

**Deloitte &
Touche**



PA-AMU-3-0
154 27526

**IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT
ESTONIAN VOUCHER PROGRAM**

Draft Deliverable

**Delivery Order No. 12
Task III, Asset Distribution Programs
Implementation Assistance**

**Contract No. EUR-0014-I-00-1056-00
U.S. Agency for International Development
EUR/RME/ER/ED**

MARCH 1993

**Deloitte Touche
Tohmatsu
International**

**IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT
OF THE ESTONIAN VOUCHER PROGRAM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II. FINDINGS	6
III. SPECIFIC PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS	9
IV. METHODOLOGY	15

APPENDICES

A. ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE	TAB 1
B. LIST OF INTERVIEWS	TAB 2
C. TRAINING	TAB 3
D. LIST OF PARTICIPATING OFFICES	TAB 4

IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT OF THE ESTONIAN VOUCHER PROGRAM

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Introduction

This report is the result of a study undertaken by the Deloitte & Touche privatization team in Estonia, funded by USAID, during the period 22 February to 12 March 1993. The findings and recommendations of the study are based on interviews with a number of officials, both at the National and the local level. The authors would like to express their thanks for all those who agreed to give their time to answer our questions and assist us in many other ways. The Team would particularly like to thank Mr. Endel Kaljusmaa of the National Housing Board, and Mrs. Tiit Strauss of the Estonian State Computing Center (ESCC), who arranged interviews for us with officials outside Tallinn.

The Team attempted to get the fullest possible cross-section of viewpoints for this study, particularly at the local level. The Team spoke with local officials in the largest city of Estonia, Tallinn; in two smaller cities, Tartu and Viljandi; in a town in the Russian-speaking area of the country, Kohtla-Järve; and in a small village, Vosu.

This report is organized into five main sections:

- This executive summary
- The Team's findings, both positive and negative
- Problems identified, and recommended solutions
- A description of the methodology used in the study
- Various appendices, including the questionnaire used; lists of persons interviewed; status of training programs; and a list of local offices and the populations they serve.

The executive summary is meant to highlight the main results of the study, which are described in more detail in the rest of the report.

2. Summary of Findings

In general the voucher distribution program, while it is still in its beginning stages, is going well. A large number of voucher cards have already been issued, perhaps as many as a third of the total. A few have already come back with the years worked filled in, and in one or two exceptional cases, housing units have actually been privatized using vouchers.

The Automated Voucher System, the computer program that will be used in managing the Popular Capital Obligations (the voucher program for mass privatization of the Government of Estonia), is now operational (though some additional features still need to be added to it), local offices have been trained to use it, and it is actually being used to collect data in a number of places. There are a great many computers installed in local offices that will run this program, so that the vast majority of data entry into the computer will take place at local offices close to where the information is collected. The ESCC has embarked on a wide-ranging training program for users of the Automated Voucher System which is improving its absorption and use by the local authorities. It appears that the Automated Voucher System program, which will be the first management information system widely used by all levels of government in Estonia, will be a success.

The local government offices which are administering the voucher program are competent and have been informed and trained by a campaign of seminars and written instructions from the National level. In spite of the fact that they have received no additional funding or personnel to do the work associated with the program, they are generally doing a good job of carrying out their responsibilities. They are especially good at adjusting procedures to local conditions, so that the voucher program is not held up by rigid rules from the National offices.

The general public is much less well-informed about the voucher program than the national and local officials. Government publicity has done a good job of informing people that they must hurry and pick up their voucher cards before the deadline for issuing them (now set at 30 April, but likely to be extended), but publicity has been less effective at communicating other aspects of the program. Individuals are still asking questions such as:

- What is the exact procedure for getting vouchers and privatizing my apartment?
- What else can I use vouchers for, besides housing?
- What is a voucher really worth?

and many more. The public information that has been issued has been partly obscured by negative misinformation from the media, and rumors from those who may be angry about the past, or fearful about the future. As a result, the public may be confused and pessimistic about the voucher program.

The legal framework for the voucher program, even for Popular Capital Obligations used for housing privatization, is not yet entirely in place. A law is now before Parliament to clarify which years worked count for vouchers. Another law will clarify the procedures and fees for registering a housing sale, so that privatization can proceed. Furthermore, a whole new set of vouchers, for compensation, are planned, as are new uses for both Popular Capital Obligations and the new compensation vouchers. These new laws will create a whole new set of implementation issues and problems

The voucher system as a whole is susceptible to error, and even outright fraud, in a number of areas. Controls and protection against fraud are minimal or non-existent at present. In addition, legislative action has not been taken to define the penalties for fraud with respect to obtaining and using vouchers.

The ESCC is already heavily burdened with administration of the voucher program, for which they have received no additional funding or staffing. The ESCC's is the only phone number mentioned in the voucher card instructions, so all the local offices are calling there for answers to their questions. This situation will be aggravated as more cards are returned and more housing privatized.

One party involved in the voucher program is highly motivated to see that it succeeds quickly: the local housing offices, which are now responsible for management and maintenance of buildings from which they receive low rents, or none at all. The other parties -- the local governments and individual persons -- lack incentives to privatize housing.

3. Summary of Problems

The Team uncovered a variety of problems, large and small, in its study. Following are brief discussions of the most important ones:

An obvious problem that the Team uncovered during this study, mentioned by nearly all the interviewees, is the lack of information on the part of the public. The immediate effect of this is to slow down the process of issuing cards, and waste precious time of local officials in answering basic questions for each individual who comes in for a card. The longer term effect could be dissatisfaction with the whole process, and public antagonism towards privatization in general.

A second problem that was mentioned over and over to the Team in its interviews was that the program is open to abuse and fraud. This could lead to unscrupulous individuals amassing more vouchers than they are entitled to. This in turn could feed any dissatisfaction with the program, and lead to antagonism towards privatization. At the limit, it could exacerbate ethnic and political tensions in the country, if many cases were rumored of one ethnic group profiting illegally.

A third problem is that many of the participants in the process -- the local housing authorities, local government officials, apartment-dwellers, and others do not have many real incentives to privatize state-owned housing. For the residents, many think it would be better to continue to pay low state-subsidized rents and utilities rather than take the burden of ownership of potentially worthless apartments on themselves. Local government officials are often not compensated for the additional work required or, if they are, they may fear that when the housing privatization is completed, they will be out of a job.

