



Institute of
Social Studies

DECENTRALIZATION, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND MARKETS
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RECENT TRENDS IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

A Research Paper presented by

Javier Huascar Eguino Lijeron
(Bolivia)

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for Obtaining the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Members of the Examining Committee

A.H.J. Helmsing
F. Uribe-Echevarria

The Hague, November 1995

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies; the views stated herein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Research papers and theses are not made available for outside circulation by the Institute.

Enquiries:

Postal Address:

Institute of Social Studies
P.O. Box 29776
2502 LT The Hague
The Netherlands

Telephone -31-70-4 260 460
Cables SOCINST
Telex 31491 ISS NL
Telefax -31-70-4 260 799

Location:

Kortenaerkade 12
2518 AX The Hague
The Netherlands

Acknowledgments.

I am grateful to the Netherlands Fellowship Programme for providing me the opportunity to study Local and Regional Development (LRD) at the Institute of Social Studies.

I am also indebted to the staff of the LRD Masters' degree programme for the fruitfull discussion that we had during the academic period 1994-1995 and, especially to my supervisor Prof. A.J.H.(Bert) Helmsing for his permanent support and for suggesting me to further explore the process of decentralization to the governments and to the markets.

CONTENT.

Introduction.

1. Theoretical Framework.

1.1. Definition of Decentralization.

1.2. Fiscal Federalism.

- 1.2.1. Nature of goods and services.
- 1.2.2. The economic roles of the different layers of government.
- 1.2.3. The Layer Cake Model.
- 1.2.4. The Tiebout Model.

1.3. Intergovernmental Relations.

- 1.3.1. Localized, Centralized and Mixed Models of Government.
- 1.3.2. The apportionment of revenue responsibilities.
- 1.3.3. The apportionment of expenditure responsibilities.
- 1.3.4. Changes of fiscal structure.

1.4. Decentralization, Local Governments and, Markets.

- 1.4.1. Diversity and common ground.
- 1.4.2. Intergovernmental relations and the legacy of welfarism.
- 1.4.3. Theoretical models to approach a variety of responses.
- 1.4.4. Is there any evolutionary structure?.

1.5. Alternative institutional arrangements to provide goods and services.

- 1.5.1. Consumers, producers and organizers/arrangers.
- 1.5.2. Institutional arrangements to provide public goods.

2. Decentralization to the local governments.

2.1. Initial considerations.

2.2. Decentralization and economic development.

2.3. Degree of decentralization of expenditures and revenues.

- 2.3.1. Indicators of decentralization. Some of their limitations.
- 2.3.2. Degree of decentralization.
- 2.3.3. Trends on the degree of decentralization of expenditures and revenues.

2.4. Resources for decentralization.

- 2.4.1. An overview.
- 2.4.2. Current revenues.
 - 2.4.2.1. The poor capacity of local governments to rely on their own tax-base.
 - 2.4.2.2. Lack of dynamism of local taxes.
- 2.4.3. Central transfers and financial autonomy.
 - 2.4.3.1. Contribution of central transfers to total government revenues.
 - 2.4.3.2. Trends over the last twenty years.

2.5. Decentralization of expenditures.

- 2.5.1. Expenditures by economic type. An overview.
- 2.5.2. Local Government priorities.
 - 2.5.2.1. Definition of social expenditure decentralization ratio.
 - 2.5.2.2. Social expenditure decentralization ratio.
 - 2.5.2.3. Education decentralization ratio.
 - 2.5.2.4. Health decentralization ratio.
 - 2.5.2.5. Central and Local Governments social allocation ratios.
- 2.5.3. An overview of other components of Local Government Expenditures.

3. Decentralization to the market: Redefinition of the balance between the government and the market.

3.1. The problem.

3.2. Size of the governmental sectors.

3.3. The historical trends: squeezing the State.

3.4. Mechanisms of market decentralization. Some illustrating experiences.

- 3.4.1. Decentralization to the markets.
- 3.4.2. Quasi-market mechanisms.
- 3.4.3. Voluntary and Non-Government Organizations.

3.5. Decentralization to the governments and to the markets: unifying approach.

- 3.5.1. Extend of decentralization to the governments and to the markets.
- 3.5.2. Analysis of change.

4. Policy Considerations.

4.1. Shifting the boundary of the government.

4.2. Innovative arrangements to provide services.

4.3. Financial reforms.

4.4. Internal and external accountability.

Conclusions. Future Research Agenda.

TABLES .

Table 1.1.	Institutional Arrangements for Providing Public Services.
Table 2.1.	Fiscal Indicators of Intergovernmental Relations.
Table 2.2.	Fiscal Indicators of Intergovernmental Relations.
Table 2.3.	Revenue Composition.
Table 2.4.	Sources of Tax Revenues for Central and Local Governments.
Table 2.5.	Local Taxes and Economic Fluctuations: Correlation Coefficients.
Table 2.6.	Expenditure Composition.
Table 2.7.	Social Expenditure Decentralization Ratios.
Table 2.8.	Expenditure Composition.
Table 3.1.	Size of Government Sector in Selected Countries.
Table 3.2.	Size of Government Sector in Industrial and Developing Countries.

GRAPHS.

Graph 1.1.	Decentralization Models.
Graph 2.1.a.	Decentralization and Economic Development.
Graph 2.1.b.	Trends on Decentralization and Economic Development.
Graph 2.2.	Decentralization Models.
Graph 2.3.a.	Social Expenditure Allocation Ratio.
Graph 2.3.b.	Educational Expenditure Allocation Ratio.
Graph 2.3.c.	Health Expenditure Allocation Ratio.
Graph 3.1.a.	Government/Market Size-GDP.
Graph 3.1.b.	Government/Market Size-GDP.
Graph 3.2.a.	Australia: Government/Market Size.
Graph 3.2.b.	Denmark: Government/Market Size.
Graph 3.2.c.	The Netherlands: Government/Market Size.
Graph 3.2.d.	United Kingdom: Government/Market Size.
Graph 3.2.e.	Chile: Government/Market Size.
Graph 3.2.f.	Colombia: Government/Market Size.
Graph 3.2.g.	Thailand: Government/Market Size.
Graph 3.2.h.	Kenya: Government/Market Size.
Graph 3.3.a.	Expenditure Decentralization Ratios.
Graph 3.3.b.	Expenditure Decentralization Ratios.
Graph 3.3.c.	Revenue Decentralization Ratios.
Graph 3.4.a.	Trends on Expenditure Decentralization Ratios.
Graph 3.4.b.	Trends on Expenditure Decentralization Ratios.
Graph 3.4.c.	Trends on Revenue Decentralization Ratios.

Introduction.

Decentralization is a complex issue that has to do not only with delegation, deconcentration or devolution of responsibilities from the central to the local level of government, but in a broader sense, it includes a rebalance between governments and markets.

The purpose of this research is to analyze the process of decentralization from this perspective and to discuss, based on information of eight countries, the variety of changes and/or their possible common grounds.

The paper is organized as follows:

Chapter One presents the theoretical framework that includes: fiscal federalism, intergovernmental relations, institutional arrangements to provide public services and, Bennett's model of resource and power allocation.

Chapter Two analyses the process of decentralization from the central to the local government. The main topics for this chapter include: the degrees of decentralization both in industrialised and in developing countries; the factors that explain the different roles of the local layer of government; the economic roles of the local and central governments under different decentralization schemes; and the factors that explain the local government fiscal imbalances between its own revenues and its expenditure responsibilities.

Additionally, Chapter Two presents a closer look at the local government finances analyzing the composition of revenues and expenditures, the importance of central government grants on the overall local resources, and the local government expenditure priorities. A central component of this chapter is a discussion of the factors that explain the poor capacity of local governments to rely on their own tax-base, the weak link between economic fluctuation and local taxes, local governments financial autonomy, decentralization of social expenditures, and a comparison of social allocation ratios between the different layers of government.

Chapter Three analyses the redefinition of the balance between the government and the market, quasi-markets and non-governmental

organizations. The aim of this chapter is to show that in order to improve economic efficiency and responsiveness to the customer there are several institutional arrangements that require more or less governmental intervention. To illustrate this issue, I first made an analysis of the balance between governments and markets and, second, I referred to concrete innovative experiences on the provision of public services both in industrialised and in developing countries.

Additionally, chapter three presents a unifying approach to the process of decentralization to the local governments and to the markets. The objective here is to analyze the variety of responses (and their common characteristics) to the problems of economic efficiency and responsiveness to the customers that are associated with the decentralization processes.

Finally, chapter four is a discussion of some policy considerations that are associated with decentralization. Based on the results of previous chapters, I show that the redefinition of the balances between governments and markets, on one side, and central and local governments on the other side, have common characteristics: the increased concern about economic efficiency on the provision of public services, the search for innovative arrangements that better respond to customer preferences, greater local government efficacy and, better representation of peoples' interest.

The research concludes with a reflection about a future research agenda and a summary of the main results. In both cases, the aim is to discuss issues that are relevant to developing countries.

Finally, it is important to highlight that this paper has three main limitations: (1) it is not intended to be a policy discussion but an empirical research of the decentralization processes, (2) it arrives at generalizations that must be taken as a departure point for future researches that deal with a bigger sample and, (3) due to data limitations the analysis of the process of decentralization to the markets is based on proxy variables and illustrating experiences rather than in direct indicators.

1. Theoretical Framework.

1.1. Definition of Decentralization.

There are many reforms which fall under the banner of decentralization. It is therefore useful to make it clear that the process of decentralization is chiefly concerned with two dimensions: (1) intergovernmental relations, and (2) the balance between government and markets. Within the first dimension we can distinguish three possible systems (UNDP, 1993):

Deconcentration. In this system some administrative responsibilities are transferred to the lower levels of government. It involves the spatial reallocation of decision making.

Delegation. In this system the managerial responsibility for specific functions is transferred to public organizations that are outside the normal bureaucratic structure of the Central Government (CG). It involves the assignment of specific decision making authority to Local Governments (LGs) or para-statal.

Devolution. The responsibilities for governing are assigned to local authorities. It involves the creation or strengthening of subnational units of governments, whose activities are outside the direct control of the CG.

The second dimension of decentralization, namely towards the market, includes different institutional arrangements for public service delivery: contracts, franchise systems, vouchers, voluntary services, self delivery and, market provision. These arrangements will be analyzed later.

1.2. Fiscal Federalism.

1.2.1. The Nature of Goods and Services.

To understand the government involvement in the process of satisfying people's needs we require to look first at the different types of goods and services. To do this we will use two classifying concepts: non-rival consumption and exclusion.

"Non-rival consumption occurs when a certain good or service can be provided to additional consumers or users at no extra cost. The supply of a good or service is (within a certain range)

indivisible" (Helmsing, 1994:5) since it is not possible to isolate the actual consumption or use by an individual and calculate its specific costs. However, even if it is possible to estimate the individual costs, there is no possibility of avoiding potential consumer/users from having access without paying for it (i.e. "free riding").

"Goods and services have the characteristic of exclusion if the potential user can be denied the goods or excluded from their use unless he meets the conditions set by the potential supplier. In other words, the goods can change hands only if the buyer and the seller agree on the terms" (Savas, 1982:30).

Using both concepts it is possible to classify the different goods and services into four groups:

Group 1. Private goods. These goods or services are consumed individually and cannot be obtained by the user without the consent of the supplier, which is usually obtained by making payment. Private goods pose no conceptual problem of supply since the market place is supposed to provide them. Collective action with respect to private goods for the most part is confined to assuring their safety (e.g. of food, buildings), honest reporting (e.g. of weights and measures, labels) and, quality (Savas, 1982).

Group 2. Toll goods. These are pure jointly consumed goods for which exclusion is completely feasible (e.g. cable TV, water supply).

Many toll goods are natural monopolies so collective action may be required to assure that they are created (or granted) and regulated.

Group 3. Common Pool Goods. These are pure individually consumed goods for which exclusion is completely unfeasible but their quantity is limited within a given period and their consumption is rival (e.g. minerals in the ocean, communal grazing). Collective action is required to avoid the danger of depletion and to safeguard these goods.

Group 4. Collective or public goods. These are pure jointly consumed goods for which exclusion is completely unfeasible (e.g. broadcast TV, air pollution controls). The market place is unable to supply such goods because they are used simultaneously by many people and no one can be excluded from enjoying them. Therefore, collective action (i.e. tax contributions) have to be obtained in order to ensure their supply.

Groups 1 and 4 are clear illustrations of private and public goods. Groups 2 and 3 are intermediate ones. In relation to this last set Helmsing (1994:6) argues that, "in cases where consumption is rival and exclusion is technically difficult, the provision tends to be public. On the other hand, if the cost of exclusion is low then private provision is possible even though consumption is not-rival".

1.2.2. The economic roles of the different layers of government.

Musgrave and Musgrave (1984) identify three economic roles of government: stabilization, distribution and allocation. They also discuss the economic reasons why certain fiscal functions should be operated in a more centralized level while others should be decentralized.

Stabilization.

This function includes measures to be taken by the government to obtain a high rate of economic growth and to address major economic imbalances (e.g. reduce fiscal deficit).

The responsibility of the stabilization policy has to be at the national level because (Musgrave, Musgrave, 1984), (Helmsing, 1994):

- (1) The attempts of the LG to apply its own fiscal stabilization policy will be restricted by the openness of the LG economy (i.e. if a high proportion of the public expenditure multiplier leaks away, the LG's fiscal policy is not very effective);
- (2) The fiscal stabilization policy requires a periodic finance of deficits or surpluses with the corresponding borrowing and debt repayments. These create a serious problem for LGs

- because they have no easy access to the capital markets and they have no control over a supporting monetary policy;
- (3) Decentralized monetary policies would be ineffective due to the openness of the local economy;
 - (4) The central banking functions, like the power to print money, are a national responsibility; and, finally,
 - (5) The stabilization measures require a certain degree of coordination between LGs and CG (e.g. revenue sharing and grants). This coordination is a CG responsibility.

Distribution.

It is possible to distinguish between: (1) distribution among individuals and (2) distribution among jurisdictions.

In relation with the first aspect, LG distribution policies cannot be effective because there is free mobility of economic factors between jurisdictions.

On the other hand, the responsibility for the distribution among jurisdictions has to be at the national level because (Musgrave, Musgrave, 1984):

- (1) National policies may cause fiscal burdens to fall upon particular jurisdictions and, therefore, some form of compensation is required.
- (2) Fiscal capacities among LGs differ because low and high income individuals tend to separate in distinct communities. Thus, some LGs have low tax base and high fiscal need while others have high tax base and low fiscal need. A national system of transfers between these jurisdictions might then serve to reduce these differences;
- (3) Grants made to poor jurisdictions will provide public service benefits to low-income people and, therefore, individual disparities will be reduced.

Allocation function.

This "concerns the process by which total resource use in an economy is divided between the private and public sectors, and by which the mix of public goods is chosen not only sectorally, but also socially and even spatially" (Helmsing, 1994:10).

To establish the extent to which the LGs should be involved in this function, we have to consider the following aspects (Helmsing, 1994):

- (1) **Market imperfections.** In general, government intervention in the allocation of resources is required if the market is not competitive. On the contrary, under non-competitive markets, LG intervention is not always required because local monopolies are protected almost exclusively by transportation costs and these are only a small part of the overall cost of a good or service.
- (2) **Externalities.** "An externality arises when the production or consumption activities of one party enter directly as an argument into the production or utility function of another party" (Brown, Jackson, 1994:38).
The presence of externalities is another argument for government intervention in the market. Furthermore, since externalities are often localized, LGs have a role to play in their generation (if they are positive) or in their control (if they are negative).
- (3) **Merit goods.** The concept of merit goods is frequently used to justify government intervention in the allocation of resources. The provision of these goods requires LG intervention because: either an individual's information set is incomplete or distorted because of misleading advertising (e.g. cigarettes) (Brown, Jackson, 1994); purchasers may not be able to afford these goods (e.g. low income housing) or; purchasers are not the final consumers (e.g. basic education) (Helmsing, 1994).
- (4) **Impure Public Goods.** In theory there are few cases of pure public goods. In practice, there are several factors that restrict access to them as congestion, spatial barriers, functional barriers and, socio-cultural limitations.
The provision of impure public goods by the different layers of government can be justified on the bases of their spatial extent. In fact, it is possible to make a hierarchy

of public goods based on their spatially declining benefits (spatial barriers) and use this hierarchy to determine the level of government at which to organize their provision. The advantages of such a system are two: the intended beneficiary group is in a better position to express their preferences and; they are expected to contribute to the costs of providing the service (Helmsing, 1994).

The disadvantages are three: the most efficient scale of production/provision (i.e. least cost technology) may not coincide with the government jurisdiction; neither the costs nor the benefits of a public good is limited to the residents of a district (there are "spill-over" effects) and; the kinds of public goods needed and the level at which they are required change over time (Helmsing, 1994).

Even though these arguments are very important, we can't infer from them that the central provision of impure public goods will be a satisfactory alternative. Instead, these arguments pose a problem of intergovernmental fiscal coordination (e.g. tax-sharing or transfers). This topic will be analyzed in detail under the section "Intergovernmental Relations".

1.2.3. The Layer Cake Model of Government.

The Tiebout-Musgrave layer cake model of the public sector provides a solution to the problem of assigning economic roles to the different layers of government. According to this model the stabilization and distribution functions should be discharged by the CG while LGs should engage in allocation activities since they are better in reflecting costumers' preferences (Brown, Jackson. 1994).

1.2.4. The Tiebout Model.

The economic roles of LGs under a decentralized system can also be discussed using a pseudo-market mechanism for preference revelation. In his formulation Tiebout imagined an economy which is characterized by local public goods, i.e. public goods whose benefits are confined to a specific region in the sense that there are no inter regional spill-overs or costs. Individuals are then

assumed to "vote with their feet", allocating themselves between localities according to their preferences for public goods and the associated tax rates. This proposal gives an apparent mechanism for individuals to reveal their preferences and a solution to the public goods optimality problem. However, this solution has two limits: (1) it does not consider the important economies of association to be gained when a number of persons share the financing of a public good and; (2) since each individual has his/her own preferences there would need to be a very large number of potential local jurisdictions to move to (Brown, Jackson. 1994), (Oates, 1990), (Musgrave, Musgrave, 1984).

1.3. Intergovernmental Relationships.

While the fiscal federalist framework is most frequently used in the analysis of administrative reforms and decentralization -its main question is "which level of government should take care of financing and delivering a particular public service?" (Prud'Homme cited by Helmsing, 1995:np)- the intergovernmental view not only separates expenditures and revenue responsibilities, but also assumes coordination between the different levels of government and deals with the conditions under which functions and sectors can be most fruitfully decentralized.

In this section we will take a closer look at this approach.

1.3.1. Localized, Centralized and Mixed forms of Government.

Before discussing in detail the apportionment of expenditure and revenue responsibilities between the different levels of government it is important to distinguish between three governmental forms: the localized, centralized and mixed ones (Bennett, 1980).

The Localized Government.

A localized government is the one where LG is responsible for all but a few public functions. The arguments in favor of this type of government are (Bennett, 1980): (1) its capacity to promote local unity, sense of community, neighborhood and self-reliance; (2) its ability to adjust more closely to geographical variations of local needs and preferences; (3) its promotion of freedom, democracy and responsibility (LGs are much more easy to

control and to participate in); (4) its encouragement of innovation and experimentation with new government organizations, or public finance provision; 5) its contribution to political stability through the diffusion of power between a multiplicity of jurisdictions; (6) its promotion of national unity and security through a greater harmony of interests at local level and the fostering of collective action; and, finally, (7) its capacity to reduce the load of higher levels of government.

On the other hand, the shortcomings of this form of government are that: "(1) it can generate extreme inequity in service standards and fiscal burdens; (2) it results in inefficient economic organizations (i.e. duplication of services); (3) it fosters local autocratic rule; (4) it breeds narrow parochialism and sectionalistic competition and; (5) it produces inertia and rigidity" (Bennett, 1980:281).

Centralized Governments.

Centralized governments retain all powers within a single unitary structure. The advantages of this system of government are (Bennett, 1980): (1) its ability to act as an external force to limit local fiscal disparity, (2) its capacity to promote economic and technical efficiency and, (3) its role in stimulating and maintaining national unity.

Extreme centralization has also its shortcomings (Bennett, 1980): (1) it facilitates totalitarian dominance; (2) it leads to congestion to central work-loads and the inability to be sensitive to local needs and geographical variations; (3) it imposed uniformity and, therefore, it leads to inefficiency in the face of geographically variable needs and demands and, finally, (4) it can weaken democracy and national unity.

Mixed Patterns of Government.

In practice, both centralized and localized governments present important advantages and disadvantages. Based on this fact, Bennett (1980) argues that the primary issue for any country must be to reach certain degree of governmental balance.

Additionally, he proposes that the economic roles of government cannot be reserved exclusively to one level of government since they require coordination between all levels of decision making.

1.3.2. The apportionment of revenue responsibilities between LGs and CGs.

There are two main questions in relation to the allocation of revenue responsibilities. First, how should the revenue responsibilities be distributed? and, second, how should revenue responsibilities be apportioned between different revenue sources? (Bennett, 1980).

Separation of revenue sources. If we apply the Benefit Principle of apportioning tax burdens then local benefits are paid for by local revenue and national benefits by national revenue. The advantages of this system (tax-separation) are that (Bennett, 1980): (1) it reinforces local autonomy and accountability, (2) it avoids tax competition between levels of government, (3) it avoids overlapping and multiple taxation and, (4) it can be easily administered and assessed.

The separation theory can, however, be objected to on a number of grounds. Bennett (1980) identifies six possible disadvantages: (1) tax overlapping and multiple taxation can be overcome by other means rather than separation (i.e. tax deductions and credits); (2) the claims of easier administration, identity of clearer consensus of interest and, better assessment depend on the methods of organization adopted at each governmental level; (3) separation can lead to administrative duplication in each local jurisdiction; (4) the revenue sources most likely to be assigned at local level are usually not adequate to finance all local needs and hence some dependence on other levels of government is required; (5) total independence and autonomy is never achievable since there is always a need for intergovernmental transfers to overcome fiscal imbalances and to achieve fiscal equalization; and finally; (6) complete separation of revenues is impossible since there is a continually changing pattern of needs at national and local level,

and the yields of different taxes at different levels change with economic conditions.

In practice, therefore, most countries have evolved a mixture of separate, shared and overlapping revenue sources.

Additionally, it is important to highlight that some revenue responsibilities are better administered at one level of government than at other. Specifically: "(1) certain taxes must be reserved to CG, at least for administrative purposes; these usually include corporate income tax, redistributive elements of personal income tax, gift tax, and any heavy burdens placed on sales tax; (2) the most appropriate local taxes are usually property tax, user charges, severance tax (where possible), with limited use also of personal income, sales and estate taxes" (Bennett, 1980:293) and, (3) policy attempts to achieve redistribution through taxation must be based on CG revenue sources.

1.3.3. The apportionment of expenditure responsibilities.

Various theoretical approaches to the determination of the most appropriate allocation of functions among the different levels of government have evolved. Bennett (1980) identifies five of them:

Sense of Community. People have often a "sense of community" and look for ways and means to improve the well being of the community as a whole. This can provide a good base to organize government responsibilities.

Technical Efficiency (X-efficiency). It involves the determination of the level of government at which the output of services can be produced at least cost. The calculations involved in this approach are only an indicator for the allocation of expenditure functions since: (1) there are important spill-overs and externalities associated with the provision of some public goods, and (2) technical efficiency changes with time modifying the economies of scale and distribution.

Economic Efficiency. The economic efficiency approach involves technical efficiency and three subsidiary features: (1) the practicalities involved in the assignment of economic roles to

the different levels of government, (2) the extent of externalities and spill-overs and, (3) the price elasticity of demand for goods.

The first aspect has already been discussed in section 1.2.4. (Tiebout-Musgrave Theorem). However, in relation to it, Bennett (1980) emphasizes that in federal countries, local services and fiscal functions are more related to local preferences and, as a consequence, a considerable degree of variation in tax rates, distribution policies and growth incentives can be found at the local level of government.

