



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Vietnam's responses to provincial
economic disparities through
central-provincial government financial
relations**

Vu, Binh and Nguyen, Tom and Smith, Christine and
Nghiem, Son

Griffith University

2015

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/67705/>
MPRA Paper No. 67705, posted 10 Mar 2016 05:54 UTC

VIETNAM'S RESPONSES TO PROVINCIAL ECONOMIC DISPARITIES THROUGH CENTRAL-PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL RELATIONS

Xuan-Binh Vu

Visiting Research Fellow, Griffith Asia Institute, Nathan campus, Griffith University, Queensland, 4111, Australia.

Email: binh.vu@griffithuni.edu.au

Duc-Tho Nguyen

Professor, Department of Accounting, Finance and Economics, Nathan campus, Griffith University, Queensland, 4111, Australia.

Christine Smith

Professor, Department of Accounting, Finance and Economics, Nathan campus, Griffith University, Queensland, 4111, Australia.

Hong-Son Nghiem

Research Fellow, Centre for National Research on Disability and Rehabilitation Medicine, The University of Queensland, Herston, Queensland, 4029, Australia.

ABSTRACT: The paper examines key changes in central-provincial government financial arrangements and their effects on provincial economic disparities in Vietnam over the period 2000-2008. We find that after 2004, transfers from the central to provincial governments conformed much more closely to objective and pre-determined criteria than before. Econometric estimations indicate that in the post-2004 sub-period, poorer provinces obtained more-than-proportionate assistance from the central government, and the favourable treatment was statistically significant. Responses from interviews and statistical data suggest that transfers from the central government played an important role in reducing poverty and provincial output disparities after 2004. The difficulties experienced by the central government in securing adequate resources to finance such transfers, the over-reliance of some provinces on the transfers, and related policy implications are also discussed in the paper.

1. INTRODUCTION

In a recent study of economic disparities across the provinces of Vietnam, Vu, *et al.* (2011) found that although provincial levels of output per capita diverged over the study period 1990-2008, the trend was reversed around 2004 (for more details, see Figure 1 below). These authors also offered a number of possible explanations for this trend reversal, one of which was the increased role of central-provincial government financial relations in response to the above disparities. This paper further develops this theme by examining more closely financial arrangements between central and provincial levels of government in Vietnam before and after 2004, and by analysing the role of transfers from the central to provincial governments in helping to reduce poverty and provincial output disparities. More specifically, the focus is on the following research questions:

- (a) How did key features of the central-provincial government financial relations in Vietnam change after 2004?
- (b) How important were transfers from the central government in helping to reduce poverty and provincial output disparities?
- (c) What have been the main issues in implementing the central-provincial government financial relations to address provincial output disparities?

In order to answer the above questions, both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed including in-depth interviews, analysis of available official documents, and econometric analyses. The paper's main contributions lie in the use of and interpretation of recent data, as well as in the analysis of the interviews and synthesis of findings therefrom. The paper is organised as follows. Following this section, Section 2 presents a brief review of a number of relevant previous studies of government responses to regional output and/or income disparities and poverty, and some background information regarding Vietnam's geography. Section 3 outlines the research methods, while Section 4 describes data sources. Section 5 discusses the findings and Section 6 provides a summary of the main points raised.




Figure 1. Disparity in GDP Per Capita across Provinces.

Source: Vu, *et al.* (2011).

2. RELEVANT PREVIOUS STUDIES

In a recent report, World Development Report (2009) argued that, if appropriately designed and implemented, policies intended to reduce inequalities between poor and rich regions in a given country may benefit not only the poorer regions but the richer ones as well. The report differentiated between policies involving universal institutions (spatially blind policies), infrastructure (spatially connective policies), and incentives (spatially focused policies). Institutions-based policies consist of such national policies as income tax systems, education, and health care. Infrastructure policies involve investments connecting places, such as interregional highways and railroads, and information and communication technologies and telecommunications networks. Incentive policies comprise spatially targeted measures to stimulate economic growth in poor areas, such as investment subsidies, tax rebates, local infrastructure development, and special regulations for export processing zones. Where there are few obstacles to labour and capital mobility, spatially connective initiatives can be particularly useful in reducing disparities. By contrast, in countries fragmented by linguistic, religious, or ethnic divisions, spatially targeted interventions may be an

appropriate method to address these disparities. In this scheme of classification, national inter-governmental financial relations are part of the institutions-based policies.

As highlighted in Table 1 findings from previous studies of the impact of inter-governmental transfers on inter-regional disparities have been mixed. Kaufman *et al.* (2003) found that equalization transfers from the federal government in Canada stimulated provincial output convergence and reduced disparities across provinces during the period 1961-2000. Similarly, Rodriguez (2006) reported that inter-provincial transfers played a vital role in accelerating the convergence process for Canadian provinces during the period 1926-1999. Akai and Hosio (2009) found that fiscal decentralization in the USA gave low-income counties greater autonomy and contributed to decreased inter-county inequality. In contrast, Garcia-Milà and McGuire (2001) found that inter-regional transfers in Spain were *not* effective in improving the economic performance of poor regions, but concluded that the transfers were not *sufficiently large* to achieve the desired improvement.

More generally, Lessmann's (2006) cross-section analysis of data for 17 OECD countries during the period 1980-2001 indicated that central government grants played an important role in helping poorer regions to catch up with richer ones. In a subsequent study, however, Kessler and Lessmann (2008) applied panel-data techniques to data from 23 OECD countries for the period 1982-2000 and found that countries with higher levels of redistributive governmental transfers actually experienced *greater inter-regional divergence*: the equalisation payments tended to mitigate migration from poorer to richer regions and therefore hindered the convergence process.

Findings from studies undertaken for China (which, like Vietnam, has been in a transition from the central planning system to a market economy) are of special relevance to the present study. Raiser (1998) argued that the rate of convergence in income per capita across the provinces of China decreased after 1985 because the inter-provincial fiscal transfer mechanism at the time tended to favour the *richer* provinces. After a reform of the tax system in 1994, however, Jiang and Zhao (2003) found that such transfer payments played an important role in reducing regional disparities during the period 1995-2000. Dabla-Norris (2005) argued that several major issues in intergovernmental fiscal relations remained after 1994, and in particular, that revenue-sharing arrangements should be further adjusted in favour of the poorer provinces.

Table 1. Previous studies of the impact of inter-governmental transfers on inter-regional disparities.

Authors	Year	Country	Data sample	Techniques	Findings
Kaufman, Swagel & Dunaway	2003	Canada	1961-2000	Panel data	Equalization transfers from the federal government stimulated provincial output convergence and reduced provincial disparities.
Rodriguez	2006	Canada	1926-1999	Time-series	Inter-provincial transfers accelerated the convergence process for the provinces.
Akai & Hosio	2009	USA	1993-2000	Cross-sectional data	Fiscal decentralization gave low-income counties greater autonomy and contributed to decreased inter-county inequality.
Garcia-Milà & McGuire	2001	Spain	1977-1992	Time-series	Inter-regional transfers were not effective in improving the economic performance of poor regions, but the transfers were not sufficiently large to achieve the desired improvement.
Lessmann	2006	17 OECD countries	1980-2001	Cross-sectional data and panel data	Central government grants played an important role in helping poorer regions to catch up with richer ones.
Kessler & Lessmann	2008	23 OECD countries	1982-2000	Cross-sectional data and panel data	Countries with higher levels of redistributive governmental transfers experienced greater inter-regional divergence: the equalisation payments tended to mitigate migration from poorer to richer regions and therefore hindered the convergence process.
Raiser	1998	China	1978-1992	Cross-sectional data and panel data	Rate of convergence in income per capita across the provinces decreased after 1985 because the inter-provincial fiscal transfer mechanism tended to favour the <i>richer</i> provinces.
Jiang & Zhao	2003	China	1995-2000	Descriptive analyses and cross-sectional data	Transfer payments played an important role in reducing regional disparities

Source: the Authors.

