Why central and local/provincial governments are both necessary

A five part educational video series,
produced by the Forum of Federations

Facilitators' Guide

Forum of Federations

Canada

Why central and local /provincial governments are both necessary is a Forum of Federations product. The Forum wishes to thank the Government of Canada, Department of Global Affairs, for its generous financial assistance.

© Copyright 2016, Forum of Federations, Ottawa, Canada

Forum of Federations
75 Albert Street, Suite 411
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1P 5E7

www.forumfed.org
forum@forumfed.org

Financial support for this publication is provided by

Contents

Overview pg. 4

Video One
Introduction to the subject pgs. 5, 6

Video Two
Decentralization, the South African Way pgs. 7-10

Video Three
Decentralization in Switzerland pgs. 11-14

Video Four
Decentralization, the Canadian Way pgs. 15-19

Video Five
Tunisia, on the road to decentralization pgs. 20-24

Credits and Acknowledgements p.25

Overview

This series of five videos is a complement to an earlier, four-part series produced by the Forum of Federations in 2014: *Gender-inclusive decentralization in the Middle East and North Africa*. That series was largely based on conferences and workshops Forum had held in the region, and focused on the prospects and challenges for decentralization in the countries of North Africa and the Middle East.

This new series takes a broader perspective. It endeavours to show how both central or national governments and sub-national institutions of government, of various types and forms, are necessary for democratic governance in decentralized countries.

The series focuses on four countries. Two have had their decentralized – and, as it happens, also federal – systems since the mid 19th century: Canada and Switzerland. One achieved a peaceful transition to non-racial democracy in the 1990s, and is now significantly decentralized, although not formally federal: South Africa. The final country is now at the early stages of its own decentralization process: Tunisia. There is also an over-arching introduction, which describes some of the essential features of countries that maintain strong and vigorous national governments together with active and effective constituent unit and/or local governments.

The purpose of this series is not to provide final answers to the issues it explores. You will find no simple recipes for success at decentralization here.

The Forum hopes, rather, that people with an interest in these subjects will use the series to stimulate discussion, dialogue and learning. Each video in the series can be watched on its own, or you can watch the entire series in one sitting.

For facilitators who plan to use the videos in workshops or training exercise – or for those simply screening the videos on their own – this Guide includes background and contextual information on the countries portrayed and suggestions for group discussion. Those are only suggestions. The Forum of Federations encourages those who use the videos as learning and teaching tools to be creative, and to apply their own knowledge and experience of the issues raised. Please make this educational tool your own.

Video One:
Introduction

The first video of the series provides an introduction to the subject, and previews what viewers will learn in the other four.

It points out that decentralized countries all have national governments, which fulfill many important functions, including national defence, the national currency and foreign trade. Decentralization means that some power is delegated to local and regional governments, which deal with local matters, such as water and infrastructure. These local governments are, like the national government, democratically elected. That is an important point. To have authentic decentralization, local governments must receive their mandate directly from the people, not from another order or sphere of government.

In some decentralized countries, there are also middle layer governments, which are also democratically elected. These are called by many names, such as state governments in the United States of America or regional governments in Kenya. In Canada and South Africa there are elected governments for the provinces; in Switzerland, the cantons have their own elected governments.

Some decentralized countries are also federal. That means there is a constitutional division of powers between a national government and what are sometimes called constituent or subnational unit governments. Canada and Switzerland have federal constitutions, which prescribe the powers and responsibilities of their national governments and those of the Canadian provinces and Swiss cantons. In both of those federal countries, which are often also called federations, the constituent unit governments play important roles in matters that are close to citizens' daily lives, such as schools and health care facilities. But the national, or federal, governments maintain very extensive powers – for the armed forces, for foreign affairs, for transport and for economic activities that cross the boundaries of the provinces or cantons.

A great many decentralized countries are not federal. South Africa is one such case. It chose, in the post Apartheid period, to adopt what is called a unitary constitution, although the country is, nonetheless, highly decentralized. Among other countries that are decentralized without being federal are Sweden and Italy. Tunisia is among a number of countries for which a transition to electoral democracy, and the adoption of a new, democratic constitution, includes a significant measure of decentralization.

