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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the World Summit for Children in September 1990 and the adoption of the Plan of Action, which called for countries to create National Programmes of Action (NPAs) for achieving the goals of the 1990s, many heads of state have been following up on their commitments to help local administrations formulate and implement their own local programmes of action.

This process, which has come to be called NPA decentralization, is taking on added importance because of its relation to current global trends of state decentralization. In order to better understand this phenomenon — where and how decentralization is occurring, the roles of the major actors, and the results that have been achieved to date — the International Child Development Centre has initiated a study entailing the collection and analysis of relevant data.

A survey of UNICEF field offices was undertaken in late 1993 and early 1994 to determine the status of NPA decentralization in developing countries: of the 103 countries that received and answered the questionnaire, 50 responded that their countries were at varying stages of decentralizing their NPAs. With no additional instructions urging such decentralization issued from UNICEF Headquarters, the number of countries carrying out NPA decentralization was considered to be surprisingly high, demonstrating the importance of the process.

Several interesting trends have emerged from the results of the study. NPA decentralization tends to occur in more modern and populous countries, which also appear to have a greater probability of reaching the goals for the 1990s. Not all of the countries surveyed are at the same stage of NPA development, and the degree of decentralization — whether at the local, district, provincial or state level — varies from country to country.

Some countries have included all of the Summit Goals in their local programmes of action, and others are focusing on selected goals, mainly in the health sector. There are also differing combinations of the major outputs achieved so far in different regions. Institutional commitment and involvement with the NPA decentralization process is quite extensive at both the national and local levels. UNICEF's role is in advocacy, financial, mobilization and technical support.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of NPA decentralization with material that was not previously available. The data from the field-office surveys is presented in chapter VII. This information should be helpful for UNICEF field offices wishing to advocate for NPA decentralization, while providing lessons from the different experiences.
I. INTRODUCTION

On 29-30 September 1990, 71 Heads of State and Government and 88 other senior officials, mostly at the ministerial level, assembled at the Headquarters of the United Nations for the World Summit for Children. To mark the event, the participants adopted the Declaration on the Survival, Protection and Development of Children as well as a Plan of Action for achieving the 29 Declaration goals during the 1990s.

Government representatives attending the Summit committed themselves to developing National Programmes of Action (NPAs) to meet those goals in their own countries, and other countries subsequently followed suit. To date, 145 developing countries have pledged to prepare an NPA; of these, 63 have finalized their NPAs, 29 have draft NPAs, 27 are preparing their NPAs and 26 have not reported on their progress.

In this paper, an attempt is made to examine the formulation and implementation of NPAs in developing countries in the context of the decentralization processes that are taking place in many of those countries. In some cases, this general move toward decentralization has carried over to NPAs, leading to the formulation and development of local programmes of action (LPAs) in which there is a degree of autonomy in one or more of the following elements: decision making, organization, administration and finance. The data contained in this paper reflect the status of NPA decentralization as of March 1994.

There is growing consensus on the part of many governments, international aid agencies and scholars about the importance of decentralizing state functions and services. This transfer of responsibilities, which begins with state deconcentration and ends with real devolution of power to localities, is a process that was initiated during decolonization.

Great variations exist in the magnitude of decentralization: its extension differs from country to country, as do its positive and/or negative effects. Nevertheless, the new global political balance and an increasingly dominant neo-liberal tendency make the decentralization of nations appear essential. Arguments in favour of decentralization often point out that it enables national administrations to function more efficiently and local administrations to become more directly involved in improving the population’s welfare. Strong emphasis is also placed on the positive democratic impact of decentralization and on the increased power of local communities in controlling and monitoring public programmes and investments.

Decentralization, however, is also looked at with caution, as doubts about its benefits have often been expressed. One such criticism is that decentralization potentially allows central states to offload their responsibilities on local governments without providing them
adequate funds to run their administration. The consequences of this are particularly damaging to the poor who need state protection to survive. Inherent to such arguments are claims that local capacities to deal with new and growing responsibilities are deficient and that training programmes for local officers have most often been unsuccessful. Another point often raised asserts that if decentralization is carried out without reforms in local social structures, it can reinforce the power of local elites, who are no more equitable than the central governments. Finally it has been affirmed that history points to many cases in which centralization has helped to radically improve the social conditions of the masses.

These is some truth to all of these assertions; the relative benefits or disadvantages that decentralization offers to an individual country depend on that country's history, its administrative structure, its social, political and economic circumstances, and the desire of its politicians to decentralize. At the same time, it would be utopian to imagine a state without a substantial degree of central functions: policy making, establishing regulations, setting standards of quality, and defining interventions in macro-projects are some of the typical functions that are controlled by central powers. It is becoming increasingly difficult, however, to ignore the many forces that are pushing for state decentralization and the new political reality that it implies.

Where NPAs are concerned, it seems reasonable that decentralization to the local level could enhance local living conditions and boost the chances for more countries to reach the goals for the 1990s, provided that some social, administrative and financial pre-requisites are maintained at the central level.

Efforts to develop LPAs should therefore be seen in the context of state decentralization, since such programmes must involve local power, local institutions, social and economic programmes at the local level, community participation and local governance. LPAs imply the need to coordinate institutions so they can work together and to map out collaboration between different administrative levels of the state, two prerequisites to make local and regional programmes of action part of the actual decentralization of the state. Such programmes should operate within the structure of existing state decentralization; in countries where no state decentralization exists, on the other hand, LPAs could represent the first step in that direction.

The Heads of State attending the World Summit agreed to help local governments develop their own programmes of action in favour of children. Article 34.1 of the Plan of Action states:
...National Governments should encourage and assist provincial and local governments as well as NGOs, the private sector and civic groups to prepare their own programmes of action to help to implement the goals and objectives included in the Declaration and this Plan of Action.¹

At the same time, some governments have come to understand the necessity of decentralizing their NPAs, often due to both internal and external pressure. In this context, the International Child Development Centre (ICDC) initiated a study to analyse the status NPA decentralization in developing countries.

The study of NPA decentralization in its early stages is particularly important, as collected data and information may provide technical advice to countries in which the process is underway or about to begin. On the basis of the different experiences that are emerging, useful recommendations can be given to countries operating in similar contexts for detecting potential difficulties and optimizing the process for reaching the goals for the 1990s.

The ICDC research proposal calls for an in-depth study of six countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, with a general analysis and conclusions on the process of NPA decentralization. Before selecting the six countries, it was necessary to carry out a global overview of the situation for the selection of the cases; moreover, because there were no data compiled on NPA decentralization by UNICEF or other agencies, we had to obtain existing information directly from UNICEF field offices. The results of this inquiry have enabled us to set up a database on NPA decentralization.

This paper is proposed to UNICEF offices, and others who are interested in the process, despite the limitations of the kind of methodology used, and taking into consideration that this effort represents the only systematized source of information on the process. In spite of these shortcomings, this information may nevertheless be useful for UNICEF field offices wishing to advocate for NPA decentralization and to identify experiences from other countries that could be valuable for their own purposes.

The findings are presented country by country in the tables printed in chapter VII. This type of presentation, rather than the use of statistical tables, has been adopted because this 'catalogue' type of presentation on the status of each country is considered more useful to UNICEF offices at this initial stage of NPA decentralization. In the text, however, some statistical data are given in order to present some general trends and situations of the process.
II. OBJECTIVES OF THE COUNTRY OVERVIEW

The general country overview, based on the database containing information supplied by UNICEF field offices, attempted to describe the situation of decentralization of National Programmes of Action in developing countries on a global basis. The database and the overview should serve to achieve the following objectives:

1. To provide a general picture of NPA decentralization in developing countries, subdivided by the six administrative UNICEF regions: East Asia and the Pacific (EAPRO), East and South Africa (ESARO), Middle East and North Africa (MENA), South Asia (ROSA), West Central Africa (WCARO) and The Americas and Caribbean (TACRO).²

2. To classify countries according to their different governance structures and the techniques used to decentralize their NPAs, whether successful or not. This is intended to be of use to countries where the process of NPA decentralization is currently underway or under consideration.

3. To select the countries from the six UNICEF operational regions where in-depth case studies will be conducted.

4. To obtain baseline data for monitoring NPA decentralization, which will be reviewed and updated annually.

5. To promote in-house institutional awareness and discussion on the subject.

III. METHODOLOGY

The following methodology was employed to create the database. A country fact-sheet questionnaire was drawn up to obtain information from UNICEF field offices about the methods being used to realize NPA decentralization. The basic questionnaire asked specific questions to obtain a rapid but precise idea of the situation in each country, while allowing for conformity in the answers to provide the necessary comparable data. The questionnaire laid out parameters for gauging the process of NPA formulation and asked respondents:

- whether NPA decentralization was taking place, and, if not, whether there was an intention to begin the process;
- the level to which NPA decentralization was taking place;
- the goals included in the exercise;
• the date of commencement;
• the major outputs attained up to that point;
• the participating institutions at the local and national levels and the roles they play;
• UNICEF's role;
• the extent of children's participation;
• the leaders of the process at both the local and national levels.

The questionnaire was initially tested on TACRO countries and on several other countries in different regions which expressed an early interest. The answers from this first round of questionnaires were all received by December 1993, and questionnaires were then sent to the WCARO field offices in January 1994. On the basis of the answers and comments received from these two regions, the questionnaire was modified and sent in March 1994 to all other UNICEF field offices in the remaining regions.

The second questionnaire varied slightly from the original version; the questions were posed more clearly to facilitate the answers, while better allowing respondents to tailor their answers to the database objectives in order to standardize data entry. These modifications, however, changed only the form and not the content of the questionnaire, and they did not alter comparability between countries and regions. Most of the responses were received by May 1994, with the data reflecting the situation of the countries as of March 1994, except TACRO (December 1993) and WCARO (January 1994).

It was decided that all UNICEF field offices should have an opportunity to answer the questionnaire, although countries under direct and intense conflict at the time the survey was conducted, such as Haiti and Somalia, were omitted, since their circumstances did not allow the application of the process. Other countries in difficult political or security situations or which are too small to decentralize their NPAs were nonetheless asked to fill out the questionnaire. For the former, it was considered that such countries could be carrying out programmes of action in less afflicted regions or even working under difficult circumstances. For the latter, it was deemed possible that these countries could be designing or implementing special programmes for their capital or main city, which could be used as examples of urban programmes of action.

Most small countries, however, were ultimately excluded from the database. Such countries are most of the Caribbean islands, Singapore and the Maldives, all of which are too small or too sparsely populated for NPA decentralization to have much relevance. Although
NPAs are produced by all nations, countries in Europe, the former Soviet Union, North America, Central Asia, Australasia, United Arab Emirates, and Israel, Japan, and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya were not selected to be part of the study because their economic and social conditions are extremely different from those of developing countries. Apart from marked differences in indicators for infant mortality, health, nutrition and education, there are also large differences in the structures and kinds of service delivery between developing and developed countries. On the other hand, countries whose political situations have changed drastically since the survey (e.g. Rwanda and Yemen) are still included, and their data reflects the prevailing circumstances as of March 1994. The changes that have subsequently occurred in those countries will be reflected in the next annual revision of the database.

