

RESEARCH REPORT

Ranking Local Government Performance in Pakistan through Scorecards

Syed Mohammad Ali

SOUTH ASIA PARTNERSHIP-PAKISTAN

Haseeb Memorial Trust Building, Nasirabad, 2 K.M Raiwind Road, P.O Thoker
Niaz Baig, Lahore 53700-Pakistan

Phone: 92-42-5311701-6 Fax: 92-42-5311710 Email: info@sappk.org

Research Report By: Syed Mohammad Ali
Data feeding & Tabulation: Asad Shakir
Research Coordinator: Anwar Chaudhary
Editor: Nida Khalid
Sub Editor: Shabnam Rashid
Title Design By: Mehboob Ali
First Publication: March, 2007
Quantity: 1000
Publisher: South Asia Partnership-Pakistan
Printer:

Financial Contribution
Canadian International Agency (CIDA)
& Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC)

Contents

1. Preface
2. List of abbreviations
3. Introduction
4. Background
5. Rationale & Methodology
6. Major Findings
7. Concluding Remarks
8. Annexure 1
9. Annexure II
10. Annexure III
11. Annexure IV
12. Annexure V
13. Annexure VI

Preface:

Pakistan is one of the several developing countries which identifies the need for devolving power and responsibility for social delivery. For this purpose, the Local Government Ordinance 2001 has created Local Government Bodies which are responsible for providing basic services to people.

South Asia Partnership, Pakistan (SAP-PK) has undertaken this research under its national program of "Strengthening Democratic Governance in Pakistan" (SDGP, 2005-9). This study will help provide a platform for communicating information to citizens, the civil society organizations and the government about what key stakeholders in local governments think about the performance of the Local Government system, therefore providing a clear picture of where they stand presently and how can they be improved in the future.

This research study was undertaken in 19 districts of Pakistan focusing on accessing the Local Government based on the views of the elected representatives and Government officials who have been responsible for implementing the new Local Government arrangements.

The objective of this report is to gauge the performance of these Local Government Bodies and to provide a comprehensive view of how well they are serving their purpose. The report will also be studying the success of these local Government Bodies and what steps can be taken to further develop their structure.

It aims to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the existing Local Government performance and will assess the overall performance of the current devolution exercise in Pakistan, providing ideas for making local governments more effective in the future.

List of Abbreviations

CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CCBs	Citizen Community Boards
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DTCE	Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment
FY	Financial Year
LG	Local Government
LGO	Local Government Ordinance
LGS	Local Government System
NRB	National Reconstruction Bureau
PRSP	Punjab Rural Support Programme
Rs.	Rupees
SAP-PK	South Asia Partnership Pakistan
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
SDGP	Strengthening Democratic Governance in Pakistan
UCs	Union Councils

Glossary of Local Terms

Aqliat	Religious minority
Kissan	Peasant
Mazdoor	Worker/Labourer
Nazim	Mayor
Naib Nazim	Deputy Mayor
Tehsil	Administrative division in district
Zila	District

Introduction

This report aims to highlight the results of scorecards ranking the local government performance across 19 districts of Pakistan. The objective is draw implications concerning the functioning of local government, since their creation by the Local Government Ordinance in 2001.

This research report begins by exploring the imperatives for initiating a performance ranking or scoring of local governments (section 2). It then moves on to describe the research methodology devised to undertake this study, describing the overall scope and the research design of this study (section 3).

The next section (section 4) focuses on the findings emerging from the research. This is the core section of the report which undertakes analysis based on the primary research of this study therein collated findings from questionnaires are analyzed alongside documentation obtained from local governments themselves. This next section provides a composite ranking of local governments on the basis of scores they obtained during the research. This section will also compare and contrast the various categories of scores obtained by the 19 districts where this research was undertaken.

The final section of the report (section 5) will reiterate major findings of the research and focus on lessons learnt in terms of making local governments more effective in the future for a range of relevant stakeholders, including civil society organizations, the donor community and the government itself.

Background

The need for devolving power and responsibility for social delivery is increasingly acknowledged by development agencies and several developing countries. Development activity is no longer considered the prerogative of centralized states. Instead of this, representative local level administrative and political units are considered better placed to provide basic services to people. Simultaneously, the role of community participation is considered essential within the devolution process for ensuring quality service and accountability.

The Local Government Ordinance 2001 in Pakistan claims that it has provided devolved decision making. However the mere fact that political parties were not allowed contesting elections by a military-led government, and that devolution took place from the provinces to the lower levels instead of commencing from the center, has led to a lot of controversy. There have been claims of having weakened the provinces and of aiming to dissipating the influence of political parties. While these are serious charges, the ultimate test of the Devolution Plan is in its stated ability of having created low tiers of government which have improved the lives of common people. This is the criterion based on which this research will try to assess the LGO 2001 and the local governments created by it.

The so-called 'implementation arm' of the National Reconstruction Bureau,¹ the UNDP supported Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment (DTCE), undertook a Social audit of governance and delivery of public services was in 2004-05. The 2004-05 social audit was based on a baseline social audit of 2001-2, and this was meant to enable it to undertake a comparison over time of citizens' views, use and experiences of public services under the devolved local government. The findings of this survey have indicated a general level of satisfaction in health, education, community participation etc. Yet other research finds evidence of elite capture of not only local governments but also citizen groups like Citizen Community Boards (CCBs) which were meant to have enhanced participation of people within governance processes. Hence, instead of aiming to refute findings of different studies, this research aims to undertake a simple exercise, of scoring Local Government (LG) performance based on responses obtained from LG representatives themselves.

The current research study will therefore focus on assessing local governments based on the views of local elected representatives and government officials themselves, who have been responsible for implementing the new local government arrangements. The questions asked of them are also in accordance to the very criteria identified for the creation of local governments. However, more will be said about the approach of the current study in the following section describing the scope and methodology, and the findings emerging from this

¹ The Chairman of NRB also heads the DTCE.

approach will themselves illustrate the efficacy of taking a more participatory approach to determining the existing state of local governments.

Rationale

Given the evident controversial perspectives concerning the efficacy of local governments which have been created under the LGO 2001, this research study has aimed to identify simple and non-controversial performance measures to determine and evaluate local governments. This research study has been undertaken by South Asia Partnership Pakistan (SAP-PK) under auspices of its national level program: 'Strengthening Democratic Governance in Pakistan' (SDGP; 2005-09) which has been jointly funded by Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC). The SDGP aims to promote and strengthen citizens' role, especially the role of the poor peasants and rural workers in governance systems and processes, to participate in the policy formulation and actions that directly affect their lives. In this pursuit, the program works closely with peasants and rural workers as its direct 'target and beneficiary population', other major actors in the local governance system i.e., the nazims, councillors and local government bodies, other government functionaries, CCBs, CSOs, representatives of political parties, social-political activists and workers groups. The program plans to cover 400 union councils (UCs) in 40 districts of Pakistan or, ten districts in each of the four provinces of the country. The LG scorecards which have been devised under this study will try to provide a vehicle for communicating information to citizens, and other stakeholders like the civil society organizations, the government and the donor community, about what key stakeholders in local governments think about the performance of the LG system, as it has been implemented on ground.

Research objective

Preparation of LG scorecards to ascertain district government performance, using the criteria identified within the Local Government Ordinance 2001 itself. The feedback obtained from the LG scorecards is meant to be used to highlight strengths and weaknesses in existing LG performance, and to assess the overall performance of the current devolution exercise in Pakistan.

Scope of research

Although this research was planned to be implemented in all twenty SDGP focus districts, data from Mastung district could not be obtained, due to which the scope of the research findings had to be confined to the remaining nineteen districts. LG performance is thus gauged in 19 district and tehsil governments using secondary information sources (such as district activity reports) and questionnaires to prepare LG scorecards. A checklist of primary data to be collected was issued to the researchers which identified the following relevant documents:

- Budget documents for the year 2005-06 and 2006-07
- Detail of district development plans

- Annual reports of district councils
- Detail of councils' activities

This questionnaire which was devised to provide information for preparing LG scorecards was designed to collect, and to thereafter be able to disseminate information, in a simple, understandable form. This questionnaire (see Annex I) was administered to 15 respondents each within 19 program districts across the country.

The relevant stakeholders to whom the questionnaires were to be administered were:

- District Nazim (1 Questionnaire)
- District Naib Nazim (1 Questionnaire)
- Member District Council (2 Questionnaires)
- Member District Council Opposition (2 Questionnaires)
- Member Tehsil Council [Naib Nazims of any UC] (2 Questionnaires)
- UC Nazim [Nazims of SDGP selected UCs] (3 Questionnaires)
- Peasant Councilor Tehsil (1 Questionnaire)
- Labor Councilor Tehsil (1 Questionnaire)
- Minority Councilor Tehsil (1 Questionnaire)
- Lady Councilor District (2 Questionnaires)

A total of fifteen questionnaires were sent to each district. The return ratio was excellent (86%) and we managed to have a total of 246 respondents. District-wise details of the respondents are attached as Annex II.

