7	38.0	54.1	61.6	69.0
		Rate (people)		21.0	37.8	56.2	65.4	74.3
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		44.4	52.4	74.5	81.1	87.4
		Rate (people)		53.0	58.9	80.1	84.9	89.9
All	2012	Line	9,002	34.08	41.03	65.04	81.30	97.56
		Rate (HHs)		34.7	46.0	65.4	72.4	79.2
		Rate (people)		39.6	50.1	70.1	76.7	83.4
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		18.4	26.5	55.9	68.6	74.6
		Rate (people)		22.9	32.0	61.8	73.3	79.4
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		44.4	52.0	72.8	80.1	86.2
		Rate (people)		50.8	58.9	77.7	84.0	89.3
All	2010	Line	27,655	29.69	35.74	56.66	70.82	84.98
		Rate (HHs)		32.7	40.6	65.2	75.0	81.0
		Rate (people)		39.2	47.7	71.1	79.5	85.2
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		18.4	25.4	46.9	61.2	69.1
		Rate (people)		23.6	30.4	54.2	67.6	75.4
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		39.7	49.3	71.0	78.2	81.2
		Rate (people)		48.0	57.9	78.0	83.9	86.8
All	2008	Line	29,468	26.92	32.41	51.38	64.23	77.08
		Rate (HHs)		30.0	38.4	60.0	70.4	75.7
		Rate (people)		37.8	46.5	68.1	77.1	82.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Guerrero): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines $1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	0.5	6.7
		Rate (people)		0.5	7.7
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	4.2	23.4
		Rate (people)		4.0	29.9
All	2014	Line		13.73	27.47
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	2.5	15.7
		Rate (people)		2.6	20.7
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	1.5	11.0
		Rate (people)		1.3	11.0
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	6.0	31.2
		Rate (people)		8.3	39.6
All	2012	Line		12.54	25.07
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	4.0	22.2
		Rate (people)		5.4	27.6
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	2.3	11.0
		Rate (people)		2.7	13.9
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	9.2	31.6
		Rate (people)		12.4	37.3
All	2010	Line		11.36	22.72
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	6.1	22.4
		Rate (people)		8.4	27.6
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	1.0	8.5
		Rate (people)		1.7	10.9
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	6.1	28.0
		Rate (people)		9.4	35.0
All	2008	Line		10.45	20.91
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	3.8	19.1
		Rate (people)		6.2	25.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Hidalgo): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	973	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		19.3	54.9	70.6	78.8
		Rate (people)		21.7	60.0	75.6	82.9
Rural	2014	Line	877	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		26.4	55.2	70.0	82.0
		Rate (people)		27.9	58.8	74.2	85.9
All	2014	Line	1,850	35.45	69.96	104.93	139.91
		Rate (HHs)		22.6	55.0	70.3	80.3
		Rate (people)		24.7	59.4	74.9	84.3
Urban	2012	Line	834	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		24.1	54.6	72.6	82.7
		Rate (people)		25.1	60.3	77.2	86.7
Rural	2012	Line	981	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		23.3	50.2	66.4	78.5
		Rate (people)		22.3	50.9	69.6	81.6
All	2012	Line	1,815	32.32	64.23	96.35	128.47
		Rate (HHs)		23.7	52.6	69.8	80.7
		Rate (people)		23.8	55.8	73.6	84.3
Urban	2010	Line	1,070	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		20.5	56.5	74.9	82.9
		Rate (people)		21.6	60.9	79.1	86.5
Rural	2010	Line	742	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		24.2	53.8	75.4	85.4
		Rate (people)		26.1	56.6	77.5	87.4
All	2010	Line	1,812	27.92	57.95	86.92	115.89
		Rate (HHs)		22.2	55.2	75.2	84.1
		Rate (people)		23.8	58.8	78.3	86.9
Urban	2008	Line	1,180	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		17.4	53.1	71.5	79.8
		Rate (people)		19.8	60.0	77.8	84.6
Rural	2008	Line	524	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		25.1	55.8	75.0	83.9
		Rate (people)		25.9	57.2	77.9	86.7
All	2008	Line	1,704	25.00	52.60	78.91	105.21
		Rate (HHs)		20.8	54.3	73.1	81.6
		Rate (people)		22.7	58.6	77.9	85.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Hidalgo): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	973	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		4.2	9.4	13.3	42.7	7.3	16.5
		Rate (people)		4.7	10.6	15.4	47.6	7.6	19.2
Rural	2014	Line	877	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		5.5	14.9	20.2	51.0	10.9	23.2
		Rate (people)		6.1	17.2	22.6	55.3	12.5	25.7
All	2014	Line	1,850	13.44	21.50	26.87	53.74	18.08	29.49
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	11.9	16.5	46.6	9.0	19.7
		Rate (people)		5.4	13.7	18.8	51.3	9.9	22.3
Urban	2012	Line	834	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		7.1	12.6	17.8	45.3	8.3	16.5
		Rate (people)		6.5	12.9	18.2	51.0	8.0	16.8
Rural	2012	Line	981	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		6.1	11.9	18.1	44.7	7.3	16.3
		Rate (people)		5.3	10.9	17.9	46.7	6.6	16.2
All	2012	Line	1,815	12.25	19.60	24.50	49.01	14.17	23.13
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	12.3	18.0	45.0	7.8	16.4
		Rate (people)		5.9	11.9	18.1	49.0	7.4	16.5
Urban	2010	Line	1,070	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		5.4	12.2	17.4	45.9	8.5	20.0
		Rate (people)		4.6	11.9	18.8	50.1	7.9	21.4
Rural	2010	Line	742	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		5.4	13.8	19.4	50.8	9.9	23.2
		Rate (people)		6.5	16.2	22.0	54.2	11.7	25.8
All	2010	Line	1,812	11.12	17.78	22.23	44.46	14.96	24.40
		Rate (HHs)		5.4	13.0	18.4	48.1	9.2	21.5
		Rate (people)		5.5	13.9	20.3	52.1	9.7	23.5
Urban	2008	Line	1,180	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		5.1	9.8	14.6	43.8	7.4	18.1
		Rate (people)		6.2	11.5	17.4	51.0	9.1	21.1
Rural	2008	Line	524	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		6.3	14.9	22.6	51.8	11.6	26.1
		Rate (people)		6.7	15.5	23.7	54.3	11.4	27.3
All	2008	Line	1,704	10.28	16.44	20.56	41.11	13.83	22.56
		Rate (HHs)		5.6	12.1	18.2	47.4	9.3	21.7
		Rate (people)		6.4	13.4	20.4	52.6	10.2	24.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Hidalgo): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	973	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		15.2	10.2	29.9	40.6	53.1	74.0
		Rate (people)		17.7	11.6	34.1	45.7	59.0	78.8
Rural	2014	Line	877	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		58.3	47.9	70.5	79.7	87.2	94.7
		Rate (people)		63.1	51.8	75.3	84.4	90.8	96.6
All	2014	Line	1,850	34.59	26.51	47.29	59.88	75.09	131.91
		Rate (HHs)		35.4	27.9	48.9	58.9	69.1	83.7
		Rate (people)		39.4	30.8	53.8	64.2	74.2	87.3
Urban	2012	Line	834	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		18.8	13.5	37.1	45.2	55.5	77.4
		Rate (people)		19.6	13.8	40.8	50.7	61.8	82.1
Rural	2012	Line	981	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		53.7	44.1	69.1	78.4	86.2	95.4
		Rate (people)		55.9	46.2	73.9	82.1	89.3	96.6
All	2012	Line	1,815	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		35.0	27.8	52.0	60.6	69.8	85.8
		Rate (people)		37.0	29.3	56.6	65.7	74.9	89.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,070	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		17.9	12.9	32.5	45.1	57.8	78.6
		Rate (people)		19.3	12.7	35.8	49.5	63.2	83.0
Rural	2010	Line	742	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		55.6	46.7	77.1	85.4	90.7	96.7
		Rate (people)		58.9	49.7	79.4	87.5	92.3	97.4
All	2010	Line	1,812	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		35.4	28.6	53.2	63.8	73.1	87.0
		Rate (people)		38.2	30.4	56.7	67.7	77.1	89.9
Urban	2008	Line	1,180	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		14.9	11.4	33.9	45.4	56.1	77.6
		Rate (people)		17.7	13.6	40.3	52.7	64.0	83.2
Rural	2008	Line	524	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		60.4	50.1	79.3	85.6	90.7	97.1
		Rate (people)		62.4	52.3	83.0	88.7	92.5	97.9
All	2008	Line	1,704	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		35.5	28.9	54.5	63.6	71.8	86.4
		Rate (people)		39.0	32.1	60.8	69.9	77.6	90.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Hidalgo): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | |
				Food	Lower	Upper 100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		13.6	26.2	54.9	61.7	68.5
		Rate (people)		16.1	31.1	61.9	69.8	76.3
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		21.1	29.2	52.1	61.8	71.3
		Rate (people)		23.7	32.1	57.5	67.0	77.0
All	2014	Line	19,479	35.35	42.35	66.56	83.20	99.84
		Rate (HHs)		18.9	28.3	52.9	61.8	70.5
		Rate (people)		21.5	31.8	58.8	67.8	76.8
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		28.2	33.8	56.7	64.5	71.7
		Rate (people)		35.1	41.4	68.4	73.2	78.1
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		20.6	28.5	53.0	66.8	74.0
		Rate (people)		24.3	32.6	58.5	73.7	79.9
All	2012	Line	9,002	33.31	39.98	63.05	78.81	94.58
		Rate (HHs)		23.4	30.4	54.3	66.0	73.2
		Rate (people)		28.0	35.6	61.9	73.6	79.3
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		18.8	29.3	53.6	64.8	74.3
		Rate (people)		23.2	34.2	58.2	69.0	78.8
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		31.9	42.4	64.7	75.2	83.0
		Rate (people)		35.1	45.8	67.3	77.8	85.5
All	2010	Line	27,655	28.42	34.02	53.39	66.74	80.09
		Rate (HHs)		28.1	38.6	61.4	72.2	80.5
		Rate (people)		31.8	42.6	64.8	75.4	83.7
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		13.3	18.3	39.0	49.0	58.3
		Rate (people)		17.4	22.7	46.8	54.6	63.3
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		29.8	38.0	58.6	74.1	82.3
		Rate (people)		33.8	42.5	62.8	79.9	86.4
All	2008	Line	29,468	26.10	31.29	49.26	61.57	73.89
		Rate (HHs)		23.8	30.8	51.4	64.9	73.5
		Rate (people)		28.7	36.3	57.7	71.9	79.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Hidalgo): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	1.2	4.5
		Rate (people)		1.2	6.3
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	1.4	11.9
		Rate (people)		1.7	13.0
All	2014	Line		13.22	26.44
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	1.4	9.7
		Rate (people)		1.6	11.1
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	1.5	13.3
		Rate (people)		1.2	15.8
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	0.5	9.6
		Rate (people)		0.5	11.9
All	2012	Line		12.25	24.49
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.8	10.9
		Rate (people)		0.8	13.2
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	1.3	11.3
		Rate (people)		2.0	13.7
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	3.1	17.8
		Rate (people)		3.0	18.1
All	2010	Line		10.87	21.74
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	2.6	15.9
		Rate (people)		2.7	16.9
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.2	5.3
		Rate (people)		0.3	7.8
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	3.1	20.0
		Rate (people)		3.6	22.5
All	2008	Line		10.13	20.27
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	2.0	14.6
		Rate (people)		2.5	17.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Jalisco): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,460	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		10.7	38.9	59.6	71.9
		Rate (people)		11.0	43.4	65.3	77.4
Rural	2014	Line	245	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		13.5	38.8	60.1	72.2
		Rate (people)		12.8	42.1	64.5	76.8
All	2014	Line	1,705	39.75	80.59	120.89	161.18
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	38.9	59.7	71.9
		Rate (people)		11.2	43.3	65.2	77.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,529	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		12.9	41.5	60.7	72.3
		Rate (people)		14.4	46.5	66.2	77.4
Rural	2012	Line	229	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		28.5	54.0	72.4	81.3
		Rate (people)		28.5	56.5	75.4	85.2
All	2012	Line	1,758	36.06	73.87	110.81	147.74
		Rate (HHs)		15.1	43.2	62.3	73.6
		Rate (people)		16.3	47.9	67.5	78.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,515	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		13.1	38.5	60.2	72.5
		Rate (people)		13.8	43.1	65.8	77.8
Rural	2010	Line	320	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		19.4	41.5	59.8	71.4
		Rate (people)		20.7	44.4	61.1	72.0
All	2010	Line	1,835	31.30	66.95	100.43	133.90
		Rate (HHs)		14.0	38.9	60.2	72.3
		Rate (people)		14.7	43.3	65.2	77.0
Urban	2008	Line	1,890	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	35.8	56.1	69.9
		Rate (people)		8.1	41.3	62.1	76.0
Rural	2008	Line	426	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		15.8	40.8	62.5	75.2
		Rate (people)		19.4	46.9	68.4	79.5
All	2008	Line	2,316	27.99	60.84	91.26	121.69
		Rate (HHs)		8.1	36.5	57.0	70.7
		Rate (people)		9.6	42.0	63.0	76.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Jalisco): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,460	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	5.5	8.0	28.3	4.0	9.4
		Rate (people)		2.2	5.7	8.6	32.9	3.8	10.3
Rural	2014	Line	245	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	6.2	10.7	35.0	4.6	11.5
		Rate (people)		2.6	6.3	10.3	38.6	5.0	11.5
All	2014	Line	1,705	15.06	24.10	30.12	60.25	20.27	33.07
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	5.6	8.3	29.2	4.1	9.6
		Rate (people)		2.3	5.7	8.8	33.6	3.9	10.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,529	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	6.8	9.9	32.6	4.2	9.1
		Rate (people)		4.0	7.7	11.2	37.6	4.6	10.4
Rural	2012	Line	229	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		9.8	17.0	24.7	49.2	10.6	23.5
		Rate (people)		10.5	17.5	25.7	51.6	11.3	24.7
All	2012	Line	1,758	13.74	21.98	27.48	54.95	15.89	25.93
		Rate (HHs)		4.6	8.2	11.9	34.9	5.1	11.1
		Rate (people)		4.9	9.0	13.2	39.4	5.5	12.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,515	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	7.3	10.3	31.2	5.8	12.8
		Rate (people)		3.2	7.3	11.0	35.8	5.8	14.3
Rural	2010	Line	320	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		7.2	13.2	18.5	37.0	10.9	19.9
		Rate (people)		7.4	15.1	19.9	40.3	12.7	21.7
All	2010	Line	1,835	12.46	19.94	24.92	49.84	16.77	27.35
		Rate (HHs)		4.2	8.1	11.5	32.0	6.5	13.8
		Rate (people)		3.8	8.3	12.2	36.4	6.7	15.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,890	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.3	3.7	6.4	27.3	2.6	7.9
		Rate (people)		1.7	4.7	7.7	33.2	3.4	10.1
Rural	2008	Line	426	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		3.0	7.7	12.7	37.3	5.3	15.4
		Rate (people)		5.0	11.0	16.4	44.7	7.6	20.1
All	2008	Line	2,316	11.51	18.41	23.01	46.03	15.48	25.26
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	4.3	7.3	28.7	3.0	8.9
		Rate (people)		2.2	5.5	8.9	34.8	3.9	11.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Jalisco): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,460	8.8	6.0	17.7	26.7	38.0	64.2
		Rate (people)		9.6	6.2	20.3	30.6	43.8	70.9
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	245	43.0	33.5	60.7	73.6	77.8	88.6
		Rate (people)		48.6	37.2	66.3	78.2	82.1	90.7
All	2014	Line		39.85	30.54	54.48	68.98	86.50	151.96
		Rate (HHs)	1,705	13.2	9.5	23.3	32.8	43.1	67.4
		Rate (people)		14.8	10.4	26.5	37.0	48.9	73.6
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,529	10.5	7.1	21.3	32.4	42.5	66.8
		Rate (people)		11.9	7.9	24.7	37.4	48.0	72.8
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	229	56.8	46.6	72.0	81.6	84.4	95.9
		Rate (people)		59.8	48.4	75.2	85.9	87.7	97.1
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,758	16.9	12.6	28.4	39.3	48.3	70.9
		Rate (people)		18.4	13.4	31.5	43.9	53.4	76.0
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,515	10.9	7.3	22.1	30.2	40.6	66.5
		Rate (people)		11.9	7.6	25.4	34.5	47.0	72.4
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	320	43.1	35.2	61.3	71.1	83.5	93.1
		Rate (people)		47.6	38.1	64.1	73.2	86.7	95.3
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,835	15.5	11.3	27.6	36.0	46.7	70.3
		Rate (people)		16.7	11.7	30.6	39.7	52.3	75.4
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,890	6.4	4.2	17.6	28.9	40.6	66.3
		Rate (people)		7.8	5.4	22.2	35.2	47.2	72.9
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	426	45.7	35.0	67.1	76.7	83.9	95.1
		Rate (people)		53.4	42.3	73.1	81.8	87.8	97.1
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	2,316	11.9	8.5	24.6	35.6	46.7	70.3
		Rate (people)		13.9	10.4	29.0	41.4	52.7	76.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Jalisco): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		5.9	11.2	39.3	48.4	58.8
		Rate (people)		9.0	15.1	48.3	58.3	69.1
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	16.1	31.9	41.0	55.6
		Rate (people)		14.1	19.8	36.9	45.4	60.3
All	2014	Line	19,479	40.24	48.97	79.08	98.85	118.61
		Rate (HHs)		7.4	12.5	37.3	46.5	57.9
		Rate (people)		10.4	16.3	45.2	54.8	66.7
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		10.9	17.6	34.4	50.6	61.8
		Rate (people)		15.4	23.1	41.1	57.4	67.8
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		21.0	28.9	57.4	68.9	77.4
		Rate (people)		25.3	33.0	63.1	72.9	80.9
All	2012	Line	9,002	36.64	44.51	71.65	89.57	107.48
		Rate (HHs)		14.0	21.0	41.3	56.1	66.5
		Rate (people)		18.6	26.3	48.3	62.4	72.1
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		11.8	18.7	36.5	48.7	57.6
		Rate (people)		13.9	23.4	44.2	55.4	65.1
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		8.8	12.8	28.1	38.5	53.0
		Rate (people)		9.6	12.8	27.8	39.3	54.4
All	2010	Line	27,655	32.74	39.88	64.48	80.60	96.71
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	17.0	34.2	45.9	56.3
		Rate (people)		12.8	20.8	40.2	51.5	62.5
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	12.7	31.5	42.7	53.5
		Rate (people)		11.8	17.1	39.3	50.7	61.2
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		14.7	19.4	41.3	52.4	61.2
		Rate (people)		17.1	22.1	46.2	58.0	65.9
All	2008	Line	29,468	29.64	36.10	58.36	72.95	87.54
		Rate (HHs)		9.8	14.3	33.9	45.1	55.4
		Rate (people)		13.1	18.3	41.0	52.5	62.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Jalisco): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	2.8
		Rate (people)		0.6	4.8
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	7.6
		Rate (people)		2.0	8.4
All	2014	Line	19,479	15.04	30.09
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	4.1
		Rate (people)		1.0	5.7
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	7.9
		Rate (people)		2.2	11.2
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		3.5	14.4
		Rate (people)		2.4	15.0
All	2012	Line	9,002	13.50	27.01
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	9.8
		Rate (people)		2.3	12.5
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		1.2	5.7
		Rate (people)		1.3	5.6
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	4.8
		Rate (people)		2.7	6.3
All	2010	Line	27,655	12.53	25.05
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	5.5
		Rate (people)		1.6	5.8
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	4.2
		Rate (people)		0.6	5.5
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	8.5
		Rate (people)		3.2	10.0
All	2008	Line	29,468	11.51	23.02
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	5.2
		Rate (people)		1.3	6.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Estado de México): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)			
				National lines (new definition)			
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,508	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		16.3	53.1	72.1	82.3
		Rate (people)		19.4	59.8	78.6	87.0
Rural	2014	Line	222	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		22.2	46.6	74.1	84.2
		Rate (people)		24.8	53.4	78.8	88.1
All	2014	Line	1,730	39.80	80.71	121.07	161.43
		Rate (HHs)		17.1	52.3	72.3	82.6
		Rate (people)		20.1	58.9	78.6	87.1
Urban	2012	Line	1,646	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		13.7	47.0	67.4	80.0
		Rate (people)		16.0	53.3	73.5	84.5
Rural	2012	Line	179	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		14.6	50.2	74.0	85.0
		Rate (people)		15.6	52.4	77.6	87.8
All	2012	Line	1,825	36.10	73.98	110.98	147.97
		Rate (HHs)		13.8	47.4	68.2	80.6
		Rate (people)		15.9	53.1	74.1	85.0
Urban	2010	Line	2,499	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		10.9	41.6	67.3	77.4
		Rate (people)		13.3	47.3	75.3	84.0
Rural	2010	Line	249	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		19.5	54.0	71.3	83.1
		Rate (people)		22.1	56.4	73.5	85.9
All	2010	Line	2,748	31.34	67.06	100.58	134.11
		Rate (HHs)		11.9	43.1	67.7	78.0
		Rate (people)		14.5	48.5	75.1	84.3
Urban	2008	Line	2,159	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		8.1	42.2	65.5	78.6
		Rate (people)		9.3	47.8	71.4	83.3
Rural	2008	Line	321	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		21.5	45.1	67.0	83.3
		Rate (people)		24.2	48.9	73.3	89.8
All	2008	Line	2,480	28.02	60.94	91.41	121.87
		Rate (HHs)		9.7	42.5	65.6	79.1
		Rate (people)		11.2	47.9	71.6	84.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Estado de México): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.00**	**$2.50**	**$5.00**	**$1.90**	**$3.10**
Urban	2014	Line	1,508	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	5.9	10.7	41.9	3.5	14.3
		Rate (people)		2.0	7.4	13.3	48.7	4.3	17.2
Rural	2014	Line	222	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	10.3	16.4	43.7	6.7	19.9
		Rate (people)		4.4	12.4	19.4	50.3	8.1	23.5
All	2014	Line	1,730	15.08	24.13	30.16	60.32	20.29	33.11
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	6.5	11.4	42.1	3.9	15.0
		Rate (people)		2.3	8.0	14.1	48.9	4.8	18.0
Urban	2012	Line	1,646	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.1	6.0	10.4	35.8	2.5	9.6
		Rate (people)		2.4	7.2	12.2	41.7	2.9	11.3
Rural	2012	Line	179	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		1.3	7.4	13.1	43.1	1.9	11.7
		Rate (people)		1.3	7.3	14.1	45.8	1.7	12.5
All	2012	Line	1,825	13.75	22.01	27.51	55.02	15.91	25.96
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	6.2	10.7	36.8	2.4	9.9
		Rate (people)		2.3	7.2	12.5	42.2	2.8	11.4
Urban	2010	Line	2,499	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	5.1	8.9	32.7	3.3	10.8
		Rate (people)		2.1	6.1	11.0	38.6	3.6	13.3
Rural	2010	Line	249	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	12.8	16.1	48.5	10.1	20.5
		Rate (people)		8.0	15.2	18.7	52.0	12.4	23.6
All	2010	Line	2,748	12.48	19.96	24.95	49.90	16.79	27.39
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	6.0	9.8	34.5	4.1	11.9
		Rate (people)		2.9	7.3	12.0	40.4	4.8	14.6
Urban	2008	Line	2,159	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	3.9	7.2	33.0	2.5	9.3
		Rate (people)		1.7	4.8	8.6	38.5	3.0	10.8
Rural	2008	Line	321	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		4.7	13.6	19.7	42.1	9.9	21.6
		Rate (people)		5.6	17.2	22.9	46.7	12.3	25.0
All	2008	Line	2,480	11.52	18.43	23.04	46.08	15.50	25.29
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	5.0	8.7	34.1	3.4	10.7
		Rate (people)		2.2	6.4	10.5	39.6	4.2	12.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Estado de México): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,508	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		12.6	6.4	27.3	39.2	52.0	76.0
		Rate (people)		15.4	7.9	32.1	45.5	59.2	82.3
Rural	2014	Line	222	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		54.7	42.4	73.3	83.8	87.0	97.1
		Rate (people)		63.2	48.2	79.3	87.9	91.1	98.4
All	2014	Line	1,730	39.91	30.59	54.57	69.08	86.64	152.20
		Rate (HHs)		17.9	10.9	33.1	44.8	56.4	78.6
		Rate (people)		21.6	13.2	38.3	51.0	63.4	84.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,646	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		11.7	7.1	23.6	35.3	48.5	73.5
		Rate (people)		13.7	8.5	27.8	40.9	55.3	80.0
Rural	2012	Line	179	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		53.8	41.0	76.5	83.5	89.9	97.3
		Rate (people)		57.0	43.7	80.1	87.3	92.6	98.2
All	2012	Line	1,825	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		17.1	11.5	30.3	41.5	53.8	76.5
		Rate (people)		19.3	13.1	34.6	46.9	60.2	82.4
Urban	2010	Line	2,499	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		9.2	5.4	21.6	31.7	42.4	72.4
		Rate (people)		11.5	6.5	26.4	37.6	48.8	80.2
Rural	2010	Line	249	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		54.8	44.4	77.1	84.6	91.7	97.4
		Rate (people)		58.4	47.9	80.2	87.5	94.5	99.1
All	2010	Line	2,748	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		14.5	9.9	28.0	37.8	48.1	75.3
		Rate (people)		17.6	11.9	33.4	44.1	54.7	82.7
Urban	2008	Line	2,159	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		7.4	4.7	23.0	34.4	46.3	74.4
		Rate (people)		8.7	5.5	27.9	40.2	52.6	80.2
Rural	2008	Line	321	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		52.8	40.9	76.3	85.0	89.5	96.9
		Rate (people)		60.0	45.0	83.6	91.4	94.1	99.0
All	2008	Line	2,480	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		12.8	9.0	29.4	40.4	51.5	77.1
		Rate (people)		15.4	10.7	35.1	46.8	58.0	82.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Estado de México): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		13.7	24.7	51.8	62.4	70.6
		Rate (people)		18.8	30.5	60.9	70.7	78.7
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		14.9	22.4	51.0	66.4	77.8
		Rate (people)		19.1	27.1	59.8	74.7	84.4
All	2014	Line	19,479	40.02	48.67	78.51	98.14	117.77
		Rate (HHs)		14.0	24.0	51.6	63.5	72.5
		Rate (people)		18.9	29.5	60.6	71.9	80.3
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		10.5	17.5	43.5	52.4	58.6
		Rate (people)		12.9	21.6	51.2	62.6	68.9
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		20.9	31.3	49.9	65.6	75.9
		Rate (people)		27.1	37.6	56.6	71.0	81.0
All	2012	Line	9,002	36.82	44.75	72.10	90.12	108.15
		Rate (HHs)		13.6	21.5	45.3	56.2	63.6
		Rate (people)		17.3	26.6	52.9	65.2	72.6
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		11.9	18.8	42.9	55.6	65.0
		Rate (people)		14.9	23.1	50.5	63.3	71.9
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		14.3	21.9	47.9	60.5	69.5
		Rate (people)		16.8	27.7	53.8	66.0	74.3
All	2010	Line	27,655	32.36	39.37	63.51	79.38	95.26
		Rate (HHs)		12.5	19.6	44.2	56.8	66.1
		Rate (people)		15.4	24.4	51.5	64.1	72.6
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		9.7	17.5	40.5	52.5	62.3
		Rate (people)		12.7	21.8	46.5	59.4	69.3
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		17.7	23.0	46.5	57.2	66.4
		Rate (people)		21.0	26.7	54.0	64.7	72.9
All	2008	Line	29,468	29.46	35.85	57.88	72.35	86.82
		Rate (HHs)		11.7	18.9	42.0	53.7	63.3
		Rate (people)		14.9	23.1	48.6	60.9	70.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Estado de México): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	5.0
		Rate (people)		0.8	6.9
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	9.0
		Rate (people)		3.7	11.4
All	2014	Line	19,479	14.96	29.92
		Rate (HHs)		1.3	6.1
		Rate (people)		1.6	8.2
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.4	5.9
		Rate (people)		0.5	7.6
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	10.6
		Rate (people)		5.9	13.7
All	2012	Line	9,002	13.57	27.14
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	7.2
		Rate (people)		2.1	9.5
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	6.7
		Rate (people)		1.2	8.0
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	6.9
		Rate (people)		1.4	8.3
All	2010	Line	27,655	12.38	24.76
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	6.7
		Rate (people)		1.2	8.1
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	4.1
		Rate (people)		0.8	5.1
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	11.8
		Rate (people)		3.6	14.6
All	2008	Line	29,468	11.44	22.88
		Rate (HHs)		1.1	6.1
		Rate (people)		1.5	7.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Michoacán): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,299	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		20.8	58.6	74.4	83.1
		Rate (people)		23.0	64.2	78.9	86.1
Rural	2014	Line	572	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		25.7	57.5	75.1	84.3
		Rate (people)		27.6	61.5	79.0	88.0
All	2014	Line	1,871	37.51	75.05	112.58	150.11
		Rate (HHs)		22.4	58.2	74.7	83.5
		Rate (people)		24.4	63.3	78.9	86.7
Urban	2012	Line	1,304	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		21.9	52.9	71.9	81.4
		Rate (people)		23.5	58.6	77.0	85.1
Rural	2012	Line	547	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		23.3	50.1	72.8	81.8
		Rate (people)		25.9	56.3	77.9	86.6
All	2012	Line	1,851	34.11	68.85	103.28	137.71
		Rate (HHs)		22.3	52.0	72.2	81.5
		Rate (people)		24.2	57.9	77.3	85.6
Urban	2010	Line	1,267	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		17.4	52.6	72.4	83.5
		Rate (people)		19.5	57.9	77.7	87.3
Rural	2010	Line	602	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		24.1	57.3	75.4	86.9
		Rate (people)		26.3	61.7	79.5	88.5
All	2010	Line	1,869	29.54	62.26	93.39	124.52
		Rate (HHs)		19.5	54.0	73.3	84.6
		Rate (people)		21.6	59.1	78.3	87.7
Urban	2008	Line	1,151	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		14.7	47.4	67.1	77.5
		Rate (people)		17.2	54.1	73.5	82.6
Rural	2008	Line	616	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		30.2	61.9	81.2	88.4
		Rate (people)		33.1	66.6	85.2	91.0
All	2008	Line	1,767	26.43	56.55	84.83	113.10
		Rate (HHs)		19.0	51.5	71.1	80.5
		Rate (people)		22.2	58.0	77.1	85.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Michoacán): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,299	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		3.6	10.6	15.8	47.1	7.6	18.6
		Rate (people)		3.7	11.7	17.9	53.7	7.9	21.0
Rural	2014	Line	572	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		5.3	13.2	19.0	51.0	10.6	23.1
		Rate (people)		5.2	14.4	21.4	56.6	11.5	25.5
All	2014	Line	1,871	14.21	22.74	28.43	56.86	19.13	31.21
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	11.4	16.8	48.3	8.5	20.0
		Rate (people)		4.1	12.5	19.0	54.7	9.0	22.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,304	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		4.9	10.9	16.9	43.7	6.0	15.2
		Rate (people)		5.1	12.0	19.1	49.4	6.4	17.4
Rural	2012	Line	547	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	13.0	18.7	46.7	7.6	17.9
		Rate (people)		7.1	15.3	21.4	53.5	8.1	20.9
All	2012	Line	1,851	12.96	20.74	25.93	51.86	15.00	24.47
		Rate (HHs)		5.4	11.5	17.4	44.6	6.5	16.0
		Rate (people)		5.7	13.1	19.8	50.7	6.9	18.5
Urban	2010	Line	1,267	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.9	8.8	14.2	43.5	6.5	16.6
		Rate (people)		4.3	9.7	15.9	49.0	7.1	19.1
Rural	2010	Line	602	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	14.0	21.8	53.4	10.4	24.2
		Rate (people)		7.5	17.0	24.3	59.1	11.6	27.6
All	2010	Line	1,869	11.76	18.82	23.52	47.04	15.82	25.82
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	10.5	16.6	46.6	7.7	19.0
		Rate (people)		5.3	12.0	18.5	52.1	8.5	21.7
Urban	2008	Line	1,151	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	8.8	13.4	38.9	6.8	15.2
		Rate (people)		4.0	11.3	16.3	45.6	8.5	18.6
Rural	2008	Line	616	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		11.5	20.6	27.1	57.2	16.5	30.6
		Rate (people)		13.5	25.0	30.8	63.9	19.4	34.4
All	2008	Line	1,767	10.87	17.39	21.73	43.46	14.62	23.85
		Rate (HHs)		5.9	12.1	17.2	44.1	9.5	19.5
		Rate (people)		7.0	15.6	20.9	51.4	11.9	23.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Michoacán): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,299	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		17.3	11.5	33.1	45.6	57.5	78.0
		Rate (people)		19.6	12.8	37.7	52.3	64.0	82.4
Rural	2014	Line	572	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		61.0	49.5	75.8	83.8	88.4	97.2
		Rate (people)		66.9	55.2	81.0	88.1	91.5	97.9
All	2014	Line	1,871	37.11	28.44	50.74	64.24	80.56	141.52
		Rate (HHs)		30.9	23.3	46.4	57.5	67.1	84.0
		Rate (people)		34.4	26.1	51.3	63.5	72.6	87.2
Urban	2012	Line	1,304	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		17.8	11.3	33.5	43.4	53.8	77.0
		Rate (people)		20.1	12.4	37.9	49.1	60.7	82.0
Rural	2012	Line	547	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		53.3	44.4	73.5	82.3	88.1	96.2
		Rate (people)		60.4	50.8	79.9	87.2	92.7	97.7
All	2012	Line	1,851	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		28.4	21.1	45.4	55.0	64.0	82.7
		Rate (people)		32.7	24.5	51.1	61.1	70.8	86.9
Urban	2010	Line	1,267	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		14.3	9.0	29.9	42.7	54.1	77.4
		Rate (people)		16.1	9.9	34.1	47.8	60.7	83.3
Rural	2010	Line	602	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		61.4	49.5	77.8	86.0	90.4	96.5
		Rate (people)		66.7	55.2	81.5	88.7	92.1	96.6
All	2010	Line	1,869	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		29.1	21.7	45.0	56.3	65.5	83.4
		Rate (people)		31.9	24.1	48.9	60.6	70.5	87.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,151	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		14.1	10.0	29.4	40.9	50.7	74.3
		Rate (people)		17.5	12.5	34.6	48.2	58.1	80.6
Rural	2008	Line	616	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		67.4	55.4	84.7	90.7	93.6	98.0
		Rate (people)		73.4	62.4	88.6	93.4	95.5	98.5
All	2008	Line	1,767	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		29.1	22.8	45.0	54.9	62.8	81.0
		Rate (people)		35.0	28.1	51.5	62.4	69.9	86.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Michoacán): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	22.2	30.3	55.5	64.9	72.3
		Rate (people)		27.0	35.4	63.2	71.6	78.3
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	29.5	39.3	64.8	76.9	83.7
		Rate (people)		33.5	44.0	71.6	82.9	88.4
All	2014	Line		37.29	44.98	71.54	89.42	107.30
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	26.0	34.9	60.3	71.1	78.2
		Rate (people)		30.4	40.0	67.7	77.6	83.7
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	19.3	26.4	53.5	64.6	69.3
		Rate (people)		22.9	31.8	62.0	70.6	74.5
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	21.2	31.1	56.9	69.4	76.5
		Rate (people)		25.9	39.2	65.1	76.1	83.3
All	2012	Line		35.09	42.40	67.64	84.56	101.47
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	20.2	28.5	55.0	66.8	72.6
		Rate (people)		24.3	35.3	63.5	73.2	78.8
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	19.8	28.7	50.4	59.8	68.3
		Rate (people)		24.4	35.3	59.6	68.8	78.0
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	21.8	30.8	54.1	66.4	73.7
		Rate (people)		23.7	34.7	60.1	71.9	78.0
All	2010	Line		29.85	35.96	57.06	71.33	85.59
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	20.9	29.9	52.4	63.4	71.2
		Rate (people)		24.0	34.9	59.9	70.5	78.0
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	9.7	15.2	35.6	47.1	56.1
		Rate (people)		12.1	19.3	42.4	54.8	63.7
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	28.3	32.4	51.4	66.9	72.8
		Rate (people)		36.1	42.7	63.0	75.1	80.7
All	2008	Line		27.54	33.24	52.95	66.19	79.43
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	18.0	22.8	42.7	56.0	63.6
		Rate (people)		24.3	31.2	52.9	65.1	72.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Michoacán): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines $1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	1.6	8.8
		Rate (people)		1.9	11.0
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	2.1	14.9
		Rate (people)		2.1	17.4
All	2014	Line		13.94	27.89
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	1.9	12.0
		Rate (people)		2.0	14.4
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.7	6.2
		Rate (people)		1.7	8.9
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	1.8	13.7
		Rate (people)		2.1	16.8
All	2012	Line		12.92	25.84
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	1.2	9.7
		Rate (people)		1.9	12.7
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	3.0	11.4
		Rate (people)		3.4	12.4
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	1.6	13.2
		Rate (people)		1.9	15.8
All	2010	Line		11.42	22.84
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	2.3	12.4
		Rate (people)		2.6	14.3
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	1.4	5.8
		Rate (people)		1.4	7.4
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	1.2	19.7
		Rate (people)		1.8	26.0
All	2008	Line		10.69	21.39
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	1.3	12.0
		Rate (people)		1.6	16.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Morelos): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)			
				National lines (new definition)			
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,492	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		18.6	54.3	71.9	81.5
		Rate (people)		21.4	59.6	76.8	85.4
Rural	2014	Line	262	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		15.3	47.9	68.4	79.9
		Rate (people)		16.2	52.6	75.1	85.6
All	2014	Line	1,754	39.40	79.74	119.61	159.48
		Rate (HHs)		18.1	53.3	71.4	81.2
		Rate (people)		20.5	58.4	76.5	85.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,465	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		14.7	48.2	68.4	78.9
		Rate (people)		14.9	51.8	72.9	83.1
Rural	2012	Line	291	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		15.0	37.9	67.0	78.6
		Rate (people)		15.9	41.0	72.5	83.4
All	2012	Line	1,756	35.76	73.11	109.67	146.23
		Rate (HHs)		14.8	46.6	68.2	78.9
		Rate (people)		15.0	50.1	72.8	83.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,512	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		14.2	47.8	67.5	79.3
		Rate (people)		14.6	50.9	72.2	82.9
Rural	2010	Line	255	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		10.4	37.5	62.7	76.8
		Rate (people)		10.3	39.4	67.6	81.4
All	2010	Line	1,767	31.03	66.23	99.35	132.46
		Rate (HHs)		13.7	46.3	66.8	78.9
		Rate (people)		13.9	49.1	71.5	82.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,521	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		16.6	48.5	67.8	79.2
		Rate (people)		17.0	51.9	71.2	82.6
Rural	2008	Line	254	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		20.6	49.8	67.9	78.9
		Rate (people)		20.3	52.3	72.3	80.5
All	2008	Line	1,775	27.75	60.19	90.28	120.37
		Rate (HHs)		17.2	48.7	67.8	79.1
		Rate (people)		17.5	52.0	71.4	82.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Morelos): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,492	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		3.0	9.9	13.9	43.1	6.2	16.6
		Rate (people)		3.2	10.7	15.8	48.5	6.6	19.4
Rural	2014	Line	262	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		3.9	7.4	11.5	44.3	5.6	14.6
		Rate (people)		4.2	7.7	11.7	49.0	6.1	16.2
All	2014	Line	1,754	14.93	23.89	29.86	59.73	20.09	32.78
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	9.5	13.5	43.3	6.1	16.3
		Rate (people)		3.3	10.2	15.1	48.6	6.5	18.9
Urban	2012	Line	1,465	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	5.8	10.3	34.7	3.2	8.5
		Rate (people)		2.5	5.5	10.6	37.4	2.9	8.9
Rural	2012	Line	291	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	6.3	11.5	31.4	1.9	10.2
		Rate (people)		1.4	6.1	11.8	35.1	1.9	10.2
All	2012	Line	1,756	13.62	21.79	27.24	54.48	15.76	25.71
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	5.9	10.5	34.1	3.0	8.8
		Rate (people)		2.3	5.6	10.8	37.0	2.8	9.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,512	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	7.8	11.0	37.8	5.6	13.5
		Rate (people)		3.5	8.1	11.7	41.6	5.5	14.6
Rural	2010	Line	255	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	5.6	8.2	31.9	4.7	8.8
		Rate (people)		2.7	6.1	9.0	34.2	5.0	9.5
All	2010	Line	1,767	12.35	19.76	24.71	49.41	16.62	27.12
		Rate (HHs)		3.5	7.5	10.6	37.0	5.5	12.8
		Rate (people)		3.4	7.8	11.3	40.4	5.4	13.7
Urban	2008	Line	1,521	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		5.3	10.2	15.3	40.0	7.8	17.3
		Rate (people)		4.7	10.1	16.1	43.8	7.4	18.3
Rural	2008	Line	254	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	13.7	19.0	47.7	11.3	20.1
		Rate (people)		6.8	14.6	19.4	51.5	12.5	20.5
All	2008	Line	1,775	11.41	18.25	22.82	45.63	15.35	25.05
		Rate (HHs)		5.5	10.7	15.8	41.1	8.3	17.7
		Rate (people)		5.0	10.8	16.6	45.0	8.2	18.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Morelos): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
					Percentile-based lines				
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,492	15.6	10.8	30.2	41.2	53.2	76.3
		Rate (people)		18.1	12.2	35.1	46.5	59.1	81.5
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	262	52.1	41.7	70.8	78.0	86.0	96.4
		Rate (people)		57.5	46.6	77.9	84.8	91.2	98.4
All	2014	Line		39.43	30.22	53.91	68.25	85.59	150.36
		Rate (HHs)	1,754	21.2	15.6	36.4	46.8	58.2	79.4
		Rate (people)		24.5	17.7	42.1	52.6	64.3	84.2
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,465	11.0	6.3	26.2	34.6	49.2	74.1
		Rate (people)		11.5	6.3	28.0	37.4	53.3	79.5
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	291	41.0	29.4	71.3	76.3	84.6	95.2
		Rate (people)		45.2	32.2	77.8	82.3	88.2	96.5
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,756	15.9	10.1	33.6	41.4	54.9	77.6
		Rate (people)		16.9	10.5	36.1	44.6	59.0	82.3
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,512	11.4	8.0	24.9	37.3	47.8	73.2
		Rate (people)		12.0	8.2	27.3	40.9	52.4	78.6
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	255	45.2	29.3	65.5	76.8	83.8	96.8
		Rate (people)		49.3	30.9	70.9	81.4	87.9	97.6
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,767	16.3	11.1	30.9	43.0	53.1	76.7
		Rate (people)		18.0	11.9	34.3	47.5	58.1	81.7
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,521	15.3	11.3	29.6	41.4	51.4	76.8
		Rate (people)		16.1	11.2	32.7	45.2	55.5	80.6
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	254	55.6	44.6	72.3	82.5	87.8	96.6
		Rate (people)		60.7	48.3	76.5	84.6	89.7	97.1
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,775	21.1	16.1	35.8	47.4	56.7	79.7
		Rate (people)		23.3	17.2	39.8	51.6	61.0	83.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Morelos): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | |
				Food	Lower	Upper 100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	14.8	21.8	49.2	63.1	68.0
		Rate (people)		17.2	25.7	55.1	70.2	75.8
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	9.7	18.0	42.2	51.8	65.2
		Rate (people)		12.6	23.4	49.6	60.3	73.3
All	2014	Line		38.58	46.72	74.82	93.52	112.23
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	12.8	20.3	46.4	58.6	66.9
		Rate (people)		15.3	24.7	52.8	66.0	74.7
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	11.1	24.3	50.2	65.9	73.5
		Rate (people)		11.2	26.7	52.5	69.2	77.3
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	10.3	19.4	44.0	62.0	68.9
		Rate (people)		12.5	23.8	49.8	68.4	74.4
All	2012	Line		35.66	43.17	69.11	86.39	103.66
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	10.8	22.3	47.6	64.2	71.6
		Rate (people)		11.7	25.5	51.4	68.8	76.1
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	6.4	13.0	35.0	49.5	58.3
		Rate (people)		8.3	16.5	41.3	57.6	65.1
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	11.5	19.0	38.2	52.4	65.4
		Rate (people)		16.2	24.8	46.5	60.9	74.2
All	2010	Line		31.11	37.66	60.28	75.35	90.42
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	8.5	15.5	36.3	50.7	61.3
		Rate (people)		11.7	20.1	43.6	59.0	69.0
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	7.7	14.6	36.8	51.8	65.4
		Rate (people)		9.3	18.1	40.4	56.8	70.9
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	12.2	17.7	35.9	46.8	52.9
		Rate (people)		17.6	24.5	43.0	54.0	58.8
All	2008	Line		28.55	34.62	55.56	69.45	83.35
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	9.5	15.8	36.5	49.9	60.6
		Rate (people)		12.5	20.6	41.4	55.7	66.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Morelos): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	**$2.50**
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	6.5
		Rate (people)		2.3	6.6
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	4.3
		Rate (people)		0.0	5.0
All	2014	Line	19,479	14.42	28.84
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	5.6
		Rate (people)		1.4	6.0
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	4.9
		Rate (people)		1.0	5.2
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	2.4
		Rate (people)		0.0	3.5
All	2012	Line	9,002	13.13	26.26
		Rate (HHs)		0.3	3.9
		Rate (people)		0.6	4.5
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	2.0
		Rate (people)		0.8	2.4
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		1.2	5.9
		Rate (people)		1.9	10.4
All	2010	Line	27,655	11.90	23.80
		Rate (HHs)		0.9	3.6
		Rate (people)		1.3	5.8
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.1	3.9
		Rate (people)		0.2	4.4
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		2.1	6.0
		Rate (people)		1.3	6.5
All	2008	Line	29,468	11.09	22.18
		Rate (HHs)		0.9	4.7
		Rate (people)		0.6	5.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nayarit): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,293	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		15.2	42.2	61.4	72.8
		Rate (people)		15.9	45.3	65.4	77.0
Rural	2014	Line	559	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		20.7	45.1	61.6	75.0
		Rate (people)		25.3	50.7	66.8	78.6
All	2014	Line	1,852	37.54	75.14	112.70	150.27
		Rate (HHs)		16.9	43.1	61.5	73.5
		Rate (people)		18.8	47.0	65.9	77.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,235	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		16.9	46.3	66.2	76.8
		Rate (people)		16.2	49.4	71.2	81.3
Rural	2012	Line	582	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		32.2	55.4	70.7	81.7
		Rate (people)		39.3	61.6	75.6	85.5
All	2012	Line	1,817	34.14	68.91	103.37	137.82
		Rate (HHs)		21.3	48.9	67.5	78.2
		Rate (people)		23.4	53.2	72.6	82.6
Urban	2010	Line	1,288	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		13.2	40.6	62.1	73.7
		Rate (people)		14.3	43.5	66.2	76.9
Rural	2010	Line	611	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		22.7	45.6	65.5	76.6
		Rate (people)		25.6	50.5	70.6	80.2
All	2010	Line	1,899	29.57	62.34	93.50	124.67
		Rate (HHs)		16.0	42.1	63.1	74.6
		Rate (people)		17.8	45.7	67.5	77.9
Urban	2008	Line	1,150	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		11.5	42.0	60.2	73.0
		Rate (people)		11.8	45.7	64.2	76.7
Rural	2008	Line	604	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		17.1	41.3	59.9	74.2
		Rate (people)		20.2	46.9	66.6	79.2
All	2008	Line	1,754	26.45	56.61	84.91	113.22
		Rate (HHs)		13.2	41.8	60.1	73.4
		Rate (people)		14.4	46.1	65.0	77.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nayarit): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,293	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	8.7	11.5	32.6	6.3	13.7
		Rate (people)		4.0	9.6	12.7	36.2	6.7	14.8
Rural	2014	Line	559	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		8.9	14.0	18.1	40.9	11.3	19.2
		Rate (people)		10.9	17.2	22.5	47.3	14.0	23.8
All	2014	Line	1,852	14.23	22.76	28.45	56.91	19.14	31.23
		Rate (HHs)		5.6	10.3	13.5	35.2	7.8	15.4
		Rate (people)		6.1	12.0	15.7	39.7	9.0	17.6
Urban	2012	Line	1,235	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		6.1	10.2	13.9	36.7	6.6	12.8
		Rate (people)		5.7	9.6	13.0	39.4	6.3	12.1
Rural	2012	Line	582	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		12.3	21.5	26.8	50.8	14.0	25.7
		Rate (people)		17.7	29.6	34.4	58.2	20.4	33.2
All	2012	Line	1,817	12.97	20.76	25.95	51.89	15.01	24.49
		Rate (HHs)		7.8	13.4	17.6	40.7	8.7	16.5
		Rate (people)		9.4	15.8	19.7	45.3	10.7	18.7
Urban	2010	Line	1,288	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		4.3	8.5	11.0	32.0	6.6	12.8
		Rate (people)		4.1	9.2	12.0	34.9	6.8	14.2
Rural	2010	Line	611	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		6.9	13.5	19.3	43.3	10.5	21.6
		Rate (people)		8.2	15.8	22.6	48.6	12.9	25.1
All	2010	Line	1,899	11.77	18.83	23.54	47.08	15.84	25.84
		Rate (HHs)		5.0	10.0	13.5	35.4	7.8	15.5
		Rate (people)		5.4	11.2	15.3	39.2	8.7	17.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,150	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	8.2	10.7	33.1	6.2	12.2
		Rate (people)		3.8	8.5	11.2	37.4	5.8	12.9
Rural	2008	Line	604	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		5.0	11.3	16.3	37.8	8.4	18.1
		Rate (people)		5.5	13.7	19.9	44.2	10.4	21.8
All	2008	Line	1,754	10.87	17.40	21.75	43.50	14.63	23.87
		Rate (HHs)		4.3	9.1	12.4	34.5	6.9	14.0
		Rate (people)		4.3	10.1	13.9	39.6	7.2	15.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nayarit): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines 20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,293	12.6	9.1	22.1	29.8	41.5	66.5
		Rate (people)		13.7	10.1	24.1	32.8	45.5	71.5
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	559	47.4	38.4	63.2	70.9	79.8	92.6
		Rate (people)		53.7	44.7	69.4	75.7	83.5	94.7
All	2014	Line		37.16	28.47	50.79	64.31	80.65	141.67
		Rate (HHs)	1,852	23.4	18.1	34.8	42.5	53.3	74.6
		Rate (people)		26.2	20.8	38.2	46.2	57.3	78.7
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,235	14.7	10.8	26.7	36.6	47.5	72.2
		Rate (people)		13.7	10.1	28.2	39.2	51.9	77.4
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	582	57.5	48.6	71.8	81.9	87.9	93.9
		Rate (people)		64.3	56.1	77.4	86.4	91.5	95.5
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,817	26.9	21.6	39.5	49.5	59.0	78.3
		Rate (people)		29.5	24.4	43.5	53.9	64.3	83.0
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,288	11.5	8.9	21.1	31.5	42.2	68.3
		Rate (people)		12.7	9.8	23.8	34.2	46.3	72.4
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	611	49.6	41.4	67.0	75.4	83.4	94.3
		Rate (people)		55.3	46.8	72.5	79.9	86.8	95.8
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,899	22.9	18.6	34.9	44.7	54.6	76.1
		Rate (people)		25.9	21.3	38.9	48.4	58.9	79.7
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,150	10.9	8.9	25.0	34.8	45.9	69.8
		Rate (people)		11.6	9.3	28.0	39.3	50.6	73.8
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	604	45.2	36.4	64.3	76.0	83.1	93.9
		Rate (people)		52.3	42.7	72.0	81.5	87.7	95.8
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,754	21.4	17.3	37.0	47.4	57.3	77.2
		Rate (people)		24.2	19.7	41.7	52.4	62.2	80.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nayarit): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
				Food	Lower	Upper 100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		12.3	20.9	41.8	49.9	57.8
		Rate (people)		14.6	24.3	47.3	56.4	65.2
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		16.9	24.5	41.9	54.7	62.6
		Rate (people)		21.4	30.8	48.1	60.4	68.6
All	2014	Line	19,479	37.35	45.06	71.69	89.61	107.53
		Rate (HHs)		14.8	22.8	41.8	52.5	60.4
		Rate (people)		18.2	27.8	47.7	58.5	67.0
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		12.4	15.2	29.6	40.0	52.8
		Rate (people)		15.8	18.5	36.9	49.8	64.2
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		27.8	34.3	55.9	69.7	74.6
		Rate (people)		40.4	46.5	66.6	78.5	82.3
All	2012	Line	9,002	34.70	41.87	66.64	83.30	99.95
		Rate (HHs)		20.0	24.6	42.5	54.7	63.5
		Rate (people)		28.6	33.1	52.3	64.7	73.6
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	14.2	31.6	49.0	55.0
		Rate (people)		15.0	17.2	36.2	55.4	62.3
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		20.8	27.4	44.7	55.5	68.8
		Rate (people)		23.8	30.8	50.0	59.8	73.4
All	2010	Line	27,655	30.49	36.82	58.70	73.37	88.05
		Rate (HHs)		16.0	20.9	38.3	52.3	62.1
		Rate (people)		19.4	24.0	43.1	57.6	67.8
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	20.3	39.9	48.9	55.6
		Rate (people)		13.6	28.7	50.7	58.3	64.6
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		22.7	27.5	48.2	60.9	66.4
		Rate (people)		25.1	30.5	51.5	64.2	71.0
All	2008	Line	29,468	27.23	32.83	52.17	65.21	78.26
		Rate (HHs)		17.9	24.5	44.7	55.8	61.9
		Rate (people)		19.9	29.7	51.2	61.5	68.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nayarit): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	7.4
		Rate (people)		1.2	9.3
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	9.4
		Rate (people)		2.3	12.9
All	2014	Line	19,479	13.97	27.93
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	8.5
		Rate (people)		1.7	11.2
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	6.3
		Rate (people)		1.0	7.3
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		12.5	20.3
		Rate (people)		20.4	31.9
All	2012	Line	9,002	12.77	25.54
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	13.2
		Rate (people)		11.1	20.1
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	8.7
		Rate (people)		0.0	11.9
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		4.6	12.1
		Rate (people)		5.0	14.0
All	2010	Line	27,655	11.66	23.33
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	10.4
		Rate (people)		2.5	12.9
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	8.5
		Rate (people)		0.7	8.9
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	14.5
		Rate (people)		3.8	16.5
All	2008	Line	29,468	10.57	21.15
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	12.0
		Rate (people)		2.4	13.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nuevo León): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)			
					National lines (new definition)		
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,634	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		5.8	26.4	48.9	63.7
		Rate (people)		6.0	29.1	53.0	68.3
Rural	2014	Line	108	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		8.9	28.2	48.2	61.3
		Rate (people)		13.5	36.1	56.6	69.8
All	2014	Line	1,742	40.76	83.09	124.64	166.19
		Rate (HHs)		5.9	26.5	48.8	63.6
		Rate (people)		6.4	29.5	53.2	68.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,555	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	28.4	49.2	64.6
		Rate (people)		8.9	31.6	54.1	69.9
Rural	2012	Line	100	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		8.5	27.1	41.5	48.8
		Rate (people)		7.7	33.2	47.1	52.3
All	2012	Line	1,655	36.93	76.13	114.19	152.26
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	28.3	48.8	63.8
		Rate (people)		8.8	31.7	53.8	69.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,649	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		5.6	26.4	48.0	61.1
		Rate (people)		6.0	28.7	53.0	66.6
Rural	2010	Line	152	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		6.4	31.3	59.2	67.8
		Rate (people)		7.5	37.7	68.0	75.6
All	2010	Line	1,801	32.09	69.07	103.60	138.13
		Rate (HHs)		5.6	26.7	48.6	61.4
		Rate (people)		6.0	29.2	53.8	67.1
Urban	2008	Line	1,562	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		4.9	25.3	46.6	61.9
		Rate (people)		4.9	27.4	50.4	65.9
Rural	2008	Line	167	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		21.7	41.5	62.8	77.0
		Rate (people)		28.1	50.1	69.7	84.7
All	2008	Line	1,729	28.69	62.78	94.17	125.56
		Rate (HHs)		5.8	26.1	47.4	62.7
		Rate (people)		6.1	28.6	51.4	66.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nuevo León): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,634	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	2.4	3.5	17.7	1.6	4.6
		Rate (people)		0.8	2.6	4.1	20.0	1.6	5.2
Rural	2014	Line	108	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	5.7	7.3	27.7	4.3	9.7
		Rate (people)		3.9	10.7	12.5	35.8	8.8	15.4
All	2014	Line	1,742	15.44	24.71	30.89	61.78	20.78	33.91
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	2.6	3.7	18.2	1.7	4.8
		Rate (people)		0.9	3.1	4.5	20.9	2.0	5.7
Urban	2012	Line	1,555	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	4.5	5.9	20.9	2.7	5.5
		Rate (people)		2.0	4.9	6.6	24.0	2.7	6.1
Rural	2012	Line	100	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		2.1	3.5	5.0	20.7	2.8	4.3
		Rate (people)		2.3	3.7	5.6	25.9	2.5	5.0
All	2012	Line	1,655	14.09	22.54	28.17	56.34	16.30	26.59
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	4.5	5.9	20.9	2.7	5.4
		Rate (people)		2.0	4.8	6.5	24.1	2.7	6.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,649	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	2.5	4.3	19.2	1.1	5.0
		Rate (people)		0.5	2.7	4.9	21.3	1.0	5.5
Rural	2010	Line	152	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	4.6	6.4	26.9	1.8	7.6
		Rate (people)		0.6	5.1	7.5	34.0	1.9	8.6
All	2010	Line	1,801	12.78	20.44	25.55	51.11	17.19	28.05
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	2.6	4.4	19.6	1.1	5.1
		Rate (people)		0.5	2.8	5.0	22.0	1.1	5.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,562	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	2.9	3.9	19.0	2.2	5.3
		Rate (people)		1.1	2.6	4.0	20.9	1.9	5.6
Rural	2008	Line	167	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		4.2	12.6	17.1	39.4	10.0	20.8
		Rate (people)		5.6	18.2	23.7	48.4	14.8	27.6
All	2008	Line	1,729	11.80	18.87	23.59	47.18	15.87	25.89
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	3.4	4.6	20.1	2.6	6.1
		Rate (people)		1.3	3.4	5.1	22.4	2.6	6.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nuevo León): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,634	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	2.6	9.4	16.1	25.2	55.4
		Rate (people)		4.9	2.8	10.3	18.2	28.5	60.8
Rural	2014	Line	108	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		31.6	25.7	49.0	60.0	69.1	88.0
		Rate (people)		41.1	34.2	58.4	69.3	80.1	93.8
All	2014	Line	1,742	41.09	31.49	56.17	71.12	89.19	156.68
		Rate (HHs)		5.6	3.8	11.5	18.4	27.5	57.1
		Rate (people)		6.8	4.4	12.9	20.9	31.3	62.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,555	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		6.2	4.7	12.9	20.6	29.5	57.1
		Rate (people)		6.9	5.1	14.5	23.7	33.4	62.9
Rural	2012	Line	100	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		28.5	19.2	41.5	49.5	51.7	69.5
		Rate (people)		35.7	23.5	47.5	54.0	55.8	65.8
All	2012	Line	1,655	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		7.4	5.5	14.5	22.2	30.7	57.7
		Rate (people)		8.5	6.1	16.3	25.3	34.6	63.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,649	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		4.5	2.6	11.1	18.8	29.0	53.0
		Rate (people)		5.1	2.8	12.1	20.9	33.0	59.7
Rural	2010	Line	152	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		36.0	25.3	60.2	65.8	76.6	90.0
		Rate (people)		44.7	30.3	69.6	74.6	81.4	92.5
All	2010	Line	1,801	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		6.1	3.7	13.7	21.2	31.5	55.0
		Rate (people)		7.2	4.2	15.2	23.7	35.6	61.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,562	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	3.2	12.9	19.8	30.0	58.7
		Rate (people)		4.1	2.9	13.7	21.9	33.4	63.3
Rural	2008	Line	167	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		44.4	38.6	68.9	78.0	83.9	93.3
		Rate (people)		54.4	48.0	77.6	85.9	89.7	96.4
All	2008	Line	1,729	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		6.1	5.1	15.9	22.9	32.9	60.5
		Rate (people)		6.8	5.3	17.1	25.3	36.4	65.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nuevo León): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		3.6	7.2	25.1	39.2	51.9
		Rate (people)		4.9	9.4	30.3	46.1	59.9
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	0.7	15.3	32.3	46.6
		Rate (people)		0.6	0.6	21.8	40.2	57.4
All	2014	Line	19,479	42.09	51.47	83.81	104.77	125.72
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	6.5	24.0	38.5	51.3
		Rate (people)		4.5	8.5	29.4	45.5	59.6
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	7.2	21.4	36.6	48.7
		Rate (people)		3.4	8.5	25.3	41.4	54.2
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	8.9	15.3	23.4	28.9
		Rate (people)		2.7	7.9	17.9	26.6	32.0
All	2012	Line	9,002	38.87	47.54	77.40	96.75	116.10
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	7.3	20.8	35.2	46.7
		Rate (people)		3.3	8.4	24.5	39.8	51.9
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	3.6	20.2	32.9	45.5
		Rate (people)		2.7	5.2	24.5	39.0	53.2
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		5.7	8.9	26.5	33.4	42.7
		Rate (people)		6.9	11.3	34.9	44.2	53.9
All	2010	Line	27,655	34.07	41.68	67.88	84.85	101.81
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	4.1	20.9	33.0	45.2
		Rate (people)		3.1	5.7	25.5	39.5	53.2
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		3.9	6.8	21.6	30.1	41.9
		Rate (people)		5.6	9.4	26.0	36.1	47.9
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		15.9	15.9	28.9	45.3	50.4
		Rate (people)		22.0	22.0	37.7	54.0	58.4
All	2008	Line	29,468	30.94	37.86	61.69	77.11	92.53
		Rate (HHs)		5.0	7.6	22.3	31.5	42.6
		Rate (people)		7.0	10.5	27.1	37.7	48.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Nuevo León): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines $1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	1.0
		Rate (people)		0.6	1.4
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	0.7
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.6
All	2014	Line	19,479	15.73	31.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	0.9
		Rate (people)		0.6	1.3
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	0.9
		Rate (people)		0.0	1.0
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	0.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.0
All	2012	Line	9,002	14.34	28.69
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	0.8
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.9
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		0.4	0.9
		Rate (people)		1.3	1.6
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	3.1
		Rate (people)		0.0	3.2
All	2010	Line	27,655	13.03	26.07
		Rate (HHs)		0.4	1.2
		Rate (people)		1.2	1.7
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	1.2
		Rate (people)		0.0	2.0
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	11.3
		Rate (people)		4.7	15.2
All	2008	Line	29,468	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		0.3	2.1
		Rate (people)		0.4	3.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Oaxaca): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	901	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		30.4	58.3	74.6	83.9
		Rate (people)		33.8	62.6	78.3	87.0
Rural	2014	Line	965	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		45.6	71.3	85.0	91.0
		Rate (people)		49.6	74.5	87.3	92.8
All	2014	Line	1,866	34.84	68.44	102.65	136.87
		Rate (HHs)		38.3	65.1	80.0	87.6
		Rate (people)		42.1	68.8	83.0	90.1
Urban	2012	Line	853	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		24.7	53.1	71.3	80.5
		Rate (people)		24.9	55.1	75.2	83.9
Rural	2012	Line	1,079	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		40.2	67.2	83.2	89.7
		Rate (people)		42.8	71.1	86.0	91.6
All	2012	Line	1,932	31.80	62.87	94.31	125.75
		Rate (HHs)		32.8	60.5	77.5	85.3
		Rate (people)		34.3	63.5	80.9	88.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,099	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		15.8	53.4	71.7	82.6
		Rate (people)		16.5	56.5	74.2	85.2
Rural	2010	Line	853	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		47.8	75.1	84.9	91.6
		Rate (people)		53.9	78.9	87.0	93.7
All	2010	Line	1,952	27.44	56.67	85.00	113.33
		Rate (HHs)		31.7	64.2	78.2	87.1
		Rate (people)		36.2	68.3	80.9	89.7
Urban	2008	Line	1,072	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		15.8	45.5	64.7	77.6
		Rate (people)		18.4	52.3	71.2	82.8
Rural	2008	Line	763	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		40.6	69.3	81.8	88.4
		Rate (people)		46.0	73.0	85.0	90.6
All	2008	Line	1,835	24.57	51.42	77.13	102.84
		Rate (HHs)		28.8	58.0	73.6	83.3
		Rate (people)		32.9	63.2	78.5	86.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Oaxaca): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines $1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	Intl. 2011 PPP lines $1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	901	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		8.9	18.4	25.0	50.9	14.5	28.2
		Rate (people)		10.2	20.4	28.6	54.9	16.0	32.1
Rural	2014	Line	965	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		15.3	27.3	37.7	66.7	21.5	42.1
		Rate (people)		18.7	32.2	42.9	71.0	26.0	47.2
All	2014	Line	1,866	13.20	21.12	26.41	52.81	17.76	28.98
		Rate (HHs)		12.2	23.0	31.6	59.1	18.1	35.4
		Rate (people)		14.6	26.6	36.1	63.4	21.2	40.0
Urban	2012	Line	853	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		7.5	13.3	19.1	45.3	8.7	17.6
		Rate (people)		7.7	13.7	18.8	48.2	9.2	17.8
Rural	2012	Line	1,079	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		11.9	24.0	32.4	62.0	15.7	29.6
		Rate (people)		13.8	28.1	36.4	66.8	18.6	33.6
All	2012	Line	1,932	12.04	19.27	24.08	48.17	13.93	22.73
		Rate (HHs)		9.8	18.9	26.0	54.0	12.3	23.9
		Rate (people)		10.9	21.3	28.1	58.0	14.2	26.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,099	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		4.5	10.1	13.7	42.2	7.7	15.6
		Rate (people)		4.4	10.7	14.4	46.2	8.0	16.6
Rural	2010	Line	853	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		16.9	33.6	42.1	72.1	25.9	45.6
		Rate (people)		23.4	41.4	49.9	76.7	34.1	53.2
All	2010	Line	1,952	10.92	17.48	21.85	43.70	14.70	23.98
		Rate (HHs)		10.7	21.8	27.8	57.1	16.8	30.5
		Rate (people)		14.4	26.9	33.1	62.3	21.8	35.9
Urban	2008	Line	1,072	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	9.3	14.2	38.3	6.7	16.4
		Rate (people)		5.4	11.7	17.0	43.9	8.4	19.9
Rural	2008	Line	763	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		15.1	28.9	38.4	64.7	22.8	42.4
		Rate (people)		17.7	34.1	44.7	70.3	26.9	48.2
All	2008	Line	1,835	10.10	16.16	20.20	40.40	13.59	22.17
		Rate (HHs)		9.8	19.6	26.9	52.1	15.2	30.0
		Rate (people)		11.9	23.5	31.6	57.8	18.2	34.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Oaxaca): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	901	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		26.7	19.4	38.8	49.3	56.7	77.3
		Rate (people)		30.7	21.7	43.1	53.4	61.3	80.9
Rural	2014	Line	965	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		73.3	64.8	85.4	90.4	93.4	97.6
		Rate (people)		77.0	69.2	88.1	92.5	95.0	98.3
All	2014	Line	1,866	33.84	25.93	46.26	58.57	73.46	129.04
		Rate (HHs)		50.9	43.0	63.1	70.7	75.8	87.8
		Rate (people)		55.1	46.7	66.9	74.0	79.1	90.1
Urban	2012	Line	853	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		20.3	14.2	33.5	45.2	53.9	76.9
		Rate (people)		20.3	14.5	36.0	48.1	56.7	80.6
Rural	2012	Line	1,079	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		69.9	59.0	85.0	90.0	92.3	97.8
		Rate (people)		74.2	63.1	88.0	92.1	94.4	98.7
All	2012	Line	1,932	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		46.1	37.6	60.4	68.6	73.9	87.8
		Rate (people)		48.8	40.1	63.4	71.3	76.6	90.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,099	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		14.0	10.6	30.0	41.4	53.2	77.5
		Rate (people)		14.9	11.2	32.9	45.4	56.9	80.6
Rural	2010	Line	853	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		76.5	67.9	87.1	90.8	94.9	98.2
		Rate (people)		80.6	73.0	89.8	93.4	96.4	98.6
All	2010	Line	1,952	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		45.1	39.1	58.4	66.0	73.9	87.8
		Rate (people)		49.5	43.7	62.9	70.7	77.8	90.1
Urban	2008	Line	1,072	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		14.2	10.6	29.3	39.5	50.1	74.2
		Rate (people)		17.0	13.1	34.3	46.0	57.8	80.6
Rural	2008	Line	763	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		72.0	63.9	84.4	89.3	93.7	98.8
		Rate (people)		77.2	69.6	87.4	91.5	96.1	99.1
All	2008	Line	1,835	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		44.5	38.5	58.2	65.6	73.0	87.1
		Rate (people)		48.8	42.9	62.3	70.0	78.0	90.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Oaxaca): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	19.3	28.6	53.8	64.0	72.3
		Rate (people)		25.4	36.0	58.7	67.4	74.1
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	43.6	53.1	70.6	79.7	84.6
		Rate (people)		51.5	61.2	76.2	83.5	88.6
All	2014	Line		34.93	41.78	65.48	81.85	98.22
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	37.1	46.5	66.1	75.4	81.3
		Rate (people)		44.9	54.8	71.8	79.4	85.0
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	10.1	22.6	58.7	66.2	75.3
		Rate (people)		10.9	24.4	62.0	72.1	79.6
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	37.7	50.6	77.7	86.3	89.7
		Rate (people)		44.7	57.4	80.0	87.6	90.8
All	2012	Line		32.96	39.51	62.16	77.69	93.23
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	28.7	41.4	71.5	79.8	85.0
		Rate (people)		34.3	47.3	74.5	82.9	87.4
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	8.8	15.3	42.2	53.2	60.3
		Rate (people)		10.5	18.2	47.4	57.8	64.6
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	36.6	43.7	60.3	67.9	74.2
		Rate (people)		43.5	50.5	65.7	71.8	76.8
All	2010	Line		28.45	34.06	53.48	66.85	80.22
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	28.3	35.3	54.9	63.5	70.1
		Rate (people)		34.4	41.5	60.6	67.9	73.4
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	9.1	16.0	34.8	49.6	56.3
		Rate (people)		10.7	18.3	39.9	57.9	63.4
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	31.2	37.2	55.6	65.9	72.6
		Rate (people)		37.7	44.7	61.7	70.4	77.7
All	2008	Line		25.64	30.67	48.09	60.11	72.13
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	25.5	31.7	50.2	61.7	68.4
		Rate (people)		30.7	37.9	56.1	67.2	74.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Oaxaca): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	12.5
		Rate (people)		2.4	17.9
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		5.9	29.4
		Rate (people)		8.7	36.7
All	2014	Line	19,479	13.06	26.12
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	24.8
		Rate (people)		7.1	31.9
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	6.4
		Rate (people)		0.8	7.3
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	26.1
		Rate (people)		10.8	32.4
All	2012	Line	9,002	12.12	24.23
		Rate (HHs)		4.9	19.6
		Rate (people)		7.7	24.7
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		0.3	3.9
		Rate (people)		0.4	5.0
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		7.7	24.5
		Rate (people)		11.3	32.1
All	2010	Line	27,655	10.88	21.77
		Rate (HHs)		5.5	18.4
		Rate (people)		8.3	24.6
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		1.2	6.0
		Rate (people)		1.7	7.2
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	21.0
		Rate (people)		7.3	27.7
All	2008	Line	29,468	9.96	19.91
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	17.1
		Rate (people)		5.8	22.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Puebla): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)			
				National lines (new definition)			
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,779	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		25.8	60.9	78.0	84.8
		Rate (people)		28.6	67.4	83.4	89.0
Rural	2014	Line	554	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		35.4	71.5	86.0	92.1
		Rate (people)		40.1	75.3	89.6	94.6
All	2014	Line	2,333	37.89	75.99	113.99	151.98
		Rate (HHs)		28.4	63.8	80.2	86.8
		Rate (people)		31.9	69.7	85.2	90.6
Urban	2012	Line	1,315	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		26.5	60.6	75.5	83.4
		Rate (people)		28.7	66.5	81.4	87.7
Rural	2012	Line	517	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		38.2	71.3	86.0	90.4
		Rate (people)		43.8	74.3	88.1	93.3
All	2012	Line	1,832	34.45	69.72	104.59	139.45
		Rate (HHs)		29.7	63.5	78.4	85.4
		Rate (people)		32.9	68.7	83.3	89.3
Urban	2010	Line	1,317	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		20.2	57.8	73.8	82.8
		Rate (people)		22.8	63.1	78.8	86.3
Rural	2010	Line	495	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		35.8	73.0	89.1	94.9
		Rate (people)		39.9	77.1	91.8	96.6
All	2010	Line	1,812	29.84	63.07	94.60	126.14
		Rate (HHs)		24.3	61.7	77.8	86.0
		Rate (people)		27.7	67.1	82.5	89.2
Urban	2008	Line	1,233	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		19.6	60.7	76.0	84.5
		Rate (people)		22.5	66.4	81.0	88.7
Rural	2008	Line	550	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		35.0	72.9	85.7	93.3
		Rate (people)		37.9	74.2	86.0	93.9
All	2008	Line	1,783	26.70	57.29	85.94	114.59
		Rate (HHs)		23.8	64.0	78.7	86.9
		Rate (people)		26.9	68.6	82.4	90.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Puebla): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | *n* | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,779	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		5.8	13.2	19.2	50.7	9.8	23.0
		Rate (people)		6.5	14.8	21.9	57.1	11.0	26.5
Rural	2014	Line	554	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		8.1	20.6	27.9	66.8	14.7	31.6
		Rate (people)		10.0	25.5	33.4	72.4	18.5	37.2
All	2014	Line	2,333	14.36	22.97	28.72	57.43	19.32	31.52
		Rate (HHs)		6.4	15.2	21.6	55.2	11.1	25.4
		Rate (people)		7.5	17.8	25.1	61.4	13.1	29.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,315	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		4.9	14.4	21.5	50.8	6.4	19.2
		Rate (people)		5.2	15.8	23.3	56.4	6.8	20.6
Rural	2012	Line	517	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		12.2	22.8	31.9	65.6	15.1	29.9
		Rate (people)		15.3	27.2	38.1	70.0	18.7	35.9
All	2012	Line	1,832	13.10	20.96	26.20	52.39	15.15	24.72
		Rate (HHs)		6.9	16.7	24.3	54.9	8.8	22.1
		Rate (people)		8.1	19.0	27.5	60.3	10.2	24.9
Urban	2010	Line	1,317	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	10.3	16.3	47.7	7.5	19.7
		Rate (people)		4.7	12.3	19.1	53.7	8.2	22.9
Rural	2010	Line	495	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		8.3	23.6	30.9	69.3	16.3	34.8
		Rate (people)		9.5	27.9	35.8	74.5	19.1	40.6
All	2010	Line	1,812	11.88	19.01	23.76	47.52	15.99	26.08
		Rate (HHs)		5.2	13.8	20.1	53.4	9.8	23.7
		Rate (people)		6.0	16.7	23.8	59.6	11.3	27.9
Urban	2008	Line	1,233	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		5.8	13.7	18.9	50.6	9.4	21.2
		Rate (people)		7.3	16.0	22.1	56.5	11.0	25.0
Rural	2008	Line	550	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		10.7	23.3	32.2	69.5	18.8	35.7
		Rate (people)		12.2	27.7	36.3	72.4	22.9	39.8
All	2008	Line	1,783	10.98	17.56	21.95	43.91	14.77	24.10
		Rate (HHs)		7.1	16.3	22.5	55.8	11.9	25.1
		Rate (people)		8.7	19.3	26.1	60.9	14.4	29.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Puebla): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,779	21.2	14.5	37.7	48.3	60.6	80.4
		Rate (people)		24.1	16.4	42.3	54.7	67.6	85.9
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	554	74.0	64.5	86.7	91.5	94.9	98.3
		Rate (people)		78.9	69.9	90.4	94.3	96.8	99.0
All	2014	Line		37.58	28.80	51.37	65.04	81.57	143.29
		Rate (HHs)	2,333	35.8	28.3	51.2	60.2	70.1	85.4
		Rate (people)		39.6	31.6	56.0	65.9	75.9	89.6
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,315	22.5	16.3	38.0	50.3	61.6	79.2
		Rate (people)		24.6	17.6	42.2	55.9	68.2	84.7
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	517	72.5	63.0	86.8	91.0	93.7	98.1
		Rate (people)		76.6	67.4	90.2	94.0	96.1	98.8
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,832	36.2	29.1	51.4	61.5	70.4	84.4
		Rate (people)		39.3	31.7	55.7	66.6	76.1	88.7
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,317	17.0	10.8	33.2	47.0	59.2	78.6
		Rate (people)		19.9	12.9	37.9	52.8	65.0	83.3
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	495	77.7	65.7	90.1	94.5	96.6	99.4
		Rate (people)		82.4	70.9	92.7	96.0	97.8	99.7
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,812	32.8	25.1	48.0	59.4	68.9	84.0
		Rate (people)		37.6	29.3	53.4	65.0	74.3	88.0
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,233	19.0	15.4	40.0	52.7	65.2	82.0
		Rate (people)		22.2	17.9	45.4	59.2	72.0	86.8
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	550	75.8	66.4	88.6	95.2	97.2	99.5
		Rate (people)		77.5	69.6	89.6	96.2	97.9	99.8
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,783	34.4	29.2	53.2	64.2	73.9	86.8
		Rate (people)		37.8	32.5	57.9	69.7	79.3	90.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Puebla): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
				Food	Lower	Upper 100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	14.4	24.8	51.4	63.7	70.8
		Rate (people)		17.9	30.2	60.7	74.1	81.1
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	29.2	38.9	67.6	77.8	84.5
		Rate (people)		34.1	45.0	72.4	81.6	87.7
All	2014	Line		37.53	45.30	72.13	90.17	108.20
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	21.8	31.8	59.4	70.7	77.6
		Rate (people)		26.2	37.8	66.7	77.9	84.5
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	18.1	22.0	48.6	67.5	74.3
		Rate (people)		23.2	27.0	59.1	78.1	81.8
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	28.5	38.9	63.1	76.5	81.2
		Rate (people)		34.7	46.7	69.9	82.1	85.6
All	2012	Line		34.97	42.24	67.33	84.16	100.99
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	23.5	30.7	56.0	72.1	77.8
		Rate (people)		28.9	36.7	64.4	80.1	83.7
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	7.8	17.5	48.8	60.8	66.2
		Rate (people)		10.3	21.3	57.1	68.0	72.4
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	32.1	39.1	64.5	74.9	83.6
		Rate (people)		39.6	46.5	73.0	82.1	88.5
All	2010	Line		30.95	37.45	59.89	74.86	89.83
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	17.9	26.4	55.3	66.6	73.4
		Rate (people)		23.3	32.5	64.2	74.2	79.6
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	11.3	21.1	51.4	60.5	69.9
		Rate (people)		13.2	23.0	57.1	67.8	78.1
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	32.9	41.6	66.7	82.2	88.1
		Rate (people)		38.0	45.5	71.7	84.2	89.7
All	2008	Line		27.67	33.43	53.30	66.63	79.95
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	21.3	30.6	58.5	70.5	78.3
		Rate (people)		25.4	34.1	64.3	75.9	83.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Puebla): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.4	6.1
		Rate (people)		0.3	7.5
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	15.3
		Rate (people)		4.1	19.0
All	2014	Line	19,479	14.03	28.06
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	10.7
		Rate (people)		2.2	13.4
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	10.3
		Rate (people)		0.0	14.9
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	18.4
		Rate (people)		3.2	22.2
All	2012	Line	9,002	12.87	25.74
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	14.4
		Rate (people)		1.6	18.5
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		0.2	4.5
		Rate (people)		0.2	6.5
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	18.0
		Rate (people)		3.4	22.2
All	2010	Line	27,655	11.84	23.68
		Rate (HHs)		1.2	10.1
		Rate (people)		1.6	13.5
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.1	5.9
		Rate (people)		0.0	6.2
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	18.6
		Rate (people)		4.3	22.2
All	2008	Line	29,468	10.74	21.49
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	11.8
		Rate (people)		2.1	14.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Querétaro): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,302	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		9.8	35.8	53.7	66.9
		Rate (people)		11.2	41.3	60.7	73.0
Rural	2014	Line	531	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		14.1	40.3	65.2	80.1
		Rate (people)		14.8	43.9	70.0	85.5
All	2014	Line	1,833	37.72	75.58	113.36	151.15
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	37.0	56.9	70.5
		Rate (people)		12.3	42.1	63.4	76.7
Urban	2012	Line	1,339	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		10.8	37.5	56.3	67.7
		Rate (people)		11.8	41.8	62.6	73.3
Rural	2012	Line	529	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		19.7	44.4	65.1	77.9
		Rate (people)		21.5	46.9	69.4	82.9
All	2012	Line	1,868	34.30	69.33	103.99	138.66
		Rate (HHs)		13.3	39.5	58.8	70.5
		Rate (people)		14.7	43.3	64.6	76.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,374	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		11.6	39.5	58.7	69.1
		Rate (people)		12.8	44.5	64.4	74.7
Rural	2010	Line	455	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		22.8	49.3	65.7	78.7
		Rate (people)		23.6	50.9	68.2	81.1
All	2010	Line	1,829	29.70	62.70	94.05	125.40
		Rate (HHs)		14.7	42.2	60.6	71.8
		Rate (people)		16.0	46.4	65.5	76.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,858	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		6.3	31.4	49.7	62.8
		Rate (people)		7.3	36.1	55.9	69.7
Rural	2008	Line	617	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		18.3	47.5	71.3	82.3
		Rate (people)		19.6	50.3	74.3	85.5
All	2008	Line	2,475	26.58	56.97	85.45	113.93
		Rate (HHs)		9.6	35.8	55.6	68.1
		Rate (people)		11.0	40.3	61.3	74.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Querétaro): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,302	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	4.9	7.7	26.7	3.9	8.9
		Rate (people)		2.9	5.5	8.9	31.7	4.2	10.3
Rural	2014	Line	531	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		3.5	7.9	11.7	36.0	5.0	12.9
		Rate (people)		3.7	8.8	12.8	40.3	5.4	14.0
All	2014	Line	1,833	14.29	22.87	28.59	57.18	19.23	31.38
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	5.7	8.8	29.2	4.2	10.0
		Rate (people)		3.1	6.5	10.1	34.3	4.5	11.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,339	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	4.6	8.0	29.0	2.4	6.4
		Rate (people)		1.7	4.5	8.7	32.3	2.4	6.5
Rural	2012	Line	529	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		6.3	11.6	15.8	39.4	7.8	14.3
		Rate (people)		6.7	12.8	17.6	42.5	8.6	15.6
All	2012	Line	1,868	13.04	20.86	26.07	52.15	15.08	24.61
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	6.6	10.2	31.9	3.9	8.6
		Rate (people)		3.2	7.0	11.3	35.3	4.2	9.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,374	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	6.0	8.9	30.6	4.1	11.9
		Rate (people)		3.2	6.7	10.3	35.0	4.6	13.9
Rural	2010	Line	455	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		6.6	14.3	19.4	44.9	10.1	23.6
		Rate (people)		8.1	16.2	21.0	47.0	11.5	25.3
All	2010	Line	1,829	11.83	18.92	23.65	47.30	15.91	25.96
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	8.3	11.7	34.5	5.8	15.1
		Rate (people)		4.7	9.5	13.5	38.5	6.7	17.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,858	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	2.7	5.5	22.8	1.8	6.6
		Rate (people)		1.4	3.5	6.8	27.1	2.5	8.1
Rural	2008	Line	617	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		3.9	11.9	17.1	45.9	9.2	20.1
		Rate (people)		4.5	12.7	18.7	49.3	9.8	21.6
All	2008	Line	2,475	10.93	17.49	21.86	43.71	14.70	23.99
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	5.2	8.7	29.1	3.8	10.3
		Rate (people)		2.3	6.2	10.3	33.6	4.7	12.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Querétaro): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,302	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		8.6	5.6	17.6	25.0	34.7	58.5
		Rate (people)		9.9	6.4	21.3	29.6	40.6	65.7
Rural	2014	Line	531	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		47.0	33.4	66.0	77.7	85.6	95.1
		Rate (people)		51.4	37.1	71.8	83.6	90.4	96.6
All	2014	Line	1,833	37.37	28.64	51.09	64.69	81.12	142.50
		Rate (HHs)		19.0	13.2	30.7	39.3	48.5	68.4
		Rate (people)		22.2	15.5	36.2	45.6	55.4	74.9
Urban	2012	Line	1,339	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		8.6	4.9	18.7	28.9	38.7	61.8
		Rate (people)		9.4	4.9	20.8	32.1	43.9	68.8
Rural	2012	Line	529	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		48.5	37.3	69.3	78.2	84.7	94.0
		Rate (people)		52.1	40.3	74.7	83.5	89.3	96.5
All	2012	Line	1,868	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		19.8	14.1	33.0	42.8	51.6	70.9
		Rate (people)		22.0	15.4	36.8	47.4	57.3	77.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,374	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		9.2	6.3	19.6	30.2	39.9	63.7
		Rate (people)		10.8	7.3	22.6	34.4	45.5	70.1
Rural	2010	Line	455	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		52.5	42.4	67.5	80.1	87.2	95.5
		Rate (people)		55.3	44.6	70.1	82.6	90.2	96.4
All	2010	Line	1,829	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		21.1	16.2	32.8	43.9	52.9	72.5
		Rate (people)		24.0	18.3	36.7	48.7	58.8	77.9
Urban	2008	Line	1,858	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		5.7	3.2	15.4	24.7	34.9	59.7
		Rate (people)		7.0	4.2	18.0	29.4	40.3	67.0
Rural	2008	Line	617	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		53.0	44.7	77.5	86.0	90.7	96.2
		Rate (people)		56.6	48.2	80.8	89.6	93.3	97.7
All	2008	Line	2,475	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		18.6	14.6	32.3	41.4	50.2	69.7
		Rate (people)		21.6	17.2	36.6	47.2	56.0	76.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Querétaro): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Upper | |
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		5.6	8.1	25.1	34.2	46.0
		Rate (people)		8.3	11.6	31.5	41.9	54.2
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		8.5	12.8	38.3	53.5	63.4
		Rate (people)		9.4	14.2	43.2	60.3	70.3
All	2014	Line	19,479	37.70	45.53	72.58	90.72	108.86
		Rate (HHs)		6.9	10.2	31.2	43.0	54.0
		Rate (people)		8.8	12.9	37.3	51.1	62.2
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		2.1	6.4	26.4	36.7	42.0
		Rate (people)		1.9	7.7	32.8	45.4	52.1
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	10.3	35.2	46.1	54.7
		Rate (people)		8.5	12.1	40.0	53.1	59.2
All	2012	Line	9,002	34.61	41.75	66.41	83.02	99.62
		Rate (HHs)		4.3	8.3	30.6	41.2	48.1
		Rate (people)		5.4	10.0	36.6	49.4	55.9
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		4.7	9.5	29.7	39.4	47.7
		Rate (people)		6.8	11.2	35.8	46.3	55.4
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		8.9	13.4	31.9	43.2	56.4
		Rate (people)		10.9	15.3	36.3	47.0	61.2
All	2010	Line	27,655	30.32	36.60	58.27	72.84	87.40
		Rate (HHs)		6.7	11.3	30.7	41.2	51.9
		Rate (people)		8.9	13.3	36.1	46.7	58.4
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		4.1	7.6	23.8	32.4	42.5
		Rate (people)		5.3	9.7	29.0	38.6	50.3
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		12.6	18.1	37.8	52.2	62.0
		Rate (people)		14.7	21.8	41.9	57.4	67.2
All	2008	Line	29,468	27.74	33.51	53.46	66.83	80.20
		Rate (HHs)		7.9	12.3	30.1	41.3	51.2
		Rate (people)		9.8	15.5	35.2	47.7	58.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Querétaro): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	0.0	2.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	3.0
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	0.6	4.8
		Rate (people)		0.5	5.9
All	2014	Line		14.10	28.19
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	0.3	3.3
		Rate (people)		0.3	4.4
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.0	0.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.0
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	0.3	1.5
		Rate (people)		0.1	2.2
All	2012	Line		12.74	25.48
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.1	0.7
		Rate (people)		0.1	1.2
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.1	1.6
		Rate (people)		0.1	2.7
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	0.0	3.8
		Rate (people)		0.0	5.0
All	2010	Line		11.60	23.20
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	0.0	2.6
		Rate (people)		0.1	3.9
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.4	1.6
		Rate (people)		0.5	2.0
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	1.3	8.1
		Rate (people)		1.7	9.4
All	2008	Line		10.77	21.54
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	0.8	4.5
		Rate (people)		1.1	5.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Quintana Roo): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)			
					National lines (new definition)		
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,495	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		10.0	33.0	50.9	65.5
		Rate (people)		11.3	39.3	59.6	74.2
Rural	2014	Line	206	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		32.0	60.5	73.0	83.2
		Rate (people)		36.9	63.3	77.4	87.1
All	2014	Line	1,701	39.95	81.09	121.63	162.17
		Rate (HHs)		12.4	36.0	53.3	67.4
		Rate (people)		14.3	42.1	61.7	75.7
Urban	2012	Line	1,467	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		12.1	36.4	55.9	68.1
		Rate (people)		13.8	42.2	64.2	75.6
Rural	2012	Line	224	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		33.9	62.8	77.1	84.9
		Rate (people)		36.6	65.7	78.7	84.5
All	2012	Line	1,691	36.22	74.29	111.43	148.57
		Rate (HHs)		14.3	39.1	58.1	69.8
		Rate (people)		16.6	45.0	65.9	76.7
Urban	2010	Line	1,398	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		8.9	31.1	50.7	63.6
		Rate (people)		9.6	35.9	58.9	70.9
Rural	2010	Line	315	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		25.6	58.8	79.2	88.1
		Rate (people)		30.4	65.0	83.0	90.8
All	2010	Line	1,713	31.45	67.36	101.03	134.71
		Rate (HHs)		10.8	34.2	53.9	66.4
		Rate (people)		12.1	39.4	61.7	73.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,365	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		9.1	29.4	46.6	59.5
		Rate (people)		10.3	35.2	54.6	67.3
Rural	2008	Line	277	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		29.0	57.6	70.0	79.5
		Rate (people)		33.4	64.0	77.9	86.4
All	2008	Line	1,642	28.12	61.21	91.82	122.42
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	32.2	48.9	61.4
		Rate (people)		13.1	38.6	57.3	69.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Quintana Roo): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,495	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	5.1	8.0	26.2	3.8	9.2
		Rate (people)		2.5	5.4	9.0	31.6	4.0	10.6
Rural	2014	Line	206	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		8.8	17.6	24.3	55.8	13.2	28.8
		Rate (people)		10.7	21.3	29.4	59.7	16.5	34.6
All	2014	Line	1,701	15.14	24.22	30.28	60.55	20.37	33.23
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	6.4	9.7	29.4	4.8	11.3
		Rate (people)		3.5	7.2	11.4	34.9	5.5	13.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,467	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		3.9	6.9	9.7	27.9	4.6	9.3
		Rate (people)		4.2	7.8	11.4	33.8	4.9	10.8
Rural	2012	Line	224	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		8.1	22.5	29.4	55.5	9.9	27.3
		Rate (people)		8.9	25.8	32.4	60.7	10.9	30.7
All	2012	Line	1,691	13.80	22.08	27.60	55.21	15.97	26.05
		Rate (HHs)		4.4	8.5	11.7	30.8	5.1	11.2
		Rate (people)		4.7	10.0	13.9	37.0	5.6	13.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,398	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	5.7	7.8	23.5	4.2	8.8
		Rate (people)		2.2	5.8	8.6	27.7	3.7	9.6
Rural	2010	Line	315	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		8.4	18.9	23.0	53.6	14.3	26.0
		Rate (people)		10.0	24.0	27.8	60.4	18.5	32.0
All	2010	Line	1,713	12.52	20.03	25.04	50.08	16.85	27.49
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	7.1	9.6	26.9	5.3	10.7
		Rate (people)		3.1	8.0	10.8	31.6	5.5	12.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,365	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	5.2	7.4	22.7	4.0	9.4
		Rate (people)		2.7	5.7	9.1	28.0	4.2	11.3
Rural	2008	Line	277	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		8.9	19.5	27.2	55.5	13.4	30.4
		Rate (people)		10.2	23.3	32.0	63.6	16.2	36.0
All	2008	Line	1,642	11.56	18.50	23.12	46.24	15.56	25.38
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	6.6	9.4	26.0	4.9	11.5
		Rate (people)		3.6	7.8	11.8	32.3	5.6	14.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Quintana Roo): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,495	8.5	5.7	15.5	24.7	33.2	57.0
		Rate (people)		9.6	6.2	18.4	29.7	40.0	66.6
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	206	62.7	53.1	72.2	81.0	88.0	95.5
		Rate (people)		66.1	57.4	77.0	86.2	92.4	97.2
All	2014	Line		40.10	30.73	54.82	69.40	87.03	152.90
		Rate (HHs)	1,701	14.4	10.8	21.7	30.8	39.2	61.1
		Rate (people)		16.2	12.2	25.3	36.4	46.2	70.2
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,467	10.2	7.8	19.6	27.7	38.3	61.6
		Rate (people)		12.1	9.0	23.3	33.3	45.7	69.8
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	224	65.3	52.7	77.1	82.9	90.1	97.1
		Rate (people)		68.8	56.9	78.7	83.7	91.1	97.7
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,691	15.8	12.4	25.5	33.3	43.6	65.2
		Rate (people)		18.8	14.7	29.9	39.3	51.1	73.1
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,398	8.0	6.3	15.6	22.9	32.1	56.9
		Rate (people)		8.7	6.6	17.5	26.9	38.5	65.4
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	315	61.1	51.8	82.3	87.4	90.8	95.0
		Rate (people)		67.6	58.8	86.4	90.6	93.0	96.6
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,713	13.9	11.4	23.1	30.1	38.7	61.2
		Rate (people)		15.7	12.8	25.6	34.5	44.9	69.1
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,365	7.6	5.9	16.2	23.6	33.4	55.9
		Rate (people)		9.3	6.4	19.4	29.0	40.4	64.5
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	277	61.2	54.1	74.1	81.0	85.2	95.4
		Rate (people)		68.7	61.8	82.9	88.2	91.7	98.0
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,642	12.9	10.7	21.9	29.3	38.5	59.8
		Rate (people)		16.4	13.0	27.0	36.0	46.5	68.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Quintana Roo): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		9.1	12.7	30.7	43.2	54.9
		Rate (people)		12.6	16.4	38.8	53.7	64.5
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		24.5	33.4	47.8	56.1	57.2
		Rate (people)		30.9	38.9	52.4	61.8	64.6
All	2014	Line	19,479	40.93	49.91	80.85	101.07	121.28
		Rate (HHs)		12.1	16.7	34.0	45.7	55.3
		Rate (people)		16.3	21.1	41.6	55.3	64.5
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		6.2	11.0	29.4	40.5	50.8
		Rate (people)		9.5	17.6	39.9	52.5	62.4
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		16.0	21.2	37.1	45.6	52.4
		Rate (people)		20.9	25.6	42.9	54.0	58.3
All	2012	Line	9,002	37.70	45.95	74.38	92.97	111.57
		Rate (HHs)		8.2	13.1	30.9	41.5	51.1
		Rate (people)		12.0	19.4	40.6	52.8	61.5
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	7.0	26.3	34.2	41.8
		Rate (people)		3.8	7.0	32.0	43.8	52.8
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		21.0	32.0	48.8	62.5	70.3
		Rate (people)		25.9	40.6	55.7	70.3	76.4
All	2010	Line	27,655	33.52	40.93	66.46	83.08	99.69
		Rate (HHs)		6.4	10.8	29.8	38.5	46.2
		Rate (people)		7.3	12.3	35.8	48.0	56.6
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		5.1	6.2	21.5	32.3	40.8
		Rate (people)		7.1	8.5	29.1	41.0	51.0
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		33.8	39.7	60.9	68.2	73.1
		Rate (people)		38.0	43.5	67.1	74.9	81.4
All	2008	Line	29,468	29.77	36.28	58.69	73.37	88.04
		Rate (HHs)		10.8	12.8	29.3	39.4	47.2
		Rate (people)		14.3	16.6	37.9	48.9	58.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Quintana Roo): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	0.5	2.8
		Rate (people)		0.9	3.8
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	0.0	13.7
		Rate (people)		0.0	19.6
All	2014	Line		15.30	30.61
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	0.4	4.9
		Rate (people)		0.7	7.0
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.5	3.6
		Rate (people)		0.1	5.6
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	0.8	8.5
		Rate (people)		1.3	12.8
All	2012	Line		13.90	27.80
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	0.6	4.6
		Rate (people)		0.4	7.2
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.6	1.8
		Rate (people)		0.7	1.3
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	1.5	6.3
		Rate (people)		1.2	7.4
All	2010	Line		12.82	25.65
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	0.7	2.5
		Rate (people)		0.8	2.3
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	1.4	3.5
		Rate (people)		2.0	4.9
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	3.7	19.5
		Rate (people)		5.2	22.2
All	2008	Line		11.56	23.12
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	1.9	6.6
		Rate (people)		2.8	8.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (San Luís Potosí): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)			
				National lines (new definition)			
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,081	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		14.1	44.4	65.8	76.0
		Rate (people)		15.7	49.0	71.0	80.6
Rural	2014	Line	649	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		36.2	68.6	85.3	93.4
		Rate (people)		36.4	70.3	86.0	93.8
All	2014	Line	1,730	36.89	73.52	110.28	147.05
		Rate (HHs)		22.1	53.1	72.9	82.3
		Rate (people)		23.2	56.7	76.4	85.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,047	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		14.5	43.5	62.0	74.5
		Rate (people)		14.9	49.0	66.7	79.0
Rural	2012	Line	673	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		34.8	66.9	82.2	89.2
		Rate (people)		38.0	71.3	86.8	92.2
All	2012	Line	1,720	33.58	67.48	101.23	134.97
		Rate (HHs)		21.7	51.9	69.2	79.8
		Rate (people)		23.3	57.1	74.0	83.8
Urban	2010	Line	1,187	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		16.1	48.9	65.5	77.1
		Rate (people)		17.2	53.7	71.0	81.6
Rural	2010	Line	640	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		39.5	66.9	79.7	86.6
		Rate (people)		41.5	69.9	82.8	89.6
All	2010	Line	1,827	29.06	60.99	91.48	121.98
		Rate (HHs)		23.9	54.9	70.2	80.3
		Rate (people)		26.0	59.6	75.3	84.5
Urban	2008	Line	1,151	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		12.3	43.8	63.0	74.4
		Rate (people)		13.5	49.1	68.2	79.1
Rural	2008	Line	618	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		32.7	66.2	84.5	89.2
		Rate (people)		37.5	71.9	88.2	91.8
All	2008	Line	1,769	26.01	55.38	83.07	110.76
		Rate (HHs)		19.2	51.4	70.3	79.4
		Rate (people)		22.2	57.3	75.4	83.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (San Luís Potosí): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Intl. 2005 PPP lines | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,081	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	6.9	11.3	33.7	5.2	12.9
		Rate (people)		2.7	7.3	12.6	38.3	5.2	14.5
Rural	2014	Line	649	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		7.8	18.1	28.3	63.4	12.9	33.2
		Rate (people)		9.3	20.2	29.0	65.7	14.5	34.1
All	2014	Line	1,730	13.98	22.37	27.96	55.92	18.81	30.69
		Rate (HHs)		4.6	11.0	17.4	44.4	8.0	20.2
		Rate (people)		5.1	12.0	18.5	48.3	8.6	21.6
Urban	2012	Line	1,047	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	8.9	11.8	34.3	4.3	10.8
		Rate (people)		3.4	8.8	12.6	39.8	4.5	11.2
Rural	2012	Line	673	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		8.8	19.3	28.3	60.5	12.1	25.8
		Rate (people)		9.3	21.7	31.3	66.6	13.1	29.0
All	2012	Line	1,720	12.75	20.40	25.51	51.01	14.75	24.07
		Rate (HHs)		5.2	12.6	17.7	43.6	7.1	16.1
		Rate (people)		5.5	13.5	19.4	49.5	7.6	17.6
Urban	2010	Line	1,187	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		4.6	9.0	12.9	41.0	6.6	15.7
		Rate (people)		4.6	9.6	14.2	46.3	6.8	17.4
Rural	2010	Line	640	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		13.4	27.3	35.1	62.8	22.4	37.9
		Rate (people)		14.1	29.4	38.0	67.2	24.1	41.0
All	2010	Line	1,827	11.57	18.51	23.14	46.28	15.57	25.40
		Rate (HHs)		7.5	15.0	20.2	48.2	11.8	23.0
		Rate (people)		8.0	16.7	22.8	53.9	13.1	26.0
Urban	2008	Line	1,151	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	7.3	10.7	35.3	5.1	13.0
		Rate (people)		2.5	8.1	12.2	40.7	5.2	14.9
Rural	2008	Line	618	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		8.0	21.5	30.0	64.0	14.8	33.6
		Rate (people)		10.3	26.4	35.5	69.9	18.4	39.3
All	2008	Line	1,769	10.69	17.11	21.38	42.77	14.39	23.47
		Rate (HHs)		4.5	12.1	17.2	45.0	8.4	20.0
		Rate (people)		5.3	14.7	20.7	51.3	10.0	23.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (San Luís Potosí): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,081	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		12.3	8.2	22.2	31.3	44.4	69.4
		Rate (people)		13.9	8.8	25.1	35.1	49.9	74.9
Rural	2014	Line	649	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		71.8	61.9	84.4	92.2	95.7	99.5
		Rate (people)		74.6	64.2	85.9	93.3	96.7	99.7
All	2014	Line	1,730	36.36	27.86	49.70	62.93	78.92	138.63
		Rate (HHs)		33.8	27.6	44.7	53.3	62.9	80.3
		Rate (people)		35.9	28.9	47.1	56.2	66.9	83.9
Urban	2012	Line	1,047	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		12.5	9.4	25.8	34.1	43.8	68.3
		Rate (people)		13.4	9.5	29.3	39.4	49.7	73.3
Rural	2012	Line	673	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		69.9	59.1	82.0	88.6	93.3	97.2
		Rate (people)		75.8	65.1	87.1	92.3	95.8	98.5
All	2012	Line	1,720	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		32.9	27.0	45.8	53.5	61.4	78.6
		Rate (people)		36.0	29.7	50.2	58.6	66.4	82.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,187	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		13.6	9.5	29.5	40.5	49.5	71.3
		Rate (people)		15.0	10.1	33.8	45.7	54.9	76.8
Rural	2010	Line	640	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		68.7	60.4	81.1	86.9	90.5	96.1
		Rate (people)		72.3	64.3	84.4	90.2	93.4	97.4
All	2010	Line	1,827	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		31.8	26.3	46.5	55.8	63.0	79.5
		Rate (people)		35.7	29.7	52.1	61.8	68.8	84.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,151	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	8.2	26.9	36.2	47.4	71.6
		Rate (people)		12.6	9.5	30.7	41.8	53.1	77.0
Rural	2008	Line	618	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		70.7	62.3	86.4	90.9	93.8	97.6
		Rate (people)		76.6	68.6	90.0	93.6	95.5	98.5
All	2008	Line	1,769	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		31.2	26.6	47.1	54.7	63.1	80.4
		Rate (people)		35.8	30.9	52.2	60.5	68.5	84.7

Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (San Luís Potosí): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		10.0	16.8	46.3	56.9	67.1
		Rate (people)		12.2	20.2	54.9	65.7	74.8
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		33.9	43.6	66.6	75.9	80.6
		Rate (people)		37.9	48.7	70.1	78.6	82.5
All	2014	Line	19,479	37.96	45.89	73.25	91.56	109.87
		Rate (HHs)		20.7	28.9	55.5	65.5	73.2
		Rate (people)		24.4	33.7	62.1	71.8	78.5
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		10.3	14.9	40.0	52.0	60.9
		Rate (people)		12.0	17.8	45.9	58.1	67.2
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		26.8	36.7	61.8	72.9	84.4
		Rate (people)		35.4	44.4	70.1	79.5	89.6
All	2012	Line	9,002	34.92	42.18	67.22	84.02	100.82
		Rate (HHs)		18.0	25.2	50.3	61.8	72.0
		Rate (people)		23.6	31.0	58.0	68.7	78.3
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		11.9	17.5	37.9	48.4	59.0
		Rate (people)		12.2	20.2	41.8	52.9	62.7
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		37.5	44.4	66.0	77.7	81.0
		Rate (people)		42.7	50.1	71.5	82.9	85.6
All	2010	Line	27,655	30.96	37.46	59.90	74.87	89.85
		Rate (HHs)		22.2	28.3	49.2	60.2	67.9
		Rate (people)		25.7	33.5	55.0	66.2	72.9
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		10.3	15.6	31.8	41.6	51.1
		Rate (people)		12.8	17.8	35.6	46.3	56.1
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		30.7	35.6	61.8	69.2	74.8
		Rate (people)		37.3	44.6	69.8	75.9	79.4
All	2008	Line	29,468	27.79	33.58	53.59	66.99	80.39
		Rate (HHs)		19.5	24.7	45.4	54.2	61.8
		Rate (people)		24.5	30.6	51.9	60.4	67.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (San Luís Potosí): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.4	4.9
		Rate (people)		0.2	5.8
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		3.5	17.9
		Rate (people)		4.7	19.9
All	2014	Line	19,479	14.19	28.39
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	10.7
		Rate (people)		2.3	12.5
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	3.1
		Rate (people)		1.5	2.3
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	14.9
		Rate (people)		3.6	20.2
All	2012	Line	9,002	12.86	25.71
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	8.6
		Rate (people)		2.6	11.2
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	5.1
		Rate (people)		0.9	5.2
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		6.9	27.2
		Rate (people)		7.1	31.0
All	2010	Line	27,655	11.84	23.69
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	14.0
		Rate (people)		3.6	16.7
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	6.6
		Rate (people)		1.9	8.1
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		3.0	20.2
		Rate (people)		3.5	25.3
All	2008	Line	29,468	10.79	21.58
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	12.8
		Rate (people)		2.7	16.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sinaloa): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,393	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		11.5	39.5	59.9	71.0
		Rate (people)		12.1	44.1	65.2	75.8
Rural	2014	Line	496	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		16.5	46.2	67.8	78.8
		Rate (people)		17.0	52.0	73.9	83.5
All	2014	Line	1,889	38.03	76.33	114.50	152.66
		Rate (HHs)		12.8	41.2	62.0	73.0
		Rate (people)		13.5	46.3	67.6	77.9
Urban	2012	Line	1,321	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		10.4	35.8	58.6	71.6
		Rate (people)		11.3	39.3	63.6	76.3
Rural	2012	Line	486	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		17.0	47.2	66.9	79.1
		Rate (people)		19.0	51.6	70.9	82.7
All	2012	Line	1,807	34.57	70.02	105.04	140.05
		Rate (HHs)		12.2	38.9	60.8	73.6
		Rate (people)		13.4	42.6	65.6	78.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,291	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		13.0	41.1	61.1	74.5
		Rate (people)		13.6	44.3	64.8	78.1
Rural	2010	Line	555	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		15.2	41.1	62.6	75.6
		Rate (people)		15.6	44.4	67.6	79.4
All	2010	Line	1,846	29.95	63.35	95.03	126.70
		Rate (HHs)		13.5	41.1	61.5	74.8
		Rate (people)		14.2	44.4	65.6	78.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,234	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		5.2	29.4	52.7	66.2
		Rate (people)		5.9	32.9	57.3	70.2
Rural	2008	Line	541	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		12.8	41.5	62.7	76.1
		Rate (people)		14.0	44.0	66.2	80.5
All	2008	Line	1,775	26.79	57.55	86.32	115.09
		Rate (HHs)		7.2	32.7	55.4	68.9
		Rate (people)		8.1	35.9	59.7	73.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sinaloa): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,393	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	5.4	8.3	29.6	3.7	10.0
		Rate (people)		2.2	5.7	8.8	34.1	3.8	10.9
Rural	2014	Line	496	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	8.1	12.8	39.6	6.4	14.9
		Rate (people)		3.6	8.6	13.2	44.9	6.8	15.7
All	2014	Line	1,889	14.41	23.06	28.82	57.64	19.39	31.64
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	6.1	9.5	32.2	4.4	11.3
		Rate (people)		2.6	6.5	10.0	37.1	4.6	12.2
Urban	2012	Line	1,321	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	5.1	8.0	27.2	2.8	7.1
		Rate (people)		2.2	5.3	8.8	31.1	2.7	7.6
Rural	2012	Line	486	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		3.2	8.8	11.8	41.3	4.4	10.6
		Rate (people)		3.4	9.6	13.4	46.1	4.7	11.7
All	2012	Line	1,807	13.14	21.03	26.29	52.58	15.21	24.81
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	6.1	9.1	31.0	3.3	8.0
		Rate (people)		2.5	6.4	10.0	35.2	3.3	8.7
Urban	2010	Line	1,291	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		4.2	7.6	11.3	30.9	5.8	13.2
		Rate (people)		3.6	7.2	11.7	33.7	5.4	14.0
Rural	2010	Line	555	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		4.2	8.7	12.6	37.5	6.6	14.4
		Rate (people)		4.3	8.9	13.1	41.3	6.6	15.4
All	2010	Line	1,846	11.92	19.08	23.84	47.69	16.04	26.17
		Rate (HHs)		4.2	7.9	11.6	32.6	6.0	13.5
		Rate (people)		3.8	7.7	12.1	35.8	5.7	14.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,234	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	3.3	4.7	21.4	2.3	5.7
		Rate (people)		1.5	3.9	5.7	24.7	2.6	6.9
Rural	2008	Line	541	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	7.1	11.5	38.3	5.1	14.3
		Rate (people)		3.2	7.9	12.8	42.2	6.1	16.7
All	2008	Line	1,775	11.01	17.62	22.03	44.06	14.82	24.18
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	4.3	6.6	26.0	3.0	8.0
		Rate (people)		2.0	5.0	7.6	29.5	3.6	9.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sinaloa): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,393	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		9.2	6.1	19.4	28.0	37.5	64.1
		Rate (people)		9.8	6.3	22.2	32.5	43.1	70.1
Rural	2014	Line	496	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		51.0	37.1	68.0	75.7	81.5	93.5
		Rate (people)		58.3	42.0	74.5	81.7	86.8	95.8
All	2014	Line	1,889	37.75	28.93	51.60	65.33	81.93	143.93
		Rate (HHs)		20.1	14.2	32.0	40.5	49.0	71.8
		Rate (people)		23.0	16.0	36.4	45.9	55.0	77.1
Urban	2012	Line	1,321	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		8.8	6.1	19.7	27.0	38.0	65.0
		Rate (people)		9.8	6.2	23.1	30.8	43.2	70.7
Rural	2012	Line	486	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		48.2	39.3	69.0	77.9	85.4	94.6
		Rate (people)		53.0	43.2	73.8	82.2	89.4	97.0
All	2012	Line	1,807	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		19.4	15.0	33.0	40.7	50.8	73.0
		Rate (people)		21.6	16.3	36.9	44.8	55.8	77.9
Urban	2010	Line	1,291	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		11.6	7.8	21.9	30.5	41.9	68.2
		Rate (people)		12.1	7.4	24.5	33.3	45.9	72.5
Rural	2010	Line	555	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		43.5	34.4	65.4	74.5	83.7	93.6
		Rate (people)		47.6	37.9	71.3	79.7	87.8	95.9
All	2010	Line	1,846	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		20.0	14.8	33.3	42.0	52.9	74.9
		Rate (people)		21.8	15.7	37.2	45.9	57.3	78.9
Urban	2008	Line	1,234	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		4.7	3.6	13.1	22.1	35.3	62.3
		Rate (people)		5.7	4.3	15.4	25.5	40.0	67.4
Rural	2008	Line	541	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		45.8	36.5	67.5	77.9	83.5	93.9
		Rate (people)		50.6	40.4	71.9	82.5	88.1	95.9
All	2008	Line	1,775	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		15.8	12.4	27.8	37.2	48.3	70.8
		Rate (people)		17.9	14.1	30.7	41.0	53.1	75.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sinaloa): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		7.1	13.7	31.9	44.8	54.3
		Rate (people)		8.7	16.9	38.5	51.8	61.9
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		11.9	17.6	44.1	55.6	62.7
		Rate (people)		14.7	22.1	52.5	63.6	70.9
All	2014	Line	19,479	38.68	46.86	75.09	93.87	112.64
		Rate (HHs)		8.9	15.2	36.6	48.9	57.5
		Rate (people)		11.2	19.1	44.2	56.6	65.6
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		8.4	12.9	28.1	44.5	56.8
		Rate (people)		10.1	15.0	32.4	50.1	62.2
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		19.6	23.3	40.5	54.6	69.2
		Rate (people)		22.9	26.8	44.4	57.7	72.1
All	2012	Line	9,002	35.56	43.04	68.85	86.06	103.28
		Rate (HHs)		13.3	17.5	33.6	48.9	62.3
		Rate (people)		15.6	20.1	37.6	53.4	66.5
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		7.8	14.2	34.5	45.8	56.2
		Rate (people)		7.7	16.5	39.7	51.7	62.7
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		6.7	11.4	34.8	49.5	57.3
		Rate (people)		8.9	15.4	43.5	60.2	66.9
All	2010	Line	27,655	31.32	37.95	60.84	76.05	91.26
		Rate (HHs)		7.4	13.1	34.6	47.3	56.7
		Rate (people)		8.2	16.1	41.2	55.1	64.4
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	6.7	26.0	35.8	47.4
		Rate (people)		4.7	7.6	31.2	42.1	54.3
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		22.8	26.8	43.9	52.5	61.5
		Rate (people)		29.2	33.7	51.7	58.6	68.8
All	2008	Line	29,468	28.34	34.33	55.02	68.77	82.52
		Rate (HHs)		11.3	14.7	33.2	42.4	53.0
		Rate (people)		14.7	18.3	39.6	48.9	60.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sinaloa): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	3.4
		Rate (people)		0.1	3.9
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		1.2	6.9
		Rate (people)		1.0	7.8
All	2014	Line	19,479	14.46	28.93
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	4.7
		Rate (people)		0.5	5.5
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	0.6
		Rate (people)		0.0	0.7
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	12.9
		Rate (people)		3.2	15.0
All	2012	Line	9,002	13.09	26.19
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	6.0
		Rate (people)		1.4	6.9
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	3.6
		Rate (people)		1.3	3.9
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	1.7
		Rate (people)		0.0	2.5
All	2010	Line	27,655	11.98	23.97
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	2.8
		Rate (people)		0.8	3.3
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		1.3	2.5
		Rate (people)		2.2	3.6
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	15.3
		Rate (people)		3.8	20.2
All	2008	Line	29,468	11.00	22.01
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	7.6
		Rate (people)		2.9	10.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sonora): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,558	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		8.7	32.6	51.3	64.2
		Rate (people)		9.5	36.6	56.2	69.4
Rural	2014	Line	270	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		10.6	33.4	59.5	75.3
		Rate (people)		11.0	37.0	64.8	81.4
All	2014	Line	1,828	39.67	80.41	120.62	160.82
		Rate (HHs)		9.0	32.7	52.4	65.7
		Rate (people)		9.7	36.6	57.4	71.1
Urban	2012	Line	1,548	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		8.7	29.2	49.7	61.5
		Rate (people)		9.2	32.6	54.6	65.8
Rural	2012	Line	264	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		16.8	38.4	57.5	70.2
		Rate (people)		15.8	41.6	63.4	76.9
All	2012	Line	1,812	35.99	73.70	110.55	147.40
		Rate (HHs)		9.9	30.6	50.8	62.7
		Rate (people)		10.2	33.8	55.8	67.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,351	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		9.4	35.2	54.5	68.3
		Rate (people)		10.3	39.8	59.7	73.0
Rural	2010	Line	521	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		14.7	39.8	61.9	77.6
		Rate (people)		14.7	41.5	65.6	81.0
All	2010	Line	1,872	31.24	66.80	100.21	133.61
		Rate (HHs)		10.1	35.8	55.5	69.5
		Rate (people)		10.9	40.0	60.5	74.1
Urban	2008	Line	2,057	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		6.0	26.2	45.2	59.9
		Rate (people)		7.1	29.5	51.0	65.5
Rural	2008	Line	455	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		11.3	37.9	59.7	74.2
		Rate (people)		12.0	43.1	66.3	79.9
All	2008	Line	2,512	27.94	60.71	91.06	121.41
		Rate (HHs)		6.7	27.8	47.1	61.9
		Rate (people)		7.8	31.4	53.1	67.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sonora): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,558	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		1.4	3.4	6.0	23.5	2.1	7.4
		Rate (people)		1.5	3.9	6.9	27.7	2.3	8.5
Rural	2014	Line	270	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	6.6	9.7	28.7	3.7	9.7
		Rate (people)		2.6	7.8	10.5	33.6	5.0	10.5
All	2014	Line	1,828	15.03	24.06	30.07	60.14	20.23	33.01
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	3.8	6.5	24.2	2.3	7.7
		Rate (people)		1.6	4.5	7.4	28.5	2.7	8.8
Urban	2012	Line	1,548	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.8	5.4	6.7	22.0	3.1	6.4
		Rate (people)		2.8	5.8	7.4	25.7	3.1	7.0
Rural	2012	Line	264	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	8.1	11.3	33.7	4.4	10.1
		Rate (people)		3.4	9.4	12.0	36.0	4.8	10.8
All	2012	Line	1,812	13.71	21.94	27.42	54.84	15.86	25.88
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	5.8	7.4	23.7	3.3	6.9
		Rate (people)		2.9	6.3	8.0	27.1	3.3	7.5
Urban	2010	Line	1,351	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	5.5	8.4	26.6	4.2	9.2
		Rate (people)		2.7	6.2	9.4	30.8	4.7	10.2
Rural	2010	Line	521	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	8.4	11.7	34.6	4.8	13.2
		Rate (people)		3.9	8.6	12.7	36.7	4.9	14.2
All	2010	Line	1,872	12.44	19.90	24.88	49.75	16.74	27.31
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	5.9	8.9	27.6	4.3	9.7
		Rate (people)		2.9	6.5	9.9	31.6	4.7	10.8
Urban	2008	Line	2,057	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		0.9	3.5	5.5	19.3	2.3	6.7
		Rate (people)		0.9	4.4	6.7	22.6	2.7	8.1
Rural	2008	Line	455	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	3.7	7.8	34.9	2.7	11.6
		Rate (people)		1.9	4.7	9.3	39.7	3.4	12.8
All	2008	Line	2,512	11.49	18.38	22.97	45.94	15.45	25.22
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	3.6	5.8	21.4	2.3	7.4
		Rate (people)		1.0	4.4	7.1	25.0	2.8	8.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sonora): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line | Percentile-based lines | | | | |
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,558	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		6.9	3.9	14.4	22.0	31.9	57.6
		Rate (people)		8.1	4.6	16.9	25.9	36.7	63.9
Rural	2014	Line	270	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		38.4	27.9	61.3	72.6	82.2	94.5
		Rate (people)		43.3	32.5	68.9	80.1	90.0	97.4
All	2014	Line	1,828	39.77	30.47	54.36	68.83	86.31	151.63
		Rate (HHs)		11.1	7.1	20.6	28.8	38.6	62.5
		Rate (people)		13.0	8.5	24.1	33.5	44.2	68.6
Urban	2012	Line	1,548	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		7.1	5.5	15.5	21.9	30.0	55.8
		Rate (people)		7.7	5.9	17.8	25.6	34.1	61.4
Rural	2012	Line	264	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		41.5	31.6	61.0	68.2	80.1	91.1
		Rate (people)		45.9	33.0	69.0	75.7	86.4	94.3
All	2012	Line	1,812	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		12.1	9.3	22.1	28.7	37.2	60.9
		Rate (people)		13.1	9.7	25.0	32.6	41.4	66.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,351	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		8.7	5.6	17.3	26.3	36.9	60.6
		Rate (people)		9.8	6.3	20.0	30.4	42.7	66.4
Rural	2010	Line	521	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		43.7	30.5	65.3	76.9	84.7	95.1
		Rate (people)		47.6	32.2	70.5	81.4	88.0	96.6
All	2010	Line	1,872	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		13.3	8.8	23.6	33.0	43.2	65.1
		Rate (people)		15.0	9.9	27.1	37.6	49.0	70.6
Urban	2008	Line	2,057	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		5.7	4.0	13.4	20.1	29.7	55.1
		Rate (people)		6.9	4.8	16.2	23.4	34.1	61.6
Rural	2008	Line	455	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		42.1	31.9	64.9	75.5	81.2	92.1
		Rate (people)		49.9	37.1	72.1	82.4	87.0	94.3
All	2008	Line	2,512	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		10.6	7.8	20.3	27.6	36.7	60.2
		Rate (people)		12.9	9.3	24.0	31.7	41.5	66.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sonora): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | |
| | | | | Food | Lower | Upper | | |
						100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		9.6	15.2	36.4	47.8	57.8
		Rate (people)		12.3	18.6	41.6	54.2	64.8
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		16.4	23.1	36.1	47.2	56.5
		Rate (people)		20.4	29.7	45.0	55.8	65.5
All	2014	Line	19,479	40.48	49.30	79.70	99.63	119.56
		Rate (HHs)		11.3	17.1	36.3	47.6	57.5
		Rate (people)		14.3	21.4	42.4	54.6	65.0
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		7.2	13.7	34.0	45.4	53.1
		Rate (people)		7.8	14.6	37.0	52.0	60.3
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		15.9	20.1	40.5	51.2	67.0
		Rate (people)		19.8	25.3	48.2	54.6	71.9
All	2012	Line	9,002	37.82	46.12	74.69	93.37	112.04
		Rate (HHs)		9.0	15.1	35.4	46.6	56.1
		Rate (people)		10.3	16.8	39.4	52.6	62.7
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		8.6	14.3	36.4	44.4	54.8
		Rate (people)		10.0	17.5	43.2	51.5	61.6
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		15.5	22.2	44.2	53.5	61.5
		Rate (people)		17.2	26.0	50.1	61.2	70.1
All	2010	Line	27,655	32.04	38.92	62.67	78.33	94.00
		Rate (HHs)		10.6	16.6	38.7	47.1	56.7
		Rate (people)		12.3	20.2	45.4	54.6	64.3
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		5.8	9.3	23.5	34.4	43.1
		Rate (people)		7.2	11.4	27.8	40.4	49.5
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		13.0	17.4	38.2	48.1	57.7
		Rate (people)		16.3	21.4	45.7	55.8	64.8
All	2008	Line	29,468	29.82	36.34	58.81	73.51	88.22
		Rate (HHs)		7.4	11.0	26.7	37.4	46.3
		Rate (people)		9.3	13.7	31.8	43.8	52.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Sonora): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	4.7
		Rate (people)		0.8	6.4
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	5.4
		Rate (people)		1.1	6.2
All	2014	Line	19,479	15.14	30.27
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	4.9
		Rate (people)		0.9	6.4
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	3.9
		Rate (people)		0.0	4.5
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	8.9
		Rate (people)		2.4	10.7
All	2012	Line	9,002	13.95	27.90
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	5.0
		Rate (people)		0.5	5.8
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		1.2	4.5
		Rate (people)		1.3	5.3
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	6.0
		Rate (people)		3.6	8.1
All	2010	Line	27,655	12.26	24.51
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	4.9
		Rate (people)		2.1	6.2
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.2	2.8
		Rate (people)		0.2	3.6
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	7.2
		Rate (people)		0.4	9.0
All	2008	Line	29,468	11.58	23.16
		Rate (HHs)		0.2	3.8
		Rate (people)		0.3	4.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tabasco): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | *n* | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,120	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		14.9	46.7	65.3	75.9
		Rate (people)		16.6	51.8	70.3	80.0
Rural	2014	Line	765	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		17.2	48.4	72.8	82.1
		Rate (people)		19.6	52.0	77.0	85.5
All	2014	Line	1,885	36.09	71.53	107.30	143.06
		Rate (HHs)		15.9	47.4	68.4	78.4
		Rate (people)		17.9	51.9	73.1	82.3
Urban	2012	Line	1,163	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		16.4	41.4	58.2	69.7
		Rate (people)		18.6	45.8	63.3	74.2
Rural	2012	Line	631	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		29.4	59.1	76.9	85.0
		Rate (people)		30.3	62.0	79.4	87.6
All	2012	Line	1,794	32.88	65.67	98.51	131.35
		Rate (HHs)		21.7	48.5	65.7	75.8
		Rate (people)		23.6	52.7	70.2	79.9
Urban	2010	Line	1,174	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		19.6	51.2	68.2	76.9
		Rate (people)		22.2	56.6	74.4	81.3
Rural	2010	Line	649	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		20.4	62.3	81.9	90.6
		Rate (people)		22.6	67.4	86.0	93.3
All	2010	Line	1,823	28.43	59.30	88.95	118.60
		Rate (HHs)		20.0	55.7	73.8	82.5
		Rate (people)		22.4	61.2	79.3	86.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,099	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		20.4	49.6	66.7	77.7
		Rate (people)		22.4	54.2	71.4	81.5
Rural	2008	Line	654	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		26.6	58.6	76.5	85.6
		Rate (people)		28.2	59.8	78.4	87.5
All	2008	Line	1,753	25.45	53.84	80.75	107.67
		Rate (HHs)		22.9	53.3	70.7	80.9
		Rate (people)		24.9	56.6	74.4	84.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tabasco): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,120	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	7.5	10.1	37.1	4.2	13.4
		Rate (people)		2.0	8.1	11.5	41.8	4.4	15.2
Rural	2014	Line	765	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	7.3	12.5	43.2	5.2	14.9
		Rate (people)		3.0	9.0	14.8	48.0	6.3	17.7
All	2014	Line	1,885	13.68	21.88	27.35	54.70	18.40	30.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	7.4	11.1	39.6	4.6	14.0
		Rate (people)		2.5	8.5	12.9	44.5	5.2	16.3
Urban	2012	Line	1,163	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		5.7	9.6	13.9	33.8	6.6	12.6
		Rate (people)		6.5	11.5	16.2	38.6	7.5	14.7
Rural	2012	Line	631	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		6.1	15.8	24.1	55.0	9.3	21.4
		Rate (people)		6.4	17.2	25.3	58.5	9.9	22.7
All	2012	Line	1,794	12.47	19.96	24.95	49.90	14.43	23.55
		Rate (HHs)		5.9	12.1	18.0	42.3	7.7	16.2
		Rate (people)		6.5	14.0	20.1	47.1	8.5	18.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,174	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	9.6	15.4	41.8	6.9	19.7
		Rate (people)		3.8	11.3	17.7	46.6	7.5	22.5
Rural	2010	Line	649	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.6	9.1	17.4	57.4	5.3	21.0
		Rate (people)		2.2	10.3	19.5	63.1	5.5	24.3
All	2010	Line	1,823	11.32	18.11	22.64	45.27	15.23	24.85
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	9.4	16.2	48.1	6.3	20.2
		Rate (people)		3.1	10.9	18.5	53.6	6.6	23.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,099	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		7.0	13.8	18.6	42.2	10.3	20.4
		Rate (people)		7.2	15.0	21.0	46.5	11.5	23.2
Rural	2008	Line	654	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		7.8	16.0	24.5	54.9	10.9	28.2
		Rate (people)		7.4	17.2	26.4	57.1	11.5	30.9
All	2008	Line	1,753	10.46	16.74	20.92	41.84	14.08	22.97
		Rate (HHs)		7.3	14.7	21.0	47.3	10.6	23.6
		Rate (people)		7.3	15.9	23.3	51.0	11.5	26.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tabasco): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,120	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		12.6	8.2	25.3	34.6	45.9	70.0
		Rate (people)		14.5	8.8	28.6	39.0	51.6	75.3
Rural	2014	Line	765	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		52.1	40.3	72.9	81.5	87.8	96.5
		Rate (people)		57.5	44.4	77.9	85.5	90.6	98.0
All	2014	Line	1,885	35.37	27.11	48.36	61.22	76.78	134.88
		Rate (HHs)		28.9	21.5	44.9	53.9	63.2	80.9
		Rate (people)		32.9	24.0	49.7	58.9	68.3	85.0
Urban	2012	Line	1,163	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		14.3	10.9	25.3	33.7	42.5	64.7
		Rate (people)		16.6	12.7	29.1	38.5	47.5	70.3
Rural	2012	Line	631	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		62.8	52.7	78.0	86.0	89.8	97.5
		Rate (people)		66.2	56.1	80.7	88.7	91.9	98.0
All	2012	Line	1,794	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		33.8	27.7	46.5	54.7	61.5	77.9
		Rate (people)		37.8	31.3	51.2	59.9	66.5	82.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,174	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		16.3	10.0	31.5	41.4	52.6	71.8
		Rate (people)		19.2	11.8	35.9	46.2	58.7	77.8
Rural	2010	Line	649	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		66.2	52.0	83.0	90.8	93.9	97.8
		Rate (people)		71.9	57.9	87.7	93.7	95.8	98.4
All	2010	Line	1,823	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		36.7	27.1	52.5	61.5	69.4	82.4
		Rate (people)		41.7	31.4	58.0	66.5	74.5	86.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,099	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		18.6	15.7	33.5	43.2	52.0	74.4
		Rate (people)		21.0	17.2	36.6	47.6	56.8	79.1
Rural	2008	Line	654	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		62.7	53.0	80.3	87.0	92.1	98.0
		Rate (people)		64.9	55.3	82.5	89.1	93.4	98.6
All	2008	Line	1,753	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		36.5	30.8	52.4	61.0	68.3	84.0
		Rate (people)		39.7	33.5	56.2	65.3	72.4	87.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tabasco): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
				Food	Lower	Upper		
						100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		10.9	16.6	38.2	50.2	59.1
		Rate (people)		13.0	19.7	44.2	55.6	64.5
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		14.3	20.9	46.6	60.9	70.8
		Rate (people)		17.8	25.6	52.6	66.7	76.5
All	2014	Line	19,479	35.83	43.00	67.78	84.72	101.66
		Rate (HHs)		13.1	19.4	43.7	57.2	66.7
		Rate (people)		16.2	23.6	49.8	63.0	72.5
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		7.5	10.4	23.9	33.8	60.1
		Rate (people)		11.2	14.6	25.0	36.7	67.2
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		23.1	30.6	55.6	65.0	73.4
		Rate (people)		26.4	34.8	58.7	66.6	74.8
All	2012	Line	9,002	32.84	39.35	61.85	77.31	92.77
		Rate (HHs)		17.8	23.7	44.7	54.3	68.8
		Rate (people)		21.9	28.8	48.8	57.8	72.5
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	16.4	43.9	52.3	62.6
		Rate (people)		14.5	21.1	54.2	61.7	70.6
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	22.9	50.7	67.7	74.3
		Rate (people)		15.5	29.1	59.8	74.3	79.8
All	2010	Line	27,655	28.75	34.47	54.25	67.81	81.37
		Rate (HHs)		11.1	20.8	48.5	62.8	70.6
		Rate (people)		15.2	26.6	58.1	70.4	77.0
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	12.2	37.9	49.7	59.6
		Rate (people)		7.7	14.1	41.8	53.0	64.2
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		23.2	29.4	52.4	63.7	70.6
		Rate (people)		29.3	36.4	58.4	68.9	75.8
All	2008	Line	29,468	26.26	31.51	49.68	62.10	74.51
		Rate (HHs)		17.4	23.4	47.3	58.8	66.7
		Rate (people)		22.1	29.0	52.9	63.6	72.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tabasco): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.9	5.8
		Rate (people)		1.1	6.8
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	6.8
		Rate (people)		0.9	8.7
All	2014	Line	19,479	13.39	26.79
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	6.5
		Rate (people)		0.9	8.1
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.0	3.0
		Rate (people)		0.0	4.2
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	12.2
		Rate (people)		2.5	15.8
All	2012	Line	9,002	12.07	24.14
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	9.1
		Rate (people)		1.8	12.4
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	6.6
		Rate (people)		3.0	8.3
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		0.3	5.0
		Rate (people)		0.4	7.3
All	2010	Line	27,655	11.00	22.00
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	5.5
		Rate (people)		1.2	7.6
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	3.4
		Rate (people)		0.5	4.0
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	14.7
		Rate (people)		1.2	17.7
All	2008	Line	29,468	10.20	20.39
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	10.7
		Rate (people)		1.0	13.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tamaulipas): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | *n* | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | |
| | | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,486	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		13.9	43.4	63.0	75.0
		Rate (people)		14.8	48.7	68.9	80.0
Rural	2014	Line	224	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		22.5	48.5	69.8	81.0
		Rate (people)		26.1	52.6	72.0	83.3
All	2014	Line	1,710	39.89	80.96	121.44	161.92
		Rate (HHs)		15.0	44.1	63.9	75.7
		Rate (people)		16.1	49.1	69.3	80.4
Urban	2012	Line	1,369	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		12.0	41.3	61.8	74.1
		Rate (people)		13.6	45.9	67.5	79.8
Rural	2012	Line	221	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		21.0	52.0	72.5	80.3
		Rate (people)		23.9	56.1	77.7	84.1
All	2012	Line	1,590	36.19	74.20	111.30	148.40
		Rate (HHs)		13.0	42.5	63.0	74.8
		Rate (people)		14.9	47.2	68.7	80.3
Urban	2010	Line	1,415	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		11.4	41.8	62.8	74.2
		Rate (people)		13.6	47.1	68.2	78.1
Rural	2010	Line	262	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		17.7	51.0	71.8	79.4
		Rate (people)		21.0	57.2	75.5	81.7
All	2010	Line	1,677	31.42	67.26	100.89	134.52
		Rate (HHs)		12.2	42.9	63.9	74.8
		Rate (people)		14.5	48.3	69.1	78.6
Urban	2008	Line	1,449	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		10.0	35.8	58.2	72.2
		Rate (people)		11.5	39.4	63.3	76.9
Rural	2008	Line	259	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		18.5	53.2	72.9	84.2
		Rate (people)		19.1	57.9	78.4	87.4
All	2008	Line	1,708	28.09	61.13	91.69	122.25
		Rate (HHs)		11.0	37.7	59.9	73.5
		Rate (people)		12.4	41.7	65.1	78.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tamaulipas): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,486	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	6.0	10.0	32.6	4.1	11.9
		Rate (people)		1.9	6.5	11.3	37.9	4.2	13.5
Rural	2014	Line	224	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		6.3	12.4	16.3	42.2	8.9	19.3
		Rate (people)		6.1	13.7	19.5	47.4	10.0	23.4
All	2014	Line	1,710	15.12	24.19	30.24	60.47	20.34	33.19
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	6.9	10.8	33.8	4.7	12.9
		Rate (people)		2.4	7.4	12.3	39.1	4.9	14.7
Urban	2012	Line	1,369	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	5.5	9.2	30.5	3.1	7.8
		Rate (people)		2.3	6.5	11.2	35.1	3.5	9.3
Rural	2012	Line	221	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	7.7	14.8	46.8	3.1	12.8
		Rate (people)		3.1	10.5	17.8	50.8	3.1	16.3
All	2012	Line	1,590	13.79	22.06	27.58	55.15	15.95	26.03
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	5.8	9.8	32.4	3.1	8.4
		Rate (people)		2.4	7.0	12.0	37.0	3.5	10.1
Urban	2010	Line	1,415	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	5.4	9.7	31.4	3.8	11.2
		Rate (people)		2.1	5.7	11.4	36.7	4.1	13.8
Rural	2010	Line	262	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	8.5	14.1	47.9	6.3	15.9
		Rate (people)		1.6	11.0	18.2	54.3	7.5	19.9
All	2010	Line	1,677	12.51	20.01	25.01	50.03	16.83	27.46
		Rate (HHs)		2.1	5.8	10.2	33.4	4.1	11.8
		Rate (people)		2.0	6.4	12.2	38.9	4.5	14.5
Urban	2008	Line	1,449	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	5.4	8.9	27.8	3.9	10.9
		Rate (people)		2.2	5.7	10.3	32.2	3.7	12.9
Rural	2008	Line	259	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	7.9	12.7	48.4	5.6	17.8
		Rate (people)		3.1	10.6	15.1	54.1	6.8	19.5
All	2008	Line	1,708	11.55	18.48	23.10	46.19	15.54	25.35
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	5.7	9.4	30.1	4.1	11.7
		Rate (people)		2.3	6.3	10.9	34.9	4.1	13.7