In all, the survey was conducted in 103 countries, all of which responded: 21 in ESARO, 14 in EAPRO, 23 in WCARO, 15 in MENA, 23 in TACRO, and 7 in ROSA. The unanimous degree of response, particularly impressive for a survey carried out by mail, might reflect the high level of interest that field offices place on this subject.

After the data were compiled in ICDC they were sent back to the field offices to give them an opportunity to review and revise the information in order to ensure the accuracy of the database. Only a few revisions were received and amendments were made accordingly.

To complement the answers sent by the field offices, additional sources of information have been used in compiling the data included in this overview. Information was extracted from the individual NPAs that contain details about future plans for decentralizing and from Annual Reports on country situations that present relevant details relating to NPA decentralization.

**Limitations of the Study**

This report aims to make an ordered presentation of the survey results, offering occasional comments and analysis to help interpret the data. The purpose of the database was limited to only the previously mentioned objectives; efforts to draw further conclusions from these data would, at this stage, be fruitless.

The information presented here is limited by the kind of questionnaire that was utilized; to keep from overburdening field offices, the questions were reduced to a minimum, which did not allow overly detailed answers. Moreover, surveys carried out by mail make
reviewing the responses more difficult, although, as mentioned previously, all respondents had the opportunity to revise the data.

Most references to economic and social indicators are from publications like UNDP’s Human Development Report and UNICEF’s State of the World’s Children. Despite the quality of the information contained in such publications, many countries might feel that some indicators are not up-to-date or sufficiently indicative. Some countries are collecting information at a rapid pace and their present situations may not be accurately reflected in this publication. Requesting up-dated information directly from the offices would be a very burdensome task and the data comparability across countries could be distorted.

IV. TYPES OF COUNTRIES DECENTRALIZING NPAS

Of the 103 countries that were ultimately the object of the analysis, 50 have some type of NPA decentralization, although the nature of this decentralization varies widely.

Some field offices sent back the questionnaire stating that it was not applicable to their cases: either these countries had not yet formulated an NPA, the NPA was under preparation centrally, a decentralizing process had been explored but not implemented, or the government is too centralized to envisage decentralization.

Many countries affirmed that they intend to decentralize their NPA; however, intent to decentralize the NPA in the future was not considered a sufficient indication of actual decentralization. On the other hand, countries categorized ‘in the process of decentralization’ include, among others, those in which the government was working to programme and develop the methodology for decentralizing its NPA.

Some countries do not have an NPA as such, but have included NPA goals in their development programmes and intend to pursue them through decentralized management. In Indonesia, for example, the Five-Year Development Plans include programmes for women and child with an aim to achieving the goals for the 1990s. In this sense, Indonesia could be an interesting case of a country attaining these goals without an NPA, but through established national programmes operating in a decentralized fashion. Therefore, we classified Indonesia as a country with NPA decentralization.

Some countries have not completed the process of NPA formulation, but were already elaborating LPAs. Sometimes this was part of a strategy to advocate for and promote the
NPA. These counties, despite not having finalized their NPAs, were included in the category of 'decentralizing NPA'. In some instances, a decentralized programme was more feasible than a national programme. Sierra Leone, for instance, has not completed its NPA, but an approved local programme of action for Freetown exists. Syria, which has also not drafted its NPA, is nevertheless at the programming stage of NPA decentralization. Other countries with only a draft or outline version of their NPAs that have been included in the 'decentralizing NPA' category include Thailand, whose draft NPA is decentralized, and Tanzania, Cameroon, Mauritania, Niger, Egypt, Brazil, Benin and São Tome, all of which have an ongoing process of NPA decentralization.

On the basis of these considerations we classified the 103 countries as follows:

- 17 field offices stated that the government had not declared its intention to decentralize and would likely not do so.
- 10 offices stated that a formal declaration to decentralize the NPA had not been made, but that it might occur in the unspecified future.
- 26 offices stated that the intention to decentralize had been declared and in some cases the government was discussing the modality.
- 26 countries were in the process of programming and developing methods to decentralize their NPA.
- 21 countries were developing NPA decentralization in some areas or regions.
- 3 countries were at the stage of decentralizing their NPAs over their entire territories.

According to these responses, only 16 per cent of the surveyed countries declared they would not decentralize and 10 per cent are undecided; but 74 per cent of the countries are in the initial phase of the process, are testing methods, or at the stage of full-scale NPA decentralization. These figures demonstrate that decentralization is currently a highly important issue for many governments, and that the support provided by UNICEF field offices in this process is valued as well. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the technical cooperation offered by UNICEF field offices is occurring without precise and systematic guidelines from Headquarters.
Characteristics of the Countries

To define the characteristics of the countries that were working on a process of NPA decentralization (DNPA) and those with a centralized NPA (CNPA) we have used secondary data. The objective is to delineate two different kinds of country profiles, although these differences are not meant to indicate a causal relation.

DNPA countries account for a total population of 3,534 million, compared with 666 million for CNPA countries, the large difference in population can be attributed to some extent by the populous countries falling under the first category, e.g. Bangladesh, Brazil, China, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan and Vietnam. While decentralization of the NPAs has not yet been extended over the entire territory of all of these countries, the quantitative potential and importance of decentralization is reflected. It does bear emphasizing, however, that comparing averages between these two categories of nations without taking into consideration such population differences could produce what has been defined as an ‘ecological fallacy’.

On average, DNPA countries are more urbanized (43%) than CNPA countries (37%). DNPA countries total 79 cities of more than one million inhabitants, compared with 22 such cities in CNPA countries. DNPA countries also have a higher indicator of ‘modernity’, as reflected in the use of contraceptives (36%) compared with CNPA countries (23%).

The collective infant mortality rate is lower in countries that are decentralizing NPAs (67 per thousand) compared with the countries that are not decentralizing NPAs (86 per thousand), although the total number of infant deaths is of course higher in the DNPA countries. The maternal mortality rate is considerably lower in DNPA countries: 268 per 100,000 as opposed to 424 per 100,000 in CNPA countries. There was no significant difference between the two groups of countries for population growth rates or in the percentage of infants with low birth weight.

DNPA countries have higher average levels for some sanitation indicators: 64 per cent vs. 59 per cent for access to safe water, and 57 per cent vs. 46 per cent for access to adequate sanitation. Also, on average, DNPA countries make more extended use of ORT (51% vs. 40%) and have more extensive coverage of measles immunization for children (74% vs. 62%). Surprisingly, however, DNPA and CNPA countries have very similar percentages of the population with access to health services (68% vs. 69%). Indicators for
education are also higher in DNPA countries: adult literacy rates (67% vs. 54%),\textsuperscript{20} adult literacy in females as a percentage of males (76% vs. 66%),\textsuperscript{21} primary school enrolment for males (78% vs. 69%)\textsuperscript{22} and particularly for females (74% vs. 58%).\textsuperscript{23} Despite these differences, the percentage of pupils enrolled in first grade reaching the final grade of primary school is slightly better in CNPA countries (63% vs. 65%).\textsuperscript{24} There is not a significant difference between the two country groups for family-income concentration, measured by Gini coefficients,\textsuperscript{25} nor between the proportion of income shared by 40 per cent of the lowest income perceivers.\textsuperscript{26} Only slight differences were found in the percentage of urban and rural populations living below the absolute poverty level.\textsuperscript{27} 29 per cent of the urban population in DNPA countries lives below the poverty level, compared with 33 per cent in CNPA countries; 47 per cent of the rural population in DNPA countries lives below the absolute poverty level and 50 per cent in CNPA countries.

It is difficult to find standardized figures on population homogeneity. Approximated indicators were sought, like the most spoken language,\textsuperscript{28} the most practiced religion\textsuperscript{29} and the most represented ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{30} It was assumed that the higher these proportions, the higher the homogeneity in the country. Using this principle, we found a higher level of homogeneity in DNPA countries (67% for language, 74% for religion and 64% for ethnic groups) compared with CNPA countries (59% for language, 70% for religion and 50% for ethnic groups).

We did not find any differences between the two country groups with respect to the percentage of central expenditures allocated to education, health and defence.\textsuperscript{31} on average, the central governments of both groups allocated 15 per cent for education, 6 per cent for health and 13 per cent for defence. But, central government expenditures as a percentage of the Gross National Product (GNP) were lower in DNPA countries (23%) compared with CNPA countries (29%).\textsuperscript{32} DNPA countries also had less debt as a percentage of GNP (76%) compared with CNPA countries (101%).\textsuperscript{33} Also, on the basis of their Gross Domestic Products, DNPA countries had lower exports (18%) compared to CNPA countries (25%).\textsuperscript{34} Finally, official development assistance as a percentage of GNP is 8 per cent in DNPA countries compared to 16 per cent in CNPA countries.\textsuperscript{35}
V. SITUATION AND PROGRESS OF NPA DECENTRALIZATION

The following information was compiled from the responses of the UNICEF field offices to the country fact-sheet questionnaires. Of the 103 countries included in the survey, 50 were actually carrying out some kind of NPA decentralization or had reached a reasonable level of programming/methodology at the time of survey. By region, there are 21 countries in ESARO, 14 in EAPRO, 23 in WCARO, 15 in MENA, 23 in TACRO and seven in ROSA.

NPA Formulation and the Decentralization Process

The process undertaken by a given country to formulate its NPA provides a first key indicator for gauging the potential for NPA decentralization in that country. It can be assumed that countries formulating their NPAs in a decentralized way (through the involvement of local levels or with some post-formulation consultation) are aware of the importance of decentralization. Of the 103 countries surveyed, 14 prepared their NPAs using a decentralized approach, 15 formulated their NPAs centrally but with some form of local consultation, and 63 formulated their NPAs in a centralized manner. Only 11 of the 103 countries were still preparing their NPAs.

There were some regional variations in the way NPAs were prepared. In ESARO, four countries carried out decentralized formulation, 10 formulated their NPAs centrally and three countries carried out consultations with local administrations. In EAPRO, two countries produced their NPAs in a decentralized way, two with consultation, and seven centrally. In MENA, no countries carried out decentralized formulation, two formulated their NPAs with consultation, and 12 centrally.

In ROSA, four countries formulated their NPA with some consultation, two formulated it centrally, and no countries formulated their NPAs through a decentralized process. In TACRO, five countries used a decentralized process to formulate their NPAs, two with some consultation, and 16 centrally. In WCARO, three countries used a decentralized method to formulate the NPA, two with consultation, and 16 centrally.

Of the countries included in the following analysis (i.e. the 50 countries that are actively in the process of NPA decentralization) 24 (48%) formulated their NPAs centrally, 12 (24%) with consultation and 14 (28%) in a decentralized manner. This demonstrates that
all countries formulating their NPA in a decentralized way, and most countries carrying out consultation, logically proceeded to a process of NPA decentralization, implying perhaps that such governments were sensitive to local realities and to the importance of involving local communities.

When NPA Decentralization Commenced

Decentralization of the NPA is a relatively new phenomenon, with the highest proportion of countries (48%) beginning the process during 1993. Colombia, Guatemala, Kenya, Thailand and Niger (10%) began the exercise in 1991, 14 (28%) countries began in 1992, and seven (14%) have begun in 1994.

