

Appendix A

Can Developing Countries Both Decentralize and Depoliticize Urban Water Services?
Evaluating the Legacy of the 1990s Reform Wave

VERONICA HERRERA, University of Connecticut, USA
ALISON E. POST, University of California, Berkeley, USA

World Development (2014). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.06.026>

Supplementary Data for: Table 2. Water and sanitation decentralization in developing countries

Region & Country	Decentralization Process? ^a	Tier of Government administering Service	Sharing of Service Responsibility between Tiers of Government ^b	Source
<i>Latin America</i>				
Argentina	Yes (1980)	Intermediate (shared with local)	9 Provincial utilities, 1,235 urban water utilities, 365 urban W&S utilities	(Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 3)
Bolivia	No	Local	Major urban centers serviced by 25 local utilities, accounting for 55% of nation's population	(Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 4)
Brazil	No	Intermediate (shared with local)	Major urban centers serviced by 27 state companies, accounting for 75% of nation's population. Remainder are serviced by municipalities (approx. 580), and 45 private utilities	(Sabbioni, 2008, p. 13; Seroa da Motta & Moreira, 2006, p. 187; Verges, 2010, pp. 23–27)

Chile	Yes (1988,1990)	Intermediate	13 regional companies	(Sjodin, 2006, p. 19)
Colombia	Yes (1987)	Local	70% of urban population served by 40 utilities; 1500 urban utilities total, 90 private utilities	(Fernandez, 2004, p. 6; Maldonado & Forero, 2001, p. 13)
Costa Rica	No	National (shared with local)	In urban population, 72% served by national utility, 23% served by local utilities; 5% independent providers	(Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 8)
Dominican Republic	No	National (shared with intermediate)	National utility serves 25 regions; remainder served by 6 regional autonomous utilities	(IADB, 2010, p. 1)
Ecuador	Yes (1992, 1994)	Local	National government continues to assist municipalities	(GWP, 2003, pp. 10–11; Rojas Ortuste, 2014, p. 34)
El Salvador	No	National (shared with local)	84% of urban population served by national utility; others served by municipalities and mixed capital firms	(Walker & Velásquez, 1999, p. 34)

Guatemala	No	Local	Many small local utilities, many municipalities serve directly	(Rojas Ortuste, 2014, pp. 38–39; Walker & Velásquez, 1999, p. 36)
Honduras	Yes (1991, 2003)	Local	62% local; 38% national. Sanitation managed by municipalities with a few exceptions (decentralization in process)	(Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 11; República de Honduras, 2005, pp. 18–19; Rosensweig & Perez, 1999, p. 5)
Mexico	Yes (1980, 1983)	Local (shared with intermediate)	Mostly local providers, some inter-municipal and state utilities	(Author withheld)
Nicaragua	No (attempts in 2006 failed)	National (shared with local)	Municipalities responsible but mostly served by national utility; 3 decentralized companies run by private management contracts	(IADB, Undated, p. 1; Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 12; Walker & Velásquez, 1999, p. 44)
Panama	No	National	A multi-sector national company serves country	(Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 13)
Paraguay	No	National	National utility serves urban areas, informal providers in capital city	(Lentini & Ferro, 2010, pp. 13–14)
Peru	Yes (1990)	Local	136 local utilities	(Foster, 2005, p. 3; Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 14)

Uruguay	No	National	National (water and sanitation), Montevideo (sanitation)	(Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 16; Rojas Ortuste, 2014, p. 68)
Venezuela	Yes (1989, 2001)	Local (shared with intermediate)	Municipalities responsible but mostly serviced by national company, 70% national and 30% state/municipal (decentralization in process)	(Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 16)

