

Community Based Targeting Mechanisms for Social Safety Nets

Jonathan Conning

Michael Kevane**

December 2000

Abstract

This paper interprets case studies and theory on community involvement in beneficiary selection and benefit delivery for social safety nets. Several considerations should be carefully balanced in assessing the advantages of using community groups as targeting agents. First, benefits from utilizing local information and social capital may be eroded by costly rent-seeking. Second, the potential improvement in targeting criteria from incorporating local notions of deprivation must be tempered by the possibility of program capture by local elites, and by the possibility that local preferences are not pro-poor. Third, performance may be undermined by unforeseen strategic targeting by local communities in response to national funding and evaluation criteria, or by declines in political support.

** Williams College, Department of Economics, Williamstown, MA and Institute for Economic Development, Boston University. jconning@williams.edu; Santa Clara University, Department of Economics, Santa Clara, CA 95053. mkevane@scu.edu (corresponding author).

We would like to extend our appreciation to Harold Alderman, Pranab Bardhan, John Blomquist, Henry Bruton, Michael Cernea, Nora Dudwick, John Giles, Margaret Grosh, William Jack, Emmanuela Galasso, Eric Hanson, Simon Harrigan, Daniel Klein, Alexandre Marc, Jessica Mott, Akbar Noman, Albert Park, Tamara Perkins, Jean-Philippe Platteau, Ashok Rai, Vivajendra Rao, Gustav Ranis, Martin Ravallion, Mary E. Schmidt, Endre Stiansen, William Sundstrom, Michael Woolcock and participants at workshops at the World Bank and at FUNDP Namur for providing input, suggestions and material. Nishant Nayyer provided able research assistance.

INTRODUCTION

Social safety nets can serve an important role in alleviating poverty and in promoting long-term growth by providing households with the protection that markets and informal networks may not supply. A social safety net may redistribute resources toward disadvantaged groups, or sustain political coalitions to support critical structural reforms. Unfortunately, the growing awareness of the importance social safety nets in developing countries has not been translated into effective action because of the failure of traditional social welfare ministries to effectively reach and engage the poor. This has led to experimentation with new bottom-up service delivery options and poverty alleviation mechanisms that more actively involve the poor and their communities in program design, implementation and monitoring. Examples include reforms that decentralize the delivery of public services to local governments, community management of forests and other natural resources, and group-based microcredit programs. Demand-driven social funds that aim by design to elicit community involvement have become increasingly popular with governments and donors, and international organizations such as the World Bank now make community participation an explicit criterion for funding approval for a growing list of projects (World Bank 1996, World Food Program 1998).

Common sense and substantial evidence suggest that community participation can lead to improved project performance and better targeting (Baland and Platteau (1996), La Ferrara (1999), Narayan et al. (1997), Wade (1988), Isham et al. (1995)). For example, a study of India's Integrated Rural Development Project found that Indian states which employed village councils to select beneficiaries had a much smaller proportion of non-poor participating households (Copesake 1992). A large recent survey of dozens of country experiences with social safety nets

conducted by Subbarao et al. (1997, p. 87) for the World Bank contends that programs that involve communities, local groups, and NGOs can achieve better targeting outcomes.

The purpose of this paper is to review evidence and to propose a framework for thinking about the community-based targeting mechanisms to deliver *private* benefits, i.e. mechanisms that target welfare or relief.¹ For the purposes of this review, we define community-based targeting as *a state policy of contracting with community groups or intermediary agents to have them carry out one or more of the following activities: 1) identify recipients for cash or in-kind benefits, 2) monitor the delivery of those benefits, and/or 3) engage in some part of the delivery process.*

Community agents can be social or religious groups, single-purpose NGOs, or local elected officials or governing bodies. The extent to which an agent qualifies or not as a community agent depends on that agent's level of embeddedness in local community affairs. By this we mean the degree of involvement of the group or functionary in other functions and activities that imbricate that agent in poor sub-communities, or the degree of involvement in day-to-day community life of the poor (through residence, leisure, private business). Throughout the paper we will often treat community groups and intermediary agents as coterminous, and apply the single label 'community agents'.

Several advantages might be expected from community-based targeting. There may be lower costs of administration through better cost sharing and faster setup where other

¹ Many useful lessons can be drawn from existing studies of community participation in programs where project benefits are shared such as social funds, the decentralized provision of local public goods (Narayan and Ebbe 1997, Reddy 1998), or community management of natural resources (Agrawal and Gibson 1999, Baland and Platteau 1996, Leach, Mearns and Scoones 1999). However, the program design and political considerations that arise in targeting *private* benefits are sufficiently distinct as to merit their own separate review. Harnessing community participation to manage a common forest area, to deliver a local public good such as a health clinic, or to maintain a collective reputation vis-à-vis a micro-credit program, are all activities where the participants are at the same time beneficiaries and intermediaries. When delivering cash or in kind benefits however, the intermediary and the beneficiary are typically no longer the same (and indeed may have quite different interests) and so a different set

administrative structures are weak or non-existent. Involving community groups as stakeholders may lead to better screening, monitoring and accountability. Community groups may have better information for identification of needs, and households may in turn have less incentive or opportunity to provide false information on assets, income or shocks. Local definitions of deprivation may be more adaptable to local conditions and culture than rigid technical national formulas. Programs may not only harness but may potentially also strengthen social capital and community organizations, with positive external effects. This may be especially true for the disadvantaged groups who may be empowered in by becoming better able to articulate and press demands. Community mobilization may be an end in itself, but may also confer legitimacy to programs that in turn helps build political support for targeted approaches.

Despite these advantages, there are several reasons to question the practicality or wisdom of community-based targeting in some settings. Amongst other problems, community-based targeting may lead to, or increase conflict and divisions within the community; it may impose high opportunity costs on community leaders, it may be subverted to serve elite interests, and like any other decentralized welfare program, it may fail to take account of important externalities across communities (such as differential benefits leading to population movements) or could undermine political support for targeted approaches.

This paper, an interpretative review of the literature, will explore just how well communities might use local information and social capital to allocate new program resources toward the poor and vulnerable. We first briefly present several examples of community-based targeting schemes. We follow this with an outline of many of the most important effects and options in constructing a community-based targeting scheme. The remaining three sections focus on what

of incentives must be provided.

appear to be the major tradeoffs in the public policy choice of community-based targeting. First, will community-based targeting 'increase the size of the cake'? In other words, will community mechanisms be effective at lowering the costs of delivering benefits to a target population? Second, what size slice of cake will the poor obtain? That is, what kinds of distributions are likely to emerge when community-based targeting is employed after taking into account the need to provide incentives, program leakage, and the rents that intermediary agents could potentially capture? Also, under devolution local targeting preferences, determined through local political processes, might differ substantially from national preferences or those of a donor. Finally, what will determine the cake-making 'ingredients' available to community-based agents for disbursement to eligible recipients? Here we focus on the national-level political economy and program design issues that arise while implementing a decentralized policy of community-based targeting.

We conclude with some observations about how to design a community-based targeting scheme. Current experiments have tended to use homogeneous community agents across the country to implement targeting – for example, local town mayors in every poor community. But agents that would empower the poor and be responsive to poor constituencies are unlikely to be homogeneous across countries, and so a more demand-driven approach to community-based targeting may be recommended in some cases. We also believe that in many instances the best community-based targeting schemes will be hybrid mechanisms where the center defines and monitors targeting categories, rather than unconditional devolution to community groups with little basis for evaluation or control.

Examples of Community-Based Targeting

There are several modern and historical examples of purposeful large-scale community based targeting for social safety nets.² Arguably one of the earliest and most studied examples of a community-based targeting mechanism was the English system of poor relief. For several hundred years until the reforms of 1834, the English poor laws implemented a highly decentralized system of poor relief administered and financed by local parishes. Although the parish began as a local church institution, by the sixteenth century the estimated 12,000-15,000 parishes in England had assumed many of the functions of local civil government including the administration of poor relief. Each parish was responsible for deciding who was unable to work and deserving of relief, and for financing and delivering relief. The following account from the diary of Thomas Turner (1754-1765) describes how poor relief decisions were made in his day (cited in Mencher 1967):

The parishioners were accustomed to meet once a week at the parish workhouse, at which meetings all applicants for relief were received and where all laborers belonging to the parish, who had not in the preceding week been in constant employment, attended to give an account of their earnings and received such sums as, with the earnings, should amount to a sum deemed competent to their maintenance in proportion to their children.

The rising poverty and the significant externalities that naturally arose in a locally financed system of poor relief meant that the system became increasingly difficult to manage, especially through the upheavals associated with the industrial revolution and the enclosure movement. This then fostered incentives for restrictions on population movement; no parish wanted an influx of poor persons. Brown and Oates (1987), in fact, cite the experience of the Poor Laws

² A simple but persuasive illustration of how much difference the choice of community agent can make for ultimate targeting outcomes comes from the study of intra-household resource allocation (Kanbur and Haddad (1992)). As countless poverty alleviation programs have discovered, and many empirical studies confirm, the decision to deliver assistance via a female parent typically leads to a larger positive impact on child welfare and household investments in health, nutrition and education than delivering the same resources via a father. Thus the use of categorical targeting of women may be thought of as a form of community based targeting where children are

and this externality as an example of the presumption for centralizing poverty alleviation programs. Eventually, a rate-payers revolt and changing political tides led to the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 which greatly reduced relief and imposed the onerous workhouse test. The reforms led to a much more centrally administered system based on uniform rules (Quigley 1999).

