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ABSTRACT In order to improve the quality of urban governance in cities in the South, it is believed that local institutions and citizens should be brought together more closely. To bridge the gap, there is a need both for citizen participation to have a stronger role in collective decision making and for institutional strengthening, to make local governments more responsive to community needs. This paper explores the role that North–South city-to-city cooperation can play as an instrument for meeting those needs. The outcome of two partnerships between cities in Nicaragua and Peru and their sister cities in the Netherlands is discussed in terms of the resulting support to urban governance. The case studies reveal that while city-to-city cooperation has a particular potential to strengthen local governments, their administrations, service delivery performance and levels of responsiveness, the outcome with regard to encouraging citizenship and citizen participation in urban decision making and development planning has been more modest.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The increased attention to good governance on the development agenda of donor agencies has not been confined to the macro level. In 2007, for the first time, the majority of the human population was urban. This reality, along with the fact that urbanization is most rapid in developing countries, means that poverty is becoming increasingly urbanized. This calls for an intensified focus on good urban governance and forms of development intervention that are geared towards meeting this goal.1

This paper deals with the question of how city partnerships contribute to improving urban governance in the South. Such partnerships link municipalities and communities in North and South and facilitate the exchange of knowledge and expertise between the cities to address needs in a range of urban issues, including institutional performance, public service delivery and civil society empowerment. In the academic discourse on urban governance, the practice of city partnerships as instruments for strengthening governance in the South has thus far been largely neglected, and a need for further research has been indicated.2 This paper aims to fill this knowledge gap.

Drawing on empirical evidence from two North–South city partnership case studies, we will explore the potential of city partnerships to...
contribute to building good governance in cities in the South. As a multi-faceted concept, governance is approached from two different angles in this analysis – from an institutional strengthening perspective on the one hand, and from the perspective of strengthening civil society on the other. Moreover, we will discuss the potential of these city partnerships to bring local governments and citizens closer together, a relationship that is believed to be imperative to participatory governance. We will argue that city partnerships can function as instruments working on both sides of the equation at the same time, thanks to their unique structure that allows participation of both local government and civil society, taking a citywide standpoint.

The cases discussed here are the partnerships of the cities of León (Nicaragua) with Utrecht (the Netherlands), and Villa El Salvador (Peru) with Amstelveen (the Netherlands). The study draws on a range of research methodologies, including:

- interviews with key local stakeholders from municipal councils, local administrations and civil society in the four cities;
- document analysis (for example, of municipal international cooperation policies, municipal budgetary reports and project evaluations); and
- observations (for example, of partnership missions and visits to project sites).


León and Villa El Salvador are interesting cases for various reasons, and Table 1 provides a number of key characteristics of the Latin American cities for comparison. León, the second largest city of Nicaragua and capital of one of the country’s 17 departments, has an impressive number of sister cities, nine in all from Europe and North America. Their financial assistance contributes substantially to the implementation of municipal projects in León: in 2007, 59 per cent of the municipal budget was financed by international cooperation (Table 1). The case of León therefore illustrates the potential economic relevance city partnerships have for local governments in the South. Part of the dominance of international resources is explained by the absence of national government financial transfers to municipalities. Nicaragua is among the last countries in Latin America to decentralize. While the Municipal Law of 1997 assigned more responsibilities to local governments, it remained silent about the transfer of financial resources to meet these obligations. Given the fact that the majority of municipalities in Nicaragua suffer from a complete lack of resources and have insufficient means to raise local revenue, the law thus left many municipalities frustrated by the extent of their duties in the absence of the resources necessary to fulfil them. Only in 2003 did the Municipal Transfer Law become the starting point of fiscal decentralization in Nicaragua, stipulating that from 2004 an incremental percentage of the national budget would be transferred to local governments, from 4 per cent in 2004 to 10 per cent in 2010. The increment has, however, fallen behind, and cities such as León continue to be overly dependent on foreign assistance to carry out public investments.

Villa El Salvador originated in the early 1970s as a typical self-built neighbourhood. Only in 1983 did it gain official status as a district municipality of Metropolitan Lima. Due to its relatively short history, the
young municipality still finds itself in the start-up phase of many of its municipal functions and services. It has partnerships with four cities in Europe, contributions from which are among the vast and varied amount of international assistance it receives to meet the need for institutional strengthening and service delivery. A new, recent wave of decentralization began in Peru after the end of Fujimori’s centralist regime. The Organic Law of Municipalities (2002) redefined the role of local government and encouraged municipalities to devise strategies to take up a stronger role in local development and to actively engage in the “fight against poverty” in Peru. Also, in the case of Villa El Salvador, the role of international cooperation, and in particular city partnerships, is evident, albeit on a more modest scale than in León. In 2006, the contributions of international cooperation comprised 8.6 per cent of the municipal budget, with a total amount of almost US$ 900,000 (Table 1).

