CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

The State of Delhi has a unique administrative set up and it has unique challenges and problems due to differences in population growth, political, social and economic life. Since Delhi is the National Capital Territory, it is a Union Territory with a legislative assembly, Chief Minister and cabinet of ministers. Law and order and Land are two major subjects, which are still with Union Government. Almost whole of the Delhi, except New Delhi Municipal corporation area and Delhi Cantonment board area, is under Municipal Corporation of Delhi, and all these 3 local bodies are not under the Delhi Government. Similarly police and Delhi Development Authority are directly under Central Government. Despite all these contradictions and difficulties, Delhi has taken strides in achievement of development goals and has been able to play pioneer role towards good governance. Departments and agencies of government in Delhi have taken many initiatives towards achievement of good governance and some of the initiatives which are common to all departments, can be listed as below.

1. Citizen Charter
2. Right to information Act and Grievances Commission
3. Public Interest litigation
4. Budget Analysis
5. Bhagidari Movement
6. Civil Society Organizations
7. E-Governance
8. Providing low-cost, high quality Citizen Centeric Services
9. Citizen Report Card

The perception of the citizens as to how and what are the indicators on which they evaluate the functioning of the government is ultimately important to know. Based on this the government can take corrective measures in its policies and execution strategies. Keeping in view this, the specific objectives of the Study are:

i) A comparative analysis of the policies and procedures of the different government agencies on certain identified indicators or characteristics towards improving governance system.

ii) To assess and analyze the impact of various Good Governance initiatives on the working conditions and acceptability by stakeholders.

iii) To assess and analyze the role of social audit for ensuring participation in decision making and improving accountability.

Hypotheses

1) There are differences in the policies and procedures of government agencies of Delhi state as perceived by stakeholders on 8 characteristics of good governance i.e. consensus oriented, participatory, follow the rule of law, effective & efficient, equitable & inclusive, responsiveness, transparency and accountability.

2) There is difference in the good governance assessment of different Delhi state agencies as perceived by different categories of stakeholders i.e. general public/citizens, political persons/elected representatives, legal professional/judiciary/advocates, bureaucracy/officials and media & communication professionals on 8 characteristics of good governance i.e. consensus oriented,
participatory, follow the rule of law, effective & efficient, equitable & inclusive, responsiveness, transparency and accountability.

3) There is no difference in the good governance assessment of different Delhi state government agencies as perceived by the stakeholders of different age groups i.e. young adults (18-35 years), middle aged (36-55 years and elderly (56 & above years) on 8 characteristics of good governance i.e. consensus oriented, participatory, follow the rule of law, effective & efficient, equitable & inclusive, responsiveness, transparency and accountability.

4) There is no difference in the perception of the stakeholders of both the sexes on 8 characteristics of governance i.e. consensus oriented, participatory, follow the rule of law, effective & efficient, equitable & inclusive, responsiveness, transparency and accountability.

5) There is difference in the perception of the stakeholders on the assessment of the socio-economic & environmental impact on the lives of the people in state of Delhi resulted due to the good governance initiatives taken by different government agencies of Delhi state.

6) There is difference in the perception of the different categories of stakeholders i.e. general public/citizens, political persons/elected representatives, legal professional/judiciary/advocates, bureaucracy/officials and media & communication professionals on the assessment of the socio-economic & environmental impact on the lives of the people in state of Delhi resulted due to the good governance initiatives taken by different government agencies of Delhi state.
7) There is no difference in the perception of stakeholders of different age groups i.e. young adults (18-35 years), middle aged (36-55 years and elderly (56 & above years) on the assessment of socio-economic & environmental impact on the lives of the people in state of Delhi resulted due to the good governance initiatives taken by different government agencies of Delhi State.

8) There is no difference in the perception of stakeholders of both the sexes on the assessment of socio-economic & environmental impact on the lives of the people in state of Delhi resulted due to the good governance initiatives taken by different government agencies of Delhi state.

9) There is difference in the perception of stakeholders on the assessment of the role of social audit in ensuring participation in decision making and improving accountability in governance of the different government agencies of Delhi state.

10) There is difference in the perceptions of different categories of stakeholder i.e. general public/citizens, political persons/elected representatives, legal professional/judiciary/advocates, bureaucracy/officials and media & communication professionals on the assessment of the role of social audit in ensuring participation in decision making and improving accountability in governance of the different government agencies of Delhi state.

