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The problem with income poverty…

**Money** is only a means to an end. It buys goods and services, but it does not measure **wellbeing**.

Better indicators of progress assess **outcomes**: hunger, deprivations.

Globally, **poverty** fell faster than **hunger** between 1990 and 2015.

**Poverty MDG** was achieved (2010).

**Hunger MDG** was **almost** achieved.

Raising incomes and reducing poverty are **necessary but not sufficient** to eradicate hunger.

---

Global poverty and hunger, 1990–2015

FAO 2013
Africa’s progress against hunger

Africa is the only global region where the number of hungry people is rising, not falling.

182 million undernourished people in 1990.

233 million undernourished people in 2015.

Hunger in Africa, 1990–2015

FAO 2015
Africa is the only global region where the number of hungry people is rising, not falling.

47 million stunted children in 1990.

58 million stunted children in 2014.

Stunted children, 1990–2015

Brazil’s ‘Zero Hunger’ Project

Brazil under President Lula chose to prioritise eradicating hunger.
Child stunting in Brazil fell from 37% in 1975 to 7% in 2005.

Four drivers of falling malnutrition:

1. **Rising incomes** of the poor due to economic growth, minimum wages, and cash transfer programmes (e.g. *Bolsa Familia*).
2. Improving **maternal education**: education access & quality rose.
3. Improved **mother and child health**, due to free health care and a Family Health Strategy.
4. Improved **sanitation** services: more households served by the public sewage system.

Monteiro et al. 2010
Multiple Overlapping Deprivation Analysis

1. **Monetary poverty**

2. **Deprivation (basic needs)**
   - Nutrition
   - Health
   - Education
   - Water
   - Sanitation
   - Housing

3. **Subjective poverty**
   - Self-assessed poverty
   - Unhappiness

De Neubourg/UNICEF
Targeting Mechanisms
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The targeting dilemma

“Leave no-one behind”

Target population (poor households)

All poor people
The targeting dilemma

Programme beneficiaries

Target population (poor households)

People receiving benefits

All poor people
The targeting dilemma

Which error should be minimised – inclusion or exclusion?
**Geographic targeting: Area-based**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>People Living Below Poverty Line</th>
<th>Poverty Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003-04 30.85%</td>
<td>Urban 15.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11 25.16%</td>
<td>Rural 27.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**People Living Below Poverty Line:**
- Far-western D Region: 45.61% (2.2m)
- Mid-western D Region: 31.68% (3m)
- Western D Region: 22.25% (4.6m)
- Central D Region: 21.69% (8m)
- Eastern D Region: 21.44% (5.3m)

*Urban Hill has the lowest poverty of 8.72 percent, followed by Kathmandu with 11.47 percent.*

Far-Western Region = 9% of the poor
Central Region = 35% of the poor
Categorical targeting: Vulnerable groups

- Children/orphans
- Persons with disability
- Older persons
Proxy means test: Poverty scorecard
**Self–targeting: Self–selection**

Public works programmes

- **High access costs**
  - (hard work, long hours)

+ **Low benefits**
  - (below market wages)

Is this ethical?
Is it efficient?
Community–based targeting: Local knowledge

Village committees or participatory wealth ranking
Targeting: Lessons learned

- Universal coverage
- Geographic targeting
- Categorical targeting
- Self-targeting
- Community-based
- Proxy means test
- Means testing

Targeting accuracy rises

Targeting cost rises
Policies and Programmes for “Leaving no-one behind”

Social protection

‘Graduation model’
Social protection reduces poverty directly
Intergenerational poverty and Poverty traps

- Poverty
- Low investment in human capital e.g. children's education and health
- Low earnings and wages
- Low productivity

Barrientos 2010
"Graduation model" in theory

**Sustainable graduation**
Participant remains self-reliant after exiting the programme, because she has built up some resilience against future shocks.
“Graduation model” in practice

Poverty Line

Extreme Poverty

Client Selection
“Graduation model” in practice

Hashemi & de Montesquiou 2011
STEP 01

Targeting

Community participates in a spatial mapping and wealth ranking exercise to identify community members in the most need.
Client receives a package of assets, in this case a goat and a cow, to raise and learn about generating income.
STEP 03
Cash transfer

To allow the client breathing room, and time to start earning income from her assets, the client receives a cash transfer or stipend, and in some cases a food to supplement their diet.
STEP 04
Savings

Clients are encouraged to save and track their savings
STEP 05

Training

Client receives weekly home visits and training on how to use their asset, on health and hygiene matters, basic skills and literacy, and general support and counseling.
Livelihood training
Behaviour
Change
Communication
“Graduation model” in Bangladesh

95% of participants graduated out of ultra-poverty (<50c/day) within two years (24 months). Higher earnings were sustained after programme exit.
On 6 Graduation Model pilot projects with RCT evaluations, 75% to 98% of participants met locally defined graduation criteria after 18 to 36 months.
Key Considerations

Focus on outcomes (e.g. child stunting)

Transfer productive assets to the poor

Strengthen resilience through insurance mechanisms

Invest in human capital of the poor (education and health)

Strengthen institutions for pro–poor service delivery

Reduce social exclusion and marginalisation

Empower women