The second aspect was also previously discussed and we arrived at the conclusion that economic efficiency criterion gives rise to a hierarchical allocation of public goods according to their degree of externality (spatial range).

Finally, the elasticity of demand as a criterion to allocate function to the different levels of government indicates that: (1) inelastic goods should be provided publicly, (2) completely inelastic goods should be provided at the national or international level as merit good and, (3) mixed or impure goods should be publicly or privately provided. In the last case, public regulation is required. (Helmsing, 1994).

Decision Making or "Calculus of consent" approach.

This approach refers to two aspects (Helmsing, 1994). First, that the costs of collective action to access a public service decline as the beneficiary group increases and, second, that the decision costs to agree and to run these collective actions rise with the group size. As a consequence, by adding the two costs curves the optimal group size with minimum costs may be determined and, therefore, an optimal pattern of government.

The problem associated with this criterion is its inconsistency with technical and economic efficiency considerations.

Administrative constraints.

This criterion is less theoretical. It says that as a government structure evolves over time, its existing organization poses constraints to the reallocation of expenditure functions.

1.3.4. Changes to Fiscal Structure.

"Under the influence of changing demands, innovations and technology, and shifts in the values and cultural identity of society, various adjustments to government structure and its fiscal responsibility can be undertaken". Several options are open (Bennett, 1980:305):

Changes in government structure. These changes usually involve: (1) consolidation of government (e.g. increased centralism, changes to boundaries); (2) decentralization of government; (3) Multi-tier government; and (4) marketplace government (e.g. creation of ad-hoc bodies or special purpose governments as in the case of marketing boards).

Changes in fiscal responsibility. These changes include (1) the reassignment of revenue responsibilities or sources; (2) reassignment of expenditure responsibilities and, finally, (3) the adjustment of intergovernmental transfers and coordination.

1.4. Decentralization, Local Governments and Markets.

1.4.1. Diversity and common ground.

Decentralization is a term that can have a variety of uses: in some cases it refers purely to intergovernmental relations and in others, its emphasis is on shifting responsibilities between the governmental and non-governmental sectors. A single term, therefore, describes a variety of situations (i.e. Thatcher and Reagan reforms) that often have a common ground and seek similar outcomes.

The common concern of decentralization policies is a search of a reorientation of governmental response to questions of need for services, demand, and costumer preferences (take-up of collective goods and services). This reorientation implies that "public-service approach is only one of a number of ways of seeking to deal with the field in which collective goods can be delivered. Voluntary, non-profit organizations, as well as regulated market responses are some of the other possibilities" (Bennett, 1990:2).

1.4.2. Intergovernmental relations and the legacy of welfarism.

Decentralization is a key issue to understanding the changes in the

role of the government that is taking place both in industrial and developing countries. However, decentralization can only be understood with respect to what were the previous government roles under the welfarist paradigm¹.

The dominant aspect of welfarism was an "institutionalization of the responsibility of the government to ensure high and stable employment, to provide income support for the poor, to provide health care, education and housing, and to plan effective provision. Government planning and rationality become by-words of a wide range of processes" (Bennett, 1990: 4). The basis of these developments was manipulation of the economy as proposed by Keynes. The result was that the market mechanisms were supplanted by a normal acceptance of welfare state in which people and places (and hence LGs) have claims for welfare against society as a matter of rights and justice. Additionally, the rapidly growing economy allowed an expansion of the concept of "needs" and, therefore, the emergence of new and rising expectations. These rising expectations induced an expansion of the governmental sector and a flow of welfare responsibilities to the LGs.

From the financial point of view, the consequence of these developments were: (1) that LGs had to undertake growing expenditure responsibilities on a static and, sometimes, narrowing revenue base (most revenue taxes remained a CG responsibility) and, (2) that the imbalances of resources and requirements between levels of government had to be solved by a growing CG involvement on the finance of local services (e.g. use of grants). As Bennett (1990: 6) says "the result has been a steady erosion of the linkage of local decisions from their financial consequences with regard to such questions as provision, assessment of needs and management".

1.4.3. Models to approach the variety of responses.

There are important differences between countries specially in the formal acquisition of legal responsibilities, the political and

¹ Welfarism was the dominant paradigm since the 1940s to the 1970s.

financial aspects involved in the provision of public services, and the form and extent of delegation of powers. The major aspects of these differences can be captured using two classifying criteria: their level of central and localized power (decentralization to the government) and, the extent to which resource allocation is dominantly market controlled or determined by the government (decentralization to the market).

On the bases of these criterion, Bennett (1990) proposes the following theoretical models (refer to Graph 1.1.):

Centralized Public Sector Model.

This model is close to the form of many developing countries today. It allocates resources through the government and is power centralized.

Localized Public Sector Model.

This model is used by the Scandinavian countries. It is characterized by the allocation of a high proportion of resources through the government and a high degree of decentralization to the state/local level.

Localized Market Model. This is Tiebout and the public-choice theorists' model. It allocates resources through the market and it is power localized.


Centralized Market Model. It is power centralized and assigns resources through the interaction of supply and demand.

Mixed Model. It is a complex mix of central/federal and state/local powers but with a greater emphasis than in the past on market allocation processes. This hybrid model (also called a "post-welfare" model) is particularly applicable to industrial countries.

1.4.4. Is there any evolutionary structure?.

For mass service provision it is possible to identify two possible common trends:

In industrialised countries there is a tendency to move from a welfarist approach to a post-welfare model whose focus is on (Bennett: 1990): (1) greater governmental responsiveness to the costumers, (2) the introduction of innovative arrangements in the



GRAPH 1.1. Categorization of intergovernmental relations by the character of their dominant method of resource allocation (governmental or market) and level at which government action is dominantly exercised (federal/central or local).

organization of service delivery, (3) managerial reforms (internal accountability), (4) reinterpretation of representation and external accountability and, (5) shifts in the "boundary" of government.

In developing countries the tendencies are less clear since they have yet to develop a "full welfare state". According to Bennett (1990: 12) "they are having to develop intergovernmental decentralization first, in order to provide a set of agencies to allow future development. They may be following the North European historical path, but more rapidly. They are also likely to bypass many of the historical precedents by moving directly towards para-state and market approaches to services".

In all countries the tendency is to downsize the government and to concentrate most of its efforts not in direct provision of services but in creating an environment (i.e. through the use of regulatory and taxing authority) that induces efficiency gains, a greater responsiveness to costumers and, promotes a higher level of economic activity.

1.5. Alternative institutional arrangements to provide goods and services.

As we previously discussed the provision of public goods does not necessarily have to be done by the public sector. In fact, the recent tendency to downsize the economic role of the government (decentralization to the market) has been associated with a discussion of alternative ways to provide goods and services. In this section we treat these alternatives.

1.5.1. Consumers, producers and service organizers (arrangers)².

Before discussing the different arrangements for public good and services provision an important distinction must be made between consumers, producers and service arrangers (Savas, 1982).

² In a recent paper Helmsing distinguish between service delivery and service provision (Helmsing, 1995). However, in this section I follow the approach proposed by Savas since it is more appropriate for my analytical purposes.

The consumers are individuals and households that directly obtain or receive the good or service.

"The producer is the agent that actually and directly performs the work or delivers the goods and services to the consumers. A producer can be a unit of government (local, county, state or federal), a multipurpose or unifunctional special district, a voluntary association, a private firm, a non-profit agency, or in certain instances, the consumer himself" (Savas, 1982:56).

The arranger is the agent who assigns the producer to the consumer. The arranger may be the LG in which the consumer is located, the state/province/federal government, a voluntary association or the service consumer himself.

To illustrate these three concepts lets suppose that a LG hires a paving contractor to resurface a street with asphalt. In this case, the municipality is the arranger, the firm is the producer, and the public in general is the consumer.

Using these three concepts we can now discuss the alternative ways to provide collective goods and services (see Table 1.1.).

1.5.2. Institutional arrangements for Providing Public Goods.

According to Savas (1982) it is possible to identify nine arrangements to deliver collective goods. These alternatives are:

(1) Government good or service.

"It denotes the delivery of a good or service by a government agency using its own resources (employees); that is, the same government unit acts as both the service arranger and the producer" (Savas, 1982:58) (e.g. municipal provision of primary education).

(2) Intergovernmental agreements.

The term intergovernmental agreements denote that one government is the producer but another is the service arranger (e.g. the LG purchase of fire protection services from a specialized government unit). Goods and Services commonly provided under intergovernmental transfers include water supply, jails, sewage treatment, policy communications, libraries, resource recovery plants and, public health services.

Table 1.1.

Institutional Arrangements for Providing Public Services.

Service Arrangement	Arranges Service	Produces Service	Pays Producer
Government Service	government	government	N.A.
Intergovernmental agreement or contract	government (1)	government (2)	government (1)
Contract	government	private firm	government
Franchise	government	private firm	consumer
Grant	government and consumer	private firm	government and consumer
Voucher	consumer	private firm	government and consumer
Market	consumer	private firm	government and consumer
Voluntary	voluntary association	voluntary association or private firm	N.A. association
Self-service	consumer	consumer	N.A.

Source: Savas E.R. (Savas, 1982: 73).

(3) Contract or purchase of goods and services.

Contracting out can be defined as public financing of private production. Alternatively, the public agency can retain responsibility for the good or service but arrange for private management (management contracts). At the LG level, some of the goods and services usually delivered under this arrangement are refuse collection, ambulance service, street paving and, traffic-light maintenance.

(4) Franchise.

"An exclusive franchise is an award of monopoly privileges to a private firm to supply a particular good or service, usually with price regulation by a government agency. Non-exclusive or multiple franchises can also be awarded, as in the case of taxis. In franchise service, the government is the arranger, a private organization is the producer and, the consumer purchases the service directly from the producer" (Savas, 1982:66).

Common utilities such as electric power, gas and water distribution, are usually provided under franchise contracts.

(5) Subsidies (or grants to private producers).

Under this system a subsidy is given by the government to the producer typically under the form of grants or tax-exemptions. Examples of this arrangements are government induced provision of low-cost housing by the private real state industry, grants to universities and, subsidies to mass transportation companies. Under a grant arrangement the producer is the private firm, both government and consumers are the arrangers and, usually, both government and the consumer make payments to the producer.

(6) Vouchers.

The voucher system is also designed to encourage the consumption of particular goods and services. The vouchers are subsidies to the consumer and permit them to exercise relatively free choice in the marketplace.

In a voucher system, the producer is a private firm (authorized by the government), both government and consumer pay the

producer but, only the consumer selects the deliverer (e.g. rent and school vouchers).

(7) Free market

This system is used to provide private and toll goods. "The consumer himself arranges for services and selects the producer, which is a private firm. Government is not involved in the transaction in any significant way, although it may establish service standards" (Savas, 1982:70).

(8) Voluntary services

"In this arrangement, a voluntary mutual-aid association acts as service arranger and either produces the service directly, using its members as workers, or hires and pays a private firm to do the work" (Savas, 1982:70). Examples of this system are recreation facilities, street cleaning, protective patrol and free protection.

(9) Self services.

In this system the arranger and the producer is the consumer. The government encourages individuals or groups such as neighborhoods associations, to undertake for their own benefit, activities that the government has previously undertaken. This results in a reduction in government activity that otherwise would be required. An example of this arrangement is household care of street and sidewalk sweeping (Hatry, 1973).

Combined Arrangements.

While a particular service is generally provided through one arrangement, it is also important to highlight that some collective goods may be provided under several systems. For example, refuse collection could be delivered by a combination of public agencies and private firms.

2. Decentralization to the local governments.

2.1. Initial considerations.

This form of decentralization can be basically assessed in relation to three criteria: (1) the importance of local expenditures in relation to the general government expenditures, (2) the importance of local revenues relative to the general government revenues and, (3) LGs' financial autonomy.

In this section I will use these criteria in order to answer the following questions: what is the degree of decentralization in both industrialised and developing countries?; what are the factors that explain the different roles of the local layer of government?; which are the economic roles of the local and central governments under different decentralization schemes? and, what are the factors that explain the local fiscal imbalances?.

From the methodological point of view the analysis will try to cover two approaches: a static comparison between countries based on indicators that resume their behavior during the last twenty years (specially averages) and; a dynamic perspective based on long term tendencies.

The data comes from the International Monetary Fund, *Governmental Finance Statistics*, (several issues) and has the following characteristics:

- (1) **Chronologically** it covers the period 1975 to 1994. However, in cases with data constraints the time-span could be shorter (e.g. Colombia),
- (2) **Geographically** it covers countries from Europe (Denmark, The Netherlands and the United Kingdom); Latin America (Chile and Colombia); Africa (Kenya); Asia (Thailand) and Australia (Australia).
- (3) **Economically** it covers industrial and developing countries.
- (4) **Politically** it includes unitary and federal countries with two and three layers of government³.

³ Formally Chile has a four tier system of government. However, its Provincial Government has only nominal functions.

In order to provide consistency and comparability to the analysis the term "local" will refer to the non-central component of the government sector. This is particularly important in three cases: Colombia where the data covers the second and the third layer of government (Departaments and Municipalities), Australia where the decentralization process is specially important for the second layer of government (States) and, The Netherlands, where the available information covers Provinces and Local Governments without differentiating them. In all other cases, the non-central component of the governmental sector refers exclusively to the local level of government⁴.

2.2. Decentralization and economic development.

Graph 2.1(a) illustrates the relationship between per capita income and degree of decentralization. From this graph we can see that industrialised countries have a higher decentralization ratio than developing ones (in average 41.7% and 13.64% respectively).⁵ The explanation for this situation has to do with two aspects: (1) the aggregate resources of the economy and, (2) the efficiency in the provision of services.

Bennett (1994: 19) explains quite clearly the first aspect: "The level of economic development of a country or region determines the aggregate resources that are available for development of governmental and other services. Generally, the higher the level of


⁴ An initial effort was made to differentiate the lower layer of the government from the other levels; however, in order to avoid inconsistencies, I decided to adopt an operational definition of LG as the "non-central" component of government.

As a result of an initial analytical effort I arrived to the conclusion that the results of this research are, in some cases, very sensitive to the definition of "local". This issue is particularly relevant for countries with decentralization processes to the second layer of government and not to the lowest one as in the case of Australia.

⁵ The regression line between percapita income and degree of decentralization shows a positive relation but a relatively poor adjustment. The interesting aspect of the regression is that the t-test shows that income is an explanatory variable for decentralization.


In order to arrive to generalizations the regression should be repeated with a bigger sample.

Graph 2.1.a.
Decentralization & Economic Development



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics.
 LPGE: Local and Provincial Government Expenditure.
 GGE: General Government Expenditure.

Graph 2.1.b.
Trends on Decent.& Economic Development



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics.
 LPGE: Local and Provincial Government Expenditure.
 GGE: General Government Expenditure. (X): Initial Position; (X'): Final Position

economic development the higher is the level of services that can be provided. Indeed, there is a strong, but approximate, relationship between these two factors.

The outcome of this relationship has to be a recognition that the scale of government action will generally be less in aggregate with lower levels of GDP. We would expect, therefore, that the extent, form and complexity of government structures will be less developed with lower levels of GDP". In other words, the level of economic activity is important to explain the increasing demand for services (both private and public) and, the complexity of the governmental structure.

In relation with the second aspect, efficiency considerations in the provision of services are important to explain why countries with low levels of GDP tend to have highly centralized governments. In fact, with very low levels of resources any "welfare state" service will suffer from problems of attaining economies of scale and a critical mass of consumers⁶.

Graph 2.1.(b) shows the relationship between decentralization and per capita income in a time-span of 20 years. In general, there are two aspects that have to be highlighted: (1) the relative stability of the decentralization ratios at different levels of income (especially in industrial countries) and, (2) the lack of a common trend among developing countries⁷.

2.3. Degree of decentralization of expenditures and revenues.

2.3.1. Indicator of decentralization.

The indicators used to study the degree of decentralization are the following (UNDP, 1993):

⁶ Oates identifies an additional argument. He says that the decentralization of a public activity is a costly enterprise so that a country must be relative affluent to adopt a decentralized form of government. Oates goes even further on this argument based on a regression analysis that shows that centralization decreases with economic growth (Oates, 1972).

⁷ The best regression curve for this data is a non linear model. Eventhough the model does not shows a very good adjustment, it shows that Oates' findings must be take with caution.

- The expenditure decentralization ratio defined as the percentage of total government expenditure spent by LGs.
- The modified expenditure decentralization ratio. It is similar to the former but it takes into account that some governmental expenditures cannot be decentralized (especially defense and debt servicing).
- The revenue decentralization ratio. It assesses the significance of local taxation. It is defined as the percentage of local government revenue in total government revenue.
- The financial autonomy ratio. It gives an indication of local government's independence from central government's fundings. It is the percentage of locally raised revenue in total local expenditure.

Of course, these indicators have to be treated with caution and complemented with additional information since: (1) it is possible that a country decentralizes its expenditures but keeps a tight control over standards and priorities, so such financial delegation may be meaningless; (2) it is difficult to estimate and quantify the contributions people make to self-help projects and, (3) the degree of decentralization depends also on several factors as the size of the country, population, area, income, and others (Oates, 1972).

2.3.2. Degree of decentralization of expenditures and revenues.

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show several indicators of Central-Local Government relationship.

From these tables we can see that, in general, the degree of decentralization of expenditures (LPGE/GGE) is higher than the degree of decentralization of revenues (LPR/GGR)⁸ and that, as a consequence, LGs are usually dependent on the CG financial support to balance their budgets.

⁸ The exception is Kenya where, on average, the expenditure decentralization ratio is 5.86 while the revenue decentralization ratio is 6.35.

Table: 2.1.
Fiscal Indicators of Intergovernmental Relations.

LGR/GGR (%)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Average	Rate of growth			Trend (Regression)	
	74/5-79	80-84	85-90	90-94		(2)-(1)	(3)-(2)	(4)-(3)	Initial	Final
Australia	5.04	5.32	5.59	5.61	5.37	5.64	5.11	0.38	4.95	5.78
Chile	1.77	5.16	5.62		4.08	191.47	8.89		1.47	6.68
Colombia	4.76	6.18	5.78		5.46	29.99	-6.51		4.61	6.31
Denmark	30.98	31.11	29.87	31.22	30.77	0.42	-3.99	4.51	30.93	30.62
Thailand	6.72	5.61	5.27	4.96	5.68	-16.49	-6.04	-5.83	6.73	4.63
Kenya	7.93	6.47	5.38	5.05	6.35	-18.46	-16.79	-6.22	8.20	4.50
Netherlands	4.48	5.52	6.93	8.64	6.27	23.21	25.56	24.72	3.71	8.84
United Kingdom	16.91	16.36	15.44	9.70	15.15	-3.25	-5.59	-37.22	18.44	11.85
LPGR/GGR (%)										
Australia	24.81	24.96	26.10	29.37	25.97	0.60	4.60	12.52	23.52	28.42
Chile	1.77	5.16	5.62		4.08	191.47	8.89		1.47	6.68
Colombia	16.17	19.79	17.00		17.69	22.42	-14.10		16.04	19.35
Denmark	30.98	31.11	29.87	31.22	30.77	0.42	-3.99	4.51	30.93	30.62
Thailand	6.72	5.61	5.27	4.96	5.68	-16.49	-6.04	-5.83	6.73	4.63
Kenya	7.93	6.47	5.38	5.05	6.35	-18.46	-16.79	-6.22	8.20	4.50
Netherlands	4.48	5.52	6.93	8.64	6.27	23.21	25.56	24.72	3.71	8.84
United Kingdom	16.91	16.36	15.44	9.70	15.15	-3.25	-5.59	-37.22	18.44	11.85
LGE/GGE (%)										
Australia	6.02	6.54	6.61	6.67	6.43	8.66	1.11	0.84	6.04	6.83
Chile	3.45	7.45	8.12		6.21	116.22	9.01		2.96	9.47
Colombia	7.00	8.63	8.24		7.82	23.26	-4.60		6.95	8.69
Denmark	60.88	57.01	54.86	54.03	56.36	-6.37	-3.77	-1.51	60.23	52.49
Thailand	19.53	9.90	7.19	8.12	11.52	-49.31	-27.41	13.00	19.19	3.86
Kenya	7.91	5.78	4.76	4.79	5.86	-26.91	-17.63	0.60	7.92	3.80
Netherlands	32.21	31.21	32.53	30.64	31.70	-3.10	4.24	-5.82	32.37	31.03
United Kingdom	31.10	28.13	28.32	29.70	29.27	-9.54	0.68	4.86	30.36	28.16
LPGE/GGE (%)										
Australia	48.98	49.60	48.99	50.79	49.46	1.25	-1.22	3.66	48.69	50.22
Chile	3.45	7.45	8.12		6.21	116.22	9.01		2.96	9.47
Colombia	27.88	33.06	35.01		30.97	18.59	5.90		25.99	35.95
Denmark	60.88	57.01	54.86	54.03	56.36	-6.37	-3.77	-1.51	60.23	52.49
Thailand	19.53	9.90	7.19	8.12	11.52	-49.31	-27.41	13.00	19.19	3.86
Kenya	7.91	5.78	4.76	4.79	5.86	-26.91	-17.63	0.60	7.92	3.80
Netherlands	32.21	31.21	32.53	30.64	31.70	-3.10	4.24	-5.82	32.37	31.03
United Kingdom	31.10	28.13	28.32	29.70	29.27	-9.54	0.68	4.86	30.36	28.18
LGE-Mod/GGE (%)										
Australia	6.42	7.02	7.06	7.07	6.87	9.32	0.65	0.11	6.47	7.28
Chile	3.95	8.43	9.01		7.00	113.48	6.86		3.47	10.52
Colombia		9.09	8.89		9.01		-2.17		9.20	8.81
Denmark	63.62	59.49	56.89	56.35	59.03	-6.49	-4.38	-0.95	63.32	54.74
Thailand	23.99	12.31	8.72	9.67	14.12	-48.71	-29.13	10.90	23.65	4.58
Kenya	8.82	6.61	5.26	5.20	6.54	-25.00	-20.44	-1.16	8.91	4.17
Netherlands	34.12	32.84	34.18	32.06	33.36	-3.75	4.09	-6.19	34.30	32.42
United Kingdom	34.90	31.50	31.73	33.00	32.76	-9.74	0.73	4.00	34.08	31.44
LPGE-Mod/GGE (%)										
Australia	52.27	53.25	52.35	53.88	52.83	1.87	-1.68	2.92	52.18	53.49
Chile	3.95	8.43	9.01		7.00	113.48	6.86		3.47	10.52
Colombia		34.52	37.80		35.83		9.51		33.65	38.02
Denmark	63.62	59.49	56.89	56.35	59.03	-6.49	-4.38	-0.95	63.32	54.74
Thailand	23.99	12.31	8.72	9.67	14.12	-48.71	-29.13	10.90	23.65	4.58
Kenya	8.82	6.61	5.26	5.20	6.54	-25.00	-20.44	-1.16	8.91	4.17
Netherlands	34.12	32.84	34.18	32.06	33.36	-3.75	4.09	-6.19	34.30	32.42
United Kingdom	34.90	31.50	31.73	33.00	32.76	-9.74	0.73	4.00	34.08	31.44
CGG/LGR (%)										
Australia	22.76	22.65	20.36	18.11	21.29	-0.46	-10.10	-11.09	24.07	18.50
Chile	45.43	20.23	32.49		32.73	-55.46	60.56		41.27	24.20
Colombia	39.29	39.18	42.67		39.77	-0.29	8.92		37.96	41.58
Denmark	49.85	50.52	43.21	43.21	46.88	1.33	-14.47	0.01	51.96	41.80
Thailand	72.41	52.16	36.60	28.75	48.47	-27.96	-29.82	-21.46	76.20	20.73
Kenya	18.91	5.02	1.40		7.28	-73.47	-72.03		19.27	-4.71
Netherlands	86.23	83.73	78.22	72.33	80.54	-2.90	-6.58	-7.53	89.17	71.91
United Kingdom	48.67	45.66	45.56	68.45	50.27	-6.18	-0.23	50.26	43.02	57.51
CGG/LPGR (%)										
Australia	53.21	51.94	47.47	41.13	49.25	-2.37	-8.62	-13.36	56.03	42.47
Chile	45.43	20.23	32.49		32.73	-55.46	60.56		41.27	24.20
Colombia	47.72	53.65	56.88		51.41	12.43	6.02		44.88	57.93
Denmark	49.85	50.52	43.21	43.21	46.88	1.33	-14.47	0.01	51.96	41.80
Thailand	72.41	52.16	36.60	28.75	48.47	-27.96	-29.82	-21.46	76.20	20.73
Kenya	18.91	5.02	1.40		7.28	-73.47	-72.03		19.27	-4.71
Netherlands	86.23	83.73	78.22	72.33	80.54	-2.90	-6.58	-7.53	89.17	71.91
United Kingdom	48.67	45.66	45.56	68.45	50.27	-6.18	-0.23	50.26	43.02	57.51
LG Financial Autonomy (%)										
Australia	77.24	77.35	79.64	81.89	78.71	0.14	2.96	2.84	75.93	81.50
Chile	54.57	79.77	67.51		67.27	46.17	-15.36		58.73	75.80
Colombia	60.71	60.82	57.33		60.23	0.19	-5.74		62.04	58.42
Denmark	50.15	49.48	56.79	56.79	53.12	-1.33	14.78	-0.00	48.04	58.20
Thailand	27.59	47.84	63.40	71.25	51.53	73.38	32.52	12.39	23.80	79.27
Kenya	81.09	94.98	98.60		92.72	17.14	3.80		78.42	110.66
Netherlands	13.77	16.27	21.78	27.67	19.46	18.18	33.86	27.06	10.83	28.09
United Kingdom	51.33	54.34	54.44	31.55	49.73	5.85	0.19	-42.06	56.98	42.49
LPG Financial Autonomy (%)										
Australia	46.79	48.06	52.53	58.87	50.75	2.70	9.31	12.07	43.97	57.53
Chile	54.57	79.77	67.51		67.27	46.17	-15.36		58.73	75.80
Colombia	52.28	46.35	43.12		48.59	-11.35	-6.96		55.12	42.07
Denmark	50.15	49.48	56.79	56.79	53.12	-1.33	14.78	-0.00	48.04	58.20
Thailand	27.59	47.84	63.40	71.25	51.53	73.38	32.52	12.39	23.80	79.27
Kenya	81.09	94.98	98.60		92.72	17.14	3.80		78.42	110.66
Netherlands	13.77	16.27	21.78	27.67	19.46	18.18	33.86	27.06	10.83	28.09
United Kingdom	51.33	54.34	54.44	31.55	49.73	5.85	0.19	-42.06	56.98	42.49

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F., Government Finance Statistics

Table: 2.2

Fiscal Indicators of Intergovernmental Relations.