Financial assistance is thus an important component of city-to-city cooperation in these cases, but how is it used to improve urban governance? In order to understand the question, this paper proceeds with a short introduction to the concept of urban governance and how it is understood and approached in this study. Then, the two case studies are discussed. Subsequently, the partnership outcomes are assessed with regard to their implications for urban governance in the South.

II. THE ROLE OF CITY PARTNERSHIPS IN STRENGTHENING URBAN GOVERNANCE

It has been estimated that, currently, 70 per cent of the world’s cities participate in so-called city-to-city cooperation partnerships, projects and programmes. City-to-city cooperation (C2C) has been considered a promising mechanism for building and developing capacity in local administrations and for contributing to improving the living conditions in urban communities, especially in the South. The linking of cities to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Key characteristics of the case study cities in the South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>León (Nicaragua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate population</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization legislation</td>
<td>1997 / 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sister cities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual municipal budget</td>
<td>US$ 15,855,637(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution from international cooperation</td>
<td>US$ 9,406,314(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of international cooperation in annual municipal budget</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Figure for 2007. Original figure in Nicaraguan Córdobas (US$ 1 = 18 Córdoba).
SOURCE: Ejecución Presupuestaria (2007), Alcaldía de León, Dirección Económica.
(b) Figure for 2007.
(c) Figure for 2006. Original figure in Peruvian Nuevos Soles (US$ 1 = 3.20 Soles).
(d) Figure for 2006.
achieve urban poverty reduction can be viewed as a decentralized form of development assistance in which local authorities have entered the arena of international development cooperation. The objectives pursued in this respect are generally two-fold.

First, C2C is relevant for what it contributes to institutional strengthening, a pre-condition to local development. Municipalities, increasingly considered agents for local development, face many difficulties with regard to organizational capacity and the delivery of basic services. For the majority of local governments in developing countries, institutional strengthening is one of the most pressing challenges. C2C is believed to enhance the capacities of local institutions. Through North–South city partnerships, municipalities in the South draw on the know-how and experience of their Northern counterparts to address needs in urban management and administration. The contribution is most visible in the formal political and technical encounters between political leaders and officials, in the provision of monetary or in-kind contributions (including training sessions and advisory services) and in the transfer of technical expertise and exchange of best practice.

A second C2C objective relates to the contribution to community strengthening and empowerment and the development of (basic) urban services, especially for the poor. The partnership aspect of C2C is not confined to local administrations. Indeed, in Hafteck’s view, while the concept of a relationship between local authorities is at the core of the partnership, the participation of civil society is a feature of equal importance. A key characteristic of C2C is that it is usually founded on two pillars: the local state apparatus and its constituency, the citizens themselves. While the former relates to the objective of institutional strengthening, the latter relates to the participation and contributions of civil society, the non-profit and the private sectors, for example through strengthening the capacity of CBOs and neighbourhood committees and stimulating business entrepreneurship with microcredit support.

City-to-city cooperation thus comprises a set of simultaneous relationships between the local authorities and civil society of the respective partner cities in North and South – each with their specific actors, objectives and mechanisms for international cooperation. In the partner cities, civil society and local government may collaborate in their C2C efforts, or may execute separate programmes. Many hybrid forms of North–South city partnership exist that allow for the coordination of efforts. Cooperation agreements are signed to formalize partnerships and to serve as a guiding framework to formulate objectives and activities. The concept of twinning implies the potential mutuality of effort and benefit between the partners and two-way capacity building, bringing about change in both North and South.

C2C practice relates well to the current development focus on good government, and especially good governance. Decentralized, democratic governance is considered increasingly a requisite component of development initiatives. While its definition remains hotly debated, there is a growing consensus that governance is critical, in the light of development and poverty reduction, also at city level. The growing attention to urban governance in the development debate is fed largely by the reshaping of public administration in the South, which has resulted in a more prominent role for local government. An underlying rationale is that bringing government closer to the people will make it more responsive to the needs of the community.

8. The wide range of support programmes set up by national governments, local authority associations and UN agencies reflect the increased recognition of local governments as development partners and the growing importance of C2C as a means of providing development assistance to cities affected by poverty. Examples include United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), UNDP, UN–HABITAT, the European Union (URB–AL), UNV (Caring Cities) and the Cities Alliance.


13. Cooperation agreements have a strong symbolic meaning, underlining mutual friendship between the cities. See Mamarodou, V (2002), “Twinning cities and towns. Localizing international relations or globalizing local ties?”, Congress Paper,
of ordinary citizens – the majority of whom are “the poor”. Advocates of
decentralization argue that devolving responsibility for service delivery
to local governments will result in better use of resources and will offer
greater effectiveness in promoting sustainable urban development.\(^\text{18}\)

