

Capital City Management in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania After Restoring Their Independence

*Mikk Lõhmus and Illar Tõnisson
Tallinn University of Technology*

This article focuses on the development of the management models applied in Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius, the capital cities of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania from the moment their independence was restored until 2005.

The Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania co-operated closely after restoring their independence in the early 1990s. Later, the countries adopted a Western orientation, and co-operation between them subsided on both the interstate (the Baltic Assembly) and the local levels. Also, with a few exceptions (Vanags, Vilka 2002), studies of local self-government have compared the Baltic States with Western countries, not with one another.

Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius were under similar conditions after the international recognition of the countries' independence in 1991. The Soviet occupation that began in 1940 paralysed the work of the local governments of these countries for half a century. The Soviet system of local bodies of power – the soviets - was alike in all the Soviet republics. The four significant reasons, based on the currently valid European Charter of Local Self-government (hereafter "the Charter"), for not considering the Soviet period local bodies of power local governments are as follows (Illner 1998, Swianiewicz 1992):

- 1) They lacked a democratically elected representative body; the elected bodies were set up by nomination rather than by actual elections.
- 2) They lacked legal autonomy; they were part of a centralised state management system;
- 3) They lacked financial autonomy, i.e. the possibility to plan their income; they lacked independent revenue; they could not impose local taxes etc.
- 4) The real decision-making power within the system was held by the Communist Party bureaucracy.

Thus, analysing the development of the capital cities of the countries that started under similar conditions is of great interest.

Table 1

Population in Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius as of 1 January 2004

Capital City	Total population of country	Population of capital city	Percentage of capital city population of total population	Population of second largest town
Estonia/Tallinn	1,356,045	397,150	29.2%	Tartu/101,190
Latvia/Riga	2,319,203	735,241	31.7 %	Daugavpils/111,231
Lithuania/Vilnius	3,445,857	542,287	15.7 %	Kaunas/378,943

Source: Europa World Year Book 2005

Management issues of the capital cities can be divided into three groups set out below (Bennett 1997, Demszky 1998, Mäeltsemees, 2003b):

1. **Relations with the central government.** The capital city fulfils various specific functions compared to other local authorities. Governmental authorities are generally located in the capital city; therefore the issue of the position of the capital city in the country and the question whether the status of the capital city requires a specific law or specific provisions in various laws are important in many countries.
2. **Relations on the horizontal level,** i.e. above all, relations with the surrounding region and its local authorities, as well as regional co-operation with its socio-economic hinterland.
3. **City management model.** There are issues in a city beside the balance between political and administrative management that concern local democracy and citizen-friendly management. Therefore, territorial management structures are often used in city management, whose rights, duties and responsibility, and position in the city management structure can cause conflicts.

In this article, the *city management models* of the capital cities of the three Baltic countries are analysed, and the similarities and differences caused by historical and other reasons are educed.

In Tallinn, the rights, obligations and responsibilities of the municipal districts have been insufficiently and ambiguously regulated; as a result, there exist both a duplication of activities and conflicts between the territorial and functional structural units of the city. Within ten years, no compromise has been reached on the status and competence of the city districts. In 2003, the Tallinn City Government commissioned a study on city management and its problems from Tallinn University of Technology. The authors of the present article participated in conducting the study, and its findings have been incorporated into the article.

The management models of Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius are compared in the article with those of the capital cities of Sweden and Norway. In Eastern and Central Europe, the development of urban self-government suffered from the effects of totalitarian state rule over the past 50 years. Local self-government in the Nordic countries has undergone a long and stable development and has also influenced the development of the models of the Baltic States due to the short geographical distance between them.

Table 2
Terminology in various European languages

	Estonian	Latvian	Lithuanian	Swedish	Norwegian
City council	volikogu	dome	taryba	kommun- fullmäktige	bystyret
Mayor	linnaepea	priekšsēdētājs	meras		byrådsleder
Executive body	linnavalitsus	-	tarybos kolegija	kommunstyrelsen	byrådet
Chief executive	linnadirektor	izpilddirektors	administracijos direktorius		
Municipal district	linnaosa	Priekšpilsēta or rajonas	seniūnija	stadsdels	bydel
District council	linnaosa halduskogu	-	seniūnijos taryba	stadsdelsnämnd	bydelsutvalg
District manager	linnaosa vanem	priekšpilsēta / rajonas izpilddirektors	seniūnas	stadsdels direktör	bydelsdirektøren
District manager's office	linnaosa valitsus	priekšpilsētas izpilddirekcija	seniūnija	stadsdels förvaltningen	bydels administrasjonen

Source: www.tallinn.ee; www.riga.lv; www.vilnius.lt; www.stockholm.se; www.oslo.kommune.no.

1. Development of legal background

In Estonia, local self-government as an institution was abolished with the decree of the Soviet Union appointed Prime Minister (acting as President), of 25 July 1940, which declared the term of office of county, city, city district and rural municipality councils, their committees and elected representatives expired, and assigned their tasks to county, city, city district and rural municipality governments.¹

On one and the same day, 21 July 1940, the parliaments of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, illegally and undemocratically formed by the occupying power, applied to the Supreme Council of the USSR to admit the independent Baltic States into the Soviet Union. The constitution of the Estonian SSR, adopted in August the same year, no longer contained the definition of local self-government.

According to the constitutions of the soviet republics, independent city, city, city district, district or village soviets were local administrative units that did not, in essence, have the characteristics of a local self-government unit but were essentially state local administrative units, local state bodies. The formally democratically elected soviets and soviet executive committees set up by the latter were the bodies of the local administrative unit.

At that time, big towns of the republics fell into the category of independent cities. In the Estonian SSR, the independent cities were the settlements with the population of at least 50,000 permanent residents, provided the settlements were important cultural, economic and political centres of the republic and it was expedient to have the central bodies of the republic manage it.² Independent cities also included towns with a smaller population that were significant war industry or military centres. The same principles also held in the Latvian SSR and Lithuanian SSR, and more generally in the whole Soviet Union.

Estonia was the first among the three Baltic States to start re-establishing the local self-government system. On 10 November 1989, the Local Government Foundation Act was adopted. The Act provided, among the rest, a two-level self-government system, contrary to the present. (Olle 1996, Mäeltseemes 2000) The same year, on 10 December 1989, the first almost free elections to local soviets took place in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. “Almost free” means that the circle of citizens had not been defined and the military personnel of the occupying army could vote at the election. (Mäeltseemes 2000)

Latvia adopted a specific Law on District, City and Rural Local Governments on 15 February 1990 (Vangas, Vilka 2000, Vanags *et al* 2004). On 24 April, a new outline law on cities/towns and rural municipalities were adopted and on 15 February 1992, a new outline law on district governments was passed. The three new laws emphasised the independence of local governments and the principles of decentralisation more than up to that moment (Vangas, Vilka 2000; Vanags *et al* 2004). On 10 June 1992, a specific law was adopted in the city of Riga. Lithuania passed a law on the reestablishment of local self-government on 12 February 1990. Unlike the currently valid law, the then law provided a two-level local self-govern-

¹ RT 1940, 83, 783. (RT – *Riigi Teataja*, in English “State Gazette”).

² ENSV Teataja (Gazette of ESSR) 1974, 47, 484.

ment system (Beksta, Petkevicius 2000).

The basic principles of local self-government are provided in the Constitutions of Estonia and Lithuania. Unlike the Constitutions of Estonia and Lithuania, the Constitution of Latvia does not contain a separate chapter on local self-government and the provisions of sections 101 and 104 in the fundamental rights chapter refer to the existence of the institution. The Lithuanian Constitution is the only Baltic State constitution mentioning the capital city. In section 15 of the Constitution of Latvia, Riga is mentioned merely as a place of sittings of the parliament, the term “capital city” is not used. The Constitution of Estonia does not contain any reference to Tallinn or the capital city, but section 5 of the Territory of the Estonia Administrative Division Act provides that Tallinn is the capital city.