Another historical example of community-based targeting comes from colonial experience. The language of Indirect Rule -- the use of 'Native Authorities' by the French and British to administer their African (and other) colonies -- is replete with references to the advantages of community intermediation. Indirect Rulers (chiefs, sheikhs and emirs) were supposed to be more accountable to their 'subjects', to know more about their needs, and were definitely cheaper than expatriate administrators. Delegation of responsibility for targeting benefits was common. For example, during scarcity-situations in World War II the British used Native Authorities in western Sudan to ration sugar, tea, petrol and other commodities.

The need to build an entirely new safety net and the search for new intermediary agents has been especially important in transition economies, such as in Uzbekistan, Albania, Armenia and China. In these countries private safety nets and community organization had been displaced or weakened by a long history of state action, yet far-reaching economic reforms have brought about an abrupt end to the existing workplace-centered social assistance programs. In these contexts an important case for building a social safety net from the ground up, employing new community intermediaries rather than state bureaucrats, is to encourage new self-help initiatives and organizations to break a tradition of looking for solutions from an outside state apparatus.

the ultimate beneficiaries.

In 1994 the Uzbek government began an experiment to involve quasi-official, quasi-religious community groups known as *mahallas* in the decentralized targeting of child benefits and other types of social assistance to low-income families. The *mahallas*, traditionally acted to mediate community problems and conflicts. A unique aspect of the program is that the State has given local *mahallas* considerable discretion in deciding whether a family should receive assistance and the amount. External reviews of the program suggest benefits were targeted relatively well (Coudouel, Marnie and Micklewright 1998).

In Albania, when faced by massive unemployment and poverty in a transition period in the early nineties, the Ndihme Ekonomika (economic support) safety net was implemented to provide benefits to poor rural households and families that lost jobs. The central government at first administered grants bureaucratically through local ministry offices but found that this formula provided little incentive for local officials to verify eligibility requirements, so the program was then devolved to local governments (communes) using a system of block grants. Using data from a recent household survey, Alderman (1998, 1999) found local targeting effectiveness compared quite favorably with safety net programs in other low-income countries although he notes that overall targeting performance could be improved by a better targeting of block grants across localities.

In Armenia, chronic public sector financing problems and low pay for doctors and teachers has meant that health and education had become de-facto fee-for-service programs, even before user fees and charges were explicitly set. Parents of children enrolled in public schools have been paying for food, for instruction that falls outside the core curriculum, and for fees for textbook. Social assessments suggest that this type of fee acts as a barrier to access to the poor (World Bank 1999, pg. 67). To respond to the problem the government established a school

textbook waiver program. The government allocates a fixed amount to each school in an amount sufficient to waive annual textbook rental fees for 10 percent of students. The remaining 90 percent of funds required are to be raised by charging parents a rental fee of approximately US\$1 for each textbook their child uses. The decision as to which students will be exempted is in some cases made by the school principal, in others by the school parent-teacher association (World Bank 1999, pp. 67-68).

In China, local communities have been responsible for providing assistance to the needy, or so-called "Five Guarantee" households. Under a new 1985 law "local autonomy was granted in standard setting and financing, with the central government only concerning itself with statutory grants to martyrs, disabled soldiers, and incapacitated veterans in institutions (Wong 1994, p. 318)." The legislation was perhaps not as significant as one might think however. Urban welfare benefits obtained through employers were by many accounts lavish, but rural benefits negligible. Rural welfare programs use community-based targeting, but state funds distributed this way have been limited (to around 1.7% of the state budget over the period 1950-91 according to Wong (pg. 316). As migration to cities has increased in recent years, urban neighborhood committees have taken on increased responsibilities for providing informal welfare services, but the level of benefits remains low (Johnson 1999).

Finally, the Programa Nacional de Solidaridad in Mexico (PRONASOL), initiated under President Salinas in 1988 combined aspects of a social fund with benefit delivery (specifically in the form of scholarships for needy children and some subsidization of basic foods, though many of the public goods investments have also been seen as public employment schemes). Locally elected Community Solidarity Committees and Municipal Solidarity Committees were supposed to be at the core of these programs. Opinions and research on the operations of Pronasol vary

widely, and are often based on scanty, anecdotal evidence and simple and perhaps flawed methodologies. Few commentators have been very positive about the program. Trejo and Jones (1998, p. 92) conclude that, "the decentralization of poverty resources to states with autocratic structures will most likely result in the perpetuation of extreme poverty and the fortification of the PRI's monopoly on power."

While the cases described above differ greatly in terms of scale and the purposefulness of their design, a common element in each of these programs is the selection of established community agents who are then given significant discretion to decide on how to target new resources.

COMMUNITY-BASED TARGETING: PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

The design of any social service or benefit delivery program is of necessity shaped by the informational asymmetries involved in determining beneficiary eligibility, and in monitoring the welfare agents whose task it is to determine eligibility. While a social safety net could in theory be administered via a single central income tax office that would make transfers based on self-reported income or other household or individual attributes, in practice all programs rely on welfare agents to assess eligibility and deliver benefits. The reason is obvious: even in industrialized countries where the income tax base is broad, self-reported data is not very reliable, and a welfare program generates incentives for dissimulation. Given the cost and difficulty of audits, benefit eligibility tends to be conditioned on personal or household characteristics or 'tags' that are thought to be less manipulable and easy to ascertain by welfare agents, such as employment status, age, gender, and number of dependents (Akerlof 1978, Besley and Coate 1995, Boadway and Keen 1999).

In developing countries where income tax systems are often weak or non-existent, and where information asymmetries can be severe, tagging is an even more important device for targeting social spending. Not surprisingly then, a good part of the large and still fast-growing literature on targeted spending in developing countries has focused on topics such as the cost effectiveness and performance of different broad targeting methods and proxy indicators, on how program design features affect the incentives of potential recipient households and individuals to reveal information or supply labor effort, and on the political economy of support for targeted interventions. Recent surveys of the literature include Grosh (1994), Rashid and Townsend (1994), Besley and Kanbur (1993), van de Walle (1995). Comparatively little attention has been devoted however to analyzing the proper choice of intermediary agent to determine beneficiary eligibility and deliver benefits, or the incentives they should face. A few recent exceptions such as Boadway (1997), Bardhan and Mookherjee (1998) and Abraham and Platteau (2000) are discussed below.

A Taxonomy of Targeting Mechanisms and Methods

We employ the term targeting *method* to refer to the set of rules, criteria and other elements of program design that define beneficiary eligibility. The broader term targeting *mechanism* is used to refer to the larger elements of program design, including the very important question of the choice of intermediary agents and organizational design. These definitions allow for the possibility that different intermediary agents using the same targeting methods could obtain different targeting results.

[Table 1 about here]

Applying these distinctions, Table 1 builds upon Grosh's (1994, pg. 34) taxonomy of targeting methods. The three main targeting methods employed in practice are: individual

assessment, tagging or categorical targeting, and self-targeting. Table 1 augments this classification by distinguishing between mechanisms that employ centralized bureaucracies to deliver benefits from mechanisms that engage community groups as intermediaries, and according to whether or not the mechanism is used to target private benefits or local public goods and services.

Individual assessment mechanisms require program agents to decide eligibility on a case-by-case basis. This may involve a direct means test, proxy means test, and/or subjective evaluation by a social worker (Glewwe 1992, Ravallion and Sen 1994). Tagging, or categorical targeting offers eligibility to all members of a group defined by an easily identifiable characteristic or trait. This includes geographic targeting (Baker and Grosh 1994, Bigman, Dercon, Guillaume and Lambotte 1998) and the restriction of benefits to identifiable social groups such as single women with children, ethnic groups, or the elderly (Appleton and Collier 1995, Buvinic and Geeta 1997, Case and Deaton 1998, Cornelius 1995). Finally, self-targeting methods take advantage of differences in participation costs across households to get non-target households to self-exclude. Examples include employment guarantee schemes with low wages and price subsidies for inferior good items (Besley and Kanbur 1991, Blackorby and Donaldson 1988, Jacoby 1997, Munro 1992, 1992).

Community-based targeting is not a separate targeting *method*, but rather part of a *mechanism* that places community agents in charge of assessing eligibility and/or implementing delivery. An agent or local institution's preferences and values and the time and effort they exert will crucial for determining the quality of the tag and therefore targeting outcomes and costs of a given method, and, depending on the degree of devolution, may even determine the local method of targeting.

Delegation versus Devolution

At the heart of the mechanism design problem is a judgment regarding the relative importance of delegation versus devolution. A center or principal *delegates* responsibility for candidate selection and benefit delivery to local community groups when the principal tries to contract to use the better information and access to local networks of a delegated intermediary agent in order to carry out the principal's objectives. Imperfect monitoring and the fact that local agents may have different welfare criteria gives rise to the possibility of moral hazard: by the center's criteria localities might misdirect or misuse resources. By way of contrast, when the center *devolves* responsibility to local communities, it transfers not only resources but also responsibility for setting the criteria by which eligibility and assistance level will be judged. We cannot then so clearly speak of moral hazard, nor can we assess program performance without first specifying by whose criteria the program is to be evaluated.

