ISN 81250

REPORT ON
THE CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY

Evaluations of Regional Program, Central American Legislative Leaders Training Seminar (CALTS), and Guatemala Bilateral Project, Strengthening of Democracy

United States Agency for International Development

By:

Richard A. Nuccio
and
David Fleischer

Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc.
1730 Rhode Island Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3193

March 28, 1990

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i
BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECTS 1
THE EVALUATIONS 2
DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION OF THE MAJOR ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECTS 4
Central American Legislative Leaders Training Seminar (CALTS) 4
Phase I 4
Phase II 6
Second Conference on Parliamentary Democracy (Washington, D.C. and Strasbourg, France) 6
Washington Dialogue 7
Colloquy on Democracy and Development in Central America 7
Guatemalan National Congress Project 10
Seminars and Meetings 10
Guatemalan Legislative Staff Seminar 10
Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union 12
ATITLAN III, Seminar for Legislators 12
Public Relations Seminar 13
Seminar on the Public Budget 15
European Parliament/Council of Europe visit 17
Interpersonal Relations Seminar 17
Atitlan IV Seminar 17
Human Rights Seminar 18
Needs Assessment 18
Preliminary Equipment Needs Assessment for the National Congress 18
Legislative Studies 20
Library and Research Facilities at the Guatemalan National Congress. 20
Deputy-Constitutent Relations at the Guatemalan National Congress 21
Training and Staff Development Activities 23
Staff Development Program: Technical Training 23
The Formation of ATELCA 24
Staff Development Program: Visit of the Guatemalan Delegation to the U.S. State Legislatures 25
Staff Development Program: Return Visit of the U.S. Clerks and Secretaries 26
Strengthening ATELCA 28
Major Accomplishments 28
Designing Innovative Programs 28
State Legislatures 28
International Contacts with Parliamentarians 29
Improving Communications among Legislators 29
Formation of ATELCA 29
Computerization 30
Instilling Awareness among Legislators and Staff of the Need for Legislative Development 30
Establishing Confidence and Trust 30
Strengths of Non-partisan Approach of Center 31

Major Issues or Problems 31
Lack of Experience in Legislative Development 31
Legislative Studies 32
Management Problems 33
The Guatemala Office and USAID 33
Relations between Guatemala and Washington 33
Weakness of Seminars 33
RECOMMENDATIONS 34
Attachments 1
Attachment A: Schedule of Interviews 1
Attachment B: Financial Statements 5
CALTS 5
Guatemala Bilateral 5
Attachment C: Scope of Work 6
Attachment D: Curricula Vitae 7

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In August 1986, AID/LAC funded a grant (LAC-0003-G-6069-000) in response to the Center's unsolicited proposal, supporting a regional program to organize and carry out the Central American Legislative Leaders Training Seminar (CALTS). Phase I brought twenty Central American legislators (four each from Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras), representing government and opposition parties, to the United States to observe the legislative process and examine legislative support mechanisms at both the state and national levels. In December 1986 the legislators traveled to Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Washington, D.C. to meet with state and national legislative leaders and to attend meetings and seminars on legislative support services, computer technology, and library systems.

Plans for Phase II, which originally called for visits to the European Parliament, the Council of Europe, and the Spanish Parliament, were modified when the Council of Europe, through the Center, invited the twenty Central American legislators to participate in the Council's Second Conference on Parliamentary Democracy in Strasbourg, France. The September 1987 meeting attracted more than 400 parliamentarians from forty nations, making it the biggest and broadest based gathering of democratically elected representatives in the world. The Central American participants had the opportunity, away from the pressures they face in their own countries, to share new experiences, explore and exchange ideas, and engage in constructive dialogue on the problems facing the future of democracy in their own and other countries.

The favorable reactions of Guatemalan legislators who participated in the regional activities led USAID/Guatemala to enter into a three-year Cooperative Agreement with the Center for Democracy (Strengthening Democracy Project, No. 520-0386) in May 1987. Initiated with regional funds from LAC/DI, this second project aimed to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Guatemalan National Congress. It provides training and technical support for the 100 member body which has approximately 115 professional, secretarial, administrative, and maintenance staff members. The Center conducts seminars, skill enhancement programs, and exchanges involving Guatemalan legislators and staff and their counterparts in the United States and other democratic countries.

In November 1989 AID/Washington issued a Task Order to Checchi and Co. for an end-of-project evaluation of the Central America Regional Legislative Leaders Training Seminars (CALTS) grant (LAC-0003-G-6069-000) and a mid-term formative evaluation of USAID/Guatemala's Strengthening of Democracy project (No. 520-0386). This one report includes both of these evaluations.

Checchi and Co. brought together the evaluation team of Richard A. Nuccio and David Fleischer. The evaluators were asked to determine:

- the effectiveness of each program in achieving stated objectives, and in dealing with unanticipated situations or opportunities;
- grantee performance in planning and administering technical and financial resources;

- the impact of training and technical assistance activities on participants, on institutional development of the legislative bodies (particularly the Guatemalan Congress), and to improved relationships and constructive dialogue among Central American legislators and political leaders, and with fellow parliamentarians in the United States and other Western democracies.

The major accomplishments of the Center's activities include the designing of innovative programs with state legislatures in the United States, the promotion of international contacts with parliamentarians from around the world, with a special emphasis on Europe, and improving communications among the Central American legislators themselves.

The Center is also to be commended for a consistent regional approach in its work. The inclusion of Belize and Nicaragua in several activities reinforced the Central Americans' own sense of mutual ties and is consistent with the approach adopted by the European community and urged on the United States by such prominent U.S. groups as the Sanford Commission. Although USAID funds could not be used to support the participation of Nicaragua, the independent status of the Center and, hence, its standing among the participants was enhanced by the regional approach adopted and the inclusion of Nicaragua.

Another major accomplishment of the Center's activities is the formation of ATELCA, an association of Central American clerks and secretaries inspired by and modeled on a similar professional association in the United States. In addition to contributing to the professional development of the staff by providing the model on which ATELCA is based, U.S. clerks and secretaries associated with the Center's programs have donated a considerable amount of very expensive expertise to the selection and design of the appropriate legislative computer support system.

The Center for Democracy deserves great credit for the confidence and trust it has established with a wide range of politicians and technicians in the legislative process. The degree of cooperation, lack of concern about U.S. interference in domestic affairs, and support from those in leadership positions are a direct result of the Center's mode of operation and a tribute to the quality of its staff. This is undoubtedly due to the great personal skills of the Center's Guatemalan staff director, Caleb McCarry, who has consistently displayed sensitivity to the concerns of the members with whom he has worked in the project.

The Center's standing as a non-governmental, nonpartisan institution has allowed it to operate in ways and in areas that would not be possible for USAID. This has at times, as in the case of Center's programs in Nicaragua, created tensions between USAID and the Center, but USAID should appreciate that the Center's work, and, hence, the goals of the project itself, are enhanced by the multi-country, regional approach pursued by the Center.

Through their innovative programs and enthusiasm, the Center has helped to create an awareness among both legislators and staff that there is a need for greater development of the legislative branch. A "market" has been created which AID can serve if it wishes to advance legislative development in Central America.

The CALTS project, at the time it was begun, was not envisaged as a long-term program of legislative development. Therefore, no initial "needs assessment" was done by a legislative development specialist or, as an alternative, a specialist in organization or management. A next stage in the development of programs for Central America's legislatures would focus on legislative development and require greater technical expertise than the Center currently possesses. Any future programs should take advantage of the Center's many strengths and positive achievements with the Congress. The Center should also be encouraged to develop its own institutional capacity for legislative development or, perhaps, to establish cooperative arrangements with other experienced institutions.

The Center's bilateral project in Guatemala has dealt more directly with legislative development. The bright and capable staff of the Center has clearly learned by doing in Guatemala, but a greater level of expertise would be needed here as well if the good beginning made by the Center is to be expanded.

Studies of the library and research facilities and deputy-constitutent relations at the Guatemalan National Congress conducted under the Guatemala bilateral project are, in the opinion of the evaluators, missed opportunities. In general the studies display a lack of sophistication about the requirements of legislative development and the methodologies appropriate to this type of research.

One of the concerns of the evaluators is that the Guatemala project work to establish linkages between the Congress and the rest of Guatemalan society that will allow a support system to develop that will outlast the work of AID and the Center. Guatemala's universities and research institutions could be usefully enlisted in the work of the Center and develop their own ties and commitments to the Congress. Studies such as these could have been an opportunity to involve other elements of Guatemalan society in the work of elevating the professionalism of the Congress.

The Guatemala USAID office has correctly perceived that the time and energies of the Center's office director, Caleb McCarry, have been significantly diverted to other countries and programs, resulting in a delayed implementation of programs and meeting of objectives.

The Center should consider upgrading seminars organized with the Guatemalan Congress by preparing the participants for them more carefully. This could take the form of commissioning short and practical briefings for the participants distributed in advance with the expectation that they would be read by the participants.

The growth of the Center from virtually a one-person operation to an institution with significant roles on the front lines of democratic developments across the world is an impressive development. Center President, Allen Weinstein, is to be congratulated for the opportunities he has given to young and enthusiastic employees to occupy key positions in the Center and to advance to greater and greater responsibilities as they demonstrate their abilities. However, the limitations of this management arrangement are becoming apparent in the Guatemala project.

Flowing from the previous discussion of strengths and weaknesses, the evaluators make the following recommendations:

- AID should accentuate legislative development in its future work to strengthen the Central American legislatures. In this effort the evaluators would recommend the examination of collaborative arrangements which would build on the Center for Democracy's many strengths while incorporating academic and other institutions with greater experience in legislative development.

- The Center should work to integrate the experience, expertise, and resources of other Guatemalan institutions into its work with the Guatemalan Congress.

- Center President Allen Weinstein should consider the need for a senior staff member, perhaps at the vice presidential level, who would have significant management responsibility for Center programs. The director of the Guatemala program should not be diverted by Washington staff from the principal assignment of working with the Guatemalan Congress.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECTS

The Center for Democracy is a private, non-profit, non-partisan organization based in Washington, D.C. Its primary purposes are to promote the democratic process, encourage dialogue on international conflicts, and strengthen democratic institutions in the United States and abroad. To support these goals, the Center sponsors studies and programs conducted on a non-partisan basis that address the fundamental issues of democratic societies. It works closely on an informal basis with the U.S. Congress and with the legislatures of parliamentary democracies in the Latin American and Caribbean region, Western Europe, Africa, and Asia. It also and has ties to regional bodies, such as the European and Andean Parliaments.

A major focus on Latin America began in 1985 when the Center, together with Boston University and the U.S. Congress' Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, organized the first "Western Hemisphere Legislative Leaders Forum." This meeting brought some 50 legislators from twenty Latin American and Caribbean democracies to Washington, D.C. for a three-day conference. The delegates, joined by a bipartisan group from the U.S. Congress, discussed such issues as armed regional conflicts, transnational economic questions including the servicing of external debt, narcotics interdiction, and strengthening democracy in the Hemisphere.

In August 1986, AID/LAC funded a grant (LAC-0003-G-6069-000) in response to the Center's unsolicited proposal, supporting a regional program to organize and carry out the Central American Legislative Leaders Training Seminar (CALTS). Phase I brought twenty Central American legislators, (four each from Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras) representing government and opposition parties, to the United States to observe the legislative process and examine legislative support mechanisms at both the state and national levels. In December 1986 the legislators traveled to Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Washington, D.C. to meet with state and national legislative leaders and to attend meetings and seminars on legislative support services, computer technology, and library systems.

Plans for Phase II originally called for visits to the European Parliament, the Council of Europe, and the Spanish Parliament. An invitation from the Council of Europe, through the Center, to the twenty Central American legislators to participate in the Council's Second Conference on Parliamentary Democracy in Strasbourg, France modified these plans. The September 1987 meeting attracted more than 400 parliamentarians from forty nations, making it the biggest and broadest based gathering of democratically elected representatives in the world. The Central American participants had the opportunity, away from the pressures they face in their own countries, to share new experiences, explore and exchange ideas, and engage in constructive dialogue on the problems facing the future of democracy in their own and other countries.