11) There is no difference in the perceptions of stakeholders of different age groups i.e. young adults (18-35 years), middle aged (36-55 years and elderly (56 & above years) on the assessment of the role of social audit in ensuring participation in decision making and improving accountability in governance of the different government agencies of Delhi state.
12) There is no difference in the perceptions of stakeholders of both the sexes on the assessment of the role of social audit in ensuring participation in decision making and improving accountability in governance of the different government agencies of Delhi state.

Methodology

To carry out the objective of the study, 9 different agencies of the Government of Delhi were selected. The selection of agencies was based on a general survey conducted by asking people to respond to a single question that which is the government agency in their view which affects their day to day lives in a major way and they have to deal with the agency more frequently. In response, people named the field units of the agencies however it was thought appropriate to consider department as a whole instead of individual branch of the department as department is responsible for controlling the policies and implementation. Health and education were two of the major areas which could not be considered for study even when people had responded that these areas are also important for them. The main reason for not considering these areas was that the services were provided by public and private sectors equally in these fields. These nine departments were listed.

Agencies of Delhi State (9)

i. Delhi Development Authority

ii. Delhi Police

iii. Delhi Jal Board

iv. Food and Civil Supply Department

v. Municipal corporation of Delhi

vi. Revenue Department

Vii. Trade and Taxes Department

Viii. Electricity Department

Ix. Transport Department
Stakeholders were kept in five major categories.

Stakeholders (5)

a) General Public/Citizen
b) Political Persons/ Elected
c) Legal Profession/Judiciary/Advocate
d) Bureaucracy/ Officials
e) Media and Communications

All respondents were considered in three age groups.

Age groups (3)-

i. Junior Group -18-35 years
ii. Middle Group -36-55 years
iii Senior Group -55+ years

Genders (2) - Male and Female.

So the total numbers of survey forms collected after survey were 1350. The matrix is 2(Gender) X 3 (Age groups) X 5 (Stakeholders) X 9 (Agencies) X 5 samples in each category=1350

Three questionnaires were constructed for getting responses of the citizens on three of the different areas of research as outlined in the objective of the study. These questionnaires were tested for validity and reliability. Face validity was checked after having discussions and suggestions from 7 representatives and specialists on governance. These indicators were placed as positive statements in 5 point Likert Scale. Test-Retest reliability was checked for all the three questionnaires, giving 45 days gap with 30 separate set of
stakeholders. Trade and Taxes department (earlier, Sales Tax department) of government of Delhi was selected as some of the major initiatives were taken recently by the department towards achieving goals of good governance. Selection of single department is essential for getting correct responses instead of generalized responses. Pearson Co-relation Co-efficient is calculated for each three categories and in all the cases the value of the co-relation co-efficient is more than 0.7. These questionnaires are

*Questionnaire survey Form I – Assessment of Good Governance.*

There are eight characteristics of good governance, so positive statements were constructed for the assessment of each characteristic. These characteristics were to evaluate the organization if its policies and procedure are.

i) Consensus oriented governance

ii) Participatory governance

iii) Rule of Law in governance

iv) Responsiveness in governance

v) Equitable and Inclusive governance

vi) Effective and Efficient governance

vii) Transparency in governance

viii) Accountability in governance

*Questionnaire survey Form II – Assessment of impact of Good Governance Initiatives*

The statements for assessment the impact of initiatives taken by government of Delhi were constructed and then collected under 3 categories.

ix) Economic Impact Assessment

x) Social Impact Assessment

xi) Environment Impact Assessment
These were broad categories as stakeholders can feel a visible impact of working procedure and conditions under these three categories broadly.

*Questionnaire survey Form III -- Assessment of Role of Social Audit* :- In this category also 30 statements were constructed based on literature and stakeholder opinions so that any such audit become relevant.

After the finalization of questionnaires, data is collected from 1350 respondents as per the matrix-9(Agencies) X 5(Stakeholders) X 2(Sexes) X 3(Age-groups) X 5(sample of each) = 1350

The data is tabulated and four way analysis of variance tests are conducted. Results are analyzed, discussed and conclusions drawn.

**Results**

**A) Assessment of Good Governance**

There are eight characteristics of good governance on which evaluation is being done.

1. **Consensus in governance** The result (table 5.1.1) shows that differences in the perception of different stakeholders and age groups exeunt, as results are significant at 1% level. In case of 3 way interactions, the differences are perceptible between Departments, sexes and age groups and stakeholders, sexes and age groups (table 5.1.1.1).

