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**Global Multidimensional Poverty Index 2019**

**Illuminating inequalities**

**What is the global Multidimensional Poverty Index?**

Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 1 aims to end poverty in all its forms and dimensions. Although often defined according to income, poverty can also be defined in terms of the deprivations people face in their daily lives. The global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) is one tool for measuring progress against SDG 1. It compares acute multidimensional poverty for more than 100 countries and 5.7 billion people and monitors changes over time.

The global MPI scrutinizes a person’s deprivations across 10 indicators in health, education and standard of living (figure 1) and offers a high-resolution lens to identify both who is poor and how they are poor. It complements the international $1.90 a day poverty rate by showing the nature and extent of overlapping deprivations for each person. The 2019 update of the global MPI covers 101 countries—31 low income, 68 middle income and 2 high income—and uses data from 50 Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), 42 Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), one DHS-MICS and eight national surveys that provide comparable information to DHS and MICS. Data are from 2007–2018, though 5.2 billion of the 5.7 billion people covered and 1.2 billion of the 1.3 billion multidimensionally poor people identified are captured by surveys from 2013 or later.

The global MPI is disaggregated by age group and geographic area to show poverty patterns within countries. It is also broken down by indicator to highlight which deprivations characterize poverty and drive its reduction or increase. These analyses are vital for policymakers.

The global MPI was developed in 2010 by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) at the University of Oxford and the Human Development Report Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for the flagship Human Development Report. The figures and analysis are updated at least once a year using newly released data. See the back cover for more details on the global MPI.

**Key findings**

- Across 101 countries, 1.3 billion people—23.1 percent—are multidimensionally poor.
- Two-thirds of multidimensionally poor people live in middle-income countries (p. 3).
- There is massive variation in multidimensional poverty within countries. For example, Uganda’s national multidimensional poverty rate (55.1 percent) is similar to the Sub-Saharan Africa average (57.5 percent), but the incidence of multidimensional poverty in Uganda’s provinces ranges from 6.0 percent to 96.3 percent, a range similar to that of national multidimensional poverty rates in Sub-Saharan Africa (6.3–91.9 percent).
- Half of the 1.3 billion multidimensionally poor people are children under age 18. A third are children under age 10 (p. 6).
- This year’s spotlight on child poverty in South Asia reveals considerable diversity. While 10.7 percent of South Asian girls are out of school and live in a multidimensionally poor household, that average hides variation: in Afghanistan 44.0 percent do (p. 7).
- In South Asia 22.7 percent of children under age 5 experience intrahousehold inequality in deprivation in nutrition (where at least one child in the household is malnourished and at least one child in the household is not). In Pakistan over a third of children under age 5 experience such intrahousehold inequality (p. 8).
- Of 10 selected countries for which changes over time were analysed, India and Cambodia reduced their MPI values the fastest—and they did not leave the poorest groups behind (p. 9).
There is wide variation across countries in inequality among multidimensionally poor people—that is, in the intensity of poverty experienced by each poor person. For example, Egypt and Paraguay have similar MPI values, but inequality among multidimensionally poor people is considerably higher in Paraguay.

There is little or no association between economic inequality (measured using the Gini coefficient) and the MPI value.

In the 10 selected countries for which changes over time were analysed, deprivations declined faster among the poorest 40 percent of the population than among the total population.

What can the global Multidimensional Poverty Index tell us about inequality?

The world is increasingly troubled by inequality. Citizens and politicians alike recognize the growing inequality in many societies and its potential influence on political stability, economic growth, social cohesion and even happiness. But how is inequality linked to poverty?

Poverty identifies people whose attainments place them at the bottom of the distribution. Inequality considers the shape of the distribution: how far those at the bottom are from the highest treetops and what lies in between. Though inequality is complex, if the bottom of the distribution rises—if the poorest improve the fastest—one troubling aspect of inequality is addressed.

FIGURE 1
Structure of the global Multidimensional Poverty Index

Source: Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative 2018.
Showcasing inequalities multidimensionally

The SDGs call for disaggregated information in order to identify who is catching up and who is being left behind. To meet this need, the MPI has been disaggregated by 1,119 subnational regions as well as by age and rural-urban area. This report uses that information to highlight gender and intrahousehold inequalities in South Asia and track whether countries that reduce multidimensional poverty are leaving no one behind.

Beyond averages

Low- and middle-income countries have extensive subnational inequality (figure 2). Of the 1.3 billion multidimensionally poor people worldwide, 886 million—more than two-thirds of them—live in middle-income countries:

FIGURE 2

Both low- and middle-income countries have a wide range of multidimensional poverty

Note: Each bubble represents a subnational region; the size of the bubble reflects the number of multidimensionally poor people. The figure is based on 1,119 subnational regions in 83 countries plus national averages for 18 countries. Data are from surveys conducted between 2007 and 2018.

Across the 101 countries covered by the global MPI, 23.1 percent of people are multidimensionally poor, but the incidence of multidimensional poverty varies across developing regions—from 1.1 percent in Europe and Central Asia to 57.5 percent in Sub-Saharan Africa.