At the request of the Central American participants, the Center organized a meeting in Washington, D.C. immediately prior to the Strasbourg conference, to discuss and debate the Central American Peace Plan proposed by President Oscar Arias of Costa Rica. It was essential to include representatives from Nicaragua, whose participation could not be funded by AID. The Center for Democracy was able to obtain funding from another source for this purpose.

In April 1988, the Center hosted a follow-up meeting to the Strasbourg Conference in Washington, D.C. Participants included members of the Council of Europe's Strasbourg Conference Steering Committee, members of the European Parliament, U.S. Congressional leaders, and legislators from Belize, Costa Rica, and Honduras.

The Washington dialogue led to the organization of a Colloquy on "Democracy and Development in Central America" in February 1989 in San José, Costa Rica, co-sponsored by the Center and the Council of Europe and European Parliament. The Colloquy was hosted by the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica and keynoted by President Arias. Participants included more than thirty political, civic, and legislative leaders from Central America, as well as parliamentarians from the United States, Canada, the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, and observers from other legislatures. Both of these meetings were partially funded under the regional AID grant.

The favorable reactions of Guatemalan legislators who participated in the regional activities led USAID/Guatemala to enter into a three-year Cooperative Agreement with the Center for Democracy (Strengthening Democracy Project, No. 520-0386) in May 1987. This project, initiated with regional funds from LAC/DI, sought to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Guatemalan National Congress. It provides training and technical support for the 100 member body which has approximately 140 professional, secretarial, administrative, and maintenance staff members. The Center conducts seminars, skill enhancement programs, and exchanges involving Guatemalan legislators and staff and their counterparts in the United States and other democratic countries.

AID added regional funds[1] to this bilateral project in 1988 to enable the Center to provide assistance to the Guatemalan Congress in hosting the 79th Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. This was an additional activity not anticipated in the original project.

THE EVALUATIONS

In November 1989 AID/Washington issued a Task Order to Checchi and Co. for an end-of-project evaluation of the Central America Regional Legislative Leaders Training Seminars (CALTS) grant (LAC-0003-G-6069-000) and a mid-term formative evaluation of USAID/Guatemala's Strengthening of Democracy project (No. 520-0386).

Checchi and Co. formed an evaluation team consisting of Richard A. Nuccio and David Fleischer. For the end–of–project evaluation of the CALTS project the evaluators were asked to determine:

- the effectiveness of each program in achieving stated objectives, and in dealing with unanticipated situations or opportunities;

---

[1]See Attachment B.

- grantee performance in planning and administering technical and financial resources;

- the impact of training and technical assistance activities on participants, on institutional development of the legislative bodies (particularly the Guatemalan Congress), and to improved relationships and constructive dialogue among Central American legislators and political leaders, and with fellow parliamentarians in the United States and other Western democracies.[1]

A series of specific questions were directed to the evaluators for the mid-term formative evaluation of the Guatemala bilateral project and were developed into the following instrument used by evaluators in their interviews:

Guatemala Instrument

I. Review of staff and committee structures, study congressional/constituent relationships, and determination of library and equipment needs.

- Has the Center for Democracy developed the information needed to successfully carry out the project?

- Are there information gaps that should be addressed?

II. Activities completion and program management

- Is the Center for Democracy completing project activities in a timely manner?

- Has the original scope of work been modified in light of experience acquired during implementation? If so what are the modifications?

III. Project concept and results obtained

- Have certain kinds of inputs (staff training, outside visits, direct technical assistance, reports/studies) been more effective than others?

- What is the rationale underlying choices in program approach (training today's legislators vs. structural reform or improvements in professional staff)?

IV. Staffing, organization, and program management capabilities of CFD-Guatemala and CFD-Washington.

- How adequate has program implementation and staffing, organization, and program management been?

V. Outside observations

- What are the observations/opinions of individuals/organizations concerning the Center's performance in implementing the project, including the validity of the objectives and priorities developed by the Center and of the quality and relevance of the inputs with respect to meeting local requirements?

---

[1] A complete scope of work is given in Attachment C.

VI. Other relationships

- Are there unexploited opportunities for developing relationships with other U.S. government or other donor-sponsored activities in democratic development that might give greater or broader impact to the activity?

The formative evaluation of the Guatemala project was to include recommendations, as applicable, on design or implementation changes to improve project effectiveness.

Drs. Nuccio and Fleischer worked separately and together in evaluating various aspects of the projects. Dr. Nuccio began in early November in Washington, D.C. by reviewing documents related to the work of the Center for Democracy and interviewing Center staff.[1] He was joined by Dr. Fleischer on November 27. Together they traveled to Boston, Massachusetts to meet with staff of the Massachusetts General Assembly who had participated in the CALTS program. Dr. Fleischer then traveled alone on December 1-3 to Costa Rica to attend a meeting of ATELCA (*Associación de Técnicos Legislativos Centroamericanos*), a regional association formed as an outgrowth of the Center's work, and to interview Central American legislators, staff, and others knowledgeable about the Center projects. (See section ? for a full discussion of ATELCA.) Drs. Nuccio and Fleischer met again in Honduras on December 4 and traveled together from that point on to Guatemala (December 7-15), Belize (December 15-17), and Tallahassee, Florida (December 17-18). They returned to Washington on December 18.

Either in person or by phone 50 people were interviewed. A complete list is given in Attachment A.

DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION OF THE MAJOR ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECTS

Central American Legislative Leaders Training Seminar (CALTS)

Phase I

Phase I of the Central American Legislative Leaders Training Seminar was designed to bring a total of twenty elected legislators, representing majority and principal minority parties, from Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras to the United States to observe legislative government at the national level in Washington, D.C. and at the state level in Boston, Massachusetts and Saint Paul, Minnesota.[2] Presentations on computer technology, library systems, and staff and legislative structures were organized to respond to the legislators interest in strengthening their parliaments. The Seminar was also designed to facilitate contacts and dialogue between the Central American legislators and U.S. legislators at the national and state levels, and to encourage greater interest in and support for Central America's parliaments by Congress and by state legislatures. An additional goal of the program was to encourage informal dialogue among the legislators themselves.

---

[1]Dr. Nuccio was to have traveled to El Salvador the weekend after the launching of the offensive by the FMLN. Security conditions did not allow his trip. Dr. Fleischer interviewed some of the Salvadoran legislative staff at the ATELCA meeting in Costa Rica.

[2]Minnesota was substituted for the original site of Cheyenne, Wyoming.

The presentations and meetings incorporated into the Seminar's schedule exposed the participants to a range of technical support systems in the United States Congress and at the state houses in Massachusetts and Minnesota. While the participants were interested in the various technical presentations on library and computer systems, the legislators appeared unprepared to absorb all the technical information contained in the briefings.

In Washington, the participants received a briefing on the operation of the Library of Congress and the Congressional Research Service. This included a tour of the Library of Congress's facilities and a presentation on research services and computer systems available to members of Congress. At the Massachusetts State House, the participants met at length with the director of the Reviser's Office for a presentation on and demonstration of the computerization of legislative drafting and revision. In an extensive presentation by the Minnesota Reviser's Office, the process was described by which all legislation is edited and modified by lawyers using computer terminals. For the first time, the legislators seemed to grasp the practical use for them of these technical means.

In Washington, Boston, and St. Paul, the participants received briefings on budgetary, financial, general support staff mechanisms, and organizational structures. In Washington, the participants met with staff members of the Congressional Budget Office and the House Ways and Means Committee. In Boston, the program included a presentation on the role of state legislatures in the U.S. federal system, administrative aspects of State House operations, and the budget structure. Two meetings dedicated to economic issues were held with executives from the Bank of Boston and with officials from Governor Michael Dukakis's Office of Economic Development. In St. Paul, presentations highlighted the way in which both partisan and nonpartisan offices work with the state legislature.

The participants held meetings and exchanges with a number of legislators including then speaker-designate, Jim Wright (D-TX); House Ways and Means Committee Chairman, Dan Rostenkowski (D-IL); Representative Robert J. Lagomarsino (R-CA); Senate Majority Leader, Robert Dole (R-KS); and others.

These discussions and contacts seem to have raised the self-esteem of the Central American legislators and, perhaps, increased awareness of Central American problems among the U.S. participants.

The Center also had success in forging communications among the Central Americans themselves. This occurred at various levels. Within each national delegation, members from opposing parties who had often not talked informally with each other, developed an easy rapport over the course of the project. The isolation between the national groups was also broken down. Perhaps the most striking evidence of this improved communication came between the Guatemalan and Belizean delegations. Although not well understood or appreciated in the United States, the divisions between the governments of Belize and Guatemala have been profound. Revanchist threats by Guatemala led Great Britain to station advanced Hawker Harrier fighters and several thousand troops in Belize.

During CALTS I a dialogue was begun that persisted throughout the life of the program. Mentioned by Guatemalans interviewed by the evaluators, this point was stressed by the Belizean delegates.[1] Alfredo Martínez, senator from the United Democratic Party (UDP) and chair of the subcommittee charged with relations with Guatemala in the parliament, described in eloquent terms the anxiety of the Belize delegation at the IPU meeting in Guatemala (see p. 12) when they received an invitation to be received by President Cerezo. Fearing that they had been invited *pro forma* with all those attending and that some incident would occur when they were finally announced to the President, senator Martínez went to his Guatemalan colleagues from CALTS to determine if the invitation was genuine and was assured that it was. Senator Martínez believes that this was the first official recognition by the Guatemalan government of the existence of the independent state of Belize. He gives a great deal of credit to the Center for Democracy for contributing to this development.

Phase II
Second Conference on Parliamentary Democracy (Washington, D.C. and Strasbourg, France)

The second stage of the Center's Central American Legislative Leaders Seminar was held from September 22-30, 1987 in Washington, D.C. and Strasbourg, France. Twenty-five legislators from six Central American countries (Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua) participated in the Washington program. All of the delegations, including that from Nicaragua, were comprised of representatives of government and opposition parties. In all, seventeen Central American political parties were represented.

The Washington leg of the program began on September 22 with then-President Oscar Arias' speech to the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives. A luncheon in honor of President Arias and the Central American legislators was held after the speech, hosted by then-House Speaker Wright, and including, among others, Foreign Affairs Committee Chair, Dante Fascell, ranking Republican, Robert Lagomarsino, other distinguished legislators, and members of the Center's Board.

On September 23, the Central American legislators convened in the Foreign Affairs Committee hearing room for the first Central American Legislative Leaders Forum. For two days the legislators debated the implementation of the regional peace plan signed by the five Central American presidents in Guatemala City on August 7, 1987 (Esquipulas II). At the conclusion of the dialogue, a statement supporting the commitments among the countries made in the peace plan was adopted by the group.

The Center deserves recognition for this event. The regional approach of including Belize and Nicaragua reinforced the Central Americans' own sense of the ties among them and is consistent with the approach adopted by the European community and urged on the United States by such prominent U.S.

---

[1]Indeed, on the weekend the evaluators were in Belize the Prime Minister of Belize and the Guatemalan President convened the first meeting of the two countries' heads of government.

groups as the Sanford Commission.[1] Although USAID funds could not be used to support the participation of Nicaragua, the independent status of the Center and, hence, its standing among the participants was enhanced by the regional approach adopted and the inclusion of Nicaragua. It was also especially appropriate for the Center to have created the opportunity for the legislative branch of government to play a role in the Esquipulas process.

With the exception of the delegation from Nicaragua, the Central American legislators then travelled to Strasbourg, France on September 25 to attend the Second Conference on Parliamentary Democracy sponsored by the Council of Europe and the European Parliament. In addition to coordinating the participation of the Central American legislators[2], the Center also assisted the efforts of the United States delegation. Board members of the Center hosted the inaugural reception for the conference, monitored the sessions of the conference, and spoke on behalf of the United States at each of the workshops held. Center Board members collaborated with the two U.S. congressmen attending and worked closely with the U.S. delegation in drafting the final conference reports. U.S. Consul General, Victor Comras, commented in his cable report to the State Department that, "Special mention must be made of the outstanding support provided to the U.S. delegation by the CFD."