Young adults (Table5.1.1.2) have better mean score. In three way interactions middle aged males have given better opinion about electricity department on consensus characteristic (table 5.1.1.4). Younger males of media and communication have (table 5.1.1.5) highest mean scores.
2. **Participatory governance**: The result of analysis of variance (table 5.1.2) shows that stakeholder’s category has shown significant results at 1% level. The two way interactions between stakeholders and sexes, stakeholders and age groups, and sexes and age groups are also significant. Three ways interaction of stakeholders, sexes and age groups is significant at 1% level of significance. Mean table for stakeholders and sexes (table 5.1.2.1) shows that mean score is highest for female ordinary citizens and lowest (26.18) for female political people. The mean score of young media personnel (table 5.1.2.2) is also highest (29.99), which is below 30. Aged females (table 5.1.2.3) have highest mean score (30.33).

3. **Rule of Law in governance** The F ratio (table 5.1.3) is significant for only stakeholders at 1% level of significance. For two-way interactions, the results are significant for interactions between stakeholders and sexes, sexes and age group at 1% levels and stakeholders and sex at 5% level of significance. The mean score (31.62) of female citizens is highest (table 5.1.3.1) for female citizens. Young and middle-aged stakeholders (Table 5.1.3.2) have mean score above 30 and thus they appreciate that the rules and procedures that are followed. Elderly males and middle aged females (Table 5.1.3.3) have mean score less than 30, which mean these two categories are not sure if agencies are fair and follows rule of Law.

4. **Responsiveness in governance** The results shows that (table 5.1.4) the significant differences exist in interaction between stakeholders and age groups and three way interactions in stakeholders, sexes and age groups as only for these, results are significant at 1% level of significance. The mean score for bureaucrats/officials is highest (31.61) which shows that they perceive that agencies/departments are
responsive (table 5.1.4.1). Young male media persons have mean score of 34.04, (table 5.1.4.2) which shows that they find that the department responds and reacts to the requirements of the people/stakeholders. Young media males (34.04), middle aged ordinary citizen males (32.38) and young official males (32.33) are categories, which have a strong belief and agreed that administrative machinery is responsive (Table 5.1.4.2).

5. Equitable and Inclusive governance The results (table 5.1.5) are significant at 1% for sex and age groups. Two way interactions of stakeholders and sex, stakeholder and age groups and sex and age groups are significant at 5% level of significance. The three way interaction of stakeholder, sex and age groups is also significant at 1% of significance. Further mean score shows that Females (29.08) have scored better than males (27.54 for all stakeholders collectively (table 5.1.5.1). While politicians are not convinced that system is equitable and inclusive, ordinary citizens also agree with them and do not find system is equitable. Elderly people (Table 5.1.5.2) have opinion that agencies fair better on this parameter and average score is decreasing for middle and young person’s respectively but again mean score is less than 30. Elderly female (table 5.1.5.3) have also scored higher (30.6), which means that they also find policies of departments equitable. In three way interaction (table 5.1.5.4), elderly political males have scored highest (32.6) while middle and elderly legal females have scored second highest (32.33).

6. Effective and Efficient governance The results (table 5.1.6) are significant at 1% for 2 way interaction of stakeholders and sex, stakeholders and age groups and sex and age group. In case of three ways interaction of stakeholders, sex and age group,
the result is significant at 5% level of significance only. Similarly, interaction of all the 4 sources of variations is not significant at 1% level. Average table of means Table (5.1.6.1) shows that female citizens have scored better (30.10) which indicate that they find the system and policies of agencies effective and efficient. In case of stakeholder category, only ordinary citizens have scored more than 30. In case of age groups (table 5.1.6.2) elderly stakeholders have rated system better than other two age groups, closely followed by middle aged and young stakeholders respectively. Elderly females (31.53) have rated it better than all other age groups (table 5.1.6.3) followed by middle-aged females and young males, both at mean score of 30.12. In four ways interactions (Table 5.1.6.5), middle-aged female political persons have scored more than 30 except for Municipal Corporation of Delhi.

