



Staatlich anerkannte, private  
**Fachhochschule des  
Mittelstands (FHM)**



# Municipal Management of Administrative Burdens

Standard Cost Model as Method of Change

Thomas Wolf-Hegerbekermeier



## Content

Abstract.....	II
Declaration of original content.....	IV
Acknowledgement.....	V
Content.....	VII
Appendices.....	XX
List of Figures.....	XXI
List of Tables.....	XXVII
List of Abbreviations.....	XXXII
<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
I.1 Personal and professional background.....	3
I.2 Self-government in municipalities.....	5
I.2.1 Self-government in Germany.....	6
I.2.2 Local administration in England.....	7
I.3 Constitutional system of municipal funding.....	8
I.3.1 Regular finance equalization.....	9
I.3.2 Principle of connectivity.....	9
I.4 New tasks without resources.....	12
I.5 Cost discussion in a “pre-SCM-era”.....	13
I.6 Measuring administrative costs as political.....	15
I.7 Standard Cost Model as method of change.....	18
I.8 Methodological approach of research.....	21
I.9 Research questions and objectives.....	24
I.10 Introductory conclusion.....	29

<b>II. Literature Review</b> .....	<b>31</b>
II.1 Literature of better legislation and the SCM.....	31
II.2 Opening scoping study.....	36
II.3 Definition of necessary boundaries.....	37
II.3.1 Year of publication.....	38
II.3.2 Language.....	39
II.3.3 Object of investigation.....	39
II.3.4 Research location.....	40
II.4 Systematic review of literature and sources.....	41
II.4.1 Academic databases.....	42
II.4.2 Scientific library catalogue ( <a href="http://www.stabikat.de">www.stabikat.de</a> ).....	44
II.4.3 Court decisions portal ( <a href="http://www.juris.de">www.juris.de</a> ).....	45
II.4.4 Key institutions websites.....	47
II.4.5 Connected sources.....	50
II.4.6 Referenced sources.....	51
II.4.7 Emerged sources.....	51
II.4.8 Qualitative results of review.....	52
II.5 Synthesis and data extraction.....	56
II.5.1 Political SCM implementation.....	57
II.5.1.1 SCM as part of impact assessment.....	57
II.5.1.2 From information obligation to compliance costs.....	59
II.5.2 Legal conditions for municipal cost measurement.....	62
II.5.2.1 Constitutional commentaries.....	62

II.5.2.2	Jurisdiction about municipal funding.....	63
II.5.2.3	Legal literature about municipal funding.....	64
II.5.3	Projects and practice examples.....	67
II.5.4	Municipalities as addressees of the SCM.....	69
II.6	Literary conclusions.....	72
<b>III.</b>	<b>Methods and Methodology.....</b>	<b>75</b>
III.1	Reflection of research philosophy.....	76
III.1.1	Ontological and epistemological aspects of research.....	76
III.1.2	Personal reflection as a researcher.....	79
III.1.3	Pragmatism of research.....	80
III.1.4	Interpretation of law.....	81
III.1.5	Advancement of law.....	83
III.1.6	Inductive approach of legal research.....	84
III.1.7	Assumption of precedence.....	86
III.2	Planning the research design.....	88
III.2.1	Choice of qualitative methods.....	90
III.2.2	Recognizing the nature of study.....	91
III.2.3	Choosing the strategic type of research.....	92
III.2.4	Time horizon of research.....	96
III.2.5	Establishing the ethics of research.....	97
III.2.6	Methodological outcome comparison.....	99
III.2.6.1	Preamble considerations.....	99
III.2.6.2	Research Question 1: Case study vs. text analysis.....	101
III.2.6.3	Research question 2: Case study vs.	

cross case analysis.....	101
III.3 Research methods and procedures.....	106
III.3.1 Institutional interview analysis.....	106
III.3.1.1 Semi-structured type of interview.....	107
III.3.1.2 Preparation of interview data.....	109
III.3.1.3 Grounded theory approach.....	110
III.3.2 Reflective presentation.....	113
III.3.3 Cross case analysis.....	114
III.3.3.1 Types of projects.....	115
III.3.3.2 Systematic Cross Case Analysis.....	116
III.3.4 Legal text analysis.....	120
III.3.4.1 Types of documents.....	120
III.3.4.2 Hermeneutic interpretation.....	122
III.3.4.3 Hermeneutic in legal application.....	125
III.3.4.4 Integration of data and text analysis.....	126
III.4 Methodological summary.....	128
IV. <b>SCM Research and data analysis</b> .....	131
IV.1 Interview data analysis.....	131
IV.1.1 Institutional selection and access.....	132
IV.1.1.1 National Regulatory Control Council (NRCC),	

