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Abstract

A Study on Effective Welfare Policy Implementation in Bangladesh: A Comparative Case Study on Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) Program

Mohammad Abdul Ahad
Public Administration Major
The Graduate School of Public Administration
Seoul National University

The aim of this study is to investigate beneficiary selection process of Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) program and its efficacy to make VGD program more effective. The VGD program attempts to improve the socio-economic conditions for the ultra poor women who are widow, divorced, separated, and abandoned or with disabled husband. The comparative case study is analyzed depending on qualitative data from field survey based on beneficiary selection process in Raiganj upazila, Bangladesh. The study reveals VGD program implementation scenario, influential factors of governance and their respective role of actors how affect the primary VGD beneficiary selection process done by Ward Level Small Groups (WLSGs) at before verification stage and how the failure case was overcome to a successful case done by Upazila VGD Committee (UZVGDC) at after verification stage. A set of twenty five issues based upon institutional,
managerial and technical level of governance with their respective success factors of governance such as legal framework, rule of law, hierarchical control, public service delivery, leadership, training, motivation & civil participation have been studied and analyzed through survey method data collection process. The comparative analysis reveals a several numbers of significant gaps or differences on these eight independent variables between before verification stage as a failure case done by WLSGs and after verification stage as a success case done UZVGDC. More specifically, the issues of clear understanding of selection criteria & selection process, arrangement of open public meeting, households visit or interviewing, utilization of rules, circulars & guideline properly, commitment to provide better public service, coordination among members of groups or committee, leadership role of female UP members & Upazila Nirbahi Officer as team leaders and active civil participation have outlined the most significant gaps and program outcomes. On the other hand, the issues of biasness, fairness, hierarchical control system, utilization of discretionary power, lack of proper training & motivation could not achieve the desire end state. These significant gaps are the most important achievements of this study and thus theoretical advancement has been created for further research and development (R&D) in the field of governance & public administration. In practical context, if the major findings & policy recommendations/implications of the study are applied to other upazila areas in Bangladesh considering the independent variables as homogeneous in nature of uniqueness of country perspective, it may contribute to better
improvement of VGD program beneficiary selection process. The government may consider the policy recommendations for further development & improvement of VGD program including beneficiary selection process. Moreover, the government of Bangladesh, NGOs & donor agencies may also apply the major findings and policy recommendations of the success factors of level of governance in others welfare policies/programs such as Vulnerable Group Feeding, Old Aged Allowance, Widow Allowance Maternity Allowance, Employment Program for Ultra poor men etc for effective policy implementation process from top (policy making) to bottom (policy implementation). The comparative study makes room for further research & development (R&D) and accelerates more in-depth analysis of research problem using the theories, methods, concepts and contents used. Besides these, a comparative study could be made between two consecutive VGD cycles of the same upazila or between two or more upazila of different areas for VGD beneficiary selection process in future. Finally the study can be utilized by policy makers, policy implementers, researchers and development partners in the field of welfare programs of Bangladesh.
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Chapter I: Introduction

I.1. Background and Purposes of the Study

Bangladesh is a developing country with a population of 142.3 million (BBS, 2011) living in an area of 147,570 square kilometers. About 75 percent of the country’s population lives in rural areas. The agricultural sector dominates the economy and the share of agriculture in gross domestic product (GDP) declined from 31.9 % in 1986 to 19.5 % in 2006 (World Bank, 2007). The ultra poor people\(^1\) are most vulnerable and have no other means to develop their economic condition. During the last four decades, the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) has been pursuing a number of social welfare or social safety net programs such as: (a) cash support program; (b) food aid program; (c) special program for poverty reduction; (d) self-employment through micro credit; and (e) some specific programs for poverty alleviation. Under these welfare or social safety net programs, Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) is one of the most well-known and popular food aid programs running to feed ultra poor people. Therefore, the significance of studying VGD program is much more required to identify the impacts of this program on improvement of livelihood of ultra poor people. The VGD program is comprised by three major parts: (1) Beneficiaries Selection, (2) Food delivery to beneficiaries and (3) Income generating activities (IGAs)

\(^1\) Daily food intake maximum 1600 calories (Rahman 2000) and having earnings less than 0.50 USD per day(IFPRI,2007).
training and providing microcredit to them for self-employment and sustainable women empowerment. Over the four decades, the program was mainly focused on the latter two parts with the collaboration of the World Food Program (WFP) and Governmental Organization-Nongovernmental Organization (GO-NGO) to complete VGD cycle\(^2\) hereafter cycle by proper distribution of food grains and microcredit in the policy implementation level. As a result, VGD program did not achieve a great success as the government and the WFP desired. Moreover, a number of scholars and researchers have studied about the second and third parts of the program and provided their valuable insights. I observed practically as a government officer (Upazila Nirbahi Officer\(^3\)) in Bhandaria\(^4\) & Raiganj upazila or Upazila Parishad (UZP)\(^5\) level that the main cause behind the less success is not to identify the incumbent ultra poor women\(^6\) properly. In these circumstances, I am interested to focus in my study regarding VGD beneficiary selection stage through a comparative case study on VGD beneficiary selection process in Raiganj\(^7\) upazila under Sirajganj\(^8\) district in 2011-2012 VGD cycle for

\(^2\) 24 months or 2 years duration of VGD program (i.e., 2011-2012 is known as one cycle)

\(^3\) Chief Executive Officer of a Upazila Parishad (Sub district council) & head of Upazila administration is appointed by central government and is holding rank of Senior Assistant Secretary of Bangladesh Civil Service (BCS) Administration cadre under the Ministry of Public Administration (MoPA). The author was appointed as UNO in two upazila (Bhandaria, Pirojpur & Raiganj, Sirajganj) for about for years from October, 2007 to July 2011.

\(^4\) One of 483 upazila under Pirojpur district in Bangladesh.

\(^5\) The second lowest tier of local government administrative unit in Bangladesh (483 upazila in Bangladesh).

\(^6\) Live under the poverty line and have food intake 1600 kilo calories daily (10-15% women are ultra poor) and are widow, divorced, separated, and abandoned or with disabled husband and having earnings less than 0.50 USD per day.

\(^7\) One of the 483 upazila having 267.83 sq km and population 325028 (Census 2011) and is consisted of 9 union parishads and 81 wards. It is also known as Sub district.

\(^8\) One of 64 districts in Bangladesh.
effective public policy implementation process. The VGD program attempts to improve the socio-economic conditions for the ultra poor women who are widow, divorced, separated, and abandoned or with disabled husband. The main purpose of the present study is to find out casual factors and actors roles in Institutional, Managerial & Technical levels of governance why the beneficiary selection process of VGD program in the field level is facing great difficulties. More specifically, my efforts will be made to review the targeting beneficiary selection process of VGD program and suggest some crucial policy recommendations for effective beneficiary selection.

Thus the research questions of this study will be as follows:

1. How does VGD program implement in Bangladesh?
2. What factors of governance do influence in VGD beneficiary selection process for effective welfare policy implementation during before verification stage\(^9\) in Raiganj upazila in 2011-2012 cycle?
3. What role of actors does influence in VGD beneficiary selection process for effective welfare policy implementation during before verification stage in Raiganj in 2011-2012 cycle?
4. How to overcome the identified failure case at before verification stage to a successful at in after verification stage\(^{10}\) in Raiganj in 2011-2012 cycle?

\(^9\) Primary/prospective VGD beneficiary selection process done by Ward Level Small Group (WLSG).
\(^{10}\) Final VGD beneficiary verification process done by Upazila VGD Committee (UZVGDC)
I.2. Methods and Scope of the study

As the VGD program is one of the social welfare & food security programs for the ultra poor women and is running more than three decades, so it is very much effective to use case from the implementing field areas. Also the case study provides in-depth knowledge and understanding about the practical situation. In this study I shall discuss a case relating with beneficiary selection process in Raiganj in 2011-2012 cycle and finally I shall compare Before Verification Stage for primary VGD beneficiary selection process done by Ward Level Small Groups (WLSGs)\(^{11}\) [Annexure II] and After Verification stage for final VGD beneficiary selection or verification process done by Upazila VGD committee (UZVGDC)\(^{12}\) [Annexure I] of the case in regarding problem of institutional, managerial and technical factors of governance. Therefore, the scope of the study is:

a) To review existing information of VGD program;

b) To assess the extent and coverage of the program;

c) To explore beneficiary selection process of the program with a view to drawing necessary policy conclusions.

---

\(^{11}\) Assigned for primary beneficiary selection process according to circular MoWCA and it is consists of 4 members including concern ward female UP member, male UP member, NGO representative and union level government officer. It is headed by female member. There are 81 WLSGs (9 union X 9 wards=81 WLSGs) in case study Raiganj Upazila.

\(^{12}\) Assigned for final verification and approval authority of final beneficiary and it is consists of 15 types Upazila level government & elected officials including all Union Parishad chairman, all Union TAG officers and assigned NGO representative. This Committee is headed by Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) and Upazila Women Affairs Officer (UWAO) is member secretary.
d) To assess the impact of the program on empowerment of ultra poor women;

e) To discuss with implementing actors at unions and upazila level, to get their views on its successes, challenges and scope for further improvements.

The study is based on case study research design and the unit of analysis is an upazila (sub district). Bangladesh is administratively divided into two levels: national or central administration 7 divisions, 64 districts & 483 upazila and local or field administration consisting of 7 city corporations (Metropolitan government), 64 zila parishads (District Council), 284 Pourashova (municipalities) and 483 upazila parishads/sub district councils (UZP)/upazila here after upazila and 4451 union parishads/union councils (UPs) or unions here after union. In terms of its geographical area, Raiganj is under district of Sirajganj and is comprised of nine unions such as Dhamainagar, Sonakhara, Dhubil, Ghurka, Chandaikona, Dhangora, Brahmagachha, Nalka and Pangashi and 81 wards. According to the 2011 Census, the total population of this upazila is 325028 and among which males and females constitute 50.4 % and 49.6 %, respectively, and its total area is 268.83 square kilometers.

---

13 The lowest tier of local government administrative units in and is consisted of nine Wards. It is run by a Chairman and twelve members including 9 male & 3 female members exclusively.

14 The smallest unit of a union and usually one village is designated as a Ward and there are 9 wards in each union.
Map 1.1: Administrative Area of Raiganj Upazila

Source: Banglapedia
Chapter II: Theoretical Background & Research Design

II.1. Theoretical Background for Policy Implementation

In this chapter, I look at implementation theories that have emerged since early 1970s, highlighting the contributions of some key scholars. The main problems regarding the study of implementation particularly concern with relationship between policy formulation and policy implementation which has been described in the early year of 1970s between Top-Down and Bottom-up perspectives. Then I look at the contributions of scholars who have sought to synthesizes these two schools of thoughts to reach a concrete conclusion about the theoretical analysis and frameworks of my study (VGD program)’s effective policy implementation. I only highlight the key issues in their arguments and point out in which way they differ from each other.

II.1.1. Top-down Approaches

The essential features of Top-down approach are that it starts with a policy decision by governmental officials. It is relatively simple and straightforward. Jefry Pressman & Aaron Wildavsky (1973,1984) are considered as the founding fathers of Top-down approach and according to them, policies normally contains both goals and means for achieving them and a effective policy implementation depends upon linkage between different organizations and departments at the local level. Doland Van Meter and Carl
Van Horn (1975), who are known as system building scientists, offer a model for the analysis of the implementation process referring to Pressman and Wildavsky’s work alongside a variety of other empirical studies. According to them, policy implementation will be the most effective where only marginal change is required and goal consensus is high. They develop a model of policy implementation process in which six variables (policy standards and objectives, resources & incentives, inter organizational relationships, implementation agencies, economic, social and political environment, and response or disposition) are linked dynamically to the outcome “performance”.

Mazmanian & Sabatier (1979) present three general sets of factors: tractability of problem, ability of statute to structure implementation and non-statutory variables affecting implementation process and these set of factors are developed into a set of seventeen independent variables that are hypothesized to influence goal compliance. They have made a clear distinction between policy formation and policy implementation but at the same time recognition of a feedback process. Moreover, Sabatier(1986) suggests *six sufficient and generally necessary conditions* for the effective policy implementation of legal objectives: (1) Clear and consistent objectives, (2) Adequate causal theory, (3) Implementation process legally structured to enhance compliance by implementing officials and target groups, (4) Committed and skillful implementing officials, (5) Support of interest groups and sovereigns, (6) Changes in socio-economic conditions which do not substantially undermine political support or causal theory. According to Brian Hogwood and Lewis Gunn (1978), actors involved in policy making and implementation
must be democratically elected. They offer some proposition as recommendation for effective implementation that policy makers should provide the adequate time and sufficient resources, a valid theory of direct relation between cause & effect and there should be a single independent implementation agency and a perfect communication among, and coordination of, the various elements involve in the program.

**II.1.2. Bottom-up Approaches**

The Bottom-up approach starts by identifying the network of actors involved in service delivery in one or more local areas and asks them about their goals, strategies, activities, and contacts. Michael Lipsky (1971), who is known as founding father of street-level bureaucracy (Bottom-up approach), argues that the decisions of street-level bureaucrats, the routine they establish, and the devices they invent to cope with uncertainties and work pressures, effectively become the public policies they carry out. He explains the role of street-level bureaucrats as an alienated one, stressing such classic features of alienation as that work is only on segments of the product that there is no control over outcomes or raw materials (clients circumstances). Benny Hjern et al. (1982) who concentrate their study in implementation structures, starts by identifying the network of actors involved in service delivery in one or more local areas and asks them about their goals, strategies, activities, and contacts and then uses the contacts as a vehicle for developing a network technique to identify the local, regional, and national actors involved in the planning, financing, and execution of the relevant governmental and non-governmental programs. Another scholar, Richard Elmore (1978) defines
‘Backward Mapping’ as backward reasoning from the individual and organizational choices that are the hub of the problem to which policy is addressed, to the rules, procedures and structures that have the closest proximity to those choices, to the policy instruments available to affect those things, and hence to feasible policy objectives. By comparison with Top-down methodology, backward mapping is relatively free of predetermining assumptions. The concept of networks is used in Bottom-up theory (particularly the work of Hjern) and is very important for many of attempts to synthesize the different approaches. According to Scharpf (1978), policy formulation and implementation are inevitably the result of interaction among a plurality of separate actors with separate interests, goals and strategies. Policy implementation is seen as involving both notions of an end-state or policy achievement and a process or policy execution (Lane, 1987). He also argues that Top-down approaches are particularly concerned to emphasize the responsibility side while Bottom-up models underline the trust side and an implementation process is a combination of responsibility and trust. Richard Matland (1995) reviews both of the Top-down and Bottom-up approaches and the main efforts to synthesize them. He argues that there is a tendency for Top-down theorists to choose relatively clear policies to study while Bottom-up theorists study policies with greater uncertainty inherent them. He then suggests that this distinction has two features: ambiguity and conflict.
II.1.3. Syntheses

I have analyzed the key findings and arguments of two schools of thoughts: Top-down Vs Bottom-up approach. A number of contributors to these approaches discussion identify the way in which the normative and methodological perspectives to interact the viewpoints on key considerations of authority, legitimacy dictating how policy implementation processes are studied. According to Top-down approach, the starting point is authoritative decision; as the name implies centrally located actors are seen as most relevant to produce the desired effect (Matland, 1995). The main actors are regarded to be the decision makers who are responsible to formulate an efficient statute which suits the kind of existing problems. To increase the level of efficiency and confidence Top-down theorists demand a clear and consistent statement of the policy goals. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975)’s argument is that implementation will be most effective where only marginal change is required and goal consensus is high. Finally they develop a model of policy implementation process in which six variables (policy standards and objectives, resources & incentives, inter organizational relationships, implementation agencies, economic, social and political environment, and response or disposition) are linked dynamically to the outcome performance. According to Bardach (1977), implementation process is a political process and Sabatier & Mazmanian (1979) make a clear distinction between policy formation and policy implementation but at the same time recognition of a feedback process. Also Sabatier (1986) suggests six sufficient and generally necessary conditions for the effective policy implementation of legal
objectives which are very consistent with public sector policy implementation. These six conditions of effective implementation have been proven to be a useful instrument of critical factors in understanding variations in program performance in the different governance levels and in understanding the strategies of program proponents over time. Hogowood and Gunn (1978) defined Top-down view on the ground that those who make policy are democratically elected and they offer some propositions as recommendation to policy makers: adequate time and sufficient resources, combination of resources, a valid theory of cause & effect, direct relation between cause & effect, a single independent implementation agency and a perfect communication among, and coordination for successful implementation.

On the other hand, the Bottom-up approach attaches exactly there where the Top-down approach shows its biggest failure. According to this point of view policy implementation process is set on two levels, local organizations react to macro-level plans, develop their own programs and implement them(Berman, 1978). Bottom-uppers focus on network of actors involved in service delivery in local areas and they are interested in actors’ goals, strategies, activities, and contracts between actors. They think that program success depends on the skills of specific individuals in local implementation structures. According to Matland (1995), there is a tendency for Top-down theorists to choose relatively clear policies to study while Bottom-up theorists study policies with greater uncertainty inherent them.
Generally, the Top-down approach is more useful in making a preliminary assessment of the scores on the six conditions of Sabatier(1986) of effective policy implementation are relatively high while in cases where the scores on the six conditions of Sabatier(1986) are relatively low and one is interested in inter-local variation, then the Bottom-up approach should be employed. When scores on the six conditions are moderate or mixed, the appropriate methodology depends on whether one is primarily interested in mean responses or in assessing inter-local variation. The Top-down is more appropriate for the former and the Bottom-up focuses on local implementation structures, and thus is better for assessing the dynamics of local variation. Moreover the Top-down approach is more useful for making these preliminary assessments because of its greater theoretical development while the Bottom-up approach of Hjern et al. (1978) has not yet developed much of a substantive theory and thus is poorly equipped to make predictions.

From the synthesization of two schools of thoughts I can make conclusion that Top-down and Bottom-up approaches are based on different concepts of rationality. Top-down approach is based on instrumental rationality or rational model while Bottom-up approach is based on limited rationality or satisfactory model. Top-down approach is based on strong legal structuring; the six conditions of Sabatier have been proven to be useful, encouraging authors to look at a longer time-frame and produce a less pessimistic evaluation while Bottom-up approach takes the present participants in an implementation structure as given without examining the prior efforts of various individuals to affect participation rates. Moreover, it is
difficult to assess the implementation outcomes and overemphasize the power of the Periphery and it is easy to neglect the importance of social, legal factors through Bottom-up approach. There is no explicit theory of the factors affecting its subject of interest.

In summary, the Top-down approach appears to have a comparative advantage in situations where (i) there is a dominant piece of legislation structuring the situation (dominant public program) or where (2) research funds are very limited, one is primarily interested in mean responses, and the situation is structured at least moderately well. By contrast, the Bottom-up approach is more appropriate in situations where (1) there is no dominant piece of legislation or policy but rather large numbers of actors without power dependency, or where (2) one is primarily interested in the dynamics of different local situations.

II.2. Literature Review

The World food Program (WFP) through the implementation of its Country Program (CP) supports the Government of Bangladesh to achieve the MDG’s (1) Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger (2) Achieve universal primary education (3) Reduce child mortality (4) Improve maternal health by improving the food security, nutritional wellbeing and livelihoods of ultra poor households. CP activities include Beneficiary selection, food delivery along with income generating activities (IGAs) & livelihood training along with microcredit program through associated NGO (optional) for self-employment.
In this literature, I shall focus on some distinguished scholars and social welfare program researchers who work regarding welfare or social safety net programs (SSNPs) prominently VGD programs. I also try to discuss about their valuable insights whether they match or how much they concern about first part of the VGD program – i.e., targeted beneficiaries selection process for effective policy implementation process. The nature of the program is public policy implementation through field level government officials, elected personnel, social actors or elites and NGOs’. This policy implementation program also involves institutional, managerial and technical level of governance with factors such as legal framework, rule of law, hierarchical control, public service delivery, leadership quality, training and motivation and civil participation. Policies are generally adopted by policy makers at central level and executed by field level government & elected officials and social actors and NGOs. According to policy cycle, policy implementation occurs in the lower of the policy process (Peter Bridgeman & Glyn Davis). Almost fifty years ago, Harold Lasswell (1956) suggested that policy implementation is one of a number of necessary steps or stages in the policy process. In this perspective I can say that the WFP Country Program (CP) is a policy of the WFP and the Government of Bangladesh based on some authoritative actions by the policy implementers.

Social welfare or social safety net programs (SSNPs) such as VGD, Vulnerable Group Feeding(VGF), Old Aged Allowance, Maternity Allowance, etc have become an important tools for achieving poverty alleviation goal and
have been proven to perform well in several developing countries including Bangladesh. However, broad-based growth through appropriate economic policies is needed to benefit short-term poverty alleviation programs designed through social safety nets (Coady 2004). Depending on the objectives of welfare in developing countries, they can be classified into 5 types: income transfer through cash; food related transfer programs; price subsidies; human capital related social safety nets; public works programs and micro credit programs (Babu 2003). These programs attempts to provide assistance to poor households specially women headed households to reduce the risk and vulnerability of falling into a poverty trap and develop their socioeconomic conditions and sustainable women empowerment. Tabor (2002) defines these social safety net programs as the provision of assistance to the poor that could be used in periods of crisis or as a short-term or mid-term poverty alleviation measure to a long term sustainable development.

Murgai & Zaidi(2005) in their paper has discussed a comparative study among the several food delivery programs like VGD, VGF, FFE(Food For Education) based on HIES(Households Income and Expenditure Survey)-2000 reports and suggests that these programs are reasonably well-targeted towards the ultra/extreme poor for their sustainable development. They express their deep concern regarding the food delivery, training and motivation of the selected beneficiaries but nothing about how the beneficiaries would be selected in a free, fair and transparent way so that the program’s goals can be achieved effectively. Furthermore they comment that better monitoring systems could allow the implementing authority to compare
performance across programs as well as across different regions of Bangladesh. Hossain (2007) explores the political dimensions of the achievements of the VGD program on documenting how political ideologies, interests and alliances at national and local levels have influenced the establishment, evolution and maintenance of the VGD program. She also shows how the program implementation process is affected by the tension and conflicting situation among different actors involving with this program. Ahmed (2007) has elaborated various dimensions of social safety net programs of Bangladesh such as scope, opportunities, targeting approach and regime shift towards emerging dimensions. He promises that entrusting local government institutions in Bangladesh such as Upazila Parishad (UZP) and Union Parishad (UP) can play pivotal role for effective policy implementation. But he did not explain how these indicators would be achieved through proper beneficiary selection from thousands of desired ultra poor families. Another comparative study done by the WFP (2007) on overall VGD program outcomes found that VGD activity made a significant difference in the food and livelihood security of extremely poor households in Bangladesh. The study also recommends that VGD beneficiaries need to be properly identified, IGAs training should be demand-driven and participatory, social and health awareness should be incorporated so that to initiate social change in relation with women empowerment. Although the WFP is the only donor agency of the popular program, the study did not outline regarding beneficiary selection process in depth. Matin & Hulme (2009) examine that Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC)’s income generating VGD (IGVGD)
program has deepened the outreach of its poverty reduction activity and achieved impressive results. Moreover, the IGVGD experience confirms that programs combining elements of livelihood protection and promotion can reach deeper than purely promotional schemes and can benefit the ultra poor.