Complete devolution is not very common in practice except for the case of fully autonomous regions. Most community based targeting mechanisms provide local communities a variable amount of discretion within a set of rules and regulations.

Schematics of the political economy of community-based targeting

With these preliminaries in mind, we may now set forth a stylized timeline or model that captures many of the tradeoffs and expected behavioral responses involved in the design and operation of community-based targeting mechanisms. The government starts by announcing a policy. This is a contract or menu of contracts specifying what the local community group is to do, which groups are eligible to compete for contracts, the choice of intermediary agents, beneficiary selection criteria, and a longer-term funding formula based in part on pre-defined evaluation methodology. Coalitions the form in communities to create new groups or to obtain

power in existing groups and then vie for contracts. Resources are used and social capital is changed in the process. Population movements may occur. Government then allocates funds to intermediary agents, who in turn allocate funds within their communities, in ways possibly unanticipated and unspecified in the original contract. Government and civil society monitor and evaluate new levels of well-being and other outcomes. Community groups, bureaucrats, IFIs, policy advisers and political entrepreneurs, the press, and population lobby government and electorate. Finally, government implements new policy.

The design challenge is to choose the mechanism that best achieves the welfare objectives of the program designers while taking into account the constraints imposed by the possible strategic responses of households, intermediary agents and other stakeholders to the policy and to each other, and how these responses lead to new group formation, population movement, lobbying, etc.

The framework glosses over several complications. First and foremost it begs the prior normative question of whose welfare criterion should be maximized. A genuine commitment to community participation would weigh local community criteria much more heavily than the center's objectives, but the center may well be reluctant to allow full discretion in the setting of program objectives and eligibility criteria, and this may lead to the choice of a more centralized delivery mechanism, and/or to stricter rules, guidelines governing local community choices.

Second, an important concern in the design of any safety net program, regardless of the targeting mechanism, is the extent to which state policy might crowd-out or displace existing private safety net programs (Cox (1995), Subbarao (1997)). Third, a more dynamic view would address such questions as how policy and community actions might evolve as the economy changes over time, and what policy rules the government might adopt when responding to

foreseen and unforeseen contingencies (i.e. does the government commit not to finance cost overruns or to bail out failed contracts?).

Fourth, the government has a further layer of decision in determining at what geographic scale to locate the community, and indeed defining community in the first place. In fact, the very notion of ‘community’ sometimes glibly employed in the literature demands greater scrutiny. Communities are often discussed as if they were well-defined geographic entities, as opposed to geographically overlapping ethnic or religious entities.³ Harragin and Chol (1999) describe the serious problems that international famine relief agencies in Southern Sudan recently encountered when they attempted to build a community based distribution network by using chiefs of traditional grazing groups as intermediaries, rather than the more natural (but to outsiders, less apparent) kin-based networks via which existing local safety net had been managed. A related point is that communities may not always exist at large enough geographic scales for cost-effective delegation. Inevitably, program officers themselves will become involved in the creation of artificial community institutions and boundaries.

Despite these omissions, the framework highlights several important tradeoffs. For instance, if communities are to be specified along geographic criteria (i.e. according to residence), and residents of different regions have different preferences or different interests, then the resulting variety in community targeting criteria may lead to large movements of population. Also, depending on how competition between community groups seeking contracts and participation is

³ Many purported 'communities' may in fact not be communities at all (in the sense of sharing a common set of values or even sharing common problems and resources). Olivier de Sardan (1999) is particularly blunt on this point and is worth quoting at length (see also Sharpe (1998 pg. 31)): "In numerous regions of Africa, despite appearances, there is no village property, or any equivalent of the former 'communal holdings' of rural European societies. If such holdings do have 'proprietors' or 'masters', who act in the interests of a 'group', these 'groups' are usually private ones, so to speak, claiming their rights against other groups of the same village, by asserting their own supremacy: the lineage of the descendants of the first settlers, or the founders of the well, or the first conquerors, or the last conquerors, or the first chiefs of the colonial administration, or the last chiefs of the independence administration, and so forth. Village infrastructures are not usually 'communal' or public, even if their usage happens to be public

structured, resources could be either used up in wasteful rent-seeking or, preferably, new social capital might be created which improves the performance of local governments in other functions. We turn now to a more detailed discussion of some of the important tradeoffs.

INCREASING THE SIZE OF THE CAKE: HOW COST-EFFECTIVE IS CBT?

A growing literature has established that community involvement can lead to improved project performance in social funds, microcredit projects, natural resources management, public health, and in local public goods provision. But community involvement is not always and everywhere the optimal policy. In managing small irrigation facilities in India, for instance, the pendulum has swung from state management to local management and in some cases back again to state management (Baker 1997). There are simply no automatic guarantees that a community group or agent who lives and interacts with the local population, will perform better than a bureaucrat, across the range of measures of performance.

What exactly might make a community agent more cost-effective at identifying beneficiaries and monitoring and delivering benefits? In other words, how does this mechanism make 'the cake' larger by lowering administrative costs and mobilizing local resources that might otherwise have remained idle or engaged in less productive uses? What characterizes localities or local agent that could not be reproduced by central government? Could not central state employees living in the locality perform as well as community agents? Obviously, relocated state employees might need higher salaries than local implementers or community groups, but such persons might be more educated and effective in managing funds than local agents.

(and though there are strong moral constraints governing their accessibility)."

The sources of advantages seem to be three: better information, better enforcement, and more positive spillovers. These advantages may come at a cost however: the superior abilities of local agents may generate rents that divert resources away from the target group, or worse yet, may create costly rent-seeking activities that drain other community resources.

Better information

Local community agents often have better information on household characteristics, needs and recent events upon which to condition beneficiary eligibility than do outside welfare agents who must often rely on crude and outdated proxy indicators (Cremer, Estache and Seabright 1996). Better information allows for fewer targeting errors of inclusion or exclusion. Better information may also greatly reduce administration costs and total deadweight loss compared to programs administered by less informed welfare agents who must rely on screening and monitoring devices such as costly audits and indirect incentive systems that place constraints on the amount and types of benefits delivered.

Local community groups may or may not consist of agents who have superior information about each other and who are enmeshed in dense local social structures of accountability. Even if they do, it is not always apparent how to make this resource operational. For example, a study of group informant food security ratings in Honduras questions the reliability of using community ratings as a guide to policy ((Bergeron, Morris and Banegas 1998))(Bergeron, Morris and Banegas 1998). The main concern was that when different randomly selected sub-groups of community members were asked to arrive at community wealth and vulnerability rankings the authors discovered a fairly weak correspondence between the rankings. Based on this and other evidence they conclude that the method of group informant ratings is at best a useful complement rather than an alternative to other assessment approaches.

Hoddinott (1999) raises similar concerns in a review of targeting methods for food security and Abraham and Platteau (2000) discuss a number of reasons for why local information flows may be limited and local informants may be reluctant to provide information to outsiders. Rai (2000) approaches the issue theoretically, arguing that mechanisms designed to get community members to truthfully reveal information about others are vulnerable to collusion, particularly under a soft budget constraint. However Adams et al. (1997) found that group ratings in Bangladesh were quite consistent with rankings arrived at through proxy means indicators constructed from a much more expensive household survey. A recent survey of the use of participatory poverty assessments in World Bank projects is provided in Robb (1999).

Useful Local Social Capital to Control Corruption

Local community agents will also be imbricated in extensive and dense locals networks of social interaction. Such overlapping ties of actors may reduce the cost of cooperation and coordination. If we think of the allocation of benefits as the outcome of an ongoing game between local intermediary agents and members of the community, the more the agent overlaps with local community members who might retaliate in other dimensions of social interaction, the less likely the agent is to ‘cheat’ any one dimension. In other words, local social capital, or local structures of accountability, can make a difference.

If we follow Spagnolo (1999) in thinking of social capital as the degree to which agents are enmeshed in other kinds of social interactions that rely on cooperation and coordination, then it is easy to see why many authors have emphasized a connection between social capital and accountability and also view open political competition as a form of social capital. The basic idea again is that if performance in one arena is closely linked to outcomes in other arenas, such

as multi-issue local politics, cooperation and accountability are more likely. Of course, a dark side to social capital has also been pointed out.

Whether or not political competition will lead to efficient program implementation is however an open theoretical and empirical question (Coate and Morris 1995).⁴ The Chicago school tradition of Stigler and Becker (Wittman 1989) suggests that political competition should lead to efficiency in the delivery of targeted transfers, otherwise politicians would be voted out of office (much like consumers might switch to the lower price provider of a good). In contrast the Virginia school of Tullock and others maintains that politicians often find 'sneaky' and wasteful ways to redistribute, usually because of a serious lack of competition, misinformed voters or high transaction costs (Wittman 1989).⁵

Many researchers argue that variation in community effectiveness is tied to variation in social capital (Brown and Ashman 1996, Collier 1998). Studies of local or international variation in social capital and the effects on performance tend to confirm the basic hypothesis of close correlation between the two measures. Putnam (1993) finds that measures of social capital vary systematically between northern and southern Italy, and account for some of the effectiveness of local bureaucracies.