7. Transparency in governance The results on transparency characteristic of governance indicate that (table 5.1.7) these are significant at 1% level of significance for age groups only. In two-way interactions also it is significant at 1% level for sex and age groups. In 3 way interactions, it is significant only for interaction between stakeholders, sex and age groups. Young males (31.45) have opinion that transparency (table 5.1.7.2) is being followed in the departments. However the mean score for elderly male citizens (table 5.1.7.3) is lowest i.e. 27.17 followed by young female political persons (28.2). Three categories of stakeholders i.e. legal professionals, officials and media professionals (Table5.1.7.1) have mean score more than 30 which shows that these three categories have opined that transparency in the agencies of Delhi Government does exist. Young and middle aged males have scores more than 30(Table 5.1.7.3).
8. Accountability in governance The analysis of variance (table 5.1.8) shows that results are significant for categories of stakeholders and age groups. Similarly, results are significant for interactions between stakeholders and sex, sex and age groups at 1% of level of significance. It is significant for stakeholders and age groups at 5% level of significance. In case of three way interactions stakeholders X sex X age groups are significant at 1% level. Four ways interactions are significant as departments X stakeholders X sex X age groups shows that result are significant at 1% level of significance. Elderly females find (table 5.1.8.1) that accountability is there in the system (score = 31.94). Highest score (34.4) of elderly female government officials indicates that they have rated accountability higher as compared is all other categories of the stakeholders (table 5.1.8.4).

9. Overall Assessment of all characteristics of Good Governance The Analysis of variance table (table 5.1.9) shows that results are significant at 1% level for departments and stakeholders only. Similarly results are significant at 1% level for departments X sex, departments X age groups, stakeholders X sex and sex X age groups. Three ways interaction is significant for departments X sex X age groups. Four ways interaction is also significant at 1% level of significance.

The table of means (table 5.1.9.1) shows that females have scored more (236.21) as compared to males, which means they are more convinced that governance is good. Highest mean score (301.2) for Delhi Jal Board is for young female officials category and second highest (282.6) for Municipal Corporation of Delhi by young males of official category. The rating of the departments on good governance by respondents (Table 5.1.9.1) is (1) Delhi Jal Board, (2) Electricity and Transco, (3) Transport, (4)

B) Overall Assessment of Good Governance Initiatives

Results (Table 5.2.4) shows that these are not significant at 1% level for any other variables individually but significant at 5% level for sexes only. Two-way interactions are significant for stakeholders and sex and sex and age groups at 1% level. Three way and four ways interaction is also not significant except for interaction of stakeholders, sex and age groups, at 5% level of significance only.

Table 5.2.4.1 shows that mean score of all the stakeholder’s categories is more than 105, which means all the five stakeholder categories are convinced that initiatives taken by agencies to achieve goal of good governance have achieved the goal. Figure 5.2.1 shows that there is great disparity in the opinion expressed by males and females in all categories of except for legal professionals. Results also show that (Table 5.2.4.2) all age groups have mean score more than 105. Figure 5.2.2 shows that middle aged citizens, elderly politicians and young legal professionals have a great difference of opinion on good governance initiatives as compared to other age groups of same category of stakeholders. Young media professionals have score less than 105. In case of interaction between sexes and age groups (Table 5.2.4.3), mean score is more than 105 in all cases, which explains that males and females in all age groups have agreed that good governance initiatives taken by government in Delhi had positive impact on the lives of the people. The ranking of agencies on the evaluation of impact of initiatives is as follows:
1. Delhi Jal Board, 2) Transport Department, 3) Electricity Department, 4) Trade and Taxes Department, 5) Food and Civil Supplies Department, 6) Delhi Development Authority, 7) Delhi Police, 8) Municipal Corporation of Delhi and 9) Revenue Department.

1. Assessment of Economic impact The result (Table 5.2.1) shows that differences are significant for the categories of stakeholders, sexes and age groups. Two ways interactions are significant at 1% level of significance for stakeholders and sex, stakeholders and age groups and sex and age groups. Three ways interactions are significant at 1% level for stakeholders, sex and age groups. All the stakeholders’ categories have mean score more than 33, which mean that all stakeholders feel that good governance initiatives impacted the economic situation (Table 5.2.1.1). Persons of all age groups (Table 5.2.1.2) have also expressed their opinion that initiatives have resulted in impacting the lives of people in a positive way. In case of interactions between sexes and age groups (Table 5.2.1.3), the mean score of young males is highest (38.01) and all categories have scored more than 33. This means while all categories appreciate that initiatives have economic impacts, young males have strongly supported this contention. The mean score of young male legal professionals is highest (40.86) followed by middle aged male official category which means these two categories of persons have appreciated the economic impact of initiatives the most.