The Charter signed in Strasbourg on 17 October 1985 is, undoubtedly, the most significant international document containing the values and principles of European local self-government. The Charter was ratified in Estonia in full on 28 September 1994, in Latvia in parts on 5 December 1996 and 1999 (Vilka, Pukis, Vanags 2002) and in Lithuania on 22 June 1999.

The local government outline laws, valid even now, yet amended, were adopted in the Baltic States in the early 1990s. The Estonian Local Government Organisation Act was enacted on 2 June 1993; the respective laws were enacted in Latvia on 19 May 1994 and in Lithuania on 7 July 1994.

The capital cities of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania are managed based on the provisions of the local government outline law of each country. The Latvian Law on Local Governments, however, provides special provisions on independent cities (cities performing the duties of both the first and the second level local government) and the capital city that are to be addressed below.

Tallinn has repeatedly made overtures that a law providing the capital city a special status be adopted. According to Subsection 65 (3) of the Local Government Organisation Act, a local council can make overtures to the Government to initiate laws and other legislation. The problems that need solving are, first and foremost, the supervisory competence of the Harju County Governor, the state functions performed by the capital city and the city management, above all the issues of delegation. The City Council made an overture to the Government in 1994 to adopt a law on the capital city.³ Next, an initiative was demonstrated in 1998 when the Council endorsed the city management principles and made an overture to adopt the law on the status of Tallinn.⁴ In 2002, the factions of the Estonian Centre Party and the Reform Party in the *Riigikogu* made a motion to amend the Local Government Organisation Act and the Government of the Republic Act by providing a special status to Tallinn.⁵ The following statement of grounds was provided in the explanatory memorandum of the draft amendment:

The legislation has so far not regulated, either from the legal or the economic aspect, the status of Tallinn as a local government unit different from other rural municipali-

³ Tallinn City Council decision No 31 of 2.10.1993.

⁴ Tallinn City Council decision No 5 of 15.1.1998.

⁵ Draft 1190, 10.10.2002. Local Government Organisation Act and Government of the Republic Act Amendment Act.

ties and cities, and as the capital city despite the fact that the problem has been addressed since 1994 already when Tallinn City Council submitted a draft Capital City Act to the Government. Till now, these overtures have not received positive feedback and, therefore, normal functioning of Tallinn has been hindered. As before, the size, number of population and complexity of management organisation of Tallinn are a problem. Lack of appropriate regulation has led to a situation where the effect and practical application of a number of laws on the administrative territory of Tallinn is hampered, this in turn directly damages the statutory rights of citizens and makes managing unfoundedly awkward.

In 2003, the so far latest overture was made to amend the Local Government Organisation Act by granting the city council and the city government the right to delegate their decision-making power to municipal district managers or municipal agencies. Yet, the overwhelming majority of overtures made by Tallinn have not been taken into account.

In Latvia, Section 21 of the Act provides that Riga City Council can delegate certain issues placed within the competence of the Council by law to institutions set up by the Council (the institutions are to be addressed below). Specific provisions concerning independent cities are laid down in Section 44.

Also in Vilnius, granting the city a specific legal status has been considered - the City has striven for direct elections of the mayor, more control over its property, separate principles for establishing its budget and subordination of the police to the City (Beksta, Petkevicius 2000).

2. Evolvement of Administrative Division of Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius

During the occupation, districts as internal structural units could be established in big cities. The principle that all of the Soviet Union adhered to said that cities with a population exceeding 200,000 inhabitants could establish a district for every 100,000 people (Mäeltsees 2005). City districts were established in four cities of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania – in Tallinn, Riga, Vilnius and Kaunas. As in cities, the directing bodies of city districts were the soviets and the executive bodies were the soviet executive committees.

In Tallinn, districts were established on 18 May 1945.⁶ Until the early 1970s, there were three districts in Tallinn; from 1975 to the restoration of independence, there were four districts – Kalinini, Lenini, Oktoobri and Mere districts. The boundaries of the districts were set without consideration to the historical, economic, and social or any other significant factors (Mäeltsees 2005; Sepp, Lõhmus 2005).

In Riga, city districts were established on 1 September 1941. They were named Proletāriešu, Kirova and Maskavas districts. In October 1969, three new districts were formed; these were Oktobra, Lenina and Leningradas districts. Thus, there were six city districts in Riga upon the restoration of independence.

In Vilnius, four city districts were established and these were Lenino, Spalio, Tarybų and Naujosios Vilnios districts.

⁶ ENSV Teataja 1945, 22, 317.

Upon implementing the administrative reform, the cities, due to arbitrary boundaries of the districts, faced a problem of how to come up with a model that would not compromise the essential principles (derived from the functioning of communal self-government) of dividing the city into city districts but would, at the same time, adhere to the principles of economic efficiency.

After the restoration of independence, under conditions of young democracy, many societies and citizens' associations of various urban regions striving for more rights to self-organisation emerged in Estonia. Although some city districts had already commenced activity earlier, mostly due to the pressure from residents and citizens' associations, Tallinn City Council took a decision on 4 March 1993 to consider a division of the city of Tallinn into eight districts with limited self-government expedient and economically justified. The Soviet city districts were abolished in the summer of 1993. The new city district governments commenced activity on 1 September 1993.

On 28 December 1990, with the decision of Riga City Council, the former Soviet names of the districts were replaced with new ones that were mostly based on Latvian historical regions. In Riga, the city districts are called either districts (*rajonas*) or suburbs (*priekšpilsēta*).⁷ Although there were discussions in Riga about replacing the districts of the Soviet era with a new city district network like in Tallinn, no consensus was reached about the reform and the number of city districts (Purgailis 1997; Vanags, Vilka 2000).

Thus, it can be said that Tallinn and Vilnius opted for a similar approach and built up a completely new administrative organisation which was based on historical urban regions. Riga maintained the district boundaries of the Soviet era. Therefore, the average number of city district population in Riga considerably exceeds that of Tallinn or Vilnius.

Table 3

Comparative table of city districts in capital cities of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania

	Total population of capital city	Number of districts (1989)	Number of city districts (2005)	Largest city district	Smallest city district	Average	Median
Tallinn	401,694	4	8	114,240	11,420	50,212	42,494
Riga	732,318	6	6	202,773	29,286	122,052	121,749
Vilnius	548,412	4	21	47,410	8,909	26,115	27,892

Source: <http://www.std.lt/puslapiai/vasv/vsavsensk/surasymas%20seniunijomis.pdf>; www.tallinn.ee; http://www.np.gov.lv/index.php?lv=fakti_lvT

Note: The data on the city district population as of the same date was unavailable. The data in the table concerning Tallinn are as of 1 January 2005, on Riga as of 1 January 2005 and on Vilnius as of 1 January 2001.

⁷ Rīgas pašvaldības nolikums /The Statutes of the City of Riga/, Section 11.

3. City Management Model

3.1 Theoretical Background

The city itself has the rights and possibilities of solving the problems encountered in working out a city management model. After all, Article 6(1) of the Charter provides that “Without prejudice to more general statutory provisions, local authorities shall be able to determine their own internal administrative structures in order to adapt them to local needs and ensure effective management.”

The Charter also adheres to the principle of democracy and citizen-friendly management. The directing bodies of local government have to maintain a balance between social and economic efficiency at the local level. Article 3(2) of the Charter provides the freely elected representative body and, thus, the representative-democratic management model as the essential characteristic of local self-government. In small local governments, other solutions, such as the general meeting of residents, can be considered.

In recent years, various local government management issues have been discussed, e.g. the optimal number of council members, the status of council committees, the balance between political and administrative management, and how territorial decentralisation should be conducted. Considering the above, precisely these topics are focussed on when general issues of city management are addressed.

