

PN=ABW=861

219.2

**MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS FOR THE
LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGIONAL OUTREACH STRATEGY (LOGROS) PROJECT:
A PRELIMINARY MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN AND INDICATOR
TRACKING SYSTEM**

Prepared **By:** **Sharon Van Pelt**
 For: **RHUDO/CA**
 Date: **20 November 1992**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I.	ROCAP/RHUDO STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	Page	1
II.	LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGIONAL OUTREACH STRATEGY	Page	2
III.	LOGROS TARGETS AND OUTPUTS	Page	3
IV.	MONITORING PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE AND PROJECT OUTPUTS	Page	6
	a.	Overview of Indicator Matrix	Page 6
	b.	Format of Matrix	Page 14
	c.	Indicators and Their Rationale	Page 15
V.	INDICATOR INFORMATION: SOURCES, USERS AND DISSEMINATION	Page	21
	a.	Sources	Page 21
	b.	Users	Page 25
	c.	Dissemination	Page 25
VI.	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	Page	26
	a.	Monitoring	Page 26
	b.	Evaluation	Page 28
	c.	Audits	Page 29
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	Page	29
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	Page	31

TABLES

Table 1:	Political Indicators	Page	8
Table 2:	Technical Indicators	Page	9
Table 3:	Financial Indicators	Page	10
Table 4:	Participation Indicators	Page	11
Table 5:	Regional Indicators	Page	12

ANNEXES

Annex 1:	Management System International (MSI) Indicator System
Annex 2:	Example of Time Comparison Indicator System
Annex 3:	Bibliography of PADCO Regional Municipal Sector Assessment
Annex 4:	Charts of Municipal Data from PADCO Assessment

2

I. ROCAP/RHUDO STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE

The Regional Office of Housing and Urban Development for Central America (RHUDO/CA) serves as the technical office for Democracy for the Regional Office for Central American Programs (ROCAP). It thereby assists ROCAP in the fulfillment of USAID's strategic objective to create stable democratic societies in Central America.

The strengthening of local governments has been increasingly recognized by AID as a means to foster and stabilize the nascent democracies of the region. This can be achieved, in part, by supporting the decentralization of authority and corresponding resources from the central to the local governments. The rationale for such an emphasis on local governance within Democratic Initiatives efforts is that municipalities are closest to the its citizens and, thus, can potentially be more responsive to citizens' needs and grievances. Indeed, local governments constitute the only level of government that offers an arena in which average citizens can exercise their democratic skills; hold government accountable for its actions; make their demands for services heard; and generally participate broadly in their own government (LOGROS PP, 1992, p.2-2).

A 1991 report by the Urban Institute, investigating the experience of Latin America in decentralization and democratic governance, notes that local collective choice, when exercised in a democratic fashion, is at the root of national democratic experience. Furthermore, it states that there are no countries in the world that have been able to sustain democracy at the central government level without also having democracy in local governance. Thus, programs that seek to strengthen local government are fundamental to democratization in countries which do not have a tradition of local democratic authority (Peterson, 1991, p.11).

Numerous other studies and, indeed, RHUDO's own experiences in this area over the past several years, support the findings of the Urban Institute report. It is in recognition of these facts and findings that ROCAP/RHUDO has established as its strategic objective in the DI arena, "More effective and democratic local governance."

II. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGIONAL OUTREACH STRATEGY (LOGROS)

In pursuit of its DI strategic objective, ROCAP/RHUDO has developed a \$6-million, seven year project called the Local Government Regional Outreach Strategy (LOGROS) which will support policy changes that lead to deeper more pervasive democratic action in the C.A. municipal system, and will help to improve the capacity of municipalities to respond to their new democratic roles. The goal of LOGROS (Project # 596-0167) is the evolution of stable democratic societies in Central America. The project's purpose is to contribute to the transfer of authority and control over financial and human resources from central to local governments while helping to improve local governments' response to citizen demands for improved services and political enfranchisement.

The LOGROS project will continue to support policy changes which lead to the expansion of democracy within the fabric of government and society at large, and it will help consolidate both those fragile changes which are in process and those already achieved. Consistent with its purpose, LOGROS has two discrete but complementary components: (1) a Regional Consensus-Building Component which will establish a regional Network and will use that Network to establish regional consensus on priority decentralization issues and benchmarks; and (2) a Regional Technical Component under which approximately 10 municipal decentralization problems will be addressed in specific municipalities (chosen based on their expressed interest and ability to work a problem through and with USAID bilateral concurrence) through workshops, technical assistance and training applied to problem resolution. Both components have been designed to respond to the mutually reinforcing political and technical concerns now prevailing in Central America. They will be supported by the development of a regional training framework which will provide limited funding to existing regional institutions providing --or capable of providing-- training for municipal officials.

It is noted in the LOGROS Project Paper that political aspects of municipal development have proven to be critical to success in Latin America. Thus, what is crucial is not simply improving technical capacity, but rather developing local institutions to provide a democratic framework. Therefore, under LOGROS, RHUDO will target technical assistance at improving local officials skills in

procedures of democratic governance, rather than at generalized institution building, and, further, will provide assistance to local participatory processes and policy reforms. Within this context, LOGROS will most likely focus on technical issues in the area of municipal service provision, fiscal and financial authorities and practices, administrative and managerial capacity, and citizen participation. Specific interventions in these areas will be in the form of problem-solving activities that will take place under the Regional Technical Component through workshops, technical assistance and training.

III. LOGROS TARGETS AND OUTPUTS

LOGROS is designed to be demand-driven, i.e., project activities will emerge from the networking and consensus-building elements. Thus, the project will respond to specific needs as expressed, during the life of the project, by mayors, national municipal associations, the regional municipal association, and others involved in the Central American municipalist movement. Therefore, outputs and targets are presently very broadly defined and do not present an exact picture of what the region would look like in terms of the specific components of decentralization and municipal development that will exist within each nation or within the region as a whole as a result of project interventions. Nonetheless, to the extent that LOGROS is a part of USAID's Democratic Initiatives program, USAID targets in this area may also serve as the general targets for LOGROS. These democratic targets are: (1) increased administrative and financial authority of local governments (including the power to generate resources) while that of central bureaucracies will be decreased; and (2) increased civic participation in the democratic process.

Furthermore, a general outline, in terms of what the project strives to achieve in terms of outputs, is presented in the Project Paper (PP). Specific outputs are listed as follows:

- (1) Regional Network established and functioning; Network meeting annually and disseminating information;
- (2) Regional Policy Framework established; Policies published and endorsed; Action Plans being implemented;

- (3) Resolution of specific constraints to decentralization; 10 constraints addressed in 10-20 localities;
- (4) Regional training capabilities mobilized; Training facilities assessed, roles established, training conducted. --

It is also envisioned that at the end of the project (i.e. End of Project Status - EOPS), the following conditions will exist as a result of the Consensus-Building Component:

- (1) Agreement of the regional network of legislators, political leaders, municipal officials, and representatives of key private organizations on a policy agenda for greater municipal autonomy; and
- (2) Implementation of specific agenda items (as per expressed needs) in participating countries.

In addition, the following conditions will exist as a result of the success of the Technical Component of the project:

- (1) Improved financial management practices in selected municipalities;
- (2) Greater citizen participation in municipal government affairs in selected municipalities; and
- (3) Improvements to be defined in selected municipalities in Central America.

Thus, from the above, a general idea becomes apparent as to how the project is expected to positively impact the degree of decentralization and municipal development in the region. However, the project does not detail more specific accomplishments that LOGROS will achieve at the region level, again, due to the project's demand-driven nature and, indeed, due to the variable nature of democracy itself.

The workings of a democracy within any particular nation are indeed a reflection of the culture, values, problems, and needs of its people. Thus, democracy eludes a clear and specific definition that is applicable in all countries. Moreover, there is a vast gap between "the ideals associated with democracy and the reality of any democratic system in existence" (Schimpp, 1992, p.3). Therefore, it is quite difficult, and, indeed, undesirable, to design and implement a democratic initiatives project that strives to reach a democratic "ideal." Furthermore, projects that support the democratic process at the

regional level, such as LOGROS, are perhaps even more difficult to design and implement as they must consider the peculiarities of each country in the region and must address the specific problems that each faces in terms of decentralization and municipal development while searching for regional applicability in obligating project funds. In trying to meet this challenge, LOGROS has been designed to make a significant impact on decentralization by addressing specific, high-priority constraints that have broad potential for replication. Project assistance will be structured so as to seek and reinforce common solutions to constraints that are familiar to many municipalities throughout the region, thereby allowing for different forms of democratic systems in each of the countries in the region based on their own particular set of needs and priorities.

Though LOGROS is indeed broad-based, RHUDO's previous work in the areas of decentralization and municipal development, including its involvement with key players in the regional municipalist movement, provides fairly reasonable projections of what the LOGROS project will be supporting at the regional level and by which its successes will be measured. Indeed, the 1991 RHUDO/CA sponsored seminar in Tegucigalpa, attended by mayors and other key players in the regional municipalist movement, produced a series of conclusions on the essential elements of municipal activity which will serve as the basis for LOGROS support efforts. Thus, extrapolating from those conclusions, LOGROS will strive to assist municipalities in achieving the following:

Municipal Functions

- Increase the authority of municipalities over those public services and other functions which they can perform more cost effectively and with greater citizen participation; the area most likely to benefit from municipal control include: health, education, rural roads, police protection, natural resources, water and sewers.

Financial Independence

- Increase the municipal fiscal base, within which priority actions are:
 - 1) Promulgate municipal codes which define municipal taxing authority;
 - 2) Promote policies which:

- a. devolve authority and resources to municipal levels;
 - b. permit issuing of municipal bonds and municipal lotteries;
 - c. improve municipal administration by improving cadastral systems.
- 3) Establish a legal basis for the transfer of resources from the central to the local government, under specified criteria.

Municipal Representation

- Establish direct municipal elections, held on a different date from national elections;
- Provide for municipal representation in proportion to the votes cast;
- Open the electoral process to other groups besides national political parties;
- Develop more mechanisms for citizen participation and control over municipal management.

The Regional Network will be tasked with reaching a consensus on the above items and ordering regional priorities. The LOGROS PP states that these priorities will be developed during the first year of the project and will be used to derive indicators that will track project progress.

IV. MONITORING PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE AND PROJECT OUTPUTS

a. Overview of Indicator Matrix: Though indicators will be developed and refined during the first year of the project, based on to-be-determined priorities, a basic set of indicators has been established according to the intended impact that LOGROS will have in specific areas of municipal development and decentralization. These specific areas are: (1) Legislative and Policy Change, (2) Electoral Reform, (3) Performance, (4) Finance, (5) Citizen Participation, (6) National Network, (7) Regional Network. They roughly correspond to the "essential elements of municipal activity" as noted in the previous section with the addition of the vitally important Regional Network that the Project will help to establish. In organizing the matrix around these specific areas, five broad categories have been defined in order to classify the character of the indicators: (1) Political; (2) Technical; (3) Financial; (4) Participation; (5) Regional.

It should be noted at this point that the matrix is preliminary and represents the aggregation of number of internal RHUDO documents regarding municipal development indicators as well as numerous discussions with RHUDO staff. It synthesizes the elements of the LOGROS Project Paper that discuss indicators and monitoring and evaluation and attempts to expand and further develop those elements to the extent possible at this time. The matrix also tries to build on work done by Management Systems International (MSI) as part of the Prism Project to help develop indicators for LOGROS (see Annex 1). It is recommended that RHUDO staff refine the matrix particularly in its separation of performance and program output level indicators [as recommended by Nancy Hooff (ROCAP/DD/PROG) so as to be in accordance with the MSI tracking system] and perhaps to reduce the number of indicators to simplify the matrix, particularly in the Performance category.

As can be seen in the matrix (see Tables 1-5), the first area, Legislative and Policy Change, is listed as a performance indicator (i.e. criteria for determining progress in the attainment of the Strategic Objective). The other indicator areas will track progress at the program output level (i.e. major accomplishments for which ROCAP/RHUDO is willing to assume direct responsibility in its efforts to achieve its strategic objective). As noted earlier, project outputs are: (1) Regional Network established and functioning; (2) Regional Policy Framework established; (3) Resolution of specific constraints to decentralization; (4) Regional training capabilities mobilized. The matrix concentrates on the elements of a policy framework within which LOGROS will promote political and administrative decentralization, principally through activities that come under Outputs 3 and 4. As noted in Section II (p.2), political aspects are critical to success in municipal development efforts in Central America. Thus, the development of a democratic framework is crucial to the success of the LOGROS Project. Consensus on this framework must be achieved through the Regional Network, yet, the "essential elements of municipal activity" as defined in the Tegucigalpa seminar can be used in this preliminary indicator matrix, serving as a basis for the still-to-be-defined regional framework.