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tamaulipas): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,486	10.8	6.9	22.0	30.7	42.1	67.8
		Rate (people)		12.2	7.5	25.8	35.9	48.5	74.5
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	224	49.0	41.3	69.9	78.4	83.8	96.1
		Rate (people)		54.3	46.6	73.2	80.6	86.6	96.5
All	2014	Line		40.04	30.68	54.73	69.29	86.90	152.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,710	15.8	11.3	28.2	36.9	47.5	71.5
		Rate (people)		17.4	12.3	31.6	41.3	53.2	77.2
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,369	9.7	6.2	20.5	30.4	42.1	68.7
		Rate (people)		12.0	7.4	23.8	34.9	47.4	75.2
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	221	57.2	43.0	73.0	79.5	85.9	94.3
		Rate (people)		62.4	46.8	78.5	84.8	88.6	96.7
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,590	15.0	10.4	26.4	35.9	47.1	71.6
		Rate (people)		18.2	12.2	30.5	41.0	52.4	77.8
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,415	10.2	6.0	20.3	30.2	41.9	67.7
		Rate (people)		12.4	6.5	24.1	35.2	48.6	73.2
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	262	56.5	43.3	73.4	81.8	89.2	95.9
		Rate (people)		63.4	48.6	77.6	86.0	92.8	98.4
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,677	15.6	10.3	26.5	36.2	47.5	71.0
		Rate (people)		18.7	11.6	30.6	41.4	54.0	76.3
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,449	9.2	6.4	20.3	28.5	40.3	66.7
		Rate (people)		10.7	7.0	24.1	33.1	45.8	72.4
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	259	57.5	47.2	77.3	84.3	91.5	96.3
		Rate (people)		63.5	53.0	81.8	87.4	93.1	97.4
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,708	14.6	11.0	26.7	34.8	46.1	70.1
		Rate (people)		17.2	12.6	31.2	39.7	51.6	75.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tamaulipas): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | |
				Food	Lower	100%	Upper 125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		13.3	20.0	41.3	56.5	65.3
		Rate (people)		16.9	24.8	49.4	64.8	72.8
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		22.6	29.3	46.1	56.4	68.7
		Rate (people)		27.6	34.6	51.1	60.5	72.1
All	2014	Line	19,479	41.19	50.26	81.51	101.89	122.27
		Rate (HHs)		15.1	21.8	42.2	56.5	65.9
		Rate (people)		18.8	26.6	49.7	64.0	72.7
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		7.1	13.4	38.8	50.8	56.8
		Rate (people)		10.0	18.0	47.2	59.4	65.7
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		23.8	33.1	54.5	73.9	75.6
		Rate (people)		31.2	42.1	60.8	83.8	84.3
All	2012	Line	9,002	37.92	46.25	74.95	93.68	112.42
		Rate (HHs)		10.2	17.1	41.7	55.1	60.3
		Rate (people)		14.2	22.8	49.9	64.2	69.4
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		8.8	13.3	42.3	54.2	63.5
		Rate (people)		11.8	16.9	50.0	61.4	70.0
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		21.3	32.4	53.3	58.9	67.1
		Rate (people)		24.8	36.4	61.0	65.2	71.9
All	2010	Line	27,655	33.29	40.61	65.87	82.34	98.80
		Rate (HHs)		11.2	17.1	44.5	55.1	64.2
		Rate (people)		14.2	20.4	52.0	62.1	70.4
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		5.6	9.9	32.0	44.7	55.5
		Rate (people)		7.0	12.6	38.8	51.9	62.3
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		21.5	29.3	44.5	56.1	67.7
		Rate (people)		27.6	35.9	55.0	65.7	73.6
All	2008	Line	29,468	30.20	36.85	59.78	74.72	89.66
		Rate (HHs)		8.4	13.3	34.2	46.7	57.6
		Rate (people)		10.7	16.8	41.7	54.3	64.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tamaulipas): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines $1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	1.0	7.7
		Rate (people)		0.8	8.3
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	3.3	11.1
		Rate (people)		3.3	14.2
All	2014	Line		15.40	30.80
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	1.4	8.3
		Rate (people)		1.3	9.4
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	0.4	0.9
		Rate (people)		1.3	2.1
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	4.8	15.0
		Rate (people)		5.9	21.5
All	2012	Line		13.99	27.97
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	1.2	3.5
		Rate (people)		2.2	6.0
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.0	4.3
		Rate (people)		0.0	5.0
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	2.7	14.9
		Rate (people)		2.5	16.8
All	2010	Line		12.73	25.47
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	0.5	6.3
		Rate (people)		0.5	7.2
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	0.3	2.5
		Rate (people)		0.3	2.8
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	3.3	10.9
		Rate (people)		5.8	14.3
All	2008	Line		11.73	23.45
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	0.8	4.0
		Rate (people)		1.3	4.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tlaxcala): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,448	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		27.9	67.4	82.7	90.0
		Rate (people)		29.6	71.0	85.5	92.2
Rural	2014	Line	380	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		15.9	45.7	68.2	81.2
		Rate (people)		16.9	48.9	71.7	84.2
All	2014	Line	1,828	38.90	78.50	117.76	157.01
		Rate (HHs)		25.4	62.9	79.7	88.2
		Rate (people)		27.1	66.6	82.7	90.6
Urban	2012	Line	1,425	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		24.9	62.8	80.2	87.8
		Rate (people)		25.6	66.7	84.1	90.7
Rural	2012	Line	375	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		18.2	48.5	71.7	82.3
		Rate (people)		19.7	53.0	75.3	84.3
All	2012	Line	1,800	35.32	71.97	107.95	143.94
		Rate (HHs)		23.6	59.9	78.5	86.7
		Rate (people)		24.4	63.9	82.3	89.4
Urban	2010	Line	1,406	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		27.5	66.3	81.4	88.9
		Rate (people)		28.5	70.0	84.6	91.5
Rural	2010	Line	382	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		21.8	57.5	76.1	87.5
		Rate (people)		20.4	58.5	78.4	89.9
All	2010	Line	1,788	30.64	65.19	97.79	130.38
		Rate (HHs)		26.4	64.6	80.4	88.7
		Rate (people)		26.9	67.7	83.3	91.2
Urban	2008	Line	1,394	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		20.6	63.7	80.7	88.8
		Rate (people)		21.1	66.4	83.8	91.5
Rural	2008	Line	369	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		21.0	55.8	79.5	87.8
		Rate (people)		24.0	60.0	82.9	89.6
All	2008	Line	1,763	27.40	59.23	88.84	118.45
		Rate (HHs)		20.7	62.2	80.5	88.6
		Rate (people)		21.7	65.1	83.6	91.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tlaxcala): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,448	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		5.1	13.8	20.4	55.9	10.0	25.2
		Rate (people)		5.5	14.5	21.7	60.0	10.5	27.2
Rural	2014	Line	380	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	7.5	12.6	41.2	6.2	15.4
		Rate (people)		3.9	7.9	13.5	45.9	6.4	16.2
All	2014	Line	1,828	14.74	23.59	29.49	58.97	19.84	32.37
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	12.5	18.8	52.9	9.2	23.2
		Rate (people)		5.1	13.2	20.1	57.2	9.7	25.0
Urban	2012	Line	1,425	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		6.3	14.2	20.6	52.5	7.8	18.1
		Rate (people)		6.2	14.0	21.4	56.3	7.7	18.5
Rural	2012	Line	375	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	7.1	11.8	43.2	3.1	10.5
		Rate (people)		1.7	8.5	14.2	47.6	3.0	12.2
All	2012	Line	1,800	13.44	21.51	26.89	53.78	15.55	25.38
		Rate (HHs)		5.4	12.7	18.9	50.6	6.9	16.6
		Rate (people)		5.3	12.9	20.0	54.5	6.7	17.2
Urban	2010	Line	1,406	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		7.0	15.4	22.5	56.8	11.5	26.8
		Rate (people)		6.7	15.5	23.4	61.3	11.7	28.2
Rural	2010	Line	382	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		6.1	12.6	20.7	54.8	9.4	23.8
		Rate (people)		4.9	11.2	19.4	56.1	8.3	22.6
All	2010	Line	1,788	12.20	19.52	24.39	48.79	16.41	26.78
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	14.8	22.1	56.5	11.1	26.2
		Rate (people)		6.4	14.6	22.6	60.2	11.0	27.1
Urban	2008	Line	1,394	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	11.2	18.4	54.7	7.3	21.9
		Rate (people)		4.1	11.3	19.6	58.7	7.3	23.2
Rural	2008	Line	369	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		7.3	12.4	19.9	53.4	11.0	22.1
		Rate (people)		8.1	14.5	22.8	58.1	12.5	25.1
All	2008	Line	1,763	11.27	18.02	22.53	45.06	15.16	24.73
		Rate (HHs)		4.6	11.5	18.7	54.4	8.0	21.9
		Rate (people)		4.9	12.0	20.2	58.6	8.4	23.6