In 2007, a study was conducted under a contract between the World Food Program (WFP) and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) which examined the efficacy of food and cash transfers in food security and livelihoods of the ultra-poor in rural Bangladesh, with a focus on Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) program: (1) Income- Generating VGD (IGVGD) and (2) Food Security VGD (FSVGD). These programs have an important role in helping ultra-poor households, but they cannot be the sole mechanisms for sustainable poverty reduction. Rather, they should be seen as one component of a portfolio of activities designed to eradicate poverty. Along with income and employment generation, NGO e.g., BRAC helps in forming organizations of the poor, awareness building awareness, raising gender equity and human resource development training. According to the study, the logic of these programs is the creation of an enabling environment in which the poor can participate in their own development and improving the quality of their lives. Targeting is an issue that has received wide attention in designing safety net program to reduce leakages and increase the effectiveness of the programs reaching the intended beneficiaries (Coady 2004). Experience from development interventions shows that unless the program is designed specifically for the poorest through a targeting mechanism, the poorest will either be missed or they will exclude themselves.
(Murdoch and Haley (2002). According to the WFP (1999)’s own definition, the targeted beneficiaries ‘belong to vulnerable social groups such as divorced, abandoned, and widowed and asset less women’. In 1993, WFP initiated the first series of studies that describe and analyze the effects and impact of different VGD interventions on the participating women. These studies assessed both the level of economic well-being as well as the empowering process that these women went through in increasing their awareness about gender-related social issues, in participating in the public sphere, and in gaining more control over resources, over decision making, and over their personal lives. According to Hashemi (2001), the latest evidence shows that the most important element of VGD beneficiary selection process was that the targeting process was not transparent and depended on the relationship between UP female members here after female members as head and UP male members here after male members as members of Ward Level Small Group (WLSG). The UP chairmen or members are likely to take key decisions regarding who makes it on the beneficiary list. Lobbying by poor people is an important factor in how beneficiaries are selected. A number of interest groups are usually involved in the selection process. In most cases, they try to select their own people. Payment of bribes also plays a significant role in the selection process. Inability to pay for cards by the poor may limit

---

15 Reserved female member in each of three greater wards of a union and 3 women members are also elected by the adult voters for 5 years duration. For VGD beneficiary selection program, they are acting as head of Ward Level Small Groups (WLSGs)

16 Each ward has a male member who is elected by the ward adult franchise for 5 years duration. For VGD selection program, he is acting as a member of Ward Level Small Group (WLSG)

17 An elected chairman in each union for 5 years tenure. He presides over the Union council meetings and all other committees. For VGD beneficiary selection program, he is acting as a member of UZVGDC
their chances of being selected. The recent evidence from Mannan (2010) also shows that some of VGD women were found to have a diversified income and were more likely to have husbands with earned income. Female UP members as head of WLSG often play a key role in selecting program beneficiaries. The UP members and other influential people make the list of beneficiaries and enjoy benefit out of it. Thus, paying bribe or otherwise putting pressure on the selection committee plays an important role for being selected as beneficiaries. This would exclude often some of the poorest from the beneficiary list.

As VGD program is comprised of three major parts and among them beneficiary selection process is the first and the foremost part to implement the program effectively and to achieve the desired end-state. But most of the policy analysts and researchers & scholars remain silent or do not focus on properly beneficiary selection process. Their principal concerns are about properly food distribution and IGAs. Because developing countries like Bangladesh where poverty is dense and around 36% population live under poverty level, it is very difficult to find out a few numbers of ultra poor households from a large number of poor populations. If the incumbent beneficiaries are not selected according to government prescribed rules, circulars and guidelines, there will a greater possibility to include a large number of households those are not entitled for VGD program. Thus wrongful/faulty list will affect the remaining two parts: food delivery, IGAs training and microfinance program for livelihood and sustainable women
empowerment. However as identified by various studies, there are some clear indications of leakages such as about 27% of VGD beneficiaries did not fulfill or meet at least four selection criteria (WB 2006). To overcome the critical situation of beneficiary selection process, this study focuses on mainly beneficiary selection process through a comparative case study method based on 2011-2012 VGD cycle at Raiganj in Sirajganj district, Bangladesh under the policy implementation tool Top-down approach developed by prominent scholars Sabatier & Mazmanian (1979) using six necessary and sufficient conditions for effective policy implementation of Sabatier (1986).

II.3. Research Design

II.3.1. Analytical Framework

In social welfare or safety net programs like VGD program, I shall develop a analytical frame in relation with the theoretical analysis. I have already discussed two schools of thoughts: Top-down and Bottom-up and synthesized them (in earlier section II.1.) in theoretical background and analysis. I observe that effective policy implementation process depends on some causal factors in Institutional, Managerial and Technical levels of governance. There are many causal actors and factors related with different factors of governance such as legal framework, rule of law, hierarchical control, public service delivery, leadership quality, training, motivation and civil participation. In this study, I shall explain that effective policy implementation process depends on these policy implementation factors as
independent variables and how much closely related with three levels of governance. Finally I shall draw a diagram of public sector governance levels and implementation factors that can be useful to our empirical work.

**II.3.1.1. Level of Governance and its Components**

Any governance regime within a policy domain (e.g., environmental protection), with respect to a type of government activity (e.g., regulation), within a particular jurisdiction (e.g., state/city), or within a particular organization (e.g., a department of human services), or organizational field (e.g., child welfare agencies)-is the result of a dynamic process that can be summarized a core of logic (Lynn, Heinrich, Hill; 2001) The levels of governance in public sector depends on a set of institutional, managerial and technical factors involve in effective policy implementation. Public sector governance is responsible to these factors. The open system model of organization that was first developed by J. Thompson (1967), which in turn is founded on Talcott Parson (1960)’s intuitive distinction between three levels of responsibility and control: institutional, managerial and technical. Scholars and practitioners have recognized the existence of levels or layers in political and organizational life (Lynn, 1987). Linking this line of intuitive insight with a logic of governance based in political economy, Lynn, Heinrich, Hill (2001) suggest the following heuristic:
II.3.1.1.a. The Institutional Level of Governance

The institutional level of governance is concerned with the establishment of governing relations or broad strategic alignments at the legislative level-comprising relationship between publics/stakeholders and legislators, between legislative preference and the formal governing public agencies, and between formal authority and the organization and management of public agencies and programs (e.g., legal framework, acts, rules). I shall discuss two important factors of governance for effective policy implementation in the public institutions as follows-

**Legal Framework:** Legal Framework provides guidance on the background statutes, regulations and policies that support the policy formulation and implementation of government’s works. It works as a guideline of the policy makers and implementers. The statute (or other basic policy decision) contains unambiguous policy directives and structures the implementation process so as to maximize the likelihood that target groups will performed as desired.

**Rule of Law:** The rule of law is a legal maxim whereby governmental decisions are made by applying known legal principles. Rule of law implies that every citizen is subject to the law. It stands in contrast to the idea that the ruler is above the law and citizens have equal right or opportunity before law. Also deprived or underprivileged citizens should have right to have preference.
II.3.1.1.b. The Managerial Level of Governance

The managerial level of governance is concerned with the further shaping of governing relations or the elaboration of strategies, by organizational actors-comprising relationships between organization, management and administration and the core technologies and primary work of public agencies (e.g., Hierarchical control/chain of command, Accountability, Public service delivery, leadership quality). I shall discuss three important factors of governance for effective policy implementation in the managerial level or management level in the public office as follows-

Hierarchical Control: The organization of controllers in a large-scale system into two or more levels so that controllers in each level send control signals to controllers in the level below and feedback or sensing signals to controllers in the level above. It is also known as control hierarchy or chain of command in managerial level of governance. The control of large systems is always organized in a distributed hierarchy.

Public Service Delivery: Public services are services which are funded with public money. Public services can be delivered by the state or on behalf of the state, e.g., public education and public health services are known as public services. Public service delivery is the implementation of those services and making sure they reach those people and places they're intended to.
**Leadership:** Leadership has been described as a process of social/organizational influence in which one can enlist the aid and support the others in the accomplishment of a common task to achieve the common goal. Leadership is essential to getting things done. But the qualities of good leaders—self-knowledge, commitment, willingness to look to others for support, being open to change, and a desire to go the extra mile—can determine whether anyone chooses to follow.

**II.3.1.1.c. The Technical Level of Governance**

The technical level of governance is concerned with further shaping of governance at the primary work level, where strategic alignments are given their operational expression—comprising relationships between primary workers and the consequences or outcomes for service recipient and other stakeholders (e.g., Training, motivation and civil participation). I shall discuss three important factors of governance for effective policy implementation in the Technical level of governance in the public institutions as follows—

**Training:** Training is the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and competencies as a result of the teaching of vocational or practical skills and knowledge that relate to specific useful competencies. Training has specific goals of improving one's capability, capacity, and performance.

**Motivation:** Motivation is the psychological feature toward a desired goal and elicits, controls, and sustains certain goal directed behaviors. There are many approaches to motivation: physiological, behavioral, cognitive, and
social. Motivation may be rooted in a basic need to minimize physical pain and maximize pleasure, or it may include specific needs such as eating and resting, or for a desired object. Conceptually, motivation is related to, but distinct from emotion.

**Civil Participation:** Civil participation has been defined as "Individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern. Civil participation has many elements, but in its most basic sense it is about decision making or governance and about who and how and by whom a community's resources will be allocated. The principle of civil participation underscores the most basic principle of democratic governance, i.e. that sovereignty resides ultimately in the people- in the citizenry. It is about the right of the people to define the public good, determine the policies by which they will seek the good, and reform or replace institutions that does not serve that good.

The value of this aggregated framework (*summarized in the following framework*) lies in directing attention to the dynamic relations within and between the institutional, managerial and technical level of governance which will be linked with a set of factors such as legal framework, rule of law, hierarchical control, public service delivery, leadership quality, training, motivation and civil participation connected with the successful public policy implementation process. From the above analytical discussion among three level of governance and their factors for effective policy implementation, I construct the following analytical framework:
Diagram-2.1: Analytical Framework (Top-Down Approach)

Source: Lynn et al 2001 and compiled by Researcher
II.3.2. Methodology

In this study, I shall adopt case study method to explain how public policy implementation process related with its level of governance. A case study design is a systematic inquiry into an event or a set of related events which aims to describe and explain the phenomenon of interest (Bromley, 1990). In most cases, a case study method selects a small geographical area or a very limited number of individuals as the subjects of study. Yin (1984:23) defines the case study research method as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used. In this study I would like to use a comparative case study method to analysis VGD beneficiary selection process in Before Verification Stage (BVS)\(^ {18}\) and After Verification Stage (AVS)\(^ {19}\) of VGD program in 2011-2012 cycle at Raiganj in Sirajganj district, Bangladesh. When the beneficiary selection process was running in 9 unions at Raiganj Upazila, 81(9 UPx9 wards) Ward Level Small Groups (WLSGs) here after WLSGs headed by female ward member and who are assigned for preparing primary VGD beneficiary list according to circulars, rules and guidelines of Ministry of Women and Child Affairs (MoWCA), it was found

\(^{18}\) The primary/prospective VGD beneficiary selection process done by WLSGs is known as Before Verification Stage (BVS) and it was done from Nov-Dec 2010 at Raiganj upazila for 2011-2012 VGD cycle.

\(^{19}\) The final VGD beneficiary verification process done by UZVGDC is known as After Verification Stage (BVS) and it was done from Nov-Dec 2010 at Raiganj upazila for 2011-2012 VGD cycle.
that the primary VGD beneficiary list here after primary list\textsuperscript{20} were not done according to the prescribed selection criteria and selection process of MoWCA. They prepared a wrongful primary list by means of unfair, partial, nepotism, corruption and illegal political influence or pressure. A large number of complaints were received by the upazila VGD committee (UZVGDC) here after UZVGDC from common people, mass media, civil society against WLSGs regarding faulty beneficiary list. After that UZVGDC checked some of complaints by random basis and the most of the complaints were proved against those 81 WLSGs and their members. As a result, UZVGDC headed by Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) verified the primary list at union level physically and open public meeting by interviewing of the primary listed women and final VGD beneficiary list here after final list\textsuperscript{21} was prepared for 2011-2012 cycle. Here I shall identify two different situations as Before Verification Stage (BVS) done by WLSG and After Verification Stage (AVS) done by UZVGDC. In this study I would like to compare these two different stages in institutional, managerial and technical levels of governance and identify 8 success factors (independent variables) such as legal framework, rule of law, hierarchical control, public service delivery, leadership, training, motivation and civil participation affecting the effective policy implementation.

In the pursuit of satisfying the purposes, the present study employed a four-step methodology:

\textsuperscript{20} The beneficiaries selected by WLSGs at before verification stage
\textsuperscript{21} The beneficiaries selected/verified by UZVGDC at during & after verification stage
1. The first step consists of analysis of available statistics on program content, allocations and coverage. An indicative list of the sources of secondary data is given below:
   a. Documents (letters, agendas, progress reports)
   b. Archival records (Service records, organizational charts, budgets etc.)
   c. Interviews (typically closed-ended, but also focused, structured & surveys are possible)
   d. Direct observations (formal or casual; useful to have multiple observers)
   e. Participant observation (assuming a role in the situations & the events)
   f. Physical artifacts

2. The second step consists of eight (8) case studies relating with violation of VGD beneficiary selection criteria and selection process done by WLSGs was identified by UZVGDC during verification stage in December, 2010 at Raiganj upazila. These case studies are the empirical evidence of Before Verification Stage as an unsuccessful event and violation of selection criteria & process according to the prescribed circular and guideline of MoWCA. The case studies are done by me during field visit February, 2012.

3. The third step consists a self administered survey questionnaire (Annexure III) to examine the impact of VGD program about the VGD beneficiary selection process by program implementers such as upazila level
government officials here after government officials, elected officials, NGO representatives, service providers local level administration UP chairman, UP female members, UP male members, political leaders, journalists & social elites etc. By this self administered questionnaire, I examined the actual scenario happened before verification stage done by WLSGs, during and after verification stage done by UZVGDC. Also this questionnaire ventilate the level of understanding of members of UZVGDC & WLSGs about the program activities, three levels of governance and factors relating with effective VGD program implementation using famous Likert type scale(5 levels scale) system. Using this questionnaire, I was able to cover 203 respondents out of 227 who were the members of both UZVGDC & WLSGs. Moreover, I want to examine the some selected VGD beneficiaries of 2011-2012 cycle through a closed ended questionnaire(Annexure IV) primary knowledge and evaluation about the program activities done by members of WLSGs and UZVGDC before and after verification stages and to identify the existing policy implementation gaps between WLSGs and UZVGDC. Using this questionnaire, I was able to cover 136 respondents out of targeted 180 who were the selected VGD beneficiaries of 2011-2012 VGD cycle.

22 Officials of different ministries & division of GoB serving at upazila level such as upazila women affairs officer, upazila agricultural officer etc
23 Elected representatives such as UZP Chairman, UP Chairmen, male members & female members etc.
24 A psychometric scale commonly involved in research that employs questionnaires & is the most widely used approach to scaling responses in survey research. The scale is named after its inventor, psychologist Rensis Likert. The format of a typical five-level Likert item, for example, could be: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree (Neutral), Agree and Strongly agree.
4. The fourth step will cover in-depth Telephonic Interview method among the members of UZVGDC at Raiganj upazila who are the key persons for VGD program in policy implementation process and local administrators using open ended questionnaire (Annexure V). Using this questionnaire, I was able to cover 24 of 34 members of UZVGDC.

The research works are based on qualitative analysis. The study has been embarked on the basis of two principal sources of data collection. The data for this study was collected both from primary and secondary sources. As primary source, data was collected through case studies, survey questionnaire, telephonic interview and the secondary sources of the facts and data drawn from the existing literatures like research papers, newspaper reports, seminar papers, reports, e-resources on the program and analysis of current documents, evaluations and reports. Primary data was collected from six target groups: (1) Government officials at upazila and union parishad levels, (2) Elected officials both in upazila and union parishad levels, (3) NGO representatives (4) Local elites (5) Journalists (6) Selected VGD beneficiaries from 2011-12 VGD cycle. Moreover, I was appointed as Upazila Nirbahi Officer here after UNO at Raiganj from June 2009 to July 2011 and engaged with the VGD Beneficiary selection process in 2011-12 VGD cycle in November-December, 2010 and was familiar with the VGD program activities in that area. Therefore it was convenient to collect data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI No.</th>
<th>Category of Respondents</th>
<th>Designation/position hold</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upazila level Government Officials (members of UZVGDC)</td>
<td>Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Women Affairs Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Agricultural Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Education Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Implementation Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Health Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Food Controller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Fishery Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upazila Level Elected Officials (members of UZVGDC)</td>
<td>Upazila Chairman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woman Vice Chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAG Officer(^{25}) (head of UPVGDC &amp; members of UZVGDC)</td>
<td>Upazila Livestock Officer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Social Service Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Cooperative Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Youth Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Asstt Education Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Asstt Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Asstt Rural Development officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Jute Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upazila Project Implementation Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UP Chairmen (members of UZVGDC)</td>
<td>UP Chairman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NGO Coordinator (members of UZVGDC)</td>
<td>Assigned NGO Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UP female members (head of WLSGs)</td>
<td>Reserved UP member</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UP male members (members of WLSGs)</td>
<td>UP member</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UP level government official (members of WLSGs)</td>
<td>Union Sub-Asstt. Agricultural Officer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NGO Representatives (members of UZVGDC &amp; WLSGs)</td>
<td>NGO officials assigned for VGD program</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UP secretary (members of UPVGDC)</td>
<td>Government employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Local Elites (members of UPVGDC)</td>
<td>School/College teacher/political leaders</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{25}\) A upazila level government officers and they are appointed by UNO to supervise & coordinate with members of WLSGs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Journalists (observers of selection &amp; verification stage)</th>
<th>Regional Correspondents</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>4.43%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total (Questionnaire for officials)</td>
<td>Members of UZVGDC &amp; WLSGs</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>VGD beneficiaries of 2011-12 cycle</td>
<td>Ultra poor women</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Telephonic Interview</td>
<td>Members of UZVGDC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>363</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2013

The survey questionnaires were developed both in language Bengali (Bangla) and English, to communicate and easy understanding the contents of research to most participants. There were 14.78% members of UZVGDC & 85.22% members of WLSGs out of 203 respondents. Primary data were analyzed and created charts, graphs and table with the help of MS Excel program and analytical part was presented to explain significant incident and personal experiences and opinions of the respondents from open ended questions.
Based on the above sample size distribution, the field survey was carried out by the Upazila Women Affairs Officer hereafter UWAO and it was supervised by me. Also case studies were done by me during field study February, 2012 and Telephonic interview among members of UZVGDC was done by me through telephone and Skype from Seoul National University, Korea.
Chapter III: Overview of VGD Program in Upazila Regions in Bangladesh

III.1. Overview of VGD Program

III.1.1. Historical Background of VGD Program

The VGD program is the largest social safety net program of the GoB that exclusively targets ultra poor households. The target group of VGD program is mainly the destitute & ultra poor women. These include landless and assetless women who are widow, divorced, abandoned, having undernourished children, lactating mothers and women with handicapped husband etc. In Bangladesh, poverty is quantified on the basis of a per capita minimum diet of 2122 calories daily. The term *absolute poor* are used for those who live below this poverty line and nearly 40% of the country's population is considered as absolute poor. *Hard-core poor* describes one who does not have a sufficient income to meet even an energy intake of 1,805 calories and more than 20.5 % are living in hard-core poverty. A new terminology, the WFP is currently attaching to identify the poorest of the poor, is ultra poor/extreme poor. According to the WFP, they are those poor in Bangladesh who live below the poverty line of 1600 calories- the most distressed segment of the population. It is estimated that 10-15 % of the country's population can be seen under this most malnourished group.
The VGD Program was initiated in the wake of the 1974 severe food crisis, is designed to reach those households or women beneficiaries who are at the highest risk of hunger, the poorest and especially female-headed households. The VGD project began as a relief program in November 1975 under the name of Vulnerable Groups Feeding (VGF) with an initial focus on providing food support to destitute women for a two-year period. Then the program was subsequently oriented towards development and renamed Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) in the mid-1980s. In the early 1980s, the then VGF program underwent a reorientation towards more developmental goals. After a period of piloting a number of different approaches, by the mid-1980s the program was delivering a package of development inputs through NGO partners. Recently 750000 VGD beneficiaries households (more than 3.75 million people) across the country receive monthly food ration of 30 kilogram wheat or rice or 25 kilogram fortified flour (Atta) for the household and a development support services (inclusive of life skills and IGAs skills training, health and hygiene awareness, savings and access to credit-microfinance program provided by assigned NGOs) for a two years VGD cycle (24 months) only once for each households in 483 Upazila. The

Table 3.1: Poverty Levels in Bangladesh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute poor</th>
<th>Hard-core poor</th>
<th>Ultra Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily food intake between 1806-2122 cal, 40% population</td>
<td>Daily food intake between 1601-1805 cal, 20.5% population (within absolute poor group)</td>
<td>Daily maximum 1600 cal, 10-15% population (within absolute poor group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

following table shows the picture of countrywide expansion of VGD program from beginning 1975 to 2014:

**Table-3.2: Overview of VGD Program in Bangladesh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl no</th>
<th>VGD cycle</th>
<th>Beneficiaries in Bangladesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>87000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>29000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>57000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>127000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>268000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>449000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>535000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>544000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>550000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>466000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>450000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>448850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>430000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>486440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>486440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>750000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>750000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DWA, MoWCA

The following table shows the picture of Raiganj upazila VGD program from beginning 1995 to 2014:
Table 3.3: Overview of VGD Program in Raiganj, Sirajganj (1995-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl no</th>
<th>VGD cycle</th>
<th>Beneficiaries at Raiganj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>3074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UWAO Office, Raiganj

III.1.2. Purpose of the VGD program

The Vulnerable Group Development activity attempts to improve the socio-economic conditions of poor women who are widowed, divorced, and separated/abandoned or with disabled husband. The Long term purpose of VGD program is to make positive change in livelihood of ultra poor women with attention to protect further deterioration of living conditions. i.e. To develop positive change in socio-economic condition of ultra-poor women so that they can achieve to overcome ultra poverty level crossing over the existing food insecurity, malnutrition, economic insecurity and lower social status successfully (VGD Guideline, 2010).
The immediate or short-term purposes of VGD program are:

a) To ensure free and fair VGD beneficiary selection ultra poor women;

b) To increase food consumption to the ultra poor households;

c) To create income generation activities (IGAs) through microcredit program;

d) To promote healthy behavior and sanitation and

e) To achieve women empowerment.