A final problem is that the last step in the use of vouchers for housing privatization, the actual purchase of housing with vouchers, is the one that involves the most difficult procedural problems and is likely to create far more questions than the issuing of vouchers. The condominium associations which must be formed are a whole new concept, of which no one has experience. There is a so far unresolved legal issue of who will pay the fee for notaries to register sales of housing, and what the fee will be. And perhaps most daunting of all, there are no mortgage loans available in Estonia at this time, which is likely to freeze the whole free market for housing in its tracks.

4. Summary of Recommended Solutions

The body of this report contains a great many recommendations to address the problems mentioned above. A few of them are most important, and address multiple problems, both large and small. This summary describes these most important recommendations.

The Team's first recommendation is that some office at the National level should "own" the voucher program; that is it should have overall responsibility of ensuring that all laws, procedures, training, and other resources are in place to make the program a success. Not only should there be such an office, there should be some person in charge of the office whose personal success or failure is tied to the program. This office, and the individual responsible, could be located in the Department of State Property, in the National Housing Board, or in a number of other places. The important recommendation is that the office and the responsibility should exist somewhere.

The Team's second recommendation is that a sustained, and not necessarily expensive, public information campaign should be undertaken to explain the voucher program to the Estonian public. One simple but important part of the campaign should be a one or two page document with the most commonly asked questions about the program, and answers to them. This document could be passed out to people when they pick up their voucher cards, and it could be made available in various public offices, too. The campaign might also include more newspaper articles and radio and TV broadcasts about the program.

The Team's third recommendation is that a well-thought-out attack should be made to prevent fraud and eliminate errors in the voucher program. The Team is already undertaking a preliminary analysis of fraud and error at the request of Mrs. Kajandu's working group under Mrs. Hänni. The report on that analysis should be ready at about the same time as this report.

The Team's final recommendation is that a package of measures should be devised to give everybody involved in the voucher program incentives to carry out the program and to privatize the housing. There especially need to be incentives to motivate individuals to buy their housing units, such as promises to perform capital improvements in their buildings if they privatize, assistance with forming condominiums, and others. It is very important, too,

to find ways to encourage the banks to begin providing mortgage loans to finance both the initial purchase of housing, and its resale.

5. Conclusion

The voucher program is off to a good start at this time. While there are some serious problems which the Team has identified in the course of its assessment, these can be resolved with the current resources and capabilities within the Estonian government and society. The legislative problems (or inaction) might make it appear that the overall Popular Capital Obligation program is at a standstill. This, however, is not the case at all. Local authorities across the country are issuing voucher applications; citizens are filling in their years worked; central authorities are crediting citizens with vouchers; and the ESCC is actively creating the register of voucher holders. Therefore, with effective and proactive stewardship by the Ministry of Reform, and with proper incentives offered to all participants, the implementation of this program can be expected to continue as planned.

II. FINDINGS

The major findings of the Deloitte & Touche Team Assessment Survey are the following:

1. The Popular Capital Voucher distribution is well underway. Most local governments have begun the process of registration and issuing popular capital obligation cards (on which applicants will specify years worked in order to receive the correct number of vouchers). (See Appendix D, List of Issuing Offices and the populations they serve.)
2. Only a few applicants have returned completed voucher forms with years worked specified.
3. The computerized "Automated Voucher System" is operational and has been distributed to local housing offices and other authorities around the country. It is in use in many locations and will come on line shortly in many others. (See Appendix D)
4. At the local level, 75-80 % of all applications for vouchers are being processed using computers and the State Computing Center software. Therefore only approximately 1/4 of all applications will need to be entered into the computer system directly by the State Computing Center itself.
5. There is, generally, enough computer hardware at the local government level for the Automated Voucher System software to be a useful tool.
6. The State Computing Center has and is providing adequate training for computer operators which makes it possible for the local governments to make adequate use of the software. (See Appendix C)
7. The State Computer Center is bearing the burden of questions about the voucher program and uses of vouchers. They are understaffed and under-financed for this task.
8. There is a good deal of local variation in implementation procedures. This does not cause problems because the information forms are standardized and all necessary information is being collected. In fact, it solves problems, because some special cases, such as housing units belonging to collective farms, co-operatives, or private joint ventures, are slightly ambiguous in the law. Local initiative allows these special cases to be handled successfully without calling on help from the national government.
9. Only a few state-owned housing units have been privatized as yet. One of the reasons for the general hold-up of housing privatization is that legislation governing property transfer and registration has not been finalized, so that the legal framework to finalize

sales contracts is lacking. This means that the process is going more slowly than planned and more slowly than in other countries.

10. There are many changes and additions to the program planned. There will be new uses for vouchers (land, shares, bonds), new kinds of vouchers (compensation vouchers), and at least one major new participant in administration (the State Savings Bank). This will create a whole new set of implementation issues and problems.
11. Old conflicts (such as whether or not to give credit for years in paid positions with communist party organs) have slowed down the process of finalizing the voucher legislation.
12. The overall voucher system is open to fraud in a number of areas: duplication of applications, falsification of working years, duplicate claims for inheritance, claims for additional children. In addition, there are no clear penalties for fraudulent activities with respect to the voucher program.
13. Local government administrators receive information about the voucher program via seminars and instruction/reference manuals and they have personal access to knowledgeable officials in the national government. The administrators therefore have fairly complete information about the process of the voucher program and the current and future uses of vouchers, and they generally have sufficient information to administer the voucher program.
14. Different groups in the population have reacted differently to the voucher program and its requirements. Elderly people are most responsive, ethnic Russians are most confused and fear being left out of the process, and young working people find the process burdensome because it is so time consuming and they probably will not receive a great deal of vouchers in any case.
15. Government publicity has been effective, in Estonian speaking areas, in getting people to register for vouchers and pick up their voucher cards.
16. Government publicity has been somewhat less effective in Russian-speaking areas. One reason for this is that Russian-speakers may watch Russian TV broadcasts and hear about the Russian voucher program, which is quite different from Estonia's. The Russian-speaking population probably has even more questions and doubts about the voucher program than the Estonian speakers.
17. Even though people are applying for vouchers, the general public is confused and uninformed about many aspects of the voucher program. They have many questions about the steps in the process beyond picking up the card, and about their options to use the vouchers for other purposes than housing privatization. Their unanswered questions may lead to pessimism and opposition to the whole voucher program.