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tlaxcala): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | *n* | Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line | Percentile-based lines | | | | |
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,448	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		22.9	15.2	40.3	53.8	65.7	85.9
		Rate (people)		24.5	15.8	43.9	57.7	70.1	88.9
Rural	2014	Line	380	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		49.6	39.6	69.7	79.8	86.3	95.9
		Rate (people)		53.4	44.3	74.0	83.4	89.1	96.7
All	2014	Line	1,828	38.82	29.75	53.07	67.19	84.26	148.03
		Rate (HHs)		28.4	20.2	46.3	59.1	69.9	88.0
		Rate (people)		30.4	21.6	50.0	62.9	73.9	90.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,425	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		21.8	15.5	40.1	52.1	64.1	84.2
		Rate (people)		22.7	15.3	42.9	55.5	69.0	87.8
Rural	2012	Line	375	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		52.2	39.8	73.5	82.8	88.0	94.2
		Rate (people)		57.1	43.9	77.8	85.3	90.3	95.4
All	2012	Line	1,800	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		27.9	20.4	46.8	58.2	68.9	86.2
		Rate (people)		29.7	21.1	50.0	61.5	73.3	89.3
Urban	2010	Line	1,406	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		23.5	16.3	42.4	56.1	66.7	85.6
		Rate (people)		24.5	16.6	45.7	60.5	71.2	88.5
Rural	2010	Line	382	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		60.3	50.9	79.1	88.1	95.0	97.3
		Rate (people)		62.1	50.5	82.3	90.7	96.0	98.0
All	2010	Line	1,788	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		30.6	22.9	49.5	62.3	72.1	87.8
		Rate (people)		32.0	23.4	53.1	66.6	76.2	90.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,394	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		18.7	13.5	43.8	56.2	67.3	86.4
		Rate (people)		19.9	14.0	47.2	60.3	70.8	89.6
Rural	2008	Line	369	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		61.7	51.4	82.5	89.2	92.5	97.8
		Rate (people)		66.5	54.8	85.5	91.3	94.5	98.7
All	2008	Line	1,763	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		26.8	20.6	51.0	62.4	72.0	88.5
		Rate (people)		29.3	22.2	54.9	66.5	75.6	91.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tlaxcala): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		27.1	42.8	69.7	76.7	84.2
		Rate (people)		32.3	47.9	77.2	83.2	88.7
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		15.1	20.9	44.1	61.2	70.3
		Rate (people)		18.2	25.7	50.4	66.4	75.3
All	2014	Line	19,479	35.95	43.16	68.09	85.11	102.13
		Rate (HHs)		19.2	28.5	52.9	66.6	75.1
		Rate (people)		23.0	33.4	59.6	72.2	79.9
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		19.8	29.4	58.6	73.9	82.6
		Rate (people)		20.3	29.3	69.7	83.2	90.8
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		15.4	22.0	46.3	66.7	76.9
		Rate (people)		18.6	25.9	53.2	72.6	82.6
All	2012	Line	9,002	34.13	41.10	65.17	81.47	97.76
		Rate (HHs)		17.2	25.0	51.3	69.6	79.2
		Rate (people)		19.3	27.3	60.2	77.1	86.1
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		15.9	32.5	66.5	76.3	80.9
		Rate (people)		17.8	38.8	75.8	85.0	88.2
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		9.1	13.7	41.6	54.8	62.4
		Rate (people)		8.9	15.3	44.8	61.2	67.9
All	2010	Line	27,655	28.93	34.71	54.70	68.37	82.04
		Rate (HHs)		11.3	19.7	49.6	61.7	68.3
		Rate (people)		11.8	23.0	55.0	69.0	74.6
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		16.3	24.8	42.2	53.4	62.1
		Rate (people)		17.0	26.2	46.5	60.2	69.8
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		19.7	25.1	44.9	60.8	71.5
		Rate (people)		20.3	25.7	48.7	63.9	74.7
All	2008	Line	29,468	26.13	31.34	49.35	61.68	74.02
		Rate (HHs)		18.5	25.0	44.0	58.3	68.4
		Rate (people)		19.3	25.9	48.0	62.7	73.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Tlaxcala): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	13.9
		Rate (people)		2.8	16.4
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		0.9	7.8
		Rate (people)		1.0	9.1
All	2014	Line	19,479	13.44	26.88
		Rate (HHs)		1.3	9.9
		Rate (people)		1.6	11.6
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	9.3
		Rate (people)		4.6	10.5
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	6.5
		Rate (people)		3.0	8.3
All	2012	Line	9,002	12.56	25.11
		Rate (HHs)		3.7	7.6
		Rate (people)		3.7	9.2
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		1.3	6.2
		Rate (people)		1.9	7.5
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	5.4
		Rate (people)		0.4	5.0
All	2010	Line	27,655	11.07	22.13
		Rate (HHs)		0.9	5.7
		Rate (people)		0.9	5.9
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		1.6	8.0
		Rate (people)		1.1	7.1
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		0.7	10.7
		Rate (people)		0.5	10.7
All	2008	Line	29,468	10.15	20.29
		Rate (HHs)		1.0	9.8
		Rate (people)		0.7	9.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Veracruz): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,129	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		22.5	52.7	70.1	80.3
		Rate (people)		26.6	58.8	75.6	85.2
Rural	2014	Line	703	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		30.9	64.9	79.8	87.8
		Rate (people)		33.2	69.6	85.9	92.1
All	2014	Line	1,832	36.56	72.71	109.06	145.41
		Rate (HHs)		25.7	57.3	73.8	83.1
		Rate (people)		29.2	63.0	79.6	87.9
Urban	2012	Line	1,086	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		17.1	47.2	67.7	79.7
		Rate (people)		19.7	51.4	72.8	84.3
Rural	2012	Line	696	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		29.2	60.9	77.8	87.1
		Rate (people)		30.8	64.8	81.6	90.4
All	2012	Line	1,782	33.29	66.72	100.08	133.44
		Rate (HHs)		21.5	52.2	71.4	82.4
		Rate (people)		24.0	56.6	76.2	86.6
Urban	2010	Line	1,152	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		17.9	51.4	69.2	77.6
		Rate (people)		20.5	55.5	73.8	81.2
Rural	2010	Line	722	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		35.5	69.7	83.8	90.1
		Rate (people)		39.2	72.5	85.7	91.7
All	2010	Line	1,874	28.79	60.27	90.40	120.53
		Rate (HHs)		24.2	58.0	74.4	82.0
		Rate (people)		27.8	62.1	78.4	85.3
Urban	2008	Line	1,069	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		11.5	42.2	61.2	73.4
		Rate (people)		13.4	47.5	67.3	78.1
Rural	2008	Line	671	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		30.0	61.8	77.4	85.7
		Rate (people)		32.3	65.0	80.8	88.7
All	2008	Line	1,740	25.77	54.73	82.09	109.45
		Rate (HHs)		18.2	49.2	67.1	77.8
		Rate (people)		20.8	54.4	72.6	82.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Veracruz): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,129	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		4.0	10.3	14.9	42.6	7.1	19.4
		Rate (people)		4.2	12.3	17.8	49.5	8.2	23.9
Rural	2014	Line	703	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		6.2	17.8	26.1	59.7	11.5	28.4
		Rate (people)		6.5	20.0	28.8	65.1	12.9	31.2
All	2014	Line	1,832	13.86	22.17	27.71	55.42	18.64	30.42
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	13.1	19.1	49.0	8.8	22.8
		Rate (people)		5.1	15.3	22.1	55.6	10.1	26.7
Urban	2012	Line	1,086	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	9.0	12.6	36.4	5.5	11.8
		Rate (people)		4.7	10.6	14.7	41.7	6.7	13.7
Rural	2012	Line	696	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		4.7	14.3	22.4	56.1	7.7	19.9
		Rate (people)		5.1	15.3	24.4	61.1	8.4	21.5
All	2012	Line	1,782	12.64	20.22	25.27	50.54	14.62	23.85
		Rate (HHs)		4.2	11.0	16.2	43.6	6.3	14.7
		Rate (people)		4.9	12.5	18.5	49.3	7.4	16.7
Urban	2010	Line	1,152	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		3.8	8.3	14.1	41.9	6.3	16.8
		Rate (people)		4.4	9.6	16.4	47.0	7.4	19.6
Rural	2010	Line	722	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		12.3	24.4	31.7	64.9	17.8	35.1
		Rate (people)		15.3	28.8	36.0	68.8	20.9	39.4
All	2010	Line	1,874	11.46	18.34	22.92	45.85	15.42	25.16
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	14.1	20.4	50.1	10.4	23.3
		Rate (people)		8.6	17.1	24.1	55.5	12.7	27.4
Urban	2008	Line	1,069	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		3.4	7.4	10.5	33.0	5.5	12.7
		Rate (people)		4.3	8.6	12.0	38.5	6.3	15.0
Rural	2008	Line	671	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		9.4	19.9	26.3	59.4	14.6	30.3
		Rate (people)		9.9	22.1	29.2	64.3	16.2	33.7
All	2008	Line	1,740	10.59	16.95	21.19	42.38	14.25	23.26
		Rate (HHs)		5.6	11.9	16.2	42.5	8.8	19.1
		Rate (people)		6.5	13.9	18.7	48.6	10.1	22.3

