DEMOCRACYWATCH
Involving People, Building Democracy

মানুষের জন্য
manusher jonno

# Project Completion Report

## Citizens Making Governance Effective (CIMAGE)

CARTA Project

A third-party monitoring project of LGSP-II in 30 districts:

Jessore and Nilphamari, Bangladesh

Sept 2012 - Sept 2014

**by**

# Democracy Watch

15 Eskaton Garden Road, Ramna, Dhaka-1000

Tel#: +88 02 9344 225-6

Email: info@dwatch-bd.org

www.dwatch-bd.org

# Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| BBG | Basic Block Grants |
| CG | Citizen Group Committee |
| CBC | Community Based Committee |
| DC | Deputy Commissioner |
| DDLG | Deputy Director of Local Government |
| DW | Democracywatch |
| FC | Field Coordinator |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| JSDF | Japan Social Development Fund |
| LG | Local Government |
| LGSP | Local Governance Supporting Project |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MJF | Manusher Jonno Foundation |
| PBG | Performance Block Grant |
| PTF | Partnership for Transparency Fund |
| RTI | Right to Information |
| SA | Social Accountability Tools |
| SSC | Scheme Supervision Committee |
| UNO | Upazila Nirbhahi Officer |
| UP | Union Parishad |
| WB | World Bank |
| WC | Ward Committee |
| WS | Ward Shava |

# Table of Contents

# 1   EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LGSP-II is a national decentralization project to strengthen local governance. Using World Bank and Bangladesh government joint financing, LGSP-II provides grants to UPs, and allows the UP community to determine—through a detailed set of rules and committees—which public projects serve their community best. The governance of the grant process, including the use of the funds, is designed to be participatory, transparent, efficient, accountable, and sustainable.

As part of the implementing agency's effort to continually look for feedback from the LGSP-II communities, a CARTA sub-project, "Citizen's Making Governance Effective," was introduced in 30 UPs, spread evenly between Jessore and Nilphamari districts, to provide additional feedback to make the service delivery of public resources more efficient. The 24-month CARTA sub-project, ending December 2014, was implemented by Democracywatch, and supervised by the Manusher Jonno Foundation and the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF), under the CARTA program, which is underwritten by the Japanese Social Trust Fund managed by the World Bank. The purpose of the CARTA sub-project was to promote local government responsiveness to community needs in the implementation of LGSP-II schemes at the Union Parishad level.

The CARTA sub-project provided data on the operations of the local UPs using surveys and other tools. The sub-project also initiated several interventions to increase the skills and knowledge of community members to monitor the activities of LGSP-II. This third party monitoring (not by the LGSP project itself) was done by a new citizens' group committee (CG) created by the sub-project, consisting of 27 members—three from each of the nine wards in every UP. The sub-project team trained these members in social audit techniques, and in all aspects of the LGSP-II operations manual, so that they would be aware of the standards that were expected in the governance of the block granting process.

There were many known challenges implementing the LGSP-II project. An earlier version, LGSP-I identified numerous issues and these were addressed in this follow-on project. Still, the implementing agency sought on-going information from the community about the processes. In particular, they needed to know if the two primary LGSP-II committees, the Ward Committee and the Scheme Selection Committees were functioning well. These two committees were responsible for the use and management of the block grants at the local level, according to the policies and procedures set out in the UP operational manual.

An initial survey by the CARTA sub-project to collect baseline information confirmed that many committees were inactive or under-functioning, mostly because members were unaware of their roles and responsibilities. Other issues were also identified: information about project selection was not being widely disseminated; meetings were not held regularly; community members and committee members were not aware of grievance processes so they generally did not know what to do when problems existed; tax collection was at low levels so sustainability was questionable; and people were reluctant to participate in open meetings. General areas of concern which were identified through the survey included: the unknown levels of participation of some marginalized groups in the processes; the transparency of decision-making, and the perceived effectiveness of the LGSP-II project structure by the community to deliver public service efficiently. Overall, while the majority of committees were operating as expected, the information about the exceptions could prove valuable in improving the overall efficiency of service delivery across all UPs.

The overall results of this CARTA sub-project were positive. Two surveys, a baseline and final assessment, and two social audit reports prepared by an external consultant, provide comparative data showing knowledge and

skill levels before and after the project interventions. The final data showed that 100% of UP committees and community members had knowledge of LGSP-II scheme implementation, compared to 58% at the beginning of the sub-project; 100% of UPs properly disseminate information through notice board, versus 42% at the beginning of the sub-project; information boards were displayed for 78% of schemes, versus 0%; and, the responsibility for monitoring schemes was assigned to respective local community members in 68% of Committees, versus 48%. The tax collection process also improved: 43% of the targeted tax level was collected versus 35% at the beginning. These improvements were due to the efforts of the CG, working with the LGSP II committee members so they understood their roles and responsibilities, and the requirements of the Operations Manual. According to the UP chairpersons and representatives, the CG members were often the most knowledgeable participants in LGSP activities and were a great help in disseminating information.

The second survey also included a comparison between CARTA and non-CARTA sites. Overall, the data indicates that UP committee members are generally knowledgeable about LGSP activities in both CARTA and non-CARTA UPs. However, the difference between CARTA and non-CARTA sites is much more significant at the committee level. Most committee members in non-CARTA locations were not knowledgeable and thus were much more ineffective. For example:

⬧ In CARTA 97% believed that the plan was disseminated, compared to 37% in non-CARTA. Most committee members (62%) in non-CARTA UPs just "did not know" if the plan was disseminated.
⬧ In CARTA, 93% reported that they are aware of the LGSP procurement process as detailed in the UPOM, compared to 21% in non-CARTA UPs.
⬧ Knowledge of grievance processes was higher in CARTA UPs—73% compared to non-CARTA—16%.
⬧ In CARTA 98% of committee members said they participate in UP planning, compared to 30% in non-CARTA.
⬧ Similarly, in CARTA 97% stated that they participated in scheme implementation, compared to 29% in non-CARTA.
⬧ In CARTA 98% of the committee members reported that the community participated in the scheme implementation, compared to 24% in non-CARTA.
⬧ Awareness of tax obligations is higher in CARTA UPs (92%) compared to non-CARTA 72%
⬧ Ward committees are perceived to function in CARTA UPs; 88% thought so in CARTA—33% in non-CARTA
⬧ Knowledge of the existence of standing committees is also higher in CARTA UPs; 85%compared to 20% in non-CARTA.

The following recommendations are based on the findings of CARTA sub-project:

For UPs and community-based committees:

⬧ Ensure proper training of all committee members in their roles and functions as soon as they are formed. Specific suggestions would be useful e.g. like share clear Terms of Reference with the committees so they understand their roles etc.
⬧ Participatory activities such as the ward shava, and the annual planning and budget meetings should be carried out regularly so that citizens may become are well acquainted with the process.
⬧ The UPs must actively attempt to increase the inclusion and participation of marginalized and poor people.

- A budget should be available to committees to cover minimal organizational development costs for citizen groups for their effective mobilization. This budget should eventually be taken from tax revenues, after the project concludes.

For the LGSP-II project team:

- Ensure more rigorous internal monitoring and supervision for schemes funded from the LGSP-II grants. Strengthen the supervision over compliance and accountability of UP for the implementation of UPOM, including procurement, documentation, record keeping, and inclusion. An intensive training and yearly refresher training is required,
- The DDLG/DF should be present in most sharing[1] meetings, for proper and regular information dissemination, and to facilitate dialogue among stakeholders. That will reduce the communication gaps and encourage committees to do their work actively,
- Ensure timely fund disbursement from LGSP-II to UP,
- Ensure regular meetings of the BGCC,
- Instruct the Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) to provide cordial cooperation to the UP as per the UP/WC requirement. In addition, upazila-based engineers need to develop the cost estimates for schemes in Bengali, and such estimates need to be given directly to the WC and SSC to increase their understanding on the specifications and requirements to be monitored,
- In coordination with the local government administration, ensure the regular availability[2] of technical personnel at a construction site during scheme implementation period to provide timely solutions.
- Encourage UP leaders to empower LGSP-II committee members[3],
- Ensure access to more training possibilities for UP representatives and committee members on issues that they identify as their main capacity-building needs.
- Procedures in the UPOM, especially related to procurement at the UP level, should be reviewed and strengthened, based on input from the community.
- Under staffing at the UP was a serious constraint[4] at the time of the survey. The issue of staffing needs to be considered together with the need to improve skills and efficiency of the existing staff, as well as to streamline administrative and managerial processes.
- For LGSP III, continue independent monitoring by citizens, preferably with an independent source of funding. This structure would need to be discussed further. What is clear is that the social audit process is more effective in monitoring government services. The quality of services has improved, primarily because the opinion of community members matters.

---

[1] The meetings are organize/conduct at community/ward/UP / Upazilla level by the respective authority to share findings.
[2] We mention regular "availability" as when required but not a fulltime presence, which could be expensive.
[2] We mention regular "availability" as when required but not a fulltime presence, which could be expensive.
[3] Certainly LGSP rules and procedures provide the basis for empowerment based on position, but the team noted a need for additional encouragement of committee members to use these powers.
[4] This problem has been recognized; one UP accounts assistant position has been approved under the UP act, and the Ministry of finance has already approved a guideline for filling the position

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Description of LGSP-II

The Local Government Support Project–II[5] (LGSP-II) is a follow-on project to LGSP-I, which started as a national pilot program in 2006. The main purpose of the project is to build the capacity of local governments to manage public services and resources. The project structure uses a block-grant methodology—from the central government to the Union Parishad. Communities must use the grants for public projects, which they choose, implement and manage. Since December 2011, LGSP II has disbursed 13,300 million taka to 4,500 Union Parishads. These direct block grants have introduced changes in the local government practices, especially in fiscal transfer, transparency, community participation and accountability.

At the local level, a three-member committee, consisting of a UP Chairman, Secretary and elected UP representative are jointly responsible for fund management. Communities are responsible for all the activities, including planning, budgeting, prioritizing, scheme implementation and maintenance. There are two primary committees that are responsible for the management of the processes: the WC, which is responsible for collecting basic information about unit costs, materials, and about standard sector norms (for roads, culverts, toilets, tube-wells, etc.) for their scheme and also scheme implementation, and the SSC, which is responsible for the selection of projects to implement. The WC has the following responsibilities:

- Planning and implementing the approved schemes handed over to them by the UP;
- Directly contracting community-based labor;
- Procuring goods through either direct procurement or RFQ;
- Undertaking social and environmental screening;
- Maintaining vouchers/payments (along with muster rolls for labor) and submitting them to the UP for audit and other necessary actions.
- Monitoring the work of the service provider;
- Organizing the ward shava and open budget session.

The SSC is the local monitor. According to the UPOM they are responsible for following activities:
- Conducting day-to-day monitoring of the implementation of a scheme in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness, as indicated in the approved procurement and implementation plan;
- Advising the WC of corrective measures if any defects are identified in the implementation of the scheme, and refer the issue (in written form) to the UP if the WC does not address the defect issue identified by the SSC, or write to the BGCC in the event that the UP does not address the defect issue;
- Certifying whether the WC completed the implementation of schemes according to design & estimates, maintaining quality or not. Upon the SSC's certification, the UP will issue a cheque for the payment of the work done;
- Reviewing the award recommendation and work-order/purchase order to the recommended bidder;
- Reviewing environmental and social safeguards forms;
- Reporting to the wider community on implementation quality/efficiency and impacts through organizing public meetings, and discharge any other functions assigned by the UP.

---

[5] LGSP-II Project Duration 29th November, 2011 – 30th November, 2016

The CARTA project is a sub-project to LGSP-II that is responsible for providing community engagement in monitoring the project activities.

## 2.2 Governance gaps and accountability issues addressed by the CARTA sub-project

The following gaps were known by the implementing agency, and reconfirmed in the **first survey**.

- Most of the surveyed WC and SSC members had limited knowledge of LGSP-II. About 72% committee members of targeted areas were unaware about LGSP-II project inclusion in their UPs.
- The UP and LGSP-II administration did not provide the UPOM to the WC & SSC so members were unaware of policies and procedures. About 83% UPs (in targeted areas) did not follow the operations manual.
- WCs and SSCs members were not sure of their role in ensuring the quality of scheme implementation, and had little knowledge of what quality was expected. 58% of the UP committee members believed they did not have the capacity to carry out their assigned responsibilities. Less than half (49.19%) of the committee members believed they could make decisions. (In Nilphamari over 84% of the committee members thought they had no authority to make decisions.)
- The UPs were generally not prepared to involve the public in the scheme implementation process. Poor levels of active disclosure of information. Information boards6 about the scheme implementation were displayed at only 5% of the sites in both districts.
- Underdeveloped citizens' feedback mechanisms and tools to measure citizen satisfaction with local governance and service delivery. About 57% of the UPs organized an open-budget session.

# 3 Overview of the CARTA sub-project:

Based on this initial assessment of problems, the goal of the sub-project was to activate the citizenry to become more active in LGSP-II activities to provide feedback to improve efficiency. The specific objectives were:

- To mobilize and capacitate UP representatives and civil society to engage communities in the open budgeting process as per LGSP-II procedures and UP OM, through the use of input tracking and public hearings.
- To strengthen capacities of civil society and communities to monitor budget transparency, efficiency, participation, inclusion and accountability at the local level.

The implementing agency, LGD, also asked the sub-project to do the following activities:

- Monitor the effectiveness of citizen engagement in the primary committees
- Monitor the availability of information to citizens
- Monitor citizen satisfaction with services and responsiveness of government
- Provide feedback to authorities from the grass roots level on project implementation
- Provide feedback on availability of information to citizen groups
- Monitor the effectiveness of the complaint mechanisms

The sub-project was completed in 24 months (September 2012 to August 2014), in 2 districts, covering 30 Union Parishads of two Sadar Upazillas, with a budget of $169,546[7] US Dollar.

---

[6] According to the LGSP Operational manual, an information board is necessary for each and every scheme implementation; it shows the planned and actual cost, name of contractor, estimated time frame etc.

[7] Total Budget $16,9546, MJF Fund - $149,948 and DW Contribution - $19,598

Table 1: Districts in the CARTA sub-project

| Name of District | Name of Upazila | Name of Union Parishad |
|---|---|---|
| Jessore | Jessore Sadar | 15 UPs: Echali, Narendrapur, Upasahar, Noapara, Lebutala, Kochua, Kasimpur, Bosundia, Fatepur, Diara, Churamonkhati, Hebotpur, Chachra, Arabpur, and Ramnagar |
| Nilphamari | Nilphamari Sadar | 15 UPs: Chowra Borogacha, Panchopukur, Tupamari, Sonaray, Sangolshi, Ramnagor, Laxmichap, Palashbari, Kundupukur, Khokshabari, Kachukata, Gorgram, Choraikhola, Chaprasaranjani, and Itakhola |

To build citizen engagement in the monitoring activities, the CARTA sub-project initiated a Citizen Group Committee (CGs) as the agent of the communities. In total, there were 30 CGs, one for each upazila, created by the sub-project. The Citizen Groups augmented the activities of the WC and SSC committees. The CG activities included:

- Preparing an action plan to resolve scheme-implementation issues. For example, in resuming project implementation such as in Chachra UP, Jessore, where a road construction project was stopped due to the low-grade raw material. To resolve the problem, the CG successfully worked with the contractor and UP Bodies to convince the contractor to resume work using better material,
- Preparing a seasonal calendar (which helps a community understand work schedules),
- Holding quarterly dialogue sessions with UP representatives,
- Conducting refresher training on social audit processes and the use of SA tools to access budget information,
- Monitoring regularly the UP "Notice and Information Board,"
- Coordinating meetings with stakeholders and public hearings, and,
- Building community awareness of the mechanisms for participation in the open-budget process

The CGs provided a useful service in the UPs, because the CG members were knowledgeable about LGSP II policies and procedures (as a result of training), and because members were trained in specific social audit skills. Most of the UP Chairman stated that they sought assistance from CGs to organize the ward shava and open-budget sessions (the responsibility of WC). The net result was that the UP Chairperson, Secretary and Representatives believed that the inclusion of CGs in LGSP-II enhanced the quality of scheme implementation process. A complete list of project activities can be found in annex 8.3.

# 4 Survey methodology and TPM tools

The CARTA project was mainly a third party monitoring project of LGSP-II activities at the UP level. The sub-project capacity building functions were focused on forming and then training CGs, who were then charged with monitoring the LGSP-II block grant process by reviewing the practices of the LGSP-II ward shavas, and scheme supervision committees. The monitoring process used social audit tools including, input tracking, FGDs, sharing meetings and public hearings. The sub-project also conducted an initial survey and second survey to determine effects of the sub-project intervention.

The sub-project did plan to use a community scorecard process rather than the surveys; however this process was discontinued due to several operational problems[8]. These included:

- The LGSP-II is too complex and has too many indicators for communities to track.
- This process needs more time. In this project timeframe there was too little time to build sufficient trust between the government implementing agency and the project staff.
- The combination of the time constraint and multiple sets of indicators resulted in lack of expertise to confidently conduct the community scorecard process by the CG members.

## 4.1   First survey methodology

At the beginning of the project an initial survey—the first—was used to collect data using three questionnaires. This process was supported by focus group discussion (FGD), key informant interviews with the main stakeholders, and observations to verify the data collected. The three questionnaires targeted by the survey were: Union Parishad (UP) representatives, Union Parishad Secretaries, and LGSP-II Committee Members. Separate surveys were created for each category[9].

The baseline survey covered 30 unions (based on convenience) out of a total of 60 covered under the two-project intervention[10].

| District | Number of UPs | UP Secretary | | UP Representatives | | UP Committee Members | | Total/ Percentage | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Satkhira | 15 | 15 | 50 | 193 | 50.39 | 165 | 50.61 | 373 | 50.47 |
| Jessore | 8 | 8 | 26.67 | 103 | 26.89 | 88 | 26.99 | 199 | 26.93 |
| Nilphamari | 7 | 7 | 23.33 | 87 | 22.72 | 73 | 22.39 | 167 | 22.60 |
| **Total** | **30** | **30** | **100** | **383** | **100** | **326** | **100** | **739** | **100** |

The first survey provided information on local budgeting process in terms of its transparency, accountability, participation and inclusion, effectiveness, capacity and competency. Questions focused on specific knowledge levels covering: the availability of a UP Plan, UP decision-making processes, information dissemination processes, UP budget processes, revenue (tax collecting) status, citizen engagement issues, information on scheme selection, the scheme implementation process, quality expectations, environmental standards, and the grievance registration process.

---

[8] Community scorecards were used as a social audit tool during LGSP I by an NGO. The reasons why this was possible in the first phase but not in LGSP-II was not researched, but should be examined in more detail.

[9] We attached the survey questionnaire of 1st survey and 2nd survey which was conducted among 3 categories of respondent. There are five questionnaires attached with this report due to the difference between 1st survey and 2nd survey questionnaire. 2nd survey had two category of Questionnaire, whereas Secretaries and UP rep's responses in the same question, so that the number is five

[10]Agragoti Sangtha is implementing "Verification-Observation-Indication through Community Engagement" project in 30 unions in the Satkhira district, and Democracy Watch (DW) is implementing "Citizens Making Governance Effective" project in 30 union's two districts - Jessore and Nilphamari

## 4.2    Final survey methodology

This second survey was conducted in August 2014, near the end of the sub-project activities. Focus group discussions (FGD), key-informant interviews, and observations were used to confirm the data collected. The three respondent groups targeted by the survey were: Union Parishad (UP) representatives, Union Parishad Secretaries, and LGSP-II Committee Members. 15 focus-group discussions (298 participants[11]) and 6 key informant interviews were conducted.

Table 2: Districts, unions and respondents included in the final assessment survey

| District | Number of UPs | UP Secretary | | UP Representative | | UP Committee Member | | TOTAL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Satkhira | 15 | 13 | 48.15 | 190 | 50.26 | 169 | 51.06 | 372 | 50.54 |
| Jessore | 8 | 8 | 29.63 | 97 | 25.66 | 82 | 24.77 | 187 | 25.41 |
| Nilphamari | 7 | 6 | 22.22 | 91 | 24.07 | 80 | 24.17 | 177 | 24.05 |
| **TOTAL** | **30** | **27** | **100.00** | **378** | **100.00** | **331** | **100.00** | **736** | **100.00** |

Similar to the first survey, the final survey provided information on the pro-active disclosure of UP annual development plans, actual grant allocations and budget—including revenues and operational budget, UP annual audit reports, procurement activities, UP monthly reports and annual financial statements to communities, information dissemination related to budget events, community awareness about participation in budgetary processes at meetings, hearings, UP Committees, and Ward shavas, communities and LG awareness about how to get access to info on public plan and budget, community awareness of projects funded by BG, community awareness of their taxation obligations and UP revenues, disclosure of information related to procurement by UPs in line with the UPOM requirements, and community awareness of relevant procurement procedures.

The UP Secretary, UP representatives, and committee members in the second survey were mostly the same as those who were included in the first survey.

This second survey also included non-CARTA sites as well. While the sample selection for the CARTA UPs in the first and second surveys was based on convenience, the sample for the second survey of non-CARTA UPs was selected using a random selection. There were 125 respondents from the non-CARTA UPs: 73 UP representatives and 52 committee members. This survey was conducted in 38 Union Parishads in six Districts (Jessore, Nilphamari, Satkhira, Rangpur, Mymansingh, Pabna) in Bangladesh.

## 4.3    Social audit methodology:

The CARTA sub-project produced two social audit reports that compiled the data from each survey. The first report entitled, *1ˢ Term Social Audit Report*, was completed after the first round of social audit on July 2013 and the second report entitled, *2ⁿᵈTerm Social Audit Report*, was completed on August, 2014. These reports were completed by an external consultant on behalf of the 30 CGs. The data was shared with the implementing agency and Manusher Jonno Foundation.