Washington Dialogue

On April 8, 1988 the Center for Democracy coordinated a meeting of the Steering Committee of the Strasbourg Conference on Parliamentary Democracy held in Washington at invitation of the U.S. Congress to review the results of the Second Strasbourg Conference and discuss plans for future programs. Following this meeting a colloquy was held with the Steering Committee, members of the U.S. Congress, and parliamentarians from Belize, Costa Rica, and Honduras on the problems facing democracy in the Central American region.

Colloquy on Democracy and Development in Central America

The Center for Democracy, together with the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica and the Strasbourg Conference on Parliamentary Democracy, organized a colloquy on democracy and development in Central America on February 6-7, 1989 in San José, Costa Rica. A delegation of parliamentarians from the Strasbourg Conference Steering Committee met with legislators, political leaders, academics, and media representatives from Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. It brought together for the first time political and parliamentary leaders from Western Europe, the United States, Canada, and the six Central American countries. Presidential candidates from four of the six Central American countries also attended. The meeting was addressed by then-President Oscar Arias of Costa Rica and discussed the establishment of a directly elected Central American

---

[1]Named for the prominent role played by North Carolina Senator, Terry Sanford, the official name of the Commission is The International Commission for Central American Recovery and Development.

[2]The Center also successfully persuaded the Steering Committee for the Strasbourg Conference to reverse a decision barring the Guatemalan delegation from participation.

parliament. It was also decided to set up a standing conference [sic] of Speakers of Parliaments from Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

The Center has clearly been successful in achieving the central goal established for this project. As stated in the original Center proposal,

> The program is designed to encourage greater understanding of common administrative problems and to foster cooperation among the participants from four Central American countries of divergent historical traditions.[1]

It is vital to the long-term sustainability of legislative development that the politicians be "educated" to the need for it. This involves, first, the upgrading of the legislators' political status and visibility within their own countries and, second, making them sensitive to the professional needs of their staff and for administrative/technical assistance. In this way, the political support necessary for the more profound and longer term development of the legislative staff can be built. The legislators interviewed manifested both an improved self-image and greater expectations for the use of the technical staff. The evaluators believe this to be a direct result of the exposure and education they received through participation in the CALTS project.

As indicated in the scope of work, there is a trade-off for the Center between training today's legislators and focusing on structural reforms of the legislative institutions themselves or on improvements in the professional staff. This trade-off is seen most clearly in Costa Rica where legislators serve only one term. There is clearly less pay off in concentrating on deputies who will return to private life after a limited term.[2] Yet, even in Costa Rica, those legislators interviewed stressed that they saw the work of the Center as important in creating awareness about the professional needs of the staff. In Guatemala, Belize, and Honduras the participants in the Center's programs remain in important positions or have acquired new responsibilities since their involvement with the projects.

The second major goal, "to increase Western European interest in and support for democratic processes in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras,"[3] is somewhat harder to measure, but successes are also evident here. The links forged between the Strasbourg Conference on Parliamentary Democracy and the five countries included in the project are significant. Guatemala might well have continued its pariah status within the European community without the strong efforts of the Center on its behalf in obtaining their

---

[1]PROPOSAL TO THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR SUPPORT OF CENTRAL AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE TRAINING PROJECT, The Center for Democracy, Boston University, June 25, 1986, 2. Belize became the fifth country after the original proposal.

[2]It should be noted, however, that, in some cases, the deputies go on to other forms of public service.

[3]CENTRAL AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE TRAINING PROJECT, 20.

inclusion in the Second Conference on Parliamentary Democracy.[1] This new international legitimacy was reinforced by the holding of the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference in Guatemala. The Center provided the key assistance to prevent logistical failures from disrupting the Conference and harming the country's international standing.

The CALTS project was a first experimental effort at regional programing for the Central American legislatures. The Center displayed ingenuity and initiative in the design and implementation of the programs. It has been particularly effective in the "people-to-people" aspects of the project. Legislators from countries without strong democratic traditions or even customs of civil public discourse among political opponents were brought together under the Center's auspices and found that they shared common goals and problems. Given the large egos and strong personalities characteristic of public figures, this would not be easy to achieve with legislators from five of the oldest democracies in the world. The Center merits special commendation for succeeding in a region marked by authoritarian rule, political polarization, and civil strife.[2]

Although laying important groundwork for later activities, the CALTS project neither intended to nor achieved profound legislative development. If true legislative development is desired, a next phase must begin. This next phase is, to some extent, represented by the Center's bilateral project in Guatemala that has dealt more directly with legislative development. Therefore, it is reasonable to ask if the Center would be the institution best suited to carry out legislative development work on the regional level. The next section, evaluating the second project of the Center with the Guatemalan National Congress, explores the answer to this question.

---

[1]This Second Conference on Parliamentary Democracy is fully described in the evaluation of the Guatemala bilateral project . See the sub-section, "Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union," p. 12.
[2]Costa Rica is, of course, the exception to this tradition.

Guatemalan National Congress Project

Although first approved in July 1987, the Guatemala Congress project was subject to several delays. These involved amendments to the original grant (not obtained until early 1988), bureaucratic delays connected with the closing of the regional AID office in Panama which was handling the Center's grant, and concerns about whether the Center should have a staff member continuously present in Guatemala. The end result was that Caleb McCarry did not arrive to undertake full-time activities in Guatemala until February 1988.

Seminars and Meetings

The staff attached to the Guatemalan National Congress have been among the most enthusiastic consumers of the work of the Center. Their Chief of Staff, Luis Mijangos, a bright and extremely able individual, has had more than 20 years working with the Congress. He has played a leadership role in the regional program and his initiative led to the establishment of ATELCA; he was elected the first general secretary of the organization.

Guatemalan Legislative Staff Seminar

From March 24 through March 31, 1988, the Center worked with five key members of the Guatemalan Congress' technical legislative staff. A delegation (consisting of Luis Mijangos, Chief of Staff; Carlos Vega, Chief Technical Adviser; Hernan Soberanis, Administrative Clerk; Roberto Alfáro, Administrative Clerk; and Trinidad Perez, Chief Recorder) visited the Minnesota and Massachusetts state legislatures and the U.S. Congress.

The purposes of the visit were to study the process of compiling and revising laws and procedures on the state and federal level; bill drafting and modern legislative practices; and the organizational structure and legislative support services of these state and national assemblies.

At the request of the President of the Congress, the Center consulted with the Congress' staff to establish a program which would examine systems of drafting, tracking, and indexing legislation; comparatively examine staff structures and responsibilities; and investigate systems used in compiling and codifying laws.

In the meetings held in Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Washington, D.C. the members of the delegation met with staff charged with providing the multitude of services to which national legislators and, more recently, state legislators have become accustomed. In Minnesota, the group spoke with individuals from the Office of the Revisor, the office which drafts bills and other documents for the legislature; the House Research and Majority Caucus Research, which function something like the Congressional Research Service on the national level; the House Index Department, which tracks bill status and compiles an index of each session; the Legislative Library; the Office of the Legislative Auditor; and various other departments charged with such details of the legislative process as the electronic compiling of votes and the organizing of committee structures. The Minnesota Legislature is highly organized and relatively apolitical in its staff support services.

The Massachusetts General Assembly is, by contrast, a more political body where older traditions of interaction prevail. In Massachusetts, the group met with

Douglas Boyer, the Assistant Clerk of the Senate, and other individuals connected to the professional or political work of the Legislature. As discussed below, Mr. Boyer has become an important part of the on-going work of the Center in Central America.

In Washington, the delegation met with individuals from personal and committee staffs and with technical support people such as those providing legal advice, research, financial, or computer assistance to the Senate and House.

The Center for Democracy identified three goals for this program: 1) to show the participating Guatemalans the workings of three different legislatures; 2) to reassure the Guatemalan staff that it is not alone in its unique work, and to illustrate that other, more advanced legislatures share similar technical and staffing problems to those the Guatemalans confront; and 3) to spark debate among the program participants toward identifying specific areas at the Guatemalan Congress for improvement under this project.

In the opinion of the evaluators, this program was very successful. Interviews with participating staff in Massachusetts demonstrated that important personal and professional bonds had been established as a result of the program. It is clear that the Center for Democracy chose wisely in deciding to include state legislatures in the tour. While the Guatemalan legislature deals at times with national issues such as foreign policy which are beyond the normal routine of state legislatures, the smaller size of the state legislatures afforded greater accessibility to the visiting delegation which, in turn, produced much more impact than visits to the U.S. national Congress. It should be noted, however, that several of the Guatemalans emphasized that visits of longer duration, to allow greater "hands on experience and more learning in depth," would be desirable.

It was clear in the evaluators' conversations with U.S. participants that they viewed the experience as an important learning opportunity for them. They were honored by the interest of the Guatemalans in the U.S. legislative process and felt that a real exchange of information and perspectives had taken place. As one respondent put it, "This was a mutual experience; we learned as well as taught."

The judgment of the U.S. participants was that the visits had built up the stature of legislative bodies on both sides. The exposure of members and staff to counterparts in other countries had instilled a greater professional feeling among U.S. and Guatemalan participants alike.

U.S. participants endorsed the nature of this kind of initiative in U.S. foreign policy. They were able to see clear benefits of the program to Guatemalan institutions and individuals. For some of the U.S. participants this was the first time that they had had any contact with AID and its international work. They expressed the view that they felt that this kind of aid was more constructive than the military aid that they were used to thinking of as a principal aspect of U.S. policy in Central America. Their hope was that other countries would become involved in similar programs and they were clearly eager to forge similar types of relationships with other countries' legislative professionals.

Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

The Center for Democracy, using funds obligated under USAID Cooperative Agreement No. 520-0003-A-7030-00, provided simultaneous interpretation equipment, 25 electronic typewriters, and one photocopier to the National Congress of Guatemala in support for the 79th Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference, hosted by the Congress in Guatemala from April 8-16, 1988. Several staff members from the Center's Washington office assisted the implementation of the Conference and Center President, Allen Weinstein, attended.

A century old, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) includes 108 legislative bodies representing the broad spectrum of governments and ideologies in the world. The full membership meets annually, and also holds regional and specialized topic meetings on issues such as disarmament, the environment, and drug trafficking. Needless to say, this is the first time in decades that Guatemala could have even been considered as the site for the annual meeting.

Only a few weeks before the opening of the IPU meeting, the committee of the Guatemalan Congress charged with organizing the conference approached the Guatemala AID mission to request assistance. The unfamiliarity of the Guatemalans with the scale of operations needed to put on such a conference and failures on the part of a Mexican translation firm to deliver on their promises, led to a last-minute rescue operation by the mission and AID in Washington and the Center to provide adequate simultaneous translation services to the more than 2,000 delegates attending. The Center for Democracy demonstrated its flexibility and responsiveness by doing its best to correct problems presented to it when those charged with responsibility for arrangements had not proved capable.

Then Ambassador James Michel, former president of the Congress Alfonso Alonso Barillas, and several other deputies interviewed by the evaluators stressed the importance of the Center in making the success of the meeting possible. All agreed that the conference provided the opportunity for world parliamentarians to take away a positive impression of Guatemala. Through the efforts of the "Twelve-plus Group" of western democracies, chaired by the late Rep. Claude Pepper, a Guatemalan representative submitted an alternate topic, "Prospects for Peace, Development and Democracy in Central America," which was accepted as the supplementary topic for the conference and discussed in both the Political Affairs Committee and the plenary sessions.

ATITLAN III, Seminar for Legislators[1]

From June 9-11, 1988 the Center for Democracy, in conjunction with the Specific Affairs Committee of the Guatemalan Congress, conducted a Seminar for Legislators on political ideologies, called Atitlan III (the third in a series of seminars held at scenic Lake Atitlan near Guatemala City). All Guatemalan Congressmen, general secretaries of the different political parties represented in Guatemala, and top Congressional reporters were invited to attend.[2]

---

[1]Atitlan I and II were seminars organized by USAID Guatemala before the Center for Democracy was involved with the project.