- 94 million multidimensionally poor people live in upper-middle-income countries, where the subnational incidence of multidimensional poverty ranges from 0 percent to 69.9 percent.
- 792 million multidimensionally poor live in lower-middle-income countries, where the subnational incidence of multidimensional poverty ranges from 0 percent to 86.7 percent.
- 440 million multidimensionally poor people live in low-income countries, where the subnational incidence of multidimensional poverty ranges from 0.2 percent to 99.4 percent. This shows that the challenge of reducing multidimensional poverty is not confined to low-income countries.

Disaggregation matters

Across the 101 countries covered by the global MPI, 23.1 percent of people are multidimensionally poor, but the incidence of multidimensional poverty varies across developing regions—from 1.1 percent in Europe and Central Asia to 57.5 percent in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Without disaggregation, the striking inequality within countries is easily missed.

Inequality between and within countries

The global MPI highlights inequalities at the global, regional, national, subnational and even household level. Each layer of analysis yields a new understanding of inequality and provides a far richer picture than the $1.90 a day poverty rate. Two examples illustrate how subnational disaggregations shine a light on inequality.

Where multidimensionally poor people live

The global MPI indicates that 1.3 billion people live in multidimensional poverty. But where are they? Increasing levels of disaggregation can help locate them:

- **Poorest two developing regions:** Ranking developing regions by average MPI value reveals that Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are the poorest (figure 3).
- **Poorest 49 countries:** Ranking countries by MPI value reveals that the poorest 49 countries are home to as many multidimensionally poor people as Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. These 49 countries are spread across all developing regions except Europe and Central Asia.
- **Poorest 675 subnational regions:** Ranking subnational regions by MPI value reveals that the poorest 675 subnational regions, located in 65 countries in all developing regions except Europe and Central Asia, are home to as many poor people as Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia combined.

Poverty is everywhere

Action against poverty is needed in all developing regions. While Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are home to the largest proportions of multidimensionally poor people (84.5 percent of all multidimensionally poor people live in the two regions), countries in other parts of the world also have a high incidence of multidimensional poverty: Sudan (52.3 percent), Yemen (47.7 percent), Timor-Leste (45.8 percent) and Haiti (41.3 percent).

Stark inequalities across countries in the same developing region

In Sub-Saharan Africa the incidence of multidimensional poverty is 91.9 percent in South Sudan and 90.5 percent in Niger but 14.9 percent in Gabon and 6.3 percent in South Africa. In South Asia it is 55.9 percent in Afghanistan but 0.8 percent in the Maldives. In the Arab States it is 52.3 percent in Sudan and
47.7 percent in Yemen but less than 1.0 percent in Jordan. In Latin America it is 41.3 percent in Haiti but 0.6 percent in Trinidad and Tobago. In East Asia and the Pacific it is 45.8 percent in Timor-Leste but 3.9 percent in China and 0.8 percent in Thailand. In Europe and Central Asia it is 7.4 percent in Tajikistan but 0.2 percent in Armenia.

What intensity adds

The MPI is the product of the incidence and the intensity of multidimensional poverty, and both are important aspects. Any reduction in intensity reduces MPI (even if incidence remains unchanged) and reflects progress towards moving people out of poverty. The poorest countries exhibit not just higher incidence of multidimensional poverty, but also higher intensity, with each poor person deprived in more indicators. Some countries have similar incidences but very different intensities. The incidence of multidimensional poverty in Pakistan and Myanmar is 38.3 percent, but the intensity is considerably higher in Pakistan (51.7 percent) than in Myanmar (45.9 percent). Another stark contrast is Nigeria, with incidence of 51.4 percent and intensity of 56.6 percent, and Malawi, with incidence of 52.6 percent, and intensity of 46.2 percent.
**Children bear the greatest burden**

Disaggregating the global MPI by age reveals inequality across age groups. Children under age 18 bear the greatest burden of multidimensional poverty. This section spotlights the 2 billion children—1.1 billion of whom are under age 10—living in the 101 countries covered by the global MPI.

Half of multidimensionally poor people are children, and a third are children under age 10

Of the 1.3 billion people who are multidimensionally poor, 663 million are children—and 428 million of them (32.3 percent) are under age 10.

One adult in six is multidimensionally poor—compared with one child in three

While 17.5 percent of adults in the countries covered by the MPI are multidimensionally poor, the incidence of multidimensional poverty among children is 33.8 percent.

Over 85 percent of multidimensionally poor children live in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa

- Most of the 663 million multidimensionally poor children live in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, split roughly equally between both regions.5
- Some 63.5 percent of children in Sub-Saharan Africa are multidimensionally poor—the highest incidence among all developing regions.
- In Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Niger and South Sudan 90 percent or more of children under age 10 are multidimensionally poor.

Children are more likely than adults to be multidimensionally poor and deprived in all indicators

A higher proportion of children than of adults are multidimensionally poor and deprived in every one of the MPI indicators, and the youngest children bear the greatest burden (figure 4). This is a clarion call for action.

**FIGURE 4**

A higher proportion of children than of adults are multidimensionally poor, and the youngest children bear the greatest burden

![Bar chart showing share of individuals who are multidimensionally poor and deprived (percent) across different age groups and indicators.]

