



2010:9

UTV Working Paper

Pierre Frühling

How Basic Community Infrastructure Works can Trigger Livelihood Improvements and Good Governance

Personal notes on a validated model integrating socio-economic progress and democracy development in poor urban areas

How Basic Community Infrastructure Works can Trigger Livelihood Improvements and Good Governance

**Personal notes on a validated model integrating
socio-economic progress and democracy
development in poor urban areas**

Pierre Frühling

UTV Working Paper 2010:9

Sida

Authors: Pierre Frühling

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

UTV Working Paper 2010:9

Commissioned by Sida, Department for Conflict and Post-Conflict Cooperation, Team for Regional cooperation Latin America and the Caribbean

Copyright: Sida and the author

Date of final report: December 2009

Printed by: Edita 2010

Art. no. Sida61276en

ISBN: 978-91-586-4142-6

This publication can be downloaded from:
<http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden.

Visiting address: Valhallavägen 199.

Phone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64.

www.sida.se sida@sida.se

Table of Contents

- Foreword** 3
- 0. Introduction** 5
- 1. Points of Departure** 5
 - 1.1 Urbanization and poverty..... 5
 - 1.2 Persistent challenges for international development cooperation..... 6
 - 1.3 PRODEL – a validated and replicable model 6
- 2. Selected Data on PRODEL, its Components and Results** 7
 - 2.1 Getting started in the midst of turmoil 7
 - 2.2 Main components and their characteristics..... 8
 - 2.3 Selected achievements and results 10
- 3. On the Replication of PRODEL Components and its Results** 11
- 4. What the Component Actually Achieves and the Mechanisms Behind it** 14
 - 4.1 A brief summary of PCIW impact in Nicaragua and Guatemala 14
 - 4.2 Main contents of the PCIW approach, its core elements and their significance 16
- 5. Defining the Magic: Why and When the Model Works**..... 19
- 6. Key Challenges on the Donor Side** 21
- 7. Final Remarks** 21
- Selected sources** 23
- Terms of reference** 25

Foreword

In the UTV Working Paper Series, Sida publishes background material and annexes to Sida Evaluations and Sida Studies in Evaluation, and other forms of working material which we believe to be of interest for a wider audience. Working Papers have not always been proof read or quality assured by the Secretariat for Evaluation.

0. Introduction

Today, half the world's population lives in cities and urbanization is particularly rapid in the developing world where a very sizeable share of the urban population are to be found in marginal areas, shanty towns and slums. These areas not only lack decent living conditions but are also often ignored or entirely abandoned by their authorities. Improving the livelihoods of the urban poor will thus also require changes in the quality and character of local governance.

In this context, traditional democracy support only is likely to yield few concrete results. And projects focusing only on concrete – that is, public works – tend to be few and expensive, of questionable quality and often not reflecting priorities within the community. Thus, the challenge is not sectoral nor that of a project. Rather, we need replicable models of an integrated character and with good prospects of becoming locally and nationally sustained.

It is within this context that the experience generated by an urban development program in Nicaragua named PRODEL – initially funded by Sida but today a national foundation – merits attention. Partly for its remarkable success measured in direct results. But even more so for its methods and approach towards integrated development among poor people in urban and peri-urban areas – an approach which has been replicated and validated under different conditions, also outside Nicaragua.

In other words: it has stood the test of becoming a model, a model which now is ready for dissemination and subsequent application within a whole range of new and relevant contexts – by the different actors within the Swedish development cooperation as well as by other international and national agencies and organizations. The purpose of this short text is to contribute to such a process.¹

1. Points of Departure

1.1 Urbanization and poverty

In 2008, the urban inhabitants of the world reached 50 per cent (or some 3.3 billion people) of the earth's total population. Thus, for the first time in history, the world is today half urban. Whereas the total urban population in the developed world is expected to increase only slightly in the coming decades, urbanization in the developing world continues at a rapid pace, particularly in Africa but also in several parts of Asia and in Latin America.² Even if it still holds true that the proportion of people living under conditions of poverty and (even more so) of extreme poverty is generally higher in the rural areas, the urban areas today concentrate the greatest absolute numbers of poor people in a considerable number of developing countries.

A sizeable share of these inhabitants live in slums and other marginal areas, which are often unattended or even abandoned by local (municipal or district) administrations. Breaking the poverty cycle in these areas thus requires change to the character of local governance as well.

¹ The author is a development practitioner with long experience as a private consultant and as Sida field officer.

This essay is based on (i) the author's first-hand experience of the contexts and projects analyzed here; (ii) revision of selected documents and literature, and; (iii) a special field mission in March, 2009 to Nicaragua and Guatemala for follow-up and reality-check purposes. The study undertaken for this essay was financed by Sida, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.

² The urban share of the total population is currently estimated at some 30 per cent for Africa, slightly over 40 per cent for Asia and a staggering 77 per cent for Latin America and the Caribbean. (UN-HABITAT, 2008)

1.2 Persistent challenges for international development cooperation

Since international development cooperation in the current meaning of the term first began some 50 years ago,³ many different paradigms have been tested for efficiently furthering democratic and socio-economic progress, considerable experience has been accumulated and a series of difficulties have found reasonable solutions. Notwithstanding this progress, certain key issues have constituted almost permanent challenges, requiring constant attention and renewed efforts in order to be more successfully addressed. Within this category, the following crucial themes merit special mention:

How to reach the poor, effectively and efficiently?

Part of the challenge here is of course how to avoid trickle down only (as much more is needed), how to prevent improper redirection of funds and how to stem outright corruption. What actor/s to involve in the channeling of the resources (and under what conditions) also becomes an important consideration in this context. However, reaching the poor effectively and efficiently is, not least, also about how to reach them with what they need and what they themselves give priority.

How to make the process sustained, beyond the life-time of the project?

National development cannot be the sum of external projects nor the result of temporary activities (which a project, by definition, is). National development towards poverty reduction and democracy can only occur from within, with processes carried by local actors. One main justification for projects should thus deal with their capacity to facilitate domestic processes of change that have a chance to continue long after the project is gone. Concentrating on formal national institutions only is no guarantee in this context, as they often do not represent the kind of change needed and may not even be real institutions.

How to handle multi-dimensional approaches within sector-shaped institutions?

People do not live in sectors yet most international development agencies are structured along such lines. How often can decisive contributions be made when it comes to poverty reduction and lack of democracy if we depart from sectoral approaches? For example, how much prevention aimed at improving the health of poor people can realistically be achieved by the country's Ministry of Health alone? At the same time, however, combined or integrated approaches must be realistic when it comes to their implementation in the real world, within the existing institutional and societal setting, without adding procedures or matrixes which become too complicated; this is the challenge.⁴

1.3 PRODEL – a validated and replicable model

It is precisely within the set of questions outlined above that the model and achievements of *PRODEL* merit becoming widely disseminated.⁵ What once started in the first half of the 1990s as a rather ordinary (even if ambitious and well-prepared) development project funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) in five small to medium sized towns in Nicaragua, has achieved measurable and clearly impressive results and its activities still continue through a national and well-consolidated foundation of the same name. Even more important, though, is the fact that several of its core components and methods have been validated as replicable under substantially different conditions, even outside Nicaragua.

³ The UN's Expanded Program of Technical Assistance (EPTA) started in 1950; the first bilateral Swedish program of a governmental character initiated operations in 1952.