18. It is not clear to individuals who own their own housing what value the vouchers have for them.
19. Local governments are financing the employees and hardware for the program from their own local budgets. This reduces the amount of money available at the local level for other important services such as health, education, and welfare.
20. For local government administrators, there is no real incentive to move quickly to finish registration and issuing of vouchers. They fear that when the process is finished, there will be a necessary reduction in employment in their offices. In addition, they are not being paid more for what they see as more work.
21. For local housing offices, there is a great incentive to privatize houses in their jurisdiction. In the past, their budgets were paid by the Government. At present, they must pay their costs from the rents they receive, which are insufficient to meet the utility and maintenance expenses for their complexes.
22. For individuals living in state-owned housing, there is little or no incentive to take ownership. State-owned housing currently costs very little, is often poorly located, and does not appear to be a good investment.

III. SPECIFIC PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS

1. **Problem:** Issuing voucher application cards (the first step in the process) should take only a few minutes. However, due to questions about the vouchers and their uses being asked by applicants, the process can take up to 15 or 20 minutes. This causes long lines and overwhelms the administrative capacity of understaffed local institutions. There has been some public information disseminated, but it has not been extensive enough, and it has been counteracted to a certain extent by negative reporting about the program in the local press.

Solution: A simple public information campaign which would include a short written hand-out available at all voucher distribution points, newspaper and radio information segments on the process and uses of vouchers, and a public information telephone line that the general public could call with questions. Note that some people, especially retirees, don't have phones, or access to free public phones; and can't afford a radio or newspaper. Therefore the information sheet should be available at offices other than housing offices, such as pension offices, banks, city hall front desk, etc.

However, public information alone will not completely resolve the problem of long lines and applicants with questions. It may be possible to distribute cards by mail or set up local satellite offices in companies so that people will not have to miss time at work.

2. **Problem:** The system is open to fraud in dispensing vouchers of people who have died since 1 January 1992.

According to the law, all residents of Estonia as of 1 January 1992 are eligible for vouchers. The vouchers of eligible residents who have died since that date are to be distributed to their heirs. The present implementation protocol cannot determine whether an heir who presents himself for a deceased person's vouchers is really the sole heir to that person.

Solution: A notarized statement by the heir would make the heir liable for fraud if he or she misrepresents his or her situation. However, there is no real way to prevent people from being dishonest -- only ways to make it more costly if detected.

3. **Problem:** There are several situations in which it may be possible for applicants to file for more than one voucher card:

- A. It is already possible that an individual or family may have kept more than one public housing unit, and therefore is registered in more than one housing office. In such a case, and perhaps in others, it is possible for the members of

the family to get duplicate voucher cards from more than one housing offices.

- B. Cyrillic to Latin transliteration. Russian names may be transliterated into Latin spelling in several different ways, so that even comparing names in the computerized data base may fail to find cases of erroneous or fraudulent duplications. This exacerbates the problem with duplicate registration and thereby may increase the incidence of fraud.

Solution: This problem may only be resolved after the fact. At some point, it may be possible to require that all parties with vouchers must have a new passport or personal ID number -- at which point duplicate records will become evident. This will only become feasible when the greatest majority of the population, perhaps 80%, have already been issued their unique personal numbers (whether passport or personal ID), and staff is in place to issue the rest quickly on request.

- 4. **Problem:** There are two related problems having to do with certification of years worked:

- A. It may be possible to persuade enterprise personnel officers to put down more years worked on the card than the individual is entitled to. Then, even if the office that receives the stamp attempts to verify the years worked by contacting the personnel office, the fraud may not be detected.
- B. It may be relatively easy to fill in the years worked oneself, and forge a signature and enterprise seal. Under present procedures, the office that receives the card does not attempt to verify the authenticity of the signature and stamp. Most local offices do not have lists of local enterprises and their enterprise registration numbers, nor do they know what the enterprises' seals look like.

Solution: One partial solution is to use the computer system to check that total years claimed does not exceed the total working years possible based on age. However, this solution does not address the problem of applicants falsifying their years worked to gain credit for time spent outside of the country or in non-eligible occupations. It may not be possible to guard against this type of fraud -- it is inherent in a system based on classification of work experience rather than simply on age.

- 5. **Problem:** Voucher applicants do not normally receive any sort of receipt when they submit a completed voucher application form. As a result, applicants may feel reluctant to relinquish their application form as it is the sole physical evidence that they have a voucher claim. The lack of a physical record may also be contributing to the apathy amongst some segments of the population.

Solution: The Estonian Government is discussing the use of "checkbooks" issued by the State Savings Bank to represent the ownership of a voucher account in the Automated Voucher System. This physical manifestation of a voucher, which is, however, not tradeable, may alleviate the problem.

Another solution is to authorize local institutions to issue receipts to applicants when they turn in completed application forms.

6. **Problem:** Residents of multi-unit housing who want to privatize their flats must form condominium associations to handle maintenance of common property and all other problems common to the multi-unit building as a whole. The general public is uninformed about condominium associations. It does not understand their benefits, nor how to form them nor what they will really accomplish. In addition, there are several outstanding issues in the legislation of these associations.

Solution: To some extent, a public information campaign to disseminate information about condominium associations to the general public will resolve part of the problem. Insofar as there are unresolved issues in the legislation concerning condominium associations, these will have to be resolved before the process can be completed.

7. **Problem:** Payment for processing various segments of a housing privatization cause several difficulties:

A. Housing privatization in general is being held up because it has not been decided whether notaries will be paid for registering privatization sales. Until the issue is decided, by pending legislation, the notaries generally will not complete the sales.

B. The immediate transaction costs, that is the notary fee, for privatizing a housing unit will discourage one party or another in the process. If the individual doing the privatizing must pay the notary fee to register the privatization, the individual will be discouraged. If the notary is told to process the privatization for nothing, the notary may refuse.

Solution: In a market economy, services in real estate transactions are must be paid for. Since the Government wishes to encourage housing privatization, the Team recommends that the Government should pay the fees to the notaries

8. **Problem:** Housing privatization is being held up by the lack of money at all levels, first at the administrative levels, and more importantly for the future, lack of mortgage finance money.

Solution: The Team recommends that the Government use some of the funds earned from privatization to pay the expenses of privatization. The Team also recommends

that the Government work closely with the emerging banking sector to support the development of mortgage lending. This support could include Government guarantees for certain types of mortgages.