Table 1. (Continued) Previous studies of the impact of inter-governmental transfers on inter-regional disparities.

Authors	Year	Country	Data sample	Techniques	Findings
Dabla-Norris	2005	China	1994 tax reform & after	Descriptive analyses	Revenue-sharing arrangements should be further adjusted in favour of the poorer provinces.
Yao	2009	China	1999, 2003, 2006	Descriptive analyses	Government responses to inter-regional disparities through major programs such as “Go West”, “Reviving the Northeast”, and “Central Rising” were analysed. These programs focused on infrastructure building, social development through education and public health, and the likes, but offered little new information on inter-governmental fiscal relations.
Chen & Groenewold	2010	China	2000-2006	Simulation models	Policies analysed aimed to reduce disparities between manufacturing-intensive and agriculture-intensive provinces through productivity improvements in agriculture, with little discussion of inter-governmental transfers.
Bird, Litvack & Rao	1995	Vietnam	1992-1993	Descriptive analyses and cross-sectional data	Pro-poor services were underfunded, especially in the poorer areas. Well-designed inter-governmental transfers could play an important role in generating additional revenues for poorer provinces.
Rao, Bird & Litvack	1998	Vietnam	1992-1993	Descriptive analyses and cross-sectional data	The high poverty rates in rural areas led to a severe shortage of resources at the provincial level and an allocation system that favoured richer provinces rather than poorer ones.
Martinez-Vazquez & Gomez	2005	Vietnam	The 2002 State Budget Law	Descriptive analyses	Briefly described revenue assignments, expenditure assignments, inter-governmental transfer mechanism, and borrowing of local governments, but did not analyse the role of subsidies from the central government in helping to reduce poverty and provincial output disparities.

Source: the Authors.

More recently, Yao (2009) studied government responses to inter-regional disparities through major programs such as “Go West”, “Reviving the Northeast”, and “Central Rising” which focused on infrastructure building, social development through education and public health, but offered little new information on inter-governmental fiscal relations. Similarly, Chen and Groenewold (2010) concentrated on policies designed to reduce disparities between manufacturing-intensive and agriculture-intensive provinces through productivity improvements in agriculture, with little discussion of inter-governmental transfers.

There are relatively few empirical studies of government responses to poverty and regional income disparities in Vietnam. Bird *et al.* (1995) examined data from the Vietnam Living Standards Survey (VLSS) 1992-1993 and found that pro-poor services were underfunded, especially in the poorer areas: they argued that well-designed inter-governmental transfers could play an important role in generating additional revenues for poorer provinces. In the same vein, Rao *et al.* (1998), suggested that one of the reasons for the high poverty rates observed in rural areas was a severe shortage of resources at the provincial level and an allocation system that favoured *richer* provinces rather than poorer ones. Martinez-Vazquez and Gomez (2005) briefly described revenue assignments, expenditure assignments, inter-governmental transfer mechanisms, and borrowing of local governments pursuant to the 2002 State Budget Law, but did not analyse the role of subsidies from the central government in helping to reduce poverty and provincial output disparities. Bjornestad (2009) examined cross-sectional data for 2002, 2004, and 2006 and found that fiscal transfers per capita from the central to provincial governments were positively correlated with provincial poverty rates. More recently, Nguyen and Anwar (2011) argued that inter-governmental transfers had a negative effect on provincial economic growth during the period 2002-2007. However, this finding should be interpreted with caution, as the cited period includes a possible structural break in 2004, when the 2002 State Budget Law came into effect.

3. BACKGROUND TO THE VIETNAMESE CASE

Lying on the eastern part of the Indochinese peninsula, Vietnam is a strip of land shaped like the letter “S”, with an area of approximately 331 000 square kilometres and a population of nearly 87.8 million (GSO, 2011). The country borders China to the north, Laos and Cambodia to the west, the East Sea to the east and the Pacific Ocean to the east and south.

The country's total length from north to south is about 1 650 kilometres with a coastline of around 3 260 kilometres and an inland border of roughly 4 510 kilometres. In administrative terms Vietnam is divided into 64 provinces (see Figure 2). These provinces are frequently grouped into eight regions: the *North West*, *North East*, *Red River Delta*, *North Central Coast*, *South Central Coast*, *Central Highlands*, *South East*, and *Mekong River Delta* regions (Figure 3). For the present purposes, it is useful to classify the 64 provinces into four groups (*richer*, *average*, *poorer*, and *remote and poor*) based on their respective levels of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita in 2008 and (in the case of the last group) their locations (Figure 4).



Figure 2. Provincial Map of Vietnam. Source: the General Statistics Office of Vietnam.



Figure 3. Regional Map of Vietnam. Source: the General Statistics Office of Vietnam.




Figure 4. Groupings of Provinces by Income. Note: The provinces are grouped on the basis of GDP per capita estimates for 2008. Source: the Authors.

4. METHODS AND MODELS

This paper uses a range of qualitative and quantitative analytical methods. Firstly, *content analysis* is applied to official documents, such as the State Budget Laws, government's papers, World Bank's reports, and previous studies to gain a systematic understanding of the key changes in Vietnam's central-provincial government financial arrangements. Secondly, information from in-depth *interviews* is synthesised and cross-checked with statistical data to ascertain the role of

inter-governmental transfers in helping to reduce poverty and provincial output disparities. Responses from interviewees are also employed to analyse the main issues that have arisen in implementing inter-governmental financial relations, with cross-checking through content analysis of documents and statistical analysis of available data. Thirdly, *econometric* regressions are employed to investigate patterns and trends in transfers from the central to provincial governments.

Specifically, the regressions portray a relationship whereby net transfers received by each province are expected to depend negatively on its GDP per capita level, as follows:

$$NTPC_{i,t} = a_{1,t} + b_{1,t} * RGDPPC_{i,t-2} + b_{2,t} * Dremote_i + \varepsilon_{1,t} \quad (1)$$

$$NTPC_{i,t} = 100 * \frac{(C_{i,t} - B_{2,i,t}) / P_{i,t}}{GDPPERCapVN_t} \quad (2)$$

$$RGDPPC_{i,t-2} = \left(100 * \frac{GDPPERCap_{i,t-2}}{GDPPERCapVN_{t-2}} \right) \quad (3)$$

where $NTPC_{i,t}$ is the real net transfers per capita received by province i in year t , de-scaled by being expressed as a percentage of the real national GDP per capita in the same year; $RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$ is the real GDP per capita of province i in year $t-2$, similarly de-scaled; $C_{i,t}$ are real transfers from the central government to province i in year t ; $B_{2,i,t}$ is real sharable revenue which was transferred to the central government by province i in year t ; $P_{i,t}$ is population of province i in year t ; $GDPPERCapVN_t$ is the real national GDP per capita of Vietnam in year t ; and $GDPPERCap_{i,t-2}$ is the real GDP per capita of province i in year $t-2$.

The reason for choosing a two-year lag ($t-2$) for $GDPPERCap_{i,t-2}$ is that according to the 2002 State Budget Law, provincial budget estimates (including transfers from the central government for the *next* financial year) are normally determined from October to December in the current financial year and based on the main provincial characteristics such as provincial terrain and level of development in the *previous* fiscal year. For robustness, a one-year lag ($t-1$) is also used in equation (1); as we shall see, however, the results are quite similar to those obtained with a two-year lag ($t-2$) (see Table 3 below).

The dummy variable $Dremote_i$ is used because some remote provinces are characterised by not only low income levels, but also remoteness from major economic/commercial centres and high concentrations of ethnic minorities: transfers from the central government to these provinces tend to be far higher than to other provinces. $Dremote_i = 1$ if province i is a very remote and mountainous province, zero if otherwise.