Methodological Approach

This sub-section outlines (a) the process whereby SAP-PK initiated work on the current assignment, including the responsibilities allocated to the research consultant, to research partners on ground, and to SAP-PK itself, and thereafter (b) it refers to some of the research considerations which were kept in mind while undertaking the research for preparing the scorecards.

Logistical issues

A research consultant (Syed Mohammad Ali) was hired by SAP-PK to devise the format of the scorecards in consultation with the SAP-PK research team. The consultant also provided standard instructions to obtain feedback from concerned stakeholders. SAP-PK itself undertook the responsibility of implementation of the field research in coordination with partner CSOs/CBOs (see Annex III for list of partnering organizations), which included undertaking preparatory workshops for district level researchers from the partnering CSOs/CBOs, and thereafter liaison with them during the data gather phase of the research. Subsequent to the provision of feedback from the field, the research consultant began reviewing the

data emerging from the field, and undertook the consolidation and analysis of findings from 19 districts to prepare this report on LG performance. SAP-PK's Research Unit especially Mr. Asad Shakir remained closely involved with the research consultant to facilitate the research analysis and finalization of the report.

Preparing LG scorecards and other Research issues

In order to compare and contrast LG performance, the quantitative segments of the LG scorecards were simply assigned numerical values ranging from 1 to 10. The average of scores given to a specific quantitative question, by all the respondents in a given district, was then used to rank the performance of that given district.

For the purpose of representation, besides the Nazims and Naib Nazims at the district and UC level, councilors from the opposition and ruling party were also interviewed. An additional attempt was made to at least interview a minority, a peasant/worker, and two female councilors (For a detailed list of people interviewed please refer to Annex IV).

Besides quantitative questions in which respondents were asked to score LG performance using numbers from 1 to 10, or else provide a specific number for a required LG activity (number of committees formed etc.), there were also qualitative questions asking for personal opinions of the different respondents. Even if responses given by different respondents within the same UC or district varied, these variances were documented, as they were stated, since these differences are indicative of prevailing contradictory perceptions regarding LG performance (see subsection for more details). An attempt was also made to obtain additional documentation (Budget and district activity reports for example), which were then used to undertake further analysis concerning LG performance, this additional analysis has also been added to relevant subsections of the following research findings section of this report.

Research Findings

The scorecards have been prepared using a questionnaire (which is attached as Annex I). The respondents were also asked to provide quantitative comments and suggestions concerning LG performance which has been analyzed alongside the quantitative data and relevant documents such as district activity reports.

Research Constraints

There were the usual challenges faced in accessing information for Local Government System (LGS) and liaison with partners had to be maintained by the

research team at SAP-PK in order to ensure a level of consistency, since ranking/scoring is always a subjective exercise. Moreover, as it was respondents, and not the researchers who were meant to rank the various criteria in the scorecards, therefore standardized criteria for scoring/ranking could not be identified based on a mutual consensus amongst the researchers involved in the study. To ensure as much consistency as possible in this regard, research partners were brought together to discuss a minimum standard for ranking/scoring (Kindly refer to Annex V for LG scorecards criteria), which they could in turn share with LG personnel (the respondents), and SAP-PK personnel also visited the field to ensure a consistent approach to the study.

Major findings

The major findings emerging from the questionnaire administered to respondents in the field are presented below sequentially. Where relevant, findings from the documents obtained for the LG offices, and quantitative feedback have also been added to shed more light on the various thematic issues mentioned below.

All the research respondents were asked to give an **overall score to their district councils**. Larkana achieved the highest scores on average, more so than districts like Faisalabad (7.17). Conversely, Nawabshah received the lowest average score amongst all the districts (2.38).

Districts	Highest score given (Designation of respondent)	Lowest score given (Designation of respondent)	Average of all scores	Number of no responses
Faisalabad	10 (district nazim and naib nazim)	2 (Aqliati ² district councilor)	7.17	2
Kalat	10 (district nazim and naib nazim)	2 (Kisan ³ tehsil councilor)	5.80	0
Lodhran	10 (district nazim, naib nazim and UC nazim)	2 (district councilor and district councilor from opposition)	6.53	0
Layyah	10 (UC nazim)	4 (tehsil councilor)	7.25	4
Toba Tek Singh	14 (Kissan tehsil councilor)	0 (Mazdoor ⁴ tehsil councilor)	7.40	2
Mianwali	10 (member tehsil council, uc nazim and lady councilor district)	0 (District councilor opposition, member tehsil council and district lady councilor)	5.93	2
Sanghar	9 (uc nazim)	4 (member district council)	7.00	0
Badin	10 (district nazim and uc nazim)	0 (kissan councilor tehsil)	5.57	1
Nawabshah	10 (member tehsil council)	0 (member district council and mazdoor councilor tehsil)	2.38	0
Larkana	10 (member district council and district nazim)	5 (district naib nazim)	7.67	0
Dadu	10 (uc nazim)	0 (member district council, district councilor opposition)	3.93	0
Mardan	8 (district nazim and aqliati councilor)	4 (member tehsil council)	6.08	0

² Minority

³ Peasant

⁴ Worker

	district)			
Charsada	9 (district nazim)	3 (member tehsil council)	6.67	1
Lower Dir	10 (uc nazim)	3 (district councilor opposition)	6.43	0
Dera Ismael Khan	8 (uc nazim and kissan councilor tehsil)	2 (district nazim, district naib nazim, district councilor opposition, member tehsil council and lady councilor district)	4.00	0
Bannu	7 (member district council opposition and uc nazim)	1 (lady councilor district)	4.83	0
Turbat (Kech)	10 (uc nazim)	0 (member district council and member district opposition)	5.33	0
Naseerabad	9 (district naib nazim and uc nazim)	1 (lady councilor district)	3.82	0
Gawader	10 (uc nazim)	1 (aqliati councilor district)	5.92	0

When asked about the **number of council meetings held** in the district, Sanghar recorded the highest score on average (36), whereas Kalat (2.27) recorded the lowest score.

Districts	Highest Score (Designation of respondent)	Lowest score (Designation of respondent)	Average of scores	Number of no responses
Faisalabad	16 (member tehsil council)	2 (uc nazim)	10	1
Kalat	3 (district nazim, naib nazim, member district council, member district council opposition, aqliati councilor district and lady councilor district)	0 (uc nazim)	2.27	0
Lodhran	16 (member tehsil council)	5 (uc nazim)	11.13	0
Layyah	25 (UC nazim)	2 (member tehsil council)	11.78	3
Toba Tek Singh	15 (member tehsil council, uc nazim and mazdoor councilor tehsil)	1 (kissan councilor tehsil and aqliati councilor district)	11.50	0
Mianwali	22 (member district council)	6 (member tehsil council)	10.63	0
Sanghar	70 (member district council)	11 (member district council)	36.00	0
Badin	11 (district nazim, district naib nazim, member district council, member district council opposition, uc nazim, aqliati councilor district and lady councilor district)	4 (mazdoor councilor tehsil)	8.64	1
Nawabshah	30 (member tehsil council and mazdoor councilor)	1 (member tehsil council)	14.50	

	tehsil)			
Larkana	22 (aqliati councilor district)	4 (member tehsil council)	15.54	2
Dadu	14(member district council and district councilor opposition)	8 (uc nazim)	11.50	0
Mardan	15 (lady councilor district)	4 (member tehsil council)	10.25	0
Charsada	28 (member tehsil council)	2 (aqliati councilor district)	16.36	2
Lower Dir	16 (lady councilor district)	2 (aqliati councilor district)	11.82	3
Dera Ismael Khan	14(district nazim, district naib nazim, member district council, member district council opposition, mazdoor councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	5 (member tehsil council)	10.64	0
Bannu	18 (uc nazim)	14 (member tehsil council)	15.67	0
Turbat (Kech)	10 (uc nazim)	2 (member district council, member district council opposition and member tehsil council)	4.87	0
Naseerabad	6 (district naib nazim)	1 (uc nazim)	3.67	2
Gawader	15 (uc nazim)	6 (uc nazim)	10.00	2

Concerning the **participation of women in council meetings**, many positive responses were noted. A District Activity Report from Charsada indicated that the district council had even approved providing Rs. 2000 per month as honorarium for women councilors. Only respondents from Lower Dir, Turbat and Naseerabad indicated that several female councilors do not participate in LG council meetings.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	14	0	0	14
Kalat	9	4	2	15
Lodhran	13	2	0	15
Layyah	8	4	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	9	3	0	12
Mianwali	15	1	0	16
Sanghar	11	2	0	13
Badin	14	0	0	14
Nawabshah	8	0	0	8
Larkana	15	0	0	15
Dadu	14	0	0	14
Mardan	11	1	0	12
Charsada	13	0	0	13
Lower Dir	3	11	0	14