Berlin.....	133
IV.1.1.2 University of Applied Sciences for the Middle Sized Business, Bielefeld.....	134
IV.1.1.3 German University of Administrative Sciences, Speyer.....	134
IV.1.1.4 Bertelsmann-Foundation, Gütersloh.....	135
IV.1.1.5 Federal Office of Statistics (destatis), Wiesbaden.....	136
 IV.1.2 Conducting the interviews.....	 137
IV.1.2.1 Phase A: Preparing the interviews.....	137
IV.1.2.2 Phase B: Executing the interviews.....	138
IV.1.2.3 Phase C: Legitimizing the interviews.....	140
 IV.1.3 Context analysis of interviewees.....	 141
IV.1.3.1 Catenhusen, Wolf Michael, Berlin.....	142
IV.1.3.2 Dreier, Prof. Dr. Anne, Bielefeld.....	143
IV.1.3.3 Konzendorf, Prof. Dr. Gottfried, Berlin.....	144
IV.1.3.4 Teppe, Günter, Gütersloh.....	145
IV.1.3.5 Vorgrimler, Dr. Daniel, Wiesbaden.....	146
 IV.1.4 Axial coding of interview content.....	 147
IV.1.4.1 Legal conditions for municipal SCM-transfer.....	148
IV.1.4.1.1 Enforcement of municipal SCM application.....	148
IV.1.4.1.2 SCM as part of negotiation process.....	149
IV.1.4.1.3 Legal fundament of SCM application.....	150
IV.1.4.2 Methodological framework for municipal compliance cost determination.....	152

IV.1.4.2.1	SCM standardization in administrative processes.....	152
IV.1.4.2.2	Municipal model testing of SCM application.....	154
IV.1.4.2.3	Possibilities of New Communal Finance Management (NCF).....	156
IV.1.4.2.4	Municipal comparability in different federal states.....	157
IV.1.4.2.5	Cost differences between municipal and state level administration.....	158
IV.1.4.2.6	Benchmarking motivation.....	160
IV.1.4.3	Sufficient conditions for SCM-implementation to municipalities.....	162
IV.1.4.3.1	Role of municipal member association....	162
IV.1.4.3.2	NRCC-like institutions in federal states....	164
IV.1.4.3.3	Transparency and communication.....	165
IV.1.5	Interview statement reflection.....	166
IV.2	Reflective presentation analysis.....	168
IV.2.1	Selection of audience.....	168
IV.2.1.1	Governmental program of better legislation.....	169
IV.2.1.2	Arbeitsgemeinschaft für wirtschaftliche Verwaltung – AWV.....	169
IV.2.2	AWV context and members anonymity.....	170
IV.2.3	Conducting the presentation.....	172
IV.2.4	Personal reflection of presentation.....	173

IV.2.5	Protocol author: Dr. Petra Pfisterer.....	175
IV.2.6	Coding protocol analysis.....	176
	IV.2.6.1 Validity and volatility of financial data.....	176
	IV.2.6.2 Constitutional aspect of federalism.....	178
	IV.2.6.3 Methodological transferability and comparability.....	178
IV.2.7	Protocol statement reflection.....	180
IV.3	Cross case analysis.....	181
IV.3.1	Relevance screening of SCM projects.....	182
	IV.3.1.1 IfM: Cost estimation in selected business branches (2006).....	183
	IV.3.1.1.1 Project description.....	183
	IV.3.1.1.2 Project analysis.....	183
	IV.3.1.1.3 Project relevance.....	184
	IV.3.1.2 Hoffian & Bramann: Gender equality in employment law (2007).....	185
	IV.3.1.2.1 Project description.....	185
	IV.3.1.2.2 Project analysis.....	186
	IV.3.1.2.3 Project relevance.....	187
	IV.3.1.3 Fischbach & Schmal: Administrative costs of the new EHUG (2007).....	188
	IV.3.1.3.1 Project description.....	188



IV.3.1.3.2	Project analysis and relevance.....	188
IV.3.1.4	NRCC: Effects of ELENA (2007).....	189
IV.3.1.4.1	Project description.....	189
IV.3.1.4.2	Project analysis and relevance.....	190
IV.3.1.5	NW Consult: Selected local administration processes (2008).....	191
IV.3.1.5.1	Project description.....	191
IV.3.1.5.2	Project analysis.....	191
IV.3.1.5.3	Project relevance.....	193
IV.3.1.6	FHM: Municipalities as victims of administrative burdens (2009).....	194
IV.3.1.6.1	Project description.....	194
IV.3.1.6.2	Project analysis.....	195
IV.3.1.6.3	Project relevance.....	196
IV.3.1.7	Walkenstik: Administration costs of Thuringian restaurant act (2009).....	196
IV.3.1.7.1	Project description.....	196
IV.3.1.7.2	Project analysis.....	197
IV.3.1.7.3	Project relevance.....	198
IV.3.1.8	NRCC: Easier to household benefits (2009b).....	199
IV.3.1.8.1	Project description.....	199
IV.3.1.8.2	Project analysis.....	200
IV.3.1.8.3	Project relevance.....	201