Note: Data are from surveys conducted between 2007 and 2018.
Inside the home: a spotlight on children in South Asia

There are many lenses through which to view the experience of children in poverty.7 The global MPI identifies each child’s deprivation by gender and age and places it in the context of the deprivation of other children in the household and of the household as a whole.

This section synthesizes a new United Nations Children’s Fund–supported study of individual child-level data for three of the global MPI indicators in South Asia: nutrition, school attendance and years of schooling (figure 5).

Nutrition

In South Asia 70 million children under age 5—42.8 percent—are stunted or underweight.8 Intrahousehold disparities in deprivation in nutrition among children under age 5 in the region are stark. Some 22.7 percent of children under age 5 live in a household in which at least one child is malnourished and at least one child is not. In Pakistan over a third of children under age 5 experience intrahousehold inequality in deprivation in nutrition.

Out-of-school children

Across South Asia 36.7 million children do not attend school through grade 8. Some 32.3 million (88.0 percent) out-of-school children live in multidimensionally poor households.

In terms of gender disparities, 9.0 percent of boys in South Asia are out of school and live in a multidimensionally poor household, compared with 10.7 percent of girls (figure 6). Country patterns vary considerably. In Afghanistan 24.8 percent of boys ages 7–15 are multidimensionally poor and out of school, compared with 44.0 percent of girls. In Bangladesh...
Children are bringing about change in South Asia. Of 436 million people who live in a household in which no adult has completed six years of schooling, 135 million live with a child age 10–17 who has completed six years of schooling.

As the only people in their households to have completed six years of schooling, these “pioneer children” are breaking new ground. While they might seem to be a rare phenomenon, 37.5 million children ages 10–17 in South Asia—or one in eight—are pioneer children. And more than half of those children are girls.

However, completing six years of schooling is no panacea. Schools may be ramshackle, and teachers may not teach, so six years of schooling may convey little. Nor does schooling snuff out poverty at once. Some 28.4 percent of pioneer children live in a multidimensionally poor household, which means they experience other deprivations that may affect their capacity to learn. And inequalities continue to plague even those households. For instance, 31.5 percent of pioneer children in Afghanistan live with at least one other child age 10–17 who has not completed six years of schooling and has already left school. Yet, despite the adversity in their lives, these 37.5 million children can bring change.

FIGURE 6
In South Asia the percentage of school-age children who are multidimensionally poor and out of school varies by country

Note: Out-of-school children are school-age children who do not attend school through grade 8.
Source: Alkire, Ul Haq and Alim 2019.

The gender pattern is reversed: 12.1 percent of boys are multidimensionally poor and out of school, compared with 7.2 percent of girls.

Do all children in the same household fare the same? No. In South Asia one child in nine is multidimensionally poor and lives in a household where some school-age children attend school but others do not.

Pioneer children: a story of hope

Education deprivations continue to affect South Asia. A shocking 436 million South Asians—one in four—live in a household in which no adult has completed six years of schooling. But children are bringing about change. Of those 436 million people, 135 million—just under a third—live with a child age 10–17 who has completed six years of schooling.

As the only people in their households to have completed six years of schooling, these “pioneer children” are breaking new ground. While they might seem to be a rare phenomenon, 37.5 million children ages 10–17 in South Asia—or one in eight—are pioneer children. And more than half of those children are girls.

However, completing six years of schooling is no panacea. Schools may be ramshackle, and teachers may not teach, so six years of schooling may convey little. Nor does schooling snuff out poverty at once. Some 28.4 percent of pioneer children live in a multidimensionally poor household, which means they experience other deprivations that may affect their capacity to learn. And inequalities continue to plague even those households. For instance, 31.5 percent of pioneer children in Afghanistan live with at least one other child age 10–17 who has not completed six years of schooling and has already left school. Yet, despite the adversity in their lives, these 37.5 million children can bring change.
Leaving no one behind

The global MPI shows the incidence of multidimensional poverty each year. Disaggregating trends by age or location—which requires strictly harmonized datasets—indicates whether people are being left behind. This section uses 10 countries from a larger OPHI study to illustrate different patterns of reduction in MPI value over time. Their combined population is about 2 billion people, they cover every developing region and they span three income categories: upper middle (Peru), lower middle (Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Viet Nam) and low (Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Haiti).

The big picture

Overall, the 10 countries made progress towards SDG 1. Eight countries saw a statistically significant reduction in their MPI value and a combined drop in the number of multidimensionally poor people from 1.1 billion to 782 million. This improvement occurred despite the rapid population growth in African countries that unfortunately led to an increase in the number of multidimensionally poor people in Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia and Nigeria.

The fastest absolute reductions in MPI value were in India, Cambodia and Bangladesh, followed by Ethiopia and Haiti. Peru joined Cambodia in experiencing the largest reduction relative to its starting MPI (7.1 percent a year).

Signs of progress

Examples of pro-poor reduction, where the poorest regions improved the fastest, included Mondol Kiri and Rattanak Kiri in Cambodia, which reduced the incidence of multidimensional poverty from 71.0 percent to 55.9 percent between 2010 and 2014, and Jharkhand in India, which reduced it from 74.9 percent to 46.5 percent between 2005/06 and 2015/16.