[2]Only 75% of those confirmed actually attended the Seminar.

The Seminar had four principal goals:

1) Help Guatemalan Congressmen to better define, understand, and identify with their own party's ideologies, and to better understand the ideologies of the other political parties as they pertain to today's society.

2) Facilitate a discussion of political thought and develop a civil relationship between the congressmen of the different political parties so as to improve the legislative process despite the ideological differences represented by the competing political parties.

3) Discuss the different societal mechanisms that are felt to be indispensable in the strengthening of the democratizing process.

4) Provide continuity in the Program of Seminars for Legislators which began in 1987. The main objective of these seminars is to build relationships and improve communications across party lines.

Speakers asked to represent their parties were determined by each party within the Congress and the format of the program was designed by the Specific Affairs Committee. The Center assisted in planning and in the logistical and financial arrangements for the seminar. AID funds were used to provide air fare, hotel expenses and per diem for the international speakers; transportation for the congressmen and other personnel who were in need of service; and hotel accommodations and conference room facilities for all invited guests and speakers.

Principal speakers included:

- Lic. José Pacheco Pereira, Member of Parliament, from Portugal, Representative of the National Centralism Union (UCN);
- Ing. Jorge Serrano Elías, Guatemalan, Secretary General of the Solidarity Action Movement (MAS), a past and probable future presidential candidate;
- Dr. Manuel Ayau, Guatemalan, Representative of the National Liberation Movement (MLN);
- Dr. Ricardo Arias Calderon, Panamanian, now second Vice President and Minister of Interior of the new Endara government;
- Lic. Enrique de León Asturias, Guatemalan, Representative of the Democratic Left Bench in Congress.

Evaluative comments about the value of this and other seminars are offered below.

Public Relations Seminar

From August 26-28, 1988, the Center for Democracy and the Specific Affairs Committee of the National Congress conducted a Seminar on Public Relations and the relationship between the Congress and the Press. Twenty-nine congressional journalists were invited to participate in the seminar. Five of the participants were

members of the Congressional Public Relations Office and 24 were working members of the recently formed Congressional Reporters Union.

Public perceptions of the Congress and media coverage of its activities have traditionally been negative.[1] Indeed, earlier seminars held by the Congress had produced quite critical reports on the behavior of the participating members and of the role of the AID mission in supporting this kind of activity. This was, therefore, a critical area for the Congress.

The five objectives of the Seminar were to:

1) focus attention on the special needs and requirements of the legislature as one of the three branches of government;

2) reinforce and improve the relations between the Public Relations staff of the Guatemalan National Congress and the working press;

3) impart special technical information to both the Public Relations Office staff and the press;

4) expose the staff of the Congress's Public Relations Office to professional and modern public relations methods and standards;

5) clarify the objectives and functions of the Congressional Public Relations Office. Throughout the seminar specific problems and needs of the Public relations office were to be investigated and a declaration was to be drawn up stating the problems encountered and recommendations for improvement. This declaration was to be presented to the President of the Congress.

The program was divided into two segments: a first addressed to the staff of the Congressional Public Relations Office; a second attended by the staff and members of the working press. Participants heard from a variety of speakers including members of the Congress, professionals in the field of public relations and journalism, and social scientists who specialize in aspects of human behavior.

The success of the seminar itself and the possibilities of future follow-on activities were jeopardized by an intense rivalry exposed in the course of the Seminar between the small Public Relations Office located the the Congress and the Social Communications Unit located in rented quarters near the Congress. This Social Communications Unit had been created by the President of the Congress, Ricardo Gomez Galvez, and charged with overseeing the work of the Public Relations office and undertaking special promotional projects requested by the Board (*Junta Directiva*) of the National Congress. These competing offices were the product of splits developing within the majority Christian Democratic party as President Cerezo's popularity waned and factions

---

[1]A signed column which appeared in the Guatemalan media during the evaluators' visit was titled "Down with Parliaments!" and advocated the abolition of the Guatemalan Congress to remove any pretense that a body so dominated by the executive branch truly served as an institution representative of the general population's will. Guillermo Girón Valdés, "!Abajo los parlamentos!" *Prensa Libre* (November 9, 1990).

competed for dominance and advantage in the upcoming presidential elections of 1990. In January 1989, the President of the Congress, José Lobo Dubón, closed the Social Communications Unit and fired its staff.

Seminar on the Public Budget

A Seminar on the Public Budget was held from November 11-12, 1988 in Antigua, Guatemala. The two principal purposes of the meeting were to provide the participating deputies with an overview of the budgetary process as requested by the Congress and to set the stage and begin planning follow-up seminars and training activities in support of the Congress' efforts to upgrade its role in the budgetary process.

Historically the Congress has had only the most minimal impact on the budgetary process. The executive branch has a near total monopoly on the technical expertise to compose and analyze the budget. Reduced to passing or rejecting the budget as a whole, Congress has rather logically chosen to pass the budget under all but the most extraordinary circumstances.[1]

Presentations at the Seminar were by members of the Asociación Guatemalteca de Investigadores de Presupuesto (AGIP), a unit of the Ministry of Finance, or by representatives of the General Controllers Office, an independently chartered office. By a decision of the chairman of the Finance Committee, discussion was limited to technical examination of the preparation, structure, and liquidation of the budget. This was a frustrating restriction for some of the Congressmen, but is a function of the highly political nature of the budget. Pressure is routinely applied by the Executive on the ruling party to pass the budget as approved or with minimal changes. In addition, the executive branch can shift funds from one line to another with only written notification to the Congress.

The Congress needs to have a better understanding of its institutional role with regard to the budget process. The brief visits to the United States under the Center's program have done little to counteract the lack of this tradition in Guatemalan politics. The Congress' principal weapons in the budget battle are in approving new taxes and accepting (or rejecting) the accounting of the previous year's budget by the Controllers Office.[2] If the Congress wishes to develop its ability to check the Executive branch's use (and misuse) of the budget, it will have to work with the General Controllers Office to develop a system for adequately tracking the Executive's line-item transfers.

The restrictions placed on this budgetary seminar by the politics of executive-legislative relations as well as the conflicts revealed in the previous meeting on public relations point out the limitations of the Center for

---

[1]Congress did in 1989 reject the Cerezo government's budget for the first time since the return of civilian rule in 1985. Most observers—and deputies interviewed for the evaluation—attribute this rejection primarily to splits within the Christian Democratic party rather than to a certain increased skepticism on the part of Congress.

[2]This step was finally taken by the Congress in 1989.

Democracy's relations with the Congress. It is, on the one hand, startling how little concern was expressed by deputies about interference in Guatemala's internal affairs by a program which deals so directly and intimately with the workings of the Guatemalan government. This is undoubtedly due to the great personal skills of the Center's Guatemalan staff director, Caleb McCarry, who has consistently displayed sensitivity to the concerns of the members with whom he has worked in the project. His complete facility in Spanish, obvious enthusiasm for his work (and for Guatemala), and deference to the needs and interests of the Guatemalans have placed the program in an enviable position of trust and confidence with the Guatemalan Congress. Caleb has cajoled, encouraged, and suggested the best course of action to the Guatemalan participants, but he has never dictated. In the evaluators' opinion, the Center's descriptions of the various programs in its reports as being developed by this or that member of the Congressional leadership correspond to reality and are not attempts to display some false obeisance to the need for local input.

The concomitant costs attached to this approach are that the Center for Democracy has nearly always worked through the leadership—a leadership that only occasionally itself has the full confidence and support of all members of Congress. The evaluators occasionally heard the criticism that the Center had chosen to work with a small group within the Congress—those in the official leadership positions of the President, vice presidents, and the governing board (*Junta Directiva*). Other members encouraged the Center to broaden its contacts to the "natural" leadership which emerges in the leaders of the party benches (*Jefes de bloque*), the presidents of committees, and others who have developed positions of respect within the Congress.

The Center is forced, then, to balance conflicting demands between working through "official" channels or with a broader group of the Congress. The official leadership has the power to grant or deny access to the Congress for the Center's programs. It clearly must be an enthusiastic supporter of the Center's efforts. Yet, this same leadership can only grant to the Center that legitimacy which it itself enjoys. The traditional weaknesses of the Guatemalan Congress, compounded in 1988 and 1989 by the disintegration of the Christian Democratic party in Guatemala, place barriers between the rank and file of Congress and their "leadership."[1] If the Center were to work only with the "natural" leadership they might well produce better programs which responded more to the needs and interests of the majority of deputies. But in doing so they could alienate the "official" leadership sufficiently to lose their standing or find themselves accused of "interference" in the legislature's internal affairs.

The Center for Democracy is aware of this tension and has chosen, for now, to err on the side of respecting the sensitivities of the "official" leadership to gain the access and legitimacy that it requires to carry out its programs. Perhaps with the record of accomplishment it has now established it can risk operating in a somewhat more independent fashion with the broadest possible range of deputies, parties, and currents within the Congress.

---

[1] The official leadership rotates on a one year basis. One suspects that this rapid turnover is to allow greater access for greater numbers of deputies to the perquisites of the leadership positions.

European Parliament/Council of Europe visit

On February 9, 1989, the Center for Democracy sponsored, with AID funding, the visit of European parliamentarians from the Council of Europe and the European Parliament, as well as a Canadian delegation and one U.S. congressman, to Guatemala. The visit centered on the issues of environmental protection and human rights.

Interpersonal Relations Seminar

On the instructions of Dip. Roberto Alejos Cambera, chairman of the Specific Affairs Committee of the Congress,[1] which was charged by the Congress during the 1988 program year with coordinating bilateral project activities, the Center co-sponsored a series of group discussions on human relations/personal growth. The discussions were held from February through July 1989. All unelected staff of the Congress were invited and given permission by their superiors to attend. The courses were designed and led by a local firm, *Alinari, Escuela Tecnica Superior*, which has extensive experience in interpersonal relations seminars of this type.

Atitlan IV Seminar

From October 15-17, 1989, the Center, responding to the request of the president of the Congress, José Lobo Dubon, sponsored a repeat seminar on the role of Congress in the budget process.

In its report on 1989 activities, the Center for Democracy commented that, "the Atitlan format has little more to offer. Some of the congressmen in attendance appeared less interested in the topics presented than in enjoying the weekend. The Center would discourage the institutionalization of the Atitlan meetings, unless a fresh approach is devised."[2]

The evaluators concur in this judgment. The Center has not been able to dispel the initial impression of some participants that the Atitlan seminars were "parties" at the expense of the rich *gringos*. Some of those interviewed are, however, committed to this type of professional development. We would suggest that the Center consider upgrading the seminars by preparing the participants for them more carefully. This could take the form of commissioning short and practical briefings for the participants distributed in advance with the expectation that they would be read by the participants. Even if this was not the case for all those who attended, the provision of background material would convey the seriousness with which the seminar should be taken. By involving Guatemalan academics and other professionals in preparing these papers, the Center would help to tie other elements of Guatemalan society to the Congress and, perhaps, improve the public image of the Congress.

---

[1]Disbanded in 1989.

[2]p. 57.

Human Rights Seminar

At the request of the Guatemalan National Congress the Center for Democracy provided partial funding for a major seminar on human rights held in October 1989.[1] The meeting was intended to review the status of human rights efforts in Guatemala and to receive information from the United Nations on methods of promoting awareness of and adherence to the concept of human rights among different sectors of Guatemalan society. Specific topics dealt with included:

- the role of the media in promoting understanding of human rights among students;
- the incorporation of human rights into Guatemala's legal and judicial system; and
- the introduction of human rights principles and practices into the training of members of the military and employees of the police and prison systems.

Those attending the five-day seminar included members of Congress, the Human Rights Enforcement Office, the Ministry of Defense, the Supreme Court, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Government, which oversees police functions. There was also a delegation of six specialists from the U.N. Human Rights Office.