Selden and You (1997) and Wang (1997) suggest that in China, where reforms are creating representative and empowered village structures, electoral competition promotes the enhancement of local capacity that will be more effective in implementing state-local contracts.

⁴ In the text below we discuss the separate but related issue of whether and how well elected local officials will represent the interests of the most poor and vulnerable in their communities. Here the focus is on whether local political competition can keep local agents from becoming corrupt.

⁵ Seabright (1996) offers a slightly different perspective in his model of incomplete contracts, suggesting that when the goals of targeting are poorly defined and non-contractible, a bureaucrat will have little accountability. His or her superior will not have the information to evaluate performance, and a national electorate may be too diffuse to discipline the ruling government. Decentralization (or devolution, properly speaking), on the other hand, offers the natural mechanism of local voting to discipline the agent.

Studies from Latin America (Fiszbein 1997, Herzer and Pirez 1991, López Murphy and Inter-American Development Bank. 1995, Nickson 1995, Peterson 1997, Veltmeyer 1997) reach similar conclusions. Electoral competition is not the only institutional prerequisite for responsiveness and effective targeting however. An econometric study of World Bank projects carried out by Isham, Kaufman and Pritchett (1997) found that there was also a strong link between civil liberties and project performance even after controlling for other factors affecting performance. They suggest the causality runs from civil liberties to citizen voice and accountability to economic performance.

Generating Social Capital

By raising the rewards to participation, programs could perhaps not only harness but also strengthen social capital and community organizations, with positive external effects. Particularly in countries coming out of central planning, a history of state action has often displaced private and informal coping mechanisms and safety nets. In these countries the hope is that community based targeting mechanisms may help to crowd-in rather than crowd-out new civic society groups and private safety nets.

The idea that outside funding could build community is often discussed in the context of local public goods projects. The idea is that by granting communities 'ownership' over new local public goods projects, and/or by insisting on community co-financing requirements, incentives can be generated for members to mobilize private energies, resources and vigilance, for the common good. There is considerable anecdotal evidence that community-based targeting does increase local social capital. Fox (1996) reports how, in indigenous communities in Mexico, waves of decentralization in provision of public goods and services, followed by crackdowns and reassertions of control, nevertheless expanded the reach and capacity of local social institutions.

A recent study by Gugerty and Kremer et al. (1999) paints a more complicated picture however. When community-organized and funded schools and self-help groups in Kenya (Harembee) received additional outside support in randomized trials, there was little evidence of an increase in measured social capital, as captured by a number of different indicators. If anything, there was some evidence that groups that received funds responded by acting to more clearly define who was and was not eligible for benefits. Those excluded or who stopped attending group meetings were typically behind on paying contributions toward group membership, and this most likely suggests that targeting toward the poor did not improve.

Rent Seeking

As previously noted, the superior information and monitoring technologies in the hands of a local intermediary means that there are potential information rents to be captured. Program design may be able to limit the level of rent capture, for example by establishing competitive bidding for contracts or by a system that assures local political accountability. But as new and existing community groups compete for control of available rents, they may also end up spending real resources that then offset the benefits of the program. Political markets fail when the outcome of local political processes is costly rent-seeking.

Given the absence or weakness of community institutions in many localities, a program of community-based targeting changes the incentives for political entrepreneurs to create new institutions. In order to create the appearance of participation entrepreneurs might use spend resources to build community centers, hold rallies, and mobilize showcase labor intensive activities. Some cynics view the rapid rise of NGOs around the world, as little more than an opportunistic response by downsized bureaucrats, and entailing no real new participation or local empowerment (Bebbington 1997, Bebbington and Sotomayor 1998, Meyer 1995, Reilly 1998).

SLICING THE CAKE: WHAT KIND OF DISTRIBUTION MIGHT RESULT?

Community agents may be in a position to employ more socially desirable, or locally adapted, criteria for assessing need. On the other hand, the community agent may be in a better position to 'capture' the program and direct resources away from intended beneficiaries. The distribution of rents, and intended benefits, will vary greatly across communities because of variation in the distribution of local preferences and ability of local groups to influence local political processes.

Community Preference and their Aggregation

Local communities sometimes share broad principles of social justice and deservingness that influence the level of willing support for safety nets and targeted benefits. Davies (1968), Peterson and Rom (1990) and Wolpert (1993) argue that variation in local preferences is responsible for much of the variation in safety nets across localities in industrial countries. King (1997, 1997) also believes that there was considerable variation in local preferences for relief in England during the time of the Poor Laws. In China, Chan, Madsen and Unger (1992, p. 189) report that in Chen village during the 1960s, "though production teams were required by law to provide food, shelter, clothing and a coffin for any needy childless elderly, the amount was a pittance, providing only for the barest subsistence. Other team members looked down upon such welfare recipients as a drain on the production team's resources. To grow old without a son's financial support was a humiliating and frightening prospect."

More likely than broad agreement is differences of opinion, regarding eligibility and deservingness, among members of a community. Individual preferences are aggregated into local social preferences by the particular political process at work in each local context. There

are few theoretical or empirical generalizations that can be made about how heterogeneous preferences are aggregated. Existing models of political competition do not generate clear results. In some analyses more poor persons generates more votes for redistribution while, under slightly different assumptions, more poor persons may generate more intense resistance to redistributive taxation by the middle and upper class (Peterson and Rom 1990, p. 53).

Capture and Exclusion

Preferences may be aggregated through open, participatory democratic processes, or through less open and more manipulable ones. The term ‘capture’ has come to denote situations where economic power can be used to influence political outcomes through manipulation of information or perceptions. The term runs the range of electoral or political practices, from ballot-rigging and other illegal manipulations, to vote buying and use of ‘big money’ to cynically sway the voting behavior of naïve voters, to ideologies that grant different ‘rights of participation’ to different members of a community even though all may be citizens and formally of equal status. The issue is complicated, because capture may have the effect of changing the formal mechanisms themselves. In a study of community heterogeneity and inequality in rural villages in Tanzania, La Ferrara (1999), found that higher inequality is associated with less democratic forms of group decision making.

Bardhan and Mooherjee (1999) analyze the factors that might determine whether under political competition capture by elites is more likely to occur at the local or national level. Capture at different levels of government then determines the targeting impact of expenditure decentralization reforms. They argue that local capture is more likely the higher is income inequality and the less mobilized (informed) are voters at the local level. They warn however that generalizations on the basis of theory alone are hazardous. Abraham and Platteau (2000) are

rather skeptical about the potential benefits of devolving social programs in many existing communities, noting that “rather than idyllic village democracies,” they are often in fact, “repressive societies where mutual control is constantly exercised, suspicions are continuously entertained about others’ intentions, inter-personal conflicts are pervasive, and a rigid rank-based hierarchical structure governs people’s life (pp. 20).”

Unfortunately, the empirical literature on the matter is also far from settled. Anecdotal evidence abounds.⁶ Scheffel's (1999) discussion of Roma (gypsies) in a Slovakian village is illustrative. Benefits were distributed by both central and local government (the latter consisting of local village council representing the dominant Gadjo majority). The council denied the Roma access to village land for housing. Ironically, the central government requirement that they be members of a village in order to acquire benefits exacerbated local tensions. Many Roma would have left the inhospitable village if they had not been tied to a locality in order to receive benefits.

In India, Echeverri-Gent (1992) suggests that 1978 electoral reforms which allowed new political parties to compete in local elections in West Bengal resulted in better pro-poor targeting of rural employment programs, after poverty alleviation programs were devolved to the local, elected governing councils (*gram panchayat*). Fox (1999) has addressed differences between communities in Chiapas compared with Oaxaca, arguing that local elites have captured programs in Chiapas but not Oaxaca.

The last few years have seen a number of econometric studies testing different methods for measuring the degree of local capture of programs. Lanjouw and Ravallion (1998) estimate the

⁶ Baland and Platteau [1998a, 1998b, 1999] provide some interesting theoretical propositions, with numerous examples of actual commons, and conclude that there is little a priori basis for judging the effectiveness of community decision-making.

odds of participation by income quintile for various public works projects in India. There are large differences between the average and marginal odds of participation. If a program has high average odds of rich quintile participation, but low marginal odds, then one might conclude that the program is captured early on, and only after coverage of interested non-poor households does the program spread to the poor.

Galasso and Ravallion (Galasso and Ravallion 2000) obtain similar results with an examination of Bangladesh's Food for Education program, which operated in several village in each of the country's 400 districts (see also Wodon and Ravallion (2000)). The villages were chosen by the central Ministry in cooperation with district officials, but the actual targeting of beneficiary families was left to the school committee in each village. Families whose children continued to attend school received substantial benefits in-kind. Galasso and Ravallion find that greater inequality in the village distribution of income reduced the incidence of the poor in receiving the targeted benefits.

La Ferrara (1999) finds that ethnic fractionalization in Tanzanian villages did not have much of an impact on individual participation in community groups, while income inequality in the village did have a significant effect. Income inequality, moreover, was associated with poor performance of groups and lower community trust.