The matrix also includes measures of progress toward Output 1 as this is also fairly well defined. The Network is an integral component of the project,

TABLE 1

POLITICAL INDICATORS OF PROGRESS FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: More Effective and Democratic Local Governance							
Indicator	Data Source	Guatemala	El Salvador	Nicaragua	Honduras	Costa Rica	Panama
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS							
LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY CHANGE							
1) Approval of policies, legislation, or regulatory change in favor of municipal autonomy (List specific change)	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation						
PROGRAM OUTPUT LEVEL INDICATORS Output 2: Regional Policy Framework Established							
ELECTORAL REFORM							
1) Direct local election of mayors (Y/N)	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2) Election of mayor held on a separate date from national elections (Y/N)			Y		N	N	n/a
3) Elimination of party candidate "slates" (Y/N)		N	N		N	N	n/a
4) Electoral process open to other groups besides national political parties (Y/N)		Y	Y		Y	Y	n/a
5) Ability of municipal citizenry to recall local elected officials (Y/N)						Y	N
6) Grounds and means for removal of elected officials established (Y/N)							

10

TABLE 2

**TECHNICAL INDICATORS OF PROGRESS FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:
MORE EFFECTIVE AND DEMOCRATIC LOCAL GOVERNANCE**

Indicator	Data Source	Guatemala	El Salvador	Nicaragua	Honduras	Costa Rica	Panama
PROGRAM OUTPUT LEVEL INDICATORS Output 2 (cont'd)							
PERFORMANCE							
1) Municipalities have control over (potable) water system	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation	Y	N	N	N	N	N
1a) % of municipalities with privatized provision of water services	Municipal records						
2) Municipalities have control over police protection	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation	N	Y	N	N	N	N
3) Municipalities have control over garbage collection/disposal	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3a) % of municipalities with privatized provision of garbage collection	Municipal records						
4) Municipalities have control over sewage/drainage systems	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation	N	N	N	N	N	N
4a) % of municipalities with privatized provision of sewage/drainage systems	Municipal records						
5) Municipalities have control over urban street construction	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation	Y	Y (shared with MOPW)	Y	N	N	N
7) Municipalities have control over urban planning/land use zoning		Y (with BANVI assistance)	Y (shared with Central Govt)	N	N	N	Y (zoning done at different govt levels)
8) Municipalities have control over local natural resources							
9) Municipalities have control over health services		N	Y (shared with Central Govt)	Y (shared with Central Govt)	N	N	N

The data in this Table is taken from the PADCO Assessment (see Annex 4 for charts). The situations that actually exist in each country in terms of distribution of authority are often complex and may require more than a simple yes or no answer.

TABLE 3

FINANCIAL INDICATORS OF PROGRESS FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: MORE EFFECTIVE AND DEMOCRATIC LOCAL GOVERNANCE							
Indicator	Data Source	Guatemala	El Salvador	Nicaragua	Honduras	Costa Rica	Panama
PROGRAM OUTPUT LEVEL INDICATORS Output 2 (cont'd)							
FINANCE							
1) Municipalities have authority for budget preparation, approval, and execution (Y/N)	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
2) Municipalities have authority to assign value to taxable base and to set rates on that base (Y/N)		N	N	N	Y (on some taxes)	N	N
3) Municipalities have authority to establish a schedule of fees for municipal services (Y/N)		N	Y	N	Y	N	N
4) Existence of a permanent, legal system of intergovernmental transfers for local investment decided on by municipality (Y/N)		Y (8%)	N	N	Y (2%-4%)	N	N
5) Implementation of policies which permit the issuing of municipal bonds and lotteries (Y/N)							
6) Increase in % of total expenditures of (all) municipalities funded by "own source" revenues (%)	Country-by-country review of national financial records						
7) % of local expenditure (all municipalities) relative to % central government expenditure							
8) % of local expenditure (all municipalities) relative to GNP							

TABLE 4

PARTICIPATION INDICATORS OF PROGRESS FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: MORE EFFECTIVE AND DEMOCRATIC LOCAL GOVERNANCE							
Indicator	Data Source	Guatemala	El Salvador	Nicaragua	Honduras	Costa Rica	Panama
PROGRAM OUTPUT LEVEL INDICATORS Output 2 (cont'd)							
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION	Municipal records						
1) Use of "cabildos abiertos" (town meetings) (Y/N)		Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
2) Number of cabildos abiertos held each year (#)							
3) Obligation of local governments to publish municipal budget (Y/N)	Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation						
4) Ability to use plebiscites/referendums which incorporate citizens into the governing process (Y/H)					Y	Y	Y
5) No. of times plebiscites/referendums were used in all municipalities	Municipal records						
6) % of eligible voters participating in local elections (Disaggregated by gender)							
NATIONAL NETWORK	Association membership and attendance records						
1) Increase in the number of municipalities actively affiliated with the national municipal association (# or % increase)							

13

TABLE 5

REGIONAL INDICATORS OF PROGRESS FOR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: MORE EFFECTIVE AND DEMOCRATIC LOCAL GOVERNANCE		
Indicator	Data Source	Regional
PROGRAM OUTPUT LEVEL INDICATORS Output 1: Regional Network Established and Functioning		
REGIONAL NETWORK		
1) Regional network established and meeting regularly (Y/N)	Network meeting and attendance records	
2) Regional network regularly disseminating regional framework products and solutions to constraints to improved municipal government (Y/N)	Network proceedings and publications	
3) Regional network disseminating available literature and other direct experience related to local government (Y/N)		
4) Increase in the number of network participants (Disaggregated by gender and affiliation) (% or #)	Network membership and attendance records	

141

particularly as it will help to define not only the regional policy framework but also Output 3, specific constraints to decentralization that will be addressed through the project's problem-solving activities. However, due to the demand-driven nature of LOGROS, Outputs 3 and 4 are relatively less defined. The measures for these outputs (see p.3) are very general and, as stated in the Project Paper, will be further developed within the first 1-2 years of the project. The Network will assist in the identification of the problem and the location for the LOGROS intervention to be completed under Output 3 and the LOGROS PSC Regional Training Coordinator will develop the regional training strategy which will define the specific training facilities to be involved and the inputs that those facilities will provide. The definition of more concrete outputs through a consensus-building process within the regional municipalist network and through the expression of priority needs by actors in the municipal systems will set regional priorities and will provide the needed projections by which the project's success can be measured. This process will further refine LOGROS outputs and, thus, will allow for the development of more refined program output level indicators.

As the matrix focuses on the policy framework within which LOGROS will undertake efforts to promote decentralization, it is rather general, concentrating on policy changes rather than on the specific results of each Project activity. Yet, it was anticipated in the Project Paper (PP) that the indicators would measure local government autonomy and performance and would track progress under the local governance component of ROCAP's strategic objective in democracy which LOGROS is designed to support. The PP also states that the LOGROS indicators will be more general in nature, going beyond those strictly related to Project activities and indeed serving as a resource for local IDs with municipal activities of their own (LOGROS PP, 1992, p.3-21).

In measuring regional progress toward democracy, it is equally as important to determine the impact of ROCAP/RHUDO interventions on improving the overall democratic process as it is to measure the degree of accomplishment of specific LOGROS outputs in terms of its discrete problem-solving activities. As noted in a 1992 study on democratic development completed by the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE), impact indicators are useful in assessing

medium to long term changes in democratic conditions, which is in accordance with overall goal of the LOGROS project. "Democracy is best described as a series of broad qualitative pattern changes, not solely or necessarily a selected list of quantitative indicators. Improvements in one area of the political system do not necessarily equate to progress toward democracy" (Schmipp, 1992, p.16). Therefore, it is important in the case of LOGROS, particularly because it is a regional project, to measure those "broad, qualitative pattern changes" if progress toward the project's goal and purpose is to be properly assessed. Moreover, the demand-driven nature of the project necessitates such a broad focus in its monitoring system. Yet, the AID report also notes that:

"...attributing impact to the AID intervention is difficult. However, precise attribution is not required for democracy programs any more than for other AID programs. Rather, association buttressed by reasonable empirical evidence of qualitative and --to the extent possible-- quantitative nature is sufficient. Evaluators need to distinguish between measuring the success of an AID project or program and measuring the impact of the AID program on democracy. Neither AID nor the Mission can be expected to engineer democratic outcomes, only to make progress in creating an enabling environment for its practice. Hence, in order to have any meaning or validity, evaluation efforts require strict identification of what is being evaluated and why" (Schmipp, 1992, p.16).

Therefore, the indicator matrix will measure LOGROS's success in creating such an enabling environment as the indicators themselves are based on what Central American mayors, officials, and other key municipalists have defined as the essential elements of municipal activity. The identification of these indicators and the justification of their use in evaluating the success of LOGROS as a project in support of the ROCAF/RHUDO Strategic Objective is included under section "Indicators and Their Rationale."

b. Format of Matrix: The matrix is formatted so as to allow for the tracking of indicators in each of the Central American countries and to provide immediate cross-national comparison as well as an overall regional perspective of the progress made toward the ROCAF/RHUDO strategic objective in any given project year. The format is limited, however, in that it does not offer an immediate view of progress made over time because it does not include columns for individual country base-line data and targets for each indicator. Yet, the

present matrix seems to offer the best known way to gain an overall perspective as to where the region as a whole is at any given time in terms of the level of decentralization and municipal development. Thus, it will provide a "snap shot" picture of the region in any one year, which, when put together with past years, will create a graphic representation, i.e. a sort of visual story, as to the regional advancements made under LOGROS during the life of the project.

Future refinements of the matrix may break down the system by individual country, including base-line data and targets, in addition to maintaining a chart consisting of an overall regional perspective, so as to overcome this lack of readily available, country-specific, time comparison data (see Annex 2 for example). Yet, it would seem that such an exercise is too cumbersome and, perhaps, unnecessary for a regional project. Therefore, a time comparison of progress for each individual country as well as the region as a whole, will have to be included within an analysis paper that should accompany each of the annual indicator matrices. Within the report, the analyst can review past matrices and may include individual sections on each of the Central American countries as well as a section that considers the entire region in determining progress.

c. Indicators and Their Rationale: As noted earlier, the indicator system consists of five broad categories, within which seven separate areas of decentralization and municipal development will be tracked and monitored. These areas have been identified as essential elements of municipal activity and, thus, institutionalizing these elements is vital to achieving regional decentralization and municipal development. Therefore, advancements made within these areas will contribute to the achievement of the project's purpose and, thus, will also help to fulfill the ROCAP/RHUDO Strategic Objective of more effective and democratic local governance.

The first section under Political indicators is Legislative and Policy Change. The LOGROS Project is designed to help build a regional environment for policy change in the municipal systems of Central America. It will also assist in improving the regional policy framework, and help "push" policy reform from the regional down to the national level. Such efforts are essential to achieving high level consensus on the need for national decentralization and gaining the

"political will", and indeed the legal framework, to increase the autonomy and authority of municipalities. These are necessary prerequisites for a local government to function as a democratic institution, accountable to its constituency rather than to the central government and thus more likely and better able to effectively meet local demands. The sole indicator listed under Legislative and Policy Change (see Table 1) will track specific changes that are approved in each of the countries that favor municipal autonomy.

The second area under Political indicators, which begins the program output level indicators, is Electoral Reform. This area is primarily concerned with the institution of free and fair elections at the local level (see Table 1). Enfranchisement of citizens is the basis upon which any operating democracy functions. Democracy at its most fundamental level, means that those in power must be elected by and responsible to the people over which they govern. Furthermore, as noted in the first section of this report, local governments constitute the only level of government that offers an arena in which average citizens can generally participate in the democratic process, holding government accountable for its actions and making their demands heard. Therefore, in striving to achieve more effective and democratic local governance, it is essential that municipal officials are elected locally, and can be recalled at that level, and that municipal representation is in proportion to votes cast and not solely a result of political party affiliation. The six specific indicators listed under Electoral Reform will measure progress made in each of the countries in establishing a fundamental element of democracy which is the representativeness of the local government and its degree of accountability to its constituency.

In terms of technical advancements on the part of municipalities that LOGROS will support, among the most important are those which signify the improved delivery of urban services. An important indicator of such improvements would be the percentage of the municipal population served by basic services provided by local government, with basic services further broken down within the matrix, such as water services, solid waste collection, etc. This would demonstrate the local government's technical and management capacity to deliver services. Though the importance of such an indicator is recognized, such data does not presently exist

in any consistent form within the Central American countries. Yet, RHUDO staff has had a preliminary meeting with a representative from WASH which is in the process of establishing an office in Guatemala that will work in conjunction with UNICEF, particularly on water and sanitation projects. Part of this joint effort is expected to include the tracking of indicators that measure the percentage of local populations in Central America covered by these types of services. RHUDO/CA plans to continue contact with the WASH project and will include such indicators in the matrix when they become available.

LOGROS is designed to increase the authority and control of municipalities over human and financial resources so as to improve their ability to answer citizens' needs, including the provision of needed services. Thus, LOGROS will work to create an environment which will enable municipalities to improve basic service delivery. A basic premise to accomplishing such an objective is that the municipalities must first have the authority over the provision of local services so as to better meet local needs. Secondly, increased private sector involvement in service delivery is believed to also contribute to its improvement based on the widespread acceptance that the private sector is, generally, more efficient and effective in bringing service to people and in maintaining those services. Therefore, these two indicators will be used to measure improvements in the ability of municipalities to deliver basic services (see Table 2). The services that are included in the matrix are based on those defined as most likely to benefit from increased municipal control in the LOGROS PP (see p. 5 of this report), the recommendations of RHUDO staff as to the importance and the feasibility of collecting data on the indicator, and the previous work completed by PADCO in gathering data on municipal control of services.

The 1992 PADCO "Regional Municipal Sector Assessment for Central America" reports that "low levels of revenues are the principal reason behind most municipal shortcomings" (PADCO, 1992, Vol.I, p.55). Major problems in this respect for local governments in Central American are the existence of a low tax base and fixed rates set by national governments and unrealistic service fees. Thus, principal among the measures necessary to increase "own source," or locally generated revenues is guaranteeing municipal authority to establish a taxable base, set rates on that base, and determine a schedule of fees for municipal

services (see Table 3). An important step to securing municipal control over the establishment of these charges is gaining municipal authority over the preparation, approval, and execution of its own budget. By increasing "own source" revenues, the municipality will be able to finance a greater range of public services.