Levels of NPA Decentralization

It was useful to determine to which administrative level countries were decentralizing their NPAs, even though the names and definitions of such levels differ from country to country. Depending upon the level of decentralization reached, countries were classified into three categories.

The first category includes the countries that were decentralizing their NPAs to the lowest administrative level (the first level of decentralization), e.g. municipalities, communes, communities, cantons, sumans, etc. The second category refers to larger administrative entities (the second level of decentralization) that encompass several first-level entities, e.g. provinces, districts, regions and sometimes states (in a federalized system). In the third category we included those countries that were decentralizing their NPAs to the first and second levels.

Given these classifications, seven countries (14%) were decentralizing to the first level, 15 countries (30%) to the second level, and 28 (56%) to the first and second level (see Table 1, column 3 for each region). EAPRO had the highest proportion of countries (six of seven) decentralizing at the first and second level, followed by WCARO (six of eight) and TACRO (nine of 17).

Many positive effects of NPA decentralization can be seen at the first level, an approach adopted by seven (14%) countries, where smaller-sized human settlements are able to participate and exert more direct control. In 30 per cent of the countries, the NPAs are
being decentralized to only the second level, which in some large countries can be as big as an independent nation. It appears, instead, that decentralizing to both the first and second levels, as 28 countries are doing, will help maintain a balance of functions that could be exclusive of each level; for instance, programme execution could be more intense at the first level, but coordination and control more important at the second level. The tendency in NPA decentralization will probably be to combine these two levels.

Extension of NPA Decentralization

One important element in decentralizing the NPA is the extent of its territorial coverage. Of the 50 countries, 24 were working toward NPA decentralization in the whole country, and 26 were working in selected areas. Some of the latter were in the process of testing methods to decentralize before going full-scale, and others were proceeding by zones instead of undertaking general decentralization from the beginning.

Selected Goals

This section aims to identify the principal Summit Goals that are being addressed through a decentralized approach. In some countries, decentralization is being undertaken to meet only a portion of the Summit Goals, which, for our purposes, we have classified into the four areas of health, education, child development and children in especially difficult circumstances. Further data have been taken from additional information included in the country-office responses.

In 32 countries, NPA decentralization aims at achieving all of the Summit Goals. Of the remaining 18 countries targeting only some of the goals through their NPA decentralization, 17 of them are doing so for health, ten for education, four for child development and seven for children in especially difficult circumstances.

Some countries referred to placing special emphasis on mid-decade goals. In addition, three countries are decentralizing toward achieving their own goals as well as all of the Summit Goals. Brazil, for instance, has included the 29 goals from the 500-day Governors' Mandate, the Philippines has included all goals incorporated in the Philippine Plan of Action for Children, and Bangladesh has included its 4th Five-Year Plan Goals. Other countries have specified certain areas that need the most attention; Chile, for example, has highlighted the
particular aspects of the Summit Goals that are most relevant to its current situation. Three countries do not fall into the above categories: Panama is elaborating its own selected goals, although priority areas have been identified; Paraguay is decentralizing only for the mid-decade goals; and Tanzania decided during the process of programming that its goals will be determined at the local level. Further information can be found in the annexes to the tables (see Table 1, last 5 columns and Table 1 annex for all regions).

Major Outputs

The questionnaire included a section on the principal outputs that have been achieved so far in the process of NPA decentralization. Most countries have achieved a combination of outputs: 38 countries (76%) included methodological outputs, 27 (54%) mobilization, 15 (30%) financing, 36 (72%) management, organization and administration, 27 (54%) political will, and 19 (38%) monitoring and evaluation (see Table 2 and annexes for all regions). Only five countries — Uganda, Vietnam, Pakistan, Mexico and Venezuela — claimed to have outputs in all six categories.

Methodological outputs refer to the development of techniques for applying decentralization in such areas as local programming, local-goal setting, administration, budgeting and costing. For mobilization, aspects such as special events and activities to mobilize the population in favour of the LPA are considered. Financing outputs include the increase or reallocation of resources to finance local programmes of action, and the more appropriate management of local finances through, for example, improved tax collection and funding from other sources (private sector, NGOs, aid agencies, etc.).

The outputs in management, organization and administration are related to the creation of instruments to manage or improve the operation of NPA decentralization. Political will outputs include factors relating to the mobilization of leaders at the national and local levels to engage their support of the process. The last category of monitoring and evaluation includes the development of specially designed systems for follow up, and for monitoring and evaluating the advances and impact of NPA decentralization.

Many countries in ESARO have been able to achieve much in the areas of methodology, mobilization, management and administration and political will, but fall short in financing and monitoring and evaluation. Seven countries have cited methodology as a major output; eight, mobilization; three, financing; seven, management and administration;
six, political will; and three, monitoring and evaluation. Uganda has had particular success in all areas, as the interest generated by the NPA has led to some areas setting up District Programmes of Action for Children Committees (DPAC). Planning and formulating procedures are being coordinated so that DPACs are established in harmony with the district planning processes.

The seven countries of EAPRO demonstrate very positive experiences in the implementation and follow-up of their programmes at the local level. Here again, however, the major downfall was in the area of financing. Seven countries have cited methodology as an area of major output; four, mobilization; two, financing; five, management and administration; five, political will; and three, monitoring and evaluation. In MENA, the four countries that are decentralizing their NPAs cited major outputs in the area of management and administration; two countries mentioned methodology; two, mobilization; two, financing; and three, political will. Only Egypt had prepared a system of monitoring and evaluation.

In ROSA, the four countries cited methodology as their major outputs; two also cited mobilization; one (Pakistan), financing; two, management and administration; two, political will; and three, monitoring and evaluation.

In the 16 countries of TACRO the highest outputs were in the areas of methodology (11 countries) and management and administration (12). Seven also cited mobilization; only four, finances; seven, political will; and seven, monitoring and evaluation.

WCARO countries also cited outputs in methodology and management and administration most often: six declared methodology as a major output; five, management and administration; three, mobilization; two, financing; three, political will; and one (Cameroon) monitoring and evaluation.

The survey did not contain enough questions to enable an appraisal of the depth and extension of the outputs, and consequently it was impossible to measure the impact on such related areas as national planning, public awareness, and the amount and proportion of mobilized resources.

**Participant Institutions**

The participant institutions, authorities and organizations in the process of decentralization provide a good indication for measuring the importance that society places on the process. In order to verify to what level and how decentralization is taking place, it is necessary to
take a look at the institutions involved in the process at both the national and local levels. This section provides a general idea of the kinds of participant institutions involved in the process. All countries feature different combinations of such institutions, and leadership at both the national and local levels varies. (See Tables 3 and 4, and annexes 3 and 4 for all regions).

It was considered important to make a distinction between local- and national-level participants and leaders, since it was assumed that central and local roles would be interdependent under NPA decentralization, and that adequate interaction, coordination, visibility and consistency should exist.

In ESARO, at the national level, two countries involved the Head of State; eight, national public institutions; six, other national institutions; seven, NGOs; and five, international cooperation agencies. At the local level, the heads of first- or second-level governments were not involved in the process for any of the countries in this region. Six countries had participation from first- or second-level institutions; seven from other local organizations; four from local national-institution offices; seven from local-level NGOs; and three from international cooperation agencies.

In EAPRO, at the national level, only Thailand had any involvement from the head of state. All seven countries had participation from national public institutions; five from other national institutions; four from NGOs; and only Vietnam from international cooperation agencies. At the local level, Vietnam involved the heads of first-level governments, namely, the provincial head of government who approves and signs the Provincial Plan of Action. All countries in the region had the involvement of first- or second-level institutions and local national-institution offices; five, other local organizations; and three countries had local-level NGO participation. At this level, no international cooperation agencies were involved.

In MENA, no countries had the participation of the Head of State at national level; all four countries, however, had the involvement of national public institutions, other national institutions and international cooperation agencies. Three countries listed involvement with NGOs at the national level. Here too, at the local level, heads of first- or second-level government were not involved in the process. First- or second-level institutions and other local organizations were involved in all four countries. Three countries listed local-national-institution offices, NGOs and international cooperation agencies as participant institutions at the local level.
Again, in ROSA, no country had the participation of their Heads of State at the national level; all four countries had the participation of national public institutions and two countries had other national institutions, NGOs and international cooperation agencies as participants at the national level. Heads of first or second level of government were involved at the local level in India and Pakistan. Three countries cited involvement from first- or second-level institutions, other local organizations and local national-institution offices. NGOs participated at the local level in the four countries and international cooperation agencies were involved in two countries.

In TACRO, at the national level, El Salvador and Mexico cited participation from their Heads of State in the process. All countries except Peru had some participation from national public institutions, nine of the 16 countries had involvement with other national institutions, and nine with international cooperation agencies. Only six countries cited involvement from national NGOs. At the local level, eight countries had participation from the heads of the first or second level of government; all except Paraguay, from first- or second-level institutions; nine countries, from other local organizations; nine, from local national-institution offices; ten, from NGOs; and only two, Bolivia and Guatemala, from international cooperation agencies at the local level.

In WCARO, at the national level, Cameroon was the only country where the Head of State (President’s Office) became involved. All eight countries had participation from national public institutions and all except for Benin from other national institutions. Four countries involved NGOs, and six involved international cooperation agencies. All countries at the local level managed to involve the heads of the first or second levels of government, except Niger and Nigeria. All countries included first- or second-level institutions and local national-institution offices. Six countries involved other local organizations and six involved international cooperation agencies. Five countries involved local NGOs.

Overall, decentralization at the national level directly involved the Heads of State in 6 of the 50 countries (12%), ministerial public institutions in 48 countries (96%), other public institutions in 31 countries (62%), NGOs in 28 countries (56%), and international cooperation agencies in 29 countries (58%).

At the local level, the local heads of government were involved in 20 countries (40%), institutions of the first and second administrative levels in 44 countries (88%), local units of national institutions in 37 countries (74%), NGOs in 29 countries (58%), and international cooperation agencies in 16 countries (32%). Local organizations, including community
organizations, were mentioned in 36 countries (72%), demonstrating a significant involvement of the local population.

Institutional Roles

This section highlights the roles played by UNICEF and multilateral and bilateral agencies, taking into consideration advocacy, financial, mobilization and technical indicators. In most regions, UNICEF is involved in all four of these areas (see Table 5 for all regions).

In all countries of ESARO, UNICEF is providing advocacy, financial, mobilization and technical support, except in Uganda, where it provides financial and technical support only. In EAPRO, UNICEF is involved only in advocacy for the Republic of Korea; in advocacy, mobilization and technical support for China and the Philippines; in advocacy and technical support for Mongolia; and in all four functions for Indonesia and Vietnam.

In MENA and ROSA, UNICEF is involved in advocacy and provides financial, mobilization and technical support for all eight countries. In TACRO, six countries have indicated UNICEF support in all four areas, two countries in the area of technical support only, two in financial and technical support, two in advocacy and mobilization, and three in technical support only. Ecuador cited advocacy, financial and technical support, Brazil indicated mobilization and technical support and Paraguay, advocacy.

In WCARO, Sierra Leone is the only country to have support from UNICEF in all four areas; two countries were receiving financial and technical support; two countries, advocacy and technical support; Niger, advocacy, financial and technical support; and one country did not specify.