Dera Ismael Khan	14	0	0	14
Bannu	5	1	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	7	8	0	15
Naseerabad	4	7	0	11
Gawader	13	0	0	13
Total	200	44	2	246

Respondents were asked whether the **honorarium being provided for council meetings** was sufficient. A majority of respondents from districts like Faisalabad, Kalat and Badin for example felt that the honorarium was sufficient. Whereas, the majority of respondents in districts like Layyah, Mardan and Lower Dir indicated that it was not. However, 160 respondents were satisfied with the honorarium in comparison to 80 respondents who were not.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	9	5	0	14
Kalat	11	2	2	15
Lodhran	6	9	0	15
Layyah	0	12	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	9	2	1	12
Mianwali	8	8	0	16
Sanghar	13	0	0	13
Badin	14	0	0	14
Nawabshah	7	0	1	8
Larkana	15	0	0	15
Dadu	12	2	0	14
Mardan	1	11	0	12
Charsada	4	9	0	13
Lower Dir	1	12	1	14
Dera Ismael Khan	6	8	0	14
Bannu	6	0	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	15	0	0	15
Naseerabad	10	0	1	11
Gawader	13	0	0	13
Total	160	80	6	246

Respondents were asked about the number of **by-laws** approved by their respective district governments. Faisalabad has passed a record number of by-laws (55) according to the District Nazim. The Activity Report of Faisalabad also indicates formation of several bylaws by the Town Municipal Administration, Jinnah Town after resolutions put forward by the councilors. This report indicates that by-laws have been formulated requiring licenses for dangerous, harmful goods and illegal businesses; formation of by-laws concerning organization and regularity of cinemas, fares, tournaments, exhibitions, circus, theatre and other public gatherings; formation of by-laws regarding slaughter houses; formation of by-laws concerning water supply; formation of by-laws regarding copying and inspection of record; and formation of by-laws concerning regulation of erection and re-erection of buildings. What is surprising in the case of Faisalabad is that no other respondents commented on the formation of these by-laws, despite the

fact that so many by-laws have been formulated within Faisalabad. A majority of respondents in other districts like Kalat, Lodhran, Layyah and Toba Tek Singh also did not respond to this question. In most other districts (with the exception of lower Dir), while the number of respondents was greater, the passage of bylaws was hardly significant. Moreover, it is interesting to note that only a small minority of respondents (45) provided qualitative information concerning bylaws. The most commonly identified bylaws named by them were codes of conduct, licensing and taxation of different sorts.

Districts	Highest score (Designation of respondent)	Lowest score (Designation of respondent)	Average	No number specified/ No response
Faisalabad	55 (district nazim)	55 (district nazim)	55	13
Kalat	0	0	0	15
Lodhran	0	0	0	15
Layyah	1(district naib nazim)	1 (district naib nazim)	1	11
Toba Tek Singh	3(member tehsil council)	3 (member tehsil council)	3	11
Mianwali	0	0	0	16
Sanghar	4(lady councilor district)	0 (member district council and member district council opposition)	1	9
Badin	-	0 (all respondents)	0	4
Nawabshah	-	0 (all respondents)	0	2
Larkana	2(district nazim, district naib nazim, member district council, aqliati councilor district and lady councilor district)	0 (lady councilor district)	1.75	7
Dadu	-	0 (all respondents)	.00	1
Mardan	2 (district nazim and district naib nazim)	0 (member district council, member district council opposition, member tehsil council, uc nazim, kissan councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	.44	3
Charsada	5 (district nazim)	0 (member district council, aqliati councilor district and lady councilor district)	1.43	6
Lower Dir	22 (aqliati councilor district)	0 (uc nazim, kissan councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	5.88	6
Dera Ismael Khan	1 (district nazim, district naib nazim and member district council opposition)	0 (member tehsil council, uc nazim and lady councilor)	0.43	7

		district)		
Bannu	-	0 (member district council opposition, member tehsil council and uc nazim)	.00	3
Turbat (Kech)	0	0	0	15
Naseerabad	0	0	0	11
Gawader	4 (member district council opposition, uc nazim and lady councilor district)	1 (member district council, aqliati councilor district and lady councilor district)	2.50	3

With reference to the number of **committees being formed** by local governments, with the notable exception of Kalat (0) and Naseerabad (4), the average scores were fairly encouraging. Yet there was a discrepancy noted in the case of reported number of committees that had been formed at the same tier of local government. For example, while the District Naib Nazim in Layyah reported formation of 25 committees, a district councilor claimed that no committee had been formed. A similar discrepancy is found in other districts like Sanghar for example. The qualitative segment further revealed that formation of committees indicated that health and education committees are most common in all the districts.

Districts	Highest score (Designation of respondent)	Lowest score (Designation of respondent)	Average	No number specified
Faisalabad	26 (member tehsil council and mazdoor councilor tehsil)	1 (member district council)	12.13	6
Kalat	0	0	0	15
Lodhran	12 (district nazim, naib nazim, member district council and member district council opposition)	8 (uc nazim and aqliati council)	10.40	0
Layyah	25 (district naib nazim)	0 (member district council)	9.09	1
Toba Tek Singh	34 (member district council)	6(uc nazim and lady councilor district)	15.67	0
Mianwali	18 (district nazim, district naib nazim and member district council)	5(uc nazim)	12.87	1
Sanghar	19 (district naib nazim and lady councilor district)	5(lady councilor district)	12.23	0
Badin	12 (kissan councilor tehsil)	0 (uc nazim)	8.38	2
Nawabshah	14 (lady councilor district)	6 (mazdoor councilor tehsil)	10.75	4
Larkana	22 (district nazim, district naib nazim and aqliati	6 (member tehsil council and uc	13.27	0

	councilor district)	nazim)		
Dadu	23 (member district council and member district council opposition)	2 (uc nazim)	10.38	1
Mardan	18 (district nazim, district naib nazim and lady councilor district)	4(uc nazim)	12.83	0
Charsada	11 (uc nazim)	4(member district council, member tehsil council and uc nazim)	6.00	1
Lower Dir	22 (district nazim, district naib nazim, member district council and lady councilor district)	4(uc nazim)	11.69	1
Dera Ismael Khan	12 (district nazim, district naib nazim, member district council opposition and lady councilor district)	4(member tehsil council)	8.57	0
Bannu	11 (lady councilor district)	6(member district council opposition and uc nazim)	8.33	0
Turbat (Kech)	16 (district nazim, district naib nazim, member district council, member district council opposition, uc nazim, kissan councilor tehsil, mazdoor councilor tehsil, aqliati councilor district and lady councilor district)	7(uc nazim)	13.00	3
Naseerabad	6 (district naib nazim)	3 (mazdoor councilor tehsil)	4.25	7
Gawader	10 (district naib nazim, member district council, member district council opposition, uc nazim, aqliati councilor district and lady councilor district)	5 (member tehsil council and kissan councilor tehsil)	8.33	1

To further probe the above issue of committees, a subsequent question asked respondents about the **number of active or functional committees**. In this instance again, a variance amongst respondents is noted, indicating that there is evident controversy regarding the membership and efficiency of the various committees being formed under the LG system.

Districts	Highest (Designation of respondent)	Lowest (Designation of respondent)	Average	No number specified
Faisalabad	26 (member tehsil council)	10 (member district council)	16	11
Kalat	0	0	0	15

Lodhran	12 (member district council)	2 (member district council)	6.33	3
Layyah	15 (district naib nazim)	0 (member district council opposition)	7.78	3
Toba Tek Singh	34 (member district council)	0 (mazdoor councilor tehsil)	14.83	0
Mianwali	18 (district nazim and district naib nazim)	1(lady councilor district)	5.91	5
Sanghar	19 (lady councilor district)	0(member district council opposition)	7.92	1
Badin	11 (district nazim, district naib nazim and member district council)	0(member tehsil council, uc nazim, kissan councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	3.90	5
Nawabshah	2 (member district council, member district council opposition and lady councilor district)	1(mazdoor councilor tehsil)	1.75	4
Larkana	22 (district naib nazim)	4(lady councilor district)	8.46	2
Dadu	2 (uc nazim and aqliati councilor district)	0(member district council, member district council opposition, member tehsil council, uc nazim, kissan councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	.31	1
Mardan	9 (member tehsil council)	0 (member district council opposition)	5.83	0
Charsada	11 (uc nazim)	0 (lady councilor district)	4.67	1
Lower Dir	8 (district nazim)	0 (member tehsil council, kissan councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	3.75	2
Dera Ismael Khan	12 (district nazim, district naib nazim and member district council opposition)	0 (mazdoor councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	6.36	0
Bannu	8 (member tehsil council)	0 (lady councilor district)	3.17	0
Turbat (Kech)	16 (district nazim, member district council and member district council opposition)	3 (member district council opposition)	12.75	11
Naseerabad	6 (district naib nazim)	4 (uc nazim)	5.00	9
Gawader	10 (district naib nazim, member district council, uc nazim and aqliati councilor district)	3 (member tehsil council and kissan councilor tehsil)	6.80	3

As for the number of **monitoring reports being prepared by LG committees**, not only is a discrepancy in responses again evident, but there is a drastic reduction in number of reports produced in comparison to the number of committees formed or their reported level of activism. Consider for example the case of Faisalabad, which reported the formation and the functioning of 26 committees, yet none of them has been submitting monitoring reports. The scores obtained in this category thus indicate that hardly any LG committees are undertaking monitoring of the situation on ground, which is the primary purpose of their creation.