Decentralization brings government and civil society closer together.
It introduces participation and responsiveness into the debate, providing
opportunities for participation, which then challenges local institutions to
be responsive to community needs.\(^\text{19}\) Governance is broadly understood
as the system of values, policies and institutions through which a society
organizes collective decision making and action related to political,
economic, sociocultural and environmental affairs, through the interaction
of the state, civil society and the private sector. The concept is based on a
recognition that it is not local government alone, but a range of actors
that shape the political urban agenda and its implementation. Decision-

making power exists both inside and outside the local government
institutions, diminishing the distinction between the public and private
spheres.\(^\text{20}\)

Entering the normative debate of good governance, the creation of
effective partnerships between these spheres is considered necessary to
base political, social and economic priorities on broad consensus, which
includes taking into account the needs of the poor.\(^\text{21}\) This has implications
for the role of institutions and citizens alike. Gaventa argues that
in order to achieve good, participatory local governance, people and
institutions need to be brought together. He stresses that rebuilding the
relationship between people and institutions calls for “working both
sides of the equation”: “…There is growing consensus that the way forward
is found in a focus on both a more active and engaged civil society, which can
express demands of the citizenry, and a more responsive and effective state,
which can deliver needed public services.”\(^\text{22}\) Moreover, good governance is
driven by advancing the intersection of the two, so that issues of citizen
participation and state responsiveness and accountability are taken into
account.

In this study, as noted above, we build on the conceptualization of this
two-fold pre-condition for good governance. We assess the impact of city
partnerships on urban governance from two perspectives. The study first
explores how C2C leads to strengthening of municipal administrations
and their services. Second, we focus on the effects of C2C on the conditions
that foster citizen participation in processes of local decision making and
local development. Of particular interest is the extent to which C2C has
been successful in delivering outcomes in these two spheres and how they
are mutually related.

III. THE CASE OF LEÓN–UTRECHT

In 1983, first initiatives by Utrecht citizens who were sympathetic to
the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua were soon followed by a formal
municipal agreement to support the municipality of León. In the summer
of 2008, the partnership celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. In both
cities, a broad variety of activities added lustre to the unique character of
this long-time city twinning. An official delegation of Leónese municipal
authorities made a visit to their counterparts in the Netherlands, and Utrecht
officials took part in the festivities in León. Cultural activities took place
on both sides of the ocean, accentuating the role of global citizenship and friendship between the citizenries of León and Utrecht. Next to the important role of the municipal apparatus in the celebrations, a special role was reserved for the Utrecht–León Friendship Foundation, which coordinates civil society initiatives, linking organizations in Utrecht to those in León. Its mission, to support development projects in León and to raise global awareness among the citizens of Utrecht, is acknowledged by the municipal government, as witnessed by the institutional subsidy the foundation receives annually from the municipal budget.\(^{(23)}\) The twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations, while reflecting the broad scope for action, also exemplify the wide spectrum of actors involved in this city twinning.

The municipal wing of international cooperation focuses first and foremost on the exchange of technical know-how and the strengthening of institutional capacity. It would be beyond the scope of this article to flesh out all activities and projects that have been developed within the framework of this city link; for our argument, some examples taken from the 25 years of experience will suffice. Over time, there has been a clear trend from relatively small projects focusing on tangible outputs towards more programme- and process-oriented activities that primarily focus on institutional strengthening and capacity building. Many of the early projects gradually evolved into larger-scale and more integrated projects that, with hindsight, have indeed had a structural or even institutional development impact in León. The development of the C2C alliance between Utrecht and León may in fact be described as a typical example of “path dependence”\(^{(24)}\) in decentralized development cooperation.

In the first years, Utrecht’s city council decided upon the continuation and the size of the C2C budget on a yearly basis. This led to the formulation of short-term projects that were financially and technically feasible and delivered a number of results in the sphere of urban service delivery and local economic productivity. In the early 1990s, a project was started that we would now perhaps characterize as urban environmental governance. This became the first integrated C2C project and eventually it included more than 20,000 people living in various neighbourhoods bordering the Río Chiquito – at the time nothing more than an open sewer and waste dump. Utrecht took the lead in a consortium that included various European sister cities of León, coordinating a variety of efforts to clean the highly polluted river, including the relocation and technical modernization of the many tanneries that drained their poisonous heavy metals into the river. The programme also included participatory dwelling and neighbourhood improvement components for the low-income settlements in the vicinity of the Río Chiquito, resulting in connections to the sewerage system, planting of the riverbanks, sports facilities, etc. Indeed, the project was among the first to match short-term actions with a long-term planning approach, based on community participation.