9. **Problem:** There is a lack of incentives for different participants in the overall process.
- A. Administrators at the local government level could be concerned about a loss of jobs in their department when the process is over. In addition, they are not being paid any more to do what is perceived as additional work.
 - B. People who live in state-owned housing may lose their low state-subsidized rents (non-payment of which brings few consequences) and maintenance costs. They do not feel they would gain anything in return by privatization because they feel that the state-owned apartments are poorly constructed, badly located, badly maintained, and generally a poor investment.
 - C. Retirees face a particularly difficult time in getting their voucher cards filled out with years worked. Retirees' workbooks are held by pension offices who sometimes throw up obstacles to the retirees. The pension offices may balk at the time required to fill out the voucher applications for retirees, especially because retirees usually have long and complicated work histories which makes calculating years worked a tedious process.

Solutions: There are a number of different possible solutions to these two problems:

- A. Provide incentive bonuses for local government officials once they have finished their part in the voucher program. Although there is no money in the budget for this at present, perhaps some funding could be made available from the proceeds from privatization.
- B. Implement a public information campaign extolling the virtues of private ownership -- especially stressing equity from ownership and the possibilities this creates for a private real-estate market.
- C. Provide incentives to real estate agents to handle privatized state-owned housing, such as offering them office space in local housing offices, subsidized mortgages for buyers, tax breaks on real estate profits, etc.
- D. Local governments could promise material improvements in living conditions if privatization goes forward, for example, a local housing office could build a new roof for a building that is to be privatized.

- E. In order to remove some of the advantages of continuing to live in state-owned housing, local housing offices could install heat and other utility meters and start charging real costs for utilities and maintenance even if units have not been privatized. In addition, the national government could be more diligent in collecting rents currently due and evicting people who will not pay.
- F. State-owned occupied housing could be made available to any investors -- not only inhabitants.

10. **Problem:** Owners of private houses do not see any concrete use of the vouchers that would interest them since they already own their own houses. Therefore, they do not want to take the time and effort to go through the voucher application process.

Solution: The reason for this problem will be alleviated when legislation governing additional uses for vouchers is finalized. In addition, the Government should publicize these other uses.

11. **Problem:** There are ambiguities and inconsistencies in the present law about how many years an individual should be credited for. Pending legislation may resolve some questions, but could create new ones as well. Even if all the questions were resolved at the national level, there would be a problem of communicating the new information down to the local governments and housing offices, and to the general public.

Solution: As soon as the pending legislation is passed, there should be a renewed series of written information and seminars for local government officials and housing offices. Increased staff should be authorized in the State Computing Center to answer telephone inquiries from the local level. Finally, a continued public information campaign should explain the new legislation to the public.

12. **Problem:** There is no national-level office that "owns" the voucher program. The Department of State Property, the National Housing Board, and the State Computing Center are all participants, but no one has been specifically charged with the responsibility of successfully carrying out the program

Solution: The Minister of Reform could name a specific office as responsible for the overall program. This office could be any one of those mentioned above.

13. **Problem:** A few local areas, such as Kohtla-Järve and Narva, have either not yet started to issue voucher cards, or are issuing them more slowly than most places. This may be due to a variety of local factors, such as not enough local staff. It does not seem to be due to any purely ethnic factor, even though both Kohtla-Järve and Narva are in the Russian-speaking Northeast.

Solution: A national-level office, the "owner" of the voucher program if one is created, should visit local governments which are lagging in their response to the program and assist them in whatever way is necessary in their particular case.

14. **Problem:** It is not clear who owns housing blocks that are part of collective farms, which were originally financed by the state, nor is it clear how to use vouchers to buy an apartment in such a block. This is a case where the agricultural voucher program could overlap and possibly conflict with the Popular Capital Voucher program.

Solution: Additional work is required to determine a solution to this particular problem.

15. **Problem:** Agricultural privatization continues to be relatively uncoordinated with overall privatization. This causes several problems, including confusion and uncertainty over conversion of agricultural vouchers to Popular Capital Obligations.

Solution: Continued efforts should be made to improve communication and coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture and the other Ministries concerned with privatization.

16. **Problem:** Prices for housing set by the privatization law seem unfair to residents of small towns and rural areas since housing location is not a major determining factor in price. The law fixes the prices within a single narrow band for the whole country. This price is probably below a market price everywhere, even in the countryside. But it is far below market price for housing in attractive neighborhoods of major cities. From the point of view of poorer people, it may seem that the old elites who generally live in the more attractive urban areas are again getting the better deal than the general public.

Solution: Widen the band of prices for housing privatization so that there are market-clearing low prices in the countryside, and closer to market, higher prices in cities and particularly in good neighborhoods.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The Estonian Government has signalled housing privatization as one of its top priorities with respect to the overall privatization program. However, the number of institutions involved and the physical complexity of the application may make orderly implementation difficult. The Deloitte & ToucheTeam undertook to study the current status of program implementation with the view to identifying existing and potential roadblocks and providing recommendations for their resolution.

In order to achieve these objectives, the Deloitte & ToucheTeam prepared a standard questionnaire (with 23 questions) and used it as a framework for conducting interviews with participants in the Popular Capital Obligation program of the Government (See Appendix A). These participants included representatives from local governments, local housing offices, central government housing and computer agencies, as well as policy makers in the government and parliament.

The questionnaire was designed to allow theTeam to compare the opinions and experiences of these diverse participants concerning the program. The specific questions were designed to 1) test theTeam's existing hypothesis about problems with the program; 2) assess progress and methods of implementation at the local level; and 3) unearth any additional problems or solutions. For example, theTeam initially hypothesized that training of participants and public relations would both be areas for improvement. However, theTeam learned that training was quite well addressed already by the State Computing Center who had established a training center for the software program which manages the Popular Capital Obligation distribution. Training had also been addressed by the National Housing Board, who had conducted seminars for local officials to instruct them on the details of the overall Popular Capital Obligation program and its specific relationship to housing privatization.

TheTeam translated the questionnaire into Estonian and distributed it at the start of each interview with the participants. This improved the consistency of results because virtually all the local interviews were, of necessity, conducted in Estonian with a translator. Each interview took approximately one hour, sometimes more. In spite of the time and logistical constraints, theTeam was still able to conduct enough interviews to form a representative sample. (See Appendix B)

At the time of the survey, implementation was occurring at the local level, however detailed and comparable information which would allow theTeam to analyze the program was not being channeled from the local level to the center in a formal manner. For this reason, theTeam identified a representative sample of local participants including county, municipal, and housing officials in large and small cities and small towns. In addition, by visiting participants in the south-central regions (Tartu and Viljandi), the urban center (Tallinn), and the north-east (Kohtla-Järve, Vosu), theTeam's results are sensitive to local and ethnic population variations. (See Appendix B)

Appendix A

ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to develop an implementation plan for the Housing Voucher Program, answers to the following questions are necessary:

Generally

1. How much time does it take for a local housing office or local government to issue a "yellow card"?
2. How much time does it take for an office to accept a filled in yellow card (to verify data, answer any questions)?
3. Which offices will accept completed cards (only local government offices, or will some local housing offices also accept and process completed cards?)
4. Which offices are currently computerized and which are not?
5. Is it possible to computerize additional offices?