III.1.3. VGD Program Implementation & Financial Management

The VGD program is implemented by five levels committees such as Central Coordination Committee (CCC) headed by Minister of MoWCA, to formulate policy implementation process & evaluation of the program; Performance Management Committee (PMC) headed by Director General (DG), Directorate of Woman Affairs (DWA) to monitor and coordinate with Upazila level administration; District VGD committee (DVGDC) headed by Deputy Commissioner (DC) of each district to coordinate between Central Government administration; Upazila VGD Committee (UZVGDC) [Annexure I] headed by Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) of each upazila to implement VGD program by directly supervising & coordinating between the field level elected and government officials ensuring fair VGD beneficiary selection, food delivery, IGAs training and microfinance etc.; Union VGD Committee (UVGDC) headed by UP chairman.
or Transfer Assurance Guide (TAG) officer of each union to compile selected VGD beneficiary, food delivery and preserve official documents ;and finally grass root level committee named as Ward Level Small Group (WLSG) [Annexure II] headed by female ward member of each UP ward is assigned for primary VGD beneficiary selection through open public meeting in each ward according to VGD beneficiary selection criteria and selection process prescribed by MoWCA circular and guideline. (VGD Guideline,2010). Ministry of Food (MoF) is assigned for supply food (rice/wheat/fortified Atta) from Upazila level Local Supply Depot (LSD) according to demand passed by Directorate of Women Affairs. The World Food Program (WFP) is assigned for technical assistance such as training and motivation program for implementing officials, NGO personnel, elected officials and selected beneficiaries for IGAs; provide logistic supports and find out program impact evaluation. The assigned NGO provide technical support to beneficiaries such as social awareness build up, beneficiary selection, training & motivation for IGAs, microfinance for self-employment and savings management to selected beneficiaries. The extent of SSNPs and VGD program is gradually increasing over the years. However, in terms of share of public expenditure, investment on SSNPs and VGD program has been increasing since 2000s. However, very recently, more specifically during the fiscal years of FY2009-2010, FY2010-2011 and 2011-2012 higher targets have been fixed for providing social security of the poor and the following table shows the comparative picture of budget allocation of last three fiscal year in Bangladesh :

Table 3.4: Budget Allocation for SSNPs & VGD program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>FY 2009-2010 (Tk in million)</th>
<th>FY 2010-2011 (Tk in million)</th>
<th>FY 2011-2012 (Tk in million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSNPs</td>
<td>19470</td>
<td>22700</td>
<td>70530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGD</td>
<td>5951</td>
<td>6383</td>
<td>9753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Budget documents of GoB, MoF
Diagram-3.1: VGD Program Administration and Finance Management

The VGD Program Administration & Financial Management
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Source: Created by Researcher, 2013
III.2. VGD Beneficiary Selection

III.2.1. Beneficiaries of VGD Program

The beneficiaries of VGD program are rural extreme or ultra poor women. The rationale for benefiting them is based on the assumption that they are relatively deprived in society, have little scope to earn money; have limited employment opportunities; have limited opportunities of receiving loans; have no part in the decision making process and the condition of their households is vulnerable. The concentration of beneficiaries under different districts depends on the concentration of poverty as identified through population density, vulnerability analysis and mapping exercise. The number of cards allocated to each of the upazila is decided according to the food insecurity and vulnerability map, which has been jointly established by the Government and WFP. The allocation of cards to each union is done according to the population density, vulnerability and the size of the population. The finally selected beneficiaries receive food grain 30 kg of rice or 25 kg of wheat flour per month for 24 months and IGAs training for microcredit program.

III.2.2. VGD Beneficiary Selection Criteria

According to the circular published by the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs (MoWCA) of Bangladesh memo no-MoWCA/ShaU-2/11/2010-46 dated 02-11-2010(Section 1(1)-(4)) and VGD program
implementation guideline 2010, the major criteria for beneficiary women selection are described in section 1 as follows:

**III.2.2.1. General Criteria**

The VGD beneficiary selection committee will select prospective female headed households among extreme destitute & ultra poor family with physically and mentally sound for 24 months cycle (widowed, divorced, separated, deserted women or women with disabled husbands).

**III.2.2.2. InclusionCriteria**

According to the ‘inclusion’ criteria, a household should meet at least four of the following criteria, and those meeting all five will be given priority:

1. Extreme food unsecured households i.e., Consumes less than two square meals per day;
2. Landless households or having less than 0.15 acre of land;
3. Very poor housing conditions (construction materials such as wall, roofs, pillars, doors and water & sanitation facilities);
4. Extremely low and irregular family income (less than Tk 300($4) per month) from daily or casual labor; and having no specific source of income;
5. Household headed by a woman with no adult male income earner and no other source of income.

**III.2.2.3. Exclusion Criteria:** There are three ‘exclusion’ criteria stating that no VGD card will be provided to a woman in any of the following categories is present even the above 4/5 criteria fulfilled:

1. Woman not within the 18–49 years age groups;
2. Women who is already member of other food and/or cash assistance government programs;

3. Woman who was a VGD cardholder just immediate previous any of two VGD cycles (for 2011-12 cycle consider previous two cycles 2007-08 and 2009-2010)

**III.2.2.4. Additional Criteria:**

1. One family shall get only one VGD card

2. Selected women/VGD beneficiaries have right to get VGD card unconditionally and without money/value. They should not be compelled to provide service or money to anybody receiving VGD card.

**III.2.3. VGD Beneficiaries Selection Process**

According to the latest circular published by the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs (MoWCA) of Bangladesh memo no-MoWCA/ShaU-2/11/2010-46 dated 02-11-2010 and VGD program implementation guideline 2010, the procedure for selecting the VGD women is as follows:

**III.2.3.a (Step 1):** Union VGD Committee (UVGDC) takes measures for disseminating terms and conditions and issues directions for selecting VGD women in each UP Ward within the Union Parishad (UP). In association with, UVGDC form Ward Level Small Group (WLSG) for each ward consisting of 4 members headed by UP female member with male UP member, UP level government officer and assigned non-government organization (NGO) representative.

**III.2.3.b.(Step 2):** WLSG clearly informs the selection process and selection criteria of VGD women beneficiaries through a open public meeting
which is supposed to be held at each UP ward. The WLSG takes necessary measures for the presence of all people of the village. At the open public meeting, necessary information with regard to the operation of VGD program along with the terms and conditions for receiving the benefit and the criteria for selecting the beneficiaries are elucidated. It is expected that through such open public meeting a preliminary idea about prospective women beneficiaries or primary VGD beneficiary list and their particulars can be obtained. With the active collaboration of NGO, the male & female members of UP are assigned to prepare the primary VGD beneficiary list of the eligible beneficiaries of VGD.

**III.2.3.c.(Step 3):** WLSGs visit each household of prospective/primary beneficiaries. Then WLSG prepare the prescribed Table 1 (Primary Table to determine destitute criteria for VGD beneficiary selection program) [Annexure IX]) for the primary VGD beneficiary list for VGD program and it should be signed by all 4 members of each WLSG. Finally WLSG submit the tabular form primary VGD beneficiary list to Union VGD committee (UVGDC) within the given time frame in the circular.

**III.2.3.d.(Step 4):** The UVGDC collects the primary VGD beneficiary lists of eligible women from all WLSGs within the Union and prepares a final list for the Union as a whole in the Table 2 (Annexure X) for final VGD beneficiary list and verifies it as much as possible. Then after signing by the chairman & UP secretary, UVGDC forwards the final list of the union to the Upazila VGD committee (UZVGDC) within the prescribed time frame.
III.2.3.e.(Step 5): As the chairman of the Upazila VGD committee, the UNO approves the final VGD beneficiary list after decision from UZVGC meeting and signs/endorses the complete final list as prescribed Table 2(Annexure X). The Upazila Women Affairs Officer (UWAO) as a member secretary of UZVGC also signs the final VGD beneficiary list.

III.2.3.f.(Step 6): The UNO sends back the final list of VGD women to the concerned UVGDC. The UVGDC preserves the final list in the VGD file and makes necessary arrangements for displaying a copy of the same in the notice board of the UP office. At the same time, the union office informs the women included in the list as well as the benefits which they are supposed to receive.

III.2.3.g.(Step 7): The UZVGC can verify the received beneficiary list of VGD women of the Union if any irregularity is found in it. As the chairman of the UZVGC, the Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) himself can verify the final list with the other UZVGC members physically at union level open public meeting or initiate the necessary verification by forming a committee consisting of 2-3 members of UZVGC. In that case, the verification report must be signed by the verification committee. After reviewing the primary VGD list of VGD women of the union by UNO himself or the report of the upazila verification committee, the Upazila VGD committee prepares a complete list of VGD women of the Upazila.

III.2.3.h.(Step 8): In the presence of Upazila Women Affairs Officer (UWAO) and Transfer Assurance Guide (TAG) Officer, the UVGDC formally distributes VGD cards among selected VGD women/beneficiaries
physically. However, prior to do so it announces the venue and the date from where and when the cards will be distributed. The following diagram exhibits the whole selection process as described above:
Diagram 3.2: VGD Beneficiary Selection Process

Source: Created by Researcher, 2013
III.3. Comparative Case Study between Before & After Verification Stages at Raiganj in 2011-2012 Cycle

III.3.1. Improvement of Beneficiary Selection Process by Verification in 2011-2012 Cycle

The VGD beneficiary selection procedure of 2011-2012 cycle was started 483 UZPs including study upazila Raiganj in the month of November, 2010 to select 2170 beneficiaries for the entire upazila area among 9 unions area. According to the prescribed circular published by MoWCA, there was held a UZVGDC meeting chaired by UNO with Upazila level 15 departmental government officers and all UP chairmen, 9 TAG officers, NGO representative. The time frame for the beneficiary selection was from 10 November to 15 December, 2010. According to circular of MoWCA memo no- MoWCA/Sec Dev-2/11/2010-416, dated 2 Nov 2010 here after circular of MoWCA & VGD Program Implementation Guideline 2010 of MoWCA here after Guideline of MoWCA, UZVGDC redistributed the total numbers of 2170 cards into 9 unions basing on the population density, poverty level and instructed to 9 Transfer Assurance Officer (TAG) officers to finish the beneficiary selection procedure by 81 WLSGs taking direct interviews of the prospective women. Then according section III.2.3.a, 9 UVGDC headed by TAG officers of 9 UP formed 81 WLSGs. According to selection process described in Section III.2.3.a-c of that circular and Guideline of MoWCA, 81

26 A upazila level government officers and they are appointed by UNO to supervise & coordinate with members of WLSGs.
WLSGs prepared primary VGD beneficiary list using Table 1\textsuperscript{27}(Annexure III) and they submitted all list to the UVGDC as the following Table in numbers:

**Table 3.5: Primary VGD Beneficiaries Prepared by WLSGs (BVS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of UP</th>
<th>Primary VGD Beneficiaries done by WLSG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward 1</td>
<td>Ward 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhamaina gar</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonakhara</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhubil</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorka</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalka</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangnali</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahimagachha</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandakotona</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total** 2704


According to section III.2.3.e, after receiving consolidation list from UVGDC, Upazila Women Affairs Officer presented the beneficiary list to UZVGDC for final approval. There was a long discussion regarding the primary VGD beneficiary list prepared by WLSGs, most of the members including Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO), Upazila level officers raised their some specific complaints such as 81 WLSGs did not select these beneficiaries through open public meeting at Ward level and they did not visit prospective beneficiaries received from various sources against primary list according to section III.2.3.a-c of beneficiary selection process. Finally UZVGDC decided to verify the whole primary beneficiary list through each union level open meeting in front of local people, social elites, journalists, and political leaders etc according to section III.2.3.g. After verifying some complain from different unions, it was found that primary list done by WLSGs were not

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Name of UP   | Primary VGD Beneficiaries done by WLSG | Total |
\hline
\hline
Dhamaina gar | 21 21 21 29 30 21 10 21 19 | 193   |
Sonakhara    | 21 31 26 22 22 24 20 26 26 | 218   |
Dhubil       | 41 36 30 29 30 35 26 33 39 | 326   |
Gorka        | 31 35 32 48 50 31 21 35 43 | 377   |
Nalka        | 40 53 35 39 36 40 50 50 34 | 377   |
Pangnali     | 51 49 40 55 40 46 55 43 40 | 419   |
Brahimagachha| 39 20 52 50 37 35 40 16 31 | 320   |
Chandakotona | 38 31 28 27 18 16 26 14 31 | 323   |
Dhangura     | 218 299 326 377 419 320 323 2704 |
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Table for Primary VGD beneficiary list for selection process done by WLSG}
\end{table}
done properly according to the selection criteria described in section III.2.2.1-4. According to sec III.2.3.g, members of UZVGDC lead by UNO verified the Primary list through open public meeting at each UP office in presence of members of WLSGs, TAG officers, UP chairman, local elites, journalists, prospective beneficiaries etc. The UZVGDC verified each and every primary listed VGD beneficiary physically, interviewing and justified the given information in Table 1 (Annexure III) prepared by WLSGs and selection process, criteria and Guideline of MoWCA. After whole verification from 9 unions, the UZVGDC cancelled those prospective beneficiaries who did not entitled or cover prescribed criteria Sec.III.2.2.1-4 and selection process Section III.2.3(a)-(h) and included the same number of fit women those who covered criteria as following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of UP</th>
<th>Number of Cancelled VGD Beneficiary done by UZVGDC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward1</td>
<td>Ward2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhamainagar</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somdikha</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhulil</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurka</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalka</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangaski</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmagacha</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandaskona</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhangara</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


After Verification of Primary VGD beneficiary list, the UZVGDC consolidated the total number of allotted 2170 VGD beneficiary list as Final VGD beneficiary list as following table:
Table 3.7: Final VGD Beneficiaries Prepared by UZVGDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of UP</th>
<th>Final VGD Beneficiary done by UZVGDC committee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward1</td>
<td>Ward2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhamainagar</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonakbara</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhubil</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurka</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalka</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangashi</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramagacha</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandakona</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhangora</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally about 25% of total 2704 prospective beneficiaries were listed by WLSG who were not eligible/fit for VGD beneficiaries according to prescribed selection criteria Sec III.2.2.1-4 and selection process Sec III.2.3.(a)-(h) and VGD Guideline 2010 as following table:

Table 3.8: Total VGD Beneficiaries in Raiganj and Cancelled/Included with Percentage in 2011-2012 cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of UP</th>
<th>Beneficiaries per UP (Population density &amp; Vulnerability)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (Selected by WLSG)</th>
<th>Cancelled / Included Beneficiaries</th>
<th>% of Cancel/ inclusion by verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhamainagar</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonakbara</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhubil</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurka</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalka</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangashi</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramagacha</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandakona</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhangora</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>25%(Average)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above case study events/reports of Raiganj of 2011-2012 cycle ventilates that primary beneficiary selection process done by WLSGs was not followed by prescribed selection criteria & process (described in section III.2.) of MoWCA on the other hand, final verification process done by UZVGDC was completely followed by circular & guideline of MoWCA. As a result, about 25% primary beneficiary (689 beneficiaries out of 2704) was identified at the after verification stage done by UZVGDC as unfit or faulty which is a significant improvement of beneficiary selection process. I shall describe 8 individual cases chosen from those 689 beneficiaries which are evidences of violation of selection criteria & process (described in section III.2.2-3) of MoWCA by WLSGs at before verification stage and these were identified by UZVGDC at after verification stage.
III.3.2. Evidence from Case Studies & Violation of VGD

Beneficiary Selection Criteria and Selection Process

After Verification stage done by UZVGDC, 689 primary VGD beneficiaries (25%) were identified as unfit or faulty for final VGD beneficiaries who were primarily selected by WLSGs at Before Verification stage. From the above verification stage it was found that most of 689 cancelled beneficiaries were included into the categories of (i) previous anyone VGD cycle (2007-08, 2009-10) beneficiaries, (ii) financially rich or solvent women having more than 0.15 acre of agricultural land, (iii) having specific source of income like business or shops, (iv) lifelong beneficiaries of government welfare program such as widow allowance or old aged allowance, (v) receiving bribe by UP chairman or male members or female members or political activists or influential persons from prospective beneficiaries, (vi) close relative of UP chairman, members female members, (vii) double card for same family etc. By interviewing the cancelled women from final VGD beneficiaries, members of WLSG, TAG officers, journalists, the researcher has collected some specific information and official documents. Depending upon that information, the following 8 case studies collected from cancelled 689 primary VGD beneficiaries those are evidence of violation of VGD beneficiary selection process & criteria and VGD Guideline 2010 of MoWCA. These case studies were done by me with the help of other official personnel of Raiganj upazila in February, 2012. For ethical perspective of research, I
describe 8 case studies using symbolic name and without address and personal identities as follows:

**Case Study 1: Ms A, An old woman**

Ms A, 46 years old a widow woman, lives in the Dhangora Union under Raiganj, Sirajganj District. Her husband died 8 years ago and she lives with 4 children (one son and 3 daughters). She was selected as a prospective VGD beneficiary by WLSGs in the VGD cycle 2011-2012. According to the given information in Table 01 prepared by WLSGs (Primary Table to determine destitute criteria for VGD beneficiary selection program) (Annexure IX), her family have 3 square meals daily, 0.15 acre land ownership, bamboo fencing housing structure, family headed by male (her son), no earning member, no NGO membership and was not a VGD beneficiary any one of previous two VGD cycles (2007-08, 2009-10). When UZVGDC verified primary VGD beneficiary list prepared by WLSGs at the Dhangora UP office open public meeting in December, 2010, it was found that Ms A age was 67 years according to her National ID card, she has 1.25 acre of agricultural land, semi-concrete structure house and family income is also sound and these verified information was checked by TAG officer & Upazila Livestock Officer and local elites supported the newly found information. Assigned NGO representative told that she is looked after by her 32 years age old son and vegetables salesman in the local market. Also Ms A confessed that she has 1.25 acre of agricultural land with semi concrete structure house (Adha paka Bari) and her two daughters has already got...
married. When members of WLSG were asked about their wrongful information given in the primary list especially about her age 67 years, they confessed that they did not verify A’s personal information visiting her house. According to circular of MoWCA (described in section III.2.2), selection criteria Sec.III.2.2.2 (1)(2)(3)(5), and Sec.III.2.2.3(1) was violated by WLSG and Ms A is an old woman and economically rich and was unfit for VGD beneficiary. Finally UZVGDC decided under section III.2.3.(g) of that circular to cancel Ms A from final VGD beneficiary list after Verification stage.

Case Study 2: Ms B, A rich woman

Ms B, 38 years old woman, lives in the Dhubil Union under Raiganj, Sirajganj. She lives with 3 children (two sons and one daughter). She was selected as a prospective VGD beneficiary by WLSG in the VGD cycle 2011-2012. According to the given information in Table 01) [Annexure IX] prepared by WLSG, her family has food insecurity having 1 or 2 square meals daily, 0.11 acre land ownership, Semi-building (Adha paka bari) housing structure with corrugated iron sheet, family headed by male member-her husband, a daily agricultural labor, no NGO or BRDB (Bangladesh Rural Development Board) membership and was not a VGD beneficiary any one of previous two VGD cycles (2007-08, 2009-10). When UZVGDC verified primary VGD beneficiary list prepared by WLSG at the Dhubil UP office open public meeting in December, 2010, it was found that Ms B belongs to 2.75 acre of agricultural land according to her National ID card, semi-
concrete structure house and family income is also sound and these verified information was checked by TAG officer & Upazila Youth Development Officer assigned for Dhubil UP. One local journalist told to the UZVGDC that Ms B has good financial condition having enough agricultural land and she has no right to receive VGD benefits. Ms B also told that members of WLSG did not visit her households. When members of WLSG including female and male UP members were asked about her financial status, they replied that they did not verify her personal information visiting her house. Also they recommended to cancel Ms B from VGD beneficiary list. Moreover, her family is male headed agricultural farmer. According to circular of MoWCA (described in section III.2.2), destitute criteria Section III.2.2.2. (2) (3) (4) (5) was violated by WLSG and Ms B is a rich woman and was unfit for VGD beneficiary. Finally UZVGDC decided under section III.2.3.(g) of that circular to cancel Ms B from final VGD beneficiary list after Verification stage.

Case Study 3: Ms C, Husband Grocery Shopkeeper

Ms C, 35 years old woman, lives in the Chandaikona, under Raiganj Upazila, Sirajganj. She lives with 2 daughters. Ms C was selected as prospective VGD beneficiary by WLSG in the VGD cycle 2011-12. According to the given information in Table 01 prepared by WLSG (Annexure IX), her family has food insecurity having often starving daily, 0.04 acre homestead land ownership, Straw fencing with CI sheet roof, family headed by male member-her husband, no specific family income, no NGO or BRDB
or any other organization membership and was not a VGD beneficiary any one of previous two VGD cycles (2007-08, 2009-10). When UZVGDC verified Primary VGD beneficiary list prepared by WLSG at Chandaikona UP office open public meeting in December, 2010, it was found that Ms C’s husband has a grocery shop at Chandaikona market having monthly income 8000-9000 Tk. She lives with her family in a semi-concrete house with CI sheet roof and hygiene sanitation system and pure drinking water. Her two daughters are studying in Chandaikona Govt. Primary School in class II and class V. This verified information was collected by TAG officer & Upazila Cooperative Officer assigned for Chandaikona UP and one local journalist told that Ms C has good financial condition and she can live smoothly by her husband business earnings. Assigned NGO representative mention that she has received microcredit from BRAC local branch for her husband’s business. Moreover when she was asked by one of committee member Upazila Agricultural Officer, she confessed about her husband grocery business and microcredit from BRAC and she told that members of WLSG did not visit her household. When WLSG members including UP Chairman were asked about her received information and financial status especially definite sound monthly income from grocery business, they replied that they did not verify her personal information visiting her house. According to circular of MoWCA (described in section III.2.2) selection criteria Sec.III.2.2.2 (1)(3)(4)(5), and Sec.III.2.2.3(2) was violated by WLSG and her husband has good source of income and was unfit for VGD beneficiary. Finally UZVGDC decided under section III.2.3 (g) of that circular to cancel
Ms C’s name from final VGD beneficiary list after Verification stage.

**Case Study 4: Ms D, A beneficiary of Widow Allowance**

Ms D, 43 years old woman, lives in the Chandaikona Union under Raiganj Upazila, Sirajganj District. She lives with one son and she was selected as a prospective VGD beneficiary by WLSG in the VGD cycle 2011-12. According to the given information in Table 01 prepared by WLSG (Annexure IX), she leads her family with extreme poverty having one or two square meals daily, 0.06 acre homestead land ownership, Straw fencing house (Choner ghor), family headed by male member - her only one son, no specific family income, no NGO or BRDB or any other organization membership and was not a VGD beneficiary anyone of previous two VGD cycles (2007-08, 2009-10). When UZVGDC verified primary VGD beneficiary list prepared by WLSG at Chandaikona UP office open public meeting in December 2010, it was found that Ms D’s son is a Van owner and puller having monthly income 5000-6000 Tk and he is unmarried young man and he looks after his mother. Assigned TAG officer & Upazila Cooperative Officer also told to the committee that her husband has died 5 years back and she is now a lifelong beneficiary of Widow Allowance provided by Social Welfare Department under Ministry of Social Welfare and it was confirmed by Upazila Social Welfare Officer. Members of WLSG concealed her as a widow and showed her husband alive. Assigned NGO representative mention that her son has received amount of 10000 Tk micro
credits from NGO ASA (Association of Social Advancement) local branch for her son’s business. WLSG members including UP Chairman admitted about her widow allowance from Social welfare Department and her son’s monthly income from Van pulling. Also they recommended to cancel Ms D’s name from VGD beneficiary list. According to circular of MoWCA (described in section III.2.2), selection criteria section III.2.2.2(1)(4)(5), & Section III.2.2.3(2) was violated by WLSG and Ms D is a permanent beneficiary of widow allowance and was unfit for VGD beneficiary. Finally UZVGDC decided under section III.2.3. (g) of that circular to cancel Ms D’s name from final VGD beneficiary list after Verification stage.