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Veracruz): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,129	18.4	11.4	30.9	41.1	51.0	74.1
		Rate (people)		23.0	13.6	36.3	47.9	58.0	80.0
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	703	66.7	57.0	79.4	85.5	89.5	95.7
		Rate (people)		71.9	62.4	85.9	90.9	93.7	97.5
All	2014	Line		35.96	27.55	49.15	62.23	78.04	137.10
		Rate (HHs)	1,832	36.6	28.6	49.2	57.8	65.5	82.2
		Rate (people)		42.0	32.6	55.6	64.7	71.9	86.8
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,086	13.1	9.4	27.6	36.4	47.7	74.0
		Rate (people)		15.5	11.2	32.4	41.7	53.5	79.6
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	696	62.7	53.7	78.9	86.3	91.6	97.8
		Rate (people)		67.6	58.5	83.4	89.7	93.8	98.7
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,782	31.2	25.6	46.4	54.6	63.8	82.7
		Rate (people)		35.8	29.6	52.3	60.4	69.2	87.0
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,152	15.2	9.0	29.1	41.3	51.9	72.6
		Rate (people)		17.8	10.6	32.7	46.3	56.6	77.4
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	722	71.9	61.3	85.9	89.7	92.3	97.4
		Rate (people)		75.4	65.3	88.3	91.6	93.7	98.2
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	1,874	35.5	27.7	49.4	58.6	66.3	81.5
		Rate (people)		40.2	31.9	54.3	64.0	71.0	85.5
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,069	10.8	8.6	25.1	33.6	45.2	69.8
		Rate (people)		12.5	9.8	29.6	39.0	51.9	75.6
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	671	65.7	57.2	80.8	87.6	92.4	97.7
		Rate (people)		70.5	61.6	85.3	90.7	95.1	98.2
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,740	30.6	26.1	45.2	53.1	62.2	79.9
		Rate (people)		35.1	29.9	51.3	59.1	68.7	84.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Veracruz): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
							Upper	
				Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)		16.0	25.3	50.1	59.2	66.9
		Rate (people)		23.4	34.9	60.6	69.5	76.3
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)		26.9	34.2	60.2	74.2	81.8
		Rate (people)		33.0	40.9	66.7	81.6	88.6
All	2014	Line	19,479	36.78	44.29	70.23	87.79	105.34
		Rate (HHs)		22.1	30.2	55.7	67.6	75.2
		Rate (people)		29.0	38.4	64.1	76.6	83.4
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)		13.6	20.2	42.8	54.7	66.1
		Rate (people)		15.6	23.3	47.0	60.8	73.7
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)		26.0	33.9	60.7	69.3	75.5
		Rate (people)		30.3	40.2	64.8	73.7	79.1
All	2012	Line	9,002	34.02	40.94	64.88	81.09	97.31
		Rate (HHs)		20.6	27.9	52.8	62.9	71.4
		Rate (people)		24.2	33.2	57.4	68.4	76.9
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)		10.6	18.0	43.2	53.3	63.1
		Rate (people)		13.7	21.5	50.5	60.6	69.7
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)		28.6	37.9	63.1	72.9	79.5
		Rate (people)		36.6	45.9	69.1	78.8	83.7
All	2010	Line	27,655	29.91	36.04	57.22	71.52	85.83
		Rate (HHs)		20.2	28.6	53.8	63.7	71.8
		Rate (people)		26.5	35.2	60.9	70.8	77.6
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)		8.8	15.1	37.0	49.1	56.3
		Rate (people)		10.5	18.9	42.7	55.5	63.3
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)		30.1	38.0	58.1	67.9	75.7
		Rate (people)		37.2	46.3	67.4	76.4	81.2
All	2008	Line	29,468	27.10	32.65	51.82	64.78	77.74
		Rate (HHs)		19.9	27.1	48.0	58.9	66.5
		Rate (people)		25.5	34.4	56.6	67.2	73.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Veracruz): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines | |
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		0.3	5.5
		Rate (people)		0.3	9.4
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	12.7
		Rate (people)		2.4	16.7
All	2014	Line	19,479	13.75	27.51
		Rate (HHs)		1.1	9.5
		Rate (people)		1.5	13.6
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		2.5	5.2
		Rate (people)		3.3	5.8
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.2	12.7
		Rate (people)		3.1	15.5
All	2012	Line	9,002	12.51	25.03
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	9.4
		Rate (people)		3.2	11.5
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		2.0	6.5
		Rate (people)		2.4	8.2
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		3.3	18.4
		Rate (people)		5.0	25.1
All	2010	Line	27,655	11.44	22.89
		Rate (HHs)		2.7	12.8
		Rate (people)		3.9	17.7
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		0.6	3.9
		Rate (people)		0.8	4.4
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	18.1
		Rate (people)		4.5	22.3
All	2008	Line	29,468	10.52	21.04
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	11.3
		Rate (people)		2.9	14.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Yucatán): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,541	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		17.7	46.9	67.9	78.2
		Rate (people)		20.4	52.8	73.4	83.0
Rural	2014	Line	288	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		19.7	48.5	71.0	82.2
		Rate (people)		22.4	52.8	76.8	87.0
All	2014	Line	1,829	39.42	79.78	119.67	159.56
		Rate (HHs)		18.0	47.2	68.4	78.7
		Rate (people)		20.7	52.8	74.0	83.6
Urban	2012	Line	1,430	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		16.3	50.5	68.4	78.3
		Rate (people)		17.1	55.2	73.7	82.4
Rural	2012	Line	313	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		13.3	51.2	77.9	87.7
		Rate (people)		14.2	54.5	82.8	92.6
All	2012	Line	1,743	35.77	73.13	109.69	146.26
		Rate (HHs)		15.9	50.6	69.8	79.7
		Rate (people)		16.6	55.1	75.2	84.0
Urban	2010	Line	2,210	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		13.1	46.5	67.0	77.6
		Rate (people)		16.6	53.9	73.7	82.9
Rural	2010	Line	509	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		20.9	55.5	78.5	90.2
		Rate (people)		24.4	59.1	81.7	92.9
All	2010	Line	2,719	31.04	66.26	99.39	132.52
		Rate (HHs)		14.3	47.8	68.7	79.4
		Rate (people)		17.9	54.8	75.0	84.5
Urban	2008	Line	1,954	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		10.6	45.6	65.3	76.3
		Rate (people)		12.5	52.2	71.6	81.3
Rural	2008	Line	455	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		14.4	44.9	73.9	86.9
		Rate (people)		15.9	49.6	79.0	90.8
All	2008	Line	2,409	27.76	60.22	90.33	120.44
		Rate (HHs)		11.2	45.5	66.6	77.9
		Rate (people)		13.0	51.8	72.8	82.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Yucatán): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,541	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	9.6	13.7	36.2	7.0	15.9
		Rate (people)		5.4	11.4	16.3	42.1	8.1	18.6
Rural	2014	Line	288	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		4.5	10.4	15.4	43.8	7.9	17.7
		Rate (people)		6.1	12.4	17.8	49.0	9.4	20.9
All	2014	Line	1,829	14.94	23.90	29.88	59.75	20.10	32.79
		Rate (HHs)		4.8	9.7	14.0	37.3	7.1	16.2
		Rate (people)		5.5	11.6	16.5	43.2	8.3	19.0
Urban	2012	Line	1,430	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		3.0	7.9	12.2	38.0	4.3	10.8
		Rate (people)		3.0	8.6	13.5	42.7	4.8	11.8
Rural	2012	Line	313	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	6.2	10.3	43.5	3.4	9.1
		Rate (people)		2.4	7.2	11.7	49.3	3.5	10.3
All	2012	Line	1,743	13.62	21.80	27.25	54.49	15.76	25.71
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	7.7	11.9	38.8	4.2	10.6
		Rate (people)		2.9	8.4	13.2	43.8	4.6	11.6
Urban	2010	Line	2,210	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	6.9	10.8	36.0	4.9	12.5
		Rate (people)		3.0	9.2	14.3	43.7	6.5	16.4
Rural	2010	Line	509	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		5.9	11.8	16.7	48.0	8.8	19.6
		Rate (people)		7.3	14.2	20.2	53.6	10.6	23.3
All	2010	Line	2,719	12.36	19.77	24.71	49.43	16.63	27.13
		Rate (HHs)		2.9	7.6	11.7	37.7	5.5	13.6
		Rate (people)		3.7	10.0	15.2	45.3	7.2	17.5
Urban	2008	Line	1,954	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	4.9	8.8	35.5	3.4	11.1
		Rate (people)		1.8	5.9	10.7	41.6	4.0	13.4
Rural	2008	Line	455	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		4.3	8.6	12.4	43.4	6.8	16.5
		Rate (people)		5.8	10.5	14.8	48.8	8.7	19.4
All	2008	Line	2,409	11.41	18.26	22.83	45.65	15.36	25.06
		Rate (HHs)		1.9	5.5	9.3	36.6	3.9	11.9
		Rate (people)		2.4	6.6	11.4	42.8	4.7	14.4

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Yucatán): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	*n*	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line		41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)	1,541	15.1	10.4	25.9	34.7	45.0	72.7
		Rate (people)		17.9	12.3	30.1	40.3	51.7	78.5
Rural	2014	Line		26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)	288	55.8	40.5	72.5	80.8	86.7	94.7
		Rate (people)		62.2	45.4	78.8	86.7	90.8	95.8
All	2014	Line		39.45	30.23	53.93	68.28	85.63	150.43
		Rate (HHs)	1,829	21.1	14.8	32.8	41.5	51.1	75.9
		Rate (people)		25.0	17.6	37.9	47.7	57.9	81.3
Urban	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,430	12.9	9.0	26.3	37.9	51.2	73.2
		Rate (people)		14.4	9.9	29.1	42.7	57.1	78.4
Rural	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	313	54.6	39.0	79.7	87.7	91.0	98.5
		Rate (people)		59.8	43.1	85.9	92.9	95.2	99.2
All	2012	Line		36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)	1,743	19.2	13.5	34.4	45.4	57.3	77.0
		Rate (people)		21.7	15.2	38.2	50.7	63.2	81.8
Urban	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	2,210	11.0	7.0	23.8	35.2	47.3	71.3
		Rate (people)		14.5	9.4	30.1	42.8	55.5	78.1
Rural	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	509	58.0	43.4	79.9	89.3	94.6	99.1
		Rate (people)		62.8	49.1	83.8	92.5	96.6	99.5
All	2010	Line		30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)	2,719	17.9	12.3	31.9	43.1	54.2	75.3
		Rate (people)		22.3	15.8	38.7	50.8	62.1	81.6
Urban	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	1,954	9.1	5.3	24.0	37.2	49.5	72.9
		Rate (people)		11.1	6.3	28.2	43.7	57.1	78.7
Rural	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	455	51.0	40.2	81.1	88.4	93.0	97.0
		Rate (people)		56.9	45.0	86.3	92.5	95.7	98.2
All	2008	Line		27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)	2,409	15.1	10.4	32.3	44.6	55.8	76.4
		Rate (people)		18.4	12.5	37.5	51.5	63.3	81.9

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Yucatán): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Food	Lower	Upper 100%	Upper 125%	Upper 150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	12.4	20.3	40.7	53.2	64.9
		Rate (people)		16.2	25.0	47.0	59.1	71.2
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	15.1	20.0	53.0	69.7	78.5
		Rate (people)		18.5	24.8	59.1	76.1	84.5
All	2014	Line		38.89	47.14	75.62	94.53	113.43
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	13.4	20.1	45.1	59.1	69.8
		Rate (people)		17.1	24.9	51.7	65.7	76.3
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	10.0	14.5	38.2	53.1	61.5
		Rate (people)		13.9	18.0	46.3	60.3	66.3
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	24.7	34.4	64.0	79.2	84.5
		Rate (people)		28.1	38.9	70.0	84.6	89.4
All	2012	Line		36.07	43.73	70.16	87.71	105.25
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	15.5	22.0	47.9	62.9	70.2
		Rate (people)		19.3	26.0	55.4	69.6	75.2
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	10.6	17.1	39.4	51.3	60.5
		Rate (people)		14.7	22.6	47.5	59.5	68.8
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	19.8	27.1	54.2	67.4	75.8
		Rate (people)		22.6	30.9	60.4	73.1	81.8
All	2010	Line		31.41	38.07	61.06	76.33	91.60
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	13.9	20.8	44.8	57.2	66.1
		Rate (people)		17.8	25.9	52.6	64.9	73.9
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	11.5	16.7	39.7	51.2	59.3
		Rate (people)		14.4	20.6	47.0	58.4	65.9
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	17.1	23.4	49.7	65.0	75.1
		Rate (people)		20.6	27.5	54.8	71.2	80.9
All	2008	Line		28.48	34.52	55.37	69.21	83.05
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	13.6	19.2	43.4	56.3	65.1
		Rate (people)		16.9	23.3	50.0	63.4	71.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Yucatán): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) Intl. 2005 PPP lines $1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line	11,131	16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	5.8
		Rate (people)		2.5	8.0
Rural	2014	Line	8,348	12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	8.0
		Rate (people)		2.3	11.6
All	2014	Line	19,479	14.54	29.08
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	6.6
		Rate (people)		2.4	9.4
Urban	2012	Line	4,384	14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)		0.5	5.6
		Rate (people)		2.3	8.4
Rural	2012	Line	4,618	10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)		2.4	10.7
		Rate (people)		2.9	13.7
All	2012	Line	9,002	13.29	26.57
		Rate (HHs)		1.2	7.5
		Rate (people)		2.6	10.4
Urban	2010	Line	18,351	13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)		0.8	5.6
		Rate (people)		1.0	8.1
Rural	2010	Line	9,304	9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)		3.1	12.4
		Rate (people)		3.8	14.0
All	2010	Line	27,655	12.02	24.03
		Rate (HHs)		1.7	8.1
		Rate (people)		2.1	10.4
Urban	2008	Line	19,275	12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)		1.5	6.2
		Rate (people)		1.3	7.9
Rural	2008	Line	10,193	9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)		2.3	10.2
		Rate (people)		3.1	12.7
All	2008	Line	29,468	11.06	22.12
		Rate (HHs)		1.8	7.7
		Rate (people)		2.0	9.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Zacatecas): New-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) National lines (new definition) | | | |
				Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Urban	2014	Line	1,100	41.42	84.74	127.11	169.48
		Rate (HHs)		22.4	53.9	69.6	79.4
		Rate (people)		24.7	57.6	73.6	82.4
Rural	2014	Line	761	28.94	53.82	80.73	107.64
		Rate (HHs)		26.3	57.1	75.1	85.4
		Rate (people)		29.6	62.6	78.9	88.4
All	2014	Line	1,861	36.36	72.21	108.31	144.41
		Rate (HHs)		24.0	55.2	71.8	81.8
		Rate (people)		26.7	59.7	75.8	84.9
Urban	2012	Line	1,030	37.51	77.63	116.44	155.25
		Rate (HHs)		22.9	51.4	67.1	77.1
		Rate (people)		23.8	54.7	71.3	80.7
Rural	2012	Line	800	26.68	49.66	74.49	99.32
		Rate (HHs)		37.2	66.9	80.7	86.9
		Rate (people)		39.7	69.3	82.8	88.9
All	2012	Line	1,830	33.11	66.27	99.41	132.55
		Rate (HHs)		28.5	57.6	72.5	81.0
		Rate (people)		30.3	60.6	75.9	84.0
Urban	2010	Line	1,131	32.62	70.46	105.69	140.92
		Rate (HHs)		23.2	57.4	72.3	79.9
		Rate (people)		24.6	62.5	76.1	82.6
Rural	2010	Line	758	22.79	44.28	66.43	88.57
		Rate (HHs)		34.2	69.8	83.1	90.1
		Rate (people)		37.1	73.9	85.9	92.1
All	2010	Line	1,889	28.64	59.85	89.78	119.71
		Rate (HHs)		27.5	62.3	76.5	84.0
		Rate (people)		29.7	67.1	80.1	86.5
Urban	2008	Line	1,048	29.15	64.06	96.09	128.12
		Rate (HHs)		16.8	47.1	64.6	74.0
		Rate (people)		17.9	52.0	69.9	78.7
Rural	2008	Line	727	20.46	40.09	60.14	80.19
		Rate (HHs)		26.8	57.8	76.3	85.4
		Rate (people)		28.9	62.3	80.6	88.9
All	2008	Line	1,775	25.63	54.34	81.52	108.69
		Rate (HHs)		20.7	51.3	69.2	78.4
		Rate (people)		22.3	56.2	74.2	82.8

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Zacatecas): New-def. international 2005 and 2011 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)					
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines				Intl. 2011 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Urban	2014	Line	1,100	15.70	25.11	31.39	62.78	21.12	34.46
		Rate (HHs)		5.0	11.7	16.5	44.3	9.0	20.0
		Rate (people)		5.1	13.2	19.1	49.3	9.9	22.9
Rural	2014	Line	761	10.97	17.55	21.93	43.87	14.76	24.08
		Rate (HHs)		6.8	13.6	19.6	51.5	10.8	22.8
		Rate (people)		8.3	16.4	23.0	58.0	13.3	27.0
All	2014	Line	1,861	13.78	22.05	27.56	55.12	18.54	30.25
		Rate (HHs)		5.7	12.5	17.8	47.2	9.7	21.1
		Rate (people)		6.4	14.5	20.7	52.8	11.3	24.5
Urban	2012	Line	1,030	14.32	22.91	28.63	57.27	16.56	27.02
		Rate (HHs)		8.1	14.4	20.1	42.8	9.3	18.7
		Rate (people)		8.0	14.8	21.2	46.7	9.1	19.6
Rural	2012	Line	800	10.01	16.01	20.01	40.02	11.58	18.89
		Rate (HHs)		11.2	23.5	30.4	60.0	13.8	28.1
		Rate (people)		11.4	26.2	33.6	63.8	14.5	31.2
All	2012	Line	1,830	12.57	20.11	25.13	50.27	14.54	23.72
		Rate (HHs)		9.4	18.0	24.2	49.7	11.1	22.5
		Rate (people)		9.3	19.4	26.2	53.7	11.3	24.3
Urban	2010	Line	1,131	12.98	20.78	25.97	51.94	17.47	28.51
		Rate (HHs)		8.8	15.4	20.9	46.9	13.1	23.2
		Rate (people)		9.7	16.6	22.5	52.0	14.1	25.0
Rural	2010	Line	758	9.07	14.52	18.15	36.30	12.21	19.92
		Rate (HHs)		11.9	22.7	29.4	64.9	17.7	32.9
		Rate (people)		13.4	25.5	32.8	70.6	19.6	36.8
All	2010	Line	1,889	11.40	18.24	22.80	45.60	15.34	25.03
		Rate (HHs)		10.0	18.2	24.3	54.0	14.9	27.1
		Rate (people)		11.2	20.2	26.7	59.5	16.3	29.7
Urban	2008	Line	1,048	11.99	19.18	23.97	47.94	16.13	26.31
		Rate (HHs)		6.2	11.1	15.3	38.9	8.3	17.1
		Rate (people)		6.4	11.7	16.6	43.6	8.8	18.7
Rural	2008	Line	727	8.41	13.46	16.82	33.65	11.32	18.47
		Rate (HHs)		9.8	18.8	25.0	56.1	14.1	28.6
		Rate (people)		10.7	21.1	27.8	61.6	16.2	31.8
All	2008	Line	1,775	10.54	16.86	21.07	42.15	14.18	23.13
		Rate (HHs)		7.6	14.1	19.1	45.6	10.6	21.6
		Rate (people)		8.2	15.5	21.1	50.9	11.8	24.0

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Zacatecas): New-definition relative- and percentile-based poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

| Region | Year | Line/rate | n | Poverty lines and poverty rates (%) | | | | | |
| | | | | Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line | Percentile-based lines | | | | |
					20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Urban	2014	Line	1,100	41.90	32.11	57.29	72.53	90.95	159.78
		Rate (HHs)		18.7	12.9	31.6	42.6	53.4	73.7
		Rate (people)		21.6	14.7	36.0	47.3	58.0	78.4
Rural	2014	Line	761	26.62	20.40	36.39	46.07	57.77	101.49
		Rate (HHs)		60.0	49.3	75.5	83.6	89.5	96.4
		Rate (people)		66.7	55.5	80.0	87.7	92.2	97.0
All	2014	Line	1,861	35.71	27.36	48.81	61.80	77.50	136.15
		Rate (HHs)		35.3	27.5	49.2	59.1	67.9	82.8
		Rate (people)		39.9	31.2	53.9	63.7	71.9	86.0
Urban	2012	Line	1,030	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		20.5	15.8	32.3	42.7	52.5	72.7
		Rate (people)		21.7	16.4	35.2	46.6	56.4	76.9
Rural	2012	Line	800	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		68.3	57.5	81.2	86.4	90.1	95.5
		Rate (people)		71.5	61.2	83.9	89.2	92.0	96.3
All	2012	Line	1,830	36.57	28.42	52.33	67.06	84.59	146.65
		Rate (HHs)		39.5	32.4	51.7	60.1	67.4	81.7
		Rate (people)		41.9	34.6	55.0	63.9	70.9	84.8
Urban	2010	Line	1,131	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		21.5	15.4	35.7	46.1	57.0	76.0
		Rate (people)		23.2	16.6	39.9	51.2	62.8	79.6
Rural	2010	Line	758	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		71.8	60.9	84.4	89.9	93.8	97.4
		Rate (people)		76.6	66.4	87.5	92.2	95.3	98.0
All	2010	Line	1,889	30.28	23.36	43.95	56.09	71.71	121.97
		Rate (HHs)		41.4	33.3	54.9	63.4	71.5	84.4
		Rate (people)		44.8	36.8	59.2	67.8	76.0	87.1
Urban	2008	Line	1,048	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		15.6	11.8	28.8	40.2	51.0	71.3
		Rate (people)		17.0	12.3	32.2	45.0	56.1	76.7
Rural	2008	Line	727	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		62.3	54.3	79.2	87.1	91.0	96.8
		Rate (people)		68.3	60.0	84.3	91.0	94.1	97.8
All	2008	Line	1,775	27.94	22.20	41.46	53.39	67.78	116.52
		Rate (HHs)		33.8	28.4	48.5	58.5	66.6	81.3
		Rate (people)		37.8	31.7	53.3	63.6	71.5	85.2

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Zacatecas): Old-definition national poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)				
				Food	Lower	100%	Upper 125%	150%
Urban	2014	Line		43.22	53.01	86.71	108.39	130.06
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	24.2	34.5	56.8	64.6	67.5
		Rate (people)		26.6	39.6	62.4	70.3	73.1
Rural	2014	Line		32.13	37.99	58.30	72.88	87.45
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	25.9	32.6	57.1	70.5	79.0
		Rate (people)		31.9	40.2	64.4	77.5	85.7
All	2014	Line		36.58	44.02	69.71	87.14	104.56
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	25.2	33.4	57.0	68.1	74.4
		Rate (people)		29.8	40.0	63.6	74.6	80.6
Urban	2012	Line		39.91	48.95	80.08	100.10	120.13
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	24.8	28.9	48.0	61.8	65.0
		Rate (people)		32.6	37.1	59.4	69.3	73.4
Rural	2012	Line		29.89	35.34	54.24	67.80	81.36
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	27.3	36.7	61.5	70.1	73.3
		Rate (people)		33.0	42.6	68.5	76.0	79.4
All	2012	Line		33.86	40.73	64.48	80.60	96.72
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	26.3	33.6	56.1	66.8	70.0
		Rate (people)		32.9	40.4	64.9	73.4	77.1
Urban	2010	Line		34.93	42.84	70.09	87.61	105.13
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	11.0	16.3	44.6	55.0	69.4
		Rate (people)		13.5	19.4	50.0	61.8	74.7
Rural	2010	Line		25.97	30.71	47.13	58.91	70.70
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	28.4	38.4	64.6	77.1	85.3
		Rate (people)		34.4	45.5	73.3	82.8	89.6
All	2010	Line		29.21	35.10	55.43	69.29	83.15
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	21.9	30.1	57.1	68.8	79.3
		Rate (people)		26.8	36.1	64.9	75.2	84.2
Urban	2008	Line		31.65	38.81	63.49	79.37	95.24
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	14.4	29.1	47.7	59.0	64.4
		Rate (people)		17.8	34.9	54.9	67.3	71.7
Rural	2008	Line		23.56	27.85	42.75	53.43	64.12
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	15.4	20.5	37.4	48.6	54.3
		Rate (people)		20.1	27.5	46.7	55.7	60.7
All	2008	Line		26.76	32.20	50.97	63.71	76.45
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	15.0	23.8	41.3	52.6	58.2
		Rate (people)		19.2	30.4	50.0	60.3	65.1

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 2 (Zacatecas): Old-definition international 2005 PPP poverty lines and poverty rates (for households and people) by urban/rural/all in 2014, 2012, 2010, and 2008

Region	Year	Line/rate	n	Poverty lines and poverty rates (%)	
				Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
				$1.25	$2.50
Urban	2014	Line		16.16	32.32
		Rate (HHs)	11,131	1.7	10.3
		Rate (people)		2.2	12.5
Rural	2014	Line		12.01	24.03
		Rate (HHs)	8,348	2.9	14.3
		Rate (people)		3.9	19.3
All	2014	Line		13.68	27.35
		Rate (HHs)	19,479	2.4	12.7
		Rate (people)		3.2	16.6
Urban	2012	Line		14.74	29.47
		Rate (HHs)	4,384	3.2	10.9
		Rate (people)		4.9	14.9
Rural	2012	Line		10.96	21.92
		Rate (HHs)	4,618	2.7	15.6
		Rate (people)		2.9	20.3
All	2012	Line		12.45	24.91
		Rate (HHs)	9,002	2.9	13.7
		Rate (people)		3.7	18.2
Urban	2010	Line		13.36	26.73
		Rate (HHs)	18,351	0.1	6.3
		Rate (people)		0.1	6.9
Rural	2010	Line		9.94	19.87
		Rate (HHs)	9,304	2.7	18.8
		Rate (people)		4.7	22.5
All	2010	Line		11.18	22.35
		Rate (HHs)	27,655	1.8	14.1
		Rate (people)		3.1	16.8
Urban	2008	Line		12.29	24.58
		Rate (HHs)	19,275	2.3	6.6
		Rate (people)		3.4	9.0
Rural	2008	Line		9.15	18.29
		Rate (HHs)	10,193	1.6	9.4
		Rate (people)		2.4	13.1
All	2008	Line		10.39	20.78
		Rate (HHs)	29,468	1.8	8.3
		Rate (people)		2.8	11.5

Source and definitions: See Table 1 and text.

Table 3: Poverty indicators

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Responses ordered starting with those linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
93	Does any household member have a health-care plan through some institution other than Seguro Popular? (No; Yes)
93	What is the highest educational level completed by the female head/spouse? (None, or primary grades 1, 2, or 3; Primary grades 4, 5, or 6; Middle grades 7, 8, or 9; Technical/trade school (any year); No female head/spouse; Any year of preparatoria, bachillerato, teacher's college, undergraduate, master's, or doctorate)
83	How many compact-fluorescent (CFL) light bulbs does the residence have? (Does not have electricity; None; One; Two; Three; Four; Five; Six; Seven; Eight; Nine; Ten; Eleven or more)
82	Are any household members currently covered by the public health-insurance program (*Seguro Popular*)? (Yes; No)
79	What is the highest educational level completed by the male head/spouse? (None; Primary grades 1, 2, or 3; Primary grades 4, 5, or 6, or middle grade 7; Middle grades 8 or 9; Any year of technical/trade school after middle, or preparatoria, or bachillerato; No male head/spouse; Any year of technical/trade school after preparatoria, teacher's college, undergraduate, or graduate school)
79	Does the residence have a toilet arrangement with a piped water supply? (No; Yes)
78	Does the household have a computer? (No; Yes)
75	Does the residence have a kitchen sink (*fregadero* or *tarja*) for washing dishes? (No; Yes)
75	Does the household have a gas or electric stove, or a microwave? (None; Gas or electric stove, without microwave; Microwave (regardless of gas or electric stove))
73	Does the household have an internet connection? (No; Yes)
70	How many digital televisions does the household have? (None; One; Two or more)
70	If the household has a toilet, latrine, or outhouse, then are there are bathrooms in residence with a toilet etc. and/or shower? (No bathrooms with toilets nor showers; Has bathroom(s) with only a shower or only a toilet etc.; Has a bathroom with toilet etc. and shower (regardless of other bathrooms))
70	Does the residence have a bathroom with both a toilet and a shower? (No; Yes)

Table 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Responses ordered starting with those linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
70	Does the residence have a toilet arrangement with a piped water supply? (No; Yes)
68	Does the residence have a shower? (No; Yes)
66	Does the household have a microwave? (No; Yes)
65	Does the household have an automobile (car, van, minivan, or SUV) or truck (pickup or larger)? (No; Yes)
65	What is the main material of the floor of the residence? (Dirt, cement, or pavement; Wood, tile, or other covering)
62	What is the main type of fuel used to cook? (Firewood, or charcoal; Gas from a tank, or electricity; Natural gas or piped gas, or other)
61	If the household has a television (analog or digital), then does it also have a VCR, DVD or Blu-ray (video-disc players), or cable/subscription or pay TV? (No TV; There is a TV, but nothing else; There is a TV and VCR, but nothing else; There is a TV and DVD or Blu-ray, but not cable/subscription nor pay TV (regardless of VCR); There is a TV and cable/subscription or pay TV, regardless of all others)
61	Does the residence have a gas hot-water heater? (No; Yes)
60	How many household members are 18-years-old or younger? (Four or more; Three; Two; One; None)
59	How many household members are 16-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
58	How many household members are 15-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
58	How many household members are 17-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
55	How many household members are 14-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
52	How many household members are 14-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
52	Does the household have cable/subscription or pay TV? (No; Yes)
52	Does the household have a printer? (No; Yes)

Table 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Responses ordered starting with those linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
52	What is the household's source of water? (Well, river, lake, stream, rainwater collectors, or other; Piped outside the residence but inside the yard, public standpipe (or hydrant), piped into another residence and then carted here, or bottled; Piped into the residence)
50	How many televisions (analog or digital) does the household have? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
48	How many household members are 12-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
46	Does the household have a land-line telephone? (No; Yes)
46	Does the household have a land-line phone and a mobile phone? (None; Only mobile; Only land-line; Both)
45	Does the household have a clothes-washing machine? (No; Yes)
45	How many household members are 11-years-old or younger? (Three or more; Two; One; None)
43	Does the household have a toaster? (No; Yes)
39	How many members does the household have? (Seven or more; Six; Five; Four; Three; Two; One; None)
39	How may rooms does this residence have in total, counting kitchens but not counting hallways nor bathrooms? (One; Two; Three; Four; Five; Six or more)
36	Does the household have a vacuum cleaner? (No; Yes)
36	What is the main material of the roof of this residence? (Metal sheets, tile, cardboard, palm leaves or straw, or scrap material; Asbestos sheets, flat roof made of rafters, or corrugated fiberglass sheets (permanent roof); Solid concrete or concrete with steel beams, or wood or shingles)
33	Does the residence have incandescent light bulbs and compact fluorescent (CFL) bulbs? (None, or no electricity; Only incandescent bulbs; Both; Only CFLs)
31	Do all household members ages 6 to 15 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No members in this age range)
30	Do all household members ages 6 to 13 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No members in this age range)
30	Do all household members ages 6 to 16 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No members in this age range)
30	Do all household members ages 6 to 14 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No members in this age range)
28	Does the household have a refrigerator? (No; Yes)

Table 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Responses ordered starting with those linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
28	Do all household members ages 6 to 17 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No members in this age range)
28	How many incandescent light bulbs does the residence have? (No electricity; One; Two; Three' Four; Five; Six; Seven; Eight or more; None)
27	Do all household members ages 6 to 12 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No members in this age range)
27	Do all household members ages 6 to 18 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No members in this age range)
27	How many household members are 6-years-old or younger? (Two or more; Two; One; None)
26	Does the household have a DVD or Blu-ray (video disc players)? (No; Yes)
26	Do all household members ages 6 to 11 currently go to school? (No; Yes; No members in this age range)
25	Does the household have a mobile phone? (No; Yes)
25	How many fans does the household have? (None; One; Two or more)
25	Can the female head/spouse read and write a note? (No; Yes; No female head/spouse)
25	If the household has a toilet, latrine, or outhouse, then how many bathrooms does the residence have with only a toilet (and no shower)? (No toilet etc.; None; One or more)
25	Does the residence have a water tank on the roof? (No; Yes)
24	Does the household have a stove (gas or electric)? (No; Yes)
24	How does the residence dispose of its garbage? (Burned, buried, thrown in a vacant lot or in the street, thrown in a gully or ravine, or thrown in a river, lake, or ocean; Picked up by a garbage truck or cart, thrown in a public dumpster, or thrown in a container)
24	Does the household have a drain or sewer connected to . . .? (Does not drain; Septic tank, a pipe that empties in a gully or ravine, or a pipe that empties in a river, lake, or ocean; Public sewer network)
24	Does the residence have air conditioning? (No; Yes)
24	Does the residence have stationary gas tank? (No; Yes)

Table 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Responses ordered starting with those linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
24	Does the female head/spouse speak or understand an indigenous language or dialect? (Speaks (and understands); Understands (but does not speak); Does not speak nor understand; No female head/spouse)
23	Does the household have a video-game player (Wii, Playstation, Xbox, or others)? (No; Yes)
22	Does the household have an electric iron? (No; Yes)
20	This residence is . . .? (Loaned, is under contract or in litigation, or other; Owned free-and-clear; Rented; Owned with a mortgage)
20	According the female head/spouse`s culture, does she consider herself to be indigenous? (Yes; No; No female head/spouse)
20	Does the household have a radio, radio-cassette player, or hi-fi stereo/component system? (Only radio; None; Radio-cassette player (without hi-fi stereo/component system, and regardless of radio); Hi-fi stereo/component system (regardless of radio and radio-cassette player))
20	Does the household have a hi-fi stereo/component system? (No; Yes)
19	Does the residence have a water pump? (No; Sí)
18	What is the current marital status of the female head/spouse? (Co-habiting; Separated; Widowed; Marriedl Single, never-married; No female head/spouse; Divorced)
15	What is the current marital status of the male head/spouse? (Co-habiting; Married; No male head/spouse; Widowed; Single/never-married, separated, or divorced)
14	Does the residence have a cistern or rain-cachement system? (No; Yes)
14	Does the male head/spouse speak or understand an indigenous language or dialect? (Speaks (and understands); Understands (but does not speak); No hay jefe/esposoNo male head/spouse; Does not speak nor understand)
13	How many analog televisions does the household have? (One; Two or more; None)

Table 3 (cont.): Poverty indicators

Uncertainty coefficient	Indicator (Responses ordered starting with those linked with higher poverty likelihoods)
12	What is the main material of the walls of this residence? (Wood, scrap materials, cardboard, asbestos, metal sheets, reeds, bamboo, palm leaves, mud, or wattle-and-daub; Adobe; *Tabique*, bricks, cinder blocks, stones, quarried stone, cement, or concrete)
12	Can the male head/spouse read and write a note? (No; Yes; No male head/spouse)
11	Does anyone sleep in the room used for cooking? (Yes; No)
11	According the male head/spouse's culture, does he consider himself to be indigenous? (Yes; No male head/spouse; No)
11	Does the household have a blender? (No; Yes)
10	If the household has a toilet, latrine, or outhouse, then is the toilet arrangement shared with another household? (No toilet etc.; Yes; No)
10	Is the female head/spouse currently covered by the public health-insurance program (*Seguro Popular*) or by a health-care plan through some other institution? (No; No female head/spouse; Yes)
10	What is the structure of household headship? (Both male and female heads/spouses; Female head/spouse only; Male head/spouse only)
7	How many rooms are used as bedrooms, not counting hallways nor bathrooms? (None; One; Two; Three or more)
7	Does the residence have a water tank? (No; Yes)
5	Does the household have a bicycle or tricyle used as a means of transport? (No; Yes)
5	If the household has a toilet, latrine, or outhouse, then how many bathrooms does the residence have with only a shower (and no toilet)? (Does not have a toilet etc.; One; Two; Three or more)
5	Does the household have a VCR (video tape player)? (No; Yes)
5	Does the household have a sewing machine?(No; Yes)
4	Does household have a lavatory, toilet, latrine, or outhouse? (No; Yes)

Source: 2014 National Household Income and Expenditure Survey and 100% of the new-definition national poverty line

Tables for
100% of the New-Definition National Poverty Line

(and Tables Pertaining
to All Poverty Lines)

Table 4 (100% of the new-definition national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	94.6
5–9	92.3
10–14	89.7
15–19	85.6
20–24	82.9
25–29	79.1
30–34	72.9
35–39	68.2
40–44	59.8
45–49	53.8
50–54	46.3
55–59	36.4
60–64	31.3
65–69	24.1
70–74	20.3
75–79	13.2
80–84	9.1
85–89	6.2
90–94	4.5
95–100	3.2

Table 5 (100% of the new-definition national line): Derivation of estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

Score	Poor households in range		All households in range		Poverty likelihood (%)
0–4	532	÷	563	=	94.6
5–9	1,103	÷	1,196	=	92.3
10–14	1,869	÷	2,084	=	89.7
15–19	2,386	÷	2,789	=	85.6
20–24	3,190	÷	3,849	=	82.9
25–29	4,811	÷	6,082	=	79.1
30–34	4,911	÷	6,734	=	72.9
35–39	5,671	÷	8,321	=	68.2
40–44	5,665	÷	9,474	=	59.8
45–49	4,753	÷	8,836	=	53.8
50–54	3,860	÷	8,330	=	46.3
55–59	2,951	÷	8,097	=	36.4
60–64	2,317	÷	7,407	=	31.3
65–69	1,456	÷	6,048	=	24.1
70–74	1,051	÷	5,187	=	20.3
75–79	580	÷	4,384	=	13.2
80–84	356	÷	3,926	=	9.1
85–89	175	÷	2,818	=	6.2
90–94	59	÷	1,335	=	4.5
95–100	80	÷	2,541	=	3.2

Number of all households normalized to sum to 100,000.

Table 6 (100% of the new-definition national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+5.0	8.1	9.4	12.3
5–9	+2.4	4.5	5.4	7.2
10–14	–2.3	2.6	3.3	4.2
15–19	–5.4	3.9	4.1	4.4
20–24	–1.6	2.8	3.5	4.4
25–29	–4.5	3.4	3.6	3.9
30–34	–2.1	2.8	3.3	4.2
35–39	–0.4	2.6	3.0	4.3
40–44	–1.9	2.5	2.8	3.9
45–49	+10.7	3.8	4.5	6.1
50–54	+9.7	3.6	4.1	5.4
55–59	+2.5	2.8	3.4	4.4
60–64	+1.4	2.7	3.1	4.2
65–69	+2.5	2.7	3.2	4.1
70–74	+6.1	2.5	2.8	3.8
75–79	–2.6	2.9	3.5	4.4
80–84	–1.3	2.8	3.2	4.1
85–89	+1.0	1.9	2.2	2.9
90–94	–3.3	4.4	5.2	6.9
95–100	+2.5	0.5	0.6	0.8

Table 7 (100% of the new-definition national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| Sample Size n | Diff. | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points) | | |
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+2.0	68.4	76.3	89.0
4	+1.2	41.7	46.8	57.9
8	+1.1	32.1	37.4	46.3
16	+1.1	23.0	27.4	36.3
32	+1.1	16.0	19.3	27.3
64	+1.5	12.2	14.5	18.1
128	+1.6	9.0	10.7	13.6
256	+1.6	6.2	7.3	9.6
512	+1.7	4.5	5.4	6.3
1,024	+1.7	3.1	3.5	4.9
2,048	+1.7	2.2	2.6	3.4
4,096	+1.7	1.7	1.9	2.5
8,192	+1.7	1.2	1.4	1.7
16,384	+1.7	0.8	1.0	1.3

Table 8 (New-definition national lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

	Poverty lines			
	National lines (new definition)			
	Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Error (estimate minus observed value)	+2.3	+1.7	+1.4	+0.9
Precision of difference	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8
Alpha factor for precision	1.11	1.23	1.32	1.52

Results pertain to the 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample.