Ethiopia, India and Peru significantly reduced deprivations in all 10 indicators, each in different ways (figure 7). Ethiopia made improvements in nutrition, school attendance, drinking water and assets. India strongly improved assets, cooking fuel, sanitation and nutrition. And Peru developed clean energy, electricity, housing and assets. The other seven countries significantly reduced deprivations in many—but not all 10—indicators: Bangladesh and Cambodia reduced deprivations in nine, Haiti reduced deprivations in eight and Democratic Republic of the Congo and Pakistan reduced deprivations in six indicators.

FIGURE 7

Ethiopia, India and Peru significantly reduced deprivations in all 10 indicators, each in different ways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annualized absolute change (percentage points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alkire, Kovesdi, Mitchell, Pinilla-Rincancio and Schafin-Pettee 2019.
Who is being left behind?

The trends in these 10 countries also shine a light on where poverty reduction has been uneven, despite the good progress overall. Among selected countries with a significant reduction in MPI\textsuperscript{r} value, India demonstrates the clearest pro-poor pattern at the subnational level: the poorest regions reduced multidimensional poverty the fastest in absolute terms (figure 8).

In all 10 countries rural areas are poorer than urban areas. In Cambodia, Haiti, India and Peru poverty reduction in rural areas outpaced that in urban areas—demonstrating pro-poor development—and in Bangladesh and Democratic Republic of the Congo poverty fell at the same speed in rural and urban areas. In Ethiopia urban areas progressed faster than rural areas, though both reduced poverty significantly.

### FIGURE 8

**Trends in poverty reduction in subnational regions for selected countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPIT value, 2010</td>
<td>MPIT value, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>Dromia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>Amhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandal</td>
<td>Ben-Gumuz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sihanoukville</td>
<td>SNNPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preah Vihear and Stung Treng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondol Kiri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratanak Kiri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svay Rieng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haiti, 2012–2016/17</th>
<th>India, 2005/06–2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPIT value, 2012</td>
<td>MPIT value, 2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord-Est</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand’Anse</td>
<td>Kerala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand’Anse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord-Est</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MPIT is the Multidimensional Poverty Index value based on harmonized survey data.

Note: Horizontally, subnational regions are placed according to their initial MPIT value, with the poorest region on the right. Vertically, the regions with the fastest absolute rate of reduction in MPIT value appear at the bottom. If improvements have benefited the poorest most, the regions to the right in each panel are closest to the bottom (indicating that they had the largest drop in MPIT value). The size of the bubbles reflects the number of multidimensionally poor people in the starting year. Grey bubbles indicate that no statistically significant change in MPIT value occurred for that region.

Source: Alkire, Kovesdi, Mitchell, Pinilla-Roncancio and Scharlin-Pettee 2019.
Children are poorer than adults in all 10 countries. Child poverty fell markedly faster than adult poverty in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Haiti, India and Peru. But children fell further behind in Ethiopia, and their progress—together with that of adults—stalled in Democratic Republic of the Congo and Pakistan.

**Case study: Ethiopia**

Between 2011 and 2016 Ethiopia reduced its MPI value from 0.545 to 0.489. The percentage of multidimensionally poor people fell from 88.4 percent to 83.5 percent, and the intensity of poverty dropped from 61.6 percent to 58.5 percent. Ethiopia made substantial improvements in all MPI indicators, with the largest annual absolute improvements in drinking water, assets and nutrition deprivations (figure 9).

Based on the $1.90 a day poverty measure, only 27.3 percent of people were classified as monetarily poor in 2015—far below the 83.5 percent classified as multidimensionally poor. In fact, of all the countries covered by the global MPI, Ethiopia has the biggest difference between the incidence of multidimensional poverty and the $1.90 a day poverty rate.

Between 2011 and 2016 Ethiopia reduced its MPI value from 0.545 to 0.489.

Of Ethiopia’s 102 million inhabitants, 85.5 million are multidimensionally poor, meaning that the country has more multidimensionally poor people than the total population of Germany—and more multidimensionally poor people than any of the 101 countries covered by the MPI except India and Nigeria. Over half the population is multidimensionally poor and has a malnourished person in the household, and half is multidimensionally poor and lives in a household in which no one has completed six years of schooling (figure 10). A third of the population is multidimensionally poor and lives with a child who is not attending school. Nearly three-quarters of the population is multidimensionally poor and lacks electricity, and 80 percent is multidimensionally poor and lacks adequate sanitation facilities.

All age cohorts reduced the incidence of multidimensional poverty significantly between 2011 and 2016. Among children ages 0–17 the incidence dropped from 91.2 percent to 87.5 percent, and intensity fell from 63.5 percent to 60.5 percent. But the incidence among adults fell faster, meaning that children are falling further behind adults—a worrying trend. Indeed, the incidence of multidimensional poverty is highest, 90 percent, among children under age 10.