After equation (1) is estimated by Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) on a cross-sectional basis, tests for normality and for heteroscedasticity of the residuals are conducted. Both null hypotheses (normality and homoscedasticity) are rejected for each of the years studied (2000 - 2008). Therefore, robust standard errors and t-statistics (White, 1980) are used.

In recognition of the fact that the current State Budget Law came into effect in 2004, the standard Chow test (1960) is used to test for a possible structural break around 2004 in the series of weighted coefficient of variation (CV_w) of provincial transfers per capita. The equation used to test for a break year is $CV_w = a + b*t + \varepsilon_t$ where t is the relevant year, with CV_w being computed as:

$$CV_w = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_i \left(s_i - \bar{s} \right)^2 \frac{p_i}{P}}}{\bar{s}} \quad (4)$$

where s_i is the transfer per capita of province i ; \bar{s} is the national mean per capita transfer; P is the national population; and p_i is the population of province i . The Chow test results indicate that there was a break of the CV_w of provincial transfers per capita in 2004, with the F-statistic (2,5) = 10.31 compared with the F-critical (2,5) value of 5.79 (at the 5per cent significance level). Our content analysis of official documents and feedback from interviews also suggest a break date of 2004 (see below). Accordingly, the study period is divided into two sub-periods: 2000-2003 and 2004-2008.

Utilising the knowledge of the above structural break and making the most of the availability of panel data, the following panel-data regression model is used:

$$\begin{aligned} NTPC_{i,t} = & a_1 + b_1 * RGDPPC_{i,t-2} + c_1 * Dremote_i + \\ & a_2 * Dbreak2004 + b_2 * Dremote * Dbreak2004 + \\ & b_3 * Dbreak2004 * RGDPPC_{i,t-2} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $NTPC_{i,t}$, $RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$ and $Dremote_i$ are as defined above, and $Dbreak2004$ is equal to one during the sub-period 2004-2008, and zero during the sub-period 2000-2003.

5. DATA SOURCES AND INTERVIEWS

The data used include real GDP per capita and real net transfers per capita at 1994 prices for 64 provinces of Vietnam. Data for GDP, population, public investment at the provincial level are available from the General Statistics Office (GSO), provincial websites and various Year Books. In addition, yearly data for subsidies from the central to provincial budgets were collected from the Ministry of Finance (MOF). As three of the 64 provinces, namely Dien Bien, Dak Nong, and Hau Giang were established only in 2004 (Resolution 22/2003/NQ-QH XI), their data have been combined with data for Lai Chau, Dak Lak, and Can Tho to represent the composite entities Lai Chau – Dien Bien, Dak Nong – Dak Lak, and Can Tho – Hau Giang, respectively, for the nine-year study period, 2000-2008.

Interviews were conducted with four central officials of the MOF and 15 provincial officials of the Department of Finance of 15 provinces, namely Hoa Binh, Bac Giang, Hai Duong, Cao Bang, Lao Cai, Lang Son, Phu Tho, Hanoi, Thanh Hoa, Quang Ngai, Quang Nam, Kon Tum, Ho Chi Minh City, and Dong Nai. The reason for choosing central officials of the MOF is that the MOF plays an important role in implementing central and provincial government financial arrangements. The provincial officials were selected on the basis that their provinces were not only representative of the seven geographical regions of Vietnam but also representative of the three groups of rich, average, and poor provinces in terms of per capita GDP and level of subsidy from the central government. The poor group included Hoa Binh in the North West region; Cao Bang, Lao Cai, Bac Kan, Lang Son, Phu Tho and Bac Giang in the North East; and Kon Tum in the Central Highland regions. The average group comprised Hai Duong in the Red River Delta region, Thanh Hoa in the North Central Coast, and Quang Ngai and Quang Nam in the South Central Coast regions. The rich group consisted of Hanoi in

the Red River Delta region and Ho Chi Minh City and Dong Nai in the South East region (for more details, see Figure 2).

6. MAIN FINDINGS

Main Features of Central-Provincial Government Financial Relations

Before 1996, central-provincial government financial arrangements in Vietnam were governed by a series of government Decrees and Resolutions. During the period 1997-2003, the arrangements were regulated by the first State Budget Law in 1996 and the amended 1998 State Budget Law. The current arrangements have been implemented by the 2002 State Budget Law which was put into effect in 2004. This section will analyse the major features of the arrangements based on the development of the regulations.

Before 1996

Central-provincial government financial arrangements in Vietnam were governed by a series of government Decrees and Resolutions including Decree 75/1945/SL-CTN, Decree 119/1967/NĐ-CP, Resolution 186/1989/NQ-HĐBT, and Decision 168/1992/QĐ-HĐBT. Overall, under the Resolution 186/1989/NQ-HĐBT and the Decision 168/1992/QĐ-HĐBT, budget revenue arrangements between central and provincial governments were determined *annually* by their negotiations (Bird *et al.*, 1995). Expenditures for development investment by provinces were also decided by negotiation and bargaining with the central government. Budgetary recurrent expenditure arrangements between central and local governments were, however, based *yearly* on norms specified for each item of expenditure including education, training, health, sports, administration, and culture and information, with arrangements finally decided after two or three rounds of negotiations. In most cases, population was the main factor taken into account when recurrent expenditures were determined; however, weights assigned to population tended to favour cities. For instance, the standardised norms for 1994 required that the budgetary distribution norms in education and health in cities were about 1.40 times and 1.12 times higher than those in plain areas and low mountainous and remote areas, respectively (Bird *et al.*, 1995). The transfer mechanism from central to local governments was not explicit and there were no budgetary distribution norms for determining the transfers from central to local governments. Therefore, the amount of

the transfers was determined yearly based on negotiations and bargaining between central and local governments. In addition, the central authorities were responsible for determining the tax base and tax rates of all major taxes (Bird *et al.*, 1995).

From 1996 to 2003

Although budget arrangements between central and local governments under the 1996 State Budget Law and the amendment in 1998 were much improved compared with the previous regulations, shortcomings still existed.

Firstly, sub-national governments tended to overstate their revenue needs; therefore, negotiations between central and local governments in setting up the expenditure budget still occurred (McLure and Martinez-Vazquez, 1998; Rao *et al.*, 1998). In addition, the negotiated approach to budget formulation tended to favour richer provincial governments which had more influence on the central government, and therefore, led to an element of opaqueness, arbitrariness, and subjectivity (Rao, 2000).

Secondly, provincial governments tended to understate their revenue potential when they submitted their revenue budget proposals to the Ministry of Finance (MOF). Therefore, the final budget proposal approved by the MOF for each province was the result of several rounds of negotiations between provincial authorities and the MOF and depended on the negotiating strength of the two parties, including the political power of particular provincial authorities. For that reason, the approach was, once again, not a transparent and certain system (McLure and Martinez-Vazquez, 1998).

Thirdly, although the transfer mechanism under the 1996 State Budget Law was determined on a formula-based general transfer for each province, specific-purpose transfers were insufficient and too fragmented (McLure and Martinez-Vazquez, 1998). As a result, the amount of transfers was heavily influenced by negotiations and bargaining between central and local governments.

Fourthly, local governments still lacked borrowing powers to get additional resources (Rao, 2000). They also lacked revenue-raising powers because the central government was mainly responsible for determining the tax base and the rate structure of all taxes (Rao *et al.*, 1998; McLure and Martinez-Vazquez, 1998). Local governments were only given powers to raise revenues from fees, tolls, and voluntary contributions from their communities. However, these resources were

very small and accounted for less than five per cent of their total expenditures even though they tended to make intensive use of their taxing powers (Rao, 2000).