Overall, the advocacy role of UNICEF was cited in 39 countries (78%), its financial role in 35 countries (70%), its role in mobilization in 32 countries (64%), and its technical role in 45 countries (90%).

In ESARO, Botswana was provided advocacy and mobilization from one multilateral agency, but it received no bilateral support; Kenya, Malawi and Swaziland received advocacy, mobilization and technical support from multilateral agencies, while only Kenya and Malawi received advocacy and mobilization support from bilateral agencies. Lesotho received technical and financial support from both multilaterals and bilateral agencies, while Uganda received the same kind of support from multilaterals only. Namibia obtained technical support from both kinds of agencies, São Tome had technical support from only
multilateral agencies, and Rwanda gained support in all four areas from both multilateral and bilateral agencies.

In EAPRO, China stated that there is limited participation from both kinds of agencies but did not provide further details; Mongolia cited only multilateral involvement, without specifying what kind of assistance was being provided. Indonesia and the Republic of Korea were receiving support from neither multilateral or bilateral agencies. The Philippines stated that they gain technical support from both kinds of agencies and Vietnam cited financial and technical support from multilaterals and financial support from bilaterals.

The advocacy and financial roles of multinational agencies were mentioned in 14 countries (28%), their mobilization roles in seven countries (14%), and their technical roles in 14 countries (28%). Twenty-four countries (48%) did not mention any role of multilateral agencies in the process of decentralizing their NPA.

Bilateral cooperation agencies, according to the responses, had an advocacy role in 29 countries (58%), a financial role in 31 countries (62%), a mobilization role in 30 countries (60%), and a technical role in 31 countries (62%).

Children's Participation

According to the responses, children have participated in the decentralization process in only 20 countries (40%). It was very difficult, however, to obtain an accurate estimate on the extent of children's participation in the process. Since the underlying aim of the NPA is to improve the life conditions of children, responses indicating children as participants on the basis of their being the main beneficiaries were discarded. Some responses reflected the instrumentalization of children, but others revealed interesting forms of participation in which children organized themselves to express their own views on their situations, the types of goals to be attained and their opinions on child rights issues. In a few countries, boy scouts and other children's organization participated in activities related to the NPA.

Leadership of NPA Decentralization

An interesting indicator is the authority or institution that leads the process of decentralization. The support received, the authority of decisions, the allocation of funds, and
also the autonomy accorded to different levels for decentralization is influenced by the leading authority or institution.

At the national level in 21 countries (42%) the leader was the ministry, or an important figure within the ministry, of planning, development or finance. In eight countries (16%) the leadership came from a social sector ministry. In seven cases (14%) it was led by an office of child welfare. In 10 countries it was led by special committees, some of them intersectoral, and in other countries a combination of both the public and the private sector.

At the local level, the leader was the local head of government in 22 countries (44%). In nine cases (18%) the process was led by the local or regional planning offices. In five countries (10%) it was led from the centre by a national institution or by a local office of a national institution. Only in four countries (8%) was the process led at the local level by a special committee. In three cases (6%) it was led by local public institutions.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Despite its limitations, this initial study of NPA decentralization gives a broad vision of a dynamic process being undertaken by a growing number of countries. Furthermore, the varying degrees of support provided by UNICEF field offices is occurring despite a lack of any specific worldwide advocacy effort on the part of Headquarters.

Several hypotheses could be drawn to interpret this phenomenon and the different factors influencing it. First, NPA decentralization has to be understood as part of the ongoing tendency of states to decentralize. Second, it facilitates the management of national programmes in countries with populations dispersed over extended territory, or with heterogenous social groups. Third, it builds to some extent on a growing tradition of cooperation agencies working with area-base projects and basic-services strategies. Fourth, it responds to the pressures of local communities for gaining more control over identifying their problems and devising their own ways of solving them. Fifth, NPA decentralization may possibly be responding to the commitments made by Heads of State to give support to local governments in developing their own programmes of action.

The data show that in many countries the process of NPA decentralization commenced very soon after the World Summit and advanced at a rapid pace, beginning in many cases at the methodological stage of NPA formulation. While it could be argued that
only half of the countries surveyed are carrying out NPA decentralization, more than half of the remaining countries have stated their intent to begin in the near future.

If the trend over the first three months of 1994 continues, the total number of countries embarking on NPA decentralization in 1994 will match last year’s total of 24. On the other hand, only 6 per cent of the field offices stated that NPA decentralization will definitely not occur in those countries. It would appear that the countries decentralizing their NPAs are larger, and in some sense more modern, with better conditions for development. This advances the hypothesis that NPA decentralization, if other preconditions are maintained, will play a positive role in helping these countries reach the decade goals.

Although countries in some regions have advanced at a particularly rapid pace in decentralizing their NPAs, all regions are moving forward without substantial differences. Only MENA has fewer than one third of its countries undertaking NPA decentralization; in the other regions, close to half of the countries are involved in the process, while in TACRO three quarters of the countries are undertaking NPA decentralization. When the countries that have declared their intent to decentralize their NPAs begin the process, the differences currently found among regions should even out.

Diverse outputs of NPA decentralization have been reported, but this kind of research provides few elements to interpret them. More extensive research is needed to produce this, and it is expected that the in-depth case studies will provide better elements for such interpretation.

It can be presumed that a more balanced participation would make the process healthier and more productive. Institutional involvement in decentralization covers a broad range of commitments, and the process demonstrates a balanced composition of political, technical, community and civic forces. The spotty participation of multilateral and bilateral organizations is evident in many countries; the role of UNICEF, however, is cited as being very extensive. In addition, NGOs and civil society appear not to play a very substantial role in any country. Children, for instance, are seldom present as actors in the process, and in many of the references to children’s participation their role is not well defined.

The process of decentralization is often seen as a technical problem, whose solutions call for a technical orientation: in a large majority of countries the leading institution is the office of planning, development or finance. The participation of such institutions can facilitate the actual incorporation of NPA decentralization into the regular mechanisms of the state. The necessary political support seems to exist as well: the participation of the political
authorities has been mentioned in many countries. The balance between the political and
technical forces could be a determinant factor for endurance and sustainability.

The information presented here makes drawing general conclusions a risky
endeavour. Countries have adopted a wide variety of strategies in attempting to accomplish
the same objectives, perhaps out of the necessity to respond to particular national realities
and conditions. General consensus exists about the need for decentralization, if not the
method to accomplish it, and external agencies, while pushing for decentralization, do not
exert control over the process. This leaves each country to chart its own process through
action and practice, implying a very rich and creative process.

Future recommendations on ways to decentralize NPAs should allow countries to
maintain this capacity for adaptation, creativity and flexibility. Anything other than general
policy and the presentation of alternative methods and techniques would be an imposition,
which is contradictory to the spirit of decentralization.

VII. TABLES AND TABLE ANNEXES ON NPA DECENTRALIZATION

The tables and table annexes presented in this chapter give the information obtained from
the 50 developing countries in the process of decentralizing their NPAs. The countries are
grouped into the six UNICEF operational regions (ESARO, EAPRO, MENA, ROSA, TACRO,
WCARO) and the data cover these five areas: Tables 1: NPA formulation, NPA
decentralization, and selected goals for decentralization; Tables 2: major outputs to date;
Tables 3: national level participant institutions: government, NGOs and community groups;
Tables 4: local level participant institutions: government, NGOs and community groups;
Tables 5: role of participants and leadership. Following the six tables (one per region) for each
of the first four areas of information, annexes provide specific information that individual
countries furnished on their questionnaires.

As previously pointed out, the country data reflects the status of NPA decentralization
in these countries as of March 1994 (December 1993 for TACRO and January 1994 for
WCARO).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPA formulation process</th>
<th>NPA decentralization experience</th>
<th>selected goals (1)</th>
<th>when NPA decentralization started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Table only shows presence or absence of some selected goals
(2) Data reflects the decentralization of the NPA as part of the ongoing NPA formulation process
(3) Decentralization process is under preparation/negotiation
(4) To be decided at local level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>NPA formulation process</th>
<th>NPA decentralization experience</th>
<th>selected goals (1)</th>
<th>when NPA decentralization started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>consultation</td>
<td>1st/2nd country</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia(2)</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd some areas</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>consultation</td>
<td>2nd country</td>
<td>selected</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd country</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd some areas</td>
<td>all(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd country</td>
<td>selected</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd country</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Table only shows presence or absence of some selected goals
(2) Indonesia does not have an NPA as such. Summit goals are incorporated in 5 Year Development Plans - Local Plans of maternal and child survival and development in selected areas
(3) Goals include those identified in Philippine Plan of Action for Children (PPAC)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPA formulation process</th>
<th>NPA decentralization experience</th>
<th>selected goals (1)</th>
<th>when NPA decentralization started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>consultation</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>country(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Table only shows presence or absence of some selected goals
(2) Planned to cover all Governorates by 1995
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>NPA formulation process</th>
<th>NPA decentralization experience</th>
<th>selected goals (1)</th>
<th>when NPA decentralization started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>consultation</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>consultation</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>consultation</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>consultation</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Table only shows presence or absence of some selected goals

(2) Also 4th Five Year Plan Goals
### Table 1. NPA FORMULATION, NPA DECENTRALIZATION, SELECTED GOALS FOR DECENTRALIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPA formulation process</th>
<th>NPA decentralization experience</th>
<th>selected goals (1)</th>
<th>when NPA decentralization started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>consultation(2)</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>consultation(5)</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Table shows only presence or absence of some selected goals
(2) Subject to states' approval
(3) Also 2º goals for 500 days Governors’ Mandate
(4) Special emphasis on mid-term goals
(5) NPA was preceded by a Provincial Programme of Action
Table 1. NPA FORMULATION, NPA DECENTRALIZATION, SELECTED GOALS FOR DECENTRALIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPA formulation process</th>
<th>NPA decentralization experience</th>
<th>selected goals(1)</th>
<th>when NPA decentralization started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
<td>selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent African Rep</td>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>centralized(3)</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>some areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>consultation(4)</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Table only shows presence or absence of some selected goals
(2) Post NPA regional health sector planning
(3) NPA Under preparation
(4) Sensitization meetings held at district level. NPA not yet completed but Local Programme of Action exists for Freetown
ANNEX TO TABLE 1: SELECTED GOALS

ESARO

NAMIBIA
The main goals to be emphasized will be decided after problem analysis and plan development has taken place. The goals will include additions to the decade goals.

RWANDA
To increase the use of ORT, implement baby friendly hospitals, eliminate Vitamin A deficiency, diarrhoeal diseases and acute respiratory infections. To continue the struggle against AIDS and the promotion of nutrition and household food security, safe water and sanitation and to ensure that iodized salt is available in the whole country. Training on the Convention of the Rights of the Child is also being promoted.

EAPRO

KOREA, REPUBLIC
The mid-decade goals have been achieved and the emphasis is now on daycare centers, training and breastfeeding.

THAILAND
Goals for health and nutrition include IDD in northern provinces, ARI, CDD and EPI. Goals forCEDC include all categories with specific attention to child prostitution, child labour and street children.

MENA

SYRIA
All Summit Goals apart from those relating to development.