The evaluators received favorable comments on the work of the Center from the head of the Human Rights Committee of the Congress, Dip. Victor Hugo Godoy, and the recently appointed Special Prosecutor for Human Rights, Ramiro Carpio de Leon. Deputy Godoy was particularly eloquent on the need for work with the political leaders to ensure a continuing "political will" of support for improving the technical capacities of the legislative staff. He anticipated that in the next Congress there will be increased demands on the staff—especially in the area of human rights where reform of existing legislation and implementation of human rights aspects of the 1985 constitution are still pending.

Needs Assessment

Preliminary Equipment Needs Assessment for the National Congress

The glaring inadequacies of the technical support available to the Congress led early on to the interest of the Center in providing support to upgrade and automate certain features of the Congress. A review by the Center identified three areas of technical and administrative support which would have the greatest impact on the

---

[1]The weak responses of President Cerezo to past and current human rights abuses have been a disappointment to the international human rights community. The evaluators were able to interview the newly appointed *Procurador de Derechos Humanos* (Special Prosecutor for Human Rights), Ramiro Carpio de Leon, and were extremely impressed with his dedication to improving the impact of his office on the human rights situation in Guatemala.

overall efficiency of the legislative process. The Technical Legislative Department, the *Diario de Sesiones* (Congressional Record), and the Treasurer's Office are the prime target areas for automation.

The Technical Legislative Department is headed by the *oficial mayor* (Chief Clerk) and is staffed by five legislative technicians and two secretaries. All of the staff positions are non-partisan in nature. Each year the department processes the roughly 125 bills submitted for Congress' consideration. This processing includes:

- Preparation of the bill in its proper form for initial tracking;
- tracking of the bill throughout the legislative process and providing legislators and staff with bill status reports;
- incorporating all modifications of the bill as it moves through committee and plenary readings in preparation for subsequent readings;
- providing legislators and staff background information on bills under consideration; and
- researching changes to existing laws implied by proposed legislation.

The department's ability to perform these functions is dramatically limited by the minimal word processing equipment available to the staff[1] and by the lack of a data base of codified and cross-referenced laws. The Code of Laws under which the staff must operate was last published in 1978 and is merely a chronological listing of the multiple laws, executive decrees, and military government proclamations which have been made in Guatemala over the last century.

The *Diario de Sesiones* is a daily verbatim transcript of the proceedings of the Congress's plenary sessions, equivalent to the Congressional Record in the United States. Currently, the *Diario* is produced by an extremely labor-intensive process of stenographic transcription, typing onto mimeographic stencils, proof-reading and correction, and printing (on an ancient mimeo machine held together with a deftly applied screwdriver). There is now a two year delay in the production of the *Diario*.

The Treasurer's Office is charged with oversight and control of the Congress's institutional expenses and budget. The office averages 1,000 transactions per month and is, at present, not automated for any of its functions.

These problem areas were identified in 1988 and were beginning to be addressed by late 1989 through the development of greater cooperation between the Guatemalan professional staff and state legislative staff brought together through the auspices of the Center for Democracy.[2]

---

[1]The ancient IBM XT which had been used for word processing had been made inoperable at the time of the evaluators' visit because of the "crash" of its hard disk; anticipating the acquisition of new equipment through the Center program, the staff were using on demonstration a Macintosh SE and laser printer supplied by the Guatemala Apple dealer.

[2]See Training and Development Activities, Formation of ATELCA, p. 24.

Legislative Studies

Nineteen eighty-nine was a period of increasing political tension and violence in Guatemala. The second major military coup attempted since the election of Cerezo, led by factions of the military associated with the most reactionary elements of the Guatemalan elite, was thwarted by loyal military officers, but at some cost in the independence of the civilian leadership. A trend of increasing bombings, murders, and kidnapings accelerated in late 1989 and will probably increase as the 1990 presidential elections draw near. Areas of the countryside near Guatemala City, which as recently as May of 1989 were accessible to foreign visitors and Guatemalan development workers, are now conflict zones in which personal safety cannot be assured. Reflecting these developments, the Department of State issue a strongly-worded travel advisory in September of 1989.[1]

These broader social divisions have been reflected in the National Congress. Conflicts within the ruling Christian Democratic party erupted into open splits between rival contenders for succession to the presidency of Vinicio Cerezo. Two of the principal contenders, Alfonso Cabrera and Rene de Leon Schlotter, have paralyzed the President's legislative agenda and all but eliminated multipartisan cooperation.

Reflecting these conditions, the Center for Democracy, at the urging of USAID-Guatemala, concentrated its activities on bolstering the capacity of the Congress's technical and professional staff and completing several technical studies envisioned in the original grant proposal.

A series of four studies was envisioned to evaluate the conditions under which the Guatemalan Congress operates. Two have been completed and two more are under contract.

Library and Research Facilities at the Guatemalan National Congress.

This study documents the great deficiencies existing in what should be a source of support to the work of the Congress and its staff. The library possesses few documents and no regional or international publications or journals; no publications have been added to the collection in over 15 years; and what collection exists is poorly organized, limiting access.

The library's location and size are inadequate and the one full-time staff person, who has no training in library science, has only limited hours of availability.

While this study documents the inadequacies of the library it demonstrates an incomplete understanding of what is required to create an adequate research facility. The basic problem facing the Congress is the need for a system of indexation of books, documents, and other materials to be developed before attempts at automation of information management are made. When this system is established and incorporates those holdings which the library does have, the numerous gaps that need to be filled can be identified.

---

[1]The U.S. Ambassador was recalled to Washington for consultation about the deteriorating human rights situation in early 1990.

It is the opinion of the evaluators that the study also failed to do a complete job of surveying other institutions which have research and information collections. An evaluation should be made of how they are organized, what indexation and retrieval systems are used, how they are tied to other existing data bases, their operating budgets, the levels of training and types of personnel used, and other critical factors.[1] From the inquiries of the evaluators it appears that no university-level degree programs in library or information science exist in Guatemala, although some secondary/technical school training is available. Examining the state of such programs and recommending the development or creation of library science training could benefit Guatemala's national needs as well as those of the Congress.

The *oficial mayor*, Luis Mijangos, was unaware that the study had been completed when interviewed by the evaluators, perhaps because it was still in a draft form. Members of the Technical Legislative Staff did recall being interviewed, but they were not involved in the operational planning and real needs assessment presumably intended as an outcome of the study. In addition, a group of technical advisers created at one point by the Congress to assist in legislative affairs were not interviewed in connection with the study.[2]

Consistent with the other studies, there is no discussion of the methodology employed in the study nor a bibliography of other assessments or relevant research on the needs of legislative libraries.

Deputy-Constitutent Relations at the Guatemalan National Congress

This study is intended as an analysis of the relations between Guatemala's elected legislators and their electors. It was conducted by Dr. Stephen O. Stewart through a series of interviews with a representative cross-section of the membership of the Congress. A survey questionnaire was distributed to supplement the qualitative interviews, but withdrawn because of problems described below.

The study highlights the problems evident in any examination of the role of the Congress: its relative weakness compared to the executive and even local officials and the lack of understanding and poor image held by most constituents of their

---

[1]By chance in their brief visit, the evaluators encountered other model research libraries which could serve as models for the Congress and should have been examined by the study. At the Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales (ASIES) an excellent research library and information center has been built in a little over a year. Building on the collection they have been accumulating since 1980, they developed a manual operation of indexation on cards and a card catalogue for books, documents, and journals focused on a narrow range of four or five issues of central importance in the research of the association. Computerization (involving only one PC under the control of a documentation specialist) has been developed to reflect the system adopted for the manual indexation system. Entry forms are in turn based on the system developed by CEPAL (Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe) so that access to the CEPAL network by modem will be possible. In terms of size, cost, and results the ASIES library appears to be a model to be studied if not emulated by the Congress.

[2]This technical assistance group consisted of individuals chosen by their respective professional associations. Although many individuals were qualified, others were not and were viewed by those in and out of Congress as political appointees. They became isolated from the workings of the Congress and were eventually abolished.

legislators. It identifies conflicts between the National List deputies—appointed along party lines in proportion to the votes received by the party's presidential candidate—and those elected by and representing actual districts.

Although providing certain useful anecdotal insights, the evaluators were surprised by the lack of a theoretical framework for examining political representation and the dearth of references to other studies from Latin America on these issues. The author states that "no study has detailed the nature and extent of contacts between members of the Guatemalan Congress and their constituents." Yet there is no reference in the study to the work of Professor Joel Werner, who has been studying the Guatemalan Congress since the 1970s; CAPEL (*Centro Interamericano de Asesoría y Promoción Electoral*), the center for electoral assistance and study based in Costa Rica , which has published several studies on elections, representation, and parties; or Guatemala's own ASIES, which has recently done studies on the representation process, political parties, pressure groups, and surveys of constituent opinions. The reader has no way to assess whether the author is aware of this important literature relevant to the premises and conclusions of his study since no bibliography or references are included.

Contractual arrangements for the completion of studies of the Staff Structure at the Guatemalan National Congress and of the Committee system at the Guatemalan National Congress have been made and are expected to be received in early 1990.

The withdrawal of the survey questionnaire raises questions about the professional procedures used by Pro Desarrollo, S.A., and the wisdom of employing a U.S.-staffed institution to conduct these studies. When the survey was received by some deputies questions arose as to whether it had been authorized by the Administrative Board (*Junta Directiva*). Such authorization had been received, but, apparently, there was no covering letter of introduction from the *Junta* or the Chief Clerk describing the research and its authorization, setting out its objectives, and asking cooperation from the deputies. Problems might have been avoided if this had been done and if either the President of the Congress or another staff official had made arrangements for the interviewers.

A trademark of the Center's work with the legislature has been its sensitivity to the need for ground-floor involvement by the Guatemalans in attempts to upgrade the Congress. That sensitivity is lacking in the way in which these studies were conceived and conducted. The Center's Guatemalan staff director was under strong pressure from the USAID project manager to complete these studies in a timely manner. Completion of the studies was made an amendment to the grant agreement and it was apparently indicated that they would be considered a central criteria by which the Center would be judged. The result was that the studies were conducted to meet the requirements of the AID mission rather than as a means to advance the process of legislative enhancement.

The result was that an important opportunity to strengthen the legislatures ties to the larger Guatemalan society was missed. One of the concerns of the evaluators is that the Guatemala project work to establish linkages between the Congress and the rest of Guatemalan society that will

allow a support system to develop that will outlast the work of AID and the Center. Seen from this perspective, these studies were missed opportunities to give institutions outside the Congress a vested interest in its work and independence.

Guatemala's universities and research institutions could be usefully enlisted in the work of the Center and develop their own ties and commitments to the Congress. For example, the evaluators visited with faculty and administrators at the University of San Carlos (a public university) and Rafael Landívar (a Jesuit institution) both of which expressed a strong interest in developing greater links with the Congress through student internships, dissertation research, and faculty projects. Studies such as those discussed here could have been an opportunity to involve other elements of Guatemalan society in the work of elevating the professionalism of the Congress. Such studies might not immediately produce the finished products desired by the project (although they would probably not have ignored the substantial Latin American literature on these subjects as the *Pro Desarrollo* studies did). But interests would be established with a stake in future work with the Congress, national capabilities for research and consulting with the legislature increased, and, potentially, greater understanding of the work and role of the Congress promoted.

Training and Staff Development Activities

Staff Development Program: Technical Training

From April 19-24, 1989 five U.S. state legislative clerks and secretaries visited Guatemala as part of the Center for Democracy's Guatemalan Staff Development Program. The North Americans worked closely with the chief clerk and staff members of the Technical Legislative Department of the National Congress of Guatemala. The U.S. group also participated in the founding session of the Association of Central American Legislative Technicians (ATELCA).