Furthermore, in order to increase the amount of resources available, local governments must have a greater share in national revenues. This can be achieved in part, through the expansion and improvement of inter-governmental transfers. Other measures of the relative share of national revenues received by municipalities is the percentage of their total expenditure related to GNP and that same figure also related to the percentage of central government expenditure. Greater local control of national resources will more likely lead to greater and more efficient and effective investment at the local level. Municipalities, as the level of government closest to the local population, are more cognizant of the direction and the level of local investment needed and they may, therefore, be better capable of mobilizing resources to meet those needs.

The first area under the Participation indicators is Citizen Participation (see Table 4). This is an essential element of democracy as it ensures that the government is responsive to its citizens. Such accountability is a central feature of a working democracy and is premised on the enfranchisement of local citizenry whereby they are given a voice in the democratic process. This voice entails, at a minimum, the ability to vote in free and fair elections. The percentage of eligible voters participating in local elections is, thus, one measure of citizen participation. Further participation through a voting process includes the use of plebiscites and referendums that incorporate citizens into the governing process.

Yet, beyond simply voting, there are a variety of forms of participation including involvement in political parties or local community organizations as well as more direct forms of participation such as the holding of political office. Citizens must have the means both to make demands on their governments and to hold officials accountable for their actions. At the grassroots level, the holding of regular, open public meetings with citizens, mayors, and municipal

officials provides a forum for the airing of citizen demands and/or complaints. It serves as an important means to hold the local government accountable and also potentially serves as an organizing mechanism as citizens are able to communicate with one another as well as with the municipality and can join forces to try and solve common problems while seeking assistance from the local government. In Central America, such public meetings exist in certain countries and are referred to as "cabildos abiertos"; however, use of these forums as a significant means of citizen participation has been quite low or non-existent in some countries. LOGROS may seek to reinforce the use of the "cabildos abiertos" through such activities as the development of public education for use at the meetings, training in conducting meetings, etc. Yet, participation and empowerment within a democracy means that both municipalities and local communities must have representation, voice and power at both the local and national levels. Municipal associations can help to provide these needed support functions but they are currently quite weak. LOGROS will support the strengthening of intermediary support institutions, including municipal associations at the national level, in promoting local participation and empowerment.

The final area in the matrix, Regional indicators, will measure LOGROS success in achieving Project Output 1, Regional Network established and functioning (see Table 5). As noted earlier, the Network is a vital part of the LOGROS Project as it will be the primary agent by which regional consensus on decentralization and local government agendas will be reached and maintained. This consensus and the setting of regional priorities on these issues will be the principal means by which LOGROS interventions will be defined and will, thereby, set the stage for the Project's TA, training and research activities. Thus, an integral part of the LOGROS project is to develop the Network to include a select group of about a hundred regional and national organizations and key government and private sector individuals who are committed to decentralization and democratization at the level of local government as well as central government decision makers whose support is important to policy changes at the central level. Important components in reaching and sustaining consensus will be the holding of regular Network meetings and the publication and distribution of technical papers, newsletters, and publications related to local government.

In developing the indicator system, RHUDO staff identified a number of indicators that are good measures of progress in specific areas of decentralization and municipal development but which are considered too difficult to track at this time due to the excessive amount of time and financial resources that such tracking would require. As LOGROS has a limited amount of funds budgeted for indicator monitoring and, moreover, because it is a regional project, intensive data collection within specific countries (i.e. at a more grassroots level) is infeasible. Nonetheless, it is worth noting these indicators as more assessable data sources may become available, at least in some countries, and because ROCAP/RHUDO may be able to encourage national and regional institutions involved in data collection to consider tracking these and other indicators that may fall into the same category. The indicators mentioned by the RHUDO staff are as follows:

FINANCE

1) Increase in the % of investment costs that municipalities recover from beneficiaries.

PERFORMANCE

1) % of the municipal population served by basic services provided by local government (these types of indicators will be added to the matrix as information becomes available through the WASH project).

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

1) Increase in the number of intermediary support institutions, both public and private, participating in the local development process (Disaggregated by type of institution, i.e. civic, professional, or community organization, NGO, etc.). This is an important area to include gender disaggregation in terms of the membership of these organization and the issues that they pursue (i.e. is the institution organized to promote issues more closely associated with women?)

Heilman & Kurz, "Democratic Initiatives Performance Study," 1991, suggests that a national census of organizations could be conducted to establish a base-line, with annual follow up monitoring.

2) Voter registration made more accessible. This includes the establishment of local voter registration centers and placing registration tables in market centers on market day, in front of church on Sundays, or where there are town celebrations so as to be accessible to all members of the community, especially those who have less opportunity to travel, for example, women.

3) Number of people participating in "cabildos abiertos" (Disaggregated by

gender).

4) Institution of education programs in schools and/or public awareness campaigns in municipalities which seek to improve citizen understanding of the democratic process and their rights and responsibilities within that process (Disaggregate by gender those that the program targets and reaches).

V. INDICATOR INFORMATION: SOURCES, USERS AND DISSEMINATION

The information contained in the indicators matrix and accompanying analysis of the progress made in strengthening the municipalist systems in the region will measure advancements made toward institutionalization of the essential elements of democracy at the municipal level. As noted earlier, the Project Paper stated that the indicators would measure local government autonomy and performance and would be more general in nature, going beyond those strictly related to Project activities and indeed serving as a resource for USAIDs with municipal activities of their own. Thus, the LOGROS indicators will provide a gauge to determine AID's overall progress in supporting local governance in Central America under the Democratic Initiatives program.

a. Sources: The sources of information on the indicators are various. Preliminary base-line data, which is included in the present indicator matrix, (see pp. 8-12) was generated through the PADCO Municipal Sector Assessment completed in June, 1992. This report helped in setting the groundwork for the LOGROS Project, particularly in its documentation of the existing situation in Central America regarding key components of municipal development. This information was gathered through various sources which are listed in the assessment's bibliography. This bibliography can be used as the basis for future data collection on indicators under the LOGROS project (see Annex 3). It provides a country-by-country data source list which is country specific, however, the following documents were generally useful for all countries considered in the assessment:

- National Constitutions
- National Municipal Codes/Laws/Mandates
- National Plans (including national decentralization plans)
- National Data

National budget and financial data
Social statistics
Economic statistics
Data on public service provision
Censuses

- National Decrees/Orders
- Statutes and records of national municipal associations
- Reports and studies from national municipal institutions (i.e. IFAM (Costa Rica), ISDEM (El Salvador), and INIFOM (Nicaragua))
- Studies completed for/by AID Missions and other international donors working in the area of municipal development (i.e. AECI, GTZ, IADB, IBRD/IDB, UNDP)
- Studies completed by regional training institutions (i.e. ICAP and INCAE)

The PADCO consultants were able to locate these documents through the following sources:

- Ministry of Planning
- Ministry of Government and Justice/Ministry of Local Government/Ministry of the President (Municipal Affairs Division)
- Ministry of Public Works
- National Institute of Statistics
- Controller General's Office
- Municipal Association records
- Municipal Institution records and database
- Regional Training Institution records and database
- National University database

Also included in the PADCO bibliography are numerous books written on the subject of decentralization and municipal development, some written and published in Central America and others in the U.S. While such documents will generally not be useful in an exercise of pure data collection, it may be useful to a researcher in preparing an analysis of the data, particularly if new books on the subject are published during the Life of the Project. In addition, such new books may include data that RHUDO is interested in tracking that can be used as a check against its own data.

The Assessment also included interviews with key people involved in issues of municipal development and decentralization which provided a secondary source of

information. Generally, the following people were those consulted in each country:

- Democratic Initiative Officers in AID Missions
- Ministers and/or Vice-Ministers of Planning
- Ministers and/or Vice-Ministers of Government
- Representative(s) from national municipal associations
- Representative(s) from national municipal institutions
- Representative(s) from regional training institutions
- Representative(s) from international donor organizations involved in municipal development
- Mayors

THE PADCO Assessment did not include data on all indicators which are listed in the present matrix and it did not always include information on all countries in all the areas that it did cover. Therefore, new sources of country-specific information may need to be identified.

The LOGROS Project Paper lists the following nine major mechanisms that will be employed to monitor LOGROS: (1) Annual Plans (AWPs); (2) Annual Reports of FEMICA (Federacion de Municipios del Istmo Centroamericano), the regional municipal association; (3) ROCAP Semi-Annual Reports (SARs); (4) Personal contact between ROCAP project management and the grantee(s) and the contractors; (5) Bilateral USAID feedback on the quality of services provided under the Project; (6) field trips and trip reports; (7) Project financial reports issued by the Controller's Office; (8) External mid-term and EOP evaluations; and (9) Audits. Furthermore, the LOGROS PSC Advisors will keep careful records on training activities and beneficiaries and will assure that the data is gender disaggregated. These mechanism may also serve as data sources for indicators, though they will more likely be useful in monitoring Project financial and output specific data and, thus, will be more related to progress made in discrete Project activities than to the more general progress made toward creating a regional policy framework within which those activities will take place.

An important source of information may be the Regional Information Clearinghouse (RIC) that is currently being established under an amendment to ROCAP's Regional Development Support (RDS) Project. RIC is designed to acquire, analyze, process

and channel important regional information, principally through bilateral USAIDs and other USG agencies, to select regional institutions, and key donors, in support of policy and decision makers of Central America. RHUDO met with CDIE personnel who visited Guatemala in October, 1992 and discussed ways in which RIC could potentially assist in the refinement of the LOGROS indicator system and the collection of data. First, RIC can help to identify the source or sources of information for each indicator, i.e. they can assist in defining more precisely the presently listed, very general data sources such as "country-by-country review of legislation and implementation" and "municipal records."

Second, RIC can undertake a preliminary data gathering exercise on the existent national legislation related to municipal government. A list of specific legislation needed should be presented to the RIC team as soon as possible once they commence their work in early 1993. Though RIC will not be involved in any extensive data gathering exercise for any particular project, the office will produce approximately five Tailored Information Packages (TIPs) per year. In developing these packages, RIC will assume responsibility for obtaining, evaluating, and producing a tailored package of current, relevant regional information on the statistics available in a specific subject area. Though such an exercise may be helpful to ROCAP/RHUDO in gaining more information on municipalities, it will most likely not be able to obtain all the information needed to track the LOGROS indicators, partly because data gathering may possibly entail field collection including sampling, surveys, questionnaires, or interviews. RIC is not equipped to handle such an intensive exercise for any one project. Furthermore, even if a TIP is completed, perhaps on behalf of the Regional Network, it is a discrete activity that cannot be done on an annual basis. A discussion of some methods for data collection, monitoring and evaluation is included in the following section.

Finally, once data is gathered and put into a manageable form, RIC may be involved in the development of a tracking system and can maintain and update that system as needed and directed by ROCAP/RHUDO. RIC should be able to assist in obtaining information gathered and studies completed by other sources, particularly other international donors involved in municipal development issues in Central America.

b. Users: Primary users of the indicator information and accompanying analysis are expected to be municipal leaders, municipal associations, central government representatives, institutes, ministries, legislators, Central American Parliament (PARLACEN) representatives, other key regional groups, and donor representatives involved in the Central American municipal development sector. The information will be helpful in tracking individual country progress. Thus, problem areas can be identified and prioritized by the key figures in the national municipal system who can then focus their efforts in promoting decentralization and municipal development and can present these priorities to the Regional Network. The indicator information will also be useful in comparing individual country progress with advancements made in other countries. This may lead to greater communication and sharing of information across nations as those progressing more slowly will want to learn how other Central American nations have been able to progress more rapidly. The sharing of such knowledge and experience will be promoted and reinforced through the Regional Network. In this manner, the regional municipal movement can be strengthened.

Both regional and international organizations will find the information useful in detecting problem areas and trends in the region that may call for focus on a particular problem or area. International donors, including USAID, will use the information to monitor change in the indicators over time, in anticipation that these changes may also signal the need for changes in emphasis in their project and programs in the municipal sector.

c. Dissemination: The LOGROS Project Paper anticipates the dissemination of information as related to the consensus achieved on decentralization issues and benchmarks as well as their revision, update, and modification, as follows:

"...they will be widely disseminated through publications and annual Network meetings. The Project will fund publication and communication functions at the regional level to assure the widest possible appropriate distribution of key information on both LOGROS-specific activities and decentralization issues in general. As the Project focus is regional, priority attention will be directed at decentralization issues with broad regional applicability" (LOGROS Project Paper, 1992, p. 3-8).

FEMICA will publish a semester newsletter to keep members informed of activities and issues and will also produce approximately 2 publications per year related to significant issues of decentralization and municipal development.

Perhaps the most appropriate forum to present the results of the indicator exercise would be the annual Network meeting where participants could discuss the implications of the information obtained and could potentially use the data to revise, update, and modify regional priorities or benchmarks on decentralization and municipal development issues. This level of discussion could also potentially function as a feedback mechanism to verify the information and the accuracy of the analysis that should accompany the annual indicator information. These findings should be published in the report on the annual Network meeting or other Network publication. These dissemination mechanisms will be funded by LOGROS and FEMICA will assume the role of Network Secretariat. Indicator information can also be more widely disseminated if included in the FEMICA Newsletter, albeit in a more condensed form.

It is important that the national municipal associations, or key players in the national municipal movement if an association does not exist, are involved in the dissemination of the indicator information as well as other FEMICA and Network publications so that they can play an important role in bringing that information to the individual municipalities. The involvement of the national associations as well as the regional municipal association, FEMICA, in the dissemination of information will be an important part of strengthening the institutional capacity of those organizations and their role as important and able representatives of the municipalities in the regional municipalist movement.