For Computerized Offices

6. For each computerized office, how many computers are there and how many employees who know how to operate them?
7. For each computerized office, how many completed voucher applications do they expect to receive?
8. Who will install the Automated Housing Voucher software and verify its correct operation?
9. If computer operators have questions about the software or the process, who can they call? Does the State Computing Center have the resources to handle questions like this?
10. What is the schedule for installation of the computerized system?
11. Which offices will be computerized, in which order?

12. How often, and in what manner will data from the computerized offices be submitted to the State Computing Center?
13. What procedures exist for correction of errors in data entry?

For Non-computerized Offices

14. For each non-computerized office, how many employees do they have?
15. For each non-computerized office, how many completed voucher applications are expected?
16. Where will data be sent for computerization? (To other local governments or housing offices with computers? Directly to the State Computing Center?)
17. In what format will data be sent? (will it be compiled or processed in any way by the non-computerized offices?)
18. How often will the data be sent (every day, once a week, once a month?)
19. What are the review procedures to ensure that non-computerized data is error free before it is forwarded to a computerized office for processing?
20. What procedures exist for correcting errors discovered at the computerized processing office? (Will the form be returned to the originating office, will a written query be sent, will a representative of the computerized processing office telephone the originating office?)

Overall Programmatic Assessment

21. Where do gaps in information and **understanding** exist?
22. Is there a pattern? (Are there certain **areas** of the country or types of participating institution where information is most **lacking** or level of understanding is lowest?)
23. What is the nature of the misunderstandings? (Which component of the housing voucher program causes the greatest confusion? Is it collecting data from applicants, entering data into the system, dealing with **general** questions from housing voucher applicants, assessing the completeness of applications, or generally, being informed and understanding the newly promulgated laws)

ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

QUESTIONNAIRE (ESTONIAN VERSION)

Elamispinnaosakute programm

Programmi juurutamiseks vajalik informatsioon

Selleks, et välja töötada elamispinnaosakute programmi juurutamise plaani, on vajalik vastata järgmistele küsimustele:

Kõigile -

1. Kui palju kulub aega elamuvalitsuses või kohalikus omavalitsuses nn. kollase kaardi väljastamiseks?
2. Kui palju aega kulub vastavas asutuses selleks, et vastu võtta täidetud kollane kaart (kontrollida andmed, vastata küsimustele)?
3. Millised asutused võtavad vastu täidetud kaarte (kas ainult kohalikud omavalitsused või ka mõningad kohalikud elamuvalitsused hakkavad vastu võtma ja töötleva täidetud kaarte)?
4. Millised asutused on käesoleval ajal varustatud arvutitega ja millised ei ole?
5. Kas on võimalik arvutitega varustada teisi asutusi täiendavalt?

Arvuteid omavatele asutustele -

6. Iga arvuteid omava asutuse puhul selgitada, mitu arvutit seal on ja kui palju on töotajaid, kes oskavad arvutit kasutada.
7. Igas arvuteid omavas asutuses küsida, kui palju täidetud osakuavaldusi nad oma arvestuste kohaselt arvavad saavat.
8. Kes paigaldab automatiseeritud elamispinnaosakute süsteemi tarkvara ja kontrollib selle õiget funktsioneerimist?
9. Kui arvutioperaatoritel tekib küsimusi seoses protsessi enese või tarkvaraga, kelle poole nad siis pöörduvad? Kas Riigiarvutuskeskusel on piisavalt ressursse taoliste küsimustega tegelemiseks?
10. Milline on arvutisüsteemi paigaldamise ajakava?
11. Millised asutused varustatakse arvutitega ja millises järjekorras?
12. Kui sageli ja millisel viisil edastatakse andmed arvuteid omavates asutustest Riigiarvutuskeskusesse?
13. Millised on olemasolevad protseduurid andmete sisestamisel tekkinud vigade parandamiseks?

Ma

Arvuteid mitteomavatele asutustele -

14. Igalt arvuteid mitteomavalt asutuselt küsida, kui palju on neil töotajaid.
15. Igalt arvuteid mitteomavalt asutuselt küsida, kui suur on oodatav taidetud osakuavalduste arv.
16. Kuhu saadetakse andmed töötlemiseks arvutil? (Kas teitesse, arvuteid omavatesse kohalikesse omavalitsustesse või elamuvalitsustesse? Kas otse Riigiarvutuskeskusesse?)
17. Millises formaadis saadetakse andmed? (Kas andmeid kompileeritakse või töödeldakse mingisugusel viisil arvuteid mitteomavates asutustes?)
18. Kui sageli toimub andmete edastamine? (iga päev, üks kord nädalas, üks kord kuus?)
19. Millised on ülevaateprotseduurid kindlustamaks, et andmetes ei esine vigu enne nende edastamist töötlemiseks arvuteid omavasse asutusse?
20. Millised on kasutatavad protseduurid vigade parandamiseks, mis avastatakse andmeid arvutiga töötlevas asutuses? (kas formaalavsaadetakse tagasi algasutusse? kas saadetakse kirjalik järeleparimine? kas arvutit omava asutuse esindaja helistab algasutusse?)