---

[11] Satkhira: 97 Male and 49 female; Jessore: 63 male and 33 female; Nilphamari: 39 male and 56 female

Social Audit is defined as a set of participatory and analytical activities that engage citizens in the monitoring of the delivery of government services. In this project these included:

**Input tracking:** Citizen Groups (CG) collected information on LGSP II activities. The CG members of each Union Parishad jointly formed a small monitoring committee to collect information on the BBG of LGSP-II. Democracywatch facilitated the process to engage the community in this process.

**Focus Group Discussion (FGD):** Afterwards the CG conducted FGD with the Ward Committee, Scheme Supervision Committee and community people to verify the data collected during the input tracking. The CGs then prepared a fact sheet, based on this analysis, identifying problems and issues.

**Sharing Meeting**: After the FGD, the sub-project staff organized a sharing meeting with CG and UP representatives to explain the findings.

**Public hearing**: After the sharing meeting, public hearings were also organized by the CG in each UP. During the public hearing, UP representatives, standing committees, ward committees, scheme supervision committees' members, civil society representatives and larger community were present and provided their constructive suggestions/ feedback. Respective authorities generally responded positively, taking several measures to address the issues to improve the quality of services.

**Reports:** Finally, with the assistance of DW field staff, CGs produced social audit reports, with their valuable suggestions for further improvement, which were distributed to stakeholders.

# 5   Findings:

### 5.1    Outcome 1: Percentage of communities with improved capacities to participate and hold the local government accountable for managing the BG.

The final survey data showed that:
- 100% of committee members participated in the scheme-selection, decision-making process (whereas 58% of the UP committee members in the baseline survey believed they did not have the capacity to carry out their assigned responsibilities, and only 55% of committee members attended meetings regularly).
- Awareness about development plans increased considerably among UP committee members (from 66% in the baseline to 97%). This happened largely because knowledgeable CG members worked closely with WC and SSC committee members, helping them to roll out the LGSP II program in the targeted areas, including dissemination of planning and implementation guidelines.
- Awareness about the annual budget among UP committee members also increased (from 76% in the baseline to 99% in the second survey).
- 94% of the committee members thought that citizens can influence the budget process (in the baseline 85% believed the chairperson made the decision, and less than 50% of committee members believed that individuals can make decisions). Decisions on projects priorities are increasingly becoming the outcome of participatory process at ward and UP levels. Project implementation is accompanied by better record keeping and information provided on project sites (sign boards). Noticeably, roads, bridges and drainage construction continue receiving priority attention in the selection of schemes.

- Communities have become more empowered by being involved in the decision making process of scheme selection, and by deciding their own local development through participation in the participatory planning sessions and open budget meetings. In the non-CARTA sites, where the inputs are lower, the level of citizen representation in the open-budget meeting is also lower.
- A remarkable change occurred in terms of the use of different information dissemination channel. In the baseline, the main reported channels of providing information to citizens were "chowkidar" and "miking"; in the final survey, the ward shava, notice boards, and UP members were cited more often. At the same time, local media as a source of information on local governance issues scored very low in both surveys.
- The fact that the "Request for Quotation" method is mainly used by UPs in procurement of goods and services for development projects is a positive sign. This approach replaces the earlier observed practice of splitting projects into a number of small contracts, which would allow the use of direct procurement and leave more space for manipulations. The "Open Procurement" method is still rarely used, also due to a small-scale nature of the projects.
- Due to CARTA's work on the "demand side," through training in local planning and the budgeting process, improvements in transparency took place. CG members built awareness of the planning and budgeting cycle among the UP committee members and citizens, including the entry points for citizens' engagement, as well as involvement of citizens in monitoring compliance with the LGSP planning and budgeting provisions.

The first survey data showed gaps between the planned and actual activities in the LGSP-II scheme implementation process. According to the UPOM, the community should play an active role in holding the UP accountable for managing the BBG and PBG; however, the first survey found that most UPs had limited capacity and motivation to do this work. Moreover, the data showed that citizens did not access the existing mechanisms designed into the LGSP project, because they were not aware of the process[12]. For example, the LGSP-II PMU hired an external audit firm to audit the UP financial system annually, but citizens did not know about the audit results. Even if the community members did know about meetings, the inhabitants often did not show their interest—and never created a demand for information—due to their lack of technical capacity to understand budget and financial management.

Using social accountability tools with the support of strong community mobilization created demand for good governance. By the end of the CARTA sub-project, due primarily to the active involvement of the CGs, there were notable improvements in citizen participation and in improvement to the management of the BBG process at the local level. For example, based on the data, citizen participation in ward and open-budget meetings increased. The respondents also mentioned that they now participate in LGSP-II project implementation, and that the overall community participation in LGSP-II project implementation has increased. Almost all the respondents consider the activities of LGSP II in UP conducive for citizens' participation. Other findings that show the improved performance of the local government—and some areas that still need more attention—are summarized below:

---

[12] There is also the likelihood that the general community often cannot participate in committee meetings due to distance between UP offices and people living in the communities. There is also the "traditional working pattern of UP and community".

| 1st round Social Audit Process in CARTA targeted areas | 2nd round Social Audit Process in CARTA targeted areas |
|---|---|
| Most UPs had five-year and annual plans, but these were not organized according to the UP Act 2009. | All UPs have Annual & Five years plan, which are organized according to the UP Act 2009 |
| The community did not know about the Basic Block Grants and performance Block Grant processes in LGSP-II. | Community awareness of BBG and PBG has increased. |
| Most WC and SSC members did not know their membership of that committee. | All WC and SSC members know their roles and responsibility and perform accordingly in targeted areas. |
| Most WC and SSC members did not know their roles and responsibilities. | All WC and SSC members know their roles and responsibility and perform accordingly. |
| The BGCC was not supportive of CARTA sub-project activities even though LGSP-II management authorized. | This situation may be unchanged; difficult to determine since BGCC meets irregularly[13]. |
| The sub-assistant engineer at the UP was not cooperative—did not support scheme estimation procedure | No change |
| Tax collection levels low; tax assessment was not updated. | Tax collection increasing; targets increasing for future years. |
| Open budget and Ward Shava were conducted irregular | Now open budget and ward shave are conducted regularly ensuring citizens participation in the meetings |
| Notice board were not updated with Committee list, Scheme list, Annual budget and plan, Annual audit report | Now UPs proactively disclose information for the citizens through notice board such as committee list, scheme list, annual budget and plan, annual audit report |

One activity that helped committee members plan better and contributed to the general awareness was the creation of a calendar. The CG members developed a calendar for each UP, based on the BBG term of LGSP-II. The calendar indicated the expenditure by the LGSP fund, and changed over time. The calendar was shown on a display board. Before posting, the CG convened one consultation meeting with each UP to incorporate suggested language for the display so that the information would be easily understood by the local community members.

**5.2    Outcome 2: Percentage of UPs with improved budget transparency, efficiency, accountability, participation and inclusion indices.**

The final survey showed that:

- 100% of Union Parishad Representatives and Secretaries encourage citizen engagement in project implementation process;
- 100% UPs disseminate information through notice board (compared to 5% in the baseline);

---

[13] According to UPOM, a BGCC meeting will be organized on a quarterly basis (Ref: UPOM- page-114, Function of BGCC). Therefore, 976 BGCC meetings should have been conducted during July to December 2014 period. According to given data (from WB/LGSP) 479 BGCC meetings were held, and 497 BGCC meeting were not held during the mentioned period.

- 100% UPs practiced procurement procedures according to the UPOM (compared to 17% in the baseline);
- 100% UPs arranged a ward shava, and open-budget session regularly (compared to 57% in the baseline).

The UPs provide services according to the UPOM. The first survey noted deficiencies; there were often gaps between the LGSP II project design and the implementation. The first survey data indicated that there was limited knowledge of budgets and contracts by committee members, and that participation in committees by the marginalized was at low levels .By the end of the sub-project, open budget sessions[14] were held in all UPs for preparing the annual budget. The primary information dissemination channels included notice boards, UP members, *miking*, and *chowkidar*. Participation by marginalized groups is still a challenge; this area needs more study to determine the causes, although the presumption is that the opportunity cost for these individuals to participate is too high.

The primary activity that contributed to the improvement was the effort of the CG committee members, working with members of the WC and SSC committees. Participating CG members were often the most knowledgeable (as a result of training from CARTA) in the roles and responsibilities of the committees and also in the operations manual requirements.

### 5.3    Outcome 3: Extent to which findings of the TPM reports were used by the LGSP-II project.

The TPM reports were important to the LGSP-II, judging by the use made of the data.
- The LGSP-II team arranged capacity-building training for WC & SSC members after reviewing the findings from the sub-project first survey data[15].
- The Deputy Project Director of LGSP-II and local DDLG appreciated the role of citizen groups of constructive citizen engagement in scheme implementation process in several meetings[16].
- LGSP-II project team recognized the role of CARTA sub-project on LGSP-II project implementation

There were several improvements in the operation of the LGSP-II project in CARTA targeted areas that can be attributed to sub-project information disseminating activities. The Union Parishad leaders used the data generated by the CARTA sub-project as an input, helping to improve overall UP activities. For examples, consider the following:

Transparency
The shift from hoarding information to dissemination is one of the major achievements of this TPM sub-project. Now the detailed information on LGSP-II is shown on a UP notice board. More information is also shared during ward shava, open budget meeting and *miking*—because the citizens demand to know more.

Accountability
Since citizens are aware of their rights and the purpose of this decentralization project, they have become more active, demanding more accountability from their local government. Local government leaders now have to be more accountable for their decisions in open meetings, or else suffer the criticism of an empowered community.

---

[14] It is mandatory for the UPs to prepare an annual budget. UPs are required to organize an open-budget meeting before the end of May. Participatory planning at ward level should be completed during April and the plan developed through the Ward Shava.
[15] Training was included in the LGSP-II project design.
[16] Jessore DDLG Appreciated CARTA work during WBI visit and World Bank Monitoring Mission visit

While it is difficult to measure the change in accountability, it was clear to CG members that local government officials were more responsive to citizen requests.

Participation

It is evident that the degree of citizens' engagement in LGSP-II is increasing through CARTA Program. Improved communication is visible among the citizens and the service providers. Community groups (CG) are acting as mediator that results in minimizing the gap between demand and supply side. CG and citizens regularly follow-up the notice board so that updated information on LGSP-II is displayed. The degree of citizen participation in ward shava and open budget meeting is evident. It is not clear if participation by marginalized groups has increased, although women have become more vocal, and do participate in more meetings.

Efficiency

The UPs are now carrying-out the activities as per the UPOM. This change has led to functional committees and constructive citizen engagement in budgeting, planning, implementation and monitoring. The trust in the efficient operation of government appears to be increasing, based on the increased willingness of community members to pay taxes. Overall, the UP performance has improved in almost all CARTA UPs, as evidenced by the improved ratings for CARTA UPs under the independent PBG rating system for UPs.

These findings cannot all be attributable to TPM—some could probably be the result of additional training and resources. It is not easy to always identify why a community member feels suddenly empowered, or why a local political leader finds it necessary to have more participation in a process to use public funds. What is clear is that knowledgeable citizen engagement is a catalyst that can bring about change. The people who experienced the sub-project repeatedly said that without this intervention change would have happened more slowly, or not at all. Citizens demand the continuation of TPM, since this is a useful tool to lessen potential corruption in public service delivery. Citizens are willing to spend their time ensuring that government officials working in the best public interest; they are growing in confidence about their own power to control the outcomes in their community.

## 5.4    Comparative Data from CARTA and non-CARTA UPs

This survey of sites was conducted in 38 Union Parishads from six districts (Jessore, Nilphamari, Satkhira, Rangpur, Mymansingh, Pabna) in Bangladesh. There were 125 respondents: 73 UP representatives and 52 committee members. The data is reported separately for UP representatives and LGSP-II committee members.

The UP representatives reported the following:

**Transparency**

* Almost all respondents knew that their UP had a development plan—100% for CARTA and 95% for non CARTA UPs
* Almost all responses indicate that UPs disseminate information about the annual plan: 100% CARTA—93% for non-CARTA.
* The use of methods to disburse information differs: notice boards were used by 91% of respondents in CARTA UPs while only 34% in non-CARTA sites; chowkidar was used more in CARTA 57% versus 43% in non CARTA UPs; miking: CARTA 56% versus non-CARTA 36%; annual meeting: CARTA 43% versus non-CARTA 31%.
* The ward meeting is the main source for decision-making. In CARTA, 98% of respondents said that all the decisions about scheme selection are made by the ward shava; in non-CARTA, the rate is 75%.

**Accountability**
- Knowledge of grievance processes was higher in CARTA UPs—84%; compared to non-CARTA 57%.

**Participation & Inclusion**
- Participation was roughly similar in both categories; in CARTA 100%: non-CARTA 90%.
- CARTA projects are more likely to have women leading projects; in CARTA UPs 81% said women representatives implement projects: in non-CARTA 59%.

**Effectiveness, Capacity & Competency**
- Both categories have a similarly high level of awareness about tax obligations: CARTA 91% versus 89% in non-CARTA
- Ward committees are perceived to function better in CARTA UPs: 97% versus 76% in non-CARTA
- Knowledge of the existence of standing committees is also higher in CARTA UPS: 93% versus 76% in non-CARTA.

The UP committee members reported the following:

Note that the differences are more significant,

**Transparency**
- In CARTA 97% believed that the plan was disseminated, compared to 37% in non-CARTA. Most committee members (62%) in non-CARTA UPs just "did not know" if the plan was disseminated.
- In CARTA 92% believed that they knew if an LGSP-II project was implemented in the last year in their UP, compared to 48% in non-CARTA UPs.

**Accountability**
- In CARTA, 93% reported that they are aware of the LGSP procurement process as detailed in the UPOM, compared to 21% in non-CARTA UPs.
- Knowledge of grievance processes was higher in CARTA Ups 73% compared to non-CARTA 16%.

**Participation & Inclusion**
- In CARTA 98% of committee members said they participate UP planning, compared to 30% in non-CARTA.
- Similarly, in CARTA, 97% stated that they participated in scheme implementation, compared to 29% in non-CARTA.
- In CARTA, 98% of the committee members reported that the community participated in the scheme implementation, compared to 24% in non-CARTA.

**Effectiveness, Capacity & Competency**
- Awareness of tax obligations is higher in CARTA UPs (92%) compared to non-CARTA 72%
- Ward committees are perceived to function better in CARTA UPs: 88% thought so in CARTA versus 33% in non-CARTA
- Knowledge of the existence of standing committees is also higher in CARTA UPS: 85%compared to 20% in non-CARTA.

Overall, while UP representatives are generally knowledgeable about LGSP II activities in both CARTA and non-CARTA UPs, the difference between the CARTA and non-CARTA sites is much more significant at the committee level. Most committee members in non-CARTA locations were not knowledgeable about LGSP and thus were much more ineffective.

**5.5    Dissemination of results and outcomes**

Achievements, outputs, and outcomes have been shared with communities to encourage them to continue their work beyond the sub-project period. The primary methods were:

- Public hearings were organized with the active support of UP stakeholders. During these meetings, good practices were shared.
- Good practices and improved results of community monitoring were shared with the respective LGSP-II related committees and Union Parishads during various training sessions as well as during the community mobilization of trained Citizen Group members.
- The Citizen Groups worked closely with UP and LGSP-II committees; they are very much aware and familiar with scheme implementation status in their area. During sharing meetings, they actively discussed the result of monitoring visits, changes due to community monitoring, grievances and challenges faced and solutions.
- Lessons learned and recommendations from the communities were also shared with Manusher Jonno Foundation, PTF, and the World Bank.
- The findings from the first and second surveys were shared with national and local level stakeholders
- Feedback from the Citizen Groups and stakeholders (like DF/DDLG, UP representatives, civil society members, and staff) has been disseminated among each other.
- Democracywatch organized an exposure visit for LGSP committee and CG members to Aggrogati Sangastha's project area to learn from their experience, and share information.
- Democracywatch also expects Manusher Jonno Foundation and PTF to use the results and impacts for wider dissemination.

# 6    Project Management

The sub-project was funded under Citizens Action for Results and Transparency and Accountability (CARTA) programme, which is being managed in Bangladesh by Manusher Jonno Foundation in partnership with the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF). Manusher Jonno Foundation provided technical support; Democracywatch was responsible for overall project delivery. Democracywatch formulated and activated 30 citizen groups (one in each UP).

A field office was set up in each UP. Two field coordinators (FC) were responsible to coordinate with CG, volunteer, local government, and other stakeholders, to implement the sub project activities smoothly. Two program officers facilitated implementation work and maintained liaisons with volunteer, CG; they also provided support to the field coordinator. One PO was deputed in each upazila level. The project also recruited 4 assistant program officers instead of volunteers for better implementation of this project. The Dhaka main office manages the overall activities: one project coordinator was recruited for project management and one M&E officer was responsible for quality implementation of field activities, especially the social audit activities, which were conducted by citizen group. The M&E person was also responsible for knowledge management.

**6.1    Implementation challenges**

There were challenges during the implementation:

- There was occasional political pressure to influence the decision-making process of scheme selection. In several cases, the locally elected representatives' personal interest influenced the scheme selection.

- Trying to increase participation in committees and in the local government was difficult, partly because most "outsiders" are often unaware of the history and social relationships in a small community. Community members are busy and don't have time, especially if they believe that the elite will just take the positions.
- WC, SSC and CG members are not paid by the project; therefore a sense of volunteerism and local ownership had to be cultivated.
- UP Chairmen's often had an autocratic approach that required considerable re-conditioning

The use of social audit tools and the formation and activation of citizen groups to monitor UP activities addressed many of these challenges.

## 6.2    Sub-project sustainability

It is hoped that the sub-project outcomes will be present in the project areas beyond the project period. Sustainability, by definition, means that the functions embodied in the infrastructure created by the LGSP project—the committee activities—would continue after the block grants ceased. The ingenious part of LGSP design is that the block grants could eventually be replaced with funds from local taxes, thereby providing a continuous, sustainable revenue stream for the local UP. The assumption is that as citizens began to have a greater say in their local government, and could not only see how money was spent, but could also influence how it was spent, that tax collection revenues would increase. This new sustainable funding source would eventually replace the block grants funded by the World Bank, and would still use the committees set up under the block grant system. This appears to be happening in many UPs.

## 6.3    Lessons learned and recommendations

- **UPs need institutional capacity strengthening:** Adopting a UP institutional development strategy that goes beyond top-down training and is more hands-on, intensive, flexible, demand-driven and sustainable over the longer term, grass root level close mentoring strategy would greatly mitigate the many implementation problems.
- **Citizens need more knowledge about projects and their rights.** Before citizens can even join committees such as the CG they need to know more about what they are being asked to do, and why these groups have been formed. We should not assume that all people are knowledgeable even of their basic rights.
- **Committee members need more knowledge about their roles and responsibilities, and they need specialized training in some social audit functions.** Lack of knowledge can lead to lack of confidence. In general, a lack of confidence among the citizen group members hampers their capacity and efficiency to undertake monitoring of the LGSP-II related schemes. During this sub-project implementation, citizen groups members, and even some UP representatives, were reluctant to get involved in monitoring activities and raise their voice, because they did not know their responsibilities. For more specialized functions such as budget monitoring, the problem is more acute. Long-term capacity building for community group members is necessary to ensure in-depth, input tracking.
- **Community empowerment is needed, not just community mobilization:** Unless community members feel that they have the power to influence the local decision-making process, the decentralization process will be stalled. Reports that show community mobilization (generally using attendance figures) simply meets project requirements, but does not represent a sustainable effort. Meaningful

participation is an empowerment process that not only involves the community members, but also helps them think beyond the box. This sub-project ensured broad local involvement at all stages of a project resulting an increased sense of control over the environment stimulating local action toward achieving project objectives.

- **The committees and the UP leaders need continuous training.** LGSP-II provided limited training, generally providing one-time training sessions at the beginning of the project implementation. It appears that the single training session is not enough for members to completely grasp the nature of their activities, and their roles and responsibilities. The change from an essentially autocratic governance system at the local level to a democratic process involving traditionally marginalized members of the community is a long developmental step that needs continuously to be discussed and re-imagined.
- **More interactions and coordination with stakeholders helps more constructive community engagement.** Many of the problems and challenges were resolved through sharing meeting, coordination and discussion sessions with stakeholders. These types of activities helped to increase the confidence and trust of stakeholders.

## 6.4    Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings of CARTA sub-project:

For UPs and community-based committees:

- Ensure proper training of all committee members in their roles and functions as soon as they are formed. Training cannot be one-time only; WC, SSC and UP members should receive additional training by visiting UPs where there are good practices and success stories.
- Participatory activities such as the ward shava, and the annual planning and budgeting meetings should be carried out regularly so that citizens will be habituated to the process.
- The UPs must actively attempt to increase the inclusion and participation of marginalized people.
- A budget should be available to committees to cover minimal organizational development costs for citizen groups for their effective mobilization. This budget should eventually be taken from tax revenues, after the project concludes.