VI. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

a. Monitoring: Of great importance in any monitoring and evaluation system is a good base-line data. While the PADCO Regional Municipal Sector Assessment is useful in providing needed information, there are still data gaps that must be filled in order to have an accurate and complete basis from which to judge progress. Therefore, it is recommended that within the first year of the project, as soon as the indicators are finalized, base-line data be gathered for

all indicators in the system. It is expected that this data can be obtained primarily through document reviews. For the most part, these documents will be those noted previously in Section V a. (p. 21). The secondary sources, such as interviews with key individuals, may also be used as necessary. Obtaining data that may be less readily available such as statistics on the use of "cabildos abiertos" in all municipalities may require a sample survey in each of the countries, possibly carried out by the national municipal association, if feasible; perhaps more practical is a mailed questionnaire which can be disseminated through FEMICA to a random or purposive sampling of municipalities as deemed most appropriate. If sufficient information can be obtained from national or regional sources, these sampling and questionnaire information gathering mechanism could serve to simply verify those information sources. According to priorities determined by consensus, the Network will select the indicators and, based on time and financial constraints, will suggest appropriate methods of data collection. However, ultimate decisions as to the proper indicator tracking system and data collection methodology are the responsibility of the LOGROS PSC Municipal Specialist, with short-term buy-in or contract Technical Assistance (TA) as needed. TA may be most useful in actual data collection. Additionally, the Municipal Specialist may seek assistance from the Regional Information Clearinghouse (RIC) which should be particularly helpful in maintaining the tracking system.

Indicator monitoring will take place on an annual basis according to the following budget:

Year 1	\$ 27,188	(indicator development)
Year 2	\$ 16,313	
Year 3	\$ 21,750	
Year 4	\$ 21,750	
Year 5	\$ 10,031	
Year 6	\$ 5,438	
Total	<u>\$ 102,770</u>	

Pure data contained in the matrix should be accompanied by an analysis of the significance of the information as an indicator of the priority areas that

require greater attention as well as a measure of change over time, including the identification of trends and areas of particularly significant progress or deficiency. Furthermore, this analysis should seek to explain these factors in terms of significant events that may have taken place within the region or within a particular country and in terms of LOGROS activities that may have influenced such change. As noted previously, what is needed is the association of LOGROS Project activities, and perhaps the efforts of bi-lateral Missions, other international donors, etc., buttressed by reasonable empirical evidence of qualitative and --to the extent possible-- quantitative nature (see p.13 of this report). In order for the Municipal Specialist (or consultant as deemed necessary) to complete such an analysis and present it at the Network annual meeting, data collection should take place in a sufficient amount of time prior to the scheduled event.

b. Evaluation: According to the Project Paper, two formal external evaluations will take place. A mid-term evaluation focusing on progress in attaining Project objectives at the output level of the LogFrame will be completed in or about Month 36 of the Project and will recommend changes and adjustments to be implemented over the remainder of the Life of the Project. To assist with this evaluation, a Regional Municipal Sector Reassessment will be prepared under contract during Year 3 of implementation and will be finalized before the external mid-term evaluation team arrive in-country. An EOP (i.e. End of Project) evaluation focusing on the attainment of Project objectives at the purpose level of the Logframe and lessons learned from the Project will be carried out in or about Month 72 of Project implementation.

The budget for the Reassessment and the evaluations is as follows:

Reassessment	\$ 217,500
Mid-term Evaluation	\$ 54,375
EOP Evaluation	\$ 67,425
Total	<u>\$ 339,300</u>

Thus, the total monitoring and evaluation budget for LOGROS is \$ 442,070 (Monitoring - \$ 102,770 and Evaluation - \$ 339,300). Guidance from CDIE on

developing a monitoring and evaluation plan states that the cost of an "information system" should be between one to three percent of total project costs. It appears from the content of the CDIE document that the information system referred to is very similar to the indicator matrix included in this report. If this inference is correct, the cost of the LOGROS information system is \$ 102,770 or approximately 2% of total Project costs and, thus, is within guideline's recommended limits.

c. Audits: It should also be noted that \$170,000 in Project funds have been budgeted for annual performance audits of grant recipients, if there are any under the Project. Additionally, U.S. contractors accessed through buy-ins will be subject to regular audits performed by the Contractor's cognizant Inspector General.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted earlier, the matrix is indeed preliminary, representing an aggregation of internal RHUDO documents and discussions with RHUDO staff, a synthesis and of the monitoring, evaluation, and indicator elements of the LOGROS PP, and an expansion and refinement of the work done by MSI. Particular attention should be paid to the congruence between the "Monitoring and Achievement of Strategic Objectives" table (see Annex 1) and the differentiation between Performance Indicators and Program Output Level Indicators. The MSI work may have to be revised to incorporate the data and information contained in the new indicator matrix which reflects further development of the MSI indicator framework in accordance with what the RHUDO staff believes to be appropriate and necessary.

Research for this report included the obtainment of information from the Ministry of Planning (MIDEPLAN) in Costa Rica which was thought to have developed a indicator tracking system which ranks municipalities according to indicators that provide some measure of municipal development. Yet, this assumption proved false as MIDEPLAN information, obtained with the help of Oscar Delgado of USAID/Costa Rica, only contained national level indicators and some general information about the income and expenditures of municipalities. The latter type of information

may be useful in data collection for the matrix, but it was of no particular help in the development of the indicator tracking system.

The work contained in this report can serve as a basis from which the LOGROS PSC Municipal Specialist can further develop municipal development indicators with potential assistance from contract TA and RIC and, of course, with the input of the Regional Network. The following are recommended as next steps to be undertaken within the first year of LOGROS:

- 1) ROCAP and RHUDO staff must decide as to the proper set of indicators, at this stage of development, assuring that there are no conflicts or inconsistencies with the work done by the MSI team and the indicators contained herein.
- 2) As soon as possible during this next year (i.e. FY93), indicators should be fully defined and the system for tracking performance established, including both the more broad indicators of municipal autonomy and performance and those related to specific LOGROS activities. According to the Project Paper, this is the responsibility of the LOGROS PSC Municipal Specialist, who is also tasked with indicator monitoring over the Life of the Project (LOP).
- 3) Once ROCAP and RHUDO have sufficiently refined the indicator system, it should be presented to the Regional Network which will provide input to be used in finalizing the system, particularly the definition of the indicators themselves according to regional priorities.
- 4) The LOGROS PSC Municipal Specialist should finalize the system, including the development of a monitoring schedule and a data collection methodology for the LOP, and should define, through discussions with staff from the Regional Information Clearinghouse (RIC), the role that RIC can play in collecting data and/or maintaining the indicator system.
- 5) The LOGROS PSC Municipal Specialist should begin the collection of base-line data with the assistance of short-term buy-in or contract TA as needed. This data should build on the work completed by PADCO in the Regional Municipal Sector Assessment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Britan, Gerald M., Ph.D., "Measuring Program Performance for Federal Agencies: Issues and Options for Performance Indicators," (USGAO) April, 1991.
- Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE), "Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plans for AID-Assisted Projects," 1991.
- Heilman, Lawrence C. and Robert J. Kurz, "Democratic Initiatives Performance Monitoring Study for the Latin American and Caribbean Bureau, Volume 1, DI Objectives and Indicators," January, 1991.
- Local Government Regional Outreach Strategy (LOGROS) Project Paper, ROCAP/RHUDO/CA, 1992.
- Management Systems International (MSI), "Monitoring Program Performance: ROCAP," June 1992.
- Management Systems International (MSI), "Tracking Program Performance: A review of Objectives and Indicators," (AID/CDIE).
- PADCO, "Regional Municipal Sector Assessment for Central America," Volume 1: Basic Analysis and Volume 2: Proposed Strategy," June, 1992.
- Peterson, George, "Decentralization and Democratic Governance: A Review of Latin American Experience and Lessons for SubSaharan Africa," Working Paper for USAID/Office of Housing and Urban Programs, March, 1991.
- Schimpp Wozniak, Michele, "AID and Democratic Development: A Synthesis of Literature and Experience," (POL/CDIE/DI) May 1992.

A N N E X 1
MSI INDICATORS

Table 2.3: STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Country: ROCAP

Strategic Objective: More effective and democratic local governance

Other Activity: N/A

Program Outputs	Activities	Source of Support	
		Title	No.
1. Regional policy framework established	1. Regional network meeting regularly and disseminating information 2. # of participants, disaggregated by gender	LOGROS	596-0167
2. Specific constraints to decentralization resolved	1. Policy documents published and endorsed 2. Action plans written and implemented	LOGROS	596-0167
3. Regional training capability mobilized	1. Financial management practices improved 2. Citizen participation in municipal gov. affairs increased (disaggregated by gender) 3. Other constraints to decentralization resolved (to be identified)	LOGROS	596-0167

55

Table 1.3: MONITORING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Country: ROCAP

LAC Bureau Objective: (1) The development of stable democratic societies
(2) The attainment of effective regional cooperation

Mission Strategy: Objective 3: More effective and democratic local governance

Indicator	Unit	Base-line		Target			Current Year 1991		1992 Target	Data source
		value	date	value	date	Reached	value	date	value	
1. Decentralization legislation extent										Country-by-country review
2. Decentralization legislation and regulations implemented										Legislation and implementation

Program Output 3.1: Regional policy framework established

1. Regional network meeting regularly and disseminating information										Network meeting proceedings and publications
2. # of participants, disaggregated by gender										Publications

Program Output 3.2: Specific constraints to decentralization resolved

1. Policy documents published and endorsed										Policy documents
2. Action plans written and implemented										Action plans and surveys

Program Output 3.3: Regional training capability mobilized

1. Financial management practices improved										Project Service Statistics
2. Citizen participation in municipal gov. affairs increased (disaggregated by gender)										
3. Other constraints to decentralization resolved (to be identified)										

2/2

A N N E X 2

EXAMPLE OF TIME COMPARISON INDICATOR SYSTEM FOR INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

(The system contained in this Annex represents a preliminary attempt at developing an indicator matrix and contains now outdated information. It, therefore, should only be used as an example of what a country-by-country time comparison chart may look like.)

Statement	Performance Indicator	Unit	Base-line		Target		Current Year		Data Source
			value	date	value	date	value	date	
Strategic Objective									
1) More effective and democratic local governance	1) Implementation of new municipal codes giving municipalities increased functions and powers	Y/N							Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation
	2) Decentralization made part of constitution	Y/N						" "	
	3) Decentralization legislation extant and implemented	Y/N						" "	
	4) Implementation of new municipal laws/ legal reforms that establish basis for the transfer of resources from the central to the local government	Y/N						" "	
	5) National commissions established which seek to reform the state (decentralization of resources and authority as a key component of reforms)	Y/N						" "	
	6) Participation of municipalities in the formulation and execution of national decentralization and municipal reform initiatives, as well as in the broader dialogue of national development	Y/N						National legislature meeting records	
	7) Independence from central government of selection of policy, administrative and financial officials	Y/N						" "	

32

Statement	Performance Indicator	Unit	Base-line		Target		Current Year		Data Source
			value	date	value	date	value	date	
Strategic Objective									
1) Cont'd	1) Electoral Reform/Universal elections of mayors	Y/N							Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation
	2) Direct local vote separate from national elections	Y/N							" "
	3) Elimination of party candidate "slates"	Y/N							" "
	4) Electoral process open to other groups besides national political parties	Y/N							" "
	5) Increase in the level of competition for leadership positions in local government (eg. 30% of local officials had competition in the selection process that granted them power)	Y/N							" "
	6) Ability to recall local elected officials	Y/N							" "

Statement	Performance Indicator	Unit	Base-line		Target		Current Year		Data Source
			value	date	value	date	value	date	
Program Output									
1a) Improved efficiency and management of local government	1) % of public services financed/ provided by municipalities (water, police, schools, electricity, telephones, solid waste collection and treatment, etc.)	%							Municipal public works records
	2) % of population served by basic services provided by local government	%							" "
	3) Increase in the proportion of total expenditures for basic urban services funded by "own source" revenues	%							Municipal financial records
	4) Increase in the share of public contracts awarded on the basis of technical and economic merit	%							Municipal records
	5) Increase in current income of municipalities	%							Municipal financial records
	6) Increase in net savings in current account (municipalities)	%							" "
Program Output									
1b) Improved proficiency of municipal officials in administrative tasks and analytical capabilities	7) Number of training workshops given on municipal management	#							Training contractor records, national training institutions' records
	8) Number of people trained by type of workshop (Disaggregated by gender)	#							" "
	9) Expansion/Creation of national institutional T.A. and training capacity	%							" "

40

Statement	Performance Indicator	Unit	Base-line		Target		Current Year		Data Source
			value	date	value	date	value	date	
Program Output									
1b) (cont'd)	10) Development of institutions and procedures for laying out choices, realistic cost estimates, and the implications for local fee or tax payments to the local electorate	Y/N							Municipal records
	11) Increase in the % of municipal services provided by the private sector	%							" "
	12) Increase in the % of investment costs recovered from beneficiaries	%							Municipal financial records, project reports

117

Statement	Performance Indicator	Unit	Base-line		Target		Current Year		Data Source
			value	date	value	date	value	date	
Program Output									
2) Strengthened municipal finance	1) Authority to assign value to taxable base and to set rates on that base rests with local government	Y/N							Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation
	2) Revenue-raising authority of municipality made permanent	Y/N							" "
	3) Increase in the % of municipal revenues coming from taxes	%							Municipal financial records
	4) Authority to establish schedule of charges and fees for services rests with the municipality	Y/N							Review of legislation and implementation
	5) Municipal autonomy over expenditures	Y/N							" "
	6) Local government authority over budget preparation and approval	Y/N							" "
	7) Expansion and improvement of intergovernmental transfers	%							Central government financial records
	8) Creation of a stable, transparent grant system, which relieves some of the local costs of service supply without a massive transfer to local government	Y/N							" "
	9) Expansion and improvement of national revenue sharing	%							Review of national budget
	10) Municipal access to commercial credit systems								

Statement	Performance Indicator	Unit	Base-line		Target		Current Year		Data Source
			value	date	value	date	value	date	
Program Output									
2) (cont'd)	11) improved cadastral systems	Y/N							Municipal tax assessment records
	12) Implementation of policies which permit the issuing of municipal bonds and lotteries	Y/N							Country-by-country review of legislation and implementation
Program Output									
3) Increased community participation in local government	1) Increase in the number of intermediary support institutions, both public and private, participating in the local development process (i.e. civic, professional, and community organizations, NGOs, etc.)	%							Annual Census of organizations *
	2) Increase in the membership of intermediary support institutions	%							
	3) Increase in financial resources available to intermediary institutions	%							" "
	4) Increase in the # of meetings of intermediary institutions	%							" "
	5) Increased use of "cabildos abiertos" (town-meetings), referendums, and plebiscites which incorporate communities into the governing process	%							" "

* The 1991 report entitled "Democratic Initiatives Performance Study" (prepared for LAC Bureau by Heilman & Kurz) notes that a national census of organizations could be conducted to establish a base-line, with follow up monitoring to provide data on change.