⁴ The well-intended programs once so popular among international development cooperation agencies for Integrated Rural Development constitute a case in point. Over time, these programs became so ambitious and complex in their design as to require a whole new cadre of experts and bureaucrats, making program as well as public administration heavier instead of easier and consequently often substituting for local forces in development efforts.

⁵ PRODEL = Programa de Desarrollo Local (Program for Local Development).

PRODEL should therefore first of all be known and understood as a workable model for substantially improving livelihoods among poor people in urban and peri-urban areas, utilizing an approach which inseparably links tangible progress (such as increased employment, improved basic infrastructure and housing) with positive change concerning the quality and democratic character of local governance.

The present document is intended as a modest contribution to this purpose. It starts by briefly describing some of the overall results achieved so far and then concentrates on one of the main components of PRODEL which has been successfully replicated, tentatively identifying the core elements of this model which has proved capable of generating socio-economic progress in poor urban neighborhoods and/through improved local governance.

2. Selected Data on PRODEL, its Components and Results

2.1 Getting started in the midst of turmoil

Studies and preparations for what finally was to become the urban development program PRODEL in Nicaragua, funded by Sida, took place during the period 1991 to 1993 with program implementation starting in 1994. This period in time coincided with a multi-dimensional and difficult transition within the Nicaraguan society following the defeat of the Sandinista Government in the general elections of January 1990 and the termination of the decade-long war once begun by the US-backed contra troops.⁶ It was a period of great turmoil which hardly represented stable conditions for any kind of development undertakings, but it also represented a situation when innovative thinking was both needed and welcomed on all sides. These same features also characterized conditions in the five small and medium sized towns in the country where the program concentrated its efforts during its first phase,⁷ towns which had all experienced serious problems related to rapid population growth, first due to internal displacement caused by the almost decade-long period of war, and then by the return of refugees.

The first phase of PRODEL covered 4 years (1994-97) and was followed by two more periods of Sida funding (1998-2003 and 2004-2008). During the first two periods, PRODEL was located within the government agency responsible for supporting the country's municipalities (the Nicaraguan Institute for Municipal Development, INIFOM). In 2003/2004, PRODEL was successfully transformed into a private Nicaraguan non-profit foundation and has continued to perform its activities in this legal form ever since. All in all, during this period of 15 years, total Sida funding for this program has amounted to some SEK 200 million, corresponding to some USD 25 million. Through the program, these resources have been more than quadrupled as a total of USD 112 million has been mobilized and invested through PRODEL.⁸

⁶ From a situation of war and political polarization, progress was made in the process of national reconciliation and democratization. From a collapsed, centrally managed economy with record levels of hyper-inflation and the highest foreign debt in the region, it was transformed into a market economy with incipient growth and relative financial stability. Departing from a centralized state structure, reforms were introduced to promote the decentralization of public administration, including the municipalities. At the same time, this needed harsh structural adjustment measures with clearly negative impact on the poorest sectors of society. Unemployment increased and wages, which already had little purchasing power, were frozen while access to basic services and infrastructure was reduced. (Stein, 2001)

⁷ León, Chinandega, Estelí, Somoto and Ocotal.

⁸ See further Section 2.3 of this text.

2.2 Main components and their characteristics

The main development objective of PRODEL since starting its operations in April 1994 has been to improve the socio-economic conditions of poor people living in urban and peri-urban areas, through a participatory investment approach which also provides a crucial role for the strengthening of local governments. The three investment components of PRODEL can, in principle, be described as follows:⁹

- (a) *Basic community infrastructure works in areas defined as the poorest* through precise and transparent criteria for categorizing each neighborhood in the town according to its conditions and the status of its public services. Decisions on which works are to be prioritized are always taken by the communities themselves and negotiated with the municipality. Construction is undertaken and financed jointly between the community and the municipality, with support from the program. The component is intended for community works costing up to USD 50,000 and can include projects such as potable water, sewers and storm drains; treatment plants; pedestrian and vehicular roads (including sidewalks and small bridges); public and household electrification; school rooms, playgrounds; minor works for disaster mitigation (retention walls); etc.
- (b) *Housing improvement through small loans* (between USD 200 and USD 1,400) targeted at poor families who have the capacity to repay their loans. In principle, loans are always combined with technical assistance and are used to gradually improve and/or enlarge houses. Typical works include the construction of additional rooms, improvement of roofs, reinforcement of outdoor walls, the construction and/or improvement of floors and interior walls, the installation of indoor plumbing and sewage facilities, electrification, upgrading of kitchens etc.
- (c) *Financial support for micro-enterprises in the same poor neighborhoods* through small short-term loans (between US\$ 300 and US\$ 1,500) for fixed and working capital, as well as for the creation of new micro-enterprises for services, trade and manufacturing. In practice, these loans have been directed particularly at micro-enterprises owned and operated by women.

These investment lines or components are also linked to specific technical assistance and support for institutional development in order to strengthen the capacities of the municipalities involved as concerns their planning processes and procedures for social investments, as well as for encouraging and facilitating financial entities to become involved at the local level with credit lines adjusted to the situation of poor families.

⁹ Several minor adjustments have of course been made over time but have not altered the principal features. These changes have therefore been largely ignored in this seemingly “timeless” description.

Box 1: Selected key characteristics of PRODEL components

Objective	Infrastructure	Housing improvement	Micro enterprises
Seeks	Improve, expand and maintain basic services and social facilities at the community level	Improve the housing conditions of households and individual families	Income and employment generation in home-based and family-owned micro enterprises, especially headed by women
How is it implemented?	To promote community participation and strengthen local governments	To demonstrate the potential for credit lines for housing improvement among poor households in the country	To show the financial sustainability of a fund outside the traditional activity areas of banks and other lenders
Development implications	Local government with community participation defines, co-administers, executes and maintains the projects	A financial institution issues loans and recovers them from individual families; technical assistance for construction is provided by PRODEL or the financial institution.	A financial institution screens, selects and issues loans to active micro-entrepreneurs; in some cases technical assistance for the creation of new micro-enterprises is provided.
Financial solution	Solutions are prioritized, negotiated and co-financed between the communities and local governments	End-user households define solutions with technical assistance directly linked to the loan; high degree of mobilization of extra family resources	In the beginning, the geographical area was defined by the program's selection criteria (poverty) but the financial institutions and the users of the loans have always established their relationship without any outside intervention; the result is a strengthening of the local economy
Type of fund	Costs shared between PRODEL, the local government and the community	The families repay the loans; the financial institution is paid a fee from the positive interest rates.	Loans repaid to the financial institution by micro-enterprises, based on positive and market interest rates
Target population/users	Conditional and participatory fund with an element of subsidy	Rotating fund with long term turnover (two to four years per loan)	Rotating fund with high turnover, high interest rates and short repayment periods (six months)
	Families of poor neighborhoods lacking basic services and infrastructure.	Households in the selected neighborhoods with ability to pay (monthly family income ranging between USD 60-500) [upper limit later increased]	Micro-enterprises, the majority of them already established, with monthly family incomes USD 60-500 [upper limit later increased]

Source: Stein (July, 2001), with adaptations by the author.

