

CDE  
September 2013

# **RURAL POVERTY AND THE PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM**

**Jean Drèze**

Email: [jean.dreze@gmail.com](mailto:jean.dreze@gmail.com)

**Honorary Professor, Delhi School of Economics**

**Affiliated to the Department of Economics, Allahabad University**

**Reetika Khera**

Email: [reetika.khera@gmail.com](mailto:reetika.khera@gmail.com)

**Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi**

**Working Paper No. 235**

**Centre for Development Economics**

Department of Economics, Delhi School of Economics

# Rural Poverty and the Public Distribution System

Jean Drèze and Reetika Khera\*

*We present estimates of the impact of India's Public Distribution System on rural poverty, using National Sample Survey data for 2009-10 and official poverty lines. At the all-India level, the PDS is estimated to reduce the poverty-gap index of rural poverty by 18 to 22 per cent. The corresponding figures are much larger for states with a well-functioning PDS, e.g. 61 to 83 per cent in Tamil Nadu and 39 to 57 per cent in Chhattisgarh.*

This note is a follow-up of earlier writings where we have tried to draw attention to the growing importance of the Public Distribution System (PDS) as a means of income support and social protection in rural India.<sup>1</sup> With market prices of PDS commodities (mainly wheat and rice) going up year after year, and issue prices being kept unchanged or even reduced in some states, the implicit value of PDS entitlements has substantially increased. Further, the functioning of the PDS has improved in many states in recent years. For the first time, the PDS is having a substantial impact on rural poverty, as we demonstrate below using National Sample Survey data for 2009-10 (66<sup>th</sup> Round).

## 1. The PDS as an Implicit Transfer

The simplest way of assessing the impact of the PDS on rural poverty is to look at it as an implicit income transfer. The PDS is not, in fact, just an implicit income transfer, but this aspect of it is a good place to start. The implicit income transfer for a particular household (say  $h$ ) can be calculated as:

$$T^h \equiv Q^h \cdot (p - q) \tag{1}$$

Where  $Q^h$  is the quantity of the subsidized commodity being provided,  $p$  is its market price, and  $q$  is the PDS issue price. This formula is appropriate if the household concerned consumes *more* than  $Q^h$ , a reasonable assumption since the PDS covers only a fraction of

---

\* Dreze is Honorary Professor, Delhi School of Economics and affiliated to the Department of Economics, Allahabad University. Khera is at the Indian Institute of Technology (Delhi). We are grateful to Aashish Gupta and Dimple Kukreja for research assistance, and to Angus Deaton for helpful comments.

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Drèze and Khera (2010, 2012), Khera (2011a, 2011b) and Drèze (2013).

most people's foodgrain requirements. If several commodities are supplied through the PDS, the total implicit transfer can be calculated in the same way by aggregating over commodities.

This implicit transfer can be added to the conventional measure of monthly per-capita expenditure (MPCE) available in National Sample Survey data, and then poverty estimates with and without the implicit transfer can be compared. This is, briefly, the basis of the poverty comparisons presented in this note. Before we proceed, however, a few clarifications are due.

## **2. Illustration: Chhattisgarh**

To keep things simple, we begin by presenting these calculations for a single state: Chhattisgarh, where the PDS functions relatively well, with standard entitlements of 35 kgs of rice per household per month at a symbolic price (Rs 2/kg or 1/kg for most eligible households, depending on the type of ration card). This is equivalent, roughly speaking, to the earnings of one week of NREGA work every month, without having to work.<sup>2</sup> In 2009-10, about 73 per cent of rural households in Chhattisgarh were buying foodgrains from the PDS according to National Sample Survey data.

As always, there is an element of arbitrariness in the choice of poverty line, and as discussed further on, the results are sensitive to this choice. For presentational convenience (more precisely, for the purpose of consistency with the inter-state comparisons presented below), we use the Planning Commission's all-India rural poverty line of Rs 673 per person per month at 2009-10 prices in this exercise. Using this poverty line, the head-count ratio in Chhattisgarh was 63.8 per cent in 2009-10 based on the conventional MPCE measure (see Table 1). When we add the implicit PDS transfer, however, the head-count ratio drops to 52.9 - a proportionate reduction of 17 per cent. The proportionate reduction in the 'poverty gap index' (a distribution-sensitive poverty measure) is much larger - 39 per cent.

