

Overview of Decentralization Worldwide: A Stepping Stone to Improved Governance and Human Development

ROBERTSON WORK*

While there may be numerous initiatives for implementing decentralization policies, not to mention the varying types and degrees of decentralization worldwide, it is inherently difficult to compare a single notion of decentralization. The lines between the forms of decentralization and existing governmental systems become quite blurred in practice. In order to accurately summarize the degree of decentralization in a country, one must simultaneously consider the political, fiscal and administrative issues at all tiers of government as well as local council elections, participatory budgeting practices, local government's borrowing powers and tax collection capacity, the prevalence and role of NGOs and advocacy groups, community organizing and freedom of voice. Definitely, as evident from the varied experiences in decentralization around the world, there is no "one-size fits all" design of decentralization policies. Instead decentralization has to be sensitive to the existing cultural, political and institutional arrangements within a particular country. Although there are many successful examples of decentralization and sustainable human development, there is much room for needed improvement. Further analysis is necessary in order to better understand which forms and under what circumstances decentralization can have a productive role in supporting sustainable human development and how governments and stakeholders should approach these processes.

Introduction

Today, academics, practitioners and development stakeholders universally recognize the importance of good governance practices for alleviating chronic poverty and injustice. Simultaneously, the world has increasingly turned towards the practice of decentralization to assure democratic governance for human development.

*Principal Policy Advisor for Decentralization, Institutional Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy (IDG-BDP); and Leader, Decentralized Governance Program Team, United Nations Development Program (UNDP) New York.

Paper prepared for the 2nd International Conference on Decentralization (ICD) with the theme "Federalism: The Future of Decentralizing States?" held on 25-27 July 2002 at the EDSA Shangri-la Hotel, Manila, Philippines.

The first section of this study provides the conceptual framework linking development, governance and decentralization. It also attempts to outline the relationship between federal and unitary states and decentralization.

The second section presents the state of decentralization in the world today. It also looks at various measures of democracy, governance, decentralization, and current development programs worldwide in an attempt to illustrate the widespread and diverse practices of democratic governance and decentralization.

Finally, the study concludes with some lessons and recommendations for practitioners and stakeholders including government, civil society, the private sector and scholars in the field of decentralization.

Providing Context—Globalization

It is clear that globalization has brought about incredible strides in economic prosperity. The record of human development over the past fifty years is unprecedented; with developing countries setting a pace three times faster than the industrialized countries did a century ago. The wealth of nations has multiplied exponentially. In the past fifty years, the global gross domestic product has increased sevenfold.

At the same time, the socioeconomic divide between developed and developing countries continues to grow. While some can actively participate in the wonders of technological achievement and increased prosperity, one-third of the global population lives in abject poverty. It is a world of stark polarity and inequality.

Yet, globalization reaches beyond economics and trade policies. It enters into the spheres of health and education with the spread of the Human Immuno Deficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS) epidemic and the practice of "brain drain"—the exporting of experts from developing countries for technical work in developed countries. Globalization affects cultural policies as the dialogue and mix of world cultures is available virtually everywhere. It affects national security with the recent threat of global terrorism and environmental policies as the world addresses the problem of ozone depletion.

Globalization has also reached the political sphere, with dozens of nations taking significant steps toward introducing democratic principles and tenets. According to the British Department for International Development, the proportion of countries with forms of democratic governance has risen from 28 percent in 1974 to 61 percent in 1998. Moreover improved global communications have facilitated greater international solidarity in support of

democratic freedoms and human rights. People everywhere are better informed about developments elsewhere, and increasingly, governments have to explain their actions and omissions to a global audience (DFID 2000).

Sustainable Human Development and Governance

“Good governance is perhaps the single most important factor in eradicating poverty and promoting development,” says Kofi A. Annan, Secretary General of the United Nations (1998: Chapter II, par. 114). Within this dichotomous reality of spectacular achievements and gross human distress is the ongoing struggle for sustainable human development. In our interdependent world, it is inadmissible to remain unresponsive to the existing conditions of poverty and suffering.

The Millennium Development Goals, a set of time-bound targets that express key elements of human development, have been created to guide the progress of sustainable solutions. They include halving income, poverty and hunger; achieving universal education and gender equality; reducing under five year-old child mortality by two-thirds and maternal mortality by three-quarters; reversing the spread of HIV/AIDS; and halving the proportion of people without access to safe water. These targets are to be achieved by 2015, from their level in 1990 (Vandermoortele 2002).

In order to fulfill these development goals, practitioners have sought a new paradigm of sustainable human development that seeks to bring humanity together through a more equitable sharing of economic opportunities and responsibilities. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) defines sustainable human development as “expanding the choices for all people in society. This means that men and women particularly the poor and vulnerable are at the center of the development process. It also means the protection of life opportunities for future generations and the natural systems on which life depends. This makes the central purpose of development the creation of an enabling environment in which all can enjoy long healthy and creative lives” (UNDP 1997a: 1).

The Enabling Environment

It has become increasingly clear that the achievement of these development criteria hinges largely on the society’s quality of governance.

Governance is broadly defined as the system of values, policies, and institutions by which a society organizes collective decisionmaking and action related to political, economic, and sociocultural and environmental affairs through the interaction of the state, civil society and the private sector.