Case Study 5: Ms E, A Beneficiary of 2009-2010 Cycle

Ms E, 30 years old woman, lives in the Sonakhara Union under Raiganj Upazila, Sirajganj District. She lives with two sons and her husband. Ms E was selected as a prospective VGD beneficiary by WLSGs in the VGD cycle 2011-2012. According to the given information in Table 01 prepared by WLSG (Annexure IX), Ms E leads her family with extreme poverty having one or two square meals daily, 0.03 acre homestead land ownership, Straw fencing house (Choner ghor), family headed by male member-her husband as daily labor, no specific family income, no NGO or BRDB or any other organization membership and was not a VGD beneficiary anyone of previous two VGD cycles (2007-08, 2009-10). When UZVGDC verified primary VGD beneficiary list prepared by WLSG at Sonakhara UP office open public meeting in December, 2010, it was found that her husband is a carpenter.
having monthly income 7000-9000 Tk. Her two sons are studying primary in class III and high school in class VIII. Upazila Woman Affairs officer & member secretary of UZVGDC informed to the committee members that Ms E was a VGD beneficiary in 2009-2010 cycle and according to VGD beneficiary criteria Sec III.2.2.3 (3) she is unfit for next two VGD cycles. Assigned NGO representative mention that she has been trained for IGAs on domestic poultry firm in the last cycle and has received amount of 10000 TK micro credits from NGO Grameen Bank local branch for her poultry firm. Members of WLSG including female member identified her as a VGD beneficiary in 2009-2010 cycle and microcredit receiver from Grameen Bank and they admitted that they did the mistake due to lack of information. Also they recommended to cancel her name from VGD beneficiary list. According to circular of MoWCA (described in section III.2.2), selection criteria III.2.2.2(4)(5), & section III.2.2.3(2)(3) was violated by WLSG and Ms E was a VGD beneficiary of previous 2009-10 cycle and was unfit for VGD beneficiary. Finally UZVGDC decided under section III.2.3 (g) of that circular to cancel E’s name from final VGD beneficiary list after Verification stage.

Case Study 6: Ms F, One family proposed for two cards

Ms F, 24 years old woman, lives in the Sonakhara Union under Raiganj Upazila, Sirajganj District. She lives with one son and her husband. Ms F was selected as a prospective VGD beneficiary by WLSG in the VGD cycle 2011-2012. According to the given information in Table 01 prepared by
WLSG (Annexure IX), she lives with her family with extreme poverty having
two or three square meals daily, 0.05 acre of homestead land ownership, soil
build house (matir ghor) with straw made roof, family headed by male
member-her husband as daily labor, no specific family income, no NGO or
BRDB or any other organization membership and was not a VGD beneficiary
previous two VGD cycles (2007-2008, 2009-2010). When UZVGDC verified
primary VGD beneficiary list prepared by WLSG at Sonakhara UP office
open public meeting in December, 2010, Upazila Woman Affairs Officer &
member secretary of UZVGDC informed to the committee members that Ms
F and Ms Z (48 years) who is also included as the primary VGD
beneficiary for 2011-12 cycle and are member of the same family and Ms
F is daughter-in-law of Ms Z living together. When the UZVGDC members
asked them about their family relationship, they confessed themselves.
Moreover local UP chairman mention that they are very poor family and her
son takes care of his widow mother in a poor way and finally he
recommended to UZVGDC to consider Ms Z as a VGD beneficiary in 2011-
12 VGD cycle and according to VGD beneficiary criteria sec. III.2.2.4(1) Ms
F is unfit for VGD beneficiary. After discussion members of WLSG and
local elites, UZVGDC committee considered Ms Z as a destitute Widow
woman. According to circular of MoWCA (described in section III.2.2),
selection criteria Sec III.2.2.4 (1) was violated by WLSG and Ms F was unfit
for VGD beneficiary. Finally UZVGDC decided under section III.2.3 (g) of
that circular to cancel Ms F’s name from final VGD beneficiary list and
include Ms F as a destitute woman under criteria Sec III.4.2.2 and Sec III.4.2.3 of that circular after Verification stage.

**Case Study 7: Ms G, Bribe 3000Tk ($38) to male UP member**

Ms G, 45 years old woman, lives in the Nalka Union under Raiganj Upazila, Sirajganj District. She lives with 7 sons and daughters and her husband. Ms G was selected as a prospective VGD beneficiary by WLSG in the VGD cycle 2011-12. According to the given information in Table 01 prepared by WLSG (Annexure IX), she leads her family with extreme poverty having two or three square meals daily, landless family, Straw fencing house (Choner ghor) to Khas land (govt owned land), family headed by male member-her husband as fisherman, no specific family income, no NGO or BRDB or any other organization membership and was not a VGD beneficiary previous two VGD cycles (2007-08, 2009-10). When UZVGDC verified primary VGD beneficiary list prepared by WLSG at Nalka UP office open public meeting in December, 2010, in her National ID card, it is mention that her husband is dead and she is a widow woman. Then Upazila Woman Affairs officer informed to the committee members that Ms G is permanent beneficiary of widow allowance under ministry of Social Welfare from 2007 and she is getting 300 Tk per month and according to VGD beneficiary criteria Sec III.2.2.3(2) of MoWCA circular, she is unfit for VGD program. When it was asked to WLSG members, they remain silent. Upazila Nirbahi
Officer declared to the meeting to cancel Ms G’s name due to violation of aforesaid criteria. Then she suddenly burst into tears and told UZVGDC that **she paid bribe 3000 TK ($38) to her male member Mr Y for her VGD card.** Then UNO asked to Male member Mr Y about her allegation against him and said bribery, he was remained silent. After cross interrogation between them, it was proved that male UP member received 3000Tk bribery from the widow woman Ms G and they showed her husband alive. Then the received money was returned back to her. According to Circular of MoWCA (described in section III.2.2), selection criteria section III.2.2.4 (2) was violated by male UP member and she was unfit for VGD beneficiary. Finally UZVGDC decided under section III.2.3 (g) of that circular to cancel Ms G’s name from final VGD beneficiary list after Verification stage.

**Case Study 8: Ms H, A close relative of UP Chairman**

Ms H, 38 years old woman, lives in the Pangasi Union under Raiganj Upazila, Sirajganj District. She lives with 2 sons, one daughter and her husband. Ms H was selected as a prospective VGD beneficiary by WLSG in the VGD cycle 2011-2012. According to the given information in Table 01 prepared by WLSG (Annexure IX), she lives her family with poverty and starvation, landless family, brick wall with CI sheet house (Tiner ghor) on Khas land (govt owned land), family headed by male member-her husband as daily labor, no specific family income, no NGO or BRDB or any other organization membership and was not a VGD beneficiary previous two VGD cycles (2007-08, 2009-10). When UZVGDC verified primary VGD
beneficiary list prepared by WLSG at Pangasi UP office open public meeting in December, 2010, Upazila Woman Affairs officer informed to the committee members that **Ms H was a VGD beneficiary in 2007-08 VGD cycle** and according to VGD beneficiary criteria section III.2.2.3(3) of MoWCA circular, she is unfit for VGD program. When it was asked to WLSG members, they remain silent. One of local elites informed to the committee that **Ms H is close relative (niece) of UP Chairman Mr W** and she is not an ultra poor woman rather **she is owner of 0.67 acre of agricultural land** with good housing condition and economic status. Also female member Mr X mentioned that UP chairman influenced her to include his relative name and other WLSG members supported this allegation. In this allegation against UP chairman, Mr W could not refuse Ms H as a close relative and replied that he did not insist WLSG members to include her niece in primary VGD list. Then UZVGDC declared to the meeting to cancel H’s name due to violation of aforesaid criteria. According to Circular of MoWCA (described in section III.2.2), selection criteria Sec III.2.2.2 (1)(2)(3), & Sec III.2.2.3(2) was violated by UP chairman and Ms H was unfit for VGD beneficiary. Finally UZVGD committee decided under section III.2.3 (g) of that circular to Cancel Ms H’s name from final VGD beneficiary list after Verification stage.

I also summarize the above 8 cases studies comparing between Before & After verification stages in **Annexure VIII** with significant findings.
Chapter IV: Analysis

IV.1. Global / National Environment

The VGD program is one of the most popular welfare programs in Bangladesh. This program was first initiated from the direct assistance and supervision of the WFP in 1970s. After four decades the program is implementing through GoB fund & supervision with technical assistance from the WFP. Though this is a great achievement and success for national context, it has also some sorts of problems in program implementation. In this study I want to focus on the problems /issues that have affected to VGD beneficiary selection process. The VGD beneficiary selection process is done for every cycle (two years) throughout the country in Bangladesh. This study is based on the VGD cycle of 2011-2012. According to the circular prescribed by MoWCA (described in section III.2.2-3) and VGD Program Implementation Guideline 2010, VGD beneficiary selection process was started from 1st November, 2010 and was finished before 15 December, 2010 so that beneficiaries would have received food from January, 2011. Depending on the selection criteria & process (Described in Sec III.2.2-3 of this paper), I prepared three types of survey questionnaires for data collection about the selection process of cycle 2011-2012. The first type of survey questionnaire was a self administered questionnaire (Annexure III) for government and elected officials working in the upazila & union level and was applied to them who were the members of UZVGDC and WLSGs. This questionnaire is
divided into two parts: Before Verification Stage based on primary beneficiary selection process done by WLSGs and After Verification Stage based on final beneficiary verification process done by UZVGDC. Before Verification Stage is described those events which were happened during the primary VGD beneficiary selection process done by WLSGs and After Verification Stage is described those events which were happened during final VGD beneficiary selection process done by UZVGDC in November-December, 2010 (For 2011-2012 cycle). Both stages are consisted of 25 questions on the basis of 8 success factors of governance (described in Sec II.3) such as Legal framework (5 issues), Rule of law (3 issues), Hierarchical Control (3 issues), Public Service Delivery (4 issues), Leadership (2 issues), Training (4 issues), Motivation (2 issues) and Civil participation (2 issues) from three levels of governance: Institutional, Managerial and Technical. The structure of the questionnaire was constructed in the Likert scale type (5 scales): Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral (neither disagree nor agree), Agree and Strongly agree format. In this survey data was collected from a total of 203 respondents out of 227 who were members of both UZVGDC & WLSGs. The second type of survey questionnaire (Annexure IV) is assigned for Beneficiaries of 2011-2012 cycle and is also consisted of two parts: Before Verification Stage and After Verification Stage having 9 closed–ended questions (Yes/No type) in each part. The questions are in both parts similar in pattern so that I can compare the two stages easily. The purpose of this survey was to know about the perception, idea and common views of the selected beneficiaries regarding what happened in the selection process in
November – December, 2010. The questionnaire was included the issues of public notice for beneficiary selection, open public meeting, attendance in open public meeting, beneficiaries households visit, fairness or biasness of selection process, presence of TAG officers/NGO representatives during primary selection or final verification and overall satisfaction of beneficiaries about the selection process in 2010. By this survey questionnaire, 136 VGD beneficiaries were interviewed out of 180 VGD beneficiaries from 9 unions of Raiganj upazila. As most of beneficiaries are either illiterate or having primary education, I prepared Yes or No type questions. For easy understanding and easy communication, both of the questionnaires were translated into native language Bengali with original English. The third type questionnaire (Annexure V) was telephonic interview with the members of UZVGDC. The purpose of telephonic interview was to know opinion of the members of UZVGDC about the activities of beneficiary selection process in 2011-2012 VGD cycle, problems, and leadership role of female UP members and UNO and further suggestions to improve this program and there were 8 specific open-ended questions in the Telephonic Interview Questionnaire. I was able to reach 24 respondents out of 34 members of UZVGDC. The respondents are Upazila Parishad Chairman, Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO), and Upazila level government officers, UP chairmen, TAG Officers, Upazila NGO Representative and Upazila Woman Affairs Officer etc (Table 2.1). The survey was done by the coordination of Upazila Women Affairs Officer (UWAO) of Raiganj upazila asking questions to the beneficiaries.
In this chapter, I shall compare gaps between before verification stage and after verification stage using respondents' answers/responses based on three sets of questionnaires consecutively. I shall discuss results of the surveys using the average given values of respondents in each question with graphical interpretation in questionnaire (Annexure III) for public officials and elected officials and opinions of beneficiaries. Moreover, I shall add the responses of beneficiaries from field survey and opinions of members of UZVGDC from telephonic interview. Finally, I shall synthesize these results with major findings.

IV.1.1 Institutional/Legislative Level of Governance

The institutional/legislative level of governance is concerned with VGD beneficiary selection guideline, circulars, rules and regulations of MoWCA. Several issues such as selection criteria & process open public meeting for prospective beneficiary selection, awareness level of public & elected officials, ensuring fairness and equal opportunities for all ultra poor women etc. have been discussed. According to analytical framework, I shall discuss two important success factors of governance for effective policy implementation in the public institutions as follows-

IV.1.1.1 Legal Framework for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

According to circular of MoWCA described in section III.2.2-3 and VGD program Implementation Guideline, 2010, Ministry of Women &
Children Affairs (MoWCA) is the head authority in the policy making process and instructs the implementation agencies as shown in the diagram 3.1. The respondents (officials) were asked whether members of WLSGs & UZVGDC clearly understood VGD beneficiary selection criteria and selection process in before verification stage & after verification stage respectively and given average values are 1.37 (Strongly Disagree) and 4.69(Strongly agree) which means that most of members of WLSGs could not understand selection criteria and process clearly on the other hand, most of members of UZVGDC understand clearly (Figure 4.1). Secondly the respondents were asked whether WLSGs & UZVGDC arranged open public meeting before verification stage & after verification stage and given average values are 1.43(Strongly Disagree) and 4.61(Strongly agree) respectively which means that most of WLSGs did not arrange open public meeting for primary VGD beneficiary selection process on the other hand, UZVGDC arranged open public meeting according to prescribed circular section III.2.3(b) of MoWCA (Figure 4.1).
Thirdly, the respondents were asked whether members of WLSGs & UZVGDC visited prospective beneficiary’s households physically and 6.40% respondents replied that WLSGs visited (Yes) and 93.60% replied not visited (No) in before verification stage and 98.52% replied that UZVGDC verified physically (Yes) and only 1.47% replied not verified (No) in after verification stage(Figure 4.2) which means that most of members of WLSGs did not visited households on the other hand, UZVGDC verified or interviewed beneficiaries physically according to section III.2.3(c).
Fourthly, the respondents were asked whether awareness level of members of WLSGs & UZVGDC about the objectives and goals of VGD program and given average values are 1.93 (Low) and 4.28 (High) respectively which means that members of WLSGs were not aware on the other hand, UZVGDC were very aware about the goals & objectives of the program (Figure 4.1). Finally the respondents were asked whether WLSGs & UZVGDC did selection & verification process for ultra poor centric and given average values are 1.54(Disagree) and 4.57(Strongly agree) respectively which means selection process done by WLSGs was not ultra poor centric on the other hand, verification process done by UZVGDC was ultra/extreme poor centric(Figure 4.1).

Moreover, according to prescribed circular and Implementation Guideline of MoWCA, each WLSG shall serve public notice mentioning time,
place etc so that all sphere of people including ultra poor women can attend the meeting and clearly explain about the selection process, criteria, number of beneficiaries etc. the public notice will be served by village defense police (VDP). In this regard the selected VGD beneficiaries were asked as respondents how they had known about the primary selection process hereafter selection process or final verification process hereafter verification process done by WLSGs or UZVGDC and 36.76% respondents replied that they were informed by UP chairmen, 61.03% by male/female members, 2.21%(negligible) by village defense police (VDP) and 0% by public notice at before verification stage on the other hand, 1.47% respondents replied that they were informed by UP chairmen, 11.03% by male/female members, 41.18% by village defense police and 46.32% by public notice at after verification stage(Figure 4.3).

**Figure 4.3: Public Notice for Selection & Verification**

![Public Notice for Selection & Verification](image)

Source: Field survey 2013

---

28 Official messengers of union parishad is appointed by UNO and assigned for one VDP for one ward.
These results show that WLSGs did not serve any public notice for primary beneficiary selection process at before verification stage which is gross violation of aforesaid circular and guideline of MoWCA; on the other hand UZVGDC served public notice and it was served by village defense police according to section III.2.3(b). According to section III.2.3(b), WLSGs shall arrange open public meeting at ward level so that selection process can be open, free & fair and people’s participatory and finally WLSGs prepare a prospective VGD beneficiary list in presence of all people to ensure more transparency. In this regard, the respondents were asked whether there held open public meeting at Ward or Union level arranged by WLSGs or UZVGDC respectively and 11.03% beneficiaries replied Yes (held meeting) and 88.97% No (not held meeting) at before verification stage on the other hand, 86.76% beneficiaries replied Yes (held meeting) and 13.24% replied No (not held meeting) at after verification stage (Figure 4.4).

**Figure 4.4: Open Public Meeting for Beneficiary Selection & Verification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Held Open Public Meeting</th>
<th>Before Verification Stage</th>
<th>After Verification Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.03%</td>
<td>86.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.97%</td>
<td>13.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey 2013
These results show that most of WLSGs did not arrange open public meeting at ward level before verification stage on the other hand, UZVGDC arranged open public meeting at union level during verification stage according to section III.2.3 (b). Hence open public meeting arranged by WLSGs is very insignificant and by UZVGDC is very significant. The respondents were asked whether they attended the open public meeting at ward & union level arranged by WLSGs and UZVGDC and 11.03% replied Yes (attend meeting) and 88.97% replied No (not attend meeting) at Before Verification Stage on the other hand, 86.03% replied Yes (attend meeting) and 13.97% replied No (not attend meeting) at After Verification Stage (Figure 4.5). These results show that WLSGs did not ensure attendance of ultra poor women for primary selection according to section III.2.3(b) on the other hand; UZVGDC ensured attendance of primary VGD beneficiaries during verification stage at union level open public meeting according to section III.2.3(g) of that circular. The reason is that WLSGs did not inform properly.

Figure 4.5: Attendance of Beneficiary for Selection & Verification

|                      | Before Verification Stage | After Verification Stage |
|----------------------|****************************|**************************|
| Attend open public meeting | 11.03%                     | 86.03%                    |
|                      | 88.97%                     | 13.97%                    |

Source: Field survey 2013
The respondents were asked whether WLSGs & UZVGDC visited their households & interview them at ward & union office during primary selection & final verification process respectively and 19.12% respondents replied Yes(visit house) and 80.88% replied No(not visit house) at before verification stage on the other hand, 86.03% replied Yes(interview) and 13.97% No(not interview) at after verification stage(Figure 4.6). These results show that most of WLSGs did not visit prospective beneficiary’s households according to section III.2.3(c) on the other hand, UZVGDC interviewed primary listed VGD beneficiaries at UP office according to section III.2.3(g) of that circular.

**Figure 4.6: Households visit & Interviewing for Selection & Verification**

![Bar chart showing visit and interview percentages](chart.png)

Source: Field survey 2013

Besides the above survey results regarding legal framework for beneficiary selection, in the telephonic interview, the members of UZVGDC were asked what the activities of VGD program were regarding beneficiary selection and verification process according the legal framework and rules as a member of UZVGDC and most of them replied that ---
To give opinion to the UZVGDC for fair VGD beneficiaries selection.

To visit the field level selection process done by WLSGs and give necessary advice.

To receive allegation or complain from people about unfair selection process against WLSGs.

Also the respondents were asked what types of problem they had faced during primary VGD beneficiary selection and verification process and they replied that-

- Most of the members of WLSGs were insincere and ignorant about circular & guideline during primary beneficiary selection process due to lack of training & motivation
- There were a lot of political pressures from political leaders to include disqualified or unfit women in the final list
- There were complaints against several members of WLSGs to violate criteria and to receive bribe from prospective ultra poor women.
- There was no priority list, population register or database of prospective women/households to verify the given information collected by WLSGs.
- Moreover some UP chairmen explained that there were shortage of resources, logistic support, skilled manpower and time of WLSGs at before verification stage.
Furthermore the respondents were asked whether the prescribed selection criteria & selection process described in circular & guideline of MoWCA is sufficient or not. Most of the members of UZVGDC commented that the selection process & selection criteria described in the circular and guideline prescribed by MoWCA for VGD beneficiary selection is sufficient and very much clear. They also add the following observations.

- The legal framework is rigid to maintain selection process & criteria, so if it is utilized properly, the selection process must be fair.
- There should be a rule for training program for the members of WLSGs, TAG officers & UZVGDC before starting beneficiary selection process of every cycle so that everybody can aware of selection process & criteria.

### IV.1.1.2. Rule of law for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

The Program Implementation Guideline, 2010 and aforesaid circular of MoWCA are ensuring rule of law in VGD beneficiary selection process i.e., equal opportunity and rights for all ultra poor women to be included as the most vulnerable beneficiaries so that public and elected officials cannot deprive them or they do not bias against laws or rules. In this research, the respondents (officials) were asked whether the selection & verification process done by WLSGs & UZVGDC abided by guideline & circulars of MoWCA and given average values are 1.45(Strongly disagree) and 4.68 (Strongly agree) respectively which means that most of WLSGs did not select
primary VGD beneficiaries according to guideline & circular of MoWCA at the before verification stage on the other hand, UZVGDC verified final VGD beneficiaries according to guideline & circular of MoWCA at the after verification stage (Figure 4.7). Secondly, the respondents were asked whether selection & verification process done by WLSGs and UZVGDC was bias and given average values are 3.75 (Agree) and 1.69(Disagree) respectively which means that most of WLSGs was biased in beneficiary selection process on the other hand, UZVGDC was not biased at the after verification stage (Figure 4.7) according to section III.2.3 (b).

![Figure 4.7: Rule of Law for Selection & Verification](image)

Source: Field Study 2013

Finally the respondents were asked whether WLSGs & UZVGDC provided all information and opportunities to all ultra poor women according to section III.2.3(b) and given average values are 1.66(Disagree) and 3.97(Agree) respectively (Figure 4.7) which means that most of WLSGs did
not provide all information and opportunities to ultra/extreme poor women; on the other hand, UZVGDC provided all information and opportunities according to rules.