LGR/GGR (%)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Average	Rate of growth			Trend (Regression)	
	74/5-79	80-84	85-90	90-94		(2)-(1)	(3)-(2)	(4)-(3)	Initial	Final
Industrial Countries	14.35	14.58	14.46	13.79	14.39	1.57	-0.81	-4.61	14.51	14.27
Developing Countries	5.29	5.85	5.51		5.39	10.60	-5.84		5.25	5.53
LPGR/GGR (%)										
Industrial Countries	19.29	19.49	19.59	19.73	19.54	1.00	0.52	0.74	19.15	19.93
Developing Countries	8.15	9.26	8.32		8.45	13.63	-10.15		8.11	8.79
LGE/GGE (%)										
Industrial Countries	32.55	30.72	30.58	30.26	30.94	-5.62	-0.46	-1.06	32.25	29.63
Developing Countries	9.47	7.94	7.08		7.86	-16.17	-10.89		9.26	6.45
LPGE/GGE (%)										
Industrial Countries	43.29	41.49	41.17	41.29	41.70	-4.18	-0.75	0.27	42.91	40.48
Developing Countries	14.69	14.05	13.77		13.64	-4.38	-1.98		14.02	13.27
LGE-Mod/GGE (%)										
Industrial Countries	34.76	32.71	32.47	32.12	33.01	-5.91	-0.75	-1.06	34.54	31.47
Developing Countries		9.11	7.97		9.17		-12.50		11.31	7.02
LPGE-Mod/GGE (%)										
Industrial Countries	46.23	44.27	43.79	43.82	44.50	-4.24	-1.09	0.08	45.31	43.02
Developing Countries		15.47	15.20		15.87		-1.74		17.42	14.32
CGG/LGR (%)										
Industrial Countries	51.88	50.64	46.84	50.53	49.74	-2.38	-7.51	7.87	52.06	47.43
Developing Countries	44.01	29.15	28.29		32.06	-33.77	-2.94		43.67	20.45
CGG/LPGR (%)										
Industrial Countries	59.49	57.96	53.61	56.28	56.73	-2.57	-7.50	4.97	60.05	53.42
Developing Countries	46.12	32.76	31.84		34.97	-28.95	-2.81		45.40	24.54
LG Financial Autonomy (%)										
Industrial Countries	48.12	49.36	53.16	49.47	50.26	2.57	7.70	-6.94	47.94	52.57
Developing Countries	55.99	70.85	71.71		67.94	26.54	1.21		55.75	81.04
LPG Financial Autonomy (%)										
Industrial Countries	40.51	42.04	46.39	43.72	43.27	3.77	10.35	-5.75	39.95	46.58
Developing Countries	51.86	67.24	68.16		65.03	24.78	1.37		54.02	76.95

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F., Government Finance Statistics

The explanation for this situation has to do with policy concerns about the economic roles of the government. In fact, a system of government that, with national differences, decentralizes expenditures and only part of revenues has the following effects (Prud'Homme, R, 1990)

- (1) positive on stabilization because CG keeps some control over the amount of taxes raised and, because it thus has a fair degree of control over expenditures through grants and subsidies;
- (2) positive allocative implications because it is assumed that expenditures decided at the local level are more responsive to local need and realities, and therefore, they are more efficient; and,
- (3) positive redistributive effects because central transfers, if properly designed, can reduce regional and personal disparities.

2.3.3. Trends on the degree of decentralization of expenditures and revenues.

In order to compare the trends of decentralization in different countries we can place them in a graph that measures the degree of decentralization of expenditures in the x-axis and the degree of decentralization of revenues in the y-axis. This graph (refer to Graph 2.2) allow us to use four theoretical models: (Prud'Homme R., 1990):

Model A is "defined by complete centralization of taxes and of expenditures. In this model, there is hardly any LG, and there is, of course, no intergovernmental subsidies" (Prud'Homme R, 1990:117). This model has positive implications from the point of view of the stabilization and redistributive functions of the government. The allocative implications are less clear since Model A can (or can not) induce greater economic efficiency.

Model B is defined by complete decentralization of taxes and expenditures. In this case, there are also no subsidies/transfers and practically no CG. This model has

negative stabilization and redistributive implications. Its allocative implications are not clear.

Model C is defined by decentralization of taxes and decentralization of expenditures. In this model, all taxes are raised by the CG, given to LGs in the form of subsidies, and spent by LGs. The implications of this model are rather good on stabilization and potentially good on the redistributive role of the government. It can contribute to a greater economic efficiency.


Model D is defined by decentralization of taxes and centralization of expenditures. In this purely theoretical case, taxes are raised by LGs, given to the CG in the form of subsidies, and spent by it. This is a model with negative implication on the economic roles of the government.

The scatterplot shows that in general developing countries are very close to model A. However, each country has its own experience and trend:

Chile. In this country the degree of decentralization is still very small in comparison with most industrial countries. However, the Chilean tendency during the last twenty years is towards a greater size of its LGs and a relatively limited financial imbalance between LG revenues and expenditures.

Thailand. Thailand shows a clear tendency towards a higher degree of centralization (it is moving even further towards model A). In fact, the expenditure decentralization ratio dropped from 19.5% in the mid-seventies to 8.1% in the early nineties while, in the same period, the revenue decentralization ratio decreased from 6.7% to 5%. The reason for these changes have to do with the stabilization and distributive advantages of model A.

Colombia. It is not only the country with the highest degree of decentralization within our developing countries but it is also the one that shows the highest dynamism in redefining its intergovernmental relations (see initial value C and final one C' in graph 2.2).



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F., Government Finance Statistics.
(X): Initial Position; (X'): Final Position.

Models of Centralization/Decentralization and their implications

	Stabilization Implications	Allocative Implications	Redistributive Implications
Model A: Centralization of taxes & expenditures	Good	Unclear	Good
Model B: Decentralization of taxes & expenditures	Bad	Unclear	Bad
Model C: Centralization of taxes & Decentralization of expenditures	Rather Good	Not too bad	Potentially Good
Model D: Decentralization of taxes & Centralization of expenditures	Poor	Bad	Probably Bad

Source: Prud'Homme in Bennett R. (1990), Decentralization, Local Governments and Markets ,

From the graph it is evident that Colombia is decentralizing without closing the local fiscal imbalance between its own revenues and expenditures.

Kenya. It shows the same tendency as Thailand but with a higher degree of centralization (this country is also moving towards model A). It is interesting to note that in Kenya LGs do not have a significant fiscal imbalance.

Industrialised countries, on the other hand, are not only more decentralized than developing ones but, according to the graph, they have also higher local fiscal imbalances.

Denmark: It is the country with the highest degree of decentralization of expenditures and revenues. Its main tendency is to reduce the local government fiscal gap through a greater centralization of expenditures. From the point of view of Prud'Homme's models, Denmark is moving towards a mixed model in between the triangle ABC. This means that Denmark's model of decentralization balances the advantages and disadvantages of models A, B and C.

The Netherlands. Its tendency is to keep a high degree of decentralization of expenditures but, at the same time, reduce the local financial dependency through a higher capacity to collect local revenues (compare N and N'). This country is also moving towards a mixed model.

United Kingdom: Contrary to the Netherlands its tendency is towards a greater centralization of revenues. In fact, the UK fiscal reforms were directed to keep the allocative functions of its LGs while increasing the CG revenue functions.

Australia. It is a highly decentralized country that is moving towards a greater financial autonomy of its States and LGs. Its tendency is towards a mixed model as in the case of Denmark.

On the bases of the national experiences we can say that: (1) all countries (no matter their level of economic development) are undergoing changes in the distribution of responsibilities between the different levels of government; (2) on average, LGs in both industrial and developing countries are trying to reduce their

financial imbalances (refer to Graph 2.2), (3) within developing countries, Kenya and Thailand are moving towards a more centralized system of government, (4) highly decentralized countries are also the ones with the highest fiscal imbalances and, (5) countries with high decentralization ratios are moving towards a model of intergovernmental relations that takes the advantages of models A, B and C.

2.4. Resources for decentralization.

2.4.1. An overview.

Table 2.3. shows the composition of local revenues in industrial and developing countries. From this table it is possible to see some basic facts:

- (1) On average, taxes represent a higher percentage of the local revenue in developing countries than in industrial ones (39.4% and 26.6% respectively). In both cases, LGs have a restricted capacity to rely on their own resources.
- (2) Countries with a high degree of decentralization are more dependent on central grants than those in which the roles of the government are more centralized (grants from the CG are 57% of all local revenues in industrial countries while they represent only 34.9% in developing ones). In practice, this substantially reduces the decision making capabilities of LGs.
- (3) Local non-tax revenues are relatively more important in developing than in industrial countries (25.8% against 14.1%). This item includes fees, user charges and, other revenues that are paid according to the related benefits.
- (4) In all countries the capital revenue is only a very small fraction of the total.

The composition of local revenues shows also important changes during the period 1975-1994. These long term trends can be summarized as follows: (Table 2.3)

- (1) While in most industrialised countries the tax revenue shows a decreasing tendency (especially in the period 1984-

Table: 2.3. Revenue Composition. (*)

		Average				Rate of Growth			
		74/5-79	80-84	85-89	90-94	Average	(2)-(1)	(3)-(2)	(4)-(3)
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)				
TOTAL REVENUE									
Australia	Central Government	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	-0.0
	State, Provincial Government	42.5	43.6	48.1	55.2	47.3	2.5	10.3	14.8
	Local Government	77.2	77.3	79.6	81.9	79.0	0.1	3.0	2.8
	Local-State Government	46.8	48.1	52.5	58.9	50.8	2.7	9.3	12.1
Chile	Central Government	94.9	97.9	100.0	100.0	98.2	3.1	2.2	0.0
	Local Government	54.9	79.8	67.5		67.4	45.4	-15.4	
Colombia	Central Government	97.0	99.9	99.0		98.6	3.0	-0.9	
	State, Provincial Government	49.5	41.9	38.3		43.2	-15.3	-8.6	
	Local Government	60.7	60.8	57.3		59.6	0.2	-5.7	
	Local-State Government	52.3	46.4	43.1		48.6	-11.3	-7.0	
Denmark	Central Government	93.6	96.8	98.5	98.7	96.9	3.3	1.8	0.2
	Local Government	50.1	49.5	56.8	56.8	53.3	-1.3	14.8	-0.0
Thailand	Central Government	98.3	97.6	97.4	99.0	98.1	-0.7	-0.2	1.6
	Local Government	27.6	47.8	63.4	71.3	52.5	73.4	32.5	12.4
Kenya	Central Government	97.0	97.5	95.3	89.6	94.9	0.5	-2.2	-6.0
	Local Government	81.1	95.0	98.7	100.0	93.7	17.1	4.0	1.3
Netherlands	Central Government	99.6	99.6	99.5	99.9	99.7	-0.1	-0.1	0.4
	Local, Provincial Government	13.8	16.3	21.8	27.7	19.9	18.2	33.9	27.1
United Kingdom	Central Government	99.8	99.1	99.5	99.2	99.4	-0.8	0.4	-0.3
	Local Government	51.3	54.3	54.4	31.5	47.9	5.9	0.2	-42.1
Ind. Countries	Central Government	98.3	98.8	99.4	99.5	99.0	0.6	0.5	0.1
	Local Government	40.5	42.0	46.4	43.7	43.0	3.8	10.3	-5.7
Dev. Countries	Central Government	96.8	98.2	97.9		97.4	1.4	-0.3	
	Local Government	54.0	67.2	68.2		65.5	24.6	1.4	
Total Average	Central Government	97.5	98.5	98.7		98.2	1.0	0.1	
	Local Government	47.2	54.6	57.3		54.3	15.7	4.9	
CURRENT REVENUE									
Australia	Central Government	99.8	99.7	99.6	99.8	99.7	-0.1	-0.2	0.2
	State, Provincial Government	41.8	42.7	46.4	53.1	46.0	2.2	8.7	14.5
	Local Government	70.4	70.6	70.4	73.6	71.2	0.2	-0.3	4.5
	Local-State Government	45.3	46.8	51.2	56.5	49.3	3.4	9.4	10.4
Chile	Central Government	92.3	96.2	97.4	94.2	95.0	4.2	1.2	-3.2
	Local Government	54.3	78.5	66.1		66.3	44.6	-15.1	
Colombia	Central Government	97.0	99.9	98.7		98.5	3.0	-1.1	
	State, Provincial Government	49.2	41.8	38.3		43.1	-15.0	-8.4	
	Local Government	60.0	59.6	57.1		58.9	-0.7	-4.1	
	Local-State Government	51.9	46.0	43.1		48.2	-11.4	-6.3	
Denmark	Central Government	93.1	96.1	98.1	97.8	96.3	3.2	2.1	-0.3
	Local Government	47.7	48.1	55.2	55.4	51.6	1.0	14.7	0.4
Thailand	Central Government	98.0	97.6	97.4	98.6	97.9	-0.4	-0.2	1.2
	Local Government	27.6	47.8	63.4	71.3	52.5	73.4	32.5	12.4
Kenya	Central Government	97.0	97.5	95.3	89.6	94.8	0.5	-2.2	-6.0
	Local Government	56.8	94.5	78.7	99.9	82.5	66.4	-16.7	26.9
Netherlands	Central Government	99.5	99.5	99.3	99.8	99.5	-0.0	-0.1	0.5
	Local, Provincial Government	13.4	15.9	21.4	24.2	18.7	18.2	34.7	13.3
United Kingdom	Central Government	96.3	99.5	100.5	99.0	98.8	3.3	1.0	-1.5
	Local Government	50.3	49.5	47.9	26.8	43.6	-1.6	-3.2	-44.0
Ind. Countries	Central Government	97.2	98.7	99.4	99.1	98.6	1.6	0.7	-0.3
	Local Government	39.2	40.1	43.9	40.8	40.8	2.3	9.6	-7.2
Dev. Countries	Central Government	96.1	97.8	97.2		96.6	1.8	-0.6	
	Local Government	47.6	66.7	62.8		62.4	40.0	-5.8	
Total Average	Central Government	96.6	98.2	98.3		97.6	1.7	0.0	
	Local Government	43.4	53.4	53.4		51.6	23.0	-0.0	
TAX									
Australia	Central Government	89.6	89.9	89.2	89.6	89.6	0.3	-0.7	0.5
	State, Provincial Government	29.3	28.8	30.0	32.2	30.1	-1.8	4.5	7.3
	Local Government	53.4	47.0	40.5	42.2	45.8	-12.0	-13.8	4.1
	Local-State Government	32.3	31.1	31.5	33.6	32.0	-3.5	1.3	6.6
Chile	Central Government	71.5	77.1	77.0	81.6	76.8	7.8	-0.2	6.0
	Local Government	37.5	36.2	32.5		35.4	-3.5	-10.1	
Colombia	Central Government	90.2	82.9	88.1		87.1	-8.0	6.2	
	State, Provincial Government	42.3	32.6	32.2		35.7	-23.0	-1.2	
	Local Government	48.9	47.4	46.7		47.7	-3.1	-1.4	
	Local-State Government	44.0	36.1	35.9		39.7	-17.9	-0.6	
Denmark	Central Government	84.7	83.9	85.3	82.8	84.2	-0.9	1.7	-2.9
	Local Government	39.8	40.1	46.7	46.8	43.4	1.0	16.3	0.3
Thailand	Central Government	88.9	88.5	88.1	89.9	88.8	-0.5	-0.5	2.0
	Local Government	22.5	39.7	53.1	60.9	44.1	76.3	33.9	14.5
Kenya	Central Government	85.0	86.8	85.0	80.3	84.3	2.1	-2.1	-5.5
	Local Government	33.2	43.5	44.8	32.2	38.4	31.1	2.9	-28.1
Netherlands	Central Government	90.4	86.9	87.8	91.3	89.1	-4.0	1.1	4.0
	Local, Provincial Government	1.9	3.2	7.8	8.7	5.4	67.3	142.4	11.7
United Kingdom	Central Government	87.2	86.9	89.0	90.4	88.4	-0.4	2.4	1.6
	Local Government	26.6	30.2	32.5	13.1	25.6	13.3	7.8	-59.7
Ind. Countries	Central Government	88.0	86.9	87.8	88.5	87.8	-1.3	1.1	0.8
	Local Government	25.1	26.2	29.6	25.5	26.6	4.1	13.2	-13.7
Dev. Countries	Central Government	83.9	83.8	84.5		84.2	-0.1	0.8	
	Local Government	34.3	38.9	41.6		39.4	13.4	7.0	
Total Average	Central Government	85.9	85.4	86.2		86.0	-0.7	1.0	
	Local Government	29.7	32.5	35.6		33.0	9.4	9.5	
NON TAX									
Australia	Central Government	10.2	9.9	10.4	10.2	10.2	-3.3	5.2	-1.7
	State, Provincial Government	12.5	14.0	16.4	20.9	15.9	11.5	17.5	27.6
	Local Government	17.0	23.6	29.9	31.4	25.5	38.9	26.8	5.1
	Local-State Government	13.1	15.3	18.3	22.4	16.7	16.9	20.0	22.2
Chile	Central Government	20.8	19.1	20.4	12.6	18.2	-8.2	6.8	-38.1
	Local Government	16.8	42.3	34.1		31.1	151.9	-19.4	
Colombia	Central Government	6.8	16.9	10.6		11.4	150.0	-37.1	
	State, Provincial Government	6.8	9.2	6.1		7.4	34.7	-34.2	
	Local Government	11.1	12.2	10.4		11.2	9.7	-14.4	
	Local-State Government	7.9	9.9	7.2		8.6	34.9	-27.4	
Denmark	Central Government	8.5	12.2	12.8	14.9	12.1	44.7	4.8	16.6
	Local Government	7.9	8.0	8.5	8.6	8.3	1.1	6.7	0.9
Thailand	Central Government	9.1	9.1	9.3	8.7	9.0	0.3	2.4	-6.6
	Local Government	5.1	8.1	10.3	10.4	8.5	60.4	25.9	1.3
Kenya	Central Government	12.0	10.6	10.3	9.3	10.6	-11.2	-3.3	-9.4
	Local Government	47.2	51.0	53.6	67.7	54.9	8.0	5.2	26.2

Table: 2.3. Revenue Composition (Continuation).