Asia

Cambodia	No	National		(Araral, 2008)
China	No	Local (shared with national)	Cities supply water, supervised by National Water Resources Ministry	(Cosier & Shen, 2009, p. 250)
India	Yes (1992)	Local (shared with intermediate)	Municipalities responsible, but states mostly service urban areas	(World Bank, 2006, p. 9)
Indonesia	Yes (1987)	Local	National government assists municipalities	(Hadipuro, 2010, p. 476)
Malaysia	Partial	Intermediate (shared with national)	National government owns assets, subnational provides service	(Tan, 2012)
Nepal	Yes (1999)	Local	Local (shared with	(Paudyal, Undated)

			communities)	
Philippines	Yes (1973)	Local (shared with intermediate)	400 semi-autonomous water districts; municipalities responsible for sanitation	(World Bank, 2003, p. 5)
Sri Lanka	Partial (1987)	National (sanitation shared with local)	Semi-autonomous national water boards with deconcentrated operators, water service more centralized than sanitation	(McLoughlin & Harris, 2013, pp. 7–8)
Vietnam	Partial (1999)	Local (shared with national)	Service is provided at the local level (decentralization in process)	(Asian Development Bank, 2009, pp. 3, 6)

Africa and Middle East

Algeria	No	National	National Water Agency oversees 26 deconcentrated operators	(Perard, 2007, p. 22)
Benin	No	National	National semi-autonomous public water and sanitation utility	(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. Annex, p. 50; US-AID, Undateda)
Cameroon	Partial (2005)	Local (shared with	Decentralization in process	(World Bank, 2010, p. 11)

			national)	
Cape Verde	Partial (Ongoing)	Local (shared with national)	Local government views water as national responsibility	(Banerjee et al., 2009, p. 20, Annex p. 50)
Chad	No	National		(Banerjee et al., 2009, p. Annex, p. 50)
Egypt	Recentrali zation (2004)	National	National water company with deconcentrated local offices	(Perard, 2007, p. 24)
Ghana	Partial	Local (shared with national)	National (water), local (sanitation)	(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. Annex p. 50)
Guinea	Partial (2006)	National (shared with local)	Remains highly centralized	(World Bank, 2007, pp. 2, 6, 9, 33–37)
Kenya	Yes (2002)	Local		2)(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. Annex p. 50; Onjala, 2002; US-AID, Undatedb, pp. 1– 2)
Lesotho	Partial (Ongoing)	Local (shared with national)	Local government views water as national responsibility	(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. Annex p. 50)
Madagascar	Yes (1994)	Local		(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 20, Annex p. 50; Marcus, 2006, p. 6)

Mali	Yes (2002)	Local (shared with national)	National government continues to service urban areas through 8 deconcentrated regional companies, extensive foreign aid	(UNDP, 2009)
Morocco	Yes (2002)	Local		(Perard, 2007, p. 26)
Namibia	Yes (1992)	Local (shared with national)	National water company supplies bulk water to municipalities	(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 20, Annex p. 50; Bayliss, 2008a, p. 221; Heyns, 2005, p. 96)
Nigeria	Partial (Ongoing)	State (shared with national and local)	37 State water agencies responsible for water, 774 local governments responsible for sanitation, (decentralization stalled), extensive foreign aid	(US-AID, 2010, p. 2)
Rwanda	No	National		(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 20, Annex p. 50)
Senegal	No	National		(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. Annex p. 50)
South Africa	Yes (1997)	Local		(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 20, Annex p. 50)
Tanzania	No	National	19 Urban water authorities are autonomous public bodies, but under legal	(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 20; Bayliss, 2008b, p. 167)

jurisdiction of Ministry				
Togo	No	National	(World Bank, 2003a, p. 2)	
Uganda	Partial (Ongoing)	National (shared with local)	National company serves 19 urban cities through deconcentrated offices, (decentralization only for small towns)	(Banerjee et al., 2008, p. 20; Kitonsa & Schwartz, 2012)
Zambia	Yes (1997)	Local (shared with intermediate)	10 intra-municipal companies, 22 local authorities deliver services	(Dagdeviren, 2008b, p. 185)
Yemen	Yes (1996)	Local	95% of urban population served by local utilities	(Gerhager & Sahooly, 2009, pp. 31, 38)

Central Asia

Armenia	Yes (1995)	Local (shared with intermediate)	Regionalization complete: 5 W&S regional operators serve 80% of population	(OECD, 2011, p. 67)
Azerbaijan	No	National	National company services 65% of population, 10% serviced by private operators, 25% by individual households	(OECD, 2011, p. 64)