Participating in the April meetings were, from the Guatemalan National Congress legislative staff:

Lic. Luis Mijangos, Chief Clerk and Chief of Staff
Sr. Roberto Alfaro, Legislative Technician
Sr. Hernan Soberanis, Legislative Technician
Sr. Humberto McKay, Legislative Technician
Sr. Cesar Hernandez, Legislative Technician
Lic. Sergio Dominguez, Legislative Technician
Lic. Hugo Casteneda, Legislative Technician

from the U.S. state legislative clerks and secretaries:

Mr. Douglas C. Boyer, Second Assistant Clerk of the Massachusetts Senate
Mr. John D. Crawford, Assistant Secretary of the Alabama Senate
Mr. John B. Phelps, Clerk of the Florida House of Representatives
Mr. Donald J. Schneider, Chief Clerk of the Wisconsin Senate
Mr. Willis H. Snow, Secretary of the Michigan Senate

The quality and level of the U.S. participants is a direct outgrowth of the work of the Center over the previous two years in the CALTS project and the Guatemala project. The evaluators interviewed Douglas Boyer and John Phelps and found them to be well-informed and enthusiastic supporters of the project. In addition to their contributions to the professional development of the staff by providing the model on which ATELCA is based (see below), these individuals have donated a considerable amount of very expensive expertise to the selection and design of the appropriate legislative computer support system.

As a result of their visit to Guatemala and observations of the problems confronting the professional staff, the visiting delegation drafted a detailed report containing their preliminary recommendations for the computerization of the National Congress. The U.S. clerks also offered to return to Guatemala to train Guatemalans in specific areas of concern. Through their connections with the American Society of Legislative Clerks and Secretaries (ASLCS) they have the capability to provide access to over 300 U.S. legislative officers and their staffs who share a unique community of interest and expertise with the Guatemalans.

Offers have come from John Crawford, Assistant Secretary of the Alabama Senate, to place two Guatemalan legislative technicians on the Alabama Senate's payroll for six months of training, and from Doug Boyer, Assistant Clerk of the Massachusetts Senate, for a two to three week training visit. The evaluators observed a continuing commitment on the part of Boyer[1] and Phelps to finalize plans for the implementation of the computerization plan and to assist in the selection of hardware and software equipment appropriate to the needs of the National Congress.

The Formation of ATELCA

Responding to a request from Luis Mijangos, chief clerk of the National Congress, The Center for Democracy sponsored the organizing meeting of the Association of Central American Legislative Technicians (ATELCA), held April 21-22, 1989 in Antigua, Guatemala.

The meeting brought together the chief clerks and key technical personnel from the legislatures of Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras to discuss and draft a document creating an association capable of promoting and building relationships among the Central American legislatures. The objective of the organization is to establish programs to increase the professionalization of Central American legislative staff and to undertake other activities to strengthen the infrastructure of the region's legislatures. The idea for ATELCA came from Mr. Mijangos and the Guatemalan delegation and a conversation with Doug Boyer of Massachusetts—an active member and officer of ASLCS.

The five members of ASLCS listed above attended the meeting to assist the Central Americans in drafting bylaws to create ATELCA and to explore the possibilities of organizing future cooperative efforts between ATELCA and ASLCS.

---

[1]Doug Boyer, assistant clerk of the Massachusetts Senate, is also an active member of the American Society of Legislative Clerks and Secretaries (ACLCS), which is in turn affiliated with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL).

In addition to the Guatemalan staff listed earlier, three other Central American[1] Chief Clerks participated:

- Dr. Olmedo Castro Rojas, Executive Director, Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica
- Lic. Mario Donald Salazar, Chief Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of El Salvador
- Licda. Adylia Zelaya, First Secretary, Junta Directiva, National Congress of Honduras[2]

Staff Development Program: Visit of the Guatemalan Delegation to the U.S. State Legislatures

In July 1989, the chief clerk of the Guatemalan National Congress and six legislative technicians visited four state legislatures in the United States as part of the Center for Democracy's legislative staff training program. As a direct result of their earlier visit to Guatemala, the U.S. delegation hosted the Guatemalan chief clerk and his top staff in an examination of the structure of U.S. legislative support services and to review the different computer technologies currently in use in U.S. state legislatures.

The Guatemalan delegation included:

Lic. Luis Mijangos, Chief Clerk and Chief of Staff
Sr. Roberto Alfaro, Legislative Technician
Sr. Hernan Soberanis, Legislative Technician
Sr. Humberto McKay, Legislative Technician
Sr. Cesar Hernandez, Legislative Technician
Lic. Sergio Dominguez, Legislative Technician
Lic. Luis Lopez, Deputy Editor, *Diario de Sesiones*

The hosts in the four states were:

John D. Crawford, Assistant Secretary of the Senate (Alabama)
Donald J. Schneider, Senate Chief Clerk (Wisconsin)
Willis H. Snow, Secretary of the Senate (Michigan)
John G. Phelps, Clerk of the House of Representatives (Florida)

A series of seminars and small group discussions was conducted by each state legislative staff and focused on such specifics as bill drafting, research, indexing and tracking, journal production, compilation of laws, statute revision, computer support and training, fiscal analysis, administrative support structures, and information bases. In Alabama, Wisconsin, and Florida, the delegation examined three different types of approaches to computerization: an independent contractor's customized system for

---

[1]Reflecting the continuing divisions among the countries on the Isthmus, Belize and Nicaragua are not yet included in ATELCA.

[2]Each delegation also included three legislative clerks.

the Alabama legislature; an IBM supplied system in Wisconsin; and an Apple Macintosh system in the Florida legislature. Each of these approaches had its own benefits and costs to recommend it to the Guatemalans as their preferred system.

The Guatemalan clerks and secretaries clearly benefitted from this trip and the information conveyed by the over 60 experienced legislative staffers in the four states who made presentations and provided hands-on experience with the different computer applications.

Staff Development Program: Return Visit of the U.S. Clerks and Secretaries

From September 10-17, 1989 the five American state clerks and secretaries returned to Guatemala to present their preliminary recommendations for the computerization of the Nation Congress contained in the report, "Automating the National Congress of Guatemala." While in Guatemala, they held further discussions with the Guatemalan legislative technicians and spoke with several computer system vendors.

A difference of opinion among the U.S. group about the best approach for meeting the needs of the Guatemalan Congress which evident at the time of the evaluators' visit to Guatemala. One of the U.S. clerks favored the "turnkey[1]" software approach, reasoning that it could greatly reduce the inevitable startup and follow-through problems. The others felt that a component system would best suit the Congress, because it would provide more flexibility and more potential for upgrading software. A component system, they believed, would also better insure ongoing maintenance and other service, especially in case of problems that might arise in the area of monthly payments required for maintaining a turnkey system.

The Guatemalan clerks, at the time of the evaluators' visit, felt that the best system for the Congress would be an Apple Macintosh system with turnkey software. This conclusion was reached on the basis of Apple's especially user-friendly equipment, combined with the advantages of a system designed specifically for the Congress.

The evaluators believe that the Center has taken a very solid approach to a choice that will carry great consequences for the success of the automatization program for the Congress. We believe that the decision about the choice of computer systems should ultimately be in the hands of those who use computers in their work and those who are familiar with the state legislative systems.[2] This process of choice should be made expeditiously, but without

---

[1]A "turnkey" system would be one which would be designed and put in place by an outside firm; all the Guatemalans would have to do to begin using it would be to figuratively "turn the key."

[2]An evaluation of the Center for Democracy's reports on computerization of the Congress by Edgardo R. Derbes of Checchi and Company disagrees with this conclusion of the evaluators. Ron Witherall, USAID-Guatemala, commissioned Mr. Derbes' evaluation by of the Center for Democracy's reports.

Mr. Derbes criticizes the Center's reports for relying too heavily on the advice of the legislative clerks and secretaries from the United States instead of technical specialists in legislative computerization. He believes that the Center should not focus on particular hardware configurations

rushing to make a "commodity drop"[1] which will fulfill administrative requirements but not provide the best and most sustainable system for the Guatemalan Congress.

The evaluators believe that the Center for Democracy has identified correctly the strengths and weaknesses of the three potential vendors for the project. IBM does have the largest regional operation and is accustomed to working on government-funded projects. The company has trained technical personnel who can provide support to the Congress over the long run.[2] Apple is the most flexible and user-friendly system.[3] However, Apple is notorious for its weak warrantees and poor customer support in the United States. Even if the Miami office becomes the main supplier for the Congress that is no guarantee of adequate maintenance and support. In addition, the Apple system is based on a proprietary technology designed *not* to be compatible with other manufacturers. If the Guatemalans wish to add equipment from their own funds at some future date, they can buy Japanese, Korean, or other third party suppliers' equipment that will be relatively inexpensive *and* fully compatible with their IBM equipment. This will *never* be the case with Apple technology.

The independent contractor's approach includes provision of all hardware, tailored software, and full-time, on-site support services.[4] Terminology, processes, menus, and procedures unique to Guatemala could be incorporated with the core software to create a "seamless" system for users. However, the evaluators are concerned about the ability of the Congress to sustain support for such a system over the long run, when AID funding may no longer be available.[5]

---

from suppliers, but rather develop a set of generic specifications to be filled by contract in a "turn key" operation. He also argues that the hardware configuration suggested in the reports will "be unable to support some of the system's most important required features" (Edgardo R. Derbes, "Guatemala National Assembly, Legislative Information System, Technical Commentaries and Recommendations," February 8, 1990). He specifically criticizes the Local Area Network (LAN) of personal computers recommended by the reports as not suited to the Free Text Retrieval application required for on-line searches of the bills and laws enacted. The Center for Democracy referred his evaluation to the group of clerks and secretaries for comment. Their response rejected most of Mr. Derbes' criticisms.

[1]This phrase was not, in fact, uttered by any USAID employee in Guatemala, but was used to describe the goal of the Honduran program.

[2]An added advantage of IBM equipment is its standardization throughout the industry. This means that compatible equipment such as modems, hard drives, tape backup systems, printers, and other peripheral equipment can be purchased at lower cost from competitive suppliers after the original grant has been exhausted.

[3]One of the evaluators wrote this report on an Apple Macintosh.

[4]The company referred to here is Public Systems Associates, Inc. (PSA) of Denver, Colorado. PSA is a leader in providing to state legislatures a comprehensive solution to the search/retrieval, bill status, archiving, codification, document management, and journal production tasks.

[5]This has become an even greater concern with the announcement of proposed cuts in aid for Guatemala of nearly $25 million from $80 to $56.4 million (*NYT*, February 1, 1990).

Strengthening ATELCA

Between October 22-26, Chief Clerk of the Guatemalan Congress and Secretary General of the newly formed *Asociación de Técnicos Legislativos de Centro América* (ATELCA), Luis Mijangos, attended the annual meeting of the American Society of Legislative Clerks and secretaries (ASLCS) in Hartford, Connecticut.

The meeting served to further cement the ties between the Guatemalan staff and their colleagues in the United States.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Designing Innovative Programs

State Legislatures

The Center's identification of the state legislatures as the most appropriate level for sustained interaction with the Central American legislatures has proven to be key in the development and execution of the programs. If the initiatives undertaken by the Center endure it will be largely because of the organic ties forged between individuals and institutions on this state level.

It is clear that the Center for Democracy chose wisely in deciding to include state legislatures in the tour. Interviews with participating staff in Massachusetts demonstrated that important personal and professional bonds had been established as a result of the program. While the Guatemalan legislature deals at times with national issues, such as foreign policy, which are beyond the normal routine of state legislatures, the smaller size of the state legislatures afforded greater accessibility to the visiting delegation which, in turn, produced much more impact than visits to the U.S. national Congress. It should be noted, however, that several of the legislators interviewed in Guatemala and Costa Rica emphasized that visits of longer duration, to allow greater "hands on experience and more learning in depth," would be desirable.

It was clear in the evaluators' conversations with U.S. participants that they also viewed the experience as an important learning opportunity for them. They were honored by the interest of the Guatemalans in the U.S. legislative process and felt that a real exchange of information and perspectives had taken place. As one respondent put it, "This was a mutual experience; we learned as well as taught."

The judgment of the U.S. participants was that the visits had built up the stature of legislative bodies on both sides. The exposure of members and staff to counterparts in other countries had instilled a greater professional feeling among U.S. and Central American participants alike.

