

Urban Governance: The Context of Citizens' Participation and Awareness - A Case Study of the 22 Project Pourashavas of Bangladesh

Prof. Dr. Md. Ghulam Murtaza*

Abstract: *It has been agreed by all concerns that the citizens living in the cities and towns are to be associated with the affairs of the urban development and management issues so that they play the role of catalyst as part and parcel in the process from very beginning of the project planning stage to the project management stage. This process eventually would develop sense of ownership and belonging of the citizens that the city where they live. Basically, this paper makes an attempt to discuss the pertinent issues relating to the citizens' participation and awareness building and relevancy in context of urban governance. The examples from an Asian Development Bank funded project attached with Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) fielded in the secondary towns of Bangladesh have been made to understand the fact more strikingly. The challenges faced in implementing the activities relating to citizens' participation and awareness in context of urban governance as well as some suggestive measures needed to address these challenges has been discussed in this paper.*

1.0 Introduction

Within the earlier part of this millennium, this earth will be urbanized. For the first time in human history, more than half of the world's population will live in urban areas very soon. Many of them will live in poverty and squalor; deprived of their basic needs and rights. In the case of the Asian cities, there are some major trends that will have serious and lasting impacts during this millennium. By the year 2010, 4.2 billion of the world's 7 billion population will reside in Asian and the Pacific; about half (45 percent) of the world's urban growth will take place in Asia; forty-three percent of the Asian population will live in cities and thirty-three Asian cities will have populations of 5 million or more in the 21st century. Growing unemployment, poverty, malnutrition, social exclusion and environmental degradation are now the main issues that are to be addressed by urban decision makers.

The capacity of the nations to pursue their economic and social goals has begun to depend more and more on their ability to govern their cities. As a result, urban management has assumed increasing importance. Under these circumstances, effective governance within the available frame of poverty and resources appears to be the only solution to minimizing the

* Professor, Urban and Rural Planning Discipline, Khulna University

managerial stress and maintaining an adequate level of urban services and facilities. The response to these challenges lies in good governance. This good governance is not just national - it is local, regional and it is international. Good governance makes accountability; transparency, participation and rule of law mandatory, administrative functions, etc. And these are vitally pre-requisites for sustainable urban development.

The United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS)-HABITAT has developed a wide range of urban governance tools which are designed to make sustainable urbanization efforts more effective. These include tools to promote local partnership; participatory decision making; transparency in local governance; participatory budgeting; building bridges between local governments and civil society; and local-to-local dialogues between grass roots women groups and city authorities. These tools can enhance inclusiveness at various stages of local decision-making on sustainable development issues. These tools are now being integrated in urban development programmes in a number of countries.

However, these above mentioned facts emphasize that how the citizens living in the cities and towns can be associated with the affairs of the urban development and management issues so that they can play the role of catalyst as part and parcel of the whole system starting from planning stage to management stage. In fact, this process eventually would develop sense of ownership of the citizens that the city where they live - it belongs to them.

This paper makes an attempt to discuss the pertinent issues relating to the citizens' participation and awareness building and the context of urban governance. Here, the examples from an Asian Development Bank funded project attached with Local Government Engineering Department (LGED) fielded in some secondary towns of Bangladesh have been set forth to understand the context and extent of the problem more clearly.

2.0 Urban Governance and the Context of Citizens' Participation and Awareness

Good urban governance is a prerequisite to sustainable development and urban poverty reduction. Today, cities are faced with a continuously growing population and the associated social needs. Resources available to municipalities are, however, not growing at a similar pace. In this context, effective decentralization, efficient management of limited resources, popular participation and the development of productive partnerships between the city and the state, civil society, grassroots communities, as well as the private sector, are becoming essential tools.

People are the principal wealth of cities; they are both the object and the

means of sustainable human development. Civic engagement implies that living together is not a passive exercise: in cities, people must actively contribute to the common good. Citizens, especially women, must be empowered to participate effectively in decision-making processes. The civic capital of the poor must be recognized and supported. Practical means of realizing this principle include, inter alia,

- ♦ Promoting strong local democracies through free and fair municipal elections and participatory decision-making processes;
- ♦ Establishing the legal authority for civil society to participate effectively through such mechanisms as development councils and neighbourhood advisory committees;
- ♦ Promoting an ethic of civic responsibility among citizens through such mechanisms as "City Watch" groups;
- ♦ Making use of mechanisms such as public hearings and surveys, town hall meetings, citizen's forums, city consultations and participatory strategy development, including issue-specific working groups;
- ♦ Undertaking city referenda concerning important urban development options.

The UN Centre for Human Settlements-HABITAT is promoting the following definition of good urban governance: Urban governance is inextricably linked to the welfare of the citizenry. Good urban governance must enable women and men to access the benefits of urban citizenship. Good urban governance, based on the principle of urban citizenship, affirms that no man, woman or child can be denied access to the necessities of urban life, including adequate shelter, security of tenure, safe water, sanitation, a clean environment, health, education and nutrition, employment and public safety and mobility. Through good urban governance, citizens are provided with the platform that will allow them to use their talents to improve their social and economic conditions.