At the time when PRODEL began in 1994, two of the three components briefly described above represented something largely new and innovative – namely the approach concerning community infrastructure works and the design of credit schemes for housing improvements which targeted poor people and always included technical assistance. Also the component for credits to micro-enterprises contained some new characteristics, but to a lesser degree as more experience in this field was already available.¹⁰

Initially, the idea was to make all these three investment components coincide within the same, selected municipalities and neighborhoods. Even if this was thought – correctly, as shown by later studies – to generate more impact in terms of families reached and contributions to the local economy, it also met with different kinds of problems originally not envisaged and sometimes proved to be difficult to achieve. Consequently, the presence of PRODEL in a municipality did not always mean that all the

¹⁰ A development which, to a large extent, had been stimulated by the success of the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, which had won wide recognition in the early 1980s. (In 1983, the Grameen Project had even been transformed into an independent bank by government legislation.)

three investment lines were present simultaneously in the areas selected. On the other hand, each one of the three components of PRODEL soon proved to constitute a constructive development instrument which could be used both on a stand-alone basis and as a complementary building block for a more powerful development effort.

2.3 Selected achievements and results

The results achieved through 15 years of continuous efforts by PRODEL cover various dimensions in the municipalities where the program has been (and still continues to be) active – physical improvements affecting living conditions in the neighborhoods, increased income-levels and better local government. According to recent studies the program has, in a tangible manner, contributed both to reducing poverty and to achieving municipal administrations with higher levels of efficiency and a more inclusive character. In spite of many changes in local government and a high turnover rate among municipal employees, the participatory approach introduced by PRODEL for community infrastructure works is not only well-known within the municipal sphere but has largely become routine procedure in a considerable number of towns – also in cases where changes have involved new political forces coming into power.

Particularly in small towns where the program has been continuously active over a long period of time (such as Ocotal and Somoto) whole neighborhoods have undergone profound change concerning physical infrastructure, housing conditions and income levels. Several neighborhoods which were earlier classified as outright slum areas with few or no links to the town, have been developed and integrated into the urban area covered by municipal planning and services.

Moreover, due to the support for micro-enterprises and housing improvements targeting the poor through credits the program has also, in a decisive manner, contributed to the development of the financial sector, facilitating the establishment of a whole range of new financial institutions covering what was earlier never considered to be a sustainable market segment: that of low-income and poor families.

Taken together, the components of PRODEL can also be shown to have caused a clearly positive impact on the local economy – generating a considerable number of jobs both directly through activities supported (infrastructure works, housing improvements, micro-enterprises) and due to the secondary effects these improvements in their turn have triggered or facilitated. According to a study covering the 10-year period 1994-2003, the accumulated direct impact of the program itself corresponded to more than 7,300 full-year jobs in the eight towns involved.¹¹

Furthermore, in the neighborhoods supported by PRODEL, house values had increased considerably as had employment. Also these neighborhoods' share of contribution to the municipality's local finances had increased, mainly due to the fact that the inhabitants now paid property taxes more frequently, as well taxes on their micro-enterprises.

Formally speaking, taxes were now due to be paid because the house had achieved another cadastral value and the small family business had increased its turnover. However, in most developing countries this does not automatically transform into taxes actually being paid – for this to happen another, motivational element must also be present. And in these cases it had come into place because, through its co-participation in the community infrastructure works, the municipal administration had shown that these poor neighborhoods (or marginal areas or slums) were not totally abandoned and that tax payers money actually could come back and be well utilized. Even payments of water fees and fees for waste handling generally increased, for the same reason – the inhabitants from the former marginal areas

¹¹ FIDEG (2006)

were becoming citizens and began to relate to the municipal administration as “their municipality” – which implied both rights and obligations.

For the fifteen-year period 1994-2008 no similar study has yet been undertaken, but the accumulated figures no doubt continue to be impressive:

- the total number of loans provided for micro-enterprises reached almost 100,000, representing a total amount of almost USD 45 million;
- for housing improvements, the total number of loans amounted to 44,000, with a total volume of USD 43 million;
- concerning community infrastructure, 650 works had been undertaken, with a total contribution from the program of some USD 9 million.

All together, this makes a total sum of USD 97 million. To this should be added some USD 6 million, which corresponds to the 15% of extra family resources which, as a rule, have always been mobilized when receiving a housing loan through PRODEL. Furthermore, some USD 9 million should be added for community infrastructure, corresponding to the value of the contributions from the municipalities and communities involved; contributions which would not have been made without the mobilizing effect of PRODEL.

These figures tell a truly amazing story. Namely, that apart from the positive and sustained development impact which has been generated through PRODEL, during the period 1994-2008 the Program mobilized and invested a total amount of USD 112 million. During the same period, the total Swedish contribution to PRODEL was some SEK 200 million, which converted into USD would be USD 25 million only,¹² or well less than a fourth of the accumulated flow mobilized and spent by the program.¹³

This reflects the usage of rotating funds based on loans provided at market interest rates and composing a stable and sound credit portfolio – making it possible to create sustainability for this kind of program. In fact, future plans for PRODEL show that with the current growth and performance of the credit portfolio, dedicating 25 per cent of the income from the interest accruing from the loans will soon enable PRODEL to finance its share of the community infrastructure works in the municipalities without any external (donor) support, probably maintaining almost the same absolute level of community investments as the program generally represented during the donor-funded years.¹⁴

3. On the Replication of PRODEL Components and its Results

So far, no replication has been made of the complete PRODEL approach – comprising a long-term commitment, all the three investment components and the institutional support linked to these. Taking the components one by one, however, quite a different situation emerges, reconfirming that they may well constitute both stand-alone tools and complementary building blocks for the same purpose: integrated development in poor urban and peri-urban areas, sustainable beyond “the project” through the creation of new mechanisms and institutional immersion.

¹² The average currency conversion for the full period (1994-2008) is 7.88 or some 8 SEK per USD.

¹³ To these figures should also be added the net reserves (and equity) possessed by PRODEL by December 31st, 2008, which amounted to USD 16 million, reflecting a solid and well capitalized foundation.

¹⁴ Approximately some USD 600,000 per year.

Regarding the credit components, the influence of the housing improvement scheme is easily discernible in both international and national programs all over Central America, including not only Honduras (post-Mitch) and El Salvador but also a country such as Costa Rica. Moreover, in Guatemala, both credit types have been adjusted to local conditions and fully replicated through the operations of the national institution FDLG which, since 1999/2000, has been managing credits and technical support through different local financial institutions for housing improvements and productive purposes among poor people.¹⁵ Results so far have been excellent, with increasing outreach (also among the indigenous population) and a profoundly healthy credit portfolio generating resources for sustaining both the credit schemes and the elements of technical-institutional assistance linked to these.

In the context of this document, however, the main interest concerns the two major replications undertaken so far of PRODEL's component for community infrastructure works. Results from these replications confirm *firstly*, that the approach and contents of that component possesses great capacity for combining livelihood improvements with tangible progress towards good local governance. *Secondly*, as these replications have been undertaken in different contexts under different conditions – requiring considerable adaptation of these instruments to the local situation – they furthermore indicate that the community works component of PRODEL has features which make it a *replicable model*. A model with integrative powers, directly twinning socio-economic progress in poor urban neighborhoods with improvements concerning the quality and character of local governance.

The term *replicable* is here not utilized as meaning “just doing the same all over again”. Rather, considerable adaptation of the approach and its components has been required, in order to make it work under different conditions. However, these adaptations have not altered the very essence of the approach, and it has been shown to work – in principle generating the same impressive results even under substantially different conditions. The expression *replicable model* utilized in this text, thus refers to *applying the same set of core concepts* – always preceded by the necessary context specific adaptations in order to make the approach work as desired, without affecting its main character (or identity).

The first of these replications was carried out within a major program, funded by Sida, on the Nicaraguan Atlantic Coast which had been initiated in the beginning of 1994. Within the overriding goal of facilitating national reconciliation (after the long war period), this program was aimed at supporting the recently created institutions who were to make operational the autonomy awarded to this multi-ethnic region in 1990. Initially, the program focused almost exclusively on the regional institutions, however starting in 1996 – when municipal elections had also been held for the first time on the Atlantic Coast – support lines were developed also for the strengthening of the (new) municipalities.