Questions for discussion: Introduction

1. In decentralized countries, what powers are normally assigned to the federal or national government? Which responsibilities are assigned to the local, regional and/or constituent unit governments?

2. Do you believe that assignment of powers is appropriate and practical?

3. What characterizes countries that are federal as well as decentralized?

4. Can a country be decentralized without being federal? Explain, and discuss.

Video Two:
Decentralization, the South African Way

For more than four decades, starting in the late 1940s, South Africa lived under the Apartheid system, which denied full civil and political rights to all non-white South Africans, the vast majority of the population. In the 1990s – as a result, at least in part, of internationally imposed economic sanctions – the National Party government that had created Apartheid opened negotiations to bring it to an end. Facing the National Party were negotiators for the anti-Apartheid movement, spearheaded by the African National Congress (ANC), led by Nelson Mandela. These negotiations produced a new, democratic and decentralized constitution for South Africa. The country thus made a peaceful transition from minority to majority rule. Since that time other countries making similar transitions have been studying South Africa's example.

In the video, ANC negotiator Mohammed Bhabha explains one of the keys to South Africa's success.

"We were able to include the masses of this country in the kind of negotiations we did, so it wasn't an elitist discussion that took place in some smoke-filled room that decided the future of this country," Bhabha says, "The people of this country decided its future. Once you sit and talk to your enemy you learn to understand that their fears are very real, they have fears like yours. At the end it's about security for themselves, their families, and it's about the simple things in life - how can I have a future for my child?"

During the negotiations, the National Party wanted to protect the rights of the white minority by having powerful provincial governments. The ANC wanted to assure equality of citizenship, and avoid an ethnically and racially divided country, by having a strong national government. Both sides found room for compromise by opting for a well-resourced and empowered third sphere of government, at the local level.

Sydney Mufamadi was a minister in the first post-Apartheid government. In the video he explains the fundamental purpose of the third sphere of government in South Africa:

"It is based on the notion of wall-to-wall representation at the local level; whereas, in the past, there were parts of the country where there was no form of elected local government at all."

Today there are vigorous and active local governments throughout South Africa. Since their inception, they have made a large and tangible difference in the quality of life throughout the country. Jaap de Visser, a professor of law at the University of Western Cape and an expert on multi-level government, puts it this way in the video:

"I think you only need to look at the statistics to be entirely convinced that we've made huge strides. Remember we came from a situation where the apartheid government deliberately neglected the majority of the population in terms of basic services: electricity, water, sanitation, and sewage. South Africa has done a tremendous job over the last 15 to 20 years in extending basic services into marginalized areas, into rural areas, into the townships."

Sydney Mufamadi cites his own community, the giant Soweto Township that is part of the Johannesburg municipality, as an example of the success of local government in the post-Apartheid era.

"I grew up in Soweto," he tells us, "from 1959 to 1981, for 22 years, without electricity… The majority of the streets of Soweto were not tarred. There is not a single street in Soweto today which is not tarred."

Local governments in South Africa have a big job. They are responsible for the built environment. That means local roads, and infrastructure such as water supply, sanitation, refuse removal, and electricity. Furthermore, despite the differences over their role during the transition negotiations, today provincial governments, also play an important coordi-

nating role. They implement over-arching national government policies in vital areas such as health, education and social welfare.

The video shows, however, that some South Africans are still not convinced of the value and utility of the provincial sphere of government. Former anti-Apartheid activist and lawyer Kabelo Lengane makes this argument:

"We must become a unitary state, with one central government that can control the country, and a government which we can hold accountable for the failings … We are one South Africa, aren't we? It's just that we have not configured things correctly in my opinion. I think that it is just unworkable … because we are paying ten governments."

On the other hand, many one-time skeptics about provinces now see their merit. Mohammed Bhabha is among them:

"The fact that provincial boundaries have been drawn up, by and large, around ethnic identities means there is a very good balance between the notion of a strong state and regional and local expression. We could not afford any area in this country that was politically marginalized."

Despite many continuing differences, South Africans are almost universally proud of their peaceful transition to democracy.