**FIGURE 9**

**Ethiopia has made substantial improvements in all Multidimensional Poverty Index indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Reduction in Percentage Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child mortality</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School attendance</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking fuel</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alkire, Kovesdi, Mitchell, Pinilla-Ronzancio and Schaafin-Pettee 2019.
Disaggregating by rural-urban area reveals that 93.3 percent of multidimensionally poor people live in rural areas.

Disaggregating by region provides an example of a reduction in the intensity of poverty in a way that risks leaving some of the poorest groups behind. There is a clear difference between the trajectories of high- and low-MPI regions. Eight of the country’s 11 regions saw a significant reduction in the incidence of multidimensional poverty, but Somali—the second poorest region, where 91.9 percent of the population is multidimensionally poor—did not. The capital city Addis Ababa had the largest reduction, nearly halving its MPI value and reducing the percentage of multidimensionally poor people by 44 percentage points, to 15.5 percent.

What is distinctive in Ethiopia is the extent to which changes in intensity between 2011 and 2016 drove changes in some regions. In Oromia, home to the largest number of multidimensionally poor people, the incidence of multidimensional poverty fell from 91.7 percent to 87.2 percent, but there was no significant reduction in intensity. Amhara had a similar reduction in incidence—but also significantly reduced intensity. The reduction in MPI value in both Tigray, from 0.520 to 0.450, and the Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples’ Region (SNNPR), from 0.567 to 0.482, was due to a decrease in intensity of over 5 percentage points. The SNNPR also reduced the incidence of multidimensional poverty by 6.5 percentage points. Tigray did not; its progress was due solely to the reduction in intensity.

In addition, the poorest quintile reduced multidimensional poverty faster than the second poorest and the richest quintiles.13 Overall, multidimensional poverty in Ethiopia improved significantly, albeit without regional equalization and with growing differences across generations and between rural and urban areas. Progress was also affected by rapid population growth. Yet, a positive trend is evident, and most regions reduced intensity significantly. So while most people remain multidimensionally poor, their lives are improving in multiple indicators.
Inequality among multidimensionally poor people

This section looks at inequality among multidimensionally poor people—that is, the difference in the intensity of poverty experienced by each poor person. Inequality among poor people is measured using the variance, which is calculated by subtracting each multidimensionally poor person’s deprivation score from the average intensity, squaring the difference, summing the squared differences, and dividing the sum by the number of multidimensionally poor people. Inequality among multidimensionally poor people is also reported in the 2019 global MPI table.

Why investigate inequality among multidimensionally poor people? Because multidimensionally poor people are deprived in anything from a third to 100 percent of MPI indicators—so even though they are all identified as multidimensionally poor, the intensity of poverty that they face differs. This can be measured using the variance. While the measurement and analysis of economic inequality are well established, inequality among multidimensionally poor people has been explored less.

Clearly, inequality among multidimensionally poor people tends to increase with MPI value, but there is wide variation across countries (figure 11). For example, Egypt and Paraguay have similar MPI values (around 0.190), but inequality among multidimensionally poor people is much higher in Paraguay (variance of 0.013) than in Egypt (0.004). In South Asia, Pakistan and Bangladesh have similar MPI values (0.198), but inequality is higher in Pakistan (variance of 0.023) than in Bangladesh (0.016). In Sub-Saharan Africa, Gambia and Nigeria have similar MPI values (around 0.290), but inequality is higher in Nigeria (variance of 0.029) than in Gambia (0.018).

The measurement of inequality among multidimensionally poor people summarizes the distribution of their deprivation scores within intensity. Variance adds an additional piece of information: it signals when average intensity is highly heterogeneous, as in Nigeria and Pakistan. Policies can be tailored to different groups of poor people, including the most and the least intensely deprived.

While variance provides useful insights, it is important to emphasize that the primary objective of SDG 1 is to end poverty—not merely to reduce inequality among poor people.

Multidimensional poverty and economic inequality

Do more economically unequal countries have a higher incidence of multidimensional poverty? It turns out that there is little or no correlation between economic inequality in a country (as measured by the Gini coefficient) and the country’s MPI value (figure 12).

Inequalities in human capabilities are important in any assessment of human development that goes beyond averages. The Inequality-adjusted HDI (IHDI), produced by the Human Development Report Office since 2010, adjusts each dimension of the Human Development Index (HDI)—health, education and standard of living—by the Atkinson inequality measure, which offers a way to explore inequalities in capabilities.

But the IHDI does not capture overlapping inequalities—whether the same person is at the lower end of the distribution of all three dimensions. The MPI uses information about the magnitude of overlapping inequalities at
The MPI, economic inequality (as measured by the Gini coefficient) and the IHDI each contribute important and distinctive information for policy action.

The bottom of the distribution to provide a better understanding of the multidimensional nature of inequality in human development and its association with multidimensional poverty.

Consider the association between inequality in the education dimension of the HDI and the incidence of multidimensional poverty (figure 13). The correlation coefficient of 0.737 indicates a strong association. The association tends to be strongest in Europe and Central Asia, where the incidence of multidimensional poverty and education inequality are low, and in Sub-Saharan Africa, where both are higher. But some differences are worth noting. Kenya and Pakistan have a similar incidence of multidimensional poverty, but inequality in education in Pakistan is twice that in Kenya. And Democratic Republic of the Congo and Iraq have similar inequality in education, but the incidence of multidimensional poverty in Democratic Republic of the Congo is 0.65 percentage points higher.