Statement	Performance Indicator	Unit	Base-line		Target		Current Year		Data Source
			value	date	value	date	value	date	
Program Output									
3) (cont'd)	6) Increase in the # of policy institutions associated with intermediary support institutions	#							Annual census of organizations
	7) Formal recognition of the neighborhood development associations and acknowledgement of their role in choosing municipal services	Y/N							Municipal laws, declarations, etc.

7/7

Statement	Performance Indicator	Unit	Baseline		Target		Current Year		Data Source
			value	date	value	date	value	date	
Program Output									
4) Strengthened municipal system/movement	1) Increase in the % of municipalities actively affiliated with the national municipal association	%							Association membership and attendance records
	2) National municipal association is financially self-sufficient	Y/H							Association financial records
	3) Regional network established and meeting regularly	Y/N							Network meeting and attendance records
	4) Regional network regularly disseminating regional framework products and solutions to constraints to improved municipal government	Y/N							Network proceedings and publications
	5) Regional network disseminating available literature and other direct experience related to local government	Y/N							" "
	6) Increase in the number of network participants (Disaggregated by gender and affiliation)	%							Network membership and attendance records

45

A N N E X 3

**BIBLIOGRAPHY FROM PADCO
REGIONAL MUNICIPAL SECTOR ASSESSMENT**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. MUNICIPAL MANDATES, LOCAL GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATIONS

COSTA RICA

- _____. *Descentralización Territorial y Fortalecimiento Municipal en Costa Rica: Una Experiencia*. IPAM. 1989.
- _____. *Fortalecer los municipios es consolidar la democracia*. IFAM. 1983.
- _____. *Las Ligas Municipales de Costa Rica*. IFAM. 1990.
- _____. *Las municipalidades y la proclamación de la República de Costa Rica*. IPAM. 1989.
- _____. *Ley de Organización y funcionamiento del IFAM*. IFAM. 1988.
- _____. *Ley de Organización y Funcionamiento del Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM)*. IFAM. 1990.
- _____. *Ley de Planificación Nacional*. IFAM. 1988.
- _____. *Ley de Planificación Urbana*. IFAM. 1988.
- _____. *Manual del Regidor*. IFAM. 1990.
- _____. *Ordenanzas municipales*. IFAM. 1988.
- _____. *Perfiles de la democracia costarricense: El Sistema Municipal de Costa Rica*. IFAM. 1985.
- _____. *Plan de Descentralización Territorial y Fortalecimiento Municipal*. IPAM. 1990.
- _____. *Programa Anual Operativo 1991*. IPAM. 1991.
- _____. *Revista Municipal*. 1984.
- _____. *Toponimia Cantonal de Costa Rica*. IFAM. 1986.
- Aguilar Fong, Justo. *Reflexiones sobre el desarrollo institucional del régimen municipal costarricense*. IFAM. 1989.
- Araya Pochet, Carlos and Priscella Albarracion. *Historia del Régimen Municipal en Costa Rica*. IFAM. 1986.
- Barahona, Francisco, et.al. *Costa Rica hacia el 2000*. Editorial Nueva Sociedad. 1988.
- Hernandez, Hermogenes. *Costa Rica: Evolución Territorial y Principales Censos de Población*. Editorial Universidad a Distancia. 1985.
- Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal. *Código Municipal Comentado*. IPAM. 1991.
- Marin, Oscar. *Régimen Municipal*. Vol.I: Evolución Histórica del Régimen Municipal. Vol. II: La Municipalidad y la Democracia. Vol.III: Funciones de la Municipalidad. Vol. IV: Proceso Electoral. Vol.V: Procedimiento Parlamentario Municipal. Vol.VI: Vigencia del Régimen Municipal. Universidad Estatal a Distancia. 1990.
- Palacios, Ivan. *Derecho Municipal*. Universidad Estatal a Distancia. 1987.
- Procuraría General de la Nación. *Código Municipal*. 1990. Imprenta Nacional.

Bibliography, 2

Stout, Donald E., et al. *Municipal Development Diagnosis and Policy Proposal: Costa Rica*. Research Triangle Institute. 1990.

Unión Nacional de Gobiernos Locales. *Estatutos*. Mimeo. 1991.

EL SALVADOR

_____, *Conara-Miplan, Manual Operativo de los Comités Especiales Departamentales*, 1991.

_____, *Constitución Política de la República de El Salvador*.

_____, *Código Municipal*, Decreto No.274. Enero 1986.

_____, *Ley Orgánica del Instituto Salvadoreño de Desarrollo Municipal (ISDEM)*, Decreto No. 616. Marzo 1987.

_____, *Ley del Fondo para el Desarrollo Económico y Social de los Municipios*, Decreto No. 74. Septiembre 1988.

_____, *Propuesta de Nuevos Estatutos de Comures*. Noviembre 1991.

Dirección General de Estadística y Censos, Ministerio de Economía, *Estimación de Población por Departamento y Municipio*. Año 1987.

Browning, David. *El Salvador, La Tierra y El Hombre*, Tercera Edición, 1987.

López, Carlos, Roberto. *Industrialización y Urbanización en El Salvador*, Segunda Edición, 1986, UCA Editores, San Salvador.

Ministerio de Planificación y Coordinación del Desarrollo Económico y Social, Dirección General de Planeamiento, Departamento de Planificación Territorial, *La Calidad de Vida en Función Del Desarrollo Económico y Social*. Septiembre 1989.

Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Dirección de Planificación, *Jerarquización Urbana Nacional* (Segunda Edición). Octubre 1975.

Miriam Hirezi Meléndez, *Avances en La Estratega de Descentralización en la Administración Pública*. Junio 1991.

GUATEMALA

_____, *Constitución Política de la República de Guatemala*, 1985.

_____, *Código Municipal*, Decreto No.58-88, 1988.

Echegaray, Francisco I. *Descentralización Administrativa y Consejos de Desarrollo Urbano y Rural: El Proyecto GUA/88/005 y otros Proyectos Relacionados*, Naciones Unidas. Abril 1991.

Echegaray, Francisco I. *El Papel de las Transferencias Fiscales del Gobierno Central Al Gobierno Municipal y la Descentralización: El Caso de Guatemala*, USAID, RHUDO/CA, ROCAP, INCAE. Septiembre 1991.

- Echegaray, Francisco I. *El Sistema Municipal de Guatemala*, INCAE, 1990.
- Echegaray, Francisco I. *La Experiencia de Guatemala en la Descentralización: Una Apreciación Objetiva*, INCAE, Guatemala, 1991.
- Rafael Alvarez y Marilú Hernández Estrada, *Manual para la administración Municipal, FLACSO-PADAM*. Marzo 1991.
- Luis Linares, *Estrategia para el Fortalecimiento Institucional del Municipio*, en Revista Momento, Guatemala, 1989.

NICARAGUA

- _____, *Análisis de los Presupuestos Municipales Para 1991*, INIFOM, Dirección Económico-Financiera. Diciembre 1990.
- _____, *Constitución Política de Nicaragua*, 1987.
- _____, *Creación de Ministerios de Estado*, Decreto Ley No.1-91. Abril 1991.
- _____, *Decreto de Creación del Instituto Nicaragüense de Fomento Municipal (INIFOM)*, Decreto No.497. Marzo 1990.
- _____, *Ley de Municipios*, Ley No. 40. Agosto 1988.
- _____, *Ley de División Político-Administrativa*, Ley No.59. Octubre 1989.
- _____, *Líneas para una Estratega de Desarrollo del Sistema Municipal de Nicaragua (Propuesta)*, INIFOM. Octubre 1990.
- _____, *Manual para el Cobro del Impuesto Sobre Bienes Inmuebles*, INIFOM, Dirección Económico-Financiera. Septiembre 1991.
- _____, *Plan de Arbitrios del Municipio de Managua*, Decreto No.10-91. Febrero 1991.
- _____, *Posición del INIFOM Ante las Reformas de los Planes de Arbitrios*, INIFOM, Dirección Económico-Financiera. Noviembre 1990.
- _____, *Programa Nacional de Desarrollo Social y Superación de la Pobreza (Documento Borrador)*. Presidencia de la República de Nicaragua, Ministerio de la Presidencia. Marzo 1991.
- _____, *Proyecto de Apoyo Orientado a las Municipalidades de Mayor Pobreza en Nicaragua*, Dirección de Atención a las Municipalidades. Noviembre 1991.
- _____, *Reglamento de Organización y Funcionamiento Municipal*, Decreto No.498. Marzo 1990.
- _____, *Simposio sobre el Régimen Municipal*, Grupo FUNDEMOS, sin fecha.
- INCAE. *El Sistema Municipal de Nicaragua*, Alajuela, Costa Rica. Enero 1989.

PANAMA

- _____. *Constitución Política de la Republica de Pánama*. Ediciones Manuel Alvaréz. 1981. ✓
- Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional. *La Municipalidad Adecuada a Centroamérica*. 1991.
- Asociación Panameña de Cooperación Intermunicipal. *Creación, Organización y Funciones del Instituto de Desarrollo Municipal*. 1990.
- Asociación Panameña de Cooperación Intermunicipal. *Estatutos*. 1990.
- Chen Barria, Jose. *Como se puede reducir la Deuda Externa*. Mimeo. 1990.
- Cochez, Guillermo. *La Elaboración y Aceptación del Derecho*. Mimeo. 1991.
- Consejo Municipal de Panama. *Apuntes Panameños de Municipalidades*. Comisión de Educación y Cultura del Consejo Municipal de Panama. 1986.
- Controleria General. *Indicadores Económicos y Sociales de Pánama:1980-89*. 1990.
- Contraloría de la República. *Indicadoras Económicos y Sociales: 1988-89*. Contraloría de la República de Panamá. 1989.
- Contraloría General de la República. *Censos Nacionales de Población y Vivienda. Resultados Finales Básicos*. Contraloría General de la República. May 1991.
- Estadística Panameña. *Situación Económica: Cuentas Nacionales, Años 1987-1989*. Estadística Panameña. 1989.
- Gaceta Oficial, República de Pánama. *Constitución Política de la República de Pánama de 1972. Reformada en Acto Constitucional de 1983*. República de Pánama. 1983.
- Fabrega, Jorge (anotado y concordado). *Código Administrativo*. Ediciones Manuel Alvarez. 1980.
- Instituto Panameño para la Democracia Municipal. *Estatutos y Planes de Acción*. Mimeo. 1991.
- McFarland, Debra (U.S. Agency for International Development/Panama). *Panama Paper: Municipal Development*. AID/Panama. October 1991.
- Ministerio de Gobierno y Justicia. *Programas con Gobierno Local*. Mimeo. 1990.
- Ministerio de Planificación y Política Económica (MIPPE). *Planificación y Coordinación Regional*. Mimeo. 1990.
- MIPPE. *Tipología Municipal*. MIPPE 1988.
- Ocana Vieto, Bernardo. *Sugerencias de Reformas a la Actual Constitución Nacional y las Consiguientes Reformas al Código Electoral*. 1991.
- Picard, Miguel Angel. *La vuelta a la comunidad: Asamblea Nacional de Representantes de Corregimiento*. 1983.
- Pinilla, Hector J. *Leyes de los Gobiernos Locales de Pánama*. Segunda Edición. 1990.
- Research Triangle Institute (RTI). *Municipal Management Assessment Panama*. RTI. 1986.
- Ubarde, Edgardo. *La situación de los municipios Panameños*. 1991.

- Ubarde, Egardo. *El rol de los municipios en el cumplimiento de las tareas sociales y en la movilización de los potenciales de autoayuda a nivel local*. Mimeo. Ministerio de Gobierno y Justicia. 1991.
- Universidad de Panamá. *Análisis Comparativo de las Bases Jurídicas del Régimen Municipal Panameño*. Universidad de Panamá. 1985.
- Universidad de Panamá. *Índice de cronólogos y de materias de las leyes (1975-80)*. Centro de Investigaciones Jurídicas, Universidad de Panamá 1980.
- Urban Institute; and Robert R. Nathan Associates. *Urban Development Assessment: Panama City*." Prepared for Agency for International Development. 1985. Urban Institute; and Robert R. Nathan Associates.
- USAID/Panama. *Compilación de las Leyes Pertencientes al Municipio y otros gobiernos locales y leyes nacionales relacionadas con municipios y gobiernos locales*. USAID/Panama. 1987.
- USAID/Panama. *Study on Local Government*. USAID/Panama. July 1991.
- Villareal, Amilcal (Director de Estadística y Censos); y Chen Barria, José. *Panama en Cifras, Años 1985-1989*. 1990.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

B. URBAN AND REGIONAL STRUCTURES

REGIONAL

_____. *Statistical Yearbook for Latin America and the Caribbean*. Santiago: ECLA, United Nations, 1989.

Fox, R.W.; I.W. Huguet. *Population and Urban Trends in Central America and Panamá*. Washington: Interamerican Development Bank, 1977.