For the LGSP-II project team:

- Ensure more rigorous internal monitoring and supervision for schemes funded from the LGSP-II grants. Strengthen the supervision over compliance and accountability of UP for the implementation of UPOM, including procurement, documentation, record keeping, and inclusion. An intensive training and yearly refresher training is required,
- The DDLG/DF should be present in most sharing meetings, for proper and regular information dissemination, and to facilitate dialogue among stakeholders. That will reduce the communication gaps and encourage committees to do their work actively,
- Ensure timely fund disbursement from LGSP-II to UP,
- Ensure regular meetings of the BGCC,
- Instruct the Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) to provide cordial cooperation to the UP as per the UP/WC requirement. In addition, upazila engineers need to develop the cost estimates for schemes in Bengali, and such estimates need to be given directly to the WC and SSC to increase their understanding on the specifications and requirements to be monitored,

- In coordination with the local government administration, ensure the regular availability of technical personnel at a construction site during scheme implementation period to provide timely solutions.
- Provide guidance to UPs for meaningful empowerment of LGSP-II related committees. Suggest holding a series of forms with these committees to work out the details.
- Ensure access to more training possibilities for UP representatives and committee members on issues that they identify as their main capacity-building needs.
- Procedures in the UPOM, especially related to procurement at the UP level, should be reviewed and strengthened, based on input from the community.
- Under staffing at the UP is a serious constraint. The UPs have limited resources to provide information and necessary documents. The project team shared this information with LGSP-II management team, explaining that additional human resources at the Union Parishad level were needed. Therefore, it is suggested that this issue be taken up in the appropriate forum so that a solution could be found. However, the issue of staffing needs to be considered together with the need to improve skills and efficiency of the existing staff, as well as to streamline administrative and managerial processes.
- The sub project has strengthened the capacity of the citizen groups only. In the future the program should focus on still wider community engagement with the help of the CBCs[17]. The CBCs should be involved to capacitate community peoples by community mobilization processes[18] so that they could continue the process of community monitoring of civil works in an effective manner.
- The final recommendation is that independent monitoring by citizens continues in some form, preferably with an independent source of funding. This structure would need to be discussed further. What is clear is that the social audit process is more effective in monitoring government services. The quality of services has improved, primarily because the opinion of community members matters.

# 7 Annexes

## 7.1 Logical Framework of the Sub project

| Project Component | Objective Verifiable Indicators (OVI) | Means of Verification (MOV) | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Goal** | | | |
| Ensured efficient management through promoting pro-people governance and human rights at UP level of Bangladesh | | | |
| **Long Term Objectives** | | | |
| *Improved supply side*: 1.Increased efficiency of local government | **In the selected 30 Union Parishads-** 1.1. Improved efficiency of total 390 LG representatives in implementing | ❖ LGCI report of the project (1st survey, | ❖ Favorable political situation |

---

[17] They are stronger than before, but still need more time to make the process sustainable.
[18] CGs should be the catalyst for community because they are more accepted within the community. Consequently, the involvement of CSOs is needed to regulate CBCs.

| Project Component | Objective Verifiable Indicators (OVI) | Means of Verification (MOV) | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|
| representatives in utilizing LGSP fund properly at30 UPs as quality services for the grassroots people **Improved demand side:** 2. Increased accessibility of the community people *(especially disadvantaged groups regardless of sex, caste, religion and ethnic minorities)*in the management system of selected 30 UPs | development projects transparently 1.2. LG representatives provided room for community people to ensure pro-people governance system in selected 30 Ups of sub project areas **In the project area –** 2.1 Improved efficiency of total 810 community people in project monitoring and implementation through social accountability tools 2.2. The prioritization of local project demands are taken place and consequently services are delivered in a participatory and transparent way 2.3. A number of total900,000 (±) community people received better services from the selected 30 UPs | midterm and end line evaluation report) ❖ UP meeting minutes ❖ Project progress report ❖ Evaluation report ❖ Visit reports ❖ Vital statistics and publication | ❖ The Community people remain freed from natural disaster like cyclone, flood etc. |
| **Output** | | | |
| **Output 1:**Improved capacity of UP representatives in managing and implementing LGSP project | In 30 UPs: ❖ A number of total 1200 participants from potential CGs and LG representatives attended in the joint plan activities workshops to prioritize the community concerns (30 workshops*40 participants) ❖ # of monitoring visit conducted over a fiscal year to ensure the quality of LGSP project implementation ❖ Recommendation and monitoring findings of CGs are placed in the UP on quarterly basis ❖ Developed and dissemination of citizen charter in 30 UPs | ❖ Attendance Sheet (attendance sheet) ❖ Case studies ❖ Progress report ❖ Photographs ❖ Monitoring report ❖ Meeting minutes/resolution ❖ Media coverage | ❖ Favorable political situation ❖ The Community people remain freed from natural disaster like cyclone, flood etc. |
| **Output-2:**Increased LG related information flow/room for *access to* information for the people | In 30 UPs: ❖ In total 90Information dissemination camp organized at UP level and IEC material distributed among the participants. ❖ Open budget conducted duly at 30 UPs in each fiscal year ❖ A number of total 30 bill board installed with citizen charter info at UP level | ❖ Monitoring reports ❖ Project progress reports ❖ Mid-term evaluation ❖ End-line evaluation ❖ Photographs ❖ Media coverage | ❖ Favorable political condition ❖ The Community people remain freed from natural disaster like cyclone, flood etc. |
| **Output-3:** Established pro-people governance in the UPs | In 30 UPs: ❖ 30 batches of training on Community score card process and prioritization of community concerns conducted by ensuring at least 90% participation of CGs members ❖ In total 90 campaigns arranged to disseminate community score card report publicly where at least 13500 community people attended(150 participants in each | ❖ Attendance Sheet ❖ Project progress reports ❖ Mid-term evaluation ❖ End-line evaluation ❖ Case study ❖ Photographs | ❖ Favorable political condition ❖ The Community people remain freed from natural disaster like cyclone, flood etc. |

| Project Component | Objective Verifiable Indicators (OVI) | Means of Verification (MOV) | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | campaign)<br>❖ # of need base monitoring to ensure the quality of LGSP project implementation*(also mentioned in output 1)* | ❖ Monitoring report |  |
| **Output-4:** Local policy implementers sensitized on citizen actions towards increasing transparency and accountability of UPs | **In two district level:**<br>❖ Four issue based round table meeting held at district level with the participation of GO, NGO concerned person (50 participants in each meeting)<br>❖ Four press conferences within two years (semiannually press conference* 2 district*2 years) | ❖ Attendance Sheet<br>❖ Project progress reports<br>❖ Mid-term evaluation<br>❖ End-line evaluation<br>❖ Case study<br>❖ Photographs<br>❖ Media coverage | ❖ Favorable political condition |

**7.2 Major Outputs of the Project:**

- 30 CGs established with 810 members, with 33% of women
- 30 Volunteers, with 50% women
- 30 introductory/ coordination meetings organized between CGs and UPs
- Two project inception workshops, conducted at the district level for two districts
- 30 copies of seasonal calendars (open budgeting) produced ( per union) and placed (at least in each ward of the union)
- 30 copies community action plan developed and placed (at least on in each ward of the union)
- 2-day trainings on social audit process conducted with 840 total participants (CG members and volunteers)
- 30 dialogue session organized with 390 UP representative with 30 office secretary
- 8 CG and project staffs Joint quarterly sharing meeting was held in the UP level
- 24 times CG members was monitored the information board using information board monitoring checklist
- Four coordination meetings with MJF and other organizations was held
- Exposure visit was successfully conducted
- 8 quarterly report was successfully completed and shared with MJF
- Revenue mobilization and collection is increasing in project location through project staffs mobilization works.
- 60 social audits conducted at the UP level (2 rounds in 30 Unions ) - including input tracking based on citizen indicators of budget transparency, participation and inclusion, efficiency, and accountability.
- A 1st survey and 2nd survey conducted at 30 Ups, measuring citizen perception of budget transparency, participation and inclusion, efficiency, and accountability.
- CG and volunteers quarterly meeting in each UP
- CG members and volunteer in each UP visit their information board
- Sharing meeting with WC, SSC & CG
- Five exposure visits (1 visit to Agragoti Shangstha and 4 visits to DW project sites).
- Two reports that reflect on the results of the social audit and the surveys

## 7.3    Project activities

The following activities implemented under the sub-project:

**DW staff orientation:** One orientation was provided to project staff to internalize the project. The staff was capacitated on the project goal, objectives, and expected result and outcome, activities, good governance, communication, facilitation, documentation, and information collection, program arrangement and specially use of SA tools conduction.

**Citizen Group (CG) formation:** To mobilize the community to play a social accountability role, through active participation in budget planning, implementing, and monitoring, the community platform "Citizen Groups (CG)" were formed in each UP. To ensure widespread participation in the CG, three community representatives, including one female and two male, were selected from each of the nine wards in a UP. The result is that each CG consists of 27 members, including women, youth, ethnic minorities, the poor, journalists, teachers, religious leaders, club representatives, and other professionals. The CG were trained to use the UP operational manual to understand the budget cycle, the LGSP-II monitoring system, and other related issues to ensure LGSP-II performance effectively. The CG played a pro-active role to monitor LGSP-II performance. Moreover, CG members attend open budget activities.

**Volunteer selection**: In the original sub-project design, 30 volunteers were selected to assist the CG and project staff with project activities. Possible volunteers included community leaders, religious leaders, poor, vulnerable people, women, minority group members, peasants and other community people. Unfortunately, the use of volunteers was not successful, primarily because most people could not afford to donate free time.

**Training CG members and Volunteers:** To develop the capacity of the CGs to use the social accountability tools properly, there was one, two-day training. A total 810 CG members and 30 volunteers participated from 30 Unions.

**Project inception workshop:** A project inception workshop was held in each district to inform, involve and influence the administration, LGSP-II related personnel, media elite, and UP. Participants were informed about goals, objectives, activities, implementation procedures, expected output and results, project area.

**Dialogue session with UP representatives:** To inform the UP representatives about the CARTA project and the roles of CGs to improve understanding of LGSP II procedures, a daylong dialogue session was held in each targeted UP in the beginning stage of the project.

**Develop community action plan:** The CG members developed a community action plan to conduct social audit and other budget-monitoring activities at the UP level.

**Conduct a 1st survey and 2nd survey:** The CG conducted a 1st survey and final survey, with the assistance of a consultant.

**Develop a block-grant distribution-calendar (based on the LGSP-II implementation cycle):** The CG members developed a calendar for each UP, based on the BBG term of LGSP-II. The calendar indicates the expenditure by the LGSP fund, and changes over time. The calendar was shown on a display board. Before posting, the CG will convene one consultation meeting with each UP to incorporate suggested language for the display.

**Community platform functioning:** Quarterly coordination meeting with volunteers and CG members have been organized to share the experience of the project intervention, achievements, implementation process, lessons learned, and best practice, with project staff.

**First joint meeting with CG & SSCs and sharing-meeting with WC, SSC & CG :** This meeting held in each UP between the WC, CG and the SSC to share the experiences, including the achievements, implementation process, lesson learned, and best practices. The activities help to inspire the SSC to perform their role actively.

**Observation activities:** CG and community visited information board of UP and closely follow the process of decision making and expenditure of BBG, in order to assess transparency and accountability of the process (in line with the budget calendar and the CGs activity plans).

**Coordination meeting with partners and MJF:** Periodic coordination meetings organized between Democracywatch, MJF and other partners involved into third party monitoring of WB funded projects under CARTA, for reflection on progress and exchange of experience.

**Exposure visit:** DW and AS project staff, selected UP, and CG members, visited project sites to share experiences. One visit made to an AS site, while four visits made to the Democracywatch project area.

**Public hearings:** The public hearings are referred to as "extra-ordinary" in order to distinguish between ordinary annual hearings initiated by UPs where last year budget implementation is reported and the current year budget is presented. These extra-ordinary public hearings were initiated and led by the CG. The agenda consisted of reviewing the results of the input tracking process and FGD.

## 7.4    Particpant numbers at the inception workshop by district

| Sl | Name of District | Male | Female | Total | Remarks |
|----|------------------|------|--------|-------|---------|
| 01 | Nilphamari | 37 | 17 | 54 | Date: 25 March 2013 |
| 02 | Jessore | 44 | 11 | 55 | Date: 2 June 2013 |
| **Total** | | **81** | **28** | **109** | |

Project inception workshop in both districts held with DC, UNO, DDLG, UP representatives and CG to meet the objective of the Project Inception Workshop is to build a common understanding on CARTA program as well as activities and outcome for builds a common understanding to achieve the goal through analogous strategy.

### 7.5    Questionnaire for UP representatives

**LGSP-II sub Project**
**1st survey Questionnaires: Union Parishad Representatives**

*(Note: For many questions the answers might include several choices. The respondent should choose the "best" response. If the answer is not one of the choices, then the 'other' option should be noted, with a short explanation.)*

Interview ID #_____

Name of the interviewer:_____Date of Interview_____

1. Location
    1.1  Union_____Ward No_____Upazila_____ District_____
    1.2  Was your union included in LGSP-I? *(circle the answer)*
          Yes                        No                            Don't Know
    1.3  If the answer is 'yes' then which year? 20__
    1.4  When did you begin the LGSP-II project? 20__
2. Personal Information:
    2.1  Name of the Respondent:_____
    2.1 Respondent's father/husband's name:_____
    2.3 Respondent's Age:_____
    2.4: Educational Qualification: (*circle one*)

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Illiterate- | 1 |
| Can Sign Name | 2 |
| Can Write- | 3 |
| Up to Class 5- | 4 |
| Up to Class 10 | 5 |
| SSC (passed)- | 6 |
| Up to HSC - | 7 |
| HSC (passed)- | 7 |
| Up to Bachelor -  9 | |
| Bachelor or above | 10 |
| Others- | 11_____ |

    2.5 Marital Status:

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Married- | 1 |
| Unmarried- | 2 |
| Widow- | 3 |
| Divorced- | 4 |
| Abandoned | 5 |

    2.6 Religion:

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Islam- | 1 |
| Hindu- | 2 |
| Buddhist- | 3 |
| Christian- | 4 |
| Other- | 5 _____ |

    2.7 Public service:

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Elected Chairman- | 1 |
| Elected Member- | 2 |

Elected Member in Reserved Seat- 3

2.8 How many years in this position? (*years*)_____

2.9 Personal Address (with the Ward No.): _____(*optional information*)

3. Transparency:

  3.1 Is there any development plan in your Union Parishad? (*circle one*)

        Yes        No        Don't Know

  3.2 For what time period is the plan?

        1 Year        5 Year        Don't Know

  3.3 If the answer is 'yes' then mention what types of projects have been implemented

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Construction of New Katcha Road- | 1 |
| Repairing Old Katcha Road- | 2 |
| Digging Cannel- | 3 |
| Development Works for Market- | 4 |
| Construction or Repairing School- | 5 |
| Brick-built Road- | 6 |
| Repairing Old Brick-built Road- | 7 |
| Other- | 8 |

_____

3.4 Is there an annual budget in your Union Parishad?        Yes        No

3.5 If the answer is 'yes' then for which projects is there an allocation?

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Construction of New *Katcha* Road- | 1 |
| Repairing Old *Katcha* Road- | 2 |
| Digging Cannel- | 3 |
| Development Works for Market- | 4 |
| Construction or Repairing School- | 5 |
| Brick-built Road- | 6 |
| Repairing Old Brick-built Road- | 7 |
| Others- | 8 _____ |

  3.6 What meetings took place for union parishad budget? (*circle one or more*)

        Formulation

        Budget

        Ward Meeting

        Union Budget Meeting

3.7 If these meetings took place then when?

        Before Budget Formulation

        After Preparing the Draft Budget

3.8 Did you ensure the participation of the citizens in budget related meetings?  Yes        No

3.9 If '*yes*', why did you ensure the participation of the citizens?

|  |  |
|---|---|
| To submit the proposals for the development of the area- | 1 |
| To inform the citizens about the budget- | 2 |
| To receive the comments of the citizens- | 3 |
| Other- _____ | 4 |

4.0 If '*no*', why not?

|  |  |
|---|---|
| I didn't know- | 1 |
| It was not felt urgent- | 2 |
| Union Parishad did not call the meeting | 3 |
| Other- _____ | 4 |

4.1 Are you aware of the committees for the selection and implementation of UP-led projects?

        Yes        No

4.2 If the answer is '*yes*', are there any existing committees in your ward that were started under LGSP-I or LGSP-II?

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Selection Committee- | 1 |
| Project Supervision (SSC) Committee- | 2 |
| Project Implementation Committee- | 3 |
| Ward Committee (WC)- | 4 |
| Others- _____ | 5 |

4.3 Is there a Ward Committee in your area?     Yes      No

   Number of Ward Committee members _____

   Number of male members  _____

   Number of female members  _____

4.4 Is there a SSC on your area?

   Total number of project supervision committee members _____

   Male members    _____

   Female members    _____

4.5 In which year was WC and SSC formed in your area?

   WC _____

   SSC _____….

4.7 Do you think the community can affect the UP budgeting?   Yes   No

4.8 If the answer is '*yes*', then how?

| | |
|---|---|
| By raising claims- | 1 |
| By giving suggestions- | 2 |
| By identifying loopholes- | 3 |
| Other _____ | 4 |

4.9 What ways do you use to receive the comments from citizens during the planning and budgeting of your Union Parishad?

| | |
|---|---|
| Through Ward Meeting- | 1 |
| Through Open Budget Meeting- | 2 |
| Through Ward Planning Meeting- | 3 |
| Comments- | 4 |
| Other _____ | 5 |

5.0 Can the citizens in your union get budget related information?  Yes   No

5.1 If the answer is '*yes*' then how can get the information?

| | |
|---|---|
| From Ward Meeting- | 1 |
| From Yearly Budget Meeting- | 2 |
| From UP Notice Board- | 3 |
| Others _____ _____ | 4 |

5.2 Was any project implemented from the Union Parishad's LGSP-II allocation.

   Yes    No

5.3 If the answer is '*yes*' then please mention what type of project it was.

  Roads (Mention the name of project implementation area & time/year)

  _____

  Digging canals/drain (Mention the name of project implementation area & time/year)

  _____

  Development of market places (Mention the name of project implementation area & time/year)-

  _____

  Construction of bridges/culverts (Mention the name of project implementation area & time/year)-

  _____

  Other_____

5.4 Are you informed about the UP Yearly Budget?   Yes     No

5.5 If the answer is '*yes*' then mention the sources:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| From different types of taxes- | 1 |
| From government fund- | 2 |
| From LGSP II- | 3 |
| From other sources-_____ | 4 |

5.6 Is tax collected from the citizens of your area?     Yes                No

5.7 If the answer is '*yes*' then what type of tax is this?

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Holding- | 1 |
| Other_____ | 2 |

5.8 Did the UP contract with any individual/company f or the implementation of any program under LGSP II

Yes           No              Don't know

5.9 If the answer is 'yes' then which type of project?

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Construction of road- | 1 |
| Digging canals- | 2 |
| Development of markets/resource places- | 3 |
| Construction of bridge/culvert- | 4 |
| Renovation of schools- | 5 |
| Others _____ | 6 |

5.10 Are you informed about the decision making process of this contract?

Yes              No

5.11 If the answer is 'yes' then how was the contract made?

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Approved by the committee- | 1 |
| Approved by the Chairman himself- | 2 |
| Approved by the entire council- | 3 |
| Other _____ | 4 |

5.12 What types of information does the UP provide to the citizens?

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Tax related- | 1 |
| Infrastructure development related- | 2 |
| Yearly work plan related- | 3 |
| Yearly development budget related- | 4 |
| Yearly income and expenditure of UP- | 5 |
| Others-_____ | 6 |

5.13 What are the existing means of providing information to the rural people regarding the activities of union parishad?

|   |   |
|---|---|
| No media- | 1 |
| Through the choukidar (security guard)- | 2 |
| Through miking- | 3 |
| Through using mobile phone- | 4 |
| Through leaflet/postering- | 5 |
| Through arranging meetings in markets- | 6 |
| Others-_____ | 7 |

6   Effectiveness related questions:

6.1  Are aware of the operation manual or guidebook of LGSP II?

Yes               No

6.2  Do you think the UP has the capacity or manpower to run LGSP II as per the operation manual?

Yes            No

6.3  If the answer is 'no' then what types of problems occur due to this?

|   |   |
|---|---|
| All works cannot be done on time- | 1 |
| All records cannot be preserved- | 2 |
| Impossible to provide the information on all services   - | 3 |

Inability to give training on capacity development on time-                4
Inability to update the documents
on time as per LGSP II operation manual-                5
Other_____                6

6.4  Does your UP have the capacity to plan and implement the yearly budget of the UP?
        Yes           No

6.5 If the answer is '*yes*' then mention the types of capacities your union has to implement the activities of LGSP II
        Formulation of plan-                1
        Formulation of yearly budget-                2
        Formulation of project-                3
        Project implementation-                4
        Preparing monthly/quarterly/annual report-                5
        Other-_ _____                6

6.6  If the answer is '*no*' then what types of problems occur?
        Not following a participatory approach in decision making-                1
        Being unable to get all the work done properly as per the policy/rules-                2
        Documents/records preservation is not proper-                3
        It is not possible to engage the local people-                4
        Preparing and submission of reports is irregular and not timely-                5
        Others-_____6

6.7   Did the members of the UP receive any type of training under LGSP II Program?
        Yes           No

6.8  If the answer is '*yes*' then mention from where they received the training?
        From Upazila/URT (Upazila Resource Team)-                1
        Self-initiative by the UP-                2
        Through NGO-                3
        Others-_____                4

6.9 If the answer is '*yes*' then what had been the subject of the training?

        _____
        _____
        _____
        _____

6.10 What was the duration of the training for UP Members under LGSP II program?
        _____

6.11 When did the UP members get the training under LGSP II Program?
        1 month earlier-                1
        2 months earlier-                2
        3 months earlier-                3
        6 months earlier-                4
        1 year ago-                5
        More than 1 year ago-                6
        Others-_____                7

6.12 What training proved to be helpful for increasing the capacity of the UP members?
        1._____
        2._____
        3._____
        4. _____
        5. _____

6.13 To carry out LGSP II Project activities what types of trainings are required for increasing the capacity of the UP members?

_____
_____
_____
_____

6.14  Does your UP have the necessary infrastructure and other facilities so that its members can carry out their duties?