The status and competence of the council and its committees, the mayor and the executive body vary from country to country. If article 3.2 of the local self-government representative-democratic management model is valid, forming the executive body is not obligatory and solutions are for the local government unit to take decisions on within the national judicial area. In Germany, for example, even four different models were used for forming executive bodies (Gisevius 1991, Wolmann 2000, Maurer 2002).

Municipal law differentiates between various approaches. According to the monistic system, the representative body has all the authority of the local government and there are no executive bodies; according to the dualistic system, the competence is divided between the representative and the executive bodies (Maurer 2002). Two basic systems – traditional and parliamentary - are applied when forming the council committees or executive body.

1. The traditional system means that the political executive body of the council is set up from among the political forces represented in the council adhering to the principle of proportionality.
2. The parliamentary system means that the political executive body is set up adhering to the principle of majority, i.e. its seats are assigned to representatives of the party or coalition of parties that won the election.

In the Nordic countries, both systems are applied; however, in Norway, for example, each local government can decide whether to operate on the basis of the traditional

or the parliamentary model.⁸ The parliamentary model has, however, been used to form the executive body, for example, in Oslo and Bergen (John 2001; Larsen, Offerdal 2000). In Sweden, the traditional model is applied when setting up the executive committee functioning as the executive body.⁹ Considering this, the organisation of local governments can be modelled on three different basic options.

The first is the **committee model** of local government. It is characterised by the monistic structure of bodies and by the important role of area-specific committees in formulating policies. In this system, the emphasis is on collegial policymaking at council committees. Councillors in this kind of local government have a very extensive workload (Rao 1999). Many routine tasks and also policy advice, which are often delegated to the executive, are done in this case by council and its committees. (Stoker 1991; Sootla, Grau 2005).

The second is the **cabinet (or parliamentary) model** of local government. It is characterised by the dualistic structure of bodies, the parliamentary system and the important role of the political executive body. The cabinet model delegates extensive policymaking authority to the politically appointed and controlled mayor, who is usually the leader of a major political party or coalition. The mayor appoints an executive body that is similar to ministerial. (Sootla, Grau 2005) The council mainly has the legislative role, the main policy proposals come from the executive body. In case of the “soft cabinet model”, members of the executive body have to be members of the council at the same time. In case of the so-called strong cabinet model, members of the executive body do not have to be members of the council and sometimes it is even foreclosed by the law. While the first option allows for a relatively strong influence of the council, the second alternative diminishes the role of the council compared to the executive body.

The third option is the mayoral model of local government. It will not be addressed further in the present article since none of the countries included in the analysis apply it.

3.2 The management model of Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius

In Tallinn, 63 members were elected to the Council. On 23 May 2004, the City Council faction of the Centre Party made a motion to designate the number of members in the next composition of the Council as 31. Also, the City Government supported the motion stating apropos in the opinion submitted on 2 June 2004 that “the City Government is of the opinion that organisation of work of the Council with a smaller membership would be more flexible, work of the Council would be more efficient, the contribution and responsibility of council members would be more personal. Efficient and professional City Council would be one of the firmest safeguards for increasing administrative capacity of local government in Tallinn.” The statement of case substantiated the need to decrease the number of council members with the fact that, both in Riga and Vilnius, the number of council members per res-

⁸ Sub-section 18(1) of the Norwegian Local Government Act.

⁹ Sections 3.2 and 5.46 of the Swedish Local Government Act.

ident was lower than in Tallinn. Due to opposition offered by other parties represented in the City Council, the motion was withdrawn on 12 May 2005. In doing so, the arguments were incompatible with the existing Estonian self-government model and the resulting alienation of authorities from people unavoidably following the decrease in the number of council members. Table 4 shows that the Council of the capital city would have become considerably smaller than the council of Tartu, the second largest city with an almost four times smaller population. A principal difference distinguishing Estonia from Latvia and Lithuania is that there has to be no correspondence between the political composition of the Council committee and the political composition of the Council, and persons (experts) who are not members of the Council (and who, as a result, are not residents of the local authority) can be members of committees (except for the audit committee). In this respect, the Estonian self-government model resembles that of Finland, and the Latvian and Lithuanian models resemble those of Sweden and Norway. Although involving experts is in itself positive, this system does not guarantee protection and representation in the committees of the opposition, not even in the audit committee.

The local self-government system in Estonia is based on the “strong cabinet model.” There are two political management levels in Tallinn – the City Council and the City Government set up by the Council. In Estonia, members of the Council cannot simultaneously be members of the executive body. According to the Local Government Organisation Act, the Council elects the mayor; other members of the City Government are appointed by the Council on the proposal of the mayor. In Estonia, neither the mayor nor members of the municipal government can be members of the council; they should not have a direct mandate from citizens. They can be businessmen, local political leaders or civil servants.

The local self-government system in Latvia is based on the committee model. The council members should, first and foremost, be professionals in the case of the committee model since they have a big work load. In Latvia, the number of population per council member is very high, not only when compared with other Baltic States but also on the European scale; the numbers are comparable with the models used in the USA (Vilka et al 2002). Riga City Council consists of 60 members; smaller communities elected seven deputies and communities over 50,000 elected fifteen members (Vanags et al 2004) The word “chairperson” is used in the legislation instead of the “mayor”. The chairperson (*Priekšsēdētājs*) of Riga City Council is sometimes called the Mayor of Riga (Vanags, Vilka, Pukis, 2002). The lack of a political executive body is the reason for committees performing the duties that usually fall within the competence of a regular executive body: monitoring the work, approving and monitoring expenditure estimates of the local government institutions and undertakings.

Table 4

Number of population of capital cities and members of representative bodies in Nordic countries as of 1 Jan 2004

	Population of capital city	Number of council members	Number of residents per council member	Name and population of second largest city	Number of council members
Tallinn	397,150	63	6,303	Tartu/101,190	49
Riga	735,241	60	12,254	Daugavpils/111,231	15
Vilnius	542,287	51	10,633	Kaunas/378,943	41
Helsinki	559,330	85	6,580	Espoo/224,231	67
Stockholm	761,721	101	7,542	Gothenburg/478,055	81
Oslo	521,886	59	8,845	Bergen/237,430	67

Source: *Europa World Year Book 2005*, number of council members taken from web pages of cities.

Lithuania uses the “soft cabinet model”, i.e. there is the institution of the executive body (City Municipal Board; hereafter: the Board) in Lithuania and its competence is laid down by law. The Council and the Board are headed by the mayor elected from among the Council Members and by them; under Section 12 of the Law on Local Self-government, the mayor has to be elected within two months after the first session of the new Council or dismissal of the previous mayor, and his/her election is organised by an electoral committee. The same principle is applied when the deputy mayor (deputy mayors) is elected. The Board is formed by the Council and only Council members, including the mayor and his/her deputy (deputies), can be members of the Board. The parliamentary system is used; members of the Board are appointed on the proposal of the mayor. The chairman, deputy chairman and members of the audit committee cannot be members of the Board.

Table 5

Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius City Council committees in city management system

	Tallinn	Riga	Vilnius
Number of committees	11	10	8
Compulsory committees	Audit committee Subsection 48(1) of Local Government Organisation Act	Finance committee, and social, education and culture issues committee (Section 51 of Law on Local Governments)	Audit committee (Subsection 15(2) of Law on Local Self-government)
Do committee members have to be members of the Council?	All members of the audit committee; in case of other committees only the chairmen (Subsections 47(1) and 48(2) of Local Government Organisation Act)	Yes (Section 50 of Law on Local Governments)	Yes (Subsection 15(2) of Law on Local Self-government)
Correspondence between the membership of committees and the political composition of the Council	No correspondence necessary	Yes (Section 54 of Law on Local Governments)	Representatives of all the victorious lists of candidates have to be represented in the audit committee; in other committees, coalition and opposition have to be proportionately represented (Subsection 15(2) of Law on Local Self-government)
Correspondence between the structure of committees and the structure of city executive agencies.	No	Yes	Yes

Now, in addition to summing up the analysis of political management of three capital cities, a couple of words on the overture concerning management reform Tallinn City Council made to the Ministry of Internal Affairs in 1998. In 1998, the Government had plans to draft a new Local Government Organisation Act. Therefore, on 11 June 1998, Tallinn City Council adopted a decision, “The Principles for Managing Tallinn”, containing proposals for the further management of the city. When the document was reviewed, it became apparent that the new management model for Tallinn had been worked out following the example of the local government model of Riga (Latvia).¹⁰ Although the cabinet model of organisation would have been maintained, the draft provided that “the City Council chairman/the mayor and the chairmen of the standing council committees/deputy mayors form the City Government.” The draft also provided that committees have the right to issue legislation upon authorisation of the Council. It would have inclined the status of the committees towards the Latvian local government organisation; but the status of the executive body (the parliamentary system, compatibility of posts) would have resembled that of Lithuanian executive bodies. The overture was incompatible with the Estonian local government model and it was rejected because of that.