Good governance has eight major characteristics. It is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law. Participation by both men and women is a key cornerstone of good governance. It is an integral element of successful planning and development projects. Community participation gives a voice of residents enabling them to advance for themselves and influence their environment. Furthermore, citizen participation can strive to include participation not just by community leaders but also by more marginalized community members.

Best practices encourage citizen participation in several ways. The most successful collaborate with residents in the assessment and planning

phases and include the voices of those who are frequently marginalized. In this way, active citizen participation can result in a stronger, more invested community. Participatory assessment and planning improve project success rates. Citizen participation leads to a clear and accurate assessment of the specific needs of a community. This makes plans easier to implement and more sustainable overtime.

3.0 Objectives and Methodology

3.1 The Objective of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are as follows :

- a. To examine how far the tools and mechanism adopted or exercised have been successful in ensuring citizens' participation in the process and in making them conscious about the affairs of municipalities/Pourashavas.
- b. To identify the challenges that the municipalities/Pourashavas might face in ensuring governance.
- c. To suggest policy required policy measures for combating the identified challenges of the municipalities/Pourashavas.

3.2 The Study Approach/Methodology

The data and information of collected and processed very recently for a study entitled 'Independent Household Survey' (IHS) for the Urban Governance and Infrastructure Improvement Project (UGIIP) attached with Local Government Engineering Department (LGED), Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh have been used in the present study. The IHS has been carried out to assess how far the project benefits have reached to the targeted beneficiaries with regard to project activities' impact, outcome and results in the 22 project Pourashavas. The population of IHS consists of holdings/households of all the wards of the 22 project Pourashavas of Bangladesh. Stratified random sampling technique has been used in all the Pourashavas for selecting sample holdings/households. Altogether 4185 households (representing 2% of the total households) have been surveyed.

In respect of citizen awareness and participation, the following issues have been considered in the study:

- ♦ status of acquaintance with Urban Governance Improvement Action Plan (UGIAP) activities
- ♦ status of receipt of leaflets and handbills by the city dwellers
- ♦ status of seeing sign board highlighting dissemination of UGIAP messages

- ♦ status of knowing about the activities of Town Level Coordination Committee established at the Pourashava level
- ♦ status of knowing about the activities of Ward Committees of the Pourashava
- ♦ status of ventilating any opinions to the Pourashava so as to improve the delivery system of urban services

4.0 The Government's Plans and Programmes on Urban Governance - LGED's Initiatives

4.1 Project Background

Urban population is increasing at an alarming rate in Bangladesh. At present the urban-rural mix is about 30:70. With the increase of urban population the demand for urban infrastructure basic services have also been increased manifold. To meet the ever-increasing need for basic services, Asian Development Bank (ADB) has been financing in the urban development projects in Bangladesh since 1990. Secondary Town Infrastructure Development Project (STIDP) Phase I and II has already been implemented with the financial assistant of ADB. Based on the experiences of STIDP, a Technical Assistance was launched by ADB in 1998 and recommended for the implementation of the Third Urban Development Project. But the earlier approach of providing only infrastructure does not really encompass the issue of owning the infrastructure and services by the citizens of the projected towns. Therefore, the aspects and areas of governance such as human development, capacity building, participatory resource management, poverty reduction and environmental protection have been considered. The experiences of STIDP reveal that physical improvement cannot be sustained unless the underlying issues of governance are addressed properly.

In view of this, it was decided to redesign the earlier prepared Third Urban Development Project (TUDP) in the name of 'Urban Governance and Infrastructure Improvement Project (UGIIP)'. The project is attached with LGED under the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives (MLGRDC), Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

4.2 Project Objectives

The primary objective of the project is to promote human development and launch urban governance in secondary towns of Bangladesh. To achieve this objective the project would assist the selected Pourashavas to:

- ♦ Enhance accountability in municipal management and strengthen their capabilities in the provision of municipal services

- ♦ Development and expand physical infrastructure and urban services to increase economic opportunities, reduce vulnerability to environmental degradation, poverty and natural hazards
- ♦ Benefit the entire urban community in general and to focus on upgrading the conditions of the poor living in slum areas
- ♦ Promote active participation of women citizens in municipal management and services both as beneficiaries and agent.

4.3 Project Locations

The project would be implemented in 3 phases:

The project activities would be implemented during phase 1 (1st 2 years) in the identified 22 Pourashavas. These are: Bandarban, Bhairab, Gazipur, Habigonj, Ishwardi, Jhalokathi, Khagrachari, Kishoregonj, Lalmonirhat, Lakshampur, Manikgonj, Meherpur, Moulovibazar, Narayanganj, Narshingdi, Netrokona, Panchagarh, Sariatpur, Savar, Shahjampur, Sherpur, and Tongi.