Yes                      No

6.15  If the answer is '*no*' please mention:

1._____
2._____
3._____
4._____

6.16 Do you know whether the activities are implemented as per the UP plan?

Yes                      No

6.17 If it is not then mention the reasons:

1._____
2._____
3._____
4._____

6.18 Did you participate in discussion s on the plan?

Yes                      No

6.19 If the answer is 'yes' then mention when and how:

1._____
2._____
3._____
4._____
5._____

7 Participation and coordination related questions:

7.1 What is the level of participation of poor people in planning at UP's ward and union level?

5% of the total participants-                    1
10% of the total participants-                   2
20% of the total participants-                   3
30% or more of the total participants-           4
Normally they do not participate-               5
Others- _____   6

7.2 What are the reasons due to which the poor do not participate in yearly and 5 yearly plan of UP at ward and union level?

1._____
2._____
3. _____

7.3 Do you know whether the poor/marginalized are included in SSC Committee?

Yes                      No

7.4 If they are included then please mention the number?          Male_____ Female_____

7.5 If they are not included then mention the reasons

1._____
2._____
3._____
4._____

7.6 Are the poor/marginalized are included in the WC Committee?

         Yes                      No

7.7 If they are included then please mention the number?         Male_____ Female_____

7.8 If they are not included then mention the reasons

    1._____

    2._____

    3._____

    4._____

7.9 Was any special development project undertaken from LGSP II allocation for the deprived people during last year?

         Yes           No           Do not know

7.10 If the answer is '*yes*' then please mention what type of project it was:

    1._____

    2._____

    3._____

    4. _____

8 What level of coordination exists among the UP. Planning committee, Supervisory Committee (SSC), Standing Committee, and Ward Committee (especially the Project Implementation Committee, Ward Committee, Scheme Supervision Committee formed under LGSPII )

    Decisions taken in that committee meeting are discussed as agenda in UP Meeting-          1

    Decisions taken in that committee meeting are not discussed as agenda in UP Meeting-      2

    Decisions taken in that committee meeting are approved and accepted in UP Meeting-      3

    Decisions taken in that committee meeting are not approved and accepted in UP Meeting-    4

    The agenda of UP Meeting is fixed as per the agenda of that committee             5

8.1 Is there any existing system for complaining if the citizens are satisfied with the implemented project by the UP?

         Yes           No           Do not know

8.2 If the answer is '*yes*' then mention the process followed:

    1._____

    2._____

    3._____

    4. _____

8.3 Are there any measures to resolve the complaint?

         Yes           No           Do not know

8.4 If the answer is '*yes*' then please mention the types of measures to resolve

    1._____

    2._____

    3._____

    4. _____

8.5 Please mention number of complaints you received so far about LGSP II Project (If possible please mention the types of complaints)

_____

8.6 How many complaints have been resolved so far regarding LGSP II Project?

_____

8.7 How many complaints have you resolved? _____

8.8 How many complaints were resolved by the Union Parishad? _____

8.9 How many complaints were resolved by the higher authority/upazila or district level ?

8.10 How many complaints have been raised about the implementation of LGSP II Project

## 7.6    Questionnaire for UP secretaries

**LGSP-II sub Project**
**1st survey Questionnaires: Secretary**
 *(Note: For many questions the answers might include several choices. The respondent should choose the "best" response. If the answer is not one of the choices, then the 'other' option should be noted, with a short explanation.)*

Interview ID #_____

Name of the interviewer:_____Date of Interview_____


1 Location
  1.1.  Union_____Ward No_____Upazila_____ District_____
  1.2.  Was your union included in LGSP-I? *(circle the answer)*
            1.2.1.1.1. Yes                    No                    Don't Know
  1.3.  If the answer is 'yes' then which year? 20__
  1.4.  When did you begin the LGSP-II project? 20__


2 Personal Information:
        2.1 Name of the Respondent:_____
        2.2 Respondent's father/husband's name:_____
        2.3 Respondent's Age:_____
        2.4 Educational Qualification: (*circle one*)
                Illiterate-                1
                Can Sign Name             2
                Can Write-                3
                Up to Class 5-            4
                Up to Class 10            5
                SSC (passed)-             6
                Up to HSC -               7
                HSC (passed)-             7
                Up to Bachelor -          9
                Bachelor or above         10
                Others-                   11_____
      2.5 Marital Status:
                Married-                  1
                Unmarried-                2
                Widow-                    3
                Divorced-                 4
                Abandoned                 5
      2.6 Religion:
                Islam-                    1
                Hindu-                    2
                Buddhist-                 3
                Christian-                4
Other-            5 _____

2.7 Public service:

        Elected Chairman-             1

        Elected Member-               2

        Elected Member in Reserved Seat-  3

2.8 How many years in this position? (*years*)_____

2.9 Personal Address (with the Ward No.): _____


**3. Transparency:**

3.1 Is there any development plan in your Union Parishad? (*circle one*)

                Yes            No            Don't Know (*circle one)*

3.1.1 If the answer is yes then mention what type of development plan is that


  Yearly Plan           5 Years Plan        No Plan Exists

3.1.2 If the answer is 'yes' then mention what types of projects have been implemented

        Construction of New Katcha Road-        1

        Repairing Old Katcha Road-            2

        Digging Cannel-                    3

        Development Works for Market-       4

        Construction or Repairing School-      5

        Other-                          6 _____(Please mention)


3.2 Is there an annual budget in your Union Parishad?         Yes-1         No-2

3.2.1 If the answer is 'yes' then for which major projects the money was allocated from that budget? works

    Construction of New *Katcha* Road-        1

        Repairing Old Road-               2

        Digging Cannel-                    3

        Development Works for Market-       4

        Construction or Repairing School-      5

        Others-                      6 _____

3.3 Did the following meetings take place for UP Budget formulation?

        Ward Meeting               Yes             No

        Union budget meeting          Yes             No


3.3.1 If these meetings took place then when? (circle one or more)

  Before Budget Formulation-1

  After Preparing the Draft Budget-2


3.4 Did you participate in the budget related meetings of UP last year?

      Yes           No


3.6 Do you think the community can affect the UP budgeting?      Yes         No

3.6.1 If the answer is 'yes', then how?

        By raising claims-               1

        By giving suggestions-           2

        By identifying loopholes-       3

        Other _____  4

3.7 What is the process of joining UP planning and budgeting?

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Through Ward Meeting-              | 1 |
| Through Open Budget Meeting-       | 2 |
| Through Ward Planning Meeting-     | 3 |
| Comments-                          | 4 |
| Other _____ | 5 |

3.8 Can the citizens in your union get budget related information?     Yes          No

3.8.1 If the answer is 'yes' then how can get the information?

|                                        |   |
|----------------------------------------|---|
| From Ward Meeting-                     | 1 |
| From Yearly Budget Meeting-            | 2 |
| From UP Notice Board-                  | 3 |
| Others _____ _____ | 4 |

3.9.1 If the answer is 'yes' then please mention what type of project it was.

|                                                    |   |
|----------------------------------------------------|---|
| Roads (Mention the area)-                          | 1 |
| Digging canals/drain (Mention the area)-           | 2 |
| Development of market places (Mention the area)-   | 3 |
| Construction of bridges/culverts (Mention the area)- | 4 |
| Others-                                            | 5 |

3.10 What are the sources of the annual budget of your UP?

|                                                      |   |
|------------------------------------------------------|---|
| From different types of taxes-                       | 1 |
| From government fund-                                | 2 |
| From LGSP II-                                        | 3 |
| From other sources-_____ | 4 |

3.11 Please mention the amount of annual tax of your union? _____

3.11.1 Mention the types of the tax:

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| Holding- | 1 |
| Others-  | 2 |

3.12 Did the UP contract with any individual/company for the implementation of any project?

Yes-1          No-2          Don't know-3

3.12.1 If the answer is 'yes' then mention the projects:

|                                                      |   |
|------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Roads (Mention the area)-                            | 1 |
| Digging canals/drain (Mention the area)-             | 2 |
| Development of market places (Mention the area)-     | 3 |
| Construction of bridges/culverts (Mention the area)- | 4 |
| Others-                                              | 5 |

3.13 Are you informed about the decision making process of this contract?

Yes-1          No-2

3.13.1 If the answer is 'yes' then how did you get the information?

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Through the Committee-   | 1 |
| Through the Chairman-    | 2 |
| Through the Entire UP-   | 3 |
| Others -                 | 4 |

3.14 What types of information does the UP provide to the citizens?

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Tax related- | 1 |
| Infrastructure development related- | 2 |
| Yearly work plan related- | 3 |
| Yearly development budget related- | 4 |
| Yearly income and expenditure of UP- | 5 |
| Others-_____ | 6 |

3.15 What are the existing means of providing information to the rural people regarding the activities of the union parishad?

|  |  |
|---|---|
| No media- | 1 |
| Through the choukidar (security guard)- | 2 |
| Through miking- | 3 |
| Through using mobile phone- | 4 |
| Through leaflet/postering- | 5 |
| Through arranging meetings in markets- | 6 |
| Others-_____ | 7 |


## 4.   Effectiveness related questions:

4.1   Are you aware of UP and LGSP II Operations Manual or Guide Book?

Yes-1          No-2

4.2 Do you think the UP has the capacity or manpower to run LGSP II as per the operation manual?

Yes          No

4.2.1     If the answer is 'no' then what types of problems occur due to this?

|  |  |
|---|---|
| All works cannot be done on time- | 1 |
| All records cannot be preserved- | 2 |
| Impossible to provide the information on all services          - | 3 |
| Inability to give training on capacity development on time- | 4 |
| Inability to update the documents on time as per LGSP II operation manual- | 5 |
| Other_____ | 6 |


4.3    Does your UP have the capacity to plan and implement the yearly budget of the UP?

Yes-1          No-2


4.3.1     If the answer is 'yes' then mention the types of capacities your union has to implement the activities of LGSP II

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Formulation of plan- | 1 |
| Formulation of yearly budget- | 2 |
| Formulation of project- | 3 |
| Project implementation- | 4 |
| Preparing monthly/quarterly/annual report- | 5 |
| Other-_ _____ | 6 |


4.3.2     If the answer is 'no' then what types of problems occur?

Not following a participatory approach in decision making-                    1

Being unable to get all the work done properly as per the policy/rules-　　2
Documents/records preservation is not proper-　　3
It is not possible to engage the local people-　　4
Preparing and submission of reports is irregular and not timely-　　5
Inability to provide information-　　6
Others-_____ 7

4.3.3　　Did the members of the UP receive any type of training under LGSP II Program?
　　　　　　　　Yes　　　　　　　　No
4.3.4　　If the answer is 'yes' then mention from where they received the training?
　　　　From Upazila/URT (Upazila Resource Team)-　　　　1
　　　　Self-initiative by the UP-　　　　2
　　　　Through NGO-　　　　3
　　　　Others-_____4
4.3.5　If the answer is 'yes' then what had been the subjects of the training?
　　　　　　　1._____
　　　　　　　2._____
　　　　　　　3._____
　　　　　　　4. _____
4.3.6　What was the duration of the training for UP Members under LGSP II program?
　　　　_____
4.3.7 When did the UP members get the training under LGSP II Program?
　　　　1 month earlier-　　　　　　　1
　　　　2 months earlier-　　　　　　2
　　　　3 months earlier-　　　　　　3
　　　　6 months earlier-　　　　　　4
　　　　1 year ago-　　　　　　　　5
　　　　More than 1 year ago-　　　　6
　　　　Others-_____　　7
4.3.8 In which areas the training proved to be helpful for increasing the capacity of the UP members?
　　　　　　1._____
　　　　　　2._____
　　　　　　3._____
　　　　　　4. _____
　　　　　　5. _____
4.3.9 To carry out LGSP II Project activities what types of trainings are required for increasing the capacity of the UP
　　　members?
　　　　　　1._____
　　　　　　2._____
　　　　　　3._____
　　　　　　4._____
　　　　　　5._____
4.4　Does your UP have the necessary infrastructure and other facilities so that its members can carry out their duties?
　　　Yes-1　　　　　　　　No-2
4.4.1　　If the answer is 'no' please mention:
　　　　　　1._____
　　　　　　2._____
　　　　　　3._____
　　　　　　4._____

4.5    Do you know whether the activities are implemented as per the UP plan?

                 Yes                   No

4.5.1    If not, then mention the reasons:

                 1._____

                 2._____

                 3._____

                 4._____

4.6    Did you participate in any discussion related to 5th year Plan?

    Yes-1               No-2

4.6.1    If the answer is 'yes' then mention how you participated:

                 1._____

                 2._____

                 3._____

                 4._____

**5.    Participation and Coordination related Questions:**

5.1  What is the level of participation of poor people in planning at UP's ward and union level?

          5% of the total participants-                       1

          10% of the total participants-                   2

          20% of the total participants-                   3

          30% or more of the total participants-          4

          Normally they do not participate-             5

          Others- _____     6

5.1.1  What are the reasons due to which the poor do not participate in yearly and 5 yearly plan of UP at ward and union level?

                 1._____

                 2._____

                 3. _____

5.2 Do you know whether the poor and marginalized are included in SSC Committee?

   Yes-1               No-2          Do not know-3

5.2.1 If they are included then please mention the number?

     Male_____ Female_____

5.2.2 If they are not included, note the reasons

                 1._____

                 2._____

                 3._____

                 4._____

5.2.3 Are the poor and marginalized are included in the WC Committee?

                 Yes                   No

5.2.4 If they are included then please mention the number?         Male_____ Female_____

5.2.5 If they are not included then mention the reasons

                 1._____

                 2._____

                 3._____

                 4._____

5.3 Was any special development project undertaken from LGSP II allocation for the deprived people during last year?

                 Yes          No          Do not know

5.3.1 If the answer is 'yes' then please mention what type of project it was:

1._____

2._____

3._____

4. _____

## 6.  Accountability related Questions:

6.1 What level of coordination exists among the UP. Planning committee, Supervisory Committee (SSC), Standing Committee, and Ward Committee (especially the Project Implementation Committee, Ward Committee, Scheme Supervision Committee formed under LGSPII )

| | |
|---|---|
| Decisions taken in that committee meeting are discussed as agenda in UP Meeting- | 1 |
| Decisions taken in that committee meeting are not discussed as agenda in UP Meeting- | 2 |
| Decisions taken in that committee meeting are approved and accepted in UP Meeting- | 3 |
| Decisions taken in committee meeting are not approved & accepted in UP Meeting- | 4 |
| The agenda of UP Meeting is fixed as per the agenda of that committee | 5 |

6.3 Is there any existing system for complaining if the citizens are satisfied with the implemented project by the UP?

Yes                 No                 Do not know

6.3.1 If the answer is 'yes' then mention the process followed:

1._____

2._____

3._____

4. _____

6.4 Are there any measures to resolve the complaint?

Yes                 No                 Do not know

6.4.1 If the answer is 'yes' then please mention the types of measures to resolve

1._____

2._____

3._____

4. _____

6.4.2 Please mention number of complaints you received so far about LGSP II Project (If possible please mention the types of complaints)

_____

6.4.3 How many complaints have been resolved so far regarding LGSP II Project?

6.5 How many complaints were resolved by the Union Parishad? _____

6.5.1 How many complaints were resolved by the higher authority/upazila or district level ?

6.6 No complaint has been reported yet regarding the implementation of LGSP II

## 7.7   Questionnaire for UP committee representatives

**LGSP-II sub Project**

**1st survey Questionnaires:** LGSP-II committee **representatives**

*(Note: For many questions the answers might include several choices. The respondent should choose the "best" response. If the answer is not one of the choices, then the 'other' option should be noted, with a short explanation.)*

Interview ID #_____

Name of the interviewer:_____Date of Interview_____

3. Location
    3.1  Union_____Ward No_____Upazila_____ District_____
    3.2  Was your union included in LGSP-I? *(circle the answer)*
        Yes                   No                          Don't Know
    3.3  If the answer is 'yes' then which year? 20__
    3.4  When did you begin the LGSP-II project? 20__
4. Personal Information:
    4.1  Name of the Respondent:_____
    2.1 Respondent's father/husband's name:_____
    2.3 Respondent's Age:_____
    2.4: Educational Qualification: (*circle one*)
        Illiterate-                    1
        Can Sign Name             2
        Can Write-                   3
        Up to Class 5-              4
        Up to Class 10             5
        SSC (passed)-             6
        Up to HSC -                7
        HSC (passed)-            7
        Up to Bachelor -  9
        Bachelor or above        10
        Others-                        11_____
    2.5 Marital Status:
        Married-                      1
        Unmarried-                 2
        Widow-                       3
        Divorced-                    4
        Abandoned                 5
    2.6 Religion:
        Islam-                         1
        Hindu-                        2
        Buddhist-                    3
        Christian-                   4
        Other-                         5 _____
    2.7 Occupation:
        Household work -        1

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Services- | 2 | |
| Business- | 3 | |
| Other - | 4 | _____ |

2.7.1 Monthly income of respondent ----------------------- taka (approximate)

2.8 Occupation of respondent father/husband:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Agricultural work- | 1 | |
| Services- | 2 | |
| Business- | 3 | |
| Other - | 4 | _____ |

2.9 Occupation of respondent mother:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Household work  - | 1 | |
| Services- | 2 | |
| Business- | 3 | |
| Other - | 4 | _____ |

3. Transparency:

3.1 Is there any development plan in your Union Parishad? (*circle one*)

Yes          No          Don't Know

3.1.1  If the answer is 'yes' then mention what types of projects have been implemented

| | |
|---|---|
| Construction of New Katcha Road- | 1 |
| Repairing Old Katcha Road- | 2 |
| Digging Cannel- | 3 |
| Development Works for Market- | 4 |
| Construction or Repairing School- | 5 |
| Bridge-culvert- | 6 |
| Other- | 8 _____ |

3.2 Is there an annual budget in your Union Parishad?          Yes-1     No-2     Don't Know-3

3.2.1 If the answer is 'yes' then for which projects is there an allocation in?

| | |
|---|---|
| Construction of New Katcha Road- | 1 |
| Repairing Old Katcha Road- | 2 |
| Digging Cannel- | 3 |
| Development Works for Market- | 4 |
| Construction or Repairing School- | 5 |
| Bridge-culvert- | 6 |
| Other- | 8 _____ |

3.3 Are you member of any committees of LGSP-II UP-led projects?

Yes-1     No-2

3.3.1 If the answer yes then mentioned your membership with which committee?

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Selection Committee- | 1 |
| Project Supervision (SSC) Committee- | 2 |
| Project Implementation Committee- | 3 |
| Ward Committee (WC)- | 4 |
| Others- _____ | 5 |

3.3.2 How many members of this committee are owned by you?

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Selection Committee- | 1 (Total member -------, Male------ and Female-------) |
| Project Supervision (SSC) Committee- | 2 (Total member -------, Male------ and Female-------) |
| Project Implementation Committee- | 3(Total member -------, Male------ and Female-------) |
| Ward Committee (WC)- | 4(Total member -------, Male------ and Female-------) |
| Others- _____ | 5 (Total member -------, Male------ and Female-------) |

3.3.3 When the committee formed which you have owned?

        Year 20--------

3.4 Please mention at least three task or responsibility?

    1. --------------------------------------

    2. --------------------------------------

    3. --------------------------------------

3.5 Is the committee meeting held regularly?

                Yes-1            No-2

**3.5.**1 If the answer no then mention the reason?

    Less interest of UP -                1

    Non-cooperation by UP Chairman-      2

    Political pressure-               3

    Others- _____ 4

3.6 Are people informed about the decision taken in committee meetings?

    Yes-1    No-2

3.6.1 If the answer is 'Yes' then mention the ways/means of sharing.

    Local level meetings-1

    Through UP notice board-2

    Others- _____ 4

3.7 Are you aware of the sources of UP budget?

    Yes-1    No-2

3.7.1 If the answer is 'Yes' then mention the sources of budget.

    UP revenue/tax-1

    Government allocation-2

    LGSP Project allocation-3

    Others-------------4

3.8 Has any project been undertaken after receiving LGSP II Block Gran?

    Yes-1         No-2         Do not know-3

38.1 If the answer is 'Yes' then mention the types of those projects.

    1.

    2.

    3.

3.9 Is UP revenue/tax regularly paid from/by your household?

    Yes-1        No-2

3.9.1 If the answer is 'No' then mention the reasons behind not paying the tax

    1.

    2.

    3.

**4. Effectiveness related questions:**

4.1 Please measure the effectiveness the committee you are involved :

    All taken decisions have been implemented-                     1

    Few decisions haven't been implemented-                   2

    Partial implementation of the taken decisions-             3

    UP did not take decision on the agenda emerged in committee meeting -    4

    Others-                                     5

4.1.1 If it is executed/accepted then mention:

    1.

    2.

    3.

4.2 Can your committee take decision on LGSP II Project related activities?

        Yes-1              No-2

4.2.1 If the answer is 'Yes' then mention the types of taken decisions:

        1.

        2.

        3.

        4.

        5.

4.3: How are the decisions influenced?

        By UP Chairman-                1

        Politically-                     2

        By the Govt. officials-         3

        Others-                     4

4.4: Are you aware of the UPOM and LGSP Operation Manual

                Yes-1           No-2

4.4.1 If the answer is 'Yes' then mention your role (being the member of the committee):

        1.

        2.

        3.

        4.

4.4.2: Do you think the implementation of LGSP II Project activities follow the operational manual?

        Yes-1           No-2           Do not know-3

4.2.1 If it is not followed then what types of problems occur?

        All activities are not completed timely-                1

        Formulation and submission of reports does not take place timely-    2

        The public opinion is not reflected properly-          3

        It is not possible to update the documents-           4

        Others- (Please mention)                     5

4.5 Have you received any training after getting membership of this committee?

                Yes-1           No-2

4.5.1 If the answer 'No' then mentions the reason:

        1.

        2.

        3.

4.5.2 If the answer 'No' then mentions what kind of training you have received:

        1.

        2.