Governance comprises the complex mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, mediate their differences and exercise their legal rights and obligations.

The fundamental principles of good governance include respect for human rights, political openness, participation, tolerance, administrative and bureaucratic capacity and efficiency. It is also generally accepted that good governance entails the creation of effective partnerships to ensure that political, social, and economic priorities are based on broad consensus in society and that the voices of the poorest and most vulnerable are heard in the decisionmaking process.

Ultimately, only a nation's government, civil society and private sector can facilitate this "enabling environment" and the challenge is to create a system of governance that promotes these fundamental principles. For this reason democratic and decentralized governance is increasingly considered a requisite component of development initiatives.

Decentralization and Development

While a portion of this study focuses on decentralization driven institutional reforms, in fact, decentralization is a complex process that reaches beyond structural reforms proposed in institutional frameworks. Decentralization can address poverty, gender inequality, environmental concerns, the improvement of healthcare, education and access to technology. Moreover, decentralization does not only affect government and civil service, but is conditional on the involvement of community organizations, stakeholders in the private sector, international aid organizations, and citizens.

Decentralization brings decisionmaking closer to the people and therefore yields programs and services that better address local needs. The challenge is to ensure that all stakeholders can and will voice their opinions. As part of the decentralization process, policymakers and politicians are integrating programs to address citizen participation, promote advocacy groups, incorporate women and the poor in policy decisions, aid in poverty reduction and environmental initiatives at the local level, and encourage sub-national autonomy and creativity in addressing local needs.

While it is empirically difficult to prove the effects of decentralization on human development, there is a multitude of individual examples that help illustrate successful steps forward.

Community participation and boosting grassroots development play a key role in the sustainability of programs and quality of life improvements.

Bringing stakeholders together to define priorities for projects and programs increases interest and sense of ownership, which in turn promotes sustainability. A municipality in Brazil, Belo Horizonte, formed a municipal health council bringing together stakeholders from the community, the local and central governments. Consequently, the council was better able to prioritize the needs of the community, improve communication with all stakeholders including the private sector and increase allocated resources from the Ministry of Health in exchange for a stronger system of accountability. These achievements ultimately led to the improvement of immunization rates and lower infant mortality—top priorities defined by the council.

Supporting open dialogue and participation between the local government and civil society can ensure improved self-reliance. The Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE) program in Tanzania has helped strengthen the link between civil society and local governance institutions and thereby improved local capacity to solve key development problems.

Encouraging a culture of participatory democracy assists in ensuring the accountability of elected local government officials. In turn increased responsiveness of local authorities and improved service provision assist in better revenue and local tax collection. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is sponsoring a program in Nigeria that aims to promote more effective participation in the democratization process. As a result of the project, more grassroots organizations are helping women learn about their rights, identify special concerns, and generate support for their issues. As a result women are gaining greater decisionmaking abilities in the household, community, and political arenas. Not only does this program bolster democratic processes, but also Nigerian women have gained more control over their destinies, which ultimately increases their contribution to the country's development (Jay 2001).

Empowering and supporting women and the underprivileged help to improve their economic conditions and make progress in alleviating widespread poverty. Simply increasing representation for these groups by mandating allotment of a certain proportion of representatives to a certain group, helps to achieve these goals.

These are only a few examples of successful programs that link the processes of decentralization and human development.

*Defining Decentralization*¹

While decentralization has undoubtedly gained popularity within the last two decades, it is not a new concept. The term attracted attention in the

1950s and 1960s when British and French colonial administrations prepared colonies for independence by devolving responsibilities for certain programs to local authorities. In the 1980s decentralization came to the forefront of the development agenda alongside the renewed global emphasis on governance and human-centered approaches to human development.² Today both developed and developing countries are pursuing decentralization policies.

Robert Ebel and Serdar Yilmaz point out in their overview of decentralization that “the western world sees decentralization as an alternative to provide public services in a more cost-effective way. Developing countries are pursuing decentralization reforms to counter economic inefficiencies, macroeconomic instability, and ineffective governance. Post-communist transition countries are embracing decentralization as a natural step in the shift to market economies and democracy. Latin America is decentralizing as a result of political pressure to democratize. African states view decentralization as a path to national unity” (Ebel and Yilmaz 2001: 2). There are many different reasons why governments pursue decentralization and there are numerous forms and degrees that decentralization can take on.

While there are numerous political and economic reasons why governments adopt decentralization policies, scholars and practitioners have theorized about the interdependence of decentralization and size variables such as population, land area and GDP. Are countries with certain demographic, or economic characteristics more likely to attempt decentralization? Indeed high-income countries are relatively more decentralized than low-income countries, and Sub-Saharan Africa has the lowest levels of local expenditure and revenue shares compared to the world. Additionally, countries with greater populations and area are more decentralized—as country size and population increase, subnational governments are expected to play a larger role in service delivery (Ebel and Yilmaz 2001: 21).

Decentralization can be defined as the transfer of responsibility for planning, management and resource raising and allocation from the central government and its agencies to the lower levels of government. Decentralization is closely linked to the concept of subsidiarity, which proposes that functions (or tasks) be devolved to the lowest level of social order that is capable of completing them.³ As the UNDP states: “Decentralizing governance is the restructuring of authority so that there is a system of co-responsibility between institutions of governance at the central, regional and local levels according to the principle of subsidiarity, thus increasing the overall quality and effectiveness of the system of governance, while increasing the authority and capabilities of subnational levels” (UNDP 1997b: 5).