2. Assessment of Social impact The result (Table 5.2.2) shows that these are significant for sexes only. Two-way interaction is significant at 1% level of significance for stakeholders and sexes; and sexes and age groups. Three-way
interaction is significant for stakeholders, sexes and age group. Four-way interaction for all the four variables is also significant at 1% level of significance. The mean score for all the stakeholders’ categories is more than 42, which means that all stakeholders are of the opinion that initiatives taken by agencies of Delhi government have resulted in social improvements. Same is the views of both the sexes i.e. males and females categories. In 12 categories out of 270, mean scores have been more than 50, which explains that in these cases, stakeholders have highly appreciated the social impact of initiatives. Such categories of stakeholders scoring more than 50 are Delhi Development Authority (1), Delhi Jal Board (1), Food and Civil Supplies (2), Revenue Department (1), Trade and Taxes (4), Electricity (2) and Transport department (1). Highest (56) mean score is by middle-aged females for Food and Civil Supplies department.

3. Assessment of Environmental Impact Results (Table 5.2.3) is significant at 1% level of significance for departments, stakeholders and sex. Two-way interactions are also significant for all the six interactions for four variables i.e. departments, stakeholders, sex and age groups. Three way interactions are significant for all the four interactions of 4 variables. Similarly four-way interaction is significant. This explains that there are differences in opinions expressed by stakeholders as per sex and age groups for different agencies of the government. All stakeholders have mean score (Table 4.2.3.1) more than 30, except media professionals. Results show that mean score for both the sexes i.e. males and females are also (Table 5.2.3.2) more than 30. In case of age groups (Table 5.2.3.3), all age groups have agreed that initiatives of departments helped in improvement
of environment, as mean score is more than 30. All stakeholder males and females (Table 5.2.3.4) have mean score more than 30 except female media professional.

C) Assessment of Role of Social Audit Results of the analysis of variance table for role of social audit (Table 5.3.1) shows that it is significant for the three variables i.e. stakeholders, sex and age groups at 1% level of significance. Two-way interactions are significant for stakeholders x age groups and sex x age groups at 1% level. Three way and four way interactions are not significant. Table 5.3.1.1 shows that all the stakeholders’ categories have mean score more than 90 which means that all the five categories of stakeholders believe that social audit has an important role in ensuring participation and accountability. Mean score for all age groups is also above 90. All interactions between stakeholders and age groups have mean score above 90 which explains that all these categories appreciate the role of social audit for having participation in decision making and have accountability. Individually, males and female stakeholders have a view that social audit does play a role in ensuring accountability but in two way interactions, young females have score less than 90 while rest of the age groups and sexes categories have mean score more than 90 (Table 5.3.1.2).

Conclusions

I) Assessment of characteristics of Good Governance

A) The exercise of development of questionnaire also confirms that these eight characteristics are major indicators or characteristics of good governance. Thus as a result of this study not only a valid and reliable tool/questionnaire has been designed but it also confirms the contention of UNESCAP (United Nation Economic and
Social Condition for Asia and the Pacific) that has identified eight major characteristics of good governance (figure 3.1).

B) The study also testifies that there are differences in the policies and procedures of government agencies of Delhi state as perceived by stakeholders on 8 characteristics of good governance i.e. consensus oriented, participatory, follow the rule of law, effective & efficient, equitable & inclusive, responsiveness, transparency and accountability. The agencies of government of Delhi have been evaluated as below

(I) Delhi Jal Board, (II) Electricity Department, (III) Trade and Taxes Department, (IV) Transport Department, (V) Revenue Department, (VI) Delhi Police, (VII) Municipal Corporation of Delhi, (VIII) Delhi Development Authority, (IX) Food and Civil Supplies.

C) This study also agrees that there is difference in the good governance assessment of different Delhi state agencies as perceived by different categories of stakeholders i.e. general public/citizens, political persons/elected representatives, legal professional/judiciary/advocates, bureaucracy/officials and media & communication professionals on 8 characteristics of good governance. Only officials are of the opinion that agencies of government of Delhi qualify to be good in governance. Other stakeholders i.e. politicians, legal professionals, media professionals and ordinary citizens do not agree that governance is good

D) The study does testifies that there is no difference in the good governance assessment of different Delhi state government agencies as perceived by the stakeholders of different age groups i.e. young adults (18-35 years), middle aged (36-55 years and elderly (56 & above years) on 8 characteristics of good governance.
E) The study does confirm the null hypotheses that there is no difference in the perception of the stakeholders of both the sexes on 8 characteristics of governance.