GETTING THE INGREDIENTS FOR MAKING CAKE: NATIONAL-LEVEL ISSUES

The end result of a program to target resources through decentralized community-based targeting is influenced not just by the cost advantages and the nature of local preferences and capture, but also by national choices about funding. National funding is in turn determined by at least three processes. First, decentralized democratic political processes may tend to be less favorable to narrower targeting (the 'paradox of targeting') and community targeting may result

in co-optation from above and less overall relief for the poor in the longer run. Second, the financing modality of the national scheme, in terms of the rules for allocating funds across communities, may induce strategic targeting behavior by the community agent. Third, local targeting may lead to population movements.

The Paradoxes of Targeting

The literature on the political-economy of expenditure decentralization in developing countries is in its infancy (see Treisman(1999) and Jones, Sanguinetti and Tomasi (2000) for recent models). The few papers that do model the process in regards to poverty alleviation take as their starting point the paradox of targeting. Better targeting policy may well end up undercutting political support for social spending programs (Perotti (1993), Benabou (2000), Sen (1995), Gelbach and Pritchett (1997), Van de Walle (1995), deDonder and Hendricks (1998), Casamatta, Cremer and Pestieau (2000)).

Cremer and Palfrey (1996) point out an additional consideration in a simple model of decentralization. They abstract from incentive considerations, and focus on the issue of preference aggregation. If citizens have preferences over a policy (in this case targeting), and preferences are aggregated via majority voting, then there are circumstances where citizens would prefer to have the policy decision taken at the national or central level, rather than at a district level. Citizens may be worried that local majority preferences will differ considerably from their own. Since national preferences aggregate over all preferences, the median preference in the nation is less likely to be an 'extreme' preference. Thus, while one might think that local decisions are better in that they respond to local preferences, this may not be the case if there is wide dispersion of preferences within localities.

The point, as far as targeting is concerned, is that national targeting may be an equilibrium arising naturally out of a political process. Attempts to alter that equilibrium may then meet with considerable resistance, and may well be overturned.⁷ Besley (1997:125) has pointed out that in an equilibrium sense more effective performance by community groups need not translate into larger benefits for the poor; the efficiency gains may be captured entirely by the government or wealthy taxpayers.

Decentralization may also lead to competition and rent-seeking that may erode local capacity to challenge national leadership. Co-optation is the watchword here; Cleary (1997), for example, is extremely critical of the possibility of NGO independence under authoritarian regimes. A very common concern in the literature is that, "as the voluntary/community sector becomes increasingly involved in public-sector contracts to provide services... the focus has to be upon those services ... rather than upon broader 'watch-dog'-type function, let alone advocacy and campaigning functions..." (Mayo and Craig 1995:8). A similar concern arises when community groups are more radical than the government; for instance in many countries with large or predominant Muslim populations, opposition Islamic groups have strategically developed large social service programs (Clark 1995). Governments then have been very careful in decentralizing authority over welfare.

There are numerous examples of occasions where administrative decentralization and devolution of power was accompanied by the centralization of political power. Under apartheid

⁷ The difficulties in planning for these national political economy issues were illustrated at the recent second Micro-Credit Summit. An exchange on the floor, summarized in the summit newsletter, went as follows: "In discussing a \$105 million World Bank loan to the Bangladesh government for PKSF, [Ismail] Serageldin said, 'Autonomy wasn't easy...credit to PKSF was blocked for about seven or eight months because the minister of finance insisted that they would name the head of the agency. Dr. Yunus [of Grameen Bank] and other microfinanciers said, 'No,' that the board had to name the CEO or else there would be no autonomy... I am happy to say that the World Bank, in fact, sided with the microfinanciers and as a result we do have PKSF and \$105 million went there. But there aren't many such examples."

the South African government took a number of initiatives with the stated objective of devolving power to local governments. Many observers interpreted this as a strategy to de-politicize the population, co-opt local political leadership, and deflect popular protest from national to local levels (see Klugman (1994:46)). The military dictatorship in Chile devolved responsibilities for basic social services to regional governments and municipalities at the same time that it was replacing once elected officials with presidential appointees. Quiroz et. al. (1997) suggest that decentralization was more about de-politicization than empowerment.⁸ Finally, in China residents' committees and street offices are supposed to provide opportunities for participation but have been criticized as vehicles for a 'top down' approach to development aimed at garnering support for policies handed down from the center.

Allocating Funds to Communities and CBT Evaluation

Rules concerning the amount and form of financing that community agents should receive for disbursement to the local poor are at the heart of any community-based targeting scheme. Ravallion (1999) has argued that any reasonable formula for funding decentralized community groups ought to incorporate evaluation results into the formula. Thus formulas should incorporate not just how poor the locality is in relation to other localities, but also assessments of how past local targeting efforts.

Evaluation of community-based targeting by the center or outside funding agencies is likely to encounter numerous problems. One immediate philosophical concern arises: if the locality and center have different social welfare functions, on what criteria is community-based targeting

⁸ Since democratization in 1990 however, government has introduced several new approaches to integrate organized community groups into targeting programs. These include making local governments pay more attention to and be more accountable to local neighborhood committees, and rewarding community group projects through social fund programs such as FOSIS (Graham 1994).

to be judged, the center's or the locality's? If local agents can identify the poor better than conventional survey methods or means-testing because it brings in intangible elements such as capability deprivation, functioning, status, access to networks, etc. (Sen 1995, Sen 1984), then evaluation of targeting according to standard criteria may suggest it is not working. Villages and communities may be much more concerned with preserving a sense of inclusiveness (in terms of rich and poor) and much more willing to exclude certain segments of the poor (always, of course, on the justification of deservingness). Finding that many of the poor are excluded and many of the rich included would then be judged to be poor targeting by the national standard and excellent targeting by the local standard.

Alderman (1998) discusses the difficulties of evaluation in his study of local knowledge in the community-based Albanian safety net. He finds that households already receiving state pensions are less likely to receive additional benefits, but households that receive both pensions and an additional transfer from local authorities do not get transfers that are statistically any smaller than households without a state pension. This may mean commune officials are privy to special circumstances of households, but is also consistent with commune officials not knowing that households are receiving pensions. As Alderman (1999) has succinctly phrased it, there is an “inherent irony” in the search for more effective decentralized targeting mechanisms. That irony is that while local community groups do have better information about local conditions and preferences than the central government, unless local bodies have incentives to truthfully reveal and act on that information, the center will remain largely in the dark about the key decision of how to allocate resources across localities.

Ravallion (1998, 1998) develops a simple model showing that if localities work within a given budget and optimally allocate services and benefits between the rich and poor, if given an

extra dollar to spend, poorer localities will pass on a smaller fraction of that dollar to the poor, in part because they will be spending a larger fraction of their budget on the poor to start with. The point is that poorer localities may appear to be less effective at targeting than the richer communities not just because of lack of capacity. Ravallion tests this implication in a statistical analysis of targeting performance in Argentina's Trabajar work program. He concludes that, "the incentive to reach poor areas within the province was duller for a poorer province," but the center took this into account and allocated resources to provinces that were more effective in reaching poor areas (Ravallion 1998, pg. 22). He suggests that the project selection criteria that the federal government has put in place was an important complement to a system of allocating grants on the basis of a national poverty ranking.

Population Movements

Many community-based targeting programs will be small-scale, and so their behavioral effects will be small. Larger programs will have bigger effects. One concern is that because program implementation will vary, population movements may follow; as the Chinese proverb has it, "water flows lower, the poor flow higher." The externality this creates across jurisdictions may invite uncoordinated compensatory adjustments at the local level, particularly when local revenues are raised (Cremer, Estache and Seabright 1996).⁹ Population movement has been an important topic in debates over decentralization of the U.S. safety net, with some authors arguing

⁹ In fact, the English poor law administrators developed an extensive body of regulations, known the 'law of settlements' that severely limited geographic movement between parishes and aimed to greatly further stigmatize those who accepted relief. Forty days witnessed residence without objection became the basic criteria for eligibility but those in charge of poor relief would, of course, often object to residence of poor persons, and send them back to their original parish. This then led to systems of certificates, so that officials could know where a person was originally from. Adam Smith, who became a vocal critic of the system, exclaimed at the time that "there is scarce a poor man in England of forty years of age, I will venture to say, who has not in some part of his life felt himself most cruelly oppressed by this ill-contrived law of settlements" (Smith, American Imprint Collection (Library of Congress) and Marian S. Carson Collection (Library of Congress) 1789, pp. 240-48).

that variability in state benefit levels generates inefficient incentives to locate residence (see Peterson and Rom 1990). The debate over the magnitude of the effects of 'welfare magnets' is by no means settled, however as many researchers find no effects or very small effects using U.S. data (see (Allard 1998, Cebula and Belton 1994, Enchautegui 1997, Frey 1997, Frey, Liaw, Xie and Carlson 1996, Schram, Nitz and Krueger 1998, Schram and Krueger 1994)).