---

<sup>2</sup> For further discussion of the PDS in Chhattisgarh, see Drèze and Khera (2010), Raghav Puri (2012), John Parker (2012), Sheila Vir (2012), among others. The statement about equivalence with NREGA work assumes that the market price of rice is Rs 16 per kg and that the wage rate on NREGA works is Rs 82 per day. Both figures are based on National Sample Survey data (median price and average wage, respectively).

Thus, in a state like Chhattisgarh, where the system functions relatively well, the PDS clearly has a substantial impact on rural poverty, at least in terms of conventional poverty measures, especially distribution-sensitive measures such as the poverty-gap index. As we shall see, this also applies to other states with a relatively effective PDS, such as Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. As one might expect, it does not apply to states such as Bihar where the PDS is still in bad shape. The contrast between Bihar and Chhattisgarh is illustrated in Table 2, based on the findings of the ‘PDS Survey 2011’, reported in more detail elsewhere.<sup>3</sup>

One interesting aspect of this contrast relates to the extent of hunger, in terms of the frequency of skipping meals. The proportion of BPL households who had to skip meals sometime during the three months preceding the survey was as high as 70 per cent in Bihar, but only 17 per cent in Chhattisgarh. This is quite striking considering that the levels of rural poverty are much the same in both states, in terms of standard poverty indicators (according to Planning Commission estimates, the ‘head-count ratio’ of rural poverty in 2009-10 was 56 per cent in Chhattisgarh and 55 per cent in Bihar ).<sup>4</sup> This contrast highlights not only the substantial impact of the PDS on rural poverty in states with a well-functioning PDS but also the misleading nature of official poverty estimates that effectively ignore the PDS factor.

### **3. Poverty Lines and the PDS**

At this point, a sceptical reader may object that this line of analysis is misleading, on the grounds that the PDS factor is *already* taken into account in official poverty estimates, by suitable construction of price indexes. The claim is that state-specific poverty lines are set by deflating the national poverty line by an appropriate price index (reflecting consumer prices in the concerned state), and that if price indexes are correctly designed, they would take into account the relatively low cost of living in states where consumers enjoy PDS subsidies.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Khera (2011b). While Bihar had the worst PDS among nine states included in that survey, even in Bihar there were signs of improvement over time, partly due to rudimentary PDS reforms such as the introduction of a system of coupons aimed at tracking PDS transactions. The fact that the sample households in Bihar had received 45 per cent of their PDS entitlements during the preceding three months puts Bihar in a very poor light compared with other states, but it is much more than what they used to get just a few years earlier, when the bulk of PDS rice and wheat was sold in the black market. There are also, it appears, some signs of improvement in Bihar’s PDS performance in National Sample Survey data for 2011-12; see Himanshu (2013).

<sup>4</sup> Government of India (2012), Table 2.

Adding these subsidies again to the MPCE estimates (as we have done in the preceding section) would be double-counting – so goes the argument.

We submit that this argument is unconvincing for two reasons. First, it is very doubtful that price indexes adequately capture PDS subsidies. Second, even if they do, the price-index approach would fail to capture the *distributional* aspects of PDS subsidies.

Prior to the Tendulkar Committee Report (Government of India, 2009), the Consumer Price Index for Agricultural Labourers (CPI-AL) was used to update poverty lines over time, state-wise. The weights of different commodities in the CPI-AL are very old, and certainly do not take into account the effects of the PDS on the cost of living today.<sup>5</sup>

The price indexes and poverty lines used in the Tendulkar methodology have a better chance of capturing the effect of the PDS on the cost of living. In the Tendulkar methodology, the poverty line in a specific state and sector (say, rural Jharkhand or urban Tamil Nadu) in 2004-5 is essentially the cost of a fixed basket of commodities (the ‘poverty line basket’), calculated using the prices applicable in that state and sector. The relevant prices are derived from National Sample Survey data. Further, in the case of rice and wheat, the relevant price is effectively calculated as a weighted average of the market price and the PDS price. The weights are the respective shares of market purchases and PDS purchases in total purchases of rice or wheat, in quantity terms, in the relevant state and sector. Thus, if we compare two otherwise identical states, where consumers are getting (say) one fourth and three fourths of their rice from the PDS respectively, the price of rice would be deemed lower in the second state. Correspondingly, the poverty line for that state would be lower too.