U.S. participants endorsed the nature of this kind of initiative in U.S. foreign policy. They were able to see clear benefits of the program to Central American institutions and individuals. For some of the U.S. participants this was the first time that they had had any contact with AID and its international work. They felt that this kind of aid was more constructive than the military aid which they identified as a principal aspect of U.S. policy in Central America. Their hope was that other countries would become involved in similar programs and they were clearly eager to forge

similar types of relationships with legislative professionals from other parts of the world.

International Contacts with Parliamentarians

The wisdom of the Center in broadening the range of experience of the Central American legislators to European and other parliamentary systems is to be applauded as is the farsightedness of USAID in recognizing the legitimacy of using USG funds for such activities.

The links forged between the Strasbourg Conference on Parliamentary Democracy and the five countries included in the project are significant. Guatemala might well have continued its pariah status with the European community without the strong efforts of the Center on its behalf in obtaining their inclusion in the Second Conference on Parliamentary Democracy. This new international legitimacy was reinforced by the holding of the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference in Guatemala. The Center provided the key assistance to prevent logistical failures from disrupting the Conference and reflecting adversely on the Guatemalan Congress.

Improving Communications among Legislators

The Center has had success in forging communications among the Central American participants. This occurred at various levels. Within each national delegation, members from opposing parties who had often not talked informally with each other, developed an easy rapport over the course of the project. The isolation between the national groups was also broken down. Perhaps the most striking evidence of this improved communication came between the Guatemalan and Belizean delegations.

The Center is also to be congratulated for its consistent regional approach to its work. The inclusion of Belize and Nicaragua in several activities reinforced the Central Americans' own sense of mutual ties and is consistent with the approach adopted by the European community and urged on the United States by such prominent U.S. groups as the Sanford Commission.[1] Although USAID funds could not be used to support the participation of Nicaragua, the independent status of the Center and, hence, its standing among the participants was enhanced by the regional approach adopted and the inclusion of Nicaragua. It was also especially appropriate for the Center to have created the opportunity for the legislative branch of governments to play a role in the regional process process of Esquipulas.

Formation of ATELCA

The quality and level of the U.S. participants in the several staff development activities is a direct outgrowth of the work of the Center in the CALTS project and the Guatemala project. Douglas Boyer and John Phelps are well-informed and enthusiastic supporters of the project. They and their colleagues have served as an inspiration and model for the Central Americans on how to increase the professional stature and standing of the legislative staff within their respective countries. ATELCA will serve as a vehicle for reinforcing and extending the activities initiated by the Center.

---

[1]Named for the prominent role played by North Carolina Senator, Terry Sanford, the official name of the Commission is The International Commission for Central American Recovery and Development.

Computerization

In addition to their contributions to the professional development of the staff by providing the model on which ATELCA is based, U.S. clerks and secretaries associated with the program have donated a considerable amount of very expensive expertise to the selection and design of the appropriate legislative computer support system.

The evaluators believe that the Center has taken a very solid approach in employing the U.S. clerks and secretaries in selecting the best computerization approach. This is a choice which will carry great consequences for the success of the automatization program for the Congress. We believe that the decision about the choice of computer systems should ultimately be in the hands of those who use computers in their work and those who are familiar with the state legislative systems.[1]

Instilling Awareness among Legislators and Staff of the Need for Legislative Development

Through their innovative programs and enthusiasm, the Center has helped to create an awareness among both legislators and staff that there is a need for greater development of the legislative branch. A "market" has been created which must now be served.

It is vital to the long-term sustainability of legislative development that the politicians be "educated" to the need for it. This involves, first, upgrading the legislators' political status and visibility within their own countries and, second, making them sensitive to the professional needs of their staff and for administrative/technical assistance. In this way, the political support necessary for the more profound and longer term development of the legislative staff can be built. The legislators interviewed manifested both an improved self-image and greater expectations for the use of the technical staff. The evaluators believe this to be a direct result of the exposure and education they received on the programs organized by the Center.

Establishing Confidence and Trust

The Center for Democracy deserves great credit for the confidence and trust it has established with a wide range of politicians and technicians in the legislative process. The degree of cooperation, lack of concern about U.S. interference in domestic affairs, and support from those in leadership positions is a direct result of the Center's mode of operation and a tribute to the quality of its staff.

It is startling how little concern was expressed by deputies about interference in Guatemala's internal affairs by the bilateral program which deals so directly and intimately with the workings of the Guatemalan government. This sentiment was also confirmed directly in Honduras and appears to be the case in the other countries

---

[1]As mentioned earlier, this view is not shared in the outside evaluation done of the Center for Democracy's reports on computerization of the Congress by Edgardo R. Derbes of Checchi and Company. See Edgardo R. Derbes, "Guatemala National Assembly, Legislative Information System, Technical Commentaries and Recommendations," February 8, 1990.

participating in the regional project. This is undoubtedly due to the great personal skills of the Center's Guatemalan staff director, Caleb McCarry, who has consistently displayed sensitivity to the concerns of the members with whom he has worked in the project. His complete facility in Spanish, obvious enthusiasm for his work (and for Guatemala), and deference to the needs and interests of the Guatemalans have placed the program in an enviable position of trust and confidence with the Guatemalan Congress. Caleb has cajoled, encouraged, and suggested the best course of action to the Guatemalan participants, but he has never dictated. In the evaluators' opinion the descriptions of the various programs as being developed by this or that member of the Congressional leadership correspond to reality and are not attempts to display some false obeisance to the need for local input.

The degree of confidence and trust established by the Center was displayed by the Chief Clerk of the Guatemalan Congress, Luis Mijangos. When asked directly if the Center was the most appropriate institution to carry out the necessary programs in legislative development, he responded that it was not only the most adequate, but the *only* institution capable of carrying them out. He described the Center as the "engine that has driven the entire process" of advancement of the technical skills of the staff.

Strengths of Non-partisan Approach of Center

The Center's standing as a non-governmental, nonpartisan institution has allowed it to operate in ways and in areas that would not be possible for AID. It was clear to the evaluators that the deputies in several of the countries visited preferred to think of the projects in which they were involved as constituting a relationship with the Center, not with the U.S. government. Although they were perfectly aware of the principal sourcing for many of the programs, they stressed that these were Center projects to the evaluators and, apparently, to other legislators and their constituents.

The fact that the Center is able to work with individuals and in countries where a direct U.S. government connection is a distinct liability has, at times, created tensions between AID–Guatemala and the Center. Center programs in Nicaragua, for example, have diverted time from the Guatemala bilateral project, but AID should appreciate that the Center's work, and, hence, the goals of the regional and bilateral projects, are enhanced by the multi-country, regional approach pursued by the Center. The Center should also take care to insure that it does not "subsidize" activities on other projects from the budget or staff of the Guatemala office.

MAJOR ISSUES OR PROBLEMS

Lack of Experience in Legislative Development

The original goal of the CALTS project was to "support efforts of Central American legislatures to strengthen their role in democratic governmental decision-making...." Through a mix of programs to establish or enhance training and support services and to form mechanisms for intra-regional cooperation, the Center has achieved this goal.

A next stage in the development of programs for Central America's legislatures would focus on legislative development and require greater technical expertise than the Center currently possesses. In a real sense, this next phase is

represented by the Center's bilateral project in Guatemala, which has dealt more directly with legislative development. The bright and capable staff of the Center has clearly learned by doing in Guatemala, but a greater level of expertise would be needed here as well if the good beginning made by the Center is to be expanded. It is striking that the Center still has no "in-house" expertise on how legislatures operate or the technical or scholarly assistance to make comparative judgments about the development of legislatures throughout Latin America or in other parts of the Third World, Europe, or the United States. Any future programs should take advantage of the Center's many strengths and positive achievements with the Congress. The Center should also be encouraged to develop its own institutional capacity for legislative development or, perhaps, to establish cooperative arrangements with other experienced institutions.

A related issue is the trade-off between training today's legislators and focusing on structural reforms of the legislative institutions themselves or on improvements in the professional staff. In Costa Rica where legislators serve only one term it is clear that there is less pay off in concentrating on deputies who will return to private life or, in some cases, other forms of public service. Yet, even in Costa Rica, those legislators interviewed stressed that they saw the work of the Center as important in creating awareness about the professional needs of the staff. The Center must now, however, shift from this first stage of generating demand for services to that of legislative development. Its present institutional arrangement is not fully suited to do this.

Legislative Studies

The studies of the library and research facilities and deputy-constitutent relations at the Guatemalan National Congress are, in the opinion of the evaluators, missed opportunities. A trademark of the Center's work with the legislature has been its sensitivity to the need for ground-floor involvement by the Guatemalans in attempts to upgrade the Congress. That sensitivity is lacking in the way in which these studies were conceived and conducted. The Center's Guatemalan staff director was under strong pressure from the USAID project manager to complete these studies in a timely manner. Completion of the studies was made an amendment to the grant agreement and it was apparently indicated that they would be considered a central criteria by which the Center would be judged. The result was that the studies were conducted to meet the requirements of the AID mission rather than as a means to advance the process of legislative enhancement.

One of the concerns of the evaluators is that the Guatemala project work to establish linkages between the Congress and the rest of Guatemalan society. This will allow a support system to develop that will outlast the work of AID and the Center. Seen from this perspective, these studies were missed opportunities to give institutions outside the Congress a vested interest in its work and independence. Guatemala's universities and research institutions could be usefully enlisted in the work of the Center and encouraged to develop their own ties and commitments to the Congress. Studies such as those discussed here should have been used to involve other elements of Guatemalan society in the work of elevating the professionalism of the Congress.

Management Problems

The Guatemala Office and USAID

The Guatemala USAID office has correctly perceived that the time and energies of the Center's office director, Caleb McCarry have been significantly diverted to other countries and programs, resulting in a delayed implementation of programs and meeting of objectives. This will only partly be addressed by the changes envisioned for the Guatemala office of the departure of Caleb McCarry and his replacement by Robert Murphy.

The multiple demands made on McCarry's time by the Washington office and other Center programs, especially in Nicaragua, have diverted time and energy from the design and implementation of program activities in the bilateral Guatemala program.[1] USAID-Guatemala perceives the Center as having used mission support for the bilateral program to house their representative for the rest of Latin America. The frustration of the USAID Project manager with his inability to count on the Center to be there when needed or to, at least, inform him of McCarry's travel plans when they take him out of the country for days and weeks at a time is understandable.

Relations between Guatemala and Washington

The growth of the Center from virtually a one-person operation to an institution with significant roles on the front lines of democratic developments across the world is an impressive achievement. Center President, Allen Weinstein, is to be congratulated for the opportunities he has given to young and enthusiastic employees to occupy key positions in the Center and to advance to greater and greater responsibilities as they demonstrate their abilities.

However, the limitations of this management arrangement are becoming apparent in the Guatemala project. Dr. Weinstein's staff is fiercely loyal to him and willing to perform under extraordinary pressures. They all appear to have a strong mentor relationship with him and feel that they have learned much from him and, in turn, owe a great deal to him. The impression of the evaluators, based on limited exposure, of course, is that the staff would find it difficult to say no to Dr. Weinstein, even if their individual projects or responsibilities were affected by his requests. The Guatemala project has suffered, in the opinion of the evaluators, from competing demands placed on McCarry's time and from his involvement in translation, advance preparations, and other activities which need not be the responsibility of a senior member of the Center's staff.