Belarus	No	National	(OECD, 2011, p. 64)
Georgia	Yes (1990s)	Local (shared with national)	Regionalization complete: one national company serves country
Kazakhstan	Yes (1990s)	Local	(OECD, 2011, p. 67)
Moldova	Yes (1990s)	Local	Regionalization studies in progress
Russia	Yes (1990s)	Local	(OECD, 2011, p. 67)
Tajikistan	Yes (1990s)	Local	(OECD, 2011, p. 67)
Turkmenistan	No	National	(OECD, 2011, p. 64)
Ukraine	Yes (1990s)	Local	Regionalization in progress
Uzbekistan	Yes (1990s)	Local	(OECD, 2011, p. 67)

Supplementary Data for: Table 3. Water and sanitation corporatization in developing countries

Argentina: (Schifini, 1998, pp. 52–57)
Bolivia: (Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 4; Rojas Ortuste, 2014, p. 22)
Brazil: (Ferro & Lentini, 2013, p. 36; Lobina & Hall, 2000, p. 49; Sabbioni, 2008, pp. 11–14; US-AID, 2006, p. 51)
Colombia: (Fernandez, 2004, p. 95; Gilbert, 2007; Krause, 2009, pp. 116–117)
Costa Rica: (Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 8)
Dominican Republic: (IADB, 2010, p. 2; Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 15)
Ecuador: (Rojas Ortuste, 2014, p. 35)
Guatemala: (Lentini & Ferro, 2010, p. 10; Rojas Ortuste, 2014, pp. 39–40)
Honduras: (Dickson, 2006)
Mexico: (Author Withheld; US-AID, 2005; Wilder & Romero Lankao, 2006, pp. 69–75)
Paraguay: (Lentini & Ferro, 2010, pp. 13–14)
Peru: (Ioris, 2012)
Kenya: (Onjala, 2002, pp. 12–18)
Namibia: (Bayliss, 2008a)
Nicaragua: (Rojas Ortuste, 2014, p. 51)
Nigeria: (US-AID, 2010, p. 2)

South Africa: (Loftus, 2005; McInnes, 2005; Smith, 2004)
Tanzania: (Bayliss, 2008b, p. 167)
Uganda: (Kitonsa & Schwartz, 2012)
Zambia: (Dagdeviren, 2008a, pp. 184–207)
Cambodia: (Araral, 2008, p. 538)
Malaysia: (Tan, 2012, p. 2556)
Jordan: (US-AID, 2006)
Egypt: (Perard, 2007, pp. 23–25; US-AID, 2005, pp. 23–32)
Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger, Sudan: (Banerjee et al., 2008, pp. 15–16, 50).

References for Online Appendix A

- Araral, E. (2008). Public Provision for Urban Water: Getting Prices and Governance Right. *Governance*, 21(4), 527–549.
- Asian Development Bank. (2009). *Sector Assistance Program Evaluation on Urban Services and Water Supply and Sanitation Sector in Vietnam* (Evaluation Study). Asian Development Bank.
- Banerjee, S., Skilling, H., Foster, V., Briceño-Garmendia, C., Morella, E., & Chfadi, T. (2008). *Ebbing Water, Surging Deficits: Urban Water Supply in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Bayliss, K. (2008a). Namibia: Lessons from Commercialization. In K. Bayliss & B. Fine (Eds.), *Privatization and Alternative Public Sector Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa: Delivering on Electricity and Water* (pp. 208–231). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bayliss, K. (2008b). Tanzania: From Nationalization to Privatization-and Back? In K. Bayliss & B. Fine (Eds.), *Privatization and Alternative Public Sector Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa- Delivering on Electricity and Water* (pp. 151–181). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cosier, M., & Shen, D. (2009). Urban Water Management in China. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 25(2), 249–268.