Netherlands	Central Government	9.1	12.6	11.5	8.6	10.4	39.3	-8.5	-25.9
	Local, Provincial Government	11.5	12.7	13.6	15.6	13.4	10.1	7.5	14.2
United Kingdom	Central Government	9.1	12.6	11.5	8.6	10.5	39.3	-8.5	-25.1
	Local Government	23.7	19.3	15.4	13.7	18.0	-18.3	-20.2	-11.0
Ind. Countries	Central Government	9.2	11.8	11.6	10.6	10.8	28.7	-2.2	-8.5
	Local Government	14.0	13.8	14.0	15.1	14.1	-1.6	1.1	7.8
Dev. Countries	Central Government	12.2	13.9	12.7		12.3	14.7	-9.1	
	Local Government	19.3	27.8	26.3		25.8	44.6	+5.5	
Total Average	Central Government	10.7	12.9	12.1		11.6	20.7	-6.0	
	Local Government	16.6	20.8	20.1		19.9	25.1	-3.3	
CAPITAL REVENUE									
Australia	Central Government	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.3	27.3	57.8	-53.1
	State, Provincial Government	0.7	0.9	1.6	2.1	1.3	19.4	86.6	25.7
	Local Government	6.8	6.8	9.2	8.3	7.8	-1.0	36.5	-10.2
	Local-State Government	1.5	1.7	2.7	2.9	33.6	12.3	62.5	7.5
Chile	Central Government	2.7	1.7	0.9	0.6	1.5	-37.3	-46.3	-28.6
	Local Government	0.5	1.2	0.9		0.9	128.0	-29.4	
Colombia	Central Government	0.0	0.0	0.3		0.1	-0.5	591.2	
	State, Provincial Government	0.3	0.1	0.0		0.1	-66.1	-79.2	
	Local Government	0.7	1.3	0.2		0.7	72.0	-85.6	
	Local-State government	0.4	0.4	0.1		0.3	-7.9	-83.7	
Denmark	Central Government	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.6	23.7	-36.1	122.1
	Local Government	2.5	1.3	1.6	1.3	1.7	-46.2	17.5	-14.2
Thailand	Central Government	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.2	-96.5	3.0	4636.6
	Local Government	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
Kenya	Central Government	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	314.0	-48.7	-17.5
	Local Government	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.2		-27.9	-71.8
Netherlands	Central Government	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-46.2	74.0	-35.4
	Local, Provincial Government	0.3	0.4	0.4	3.4	1.1	16.5	0.5	797.9
United Kingdom	Central Government	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.3	68.5	19.0	-42.4
	Local Government	1.1	4.9	6.5	4.7	4.3	358.8	34.4	-27.5
Ind. Countries	Central Government	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	23.3	3.7	3.8
	Local Government	1.3	2.1	2.8	3.1	2.3	54.1	35.8	11.1
Dev. Countries	Central Government	0.7	0.4	0.3		0.4	-40.7	-32.1	
	Local Government	0.2	0.5	0.3		0.4	113.8	-39.3	
Total Average	Central Government	0.5	0.4	0.3		0.4	-23.5	-16.6	
	Local Government	0.8	1.3	1.6		5.3	63.1	21.0	
GRANTS & TRANSFERS									
Australia	Central Government	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
	State, Provincial Government	57.5	56.4	51.9	44.8	52.7	-1.8	-7.9	-13.7
	Local Government	22.8	22.7	20.4	18.1	21.0	-0.5	-10.1	-11.1
	Local-State Government	53.2	51.9	47.5	41.1	49.2	-2.4	-8.6	-13.4
Chile	Central Government	5.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.8	-57.7	-100.0	137.0
	Local Government	45.1	20.2	32.5		32.6	-55.2	60.6	
Colombia	Central Government	3.0	0.1	1.0		1.4	-96.3	822.4	
	State, Provincial Government	50.5	58.1	61.7		56.8	15.0	6.2	
	Local Government	39.3	39.2	42.7		40.4	-0.3	8.9	
	Local-State government	47.7	53.6	56.9		51.4	12.4	6.0	
Denmark	Central Government	6.4	3.2	1.5	1.3	3.1	-49.2	-54.2	-11.0
	Local Government	49.9	50.5	43.2	43.2	46.7	1.3	-14.5	0.0
Thailand	Central Government	1.7	2.4	2.6	1.0	1.9	38.4	7.3	-61.8
	Local Government	72.4	52.2	36.6	28.7	47.5	-28.0	-29.8	-21.5
Kenya	Central Government	3.0	2.5	4.7	10.4	5.1	-16.0	87.5	121.3
	Local Government	18.9	5.0	1.3	0.0	6.3	-73.5	-74.8	
Netherlands	Central Government	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.3	24.4	16.4	-84.5
	Local, Provincial Government	86.2	83.7	78.2	72.3	80.1	-2.9	-6.6	-7.5
United Kingdom	Central Government	0.2	0.9	0.5	0.8	0.6	429.4	-45.9	52.4
	Local Government	48.7	45.7	45.6	68.5	52.1	-6.2	-0.2	50.3
Ind. Countries	Central Government	1.7	1.2	0.6	0.5	1.0	-33.2	-45.7	-13.2
	Local Government	59.5	58.0	53.6	56.3	57.0	-2.6	-7.5	5.0
Dev. Countries	Central Government	3.2	1.8	2.1		2.6	-44.0	15.9	
	Local Government	46.0	32.8	31.8		34.5	-28.8	-2.9	
Total Average	Central Government	2.5	1.5	1.3		1.8	-40.2	-8.2	
	Local Government	52.8	45.4	42.7		45.7	-14.0	-5.8	
OVERALL DEFICIT									
Australia	Central Government	-14.9	-7.4	-2.8	0.4	-6.2	-50.6	-62.5	-115.3
	State, Provincial Government	-7.9	-4.6	-4.2	-5.0	-5.4	-41.8	-7.3	17.7
	Local Government	-7.7	-4.5	1.0	0.5	-2.7	-41.0	-122.6	-51.6
	Local-State Government	-7.8	-4.5	-3.5	-4.2	-5.1	-42.1	-23.0	21.4
Chile	Central Government	3.0	0.1	-0.4	7.3	2.5	-95.0	-396.3	-1744.3
	Local Government	2.1	-12.1	0.1		-3.3	-678.7	-101.1	
Colombia	Central Government	-3.6	-31.7	-11.9		-15.7	771.5	-62.3	
	State, Provincial Government	-0.0	6.5	-3.3		1.1	-36831.0	-150.4	
	Local Government	-0.0	-6.0	7.2		0.4	11927.6	-219.6	
	Local-State government	0.1	3.8	-0.0		1.5	4605.9	-100.3	
Denmark	Central Government	-2.5	-14.8	5.2	-3.4	-3.9	501.9	-135.4	-165.9
	Local Government	-0.3	0.6	-0.9	-1.3	-0.5	-306.1	-255.3	44.3
Thailand	Central Government	-25.7	-29.1	-10.7	19.0	-11.6	13.1	-63.3	-277.8
	Local Government	2.7	3.8	7.2	6.4	5.0	40.8	89.8	-11.3
Kenya	Central Government	-23.6	-26.1	-25.2	-11.0	-21.5	10.9	-3.7	-56.4
	Local Government	3.4	-2.9	-2.1	1.4	-0.0	-184.3	-27.6	-169.6
Netherlands	Central Government	-6.6	-13.2	-7.6	-6.1	-8.4	99.7	-42.4	-19.6
	Local, Provincial Government	-5.4	-4.9	-10.2	-0.7	-5.3	-8.5	106.5	-93.3
United Kingdom	Central Government	-16.2	-11.1	-1.5	-4.8	-8.4	-31.5	-86.7	228.6
	Local Government	-9.9	-3.0	-1.3	0.1	-3.5	-69.4	-57.7	-110.0
Ind. Countries	Central Government	-10.0	-11.6	-1.6	-3.5	-6.7	15.5	-85.8	111.8
	Local Government	-5.9	-3.0	-4.0	-1.5	-3.6	-49.1	33.2	-61.5
Dev. Countries	Central Government	-12.5	-21.7	-12.1		-11.6	73.7	-44.4	
	Local Government	2.1	-1.8	1.3		0.8	-188.5	-171.8	
Total Average	Central Government	-11.3	-16.6	-6.8		-9.1	47.8	-58.8	
	Local Government	-1.9	-2.4	-1.3		-1.4	26.7	-44.8	

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F. Government Finance Statistics.

(*) Calculated as a percentage of Total Revenues & Grants

1994) in developing countries, the same item shows the opposite tendency.

- (2) Both in developing and industrial countries the non-tax component shows a tendency to increase its contribution to the total local government revenue.
- (3) On average the contribution of grants to the overall LG revenue tends to decrease in industrial and developing countries. This indicates that LGs are moving towards higher levels of local financial autonomy. In industrialised countries grants were 59.6% of all local revenues during the early 70s while now they are about 56.3%. In developing countries, the importance of grants in the overall local revenue dropped from 46% to 31.8% in the period 1975 to 1989.⁹
- (4) The percentage contribution of the capital revenue to the total local revenue is increasing in industrialised countries while it is much more unstable in developing ones.

2.4.2. Current revenues.

In this section we are going to answer two questions: (1) What are the factors that explain the poor capacity of LGs to rely on their own tax-base, and (2) if local taxes are pro-cyclical or anti-cyclical.

2.4.2.1. The poor capacity of LGs to rely on their own tax-base.

In general, LGs have a restricted capacity to rely on their own resources (taxes are on average only 33% of all local revenues) because they have limited tax possibilities. This is the direct consequence of the CGs' tendency to reserve for themselves the most buoyant and lucrative tax revenues.

The above proposition can be demonstrated by simply looking at the

⁹ Unfortunately, more recent data is not available for all developing countries.

tax responsibilities of CG and LGs¹⁰. From Table 2.4. we see that LGs rely mainly on: (1) property taxes, (2) domestic taxes on goods and services and, (3) other taxes like the ones on vehicles, entertainment, and licenses¹¹. On the contrary, the CG tax responsibilities include the most lucrative sources as: (1) taxes on personal income, profits and capital gains; (2) domestic taxes on goods and services (including value added tax) and, (3) taxes on international transactions and trade.

Once again the analysis dividing the sample between developing and industrialised countries allows us to see that LGs in advanced countries are, in general, less dependent on property taxes than their counterparts in the Third World. The reason is that they have additional tax responsibilities like the income taxes in Denmark or the poll taxes in the United Kingdom.

From a theoretical point of view the distribution of tax responsibilities between the different layers of government can be explained using the "principles of good taxation". According to these principles: (1) since mobility places limits on variations between the taxation policies of different LGs, taxes that are highly mobile -like corporate and personal income taxes- are more appropriately taxed by a higher level of government; (2) tax bases which are unevenly distributed between localities -such as those on international trade- are inappropriate candidates for decentralization, because of their negative repercussions on equity, (3) taxes that are calculated using local data systems should be decentralized (e.g. property taxes) and, (4) taxes should be paid at the level in which they are more correlated with their benefits (as in the case of licenses paid to the local government) (UNDP, 1993).

¹⁰ For Colombia and Australia, both with three layers of government, the information refers to the lowest level of government.

¹¹ It is interesting that in Kenya and Denmark LGs have access to income taxes while in Colombia LGs receive 10% of their revenues from "Social Security".

2.4.2.2. Lack of dynamism of local taxes.

Another characteristics of LGs is that they rely on taxes that do not change with the economic activity and prices. In other words, local taxes are neutral or anti-cyclical in relation to the fluctuations of prices and income.

In order to demonstrate this proposition we can use a correlation analysis that should give us the following results:

$$(1) \quad \rho(\Delta CT, \Delta Y) > \rho(\Delta LT, \Delta Y) > \rho(\Delta LPT, \Delta Y)$$

$$(2) \quad \rho(\Delta CT, \Delta P) > \rho(\Delta LT, \Delta P) > \rho(\Delta LPT, \Delta P)$$

where:

ρ : Linear correlation

ΔCT : Percentage change of central government tax revenue.

ΔLT : Percentage change of local government tax revenue.

ΔLPT : Percentage change of local government property tax.

ΔY : Percentage change of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

ΔP : Percentage change of the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

From (1) we expect to show that CG taxes are more correlated with the general economic activity (in this case GDP) than local taxes and, that local taxes should have a higher correlation coefficient than property taxes.

Proposition (2) is intended to demonstrate the same as (1) but using the rate of inflation instead of the percentage change of GDP.

Table 2.5. shows the results of the calculations. The data is in line with our expectations since, in general, local taxes (especially property taxes) do not always change with economic activity and prices.

Additionally, the results show that LGs in industrialised countries have a higher capacity than developing ones to adjust their taxes (including property tax) to the economic fluctuations of prices and GDP¹². The factor that explain this last issue seems to be

¹² Chile is the only country in the second group with very high correlation coefficients. This shows the relatively high efficacy of its property tax revaluation system.

Table 2.4
Sources of Tax Revenues for Central and Local Governments

	Income Tax	Social Security	Tax on Wages	Tax on Property	Domestic Taxes on GGs & SSs	International Trade Taxes	Other Taxes	Total
Australia								
Central	72.1		1.6		22.3	3.9		100.0
Local				100.0				100.0
Chile								
Central	28.4	7.3		0.5	45.3	12.0	6.5	100.0
Local				56.0	44.0			100.0
Colombia								
Central	25.1	12.1	4.8	0.3	32.1	22.2	3.4	100.0
Local		10.0		40.1			49.9	100.0
Denmark								
Central	45.0	4.6	1.6	2.5	45.5	0.1	0.8	100.0
Local	92.1			7.8			0.1	100.0
Kenya								
Central	92.1			7.8			0.1	100.0
Local	30.7			51.0	17.3		1.0	100.0
Netherlands								
Central	33.5	40.1		2.5	22.9		1.0	100.0
Local				38.8	4.1		57.1	100.0
United Kingdom								
Central	38.6	17.9		8.4	35.1	0.1		100.0
Local				1.1			98.9	100.0
Thailand								
Central	31.0	1.3		2.6	44.2	20.2	0.8	100.0
Local				16.5			83.5	100.0

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F. Government Finance Statistics

Table 2.5.
Local Taxes and Economic Fluctuations. Correlation Coefficients

	CT,Y	LT,Y	LPT,Y	CT,P	LT,P	LPT,P	CT~,Y~	LT~,Y~	LPT~,Y~	CT~,P~	LT~,P~	LPT~,P~
Australia	0.996	0.996	0.996	0.995	0.993	0.993	0.678	0.209	0.209	0.796	0.709	0.709
Chile	0.996	0.994	0.983	0.965	0.905	0.962	0.984	0.895	n.a.	0.925	0.905	n.a.
Colombia	0.998	0.990	0.985	0.988	0.994	0.996	0.442	-0.137	-0.111	-0.023	0.025	0.044
Denmark	0.995	0.998	0.938	0.986	0.988	0.916	0.847	0.695	-0.113	0.567	0.700	-0.133
Thailand	0.996	0.996	0.949	0.905	0.905	0.936	0.778	0.695	0.143	0.427	0.237	0.143
Kenya	0.997	0.960	0.957	0.964	0.927	0.905	-0.142	0.406	0.119	0.055	0.177	-0.009
Netherlands	0.996	0.939	0.985	0.964	0.884	0.978	0.631	-0.284	0.002	0.563	-0.176	0.746
United Kingdom	0.996	0.621	0.138	0.993	0.603	0.124	0.595	0.666	0.264	0.823	0.279	0.264
Ind. Countries	0.996	0.888	0.764	0.984	0.867	0.753	0.688	0.322	0.086	0.687	0.378	0.397
Dev. Countries	0.997	0.985	0.968	0.956	0.933	0.950	0.516	0.465	0.036	0.356	0.336	0.045
Total	0.996	0.937	0.866	0.970	0.900	0.851	0.602	0.393	0.062	0.522	0.357	0.221

Where: CT: Central Government Taxes
 LT: Local Government Taxes
 LPT: Local and Provincial Taxes
 Y: Income
 P: Prices
 ~: Percentual Variation

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F. Government Finance Statistics

associated with the higher institutional capacity of their LGs. As expected the differences between countries are also important. (Table 2.5). The factors that account for these differences are: (1) that some countries have a system of property tax valuation that is less sensitive to economic and prices fluctuations than others; (2) that the indexation procedures to adjust local taxes are not always based on enough information and, therefore, they can underestimate the actual economic fluctuations (as in the case of inflation) and; (3) that local political influences can play an important role to delay or avoid revaluation of the tax-base. For example, in Colombia, although important changes were made to reevaluate property taxes on the basis of the price index, political factors were important to keep the rate of indexation below the rate of inflation (UNDP, 1993).

2.4.3. Central transfers and financial autonomy.

It follows from our discussion in section 2.4.2.1 that, as a consequence of the limited capacity of LGs to rely on their own tax-base, intergovernmental transfers play a critical role in local finance. Here we are going to examine the contribution of these transfers to the total local government revenues and, their tendencies during the last twenty years.

2.4.3.1. Contribution of central transfers to local government revenues.

The available data about the contribution of the central transfers to local government revenues shows that, on the average, grants stands for a very important part of local inflows (Table 2.3). In fact, CG transfers account for about 60% and 35% of LG revenues in industrialised and developing countries respectively. Additionally, if we recall that advanced countries tend to have a higher degree of decentralization than developing ones, we could deduce that the proportion of grants over the total revenue tends to be higher in decentralized countries than in more centralized ones. The main reason for this situation is that decentralization usually implies additional expenditure responsibilities for LGs but not always a

redistribution of revenue responsibilities (we already discussed this issue).

Of course, all generalizations must be taken with caution because there is a wide range of national experiences. For example, in developing countries the contribution of grants to the local revenue is: 32.6% in Chile, 51.4% in Colombia, 47.5% in Thailand and 6.3% in Kenya. On the other hand, in industrialised countries LGs show the following levels of financial dependency from central grants: 80.1% in The Netherlands, 52.1% in United Kingdom, 46.7% in Denmark and, 49.2% in Australia.

2.4.3.2. Trend over the last twenty years.

On average, there is a tendency to reduce the local government dependency on central grants both in industrialised and in developing countries (Table 2.3).

However, if we refer to the disaggregated data we can see the variety of national experiences. For example, among industrialised countries Australia, Denmark and The Netherlands are reducing their financial dependency on central grants, while the United Kingdom shows the opposite tendency (specially during the period 1985-1994). On the other hand, within developing countries the differences are also evident: in Colombia LGs are continuously increasing their dependency on the CG; Chile has a tendency to downsize the importance of grants on LG revenues; Thailand shows a reduction of the contribution of grants to its LGs and; finally, in Kenya local authorities are practically financially independent of their CG.

Of course, in each case the implications for LGs are totally different. Countries with low degrees of financial autonomy show a greater involvement of central authorities in the establishment of standards and norms for service delivery and, therefore, they usually show a weak linkage between local government decisions and people's needs. As Rondinelli says (cited by UNDP, 1993: 33) the lack of financial autonomy in these countries "reduces the burden, but increases the dependence of local authorities, who generally

neither impose taxes nor have to justify to local population how money is spent".

Additionally, countries where central grants are an important component of local revenues can achieve several objectives as: (1) the reduction of vertical and horizontal fiscal imbalances; (2) reductions in differences in fiscal capacity between LGs resulting from different resource endowments and economic structures; (3) ensuring a similar pattern in the provision of services in each locality and; (4) internalizing externalities (compensation principle).

On the other hand, countries with a relatively high degree of local financial autonomy show a greater independence in decision making, can be more sensitive to both costs and local priorities but, their equity considerations are some how less important.

2.5. Decentralization of expenditures.

This section has the purpose to answer to the following questions: how LGs expenditures are composed?; what is the degree of decentralization of social expenditures?; and, if the social allocation ratio is higher at local level than at the central one.

2.5.1. Expenditures by economic type: an overview.

Current expenditures account for about 80% to 85% of all local spendings both in developing and in industrialised countries. However, if we disaggregate this account into its main components the sample shows the following differences (Table 2.6):

- (1) That LGs in developing countries spend more on goods and services than industrialised ones (67.5% against 56.2% respectively). The explanation for this difference has to do with the relative importance of "wages and salaries" over the total spendings. In fact, Colombia spends 53.6% of all the local budget on wages and Kenya 51.3%, while the same item accounts for 35.3% in The Netherlands, 37.9% in Denmark and 44.1% in the United Kingdom.¹³

¹³ Chile is an exception between developing countries because its local governments spend only 36.8% of their budget on salaries and wages.

Table. 2.6.
Expenditures Composition. (*)

		Average				Rate of Growth			
		74/5-79 (1)	80-84 (2)	85-89 (3)	90-94 (4)	Average	(2)-(1)	(3)-(2)	(4)-(3)
TOTAL EXPENDITURES									
Australia	Central Government	92.4	97.6	99.5	101.6	100.0	5.6	2.0	2.1
	State, Provincial Government	95.7	98.1	98.2	99.5	46.5	2.5	0.1	1.4
	Local Government	99.6	99.9	100.2	100.1	78.7	0.4	0.2	-0.0
	Local-State Government	96.2	98.4	98.4	99.6	98.0	2.3	0.1	1.2
Chile	Central Government	98.0	102.3	102.8	100.9	101.0	4.4	0.5	-1.8
	Local Government	100.0	99.5	99.9		99.8	-0.5	0.4	
Colombia	Central Government	99.0	97.7	97.5		98.2	-1.4	-0.2	
	State, Provincial Government	100.0	99.9	99.5		99.9	-0.0	-0.5	
	Local Government	100.2	100.3	99.9		100.2	0.1	-0.4	
	Local-State Government	100.0	100.0	99.7		99.9	0.0	-0.4	
Denmark	Central Government	98.9	99.1	99.5	99.3	99.2	0.1	0.5	-0.2
	Local Government	99.8	99.9	99.9	100.0	99.9	0.1	0.1	0.1
Thailand	Central Government	98.2	99.1	97.6	99.0	98.5	0.9	-1.5	1.5
	Local Government	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kenya	Central Government	91.0	95.0	98.1	98.4	95.4	4.4	3.2	0.3
	Local Government	100.0	100.0	96.8	92.2	97.4	0.0	-3.2	-4.7
Netherlands	Central Government	97.6	97.7	102.0	100.8	99.5	0.1	4.4	-1.1
	Local, Provincial Government	103.0	100.4	93.7	100.4	99.3	-2.5	-6.7	7.2
United Kingdom	Central Government	94.8	97.3	99.2	104.0	98.2	2.6	1.9	4.9
	Local Government	99.1	99.5	100.7	100.5	99.8	0.4	1.2	-0.2
Ind.Countries	Central Government	95.9	97.9	100.1	101.5	99.2	2.0	2.2	1.4
	Local Government	99.5	99.5	98.2	100.1	99.3	0.0	-1.4	2.0
Dev.Countries	Central Government	96.6	96.5	99.0		98.3	2.0	0.5	
	Local Government	100.0	99.9	99.1		99.3	-0.1	-0.8	
Total Avg.	Central Government	96.3	98.2	99.5		98.7	2.0	1.3	
	Local Government	99.8	99.7	98.6		99.3	-0.1	-1.1	
CURRENT EXPENDITURES									
Australia	Central Government	83.4	91.2	93.2	95.7	90.4	9.4	2.2	2.7
	State, Provincial Government	75.3	83.2	83.7	86.0	81.6	10.5	0.6	2.7
	Local Government	50.3	63.3	69.3	72.5	62.9	25.6	9.6	4.7
	Local-State Government	72.2	80.6	81.8	84.2	79.2	11.6	1.4	3.0
Chile	Central Government	84.1	94.0	90.6	87.9	89.2	11.7	-3.6	-3.0
	Local Government	92.9	82.4	81.6		85.9	-11.4	-1.0	
Colombia	Central Government	65.2	78.3	80.0		73.4	20.1	2.2	
	State, Provincial Government	86.2	86.8	89.8		87.0	0.8	3.5	
	Local Government	81.3	69.1	81.5		76.6	-14.9	17.9	
	Local-State Government	84.8	82.2	87.1		84.3	-3.1	6.0	
Denmark	Central Government	93.4	93.8	95.8	95.8	94.6	0.5	2.1	0.0
	Local Government	88.5	92.7	93.7	94.8	92.7	4.7	1.1	1.2
Thailand	Central Government	74.4	77.9	81.3	77.2	77.8	4.7	4.5	-5.0
	Local Government	69.3	63.4	62.3	54.4	62.8	-8.6	-1.6	-12.7
Kenya	Central Government	70.7	78.2	82.8	82.3	78.2	10.6	5.9	-0.6
	Local Government	88.0	93.8	91.0	84.1	89.3	6.5	-2.9	-7.5
Netherlands	Central Government	90.6	89.6	94.0	96.1	92.4	-1.2	4.9	2.2
	Local, Provincial Government	88.0	88.6	82.9	85.2	86.2	0.6	-6.4	2.8
United Kingdom	Central Government	89.5	92.9	94.0	95.5	92.7	3.8	1.2	1.6
	Local Government	80.2	84.7	86.0	86.7	84.2	5.7	1.5	0.8
Ind.Countries	Central Government	89.2	91.9	94.2	95.8	92.5	3.0	2.6	1.6
	Local Government	82.2	86.7	86.1	87.7	85.6	5.4	-0.7	1.9
Dev.Countries	Central Government	73.6	82.1	83.7		79.6	11.5	1.9	
	Local Government	63.8	80.4	80.5		80.6	-4.0	0.1	
Total Avg.	Central Government	81.4	87.0	89.0		86.1	6.8	2.3	
	Local Government	83.0	83.5	82.3		83.1	0.6	-0.3	
EXPENDITURES ON GOODS & SERVICES									
Australia	Central Government	20.8	21.5	22.0	24.1	21.9	3.3	2.5	9.7
	State, Provincial Government	58.0	62.8	61.1	61.9	60.8	8.2	-2.6	1.2
	Local Government	43.0	53.8	60.7	64.5	54.2	27.9	12.9	6.2
	Local-State Government	56.1	61.6	61.1	62.2	60.0	9.9	-0.9	1.9
Chile	Central Government	40.5	34.7	28.8	28.4	33.4	-14.3	-17.1	-1.5
	Local Government	53.1	61.5	64.3		59.3	15.7	4.6	
Colombia	Central Government	38.9	30.4	26.5		29.4	-21.8	-12.9	
	State, Provincial Government	65.5	73.8	62.6		68.2	12.5	-15.1	
	Local Government	67.9	58.8	55.5		62.5	-13.4	-5.6	
	Local-State Government	66.1	69.8	66.5		66.7	5.7	-4.7	
Denmark	Central Government	24.9	20.2	20.4	20.1	21.5	-19.1	1.2	-1.5
	Local Government	51.1	55.7	56.3	55.7	55.1	9.0	1.2	-1.1
Thailand	Central Government	51.7	59.4	58.2	59.3	56.9	14.9	-2.1	1.9
	Local Government		58.3			58.3			
Kenya	Central Government	51.2	53.3	50.6	49.2	51.1	4.0	-5.0	-2.7
	Local Government	55.7	90.9	85.8	81.3	85.7	63.2	-5.7	-5.2
Netherlands	Central Government	16.1	14.6	15.1	14.6	15.1	-9.5	3.6	-3.4
	Local, Provincial Government	52.2	45.8	40.5	44.7	45.9	-12.3	-11.5	10.3
United Kingdom	Central Government	29.7	30.5	30.4	31.2	30.4	2.7	-0.1	2.6
	Local Government	60.9	64.2	65.3	66.6	64.0	5.4	1.7	2.0
Ind.Countries	Central Government	22.9	21.7	22.0	22.5	22.2	-5.3	1.4	2.4
	Local Government	55.1	56.8	55.6	57.3	56.2	3.2	-1.8	2.7
Dev.Countries	Central Government	45.6	44.5	41.0		42.7	-2.5	-7.8	
	Local Government		70.1			67.5			
Total Avg.	Central Government	34.2	33.1	31.5		32.4	-3.4	-4.7	
	Local Government		63.5			61.9			
WAGES & SALARIES & EMPLOYERS CONTR.									
Australia	Central Government								
	State, Provincial Government								
	Local Government								
	Local-State Government								
Chile	Central Government	29.8	24.3	17.9	18.2	22.8	-18.6	-26.2	1.6
	Local Government	30.0	39.1	42.5		36.8	30.1	8.8	
Colombia	Central Government	24.8	20.2	18.3		19.8	-18.3	-9.6	
	State, Provincial Government	51.8	60.5	48.7		56.5	16.8	-19.5	
	Local Government	54.3	44.2	44.2		45.4	-18.7	0.1	
	Local-State Government	55.3	56.2	53.3		53.6	7.4	-5.1	
Denmark	Central Government	16.6	12.7	12.5	11.7	13.5	-23.8	-1.4	-6.1
	Local Government	34.5	38.2	39.0	38.6	37.9	10.7	2.1	-0.9
Thailand	Central Government	22.6	27.2	30.5	33.5	28.1	23.5	9.4	9.7
	Local Government								

Table: 2.6. Expenditures Composition. (continuation).