Second phase of the Project (2nd 2 Years) would cover a maximum of 30 Pourashavas. These 30 Pourashava will include the qualified Pourashavas from phase 1 to be selected on the performance of Urban Governance Implementation Action Plan (UGIAP) and new Pourashavas from category A and B to be selected on the basis specific entry criteria.

Only those Pourashava, which maintain a fully satisfactory rating during phase 2, will proceed to the phase-3 (3rd 2 Years) to fully utilize the financial assistance offered through the project for Urban Infrastructure Improvement Component.

Urban Governance Improvement Action Program (UGIAP) is a performance achieving targets of some key area of activity to ensure good governance in the project Pourashavas. In the light of performance of activities/criteria mentioned in UGIAP, each participating Pourashava will be evaluated to proceed from phase-1 to phase-2. Only those Pourashavas that maintain a fully satisfactory rating of performance criteria mentioned in UGIAP during phase-2, will proceed to phase-3 of the project.

4.4 Key Areas of Activities

The key areas of activities of UGIAP are; Citizen Awareness and Participation; Women's Participation; Integration of the Urban Poor; Financial Accountability and Sustainability; Administrative Transparency. These are to be implemented in the project Pourashavas during the implementation period of the project.

4.5 Project Components

Essentially, the project has three components:

Part A: Urban Infrastructure Improvement: It covers the improvement/expansion of the following municipal infrastructure facilities: (i) roads and bridges, (ii) storm water drainage, (iii) low-cost sanitation, (iv) solid waste management, (v) municipal facilities (e.g. bus and truck terminals, kitchen markets and slaughterhouses) and (vi) slum improvement. Under specific circumstances inclusion of water supply rehabilitation schemes will also be considered.

Part B: Urban Governance Improvement: It covers micro credit, community poverty alleviation activities and institutional reform and capacity building. Part B also includes an action programme in five key result areas: (i) citizen awareness participation; (ii) women's participation; (iii) integration of the urban poor; (iv) financial accountability and sustainability and (v) administrative transparency. In each of these five areas, the Pourashava will need to achieve well-defined performance targets that will be closely monitored and evaluated during project implementation.

Part C: Capacity Building and Implementation

4.6 Project Cost/ Financing

The total cost of project is estimated at Tk. 5163.80 million (\$87.00 million) of Tk.3600.00 million will be provided by ADB as project aid (PA) and Tk. 1563.80 million would be provided by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

4.7 Project Implementation Period

The project would be implemented in 3 phases for a total period of six years starting from July 2003 and is scheduled to be completed in June 2009.

4.8 Implementation Arrangements

a. Central Level: The Executive Agency of the Project is LGED and LGED works under the overall supervision of LGD of MLGRDC. An inter-ministerial Steering Committee (ISC) has been established to oversee the project. The ISC consists of senior-level representatives from different relevant Government Agencies. LGED has already set up a Project Management Office (PMO) in LGED HQ in Dhaka, led by a full-time Project Director (PD). The PD is supported by two Deputy Project Directors and other support staff of PMO is directly responsible for

overall project implementation, monitoring and supervision of the project under the guidance of the Director in the charge of the Urban Management wing of LGED who reports to Chief engineer, LGED.

b. Pourashava Level: In each participating Pourashava, a project Implementation Unit (PIU) has been established as the respective Pourashava enters into a sub-project agreement with LGED. The PIU is headed by the Pourashava Chairman and is comprised of three sections:

- ♦ Infrastructure Improvement Section (IIS);
- ♦ Environment, Sanitation and Slum Improvement Section (ESSIS); and,
- ♦ Urban Governance Improvement Section (UGIS).

The IIS is responsible for the implementation of all physical infrastructures works and headed by the head of the engineering department of the concerned Pourashava. Additional technical staff will be deputed from LGED in order to support the Municipal Engineering. The ESSIS undertakes all environmental and slum improvement activities and will be headed by the Health Officer of the Pourashava. The UGIS, headed by the Secretary of the Pourashava, is responsible for the implementation of the Urban Governance Improvement Action Program (UGIAP) in order to ensure performance-based approach.

5.0 Major Findings and Discussion

5.1 Aspects Considered

In respect of citizens' participation and awareness, the following aspects have been considered:

- ♦ status of acquaintance with UGIAP activities by the citizens
- ♦ status of receipt of leaflets and handbills by the citizens
- ♦ status of seeing sign board highlighting dissemination of UGIAP messages by the citizens
- ♦ status of knowing about the activities of Town Level Coordination Committee in the Pourashava
- ♦ status of knowing about the activities of Ward Committees in the Pourashava
- ♦ status of ventilating any opinions by the citizens to the Pourashava so as to improve the delivery system of urban services

5.2 Status and Sources of Knowledge about UGIAP

Citizen's awareness and participation is the first area of activity of UGIAP. This component is very important since the successful implementation and sustenance of the UGIAP depend largely on the participation and support of the citizen of the Pourashava under the project.

For full and active participation of the citizens' proper knowledge of UGIAP is a must. Therefore, to assess the awareness and knowledge about the project, the question was set out. The survey results are depicted in the Table-1.