Although inter-jurisdictional externalities are less of a concern in a centrally funded safety net program, community agents may be reluctant to extend safety nets to new migrants.¹⁰ Haenn (1999) discusses membership and exclusion decisions in agricultural *ejidos* in southeastern Mexico. Formal *ejido* members imposed conditions for receiving benefits, ranging from access to village land to participation in government and NGO-sponsored development projects upon migrants fleeing civil war, or marginalized *ejido* members. In one case, indigenous *chola*-speaking refugees requested permission to become members of a village and agreed to pay an entrance fee, but then waited for two years before becoming finally convinced that their admission would be vetoed by the non-*chola* speaking faction within the *ejido* who feared their local power would be undermined. The refugees were denied benefits of the village, even though they were clearly the most in need of benefits.

Designing a Community-Based Targeting System

Most existing CBT schemes are homogeneous with uniform community entities and agents. That is, the same agents are used across the breadth of the country. The 'endgame' for these programs seems to be increased or eventual incorporation of community agents into the

¹⁰ Consider another angle on this same question, applied to peer-group microcredit programs. It is argued that many recent programs have succeed in achieving good repayment records because they use the poor themselves as financial intermediaries, for example by using solidarity groups to encourage peer- selection and monitoring . But both theory and evidence suggests that in forming groups, borrowers have no particular incentive to choose poorer,

social welfare bureaucracy. Community-based targeting thus appears as a formula for rebuilding a bureaucratic social safety net with a new bureaucracy.

Given our emphasis on community-based targeting as a potential method to empower marginalized groups and encourage participation, it seems unlikely that a uniform program would accomplish this goal effectively. Especially in the absence of participatory democracy, municipalities or uniform community entities are not likely to be appropriate purveyors of community demands as they have already been captured by an undemocratic state. Even in a participatory democracy, local institutions respond to median voters. The paradox of targeting, now applied at the locality level, suggests broader redistribution versus targeting.

To empower marginalized groups community-based targeting may need to incorporate some of the lessons of the social fund approach, and adopt a demand-driven, menu approach that broadens the diversity of participating community agents, perhaps using detailed and transparent public consultations and analysis before decisions are taken regarding contracts with given community groups.¹¹ The 'local community' to be considered could then include semi-formal or informal village councils, school boards and mosques, organized NGOs, or perhaps ethnic groups and traditional leaders, assisted perhaps by institutional organizers. Depending on the context each of these community institutions will vary in terms of their superior information, embeddedness in monitoring institutions, willingness to engage in rent-seeking, and their propensity to be responsive to the poor. Choosing amongst them is of course not an easy task, but Smoke and Lewis (1996) report on one practical exercise to construct measures of capacity of local government in Indonesia.

more vulnerable partners. To the contrary, some evidence suggests positive assortative matching and a tendency to exclude poorer members (Ghatak and Guinnane 1999)

¹¹ Graham (1995) reports wide variability in social funds, with some programs (Zambia and Chile) doing reasonably well, and others doing very poorly (Senegal and Peru). See also Tandler (2000) Reddy (1998) and

Moreover, if there is strong likelihood that dominant community groups will exclude weaker groups, one possible way to target excluded groups is to explicitly use categorical targeting or quotas. For example, in the state of Karnataka in India the composition of the *mandal panchayat* (group of villages) reserves a quarter of all seats for women, and 18 percent for members of scheduled castes. Vietnam seeks the adequate representation of poor peasants on the governing bodies of production cooperatives by reserving two-thirds of the seats for low income groups (Majeres (1985) cited in Klugman (1994 p48)).

The uninformed center's need to provide an intermediary agent with incentives may create a tension between achieving good targeting and other program objectives. The problem is that it is usually easier to tie performance to easily measured and observed variables, such as the number of clients attended, or the number of clients who find jobs, yet reward along these narrow dimensions may provide incentives against reaching the poorest or most vulnerable, who may sometimes be the most difficult to attend. For example, loan staff at microlending organizations are often placed on high powered incentive contracts which tie remuneration to repayment performance and some argue that this dulls incentives to target poorer and more vulnerable residents. Those microlending organizations that have achieved relatively good targeting outcomes, such as Grameen Bank, seem to have accomplished this in part by also insisting on categorical targeting, such as targeting women and imposing wealth ceiling eligibility requirements (Conning (1999)).

The best community targeting outcomes are likely to be achieved within hybrid systems which allow for significant local community agent discretion but also stipulate clear rules and targeting guidelines and which keep local agents accountable through external auditing and evaluation, and institutions such as mandatory public meetings, and competition among groups for contracts and elected office.

Narayan (1997).

CONCLUSION

This review has highlighted four key points in discussing community-based targeting: (1) communities vary in their ability to mobilize information and implement effective monitoring systems, and this will influence whether community based targeting leads to cost saving advantages or just opens up more opportunities for local-level corruption and costly rent-seeking; (2) local communities will vary in their willingness to target the poor; (3) national political economy effects are likely to be complex and may result in paradoxical undermining of safety nets; and (4) evaluation and funding of community-based targeting poses several special conceptual problems.

Community based targeting is likely to offer advantages over other targeting mechanism when communities can be clearly defined, say by region or social group. One may want to avoid situations where people are members of multiple communities, first to avoid double-dipping for benefits, but also to avoid creating frictions within communities by forcing beneficiaries to choose among them in terms of primary membership. To be cost-effective, community-based targeting may need to take place at a large enough scale, but this is not always practical. Many tagged groups are often not organized communities (for example women and widows). Here creating community may be useful and empowering, but is not a task easily accomplished.

Many, if not most of the examples of community based targeting involve a state contracting with homogenous community entities on a national or regional scale. But this suggests that community based targeting is almost by definition a transitional phenomenon as the ultimate aim of most of these programs seems to be to build a new social welfare bureaucracy with more responsive community agents. While this should be the ultimate goal and is itself laudable, we have suggested that in some cases, especially in those cases where an absence of democratic

participation is likely, one may want to experiment by encouraging heterogeneous community entities to compete to provide different social safety services.

While local democratic participation is to be encouraged as a mechanism to insure greater transparency and accountability of local officials, leaving the decision over how to target and redistribute funds to local voting is unlikely to guarantee targeting of the most vulnerable and under-privileged groups. If the existing 'community' has already failed to make the existing flawed safety net bureaucracy responsive to the needs of the most vulnerable, then why believe that same community would target the most poor and vulnerable?

This perspective is brought out by Sen (1984; 1995), who has long argued that rather than focus on income deprivation, poverty ought to be understood as a deprivation in a minimum acceptable set of functionings. These include not only basic physical functionings such as being well nourished, having adequate clothing and shelter, or avoiding preventable disease, but also social functionings such as being able to participate in the life of the community, to be in public without feeling shame, etc. The problems of social exclusion and entitlement failure that dictate and condition a person's capability deprivation are often deeply rooted in local social divisions and the way the community operates and regulates access to resources.

Changing these structures and breaking down social divisions often requires challenging established structures and mobilizing the disadvantaged. Building a more effective social safety net will not just be a matter of finding better information or proxy indicators, but of opening valid and lasting opportunities for participation through which the poor can establish and press for claims when this becomes necessary. The best community agents may be activists and entrepreneurs; people who can engage the poor in the political process to obtain greater say and

control over how community resources are allocated to those in need.¹² While this does require allowing for more local community discretion in deciding resource allocations, carefully chosen national targeting rules, criteria and national political support can help strengthen the position of disadvantaged groups in these local contests.

¹²¹² We recognize of course that this type of intermediary agent – local leaders who are willing and able to challenge existing institutional structures -- may be in short supply (see also Tendler (2000) and Abraham and Platteau(2000)).