Kenya	Central Government	30.8	28.9	31.5	30.7	30.5	-6.1	9.1	-2.7
	Local Government	48.1	56.4	48.8	49.5	51.3	17.2	-13.5	1.4
Netherlands	Central Government	10.9	9.4	9.0	8.7	9.5	-13.9	-4.1	-3.6
	Local, Provincial Government	42.2	35.8	30.8	31.7	35.3	-15.2	-13.9	2.9
United Kingdom	Central Government	13.9	12.9	12.8	12.5	13.1	-7.1	-1.4	-1.9
	Local Government	41.2	45.0	46.1	43.9	44.1	9.1	2.4	-4.7
Ind.Countries	Central Government								
	Local Government								
Dev.Countries	Central Government	27.0	25.3	24.6		25.3	-6.1	-3.0	
	Local Government								
Total Avg.	Central Government								
	Local Government								
OTHER PURCHASES OF GOODS & SERVICES									
Australia	Central Government								
	State, Provincial Government								
	Local Government								
	Local-State Government								
Chile	Central Government	10.7	10.5	10.9	10.1	10.6	-2.4	3.8	-6.8
	Local Government	23.1	22.4	21.8		22.5	-3.0	-2.7	
Colombia	Central Government	14.1	10.2	8.2		9.6	-27.9	-19.6	
	State, Provincial Government	13.5	13.2	13.4		13.3	-1.9	1.4	
	Local Government	15.9	14.7	11.3		14.0	-7.6	-23.0	
	Local-State Government	14.0	13.6	13.2		13.5	-2.8	-3.0	
Denmark	Central Government	8.3	7.5	7.9	8.4	8.0	-9.7	5.5	5.8
	Local Government	16.6	17.5	17.4	17.1	17.2	5.5	-0.9	-1.6
Thailand	Central Government	29.1	31.5	27.2	25.8	28.8	8.3	-13.8	-5.3
	Local Government								
Kenya	Central Government	20.5	24.4	19.1	18.6	20.6	19.1	-21.7	-2.8
	Local Government	35.5	34.5	36.9	31.8	34.4	-2.7	7.1	-14.0
Netherlands	Central Government	5.2	5.2	6.1	5.9	5.6	-0.3	17.5	-3.2
	Local, Provincial Government	10.1	10.0	9.7	13.1	10.6	-0.3	-2.9	34.0
United Kingdom	Central Government	15.7	17.5	17.7	18.7	17.3	11.3	0.8	5.9
	Local Government	19.7	19.2	19.2	22.7	19.9	-2.4	0.1	18.0
Ind.Countries	Central Government								
	Local Government								
Dev.Countries	Central Government								
	Local Government								
Total Avg.	Central Government								
	Local Government								
INTEREST PAYMENTS									
Australia	Central Government	5.5	6.9	9.3	6.5	7.1	25.4	34.6	-30.4
	State, Provincial Government	7.4	7.7	8.8	11.1	8.5	3.4	14.7	25.2
	Local Government	6.7	7.7	7.2	7.2	7.2	14.0	-6.1	-0.5
	Local-State Government	7.4	7.7	8.6	10.5	8.3	4.5	12.0	22.4
Chile	Central Government	7.2	2.9	7.8	8.2	6.4	-60.3	172.9	5.7
	Local Government	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	6.8	-83.9	
Colombia	Central Government	4.4	4.6	8.6		6.4	3.9	88.2	
	State, Provincial Government	0.9	0.9	1.5		1.0	5.8	70.5	
	Local Government	1.6	1.7	2.2		1.7	4.6	32.6	
	Local-State Government	1.1	1.1	1.6		1.2	4.6	41.7	
Denmark	Central Government	3.2	11.1	17.1	14.1	11.2	243.3	53.5	-17.5
	Local Government	1.8	1.4	1.1	1.0	1.3	-19.6	-22.6	-6.5
Thailand	Central Government	7.0	10.5	15.6	8.6	10.5	50.0	47.7	-44.9
	Local Government								
Kenya	Central Government	5.8	11.1	17.0	24.5	14.2	89.7	53.5	44.5
	Local Government								
Netherlands	Central Government	2.9	5.3	8.7	8.9	6.3	65.7	61.8	3.2
	Local, Provincial Government	13.8	14.5	12.5	11.9	13.2	5.2	-14.0	-4.7
United Kingdom	Central Government	8.9	10.1	10.2	7.3	9.3	13.3	1.5	-28.4
	Local Government	13.2	11.1	8.8	7.2	10.4	-16.0	-20.3	-18.1
Ind.Countries	Central Government	7.3	7.5	7.9	8.2	7.7	3.3	4.8	4.1
	Local Government	11.6	11.7	11.6	13.2	11.9	0.9	-0.9	14.0
Dev.Countries	Central Government								
	Local Government								
Total Avg.	Central Government								
	Local Government								
SUBSIDIES AND OTHER TRANSFERS									
Australia	Central Government	57.1	62.6	61.9	65.1	61.4	10.0	-1.5	5.2
	State, Provincial Government	9.8	12.8	13.8	13.1	12.3	30.0	7.8	-4.9
	Local Government	1.6	1.8	1.4	0.9	1.5	14.3	-22.7	-35.5
	Local-State Government	8.8	11.3	12.1	11.5	10.9	28.4	6.9	-5.0
Chile	Central Government	36.4	56.4	54.0	51.3	49.4	54.8	-4.2	-5.1
	Local Government	39.8	20.9	17.3		26.6	-47.5	-17.3	
Colombia	Central Government	39.4	43.4	45.0		43.7	10.0	3.7	
	State, Provincial Government	19.8	12.2	26.1		17.8	-38.5	114.9	
	Local Government	11.7	8.6	23.7		12.4	-26.6	176.1	
	Local-State Government	17.6	11.2	19.0		16.4	-36.4	69.3	
Denmark	Central Government	65.2	62.6	58.3	61.6	61.9	-4.1	-6.8	5.7
	Local Government	35.7	35.6	36.2	38.0	36.4	-0.3	1.9	5.0
Thailand	Central Government	14.9	7.8	7.7	8.3	9.8	-47.3	-1.6	7.6
	Local Government		3.6			3.6			
Kenya	Central Government	13.7	13.9	15.2	8.6	12.9	1.7	9.6	-43.6
	Local Government	3.7	2.8	5.2	2.8	3.5	-24.5	84.9	-45.6
Netherlands	Central Government	71.7	69.7	70.2	72.6	71.0	-2.8	0.8	3.3
	Local, Provincial Government	22.0	28.3	29.9	28.6	27.1	28.5	5.6	-4.3
United Kingdom	Central Government	50.9	52.3	53.4	57.0	53.0	2.8	2.0	6.8
	Local Government	6.1	9.5	11.9	12.9	9.8	54.8	25.4	8.2
Ind.Countries	Central Government	5.1	8.4	11.3	9.2	8.5	62.9	35.2	-18.7
	Local Government	9.0	8.7	7.8	7.7	8.3	-3.9	-10.6	-1.1
Dev.Countries	Central Government		7.3			9.4			
	Local Government		0.3			0.3			
Total Avg.	Central Government		7.8			8.9			
	Local Government		4.5			4.3			
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES									
Australia	Central Government	9.0	6.4	6.3	5.9	7.0	-29.5	-0.6	-6.8
	State, Provincial Government	20.4	14.9	14.5	13.5	16.1	-27.0	-2.9	-6.5
	Local Government	49.2	36.7	30.8	27.6	37.0	-25.5	-15.9	-10.6
	Local-State Government	23.9	17.7	16.7	15.4	18.8	-25.9	-6.0	-7.8
Chile	Central Government	13.8	8.3	12.2	13.1	11.8	-39.6	47.5	6.9
	Local Government	7.0	17.1	18.5		13.8	142.3	7.0	

Table: 2.6. Expenditures Composition. (continuation).

Colombia	Central Government	23.5	24.7	17.4		21.3	5.1	-29.5	
	State, Provincial Government	13.8	13.1	9.6		12.9	-4.8	-26.7	
	Local Government	18.9	31.1	18.4		23.5	64.8	-41.0	
	Local-State Government	15.2	17.8	12.5		15.7	17.5	-29.7	
Denmark	Central Government	5.6	5.2	3.8	3.5	4.6	-6.2	-27.5	-6.6
	Local Government	11.3	7.2	6.3	5.2	7.2	-36.4	-12.7	-16.3
Thailand	Central Government	23.9	21.2	16.3	21.6	20.6	-10.9	-23.4	32.8
	Local Government	30.7	36.6	37.7	45.6	37.2	19.4	2.8	21.1
Kenya	Central Government	20.3	16.8	15.3	16.1	17.3	-17.0	-9.1	5.2
	Local Government	6.3	3.6	5.0	9.9	6.3	-42.4	38.3	96.6
Netherlands	Central Government	6.9	8.1	8.1	4.8	7.1	16.7	-0.1	-40.6
	Local, Provincial Government	15.0	11.8	10.8	15.2	13.1	-21.1	-8.8	41.4
United Kingdom	Central Government	5.4	4.4	5.1	8.5	5.6	-17.9	16.6	65.0
	Local Government	18.9	14.7	14.7	13.8	15.7	-21.9	-0.4	-6.1
Ind.Countries	Central Government	61.2	61.9	60.9	64.1	61.8	1.0	-1.5	5.1
	Local Government	18.2	21.2	22.5	22.7	21.0	16.6	6.4	1.0
Dev.Countries	Central Government	26.1	30.4	30.5		29.0	16.4	0.4	
	Local Government	15.3	9.6	10.4		12.5	-37.0	7.6	
Total Avg.	Central Government	43.7	46.1	45.7		45.4	5.6	-0.9	
	Local Government	16.7	15.4	16.4		16.8	-7.9	6.8	
LENDING - REPAYMENTS									
Australia	Central Government	7.6	2.4	0.5	-1.6	2.6	-68.3	-81.2	-460.3
	State, Provincial Government	4.3	1.9	1.8	0.5	2.3	-56.4	-2.7	-74.0
	Local Government	0.4	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.1	-80.8	-290.3	-23.9
	Local-State Government	3.8	1.6	1.6	0.4	2.0	-57.2	-5.0	-74.1
Chile	Central Government	2.0	1.0	-2.8	-0.9	-1.0	-52.2	-388.7	-66.2
	Local Government	0.0	1.2	0.1		0.2	21803.1	-88.8	
Colombia	Central Government	1.0	2.3	2.5		1.8	136.5	9.4	
	State, Provincial Government	0.0	0.1	0.5		0.1	16.4	868.0	
	Local Government	-0.2	-0.3	0.1		-0.2	63.4	-146.2	
	Local-State Government	-0.0	-0.0	0.3		0.1	492.0	-1229.4	
Denmark	Central Government	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.8	-10.1	-51.8	49.4
	Local Government	0.2	0.1	0.1	-0.0	0.1	-28.1	-56.2	-147.8
Thailand	Central Government	1.8	0.9	2.4	1.0	1.5	-49.1	168.9	-59.5
	Local Government								
Kenya	Central Government	9.0	5.0	1.9	1.6	4.6	-44.9	-61.7	-16.4
	Local Government			13.0	7.8	8.7			-39.6
Netherlands	Central Government	2.4	2.3	-2.0	-0.8	0.5	-4.6	-186.4	-57.9
	Local, Provincial Government	-3.0	-0.4	6.3	-0.4	0.7	-86.2	-1629.5	-106.9
United Kingdom	Central Government	5.2	2.7	0.8	-4.0	1.8	-47.0	-69.2	-577.0
	Local Government	0.9	0.5	-0.7	-0.5	0.2	-43.9	-224.9	-31.9
Ind.Countries	Central Government	6.7	6.0	5.8	5.7	6.1	-10.5	-3.1	-2.6
	Local Government	17.3	12.9	12.1	12.4	13.7	-25.5	-6.0	2.6
Dev.Countries	Central Government			15.3		17.7			
	Local Government			18.4		18.3			
Total Avg.	Central Government			10.6		11.9			
	Local Government			15.2		16.0			

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F. Government Finance Statistics

(*): Calculated as a percentage on Total Expenditures + Lendings - Repayments.

- (2) There are two components of current expenditures that, on average, are more important in industrialised than in developing countries: interest rates and subsidies. The high proportion of subsidies over the local budget is the result of a relatively well developed welfare state, while the importance of interest rates shows that LGs in industrialised countries have an easier access to the banking system and have less legal limitations to borrow than their counterparts in less developed countries.
- (3) That LGs in industrialised countries spend more on capital items than developing ones. In fact, in developing countries, capital expenditure is about 12.5% of the total while in industrialised ones this component accounts for about 21%.

Once that we have an idea about the composition of the local expenditures by economic type it is important to identify what their recent trends are. The available data (Table 2.6) shows that:

- (1) The proportion of current spendings in total local budget is increasing in most industrialised countries: in Australia this item was 72.2% in the mid seventies and actually it accounts for 84.2% of all spendings; in Denmark it increased from 88.5% to 94.8% in the same period and, in the United Kingdom it increased from 80.2% to 86.7% in two decades. The exception is The Netherlands where the proportion of current items on local expenditures is decreasing.

In developing countries we find the opposite tendency since LGs in Chile, Kenya and, Thailand made an effort to increase their capital spendings and, consequently to reduce the importance of their current accounts¹⁴. Unfortunately, there is not enough information to establish what items explain this increase, even though it remains a

¹⁴ Once again we have an exception: Colombia. In this country both current and capital spending are much more fluctuating.

positive sign for local economic development.

- (2) The proportion of expenditures on goods and services in the total local budget shows a relative stability in industrialised countries, particularly since the early eighties. The exception to this trend is once again The Netherlands where this component dropped from 52.5% in the mid-seventies to 40.5% in the late eighties and actually, it is growing again.

In developing countries there is no common trend: in Chile the importance of this account has been increasing since 1975; in Colombia the proportion of expenditures on goods and services shows a tendency to fluctuate between 65% and 70%, and, in Kenya since the early 80s there has been a consistent effort on the part of LGs to reduce the proportion of their spendings on goods and services.¹⁵

- (3) The proportion of wages and salaries in total spendings does not show any common trend. In Chile and Denmark it is growing; in The Netherlands, United Kingdom and Kenya, after an increase in the mid-seventies, there is an evident effort of LGs to reduce their importance over total expenditures and, in Colombia it fluctuates around 54% of all the aggregated local budget.

- (4) The proportion of "other purchases of goods and services" in the total local budget is decreasing in all countries except The Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

- (5) In Denmark, The Netherlands and the United Kingdom the proportion of interest payments in the aggregated local budget shows a clear decreasing tendency, while the opposite is true for Australia and Colombia.

- (6) In general, the importance of subsidies in the total local-budget does not show a common trend. The extreme case of subsidy reduction is Chile where it dropped from 39.8% in

¹⁵ There is not enough information to analyze the trends in Thailand.

the mid-seventies to only 17.3% in the late eighties¹⁶. Countries with more recent experiences on local subsidies reduction are Australia, The Netherlands and Kenya. Denmark, the United Kingdom and Colombia all show a tendency to increase the proportion of subsidies in their aggregated local budgets. Unfortunately, no information about the subsidized items is available at local level and, therefore, it is not possible to identify what the more dynamic ones are.

- (7) The percentage of capital expenditures in the total local budget shows a decreasing tendency in the United Kingdom, Denmark and Australia.¹⁷ The explanation for this situation is that in order to reduce fiscal imbalances it is more easy for LGs to delay a big project than to reduce the current expenditures (e.g. reduce the number of employees).

An opposite tendency can be found in Chile, Kenya and, Thailand where there is a significant effort of local authorities to increase the importance of their capital spendings. Obviously this is a good signal for their local economic development processes.¹⁸

2.5.2. Local government priorities.

The task of this section is to identify what the priorities of LGs expenditures are. The emphasis will be put on social spendings since the interest is to establish: (1) what their degree of decentralization is and, (2) whether or not LGs spend more on areas of priority for human development than CGs.

¹⁶ The reduction of subsidies was part of the economic reforms introduced by the chilean military regime that ruled Chile from 1973 to 1989.

¹⁷ In the Netherlands local capital expenditures were reduced in the period 1975 to 1989 (15% to 10.8% of all local spending respectively). However, more recent information shows that, in the nineties, this item is regaining importance.

¹⁸ In Colombia the trends of capital expenditures show that: this item grew till the mid eighties but it decreased afterwards.

2.5.2.1. Definition of social decentralization ratios.

The distribution of the local government expenditures will be analyzed through the following ratios (UNDP, 1993):

- (1) **The social expenditure decentralization ratio** that is defined as the proportion of LGs' social spendings in total government social spendings.
This ratio gives an indication of the extent to which social expenditures are decentralized. Since its value can change according to the definition of social spending, here we adopt two approaches: first, define social spending as composed by education, health, social security, housing and communal amenities (indicator A) and, second define social spending as to include only education and health (indicator B) (Steward, Ranis, 1994).
- (2) **The central government social allocation ratio** that is defined as the percentage of the central government budget devoted to social expenditures (A').
- (3) **The local government social allocation ratio.** It is the percentage of Local Government budgets devoted to social items (B'). (UNDP, 1993)

Additionally, we estimated two sectoral decentralization ratios:

- (4) **The education decentralization ratio** that is defined as the proportion of general government expenditures on education spent by municipalities (Steward, Rains, 1994) and,
- (5) **The health decentralization ratio** that is defined as the percentage of general government expenditures on health spent by LGs.

2.5.2.2. Social expenditure decentralization ratios.

Indicator A.

Social provision ultimately appears almost entirely at the local level in terms of clinics or schools or welfare services. So control over this could, in theory, be highly decentralized (UNDP, 1993). In practice, this does not always happen since the social decentralization ratio is only 38.1% in industrialised countries and, 15.3% in developing ones. The reason for this situation has to

do (with national differences) with the assignment of the most redistributive and equity responsibilities (of which social spending is an important component) to the CG and not to the local one.

The analysis of national data shows a wide range of experiences¹⁹. In developing countries Chile has the lowest social expenditure decentralization ratio (about 5%), Colombia is around 33.3% and, Kenya 8.1%. However, while in Kenya the trend is towards an even higher centralization, in Colombia and Chile the situation is the opposite (Table 2.7)²⁰.

On the other hand: (1) in Australia, indicator A shows a slight decreasing tendency (it dropped from 41.4% in the late seventies to 38.7% in the early nineties); (2) in Denmark the expenditure decentralization ratio is similar to the social decentralization ratio (56.5% and 56.36% respectively); (3) The Netherlands has a social decentralization ratio of 24% (lower than the average for industrialised countries) and, lower than its own expenditure decentralization ratio and, finally; (4) The United Kingdom has a social decentralization ratio that is slightly higher than its expenditure decentralization ratio.

From the above data it is possible to say that although LGs are supposed to be more efficient and effective in providing social services, in general social expenditures are still very centralized. It is only in Colombia, Kenya and the United Kingdom that the social decentralization ratio is higher than the general expenditure decentralization ratio.

Indicator B.

Indicator B (Table 2.7). shows that in most countries LGs have more responsibilities in areas of high priority for human development (education and health) than in other social matters (as housing,

¹⁹ Thailand was not included in this section due to the lack of information.

²⁰ Unfortunately, in the case of Chile and Colombia the social decentralization ratio (A) can only be calculated for the period 1980-1989. It is realistic to expect that this indicator is rising under the Chilean democratic government.

Table 2.7.
Social Expenditure Decentralization Ratios (%).