It may be observed that 90 per cent of the households of all the Pourashavas have some kind of knowledge about UGIIP/UGIAP and 10 per cent do not have any knowledge. There are some Pourashavas where the households still have poor knowledge about UGIAP/UGIIP. It is to be noted that 65 per cent, 44 per cent and 37.4 per cent of the households of Shariatpur Pourashava, Shahjadpur Pourashava and Narayangonj Pourashava respectively are not acquainted with any news related to UGIAP/UGIIP.

The main reason behind such unawareness might be the failure of these Pourashavas to disseminate the information to the citizens properly or adequately.

About the media of dissemination of the knowledge of UGIAP/UGIIP, the signboards topped the list (53.7 per cent) followed by Pourashava's other activities (41.9 per cent) and from other sources (4.4 per cent). Table-1 depicts more detailed information on sources of knowing news about UGIAP/UGIIP by the project Pourashavas.

5.3 Status of Receiving Leaflets by the Households

Leaflets and handbills are considered as popular methods for mass communication to the common citizens of the Pourashava. As such information on the issue of receiving leaflets and handbills by the households were collected and shown in Table-2.

It is found that 77.4 per cent of the surveyed households of all the Pourashavas have received leaflets or handbills disseminating UGIAP/UGIIP related activities and 22 per cent of the households received no such leaflets or handbills.

With regard to individual Pourashava, maximum number of respondent households (99.1 per cent) was reported from Bhairab Pourashava who got leaflets or handbills and the lowest from Shahjadpur Pourashava (20.4 per cent).

Getting leaflets is not enough; the receivers must understand the contents of leaflets or handbills. As such information was also gathered in this respect. On the whole, 89.3 per cent of the total households could clearly understand while 4.8 per cent could not understand the content. Only 1.2 per cent of the households in Moulavibazar Pourashava could understand clearly. This abnormally low rate may be due to indifference or poor literacy rate of the citizens in that Pourashava as is evident from the

statistics of no response (98.8 per cent). There are a number of Pourashavas such as Bhairab, Kishoregonj, Hobigonj, Gazipur and Khagrachari where the messages of leaflets or handbills are clear to the readers.

5.4 Status of Knowledge about UGIAP/UGIIP Publicity Signboards

In order to disseminate the information related to UGIAP/UGIIP activities arrangements have been made to fix signboards at mass assembling areas of the project Pourashavas. To assess the impact of these signboards on issue of receiving messages relating to the project, the relevant questions were asked from the respondent households of the project Pourashavas.

The survey findings on this issue have been presented in Table-3. Overall 88 per cent of the respondent households in different Pourashavas have seen the signboards of UGIAP/UGIIP and the remaining 12 per cent of the households have not seen. It is to be noted here that 62 per cent of the households of Shahjadpur Pourashava have not noticed any signboards of UGIAP/UGIIP followed by 38 per cent of the households of Narayanganj Pourashava.

Further, 86 per cent of the households have understood the contents of these signboards clearly and 13.3 per cent of the households reported that they could not understand the contents clearly. Amongst the households who have noticed the signboards in the different Pourashavas under UGIIP, 63 per cent of the households of Narsingdi Pourashava could not understand the contents of those signboards clearly.

5.5 Status of Awareness about TLCC Activities

Town Level Co-ordination Committee (TLCC) is an important committee formed for implementation of UGIAP activities; as such the citizens should have knowledge about its activities.

Table-4 shows the status of knowledge of the respondent households about the activities of TLCC in the 22 project Pourashavas. In general, 50 percent of the households of the project Pourashavas have some knowledge about the TLCC activities and the rest 50 per cent have no knowledge. The highest number (100 per cent) of respondent households in Khagrachari Pourashava has the knowledge of TLCC activities and lowest 9.7 per cent respondent's households in Shahjadpur Pourashava. In fact, overall 50 per cent households in 21 Pourashavas have the knowledge which is a poor percentage and signifies that the resolution of the meetings is not being disseminated at the community level properly.

5.6 Status of Providing Opinions about Municipal Services

The municipal citizens need the services provided by the Municipal/Pourashava Authority everyday. Therefore, as municipal residents the citizens should have the scope in giving their opinions to the Pourashava so as to provide municipal services in line with the realistic demand of the citizens.

The households' opinions on this issue have been obtained and shown in Table-5. As a whole, 53 per cent respondents of the project Pourashavas gave affirmative reply and only 46 per cent negative reply. The lowest i.e., 4.5 per cent of the households of Narayangonj Pourashava has got the scope to give opinion and the highest i.e. 100 per cent respondents of Khagrachari Pourashava have the scope. However, there should be some kind of arrangements for providing opinions by the citizens particularly in the delivery system of municipal services by the Pourashavas. In other way, this implies that the greater participation of the citizens is to be ensured so as to facilitate the Pourashavas to provide pro-people and need oriented services.