        3.

4.5.3 Do you think your committee is enough capable to implement LGSP-II project activities?

              Yes-1           No-2

4.5.4 If the answer 'Yes' then mention the types of capacity of your committee has to implement LGSP-II

        Formulation of plan-                 1

        Formulation of yearly budget-        2

        Formulation of project-            3

        Project implementation-           4

        Preparing monthly/quarterly/annual report-     5

        Monitoring the activities             6

        Other-_ _____7

4.5.5 If the answer is '*no*' then what types of problems occur?

       Not following a participatory approach in decision making-          1

       Being unable to get all the work done properly as per the policy/rules-    2

       Documents/records preservation is not proper-                  3

       It is not possible to engage the local people-                  4

       Information does not make available properly                 5

       Preparing and submission of reports is irregular and not timely-      6

       Others-_____7

4.5.6 Did the members of the committee receive any type of training under LGSP II Program?

                        Yes-1                  No-2

4.5.7    If the answer is '*yes*' then what had been the subject of the training?

       1.

       2.

       3.

       4.

4.5.8 What was the duration of the training for committee members under LGSP II program?

4.5.9 When did the committee members get the training under LGSP II Program?

       1 month earlier-                1

       2 months earlier-               2

       3 months earlier-               3

       6 months earlier-               4

       1 year ago-                    5

       More than 1 year ago-          6

       Others-_____    7

4.5.10 What training proved to be helpful for increasing the capacity of the committee members?

       1._____

       2._____

       3._____

       4. _____

       5. _____

4.6  Does the training help to understand your role, responsibility and activities being a member of LGSP II Project

           Yes-1             No-2

4.6.1    If the answer 'Yes' then mentioned which subject/area you are well known through the training facilities:

       UP activities -        1

       Role of the member -    2

       Financial management -  3

       Planning -          4

       Preparing budget -     5

       Other               6

4.7  Does the training help you for ensure better implement the LGSP-II project and the activities of the committee?

       Yes-1          No-2

4.7.1    If the answer 'No' then mention the reason

       1.

       2.

       3.

       4.

       5.

4.8 what types of trainings are required for increasing the capacity of the committee members to implement LGSP-II project activities?

        1.
        2.
        3.
        4.
        5.

## 5. Participation and Coordination:

5.1 Do you know what process followed to forming the committee?

| | |
|---|---|
| The committee member selected by the UP Chairman- | 1 |
| The committee member selected in consultation with members- | 2 |
| The committee member selected by the upazila Nirbahi (executive) officer - | 3 |
| The committee member selected by the upazila engineer - | 4 |
| Other | 5 |

5.2 Do you know the ward committee and the scheme supervision committee formed in last year?

        Yes-1        No-2        Don't know - 3

5.3 Please mentioned your committee was involved with any type of projects:

        1.
        2.
        3.
        4.

5.4 Did you proposed for any development project/activities

        Yes-1        No-2        Don't know-3

5.5.1 If the answer 'Yes' then how many times accepted your proposal (project you have proposed)?

        Always--        1
        Sometimes-        2
        Very few -        3
        Not at all -        4

5.5.6 If the answer 'No' then mentioned the reasons:

        1.
        2.
        3.

5.7 Who is the key person for designing/planning and implementation of development project?

        Upazila Nirbahi (executive) officer -        1
        Upazila engineer -        2
        Project Implementing officer-        3
        Other-        4

5.8 Who has been provided most of the support to implement LGSP-II project

        Upazila Nirbahi (executive) officer -        1
        Upazila engineer -        2
        Project Implementing officer-        3
        Other-        4

5.9 Please mentioned the barrier for getting essential support:

      1.

      2.

      3.


5.10 Did you participate in committee meeting regularly?

      Yes-1          No-2


5.10.1 If the answer 'Yes' then mentioned the reason:

      1.

      2.

      3.

5.11 Has the UP approved the decision undertaken by the committee?

      Yes-1          No-2

5.11.1 If the answer 'yes' then mentioned how it accepted by the UP:

      1.

      2.

      3.

 5.12 How to take people opinion on the decision that has already taken by your committee?

| | |
|---|---|
| Through ward Shava- | 1 |
| UP budget Shava- | 2 |
| Mass gathering/meeting- | 3 |
| Other - | 4 |

**6. Access to information:**

6.1 Does the UP share the information to the committee members where getting from different sources?

      Yes-1          No-2

6.2 If the answer 'No' then mentioned source of information of your committee:

| | |
|---|---|
| Other members- | 1 |
| UP secretary - | 2 |
| Other sources - | 3 |
| Other - | 4 |

6.2 Does your UP share all kind of circulation/notice/direction with your committee related to LGSP-II project?

      Yes -1          No-2

## 7.8    Questionnaire for UP Representatives for 2<sup>nd</sup> survey

**LGSP-II Project**

*First introduce the purpose of the survey, and then ask the respondent if s/he agrees to take part*

Type of interview: UP Chairman/Member:
Interview ID #
Name of the interviewer
Date of Interview

1) Address of Respondents
Village _____Ward No: _____ Union --------------------Upazila _____District_____

1.1) Name of the Respondent _____Respondent's father/husband's name_____
1.2) Respondents Contact number _____

**2. Personal Information:**
2.1) Respondent's Age: _____
2.2) Educational Qualification

| | |
|---|---|
| Up to Class 5- | 1 |
| Up to Class 10 | 2 |
| SSC (passed)- | 3 |
| Up to HSC - | 4 |
| HSC (passed)- | 5 |
| Up to Bachelor - | 6 |
| Bachelor or above | 7 |
| Others- | 8_____ |

2.3) Marital Status:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Married | - | 1 |
| Unmarried | - | 2 |
| Widow / widower | -3 | |
| Others | -4 | |

2.4) Position:

| | |
|---|---|
| Chairman | -1 |
| Member | -2 |
| Member in Reserved Seat | -3 |
| Secretary | -4 |

2.5) How many terms/years in this position? *years*--------------

2.6) Occupation (Farmer/household chores-1; Job (Private/NGO)-2; Business (large-contractor, supplier, wholesaler)-3; Business (Small- Grocery shopkeeper, stationary, Small Business)-4; Fish farmer-5; Doctor (homeopathy / Allopathic)-6; Advocat-7; Teacher-8; Imam/Religious Leader-9; Unemployed-10, Housewife-11; Others-12) ------------------------
2.7) Monthly income (taka) ----------

**3. Transparency**

3.1) Are there any development plan in your UP?
  Yes -1  No-2      Do not know-3

3.2) If yes then list the development plan in your UP
          1 year /Annual Plan -1
          5 year Plan    -2
          Both type of Plan- -3

3.3) Does your UP formulate development plan every year ?
  Yes -1  No-2      Do not know-3

3.4) If not, what are the reasons?
Lack of skilled manpower-1, Lack of required resources-2, No instruction from higher authority-3, Others-4  (Please specify)

3.5) Had the UPOM properly been followed in preparing plan?
      Yes -1          No-2      Do not know-3

3.6) If not, what are the reasons
          a)
          b)
          c)
          d)
3.7) If yes, who does prepare the plan?
  UP Chairman-1; UP member-2; Local elite-3; Local citizens-4

3.8) Did you receive any training under LGSP II?
  Yes -1  No-2

3.9) If yes, who provided training?
  URT-1; NGO Officials-2, Others-3 (Please specify)

3.10) How the received training had been helpful in your activities in the UP?
      (Quality of work has increased-1; Quality of financial management/accountancy has increased-2; Tax collection has increased-3; More transparency, efficiency and accountability-4; Education and health consciousness has increased-5; Women development/Empowerment of women has increased-6; Other-7)

3.11) What types of training are essential to proper implementation of LGSP II?
      (Financial management-1; Project planning, initiation and implementation-2; Taxation-3, Report writing-4, Office management-5; Vocational training-6; Activities of UP Member-7; Budgeting-8; Procurement-9; Others-10)

3.12) Does your UP disseminate development plan to the community?
    Yes-1 No-2

3.13) If yes, how is the information about the UP development plan usually disseminated to the community?
  (Notice board-1; Micking-2; Chowkidar-3; Annual general meeting-4; Member-5; Others-6)

3.14) *If not, please mention the reasons*

a)

b)

c)

d)

3.15) In your opinion had there been any scheme implemented in your UP/Ward last year under LGSP II?

        Yes-1          No-2

3.16) If yes, what types of projects were implemented

| Sl | Types of projects | Implemented in your community – (indicate) |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Communication** | 1. Construction/reconstruction of village roads <br> 2. Maintenance of existing village roads <br> 3. Construction of culvert, , construction of Bridge/ foot over bridge <br> 4. Construction of drainage system <br> 5. Passenger shed |
| 2 | **Health** | 6. Construction/renovation of health center <br> 7. Campaign on health related awareness, family planning, public health, cleanliness/hygiene <br> 8. Supply of medicine <br> 9. Logistics support for the health center <br> 10. Providing salary for the part time staff |
| 3 | **Water Supply** | 11. Installing tube-well <br> 12. Pipe water scheme <br> 13. Construction of water reserve (tank) |
| 4 | **Education** | 14. Construction, reconstruction & renovation of educational institution <br> 15. Logistics (furniture and fixture) supply for primary school <br> 16. Procurement of educational materials <br> 17. Taking up awareness program on education |
| 5 | **Natural Resources Management** | 18. Social forestry, <br> 19. Infrastructure development for protecting land erosion <br> 20. Provide natural resource management training |
| 6 | **Agriculture & Bazar** | 21. Construction of vaccination center for the livestock <br> 22.  Construction of toll point/shed in the market <br> 23. Development of irrigation system for the mass <br> 24. Provide technical training on advanced agriculture |
| 7 | **Sewerage & Garbage Management** | 25. Construction of sewerage system <br> 26. Campaign on raising awareness about sewerage system <br> 27. Installing bio-gas plant |
| 8 | **Human Resources Management** | 28. Development of women & self-employment education for women <br> 29. IGA training for the vulnerable <br> 30. Skill development training for the poor youth (male &female) <br> 31. Support for UP Information Service Centre <br> 32. Development of information technology |
| 9 | Others (Please specify) | |

3.17) Are you aware of decisions taken for project selection?
   Yes-1  No-2


3.18) If yes, how was the decision to select the projects made?
      Ward meeting-1; UP Member-2; UP Member (reserved)-3; UP Chairaman-4; Secretary-5; Others-6
3.19) Did the citizens participate in decision-making process for these projects?
   Yes-1          No-2
3.20) If the answer is yes, how did the citizens participate?


3.21) Are the citizens informed about the project implementation progress by the UP?
               Yes-1               No-2
3.22) If yes, how is the information disseminated to the citizens?
      *Ward Shava-1; Notice board-2;UP member-3; UP member reserve seat-4; UP Chairman-5; Others-6*


3.23) Are you aware of the UP information dissemination instructions of UPOM?
   Yes-1          No-2
3.24) *If the answer is yes, does your UP disseminate LGSP project related information according to the UPOM?*
      Yes-1          No-2
 3.25) If the answer is yes what types of information is disseminated*?*
   *Committee list-1; Project list-2; Project allocation-4; Others-5*


3.26) Through which channels the information about the LGSP-II related development plan of your UP usually disseminated to the citizens?
      *Ward Shava-1; Notice board-2; UP member-3; UP member reserve seat-4;Micking-5; Chowkidar-6; UISC-7; Others-8-*
      *------------*


3.27) How many projects were taken in the FY- 2012- 13? ---------------------


3.28) How many projects were completed out of those? ----------------


3.29) Mention the reason behind project incompletion
         a)
         b)
         c)
         d)
3.30) Are you aware of LGSP-II procurement process as per UPOM?
   Yes-1  No-2
3.31) If yes, mention the procurement processes according to UPOM.
      Direct procurement procedure-1; Community procurement procedure-2; RFQ procedure-3; Open procurement procedure-4
3.32) Do you think the UP was transparent in contracting process under the LGSP II grants projects?
         Yes-1          No-2
3.33) If the answer is no then please mention the reason
         a)
         b)
         c)
         d)
3.34) Are you aware of annual budget of your Union Parishad?
         Yes-1          No-2          Don't Know-3

3.35) If yes, the does your UP formulate the budget every year?
  Yes-1  No-2
3.36) If no, what are the reasons?
  Lack of skilled manpower-1; Lack of required resources-2; No instruction from higher authority-3; Others-4 (Please specify) ------------------------
3.37) Had the procedures been properly followed in budget formulation as per UPOM?
  Yes-1                    No-2
3.38) If yes, what was done in this regard?
  Micking-1; Notice board-2; Chowkidar-3; Ward meeting-4; Others-5
3.39) If no, what are the reasons?
        a)
        b)
        c)
3.40) Do you think the appointment of skilled personnel is required in your UP to formulate budget and for documentation?
  Yes-1  No-2
3.41) Had the open budget session been held in last year?
  Yes-1  No-2
3.42) If yes, mention the number of total participants? ---------------------

3.43) Who participated in the open budget session?
  UP Chairman-1; UP member-2; Local elite-3; Local citizens-4; The poor-5

3.44) When was the budget formulation meetings held for the last time at your UP/Ward?
        Ward Meetings: when? _____

        Open budget meeting: when?

3.45) How do the citizens in your locality get to know about the ward shava?
        *Notice board-1; UP member-2; UP member reserve seat-3: Micking-4; Chowkidar-5; UISC-6; Others-7*

3.46) How do the citizens in your locality get to know about the open budget?
        *Notice board-1; UP member-2; UP member reserve seat-3: Micking-4; Chowkidar-5; UISC-6; Others-7*

3.47) Did you ensure citizens' participation in open budget meetings?
  Yes-1              No-2
3.48) If '*yes*', why did you ensure the participation of the citizens?
  To submit the proposals for the development of the area-1; To inform the citizens about the budget-2; To receive the comments of the citizens on budget formulation-3; Other-4
3.49) If '*not*', what are the reasons?
        a)
        b)
        c)
        d)
3.50) Did the citizens participate in Ward Shava & Open Budget Meetings?

  Ward Shava:      Yes-1  No-2

  Open Budget Meeting: Yes-1       No-2

3.51) Did the poor participate in Ward Shava & Open Budget Meetings?
  Ward Shava:   Yes-1                No-2
  Open Budget Meeting: Yes-1              No-2
3.52) If not, what are the reasons
Ward Shava
        a)
        b)
        c)
Open Budget Meeting
        a)
        b)
        c)
3.53) Does your UP disseminate the budget related information for the citizens?
  Yes-1        No-2
3.54) If yes, then what, when and how?

| *What information?* | *When disseminated?* | *How?* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3.55) What was the FY- 2013- 14's planned budget? (Amount)-

3.56) Source of the budget for the FY- 2013- 14?
  Government allocation-1; Income of UP-2; Others-3

3.57) What was the FY- 2014- 15's planned budget? Amount

3.58) Source of the budget for the FY- 2014- 15?
  Government allocation-1; Income of UP-2; Others-3

3.59) Do you think the community can influence the UP budget process?
  Yes-1        No-2

3.60) If the answer is '*yes*', then how?
  Claiming-1; Giving suggestions-2; Identifying loopholes-3; Others-4

3.61) If 'not', please mention the reasons

        a)
        b)
        c)

**4. Accountability:**
4.1) Mention particular procurement processes that are generally followed by your UP/Ward

     Direct procurement procedure-1; Community procurement procedure-2; RFQ procedure-3; Open procurement procedure-4
4.2) Are you aware about issuing/receiving testimonial/certificate after the implementation of the schemes for paying the bill

to the contractor?

Yes-1          No-2 Don't know-3

4.3 If yes then who has provide/received the certificate after completion of schemes implementation?

WC-1; SSC-2; Engineer-3

4.4) Are you aware of a grievance process under LGSP II?

Yes-1          No-2

4.5) Any grievances were raised under LGSP II projects?

Yes-1          No-2

4.6) If yes, what grievances were raised?

Not using cross cheque-1; Problems in bill-voucher-2; Inconsistency between bill and work-4; Use of low standard raw materials-5; Use of small amount of raw materials-6; Others-7

4.7) Which process/mechanism had the grievances been resolved?

Identifying problems and mitigate-1; Facts finding and discussion with parties-2; Discussion with UP Chairman and member-3; Hearing-4; Discussion with WC-5, Others-6

4.8) In your opinion had there been any hearing held during last year?

Yes-1          No-2

4.9) If yes then what had been the issues of those for hearing?

a)

b)

c)

## 5. Participation and inclusion:

5.1) Are the existing Laws/Rules of Union Parishad are conducive for citizens' participation in LGSP-II project activities?

Yes-1          No-2

5.2) If yes, how?

a)

b)

c)

5.3) If not, mention the reasons.

a)

b)

c)

5.4) Which factors influence citizens not to participate in LGSP-II projects?

a)

b)

c)

5.5) Are there any projects implemented in your UP in the last year that specifically leaded by women representative?

Yes-1 No-2 Don't Know-3

5.6) If yes, please mention the projects name.

a)

b)

c)

5.7) If not please mention the reasons.

a)

b)

c)

d)

5.8) In your opinion is there advantage of citizen engagement to implement of LGSP-II project?

Yes-1          No-2

5.9) If yes, please mention the advantages.

Citizen can give opinion through Ward meeting-1; Citizen can give opinion in budget meeting-2; Citizen can monitor-3; Can raise project/proposal-4; Can Select projects-5; Membership of SSC-6; People can set project-7; Image of UP has changed-8

5.10) In your opinion is there disadvantage of citizen engagement to implement of LGSP-II project?

Yes-1          No-2

5.11) If yes, please mention what are the disadvantages?

a)
b)
c)

5.12) What is your advice for ensuring citizens' participation in LGSP-II projects?

People should aware-1; Accountability and transparency must be ensured-2; Open discussion about the projects in different meeting-3; Strengthening WC/SSC-4; Training-5; Others-7

## 6. Effectiveness, capacity and competency

6.1) Was there any implemented LGSP-II projects in the last year having social negative impacts on your UP/Ward?

Yes-1          No-2     Don't Know-3

6.2)    If yes, list the projects' name and explain the negative impact.

| Projects | Negative impact |
|---|---|
|  |  |
|  |  |

6.3) Was there any implemented LGSP-II projects in the last year having environmental negative impacts on your community?

Yes-1          No-2     Don't Know-3

6.4)    If yes, list the projects' name and explain the negative impact.

| Projects | Negative impact |
|---|---|
|  |  |
|  |  |

6.5) Did your UP receive any performance-based grants (PBG) under the LGSP-II program?

Yes-1               No-2

6.6) If not mention the reasons.

a)
b)
c)

6.7) Is there a tax collection plan/target in your UP?

Yes-1               No-2

6.8) Are you aware tax collection target in the FY 2012- 13?

Yes-1               No-2

6.9) If yes, what was the FY- 2012- 13's tax collection target? (Amount)

6.10) Collected tax during FY 2012- 13 (Amount)

6.11) Are you aware tax collection target in the FY- 2012- 13?

Yes-1          No-2

6.12) If yes, what was the FY- 2013- 14's tax collection target? (Amount)

   Yes-1                No-2

6.13) Collected tax during FY 2013- 14 (Amount)

6.14) Are you aware tax collection target in the FY2014- 15?

   Yes-1                No-2

6.15) If yes, what was the FY- 2014- 15's tax collection target? (Amount)


6.16) Are you aware about the taxation obligations?

   Yes-1                No-2


6.17) If yes then what types of taxes are collected by your UP?

   a)

   b)

   c)

6.18) Does the UP initiate any projects from collected taxes?

   Yes-1                No-2

6.19) If yes then what are these schemes?

   Communication-1; Sanitation-2; Tubewell-3; Culvert/Bridge construction and repair-4; **Drain Construction-5;** Financial assistance-6; Others-7


6.20) How many female members are included in your Ward committees?


   Ward Committee:


   Scheme Supervision Committee


6.21) Are you satisfied with the formation process of WC?

   Yes-1                No-2

6.22) If not then mention the reason.

   a)

   b)

   c)

6.23) Do you think WC is functioning in your UP?

   Yes-1                No-2

6.24) How WC assisting to LGSP-II project implementation?

   Assist in initiating projects-1; Assist in implementing development projects-2; Justify the social and environmental impacts of the schemes-3; Assist in recruiting contractor-4; Provide certificate-5; Others-6


6.25) Do you think SSCs are functioning in your UP?

   Yes-1          No-2

6.26) How SSC assisting to LGSP-II project Supervision?

   Supervise in implementing projects-1; Supervise in financial matters-2; Provide certificate-3; Participate in different meetings-4; Others-5

6.27) Are you aware of standing committees in your UP?

   Yes-1          No-2

6.28) If yes, please list them – beginning with most effective and finishing with the least effective ones

| | Type of committees (most effective on top of the list, least effective in the bottom of the list) |
|---|---|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |

6.29) In your opinion, why are some committees less effective?

Irresponsibility-1; Meetings are not conducted regularly-2; Small number of participants-3; No place for conducting meeting-4; Lack of training-5; Member are not selected proper way-6; Non cooperation of Chairman-7; Others-8

6.30) Are you familiar with the Women's Development Forum, under LGSP-II?

Yes-1            No-2

6.31) If yes, what do you know about its role and responsibilities?

a)

b)

c)

6.32). Did you receive any training from other sources?

Yes -1            No -2

6.33) If yes, specify the type of training.

a)

b)

c)

6.34) Did you face any problems to implement LGSP-II?