If the public distribution system were *universal* in each state (with PDS prices and quantities being the same for every household within though not necessarily across states), this might be a satisfactory way of adjusting state-specific poverty lines to take into account the effect of

---

<sup>5</sup> The current ‘base year’ of the CPI-AL series is 1986. However, for the purpose of updating state-specific poverty lines from 1973-4 onwards (prior to the Tendulkar Committee Report), some of its components used to be re-weighted using 1973-4 weighting diagrams. Further, the inter-state differentials in price levels used to set state-specific poverty lines in the initial year, i.e. 1973-4, are based on a method and data that go back to 1960-1 (see Government of India, 1993).

the PDS on the cost of living.<sup>6</sup> However, if the PDS is not universal, then for purposes of poverty estimation it is extremely important to take into account the *distributional* impact of the PDS. This cannot be done by adjusting price indexes and poverty lines.

To illustrate, consider a state where the PDS is used only by people below the poverty line, and poor people represent a small fraction of the population. In this state, the weighted-average price of foodgrains would not be very different from the market price, so that the PDS would have little impact on poverty estimates *à la* Tendulkar. And yet the PDS could make a big difference to poor people, and perhaps even raise most of them, effectively, above the Tendulkar poverty line. As this example illustrates, the Tendulkar methodology is likely to *underestimate* the effect of the PDS on poverty.

#### 4. A Way Forward

The problem discussed in the preceding section arises mainly when *several states* are included in the analysis. When we focus on a single state, there is no major difficulty. Since the poverty line is in any case an arbitrary benchmark, we can take any poverty line and examine the effect of the PDS on rural poverty in terms of that poverty line using the method described earlier, as we have already done for Chhattisgarh. It is when several states are involved that the question arises as to whether and how state-specific poverty lines should be adjusted to take the PDS into account.

One way to proceed is as follows. Instead of using state-specific poverty lines, we use the all-India poverty line of Rs 673 per person per month (in 2009-10) in *each state*, and calculate the impact of the PDS on rural poverty using the ‘implicit transfer’ method outlined in Section 1. In other words, we do not make *any* adjustments for differences in the price level across states. This helps to ensure that there is no ‘double-counting’ of the effect of the PDS

---

<sup>6</sup> In fact, it can be shown that this method would generally *overstate* the reduction in the cost of living induced by the PDS. To see this, consider someone who is getting 15 kg of rice from the PDS at (say) Rs 2/kg, and buying another 10 kg on the market price of Rs 12/kg. Would this person be better off paying for rice at a single weighted-average price of Rs 6/kg? The answer is yes. This is because he or she would pay the same amount for 25 kg of rice (namely, Rs 150), but only Rs 6/kg from there at the margin, as against a ‘marginal willingness to pay’ of Rs 10/kg. This would make it possible for him or her to achieve an increase in utility by buying some more rice. Thus, the price-index adjustment overstates the implicit transfer associated with the PDS. This argument is based on textbook reasoning on consumer choice, but it is also plausible from a common-sense point of view.

on rural poverty (as there might be if we combined the implicit-transfer method with state-specific poverty lines that already take the PDS into account). On the other hand, it means that the poverty lines are not strictly comparable across states, since they ignore inter-state price differentials. This, however, is not a major issue as long as we focus on the comparative *reduction* of rural poverty associated with the PDS in different states, rather than on the respective *levels* of poverty.

Another possible approach is to revert to the ‘pre-Tendulkar’ practice of updating poverty lines using the CPI-AL. State-specific poverty lines for 2004-5 using the pre-Tendulkar method are available from Deaton (2008), and these can be combined with CPI-AL data to work out the corresponding 2009-10 poverty lines. In other words, we are extending the methodology of the pre-Tendulkar days, proposed by the 1993 ‘Expert Group’ on poverty estimation (Government of India, 1993), up to 2009-10. Since the CPI-AL essentially ignores the PDS, as discussed earlier, the corresponding poverty lines can also be assumed to ignore the PDS. The implicit-transfer method can then be used to estimate the impact of the PDS on rural poverty in terms of these poverty lines.

We shall present and compare estimates based on both methods – the ‘national poverty line’ method and the ‘CPIAL-based poverty lines’ method.<sup>7</sup> Before that, the valuation of PDS commodities needs further discussion.