Across the other dimensions of the HDI, the association with the incidence of multidimensional poverty is highest for inequality in life expectancy (0.869) and lowest for inequality in standard of living (0.086).

The conclusion is evident: no single measure is a sufficient guide to both inequality and multidimensional poverty. The MPI, economic inequality (as measured by the Gini coefficient) and the IHDI each contribute important and distinctive information for policy action.
SDG target 10.1 calls for tracking progress of the bottom 20 percent of the population compared with that of the total population. The World Bank calls this comparison “shared prosperity.” Of the 10 selected countries from the OPHI study that are discussed in the section on leaving no one behind, 8 had data on shared prosperity, and only 2—Peru and Viet Nam, to some extent—exhibited equalizing growth (figure 14).

What about nonmonetary indicators? The 10 selected countries discussed above showed mostly equalizing growth in attainments (the opposite of deprivations) across the 10 MPI indicators, regardless of whether growth was measured in absolute terms (as the change between two years divided by the number of years elapsed) or in relative terms (as the change between two years divided by the value in the previous year).

**FIGURE 13**

The incidence of multidimensional poverty is strongly but imperfectly correlated with inequality in education.

![Graph showing the correlation between multidimensional poverty incidence and inequality in education](image)

*Note: Data are from surveys conducted between 2007 and 2018. The size of each bubble reflects the size of the population. Source: Kovacevic 2019.*

**FIGURE 14**

Of eight selected countries with data, only Peru and Viet Nam saw higher growth in income or consumption per capita among the poorest 40 percent than among the total population.

![Bar chart showing average annual growth in income or consumption per capita](image)

first year). In absolute terms the average attainment score (the proportion of MPI indicators in which a person is not deprived) grew faster among the bottom 40 percent than among the total population in all countries except Ethiopia (figure 15). India and Peru had the largest difference between the two groups, followed by Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cambodia and Bangladesh. Haiti and Pakistan had only slightly equalizing patterns. In relative terms, growth in the average attainment score among the bottom 40 percent exceeded that among the total population in all 10 countries.

Growth in attainments among the bottom 40 percent across the 10 MPI indicators is not the same as shared prosperity in income per capita. Attainments cover only 10 indicators and are bounded, so they cannot increase indefinitely. Nonetheless, exploring the patterns of growth provides novel information on multidimensional trajectories of change.

**FIGURE 15**
In all but one of the 10 selected countries the bottom 40 percent are improving Multidimensional Poverty Index attainments faster than the total population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>2011–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2006–2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2013–2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2010–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2012–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2005–2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2013–2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2004–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, DR</td>
<td>2007–2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2011–2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Countries are ordered from highest to lowest average attainment score in the first year of the period shown.
Source: Seth and Alkire 2019.
19 This section synthesizes Seth and Alkire (2019).
17 This section draws on Kovacevic (2019). Because current data
16 Kolm (1977) and Atkinson and Bourguignon (1982) pioneered
14 This section synthesizes Alkire and Santos (2019).
12 Population figures in this section refer to the year of the
11 This section summarizes Alkire, Kovesdi, Mitchell, Pinilla-
10 To compare the incidence of multidimensional poverty over
9 This section synthesizes Alkire, Kovesdi, Mitchell, Pinilla-
8 Data on child nutrition in Afghanistan in 2015 are unavailable.
7 This section draws on Alkire, Ul Haq and Alim (2019), who
6 With standard errors, the regions cannot be distinguished.
5 The analysis of subnational disaggregation includes South
4 The analysis in this section is based on 1,119 subnational
3 All population aggregates in this report use 2017 population
2 As of 15 April 2019, MPI statistics have been updated for 14
countries using new datasets: Albania (DHS 2017/18), Benin (DHS 2017/18), Congo (MICS 2014/15), Haiti (DHS 2016/17),
Iraq (MICS 2018), Jordan (DHS 2017/18), Lao People’s Democratic Republic (MICS 2017), the Maldives (DHS 2016/17),
Pakistan (DHS 2017/18), Philippines (DHS 2017), Senegal (DHS 2017), Sierra Leone (MICS 2017), South Africa (DHS 2016) and
Tajikistan (DHS 2017).
3 All population aggregates in this report use 2017 population
data from UNDESA (2017), unless otherwise indicated. Online
data tables provide results using population data for survey
years.
1 United Nations 2015.