- Dagdeviren, H. (2008a). Waiting for Miracles: The Commercialization of Urban Water Services in Zambia. *Development and Change*, 39(1), 101–121.
- Dagdeviren, H. (2008b). Zambia: The Commercialization of Urban Water and Sanitation. In K. Bayliss & B. Fine (Eds.), *Privatization and Alternative Public Sector Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa- Delivering on Electricity and Water* (pp. 208–234). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dickson, E. (2006). *Management Models of Water and Sanitation: Approaches to Decentralization in Honduras*. International Development Research Centre.
- Fernandez, D. (2004). *Colombia: Desarrollo Económico Reciente en Infraestructura. Balanceando las necesidades sociales y productivas de infraestructura. (Informes de Base)*. Washington, DC: World Bank, Finance, Private Sector and Infrastructure Unit - Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Ferro, G., & Lentini, E. (2013). *Políticas tarifarias para el logro de los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio (ODM): situación actual y tendencias regionales recientes*. Santiago, Chile: United Nations: (CEPAL) Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe.
- Foster, V. (2005). *Ten Years of Water Service Reform in Latin America: Toward an Anglo-French Model*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

- Gerhager, B., & Sahooy, A. (2009). Reforming the Urban Water Supply and Sanitation (UWSS) Sector in Yemen. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 25(1), 29–46.
- Gilbert, A. (2007). Water For All: How to Combine Public Management with Commercial Practice for the Benefit of the Poor. *Urban Studies*, 44(8), 1559–1579.
- GWP. (2003). *La Gobernabilidad de la Gestión del Agua en el Ecuador*. Global Water Partnership.
- Hadipuro, W. (2010). Indonesia's Water Supply Regulatory Framework: Between Commercialisation and Public Service? *Water Alternatives*, 3(3), 475–491.
- Heyns, P. (2005). Water institutional reforms in Namibia. *Water Policy*, 7, 89–106.
- IADB. (Undated). *Nicaragua: Water Supply and Sanitation Investment Program (NI-L1017): Loan Proposal*. Washington D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank.
- IADB. (2010). *INAPA Water and Sanitation Investment Program. Dominican Republic (Loan and Grant Proposal)*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Ioris, A. A. R. (2012). The Geography of Multiple Scarcities: Urban Development and Water Problems in Lima, Peru. *Geoforum*, 43(3), 612–622.

- Kitonsa, W., & Schwartz, K. (2012). Commercialisation and Centralisation in the Ugandan and Zambian Water Sector. *International Journal of Water*, 6(3/4), 176–194.
- Krause, M. (2009). *The Political Economy of Water and Sanitation*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lentini, E., & Ferro, G. (2010). *The Changing Latin-American Landscape in Provision and Regulation of the Water and Sanitation Services (MRPA Paper No. 25594)*. Centro de Estudios Transdisciplinarios del Agua, FCV-UBA, and GDR Res-Eau-Ville, Instituto de Economía UADE y CONICET. Retrieved from <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/25594/>
- Lobina, E., & Hall, D. (2000). Public Sector Alternatives to Water Supply and Sewerage Privatization: Case Studies. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 16(1), 35–55.
- Loftus, A. (2005). “Free Water” as Commodity: The Paradoxes of Durban’s Water Service Transformations. In D. A. McDonald & G. Ruiters (Eds.), *The Age of Commodity: Water Privatization in Southern Africa* (pp. 189–203). London, UK: Earthscan.
- Maldonado, M. M., & Forero, G. V. (2001). *Evaluación de la descentralización municipal en Colombia. La descentralización en el sector de agua potable y saneamiento básico* (ARCHIVOS DE ECONOMÍA No. 002629). DEPARTAMENTO NACIONAL DE PLANEACIÓN.
- Marcus, R. R. (2006). *Local Responses to State Water Policy Changes in Kenya and Madagascar* (Human Development Report Occasional Paper). United Nations Publication.

- McInnes, P. (2005). Entrenching Inequalities: The Impact of Corporatization on Water Injustices in Pretoria. In D. A. McDonald & G. Ruiters (Eds.), *The Age of Commodity: Water Privatization in Southern Africa* (pp. 99–117). London, UK: Earthscan.
- McLoughlin, C., & Harris, D. (2013). *The Politics of Progress on Water and Sanitation in Colombo, Sri Lanka*. UK Department for International Development.
- OECD. (2011). *Ten Years of Water Sector Reform in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia*. Paris, France: OECD Publisher.
- Onjala, J. (2002). *Good Intentions, Structural Pitfalls: Early Lessons from Urban Water Commercialisation Attempts in Kenya*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Center for Development Research.
- Paudyal, D. (Undated). The Concept of Decentralized System of Governance in the Context of Balanced Development of Nepal. Retrieved from www.nepaldemocracy.org
- Perard, E. (2007). *Private Sector Participation and Regulatory Reform in Water Supply: The Middle East and North African (MEDA) Experience (Specific Targeted Research Project No. CIT5-CT-2005-028647)*. Milan, Italy: Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM).
- Républica de Honduras. (2005). *Honduras: Plan Estratégico de Modernización del Sector de Agua Potable y Saneamiento, Hacia una gestión descentralizada*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: Consejo Nacional del Agua Potable y Saneamiento.