Districts	Highest score (Designation of respondent)	Lowest score (Seat/designation of respondent)	Average	No number specified
Faisalabad	0	0	0	14
Kalat	0	0	0	15
Lodhran	5 (kissan councilor)	5 (kissan councilor)	5	14
Layyah	2 (uc nazim)	2 (uc nazim)	2.00	11
Toba Tek Singh	2 (uc nazim)	2 (uc nazim)	2.00	11
Mianwali	6 (district nazim)	6 (district nazim)	6.00	15
Sanghar	16 (member district council)	0 (member district council opposition)	7.00	3
Badin	11 (district nazim, district naib nazim and member district council)	0 (member tehsil council, uc nazim, kissan council tehsil and lady councilor district)	3.30	5
Nawabshah	1 (member district council opposition and lady councilor district)	0 (member district council)	0.67	5
Larkana	8 (aqliati councilor district)	0 (district naib nazim and lady councilor district)	2.92	3
Dadu	-	0 (all respondents)	.00	1
Mardan	6 (lady councilor district)	0 (member tehsil council and kissan councilor tehsil)	2.83	0
Charsada	5 (member tehsil council)	0 (member tehsil council, uc nazim, aqliati councilor district and lady councilor district)	2.09	2
Lower Dir	3 (district naib nazim, member district council, member district council opposition and member tehsil council)	0 (kissan councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	2.10	4
Dera Ismael Khan	7 (uc nazim)	0 (member district council opposition, member tehsil council, mazdoor councilor tehsil and lady	2.08	2

		councilor district)		
Bannu	4 (member district council)	0 (lady councilor district)	1.67	0
Turbat (Kech)	0	0	0	15
Naseerabad	0	0	0	11
Gawader	4 (uc nazim)	1 (lady councilor district)	2.67	10

Asked about the **preparation of district performance reports**, Faisalabad and Sanghar scored best (12), whereas Turbat (13) and Mianwali (13) had the worst performance scores.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	12	1	1	14
Kalat	10	5	0	15
Lodhran	9	6	0	15
Layyah	5	7	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	10	2	0	12
Mianwali	4	12	0	16
Sanghar	12	1	0	13
Badin	10	4	0	14
Nawabshah	1	7	0	8
Larkana	14	1	0	15
Dadu	7	7	0	14
Mardan	9	2	1	12
Charsada	8	5	0	13
Lower Dir	7	6	1	14
Dera Ismael Khan	7	7	0	14
Bannu	6	0	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	2	13	0	15
Naseerabad	3	8	0	11
Gawader	11	2	0	13
Total	147	96	3	246

As for the **number of reports sent to provincial LG departments**, local governments in Sanghar (16), Toba Tek Singh (13) and Lodhran (11) obtained high average scores, whereas respondent in Nawabshah, Mianwali, Naseerabad and Turbat indicated that their local governments do not have any rapport with provincial line departments (with average scores of 0).

Districts	Highest score (Designation of respondent)	Lowest score (Designation of respondent)	Average	No number specified
Faisalabad	5 (lady councilor district)	2 (district nazim)	3.5	12
Kalat	2 (uc nazim)	1 (district nazim)	1.50	13
Lodhran	12 (district nazim)	10 (kissan councilor tehsil)	11.00	12
Layyah	8 (uc nazim)	0 (district naib nazim and member district council)	1.67	6
Toba Tek Singh	13 (member district council and lady councilor)	12 (uc nazim)	12.75	8

	district)			
Mianwali	0	0	0	16
Sanghar	70 (member district council)	1 (district naib nazim)	15.56	4
Badin	7 (uc nazim)	0 (member district council opposition, member tehsil council and lady councilor district)	3.33	6
Nawabshah	-	0 (member tehsil council and mazdoor councilor tehsil)	.00	6
Larkana	12 (district naib nazim)	1 (kissan councilor tehsil)	4.27	4
Dadu	12 (member district council)	8 (uc nazim)	10.00	7
Mardan	3 (aqliati councilor district)	0 (member tehsil council and uc nazim)	1.00	9
Charsada	15 (member district council)	6 (member tehsil council)	10.50	11
Lower Dir	15 (uc nazim and kissan councilor tehsil)	4 (member tehsil council)	8.80	9
Dera Ismael Khan	12 (uc nazim and kissan councilor tehsil)	2 (member district council)	6.57	7
Bannu	10 (lady councilor district)	2 (member district council and uc nazim)	5.60	1
Turbat (Kech)	0	0	0	15
Naseerabad	0	0	0	11
Gawader	7 (member district council)	1 (member district council opposition and uc nazim)	3.57	6

Respondents were asked to comment on the evident **relations of district government with lower tiers of government** (UCs and tehsils). While nearly the same number of respondents described these relations as being 'average' (53) or 'very good' (59). There were also some respondents (29) to claim that these relations to be 'bad or non-existent' (29). Overall, however a majority considered them to be 'good' (99) which is encouraging and indicative of a sense of cohesion between the tiers of local government. Whether this sense of cohesion is maintained with higher tiers of governance (i.e. the province) is another issue which was also explored separately, given its relevance to the broader context of this study.

Districts	Very good	Good	Average	Bad/non-existent	No response	Total
Faisalabad	3	8	1	2	0	14
Kalat	6	6	3	0	0	15
Lodhran	4	10	1	0	0	15
Layyah	3	5	4	0	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	2	7	2	1	0	12
Mianwali	6	7	1	2	0	16
Sanghar	5	4	2	0	2	13

Badin	3	7	0	1	3	14
Nawabshah	0	1	2	5	0	8
Larkana	10	5	0	0	0	15
Dadu	0	3	6	5	0	14
Mardan	3	6	2	1	0	12
Charsada	5	4	2	2	0	13
Lower Dir	1	3	8	1	1	14
Dera Ismael Khan	4	3	7	0	0	14
Bannu	1	2	3	0	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	1	3	5	6	0	15
Naseerabad	2	4	3	2	0	11
Gawader	0	11	1	1	0	13
Total	59	99	53	29	6	246

As mentioned above, respondents were also asked about **LG relations with the provincial administration**, and the largest number of respondents (83) indicated that the relations of local governments with the provincial level were 'bad or non-existent'. This response has important implications concerning the relations between local and provincial governments.

Districts	Very good	Good	So-so	Bad/Non-existent	No response	Total
Faisalabad	3	5	1	4	1	14
Kalat	1	3	4	7	0	15
Lodhran	1	3	5	6	0	15
Layyah	3	3	0	4	2	12
Toba Tek Singh	5	5	1	1	0	12
Mianwali	6	2	4	4	0	16
Sanghar	2	3	0	0	8	13
Badin	0	2	1	2	9	14
Nawabshah	0	1	2	5	0	8
Larkana	7	3	3	2	0	15
Dadu	0	3	5	6	0	14
Mardan	0	3	4	5	0	12
Charsada	0	6	2	5	0	13
Lower Dir	1	1	4	7	1	14
Dera Ismael Khan	4	2	7	1	0	14
Bannu	2	2	2	0	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	1	3	2	9	0	15
Naseerabad	1	4	2	4	0	11
Gawader	0	1	0	11	1	13
Total	37	55	49	83	22	246

More respondents maintained that there was no complaint cell (145) and those who claimed that there was (96) a **complaint cell** functioning as per the requirements of the LGO 2001.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	5	9	0	14

Kalat	12	3	0	15
Lodhran	3	12	0	15
Layyah	7	5	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	12	0	0	12
Mianwali	4	12	0	16
Sanghar	9	3	1	13
Badin	6	8	0	14
Nawabshah	2	6	0	8
Larkana	6	9	0	15
Dadu	10	4	0	14
Mardan	7	3	2	12
Charsada	5	8	0	13
Lower Dir	3	9	2	14
Dera Ismael Khan	3	11	0	14
Bannu	1	5	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	1	14	0	15
Naseerabad	0	11	0	11
Gawader	0	13	0	13
Total	96	145	5	246

Similarly, concerning the existence of a **record of complaints** at the complaint cells, more respondents maintained that there was no record (154) and those who claimed that there was one (73).