5.7 Status of Awareness about the Activities of the Ward Committees

As a part of UGIAP activities, Ward Committees have been formed in each ward of the project Pourashavas. The Ward Committee is the forums to discuss the local problem at the grass root levels. And as such, the Ward residents should have knowledge about the activities of the said committees.

Table-6 shows that overall 65 per cent of the citizens know about the activities of the ward committee and 34 per cent do not. It appears that 84 per cent households of Shahjadpur Pourashava, 69 per cent of Kishoregonj Pourashava, and 62 per cent of Laxmipur Pourashava do not have any knowledge about the activities of Ward Committees in their Pourashavas.

6.0 Challenges

6.1 Sustainability of the Activities

The continuity of the activities such as holding of TLCC and Ward Committees meetings regularly, distribution of leaflets and fixing of signboards disseminating Pourashava activities etc as envisaged in the UGIAP seem to be uncertain.

6.2 Citizens' Willingness for Participation

It appears that the citizens are not interested to be associated with activities of the Pourashavas since the Pourashava authority do not positively endorse their participation.

6.3 Donor's Driven Factor

Since the UGIIP is an ADB funded project, the project implementation unit (PIU) is paying greatest attention to execute the aspect of citizens' participation and awareness. The implementation of these activities is not spontaneous and in-built ones. As the project has been fielded, the PIU are compelled to accomplish these activities.

6.4 Interest of the Officials and Staff of the Pourashavas

In fact, the officials and staff of the project Pourashavas have not yet been realized that the task of citizens' participation and awareness building is as one of their duties. They understand that this is a project-based task and as such they do not own this.

6.5 Interest of the Pourashavas' Chairmen and Ward Commissioners

The citizens' representatives of the Pourashavas i.e., the Chairmen and the Ward Commissioners of the Pourashavas have not yet been able to own governance to the extent of a certain level. The Chairman and the Ward Commissioners of the Pourashava are just compiling to the UGIAP only for the sake of running the project in their respective Pourashava. The level of possession of views and thoughts of the Chairmen and the Ward Commissioners of the Pourashavas regarding ensuring citizens' participation and awareness is not much encouraging.

6.6 Orientation of the Citizens

The citizens of the secondary towns of Bangladesh are not attuned with the issue that their participation and awareness in respect of their role in planning, development and management of the municipal services. Neither such awareness building plans nor programmes have been fielded at the Pourashava levels.

7.0 Suggested Policy Measures

The following are some suggestive measures in order to combat the above-mentioned challenges in the implementation process of urban governance in the secondary towns of Bangladesh:

- ♦ The Pourashavas have to undertake more non-conventional innovative ideas and actions to propagate the information about UGIIP/UGIAP to the citizens effectively.
- ♦ More signboards are to be placed in the public assembling points so as to disseminate the messages of the UGIIP/UGIAP since these play vital role in the Pourashavas.
- ♦ The leaflets containing the messages of UGIIP/UGIAP should be widely distributed among the citizens of the Pourashavas and thereof the language should be more simple and informative.

- ♦ The citizens of the project Pourashavas need to be kept informed about the TLCCs' activities through increasing more the interaction between the citizens and the members themselves so as to ensure peoples' participation in addressing the municipal problems and issues.
- ♦ The residents of the Pourashavas have the scope in giving their opinions to the Pourashavas so that municipal services are provided according to the demand of the citizens. This implies that the greater participation of the citizens is to be ensured so that the Pourashava provides pro-people and need oriented services.
- ♦ The community people should know about existence of the Ward Committees of UGIIP so that interested citizens have greater participation in those committees.
- ♦ The community people has to be aware of the activities of the Ward Committees of UGIIP so that they can be interested to have greater participation in those activities.

8.0 Concluding Observations

Participation refers to the involvement of citizens in the development process. Awareness building means the increase in the value of responsiveness and consciousness of the citizens. Beneficiaries and groups affected by the project need to participate so that the government can make informed choices with respect to their needs and social groups could protect their rights. This norms need to be ensured for the greater interest of the nation.

At the grass roots level, participation implies that government structures are flexible enough to offer beneficiaries and other affected, the opportunity to improve the design and implementation of public programmes and projects. This process increases sense of ownership and belongings of the citizens of the city dwellers towards the infrastructure to be developed and services to be provided.

For the first time in the history of Bangladesh, the issue of governance has been introduced at the level of secondary towns. Therefore, all efforts needed must be ensured to continue this process by all the stakeholders so that people living in the towns get benefits of activities of the project or Pourashavas and thus own those activities.