II Assessment of Good Governance Initiatives

A) The testing of reliability and validity of questionnaire/tool has been an exercise in evaluating that stakeholders have confirmed the contents and statements, which are nothing but indicators of assessment of good governance. These indicators have been placed under three categories i.e. Social, Economic and Environmental Impacts.

B) This study does not testifies that there is difference in the perception of the stakeholders on the assessment of the socio-economic & environmental impact on the lives of the people in state of Delhi resulted due to the good governance initiatives taken by different government agencies of Delhi state as the results were not significant.

C) This study does not confirm that there is difference in the perception of the different categories of stakeholders i.e. general public/citizens, political persons/elected representatives, legal professional/judiciary/advocates, bureaucracy/oﬃcials and media & communication professionals on the assessment of the socio-economic & environmental impact on the lives of the people in state of Delhi resulted due to the good governance initiatives taken by different government agencies of Delhi state. But all agree that good governance initiatives taken by government agencies in Delhi resulted in the development process (good governance).(Table 5.2.4.1).

D) This study confirms that there is no difference in the perception of stakeholders of different age groups i.e. young adults (18-35 years), middle aged (36-55 years and elderly (56 & above years) on the assessment of socio-economic & environmental
impact on the lives of the people in state of Delhi resulted due to the good governance initiatives taken by different government agencies of Delhi State.

E) This study testifies that there is no difference in the perception of stakeholders of both the sexes on the assessment of socio-economic & environmental impact on the lives of the people in state of Delhi resulted due to the good governance initiatives taken by different government agencies of Delhi state as results were not significant at 1% level of significance, however it was significant at 5% level of significance. Males and females collectively as group are convinced that initiatives of departments resulted in good governance (Table 5.2.4.1).

III) Assessment of Role of Social Audit

A) As a result of this study, valid and reliable tool/questionnaires have been designed. The exercise of designing a valid and reliability tools is essential to fix the criteria or indicators on the role of social audit and establish that social audit is not merely an assessment of physical and financial targets but achievement of satisfaction levels by the citizens. Satisfaction level can be measured only if study is able to evaluate and assess the attitude and perception about the performance in various activities undertaken to make governance good.

B) The study does not support that there is difference in the perception of stakeholders on the assessment of the role of social audit in ensuring participation in decision making and improving accountability in governance of the different government agencies of Delhi state as results are not significant.

C) This study confirms that there is difference in the perceptions of different categories of stakeholder i.e. general public/citizens, political persons/elected representatives, legal
professional/judiciary/advocates, bureaucracy/officials and media /communication professionals on the assessment of the role of social audit.

D) The study does not testify the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the perceptions of stakeholders of different age groups i.e. young adults (18-35 years), middle aged (36-55 years and elderly (56 & above years) on the assessment of the role of social.

E) The study does not support that there is no difference in the perceptions of stakeholders of both the sexes on the assessment of the role of social audit in ensuring participation in decision making and improving accountability in governance of the different government agencies of Delhi state as results are significant.

This study has been able to throw light on the fact that how citizens perceive that various agencies are working. The difference in perceived performance of agencies and within agencies, by different stakeholder, sexes and age-groups will offer an opportunity towards improvement in the functioning of these agencies. Where ever weak areas have been identified, corrective measures will have to be taken. Government has to create enabling environment and institutional changes along with appropriate human resource capacity building action.
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APPENDIX

SURVEY FORM I

ASSESSMENT OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

Name of Government Agency:

A. Biographic Sketch

1. Name
2. Address
   Telephone No. ______________
   Email ______________
3. Sex — Male/Female
4. Age Group:
   i. Young adults (18-35 years)
   ii. Mid. age adults (36-55 years)
   iii. Senior adults (55 years & Above)
5. Profession of stakeholder
   a. General Public/Citizen
   b. Political persons/Elected representatives
   c. Legal Professional/Judiciary/Advocates
   d. Bureaucracy/officials
   e. Media and Communication

a) Consensus Oriented

1. Policies of the Department have been developed on consensus.
   5 4 3 2 1
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
2. Views of Public/Stakeholders have been taken while framing polices.
   5 4 3 2 1
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
3. The policy of the Department reflects the mediation of different interest groups.
   5 4 3 2 1
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
4. Policies confirm to the aspiration and needs of all the stakeholders.
   5 4 3 2 1
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
5. Procedures and rules are framed in confirmation with mutually accepted norms.
   5 4 3 2 1
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
6. Decisions in the Department are taken keeping in view the needs/requirement of all.
   5 4 3 2 1
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
7. Decisions taken in the Department are based on broad consensus.
   5 4 3 2 1
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
8. Activities and actions of the Department are always in the best interest of the whole community.
   5 4 3 2 1
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
9. Implementation of policies of the Department helps in sustainable human development.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