"What we got was a better resolution to problems than the barrel of the gun," concludes Kabelo Lengane.

Others point to possible lessons from their own country's experience.

"Be very conscious and deliberate about your transition," counsels Jaap de Visser. "It doesn't happen with the stroke of a pen. It takes years and years of building new institutions, breaking down old institutions, changing cultures, changing mindsets."

Western Cape Province official Hildegarde Fast gives some very practical and tangible advice:

"One of the key lessons that we've learned in South Africa is that setting up and maintaining an effective system of intergovernmental relations is absolutely critical to

making sure that you have clear communication flowing throughout the entire system. We don't have a hierarchical tiered system where we say national is up there and local is down here. We have a sphere system where we are colleagues to each other."

Sydney Mufamadi tells us that South Africans "learned a lot from others," but, in the end, devised their own, unique solutions, suitable to their own country's situation and history. As the former minister puts it: "The solutions to your problems must be as novel as your own analysis."

Questions for discussion: South Africa

1. How did the two sides in the negotiations to end Apartheid find common ground?

2. What important functions do local governments in South Africa fulfill?

3. Why was the creation of provinces controversial?

4. What role do provinces now fulfill and how have the helped maintain the unity of South Africa?

5. Why did ANC leaders believe a strong national government was necessary?

6. What lessons might other countries in transition learn from the South African experience?

Video Three:
Decentralization in Switzerland

Switzerland is a small landlocked country of eight million people in the heart of Europe. It is surrounded by larger and more powerful neighbours, but has maintained its independence and neutrality for well over a century. It has also had the main features of its decentralized, federal, democratic system since 1848.

There are three official languages in Switzerland – German, French and Italian – and nearly 3,000 local districts, called communes, that all have democratically elected governments. There are also 26 cantons or half cantons, the constituent units of the Swiss federation, and the Swiss people elect the cantonal governments as well. In addition, there is the democratically elected national or federal government. The Swiss sometimes refer to their federal government as the "Confederation."

Both subnational orders of government have significant powers. As former communal official Marie Garnier, who is a now a minister in the Fribourg cantonal government, explains:

"The communes take care of traffic infrastructure, school buildings, and cultural infrastructure, including theatres."

As for the cantons, they are responsible for education, health care, the environment within their borders, and economic development. The significant power assigned to communes and cantons does not mean that there is not also a large and important role for the national government. The Swiss federal government deals with the national currency and financial regulation, defence and foreign affairs, communications, and large-scale environmental matters. The Swiss do not see their version of decentralization as one in which one order of government takes away from another. Rather, they see the three orders of government supporting each other, working together in order to making the overall system more effective and responsive to the will of the people.

"The Swiss system is well organized," says Marie Garnier, "Each government has the tasks it is best suited to undertake – at the national, cantonal and communal level. There is a regular re-evaluation of the tasks to assure they are effective. We, the elected politicians, have a great 'closeness' to the citizens. We do not close ourselves in our offices. We try to get familiar with the problems and issues of the citizens. That is a Swiss quality."

The Swiss are concerned with democracy above all; with maximizing the opportunities for all citizens to participate fully in the political decision-making process. Thomas Pfisterer is a lawyer who spent much of his career working in government, mostly at the cantonal level in his canton, Aargau. He emphasizes the participatory nature of the decentralized Swiss system.

"The main thing is democracy, the will of the people," Pfisterer argues, "But to give the people the most influence is to let them work not only on the national level, but also at the cantonal level and the municipal level - the three levels. Three times they can elect authorities, they can veto government acts, they can initiate government work on all level and different levels. That's important."

The Swiss believe it is crucial not to give one leader, or a small group of leaders, an excessive degree of power. They believe in consultation and shared responsibility, as opposed to overly powerful and concentrated authority. Pfisterer sums up this distinctively Swiss philosophy well:

"I think you can reduce it a little bit to saying we don't trust people. That's an experience over centuries. People can abuse their power. Therefore, we like to have not one single authority, but elected bodies."