Nuhn, Helmut. *Estructura y Desarrollo del Sistema de Ciudades en Centroamérica y Panamá*, in Nuhn, Helmut and Alberto McKay, eds. *Desarrollo Polarizado y Política de Descentralización en América Central: El Caso de Panamá*. Hamburg: Wayasbah, 1990, pp.19-58.

Wilkie, Richard. *Latin American Population and Urbanization Analysis*.

Wilson, Patricia. *Exports and Local Development*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992.

COSTA RICA

_____. *Estado de la Investigación Científica y la Acción Social sobre la Región Atlántico de Costa Rica*. San José, Costa Rica: Oficina de Publicidad de la Universidad de Costa Rica.

Anuario Estadístico de Costa Rica. *Costa Rica: Dirección General de Estadísticas y Censos*, 1982.

Alvarado, Guillermo C.; Jorge Vargas Gullel. *El Surgimiento de un Espacio Urbano Metropolitano en el Valle Central de Costa Rica, 1950-1980*, Anuario de Estudios Centroamericanos 13:1, 1987, pp.71-94.

Araya Pochet, Carlos. *Historia del Régimen Municipal*. Costa Rica: EUED, 1986.

Astorga, Nidia Valle. *Proceso de Estructuración del Espacio en una Ciudad Intermedia Costarricense: Ciudad Quesada*. Revista Interamericana de Planificación. 22:86, junio 1989.

Booth, John A. *Características Socio-Gráficas de las Regiones Periféricas de Costa Rica*. San José, Costa Rica: IFAM, 1984.

Brugger, Ernst A. *Regional Policy in Costa Rica: The Problems of Implementation*. Geoforum 13:2, 1986, pp.177-192.

Bibliography, 2

- Castro, Gerardo. *El Sector Industrial en Ciudades Intermedias Costarricenses: Los Casos de Perez Zeledón y San Carlos*, in Morales, Miguel and Gerhard Sandner, eds. *Regiones Periféricas y Ciudades Intermedias en Costa Rica*. San José, Costa Rica: EUND, 1982, pp.189-209.
- CELADE. *Migración Interna, Encuesta Demográfica de Honduras: II*. Costa Rica: CELADE, 1986.
- Economist Intelligence Unit. *Country Profile, 1991-92: Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panamá*. London: Business International Limited, 1991.
- Hall, Carolyn. *Costa Rica: Una Interpretación Geográfica*. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial Costa Rica, 1984.
- Hernandez, Hermeogenes. *Costa Rica: Evolución Territorial y Principales Censos de Población*. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial Universidad Estatal a Distancia, 1985.
- Maguid, Alicia. *Migración y Empleo en la Aglomeración Metropolitana de Costa Rica*. *Revista Latinoamericana de Demografía* 14, April, 1986, pp.75-123.
- Ministerio de Planificación. *Costa Rica: Proyección de la Población Económicamente Activa por Regiones, Sexo y Grupos de Edades, 1975-2000*. Costa Rica: CELADE, 1989.
- Morales, Miguel A. *El Proceso de Metropolitización en Costa Rica y América Latina*. San José, Costa Rica: MOPT, 1976.
- Morales, Miguel; Gerhard Sandner, eds. *Regiones Periféricas y Ciudades Intermedias en Costa Rica*. San José, Costa Rica: EUNED, 1982.
- Oficina Internacional del Trabajo. *Migraciones Internas y Mercado de Trabajo en San José, Costa Rica*. Santiago, Chile: PREALC, 1987.
- Romein, Arie; Jur Schuurman. *Las Funciones de los Centros Urbanos en el Desarrollo Regional: La Región Huetar Norte en Costa Rica*. *Revista Interamericana de Planificación*, XXIV: 93, 1991, pp.127-158.

EL SALVADOR

- _____. *Caracterización Socioeconómica de la Población de El Salvador, Análisis, Descriptivo*. San Salvador. FUSADES, 1989.
- Anuario Estadístico. *San Salvador: Dirección General de Estadística y Censos*, 1971, 1981.
- Browning, David. *El Salvador, La Tierra y El Hombre*. San Salvador: Dirección General de Publicaciones del Ministerio de Educación, 1975.

Echegaray, Francisco I. *Esquema General del Sistema Urbano de El Salvador*, San Salvador: Instituto Centroamericano de Administración de Empresas, octubre 1990.

Economist Intelligence Unit. *Country Profile, 1991-92: Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras*. London: Business International Limited, 1991.

Hagerty, Richard A. *El Salvador: A Country Study*. Washington, DC: US Department of the Army, 1988.

Lopez, Carlos Roberto. *Industrialización y Urbanización en El Salvador 1969-1979*. San Salvador: UCA Editores, 1986.

Lungo, Mario. *Centralización/Descentralización del Estado en El Salvador en Los Años 80*. Estudios Sociales Centroamericanos, 52, pp.109-126, 1990.

GUATEMALA

Anuario Estadístico. *Guatemala: Dirección General de Estadística y Censos*, 1983.

Echegaray, Francisco I. *Esquema del Sistema Urbano de Guatemala*, Guatemala: Instituto Centroamericano de Administración de Empresas, julio 1990.

Economist Intelligence Unit. *Country Profile, 1991-92: Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras*. London: Business International Limited, 1991.

Melville, Thomas; Marjorie Melville. *Tierra y Poder en Guatemala*. Guatemala: Universidad de San Carlos, 1982.

PNUD/SEGEPLAN; Proyecto GUA/87/010, Segunda Misión, Informe de Consultoría, Guatemala, septiembre 1989.

Schwartz, Norman B. *Colonization of Northern Guatemala: The Peten*. Journal of Anthropological Research 43, pp.163-183, 1987.

HONDURAS

Anuario Estadístico. *Tegucigalpa: Dirección General de Estadística y Censos*, 1970, 1989.

Economist Intelligence Unit. *Country Profile, 1991-92: Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras*. London: Business International Limited, 1991.

Pineda Portilo, Noe. *Geografía de Honduras*. Tegucigalpa: ESP, 1984.

República de Honduras. *Población y Vivienda: 1988*. Tegucigalpa: SECPLAN, 1988.

Bibliography, 4

Rudolph, James D., ed. *Honduras: A Country Study*. Washington, DC: American University, Foreign Area Studies, 1984.

Suazo, M., Aplicano. *Población y Desarrollo Socioeconómico en Honduras*. Chicago: 1984.

Urban Institute. *Honduras Shelter and Urban Development Sector Assessment*. Washington, DC, report prepared for USAID. May 1989.

NICARAGUA

_____. *Nicaragua en Cifras: Diez Años*. Nicaragua: Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos, 1989.

Anuario Estadístico de Nicaragua. *Managua: Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos*, 1983, 1985.

Conroy, Michael E.; Rolf Pendall. *Internal Migration, War, and the Regional Outreach of the Nicaraguan State: 1980-1986*, in Michael E. Conroy, ed., *Nicaragua: Profiles of the Revolutionary Public Sector*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1987; pp.59-94.

Economist Intelligence Unit. *Country Profile, 1991-92: Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panamá*. London: Business International Limited, 1991.

Norsworthy, Kent. *Nicaragua: A Country Guide*. Albuquerque: Inter-Hemispheric Education Resource Center, 1989,

Whiteford, Scott; Terry Hoops. *Labor Organization and Participation in the Mixed Economy: The Case of Sugar Production*, in Michael E. Conroy, ed. *Nicaragua: Profiles of the Revolutionary Public Sector*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1987, pp.171-200.

PANAMA

_____. *Las Migraciones Internas*. Panamá: Centro de Estudios del Trabajo, Ministerio del Trabajo, 1989.

_____. *Panamá en Cifras: 1982-1986*. Panamá: Dirección de Estadística y Censos, 1988.

Aracia, Hildebrando. *Población y Desarrollo Social*. Panamá: Dirección General de la Caja de Seguro Social, 1984.

Barry, Tom. *Panamá: A Country Guide*. Albuquerque: Inter-Hemispheric Education Resource Center, 1990.

Boyce, Charles P. *El Sistema Urbano de Panamá*. Panamá: Ministerio de Planificación, 1975.

- Economist Intelligence Unit. *Country Profile, 1991-92: Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panamá.* London: Business International Limited, 1991.
- Ferrero, Elia G.; Guillermo G. de Rueda. *Problemas Políticos y Socio Económicos de Panamá.* Panamá: 1988.
- Mizrachi, Victor R. *Desarrollo Urbano de la Ciudad de Santiago como Centro de Servicios y su Importancia Regional*, in Nuhn, Helmut and Alberto McKay, eds. *Desarrollo Polarizado y Política de Descentralización en América Central: El Caso de Panamá.* Hamburg: Wayasbah, 1990, pp.157-176.
- Molo, Julio Cesar. *El Centro Secundario de David: Polo Regional de Desarrollo en el Sector Occidental de Panamá*, in Nuhn, Helmut and Alberto McKay, eds. *Desarrollo Polarizado y Política de Descentralización en América Central: El Caso de Panamá.* Hamburg: Wayasbah, 1990, pp.111-156.
- Nuhn, Helmut. *Desarrollo Polarizado del Sistema Urbano y Política de Descentralización y Desconcentración*, in Nuhn, Helmut and Alberto McKay, eds. *Desarrollo Polarizado y Política de Descentralización en América Central: El Caso de Panamá.* Hamburg: Wayasbah, 1990, pp.1-18.
- Nuhn, Helmut; Alberto McKay, eds. *Desarrollo Polarizado y Política de Descentralización en América Central: El Caso de Panamá.* Hamburg: Wayasbah, 1990.
- Sahota, Gian Singh. *Poverty Theory and Policy: A Study of Panama.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- Urban Institute; Nathan Associates. *Urban Development Assessment: Panama.* Vol.I, Washington, DC, report prepared for USAID, 1985.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

C. MUNICIPAL FINANCE

CENTRAL AMERICA

Em Busca de... La Municipalidad Adecuada a Centro América, Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional e ICAP (abril 1991).

Municipalismo en Centro América, Cooperación Española (1990).

COSTA RICA

_____, *Annual Report of the Comptroller*, Excerpts Related to Local Government (1990).

Chinchilla V., Eduardo. *El IFAM y Impuesto Territorial*, 1985.

Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM). *Anexo: Parte 2, Estudios y Documentos Técnicos*, agosto 1990.

Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM). *Costa Rica: Cifras Del Regimen Municipal*, 1988.

Research Triangle Institute. *Costa Rica: Municipal Development Diagnosis and Policy Proposal*, (1990).

EL SALVADOR

_____, *Budget Data*, Selected Municipalities, ISDEM (1984-1989).

_____, *Decreto No. 86, Ley de Municipalidades* (Borrador, 1991).

_____, *Decreto No. 618*, Presidencia de la República (1981).

_____, *Memoria de Labores*, Instituto Salvadoreño de Desarrollo Municipal (ISDEM) (1988-89 AND 1990).

_____, *Population Data for Departamentos y Municipios* (estimated as of julio 1, 1987).

Research Triangle Institute. *CONARA Impact Evaluation*, prepared for USAID, September 1988.

Research Triangle Institute. *Impact Evaluation: Special Programs in Chalatenango and the Eastern Region*, prepared for USAID, agosto 1990.

Instituto Centroamericano de Administración de Empresas (INCAE). *Programa Para El Desarrollo Local*, January 1991.

Persons Interviewed, 2

GUATEMALA

_____, *Budget, Fiscal Year 1991*, City of Guatemala.

David Hoelscher. *Recent Economic Developments in Guatemala*, USAID-Guatemala (November 1991).

_____, *Finanzas Municipales, 1987 y otros años*, Instituto Nacional de Estadística. (noviembre 1988).

_____, *Ocho Por Ciento Para Obros de Infraestructura y Servicios Públicos Municipales*, INFOM (sin fecha).

_____, *Primer Informe del Contralor General de Cuentas, Año 1990*, Contraloría General de Cuentas.

Ferguson, Bruce; Francisco Echegaray. *Municipal Development in Guatemala: A Role for USAID*. The Urban Institute (October 1991).

Francisco I. Echegaray. *El Papel de Las Transferencias Fiscales: El Caso de Guatemala*. INCAE (prepared for RHUDO/CA/AID, September 1991).

HONDURAS

_____, *Annexes to USAID Program Document (Data on Three Honduran Cities)*

Pérfil de Proyectos de Privatización de Servicios Municipales, Municipalidad of La Ceiba, por Centro de Estudios Políticos y Sociales, 18 de octubre, 1991.

_____, *Estudio de la Administración Tributaria Municipal*, IBAM and Price Waterhouse, 1987.

_____, *Presupuesto Por Programas*, Municipalidad de Tegucigalpa, 1991.

Fiscal Data on Selected Honduran Cities, 1982-1989, prepared by the Director of Technical Assistance, Ministry of Local Government, October 1991.

NICARAGUA

_____, *Manual Para El Cálculo De Los Costos De Los Servicios Municipales*, Dirección

_____, *Presupuesto de Managua, 1992*, Ciudad de Managua.

General de Asuntos Municipales, etc., Ministerio de la Presidencia (jenero 1989)

INIFOM. *Análisis De Los Presupuestos Municipales Para 1991*, diciembre 1990, revisado octubre 1991.

INCAE. *El Sistema Municipal De Nicaragua*, jenero 1989.

Dirección Económica de INIFOM. *Modelo De Financimiento Municipal*, sin fecha.

INIFOM. *Manual De Finanzas Municipales*, septiembre 1990.