Üldine programmiline hinnang -

21. Kus eksisteerivad informatsiooni ja arusaamise tühimikud?
22. Kas sellel on oma kindel struktuur? (Kas on olemas teatud piirkonnad riigis või osalevate asutuste tuubid, kus on kõige rohkem informatsiooni puudujäaske või kus arusaamise tase on madalaim?)
23. Milline on arusaamatuste olemus? (Milline elamispinnaosakuprogrammi komponent põhjustab kõige enam segadust? Kas selleks on andmete kogumine taotlejatel, andmete sisestamine süsteemi, elamispinnaosakute taotlejate üldiste küsimustega tegelemine, avalduste täitmise hindamine, või uldisemalt, informeeritus ja uuesti formuleeritud seaduste mõistmine)

Appendix B

ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

LIST OF INTERVIEWS

1. Mr. Raivo Kasemaa
General Manager
Estonian State Computing Center
Tallinn
2. Mrs. Marja Kajandu
Production Manager
Estonian State Computing Center
Tallinn
3. Ms. Tiiu Strauss
Project Manager
Estonian State Computing Center
Tallinn
4. Mrs. Liia Hanni
Minister of Reform
Tallinn
5. Mr. Meelis Paaro
Vice Chairman
Tallinn East District
Tallinn
6. Mr. August Koppel
Manager
Oismae Local Housing Board
Tallinn
7. Mr. Endel Kaljusmaa
Deputy Director
National Housing Board
Tallinn
8. Mr. Roman Mugur, Alderman
Mr. Arvo Sakarias, Computer Specialist
Mr. Peeter Tooming, Computer Specialist

Tartu

9. **Mr. Heike Tamm**
City Housing Administrator
Tartu
10. **Mrs. Riisalu**
Director of Development Department
Kohtla-Järve
11. **Mrs. Velbaum**
Deputy Director of Development Department
Kohtla Jarva
12. **Mrs. Tiiu Kibe**
Manager
Town Land Department
Vosu
13. **Mr. Laukse**
City Councilman
Viljande
14. **Mr. Michael Servinski**
Director
Viljande Statistics Office
Viljande
15. **Mr. Riho Rasmann**
Director
Department of State Property
Tallinn

Appendix C

ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

TRAINING

The need for training for the Popular Capital Obligation program has been addressed in a number of different ways.

Housing Privatization

The housing privatization component of the Popular Capital Obligation program in particular has been the subject of many different training and information dissemination activities. For example, all local government participants and certain major local housing offices were issued a detailed instruction manual containing information on all aspects of voucher issuance and housing privatization in general. This information was supplemented with a series of seminars with presentations by knowledgeable central government policy makers and others. These seminars were very successful in promoting a dialogue between the different participants and were well attended.

Automated Voucher System

The Estonian State Computing Center (ESCC) has been very proactive in disseminating the software for the Automated Voucher System. The ESCC notified all county and local governments that the computer program was available to them and informed them of their training options. The ESCC is providing training for all interested local government or local housing authorities who intend to use the computerized system. A partial list of attendees at the Computing Center training classes is attached as part of this Appendix.

The ESCC also responds to questions from local authorities regarding procedural issues. In fact, the ESCC's is the only telephone number listed on any of the documentation distributed to the local authorities.

ATTACHEMENT - PARTIAL LIST OF TRAINING SESSION ATTENDEES

RAHVARAHVITALI USAKUTE REGISTRI
koostatute nimekiri

Leht

1

Jrk.	Ettevotte nimetus	Opilase nimi	Telefon	Kuupaev
1	Haabersti Haldusüksuse Valitsus	Press, Esta	599111	28.01.93
2	Kesklinna Elamute Valitsus	Elias, Rita	444698	28.01.93
3	Põhjarajooni V jaoskond	Slepkina, Ljubov	492095	28.01.93
4	Maardu Haldusüksuse Valitsus	Kiter, Urve	235508	28.01.93
5	Nõmme Haldusüksuse Valitsus	Järve, Signe	514675	28.01.93
6	Laäne Haldusüksuse Valitsus	Lippur, Sirje	448531	28.01.93
7	Idarajooni Elamuamet	Koppel, Riina	437625	28.01.93
8	Lasnamae EEV	Weizman, Vadim	331435	28.01.93
9	ME "Saurem"	Veerg, Ulla	596148	28.01.93
10	Vasalemma Vallavalitsus	Annert, Ulvi	749410	01.03.93
11	Aegviidu Alevivalitsus	Pürjema, Aili	767395	01.03.93
12	Kuusalu Vallavalitsus	Leedjärv, Jaan	772582	01.03.93
13	Võru Infokeskus 45000	Ojamaa, Margo	21146	01.03.93
14	Tartu Maavalitsus 49000	Puus, Uuno	31395	01.03.93
15	Sõmeru Vallavalitsus	Lainjärv, Janne	46119	01.03.93
16	Rakvere Vallavalitsus	Eiber, Uuno	42532	01.03.93
17	Nissi vald	Kiisel, Urmas	737231	01.03.93
18	Tapa linnavalitsus	Kukk, Külli	75113	01.03.93
19	Rapla Vallavalitsus	Saar, Ülo	58887	01.03.93
20	Haapsalu Kommunaalosakond	Karolin, Triinu	44584	01.03.93
21	Järvakandi Alevivalitsus	Tomson, Kersti	77230	01.03.93
22	Sillamäe Linnavalitsus 21000	Nazarjeva, Irina	1929	01.03.93
23	Jõhvi linn 15000	Merilai, Kalle	26682	01.03.93

RAHVAKAPITALI OSAKUTE REGISTER
Koolitatute nimekirj

Leht

2

Jrk.	Ettevõtte nimetus	Opilase nimi	Telefon	Kuupaev
24	Võsu alevivalitsus	Kibe, Tiit	99101	01.03.93
25	Pärnu Linna Infoosakond <i>5211</i>	Volkov, Viktor	45848	02.03.93
26	AS A.P.E.	Majajaas, Ellen	0	02.03.93
27	Ida-Viru Maavalitsus <i>2,3000</i>	Faaps, Galina	22453	02.03.93
28	Kohtla-Järve Linnavalitsus <i>17855</i>			02.03.93
29	Haljala vallavalitsus	Krull, Mati	49175	02.03.93
30	AS PT Mikro	Trutsi, Peeter	47340	02.03.93
31	Tabivere Vallavalitsus	Õispuu, Viljar	36248	02.03.93
32	Harku Vallavalitsus	Ariko, Aune	716354	02.03.93
33	Kehtna Vallavalitsus	Kivimägi, Natalja	75357	02.03.93
34	Kõue Vallavalitsus	Vilipõld, Marika	753317	02.03.93
35	Põltsamaa Ettevõte "TARE"	Tünne, Liia	51368	02.03.93
36	Põltsamaa Vallavalitsus	Tünne, Liia	51514	02.03.93
37	Järva-Jaani Vallavalitsus	Mõtsnik, Jaan	63377	02.03.93
38	Kareda Vallavalitsus	Vahtramäe, Ullar	64448	02.03.93
39	Tamsalu Alevivalitsus	Padda, Ulo	30474	02.03.93
40	Kuressaare linnavalitsus <i>40000</i>	Lemba, Hulda	54246	02.03.93
41	Saku Vald	Luht, Sirje	721011	02.03.93
42	Jõgevsa Linna Elamuosakond	Eik, Kersti	21007	02.03.93
43	Pajusi Vallavalitsus	Juhkam, Tiia	50251	02.03.93
44	Hiiu Maavalitsus <i>11000</i>	Paljasma, Monika	91055	02.03.93
45	Laekvere vald	Altperc, Neeme	95301	02.03.93
46	Palamuse Vallavalitsus	Nigulas, Heili	33181	02.03.93