In 1993, Utrecht’s city council decided to allocate a structural budget\(^{(25)}\) for development cooperation with León for the duration of each political term. This facilitated the programmatic approach of the city link. The first programme that a priori demonstrated a long-term vision and development approach focused on introducing strategic urban development planning in León. The aim was to tackle structurally some of the most pressing bottlenecks, including economic decline and the lack of adequate housing, which, in combination with explosive population growth, were
leading to uncontrolled urban expansion and illegal land occupation. From 1994, with technical assistance from Utrecht municipality and funding from the Netherlands Ministry of Development Cooperation, a two-year planning process took place that eventually led to the creation of a municipal master plan. This plan was approved by the León city council in 1996 and set out a vision for future urban development of the municipal territory with a corresponding zoning plan and defined control measures. The planning process resulted in a set of strategies, such as upgrading the historical–colonial city centre, improving rural infrastructure and promoting tourism as an economic activity. It also included ambitious aims to control the urban expansion of León, which would be concentrated in the southeastern rural–urban fringe zone. In 1998, Utrecht and León decided that the latter component of the master plan would become their prime focus for joint action (see below). León municipality used its Plan Maestro as a starting point for a consultative process that led to the approval of the León strategic plan in 1999. It meant that a strong element of civil participation was introduced, with various organizations and neighbourhood representatives participating in the planning process. A next step was to integrate both existing plans into one strategic municipal development plan. From 2004, this PEDM has been the organizing planning framework for municipal planning. It serves as an instrument to bring together municipal, civil society and private sector stakeholders to allow for an integrated and consultative development process and a participatory implementation of projects. In addition, the numerous work visits between Utrecht and León officials within the framework of the strategic planning project strengthened the organizational and technical capacity of León’s Department of Physical Planning.

Since 1998, the municipality of Utrecht has supported León in its urban expansion ambitions in the southeastern part of the city. The long-term León Sur Este (LSE) programme entails a planning process that will provide 5,000 plots and infrastructure for low- and medium-income housing. The annual budget that Utrecht has allocated to LSE has risen over the years to some 210,000 Euros (or US$ 324,000) in 2008. This amount is more than doubled by external sources, from the Dutch Ministry of Development Cooperation, channelled through VNG–International (VNG) (the International Office of the Netherlands’ Association of Local Governments), UNDP and the European Union. By mid-2008, over 3,000 plots have been delivered and sold. During the first years of the LSE support programme, assistance was characterized as highly technical and on an individual basis. Urban planners and engineers from Utrecht assisted their counterparts in León municipality by means of field visits, coaching and developing products together. Topics ranged from urban planning issues, including legal advice on land acquisition and the allotment of land, to designing the layout of the new urban area and planning infrastructure. Later on, the approach to planning became more integrated, with attention to social cohesion and community participation, environmental management and the provision of social services. Moreover, increased attention was paid to institutional strengthening of the municipal organization and the skills and competencies of its administrators in León in the sphere of urban planning, policy making and skills development. Assistance in policy making has not only supported the León administration in setting


27. PEDM = Plan Estratégico de Desarrollo Municipal.

28. In addition, two other city partnerships (Zaragoza and the Basque Country) play a role in financing León southeast developments.
objectives and defining implementation strategies, it has also promoted a culture of policy making and long-term planning, which had been found to be weak within the administration. In 2004, León expressed an interest in improving the organizational capacity of the local authority. Utrecht sub-contracted a local consultant to provide courses on leadership skills, time management and decision making for political leaders and administrative directors. Besides the gradual shift away from providing technical solutions to process and organizational support, Utrecht’s role is changing to prepare León for independent continuation of the urban development project. An important step was the integration of the LSE project office, founded in 1998 as an independent entity of the León administration, into the Department of Urban Development. This merged both the project’s institutional setting and existing policy and planning instruments with the wider urban planning structure of the municipality.

A recent project of the city partnership concerns the establishment of a permanent international trade fair, hosting a range of events, activities, conferences, etc. Existing fairs within the sister cities of Utrecht (home to the principal fair in the Netherlands) and Zaragoza support feasibility studies for an international fair in León, which is envisaged to be built in LSE and is considered a potential catalyst to local entrepreneurship and economic development. The project not only brings more private sector involvement to the C2C partnership, but also leads to new local public–private cooperation arrangements. Utrecht’s municipality and fair deliver joint expertise, the former on organizational matters, the latter on developing and managing such a fair. In León, public–private partnerships emerge as public bodies, but (some 100) local entrepreneurs have also acquired shares in the limited liability company that has been established. The ruling body of this organization includes representatives from the municipality, the university, the institute for micro and small enterprises, the association of cattle farmers and the chamber of commerce.

The cooperation of Zaragoza and Utrecht mentioned here is not the only joint effort by León’s sister cities. As Table 1 shows, León has a range of city partnerships, and municipal international cooperation has been vital for León’s municipal management and public investments. To some extent, the range of international development organizations, aid programmes and twinning partnerships active in León seek to coordinate their development efforts. León and its city partners come together every two or three years in one of the cities that constitute León’s partner city network. The most recent sister cities conference was held in Zaragoza in March 2007. More than 80 delegates from the municipal and civil society wings of each city or region discussed the main challenges ahead for León. Such an event provides an opportunity for León municipality to link the efforts of its international partners with existing municipal priorities, in order to use them as a strategy for meeting its urban development objectives, especially since Leon has a strategic plan in place that can serve as a guiding framework for coherent C2C. It was observed, however, that León’s administrators did not arrive at the conference with specific project proposals geared to the development plan, and hence failed to exercise ownership when priorities were set out. Moreover, donor coordination may be hampered when each partnership has different focus areas that have developed throughout the longstanding cooperation and their own traditions in decentralized development cooperation.