Notes
1 United Nations 2015.
2 As of 15 April 2019, MPI statistics have been updated for 14
countries using new datasets: Albania (DHS 2017/18), Benin (DHS 2017/18), Congo (MICS 2014/15), Haiti (DHS 2016/17),
Iraq (MICS 2018), Jordan (DHS 2017/18), Lao People’s Democratic Republic (MICS 2017), the Maldives (DHS 2016/17),
Pakistan (DHS 2017/18), Philippines (DHS 2017), Senegal (DHS 2017), Sierra Leone (MICS 2017), South Africa (DHS 2016) and
Tajikistan (DHS 2017).
3 All population aggregates in this report use 2017 population
data from UNDESA (2017), unless otherwise indicated. Online
data tables provide results using population data for survey
years.
4 The analysis in this section is based on 1,119 subnational
regions in 83 countries plus national averages for 18 countries.
Unless otherwise indicated, all data are based on Alkire,
Kanagaratnam and Suppa (2019).
5 The analysis of subnational disaggregation includes South
Sudan, for which disaggregated data are unavailable.
6 With standard errors, the regions cannot be distinguished.
7 This section draws on Alkire, Ul Haq and Alim (2019), who
used 2016 population weights and covered Afghanistan
(2015), Bangladesh (2014), Bhutan (2010), India (2015/16), the
8 Data on child nutrition in Afghanistan in 2015 are unavailable.
9 This section synthesizes Alkire, Kovesdi, Mitchell, Pinilla-
Roncancio and Scharlin-Pettee (2019). Population data in this
section refer to the year of the survey.
10 To compare the incidence of multidimensional poverty over
time, surveys were harmonized to create full comparability for one country (see Alkire, Kovesdi, Mitchell, Pinilla-Roncancio
and Scharlin-Pettee 2019). Due to these adjustments, the
harmonized results may differ from published global MPI values and are therefore denoted MPI T. The number of years between
surveys must also be considered in interpreting results.
11 This section summarizes Alkire, Kovesdi, Mitchell, Pinilla-
Roncancio and Scharlin-Pettee’s (2019) analysis of Ethiopia’s
reduction in MPI value.
12 Population figures in this section refer to the year of the survey.
13 For quintile analysis of all 10 countries, see Seth and Alkire
(2019).
14 This section synthesizes Alkire and Santos (2019).
15 Alkire and Foster, 2019; Alkire and Santos 2019.
16 Kolm (1977) and Atkinson and Bourguignon (1982) pioneered
the analysis of inequality in the multidimensional poverty
space. See also Alkire and others (2015), Alkire and Foster
(2016, 2019), Seth and Alkire (2019), and Seth and Santos
(2019).
17 This section draws on Kovacevic (2019). Because current data
on inequality refer to income or consumption inequality, the
generic term “economic inequality” is used.
18 For details on the IHDI, see wwwhdr.undp.org/en/content/
inequality-adjusted-human-development-index-ihdi.
19 This section synthesizes Seth and Alkire (2019).
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## Multidimensional Poverty Index: developing countries

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>19.376E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>14,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>6,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>7,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>1,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>0.008f</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015 N</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>13,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>8,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>5,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>10,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>3,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>12,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>2,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>54,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>10,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini (Kingdom of)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>35,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>8,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>4,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>7,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>4,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011/2012</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>369,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.028f</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>17,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>2,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>15,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2014</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>9,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>13,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>2,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 N</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova (Republic of)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **Poverty Index**: A multidimensional poverty index is a measure that integrates information on poverty from various dimensions, such as education, health, and living standards.
- **Population in multidimensional poverty**: This refers to the number of individuals living in multidimensional poverty.
- **Inequality among the poor**: This measures the disparity within the poor population.
- **Population in severe multidimensional poverty**: This refers to those living in severe poverty.
- **Population vulnerable to multidimensional poverty**: This measures the sensitivity to multidimensional poverty.
- **Contribution of deprivation in dimension to overall multidimensional poverty**: This indicates the proportion of multidimensional poverty caused by each dimension.
- **Health**: This includes access to healthcare, nutrition, and sanitation.
- **Education**: This includes literacy rates and access to education.
- **Standard of living**: This includes access to basic needs and services.
- **National poverty line**: This refers to the official poverty line set by each country.
- **PPP $1.90 a day**: This is the poverty line in constant 2011 international dollars.

### Source
- Data from various sources, including national statistical offices and international organizations.

### Key
- **D**: Data is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
- **N**: Data is not statistically significant.
- **e**: Data is estimated.
### DEFINITIONS

**Multidimensional Poverty Index:** Percentage of the population that is multidimensionally poor adjusted by the intensity of the deprivations.

**Integrity score:** Weighting differences by the number of multidimensionally poor people. It is calculated by subtracting the deprivation score experienced by people in multidimensional poverty from the national poverty line (in purchasing power parity [PPP] terms) a day.

**Inequality among the poor:** Percentage of the population in severe multidimensional poverty—that is, those with a deprivation score of at least 33 percent. It is expressed as a share of the population in severe multidimensional poverty.

**Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey:** Surveys carried out at the household level to calculate the country's Multidimensional Poverty Index value and its components.

**Poverty line:** National poverty line of $1.90 (in PPP terms) a day.

**Population living below national poverty line:** Percentage of the population in severe multidimensional poverty—those with a deprivation score of 50 percent or more.

**Population living below PPP $1.90 a day:** Percentage of the population in severe multidimensional poverty.

**Sub-Saharan Africa:** Developing countries other than North Macedonia, Pakistan, the Arab States, and the South Asian Region.