## 5. Valuation of PDS Commodities

In the simplest version of equation (1),  $p$  and  $q$  (market and PDS prices, respectively) are the same for all households. In practice,  $q$  is indeed household-invariant, at least among households with the same ration card within a particular state.<sup>8</sup> However, the market price  $p$  does vary from household to household, for at least three reasons: regional variations in

---

<sup>7</sup> A third method is to re-calculate the Tendulkar poverty lines by valuing rice and wheat at market prices, instead of valuing them at the weighted-average of market and PDS prices. This seems to be the approach followed by Himanshu (2012), who arrived at similar findings on the impact of the PDS on rural poverty based on independent work.

<sup>8</sup> One qualification is due: sometimes the PDS dealers ‘over-charge’, i.e. they charge cardholders more than the official issue price and pocket the difference (or use it to pay for various transaction costs). This does not affect our results since we are using the PDS price actually paid, household-wise, to calculate implicit subsidies.

production and transport costs; lack of market integration; and inter-household variations in the quality of rice or wheat being purchased. This raises the question – what is the appropriate price to use for the purpose of calculating the implicit PDS transfer?

One option is just to rewrite equation (1) as

$$T^h \equiv Q^h \cdot (p^h - q) \quad (2)$$

where  $p^h$  is the market price paid by household  $h$ . If the quality of foodgrains purchased by household  $h$  from the market is higher than that of PDS foodgrains, this formula would overestimate the implicit transfer. In the case of wheat, this may not be a major issue, because wheat does not have the sort of quality grading that rice has, and while PDS wheat has often been of poor quality in the past, it appears to be of ‘fair average quality’ in most states today. In the case of rice, however, quality is an issue, and equation (2) might involve a non-trivial overestimation of the implicit PDS transfer. Another problem is that  $p^h$  is missing for a substantial proportion (about 13 per cent) of households.

An alternative is to use the mean or median price in the sample to value PDS commodities – in other words, revert to equation (1) where  $p$  is interpreted as the mean or median price. Mean price is not a good idea, because the distribution of market prices (for a specific PDS commodity, rice or wheat) has a long tail on the right, so that the mean price is driven up by freak cases of very high price, including at least some that would be due to measurement errors. The median price, on the other hand, sounds like a reasonable benchmark, though it could lead to some overestimation or underestimation of the implicit transfer. For instance, if most PDS cardholders buy at a price below the median price when they purchase rice or wheat on the market, this method would lead to some overestimation of the implicit transfer. A more conservative benchmark is ‘ $p_{25}$ ’, the price corresponding to the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of the price distribution. We tried both  $p_{50}$  (the median price) and  $p_{25}$ , and since the results are very similar, the calculations presented here pertain to the median price.

## **6. Rural Poverty and the PDS**

Table 3 presents state-wise estimates of the impact of the PDS on rural poverty, based on National Sample Survey data for 2009-10 (close to 60,000 rural households). As discussed



earlier, we treat the PDS as an implicit transfer, and use median prices to calculate the implicit transfer. Two different sets of poverty lines are used: (1) the national poverty line (Rs 673 per month at 2009-10 prices, in rural areas) without inter-state price adjustments, and (2) the CPI-AL based poverty lines.

Focusing for now on the ‘national poverty line’ approach, the estimates in Table 3 suggest that the PDS-induced reduction of rural poverty at the all-India level in 2009-10 was around 11 per cent based on the head-count ratio, and 18 per cent based on the poverty-gap index. At the state level, the impact of the PDS on rural poverty varies a great deal, as one would expect. In states like Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh, where the functioning of the PDS was very poor at that time, the impact is very small. But in states with a well-functioning public distribution system, the impact of the PDS on rural poverty is substantial, especially in terms of the distribution-sensitive poverty-gap index: 61 per cent reduction in Tamil Nadu, 33 to 41 per cent in the other southern states (Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Kerala), 39 per cent in Chhattisgarh, and around 35 per cent in Himachal Pradesh as well as Jammu & Kashmir.