3.4 Balance between political and administrative management

We are addressing yet another significant topic – the balance between political and administrative management. In Estonia, political and administrative management is not very clearly distinguished. Although the Local Government Organisation Act does not treat it in detail, such a layout is generally used where departments representing administrative management set up based on the functional principle are subordinate to individual members of the City Government depending on their established division of labour. In Tallinn, it means that one or more municipal authorities are directly subordinate to the mayor and each deputy mayor. In addition to Tallinn, such a system is also in use in Helsinki, Stockholm and Oslo.

In Estonia, the political and administrative management levels are entwined at the City Government level and all authorities are directly subordinate to the political level, whereas in Latvia and Lithuania, the political and administrative management are clearly separated and they are connected by the apolitical office of chief executive subordinate to the Council.

In Riga, according to Section 68 of the Law on Local Governments, the chief executive is appointed by the Council on the proposal of the mayor. For each area of activity of a council committee, there is a corresponding functional executive agency. The committee is responsible for formulating the policies for the area and for its supervision; administrative management of executive agencies is under the chief executive. In Vilnius, the chief executive is appointed by the committee set up by the Council, while a representative of the Lithuanian Ministry of Internal Affairs is also a member of the committee. The chief executive is accountable and reports

¹⁰ The people who worked out the draft referred to the example of Riga in their published articles; e.g. „Kohaliku omavalitsuse probleemid Eestis lahendamata” by Hilja Anne Merzin, then the legal advisor to the Council, daily „Postimees“, 7.7.1998.

to the mayor. According to the earlier version of the law, both the chief executive and the controller were appointed by the Council for its term of office; for that reason undesired political occurrences can be considered to have impelled the amending of the law.

Introducing the office of the chief executive has been discussed also in Estonia. The strategy states: *“According to the current management model, local government administration is directly subordinate to the rural municipality or city government, thus, over-politicising local executive power. At the moment, executive power (apparatus) dominates in Estonian local governments and, therefore, the council as the representative body of the people and the essence of local self-government does not have the place it should have in a democratic country.”*

Among the rest, the following overtures were made in the concept (Olle 2000):

- Separate political (strategic) management from every-day administrative (operational) management in order to improve municipal management;
- The rural municipality or city administration is headed by the chief executive whose length of contract does not depend on the term of office of the Council;
- The municipal director is appointed by the Council on proposal of the mayor for the specified term of five to seven years depending on the municipal statutes.

The overture was criticised by the Reform Party that also belonged to the political coalition.¹¹ First and foremost, it was emphasised that it makes no sense to talk about the apolitical chief executive in a country of developing democracy. Even now local governments have a choice whether to form a political or apolitical (i.e. consisting of specialists) municipal government. In the “strong” cabinet system, this is not necessary because of the balance between the roles of mayor and council. (Sootla, Grau 2005)

4. Decentralised City Management Model

4.1 Theoretical background

In a large local government, the issue of social anonymity of the local government inevitably arises. Democracy and citizen friendliness is what makes the city district position unique compared to other city management structures.

The case for sub-municipal area councils or representative advisory committees has been accepted in most large European countries since 1950s. (Norton 1994) In most governmental systems, centralising and decentralising occur simultaneously. The governing of large cities has long been an arena for the interplay of centralising and decentralising influences. Centralised authority is needed in order to capture scale economies; centralised coordination is needed for effective management of

¹¹ E.g. the article “Haldusreform ülepeakaela” by Meelis Atonen in the daily *Postimees* on 30.3.2001.

area-wide services; a centralised perspective is needed in land-use planning and public policy formation. (Barlow 1993) On the other hand, the case against centralised government is based largely on decentralist arguments. The following reasons for establishing city districts in the course of territorial decentralisation of city management have been mentioned in literature (Barlow 1993, Norton 1994):

- 1) City district management structures enable members of the public to participate in the political life and have a say in taking decisions on issues important for the district;
- 2) At the city district level, it is better to take into account the local priorities, manage resources efficiently according to the real needs and, thus, bring about efficient management;
- 3) The residents of the district must be provided services as close to home as possible.

From the aspect of democracy, decentralisation can be viewed in two dimensions.

- 1) Administrative decentralisation means granting structural units the rights of self-organisation, i.e. decisions are taken by civil servants within the organisation.
- 2) Democratic decentralisation means that people outside the organisation (i.e. local residents) are involved both in preparing and taking decisions (Pollit, Birchall, Putnam 1998, www.worldbank.com). The extent of decentralisation within the local government is for the representative body to decide. Democratic decentralisation requires subordinate units to have been granted the right to take decisions and issue legislation in order to solve certain problems, or in a broader sense – the right to make political choices between alternatives.

The application of democratic decentralisation is justified before all else if city districts differ in terms of their identity. Then it can be assumed that neither the preferences of the citizens nor local priorities are similar. Also the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers supported the democratic decentralisation in the recommendation submitted on 20 October 2004: "*within large metropolitan areas, internal decentralisation and deconcentration may help to improve participation (for example, elected bodies at municipal district level).*"

The authors feel that the principle of subsidiarity should be the principal criterion upon delegation of responsibilities to city districts. The said principle is defined in Article 4(3) of the Charter. Although the principle is generally treated in the context of the state – local governments, the rights, duties and responsibility move closer to the citizen and the problem upon territorial decentralisation of the city, and, therefore, the principle can also be applied to the context of city management. (Mäeltsemees 2003a) Since the principle concerns territorial distribution of competence, adhering to it is not the case when the representative body delegates responsibilities to the executive body or to a city administrative agency.

4.2 Municipal Districts' Management

4.2.1 Citizen involvement in city district management – city district council

When comparing the Baltic States with Sweden and Norway, democracy and the involvement of the people is of cardinal importance in those two countries (Bäck *et al* 2001, Bäck 2002). The city district statutes of Stockholm and Oslo are examples of this; under the statutes, the principle of local democracy is of cardinal importance to activities of city districts. Section 1 of the Stockholm district statutes states the principle of local democracy and resident inclusion as an objective of districts in addition to efficiency and improving the quality of local government, with the said principle at the top of the list (Reglement 2001). The principal characteristic and political decision-making body of Stockholm, Oslo and other Swedish and Norwegian cities applying the decentralised management model is the city district council, either elected directly by the district residents (in four districts of Oslo) or appointed by the city council from among the district residents in accordance with the political composition of the council (Stockholm, Malmö, Gothenburg, the remaining 11 districts of Oslo). The district council operates within the limits set by the council.