22

RAHVAKAPITALI OSAKUTE REGISTER
Koolitatute nimekirj

Leht

3

Jrk.	Ettevõtte nimetus	Oopilase nimi	Telefon	Kuudae
47	Kõhila alevivalitsus	Äbroi, Aili	33064	02.03.
48	Loksa Vallavalitsus	Kasetalu, Ain	775246	02.03.
49	Sandaste Vallavalitsus	Korbun, Aldo	91337	02.03.
50	Viimsi Vallavalitsus	Saks, Sirje	770699	02.03.
51	Tartu EMO <i>113000</i>	Ta 09 00 ik 02.03.93		

*Total - 1 - 1.2M.
(includes children)*

23

LIST OF PARTICIPATING OFFICES
HALDUSOKSUSED

		population served	leht: 1 will use computer osa/us system
Tallinn		490 000	✓
Kood	Nimi		
728	Saue alev		
446	Maardu linn		
Kohtla-Järve		74 000	✓
Kood	Nimi		
323	Kohtla-Nõmme alev		
645	Püssi alev		
894	Viivikonna alev		
749	Sompa alev		
338	Kukruse alev		
551	Oru alev		
309	Kiviõli linn		
120	Ahtme linn		
Narva		26 000	—
Kood	Nimi		
513	Narva-Jõesuu alev		
Pärnu		57 000	✓
Kood	Nimi		
741	Sindi linn		
HARJUMAA		1006 00	
Kood	Nimi		
112	Aegviidu alev	1100	✓
290	Kehra alev	4000	
424	Loksa alev	7500	
296	Keila linn	10300	
580	Paldiski linn	7600	
140	Anija vald	2800	
198	Harku vald	5000	✓
245	Jõelähtme vald	5000	
295	Keila vald	2800	
337	Kose vald	7800	
352	Kuusalu vald	4600	✓
363	Kõue vald	1800	✓
423	Loksa vald	2500	✓
518	Nissi vald	4900	✓
562	Padise vald	1200	
	Σ 15 0/1		
Tartu		113 400	✓
Siimäe		21 100	✓

651	Raasiku	vald	4100	
653	Rae	vald	7100	
718	Saku	vald	8400	v
727	Saue	vald	6400	v
868	Vasalemma	vald	4800	v
890	Viimsi	vald	5800	v
	Σ 21 o/v		Σ 100600	Σ 10 o/v 45300
	HIILUMAA		11800	v
Kood	Nimi			
371	Kärbla	linn	4300	v
175	Emmaste	vald	1600	v
368	Käina	vald	1500	v
392	Lauka	vald	1600	v
639	Pühalepa	vald	1800	v
	Σ 5 o/v		Σ 11800	Σ 11200
	IDA-VIRUMAA		39300	v
Kood	Nimi			
253	Jõhvi	linn	17300	v
122	Alajõe	vald	1000	v
154	Aseri	vald	1300	v
164	Avinurme	vald	1800	v
224	Iisaku	vald	1500	v
229	Illuka	vald	1200	v
252	Jõhvi	vald	2000	v
320	Kohtla	vald	1700	v
420	Lohusuu	vald	800	v
437	Lüganuse	vald	1400	v
449	Maidla	vald	900	v
498	Mäetaguse	vald	1800	v
851	Vaivara	vald	1800	v
751	Sonda	vald	1500	v
802	Toila	vald	2600	v
815	Tudulinna	vald	700	v
	Σ 16 o/v		Σ 39300	39300
	JÕGEVAMAA		42600	
Kood	Nimi			
249	Jõgeva	linn	1000	v
485	Mustvee	linn	2000	v
617	Põltsamaa	linn	5200	v
248	Jõgeva	vald	5900	v
573	Pajusi	vald	1900	v
576	Pala	vald	1500	v
578	Palamuse	vald	2800	v
611	Puurmani	vald	2100	v
616	Põltsamaa	vald	5100	v
657	Raja	vald	1600	v
713	Saare	vald	1200	v

25

773	Tabivere	vald	2500	
810	Torma	vald	3100	
	Σ 13 o/r		Σ 42600	Σ 60 o/r 24200
	JÄRVAMAA		43600	

Kood

Nimi

566	Paide	linn	10700	
837	Türi	linn	6900	
129	Albu	vald	1600	
134	Ambla	vald	2900	
234	Imavere	vald	1000	
257	Järva-Jaani	vald	2500	
314	Koeru	vald	2800	✓
325	Koigi	vald	1400	
400	Lehtse	vald	2000	
537	Oisu	vald	1600	
271	Kabala	vald	1300	
565	Paide	vald	2000	
288	Kareda	vald	1100	✓
836	Türi	vald	2900	
937	Väätsa	vald	1500	
684	Roosna-Alliku	vald	1600	
	Σ 16 o/r		Σ 45600	Σ 2 o/r 3400
	LÄANEMAA		33800	

Kood

Nimi

412	Lihula	alev	1800	
183	Haapsalu	linn	15000	
195	Hanila	vald	2200	
342	Kullamaa	vald	1800	
411	Lihula	vald	1600	
552	Oru	vald	900	
452	Martna	vald	1300	
531	Nõva	vald	600	
520	Noarootsi	vald	1000	
674	Ridala	vald	3500	
680	Risti	vald	1000	
776	Taebla	vald	3000	
907	Vormsi	vald	300	
	Σ 13 o/r		Σ 33800	
	LÄANE-VIRUMAA		79600	

Kood

Nimi

788	Tamsalu	alev	2900	✓
922	Võsu	alev	700	✓
345	Kunda	linn	5000	
663	Rakvere	linn	19800	
791	Tapa	linn	10000	✓
190	Haljala	vald	3200	✓
770	Sõmeru	vald	4000	✓

273	Kadrina	vald	6700	
381	Laekvere	vald	2200	
660	Rakke	vald	2500	v
662	Rakvere	vald	2400	
702	Rägavere	vald	1100	v
161	Avanduse	vald	1100	
787	Tamsalu	vald	2600	
887	Vihula	vald	1600	
900	Vinni	vald	6600	v
902	Viru-Nigula	vald	1400	
927	Väike-Maarja	vald	5800	
	Σ 18 o/r		Σ 79600	Σ 80, r 82000
	POLVAMAA		36400	—