Yes-1            No-2

6.35) If yes please mentioned what type problems?

a)

b)

c)

6.36) Do you have any recommendations to avoid these problems?

     a)

     b)

     c)


Questionnaire for LGSP committee members for 2nd survey

**LGSP-II Project**

*(First introduce the purpose of the survey, and then ask the respondent if s/he agrees to take part)*

**Type of Interviewee: Member of WC/ Member of SSC:**

Interview ID: _____

Name of the interviewer: _____Date of Interview_____

Location: Union _____Ward No_____ Upazila _____District_____

Name of the Respondent: _____Respondent's father/husband's name: _____

Respondents Contact number _____

Respondent is a member of (1. WC; 2. SSC) _____

**1. Personal Information:**

1.1) Respondent's Age: _____

1.2) Educational Qualification

    Up to Class 5-1; Up to Class 10-2; SSC (passed)-3; Up to HSC-4; HSC (passed)-5; Up to Bachelor-6; Bachelor or above-7; Other-8

1.3) Marital Status:

  Married -1; Unmarried-2; Widow / widower-3; Others -4

1.4) Occupation

    Farmer/household chores-1; Job (Private/NGO)-2; Business (large-contractor, supplier, wholesaler)-3; Business (Small-Grocery shopkeeper, stationary, Small Business)-4; Fish farmer-5; Doctor (homeopathy / Allopathic)-6; Advocat-7; Teacher-8; Imam/Religious Leader-9; Agricultural labor-10; Non agricultural labor-11; Unemployed-12, Housewife-13; Others-14 ------

1.5) Monthly income (taka) ----------

**2. Transparency**

2.1) What is the reason behind your membership in this committee?

    Elected Member in General seat-1; Elected Member in Reserve seat-2; Teacher-3; Representatives of Civil Society-4; Freedom Fighter-5; Representative of NGOs-6; General Citizens-7; Others-8

2.2) What is the formation process of the committee?

    Open meeting in ward-1; Through Ward shava-2; Nominated by UP Chair-3; Nominated by UP member-4; Don't know the formation process-5; Others-6

2.3) How the UP provide information about WC and SSC to the citizens?

Hanging he list of committee in open place-1; Through UP Chairman/member-2; Through UP notice board-3; Did not follow above mentioned process-4

2.4) Are there any development plan in your UP?

Yes-1    No-2    Do not know-3

2.4.1) If yes then list the development plan in your UP?

1 year /Annual Plan-1, 5 year Plan; Both type of Plan-3

2.5) Had there any planning session been held at your Ward last year

Yes-1    No-2    Do not know-3

2.5.1) If yes, how many citizens participated (approx.)? ---------------------

2.5.2) Who participated in the planning session?

UP member-1; UP Chairman-2; Local elite-3; Local citizens-4; The poor-5; Others-6 (Please specify)

2.6) Had your UP properly disseminated UP developmental plan to the citizens?

Yes-1    No-2    Do not know-3

2.6.1) If yes, how is the information about the UP development plan usually disseminated to the population?
*Please list (*Give number in order to most use)

Ward Shava-1; Notice board-2; Micking-3; Chowkidar-4; Others-5

2.6.2.) If not, please mention the reasons.

a)
b)
c)

2.7) In your opinion had there been any scheme implemented in your ward last year under LGSP II?

Yes -1    No-2    Do not know-3

2.7.1) If yes, what types of projects were implemented?

| Sl | Types of projects | Implemented in your community – (indicate) |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Communication** | 33. Construction/reconstruction of village roads |
| | | 34. Maintenance of existing village roads |
| | | 35. Construction of culvert, , construction of Bridge/ foot over bridge |
| | | 36. Construction of drainage system |
| | | 37. Passenger shed |
| 2 | **Health** | 38. Construction/renovation of health center |
| | | 39. Campaign on health related awareness, family planning, public health, cleanliness/hygiene |
| | | 40. Supply of medicine |
| | | 41. Logistics support for the health center |
| | | 42. Providing salary for the part time staff |
| 3 | **Water Supply** | 43. Installing tube-well |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | 44. Pipe water scheme |
| | | 45. Construction of water reserve (tank) |
| 4 | **Education** | 46. Construction, reconstruction & renovation of educational institution |
| | | 47. Logistics (furniture and fixture) supply for primary school |
| | | 48. Procurement of educational materials |
| | | 49. Taking up awareness program on education |
| 5 | **Natural Resources Management** | 50. Social forestry, |
| | | 51. Infrastructure development for protecting land erosion |
| | | 52. Provide natural resource management training |
| 6 | **Agriculture & Bazar** | 53. Construction of vaccination center for the livestock |
| | | 54.  Construction of toll point/shed in the market |
| | | 55. Development of irrigation system for the mass |
| | | 56. Provide technical training on advanced agriculture |
| 7 | **Sewerage & Garbage Management** | 57. Construction of sewerage system |
| | | 58. Campaign on raising awareness about sewerage system |
| | | 59. Installing bio-gas plant |
| 8 | **Human Resources Management** | 60. Development of women & self-employment education for women |
| | | 61. IGA training for the vulnerable |
| | | 62. Skill development training for the poor youth (male &female) |
| | | 63. IT training for the poor youth (male &female) |
| | | 64. Support for UP Information Service Centre |
| | | 65. Development of information technology |
| 9 | Others (Please specify) | |

2.8. Did the citizens participate in decision-making process for these projects?

   Yes-1    No-2    Do not know-3


2.8.1) If yes, how was the decision to select the scheme made?
  Through Ward Shava-1; UP member-2; UP reserved member-3; UP Chairman-4; Others-5



2.9) Are the citizens informed about the project implementation progress by the UP?
   Yes-1    No-2    Do not know-3

2.9.1) If yes, how is the information disseminated to the citizens?
 *Please list (from the most used to the least used)*
  Ward Shava-1; Notice board-2; UP member-3; UP member reserve seat; UP Chairman-5; Others-6

2.10) Are you aware of the UP information dissemination instructions of UPOM?
 Yes-1   No-2    Do not know-3


**2.10.1)** If the answer is yes, does your UP disseminate LGSP project related information according to the UPOM?
   Yes-1    No-2    Do not know-3

2.10.2) If the answer is yes what types of information is disseminated?
   Committee list-1; Project list-2; Project allocation-3; Others-4


2.11) Through which channels the information about the LGSP-II related development plan of your UP usually disseminated to the citizens?
   Ward Shava-1; Notice board-2; UP member-3; UP member reserve seat-4; Micking-5; Chowkidar-6; UISC-7; Others-8


2.12) How many schemes were taken in the FY 2013- 14 in your Ward?

2.13) How many scheme were completed out of those in your Ward?


2.14) Mention the reasons behind project incompletion?
   a)
   b)
   c)


2.15) Are you aware of LGSP-II procurement process as per UPOM ?
   Yes-1          No-2          Do not know-3

2.15.1) If yes, mention the procurement processes according to UPOM. *(*Give number in order to most use)
   Direct procurement procedure-1; Community procurement procedure-2; RFQ procedure-3; Open procurement procedure-4


2.16) Is there an annual budget in your Union Parishad?
   Yes-1          No-2          Do not know-3


2.16.1) If yes, then does your UP formulate the budget every year?
   Yes-1          No-2          Do not know-3

2.16.2) If no, what are the reasons?
   Lack of skilled manpower-1; Lack of required resources-2; No instruction from higher authority-3; Others (Please specify)-4

2.17) Are you aware about budgeting process?
   Yes-1          No-2          Do not know-3

2.17.1) If no, what are the reasons (DËi bv n‡j KviY ¸‡jv D‡iøL Kiæb)?
   a)
   b)
   c)


2.17.2) If yes , who participated in preparing the budget (Multiple Choice)
   UP members-1; UP Chairman-2; Local elite-3; Local citizens-4; The poor-5


2.18) Did you receive any training from LGSP II?
   Yes -1 No-2

2.18.1) If yes, who provided the training?
   URT -1; NGO Officials-2; Others (Please specify)-3


2.18.2) How the received training had been helpful in your activities?
   (Quality of work has increased-1; Quality of financial management/accountancy has increased-2; Tax collection has increased-3; More transparency, efficiency and accountability-4; Education and health consciousness has increased-5; Women development/Empowerment of women has increased-6; Other-7)

2.19) What types of training are essential to proper implementation of LGSP II?
(Financial management-1; Project planning, initiation and implementation-2; Taxation-3, Report writing-4, Office management-5; Vocational training-6; Activities of UP Member-7; Budgeting-8; Procurement-9; Others-10)

2.20) Had the open budget session been held in last year?
  Yes-1            No-2              Do not know-3

2.20.1) Did you participate in that meeting?
   Yes-1                  No-2

2.20.2) Who had been the participants in that open budget session?
       UP members-1; UP Chairman-2; Local elite-3; Local citizens-4; The poor-5; All of above-6


2.21) When the budget formulation meetings was held at your UP last time through the following meeting?

       Ward Meetings: when? ___/___ (Month/Year)                          Open      budget
meeting: when? ___/___ (Month/Year)


2.22) How do the citizens in your locality get to know about the ward shava?
       Notice board-1; UP member-2; UP member reserve seat-3; Micking-4; Chowkidar-5; UISC-6; Others-7

2.23) How do the citizens in your locality get to know about the open budget?
       Notice board-1; UP member-2; UP member reserve seat-3; Micking-4; Chowkidar-5; UISC-6; Others-7

2.24) Did your UP take any initiative to ensure citizens' participation in open budget meeting?
  Yes -1   No-2   Don't Know-3


2.24.1) If '*yes*', then what was the reason behind ensuring the participation of the citizens?
       To submit the proposals for the development of the area-1; To inform the citizens about the budget-2; To receive the comments of the citizens on budget formulation-3; Others-4    _____

2.24.2) If '*not*', what are the reasons?
       a)
       b)
       c)


2.25) Did the citizens participate in Ward Shava & Open Budget Meetings?

  Ward Shava:     Yes-1 No-2 Don't know-3

  Open Budget Meeting: Yes-1 No-2 Don't know-3

2.25.1) If '*yes*' what types of claims raised by the participants?
   Ward Shava
       a)
       b)
       c)

Open Budget Meeting
       a)
       b)
       c)


2.26) Which claims had been accepted?

Ward Shava
     a)
     b)
     c)
     d)
Open Budget Meeting
     a)
     b)
     c)
     d)

2.27) Did the poor participate in the Ward Shava/open budget session you attended/participated?

  Yes-1 No-2 Don't know-3

If not, what are the reasons?

Ward Shava
     a)
     b)
     c)

Open Budget Meeting
     a)
     b)
     c)

2.28. Does your UP disseminate the budget related information for the citizens?
  Yes-1 No-2 Don't know-3

2. 28.1 If yes, then what, when and how (using which channels)?

| *What information?* | *When disseminated?* | *How?* |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

2.29) Is there any scope for the participants to give comment/opinion during open budget session?
  Yes-1    No-2    Don't know-3

2.29.1) If the answer is '*yes*', then how?
  Claiming-1; Giving suggestions-2; Identifying loopholes-3; Others-4

2.29.2) If 'not', please mention the reasons.
     a)
     b)
     c)

**3. Accountability**

3.1) Do you know the procurement process under LGSP-II?

    Yes-1              No-2

3.1.1) Specify the procurement processes followed.

    Direct procurement procedure-1; Community procurement procedure-2; RFQ procedure-3; Open procurement procedure-4

3.1.2) If the answer is no then please mention the reason.

    a)
    b)
    c)

3.2) Are you aware about issuing/receiving testimonial/certificate in your ward after the implementation of the schemes for paying the bill to the contractor?

            Yes-1          No-2          Do not know-3

3.2.1) If yes then who has provided the certificate after completion of schemes implementation?

    a)
    b)
    c)

3.3) Are you aware of a grievance process under LGSP-II?

    Yes-1              No-2

3.3.1) If yes, any grievances were raised under LGSP-II in your Ward?

    Yes-1         No-2

3.3.2) If yes, specify the types of grievances.

  a)
  b)
  c)

3.3.3) Were the grievances resolve?

  Yes-1        No-2

3.3.4) If yes, which process/mechanism was followed to resolve the grievances?

    a)
    b)
    c)

3.5) In your opinion had there been any hearing held during last year?

    Yes-1         No-2         Do not know-3

3.5.1) If yes then what had been the issues of those for hearing?

    a)
    b)
    c)

**4. Participation and inclusion**

4.1) Did you ever participate in LGSL-II project planning at ward level?

  Yes-1          No-2


4.2) Did you ever participate in LGSL-II project implementation at ward level?

  Yes-1          No-2

4.3) If the answer of above mentioned question is yes, had your opinions been considered with due emphasis in LGSL-II project implementation?

  Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3


4.4) Do you think LGSP-II project implementation was carried out based on community participation?

  Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3

4.5) Do you think the activities of LGSP II in UP are conducive for citizens' participation?

  Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3

4.5.1) If yes, how?

        a)
        b)
        c)
        d)

4.5.2) If not, mention the reasons.

        a)
        b)
        c)
        d)

4.6. Which factors influence citizens' non-participation in LGSP-II scheme?

        a)
        b)
        c)


4.7) Had there been any female UP representative led scheme implemented in your ward last year?

        Yes-1              No-2    Don't Know-3

4.7.1) If yes, please mention the projects name.

        a)
        b)
        c)


4.7.2) If not please mention the reasons.

        a)
        b)
        c)


4.8) In your opinion is there advantage of citizen engagement to implement of LGSP-II project?

  Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3


4.8.1. If yes, please mentioned what are the advantages?

        a)
        b)
        c)
        d)

4.9) In your opinion is there disadvantage of citizen engagement to implement of LGSP-II project?

  Yes-1          No-2           Do not know-3

4.9.1. If yes, please mentioned what are the disadvantages?
      a)
      b)
      c)
      d)

4.10) What is your advice for ensuring citizens' participation in LGSP-II projects?
      a)
      b)
      c)
      d)

## 5. Effectiveness, capacity and competency

5.1) Had there been any scheme implemented last year under LGSP-II that had negative social impact in your ward?

Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3

5.1.1) If yes, list the projects' name and explain the negative impact.

| Projects | Negative impact |
|---|---|
|  |  |
|  |  |

5.2) Had there been any scheme implemented last year under LGSP-II that had negative social impact in your ward?

  Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3

5.2.1) If yes, list the projects' name and explain the negative impact.

| Projects | Negative impact |
|---|---|
|  |  |
|  |  |

5.3) Did your UP receive any performance-based grants (PBG) under the LGSP-II program?

  Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3

5.3.1) If not mention the reasons.
      a)
      b)
      c)
      d)

5.4) Are you aware about the taxation obligations?

  Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3

5.4.1) If yes then what types of taxes are collected by your UP?
      a)
      b)
      c)

5.5) Does the UP initiate any schemes from collected taxes?

  Yes-1          No-2    Don't Know-3

5.5.1) If yes then what are these schemes?
      a)
      b)
      c)
      d)

5.6) How many member in your committee?
  Ward Committee:

  Scheme Supervision Committee:

5.7) How many female members are there?
  Ward Committee:

  Scheme Supervision Committee:

5.8) Are you satisfied with WC formation process?
      Yes-1         No-2    Don't Know-3

5.8.1) If not then mention the reason.
      a)
      b)
      c)
      d)

5.9) Do you think WC is functioning in your UP?
  Yes-1       No-2

5.10) How does WC assist UP in LGSP-II project implementation?
      a)
      b)
      c)
      d)

5.11) Do you think the respective SSC is functioning in your ward?
  Yes-1         No-2

5.12) How does SSC assist UP in LGSP-II project implementation?
      a)
      b)
      c)
      d)

5.13) Are you aware of the existing standing committees in your UP?
  Yes-1      No-2

5.13.1. If yes, please list them – beginning with most effective and finishing with the least effective ones

|    | Type of committees (most effective on top of the list, least effective in the bottom of the list) |
|----|----|
| 1  |    |
| 2  |    |
| 3  |    |
| 4  |    |
| 5  |    |
| 6  |    |
| 7  |    |
| 8  |    |
| 9  |    |
| 10 |    |
| 11 |    |
| 12 |    |
| 13 |    |

5.14) In your opinion, why are some committees less effective?

      a)

      b)

      c)

      d)

5.15) Did you face any problems to implement LGSP-II?

   Yes 1          No-2

5.15.1) If yes please mentioned what type problems?

      a)

      b)

      c)

5.15.2) Do you have any recommendations to avoid these problems?

      a)

      b)

      c)

## 7.9 Sub-Project Work Plan

| Sl | Name of Activities | Year-1 | | | | Year-2 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Q-1 | Q-2 | Q-3 | Q-4 | Q-1 | Q-2 | Q-3 | Q-4 |
| 1 | Staff recruitment | 6 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Office set up | 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Volunteer selection (non-budgetary) and orientation (budgetary) | 30 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Orientation to Volunteer (budgetary) | 30 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Citizen Group formation (non-budgetary) | 30 | | | | | | | |
| | Quarterly CG follow up Meeting | 4 | | | | | 2 | | 2 |
| 6 | Field base quarterly meeting with volunteer | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | Project inception workshop in district level with DC, UNO, DDLG, UP representatives and CG | | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| 8 | Base line survey | | | 1 | | | | | |
| 9 | 2nd survey | | | | | | | 1 | |
| 10 | Develop and display of community action plan | | 15 | 15 | | | | | |
| 11 | RTI application and verification by members | | | Need based | Need based | Need based | Need based | Need based | Need based |
| 12 | Seasonal calendar. | | 15 | 15 | | | | | |
| 13 | Social mapping. | | | 15 | 15 | | | | |
| 14 | Publication (poster, seasonal calendar, action plan, paper clipping as per need). | | | Need based | Need based | Need based | Need based | Need based | Need based |
| 15 | Community checklist | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | 90 CG monitoring visit of BBG implementation of LGSP (non-budgetary). | | | 30 | | | 30 | | 30 |
| 18 | Community people and CG 12 times follow up in each union on monthly meeting and documentation (non-budgetary) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 19 | 60 social audits conduct 9 (using Community monitoring, Quick Impression Survey (QIS), FGD, RTI) at UP level on LGSP-II performance (2 times). | | | 15 | 15 | 15 | | 15 | |
| 20 | Public hearing based on Social Audit at UP level | | | | 7 | 8 | | 7 | 8 |
| 21 | Sharing meeting with CG, Up representative & Govt. official based on social audit at Upzila level. | | | | | 2 | | | 2 |
| 22 | First joint meeting with CGs and SSCs held | | | 30UPs | | | | | |
| | Sharing meeting with WC, SSC & CG | 2 | | | | | | 2 | |
| 23 | CG and community people participate in open budget process(non-budgetary) | | | 30 UPs | | | | | |
| 24 | CG and community follow up information board regarding LGSP-II in UP level (non-budgetary) | | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs |
| 25 | UP Notice Board monitoring by CG (non-budgetary) | | 30 Ups | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs | 30 UPs |
| 26 | Training on social audit process. RTI, Budget cycle. LGSP, UP operational manual and prioritization of community concerns for CG members and volunteers (two days long) | 4 batches | 17 batches | 9 batches | | | | | |
| 27 | ToT for project staff | | 1 batch | | | | | | |
| 28 | 1 Exposure visit in country (Satkhira) and 4 inter field of DW for staff and CGs | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | |

| Sl | Name of Activities | Year-1 | | | | Year-2 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Q-1 | Q-2 | Q-3 | Q-4 | Q-1 | Q-2 | Q-3 | Q-4 |
| 29 | Refresher training on social audit. RTI, Budget cycle. LGSP, UP operational manual and prioritization of community concerns for CG members and volunteers (one day long) | | | | | 30 batches | | | |
| 30 | Orientation on 1st survey checklist | | | 1 batch | | | | | |
| 31 | Monitoring field visit by the project staff | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | Coordination meeting with project staff inter organization and MJF | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 33 | Six monthly coordination meeting with DC, UNO, DDLG, UP representatives, CG members | | | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | |
| 34 | Coordination meeting with CG, project staff (non budgetary) | | | | | | | | |

**7.10 Training on Community Score Card for Citizen Group (2 days long)**

*Training Schedule*

| Day | Main Issues | Time | Sub issues |
|---|---|---|---|
| Day -1 | Creating enable environment for learning | 9:30-10:30 | • Welcome speech<br>• Introducing & Inauguration<br>• Expectation assessment<br>• Objective of the Training<br>• Principle of the Training |
| | Tea Break | 10:30-11:00 | |
| | Concept on CARTA | 11:00-12:00 | • Goal & Objective of CARTA<br>• Strategy of CARTA<br>• Activities & Results of CARTA<br>• Duration & Beneficiaries of CARTA |
| | Concept on LGSP-II | 12:00-01:00 | • Basic Block Grants (BBG)<br>• Performance Block Grants (PBG)<br>• Committees of LGSP-II Grants Implementation<br>• LGSP-II Grants Implementation Process |
| | Lunch Break | 01:00-02:00 | |
| | Concept on Transparency & Accountability | 02:00-03:20 | • Definitions of Transparency & Accountability<br>• Way to ensure Transparency & Accountability<br>• Necessity of Transparency & Accountability for local development |
| | Tea Break | 03:20-03:50 | |
| | Strategy of Communication & Dialogue | 03:50-04:40 | • Concept on Communication<br>• Concept on media of Communication<br>• What is Dialogue?<br>• Mode of Dialogue<br>• Necessity of Dialogue |
| | Recap of whole day discussion | 04:40-05:00 | |
| Day 2 | Recap of 1st day | 09:00-09:30 | |
| | Introducing Community Score Card (CSC) | 09:30-11:00 | • What is Community Score Card?<br>• Steps of Community Score Card Process<br>• Community Score Card Implementation<br>• Demonstration & discussion of Community Score Card |
| | Tea Break | 11:00-11:30 | |
| | Introducing Community Score Card (CSC) | 11:30-01:00 | • Risk analysis of Community Score Card Monitoring process<br>• Sharing with service provider agencies on collected information from CSC & service |

| | | | providers<br>• Interface meeting |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lunch Break | 01:00-02:00 | | |
| Public Hearing | 02:00-03:00 | | • Concept on Public Hearing<br>• Objective of Public Hearing<br>• Necessity of Public Hearing |
| Action Plan of Monitoring | 03:00-04:15 | | • What is Monitoring<br>• What's & how monitor the LGSP-II<br>• Necessity of Monitoring Plan<br>• Prepare Action plan of Monitoring |
| Tea Break | 04:15-04:30 | | |
| Evaluation & Closing | 04:30-05:00 | | • Discussion on Trainees expectation<br>• Evaluation of the training Course<br>• Closing Speech |

*Refreshers (day long) Training on Social Audit process*

| Main issues | Sub issues | Time | Facilitator |
|---|---|---|---|
| Registration | | 9.30:- 10.00 am | |
| Concept on CARTA | • Goal & Objective of CARTA<br>• Strategy of CARTA<br>• Activities & Results of CARTA<br>• Duration & Beneficiaries of CARTA | 10:00- 11:00 | |
| Tea Break 11:00-11:20 | | | |
| Concept on LGSP-II | • Basic Block Grants (BBG)<br>• Performance Block Grants (PBG)<br>• Committees of LGSP-II Grants Implementation<br>• LGSP-II Grants Implementation Process | 11:20- 12: 00 | • |
| Social Audit process | • What is social Audit<br>• Strategies of Social Audit<br>• Steps of Social Audit | 12:00-1:30 | |
| Lunch break 1:30-2:20 | | | |
| Social Audit process | • Input tracking<br>FGD<br>• FGD with Community<br>• FGD with WC & SSC<br>• FGD with UP bodies<br>Sharing meeting with UP<br>Public hearing | 2:20-4:30 | |
| Tea & Closing 4:30-5:00 | | | |

**7.11  Case study from Kachua Union Parisad, Jessore**

Jahangir Hossain, Lives in 02 No. Ward, Post- Norendropur Thana- Kotoali, District- Jossore. He always concerning about Citizens right, his childhood experience in this manner is not good, in his word- `I always experienced with the corruptive mind setup of UP Bodies, I saw many cases where they took illegal advantage from the poor. I always dreamed to change that scenario; in my childhood, my main wish is in future I will try my best to involve with UP functioning for taking side of the poor. Democracywatch first gives me the opportunity. It is CARTA program, Democracywatch Program officer introduced me with that new project, he showed me the way on how I could learn about UP functioning and even help Ups development work as an active citizen, this is the time, my dream has a way to be true.'