In Estonia, the definition, status or competence of the city district have not been provided in the Local Government Organisation Act or other legislation. Therefore, the City Council or City Government cannot delegate to the district council the right to issue legislation, and the district council can give only advisory opinions. In Tallinn, the district councils composed of district residents were formed already in the early 1990s but almost without any rights, obligations and responsibility; their role in city management has been marginal. The procedure for forming the district council has changed over time but an essential principle has remained the same – the candidate for the council membership must have stood for the City Council and be entered in the city district population register. The number of district council members is equal to twice the number of city district electoral mandates plus one. The members are appointed, according to the local election results, from among the political parties, election coalitions and independent candidates in favour of whom more votes have been cast than is required for becoming elected (in Estonia the requirement is 5% of the total votes cast), i.e. in principle, the same system was applied as at local elections. Thus, the district council members have the mandate won from the residents of the district contrary to the Council committees that can consist of the members of the public who did not participate in the election or did not succeed in being elected.

The Law in Latvia does not contain the definition of the district council. In Riga, representative bodies elected by the residents existed in city districts until 1994 and the Law on the Capital of Riga adopted by the *Saeima* was in force. In the case of Riga, it was essentially a two-level local government where the city districts were the first level of local government and the city as a whole was the second level. At local elections, the residents of Riga elected both the City Council and the city district councils. The supreme body of the city was, however, the Riga Municipal Council (*Dome*) consisting of 60 members who were not elected but were delegates of the Council (30 members) and city district councils (30 members, i.e. five from

each district). Since both levels were virtually autonomous, it caused constant conflicts over competence between the districts and the central level of the city; also, the process of decision-making on budgetary as well as other issues was time-consuming and rigid. All this led to repealing the Law on the Capital of Riga in 1994 and extending the Law on Local Governments to Riga on 24 May 1994. The same reform abolished city district councils and one City Council was elected in Riga (Vanags, Vilka, 2000).

Lithuania is the only Baltic State where city district councils are provided by legislation. According to Subsection 30 (4) under the Law on Local Self-government, the city district council can be established as an advisory body. The mayor endorses the statutes of the district council taking into account the model statutes endorsed by the Minister of the Interior. It is interesting to note that the definition of the district council was not mentioned in the original version of the law; it was added with an amendment in 2000. In Vilnius, an advisory district council operating on a voluntary basis can be formed of the residents of the city district under Section 6 of the City Statutes. Thus, like in Tallinn, the district councils in Vilnius have but an advisory purpose.

4.2.2 District manager

At the beginning of the previous part it was shown that in Sweden and Norway, the decision-making body is the district council elected or appointed from among district residents. The city district manager in those cities is apolitical; the length of his/her contract does not depend on the election cycle of the council. (*Reglemente ...2001, Reglemente ... 2003, Bäck 2002, Lõhmus 2005*)

In Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the city district as the municipal authority is headed personally by the city district manager. At the same time the status and the competence of the city district manager varies from country to country.

Legally, the city districts' management structures are regulated by the Local Government Organisation Act (Estonia) and the Law on Local Governments (Lithuania). Creating and abolishing city districts, and endorsing their boundaries lies within the sole competence of the city council both in Estonia and Lithuania.¹² The city district is headed in Estonia and Lithuania by the city district manager. In Estonia, the city district manager is appointed by the City Government on the proposal of the mayor; in Lithuania, the mayor appoints the district manager under Subsection 30(2) of the Law on Local Self-government. In Latvia, under Subsection 21(6) of the Law on Local Governments, creating local government territorial structural units and endorsing their structure lies within the sole competence of the council. No other specific provisions regulate decentralised city management in Latvia.

In Tallinn, the office of the city district manager is political: district managers are usually leaders of coalition parties' local organisations. District managers as political officials are interested in holding their offices also after elections; therefore,

¹² Clause 22 (1) 11) of the Local Government Organisation Act (Estonia); Sub-section 30 (1) of the Law on Local Self-government (Lithuania).

they are, first and foremost, guided by political motives upon managing their city districts. In 2002, six city district managers out of eight of those who stood for the Council were victorious; at the same time, three city district managers got the highest number of votes in their electoral district. Until 2005, appointment and discharge of the city district manager was regulated by the city and city district statutes endorsed by the City Council under Clause 54(2) 3) of the Local Government Organisation Act. Under Subsection 96(3) of the Statutes of Tallinn, the City Government appoints and discharges the city district manager on the proposal of the Mayor after hearing the city district council. For the purposes of the Estonian Public Service Act, the city district manager was an official appointed for a specified term (i.e. for the term of office of the Council) whose holding the office should not have depended on the changes in the coalition in power in the city. In real life, however, city district managers were replaced when a new coalition and City Government were formed. Replacement was achieved by paying financial compensation. In 2005, the Local Government Organisation Act was amended so that, firstly, the city district manager is appointed by the City Government on the proposal of the Mayor and secondly, the Manager's discharge has to be based on the reasoned motion of the Mayor. This made the office of the city district manager definitively political. The city district managers are directly under the Mayor but since they are nominees of the Council coalition parties, they are actually relatively independent.

The previous chapter introduced the two-level management system applied in Riga in the early 1990s. In addition to the directly elected councils, there was the district executive board appointed by the district council in each city district. Following the abolishment of district councils in 1994, the district executive boards continued to operate during the transition period until 31 December 1995 (Purgailis 1997). As a result of the reform, city districts became territorial authorities under the chief executive. In Riga, the office of the city district manager is formally apolitical.¹³ The district manager is appointed and discharged by the City Council on the proposal of the chief executive. The chief executive concludes the contract of employment with the district manager and the latter is directly responsible to the chief executive. The district manager is, by virtue of office, a deputy for the chief executive. The officials of the city district manager's office are appointed and discharged by the district manager but appointment of the deputy district manager has to be approved by the chief executive.

As in Riga, the Vilnius city district manager is subordinate to the municipal chief executive. The district manager is chosen by way of competition and the favourable opinion of the public is considered an advantage to the candidate. The mayor appoints and discharges the district manager under the Law on Civil Service.¹⁴ The officials of the city district manager's office are appointed and discharged by the chief executive.

¹³ Points 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of the Statutes of Riga City Districts.

¹⁴ Section 14 of the Statutes of Vilnius City Districts.

4.2.3 Responsibilities of Municipal Districts

In the Swedish and Norwegian cities applying decentralisation such as Stockholm, Oslo, Gothenburg, Malmö, such responsibilities have been delegated to city districts which require the public services to be available to the citizens near their places of residence or if the local government must reach an individual or a problem rather than the other way round, i.e. be as close to the problem as possible (Bäck 2002, Hegelsen *et al* 2001). These responsibilities are set out below:

- 1) cohesion between the resident and the local government, appreciation of the specific character and history of the area;
- 2) social welfare (incl. nursing services, counselling, work with the youth of special needs, provision of other social services);
- 3) recreation and leisure (culture, sports, spare time of the youth and adults);
- 4) maintenance (public green zones, parks, local roads).

These are responsibilities over which city districts usually exercise quite a lot of discretionary power both in terms of decision-making and revenue. In addition to the said responsibilities, responsibilities in other areas such as education, street trading etc are delegated to city districts.

The legislation of the Baltic States and the statutes of Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius regulate the responsibilities of city districts in varying detail. The Estonian legislation provides a curt description of the responsibilities of city districts, e.g. Subsection 11(3) of the Juvenile Sanctions Act authorises the city district manager's offices in concordance with the City Government to establish the district juvenile committee; Section 3 of the Response to Memoranda and Requests for Explanations Act requires city district managers' offices, beside municipal governments, to provide free explanations on the legislation issued by them or draft legislation worked out by them, on the competence of an authority or on the legislation the agency operates under.

The statutes of the Tallinn city districts contain five points describing the responsibilities of the city districts in an extremely general manner that leave ample room for interpretation.¹⁵ According to these points, the city districts have the following responsibilities:

- 1) *guaranteeing development of the city district and ensuring normal functioning of the infrastructure proceeding from the interests and responsibilities of the district, from the needs of its residents, from the specific character of the district, and taking into account the interests of the city as a whole;*
- 2) *providing and intermediating social and public services to the residents of the district and citizens' associations operating in the district;*

¹⁵ Subsection 87 (2) of the Statutes of Tallinn City Districts, points 2.2.1 to 2.2.5 of statutes of city districts.