Quite early on, the pressing socio-economic conditions on the Atlantic Coast led to the recognition of the need to combine what was essentially a democracy program of a classic kind with instruments for tangible local development. Contacts between PRODEL and the Atlantic Coast Program were promoted and after a somewhat slow start systematic efforts were undertaken in order to review and adjust the instruments utilized by PRODEL in the towns of “Spanish Nicaragua” to the conditions characterizing the country's Caribbean half, including the translation of manuals into local languages. Support was provided to the local administrations for establishing Municipal Technical Units and suitable staff were recruited. Finally, in 2000 the community infrastructure works component had become integrated into the Atlantic Coast Program and started up properly.

Over the following five years (from mid-2000 until mid-2006 when the Program was finally concluded), the community works component generated a whole range of tangible improvements for the local population and – under the local name of *INDEL* – came to be the most well-known part of the Swedish support. All in all, some 600 works were undertaken in 10 municipalities, all of which soon had inte-

¹⁵ FDLG = Fideicomiso para el Desarrollo Local en Guatemala. (FDLG still receives active support from Sida.)

grated the personnel (engineers and social facilitators) initially subsidized by the Program for the technical units into their permanent staff.

Notwithstanding the staff turnover during the past years, all technical units supported by the Program are still in place; represent good or reasonable levels of capacity and the participatory approach implemented for community works is still used whenever possible.¹⁶ Dropping by the sites of the works performed – such as concrete sidewalks or paved paths for bikes and pedestrians, smoothly connecting houses and community blocks also during the long rainy season (when mud is everywhere else) – local inhabitants still gather to enthusiastically tell the visitor how the task was organized and how it was carried out between the municipality and themselves.

The second of these replications relates to a major program for local development in Guatemala called PROMUDEL, designed in 2004/2005 as a joint effort between the Swedish (Sida) and German (GTZ/BMZ) international development cooperation agencies, with the active involvement of the Guatemalan government and other relevant national actors. The program is planned for a period of eight years (Jan 2006 – Dec 2013) and financing estimated at some EUR 20 Million, to be divided in equal parts between Germany and Sweden. The main goals of the program are related to the improvement of municipal policies and the levels of good governance, for sustainable local socio-economic development, with a special focus on poverty reduction.

Among the core ideas which inspired the design of PROMUDEL, was the conviction that the program must include activities which would generate tangible improvements in the living conditions of poor people, with results to be observable as early as in the short-to-medium term. In this context, the slogan during the process of program design was: “Citizen participation without tangible improvements is like swimming without water”, implying that it was neither attractive nor sustainable.

In this case, the process for learning the validated PRODEL procedures and then adjusting them to local conditions was built into the starting phase of the program. However, it came to require more effort and time than originally planned, mainly for two reasons. Firstly, because of the sheer number and character of the differences between the Nicaraguan context and the situation in Guatemala, not only in terms of the national institutional setup but even more so in relation to local conditions in the poor and predominantly indigenous regions where the program was to concentrate its activities – regions which furthermore are of a markedly rural character, with implications also for small towns. Secondly, due to the fact that within the tradition of the international program coordinator, GTZ, the implementation of community infrastructure works carried negative connotations (for historically having been associated with clientelistic and/or corrupt structures) or simply constituted an unknown kind of activity outside the normal territory of the GTZ.¹⁷

However, after several field trips to Nicaragua and hard work from PROMUDEL staff and some external consultants, the basic community infrastructure works component was initiated in Guatemala too. During the four-year period 2006-2009 a total of almost 80 projects will have been carried out, benefiting more than 12,000 families. The most frequent kind of works so far have been related to (i) potable water, sewerage and rain water drainage and (ii) paved paths for pedestrians in areas with heavy rains and bad or non-existent roads.

The approach and procedures represented by this component constituted something new and innovative in Guatemala and was at first received with certain skepticism. Within a short period, however, when shown to quickly yield good results, it generated strong enthusiasm from all parties involved and demand

¹⁶ Depending mainly, it seems, on procedures required for the procurement of contractors when works of magnitude are involved.

¹⁷ Within the German structure for development cooperation, GTZ specializes in technical support and advice, whereas activities involving works and physical investments are normally undertaken by another agency, KfW.

is now accumulating far beyond the current technical and financial capacities of the program and the municipalities involved. In many areas where works have been performed, local inhabitants have taken on a strong commitment also concerning activities for maintenance and repairs – of paved pedestrian paths in erosion-prone neighborhoods, for example. Moreover, in the peri-urban and rural areas, responsibility for operation of community works such as potable water schemes has also been taken on by local committees – including the collection of water fees and the provision of constant supervision and maintenance.

Within the local administrations, this new approach concerning basic public services and infrastructure has generated great interest and is increasingly becoming incorporated as an instrument for the identification and planning of prioritized public needs, even beyond the scope of the cooperation represented by the program. In other words, steps have been taken towards converting this project tool into something which may take on an institutional character.

4. What the Component Actually Achieves and the Mechanisms Behind it

4.1 A brief summary of PCIW impact in Nicaragua and Guatemala

In the preceding sections, three considerably different contexts have been mentioned where so far successful implementation of PRODEL's component for participatory community infrastructure works (from now on called PCIW) has been undertaken:

- small and mid-sized towns in Nicaragua's western and central parts (corresponding to what culturally and historically may be called "Spanish Nicaragua");
- small towns and recently established municipalities on the Nicaraguan Atlantic Coast (representing the country's Caribbean part, with a pluri-ethnic composition and a different cultural identity) and, finally;
- mid-sized and small towns in regions of Guatemala with a predominantly indigenous population, located in the highlands with a markedly rural character.

Within all three of these geographical and cultural contexts, the results from PCIW have been clearly positive and have produced an impact which spans many different dimensions and may tentatively be summarized as follows:

1. Genuinely representative and inclusive forms of organization have been created among inhabitants in poor neighborhoods. Considering the usual patterns of control over the local public space (generally dominated by a single 'boss' or a small group of powerful people) these neighborhood organizations reflect something really new, developing a dynamic of their own and showing an interesting future potential. (While set up for the purpose of carrying out specific development initiatives prioritized by the communities themselves, they often end up having a considerably longer life-time than required by the initial project only and rather frequently provide elements of citizen participation concerning local development in various fields);
2. A new and constructive relationship has emerged between the local administration and the poor neighborhoods within the municipality where PCIW projects have been undertaken (due to the fact that every such project is carried out jointly between the municipal administration and the inhabitants of areas who previously were more or less abandoned by local government);