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Table 8 (New-definition international 2005 and 2011 PPP lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

	Poverty lines					
	Intl. 2005 PPP				Intl. 2011 PPP	
	$1.25	**$2.00**	**$2.50**	**$5.00**	**$1.90**	**$3.10**
Error (estimate minus observed value)	+0.9	+1.5	+2.1	+1.7	+1.2	+2.5
Precision of difference	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.5
Alpha factor for precision	0.96	1.00	1.07	1.12	0.96	1.09

Results pertain to the 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample.

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

316

Table 8 (New-definition relative- and percentile-based lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

	Poverty lines					
	Poorest half of people below 100% Natl. line	Percentile-based lines				
		20th	40th	50th	60th	80th
Error (estimate minus observed value)	+4.2	+3.4	+4.6	+3.5	+3.4	+2.4
Precision of difference	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8
Alpha factor for precision	1.10	1.02	1.22	1.10	1.20	1.41

Results pertain to the 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample.

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Table 8 (Old-definition national lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

	Poverty lines				
				Upper	
	Food	Lower	100%	125%	150%
Error (estimate minus observed value)	+1.0	+0.4	−1.6	+0.1	−0.6
Precision of difference	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5
Alpha factor for precision	1.01	1.01	0.94	0.91	0.89

Results pertain to the 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample.

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Table 8 (Old-definition international 2005 PPP lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for poverty rates of a group of households at a point in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

	Poverty lines	
	Intl. 2005 PPP lines	
	$1.25	**$2.50**
Error (estimate minus observed value)	−0.2	+0.8
Precision of difference	0.2	0.3
Alpha factor for precision	1.03	0.94

Results pertain to the 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample.

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Table 9 (New-definition national lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for changes in poverty rates for two independent samples between two points in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and to all of the 2012, 2010, or 2008 data (follow-ups)

| | Year | | Poverty lines | | | |
| | | | National lines (new definition) | | | |
	Baseline	Follow-up	Minimum	100%	150%	200%
Error (estimate minus observed value)	2014	2012	+0.8	+2.2	+1.3	+0.4
	2014	2010	+10.5	+26.6	+4.7	+8.2
	2014	2008	+7.2	+9.6	+7.7	+5.6
Precision of difference	2014	2012	0.8	1.1	1.1	1.1
	2014	2010	1.2	2.3	2.1	2.3
	2014	2008	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0
Alpha factor for precision	2014	2012	1.15	1.21	1.22	1.36
	2014	2010	1.70	2.60	2.31	2.82
	2014	2008	1.11	1.13	1.20	1.25

New 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and the 2008, 2012, and 2014 validation samples (follow-ups).

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Table 9 (New-definition international 2005 and 2011 PPP lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for changes in poverty rates for two independent samples between two points in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and to all of the 2012, 2010, or 2008 data (follow-ups)

| | Year | | Poverty lines | | | | | |
| | | | Intl. 2005 PPP | | | | Intl. 2011 PPP | |
	Baseline	Follow-up	$1.25	$2.00	$2.50	$5.00	$1.90	$3.10
Error (estimate minus observed value)	2014	2012	–0.3	–0.2	–0.3	+2.9	+1.2	+3.1
	2014	2010	+1.3	+4.6	+7.0	+22.5	+2.9	+8.5
	2014	2008	+0.5	+2.2	+3.4	+9.0	+1.5	+4.2
Precision of difference	2014	2012	0.4	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.4	0.8
	2014	2010	0.3	0.7	1.0	2.1	0.5	1.1
	2014	2008	0.4	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.5	0.8
Alpha factor for precision	2014	2012	1.06	1.11	1.13	1.15	0.98	1.11
	2014	2010	1.02	1.37	1.66	2.43	1.20	1.76
	2014	2008	1.15	1.14	1.16	1.10	1.10	1.16

New 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and the 2008, 2012, and 2014 validation samples (follow-ups).

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Table 9 (Old-definition national lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for changes in poverty rates for two independent samples between two points in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and to all of the 2012, 2010, or 2008 data (follow-ups)

| | Year | | Poverty lines | | | | |
	Baseline	Follow-up	Food	Lower	100%	Upper 125%	150%
Error (estimate minus observed value)	2014	2012	+1.1	+1.7	+3.8	+2.1	+3.5
	2014	2010	+3.8	+6.3	+10.2	+9.1	+8.7
	2014	2008	+4.9	+8.4	+15.1	+13.7	+13.0
Precision of difference	2014	2012	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
	2014	2010	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9
	2014	2008	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9
Alpha factor for precision	2014	2012	0.96	0.96	0.91	0.91	0.89
	2014	2010	1.03	1.02	1.01	1.01	1.01
	2014	2008	1.08	1.04	0.99	0.99	0.99

New 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and the 2008, 2012, and 2014 validation samples (follow-ups).

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Table 9 (Old-definition international 2005 PPP lines): Average errors between estimates and observed values for changes in poverty rates for two independent samples between two points in time, precision, and the α factor for precision, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and to all of the 2012, 2010, or 2008 data (follow-ups)

	Year		Poverty lines	
			Intl. 2005 PPP	
	Baseline	Follow-up	$1.25	$2.50
Error (estimate minus observed value)	2014	2012	+0.2	−0.3
	2014	2010	+0.3	+1.2
	2014	2008	+0.9	+1.8
Precision of difference	2014	2012	0.2	0.5
	2014	2010	0.3	0.5
	2014	2008	0.2	0.5
Alpha factor for precision	2014	2012	0.98	0.93
	2014	2010	1.08	0.98
	2014	2008	1.04	1.10

New 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample (baseline) and the 2008, 2012, and 2014 validation samples (follow-ups).

Differences between estimates and observed values are displayed in units of percentage points.

Precision is measured as 90-percent confidence intervals in units of ± percentage points.

Differences and precision estimated from 1,000 bootstraps with n = 16,384.

Alpha is estimated from 1,000 bootstrap samples of n = 256, 512, 1,024, 2,048, 4,096, 8,192, and 16,384.

Table 10 (All poverty lines): Possible targeting outcomes

		Targeting segment	
		Targeted	**Non-targeted**
Observed poverty status	**Poor**	**Inclusion** Poor correctly targeted	**Undercoverage** Poor mistakenly not targeted
	Non-poor	**Leakage** Non-poor mistakenly targeted	**Exclusion** Non-poor correctly not targeted

Table 11 (100% of the new-definition national line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.5	47.1	0.0	52.3	52.9	−97.7
<=9	1.6	46.0	0.1	52.2	53.8	−92.9
<=14	3.5	44.1	0.3	52.0	55.5	−84.6
<=19	6.0	41.6	0.6	51.7	57.7	−73.5
<=24	9.2	38.4	1.3	51.1	60.3	−58.6
<=29	14.1	33.6	2.5	49.9	63.9	−35.7
<=34	19.1	28.6	4.2	48.2	67.2	−11.0
<=39	24.6	23.0	7.0	45.4	70.0	+18.1
<=44	30.3	17.3	10.8	41.6	71.8	+49.9
<=49	34.8	12.8	15.1	37.3	72.1	+68.3
<=54	38.6	9.0	19.7	32.7	71.3	+58.7
<=59	41.6	6.1	24.8	27.6	69.1	+47.9
<=64	43.9	3.7	29.9	22.5	66.4	+37.3
<=69	45.3	2.3	34.5	17.9	63.2	+27.6
<=74	46.3	1.4	38.7	13.6	59.9	+18.7
<=79	46.9	0.7	42.4	9.9	56.9	+10.9
<=84	47.3	0.3	46.0	6.4	53.7	+3.4
<=89	47.5	0.1	48.6	3.8	51.3	−2.1
<=94	47.6	0.0	49.9	2.5	50.1	−4.7
<=100	47.6	0.0	52.4	0.0	47.6	−10.0

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

Table 12 (100% of the new-definition national 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 who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	93.1	1.1	13.5:1
<=9	1.8	91.8	3.4	11.2:1
<=14	3.8	91.3	7.4	10.5:1
<=19	6.6	90.5	12.6	9.5:1
<=24	10.5	88.0	19.4	7.3:1
<=29	16.6	84.8	29.5	5.6:1
<=34	23.3	81.9	40.1	4.5:1
<=39	31.6	77.8	51.7	3.5:1
<=44	41.1	73.7	63.6	2.8:1
<=49	49.9	69.8	73.2	2.3:1
<=54	58.3	66.2	81.0	2.0:1
<=59	66.4	62.6	87.3	1.7:1
<=64	73.8	59.5	92.2	1.5:1
<=69	79.8	56.8	95.2	1.3:1
<=74	85.0	54.4	97.1	1.2:1
<=79	89.4	52.5	98.5	1.1:1
<=84	93.3	50.7	99.4	1.0:1
<=89	96.1	49.4	99.8	1.0:1
<=94	97.5	48.8	99.9	1.0:1
<=100	100.0	47.6	100.0	0.9:1

Table 13: Distribution of values of scorecard indicators in the 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014 ENIGH

Indicator	Response	'08	'10	'12	'14
1. How many household members are 17-years-old or younger?	A. Three or more	22	20	17	17
	B. Two	23	22	22	22
	C. One	21	22	22	22
	D. None	34	36	39	39
2. What is the highest educational level and grade completed by the male head/spouse?	A. None, pre-school/kindergarten, or primary grade 1	8	8	7	7
	B. Primary grades 2 or 3	9	8	8	7
	C. Primary grades 4, 5, or 6, or middle grade 1	20	19	18	18
	D. Middle grades 2 or 3	17	18	19	18
	E. No male head/spouse	22	21	22	22
	F. High school/college prep. (any grade), or post-secondary technical/trade school (any grade)	12	12	13	14
	G. College/university (any year), teacher's college (any year), or post-graduate (any year)	12	13	13	14
3. What is the main material of the floor of the residence?	A. Dirt, cement, or pavement	62	59	58	56
	B. Wood, tile, or other covering	38	41	42	44
4. Does the residence have a kitchen sink (*fregadero* or *tarja*) for washing dishes?	A. No	46	43	42	41
	B. Yes	54	57	58	59
5. Does the household have a gas or electric stove, or a microwave?	A. None	11	10	10	10
	B. Gas or electric stove, without microwave	47	47	48	45
	C. Microwave (regardless of gas/electric stove)	43	43	42	45
6. Does the residence have a toilet arrangement with a piped water supply?	A. No	38	36	34	33
	B. Yes	62	64	66	67
7. Does the household have a clothes-washing machine?	A. No	49	36	36	34
	B. Yes	51	64	64	66
8. How many fans does the household have?	A. None	53	54	55	54
	B. One	27	27	27	27
	C. Two or more	20	18	18	18
9. Does the household have an automobile (car, van, minivan, or SUV) or truck (pickup or larger)?	A. No	58	58	59	58
	B. Yes	42	42	41	42
10. Does the household have a computer?	A. No	78	74	71	71
	B. Yes	22	26	29	29
11. Does the household have a mobile phone?	A. No	48	37	31	27
	B. Yes	52	63	69	73

All figures are rounded percentages. Weighted in all years with new-definition weights.

Tables for
the New-Definition Food Poverty Line

Table 4 (New-definition food line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	75.3
5–9	62.6
10–14	54.7
15–19	47.4
20–24	40.6
25–29	36.0
30–34	29.8
35–39	25.2
40–44	20.2
45–49	16.6
50–54	12.9
55–59	9.5
60–64	6.8
65–69	5.2
70–74	4.3
75–79	2.5
80–84	2.0
85–89	1.4
90–94	1.3
95–100	0.8

Table 6 (New-definition food line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16{,}384$, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Score	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+21.7	11.9	13.2	17.0
5–9	−0.9	7.1	8.6	11.8
10–14	+7.6	5.2	6.3	8.7
15–19	+6.7	4.8	5.7	7.2
20–24	−2.5	4.0	4.8	6.4
25–29	+8.0	3.7	4.5	5.6
30–34	+2.6	2.7	3.3	4.4
35–39	−1.3	2.5	3.1	3.9
40–44	+4.5	1.9	2.2	2.8
45–49	+4.5	1.7	2.0	2.7
50–54	+4.6	1.4	1.6	2.1
55–59	+1.9	1.3	1.6	2.0
60–64	0.0	1.4	1.6	2.2
65–69	+1.2	1.1	1.3	1.7
70–74	+1.1	1.2	1.4	1.8
75–79	−2.1	2.0	2.2	2.9
80–84	−1.3	1.7	2.1	2.6
85–89	0.0	0.9	1.0	1.4
90–94	−0.5	1.5	1.8	2.2
95–100	+0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6

Table 7 (New-definition food line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| Sample Size | Difference between estimate and observed value | | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.8	60.2	67.2	79.6
4	+1.3	32.8	39.3	50.5
8	+1.7	23.1	27.5	36.5
16	+1.7	17.0	19.8	25.4
32	+1.8	12.1	14.5	19.7
64	+2.1	8.6	10.5	13.7
128	+2.0	6.1	7.2	9.4
256	+2.2	4.2	5.1	6.9
512	+2.3	3.2	3.8	4.9
1,024	+2.4	2.2	2.7	3.6
2,048	+2.4	1.6	1.8	2.6
4,096	+2.4	1.2	1.4	1.8
8,192	+2.4	0.8	1.0	1.4
16,384	+2.3	0.6	0.7	0.9

Table 11 (New-definition food line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.4	17.6	0.2	81.8	82.2	−94.7
<=9	1.2	16.8	0.6	81.4	82.6	−83.7
<=14	2.2	15.7	1.6	80.4	82.6	−66.2
<=19	3.5	14.4	3.1	78.9	82.5	−43.4
<=24	5.2	12.8	5.3	76.7	82.0	−12.7
<=29	7.5	10.5	9.1	72.9	80.4	+33.6
<=34	9.4	8.6	13.9	68.1	77.5	+22.7
<=39	11.6	6.4	20.0	62.0	73.6	−11.3
<=44	13.3	4.7	27.8	54.2	67.5	−54.6
<=49	14.7	3.3	35.3	46.7	61.4	−96.1
<=54	15.7	2.3	42.5	39.5	55.2	−136.6
<=59	16.5	1.5	49.9	32.1	48.6	−177.3
<=64	17.1	0.9	56.7	25.3	42.4	−215.3
<=69	17.4	0.6	62.4	19.6	37.0	−247.1
<=74	17.6	0.4	67.4	14.6	32.2	−274.7
<=79	17.8	0.2	71.6	10.4	28.2	−298.1
<=84	17.9	0.1	75.4	6.6	24.5	−319.4
<=89	17.9	0.0	78.2	3.8	21.8	−334.7
<=94	18.0	0.0	79.5	2.5	20.5	−342.0
<=100	18.0	0.0	82.0	0.0	18.0	−356.0

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

Table 12 (New-definition food line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	69.0	2.2	2.2:1
<=9	1.8	67.1	6.6	2.0:1
<=14	3.8	58.2	12.4	1.4:1
<=19	6.6	53.4	19.7	1.1:1
<=24	10.5	49.8	29.0	1.0:1
<=29	16.6	45.0	41.5	0.8:1
<=34	23.3	40.3	52.2	0.7:1
<=39	31.6	36.7	64.5	0.6:1
<=44	41.1	32.3	73.9	0.5:1
<=49	49.9	29.4	81.5	0.4:1
<=54	58.3	27.0	87.4	0.4:1
<=59	66.4	24.8	91.6	0.3:1
<=64	73.8	23.1	94.8	0.3:1
<=69	79.8	21.8	96.7	0.3:1
<=74	85.0	20.7	97.9	0.3:1
<=79	89.4	19.9	98.9	0.2:1
<=84	93.3	19.2	99.4	0.2:1
<=89	96.1	18.7	99.7	0.2:1
<=94	97.5	18.4	99.9	0.2:1
<=100	100.0	18.0	100.0	0.2:1

Tables for
150% of the New-Definition National Poverty Line

Table 4 (150% of the new-definition national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	100.0
5–9	98.4
10–14	97.7
15–19	96.6
20–24	94.6
25–29	93.1
30–34	89.4
35–39	86.6
40–44	83.0
45–49	77.7
50–54	70.7
55–59	63.8
60–64	55.0
65–69	47.0
70–74	37.2
75–79	30.3
80–84	19.9
85–89	15.6
90–94	12.0
95–100	7.5

Table 6 (150% of the new-definition national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+0.4	0.7	0.8	0.9
5–9	+1.6	2.2	2.6	3.4
10–14	+0.7	1.9	2.3	3.0
15–19	−0.6	1.5	1.8	2.5
20–24	−1.1	1.6	1.9	2.6
25–29	−1.7	1.5	1.7	2.1
30–34	−0.6	2.0	2.5	3.1
35–39	−2.0	1.9	2.1	2.7
40–44	−2.0	1.9	2.2	3.0
45–49	+12.9	4.8	5.6	7.5
50–54	−5.3	4.0	4.3	4.6
55–59	+8.3	3.2	3.7	5.0
60–64	+0.2	2.9	3.4	4.5
65–69	+3.1	3.3	3.8	5.1
70–74	+7.2	3.5	4.2	5.7
75–79	−3.9	3.9	4.6	5.9
80–84	−1.3	3.4	4.1	5.2
85–89	+3.0	3.0	3.5	4.5
90–94	−9.0	7.8	8.4	9.5
95–100	+4.0	1.4	1.7	2.2

Table 7 (150% of the new-definition national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.7	66.7	78.2	89.2
4	+0.8	38.7	45.9	59.3
8	+0.7	30.0	36.9	47.9
16	+0.9	23.0	27.8	38.1
32	+0.7	16.5	20.7	27.6
64	+1.3	12.2	14.6	18.4
128	+1.3	8.7	10.3	13.5
256	+1.3	6.2	7.3	9.7
512	+1.4	4.5	5.5	7.8
1,024	+1.4	3.3	3.8	5.1
2,048	+1.4	2.3	2.6	3.7
4,096	+1.4	1.6	1.9	2.7
8,192	+1.4	1.1	1.4	2.0
16,384	+1.4	0.8	1.0	1.3

Table 11 (150% of the new-definition national line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.6	65.9	0.0	33.5	34.1	−98.3
<=9	1.7	64.7	0.0	33.5	35.2	−94.8
<=14	3.7	62.7	0.1	33.4	37.2	−88.6
<=19	6.4	60.0	0.2	33.4	39.8	−80.3
<=24	10.1	56.4	0.4	33.2	43.3	−69.0
<=29	15.8	50.7	0.8	32.8	48.5	−51.3
<=34	21.9	44.6	1.4	32.1	54.0	−32.0
<=39	29.1	37.3	2.5	31.0	60.2	−8.6
<=44	37.0	29.4	4.1	29.5	66.5	+17.5
<=49	43.8	22.7	6.2	27.4	71.1	+41.0
<=54	49.7	16.7	8.6	25.0	74.7	+62.5
<=59	54.6	11.9	11.8	21.8	76.4	+82.0
<=64	58.7	7.7	15.0	18.5	77.2	+77.4
<=69	61.4	5.0	18.4	15.2	76.6	+72.4
<=74	63.4	3.1	21.6	11.9	75.3	+67.5
<=79	64.8	1.7	24.6	8.9	73.7	+63.0
<=84	65.6	0.8	27.7	5.9	71.5	+58.3
<=89	66.1	0.4	30.1	3.5	69.6	+54.8
<=94	66.3	0.1	31.2	2.4	68.7	+53.1
<=100	66.4	0.0	33.6	0.0	66.4	+49.5

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

Table 12 (150% of the new-definition national line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	99.2	0.8	118.9:1
<=9	1.8	97.4	2.6	37.3:1
<=14	3.8	97.2	5.6	35.4:1
<=19	6.6	97.0	9.7	32.1:1
<=24	10.5	96.3	15.2	26.4:1
<=29	16.6	95.3	23.7	20.1:1
<=34	23.3	93.9	32.9	15.3:1
<=39	31.6	92.1	43.8	11.6:1
<=44	41.1	90.1	55.7	9.1:1
<=49	49.9	87.6	65.8	7.1:1
<=54	58.3	85.3	74.8	5.8:1
<=59	66.4	82.3	82.2	4.6:1
<=64	73.8	79.6	88.4	3.9:1
<=69	79.8	77.0	92.5	3.3:1
<=74	85.0	74.6	95.4	2.9:1
<=79	89.4	72.5	97.5	2.6:1
<=84	93.3	70.3	98.8	2.4:1
<=89	96.1	68.7	99.4	2.2:1
<=94	97.5	68.0	99.8	2.1:1
<=100	100.0	66.4	100.0	2.0:1

Tables for
200% of the New-Definition National Poverty Line

Table 4 (200% of the new-definition national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	100.0
5–9	99.3
10–14	99.2
15–19	98.9
20–24	98.1
25–29	97.4
30–34	95.9
35–39	94.4
40–44	91.9
45–49	88.4
50–54	84.2
55–59	80.3
60–64	72.2
65–69	63.7
70–74	54.1
75–79	44.4
80–84	31.7
85–89	27.8
90–94	20.0
95–100	13.4

Table 6 (200% of the new-definition national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
5–9	+0.2	1.2	1.4	1.7
10–14	−0.1	0.6	0.7	0.9
15–19	−0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8
20–24	−1.2	0.8	0.8	0.9
25–29	−0.1	1.0	1.2	1.6
30–34	−0.7	1.1	1.3	1.8
35–39	+0.3	1.3	1.5	2.0
40–44	−1.8	1.5	1.6	2.0
45–49	+13.8	5.3	6.4	8.2
50–54	−3.4	2.6	2.9	3.2
55–59	+9.9	3.3	3.9	5.3
60–64	−0.1	2.8	3.3	4.0
65–69	0.0	3.3	3.8	4.9
70–74	−6.2	5.2	5.6	6.4
75–79	−6.0	4.9	5.3	6.1
80–84	−4.1	4.0	4.9	6.3
85–89	+4.1	4.0	4.8	6.0
90–94	−10.5	8.8	9.5	11.2
95–100	+4.5	2.4	2.8	3.4

Table 7 (200% of the new-definition national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.6	65.1	73.8	87.9
4	+0.2	34.5	42.9	56.2
8	+0.7	26.9	34.4	50.8
16	+0.3	20.1	26.3	38.2
32	+0.2	15.8	21.2	28.5
64	+0.7	12.3	14.6	20.6
128	+0.7	8.4	10.5	13.5
256	+0.9	6.4	7.1	10.1
512	+0.9	4.5	5.5	7.4
1,024	+0.9	3.3	4.0	5.2
2,048	+0.9	2.3	2.8	3.8
4,096	+0.9	1.6	1.9	2.6
8,192	+0.9	1.1	1.4	1.9
16,384	+0.9	0.8	1.0	1.3

Table 11 (200% of the new-definition national line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.6	76.7	0.0	22.7	23.3	−98.5
<=9	1.7	75.5	0.0	22.7	24.5	−95.5
<=14	3.8	73.5	0.0	22.7	26.5	−90.1
<=19	6.6	70.7	0.1	22.7	29.2	−82.9
<=24	10.4	66.9	0.1	22.6	33.0	−73.0
<=29	16.3	61.0	0.3	22.4	38.7	−57.5
<=34	22.7	54.5	0.6	22.2	44.9	−40.4
<=39	30.5	46.7	1.1	21.7	52.2	−19.6
<=44	39.3	37.9	1.8	21.0	60.3	+4.1
<=49	47.1	30.2	2.8	19.9	67.0	+25.5
<=54	54.2	23.1	4.1	18.6	72.8	+45.5
<=59	60.4	16.9	6.0	16.8	77.1	+64.0
<=64	65.8	11.5	8.0	14.7	80.5	+80.6
<=69	69.6	7.7	10.2	12.5	82.1	+86.8
<=74	72.4	4.9	12.6	10.1	82.5	+83.7
<=79	74.5	2.8	14.9	7.8	82.3	+80.7
<=84	75.9	1.4	17.4	5.3	81.1	+77.4
<=89	76.6	0.6	19.5	3.2	79.9	+74.8
<=94	77.0	0.3	20.5	2.2	79.2	+73.5
<=100	77.3	0.0	22.7	0.0	77.3	+70.6

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

Table 12 (200% of the new-definition national line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	99.4	0.7	177.2:1
<=9	1.8	99.2	2.3	128.4:1
<=14	3.8	99.0	4.9	100.9:1
<=19	6.6	99.0	8.5	94.4:1
<=24	10.5	98.8	13.4	84.2:1
<=29	16.6	98.2	21.0	53.5:1
<=34	23.3	97.6	29.4	40.7:1
<=39	31.6	96.6	39.5	28.6:1
<=44	41.1	95.7	50.9	22.4:1
<=49	49.9	94.3	60.9	16.6:1
<=54	58.3	93.0	70.1	13.3:1
<=59	66.4	91.0	78.1	10.1:1
<=64	73.8	89.2	85.1	8.2:1
<=69	79.8	87.2	90.1	6.8:1
<=74	85.0	85.2	93.7	5.7:1
<=79	89.4	83.3	96.4	5.0:1
<=84	93.3	81.3	98.2	4.3:1
<=89	96.1	79.7	99.2	3.9:1
<=94	97.5	79.0	99.6	3.8:1
<=100	100.0	77.3	100.0	3.4:1

Tables for
the New-Definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Table 4 (New-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	36.6
5–9	22.5
10–14	16.7
15–19	9.1
20–24	6.9
25–29	6.6
30–34	6.1
35–39	4.4
40–44	3.3
45–49	2.8
50–54	2.4
55–59	1.9
60–64	1.5
65–69	1.0
70–74	0.9
75–79	0.7
80–84	0.5
85–89	0.5
90–94	0.5
95–100	0.2

Table 6 (New-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+19.0	6.1	7.2	9.4
5–9	+4.3	4.8	5.7	7.0
10–14	+5.3	3.0	3.7	4.9
15–19	+1.6	2.0	2.5	3.5
20–24	−1.3	2.1	2.5	3.0
25–29	+1.7	1.2	1.5	1.9
30–34	−0.3	1.6	1.9	2.4
35–39	+1.6	0.7	0.8	1.2
40–44	+0.6	0.9	1.0	1.3
45–49	+1.3	0.6	0.7	1.0
50–54	+1.2	0.4	0.5	0.7
55–59	+0.6	0.5	0.6	0.8
60–64	+0.5	0.4	0.5	0.6
65–69	+0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5
70–74	+0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6
75–79	+0.2	0.4	0.4	0.5
80–84	+0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1
85–89	+0.3	0.2	0.2	0.4
90–94	−1.0	1.5	1.8	2.1
95–100	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.5

Table 7 (New-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.1	4.4	54.9	60.2
4	+0.8	12.6	18.5	31.8
8	+0.8	9.1	12.6	20.9
16	+0.6	7.4	9.7	14.7
32	+0.6	5.6	6.9	9.2
64	+0.8	3.6	4.5	5.8
128	+0.8	2.5	3.1	4.1
256	+0.9	1.8	2.1	2.9
512	+0.9	1.3	1.5	2.0
1,024	+0.9	0.9	1.1	1.5
2,048	+0.9	0.6	0.7	1.0
4,096	+0.9	0.5	0.5	0.8
8,192	+0.9	0.3	0.4	0.5
16,384	+0.9	0.2	0.3	0.4

Table 11 (New-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.2	3.6	0.4	95.9	96.0	−80.7
<=9	0.4	3.3	1.3	94.9	95.4	−41.1
<=14	0.7	3.0	3.1	93.1	93.9	+16.3
<=19	1.0	2.7	5.6	90.7	91.7	−50.6
<=24	1.4	2.3	9.1	87.2	88.6	−143.7
<=29	1.8	1.9	14.7	81.5	83.4	−294.8
<=34	2.2	1.5	21.1	75.2	77.4	−464.6
<=39	2.6	1.2	29.0	67.2	69.8	−678.3
<=44	2.9	0.9	38.2	58.0	60.9	−924.6
<=49	3.0	0.7	46.9	49.4	52.4	−1,156.6
<=54	3.2	0.5	55.0	41.2	44.5	−1,374.8
<=59	3.4	0.3	63.0	33.3	36.7	−1,587.7
<=64	3.5	0.2	70.3	26.0	29.5	−1,783.3
<=69	3.6	0.2	76.2	20.0	23.6	−1,943.3
<=74	3.6	0.1	81.4	14.9	18.6	−2,080.5
<=79	3.7	0.0	85.7	10.6	14.3	−2,197.0
<=84	3.7	0.0	89.6	6.7	10.3	−2,302.0
<=89	3.7	0.0	92.4	3.8	7.6	−2,377.2
<=94	3.7	0.0	93.7	2.5	6.3	−2,412.4
<=100	3.7	0.0	96.3	0.0	3.7	−2,480.3

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

Table 12 (New-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Share of all
households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-
off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is,
have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor
households who are targeted, and the number of poor
households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-
poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard
applied to the 2014 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	0.6	27.7	4.2	0.4:1
<=9	1.8	25.0	11.8	0.3:1
<=14	3.8	18.8	19.3	0.2:1
<=19	6.6	15.3	27.2	0.2:1
<=24	10.5	13.3	37.3	0.2:1
<=29	16.6	11.1	49.2	0.1:1
<=34	23.3	9.6	59.8	0.1:1
<=39	31.6	8.2	69.2	0.1:1
<=44	41.1	7.0	76.8	0.1:1
<=49	49.9	6.1	81.6	0.1:1
<=54	58.3	5.5	86.7	0.1:1
<=59	66.4	5.1	90.8	0.1:1
<=64	73.8	4.7	93.8	0.0:1
<=69	79.8	4.5	95.9	0.0:1
<=74	85.0	4.3	97.6	0.0:1
<=79	89.4	4.1	98.7	0.0:1
<=84	93.3	4.0	98.9	0.0:1
<=89	96.1	3.9	99.3	0.0:1
<=94	97.5	3.8	99.8	0.0:1
<=100	100.0	3.7	100.0	0.0:1

Tables for
the New-Definition $2.00/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Table 4 (New-definition $2.00/day 2005 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	63.5
5–9	43.5
10–14	35.2
15–19	26.3
20–24	20.0
25–29	18.0
30–34	15.0
35–39	11.7
40–44	8.3
45–49	7.1
50–54	6.1
55–59	4.5
60–64	3.1
65–69	2.1
70–74	2.1
75–79	1.5
80–84	0.9
85–89	0.8
90–94	0.8
95–100	0.4

Table 6 (New-definition $2.00/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+20.1	10.4	12.2	16.4
5–9	−0.7	7.0	8.4	11.1
10–14	+4.4	4.9	5.9	8.1
15–19	+1.0	4.0	4.6	5.9
20–24	−1.7	3.2	3.9	5.1
25–29	+6.0	2.0	2.4	3.0
30–34	+2.4	2.0	2.4	3.1
35–39	+3.0	1.3	1.6	2.1
40–44	+0.5	1.3	1.6	2.2
45–49	+0.7	1.3	1.5	1.9
50–54	+3.4	0.7	0.8	1.1
55–59	+0.9	0.9	1.1	1.5
60–64	+0.2	1.0	1.1	1.5
65–69	+0.6	0.6	0.7	0.9
70–74	+1.1	0.5	0.6	0.7
75–79	+0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6
80–84	−1.4	1.7	1.9	2.5
85–89	+0.3	0.5	0.6	0.8
90–94	−0.8	1.5	1.8	2.1
95–100	+0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5

Table 7 (New-definition \$2.00/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.6	50.0	59.0	69.9
4	+1.0	23.6	31.2	44.3
8	+1.0	17.5	21.3	30.8
16	+0.9	12.4	15.8	21.1
32	+0.9	9.2	10.9	14.5
64	+1.2	6.2	7.2	9.3
128	+1.2	4.2	5.1	6.6
256	+1.4	2.9	3.4	4.6
512	+1.5	2.1	2.6	3.5
1,024	+1.5	1.5	1.8	2.4
2,048	+1.5	1.0	1.2	1.7
4,096	+1.5	0.8	0.9	1.2
8,192	+1.5	0.5	0.7	0.9
16,384	+1.5	0.4	0.5	0.6

Table 11 (New-definition $2.00/day 2005 PPP line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.3	8.9	0.2	90.6	90.9	−90.5
<=9	0.9	8.3	0.8	90.0	90.9	−70.9
<=14	1.6	7.6	2.2	88.6	90.2	−40.6
<=19	2.5	6.7	4.2	86.6	89.1	−1.2
<=24	3.4	5.8	7.1	83.7	87.0	+22.6
<=29	4.4	4.8	12.1	78.7	83.1	−31.8
<=34	5.4	3.8	17.9	72.9	78.3	−94.8
<=39	6.3	2.9	25.3	65.5	71.8	−175.3
<=44	7.1	2.1	34.0	56.8	63.9	−269.5
<=49	7.8	1.4	42.2	48.6	56.4	−358.5
<=54	8.2	1.0	50.1	40.7	48.9	−444.6
<=59	8.5	0.7	57.8	33.0	41.5	−528.9
<=64	8.8	0.4	65.0	25.8	34.6	−606.6
<=69	8.9	0.3	70.9	19.9	28.8	−670.7
<=74	9.0	0.2	76.0	14.8	23.9	−725.9
<=79	9.1	0.1	80.3	10.5	19.6	−772.9
<=84	9.1	0.1	84.2	6.6	15.8	−815.0
<=89	9.2	0.0	87.0	3.8	13.0	−845.3
<=94	9.2	0.0	88.3	2.5	11.7	−859.6
<=100	9.2	0.0	90.8	0.0	9.2	−887.2

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

Table 12 (New-definition $2.00/day 2005 PPP line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	55.9	3.4	1.3:1
<=9	1.8	52.3	10.0	1.1:1
<=14	3.8	42.1	17.6	0.7:1
<=19	6.6	37.0	26.7	0.6:1
<=24	10.5	32.1	36.6	0.5:1
<=29	16.6	26.8	48.3	0.4:1
<=34	23.3	23.1	58.5	0.3:1
<=39	31.6	19.9	68.4	0.2:1
<=44	41.1	17.3	77.2	0.2:1
<=49	49.9	15.5	84.3	0.2:1
<=54	58.3	14.0	88.8	0.2:1
<=59	66.4	12.8	92.5	0.1:1
<=64	73.8	11.9	95.3	0.1:1
<=69	79.8	11.2	96.9	0.1:1
<=74	85.0	10.6	98.2	0.1:1
<=79	89.4	10.2	98.8	0.1:1
<=84	93.3	9.8	99.4	0.1:1
<=89	96.1	9.5	99.7	0.1:1
<=94	97.5	9.4	99.9	0.1:1
<=100	100.0	9.2	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for
the New-Definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Table 4 (New-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	72.9
5–9	57.3
10–14	47.8
15–19	39.8
20–24	32.0
25–29	28.3
30–34	21.8
35–39	17.8
40–44	13.4
45–49	11.3
50–54	8.6
55–59	6.0
60–64	4.4
65–69	3.6
70–74	3.1
75–79	1.9
80–84	1.3
85–89	1.1
90–94	1.1
95–100	0.7

Table 6 (New-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Score	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+20.7	11.4	13.3	17.1
5–9	+3.1	7.3	8.7	11.5
10–14	+5.2	5.3	6.2	7.9
15–19	+2.5	4.7	5.3	6.9
20–24	−3.4	3.9	4.5	5.8
25–29	+7.4	2.9	3.7	4.5
30–34	+2.0	2.5	3.0	4.0
35–39	+1.8	2.0	2.4	3.0
40–44	+2.7	1.5	1.8	2.4
45–49	+2.3	1.5	1.8	2.4
50–54	+4.1	0.9	1.1	1.5
55–59	+0.7	1.2	1.4	1.9
60–64	+0.7	1.0	1.2	1.5
65–69	+1.6	0.7	0.8	1.1
70–74	+1.8	0.5	0.6	0.8
75–79	+0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9
80–84	−1.2	1.6	2.0	2.5
85–89	+0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8
90–94	−0.4	1.5	1.8	2.1
95–100	+0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5

Table 7 (New-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.2	57.1	64.2	76.5
4	+0.9	29.0	36.9	47.9
8	+1.2	20.6	24.7	33.9
16	+1.2	14.8	18.1	23.0
32	+1.5	10.4	12.6	15.7
64	+1.8	7.6	8.9	11.1
128	+1.7	5.3	6.4	8.8
256	+2.0	3.7	4.4	5.8
512	+2.0	2.6	3.2	4.2
1,024	+2.1	1.8	2.3	3.2
2,048	+2.1	1.3	1.6	2.2
4,096	+2.1	1.0	1.1	1.5
8,192	+2.1	0.7	0.8	1.1
16,384	+2.1	0.5	0.6	0.7

Table 11 (New-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.4	13.1	0.2	86.3	86.7	−93.0
<=9	1.1	12.4	0.7	85.9	87.0	−78.8
<=14	2.0	11.4	1.8	84.7	86.8	−56.3
<=19	3.2	10.3	3.4	83.1	86.3	−27.0
<=24	4.6	8.9	5.9	80.7	85.3	+12.0
<=29	6.4	7.1	10.2	76.3	82.7	+24.4
<=34	7.8	5.6	15.5	71.1	78.9	−14.8
<=39	9.3	4.2	22.3	64.2	73.5	−65.6
<=44	10.5	3.0	30.6	55.9	66.4	−127.2
<=49	11.4	2.0	38.5	48.0	59.5	−185.7
<=54	12.1	1.4	46.2	40.3	52.4	−242.8
<=59	12.6	0.9	53.8	32.7	45.3	−299.2
<=64	12.9	0.6	60.9	25.7	38.6	−351.6
<=69	13.1	0.4	66.7	19.8	32.9	−395.0
<=74	13.2	0.2	71.8	14.8	28.0	−432.5
<=79	13.3	0.1	76.0	10.5	23.8	−464.3
<=84	13.4	0.1	79.9	6.6	20.0	−492.9
<=89	13.4	0.0	82.7	3.8	17.3	−513.6
<=94	13.5	0.0	84.0	2.5	16.0	−523.3
<=100	13.5	0.0	86.5	0.0	13.5	−542.1