- 3) *holding, exploitation and disposal of the municipal property located on the territory of the city district and other property placed under its administration pursuant to the procedure provided for in legislation issued by the City Council, and of its budget funds;*
- 4) *supporting the enterprises started by the residents of the district providing services to them;*
- 5) *organising co-operation with other city districts.*

The areas of responsibility of the Tallinn city districts resemble those of Stockholm and Oslo, considering, naturally, the differences arising from the peculiarities of the legislation of these countries. Until 1999, the Tallinn city districts were responsible for educational issues. Then city district education authorities were abolished and their responsibilities were taken on by the Tallinn Education Department to which all the educational institutions under the city districts, such as general education schools, pre-school child care institutions, hobby schools, were subordinated.¹⁶ The responsibilities of the Riga and Vilnius city districts are provided more thoroughly with 24 points and 40 points, respectively, by the statutes of Riga and Vilnius city districts.

Latvian legislation does not contain specific provisions on the responsibilities of city districts. The responsibilities of city districts are provided by the Statutes of Riga. The responsibilities of the Riga city districts mainly concern provision of public services and amenities – maintenance of residential buildings and public areas, but also the population register etc. When comparing the responsibilities of Riga with those of Tallinn, the most striking differences lie in the areas of social welfare and leisure and recreation. In Riga, the regional departments of the Social Administration under the Welfare Department provide public social services, not the city district managers' offices. Also the Education, Youth and Sports Departments in Riga have established district regional departments. In Tallinn, there are no regional sub-structures under city departments.

Clauses 31(2) 1) to 14) of the Lithuanian Law on Local Self-government provides a relatively thorough list of responsibilities for Lithuanian city districts. It gives them a certain autonomy and protection against the centralisation policy of the central level of the city since it is complicated for the central level to take over the responsibilities assigned to city districts by law. In Tallinn, the city districts themselves actively provide public services; the city districts in Vilnius are rather the connecting link between the central level of the city and the members of the public defining the wishes and needs of the members of the public and other subjects, and passing the information on to the central level, as well as exercising supervision over compliance with various pieces of legislation. Specific public services are then provided by appropriate functional authorities.

¹⁶ Tallinn City Government regulation No 88 of 13.10.1999; Tallinn City Government regulation No 16 of 23.2.2000.

In the case of Vilnius, special attention must be drawn to the role of the city districts in creating cohesion between the residents of the city and the local government emphasised in the list of responsibilities. In the course of this, the responsibilities of the city districts are as follows:¹⁷

- 1) Creating conditions for members of the public to be involved in decision-making process of the council to solve problems of both the city and the city district.*
- 2) Organising meetings of city district residents; organising meetings between members of the public and the city district administrative board and officials of state authorities; discussing proposals made by members of the public; conducting opinion polls and organising discussions of public letters and petitions, and supporting other initiatives of citizens.*
- 3) Supporting initiatives of non-profit organisations related to the activities of the city district and also creating conditions for such organisations to operate.*

These points prove that the importance of the city district upon developing local democracy is generally recognised at the city level.

4.3 Analysis and discussion

Considering the above, a conclusion could be drawn that there is no democratic decentralisation in Tallinn, Riga or Vilnius. Although district councils are comprised of district residents exist in Tallinn and Vilnius, they are but advisors and recommenders.

The principles encompassed in the legislation of the Baltic States on the local government provide a basis for that: a formal separation of the political and administrative management in Latvia and Lithuania, and a combination of the political and administrative management in Estonia. In Riga and Vilnius, the district manager heads the district manager's office and, as municipal officials, they are directly under the chief executive. In this context, the management system of Tallinn is similar to the model of the Nordic countries. While in the Nordic countries, the political district council issues administrative legislation, in Estonia, it is done by the city district manager. Thus, Tallinn represents a combined system where a political monocratic directing institution – the city district manager – simultaneously represents the administrative authority by formally being a municipal official.

The summary of the legal and management study made by Tallinn University of Technology concluded that due to the cabinet model applied in Estonia and the organisation of the city, Tallinn is a strongly centralised local government. Under the local self-government model applied in Estonia, the political influence of the municipal council can decrease and in the opinion of the research group, Tallinn has failed to take sufficient measures to compensate for such an effect. Keeping in mind the

¹⁷ Points 12.4, 12.6 and 12.7 of the statutes of city districts.

young democracy, the recent 15 years in the history of Tallinn have been marked by political instability and, as a result, by frequent replacements of the members of the City Government and district managers. Consequently, the heads of municipal administrative agencies employed without a term have considerable influence in the city. Without prior study, decisions based on political interests of the specific moment have been made to limit the rights, obligations and responsibility of the city districts while expanding the limits of competence of municipal administrative agencies.

The responsibilities of city districts are provided by various pieces of legislation issued in the city; the various pieces of legislation, more often than not unsystematically and without common principles, assign the city structural units with tasks while the rights, obligations, responsibility and financing have not been specified. (Sepp, Lõhmus, 2005). Today, the city districts are more like district service stations rather than representatives of local democracy.

The university research team asserted that the city districts have to gain in importance in the overall city management and they have to be granted more rights, obligations and responsibility. The Tallinn city districts differ greatly in terms of identity. Therefore, the research team recommended democratic decentralisation and granting the city district administrative councils real decision-making power. This situation indicates the need to separate the political and administrative management at the city district level entrusting the council with political management, and make the city district manager an apolitical municipal official.

Conclusion

The capital cities of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have introduced new management since the restoration of independence. Although the countries started under similar conditions due to the similarity of their historical background, the experience of 15 years differs from country to country. The development of capital city management cannot be studied separately from the development of the judicial area of these countries. Although the Charter allows the local governments to exercise a certain discretion in establishing their internal structure, the internal structure of the local governments is still largely based on the framework provided by the law.

In terms of territorial organisation of the city, Tallinn and Vilnius are similar, having chosen the system based on historical urban regions. The system in Riga is based on the Soviet period districts where only the names of the districts were replaced by contemporary ones.

The principal differences in the management models applied in these three cities of the Baltic States are the status of the political executive body and the balance between political and administrative management. The status of the political executive body is alike in Estonia and Lithuania since the City Government and the Municipal Board as political executive bodies have been established according to the cabinet model both in Tallinn and Vilnius. The difference lies only in the fact that in Estonia, unlike in Lithuania, members of the representative body cannot be members of its political executive body. There is no political executive body in the Latvian local government management model. Since there is no executive body and

the monistic model is applied, the City Council committees performing the duties of the executive body in Latvia and Riga play an important role in management. Thus, the Latvian model can be called the model of committees. While, above all, the City Council and the City Government form policies in Estonia and Lithuania, in Latvia, in addition to the Council, also Council committees participate in the process.

While the models applied in Estonia and Lithuania are similar in terms of the political executive body, the models applied in Latvia and Lithuania are alike in terms of political and administrative management. Political and administrative management are separated in those countries and the common feature is the office of the apolitical chief executive. In Estonia, political and administrative management are entwined at the City Government level.

The article focuses on the topic of decentralisation and city districts. A common characteristic of all three Baltic States is that their capital cities, including their internal organisation are integral local government units. Thus, city districts established as territorial management units of the city are not autonomous local governments but parts of the city management organisation.

The legal systems of these countries provide a basis for differences in city district management. It is, first and foremost, caused by the principle adhered to in Latvia and Lithuania that political and administrative management in local governments are clearly separated – the office of the chief executive is the link between the administrative organisation and the Council. Thus, city districts are also subordinate units to this office.

The city management model applied in Tallinn differs from that applied in Riga and Vilnius; it differs, above all, in terms of the degree of politicisation. While city district management in Riga and Vilnius is formally apolitical, the model applied in Tallinn is a symbiosis of collective political management characteristic of the Nordic countries and apolitical administrative management exercised by Estonia's Southern neighbours. On the one hand, the political management of the Tallinn city districts makes it possible to react more quickly to the needs of the citizens and the changing political climate, yet, on the other hand, it makes the system unstable; also, the boundary between political and administrative management becomes unclear as does continuity of the agency contingent upon it.