INIFOM. *Manual Para El Cobro Del Impuesto Sobre Bienes Inmuebles*, septiembre 1991.

INIFOM. *Repercusiones Del Plan De Estabilización De Marzo/91 En Las Finanzas Municipales*, abril 1991.

INIFOM. *Posición Del INIFOM Ante Las Reformas De Los Planes De Arbitrios*, julio 1990.

INIFOM. *Esquema Sobre La Situación De Las Finanzas Municipales No. 2*, agosto 1990.

INIFOM. *Líneas Para Una Estrategia De Desarrollo Del Sistema Municipal De Nicaragua*, octubre 1990.

INIFOM. *Análisis De Las Finanzas Municipales, 1989*, octubre 1991.

MIPRES. *Análisis Financiero Municipal, 1988*, junio 1989.

MIPRES. *Agenda Para Una Descentralización Económica and Social*, Programa de Desarrollo Social y Superación de la Pobreza (Documento No.8, enero 1991).

Various issues of *La Gaceta, Diario Oficial*:

Ley De Municipios (agosto 1988)

- *Plan De Arbitrios Municipal* (julio 1990)
- *Normativa Presupuestoria* (noviembre 1990)
- *Ley Creadora De Ministerios* (mayo 1990)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

D. COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT AND PARTICIPATION

GENERAL/REGIONAL

- Annis, Sheldon; Hakim, Peter, eds. *Direct to the Poor: Grassroots Development in Latin America*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1988.
- Carroll, Thomas F. *Tending the Grassroots: Performance of Intermediary Non-Government Organizations*. Sponsored by the Inter-American Foundation. (Rosslyn, Virginia.) West Hartford, CT: Kumarian. Draft. (Forthcoming, 1992)
- Cheema, G. Shabbir; Rondinelli, Dennis A., eds., *Decentralization and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983.
- Evans, Hugh; Siglin, Douglas. *Making Planning More Effective in Developing Countries: Lessons from Potosí, Bolivia*. Prepared under the Cooperative Agreement on Human Settlement and Natural Resource Systems Analysis. Worcester, MA and Binghamton, NY: Clark University and the Institute for Development Anthropology, 1983.
- Friedmann, John. *Life Space and Economic Space: Essays in Third World Planning*. New Brunswick and Oxford: Transaction Books: 1988.
- Friedmann, John; Weaver, Clyde. *Territory and Function: The Evolution of Regional Planning*. London: Ernold Arnold, 1979.
- Hellinger, Stephen; Hellinger, Douglas; O'Regan, Fred M. *Aid for Just Development*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1988.
- Jager, Harry. *La Municipalidad: Un Sistema Representativo de Gobierno*. (Paper para el Seminario Municipal para la Región Centroamericana sobre Los Elementos Esenciales de la Actividad Municipal.) Tegucigalpa, Honduras: RHUDO/CA (USAID), 1991.
- Morgan, Mary. *Stretching the Development Dollar: The Potential for Scaling-Up*. Inter-American Foundation (IAF) Grassroots Development, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1990): 2-11.
- O'Regan, F.; Walker E; Hellinger, D.; Bendavid-Val, Avrom; Hellinger, S. *Public Participation in Regional Development Planning: A Strategy for Popular Involvement*. The Development GAP Paper No. 3. Washington, DC: The Development Group for Alternative Policies (DGAP), 1980.
- PADCO. *Declaración de los Procedimientos y Recomendaciones del Seminario Regional Sobre los Elementos Esenciales de Actividad Municipal*. (Sponsored by FEMICA and USAID RHUDO/CA). Washington, DC: PADCO, 1991.

Bibliography, 2

- Potter, Robert B. *Urbanisation and Planning in the 3rd World: Spatial Perceptions and Public Participation*. London & Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Powell, Walter W. *Neither Market Nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization*. Research in Organizational Behavior. Vol. 12 (1990): 295-336.
- Ralston, Lenore; Anderson, James; Colson, Elizabeth. *Voluntary Efforts in Decentralized Management*. University of California, Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1983.
- Riofrío, Gustavo. *Habilitación urbana con participación popular: tres casos en Lima, Perú*. Eschborn: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), 1976.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A.; Wilson, Patricia. *Linking Decentralization and Regional Development Planning: The IRD Project in Peru*. American Planning Association Journal. (Summer 1987): 348-357.
- Sewell, W. R. Derrick; Coppock, J.T.; eds. *Public Participation in Planning*. London: John Wiley and Sons, 1977.
- Smith, Laverna Sofia. *Citizen Participation in Natural Resource Planning Programs: A Framework for Contextual Analysis*. Master's Thesis, Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin, 1979.
- Stohr, Walter B; Fraser, D.R. Taylor, eds. *Development from Above or Below? The Dialectics of Regional Planning in Developing Countries*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1981.
- Wheaton, Sandra. *Regional Participatory Planning: A Framework for Development in Latin America*. Master's Thesis. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin, 1991.

COSTA RICA

- CECADE. *CECADE: Ideas y Acciones al Servicio de los Grupos Populares*. Segunda Edición. San José, Costa Rica: CECODE, 1991.
- CONCERTACION. *Concertación Centroamericana de Organismos de Desarrollo*. (Información Básica). San José, Costa Rica, 1991.
- Dirección Nacional de Desarrollo de la Comunidad (DINADECO). *Ley sobre el Desarrollo de la Comunidad y sus Reglamentos*. (25 Aniversario). Costa Rica: DINADECO. 7 de abril de 1992.
- IFOM. *Información Básica de la Municipalidad de Turriabla*. San José, Costa Rica: IFOM, Departamento de Asistencia Técnica, 1990.

IFOM. *Información Básica de la Municipalidad de La Unión*. San José, Costa Rica: IFOM, Departamento de Asistencia Técnica, 1990.

Ministerio de la Justicia. *Ley de Asociaciones*. Colección de Pesamiento Jurídico: Cuarta Edición. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial Porvenir, 1991.

Osorio, Antonio, *Informe de Actividades en la Actividad de Escritura de Casos Relevantes de Participación Comunitaria en Costa Rica*. San José, Costa Rica, 1991.

EL SALVADOR

_____, *Análisis sobre la Legislación Municipal y de los Componente Técnicos, Económicos y Administrativos que Limitan el Alcance de la Autonomía Municipal*, Enero de 1992, DEICO, S.A.

_____, *Código Municipal de El Salvador*, Septiembre 1989.

_____, *Manual de Operaciones de CONARA*, Octubre 1989.

Martínez, Ing. Miguel . *Investigación sobre la Participación de la Comunidad en Pro del Desarrollo Municipal: Informe Técnico/El Salvador*. San Salvador, El Salvador: DEICO, enero de 1992.

GUATEMALA

_____, *Constitución Política de la República de Guatemala*, 1985.

_____, *Código Municipal*, Decreto No.58-88, 1988.

Echegaray, Francisco L. . *Descentralización Administrativa y Consejos de Desarrollo Urbano y Rural: El Proyector GUA/88/005 y otros Proyectos Relacionados*, Naciones Unidas, Abril 1991.

Echegaray, Francisco L. . *La Experiencia de Guatemala en la Descentralización: Una Apreciación Objetiva*, INCAE, Guatemala, 1991.

Ferguson, Bruce W.; and Echegaray, Francisco I. *Municipal Development in Guatemala: A Role for USAID*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, November 1991.

Fundación Interamerica. *La Participación de las ONG en Guatemala y los Grupos Típicos con los Cuales Trabaja la Fundación Interamericana*. Guatemala, Guatemala: Fundación Interamericana, 1991.

HONDURAS

Aguilar, René. *Participación Comunitaria en la Municipalidad de San Pedro Sula*. San Pedro Sula, Honduras: 1991.

Callejas, Rafael Leonardo. *Plan de Gobierno 1990-1994*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: 1990.

Congreso Nacional de Honduras. *Constitución de la República de Honduras*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: 1982.

Federación de Organizaciones Privadas de Desarrollo de Honduras (FOPRIDEH), *Directorio de OPD*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: FOPRIDEH, 1990.

González, César. *Estudio Regional Sobre la Participación Comunitaria en el Sector Municipal: Honduras*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras, diciembre de 1991.

República de Honduras. *Ley de Municipalidades 1990*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras, 1990.

República de Honduras. *Ley General de la Administración Pública*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras, octubre de 1996.

NICARAGUA

_____, *Constitución Política de Nicaragua*, 1987.

_____, *Ley de Municipios*, Ley No.40. Agosto 1988.

Movimiento Comunal Nicaragüense, *Primer Encuentro Nacional de Brigadistas Populares de Salud: La Salud Comunitaria—Un Compromiso de Todos*. Managua, Nicaragua: Movimiento Comunal (Juntos en Defensa de la Vida), 11 de agosto de 1991.

Perez, Luisa Amanda. *El Municipio en Nicaragua: La Participación Comunitaria en la Gestión Municipal*. Managua, Nicaragua: 1991.

Perez, Luisa Amanda. *Casos para el Estudio de la Participación: los Municipios de León y San Isidro*. Managua, Nicaragua, 1991.

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

A. MUNICIPAL MANDATES, LOCAL GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES AND MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATIONS

COSTA RICA

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|---|
| 1. | Eduardo Azofeifa | Director, Publication, Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM) |
| 2. | Oscar Delgado | GDO Officer, USAID/Costa Rica |
| 3. | Jorge Enrique Esquivel | Researcher, Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM) |
| 4. | Olga Fallas | Asst. to Executive Director, Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM) |
| 5. | Henry Reynolds | Chief, GDO Office, USAID/Costa Rica |
| 6. | Miguel Angel Rodriguez | President, National Congress |
| 7. | Benedicto Solis Rojas | Assistant to Executive Secretary, Union Nacional de Gobiernos Locales (UNGL) |
| 8. | Guillermo Sorbio | Executive Director, Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM) |
| 9. | Jorge Urbina | President, Pro Desarrollo |
| 10. | Roberto Valverde | Researcher, Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM) |
| 11. | Carlos Venancio Mora | Executive Secretary, Union Nacional de Gobiernos Locales |

EL SALVADOR

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--|
| 1. | Thomas Hawk | AID |
| 2. | Francisco Flores | Vice-ministro de Planificación |
| 3. | Carlos Alfredo Molina | Instituto Salvadoreño de Desarrollo Municipal (ISDEM) |
| 4. | Norma de Dawe | Comisión Nacional de Restauración de Areas (CONARA) |
| 5. | Martín Rieger | German Technical Cooperation Agency for Development (GTZ) |
| 6. | Pedro Chinchilla | German Technical Cooperation Agency for Development (GTZ) |
| 7. | Tránsito Cepeda | Alcalde de Armenia |
| 8. | Guillermo A. Martínez | Alcalde de San Julián |
| 9. | Abraham López de León | Alcalde de Sonsonate |
| 10. | Miguel Mardoqueo Rivas | Alcalde de Apaneca |
| 11. | Jorge Abelarde Hasfura | Alcalde de Ahuachapán |
| 12. | Licenciada de Cornejo | Asesor Jurídico, Corporación de Municipalidades de la República de El Salvador (COMURES) |

Persons Interviewed, 2

GUATEMALA

- | | | |
|----|------------------------|--|
| 1. | Bambi Arellano | AID, Guatemala |
| 2. | Anette Taubner | AID, Guatemala |
| 3. | David Hoisher | AID, Guatemala |
| 4. | Alfredo Privado | Ministerio de Desarrollo Urbano y Rural |
| 5. | Francisco Mencos | Instituto Nacional de Administración Pública |
| 6. | Erwin Solórzano | Instituto Nacional de Administración Pública |
| 7. | Joaquín Martínez | Alcalde de Villa Nueva |
| 8. | Mirla Flores de Alfaro | Alcaldesa de Amatitlán |
| 9. | J. Eveldo Yantuchi | Alcalde de Palín |

HONDURAS

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|--|
| 1. | Dennis Aguiluz | Advisor, Municipal Development Sector,
United Nations Development Program |
| 2. | Ronald Carlson | Project Officer, RHUDO, USAID/Honduras |
| 3. | Carlos Fiallos Soto | Secretary General, Centro de Estudios
Económicos, Políticos y Sociales (CEPS) |
| 4. | Juan Pablo Hernandez | Executive Director, Asociación Hondureño de
Municipalidades (AHMUN) |
| 5. | Antonio N. Kawas | General Manager, Banco Municipal Autonomo |
| 6. | Antonio Leva | Mayor, La Ceiba
President, Asociación Hondureña de Municipal-
idades (AMHON) |
| 7. | Jorge Navarro | Director, External Sector, Secretario de
Planificación (SECPLAN) |
| 8. | Virgilio Paredes Machado | General Coordinator, Centro de Estudios
Económicos, Políticos y Sociales (CEPS) |
| 9. | Roque Ruben Pascua R. | Vice Minister, Ministry of Government |
| 10. | Diane Tsitosis | Project Officer, RHUDO, USAID/Honduras |
| 11. | Harry Yager | Project Officer, RHUDO, USAID/Honduras |
| 12. | Margarita Zamora | Tribunal Nacional de Elecciones |

NICARAGUA

- | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|
| 1. | Fernando Mayorga | Delegado Regional del Instituto Nicaragüense
de Fomento Municipal (INIFOM), León |
| 2. | Ramiro Quiróz Carrillo | Técnico Delegación Regional INIFOM, León |
| 3. | Denis Pérez | Técnico Delegación Regional INIFOM, León |
| 4. | Ricardo Castellón | Técnico Delegación Regional INIFOM, León |
| 5. | Eduardo Leiva | Sub-Delegado Delegación Regional INIFOM,
León |