After 2004

Under the 2002 State Budget Law, revenue arrangements indicate explicitly which sources of revenue can be collected 100 per cent by the central or by the provincial governments, and which sources of revenue can be shared between them. A substantial change in revenue assignments, as stipulated in the 2002 State Budget Law compared with those indicated in the 1996 State Budget Law was that such assignments are only between the central and provincial governments. Provinces now have responsibility to set revenue assignments for the districts and communes in their territories. Therefore, the revenue assignments between provincial and local governments may provide provincial governments with budget flexibility, the ability to adapt to the particular circumstances in the province, and could generate high levels of equalization (Maztinez-Vazquez, 2004).

Expenditure arrangements between the central and provincial governments continue to be determined based on norms. However, provincial recurrent expenditures have been determined by clearer norms since 2004 as indicated in Decision 139/2003/QĐ-TTg, Decision 151/2006/QĐ-TTg, and Decision 59/2010/QĐ-TTg. Since 2007, norms applied when determining the capital expenditures of provinces have also been stipulated in Decision 210/2006/QĐ-TTg and Decision 60/2010/QĐ-TTg. An interesting note is that a majority of these norms are much more favourable to poorer provinces (for more details, see Section 5.2). Similar to the case of revenue assignments, expenditure assignments are now only assigned for the central and provincial governments. Provincial governments have authority to specify expenditure assignments for their lower level governments, enabling them to assign budget expenditure tasks to their lower authorities in accordance with their varying specific needs.

Under the clearer budget distribution norms associated with the 2002 State Budget Law, the current sharing system represents a considerable improvement compared with the one arising under the 1996 State Budget Law. Moreover, the sharing rates are decided for each particular province and the current sharing system tends to leave 100 per cent of the sharable taxes for poorer provinces. This may encourage provinces to make increased efforts to raise revenues, especially as poorer provinces

understand that they are usually allowed to keep 100 per cent of the shared taxes. However, a notable point is that under the 2002 State Budget Law, the central government is still fully responsible for introducing taxes, changing the structure of existing taxes, and fixing tax rates. Local governments are only allowed to introduce tolls for roads and certain fees for schools and hospitals that contribute insignificantly to their budgets (Maztinez-Vazquez, 2004; Bjornestad, 2009).

According to the World Bank (2005, volume I), another improvement was the use of fixed transfers during the budget stability period because fixed transfers help control negative incentives to revenue mobilisation by provincial governments and provide more certainty and stability. However, although progress has been made by the introduction of per capita expenditure norms to reasonably account for the relative expenditure needs at the central and provincial level, old physical standards or norms (such as number of staff in the measurement of expenditure needs) are still used by many provinces for allocation of resources to sub-national entities such as districts and communes. This leads to negative incentives in expenditure decisions, such as storing up of excess staffing capacity.

The 2002 State Budget Law and Circular 59/2003/TT-BTC provided that provinces be further allowed to mobilise domestic investment to obtain additional resources for their infrastructure development projects. The domestic sources of investment which provinces could mobilise included investment bonds issued by provincial governments and invested capital advanced from provincial Treasuries. In addition, provinces were allowed to borrow capital from the Vietnam Development Assistance Fund (VDAF was established according to Decree 50/1999/NĐ-CP.) and the Vietnam Development Bank (VDB was formed according to Decision 108/2006/QĐ-TTg based on VDAF.). These bodies are permitted to establish development investment funds (as stipulated in Decree 138/2007/NĐ-CP) and land development funds (as specified in Decree 69/2009/NĐ-CP and Decision 40/2010/QĐ-TTg).

Officials' Assessment of Effectiveness of Transfers from Central Government

Sixteen out of nineteen officials interviewed indicated that the role of transfers from the central government in reducing poverty and provincial output disparities were *somewhat effective before 2004*. Only one interviewee felt that the transfers were *effective*, one interviewee

indicated that the transfers had *no* impact and one interviewee gave no rating about effectiveness of the transfers (for more details, see Table 2).

An examination of the reasons resulting in the lower effectiveness ratings indicates that the “*ask and give*” mechanism still applied in the central and provincial government financial arrangements before the 2002 State Budget Law was put into effect in 2004. This means that the more transfers provinces could ask for and succeeded in receiving, the more expenditure they were able to make. They said that “the MOF and provincial Departments of Finance saw many local officials at the end of the period from 1996-2003 because the officials visited and asked the Ministry and the Departments for transfers for their next fiscal year”.

Table 2. Ratings of Interviewees Regarding Effectiveness of the Transfers in Helping to Reduce Poverty and Provincial Output Disparities.

Effectiveness of the transfers	Effective	Somewhat effective	No impact	No idea
Before 2004	1	16	1	1
After 2004	15	4		

Source: the Authors.

Fifteen out of nineteen interviewees indicated that transfers from the central government to the poorer provinces played an *effective* role in reducing poverty and provincial output disparities after 2004. Only four interviewees indicated that the transfers played an *insignificant* role in reducing poverty and output inequality between provinces (for more details, see Table 2).

The higher effectiveness ratings were caused by the transfer mechanism from the central to provincial budgets being implemented on clearer norms. More importantly, the norms have been much more systematic and favourable to poorer provinces. For example, Decision 139/2003/QĐ-TTg required that the use of the number of school aged children to determine the distribution norm for education rather than the number of children enrolled in schools. This regulation benefited poor provinces because the number of children enrolled in schools in poorer provinces was usually proportionally lower than those in richer provinces. In addition, Decision 139/2003/QĐ-TTg, Decision 151/2006/QĐ-TTg, and Decision 59/2010/QĐ-TTg instructing budget

distribution norms provided that ratios of recurrent investments per head in education in high mountainous areas to those in urban areas increase from 1.70 in 2004 to 2.02 in 2007 and 2.23 in 2011. Moreover, in the cases where provinces had extremely poor communes (According to Decision 135/1998/QĐ-TTg.) or districts (According to Resolution 30a/2008/NQ-CP.), each school age child is additionally supported. For example, additional resources distributed for a school age child per year were about VND 49.4 thousand (nearly USD 3.1), VND 70 thousand (approximately USD 4.3), and VND 140 thousand (about USD 7) in 2004, 2007, and 2011, respectively. Similarly, recurrent investment norms per capita in health in high mountainous areas were 1.80, 2.39 and 2.47 times those in urban areas in 2004, 2007, and 2011, respectively.

The officials' assessment is broadly consistent with the available statistical data. As shown in Figure 1 above, inter-provincial disparity in output per capita experienced a reversal of trend around the year 2004, when both the weighted and unweighted CV of provincial GDP per capita began to fall noticeably, after having generally increased for (at least) more than a decade.

Since 2007, budget distribution norms also applied for determining capital expenditures. In particular, during the budget stability period 2007-2010 the capital expenditures of provinces were determined by their cumulative score, based on five norms including population, level of development, natural areas, administrative units, and a supplementary norm. The higher cumulative scoring, provinces received more transfers from the central government. Of particular interest is that, special attention was paid to mountainous, remote, and disadvantaged areas as well as the ethnic minority areas when determining this cumulative score. For example, according to the population norm, if the population of a particular province was 100 000 people, the province would obtain one score. However, if population of a province was below 500 000, it received five scores. In addition, for each 100 000 ethnic minority people in a province one more score was allocated. Therefore, the population norm favoured provinces having less population and more ethnic minorities. Regarding the level of development, for each 10 per cent of poverty rating, provinces gained one score. With respect to the administrative unit norm, each mountainous or remote district province received a 0.2 score.

During the period 2011-2015, the capital expenditures of provinces will continue to be determined based on these five main norms; however, there are some changes in each particular norm and some of them further

favour the poorer provinces. For example, provinces receive 1.5 scores instead of one score if they have an ethnic minority of 100 000. In addition, each five per cent of poor households generate two scores. Similarly, for each mountainous or remote district that provinces have within their boundaries, they receive a 0.5 score rather than a 0.2 score. Moreover, each district located in a border area receives one score compared with the previous a 0.2 score.