The respondents (beneficiaries) were asked whether the beneficiary selection & verification process done by WLSGs & UZVGDC was fair and 15.44% respondents replied Yes(fair) and 84.56% replied No (Unfair) at the before verification stage on the other hand, 86.76% replied Yes(fair) and 13.24% replied No(unfair) at the after verification stage(Figure 4.8). These results show that primary VGD beneficiary selection process done by WLSGs was significantly unfair on the other hand; final VGD beneficiary verification process done by UZVGDC was significantly fair according to selection process and criteria of MoWCA.

**Figure 4.8: Fairness of Selection & Verification**

Source: Field survey 2013
The respondents were asked whether the beneficiary selection & verification process done by WLSGs & UZVGDC was bias respectively and 83.09% respondents replied Yes(bias) and 16.91% replied No (unbiased) at the before verification stage on the other hand, 17.65% replied Yes(bias) and 82.35% replied No(unbiased) at the after verification stage(Figure 4.9). These results show that primary VGD beneficiary selection process done by was significantly bias on the other hand; final VGD beneficiary verification process done by UZVGDC was significantly unbiased according to selection process and criteria of MoWCA.

**Figure 4.9: Biasness of Selection Process**

![Biasness of Selection Process](source: Field survey 2013)

**IV.1.2. Managerial Level of Governance**

The managerial level of governance is concerned with the further shaping of governing relationship among members, administration, accountability, responsibility to the organizational works, leadership quality in team work etc for better service delivery in VGD program implementation.
There are several ministries and divisions are engaged with VGD program administration and management level (Diagram 3.1). I shall discuss three important success factors of governance for effective policy implementation in the managerial level or management level in the public office as follows-

**IV.1.2.1. Hierarchical Control for Selection & Verification Process**

Hierarchical control or chain of command in level of governance ensures accountability and responsibility of public & elected officials in the selection process of VGD program. The respondents (officials) were asked whether selection & verification process regularly supervised by TAG officers at before verification stage & by UNO at the after verification stage and given average values are 1.70(Disagree) and 4.65 (Strongly disagree) (Figure 4.10) respectively which means that most of TAG officers did not supervise primary beneficiary selection process; on the other hand, UNO supervised final beneficiary verification process according to section III.2.3(g).

**Figure 4.10: Hierarchical Control for Selection & Verification**

![Diagram showing hierarchical control for selection & verification process](source: Field Study 2013)

Source: Field Study 2013
Secondly, the respondents were asked how much discretionary power was exercised by WLSGs & UZVGDC to take decision and given average values are 1.90 (Low) and 4.62 (Very high) respectively (Figure 4.10) which means that most of WLSGs did not exercise their level of discretionary power according to section III.2.3 (b) (c) on the other hand, UZVGDC exercised their level of discretionary power independently according to section III.2.3 (g). Finally, the respondents were asked whether the existing hierarchical control system among WLSGs & UZVGDC and given average values are 1.42 (Very low) and 4.04 (High) respectively (Figure 4.10) which means that hierarchical control system among members of WLSGs were very low during primary beneficiary selection process; on the other hand, hierarchical control system among members of UZVGDC was high during final verification process in November-December, 2010 according to selection process.

IV.1.2.2.Public Service Delivery for Selection & Verification Process

Ensuring public service delivery depends on highly committed, effectiveness, coordination and feedback from service receivers’ satisfaction by the public and elected officials for effective program implementation. In this regard, the respondents (officials) were asked whether members of WLSGs & UZVGDC were committed to provide better public service delivery during selection & verification process and received average values are 1.33 (Strongly disagree) and 4.63 (Strongly agree) respectively (Figure 4.11) which means that most of members of WLSGs were not committed to
provide better public service delivery at before verification stage; on the other hand, most of members of UZVGDC were committed to provide better public service at after verification stage according to circular & guideline of MoWCA. Secondly, the respondents were asked whether the effectiveness of public service delivery system among members of WLSGs & UZVGDC during selection & verification process and received values are 1.56 (Low) and 4.03 (High) respectively (Figure 4.11) which means that most of WLSGs were low effective on the other hand, UZVGDC was high effective to provide public service according to VGD Implementation Guideline, 2010 of MoWCA.

**Figure 4.11: Public Service Delivery for Selection & Verification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to Public Service</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Public Service</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Verification Stage</td>
<td>After Verification Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.32 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Study 2013

Thirdly, the respondents were asked whether the coordination among members of WLSGs & UZVGDC during selection & verification process and received average values are 1.78 (Bad) for WLSGs and 4.32(Good) for
UZVGDC respectively (Figure 4.11) which means that most of members of WLSGs had bad coordination among themselves during primary selection process on the other hand, most of members of UZVGDC had good coordination among themselves during final verification stage according to circular and guideline of MoWCA. Finally, the respondents were asked how much the members of WLSGs & UZVGDC were satisfied in selection process and received average values are 2.94(Neutral) for WLSGs and 4.48(High) for UZVGDC respectively (Figure 4.11) which means that most of members of WLSGs are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied about their satisfaction level in selection process on the other hand, most of members of UZVGDC are highly satisfied to provide public service in verification process.

According to VGD Program Implementation Guideline, 2010, TAG officers shall ensure open public meeting, presence of extreme poor women at ward level meeting. The respondents (beneficiaries) were asked whether TAG officers were present during primary & final VGD beneficiary selection & verification process and 11.76% respondents replied Yes(present) and 88.24% replied No (not present) at before verification stage on the other hand, 79.41% replied Yes(present) and 20.59% replied No(not present) at after verification stage(Figure 4.12). These results show that most of the TAG officers were not present at primary beneficiary selection process on the other hand, most of them were present at final beneficiary verification process according to section 3 of prescribed guideline, 2010 of MoWCA. Moreover these results imply the negligence, insincerity and unaccountability of TAG officers
resulted unfair and unsuccessful primary selection process at before verification stage.

**Figure 4.12: Presence of TAG Officers in Selection & Verification**

Associated NGO are assigned by government and representatives appointed by local NGO authority to coordinate the overall activities of WLSGs and TAG officers. According to VGD Program Implementation Guideline, 2010, they shall ensure presence of ultra poor women at ward level meeting. The respondents were asked whether NGO representatives were present during primary & final VGD beneficiary selection or verification process and 16.18% respondents replied Yes(present) and 83.82% replied No (not present) at before verification stage on the other hand, 88.97% replied Yes(present) and 11.03% replied No(not present) at after verification stage(Figure 4.13). These results show that most of NGO representatives were not present at primary beneficiary selection process on the other hand, most of them were present at final beneficiary verification process according to
section 6 of prescribed guideline, 2010 of MoWCA. These findings also imply that assigned NGO did not coordinate & cooperate with members of WLSGs or there were lack of coordination between members of WLSGs & NGO representatives.

Figure 4.13: Presence of NGO Representative in Selection & Verification

![Chart showing presence of NGO representative before and after verification stage.](chart)

Source: Field survey 2013

The respondents were asked whether they were satisfied overall activities done by WLSGs & UZVGDC during beneficiary selection & verification process and 29.41% respondents replied Yes (satisfied) and 70.59% replied No (not satisfied) at the activities of WLSGs at before verification stage whereas 100% replied Yes (satisfied) at the overall activities of UZVGDC at after verification stage. (Figure 4.14). These results imply that overall primary selection activities done by WLSGs was not known to ultra poor women, that is why most of the beneficiaries were not satisfied to them on the other hand, overall final verification activities done by UZVGDC was known to ultra poor women and all beneficiaries were fully satisfied.
Moreover, in telephonic interview, members of UZVGDC were asked whether they were satisfied with the primary beneficiary selection activities done by WLSGs at before verification stage and most of the participants replied that----

- They were dissatisfied to WLSGs’ activities.
- They also told that most of members of WLSGs were not aware of prescribed selection criteria & process.
- Some of them were engaged several unfair means such as corruption, nepotism, biasness, personal choice etc.

**IV.1.2.3. Leadership Role in Selection & Verification Process**

Leadership quality is very much important to implement public policy effectively. Female UP members and Upazila Nirbahi Officer play leadership role in WLSGs & UZVGDC respectively and male UP members
and TAG officers play vital role as a members of WLSGs & UZVGDC respectively according to section III.2 3(a) & (g). In this regard the respondents (officials) were asked whether the female UP members were less committed than male members in WLSGs & TAG officers were less committed than UNO in UZVGDC in beneficiary selection process. Thus received average values given by respondents are 3.78(Agree) for WLSGs and 4.67(Strongly agree) for UZVGDC (Figure 4.15) which means that most of female members had less committed and efficacy than male members to lead WLSGs in primary beneficiary selection process on the other hand, TAG officers had less committed and efficacy than UNO to lead UZVGDC in final beneficiary verification process.

Figure 4.15: Leadership Role in Selection & Verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before Verification Stage</th>
<th>After Verification Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of Male UP member to Female/Efficiency of UNO to TAG officer</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Leadership</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Study 2013
Secondly, the respondents were asked whether the strength of leadership of WLSGs & UZVGDC during beneficiary selection & verification process and the received average values are 1.61(Low) and 4.00(High) respectively(Figure 4.15) which means that strength of leadership of WLSGs was low on the other hand, strength of leadership of UZVGDC was high.

Moreover from the telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC, the respondents were asked whether the leadership role of female UP members as head of WLSGs was successful or failure during primary VGD beneficiary selection process in 2011-2012 VGD cycle and the most of the participants replied that female UP members had weak leadership role(failure) and provided following observations:

- Most of them were honest but less efficient than male members during primary beneficiary selection process
- They had less leadership capacity than male members
- They had better service commitment than male members but they had no sufficient logistics and staff
- They failed to lead WLSGs successfully due to lack of managerial role and they failed to maintain hierarchical control system among members.
- As most of them were less educated, they were less motivated.
- Sometimes husbands of female UP members influenced over the primary selection process illegally and they are known as shadow members of UP.
Sometimes they did not know how to control illegal activities of male members or felt embraced.

As they were elected representatives of the same ward or union, sometimes they involved nepotism or they could not maintain neutrality or they had personal choice/fascination for next election.

Also, the respondents were asked whether the leadership role of Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) as head of UZVGDC was successful or failure during verification stage and most of them replied that UNO had very active leadership role (successful) and provided following observations-

- As UNO was public official from central government, he had no personal choice & interest.
- As he had higher education and sufficient training base knowledge, he had enough managerial capacity and highly motivated to provide better public service.
- By law, he was bound to maintain highest neutrality and fairness.
- He had to maintain chain of command and accountability to government.
- He could overcome illegal political pressure.
- He had sufficient manpower, logistics and staffs.

IV.1.3. Technical Level of Governance
The technical level of governance is concerned with the primary work level, where strategic alignments are given their operational expression-comprising relationships between primary workers and the consequences or outcomes for service recipient and other stakeholders of VGD program. I shall discuss three important success factors such as training, motivation and civil participation of governance for effective VGD program implementation as follows-

**IV.3.1. Training for Members of WLSGs & UZVGDC in Selection & Verification Process**

Training enhances skill development, quality of work, capacity building and efficiency of public and elected officials for public policy implementation. Though there is no prescribe rule for training in the circular and guideline of MoWCA, the World Food Program (WFP) arrange a day long workshop/seminar only for the members of UZVGDC to improve quality of beneficiary selection process through District Women Affairs Officer with assigned NGO in District level which is inadequate in time & contents. There is no training program or workshops for the members of WLSGs and TAG officers. This is one of the weaknesses of VGD program. Because most of the members of WLSGs are less educated, newly elected representatives and they have no organizational capacity and experience. The respondents (officials) were asked whether training provided by the WFP to members of WLSGs & UZVGDC was adequate for selection & verification process and received average values are 1.27(Strongly Disagree) for members of WLSGs and 2.97(Neutral) for members of UZVGDC respectively (Figure 4.16) which
means that training program is completely inadequate or no training for members of WLSGs on the other hand, it was neither adequate nor inadequate for most of members of UZVGDC. Secondly, the respondents were asked whether members of WLSGs & UZVGDC were able to training base knowledge for beneficiary selection & verification successfully and received average values are 1.16 (Strongly Disagree) and 4.18(Strongly agree) respectively (Figure 4.16) which means that members of WLSGs were not able to apply training base knowledge during primary beneficiary selection process on the other hand, most of members of UZVGDC were able to apply training base knowledge during verification process. Thirdly, the respondents were asked whether satisfaction level of received training of members of WLSGs and UZVGDC for beneficiary selection process and received average values are 1.10 (Very low) and 3.49 (Neutral) respectively (Figure 4.16) which means that no satisfaction for members of WLSGs on the other hand, satisfaction for most of members of UZVGDC is neither low nor high.
Finally the respondents were asked whether received training increased level of efficiency of members of WLSGs & UZVGDC and received average values are 1.08 (Strongly disagree) and 3.84 (Agree) respectively (Figure 4.16) which means that there is no increase the level of efficiency members of WLSGs on the other hand, increased the level of efficiency most of members of UZVGDC during final VGD beneficiary selection process.

From the telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC, the respondents were asked whether training program provided by the WFP for members of UZVGDC & WLSGs for beneficiary selection was sufficient or insufficient and they replied that training was not sufficient for the members
of UZVGDC and there is no training program for the members of WLSGs and provided the following observations-

- As most of the members of WLSGs were less educated and elected representatives, they must require intensive training regarding beneficiary selection.
- Also members of UZVGDC require specific training program. Daylong seminar/workshop is not sufficient for them.
- Most of them mention that due to lack of training & knowledge about VGD beneficiary selection process, the primary selection process was affected rigorously in Raiganj Upazila in 2011-12 cycle.
- As most of them were newly elected UP members and they had no previous job experience or training base knowledge.
- Less training built them less motivated.
- There should be included ethical and moral learning in training course to improve their service quality and motivation.

**IV.3.2. Motivation for Members of WLSGs & UZVGDC in Selection & Verification Process**

The VGD beneficiary selection process depends on how much members of WLSGs and UZVGDC are motivated to perform their duty. Motivation level can be increased providing adequate training base knowledge among actors or policy implementers. In this regard, the respondents (officials)
were asked whether the members of WLSGs & UZVGDC were motivated during selection & verification stage and received average values are 1.14 (Strongly Disagree) and 4.42 (Agree) respectively (Figure 4.17) which means that most of members of WLSGs did not motivated on the other hand, most of members of UZVGDC were motivated. Also the respondents were asked whether motivation of WLSGs & UZVGDC were effective during selection & verification process and received average values are 1.18 (Strongly Disagree) and 3.8 (Agree) respectively (Figure 4.17) which means that motivation was not effective for most of members of WLSGs on the other hand, motivation was effective for most of members of UZVGDC.

Figure 4.17: Motivation for Selection & Verification

Source: Field Study 2013

Moreover, from the telephonic interview with the members of UZVGDC, the respondents were asked whether motivation program provided by the WFP for members of UZVGDC & WLSGs for beneficiary selection was sufficient or insufficient and they replied that training was not sufficient
for the members of UZVGDC and there is no motivational program for the members of WLSGs and provided the following observations-

- As most of the members of WLSGs were less educated and elected representatives, they must require intensive motivation regarding beneficiary selection.
- Also members of UZVGDC require specific motivation program for further improvement.
- Most of them mention that due to lack of training & motivation about VGD beneficiary selection process, the primary selection process affected rigorously in Raiganj Upazila in 2011-12 cycle.
- As most of them were newly elected UP members and they had no previous job experience or motivation base knowledge.
- Less training built them less motivated.

IV.1.3.3. Civil Participation for Selection & Verification Process

Civil participation plays vital role for fair, unbiased and neutral beneficiary selection process. The respondents (officials) were asked whether civil participation at ward level open public meeting arranged by WLSGs & union level open public meeting arranged by UZVGDC was effective and received values are 1.36(Strongly disagree) and 4.45(Agree) respectively (Figure 4.18) which means that there was no civil participation during primary beneficiary selection process on the other hand, there was active civil participation union level open public meeting.
Finally, the respondents were asked whether ward & union level mass people consciousness and active civil participation helped to identify wrongful beneficiary list done by WLSGs & UZVGDC and received values are 1.35 (Strongly disagree) and 4.60 (Strongly agree) respectively (Figure 4.18) which means that there were no open public meeting & active civil participation at ward level which ensured to identify wrongful VGD lists by WLSGs on the other hand, there were open public meeting & active civil participation at union level which helped to identify wrongful primary beneficiary list during final beneficiary verification.

Moreover from telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC, the respondents were asked whether they had more suggestion to make VGD beneficiary selection process more effective and most of them provide the following suggestions—
They proposed that there should be a ultra poor women priority list covering the entire upazila which is selected by 3 members-subcommittee lead by Upazila Women Affairs Officer, Project Implementation Officer and one NGO representative. They will prepare this priority list under the selection criteria of MoWCA through open public meeting at each union level. Collecting data from open public meeting, they prepare a database system of prospective beneficiaries’ lists and upload it to the national, MoWCA, DWA, District & Upazila Web portals so that everybody can share it. Also there should be a system to update the database system every year in the month of January. There should be a priority list of prospective beneficiaries in the office of Upazila Women Affairs and Union Information Service Centre (UISC).

They add that there should be a written application form with basic data and information of each prospective beneficiary/woman so that they can be verified easily

Exhibition of National ID card (NID) should be compulsory during primary selection & final verification

There should be introduced intensive training program in VGD Program Implementation Guideline for members of WLSGs, UZVGDC and TAG officers.

Primary selection process must be done through open public meeting at ward level and household visit

There should be included headmaster of Govt primary school or high school and religious leader (Imam) as members of WLSGs.
Moreover headmaster should be appointed as head of WLSGs to remove conflict between male & female members and to control influence of UP chairman.

- As most of the male/female members and UP chairmen have no specific source of income and they are very less amount as honorarium\(^29\) per month, government should pay a certain amount of incentives or increase their allowance to satisfactory level so that they can be motivated and devoted to VGD program.

### IV.2. Syntheses

I have already discussed evidences from surveys on beneficiaries & public officials and telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC and identified significant gaps/differences between before verification stage at the primary beneficiary selection process done by WLSGs and after verification stage at final beneficiary verification done by UZVGDC using questionnaire for beneficiaries (Annexure IV), questionnaire for Public officials (Annexure III) and questionnaire for UZVGDC members (Annexure V) respectively. The discussion is based on three level of governance and 8 success factors of governance (independent variables). In this section major findings will be grouped under three levels of governance-Institutional Level with two factors of governance.

\(^29\) Pay benefit to elected officials by local government and it is fix for all over the country. At present, honorarium for male members/female members is 2100 Tk(USD 26) and for UP chairmen is 3200 Tk(USD 40) which is less than the lowest grade(20th) of civil service pay benefit 6800 Tk ($85)(National Pay scale, 2009).
IV.2.1 Legal Framework for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Under Legal Framework 5 issues have been touched such as clear understanding of selection criteria and process, arrangements of open public meeting, household visit/physical verification by interviewing, awareness level and ultra poor centric selection criteria & process by the members of either WLSGs or UZVGDC. According to officials’ responses, most of members of WLSGs did not understand selection criteria & process clearly, most of WLSGs did not arrange ward level open public meeting for primary (prospective) beneficiaries and selection criteria & process was not applied for ultra poor women properly during primary VGD beneficiary selection stage on the other hand, most of the members of UZVGDC clearly understand selection process & criteria, UZVGDC arranged open public meeting at union level and the selection criteria & process was for exclusively applied for ultra poor centric during final verification stage (Annexure VI). Besides these, WLSGs did not visit prospective beneficiary’s households on the other hand; UZVGDC verified by interviewing 99% of primary selected beneficiaries. Moreover, according to beneficiary’s responses, it has been found that WLSGs did not serve public notice for ward level open public meeting (0%) and they did not visit house (81%) on the other hand; UZVGDC served public notice for union level open public meeting (87%) and they arranged open public meeting (Annexure VII). Also it has been found that WLSGs violated section III.2.2 of prescribed selection criteria of MoWCA during primary selection process. According to telephonic interview to members of UZVGDC, they commented that legal process, the selection process & selection criteria
described in the circular and guideline prescribed by MoWCA for VGD beneficiary selection is sufficient and very much clear. Moreover, they expressed deep concern about the violation of legal process, selection criteria & selection process by members of WLSGs. They suggest to add one more criteria that there should be a written application form with color photograph, copy of NID card and information of each prospective beneficiary/woman so that they can be verified easily. These results & comments prove that WLSGs violated section III.2.3 (a) (b) (c) of the prescribed selection process of MoWCA at before verification stage but UZVGDC followed selection process accordingly at after verification stage.

IV.2.2. Rule of Law for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Under rule of law 3 issues have been touched such as selection process abided by prescribed guideline & circular of MoWCA, biasness of selection process and opportunities for all ultra poor women by either WLSGs or UZVGDC. According to officials’ responses, WLSGs did not abide by guideline & circular selection process and were biased on the other hand, UZVGDC abided by guideline & circular and was not biased (Annexure VI). Moreover according to beneficiary responses, WLSGs did not select primary beneficiary fairly and they were biased on the other hand UZVGDC verified final beneficiary fairly (87%) and they were unbiased (82%) (Annexure VII). Moreover according to telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC, they told that rule of law or equity should be ensured in the selection process so that WLSGs could maintain maximum fairness to control corruption and misuse of power. These results & comments prove that WLSGs did not ensure
rule of law in primary VGD beneficiary selection process on the other hand UZVGDC ensured rule of law in final beneficiary selection process.

**IV.2.3. Hierarchical Control for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process**

Under Hierarchical Control 3 issues have been touched such as supervision of selection process done by TAG officers or UNO, utilization of discretionary power for decision making process and hierarchical control system for beneficiary selection process by either WLSGs or UZVGDC. According to officials’ responses, TAG officers did not supervise primary selection process regularly and most of WLSGs did not exercised/utilized their discretionary power on the other hand, UNO supervised final verification process successfully and UZVGDC exercised/utilized their discretionary power freely (Annexure VI). Moreover according to telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC, they told that most of the members of UZVGDC are government officials and they are abiding by law, rules and regulations. They have to maintain hierarchical control system or chain of command with higher authority according to service rules. As a result, UZVGDC verified the beneficiary list with highest sincerity, integrity, accountability & responsibility. On the other hand most of members of WLSGs were elected representatives for only 5 years and they had no service rule or hierarchical control system in the office of union parishads. Usually they do not abide by rules & circulars like government officials. As a result, WLSGs selected wrongful or unfit beneficiary (primary) list with their highest personal choice and interest. These results & comments prove that hierarchical control system
or chain of command among members of WLSGs was not performing properly on the other hand; members of UZVGDC were performing hierarchical control system very well during final verification process.