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

Table 12 (New-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	66.4	2.8	2.0:1
<=9	1.8	62.1	8.1	1.6:1
<=14	3.8	53.2	15.2	1.1:1
<=19	6.6	48.4	23.8	0.9:1
<=24	10.5	44.0	34.3	0.8:1
<=29	16.6	38.5	47.3	0.6:1
<=34	23.3	33.6	58.1	0.5:1
<=39	31.6	29.4	69.0	0.4:1
<=44	41.1	25.5	77.8	0.3:1
<=49	49.9	22.9	84.8	0.3:1
<=54	58.3	20.7	89.5	0.3:1
<=59	66.4	18.9	93.2	0.2:1
<=64	73.8	17.5	95.8	0.2:1
<=69	79.8	16.4	97.3	0.2:1
<=74	85.0	15.6	98.3	0.2:1
<=79	89.4	14.9	99.0	0.2:1
<=84	93.3	14.4	99.5	0.2:1
<=89	96.1	14.0	99.7	0.2:1
<=94	97.5	13.8	99.9	0.2:1
<=100	100.0	13.5	100.0	0.2:1

Tables for
the New-Definition $5.00/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Table 4 (New-definition $5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	95.0
5–9	91.8
10–14	87.4
15–19	82.9
20–24	78.7
25–29	72.9
30–34	63.4
35–39	57.0
40–44	48.3
45–49	41.1
50–54	34.3
55–59	24.7
60–64	18.9
65–69	15.3
70–74	11.1
75–79	7.1
80–84	5.0
85–89	4.1
90–94	2.6
95–100	1.7

Table 6 (New-definition $5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+13.0	9.7	11.8	14.6
5–9	+3.9	4.8	5.8	7.4
10–14	−2.5	3.0	3.8	4.9
15–19	−1.7	3.6	4.3	5.7
20–24	−1.4	3.3	3.8	5.3
25–29	−5.5	4.2	4.5	4.9
30–34	−4.9	3.9	4.2	4.8
35–39	−1.5	2.8	3.3	4.5
40–44	+2.0	2.7	3.1	4.0
45–49	+10.6	3.0	3.6	4.7
50–54	+9.5	2.7	3.3	4.1
55–59	+1.9	2.4	3.0	3.7
60–64	+1.7	2.1	2.4	3.1
65–69	+1.6	2.3	2.7	3.5
70–74	+1.8	2.0	2.3	3.0
75–79	−0.7	2.1	2.5	3.2
80–84	−0.9	2.0	2.4	3.2
85–89	+1.5	1.1	1.3	1.7
90–94	+0.5	1.6	1.9	2.3
95–100	+1.3	0.4	0.5	0.6

Table 7 (New-definition $5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+2.8	64.5	77.0	88.4
4	+1.3	38.8	45.7	55.6
8	+1.4	30.6	35.2	43.5
16	+1.4	21.6	25.3	33.7
32	+1.3	15.7	18.6	25.4
64	+1.5	11.3	13.0	16.8
128	+1.6	8.2	9.6	12.6
256	+1.6	5.5	6.5	8.9
512	+1.7	4.0	4.7	6.2
1,024	+1.7	2.8	3.3	4.2
2,048	+1.7	1.9	2.4	3.4
4,096	+1.7	1.4	1.7	2.3
8,192	+1.7	1.0	1.2	1.6
16,384	+1.7	0.7	0.9	1.1

Table 11 (New-definition $5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.5	38.4	0.1	61.0	61.5	−97.2
<=9	1.6	37.3	0.2	60.9	62.5	−91.4
<=14	3.4	35.5	0.4	60.7	64.1	−81.3
<=19	5.8	33.1	0.8	60.3	66.1	−68.0
<=24	8.9	30.0	1.6	59.5	68.4	−50.2
<=29	13.3	25.6	3.2	57.9	71.2	−23.1
<=34	17.9	21.1	5.4	55.7	73.5	+5.8
<=39	22.6	16.3	9.0	52.1	74.7	+39.3
<=44	27.1	11.9	14.0	47.1	74.1	+63.9
<=49	30.4	8.5	19.5	41.6	72.0	+49.8
<=54	33.1	5.8	25.1	35.9	69.0	+35.4
<=59	35.1	3.8	31.2	29.9	65.0	+19.8
<=64	36.7	2.3	37.1	24.0	60.6	+4.6
<=69	37.5	1.4	42.3	18.8	56.4	−8.6
<=74	38.2	0.7	46.8	14.3	52.4	−20.4
<=79	38.5	0.4	50.9	10.2	48.7	−30.7
<=84	38.7	0.2	54.6	6.5	45.3	−40.2
<=89	38.9	0.1	57.3	3.8	42.7	−47.2
<=94	38.9	0.0	58.6	2.5	41.4	−50.5
<=100	38.9	0.0	61.1	0.0	38.9	−57.0

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

Table 12 (New-definition $5.00/day 2005 PPP line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	90.4	1.3	9.4:1
<=9	1.8	89.6	4.1	8.6:1
<=14	3.8	89.2	8.8	8.2:1
<=19	6.6	87.6	14.9	7.1:1
<=24	10.5	84.7	22.8	5.6:1
<=29	16.6	80.5	34.3	4.1:1
<=34	23.3	76.7	45.9	3.3:1
<=39	31.6	71.5	58.1	2.5:1
<=44	41.1	65.8	69.5	1.9:1
<=49	49.9	60.9	78.2	1.6:1
<=54	58.3	56.8	85.1	1.3:1
<=59	66.4	53.0	90.3	1.1:1
<=64	73.8	49.7	94.2	1.0:1
<=69	79.8	47.0	96.5	0.9:1
<=74	85.0	44.9	98.1	0.8:1
<=79	89.4	43.1	99.0	0.8:1
<=84	93.3	41.5	99.6	0.7:1
<=89	96.1	40.4	99.8	0.7:1
<=94	97.5	39.9	99.9	0.7:1
<=100	100.0	38.9	100.0	0.6:1

Tables for
the New-Definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP Poverty Line

Table 4 (New-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	52.9
5–9	36.5
10–14	27.0
15–19	18.0
20–24	13.4
25–29	11.9
30–34	10.4
35–39	8.3
40–44	5.6
45–49	4.8
50–54	4.3
55–59	3.3
60–64	2.4
65–69	1.5
70–74	1.5
75–79	1.1
80–84	0.7
85–89	0.6
90–94	0.6
95–100	0.3

Table 6 (New-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| Score | Diff. | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+25.2	8.1	9.5	12.1
5–9	+0.8	6.5	8.0	10.3
10–14	+5.2	4.1	5.2	6.6
15–19	−0.7	3.4	3.9	4.9
20–24	−2.2	2.8	3.3	4.3
25–29	+3.9	1.5	1.9	2.4
30–34	+0.9	1.8	2.2	2.7
35–39	+2.0	1.1	1.4	1.7
40–44	+0.9	1.0	1.2	1.8
45–49	+1.4	0.9	1.0	1.3
50–54	+2.2	0.6	0.7	1.0
55–59	+1.2	0.6	0.7	1.0
60–64	+0.2	0.8	1.0	1.3
65–69	+0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8
70–74	+0.7	0.4	0.5	0.6
75–79	+0.6	0.4	0.4	0.5
80–84	+0.5	0.2	0.2	0.3
85–89	+0.1	0.5	0.5	0.7
90–94	−1.0	1.5	1.8	2.1
95–100	+0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5

Table 7 (New-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| Sample Size n | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	0.0	43.2	57.9	66.6
4	+0.9	18.7	25.8	40.7
8	+1.1	13.5	18.6	26.7
16	+0.8	10.6	13.1	18.5
32	+0.7	7.3	9.2	11.9
64	+1.1	4.9	5.8	7.7
128	+1.1	3.5	4.2	5.6
256	+1.2	2.4	2.8	3.8
512	+1.2	1.7	2.1	2.8
1,024	+1.3	1.3	1.5	1.9
2,048	+1.2	0.8	1.0	1.4
4,096	+1.2	0.6	0.7	0.9
8,192	+1.3	0.4	0.5	0.7
16,384	+1.2	0.3	0.4	0.5

Table 11 (New-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.2	6.4	0.3	93.0	93.3	−88.1
<=9	0.7	5.9	1.0	92.3	93.1	−62.4
<=14	1.3	5.4	2.6	90.8	92.0	−23.2
<=19	1.9	4.8	4.8	88.6	90.5	+28.0
<=24	2.5	4.1	7.9	85.4	88.0	−19.6
<=29	3.3	3.3	13.3	80.1	83.4	−99.7
<=34	4.0	2.7	19.3	74.0	78.0	−191.0
<=39	4.6	2.0	27.0	66.4	71.0	−306.2
<=44	5.2	1.5	35.9	57.4	62.6	−440.8
<=49	5.6	1.1	44.3	49.0	54.6	−567.8
<=54	5.9	0.7	52.4	41.0	46.9	−688.5
<=59	6.1	0.5	60.2	33.2	39.3	−806.6
<=64	6.3	0.3	67.4	25.9	32.3	−915.3
<=69	6.4	0.2	73.4	20.0	26.4	−1,004.9
<=74	6.5	0.1	78.5	14.9	21.4	−1,081.6
<=79	6.6	0.1	82.8	10.5	17.1	−1,146.9
<=84	6.6	0.1	86.7	6.6	13.2	−1,205.8
<=89	6.6	0.0	89.5	3.8	10.5	−1,247.9
<=94	6.6	0.0	90.8	2.5	9.2	−1,267.6
<=100	6.6	0.0	93.4	0.0	6.6	−1,305.8

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

Table 12 (New-definition $1.90/day 2011 PPP line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	40.9	3.5	0.7:1
<=9	1.8	42.0	11.1	0.7:1
<=14	3.8	32.7	18.9	0.5:1
<=19	6.6	28.1	28.1	0.4:1
<=24	10.5	24.2	38.2	0.3:1
<=29	16.6	19.9	49.7	0.2:1
<=34	23.3	17.0	59.8	0.2:1
<=39	31.6	14.7	69.9	0.2:1
<=44	41.1	12.6	77.9	0.1:1
<=49	49.9	11.2	84.0	0.1:1
<=54	58.3	10.1	88.7	0.1:1
<=59	66.4	9.3	92.6	0.1:1
<=64	73.8	8.6	95.4	0.1:1
<=69	79.8	8.1	96.9	0.1:1
<=74	85.0	7.7	98.2	0.1:1
<=79	89.4	7.4	98.9	0.1:1
<=84	93.3	7.1	99.2	0.1:1
<=89	96.1	6.9	99.6	0.1:1
<=94	97.5	6.8	99.9	0.1:1
<=100	100.0	6.6	100.0	0.1:1

Tables for
the New-Definition $3.10/day 2011 PPP Poverty Line

Table 4 (New-definition $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	75.6
5–9	63.5
10–14	54.8
15–19	47.2
20–24	39.3
25–29	33.2
30–34	26.8
35–39	21.8
40–44	16.9
45–49	13.9
50–54	10.5
55–59	7.5
60–64	5.6
65–69	4.6
70–74	3.6
75–79	2.3
80–84	1.4
85–89	1.2
90–94	1.2
95–100	0.7

Table 6 (New-definition \$3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| Score | Diff. | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+20.3	11.6	13.5	16.9
5–9	+2.3	7.4	8.9	12.1
10–14	+6.9	5.3	6.3	8.8
15–19	+7.2	4.6	5.6	7.1
20–24	−2.5	4.0	4.7	6.2
25–29	+8.8	3.2	3.9	5.0
30–34	+1.8	2.7	3.3	4.5
35–39	−0.7	2.4	2.9	3.7
40–44	+4.0	1.7	2.0	2.8
45–49	+3.7	1.6	1.8	2.5
50–54	+4.8	1.1	1.3	1.7
55–59	+1.3	1.2	1.5	2.0
60–64	+0.9	1.1	1.3	1.8
65–69	+2.0	0.8	0.9	1.1
70–74	+1.4	1.0	1.1	1.4
75–79	+0.8	0.7	0.8	1.0
80–84	−1.2	1.7	2.0	2.5
85–89	+0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9
90–94	−0.5	1.5	1.8	2.1
95–100	+0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6

Table 7 (New-definition $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value Confidence interval (±percentage points) 90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+2.0	58.8	66.7	77.0
4	+1.9	31.4	38.3	50.2
8	+2.0	22.1	26.2	35.2
16	+2.0	15.9	19.1	23.5
32	+2.1	11.5	13.2	18.1
64	+2.3	8.2	9.6	12.9
128	+2.3	5.7	6.7	9.2
256	+2.4	3.9	4.8	6.1
512	+2.5	2.9	3.5	4.5
1,024	+2.6	2.1	2.5	3.2
2,048	+2.5	1.5	1.7	2.3
4,096	+2.5	1.1	1.3	1.7
8,192	+2.5	0.8	0.9	1.2
16,384	+2.5	0.5	0.6	0.8

379

Table 11 (New-definition $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.4	15.4	0.2	84.0	84.4	−93.9
<=9	1.2	14.7	0.6	83.6	84.8	−81.4
<=14	2.3	13.6	1.6	82.6	84.8	−61.5
<=19	3.5	12.3	3.1	81.1	84.6	−35.8
<=24	5.2	10.7	5.3	78.8	84.0	−1.3
<=29	7.2	8.6	9.4	74.8	82.0	+40.9
<=34	9.0	6.9	14.3	69.8	78.8	+9.5
<=39	10.8	5.0	20.8	63.4	74.2	−31.1
<=44	12.2	3.6	28.8	55.3	67.6	−82.1
<=49	13.4	2.5	36.6	47.6	61.0	−130.8
<=54	14.1	1.7	44.1	40.0	54.2	−178.5
<=59	14.7	1.1	51.6	32.5	47.3	−225.8
<=64	15.2	0.7	58.6	25.6	40.7	−269.9
<=69	15.4	0.4	64.4	19.8	35.2	−306.5
<=74	15.6	0.3	69.4	14.7	30.3	−338.2
<=79	15.7	0.2	73.7	10.5	26.1	−365.2
<=84	15.8	0.1	77.5	6.6	22.4	−389.5
<=89	15.8	0.0	80.3	3.8	19.6	−407.0
<=94	15.8	0.0	81.6	2.5	18.3	−415.3
<=100	15.8	0.0	84.2	0.0	15.8	−431.2

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

Table 12 (New-definition $3.10/day 2011 PPP line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	70.5	2.5	2.4:1
<=9	1.8	67.6	7.5	2.1:1
<=14	3.8	58.8	14.3	1.4:1
<=19	6.6	53.5	22.4	1.1:1
<=24	10.5	49.2	32.6	1.0:1
<=29	16.6	43.4	45.4	0.8:1
<=34	23.3	38.5	56.6	0.6:1
<=39	31.6	34.3	68.5	0.5:1
<=44	41.1	29.8	77.3	0.4:1
<=49	49.9	26.8	84.4	0.4:1
<=54	58.3	24.3	89.2	0.3:1
<=59	66.4	22.2	93.0	0.3:1
<=64	73.8	20.6	95.7	0.3:1
<=69	79.8	19.3	97.3	0.2:1
<=74	85.0	18.3	98.4	0.2:1
<=79	89.4	17.5	99.0	0.2:1
<=84	93.3	16.9	99.5	0.2:1
<=89	96.1	16.4	99.7	0.2:1
<=94	97.5	16.2	99.9	0.2:1
<=100	100.0	15.8	100.0	0.2:1

Tables for
the New-Definition Poverty Line
Marking the Poorest Half of People
below 100% of the New-Definition National Poverty Line

Table 4 (New-definition line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	91.1
5–9	84.7
10–14	77.5
15–19	67.5
20–24	54.5
25–29	50.5
30–34	40.2
35–39	33.1
40–44	25.9
45–49	19.9
50–54	14.2
55–59	10.0
60–64	6.6
65–69	4.9
70–74	3.9
75–79	2.3
80–84	1.5
85–89	1.2
90–94	1.2
95–100	0.8

Table 6 (New-definition line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = $ 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| Score | Diff. | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+16.9	11.5	13.9	17.7
5–9	+10.3	7.1	8.4	10.8
10–14	+12.1	5.4	6.3	9.3
15–19	+10.0	4.9	5.7	7.2
20–24	−1.4	4.1	4.8	6.1
25–29	+14.7	4.2	4.9	6.3
30–34	+1.0	3.0	3.5	4.6
35–39	+1.8	2.6	3.1	4.2
40–44	+7.4	1.9	2.3	2.9
45–49	+6.9	1.7	2.0	2.7
50–54	+6.2	1.2	1.5	1.9
55–59	+2.4	1.3	1.6	2.1
60–64	+1.4	1.1	1.3	1.7
65–69	+2.1	0.8	0.9	1.1
70–74	+2.1	0.7	0.8	1.0
75–79	+0.3	0.8	0.9	1.3
80–84	−1.2	1.6	2.0	2.6
85–89	+0.6	0.5	0.6	0.8
90–94	−0.4	1.5	1.8	2.1
95–100	+0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5

Table 7 (New-definition line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and observed value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.3	63.8	70.2	90.2
4	+2.7	33.4	40.6	54.5
8	+2.9	24.4	29.4	39.6
16	+3.2	17.1	20.7	28.0
32	+3.4	12.4	15.5	21.9
64	+3.8	8.8	10.8	14.7
128	+3.8	6.6	7.7	10.4
256	+4.1	4.7	5.7	7.5
512	+4.2	3.5	4.1	5.2
1,024	+4.3	2.4	2.8	3.6
2,048	+4.2	1.7	2.1	2.8
4,096	+4.2	1.2	1.4	1.9
8,192	+4.2	0.9	1.0	1.3
16,384	+4.2	0.6	0.7	1.0

Table 11 (New-definition line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.5	22.4	0.1	77.1	77.6	−95.4
<=9	1.5	21.4	0.3	76.9	78.3	−85.9
<=14	3.0	19.9	0.9	76.3	79.2	−70.2
<=19	4.8	18.0	1.8	75.3	80.1	−49.9
<=24	7.1	15.7	3.4	73.8	80.9	−23.0
<=29	10.2	12.6	6.3	70.8	81.1	+17.3
<=34	13.0	9.8	10.3	66.9	79.9	+55.1
<=39	15.9	7.0	15.7	61.4	77.3	+31.3
<=44	18.1	4.7	23.0	54.2	72.3	−0.4
<=49	19.7	3.2	30.2	46.9	66.6	−32.2
<=54	20.8	2.0	37.4	39.7	60.5	−63.7
<=59	21.6	1.2	44.7	32.4	54.0	−95.6
<=64	22.1	0.7	51.6	25.5	47.6	−125.8
<=69	22.4	0.4	57.4	19.7	42.2	−151.0
<=74	22.6	0.3	62.4	14.7	37.3	−172.9
<=79	22.7	0.1	66.7	10.5	33.2	−191.5
<=84	22.8	0.1	70.5	6.6	29.4	−208.4
<=89	22.8	0.0	73.3	3.8	26.7	−220.6
<=94	22.8	0.0	74.6	2.5	25.4	−226.3
<=100	22.9	0.0	77.1	0.0	22.9	−237.4

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

Table 12 (New-definition line marking the poorest half of people below 100% of the new-definition national line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	88.0	2.2	7.3:1
<=9	1.8	83.8	6.4	5.2:1
<=14	3.8	77.0	12.9	3.3:1
<=19	6.6	72.6	21.1	2.7:1
<=24	10.5	67.9	31.1	2.1:1
<=29	16.6	61.9	44.8	1.6:1
<=34	23.3	55.9	57.0	1.3:1
<=39	31.6	50.3	69.6	1.0:1
<=44	41.1	44.1	79.3	0.8:1
<=49	49.9	39.5	86.2	0.7:1
<=54	58.3	35.7	91.1	0.6:1
<=59	66.4	32.6	94.6	0.5:1
<=64	73.8	30.0	96.8	0.4:1
<=69	79.8	28.1	98.1	0.4:1
<=74	85.0	26.6	98.8	0.4:1
<=79	89.4	25.4	99.4	0.3:1
<=84	93.3	24.4	99.7	0.3:1
<=89	96.1	23.7	99.8	0.3:1
<=94	97.5	23.4	99.9	0.3:1
<=100	100.0	22.9	100.0	0.3:1

Tables for
the New-Definition First-Quintile
(20th-percentile) Poverty Line

Table 4 (First-quintile (20th-percentile) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	86.9
5–9	77.6
10–14	64.3
15–19	52.0
20–24	41.4
25–29	39.0
30–34	29.9
35–39	23.9
40–44	17.3
45–49	13.2
50–54	10.3
55–59	7.3
60–64	3.9
65–69	2.8
70–74	2.7
75–79	1.8
80–84	1.1
85–89	1.0
90–94	1.0
95–100	0.7

Table 6 (First-quintile (20th-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Score	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+26.0	11.7	14.2	17.7
5–9	+14.8	7.5	8.9	11.3
10–14	+7.9	5.4	6.5	9.1
15–19	+6.0	4.8	5.4	7.3
20–24	−1.1	4.0	4.6	6.3
25–29	+12.4	3.3	3.9	5.0
30–34	+3.5	2.7	3.1	4.4
35–39	+4.9	1.8	2.2	2.9
40–44	+3.6	1.7	2.0	2.7
45–49	+3.8	1.4	1.7	2.3
50–54	+4.9	1.0	1.1	1.6
55–59	+2.3	1.1	1.3	1.7
60–64	+0.1	1.0	1.2	1.6
65–69	+0.9	0.7	0.8	1.1
70–74	+1.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
75–79	+0.7	0.6	0.7	0.9
80–84	−1.2	1.7	1.9	2.5
85–89	+0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8
90–94	−0.6	1.5	1.8	2.1
95–100	+0.4	0.3	0.4	0.5

Table 7 (First-quintile (20th-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points)		
n		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.3	57.5	64.1	86.8
4	+2.2	30.3	38.7	51.2
8	+2.4	21.4	26.4	38.6
16	+2.6	15.6	18.6	25.3
32	+2.7	10.9	13.6	19.0
64	+3.1	7.7	9.2	12.5
128	+3.1	5.4	6.5	8.5
256	+3.3	3.9	4.9	6.5
512	+3.3	2.8	3.4	4.4
1,024	+3.4	1.9	2.4	3.2
2,048	+3.4	1.4	1.7	2.3
4,096	+3.4	1.0	1.2	1.8
8,192	+3.4	0.7	0.9	1.3
16,384	+3.4	0.5	0.6	0.9

Table 11 (First-quintile (20th-percentile) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.4	16.9	0.1	82.5	83.0	−94.2
<=9	1.3	16.0	0.4	82.2	83.5	−82.3
<=14	2.6	14.8	1.3	81.4	84.0	−62.9
<=19	4.1	13.2	2.5	80.2	84.3	−37.9
<=24	5.9	11.4	4.6	78.1	84.0	−5.4
<=29	8.4	9.0	8.2	74.5	82.8	+43.8
<=34	10.4	6.9	12.9	69.8	80.2	+25.6
<=39	12.4	4.9	19.2	63.5	75.9	−10.6
<=44	14.0	3.3	27.0	55.6	69.6	−56.0
<=49	15.2	2.2	34.8	47.9	63.0	−100.5
<=54	15.9	1.4	42.3	40.3	56.2	−144.1
<=59	16.5	0.9	49.9	32.8	49.2	−187.7
<=64	16.8	0.5	56.9	25.7	42.5	−228.3
<=69	17.0	0.3	62.8	19.9	36.9	−262.0
<=74	17.2	0.2	67.8	14.8	32.0	−291.1
<=79	17.2	0.1	72.2	10.5	27.7	−316.0
<=84	17.3	0.1	76.0	6.6	23.9	−338.3
<=89	17.3	0.0	78.8	3.8	21.2	−354.4
<=94	17.3	0.0	80.1	2.5	19.9	−362.0
<=100	17.3	0.0	82.7	0.0	17.3	−376.6

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

Table 12 (First-quintile (20th-percentile) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	78.1	2.5	3.6:1
<=9	1.8	74.9	7.6	3.0:1
<=14	3.8	67.4	14.9	2.1:1
<=19	6.6	62.4	23.8	1.7:1
<=24	10.5	56.5	34.1	1.3:1
<=29	16.6	50.5	48.3	1.0:1
<=34	23.3	44.6	60.0	0.8:1
<=39	31.6	39.3	71.7	0.6:1
<=44	41.1	34.2	81.0	0.5:1
<=49	49.9	30.4	87.4	0.4:1
<=54	58.3	27.3	91.8	0.4:1
<=59	66.4	24.8	94.9	0.3:1
<=64	73.8	22.8	97.0	0.3:1
<=69	79.8	21.3	98.1	0.3:1
<=74	85.0	20.2	98.9	0.3:1
<=79	89.4	19.3	99.3	0.2:1
<=84	93.3	18.5	99.7	0.2:1
<=89	96.1	18.0	99.8	0.2:1
<=94	97.5	17.8	100.0	0.2:1
<=100	100.0	17.3	100.0	0.2:1

Tables for
the New-Definition Second-Quintile
(40th-percentile) Poverty Line

Table 4 (Second-quintile (40th-percentile) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	96.6
5–9	94.5
10–14	89.9
15–19	84.6
20–24	76.7
25–29	70.1
30–34	61.3
35–39	54.5
40–44	42.6
45–49	34.7
50–54	26.6
55–59	19.2
60–64	13.3
65–69	10.0
70–74	8.1
75–79	3.9
80–84	3.0
85–89	2.6
90–94	2.3
95–100	1.4

Table 6 (Second-quintile (40ᵗʰ-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Score	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+9.0	9.1	11.3	14.4
5–9	+7.2	5.8	7.0	8.6
10–14	−0.2	3.2	3.8	4.6
15–19	+4.2	4.6	5.4	6.5
20–24	+3.3	3.8	4.6	5.6
25–29	+16.3	5.4	6.6	8.1
30–34	−1.1	3.1	3.8	4.7
35–39	+4.0	2.8	3.3	4.4
40–44	+6.7	2.5	2.9	3.6
45–49	+10.0	2.4	3.0	3.9
50–54	+8.8	2.2	2.6	3.4
55–59	+3.2	2.0	2.2	3.0
60–64	+2.1	1.8	2.0	2.5
65–69	+1.8	1.8	2.1	2.9
70–74	+3.3	1.4	1.6	2.1
75–79	−2.3	2.2	2.5	3.1
80–84	−1.1	1.8	2.1	2.8
85–89	+1.1	0.9	1.0	1.4
90–94	+0.4	1.6	1.9	2.2
95–100	+0.9	0.5	0.5	0.7

Table 7 (Second-quintile (40th-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.4	67.3	75.4	92.0
4	+3.1	38.4	45.1	61.0
8	+2.9	28.1	33.8	44.8
16	+3.5	20.8	24.0	32.2
32	+3.7	15.4	18.5	24.3
64	+4.3	11.2	13.8	19.7
128	+4.3	8.4	9.9	13.1
256	+4.5	5.9	7.4	9.2
512	+4.6	4.0	4.9	6.6
1,024	+4.7	2.9	3.5	4.4
2,048	+4.7	2.1	2.7	3.2
4,096	+4.7	1.5	1.9	2.3
8,192	+4.7	1.1	1.3	1.8
16,384	+4.6	0.8	0.9	1.2

Table 11 (Second-quintile (40th-percentile) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.5	34.5	0.0	64.9	65.5	−96.9
<=9	1.6	33.4	0.1	64.8	66.4	−90.4
<=14	3.5	31.6	0.4	64.6	68.1	−79.1
<=19	5.9	29.2	0.8	64.2	70.0	−64.4
<=24	8.8	26.2	1.7	63.3	72.1	−44.9
<=29	13.1	21.9	3.4	61.5	74.6	−15.3
<=34	17.4	17.6	5.9	59.1	76.5	+16.2
<=39	21.8	13.2	9.8	55.2	77.0	+52.6
<=44	25.8	9.2	15.3	49.7	75.5	+56.3
<=49	28.7	6.4	21.2	43.7	72.4	+39.4
<=54	30.9	4.2	27.4	37.6	68.5	+21.8
<=59	32.5	2.5	33.8	31.1	63.6	+3.4
<=64	33.5	1.5	40.2	24.7	58.3	−14.8
<=69	34.1	0.9	45.7	19.3	53.4	−30.4
<=74	34.5	0.5	50.5	14.5	49.0	−44.1
<=79	34.8	0.3	54.6	10.3	45.1	−55.9
<=84	34.9	0.1	58.4	6.6	41.5	−66.7
<=89	35.0	0.1	61.1	3.8	38.8	−74.5
<=94	35.0	0.0	62.4	2.5	37.5	−78.2
<=100	35.0	0.0	65.0	0.0	35.0	−85.4

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

Table 12 (Second-quintile (40th-percentile) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	94.9	1.5	18.4:1
<=9	1.8	92.2	4.6	11.9:1
<=14	3.8	90.7	9.9	9.7:1
<=19	6.6	88.3	16.7	7.5:1
<=24	10.5	84.1	25.1	5.3:1
<=29	16.6	79.2	37.5	3.8:1
<=34	23.3	74.8	49.7	3.0:1
<=39	31.6	69.1	62.4	2.2:1
<=44	41.1	62.8	73.6	1.7:1
<=49	49.9	57.4	81.9	1.3:1
<=54	58.3	53.0	88.1	1.1:1
<=59	66.4	49.0	92.8	1.0:1
<=64	73.8	45.5	95.7	0.8:1
<=69	79.8	42.8	97.4	0.7:1
<=74	85.0	40.6	98.4	0.7:1
<=79	89.4	38.9	99.2	0.6:1
<=84	93.3	37.4	99.7	0.6:1
<=89	96.1	36.4	99.8	0.6:1
<=94	97.5	35.9	99.9	0.6:1
<=100	100.0	35.0	100.0	0.5:1

Tables for
the New-Definition Median (50th-percentile) Poverty Line

Table 4 (Median (50th-percentile) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	99.4
5–9	96.7
10–14	95.7
15–19	92.1
20–24	87.2
25–29	82.0
30–34	74.7
35–39	67.6
40–44	58.7
45–49	47.7
50–54	38.1
55–59	28.5
60–64	21.6
65–69	15.8
70–74	11.4
75–79	6.5
80–84	5.2
85–89	3.4
90–94	2.5
95–100	1.6

Table 6 (Median (50th-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and true poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16{,}384$, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| Score | Diff. | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+0.2	1.1	1.4	1.9
5–9	+0.2	2.5	2.9	3.6
10–14	+1.1	2.6	3.1	3.9
15–19	+2.0	3.2	3.7	5.1
20–24	+2.5	3.3	3.8	5.3
25–29	−3.0	2.7	3.0	3.9
30–34	−1.0	2.6	3.1	4.2
35–39	+1.6	2.7	3.2	4.0
40–44	+6.9	2.7	3.1	4.0
45–49	+13.5	3.2	3.6	4.9
50–54	+11.3	2.9	3.5	4.2
55–59	+4.1	2.6	3.1	3.8
60–64	+3.4	2.0	2.3	2.9
65–69	+0.1	2.5	3.0	3.7
70–74	+2.0	2.0	2.3	3.0
75–79	−1.6	2.1	2.5	3.4
80–84	−0.9	2.0	2.5	3.2
85–89	+1.0	1.0	1.3	1.6
90–94	+0.6	1.6	1.9	2.2
95–100	−0.2	1.4	1.7	2.2

Table 7 (Median (50th-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and observed value			
	Diff.	Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+2.1	69.6	80.2	91.9
4	+2.9	39.9	45.7	57.3
8	+2.8	29.5	34.9	45.4
16	+3.0	21.3	24.8	33.3
32	+3.0	15.1	18.5	23.7
64	+3.5	10.8	13.1	16.9
128	+3.5	8.1	9.6	12.5
256	+3.5	5.6	6.5	8.6
512	+3.6	4.1	4.8	5.9
1,024	+3.6	2.7	3.3	4.3
2,048	+3.6	2.1	2.4	3.2
4,096	+3.6	1.4	1.7	2.3
8,192	+3.5	1.0	1.2	1.6
16,384	+3.5	0.7	0.8	1.2

Table 11 (Median (50th-percentile) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.6	43.6	0.0	55.8	56.4	−97.5
<=9	1.7	42.5	0.0	55.8	57.5	−92.1
<=14	3.7	40.5	0.2	55.6	59.3	−83.0
<=19	6.3	37.9	0.4	55.4	61.7	−70.8
<=24	9.6	34.6	0.8	55.0	64.6	−54.5
<=29	14.7	29.5	1.9	53.9	68.6	−29.3
<=34	19.8	24.4	3.5	52.3	72.1	−2.5
<=39	25.4	18.8	6.2	49.6	74.9	+28.9
<=44	30.7	13.5	10.4	45.4	76.1	+62.4
<=49	34.6	9.6	15.3	40.5	75.1	+65.3
<=54	37.8	6.4	20.5	35.3	73.1	+53.7
<=59	40.1	4.1	26.3	29.6	69.7	+40.6
<=64	41.8	2.4	32.0	23.8	65.6	+27.6
<=69	42.8	1.4	37.0	18.8	61.5	+16.2
<=74	43.4	0.8	41.6	14.2	57.6	+5.9
<=79	43.8	0.4	45.6	10.2	54.0	−3.2
<=84	44.0	0.2	49.3	6.5	50.5	−11.5
<=89	44.1	0.1	52.0	3.8	47.9	−17.7
<=94	44.2	0.0	53.3	2.5	46.7	−20.6
<=100	44.2	0.0	55.8	0.0	44.2	−26.3

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

Table 12 (Median (50th-percentile) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	99.0	1.3	98.6:1
<=9	1.8	97.4	3.9	37.7:1
<=14	3.8	96.0	8.3	23.8:1
<=19	6.6	94.3	14.2	16.6:1
<=24	10.5	92.0	21.8	11.5:1
<=29	16.6	88.5	33.2	7.7:1
<=34	23.3	84.9	44.8	5.6:1
<=39	31.6	80.2	57.4	4.1:1
<=44	41.1	74.7	69.5	3.0:1
<=49	49.9	69.3	78.3	2.3:1
<=54	58.3	64.8	85.5	1.8:1
<=59	66.4	60.4	90.7	1.5:1
<=64	73.8	56.6	94.5	1.3:1
<=69	79.8	53.6	96.8	1.2:1
<=74	85.0	51.1	98.2	1.0:1
<=79	89.4	49.0	99.1	1.0:1
<=84	93.3	47.2	99.6	0.9:1
<=89	96.1	45.9	99.8	0.8:1
<=94	97.5	45.3	99.9	0.8:1
<=100	100.0	44.2	100.0	0.8:1

Tables for
the New-Definition Third-Quintile
(60th-percentile) Poverty Line

Table 4 (Third-quintile (60th-percentile) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	100.0
5–9	98.4
10–14	98.3
15–19	96.7
20–24	93.6
25–29	90.0
30–34	86.1
35–39	80.5
40–44	70.6
45–49	61.3
50–54	51.3
55–59	39.8
60–64	33.5
65–69	25.5
70–74	19.8
75–79	13.0
80–84	8.7
85–89	5.5
90–94	4.2
95–100	2.9

Table 6 (Third-quintile (60th-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
5–9	−0.9	1.0	1.1	1.5
10–14	+1.3	2.0	2.4	3.1
15–19	−1.1	1.4	1.6	2.1
20–24	+0.8	2.1	2.6	3.6
25–29	−2.9	2.2	2.4	2.5
30–34	+1.0	2.3	2.8	3.5
35–39	+2.0	2.3	2.8	3.9
40–44	+0.9	2.4	2.8	3.5
45–49	+13.8	4.0	4.6	6.4
50–54	+12.1	3.6	4.3	5.2
55–59	+5.3	2.9	3.3	4.3
60–64	+2.2	2.6	3.1	4.1
65–69	+2.0	2.8	3.3	4.4
70–74	+5.6	2.4	2.8	3.7
75–79	−1.1	2.8	3.3	4.2
80–84	−1.6	2.6	3.3	4.2
85–89	+0.4	1.8	2.2	2.9
90–94	−3.3	4.4	5.2	6.9
95–100	+1.0	1.4	1.7	2.2

Table 7 (Third-quintile (60th-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and observed value			
		Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points)		
	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.0	68.6	80.3	90.7
4	+2.0	39.7	47.4	55.7
8	+2.1	30.7	37.1	47.6
16	+2.6	22.2	27.1	34.7
32	+2.7	16.2	19.6	25.5
64	+3.2	11.5	13.8	18.2
128	+3.2	8.5	9.9	13.6
256	+3.3	5.8	7.0	9.2
512	+3.4	4.3	5.0	6.2
1,024	+3.4	3.0	3.5	4.6
2,048	+3.4	2.1	2.5	3.4
4,096	+3.4	1.6	1.8	2.5
8,192	+3.4	1.1	1.4	1.7
16,384	+3.4	0.8	0.9	1.2

Table 11 (Third-quintile (60th-percentile) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.6	53.1	0.0	46.3	46.9	−97.9
<=9	1.7	51.9	0.0	46.3	48.1	−93.5
<=14	3.8	49.9	0.1	46.3	50.1	−85.8
<=19	6.5	47.2	0.1	46.2	52.7	−75.5
<=24	10.1	43.6	0.4	46.0	56.0	−61.7
<=29	15.6	38.0	1.0	45.4	61.0	−40.0
<=34	21.4	32.3	1.9	44.4	65.8	−16.7
<=39	27.9	25.7	3.7	42.7	70.6	+11.0
<=44	34.6	19.0	6.5	39.9	74.5	+41.1
<=49	39.8	13.9	10.1	36.2	76.0	+67.2
<=54	44.1	9.6	14.2	32.2	76.2	+73.6
<=59	47.3	6.4	19.1	27.3	74.6	+64.5
<=64	49.8	3.8	23.9	22.4	72.3	+55.4
<=69	51.3	2.3	28.5	17.9	69.2	+47.0
<=74	52.3	1.3	32.7	13.7	66.0	+39.1
<=79	53.0	0.7	36.4	9.9	62.9	+32.1
<=84	53.3	0.3	40.0	6.4	59.7	+25.5
<=89	53.5	0.1	42.6	3.8	57.3	+20.6
<=94	53.6	0.0	43.9	2.5	56.1	+18.2
<=100	53.6	0.0	46.3	0.0	53.6	+13.6

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

Table 12 (Third-quintile (60th-percentile) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	99.9	1.0	739.7:1
<=9	1.8	99.4	3.3	179.2:1
<=14	3.8	98.2	7.0	53.6:1
<=19	6.6	97.8	12.1	45.4:1
<=24	10.5	96.2	18.8	25.5:1
<=29	16.6	94.3	29.1	16.4:1
<=34	23.3	91.8	39.9	11.2:1
<=39	31.6	88.4	52.1	7.6:1
<=44	41.1	84.3	64.5	5.4:1
<=49	49.9	79.7	74.2	3.9:1
<=54	58.3	75.6	82.1	3.1:1
<=59	66.4	71.3	88.1	2.5:1
<=64	73.8	67.6	92.9	2.1:1
<=69	79.8	64.3	95.7	1.8:1
<=74	85.0	61.6	97.5	1.6:1
<=79	89.4	59.2	98.7	1.5:1
<=84	93.3	57.2	99.4	1.3:1
<=89	96.1	55.7	99.8	1.3:1
<=94	97.5	55.0	99.9	1.2:1
<=100	100.0	53.6	100.0	1.2:1