Democracywatch built a three-member ward level committee, in Union level the total member was 27. They organized several training, which plays vital role for communal awareness building towards LGSP-II project implementation. He said-`From Democracywatch, we learn a lot about LGSP-II project implementation process, prior to this nobody said us that our voice is so much important in development work. We are empowered by the help of Democracywatch, they inform us about our roles and responsibilities and guide us to monitor UP activities as regular manner- now we checked UP notice board at regular manner, we always tries to held consultation meeting with Ups to influence them to conduct ward shava regularly, motivate peoples to express their needs in ward shava, Importance of tax payment. We always involve with this type of work and also assist WC and SSCs on project implementation activities. We learn that every development works quality ensuring is a responsibility as a good citizen.'

Stating this he shared one of his recent experiences on CGs involvement with LGSP-II schemes. He said- `I want to share one of my personal experience. In our ward, we citizen group members closely monitor the construction work of a road in this year, according to the plan it should be built from Tobir masters house to Shofiurs house, it is a brick road, the total budget is 160000/-. Firstly we noticed that the contractor bought very low quality material for this, they brought 3rd class brick, and very low-level sand quality. We talked with SSC members, and also the chairman of our UP. Our consultation worked, the contractor changed the material quality. Democracywatch and the CARTA program opened our eyes, now we are actively participating in any type of development works, which are implemented, in our community.

**7.12  Case study: Sewing matching distribution and training**

Altogether there are 27 Citizen Group members in no. 14 Norendrapur Union Parishad, after joining the training from CARTA project, a meeting was initiated by 9 female CG members with the UP Chairman and 3 female Councilors. The CG members



shared, from the training they came to know, that a project on human resource development could be initiated through an LGSP-II allocation. They also stated that they would be present



their proposal in the Ward Shava and insist on at least one sewing-machine-based project in each ward. At the end of the meeting the

Chairman thanked them for such a good plan and added, as per regulation of LGSP-II, the demand should be placed during the Ward Shava. After that meeting, the female CG members shared and discussed these with rest of the CG members. They all agreed to participate in every Ward Shava and initiate a sewing-based project especially for women. Based on this, Md. Abdus Salam Bishwas the Chairman of no. 14 UP arranged a month-long sewing training and distributed 10 sewing machines among 10 ultra poor women of 9 wards at the public hearing session at Noredrapur UP under LGSP-II allocation for 2012-13.

## 7.13   Case study: Churamonkathi Union Parishad, Jessore Sadar

Eliyas Hossain is a member of no. 5 ward of no. 7 Churamonkathi Union Parishad. He participated in training on LGSP-II project arranged by Democracywatch.

As a Citizen Group (CG) member Eliyas has been proactively updating the UP notice board, sorting the



1 No Ward

information by the LGSP-II scheme name, allocation and list of ward committee and scheme supervision committee. Mr. Hossain also has been capturing the images of flat finishing, tube-well construction, school-bench construction, and several other development initiatives; he has shared them with leaders, and other respective ward members. He also conducted a meeting on yearly allocation of LGSP-II, and he requested others to attended Ward Shava and open budget sessions. Sometimes he arranges meeting to make people aware to ensure proper completion of all the tasks in his own ward. Needless to say,



8 No Ward flat soling

everyone is satisfied and better informed because of the activities accomplished by Elias. His work has influenced others. Women in another ward were inspired by these initiatives, and are now quite keen to be involved and help him in the future.

### 7.14 Third Party Monitoring Report (Social Audit 1$^{st}$ & 2$^{nd}$ Cycle)

**Third Party Monitoring Report (1$^{st}$ cycle)**

Introduction

Generally TPM is used for showing reality on the basis of 1st survey data, establishing indicators to measure efficiency, effectiveness and impact of project, logical analysis of information regarding the indicators, comprehensive assessment of on-site prescribed safety nets used in the project, helping the stakeholders in identifying problems, their causes and possible solution, performing quality check to measure the performance of project activities separately, providing useful benchmarking perspectives for executing the project successfully and providing regular, periodic and reliable feedback of project performance.

The basic objective of DW-CARTA third party monitoring is to determine field level implementation problems and issues and recommend realistic solutions. Also efforts to be made to ensure participation by all concerned stakeholders during assessment of CARTA project.

Objective:

Third party monitoring of the project (CARTA) is to promote local governance's responsiveness through ensuring accountability and transparency of UPs for better performance in particularly LGSP-II involved by community people specially to mobilize and capacitate UP representatives and civil society to engage community into open budgeting process as per LGSP-II procedures and UP OM, through the use of input tracking, FGD and public hearing as well as to enhance capacities of civil society and communities to monitor transparency, efficiency, participation, inclusion and accountability at the local level. In brief, to increase knowledge and accountability as well as transparency of local government through greater involvement of citizen groups (CG). Based on 1st survey community groups (CG) being aware about local government activities, social audit process as well as participation of citizen group in the activities of UPs and the services deliver by the UPs or local government.

Scope of Work:

This project aims to promote local government responsiveness, community needs and performance in the implementation of LGSP-II. To achieve the objectives the project formed citizen groups who facilitated and mobilized community people to engage in open budget process as per LGSP-II procedures and UPOM through the use of social audit tools. It also worked for strengthening capacity of the community people to monitor budget transparency, efficiency, participation, inclusion and accountability at the local level. This project strengthened the demand side of public budgeting through: enhancing UP accountability *vis-a-vis* the citizens, improving local public financial management system, institutionalizing community participatory planning, budgeting and monitoring and to develop citizen feedback mechanism to assess budgetary process. The project implemented highly in rate but it has some deviation also for the reason of political instability and local constraint.

Methodology/Process:

Different methods have been used in different segments as the part of monitoring. Data sources, data collection method, data collection tools are used during 1st survey and sample survey, UP, CG, events, documentations, progress and event reports, UPs community platform, coordination meetings etc. UP-CG joint events were also used as data sources. We used case study, FGD, interview and observations as data collection method in all stages where and as required. On the other hand questionnaires, checklist, attendance register, module, schedule, reports, meeting minutes and physical observation were the data collection tools overall.

We have shared collected data with the UP representatives, conducted Focus Group Discussions (FGD) on basic block grant (BBG). Also conducted oversight on word committee and scheme supervision committee member process and specific procedure of BBG as well as monitoring plan as per UPOM requirements. BBG procedures were reviewed in detail to determine the effectiveness of the expenditure. Discussion with representatives of local government, community people through the mechanism bellow-

- Input tracking/data collection
- Dialogue session with Union Parishad (UPs)
- Focus Group Discussion (FGD)
- Public hearing
- Sharing with Union Parishhad (UPs) representatives
- Social mapping

Approach:

Project was designed to implement in a participatory approach (top-down and bottom up, as well as contingency approach) with national and local level stakeholders. Community people, citizen group members, volunteers from 30 UPs as primary stakeholders as well beneficiaries and secondary as UP representatives, UP office secretary and representative of civil society, related official of LGSP, Members of standing committee as well. As participatory approach representation of voices of women, men, youth and older citizens as well as poor are the target group of the project.

Context/ situation analysis

In Bangladesh local governments are reluctant to disseminate information to locals or community people. Some UP representatives are not keen to disclose their block grants allocation. Also they try to hide project allocations. But now as per Union parishad operational manual (UPOM) union parishad following and arranged open budget process and allocation of each word to knowing their valuable opinion of citizen groups (CG). Citizen groups are made aware about their involvement in union parishad (UPs). Now they want to know their allocations of individual ward. Citizen groups (CG) want to do participate in every effective work.

After implementing the project for increasing accountability and transparency of Union parishad of (UPs) through greater participation of citizen groups (CG) for betterment improvement in project areas.

All committee member like citizen groups (CG), word committee (WC) and scheme supervision committee (SSC) member as well as representatives of Union Parishad was involved in Focus Group Discussion (FGD). They discussed about basic block grant (BBG) process, open budget process, allocation of their ward based on BBG, few people want to know- how people know about the open budget? Is there any allocation for the deprived community? Whether UP follows the UPOM during fulfilling the quorum of Ward Shava? What type of schemes gets priority by the UPs? How representatives of SSC supervise the scheme under LGSP-II?

Executive Summary:

Citizens Making Governance Effective project under CARTA program is implemented by Democracywatch funded by MJF since 15 September, 2012 at 30 unions of Nilphamari and Jessore districts of Bangladesh. Total 810 Citizen Group members and 30 volunteers are directly engaged in project implementation. Deputy Commissioner, DDLG, UNO of two districts and 30 UP representatives are also involved with this project. Besides total 6,00,000community people of 30 UPs are benefitted through the project. This report was prepared in accordance with project specific objectives and provides a detailed analysis like data collection from UPs, FGD,

social mapping, public hearing, sharing meeting with UPs representatives from the project area, and the 1st survey from which to measure the impact on union parishad services and based on data collection from the UPs.

**Key Findings:**
Bearing these knowledge Citizens Making Governance Effective (CIMAGE) project under CARTA program is implemented by Democracywatch funded by The Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF), World Bank (WB) and the Japanese Social Development Fund (JSDF) are jointly implementing a program since 15 September, 2012. PTF is working with Manusher Jonno Foundation (MJF) in Bangladesh to implement the program respectively 30 unions of Nilphamari and Jessore district of Bangladesh Local government for ensuring effective local governance with the interaction between local authority and its citizen.

- Many WC and SSC members do not know that they are in the committee.
- Representatives of SSC do not know their duties and responsibilities
- Most of UPs did not take any initiatives for awareness for WC,CG and SSC member
- Committee built without knowing concern/consent of respective member
- Representatives of Citizen Groups knew about LGSP-II through the CARTA and UP activities
- CG and SSC members do not know about open budget process, and few CG, SSC members were present in open budget process but they did not know about this
- Some WC and SSC are in paper only, just for follow the UP operational manual. Members do not have any role in the committee.
- CG, SSC do not know about procurement committee and system as well as how much people need to consist to be procurement committee, as well as their role as a committee member.

**Social Audit/Committee:**
A daylong Orientation sessions on Social Audit Process as a Social Accountability tools organized for Project staffs and Volunteers of Nilphamari Field dated on 5th August 2013. Field Coordinator, Program Officer and 12 volunteers of our project are participated the orientation session. Md. Shahin Kauser, Deputy Manager, Manusher Jonno Foundation and Md. Murad Pervez, M&E Officer, CARTA Program of DW facilitated the orientation session. Through the orientation session Project staff and volunteers developed capacity to conduct Social Audit Process as well as to facilitate orientation for Citizen Group.

**Orientation on Social Audit Process for Citizen Group (CG) and Volunteers as a Social Accountability tools:** A daylong Orientation sessions on Social Audit Process as a Social Accountability tools has organized for Citizen Group (CG) and Volunteers. Through the 30 orientation sessions about 734 CG and 30 volunteers developed capacity on Social Audit Process as monitoring tools to conduct Social Audit to explore present implementation status block grants of LGSP-II and identify gaps as well as ensure accountability and transparency as well participation of Community people of BBG of LGSP-II of UP.

**Information Collection / Input tracking as a part of Social Audit:** CG (Citizen Groups) of each UPs have been formed a Monitoring Committee with 9 to 13 members to collect information regarding BBG of LGSP-II. Monitoring Committees have been collected information paper on selected schemes regarding BBG of LGSP-II of 9 wards of Union from Union Parishad to conduct FGD to identify Present implementation status of BBG of LGSP-II.

**Focus Group Discussion (FGD)**

**FGD with WC, SSC and Community Peoples of UP as a Part of Social Audit:** Through the DW-CARTA project CG members are organized 30 FGDs as a part of Social Audit process of 30 UPs to explore experience, understanding and Opinion of WC, SSC and Community people on Present implementation status of BBG of LGSP-II.

**Sharing with UP about finding of FGD as a part of Social Audit process:** After Collection Information and conduct FGD with WC, SSC and Community people on present implementation status of BBG of LGSP-II, monitoring team shared with UPs about finding of FGD to cope with these problems and take preparation to organize Public hearing to ensure transparency, accountability of UPs as well as ensure community participation in BBG of LGSP-II.

**Public hearing list/Stakeholders:**

**Public hearing at UP level in Nilphamari & Jessore as a part of Social Audit:** After Collection Information and conduct FGD on present implementation status of BBG of LGSP-II as well as shared with UP about findings from FGD, CG have been organized 25 Public hearing as a part of Social Audit in this reporting period. In the public hearing, UP representatives, standing committees, project selection committees, project supervision committees' members, civil society representatives and larger community have been presented and raised questions about problems as well as provided their suggestions for ensuring the use of block grants for development projects at the community level. Accordingly, respective authorities have been commitment to take necessary measures to address the gaps and to improve the quality of services.

**Findings of Public hearing:**
 * Participants known about all information about LGSP-II and all committee of UPs as well as roles and responsibilities.
 * Citizen groups (CG) are aware about LGSP-II and activities of union parishad as well as there have WC, SSC and procurement committee for organize and implementation.
 * Union parishad representatives realized it's a procedure to increase accountability and transparency.
 * As it is a new method for citizen groups to raise participation of citizen groups (CG) and accountability and transparency of UPs respectively.
 * Citizen Groups wanted to know about LGSP-II in this public hearing process as well as allocation of each word from UP.
 * Especially women participants wanted is there any project or IGA training for them?
 * Participants highly appreciated as they knew about LGSP-II through CARTA activities.
 * All respective committee member were known their roles and responsibilities through CARTA

**Suggestions (from citizen groups) of public hearing:**
 * It seems better to display all the information regarding LGSP-II in notice board of UPs, If it happened they can know all about the matter.
 * Notice board should be up to date by the UP authority.
 * According to the list of the project it should be displayed in the UPs board.
 * Need to arrange Word Shova as per government rules
 * According to UPOM need to arrange Word Shova two times in every year
 * To take any project as per demand of community people

- To display all committee member list on UP.
- To inform duties and responsibilities of respective committee member

**Social Mapping:** Community people, CG and volunteers of 29 UPs developed 29 Social Mapping to reveal the overall situation of union as well as identify the performance of UPs regarding LGSP-ll. As a first step, they collected a dummy of UPs map then they have been drawing UPs physical Map. After drawing the UP's Map they have been identified physical infrastructure, Institution, natural resources and other similar Information of 9 wards of each UP. They identify what kinds of schemes have been implementing each ward under BBG of LGSP-II. Then they analyzed how these schemes are influencing to develop the UP and what kinds of schemes should to take for next fiscal year to develop the community by the use of BBG of LGSP-II.

Overall Findings on Social Mapping:
- Most of the community people didn't know what about LGSP-II?
- Most of the community people didn't know the running scheme of LGSP-II.
- Most of the community people were not introduce with Scheme supervision committee and Ward committee under scheme of LGSP-II.
- Those schemes are implemented in community, the participants appreciate for that and they recommended some of scheme upcoming year/fiscal year.
- There was no involvement of community people in scheme selection process.
- Community people were not informed on scheme of LGSP through UPs.

**Major findings from Social Audit:**
Democracywatch have been conducted 26 Social Audit in two upzila under Nilphamari and Jessore district and rest of social Audit could not accomplish due to political unrest**.**

**Functioning of LGSP related committee:**
94% WC and SSC committee list (262 Wards out of 270 Ward - 30 UP)
100% WC and SSC formed at the beginning.
All UP ensured women participation in WC and SSC
100% WC and SSC formed according to UPOM
70 community people were no informed and aware formation process regarding WC and SSC member

**Planning & Budgeting**
100 %(30 UP) UP have five years plan
100 %(30 UP) UP have annual plan

**Information Dissemination**
10% UPs displayed five years plan on notice board but 90% UPs did not displayed that.
47% UP (14 UPS) displayed annual plan on notice board but 90% UPs did not displayed that
100% UP have conducted Ward Shova.
57% UPS (17 UPs) has been conducted open budget session.

**Tax Collection**
27% UPs (8 UPs) have been organized tax collection fair but 73% could not arranged.

**Project taken for women development**

1 UP (out of 30) arranged and implemented tailoring training for 10 (One month Duration) women & provide sewing machine.

Name of Upazila: Jessore Sadar

| Name of Union | Ward Committee | | | Scheme Supervision Committee | | | | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Tech. Person | Total | |
| 01 No Hoibotpur | 40 | 16 | 56 | 40 | 16 | 1(UAE) | 56 | 8th Project×7 |
| 02 No Lebotala | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 03 No Ichaly | 30 | 12 | 42 | 30 | 12 | 1(UAE) | 42 | 6th Project×7 |
| 04 No Nowapara | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 05 No Upshahar | 40 | 16 | 56 | 40 | 16 | 1(UAE) | 56 | 8th Project×7 |
| 06 No Kashimpur | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 07 No Churamonkati | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 08 No Deara Model | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 09 No Arabpur | 30 | 12 | 42 | 30 | 12 | 1(UAE) | 42 | 6th Project×7 |
| 10 No Chanchra | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 11 No Ramnagar | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 12 No Fatepur | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 13 No Kachua | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 14 No Norendropur | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| 15 No Basundiah | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 1(UAE) | 63 | 9th Project×7 |
| **Total:** | **635** | **254** | **889** | **635** | **254** | **15** | **889** | |

*Name of Upazila: Nilphamari Sadar*

| Name of Union | Ward Committee | | | Scheme Supervision Committee | | | | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Tech. Person | Technical person (Sub Asst. Engr.) is appointed by UNO |
| Chowra Barogacha | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Gorgram | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Khokshabari | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Polashbari | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Tupamari | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Ramnagor | 44 | 19 | 63 | 36 | 27 | 63 | 1 | |
| Kachulata | 44 | 19 | 63 | 36 | 27 | 63 | 1 | |
| Panchopukur | 44 | 19 | 63 | 36 | 27 | 63 | 1 | |
| Itakhola | 36 | 27 | 63 | 36 | 27 | 63 | 1 | |
| Kundapukur | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Sonaroy | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Songolshi | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Charaikhola | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ChapraSaromjani | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| Laxmichap | 45 | 18 | 63 | 45 | 18 | 63 | 1 | |
| **Total** | **663** | **282** | **945** | **639** | **306** | **945** | **15** | |

| Name of District | Ward Committee | | | Scheme Supervision Committee | | | | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Tech. Person | Technical person (Sub Asst. Engr.) is appointed by UNO |
| Jessore | 635 | 254 | 889 | 635 | 254 | 889 | 15 | |
| Nilphamari | 663 | 282 | 945 | 639 | 306 | 945 | 15 | |
| **Total** | **1298** | **536** | **1834** | **1264** | **560** | **1824** | **30** | |

Major Findings:

- About 70% UPs out of 30 UPs have been organized Ward Shaba according to conserving papers and other document (not every Ward) but they have not organized Ward Shaba according to UPOM. Community people claimed that there were no Ward Shaba has been arranged in their Wards. Moreover, UPs are not capable to organize Ward Shaba according to UPOM.
- Books and other evidence (documents) shows that most of the UPs are arranged five years and periodic plans but they have not organized it as per UP act 2009. Besides, participations of community people were not considerable in the mentioned planning process. Furthermore, most of UPs haven't disseminated planning activities to community people through the notice board.
- About 12 UPs of Jessore and Nilphamari have been organized Open Budget out of 30 UPs.
- Most of the community people of UPs didn't know about the Block Grants of LGSP-II. So they never been participated in this program of development.
- Most of the WC and SSC of UPs didn't know that they are the Committee Members but ever and rapidly they are giving signature as per need of Ward Members.
- Most of the WC and SSC didn't know about their role and responsibilities to implements Block Grants of LGSP-II.
- Few people of WC and SSC member of UP got their position for nepotism.
- Papers and other documents illustrated that most of the UPs have been procured all equipment as per UPOM but real scenario is totally different. WC and SSC said that they are not involved in the process of procurement and they didn't know the system of procurement.
- About 8 UPs of Jessore out of 15 are collecting Tax according to the model Tax schedule 2012 where SDLG (Strengthening Democratic Local Governance) project is implementing. Rest of the UPs of Jessore and Nilphamari are not collecting Tax.
- Most of the UPs are not capacitated to implement Block Grants of LGSP-II as per the regulation of UPOM.