There are three broad types of decentralization: political, administrative and fiscal and four major forms of decentralization: devolution, delegation, deconcentration and divestment.

Political decentralization normally refers to situations where political power and authority has been transferred to subnational levels of government. The most obvious manifestations of this type of decentralization are elected and empowered subnational forms of government ranging from village councils to state level bodies. Devolution is considered a form of political decentralization.

Devolution refers to the full transfer of responsibility, decisionmaking, resources and revenue generation to a local level public authority that is autonomous and fully independent of the devolving authority. Units that are devolved are usually recognized as independent legal entities and are ideally elected (although not necessarily).

Political decentralization requires a constitutional, legal, and regulatory framework to ensure accountability and transparency. It also necessitates the restructuring of institutions and developing linkages with civil society and the private sector. Simultaneously, political decentralization necessitates universal participation and new approaches to community institutions and social capital.

Administrative decentralization aims at transferring decisionmaking authority, resources and responsibilities for the delivery of select number of public services from the central government to other levels of government, agencies, and field offices of central government line agencies. Administrative decentralization is often simultaneous with civil service reform. There are two major forms of administrative decentralization:

- Deconcentration refers to the transfer of authority and responsibility from one level of the central government to another while maintaining the same hierarchical level of accountability from the local units to the central government ministry or agency, which has been decentralized. Deconcentration can be seen as the first step in a newly decentralizing government to improve service delivery.
- Delegation redistributes authority and responsibility to local units of government or agencies that are not always necessarily branches or local offices of the delegating authority. While some transfer of accountability to the subnational level units to which power is being delegated takes place, the bulk of accountability is still vertical and to the delegating central unit.

Fiscal decentralization is the most comprehensive and possibly traceable degree of decentralization since it is directly linked to budgetary practices. Fiscal decentralization refers to the resource reallocation to subnational levels of government. Arrangements for resource allocation are often negotiated between the central and local authorities based on several factors including interregional equity, availability of resources at all levels of government and local fiscal management capacity. Experience in fiscal decentralization has led to capacity building in expenditure and revenue assignment as well as the design of fiscal transfer formulas and subnational borrowing.

Divestment is when planning and administrative responsibility or other public functions are transferred from government to voluntary, private or nongovernmental institutions with clear benefits to and involvement of the public. This often involves contracting out partial service provision or administrative functions, deregulation or full privatization.

Federalism and Decentralization

There exists an extensive debate over the relationship of federalism and decentralization among development practitioners. Federalism is often accompanied by decentralization, but it is not a necessary condition for decentralization, nor is decentralization a sufficient condition for federalism (Baldi 1999). Thereby, does a federal system facilitate decentralization and development better than unitary systems? Is the success of decentralization and development efforts greater in a federal rather than a unitary system or is it independent of the government structure? For decentralizing unitary systems, is federalism the logical next step (Baldi 1999)?

In practice, the line between decentralization, federalism, unitary states and centralized systems becomes blurred. As Lidija Basta points out in her overview on decentralization: "There is no completely unitary state. Every state is at least composed of municipalities as decentralized units. Accordingly, the major question arises on how to differentiate among a unitary state practicing deconcentration, a decentralized unitary state and a federal state" (Basta n.d.: 29-30). Ultimately she argues that "the member states within a federal state dispose of original autonomy, which is not the case with the autonomy of decentralized units within a unitary state; in other words, the autonomy of member states has been established and guaranteed on a constitutional not merely legislative (statutory level) basis as it is the case with decentralized units" (Basta n.d.: 30).

Some consider federalism "a special case of decentralization: a system in which public sector decisions can be taken at various levels of government—a compromise between a unitary state and complete decentralization" (Ebel 1998: 3). Under the unitary system, the subnational units function largely as

the administrative unit of the center. One government dominates the fiscal decisions, which may include granting some devolution or deconcentration with authority. Thus some local autonomy can emerge even in unitary states.

In a federal system, different independent governments make public sector decisions and provide greater opportunities than a unitary system for citizen participation at subnational levels. A federal system is expensive and institutionally complex. It requires high levels of cooperation and capacity at the subnational levels to ensure the enhancement of good governance. The argument then is that a federal state is more apt for deconcentration since the administrative and political structures are already in place. Additionally, the center does not control member state officials in a federation, whereas subnational governments in unitary states can operate only within the legislative powers assigned to them by the center. Therefore the workability of decentralization depends on the goodwill of the unitary central government, instead of relying on existing constitutional divisions of power (Basta n.d.).

The counterarguments to federalism include the following: federalism can aggravate ethnic differences and promotes separatist movements; it may promote unequal development of regions when universal and equal development is necessary; and, federalism is sometimes ineffective and inefficient, particularly in developing countries with a nonexistent or underdeveloped infrastructure.