		74/5-79 (1)	80-84 (2)	85-89 (3)	90-92/4 (4)	Average 74/5-92/4	Rate of Growth		
							(2)-(1)	(3)-(2)	(4)-(3)
Social Decentr. Ratio (A)	Australia	41.4	41.0	39.6	38.7	40.4	-1.0	-3.5	-2.4
	Chile		4.4	4.8		4.6		9.1	
	Colombia		32.9	33.9		33.3		3.1	
	Denmark	56.6	55.5	57.4	56.7	56.5	-2.0	3.4	-1.2
	Kenya	10.4	8.0	7.3	7.0	8.1	-22.6	-8.7	-4.2
	Netherlands				24.0	24.0			
	United Kingdom		32.9	31.7	30.6	31.7		-3.7	-3.5
	Industrial Countries				37.5	38.1			
	Developing Countries		15.1	15.4		15.3		1.6	
Social Decentr. Ratio (B)	Australia	61.6	64.7	61.9	59.4	62.2	5.1	-4.4	-4.0
	Chile		12.0	13.9		13.0		16.3	
	Colombia		44.2	45.1		44.6		2.1	
	Denmark	68.7	68.1	68.8	66.7	68.4	-0.9	1.1	-3.1
	Kenya	7.3	6.1	3.6	3.6	5.1	-15.6	-41.0	0.2
	Netherlands				18.2	18.2			
	United Kingdom		51.0	48.5	44.6	48.1		-5.0	-8.0
	Industrial Countries				47.2	49.2			
	Developing Countries		20.8	20.9		20.9		0.6	
Social Allocation Ratio (A')	Australia								
	Central Government	47.7	45.4	46.2	51.4	47.3	-4.9	1.7	11.3
	State, Province Government	57.3	55.5	54.1	53.4	55.3	-3.2	-2.5	-1.4
	Local Government	16.6	19.5	20.7	21.7	19.4	17.6	5.9	5.1
	Local, Prov-State Governments	52.1	50.7	49.5	49.2	50.5	-2.8	-2.3	-0.6
	Chile								
	Central Government	52.4	63.6	58.3	62.9	59.1	21.6	-8.3	7.8
	Local Government		35.2	34.9		35.0		-0.9	
	Colombia								
	Central Government		47.7	52.6		49.7		10.3	
	State, Province Government	75.8	70.7	68.7		72.8	-6.7	-2.9	
	Local Government	47.4	38.2	45.9		43.6	-19.2	20.0	
	Local, Prov-State Governments	68.6	62.2	63.3		65.3	-9.3	1.7	
	Denmark								
	Central Government	56.6	52.9	49.8	51.5	52.9	-6.4	-5.9	3.4
	Local Government	83.4	82.7	83.6	84.4	83.4	-0.9	1.1	1.0
	Kenya								
	Central Government	30.5	30.2	30.2	28.8	30.0	-1.1	-0.1	-4.6
	Local Government	38.4	42.7	52.3	47.4	45.6	11.0	22.6	-9.3
	Netherlands								
	Central Government	65.1	63.6	61.6	65.2	63.8	-2.4	-3.1	5.8
	Province, Local Governments				62.4	62.4			
	United Kingdom								
	Central Government	43.6	46.4	50.8	49.1	47.4	6.4	9.4	-3.3
	Local Government		68.0	69.2	68.3	68.6		1.7	-1.2
	Industrial Countries								
	Central Government	53.3	52.1	52.1	54.3	52.8	-2.2	-0.0	4.3
	Local Government				59.2	58.4			
	Developing countries								
	Central Government		47.2	47.0		46.3		-0.3	
	Local Government		38.7	44.4		41.4		14.6	
Social Allocation Ratio (B')	Australia								
	Central Government	37.1	36.5	37.4	42.8	37.9	-1.6	2.5	14.5
	State, Province Government	52.8	50.6	47.6	45.4	49.5	-4.2	-5.9	-4.6
	Local Government	3.1	2.6	2.3	2.3	2.6	-16.4	-10.3	-0.3
	Local, Prov-State Governments	46.5	44.1	41.4	39.7	43.3	-5.0	-6.3	-4.0
	Chile								
	Central Government	20.6	20.7	18.8	23.5	20.8	0.4	-9.0	24.5
	Local Government		32.3	34.8		33.5		7.7	
	Colombia								
	Central Government		25.6	29.0		26.9		13.5	
	State, Province Government	71.1	63.8	63.3		67.1	-10.3	-0.9	
	Local Government	36.4	27.9	32.6		32.5	-23.3	16.8	
	Local, Prov-State Governments	62.3	54.4	56.0		58.3	-12.6	2.9	
	Denmark								
	Central Government	13.0	11.1	10.3	10.8	11.4	-14.3	-7.7	5.4
	Local Government	32.2	29.8	28.3	27.1	29.8	-7.5	-5.1	-4.0
	Kenya								
	Central Government	29.1	27.4	26.9	25.7	27.5	-6.0	-1.6	-4.6
	Local Government	25.3	29.2	22.0	21.2	24.5	15.5	-24.6	-3.8
	Netherlands								
	Central Government	26.1	23.3	21.5	23.7	23.6	-10.6	-7.8	10.2
	Province, Local Governments				16.1	16.1			
	United Kingdom								
	Central Government	15.4	15.2	16.8	17.4	16.2	-1.0	10.0	3.7
	Local Government		35.1	34.6	34.0	34.6		-1.6	-1.5
	Industrial Countries								
	Central Government	22.9	21.5	21.5	23.7	22.3	-5.9	-0.3	10.2
	Local Government				19.9	20.8			
	Developing countries								
	Central Government		24.5	24.9		25.1		1.5	
	Local Government		29.8	29.8		30.2		0.0	
Educational Decentr. Ratios	Australia	68.5	70.5	70.3	71.0	70.0	3.0	-0.3	1.0
	Chile		15.9	18.7		17.3		17.7	
	Colombia		42.6	39.4		41.3		-7.5	
	Denmark	55.1	52.9	52.3	48.7	52.9	-4.1	-1.0	-7.0
	Kenya	6.3	5.3	2.1	2.1	5.7	-14.8	-60.5	-1.1
	Netherlands				20.1	20.1			
	United Kingdom		84.2	80.1	76.5	80.3		-4.9	-4.4
	Industrial Countries				54.1	55.8			
	Developing Countries		21.3	20.1		21.4		-5.7	
Health Decentr. Ratios.	Australia	52.3	56.8	52.3	47.9	52.8	8.5	-8.0	-8.4
	Chile		2.1	2.6		2.4		25.2	
	Colombia		51.0	63.3		55.9		24.2	
	Denmark	87.0	90.7	91.4	92.1	90.0	4.3	0.8	0.7
	Kenya	9.7	8.2	8.7	8.8	8.8	-15.2	5.7	1.8
	Netherlands				16.6	16.6			
	United Kingdom	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
	Industrial Countries				52.2	53.1			
	Developing Countries		20.4	24.8		22.3		21.7	

Source: UNFPA, elaboration based on I.M.F. Government Finance Statistics.

social security and communal amenities). In fact, with the exception of Kenya and the Netherlands all national experiences show that education and health are an important local government concern.

For example, (1) in Australia the decentralization of expenditures on education and health is around 60% against only 40% for all social issues and, (2) in Denmark the relation is 68.4% against 56.5%²¹.

The same situation can be found in developing countries: (1) in Chile about 13% of the general government expenditure on education and health is the responsibility of the local government against only 4.6% if we make the calculations including all social expenditures and; (2) in Colombia the relation is 44.6% against 33.3%.

2.5.2.3. Education decentralization ratio.

In general, the degree of decentralization of education expenditures depends, to a large extent, upon the allocation of responsibilities among the different layers of government. Nevertheless, it is important to analyze the education decentralization ratio to explore if there is any evidence that local governments are increasing their allocative function in this sector.

From the information of Table 2.7 it is possible to see that: (1) in Kenya the responsibilities for education are becoming increasingly centralized (on average only 5.7% of all government expenditure on education is allocated through LGs); (2) in Colombia LGs educational budget accounts for about 41.3% of all educational expenditures but with a decreasing tendency and; (3) in Chile there is a clear tendency to decentralize some educational responsibilities to the lowest level of government. Chile is also an interesting case since its educational decentralization ratio is significantly higher than its social expenditure decentralization

²¹ This indicator can not be estimated for the United Kingdom due to the lack of information about health items.

ratio (indicator B). In other words, in Chile LGs are more involved in education than in other social sectors.

The decentralization of educational responsibilities in industrial countries shows that: LGs in the United Kingdom are responsible for 4/5 of the sectoral spendings, in Australia the ratio is 7/10, in Denmark about 1/2 and, in The Netherlands 1/5. In two cases (United Kingdom and Australia) the education decentralization ratio is higher than indicators A and B.

Even if the national experiences are very different, the above data suggest that the education decentralization ratio tends to be higher than the social decentralization ratios A and B. In fact, Table 2.7. shows that in industrialised countries the education decentralization ratio is higher (on average) than the social decentralization ratios A and B (55.8% against 38.1% and 49.2% respectively) while in developing countries the same indicators account for 21.4% in the first case and, 15.3% and 20.9% for the second ones (i.e. A and B).

2.5.2.4. Health Decentralization Ratio.

From the information of Table 2.7. we can see that, within industrialised countries, in Denmark and Australia health services are highly decentralized responsibilities. In The Netherlands the sectoral decentralization ratio is far below the social one.

In Chile LGs spend only 2.4% of all public health resources, while in Colombia and Kenya the same ratio is 55.9% and 8.8% respectively. Since in the last two countries the sectoral ratio is higher than indicators A and B, we can say that health is also a high priority for their LGs. Obviously, there is no possibility to identify a common ground for all countries in the sample.

2.5.2.5. Central and Local Governments Social Allocation ratios.

The question here is whether or not LGs spend more than CGs in areas of human development priority.

In order to answer this question two indicators of social allocation were estimated: one with a wide definition of social spendings (indicator A') and the second with a more restricted one (indicator B'). The results are shown in Table 2.7 and with greater

detail in Table 2.8. (refer also to Graphs 2.3.a, 2.3.b and 2.3.c).

Indicator A'.

From indicator A' we can see that, in industrialised and developing countries, the non-central component of the government tends to have a higher (or at least similar) social allocation ratio than the central one.

In fact, the information from Tables 2.7 and 2.8 show that: (1) both in the United Kingdom and Denmark social functions accounts for about 68.6% and 83.4% of all the LG budget, while at central level the same indicator is only 52.9% and 47.4% respectively; (2) in the Netherlands all levels of government have more or less the same social allocation ratio (about 63%); (3) in Australia the state-local governments' social allocation ratio is higher than the central one and; (4) in Colombia and Kenya indicator A' is always lower at the central level than at the local-provincial one ²²




Indicator B'.

The use of indicator B' gives us additional information about the importance of health and education in local and central governments budgets.

In developing countries, Chile and Colombia have social allocation ratios that are higher at local level than at the central one, while the opposite is true for Kenya. A possible explanation for this situation is that developing countries with a relatively high decentralization ratio (Colombia and Chile) are very selective in their social spendings, especially in those areas of human development priority.

In industrialised countries, the results are the same as in indicator A'. In fact, in the United Kingdom, Denmark and Australia, the LG social allocation ratio is higher than the central one. The opposite is true for The Netherlands where the CG has more responsibilities in the areas of health and education than the LG.

²² Chile is the exception with a social allocation ratio of 59.1% at central level and 35% for its local governments.



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F., Government Finance Statistics.

Table: 2.8.
Expenditures Composition. (%)

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Average	Rate of Growth		
		74/5-79	80-84	85-89	90-92/4	74/5-92/4	(2)-(1)	(3)-(2)	(4)-(3)
GENERAL PUBLIC SERVICES									
Australia	Central Government	8.0	7.3	7.3	8.9	7.8	-9.0	1.0	21.3
	State, Province Government	6.3	6.9	7.7	9.6	7.4	8.7	12.2	24.7
	Local Government	22.8	21.6	21.8	23.4	22.3	-5.0	0.5	7.3
Chile	Local, State & Provincial Government	8.4	8.8	9.6	11.4	9.4	5.2	8.9	18.6
	Central Government	12.0	11.2	7.4	3.9	8.9	-6.5	-33.8	-46.8
	Local Government		64.8	65.1		64.9		0.5	
Colombia	Central Government		18.7	19.0		18.8		1.9	
	State, Province Government	16.2	14.2	15.9		15.3	-12.3	12.0	
	Local Government	25.4	28.2	15.0		24.9	10.9	-46.6	
Denmark	Local, State & Provincial Government	18.3	17.8	15.8		17.7	-2.6	-11.3	
	Central Government	9.1	7.9	7.0	6.6	7.8	-12.4	-12.2	-5.1
	Local Government	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0	0.8	2.9	-4.7
Kenya	Central Government	17.6	12.2	10.0	11.8	13.2	-30.9	-17.5	17.7
	Local Government	15.4	21.2	28.6	38.1	26.9	38.0	34.6	33.3
	Central Government	7.2	5.8	6.6	6.5	6.5	-19.1	12.4	-0.6
United Kingdom	Province, Local Governments				9.5	9.5			
	Central Government	7.8	3.7	3.9	4.2	5.1	-52.0	4.6	8.0
	Local Government		3.0	3.5	4.4	3.6		13.8	27.4
Ind.Countries	Central Government	8.0	6.2	6.2	6.6	6.8	-22.7	0.0	6.0
	Local Government				10.3	6.6			
	Central Government		14.0	12.2		13.6		-13.2	
Dev.Countries	Local Government		38.1	36.2		36.5		-4.8	
	Central Government		9.5	8.8		9.7		-8.3	
	Local Government					22.3			
DEFENSE									
Australia	Central Government	9.2	9.6	9.0	8.2	9.1	3.7	-6.1	-8.1
	State, Province Government								
	Local Government								
Chile	Local, State & Provincial Governments								
	Central Government	12.8	11.9	10.3	9.9	11.3	-6.5	-13.3	-4.4
	Local Government								
Colombia	Central Government		6.9	9.0		7.8		29.8	
	State, Province Government								
	Local Government								
Denmark	Local, State & Provincial Governments								
	Central Government	6.5	5.9	5.2	5.0	5.8	-10.3	-10.7	-4.6
	Local Government	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	12.0	-1.8	-6.4
Kenya	Central Government	11.1	12.6	9.3	8.2	10.7	13.0	-25.9	-12.1
	Local Government								
	Central Government	6.0	5.4	5.1	4.7	5.3	-10.6	-5.6	-8.5
Netherlands	Province, Local Governments								
	Central Government	13.9	13.7	12.9	10.6	12.9	-1.0	-6.4	-17.4
	Local Government		0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0		66.7	5.2
Ind.Countries	Central Government	8.9	8.6	8.0	7.1	8.3	-3.1	-6.9	-11.3
	Local Government								
	Central Government		10.5	9.6		9.9		-8.9	
Dev.Countries	Local Government								
	Central Government	9.9	9.4	8.7	7.8	9.0	-5.0	-7.9	-10.6
	Local Government								
PUBLIC ORDER & SAFETY									
Australia	Central Government	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.9	0.5		76.0	30.9
	State, Province Government	7.1	7.7	7.4	7.7	7.4	8.3	-3.0	3.7
	Local Government	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.5	26.1	-7.4	-11.7
Chile	Local, State, Provincial Governments	6.3	6.9	6.6	6.9	6.7	8.1	-3.5	3.7
	Central Government	0.0	0.0	3.5	4.8	1.9			39.9
	Local Government								
Colombia	Central Government								
	State, Province Government	1.0	0.6	0.0		0.7	-36.7	-100.0	
	Local Government	3.4	2.2	0.0		2.4	-35.7	-100.0	
Denmark	Local, State, Provincial Governments	1.6	1.1	0.0		1.2	-35.4	-100.0	
	Central Government	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.1	0.9			-4.4
	Local Government	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	-1.4	0.9	-1.3
Kenya	Central Government	0.0	3.3	5.6	5.8	3.4		68.5	5.2
	Local Government	2.3	2.5	1.4	0.0	1.4	7.2	-44.3	-100.0
	Central Government	0.0	0.9	2.2	2.3	1.3		150.0	3.6
Netherlands	Province, Local Governments				3.6	3.6			
	Central Government	0.0	1.3	3.0	3.6	1.8		127.4	20.0
	Local Government		9.9	11.1	12.8	11.2		11.3	15.5
Ind.Countries	Central Government	0.0	0.7	2.0	2.2	1.1		212.1	9.8
	Local Government				4.5	4.2			
	Central Government								
Dev.Countries	Local Government								
	Central Government								
	Local Government								
SOCIAL SPENDING									
Australia	Central Government	47.7	45.4	46.2	51.4	47.3	-4.9	1.7	11.3
	State, Province Government	57.3	55.5	54.1	53.4	55.3	-3.2	-2.5	-1.4
	Local Government	16.6	19.5	20.7	21.7	19.4	17.6	5.9	5.1
Chile	Local, State, Provincial Governments	52.1	50.7	49.5	49.2	50.5	-2.8	-2.3	-0.6
	Central Government	52.4	63.6	58.3	62.9	59.1	21.6	-8.3	7.8
	Local Government		35.2	34.9		35.0		-0.9	
Colombia	Central Government		47.7	52.6		49.7		10.3	
	State, Province Government	75.8	70.7	68.7		72.8	-6.7	-2.9	
	Local Government	47.4	38.2	45.9		43.6	-19.2	20.0	
Denmark	Local, State & Province Governments	68.6	62.2	63.3		65.3	-9.3	1.7	
	Central Government	56.6	52.9	49.8	51.5	52.9	-6.4	-5.9	3.4
	Local Government	83.4	82.7	83.6	84.4	83.4	-0.9	1.1	1.0
Kenya	Central Government	30.5	30.2	30.1	28.8	30.0	-1.1	-0.2	-4.5
	Local Government	38.4	42.7	52.3	47.4	45.6	11.0	22.6	-9.3
	Central Government	65.1	63.6	61.6	65.2	63.8	-2.4	-3.1	5.8
Netherlands	Province, Local Governments				62.4	62.4			
	Central Government	43.6	46.4	50.8	49.1	47.4	6.4	9.4	-3.3
	Local Government		68.0	69.2	68.3	68.6		1.7	-1.2
Ind.Countries	Central Government	53.3	52.1	52.1	54.3	52.8	-2.2	-0.0	4.3
	Local Government				59.2	58.4			
	Central Government		47.2	47.0		46.3		-0.3	
Dev.Countries	Local Government		38.7	44.4		41.4		14.6	
	Central Government								
	Local Government								

Table:2.8. Expenditures Composition (Continuation).

Total Sample		50.0				50.0			
Central Government		49.9				51.1			
Local Government						-0.1			
EDUCATION									
Australia	Central Government	9.5	8.0	7.1	7.0	8.0	-16.2	-10.4	-1.7
	State, Province Government	34.2	32.3	29.1	27.2	31.1	-5.7	-9.9	-6.3
	Local Government	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	-17.3	-15.1	-2.4
	Local, State & Province Governments	29.9	28.0	25.1	23.7	27.0	-6.4	-10.3	-5.8
Chile	Central Government	13.8	14.2	12.1	12.8	13.2	2.7	-14.6	6.2
	Local Government		31.2	32.9		32.0		5.7	
Colombia	Central Government		21.3	24.3		22.5		13.7	
	State, Province Government	48.7	49.6	41.8		48.0	1.9	-15.8	
	Local Government	27.0	18.2	21.9		22.8	-32.6	20.2	
	Local, State & Province Governments	43.2	41.4	37.1		41.5	-4.1	-10.4	
Denmark	Central Government	10.6	9.8	9.1	9.7	9.8	-7.8	-7.5	7.4
	Local Government	14.8	13.8	12.4	11.6	13.4	-6.7	-10.0	-6.9
Kenya	Central Government	21.4	20.1	21.1	20.2	20.8	-6.5	5.1	-4.2
	Local Government	15.5	18.6	9.9	9.5	13.3	19.7	-46.9	-3.5
Netherlands	Central Government	14.3	11.8	10.5	10.6	11.9	-17.3	-11.0	0.8
	Province, Local Governments				8.0	8.0			
United Kingdom	Central Government	2.7	2.2	2.9	3.3	2.8	-18.8	33.4	12.5
	Local Government		35.1	34.6	34.0	34.6		-1.6	-1.5
Ind.Countries	Central Government	9.3	8.0	7.4	7.7	8.1	-14.4	-6.7	3.3
	Local Government				13.5	14.1			
Dev.Countries	Central Government		18.5	19.1		18.8		3.4	
	Local Government		22.6	21.6		22.7		-4.8	
Total Sample	Central Government		12.5	12.4		12.7		-0.3	
	Local Government					17.8			
HEALTH									
Australia	Central Government	10.5	8.4	10.0	12.7	10.1	-19.7	19.0	26.3
	State, Province Government	18.6	18.3	18.5	18.2	18.4	-1.6	1.2	-1.9
	Local Government	2.5	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.1	-16.2	-9.2	0.1
	Local, State & Province Governments	16.5	16.1	16.2	16.0	16.3	-2.5	0.6	-1.4
Chile	Central Government	6.8	6.6	6.8	10.6	7.5	-4.0	3.0	57.2
	Local Government		1.1	1.9		1.5		64.3	
Colombia	Central Government		4.2	4.7		4.4		12.0	
	State, Province Government	22.5	14.2	21.5		19.1	-36.7	51.4	
	Local Government	9.4	9.7	10.7		9.7	3.5	10.5	
	Local, State & Province Governments	19.1	13.1	19.0		16.8	-31.6	45.3	
Denmark	Central Government	2.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.6	-43.9	-9.4	-10.1
	Local Government	17.4	16.0	15.9	15.6	16.3	-8.3	-0.9	-1.8
Kenya	Central Government	7.7	7.3	6.0	5.5	6.7	-4.7	-17.7	-8.3
	Local Government	9.8	10.6	12.2	11.7	11.1	9.0	14.4	-4.1
Netherlands	Central Government	11.7	11.4	10.9	13.1	11.7	-2.5	-4.4	19.4
	Province, Local Governments				8.1	8.1			
United Kingdom	Central Government	12.7	13.0	13.8	14.1	13.4	2.8	6.0	1.8
	Local Government		12.3	11.7	10.2	11.5		-4.9	-12.6
Ind.Countries	Central Government	9.3	8.6	9.0	10.2	9.2	-8.2	5.1	13.6
	Local Government				9.0	9.5			
Dev.Countries	Central Government		6.0	5.8		6.2		-3.3	
	Local Government		7.1	8.2		7.4		15.3	
Total Sample	Central Government		7.5	7.6		7.9		2.2	
	Local Government					8.6			
SOCIAL SECURITY & WELFARE									
Australia	Central Government	26.6	28.0	27.3	30.1	27.8	5.5	-2.5	10.2
	State, Province Government	2.2	2.4	3.4	4.5	3.0	9.6	44.1	30.5
	Local Government	1.6	2.5	3.4	4.2	2.8	54.4	35.8	24.9
	Local, State & Province Governments	2.1	2.4	3.4	4.5	2.9	14.0	43.0	29.8
Chile	Central Government	26.9	39.1	34.9	34.0	33.7	45.3	-10.6	-2.6
	Local Government		2.9	0.1		1.5		-96.3	
Colombia	Central Government		18.8	18.6		18.7		-0.9	
	State, Province Government	2.7	5.0	4.6		3.9	86.1	-8.3	
	Local Government	7.1	4.9	9.2		6.6	-30.6	86.2	
	Local, State & Province Governments	3.8	5.0	5.7		4.5	31.4	13.6	
Denmark	Central Government	41.7	39.7	38.2	39.0	39.7	-4.9	-3.7	2.2
	Local Government	46.3	49.4	52.6	54.6	50.1	6.6	6.6	3.6
Kenya	Central Government	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	-74.5	-12.6	-22.5
	Local Government	1.0	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.9	-15.9	-10.7	34.0
Netherlands	Central Government	36.5	37.1	35.8	37.7	36.7	1.6	-3.3	5.0
	Province, Local Governments				25.6	25.6			
United Kingdom	Central Government	24.1	29.3	31.2	28.7	28.2	21.6	6.6	-8.0
	Local Government		16.2	18.7	19.6	18.3		15.2	5.0
Ind.Countries	Central Government	32.2	33.5	33.1	33.9	33.1	4.0	-1.1	2.2
	Local Government				26.0	24.2			
Dev.Countries	Central Government		19.3	17.9		17.6		-7.5	
	Local Government		2.9	3.3		3.0		15.9	
Total Sample	Central Government		27.4	26.6		26.4		-3.0	
	Local Government								
HOUSING & COMMUNITY AMENITIES									
Australia	Central Government	1.2	1.0	1.6	1.6	1.3	-17.0	71.0	-3.6
	State, Province Government	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.5	2.8	7.4	21.9	13.3
	Local Government	11.9	14.4	15.0	15.2	14.0	21.4	3.6	1.5
	Local, State & Province Governments	3.6	4.1	4.7	5.0	4.3	15.7	14.3	6.8
Chile	Central Government	4.9	3.9	4.6	5.4	4.6	-20.3	18.6	18.5
	Local Government								
Colombia	Central Government		3.4	5.0		4.0		48.5	
	State, Province Government	2.0	1.9	0.8		1.8	-7.0	-58.9	
	Local Government	3.9	5.4	4.1		4.5	39.6	-24.2	
	Local, State & Province Governments	2.5	2.8	1.6		2.5	10.2	-44.0	
Denmark	Central Government	1.9	2.1	1.3	1.7	1.6	14.4	-37.0	23.5
	Local Government	4.9	3.5	2.7	2.7	3.6	-29.1	-23.3	2.2
Kenya	Central Government	0.8	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.2	225.0	9.4	2.1
	Local Government	12.2	12.7	29.6	25.3	20.3	3.7	133.4	-14.5
Netherlands	Central Government	2.6	3.2	4.3	3.9	3.5	24.8	33.4	-9.5
	Province, Local Governments				20.7	20.7			
United Kingdom	Central Government	4.1	1.9	2.8	3.0	3.1	-54.0	46.7	7.6
	Local Government		4.3	4.2	4.4	4.3		-2.8	5.6
Ind.Countries	Central Government	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.4	-15.7	22.7	0.6
	Local Government				8.2	8.2			
Dev.Countries	Central Government		3.3	4.2		3.6		26.3	
	Local Government								

Table:2.8. Expenditures Composition (Continuation).