Weakness of Seminars

The Center has not been able to dispel the initial impression of some participants that the Atitlan seminars were "parties" at the expense of the rich *gringos*. Some of those interviewed are, however, committed to this type of professional development. We would suggest that the Center consider upgrading the seminars by preparing the participants more carefully. This could take the form of commissioning short and practical briefings for the participants distributed in advance

---

[1]The Center for Democracy's 1989-1990 Program Implementation Plan (August 28, 1989) is already seriously behind schedule.

with the expectation that they would be read by the participants. Even if all those who attended did not prepare fully, the provision of background material would convey the seriousness with which the seminar should be taken. By involving Guatemalan academics and other professionals in preparing these papers, the Center would help to tie other elements of Guatemalan society to the Congress and, perhaps, improve its public image.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Flowing from the previous discussion of strengths and weaknesses, the evaluators make the following recommendations:

- If AID decides to undertake future work to strengthen the Central American legislatures, it should accentuate legislative development. In this effort the evaluators would recommend the examination of collaborative arrangements which would build on the Center for Democracy's many strengths while incorporating academic and other institutions with greater experience in legislative development.[1]

- The Center should work to integrate the experience, expertise, and resources of other Guatemalan institutions into its work with the Guatemalan Congress.[2]

- Center President Allen Weinstein should consider the need for a senior staff member, perhaps at the vice presidential level, who would have significant management responsibility for Center programs. The director of the Guatemala program should not be

---

[1]The Costa Rica seminar organized by INCAE in late September 1989 is an example of the kind of next step that needs to be taken. At the initiative of Mr. Olmedo Castro, Executive Director of the Costa Rican Legislative Assembly, a seminar was organized in cooperation with Florida International University and the *Instituto Centroamericano de Administración de Empresas* (INCAE: Central American Institute for Business Administration) on "Training and Reorganization of the Administrative Structure of the Legislative Assembly of Costa Rica." The seminar was funded by USAID's Regional Office for the Administration of Justice (RAJO). Responding to the increasing demands being faced by the staff of the Costa Rican legislature, Mr. Castro wished to initiate a process of organizational change and human resource improvement. In interviews with the evaluators Mr. Castro stressed his appreciation for the first steps taken by the Center to rouse the interest of the politicians in legislative development activities for the staff. However, when he wished to take the "next steps" he turned to institutions with experience in developing such activities.

The approach taken by INCAE and FIU was very positive in that it used the staff themselves as a primary resource in developing an assessment of the legislature's needs. In the opinion of the evaluators, this is the kind of "bottom up" development assessment which is the most useful and could form a model for future legislative development work.

[2]The evaluators visited with faculty and administrators at the University of San Carlos (a public university) and Rafael Landívar (a Jesuit institution) both of which expressed a strong interest in developing greater links with the Congress through student internships, dissertation research, and faculty projects.

diverted by Washington staff the principal assignment of working with the Guatemalan Congress.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Schedule of Interviews

Interviewee	Date
UNITED STATES	
Boyer, Douglas Assistant Clerk, Massachusetts State Senate	11/28/89
Michel, Hon. James Former Ambassador to Guatemala	11/28/89
Murphy, Robert USAID	11/27/89
SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA	
Interviewee	Date
Arguedas, Carlos Ministry of Presidency	12/1/89
Burke, Richard USAID	11/30/89
Castro Rojas, Olmedo Executive Director, Legislative Assembly, Costa Rica	12/2/89
Cira, Carl Director, USAID RAJO	11/30/89
Del Rocio Cerdas Quesada, Maria Professional Staff, Assembly of Costa Rica	12/2/89
Estevanovich G., Alfonso National Liberation Party (PLN)	11/30/89
Ganeva, Iveta Consultant	12/2/89

Méndez Mata, Rodolfo PUSC	11/30/89
Osland, Joyce Consultant	12/2/89
Reed, Gerald G. ILANUD	12/1/89
Salazar, Mário Donald Director General, Legislative Assembly of El Salvador	12/2/89
Stewart, Todd DCM U.S. Embassy	12/1/89

HONDURAS

Interviewee	Date
Bendaña, Rene Arturo National Party (PN)	12/5/89
Bonilla Medrano, Evanor Liberal Party (PL)	12/5/89
Figueredo, Roberto USAID	12/4/89
Garufi, Remo Ray Georgetown University	12/7/89
Harms , Norma U.S. Embassy	12/7/89
Hernandez , Jacobo National Party (PN)	12/5/89
Irías, Rodolfo National Party (PN)	12/5/89
Kattan S, Carlos President of the PN in the state of Cortez	12/5/89
Leonard, Emily U.S. AID	12/5/89

Martel , Dep. Teofilo National Party (PN)	12/5/89
Melara Murillo, Oscar Armando Liberal Party (PL)	12/5/89
Moncada, Javier Liberal Party (PL)	12/5/89
Montoya, Carlos Orbin Liberal Party (PL) President, Honduran Congress	12/5/89
Serrano, Olman Ernesto National Party (PN)	12/5/89
Williams Agasse, Emilio National Party (PN)	12/5/89
Zelaya, Adelia Assistant Secretary, Honduran Congress	12/5/89

GUATEMALA

Interviewee	Date
Alonso Barillas, Alfonso Christian Democracy (PDC)	12/12/89
Azpuru Coronado, Dinorah Rafael Landivar University	12/13/89
Cabrera, Colonel Military Liaison to Guatemalan Congress	12/14/89
Carpio de Leon, Ramiro Special Prosecutor for Human Rights	12/14/89
Dardón Castillo, Marco Antonio First Vice President of Congress Christian Democracy (PDC)	12/14/89
Godoy Morales, Víctor Hugo Revolutionary Party (PR)	12/12/89
Mijangos, J.Luis Chief Clerk, Guatemalan Congress	12/11/89

Sáenz, Edgar Amado University of San Carlos	12/12/89
Serrano Elias, Jorge Movement of Solidary Action (MAS)	12/11/89
Tonkin, Tom US Embassy	12/13/89
Luna Trocoli, Héctor Union of the National Center (UCN)	12/14/89
Simons, Juan Carlos Movement of National Liberation (MLN)	12/14/89
Witherell, Ronald A. USAID	12/8/89
Espinoza Farfán, Héctor Iván Rafael Landivar	12/13/89

BELIZE

Interviewee	Date
Martínez, Alfredo Senator United Democratic Party (UDP)	12/16/89
Ortega, Asterio United Democratic Party (UDP)	12/16/89
Marin, Florencio Deputy Prime Minister	12/16/89

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

Interviewee	Date
Kocourek, Todd House Legislative Analyst Committee on Commerce	12/18/89
Phelps, John B. Chief Clerk, Florida House of Representatives	12/18/89

Attachment B: Financial Statements[1]

CALTS

An original grant of $351,059 was awarded to the Center for Democracy in late August 1986. This agreement was amended twice and extended once to allow the Center to continue to expend funds on project activities until September 30, 1989. The second amendment allowed the Center to use remaining funds on hand at that time for the San José colloquy.

Guatemala Bilateral

A total of $1.765 million of AID funds have been authorized to be allocated incrementally to the Center for its bilateral project in Guatemala. Four hundred sixty-five thousand dollars were released in 1987, and an additional $100,000, to be used in support of the Inter-Parliamentary Union meeting, in June 1988. After this point USAID/Guatemala took over disbursement of the remaining funds. Seven hundred thousand dollars were disbursed in 1988 and $500,000 in 1989. In late 1989, the Center's project was extended six months to conclude at the end of 1990.

[1]During the period this evaluation was being written, the Center was undergoing an AID audit and was unable to provide more exact figures.

Attachment C: Scope of Work

A team of two evaluators, one of whom will be Chief of Party, will carry out the data gathering in Washington and in Central America. While the work will be conducted jointly, one evaluator will focus on the regional (CALTS) program, and the other on the Guatemala project. The Chief of Party will coordinate the entire effort and will be responsible for preparation of the final reports to LAC/DI and USAID/Guatemala.

The data will be gathered through site visits to 1) grantee headquarters in Washington DC, and to the U.S. Congress for interviews with members and staff who participated in the regional program; 2) to Boston, Mass. and/or Minneapolis, Minn. to visit members and staff of the state legislatures who assisted in the regional project; 3) to Guatemala for consultation with USAID staff, followed by interviews with members and professional staff of the Guatemalan Congress, with other political and civic leaders, members of the press, representatives of European governments, and other individuals who are likely to be familiar with project activities; and 4) to Belize, El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica for similar consultations and interviews.

Each evaluator may spend approximately seven days in the U.S. prior to departure for the field to obtain information from LAC/DI, the Center for Democracy and people/organizations in the U.S. that have participated in the activity. Another fifteen days is allotted for the preparation of the final report. The remaining 34 working days will be spent in Central America. Proportionally more time will be spent in Guatemala given the dual character of the work to be done there. The evaluators may agree to modify the actual days that each one spends in completing the above tasks as long as the combined number of days does not exceed 72 and that reports are submitted as required.

Prior to initiating the activity, the Contractor will review the Scope of Work and prepare a detailed, time phased implementation plan to be approved by LAC/DI and USAID/Guatemala. The Contractor will review the questions included in the Scope of Work and make any comments or recommended changes prior to initiating the activity. Contractor modifications/additions are welcome providing they have the prior approval of LAC/DI and USAID/Guatemala. The Contractor will initiate the project with visits to LAC/DI and USAID/Guatemala to obtain more detailed information of the agreed upon implementation plan and to review project files.

Dr. Richard Nuccio and Dr. David Fleischer were chosen as evaluators on this project because of their unique qualifications as a political scientist and a legislative development specialist, respectively. Dr. Nuccio is currently the Senior Associate for the Inter-American Dialogue under the auspices of the Aspen Institute in Washington, D.C. and Dr. Fleischer is a Professor of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Brasilia in Brazil, with over twenty five years of experience in Brazil.

* * * * *

Dr. Richard Nuccio received his A.B. in Political Science from the University of Massachusetts (magna cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa), his M.A. in Latin American Studies from Stanford University and his Doctorate in Political Science from the University of Massachusetts. For most of the last decade Dr. Nuccio has worked exclusively in the field of political science as it relates to Latin America. He currently directs international programs for the Aspen Institute. For a number of years he managed international programs for the Roosevelt Center for American Policy Studies as well as serving as the founding director of the Center's Latin American and Caribbean programs. The Center's programs range from increasing citizen participation in Latin American policy debates and conducting voter education programs, to directing a series of U.S.'88 candidate questionnaires.

His teaching experience includes courses given as a visiting professor for undergraduates at Bennington College, a visiting professor for graduates at John Hopkins School of Advanced International Study (SAIS), and as the Chair of the Advanced Area Studies Course on Central America and the Spanish Caribbean for the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute. He is currently an Adjunct Professor at Georgetown University in Washington.

Dr. Nuccio worked with the Ford Foundation in Perú on an assignment to evaluate FOMCIENCIAS, a Peruvian social science research institute. He served as an Associate Counsellor to both Chile and Mexico for the International Business-Government Counsellors (IBGC) organization. He has held assignments and completed research in many countries including Austria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, México, Nicaragua, Perú, Spain, and Yugoslavia.

* * *

Dr. David Fleischer, a professor of Political Science and International Relations, is one of today's

foremost experts on the Brazilian political system. His consultancies as well as grant awards have been based on his knowledge of political leadership and recruitment, electoral systems, simulations of election districts, political parties in Brazil, the Brazilian military institution and the problems of political transitions. He gained first hand knowledge of the Brazilian legislature by serving as a legislative assistant to Brazilian Senator Enéas Faria (PMDB-PR).

After completing his B.A. in Political Science from Antioch College, he received both an M.A. in Latin American Studies and a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Florida. His teaching experience began with the Peace Corp Training Program as the coordinator of Brazilian studies and continued as an instructor, visiting professor, and Associate Professor for the Department of Political Science at the University of Florida, the Department of Political Science and the Department of Economic Science at The Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG) in Brazil, the Department of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Brasilia, and in the Comparative Development Studies Center at the State University of New York.

During the last twenty five years, Dr. Fleischer has served as a consultant for the Tinker Foundation in New York, the Westinghouse Learning Corporation in Washington D.C., the Brazilian Ministry of Education, the Brazilian Enterprise for Agricultural Research (EMBRAPA), and the Brazilian Federal Education Council (CFE). He has prepared surveys and done research designs for the Banco do Brasil & Projeto Rondon, the Brazilian Commission for Production Credit (CFP), the Brazilian National Research Council, the Brazilian Telecommunications Holding Co., and the Brazilian Ministry of Justice.

Dr. Fleischer has received numerous grants and honors, including a Fulbright Hays Fellowship and Ford Foundation grants to travel. He is the founding member of a number of professional organizations including the Brazilian Association of American Studies and the International Institute of Comparative Government. Dr. Fleischer is an active member of many political science associations in both the U.S. and Brazil.