3. The municipal units for planning and investment show institutional changes in several respects: they have been technically reinforced when it comes to design and supervision of works, selection criteria include more social awareness and local priorities are given more weight (also, transparency has begun to appear as a concept related to efficiency and not necessarily reduced to something of a moral character only);
4. The share of investment from public sources dedicated to poor neighborhoods within the town tends to increase, while at the same time contributions to the municipal finances in the form of local taxes and fees from these same neighborhoods also show positive development (valid at least for areas with a sustained period of PCIW activities);
5. Families in neighborhoods with PCIW activities have experienced measurable and tangible improvements concerning their living conditions and livelihoods (such as being able to arrive indoors without mud up to the knees, better and cheaper access to transport, easier for kids to attend school, better indoor conditions, less work-load for female household members etc. – resulting, among other things, in their houses or dwellings acquiring a higher value).
6. Works have become less costly for the municipalities to undertake, due not only to community participation in the construction work itself but also because of better design (more adjusted to the local context), improved control over building materials (almost zero losses) and supervision concerning the work performed by contractors which is both better and less costly. Works performed this way are also likely to be implemented much more rapidly than constructions financed from central funds and have a longer life-span due both to their improved quality and to the fact that they are very much appreciated by the community. (“This pedestrian bridge belongs to us, we wanted it and did much of the labor ourselves. Now we’ll also care for it on a daily basis and will see to it that the municipality assigns funds in the annual budget for major overhaul and repair”.)
7. The position of women in the local community has been strengthened and progress made when it comes to reducing unequal gender relations. All geographical areas where the PCIW approach has been utilized so far are characterized by male dominance within a patriarchal structure. This has, however, not constituted any major obstacle for the participatory approach at the neighborhood level. In general, the rules concerning gender balance (50-50) in all committees and other groups elected at community level¹⁸ have been observed and women have gained a reputation for outstanding performance in these contexts (not least when it comes to important and delicate positions such as cashier and controller of construction materials; positions which both are crucial when it comes to building and maintaining the social trust needed for the undertaking of this kind of common effort);
8. Power inequality within the local community has tended to decrease due to the fact that the community works (generated by the PCIW approach) have resulted from genuinely collective efforts organized in an inclusive manner and have not been “appropriated” or “co-opted” by a local elite (in a very encouraging manner this becomes visible, for instance, when observing the distribution of water taps within the neighborhood after the completion of a potable water scheme, or the location and extension chosen for road works, etc);
9. Social cohesion has been built within these poor and, initially, often fragmented neighborhoods, providing a start for collective self-esteem and local empowerment which may result in the construction of citizenship.

In short, PCIW activities have proved to constitute a vehicle for facilitating socio-economic development which is prioritized by the local population and directly linked to improvements in the quality of

¹⁸ For some details on these elected posts, see Section 4.2 below.

municipal services and the character of local governance. It thus combines various “sectors” in one single strategic package and also seems to have good chances of becoming institutionalized, implying a sustained life beyond the time horizon of the project.

How this simultaneous impact concerning poverty reduction and good local governance can be achieved with something as seemingly innocent or technical as “physical infrastructure works” is no mystery but rather to be found in the set of methods and procedures contained in the approach. Equally important is their correct application, implying that while there is considerable flexibility concerning several aspects (as shown by the successful adjustment to different cultural and geographical contexts), there are certain core elements which must always be safeguarded.

In the following section a brief but rather detailed description of the contents of the PCIW approach is provided, with comments on the implications of each of its main steps.

4.2 Main contents of the PCIW approach, its core elements and their significance

The PCIW deals with identifying locally prioritized needs in poor urban areas and constructing physical community infrastructure in a tripartite set-up between the community, the municipality and the program. Primary responsibility for planning and carrying through rests with the municipality and the community, with some support provided by the program. Common proportions concerning the financing is a program contribution of some 50%, approximately 40% from the municipality and a community contribution amounting to 10% or sometimes more (mostly in the form of labor but often also in materials and cash).

When the work has been completed, the municipality and the community present a final report on the use of resources (materials, labor) which also contains observations on the process as such. The final report elaborated and presented by the community is of great importance for alliance-building between the neighborhood and the municipality and also reflects that the PCIW approach goes far beyond “mere participation”, including a substantial dimension of social auditing as well.

Furthermore, the investment is not performed as an add-on to municipal planning but is integrated into local development plans on an annual basis. While the PCIW approach is first started or introduced as “a project”, it soon becomes immersed in the local institutions and – when successful – ends up constituting part of the institutional tools and procedures for local urban development, known and supported by the local communities due to its merits. Instead of representing another variety of the “by-pass-thinking” still common within international development cooperation, it addresses the needs of poor neighborhoods through institutional development and change.

The core elements may briefly be described as follows:

(a) Selection of towns and municipalities where the program will be applied

The first part of this selection is of a rather traditional kind and is generally undertaken by the donor in collaboration with national and local authorities, utilizing criteria such as poverty rates, unsatisfied basic needs (the status of public infrastructure and public services), presence of other major national and international efforts within this field in the different towns, etc.

The second part contains elements which are still somewhat innovative or at least not always utilized in other contexts. This refers to the fact that before the tentatively selected municipalities can actually enter the program, the approach and main principles of PRODEL (including the emphasis on poor neighborhoods, the need for municipal contributions to infrastructure works, etc.) are explained to the Mayor and the Municipal Council. If accepted, a framework agreement is signed between the Municipality and the Program.

Comments:

The second part of this step is the most important one, as it formalizes the political will to enter the program as a partner and embraces its specific priorities (focusing on infrastructure and public services in poor neighborhoods). It also implies the first step towards integrating preparations for “program works” into the normal system of municipal planning, thus avoiding traditional bypass performance.

(b) Identification of neighborhoods within the towns selected for program activities

In the next step program staff, together with personnel from the town’s unit for planning and public works, apply a specific instrument (called Matrix 65) elaborated by the program to neighborhoods known to be deficient in public services and infrastructure. The exercise results in each neighborhood being assigned an objective score (from 1 to 100), figures which are internally comparable. All neighborhoods scoring 65 points or below have considerable deficits in infrastructure and are thus, in principle, eligible to enter the program.

Other eligibility criteria are also taken into account when drawing up the final list of neighborhoods, including the presence of other major efforts (projects) of a similar kind, the situation concerning land tenure (mainly concerning security of tenure), the organization of each community, etc. If two neighborhoods are similar in their needs (and both cannot be accepted at the same time), an analysis of the interest, attitudes and organizational strengths of each area is undertaken. Finally, the list is handed over to the Municipal Council who has to make a decision concerning which of the listed areas are to be given priority. Once the decision is made, the social promotor of the municipality meets with the different leaders within each community or neighborhood, explains what the process will look like and promotes their active interest.

Comments:

From a development point of view (poverty reduction and good governance), the most essential part of this step is two-fold. Firstly, it shows that the agreement signed (see above) is to be taken seriously, as Matrix 65 provides a transparent and well-defined tool for selection and reduces the chances of benefitting areas other than the poorest (in case such a temptation should exist). Secondly, this is then reconfirmed by the Municipal Council, not only by the Mayor and not only through a decision at technical level – implying broad political legitimacy for the future process and a reconfirmation of the initial agreement.

(c) Identification within each selected neighborhood of works prioritized by the inhabitants

This part of the process consists of three major steps:

- (i) the celebration of a General Assembly within the community;
- (ii) the selection of a group of community members who are trained in participatory micro-planning methods which they subsequently apply within their own community;
- (iii) the elaboration and presentation of different project proposals to the community and decision-making by the General Assembly concerning which project to begin with.

This crucial part of the process chain is managed by the municipality together with the community, supported by the program (and not the other way round, as a “project matter”). The rules are clearly explained at the outset – there will be a project for the community (within certain financial limits) but only if there is participation and community contribution.¹⁹

- (i) The conditions applied to the General Assembly are of great importance because this is where the basis is created for all that is to follow; genuine participation and legitimacy concerning the decisions must be ensured. The Assembly must be truly representative and it must offer everybody a real

¹⁹ The project also has to be technically vetted by the municipal unit and PRODEL. All proposals cannot be translated into feasible projects due to factors such as complexity and cost.

possibility to voice her or his opinion. Hence, the maximum size of the area (from which people can participate) has been set to 150 families – if the neighborhood involved is bigger, then it is divided into sectors and more than one assembly is held. Furthermore, at least 60 per cent of all heads of the families living in each neighborhood (or sector) must be present at the Assembly in order for the decisions to be considered legitimate. To obtain this figure, local motivation must be strong and the event duly prepared in advance. Here, the initial work done by the municipal team and their level of contact and involvement with the local leaders and key community players is of crucial importance.