Tables for
the New-Definition Fourth-Quintile
(80ᵗʰ-percentile) Poverty Line

Table 4 (Fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	100.0
5–9	100.0
10–14	99.9
15–19	99.4
20–24	98.9
25–29	98.1
30–34	97.2
35–39	95.7
40–44	92.8
45–49	86.6
50–54	82.0
55–59	75.4
60–64	65.6
65–69	57.2
70–74	46.3
75–79	36.1
80–84	25.2
85–89	18.8
90–94	16.1
95–100	9.1

Table 6 (Fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5–9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10–14	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3
15–19	−0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
20–24	0.0	0.9	1.0	1.3
25–29	−0.5	0.8	0.9	1.3
30–34	0.0	1.1	1.3	1.7
35–39	+0.3	1.1	1.4	1.7
40–44	+0.7	1.5	1.7	2.2
45–49	+14.5	5.3	6.1	8.1
50–54	−3.1	2.6	2.8	3.3
55–59	+11.0	3.3	3.9	5.3
60–64	+1.2	2.9	3.4	4.7
65–69	+2.8	3.2	3.9	5.3
70–74	+1.7	4.4	5.3	6.9
75–79	−2.5	3.8	4.6	6.0
80–84	−1.1	3.4	4.1	5.7
85–89	+4.9	3.1	3.6	4.7
90–94	−5.7	6.4	7.6	9.6
95–100	+3.4	2.0	2.4	3.1

Table 7 (Fourth-quintile (80ᵗʰ-percentile) line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and observed value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+1.9	64.6	75.3	89.2
4	+1.5	34.0	43.0	57.6
8	+1.9	27.8	34.8	49.1
16	+2.1	21.2	25.1	38.6
32	+2.0	16.1	20.4	28.6
64	+2.4	12.3	15.1	19.0
128	+2.3	8.4	10.2	13.3
256	+2.3	6.0	7.4	9.3
512	+2.3	4.7	5.4	7.2
1,024	+2.4	3.2	3.9	5.2
2,048	+2.4	2.3	2.7	3.9
4,096	+2.3	1.6	2.0	2.6
8,192	+2.4	1.2	1.4	1.9
16,384	+2.4	0.8	1.0	1.3

Table 11 (Fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.6	73.8	0.0	25.6	26.2	−98.5
<=9	1.8	72.6	0.0	25.6	27.3	−95.3
<=14	3.8	70.6	0.0	25.6	29.4	−89.7
<=19	6.6	67.8	0.0	25.6	32.2	−82.2
<=24	10.4	64.0	0.0	25.5	36.0	−71.9
<=29	16.4	58.0	0.1	25.5	41.9	−55.7
<=34	23.0	51.4	0.3	25.3	48.3	−37.8
<=39	30.9	43.5	0.7	24.9	55.8	−15.9
<=44	39.7	34.7	1.4	24.2	63.9	+8.6
<=49	47.3	27.1	2.6	23.0	70.3	+30.7
<=54	54.2	20.2	4.0	21.6	75.8	+51.2
<=59	60.0	14.4	6.3	19.3	79.3	+69.9
<=64	64.9	9.5	8.8	16.8	81.7	+86.4
<=69	68.3	6.1	11.5	14.1	82.4	+84.5
<=74	70.7	3.7	14.3	11.3	81.9	+80.8
<=79	72.3	2.1	17.1	8.5	80.9	+77.1
<=84	73.4	1.0	19.9	5.7	79.1	+73.3
<=89	74.0	0.5	22.2	3.4	77.4	+70.2
<=94	74.2	0.2	23.2	2.3	76.5	+68.8
<=100	74.4	0.0	25.6	0.0	74.4	+65.6

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

Table 12 (Fourth-quintile (80th-percentile) line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.6	100.0	0.8	Only poor targeted
<=9	1.8	100.0	2.4	Only poor targeted
<=14	3.8	99.9	5.2	1,141.1:1
<=19	6.6	99.8	8.9	551.0:1
<=24	10.5	99.6	14.0	240.1:1
<=29	16.6	99.2	22.1	121.6:1
<=34	23.3	98.8	30.9	79.2:1
<=39	31.6	97.8	41.6	44.6:1
<=44	41.1	96.7	53.4	29.1:1
<=49	49.9	94.8	63.6	18.3:1
<=54	58.3	93.1	72.9	13.5:1
<=59	66.4	90.5	80.7	9.5:1
<=64	73.8	88.1	87.3	7.4:1
<=69	79.8	85.6	91.8	5.9:1
<=74	85.0	83.1	95.0	4.9:1
<=79	89.4	80.9	97.2	4.2:1
<=84	93.3	78.7	98.7	3.7:1
<=89	96.1	76.9	99.4	3.3:1
<=94	97.5	76.1	99.7	3.2:1
<=100	100.0	74.4	100.0	2.9:1

Tables for
the Old-Definition Food Poverty Line

Table 4 (Old-definition food line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	84.5
5–9	77.0
10–14	66.6
15–19	58.1
20–24	45.9
25–29	35.7
30–34	28.6
35–39	21.6
40–44	13.1
45–49	10.2
50–54	8.5
55–59	5.8
60–64	3.1
65–69	2.3
70–74	1.0
75–79	0.9
80–84	0.4
85–89	0.4
90–94	0.3
95–100	0.0

Table 6 (Old-definition food line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16{,}384$, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Score	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	−1.1	7.3	8.5	11.6
5–9	+7.2	6.6	8.1	10.9
10–14	+9.3	5.1	6.1	7.7
15–19	+12.6	4.2	4.9	6.7
20–24	−4.4	4.2	4.6	5.9
25–29	−5.1	4.1	4.5	5.3
30–34	+3.5	2.5	3.0	3.9
35–39	+1.7	2.1	2.6	3.3
40–44	+3.4	1.3	1.6	2.0
45–49	−0.1	1.6	1.9	2.6
50–54	+3.0	1.1	1.4	1.8
55–59	+0.4	1.2	1.5	2.0
60–64	+0.6	0.6	0.8	1.0
65–69	+0.2	0.8	0.9	1.1
70–74	−1.4	1.3	1.6	2.0
75–79	+0.6	0.2	0.3	0.4
80–84	+0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2
85–89	+0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1
90–94	−4.7	3.8	4.2	4.7
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 7 (Old-definition food line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.5	59.6	72.5	86.3
4	+0.8	29.4	35.2	48.2
8	+1.3	19.7	23.4	33.0
16	+1.5	14.5	17.5	22.5
32	+1.5	9.7	11.6	15.3
64	+1.5	7.3	8.7	11.3
128	+1.3	5.3	6.3	8.2
256	+1.0	3.8	4.5	6.3
512	+1.1	2.6	3.1	4.4
1,024	+1.1	1.9	2.2	2.9
2,048	+1.1	1.3	1.6	2.1
4,096	+1.1	0.9	1.1	1.5
8,192	+1.0	0.6	0.8	1.0
16,384	+1.0	0.5	0.5	0.7

Table 11 (Old-definition food line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.4	15.3	0.1	84.2	84.6	−94.0
<=9	1.3	14.4	0.4	83.9	85.2	−80.8
<=14	2.5	13.2	1.2	83.1	85.6	−60.3
<=19	4.0	11.7	2.6	81.7	85.7	−32.6
<=24	6.0	9.7	4.7	79.6	85.6	+5.7
<=29	8.4	7.4	8.1	76.2	84.6	+48.6
<=34	10.2	5.5	13.0	71.3	81.5	+17.3
<=39	12.0	3.7	19.6	64.7	76.7	−24.5
<=44	13.3	2.5	28.1	56.2	69.4	−78.6
<=49	14.1	1.6	35.8	48.5	62.6	−127.6
<=54	14.7	1.0	43.8	40.5	55.2	−178.3
<=59	15.1	0.6	50.7	33.6	48.7	−222.3
<=64	15.4	0.4	58.3	26.0	41.4	−270.3
<=69	15.5	0.2	63.7	20.6	36.1	−304.7
<=74	15.6	0.1	68.9	15.4	31.0	−337.7
<=79	15.7	0.1	73.3	10.9	26.6	−366.2
<=84	15.7	0.1	77.2	7.1	22.8	−390.6
<=89	15.7	0.1	80.3	3.9	19.6	−410.5
<=94	15.7	0.0	81.6	2.6	18.4	−418.9
<=100	15.7	0.0	84.3	0.0	15.7	−435.6

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

Table 12 (Old-definition food line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.5	87.5	2.8	7.0:1
<=9	1.7	78.5	8.4	3.7:1
<=14	3.7	67.4	16.0	2.1:1
<=19	6.6	60.5	25.4	1.5:1
<=24	10.6	56.2	38.0	1.3:1
<=29	16.5	50.9	53.3	1.0:1
<=34	23.2	44.0	65.1	0.8:1
<=39	31.6	38.1	76.6	0.6:1
<=44	41.4	32.1	84.4	0.5:1
<=49	50.0	28.3	89.9	0.4:1
<=54	58.5	25.1	93.5	0.3:1
<=59	65.8	22.9	96.0	0.3:1
<=64	73.6	20.9	97.7	0.3:1
<=69	79.2	19.6	98.6	0.2:1
<=74	84.5	18.5	99.3	0.2:1
<=79	89.0	17.6	99.5	0.2:1
<=84	92.9	16.9	99.6	0.2:1
<=89	96.0	16.3	99.6	0.2:1
<=94	97.4	16.2	100.0	0.2:1
<=100	100.0	15.7	100.0	0.2:1

Tables for
the Old-Definition Lower National Poverty Line

Table 4 (Old-definition lower national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	92.7
5–9	86.2
10–14	75.1
15–19	70.5
20–24	58.3
25–29	49.9
30–34	41.7
35–39	34.1
40–44	27.6
45–49	18.7
50–54	14.5
55–59	10.0
60–64	6.4
65–69	4.3
70–74	2.4
75–79	1.6
80–84	1.0
85–89	0.9
90–94	0.7
95–100	0.0

Table 6 (Old-definition lower national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of $n = 16,384$, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	−2.5	4.1	4.8	6.3
5–9	−1.5	4.2	4.9	6.4
10–14	+2.0	4.5	5.3	7.3
15–19	+3.5	4.4	5.3	6.3
20–24	−5.8	4.6	5.0	5.9
25–29	−8.6	5.9	6.2	6.9
30–34	+1.8	2.8	3.5	4.6
35–39	−0.9	2.5	3.0	4.1
40–44	+8.6	1.9	2.3	3.0
45–49	−0.1	2.1	2.5	3.0
50–54	+1.4	1.8	2.1	2.8
55–59	+0.6	1.6	1.9	2.3
60–64	+0.4	1.1	1.3	1.7
65–69	0.0	1.1	1.4	1.8
70–74	−0.8	1.3	1.5	2.1
75–79	+1.0	0.3	0.4	0.5
80–84	+0.9	0.1	0.1	0.2
85–89	+0.8	0.1	0.1	0.1
90–94	−4.7	3.9	4.2	4.8
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 7 (Old-definition lower national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Difference between estimate and observed value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.6	61.2	70.8	87.7
4	+0.2	32.6	40.2	53.3
8	+0.4	23.4	27.8	36.5
16	+0.5	16.4	20.7	26.9
32	+0.7	11.5	13.6	16.8
64	+0.9	8.0	9.4	13.4
128	+0.7	5.8	6.7	10.0
256	+0.5	4.1	5.0	6.4
512	+0.5	3.0	3.7	5.1
1,024	+0.5	2.1	2.5	3.4
2,048	+0.5	1.5	1.8	2.5
4,096	+0.5	1.1	1.4	1.8
8,192	+0.4	0.8	1.0	1.3
16,384	+0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9

e

Table 11 (Old-definition lower national line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.5	22.8	0.0	76.7	77.1	−95.8
<=9	1.5	21.8	0.2	76.5	78.0	−86.3
<=14	3.0	20.3	0.8	75.9	78.9	−71.2
<=19	5.0	18.3	1.6	75.1	80.1	−50.2
<=24	7.5	15.8	3.2	73.5	81.0	−22.3
<=29	10.8	12.5	5.7	71.0	81.8	+17.0
<=34	13.6	9.7	9.6	67.0	80.6	+58.0
<=39	16.5	6.8	15.1	61.6	78.1	+35.1
<=44	18.7	4.6	22.7	54.0	72.7	+2.6
<=49	20.3	3.0	29.7	47.0	67.3	−27.3
<=54	21.4	1.9	37.1	39.6	61.0	−59.0
<=59	22.1	1.2	43.7	33.0	55.1	−87.4
<=64	22.7	0.6	50.9	25.8	48.5	−118.3
<=69	23.0	0.3	56.2	20.5	43.5	−141.0
<=74	23.2	0.1	61.3	15.4	38.5	−163.0
<=79	23.2	0.1	65.8	10.9	34.1	−182.1
<=84	23.2	0.1	69.6	7.1	30.3	−198.6
<=89	23.2	0.1	72.8	3.9	27.2	−212.1
<=94	23.3	0.0	74.1	2.6	25.9	−217.6
<=100	23.3	0.0	76.7	0.0	23.3	−228.9

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

Table 12 (Old-definition lower national line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.5	94.4	2.0	16.8:1
<=9	1.7	88.6	6.4	7.7:1
<=14	3.7	79.8	12.8	4.0:1
<=19	6.6	75.6	21.4	3.1:1
<=24	10.6	70.3	32.1	2.4:1
<=29	16.5	65.6	46.4	1.9:1
<=34	23.2	58.5	58.3	1.4:1
<=39	31.6	52.2	70.8	1.1:1
<=44	41.4	45.1	80.1	0.8:1
<=49	50.0	40.6	86.9	0.7:1
<=54	58.5	36.6	91.8	0.6:1
<=59	65.8	33.6	94.9	0.5:1
<=64	73.6	30.9	97.5	0.4:1
<=69	79.2	29.1	98.7	0.4:1
<=74	84.5	27.4	99.4	0.4:1
<=79	89.0	26.1	99.6	0.4:1
<=84	92.9	25.0	99.7	0.3:1
<=89	96.0	24.2	99.7	0.3:1
<=94	97.4	23.9	100.0	0.3:1
<=100	100.0	23.3	100.0	0.3:1

Tables for
100% of the Old-Definition Upper National Poverty Line

Table 4 (100% of the old-definition upper national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	98.6
5–9	97.4
10–14	96.5
15–19	92.0
20–24	89.7
25–29	84.7
30–34	76.2
35–39	71.3
40–44	59.8
45–49	49.6
50–54	42.2
55–59	30.4
60–64	25.1
65–69	20.6
70–74	10.5
75–79	7.0
80–84	5.5
85–89	4.9
90–94	2.9
95–100	1.4

Table 6 (100% of the old-definition upper national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Score	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	−1.4	0.7	0.7	0.7
5–9	−0.8	1.7	2.0	2.4
10–14	−0.6	1.4	1.7	2.5
15–19	+0.3	2.6	3.2	4.1
20–24	−3.1	2.4	2.5	2.7
25–29	−2.7	2.3	2.6	3.1
30–34	−7.7	4.8	5.0	5.2
35–39	−3.8	3.0	3.1	3.6
40–44	+0.3	2.4	2.9	3.9
45–49	−5.4	4.1	4.3	4.8
50–54	+2.1	2.6	3.1	4.1
55–59	−5.3	4.1	4.3	4.8
60–64	−2.6	2.6	3.1	3.9
65–69	+5.3	2.2	2.6	3.5
70–74	−3.4	2.9	3.1	3.6
75–79	+1.1	1.5	1.8	2.3
80–84	+2.0	1.1	1.3	1.6
85–89	+4.4	0.4	0.5	0.6
90–94	−3.5	3.3	3.6	4.6
95–100	+1.2	0.2	0.2	0.3

Table 7 (100% of the old-definition upper national line):
Average errors between estimated and observed poverty
rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with
confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various
sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014
validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and observed value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.3	73.1	75.6	90.9
4	−0.8	36.5	42.1	54.7
8	−0.6	25.1	30.0	38.2
16	−0.9	18.2	22.0	29.0
32	−1.2	13.8	16.8	21.6
64	−1.2	9.8	11.8	14.8
128	−1.5	6.8	7.9	10.2
256	−1.5	4.8	5.9	7.2
512	−1.5	3.5	4.1	5.3
1,024	−1.5	2.3	2.8	3.7
2,048	−1.6	1.7	1.9	2.6
4,096	−1.6	1.2	1.5	1.9
8,192	−1.6	0.9	1.0	1.4
16,384	−1.6	0.6	0.7	0.9

Table 11 (100% of the old-definition upper national line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.5	46.8	0.0	52.7	53.2	−97.9
<=9	1.7	45.7	0.0	52.6	54.3	−92.9
<=14	3.6	43.7	0.1	52.6	56.2	−84.5
<=19	6.3	41.0	0.3	52.4	58.7	−72.7
<=24	10.0	37.3	0.6	52.0	62.0	−56.4
<=29	15.0	32.3	1.5	51.2	66.2	−33.5
<=34	20.5	26.9	2.8	49.9	70.4	−7.6
<=39	26.5	20.9	5.2	47.5	74.0	+22.8
<=44	32.2	15.1	9.2	43.5	75.7	+55.5
<=49	36.8	10.5	13.2	39.5	76.3	+72.2
<=54	40.3	7.0	18.2	34.5	74.8	+61.6
<=59	42.7	4.6	23.1	29.6	72.3	+51.2
<=64	44.9	2.4	28.7	24.0	68.9	+39.3
<=69	45.9	1.4	33.3	19.4	65.2	+29.6
<=74	46.6	0.7	37.9	14.8	61.5	+20.0
<=79	47.0	0.4	42.0	10.6	57.6	+11.2
<=84	47.2	0.1	45.7	7.0	54.2	+3.5
<=89	47.2	0.1	48.8	3.9	51.1	−3.1
<=94	47.3	0.0	50.1	2.6	49.9	−5.8
<=100	47.3	0.0	52.7	0.0	47.3	−11.3

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

Table 12 (100% of the old-definition upper national line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.5	100.0	1.1	Only poor targeted
<=9	1.7	98.5	3.5	67.7:1
<=14	3.7	97.2	7.7	34.2:1
<=19	6.6	95.8	13.4	23.0:1
<=24	10.6	94.0	21.1	15.6:1
<=29	16.5	91.1	31.7	10.3:1
<=34	23.2	88.1	43.3	7.4:1
<=39	31.6	83.7	55.9	5.1:1
<=44	41.4	77.9	68.1	3.5:1
<=49	50.0	73.6	77.7	2.8:1
<=54	58.5	68.9	85.1	2.2:1
<=59	65.8	64.9	90.3	1.9:1
<=64	73.6	61.0	94.9	1.6:1
<=69	79.2	57.9	97.0	1.4:1
<=74	84.5	55.2	98.5	1.2:1
<=79	89.0	52.8	99.2	1.1:1
<=84	92.9	50.8	99.7	1.0:1
<=89	96.0	49.2	99.8	1.0:1
<=94	97.4	48.6	100.0	0.9:1
<=100	100.0	47.3	100.0	0.9:1

Tables for
125% of the Old-Definition Upper National Poverty Line

Table 4 (125% of the old-definition upper national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	100.0
5–9	100.0
10–14	99.5
15–19	98.0
20–24	96.0
25–29	93.1
30–34	89.0
35–39	83.4
40–44	75.9
45–49	68.7
50–54	61.3
55–59	47.2
60–64	37.7
65–69	31.0
70–74	18.9
75–79	14.0
80–84	11.3
85–89	8.3
90–94	5.3
95–100	1.7

Table 6 (125% of the old-definition upper national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5–9	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
10–14	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.7
15–19	+0.3	1.1	1.4	1.7
20–24	−1.4	1.2	1.3	1.7
25–29	−1.1	1.4	1.7	2.0
30–34	−4.1	2.7	2.8	3.0
35–39	−2.8	2.3	2.4	2.7
40–44	+4.1	2.3	2.8	3.5
45–49	−0.5	2.5	2.9	3.6
50–54	+4.9	2.7	3.1	4.2
55–59	−4.3	3.6	3.8	4.3
60–64	−1.1	2.7	3.2	4.2
65–69	+4.5	2.7	3.3	4.2
70–74	−2.5	2.6	3.1	4.0
75–79	−1.4	2.5	2.9	3.8
80–84	+2.7	1.7	2.1	3.0
85–89	+5.1	1.1	1.3	1.8
90–94	−3.4	3.3	3.7	5.1
95–100	+1.0	0.4	0.5	0.7

Table 7 (125% of the old-definition upper national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.7	69.1	82.3	90.9
4	+0.4	35.5	41.7	53.7
8	+0.6	23.7	28.5	37.9
16	+0.8	18.5	22.2	28.6
32	+0.5	13.1	15.5	21.2
64	+0.2	9.4	11.5	14.2
128	0.0	6.6	7.7	9.5
256	0.0	4.5	5.4	7.2
512	+0.1	3.3	4.0	5.3
1,024	+0.1	2.2	2.8	3.5
2,048	+0.1	1.7	2.0	2.6
4,096	0.0	1.2	1.4	1.8
8,192	+0.1	0.8	1.0	1.3
16,384	+0.1	0.6	0.7	0.9

Table 11 (125% of the old-definition upper national line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.5	57.7	0.0	41.8	42.3	−98.3
<=9	1.7	56.6	0.0	41.8	43.4	−94.2
<=14	3.7	54.5	0.0	41.7	45.4	−87.2
<=19	6.5	51.7	0.1	41.7	48.2	−77.5
<=24	10.4	47.8	0.2	41.5	51.9	−63.9
<=29	15.8	42.4	0.6	41.1	57.0	−44.5
<=34	22.0	36.2	1.2	40.5	62.6	−22.3
<=39	29.1	29.2	2.6	39.2	68.2	+4.2
<=44	36.2	22.1	5.2	36.5	72.7	+33.1
<=49	42.1	16.1	7.9	33.9	76.0	+58.1
<=54	47.0	11.2	11.5	30.3	77.3	+80.3
<=59	50.6	7.6	15.2	26.6	77.2	+73.9
<=64	53.7	4.5	19.9	21.9	75.6	+65.8
<=69	55.4	2.9	23.8	17.9	73.3	+59.1
<=74	56.7	1.6	27.8	13.9	70.6	+52.2
<=79	57.4	0.8	31.6	10.2	67.6	+45.8
<=84	57.9	0.3	35.0	6.8	64.7	+40.0
<=89	58.1	0.2	38.0	3.8	61.9	+34.8
<=94	58.2	0.0	39.2	2.6	60.8	+32.8
<=100	58.2	0.0	41.8	0.0	58.2	+28.3

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

Table 12 (125% of the old-definition upper national line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.5	100.0	0.9	Only poor targeted
<=9	1.7	99.9	2.9	773.5:1
<=14	3.7	99.4	6.4	153.1:1
<=19	6.6	98.5	11.2	66.0:1
<=24	10.6	97.8	17.9	43.6:1
<=29	16.5	96.2	27.2	25.7:1
<=34	23.2	94.8	37.8	18.1:1
<=39	31.6	91.9	49.9	11.3:1
<=44	41.4	87.4	62.1	6.9:1
<=49	50.0	84.3	72.3	5.4:1
<=54	58.5	80.4	80.7	4.1:1
<=59	65.8	76.9	86.9	3.3:1
<=64	73.6	73.0	92.3	2.7:1
<=69	79.2	69.9	95.1	2.3:1
<=74	84.5	67.1	97.3	2.0:1
<=79	89.0	64.5	98.6	1.8:1
<=84	92.9	62.3	99.4	1.7:1
<=89	96.0	60.5	99.7	1.5:1
<=94	97.4	59.8	99.9	1.5:1
<=100	100.0	58.2	100.0	1.4:1

Tables for
150% of the Old-Definition Upper National Poverty Line

Table 4 (150% of the old-definition upper national line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	100.0
5–9	100.0
10–14	99.8
15–19	99.5
20–24	98.0
25–29	95.4
30–34	94.4
35–39	91.3
40–44	85.1
45–49	79.0
50–54	72.9
55–59	63.8
60–64	51.2
65–69	42.6
70–74	31.1
75–79	23.4
80–84	17.9
85–89	12.3
90–94	8.9
95–100	4.1

Table 6 (150% of the old-definition upper national line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5–9	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
10–14	−0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
15–19	+0.3	0.6	0.7	1.0
20–24	−0.8	0.8	0.9	1.2
25–29	−2.4	1.7	1.8	1.9
30–34	−1.2	1.1	1.2	1.6
35–39	−1.7	1.5	1.5	1.9
40–44	+1.4	1.8	2.1	2.8
45–49	−2.2	2.1	2.4	3.1
50–54	−2.2	2.3	2.7	3.5
55–59	−0.2	2.6	3.0	4.0
60–64	−2.6	2.8	3.2	4.2
65–69	−4.8	3.9	4.2	5.3
70–74	+1.6	3.0	3.6	4.6
75–79	−0.3	3.0	3.7	5.2
80–84	+2.9	2.5	3.0	4.0
85–89	+5.6	1.6	1.9	2.5
90–94	−0.1	3.2	3.8	5.0
95–100	+0.8	1.3	1.6	2.1

Table 7 (150% of the old-definition upper national line):
Average errors between estimated and observed poverty
rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with
confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various
sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014
validation sample

Sample Size	Difference between estimate and observed value			
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
n	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	−1.0	65.2	80.8	88.1
4	0.0	33.1	41.1	51.4
8	−0.3	23.4	29.1	36.7
16	0.0	16.9	20.9	27.1
32	−0.2	12.0	14.3	19.0
64	−0.5	8.8	10.1	13.1
128	−0.7	5.9	7.1	9.6
256	−0.7	4.4	5.2	6.6
512	−0.6	3.0	3.5	4.3
1,024	−0.6	2.2	2.6	3.4
2,048	−0.6	1.5	1.8	2.3
4,096	−0.6	1.1	1.4	1.8
8,192	−0.6	0.8	0.9	1.2
16,384	−0.6	0.5	0.6	0.8

Table 11 (150% of the old-definition upper national line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.5	66.6	0.0	32.8	33.4	−98.5
<=9	1.7	65.5	0.0	32.8	34.5	−95.0
<=14	3.7	63.4	0.0	32.8	36.6	−88.9
<=19	6.6	60.6	0.0	32.8	39.4	−80.4
<=24	10.5	56.6	0.1	32.7	43.3	−68.5
<=29	16.2	50.9	0.3	32.6	48.8	−51.4
<=34	22.6	44.5	0.6	32.2	54.8	−31.7
<=39	30.3	36.9	1.3	31.5	61.8	−7.8
<=44	38.5	28.7	2.9	29.9	68.4	+18.9
<=49	45.3	21.8	4.6	28.2	73.5	+41.9
<=54	51.5	15.6	7.0	25.9	77.4	+63.8
<=59	56.1	11.1	9.7	23.1	79.2	+81.5
<=64	60.3	6.9	13.3	19.5	79.8	+80.1
<=69	62.8	4.3	16.4	16.5	79.3	+75.6
<=74	64.6	2.5	19.9	13.0	77.6	+70.4
<=79	65.8	1.4	23.2	9.6	75.4	+65.4
<=84	66.5	0.6	26.3	6.5	73.0	+60.8
<=89	66.9	0.3	29.1	3.7	70.6	+56.6
<=94	67.0	0.1	30.3	2.5	69.5	+54.8
<=100	67.2	0.0	32.8	0.0	67.2	+51.1

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

Table 12 (150% of the old-definition upper national line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.5	100.0	0.7	Only poor targeted
<=9	1.7	99.9	2.5	773.5:1
<=14	3.7	99.8	5.5	506.7:1
<=19	6.6	99.3	9.8	142.9:1
<=24	10.6	99.0	15.7	98.6:1
<=29	16.5	98.4	24.1	63.0:1
<=34	23.2	97.3	33.7	36.4:1
<=39	31.6	95.7	45.1	22.5:1
<=44	41.4	92.9	57.3	13.2:1
<=49	50.0	90.7	67.5	9.7:1
<=54	58.5	88.1	76.7	7.4:1
<=59	65.8	85.2	83.5	5.8:1
<=64	73.6	81.9	89.8	4.5:1
<=69	79.2	79.3	93.5	3.8:1
<=74	84.5	76.5	96.2	3.2:1
<=79	89.0	73.9	97.9	2.8:1
<=84	92.9	71.6	99.1	2.5:1
<=89	96.0	69.6	99.6	2.3:1
<=94	97.4	68.8	99.8	2.2:1
<=100	100.0	67.2	100.0	2.0:1

Tables for
the Old-Definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Table 4 (Old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	25.2
5–9	14.8
10–14	7.4
15–19	4.9
20–24	2.6
25–29	2.2
30–34	2.2
35–39	0.9
40–44	0.8
45–49	0.6
50–54	0.6
55–59	0.4
60–64	0.1
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 6 (Old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval (±percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+3.2	7.6	9.2	11.6
5–9	+0.7	4.0	4.9	6.6
10–14	−5.3	4.6	5.0	5.9
15–19	+0.3	1.5	1.8	2.4
20–24	−1.5	1.4	1.6	2.1
25–29	+1.1	0.5	0.5	0.7
30–34	+0.5	0.8	1.0	1.2
35–39	−0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7
40–44	−1.1	0.9	1.0	1.2
45–49	+0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3
50–54	+0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4
55–59	−0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8
60–64	−0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
65–69	−0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4
70–74	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
75–79	+0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
80–84	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
85–89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
90–94	−4.5	3.7	4.1	4.6
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 7 (Old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value Confidence interval (±percentage points) 90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	−0.5	2.5	3.7	57.0
4	−0.5	8.8	15.4	26.7
8	−0.3	6.8	9.8	15.1
16	−0.3	5.3	6.7	9.4
32	−0.2	3.4	4.3	6.4
64	−0.2	2.5	2.9	4.3
128	−0.3	1.8	2.2	2.8
256	−0.3	1.3	1.6	2.1
512	−0.3	0.9	1.1	1.4
1,024	−0.2	0.6	0.7	1.0
2,048	−0.2	0.5	0.5	0.7
4,096	−0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5
8,192	−0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4
16,384	−0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3

Table 11 (Old-definition $1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.1	1.5	0.4	98.0	98.2	−60.7
<=9	0.3	1.3	1.4	97.0	97.3	+11.0
<=14	0.5	1.0	3.2	95.2	95.8	−104.5
<=19	0.7	0.9	5.9	92.5	93.2	−277.9
<=24	0.9	0.7	9.8	88.7	89.5	−524.4
<=29	1.0	0.6	15.5	82.9	83.9	−889.2
<=34	1.1	0.5	22.2	76.3	77.3	−1,315.9
<=39	1.2	0.4	30.4	68.0	69.2	−1,843.9
<=44	1.3	0.2	40.0	58.4	59.7	−2,456.9
<=49	1.4	0.2	48.6	49.8	51.2	−3,002.6
<=54	1.4	0.2	57.1	41.4	42.8	−3,544.6
<=59	1.5	0.1	64.4	34.1	35.5	−4,008.9
<=64	1.5	0.1	72.1	26.3	27.8	−4,505.4
<=69	1.5	0.1	77.7	20.8	22.3	−4,859.8
<=74	1.5	0.1	83.0	15.5	17.0	−5,198.4
<=79	1.5	0.1	87.5	10.9	12.5	−5,486.2
<=84	1.5	0.0	91.3	7.1	8.6	−5,732.0
<=89	1.5	0.0	94.5	3.9	5.5	−5,933.2
<=94	1.6	0.0	95.8	2.6	4.2	−6,017.3
<=100	1.6	0.0	98.4	0.0	1.6	−6,185.2

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

Table 12 (Old-definition \$1.25/day 2005 PPP line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.5	22.3	7.2	0.3:1
<=9	1.7	17.5	18.9	0.2:1
<=14	3.7	14.2	33.8	0.2:1
<=19	6.6	10.4	43.9	0.1:1
<=24	10.6	8.1	55.1	0.1:1
<=29	16.5	5.9	61.9	0.1:1
<=34	23.2	4.6	68.1	0.0:1
<=39	31.6	3.8	75.9	0.0:1
<=44	41.4	3.2	85.4	0.0:1
<=49	50.0	2.7	87.4	0.0:1
<=54	58.5	2.4	90.1	0.0:1
<=59	65.8	2.2	93.5	0.0:1
<=64	73.6	2.0	95.7	0.0:1
<=69	79.2	1.9	96.7	0.0:1
<=74	84.5	1.8	96.7	0.0:1
<=79	89.0	1.7	96.8	0.0:1
<=84	92.9	1.6	97.1	0.0:1
<=89	96.0	1.6	97.1	0.0:1
<=94	97.4	1.6	100.0	0.0:1
<=100	100.0	1.6	100.0	0.0:1

Tables for
the Old-Definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP Poverty Line

Table 4 (Old-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Estimated poverty likelihoods associated with scores

If a household's score is . . .	. . . then the likelihood (%) of being below the poverty line is:
0–4	69.5
5–9	55.3
10–14	45.8
15–19	36.3
20–24	24.6
25–29	15.9
30–34	12.8
35–39	9.1
40–44	5.7
45–49	3.7
50–54	3.2
55–59	2.5
60–64	1.2
65–69	0.5
70–74	0.4
75–79	0.4
80–84	0.3
85–89	0.3
90–94	0.2
95–100	0.0

Table 6 (Old-definition \$2.50/day 2005 PPP line):
Average errors between estimated and observed poverty likelihoods for households by score range, with confidence intervals, from 1,000 bootstraps of n = 16,384, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

| | | Difference between estimate and observed value | | |
| | | Confidence interval ($\pm$percentage points) | | |
Score	Diff.	90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
0–4	+4.1	9.9	11.3	14.1
5–9	+0.5	7.0	8.1	10.5
10–14	+4.8	5.0	5.8	7.7
15–19	+11.3	3.4	3.8	5.0
20–24	+1.1	3.2	3.8	4.8
25–29	−1.4	2.3	2.8	3.7
30–34	+1.2	1.9	2.3	2.9
35–39	+1.0	1.4	1.7	2.3
40–44	+1.2	0.9	1.1	1.4
45–49	+0.6	0.9	1.0	1.3
50–54	+0.9	0.6	0.7	0.9
55–59	+0.1	0.8	1.0	1.3
60–64	+0.6	0.3	0.4	0.5
65–69	−0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7
70–74	+0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
75–79	+0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
80–84	+0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
85–89	+0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
90–94	−4.3	3.6	3.9	4.5
95–100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 7 (Old-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Average errors between estimated and observed poverty rates for a group at a point in time by sample size, with confidence intervals, for 1,000 bootstraps of various sample sizes, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Sample Size n	Diff.	Difference between estimate and observed value		
		Confidence interval (±percentage points)		
		90-percent	95-percent	99-percent
1	+0.5	47.1	61.7	76.2
4	+0.2	21.8	28.5	40.4
8	+0.5	15.3	18.4	27.3
16	+0.7	10.4	12.7	18.5
32	+1.0	7.2	8.9	11.5
64	+0.9	5.4	6.3	8.5
128	+0.8	3.7	4.4	5.8
256	+0.8	2.7	3.0	4.4
512	+0.7	1.9	2.3	2.9
1,024	+0.7	1.4	1.7	2.1
2,048	+0.8	1.0	1.1	1.5
4,096	+0.8	0.7	0.8	1.1
8,192	+0.8	0.5	0.5	0.8
16,384	+0.8	0.3	0.4	0.5

Table 11 (Old-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Percentages of households by cut-off score and targeting classification, along with the hit rate and BPAC, 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 validation sample

Targeting cut-off	Inclusion: Poor correctly targeted	Undercoverage: Poor mistakenly not targeted	Leakage: Non-poor mistakenly targeted	Exclusion: Non-poor correctly not targeted	Hit rate Inclusion + Exclusion	BPAC See text
<=4	0.4	7.8	0.1	91.7	92.1	−89.4
<=9	1.1	7.0	0.6	91.3	92.3	−66.1
<=14	1.9	6.2	1.8	90.1	92.0	−30.3
<=19	2.8	5.3	3.8	88.1	90.9	+16.0
<=24	3.8	4.3	6.8	85.1	88.9	+16.2
<=29	5.0	3.2	11.5	80.4	85.3	−41.9
<=34	5.8	2.3	17.4	74.4	80.2	−115.1
<=39	6.6	1.6	25.1	66.8	73.4	−209.2
<=44	7.1	1.0	34.3	57.6	64.7	−322.8
<=49	7.4	0.7	42.6	49.3	56.7	−424.9
<=54	7.7	0.5	50.8	41.1	48.7	−526.8
<=59	7.9	0.3	58.0	33.9	41.8	−614.6
<=64	7.9	0.2	65.7	26.2	34.1	−710.0
<=69	8.0	0.1	71.2	20.7	28.7	−777.8
<=74	8.0	0.1	76.5	15.4	23.5	−842.8
<=79	8.0	0.1	81.0	10.9	19.0	−898.2
<=84	8.1	0.1	84.8	7.1	15.1	−945.6
<=89	8.1	0.0	87.9	3.9	12.0	−984.4
<=94	8.1	0.0	89.3	2.6	10.7	−1,000.6
<=100	8.1	0.0	91.9	0.0	8.1	−1,033.0

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

Table 12 (Old-definition $2.50/day 2005 PPP line): Share of all households who are targeted (that is, score at or below a cut-off), the share of targeted households who are poor (that is, have consumption below the poverty line), the share of poor households who are targeted, and the number of poor households who are successfully targeted (inclusion) per non-poor household mistakenly targeted (leakage), 2014 scorecard applied to the 2014 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	0.5	70.4	4.4	2.4:1
<=9	1.7	62.8	13.1	1.7:1
<=14	3.7	51.4	23.7	1.1:1
<=19	6.6	42.4	34.5	0.7:1
<=24	10.6	36.1	47.4	0.6:1
<=29	16.5	30.1	61.1	0.4:1
<=34	23.2	24.9	71.5	0.3:1
<=39	31.6	20.7	80.8	0.3:1
<=44	41.4	17.1	87.5	0.2:1
<=49	50.0	14.8	91.1	0.2:1
<=54	58.5	13.1	94.4	0.2:1
<=59	65.8	11.9	96.9	0.1:1
<=64	73.6	10.8	97.8	0.1:1
<=69	79.2	10.1	98.7	0.1:1
<=74	84.5	9.5	99.0	0.1:1
<=79	89.0	9.0	99.2	0.1:1
<=84	92.9	8.7	99.4	0.1:1
<=89	96.0	8.4	99.4	0.1:1
<=94	97.4	8.3	100.0	0.1:1
<=100	100.0	8.1	100.0	0.1:1