Econometric Analysis of Trends Underlying Transfers from Central Government

The findings gained from the analysis of interviews regarding the role of transfers from the central to provincial governments in helping to reduce poverty and provincial output disparities are broadly supported by our econometric analysis. As can be seen in Table 3, poorer provinces tended to receive more subsidies from the central government, especially after 2004. For example, in 2000, the ratio of net transfers per capita of a province to the real national GDP per capita ($NTPC_{i,t}$) increased by roughly 0.06 percentage points if the (lagged) ratio of real GDP per capita of this province to the real national GDP per capita ($RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$) decreased by one percentage point. Moreover, in 2008, the ratio of net transfers per capita of a province to the real national GDP per capita ($NTPC_{i,t}$) increased by approximately 0.07 percentage points if the ratio of real GDP per capita of this province to the real national GDP per capita ($RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$) declined by one percentage point. Although the changes in these ratios between 2008 and 2000 are numerally small, they are statically significant.

In particular, Bac Kan, one of the poorest provinces of Vietnam in terms of real GDP per capita, received the highest real transfers per capita from the central government in 2002 and 2006. Further, the real transfers per capita from the central government to Bac Kan increased nearly 1.3 times, from VND 1.4 million in 2002 to VND 1.9 million in 2006. In contrast, richer provinces in terms of real GDP per capita tended to contribute more significantly to the central budget. For example, the real sharable revenues per capita of Ho Chi Minh City transferred to the central budget increased by 2.1 times, from VND 1.1 million in 2002 to VND 2.3 million in 2008. Similarly, the real sharable revenues per capita of Hanoi transferred to the central government almost doubled, from VND 0.7 million in 2002 to VND 1.3 million in 2008.

Table 3. Estimated Relationships Between the Ratios of Net Transfer Per Capita of Provinces to the National GDP Per Capita and the Ratios of GDP Per Capita of Provinces to the National GDP Per Capita.

Dependent variable		$NTPC_{i,t}$			
Independent variables		$Intercept$	$RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$	$Dremote_i$	Adjusted R^2
Year					
2000		9.8065***	-0.0554*	7.6267***	0.4658
2008		9.0649***	-0.0643***	10.7484***	0.5707
		$Intercept$	$RGDPPC_{i,t-1}$	$Dremote_i$	Adjusted R^2
2000		9.2406***	-0.0493*	7.8345***	0.4403
2008		9.6207***	-0.0701***	10.5307***	0.5804

Note: Number of provinces = 61; *** Significant at one per cent, *Significant at 10 per cent.

Source: the Authors

Provinces located in very remote areas ($Dremote_i = 1$) tended to receive more subsidies from the central government after 2004. For instance, they received nearly 1.4 times higher in terms of ratios of real net transfers from the central government to the real national GDP per capita in 2008 compared with those in 2000.

Comparing the adjusted R^2 between 2008 and 2000, it can be seen that the estimated relationship for 2008 is a much better fit of the data available for that year (adjusted $R^2 = 0.57$) than is the case for 2000 (where adjusted $R^2 = 0.46$). This is because the budget transfer mechanism from the central to provincial governments have been much more systematic and favourable to poorer provinces since the 2002 State Budget Law came into effect in 2004.

It is assumed that all individual province differences are captured by differences in the intercept parameters. The fixed effects estimator was applied because it has the advantage of capturing all time-invariant unobserved characteristics of each province whilst imposing no assumption between these characteristics and exogenous variables. Using a fixed effect model can also overcome endogenous issues of time-invariant omitted variables. In addition, fixed effects estimation is preferred if the individual units are “one of a kind” and of interest, for example countries or provinces. However, in this case, a variable ($Dremote_i$) was dropped from equation 5 because it is a time-invariant variable and already captured by using fixed effects.

The results of panel data regressions (fixed effects) indicate that provinces having lower ratios of provincial GDP per capita to the national GDP per capita tended to receive more transfers from the central government. Indeed, during the sub-period 2000-2003, provinces with one percentage-point lower ratios of provincial GDP per capita to the national GDP per capita received approximately 0.11 percentage-point higher ratios of net transfers per capita to the national GDP per capita.

The regression results also indicate that there was a break in terms of ratios of real net transfers per capita to the real national GDP per capita around 2004 and the intercept term decreased by 0.90 percentage points (see *Dbreak2004*). This was because revenue arrangements and expenditure responsibilities tended to be further decentralised to provincial governments and the central government only transferred significant subsidies to poorer provinces.

More importantly, the slope of $Dbreak2004*RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$ indicates that after 2004 the central government tended to transfer more than previously to poorer provinces. For example, from 2004 to 2008, the ratio of real net transfers per capita to the real national GDP per capita of a province increased by 0.008 percentage points if this province suffered from one percentage-point lower ratio of its real GDP per capita to the real national GDP per capita (for more details, see Table 4).

Table 4. Panel Data Estimations (Fixed Effects).

Dependent variable Independent variable	$NTPC_{i,t}$
<i>Intercept</i>	17.8078 ^{***}
$RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$	-0.1081 ^{***}
<i>Dbreak2004</i>	-0.9003 ^{***}
$Dbreak2004*RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$	-0.0077 ^{***}
Adjusted R ²	0.9451

Note: ***Significant at one per cent; Number of provinces = 61; Sample period: 2000-2008; and Number of observations = 549. Source: the Authors

The random effects estimator was applied for equation 5 when a time-invariant variable ($Dremote_i$) was controlled. The results of panel data regressions (random effects) indicate that provinces having lower ratios of provincial GDP per capita to the national GDP per capita tended to receive more transfers from the central government. Indeed, during the sub-period 2000-2003, provinces with one percentage-point lower ratios of provincial GDP per capita to the national GDP per capita received approximately 0.06 percentage-point higher ratios of net transfers per capita to the national GDP per capita.

Provinces located in very remote areas tended to receive more subsidies from the central government during the period 2000-2008. For instance, they received approximately 8.58 percentage-point higher ratios of real net transfers per capita to the real national GDP per capita for the sub-period 2000-2003. Of particular interest is that the slope of $Dremote_i * Dbreak2004$ indicates that after 2004 the central government tended to transfer more than previously to remote or mountainous provinces. For example, from 2004 to 2008, if a province was located in remote or mountainous area, the ratio of real net transfers per capita to the real national GDP per capita of this province increased by 1.58 percentage points.

The regression results also indicate that there was a break in terms of ratios of real net transfers per capita to the real national GDP per capita around 2004 and the intercept term decreased by 1.35 percentage points (see $Dbreak2004$). This was because revenue arrangements and expenditure responsibilities tended to be further decentralised to provincial governments and the central government only transferred significant subsidies to poorer provinces.

More importantly, the slope of $Dbreak2004 * RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$ indicates that after 2004 the central government tended to transfer more than previously to poorer provinces. For example, from 2004 to 2008, the ratio of real net transfers per capita to the real national GDP per capita of a province increased by 0.008 percentage points if this province suffered from one percentage-point lower ratio of its real GDP per capita to the real national GDP per capita (for more details, see Table 5).

Table 5. Panel Data Estimations (Random Effects).

Dependent variable	$NTPC_{i,t}$
Independent variable	
<i>Intercept</i>	11.0168***
$RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$	-0.0588***
$Dremote_i$	8.5828***
$Dbreak2004$	-1.3502***
$Dremote_i * Dbreak2004$	1.5840***
$Dbreak2004 * RGDPPC_{i,t-2}$	-0.0076***
Adjusted R ² (weighted statistics)	0.2845
Adjusted R ² (unweighted statistics)	0.5416

Note: ***Significant at one per cent; Number of provinces = 61; Sample period: 2000-2008; and Number of observations = 549. Source: the Authors

Relative Importance of Transfers from Central Government

There are indications that public expenditure, especially public investment, at the provincial level has played a key role in reducing inter-provincial disparities in recent years. For instance, while the domestic (total) investment-to-GDP ratio for the country as a whole increased from 39 per cent in 2005 to 46 per cent in 2008, in Lai Chau-Dien Bien, one of the poorest provinces, it surged from approximately 8 per cent in 1990 to nearly 89 per cent in 2005 and to about 94 per cent in 2008. The number of provinces with an investment-to-output ratio at or above 50 per cent increased from 13 in 2001 (eight of which could be considered relatively poor) to 25 in 2005 and 30 in 2007 (17 of which were poor). Such extraordinarily high investment-output ratios implied that much of the goods and services that went into the relevant capital formation must have come from outside the province. In other words, it must have been imported from other provinces or from overseas. Typically the investment would involve the construction of infrastructure for which the *central government* must pay the lion's share, either directly or through transfers to the relevant provincial authorities.