At the General Assembly, a group of some 25 to 30 community members are elected, to participate – on behalf of the neighborhood – in a micro-planning exercise which combines training with direct application. In order to ensure legitimacy, the composition of the group elected should comply with certain criteria concerning gender (50%) and age.

(ii) Then the micro-planning workshops and exercises follow, always starting with a mapping of all of the conditions and problems in the entire area, in order to include problems which may otherwise not be perceived (or perceived only by some). During the discussion and processing of the data obtained, importance is given to making local participants transform “lacks” and “needs” into problems, trying to analyze what the problem really consists of, what the reasons are and what can be done to resolve or alleviate it within the community. The final step within this part of the cycle is to formulate solutions in relation to the major problems identified (related to infrastructure and public services), transform these solutions into projects and then evaluate them together with staff from the municipality, ending with a ranking of each project according to its importance.

(iii) Finally, the list of suggested and ranked projects is presented by community members and the municipality at another General Assembly, where the proposal is discussed and a decision is made concerning which project to choose. This decision is then reported to the municipal council so that resources earlier set apart as “social investments” can now be earmarked for a specific project. At this second General Assembly, another election of great importance takes place, namely the conformation of the Community Project Administration Committee (CPAC), containing seven specific posts directly related to the remaining pre-construction and construction stage (such as the revision of the detailed technical proposal) and the implementation of the work itself (including the organization of the community’s contribution in labor, the administering of materials and supervision). Workshops are later organized for the CPAC, in order to train them in skills needed to fully carry out their (very real and considerable) responsibilities.

Comments:

One element of enormous developmental value in this phase is the construction of legitimacy, both when it comes to ensuring how decisions within the community are taken (which in other contexts often follow very different patterns) and, later, how the final decision on what project to prioritize is respected and supported by the municipality. This also entails the start of a new kind of relationship between the neighborhood and the municipality, which (if the next phase is successful) may generate a feeling of belonging and a step towards the construction of citizenship.²⁰

(d) The implementation of the project

During this phase, community participation is direct and permanent. The committee selected (CPAC) not only organizes the rest of the community for the physical execution of the project but also coordinates the management of the project as such, administering the stock of materials (generally kept within the community and controlled by CPAC), equipment and labor – supplied both by the community and the municipality. The committee regularly reports back to the community

²⁰ In this context, it is worth mentioning that costs for a normal workshop of the kind described above are generally some USD 300 only.

assembly on how the project is developing and on the use of materials and funds. Together with the municipality, it supervises the quality of materials delivered and of works performed by contractors.

Control of materials is meticulous, books kept by the elected community members record deliveries and daily use of materials. The same procedure is applied when it comes to labor, not least the community's own contribution. Only elderly or sick people are exempt and their share is taken on by the community as a whole; able adults who do not contribute (which generally depends on employment somewhere else) have to send a substitute (generally a family member or friend) or pay his/her part in cash. All books and records are signed and kept for the final auditing and, later on, as a proof of what was done and how.

Finally, when the works have been terminated and inspected, both the technical unit of the municipality and the CPAC presents its final report and auditing, with comments concerning the process and lessons for the future.

Comments:

This part of the process generates empowerment of considerable proportions and boosts both individual and collective self-esteem. It increases local cohesion considerably; thereby building social capital within the community. It also reconfirms that the neighborhood belongs to a municipality and that the municipal administration has no longer abandoned them or can be discarded as entirely corrupt as the procedures complied with during the execution of the works according to this model are transparent and contain strong elements of social auditing.

For the municipal administration, the successful completion of a project of this kind which has been coordinated by the community constitutes hard evidence that by utilizing a participatory approach, social investments can be made in a more efficient and less costly manner. It also states that this neighborhood can be relied upon and that it is home to honest and hard-working people – far from the description often offered before having experienced such results (*“lazy, criminal squatters who complain about everything”*). In sum, a new and more constructive relationship has been created.

Furthermore, as the community now knows what can be done and probably will maintain some kind of organization (often the CPAC develops into a committee for neighborhood development) who will approach the Mayor and the municipality with more proposals. And as the Mayor – as well as all politicians in the town – will have noticed that this may also be a good way of getting votes, a change in the political leadership is not likely to end the interest in doing things this way, applying the PCIW approach.

5. Defining the Magic: Why and When the Model Works

When presenting the achievements from this model, the following question is almost invariably raised:

If what has been stated is true – then what makes this approach so different from most other “participatory methods” we have heard of for decades which have shown a very mixed performance and frequently haven’t worked at all?

The main answer to this question is simply that we have to carefully define the character of the “participation” we are referring to in each and every context before concluding what it actually denotes. The mere usage of the terms themselves – *participation, participatory* – should not lead us astray. There are obviously huge differences between different kinds of “local participation” and between varying ways of utilizing the same term. Local people may, for example, “participate” in the construction of a road close to their community or village in exchange for food, or they may be invited to “participate” in a

discussion on a development plan proposed by some national institution. However, while both these examples may well constitute something constructive their contents are still widely different from the kind of participation referred to in this article.

At the core of the PCIW approach is a kind of neighborhood participation which *(i) embraces a full cycle* – establishing the organization, undertaking the planning, discussing and deciding on priorities and finally the implementation of the works. This aspect is crucial as it means that as early as the first stage, people know that there will not only be planning and workshops but also implementation – that is, participation is directly linked to achieving tangible improvements in the neighborhood.

Furthermore, this community participation is *(ii) built on inclusion and legitimacy*, constructed through the representativeness of the General Assembly, the procedures followed at the election of community members for different functions and the agreements reached with the municipality. This ensures that works undertaken are genuinely prioritized by the local population and that neither the type of works nor their design have been determined by a small local elite – in the neighborhood or at the Mayor's office.

Finally, *(iii) participation is reinforced through the dimension of social auditing*, which generates trust and thus enables progress both concerning enhanced community cohesion and the construction of a new relationship vis-à-vis the local government.

In addition, the overall local political and institutional context within which the participation described above takes place, is characterized by (and obviously requires) the approval and active involvement of the municipal authorities – in its political as well as technical capacities. Whereas many local authorities from the outset may have perceived the PCIW approach with a certain degree of skepticism and even suspicion, its results have mostly generated approval and enthusiasm, ensuring continuity and institutionalization of procedures and methods even in spite of local political changes.

The tentative definitions above may be taken as an outline of the core elements which together constitute the essence of the PCIW approach and the context needed for its successful performance.

In the replications undertaken outside the original geographical area of PRODEL, considerable adjustment of the procedures has been necessary due to different local conditions, both culturally and in other respects. For example, on the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua the local contribution for the execution of the works did not include any collection of cash or the establishment of a bank account belonging to the community – which was the rule in the western (and also more urbanized) part of Nicaragua. The same variation was necessary in the highlands of Guatemala, with their markedly rural character due to difficult access to bank services and very scarce circulation of cash among the poor. Moreover, in Guatemala also the functions described above concerning the General Assembly in each community had to be combined and harmonized with the powers of the local, already elected and institutionalized Committees for Community Development (Cocodes).