- Rojas Ortuste, F. (2014). *Políticas e institucionalidad en materia de agua potable y saneamiento en América Latina y el Caribe* (No. 166). Santiago, Chile: United Nations: (CEPAL) Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe.
- Rosensweig, F., & Perez, E. (1999). *Decentralization of Water Supply and Sanitation Systems in Central America and the Dominican Republic*. Washington D.C.: Prepared for the US-AID and Water Team under EHP Activity No. 517-CC.
- Sabbioni, G. (2008). Efficiency in the Brazilian Sanitation Sector. *Utilities Policy*, 16, 11–20.
- Schifini, J. P. (1998). Panorama General de las Transformaciones en Argentina. In *In Empresas de Saneamiento, su Transformación y Regulación: Conflicts y Soluciones*. Buenos Aires: COFES.
- Seroa da Motta, R., & Moreira, A. (2006). Efficiency and regulation in the sanitation sector in Brazil. *Utilities Policy*, 14(3), 185–195.
- Sjodin, J. (2006). *Determinants of the performance of public water services in Chile 1977-1999*. Santiago, Chile: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Smith, L. (2004). The Murky Waters of the Second Wave of Neoliberalism: Corporatization as a Service Delivery Model in Cape Town. *Geoforum*, 35(3), 375–393.
- Tan, J. (2012). The Pitfalls of Water Privatization: Failure and Reform in Malaysia. *World Development*, 40(12), 2552–2563.

- UNDP. (2009). *Country Sector Assessments; UNDP GOAL WASH Programme: Governance, Advocacy and Leadership for Water and Sanitation and Hygiene: MALI*. New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme.
- US-AID. (Undateda). *Benin Water and Sanitation Profile*.
- US-AID. (Undatedb). *Kenya: Water and Sanitation Profile*. Washington D.C.: US Agency for International Development.
- US-AID. (2005). *Case Studies of Bankable Water and Sewerage Utilities. Vol. 1*. Washington, D.C.: United States Agency for International Development.
- US-AID. (2006). *Good Practices in Public Water Utility Corporatization* (Power Point Presentation). Washington D.C.: US Agency for International Development.
- US-AID. (2010). *Nigeria Water and Sanitation Profile*. US Agency for International Development.
- Verges, J.-F. (2010). *Experiencias relevantes de marcos institucionales y contratos en agua potable y alcantarillado (Documento de Proyecto CEPAL)*. Santiago, Chile: United Nations Publication.
- Walker, I., & Velásquez, M. (1999). *Regional analysis of decentralization of water supply and sanitation services in Central America and the Dominican Republic: Final Report*. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: ESA Consultores for US-AID.
- Wilder, M., & Romero Lankao, P. (2006). Paradoxes of Decentralization: Water Reform and Social Implications in Mexico. *World Development*, 34(11), 1977–1995.

World Bank. (2003a). *Implementation Completion Report on a Credit of \$18.6 Million to the Republic of Togo* (No. 26181).

Washington D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank. (2003b). *Urban Sewerage and Sanitation: Lessons learned from case studies in the Philippines: Field Note*. World Bank Water and Sanitation Program.

World Bank. (2006). *India: Water Supply and Sanitation: Bridging the Gap Between Infrastructure and Service* (Background Paper: Urban Water Supply and Sanitation (35386)). Washington D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank. (2007). *Guinea: Decentralization in Guinea: Strengthening Accountability for Better Service Delivery* (No. 38664-GN). Washington D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank. (2010). *Water Supply and Sanitation in Cameroon: Turning Finance into Services for 2015 and Beyond*. World Bank Water and Sanitation Program.