The loudest arguments against federalism have been recently expressed in reference to Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka is a small multiethnic, multireligious and multilingual country, in the process of adopting a comprehensive "devolution package" to amend the Constitution and adopt a federal system. Some argue that the pursuit of a federal state will only aggravate the anti-democratic and separatist elements within the country and put statehood at risk. Given the current situation, many believe that only a strong center can promote development and economic growth. Additionally, it is argued that fragmentation of the state would lead to units too small to be economically viable, environmentally sustainable and geographically homogenous. In effect, certain regions would be deprived of natural resources such as water. Ultimately some sources conclude that there are no convincing economic, political or developmental reasons to divide Sri Lanka into nine federal states.⁴

Exploring Decentralization Worldwide

Given the many impetuses for implementing decentralization policies and varying types and degrees of decentralization across countries, it is inherently difficult to compare a single notion of decentralization. In fact, as pointed out previously, the lines between the types of decentralization and

existing governmental systems become quite blurred in practice. To accurately summarize the degree of decentralization in a country, one must simultaneously consider the political, fiscal, and administrative issues at all levels of government as well as local council elections, participatory budgeting practices, local government's borrowing powers, and tax collection capacity, the prevalence and role of nongovernment organizations (NGOs) and advocacy groups, community organizing and freedom of voice.

While categorizing and comparing decentralization across countries are challenging tasks, they are important for monitoring and evaluation purposes. A better understanding of changing governmental systems and the effects of decentralization on service delivery, socioeconomic status, and institutional arrangements will allow for cross-national learning and improved approaches to development.

Currently there is one existing source and there are two sources being developed to assess and compare decentralization indicators (Ebel 1998):

- Government Finance Statistics which are particularly helpful when evaluating fiscal decentralization but do not provide details on own-source revenue or expenditure autonomy;
- An Overseas Economic Coöperation and Development (OECD) survey on Fiscal Design Across Levels of Government; and
- Fiscal Decentralization Indicators Project currently being developed by the World Bank.

Additionally, governance indicators and democracy and freedom indicators are helpful in providing context for decentralization. Sources such as the UNDP Human Development Report for 2002, which is dedicated to the issues of Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World and the United Nations University-initiated Global Survey on Governance help obtain a broader understanding of the extent and effects of decentralized governance. While currently the most often used measures in assessing decentralization are subnational shares of revenues and expenditures and local government elections, it is important to pair these empirical measures with qualitative assessments of governance indicators for a fuller picture of the impacts of decentralization.

Democracy, Governance and Decentralization


In the year 2000, 120 of the 192 countries included in a Freedom House study were democracies. At the brink of the new millennium, over 58 percent of the world's population was living in a democracy. In contrast slightly more

than 33 percent of the population was living in an authoritarian regime (39 states), a one-party state or military dictatorship in which there are significant human rights violations. Sixteen states or eight percent of all states had "restricted democratic practices."

While the number and percentage of democracies in the last 50 years has increased dramatically from 22, so has the number of authoritarian regimes (from ten). Given the accelerated spread of democracy, one should remember that this shift has not always been a peaceful one, and democracy itself has no guarantee for human rights and freedoms. Additionally, the increase in the number of regimes calls for an increased commitment to the spread and strengthening of democratic governance.


It is not surprising that decentralization has complemented the growth of democracies worldwide. It is estimated that 80 percent of developing countries including the transitional economies of Eastern and Central Europe are experimenting with some form of decentralization (Furtado 2001). Using subnational government elections as an indicator of political decentralization, in 1999, 96 of the 126 countries included in the World Development Report tables had at least one elected subnational level of government. Forty-two countries had two or more elected subnational levels.

Figure 1. State of Decentralization Worldwide (1999)



Between 1980 and 1998, the average share of subnational expenditures and revenues for 28 countries reported in the Government Finance Statistics, increased steadily (Ebel and Yilmaz 2001). Based on shares of revenues and expenditures, in 1997, 52 countries had some degree of fiscal decentralization. Of these 52 countries, 48 had at least one level of subnational elections.


Figure 2. Subnational Elections in Fiscally Decentralized Countries (1997)



In 1998, of the 75 developing and transition countries with populations greater than five million, all but twelve claimed to be embarking on some form of fiscal decentralization (Ebel 1998).

Degrees and types of decentralization vary by region and income. Countries with high incomes are more likely to adopt both fiscal and political decentralization. Countries with low Gross Domestic Product are least likely to devolve fiscal responsibilities to the subnational level.⁵

Figure 3. Decentralization by Income Group




Federalism and Decentralization in Practice

No broad-based generalization can be made about the correlation of federal/unitary states and decentralization. Some federal states are highly centralized—such as Malaysia, while some unitary states have a high degree of decentralization such as China. According to a study of fiscal decentralization (based on subnational governments' expenditure share) of 31 decentralized countries, 18 are unitary governments and thirteen are federal. According to Robert Ebel (1998), the average subnational share of expenditures is 38 percent for federal countries and 22 percent for unitary countries. While this may give a sense that federal countries are more decentralized one should keep in mind that these measures do not reflect subnational government capacity, quality of service provision, and citizen participation (Ebel 1998).

Country Cases—Categorizing Decentralization in the Field

Devolution is often the form that is considered “true decentralization” and while the literature focuses largely on devolution and fiscal decentralization, often in practice, particularly in the case of developing countries the focus is on milder forms of decentralization.⁶ In addition, all governmental systems are likely to have elements of devolution, deconcentration and delegation; therefore a clear delineation of forms of decentralization is not possible.