However, results from these replications – which both represent undertakings of considerable magnitude in terms of funds, number of projects and years – have been very similar to those achieved by PRODEL in its original geographical area, thus suggesting that the adjustments mentioned did not substantially change the core elements of the approach as defined above. On the other hand, it also follows that if the core elements and the contextual setting outlined above cannot be ensured, then the PCIW approach will simply not work properly.²¹

²¹ Implying that works performed may be of low standard, not corresponding to the community's needs, represent a design that improperly benefits just a small group of people etc. However, judging from the evaluations of the projects analyzed in this context, such situations have been uncommon and generally seem to have resulted in no works at all becoming executed and the process interrupted or terminated.

Returning to the initial question on what makes this approach so different from most other “participatory methods”, we may thus conclude that there is an enormous difference between almost participating and fully participating; between a community managing a full participatory cycle of its own which includes the generation of tangible local changes as compared to participating in one or more parts only of a cycle which constitutes somebody else’s project or endeavor and which does not end up causing any visible impact on local living conditions.

6. Key Challenges on the Donor Side

In addition to the critical aspects described above concerning the local setting and the application of its core procedures, the PCIW approach also poses some challenges to the donor if it is to yield the desired results.

Firstly, the donor – or, in more generic terms, the agent of external support – must be able to handle projects or efforts which are of a multi-dimensional character, not possible to reduce to one “sector” or one “category” of support only.²² Unfortunately, this aspect is not trivial as most international development agencies are structured along sector lines (more or less rigidly, though). Experience shows this may result in the approach appearing unattractive (and thus not receiving any funding at all) or that the project – when supported – does not become known outside the sector circle and thus will receive less support, or more narrow support, than would have been optimal.

Secondly, in order not to end up as a project (or a one-shot/temporary activity) only, there is a need for a somewhat longer time horizon, with a firm commitment covering at least 5 years and preferably more. The sequencing of the project as related to local electoral periods is also of great relevance in this context – covering (at least substantial parts of) two or three different municipal administrations may be seen as the minimum needed for ensuring that the approach can make it from being a project to acquiring institutional character.

Thirdly, the kind of external support and funding provided must allow great emphasis on staff development, as qualified and properly trained personnel constitute a key element for ensuring a high level of quality in the application and guidance of the PCIW approach. Continuous development of staff skill – including systematic exchange of experience within and between municipalities – should become part of the institutional routines.

7. Final Remarks

- The approach applied by PRODEL over almost 15 years related to *Participatory Community Infrastructure Works* (PCIW) has shown to be an efficient vehicle not only for achieving tangible socio-economic progress in poor urban and peri-urban areas but also in a way which directly links this progress to improvements concerning the quality and democratic character of local governance. In other words, it twins socio-economic progress to better local governance, combining various “sectors” in one single strategic package, constituting a mechanism with great integrative powers.

²² Democracy/good governance and infrastructure; technical support/advice and investments, etc.

- As a consequence, it also offers good prospects for becoming a sustained practice, beyond the project time horizon and integrated into the permanent local context – routines within the municipal administration and activities performed by the local civil society.
- The simultaneous impact concerning poverty reduction and good governance is achieved with physical infrastructure works as the entry point, applying a small but vital number of strategically coherent and well-defined procedures and methods.
- The approach has so far been replicated in two widely different contexts (on the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua and in several indigenous and markedly rural regions in Guatemala). In both these cases results have been very similar to those achieved by PRODEL within the initial (and different) program area, combining tangible socio-economic progress with improved governance and enthusiasm among the local population as well as within the municipal administration.
- Without this having been the intention, the replications of this approach have thus shown that PCIW is a robust set of procedures which should be treated and utilized as a replicable model, applicable under widely different local conditions – as long as its core elements as described above remain essentially unaltered.
- The knowledge and experience represented by the national foundation PRODEL in Nicaragua as well by the ongoing local development project PROMUDEL in Guatemala constitute a key asset for embarking upon a process of wider international dissemination of the PCIW approach as a successful and replicable model for integrated development in poor urban and peri-urban areas. This experience should now be systematized and formatted for an external public. Establishing a small but easily accessible and efficient support function at PRODEL (for training, advisory services, etc) available for international replications would probably also be of great value in this context.

Selected sources

Becerra, Norah et. al. (2005)

Programa de Desarrollo Local (PRODEL) en Nicaragua – una evaluación, Sida Evaluation 02/05, Stockholm.

BMZ/Sida (2005)

Municipalities for Local Development (PROMUDEL): Programme Document, Guatemala.

Boman, Kristina and Ray Rahman et al (2007) *Exploratory study for innovative financial instruments to increase the poor's access to microfinance in Central America*, Report to Sida, Stockholm.

Buvollen, Hans Petter; Rosales, Mario and Velásquez, Leticia (2000)

Evaluación del Programa RAAN-ASDI-RAAS (1994-2000), Report to Sida.

Canek, Maritza (2005)

El Microcrédito de Vivienda y su aporte a la inclusión indígena en Guatemala, paper presented at the 6th N-AERUS Conference, Lund University, Sweden

Castillo Luis (2005)

Experience in transforming FUSAI's credit programme into a regulated company, paper presented at the 6th N-AERUS Conference, Lund University, Sweden

Edgren Gösta (1986)

'Changing Terms: Procedures and Relationships in Swedish Development Assistance' in Frühling, Pierre (editor) *Swedish Development Aid in Perspective. Policies, Problems and Results Since 1952*, Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm, Sweden.

FIDEG (2006)

Reducción de la Pobreza y Mejora Urbana en Nicaragua: Diez años de avance de PRODEL, (external evaluation covering the period 1994-2003), Managua, Nicaragua.

Forsse, Anders (1986)

'With the Benefit of Hindsight. Reflections of a Former Aid Bureaucrat', in Frühling, Pierre (editor) *Swedish Development Aid in Perspective, Policies, problems and results since 1952*, Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm, Sweden.

Frühling, Pierre; González, Miguel and Buvollen, Hans Petter (2007)

Etnicidad y Nación. El desarrollo de la autonomía de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua (1987-2007), F&G Editores, Guatemala.

FUPROVI (2004)

Dignificando la vivienda, promoviendo la participación, FUPROVI, San José, Costa Rica.

GAIA S.A. (2005)

Evaluación del Programa RAAN-Asdi-RAAS, Informe Final, External report to Sida.

Ljunggren, Börje (1986)

'Swedish Goals and Priorities' in Frühling, Pierre (editor) *Swedish Development Aid in Perspective, Policies, problems and results since 1952*, Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm, Sweden.

Morazán, Pedro (2008)

Evaluación intermedia 2008 del Programa Municipios para el Desarrollo Local (PROMUDEL), Guatemala, External report to GTZ.

Olivas Altamirano, Marlon (2006)

Basic Services and Infrastructure: a model of local development with participation of municipalities and communities, paper presented at the World Urban Forum 3, 'Innovative finance for infrastructure and basic services provision for low-income human settlements', June 2006, Vancouver, Canada.

Samayoa, Roberto et al (2003)

Fideicomiso para el Desarrollo Local en Guatemala (FDLG). Evaluación de avances y resultados, Sida Evaluation 03/10.