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	5	6	3	14
Kalat	10	5	0	15
Lodhran	0	15	0	15
Layyah	6	6	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	8	4	0	12
Mianwali	6	10	0	16
Sanghar	8	3	2	13
Badin	6	8	0	14
Nawabshah	2	6	0	8
Larkana	5	10	0	15
Dadu	2	12	0	14
Mardan	3	0	9	12
Charsada	6	6	1	13
Lower Dir	3	7	4	14
Dera Ismael Khan	1	13	0	14
Bannu	1	5	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	0	15	0	15
Naseerabad	1	10	0	11
Gawader	0	13	0	13
Total	73	154	19	246

More respondents expressed dissatisfaction (135) with the **LG system of tax collection** than those who expressed satisfaction (98).

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	8	5	1	14
Kalat	7	8	0	15

Lodhran	2	13	0	15
Layyah	8	4	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	9	2	1	12
Mianwali	9	7	0	16
Sanghar	9	2	2	13
Badin	10	4	0	14
Nawabshah	2	5	1	8
Larkana	4	11	0	15
Dadu	6	8	0	14
Mardan	4	8	0	12
Charsada	8	5	0	13
Lower Dir	0	11	3	14
Dera Ismael Khan	4	9	1	14
Bannu	0	5	1	6
Turbat (Kech)	2	11	2	15
Naseerabad	3	8	0	11
Gawader	3	9	1	13
Total	98	135	13	246

A majority of respondents (177) mentioned that there was **use of tenders for development schemes**, in comparison to a minority (59) which claimed that tenders were not being used as required.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	12	1	1	14
Kalat	9	6	0	15
Lodhran	12	3	0	15
Layyah	6	2	4	12
Toba Tek Singh	8	4	0	12
Mianwali	12	3	1	16
Sanghar	13	0	0	13
Badin	12	2	0	14
Nawabshah	7	1	0	8
Larkana	6	8	1	15
Dadu	11	3	0	14
Mardan	11	1	0	12
Charsada	11	2	0	13
Lower Dir	8	3	3	14
Dera Ismael Khan	4	10	0	14
Bannu	6	0	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	7	8	0	15
Naseerabad	10	1	0	11
Gawader	12	1	0	13
Total	177	59	10	246

Concerning the **transparency of contracts of independent contractors** however, the margin was much lower (since 129 respondents claimed the process was transparent while 97 said it wasn't).

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	11	2	1	14
Kalat	5	10	0	15

Lodhran	9	5	1	15
Layyah	5	3	4	12
Toba Tek Singh	11	1	0	12
Mianwali	9	5	2	16
Sanghar	10	2	1	13
Badin	11	3	0	14
Nawabshah	1	7	0	8
Larkana	6	8	1	15
Dadu	3	11	0	14
Mardan	5	3	4	12
Charsada	10	3	0	13
Lower Dir	4	5	5	14
Dera Ismael Khan	5	9	0	14
Bannu	4	2	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	5	10	0	15
Naseerabad	4	7	0	11
Gawader	11	1	1	13
Total	129	97	20	246

There was a narrower margin between respondents claiming that the public has (125), or does not have (105), accesses to records of work being done by **private contractors**.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	11	2	1	14
Kalat	1	14	0	15
Lodhran	7	8	0	15
Layyah	4	4	4	12
Toba Tek Singh	11	1	0	12
Mianwali	8	8	0	16
Sanghar	8	4	1	13
Badin	12	2	0	14
Nawabshah	1	7	0	8
Larkana	10	4	1	15
Dadu	3	11	0	14
Mardan	2	7	3	12
Charsada	9	4	0	13
Lower Dir	5	5	4	14
Dera Ismael Khan	5	7	2	14
Bannu	6	0	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	7	8	0	15
Naseerabad	6	5	0	11
Gawader	9	4	0	13
Total	125	105	16	246

When asked if there was an **internal audit** taking place, a significant majority of respondents (185) said 'yes'.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	12	2	0	14
Kalat	8	7	0	15
Lodhran	7	8	0	15

Layyah	7	2	3	12
Toba Tek Singh	9	2	1	12
Mianwali	12	3	1	16
Sanghar	11	2	0	13
Badin	11	3	0	14
Nawabshah	7	1	0	8
Larkana	15	0	0	15
Dadu	12	0	2	14
Mardan	8	4	0	12
Charsada	7	6	0	13
Lower Dir	6	6	2	14
Dera Ismael Khan	8	6	0	14
Bannu	4	2	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	3	12	0	15
Naseerabad	3	8	0	11
Gawader	2	11	0	13
Total	152	85	9	246

There were nearly the same number of respondents maintaining that there was (116) or was not (122) **LG independence concerning budget formulation and initiating development schemes**. Moreover, a perusal of consolidated budget reports prepared by the concerned districts indicated a lot of gaps in available data. For example, districts like Larkana only had total budgetary figures available for the FY 2005-2006, there was no difference being recorded between developmental and non-developmental expenditures, nor were there any available details of expenditures undertaken by the district. The exact same problem was noticed in the case of Badin district. While budget reports for Sanghar and Faisalabad districts did distinguish development and non-development budgetary allocations, it did not have any details available with regards to expenditures. Many of the other districts had not been able to spend their budgetary allocations, particularly those allocated for development expenditures. Mardan district for example had spent only 78.319 million out of the total 282.933 million rupees allocated for non-salary related development expenditures (for more details concerning other districts, please refer to Annex VI). Given this situation, is no wonder that development has not occurred despite the formulation of local governments.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	7	6	1	14
Kalat	1	14	0	15
Lodhran	8	7	0	15
Layyah	7	5	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	8	4	0	12
Mianwali	8	6	2	16
Sanghar	7	6	0	13
Badin	8	6	0	14
Nawabshah	5	3	0	8
Larkana	4	11	0	15
Dadu	4	10	0	14
Mardan	4	7	1	12
Charsada	6	6	1	13

Lower Dir	9	4	1	14
Dera Ismael Khan	9	5	0	14
Bannu	4	2	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	6	9	0	15
Naseerabad	1	9	1	11
Gawader	10	2	1	13
Total	116	122	8	246

More respondents (128) claimed that there was adequate preparation of **annual performance reports within the local governments than those who didn't (109).**

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	9	4	1	14
Kalat	5	10	0	15
Lodhran	8	7	0	15
Layyah	7	5	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	7	3	2	12
Mianwali	5	9	2	16
Sanghar	11	2	0	13
Badin	9	5	0	14
Nawabshah	1	7	0	8
Larkana	14	1	0	15
Dadu	5	9	0	14
Mardan	3	8	1	12
Charsada	7	6	0	13
Lower Dir	6	7	1	14
Dera Ismael Khan	9	5	0	14
Bannu	3	3	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	4	10	1	15
Naseerabad	3	7	1	11
Gawader	12	1	0	13
Total	128	109	9	246

Concerning the **number of development schemes examined by monitoring committees**, Faisalabad scored the highest marks on average (68%).

Districts	Highest number (designation of respondent)	Lowest number (designation of respondent)	Average	No number specified
Faisalabad	200 (district nazim)	2 (lady councilor district)	68.33	11
Kalat	2 (uc nazim)	2 (uc nazim)	2.0	14
Lodhran	11 (member district council)	1 (member tehsil council)	6.00	13
Layyah	150 (district naib nazim)	0 (member district council, member district council opposition and mazdoor councilor tehsil)	3.00	7
Toba Tek Singh	25 (mazdoor councilor tehsil)	2 (member district council)	8.00	5

Mianwali	6 (district nazim)	3 (member tehsil council and aqliati councilor district)	4.00	13
Sanghar	30 (uc nazim)	0 (member district council and member district council opposition)	9.11	4
Badin	13 (uc nazim)	2 (aqliati councilor district)	5.22	6
Nawabshah	6 (mazdoor councilor tehsil)	0 (member district council, member tehsil council and mazdoor councilor tehsil)	1.50	4
Larkana	10 (uc nazim)	1 (mazdoor councilor tehsil)	4.13	7
Dadu	100 (member district council)	0 (lady councilor district)	20.29	0
Mardan	0 (district naib Nazim)	0 (district naib nazim)	.00	11
Charsada	4 (member tehsil council and uc nazim)	0 (lady councilor district)	2.60	8
Lower Dir	20 (district naib Nazim)	0 (member district council, kissan councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	5.33	8
Dera Ismael Khan	6 (member tehsil council)	0 (member tehsil council, uc nazim, mazdoor councilor tehsil and lady councilor district)	2.20	4
Bannu	12 (member district council opposition)	2 (member tehsil council)	6.25	2
Turbat (Kech)	4	4	4	14
Naseerabad	7 (district naib Nazim)	2 (mazdoor councilor tehsil)	3.80	6
Gawader	8 (district naib nazim and member tehsil council)	3 (uc nazim)	6.00	9

Many more respondents felt that there was adequate **LG guidance concerning CCB formation** (176) in comparison to those who felt that it was not sufficient (65). The qualitative comments concerning this query indicated that LGS help provide guidance in the form of information, registration and implementation of schemes in addition to release of required funds for the purpose (147 out of 246 respondents chose to provide quantitative comments).