31. For example, New Haven specifically focuses on rural development, Zaragoza emphasizes environmental management issues, Lund is concerned with child-centred development and Utrecht has always stressed municipal strengthening.
The specific role and responsibilities of the Utrecht-based Utrecht–León Friendship Foundation are quite different from those of the city administration. Its broad spectrum of activities includes:

- the twinning of schools and child care centres;
- the facilitation of Utrecht higher education student internships in León;
- the implementation of concrete development projects in León in the field of primary and environmental education, and employment creation and culture; and
- the organizational strengthening of CBOs and microfinance schemes in the sister city.

Over the last decade, the foundation has moved from executing a range of often uncoordinated and thematically dispersed projects to adopting a policy that prioritizes options for cooperation. It has become a more professional partner with institutionalized processes of policy formulation, reporting and planning, and has developed higher levels of accountability to donors, municipality and partner organizations in León. The foundation’s work has focused on capacity strengthening of local civil society organizations in León. Over the years, various CBOs have received assistance in building management and organizational skills, such as writing business plans, having a financially sound administration, formulating strategies and actions, and developing proposal-writing skills to apply for external funding. Examples include microcredit associations in the indigenous quarter of Sutiaba, an organization dealing with the prevention of child prostitution, and a CBO concerned with the promotion of sport and crime prevention. Organizational strengthening is considered a pre-condition to allowing local organizations more negotiation power and a stronger voice in local decision-making processes.

While it can be said that the organizational support provided by the foundation to León organizations has to some extent contributed to civil society strengthening, perhaps of more importance for community participation has been the way in which the municipal projects have been executed, emphasizing citizen participation and involving a wide range of actors in project decision making.\(^{32}\) This relates to both the objectives of C2C projects (e.g. introducing participatory planning) and their implementation (e.g. involving citizens in the sanitation of the Río Chiquito). In the LSE programme, neighbourhood committees were set up in order to foster active citizenship in the newly built areas and to secure residents’ participation in decision making. Another concrete example of municipal C2C enhancing civil society involvement is the effort to stimulate Local Agenda 21 (LA21) processes in both partner cities. By definition, LA21 requires the active participation of all local stakeholders in the formulation of a vision for the future of the city and in ensuing action.\(^{33}\) An LA21 charter was signed by the municipalities in 2001, which added the focus of sustainable development to all municipal C2C. In León, various stakeholder groups (roundtables) were established, covering a variety of sustainability and environmental issues, to participate in the LA21 process in close cooperation with the municipality.\(^{34}\) Although most of the roundtables have become inactive, and LA 21 is no longer part of the terminology used in environmental management, the municipalities have continued the sustainability charter with a renewal in 2003 and 2006.

---

32. Moreover, it has been argued that compared to the much larger public sector component in the C2C partnership in terms of capacity and budget, the effect of the civil linkage wing is a mere drop in the ocean. Indeed, Utrecht municipality has been very successful in multiplying investments by attracting large sums of external funding.


IV. THE CASE OF VILLA EL SALVADOR–AMSTELVEEN

The municipalities of Villa El Salvador and Amstelveen became official twinning partners in 1997. As in the case of Utrecht and the large majority of Dutch city twinnings, the first contacts between the two cities were established through civil society initiatives, and only later did the respective local authorities become involved. In 1987, a community project was launched and Amstelveen citizens then requested the municipality to become engaged and to formalize the established relationship by making it a municipal affair. The partnership was institutionalized in 1997, with the signing of a cooperation agreement. Over the years, partnership organization in the North has maintained a dual structure in which both civil and government involvement has been sustained. Civil society initiatives have included a number of people-to-people contacts between Amstelveen and Villa El Salvador, with the participation of schools, youth organizations, a neighbourhood committee and the local rotary. Municipal staff exchanges and overseas missions, with the participation of mayors, councillors and officials have taken place in both cities, where a range of institutional and technical issues have been dealt with. These took place within the context of a number of projects, of which the most recent (2004–2007) have been directed at building capacity in the field of environmental and waste management and strengthening the financial administration of the municipal organization of Villa El Salvador.

The environmental management project is the continuation of previous cooperation between Amstelveen and Villa El Salvador (1998–2000), when waste collection was set up as one of the municipality’s services. The overall aim of the project was to strengthen the newly established Environmental Services Department. First, an environmental management policy plan was drafted. It was adopted with the approval of the provincial authorities of Lima, making Villa El Salvador the second district municipality of Lima with an approved policy and structured approach with regard to waste management. Second, the waste collection service was improved, with waste recycling and separated waste collection as new strategies. Another goal concerned an increase in green areas and a supporting irrigation system, where use was made of treated wastewater. Based on the experiences of a neighbouring municipality, Villa El Salvador asked Amstelveen to assist with the introduction of the Bono Verde (“green ticket”) system. The system provides an incentive to citizens to separate solid waste, whereby citizens receive a green ticket for waste separation that they can exchange for a discount on municipal waste service fees. Not only does the green ticket promote environmentally friendly citizen behaviour, it also makes the work of local private waste collectors more manageable and profitable: the sale of recyclable waste provides some economic opportunities to marginal groups. At the same time, such outsourcing of services reduces the operational costs of the municipality.