Keeping the focus on the poverty-gap index, which is more appropriate for our purposes than the head-count ratio, a few other states deserve special mention. The impact of the public distribution system on rural poverty is well above the all-India average in Odisha, a state where the PDS has significantly improved in recent years.<sup>9</sup> The improvements seem to have continued after 2009-10, with a correspondingly larger impact, hopefully, on rural poverty and economic insecurity. In Rajasthan, on the other hand, the poverty impact of the PDS is below the all-India average. It is worth noting, however, that Rajasthan initiated significant PDS reforms in 2010, with positive results.<sup>10</sup> Finally, the state where there is least evidence of any impact of the PDS on rural poverty is Bihar. This is not surprising, since Bihar seems to have the worst public distribution system in India.<sup>11</sup> The impact of the PDS on rural

---

<sup>9</sup> See e.g. Ankita Aggarwal (2011), Jijo Jose (2011), Mihika Chatterjee (2013). The last author found that 97 per cent of households with a ration card in Koraput district were getting their full monthly quota of rice from the PDS. This is particularly encouraging since Koraput is one of Odisha’s poorest districts – part of the ‘KBK’ (Kalahandi-Bolangir-Koraput) region, known not so long ago for regular starvation deaths.

<sup>10</sup> See Khera (2011b) and Ria Singh Sawhney (2011). Some of these positive results, in fact, already show in the fourth quarter of the 66<sup>th</sup> Round of the National Sample Survey, for instance in the form of higher household purchases from the PDS.

<sup>11</sup> See Khera (2011b) and Dhorajiwala and Gupta (2011). As mentioned earlier, however, there are some signs of gradual improvement in the performance of the PDS in Bihar in recent years.

poverty is also small in Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, two other poor (and large) states where PDS reforms have barely begun.

As one would expect, the results are sensitive to the choice of poverty lines (less so, however, when the poverty-gap index is used instead of the head-count ratio) . When CPI-AL based poverty lines are used instead of the national poverty line (last two columns of Table 3), the percentage reduction in poverty associated with the PDS is larger at the national level: 18 per cent for the head-count ratio and 24 per cent for the poverty-gap index. This is not surprising, since the all-India poverty line in this approach (the ‘pre-Tendulkar’ poverty line) is *lower* than the Tendulkar poverty line. The same pattern applies state-wise, with a few exceptions like Kerala and Punjab. While there are, as expected, significant differences between the two approaches in terms of the state-specific estimates, the *contrasts* across states are much the same in each case. In particular, major reductions of rural poverty are attributable to the PDS in states like Chhattisgarh and Tamil Nadu where the system works relatively well, but not in states like Bihar and Uttar Pradesh where the opposite applies.

The benefits of the PDS, of course, need to be evaluated against the costs and compared with possible alternatives. Using Rs 26 and Rs 20 per month as the per-capita implicit transfer achieved by the PDS (see Table 3), and combining this with population figures from the 2011 census, the aggregate transfer adds up to Rs 35,000 crores in 2009-10. This is about 59 per cent of the food subsidy in that year (Rs 58,242 crores).<sup>12</sup> To put it another way, for each rupee of actual transfer to consumers through the PDS, the central government was spending 1.68 rupees in 2009-10. However, part of this Rs 1.68 is an implicit transfer to farmers, not a transaction cost, in so far as the Minimum Support Prices paid by the government are higher than market prices. If the implicit income transfers to consumers and farmers are added up, they would account for more than 59 per cent of the food subsidy. Correspondingly, the ratio of government expenditure to actual transfer would be lower than 1.68. Not all of this transfer, of course, is a transfer to people below the poverty line. But nor would it be right, in the accounting of the benefits of the PDS, to give zero weight to transfers received by people above the poverty line (as some earlier studies have done), considering that the poverty line is

---

<sup>12</sup> Strictly speaking, this is the amount spent by the central government on the food subsidy. Some states, like Chhattisgarh and Tamil Nadu, also spend some of their own resources on the PDS. On the other hand, the central subsidy also includes expenditure on items other than the PDS, such as midday meals and buffer stocks. The figures in this paragraph should be treated as illustrative.

so low. A convincing cost-benefit analysis would need to separate the transaction costs from the transfer component of the food subsidy, and also to give appropriate weights to transfers received by different groups.

## 7. Further Considerations

Before concluding, we should mention a few qualifications as well as possible extensions of this analysis. First, there is no simple way of taking account possible differences in the quality of foodgrains bought from the PDS and the open market. The fact that the basic results do not vary much whether we value PDS purchases of rice and wheat at median prices or at 'p<sub>25</sub>' (the price corresponding to the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile of the distribution of market prices) is somewhat reassuring. A more explicit analysis of quality differences, however, would be a useful extension of this enquiry.