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	12	1	1	14
Kalat	3	12	0	15
Lodhran	12	3	0	15
Layyah	8	4	0	12
Toba Tek Singh	11	1	0	12
Mianwali	13	2	1	16
Sanghar	10	3	0	13

Badin	7	7	0	14
Nawabshah	6	2	0	8
Larkana	14	1	0	15
Dadu	4	10	0	14
Mardan	12	0	0	12
Charsada	13	0	0	13
Lower Dir	10	2	2	14
Dera Ismael Khan	13	1	0	14
Bannu	6	0	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	11	4	0	15
Naseerabad	3	7	1	11
Gawader	8	5	0	13
Total	176	65	5	246

Most respondents (203) felt that there was evident **LG rapport with people, private or voluntary organizations**. Qualitative analysis revealed that most LG officials consider participation in civil society events as being a sufficient LG contribution. **One peculiar fact was noticed in** the district activity report of Mianwali, which indicated that it had requested transfer of the District In-charge of Punjab Rural Support Programme (PRSP) from Mianwali, due to his misconduct and corruption. While details concerning the nature of misconduct were not available, it is interesting to note the fact that districts governments do have the ability to influence transfer of quasi-government development organizations like the PRSP.

Districts	Yes	No	No Response	Total
Faisalabad	12	2	0	14
Kalat	2	13	0	15
Lodhran	15	0	0	15
Layyah	8	2	2	12
Toba Tek Singh	10	2	0	12
Mianwali	16	0	0	16
Sanghar	9	4	0	13
Badin	11	3	0	14
Nawabshah	8	0	0	8
Larkana	15	0	0	15
Dadu	14	0	0	14
Mardan	12	0	0	12
Charsada	13	0	0	13
Lower Dir	12	1	1	14
Dera Ismael Khan	12	2	0	14
Bannu	6	0	0	6
Turbat (Kech)	13	2	0	15
Naseerabad	4	7	0	11
Gawader	11	2	0	13
Total	203	40	3	246

Retrospect

This section will not only summarize above findings but also highlight advocacy and capacity building niches for policy makers, devolution support programmes and NGOs like SAP-PK.

Major findings

Respondents were asked to give an **overall score to their district councils**. Larkana achieved the highest scores on average, more so than districts like Faisalabad. Conversely, Nawabshah received the lowest average score amongst all the districts.

When asked about the **number of council meetings held** in the district, Sanghar recorded the highest score on average, whereas Kalat recorded the lowest score. Respondents were asked whether the **honorarium being provided for council meetings** was sufficient. A majority of respondents from districts like Faisalabad, Kalat and Badin for example felt that the honorarium was sufficient. Whereas, the majority of respondents in districts like Layyah, Mardan and Lower Dir indicated that it was not. However, 160 respondents were satisfied with the honorarium in comparison to 80 respondents who were not.

Concerning the **participation of women in council meetings**, many positive responses were noted. Only respondents from Lower Dir, Turbat and Naseerabad indicated that several female councilors do not participate in LG council meetings. The query did not probe nuanced issues of gender empowered legislation, given the simply format required for this research, but probing the outcome of responses concerning deeper implications of female participation in politics may not have been as optimistic.

When asked about the number of **by-laws** approved by their respective district governments, Faisalabad indicated that it had passed a record number of by-laws. But this was only according to the District Nazim. No other respondent in the Faisalabad district government chose to comment on this question, which is perhaps indicative of the lack of involvement of other respondents in the formulation of the by-laws. A majority of respondents in other districts like Kalat, Lodhran, Layyah and Toba Tek Singh also did not respond to this question. In most other districts (with the exception of lower Dir), while the number of respondents was greater, the passage of by-laws was hardly significant.

With reference to the number of **committees being formed** by local governments, with the notable exception of Kalat and Naseerabad, the average scores were fairly encouraging. Yet there was a discrepancy noted in the case of reported number of committees that had been formed at the same tier of local government. For example, while the District Naib Nazim in Layyah reported formation of 25 committees, a district councilor claimed that no committee had been formed. A similar discrepancy is found in other districts like Sanghar for

example, which indicates that either the committees are not functional or else not all councilors are aware of their activities. The qualitative segment further revealed that formation of committees indicated that health and education committees are most common in all the districts. But to probe the above issue of committees further, a subsequent question asked respondents about the **number of active or functional committees**. In this instance again, a variance amongst respondents is again noted, indicating that there is evident controversy regarding the membership and efficiency of the various committees being formed under the LG system. As for the number of **monitoring reports being prepared by LG committees**, not only is a discrepancy in responses again evident, but there is a drastic reduction in number of reports produced in comparison to the number of committees formed or their reported level of activism. Consider for example the case of Faisalabad, which reported the formation and the functioning of 26 committees, yet none of them has been submitting monitoring reports. The scores obtained in this category thus indicate that hardly any LG committees are undertaking monitoring of the situation on ground, which is the primary purpose of their creation. Concerning the **number of development schemes examined by monitoring committees**, Faisalabad scored the highest on average, with a significant lead over other districts. A qualitative analysis of steps taken on the basis of monitoring (according to the 67 respondents who chose to answer this question) revealed some positive action being taken in the case of non-performing schools, but the impact of frequent references to concerned departments was not further probed, which could be problematic given the evident tensions between provincial line departments and local governments (see below).

Asked about the **preparation of district performance reports**, Faisalabad and Sanghar scored best, whereas Turbat and Mianwali had the worst performance scores. As for the **number of reports sent to provincial LG departments**, local governments in Sanghar, Toba Tek Singh and Lodhran obtained high average scores, whereas respondent in Nawabshah, Mianwali, Naseerabad and Turbat indicated that their local governments do not have any rapport with provincial line departments. More respondents claimed that there was adequate preparation of **annual performance reports within the local governments than those who didn't**, yet the marginal difference between these contrary responses is noticeable.

When respondents were asked to comment on the evident relations between **lower tiers of government** (UCs and tehsils with district administration), nearly the same number of respondents described these relations as being 'average' or 'very good'. There were also some respondents to claim that these relations to be 'bad or non-existent'. Overall, however a majority considered them to be 'good' which is encouraging and indicative of a sense of cohesion between the tiers of local government. Whether this sense of cohesion is maintained with higher tiers of governance (i.e. the province) is another issue which was also explored separately, given its relevance to the broader context of this study.

When respondents were asked about LG relations with provincial administration and the largest number of respondents indicated that the relations of local governments with the provincial level were 'bad or non-existent'. This response is indicative of the urgency of devolution to take place at the higher levels of governance, ideally beginning from the centre to the provinces and then moving onwards to the district level.

When asked if there was an **internal audit** taking place, a significant majority of respondents said 'yes'. A majority of respondents mentioned that there was **use of tenders for development schemes**, in comparison to a minority which claimed that tenders were not being used as required. Concerning the **transparency of contracts of independent contractors however**, the margin was much lower. There was even a narrower margin between respondents claiming that the public has, or does not have, accesses to records of work being done by **private contractors**. This three-stepped query concerning the contracting system put in place by the LGO indicates that while the procedures for contractual work may be followed, this mechanism may not be as transparent and efficient as it was assumed to be in principle.

Many more respondents felt that there was adequate **LG guidance concerning CCB formation** in comparison to those who felt that it was not sufficient. Yet, it must be kept in mind that this was predominantly the perspective of LG personnel themselves, not of local communities. Most respondents felt that there was evident **LG rapport with people, private or voluntary organizations**. Here again it is important to note that this is the perspective of LG personnel themselves instead of the other mentioned stakeholders.

There is also some evidence of extra/miscellaneous innovations on ground, based on qualitative responses provided by a quarter of the respondents, LGS had initiated innovative projects on ground through CCBs and also put in place special measures to look after the destitute (such as providing them financial support, distribution of wheelchairs to disabled, or giving sewing machines to widows).