**Survey year:** Year in which the survey was carried out to estimate the headcount numbers.

**Technique employed:** The methodology was adjusted to account for missing indicator values from national surveys and the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey are 0.010 for Multidimensional Poverty Index estimates are based on the 2016 Multidimensional Poverty Index estimates.

**Tableau des surveys:** The table is based on the survey year.

**Weighted square:** Squaring the differences and dividing the sum of the weighted squares by the number of multidimensionally poor people.
Table 2

Multidimensional Poverty Index: changes over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year and survey</th>
<th>Multidimensional Poverty Index value²</th>
<th>Headcount (thousands)</th>
<th>Intensity of deprivation (%)</th>
<th>People who are multidimensionally poor and deprived in each indicator*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2004 D¹</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>93,857</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 D¹</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>74,374</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 D²</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>66,468</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2016 D</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017 D</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 D²</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2010 D</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 D</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Democratic Republic of)</td>
<td>2002 D</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>45,335</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 D</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>54,350</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Democratic Republic of)</td>
<td>2013/2014 D¹</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>54,590</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2011 D¹</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>76,558</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 D¹</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>85,520</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 D²</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>85,511</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2012 D¹</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>4,982</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017 D¹</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>4,382</td>
<td>48.1 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017 D¹</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2005/2006 D</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>640,550</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2016 D</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>369,546</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015/2016 D¹</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>369,546</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2013 D</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>66,341</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017 M¹</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>60,445</td>
<td>55.6 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017 M²</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>56,175</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2012/2013 D¹</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/2014 D</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>67,916</td>
<td>51.7 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017/2018 D¹</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>67,916</td>
<td>51.7 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2006 D¹</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>5,447</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 D¹</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 D¹</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>2010/2011 M¹</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8,290</td>
<td>42.1 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/2014 M¹</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15,308</td>
<td>43.4 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013/2014 M²</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>39.5 (*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- *Refers to the year and the survey in which the Multidimensional Poverty Index value and its components are available.
- ‡Includes all indicators that are available in a particular year and survey.

Definitions:
- Multidimensional poverty headcount: Population with a deprivation score of at least 33 percent. It is expressed as a share of the population in the survey year and the number of poor people in the survey year.

Main data sources:
- Column 1: Refers to the year and the survey whose data were used to calculate the country’s Multidimensional Poverty Index value and its components.
How the global Multidimensional Poverty Index is calculated

The global MPI is calculated using a flexible method developed by Alkire and Foster (2011) that can be used with different dimensions, indicators, weights and cutoffs, as well as with individual- or household-level data, to create measures tailored to different situations. The MPI is the product of the incidence of multidimensional poverty (the percentage of people who are multidimensionally poor—also referred to as the headcount ratio or the multidimensional poverty rate, $H$) and the intensity of multidimensional poverty (the average share of indicators in which poor people are deprived, $A$): $MPI = H \times A$. To be multidimensionally poor, a person must be deprived in at least a third of the weighted indicators. A person who is deprived in 50 percent or more of the weighted indicators is considered severely multidimensionally poor.

Tamang,* a 56-year-old landless woman from an indigenous minority caste, lives near a remote jungle in Nepal with her husband, who is living with significant disabilities and a low body mass index (less than 18.5), and two granddaughters, who are attending school, the older of whom just started 7th grade.

Her livelihood is collecting and selling wood. Waking before dawn, she feeds the chickens then walks with friends to the jungle to collect wood, often going deep inside, which is not safe due to wild animals. After chopping the wood, she carries it on her back to the market, because she does not own any means of transportation. If it sells, she buys some rice and vegetables for the family, returning home around 11 am. After cooking lunch, she returns to the jungle to fetch her own cooking fuel.

Tamang lives in a single room rudimentary hut with a dirt floor. She has no toilet and uses her neighbour’s unprotected well for drinking water. She has electricity but does not own a phone, refrigerator, television or even a radio.

Despite plentiful obstacles, she is happy because the family bonds of affection are strong. She observes that happiness is something that we cannot buy in the market.

Tamang is poor according to the global MPI. She is deprived in 44.4 percent of weighted indicators (see figure).

* Some details have been changed.

The global Multidimensional Poverty Index builds on each person’s deprivation profile

![Diagram of the global Multidimensional Poverty Index](image)

Source: Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative 2018.
Find out more

The global MPI 2019 is accessible online at http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/2019-MPI and www.ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index, including the following resources:

- OPHI’s interactive databank (https://ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index/databank/) provides visualizations of the data for the 2019 global MPI and enables users to study the multidimensional poverty of 101 developing countries, disaggregated by age, rural-urban area and subnational region. Interactive data visualizations allow users to explore which indicators people are deprived in and to see how MPI values compare with complementary data, such as $1.90 a day poverty rate.
- Country briefing files (https://ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index/mpi-country-briefings/) provide insight into MPI values and contain graphs and maps are available for 101 countries.
- Excel data tables and do-files (https://ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index/mpi-resources/) have all the details of MPI data plus population values, standard errors, sample sizes and much more.
- Methodological notes (https://ophi.org.uk/mpi-methodological-notes/) provide the particularities of each country’s survey data treatment.