Second, this analysis also ignores possible transaction costs associated with PDS purchases, such as the cost of queuing or of repeated visits to a ration shop that has unpredictable opening hours. It is important to mention that the PDS can also have transaction *benefits*. For instance, in the tribal areas of Central India, the local ration shop is often far more accessible and convenient than the nearest market (typically a weekly market situated at some distance). Nevertheless, it is quite possible that PDS purchases, in general, do involve substantial transaction costs.

Third, our illustrative calculations are based on the official poverty line (set by the Planning Commission), which is very low. Since most of the literature on poverty in India is based on this poverty line, we have followed the same convention, for purposes of comparability. With a higher poverty line, however, the percentage reduction in the head-count or poverty-gap index associated with the PDS would be smaller.

Fourth, our analysis ignores general-equilibrium effects of the PDS on production, prices and so on. For purposes of general-equilibrium analysis, one would have to compare the current situation with a 'counter-factual' where the PDS is dismantled. If the counter-factual involves selling on the market what is currently being distributed through the PDS (keeping procurement levels unchanged), then the main difference between the 'with PDS' and 'without PDS' scenarios would be the implicit income transfer associated with the PDS. The

general equilibrium effects would work mainly through this income transfer as well as through the corresponding change in government revenue. On the other hand, if the ‘without PDS’ counter-factual involves lower levels of foodgrain procurement, or larger foodgrain exports, other general equilibrium effects (e.g. on foodgrain availability and prices) would also need to be considered. This is way beyond the scope of this paper.

Finally, even in a partial-equilibrium framework, treating the PDS as an implicit income transfer is a simplification. PDS entitlements can have value over and above their income equivalent (as per equation (1)), for various reasons. For instance, in-kind transfers through the PDS can help to ensure that income is not misused, and also that resources are shared equitably within the family. More importantly perhaps, the PDS has important ‘stabilization benefits’ (in the form of a regular and assured source of economic support) in addition to ‘transfer benefits’.<sup>13</sup> From this point of view, the estimates we have presented of the impact of the PDS on rural poverty are likely to *underestimate* the real benefits of the PDS.

## **8. Concluding Remarks**

There is both good news and bad news in our findings. The good news lies in clear evidence that India’s public distribution system now has a significant impact on rural poverty. The impact is particularly large in states with a well-functioning PDS, reinforcing recent evidence of the fact that the PDS is now an important source of economic security for poor people in many states.<sup>14</sup> The bad news is that the PDS still has very little impact on rural poverty in a number of large states such as Bihar, Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal where PDS reforms are long overdue. Hopefully, evidence of continued revival of the PDS around the country will emerge from later rounds of the National Sample Survey.

---

<sup>13</sup> On the distinction between transfer benefits and stabilization benefits, see Martin Ravallion (1990).

<sup>14</sup> See Ankita Aggarwal (2011), Khera (2011b), Raghav Puri (2012), Mihika Chatterjee (2013), among others.

## References

- Aggarwal, Ankita (2011), 'The PDS in Rural Orissa: Against the Grain?', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3 September.
- Chatterjee, Mihika (2013), 'An Improved PDS in a "Reviving" State: Food Security in Koraput, Odisha', mimeo, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, Oxford University; forthcoming in *Economic and Political Weekly*.
- Deaton, Angus (2008), 'Price Trends in India and their Implications for Measuring Poverty', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 9 February.
- Dhorajiwala, S., and Gupta, A. (2011), 'Coupon Fiasco', *Frontline*, 31 December.
- Drèze, J. P. and Khera, R. (2010), 'Chhattisgarh Shows the Way', *The Hindu*, 13 November.
- Drèze, J. P. and Khera, R. (2012), 'A Bill that Asks too Much of the Poor', *The Hindu*, 5 September.
- Drèze, J. P. (2013), 'From the Granary to the Plate', *The Hindu*, 1 August 2013.
- Government of India (1993), *Report of the Expert Group on Estimation of Proportion and Number of Poor* (New Delhi: Planning Commission).
- Government of India (2009), *Report of the Expert Group to Review the Methodology for Estimation of Poverty* (New Delhi: Planning Commission).
- Government of India (2012), 'Press Note on Poverty Estimates, 2009–10' (New Delhi: Planning Commission).
- Himanshu (2012), 'Poverty and Food Security in India, Paper presented at a symposium on Food Security in Asia and the Pacific, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 17-18 September.
- Himanshu (2013), 'PDS: A Story of Changing States', *Live Mint*, 7 August.
- Jose, Jijo (2011), 'The PDS Learning Curve', *Down to Earth*, 18 August.
- Khera, Reetika (2011a), 'Trends in Diversion of Grain from the Public Distribution System', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 21 May.
- Khera, Reetika (2011b), 'Revival of the Public Distribution System: Evidence and Explanations', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 5 November.
- Parker, John (2012), 'Development in India: A Tale of Two Villages', *The Economist*, 17 November.
- Puri, Raghav (2012), 'Reforming the Public Distribution System: Lessons from Chhattisgarh', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 4 February.