Figure 4. Decentralization by Region



Below is a small sample of country case studies to illustrate the diversity and complexity of types, degrees and approaches to decentralization.

Nepal. Nepal initiated decentralization policies to accommodate its heavily diverse population and in an attempt to ameliorate service provision and reduce poverty. The Local Self-Governance Act (LSGA) of 1999 is the main legal document guiding decentralization in the country. The democratic constitution is not very explicit on decentralization and self-governing issues. Administratively, Nepal is divided into five development regions, 145 zones and 75 districts. Regional administration consists of regional level offices of sectoral ministries. The local government system in Nepal has two tiers: the district and village/municipal levels. While the LSGA authorizes local governments to have their own secretariat and staff, in practice there are two levels of staff—that deputed by the central government and the staff recruited by the local government. District level committees are the key coordinating institutions for all planning activities in the district. They also provide technical and capacity assistance to the local governments. Fiscal decentralization in Nepal is weak and while the LSGA allots for revenue sharing, in practice its success is hampered by lack of procedures to be followed.

Jordan. The driving impetus in Jordan to adopt decentralization policies is to increase economic growth by reducing the public sector role and increasing private sector participation. Decentralization in Jordan results from a combination of deconcentration, devolution and delegation of authority and resources to a variety of structural forms of the government (UNDP n.d.). The Civil Service Bylaw of 1998 is one of the most promising initiatives in Jordan toward the decentralization of government services and sustainable human resource development. It transferred the central employment authority of the Civil Service Bureau to the governors in the districts and provided the formation of personnel units in every district. The committee role is to advertise, recruit and hire civil service employees in the districts. The two largest ministries, Health and Education, whose workforce represents 87 percent of total civil service employment, have institutionalized the principle of regional distribution of services and delegated most of the ministers' authorities to the regional directors. The Ministry of Education has clearly delegated financial and administrative authority to the local units, reorganized the ministry itself to be better responsive to the local governments and in turn empowered local level decisionmakers to become responsive to their constituents through participatory budgeting practices. Additionally, Jordan is in the process of decentralizing authorities of the Ministries of Interior, Municipal, Rural and Environmental Affairs, as well as the Cities and Development Bank (Jordan Institute of Public Administration 1999).

Morocco. Decentralization is not a new experience in Morocco. Since the 1960s the country tried to respond to growing social pressure by assigning certain management and decisionmaking functions to the local level. A decentralization law was enacted in 1973 and two constitutional reforms were introduced in 1986 and 1992, such that the process has taken on the form of moderate devolution. While subnational authorities can exercise a number of legislative and administrative powers, the central government limits the resources allotted to subnational governments. In addition, the local entities have only some degree of autonomy in the allocation of their resources since they are under the authority of the Ministry of Interior.

Malawi. Decentralization in Malawi was undertaken to counter the deteriorating socioeconomic situation in the country and it is still at the developmental stages. The major debate in Malawi's process of decentralization has been whether the policy should focus on deconcentration or devolution. Malawi has settled on devolution and the government has adopted the Local Government Act delineating a national decentralization framework. The government has established relevant committees to guide the process, developed a decentralization policy, developed a district planning framework and participatory planning guidelines and created a district development fund. The new local government act provides for a unified system of local governance and development management in the districts including financial management.

Tanzania. Tanzania has always seen decentralization as an ideal approach to rural and urban development. Since independence, the government adopted several decentralization measures geared towards promoting rural and urban development. While central government administrative structures improved through these decentralization initiatives, actual participation by the rural and urban populace in the development process was not realized. This type of decentralization was more of deconcentration than devolution of power through local level democratic organs. Tanzania's ongoing political and economic reforms demand effective decentralization in which the involvement of the people directly or through their democratically elected representatives is given paramount importance. These reforms include the civil service reform, which aims to achieve a smaller, efficient, and effectively performing public service; the local government reform summarized by the Local Government Reform Agenda 1996-2000, which focuses largely on political devolution and fiscal decentralization. The Local Government Reform Program aims to amend local government laws and increase resources available to local government authorities as well as improve the management of these resources (Ngwilizi 2001).

Uganda. Uganda's reforms to decentralize down to the district level date from the early 1990s. The new constitution adopted in 1995 devolved

responsibilities and power to local government. The Local Government Act of 1997 deepened reforms by giving authority to local councils at the subcounty level to raise revenues and initiate development projects. Local councilors were elected in 1998 at various levels of government, though their responsiveness to the electorate has yet to be tested (UNDP 2000). Fiscal decentralization has accompanied the decentralization of responsibilities. Subcounties may now retain about two-thirds of the revenue collected within their area. But overall resources remain meager, and transfers from central government are low and increasingly tied to conditions, leaving little room for local discretion. Additionally, broader reforms are necessary to achieve effective participation by villagers. Local elites still exercise much influence in determining how funds are used. Many local leaders are held back by illiteracy, lack of knowledge of government procedures, and low awareness of their rights.