Observation/Community Observation:

Citizens Making Effective Governance project under CARTA program targeted goal is to improve the progress impact, generate sustainability and local ownership of projects financed through LGSP-II by the World Bank and PTF through the engagement of civil society, perceptive, experience and capacity for providing support to

improved governance. Detail overall progress of this proposal is given below according to the sub-grants supporting four components:-

- Through the project intervention CG have been aware and developed their capacity about their role and responsibilities through several training and orientation to monitor BBG of LGSP-II using Social Audit as a Social Accountability tools. Now they are making aware community peoples to participation Ward Shaba and open budget declaration to proper implement BBG of LGSP-II. Moreover, they are playing intermediary role to minimize gap between services providers and services receivers.
- Through the intervention of Social Audit (FGD, Public hearing) WC, SSC and Community people have been made aware their role and responsibilities to implement block grants of LGSP-II. As consequences, Community people are participating in public hearing and raise their voice to demand select schemes. Moreover, they are communicating with UPs to organize Ward Shaba and Open budget declaration as well as participating open budget declaration.
- Through the project intervention CG and community following up information board regarding LGSP-II. Furthermore, CG are monitoring notice board of UPs.
- UP representatives are sensitizing that this project are helping to develop UP's activities especially to proper implementation of LGSP-II.
- Through the project Intervention Govt. Official making convince and sensitize that the project activities can help UPs as well as community. As result they are making sure community demand to select schemes through Open budget declaration to implement block grant of LGSP-II Ward Shaba and Open budget declaration.
- Through project Intervention UP representatives are developing capacity to fruitfully implement block grant of LGSP-II.
- Through the project intervention UPs are organizing five years and periodic plan according to UP act 2009.
- Through that project intervention UPs have been assured that they will be organized Ward Shaba in every ward according to UP act 2009.
- Through the project intervention UPs have been developed their capacity on procurement system according to UPOM and they assured that from next they will procure all equipment as per UPOM.

Through the project intervention targeted UPs have become been aware about Tax collection according to Tax model schedule 2012. Now they are taking initiatives to collect Tax by using Tax assessment form and collection standing committee.

Suggestion / Recommendation of Community people: Through the discussions with Citizen Groups (CG) they who had been assigned responsibility of the committee for special performance like WC, SSC member need to clear for increasing accountability, transparency as well as greater involvement of citizen groups. As a part of evaluation of assignment/responsibility of committee member and quality review from monitoring team/committee of work UPs project.

- UPs arrange Word Shova as per Operational manual.
- To inform community people before declaration of arrange UPs open budget
- It seems better to display all the information regarding LGSP-II in notice board of UPs, if it happened they can know all about the matter.
- Notice board should be up to date by the UP authority.

- According to the list of the project it should be displayed in the UPs board.
- Need to arrange Word Shova as per government rules
- According to UPOM need to arrange Word Shova two times in every year
- To take any project as per demand of community people
- To display all committee member list on UP.
- To inform duties and responsibilities of respective committee member

Achievements:
- The Citizen Group members and volunteers have been become aware and developed capacity to monitor performance of block grants of LGSP-II Using Social Audit as part as Social Accountability tools.
- Through the project interventions community people are becoming aware on Basic Block Grants, Social Audit process, Ward Shaba, as well as their role and responsibilities to proper implement selected schemes of LGSP-II. In that case, they are feeling interest to involve project activities.
- Through the intervention of Social Audit WC, SSC and Community people have been made aware their role and responsibilities to implement block grants of LGSP-II. Moreover, Community people got opportunity to raise their voice to demand select schemes.
- Through project intervention of Social Audit especially public hearing UP representatives are convinced and sensitized as well as made commitment to work hands together with WC, SSC and Community people to proper implement block grants of LGSP-II.
- Due to project interventions in the reporting period Citizen Group members and volunteers created access to UPs and government officials and other stakeholders and provide effective suggestion for implement the project.
- Through the project intervention UPs are organizing five years and periodic plans according to UP act 2009.
- Through that project intervention UPs have been assured that they will be organized Ward Shaba in every ward according to UP act 2009.
- Through the project intervention UPs have been developed their capacity on procurement system according to UPOM and they assured that from next they will procure all equipment as per UPOM.
- Through the project intervention targeted UPs have become been aware about Tax collection according to Tax model schedule 2012. Now they are taking preparation to collect Tax with form Tax assessment and collection standing committee.

Challenges and way forward:
- Due to long tradition of secrecy and lack of transparency, local governments in Bangladesh are reluctant to give away information about their project allocation. They also formed different committees (WC, SSC) just on paper, which are not fully operationalized.

*Through different mechanism and strategy we are trying to win the support of the UP representatives and motivate them to practice participatory approaches. We strongly believe that after practicing these new approaches for couple of years eventually these will be adopted as regular practice by the UPs.*

### 7.15 Third Party Monitoring Report (2$^{nd}$ Cycle)

**Executive Summary:**

Citizens Making Governance Effective project under CARTA program has been implemented by Democracywatch funded by MJF since 15 September, 2012 at 30 unions of Nilphamari and Jessore districts of Bangladesh. Total 810 Citizen Group members were directly engaged in project implementation. Deputy Commissioner, DDLG, UNO of two districts and 30 UP representatives were also involved with this project. Besides total 600000community people of 30 UPs are benefitted through the project. This report was prepared in accordance with project specific objectives and provides a detailed analysis on the process and findings from input tracking and public hearing, several tools were used for data collection from Union Parisad level- these are Document review, FGD and KII with relevant stakeholders, sharing with Union Parisad and public hearing. A total of 30 public hearing, some of the major findings is listed below-

- Most of UPs did not take any initiatives for awareness for WC,CG and SSC members
- Scope of Citizen groups work depends on the environment of Union Parisad
- In some cases WC and SSC members did not know the process of open budget process
- CG Found WCs and SSCs were created for fulfilling LGSP-II criteria, in some cases some members of this committees did not know about their inclusion in the committees
- SSC members still did not know about procurement process as well as how much people need to consist to be procurement committee, as well as their role as a committee member.
- On site scheme information board is still not present in most of the case.

Every finding was shared with community with presence of UP representative, Chairman, LGSP-II related officials and community peoples, and they also provide their feedback on it. This report tries to capture all of this, First part of the report deal with the process, second part will present the findings and the last part will present the challenges and recommendation.

**Introduction**

Democracywatch has been implementing "Citizens Making Governance Effective (CiMaGE)" under the CARTA program by the support of MJF and PTF, the program has implemented in 30 Union Parisad of Nilphamari and Jessore sadar Upazilla. The major focus of this project is to build a constructive citizen platform for monitoring LGSP-II schemes. The project uses third party monitoring as a social accountability tool to achieve its goal. TPM is used for establishing indicators to measure efficiency, effectiveness and impact of project, logical analysis of information regarding the indicators, comprehensive assessment, helping the stakeholders in identifying problems, their causes and possible solution, performing quality check to measure the performance of project activities separately, providing useful benchmarking perspectives for executing the project successfully and providing regular, periodic and reliable feedback of project performance.

The basic objective of DW-CARTA third party monitoring is to determine field level implementation problems and issues by local community members and also find and recommend realistic solutions from grass root level, project staffs always emphasizes to put their best efforts to ensure participation by all concerned stakeholders during assessment of CARTA project.

**Objective:**
Third party monitoring of the sub-project (CARTA) is to promote local governance's responsiveness in local level through ensuring accountability and transparency of UPs for providing better service delivery. This process is fully focused on LGSP-II scheme implementation process, project works for community people specially to mobilize and capacitate UP representatives and civil society to engage community into open budgeting process as per LGSP-II procedures and UP OM, through the use of input tracking, FGD and public hearing as well as to enhance capacities of civil society and communities to monitor transparency, efficiency, participation, inclusion and accountability at the local level. In brief, the main objective of this TPM is to increase knowledge and accountability as well as transparency of local government through greater involvement of citizen groups (CG). social audit process as well as participation of citizen group in the activities of UPs and the services deliver by the UPs or local government.

**Scope of Work:**
This project aims to promote local government responsiveness, community needs and performance in the implementation of LGSP-II. To achieve the objectives the project formed citizen groups who facilitated and mobilized community people to engage in open budget process as per LGSP-II procedures and UPOM through the use of social audit tools. It also worked for strengthening capacity of the community people to monitor budget transparency, efficiency, participation, inclusion and accountability at the local level. This project strengthened the demand side of public budgeting through: enhancing UP accountability *vis-a-vis* the citizens, improving local public financial management system, institutionalizing community participatory planning, budgeting and monitoring and to develop citizen feedback mechanism to assess budgetary process. The project implemented highly in rate but it has some deviation also for the reason of political instability and local constraint.

**Relevance of use social audit**
- Gather Information from grass root level
- Involved local level demand side and supply side beneficiaries in a common platform
- Find out the success and gaps directly by the community.
- Include opinion of all types of relevant groups.
- Gather better information within a short time.

**Methodology/Process:**
Different methods have been used in different segments as the part of monitoring. Data sources, data collection method, data collection tools are used during the whole process- UP, CG, events, documentations, progress and event reports, UPs community platform, coordination meetings etc. UP-CG joint events were also used as data sources. We used case study, FGD, interview and observations as data collection method in all stages where and as required. On the other hand questionnaires, checklist, attendance register, module, schedule, reports, meeting minutes and physical observation were the data collection tools overall.
We have shared collected data with the UP representatives, conducted Focus Group Discussions (FGD) on basic block grant (BBG). Also conducted oversight on word committee and scheme supervision committee member process and specific procedure of BBG as well as monitoring plan as per UPOM requirements. BBG procedures were reviewed in detail to determine the effectiveness of the expenditure. Discussion with representatives of local government, community people through the mechanism bellow-
- Input tracking/data collection

- Dialogue session with Union Parishad (UPs)
- Focus Group Discussion (FGD)
- Public hearing
- Sharing with Union Parishad (UPs) representatives
- Social mapping

**Approach:**

Project was designed to implement in a participatory approach (top-down and bottom up, as well as contingency approach) with national and local level stakeholders. Community people, citizen group members, volunteers from 30 UPs as primary stakeholders as well beneficiaries and secondary as UP representatives, UP office secretary and representative of civil society, related official of LGSP, Members of standing committee as well. As participatory approach representation of voices of women, men, youth and older citizens as well as poor are the target group of the project.

**Context/ situation analysis**

In Bangladesh local governments are reluctant to disseminate information to locals or community people. Some UP representatives are not keen to disclose their block grants allocation. Also they try to hide project allocations. But now as per Union parishad operational manual (UPOM) union parishad following and arranged open budget process and allocation of each word to knowing their valuable opinion of citizen groups (CG). Citizen groups are made aware about their involvement in union parishad (UPs). Now they want to know their allocations of individual ward. Citizen groups (CG) want to do participate in every effective work.

After implementing the project for increasing accountability and transparency of Union parishad of (UPs) through greater participation of citizen groups (CG) for LGSP-II project, this TPM method helps to understand the scenario in the project location.

After collecting information from the respective Union Parisad by community groups, they were conducted FGDs with ward committee (WC), scheme supervision committee (SSC) member as well as representatives of Union Parisad. They discussed about basic block grant (BBG) process, open budget process, allocation of their ward based on BBG, awareness of community peoples- how people know about the open budget? Is there any allocation for the deprived community? Whether UP follows the UPOM during fulfilling the quorum of Ward Shava? What type of schemes gets priority by the UPs? How representatives of SSC supervise the scheme under LGSP-II? Etc. this type of questions mainly citizen group members asked to have an understanding on LGSP-II schemes.

**Steps of Conducting Social Audit:**

Following steps had been followed for successfully completion of social audit process-

**Social Audit/Committee-**

A daylong Orientation sessions on Social Audit Process as a Social Accountability tools organized by Project staffs in the project location, in Jessore it was held at 5th July, 2014 and Nilphamari it was held at 11th July 2014. Field Coordinator, Program Officer and citizen group members were participated the orientation session. Through the orientation session Project staffs orient citizen group members and form committee to conduct Social Audit Process.

**Orientation on Social Audit Process for Citizen Group (CG) and Volunteers as a Social Accountability tools:** A day long Orientation sessions on Social Audit Process was organized in each field, then the participants organize

union level orientation sessions. Through the 30 orientation sessions, social audit committees capacitate a total of 730 CG members for conducting Social Audit Process as monitoring tools to conduct Social Audit to explore the scheme implementation process and quality of LGSP-II lead project and identify gaps as well as ensure accountability and transparency as well participation of Community people of BBG of LGSP-II of UP.

**Information Collection / Input tracking as a part of Social Audit:** The Monitoring committees lead by citizen groups was visit Union parisad for LGSP-II related document review. They going through the paper thoroughly and try to have a clear understanding about the schemes and noted it.

**Focus Group Discussion (FGD)**
**FGD with WC, SSC and Community Peoples of UP as a Part of Social Audit:** Through the DW-CARTA project CG members are organized 30 FGDs as a part of Social Audit process of 30 UPs to explore experience, understanding and Opinion of WC, SSC and Community people on Present implementation status of BBG of LGSP-II.

**Sharing with UP about finding of FGD as a part of Social Audit process:** After Collection Information and conduct FGD with WC, SSC and Community people on present implementation status of BBG of LGSP-II, monitoring team shared with UPs about finding of FGD to cope with these problems and take preparation to organize Public hearing to ensure transparency, accountability of UPs as well as ensure community participation in BBG of LGSP-II.

**Public hearing list/Stakeholders:**
**Public hearing at UP level in Nilphamari & Jessore as a part of Social Audit:** After Collection Information and conduct FGD on present implementation status of BBG of LGSP-II as well as shared with UP about findings from FGD, CGs were organized 30 Public hearing as a part of Social Audit. In the public hearing, UP representatives, standing committees, project selection committees, project supervision committees' members, civil society representatives and larger community have been presented and raised questions about problems as well as provided their suggestions for ensuring the use of block grants for development projects at the community level. Accordingly, respective authorities showed their commitment to take necessary measures to address the gaps and to improve the quality of services.

**Major findings from Input Tracking:**
Democracywatch have been conducted 30 Social Audit in two upzila under Nilphamari and Jessore district and rest of social Audit could not accomplish due to political unrest**.**

**WC and SSC committees' status:**
This process found 100% WCs and SSCs members list from the Union parisad and also these committees is formed in the beginning of the LGSP-II project intervention, some committees was reformed during the time, the changing percentage is about 9.19%, the membership changed due to their inactivity, low reputation within the community, self-dropout. The current information regarding committees is present in the following table-

| Name of District | Ward Committee | | | Scheme Supervision Committee | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Tech. Person |
| Jessore | 635 | 254 | 889 | 635 | 254 | 889 | 15 |
| Nilphamari | 663 | 282 | 945 | 639 | 306 | 945 | 15 |
| **Total** | **1298** | **536** | **1834** | **1264** | **560** | **1824** | **30** |

**Functioning of LGSP related committee:**
- All UP ensured women participation in WC and SSC
- 100% WC and SSC formed according to UPOM, and they also ensured the women's membership within the committees, 100% members of these committees know their roles and responsibilities and they also showed their awareness about those issues.

**Planning & Budgeting**
- 100 %(30 UP) UP have five years plan
- 100 %(30 UP) UP have annual plan

**Information Dissemination**
- 100% UPs displayed five years plan on notice board.
- 100% Ups displayed annual plan on notice board.
- 100% UP have conducted Ward Shova.
- 100% UPS was conducted open budget session.

**Tax Collection**

Tax collection rate is gradually increasing. The audit found the revenue collection was increasing about 76.67% ups on the project location and the rest of 23.33% Ups collection was decreasing, Ups conduct several innovative measures for confirming the revenue collection such as tax fair, collect tax against any type of service delivery etc. the following table shows the information-

| Findings | Number | Ups |
|---|---|---|
| Revenue collection was Increased | **23 Ups** | Hoibatpur, Lebutola, Ichaly, Upashahar, Kashimpur, Churamoncati, Arabpur, Chanchra, Ramnagar, Fatehpur, Norendrapur, Chowra Borgasa, Gorgram, Khokshabari, Palashbari, Ramnagar, Kachukata, Itakhola, Kundapukur, Sonaroy, Charaikhola, Chaprasaranjani, Laxmichap |
| Revenue collection was decreased | **7 Ups** | Nowapara, Dewara, Kachua, Bashundia, Tupamari, Punchopukur, Songolsi |

**Project taken for women development**

7 UPs (out of 30) arranged and implemented schemes for women development, which is shown in the following table.

| Findings | Number | Ups |
|---|---|---|
| Ups taken schemes for women development | **19 Ups** | Hoibatpur, Lebutola, Upashahar, Nowapara, Kashimpur, Churamoncati, Arabpur, Chanchra, Ramnagar, Norendrapur, Chowra Borgasa, Palashbari, Ramnagar, Kachukata, Itakhola, Kundapukur, Sonaroy, Charaikhola, Chaprasaranjani, |
| Ups did not taken schemes for women development | **11 Ups** | Dewara, Kachua, Bashundia, Tupamari, Punchopukur, Songolsi, Khokshabari, Ichaly, Fatehpur, Gorgram, Laxmichap |

**Major Findings from the Social Audit Process:**

* 100% UPs were organized Ward Shaba accordingly which was found in the stored documents of UP. But in some places community people claimed that there were no Ward Shaba was arranged in their Wards. In some places Ups were not interested to conduct ward shava, they targeted any safety net program and shows the participants list as an attendance of ward shava.
* Books and other evidence (documents) shows that most of the UPs are arranged five years and periodic plans but they have not organized it as per UP act 2009. Besides, participations of community people were not considerable in the mentioned planning process. Furthermore, most of UPs haven't disseminated planning activities to community people through the notice board.
* About 27 UPs out of 30 Ups arranged open budget session in their working area.
* Most of the community people of UPs still didn't know about the Block Grants of LGSP-II. So they never been participated in this program of development.
* Most of the WC and SSC of UPs were known their roles and responsibilities as a member of LGSP-II related committees but still they are not fully aware, rapidly they were giving signature as per need of Ward representatives.
* A bit of reluctance was found in the members of WCs and SSCs to involve the implementation of LGSP-II.
* Few people of WC and SSC member of UP got their position for nepotism
* Papers and other documents illustrated that most of the UPs have been procured all equipment as per UPOM but real scenario is totally different. WC and SSC said that they are not involved in the process of procurement and they didn't know the system of procurement.

**Suggestion / Recommendation of Community people:**

* The process found following recommendation from the community-
* UPs arrange Ward Shava as per Operational manual.
* To inform community people before declaration of arrange UPs open budget
* It seems better to display all the information regarding LGSP-II in notice board of UPs, if it happened they can know all about the matter.
* Notice board should be up to date by the UP authority.
* According to the list of the project it should be displayed in the UPs board.
* Need to arrange Ward Shava as per government rules
* According to UPOM need to arrange Ward Shava two times in every year
* To take any project as per demand of community people
* To display all committee member list on UP.
* To inform duties and responsibilities of respective committee member

**Lesson Learned:**

* Social Audit (FGD, Public hearing) Process helps WC, SSC and Community people to be aware about their role and responsibilities to implement block grants of LGSP-II. As consequences, Community people are participating in public hearing and raise their voice to demand select schemes. Moreover, they are communicating with UPs to organize Ward Shaba and Open budget declaration as well as participating open budget declaration.
* CG and community following up information board regarding LGSP-II. Furthermore, CG are monitoring notice board of UPs.

- UP representatives are sensitizing that this project are helping to develop UP's activities especially to proper implementation of LGSP-II.
- Govt. Official making convince and sensitize that the project activities can help UPs as well as community. As result they are making sure community demand to select schemes through Open budget declaration to implement block grant of LGSP-II Ward Shaba and Open budget declaration.
- UP representatives are developing capacities to fruitfully implement block grant of LGSP-II.
- UPs are organizing five years and periodic plan according to UP act 2009.
- UPs have been assured that they will be organized Ward Shaba in every ward according to UP act 2009.
- UPs have been developed their capacity on procurement system according to UPOM and they assured that from next they will procure all equipment as per UPOM.

**Challenges and way forward:**

Due to long tradition of secrecy and lack of transparency, local governments in Bangladesh are reluctant to give away information about their project allocation. They also form different committees (WC, SSC) just on paper, which are not fully operationalized.

*Through different mechanism and strategy of community mobilizations, project team motivated representatives to practice participatory approaches.*

**Achievements:**

- The Citizen Group members have been become aware and developed capacity to monitor performance of block grants of LGSP-II Using Social Audit as part as Social Accountability tools.
- Community people are becoming aware on Basic Block Grants, Social Audit process, Ward Shaba, as well as their role and responsibilities to proper implement selected schemes of LGSP-II. In that case, they are feeling interest to involve project activities.
- Social Audit process especially public hearing UP representatives are convinced and sensitized as well as made commitment to work hands together with WC, SSC and Community people to proper implement block grants of LGSP-II.
- UPs have been organizing five years and periodic plans according to UP act 2009.
- UPs were conducted Ward Shaba in every ward according to UP act 2009.
- UPs had been developed their capacity on procurement system according to UPOM and they assured that from next they will procure all equipment as per UPOM.
- Targeted UPs have become aware about Tax collection according to Tax model schedule 2012.