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------------|
| 6. | Luis Felipe Pérez | Alcalde de León |
| 7. | Representantes de las Comarcas en Telica: | |
| | - señor Delgado | (El Nacarito) |
| | - señor Gómez | (El Panal) |
| | - señor Ríos | (Los Cocos) |
| | - señor Gutiérrez | (Garrobo Empinado) |
| 8. | Frank Lanza | Alcalde de Matagalpa |
| 9. | Mariana Gómez | Delegada Regional INIFOM, Granada |
| 10. | Alcalde de Granada | |
| 11. | Delegado Regional | INIFOM, Matagalpa |
| 12. | Alcalde de Diriomo | |
| 13. | Alcalde de Santa Teresa | |
| 14. | Alcaldesa de Jinotepe | |
| 15. | Alcaldesa de La Paz Centro | |
| 16. | Benjamín Lugo | Ministerio de la Presidencia |
| 17. | Cairo Manuel López | Diputado al Congreso |

PANAMA

- | | | |
|-----|------------------|--|
| 1. | Francisco Arbe | Assistant Director, Instituto Panameño para la Democracia Municipal |
| 2. | Augustin Camano | Vice-President, Consejo Nacional de Representantes y Consejales de Panamá |
| 3. | Guillermo Cochez | Congressmen, National Assembly |
| 4. | Marco Fernandez | Director, INCAE en Panama |
| 5. | Migdalia Fuentes | President, Municipal Council, Panama District |
| 6. | Keith Holder | Congressmen, National Assembly |
| 7. | Carol Horning | Assistant Chief, Public Administration Office, USAID/Panama |
| 8. | Edgardo Matteo | Assistant Director, Local Government Program, Ministry of Government and Justice |
| 9. | Debra McFarland | Chief, Public Administration Office, USAID/Panama |
| 10. | Ana Monje | Director, Local Government Division, Ministry of Planning and Economics (MIPPE) |
| 11. | Fautino Moreno | Representative, Caimito, Capira District, Panama Province |
| 12. | Hector Pinilla | Technical Advisor, Mayors office, Panama City |
| 13. | Ivan Romero | Director, Instituto Panameño para la Democracia Municipal |
| 14. | Eduardo Ubarte | Consultant, USAID/Panama |

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

B. URBAN AND REGIONAL STRUCTURES

COSTA RICA

1. José R. Brenes Vega
Viceministro de Planificación, San José, Costa Rica
2. Arq. Cesar Augusto Diaz Poveda
Director, Planificación Sectorial, Ministerio de Planificación, San José, Costa Rica
3. Dr. Juan Luis Delgado Monge
Presidente Ejecutivo, Instituto Nacional de Vivienda y Urbanismo, San José, Costa Rica

HONDURAS

1. Henry Merriam
Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Former Secretario de Urbanismo; former Manager, National Cadaster; former Mayor of Tegucigalpa
2. Carlos Aguirre
Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Former Director General, Planificación Territorial, Secretaria de Planificación

EL SALVADOR

1. Francisco Echeagaray
Urban Development Specialist, Guatemala and El Salvador

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

C. MUNICIPAL FINANCE

COSTA RICA

1. Johny Araya Executive, City of San Jose
2. José R. Madrigal Corrales Director of Finance, San Jose
3. Mario Montero Executive, City of Curridabat
4. Gilberto Gonzalez Director of Pre-Audit for Local Governments, Office of the Comptroller-General
5. Guillermo Saborio Executive Director, Instituto de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM)
6. Olga Fallas Solis Technical Services Director, IFAM
7. Leannette Obando Fiscal Analyst, IFAM
8. Thomas Bloch Director of Libraries, Instituto Centoamericano de Administración de Empresas (INCAE)
9. Henry Reynolds USAID

EL SALVADOR

1. Carlos Alfredo Molina Director of Operaciones, Instituto Salvadoreño de Desarrollo Municipal (ISDEM)
2. Norma Haydee Rodriguez de Dowe Coordinadora General, Comisión Nacional de Restauración de Areas (CONARA)
3. Manuel Alfredo Novoa Flores Desarrollo, Investigación y Consultoría (DEICO)
4. Francisco Alfonso Velasco DEICO
5. Mayors and Finance Directors from the following cities:
Armenia
San Julian
Sonzote
Apaneca
Ahuachapau

Persons Interviewed, 2

GUATEMALA

1. Carlos Nuñez
Division de Rentas Internas, Ministerio de Finanzas Públicas
2. Romero Villatoro
Sub-Director, Contraloría General de Cuentas
3. Guillermo Garcia
Asesor Técnico, INFOM
4. Buenaventura Coronado
Department of Planning, Guatemala City
5. Mayors
Villanueva and Amatitlan
6. Bambi Arellano
USAID
7. Annette Tuebner
USAID
8. David Hoelscher
Economist, USAID

HONDURAS

1. Teobaldo Suazo Enamorado
Comptroller-General
2. Rogue Pasqua
Vice-Ministro, Ministerio de Gobernación
3. Roland Raudales
Director of Technical Assistance, Ministry of Government
4. Antonio N. Kavas
Director-General, Banco Municipal Autónomo (BANMA)
5. Ivis Discua Barillas
Secretary-General, Municipality of Tegucigalpa
6. Reuben Mondragon C.
Economic Assessor, Municipality of Tegucigalpa
7. Deuis Aquiluz
Consultant to Canadian AID

NICARAGUA

1. Santiago Rivas LeClar
President, Instituto Nicaragüense de Fomento Municipal (INIFOM)
2. Flavio Valladares
Director of International Relations, INIFOM
3. Adolfo Rodriguez
Director of Economics and Finance Unit, INIFOM
4. Arnaldo Aleman
Mayor, City of Managua

Persons Interviewed, 3

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---|
| 5. | Julio Morales | Secretary to the Council, City of Managua |
| 6. | Roger Solorzano Marin | Assessor, Office of the Mayor, Managua |
| 7. | Yader Baldizon/Henry Centeno | Decentralization Unit, Ministry of the Presidency |
| 8. | Leonel Rodriguez | Vice Minister, Ministry of Finance |
| 9. | Liliana Ayalde | AID |
| 10. | Mila Brooks | AID |
| 11. | Farid Ayales | AID |
| 12. | Robert Burke | AID (Economist) |

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

D. COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT AND PARTICIPATION

COSTA RICA

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Osorio, Antonio | Profesor, Instituto Centroamericano de Administración de Empresas (INCAE), Alajuela, Costa Rica |
| 2. Sra. María Esther López | Directora Nacional, Dirección Nacional de Desarrollo de la Comunidad (DINADECO) |
| 3. Sr. Carlos V. Mora | Unión Nacional de Gobiernos Locales (UNGL) |
| 4. Sr. Carlos Venancio | Director, Ejecutivo Unión de Cebrienos Locales |
| 5. Sr. William Rueben Soto | Director, Centro de Capacitación para el Desarrollo (CECADE) |
| 6. Lic. René Barrantes | Institute de Fomento y Asesoría Municipal (IFAM) |
| 7. Dr. Miguel Angel Rodriquez | Presidente, Asamblea Legislativa |

EL SALVADOR

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Lic. Miguel Martínez Rodriguez | Desarrollo, Investigación y Consultoría (DEICO) |
| 2. Ing. Carlos Antonio Zavala | DEICO |
| 3. Jim Criste | Director, Desarrollo Juvenil Comunitario (DJC) |
| 4. Lic. Marina Morales Carbonell | Consultora, UNICEF |
| 5. Representante | Fondo de Inversión Social de El Salvador (FISE) |
| 6. Lic. Roberto Figueroa | Fundación Cristiana para el Desarrollo (FUCRIDES) |
| 7. Sr. Rafael Reyes | Dirección de Desarrollo de la Comunidad (DIDECO), Ministerio del Interior |
| 8. Lic. Luis Antonio Bermudez | Comisión Nacional de Restauración de Areas (CONARA) |
| 9. Alcaldías Municipales: | Nueva Salvador, La Libertad |
| Ovidio Palomo Cristales | La Libertad, Nueva San Salvador, La Libertad |
| Elias Calderon Bogle | La Liebertad, La Libertad |
| Luz Angélica Rivera | Alcalde, ~ goza, La Libertad |
| Rafael Baires Pérez | Alcalde, Quetzaltepeque, La Libertad |
| Manuel de Jesús Palacios | Alcalde, San Martín, San Salvador |
| Romeo Humberto González | Alcalde, Apopa, San Salvador |
| Herculano de Jesús Plaero | Alcalde, Ilobasco, Cabañas |
| Renán Humberto Millas | Alcalde, Cojutepeque, Cuscatlán |

A N N E X 4

**CHARTS OF MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT DATA
FROM PADCO REGIONAL MUNICIPAL SECTOR ASSESSMENT**

CHART I. MUNICIPAL MANDATES AND ACTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

CATEGORY	GUATEMALA	EL SALVADOR	NICARAGUA	HONDURAS	COSTA RICA	PANAMA
MUNICIPAL MANDATES						
1. Year of Constitution	1985	1983	1987	1982	1949	1970
2. Constitutional Character of Municipality	Autonomous corporations	Autonomous Entity	Autonomous unit Politico-administrative	Independent	Deliberating Body and City manager	Municipal Council
3. Legal Mandate of Municipality	Municipal Code	Municipal Code	Municipal Code	Municipal Code	Municipal Code	Municipal Code
4. Effective Year	1988	1985 Reforms 1986, 1987	1988	1990; Revised 1991	1971; Revised 1983	1973
5. Municipal Codes Titles and Articles	148 Articles	159 Articles	73 Articles	8 Titles 115 Articles	8 Titles 190 Articles	10 Titles 241 Articles
MUNICIPAL ACTIONS AND ACTIVITIES						
URBAN SERVICES						
1. Urban Street Construction	Municipality	Shared by municipality and Ministry of Public Works	Municipality	SECOPT provides designs and works; municipality assists with labor	MOPT principal function; minimal local assistance	MOP major responsibility; local support for labor
2. (Potable) Water Systems	Municipality has competency; UNEPAR & INFOM for rural areas	Central government (ANDA) in 1982, 5% of municipalities; municipalities the rest	Central government with some municipal participation	SANNA design and local labor	Instituto Costarricense de Acueducto y Alcantarillado major function; about 50% municipalities involved in construction	IDAAN central control water systems; Junta Comunales assist labor
3. Sewage/Drainage Systems	IDEM	Central government	Central government (INAA)	SANNA design and labor	AyA provides all as above	IDAAN major provider
4. Garbage Collection/Disposal	Municipality, Some private operation	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality
5. Street Cleaning	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality	Municipality
6. City Lighting	Instituto Nacional de Electrificación-INDE	Central government (LEL)	Central government (INE)	Empresa Nacional de Electrificación (ENEE)	Compania Nacional de Fuerza y Luz, Cooperatives and some Municipalities	IHRE and has provincial offices
7. Urban Planning/Land Use Zoning	Municipality with some BANVI participation	Shared by municipality and central government (DUA)	Central government	Dirección General Urbano (GDU of SECOPT design and most labor	Central government; cities sell land for profit	Land zones at central, provincial, and municipal level

74

CHART II. STRUCTURE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

CATEGORY	GUATEMALA	EL SALVADOR	NICARAGUA	HONDURAS	COSTA RICA	PANAMA
STRUCTURE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT						
1. Local Authorities Elected	Mayors, Syndicos and Councils by direct vote	Mayor, Syndicos and Councils	Councils elected by direct vote; elect Mayor from among members	Mayor, Syndicos, and regidores elected direct vote	Regidores elected by direct vote	Representatives of corregimientos by districts
2. Local Authorities Selected	--	Governors	--	Governors	City Managers by Municipal Council	Governors of provinces; Mayors of municipalities
3. Municipal Councils	Mayors, Syndicos and Regidores	Regidores, Syndicos and Mayor	Regidores elected make up Municipal Council and elect Mayor	Mayor, Syndico, and regidores make up Municipal Council	Regidores elected make up Municipal Council; elect own President; select City Manager	Elected representatives of corregimientos organize Council and elect President
4. Municipal Administration	Council integrated by a Mayor, Council, Syndico under a Strong Mayor/Weak Council system	Council integrated by a Mayor, Councils and Syndicos with a Strong Council/Weak Mayor system	Municipal Council integrated by Councils and Mayor with Strong Council/Weak Mayor system	Municipal Corporation and Municipal Development Council	Municipal Council made up of regidores, Syndicos, and City Manager	Municipal Council made up of elected representatives cor-regidores; Mayor appointed separately by President
5. Relationship Municipal Government and Lower Levels of Representation	Auxiliary Mayor and municipality delegate	Municipalities responsible for entire municipal region	Formal relationship with popular Councils, municipal popular committees and auxiliary Mayors	Municipality responsible for entire municipal region; informal relationships with aldeas, caserios, and patronatos	Municipality has formal relationship with associations based on budget presentations	510 corregimientos correspond equal with 510 juntas comunales; representatives are President of Junta Comunales
MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS						
i. Electoral Model	Direct for Mayor, Syndicos and Councils	Direct for Mayor and Regidores	Direct for Council, Indirect for Mayor	Direct for Mayor and Regidores	Direct for regidores who form Municipal Council; indirect for municipal executive City Manager	Direct for 510 cor-regidores of corregimientos; Mayor appointed by President
2. Relationship Candidates with Parties	Listed by parties, 10% by civic movements	Listed only by political parties	Listed only by political parties	Mayors, Regidores, Syndicos listed by party	Regidores listed by parties	Cor-regidores listed by parties
3. Period of office	5 years in municipality with more than 20,000; 2-1/2 for rest	3 years	6 years	4 years	4 years	4 years
4. Last Election	January 1991	March 1989	February 1990	November 1989	February 1990	March 1989