Relevant issues

There is tremendous variance in results being produced by local governments according to LG personnel themselves. There is an urgent need to address this disparity of outcomes under devolution, if regional and inter-provincial disparities evident across the country are to be reduced instead of being exacerbated.

In comparison to relations within lower tiers of government, most respondents consider relations with provincial governments to be much less effective. Qualitative analysis revealed that LG respondents requested more training and access to funds, but a majority of them more powers to councilors and to the UC, and some explicitly pointed to the need for devolution to take place at the

provincial level and stressed the need for greater 'democracy' in the entire country, instead of the grassroots, or local government level alone.

In-depth analysis reveals that while monitoring committees are formed their effectiveness on ground, in terms of keeping a check on the performance of social service delivery is not really that effective.

Both primary and secondary sources indicate that local governments often fail to comply fully with budgetary rules. Other research also highlights that most local governments prepare the annual budgets in the last few days of June, which amounts to the complete disregard of the budget cycle provided in the Budget Rules 2003.⁵ Under the Budget Rules, the budget preparation must begin a lot earlier and actually the draft budget, including all development schemes, should be ready by April for presentation and debate in the Council. Such a debate in the Council could enable the councilors to give their feedback on the draft and, hence, allow the government to refine the budget document accordingly. Access to draft budget documents could also enable civil society organizations to analyze the draft budget and related priorities, and participate in the finalization process by giving their feedback. Moreover, similar arguments can be made concerning the tendering and contract allocation procedures being adopted by local governments.

Local governments would be better advised to not only ensure compliance with existing LG rules but also learn from the national and international best practices for local governance. According to the collated responses of LG personnel themselves, there is still a long way to go in terms of ensuring transparency by providing detailed information about budgetary and other LG procedures to make LG structures more accountable and response to peoples needs.

Variance in Results

Given the fact that a range of different stakeholders were interviewed for preparing the LG scorecards, there was also a variance in results depending on who the respondent was. This variance becomes evident from a collation of scores given by respondents in the same position (Opposition, Nazims etc.) across the 19 districts.

For example, it is interesting to note that most of the Nazims gave very high scores while ranking the performance of their districts, with the exception of Nazims in Lower Dir and Dera Ismael Khan. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that there is a lesser variance in scores given by opposition members and

⁵ See CDPI-Pakistan website: www.cpd-pakistan.org

lady councilors to the same query.

Overall scores given for LG performance across district (compared by types of respondents)				
No.	District	District Nazim	Member District Council (Opposition)	Lady Councilor District
1	Faisalabad	10	6	5
2	Kalat	10	5	6
3	Lodhran	10	2	5
4	Layyah	-	6	-
5	Toba Tek Singh	-	-	7
6	Mianwali	8	0	0
7	Sanghar	-	6	8
8	Badin	10	5	5
9	Nawabshah	-	2	1
10	Larkana	10	-	7
11	Dadu	-	0	5
12	Mardan	8	7	5
13	Charsada	9	-	3
14	Lower Dir	5	3	4
15	Dera Ismael Khan	2	2	2
16	Bannu	-	7	1
17	Turbat (Kech)	8	0	6
18	Naseerabad	-	-	2
19	Gawader	-	2	7

Note: The dash marks above imply either a no response for the concerned respondents or the unavailability of required respondents in a given district.

While the above analysis of LG scorecards has not compared the variance between different types of respondents within districts, as it is instead focusing on differences in scores between districts, yet the fact that the overall score given to a particular district is based on an average of scores given by different stakeholders in the LG, this variance in scores is implicitly reflected in the overall performance ranking of all the 19 districts.

Concluding Remarks

In view of the above findings, which were based on laborious efforts of researchers, the need for greater transparency and flow of information from and to local governments has become evident. It is now imperative that civil society groups advocate more strongly for district and town administrations implement Section 114(5) and Section 137 (3) of the Local Government Ordinance 2001, which require all local governments (e.g. union, town/tehsil and district) to place at a conspicuous place statements for public information. Section 137 of LGO 2001 clearly says that every citizen shall have the right to information about any office of the district government, Tehsil Municipal Administration and Union Administration. These legal requirements have been largely ignored so far, which is a matter of serious concern as it defeats the purpose of increasing transparency which was one of the major reasons for devolving power to local governments.

Moreover, the issues identified by this research itself should prove of relevance to not only government departments but also devolution support programmes including the Devolution Trust for Community Empowerment, as well as bilateral (Japanese, United States, Canadian etc.) devolution support programmes. Moreover, it is imperative that civil society organizations undertake advocacy and subsequent monitoring concerning these issues to help ensure that these pending needs are met, whereby devolution can live up to its claims of improving social service delivery, and of providing better governance for poor people across Pakistan.

Checklist of Primary Data to be collected

- Photocopy of district budget (2005-06 and 2006-07) from Secretary district council
- Detail of district development plans
- Annual report of district council
- Detail of councils' activities

Questionnaire

1. Name and position of respondent: _____
2. District: _____ Tehsil: _____

Union Council (For UC Nazims only): _____
3. How would you rank the overall performance of your council (on a scale of 1 to 10)? _____
4. How many times has the council sessions been held so far? _____
5. Do the majority of women participate in the meetings/sessions?
 Yes No
6. Do all members get honorariums? Yes No
7. How many bylaws were devised by your council? _____
- 7.1 If yes, what are they? _____

8. How many committees have been formed in your council? _____
- 8.1 Kindly write their names _____

-
-
- 8.2 How many of them are effective/ active? _____
- 8.3 How many monitoring committees presented their reports in the last meeting/session? _____
- 8.4 What steps were taken on the basis of these reports? _____
-
9. Was the on performance of council presented in the meeting of Zila Council (Necessary twice a year in LG plan)? Yes No
10. How many reports have been referred to the Tehsil/District/Provincial Local Government Department? _____
11. How would you rate your working relationship with the civil bureaucracy?
- i) Provincial government- (Very good, Good, So-so, Not at all)

- ii) District government officials- (Very good, Good, So-so, Not at all)

12. What new functions/procedures have been introduced by your government, which were not present in the previous local government?

13. Is there a complaint cell in your council? Yes No
- 13.1 Is there any record of these complaints? Yes No
14. Are you satisfied with your council's tax collection system?
 Yes No
15. Does your council demands tenders for development schemes/plans?

Yes No

16. Have contracts of development schemes been given in a transparent way? Yes No
17. Are peoples informed about the sum of the allocated development schemes, completion time and contractors through notice? So that they can supervise the situation. Yes No
18. Has your council passed a resolution/resolutions or taken any steps for The disabled, the poor, elderly, patients, mentally retarded people, juvenile delinquent, drug addicts, sufferers of child abuse, needy and deprived people? Please provide detail.

19. Is there any internal audit of your council? Yes No
20. Do you have authority to form budget and development schemes of your council? Yes No
21. Has the Secretary of your council presented an annual performance report for approval? Yes No
22. How many council's schemes have been examined by you? _____
23. Do you assist/guide people in the formation of CCBs? Yes No

23.1 If yes, to what extant and how? (Any example please)

24. Do you support civil society, private or volunteer organizations? Yes No

24.1 If yes, how? _____

-
-
25. What is/are your suggestion/suggestions to improve council's performance? _____
-
-
-
26. Name of Interviewer: _____
27. Address: _____
-
28. Telephone/Cell Number: _____
29. Email: _____
30. How would you rank the overall performance of the LG system (on a scale of 1 to 10)? _____
31. Overall comments _____
-
-
-

District-wise details of respondents

District	Seats Status										Total
	Distt. Nazim	Distt. Naib Nazim	Member Distt. Council	Member Distt. Council (Oppo.)	Member Tehsil Council (UC Naib Nazim)	UC Nazim (Distt. Coun. Mem.)	Kissan Councilor (Tehsil)	Mazdoor Councilor (Tehsil)	Aqliati Councilor (Distt.)	Lady Councilor (Distt.)	
Faisalabad	1	1	2	1	3	3	0	1	1	1	14
Kalat	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	15
Lodhran	1	1	3	1	2	4	1	0	1	1	15
Layyah	0	1	2	2	1	4	0	1	1	0	12
T.T. Singh	1	0	2	0	2	2	1	1	1	2	12
Mianwali	1	1	1	1	4	3	2	0	1	2	16
Sanghar	0	1	3	1	1	3	1	0	1	2	13
Badin	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	14
Nawabshah	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	8
Larkana	1	1	2	0	2	3	1	1	1	3	15
Dadu	0	0	3	1	3	3	1	0	1	2	14
Mardan	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	12
Charsada	1	1	2	0	3	3	0	0	1	2	13
Lower Dir	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	0	1	2	14
D.I. Khan	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	0	2	14
Bannu	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	6
Turbat (Kech)	1	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	15
Naseerabad	0	1	2	0	2	3	0	1	0	2	11
Gawader	0	1	2	1	2	3	1	0	1	2	13
Total	12	15	37	16	41	51	14	11	15	34	246