The responsibilities of city districts are similar in all three Baltic States; the methods of performing the duties vary. In Tallinn, the city districts perform their duties by either providing public services themselves or commissioning the services by organising public procurement. In Vilnius, the city districts are more like mediators between the citizen and other subjects such as companies, non-profit associations; a specific service is provided by an institution owned by the city or an appropriate functional municipal structure.

The authors believe that all the cities must, above all, identify the most suitable management organisation and the balance between decentralisation and centralisation for local conditions, and the possibilities of exercising local democracy. The models must be systematic and carefully planned, based on appropriate research not on the current political conditions or the wishes of the officials and authorities concerned for their operational environment and proceeding from the interests of the agency.

REFERENCES

- Alaealiste mõjutusvahendite seadus [Juvenile Sanctions Act]. RT I 1998, 17, 264; 2002, 82, 479; 90, 521; 2003, 26, 156; 2004, 30, 206; 2004, 46, 329.
- Avaldustele ja märgukirjadele vastamise seadus. [Response to Memoranda and Requests for Explanations Act] RT I 2004, 81, 542.
- Bäck, H. 2002. *Fragmentation and Consolidation in the Big City: Neighbourhood Decentralization in Six Scandinavian Cities*. Göteborg University. At <http://www.socsci.auc.dk/institut2/nopsa/arbejdsgruppe12/henryb.pdf>.
- Bäck H. et al. 2001. Slutrapport: Stadsdelsnämnder i Stockholm – Demokrati och effektivitet. IKKE Rapport nr 2001, 11.
- Barlow, M. 1993. "Large City Reforms." In J.R. Bennett (ed.), *Local Government in the New Europe*. London: Belhaven Press, 130-143.
- Beksta, A & A. Petkevicius. 2000. "Local Government in Lithuania." In T.M. Horváth (ed.), *Decentralization: Experiments and Reforms*. Budapest: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, 165-216.
- Bennett, J. R. 1997. Local Government in Post Socialist Cities. Discussion papers no 2, Budapest: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative.
- Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. Adopted by the Constitutional Assembly of Latvia on 15 February 1922, with amendments.
- Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania. Adopted by the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania in the Referendum of 25 October 1992. At <http://www.lrkt.lt/konst/eng/constitution.htm>
- Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers. Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the processes of reform of boundaries and/or structure of local and regional authorities. 2004 (12), 20.10.2004
- Demszky, G. 1998. "Perspectives on Budapest". In J.D. Kimball (ed.), *The Transfer of Power. Decentralization in Central and Eastern Europe*. Budapest: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, 59-78
- Eesti NSV asulate, linnade, alevike, alevite ja külade kategooriasse arvamise kord. ENSV Ülemnõukogu presiidiumi seadlus. ENSV Teataja 1974, 47, 484.
- Eesti NSV kohaliku omavalitsuse aluste seadus [Local Government Foundation Act]. ENSV Teataja 1989, 34, 517.
- Eesti NSV konstitutsioon [The constitution of the Estonian SSR]. RT 1940, 111, 1117.
- Eesti NSV seadus Eesti NSV linna ja linnarajooni tööraha saadikute nõukogu kohta, ENSV Teataja 1979, 50, 605.
- Eesti Põhiseadus [Estonian Republic Constitution]. RT I 1992, 26, 349; RT I 2003, 29, 174; RT I 2003, 64, 429.
- Eesti territooriumi haldusjaotuse seadus [Territory of Estonia Administrative Division Act]. RT I 1995, 29, 356; 1996, 42, 808; 1999, 93, 833; 2002, 34, 207; 2004, 56, 399.
- Europa World Year Book*, The. 2005. 46th edn, vol 1-2. London: Rutledge.
- European Charter of Local Self-Government. Explanatory report. Council of Europe. At www.conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/reports/html/122.htm
- Gisevius, W. 1991. *Leitfaden durch die Kommunalpolitik*. Bonn: Dietz.
- Haldusreform kohaliku omavalitsuse valdkonnas [Administrative reform in the area

- of local self-government]. 2001. Strateegia. Siseministeerium, kohaliku omavalitsuse osakond ja regionaalarengu osakond. At www.sise.gov.ee
- Hegelsen M., J.E. Klausen & A.L. Fimreite. 2001. *Faerre og Storre Bydeler. Prosjektrapport 2001*: 17.
- Illner, M. 1998. "Territorial Decentralization: an Obstacle to Democratic Reform in Central and Eastern Europe?" In J.D. Kimball (ed.), *The Transfer of Power: Decentralization in Central and Eastern Europe*. Budapest: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, 7-42.
- John, P. 2001. *Local Governance in Western Europe*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kohaliku omavalitsuse korralduse seadus [Local Government Organisation Act]. RT I 1993, 37, 558; 1999, 82, 755; 2000, 51, 322; 2001, 82, 489; 100, 642; 2002, 29, 174; 36, 220; 50, 313; 53, 336; 58, 362; 61, 375; 63, 387; 64, 390 ja 393; 68, 407; 82, 480; 96,565; 99, 579; 2003, 1, 1; 4, 22; 23, 141; 88, 588. 2005, 31, 230.
- Kohaliku omavalitsuse volikogu valimise seadus [Local Government Council Election Act]. RT I 2002, 36, 220; 2005, 25, 194; 2005, 47, 387.
- Larsen, O H & A. Offerdal. 2000. "Political implication on the New Norwegian Local Government Act." In E.Amnå & S. Montin (eds), *Towards a New Concept of Local Self-government?: Recent Local Government Legislation in Comparative Perspective*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Law on Elections to Municipal Councils, The (Lithuania). 07.06.1994 no I-532, amended 23.12.1996 no VIII-57
- Law on Elections to the City and Town Councils, District Councils and Pagasts Councils, The (Latvia). Adopted 13.01.1994, with amendments. At http://web.cvk.lv/pub/?doc_id=29073
- Law on Local Government of the Capital Riga, The (Latvia). 10.06.1992.
- Law on Local Self-Government, The (Lithuania). 07.07.1994, no I-533, new ed by 12.10.2000 VIII-2018, amended 28.03.2002 nr IX 823
- Law on the Local Governments, The (Latvia). With Amendments 08.06.1995, 23.05.1996, 05.02.1997, 30.10.1997, 13.11.1997, 05.02.1998, 16.06.1998, 14.10.1998, 09.12.1999, 15.06.2000, 21.12.2000.
- Local Government Act, The (Norway). 25.09.1992 nr 107, updated with amendments up to 1 January 2001.
- Local Government Act, The (Sweden). SFS 1991:900 with amendments.
- Lõhmus, M. 2005. "Fiskaalse detsentraliseerimise koht linnasiseses juhtimises [Fiscal decentralization and City Governing]." In *XIII majanduspoliitika teaduskonverents*. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts Verlag GmbH.
- Maa-, linna- ja vallavolikogude tegevuse lõpetamise seadus. RT 1940, 83, 783.
- Mäeltsemees, S. 2005. "The Capital City in the Local Self-Government System in Europe." In: *Capital City Administration: opportunities and Challenges*. Tallinn: Tallinn University of Technology.
- Mäeltsemees, S. 2003a. Kohaliku omavalitsuse korralduse seaduse ja Vabariigi Valitsuse seaduse muutmise seaduse eelnõu (1190 SE) ekspertarvamus [Expert opinion on Local Government Organisation Act and Government of the Republic Act Amendment Act]. Tallinn 03.02.2003.
- Mäeltsemees, S. 2003b. "Status von Tallinn in der öffentlicher Verwaltung Est-