The budget for the environmental management project (2004–2007) was 855,000 Euros (US$ 1.3 million), of which about one-third was financed with international assistance from the Netherlands: 45,000 Euros (US$ 69,000) from Amstelveen municipality and 200,000 Euros (US$ 308,000) from the Dutch Association of Local Governments.

Strengthening the financial administration was a second objective of municipal cooperation. Villa El Salvador defined it as a key priority, as the lack of proper financial planning hindered an adequate allocation
of municipal investment. There was an exchange of municipal expertise during a series of work visits in Amstelveen and Villa El Salvador on various topics, such as complying with municipal financial legislation, information and communication technology, departmental budget management, increasing local revenue, and human resource management. Expertise was accompanied by the physical delivery of hardware and software to support the financial reorganization. Staff (188 in all) were trained to guarantee a sound application and implementation of the financial administration system. The results of the project include new information systems to improve customer service to citizens, including the municipality’s website, and the provision of up-to-date financial information readily available to all municipal departments. This has not only resulted in more realistic investment planning and decision making, it has also improved the conditions for transparency and the provision of information for citizens and for increasing municipal revenues from local taxes on property and services. A total of 190,000 Euros (US$ 293,000) was invested in the project (2004–2006), of which Amstelveen municipality contributed 30,000 Euros (US$ 46,000) (16 per cent), VNG 74,000 Euros (US$ 114,000) (39 per cent) and Villa El Salvador municipality 86,000 Euros (US$ 133,000) (45 per cent).

A concrete example of strengthening the financial administration involved the upgrading of various decentralized municipal agencies that are dispersed in the neighbourhoods of Villa El Salvador. For a large number of citizens, these agencies perform the functions and services of the municipality, because of the long distances to the town hall and the long queues involved. Previously, the agencies failed to provide adequate financial information to citizens who came to pay their municipal taxes, which caused frustration and mistrust and increased citizens’ unwillingness to contribute. A network system was set up connecting the agencies to the town hall, which allowed integration into the financial administration and direct data access and processing. Citizens who pay their contributions at the agencies now receive an instant confirmation, which increases customer satisfaction. Simultaneously, the municipality has a more reliable budget overview on which to base financial planning.

Altogether, Amstelveen has invested more than US$ 600,000 in Villa El Salvador municipality in the years 2004–2006. That is a considerable amount compared to the contribution of the other sister cities of Santa Coloma de Gramenet, Spain (US$ 60,000) and Rezé, France (US$ 42,000). The figures do not include the fourth partner city, Tübingen, as the partnership was only formalized in 2006. Total international funding to Villa El Salvador municipality in this period equalled US$ 1.4 million. In addition to the city partnerships, which together provided 53 per cent of international resources (Amstelveen alone accounted for 46 per cent), several donor programmes supported the municipality of Villa El Salvador, including the EU (URB–AL, PROPOLI) and the United Nations (UNIFEM, UNICEF). International donor coordination has occurred to some extent, albeit on an ad hoc basis. The EU, for example, linked up with Amstelveen’s environmental management project by financing a waste separation station within the framework of PROPOLI. Among the sister cities, however, it is proving difficult to organize coordinated action. Although Villa El Salvador, Amstelveen, Santa Coloma and Rezé aimed to tackle jointly issues of environment and security in Villa El Salvador, and this was discussed at a C2C conference held in Villa El Salvador in 2004, the great divergence in approach, objectives and expectations of the different sister cities prevented the implementation of coordinated action.35

35. The figures do not include the fourth partner city, Tübingen, as the partnership was only formalized in 2006.
36. PROPOLI = Programa de Lucha Contra la Pobreza en Lima Metropolitana.
of collective projects. Amstelveen’s objectives, for example, were geared towards institutional strengthening, while Santa Coloma and Rezé were more focused on Villa El Salvador’s civil society. As in the case of León, coordinating foreign assistance in a municipal context seems difficult to achieve. It raises questions about the leadership role of the recipient municipality in setting out development priorities and the willingness of donors to adjust to these priorities in their projects in a demand-driven way. Therefore, strengthening the coherence of donor policies that allow development to be driven by local needs and expressed, for example, in a municipal development plan, could increase the effectiveness of individual C2C activities.