ROSA

BANGLADESH
All summit goals are incorporated, plus the 4th Five Year Plan Goals including: reduction of IMR, U5MR, MMR, Immunization Coverage, CDD, ARI, BFHI and Primary School enrollment completion.

TACRO

ARGENTINA
Maternal and health goals.

BRAZIL
Special emphasis on mid-term and new goals.

CHILE
Mainly goals relating to the following: early stimulation, basic education, mother and child care, nutrition, problems derived from the consumption of alcohol, drugs and tobacco, maltreatment, abandonment or sexual abuse of children and adolescents, handicapped children, children in conflict with the law, environmental problems in Chile and how they relate to children and to health, water and basic sanitation.

EL SALVADOR
Virtual elimination of neonatal tetanus, reduction of mortality due to measles, universal immunization, eradication of polio by 1995, 100% of all maternity units as BFH, to achieve by 80% the use of ORT, virtual elimination of iodine and vitamin A deficiency disorders.

MEXICO
Special emphasis on the following selected goals: elevation of immunization to 90% or more, elimination of neonatal tetanus, virtual elimination of measles, elimination of poliomyelitis, virtual elimination of Vitamin A deficiency, elimination of diseases caused by iodine deficiency, reduction by half by 1994 of
mortality of under 5s due to ADD as compared with 1990 figures. To achieve 80% usage of ORT, reduction by one third of mortality rate caused by ARI, making all hospitals and maternity wards "baby-friendly", modernized basic education, increased availability of and access to preschool education to 75%, reduction of illiteracy rate to 8%, to maintain an annual increase of Water and Basic Sanitation Services, to reach 3 million people with drinking water and 2.5 million with sanitation services, give prenatal attention to 80% of pregnant women by trained personnel, attention by trained personnel to 80% of the births, 50% coverage by trained personnel during postpartum period, access to medical services for 80% of high-risk pregnancies and for obstetric emergencies, provide rooming-in for 100% of the institutions which provide care for deliveries, and create committees for the study of maternal and perinatal mortality in 100% of hospitals.

NICARAGUA
To reduce infant mortality by 15% achieving 61 per 1,000 live births and reduce maternal mortality by 50%, achieve completion of at least the 4th grade by 75% of children of school age and to expand national potable water coverage to 68% with an urban level of 80% and rural level of 50%.

PARAGUAY
Mid-term goals for 1995.

PERU
Eradication of poliomyelitis and elimination of neonatal tetanus by 1995, to reduce deaths due to measles by 95%, to raise EPI coverage to 85% by 1995, to increase by 80% the use of ORT with feeding in children under 5 years of age with diarrhea, to reduce the mortality due to pneumonia by 20% in children under 5 years of age in selected areas, and to iodize salt for human consumption in those areas where endemic goiter is a public health problem.

VENEZUELA
Health and education goals.

WCARO

BENIN
Increase EPI coverage to at least 80% of 0-11-month-old children and pregnant women and at least 10% for measles, increase ORS use to 80%, eliminate vitamin A deficiency disorders, ensure that iodized salt is available in the whole country, and promote breastfeeding through BFHI and BFWI.

CAMEROON
Goals relating to EPI, girl child education and guinea worm.

COTE D'IVOIRE
Reduce IMR from 97 to 50 per 1,000, reduce MMR by 400 to 200 births per 100,000, attain 90% rate of school enrolment, increase literacy rate in women and girls from 30% to 60%, increase rate of the population with access to safe water.

MAURITITANIA
Special emphasis on health, nutrition, water and sanitation, basic education and CRC goals.

NIGER
All goals are included apart from those related to education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Mobilization</th>
<th>Financing</th>
<th>Management/ Administration</th>
<th>Political Will</th>
<th>Monitoring/ Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. MAJOR OUTPUTS TO DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>methodology</th>
<th>mobilization</th>
<th>financing</th>
<th>management/administration</th>
<th>political will</th>
<th>monitoring/evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. MAJOR OUTPUTS TO DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>methodology</th>
<th>mobilization</th>
<th>financial</th>
<th>management/adm.</th>
<th>political will</th>
<th>monitoring/evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. MAJOR OUTPUTS TO DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>methodology</th>
<th>mobilization</th>
<th>financing</th>
<th>management/administration</th>
<th>political will</th>
<th>monitoring/evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methodology</td>
<td>mobilization</td>
<td>financing</td>
<td>management/administration</td>
<td>political will</td>
<td>monitoring/evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>◼</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>◼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Political Will</td>
<td>Monitoring/ Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX TO TABLE 2: MAJOR OUTPUTS TO DATE

ESARO

BOTSWANA
A methodology for districts to prepare their own programmes of action drawing on the NPA and district level data to set priorities and determine activities.

KENYA
The decentralization process is in the form of programmes addressing various aspects of the NPA goals, including district development plans. The NPA has created a greater awareness among partners of concerns for children.

LESOTHO
The NPA is currently being produced through a participatory process. Monitoring and evaluation baseline data is being collected and imputed as an ongoing process.

MALAWI
The negotiation process has just begun with the first public recognition of the degree of poverty with the release of the UNICEF financed Situational Analysis on Poverty (December 1993). The debate has begun, but no formal NPA decentralization has started to date.

NAMIBIA
NPA decentralization process has begun in one municipality and four of the 13 regions.

RWANDA
Not specified.

SAO TOME
Not specified.

SWAZILAND
Aspects of methodology, mobilization, financing, political will and management have been considered and budgeted.

TANZANIA
Plans being formulated for decentralizing the NPA with the objective of developing district programmes of action.

UGANDA
Interest in the NPA has been generated. Some districts have set up District Plans of Action for Children Committees (DPAC). Planning and formulating procedures are being implemented for establishing DPACs in harmony with district planning processes.

EAPRO

CHINA
Provincial, sectoral and some municipal, city and county plans of action.

INDONESIA
Indonesia does not produce actual national plans of action but incorporates their functional roles in the country’s REP LiTAs (Five year Development Plans). These plans contain broad policy guidelines and more specific development targets (i.e. for provinces). Over the last several years detailed Plans of Action for Mother and Child Survival and Development have been implemented in selected districts and are produced following extensive local, provincial and national consultations. Included in these plans are specific projects and funding levels which the Government agrees to conduct with the support of UNICEF.

KOREA, REPUBLIC
Implementation of the NPA is underway.

MONGOLIA
All 18 aimags and four main cities in Mongolia have appointed commissions for NPA formulation. Several draft Local Plans of Action are nearing completion. A five-Aimag Western Regional Seminar on NPA Implementation was held last year and the first aimag-level seminar was held in Obohangay Aimag the same week. All aimags contacted are well motivated and committed to the process. A National Seminar brought all aimags together at the end of last year.
PHILIPPINES
About 25-30 per cent of the country's 60 cities, 76 provinces and 1,500 municipalities have prepared Local Plans of Action. These vary in scope, detail and quality. Some are a compilation of programmes for children and some contain some budget estimates. The process needs a thorough review and a more systematic approach with the objective of integrating it with the existing planning, legislative, budgeting and programming process of local governments. Local governments prepare about 25-30 local plans with which the NPA process competes or needs to be linked, they have a long tradition of preparing various plans even prior to the national proclamation of the Philippine Plan of Action for Children (PPAC).

THAILAND
Preparations are underway for subnational NPAs in provinces and municipalities. Governors and mayors are included in the social mobilization effort. 15 northern provinces and 15 municipalities have been provisionally selected to implement the subnational NPAs for goals relating to health, nutrition and CEDC in 1994. A national workshop has been planned for 20 June 1994 to finalize selection. Various meetings have already been held with attendance by all governors and mayors.

VIETNAM
All 53 provinces have programmes of action, training of provincial staff is underway, a workshop was held to develop a model PPA and training workshops have been instigated to establish social indicators inclusive of those to monitor NPA implementation. Numerous advocacy/social mobilization initiatives at national and local levels have taken place, a National Summit for Children was organized in 1991. The CRC Two Year Implementation Report has been developed, which features the NPA as a key national CRC response. There is a Journalist Club for children's goals (MDG/NPA focus), the CPCC is being assigned the responsibility for formulation of NPA and CPCC chairperson has participated in the Regional Conference on NPA Formulation. There has been the creation of a Minister for Child Protection and Care and the NPA approval by the National Assembly. UNICEF and CPCC will be conducting a donor conference in support of the NPA/PPAs in September 1994.

MENA

EGYPT
A national monitoring and evaluation system is being prepared to allow for more appropriate resource allocation and decision making. A sub-national situation analysis and corresponding plans of action are being implemented in five governorates where UNICEF Area Base programmes are set up.

SUDAN
The leadership by the Ministry of Planning and Investment with a decentralized management of the process has resulted in a participatory effort by all concerned ministries/agencies.

SYRIA
An agreement with the Government to commence NPA implementation by March 1994 within the governorates has been reached.

TURKEY
NPA decentralization has begun in eight of the 76 provinces.

ROSA

BANGLADESH
The approach to district plans and methodology to monitor the goals have been identified.

INDIA
Involvement of chief ministers and other political leaders and intersectoral consultations with NGO participation have begun. The database and other mechanisms for monitoring are emerging as major outputs.

PAKISTAN
A higher resource allocation process has been started. Some legislative bills are at a preparatory phase. The Federal Bureau of Statistics has been given the responsibility for monitoring social sector indicators. Development Boards have been established under the Social Action Programme with members of national and provincial assemblies as members. These are elected representatives and their role would be to monitor and oversee the Programme at the district level.

SRI LANKA
Not specified.
ARGENTINA

Programme: The NPA is mainly concerned with mother and child health and nutrition promoting improvement of health and nutritional status of poor mothers and children and care and development of pre-school children. It promotes the Government’s ongoing efforts to decentralize social service management and financing. The plan is flexible and adapts basic services to local conditions. The NPA is structured as a mechanism for financing activities which provinces have access to. Primary health care is beginning to be established as main priority of public health sector and child-development services have been created. The family is the basic unit to be targeted. Benefits have been seen for 400,000 pregnant women, 700,000 children under-2 and 500,000 children between two and five, per year.

Financing: US$413 million needed over 5 years to achieve the goals. The NPA is financed by US$160 million World Bank loan for the programme and the remainder through government budgetary allotments. A second project with World Bank is scheduled for 1995.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Plan information system (SIP) is established, including administration, project management and monitoring.

BOLIVIA

Los Niños de la Comuna: Responsabilidad de todos, Declaración de Santa Cruz, Compromiso de los Alcades de Bolivia en Defensa de los Niños.

BRAZIL

Programmes of action for 24 States, follow-up of plans of action, establishment of 19 State Councils on behalf of children.

CHILE

Six regional plans in draft form. They are all being reformulated for local/sub-national goals.

COLOMBIA

Departmental Planning Workshops: nine (out of 33), Municipal Planning Workshops.

COSTA RICA

Definition of the baseline, establishment of Inter-Institutional Committee, inter-sectoral work plan for 1994.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

PPA of the province of Salcedo being implemented according to available resources. The process NPA decentralization has been linked with promotion of the “Mayors as defenders of children” initiative. National Planning Office is interested in working at provincial level and has assigned persons for follow-up of decentralization process.

ECUADOR

Two provincial technical programmes to be implemented. New process to adapt NPA and LPAs in relation to new political realities and new government.