Ravallion, Martin (1990), 'Market Responses to Anti-hunger Policies: Effects on Wages, Prices and Employment', in Drèze, J. P., and Sen, A.K. (eds.)(1990), *The Political Economy of Hunger. Vol. II: Famine Prevention* (Oxford: Clarendon).

Sawhney, Ria Singh (2011), 'The PDS in Rajasthan: A New Start', partly published in *The Tribune*, 7 September.

Vir, Sheila C. (2012), 'Mitanin Initiative and Nutrition Security Innovation Chhattisgarh State, India: An Evaluation', project report, State Health Resource Centre, Chhattisgarh.

**Table 1**  
**Rural Poverty and the PDS in Chhattisgarh, 2009-10**

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Proportion of households with positive PDS purchases (%) | 73           |
| Average implicit subsidy <sup>a</sup> (Rs/month/capita)  | 70.6 (106.6) |
| Head-count ratio <sup>b</sup>                            |              |
| Without implicit subsidy                                 | 63.8         |
| With implicit subsidy                                    | 52.9         |
| Percentage reduction                                     | 17           |
| Poverty-gap index <sup>b</sup>                           |              |
| Without implicit subsidy                                 | 16.3         |
| With implicit subsidy                                    | 9.9          |
| Percentage reduction                                     | 39           |

MPCE = Monthly average per-capita expenditure

<sup>a</sup> The average is taken over *all* households. In brackets, average over households with positive PDS purchases (of wheat or rice) in 2009-10.

<sup>b</sup> Based on the all-India ‘Tendulkar poverty line’ for rural areas (Rs 673/month in 2009–10).

Source: Authors’ calculations from National Sample Survey data (66<sup>th</sup> Round, ‘mixed reference period’). For further details, see Table 3.

**Table 2**  
**The PDS in Bihar and Chhattisgarh, 2011**

|  | <b>Bihar</b> | <b>Chhattisgarh</b> |
|--|--------------|---------------------|
| Proportion of BPL households who did not get any foodgrains from the PDS in the last 3 months (%)        | 35           | 0                   |
| Average foodgrain purchases of BPL households from the PDS in the last 3 months:                         |              |                     |
| In absolute terms (kg/month)   | 11           | 33                  |
| As a proportion of entitlements <sup>a</sup> (%)   | 45           | 95                  |
| Proportion of BPL respondents who said that they 'normally' get their full PDS entitlements (%)          | 18           | 97                  |
| Proportion of BPL respondents who agree with the entries in their ration cards (%)                       | 25           | 94                  |
| Proportion of BPL households who skipped meals in the last three months (%)                              | 70           | 17                  |
| Proportion of BPL households who would support the PDS being replaced with equivalent cash transfers (%) | 54           | 2                   |
| 'Poverty-gap index' of rural poverty, 2009–10 <sup>b</sup> (%)   |              |                     |
| Without implicit subsidy   | 14.4         | 16.3                |
| With implicit subsidy  | 13.8         | 9.9                 |
| Percentage reduction   | 4            | 39                  |

<sup>a</sup> Entitlements: 25 kgs and 35 kgs per household per month in Bihar and Chhattisgarh, respectively (for rice and wheat combined).

<sup>b</sup> Based on the all-India 'Tendulkar poverty line' for rural areas (Rs 673/month in 2009–10).

Source: PDS Survey 2011 (see Khera, 2011b), based on a random sample of 264 households in 24 villages of Bihar and Chhattisgarh (6 villages per district in two districts of each state). The last row (poverty-gap index) is based on calculations from National Sample Survey data, discussed in the text; see also Table 3.