List of partner organizations

Partner Organization	Contact Person	District	Province	Address
Agency for Sustainable Development Pakistan	Amina Zaman	Faisalabad	Punjab	P-57/6 Bilal street civil line Faisalabad
Awami Welfare Society	Mr. Shahzad Gul	Layyah	Punjab	Housing Colony # 2, Layyah.
Farmer Development Organization	Mr. Ghulam Mustafa	Lodhran	Punjab	Basti Malok, Sukh Bias, Lodhran
Pakistan Kisan Trust	Mr. Aslam Kousar	Toba Tek Singh	Punjab	Housing Colony near Dr. Aslam Puwar Hospital, Toba Tek Singh.
Anjuman Falah Mashara	Mr. Muhammad Nawaz Salar	Mianwali	Punjab	Wah Bacharan District Mianwali
Makran Resource Center	Basheer Baloch	Turbat	Balochistan	R: 101 Bismillah Markeet Turbat
Poverty Alleviation Organization	Jabbar Baloch	Kalat	Balochistan	c/o: CAP office, near Police line Kalat
Women Development Organization	Ms. Wafa Umrani	Naseer Abad	Balochistan	c/o: Bugti Kiryana Store, Aliabad road, Usta
Rural Community Development Council (RCDC)	Mr. Ghaffar Baloch	Gwadar	Balochistan	C/O RCDC Club Road Gawader
Jaago Development Society	Mr. Javaid Iqbal Bhatti	Badin	Sindh	Ward No. 03, Golarchi, 72220
Young Samaji Tanzim Johi	Mr. Sawan Khan Babar	Dadu	Sindh	Babar Mohallah, Ward No.2 Town Johi P.O Johi
Ghazi Social Welfare Association	Mr. Maqbool Mashoori	Larkana	Sindh	House No. 95, Rehmat Pur, Wakeel Colony,
Shah Sachal Sami Welfare Association	Mr. Arshad Khaskheli	Nawab Shah	Sindh	H # 6 VIP Road, Bhangwar Colony,
Sindh Agriculture & Forestry Workers Coop Organization (SAFWCO)	Mr. Suleman G. Abro	Sanghar	Sindh	House 248/49, Cooperative Housing Society, Shahdadpur,
Community Development Organization (CDO)	Mr. Ikram ullah Khan	Bannu	NWFP	House No. 314/C, Mohalla Bhatia,
Jobs Creating Development Society (JCDS)	Mr. Ali akbar	Charsada	NWFP	Opposition site Petrol Pump Near Saleem Sugar Mill,
SERVE	Mr. Ahmed Zeb Khan	Dera Ismael Khan	NWFP	House # 146/C, Ghaffar Road,
Social Awareness & Development Organization (SADO)	Mr. Umar zada	Lower Dir	NWFP	Officer Colony near Dir Scouts, Main Balambat Timargara
Women's Development Organisation	Mr. Naeem Chaudhry	Mardan	NWFP	Opposition site Public Health, Eidgah Road,

Identified respondents for the LG questionnaires (at district/tehsil/uc levels)

1. District Nazim
2. District Naib Nazim
3. Member District Council
4. Member District Council (Opposition)
5. Minority Councilor (District)
6. Lady Councilor (District)
7. Member Tehsil Council (UC Naib Nazim)
8. UC Nazim (District Council Member)
9. Kissan Councilor (Tehsil)
10. Labor Councilor(Tehsil)

Criteria for preparing LG scorecards

I Data collation on the basis of districts

Based on the methodology of the study, LG scorecards are to be administered to 15 respondents each within selected 19 districts across the councilortry. There are 15 questionnaires in total for each district which will provide the basis for preparing scorecards for each of the 19 selected districts.

II Approach to assigning value to LG scorecards

To avoid controversy of assigning a particular weight or value to different functions of LGS, as well as the methodological challenge of assigning absolutist values to rank particular functions of LGS (such as formulation of bylaws for which no prescribed numerical value has been suggested by the LGO 2001, it was thought best to place a consistent value to the varying components of the scorecards, yet a comparison between the varying performance of LGS will still be made possible on the basis of quantitative questions included within the scorecards as well as by comparing the results/scores achieved by one given district with the remaining 19 districts.

III How to score the questionnaires

Question 1 and 2 are about name and position of respondents and the name of their districts, from which a simple list is to be generated which will be attached in the annexure 'List of people interviewed, their designation and location.

In question three respondents are asked to rank the performance of the LG system on a scale of 1 to 10, the given score is how many points they get for this question

In question 4, respondents are asked how many times the district councils' sessions have been held so far, this given number will provide the points given for this question.

In question 5 which is made up of two parts, if the district has devised any bye-laws, it will be given 5 points, if it hasn't it will get 0 points (in 5.0). For 5.1, there is no fixed value assigned, the descriptions will be considered at the time of preparing the report however to show variance in responses across districts.

In question 6 which is made up of two parts, the district will be given the same number of points as the number of committees it has formed (in 6.0). For 6.1, there is no fixed value assigned, the descriptions will be considered at the time of preparing the report however to show variance in responses across districts.

In question 7, if the report on performance of District Government was presented in Zila Councils' meeting twice, district will get 10 points, if it was presented once, the district will get 5 points, if it was never presented the district will get 0 points.

In question 8, the district will get the same number of points as the number of reports referred to the Provincial Local Government Commission.

In question 9.1, if the working relationship with provincial government is rated good, the district gets 5 points, if it is rated satisfactory, it gets 2.5 points, if it is rated poor, it gets 0 points. In question 9.2, if the LG government's interaction with district government officials is rated good, the district gets 5 points, if it is rated satisfactory, it gets 2.5 points, if it is rated poor, it gets 0 points.

In question 10, the responses will simply be collated for analysis for report making purposes. No numerical value is assigned for this question.

In question 11, if there is there a complaint cell in the district government office, a district gets 5 points, the number of complaints has it approximately received will not be scored but it will be tabulated for making analytical comparisons between districts, if there is a record, if a record of these complaints kept, the district gets another 5 points.

In question 12, if a district development plan has been prepared, a district gets 10 points, otherwise 0.

In question 13, the amount of local taxes will be tabulated for comparison/analysis purposes, no scoring will be done for this question.

Question 14 will not be directly scored but an average of results will be tabulated. For the district (based on comparison with question 4).

In question 15, the number of tenders for development projects awarded will be tabulated as it is for comparison between and within district. No score is assigned to this part of the question. If information boards are being used, 5 points will be given to each district.

Consolidated District Budgets

District	Total Budget of the District for the year 2005-06 (Rs.)			Total Expenditures of the District for the year 2005-06 (Rs.)			
	Developmental (Non-Salary)	Non-Developmental (Salary)	Total	Developmental (Non-Salary)	Remaining/Extra Exp.	Non-Developmental (Salary)	Remaining/Extra Exp.
Mardan	78.319 M 71.693 M 132.921 M <hr/> 282.933 M	1288.445 M	1571.378 M	78.319 M	132.921 M 71.693 M <hr/> 204.614 M	1288.445 M	-
D. I. Khan	112.526 M 43.504 M <hr/> 156.03 M	970.856 M	1126.886 M	28.344 M	12.8835 M 2.2765 M <hr/> 15.16 M	970.856 M	112.526 M
Dir Lower	129.568 M	847.073 M	976.641 M	59.195 M	-	847.073 M	66.74 M
Bannu	48.600564 M	808.310818 M	856.911382 M	23.549 M	25.051564 M	788.991 M	19.319818 M
Charsada	-	-	982.78562 M	81.422 M	31.400 M	869.96362 M	-
Lodhran	174320000	899364000	1073684000	174320000	000000000	899364000	000000000
Mianwali	921900000	1538100000	2460000000	901200000	197000000	1389300000	1488000000
Layyah	371.159 M	1324.588 M	1695.747 M	294.755 M	76.404 M	1324.588 M	000000000
Faisalabad	514223567	3864310092	4378533659	-	-	-	-
Toba Tek Singh	391M	1782M	2173M	-	-	-	-
Gawader	39.448 M	281.456 M	320.904 M	16.610 M	-	251.756 M	-
Kalat	90030203	408924266	-	90030203	10232532	936694	-
Kech	117.957 M	639.958 M	757.916 M	117.957 M	13.339 M	639.958 M	-
Dadu	259639933	1237481635	1497121568	259639933	-	1237481635	-
Larkana			169.718 M	-	-	-	-
Sanghar	1584000000	1444614000	1603014000	-	-	-	-
Badin	-	-	1544647162	-	-	-	-

Note: "M" stands for million in above table and where there is no "M", it means that amount is in rupees.