EL SALVADOR

Not specified.

GUATEMALA

Diagnosis of Quiche, Plan of Action, and Municipal Plan are in progress, constitution of and Inter-Institutional Commission for the Social Development of Quiche, consolidation of "Comités Municipales".

MEXICO


NICARAGUA


PANAMA

Priority areas defined, projects under elaboration.

PARAGUAY

16 regional workshops for NPA presentation.

PERU

Since August 1992, 3 provincial plan of action technical committees have been established in Cajamarca, Cuzco and Trujillo, headed by the provincial mayors. These proposals will be launched in December. At regional level, a technical committee was established to formulate a regional plan of action for children.

URUGUAY
A project has been elaborated and is due to be implemented in January 1994 to establish a decentralized execution of the NPA. The first stage of NPA decentralization has been accomplished in this way.

**VENEZUELA**

Two municipal plans of action are almost finished. Twenty municipalities working on plans of action.

**WCARO**

**BENIN**

The first draft of the NPA is available for four regions. The process is ongoing at subnational levels. Completion is planned for the first quarter in 1994.

**CAMEROON**

Not specified.

**CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC**

A series of studies and seminars have been carried out on the microplanning approach (1992-93), a series of micro-programmes in the Nana-Grebizi region set up, and the inter-ministry commission on micro-planning constituted.

**COTE D'IVOIRE**

Sensibilization and mobilization missions are planned for 1994.

**MAURITANIA**

Decentralized policies for regional level health planning and delivery together with cost recovery mechanism approved by Government Decree. Essential drugs policy has been implemented together with procurement (through the national budget), of US$1.6 million worth of essential drugs through UNICEF.

**NIGER**

Awareness creation as to the real needs of the population and actions that need to be taken in the areas of nutrition, sanitation and water.

**NIGERIA**

State functionaries have been effectively mobilized to implement CSPD goals at state level. Preparation of State Programme of Action (SPA) is ongoing in specific UNICEF-supported states, in others the process is underway.

**SIERRA LEONE**

Freetown City Council Plan of Action for Women and Children and draft NPA which will be finalized during first quarter of 1994.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>head of state</th>
<th>national public institutions</th>
<th>other national institutions</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>international cooperation agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>National Public Institutions</td>
<td>Other National Institutions</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>International Cooperation Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. PARTICIPANT INSTITUTIONS AT NATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>head of state</th>
<th>national public institutions</th>
<th>other national institutions</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>international cooperation agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. PARTICIPANT INSTITUTIONS AT NATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>head of state</th>
<th>national public institutions</th>
<th>other national institutions</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>international cooperation agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Head of State</td>
<td>National Public Institutions</td>
<td>Other National Institutions</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NPA Decentralization Overview: West and Central Africa Region, January 1994

### Table 3. Participant Institutions at National Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Head of State</th>
<th>National Public Institutions</th>
<th>Other National Institutions</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>International Cooperation Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Rep</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX TO TABLE 3: NATIONAL LEVEL PARTICIPANT INSTITUTIONS:
GOVERNMENT, NGOS AND INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

ESARO

BOTSWANA
Government (unspecified)
University of Botswana
Food Technology Research Services
Botswana Red Cross
YWCA

KENYA
Ministries of Planning and National Development, Health
Municipal Authorities of Kisumu and Mombasa
University of Nairobi
Kenya Medical Women Associates
Kenyan Economic Association
FEMNET
World Vision International
German Cooperation Agency (GTZ)
Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA)
Inter-American Committee for Agricultural Development (CIDA)
UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)
UNDP, USAID

LESOTHO
Ministries of Planning, Agriculture, Health, Education, Home Affairs and Information and Broadcasting
Lesotho Council of NGOs
Private Health Association of Lesotho
Lesotho Christian Council
Churches
40 National NGOs
International Agencies(to be involved later on)

MALAWI
Office of the President
National Steering Committee on Poverty Alleviation Including:
Government, Donors, NGOs, Academics and the Private Sector, Legal Resources Centre.
UNDP

NAMIBIA
National Planning Commission
Ministries of Education, Health and Water Affairs
NGOs

RWANDA
Ministries of Planning, Health, Information, Labour and Social Affairs, Primary and Secondary Schools,
Internal and District Development, Family and Women’s Development, Finance, Justice and Trade,
Manufacturers and Handicraft
ORINFOR Rwandese Information Office
National Population Office (ONAPo), National Programme of Social Action (PNAS), National
Pharmaceutic Laboratory (LABOPHAR), National Rwandese Bank (BNR), National Office of Food Supplies
(OPROVIA)
Sanitation Information System (SIS)
National Rwandese University (NRU), Butare University Hospital
Rwandese Brewery and Lemonadery (BRALIRWA)
Sulfo Rwanda (Soap Factories)
Association of Local Churches
Rwandese Chamber of Commerce and Industries (CCIR)
Caritas Rwanda
Rotary International
BUFFMAR
Care International
Child Bornefonden  
National Service of Family Action (SNAF)  
Lions Club (RFODR)  
Women's Network for Working Rural Development  
Blind Associations, Physically Handicapped Associations  
WHO, UNDP, UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), PAM, CEE  
US Agency for International Development  
Apostolic Nunciature  
Wellstart Belgian Embassy

SAO TOME  
Ministries of Health, Education, Finance and Cooperation and Development  
Red Cross  
Children's Friends Association  
WHO

SWAZILAND  
Ministries of Economic Planning and Health  
Head of Regional Administrators  
Swaziland Infant Nutrition Action Network  
Sebenta Institute for Adult Literacy  
SACRO (NGO for street children)  
Council and Conference of Churches  
WHO  
UNDP

TANZANIA  
Secretariat of National Coordinating Committee for Child Survival, Protection and Development

UGANDA  
Ministries of Finance and Economic Planning, Health, National Resources, Labour and Social Affairs and Education  
Makerere University of Social Research  
Child Health Development Centre  
The Aids Support Organization (TASO)  
World Vision International (WVI)  
Uganda Community-based Health Care Association (UCHB)  
Uganda Community-Based Association for Child Welfare (UCOBAC)  
UNDP  
Italian Cooperation Agency (AVSI)  
Action for Development (ACFODE)  
Uganda Association of Women Lawyers (FIDA)  
National Council for Children (NCC)

EAPRO

CHINA  
State Council Committee for Women and Children  
All China Women's Federation (ACWF)  
Sectoral Ministries  
State Statistical Bureau  
China Disabled Persons Federation  
China Law Society (for CRC)

INDONESIA  
Sectoral Agencies  
Department of Home Affairs  
National Planning Board (BAPPENAS)  
Local Planning Boards (BAPPEDA)  
Family Welfare Movement (PKK)

KOREA, REPUBLIC  
Ministry of Health and Social Affairs (MOHSA)  
National Council of Organizations for Children  
National Authority for BFHI
MONGOLIA
National Centre for Children
National Development Board
Ministry of Health, Science and Education, Population Policy and Labour, Justice and Finance
National Police - Juvenile Division
Mongolian Women’s Federation
Mongolian Red Cross

PHILIPPINES
Council for the Welfare of Children
Departments of Social Welfare and Development, Education, Culture and Sports, Health, Agriculture,
Justice, Interior and Local Government and Labour and Employment
National Economic and Development Authority
National Nutrition Council
Private individuals on CWC board
Selected NGOs
National Legislators

THAILAND
Office of the Permanent Secretary (Office of Prime Minister)
Office of the Inspector Generals (Office of Prime Minister)
Departments of Public Welfare, Labour Welfare and Protection, Non-Formal Education, Communicable
Diseases Control, Health and Community Development
Police Department
National Economic and Social Development Board
National Youth Bureau
Chulalongkorn University
Office of the Attorney General
Nutrition Division
National Council for Child and Youth Development
ILO/International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour
WHO

VIETNAM
National Assembly (to approve the NPA)
Cabinet Minister (to carry out CRC monitoring)
Committee for the Protection and Care of Children
State Planning Committee
Ministries of Education and Training, Public Health, Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs, Foreign Affairs
and Information and Culture
Vietnam Women’s Union

EGYPT
Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS)
Sectoral Ministries
Universities
OXFAM
Ford Foundation
World Bank
National Council for Children and Motherhood
Social Fund for Development
NGOs
UNDP, UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)
Scouts
Governorates Planning Units

SUDAN
Ministry of Economic Planning and Investment
Sectoral Ministries/Agencies of Health, Education, Social Welfare and Water and Sanitation
National Council for Child Welfare
Regional Planning Units of the State’s Government
Office of the Wali (State Governors)
NGOs
UNDP, UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA, WHO)

SYRIA
Ministries of Planning, Health and Local Administration
Executive Committee at Governorate Level
Directorate of Health and Education
WGU
Youth Union
Pioneers Organization (Children's Organization)
WHO
UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)

TURKEY
Ministries of the Interior, Health and National Education, Foreign Affairs, Labour and Ministry of State in Charge of Women
State Planning Organization
WHO
UNDP, UN Sub-group on Children (Ref. Country Strategy Note)

ROSA

BANGLADESH
Government Ministries involved in UNICEF assisted projects
NGOs who are supporting/implementing projects related to women and children

INDIA
National Institute for Rural Development
National Institute for Nutrition
National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development
National Institute of Urban Affairs
Department of Women and Child Development
Ministry of Human Resources Development
Government of India
Committee for American Relief Everywhere
World Food Programme

PAKISTAN
National Planning and Development Division
Commission for Child Welfare and Development
Family Planning Association of Pakistan
Punjab Social Services Board
Orangi Pilot Project
Trust for Voluntary Organization
Aurat Foundation
Bahoo Association
Adult Basic Education Society
Athan-i-Latif
Punjab & Sindh Education Foundations
Female Youth Croupus
National Rural Support Programme
Baluchistan and NWFP Rural Support Programmes
World Bank
Asian Development bank
UNDP, UNESCO, UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), United Nations Women's Fund
Inter-American Committee for Agricultural Development (CIDA)
US Agency for International Development (USAID)
WHO, ILO, World Food Programme (WFP)
SRI LANKA
  Ministries of Policy Planning, Health, Education, Social Welfare, Education
  and Local Government

TACRO

ARGENTINA
  Ministry of Health
  World Bank
  UNDP

BOLIVIA
  Ministry of Human Development
  Organismo Nacional del Menor, Mujer y Familia (ONAMFA)

BRAZIL
  Ministry of Health
  National Health Foundation
  National Health Council
  National Council for Children and Adolescents
  National Council for Women’s Rights
  Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics
  National Confederation of State and Municipal Health Secretaries (CONNASS and CONASEMS)

CHILE
  Ministry of Planning
  Family Commission of the Senate
  Socio-Economic Council
  Inter-Ministerial Committee for Children
  Supporting Group to the Convention on the Rights of the Child

COLOMBIA
  First Lady’s Office
  NPA Coordinator
  Regional Advisers
  Representatives of Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar (ICBF)
  Ministries of Health, Education and Labour
  National Planning Office
  Presidential Counselor for Youth, Women and Family
  PAHO

COSTA RICA
  Ministries of Education, Labour and Justice
  IMAS
  Patronato Nacional de la Infancia
  Centro Para Desarrollo de Mujer y familia
  Universities
  NGOs
  MIDEPLAN
  UNDP
  OPS