In interviews, both central and provincial officials confirmed that subsidies from the central government to provinces, especially poor provinces, made very important contributions to provincial budgets,

poverty reduction, and mitigation of inter-provincial output disparity. The reason was that a majority of provinces did not have enough resources to meet their requirements for budget expenditure; therefore, they relied mainly on the transfers from the central government (for more details, see Table 6).

Table 6. List of Provinces in Receipt of Net Transfers from the Central Budget and the Ratios of the Transfers to Provincial Budget Expenditures in 2008.

Ratios of the transfers to provincial budget expenditures were	Number of provinces	Name of provinces
above 70 per cent	7	Lai Chau-Dien Bien, Son La, Hoa Binh, Ha Giang, Cao Bang, Yen Bai, and Quang Tri
from 50 per cent to 70 per cent	22	Lao Cai, BacKan, Lang Son, TuyenQuang, Thai Nguyen, Phu Tho, BacGiang, Ha Nam, Nam Dinh, Thai Binh, ThanhHoa, Nghe An, Ha Tinh, QuangBinh, Quang Nam, Kon Tum, Dak Nong-DakLak, NinhThuan, Ben Tre, TraVinh, SocTrang, and Bac Lieu
from 30 per cent to 50 per cent	15	Ha Tay, Hung Yen, NinhBinh, ThuaThien Hue, Quang Ngai, BinhDinh, Phu Yen, Gia Lai, Lam Dong, BinhThuan, Dong Thap, An Giang, Tien Giang, Vinh Long, and KienGiang
below 30 per cent	6	Hai Duong, BacNinh, BinhPhuoc, Tay Ninh, Long An, and Ca Mau

Source: the Authors

It can be shown that poor provinces received subsidies including balancing transfers and targeted transfers from the central budget accounting for more than 70 per cent of their budget expenditures in 2008, indicating that the subsidies played vital roles in generating their sources of budget expenditure. Indeed, the subsidies from the central budget to Ha Giang accounted for about 81 per cent of its total expenditures in 2008. Further, in 2008 the ratios of subsidies from the central budget of Cao Bang and Dien Bien were approximately 77 per cent and 75 per cent, respectively.

In 2008, poor provinces having ratios of subsidies from the central government to their budget expenditures of between 50 per cent and 70 per cent also showed that the subsidies contributed significantly to their budget expenditure. For instance, in 2008 the subsidies from the central budget to Bac Kan and Thanh Hoa accounted for 68 per cent and 64 per cent of their budget expenditures, respectively.

All provinces are encouraged to raise revenue from other resources such as advancing unused capital, issuing investment bonds, borrowing money from the provincial VDAF and VDB, establishing development investment funds, and forming land development funds. However, the results from mobilising the resources vary, and provinces have different opinions about the importance of the utilisation of such resources.

Firstly, in the opinion of poorer provinces, unused capital advanced from their Treasuries or borrowed from their VDAF and VDB contributed moderately to their development investment because the investment mobilised from these sources is small compared with their overall budget expenditures. For example, Kon Tum borrowed VND 15 billion from the VDAF for its irrigation system improvement, but this accounted for only about 1.1 per cent of its budget expenditures in 2005. In addition, a majority of poor provinces have not issued investment bonds to raise additional resources because their investment bonds may not be attractive to domestic organisations or local people. Therefore, investment bonds still do not play any role in generating additional sources for their budgets. Only very few poor provinces, such as Bac Giang, issued investment bonds to get additional resources but the result was not significant. For example, the total investment bonds issued by Bac Giang was VND 9.73 billion and accounted for only one per cent of its total budget expenditure in 2002.

Secondly, poor provinces such as Phu Tho and Thanh Hoa reported that although their land development funds were established in 2010, the roles of these funds in contributing additional resources to their budget expenditures were also limited. For example, the investment of land development funds of Phu Tho and Thanh Hoa was about VND 60 billion and VND 140 billion accounting for only 1.4 per cent and 1.6 per cent of their budget expenditures in 2010, respectively.

From the above analysis, it is clear that wealthier provinces could get additional resources from these alternative sources more readily than poorer provinces. Subsidies from the central authorities were still the main sources contributing additional resources to budget expenditures of poorer provinces.

Some poor provinces appear to have relied heavily on transfers from the central authorities for the following reasons. *Firstly*, their sources of revenue including revenues which they could collect totally and revenues shared with the central government did not meet their budget expenditures. Indeed, in 2008, the total revenue collected by Ha Giang, one of poorest provinces, was only VND 214 billion, accounting for approximately 5.7 per cent of its total budget expenditure. *Secondly*, contributions of organisations and individuals to the budgets of poorer provinces were insignificant as people mainly contributed in kind to infrastructure development projects in their areas. For instance, the contributions of individuals and organisations of Lang Son were roughly VND one billion, accounting for only 0.03 per cent of its budget expenditure in 2008. *Thirdly*, although provinces were allowed to mobilise additional resources to meet their requirements of budget expenditures, the capital mobilised by poorer provinces was insignificant. Therefore, transfers from the central government remain the main resources contributing considerably to budget expenditures of poor provinces.

Securing Adequate Resources to Finance Transfers from Central Government

Both central and provincial officials indicated that the central government faced difficulties in securing resources for redistribution to poorer provinces because of the following:

Firstly, sources of revenue of the central government (including revenues of which the central government could collect 100 per cent as well as sharable taxes with provincial governments) tended to decrease due to the negative impact of both economic recessions during the periods 1997-1998 and 2007-2008 and high inflation during the period 2007-2008. Indeed, the national economic growth rate declined from approximately 9.3 per cent in 1996 to nearly 8.2 per cent in 2006 and then 5.3 per cent in 2009. As a result, the growth rate of revenues collected by the central government decreased from approximately 41 per cent in 2002 to 21 per cent in 2004 and to 10 per cent in 2008.

Secondly, few richer cities and provinces were in a position to transfer their revenues to the central budget. Indeed, in 2003, only five of 61 provinces (namely Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Dong Nai, Binh Duong, and Ba Ria Vung Tau) transferred some of their revenues to the central budget. Although the number of provinces transferring their revenues to

the central budget increased by 2008, only eleven provinces (comprising Quang Ninh, Hanoi, Hai Phong, Vinh Phuc, Da Nang, Khanh Hoa, Ho Chi Minh City, Binh Duong, Dong Nai, Ba Ria Vung Tau, and Can Tho) contributed some of their revenues to the central budget, and these provinces only accounted for approximately 25 per cent of the national population of Vietnam in 2008 (for more details, see Table 7). Further, although the contributions of these richer provinces to the central budget increased after 2004, the ratios of richer provincial contributions to the total subsidies from the central to provincial governments remained almost unchanged at approximately 66 per cent during the sub-period 2005-2008.

Table 7. List of Provinces and Cities Which Transferred Revenues to the Central Budget in 2003 and 2008.