Stein, Alfredo and Vance, Irene (2008)

Housing and Urban Services Delivery: Experience of the Impact on Asset Accumulation in Central America, presentation at the seminar "Building Assets for the Poor – Going Beyond Financial Inclusion to Wealth Creation, Stockholm 15-16 January, 2008

Stein, Alfredo (2001)

Participation and sustainability in social projects: the experience of the Local Development Programme (PRODEL) in Nicaragua, IIED, Human Settlements Programme, London

Stein, Alfredo (2008)

The potentials and limitations of social housing finance to reduce urban poverty and social exclusion: lessons from case studies in Central America (draft for doctoral thesis, University of Lund, Sweden and University of Manchester, UK, November 2008)

Tannerfeldt Göran and Per Ljung (2006)

More Urban Less Poor: An introduction to urban development and management, Earthscan Publications, London.

UN-Habitat (2008)

State of the World's Cities 2008/2009, UN/Earthscan publications

Terms of reference

A model for making local empowerment and livelihood improvements converge?

Analyzing the mechanisms behind the urban development facilitated by Prodel

1. Bakgrund

Strax före mitten av 1990-talet ägnade Sida stora ansträngningar åt att utforma ett nytt slags program för att främja utveckling bland fattiga invånare i urbana och peri-urbana områden i ett antal städer i de centrala och västra delarna av Nicaragua. Programmet – som senare blivit känt som PRODEL – startade på allvar kring 1995 och omfattade tre huvudsakliga beståndsdelar: stöd till basal fysisk infrastruktur i fattiga områden, krediter till förbättring av fattiga familjers bostäder samt krediter för produktiva ändamål inom samma områden.

Inom ramen för Prodel utvecklades en sammanhållen metodik och flera nya instrument för att man i tillämplig form dels skulle kunna säkra att konsekvent nå fram just till de områden och den målgrupp man avsåg, dels att det hela skulle åstadkommas genom ett mycket aktivt deltagande och ansvarstagande från medborgarna själva liksom från relevanta delar av den kommunala förvaltningen inom respektive område.

Rapporter och analyser visar genomgående på mycket goda resultat från Prodel som nu har bedrivit sin verksamhet under snart 15 års tid, med en nästan oavbruten expansion till allt fler orter i Nicaragua, sedan flera år tillbaka i form av en oberoende stiftelse. Mycket tyder på att Prodel inte bara blivit ”ett institutionaliserat projekt” som ger goda resultat, utan också att det representerar en beprövad och replikerbar modell för urban utveckling med medborgerligt deltagande. Delar av metodiken har använts på andra håll än de ursprungliga, som representerar väsentligt annorlunda förhållanden (Nicaraguas Atlantkust och Guatemalas landsbygd) och har även där visat goda resultat.

2. Uppdragets huvudsakliga syfte

De goda resultat som hittills konsekvent rapporterats från Prodel i Nicaragua – liksom när dess metod använts på andra håll – gör det av stort intresse att analysera vilka som utgör de bärande beståndsdelarna i den metodik som använts. Syftet är att dels att bidra till en systematisering av erfarenheterna hittills från Prodel (resultat och metodutveckling), dels att analytiskt granska den använda metoden. Skulle det grundläggande antagandet om metodikens avgörande betydelse för resultaten bekräftas, ska uppdraget även omfatta utarbetandet av en första presentation av denna som en modell för urban utveckling genom/med aktivt medborgerligt deltagande.

Uppdraget ska redovisas i en form som lämpar sig såväl för interna ändamål på Sida som för att externt kunna sprida information om modellen, dess resultat och grunddrag bland relevanta aktörer inom våra samarbetsländer och inom kretsen av internationella utvecklingsorganisationer. Språket ska därför vara engelska.

3. Steg och metoder i arbetet

Den konkreta uppläggningsen ska diskuteras och överenskommas med Sida före arbetets start. Följande huvudmoment bör dock ingå:

- a) intervjuer med nyckelpersoner vad gäller Prodel, dess start och utveckling
- b) analys och sammanställning av bakgrundsmaterial samt inrapporterade resultat av Prodels arbete

- c) fältbesök i Nicaragua och Guatemala för att besöka orter där Prodel funnits/är verksamt, bese resultaten samt intervjua lokala aktörer och medborgare
- d) presentation av utkast till rapport och diskussion på Sida kring denna
- e) färdigställande av slutlig rapport, som ska kunna användas som presentation (internt och externt) av Prodel's resultat samt huvuddragen i den använda metodiken med sikte på att tydliggöra vad som utgör kärnan i en replikerbar modell, robust nog att anpassas till olika förhållanden.
- f) presentation av den slutliga produkten inom Sida och/eller en utökad krets.

4. Tidsåtgång och tidplan

För uppdraget beräknas åtminstone 25 effektiva arbetsdagar åtgå, att fördelas under en period om cirka 2,5 månader. Uppdraget inleds i slutet av januari 2009 och slutförs omedelbart efter påsk. Planeringen ser då i huvuddrag ut som följer:

- 19–30 januari (5 arbetsdagar):
 - detaljplanering av arbetet, inläsning av material, intervjuer i Sverige och förberedelse av fältbesök
- 2–13 februari (10 arbetsdagar varav 2 internationella resdagar):
 - fältbesök i Nicaragua (inkl. Atlantkusten) och i Guatemala
- 16–27 februari (5 arbetsdagar) :
 - utarbetande av utkast till rapport
- 2–13 mars (4 arbetsdagar):
 - diskussion med Sida om rapporten, samt utarbetande av slutlig version
- 13–17 april (1 arbetsdag):
 - presentation av den slutliga produkten i sammanhang som Sida bestämmer.

UTV Working Paper

- 2010:1 Gender Equality in Swedish Development Cooperation
Annex IV: Ethiopia Country Report**
Gabriela Byron, Mulunesh Woldemariam
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:2 Gender Equality in Swedish Development Cooperation
Annex V: Kenya Country Report**
Charlotte Örnemark, Pauline Nyamweya
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:3 Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – International Literature Review**
Ambra Gallina
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:4 Gender Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Ethiopia Country Report
A special study of the Sida-Amhara Rural Development Programme (SARDP III)
and the work of selected agencies in Ethiopia.**
Cathy Rozel Farnworth, Tamene Hailegeorgis Gutema
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:5 Gender Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Kenya Country Report
A special study of the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP II)**
Cathy Rozel Farnworth, Marceline Obuya
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:6 Gender Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Mozambique Country Report
A special study of the National Agricultural Development Programme (ProAgri II)**
Ambra Gallina, Catarina Chidiamassamba
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:7 Enfoques de Género en los Programas de Agricultura – Informe en Nicaragua
El caso del programa Fondo de Desarrollo Agropecuario (FondeAgro)**
Ambra Gallina, Lola Ocón
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:8 Gender Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Zambia Country Report
A special study of the Agricultural Support Programme (ASP)**
Cathy Rozel Farnworth, Monica Munachonga
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:9 How Basic Community Infrastructure Works can Trigger Livelihood Improvements
and Good Governance
Personal notes on a validated model integrating socio-economic progress
and democracy development in poor urban areas**
Pierre Frühling
Department for Conflict and Post-Conflict Cooperation,
Team for Regional cooperation Latin America and the Caribbean



How Basic Community Infrastructure Works can Trigger Livelihood Improvements and Good Governance

A model for integrated infrastructure and good governance development in urban and peri-urban areas is described and analyzed. Participatory community infrastructure works can achieve tangible socio-economic progress in poor urban areas combining socio-economic development and transparent local governance. The model has been developed under 15 years of implementation in 13 Nicaraguan towns and has been introduced in municipal development programs in Guatemala.”

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden.

Visiting address: Valhallavägen 199.

Phone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64.

www.sida.se sida@sida.se