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
  National Planning Office (ONAPLAN)

ECUADOR
  National Planning Office
  Ministries of Health and Education
  Instituto Nacional del Niño y La Familia (INNFA)

EL SALVADOR
  The President
  Presidential Cabinet
  Ministries of Planning, Health, Education and Water and Sanitation,
  United Nations High Commission for Refugees
  PAHO
  UNDP
GUATEMALA
National Reconstruction Committee
Rural Area and Family Education Department
Child and Family Welfare Directorate
Cattle Raising Services General Directorate
Forests and Wildlife General Directorate
Ministry of Urban and Rural Development
National Women's Bureau
Programme for Assistance to Widows and Orphans
General Secretariat of the National Economic Planning Council (SEGEPLAN)
Help Yourselves and We Will Help You Association, Fighting Hunger Foundation
Redh Integral, Health for All
Society for the Development of the Guatemalan Family
Guatemala-Germany Cooperation Programme of Food for Work
Barefooted Physicians
SEDEPLAN, GTZ

MEXICO
National Commission for the Follow-up and Evaluation of the NPA
National System for Integral Family Development (DIF)
National Water Commission
National Food Commission
Mexico City's Governing Body (DDF)
Attorney General's Office
Mexico City's Attorney General's Office
Vice-Ministry of Programming and Budget
Mexico's National Oil Company (PEMEX)
Mexican Social Security Institute (IMSS)
Federal Employees' Social Security Institute (ISSSTE)
National Solidarity Programme
National Basic Product Distribution Network (CONASUPO)
National Fund for Low-cost Housing (FONHAPO)
Youth Integration Centres
National Council of Volunteer Women, National Council for Education Promotion, Child Council
National Institute of Adult Education
National Indian Institute
"Salvador Zubiran" National Nutrition Institute

NICARAGUA
Social Cabinet
National Assembly

PANAMA
Social Emergency Fund
UNDP
Interamericana Development Bank

PARAGUAY
Ministries of Public Health and Social Welfare, Culture and Education and Agriculture
Technical Secretariate of Planning
Catholic Church

PERU
NPA Special Commission

URUGUAY
Technical Cooperation Bureau of the Planning and Budget Office
Central Directive Council (CODICEN)
Ministry of Health (MSP)
National Administration of Public Education (ANEP)
National Nutrition Institute (INDA)
National Institute for the Family and Women (INFEM)
Programme Care Centers for Children and the Family (CAIF)
CLAEH
Gurises
Movimiento Paulina Luisi
PLEMUU

VENEZUELA
Ministries of the Family and Sanitation
Ministry of Sanitation
Venezuelan Planning Institute (IVEPLAN)
Childrens' NGOs Coordinating Committee

WCARO

BENIN
Ministries of Planning, Health, National Education, Social Affairs and Rural Development

CAMEROON
Office of the President
Ministries of Health, Education, Social Welfare and Women's Affairs and Planning

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
Ministry of Planning
High Commission on Decentralization

COTE D'IVOIRE
Direction Générale du Plan
Ministry of Planning
Other Ministries concerned with the NPA
NGOs
National Private Sector
Department in charge of population (being created by the Ministry of Planning)

MAURITANIA
Sectoral Ministries supervised by Ministry of Planning
UN System
French Ministry of Cooperation
GTZ
World Bank
NGOs

NIGER
Comité National pour la Survie, la Protection et le Développement de l'enfant
Agences de Coopération multilatérales et bilatérales
ONGs internationales et nationales
Associations nationales

NIGERIA
National Planning Commission
National Commission for Women
National Ministries of Health, Education, Water Resources
National NGOs

SIERRA LEONE
Departments of National Development and Economic Planning
Departments of Health and Social Services, Education, Agriculture, Energy and Power and Internal Affairs National Council for Children
### Table 4. PARTICIPANT INSTITUTIONS AT LOCAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>heads of first or second level government</th>
<th>first or second level institutions</th>
<th>other local organizations</th>
<th>local national institutions offices</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>international cooperation agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
<td>°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heads of first or second level government</td>
<td>first or second level institutions</td>
<td>other local organizations</td>
<td>local national institutions offices</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>international cooperation agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Heads of first or second level government</td>
<td>First or second level institutions</td>
<td>Other local organizations</td>
<td>Local national institutions offices</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>International cooperation agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of first or second level government</td>
<td>First or second level institutions</td>
<td>Other local organizations</td>
<td>Local national institutions offices</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>International cooperation agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. PARTICIPANT INSTITUTIONS AT LOCAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Heads of first or second level government</th>
<th>First or second level institutions</th>
<th>Other local organizations</th>
<th>Local national institutions offices</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>International cooperation agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4. Participant Institutions at Local Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heads of first or second level government</th>
<th>First or second level institutions</th>
<th>Other local organizations</th>
<th>Local national institutions offices</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th>International cooperation agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent African Rep</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX TO TABLE 4: LOCAL LEVEL PARTICIPANT INSTITUTIONS:
GOVERNMENT, NGOS, INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY GROUPS

**ESARO**

**BOTSWANA**
Government (unspecified)
University of Botswana
Food Technology Research Services
Botswana Red Cross
YWCA

**KENYA**
Ministries of Planning and National Development and Health
Municipal Authorities of Ksumu and Mombasa
Nairobi City Council
Care Kenya
Bamako Initiative Communities
Sub-locational CSD Committees
District/Divisional Development Committees

**LESOTHO**
Ministries of Planning, Agriculture, Health, Education, Home Affairs and Information and Broadcasting
Lesotho Council of NGOs
Private Health Association of Lesotho
Lesotho Christian Council
Churches
40 National NGOs
International Leaders and Village Cluster Leaders (to be involved later)

**MALAWI**
NGOs
Church related groups

**NAMIBIA**
Ministries of Education, Health and Water Affairs
Regional Councillors
Mayors' Offices
Community Groups (unspecified)
NGOs
WHO
UNDP

**RWANDA**
Ministry of Planning (through Municipality)

**SAO TOME**
Not applicable

**TANZANIA**
Regional and District CSPD Officers

**SWAZILAND**
Head of Regional Administrators
Regional Administrators
Regional Development Committees and Health Teams
Chiefs
Local Development Committees
Swaziland Infant Nutrition Action Network
Sebenta Institute for Adult Literacy
SACRO (NGO for Street Children)
Council and Conference of Churches
Rural Health Motivators
Women's Groups
Community Development Committees
WHO
UNDP
UGANDA
District Executive Officer
District Education Officer
District Medical Officer
District Executive Secretary and Planning Team
Representative of Communities
RCs - NGOs collaborating in the social sector development in the district
Interested groups (Women's, Religious etc.)

EAPRO

CHINA
Provincial and lower-level Government
Sectoral Agencies
Local All China Women's Federation

INDONESIA
Sectoral Agencies
Department of Home Affairs

KOREA, REPUBLIC
National Council of Organizations for Children
National Authority for BFHI

MONGOLIA
Aimag Governors
Aimag City Administration
Aimag Children's Centres
Physicians and Hospital Staff
Local Mongolian Women's Federation
Local Mongolian Red Cross

PHILIPPINES
Local Government Units
Local Academic Institutions
Department of Social Welfare and Development
National Economic and Development Authority
Selected NGOs

THAILAND
Office of the Inspector Generals (Office of the Prime Minister)
Office of the Attorney General
Department of Communicable Diseases Control
Planning units of the Offices of the Governors and Mayors
Provincial and Municipal Education Offices
Provincial, district and municipal health offices
Provincial, district and municipal social welfare divisions
Village Welfare Centres
Police Stations
Children and Youth Courts
Hill Tribe Division
Foundation for Children's Development
Foundation for Women
Buddhist Youths for Development
Daughter's Education Programme
New Life Centre of the Baptist Missionary Fellowship
ECPAT
TECST
National Council for Child and Youth Development
World Vision
Child Rights Volunteers
Village Women Development Committees
Youth Volunteers
VIETNAM
Provincial Head of Government (who approves and signs the PPA)
 Provincial People's Committee
 Provincial and City Committee for Protection and Care of Children
 Vietnam Women's Union
 Line Ministry Representatives
 HCMC Fund for Children (only in Ho Chi Minh City)
 Youth Union (in some provinces)

MENA

EGYPT
Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS)
Sectoral Ministries
Universities
Oxfam
Who
ILO
Ford Foundation
World Bank
Egyptian Save the Children
Community Medicine NGO
Scouts
Environment NGO

SUDAN
Ministry of Economic Planning and Investment
Sectoral Ministries/Agencies of Health, Education, Social Welfare and Water and Sanitation
National Council for Child Welfare
Regional Planning Units of the State's Government
Office of the Wali (State Governors)
NGOs
UNDP
People's Committees
Sudanese Women's Union
Rural Councils (lowest administrative unit)

SYRIA
Executive Committee at Governorate Level
Directorate of Health and Education
WGU
Youth Union
Pioneers Organization (Children's Organization)

TURKEY
Ministry of the Interior
Ministry of Health
Ministry of National Education
Provincial Councils
Village Committees (in all provinces)
Women's Groups
Muhtar (Heads of villages)
WHO
UNDP
UN Sub-group on Children (Ref. Country Strategy Note)

ROSA

BANGLADESH
Relevant NGOs who are supporting/implementing projects related to women and children
District Level Deputy Commissioners
INDIA
National Institute for Rural Development
National Institute for Nutrition
National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development
National Institute of Urban Affairs
Department of Women and Child Development
Ministry of Human Resources Development
Government of India
Committee for American Relief Everywhere
World Food Programme
Medical Colleges
Universities
Research and Training Institutes
Indian Medical Association
Academy of Paediatrics
NGOs
Block and Village Panchayats (elected local bodies)
Women and Youth Organizations
State/Union Territories Chief Secretaries
District Collectors
Mayors/Chief Councillors

PAKISTAN
Head of State
Local Planning and Development Division
Commission for Child Welfare and Development
Provincial Departments of Planning and Development, Education, Health, Local Government and Rural Development and Social Welfare and Finance
Family Planning Association of Pakistan
Punjab Social Services Board
Orangi Pilot Project
Trust for Voluntary Organization
Aurat Foundation
Behboob Association
Adult Basic Education Society
Ashan-i-Latif
Punjab & Sindh Education Foundations
Female Youth Corps
National Rural Support Programme
Baluchistan and NWFP Rural Support Programmes
World Bank
Asian Development bank
UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNIFEM
CIDA, USAID, WHO, ILO, WFP

SRI LANKA
Line Ministries
NGOs

ARGENTINA
 Ministry of Health
 Ministry of Education
 Municipalities
 CARITAS
 NGOs
 Governors
 Programme Committee
BOLIVIA
Municipal Governments
Local offices of the National Organization for Children, Women and Family (ONAMFA)

BRAZIL
Governors
Pact for Children
North and Northeastern State Governments
State Secretaries of Health and Education
· Municipal Governments
Children's Health Defence Group
National Conference of Brazilian Bishops
Children's Pastorate
Brazilian Pediatric Society
Brazilian Federation of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Brazilian Institute for Municipal Administration