Marie Garnier emphasizes the important relationship in Switzerland between government and citizen community-level voluntary organizations, often described collectively as civil society. Garnier was herself a civil society environmental activist before getting involved in government for her own commune. She sees a vibrant and free civil society as essential to healthy democracy in Switzerland.

"Civil society is very strong in Switzerland. There are all kinds of associations," Garnier comments, "There are arts and culture associations, as well as those for social welfare recipients, the sick, elderly people, and children. There is great range. "

Pfisterer emphasizes the degree to which the activities of the three orders of government are intertwined. He uses the example of water.

"The cleanliness of water has to be secured by the federal government, because the water doesn't respect the [municipal and cantonal] borderlines," Pfisterer explains, "Of course, it's coming from the mountains, going down to the lower lands, but within the system the rivers belong to the cantons, not the federal government. Even the small areas belong to the municipalities and they are responsible of taking care of the security problems around water."

Pfisterer also emphasizes the dynamic nature of the Swiss system. It is constantly changing and evolving. As he puts it:

"Switzerland is a very, very complicated country and we suffered over centuries to find the form of government we have today. And we are still not at the end of the development."

Both Pfisterer and Garnier believe there are lessons others might learn from Switzerland's long experience with decentralized democracy.

For Pfisterer, the most important lesson is about the possibility of shared and cooperative government, without an all-powerful figure at the top:

"Everybody has to have his say in the federal government, in the cantonal government it is the same, in the local governments it's the same. There's a need to incorporate different regions, different cultures and so on and basically we do not trust single people. That's an experience derived from our history. We never had a king. There was never a king of Switzerland."

For Garnier, the Swiss experience of accommodating cultural diversity via a decentralized system is what might be of greatest interest to others:

"We must admit that other systems sometimes allow for quicker actions and results. But the Swiss system, with its respect for multiple languages and religions, is a system -- in this time of migrations and mixing of populations -- that could be a model, or, in any case, a formula that works."

Questions for discussion: Switzerland

1. When the Swiss say, "We don't trust people," what do they mean?

2. Why is this concept important to Swiss democracy?

3. Explain why the Swiss believe that having multiple orders of government does not mean that each order takes from the others?

4. How do the communal, cantonal and national governments work together and support each other in Switzerland?

5. How is civil society an important element of Swiss democracy?

6. What are the main and distinct tasks of the three orders of government in Switzerland?

7. Would the Swiss method of dividing and sharing responsibilities be appropriate to your country? Why or why not?

Video Four:
Decentralization, the Canadian Way

Canada is a vast country which spans three oceans: the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Arctic. There are over 36 million people in Canada, of whom between one and two million are Indigenous people. The rest are descended from settlers or immigrants. The country was first colonized by the French in the early 17th century and then by the British. The entire country became a part of the British Empire in 1763, following the Treaty of Paris, which ended the Seven Years' War between Britain and France. Thus, when Canada acceded to independence in 1867, it adopted a British, so-called Westminster-style, parliamentary system.

Today, both French and English are official languages of Canada, and the country is also highly diverse. It has long encouraged immigration, at first mostly from Europe. Today, it takes in more than 250,000 immigrants per year, the majority of whom come from Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America. The country considers itself to be formally multicultural. At the same time, Indigenous Canadians have struggled for more than a century to have their rights fully respected, an endeavour which continues to this day. Like Switzerland, Canada is both decentralized and federal. The Canadian federation is,

constitutionally, composed of a federal government and ten provinces, which vary in population from less than 200,000 for the smallest, Prince Edward Island, to more than thirteen million for the largest, Ontario. In addition, there are three federal territories in the Arctic which have quasi-provincial status. And there are thousands of local districts and municipalities throughout the country. They do not have constitutionally prescribed status, as in some federations. Local governments are defined by the Canadian constitution as "creatures" of the provinces. They nonetheless have significant responsibilities, which vary across the country, but which usually include: water, sewage, public transit, local roads, recreation, local tourism, and regulation of retail businesses and real estate development.

The Canadian constitution assigns foreign affairs, criminal law, defence and national security, fisheries, immigration, and broadcasting and communications to the federal government, while the provinces are chiefly responsible for education, health, and social services. There are many areas in which the federal and provincial governments share jurisdiction, including transport, agriculture, the environment, culture, and regulation of financial markets and institutions.