Total Sample		Central Government		Local Government		2.6		3.2		2.9		24.6	
REC.CULTR. & RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS													
Australia	Central Government	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.2				1.2		-5.4	13.8
	State, Province Government	1.5	1.9	2.5	2.0	2.0				2.0		28.1	27.0
	Local Government	14.8	15.3	15.3	14.5	15.0				15.0		3.8	-0.0
	Local, State & Province Governments	3.2	3.7	4.2	3.6	3.7				3.7		16.5	13.4
Chile	Central Government	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.0	0.5				0.5		18.0	-11.9
	Local Government												-100.0
Colombia	Central Government		0.6	1.5		0.9						163.5	
	State, Province Government	1.6	2.0	0.0		1.5				1.5		27.4	-100.0
	Local Government	2.6	3.3	0.0		2.5				2.5		27.0	-100.0
	Local, State & Province Governments	1.8	2.3	0.0		1.7				1.7		27.5	-100.0
Denmark	Central Government	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.8				1.8		-14.2	-6.1
	Local Government	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.1				3.1		-5.1	-3.0
Kenya	Central Government	2.2	2.7	3.6	1.9	2.6				2.6		21.6	31.2
	Local Government	2.4	2.4	3.0	1.1	2.1				2.1		0.5	25.8
Netherlands	Central Government	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.4	0.7				0.7		4.2	-16.6
	Province, Local Governments				6.5	6.5				6.5			
United Kingdom	Central Government	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.4				0.4		1.9	34.8
	Local Government												7.2
Ind.Countries	Central Government	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0				1.0		-7.2	0.3
	Local Government												-13.5
Dev.Countries	Central Government		1.3	1.9		0.9				0.9		42.5	
	Local Government												
Total Sample			1.2	1.4		1.2				1.2		21.0	
ECONOMIC AFFAIRS & SERVICES													
Australia	Central Government	8.5	8.4	8.0	7.9	8.3				8.3		-0.9	-4.7
	State, Province Government	18.6	18.8	18.2	15.0	17.9				17.9		0.8	-2.7
	Local Government	37.8	34.2	33.7	32.0	34.7				34.7		-9.6	-1.5
	Local, State & Province Governments	21.0	20.8	20.4	17.3	20.2				20.2		-1.1	-2.2
Chile	Central Government	14.9	9.6	10.2	13.5	12.0				12.0		-35.3	6.1
	Local Government												31.9
Colombia	Central Government		24.2	14.5		20.3							-39.9
	State, Province Government	13.9	11.7	12.2		12.8				12.8		-15.7	4.1
	Local Government	21.3	25.8	21.8		23.1				23.1		21.3	-15.5
	Local, State & Province Governments	16.0	15.4	14.5		15.5				15.5		-3.3	-6.2
Denmark	Central Government	11.1	8.5	7.4	7.6	8.9				8.9		-23.5	-12.7
	Local Government	6.7	8.3	7.5	7.0	7.4				7.4		23.9	-9.4
Kenya	Central Government	29.4	24.7	22.7	17.3	24.1				24.1		-15.9	-8.4
	Local Government	35.4	28.2	17.4	19.9	24.5				24.5		-20.4	-38.4
Netherlands	Central Government	9.3	10.6	9.8	6.4	9.2				9.2		14.8	-7.9
	Province, Local Governments				8.7	8.7				8.7			-35.0
United Kingdom	Central Government	9.3	7.7	7.8	7.9	8.3				8.3		-16.9	0.4
	Local Government		9.0	7.4	7.3	7.8				7.8		-18.6	-0.7
Ind.Countries	Central Government	9.6	8.8	8.3	7.4	8.6				8.6		-7.6	-6.5
	Local Government				13.8	14.7				14.7			-10.0
Dev.Countries	Central Government		19.5	15.8		18.8				18.8			-19.0
	Local Government												
Total Sample			13.4	11.5		13.0				13.0		-14.3	
OTHER EXPENDITURES													
Australia	Central Government	25.3	27.8	27.5	21.5	26.0				26.0		9.7	-1.1
	State, Province Government	9.2	9.3	10.1	12.3	10.0				10.0		1.4	8.0
	Local Government	6.8	7.7	7.1	7.1	7.2				7.2		13.8	-8.3
	Local, State & Province Governments	8.9	9.1	9.6	11.6	9.6				9.6		2.4	6.1
Chile	Central Government	7.4	2.9	10.4	9.0	7.4				7.4		-61.3	264.4
	Local Government												-13.4
Colombia	Central Government		5.4	3.3		4.5							-37.4
	State, Province Government	1.5	2.2	3.2		2.1				2.1		49.3	44.1
	Local Government	3.3	2.2	2.3		2.7				2.7		-32.7	4.3
	Local, State & Province Governments	1.9	2.2	3.0		2.2				2.2		15.2	35.8
Denmark	Central Government	15.5	23.3	26.7	25.5	22.2				22.2		50.4	14.6
	Local Government	2.1	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.6				1.6		-32.2	-12.4
Kenya	Central Government	9.1	13.5	18.7	26.1	16.0				16.0		48.8	38.4
	Local Government	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.4				0.4		6.3	-29.2
Netherlands	Central Government	11.5	12.8	14.0	14.5	13.1				13.1		11.1	9.4
	Province, Local Governments				9.3	9.3				9.3			
United Kingdom	Central Government	25.1	27.7	22.3	25.1	24.7				24.7		10.4	-19.3
	Local Government		10.0	8.9	7.1	8.7				8.7		-10.5	-20.0
Ind.Countries	Central Government	19.3	22.9	22.6	21.7	21.5				21.5		18.3	-1.2
	Local Government				6.2	6.7				6.7			-4.1
Dev.Countries	Central Government		7.2	10.8		9.3				9.3			49.5
	Local Government												
Total Sample			16.2	17.6		16.3				16.3		8.6	

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F. Government Finance Statistics.

2.5.3. An overview of the other components of LG expenditures.

There are two components of government expenditures that require a closer look: (1) social security and welfare and, (2) housing and community affairs (Table 2.8).

Both in industrialised and developing countries social security expenditures are basically a CG concern²³. However, this does not mean that LGs are not involved in this area, especially in countries with a well developed welfare state. For example, in the United Kingdom 18.3% of all the local government budget is dedicated to this item, while in the Netherlands and Denmark the percentage is even higher (25.6% and 50.1% respectively).

In developing countries, since the welfare state is not yet well developed, LG involvement in the provision of social security and welfare is minimal. Table 2.8 shows that in Chile LGs spend only 1.5% of the aggregate budget on this area, while in Colombia the proportion is at most 5.7%.

Contrary to social security and welfare expenditures, housing and community amenities are a local government concern both in industrialised and in developing countries. In fact, in most cases the LG social allocation ratio is higher than the CG one.

²³ The exception is Denmark where social security and welfare functions are mainly a local government responsibility.

3. Decentralization to the market, quasi-markets and, NGOs.

3.1. The problem.


The issue of decentralization implies the redefinition of the economic roles assigned to the different levels of government and a redefinition of the balance between the public and private sectors. In this section we will analyze this topic on the basis of two guiding questions: what are the main changes in the processes of decentralization to the governments and to the markets both in industrialised and developing countries and, what are the economic factors (efficiency considerations) that account for these changes. The methodology is similar to the one already applied to the study of decentralization of governance in the sense that it combines cross-section and time series analysis. However, since decentralization to the markets, quasi-market, and non-governmental organizations is a relatively new area of research some indicators are only a rough approach to the phenomenon. A further analysis was possible using "illustrating experiences" of innovative arrangements in the provision of public services for each country in the sample.

3.2. Size of governmental sector.


In order to measure the extent to which resource allocation is dominantly market controlled or determined by government we can use, as a "proxy" variable, the proportion of government expenditures to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Additionally, if we relate the size of the governmental sector in each country with its respective per-capita income we can explore if there is any link between economic development and the system of resource allocation. Graphs 3.1.a and 3.1.b (based on Tables 3.1 and 3.2) allow us to analyze these issues²⁴. Both graphs clearly show that the higher the level of economic development of a country the higher are the aggregate resources for the development of the

²⁴ The first graph shows the relation between means and the second tries to capture the long-term trends. For all countries the signal (') shows the final position in a trend analysis.



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F., Government Finance Statistics.
GGE: General Government Expenditures



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F., Government Finance Statistics.
GGE: General Government Expenditures
(X): Initial Position; (X'): Final Position.

Table: 3.1.

Size of Government Sector in Selected Countries

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Average	Rate of growth			Trend (Regres.)	
	74/5-79	80-84	85-90	90-94		(2)-(1)	(3)-(2)	(4)-(3)	Initial	Final
GGR/GDP (%)										
Australia	31.35	33.98	37.54	37.50	34.83	8.38	10.49	-0.13	30.55	39.10
Chile	33.65	32.45	28.62		31.78	-3.57	-11.79		35.30	28.26
Colombia	14.06	14.32	15.01		14.31	1.85	4.85		13.84	14.77
Denmark	51.22	54.84	59.69	58.98	56.04	7.06	8.84	-1.18	50.62	61.45
Thailand	13.89	15.89	17.12	19.63	16.47	14.41	7.74	14.70	13.18	19.77
Kenya (*)	22.52	24.89	24.84	28.21	24.83	10.53	-0.23	13.59	21.60	28.07
Netherlands	50.82	54.71	54.56	54.06	53.51	7.65	-0.27	-0.92	51.57	55.45
United Kingdom	41.15	44.33	43.02	41.85	42.67	7.71	-2.95	-2.73	42.46	42.88
CGR/GDP (%)										
Australia	23.57	25.49	27.74	26.49	25.75	8.14	8.82	-4.52	23.45	28.05
Chile	33.05	30.79	25.90	22.66	28.39	-6.85	-15.87	-12.53	34.72	23.08
Colombia	11.79	11.49	12.47		11.78	-2.58	8.53		11.63	11.92
Denmark	35.36	37.78	41.86	40.23	38.65	6.87	10.78	-3.89	34.87	42.43
Thailand	12.95	15.00	16.22	18.66	15.55	15.76	8.14	15.06	12.27	18.83
Kenya	20.75	23.28	23.39	26.79	23.25	12.19	0.44	14.58	19.79	26.71
Netherlands	48.55	51.68	50.79	49.37	50.13	6.47	-1.74	-2.78	49.67	50.60
United Kingdom	34.20	37.08	36.38	37.79	36.20	8.42	-1.88	3.89	34.65	37.76
LGR/GDP (%)										
Australia	2.03	4.18	8.05	11.32	5.85	105.42	92.77	40.68	0.28	11.42
Chile	0.59	1.66	1.61		1.26	178.51	-2.91		0.58	1.95
Colombia	0.67	0.88	0.87		0.78	32.79	-2.03		0.63	0.93
Denmark	15.87	17.05	17.83	18.41	17.23	7.50	4.55	3.25	15.64	18.82
Thailand	0.93	0.89	0.90	0.97	0.92	-4.38	1.02	8.22	0.90	0.94
Kenya	1.77	1.61	1.08	1.42	1.49	-8.89	-32.75	30.95	1.75	1.22
Netherlands	2.28	3.03	3.78	4.69	3.38	32.89	24.76	24.12	1.90	4.86
United Kingdom	6.96	7.25	6.64	4.05	6.47	4.24	-8.41	-38.96	7.81	5.12
LPGR/GDP (%)										
Australia	7.78	8.49	9.80	11.01	9.08	9.08	15.51	12.30	7.11	11.05
Chile	0.59	1.66	1.61		1.26	178.51	-2.91		0.58	1.95
Colombia	2.27	2.83	2.55		2.53	24.91	-10.04		2.21	2.84
Denmark	15.87	17.05	17.83	18.41	17.23	7.50	4.55	3.25	15.64	18.82
Thailand	0.93	0.89	0.90	0.97	0.92	-4.38	1.02	8.22	0.90	0.94
Kenya	1.77	1.61	1.08	1.42	1.49	-8.89	-32.75	30.95	1.75	1.22
Netherlands	2.28	3.03	3.78	4.69	3.38	32.89	24.76	24.12	1.90	4.86
United Kingdom	6.96	7.25	6.64	4.05	6.47	4.24	-8.41	-38.96	7.81	5.12
GGE/GDP (%)										
Australia	36.59	37.22	39.50	38.40	37.87	1.74	6.11	-2.77	36.16	39.59
Chile	31.79	32.10	29.36		31.21	0.95	-8.52		32.65	29.76
Colombia	15.71	17.82	16.94		16.71	13.44	-4.95		15.65	17.77
Denmark	52.73	60.17	57.76	60.82	58.30	14.09	-3.99	5.29	55.03	61.57
Thailand	17.15	20.14	18.64	15.63	18.14	17.43	-7.44	-16.18	18.87	17.42
Kenya	27.28	29.82	28.59	30.10	28.89	9.34	-4.12	5.28	27.43	30.34
Netherlands	54.10	62.15	59.04	55.44	57.80	14.89	-5.00	-6.11	57.26	58.34
United Kingdom	48.01	48.81	43.74	43.59	46.31	1.67	-10.38	-0.35	50.02	42.60
CGE/GDP (%)										
Australia	18.66	18.78	20.17	18.90	19.15	0.64	7.38	-6.25	18.57	19.74
Chile	30.71	29.69	25.52	20.99	27.02	-3.35	-14.02	-17.75	31.64	25.09
Colombia	11.34	11.93	10.99		11.52	5.19	-7.93		11.62	11.41
Denmark	20.32	25.88	26.08	27.97	24.91	27.32	0.79	7.24	20.49	29.32
Thailand	13.82	18.15	17.30	14.81	16.08	31.35	-4.65	-14.41	15.48	16.68
Kenya	24.55	28.09	27.49	28.67	26.99	14.42	-2.15	4.30	24.45	29.54
Netherlands	36.68	42.75	39.78	38.44	39.46	16.56	-6.95	-3.36	38.75	40.17
United Kingdom	33.05	35.08	31.38	30.65	32.75	6.15	-10.56	-2.33	34.82	30.68
LGE/GDP (%)										
Australia	2.20	2.44	2.61	2.56	2.44	10.78	7.05	-2.03	2.18	2.70
Chile	1.09	2.42	2.38		1.93	122.55	-1.62		1.01	2.85
Colombia	1.10	1.54	1.40		1.31	39.88	-8.73		1.08	1.55
Denmark	32.11	34.29	31.68	32.85	32.80	6.80	-7.61	3.69	33.15	32.45
Thailand	3.34	1.99	1.34	1.29	2.03	-40.20	-32.78	-3.63	3.36	0.69
Kenya	2.10	1.73	1.37	1.43	1.69	-17.80	-20.76	4.65	2.17	1.22
Netherlands	17.42	19.40	19.27	16.99	18.34	11.39	-0.69	-11.79	18.51	18.17
United Kingdom	14.96	13.73	12.36	12.94	13.56	-8.22	-9.93	4.68	15.19	11.93
LPGE/GDP (%)										
Australia	17.93	18.44	19.33	19.50	18.72	2.89	4.81	0.86	17.59	19.85
Chile	1.09	2.42	2.38		1.93	122.55	-1.62		1.01	2.85
Colombia	4.36	5.89	5.95		5.19	34.90	1.08		4.03	6.36
Denmark	32.11	34.29	31.68	32.85	32.80	6.80	-7.61	3.69	33.15	32.45
Thailand	3.34	1.99	1.34	1.29	2.03	-40.20	-32.78	-3.63	3.36	0.69
Kenya	2.10	1.73	1.37	1.43	1.69	-17.80	-20.76	4.65	2.17	1.22
Netherlands	17.42	19.40	19.27	16.99	18.34	11.39	-0.69	-11.79	18.51	18.17
United Kingdom	14.96	13.73	12.36	12.94	13.56	-8.22	-9.93	4.68	15.19	11.93

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F. Government Finance Statistics

Table: 3.2.

Size of Government Sector in Industrial and Developing Countries

GGR/GDP (%)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Average	Rate of growth			Trend (Regression)	
	74/5-79	80-84	85-90	90-94		(2)-(1)	(3)-(2)	(4)-(3)	Initial	Final
Industrial Countries	43.64	46.96	48.70	48.10	46.76	7.62	3.70	-1.25	43.80	49.72
Developing Countries	22.17	23.16	22.19		22.73	4.48	-4.21		20.98	22.71
CGR/GDP (%)										
Industrial Countries	35.42	38.01	39.19	38.47	37.68	7.32	3.11	-1.84	35.66	39.71
Developing Countries	19.64	20.14	19.49		19.74	2.55	-3.21		19.60	20.13
LGR/GDP (%)										
Industrial Countries	6.78	7.88	9.07	9.62	8.23	16.13	15.20	6.00	6.41	10.05
Developing Countries	0.99	1.26	1.11		1.11	27.33	-11.59		0.97	1.26
LPGR/GDP (%)										
Industrial Countries	8.22	8.95	9.51	9.54	9.04	8.94	6.23	0.29	8.11	9.96
Developing Countries	1.39	1.75	1.54		1.55	25.69	-12.17		1.36	1.74
GGE/GDP (%)										
Industrial Countries	47.86	52.09	50.01	49.56	50.07	8.84	-3.99	-0.90	49.62	50.53
Developing Countries	22.98	24.97	23.38		23.74	8.65	-6.35		23.65	23.82
CGE/GDP (%)										
Industrial Countries	27.18	30.62	29.35	28.99	29.07	12.67	-4.15	-1.23	28.16	29.98
Developing Countries	20.10	21.96	20.32		20.40	9.24	-7.46		20.80	20.68
LGE/GDP (%)										
Industrial Countries	16.67	17.46	16.48	16.34	16.78	4.76	-5.63	-0.88	17.26	16.31
Developing Countries	1.91	1.92	1.62		1.74	0.71	-15.45		1.91	1.58
LPGE/GDP (%)										
Industrial Countries	20.60	21.47	20.66	20.57	20.85	4.19	-3.75	-0.43	21.11	20.60
Developing Countries	2.72	3.01	2.76		2.71	10.46	-8.22		2.64	2.78

Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics.

governmental sector and the provision of services. Indeed, while in developing countries about 24% of all resources are allocated through the government, in industrialised countries this figure is about 50%.

The difference between percentages is not only quantitative but also qualitative. In industrialised countries governments are involved in the provision of social services or "welfare", while in developing countries, the aggregated resources are more restricted and, therefore, the possibilities for government to provide "welfare" or intervene in the economy.


3.3. The historical trends: squeezing the State.

Graphs 3.2.a. to 3.2.h. show the changing government size for the period 1975-1994.


In general two forces have combined to reduce the size of the state over the last two decades. One has been the economic crisis, which has reduced both governments' tax revenues and their ability to borrow. The other has been deliberate policy. Neo-liberal governments working from "private interest" premises have sought to reduce the size of the state; while other governments have been pushed into similar reforms under the scheme of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) (Mackintosh, 1992).

In advanced countries the government size had a first fluctuation during the economic crisis of the seventies and a second one from the 1980s onwards. The best example of this behavior is the United Kingdom where from the 80s market mechanisms were introduced to provide public services and, therefore, the contribution of the government sector to the GDP dropped drastically. The same behavior can be found in The Netherlands and Australia, while in Denmark the size of the government had some fluctuation but, not as in the other advanced countries.

In order to analyze the downsizing of the government in developing countries it is important to have in mind some aspects. First, the countries are relatively small and, as a consequence, there is less scope for cuts than in industrialised countries. Second, since the structure of spendings shows that social security and welfare are,




Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics




Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics

Graph 3.2.c.
Netherlands: Government-Markets Sizes




Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics

Graph 3.2.d.
United Kingdom: Government-Markets Sizes




Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics

Graph 3.2.e.
Chile: Government-Markets Sizes




Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics

Graph 3.2.f.
Colombia: Government-Markets Sizes




Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics

Graph 3.2.g.
Thailand: Government-Markets Sizes



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics

Graph 3.2.h.
Kenya: Government-Markets Sizes



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics

especially in low-income countries, relatively small, the budget cuttings had to be in other items. Third, that in order to keep under control the public deficit and the external gap most developing countries decided to apply a Structural Adjustment Program that seriously reduced the role of their public sector in the overall economy aggregate (Mackintosh, 1992).

It is difficult to generalize about the rebalance between market and government in developing countries. Chile is probably the best example of downsizing the government sector based on deliberate policies. Indeed, from the mid seventies to the late eighties, we can see that there was not only a reduction of the government sector but also a decentralization process to the local government. In Colombia, the process was some how different since this country did not apply an SAP during the period for which we have statistical information, it did not have a critical debt problem and, its government size was always relatively small. As a consequence, its governmental sector shows an unusual stability for a developing country.

Thailand shows a significant process of market decentralization from the mid eighties onwards. It is also interesting to note that during the early nineties there was again a growth in the size of its governmental sector.

Kenya is a country with a very fluctuating presence of the governmental sector in the economy. However, once its government sector reached its maximum size in 1982 there has been a permanent effort to reduce it or at least to maintain stable its contribution to the GDP.

3.4. Mechanisms of market decentralization. Some illustrating experiences.

The aim of this section is to illustrate some of the institutional arrangements that are frequently used to redefine the balance between governments and markets and to show that privatization is only its extreme form.

Indeed decentralization, as a redefinition of the government size, can take three forms: (1) to the market (as the case of

privatization), (2) to quasi-markets (contracting out, vouchers and franchises) and, (3) to non-government organizations (voluntary associations).

3.4.1. Decentralization to the Markets.

Chile: Compañía de Teléfonos de Chile (CTC).

In 1987 there was a transfer of the (very profitable) telephone monopoly to the employees (4500 out of 6800) and a 30 per cent (later 45 per cent) holding to the Australian Bond Group. The actual (1991) division of the capital is Asociación de Fondo de Pensiones (10 per cent), stock market (19.5%), employees (8%) and private groups (62.5%). (OECD, 1991).

Colombia: Instituto de Fomento Industrial (IFI)

The process of market decentralization began in Colombia only in the early nineties. One of the most illustrating experiences is the privatization of eleven enterprises of the public development corporation Instituto de Fomento Industrial (IFI) in the relatively short period October 1990 and September 1991. Some of these enterprises are the Compañía Automotriz Colombiana transferred to Massed Corporation, CEM sold to Cementos del Valle and, PROCARBON sold to the private Propal²⁵ (Consejería Presidencial para la Modernización del Estado, 1994)

3.4.2. Quasi-market mechanisms.

Contracting out.

In this arrangement a private firm is the producer and the government arranges and pays for the service.

Denmark. Contracting out fire and ambulance services.

In Denmark the private Falck Company has contracts with 271 of 279 municipalities for at least one service, particularly municipal

²⁵ The Colombian government intends to sell between 1995 and 1998 eight electricity companies, two mines (Carbones de Colombia and the nickel mine Cerro Matosa), an insurance company (La Previsora) and other 28 public enterprises for a value of US 2.3 billions. The privatization plan includes to sell the country's five main airports at Bogota, Medellin, Cali, Barranquilla and Cartagena plus the cities' pipelines and refineries. (Latin America Report, September, 1995)

fire and ambulance. It also pays reservists to supplement full-time personnel (Hatry, 1983).

United Kingdom. Contracting out refuse collection services.

The example illustrates a policy that could better be described as "'competitive tendering' as opposed to 'contracting out' because the term contracting out carries an implicit assumption that the service will be provided by a private contractor. Instead the objective is to compare costs of existing provision with alternatives, either those offered by private firms or the city's own labor force" (OECD, 1987:88).