IV.2.4 Public Service Delivery for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Under Public service delivery 4 issues have been touched such as commitment to provide better public service, effectiveness of public service delivery, coordination among group/committee members and satisfaction level of selection process by either WLSGs or UZVGDC. According to officials’ responses, most of members of WLSGs were not committed to provide better public service and coordination among members of WLSGs was bad on the other hand, members of UZVGDC were very committed to provide better public service and coordination among members of UZVGDC was good (Annexure VI). Also according to beneficiary’s responses, TAG officers and NGO representatives were not present during primary selection process on the on the other hand, they were present during final verification process (Annexure VII). Moreover according to telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC, they replied that they tried to provide better service during selection & verification process. During field visit, they heard allegation from poor women & common people about unfair and secret selection by some members of WLSGs. Also they mentioned that they had faced some problems during primary VGD beneficiary selection and verification process such as political pressures and interference to include disqualified or unfit women/relatives in the final list according to their choice.
and to violate selection criteria receiving bribe from prospective poor women. Besides these, they were satisfied with the final beneficiary selection activities done by UZVGDC and dissatisfied with the primary selection process done by WLSGs. They also told that most of members of WLSGs were not aware of their service & duties and some of them were engaged several unfair means such as corruption, nepotism, biasness, personal choice etc. They added that there were lack of coordination & cooperation among the members of WLSGs which affected the selection process. Besides these, most of the female and male UP members are poor and their pay benefit or honorium per month is very negligible amount comparing to the members of UZVGDC or government officials and there is no incentive for VGD program. According local government pay befit for union parishad chairmen & members, each UP chairman receives only 3200 Tk($ 40), male/female member receives 2100 Tk($ 26) which is less than the lowest grade among 20 grades government employee gross pay benefit 6800Tk($85) and upazila level government officer gross benefit 16000 Tk ($ 200)per month(National Pay Scale,2009). This lower pay benefit of members of WLSGs creates dissatisfaction to provide better public service and compel them to involve in corruption in selection process. These results & observations prove that members of WLSGs were weakly committed and had bad coordination during primary selection process on the other hand, members of UZVGDC were strongly committed and had good coordination during final verification process.
IV.2.5. Leadership Role for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Under leadership 2 issues have been touched such as leadership commitment of head of group or committee and strength of leadership during selection process by either WLSGs or UZVGDC. According to officials’ responses, female UP members (head of WLSGs) had less leadership commitment efficiency than male members (members of WLSGs) on the other hand, TAG officers had less commitment and efficiency than UNO (head of UZVGDC)(Annexure VI). Moreover according to members of UZVGDC, female members had weak leadership role and most of them were honest but less efficient than male members during primary beneficiary selection process. A few members of UZVGDC argued that female members had better service commitment than male members but they had no sufficient logistics and staffs and sometimes their husbands influenced over the primary selection process illegally and they are known as shadow members of UP. Also they did not know how to control illegal activities/corruption of male members or felt embraced. Besides, they were elected representatives of the same ward or union, sometimes they involved nepotism or they could not maintain neutrality or they had personal choice/fascination for next election. On the other hand, the leadership role of Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) as head of UZVGDC was successful during verification stage and most of them argued that he could overcome illegal political pressure; nepotism/favoritism and he had sufficient manpower, logistics and staffs. Some other argued that as he had higher education, sufficient training base knowledge, enough managerial capacity he was highly committed to lead UZVGDC during
verification process. These results & comments imply that leadership role of female members/head of WLSGs was unsuccessful during primary selection process on the other hand leadership role of UNO as head of UZVGDC was more successful during final verification process.

IV.2.6. Training for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Under training for members of WLSGs and UZVGDC 4 issues have been touched such as adequacy of training, application of training base knowledge, satisfaction level of received training and increased efficiency level by received training. According officials’ responses, training arranged by the WFP for members of WLSGs was not adequate, they were not able to apply training base knowledge for primary selection process and received training was not able to increase efficiency level and satisfaction level of received training was very low on the other hand, training was neither insufficient nor adequate for members of UZVGDC but they were able to apply training base knowledge during final verification process, received training increased level of efficiency and satisfaction level of received training neither low nor high(Annexure VI). Moreover according telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC, most of them replied that there is no training program for the members of WLSGs & UZVGDC. The daylong seminar or workshop for members of UZVGDC was not adequate for them. They argued that as most of the members of WLSGs were less educated, newly elected representatives, no previous experience or training base knowledge with official job, the WFP should take necessary steps for intensive training program for members of WLSGs, UZVGDC and TAG officers. On the other
hand, most of members of UZVGDC are highly educated, have various types of training base knowledge & skills and have previous experiences to select VGD beneficiary several cycles, they were able to apply training base knowledge and to increase efficiency for verification process successfully. These results and findings that members of WLSGs & UZVGDC were not trained adequately though members of UZVGDC were able to apply training base knowledge effectively.

IV.2.7. Motivation for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Under motivation, 2 issues have been touched such as motivation of committee members and effectiveness of motivation for selection process. According to officials’ responses, members of WLSGs were not motivated to perform their duty for primary beneficiary selection and accordingly their motivation was not effective before verification stage on the other hand, members of UZVGDC were motivated by nature of duty and their motivation was effective (Annexure VI) during verification stage. Also most of the members of WLSGs were insincere and ignorant about circular & guideline during primary beneficiary selection process due to lack of training & motivation. Moreover according to telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC, they told that most of them were effectively motivated by received training & knowledge to perform beneficiary verification process well and most of the members of WLSGs were not able to effectively motivate due to lack of training, knowledge and experience. They also argued that less education, knowledge, training, skills and experiences tends to less motivation. These results imply that as the members of WLSGs were elected local
representatives and they were not enough educated as members of UZVGDC who were government officials and highly educated, members of WLSGs were less motivated.

**IV.2.8 Civil Participation for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process**

Under civil participation 2 issues have been touched such as effectiveness of civil participation through open public meeting and identification of beneficiaries by active civil participation. According to officials’ responses, there was no effective civil participation and no open public meeting to identify faulty/wrongful beneficiaries at before verification stage on the other hand, there was effective civil participation and that active civil participation identified wrongful faulty beneficiaries (Annexure VI) at union level open public meeting during final verification stage. These results and comments imply that WLSGs clearly violated section III.2.3(b) not to arrange open public meeting with civil participation at ward level. On the other hand, UZVGDC ensured highest accountability to arrange open public meeting with active civil participation to identify wrongful women from primary list and finally UZVGDC was able to prepare a correct final beneficiary list in 2011-2012 VGD cycle.

From the above syntheses (comparative discussion and major findings) in three level of governance covering 8 factors of governance, I can come to conclusion that WLSGs did not abide by the selection criteria & selection process according to prescribed rule, circular and guideline of MoWCA and this violation of circular & guideline they prepared a wrongful, unfair primary
VGD beneficiary list at before verification stage on the other hand, UZVGDC abided by the prescribed selection criteria & process to verify the primary beneficiary list, they were able to identify 689 wrongful/unfit beneficiaries (25%) and finally UZVGDC prepared a correct, fair final VGD beneficiary list including 25% fit women (Table 3.8) at after verification stage in 2011-2012 VGD cycle. Moreover I have found significant gaps in ensuring rule of law, hierarchical control, commitment to provide better public service and civil participation between before verification stage & after verification stage. Moreover, most of the respondents provided ambiguous and insignificant responses in leadership, training and motivation between before and after stage. The reason behind are most of the respondents belongs to male group (gender biased) which affected the issue of leadership role of female members was less than male and there in no training facilities both for the members of WLSGs & UZVGDC. The lack of training program for officials obviously affected effective motivation. During the beneficiary selection & verification process, WLSGs failed to overcome these shortcomings but UZVGDC has overcome efficiently. That is why, the before verification stage done by WLSGs is an unsuccessful case and after verification stage done by UZVGDC is a successful case in this study.
Chapter V: Conclusion

In this chapter I summarize the analysis of the study, policy recommendation for further improvement of VGD program for government of Bangladesh, NGOs and Inter Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and finally contribution to other social welfare programs, theoretical implication and analytical framework for further research & development (R&D) for the readers, researchers and policy makers. The chapter also outlines the limitations of the study.

V.1. Summary of Analysis

The discussion is based on three level of governance including their eight success factors of governance: Institutional Level with two factors of governance: Legal framework and Rule of Law; Managerial Level with three factors of governance: Hierarchical Control, Public Service Delivery and Leadership and Technical Level with three factors of governance: Training, Motivation and Civil Participation. I summarize only the significant differences or gaps of these independent variables identified in chapter IV so that I can be able to find out why before verification stage done by WLSGs was a failure case and after verification stage done by UZVGDC was a successful case.
V.1.1.Legal Framework for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Among five issues of legal framework, it has been found from analysis that there are significant gaps on three issues: clear understanding of selection process & criteria; arrangement of open public meeting and households’ visit/interviewing for selection process between before verification and after verification stages (Annexure VI). The results prove that primary selection process was not done according to legal process or the prescribed selection process & criteria by WLSGs but final verification process was done according to legal framework by UZVGDC properly. Also these results are supported by beneficiaries’ responses (Annexure VII) & telephonic interview with members of UZVGDC.

V.1.2.Rule of Law for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Among three issues of rule of law, it has been found from analysis that there is significant gap on one issue: selection or verification process was abided by prescribed rules, circulars & guideline of MoWCA between before verification and after verification stages (Annexure VI). This result proves that WLSGs failed to abide by rules, circulars & guideline accordingly but UZVGDC abided properly. Also results of survey on beneficiary agreed with fairness & unbiasness of verification process by UZVGDC (Annexure VII) and most of members of UZVGDC opined in favor of verification process on telephonic interview.
V.1.3. Hierarchical Control for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Among three issues of hierarchical control, it has been found from analysis that there is significant gap on one issue: supervision of selection or verification process between before verification & after verification stages (Annexure VI) which prove that hierarchical control or chain of command was failed among members of WLSGs but it was successful among members of UZVGDC.

V.1.4. Public Service Delivery for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Among four issues of public service delivery, it has been found from analysis that there are significant gaps on two issues: commitment to provide better public service delivery and coordination among members of WLSGs or UZVGDC (Annexure VI) between before verification and after verification stages which prove that WLSGs was failure to provide better service delivery but UZVGDC was successful. Also beneficiaries were satisfied with public service provided by members of UZVGDC (Annexure VII).

V.1.5. Leadership Role for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Among two issues of leadership, it has been found from analysis that there is significant gaps on one issue: leadership commitment of female members or TAG officers less than male members or UNO (Annexure VI) respectively between before verification stage & after verification stage which proves that female members was failure to lead WLSGs but UNO was successful to lead UZVGDC and dissatisfied to members of WLSGs. It was
also supported from telephonic interview that there was always lack of coordination & cooperation between male & female member and conflict each other which strongly affected leadership role of female member.

V.1.6. Training for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Among four issues of training, it has been found from analysis that there is the most ambiguous difference between before verification and after verification stages. There was training program neither for members of WLSGs nor UZVGDC. Daylong seminar or workshop provided by the WFP was not adequate and satisfactory for members of UZVGDC though they were able to utilize it successfully due to their others on the job training, experiences, skills & depth of knowledge. As a results, most of the respondents were strongly disagree about adequacy of training, application of training base knowledge, efficiency level increased by training and satisfaction level for the members of WLSGs on the other hand, neutral(neither disagree nor agree) about adequacy of training & satisfaction level and agree about training base knowledge & efficiency level for members of UZVGDC(Annexure VI).

V.1.7. Motivation for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Among two issues of motivation, it has been found from analysis that there is also the most significant difference between before verification & after verification stages (Annexure VI). Because daylong workshop provided by WFP was effective but not enough for members of UZVGDC but was not effective for members of WLSGs. Hence effective training leads to effective motivation and vice versa.
V.1.8. Civil Participation for Beneficiary Selection & Verification Process

Among two issues of civil participation, it has been found from analysis that there is significant difference in two issues: effectiveness of civil participation at open public meeting and identification of wrongful or unfit beneficiaries through active civil participation between before verification and after verification stages (Annexure VI) which prove that there was no open public meeting at ward level and no active civil participation during primary selection process but there was open public meeting at every union office and active civil participation during final verification stage to identify unfit women according to selection criteria & process. Thus WLSGs were failed to arrange civil participation but UZVGDC was successful to arrange active civil participation. Also most of the selected beneficiaries were dissatisfied with primary selection process but completely satisfied with final verification process (Annexure VII).

From the above summarization in three level of governance covering eight independent variables (success factors of governance), I conclude that WLSGs did not abide by the selection criteria & selection process according to prescribed rule, circular and guideline of MoWCA and this violation of circular & guideline they prepared a wrongful, unfair primary VGD beneficiary list at before verification stage on the other hand, UZVGDC abided the prescribed selection criteria & process to verify the primary beneficiary list, they were able to identify 689 wrongful/unfit beneficiaries (25%) and finally UZVGDC prepared a correct, fair final VGD
beneficiary list including 25% fit women (Table 3.8) at after verification stage in 2011-2012 VGD cycle.

In short, the key features of Before Verification Stage: most of WLSGs were failed

(i) Not to abide by circular, rules & guideline of MoWCA
(ii) Not to have a clear understanding of rules & goals of VGD program
(iii) Not to arrange open public meeting for prospective ultra poor women and ensure active civil participation at ward level
(iv) Lack of formal education, training and motivation
(v) Not to have leadership commitment.

On the other hand, the key features of After Verification Stage: UZVGDC was successful

(i) To abide by circular, rules & guideline of MoWCA
(ii) To have a clear understanding of rules, goals & objectives of VGD program
(iii) To arrange open public meeting for prospective ultra poor women and ensure active civil participation at union level
(iv) To have higher education, experience, on the job training and motivation
(v) To have commitment to provide better public service delivery
(vi) Leadership quality and chain of command in delivering public service.
In conclusion, the before verification stage done by WLSGs is an unsuccessful case and after verification stage done by UZVGDC is a successful case in this study.

V.2. Policy Recommendations

In this study, I have discussed theoretical background using two school of thoughts: Top-down Approach and Bottom-up Approach with respective theories & arguments by prominent scholars. According to VGD program implementation process, I make conclusion in favor of Top-down Approach. Because Top-down Approach has a comparative advantage in case where (i) there is a dominant piece of legislation structuring the public program or where (ii) research funds are very limited (Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1986). Moreover, Sabatier (1986) suggests six sufficient and generally necessary conditions for effective policy implementation (Section II.1.1) of legal objectives which are very consistent with public sector policy implementation process. Also these conditions have been proven to be a useful instrument of critical factors in the different governance levels. Finally analytical framework has been constructed according to Top-down Approach in three levels of governance. Therefore I shall make policy recommendations depending upon the analytical framework i.e., three level of governance with eight key success factors, previous studies, 8 case studies, field survey reports, opinions of the respondents and qualitative data:
V.2.1. Institutional Level of Governance Specific Recommendations

➢ For effective policy implementation of VGD beneficiary selection process, government should ensure awareness build up program by appropriate training for members of WLSGs to clear understanding of criteria & process, arrange open public meeting at ward level and visit every households of ultra poor women physically.

➢ The government should incorporate permanent e-data base system or priority list of ultra poor women or most vulnerable women using proposed formal application form (Annexure XI) in each upazila. The Union Information Service Centre (UISC) should be tagged with this e-data base system for public documentation and services. This e-database priority list should be upload in district web portal and upazila web portal and it will be updated every year in the month of October. This system will control corruption of members of WLSGs and ensure higher accountability to people.

➢ Number of group members in prescribed WLSGs (Annexure II) should be increased from 4 members to 6 members: one primary or high school headmaster as head of WLSGs & one religious or social leader to control illegal influence of UP chairman & members.

➢ The Upazila Nirbahi Officer shall ensure open public meeting at each ward or union and the prescribed circular, rules & guideline of MoWCA especially selection criteria & selection process should be explained in front of most vulnerable women, local elites & common people at ward or union level open public meeting during primary selection process and final
verification stage respectively so that rule of law, equity, fairness, unbiasedness and equal opportunity can be ensured and WLSGs or UZVGDC cannot conceal or hide the rules circular or guideline.

Moreover, Government should ensure to establish e-information system in district & upazila web portal including the following information:

(i) e-priority list of ultra poor women ward to ward

(ii) Beneficiary selection criteria & process

(iii) Beneficiary list of previous three VGD cycle final (i.e., 2007-2008, 2009-2010, 2011-2012)

(iv) Application form as proposed (Annexure XI)

V.2.2. Managerial Level of Governance Specific Recommendations

The chain of command from top management to bottom level especially between members of UZVGDC & WLSGs should be enhanced for effective VGD program implementation, there should be incorporated certain degree of discretionary power & freedom in legal system so that WLSGs can exercise decision making process freely and fairly within laws.

Duties and responsibilities of members of WLSGs & UZVGDC should be specifically and equitably distributed so that commitment to provide better service & coordination can be ensured. UNO should appoint comparatively less burden upazila level officers as TAG officers so that they can engage in selection process and supervise & coordinate activities of WLSGs regularly.
The government should increase or adjust the pay benefit or honorarium for UP chairmen, members and female members with government employee pay benefit or cost of living standard to improve the quality of services and effective motivation.

Government should take initiatives to reward for better public service delivery in beneficiary selection process and to punish exemplary in case of misappropriation, corruption, negligence or violation of selection criteria & process so that accountability, responsibility and chain of command can be ensured during selection and verification.

The role of UP chairmen should be more specified and restricted over WLSGs so that they cannot interfere or influence in primary selection process.

The government should provide sufficient logistic supports such as computer, photocopy machine, internet connection and skilled personnel to WLSGs, TAG officers & UZVGDC.

Though leadership of role of male UP members is higher committed than female members, both of them are incapable to lead WLSGs. The government should make rule for primary or high school headmaster as head of WLSGs to remove conflict between male & female members and to establish active leadership role in WLSGs. This provision will reduce illegal influence of UP chairman, members, husbands of female members, political activists.

V.2.3. Technical Level of Governance Specific Recommendations

Since lack of training affected the primary selection process, the World Food Program should incorporate intensive training & motivation.
program for both members of WLSGs as well as UZVGDC considering their level of education & knowledge to improve primary selection process. Moreover, there should be included ethical and moral learning in training course to improve their service quality and motivation level.

- Moreover, the conditions for eligibility of candidature of UP chairmen, male & female members may be legally restricted for at least higher secondary graduates.
- Since the primary selection process was mostly affected by not to arrange ward level open public meeting with active civil participation i.e., in presence of prospective ultra poor women, local elites, common people and civil society, WLSGs must ensure active & participatory open public meeting each ward level in front of school field or market/growth centre of union and they should be well-aware about the selection process & criteria. The UZVGDC should also cross-checked the primary information by interviewing with primary selected beneficiaries through open public meeting at union office during final verification.

V.3.Contribution

From the theoretical point of view I have constructed analytical framework of three layer level of governance policy implementation process with eight factors of governance or independent variables(e.g., legal framework, rule of law, hierarchical control, public service delivery, leadership, training, motivation and civil participation) (Diagram 2.1). The effective welfare policy implementation of VGD program largely depends on
these success factors of governance i.e. if the components of level of governance are executed efficiently then VGD beneficiary selection & verification process will be effective.

I have found significant gaps/differences in legal framework, public service delivery, Training for officials, motivation & civil participation between before & after verification stages that are important in exploring and analyzing the issue of effective policy implementation process in VGD program. Since these major findings reveal that effective policy implementation process is crucial problematic issue of VGD beneficiary selection process and this comparative case study is based on only one upazila out of 483 upazilas, it may apparently be possible to generalize throughout the country. The significant gaps between before & after verification stages are the most important achievements of this study and thus theoretical advancement has been created for further research and development (R&D) in the field of public policy & public administration in Bangladesh. In practical context, if the major findings & policy recommendations/implications of the study are applied to other upazila areas considering the independent variables as homogeneous in nature of uniqueness of country perspective, it may also contribute to better improvement of VGD program beneficiary selection process. The government of Bangladesh, assigned NGOs & IGO (such as WFP, UNDP, FAO) may apply the major findings and policy recommendations of the success factors of level of governance in others welfare policies/programs such as VGF, EGP, Old Aged Allowance, Widow Allowance etc for effective policy implementation process from top (policy
making) to bottom (policy implementation). Moreover this comparative study makes room for further research and accelerates more in-depth analysis of research problem using the theories, methods, concepts and contents used. Also a comparative study could be made between two consecutive VGD cycles of the same upazila or between two upazila of different area for VGD beneficiary selection process in future. Finally, the study can be a good contribution to the welfare program policy makers, policy implementers, researchers and developing countries including Bangladesh.

V.4. Limitations of the Study

The case study has been performed in Raiganj upazila out of 483 upazila in Bangladesh. Though the nature of VGD program implementation is same throughout the country but there might have some dissimilarity in socio-economical, political and population & poverty density. If I could cover more upazilas, it would give more vibrant picture and results. I was able to conduct 8 case studies in February 2012. Due to budgetary and time constraint, I was not able go to study area during field survey in February 2013. It was hard to conduct over 363 respondents through field survey and telephonic interview using three categories of questionnaires. As most of the beneficiaries of these programs are illiterate or primary educated, they are not well aware of this program and they have no basic ideas concerning VGD program. Sometimes they kept silent in responding certain relevant questions of field survey even though they are supposed to be the potential beneficiaries of these programs. They often hesitated to expose the real scenario fearing the oppression of
influential elected representatives. The elected and government officials are very much busy persons at field level and they are not habitual with field survey. Moreover the case study was previous events in 2011-2012 cycle, it was difficult for the respondents to recall & refresh memories from their experience.
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### List of Abbreviations & Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARDO</td>
<td>Assistance Rural Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA</td>
<td>Association Social Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>After Verification Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRDB</td>
<td>Bangladesh Rural Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVS</td>
<td>Before Verification Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Central Coordination Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFW</td>
<td>Cash for Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Country Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoA</td>
<td>Deed of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Delivery Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWA</td>
<td>Directorate of Women Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVGDC</td>
<td>District Vulnerable Group Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGP</td>
<td>Employment Generation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFE</td>
<td>Food for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFW</td>
<td>Food for Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSVGD</td>
<td>Food Security Vulnerable Group Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSP</td>
<td>Female Secondary School Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoB</td>
<td>Government of Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Grameen Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Gratuitous Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIES</td>
<td>Household Income &amp; Expenditure Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAs</td>
<td>Income Generating Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGOs</td>
<td>International Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGVGD</td>
<td>Income Generating Vulnerable Group Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>International Food Policy Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoF</td>
<td>Ministry of Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoWCA</td>
<td>Ministry of Women &amp; Children Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NID</td>
<td>National Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESP</td>
<td>Primary Education Stipend Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIO</td>
<td>Project Implementation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>Performance Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC</td>
<td>Rural Mother Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>Rural Maintenance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAO</td>
<td>Sub-Assistant Agricultural Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFAD</td>
<td>Strengthening Institutions for Food Assisted Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSNPs</td>
<td>Social Safety Net Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>Transfer Assurance Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Test Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAO</td>
<td>Upazila Agricultural Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCO</td>
<td>Upazila Cooperatives Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEO</td>
<td>Upazila Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFC</td>
<td>Upazila Food Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFO</td>
<td>Upazila Fisheries Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UISC</td>
<td>Union Information Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULO</td>
<td>Upazila Livestock Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>Upazila Nirbahi Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>Union Parishad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>Union Parishad Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPVGDC</td>
<td>Union Parishad Vulnerable Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USO</td>
<td>Upazila Statics Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSO</td>
<td>Upazila Social Service Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVC</td>
<td>Upazila Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWAO</td>
<td>Upazila Women Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWVC</td>
<td>Upazila Woman Vice Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYDO</td>
<td>Upazila Youth Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UZVGDC</td>
<td>Upazila Vulnerable Group Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UZC</td>
<td>Upazila Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UZP</td>
<td>Upazila Parishad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDP</td>
<td>Village Defense Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGD</td>
<td>Vulnerable Group Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VGF</td>
<td>Vulnerable Group Feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLSGs</td>
<td>Ward Level Small Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexation

Annexure I: Composition of Upazila VGD Committee (UZVGDC)

1. Upazila Nirbahi Officer Chairman
2. Upazila Agriculture Officer Member
3. Upazila Food Controller Member
4. Upazila Livestock Resources Officer Member
5. Upazila Fisheries Officer Member
6. Upazila Education Officer Member
7. Upazila Cooperatives Officer Member
8. Upazila Social Service Officer Member
9. Upazila Rural Development Officer Member
10. Upazila Health and Family Planning Officer Member
11. Upazila Youth Development Officer Member
12. Upazila Project Implementation Officer Member
13. Chairmen (all Union Parishads) Member
14. Representative of assigned NGO Member
15. Community Nutrition Organizer (where applicable) Member
16. Upazila Women Affairs Officer Member-Secretary

Functions of Upazila VGD committee:

1. Supervise VGD beneficiary selection process and verification it physically according to rules & guideline
2. Approve final VGD beneficiaries list according to rules
3. Fund release (delivery order-DO).
4. Redistribute VGD cards among unions according to food insecurity, poverty and destitute population density
5. Coordinate with assigned NGOs for VGD beneficiary selection and service delivery
6. Appoint TAG (Transfer Assurance Guide) officers from upazila level government officers to supervise Ward Level Small Groups (WLSGs) and their selection process.