Although the Canadian constitution was not designed, as others such as the German constitution were, to provide for a formal intertwining of federal and provincial roles, over time such interweaving has developed, in practice. The federal government is deemed to have the power to spend money in areas of provincial jurisdiction, and it has used that power to exert influence in constitutionally defined provincial areas, particularly in health and social affairs.

In the video, David Zussman, a professor of public sector management at the University of Ottawa, explains how the federal government has assumed a role in health and other social policy areas.

"Federal governments provide a framework around which the provinces could provide the services; and, in some ways, federal governments have kept a scorecard for each of the provinces. They try to at least maintain a level of standards that will be comparable across the country, given that each of the provinces has the right to choose the way in which they deliver the services in their own unique way depending on the makeup of the population and the demographics and the like."

The federal role in social policy areas has existed, to a limited extent, for a long time, but

became more intense following the Great Depression of the 1930s. The catastrophic level of unemployment Canada experienced during that period prompted the federal government to create a national system of unemployment benefits. In 1940, with the agreement of the provinces, the federal government amended the constitution to so that it could establish the program to aid workers who lose their jobs.

Later, during the 1960s, when many countries were expanding their social safety nets, the Canadian federal government again sought to actively insert itself into areas of provincial jurisdiction. David Zussman explains:

"The federal government got involved in a number of different activities where Canadian citizens were demanding better provisions for services and for preparing for retirement. A national pension plan was conceived of where, again, a notion would be that all Canadians from coast to coast would benefit from the same level of support after they made a contribution throughout their working lives."

Federal involvement in matters in which the provinces have constitutional authority has not been consistent over time. Libby Davies, who started her career as a community activist, then became a municipal councillor for the city of Vancouver, and ultimately a member of the federal parliament, explains in the video how her concern with federal decisions motivated her political choices.

"I was motivated to run as a member of parliament because I was actually very upset that the national housing programs that Canada had that we had relied upon municipally for funding had been completely obliterated by the federal government of the day," Davies explains in the video, "When I first started working on one particular neighbourhood in the 1970s there was no homelessness. But as a a result of a decision of the national government of the day, when these housing programs disappeared - a cost-saving measure - we saw the consequences of that."

Davies was an opposition member of parliament. She explains how, despite not being part of the governing party, she played an important role in governance.

"I think it's an incredibly important lesson to understand that not all change comes from the government or the dominant party that forms the government. That the role of the opposition, what we call the loyal opposition, is critical to how our democracy functions," she states.

Davies then adds: “I remember one of the government ministers who was responsible for homelessness, she would say to me, ‘Libby, keep pushing me, keep asking me questions in question period because the pressure is helping me in the cabinet.’ She understood that for me doing my job and pushing her and putting pressure on her was actually helping her at the cabinet table fight for money.”

One large area of shared jurisdiction in Canada is the environment. Developing a Canadian strategy to combat climate has been complicated because some provinces extract and export greenhouse gas producing oil and gas, while others produce energy from ‘clean’ sources, primarily hydroelectricity. It has been the federal government’s role to forge a consensus among the provinces in order to set targets for reducing the entire country’s emissions, in line with international agreements.

“In many ways the federal government and the provinces work in parallel to one another,” explains David Zussman, “But there should be and there is a fair amount of conversation going on between these two orders of government in order to achieve the broader objectives set by the federal government.”

During the last half century the greatest threat to the national unity of Canada has come from a secessionist movement in the one predominantly French province, Quebec, which has a population of eight million people. Twice, first in 1980 and then in 1995, Quebeckers voted on referenda which asked if they wished to secede or remain part of Canada. The first time the pro-federal side won handily, with a 20 per cent margin of victory. The second time, the victory margin for the side that wished to remain in Canada was tiny, less than one per cent.

Despite these hard fought political battles, and, in one case, very close outcome, Canada has dealt with the secession issue legally and, perhaps more importantly, peacefully. Quebecker and former senior federal civil servant André Juneau explains how:

“It got resolved through the democratic process. It is in a sense that simple. People in Canada accept the results of votes, whatever they may be. Sometimes, people might regret how they voted [and] that sort of thing. But people accept the results of votes.”