References

- Bharda, Dipasis, (1996). The Urban Sector of Bangladesh in 2020, unpublished manuscript, Dhaka: The World Bank.
- Chowdhury, A.K.M.K (1985). Land Use Planning in Bangladesh, Dhaka: National Institute of Local Government.
- Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, (1977). The Pourashava Ordinance, Ministry of Law and Parliamentary Affairs, Dhaka: Bangladesh Government Press.
- Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, (1990). Report of the Poura (Municipal) Commission (in Bangla, unpublished Mimeo), Dhaka: Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives.
- Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, (1992). Report of the Local Government Structure Review Commission, Dhaka: Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives.
- Islam, Nazrul and Khan, Mohammad Mohabbat (ed), (1997), Urban Governance in Bangladesh and Pakistan, Dhaka: Centre for Urban Studies.
- Local Government Engineering Department, (2006), Independent Household Survey (IHS), Urban Governance and Infrastructure Improvement (Sector) Project (UGIIP): ADB Loan 1947-Ban (SF), Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.
- Monitoring and Evaluation Consultants, (2005), Report on Benefit Monitoring and Evaluation(BME), Urban Governance and Infrastructure Improvement (Sector) Project: ADB Loan 1947-BAN (SF), Local Government Engineering Department, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.
- Murtaza, Mohammad Ghulam, (2002). Urban Governance in Bangladesh, Khulna: A.K. Sultana Murtaza.
- Rahman, M. Shamsur, (1989). "Challenges to the City Government in Bangladesh: A Case of Rajshahi Municipal Corporation" The Journal of Local Government, Vol. 18, No. 1.
- Saqui, Md. Afsar Hossain, (1992). "Urban Administration Structure and Urban Management Problems in Bangladesh", The Journal of Local Government, Vol. 21, No. 2.
- Siddqui, Kamal, ed.(1994). Local Government of Bangladesh, Dhaka: University Press Limited.

Table-1: Status and Sources of Knowledge about UGIIP

Name of the Pourashava	Status of knowledge about UGIAP/UGIIP					Sources of knowledge						Total
	Yes		No		Total	Through signboards		Through Pourashava's other Activities		Other Sources		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
Bandarban	67	74.4	23	25.6	90	38	56.7	17	25.4	12	17.9	67
Bhairab	228	97.9	5	2.1	233	124	54.4	103	45.2	1	0.4	228
Gazipur	261	96.7	9	3.3	270	46	17.6	215	82.4	0	0	261
Hobigonj	128	98.5	2	1.5	130	114	89.1	14	10.9	0	0	128
Ishwardi	189	94.0	12	6.0	201	47	24.9	138	73.0	4	2.1	189
Jhalokati	123	96.9	4	3.1	127	59	48.0	64	52.0	0	0	123
Khagrachari	149	100.0	0	0	149	5	3.4	133	89.3	11	7.4	149
Kishoregonj	209	98.6	3	1.4	212	204	97.6	5	2.4	0	0	209
Laxmipur	254	89.1	31	10.9	285	206	81.1	42	16.5	6	2.4	254
Lalmonirhat	199	100.0	0	0	199	174	87.4	25	12.6	0	0	199
Manikgonj	170	94.4	10	5.6	180	128	75.3	28	16.5	14	8.2	170
Meherpur	113	100.0	0	0	113	82	72.6	31	27.4	0	0	113
Moulavibazar	93	93.0	7	7.0	100	78	83.9	15	16.1	0	0	93
Narshingdi	201	95.3	10	4.7	211	34	16.9	93	46.3	74	36.8	201
Narayanganj	124	62.6	74	37.4	198	119	96.0	1	0.8	4	3.2	124
Netrokona	167	98.2	3	1.8	170	3	1.8	161	96.4	3	1.8	167
Panchagarh	137	97.9	3	2.1	140	131	95.6	2	1.5	4	2.9	137
Savar	272	97.1	8	2.9	280	192	70.6	76	27.9	4	1.5	272
Shariatpur	57	35.0	106	65.0	163	11	19.3	39	68.4	7	12.3	57
Shahjadpur	121	56.0	95	44.0	216	34	28.1	76	62.8	11	9.1	121
Sherpur	185	92.5	15	7.5	200	22	11.9	163	88.1	0	0	185
Tongi	314	98.7	4	1.3	318	168	53.5	136	43.3	10	3.2	314
Total	3761	89.9	424	10.1	4185	2019	53.7	1577	41.9	165	4.4	3761

Source: Household Survey, 2006

Table-2: Status of Receiving Leaflets or Handbills about UGIAP/UGIIP by the Respondent Households