**Table 3: Rural Poverty and the PDS, 2009-10**

|                | Average 'implicit subsidy' <sup>a</sup><br>(Rs/month/capita) |              | Poverty reduction due to the PDS <sup>b</sup> (%)      |       |   |      |
|----------------|--|--------------|--|-------|---|------|
|                |  |              | Using the Tendulkar national poverty line <sup>c</sup> |       | Using CPI-AL based poverty lines <sup>d</sup> |      |
|                | Rural  | Urban        | HCR  | PGI   | HCR   | PGI  |
| Andhra Pradesh | 61.7 (70.7)  | 46.6 (92.8)  | 32.8   | 40.6  | 56.1  | 57.2 |
| Assam          | 13.7 (43.1)  | 5.6 (33.7)   | 9.2  | 17.9  | 16.3  | 27.2 |
| Bihar          | 5.5 (37.5)   | 3.8 (41.3)   | 1.3  | 4.3   | 4.2   | 7.1  |
| Chhattisgarh   | 70.6 (106.6)   | 43.4 (110.7) | 17.2   | 39.0  | 44.4  | 56.8 |
| Gujarat        | 14.4 (37.6)  | 10.0 (38.1)  | 11.8   | 15.3  | 18.7  | 18.7 |
| Haryana        | 8.4 (42.6)   | 4.0 (40.4)   | 13.8   | 15.1  | 15.4  | 15.1 |
| Himachal P.    | 46.1 (52.2)  | 28.8 (52.1)  | 36.1   | 35.3  | 37.9  | 36.9 |
| Jammu & K.     | 41.7 (61.0)  | 58.9 (87.0)  | 45.0   | 35.3  | 26.4  | 41.5 |
| Jharkhand      | 16.2 (61.4)  | 5.3 (53.2)   | 3.3  | 13.2  | 16.0  | 21.7 |
| Karnataka      | 49.4 (64.7)  | 23.9 (76.3)  | 22.2   | 33.1  | 34.6  | 45.5 |
| Kerala         | 37.1 (57.8)  | 28.5 (52.4)  | 33.0   | 36.7  | 39.6  | 38.2 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 25.1 (50.7)  | 10.0 (38.1)  | 6.0  | 13.4  | 9.6   | 25.7 |
| Maharashtra    | 19.0 (40.2)  | 6.2 (44.8)   | 18.9   | 30.0  | 35.5  | 30.1 |
| Odisha         | 37.1 (62.7)  | 19.2 (63.9)  | 9.6  | 23.3  | 27.7  | 40.8 |
| Punjab         | 8.1 (36.1)   | 5.6 (44.6)   | 15.8   | 14.4  | 19.6  | 14.9 |
| Rajasthan      | 6.4 (35.3)   | 5.8 (35.3)   | 7.6  | 11.7  | 15.7  | 14.2 |
| Tamil Nadu     | 107.3 (112.8)  | 86.0 (110.5) | 44.4   | 61.3  | 80.3  | 83.4 |
| Uttar Pradesh  | 10.8 (45.5)  | 5.8 (27.4)   | 5.17   | 11.1  | 11.4  | 16.7 |
| Uttarakhand    | 17.8 (43.9)  | 5.1 (27.1)   | 17.67  | 24.1  | 27.3  | 26.8 |
| West Bengal    | 13.0 (33.4)  | 5.9 (33.0)   | 9.63   | 11.5  | 13.5  | 14.4 |
| <b>INDIA</b>   | 26.2 (60.4)  | 20.2 (71.6)  | 10.56  | 17.60 | 16.4  | 22.4 |

<sup>a</sup> The average is taken over *all* households. In brackets, average over households with positive PDS purchases (of rice or wheat) in 2009-10.

<sup>b</sup> Proportionate reduction in the head-count ratio (HCR) and poverty-gap index (PGI).

<sup>c</sup> All-India ‘Tendulkar poverty line’ for rural areas (Rs 673/month in 2009–10), applied to all states *without* adjustments for inter-state price differences.

<sup>d</sup> ‘Pre-Tendulkar’ all-India rural poverty line for 2004-5 from Deaton (2008), updated using state-specific CPI-AL (updated line: Rs 552/month at 2009-10 prices).

Source: Authors’ calculations from National Sample Survey data (66<sup>th</sup> Round, ‘mixed reference period’). CPI-AL data from Labour Bureau, converted into yearly figures, state-wise, by taking unweighted averages of month-wise figures from July to June. For the six states bifurcated from undivided Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh (i.e. Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand), the CPIAL figures pertain to the relevant undivided state (e.g. undivided Bihar in the case of Jharkhand). Implicit subsidies are calculated using ‘median prices’ (see text for further details).