Year	2003	2008
Provinces		
Number of provinces	5	11
Names of provinces	Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Dong Nai, Binh Duong, and Ba RiaVung Tau	QuangNinh, Hanoi, Hai Phong, VinhPhuc, Da Nang, KhanhHoa, Ho Chi Minh City, Binh Duong, Dong Nai, Ba RiaVung Tau, and Can Tho

Source: the Authors

Thirdly, a majority of provinces received subsidies from the central government, some of these provinces were extremely poor and relied mainly on these subsidies. In particular, in 2008, seven poor provinces (including Lai Chau-Dien Bien, Son La, Hoa Binh, Ha Giang, Cao Bang, Yen Bai, and Quang Tri) received transfers from the central budget, and these transfers accounted for more than 70 per cent of their budget expenditures. Ha Giang received transfers up to nearly 81 per cent of its budget expenditure in 2008. In the same year 22 other poor provinces received subsidies of 50 per cent to 70 per cent, while 15 provinces received transfers from the central budget between 30 per cent and 50 per cent of their budget expenditures. Further, only six provinces received

subsidies of less than 30 per cent of their budget expenditures from the central government (for more details, see Table 6).

Fourthly, the central government was limited to the amount it could borrow from domestic and international organisations due to a legislated limit on the size of the budget deficit. For example, the budget deficit approved by the Vietnamese National Assembly was 5.0 per cent of GDP in 2008 and 6.2 per cent of GDP in 2010 (MOF, 2008; 2010).

Fifthly, budget expenditure tasks undertaken by the central government for important development investment projects are heavy and this put more pressure on the central budget. For example, in 2005, the investment in the Dung Quat Oil Refinery project was approximately US dollar three billion, accounting for six per cent of the nominal GDP of Vietnam (The Vietnamese Ministry of Planning and Investment, 2005). Further, changes of government policies also put additional pressure on the central budget. For instance, in 2011, total state budget allocated for the salary reform policy was VND 27 000 billion, accounting for approximately 4.5 per cent of the total national budget expenditure when the basic salary was adjusted from VND 730 thousand per month in 2010 to VND 830 thousand per month (MOF, 2011). As a result, the national budget deficit occurred for several years. For example, the ratios of national budget deficit to GDP were approximately five per cent in 2000, 4.9 per cent in 2004, five per cent in 2006, and 4.6 per cent in 2008 (MOF, 2000; 2004; 2006; 2008).

Sixthly, provinces, especially poor provinces are frequently and heavily affected by natural disasters. Therefore, the central budget is subject to more pressure when blocks of urgent subsidies are required to help these provinces overcome the disasters. For instance, in 2009, the 'main projects' invested through several years as well as the agricultural sector of Kon Tum were almost completely destroyed by storm N₉, called a historic storm. As a result, about VND 250 billion from the central budget, accounting for approximately 14 per cent of Kon Tum's budget expenditure in 2009, was subsidised for Kon Tum to overcome this severe disaster" (A provincial official of Department of Finance of Kon Tum).

Finally, an increasing gap in socio-economic development between poor and rich regions as well as between poor and rich provinces also put more pressure on the central budget during the new budget stabilisation period. This is because the central government has responsibilities for solving uneven development between regions and between provinces. For example, the gap in GDP per capita between the poorest North West

region and the richest South East region increased from approximately 3.6 in 1990 to nearly 5.3 in 2004 and 4.9 in 2008. Further, the gap in GDP per capita between the richest city (Ho Chi Minh City) and the poorest province (Ha Giang) increased from 6.5 in 1990 to 7.2 in 2004 and 6.9 in 2008.

In conclusion, as discussed previously, under the 2002 State Budget Law, the transfers from the central government to poorer provinces in Vietnam played an important role in balancing the gap in revenues and expenditures of poorer provinces, and in promoting their economic growth. The transfers also contributed to reducing output disparities between poorer provinces and richer ones. Therefore, the transfer mechanism should be continuously implemented to safeguard resources for poorer provinces. However, the output inequality across provinces in Vietnam was still high (for more details, see Figure 1), and the central government faced difficulties in securing resources for re-allocation to poorer provinces. For that reason, solutions for improving the budget capacity of poorer provinces should be considered to reduce budget pressure on the central government. For example, additional special policies attracting investors, especially foreign investors to invest in infrastructure through Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT), Build-Transfer (BT), and Public Private Partnership (PPP) projects should be issued to promote socio-economic development in poorer provinces. This is because although the distribution of FDI across provinces has become less uneven since 2004, about 73 per cent of FDI in Vietnam in 2008 was still concentrated in 11 richer cities/provinces including Ho Chi Minh City, Dong Nai, Binh Duong, Hanoi, Ba Ria Vung Tau, Da Nang, Hai Phong, Can Tho, Quang Ninh, Vinh Phuc, and Khanh Hoa. Furthermore, policies aimed at improving public investment efficiency and stabilising the economy should be strengthened to generate more resources for the central and local governments because public investment in Vietnam has recently tended to be unaffordable, inefficient, and unsustainable (Vietnam Development Report, 2012). Also, according to the Global Competitiveness Report 2013-2014, the overall global competitiveness index of Vietnam is just above average, for example 70/148 countries. The two other indicators including efficiency enhancer, and innovation and sophistication factors are even worse, for instance 74/148 and 85/148 countries, respectively.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper examines changes in key features of central-provincial government financial arrangements in Vietnam during the period 2000-2008, and their effects on provincial economic disparities. Our analysis suggests that after 2004, transfers from the central government to provincial governments conformed much more closely to objective, pre-determined criteria than before, due to the implementation of the new Law which came into effect in 2004. Econometric estimations confirm that in the post-2004 sub-period, poorer provinces obtained more-than-proportionate assistance from the central government, and the favourable treatment was statistically significant. Responses from interviews and statistical data indicate that transfers from the central government played an important role in reducing poverty and provincial output disparities after 2004. The paper also highlights the difficulties experienced by the central government in securing adequate resources to continue financing such transfers, and by many poorer provinces in trying to reduce their heavy reliance on transfers from the central government. Thus there is a continuing need to enhance the budget capacity of poorer provinces, as well as to improve the efficiency of public investments.

REFERENCES

- Akai, N. and Hosio, M. (2009). Fiscal Decentralisation, Commitment and Regional Inequality: Evidence from State-level Cross-sectional Data for the United States. *Journal of Income Distribution: An International Quarterly*, 18(1), pp. 1-28.
- Bird, R.M., Litvack, J.I. and Rao, M.G. (1995). *Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations and Poverty Alleviation in Vietnam*. WPS 1430, the World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433.
- Bjornestad, L. (2009). *Fiscal Decentralisation, Fiscal Incentives, and Pro-poor Outcomes: Evidence from Vietnam*. 168, the Asian Development Bank, 6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City, 1550 Metro Manila, Philippines.
- Chow, G.C. (1960). Tests of Equality Between Sets of Coefficients in Two Linear Regressions. *Econometrica*, 28(3), pp. 591-565.
- Dabla-Norris, E. (2005). *Issues in Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations in China*, WP/05/30, the International Monetary Fund, 700 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20431.
- Chen, A. and Groenewold, N. (2010). Reducing Regional Disparities in China: An Evaluation of Alternative Policies. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 38, pp. 189-198.
- Garcia-Milà, T. and McGuire, T.J. (2001). Do Interregional Transfers Improve the Economic Performance of Poor Regions? The Case of Spain. *International Tax and Public Finance*, 8, pp. 281-295.
- Jiang, T. and Zhao, Z. (2003). Government Transfer Payments and Regional Development in China. Proceedings of the 15th Annual Conference of the Associations for Chinese Economics Studies Australia, pp. 1-27.
- Kaufman, M. Swagel, P. and Dunaway, S. (2003). *Regional Convergence and the Role of Federal Transfer in Canada*. WP/03/97, the International Monetary Fund, 700 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20431.
- Kessler, A.S. and Lessmann, C. (2008). Interregional Redistribution and Regional Disparities: How Equalization Does (Not) Work. Online version accessed 10 April 2014, http://tu-dresden.de/die_tu_dresden/fakultaeten/fakultaet_wirtschaftswissenschaften/cepe/dateien/publications/lessmann/Interregional_Redistribution_Kessler_Lessmann.pdf.
- Lessmann, C. (2006). *Fiscal Decentralisation and Regional Disparity: A Panel Data Approach for OECD Countries*. 25, Ifo Institute for Economic Research, University of Munich.