Name of the Pourashava	Status of Getting leaflets or handbills							Understanding about the contents of leaflets or handbills by the Respondents						
	Yes		No		No Response		Total	Clear		Not clear		No Response		Total
	F	%	F	%	F	%		F	%	F	%	F	%	
Bandarban	63	70.0	25	27.8	2	2.2	90	50	79.4	3	4.8	10	15.9	63
Bhairab	231	99.1	2	0.9	0	0	233	231	100.0	0	0	0	0	231
Gazipur	237	87.8	33	12.2	0	0	270	232	97.9	4	1.7	1	0.4	237
Hobigonj	128	98.5	2	1.5	0	0	130	124	96.9	0	0	4	3.1	128
Ishwardi	141	69.8	60	29.7	1	0.5	202	124	87.9	13	9.2	4	2.8	141
Jhalokati	101	79.5	24	18.9	2	1.6	127	88	87.1	13	12.9	0	0	101
Khagrachari	128	85.9	19	12.8	2	1.3	149	127	99.2	0	0	1	0.8	128
Kishoregonj	208	98.6	2	0.9	1	0.5	211	208	100.0	0	0	0	0	208
Laxmipur	252	88.4	28	9.8	5	1.8	285	226	89.7	15	6.0	11	4.4	252
Lalmonirhat	197	99.0	2	1.0	0	0	199	186	94.4	0	0	11	5.6	197
Manikgonj	84	46.7	95	52.8	1	0.6	180	77	91.7	2	2.4	5	6.0	84
Meherpur	50	44.2	63	55.8	0	0	113	43	86.0	2	4.0	5	10.0	50
Moulavibazar	81	81.0	17	17.0	2	2.0	100	1	1.2	0	0	80	98.8	81
Narshingdi	193	91.5	13	6.2	5	2.4	211	185	95.9	3	1.6	5	2.6	193
Narayanganj	121	61.1	76	38.4	1	0.5	198	117	96.7	1	0.8	3	2.5	121
Netrokona	165	97.1	5	2.9	0	0	170	130	78.8	32	19.4	3	1.8	165
Panchagarh	131	93.6	7	5.0	2	1.4	140	128	97.7	2	1.5	1	0.8	131
Savar	239	85.4	37	13.2	4	1.4	280	218	91.2	16	6.7	5	2.1	239
Shariatpur	62	38.0	98	60.1	3	1.8	163	28	45.2	2	3.2	32	51.6	62
Shahjadpur	44	20.4	171	79.2	1	0.5	216	27	61.4	8	18.2	9	20.5	44
Sherpur	123	61.5	74	37.0	3	1.5	200	100	81.3	23	18.7	0	0	123
Tongi	261	82.1	55	17.3	2	0.6	318	242	92.7	17	6.5	2	0.8	261
Total	3240	77.4	908	21.7	37	0.9	4185	2892	89.3	156	4.8	192	5.9	3240

Source: Household Survey, 2006

Table-3 : Status of Knowledge about UGIIP Publicity Signboards by the Respondent Households

Name of the Pourashava	Status of viewing signboards							Status about understanding the contents of signboards						
	Yes		No		No Response		Total	Clear		Not clear		No Response		Total
	F	%	F	%	F	%		F	%	F	%	F	%	
Bandarban	70	77.8	18	20.0	2	2.2	90	66	94.3	4	5.7	0	0	70
Bhairab	232	99.6	1	0.4	0	0	233	232	100.0	0	0	0	0	232
Gazipur	238	88.1	32	11.9	0	0	270	218	91.6	20	8.4	0	0	238
Hobigonj	128	98.5	2	1.5	0	0	130	126	98.4	1	0.8	1	0.8	128
Ishwardi	176	87.1	26	12.9	0	0	202	163	92.6	13	7.4	0	0	176
Jhalokati	124	97.6	1	0.8	2	1.6	127	117	94.4	7	5.6	0	0	124
Khagrachari	149	100.0	0	0	0	0	149	149	100.0	0	0	0	0	149
Kishoregonj	208	98.6	2	0.9	1	0.5	211	207	99.5	1	0.5	0	0	208
Laxmipur	250	87.7	34	11.9	1	0.4	285	216	86.4	33	13.2	1	0.4	250
Lalmonirhat	199	100.0	0	0	0	0	199	188	94.5	6	3.0	5	2.5	199
Manikgonj	130	72.2	49	27.2	1	0.6	180	103	79.2	24	18.5	3	2.3	130
Meherpur	106	93.8	7	6.2	0	0	113	91	85.8	13	12.3	2	1.9	106
Moulavibazar	93	93.0	5	5.0	2	2.0	100	93	100.0	0	0	0	0	93
Narshingdi	206	97.6	4	1.9	1	0.5	211	76	36.9	130	63.1	0	0	206
Narayangonj	122	61.6	75	37.9	1	0.5	198	120	98.4	2	1.6	0	0	122
Netrokona	169	99.4	1	0.6	0	0	170	137	81.1	32	18.9	0	0	169
Panchagarh	132	94.3	6	4.3	2	1.4	140	114	86.4	17	12.9	1	0.8	132
Savar	253	90.4	25	8.9	2	0.7	280	207	81.8	43	17.0	3	1.2	253
Shariatpur	126	77.3	37	22.7	0	0	163	67	53.2	58	46.0	1	0.8	126
Shahjadpur	83	38.4	133	61.6	0	0	216	40	48.2	42	50.6	1	1.2	83
Sherpur	182	91.0	16	8.0	2	1.0	200	177	97.3	5	2.7	0	0	182
Tongi	295	92.8	23	7.2	0	0	318	257	87.1	37	12.5	1	0.3	295
	3671	87.7	497	11.9	17	0.4	4185	3164	86.2	488	13.3	19	0.5	3671