REFERENCES

- Abraham, A. and J.-P. Platteau, "The dilemma of participation with endogenous community imperfections," Department of economics and CRED (Centre de Recherche en Economie du Développement), University of Namur, 2000).
- Agrawal, A. and C. C. Gibson, "Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation," *World Development*, volume 27, 4 1999, pp. 629-649.
- Akerlof, G. A., "The Economics of "Tagging" as Applied to the Optimal Income Tax, Welfare Programs, and Manpower Planning," *American Economic Review*, volume 68, 1 1978, pp. 8-19.
- Alderman, H., "Do Local Officials Know Something We Don't? Decentralization of Targeted Transfers in Albania," (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1998).
- Alderman, H., "Multi-tier Targeting of Social Assistance: Role of Inter-governmental Transfers," (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1999).
- Allard, S. W., "Revisiting Shapiro: Welfare magnets and state residency requirements in the 1990s," *Publius-the Journal of Federalism*, volume 28, 3 1998, pp. 45-65.
- Appleton, S. and P. Collier, "On Gender Targeting of Public Transfers," in *Public Spending and the Poor: Theory and Evidence*, D. v. d. W. a. K. Nead, ed. (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), pp. 555-84.
- Baker, J. L. and M. E. Grosh, "Poverty Reduction Through Geographic Targeting - How Well Does It Work," *World Development*, volume 22, 7 1994, pp. 983-995.
- Baker, J. M., "Common property resource theory and the Kuhl irrigation systems of Himachal Pradesh, India," *Human Organization*, volume 56, 2 1997, pp. 199-208.
- Baland, J.-M. and J. P. Platteau, *Halting degradation of natural resources : is there a role for rural communities?* (Rome: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. xv, 423.
- Bardhan, P. and D. Mookherjee, "Expenditure Decentralization and the Delivery of Public Services in Developing Countries," (Boston: Boston University, 1998).
- Bebbington, A., "New states, new NGOs? Crises and transitions among rural development NGOs in the Andean region," *World Development*, volume 25, 11 1997, pp. 1755-1765.
- Bebbington, A. and O. Sotomayor, "Demand-Led and Poverty-Oriented . . . Or Just Subcontracted and Efficient? Learning from (Semi-) Privatized Technology Transfer Programmes in Chile," *Journal of International Development*, volume 10, 1 1998, pp. 17-34.
- Benabou, R., "Unequal Societies: Income Distribution and the Social Contract," *American Economic Review*, volume 90, 1 2000, pp. 96-129.
- Bergeron, G., S. S. Morris and J. M. Banegas, "How reliable are group informant ratings? : a test of food security ratings in Honduras," *World Development*, volume 26, 10 1998, pp. 1893-1902.
- Besley, T., "Political Economy of Alleviating Poverty: Theory and Institutions," in *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics 1996*, M. Bruno and B. Pleskovic, ed. (Washington, DC: The World Bank, 1997), pp. 117-147.
- Besley, T. and S. Coate, "The Design of Income Maintenance Programmes," *Review of Economic Studies*, volume 62, 2 1995, pp. 187-221.
- Besley, T. and S. M. R. Kanbur, "The Principles of Targeting," in *Current Issues in Development Economics*, V. N. Balasubramanyam, ed. (New York: Saint Martin's Press, 1991), pp. 69-90.
- Bigman, D., S. Dercon, D. Guillaume and M. Lambotte, "Community Targeting for Poverty Reduction in Burkina Faso," (Oxford: Centre for the Study of African Economies, 1998).

- Blackorby, C. and D. Donaldson, "Cash, In-Kind Transfers and Selection," *American Economic Review*, volume 71 1988, pp. 691-700.
- Boadway, R. and M. Keen, "Redistribution," in *Handbook of Income Distribution*, A. B. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon, ed: North Holland, 1999).
- Boadway, R., N. Marceau and M. Sato, "An Agency Model of Welfare and Disability Assistance," *Queen's Institute for Economic Research Discussion Paper*, volume 949 1997, pp. 25.
- Brown, C. C. and W. E. Oates, "Assistance to the Poor in a Federal System," *Journal of Public Economics*, volume 32 1987, pp. 307-330.
- Brown, L. D. and D. Ashman, "Participation, Social Capital, and Intersectoral Problem Solving: African and Asian Cases," *World Development*, volume 24, 9 1996, pp. 1467-79.
- Buvinic, M. and G. R. Geeta, "Female-headed households and female-maintained families: are they worth targeting to reduce poverty in developing countries?," *Economic Development & Cultural Change*, volume 45 1997.
- Casamatta, G., H. Cremer and P. Pestieau, "Political sustainability and the design of social insurance," *Journal of Public Economics*, volume 75 2000, pp. 341-364.
- Case, A. and A. Deaton, "Large cash transfers to the elderly in South Africa," *Economic Journal*, volume 108, 450 1998, pp. 1330-1361.
- Cebula, R. J. and W. J. Belton, "Voting With Ones Feet - an Empirical Analysis of Public Welfare and Migration of the American Indian, 1985-1990," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, volume 53, 3 1994, pp. 273-280.
- Clark, J. A., "Islamic social welfare organizations in Cairo: Islamization from below?," *Arab Studies Quarterly*, volume 17, 4 1995, pp. 11-30.
- Cleary, S., *The role of NGOs under authoritarian political systems* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997).
- Coate, S. and S. Morris, "On the Form of Transfers in Special Interests," *Journal of Political Economy*, volume 103, 6 1995, pp. 1210-35.
- Collier, P., "Social Capital and Poverty," World Bank, 1998).
- Conning, J. H., "Outreach, Sustainability and Leverage in Monitored and Peer-Monitored lending," *Journal of Development Economics*, volume 60, 1 1999.
- Copesake, J., "The Integrated Rural Development Project," in *Poverty in India*, R. Cassen, ed. (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- Cornelius, P. K., "Cash benefits and poverty alleviation in an economy in transition: the case of Lithuania.," *Comparative Economic Studies*, volume 37, 2 1995.
- Coudouel, A., S. Marnie and J. Micklewright, "Targeting Social Assistance in a Transition Economy: The Mahallas in Uzbekistan," UNICEF, 1998).
- Cremer, J., A. Estache and P. Seabright, "Decentralizing Public Services: What Can We Learn from the Theory of the Firm?," *Revue d'Economie Politique*, volume 106, 1 1996, pp. 37-60.
- Cremer, J. and T. R. Palfrey, "In or Out - Centralization By Majority Vote," *European Economic Review*, volume 40, 1 1996, pp. 43-60.
- Davies, B., *Social Needs and Resources in Local Services* (London: Michael Joseph Ltd., 1968).
- de Donder, P. and J. Hendriks, "The political economy of targeting," *Public Choice*, volume 95 1998, pp. 177-200.
- Echeverri-Gent, J., "Public participation and poverty alleviation: the experience of reform communists in India's West Bengal," *World Development*, volume 20 1992.
- Enchautegui, M. E., "Welfare payments and other economic determinants of female migration," *Journal of Labor Economics*, volume 15, 3 PT1 1997, pp. 529-554.
- Fiszbein, A., "The Emergence of Local Capacity: Lessons from Colombia," *World Development*,

- volume 25, 7 1997, pp. 1029-43.
- Fox, J., "How Does Civil Society Thicken - the Political Construction of Social Capital in Rural Mexico," *World Development*, volume 24, 6 1996, pp. 1089-1103.
- Fox, J., "The Inter-Dependence Between Citizen Participation and Institutional Accountability: Lessons from Mexico's Rural Municipal Funds," in *Thinking Out Loud: Innovative Case Studies on Participation Instruments*, K. Piester, ed. (Washington, Latin America and Caribbean Region Civil Society Papers: World Bank, 1999).
- Frey, W. H., "Immigration, welfare magnets and the geography of child poverty in the United States," *Population and Environment*, volume 19, 1 1997, pp. 53-86.
- Frey, W. H., K. L. Liaw, Y. Xie and M. J. Carlson, "Interstate Migration of the Us Poverty Population - Immigration Pushes and Welfare Magnet Pulls," *Population and Environment*, volume 17, 6 1996, pp. 491-536.
- Galasso, E. and M. Ravallion, "Local Knowledge vs Local Accountability? Decentralized Targeting of an Anti-Poverty Program in Bangladesh," (World Bank working paper, Washington, 2000).
- Gelbach, J. B. and L. Pritchett, "More for the poor is less for the poor : the politics of targeting," (Washington, DC: World Bank Development Research Group Poverty and Human Resources, 1997).
- Ghatak, M. and T. W. Guinnane, "The Economics of Lending with Joint Liability: A Review of Theory and Practice," *Journal of Development Economics*, volume 60, 1, forthcoming 1999.
- Glewwe, P., "Targeting assistance to the poor: efficient allocation of transfers when household income is not observed.," *The Journal of Development Economics*, volume 38 1992.
- Graham, C., *Safety nets, politics, and the poor : transitions to market economies* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1994), pp. xiv, 378.
- Grosh, M. E., *Administering targeted social programs in Latin America : from platitudes to practice* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1994), pp. ix, 174.
- Gugerty, M. K. and M. Kremer, "The Impacts of Development Funding on Social Capital: The Kenya Local Community Action Project," (Washington: World Bank, 1999).
- Haddad, L. and R. Kanbur, "Intrahousehold Inequality and the Theory of Targeting," *European Economic Review*, volume 36, 2-3 1992, pp. 372-78.
- Haenn, N., "Community Formation in Frontier Mexico: Accepting and Rejecting New Migrants," *Human Organization*, volume 58, 1 1999, pp. 36-43.
- Harragin, S. and C. C. Chol, *The Southern Sudan Vulnerability Study: The Save the Children Fund (UK) South Sudan Programme*, 1999).
- Herzer, H. and P. Pirez, "Municipal Government and Popular Participation in Latin America," *Environment and Urbanization*, volume 3, 1 1991, pp. 79-95.
- Hoddinott, J., "Targeting: Principles and Practice," (Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute, 1999).
- Isham, J., D. Kaufmann and L. H. Pritchett, "Civil Liberties, Democracy, and the Performance of Government Projects," *World Bank Economic Review*, volume 11, 2 1997, pp. 219-42.
- Jacoby, H. G., "Self-selection and the redistributive impact of in-kind transfers - An econometric analysis," *Journal of Human Resources*, volume 32, 2 1997, pp. 233-249.
- Johnson, I., "Posters, Propaganda Give Way To Social Work and Healing," (1999).
- King, S., "Poor relief and English economic development reappraised," *Economic History Review*, volume 50, 2 1997, pp. 360-368.
- King, S., "Reconstructing lives - Social structures in Britain: the poor, the Poor-Law and welfare in Calverley, 1650-1820," *Social History*, volume 22, 3 1997, pp. 318-338.
- Klugman, J., "Decentralisation: A Survey Of Literature From A Human Development Perspective,"