Nigeria. During the colonial period, Nigeria had a unified administrative structure in which there was devolution of power to administrative organs of the three regions. Unitary institutions were dismantled in the terminal colonial period and a federal structure of government established. It was a "true" federation in the sense that the component units, regions, were powerful, had significant independent sources of revenue and clear areas of competence. Nigeria has remained a "formal" federation since then but there has been a significant shift in the content of its federal structure. The direction of change has been towards an ever-strengthening federal center by a powerful military central administration. The character of Nigerian federalism has been shifting towards a unitary State with a strong dose of decentralization. The central government now has control over the main source of revenue in the country—petroleum rent has become the major provider of finance to State governments. In 1992, the Federal government created the Ministry of State and Local Government Affairs charged with monitoring and controlling the activities of state and local governments. The ministry is also charged with the task of improving the executive capacity of local government, which now has a revenue allocation of 20 percent of the Federation Account.

Each state has its own elected government with a wide range of fiscal and programming powers. Considerable decentralization and delegation in financial management has been introduced under the current reforms. The purpose of this is to speed up effective operations, policy implementation, and decisionmaking, particularly by officials at the management level.⁷

Ghana in contrast is a unitary state with political subdivisions at the district level. Ghana has deconcentrated a number of responsibilities to the districts, but the process has taken on a more administrative and operational character. The central government still maintains a great degree of control through directives and decrees.

Argentina. Argentina is an example of a decentralized federation. Argentina has three tiers of government: federal, provincial and municipal. Municipal Mayors are elected. The subnational government has the authority to set and approve its own budget but tax rate setting power remains in the center and subnational governments depend on transfers from the federal government. While there is clear assignment of functions, in practice, there is still significant overlap in service provision among levels of government.

Colombia, Brazil, the Philippines and South Africa are considered politically decentralized (as is Argentina). They all have elected local officials and councils. They all approve their own budget and generally, with the exception of Colombia, have tax-rate setting autonomy. In Colombia, the national government determines the tax rate for all major taxes. All local authorities in these countries have borrowing powers to some extent and there are defined transfer formulas for local government transfers. All levels of government have assigned expenditure responsibilities.

Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia are examples of transition economies that are embracing decentralization as part of their transition to market economies. In all three countries the local governments are part of a two-tier system. All three countries have elected local officials and councils, but all three also have some local government officials appointed by the central government, thereby ensuring some degree of central government control over regional affairs. In all three countries, local councils have the right to draft and approve their own budgets. Local governments in these countries do not have control over their own revenues—they are heavily dependent on transfers and grants. In addition, the center controls local government taxes. In each country, there is a clear assignment of expenditure responsibilities but service provision and expenditures vary greatly among local authorities. In addition, in Latvia, the central government can delegate specific additional tasks to the local authorities, but it must also transfer adequate funds. It is commonly accepted that the local governments do not have the capacity to collect local revenues and deliver adequate services.

Kyrgyzstan. Kyrgyzstan is not unlike the other transition states. Politically and administratively, the system operates in a deconcentrated manner: three (national, regional and district) of the five levels of government (national, regional, district, city and village) are accountable to central agencies and have heads appointed directly by the President. Fiscally, the intergovernmental finance system operates a conventional combination of tax sharing and grants from central governments to equalize revenue capacity and ensure appropriate incentives for local tax collection. Although there are five levels of government, in practice more than three quarters of funding for local government services comes from central government through the categorical and equalization grants. Consequently, local parliaments have relatively little discretion over the services provided in their localities and

little control of the level of financing. While local governments are primarily responsible for providing primary and secondary health and education, the structure of the intergovernmental finance system actually inhibits the decentralization of decisionmaking and provision of services (Lister and Betley 1999).

Donor Support to Decentralization

As is evident from the varied experiences in decentralization worldwide, there is no "one size fits all" design of decentralization policies. Instead decentralization has to be sensitive to the existing cultural, political, and institutional arrangements within the given country. As mentioned before, decentralization is a complex process with numerous stakeholders including the central and local governments, citizens, NGOs and community-based organizations and the private sector.

The recent resurgence in decentralization has been accompanied, or perhaps driven, by an increase in donor support of various decentralization initiatives addressing the needs of all of the stakeholders. Various United Nations agencies including the UNDP and the United Nations Capital Development Fund, the World Bank, USAID and numerous other international donors and bilateral agencies have invested significant resources towards decentralization programs in efforts to improve governance practices and strengthen democracy worldwide. These programs assist central governments in designing and implementing decentralization plans; reforming legal, political and fiscal systems; and carrying out sectoral programs. Other programs address local government capacity building (resource mobilization and management); social services planning and delivery; popular participation; gender equity; and natural resource management. Table 1 illustrates the diversity of current decentralization programs and areas of support being carried out by various donors and national governments.

The UNDP has been at the forefront of providing assistance to governance programs in efforts to achieve sustainable human development. UNDP financial allocations to decentralization have increased sixfold over the past decade. The most recent UNDP Results Oriented Annual Report states: "Decentralization and local governance has moved from an already established base of UNDP support to the extent that it can be confirmed as the major area of business. Ninety countries are being supported by UNDP in decentralization. Forty-two offices reported strategic interventions in decentralization which mark a significant 16 percent increase from 36 in 2000" (UNDP 2002: 5).