Source: Household survey, 2006

Table-4 : Status of Awareness about TLCC Activities by the Respondent Households

Name of the Pourashava	Status of Knowing TLCC						
	Yes		No		No Response		Total
	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Bandarban	48	53.3	35	38.9	7	7.8	
Bhairab	172	73.8	61	26.2	0	0	233
Gazipur	115	42.6	155	57.4	0	0	270
Hobigonj	121	93.1	9	6.9	0	0	130
Ishwardi	76	37.6	126	62.4	0	0	202
Jhalokati	33	26.0	92	72.4	2	1.6	127
Khagrachari	149	100.0	0	0	0	0	149
Kishoregonj	34	16.1	176	83.4	1	0.5	211
Laxmipur	104	36.5	174	61.1	7	2.5	285
Lalmonirhat	129	64.8	68	34.2	2	1.0	199
Manikgonj	22	12.2	157	87.2	1	0.6	180
Meherpur	91	80.5	21	18.6	1	0.9	113
Moulavibazar	79	79.0	19	19.0	2	2.0	100
Narshingdi	170	80.6	40	19.0	1	0.5	211
Narayangonj	96	48.5	101	51.0	1	0.5	198
Netrokona	151	88.8	19	11.2	0	0	170
Panchagarh	85	60.7	51	36.4	4	2.9	140
Savar	148	52.9	126	45.0	6	2.1	280
Shariatpur	25	15.3	138	84.7	0	0	163
Shahjadpur	21	9.7	195	90.3	0	0	216
Sherpur	132	66.0	62	31.0	6	3.0	200
Tongi	90	28.3	223	70.1	5	1.6	318
Total	2091	50.0	2048	48.9	46	1.1	4185

Source: Household Survey, 2006

Table-5 : Status of Providing Opinions by the Respondent Households in Affairs of Municipal Services

Name of the Pourashava	Status of Providing Opinions						
	Yes		No		No Response		Total
	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Bandarban	45	50.0	39	43.3	6	6.7	90
Bhairab	218	93.6	15	6.4	0	0	233
Gazipur	133	49.3	136	50.4	1	0.4	270
Hobigonj	107	82.3	22	16.9	1	0.8	130
Ishwardi	30	14.9	172	85.1	0	0	202
Jhalokati	57	44.9	68	53.5	2	1.6	127
Khagrachari	149	100.0	0	0	0	0	149
Kishoregonj	157	74.4	53	25.1	1	0.5	211
Laxmipur	68	23.9	211	74.0	6	2.1	285
Lalmonirhat	190	95.5	9	4.5	0	0	199
Manikgonj	13	7.2	165	91.7	2	1.1	180
Meherpur	108	95.6	4	3.5	1	0.9	113
Moulavibazar	94	94.0	4	4.0	2	2.0	100
Narshingdi	129	61.1	80	37.9	2	0.9	211
Narayangonj	9	4.5	188	94.9	1	0.5	198
Netrokona	168	98.8	2	1.2	0	0	170
Panchagarh	104	74.3	29	20.7	7	5.0	140
Savar	48	17.1	228	81.4	4	1.4	280
Shariatpur	25	15.3	138	84.7	0	0	163
Shahjadpur	50	23.1	165	76.4	1	0.5	216
Sherpur	163	81.5	33	16.5	4	2.0	200
Tongi	162	50.9	153	48.1	3	0.9	318
Total	2227	53.2	1914	45.7	44	1.1	4185

Source: Household Survey, 2006

Table-6 : Status of Awareness about the Activities of Ward Committees by the Respondent Households

Name of the Pourashava	Status of Knowing						
	Yes		No		No Response		Total
	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Bandarban	52	57.8	34	37.8	4	4.4	90
Bhairab	199	85.4	33	14.2	1	0.4	233
Gazipur	144	53.3	126	46.7	0	0	270
Hobigonj	120	92.3	9	6.9	1	0.8	130
Ishwardi	93	46.0	109	54.0	0	0	202
Jhalokati	84	66.1	41	32.3	2	1.6	127
Khagrachari	149	100.0	0	0	0	0	149
Kishoregonj	65	30.8	145	68.7	1	0.5	211
Laxmipur	105	36.8	176	61.8	4	1.4	285
Lalmonirhat	182	91.5	16	8.0	1	0.5	199
Manikgonj	126	70.0	54	30.0	0	0	180
Meherpur	108	95.6	4	3.5	1	0.9	113
Moulavibazar	92	92.0	6	6.0	2	2.0	100
Narshingdi	197	93.4	13	6.2	1	0.5	211
Narayangonj	122	61.6	72	36.4	4	2.0	198
Netrokona	152	89.4	18	10.6	0	0	170
Panchagarh	124	88.6	11	7.9	5	3.6	140
Savar	227	81.1	51	18.2	2	0.7	280
Shariatpur	62	38.0	101	62.0	0	0	163
Shahjadpur	35	16.2	181	83.8	0	0	216
Sherpur	162	81.0	33	16.5	5	2.5	200

Source: Household Survey, 2006