IV.3.1.9	NRCC: Easier to parent's money (2009a).....	201
	IV.3.1.9.1 Project description.....	201
	IV.3.1.9.2 Project analysis and relevance.....	202
IV.3.1.10	FHM: Administrative costs of EU soil protection act (2010).....	203
	IV.3.1.10.1 Project description.....	203
	IV.3.1.10.2 Project analysis.....	203
	IV.3.1.10.3 Project relevance.....	204
IV.3.1.11	NRCC: Easier to education grants (2010).....	205
	IV.3.1.11.1 Project description.....	205
	IV.3.1.11.2 Project analysis and relevance.....	205
IV.3.1.12	NRCC: Immigration process of foreign professionals (2011).....	207
	IV.3.1.12.1 Project description.....	207
	IV.3.1.12.2 Project analysis and relevance.....	207
IV.3.1.13	Bertelsmann Stiftung: Executive costs in public tax administration (2012).....	208
	IV.3.1.13.1 Project description.....	209
	IV.3.1.13.2 Project analysis.....	209
	IV.3.1.13.3 Project relevance.....	210
IV.3.2	Coding analysis of relevant SCM projects.....	211

IV.3.2.1	Municipal SCM permissibility.....	212
IV.3.2.2	Standardization as methodological framework.....	213
IV.3.2.3	Early feedback in federal legislation.....	214
IV.3.3	Review of SCM project contribution.....	215
IV.4	Linking data and text analysis.....	217
<b>V.</b>	<b>Legal hermeneutic text analysis.....</b>	<b>219</b>
V.1	Differentiation of texts and documents.....	219
V.2	Categorization of analysis statements.....	224
V.2.1	Grammatical and historical arguments.....	227
V.2.2	Systematic arguments.....	229
V.2.3	Teleological arguments.....	230
V.3	Systematic reading of legal texts and data sources.....	231
V.4	Research question 1: Legal conditions for municipal SCM-transfer.....	233
V.4.1	Hermeneutic prejudice.....	233
V.4.2	Analysis of jurisdictional and legal literature.....	234
V.4.2.1	Necessary reservation by law.....	235
V.4.2.2	Municipal guarantees within finance equalization.....	237
V.4.2.2.1	Dimension of municipal funding.....	238
V.4.2.2.2	State specific model of municipal finance equalization.....	239
V.4.2.2.3	Necessity of realistic cost assessment.....	242
V.4.2.2.4	SCM as method of realistic cost assessment	243

V.4.2.3	Municipal guarantees by principle of connectivity.....	244
V.4.2.3.1	Political integration of the principle of connectivity.....	245
V.4.2.3.2	Refunding as result of the principle of connectivity.....	246
V.4.2.3.3	SCM as method of appropriate funding.....	248
V.4.2.4	Proposals for legal development.....	248
V.4.2.4.1	Additions for municipal finance equalization.....	249
V.4.2.4.2	Standard compliance cost method.....	250
V.4.2.4.3	Additions for the principle of connectivity...	251
V.4.2.4.4	Obligation transfer by the Deutscher Bundestag.....	251
V.4.2.4.4.1	Obligation transfer by federal state legislation.....	252
V.4.2.4.4.2	Municipal funding in federal state equalization.....	253
V.4.2.4.4.3	Coherence in total equalization systems.....	254
V.4.2.4.4.4	State oriented cost impact assessment.....	255
V.4.3	Hermeneutic review of legal conditions.....	257
V.5	Research question 2: Methodological framework for municipal compliance cost determination.....	258
V.5.1	Hermeneutic prejudice.....	258
V.5.2	Analysis of jurisdictional and legal literature.....	260

V.5.2.1	Parliament’s wide scope of decision making.....	260
V.5.2.2	Methodological guidelines for municipal cost Estimation.....	262
V.5.2.3	Amount of municipal compliance costs.....	264
V.5.2.3.1	Compliance costs in municipalities.....	264
V.5.2.3.2	Administrative and purposes costs in municipalities.....	265
V.5.2.4	The “average economic municipality”.....	268
V.5.2.5	SCM as method for measuring compliance costs....	269
V.5.3	Hermeneutic review of methodological framework.....	270
V.6	Research question 3: Sufficient conditions for SCM- implementation to municipalities.....	271
V.6.1	Hermeneutic prejudice.....	271
V.6.2	Analysis of jurisdictional and legal literature.....	273
V.6.2.1	Responsibility of the leading ministry.....	274
V.6.2.2	Municipal consultations.....	275
V.6.2.3	Point of time for municipal cost estimation.....	277
V.6.2.4	Proposed legislative process design.....	279
V.6.3	Hermeneutic review of SCM implementation.....	280
V.7	Summary of research analysis.....	281
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Conclusions of municipal SCM research.....</b>	<b>285</b>
VI.1	Relevance of research.....	285

VI.2	Implications and limitations of main research findings.....	286
VI.2.1	Qualitative research design.....	287
VI.2.2	Research question 1: Legal research findings.....	288
VI.2.3	Research question 2: Methodological research findings.....	291
VI.2.4	Research question 3: Organizational research findings.....	293
VI.2.5	Limitations of research study.....	295
	V.2.5.1 Transfer of jurisdiction.....	296
	V.2.5.2 Impacts into public finance system.....	296
VI.3	Recommendations for future SCM research.....	298
VI.4	Final remarks.....	300