Kood	Nimi			
620	Põlva	alev	7300	
705	Räpina	alev	5500	
117	Ahja	vald	1300	
707	Räpina	vald	3100	
354	Kõlleste	vald	1200	
285	Kanepi	vald	3500	
385	Laheda	vald	1500	
465	Mikitamäe	vald	1400	
473	Mooste	vald	1900	
619	Põlva	vald	4100	
547	Orava	vald	1000	
856	Valgjärve	vald	2000	
872	Västse-Kuuste	vald	1300	
879	Veriora	vald	1900	
934	Värskä	vald	1200	
	Σ 15 o/r		Σ 36400	
	PÄRNUMAA		43300	—

Kood	Nimi			
395	Lavassaare	alev	500	
627	Pärnu-Jaagupi	alev	1500	
805	Tootsi	alev	1300	
931	Vändra	alev	3000	
306	Kilingi-Nõmme	linn	2500	
149	Are	vald	1500	
159	Audru	vald	4600	
188	Halinga	vald	2400	
213	Häädemeeste	vald	3300	
276	Kaisma	vald	600	
303	Kihnu	vald	500	
334	Koonga	vald	1700	
568	Paikuse	vald	1400	
711	Saarde	vald	3000	
730	Sauga	vald	2100	
756	Surju	vald	1000	
782	Tali	vald	1000	

808	Tori	vald	2800	
826	Tõstamaa	vald	1700	
848	Uulu	vald	1800	
863	Varbla	vald	1300	
930	Vändra	vald	2200	
	Σ 2200			
	RAPLAMAA		Σ 43300	
			39600	

Kood	Nimi			
260	Järvakandi	alev	1800	
318	Kohila	alev	3600	✓
505	Märjamaa	alev	3300	
670	Rapla	alev	6400	
240	Juuru	vald	3400	
292	Kehtna	vald	5400	
317	Kohila	vald	2000	✓
375	Käru	vald	900	✓
427	Loodna	vald	1300	
504	Märjamaa	vald	3700	
654	Raikküla	vald	1900	
669	Rapla	vald	3600	✓
884	Vigala	vald	2300	
	Σ 13000		Σ 39600	Σ 4000 12200
	SAAREMAA		40600	✓

Kood	Nimi			
349	Kuressaare	linn	16600	✓
270	Kaarma	vald	1800	✓
301	Kihelkonna	vald	1400	✓
348	Kuressaare	vald	2100	✓
373	Kärla	vald	2200	✓
386	Laimjala	vald	900	✓
403	Leisi	vald	2600	✓
440	Lümanda	vald	1000	✓
478	Muhu	vald	2200	✓
483	Mustjala	vald	1000	✓
550	Orissaare	vald	1100	✓
592	Pihla	vald	1200	✓
634	Põide	vald	2300	✓
689	Ruhnu	vald	60	✓
721	Salme	vald	1900	✓
858	Valjala	vald	1700	✓
	Σ 16000		Σ 40600	Σ 16000 40600
	TARTUMAA		49300	✓

Kood	Nimi			
170	Elva	linn	6300	✓
279	Kallaste	linn	1300	✓
126	Alatskivi	vald	1600	✓
185	Haaslava	vald	1600	✓

29

282	Kambja	vald	2600	v
331	Rõnoute	vald	1500	v
383	Laeva	vald	900	v
437	Luunja	vald	2400	v
454	Meeksi	vald	1000	v
501	Maksa	vald	1700	v
528	Nõo	vald	3600	v
587	Peipsiääre	vald	900	v
595	Piirissaare	vald	30	v
605	Puhja	vald	2600	v
666	Rannu	vald	2100	v
694	Rõngu	vald	3300	v
794	Tartu	vald	4900	v
831	Tähtvere	vald	3000	v
861	Vara	vald	2100	v
915	Võnnu	vald	1300	v
949	Olenurme	vald	4500	v
Σ 21 o/v			Σ 49300	Σ 21 o/v 49300
VALGAMAA			41400	

Kood Nimi

556	Otepää	linn	2500	
823	Tõrva	linn	3600	
854	Valga	linn	17300	
203	Helme	vald	2900	
208	Hummuli	vald	1100	
289	Karula	vald	1500	
582	Palupera	vald	1300	
608	Puka	vald	2100	
613	Põdrala	vald	1100	
724	Sangaste	vald	1800	v
779	Taheva	vald	1200	
820	Tõlliste	vald	2300	
943	Oru	vald	100	
636	Pühajärve	vald	2000	
Σ 14 o/v			Σ 41400	Σ 1 o/v 1800
VILJANDIMAA			65300	v

Kood Nimi

107	Abja-Paluoja	alev	1700	v
287	Karksi-Nuia	alev	2400	v
912	Võhma	alev	2000	v
490	Mõisaküla	linn	1300	v
760	Suure-Jaani	linn	1500	v
897	Viljandi	linn	23000	v
105	Abja	vald	1600	v
192	Halliste	vald	2400	v
328	Kolga-Jaani	vald	2100	v
357	Kõo	vald	1400	v
360	Kõpu	vald	900	v
545	Olustvere	vald	1200	v

leht: 7

570	Paistu	vald	1800	v
600	Polli	vald	2200	v
629	Pärsti	vald	4400	v
715	Saarepeedi	vald	1400	v
759	Suure-Jaani	vald	2500	v
797	Tarvastu	vald	5000	v
870	Vastemõisa	vald	1200	v
892	Viiratsi	vald	4200	v
	$\Sigma 20$		$\Sigma 65300$	$\Sigma 20 \text{ o/v } 65300$
	VORUMAA		45700	v
Kood	Nimi			
144	Antsla	linn	1600	v
919	Võru	linn	18000	v
143	Antsla	vald	3400	v
181	Haanja	vald	1500	v
389	Lasva	vald	1900	v
460	Meremäe	vald	2200	v
468	Misso	vald	1200	v
493	Mõniste	vald	1300	v
697	Rõuge	vald	2300	v
767	Sõmerpalu	vald	2300	v
843	Urvaste	vald	1700	v
865	Varstu	vald	1600	v
874	Vastseliina	vald	2100	v
918	Võru	vald	4200	v
	$\Sigma 14$		$\Sigma 45700$	$\Sigma 14 \text{ o/v } 45700$