7. Supervise food delivery system and IGAs activities

Source: VGD Program Implementation Guideline, 2010, MoWCA

**Annexure II: Composition of Ward Level Small Group (WLSG)**

1. Concerned Ward Female UP member  
   Chairperson

2. Concerned Ward Male UP member  
   Member

3. Assigned NGO Representative  
   Member

4. Union level Government Officer  
   Member

**Functions of Ward Level Small Groups (WLSGs):**

1. Deliver public notice to all people including extreme poor women for primary beneficiary selection

2. Arrange ward level open public meeting and ensure presence of extreme poor women

3. Discuss about the beneficiary selection criteria and process in the open public meeting according to circular & guideline of MoWCA

4. Ensure active civil participation so that selection process can be free, fair and participatory.

5. Visit prospective beneficiary’s households and collect information according to prescribed table

6. Submit primary VGD beneficiary list to Union VGD committee within prescribe time frame

7. Identify selected beneficiaries during food delivery.

Source: VGD Program Implementation Guideline, 2011, MoWCA
Annexure III: Survey Questionnaire for Elected & Public Officials

(জরিপের প্রশ্নমালা)

Section-A

Respected Respondents

I am Mohammad Abdul Ahad studying Master’s degree program at Graduate School of Public Administration in Seoul National University, South Korea. Currently I am conducting my Master degree thesis on “A Study on Effective Policy Implementation: A comparative Case on Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) Program in Bangladesh”. The main purpose of the present study is to review the targeting beneficiary selection process of VGD program; to assess the impact of the program towards empowering women and suggest some crucial policy recommendations for effective beneficiary selection process. I would like to focus in my study regarding VGD beneficiaries’ selection stage through a case study in the VGD cycle 2011-12 of Raiganj Upazila, Sirajganj district for public policy implementation process and finally I shall compare the Before Verification Stage(done by Ward Level Small Group- WLSG) and After Verification Stage(done by Upazila VGD Committee-UZVGD committee) of the case in regarding problem of institutional, legal and technical factors.

I know that you are a very important and responsible person for this program and your valuable time, kind response and active participation will be highly appreciated. I promise you that data and information collected through this questionnaire will be used only for academic purposes and your valuable answers and comments will be kept in completely confidential. I would like to request you to recall your memory during beneficiary selection & verification process was done at Raiganj Upazila in the month of November and December, 2010 to spend your valuable a couple of minutes to answer this questionnaire.

I will be highly glad and grateful if you complete this questionnaire and return it to me within the shortest possible time. For further clarification on any of these questions, you are requested to ask me freely over my following e-mail or phone.

Thank you for your kind cooperation and participation in this survey.

Best regards

Mohammad Abdul Ahad

e-mail-ahadadmn@ymail.com
Mobile-+8201086929282
Global MPA Program
### Section-B: Questionnaire for Elected & Public Officials

Please complete this Questionnaire by marking the appropriate circle with the letter (O)

#### Part-A: Before Verification Stage (ঝাঙাই পূর পূর্ব) (Primary VGD Beneficiary Selection Process done by Ward Level Small Groups-WLSGs in 2011-12 cycle (২০১১-১২ VGD ঘটক ওয়ার্ড পর্যায়ে সুবিধার তালিকা দ্বারা প্রাথমিক VGD সুবিধারোগী বাচাই প্রক্রিয়া)

**About Before Verification Stage:** Ward Level Small Groups (WLSGs) are responsible for primary VGD beneficiary selection process according to guideline of Ministry of Women and Children Affairs (MoWCA) and it is consists of 4 members including concern ward female member, male member, NGO representative and union level government officer. It is headed by female UP member. There are 81 WLSGs (9 union X 9 wards=81 WLSGs) These groups are supervised by 9 TAG (Transfer Assurance Guide) Officers who are upazila level government officer and they are appointed by Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO). In 2011-12 cycle, during the primary VGD beneficiary selection process in Raiganj Upazila, there were a lot of complains from ordinary people, civil society, journalists, political leaders that WLSG members did not select according to the prescribed circular/guideline of MoWCA. Then Upazila VGD committee verified whole process of all union parishads and found irregularities in the primary VGD beneficiary list done by WLSGs. From that situation /event this Before Verification Stage has described and I include some critical issues and points in the following questionnaire. Before giving your answer, I request you to recall your memory in the month of November and December 2010, when this primary VGD beneficiary selection process was done by WLSGs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Legal Framework</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Members of WLSGs clearly understood primary VGD selection criteria and selection process (WLSGs সদস্যরা প্রাথমিক VGD সুবিধারোগী বাছাই প্রক্রিয়ার কী এবং প্রক্রিয়ার উদ্দেশ্যের সুবিধার সূচনা দিয়েছিলেন)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WLSGs arranged open public meeting for primary selection according to MoWCA guideline &amp; circular (WLSGs গাইডলাইন অনুসারে প্রাথমিক বাছাই এবং উদ্দেশ্যের সূচনা দিয়েছিলেন)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WLSGs visited beneficiary’s households for primary selection according to MoWCA guideline &amp; circular (WLSGs গাইডলাইন অনুসারে প্রাথমিক বাছাই এবং উদ্দেশ্যের সূচনা দিয়েছিলেন)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Awareness level among members of WLSGs about the objective and goals of VGD program according to guideline &amp; circular (WLSG সদস্যরা প্রাথমিক VGD প্রক্রিয়ার উদ্দেশ্যের সূচনা দিয়েছিলেন)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think that the primary selection criteria and process was done for ultra poor women centric? (আপনি কি মনে করেন যে প্রাথমিক বাছাই শত্রু এবং উদ্দেশ্য অতি অর্থহীন নারীর ক্ষেত্রে?)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Rule of Law</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Primary VGD beneficiary selection process done by WLSGs abide by Guideline &amp; Circular of</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoWCA/WLSGs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The primary VGD beneficiary selection process done by WLSGs was bias (গাইডলাইন: প্রাথমিক সুবিধাবদ্ধী বাছাই প্রক্রিয়া)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WLSGs provided all information and opportunities to all people including the ultra poor women according to circulars (পিরপ অনুসারে সকল জনগনের সহ অর্থনীতির জন্য সকল জন্ম ও যুগ্মবশ প্রচার করেছিল।)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Hierarchical Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Primary VGD selection process was regularly supervised by TAG officers (টাগ অফিসার উপর সমর্থিত বাছাই প্রক্রিয়া)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 How much WLSGs’ level of discretion was utilized to take decision (WLSG প্রাথমিক সিদ্ধান্ত সমন্বয় নিয়ন্ত্রণ চেয়ার মাননীয় নিবন্ধিত ছিল।)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Existing hierarchical control system of Primary VGD selection process (প্রাথমিক বাছাইকাঠামোর সিদ্ধান্ত নিয়ন্ত্রণ চেয়ারনীয় নিবন্ধিত ছিল।)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Public Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Members of WLSGs were committed to provide better public service delivery during primary VGD beneficiary selection process (প্রাথমিক বাছাইকাঠামোর সমন্বয় নিয়ন্ত্রণ চেয়ার মাননীয় নিবন্ধিত)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The effectiveness of public service delivery system during primary VGD beneficiary selection process (প্রাথমিক বাছাইকাঠামোর সমন্বয় নিয়ন্ত্রণ চেয়ার মাননীয় নিবন্ধিত)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How was the coordination among members of WLSGs during primary VGD beneficiary selection process (প্রাথমিক বাছাইকাঠামোর সমন্বয় নিয়ন্ত্রণ চেয়ার মাননীয় নিবন্ধিত)</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 How much the members of WLSGs were satisfied with primary VGD selection process (WLSGs সদস্যর সমন্বয় নিয়ন্ত্রণ চেয়ার মাননীয় নিবন্ধিত)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Do you believe that the female UP members were less committed than male members during primary VGD beneficiary selection process (প্রাথমিক বাছাইকাঠামোর সমন্বয় নিয়ন্ত্রণ চেয়ার মাননীয় নিবন্ধিত)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The strength of leadership of Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The training provided by World Food Program (WFP) to members of WLSGs for primary VGD beneficiary selection process was <strong>adequate</strong> (WFP দ্বারা WLSGs সদস্যদের প্রশিক্ষণ পর্যালোচনা হয়েছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Members of WLSGs were able to <strong>apply training base knowledge successfully</strong> for primary VGD beneficiary selection process (WLSGs প্রশিক্ষণ নীতির ভিত্তিতে প্রাথমিক ভিত্তিতে প্রশিক্ষণ ব্যবহার করেছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The satisfaction level of received training for primary VGD beneficiary selection process (সাধারণের মাধ্যমে প্রাথমিক ভিত্তিতে প্রশিক্ষণ প্রদানের সম্পর্কের ভাংটি)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training provided by the WFP to members of WLSGs increased the <strong>level of efficiency</strong> for primary VGD beneficiary selection process (WFP দ্বারা WLSGs সদস্যদের মাধ্যমে প্রাথমিক ভিত্তিতে প্রশিক্ষণ বৃদ্ধি করেছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Members of WLSGs were <strong>motivated</strong> for primary VGD beneficiary selection process (WLSGs সদস্যদের মাধ্যমে প্রাথমিক ভিত্তিতে প্রশিক্ষণ করেছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivation of members of WLSGs was <strong>effective</strong> for primary VGD beneficiary selection process (WLSGs সদস্যদের প্রাথমিক ভিত্তিতে প্রশিক্ষণ করেছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Civil Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Civil participation at ward level open public meeting was <strong>effective</strong> (ওয়ার্ড স্তরের স্বাগতিক সমাবেশের সম্পর্কের ভাংটি)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ward level <em>mass people consciousness and active civil participation</em> helps to identify wrongful VGD primary list done by WLSGs (ওয়ার্ড স্তরের স্বাগতিক ভিত্তিতে অংশগ্রহণ মাধ্যমে কূল প্রাথমিক ভিত্তিতে প্রাথমিক তিলক সনাক্ত করা হয়েছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part-B: After Verification Stage** (যাচাই উত্তর পর্যন্ত) (Final VGD Beneficiary Selection/Verification done by Upazila VGD Committee-UZVGDC) in 2011-12
About After Verification Stage: Upazila Vulnerable Group Development Committee(UZVGD committee) is head authority for VGD beneficiary selection, final verification and approval authority of final VGD beneficiary list according to MoWCA guideline and it is consists of 14 Upazila level officers with all Union Parishad chairman and assigned NGO representative. This Committee is headed by Upazila Nirbahi Officer(UNO) and Upazila Women Affairs Officer(UWAO) is member secretary. In 2011-12 cycle, When the primary VGD beneficiary selection process was done by WLSGs, there were a lot of complains against the primary VGD list from ordinary people, civil society, journalists, political leaders that WLSG members did not select according to the prescribed circular/guideline of MoWCA. Then Upazila VGD committee verified whole process of all union parishes and found irregularities in the primary VGD beneficiary list done by WLSGs. The UZVGD committee verified the primary VGD listed beneficiaries physically at union level open public meeting in presence of common people, local elites, WLSG member, UP chairman, journalists and detected the irregularities. Finally UZVGD committee cancelled the unfit women and included the fit women according to the prescribed circular/guideline of MoWCA. From that situation/event this After Verification Stage has described and I include some critical issues and points in the following questionnaire. Before giving your answer, I request you to recall your memory in the month of November and December 2010, when this final VGD beneficiary selection/verification process was done by UZVGD committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Legal Framework</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Members of UZVGDCC clearly understood the final VGD selection criteria and selection process(UZVGDCC সদস  গণ চূড়া VGD সুিবধােভাগী বাছাই শত ও প্র্যায়া বন্ধকের নিয়মে )</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (দৃঢ়ভ মত)</td>
<td>Disagree (িভ মত)</td>
<td>Neutral (িনরেপ)</td>
<td>Agree (একমত)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (দৃঢ়ভ মত)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UZVGDCC arranged open public meeting for final selection/verification according to MoWCA guideline &amp; circular(UZVGDCC কিম র সদেসর মেধ  কম সূচীর ল ও উে শ সেচতনতার মা া )</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UZVGDCC verified physically primary VGD listed women at UP office according to selection criteria of circular &amp; guideline(UZVGDCC গাইডলাইন অনুসাের ইউিনয়েন আসার মরণালী যাচাই কেরিছল। )</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Awareness level among members of UZVGDCC about the objective and goals of VGD program according to guideline &amp; circular(UZVGDCC গাইডলাইন অনুসাের ইউিনয়েন আসার মরণালী যাচাই কেরিছল। )</td>
<td>Very Low (খুব িন)</td>
<td>Low(িন)</td>
<td>Neutral (িনরেপ)</td>
<td>High (উ)</td>
<td>Very High (খুব উ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think that the final selection criteria and process was done for ultra poor women centric?(আপিন কি মেন কেরন ে চূড়া যাচাই/বাছাই শত ও প্র্যায়া বন্ধকের নারী কেরিছল। )</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Rule of Law</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Final VGD beneficiary verification process done by UZVGDCC abide by Guideline &amp; circulars of MoWCA(গাইডলাইন অনুসাের UZVGDCC চূড়া সুিবধােভাগী বাছাই ভােব বুেঝিছে )</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The final VGD beneficiary verification process done by UZVGDC was bias (চূড়ান্ত বৃত্তি গ্রহণকারী ব্যক্তিগত প্রতিষ্ঠান স্বাধীনতা ছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UZVGD committee provided all information and opportunities to all people including the ultra poor women according to circulars(পরিপালন অনুযায়ী UZVGD committee সকল জনসাধারণ অন্ধকার ও সুযোগ প্রদান করেছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public Service Delivery</td>
<td>Scale 1</td>
<td>Scale 2</td>
<td>Scale 3</td>
<td>Scale 4</td>
<td>Scale 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Members of UZVGDC were committed to provide better public service delivery during final VGD beneficiary verification process(UZVGDCকল সদস্যরা চূড়ান্ত ব্যবহারের সময় সবেক্ষণা দান করেছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The effectiveness of public service delivery system during final VGD beneficiary verification process(চূড়ান্ত ব্যবহারের সময় সেবার কার্যকরতা)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How was the coordination among members of UZVGDC during final VGD beneficiary verification process(চূড়ান্ত ব্যবহারের কমিটির সদস্যরা মধ্যে সংলাপ)</td>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How much the members of UZVGDC were satisfied with final VGD verification process(কমিটির সদস্যরা মধ্যে দলবদ্ধ কাজের সুখস্বাগত)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leadership</td>
<td>Scale 1</td>
<td>Scale 2</td>
<td>Scale 3</td>
<td>Scale 4</td>
<td>Scale 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do you believe that TAG officers were less committed than UNO during final VGD beneficiary verification process(চূড়ান্ত ব্যবহারের সময় TAG অফিসারগণ UNO চেয়ে কম আগ্রহী ছিলেন)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The strength of leadership of members of UZVGDC in final VGD beneficiary verification process(চূড়ান্ত ব্যবহারের সময় UZVGDC সদস্যরা নেতৃত্বের ক্ষেত্রে)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The training provided by the WFP to members of UZVGDC for final VGD beneficiary verification process was <strong>adequate</strong> (WFP দ্বারা UZVGDC সদস্যদের জন্য প্রতিষ্ঠিত পর্যালোচনা প্রক্রিয়া অপেক্ষায়ী ছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Members of UZVGDC were able to apply <strong>training base knowledge</strong> successfully for final VGD beneficiary verification process (চূড়া বাছাই কমিটির সদস্যদের জন্য প্রতিষ্ঠিত শিক্ষার ভিত্তিতে সম্পন্ন হয়েছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The satisfaction level of received training among members of UZVGDC for final VGD beneficiary verification process (সদস্যদের মধ্যে প্রতিষ্ঠিত শিক্ষার স্তর)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training provided by the WFP to members of UZVGDC increased the level of <strong>efficiency</strong> for final VGD beneficiary selection process (WFP দ্বারা UZVGDC সদস্যদের জন্য প্রতিষ্ঠিত শিক্ষার ভিত্তিতে সম্পন্ন হয়েছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Members of UZVGDC were <strong>motivated</strong> for final VGD beneficiary verification process (চূড়া বাছাই কমিটির সদস্যদের জন্য প্রতিষ্ঠিত শিক্ষা)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Motivation of members of UZVGDC was <strong>effective</strong> for final VGD beneficiary verification process (কমিটির সদস্যদের জন্য প্রতিষ্ঠিত শিক্ষা)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Civil Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Civil participation at Union level open public meeting was <strong>effective</strong> (ইউনিয়ন পত্য বিশ্বাস সংগঠনের অনুষ্ঠান প্রশাসনিক হয়েছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Union level <strong>mass people consciousness and active civil participation</strong> helps to identify wrongful VGD primary list done by WLSG members (ইউনিয়ন বিশ্বাস সংগঠনের অন্যান্য প্রশাসনিক যোগাযোগ সম্পাদন করেছিল)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section-C: Information of the Respondent (উত্তরদাতার তথ্য)

Name: 
Gender: Male/Female
Age:

Designation (পদবি): 
Organization/Department

Place of Posting: 
Previous place of posting:

Working Experience with VGD program: ..............cycles/years

Role of Respondent in the VGD Program:
1) Upazila Chairman 2) Upazila Nirbahi Officer 3) Upazila Vice Chairman/Woman Vice Chairman 4) Member of UZVGDC 5) TAG Officer/Officer 6) UP Chairman 7) UWA Officer 8) Female Member 9) Male Member 10) Local Elites 11) Journalist 12) Others

Academic qualification: Under Graduate/ Graduate/Master’s

Contact: Mobile- 
E-mail:

Thank you very much for completing this survey. Please send back this questionnaire to the following e-mail: ahadadm@mail.com

ধন্যবাদ।

End of Survey
Annexure IV: Survey Questionnaire for Beneficiaries of 2011-2012 Cycle

(জরিপের জন্য প্রশ্নালিপি)

Section-A

Respected Respondents

I am Mohammad Abdul Ahad studying Master’s degree program at Graduate School of Public Administration in Seoul National University, South Korea. Currently I am conducting my Master degree thesis on “A Study on Effective Policy Implementation: A comparative Case on Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) Program in Bangladesh”.

I would like to request you to recall your memory during beneficiary selection process was done at your locality in the month of November and December, 2010 and spend your valuable a couple of minutes to answer this questionnaire. Thank you for your kind cooperation and participation in this survey.

Best regards

Mohammad Abdul Ahad

e-mail: ahadadmn@ymail.com

Mobile: +8201086929282

Global MPA Program

Section-B: Questionnaire for VGD Beneficiary (2011-12 cycle)

Part-A: Before Verification Stage (ৰাধাই পূর্ব পর্ব) (Primary VGD Beneficiary Selection Process done by Ward Level Small Group-WLSGs) in 2011-12 cycle (২০১১-১২ VGD চট্ট ওয়াড়া পর্বের কার্ড বাছাই ব্যাখ্যা প্রণালী)

1. How did you know about primary VGD card selection by Ward Level Small Group(WLSGs) in 2011-2012 cycle? (ওয়াড়া পর্বের কার্ড বাছাইকাল প্রাধানিক কার্ড বাছাইকাল আপনার জেনেছন কোনো দিক থেকে জানা গেছে কি?)
   a. Public notice  
   b. Union Parishad(UP) chairman  
   c. UP male/female members  
   d. Village defense police(VDP)/chokidar(চকিদার)

2. Did there any ward level open public meeting by WLSGs for VGD card selection? (ওয়াড়া পর্বের কার্ড বাছাইকাল আপনি কোনো সভায় অংশ নেন কি?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No

3. Did you attend to open public meeting at ward level arranged by WLSGs during primary VGD card selection process? (ওয়াড়া পর্বের কার্ড বাছাইকালের সভায় আপনি অংশ নেন কি?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No

4. Did members of WLSGs visit your house during primary VGD card selection? (প্রাধানিক কার্ড বাছাইকালে কার্ড বাছাইকাল আপনার বাড়িতে গিয়েছেন কি?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No
5. Did the primary VGD selection process done by WLSGs was fair? (ফুল দল দ্বারা প্রাথমিক কার্ড বাছাই কি সুন্দর ছিল?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No

6. Did the primary VGD selection process done by WLSGs was bias? (ফুল দল দ্বারা প্রাথমিক কার্ড বাছাই কি পর্যাপ্ত যুক্ত ছিল?)
   Yes  
   b. No

7. Did Transfer Assurance Guide (TAG) officers be present during primary VGD card selection process at ward level open meeting? (ওয়ার্ড প্রাথমিক কার্ড বাচাইকালে TAG অফিসার কি উপস্থিত ছিল?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No

8. Did NGO representative be present during primary VGD card selection process at ward level open meeting? (ওয়ার্ড প্রাথমিক কার্ড বাচাইকালে NGO প্রতিনিধি কি উপস্থিত ছিল?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No

9. Do you satisfy overall primary VGD card selection program done by WLSGs? (ফুল দল দ্বারা প্রাথমিক কার্ড বাছাই প্রক্রিয়ায় কি আপনি সহায়তা প্রকাশ করেছেন ?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No

Part-B: After Verification Stage (যাচাই উপর পর্যন্ত) (Final VGD Beneficiary Selection/Verification done by Upazila VGD Committee-UZVGDC) in 2011-12 cycle (২০১১-১২ VGD চত্বরে উপজেলা কমিটি(UZVGDC) দ্বারা চূড়া কার্ড সুবিধাধীন বাছাই/যাচাই প্রক্রিয়া )

1. How did you know about final VGD card selection/verification done by UZVGDC in 2011-12 cycle? (ইউইন পর্যায়ে উপজেলা VGD(UZVGDC) কমিটি দ্বারা চূড়া কার্ড বাছাই/যাচাই সম্পর্কে আপনি জানেন ?)
   a. Public notice  
   b. Union Parishad(UP) chairman  
   c. UP male/female members  
   d. Village defense police(VDP)/chokidar (চিকদার)

2. Did there any ward level open public meeting by UZVGDC for final VGD card verification process? (ইউইন পর্যায়ে চূড়া কার্ড বাছাই/যাচাই কি কোন উম্মুক্ত সমন্বয় করেছিল?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No

3. Did you attend to open public meeting at union level arranged by UZVGDC during final VGD card verification process? (ইউইন পর্যায়ে UZVGDC কমিটি দ্বারা কার্ড বাছাই উম্মুক্ত সমন্বয়ে আপনি কি যোগদান করেছিলেন?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No

4. Did members of UZVGDC verify physically/interview during final VGD card verification? (চূড়া কার্ড আচার/বাচাইকাল UZVGDC কমিটি আপনাকে বাছাই করেছিল?)
   a. Yes  
   b. No
5. Did the final VGD verification process done by UZVGDC was fair?
   a. Yes  b. No

6. Did the final VGD verification process done by UZVGDC was bias?
   a. Yes  b. No

7. Did Transfer Assurance Guide (TAG) officer be present during final VGD card verification process at union level open meeting?
   a. Yes  b. No

8. Did NGO representative be present during final VGD card verification process at union level open meeting?
   a. Yes  b. No

9. Do you satisfy overall final VGD card verification program done by UZVGDC?
   a. Yes  b. No

Section-C: Information of Respondent (Beneficiary)

Name:  Husband name:  Ward:  Union:
Upazila: Raiganj  Country: Bangladesh  Education: Primary/Secondary/Illiterate
No of Children:  Occupation:  Age:

Thank you Very Much  আপনাকে অনেক ধন্যবাদ

End of Survey
Annexure V: Questionnaire for Telephonic Interview
with members of UZVGDC

Name: 

Designation: 

Organization/Department: 

Place of Posting: 

Previous place of posting: 

Working Experience with VGD program: ………cycles/years

Q.1. What is the activities of VGD program regarding beneficiaries selection process in Raiganj Upazila?