- Martinez-Vazquez, J. (2004) *Making Fiscal Decentralisation Work in Vietnam*. 04-04, George State University: Andrew Young School of Policy Studies.
- Martinez-Vazquez, J. and Gomez, J.L. (2005). Effective Fiscal Decentralisation in Vietnam. Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Taxation, USA, 98, pp. 356-361.
- McLure, C.E. and Martinez-Vazquez, J. (1998). *Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations in Vietnam*. 98-2, Georgia State University: Andrew Young School of Policy Studies.
- Nguyen, P-L and Anwar, S. (2011). Fiscal Decentralisation and Economic Growth in Vietnam. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, 16(1), pp. 3-14.
- Raiser, M. (1998). Subsidising Inequality: Economic Reforms, Fiscal Transfers and Convergence Across Chinese Provinces. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 34(3), pp. 1-26.
- Rao, M.G. (2000). Fiscal Decentralisation in Vietnam: Emerging Issues. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Economics*, 41, pp. 163-177.
- Rao, M.G., Bird, R.M. and Litvack, J.I. (1998). Fiscal Decentralisation and Poverty Alleviation in a Transitional Economy: The Case of Vietnam. *Asian Economic Journal*, 12(4), pp. 353-378.
- Rodriguez, G. (2006). The Role of the Interprovincial Transfers in the β -convergence Process. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 33(1), pp. 12-29.
- Vietnam Development Report (2012). Market Economy for a Middle-Income Vietnam, 65980, the World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433.
- Vu, X-B. Nguyen, D-T. and Nghiem, H-S. (2011). Provincial Output Disparities in Vietnam: 1990-2008. Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Science, Economics, and Arts, Malaysia, pp. 32-39.
- White, H. (1980). A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and A Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica*, 48(4), pp. 817-838.
- World Bank (2005, volume I). Vietnam Managing Public Expenditure for Poverty Reduction and Growth. 30035-VN, the World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433.
- World Development Report (2009). Reshaping Economic Geography, the World Bank. 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433.

- Yao, Y. (2009) The Political Economy of Government Policies toward Regional Inequality in China. In Y. Huang and A.M. Bocchi (Eds), *Reshaping Economic Geography in East Asia, the World Bank*, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433, 47242, pp. 217-40.

LIST OF OFFICIAL VIETNAMESE DOCUMENTS

- 1945, Decree 75/1945/SL-CTN, *the National Treasury's Establishment (in Vietnamese: Thanh Lap Nha Ngan Kho)*.
- 1967, Decree 119/1967/NĐ-CP, *Management Decentralisation in State Budgets (in Vietnamese: Phan Cap Quan Ly Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc)*.
- 1989, Resolution 186/1989/NQ-HĐBT, *Budget Management Decentralisation for Local Governments (in Vietnamese: Phan Cap Quan Ly Ngan Sach cho Dia Phuong)*.
- 1992, Decision 168/1992/QĐ-HĐBT, *Amendment and Supplement to the Resolution 186/1989-HĐBT (in Vietnamese: Sua Doi Bo Sung Nghi Quyet 186/1989/HĐBT)*.
- 1996, *the State Budget Law (in Vietnamese: Luat Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc nam 1996)*.
- 1998a, *the State Budget Law (in Vietnamese: Luat Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc nam 1998)*.
- 1998b, Decision 135/1998/QĐ-TTg, *the Programme for Socio-Economic Development in Communes Facing Extreme Hardship in Ethnic Minority and Mountainous Areas (in Vietnamese: Chuong Trinh Phat Trien Kinh Te Xa Hoi Cac Xa Dac Biet Kho Khan Mien Nui, Vung Sau, Vung Xa)*.
- 1999, Decree 50/1999/NĐ-CP, *the Organisations and Operations of Development Assistance Fund (in Vietnamese: To Chuc va Hoat Dong cua Qui Ho Tro Phat Trien)*.
- 2002, *the State Budget Law (in Vietnamese: Luat Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc nam 2002)*.
- 2003a, Circular 59/2003/TT-BTC, *the Instructions for Decree 60/2003/NĐ-CP and the 2002 State Budget Law (in Vietnamese: Huong Dan Thi Hanh Luat Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc nam 2002)*.
- 2003b, Decision 139/2003/QĐ-TTg, *the Allocation Norms of Budget Expenditure Forecast in 2004 (in Vietnamese: Dinh Muc Phan Bo Du Toan Chi Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc nam 2004)*.
- 2003d, Resolution 22/2003/NQ-QH XI, *Administrative Border Adjustment for Provinces (in Vietnamese: Dieu Chinh Dia Gioi Hanh Chinh Cho Cac Tinh)*.

- 2006a, Decision 210/2006/QĐ-TTg, *the Allocation Norms of Capital Expenditure during the period 2007-2010* (in Vietnamese: *Nguyen Tac, Tieu Chi, Dinh Muc Phan Bo Chi Dau Tu Phat Trien Bang Nguon Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc giai doan 2007-2010*).
- 2006b, Decision 151/2006/QĐ-TTg, *the Allocation Norms of Recurrent Expenditure Forecast in 2007* (in Vietnamese: *Dinh Muc Phan Bo Du Toan Chi Thuong Xuyen Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc nam 2007*).
- 2006c, Decision 108/2006/QĐ-TTg, *the Vietnam Development Bank's Establishment* (in Vietnamese: *Thanh Lap Ngan Hang Phat Trien Vietnam*).
- 2007, Decree 138/2007/NĐ-CP, *the Organisations and Operations of Provincial Development Investment Funds* (in Vietnamese: *To Chuc va Hoat Dong cua Qui Dau Tu Phat Trien Dia Phuong*).
- 2008a, Resolution 30a/2008/NQ-CP, *the Programme for Sustainable Poverty Reduction in 61 Poor Districts* (in Vietnamese: *Chuong Trinh Ho Tro Giam Ngheo Ben Vung o 61 Huyen Ngheo*).
- 2009, Decree 69/2009/NĐ-CP, *the Instructions for the Use of Land* (in Vietnamese: *Qui Dinh ve Qui Hoach Su Dung Dat*).
- 2010a, Decision 60/2010/QĐ-TTg, *the Allocation Norms of Capital Expenditure during the period 2011-2015* (in Vietnamese: *Nguyen Tac, Tieu Chi, Dinh Muc Phan Bo Von Dau Tu Phat Trien Bang Nguon Ngan Sach Nha Nuoc giai doan 2011-2015*).
- 2010b, Decision 59/2010/QĐ-TTg, *the Allocation Norms of Recurrent Expenditure Forecast in 2011* (in Vietnamese: *Dinh Muc Phan Bo Du Toan Chi Thuong Xuyen Ngan Sach nam 2011*).
- 2010c, Decision 40/2010/QĐ-TTg, *the Instructions for Land Development Funds* (in Vietnamese: *Qui Che ve Quan Ly va Su Dung Qui Phat Trien Dat*).
- 2011, Statistical Year Book of Vietnam, General Statistics Office (GSO), <http://www.gso.gov.vn/default.aspx?tabid=512&idmid=5&ItemID=12574>.
- 2000-2011, State Budget Data, Ministry of Finance of Vietnam (MOF), http://www.mof.gov.vn/portal/page/portal/mof_vn/1351583/2126549/2115685.
- 2005, Investment Data, Ministry of Planning and Investment of Vietnam, http://www.mof.gov.vn/portal/page/portal/mof_vn/1351583/2126549/2115685.