The case study was presented on the OECD/Sweden seminar on "Community Involvement in Urban Service Provision" and involves two boroughs of inner London: Kensington and Chelsea. "These two boroughs were amalgamated inheriting two separate refuse collection systems, both publicly provided. Chelsea's system was considered inefficient and thus invitations to tender were issued while Kensington refuse collection was to remain in the hands of a direct labor force. In Chelsea the contract was awarded to a firm proposing costs reductions of 51%. In addition, in conjunction with the evaluation process, improvements were made in the Kensington service resulting in an annual 29% per cent cost savings.

Although complaints were lower in Kensington than Chelsea, the direct labor organization was not allowed to tender for Chelsea work when it came up for renewal. The authority decided that it wanted to maintain a situation for which part of the service was provided by the direct labor force and part by external contractors since, if competition was reduced, some of the advantages of competitive tendering were going to be lost" (OECD, 1987:89).

Chile: Water Services.

A public water company, Empresa Metropolitana de Obras Sanitarias (EMOS), in Santiago, Chile, encouraged employees to leave the company in 1977 and compete for service contracts for tasks previously performed internally. The results were large productivity gains. The tasks that were subject to this arrangement are meter reading, billing and collection, and maintenance of

private connections (World Bank, 1994).

Colombia. Contracting out refuse collection services.

Refuse collection was partially transferred to the private sector in Bogota under the scheme of competitive tendering.

In Barranquilla, private management was contracted out but the refuse collection services is still public (Consejería Presidencial para la Modernización del Estado, 1994).

Kenya. Contracting out locomotive repairs.

The state railroad in Kenya has private contractors to do limited locomotive repair and maintenance. The objective was to induce X-efficiency (technical) gains. (World Bank, 1994)

Netherlands. Universities and Hospitals.

In The Netherlands several public services are regulated through a special law that allows private organizations (mainly foundations) to have management contracts in several social areas as high education (i.e. universities) and hospitals. The system has the advantage to increase flexibility on service delivery and, therefore, induce efficiency gains.

Vouchers.

Chile: Primary Education.

A good example of this system of quasi-market decentralization can be found in Chile.

In this country private education has been encouraged by means of vouchers paid by the government to a school that was freely selected by the consumers. The aim was to increase competition between private and public schools through "per-student" vouchers. (MacKintosh, 1992) (Castañeda, 1992).

Franchises.

Multiple Franchising on Urban Bus Transport.

Competition has stimulated both innovation and cost reduction in urban public transport. In Sri Lanka, for example, deregulation permitted the profitable operation of smaller vehicles by small-scale entrepreneurs, substantially improving service availability. Competitively tendered franchises or the granting of overlapping franchise to competing associations of operators is being practiced

successfully in several major cities of Latin America and Africa (World Bank, 1994).

3.4.3. Voluntary and Non-government Organizations.

Chile: Non-Government Organizations and Technical Schools.

As part of the 1980-1981 educational reform, the public vocational secondary schools were transferred to private non-profit organizations created by associations of employees. For example, the agricultural schools were transferred to the National Agriculture Association (Castañeda, 1992).

United Kingdom. Royal Institute for British Architects' (RIBA) Community Project Fund.

"This scheme began in 1982 as part of the Department of the Environment's Urban Initiative Fund (UIF), which is matched by RIBA contributions, mainly staff resources. UIF subsidizes voluntary organizations which provide advice and other assistance to local groups wishing to improve, or bring back into use, land and buildings in urban areas. The fund is managed by RIBA which appoints a group of architects to examine them. An architect visits the site, meets with the community group and prepares a report on the architectural feasibility of the project, sources of funding and further technical advice. The RIBA arranges training for the architects involved and publicity for the project.

More than half of the projects are building conversions, one-third new constructions and the remainder are environmental improvements, development plants and campaigns to save buildings or communities. The results of the scheme, helping citizens to mobilize community resources to improve the urban environment, have been shown to be large compared to the amount of CG grant" (OECD, 1987:89).

3.5. Decentralization to the governments and to the markets: a unifying approach.

3.5.1. Extent of decentralization to the governments and to the markets.

The extent of decentralization to the governments and to the markets in any country can be compared with that of other countries by using a diagram that: on the vertical axis classifies the extent

to which resource allocation is dominantly market controlled or determined by government and, on the horizontal axis, classifies the general financial, economic and political powers of governments with respect to their level of centralization or localization.




Graphs 3.3.a, 3.3.b and 3.3.c. show what are the extents of decentralization to the governments and to the markets in all the countries of the sample and in industrialised and developing countries taken as separated groups. The differences between these three graphs are that the horizontal axis measures the extent of expenditure decentralization through the ratio local government expenditure/total government expenditure (Graph 3.3.a), the modified expenditure decentralization ratio (Graph 3.3.b.) and, the revenue decentralization ratio (Graph 3.3.c). On the vertical axis, Graphs 3.3.a and 3.3.b. show the ratio general government expenditure/GDP and Graph 3.3.c measures the proportion of the general government revenues to GDP.

In the bottom left corner of all graphs we find most developing countries since they assign most of their resources through the market and, with different extent, are power centralized. The theoretical model that best applies to them is the Centralized Market Model and not the Centralized Public Sector Model as proposed by Bennett²⁶. In fact, all our developing countries have a relatively small public sector and, therefore, it is evident that they allocate most of their resources through the market²⁷.

Using the same graphs we can also analyze if one country is more decentralized or centralized. In fact, in developing countries only Colombia is close to the industrialised countries in matters of

²⁶ Explicitly Bennett says that "The botton left case, of a centralized public sector model, can perhaps be identified with Spain, Portugal, and to a lesser extend France in the early seventies. This model is close to the form of many developing countries today" (Bennett, 1994: 7).

²⁷ The classification capabilities of Bennett's models could be improved adding a third dimension: the degree of decentralization/centralization of economic units (Helmsing). The advantage of such addition is that it could allow a better understanding of the decentralization process not only based on fiscal variables but also including statistics about the distribution of economic units.



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F, Government Finance Statistics
 GGE: General Government Expenditures; LPGE: Local-Prov. Government Expenditures
 LPGE-Mod: Local-Prov. Government Expenditures Modified;
 GGR: General Government Revenues; LPGR: Local-Prov. Government Revenues.

government decentralization²⁸ but, of course, the size of its government sector is far below the ones of Denmark, Australia, United Kingdom or The Netherlands.

All industrialised countries are placed in the center of the graphs so we can say that they have a Mixed Model of decentralization. This hybrid model is a complex mix of decentralization to the governments and to the markets and, in general, it applies to countries with a "well developed welfare state".

3.5.2. Analysis of change.

Graphs 3.4.a. to 3.4.c. show the direction of the decentralization trends using a dash to differentiate a final position from the initial one (e.g. D identifies Denmark at the beginning of the analytical period and D' represents the same country at the end)²⁹.

In general, there are two patterns of change in developing countries (refer to Graph 3.4.a). Kenya and Thailand are moving towards a greater centralization with a relatively static government size³⁰. Chile and Colombia, on the other hand, made a significant effort to decentralize power to the LGs and, in the first case, increase the allocation of resources through the market³¹. Obviously, none of the developing countries was able to develop a welfarist model.




All industries are moving in the area of a mixed or post-welfare model (central area of the graphs). The common characteristic of this model are: (1) demand for greater responsiveness to costumers; (2) innovations on service delivery; (3) managerial reform

²⁸ Specially if we use the expenditure decentralization ratio.

²⁹ The tendencies were calculated using Ordinary Least Squares for each series.

³⁰ In order to analyse each country experience it is necessary to complement the information of graphs 3.4.a, 3.4.b and 3.4.c. with graphs 3.2.a to 3.2.h of this chapter.

³¹ It is important to recall that the available data do not show the recent changes registered in Colombia. The reason is that decentralization to the market began in Colombia only in the early nineties as a consequence of the economic reforms.



Source: Own elaboration based on I.M.F. Government Finance Statistics
 GGE: General Government Expenditures; LPGE: Local-Prov. Government Expenditures
 LPGE-Mod: Local-Prov. Government Expenditures Modified. GGR: General Govtn Revenues
 LPGR: Local-Prov. Government Revenues. (X) Initial position, (X') Final position.

(internal accountability); (4) reinterpretations of representation and external accountability and; (5) attempts to shift the boundary of government (Bennett, 1994).

The most interesting experience in industrial countries is the United Kingdom. "The reforms of the three Thatcher administrations have at one level imposed new and major centralizing controls: limitation of local tax rates; direct capital and expenditure controls, local spending targets with penalties and grant "clawback"; and directives to modify local services". (Bennett, 1990: 9). At another level, however, the Thatcher government has been profoundly decentralizing to the markets as we could see from our graphs.

Analyzing all the sample we can say that it is only in two countries in which there is evidence of a significant effort to increase the expenditure responsibilities of LGs. These countries are Chile and Colombia. In industrialised countries, there is a redefinition of the balance between the different layers of government but LGs remain very important.

The process of market decentralization is more recent and, therefore, its premature to talk about its effects. However, both in Chile and the United Kingdom, there is evidence that market decentralization is an emerging phenomenon. The common ground for these two countries is that they underwent significant economic and political reforms as part of their shift towards a greater market allocation of resources. The rest of the countries show a surprising stability.

4. Policy Considerations.

Both decentralization to the markets and to the governments have common objectives: increase economic efficiency on the provision of public services and promote a higher responsiveness to the consumer.

Several policy considerations are associated with these objectives (Bennett, 1990):

4.1. Shifting the boundary of the government.

Even though the increase in economic efficiency and responsiveness to the consumer can be achieved almost in any institutional arrangement, there seems to be a greater consensus to shift back the boundary of the state.

The efficiency arguments in favor of this strategy are: (1) "that the welfare gain to be derived from pursuit of equity goals is less than the efficiency loss which government intervention produces" (Bennett, 1990: 22) (i.e. price of fairness principle) and; (2) that government administration is less efficient than a market where incentives to good management and personnel performance are used to assure greater efficiency (fallibility of government principle) (Bennett, 1990). From the responsiveness to the consumer point of view the argument in favor of market decentralization is that government intervention has created dependency on public services and, therefore, it failed to reflect individual preferences.

Some of the instruments used to reduce the government size are "privatization" (e.g. Colombian privatization of public enterprises of the Instituto de Fomento Industrial) and transfer of government responsibilities to Non Government Organization, associations, cooperatives and voluntary bodies (e.g. Chilean transfer of technical schools to non-profit private organizations). However, as we argue in the next section these are only extreme possibilities for "load shedding" since there is a wide range of innovative arrangements to provide public goods.

4.2. Innovative arrangements to provide services.

As we saw from our illustrating experiences, an alternative

strategy for restraining government involvement in service delivery is to make greater use of those arrangements in which government plays a relatively minor role. These arrangements include franchise arrangements for toll goods (e.g. multiple franchising of urban bus services), vouchers (e.g. Chilean experience on primary education), contracting out for the provision of toll or collective goods (e.g. Kenyan locomotive repair system) and, grants or subsidies to private firms that provide private or toll goods (e.g. in transit systems where the companies are not permitted to raise fares or remove unprofitable routes, subsidies are frequently used to reimburse the company).

Additionally, the policies to increase economic efficiency and costumer responsiveness do not necessarily imply downsizing the governmental sector. In fact, efficiency gains can also result from: new financial arrangements on public service delivery (e.g. user charges, cost recovery mechanisms), improved systems of government accountability and, a greater government capacity to provide an appropriate regulatory environment (Bennett, 1990).

4.3. Financial reforms.

Another approach to increase economic efficiency and responsiveness to the costumer is the introduction of "cost recovery" mechanisms (i.e. user charges and fees) and innovations in the area of taxation.

User charges and fees are important to reveal costumer preferences and improve efficiency because unsatisfied citizens have the possibility to look for an alternative provider if they feel a service is not worth the price. According to Bennett (1990:22) cost recovery mechanisms have the potential of: "(1) improving resource allocation in the economy as a whole; (2) controlling the possibility of 'crowding out' by imposing a uniform basis for competition which allows alternative suppliers in the non-governmental area to survive and develop; (3) stimulating a closer response of service producers and managers to consumer demands which in turn should raise quality and remove unnecessary production and; (4) may be used to improve social equity and

environmental policy by incorporating the social costs of externalities".

In the area of taxation there is a shift from taxation according to the ability to pay to taxation according to benefits. The argument behind this shift is that on efficiency considerations, better resource allocation can be achieved by more closely linking service benefits and tax charges (Bennett, 1990). Examples of this approach are sales taxes and value added taxes.

Since cost recovery and taxation according to benefits imply a closer link between consumers and providers, they are a strong argument in favor of decentralization to the local level of government.

4.4. Internal accountability, representation, effectiveness and, external accountability.

Internal Accountability.

The objective of internal accountability is to improve local government efficiency and responsiveness to the customer setting up a managerial system that is more sensible to demand-supply forces. For example, the introduction of accounting concepts used in the private sector can improve the financial control over the costs of providing public services.

Representation and effectiveness.

Decentralization to the LGs is important because it minimizes political rents and therefore, improves representation and effectiveness. In other words, the higher the level of information the lower is the probability that politicians receive more votes than they deserve³². Consequently, intergovernmental decentralization should be promoted as a way to achieve greater representation and LGs effectiveness.

External accountability.

Since "voting as a signal of market preferences is a very imperfect copy of real markets" (Bennett, 1990: 18) there must be mechanisms

³² This is what Galeotti calls "minimization of political rents" (Bennett, 1990)

to improve the link between decisions and services outcomes. These mechanisms involve four areas of external accountability: to taxpayers (i.e. "no taxation without representation"), to local business, to higher levels of government and, to the electorate (Bennett, 1990).

As we can deduce from the policy considerations that are involved in decentralization, the redefinition of the balance between governments and markets and intergovernmental relations are part of broader policy issues: economic efficiency, customer responsiveness, effectiveness and representation. These are aspects that exceed the scope of this research but they can be tackled on the basis of a better understanding of the recent trends of decentralization to the governments and to the markets. Obviously, this paper is just a contribution on this last area of research.

Conclusions and future research agenda.

Decentralization is a complex issue if we define it not only in the context of intergovernmental relations but as a process that includes a redefinition of roles between governments and markets. In order to analyze this process this research was divided into four main aspects: (1) analysis of decentralization to the LGs; (2) analysis of decentralization to the markets, quasi-markets and NGOs; (3) analysis of decentralization using a unifying approach of its components and; (4) identification of policy issues relevant for developing countries.

In relation to the process of decentralization to the LGs several issues were explored and we found that:

- (1) Industrialised countries have a higher decentralization ratio than developing ones. The reason for this situation is that the level of economic development of a country determines the aggregate resources that are available for the growth of the governmental sector and, consequently:
 - the scale of government action will be limited by lower levels of GDP; and
 - the extent, form and complexity of government structures will be less developed with lower levels of economic activity.

The logical corollary of this finding is that low levels of economic development will limit the possibilities of decentralization (especially to the LGs).

- (2) In general, the degree of decentralization of expenditures is higher than the degree of decentralization of revenues and, therefore, LGs are always financially dependent on CG transfers.

The direct consequence of this dependency is that LGs are restricted on their capacity to respond to costumer preferences especially because they have to follow CGs' standards, norms and regulations rather than local demands.

- (3) Generally, higher levels of decentralization imply a lower financial autonomy. However, both in industrialised and in

developing countries, LGs are trying to reduce their financial imbalances as a way to better link managerial decisions and the use of LGs resources.

- (4) Both in industrialised and in developing countries LGs have a restricted capacity to rely on their own resources because they have limited tax possibilities. This is a direct consequence of the CGs tendency to reserve for themselves the most buoyant and lucrative tax-revenues.
- (5) Another restriction of LGs is the weak correlation between tax-revenues and the economic fluctuations of prices and income. This generates a financial problem for LGs (i.e. potential financial crisis) since their expenditures change with income variations and inflation while their revenues are more static. In other words, expenditures are cyclical while revenues are not.
- (6) Both subsidies and interest payments are more important for LGs in industrialised countries than in developing ones. The reasons for this situation are:
 - That welfare services in industrialised countries are partly financed through LGs subsidies.
 - That LGs in industrialised countries have an easier access to the banking system and less legal limitations to finance their programmes through it than their counterparts in the Third World.
- (7) The proportion of current expenditures in the total shows an increasing tendency both in industrialised and developing countries. Part of this situation can be explained by LGs tendency to adjust their budgets (especially during periods of financial constraints) using capital rather than current items (i.e. it is much more easy to delay a big project than to reduce "wages and salaries").
- (8) Although LGs are supposed to be more efficient and effective in providing social services, in general social spending is still very centralized. The disaggregation of

the general government social budget shows that this is not true for all social services.

- (9) In most countries LGs have more responsibilities in areas of high priority for human development (education and health) than in other social matters. This implies that social policies directed to increase human capital could be more effective if they involve LGs.
- (10) In general, the education decentralization ratio tends to be higher than the social decentralization ratios A and B. This shows that education is a LGs' primary concern.
- (11) In industrialised and in developing countries the non central component of the government tends to have a higher social allocation ratio than the CG. On average, the education and health allocation ratios are also higher at LGs than at CGs.

In relation to the process of decentralization to the markets, quasi-markets and NGOs we found that there is a variety of possible institutional arrangements to achieve efficiency gains and a greater responsiveness to costumers. Indeed, through illustrating experiences we showed that public goods can be provided using private firms, contracting out public services, providing vouchers, granting franchises, and through voluntary work or NGOs involvement.

Additionally, using a "proxy variable" we measured the extent to which resources are allocated using the market. The results show that in industrialised countries an important part of the aggregate resources is allocated through the government while, in developing countries, governments are still very small and, therefore, most resources are generally allocated through the markets, quasi markets and NGOs.

The third chapter ends showing the relative position and trends of our sample countries in a system that measures both decentralization processes. The results indicate that developing countries are very near a Centralized Market Model since they allocate most of their resources through the market and their

governmental systems are highly centralized. On the other hand, all industrialised countries have a Hybrid Model of resource and power allocation. This model is a complex mix of decentralization to the governments and to the markets.

Finally, the last chapter is a discussion of the common policy issues that are associated with the processes of decentralization to the local governments and to the markets. In this area we argue that: (1) the shifts in the governmental "boundary", (2) the use of innovative arrangements to provide public services, (3) the financial reforms of LGs and, (4) the greater concerns about local government accountability, are part of a broader discussion of the ways to increase economic efficiency and a greater responsiveness to the costumers. These last issues are a central concern for policy makers involved in the process of decentralization.

Based on the findings of this paper it is evident that the processes of decentralization to the governments and to the markets is a complex issue that requires more extensive research. In order to contribute in this direction I tried to identify some preliminary questions that certainly will have to make part of a future research agenda. These questions are: (1) Under what circumstances can decentralization induce efficiency gains?; (2) What is the policy environment that is required to implement a successful decentralization process?, (3) Can decentralization be feasible without a deep Governmental Reform?, (4) What are the institutional aspects that constrains the decentralization processes?, (5) What are the limits and constraints of the process of market decentralization?, (6) How is it possible to balance efficiency and equity considerations in the assignment of economic roles to the different layers of government? and, (7) How does decentralization contribute to areas of human development priority?. Obviously, any effort to answer these questions should focus on relevant policy issues for developing countries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Bahl R.W. & Linn J.F. (1992), Urban Public Finance in Developing Countries, OUP for the World Bank. New York.
- Bennett, R.J. (1980), The Geography of Public Finance. Welfare under Fiscal Federalism and Local Government Finance. Methuen, London.
- Bennett, R.J. (1990), Decentralization, Local Governments, and Markets. Towards a Post-Welfare Agenda, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Bennett R. (1994), Local Governments and Market Decentralization: Experiences in industrialized, developing and former Eastern block countries, United Nations University Press, Tokyo, New York, Paris.
- Bird R. (1990), 'Fiscal Decentralization in Colombia', in Bennett, Decentralization, Local Governments and Markets, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Borhaug Kjetil, Local Government and Decentralization in Sub-Saharan Africa, An Annotated Bibliography, Working Paper 1994: 5, Chr. Michelsen Institute, Norway.
- Brown C.V. & Jackson P.M. (1994), Public Sector Economics, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Castañeda, Tarsicio (1992), Combating Poverty. Innovative Social Reforms in Chile During the 1980s, International Center for Economic Growth, San Francisco-California.
- Consejo Presidencial para la Modernización del Estado, Asociación Colombiana para la Modernización del Estado (1994), Gerencia Pública en Colombia, Bogotá.
- Hatry, H. (1983), A Review of Private Approaches for Delivery of Public Services, The Urban Institute Press, Washington D.C.
- Helmsing A.H.J. (1995), "South Africa: post-apartheid restructuring of government - which way? Reflections on international experiences", Paper presented to the Conference on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations, Johannesburg, 3-5 May, 1995.
- Helmsing A.H.J. (1994), Local Government Finance: An Introduction, Institute of Social Studies. The Hague.
- International Bureau of Fiscal Documentation (1985), Local taxes in Europe, IBFD, Nro 37, Amsterdam.

- Johannisson B (1990), 'The Nordic Perspective: Self-reliant local development in four Scandinavian Countries', in Stohr Walter, Global challenge and local response: initiatives for regeneration in contemporary Europe, Cooperation for Development Series, European Perspectives, v. 2.
- Johnston R.J. (1982), Geography and the State: An Essay on Political Geography, Macmillan, London.
- Klugman Jeni, (1994), Decentralization: A Survey of Literature from a Human Development Perspective, Human Development Report Office, Occasional Papers 13, New York.
- Landua Daniel, (1986), "Government and Economic Growth in the Less Developed Countries: an empirical study for 1960-1980". EDCC, 35,1,86, pg 35-77.
- Mahar D, Dillinger W (1983), Financing State and Local Government in Brazil: Recent Trends and Issues; World Bank Staff Working Papers Number 612.
- MacKintosh M. (1992), "Questioning the State" in Development Policy and Public Action, Wuyts, MacKintosh and Hewitt (eds). Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Musgrave, R.A. & Musgrave, P.B. (1986), Public Finance in Theory and Practice, MacGraw-Hill, Tokyo.
- Oates, Wallace (1990), Fiscal Federalism, Gregg Revivals, England.
- OECD (1987), Managing and Financing Urban Services, OECD, Paris.
- Paddison Ronan & Bailet Stephen (1988), Local Government Finance: International Perspectives. London.
- Prud'Homme R. (1990), 'Decentralization of Expenditures and Taxes: The case of France' in Benett R. Decentralization, Local Governments and Markets, United Nations University Press, Tokyo, New York, Paris.
- Rhodes, R.A.W, (1981), Control and Power in Central-Local Government Relations. England.
- Roth G. (1987). The Private Provision of Public Services in Developing Countries; EDI Series on Economic Development, World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Savas E.S, (1982). Privatizing the Public Sector: How to Shrink Government; Chatham House Publishers Inc., New Jersey.
- Steward. F, Klugman J, and Helmsing A.H (1994). Decentralization in Zimbabwe; Human Development Report Office, Occasional Papers 15, New York.

Steward F, and Rains G, (1994); Decentralization in Chile; Human Development Report Office, Occasional Papers, New York.

UNDP, (1993) Human Development Report 1993, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Wiesner Duran, E and Bird R (1981), Las Finanzas Intergubernamentales en Colombia. Informe de la Mision Wiesner-Bird de Finanzas Intergubernamentales, Bogota.

Wiesner Duran, Eduardo (1992), Colombia: Descentralizacion y Federalismo Fiscal, Informe Final de la Mision para la Descentralizacion, Presidencia de la Republica- Departamento Nacional de Planificacion. Bogota.

Winkler, Donald (1994). The Design and Administration of Intergovernmental Transfers: Fiscal Decentralization in Latin America; World bank Discussion Papers, 235, New York.

World Bank (1988), "The role of Public Finance in Development" in World Development Report, New York.

World Bank (1994), World Development Report, World Bank, Washington. D.C.