- lands.” In *Eesti majanduspoliitika teel Euroopa Liitu*. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts Verlag GmbH.
- Mäeltsemees, S. 2000. “Local Government in Estonia.” In T.M. Horváth (ed.), *Decentralization: Experiments and Reforms*. Budapest: Open Society Institute, Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, p 64-113
- Maurer, H. 2002. *Allgemeines Verwaltungsrecht*, 14th edn. München: Verlag C. H. Beck oHG,
- Norton, A. 1994. *International Handbook of Local and Regional Government: a Comparative Analysis of Advanced Democracies*. Aldershot: Elgar.
- Olle, V. 2000. “Estonian Municipal Law, Municipal Policy and Municipal Politics on the Threshold of Changes.” *Juridica International* 5, 49-57.
- Olle, V. 1996. “Local Government reform in Estonia 1989-1996.” *Juridica International* 1, pp14-24.
- Pollit, C, J. Birchall & K. Putnam. 1998. *Decentralising public service management*. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Purgailis, M. 1997. “Riia- tsentraliseerimine, detsentraliseerimine või kontsentreeritud detsentraliseerimine.” In *Juhtimise detsentraliseerimine suurlinnas: rahvusvaheline konverents*. Tallinn: Eesti Haldusjuhtimise Instituut, 54-58.
- Rao, N. 1999. “Representing the People? Testing Assumptions about Local Government Reform.” *Public Administration* 77 (2), 257-271.
- Reglement for Bydelene [The Statutes of Oslo City Districts]. Vedtatt av Oslo bystyre 15.10.2003 sak 363. Oslo
- Reglemente för Stadsdelsnämnderna [The Statutes of Stockholm City Districts]. Kommunfullmäktiges beslut den 5 november 2001 och 3 december 2001 (Utl 2001:135, 2001:146).
- Rīgas domes Labklājības departamenta nolikums [The Statutes of Riga Welfare Department]. Rīgas Dome nolikums 28.12.1999 nr 71.
- Rīgas pašvaldības nolikums [The Statutes of Riga]. Rīgas Domes nolikums 19.08.1997 nr 11.
- Rīgas priekšpilsetas (rajona) izpilddirekcijas nolikums [The Statutes of Riga City Districts]. Rīgas Dome nolikums, 23.09.1997 nr 13. Grozījumi 08.06.1999 nr 60, 19.04 2005 nr 1
- Rīgas priekšpilsetas (rajona) Sociālās palīdzības dienesta nolikums [The Statutes of Regional Departments of the Social Administration]. Rīgas Domes nolikums 13.04.1999 nr 55
- Sepp, T. & M. Lõhmus. 2005. “Managing the City of Tallinn – Opportunities and Challenges.” In *Capital City Administration: Opportunities and Challenges*. Tallinn University of Technology.
- Sootla, G & K. Grau. 2005. “Institutional Balance in Local Government: Council, Mayor, and City Manager in Local Policymaking.” In G. Soós & V. Zentai (eds), *Faces of Local Democracy*. Budapest: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, 275-301.
- Stoker G. 1991. *The Politics of Local Government*. 2nd edn. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Swianiewicz, P. 1992. “The Polish Experience of Local Democracy: Is Progress Being Made?” *Policy and Politics* 20 (2), 87-98.
- Tallinna juhtimise teesid [The Principles for Managing Tallinn]. Tvk m 11. juuni 1998 nr 71.

- Tallinna linnaosade põhimäärused [The Statutes of Tallinn City Districts]. Tvk m 06.10.1997 nr 49.
- Tallinna põhimäärus /1993. a versioon/ [The Statutes of Tallinn]. Tvk o 17. juuni 1993.
- Tallinna põhimäärus [The Statutes of Tallinn]. Tvk m 06.03.1997 nr 6 jõust. 16.03.1997, viimane redaktsioon Tvk m 29.04.2004 nr 11 jõust. 06.05.2004.
- Vanags, E. et al. 2004. "Local Government Reforms in Latvia 1990-2003: Transition to a Democratic Society." *Public Administration* 82 (4), 777-1058.
- Vanags, E. & I. Vilka. 2002, "Local Government Reform in the Baltic Countries." In *Reforming Local Government in Europe: Closing the Gap between Democracy and Efficiency*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, Opladen, 309-322. At www.uni-stuttgart.de/soz/avps/rlg/papers/Baltic%20Countries-Vanags.pdf.
- Vanags, E. & I. Vilka. 2000. "Local Government in Latvia." In T.M. Horváth (ed.) *Decentralization: Experiments and Reforms*. Budapest: Open Society Institute, 119-163.
- Vanags, E., I. Vilka & M. Pukis. 2002. "Indicators of Local Democracy in Latvia." In G. Soos, G. Toka & G Wright (eds), *The State of Local Democracy in Central Europe*. Budapest: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative, pp 111-179.
- Vilniaus miesto Savivaldybes administracijos seniuniju veiklos nuostatai [The Statutes of Vilnius City Districts]. Vinius miesto savivaldybes administracijos direktoriaus isakymas 30. jaanuar 2004 no 40-86.
- Wolmann, H. 2000. "Local Government Modernization in Germany: Between Incrementalism and Reform Waves." *Public Administration* 78 (4), 915-936.

Annex 1

Statistical information on city districts

Table 1: Statistics on Tallinn city districts as of 1 January 2005

	City districts	Area km ²	Population	Density persons/km ²	Members in district council	Employees
1	Haabersti (incl. Lake Harku)	22.17	38,368	1,722	15	47.0
	Kesklinn (incl. Lake Ülemiste and Island of Aegna)	30.62	45,752	1,495	17	92.0
3	Kristiine	7.87	29,912	3,811	13	58.5
4	Lasnamäe	27.41	114,240	4,175	27	122.0
5	Mustamäe	8.15	65,814	8,096	19	85.5
6	Nõmme	29.16	39,236	1,333	15	55.0
7	Pirita	18.69	11,420	601	11	24.5
8	Põhja- Tallinn	15.16	56,952	3,770	17	93.0
	Average		50,212			
	TOTAL:	159.23	401,694			

Source: www.tallinn.ee.

Table 2: Statistics on Riga city districts as of 1 January 2005

	City districts	Old soviet name	Area km ²	Population	Density persons/km ²
1	Ziemeļu	Oktobra rajons	76.90	83,472	1,085
2	Vidzemes	Proletāriešu rajons	57.70	173,288	3,003
3	Latgales	Maskavas rajons	49.90	202,773	4,063
4	Centrs	Kirova rajons	2.90	29,286	10,098
5	Zemgales	Ļeņina rajons	41.30	106,267	2,573
6	Kurzemes	Ļeņingradas rajons	79.10	137,231	1,735
			307.17	732,318	

Source: http://www.np.gov.lv/index.php?lv=fakti_lv.

Table 3: Statistics on Vilnius city districts as of 1 January 2001

	City districts	Area km ²	Population				
1	Antakalnio	77.2	39,697	12	Pilaitės	13.9	15,996
2	Fabijoniškių	5.9	36,644	13	Rasų	16.3	13,054
3	Grigiškės	7	11,617	14	Senamiesčio	4.4	21,022
4	Justiniškių	3	30,958	15	Šeškinės	4.6	36,604
5	Karoliniškių	3.7	31,175	16	Šnipiškių	3.1	19,321
6	Lazdynų	9.9	32,164	17	Žirmūnų	56	30,856
7	Naujamiesčio	4.9	27,892	18	Žvėryno	10.8	24,749
8	Naujininkų	37.6	33,457	19	Verkių	2.6	16,250
9	Naujosios Vilnios	38.6	32,775	20	Vilkpėdės	5.7	47,410
10	Panerių	84.8	8,909	21	Viršuliškių	2.6	12,188
11	Pašilaičių	7.9	25,674				
		400.5	548,412				
			26,115				

Source: <http://www.std.lt/puslapiai/vasv/vsavsensk/surasyimas%20seniunijomis.pdf>.