As for what countries in transition might be able to learn from Canada’s experience, Davies emphasizes that government at all levels must be accessible and understandable to the people. To the citizen, government should not be a complex puzzle:

“I think our job as elected representatives is to be responsive and to be able to work with each other, so that we can present a public service that is seamless. We don’t want to see things stuck into different boxes and it makes it complicated for people.”

André Juneau emphasizes that each country has to find its own way, but then adds that others can look at Canada and “see that multi-ethnic regionally diverse countries can make a federal system work, and probably, it’s better than if you were to try to run a diverse country with only one central government.”

Questions for discussion: Canada

1. How do the federal and provincial governments work together in Canada?

2. In what way might your country learn from the Canadian experience of cooperation between orders of government?

3. What tasks are, in general, assigned to local and provincial governments and to the federal government in Canada?

4. To what extent might that assignment of tasks be appropriate for your country?

5. Which policy areas in your country would require collaboration and cooperation between and among different orders of government?

6. What political movement has, historically, posed the greatest threat to national unity in Canada?

7. How has Canada dealt with that threat, and what lessons might others learn from the Canadian experience?

Video five:

Tunisia, on the road to decentralization

Tunisia is not yet decentralized, as Canada, South Africa, and Switzerland are. However, Tunisia's newly adopted constitution mandates that there will be an elected, local sphere of government, something the country has never had in the past. As Tunisia prepares to implement decentralization, there are great differences among the Tunisian people as to the appropriate pace of that implementation and the degree to which the national government should delegate powers to the new local governments.

Rifaat Kristou is an information technologist and civil society activist in the Tunisian city of Bizerte. He points out that Tunisia has no experience with local governments, and that it must deal with the situation imposed on it by its history.

"We have a colonial heritage which defined the borders of our regions, and which we did not choose." Kristou says in the video, "We have not reflected much on what societal model we want."

He then adds, hopefully:

“The tasks are immense. Today, Tunisia is a great laboratory of governance. We have already made progress by drafting a new constitution, which brings us toward more participatory and democratic governance.”

Khalil Maamari, a Tunisian citizen interviewed in the streets of Tunis by the filmmakers, talks about the importance of communication:

“We managed to develop a constitution that prevents the centralization of power and reflects, instead, the reality on the ground, which is not an easy task. It needs a thorough communication policy with the citizens. They need to understand the importance of regional or local governance and discover its positive aspects. ”

Rachid Touzi, a former senior official of the Tunisian finance ministry, is more cautious in his evaluation. He believes the national government must maintain a significant degree of power:

“We are a developing country and we must manage scarce resources. We have inadequate resources for our large population. We will develop by having a strong and united central state. That is what the new constitution says. We will make a big effort to decentralize without taking away too much power from the centre.”

In contrast, Mohamed Salah Fliss, the mayor of Bizerte and a human rights activist, argues that decentralization should be accomplished in a quick and decisive manner. He worries that the process so far has been too slow and lacking in direction. Like Rifaat Kristou, Fliss attributes this to the burden of history.

“The current central government of Tunisia perpetuates the tradition of centralization that existed for fifty six years, “ Fliss argues, “And so now we have a system that is not yet sure of itself, that has not found all its bearings.”

All who comment in the video have a clear idea of the actual role of the central or national government in Tunisia. Sawsen Bencheikh is a jurist and former consultant to the Tunisian interior ministry. She sees the current Tunisian central government as virtually all-powerful:

“The central government deals with a wide range of policies: economic, social, cultural, financial and even related to such matters as sport. It makes policy choices for the whole nation, which it must implement.”

Mohamed Fliss has a similar perspective:

“The main role of the central government is to manage the entire country. It is responsible for economic policy, and for maintaining a balance among the regions. And it is responsible for all the regional governors and for the municipalities.”

Or, as Rachid Touzi puts it, in more technical terms:

“The role of the central government in Tunisia is the classical one, which includes the police and defending national sovereignty. [It also] takes a great interest in economic policy for the country and in social policy. The central government spends half its budget on health and education.”