Table 1. Current Decentralization Programs and Areas of Support of Donors and National Governments

	<i>Africa</i>	<i>Arab States</i>	<i>Asia and the Pacific</i>	<i>Europe and CIS</i>	<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>
Political and Legal Reform	Cote D'Ivoire, Zimbabwe				
Fiscal, Administrative and Civil Service Reform	South Africa	Jordan, Yemen	Mongolia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Sri Lanka	Kazakhstan	Guatemala, Honduras, Venezuela
Popular Participation	Mali	Tunisia	Indonesia, Nepal	Romania	Argentina, Paraguay
Local Governance Strengthening	Eritrea, Malawi, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia				Colombia, Ecuador
Gender Equity	Kenya		India		
Resource Mobilization and Management	South Africa, Uganda, Zimbabwe		Pakistan		Brazil
Natural Resource Management	Mali	Egypt		Poland	
Social Services Planning and Delivery			Philippines, Vietnam		Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Nicaragua
Capacity Building	Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Uganda			Poland, Romania	

Source: MDGD/UNDP 2000a.

Additionally, decentralization has been identified as one of the key service lines of the UNDP Trust Fund for Democratic Governance. In this context the UNDP is providing services in the following areas: support for national decentralization strategies; improving coordination between key national ministries; strengthening the capacities of citizen's groups and local authorities to advocate; strengthening the subnational electoral, legislative and judicial processes; promoting an environment that enables the participation of marginalized groups of society and citizenship and supporting needs-based planning and participatory budgeting. Further, UNDP is launching a global knowledge network or community of practices on Decentralization, Local Governance and Urban Development.

Lessons Learned

Increased international experience has led to a number of lessons learned. Below is a list of some of these lessons, with some brief examples from selected countries:

1. Plans for decentralization should be strategic rather than predefined. Decentralization needs to be a flexible process, allowing the central/local dynamics to evolve and taking into consideration potential instability of the political framework. Since decentralization is heavily dependent on political will of the central government and consensus of the population, constant changes in the political framework can hinder the building of support for decentralization.

There should be a clear implementation design with defined roles for the various management levels and linkages between them. Additionally, local capacities for decentralization should be fully assessed prior to implementation of a countrywide process and this process should build on existing institutional arrangements.

In face of the enormous challenges to decentralization in Burkina Faso, the political will, expressed by the central government and the strength of the civil society are imperative. Also, the process is not being implemented hastily, but very deliberately and coherently incorporating management tools, training sessions and pilot programs.

2. Broad participation is needed for the decentralization process to be successful. Support for decentralization must be deliberately and carefully mobilized among all critical actors and the private sector should be recognized as a critical partner in the process. Decentralization can facilitate empowerment and encourage

creative local solutions. In Lunawka, Poland, a Committee of Local Initiatives formed among a number of municipal employees, the private sector, and interested individuals. Professional groups have developed creative initiatives to improve the quality of life and boost economic development. In this case, public-private partnerships and the promotion of tourism have led to a cleaner environment and better infrastructure. Local participation is recognized as the key factor for sustainable natural resource management and community development in the historic El Gamaleya district in Cairo, Egypt (MDGD/UNDP 2000b).

3. Not all government functions should be entirely decentralized. Following the principle of subsidiarity, a function should not be decentralized to a lower level if it is critical in the achievement of central-level goals and its sustainability at the local level cannot be guaranteed, the capacity to perform the function does not exist or the function at this level is not cost-effective. Evidence from Uganda highlights the need to maintain public goods with interjurisdictional spillovers under central government control. In Uganda, the decentralization of immunization services has resulted in falling immunization rates. While the central government delivered vaccines to health facilities, local authorities were given responsibility for funding outreach and immunization advocacy programs. The financially-restricted local governments did not view immunization programs as a priority, and consequently immunization rates declined. At the same time this example may illustrate that with sufficient human and technical capacity and access to adequate fiscal resources, lower levels can provide the services needed (World Bank 2001).
4. While decentralization is primarily a political process, it will not be successful unless adequate provision is made to finance the devolved or deconcentrated responsibilities. As is evident from the few case studies presented above, a large impediment to local service provision is lack of resources. More capacity and technical expertise needs to be provided in the areas of local revenue generation and financial assistance from the center. While the decentralization process in South Africa is far from complete, the comprehensive vision of South African policymakers is remarkable. The design of the political, fiscal and institutional changes is being managed simultaneously and in different ways for different jurisdictions (MDGD/UNDP 2000b).

Conclusion—Further Steps

While there are many successful case studies of decentralization and sustainable human development, there is much room for improvement. More needs to be learned from these individual experiences and they need to be translated into practical actions. Further analysis is necessary in order to better understand which forms and under what circumstances decentralization can have a productive role in supporting sustainable human development and how governments and stakeholders should approach these processes. In order to ensure flexibility and strategic planning, new methods of monitoring and evaluating decentralization policies need to be developed and applied.

Currently, new initiatives are expanding the role of local governments. These include Poverty Reduction Strategies, which highlight an important role for local governments in poverty alleviation, but do not define how this role should be implemented. Also, there is an increased interest in the responsibility of subnational governments in local economic development. Yet, it remains somewhat unclear, in practice, how local governments can help support business development.