While efforts regarding the institutional performance component of strengthening urban governance can be considered a success in the case of Villa El Salvador–Amstelveen, evidence on the effects of civil society participation has been more mixed. On the one hand, there has been some positive spin-off from the projects described above with regard to building multi-sectoral partnerships between Villa El Salvador municipality and other community actors, leading to higher responsiveness and participation. The Bono Verde project for instance, led to the establishment of public–private partnerships, as municipal waste collection is outsourced to waste collectors. These collectors are not employed by the municipality but have been licensed to operate independently. The income from their work derives from the sale of recyclable waste (bottles, tins, paper, metals) to a wholesale waste buyer. Moreover, the work of the Environment Department has built on the tradition of community participation in Villa El Salvador,(37) with more than 1,200 citizens having participated through environmental neighbourhood committees in municipal environmental management. Thus, it can be argued that the strengthening of the department through the C2C partnership has indirectly enhanced community involvement and citizen participation. It has been noted, however, that this aspect was considered the weakest link in the project. The environment committees were heavily supported by an NGO, and after termination of its support, much of the committees’ work imploded, undermining the sustainability of their participation in municipal environmental management. According to an Amstelveen official, it would have been better to institutionalize citizen participation further in the municipal C2C project rather than depend on other actors in the local aid architecture. This would have ensured a stronger integration of community participation in the context of environmental management, and the necessary guidance and support from the municipality itself to sustain it. Finally, the example of the financial management project, which led to a more efficient operation of the decentralized municipal agencies, showed how institutional strengthening indirectly led to increased government responsiveness by improving customer care to local taxpayers and transparency of financial records.

On the other hand, further focusing on enhancing conditions for civil society strengthening, it can be noted that efforts from civil society in Amstelveen, and the corresponding C2C impact in Villa El Salvador, have been modest. Examples of community C2C projects include the twinning of schools, which, for example, resulted in fundraising for the purchase of books and other teaching materials and in donations from an Amstelveen church for the upgrading of a home for the elderly in Villa El Salvador. The rotary in Amstelveen has supported the communal kitchens of Villa

37. See, for example, Hordijk, M (2005), “Participatory governance in Peru: exercising citizenship”, Environment and Urbanization Vol 17, No 1, April, pages 219–236.
El Salvador, allowing the purchase of kitchen equipment and facilitating education courses to kitchen staff with regard to nutrition and hygiene.

Still, these examples remain anecdotal and, in general, community support to Villa El Salvador is not thriving. Awareness raising and education of the Amstelveen population has been a main partnership objective for Amstelveen municipality. Initially, this task was performed by the regional Centre for Development Cooperation (COS), but in 2003 the municipality took over the role. Thus far, the municipality has not found an appropriate civil society organization that can take on the responsibility for awareness raising and publicity. Instead, the budget that used to be allocated to the Centre for Development Cooperation subsidies is now managed internally in the local administration as part of the international cooperation budget. As a result, the municipality takes on responsibilities that, in Utrecht, are performed by civil society; Utrecht municipality and the Utrecht–León Friendship Foundation coordinate, while having well-defined, complementary responsibilities in which the latter is concerned with awareness raising. In Amstelveen, however, it was the local administration that organized a festival to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the partnership with Villa El Salvador. On work visits to Peru, local government officials act as civil society bridge builders and ambassadors for Amstelveen civil society by paying visits to schools and evaluating projects supported by Amstelveen organizations. They also report to the latter upon their return.

The role of local administration in orchestrating citizens’ actions has been criticized as not relating well with “…the way Dutch government deals with civil society initiatives: government facilitates and merely provides a framework for activities.”(38) There is now the perception in both Amstelveen and Villa El Salvador that the partnership has become more technocratic and a local administrative affair, with an emphasis on technical exchanges rather than a partnership owned by the community. There is a risk in the perception that civil society participation has become of minor importance, as it reduces public support and commitment. In both Villa El Salvador and Amstelveen, voices are raised to make the partnership more community driven. In the opinion of an Amstelveen alderman, the municipality’s international cooperation policies have been too bureaucratic. Instead, there is a need to stimulate civil society participation, and part of the municipal budget for C2C should be managed by civil society to implement projects. This would also increase public support for the partnership.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have explained city-to-city cooperation as an instrument to strengthen governance in cities in the South, and have described how this has worked in practice in two cases. In these cases, the practice of C2C has some unique features that are distinct from such mainstream decentralized cooperation as the work of NGOs; long-lasting twinning agreements, intensified by feelings of mutual friendship and trust and an increased level of professionalism that has replaced amateurish aid efforts, may allow for long-term, process-oriented cooperation, based on peer-to-peer exchanges and consolidated by civil support. Municipalities in the North have a niche in international development cooperation, as

they are able, potentially, to provide the necessary municipal expertise needed to strengthen local governments in the South. The contribution of C2C to municipal budgets can be substantial; the case of León shows that it may constitute as much as 60 per cent. Thus, while León may be considered a success story with regard to attracting foreign assistance, it also exhibits the municipality's financial vulnerability and its aid dependency, especially when compared to the more moderate share of international assistance to Villa El Salvador's municipal budget (less than 9 per cent). The capacity to tap external funding (VNG, international donors, etc.) puts Northern municipalities in a position to support their in-house expertise with considerable funding for project investments. Donor coordination in the South, preferably framed by locally owned municipal development priorities, is another underlying success factor. Furthermore, the participation of a range of urban actors from the public and the private spheres allows for a wide scope of actions to be undertaken to deal with urban challenges and poverty.