As for local and regional government, Mohamed Fliss reflects on how it works now:

“Local governments are absent from the Tunisian landscape. We do not have the symbiosis that must exist between local and regional authorities and the centre. That is how it has been for six decades. Local governments only execute the orders of the centre.”

But others foresee a positive, if not overly ambitious, evolution toward effective local government.

“There will be a certain degree of autonomy for local government,” says Sawsen Bencheikh, “But still some control from the centre. The centrally appointed governors will implement the centre’s policies. Local communities will deal with development in their own territory.”

Rachid Touzi takes a similar view:

“Reinforcing local government does not mean the centre should lose powers. To the contrary, national unity will be reinforced by local power.”

Touzi echoes the Swiss view of decentralization when he describes a system in which dif-

ferent spheres of government add to each other each other's effectiveness and responsiveness to citizens:

"Freedom for the local level of government does not mean there should be a rupture, a distance, between the two levels of government. As economic agents, the two levels will work in total symbiosis and in harmony. The goal is to enhance the possibilities and opportunities for each person, for all citizens."

Despite their differences, Rachid Touzi and Mohamed Fliss share a hope for governments that work together harmoniously, or in their own words, symbiotically.

"For the future, it is important that we live up to the promise of the January 14 revolution, in the light of modern Tunisian history," says Fliss, "The two levels of government must be separate, each with its own field of action. At the same time, the two must work together symbiotically."

Sawsen Bencheikh looks to the future and concludes:

"Let's hope the experience is positive. For now we do not know what will happen. We must hope that we Tunisians succeed in implementing these major reforms."

Questions for discussion: Tunisia

1. What is the historic heritage of Tunisia when it comes to local government?

2. How has that history had an impact on current practice?

3. What sort of differing roles do commentators in the video foresee for local governments?

4. Why do they take different points of view?

5. Should decentralization proceed quickly or at a slower and more deliberate pace? Explain your answer.

6. What would it mean for governments to work together symbiotically?

Credits and Acknowledgements

This series of videos is a product of the Canadian-based, international organization the Forum of Federations. The Forum gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the Government of Canada, Department of Global Affairs.

Producer, director, writer: Karl Nerenberg, Nerenberg-Plaine Media Inc., Ottawa

Videographer and video editor: Malcolm Hamilton, streamMEDIA Productions, Ottawa

Project manager, Forum of Federations: Sheela Embounou

Administrative support, Forum of Federations: Donna Duffett

Videography in Tunisia: SVP Productions, Tunis

Interviews: Karl Nerenberg, Rawaa Salhi (Tunisia), Leila Haouaoui (Tunisia)

Transcripts and translations: Lina Charpentier, Bureau Bilingue; Rawaa Salhi; Robert Chidiac; Karl Nerenberg

Original music: Karl Nerenberg, Anouar Brahem

Thanks to: Leila Haouaoui, Nico Steytler, Jaap De Visser, Mohammed Bhabha, Sydney Mufamadi, Hildegarde Fast, Solly Suleiman, Tema Dolamo, Kabelo Lengane, Thomas Pfisterer, Marie Garnier, André Juneau, Libby Davies, Kim Elliott, David Zussman, Rachid Touzi, Rifaat Kristou, Sawsen Bencheikh, Martha Plaine, Pamela Boyle, Mohammed Fliss, Rupak Chattopadhyay, President/CEO, and the staff of the Forum of Federations.

The Forum of Federations, the global network on federalism and multi-level governance, runs training and knowledge-sharing programs to address governance challenges. Active on six continents, it has run programs in over 20 countries including established federations, as well as countries transitioning to devolved and decentralized governance options. The Forum publishes a range of information and educational materials. It is supported by the following partner countries: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Ethiopia, Germany, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan and Switzerland.

Forum of Federations
75 Albert Street, Suite 411
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1P 5E7

www.forumfed.org
forum@forumfed.org

Why central and local /provincial governments are both necessary is a Forum of Federations product. The Forum wishes to thank the Government of Canada, Department of Global Affairs, for its generous financial assistance.