10. Decisions taken in the Department are based on the understanding of historic, cultural and social context.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

b) Participatory:-

1) All Stakeholders are involved in decision making process.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

2) Procedures/practices are evolved through participation process.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

3) Department takes up activities which are recognized on priority basis by the community.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

4) Department aims at community self-determination.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

5) Department engages the community in an active way in solution of the problems.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

6) Department moves at a pace that is comfortable for the community.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

7) All the activities in the Department involve participation in organized way.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

8) Stakeholders are well informed about activities of the Department before they are involved in decision making.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

9) The decision making bodies are created based on representations of various stakeholders.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

10) The suggestions & recommendation of organized civil societies are valued in the Department.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

c) Follow the rule of Law

1) Department respects Human Rights & Fundamental freedoms.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

2) Department has a well developed Grievances redressal system.

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree

3) Department ensures that deadlines are met for all activities

- Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  strongly disagree
4) Department follows rules & procedures strictly.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

5) Department provides Legal remedies which are available at all levels.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

6) Department ensures that there is protection of Human rights.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

7) Minorities are adequately protected in the Department.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

8) Work force of the Department is impartial in its dealings.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

9) There exists an Independent appellant authority in the Department.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

10) There are impartial decision making processes and procedures in the Department.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

d) Responsiveness

1) Department has regards for public comfort and conveniences

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

2) Disposal of application/requests is quick.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

3) Department has reduced the number of sections with which the citizen has to deal with.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

4) Handy details of information on benefits/procedures are available to the citizen.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

5) Staff is extra responsive and goes beyond the fixed activities to help the citizen.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

6) The staff exhibits genuine sincerity and commitment towards development of vulnerable and backward sections.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

7) Good institutions and procedures exist in the Department.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

8) Department serves all stake holders without any discrimination.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree

9) Redressal of grievances is within reasonable time frame.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree strongly disagree
10) Department allocates budget as per the priority identified and needs of the stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e) Equitable & Inclusive**

1) There is equal opportunity for women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Policies of the Department have universal coverage for the poor of all sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Department focuses on most vulnerable groups (SC/ST/minorities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Policies of the Department are targeted towards disadvantaged (aged, disabled & children).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Department is always willing to consult and involve backward and illiterate people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) There is equal treatment to all within the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) All stakeholders feel that they have a stake in the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Vulnerable groups feel comfortable in dealing with the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) There is freedom of association in the Department for all the age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) There is no discrimination based on caste, creed or race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**f) Effective & Efficient**

1) Projects/works are finished in time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Department is prompt in delivering services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) There is decentralization of Power at all levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Systems and Procedures are well developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Computerization and automation in the Department are in advanced stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) High level of controls are exercised on expenditure.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

7) There is proper allocation of functional duties & responsibilities.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

8) Workload in the Department is distributed fairly.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

9) Delegation of powers at field office/Head office level is appropriate.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

10) Quality control systems do exist at all levels and for all services.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

g) Transparency

1) Decisions are taken as per laid down rules and procedures.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

2) Enforcements/actions are as per rules and procedures.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

3) Stakeholders have accessibility to Information.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

4) All information is available in easily understandable form and medium.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

5) Citizen charter contains all relevant information.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

6) The Right to Information Act is being enforced properly.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

7) There is a lot of transparency in dealing with citizen.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

8) Staff is adequately trained in communicating or dispersing information.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

9) There is a freedom of expression in the Department.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1

10) Department adheres to work ethics.

Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
5 4 3 2 1
h) Accountability
1. There is clear cut demarcation and fixation of responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The decentralization of power is adequate and appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Department is fulfilling its duties and obligations as expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Grievance redressal mechanisms are effective and responsive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Legal remedies are available at all levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Public officials feel responsible to inform and explain about their actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. There are norms to impose sanctions and punish power holders who violate public duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. There are minimum Corruption opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Corruption cases/ numbers are almost nil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. There is less/no misuse of power.

    | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
    |----------------|-------|-----------|----------|------------------|
    | 5              | 4     | 3         | 2        | 1                |
Impact of Good Governance Initiatives (GGI)

a) Economic Impact Assessment

1. Good Governance Initiatives encouraged economic development activities

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

2. Good Governance Initiatives enhanced job creation prospects.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

3. Good Governance Initiatives empowered the community in a meaningful way

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

4. Good Governance Initiatives helped in improvement of services.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

5. As a result of Good Governance Initiatives, Physical targets were met.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

6. As a result of Good Governance Initiatives, Financial targets were met

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

7. Good Governance Initiatives resulted in use local goods, materials and services.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

8. Good Governance Initiatives resulted in optimum use of all resources.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

9. Good Governance Initiatives achieved an annual surplus for investment and innovation.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

10. Good Governance Initiatives resulted in financial innovations at all levels.

    Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
    5  4  3  2  1

11. As a result of Good Governance Initiatives adequate economic and financial reforms came into being to improve efficiency.

    Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
    5  4  3  2  1

b) Social Impact Assessment

1. GGI resulted in offering one to one guidance and help.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1

2. Good Governance Initiatives developed structures and policies which facilitated community control.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
   5  4  3  2  1
3. GGI supported and benefited the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. GGI strengthened the capacity of people and organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. GGI provided information, advice and support to community groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. GGI stimulated and strengthened the local community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. GGI treated everyone fairly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. GGI empowered vulnerable groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. GGI involved young people in governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. GGI generated positive media coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. GGI helped in supporting and encouraging personal development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. GGI developed an open, transparent & supporting culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. GGI resulted in developing processess of the Department as per the needs of the society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Results of GGI are as per the aspiration of the public/public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

c) Environmental Impact Assessment

1) GGI adopted environmental friendly policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Good Governance Initiatives minimized impact of development on environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) GGI complied with relevant environmental laws/regulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) GGI used techniques of re-using or re-cycling wherever possible.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

5) GGI adopted policies to reduce energy consumption.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

6) GGI maintained and developed a sustainable organization.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

7) GGI adopted and implanted effective health and safety policies.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

8) GGI ensured that adequate care is taken towards protection of environment.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

9) GGI resources are being used in an efficient way  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

10) GGI activities confirm to the sustainable use of resources.  
    | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
    | Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
SURVEY FORM III

Role of Social Audit

1. SA will contribute towards Department efficiency.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

2. SA will help in advising social and ethical goods and value.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

3. SA will create transparency and confidence in people.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

4. SA will ensure accountability of the Department.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

5. SA will provide verifiable and verified data to substantiate claims on social and ethical performance.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

6. SA will act as tool to enhance inclusion, partnership and participation.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

7. SA will help in fixing the Department priorities as per actual need of the people.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

8. SA will help in assessing quality of the relationships with and the perceptions of the stakeholders.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

9. SA will give a tangible quality to the abstract notice of transparency and the right of information.
   5  4  3  2  1
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

10. SA will lead to the crystallization of issues and priorities.
    5  4  3  2  1
    Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

11. SA will ensure transparency and inclusion of vulnerable group.
    5  4  3  2  1
    Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

12. SA will help in achieving participation of all stakeholders.
    5  4  3  2  1
    Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

13. SA will improve quality of decision making.
    5  4  3  2  1
    Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

14. SA will improve accountability.
    5  4  3  2  1
    Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

15. SA will ensure responsiveness.
    5  4  3  2  1
    Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree
16. SA will inculcate culture of rule of law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. It facilitates and encourages the sharing of information and experience in social, community and co-operative economy sectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. It will improve financial performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. SA helps in managing visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. SA help in aligning strategy and operations with aims and values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. SA will establish the Departments boundaries of responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. SA helps in influencing the development of public policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. It improves the performance and deepen the existing commitment to involving stakeholders in their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Develops performance indicators that are relevant to its stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. It reveals how to provide services that give best value to residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. It enhances commitment to actively promote openness, and report on sustained accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. It identifies room for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. It assess the ethical behavior of the organization in relation to its aims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. It enhances capacity building efforts at each levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. It encourages growth in the community through solving the problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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