In this study, we have considered both institutional (municipal) strengthening and the fostering of civil society participation as components of stronger urban governance. Although it is difficult to know whether changes in this respect are the explicit result of city-to-city cooperation, our two examples do shed light on the processes inherent in this type of intervention. There are some commonalities: in both León and Villa El Salvador, institutional strengthening has been a key component of C2C efforts. There have been various outcomes vis-à-vis the effectiveness of municipal administrations in both cities, regarding staff capacity (e.g. technical knowledge, organizational and leadership skills), the performance of various departments (e.g. the Environment Department in Villa El Salvador and the LSE project office in León), and the efficiency of administrative processes, including financial administration and institutional reorganization. There are also examples of service delivery improvements, e.g. housing and infrastructure through the LSE project in León and waste collection in Villa El Salvador.

While the case studies provide clear examples that illustrate the effects of C2C with regard to improving municipal performance, outcomes with regard to civil society are more mixed. C2C activities initiated by civil society in the North, implemented in parallel yet separate from municipal cooperation, are rather ad hoc and isolated. While there are examples of improved living conditions in the partner cities, there is little evidence of civil society projects that have indeed empowered citizens overseas. In León, the Utrecht–León Friendship Foundation has contributed to organization building of CBOs, which to some extent has strengthened their negotiating powers in local planning and decision making. Further research is needed, however, to assess the real impacts with regard to their participation in these processes of collective urban action.

It appears that municipal programmes may, indirectly, have delivered more results regarding community participation and collective decision making than the direct efforts of Northern civil society. Both cases reveal that municipal C2C projects have encouraged interaction between citizens, private bodies and local government. Multi-sectoral partnerships are built by bringing together citizens, government and the private sector in Villa El Salvador through the Bono Verde system. In León, the trade fair to be built in LSE is based on public–private arrangements. Neighbourhood committees in LSE liaise with municipal planners. In a range of C2C projects in
both cities, community participation was a key component. Participation has traditionally been a feature of local planning in both Villa El Salvador and León. The projects not only acknowledged this, they also created favourable conditions to further enhance active citizen engagement. The environmental neighbourhood committees in Villa El Salvador and the participatory planning processes for the municipal strategic plan and LA21 in León are clear examples. Intimately related to this is an increased responsiveness from the local administration, through a more transparent administration (Villa El Salvador) and through the participatory nature of planning in León at both city level (strategic plan) and neighbourhood level (neighbourhood committees in LSE). It widens the action space where community voices can be expressed.

Although focusing on municipal performance may thus be a recipe for successful C2C, the case of Amstelveen–Villa El Salvador also shows that too much emphasis on institutional issues risks resulting in a rather technocratic and narrow interpretation of city twinning. In both cities in the Netherlands, fostering global citizenship and raising awareness locally are important objectives of the city partnerships, and participation of civil society is imperative in sustaining public and political support. Yet, there is the question of whether city-to-city cooperation should also deliver more tangible benefits to the partners in the North. While C2C rhetoric implies mutuality of efforts and benefits, these case studies show that in practice, persistent inequalities result in one-way flows from North to South of money, expertise and information. Other studies seem to corroborate such a gap in North–South partnerships, and question the opportunities for learning and benefitting in the North that allow municipal partnerships to truly become sites for learning for all stakeholders involved.  

The notion of mutual benefit links up with the recent trend of the adoption in the North of innovations in democratic governance that have emerged in cities in the South. Exporting ideas and knowledge on urban governance from South to North has been specifically related to experiences in participatory budgeting, with its cradle in Porto Alegre, Brazil. This counter-trend to traditional North–South flows has been referred to as “the return of the caravels” and has been promoted by various international donor programmes. In light of this, and given the fact that both León and Villa El Salvador build on a long tradition of community participation and have innovative forms of urban governance in place, including participatory budgeting methodologies, the question arises as to whether it has inspired their Dutch partner cities. Therefore, a next step in research would be to assess the extent to which C2C brings good governance to cities in both North and South, and which factors promote or undermine such mutual processes.

Returning to our case studies, it has been shown that city-to-city cooperation has the potential to challenge local governments in the South to work efficiently and be responsive to citizen needs, while at the same time encouraging participation and supporting citizens to raise their voice. In this process, the boundaries between the municipal and civil society wings of C2C intervention and outcomes become blurred. This can be considered a strength. As an instrument to support good governance in cities in the South, C2C goes beyond the government or civil society-based approaches of NGOs or donors’ decentralization programmes. Rather, it focuses on the intersection of the two, and hence has the potential to touch upon the core of urban governance.
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