- UNDP, Human Development Report Office, 1994).
- La Ferrara, E., "Inequality and Participation: Theory and Evidence from Rural Tanzania," Harvard University and IGER, Bocconi University, 1999).
- Lanjouw, P. and M. Ravallion, "Benefit Incidence and the Timing of Program Capture," World Bank, 1998).
- Leach, M., R. Mearns and I. Scoones, "Environmental Entitlements: Dynamics and Institutions in Community-Based Natural Resource Management," *World Development*, volume 27, 2 1999, pp. 225-47.
- López Murphy, R. and Inter-American Development Bank., *Fiscal decentralization in Latin America* (Washington, DC: Published by the Inter-American Development Bank ; Distributed by The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), pp. 297.
- Mayo, M. and G. Craig, "Community Participation and Empowerment: The Human Face of Structural Adjustment or Tools for Democratic Transformation?," in *Community empowerment : a reader in participation and development*, G. Craig and M. Mayo, ed. (London ; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed Books, 1995), pp. 1-11.
- Mencher, S., *Poor law to poverty program; economic security policy in Britain and the United States* ([Pittsburgh]: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967), pp. xix, 476.
- Meyer, C. A., "Opportunism and Ngos - Entrepreneurship and Green North-South Transfers," *World Development*, volume 23, 8 1995, pp. 1277-1289.
- Munro, A., "In-Kind Distribution, Uncertainty, and Merit Wants - a Simple Model," *Public Finance Quarterly*, volume 20, 2 1992, pp. 175-194.
- Munro, A., "Self-Selection and Optimal in-Kind Transfers," *Economic Journal*, volume 102, 414 1992, pp. 1184-1196.
- Narayan, D. and K. Ebbe, *Design of social funds: Participation, demand orientation, and local organizational capacity* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1997), pp. viii, 75.
- Narayan, D. and L. Pritchett, "Cents and Sociability: Household Income and Social Capital in Tanzania," (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1997).
- Nickson, R. A., *Local government in Latin America* (Boulder: L. Rienner Publishers, 1995), pp. xi, 316.
- Perotti, R., "Political Equilibrium, Income Distribution, and Growth," *Review of Economic Studies*, volume 60 1993, pp. 755-76.
- Peterson, G. E., *Decentralization in Latin America : learning through experience* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1997), pp. v, 38.
- Peterson, P. E. and M. C. Rom, "Welfare magnets: A new case for a national standard," *Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution*, volume 178 1990, pp. 178.
- Putnam, R. D., R. Leonardi and R. Nanetti, *Making democracy work : civic traditions in modern Italy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. xv, 258.
- Quigley, W., "Five Hundred Years of English Poor Laws, 1349-1834: Regulating the Working and Nonworking Poor," *Akron Law Review* 1999.
- Quiroz, T., M. Palma Rodriguez and D. Palma Rodriguez, "Chile," in *Community development around the world : practice, theory, research, training*, H. Campfens, ed. (Toronto ; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1997), pp. 385-436.
- Rai, A. S., "Targeting the Poor Using Community Information," (Cambridge: Harvard Institute for International Development, 2000).
- Ravallion, M., "Reaching Poor Areas in a Federal System," World Bank, 1998).
- Ravallion, M. and B. Sen, "Impacts on Rural Poverty of Land-Based Targeting: Further Results for Bangladesh," *World Development*, volume 22, 6 1994, pp. 823-38.

- Ravallion, M. and Q. Wodon, "Evaluating a Targeted Social Program when Placement is Decentralized," World Bank, 1998).
- Ravallion, M. and Q. Wodon, "Monitoring Targeting Performance When Decentralized Allocations to the Poor Are Unobserved," World Bank, 1999).
- Reddy, S., "Social funds in developing countries: recent experiences and lessons," UNICEF, 1998).
- Reilly, C., "Balancing State, Market, and Civil Society," in *Poverty and inequality in Latin America : issues and new challenges*, V. E. Tokman and G. A. O'Donnell, ed. (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998), pp. xiv, 245.
- Robb, C. M., *Can the Poor Influence Policy? Participatory Poverty Assessments in the Developing World* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1999).
- Sardan, J. P. O. d., "A Moral Economy of Corruption in Africa?," *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, volume 37, 1 1999, pp. 25-52.
- Scheffel, D., "The Untouchables of Svinia," *Human Organization*, volume 58, 1 1999, pp. 44-53.
- Schram, S., L. Nitz and G. Krueger, "Without cause or effect: Reconsidering welfare migration as a policy problem," *American Journal of Political Science*, volume 42, 1 1998, pp. 210-230.
- Schram, S. F. and G. Krueger, "Welfare Magnets and Benefit Decline - Symbolic Problems and Substantive Consequences," *Publius-the Journal of Federalism*, volume 24, 4 1994, pp. 61-82.
- Seabright, P., "Accountability and decentralization in government: An incomplete contracts model," *European Economic Review*, volume 40 1996, pp. 61-89.
- Selden, M. and L. Y. You, "The reform of social welfare in China," *World Development*, volume 25, 10 1997, pp. 1657-1668.
- Sen, A., "The Political Economy of Targeting," in *Public Spending and the Poor: Theory and Evidence*, D. van de Walle, ed, 1995), pp. 11-24.
- Sen, A. K., *Resources, values, and development* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), pp. viii, 547.
- Sharpe, B., "'First the forest': Conservation, 'community' and 'participation' in southwest Cameroon," *Africa*, volume 68, 1 1998, pp. 25-45.
- Smith, A., American Imprint Collection (Library of Congress) and Marian S. Carson Collection (Library of Congress), *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations* (Philadelphia: Printed for Thomas Dobson ..., 1789), pp. 3 v.
- Spagnolo, "Social relations and cooperation in organizations," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, volume 38 1999, pp. 1-25.
- Subbarao, K., J. Bonnerjee, S. Braithwaite, K. Carvalho, C. Graham and A. Thompson, "Safety net programs and poverty reduction: Lessons from cross-country experience," (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1997).
- Tendler, J., "Why Are Social Funds So Popular?," in *Local Dynamics in the Era of Globalization*, S. Yusuf, W. Wu and S. Everett, ed: Oxford University Press, forthcoming., 2000).
- Treisman, D., "Political Decentralization and Economic Reform: A Game-Theoretic Analysis," *American Journal of Political Science*, volume 43, 2 1999, pp. 488-517.
- Trejo, G. and C. Jones, "Political Dilemmas of Welfare Reform: Poverty and Inequality in Mexico," in *Mexico under Zedillo*, S. K. Purcell and L. Rubio-Freidberg, ed. (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Pub., 1998), pp. xiv, 151.
- Van de Walle, D., K. Nead and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development., *Public spending and the poor : theory and evidence* (Baltimore: Published for the World Bank [by] Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), pp. xviii, 619.
- Veltmeyer, H., "Decentralisation as the Institutional Basis for Community-Based Participatory Development: The Latin American Experience," *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*,

COMMUNITY BASED TARGETING FOR SOCIAL SAFETY NETS

- volume 18, 2 1997, pp. 303-25.
- Wade, R., *Village Republics*: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Wang, X., "Mutual empowerment of state and peasantry: Grassroots democracy in rural China," *World Development*, volume 25, 9 1997, pp. 1431-1442.
- Wittman, D., "Why Democracies Produce Efficient Results," *Journal of Political Economy*, volume 97, 6 1989, pp. 1395-1424.
- Wodon, Q. T. and M. Ravallion, "Evaluating a Targeted Social Program when Placement is Decentralized," 2000.
- Wolpert, J., *Patterns of generosity in America : who's holding the safety net?* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund Press, 1993), pp. ix, 69.
- Wong, L., "Privatization of Social Welfare in Post-Mao China," *Asian Survey*, volume 34, 4 1994, pp. 307-325.
- World Bank, "The World Bank Participation Sourcebook," : ESD, Washington, DC, 1996).
- World Bank, "Improving Social Assistance in Armenia," : Human Development Unit, 1999).
- World Food Program, "Participation: An Approach to Reach the Poor," : 1998).

Table 1: A taxonomy of targeted poverty alleviation methods and mechanisms

	<i>Intermediary agent / Type of benefit or project</i>			
	bureaucracy → beneficiary		bureaucracy → community group → beneficiary	
Targeting Method	<i>individual cash or kind benefits</i>	<i>creation of local public goods</i>	<i>individual cash or kind benefits</i>	<i>creation of local public goods</i>
Individual assessment	means-testing with questionnaires	Variable access fees	informal means-testing using local deservingness criteria	local club goods boundary enforcement
Self-selection	in-kind transfers, non-pecuniary costs (stigma, waiting)	employment guarantee schemes (with low wages)	competitive grants for community groups	social fund projects (cofinancing and other participation costs)
Categorical and Geographic	tagging by social characteristic (ethnicity, gender, family status) or geographic region	Women's projects (for selected regions or eligible participants)	Social exclusion at local level	neighborhood allocations, Empowerment zones (in the U.S.)