Capacity building, both in terms of human resources and financial support, has often been quoted as the principal obstacle in furthering decentralization processes. There is an ongoing need for capacity building and technical assistance, as well as practical lesson sharing and while there has been progress in this area, more needs to be done. In addition, assistance needs to be provided simultaneously “upwards” to the central and municipal government levels addressing advocacy and policy design and “downward” to the field-level stakeholders and local government authorities (UNDP/BNZ 2000).

Finally, improved donor coordination is fundamental to avoid conflicting advice, duplication and waste. Donors are integral partners in the decentralization process and measures need to be taken by developing countries to improve the coordination of efforts to provide efficient and effective assistance.

As mentioned previously, decentralization is a challenging complex process that requires patience and dedication on the part of all the stakeholders. It also promises to be a mechanism for improved democratic governance and sustainable human development.

Endnotes

¹This section includes definitions developed by MDGD, UNDP (2000b).

²For more discussions on the new approach to development, see WDR 1999/2000 and WDR 2000, "Voices of the Poor" as well as the UNDP website: <www.undp.org>.

³For a detailed discussion of the concept of subsidiarity, see Stohr 2001.

⁴These arguments are based on "A Federal Constitution for Sri Lanka in the Guise of a Devolution Package," K.H.J. Wijayadas and "Only Separatists Want Devolution As a Step to A Separatist State" extracts from "The Devolution Proposals," S.B. Herriararchi.

⁵Data for these tables came from the World Bank "Entering the 21st Century," World Development Report 1999/2000. Table A.1. Regions and income distribution is based on the Classification of Economies by Income and Region, 1999: 290. Figures for fiscal decentralization are based on 1997 data, and political decentralization on 1999 data.

⁶Decentralization Toolkit Introduction, www.worldbank.org.

⁷"Nigeria—Changing Context of Government," <unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan000222.html>.

References

- Annan, Kofi A.
1998 *Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization*. New York: United Nations. 27 August. Available on <http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/Report98/ch2.htm>
- Baldi, Brunetta
1999 *Beyond the Federal-Unitary Dichotomy*. Working Paper 99-7. University of California, Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies.
- Basta, Lidija R.
n.d. *Decentralisation—Key Issues, Major Trends and Future Developments*. University of Fribourg. Available in http://www.ciesin.org/decentralization/English/General/SDC_keyissues.pdf
- Department For International Development (DFID)
2000 *Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*. White Paper on International Development. December.
- Ebel, Robert D.
1998 *Logic of Decentralisation and Worldwide Overview*. Talking Points. Mediterranean Development Forum. Marrakech, Morocco. 4 September.
- Ebel, Robert D. and Serdar Yilmaz
2001 *Concept of Fiscal Decentralisation and Worldwide Overview*. International Symposium Quebec Commission of Fiscal Imbalance. Quebec City. 13-14 September.
- Furtado, Xavier
2001 *Decentralisation and Capacity Development: Understanding the Links and the Implications for Programming*. CIDA Policy Branch. August.
- Jay, Susan
2001 *USAID Nigeria's Democracy Program Focuses on Women*. Summer.

- Jordan Institute of Public Administration
1999 Synopses of Ten Best Practices in the Jordan Civil Service Reforms for Sustainable Human Development. Prepared for the MDGD/BDF/UNDP. April.
- Lister, Stephen and Mary Betley
1999 Approaches to Decentralisation in Developing Countries. Paper prepared as background reading for the MEFMI/DFID workshop on Good Practice in Public Expenditure Management. Capetown. June.
- Management Development and Governance Division/
United Nations Development Program (MDGD/UNDP)
2000a Decentralised Governance, A Global Matrix of Experiences. July.
2000b The Impact of Participation in Local Governance: A Synthesis of Nine Case Studies. *Decentralized Governance Programme*. Draft Report. January.
- Ngwilizi, Hassan
2001 Decentralisation in Tanzania. Paper submitted to the UNCDF Conference on Decentralisation and Local Governance in Africa, Capetown. 26-30 March.
- Nigeria – Changing Context of Government
<unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan000222.html>.
- Stohr, Walter B.
2001 Subsidiarity: A Key Concept for Regional Development Policy. In Walter B. Stohr, Josefa S. Edralin and Devyani Mani, eds. *New Regional Development Paradigms, Volume 3: Decentralization, Governance, and the New Planning for Local-Level Development*. Greenwood Press and the United Nations Center for Regional Development: 35-52.
- The World Bank
2001 Decentralisation and Governance: Does Decentralisation Improve Service Delivery? PREM Notes. June.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
2002 *Results-Oriented Annual Report 2001*. New York: UNDP.
2000 Uganda Country Assessment. Poverty Report 2000. www.undp.org/povertyreport/countryprofiles/uganda1.html.
1997a Governance for Sustainable Human Development. A UNDP Policy Document. Available on <http://magnet.undp.org>.
1997b Decentralized Governance Programme: Strengthening Capacity for People-Centered Development. Management Development and Governance Division, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP. September. Available on <http://www.magnet.undp.org/docs/dec/decen923/decenpro.htm>
undated Jordan Case Study. www.magnet.undp.org.
- United Nations Development Program/Bank of New Zealand (UNDP/BMZ)
2000 *The UNDP Role in Decentralisation and Local Governance*. UNDP Evaluation Office. February.
- Vandemoortele, Jan
2002 Are the MDGs Feasible? Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP. June.