CHILE
Regional Planning Departments
Local NGOs

COLOMBIA
Local First Ladies
Mayors and their Secretaries
Local or Regional Coordinators
Institutional Representatives
NGOs
Planning Offices
Catholic Church
Scouts
Municipal Councils
Private Sector

COSTA RICA
Ministries of Planning, Health, Education, Labour and Natural Resources
Municipalities
Institute of Agrarian Development
NGOs
JAPDEVA

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
OTP- SALCEDO
Municipality of San Juan de la Maguana
Neighborhood Committee in San Juan de la Maguana
CIPROS
Foro Social de Puerto Plata
NGOs
PVOs

ECUADOR
Subsec. y Dirección Provincial de Salud y Educación
Instituto Nacional del Niño y La Familia (INNFA)
Consejo Nacional de Desarrollo (CONADE)
Institutional Committee

EL SALVADOR
Mayors
Local Services of: Health, Education, Water and Sanitation
NGOs

GUATEMALA
Health Area
Social Welfare Centre of Santa Cruz del Quiché
Regional Council for Urban and Rural Development
Departmental Coordinating Unit for the National Literacy Committee
Departmental Coordinating Unit for the Project for Services to Children under 6
Departmental Education Directorate
Regional Headquarters of Technical Institute for Training and Productivity
Peasants Association of San Marcos
Association of Pre-School Teachers of El Quiché
Centro Cultural y Asistencia Maya
Municipalities: Canillá, Cunén, Chajul, Chicamán, Chiché, Pachalum, Sacapulas, San Bartolomé Jocotengo, San Juan Cotzal, San Pedro Jocopilas and San Miguel Uspantán
Consejo de Desarrollo de Quiche

MEXICO
State Government
National Public Organisms and Institutions working in the State Municipal Governments
State Commission for the Follow-up and Evaluation of the SPA

NICARAGUA
Municipality of Estelí
Political Parties
Schools
Catholic Church
Child Organizations

PANAMA
Municipality of San Miguelito
Districts of Chiriquí
NGOs

PARAGUAY
Not specified

PERU
Three Provincial Municipalities
Ministries of Health and Education
Regional Government
Departmental Committee for the Rights of the Child

URUGUAY
Regional and local Governmental bodies
CLAEH
Gurises
Movimiento Paulina Luisi
PLEMUU

VENEZUELA
Municipalities, Mayors
Governors
Local Agencies of National Institutions
Church
NGOs

WCARO

BENIN
Swiss and German Ministries of Cooperation
WHO
Traditional Leaders
French Ministry of Cooperation
“Sous-Prefet”
Prefet
Local sectors of Ministries
Local Management Committee

CAMEROON
Municipalities of Garoua and Marola
Selected Communities
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
CREF
Municipality

COTE D'IVOIRE
Directions Régionales de la Planification
Directions Régionales des Ministères Techniques (Santé, Education, Eau-Assainissement
Associations de jeunes
Associations religieuses
Conseils Municipaux
ONG
Centres d'Animation Socio-Educative
Organisations Villageoises

MAURITANIA
Regional Authorities
Regional Development Committees
Women's Cooperatives
UN System
World Bank
EEC
NGOs

NIGER
Groupements Feminins
Coopératives
Comités Villageois de Développement
Bureaux Locaux des Associations et des ONGs Nationales

NIGERIA
State Governments (Office of Governors)
State-based Universities (consultants)
State-based NGOs
Women's Organizations
Community Organisations
National Planning Commission

SIERRA LEONE
Islamic Action Group for Child Survival
Christian Action Group for Child Survival
Christian Children Fund
National Council for Children
Plan International
CUSO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>UNICEF Role</th>
<th>Multilateral Role</th>
<th>Bilateral Role</th>
<th>Children Participate?</th>
<th>National Leadership</th>
<th>Local Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td>A/M</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Government (unspecified)</td>
<td>Government (unspecified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td>A/M/T</td>
<td>A/M</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Min Plan/National Develop</td>
<td>Distr/Div Development Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>National Institutions</td>
<td>MPs(2)/Field Offices of Nat Insts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td>A/M/T</td>
<td>A/M</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Office of the President</td>
<td>Churches and NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Nat Plan Commission</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td>A/F/M/T</td>
<td>A/F/M/T</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning (Municipality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Min. Coop &amp; Development</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td>A/M/T</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Regional Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobil/Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>Secretariat of NCC-CSPD(3)</td>
<td>Regional/District CSPD Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Fin/Tech</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Nat Coun Child/Ministries(4)</td>
<td>District Exec Sec/Planning Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A = Advocacy, F = Financial, M = Mobilization, T = Technical
(2) Members of Parliament
(3) National Coordinating Committee for Child Survival, Protection and Development
(4) Ministries of Labour and Social Affairs and Financial and Economic Planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>role of UNICEF(1)</th>
<th>role of multilateral</th>
<th>role of bilateral</th>
<th>do children participate?</th>
<th>leader at national level</th>
<th>leader at local level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Adv/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>State C. C. Wom&amp;Child(2)</td>
<td>Provincial Vice-Governor/ACWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Department Home Affairs</td>
<td>Department Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Min Health &amp; Soc Affairs</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Adv/Tec</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>National Centre for Children</td>
<td>LPA Commissions(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Office of the Prime Minister</td>
<td>Governors/Mayors/NGOs Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>Fin/Tec</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>CPCC(4)/State Planning Com</td>
<td>Peoples &amp; Children’s Committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Adv = Advocacy, Fin = Financial, Mob = Mobilization, Tec = Technical
(2) State Council Committee for Women and Children
(3) Appointed by Governors and usually headed by Chairperson of Aimag Children’s Centre or Deputy Governor in charge of Social Sector
(4) Committee for Protection and Care of Children
### Table 5. PARTICIPANTS ROLE AND LEADERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>role of UNICEF</th>
<th>role of multi-lateral</th>
<th>role of bilateral</th>
<th>do children participate?</th>
<th>leader at national level</th>
<th>leader at local level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobiliz/Tec</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>NCCM(2) / MinLocAdmin</td>
<td>Governates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobiliz/Tec</td>
<td>A/F/M/T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>MinEconPlan&amp;Invest</td>
<td>State Government RegPlanUnit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobiliz/Tec</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>Ministry of the Interior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mobiliz/Tec</td>
<td>F/T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) A = Advocacy, F = Financial, M = Mobilization, T = Technical
(2) National Council for Childhood and Motherhood
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of UNICEF</th>
<th>Role of UNICEF</th>
<th>Role of UNICEF</th>
<th>Do Children Participate?</th>
<th>Leader at National Level</th>
<th>Leader at Local Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec(1)</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Ministry Planning &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOHRD/GOI(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>State/UT Chief Secretaries(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>Fin/Tec</td>
<td>Fin/Tec</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Nat Plan/Dev Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Adv = Advocacy, Fin = Financial, Mob = Mobilization, Tec = Technical
(2) Department of Women and Child Development is also leading at national level
(3) State /UT Chief Secretaries, District Collectors and Mayors/Chief Councillors, Chief Ministers and Ministers of Developmental Departments are also leading at local level
### Table 5. PARTICIPANTS ROLE AND LEADERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of UNICEF</th>
<th>Role of Multilateral</th>
<th>Role of Bilateral</th>
<th>Do Children Participate</th>
<th>Leader at National Level</th>
<th>Leader at Local Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina Tec(1)</td>
<td>Tec/Fin</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Governors &amp; Prog. Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia Adv/Fin/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Ministry of Human Development</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil Mob/Tec</td>
<td>Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Summit Governors/Pact</td>
<td>Governors/Municipal Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>MPlan/Family Senate Com</td>
<td>Heads of Regions/ Mayors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Office of First Lady</td>
<td>Various (Dependent on Locality)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic Adv/Mob</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>National Planning Office</td>
<td>Institutional Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador Adv/Fin/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>National Planning Office</td>
<td>Mayors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador Adv/Mob</td>
<td>Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>MPlan/Presidential Cabinet</td>
<td>Municipal Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala Fin/Tec</td>
<td>Specified</td>
<td>Specified</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>SGEPLAN</td>
<td>Governors/State Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico Adv/Fin/Tec</td>
<td>Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>National Commission for NPA</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua Adv/Fin/Tec</td>
<td>Tec/Fin</td>
<td>Fin/Tec</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Ministry Social Affairs</td>
<td>Various(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Social Emergency Fund</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Provincial Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru Fin/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Budget Office</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>Fin/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ministerio de la Familia</td>
<td>Governors and Mayors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Adv = Advocacy, Fin = Financial, Mob = Mobilization, Tec = Technical
(2) Mayors, ICBF, NGOs, Local First Ladies
(3) Municipalities, NGOs, PVOs, OTP
(4) Locals politicians, NGOs, Local Governmental Authorities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>role of UNICEF</th>
<th>role of multi-lateral</th>
<th>role of bilateral</th>
<th>do children participate?</th>
<th>leader at national level</th>
<th>leader at local level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Fin/Tec(1)</td>
<td>Tec</td>
<td>Tec/Fin</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
<td>Local Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Adv/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
<td>Governments/UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent African Rep</td>
<td>Fin/Tec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>MPlan/HighComDecentraliz.</td>
<td>Commune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Direccion Générale du Plan</td>
<td>Direct. Régionales de la Planificacion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>Adv/Tec</td>
<td>Fin/Tec</td>
<td>Fin/Tec</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning</td>
<td>Regional Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Tec</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Nat Com Surv/ProDev of Child</td>
<td>Village Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Tec</td>
<td>Tec</td>
<td>Tec</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Nat Planning Commission</td>
<td>Nat Plan Commission/Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Adv/Fin/Mob/Tec</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Dep. National Development</td>
<td>Dep Int Affairs/City Gov &amp; Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Adv = Advocacy, Fin = Financial, Mob = Mobilization, Tec = Technical
SURVEYED COUNTRIES NOT DECENTRALIZING NPAs

The following 53 countries were not included in the tables for the following reasons: they have not yet formulated an NPA, they have declared that they could not envisage decentralization of the NPA, they foresee the possibility of decentralizing the NPA or they have declared an intention to decentralize but have not yet begun the process.

ESARO
Angola
Burundi
Comoros
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Madagascar
Mauritius
Mozambique
South Africa
Zambia
Zimbabwe

ROSA
Afghanistan
Bhutan
Nepal

TACRO
Belize
Cuba
Guyana
Honduras
Jamaica
Suriname

EAPRO
Cambodia
Fiji
Korea DPR
Lao
Malaysia
Myanmar
Papua New Guinea

WCARO
Burkina Faso
Cape Verde
Chad
Congo
Equatorial Guinea
Gabon
Gambia
Ghana
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Liberia
Mali
Senegal
Togo
Zaire

MENA
Algeria
Djibouti
Iran
Iraq
Jordan
Lebanon
Maroc
Oman
Saudi Arabia
Tunisia
Yemen
NOTES


2. As this paper is principally for the use of UNICEF offices, the acronyms for the UNICEF programmatic regions will be used.

3. "Indonesia does not produce stand-alone National Plans of Action but instead incorporates their functional roles in the country's RERPELITAs (Five Year Development Plans)" — UNICEF Jakarta answer to ICDC NPA decentralization questionnaire.
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