Q.2. What type of problems did you face during VGD beneficiaries selection and verification in 2011-2012 cycle?

Q.3. Do you think that VGD beneficiary selection process and selection criteria prescribed in the MoWCA ‘s guideline is sufficient? Do you have any more suggestion regarding this?

Q.4. Do you satisfy about the primary VGD beneficiary selection process and activities done by Ward Level Small Group (WLSG) in 2011-2012 cycle? (Before Verification Stage)

Q.5. What do you think about the role of Female member as head of WLSG during primary VGD beneficiary selection process during 2011-12 cycle? Do you think that female member lead the WLSG successfully?

Q.6. What do you think about the role of Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO) as head of UZVGDC during final VGD beneficiary selection & Verification process and activities in 2011-12 cycle? (After Verification Stage). Do you think that UNO lead UZVGDC successfully?

Q.7. Do you think that Training and motivation program given by the World Food Program (WFP) for WLSG and UZVGDC members is sufficient?

Q.8. Do you have any more suggestion to implement VGD program effectively?

Thank you very much for your cooperation
### Annexure VI: Comparison of Officials’ Responses between Before & After Verification Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Level</th>
<th>Factors of Governance</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Before Verification Stage by WLSGs</th>
<th>After Verification Stage by UZVGdC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Level</strong></td>
<td>Legal Framework</td>
<td>Clear understanding of selection criteria &amp; process</td>
<td>1.37 Strongly Disagree Members of WLSGs could not understand clearly</td>
<td>4.69 Strongly Agree Members of UZVGdC understood clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrangement of open public meeting</td>
<td>1.43 Strongly Disagree They did not arrange open public meeting</td>
<td>4.61 Strongly Agree They arranged open public meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Households visit/physical verification (Interviewing)</td>
<td>94% no 6% yes They did not visit beneficiary’s households</td>
<td>1% No 99% Yes Yes They verified beneficiary’s physically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness level among committee members</td>
<td>1.93 Low Their awareness level was low</td>
<td>4.28 High Their awareness level was high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultra poor centric selection criteria &amp; process</td>
<td>1.54 Disagree The selection process was not ultra poor centric</td>
<td>4.57 Strongly Agree The selection process was ultra poor centric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule of Law</strong></td>
<td>Selection process was abided by Guideline &amp; rules, circulars</td>
<td>1.45 Strongly Disagree They did not abide by guideline rules &amp; circulars</td>
<td>4.68 Strongly Agree They abided by guideline rules &amp; circulars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biasness of selection process</td>
<td>3.75 Agree WLSGs were bias</td>
<td>1.69 Disagree UZVGdC was not bias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for all extreme poor women</td>
<td>1.66 Disagree They did not provide all information and opportunities to ultra poor women</td>
<td>3.97 Agree They provided all information and opportunities to ultra poor women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial Level</strong></td>
<td>Hierarchical Control</td>
<td>Supervision of selection process by TAG officers/UNO</td>
<td>1.70 Disagree TAG officers did not supervise primary selection process</td>
<td>4.65 Strongly Agree UNO supervised final selection process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilization of discretionary power for decision making</td>
<td>1.90 Low They did not utilize their discretionary power</td>
<td>4.62 Very high They utilized their discretionary power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical control system for selection process</td>
<td>1.42 Very Low Hierarchical control system among members of WLSGs was very low</td>
<td>4.84 High Hierarchical control system among members of UZVGdC was high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Service Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Commitment to provide better public service</td>
<td>1.33 Strongly Disagree They were not committed to provide better public service delivery</td>
<td>4.63 Strongly Agree They were committed to provide better public service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness of public service delivery</td>
<td>1.56 Low They were low effective</td>
<td>4.03 High They were high effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination among committee members</td>
<td>1.78 Bad They had bad coordination among themselves</td>
<td>4.32 Good They had good coordination among themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction level of selection process</td>
<td>2.94 Neutral They were neutral about their satisfaction level</td>
<td>4.48 High They were highly satisfied about their satisfaction level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership quality</strong></td>
<td>Leadership commitment of team leader (Female members/TAG officers) less than male members/UNO</td>
<td>3.78 Agree Female UP members had less committed and efficacy than male members</td>
<td>4.67 Strongly Agree TAG officers had less committed and efficacy than UNO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength of leadership during selection process</td>
<td>1.61 Low The strength of leadership of WLSGs was low</td>
<td>4.00 High The strength of leadership of WLSGs was high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Level</strong></td>
<td>Adequacy of training for committee members</td>
<td>1.27 Strongly Disagree Training provided by the WFP was not adequate for members of WLSGs</td>
<td>2.97 Neutral Training provided by the WFP was not adequate for members of UZVGdC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilization of training base knowledge by committee members</td>
<td>1.16 Strongly Disagree They were not able to utilize training base knowledge</td>
<td>4.18 Agree They were able to utilize training base knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction level of received training</td>
<td>Efficiency level increased by received training</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Civil Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.08 Very low</td>
<td>1.10 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.14 Disagree</td>
<td>1.36 Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction level of received training for members of WLSGs is very low</td>
<td>Received training did not increase the level of efficiency of members of WLSGs</td>
<td>They were not motivated</td>
<td>There was no civil participation during primary VGD selection process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49 Neutral</td>
<td>3.84 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.42 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.60 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Before Verification Stage by WLSGs</td>
<td>After Verification Stage by UZVGDC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice for beneficiary selection</td>
<td>0% by notice</td>
<td>46% by notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of responses</td>
<td>WLSGs did not serve any public notice to arrange open public meeting at ward level for ultra poor women before primary beneficiary selection process</td>
<td>UZVGDC served public notice to arrange open public meeting at union level for ultra poor women before primary beneficiary selection process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37% by UP chairmen</td>
<td>2% by UP chairmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61% by UP members</td>
<td>11% by UP members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% VDP</td>
<td>41% VDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Open public meeting</td>
<td>11%Yes 89% No</td>
<td>87%Yes 13% No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of ultra poor women at open public meeting</td>
<td>11%Yes 89% No</td>
<td>86%Yes 14% No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households visit/physical verification</td>
<td>19%Yes 81% No</td>
<td>86%Yes 14% No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness of selection process</td>
<td>15%Yes 85% No</td>
<td>87%Yes 13% No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biasness of selection process</td>
<td>83%Yes 17% No</td>
<td>18%Yes 82% No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of TAG officers</td>
<td>12%Yes 88% No</td>
<td>79%Yes 21% No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of NGO representatives</td>
<td>16%Yes 84% No</td>
<td>89%Yes 11% No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction level of beneficiaries</td>
<td>29%Yes 71% No</td>
<td>100%Yes 0% No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annexure VII: Comparison of Beneficiaries’ Responses between Before & After Verification Stages**

- WLSGs did not serve any public notice to arrange open public meeting at ward level for ultra poor women before primary beneficiary selection process.
- UZVGDC served public notice to arrange open public meeting at union level for ultra poor women before primary beneficiary selection process.
- WLSGs did not arrange open public meeting at ward level accordingly.
- UZVGDC arranged open public meeting at union level accordingly.
- WLSGs did not ensure attendance of ultra poor women for primary selection.
- UZVGDC ensured attendance of ultra poor women for primary selection.
- WLSGs did not visit prospective beneficiary's households accordingly.
- UZVGDC interviewed primary listed VGD beneficiaries at UP office to identify wrongfully selected primary beneficiaries by WLSG.
- WLSGs did not ensure fair selection process.
- UZVGDC ensured fair selection process.
- WLSGs did not ensure unbiased selection process.
- UZVGDC ensured unbiased selection process.
- TAG officers were not present at primary beneficiary selection process.
- TAG officers were not present at final beneficiary verification process.
- NGO representatives were not present at primary beneficiary selection process.
- NGO representatives were present at final beneficiary verification process.
- Beneficiaries were partially satisfied to overall selection process done by WLSGs.
- Beneficiaries were fully satisfied to overall verification process done by UZVGDC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Case</th>
<th>Before Verification Stage by WLSGs</th>
<th>After Verification Stage by UZVGDC</th>
<th>Violation of Criteria (Evidence for Cancellation)</th>
<th>Findings and Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Case Study 1** Ms A, An Old women | a. Age (18-49yrs) - 46 years  
  b. Land - less than 0.15 acre  
  c. Food - 3 square meals daily  
  d. Housing - Bamboo fencing  
  e. Earnings - No earning member  
  f. Family head - Male (her son)  
  g. NGO - No membership  
  h. 2007-2010 cycle - No VGD card | a. Age (18-49yrs) - 47 years (NID)  
  b. Land - 1.25 acre  
  c. Food - 3 square meals daily  
  d. Housing - semi-concrete  
  e. Earnings - Her son vegetables salesman  
  f. Family head - Male (her son)  
  g. NGO - no membership  
  h. 2007-2010 cycle - No VGD card | Selection criteria  
  Sec. III.2.2.1(3)(4)(5)  
  Sec. III.2.2.3(1) | Findings:  
  a. No open public meeting  
  b. No household visit  
  c. Lack of information  
  **Decision-Cancelled from final list by section III.2.3(g)** |
| **Case Study 2** Ms B, A Rich Woman | a. Age (18-49yrs) - 38 years  
  b. Land - 0.11 acre homestead  
  c. Food - 1 or 2 square meals daily  
  d. Housing - Semi-building with CI sheet  
  e. Earnings - Husband Daily labor  
  f. Family head - Male (her husband)  
  g. NGO - No membership  
  h. 2007-2010 cycle - No VGD card | a. Age (18-49yrs) - 38 years (NID)  
  b. Land - 2.75 acre  
  c. Food - 3 square meals daily  
  d. Housing - semi-concrete  
  e. Earnings - Husband agriculture farmer  
  f. Family head - Male (her husband)  
  g. NGO - no membership  
  h. 2007-2010 cycle - No VGD card | Selection criteria  
  Sec. III.2.2.2(2)(3)(4)(5)  
  Sec. III.2.2.3(2) | Findings:  
  a. No open public meeting  
  b. No household visit  
  c. Lack of information  
  **Decision-Cancelled from final list by section III.2.3(g)** |
| **Case Study 3** Ms C, Husband Grocery Shopkeeper | a. Age (18-49yrs) - 35 years  
  b. Land - 0.04 acre homestead  
  c. Food - 1 or 2 square meals daily  
  d. Housing - Straw fencing with CI sheet  
  e. Earnings - No specific income  
  f. Family head - Male (her son husband)  
  g. NGO - No membership  
  h. 2007-2010 cycle - No VGD card | a. Age (18-49yrs) - 35 years (NID)  
  b. Land - 0.04 acre homestead  
  c. Food - 3 square meals daily  
  d. Housing - semi-concrete with CI sheet  
  e. Earnings - Husband grocery shopkeeper  
  f. Family head - Male (her husband)  
  g. NGO - Microcredit from BRAC  
  h. 2007-2010 cycle - No VGD card | Selection criteria  
  Sec. III.2.2.2(1)(3)(4)(5)  
  Sec. III.2.2.3(2) | Findings:  
  a. No open public meeting  
  b. No household visit  
  c. Lack of information  
  d. No priority list  
  e. Negligence of NGO representative  
  **Decision-Cancelled from final list by section III.2.3(g)** |
| **Case Study 4** Ms D, A Beneficiary of Widow Allowance | a. Age (18-49yrs) - 43 years  
  b. Land - 0.06 acre homestead  
  c. Food - 1 or 2 square meals daily with extreme poverty  
  d. Housing - Straw fencing with bamboo pillar  
  e. Earnings - No specific income  
  f. Family head - Male (her son)  
  g. NGO - No membership  
  h. 2007-2010 cycle - No VGD card | a. Age (18-49yrs) - 43 years (NID)  
  b. Land - 0.06 acre homestead  
  c. Food - 3 square meals daily  
  d. Housing - semi-concrete with CI sheet  
  e. Earnings - Her son is Van puller  
  f. Family head - Male (her husband)  
  g. NGO - Microcredit from ASA  
  h. 2007-2010 cycle - No VGD card  
  i. Beneficiary of Widow Allowance | Selection criteria  
  Sec. III.2.2.2(1)(4)(5)  
  Sec. III.2.2.3(2) | Findings:  
  a. No open public meeting  
  b. No household visit  
  c. Lack of information  
  d. No priority list  
  e. Negligence of NGO representative  
  f. No Prospective beneficiary database  
  **Decision-Cancelled from final list by section III.2.3(g)** |
### Case Study 5
**Ms E**, Beneficiary of 2009-2010 cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-49yrs, 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>0.03 acre homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2 or 2 square meals daily with extreme poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Straw fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>No specific income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family head</td>
<td>Male (her husband)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>No membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2010 cycle</td>
<td>No VGD card</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection criteria**
- Sec.III.2.2.2(4)(5)
- Sec.III.2.2.3(2)(3)

**Findings**
- Lack of information
- Negligence of NGO representative
- No Prospective beneficiary database
- Decision: Cancelled from final list by section III.2.3(g)

### Case Study 6
**Ms F**, One family selected two beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-49yrs, 24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>0.05 acre homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2 or 3 square meals daily with extreme poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Soil build house with straw made roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>No specific income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family head</td>
<td>Male (her husband)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>No membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2010 cycle</td>
<td>No VGD card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her mother-in-law Ms Z</td>
<td>Selected as VGD beneficiary from same family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection criteria**
- Sec.III.2.2.4(1)
- Sec.III.2.2.4(2)

**Findings**
- Lack of information
- Negligence of NGO representative
- No Prospective beneficiary database
- Lack of Motivation
- Lack of leadership
- Lack of civil participation
- Decision: Ms F Cancelled from final list and Ms Z included in final list by section III.2.3(g)

### Case Study 7
**Ms G**, Selected by means of bribe 3000Tk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-49yrs, 45 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Landless family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2 or 3 square meals daily with extreme poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Straw fencing house at khas land (govt land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>No specific income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family head</td>
<td>Male (her husband)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>No membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2010 cycle</td>
<td>No VGD card</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection criteria**
- Sec.III.2.2.2(1)(2)(3)
- Sec.III.2.2.3(3)

**Findings**
- Lack of information
- Negligence of NGO representative
- No Prospective beneficiary database
- Lack of Motivation
- Lack of leadership
- Decision: Cancelled from final list by section III.2.3(g)

### Case Study 8
**Ms H**, A close relative of a UP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-49yrs, 38 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Landless family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Live with extreme food insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Brick wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>No specific income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family head</td>
<td>Male (her husband)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>No membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2010 cycle</td>
<td>No VGD card</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection criteria**
- Sec.III.2.2.2(1)(2)(3)
- Sec.III.2.2.3(3)

**Findings**
- Lack of information
- Negligence of NGO representative
- No Prospective beneficiary database
- Lack of leadership
- Lack of civil participation
- Decision: Cancelled from final list by section III.2.3(g)
Annexure IX: Table-1 for Primary VGD beneficiary list for selection process done by WLSG  
VGD cycle 20..-20..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI no</th>
<th>Name with Husband/Guardian’s name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Family members</th>
<th>Determinant for destitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have to starve very often(Y/N)</td>
<td>Land (less than 0.15 acre)</td>
<td>Infrastructure of household</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Head of WLSG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>UP female member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Male member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ward number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward number</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Annexure X: Table-2 for Final VGD beneficiary list for selection process done by UZVGDC

VGD cycle 20..-20..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl no</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Father/Husband/Guardian’s name</th>
<th>Family members</th>
<th>Ward no</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Para/Moholla</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Final List Preparatory**

Signature | Signature
---|---
Designation | Member-Secretary, UVGDC | Designation | Chairman, UVGDC
UP name | UP Name

**Final List Approval**

Signature
Designation | UWAO & Member-Secretary UZVGDC | Designation | UNO & Chairman UZVGDC
Organization | ………… Upazila,DWA, | ……… Upazila
Annexure XI: Application Form for VGD Beneficiary (Proposed by Author)

To

Upazila VGD Committee (UZVGDC)

………………………Upazila…………………Zila………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Father’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mother’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Husband’s/Guardian’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Date of birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Mobile no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Birth registration no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 National ID(NID) no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Priority list serial no(Upazila e-data base)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Education qualification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Present Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upazila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Zila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Permanent Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upazila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Zila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Qualifying Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Income Generating Activities(IGAs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Beneficiary of any other welfare government program(Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 NGO/BRDB/Others society’s members(Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Head of Family (Female/ No male earning member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Infrastructure of Households(Roof, fencing, doors, pillars of house; water &amp; sanitation system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Age(18-49 years)(Yes/no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Family Income(very less/daily labor/no specific income)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Family planning process(Permanent/Temporary) (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Have to starve very often(Yes/no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Land ownership(less than 0.15 acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 VGD cardholder before or during previous two cycle(Yes/no)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
국문초록

방글라데시의 효과적 복지정책 집행 연구: 
VDG 프로그램의 비교사례를 중심으로

Ahad Mohammad Abdul
행정대학원 행정학 전공
서울대학교

본 연구는 방글라데시 취약층개발 프로그램(VGD, Vulnerable Group Development)의 수혜자 선정과정을 살펴보고 이를 더욱 효과적으로 발전시킬 수 있는 방안에 대해 탐색해보고자 하였다. VGD 프로그램은 과부, 이혼, 별거, 유기 혹은 장애인 남편과 거주하는 등 매우 열악한 상황에 처한 여성의 사회경제적 지위를 향상시키기 위한 프로그램이다. 본 연구는 Raiganj Upazila(읍) 지역에서 현지조사를 통해 확보한 질적자료를 바탕으로 비교사례연구를 통해서 수혜자 선정과정에 대해 분석하였다.

먼저 VGD 프로그램 집행 시나리오를 살펴보고 거버넌스 요인을 살펴보았다. 이러한 요인들이 초기에 검증이전 단계에서 Ward Level Small Groups(WLSGs)에 의해 실시된 수혜자 선정과정에 어떤 영향을 미쳤으며, 이후 검증이후 단계에서 Upazila VGD Committee (UZVGDC)에 의해서 실패가 성공으로 어떻게 바뀔 수 있었는지를 살펴보았다.

제도적, 관리적, 기술적인 거버넌스 단계별로 25개의 성공요인을 도출하였는데, 그 중에서도 예를 들어 법적제도, 법치주의, 계서적 통제, 공공서비스 전달, 리더십, 교육훈련, 동기, 시민참여 등의 요인들을 선정하여 이러한 변수들에 대해서는 설문조사를 통해 데이터를 수집하였다. 검증이전의 WLSG에 의한 실패사례와 검증이후 UZVGDC의 성공사례를 비교분석한 결과, 8개의 독립변수에 있어서
유의미한 차이가 있는 것을 확인하였다. 보다 구체적으로 살펴보면, 선정기준과 선정과정을 명확히 이해하는 것, 공개회의를 개최하는 것, 가구 방문 혹은 인터뷰 수행, 규칙, 회람 및 안내지침서를 적절히 활용하는 것, 보다 양질의 공공서비스를 제공하는 것, 집단 및 위원회 구성원들간 조화, 여성 위원의 리더십을 향상하는 것, 활발한 시민참여를 보장하는 것 등에 있어서 성공사례와 실패사례의 차이가 명확히 나타났고 이것이 프로그램의 결과에 있어 차이를 초래하였다. 반면에 편견, 공정성, 계시적 통제 시스템, 재량권의 활용, 교육훈련 및 동기 부여 등으로 인하여 바람직한 결과를 달성하지 못하는 것으로 나타났다.

이러한 차이점을 확인한 것이 본 연구의 가장 주요한 성과이며, 이를 통해 거버넌스와 행정에 관한 연구에 이론적으로 기여하였다. 또한 실제 정책현장에서 본 연구에서 사례를 통해 발견한 정책체인을 적용한다면 방글라데시의 취약층개발 프로그램의 수혜자 선정과정의 개선에 기여할 수 있을 것이다. 또한 본 연구의 함의를 다른 취약층 대상 복지정책, 가령 취약층 식량지원 프로그램, 노인수당, 과부수당, 모성수당, 극빈층 남성을 위한 고용프로그램 등에 활용할 수도 있을 것이다.

그럼에도 불구하고 본 연구는 다음과 같은 한계를 가진다. 후속연구는 보다 정교한 이론과 연구방법을 사용하여 심화된 연구를 수행해야 할 것이며, 사례를 비교함에 있어서 같은 읍(upazila) 지역에서 두 번의 사업수행주기를 비교한다면거나 서로 다른 지역을 비교하여 분석하는 연구가 필요할 것이다.

주요어: 거버넌스, 정책집행, 복지정책, 취약층개발 프로그램, 수혜자 선정과정, 비교사례연구
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